UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 89— PART 4

MAY 14, 1943, TO JUNE 14, 1943
(PAGES 4389 TO 5838)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1943

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 14, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 12, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, whose truest words to us are heard in the silences of the soul, give Thy servants quiet hearts and open minds lest while we are busy here and there we miss the vision splendid. May the fret and fever of our own spirits not add to the confusion of a confused age instead of helping and healing.

Lift us, we pray Thee, above the foggy valley of narrow loyalties and partisan interests to vaster vistas where small things are seen as small, and great things as great. In all our attitudes and decisions give us perspective and horizon. Remove far from us even unconscious bigotries and antipathies. Help us to recognize truth and to welcome revelation, from whatever quarter they arise. Disappointed with ourselves, shamed by our sins, defeated by life, haunted by fears, wounded by the world, we would find strength in Thy presence, forgiveness in Thy grace, cleansing in Thy mercy, and victory in Thy love. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 13, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Butler	Ferguson
Austin	Byrd	George
Bailey	Capper	Gerry
Ball	Caraway	Gillette
Bankhead	Chandler	Green
Barbour	Chavez	Guffey
Bilbo	Clark, Idaho	Gurney
Bone	Clark, Mo.	Hatch
Brewster	Connally	Hawkes
Bridges	Danaher	Hayden
Brooks	Davis	Hill
Buck	Downey	Holman
Burton	Eastland	Johnson, Colo.
Bushfield	Ellender	Kilgore
La Follette	Nye	Thomas, Utah
Langer	O'Daniel	Tobey
Lodge	Overton	Tunnell
Lucas	Radcliffe	Tydings
McClellan	Reed	Vandenberg
McFarland	Revercomb	Van Nuys
McNary	Reynolds	Wagner
Maloney	Robertson	Walsh
Maybank	Russell	Wheeler
Mead	Scrugham	Wherry
Millikin	Stewart	White
Moore	Taft	Wiley
Murdock	Thomas, Idaho	Wilson
Murray	Thomas, Okla.	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD—STABILIZATION OF WAGES, ETC.

A letter from the Chairman of the National War Labor Board, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 130 (submitted by Mr. BYRD; agreed to April 9, 1943), a report on wage increases and adjustments covering the period from January 12, 1942, to March 31, 1943, not including any analysis of the effects of Executive Order 9238, of April 8, 1943 (with accompanying papers); ordered to lie on the table.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Administrator of the War Food Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 40

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation to establish a military and a naval academy on the Pacific coast

"Whereas the United States is to have a great Army and Navy and will need twice and three times the number of officers that West Point Military Academy and Annapolis Naval Academy can produce because these institutions have reached the limit of expansion at their present sites, cannot provide needed room for airplanes to fly and tanks to maneuver and cannot teach adequately more students than they have taught in the past; and

"Whereas there are many miles of coast along the Pacific which would afford the country ideal locations for both a military and a naval academy; and

"Whereas world conditions and the war have made it advisable that cadets and midshipmen can be made familiar with the Pacific coast as well as with the Atlantic coast; and

"Whereas Army and Navy traditions could be maintained by having cadets and midshipmen receive their first 2 years of training on the Pacific coast and complete their training at West Point or Annapolis and in so doing become familiar with the west coast and the Pacific as well as with the east coast and the Atlantic: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized immediately to enact legislation to establish a military and a naval academy on the Pacific coast; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States, and that the Senators and Representatives from California are hereby respectfully requested to urge such action."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to old-age assistance

"Whereas it is the desire of the Legislature of California to make sufficient provision for the needy aged of this State; and

"Whereas prior to July 1, 1941, the old-age-security law of California permitted a recipient of aid to receive up to $15 per month from certain specified sources, including the earnings of the recipient, without deduction thereof from the amount of his aid, and it was with the greatest reluctance that the Legislature of California in 1941 amended the California law to deny the aged this privilege, which amendment was made solely to enable the State to comply with the Federal Social Security Act as that act was construed by the Federal Social Security Board, and so to continue to receive Federal old-age assistance; and the Legislature of California believes that this privilege should be afforded to the aged, and that the withdrawal of the privilege was hasty and ill-advised; and

"Whereas at the present time a recipient of aid in California may receive income in addition to the aid only by showing excess need therefor, and submitting to the most detailed and onerous supervision of his personal budget, and so is discouraged from engaging in gainful employment despite the well-recognized need for the maximum utilization of the services of every American in the furtherance of the war effort; and

"Whereas the maximum amount of old-age assistance granted to an eligible aged person which the Government of the United States will recognize for the purpose of reimbursing the State to the extent of one-half of the assistance granted is $40, which sum is entirely inadequate under present conditions to provide an aged person with the necessities of life or permit him to maintain a proper standard of living: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the President and Congress of the United States are hereby memorialized to amend the Federal Social Security Act to provide for Federal participation at the present rate in the payment of aid in the amount of $60 to any eligible individual in any month, or, if this is not possible, to amend the Federal Social Security Act to permit the State agency, in determining need, not to take into consideration other income and resources of an individual claiming old-age assistance to the extent of $20, or such greater sum as the President and Congress may determine to be proper and just; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 32

"Joint resolution relative to auditing the accounts of the department of employment

"Whereas the receipts and disbursements of the benefit fund of the State department of employment receiving vast sums of money from employers and employees of California have never been audited by any State or Federal agency; and

"Whereas the employers of this State, subject to the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, normally pay 2.7 percent of the wages paid by them, into the Treasury of the United States; and employees pay 1 percent of their wages to that source; and

"Whereas it is desirable and necessary that every agency of Government expending money have a periodical audit of its books and accounts; and

"Whereas the Federal Social Security Board has made no allowance to the State of California for auditing the accounts of the department of employment, and has declined, itself, to make such audits for the California department of employment or a similar department in any other State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to pass such legislation as will make it mandatory upon the Social Security Board to allocate funds to the various States of the Union, and particularly to this State, for a proper audit under the supervision of the State department of finance, of the funds and accounts of the State department of employment; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, every Member of the Senate and House of Representatives from California, the Social Security Board, and every Governor and State legislature."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 375. A bill for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 235).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 426. A bill for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding; with an amendment (Rept. No. 236); and

S. 1001. A bill for the relief of the Meadow Brook Club; with an amendment (Rept. No. 237).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 761. A bill for the relief of Charles T. Dulin; without amendment (Rept. No. 238).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 929. A bill for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson; without amendment (Rept. No. 239).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 897. A bill to amend the act known as the Insecticide Act of 1910 (36 Stat. 331), approved April 26, 1910; with an amendment (Rept. No. 240).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mrs. CARAWAY:

S. 1107. A bill to incorporate the United States Army Mothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary

(Mr. WAGNER introduced Senate bill 1108, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1109. A bill to increase by $400,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce and have appropriately referred a bill dealing with matters in relation to the Commodity Credit Corporation. I also request that the bill together with a letter written by the War Food Administrator, Department of Agriculture, to the Vice President, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and properly referred, and together with the letter referred to by the Senator from New York, printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1108) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting from the first sentence thereof the term "31st of March" where that term first appears therein and substituting in lieu thereof the term "30th of June," and by deleting from the second sentence thereof "on the basis of the cost, including not more than 1 year of carrying charges, of such assets to the Corporation, or the average market prices of such assets for a period of 12 months ending with March 31 of each year, whichever is less," and inserting in lieu thereof "on the basis of the cost, or insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower." Only one appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Corporation shall be made during the calendar year 1943 which shall be on the basis established by this amendment.

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the term "$2,650,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the term "$3,650,000,000."

SEC. 3. Section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by changing the designation thereof to section 7 (a) and by deleting from the first sentence thereof the term "June 30, 1943" and by inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1947, or the end of the second year following the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated, whichever is the later"; and is further hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the section and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "without regard to provisions of any other existing law relating to public funds: *Provided, however*, That the Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall determine the procedures to be followed in the transaction of the corporate business.

"(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation beginning with the period from July 1, 1943, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers: *Provided further*, That a report of such audit shall be made to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, and that each such report shall cover a period of 1 fiscal year and shall not be made until the Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture shall have had a reasonable opportunity, not to exceed 90 days, to examine the report, point out errors therein, explain or answer the same, and file a statement which shall be submitted by the Comptroller General with his report: *Provided further*, That a copy of each such report shall be furnished the Secretary of the Treasury and that the findings contained therein shall be considered by the Secretary in appraising the assets and liabilities and determining the net worth of the Corporation

under sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying legislation authorizing the use of funds of the Corporation for administrative expenses and requiring accountability therefor.

"(c) The expenses of the audit as provided in this section may be paid up to and including June 30, 1945, from moneys advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office, and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed promptly by the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller General: *Provided,* That any such advances or reimbursements shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses of the Corporation. For the purpose of such audit, the representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all papers, books, files, accounts, financial records, warehouses, and all other things, property and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation, and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with and balances in depositaries and with fiscal agents: *Provided,* That the certified financial reports and schedules of the fiscal agents of the Corporation based on commercial audits in the usual course of business may be accepted by the General Accounting Office in its audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation as final and not subject to further audit verification.

"(d) Any examination of the corporate records shall be made at the place or places where such records are normally kept in the transaction of the corporate business, and the Corporation shall retain custody of contracts, vouchers, schedules, or other financial or accounting documents, either original or duplicate, relating to its nonadministrative transactions."

SEC. 4. The Federal Reserve banks are hereby authorized to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The letter addressed by the War Food Administrator to the Vice President in relation to the bill is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, May 10, 1943.

The Honorable the VICE PRESIDENT.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith, for the consideration of the Senate, a draft of a proposed bill relating to Commodity Credit Corporation, entitled, "A bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes."

The proposed legislation combines in one bill several matters of importance to Commodity Credit Corporation in order to bring them to the attention of Congress at one time.

The proposed bill provides for an increase of $1,000,000,000 in the authorized borrowing power of the Corporation. This additional borrowing power is needed in order to finance the activities of the Corporation as a war agency and to enable the Corporation to carry out loan, purchase and other operations relating to cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, peanuts, potatoes, butter, cheese, hemp, flax, naval stores, soybeans, vegetable seeds, sugar, vegetables for canning, wool, and other commodities and production facilities. These operations are designed to bring about the necessary production of commodities now vital to the war effort and to afford price support to the producers of such commodities.

By the act of May 26, 1941 (Public, No. 74, 77th Cong.), as amended, the Commodity Credit Corporation was required to make available loans at the rate of 85 percent of parity on the 1941 through 1946 crops of the basic commodities, corn, cotton, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts. The act of October 2, 1942 (Public, No. 729, 77th Cong.), requires the Corporation to make available loans at the rate of 90 percent of parity upon any crop of the basic commodities harvested after December 31, 1941, and before the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated. Section 4 of the act of July 1, 1941 (Public, No. 147, 77th Cong.), the Steagall amendment, directs the use of funds available to Commodity Credit Corporation, if found necessary to encourage the expansion of production of any nonbase agricultural commodity, through a loan, purchase, or other operation, so as to support a price to the producers of such nonbasic agricultural commodity of not less than 85 percent of the parity or comparable price. The act of October 2, 1942, amended the Steagall amendment by increasing the minimum support price level to 90 percent of the parity or comparable price, and by requiring, as in the case of mandatory loans on the basic agricultural commodities, that the price supporting operation with respect to any commodity be continued for at least 2 full years after the termination of the war.

Since under the terms of the latest amendment of the act initially extending the life of the Corporation as an agency of the Federal Government, the status of the Corporation as an agency of the United States will expire on June 30, 1943, it seems necessary and appropriate to formally authorize the Corporation to continue as an agency of the United States during the period it is required to carry out loan, purchase, and other operations under the acts of Congress referred to above. Accordingly, the proposed bill provides that its status as an agency of the United States be continued until "June 30, 1947, or the end of the second year following the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated, whichever is the later."

A revision of the basis of the annual Treasury appraisal of the Corporation is considered desirable in order to make the date of appraisal coincident with the end of the fiscal year, whichever is lower, rather than of the appraisal without sacrifice of sound accounting principles. The proposed basis is cost at the time of appraisal, or the average market values during the last month of the fiscal year, whichever is lower, rather than cost plus a year's carrying charges or the average market for 12 months, whichever is the lower. The Treasury Department has given informal assurance that it has no objection to these changes.

Further provisions of the bill relate to a proposal for an audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions. As a corporate agency of the United States, the transactions of Commodity Credit Corporation, other than administrative expense items, are not now audited and controlled by the General Accounting Office. Corporate capital fund transactions have been subject, however, to certain types of audit review, i. e., by examinations of the Federal Reserve banks and by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In addition, the United States Treasury has made annual appraisals of the net worth of the Corporation which are regularly reported to Congress. As the officers of the Corporation desire to secure an audit according to principles mutually satisfactory to the Comptroller General and the Corporation, the Secretary of Agriculture on November 28, 1942, wrote to the Comptroller General suggesting that a joint committee representative of both agencies be appointed to study and work out a recommended course of action to attain this objective. The Comptroller General agreed and a joint committee was appointed composed of three representatives of the Department of Agriculture and three representatives of the General Accounting Office. New legislation was deemed necessary since the General Accounting Office indicated that it does not have present legislative authority to make an audit of the type proposed. The committee held numerous meetings and after careful deliberations agreed that the legislation here proposed would be appropriate to suggest to the Congress. Both the General Accounting Office and the Corporation believe that the proposed legislation would provide an adequate type of audit for the financial transactions of the Corporation. Such an audit would serve to give to Congress a regular and official report of the fiscal affairs of the Corporation on which to appraise the discharge by the Corporation of its responsibilities.

The Comptroller General concurs in and approves that part of the proposed legislation relating to the audit. A copy of his letter of April 2, 1943, to the Secretary of Agriculture is attached.

Section 4 provides authority for the Federal Reserve banks to act as fiscal agents for the Corporation. At present, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation acts as fiscal agent for the Corporation, and the Federal Reserve banks, in turn, are employed as fiscal agents and depositories by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The proposed authorization would permit the direct use of the Federal Reserve banks by the Commodity Credit Corporation if that should become desirable. The Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System concurs in the recommendation of this section.

The passage of the proposed legislation is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that the proposed legislation is in harmony with the program of the President and it has no objection to the submission of the proposed bill and explanatory letter to the Congress for its consideration.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

CHESTER C. DAVIS,
Administrator.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WAGNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place insert the following:

"EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, there is hereby reappropriated for the fiscal year 1944 the unobligated balances of the funds made available for the purposes of such section 32 for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943. Such sums shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, other

appropriations made by such section or for the purposes of such section: *Provided*, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, funds appropriated by or for the purposes of section 32 of said act shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the maintenance, expansion, and operation of a school milk and lunch program under clause (2) of said section 32, without regard to the requirement therein relating to the encouragement of domestic consumption."

MARBLE PEDESTAL FOR BUST OF FORMER VICE PRESIDENT GARNER

Mr. CONNALLY submitted the following Resolution 150, which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Architect of the Capitol hereby is authorized to procure a marble pedestal for the bust in the Senate wing of the Capitol of former Vice President John N. Garner, the expense thereof, not exceeding $300, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Library.

THE PHILOSOPHY, AIMS, AND RESOURCES OF THE JAPANESE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address, entitled "The Philosophy, Aims, and Resources of the Japanese," delivered by him before the members of Barrister's Lodge, No. 48, Free and Accepted Masons, in Washington, D. C., on May 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR FOREIGN RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address, entitled "Our Foreign Relations," delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, at the meeting of the Six O'Clock Dinner Club, Minneapolis, Minn., May 13, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CAUSE FOR WHICH WE FIGHT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address entitled "The Cause for Which We Fight," delivered by him at the Jewish Relief Rally, Public Hall, Cleveland, Ohio, May 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIG BUSINESS AND THE WAR—EDITORIAL BY WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial by William Allen White, from the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette, reprinted in Labor, which appears in the Appendix.]

LONGER VOTING HOURS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Longer Voting Hours," from the Washington Evening Star of Friday, May 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. CHURCHILL'S VISIT—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Churchill Here Again," from the Times-Herald, of Washington, D. C., of May May 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHINESE EXCLUSION LAWS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a brief relating to the Chinese exclusion laws, prepared by James R. Wilmeth, national secretary of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, which appears in the Appendix.]

CURRENT PAYMENT OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to strike out section 6, beginning on page 97, line 12, and to incert in lieu thereof certain other words. Under the unanimous-consent order no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana or on any amendment proposed thereto.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, yesterday I had occasion to discuss the pending amendment to some extent, and I will ask the indulgence of the Senate a little while longer so that I may explain my proposal for the benefit of those who may not have been present yesterday.

As I stated on yesterday the effect of my amendment would be to strike from section 6 of the pending bill that portion of the section which would cancel taxes, and substitute therefor a method by which the taxes ior 1942 could be discharged by the taxpayer.

If my amendment should be adopted, there would be no cancelation whatever of any of the taxes. The pay-as-you-go plan as incorporated in the pending bill would remain as written. All the taxes paid by the taxpayer in 1943 under his 1942 tax bill would be applied to the 1943 taxes, and the rest of the taxes for 1943 would be paid from the 20 percent withheld which is to be made from the taxpayer's income from July 1 to December 31 of this year as provided for in the pending bill, and the payment of the taxes for 1942 would be spread over a period of 5 years. The first payment of the taxes for 1942 would be due on March 15. 1944, and the amount to be paid by each taxpayer each 6 months would be one-tenth of whatever his 1942 taxes amounted to. So that by paying on March 15, 1944, and every 6 months thereafter, one-tenth of the 1942 taxes, the entire tax bill of the taxpayer would be discharged in 5 years.

Mr. President, that would be the only effect of the amendment. As I said yesterday, it would be almost criminal for the Congress to enact a law forgiving any taxes at this time. We are not in a position to cancel taxes. The President, as well as the Secretary of the Treasury, advised us last year and this year that it would be necessary to increase the tax bill by $16,000,000,000.

Mr. BILBO. If the Senator will yield, does he propose that interest shall be charged on the deferred payments for the 5-year period?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; there is to be no interest so long as the taxpayer keeps his deferred payments current. Should he default as to any of his payments, then the remaining installments will become due and interest will be imposed thereon.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am very much impressed by the Senator's amendment. I am also impressed by the article which appeared in this morning's newspaper telling us that $16,000,000,000 is the amount of additional taxes under the Treasury program.

Listening to the debate which has taken place here for the past 2 or 3 days, it seems to me that the important thing is the withholding tax of 20 percent. According to the argument which has been made, it is important because there is fear that the wage earner and the salaried man may spend their wages and salaries before the Treasury gets its cut.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the Senator that that was the genesis of the Ruml plan. It was an effort to put into the taxing net the salaried men and the vast number of new wage earners, and a smart idea was cooked up that in order to put us on a pay-as-you-go basis, that it would be necessary to cancel the taxes of those able to pay. Such cancelations, as I pointed out yesterday, ranged from over four to almost ten billions of dollars.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will bear with me a moment or two further, I wish to see if we cannot improve his amendment.

If we should adopt a withholding tax of 20 percent, what difference would it make to the Treasury whether it were paid on 1942 taxes or 1943 taxes? The dollars would roll into the Treasury exactly at the same time; they would come to the Treasury in the same quantity and number, whether we applied them on 1942 or 1943 taxes. The question then occurs to me, inasmuch as the Treasury is coming back to Congress later for additional taxes, why should we add the installments which the Senator from Louisiana contemplates in his amendment? Why not adopt the 20-percent withholding tax and let the law remain as it is?

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the effect of the Senator's suggestion would be that the taxes be discharged as they are now paid?

Mr. MURDOCK. Exactly as they are now paid.

Mr. ELLENDER. And add 20 percent?

Mr. MURDOCK. No. I do not mean to add 20 percent to them, but the idea of the 20-percent withholding tax, as I understand, is to reach the person who some are a little afraid might not pay his tax.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. If my suggestion is followed, and if we apply the 20-percent withholding tax under the present rate, and under the present tax, then we shall have accomplished the main thing that is desired by everyone, and we shall not forgive $9,000,000,000 in taxes, or add to the present burden. Is that not the proper solution of the question?

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be another way of doing it, but I propose to show that I think it is possible for most taxpayers to pay their normal taxes plus

the one-fifth which I propose be paid in addition each year. Let us consider the plan which will be submitted by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. He proposes to forgive 75 percent of the taxes for 1 year, and he further proposes to spread the remaining 25 percent over a period of 2 years. In other words, the deferred tax of a taxpayer to the extent of one-quarter of the entire 1942 or 1943 tax, whichever is lower, will be spread over 2 years, whereas under my proposal the tax for 1942 would be spread over a period of 5 years.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield for another observation?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have but 15 minutes. Of course, I may be able to take a little time in speaking on the bill, but I would rather not do so.

Mr. MURDOCK. I simply wish to make a brief observation. It seems to me that if the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] would get together on their two amendments we could then simplify what in my opinion is a very difficult situation.

Mr. ELLENDER. To continue my discussion, Mr. President, with respect to the so-called George amendment. Senators, listen to this. The amendment proposes to forgive 75 percent of the 1942 tax, or the 1943 tax, whichever is the lowest, and provide that the payment of the remaining 25 percent, that is one-quarter, shall be divided into two equal installments payable yearly. My amendment provides that the 1942 taxes shall be spread over a period of 5 years, and if I were to modify my amendment so as to make the period of payment 8 years instead of 5 years, the taxpayer would pay the same amount per year as he would under the George amendment. I feel confident that the distinguished Senator from Georgia has found it possible for a taxpayer to pay his normal taxes and one-eighth of the payments deferred as above set forth, otherwise he would not be advocating such a method. I believe that I can show that a taxpayer can pay each year his normal taxes and one-fifth of his 1942 taxes.

I realize that a few may suffer. There is a provision in the bill to the effect that in the event a taxpayer is unable to meet his taxes some discretion is left in the hands of the Commissioner to make an adjustment or ease his payments in some equitable and just manner.

Forgiveness of an entire year's taxes, as proposed in the Senate bill, involves the unjust enrichment of many individuals. For example, a married person with a net income before personal exemptions of $100,000 is forgiven a tax debt of $64,060. If his income is $1,000,000, he is forgiven a tax debt of $854,000. These reductions in liabilities result in an increase in the net worth of the individual just as truly as if these huge amounts had actually been bestowed upon the individual in the form of a gift in cash.

The benefits received from such forgiveness will be immediate as well as ultimate. Not only will the estate of these individuals at time of death be higher than they would have been without the tax cancelation, but these persons can immediately enjoy the fruits of cancelation. They can borrow against their improvement in net worth.

Another way of looking at this unjust enrichment is to compare the amount of tax forgiven with the amount of income remaining or available to these individuals after taxes. The taxpayer with $100,000 net income will have left $35,940 after present taxes. The amount forgiven under the Senate bill is 178.2 percent of the income after taxes. In the case of the $1,000,000 income the amount forgiven is 585 percent of the income available after taxes. Even if this individual were to save every cent of the income available after taxes, the amount forgiven would amount to about 6 years' savings.

Another way of looking at the unjust enrichment which complete cancelation bestows on the high-income receivers is to compare the amount forgiven with the tax increases which the Congress has enacted in 1940, 1941, and 1942, for the purpose of strengthening our national defense and preparing for war finance. For the person receiving $100,000 of net income before personal exemption, the tax increases under the acts of 1940, 1941, and 1942 amounted to $62,833, or over $1,000 less than the $64,060 which would be canceled under the Senate bill. For the $1,000,000-income receiver, the tax increases since 1939 amount to $267,006. The amount forgiven, $854,000, is more than three times as great as the entire tax increases since 1939.

Complete cancelation of a year's taxes, or 75 percent cancelation of a year's taxes, or any other substantial percent cancelation which applies uniformly up and down the scale, must inevitably bestow unjust enrichment upon the higher income receivers.

The Senate Finance Committee bill would cancel $9,815,000,000 of 1942 tax liabilities and would add to the 1943 net income tax liabilities certain amounts attributable to the so-called windfall provisions which, in the aggregate, amount to $1,300,000,000, leaving a net cancelation of $8,500,000,000. It is bad public policy—bad for the morale of the Nation—to relieve taxpayers of an incurred liability of $8,500,000,000 while at the same time our President is calling upon us to strengthen the revenues for the fiscal year 1944 by $16,000,000,000. The public debt of the United States stood at $144,000,000,000 on May 10 this year and it is estimated that it will reach over $200,000,000,000 by the end of the fiscal year 1944. Why should we not collect the 1942 liabilities already incurred and have them apply toward the reduction of the public debt which, despite any revenue measures we can take during this war emergency, will almost certainly climb to $300,000,000,000 and perhaps more? The Federal Government cannot afford to cast away billions of assessed taxes. If relief for the armed forces were made applicable to the liabilities in 1942, the total 1942 liabilities would amount to approximately $9,500,000,000. If, as suggested, one-fifth of this were made payable each year for 5 years, the Federal revenues would be increased by $1,900,000,000 a year.

It should be noted that without cancelation, this $1,900,000,000 of revenue increase in each of 5 years is obtained in an equitable way, is fairly distributed over all classes of income—everybody contributes in accordance with our present conception of how the taxes should be loaded over the different income brackets. But if you cancel the taxes for 1942 and try to reimpose new tax rates, higher tax rates, which will bring in $1,900,000,000 additional revenue in each of 5 years, you will find that it is not possible to increase the upper middle and top brackets sufficiently to get anything like the same proportion of the $1,900,000,000 out of these classes as you will get under my suggestion that these taxes be postponed rather than canceled. If you cancel taxes you will inevitably shoulder most of the tax increase onto the lower and least-able-to-pay taxpayers. That is why I do not propose to cancel any taxes.

Now, it has been stated that the taxpayers simply cannot bear the tax burden which the suggested pay-as-you-go plan would impose upon them—that they cannot pay a full year's taxes and in addition one-fifth of another year's taxes. There are two answers to this argument. The first is that the incomes and the savings of the American people are now larger than they have ever been in the history of the country; and the second is that for the rank and file of the people, the great majority of average citizens, there is no alternative—they must pay higher taxes and it matters little to them whether these higher taxes result from new and higher rates or whether they result from the retention of the present rates but the liquidation in five annual installments of an additional year's liabilities. Under the postponement plan the great majority of individuals will fare about as well under one alternative as under the other. The only difference is that postponement avoids the unjust enrichment of the few in the upper, middle, and top income brackets through relieving them of their just share in the burden of financing the war.

Liquid savings of individuals throughout the country reached the unprecedented figure of $28,900,000,000 in 1942. This is almost three times the amount of individual savings in 1941 and is seven times the figure for 1940. It is nearly three times the tax liability on 1942 income.

The great increase in savings arose from the largest national income, $120,000,000,000, in our history. This income was largely paid out to individuals, predominantly in salaries and wages, and was paid to increased numbers of individuals, unemployment being at almost a minimum. The enlarged payments were distributed widely, with the lower income groups enjoying huge increases. Since price control held down

the cost of living, and rationing and the unavailability of many items, such as automobiles, restrained the amount of purchases which might have been made, a great part of the increased income found its way into savings.

This year income will be even higher and the volume of civilian goods and services smaller. There will be tens of billions of dollars of income above taxes that cannot be spent. For 1943, it is estimated, savings of individuals may exceed $40,000,000,000 after payment of taxes.

In practically every income group this will mean savings many times greater than the tax that must be paid. The following table shows average savings by income classes in 1942, together with average taxes paid. This table indicates that in 1942 the group with incomes between $1,500 and $3,000 saved on the average, after taxes, $338 apiece; those with incomes between $3,000 and $5,000 saved $943 apiece; and those with incomes of $5,000 to $10,000 saved $2,366 apiece.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks the table to which I have just referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

Average income, taxes, consumption and savings of families and single civilians, by income level, 1942 [1]

Income level	Average income and outlay					
	Money income	Taxes	Income after taxes	Consumption	Gifts to organizations	Savings
Under $1,500	$862	$4	$858	$845	$11	$2
$1,500–$3,000	2,139	14	2,125	1,763	24	338
$3,000–$5,000	3,813	57	3,756	2,767	46	943
$5,000–$10,000	6,716	208	6,508	4,049	93	2,366
$10,000 and over	21,074	3,932	17,142	6,999	153	9,990
All levels	2,558	104	2,454	1,808	29	617

[1] The averages cover approximately 41,000,000 civilian spending units, consisting roughly of 33,000,000 families of 2 or more persons and 8,000,000 single civilians.

Source: Office of Price Administration, Civilian Spending and Saving, 1941 and 1942.

Mr. ELLENDER. Much of the savings, particularly at income levels above $2,000, is highly liquid. The unprecedented incomes that are being received this year by the American public cannot be spent in full, without ruinous inflation. The result will be, among all income classes, unprecedented savings that could be utilized to meet increased tax liabilities.

Let me state this point in another way. The Department of Commerce reports that the disposable income of individuals for 1942 amounted to $108,800,000,000. This disposable income is income after taxes and was more than $20,000,000,000 higher than in any year since 1929, the first year for which comparable figures are available. The net savings of individuals are estimated by the Department of Commerce at $26,900,000,000, more than $12,000,000,000 in excess of their estimate for 1941, and more than three times their estimate for the banner year 1929. The net savings of individuals as a percent of the disposable income amounted to 24.7 percent in 1942. It is interesting to note that in 1929 the people of this country saved 11.1 percent of the disposable income and they did not save as much as that from 1929 to 1941. In 1941 they saved 15.5 percent of their disposable income.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the savings as a percent of disposable income of individiduals, 1929–42, be inserted in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

Savings as a percent of disposable income of individuals, 1929–42

[Amounts in billions of dollars]

Year	Disposable income of individuals	Net savings of individuals	Percent net savings to disposable income
1929	79.6	8.8	11.1
1930	70.7	5.8	8.2
1931	59.6	5.4	9.1
1932	45.6	2.6	5.7
1933	44.5	2.1	4.7
1934	51.0	3.3	6.5
1935	56.3	4.1	7.3
1936	65.2	6.1	9.4
1937	69.2	6.7	9.7
1938	62.9	4.4	7.0
1939	67.7	6.0	8.9
1940	73.2	7.5	10.2
1941	88.2	13.7	15.5
1942	108.8	26.9	24.7

Source: Survey of Current Business, May 1942 and March 1943.

Mr. ELLENDER. The point I am making is that no matter whether we use the S. E. C. savings figures, or the O. P. A. savings figures, or the Department of Commerce savings figures, we find that the people of this country are saving more and a larger percentage of their income, at almost all levels of income, than they ever have in the history of the income tax. These savings are mostly liquid and they are available for tax payment. The people cannot buy many of the durable goods that they have been accustomed to buying; their incomes are higher, their savings are high, and they can well afford to pay over the next 5 years a little so-called doubling up of taxes.

The suggested plan is that taxpayers pay a full year's taxes plus one-fifth of the 1942 taxes. Let us examine a few figures to see whether the total payments are unreasonable in years of very high national income and war emergency. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point of my remarks a table showing individual income and net Victory taxes for a full year under present rates, plus one-fifth of the 1942 income-tax liabilities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

Individual income and net Victory taxes for a full year under present rates plus one-fifth of the 1942 income-tax liabilities—married persons, no dependents

Net income before personal exemption	Income tax plus net Victory tax	One-fifth of 1942 tax	Total taxes	Effective rates of total tax
				Percent
$1,200	$21	$0	$21	1.8
$1,500	79	10	89	5.9
$1,800	144	21	165	9.2
$2,000	188	28	216	10.8
$2,500	297	46	343	13.7
$3,000	405	65	470	15.7
$4,000	647	106	753	18.8
$5,000	894	149	1,043	20.9
$6,000	1,173	198	1,371	22.9
$8,000	1,780	306	2,086	26.1
$10,000	2,467	430	2,897	29.0
$15,000	4,533	810	5,343	35.6
$20,000	7,100	1,290	8,390	42.0
$25,000	10,035	1,844	11,879	47.5
$50,000	27,075	5,066	32,141	64.3
$100,000	68,584	12,812	81,396	81.4
$500,000	440,747	82,800	523,547	104.7
$1,000,000	899,000	170,800	1,069,800	107.0
$5,000,000	4,499,000	874,800	5,373,800	107.5

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research.

Mr. ELLENDER. It will be noted that a married person with $1,200 net income before exemptions would have total payments in 1944 and each of the 4 subsequent years of $21, or 1.8 percent of net income.

If the income is $2,000 the total tax payments per year would be $216, or 10.8 percent of net income.

If the income is $5,000 the total payments would be $1,043, or 20.9 percent.

If the income is $10,000 the total payments would be $2,897, or 29 percent.

If the income is $100,000 the total payments would be $81,396, or 81.4 percent.

If the income is $1,000,000 the total payments would be $1,069,800, or 107 percent.

You will note from the table that the payments do not exceed the income until we reach incomes of nearly $500,000. When we get up to incomes of this size I submit that the taxpayer is likely to have accumulated sufficient assets with which to make the necessary income payments. Indeed, I would have no objection for these relatively few cases in the very high income brackets, if it were provided, as was done in the Ways and Means Committee bill, that discretionary power be bestowed upon the Commissioner to grant extensions for some further period in cases of undue hardship.

Under the plan that would not cancel any of the 1942 taxes, all war profits would pay their just and fair share of income taxes to the Federal Treasury. Once we begin to cancel taxes we must, to salve our consciences, try to figure out some device, or devices, or mechanisms

which will somehow or other make war profits bear their proper tax load. In the Senate Finance Committee bill we find two antiwindfall provisions designed to achieve this objective. The more I scrutinize these antiwindfall provisions the more I agree with the Senator from Virginia that they are discriminatory and that they would not operate in an equitable and fair way.

The first antiwindfall provision creates war profits out of distress. If 1943 incomes are low because of war dislocation, 1942 incomes are treated as if they were extraordinary and abnormal, whereas in truth they might well have been entirely normal. So this windfall catches war profits and victimizes the innocent that suffered dislocation in 1943.

So with the second antiwindfall provision. It is true that it would bring war profits under higher taxes if 1942 and 1943 incomes greatly exceeded the incomes of the base years 1938, 1939, and 1940, but it is equally true that it would treat as war profits, profits of those who for the first time came into their full earning capacity in 1942 and 1943 after years of trial and training during the period 1938 through 1940. I cannot subscribe to any measure which, in a vain attempt to catch war profiteers, would victimize millions of innocent people, some of whom had suffered dislocation in 1943 and others who for the first time came into their full earning powers in 1942 and 1943.

If we have no cancelation all war profits will pay their proper share of taxes without antiwindfall provisions, and I submit that no amount of ingenuity can supply antiwindfall provisions that would not operate in a discriminatory and unfair way.

Mr. President, I do——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will take a few minutes in speaking on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent order, all the time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I precluded, under the order, from speaking on the bill itself?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes. The order under the unanimous-consent agreement is that no Senator shall be allowed to speak over 15 minutes on the amendment or any amendment thereto.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have always asked for strict enforcement of orders made in pursuance of unanimous-consent agreements in order that the Senate may pursue its work in an orderly fashion. We are under obligation today to proceed under the order previously entered. Much as I hesitate to do so, I shall object to any further time being granted for discussion of the amendment. I shall ask for strict enforcement of the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the amendment of the committee, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Murray
Austin	Gerry	Nye
Bailey	Gillette	O'Daniel
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barbour	Gurney	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hatch	Reynolds
Bone	Hawkes	Robertson
Brewster	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Scrugham
Buck	Holman	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Langer	Tobey
Caraway	Lodge	Tunnell
Chandler	Lucas	Tydings
Chavez	McClellan	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wagner
Connally	Maloney	Walsh
Danaher	Maybank	Wheeler
Davis	Mead	Wherry
Eastland	Millikin	White
Ellender	Moore	Wiley
Ferguson	Murdock	Wilson

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the amendment of the committee, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I transfer my pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who, if present, would vote "nay." I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is unavoidably detained. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is detained in committee. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—21

Bilbo	Guffey	Murdock
Bone	Hayden	Murray
Caraway	La Follette	O'Daniel
Connally	Langer	Russell
Eastland	McFarland	Scrugham
Ellender	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Green	Mead	Wagner

NAYS—57

Aiken	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Austin	George	Reed
Bailey	Gerry	Revercomb
Ball	Gillette	Reynolds
Bankhead	Gurney	Robertson
Barbour	Hatch	Stewart
Brewster	Hawkes	Taft
Bridges	Hill	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Holman	Tobey
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Bushfield	Kilgore	Tydings
Butler	Lodge	Vandenberg
Capper	Lucas	Van Nuys
Chandler	McClellan	Walsh
Chavez	McNary	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	White
Danaher	Moore	Wiley
Davis	Nye	Wilson

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Barkley	McCarran	Smith
Brooks	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	O'Mahoney	Truman
Downey	Overton	Wallgren
Glass	Pepper	Willis

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment to the committee amendment, as amended, was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Harry L. Englebright, late a Representative from the State of California, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CURRENT PAYMENT OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the committee

amendment, as amended, which is open to further amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I submitted a couple of days ago, which has been printed and is on the table, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Beginning on page 105, line 16, it is proposed to strike out down to and including the period on page 107, line 21, and insert "In the case of any individual who dies while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States and prior to the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, the tax imposed by this chapter shall not apply with respect to the taxable year in which falls the date of his death, and the tax under this chapter and under the corresponding title of each prior revenue law for preceding taxable years which is unpaid at the date of his death (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) shall not be assessed, and if assessed the assessment shall be abated, and if collected shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, this amendment has to do solely with the case of a man or woman who has entered the armed service of the United States, and who dies during the period of such service. The difference between this provision, as contained in the amendment which I have just offered, and the provision beginning on page 105 and running over to page 106, as contained in the committee amendment, lies simply in the fact that the net effect of the committee amendment finally works out to an abatement of the earned income of a man or woman who dies in the military service of the United States during the progress of this war.

Mr. President, I believe that there can be no serious question as to persons who have entered the armed services of the United States. If they die while in the armed services, the least the Government can do is to abate or cancel what taxes they may owe the Government of the United States at that time. The purpose of this amendment is simply to clarify that principle, because the language contained in the committee amendment is so complicated that it is not very easy to discern exactly what it means. The net effect of the language in the committee amendment is to limit the remission of taxes in such a case. My amendment, unlike the general provisions of the so-called Ruml plan, is a remission of taxes, and it is intended to be a remission of taxes, granted to persons who have entered the armed forces of the United States. I may say that, so far as I am concerned, I do not think this is a sufficient remission to persons who have entered the armed forces.

With regard to the first windfall provision of the committee amendment, being the provision which requires payment on the highest of 1942 or 1943 taxes, I thought that an exception should be made with regard to men and women who have gone into the armed forces, because it seems to me that persons in private life who are making comfortable incomes, or even large incomes, and who have not been able to accumulate the money to pay their taxes, or who at least have not accumulated it, and who then go into the armed services at very much smaller remuneration, should be given the option of electing whether 1942 or 1943 income should be taxed.

I offered such an amendment in the Finance Committee and it was rejected. I shall probably offer the same amendment before the conclusion of the consideration of this measure in the Senate. The amendment which I have presently offered has nothing to do with that. It has to do with the remission of taxes in cases of members of the armed forces. The question is whether we shall make a complete remission of their tax liability to the Government in case of their death. The only instance of persons in the armed forces being entitled to remission is in case of death. The question is whether we shall make a complete remission or make a remission only as to earned income.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the language of the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri appears at page 59 of the bill before us. It is in substantially the same language as the House text there printed. The chief difference is that the Senator from Missouri would insert the language "who dies on or after December 6, 1941."

Mr. President, the committee canvassed the proposal submitted by the Senator from Missouri with very great care. We considered the House language most diligently. It appeared to us that it was open to very serious criticism in three particulars.

In the first place, the House provision, or the Clark amendment as now offered, would grant relief only to those servicemen who are delinquent in their taxes. It would abate all taxes due to the Government at the time of their death.

In the second place, the House language, or the Clark version of it, would apply to all taxes, whether attributable to earned income or income from capital.

In the third place, the House language, or the Clark amendment, would extend relief all the way back for as many years as any serviceman was delinquent in his taxes at the time of his death. It seemed to the committee, as we considered those three phases of the Clark amendment——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that this is not an abatement of all taxes. It is merely an abatement of income taxes. It would prevent the Government from proceeding against the widow in case a man were killed in the service.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, under the first point of those which I have made, the committee took the position that such a remission would be unfair to those members of the armed forces who were conscientious in meeting their tax obligations and had paid up currently all the taxes due the Government.

The so-called Clark amendment would reward those who had been delinquent in their taxes and therefore would prove unfair to the servicemen who had paid their taxes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think if the Senator will read the amendment, he will find that his statement is not entirely accurate, because it would treat all soldiers alike. I share the Senator's objection to giving a premium to taxpayers who have become delinquent in paying their taxes, but, if he will read that portion of the amendment at the top of page 2 thereof, he will discover that, if the soldier has paid his taxes, they will be credited or refunded as an overpayment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, proceeding further to the points considered by the committee, we felt that relief with respect to taxes on unearned income would be unnecessary because such income would continue during the years the serviceman is in the armed forces, out of capital, or out of the source of income from which the taxes attributable to that income could be paid, and the tax could be paid whether he were in the armed service or not.

The committee bill limits the relief to taxes attributable to a man's earned income, and it seemed to us that that would prove to be adequate relief in all cases.

As to the final point the committee took the position that the proposed relief would prove to be extraordinarily great in some cases and would have no correlation whatever with the period during which the man was in the armed services. In other words, a man who had an income of $3,000, let us say, on which taxes were owing, would find the taxes against his estate remitted in the event of death, whereas another man, who had an income of $100,000 and who might have been delinquent for 1 year, 2 years, or 3 years, would be given an equal measure of reward, multiplied, however, by the amount of the tax which would be attributable to the much larger income.

Consequently, the committee felt that the taxes to be abated or refunded should be limited to those which become due and payable after the date the man was inducted into the service, assuming that he was on a quarterly installment basis. In no case would the relief extend to any taxable year earlier than the year preceding the effective date of the Selective Service Act.

Your committee therefore would extend relief only for those years during which the serviceman's obligation to pay taxes becomes unduly burdensome by reason of his diminished earnings resulting directly from his services in the armed forces of the country.

The points I have mentioned, Mr. President, were made the subject of extended debate and argument in the committee,

and the committee overwhelmingly rejected the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The amendment was never offered in the Finance Committee in anything like its present form. So far as I know the question was never discussed in the Finance Committee, and I was present at almost every meeting of the committee when consideration was given to the amendment. This is an entirely different proposal. As I stated on the floor a moment ago, I offered an amendment, which was rejected, to allow persons in the armed services to elect whether 1942 or 1943 should be taken. But to my knowledge this particular amendment was not offered in the committee. I believe I was present during every minute of the committee's consideration of the bill.

Mr. President, I should like to modify the amendment which I have offered. On page 1, line 3, of the printed amendment, after the word "dies" I should like to modify the amendment by inserting the words "after December 6, 1941", so as to read:

In the case of any individual who dies after December 6, 1941, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces—

And so forth. There was a defect in the amendment as I offered it, and I desire to modify it in that form.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri to what years the taxes would apply. What are the limitations as to the years to which the taxes would apply?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The amendment would apply to any taxes which might be owed by a sailor or soldier at the time of his death.

Mr. MALONEY. That might be for 1941, 1942, or 1943.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. MALONEY. There is no limitation as to time?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Missouri a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am perplexed by the final language of the amendment which would apparently provide for a refund of any deficiency which had heretofore been collected against a soldier who had died in service, and it apparently applies "under the corresponding title of each prior revenue law for preceding taxable years." Would that carry the refund back 10, 15, or 20 years, if during any of that period there might have been a deficiency paid?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That provision merely means that if the tax has been paid by the man's estate, it shall be refunded.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am afraid the Senator does not catch my point. Let us say that a soldier who dies in service has hanging over him at the time of his death an uncollected income tax for 1939, which was in dispute, and therefore not settled. Obviously, it is the purpose of the Senator to cancel that tax.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have no quarrel with that purpose, but in order to equalize that situation, apparently the Senator would also provide that any man killed while in military service, who may have had a similar dispute under any tax law during his life, would be entitled to a refund.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the tax were unpaid at the date of his death, yes. It seems to me to be inconceivable that the Government would permit any tax concerning which there had been a dispute to remain unpaid for any lengthy period of time. However, under this amendment, if the tax were unpaid at the time of the soldier's death, the amendment would protect the soldier's widow against the collection of the tax.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not quarreling with that theory. I am talking about a situation in which the tax has been paid. I am referring to the point at which the Senator is trying to equalize the situation as between the soldier who did pay and the soldier who did not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not understand that this would apply to a back tax. If the Senator will read the language of the amendment, he will find that that is certainly not my intention, or the intention of those who are in sympathy with it. We do not intend it to apply to previous taxable years. We intend this amendment to apply to current taxes which have not been paid.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I think I understand one of the difficulties which faces the Senator from Michigan. There could be no refund of a tax under this amendment unless the tax had been collected after the death of the soldier. That is my interpretation of it. If at the time the soldier is killed there is an unpaid tax, and if thereafter there is a collection of that tax, then there would be a refund.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If that is the correct interpretation, I have no quarrel with it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is certainly the intention of the amendment. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that I wish to put all members of the armed forces on a basis of equality. If after the death of a member of the armed forces his widow or his estate had paid this tax, then his widow or his estate should be put back in status quo with those who had not paid it. That is the intention of the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas, if I have the floor. The question as to who is in possession of the floor seems to be rather uncertain.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri is in possession of the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am interested in the Senator's amendment, although I think we ought to be very careful about a soldier who has given his life on the battlefield and has a family and children; when we are handing out $9,000,000,000 as a gift we ought not to be too generous with him; we ought not to give him a great deal, according to the contention of Senators. It seems to me——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator from Texas that he has never heard any such contention advanced by me.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true. I want to give the Senator credit because he has offered the amendment, but, it seems to me, when we go forth with our hands full of good old currency handing out $9,000,000,000——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yielded to the Senator from Texas for a question, not for a speech.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well; I will speak a little later.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Very well; the Senator can speak as long as he wants to speak in his own time.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut if I still have the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Missouri and I have collaborated so generously in sharing the floor, if I may put it in that way, I should like to emphasize one further point with reference to the Senator's amendment. I will present it in my own way, and he may make such further rebuttal as he chooses. I think it apropos that I take the floor.

Every legitimate objective, every purpose properly to be achieved under the very noble impulse of the Senator from Missouri, which we all share, can be achieved and attained under the committee amendment. I should like to have Senators turn to page 106 of the bill on their desks where they will find that there are three situations which we take care of.

If the individual entered upon service in the armed forces of the United States before the commencement of the taxable year beginning in 1943 the committee proposal provides that there shall not be assessed against him, and if assessed the assessment shall be abated, and, if collected, the amount so collected or credited shall be refunded:

First. In the entire amount of the tax attributable for the taxable year in which falls the date on which the soldier or sailor entered the service or as of September 16, 1940, whichever is the later.

The second case we deal with results in equal treatment for the entire amount of the tax so attributable for all subsequent taxable years during which the soldier or sailor was in the service.

And in the third case we take care of that portion of the tax so attributable for the taxable year last preceding the date on which he entered the armed forces or September 16, 1940, whichever date is the later, which bears the same ratio to the total tax so attributable as

the number of quarters in the taxable year described in subparagraph (A) subsequent to the date on which he entered the service, whichever is the later, bears to four.

That sounds like a complex formula, but the fact of the matter is that, technically, our draftsmen advised us that it had to be written in that way in order to take care of the four installment payments which mature annually, assuming that a taxpayer is on a quarterly installment basis.

Moreover, if the individual entered upon the service during the taxable year beginning 1943, the committee amendment would give fair treatment, as we feel, to that portion of the tax for the taxable year beginning in 1943, reduced by the increase under section 6 (b) of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, which bears the same ratio to the total tax so reduced as the number of quarters in the taxable year subsequent to the date on which a serviceman entered the service bears to four, to the extent that such portion is so attributable.

Abatement would be obtained, in other words, in the taxable year 1943 if a man entered the service this year, or for so much of the unabated quarters of the tax during 1942 as remained unpaid or if paid it would be subject to refund.

Mr. President, we also take care or sought to take care of other situations which it seemed to us fairly comprehended the overwhelming plurality of the taxpayers who enter the armed forces. The matter was very fully canvassed, and we rejected the House language, which, as slightly modified by the Senator from Missouri in his pending amendment, it seemed to us dealt unfairly to the Government and to all other taxpayers and even discriminated among taxpayers who are in the armed services.

Therefore, Mr. President, the committee reported the amendment which is apparent in the bill commencing on page 105, line 14, and running through page 107, line 20, if Senators wish to study it further.

I thank the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to the committee amendment as amended. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt. Those who are in favor of the amendment will stand. [A pause.] Those opposed will stand. [A pause.] The amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas will be stated.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be stated briefly.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

The amendment offered by Mr. CONNALLY to the amendment, as amended, of the committee in the nature of a substitute, is as follows:

That (a) this act may be cited as the "Current Tax Payment Act of 1943."

(b) Meaning of terms used: Except as otherwise expressly provided, terms used in this act shall have the same meaning as when used in the Internal Revenue Code.

SEC. 2. Collection of tax at source on wages.

(a) In general: Chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to employment taxes) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subchapters:

"SUBCHAPTER D—COLLECTION OF INCOME TAX AT SOURCE ON WAGES

"SEC. 1621. Definitions.

"As used in this subchapter—

"(a) Wages: The term 'wages' means all remuneration (other than fees paid to a public official) for services performed by an employee for his employer, including the cash value of all remuneration paid in any medium other than cash; except that such term shall not include remuneration paid—

"(1) for services performed as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, other than pensions and retired pay includible in gross income under chapter 1, or

"(2) for agricultural labor (as defined in section 1426 (h)), or

"(3) for domestic service in a private home, local college club, or local chapter of a college fraternity or sorority, or

"(4) for casual labor not in the course of the employer's trade or business, or

"(5) for services by a citizen or resident of the United States for a foreign government or for the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, or

"(6) for services performed by a nonresident alien individual, other than a resident of a contiguous country who enters and leaves the United States at frequent intervals, or

"(7) for such services, performed by a nonresident alien individual who is a resident of a contiguous country and who enters and leaves the United States at frequent intervals, as may be designated by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, or

"(8) for services for an employer performed by a citizen or resident of the United States while outside the United States (as defined in section 3797 (a) (9)) if the major part of the services for such employer during the calendar year is to be performed outside the United States, or

"(9) for services performed as a minister of the gospel.

For the purpose of paragraph (8) services performed on or in connection with an American vessel (as defined in sec. 1426 (g)) under a contract of service which is entered into within the United States or during the performance of which the vessel touches at a port in the United States, or on or in connection with any vessel as an employee of the United States employed through the War Shipping Administration, shall not constitute services performed outside the United States.

"(b) Pay-roll period: The term 'pay-roll period' means a period for which a payment of wages is ordinarily made to the employee by his employer, and the term 'miscellaneous pay-roll period' means a pay-roll period other than a weekly, biweekly, semimonthly, monthly, quarterly, semiannual, or annual pay-roll period.

"(c) Employee: The term 'employee' includes an officer, employee, or elected official of the United States, a State, Territory, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing. The term 'employee' also includes an officer of a corporation.

"(d) Employer: The term 'employer' means the person for whom an individual performs or performed any service, of whatever nature, as the employee of such person, except that—

"(1) if the person for whom the individual performs or performed the services does not have control of the payment of the wages for such services, the term 'employer' (except for the purposes of subsection (a)) means the person having control of the payment of such wages; and

"(2) in the case of a person paying wages on behalf of a nonresident alien individual, foreign partnership, or foreign corporation, not engaged in trade or business within the United States, the term 'employer' (except for the purposes of subsection (a)) means such person.

"(e) Single person: the term 'single person' means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that such person is single, or is married and not living with husband or wife, and is not the head of a family.

"(f) Married person: the term 'married person' means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that he is married and living with husband or wife.

"(g) Married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding: the term 'married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding' means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that for the purposes of this subchapter such person claims all of the personal exemption and that for the purposes of this subchapter his spouse is claiming none of the personal exemption.

"(h) Married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding: the term 'married person claiming half of the personal exemption for withholding' means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that for the purposes of this subchapter such person claims half of the personal exemption and that for the purposes of this subchapter his spouse is claiming not more than half of such exemption.

"(i) Married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding: the term 'married person claiming none of the personal exemption for withholding' means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) making no claim with respect to the personal exemption for the purposes of this subchapter.

"(j) Head of family: The term 'head of a family' means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that he is the head of a family.

"(k) Dependent: The term 'dependent' means a person included in a withholding exemption certificate in effect under section 1622 (h) as a person dependent upon and receiving his chief support from the employee and either under 18 years of age or incapable of self-support because mentally or physically defective.

"SEC. 1622. Income tax collected at source.

"(a) Requirement of withholding: Every employer making payment of wages shall withhold and collect upon such wages a tax equal to the greater of the following:

"(1) Twenty percent of the excess of each payment of such wages over the family status withholding exemption allowable under subsection (b) (1) (A), or

"(2) Three percent of the excess of each payment of such wages over the Victory tax withholding exemption allowable under subsection (b) (1) (B).

"(b) Withholding exemption.—

"(1) In computing the tax required to be withheld under subsection (a), there shall be allowed as a withholding exemption with respect to the wages paid for each pay-roll period—

"(A) in computing the tax required to be withheld under subsection (a) (1), a family status withholding exemption determined in accordance with the following schedule:

"Family status withholding exemption

"Pay-roll period	Single person	Married person claiming whole of personal exemption for withholding or head of family	Married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding	Married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding	Each dependent, other than the first dependent in the case of the head of a family
Weekly	$12	$24	$12	0	$6
Biweekly	24	48	24	0	12
Semimonthly	26	52	26	0	13
Monthly	52	104	52	0	26
Quarterly	156	312	156	0	78
Semiannually	312	624	312	0	156
Annually	624	1,248	624	0	312
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.70	3.40	1.70	0	.85

"(B) in computing the tax required to be withheld under subsection (a) (2), a Victory tax withholding exemption determined in accordance with the following schedule:

"Pay-roll period:	*Victory tax withholding exemption*
Weekly	$12.00
Biweekly	24.00
Semimonthly	26.00
Monthly	52.00
Quarterly	156.00
Semiannual	312.00
Annual	624.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.70

"(2) If wages are paid with respect to a period which is not a pay-roll period, the withholding exemption allowable with respect to each payment of such wages shall be the exemption allowed for a miscellaneous pay-roll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days in the period with respect to which such wages are paid.

"(3) In any case in which wages are paid by an employer without regard to any pay-roll period or other period, the withholding exemption allowable with respect to each payment of such wages shall be the exemption allowed for a miscellaneous pay-roll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days (including Sundays and holidays) which have elapsed since the date of the last payment of such wages by such employer during the calendar year, or the date of commencement of employment with such employer during such year, or January 1 of such year, whichever is the later.

"(4) In any case in which the period, or the time described in paragraph (3), in respect of any wages is less than 1 week, the Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, may authorize an employer, in computing the tax required to be withheld, to use the excess of the aggregate of the wages paid to the employee during the calendar week over the withholding exemption allowed by this subsection for a weekly pay-roll period.

"(5) In determining the amount to be withheld under this subsection, the wages may, at the election of the employer, be computed to the nearest dollar.

"(c) Wage bracket withholding—

"(1) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employer shall deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee a tax determined in accordance with the following tables, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be withheld under subsection (a):

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly

And the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
		Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
		Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—									
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
		Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
						No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—									
						No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
At least	But less than	The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$10	$1.00									
10	15	2.50	$1.30	$0.10							
15	20	3.50	2.30	1.10	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20
20	25	4.50	3.30	2.10	.90	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30
25	30	5.50	4.30	3.10	1.90	.70	.50	.50	.50	.50	.50
30	40	7.00	5.80	4.60	3.40	2.20	1.00	.70	.70	.70	.70
40	50	9.00	7.80	6.60	5.40	4.20	3.00	1.80	1.00	1.00	1.00
50	60	11.00	9.80	8.60	7.40	6.20	5.00	3.80	2.60	1.40	1.30
60	70	13.00	11.80	10.06	9.40	8.20	7.00	5.80	4.60	3.40	2.20
70	80	15.00	13.80	12.60	11.40	10.20	9.00	7.80	6.60	5.40	4.20
80	90	17.00	15.80	14.60	13.40	12.20	11.00	9.80	8.60	7.40	6.20
90	100	19.00	17.80	16.60	15.40	14.20	13.00	11.80	10.60	9.40	8.20
100	110	21.00	19.80	18.60	17.40	16.20	15.00	13.80	12.60	11.40	10.20
110	120	23.00	21.80	20.60	19.40	18.20	17.00	15.80	14.60	13.40	12.20
120	130	25.00	23.80	22.60	21.40	20.20	19.00	17.80	16.60	15.40	14.20
130	140	27.00	25.80	24.60	23.40	22.20	21.00	19.80	18.60	17.40	16.20
140	150	29.00	27.80	26.60	25.40	24.20	23.00	21.80	20.60	19.40	18.20
150	160	31.00	29.80	28.60	27.40	26.20	25.00	23.80	22.60	21.40	20.20
160	170	33.00	31.80	30.60	29.40	28.20	27.00	25.80	24.60	23.40	22.20
170	180	35.00	33.80	32.60	31.40	30.20	29.00	27.80	26.60	25.40	24.20
180	190	37.00	35.80	24.60	33.40	32.20	31.00	29.80	28.60	27.40	26.20
190	200	39.00	37.80	36.60	35.40	34.20	33.00	31.80	30.60	29.40	28.20
$200 or over		20% of the excess over $200 plus									
		$40.00	$38.80	$37.60	$36.40	$35.20	$34.00	$32.80	$31.60	$30.40	$29.20

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $1.20 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall (or if the wages paid are $200 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $12, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly

And the wages are		And. (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
		Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents		
		Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents		
		Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents				
		Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—									
At least	But less than	No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents				
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$20	$2.00									
20	30	5.00	$2.60	$0.20							
30	40	7.00	4.60	2.20	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	9.00	6.60	4.20	1.80	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	11.00	8.60	6.20	3.80	1.40	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	14.00	11.60	9.20	6.80	4.40	2.00	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40
80	100	18.00	15.60	13.20	10.80	8.40	6.00	3.60	2.00	2.00	2.00
100	120	22.00	19.60	17.20	14.80	12.40	10.00	7.60	5.20	2.80	2.60
120	140	26.00	23.60	21.20	18.80	16.40	14.00	11.60	9.20	6.80	4.40
140	160	30.00	27.60	25.20	22.80	20.40	18.00	15.60	13.20	10.80	8.40
160	180	34.00	31.60	29.20	26.80	24.40	22.00	19.60	17.20	14.80	12.40
180	200	38.00	35.60	33.20	30.80	28.40	26.00	23.60	21.20	18.80	16.40
200	220	42.00	39.60	37.20	34.80	32.40	30.00	27.60	25.20	22.80	20.40
220	240	46.00	43.60	41.20	38.80	36.40	34.00	31.60	29.20	26.80	24.40
240	260	50.00	47.60	45.20	42.80	40.40	38.00	35.60	33.20	30.80	28.40
260	280	54.00	51.60	49.20	46.80	44.40	42.00	39.60	37.20	34.80	32.40
280	300	58.00	55.60	53.20	50.80	48.40	46.00	43.60	41.20	38.80	36.40
300	320	62.00	59.60	57.20	54.80	52.40	50.00	47.60	45.20	42.80	40.40
320	340	66.00	63.60	61.20	58.80	56.40	54.00	51.60	49.20	46.80	44.40
340	360	70.00	67.60	65.20	62.80	60.40	58.00	55.60	53.20	50.80	48.40
360	380	74.00	71.60	69.20	66.80	64.40	62.00	59.60	57.20	54.80	52.40
380	400	78.00	75.60	73.20	70.80	68.40	66.00	63.60	61.20	58.80	56.40
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus—									
		$80.00	77.60	75.20	$72.80	$70.40	$68.00	$65.60	$63.20	$60.80	$58.40

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $2.40 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 percent of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $24, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly

And the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
		Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
		Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—									
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
At least	But less than	Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for with holding and has—									
						No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
		Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—									
						No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$20	$2.00									
20	30	5.00	$2.40								
30	40	7.00	4.40	$1.80	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	9.00	6.40	3.80	1.20	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	11.00	8.40	5.80	3.20	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	14.00	11.40	8.80	6.20	3.60	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
80	100	18.00	15.40	12.80	10.20	7.60	5.00	2.40	1.90	1.90	1.90
100	120	22.00	19.40	16.80	14.20	11.60	9.00	6.40	3.80	2.50	2.50
120	140	26.00	23.40	20.80	18.20	15.60	13.00	10.40	7.80	5.20	3.10
140	160	30.00	27.40	24.80	22.20	19.60	17.00	14.40	11.80	9.20	6.60
160	180	34.00	31.40	28.80	26.20	23.60	21.00	18.40	15.80	13.20	10.60
180	200	38.00	35.40	32.80	30.20	27.60	25.00	22.40	19.80	17.20	14.60
200	220	42.00	39.40	36.80	34.20	31.60	29.00	26.40	23.80	21.20	18.60
220	240	46.00	43.40	40.80	38.20	35.60	33.00	30.40	27.80	25.20	22.60
240	260	50.00	47.40	44.80	42.20	39.60	37.00	34.40	31.80	29.20	26.60
260	280	54.00	51.40	48.80	46.20	43.60	41.00	38.40	35.80	33.20	30.60
280	300	58.00	55.40	52.80	50.20	47.60	45.00	42.40	39.80	37.20	34.60
300	320	62.00	59.40	56.80	54.20	51.60	49.00	46.40	43.80	41.20	38.60
320	340	66.00	63.40	60.80	58.20	55.60	53.00	50.40	47.80	45.20	42.60
340	360	70.00	67.40	64.80	62.20	59.60	57.00	54.40	51.80	49.20	46.60
360	380	74.00	71.40	68.80	66.20	63.60	61.00	58.40	55.80	53.20	50.60
380	400	78.00	75.40	72.80	70.20	67.60	65.00	62.40	59.80	57.20	54.60
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus									
		$80.00	$77.40	$74.80	$72.20	$69.60	$67.00	$64.40	$61.80	$59.20	$56.60

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $2.60 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $26, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $10.10.

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly

And the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
				Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
				Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
						Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—					
						No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
						Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—					
						No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
At least	But less than	The amount of the tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$40	$4.00									
40	50	9.00	$3.80								
50	60	11.00	5.80	$0.60	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10
60	70	13.00	7.80	2.60	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40
70	80	15.00	9.80	4.60	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70
80	100	18.00	12.80	7.60	2.40	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
100	120	22.00	16.80	11.60	6.40	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
120	140	26.00	20.80	15.60	10.40	5.20	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30
140	160	30.00	24.80	19.60	14.40	9.20	4.00	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90
160	200	36.00	30.80	25.60	20.40	15.20	10.00	4.80	3.80	3.80	3.80
200	240	44.00	38.80	33.60	28.40	23.20	18.00	12.80	7.60	5.00	5.00
240	280	52.00	46.80	41.60	36.40	31.20	26.00	20.80	15.60	10.40	6.20
280	320	60.00	54.80	49.60	44.40	39.20	34.00	28.80	23.60	18.40	13.20
320	360	68.00	62.80	57.60	52.40	47.20	42.00	36.80	31.60	26.40	21.20
360	400	76.00	70.80	65.60	60.40	55.20	50.00	44.80	39.60	34.40	29.20
400	440	84.00	78.80	73.60	68.40	63.20	58.00	52.80	47.60	42.40	37.20
440	480	92.00	86.80	81.60	76.40	71.20	66.00	60.80	55.60	50.40	45.20
480	520	100.00	94.80	89.60	84.40	79.20	74.00	68.80	63.60	58.40	53.20
520	560	108.00	102.80	97.60	92.40	87.20	82.00	76.80	71.60	66.40	61.20
560	600	116.00	110.80	105.60	100.40	95.20	90.00	84.80	79.60	74.40	69.20
600	640	124.00	118.80	113.60	108.40	103.20	98.00	92.80	87.60	82.40	77.20
640	680	132.00	126.80	121.60	116.40	111.20	106.00	100.80	95.60	90.40	85.20
680	720	140.00	134.80	129.60	124.40	119.20	114.00	108.80	103.60	98.40	93.20
720	760	148.00	142.80	137.60	132.40	127.20	122.00	116.80	111.60	106.40	101.20
760	800	156.00	150.80	145.60	140.40	135.20	130.00	124.80	119.60	114.40	109.20
$800 or over		20% of the excess over $800 plus									
		$160.00	$154.80	$149.60	$144.40	$139.20	$134.00	$128.80	$123.60	$118.40	$113.20

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $5.20 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 percent of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $800 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $52, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period

And the wages divided by the number of days in such period are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
		Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
		Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—									
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
						Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—					
						No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
						Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—					
At least	But less than					No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period									
$0	$1	$0.10									
1	2	.30	$0.15								
2	3	.50	.35	$0.15							
3	4	.70	.55	.35	$0.20	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05
4	5	.90	.75	.55	.40	.20	.10	.10	.10	.10	.10
5	6	1.10	.95	.75	.60	.40	.25	.10	.10	.10	.10
6	7	1.30	1.15	.95	.80	.60	.45	.30	.15	.15	.15
7	8	1.50	1.35	1.15	1.00	.80	.65	.50	.30	.15	.15
8	9	1.70	1.55	1.35	1.20	1.00	.85	.70	.50	.35	.20
9	10	1.90	1.75	1.55	1.40	1.20	1.05	.90	.70	.55	.35
10	12	2.20	2.05	1.85	1.70	1.50	1.35	1.20	1.00	.85	.65
12	14	2.60	2.45	2.25	2.10	1.90	1.75	1.60	1.40	1.25	1.05
14	16	3.00	2.85	2.65	2.50	2.30	2.15	2.00	1.80	1.65	1.45
16	18	3.40	3.25	3.05	2.90	2.70	2.55	2.40	2.20	2.05	1.85
18	20	3.80	3.65	3.45	3.30	3.10	2.95	2.80	2.60	2.45	2.25
20	22	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.70	3.50	3.35	3.20	3.00	2.85	2.65
22	24	4.60	4.45	4.25	4.10	3.90	3.75	3.60	3.40	3.25	3.05
24	26	5.00	4.85	4.65	4.50	4.30	4.15	4.00	3.80	3.65	3.45
26	28	5.40	5.25	5.05	4.90	4.70	4.55	4.40	4.20	4.05	3.85
28	30	5.80	5.65	5.45	5.30	5.10	4.95	4.80	4.60	4.45	4.25
$30 or over		20% of the excess over $30 plus									
		$6.00	$5.85	$5.65	$5.50	$5.30	$5.15	$5.00	$4.80	$4.65	$4.45

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $0.15 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the product of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall and the number of days in the period (or if the wages paid are $30 or over, of the excess of the wages) over the product of $1.70 and the number of days in the period, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.05 to the nearest multiple of $0.05.

"(2) If wages are paid with respect to a period which is not a pay-roll period, the amount to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of a miscellaneous pay-roll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days in the period with respect to which such wages are paid.

"(3) In any case in which wages are paid by an employer without regard to any pay-roll period or other period, the amount to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of a miscellaneous pay-roll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days (including Sundays and holidays) which have elapsed since the date of the last payment of such wages by such employer during the calendar year, or the date of commencement of employment with such employer during such year, or January 1 of such year, whichever is the later.

"(4) In any case in which the period, or the time described in paragraph (3), in respect of any wages is less than 1 week, the Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, may authorize an employer to determine the amount to be withheld under the tables applicable in the case of a weekly pay-roll period, in which case the aggregate of the wages paid to the employee during the calendar week shall be considered the weekly wages.

"(5) In determining the amount to be withheld under this subsection, the wages may, at the election of the employer, be computed to the nearest dollar.

"(d) Tax paid by recipient: If the employer, in violation of the provisions of this subchapter, fails to withhold and collect the tax under this subchapter, and thereafter the tax against which such tax may be credited is paid, the tax so required to be withheld and collected shall not be collected from the employer; but this subsection shall in no case relieve the employer from liability for any penalties or additions to the tax otherwise applicable in respect of such failure to withhold and collect.

"(e) Nondeductibility of tax in computing net income: The tax withheld and collected under this subchapter shall not be allowed as a deduction either to the employer or to the recipient of the income in computing net income for the purpose of any tax on income imposed by act of Congress.

"(f) Refunds or credits.—

"(1) Employers: Where there has been an overpayment of tax under this subchapter, refund or credit shall be made to the employer only to the extent that the amount of such overpayment was not withheld and collected under this subchapter by the employer.

"(2) Employees: For refund or credit in cases of excessive withholding, see section 322 (a).

"(g) Included and excluded wages: If the remuneration paid by an employer to an employee for services performed during one-half or more of any pay-roll period of not more than 31 consecutive days constitutes wages, all the remuneration paid by such employer to such employee for such period shall be deemed to be wages; but if the remuneration paid by an employer to an employee for services performed during more than one-half of any such pay-roll period does not constitute wages, then none of the remuneration paid by such employer to such employee for such period shall be deemed to be wages.

"(h) Withholding exemption certificates: Every employee receiving wages shall furnish his employer a signed withholding exemption certificate relating to his status for the purpose of computing the withholding exemption, or if the employer exercises his election under section 1622 (b) (relating to wage-bracket withholding), for the purpose of computing the amount to be withheld under such subsection. In case of a change of status, a new certificate shall be furnished not later than 10 days after such change occurs. The certificate shall be in such form and contain such information as the Commissioner may, with the approval of the Secretary, by regulations prescribed. Such certificate—

"(1) If furnished after the date of commencement of employment with the employer, shall take effect with respect to the first payment of wages made on or after the first status determination date which occurs at least 30 days from the date on which such certificate is furnished to the employer, except that at the election of the employer such certificate may be made effective with respect to any previous payment of wages made on or after the date of the furnishing of such certificate. For the purposes of this paragraph the term 'status determination date' means January 1 and July 1 of each year.

"(2) If furnished on or before the date of commencement of employment with the employer, shall take effect as of the beginning of the first pay-roll period ending, or the first payment of wages made without regard to a pay-roll period, on or after the date on which such certificate is furnished to the employer.

A certificate which takes effect under this subsection shall continue in effect with respect to the employer until another such certificate furnished by the employee takes effect under this subsection. If no certificate is in effect under this subsection with respect to an employee, such employee shall be treated, for the purposes of the withholding exemption, or in case the employer exercises his election under section 1622 (c) (relating to wage-bracket withholding), for the purpose of computing the amount to be withheld under such subsection, as a married person claiming none of the personal exemption for withholding.

"(i) Overlapping pay periods, and so forth: If a payment of wages is made to an employee by an employer—

"(1) with respect to a pay-roll period or other period, any part of which is included in a pay-roll period or other period with respect to which wages are also paid to such employee by such employer, or

"(2) without regard to any pay-roll period or other period, but on or prior to the expiration of a pay-roll period or other period with respect to which wages are also paid to such employee by such employer, or

"(3) with respect to a period beginning in one and ending in another calendar year—

the manner of withholding and the amount to be withheld under this subchapter shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary under which the withholding exemption allowed to an employee in any calendar year shall approximate the withholding exemption allowable with respect to an annual pay-roll period.

"(j) Withholding on basis of average wages: The Commissioner may, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, authorize employers (1) to estimate the wages which will be paid to any employee in any quarter of the calendar year, (2) to determine the amount to be withheld and collected upon each payment of wages to such employee during such quarter as if the appropriate average of the wages so estimated constituted the actual wages paid, and (3) to withhold and collect upon any payment of wages to such employee during such quarter such amount as may be necessary to adjust the amount actually withheld and collected upon the wages of such employee during such quarter to the amount required to be withheld during such quarter without regard to this subsection.

"SEC. 1623. Liability for tax.

"The employer shall be liable for the payment of the tax required to be withheld and collected under this subchapter, and shall not be liable to any person for the amount of any such payment.

"SEC. 1624. Return and payment by governmental employer.

"If the employer is the United States, or a State, territory, or political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing, the return of the amount withheld and collected upon any wages may be made by any officer or employee of the United States, or of such State, territory, or political subdivision, or of the District of Columbia, or of such agency or instrumentality, as the case may be, having control of the payment of such wages, or appropriately designated for that purpose.

"SEC. 1625. Receipts.

"(a) Requirement: Every employer required to withhold and collect a tax in respect of the wages of an employee shall furnish to each such employee in respect of his employment during the calendar year, on or before January 31 of the succeeding year, or, if his employment is terminated before the close of such calendar year, on the day on which the last payment of wages is made, a written statement showing the wages paid by the employer to such employee during such calendar year, and the amount of the tax withheld and collected under this subchapter in respect of such wages.

"(b) Statements to constitute information returns: The statements required to be furnished by this section in respect of any wages shall be furnished at such other times, shall contain such other information, and shall be in such form as the Commissioner, with the approval of the secretary, may by regulations prescribe. A duplicate of such statement if made and filed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the secretary shall constitute the return required to be made in respect of such wages under section 147.

"(c) Extension of time: The Commissioner, under such regulations as he may prescribe with the approval of the secretary, may grant to any employer a reasonable extension of time (not in excess of 30 days) with respect to the statements required to be furnished to employees under this section.

"SEC. 1626. Penalties.

"(a) Penalties for fraudulent receipt or failure to furnish receipt: In lieu of any other penalty provided by law (except the penalty provided by subsection (b) of this section), any person required under the provisions of section 1625 to furnish a receipt in respect of tax withheld pursuant to this subchapter who willfully furnishes a false or fraudulent receipt, or who willfully fails to furnish a receipt in the manner, at the time, and showing the information required under section 1625, or regulations prescribed thereunder, shall for each such failure, upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(b) Additional penalty: In addition to the penalty provided by subsection (a) of this section, any person required under the provisions of section 1625 to furnish a receipt in respect of tax withheld pursuant to this subchapter who willfully furnishes a false or fraudulent receipt, or who willfully fails to furnish a receipt in the manner, at the time, and showing the information required under section 1625, or regulations prescribed thereunder, shall for each such failure be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $50.

"(c) Failure of employer to file return or pay tax: In case of any failure to make and file return or pay the tax required by this subchapter, within the time prescribed by law or prescribed by the Commissioner in pursuance of law, unless it is shown that such

failure is due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect, the addition to the tax shall not be less than $10.

"(d) Penalties in respect of withholding exemption certificates: Any individual required to supply information to his employer under section 1622 (h) who willfully supplies false or fraudulent information, or who willfully fails to supply information thereunder which would require an increase in the tax to be withheld under section 1622, shall, in lieu of any penalty otherwise provided, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 1627. Other laws applicable.

"All provisions of law, including penalties, applicable with respect to the tax imposed by section 1400 shall, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this subchapter, be applicable with respect to the tax under this subchapter.

"SUBCHAPTER E—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 1630. Verification of returns, etc.

"(a) Power of commissioner to require: The Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, may require that any return, statement, or other document required to be filed under this chapter shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, and such declaration shall be in lieu of any oath otherwise required.

"(b) Penalties: Every person who willfully makes and subscribes any return, statement, or other document, which contains or is verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, and which he does not believe to be true and correct as to every material matter, shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be subject to the penalties prescribed for perjury in section 125 of the Criminal Code.

"SEC. 1631. Use of Government depositaries in connection with payment of taxes.

"The Secretary may authorize incorporated banks or trust companies which are depositaries or financial agents of the United States to receive any taxes under this chapter in such manner, at such times, and under such conditions as he may prescribe; and he shall prescribe the manner, times, and conditions under which the receipt of such taxes by such depositaries and financial agents is to be treated as payment of such taxes to the collectors."

(b) Technical amendments.—

(1) Amendment to section 34: Section 34 of the Internal Revenue Code (cross reference) is amended by striking out "453, 454, and 466 (e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "453 and 454."

(2) Amendment to section 322: Section 322 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code (cross reference) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Tax withheld at source: For refund or credit in case of withholding agent, see section 143 (f). For refund or credit in case of employer required to withhold tax on wages, see section 1622 (f)."

(c) Expiration date for withholding at source on wages under subchapter D of chapter 1: Section 476 of the Internal Revenue Code (prescribing the expiration date for the taxes imposed by subchapter D) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 476. Expiration date.

"The tax imposed by part I of this subchapter shall not apply with respect to any taxable year commencing after the date of cessation of hostilities in the present war. The tax imposed by part II of such subchapter shall not apply with respect to any wages paid after June 30, 1943."

(d) Effective date: The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect July 1, 1943, and shall be applicable to all wages paid on or after such date.

SEC. 3. Credit for tax withheld at source.

Section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the credit for tax withheld on wages) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 35. Credit for tax withheld on wages.

"The amount withheld and collected as tax under subchapter D of chapter 9 during any calendar year upon the wages of any individual shall be allowed as a credit to the recipient of the income against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year beginning in such calendar year. If more than one taxable year begins in any such calendar year, such amount shall be allowed as a credit against the tax for the last taxable year so beginning."

SEC. 4. Refunds.

(a) Excessive withholding, etc.: Section 322 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to excessive withholding) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Excessive withholding: Where the amount of the tax withheld at the source under part II of subchapter D or subchapter D of chapter 9 exceeds the taxes imposed by this chapter against which the tax so withheld may be credited under section 35 or 466 (e), the amount of such excess shall be credited against any income tax or installment thereof then due from the taxpayer, and any balance thereof shall be refunded immediately to the taxpayer.

"(3) Credits against estimated tax: The Commissioner is authorized to prescribe, with the approval of the Secretary, regulations providing for the crediting against the estimated tax for any taxable year of the amount determined by the taxpayer or the Commissioner to be an overpayment of the tax for a preceding taxable year."

(b) Presumption as to date of payment: Section 322 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to presumption as to date of payment) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Presumption as to date of payment: For the purposes of this section, any tax actually withheld and collected at the source during any calendar year under part II of subchapter D or under subchapter D of chapter 9 shall, in respect of the recipient of the income, be deemed to have been paid by him on the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of his taxable year with respect to which such tax is allowable as a credit under section 35 or section 466 (e); except that in the case of a nonresident alien individual, it shall be deemed to have been paid by him on the fifteenth day of the sixth month following the close of such taxable year. For the purposes of this section, any amount paid as estimated tax for any taxable year shall be deemed to have been paid not earlier than the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of such taxable year."

(c) Delegation of authority to collectors to make refunds: Section 3770 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to authority to make refunds) is amended (1) by striking out "(4)" at the beginning of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "(5)"; and (2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

"(4) Delegation of authority to collectors to make refunds: The Commissioner is authorized to delegate, with the approval of the Secretary, to collectors any authority, duty, or function which the Commissioner is authorized or required to exercise or perform under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection, or under section 3772 or 1027, where the amount involved does not exceed $1,000."

(d) Overpayments: Section 3770 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to authority to make credits and refunds) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(c) Rule where no tax liability: An amount paid as tax shall not be considered not to constitute an overpayment solely by reason of the fact that there was no tax liability in respect of which such amount was paid."

(e) Cross-reference: The last subsection of section 3771 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to interest on overpayments) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Estimated tax and tax withheld at source: For date of payment in respect of estimated tax and of tax withheld at source on wages, see section 322 (e)."

(f) Review of allowance of interest: Section 3790 of the Internal Revenue Code (prohibiting administrative review of Commissioner's decisions) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "In the absence of fraud or mistake in mathematical calculation, the allowance or nonallowance by the Commissioner, of interest on any credit or refund under the internal-revenue laws shall not, except as provided in chapter 5, be subject to review by any other administrative or accounting officer, employee, or agent of the United States."

SEC. 5. Current payment of tax not withheld at source.

(a) In general: The Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out sections 58, 59, and 60 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 58. Declaration of estimated tax by individuals.

"(a) Requirement of declaration: Every individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien) shall, at the time during the taxable year prescribed in subsection (d), make a declaration of his estimated tax for the taxable year if—

"(1) his gross income from wages (as defined in section 1621)

"(A) in case such individual is single or married but not living with husband or wife: can reasonably be expected to exceed $2,700 for the taxable year; or did exceed $2,700 for the preceding taxable year; or

"(B) in case such individual is married and living with husband or wife: can when added to the gross income which can reasonably be expected to be received by such husband or wife from wages (as so defined) reasonably be expected to exceed $3,500 for the taxable year; or did when added to the gross income of such husband or wife from wages (as so defined) for the preceding taxable year, exceed $3,500 for such preceding taxable year; or

"(2) his gross income from sources other than wages (as defined in section 1621)

"(A) in case such individual is single or married but not living with husband or wife: can reasonably be expected to exceed $100 for the taxable year and his gross income to be such as will require the making of a return for the taxable year under section 51; or did exceed $100 for the preceding taxable year and such individual either was required to make a return under section 51 or 455 for such preceding taxable year or would have been so required if he had been single during the whole of such preceding taxable year; or

"(B) in case such individual is married and living with husband or wife: can when added to the gross income which can reasonably be expected to be received by husband or wife from such sources, reasonably be expected to exceed $100 for the taxable year and the aggregate gross income of such husband and wife can reasonably be expected to be such as will require the making of a return under section 51 or 455; or did, when added to the gross income of such husband or wife from such sources for the preceding taxable year, exceed $100 for such preceding taxable year and such individual would have been required to make a return under section 51 or 455 for such preceding taxable year if he had been married and living with husband or wife during the whole of such preceding taxable year.

"(b) Contents of declaration: In the declaration required under subsection (a) the individual shall state—

"(1) the amount which he estimates as the amount of tax under sections 11 and 12, or 400, as the case may be, and section 450, for the taxable year, without regard to any credits under sections 32, 35, and 466 (e);

"(2) the amount which he estimates as the credits for the taxable year under sections 32, 35, and 466 (e); and

"(3) the excess of the amount estimated under paragraph (1) over the amount estimated under paragraph (2), which excess for the purposes of this chapter shall be held and considered the estimated tax for the taxable year.

The declaration shall also contain such other information for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this chapter as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe, and shall contain or be verified by a written statement that it is made under the penalties of perjury.

"(c) Joint declaration by husband and wife: In the case of a husband and wife living together, a single declaration under this section may be made by them jointly, in which case the liability with respect to the estimated tax shall be joint and several. No joint declaration may be made if either the husband or wife is a nonresident alien. If a joint declaration is made but a joint return is not made for the taxable year, the estimated tax for such year may be treated as the estimated tax of either the husband or the wife, or may be divided between them.

"(d) Time and place for filing: The declaration required under subsection (a) shall be filed on or before the fifteenth day of the third month of the taxable year, except that if the requirements of subsection (a) are first met after such date, the declaration shall be filed on or before the fifteenth day of the last month of the quarter of the taxable year in which such requirements are first met. An individual may make amendments or revisions of a declaration filed under this subsection, under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. If so made, such amendments or revisions shall be filed on or before the fifteenth day of the last month of any quarter of the taxable year subsequent to that in which the declaration was filed and in which no previous amendments or revisions have been made or filed. Declarations and amendments and revisions thereof shall be filed with the Collector specified in section 53 (b) (1).

"(e) Extension of time: The Commissioner may grant a reasonable extension of time for filing declarations and paying the estimated tax, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe with the approval of the Secretary. Except in the case of taxpayers who are abroad, no such extension shall be for more than 6 months.

"(f) Persons under disability: If the taxpayer is unable to make his own declaration, the declaration shall be made by a duly authorized agent or by the guardian or other person charged with the case of the person or property of such taxpayer.

"(g) Signature presumed correct: The fact that an individual's name is signed to a filed declaration shall be prima facie evidence for all purposes that the declaration was actually signed by him.

"(h) Publicity of declaration: For the purposes of section 55 (relating to publicity of returns), a declaration of estimated tax shall be held and considered a return under this chapter.

"SEC. 59. Payment of estimated tax.

"(a) In general: The estimated tax shall be paid in four equal installments except that—

"(1) if the declaration is filed (otherwise than pursuant to an extension of time) after the fifteenth day of the third month of the taxable year, the estimated tax shall be paid in equal installments the number of which is equal to the number of quarters remaining in the taxable year (including the quarter in which the declaration is filed); and

"(2) if any amendment or revision of a declaration is filed, the remaining installments shall be ratably increased or decreased, as the case may be, to reflect the increase or decrease, as the case may be, in the estimated tax by reason of such amendment or revision; and

"(3) at the election of the individual, any installment of the estimated tax may be paid prior to the date prescribed for its payment. One installment of the estimated tax shall be paid at the time of making the declaration, and an installment thereof shall be paid on the fifteenth day of the last month of each succeeding quarter of the taxable year. Payment of any installment of the estimated tax shall be considered payment on account of the tax for the taxable year.

"(b) Assessment: The estimated tax shall be assessed only to the extent paid.

"SEC. 60. Special rules for application of sections 58 and 59.

"(a) Farmers: In the case of an individual whose estimated gross income from farming for the taxable year is at least 80 percent of the total estimated gross income from all sources for the taxable year, in lieu of the time prescribed in section 58 (d), the declaration for the taxable year may be made at any time on or before the fifteenth day of the last month of the taxable year.

"(b) Application to short taxable years: The application of sections 58, 59, and 294 (a) (3), (4), and (5) to taxable years of less than 12 months shall be as prescribed in regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"(c) Application to taxable years beginning in 1943: If the taxable year is the calendar year 1943, the 15th day of September 1943 shall be substituted for the 15th day of March for the purposes of section 58 (d). If the taxable year begins in 1943 after January 1, the date which shall be substituted for the fifteenth day of the third month of the taxable year for the purposes of section 58 (d) shall be prescribed by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. In either case installments of the estimated tax for such taxable year payable after September 1, 1943, shall be ratably decreased to reflect the payments on account of a taxable year beginning in 1942 which are treated as payments on account of the estimated tax for a taxable year beginning in 1943."

(b) Additions to tax: Section 294 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to additions to tax in case of nonpayment) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(3) Failure to file declaration of estimated tax: In the case of a failure to make and file a declaration of estimated tax within the time prescribed, there shall be added to the tax an amount equal to 10 percent of the tax.

"(4) Failure to pay installment of estimated tax: In the case of the failure to pay an installment of the estimated tax within the time prescribed there shall be added to the tax $2.50 or 2½ percent of the tax, whichever is the greater, for each installment with respect to which such failure occurs.

"(5) Substantial underestimate of estimated tax: If 80 percent of the tax (determined without regard to the credits under sections 32, 35, and 466 (e) in the case of individuals other than farmers exercising an election under section 60 (a) or 66⅔ percent of such tax so determined in the case of such farmers, exceeds the estimated tax (increased by such credits) there shall be added to the tax an amount equal to such excess or equal to 6 percent of the amount by which such tax so determined exceeds the estimated tax so increased, whichever is the lesser. This paragraph shall not apply to the taxable year in which falls the death of the taxpayer."

(c) Penalties: Section 145 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to criminal penalties) is amended (1) by inserting after "return" wherever appearing therein the words "or declaration", and (2) by inserting before "tax" wherever appearing therein the words "estimated tax or."

(d) Payment by installments: Section 56 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to installment payments) is amended by striking out "The" at the beginning thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "Except in the case of an individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien), the."

(e) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

SEC. 6. Relief from double payments in 1943.

(a) In general: This subsection shall be applicable with respect to the taxable year 1942 but shall not take effect until September 1, 1943. The tax imposed by Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code upon any individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien) shall, in lieu of that otherwise imposed, be a tax determined in accordance with the following schedule:

If the tax determined without regard to this subsection is

More than	But not more than	The tax shall be
$0	$60	$0.
60	600	50% of excess over $60.
600	1,000	$270, plus 66⅔% of excess over $600.
1,000	1,400	$510, plus 65% of excess over $1,000.
1,400	2,000	$770, plus 69% of excess over $1,400.
2,000	2,500	$1,184, plus 71% of excess over $2,000.
2,500	3,000	$1,539, plus 73% of excess over $2,500.
3,000	3,500	$1,904, plus 75% of excess over $3,000.
3,500	4,000	$2,279, plus 77% of excess over $3,500.
4,000	6,000	$2,664, plus 78% of excess over $4,000.
6,000	7,000	$4,224, plus 79% of excess over $6,000.
7,000	8,000	$5,014, plus 81% of excess over $7,000.
8,000	10,000	$5,824, plus 82% of excess over $8,000.
10,000	15,000	$7,464, plus 83% of excess over $10,000.
15,000	30,000	$11,614, plus 85% of excess over $15,000.
30,000	45,000	$24,364, plus 84% of excess over $30,000.
45,000	60,000	$36,964, plus 83% of excess over $45,000.
60,000	130,000	$49,414, plus 81% of excess over $60,000.
130,000	160,000	$106,114, plus 80% of excess over $130,000.
160,000	200,000	$130,114, plus 82% of excess over $160,000.
200,000	240,000	$162,914, plus 83% of excess over $200,000.
240,000	255,000	$196,114, plus 84% of excess over $240,000.
255,000	290,000	$208,714, plus 85% of excess over $255,000.
290,000	385,000	$238,464, plus 86% of excess over $290,000.
385,000	525,000	$320,164, plus 87% of excess over $385,000.
525,000	715,000	$441,964, plus 88% of excess over $525,000.
715,000	1,055,000	$609,164, plus 89% of excess over $715,000.
1,055,000	2,150,000	$911,764, plus 90% of excess over $1,055,000.
2,150,000	4,200,000	$1,897,264, plus 91% of excess over $2,150,000.
4,200,000	4,500,000	$3,762,764, plus 92% of excess over $4,200,000.
4,500,000	----------	$4,038,764, plus 92.05% of excess over $4,500,000.

(b) Time for payment of reduced 1942 tax: In lieu of the time prescribed in section 56 of the Internal Revenue Code for the pay-

ment of the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code, as reduced under subsection (a), upon an individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien) for a taxable year beginning in 1942, such tax as so reduced shall be paid as follows: One-third thereof on or before the 15th day of the 27th month following the beginning of such taxable year, one-third on or before the fifteenth day of the 39th month following the beginning of such taxable year, and one-third on or before the 15th day of the 51st month following the beginning of such taxable year.

(c) Treatment of payments on account of 1942 tax: Any payment (other than interest and additions to the tax) made on account of the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code for the taxable year 1942 upon a taxpayer any part of whose liability for such tax is discharged under subsection (a) shall be considered as payment on account of the estimated tax for the taxable year 1943. In the case of any extension of time for the payment of such tax granted by the Commissioner prior to September 1, 1943, payment of the portion thereof which if such extension had not been granted would have been payable under section 56 (b) prior to such date shall be made notwithstanding subsection (a), but the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall apply to any such payment. In case the taxpayer becomes delinquent, prior to September 1, 1943, in the payment of such tax or any installment thereof, subsection (a) shall not relieve the taxpayer of his liability for the tax, but the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall be applicable to payment of such liability. If any payment on account of the tax imposed by such chapter for the taxable year 1942 is made pursuant to a joint return made by husband and wife for such taxable year, and such payment is considered as a payment on account of the estimated tax for the taxable year 1943, such payment may be treated as a payment on account of the estimated tax of either the husband or the wife for such taxable year or may be divided between them.

(d) Extension of time for payment of reduced 1942 tax: Where it is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the payment of any installment under subsection (c) upon the date prescribed for the payment thereof will result in undue hardship to the taxpayer the Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may grant an extension for the payment of such installment for a period not in excess of 18 months, and, in exceptional cases, for a further period of not in excess of 18 months. If an extension is granted, the Commissioner may require a taxpayer to furnish a bond in such amount, not exceeding double the amount of the installment, with such sureties, as the Commissioner deems necessary, conditioned upon the payment of the installment in accordance with the terms of the extension. If the time for the payment of any installment is extended, there shall be collected, as a part of the tax, interest on the installment at the rate of 6 percent per annum for the period of the extension, and no other interest shall be collected on such installment for such period. If the installment the time for the payment of which is so extended is not paid in accordance with the terms of the extension, there shall be collected, as a part of the tax, interest on the unpaid amount at the rate of 6 percent per annum for the period from the time fixed by the terms of the extension for its payment until it is paid, and no other interest shall be collected on such unpaid amount for such period.

(e) For the purposes of this section the term "taxable year 1942" means a taxable year beginning in the calendar year 1942, but shall not include any period of less than 12 months unless occasioned by the death of the taxpayer or unless there is no taxable year of 12 months beginning in such calendar year.

SEC. 7. Discount for advance payment of deferred 1942 tax.

In addition to the credits against the tax allowed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by such chapter upon an individual with respect to whom and for the taxable year with respect to which section 5 (a) is applicable—

(1) an amount equal to 6 percent of such tax if such tax is paid on or before the 15th day of the twenty-seventh month following the beginning of such taxable year, or

(2) an amount equal to 2 percent of such tax if the first installment thereof is paid within the time prescribed in section 5 (b) and the last two installments are paid on or before the 15th day of the thirty-ninth month following the beginning of such taxable year.

SEC. 8. Additional allowance for members of armed forces.

(a) In general: Section 22 (b) (13) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to additional allowance for military and naval personnel in computing net income) is amended to read as follows:

"(13) Additional allowance for military and naval personnel: In the case of compensation received during any taxable year and before the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, by a member of the military or naval forces of the United States for active service in such forces during such war, so much of such compensation as does not exceed $1,500."

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

SEC. 9. Abatement of tax for members of armed forces upon death.

Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after section 404 the following new supplement:

"SUPPLEMENT U—ABATEMENT OF TAX FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES UPON DEATH

"SEC. 421. Abatement of tax for members of armed forces upon death.

"In the case of any individual who dies on or after December 7, 1941, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States and prior to the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, the tax under this chapter (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) attributable to earned net income (as defined in section 25 (a) (4)) received or accrued by him shall not be assessed, and if assessed, the assessment shall be abated, and if collected shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment, in the following amounts and for the following taxable years:

"(1) if such individual entered upon such service before the commencement of the taxable year beginning in 1943:

"(A) the entire amount of the tax so attributable for the taxable year in which falls the date on which he entered upon such service or September 16, 1940, whichever date is the later;

"(B) the entire amount of the tax so attributable for all subsequent taxable years during which he was in such service; and

"(C) that portion of the tax so attributable for the taxable year last preceding the date on which he entered upon such service or September 16, 1940, whichever date is the later, which bears the same ratio to the total tax so attributable as the number of quarters in the taxable year described in subparagraph (A) subsequent to the date on which he entered upon such service or September 16, 1940, whichever date is the later, bears to four; or

"(2) if such individual entered upon such service during the taxable year beginning in 1943:

"(A) that portion of the tax for the taxable year beginning in 1943, which bears the same ratio to the total tax so reduced as the number of quarters in such taxable year subsequent to the date on which he entered upon such service bears to four, to the extent that such portion is so attributable;

"(B) the entire amount of the tax so attributable for all subsequent taxable years during which he was in such service; and

"(C) the entire amount of the tax so attributable for the taxable year beginning in 1942; or

"(3) if such individual entered upon such service after the close of the taxable year beginning in 1943:

"(A) that portion of the tax for the taxable year beginning in 1942 so attributable which falls due (otherwise than by an extension of time) subsequent to the date of entering upon such service; and

"(B) the entire amount of the tax so attributable for all taxable years during the whole of which he was in such service.

The computations required by this section shall be made in conformity with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. For the purposes of this section, a fractional part of a quarter shall be disregarded unless it exceeds 15 days, in which case it shall be considered a quarter."

SEC. 10. Assistant commissioners.

Subchapter B of chapter 39 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"SUBCHAPTER B—ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS

"SEC. 3905. Appointment.

"There shall be in the Bureau of Internal Revenue two Assistant Commissioners, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"SEC. 3906. Duties.

"The Assistant Commissioners shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Commissioner or required by law."

SEC. 11. Extension of time in connection with release of powers of appointment.

Section 403 (d) (3) of the Revenue Act of 1942 is amended by striking out "July 1, 1943" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1, 1944"; and section 452 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1942 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Release before March 1, 1944.—

"(1) A release of a power to appoint before March 1, 1944, shall not be deemed a transfer of property by the individual possessing such power.

"(2) This subsection shall apply to all calendar years prior to 1944 and to that part of the calendar year 1944 prior to March 1, 1944."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered is sometimes known as the Doughton bill and sometimes known as the House Ways and Means Committee bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the amendment offered by the Senator represent the first, second, third, or fourth Doughton bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. With his wide knowledge of tax matters, all in the world the Senator from Missouri has to do is to look at it, and I know he will understand which one it is.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As there were about a dozen, I am not certain

anyone could recognize which is which. The Senator referred to it as the Doughton bill. There were several different bills known as Doughton bills and several different bills known as Ways and Means Committee bills, none of which got to first base in the House of Representatives, and I was curious to know which one the Senator is proposing.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will tell the Senator, but the Senator is not asking for information. He is asking in order to try to confuse and embarrass the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That would be impossible, I will say to the Senator; it would be like "carrying coals to Newcastle."

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator, but when he sticks his knife in my ribs he cannot divert me by sticking a flower at my nose. [Laughter.] As a matter of fact, this was the bill which was reported, as I now recall, by the House Ways and Means Committee on the 30th of April. The Senator knows that the 30th of April is the day before the 1st of May, and if he looks he will see that the bill was reported by the House Ways and Means Committee on the 30th of April.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, it would have been much more appropriate if the bill had been reported on the 1st day of April, but the Senator has sufficiently identified the numerical succession of the Doughton bill to the Ways and Means Committee bill to which he is now referring.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that the bill should really have been offered on the 1st of April, because it is really intended to fool people by the Ruml plan. Those sponsoring it may fool them now, but I say to the Senator from Missouri and to other Senators that before they cease hearing about the Ruml plan they are going to find out that while it may fool some of the people, all the people of the United States are not going to be fooled as to the purpose, the intent, and the effect of the Ruml plan.

A few days ago, after I had left the Chamber, the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Connecticut made some animadversions as to what the Senator from Texas had said and contended. Their contention is, as I understand, that they are not proposing to give away anything, that the Treasury is really to get more money by giving away $9,000,000,000 or $11,000,000,000 than if it is not given away. If the supporters of the Ruml plan are convinced that they are not being given anything, the plan is going to blow up. If Mr. Ruml, and all the others from whom Senators are getting telegrams whooping up the Ruml plan, are convinced that when it is adopted they are not going to get any money back, that they are not going to get any cancelation, that they are not going to get any increase of their assets, the Ruml plan will be blown out of the water. So its supporters had better act quickly, they had better vote on it quickly, because if those sponsoring it outside ever come to believe they are not to receive anything, the bill is going to collapse.

Mr. President, I have seen a great many magicians in my time, starting when I was a country boy, at the Indian show, the entrance fee a dime, proceeding from the lowest and coming to the real experts of the present day. I have seen them put rabbits under the hat, and then when the hat is lifted the rabbit is not there; it is over somewhere else, in somebody else's hat. But of all the magicians' tricks I ever saw, the greatest is the supposed theory of the Ruml plan—that we can forgive or abate or cancel $9,000,000,000 that are due to the United States on the tax books and not give somebody something. That suggestion is the most astounding, the most shocking to my imagination, and the most amazing to what little reason I have than any other I have ever heard in all the history of my short, uneventful, obscure life. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, what would this bill do? I understand that one Senator—I believe it was the Senator from Connecticut—said after I left the Chamber a few days ago that I had indicated I proposed to vote for the George plan in substitution for the Ruml plan, and therefore there was no principle involved in my viewpoint but a question of rates only. If the Senator from Connecticut had done me the honor either to read or to listen to what I stated, he would have observed that I said throughout the debate that I was not in favor of forgiving or canceling a single dollar that is now due.

If there is a desire to adopt the withholding tax, very well, I have no objection to adopting the withholding tax as to salaries and wages for 1943, and crediting it to a man's taxes for 1943. That is not inconsistent with keeping the tax system as we have it now.

Oh, but gentlemen say we want to make taxpayers current. Oh, yes; we have to pay taxes. When we assessed the 1942 tax to be paid in March 1943, a man cannot be paying it out of the income of 1943 because he has not received the 1943 income, except for 2½ months. He is paying it out of what he saved and accumulated in 1942 with which to pay the 1942 taxes, and if he has not saved it, is it very wise to teach the people to do that very thing—to accumulate during the year the money with which to pay their taxes in March of the following year.

When we pay our State and county taxes, do we pay them by the day or the month in advance? No, we pay them at the end of the year. When do we pay our rent—every morning, or at the end of the month? When do we pay our grocery bill—before we eat the groceries, or after we have eaten them at the end of the month?

Mr. President, with the condition of the Treasury of the United States as it is, with this colossal war debt hanging over us, I cannot see how we can afford to give away $9,000,000,000 of money now due to the Treasury of the United States.

Let me remind Senators that, under the present laws, revenues from individual income taxes amount to about $13,000,000,000 under the most favorable circumstances. We have to raise $16,000,000,000 more, it is said. Where are we to get it? Unless corporation taxes are raised—and you are not in favor of that, oh, no—unless corporation taxes are raised we must get the money from the individual income taxpayers, and that means that we will have to more than double the tax on the man with five or ten or fifteen or twenty thousand dollars of income, and even on the $3,000 man and on all the men and women in the lower brackets. We will have to more than double the present taxes in order even to get $13,000,000,000, and in the face of that, it is proposed that we give away $9,000,000,000.

Mr. President, I offer the Doughton plan, which provides in substance as follows: It adopts for 1942 the 1941 tax rates. It does not give the money all away, it gives some of it away, it remits some of it, it puts the tax back on the 1941 basis. That is the same basis which was arrived at by the committee and the Congress after consideration and after the most careful examination. It is a reasonable and a logical basis.

As to current payments, it provides for the same kind of current payments as provided in the bill now before us, the same as the Finance Committee bill provides for. It provides for withholding at the source, the same as the Finance Committee bill. That is the so-called Ruml plan. It recomputes the 1942 tax at the 1941 rates and exemptions. It forgives the difference between that and the present 1942 tax. It spreads the payment of the balance, not forgiven, over 3 years. The taxpayer will have 3 years in which to pay the 1942 tax. He will have to pay only one-third of it in the same year in which he pays his tax for 1943. I understand there is a provision in the bill which authorizes the Commissioner to grant an additional 3 years to the taxpayer in an extreme case, if he can make a showing that it will be a hardship to him to pay the tax in 3 years.

The substitute which I offer forgives four and a half billion dollars, which is much less than is forgiven either under the George plan or the Senate Finance Committee plan, and only one-half as much as would be handed out under the Ruml plan. The forgiveness, the deduction, or the abatement, would be distributed fairly, and would not discriminate in favor of the incomes in the higher brackets, as would the other plans.

For the fiscal year 1944 the revenue receipts would be increased, under the substitute, by $3,000,000,000, which is a starter at least on the $16,000,000,000 we are expecting to raise.

Mr. President, in brief I have stated what the substitute proposes. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate further; I was about to say I think it understands these questions, but it does not.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Sena-

tor from Texas yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have been studying the table on page 15 of the committee report to ascertain how much actual money would come into the Treasury under any of the plans which are now before us, or which are suggested. I can see how the income in the form of liability can be distributed, and frankly there is not a great deal of difference between the five or six plans set forth on page 15 with respect to income-tax liability. But when we come to the section "Income Tax Liabilities Due and Payable Into the Treasury" in fiscal years there is a wide difference. To Senators who serve on the Finance Committee this table probably is understandable. Frankly, to me it is not altogether clear as to how much less money, actual cash, will come into the Treasury under this, or that, or the other plan, as compared with existing law.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not have the report before me. If the Senator will lend me his copy I shall be glad to examine it. I will say to the Senator it is perfectly understandable that in such a period as we are now going through, when incomes are rising and are higher than they have ever been, by the forgiveness of the 1942 tax entirely and the speeding up and inducement to people to pay their taxes currently, probably there would be more actual cash coming in for a time than there would be under the old system, because under the old system the taxpayers can pay quarterly or semiannually. There, Mr. President, lies the trick. A "basement sale," as it were, is put on, and a great deal of money is brought in suddenly, but after that the market falls off for the succeeding month. By that "sale" an inducement is offered, the taxpayers are stimulated to come in and pay the 1943 taxes.

Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that this is something we cannot view simply for 1 year or for 2 or 3 years. We are obliged to view the long picture of the great national debt we owe, and whenever we forgive certain obligations, whether the tax money comes in cash at once or not, we are giving away an asset which would ultimately find its way into the Treasury and offset the public debt.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand the philosophy of the Senator's argument, it is that if we waive or cancel or forgive the tax for that year in which the Nation's income is large, the tax for that year is gone forever, and it can only be replaced later on by a tax in a year in which the income of the Nation is smaller.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I wanted to know, however, is how much money will come to the Treasury in this particular year under the different plans which are proposed. I am confused with respect to how much money would flow into the Treasury under the House plan, the old law, the Senate Finance Committee plan, the substitute offered by the Senator from Texas, and so forth.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that the George plan, for instance, breaks up the payment of the 25 percent into 2 years, and the taxpayers must pay 12½ percent of the 25 percent in the first year. It is perfectly conceivable that that will produce more revenue for the moment than the so-called Ruml plan. Under the House Ways and Means Committee bill the taxpayer would be required to pay only one-third of his 1942 taxes at the rate of 1941. I am not prepared, I will say to the Senator from Maryland, and I do not have the time now to go into all the questions involved. I will call some of the experts to give me certain information.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not want to divert the Senator from his argument.

Mr. CONNALLY. Such a maze exists, I will say to the Senator from Maryland, with respect to the different plans, that, with all deference to the Committee on Finance, I will say that I do not think there is anyone on the committee who completely understands all the angles and reactions. Taxation with us has become such a complex and involved matter that the Finance Committee in considering tax bills at any time could never make any progress or headway if it did not have available the experts of the Treasury. When a question arises we call on them for information as to what the effect of certain proposals would be, what the repercussions would be, what the reactions would be, and we are obliged to act on the basis of the information thus furnished.

Mr. President, the point I am trying to make, however, is that we cannot forgive—I do not care what year it is—a tax liability and maintain the financial or statistical position of the Government. If I go to a bank to borrow money the banker will say, "Mr. CONNALLY, we want a financial statement from you." I list on that statement what little chips and whetstones I possess. The banker will ask, "Have you any credit? Does anyone owe you anything?" That credit is one of my assets. He takes that into consideration. He looks forward to the time when payment is due and thinks that perhaps I will be able to pay him out of collections of what people owe me. It is not required that I have cash money in my pocket, but he wants to know that I have the resources with which to pay my loan.

Mr. President, if taxpayers pay 1942 taxes and then pay 1943 taxes, the Government will have 2 years taxes, will it not, in its Treasury? If they simply pay 1943 taxes, the Government will never have the 1942 taxes in the Treasury until kingdom come. It will never be there.

I wish to remind Senators that now is the flush period. We are in a period of great profits. We are in a period of prosperity. We are in a period of rising income. But when the war is over, when the accelerated rate of income from war production and war activities comes to an end, we are going to have a period of declining incomes and declining revenues. We probably will have an economic panic, and then, by reason of the decline, is the time when we shall have to put heavier and heavier taxes on the people. The rates will have to go up above the rates we now have levied.

Mr. President, I regret that I seem to be in a minority on this theory, but I cannot consent to abate or forgive $9,000,000,000 of the Treasury's money, the people's money, the Government's money, in order to lure somebody into current payment. The substitute which I offer carries the deduction principle. I am perfectly willing to take 20 percent out of my salary and have 20 percent taken out of the wages and salaries of everyone else, but the idea that the little income taxpayers are evading taxes, and that there are large defaults, is denied by the statistics of the Treasury Department. The statistics of the Treasury Department show that only a fraction of 1 percent of the taxpayers are in default.

Mr. President, it has been said that men receiving $10 or $15 a day in war plants will not pay their income taxes. There is a way to make them pay the taxes. There is a way to teach them how to save against the hour of payment. If they are to be tax-conscious, ought they not to know of the obligation they owe to the Government of the United States, which has made it possible for them to receive greatly enhanced incomes, and should they not save and provide to pay their taxes when they are due?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If we adopt the 20-percent withholding tax about which the Senator is talking and to which every other Senator who has spoken on the question has referred, does it make any difference at all to the Treasury in which year the 20 percent is credited? Whether it is credited to 1942 or 1943, exactly the same number of dollars will flow into the Treasury.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then why is it not the sensible and the simple thing to continue under the present tax law and add the 20-percent withholding tax.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is exactly what the Senator from Texas favors.

Mr. MURDOCK. And that is what the amendment offered by the Senator's colleague [Mr. O'DANIEL] would accomplish.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am going to vote for that amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think that by the adoption of that amendment we would resolve this question very simply, and accomplish exactly what we all want to accomplish, and not forgive or double up.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has stated my position as I announced it the first time I spoke on the bill. I see no reason on earth, I say to the Senator from Utah, for forgiving anything. I should prefer that we go right on under the present tax system, and then levy the withholding tax, if it is desirable,

for future years, and credit it to the taxpayer's account. That is all.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right; and that is exactly my position. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I was talking about the percentage of delinquencies. I have before me a table coming from the Treasury Department, showing that in 1941, the delinquencies amounted to five-tenths of 1 percent, or one-half of 1 percent. For 1942 taxes—I suppose the figures relate to the returns—three-tenths of 1 percent were all that were delinquent; for 1940, 1.2 percent; for 1939, 1.2 percent.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask if the figures the Senator is reading are for the persons who filed income-tax returns but neglected to pay the taxes when they were due, or whether they are for those who should have filed income-tax returns because their incomes were sufficiently large, but did not file them.

Mr. CONNALLY. The figures relate to the first branch of the Senator's inquiry, for when persons who should file income-tax returns do not file them at all, it is very difficult to find out who they are.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is the main argument in favor of making the deductions.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to interject at this point, let me say that I think one of the reasons why we have before us the tax-withholding plan, as I understand it, has been the supposition that many persons who heretofore have not paid income taxes have for the first time been shuttled into the income-tax brackets, but have not bothered to pay the taxes; and, therefore, the withholding tax is a device to reach them.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not been advised, beyond that, that there is any need for the withholding system. I still have an open mind on the subject, of course.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that, of course, he has put his finger on a very sensitive point. All the argument for the Ruml plan is based on the theory that it is necessary to have payments made currently because otherwise many persons will not file returns at all. But if the deductions or withholdings are to be provided for the people in that particular class, by providing that portions of all wages and salaries shall be withheld—for that is about the only way it can be done; it can be done only as to current salaries and wages; it cannot be done as to a grocer's business or other businesses of that sort—the difficulties will be met by the withholding provision, and at the same time we can go on with the present system in other respects. That is my point of view.

Mr. President, I do not want to take up any more time. When the Ruml plan was proposed, the people of the country and the Congress, in my opinion, were absolutely astounded. Then there opened up the campaign of propaganda over the radio, through the press, and by means of telegrams; and the thought of the desirability of getting current all at once took possession of the minds of a large segment of our population. But, Mr. President, the way to get current is not to give away what is due. The way to get current is to provide for withholdings to be made—if a system of withholding is desired—from the earnings of those who are not paying income taxes or who have not been in the habit of paying them, and to let the remainder of the people go right on paying as they have always paid. I pay every year; every other Member of the Senate pays every year. If we pay every year, what difference does it make to us whether theoretically the payment is made on 1942 or on 1943 incomes? Only our administrator or executors will be interested in that particular matter, at the time of our deaths.

So, Mr. President, as I have stated, I am against any remission or any abatement; but I offer the amendment for those Senators who want to provide some forgiveness and yet who are not prepared to swallow the Ruml plan.

The amendment in its entirety would amount to giving away about half as much—four and one-half billion dollars—as would the Ruml plan. Its rates are more equitably adjusted. The large taxpayers would not be given any favoritism. The distribution would be carried over the whole body of the taxpayers. The plan provides for a withholding tax on salaries and wages, and it further provides that when the taxpayer pays his 1942 tax on the basis of 1941 rates, he has to pay only that additional sum; and, if necessary, the Commissioner may give him 3 additional years in which to pay. So his income tax would be split up into six segments, under the most severe circumstances. That provision is simply an addition.

Mr. President, let me say a word further. Those members of the Senate who complain because of the fact that everyone will have to pay one-sixth or one-third in addition to his regular 1943 income tax, must remember that if that were the whole story that would be one thing, but it must not be forgotten that we shall have to raise $16,000,000,000 in additional taxes. Where we are to get them, I do not know. If we are to get them at all, we shall have to get them by raising the rates of most corporation taxes to still higher levels, and then by doubling the rates which the masses of the ordinary taxpayers are now paying. We cannot get much more from the very high brackets, because as to them we have already reached the point of unproductiveness.

However, that will not be all, I say to the Senate. In the dire necessities of the Government's need we may have to come to a sales tax, to levying a percentage tax on every transaction made by every man and woman in the United States. We must get the money; and every dollar we give away in the form of an abatement or a remission will have to be paid back into the Treasury out of the sweat, out of the blood, out of the toil, and out of the work of the horny hands of those whose incomes fall in the middle and lower brackets. Does the Senate want to do that?

Mr. President, I have a memorandum which is somewhat in the nature of a speech. I do not want to take the time of the Senate to read it, and I do not want it to appear in the RECORD as if I read it on the floor of the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may label it "Memorandum," and have it printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am against the Ruml plan not only because I am opposed to it but also because I believe a great many people do not understand how it works and have been misled by the strong publicity campaign which the newspapers and wealthy people of this country have been carrying on at great expense during the past 6 months.

Even the most basic ideas are confused. I would have thought that by this time everyone would understand clearly the fact that the Ruml plan actually forgives a year of taxes, not just theoretically, not at some indefinite future time of death, but now, the date when this bill became law. To my surprise some of my colleagues, even on the Senate Finance Committee, have denied this fact of forgiveness. Some have called it a postponement. The 1942 tax would not be postponed; it would never be paid. Some have said that in their opinion the Ruml plan does not really result in any financial gain to the taxpayer and that if they could be convinced that it does, they would vote against it. I suppose there is not much hope of trying to convince people who still hold this opinion after months of wrangling, but at least I am going to try.

This Ruml bill wipes out the income tax on the income for 1 year. On December 31, 1940, the taxpayer was in debt to the Federal Government for income taxes on 1940 income. On December 31, 1941, he was in debt to the Federal Government for the taxes on his 1941 income. On December 31, 1942, he was in debt to the Federal Government for the taxes on his 1942 income. Under the Ruml plan the amount of that 1942 debt is simply canceled without payment. What the taxpayer pays in 1943 is counted as payment of the tax on his 1943 income. He never pays the 1942 tax, now or any other time. He has simply and clearly been forgiven 1 year's taxes. The moment that forgiveness becomes effective, his estate or net worth is increased by the amount of the 1942 tax. For example, take a man with a $10,000 net income. That is a familiar amount to Members of this body. A married man with no dependents and $10,000 of net income would have a 1942 tax of $2,152. Under the Ruml plan that tax is wiped out, forgiven, canceled, remitted—call it what you please—and on the date that cancelation becomes effective, if this law is passed, the net worth of that man and every man like him is increased by $2,152.

Some people who admit that this is true—and of course it cannot be denied—say that the increase in estate is of no value until the man dies. That is certainly a new way to look at an increase in net worth and at the cancelation of a liability. A lot of us have other kinds of debts. Wiping out a debt certainly is a benefit I would feel now. I don't have to wait until I die to feel it.

If I am a businessman or a farmer and I want to borrow money from the bank, my

banker will want to know what my assets are and what my liabilities are. My tax debt to the Federal Government is one of the liabilities that my banker is interested in. If that debt is wiped out, the chance that I am going to pay the bank is better. I shall be able to borrow more money or borrow it at a lower rate of interest. That is a real and immediate benefit.

But I don't need to borrow money from the bank to realize immediately the benefit of this decrease in my liabilities. If I have had any common sense and foresight, I have been saving money to pay my taxes. Through such saving—and most of the people who have substantial taxes to pay do save for taxes—at the end of each year I have set aside enough out of the income of that year to meet my tax debt. . was therefor. even, so far as the year was concerned. Thus, a $10,000 man who owed $2,152 tax debt by December 31, 1942, would have $2,152 out of his 1942 income to meet that debt. He is, likewise, at this moment accumulating savings out of his 1943 income to meet the tax debt which is being built up on account of 1943 income. If we cancel the 1942 tax liability of $2,152 he does not need to use the amounts he has saved up in 1942 to pay his taxes. With his tax debt wiped out, the savings that he made in 1942 to meet that debt are available for other purposes. He does not need the 1942 savings to pay his taxes during 1943 because the savings he is accumulating out of 1943 income for the tax for 1943, and which he expected to use in 1944, under a current system would be paid directly in 1943 on 1943 taxes. Under any pay-as-you-go plan each year provides the income to pay the taxes of that year. A person does not need to save to meet a liability due next year, for there is no overhanging liability. If the Ruml plan passes, that money you have saved up in 1942 to pay your taxes is free for you to use in any other way you wish. You can make it a permanent part of your capital. Or you can spend it. It is money in your pocket available now to do with what you wish. That is an immediate benefit. An acquaintance of mine has been buying tax-savings notes. After the Senate Finance Committee voted to forgive a year's taxes he said he was writing his banker to stop deducting money to buy more notes. He has a year's notes that he can cash. This is a real and immediate benefit from forgiveness.

Some people do not save specifically to pay taxes but do save for other purposes. The result is the same. The taxpayer's need for savings is less by the amount of the forgiven tax. Even people who have been unwise enough not to save anything get an immediate financial benefit from forgiveness because they are freed from the danger of having a debt to meet with no income from which to meet it.

It does not matter whether your income is going up, or going down, or remains the same. The minute the Ruml plan became law, every taxpayer would be immediately benefited by an increase in his net worth of 1 year's taxes and that increase in net worth gives an immediate benefit of the same kind as any other forgiveness of debt.

Let us look at the tax payments for a minute. A pay-as-you-go plan, whether it is tied up with Ruml forgiveness or not, speeds up collection of taxes by about 1 year. The taxpayer would no longer be given the favor he has had of waiting a year to pay his income taxes. It is this speeded up collection that results in the receipts of the Government not dropping out disastrously for a year. Pay-as-you-go means that tax payments respond more quickly to increases or decreases in tax rates. As long as incomes are going up, a pay-as-you-go system will bring in more money than our present system. The minute incomes turn downward—and I think all of us believe they will turn downward after this war—the tax collections will turn downward 1 year sooner than under present law. Then is when the Government will particularly feel the loss in actual receipts from forgiving a year's taxes.

How are Government receipts kept up when people retire or die? If they are, it will be due to new taxpayers who did not get the benefit of the forgiveness. New taxpayers who have taxable incomes for the first time in 1943 or thereafter would have to pay currently but would not have had a year's tax dropped out. They are the ones who will make up for the loss in revenue which comes from the older taxpayers' declining incomes, or loss in incomes, to the extent that it is made up without raising rates.

The proponents of the Ruml plan talk as if no one was going to die, or retire, or lose his income for a lifetime. People are dying every day. The Rumlites saw they could not support a forgiveness plan where the taxpayer died in 1942 so they deny the forgiveness in that case. They say they could not support it where he died in 1943, so they put in a special windfall provision to reduce or wipe out the forgiveness. But, if he dies in 1944, the final and full effect of forgiveness as well as the immediate benefit is felt. There will be many people dying in 1944 and in the early years thereafter. Moreover, there are many people who will retire in 1944, or 1945, or 1946, and who will then derive all the final benefits of the year's forgiveness. Like everybody else, they would get the increase in net worth at once in 1943. But they would also get quickly the benefits of not having the final year's tax to pay. The elderly taxpayer gets the maximum benefit out of this plan sooner instead of later. Moreover, the more elderly taxpayers are likely to be the ones with the large incomes.

The advocates of tax cancelation have made a big point about getting back some of this forgiveness in the estate tax. Of course, the minute they talk about getting it back and the minute they talk about windfall provisions, that minute they are admitting the benefits I have been talking about. But let us pass over that inconsistency. They talk as if the estate tax would recover the loss in income tax. This is obviously not the case. Under no circumstances could the estate-tax return to the Federal Government exceed 77 percent, since that is the maximum estate-tax ate and it applies only above $10,000,000.

By far the largest part of the estates will, of course, not fall in these very high brackets. Only about 1 percent of the people dying in the United States have estates large enough to be subject to any Federal estate tax whatever. Moreover, the law affords ample opportunity for giving away property without tax or at much lower tax rates. The gift loophole would greatly cut down the return through the estate tax. There is also no assurance that the funds represented by this forgiveness will remain in the estate. Being a windfall, they are available for expenditure. They can support a trip to California, or a summer home in the mountains. Or the forgiven tax may be invested and lost in business. Any one of a dozen things may happen to keep the return to the Government from being substantial. There will be some return, no doubt, but the total amount of it can hardly be more than minor.

So much for the question of whether there really is forgiveness and really is a benefit.

This Ruml plan is bad chiefly because of the way in which the forgiveness is distributed. There are all sorts of ideas of what is fair and what is just. I am not going to try to impose my ideas of what is fair on my colleagues. But I want to give you a few facts and see if you do not agree that a tax bill which distributes its forgiveness the way this one does is grossly inequitable, according to your standards of fairness.

At the top are the 60 or so people who have incomes of a million dollars or more. The effect of this Ruml plan of forgiveness is to remit for each of these people as much as they could possibly save in 6 years if they saved every cent of what they would have left after taxes. Now, I think Congress did what it thought was equitable when it put the existing tax rates on the higher incomes. I think Congress wanted to have that tax burden imposed. The effect of this forgiveness is to undo our progressive tax schedules to the tune of handing our most fortunate citizens—60 in number—as much as they would have left over 6 years under our tax laws.

The same thing is true to a lesser extent for other high incomes. The person with a $100,000 income would be forgiven the equivalent of 20 months' income after taxes. But a person with an income of $2,000 would get the equivalent of less than 1 month's income after taxes.

It needs to be pointed out that under this bill 60 people with net incomes of $1,000,000 and over will receive as much forgiveness under the plan as 2,800,000 people with net incomes of less than $1,000; as much as 750,000 people with net incomes of $1,000 to $2,000; and as much as 550,000 people with net incomes of $2,000 to $3,000; and the forgiveness for the 60 millionaires will represent a far larger proportional increase in the income remaining after taxes. The forgiveness will average 226 months of income after taxes for the 60 people with the largest incomes as compared to an average of slightly over a half month for the large number having small incomes of less than $1,000, slightly over a month's income for those with incomes of from $1,000 to $2,000, and a little less than a month's income for people with net incomes of $2,000 to $3,000.

I do not want to cast aspersions on the supporters of the Ruml plan, but in the light of the disproportionately large benefits to the high-income groups, is it any wonder that the issues of the Ruml plan have been consistently and persistently misstated in the newspapers and that the facts of the kind I am telling you have scarcely appeared at all? Is it any wonder that the editorials of our most prosperous newspapers have fanatically favored the Ruml plan? Is it any wonder that the financial leaders of the Nation have thrown their prestige behind the Ruml plan? The unfortunate fact is that the great masses of the people who will get little out of this and who, as I shall point out in a few minutes, will lose what little they do get—the unfortunate fact is that these people have not been informed by the newspapers and by the radio of what the truth is about the Ruml plan. The people are all mixed up. I am willing to prophesy that if this plan becomes law the politicians who run for our seats and try to take our places here will be better able to persuade them than the Treasury Department has.

Here are some more facts that you do not read about in the newspapers. In the last 3 years, 1940, 1941, and 1942, we have been imposing new taxes to pay for the defense effort and the war. Now it is proposed that we turn around and forgive taxes for the year 1942. A person who has steadily had an income of $5,000 has had imposed on him new additional taxes for the war, totaling $991 up through December 31, 1942. An amount equal to three-fourths of that $991 is forgiven under the Ruml plan. The person with the $100,000 income will have had the whole increase forgiven under the Ruml plan. So far as the increased war taxes are concerned, the slate will be clean for him as of January 1, 1943. Finally, the man who has been getting $1,000,000 year after year will not only have been forgiven all tax increases up to January 1, 1943, but at present tax rates for 3 years more. He will actually be better off as of January 1, 1943,

by nearly $600,000, than if there had been no revenue act of 1940, 1941, and 1942, and no Ruml plan.

It is very unfortunate that this tax forgiveness proposal comes before the Senate as a separate issue. It should come here as part of the revenue bill. The President of the United States has asked for an additional $16,000,000,000. That is a conservative request in the light of the huge expenditures we are making and the terrific pressure of consumer purchasing power which threatens daily to break price ceilings and has made necessary extensive rationing and has given rise to black markets. Many people go along complacently as if our financing of the war was adequate. It is far from being adequate, either to raise the money the Government must have or to prevent inflation and other disastrous consequences during and after the war. And yet the bill before us does not raise $16,000,000,000. It does not raise any money, although it may result in a small immediate increase in receipts due to speeding up tax collections and to the so-called windfall provisions. It is not a revenue bill—it is a forgiveness bill. At a time when we should be raising $16,000,000,000 f additional revenue we are giving away nearly $9,000,000,000 of liabilities already owed to the Government. Now, you may be able to pick flaws with the idea that this $9,000,000,000 is a cashable asset of the Government. Be that as it may, the people know that forgiveness means a lightening of their burdens, as I have already shown you. It is certainly peculiar war psychology to tell the people of the United States that we can forgive the collection of $9,000,000,000 of tax liabilities in the middle of a war, when the need for revenue is as tremendous as it is. How can we expect in another month, or 2, or 3, or 4, to pass a bill increasing taxes as they should be increased—and as they must be increased if you and I and everyone else in the country is not to suffer, when we have told the American public that this is the time to decrease their taxes?

The matter is worse than that. Where are we going to get the $16,000,000,000? Obviously, we are not going to get it from the upper income brackets. We set an upper limit of 90 percent last year so that the full impact of the victory tax would not be felt by the top incomes. We are going to get the increased revenue out of the little fellow and out of the middle incomes. It does not matter how we do it. If we get it by a sales tax we get it out of the lowest incomes rather than out of the middle and higher ones. If we do it from an income tax, we protect the very lowest groups but get it out of some forty or forty-five million of our taxpayers, most of them with small and middle incomes. When we are through forgiving $9,000,000,000 and imposing $16,000,000,000 of additional taxes, those small and middle income groups will have nothing to show from this legislation. They will financially be far behind what they are now.

But the higher income groups are going to have a great deal to show from this year's legislation. The man with a million-dollar income is going to have 6 years of income after taxes to show for this year's legislation. There is no way by which we can take that from him and there is no way by which we can offset the gift by increasing the rates on his future income. He has a final net gain.

The small and middle incomes will get this forgiveness, to be sure, but it will not represent a net gain to them because we will have to impose on them much more than they gain. We shall simply have to if we are to get anything like $16,000,000,000. They would be very much better off if we were not to allow this forgiveness and to speed up collection of existing taxes instead of imposing as much new taxes. Taxpayers already owe the taxes on 1942 incomes. They received the income. By and large they saved money in 1942. The rate of saving in this country was higher in 1942 than it ever has been before. There would be little hardship in paying the 1942 tax over a period of 2 or 3 years while putting current taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis. It would be equitable and would merely be collecting what the taxpayers of this country now owe their Government. It would be simply removing the privilege of postponing payment by 1 year.

But what does this bill do? Does this bill get a substantial portion of the money we need by collecting the debts of people to the Government? It does not. It forgives all the taxpayers of the country 1 year's tax. It will be followed by a revenue measure which will in effect reimpose on the lower incomes and middle incomes the taxes which might have been gotten by collecting that debt. The upper income groups will have received benefits which cannot be taken away from them and which will permit them to retire and live in luxury the rest of their lives, without another stroke of work.

These are some of the things this bill does. Those are some of the reasons why I believe that the members of the Senate Finance Committee and the Members of this Body must not have been fully informed on the way the bill operates and on the effects it will have on the distribution of our tax burdens. It is not too late to kill this obnoxious plan and substitute some more rational measure in its place.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I rise at this time, not for the purpose of discussing the merits of the proposition for confiscation and double taxation, offered by the Senator from Texas, but simply to discuss a point of order. I do so at this time, because I preferred not to interrupt the Senator from Texas by rising to a point of order at the time when he called the representative of the Treasury Department to his side a moment ago. I had previously advised the Senator from Texas of my intention to advert to the rule of the Senate in this matter.

Mr. President, rule No. XXXIII of the Senate relates to the question of the privilege of the floor. I shall take the trouble to read the rule in full, Mr. President, in order to elaborate the point which I am about to make.

Rule XXXIII of the standing rules of the Senate is as follows:

RULE XXXIII. PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

No person shall be admitted to the floor of the Senate while in session, except as follows:

The President of the United States and his private secretary.

The President elect and Vice President elect of the United States.

Ex-Presidents and ex-Vice Presidents of the United States.

Judges of the Supreme Court.

Ex-Senators and Senators elect.

The officers and employees of the Senate in the discharge of their official duties.

Ex-Secretaries and ex-sergeants at arms of the Senate.

Members of the House of Representatives and Members elect.

Ex-Speakers of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, under the rule, not even an ex-Member of the House of Representatives is entitled to the privilege of the floor of this body, under the standing rule of the Senate. An exception is made in the case of those who have held the high honor of presiding over the House of Representatives.

The Sergeant at Arms of the House and his chief deputy and the Clerk of the House and his deputy.

Heads of the executive departments.

That is, Cabinet officers of the United States.

Ambassadors and Ministers of the United States.

Governors of States and Territories.

The General Commanding the Army.

The Senior Admiral of the Navy on the active list.

Not every admiral, not every general, but the General Commanding the Army and the Senior Admiral of the Navy on the active list.

Members of national legislatures of foreign countries.

Judges of the Court of Claims.

Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The Librarian of Congress and the Assistant Librarian in charge of the Law Library.

The Architect of the Capitol.

He, of course, is an official of the Senate and the House.

The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

Clerks to Senate committees and clerks to Senators when in the actual discharge of their official duties.

Clerks to Senators, to be admitted to the floor, must be regularly appointed and borne upon the rolls of the Secretary of the Senate as such.

Mr. President, under the explicit terms of the rule, those are the only persons who are entitled to be admitted to the floor of the Senate while the Senate is in session, and yet—and this does not apply only to the present debate—over a long period of time we have seen representatives of the various departments come into the Senate Chamber and sit around like crows on a limb, trying to influence the action of the Senate in passing on legislation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator has stated the rule exactly as it is written.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have read the rule.

Mr. HILL. Since the Senator has made the statement which he has made about the departments, does he not think it is fair to say that although bringing representatives of the departments to the floor of the Senate has not been in accordance with the rule, as the Senator says, it has been the practice to do so?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am protesting against the practice. I am not only protesting against the practice, but I am particularly protesting against such an instance as this, in which representatives of the Treasury Department have come into the Senate Chamber for the purpose of opposing a measure approved and recommended to the Senate by an overwhelming majority of one of its great standing committees.

It is a matter of common knowledge that representatives of the Treasury Department have been on the floor of the Senate actively lobbying in opposition to

the report submitted by the Finance Committee of the Senate. When the Senate adjourned yesterday there were a sufficient number of those representatives around the desk of the Senator from Louisiana, waving their arms, to have constituted a town meeting.

Mr. HILL. Is it not fair to say that the representatives who have come here from the Treasury Department and from other departments have come at the invitation or suggestion of some Member of the Senate?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not think there is the slightest doubt of it. I am not making these remarks for the purpose of criticizing the young men who come here from the Treasury Department. I am simply giving notice that I think the rule ought to be enforced or repealed. I think the practice has been a growing evil. I have seen examples of it on several previous occasions. I remember when Mr. Thomas Corcoran and Mr. Ben Cohen came here and took their places on the floor of the Senate alongside the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] advising him and whispering in his ear in connection with most important legislation. I have seen Army officers in uniform come here and sit beside a Senator. I think the practice is in violation of the rule, and ought to be stopped.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. For the purpose of the RECORD, let me say that Mr. Corcoran never came on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As a matter of fact, I think Tommy sat on the lounge outside the door, and Ben sat next to the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. Ben Cohen came here when the public utility holding company bill was before us, and he came at my request. Mr. Corcoran never came into the Chamber.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He sat on the couch which I can see through the door. The Senator is probably correct.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator probably saw him. I asked him to come here. The question was never raised, and he rendered valuable service when the bill was before the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I say, I did not raise the point of order when the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] turned around and called this young man to his side. I do not wish to make a personal issue of it, because I do not think it is the fault of the young man who came here. Treasury representatives have been in the habit of coming here and sitting around, giving advice. They are encouraged to do so by the attitude of the Secretary of the Treasury, who gives advice to Congress through the newspapers almost daily, and by the attitude of Mr. Randolph Paul, general counsel of the Treasury Department, who tells on the radio what Congress ought to do, and what Congress must do. However, I call attention to the rule, with the suggestion that I think a great deal more attention should be paid to it in the future than has been paid to it in the past, or else the rule should be repealed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator is well within his rights in calling attention to the rule. He has read the rule. Under the rule, gentlemen, who come not only from the Treasury Department but other departments, are not entitled to be admitted to the floor of the Senate. However, I do not think the Senator ought to give the impression to the Senate or to the country that these gentlemen have shoved themselves in here, so to speak, as lobbyists, on their own initiative. They have come here, whether they have come from the Treasury Department or from some other department, at the invitation and request of some Member of the Senate. Of course, the purpose of having them here, as the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] has said, and as has been my experience on one or two occasions, is that the Senator in charge of a bill or some particular amendment may have the information which the representative of the department can give him, so that the Senator may transmit such information to the Senate.

The Senator is entirely within his rights in calling attention to this practice, but he ought not to give the impression that representatives of the departments have crowded into the Senate like lobbyists. They have come here at the request of Members of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I still have the floor.

I have already said that I recognize this practice as a growing evil. That is the reason I am calling attention to it today. I do not know who invited these gentlemen to come here. I do know that the practice has been an increasingly prevalent evil in the Senate. Almost anyone connected with any executive department has felt that he had the right to be admitted to the floor of the Senate. As a matter of fact, they pull at the coattails of Senators and give them advice. At the conclusion of the debate in the Senate yesterday I noted the occurrence to which I have referred, in the nature of a town meeting. I am now calling attention to the letter of the rule, with the suggestion that I think it should be enforced. I do not criticize the representatives of the Treasury Department particularly, because I have seen on the floor of the Senate representatives of almost every other department and commission. I have always thought that it was an evil to violate the rule of the Senate in that way, and I am now calling attention to the specific provisions of the rule.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Missouri is quite familiar with all the rules. However, the Senator knows that there is statutory law and there is common law. Common law grows up as a matter of custom, and statutory law supersedes the common law.

For years it has been the practice, at the request of Senators, to have representatives from the departments who are familiar with all the facts sit by them and respond to requests for information. As I stated to the Senate, the young man from the Treasury Department came here at my invitation, so that instead of my stopping in the middle of a speech and running through a pamphlet containing 10 or 15 pages, I could call on him, and in a moment, while I was talking about something else, he could have the information ready for us. If the Senator from Missouri is going to insist upon a strict construction of the rule, the legislative counsel who sits by the Senator from Georgia cannot remain in the Chamber.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me, I think that the head of the joint congressional committee staff is clearly entitled to be admitted to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Where does the rule say that he is entitled to be admitted to the floor of the Senate?

Mr. WHEELER. It is not in the rule.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is nothing in the rule which would entitle him to that privilege.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I disagree with the Senator. I think that the provision entitling clerks to Senate committees and clerks to Senators to be admitted to the floor of the Senate would apply to members of the staff of a joint legislative committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let us see if it does.

Clerks to Senate committees and clerks to Senators when in the actual discharge of their official duties. Clerks to Senators, to be admitted to the floor, must be regularly appointed and borne upon the rolls of the Secretary of the Senate as such.

That is, as clerks to Senators. The joint committee is not a Senate committee. It is a joint committee between the House and Senate.

I do not wish to exclude those gentlemen. I wish to have them here. I do not wish to shut the windows of my soul to information. I obtain a great deal of information from Senators, but there is some information which Senators do not have. I have found on several occasions that I can thus obtain information which is not in the possession of any Senator. So I think it is very helpful. I think it expedites the work of the Senate. If the rule is to be invoked harshly and rigidly, I should favor a modification or an amendment of it, because I believe the Senate needs information at times, and I am willing to receive information, but I want it to come from a reliable source. From my contacts with them I have never found among the representatives of the Treasury Department or other departments who have been sent here to aid Senators anyone who did not answer honestly and intelligently concerning the matters under inquiry. I never had one to press his views on me. I did not invite him here for that purpose. We may have our own views, but we certainly can obtain from these men factual information, as well as information concerning practices of the departments and their reactions to the laws which Congress has passed. So, Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Missouri will exercise the able and gracious

tolerance for which he is famed, and not insist on a rigid and strict enforcement of the rule.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the matter which has been brought up by the Senator from Missouri.

It is obvious from a reading of the rule that a strict enforcement of it would exclude any person not mentioned directly in the rule and described therein, from having the privilege of the floor of the Senate. But, Mr. President, it is a matter of common knowledge that legislation, and the problems with which the House and the Senate have to deal have become so complex, and the duties, obligations, and problems confronting Senators have become so diverse, that it is impossible for any one Senator, no matter how hard he may work, to become an expert on complex questions such as those involving tax legislation.

I am proud of my membership on the Finance Committee. I think I can say, without making any comparison with any other committee, that the membership of the Finance Committee other than myself, is certainly representative of the ability which is lodged in this Chamber. Mr. President, I venture the assertion that if that committee had nothing else to do it could not frame and bring to the floor of the Senate a tax bill under conditions which confront us when we come to a revision of the tax laws, or the necessity of increasing revenue.

To my certain knowledge, Mr. President, ever since the Revenue Act of 1917 representatives of the Treasury Department have been upon the floor of the Senate, not to lobby, but to furnish information to Senators. I grant that they have been here in violation of a strict enforcement of the rule, but I also make the assertion that the Senate could not have legislated, it could not have discharged its responsibility in connection with these important measures without the assistance of experts here to give information impartially to any Senator who desired to ask for it—not argument, but information, I emphasize.

We have also had present with us since 1924, I believe, if my recollection serves me correctly, representatives of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation in connection with each revenue bill. I do not think they are privileged to the floor under the strict interpretation of the rule. Yet, I say that it would be a great mistake, and the work of the Senate upon revenue legislation would be greatly impaired, if the members of the staff of the joint committee could not be here likewise to furnish impartial information to Senators who disagree—sometimes very definitely and sharply—upon questions of policy in connection with revenue legislation.

It has been my experience, Mr. President, that both the experts of the Treasury Department and the experts of the joint committee have, insofar as humanly possible, endeavored to furnish impartially, and without bias, information to Senators who have disagreed violently upon principles as well as the application of principles to questions of taxation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is a member of the Finance Committee. Does he think the committee itself, the members of which are supposed to be well informed upon the subject, could get anywhere without the constant attendance of these experts before the committee? Does that not hold true also here in the Senate?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I made the statement that I do not believe the committee could discharge its responsibilities without the assistance of experts both from the joint committee and from the Treasury. I think it follows that the Senate could not discharge its responsibility as well as it does discharge it if it did not have the privilege of allowing these experts to be present here upon the floor of the Senate.

I would join with the Senator from Missouri in saying that we ought to modify the rule and make it definite and specific. But, unfortunately, Mr. President, or fortunately—I have never been able to decide which—the Senate does not enforce its rules. The Senate has operated usually on the principle of unanimous consent and practice. It is only when some advantage from a parliamentary standpoint can be obtained that the rules of the Senate are invoked.

That leads me to say that once a very able man came to the Senate of the United States. He had never had any experience in legislative bodies, but he had made a mark for himself in the world outside affairs of government. At various times during the first few months of his work in the Senate I saw him reading the Senate Manual, marking paragraphs of the rules. Occasionally he would raise his eyes from his book and a look of mystery and amazement would come over his face as I assumed he was attempting to apply the rule to the procedure which was taking place before his eyes.

I ventured to say to him that I thought that unless he intended to become involved in a filibuster, or unless he hoped at some time to take a parliamentary advantage as a result of knowledge of the rules, he certainly could learn nothing as to the daily activity and action of the Senate by a study of its rules, no matter how long he devoted himself to that purpose.

Mr. President, I hope at some time the Rules Committee will undertake a revision and modernization of the rules of the Senate, but it seems to me it would be unfortunate to invoke the rule now. I wish to join with the Senator from Texas in urging the Senator from Missouri not to invoke the rule in the midst of consideration of what is obviously a very complex and difficult tax bill or tax problem.

Mr. McFARLAND and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall yield in a moment. I wish to say one further word.

I have observed the experts present upon the floor of the Senate, and I wish to say that there are only two experts from the Treasury Department whom I have recognized as being on the floor of the Senate during the time the pending bill has been under consideration. That is a lesser number than has usually been present. The other experts here are from the joint committee staff or from the legislative counsel's office of the House of Representatives and of the Senate.

I now yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he does not agree that this discussion shows the need for experts being employed by the Senate so that the Senate may rely on them and not be required to call in experts from the various departments.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, we have available to us the experts of the joint committee. I certainly would join with the Senator in saying that I believe we need more expert service in the Senate. But unless the Senate and the House of Representatives are willing to appropriate a great deal more money for expert services than they have been willing to appropriate in the past, there will be a continuing need on the part of the Senate, when confronted with legislation such as tax legislation or complex legislation of other character, to call upon experts from various departments of the Government. I certainly hope that we will not place ourselves in such a position that we cannot obtain the information which is necessary to an intelligent consideration of the problems which confront us.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not understand that a motion has been submitted by the distinguished Senator from Missouri but that he has simply called attention to the rules. I hope very much that we may proceed with the bill. I regret the circumstances which have provoked this discussion, because I think the officials of the Treasury Department have usually come here at our insistence and request to aid and assist us, and I know that I have always found their assistance to be invaluable.

Mr. President, there is a point I should like to bring to the attention of the Senator from Texas. Since the proposal which I have made is not in the form of a substitute for the entire bill but is in the nature of a perfecting amendment to a particular section of the bill, the question has arisen in my mind—and my view has been confirmed by the statement of the Parliamentarian—that the vote upon that amendment should come before the vote upon the complete substitute, because, if the complete substitute should be adopted, I would have no opportunity to present my amendment. I did not think that was the situation when the Senator from Texas presented his amendment, because he very kindly said he would be glad to have my amendment presented first, but I think that is the situation at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have assured the Senator from Georgia all along that I did not want to embarrass the status of his amendment in any way. I also propounded an inquiry or two with reference to the matter.

Mr. GEORGE. The amendment of the Senator from Texas would be in order after action on my amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would then be in order.

Mr. GEORGE. That is quite true.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I understand the ruling of the Chair, the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, if it does not go to the whole bill and is not a complete substitute, could be considered as being in the nature of a perfecting amendment, which would take precedence over my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of opinion that the Senator from Texas is correct. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia being in the nature of a perfecting amendment would take precedence.

Mr. CONNALLY. With that understanding, I have no objection. I desire to go along with the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas very much. This question, I think, has been pretty thoroughly debated, and I do not care to elaborate on it, but I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate a few facts which, as I view them, may dissipate some confusion.

I think there can be little criticism made of the Canadian system and of the method by which they assess and collect their individual income taxes. I should like to read from the budget statement of the Minister of Finance of Canada under date of March 2, 1943, and I invite Senators who do not think there is any reason to change to a pay-as-you-earn basis to notice the common sense of the statement of the Canadian Minister of Finance.

The first and most important measure I shall propose—

Said the Minister—

is the placing of our personal income tax on a pay-as-we-earn basis. In this way we will complete the transformation in our income tax begun with the enactment of the national-defense tax in 1941, and carried last year to an advanced stage both in collecting a graduated tax at the source and in collecting as early as possible after the income is received on which the tax is assessed.

That is precisely our problem.

I am proposing—

Said the Minister—

that beginning this year, 1943, the income tax currently collected at the source or paid in quarterly installments shall apply in respect of the tax to be assessed on the income of this current year, 1943. If Parliament sees fit to put this proposal into effect, we shall then be on a fully current income-tax basis. No one, speaking generally, will then be liable for large amounts of income tax on income he has earned in the past, except to the extent that adjustments in tentative tax deductions or payments must be made after the year's income is finally determined with accuracy.

Listen, I beg of my colleagues—

The advantages of a system of current payment of tax such as I propose are now well known, so I need only remind you of them. Under this plan, when a man's income falls off, his tax falls off with it; when his income rises, his tax rises with it. It enables us to avoid the lag in the payment of tax under our present system—a lag which now amounts to about 8 months—

In our case 15 months, because we are not on a partially current basis; Canada was on a current basis at the time, or prior to 1943—

substantially less than it was several years ago, but still a problem to those suffering or expecting to suffer a reduction in income.

Need I remind the Senate and the country that the hour is inevitable when every taxpayer, must of necessity and without exception, witness the complete cessation of income, all of us, because all of us must eventually die.

The difficulties in the present system are most serious in the case of those whose incomes cease or decline severely because they enter the armed forces, lose their jobs, retire or die. Advocates of such a plan have made most people very much aware of the personal problems created in such situations by income tax debts. With taxes at present levels, such problems are now very difficult ones for any who have not made provision in advance for their taxes.

Our friends say that we ought all to make provision in advance for our taxes, but the answer is we do not do it; the answer is that humanity is not perfect, that it is weak, and there is no need to talk about what we should do either as a moral obligation or as a matter of convenience. We simply do not do it. Forty-four million taxpayers in this country will not do it. There need be no mistake about that. Reading further from the statement of the Canadian Minister of Finance:

For example, a young married man who has earned $40 a week during 1942 who wished to join the Air Force at the beginning of this year had to face the necessity of paying income tax of $282, on his civilian income of last year and out of his much lower service pay this year. Again, if a professional man earning, say, $5,000 a year, should die and leave behind a wife and two children, they would be liable for perhaps $831 of income taxes, whether or not there was any estate. The wage earner who loses his job would in many cases have anything up to several hundred dollars of income taxes to pay during the succeeding 6 months or year—taxes on income he had probably spent while he was earning it.

It is taxes on income which he most certainly would have spent in 90 cases out of every hundred.

Anyone who looks forward to early retirement on a pension considerably lower than his current earnings faces an almost insuperable barrier. We do not wish such persons either to exhaust what savings they have set aside or to be forced to break the law.

Mr. President, that is a pretty sound philosophy of government, we have to learn all over again in these United States, that before our citizens can furnish the money to the Government, they have to be permitted to earn it.

We hear a great deal about the pending proposal being a scheme to take care of the rich. Tax rates in Canada are very similar to ours, and let us take the case of an ordinary young man in any profession, say a lawyer, a teacher, a doctor, a dentist, one who earns five or six thousand dollars a year, and has a wife and two children. At any time when he dies he will owe nearly a thousand dollars in taxes, and perhaps the only thing on earth he leaves in his estate is a little four- or five-room house, and that house would have to be sold, or the widow would have to beg for extension at the Treasury, and at the tax collector's office, with this tax liability hanging over her head, and nothing with which to pay it, the income earner gone, and practically no estate at all.

The Minister of Finance said further:

There are other substantial advantages of a pay-as-we-earn plan. It enables us to make more effective use of collection at the source from earnings and to avoid many refunds and adjustments that would otherwise be necessary. Secondly, it will make it possible in the future to adjust our income-tax rates and collections more promptly when changes in economic or other circumstances make such adjustments desirable. In this way it will make the income tax a better instrument of fiscal policy in helping to maintain full employment.

It is to overcome the various types of difficulty which I have described, and to obtain the other advantages of having our taxes on a sound current basis that the Government is proposing now to complete the transformation of our income-tax system to a full pay-as-we-earn plan.

In the case of Canada, it is necessary to forgive only 50 percent of the tax on all earned income, carrying over the tax on unearned income until the date of the death of the decedent, with certain privileges of redemption by him.

Now I wish to read a few concluding words from this sober, thoughtful, tax executive, commenting on conditions in a country undergoing almost the same experiences we are undergoing, paralleling almost our own experiences here, a country at war, with rising incomes, with advancing wages. He says:

In order to make the change to a complete pay-as-we-earn system of taxation on the income of 1943 and subsequent years, it is necessary to make some adjustments of the tax on 1942 incomes.

He is right; there is no other way of doing it, because it is not possible to double up sufficiently to do it, without destroying the taxpayers.

I continue reading from the Minister of Finance:

If this is not done, we should have to pay a large part of the 1942 tax as well as the 1943 tax during the year 1943. If tax rates were substantially lower than they are, this overlapping would not be serious. With rates at their present high levels, we must avoid piling the unpaid portion of the 1942 tax liability on top of the current collections for 1943. This is the difficult problem of the transition to the pay-as-we-earn system. Nearly everyone

has recognized the virtues of being on the pay-as-we-earn system.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to be considered before the one offered by the Senator from Texas?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; because mine is in the nature of a perfecting amendment, and has to be voted on first. The Senator from Texas has very kindly offered to permit that course to be followed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know whether the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is in the Chamber, but he has an amendment which I had hoped would be brought up ahead of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia. His amendment proposes to assess a withholding tax, and apply it to the 1942 liability currently.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be very glad to do what I can to get a vote; I am trying to bring the debate to an end, and obtain a final determination.

I have spoken of the necessity of getting on a pay-as-you-earn basis. Regarding the wisdom and the necessity of that at this time, I do not see how reasonable minds can differ. It will cost something to do it, because we are not able to collect 2 years' taxes in 1 year.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], on whose amendment we voted this morning, proposed to spread the 1942 tax over 5 years. On incomes of $250,000 and up there would have been exacted of the taxpayer many thousands of dollars more than his total earnings. With a provision for a 5-year period, when one has accounted for his living expenses, for his doctor's bills, and made all the other deductions, the Senator's amendment would have meant plain bankruptcy of every man in the United States earning $250,000, who paid taxes on it in 1942.

Under the amendment I am offering there would be a slight doubling up, and there would be, for the period of 2 years, an increase above the actual income of the taxpayer whose income reached $500,000 or more. It is perfectly clear that the income taxpayer whose income is above $500,000 can pay slightly more for 2 years for a privilege which is of inestimable benefit to him and to his estate, and which will enable his government to go on a pay-as-you-earn basis.

When one considers the high rates of our present income taxes, and when one considers that the taxpayer is always behind one full year, and contemplates the end of that taxpayer's life, or the end of his career as an earner, and adds the two taxes which may be exacted, or only one tax, if you please, if there be no taxable estate under the estate tax law, incomes will have to be very large before the widow and children of the deceased taxpayer can be assured of the retention of even small property holdings.

Mr. President, I have offered to do no more than the House did in its bill so far as the matter of revenue is concerned. Under the bill passed by the House the aggregate individual income tax is reduced by some 76 or nearly 77 percent—at least 76 percent—but that reduction is not uniform. It is a 100-percent reduction in the low brackets and it ranges to 19-percent deduction in the higher brackets.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the argument is made that that is the way it should be, but I do not see how reasonable men can take that position. If we are to have a progressive income-tax system, if we are to have it properly graduated—and while it is not perfect, it is graduated from the ground up to 88 percent, not considering the Victory tax of 5 percent on gross—if we have done a halfway job in graduating the tax on income and it rises, then the only fair and logical and consistent thing to do is to give to every taxpayer the same percentage reduction when there is to be a reduction made in the tax.

Mr. President, in 1924 we reduced taxes in this country effective as beginning in the calendar year 1923, by a flat 25 percent in everybody's tax. At one time, there was a proposal before the Ways and Means Committee to apply the same principle in the form of a flat 50-percent reduction of each individual's income tax. This is a true principle which, in my opinion we ought to apply in canceling or abating any part of the 1942 tax liability.

The bill as passed by the House, while it cancels about 76 percent of the 1942 liability, does not give equal treatment to all taxpayers. Some taxpayers have only 20 percent of their tax liability canceled while others have 100 percent canceled. In terms of cancelation under the bill passed by the House the cancelation ranges, as I have said, from 100 to 19 percent.

Mr. President, I invite Senators who are present to look at the committee bill and see what the amendment which I have proposed will accomplish so far as producing revenue is concerned. The amendment I have proposed would bring in a substantial amount of additional revenue to the Treasury and at the same time would make it possible for a taxpayer to go on a pay-as-you-earn basis. As has been pointed out, the committee bill technically cancels the entire 1942 liability, but in effect draws back or recoups $1,300,000,000, or 13 percent of that liability, through the two windfall provisions. The first windfall provision is estimated to bring in $900,000,000, the second $400,000,000.

The amendment I have proposed also technically cancels the 1942 liability, but in effect would recoup $3,129,000,000, or practically one-third of that liability. Of this total recoupment, $2,229,000,000 would represent 25 percent of the lower year, either 1942 or 1943 liability of all taxpayers, and $900,000,000 would represent the gain under the first windfall provision, whose effects would not be materially altered under or by my amendment.

By way of comparison, it has been estimated that $2,213,000,000, or about 23 percent of the 1942 liability, would remain uncanceled under the bill passed by the House. It will be noted that my amendment in effect would bring into the Treasury $1,829,000,000 more of the 1942 liability than would the Finance Committee bill as it stands, and $916,000,000 more than would the bill as passed by the House. Moreover these increases would be reflected in Treasury receipts almost immediately, that is in the fiscal years 1944 and 1945.

Mr. President, that is all I care to say upon this amendment, except to repeat that after the most careful thought and most careful consideration, I am convinced that the taxpayers can pay 25 percent straight through in all the brackets of the 1942 liability, and that being true, I do not think that we should abate it. Therefore, as much as I desire to go on a pay-as-you-earn basis, I believe we should recognize these facts and refuse to abate anything more than we are compelled to abate.

Mr. President, I do not care to discuss the substitute amendment which the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has already presented to the Senate, and which he very kindly placed aside in order to give me a parliamentary status for the vote, except to say that under the amendment which I have offered, if the bill goes to conference, and it is the judgment of the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate, and of the two Houses subsequently, to accomplish substantially all that the Senator from Texas can accomplish under his substitute, it will be entirely within the province of the conferees and of the two Houses subsequently to do, by merely reducing or abating the 1942 tax by 50 percent. It would do it in the same way, because under the bill known as the committee bill in the House you go back to the 1941 rates and to the 1941 exemptions, you recalculate your income in 1942 by applying the rates and exemptions, doubling up the work placed upon the taxpayers, and immensely increasing the work of the Treasury Department and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Mr. President, in the 1942 act we lowered exemptions and increased rates, which resulted in adding 7,000,000 taxpayers to the rolls. The substitute amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Texas would propose to repeal that provision in the 1942 act as to the year 1942, and to let these 7,000,000 taxpayers go free of all tax liability for that year.

Much as I regret it, Mr. President, I would not be able to support that measure. Much as I regret it, because I have the greatest confidence and respect for the House conferees and for the members of the House Ways and Means Committee, I could not support that particular measure. I do not think it is as good as a great many other proposals. Actually it will raise or retain for the Treasury more of the 1942 liability, but its effect is not to apply the reduction equally among our taxpayers.

I shall be glad to answer any questions with respect to the amendment I have offered, but its terms are so well understood and so clear to the minds of all Senators that perhaps no question is necessary.

Mr. President, I wish to offer the amendment in corrected form. The amendment has been printed, and there is no change in substance. There are simply certain technical corrections in the amendment as printed, and there is one subsection which was inadvertently omitted; but that subsection merely would give to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary, the power to administer the section I have amended, under rules and regulations to be promulgated by him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment as now presented as modified will be printed in the RECORD, unless the Senator desires to have it read.

Mr. GEORGE. No, Mr. President; it is practically the same as the one read yesterday and printed in the RECORD. Unless some other Senator desires to have the amendment read, I see no necessity to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment, as modified, will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. GEORGE is as follows:

Page 97, line 19, strike out "and (2)" and insert: "(2) the tax under such chapter for the taxable year 1943 shall be increased by an amount equal to 25 percent of the tax for the taxable year 1942 (determined without regard to this subsection, without regard to interest and additions to such tax, and without regard to credits against such tax for amounts withheld at source), and (3)."

Page 98, line 12, strike out "such excess" and insert: "the sum of such excess plus an amount equal to 25 percent of the tax for the taxable year 1943 (so determined), which shall be in lieu of the increase therein under clause (2) of subsection (a)."

Page 98, beginning with the word "the" at the end of line 14, strike out down to and including the word "Secretary" in line 19 and insert: "in determining such increase the portion of such excess which is attributable to earned net income (as defined in section 25 (a) (4)), as determined under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, shall be disregarded."

Page 98, beginning in line 20, strike out all of subsection (c).

Beginning on page 100, line 23, strike out down to and including the period in line 11 on page 101 and insert:

"(c) Extension of time for payment of half of 25 percent increase in 1943 tax under subsections (a) or (b): At the election of the taxpayer, made under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, the Commissioner shall, except as hereinafter provided, extend the time for the payment of the portion of the tax for the taxable year 1943 equal to one-half of the amount of the 25-percent increase therein under subsection (a) or (b), in which case such portion shall be paid on or before the 15th day of the fifteenth month following the close of such taxable year."

Page 101, lines 13 and 14, strike out "of such increase" and insert "with respect to which the extension applies."

Page 101, line 18, strike out "on each installment" and insert in lieu thereof "on such portion", and in line 22 strike out "installment" and insert "portion."

Page 101, line 23, strike out "any installment" and insert "such portion", and in lines 24 and 25 strike out "and the remaining installments."

Page 102, line 1, strike out "any installment" and insert "such portion", and in line 3 and in line 5 strike out "installment" and insert "portion."

Page 102, line 7, strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)."

Page 102, lines 7 and 8, strike out "(b) and (c)" and insert "(a) and (b)."

Page 102, in line 12, and in lines 14 and 15, strike out "(b) and (c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(a) and (b)."

Page 102, in line 19, and in line 22, strike out "subsections (b) and (c)" and insert "subsection (b)."

Page 102, after the period in line 23, insert: "The 25 percent amount by which the tax for the taxable year 1943 is increased under subsection (a) or (b) shall not be held or considered to be a part of the tax for such taxable year for the purposes of sections 58, 59, 60, and 294 (a) (3), (4), and (5) of the Internal Revenue Code. Subsections (a) and (b) shall be applied in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary."

Page 102, line 24, strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)."

Page 103, line 3, strike out "(g)" and insert "(f)."

Page 104, line 5, strike out "(h)" and insert "(g)."

Page 107, line 3, strike out "6 (b)" and insert "6 (a) or (b)."

Page 107, strike out lines 9 to 15, inclusive, and insert:

"(B) the entire amount by which the tax for the taxable year 1943 is increased under section 6 (a) or (b) to the extent that such amount is so attributable; and

"(C) the entire amount of the tax so attributable for all subsequent taxable years during which he was in such service; or

"(3) if such individual entered upon such service after the close of the taxable year beginning in 1943,

"(A) that portion of the amount by which the tax for the taxable year 1943 is increased under section 6 (a) or (b) of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943 which falls due (otherwise than by reason of an extension of time for payment) after entering upon such service, to the extent that such portion is so attributable;

"(B) the entire amount of the tax so attributable for all taxable years during the whole of which he was in such service."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before the question is put, unless there is to be argument——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, let me inquire what is the present parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Georgia, as modified, has just been submitted; and the question will be on agreeing to it.

Mr. LODGE. As an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. As an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Has the Senator from Texas withdrawn his amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. Temporarily.

Mr. LODGE. Temporarily?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; because the adoption of his amendment, which was a complete substitute, would have precluded any further discussion on the committee version.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia were agreed to, would it then be impossible for the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] to offer his amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair understands not. The bill would be open to further amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think the Senator from Texas would be precluded from offering his amendment; and in the event that question should arise, I would ask that the Senator have the privilege of presenting it. I think undoubtedly he could present it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have only this final word to add: I believe that when the thoughtful people of the country—small taxpayers and large taxpayers—know all the facts they will not hesitate to say that the amendment I have offered to the bill should be agreed to, rather than the committee version, because it goes as far as it is necessary to go, in my opinion, in order to accomplish everything which should be properly accomplished by the committee version. I think the American people will feel, upon sober reflection, that the Congress should not take steps to abate the entire 1942 liability, when that is unnecessary.

So far as the committee plan is concerned, I frankly admit that if it were agreed to, there would come into the Treasury in 1943 the same amount of money as that under existing law, increased by any increase in income upon which the levy would be imposed, plus the windfalls. But all the windfall effect, of course, would not come in within the first fiscal year, because such items would be collected over a period of years.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. From the statement the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the very able and much-beloved chairman of the Finance Committee, made in the Finance Committee, I have understood that it was the theory of the Senator from Georgia, in offering his substitute, that a certain amount of double taxation—which, of course, his proposal is, to the extent of 25 percent of the 1942 taxes—would be justifiable if taken as an increase in the forthcoming tax rates, and that it would be a substitute for an increase in the tax rates. Am I correct in that statement? I certainly so understood the Senator, as he made his original statement.

Mr. GEORGE. I may have made that statement, and I think I did make it in substance; but, of course, in that respect I was speaking for myself; I was not undertaking to bind the Treasury.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I understood that was the Senator's individual proposition.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; and I still think so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But, of course, the Senator is familiar with the fact that, possibly for the purpose of increasing any effective support that

there might be for the so-called Ellender plan, and perhaps for the purpose of trying to influence Senate action against either the committee amendment or the Senator's own substitute, the Secretary of the Treasury yesterday took occasion to announce that he was going to insist on the levying of $16,000,000,000 of new taxes. As I read his statement, he said Congress had to do that. Of course, I do not understand what authority the Secretary of the Treasury has to say that Congress has to do anything; but I so read the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Therefore, I take it that the Senator from Georgia is not in a position to say that his proposal would be a substitute for additional taxes. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I cannot say that; because I am not speaking for the Treasury. Frankly, although some part of the press has intimated that my plan has the approval of the Treasury, I do not think I should say that my plan does have the Treasury's approval—certainly not in the first degree; it might have in the second, third, or fourth degree.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But the Senator's own proposition, as presented to the Finance Committee, was that the increasing or doubling-up of taxes to the extent of 25 percent of 1942 income, which would be spread over 2 years, and would amount to a 12½-percent increase of taxes——

Mr. GEORGE. Not a 12½-percent increase; it would be a 12½-percent increase of the 1942 liability, which would be far less——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is correct. As I was saying, the Senator's own proposition, as presented to the Finance Committee, was that the increasing or doubling-up of taxes to the extent of 25 percent of 1942 income would be taken in lieu of further taxes in the period in which the increase or doubling-up would be imposed; is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. I speak to the Senator in perfect frankness, and say that would be so only insofar as I myself am concerned.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understood that the Senator from Georgia was speaking only for himself. I am very much interested in his proposition, and I am interested in ascertaining now what it is. But, in view of the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, it seems to me that that very appealing argument for the plan of the Senator from Georgia has failed.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know why the Secretary of the Treasury made the statement, and I do not know what statement he made. I suspect that he expressed the hope that we might raise $15,000,000,000 or $16,000,000,000 of new taxes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, the Senator from Georgia is undoubtedly familiar with the fact that certain elements of the taxpayers of the country have taken that proposition, as it was understood by me and, I think, by every other member of the Finance Committee, and have been sending out telegrams urging the support of the Senator's proposal on the very basis that it might obviate an increase in corporation taxes.

Mr. GEORGE. I said nothing about corporation taxes, and corporation taxes are not involved in the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I entirely agree with the Senator from Georgia on that point. However, a certain very powerful organization of large taxpayers, I am informed, not by authority of the organization itself, but by authority of a section of the organization, has been sending out telegrams, as the Senator may or may not know, supporting his amendment on the theory that it was the most effective way to prevent increased taxes on corporations during the period of the next 2 years. I refer to the National Association of Manufacturers, I say to the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. I know nothing of the telegrams. I have conferred with no member of the association.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I was not suggesting that the Senator from Georgia had done so. I should like to have the Senator understand me on that point. I am not suggesting that the Senator from Georgia was a party to the sending out of the telegrams. As a matter of fact, I am informed by responsible officers of the National Association of Manufacturers that the telegrams were sent out not by that organization, but by an individual member of the organization who happened to be chairman of its tax committee. Nevertheless, the fact remains that within the last 2 days a considerable propaganda has been started in behalf of the Senator's substitute, on the theory that it would obviate any increase in corporation taxes.

Mr. GEORGE. As I see it, corporation taxes are certainly not involved in this bill either directly or indirectly. My position is that if 25 percent of the 1942 liability of the individual income taxpayer were carried over, as I have suggested, there should be no further increase in individual income-tax rates for the next 2 years. If the Republicans should take charge of the Senate 2 years hence—the good Lord forbid—I think we might safely anticipate that they would not suggest a further increase in individual income-tax rates.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. That was the very question I wished to ask the Senator. Of course, the assurance given by the Senator is only his own.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The Treasury certainly has given no such assurance, as I understand.

Mr. GEORGE. Not so far as I know.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to state also, for myself, that I certainly would give no such assurance. In my opinion individual income taxes should be raised during the next 2 years. Certainly I would not regard the increase which is proposed, of one-eighth of the tax, without any attempt to adjust the rates as between the lower and upper brackets, as adequate. In some cases I think the rates are too low, and in other cases I think they are too high. Certainly the passage of this bill would not lead me to think that we can set aside any possible increase in individual income taxes. I believe that individual income taxes should be increased.

Mr. GEORGE. I am speaking only for myself. I agree with the Senator from Ohio that there should be some adjustments in individual income-tax rates, but I would not be willing to vote for still further increases in the individual rates if 25 percent of the 1942 liability were carried over, as I have suggested. However, I am speaking only for myself. I am not undertaking to bind the Treasury, and I am not suggesting that my view represents the Treasury's attitude.

However, I hope that I may be permitted to live during the next 2 years, and that will be my position, particularly if this increase is now superimposed on top of the present rates. That would not preclude certain necessary adjustments which should be made.

I am very anxious to have the opportunity to make some adjustment in the Victory tax, and particularly in the provision for crediting that tax in the computation of income for general income-tax purposes. However, those questions are, of course, not precluded by my statement. I would not undertake to influence any Senator to vote for this proposal in the hope that there would be no further increase in individual income taxes, but I can say with great confidence that there is certainly much stronger probability that we shall face a demand for an increase in the individual income-tax rates if the committee bill is enacted as it was reported to this body, and that demand will be very difficult to resist.

So far as the corporate rates are concerned, I think my own opinion is fairly well known to the country. I know nothing of any telegram which anyone sent, why he sent it, or what may have influenced the sending of the telegram; and I do not care. I have never been afraid that any kind of propaganda would persuade me to do wrong. I have never been afraid to talk to anyone because I have never believed that anyone, by talking to me, could make me believe something that was not true.

I have received many protests against the proposal. The C. I. O. is against it. If Senators wish to adopt the C. I. O. program, they may do so. I do not ask Senators to compare one program to another according to the endorsers of the respective programs. I do not care a continental who endorses my proposal outside the Senate. I have made it in the interest of the American people, the American taxpayers, and the Treasury of the United States. On that ground I stand.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one suggestion?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to make it very clear to the Senator from Georgia and to the Senate that I was not suggesting in any way that the Senator from Georgia had anything whatever to

do with sending the telegrams to which I referred. I know that what the Senator from Georgia has said as to his attitude on this and other legislative matters is absolutely true. I know that from 10 years' service with him in this body. I simply called attention to this matter because it seemed to me that the sending of the telegrams might be based on a misapprehension of the effect of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe I understand the position of the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the amendment of the committee, as amended.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator desires to speak, I shall be glad to withhold my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to address the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, does the Senator wish to have a quorum call?

Mr. TAFT. I do not believe it is necessary.

Mr. President, I have not taken a very active part in the discussion of this particular amendment, and I do not feel so enthusiastic in favor of the Ruml plan as some other Members of the Senate may feel—certainly not so enthusiastic as some members of the press. When it was first presented last summer it seemed to be of relative unimportance; and I still think it is relatively unimportant, compared with some of the more important issues of taxation and the financing of the war.

It seems to me that the Ruml plan would leave us just about where we are. I never could see that the Ruml plan would greatly change my liability or change the Government's revenue, or make any substantial change in the realities of the situation. So at that time, while I was mildly in favor of it, I took no particular interest in its presentation.

More and more, however, as we went on it became apparent that we had to have a withholding tax. If we are to have a withholding tax, a situation is produced in which we must deal with the problem raised by the Ruml plan.

The one thing which seemed to me to be unfortunate is the Treasury's proposal of last summer, however, and the ground on which I object to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia, is that 2 years' taxes are made payable in 1 year. That is the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia. It is an increase of taxes. The taxpayer would pay all his taxes for 1943, and in addition, one-eighth of his tax for 1942. The next year he would pay all his taxes for 1944, and one-eighth of the 1942 tax in addition.

If we are to increase income taxes, I think we ought to increase them directly. We ought to increase them after a consideration of the whole problem of all the taxpayers, and consideration of the question of where the burden ought to fall. We ought not to increase them by telling a taxpayer that he must pay two taxes in 1 year.

It seems to me that the objection which has been raised against the other amendments proposed is equally an argument against the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

I have never been able to understand the theory that the Ruml plan is forgiveness. If we were really forgiving taxes, it seems to me that the arguments presented by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] would be valid. I have never been able to see where there is any forgiveness. Let us look at the question from two points of view—from the point of view of the Government, and the point of view of the individual taxpayer. From the Government's point of view, how can there be any forgiveness when the Government receives the same amount of money every year, whether or not the Ruml plan is adopted? As a matter of fact, over a long period the Government would receive exactly the same—probably more in the long run—under the Ruml plan as it would receive under the other plan.

It is said that the 1942 taxes are to be forgiven; but at the same time that it is proposed to forgive the 1942 taxes, it is proposed that the taxpayer pay the 1943 taxes, which would not otherwise be payable until 1944, in the year 1943, when otherwise the taxpayer would pay his 1942 taxes. Sc he would pay exactly the same amount whether we adopt the Ruml plan or not.

In 1943 the Government would actually receive more money under the Ruml plan that it would under any of the other plans. In 1944 it would still receive more money. In the long run the Government will always receive more money when the national income is rising. It is rising now, and is likely to rise again in 1944, and in 1945.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think the Senator from Ohio means to say that under the Ruml plan the Treasury would receive more money in the fiscal year 1944 than it would under the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. TAFT. No, I think not; because the Senator is proposing that 2 years' taxes be paid in 1 year. Of course, if that were done, more money would be collected than under any other plan. I was really referring to the amendment presented by the Senator from Texas. His amendment is in opposition to the Ruml plan altogether.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not think it is an accurate statement to say that under the Ruml plan more taxes would be collected in 1944 than under any other plan. If the taxes are to be collected as they are collected under the present law, if no change were made whatever, we would collect just as much in the way of taxes for 1944 as we would under the Ruml plan. We would collect them, however, in 1945.

Mr. TAFT. I was assuming that the national income would still be rising in 1944. It has risen every year so far. The Government would collect taxes on the 1944 income which would be greater than for 1943. It would collect more money in 1944 under the Ruml plan than under existing law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The point is that the Government would collect the 1944 liability in 1945.

Mr. TAFT. That may be; but——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is not "may be"; it is absolutely true.

Mr. TAFT. The Government will collect the same amount of money; and when we make a budget today for 1944, we are concerned as to how much money the Government will collect in 1944, not in 1945. In the long run the Government is in exactly the same condition it would be in whether we adopted the Ruml plan or did not adopt it, because in the years of rising income the Government would get advantage of that income more quickly, and in years of a falling income the Government would feel the effect of the lowered income more quickly, and therefore it would collect less money. I think in the long run the Government would receive the same amount of money, whether we adopt the Ruml plan or did not adopt it. The only difference in the world between the two plans is that at the end of each year the Government does not have on its books a lot of accounts receivable in taxes. And what good are they, Mr. President? The Government cannot sell them, cash in on them, or use them in any way. As a matter of fact, the Government actually pays me interest on the money I loan the Government on tax anticipation notes, which it will later pay back to help me pay my taxes next year. Those accounts receivable on the Government books would not make any difference, and in 1980, if you please, the Government would be in exactly the same financial condition under one plan as under the other, except that in 1980 it would not have those accounts receivable on its books. That is the only effect I can see of the adoption of the Ruml plan, so far as the Government is concerned.

There are certainly many individuals to whom the Ruml plan might make a difference. However, so far as I myself am concerned, I do not see any difference. I would pay in 1943 actually the same amount under the Ruml plan as I would pay under the existing law. It would be just the same, dollar for dollar, unless there should be imposed on me the additional 12½-percent tax, as proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Georgia. Otherwise I would pay the same amount, and next year I would pay the same amount.

When national income or individual income is falling, it is true that one

would pay less money under the amendment proposed than he would under the existing law. Should not that be so? If the national income at any time drops from $100,000,000,000 to $80,000,000,000, should not the tax burden of the people be reduced? Is not that a sound policy of taxation? And when the national income increases, should not the Government get the advantage of the increase more quickly? Should we not have that additional income reflected in greater taxes more quickly than under the present plan? As a matter of fact, if my income is falling off, I think I ought to pay a lower tax in the year in which the income falls off. That seems to me to be a sound policy of taxation. But, as a matter of fact, the great bulk of people pay from year to year about the same income tax. The only time a person receives an advantage is when he dies, and his estate is left without any income tax to pay. That, as a rule, would result in an increase in the estate tax, and probably result in the Government recovering about 50 percent of the money not paid in income taxes. But consider the continuation of that property. If that man had property and was receiving income from it, the property would presumably go to his heirs, and under the Ruml plan his heirs would begin to pay taxes 1 year sooner than they would otherwise pay under the existing law. So, what is lost from the man who dies is made up by 1 year's equivalent collection of taxes from his heirs.

The Senator from Virginia stated that when his term came to an end and his income of $10,000 a year was reduced to nothing—which was a violent assumption, as I pointed out—if we suppose there could be such a case, there would be a successor from the State of Virginia who would receive $10,000, and the successor would have to pay 1 year sooner on the $10,000 salary which he would be receiving from the United States Government. So the Government would be losing nothing. The mere fact that we can find here and there some case in which somebody derives an advantage by having all these taxes moved up 1 year does not seem to me a valid argument against the general policy.

So far as the claim is concerned that there is forgiveness of $9,000,000,000 in taxes, it seems to me that we have departed very far from the realities. The Government gets just as many dollars every year from now to about 1980 or 2000. It is very hard for me to see how it can be said to be giving up $9,000,000,000. There would be no forgiveness.

The result is that when we come to the point of dealing with the additional tax proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, what we are really asked to do is to increase everybody's income tax. That is admitted. If there is really any forgiveness, how could it possibly result in an increase in people's taxes?

It is said there is a 75-percent forgiveness. Yes; but it is imposing such a tremendous additional burden on the taxpayers of the United States during the next 2 years, that the Senator says he is opposed to any additional increase in rates of any kind on individual incomes. There can be no forgiveness in that plan. It is a plan to impose additional taxes; to impose part of 2 years' taxes in 1 year.

I think there should be additional taxes, but I do not think taxes should be increased by adding one-eighth to the amount everyone pays in taxes. If we need more money, we ought to approach the whole problem and consider corporations and individuals alike, and try to work out an equitable burden over the whole field of taxes in connection with all the taxes.

The purpose of the pending bill is merely to provide a withholding tax and as nearly as possible to put people on an equal basis. The Treasury has said, and properly so, that whether the Congress passes this bill or not, it will propose immediately another bill to increase taxes. I believe it will, and I think we should consider that bill. I do not think we ought to take this bill and use it as a means of increasing people's taxes.

Reference has been made to the fact that the National Association of Manufacturers has sent out telegrams. I have received I suppose from 50 to 100 telegrams from leading manufacturers of my State as a result of the telegram which was sent by the National Manufacturers' Association, which said "Vote for the George amendment, because if you do it will mean an indefinite postponement of additional taxes, particularly on corporations," and this 12½ percent increase on every individual in the United States who pays taxes is going to protect the corporations and protect all the rest of us individually against greater increases than 12½ percent.

Certainly it seems to me that we would be going a long way from the proper purposes of a pay-as-you-go tax bill. If there is any forgiveness involved in this bill, we should not pass it at all, or pass the House text, or simply provide that money withheld shall be applied on last year's tax. But if it is not forgiveness, and I am convinced it is not, we should certainly not adopt the George amendment as a means of increasing the individual taxes 12½ percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the amendment of the committee, as amended.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Caraway	Hatch
Austin	Chandler	Hawkes
Bailey	Chavez	Hayden
Ball	Clark, Idaho	Hill
Bankhead	Clark, Mo.	Holman
Barbour	Connally	Johnson, Colo.
Bilbo	Danaher	Kilgore
Bone	Davis	La Follette
Brewster	Downey	Langer
Bridges	Ellender	Lodge
Brooks	Ferguson	Lucas
Buck	George	McClellan
Burton	Gerry	McFarland
Bushfield	Gillette	McNary
Butler	Green	Maloney
Byrd	Guffey	Maybank
Capper	Gurney	Mead
Millikin	Robertson	Tydings
Moore	Russell	Vandenberg
Murdock	Scrugham	Van Nuys
Murray	Shipstead	Wagner
Nye	Stewart	Walsh
O'Daniel	Taft	Wheeler
Overton	Thomas, Idaho	Wherry
Radcliffe	Thomas, Okla.	White
Reed	Thomas, Utah	Wiley
Revercomb	Tobey	Wilson
Reynolds	Tunnell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the amendment of the committee, as amended.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment to the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who is absent because of illness. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], who, if present, would vote "nay." I am prepared to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. If he were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who if present and voting would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who if present and voting would vote "nay."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], who if present and voting would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], who if present and voting would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 32; nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—32

Bailey	Hayden	Robertson
Ball	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Scrugham
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Caraway	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
George	Maybank	Van Nuys
Green	Murdock	Wiley
Guffey	Murray	Wilson
Hatch	Reynolds	

NAYS—50

Aiken	Danaher	Nye
Austin	Davis	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Ellender	Overton
Barbour	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Bone	Gerry	Reed
Brewster	Gillette	Revercomb
Bridges	Gurney	Shipstead
Brooks	Hawkes	Taft
Buck	Kilgore	Tobey
Burton	La Follette	Tunnell
Bushfield	Lodge	Vandenberg
Butler	Lucas	Wagner
Capper	McNary	Walsh
Chandler	Maloney	Wheeler
Chavez	Mead	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	Millikin	White
Clark, Mo.	Moore	

NOT VOTING—14

Andrews	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Barkley	McKellar	Truman
Eastland	O'Mahoney	Wallgren
Glass	Pepper	Willis
Johnson, Calif.	Smith	

So Mr. GEORGE'S amendment, as modified, to the amendment of the committee, as amended, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to the amendment of the committee as amended.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I realize that a stage has been reached in the consideration of the problem before the Senate where it is probably impossible for debate to have any effect upon the ultimate outcome. However, in view of the importance of the question under consideration, I wish briefly to state my position for the RECORD. I ask my colleagues to bear with me, because I am slightly indisposed today, and therefore I shall not be able to speak long and to cover as much ground as I had intended.

I feel that our country faces not only the gravest military crisis ever confronted by any nation in the history of the world, but I feel likewise that we face the most serious fiscal crisis any nation in modern times has ever been forced to confront.

I yield to no man, in this Chamber or out of it, in my firm confidence in the vast productive capacity of this Nation and its people. However, no other nation in all the written history of the world has ever undertaken such a task as that which this Nation has assumed in this war. We are attempting not only to raise, equip, and to carry overseas a huge Army of our own; we are also attempting to act as the arsenal for the United Nations, not only for their actual munitions and equipment of war, but even so far as a substantial part of their food and clothing is concerned.

Mr. President, this has resulted in appropriations of money the sums of which I contend are beyond the comprehension of the human mind. It may be, and I do not question, that there are mathematicians who understand the mathematics of the figures which we use in connection with the stupendous and unprecedented appropriation record of the American Congress since 1939, but I insist that there is no one in this Chamber or out of it who knows what these figures mean, when translated into dollars and cents, in terms of wealth and the productive capacity necessary to produce these sums of money.

Naturally, Mr. President, with this huge expenditure of money we are, and have been from the beginning of our defense program, in danger of experiencing a run-away inflation. When I use that term I wish to distinguish clearly and concisely between a rising price level, which I think all too often people have characterized as inflation, and that form of inflation which comes when there is a flight from currency into goods. Every intelligent person knows that if such inflation as I have described is experienced by this Nation, all citizens of the United States will suffer. They will suffer the loss of their accumulated savings. Those who are creditors will suffer the loss of their assets. But over and above that, Mr. President, if any such unfortunate condition ever descends upon America we shall be in danger of losing all the things for which we say we are fighting this war.

It is a blind man, indeed, Mr. President, who cannot see that one of the principal things which produced totalitarianism in this world was the uncontrolled inflation which swept over the countries that became the victims of totalitarianism. So far as my limited knowledge of history goes, there is no nation in all history in which the liberties of people have existed, that has preserved them under a runaway, uncontrolled inflation.

Mr. President, there are certain methods by which a government may seek to prevent an inflation in the face of stupendous expenditures. One is by setting prices and attempting to regulate the prices of commodities. Another method, when commodities are scarce in relation to purchasing power, is to ration the distribution of such commodities. Another method is to utilize the taxing power of government to subtract from the income stream of the citizens large portions of the purchasing power which are over and above the available goods and services to be purchased therewith.

In view of the astronomical character of our appropriations and expenditures it seems to me that we are indeed caught in a strange situation when the Congress of the United States, first in the House of Representatives and now in the Senate, for the first 4 months of its session, should have been the scene of a bitter struggle over how much of the tax liability owing and assessed against the taxpayers of the United States should be abated, canceled, or forgiven.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I wonder if the Senator has given any thought to another possible alternative, and that is a capital levy, which is almost an anathema at this moment, but which, if properly worked out from a mechanical standpoint, may solve many of the difficulties which the Senator is dwelling upon in so scholarly a fashion.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am frank to confess that I have never given any serious consideration to a capital levy. Such time as I have had to devote to matters of taxation has been devoted to meeting the growing need for greater taxation and more equitable taxation. I have never devoted any time to the consideration of a capital levy, because I have always considered it to be unconstitutional, and therefore futile.

I repeat, Mr. President, that it seems absolutely incomprehensible to me that we should have devoted such a large portion of the first session of this Congress to a clash over how much of the 1942 tax liability already assessed and partially collected the Congress should abate, cancel, or forgive. In my opinion, it is very unfortunate that we are forced to consider as a separate problem the question of the advisability and the practicability of making a portion or all of the taxpayers in this country current when there exists the absolute, urgent necessity of increasing the amount of money which is being collected from the taxpayers.

I venture the assertion that many of the words—and there have been millions of them—which have been uttered in this debate in the two Houses of Congress and in the country would never have been uttered if we were attempting to achieve a certain goal in the collection of increased taxes from the taxpayers of the United States. It is only because we are considering this question as a sole and single question, seemingly unrelated to the question of the urgent need of the Treasury for increased revenue, that we are able to feel we are in a position to abate, cancel, or forgive all or a portion of the 1942 tax liability of the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. President, one could go on at great length in discussing the question of inflation. It is not my purpose to do so, but I do wish to point out one state of facts which it seems to me should impress every Senator who is considering the problem before us. The national income for 1943 is estimated, as I understand, by the most recent estimates, to be $135,000,000,000. We are collecting about $15,000,000,000 in personal taxes. If we subtract the taxes from the national income we find that $120,000,000,000 over and above personal taxes is in the hands of people in this country, or will have passed through their hands by the end of 1943. During this year it is estimated that there will be available,

due to the sharp curtailment of civilian supplies, only $65,000,000,000 worth of goods and services. So, it is obvious that there are approximately $55,000,000,000, over and above personal taxes, goods, and services, which could become, and probably will become, a great inflationary influence in this country. In fact, Mr. President, in my humble opinion, unless we have the courage to be realistic in our application of taxes, all other efforts to prevent inflation by other methods will fail.

As has been mentioned so many times in the debate, the President of the United States in his Budget message—and again on yesterday, the Secretary of the Treasury reiterated the President's statement—said that $16,000,000,000 is requested by the executive arm of the Government.

Mr. President, in this connection I desire to point out that one of the battles we are fighting on the economic front in this war is to prevent inflation and to carry our Nation through the war in as sound an economic condition as possible, in order that we may successfully face and deal with the post-war problems. We should take warning from the fact that this great Nation, the richest Nation on earth, is raising by taxation only a small percentage of the funds required for its total expenditures. It is estimated that in 1943 this country will obtain from tax revenues only 28 percent of its expenditures, whereas Canada will raise 48.1 percent, and the United Kingdom will raise 46.3 percent. I offer a table with the supporting figures, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tax revenues as a percent of expenditures for National Governments in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom for fiscal fiscal year 1943

[In thousands of dollars]

	United States	Canada	United Kingdom [1]
Tax revenue (excluding social-security taxes)	[2] 22,339,210	[3] 2,135,875	[3] 9,444,000
Expenditures (excluding social security)[4]	79,915,278	4,439,973	20,415,360
Tax revenues as a percent of expenditures ..... percent	28.0	48.1	46.3

[1] Pound converted at $4.
[2] Includes post-war credits for excess-profits tax and Victory tax.
[3] Includes refundable taxes
[4] United States excludes expenditures of $522,049,500 for social security; Canada excludes expenditure of $29,985,000 for old age pensions; and United Kingdom excludes $730,556,000 for health, labor, insurance (including old-age and widows' pensions)

Source: For United States, Budget of United States, 1944; for Canada, House of Commons Debates, Mar. 2, 1943; for Great Britain, Financial Statement (1942-43).

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I say that we should take into consideration the economic conditions our country will face. In my opinion, we do not discharge our full responsibility to posterity, we do not discharge our full responsibility, if you please, to the men who are fighting on all the far-flung battle fronts, if we do not have the courage to tax heavily enough to maintain a sound economy to which our fighting men can return with the expectation of resuming a somewhat normal life.

Therefore, Mr. President, in my humble opinion, in our approach to the pending bill and amendments we should not separate these problems, even if they are separated at the time of our consideration of them. For I feel certain that when the temporary insanity which, it seems to me, has seized upon the Congress and the country is dissipated and lifted, we shall realize that we must assume our responsibility and must discharge it, and that before the end of the present taxable year we shall have pending in this Chamber a tax bill designed to raise by taxation more revenue than we are now raising. When we are confronted with that situation, Mr. President, when we are confronted with the need to raise more money in taxes this year, I think we shall realize that the Congress and the country have been caught in a mare's nest in the consideration of these various proposals.

Mr. President, how did the question of current collection of taxes happen to be raised? It happened to be raised because in the exercise of our plenary power to tax, we decided that in the face of the great burden confronting the Treasury we would have to dip down into the low-income groups of our people and ask them out of their meager incomes—many of them so low as not to furnish a decent standard of living—to contribute toward meeting the extraordinary burden created by the war. To accomplish that end, we lowered the personal exemptions and we imposed the Victory tax.

Mr. President, that was how the main question of current collection of taxes came to be raised—in that way and also in connection with the problem of men going into the armed services who find themselves with less income than they had in private life.

Collection at the source is provided for in all the measures, so far as I know, upon which the Senate will vote this afternoon before it concludes consideration of the pending bill. Under all the plans, as I understand them, at least 70 percent of the taxpayers will be made current in their tax payments, because the withholding tax provided will be sufficient, under existing law and exemptions, to discharge their tax liabilities to the Government. In other words, at least 30,000,000 of our taxpayers will be made current in their tax payments through the withholding tax, insofar as any of the plans upon which the Senate will vote are concerned.

But beyond that we are considering, Mr. President, the problem of the 14,000,000 taxpayers who will not become absolutely current in their tax payments because they do not derive their incomes from salaries and wages or do not have a sufficient amount of their income deducted at the source in order to discharge their current tax liabilities. I recognize that Congress and the country have become enamored of current collection of taxes. I confess that I fell victim to the blandishments of that suggestion. But I should like to say, in passing, that in my opinion the group which does not have a collection at the source of an amount sufficient to discharge its full tax liabilities will find the methods proposed in these measures—proposals of quarterly returns and estimates of income—more onerous and less desirable than the existing law, as it has worked out in their experience. Certainly it would make the administration of the law more complicated, and it certainly would require a great many more persons in the Bureau to collect the taxes.

Mr. President, there are 4,000,000 taxpayers whose incomes exceed the first surtax bracket after exemption, and they, of course, are the persons whom we normally speak of as being in the middle or upper brackets of income. Despite the fact that many middle-bracket taxpayers would receive substantial abatements under the Finance Committee bill, it is my belief that in the long run, in view of the over-all revenue problems with which we are confronted, the taxpayers in the middle- and lower-income brackets would be better off if we would inaugurate current collections on 1943 incomes on July 1, 1943, without canceling the 1942 liability, and would permit taxpayers to pay in quarterly installments in 1944 that part of their 1943 income tax not paid by current collections in 1943. I recognize that this would mean a stiff burden; but, Mr. President, if we are to prevent inflation in this country, from which all persons would suffer grievously, we must stiffen the burden upon the taxpayer. Such a program would have produced about $8,000,000,000 in additional revenue and would have gone a long way toward meeting the fiscal problems of the Government. At least the taxpayer would know early in the year what his burden in 1943 is going to be.

Now, I fear that the taxpayers will be subjected to the same tragic experience which they suffered in connection with the 1942 tax bill. I fear that once collection-at-the-source has been written upon the statute books it will be many months before another revenue bill can be fought through the Ways and Means Committee, the House of Representatives, the Senate, and conference, and become law. And throughout all that time the taxpayer will be in the dark as to his final tax bill.

However, Mr. President, I was in no position to write the ticket, and so, as I see it, we are confronted with a series of choices. If we are to cancel, abate, or forgive the 1942 tax liability, the question is, How much shall be abated

and to what groups shall that abatement be given?

In my humble opinion, the greatest fallacy in this whole debate is the idea that the tax liability assessed and due from the individual taxpayer is something which belongs to the particular individual. It does not. As I see it, it is an obligation which he owes under existing law as a citizen to his Government. It is his share of the cost of Government in 1942, and that portion of the cost of the war which the Government saw fit to levy in the form of taxes. He has enjoyed that income. He has either spent it all or saved a portion of it.

It seems to me that the contention that if we now move in the direction of abatement, cancelation, or forgiveness at all, we must return something to the taxpayer because it belongs to him does not bear analysis. Of course, the Government has the right to cancel all or a part of the 1942 tax liability of any individual or any group of individuals, but, in my judgment, that would be only an act of grace on the part of the Government. In my opinion, it would be justified only if we should come to the conclusion that the taxpayer cannot afford to pay the tax liability which has been assessed against him.

Therefore, Mr. President, as I view it, it is a question of policy; but in the event that we are, as a matter of policy, to cancel this obligation, we should be governed by the facts, and, so far as it is applicable, we should be governed by the principle of ability to pay.

I have never known of a question which has come before Congress in all the years that I have been a Member of it which has brought such a sharp division of opinion among honest men as to what the proposal of cancelation or abatement actually would accomplish. I read the debates in the House; I read the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee; I listened to the debate in the Senate; and on each and every one of those occasions there was a sharp difference of opinion among perfectly honest men. The difficulty has been in obtaining a stipulation of facts as a premise from which men could argue as to the policy which should be adopted.

Mr. President, I wish to make a few statements concerning the effect of canceling the 1942 taxes, which statements, it seems to me, are incontrovertible, although I recognize that there are Senators supporting the committee bill who would contend that statement is not correct. These comments, Mr. President, for the sake of some simplicity, disregard the operation of the antiwindfall provisions of the committee bill, and attempt to deal with abatement of 1942 taxes for a moment as a naked issue.

Taxpayers who had taxable income in 1942 under the committee bill would pay 1 year less taxes during their taxpaying lifetime. The tax which they would not pay would be the tax on their 1942 income. Taxes on incomes of 1943 and later years would be paid 1 year sooner than under the existing law. So long as income, exemption status, and tax rates all remain unchanged from the 1942 level, annual tax payments remain unchanged, and are the same as they would be under the existing law. Thus a taxpayer with an annual net income of $10,000, who is married and has no dependents, would pay $2,152 in 1943 and in each subsequent year in which there was no change in his income-exemption status or tax rate.

If the taxpayer's income rises from one year to the next, the increase in tax payments takes place 1 year sooner than under present law. Thus a person with a net income in 1942 of $10,000, of $15,000 in 1943, and of $20,000 in 1944 and subsequent years, would pay the $4,052 tax on the $15,000 1943 income in 1943 under the cancelation pay-as-you-go plan, while under present law the taxpayer would pay $2,152 in 1943 and $4,052 in 1944. Conversely his income tax payment declines 1 year sooner than under present law. Thus a taxpayer with an income of $10,000 in 1942, $8,000 in 1943, and $6,000 in 1944, would pay the $1,532 tax on the 1943 income of $8,000 in 1943, while under present law the taxpayer would pay $2,152 in 1943 and pay the $1,532 in the following year 1944. If income ceases tax payment ceases 1 year sooner than under present law. Thus a taxpayer with $10,000 net income in each year through 1944 and no income thereafter would pay $2,152 in 1945 under present law but would pay nothing in that year under a pay-as-you-go system with 1 year's tax cancelation.

If tax rates are increased, tax payments will increase 1 year sooner than under present law. Conversely if tax rates decrease tax payments will decrease 1 year sooner than under present law.

Under existing law the taxpayer at the end of each income year is in debt to the Government for the amount of the tax on the income of that year. This liability affects the taxpayer's net worth in exactly the same manner as any other liability. If 1942 taxes are canceled and future tax payments are placed on a current basis the taxpayer's net worth, that is, assets less liabilities, is immediately increased by the amount of the canceled tax.

And as has been stated in this debate, that becomes an asset in any statement of assets and liabilities of any taxpayer's situation.

Under a current payment plan the saving or accumulating of funds to meet taxes in the following year is unnecessary; each year's income furnishes the funds to meet the tax payable in that year. If funds have been accumulated under present law the shift to current payment and the cancelation of the 1942 tax will release such accomulated funds for whatever other purpose the taxpayer may choose to use them. If the tax liability each year is $12,000 and the taxpayer has accumulated funds to meet the tax at the rate of $1,000 a month, the cancelation of the 1942 tax will release $12,000 for other purposes.

Mr. President, it seems to me there is absolutely no escape from that proposition. The taxpayer may retain the $12,000 as part of his permanent capital. He may spend the $12,000 on current consumption or he may try to spend it, and because of the shortage of goods and services, he and others similarly situated will contribute to the tremendous inflationary influence which I fear will flow from the enactment of this measure. It will be in his hands. He can spend it. He can blow it in for any purpose he wants to, providing the goods and services are available.

Mr. President, that condition is very much more likely to obtain, and I contend we have a right to take judicial knowledge of the fact that it is very much more likely to obtain, among taxpayers in the medium and upper brackets than among the taxpayers in the lower brackets.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does not the Senator recall that the financiers and experts have calculated that the national income will exceed the available consumers' goods by something like $20,000,000,000?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The estimate is $55,000,000,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. Fifty-five billion dollars—whatever the figure is. So there will be that much surplus money over and above our absolute needs; and yet, in the face of that situation, instead of gathering some of that money into the Treasury, we are dishing out more to increase the amount.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the advocates of the Ruml plan, the Rumlites, contend that no actual money would flow out of the Treasury into the hands of the taxpayers. But, Mr. President, if we do not exercise the power which we have under the present law and take from the taxpayer the money he had accumulated to pay his taxes, it will be tantamount to paying it out in cash, because it becomes a sum of money which he can utilize to add to his capital or which he can spend for any purpose he sees fit.

Mr. President, my consultation with persons who ought to know, persons who have acted as tax advisers to those in the upper brackets, inform me that to set aside tax money out of current income is a common practice; that it is a rare exception for a man who has enjoyed a substantial income not to accrue or provide for the payment of his taxes as the income is received. If he is in the uppermost brackets, Mr. President, he may not have to do that. If necessary, he can borrow the money to pay his taxes if he desires to do so. The fact remains that so far as the medium- and upper-bracket taxpayers are concerned, the enactment of the pending bill would release very substantial sums of money which would otherwise go to increase the capital assets of the taxpayers or go into the stream of spending at the very time when we ought to be exercising our taxing power to reduce the amount of money available for spending if we are to avert an uncontrolled inflation.

If he chooses to use the $12,000 to pay taxes, he will have $12,000 more of current income available for expenditure.

It is not necessary that the savings be made for this specific purpose of meeting tax liabilities. Savings made not specifically to meet the taxes are relieved of the liability for taxes on the income from which the savings were made upon cancelation of the tax.

If the taxpayer under present law accumulates no saving or insufficient savings to meet his accumulating tax liability, he has lived beyond his income. Even if he has made no savings, the effect of the cancelation is to remove immediately the danger of insolvency with respect to the tax liability. That is certainly a tangible and substantial benefit to confer upon the taxpayer even though he may be in this sorry plight.

Mr. President, it is true that some of the canceled income tax will be returned to the Government in the form of higher estate- and gift-tax revenues, but at the most this return, in the case of a taxpayer with an estate of more than $10,000,000, will be only 77 percent of the canceled tax, minus the amount of State death tax credited against the Federal tax. At the other extreme there will be no return to the Government in either estate or gift tax. The actual amount of the estate or gift tax will depend (1) on the extent to which the canceled tax is spent or lost; (2) on the extent to which the canceled tax is given away free as a gift; and (3) on the size of the estate and the estate- and gift-tax rates at the time of gift or death.

Since under a current payment plan the income tax must be paid sooner than under the present law, the pay-as-you-go system results in the loss of whatever interest the taxpayer would earn on the funds accumulated to pay the tax. The taxpayer who retires or dies soon after the tax cancelation loses less interest than the taxpayer who continues to pay taxes for many years thereafter. The taxpayer who retires or dies soon after the tax cancelation receives a larger net benefit from cancelation than the taxpayer who continues to pay income taxes over a long period of time.

Taxpayers who did not receive taxable income in 1942 receive no benefit from cancelation and pay taxes on each year's income thereafter. The taxes are paid 1 year sooner than under existing law. The receipt of taxes 1 year sooner from these new taxpayers tends to offset the loss to the Treasury which results when older taxpayers retire or die or suffer a loss of income.

I realize, Mr. President, that the statement of facts which I have made with regard to the naked effect of cancelation may be disputed, but, after the best study I have been able to give to this question, I cannot escape the conclusion that it is absolutely correct.

Now, Mr. President, I desire briefly to advert to one other aspect of this situation which has been discussed at great length here and in the hearings. I wish to refer to a table to which the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] made reference in his address the other day, showing what happens to the distribution of this tax cancelation. In the light of the fact that taxpayers in the medium and upper brackets are very much more likely to have accumulated money to pay 1942 taxes, I think we are obligated, if we believe in the principle of the ability to pay, to consider the effect of the distribution of this cancelation of the 1942 tax liability.

A person with a net income before personal exemption—and the maximum earned net income is assumed—of $2,000 under the House bill would receive a tax cancelation of $140; under the Ways and Means Committee bill, which the Senator from Texas has offered as an amendment, the same taxpayer would receive a tax cancelation of $100; and under the Senate Finance Committee bill he would receive a tax cancelation of $140.

A person with a net income of $5,000, under the House bill, would receive a tax cancelation of $691, under the Ways and Means Committee bill and under the amendment of the Senator from Texas he would receive $388, and under the Senate Finance Committee bill he would receive $746.

A person with a net income of $10,000, under the House bill would receive $1,614 of tax cancelation, under the Connally amendment he would receive $860, and under the Finance Committee bill he would receive $2,152.

A person with a net income of $100,000 would, under the House bill, receive a tax cancelation of $18,690, under the Connally amendment he would receive a tax cancelation of $11,357, and under the Finance Committee bill he would receive a tax cancelation of $64,060.

A taxpayer with a net income of $1,000,000 under the House bill would receive a tax cancelation of $189,750, under the Ways and Means Committee bill and under the Connally amendment he would receive $121,126, and under the Senate Finance Committee bill he would receive $854,000.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the statement cannot be successfully refuted that if a taxpayer with $100,000 of net income in 1942 had accumulated money with which to pay his 1942 taxes, as most taxpayers in the upper brackets do under common practice, if we abate or cancel his 1942 tax he will have $64,060 which will either be added to his capital or which will be available to him to spend.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a table showing the amounts of tax cancelation at selected income levels and the total amount canceled, for all taxpayers, under the various proposals made.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amounts of tax cancelation at selected income levels and total amount canceled for all taxpayers under different plans

A. SELECTED INCOME LEVELS (MARRIED PERSON, NO DEPENDENTS)

Net income [1]	House bill	Connally amendment	Uniform cancelation of—		
			50 percent	75 per cent	100 percent (Senate Finance Committee bill)
$2,000	$140	$100	$70	$105	$140
$5,000	691	388	373	560	746
$10,000	1,614	860	1,076	1,614	2,152
$100,000	18,690	11,357	32,030	48,045	64,060
$1,000,000	189,750	121,126	427,000	640,500	854,000

B. TOTAL FOR ALL TAXPAYERS, IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS

Total amount of forgiveness for all taxpayers [2]	7,238	4,672	4,968	7,361	9,315

[1] Before personal exemptions; maximum earned net income assumed.
[2] Exclusive of windfall provisions and allowing for relief provisions applicable to members of the armed forces.
Source: Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, May 12 1943.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, one significant aspect of the present problem clearly demonstrated by this table is found in comparing the effect of the House version with the proposal made by the Senator from Georgia. It will be seen that, although the total amount of tax liability forgiven in terms of dollars is practically the same, the distribution of the cancelation is decidedly different. Whereas, under the House version a man with a $2,000 net income would be forgiven $140, the proposal of the Senator from Georgia would cancel only $105 of the liability; and in the higher brackets the effect is reversed. Under the House version a person with $1,000,000 income would be forgiven $189,750 of taxes, and the so-called George amendment would forgive him $640,500.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have been very much interested in what my colleague has said, but I want to find out if I comprehend the situation. First, he says that because cancelation would allow more money to remain in the hands of the public there would result a pressure on the so-called commodity goods and thus increase prices. Let me put it concretely. I have been trying to apply his reasoning to my situation. It is very enlightening to know that the Treasury officials stated this morning that less than 1 percent of all the taxpayers in this country were in default on their March payments. I take it that a large percentage of them did as I did, and paid the whole 1942 tax in March. If the new bill which we are contemplating should go into effect, there would be not only $2,200 which I would have to pay, but I would have to pay 20 percent each

month from July on this year. That, plus my $2,200 next year, will be calculated, and then I will have a credit on my next year's tax. It seems to me that if there is any danger it is in the next year, because then I do not have to build up the difference to pay the next year's tax. In other words, I believe the 1942 taxes, according to the figures here, have been mostly paid. Is my assumption correct?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I do not think my colleague's assumption is correct.

It is my belief that most of the taxpayers in the upper- and high-income brackets do not pay their taxes in full on the 15th of March, as did my thrifty colleague. They prefer to keep the money and to earn interest on it, rather than let the Government have it. Most of them had heard about the Ruml plan, I feel sure, prior to the 15th of March, and I feel quite sure that most of them paid only one-quarter of their tax. If they saved $64,060, and if they paid only a quarter of their tax, they would have three-fourths of it in the form of cash, or assets convertible into cash, plus a portion of what they are setting aside currenly for taxes, which they could either add to their capital or could go out and spend, and, in my opinion, no one can successfully deny that that is going to be the effect of this bill if it becomes law.

A taxpayer with an income of $1,000,000, who accumulated and provided for the payment of the tax on the income, will have $854,000, less one-quarter paid on the 15th of March, which he can either add to his capital or utilize for spending.

Mr. President. I say that sooner or later the American people will find out exactly what has been done here. They are not going to swallow this "bunk" that it is possible to cancel taxes for persons who have accumulated money with which to pay it, and not have that money released in the hands of the taxpayers to add to their capital or utilize for the purpose of spending.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I believe I am partially convinced as to the correctness of my colleague's conclusion. However, we must first say that there is a national income of $135,000,000,000. If the pending bill shall go into effect in July, the impact upon that income will be 20 percent a month, and certainly we have to consider that as a large fraction of the $135,000,000,000. So that my question is, What proportion of the national income is in the bracket my colleague is now discussing, which would constitute an additional menace toward inflation?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let me see if I can find the figures on my desk.

Mr. WILEY. It has been stated all along that wages and salaries amount to a hundred billion dollars. There would be a deduction of 20 percent of that amount starting in July, and there would be the balance which would be in the other bracket, perhaps part of which is soldiers' pay, I do not know.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. At the risk of having some one expelled from the floor, I shall ask the gentleman from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation if he can tell me where the table is showing the percentages. I could figure that out for my colleague, but I would have to do some adding and subtracting. So I have asked the expert to do it. He gives me the following figures:

Estimates of the Treasury Department indicate that for the calendar year 1942 0.20 percent of the total number of taxpayers had net incomes in excess of $25,000; and that this group accounted for 24.07 percent of the total tax liability for that year. This would amount to $2,355,600,000.

Mr. President, in my opinion one evil effect of the discussion which has taken place in the country will prove to be the destruction, or partial destruction, of the taxpaying morale of the people. Unfortunately, a large majority of the taxpayers of the United States have gained the impression, because we are in a position to fight over how much of their 1942 tax liability we will abate, cancel, or forgive, that they can fight a war without paying for it.

I am convinced, from reading some of the mail that has come to me, that many taxpayers have a conviction—an erroneous conviction, it is true, but nevertheless it exists—that in some way the Ruml plan will perform some sort of a tax miracle, whereby they will not only have their 1942 tax liability abated, but that they will not suffer any increase in taxes during the remainder of the war, and that they will not even have to make out income-tax returns, because their tax will be collected at the source.

If we do not discharge our responsibility, if we do not now have the courage to be cruel in order to be kind in this matter of taxes, I say that the new tax bill in 1943, which will have to follow the bill we are now considering, will come as a rude shock and awakening to the taxpayers of this country, and it will come after this propaganda has resulted in a reduction in their morale and their willingness to pay taxes.

In my opinion, contrary to what apparently many of my colleagues believe, I think the people will not look with favor upon the Congress which has abated or canceled or forgiven the 1942 tax liability. I think they will turn upon the Congress and say that they have been misled, and that they will protest the effort to levy more taxes upon them.

Mr. President, as I stated at the outset, one day there will be a rude awakening from this mild form of insanity which has seized upon the Congress and the country. One day there will be an understanding as to exactly what has been done by the measure before us. And when that time comes, those who have been responsible for the abatement, cancelation, or forgiveness of the 1942 tax liability, already assessed and partially collected, will have to assume full responsibility for securing the taxes with which to meet the fiscal problem of the Government, for it must be obvious to everyone that although the expedient of canceling the 1942 tax liabilities has no significance so far as reducing the ultimate tax burden of the war is concerned, it is significant as a means of redistributing that burden at the expense of lower and middle income taxpayers.

The measure and the inequity of 100-percent cancelation of the 1942 tax liability can be illustrated in different ways, in comparison with other alternatives before the Senate.

They can be measured in terms of the taxpayer's income after taxation. Judging 100-percent forgiveness on that basis, it becomes evident that the Ruml plan for 100-percent cancelation of the 1942 tax liability, ignoring for the moment the windfall provisions proposed, would give a person with a net income of $2,000 a tax cancelation, stated in terms of the amount forgiven as a percentage of income after tax, amounting to 7.5 percent of his income after tax, as compared with a tax forgiveness of 584.9 percent of his income after tax, for a person with a million-dollar income.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table setting forth that comparison.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Net income before personal exemption	Income tax, present law (married person no dependents)	Income after tax	Amount forgiven under—		
			100 percent cancelation	House bill	Connally amendment
$2,000	$140	$1,860	$140	$140	$100
$3,000	324	2,676	324	324	192
$5,000	746	4,254	746	691	388
$10,000	2,152	7,848	2,152	1,614	860
$25,000	9,220	15,780	9,220	4,437	2,396
$100,000	64,060	35,940	64,060	18,690	11,357
$1,000,000	854,000	146,000	854,000	189,750	121,126

Net income before personal exemption	Income after tax	Amount forgiven as percent of income after tax under—		
		100 per cent cancelation	House bill	Connally amendment
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
$2,000	$1,860	7.5	7.5	5.4
$3,000	2,676	12.1	12.1	7.2
$5,000	4,254	17.5	16.2	9.1
$10,000	7,848	27.4	20.6	11.0
$25,000	15,780	58.4	28.1	15.2
$100,000	35,940	178.2	52.0	31.6
$1,000,000	146,000	584.9	130.0	83.0

Source: Treasury Department.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in relation to the amount of increased taxes which have been levied against the various brackets to finance the national defense and war programs in 1940, 1941, and 1942, complete cancelation of the 1942 tax liability will have the effect of abating approximately 77 percent of the increases levied against a person with a $2,000 net income in those years, while abating for a person with a million dollar income three times as much as all the increases levied on his income.

I submit a table showing the comparison in detail, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Net income before personal exemption	Tax increases under Acts of 1940, 1941, and 1942 for married person, no dependents	Amount forgiven as percent of tax increases under—		
		100 percent cancelation	House bill	Connally amendment
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
$2,000	$182	76.9	76.9	55.0
$3,000	469	69.1	69.1	40.9
$5,000	991	75.3	69.7	39.2
$10,000	2,740	78.5	58.9	31.4
$25,000	12,460	74.0	35.6	19.2
$100,000	62,833	102.0	29.7	18.1
$1,000,000	267,006	319.8	71.1	45.4

Source: Treasury Department.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it is a foregone conclusion that the amount forgiven each of the various income groups cannot, as a practical matter be recovered from exactly the same groups through increased rates. The rates in the upper brackets cannot be raised substantially, and consequently taxpayers in the middle and lower income groups will have to pay later, in one form or another, not only the full amount now forgiven them, but also a substantial part of the 1942 taxes of the taxpayers in the upper brackets.

The Treasury Department submitted to the Finance Committee a table, which I offer for the RECORD, showing the rate increases necessary to recoup from taxpayers in the various income brackets the amounts canceled under the Ruml plan, the House version, and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas. The table shows that in order to recoup the total cancelation of the 1942 tax on a million-dollar income, it would be necessary to increase the effective rate, from present rate of 89.9 percent, by an additional 28.5 percent. Obviously, it is impossible to impose such a rate. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Net income before personal exemption	Effective rates of income and net Victory tax liability, present law	Effective tax rate increase necessary to recoup canceled taxes at same income levels over a 3-year period		
		100-percent cancelation	House bill	Connally amendment
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
$2,000	9.4	2.3	2.3	1.7
$3,000	13.5	3.6	3.6	2.1
$5,000	17.9	5.0	4.6	2.6
$10,000	24.7	7.2	5.4	2.9
$100,000	68.6	21.4	6.2	3.8
$1,000,000	89.9	28.5	6.3	4.0

Source: Treasury Department.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the other two tables from the minority or individual view report which I filed from the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From the following table, showing the effective tax rates on individual incomes it is clear that the greatest increases in rates must necessarily fall upon taxpayers with net incomes between $1,500 and $25,000.

Married person—no dependents

Net income before personal exemption [1]	Effective rates of present law
	Percent
$1,200	3.2
$1,500	5.7
$1,800	7.0
$2,000	9.3
$2,500	10.8
$3,000	13.3
$4,000	14.9
$5,000	16.5
$6,000	19.2
$8,000	21.5
$10,000	27.0
$15,000	32.3
$20,000	36.9
$25,000	50.7
$50,000	64.1
$100,000	82.8
$500,000	85.4
$1,000,000	87.5
$5,000,000	

[1] Maximum earned net income assumed.

Source: Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research.

In the case of consumption taxes the following table shows how the income groups under $10,000 per year and particularly those under $2,000 would be most seriously burdened because of the larger percentages of their incomes that go to consumption.

TABLE A.—*Families: Average outlay for personal taxes, consumption, gifts, and savings, by money income level, 1942* [1]

Income level	Percentage of income for—			
	Personal taxes [2]	Consumption [3]	Gifts to organizations [4]	Savings
Under $500	0.6	133.4	1.5	−35.5
$500 to $1,000	.3	104.4	.8	−5.5
$1,000 to $1,500	.2	97.8	.6	1.4
$1,500 to $2,000	.2	88.2	.7	10.9
$2,000 to $2,500	.2	83.6	.9	15.3
$2,500 to $3,000	.4	79.7	.9	19.0
$3,000 to $4,000	.8	75.2	1.1	22.9
$4,000 to $5,000	1.8	70.7	1.2	26.3
$5,000 to $7,500	2.7	63.2	1.3	32.8
$7,500 to $10,000	3.4	55.0	1.5	40.1
$10,000 and over	18.3	33.4	.7	47.6
All levels	4.0	70.5	1.0	24.5

[1] Estimates cover all civilian consumers except those living in institutions. Families are defined as economic units of 2 or more persons sharing a common or pooled income and living under a common roof. Single consumers are defined as men or women maintaining independent living quarters or living as lodgers or servants in private homes, rooming houses or hotels. The term "spending unit" is used to cover both groups. Estimates are on a calendar-year basis. The form of average used is the arithmetic mean.

[2] Personal taxes shown here include only individual income taxes, poll taxes, and certain minor personal-property taxes. It should be noted that sales taxes, excise taxes, and all indirect taxes on consumption are included under expenditures for goods and service.

[3] Consumption consists of money expenditures only.

[4] Gifts consist only of money contributions to the church, the Red Cross, and other institutions and funds.

[5] Savings are defined as the net change in assets and liabilities of the spending unit durint the year exclusive of gains or losses from revaluation of assets.

Source: Office of Price Administration, Division of Research, Mar. 1, 1943.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I suppose that the votes have been gathered in to pass this bill. If that is true I regret it. I think the bill, if passed, will have a very adverse effect upon the economy of this Nation as we face the harrowing years of war ahead of us. I fear that it will have a weakening effect upon the fiscal strength and ability of the Nation not only to meet the impact and the drain of war, but to meet perchance the greater strain of the problems of reconstruction and the peace when it comes. I only regret that there has not been a more concerted effort made to save the country from this tragic mistake.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Nye
Austin	George	O'Daniel
Bailey	Gerry	Overton
Ball	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Green	Reed
Barbour	Guffey	Revercomb
Bilbo	Gurney	Reynolds
Bone	Hatch	Robertson
Brewster	Hawkes	Russell
Bridges	Hayden	Scrugham
Brooks	Hill	Shipstead
Buck	Holman	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Tobey
Caraway	Lucas	Tunnell
Chandler	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Danaher	Mead	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	Wherry
Downey	Moore	White
Eastland	Murdock	Wiley
Ellender	Murray	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE. A parliamentary inquiry. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the substitute amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] for the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. CONNALLY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. My amendment being a substitute for the entire committee amendment, as amended, it would give way to perfecting amendments, as I understand?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; perfecting amendments have precedence over the Senator's substitute amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit a clerical amendment to the committee amendment, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 103, line 9, before "1943", it is proposed to insert "the taxable year."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. I send forward another amendment the purpose of which is to correct an error.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 98, it is proposed to strike out lines 13 and 14 and to insert "is in active service in the military or naval forces of the United States at any time during the taxable year 1942 or 1943, the."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, permit me to make a statement with respect to that amendment so as to make the RECORD clear. The language in the lines proposed to be stricken is "enters upon active service in the military or naval forces of the United States during the taxable years 1942 or 1943, the." The amendment simply is for the benefit of members of the armed forces in active service in the military and naval forces in 1942 or 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment as amended. The amendment has been printed and lies on the desks of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 85, line 13, after "calendar year", it is proposed to insert "to the extent not credited against the tax for a taxable year beginning in the preceding calendar year as hereinafter provided", and following the amendment heretofore adopted to the committee amendment in such line to insert:

The amount so withheld and collected during any calendar year shall also be allowed as a credit to the recipient of the income against the tax imposed by this chapter for any taxable year beginning in the preceding calendar year as follows:

(a) If the tax so imposed is paid otherwise than by installments, such recipient may credit against such tax the amount which he estimates as the amount withheld and collected during the first quarter of such calendar year.

(b) If the tax so imposed is paid in installments, such recipient may credit against each installment the amount which he estimates as the amount withheld and collected for the quarter of such calendar year during which such installment is paid, and for preceding quarters to the extent not credited against any preceding installment.

(c) If the aggregate of the amount so estimated as withheld and collected during such calendar year and allowed as a credit under subsection (a) or (b) exceeds the amount actually withheld and collected during such calendar year, such excess shall, in lieu of the time prescribed in section 56, be paid on or before March 15 of the succeeding calendar year.

On page 86, strike out lines 3 to 9, inclusive, and beginning in line 24, strike out down to and including the period in line 4 on page 87.

On page 88, after line 16, strike out all down to and including the period in line 14 on page 104.

On page 104, line 15, strike out "7" and insert "5."

On page 105, line 8, strike out "8" and insert "6."

On page 106, strike out lines 3 to 5, inclusive, and beginning with the semicolon in line 21, strike out down to and including the word "service" in line 15 on page 107.

On page 107, line 22, strike out "9" and insert "7."

On page 108, line 10, strike out "10" and insert "8."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate long in speaking for the amendment, because I think the subject has been fully debated during the course of the week. Possibly each Member of the Senate has come to a conclusion as to the position he intends to take on the pending measure.

There seems to be one question to decide—namely, the question whether we are to forgive, or abate, or cancel accrued taxes for some of our citizens.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I hope the Senator will take considerable time to explain his amendment, because I do not quite understand it. I think it is the best amendment offered thus far, and I hope the Senator will take sufficient time to explain it thoroughly.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator. I shall take all the time I think it necessary to take. If I fail to explain the amendment fully, I shall be glad to answer any questions which the Senator form North Dakota or other Senators may ask at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, the amendment I offer is so simple and so fair that I think it will not require much explanation. My amendment is intended to leave the whole income-tax system in practically the same position as that which it now occupies and has occupied for a period of 30 years.

To me, the proposition before us is a very simple and elementary one. However, from the debate which has occurred, it seems that there is much confusion, and that the gentle breeze has been fanned into a hurricane. The proposal I have made has had the endorsement of the majority of the Members of the Congress during the past 30 years; the majority of the Members of Congress have approved the plan I have proposed; because I have proposed the plan which has been in effect for the past 30 years and is in effect at the present time. My amendment would allow the income-tax system to remain in status quo. The only change my amendment would make would be to set up a collection system covering income tax on wages and salaries.

There is no doubt in my mind that the taxes which have accrued for the year 1942 constitute a just and honest debt from the individual taxpayers to the Government of the United States; and any abatement or forgiveness of those taxes simply would add to the capital of the taxpayers whose 1942 taxes were abated in any degree, either in whole or in part.

On the theory that the accrued taxes constitute a just debt, and under the conditions which exist at the present time, when our country is engaged in a great war, and is in need of funds more than ever before in our history, I think that now is a bad time to forgive any debt due the United States.

Mr. President, as I listened to the debate I recalled the statement made on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Committee on Finance, who is in charge of the bill, upon whose judgment I rely greatly, and for whom I have the utmost respect and confidence. He stated that whether taxes are remitted, canceled, or abated makes no difference so far as the Government is concerned, because the Government has the power to tax; and, therefore, if taxes are forgiven now, and if later more money is needed, the tax rate may later be increased. Even admitting that that may be true, the point I wish to make is that different individuals will be called upon to make up for the taxes that are abated. Individual citizens who have profited during 1942 or 1943 will have their taxes forgiven; and to the extent that their taxes are forgiven, the amounts forgiven will become capital for them. If, later, the Government decides that was a mistake, and concludes that it must raise more money and must increase taxes, possibly the tax burden will fall upon some other individuals. Some of it may fall upon the same individuals, but not to the same extent as it would have fallen; and in that way, the procedure will constitute an inequity.

We all know that at this particular time, when we are discussing the cancelation or abatement of income taxes, our Treasury Department is reminding us that we must find new taxes, that by taxation we must bring an additional $16,000,000,000 into the Treasury. While we are being reminded of that, we are considering the abatement or cancelation of taxes, which seems to me to be a very strange procedure. I, for one, am not in favor of the abatement or cancelation—whatever term may be used—of 100 percent of 1942 or 1943 taxes or of any other percentage of the taxes. I think they are due. I know that at the time when the taxpayers were making the profits, they were under the impression that a certain percentage of the profits belonged to the Government. I know that corporations which kept books considered a portion of the profits they made to be an honest debt to the Government—so much so, that each month they set up the amounts on their books as a liability, and considered them as liabilities, the same as their outstanding bonds or notes payable or accounts payable. I know that individuals who kept books made the same entries; and I know that other individuals who do not keep books consider that, as to all the profits they make, they are in partnership with their Government, and at the time when they are doing business they determine what percentage of their profits will possibly go to the Government. When large trades are made on oil wells or on land, and when other trades are made, before the trade is consummated each party to the trade wants to know exactly what amount will be due the Government. Those who have made such trades in 1942 or in 1943 to date have followed that

plan. They know that that tax due the Government is a liability, and that if it is canceled or abated it will become a capital asset for them individually.

Most of the argument which has been put forth has been to the effect that everyone is anxious to get on a current basis. Anyone who wants to get on a current basis has had the opportunity to become current any day since 1913. He can take his money down to the Treasury Department and become current.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator certainly must agree that it is as much to the interest of the United States Government as it is to the interest of any individual to have taxpayers current with their income. For a liability with which, under the present system, the Government would never catch up until judgment day, it is proposed to substitute actual cash in the till. Furthermore, the Government cannot set up any sort of scientific tax system based upon scientific rates without having the people current in their taxes, so that the Government can take the money as it comes in. Let me ask my friend the Senator from Texas whether it is not as much to the interest of the Government as it is to the interest of the individual taxpayer himself to have taxpayers current with their taxes.

Mr. O'DANIEL. My answer to that is that I do not believe the Government is interested in whether the money it receives for taxes is current money or money which has been lying in the till of the individual for the past 2 or 3 years. The Government is interested in getting the money which is due it as its share of the profits made by the individual.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me one further question, is not the Government interested in the amount of money it gets into the Treasury this year?

Mr. O'DANIEL. It is.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And next year?

Mr. O'DANIEL. And following years.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is certainly true.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me to finish my question, the Government is certainly interested in whether or not the money which is earned by income taxpayers in this year is paid this year, or whether a certain amount of it is lost by reason of the fact that taxpayers who are liable this year under a pay-as-you-go plan will not have the money at hand and will not be able to pay next year. There will be no way to collect it from them next year. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I hardly believe that is correct. At least, that is not my impression.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator differs with that statement, I have no argument with him, because it represents an essential disagreement on the whole theory of taxation. If the Senator believes that it makes no difference to the Government whether it collects the money which should be collected, and which is earned this year, or whether it loses a part of it next year because the taxpayers who have earned it this year will have already spent it and will suffer a falling off in their income and will not be able to pay it, then there is such an essential difference in general principle between the Senator and myself that there is no use in arguing the question.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The statement I made was that so far as the collection and payment of income taxes are concerned, I do not believe it makes any difference to the Government whether such taxes are paid from money which was earned in May 1943 or January 1942, or money which the taxpayer borrows from the bank. The Government is interested in getting the money which is due it as its share of the partnership arrangement for 1942.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not wish to trespass on the time and patience of my friend from Texas, but if he will permit me to ask one further question I will not interrupt him further.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I gladly yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, the Senator knows that under the present tax laws there are a great many taxpayers who never previously paid taxes. They are liable under the 1943 tax laws. They have not been in the habit of accumulating money, as most taxpayers are not. I should say that 99.99 percent of taxpayers have not been in the habit of accumulating money to pay their taxes. As to those persons who have not been in the habit of paying taxes and who may make less next year and may not be able to pay their taxes, does the Senator say that the Government is not concerned with the question whether they pay taxes out of income as it is earned or fail to pay their taxes next year out of income not earned?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I would not make the statement that the Government is not interested in the failure of anyone to pay his taxes; but I do say that the Government is not concerned about the source of the money which the taxpayer uses to discharge his tax debt.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is not the answer to the Senator from Missouri that under the Senator's amendment he proposes to do exactly the same thing as is proposed by the substitute offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], or the bill which comes over from the House, or the substitute of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]? Under the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], we would begin the withholding tax at the same date.

In my opinion, what the Treasury of the United States is interested in, is having money flowing into the Treasury. It would flow in just as currently, just as rapidly, and in the same volume under the Senator's amendment as it would under any other bill or amendment which is being considered by the Senate today. Does it make any difference to the Treasury of the United States whether the Treasury credits the 20-percent withholding tax which it receives on the 1942 or 1943 tax of the taxpayer? It makes no difference to the Treasury, does it?

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is exactly correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. On the other hand, in order to become current, as some Senators are advocating, they propose to cancel debts to the Treasury in the amount of $9,000,000,000 in order to credit it on the 1943 tax instead of on the 1942 tax. Have I correctly stated the Senator's amendment?

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator from Utah is eminently correct. My amendment would leave the tax situation in status quo, except that it would set up a tax collection system on salaries and wages, the tax to be deducted at the source. Those deductions would be forwarded to the United States Treasury, where they would be credited to the individual taxpayer's taxes which were then due, and which had accrued during the previous year.

It is simply a collection system. At the end of 1943, if the amounts deducted, plus other amounts sent in under the quarterly payments, should exceed the amount of the 1942 tax of the individual, the excess would be refunded by the Treasury Department. If those amounts should not pay in full the amount due, the taxpayer would be responsible for the balance due.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, the Government would receive more money under his amendment than it would receive under the pending bill, as amended, for this reason: We all know that during wartime the income of the Nation is probably the greatest in its history. It is estimated, for example, that about $130,000,000,000 a year will be the income of all the people during the war period. Let us suppose that 4 years from now the war is over. As soon as the war is over the demand for munitions, shells, tanks, and other things of like character will cease, and when it ceases employment will drop, and consequently the Nation's income will decline. So, looking at a 10-year period from 1942 to 1952, and assuming that the war ends in 1946, under the Senator's proposal the Government would collect income on 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945 before the war ended, and then for 5 years after the war ended. However, under the committee amendment the Government would collect income taxes only for 1943, 1944, and 1945. Thus it would collect no taxes for a year during which the income of the people was tremendously high, and substitute for it a year in the future when the income would be low. The net consequence would be, if the Ruml plan, unadulterated, should be adopted, that one whole high-income year would be completely eliminated, and in its place would be a low-income year, on the basis of which taxes would be levied. The Senator, therefore, in order

not to lose that high-income year, would provide that taxes shall be collected currently so that no one may evade them without losing the potential income of the Government from the existing set-up which would be lost if we should wipe out a whole year's liability.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator from Maryland is absolutely correct and has made the situation very plain, indeed. If the Ruml plan were adopted, there would simply be a gap in our income-tax system of 1 year, either 1942 or 1943, which would be forgiven, abated, canceled, and the Government would never receive an income for that year. But on a lower-income year, at the end of the war, the Government would receive less money and would therefore be short the difference.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Ruml plan were offered to the Senate, say, 5 years after the war was over, when we had gone through a depression and were on the upgrade, when income was increasing, say, in 1950 or 1951 or 1952, for illustration, and then we should adopt the Ruml plan, the Government would lose nothing for the reason it would be substituting a current year for the past year, the current year's income being higher than that of the preceding year. When the transition is made is all-important. However, to make it when income is high and when a poorer year is coming would be to give away a tax on a large yield for a tax on a small yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. From a business standpoint the Senator's contention is absolutely correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In addition to what the distinguished Senator from Maryland has said, is it not also likely to be true that over a period of years new taxpayers will take the place of some whose taxes it is now proposed to forgive, and will they not be obliged to assume the tax burden that is now proposed to be lifted or forgiven?

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is correct, and therein lies the great inequity and injustice which will be perpetrated if the Ruml-Carlson plan shall be adopted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Over a period of years many of the taxpayers whose tax it is now proposed to forgive will have died, and many of those who will take their places, who will be substituted as taxpayers for them, are men in the service who are now fighting on foreign soil and offering their lives for their country.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is correct. Present taxpayers will be replaced by other taxpayers completely in years to come, or gradually as the years go by.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. BONE. It seems to me that in all this argument we have laid very little stress on one vital aspect which I think is quite important in these trying times. It is the cold hard relationship of the taxpayer to his Government. I am now referring to the ethical and emotional side of the picture.

Whatever one may think of the tax abatement proposals submitted here, they simply mean that in the liability of a taxpayer, he will save for himself one full year's taxes which he may add to his capital. He has abated to that extent the financial burden which the Government has to lay upon all of us in the most trying moment in all American history. Libations of blood are being poured out which stagger the conscience of the world. While we face this grim tragedy, some lucky fellow will be given, perhaps $1,000,000 to put into his aggregate capital. The Government will never take this money from him. There is no arguing ourselves out of that. That is the ethical and emotional side of the tax picture which in due time will be most deeply impressed upon the consciousness of America. Under the Ruml proposal, one of these lucky taxpayers could and would keep that $1,000,000.

It would be staggering, weird, bizarre, and utterly stupid for one to rise in this Chamber and say we could abate one tiny segment of the agony of the battlefield. We can only abate taxes.

Mr. President, we are spending our time talking about abating taxes for some fellow who may thereby add from a thousand to a million dollars to his capital amidst the blood and travail of the battlefront. Returning to us are insane boys and those who will be wrecked physically for the remainder of their lives.

A short time ago I saw three letters from mothers and these letters were wet with the tears of these mothers. Their boys, who had returned to them from the eastern battlefront, were insane. Never again will these brave lads know the joy of living. The sunshine and the flowers have disappeared. They died to protect America, including the property of the taxpayers we so tenderly protect in this somber hour.

Here we stand figuring out how we can rebate enormous tax levies, which will be added to the capital of the fortunate taxpayer. One tax year is lifted out of his life, at a time when issues face the Nation which may ultimately destroy its institutions. I say the Senate of the United States should not spend its time listening to talk about how much some fellows can make out of the war when sons of the Republic are dying in battle. Possibly 3,000,000 of them may die before the war shall have been concluded. The rest will come home and read these long debates concerning methods which will give some fellow more dollars to add to his happiness and his capital. For one, I do not believe that we dare aid in a program that will translate widows' sighs and orphans' tears into more dollars for any man.

Mr. President, if we walk away from the ethical and moral implications of this tax problem we shall have occasion to regret it. We should not lay aside such considerations now any more than we should have laid aside similar issues confronting the Republic when its sons were turning back dissolution of the Union on the flame-crested hills of Gettysburg in front of the soldiers of Lee and Longstreet. That is all it means. Members may flounder around in this tank of argument until they develop dorsal fins and caudal appendages, but they will never change the picture.

Fathers and mothers who are seeing their boys shot to death on the battlefield to save our financial and economic system will not listen with much tolerance to discussions of the Ruml plan or any other plan which will permit any man to add a million dollars to his capital and justify it on the fantastic theory that it will be to the best interests of the country to do so. That is what this thing means. Nothing else. It cannot be translated into anything else.

This Chamber has rung with the oratory of men who proclaimed to the people of America that we must get money out of the hands of the people who are earning it, in order to prevent a disastrous inflation. It is argued that taxation of stored up purchasing power is necessary to resist inflationary tendencies, yet we are now assured that the proposal to allow some fellow to keep an extra million dollars of profit and add it to his income, if he earned that much, will help to do that. By abating that tax he would therefore have a million dollars more of purchasing power to threaten the whole commodity price structure of this country. That is either true, or else the inflation arguments advanced here rest on utterly fallacious assumptions.

I am sorry I have taken the Senator's time, but if I, as a Senator, could abate any of the blood and tears and agony of the boys dying on the battlefields, if I could abate one little bit of the horror facing young men marching away under the American flag into this world of conflict, I would abate that horror coming to them, rather than abate a year's taxes for us who stay at home. I wish I could vote to abate blindness and insanity and vote away the blasting of boys' lives by shells on the battle fronts. But we cannot do that. All we can do is to abate the tax on some fellow's income. The whole thing presents a grotesque twist of logic. It is a sort of madness.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I think it is very timely that the able Senator from Washington has made such an eloquent speech in support of my amendment, and should there be anyone within the sound of my voice interested in this subject from a political standpoint, may I remind him that the type of speech to which we have just listened by the Senator from Washington may be the type of speech which will be heard throughout the campaign of 1944, and those who make such speeches will be able to name the individuals who have profited by the Ruml-Carlson amendment, if such an unfortunate thing should occur as the passage of the amendment. Each one interested may consider the political consequences of the enactment of such an outrageous proposal as the Ruml-Carlson plan.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. It was suggested to me during the lunch hour that some of the men who some persons seem to fear might not pay their taxes and whom the 20-percent withholding tax is necessary in order to catch are making high wages in 1943 and will continue to make high wages in 1944 and probably in 1945; but in 1946, or after the war is over, their income may drop very materially. The question was asked me, What will be the situation of such an individual at that time? What is the Senator's answer to that? In other words, if that happens, the individuals who are caught in that kind of circumstances will be called upon to pay income taxes on a high income when they have dropped back to a lower income. I think there is an answer to that question, and I believe the Senator has it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator for propounding that question. In reply, let me say that, of course, all who are accustomed to paying income taxes, and have been accustomed to paying them for years, realize that as they make profits or earnings, a certain proportion of such profits and earnings belong to the Government, and, in reality, they become custodians of Government funds, but have the free use of such funds from the time the profit or earnings accrued until tax pay day to the Government. Therefore citizens in that category incur the liability and retain the money which is due the Government so that they may be able to pay on pay day. Others, who are new to the game of paying income taxes, will sooner or later come to a realization that the payment of income taxes is very difficult to evade, and they will likewise follow the course of those who have set up reserves.

To answer the specific question, in case they should not do that, and in the event we should come to the time when incomes decrease, the taxpayer who in a lean year discovers and suddenly comes to the sad realization that he owes a larger tax for the preceding year than he is able to meet will, no doubt, be in a very bad predicament. It is, however, exactly that kind of individual who should have tax-forgiveness consideration of the Congress and the Government. Then will be the time when the tax debt should be forgiven. It should not be forgiven now to many people who have plenty of money with which to pay. We should wait until the time comes, when the individual finds himself destitute or insolvent before we consider canceling income-tax debts due the Government. Our system takes care of that; if he is unable to pay, he cannot pay, and the debt will then have to be forgiven. That is the only time when any debt to our Government should be forgiven.

Mr. President, it is said that the Ruml-Carlson plan is designed to make tax payments easier for the taxpayer, but some of the proposals I have heard suggested here make it harder for the taxpayer in that they increase his current payments. One of the proposals is that 75 percent of the 1942 tax shall be canceled and the remaining 25 percent divided, and 12½ percent of it paid with 100 percent of the 1944 tax, thus making 112½ percent which must be paid by each individual taxpayer in 1944 who had an income in 1942 and in 1944, and the same thing provided for the year 1945.

Other proposals have been made whereby the 1942 tax will be divided up and paid over a period of 5 years, which increases the percentage of payment to more than 100 percent during the time the old debt is being paid. Therefore, it is an imposition on the taxpayer.

I think our Nation discovered long ago and adopted as a sensible plan the system of installment payments. Many persons would not have had the opportunity of buying automobiles and electric refrigerators and other articles from commercial organizations had credit not been extended to them so that they might pay in the future on the installment plan and not pay as they go. Our Government is extending installment payments on income taxes to all its citizens over a period of 11½ months after the 12 months' period in which the tax debt accrued and is extending them without interest. Nothing it seems to me could be more fair. Many people use the amount of income tax due their Government as capital without paying interest. So far as the taxpayer is concerned, that certainly is fair. While our rates on income taxes may be objectionable to some persons and while there may be some inconsistencies and some inequities, yet I think we must all admit that, on the whole, throughout the years, our present income tax system has been equitable and fair. I see, therefore, no reason to make any change whatever. The only reason thus far advanced which to me has any sound basis is the desirability of taking care of the collection of income taxes from wage earners and salary earners who have not heretofore been accustomed to paying such taxes and possibly are under the impression that it is a debt they can evade. Therefore, as they get their money, either because it is all needed in order to pay their current expenses or because they like to spend it for some other purpose, they spend their money as fast as they get it. If it is not retained at the source, they may not have the money in the following year with which to pay their accrued taxes. Therefore, my amendment simply sets up a collection agency on every pay day and makes all salaries and all wages before they are paid to the individuals subject to a deduction of 20 percent.

The 20-percent deduction is not an additional tax; the 20-percent reduction is simply a remittance which is sent to the United States Treasury, and is a guaranty that the individual will pay his income tax. It also serves as a benefit to the taxpayer who might not be acquainted with the fact that income taxes must be paid. When the money thus collected is sent to the Treasury there it is credited to the accrued income tax due by the individual according to the tax return which he should have sent in on or before March 15 of that year. An adjustment will be made at the end of the period for taxes due for the previous year by making a refund to the taxpayer for overpayment or the collection of balance due. He has not had to pay twice; it has not been a doubling-up system; nobody has been relieved of his accrued tax liability, and the Government gets all the money that is due it. It is simply a fair, equitable tax, and, as I have already said, this system, with the exception of the withholding feature, has been approved by the majority of Members of both Houses of Congress since 1913. Now, in a time of fever and excitement, it seems to me it is inopportune to upset anything so substantial and fair and equitable as the system which is now in effect.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand the Senator's amendment, by providing for a withholding tax of 20 percent, beginning on July 1, the Treasury will begin receiving the same money it would receive under the committee bill or the Ruml plan. Is that not correct?

Mr. O'DANIEL. It is absolutely correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There will be no difference in the receipts of the Treasury?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Absolutely none.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then, what the Senator's proposal would do would simply be put the taxpayer on a pay-as-you-go basis insofar as beginning on July 1, just as the committee bill would do, but it would not permit any abatement or cancelation of liability now due by taxpayers.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is absolutely correct. In other words, my amendment would prevent the Government from remitting or canceling about $9,000,000,000 of tax debts to certain individuals, who are not likely to be the same individuals who may be called upon later, in case of tax increases, to pay the money back to the Government.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the amendment the Senator has offered absolutely forces the issue, and draws the distinction, whereby we can actually put the taxpayer on a pay-as-you-go basis, if that is what we are really trying to do, and we can do that without having to do what is being proposed in the committee bill, forgive a large percentage of taxes and tax liability to the Government, in order to get on a pay-as-you-go basis. Therefore I intend to support the Senator's amendment.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Arkansas, and I wish to say that his statement is absolutely correct. Everyone knows that if the Ruml-Carlson bill should be agreed to, and if the accrued tax liability should be canceled, the amount of money involved must be raised by some other form of taxation, by increase of income taxes or through some other process. I am firmly convinced that the additional money to be collected when the taxes are increased will come from an almost entirely different set of individuals from those who will profit by the cancelation or abatement of their accrued income-tax liability for 1942 or 1943.

I am satisfied that some of the large corporations which were strongly in favor of the Ruml-Carlson plan at one

time are awakening to the realization, if there shall be forgiveness of the taxes to those to whom they will be forgiven by the enactment of the Ruml-Carlson bill, corporation taxes will of necessity have to be increased in order to make up the money that will be given away, or abated, or canceled by the Government.

I understand that at the present time there are millions of people who possibly have not yet gotten on the income tax rolls, but if we keep going in the direction in which we are now headed, before we get through every citizen who earns any money will be contributing to the income tax fund, and they will realize all too late that the enactment of the Ruml-Carlson plan will cause increased tax burdens to fall upon their shoulders, and, as stated by the Senator from South Carolina, upon the shoulders of the boys who are fighting overseas to preserve the profit system, which we might be tearing down if the proposed Ruml plan should be enacted.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. As I understand the Senator's plan, it is that the present law shall remain inviolate, and that, commencing July 1, 20 percent of all salaries and wages shall be deducted at the source.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. If that be so, the tax that is collected this year pays the 1942 tax, and the balance is arrived at in January or March 1944?

Mr. O'DANIEL. In March 1943. It pays the 1942 tax as determined March 15, 1943. It applies on the accrued tax.

Mr. WILEY. Then we could not use the word "current."

Mr. O'DANIEL. It depends on what we are talking about. If we are talking about current payments, we could use the word "current."

Mr. WILEY. I am not saying this facetiously; I mean that the taxpayer is always 1 year behind in the final settlement.

Mr. O'DANIEL. He is always paying in the current year for the tax which accrued during the preceding year.

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The same as in the case of an ad valorem tax on real estate and personal property.

Mr. WILEY. The condition remains just as it is now, then?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. Except that there is to be collection at the source of wages and salaries, and the final settlement is to be made in the March following:

Mr. O'DANIEL. In December of each year.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I gladly yield.

Mr. OVERTON. As I understand, every proposal which has been made, with the exception of the bill reported by the committee, contemplates a double payment in 1 year in whole or in part, and to that extent is a hardship.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is as I understand it.

Mr. OVERTON. In order to avoid a double payment in whole or in part, the committee has suggested in its bill that there be an abatement of 1 year's taxes, which, insofar as the individual is concerned, applies to either the 1943 or the 1942 tax. What the Senator's amendment proposes is that there be no abatement of taxes whosoever, that there be no double payment in any 1 year, and the theory which everyone appears to be agreed upon, that there should be a withholding tax, is embodied in the amendment proposed by the Senator.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. It carries with it the unobjectionable feature of every amendment, and does away with the objectionable phases of all of them. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I wish to ask the Senator a question on a personal basis. I have paid my 1942 taxes in full. Under the Senator's proposal, how would the withholding tax which he has in mind be applied with reference to me?

Mr. O'DANIEL. In the first place, I wish to congratulate the Senator for being in the class of people who are able to pay in full. If my amendment shall be adopted, deductions beginning July 1 will be made from the Senator's salary on the basis of 20 percent, those deductions will be sent to the United States Treasury, and will be credited to the Senator's account of his taxes for 1942, and at the end of 1943 the Treasury will reimburse the Senator for any overpayment, which, of course, in this case would amount to the deductions which are made from his salary from July 1 until December 31, 1943.

Mr. GILLETTE. These deductions would go to reimburse me for what I have paid on the 1942 tax?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes, the Senator would be reimbursed for the full amount of the overpayment.

Mr. DOWNEY. But that apparent difficulty, Mr. President, would be true only in the first 6 months' period. I mean, if the distinguished Senator continued to have his taxes deducted the following year, then the following year he would not have any rebate, the deductions would then be applied to taxes in the next year.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; without doubt, if the amendment shall be agreed to and the bill become law, then the installment payments of those drawing salaries and wages may cease. The deductions will apply, although both the installments and the deductions could continue, if there were no objection on the part of the taxpayer, and in that event the result would be that at the end of the year a refund of the overpayment would be made.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I think some of us are assuming something which does not exist. If the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] has paid his taxes on March 15 of this year, for the tax which accrued for the year 1942, he has discharged the tax for 1942, and has acquitted himself with his Government. Beginning July 1 of this year the deductions are made from the salary check of the Senator from Iowa. They would be applied on the taxes which would accrue during the year 1943. That is my assumption, since the proposal of the Senator from Texas does not abate any year's taxes, or any taxes at all. Am I correct in that?

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BONE. The Senator used the date 1942, which the Senator from Iowa has been using, and I saw Senators smile, and I knew there was a misapprehension. In other words, the Senator from Texas does not propose to abate any taxes, but if a Senator or anyone else has paid his taxes on March 15 for 1942, he has acquitted himself of any obligation to the Government. Then on July 1, 1943, he begins to have deductions from his salary check, which are applied on the tax which will be due for the year 1943. Am I correct in that?

Mr. O'DANIEL. The Senator is correct, and I thank the Senator—if I inadvertently used the wrong year in the debate. I do not want to have a misunderstanding.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if I may interrupt, the Senator from Iowa was informed, in answer to the question he propounded, that instead of his taxes paid after July being applied on 1943 taxes, they would be refunded to him. Obviously they cannot be refunded to him and be applied on the 1943 taxes at the same time. I should like to have that question cleared up.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I shall be glad to attempt to do so. In the case of the Senator from Iowa, he has already paid his taxes which accrued during 1942. If my amendment shall be adopted, and I hope it will, and the bill, as thus amended, should be enacted, beginning July 1 payments will be deducted from the Senator's salary check each month, and those payments will be remitted to the Treasury of the United States, and there they will be held to the credit of the Senator's account. At the end of 1943 the Treasury will figure up the amount of those payments, plus the amount the Senator remitted on March 15, and, of course, the sum total will exceed the amount of his 1942 tax, and the amount that it exceeds the 1942 tax will be refunded to the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. That is exactly the way I understood the Senator's explanation in the first instance, but after that the other proposition was injected, and the statement was made that the taxes paid after July would be applied on the 1943 taxes. Now another Senator says, "Of course they will."

Mr. O'DANIEL. They will not be applied on 1943 taxes unless the Senator should make a special request that the

money be retained by the United States Treasury for that purpose.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to refer to something that has been referred to before, but to point out a different meaning, or at least a meaning which I have not heard expounded on the Senate floor. What I refer to appears on page 13 of part I of the hearings of the Finance Committee on this bill. Mr. Paul made this statement:

> From the above table it is clear that while all three bills are more generous to the higher income groups than to lower income groups, the Ruml-Carlson plan is much more extreme in this effect. This may be perhaps clearer from the following illustrations.

What follows is highly important, I will say. Mr. Paul's testimony continues:

> A person with an income before taxes of $2,000 whose actual income after taxes is $1,860, under the Ruml-Carlson bill, would have $140 added to his $1,860, or slightly less than 4 weeks' actual income.
>
> A person with $5,000 income before taxes whose actual income after taxes is $4,254 would have $746 added by the Ruml-Carlson bill, or slightly less than 9 weeks' actual income.

Then Mr. Paul refers to the $10,000 bracket, the $50,000 bracket, and the $100,000 bracket. He says they all increase in proportion—or out of proportion I might say. His testimony continues:

> The person with $100,000 income before taxes whose actual income after taxes is $35,940 would have $64,060 added, or about 20 months' actual income.
>
> The person with $1,000,000 before taxes whose actual income after taxes is $146,000 would have $854,000 added, or about 6 years' actual income.

Mr. President, while, of course, it can be seen from that statement that the Ruml-Carlson plan is absolutely inequitable and unfair, and favors those in the higher brackets, yet the point I should like to make is that the person with an income of $1,000,000 could retire from business after he had had his taxes abated, and by the abatement or cancelation of his taxes would profit to the extent of $854,000; he could retire from business with that $854,000, which was due the Government until the time the Ruml-Carlson plan was enacted into law, if it shall be enacted, and he could retire for 6 years, without taking the risk of any business transaction whatever; for his earnings, which he had retained by virtue of the cancelation of his accrued tax bill, would be exactly the same amount for 6 years as though he had continued operation and had earned $1,000,000 in each of those 6 years, and had taken all the risks and performed all the work involved.

So, Mr. President, what we are actually doing is plowing under, one might say, those men who have ability to create earnings of $1,000,000. Goodness knows we need more of that kind of men in this country, because when a man makes $1,000,000 he now turns into the Treasury $854,000; we need more million-dollar earners; but by adopting the Ruml plan we are resorting to the same philosophy that was involved in plowing under every fourth row of cotton and killing the cattle and little pigs. We are creating an incentive for those who have the ability to earn $1,000,000 to retire from the field of making profit for 6 years, because they can make just as much each year during those 6 years as they could by remaining in business and making $1,000,000 profit during each one of the 6 years.

Mr. President, so I say that the Carlson-Ruml bill in every phase, in every way we look at it, is unsound, is unfair, is inequitable.

In my opinion, if the bill shall be passed, there will, in calmer moments later, be many regrets on the part of those who subscribe to the enactment of such iniquitous legislation. When the boys come home from war and look up the record and find in it the names of men who made enormous war profits during 1942 and 1943, and who while the soldiers were away from this country fighting and dying were permitted by the Ruml plan to add to their capital the amount of the accrued taxes which were due in 1942 or 1943, their reaction will hardly be a pleasant one. I do not intend that the boys who look up that record shall find that the junior Senator from Texas was a party to the enactment of such legislation, but rather that they shall discover that the junior Senator from Texas was opposed to it.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. GUFFEY. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I should like to propound an inquiry to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] who is in charge of the bill. A number of Senators find it necessary to be out of the city on official business tomorrow, and some on Sunday. I wish to know the program and plan the distinguished Senator has in mind with respect to the bill; whether the Senate shall be in session this evening, or tomorrow, or shall recess from tonight until Monday. I desire to follow the pleasure of the Senator in every way, and shall assist in every way I can to obtain an early disposition of the measure.

Mr. GEORGE. I was about to make the announcement that I shall ask the Senate to stay in session this evening until we shall finish action on the bill. The bill ought to be finished today, if it passes in any form which carries withholdings at the source. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue will not have any time to spare after the passage of the bill by the Senate and final action upon it, whether by signature of the President or otherwise, even if it were to be enacted and become law very early next week. I therefore hope that the Senate will be prepared to remain in session tonight until action on the bill has been concluded. I hope that we may have votes as rapidly as we can, of course, consistent with due consideration of the measure.

Mr. McNARY. Then, Mr. President, I understand plainly that the Senate is to stay in session until the bill is passed?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything about the pending legislation because I am not a member of the committee, and tax philosophy is so intertwined and interwoven that on most propositions one who does not serve on the committee is at great disadvantage in discussing the philosophy of any tax bill. However, in my humble judgment, there has emerged from the discussion a clear-cut principle or clear-cut policy which we must or must not embrace, depending on how we vote on the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL]. We are told by the Secretary of the Treasury that new taxes to the extent of about $16,000,000,000 are desirable. We know that frequently the Government is endeavoring to put over loans for designated amounts, such as $12,000,000,000 or $15,000,000,000 in order to obtain the cash required to finance its program.

So, therefore, our future economic or, let us say, governmental financial stability depends upon two things: The ability of the Government to borrow, on the one hand; and the Government revenue derived from taxation, on the other hand. Those two things must go along hand in hand and must provide sufficient money to enable us to successfully prosecute the war. The failure of either one of them to produce a total sum sufficient to enable the Government to meet its obligations would bring disaster; for, under the bill heretofore passed by the Congress, in the emergency, the Secretary of the Treasury would simply walk over to the Federal Reserve bank, would place the Government's I O U there, and would take out enough billions of money to make up the difference. Of course, so long as public confidence is back of the loans, our bonds are always good. But the moment we depart from the foundation of public confidence behind Government obligations, to a certain extent the financial integrity of our Government is called into question.

At the other end of the Avenue we have set up an economic stabilizer, a czar, if you please, in the person of Mr. Byrnes, our former colleague. His job, we are told, is to "hold the line," to keep prices from increasing, to keep salaries and wages from going up beyond some intangible level of the past. I know his job is a difficult one.

Then, too, we have drafted the manpower of the country. Directly, through the Selective Service System, we have drafted the manpower needed for our armed forces. Indirectly, through directives of the War Manpower Commission and of other agencies, we are compelling and inducing people to go to the farms or into essential industries.

So, under the facade or the disguise—which would be a better term—of not drafting, in effect we are drafting all manpower, and largely all womanpower, either through the medium of the Selective Service Act, for the armed forces, or, through various other media, for work in the various civilian industries essential to the war.

What is the measure now before us, in the light of the background I have briefly sketched? Is it to share the bur-

den? Is it to make equality of sacrifice? I cannot see how it is, for, no matter what one may say, the following elements stand out starkly in the tax problem: For a number of years—the years during the conduct of the war—the national income will be abnormally high. So long as the war lasts, more persons will work at wages which are abnormally high, and therefore during a number of years the national income will be far greater than the normal national income. Let us assume for the sake of argument or illustration that the national income during each of 4 war years is $160,000,000,000; let us assume that will be the national income in 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945. Likewise, let us assume that on the last day of the year 1945, hostilities will cease, and the War Production Board, the Army, the Navy, and the other agencies of the Government will immediately dispatch telegrams to Henry Ford, to General Motors, to Chrysler, to Glenn Martin, to United Aircraft, to the Baldwin Locomotive Works, to shipyards, and to everyone else, reading substantially as follows: "Stop all production forthwith"—because there will be no need for tanks or shells or guns or other munitions of war the moment hostilities cease. What will happen then?

The 20,000,000 men and women in the war plants will be without work, at least temporarily. The national income, which will have been away above normal, will drop off sharply. What will that mean, in terms of the pending bill? It will mean that if we start to collect income taxes on the basis of this year's earnings, instead of collecting income taxes during this year on the basis of 1942 earnings, the income of one of the great war years will not be used by the Government as a basis for fixing taxation.

Mr. President, we cannot get away from that point. So, if the war ends on December 31, 1945, instead of collecting income taxes on 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945, when the income is at a high level, under the Ruml plan we will collect on the basis of only 1943, 1944, and 1945 incomes—3 great years. The income for the year 1946, which will be a depression year, will, in effect and in actuality, form a substitute for the income for the year 1942, which we shall have waived.

So, instead of having a basis of $130,000,000,000 worth of actual earnings on which to siphon revenue into the Treasury, we shall take a $60,000,000,000 or a $70,000,000,000 year of earnings as the basis of which to siphon earnings into the Treasury, and over that 4-year or 5-year period we shall lose the ability to levy taxes on income actually earned, to the extent, let us say, of $50,000,000,000 or $60,000,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a few questions?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, while presumably we shall lose that year as a basis for income taxation, it is to be presumed that thereafter the national income will begin to increase again, and that during every subsequent year we shall gradually obtain more revenue than we now are obtaining under the existing plan, until by the time we get back to the level of normal incomes before the war—and I feel perfectly confident that we shall do that in time—we shall regain that loss.

Mr. TYDINGS. No, Mr. President; I do not think so. I agree in part with what the Senator from Ohio has said, except I say that the great income year 1942 will be forever lost.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield for just a moment further?

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask the Senator to let me explain why I partly differ with him. Because if that year is excluded as a basis for levying taxes, it can be made up only by some following year which, according to all human measurements, in the average can never be so great as the average war year.

Mr. TAFT. No, Mr. President; I do not agree with the Senator at all. In the first place, the Senator must remember that it is the year 1942 which we are excluding. In fact the amount excluded is less than the 1942 total tax because of the windfall provision. The 1942 national income is approximately $110,000,000,000. In 1943 it will be much greater. Presumably, in 1944 it will be nearly $150,000,000,000; and from the increased taxes, we shall get all that we are giving up under the present plan, because we shall be levying the taxes on a larger income.

It seems to me to be perfectly reasonable to assume that we shall gradually get back to a $110,000,000,000 year, which the Senator says is bigger than any other year. When we are through we shall be exactly where we started.

Mr. TYDINGS. No, we shall not, for this reason: Let us take a 10-year period. We start with the war years. They are confessedly far above normal years. They will probably average $40,000,000,000 more than the average income of America from 1935 to 1940. If we take the year 1942 as a big year, the year 1943 as a big year, the year 1944 as a big year, and the year 1945 as a big year, we have 4 big years. Then we take 4 years of sloping off—the years 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1949, and then we have 2 good years on the end. At the end of 10 years, what is the result? We have lost one of our biggest years forever.

Mr. TAFT. No; we have replaced it by the average. If the average comes back to $110,000,000,000, we shall not have lost a cent.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not agree with the Senator. If that philosophy is sound, let me say to the Senator that if he will give me his entire earnings this year, he can make them up in the next 9 years.

Mr. TAFT. Not at all. That comparison has no relation to the subject which I am discussing. The question is whether the Government would receive as much money under the Ruml plan as under the other proposal. I say that it would over a period of 10 years. I say that it would receive more. Whenever the income rises over that of the previous year, it would receive more. Whenever the income goes down, it receives less. It seems to me obvious that if we start with $110,000,000,000 for 1942, if by 1952 we are back to $110,000,000,000, we shall have collected exactly the same number of dollars as we would have collected if we were to continue the present system in effect. It seems to me perfectly clear. I do not see any answer to it.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator usually does not see anything in an argument with which he is not in accord.

Mr. TAFT. It is purely a mathematical question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not for a moment concede that the Senator's premise is correct, but I am trying to understand his point of view. If the Senator will quit talking generalities and deal with actual years, I think I can convince him that the basis for his entire assumption is not sound. Let me illustrate.

Let us take, for example, a 5-year period, 3 war years and 2 post-war years. Under the Ruml plan 1 of the war years would be eliminated, and 1 post-war year would be substituted in its place to make up the 5-year period. Am I correct in that?

Mr. TAFT. Entirely so.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then we have 3 post-war years and 2 war years, in accordance with the Ruml plan, as against 3 war years and 2 post-war years in accordance with the plan of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TAFT. Let me suggest——

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment. That is a 5-year period. Now let us take a 10-year period. In a 10-year period we would have 4 good years, 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945. Then we will take 6 post-war years, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952. Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that the last 2 of the post-war years are fairly good years. What do we get in that picture? In that 10-year picture we get the elimination of a war year for a post-war year.

Of course, it may be said that time is infinite, which it is. If we go on down the corridor of time, there will always be the possibility that at some time in the future, time being infinite, we shall reach the point where it does not make any difference. But, Mr. President, the debt which we are building is not infinite. The income which the American people are making is not permanent. Everyone knows that it is abnormal. To say that 5 or 10 years from now we shall be back in a period of prosperity equivalent to 1942 is to assume that a group of political magicians will be conducting the affairs of all the countries which are now bankrupt. To adopt such a theory is to discount entirely the tremendous economic and depressive effect of a debt of $250,000,000,000 on the shoulders of all businesses and persons in this country.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to add a word?

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. The point I am making, to take the Senator's own statement, is that, in effect, if we eliminate a $110,000,000,000 year, when we get back to another $110,000,000,000 year, which, under the Ruml plan, would be substituted, by that time the income would be equalized and we should be in exactly the same position. We would have eliminated a $110,000,000,000 year at one end and added a

$110,000,000,000 year at the other end. When we were through the total would be the same.

The Senator suggests that we will not get back to another $110,000,000,000 year.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to call attention to the fact that in 1929 we had a higher income than we had at any time during the World War.

So far as the $210,000,000,000 debt is concerned, if it means anything, it means inflation. It means, therefore, that our income is far more likely to be high 10 years from now than if there were no such debt. So it seems to me that the Senator's argument that the Ruml plan would result in a reduction of income over a 10-year period is not sound.

I should like to ask the Senator another question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I see the Senator's point of view, and I take issue with him specifically on the proposition that there is going to be a $110,000,000,000 income in the country in 1952, for these reasons:

First of all, the world is impoverished. Secondly, when we had our high income in 1929 our debt was small. Taxes were small. Furthermore, during the period from 1920 to 1929, under the aegis of this Government, loans totaling $16,000,000,000 were made to small countries. During that period we had the greatest year of foreign trade the Nation has ever seen. We had total exports of nearly $5,000,000,000 a year. Why? Foreign countries were buying our exports with the money we were lending them. When those loans washed out, as they did in 1929, we did not have real prosperity. We had an illusion of prosperity.

This money is owed to our own people. Those debts were owed by foreign governments. So the concussion of having sent wealth out of the country, which could never come back, brought on, in part, the depression, whereas in the present situation the money is actually owed to our own people, and we do not repudiate our debts. Therefore, it means that the people will have less income with which to buy than they normally would have if taxes were not so heavy. They must lay something aside.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator permit one further question?

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has pictured a condition in which the national income continues to increase until the end of 1945, when he assumes the war will end, and then there will be a sudden drop.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. What seems perfectly obvious to me is that even if the Government loses a large part of its income in 1946, it should lose it. We should never impose war taxes, based on 1945, on an income which is very much less in 1946.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree.

Mr. TAFT. So, to the extent that the Ruml plan would result in a reduction of the income of the Government in the very year in which national income is reduced, it seems to me to be a sound taxation policy, and one which should be supported by the Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. I can see the Senator's point of view, but I do not agree with it for this reason: First of all, the Senator says that a reduction in the national income will be brought about largely because the war is over. I agree to that. That is the reason why I am opposing the Ruml plan, because it is obvious that when the war is over the national income will be less. That is why the Senator's argument is refuted, in large measure, by his own utterances, because he himself has just said that following the war the Government income will be less.

Mr. TAFT. No; I was merely accepting the Senator's assumption. That was all.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator said that when the war is over the Government income should be less. I agree that it will be less.

Mr. TAFT. I said that if the national income were less, I thought the Government income should be less.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. Therefore, is that the time to collect taxes? The debt will still be there. It will be greater then than it is now. Is not the time to collect taxes to pay that debt while the people are in a position to pay the taxes to liquidate it? Every time we postpone the payment of that debt, we make it more difficult for the rich man, in finality, as well as the poor man, to pay the debt. There is demagoguery back of the Ruml plan in its last analysis. I predict that if it is adopted it will cost the wealthy more money in the long run than if they were put on a pay-as-you-go basis in accordance with the income of the people and their ability to pay based on that income.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think the Senator from Maryland has very ably defended his position.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope so.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I congratulate him on the address which he has made. However, in the debate between the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Ohio, it seems to me that one phase of the subject has been overlooked. The interest of the Government has been discussed, but the individual interest has been overlooked.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am coming to that.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator, but I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that after we get through these years of prosperity and then through the years of depression, and possibly get back to prosperity, the class of citizens now paying an income tax will not be the same class of individuals who will profit by the adoption of the plan proposed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Just look at the situation from the standpoint of sheer logic and facts, and logic should play some part in the final determination of this issue. There is no Senator who knows when the war will end. It may still be in progress 5 years from now. It may be in progress 10 years from now. I personally am inclined to take an optimistic view. I believe that at some time prior to 5 years from now the war will be over. However, there are many sound thinking persons high up in the Army and Navy who say there is no immediate prospect on the horizon for a cessation of the war.

Mr. President, what will the debt be when the war is over? It is pretty certain that it will be in the neighborhood of $250,000,000,000. That is $7,500 for every family in America, rich and poor, high and low, black and white. There will also be the State debts, the city debts, the county debts, and perhaps our own debts on top of them all. If the debt is to be greater 3 years from now than it is at the present time, what is the philosophy of the proposal now before us? It is to pay off the debt when it is greater, and when we shall have less income, rather than to pay it off when it is small and when we have more income. That is just inescapable.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Maryland made a statement in the early part of his remarks with respect to what may occur when the war is over insofar as Ford, Chrysler, the shipyards, and other industries producing implements of war are concerned.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I take it that the Senator means that millions upon millions of individuals will then be out of work.

Mr. TYDINGS. Temporarily.

Mr. LUCAS. Temporarily, at least.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. If they should temporarily be out of work, or if they could not obtain the high wages they had been receiving in the defense plants, I wonder what would happen to many millions of these defense workers insofar as their taxes for the particular year were concerned. How would they pay them?

Mr. TYDINGS. Under the plan proposed by the Senator from Texas a 20 percent withholding tax would be collected currently.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. That would be used to pay their income taxes for the preceding year.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. Let us assume that in 1945 they will have a year of tremendously high income, as well as in 1944, 1943, and 1942.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. However, in 1946, after the war is over, I estimate that 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 of the 40,000,000 taxpayers will not be able to pay the high taxes assessed against them in 1945.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Government will have collected the tax currently while the taxpayers were earning it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Government will be collecting in 1946 while the taxpayer is receiving no wage.

Mr. TYDINGS. No. As I understand the philosophy of the amendment of the Senator from Texas——

Mr. LUCAS. Then I am wrong.

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a minute. Let us assume that 1945 will be the last year

of the war, that on December 31, 1945, hostilities will have ceased, and unemployment will commence on the 1st day of January. That was the proposal of the Senator. All during 1945 20 percent of the worker's income was impounded while he was employed.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. That money would be available in 1946 to pay the income tax on earnings during 1945. Am I correct?

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. It would be used to pay off the income tax in the year in which the income was earned.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no.

Mr. TYDINGS. It would not be paid until 1946, but the Government would have the money with which to pay it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will yield in just a moment. What is the Senator's interpretation of it?

Mr. LUCAS. I am trying to ascertain the correct interpretation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me state the question again. If the amendment of the Senator from Texas should be adopted, it is my understanding that all during the year 1945, from all these workers who are steadily employed, from every salaried man there would be collected monthly by the Government a 20 percent withholding tax. At the end of 1945 the worker would make up his income tax return on the basis of 1945's earnings. The Senator disagrees with that, does he?

Mr. LUCAS. I am trying to find out.

Mr. TYDINGS. Either agree or disagree. Otherwise I cannot tell what is in dispute.

Mr. LUCAS. Wait a moment. I am trying to obtain some information. The Senator seems a little excited over the situation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not excited, but the Senator propounded a question, and I stated the case, and then he shook his head.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad to yield. Perhaps the Senator from Texas can clear up the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope someone may be able to do so.

Mr. O'DANIEL. As I understand, under my amendment the withholding tax for 1945 would be sent into the Treasury and there it would be applied on the accrued tax for 1944.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. Under the amendment of the Senator from Texas there would be withheld in 1945 the tax which was assessed in 1944 and due in 1945. Is that correct?

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. In 1946, when the great war is over, and millions of men have returned home, and are without work, who will pay the taxes in 1946 which will have been levied on the high wages earned by persons in the defense plants during 1945?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to answer the question of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have the Senator do so.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have heretofore answered the same question during the debate today. I presume the Senator from Illinois was not in the chamber at the time.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry; I may have been out at that particular moment.

Mr. O'DANIEL. If we should come to the situation referred to by the Senator from Illinois, and the income of the taxpayer or individual in 1946 should fall off, or if he did not have any money and was unable to pay his 1945 income tax, certainly we could find nowhere in the United States a more worthy individual who would be entitled forgiveness or cancelation of his income tax for 1945.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is my understanding.

Mr. O'DANIEL. And that would be the time when the United States should forgive taxes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I still have the floor, and that is not my argument at all.

I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Illinois. This is my proposition: If under the aegis of the Ruml plan there is forgiveness of the taxes for 1942, which is a big year, and the Government does not collect any taxes in that earning period because it substitutes 1943 in its place, then I want it understood that even if the condition envisaged by the Senator from Illinois comes to pass, the Government has lost a good year, under his plan, as against a bad year, under the plan of the Senator from Texas. So that no real damage is done if the assumption of the Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will yield further, I maintain that an unusual amount of damage is done to millions upon millions of workers in 1946, if a heavy tax bill for 1945 is hanging over their heads. In 1946 we may find men going from one town to another attempting to get jobs, and not able to find them. Finally the tax collector finds an automobile parked in some spot, and he annoys and harasses the owner, and continues to try to collect the $75 or $125 that is due and owing under the previous year's tax, which the man made and spent. The very reason why I am for the Ruml plan is that I want to keep the Government from annoying and harassing millions upon millions of people in the post-war era.

Mr. TYDINGS. The reason why I am not for the Ruml plan is that I know the man referred to will be 10 times as much harrassed if the integrity of our financial system is not kept strong.

Senators, as this debate takes place, I am carried back to the year 1937. There are a good many in this body now who were in the Senate at that time, but there are some new Members. Perhaps some of my older colleagues will remember that I had the temerity and the effrontery on six succeeding Monday mornings to line this Chamber with charts showing all sorts of deficits, income-tax proposals, and similar things, and I made a plea morning after morning for six successive Monday mornings that we levy more taxes; that, as we were getting out of the depression somewhat, we should try to get the country, in those peacetimes, on a sounder basis.

I remember that from the year 1930 to the year 1940, a 10-year period, the Government deficits amounted to $27,000,000,000, an average of $2,700,000,000 a year. I remember I looked up the total cost of the Army and the Navy, including everything, during that 10-year period, and it amounted to $11,000,000,000. We spent $16,000,000,000 more during the 10-year period than we took in, without counting a single penny for the Army or the Navy.

Always this anticipated prosperous year was coming, in the future, just as my good friend, the Senator from Ohio, rose only a few moments ago and talked about the $110,000,000,000 year of the future. So in those days people talked about $100,000,000,000-income year that was coming in the future.

We tried everything that could be thought of to hasten it. We tried pump priming. There was a $4,000,000,000 appropriation in 1 year in an attempt to get the machinery going at rapid speed. There were subsidies to farmers, and everything else of the kind, in an effort to start again the economy machine.

I now hear the same bewitching song, "Don't bother to collect as much taxes as you can get now," when the people are making the largest income in history, and when the debt is skyrocketing. "Put it off."

Five or 10 or 15 or 20 years from now the national income will be $150,000,000,000 or $200,000,000,000. I hope those who make that prediction will prove to be right. There is a big backlog of unfilled orders, for steel rails, cars, clothing, machinery, shoes, farm implements. But do not underestimate the fact that this is an impoverished world. Do not underestimate the fact that our responsibility to the world, at least under present leadership, will not cease when the armistice is signed. Do not lose sight of the fact that there will be a tremendous rehabilitation program, that sheer self-interest will cause many a man reluctantly to vote away the money of the people of this country in order to go to the aid of the diseased and the mentally and physically handicapped of other countries.

A few days ago I made an investigation and found that in Belgium, for example, the food allowance is 900 calories a day. Physicians say a healthy body should have 2,700 calories a day. The people of Belgium have for years been getting one-third of what they need, but now the allotment has been dropped to 800 calories a day. Look in Life Magazine for this last week, at the picture of the little Greek boy, whose legs are so thin they look like a crane's legs. He had nothing at all on his bones but skin. Do Senators realize that under the aegis of the Swedish and the Swiss Red Cross we are sending to Greece 15,000 tons of supplies a week, and that without them the people would starve by the thousands? Does any one tell me that, sketching the conditions in this brief and incomplete way, when the war is over

life is going to move along for all of us as it did in the past?

There is not a man on this planet whose imagination is sufficiently vivid even to begin to comprehend the after effects of the war, and let us make no mistake about it. I read in the press only a few days ago a statement that the Lend-Lease Administrator said he was running out of funds. We appropriated some $16,000,000,000 or $18,000,000,000 to him, as I recall, and the end of that is in sight.

I wrote to the officials of the Army and the Navy in the last couple of months—I have had quite a large correspondence with the Secretary of War—asking what in addition to lend-lease, what in addition to the visible expenditures of this Government, we had spent in foreign countries in a military way. Do Senators realize that we have spent nearly $2,000,000,000 in building installations in some 30 or 40 countries scattered all over the globe? We have done that. The Army alone has spent nearly $1,400,000,000, and there is no report under lend-lease or anywhere else of that expenditure.

Mr. President, do you realize that the coordinator of Latin-American affairs has spent $21,000,000 for health and sanitation in Central and South America? I am not criticizing any of these expenditures, I am merely stating that right now we do not know the total of what the war is going to cost.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I desire to conclude but I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am very much interested in what the Senator is saying. I am wondering whether I am correct in drawing an illustration I wish to suggest, because this is the way it appeals to me: Suppose a farmer has this year the best crop he ever had in his life, and decides that he will not pay his bills this year, but will wait 6 or 7 years, and perhaps have more money with which to pay. Is that about what the Senator has in mind?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is not wholly a far-fetched analogy of the present situation.

It does not take any intelligence at all to solve the question which confronts us, because there are certain fundamental truths which no amount of oratory or speech making can overcome. The first one is that this is the biggest year, so far as income earning is concerned, in the history of this Republic, and what does the pending amendment propose to do? It proposes to wipe that out as a basis of taxation, and to substitute some year in the future which we are told will approximate this year—and God only knows whether it will or not.

What hardship lies in paying taxes one year after they are due, particularly if the Government during that year, through the withholding tax, provides the money to pay the taxes? There may be some slight evening up, I will concede, under the Ruml plan. When one year is balanced against another, for all intents and purposes one might, according to some philosophy, call the Ruml plan a substitute. But in any case a post-war year is being substituted for a war year. We cannot get away from that. Anyone who says the national income in a post-war year will equal the income of 1942 or 1943 is, in my opinion, a dreamer.

Mr. President, we cannot have a debt of $250,000,000,000 and have low taxes. Taxes are a burden on the purchasing power of the people. Taxes are a burden on the advancement of free enterprise. Taxes are a burden on private initiative. The rich man, looking ahead, will want all the taxes possible collected now, because when the day when everyone receives large incomes shall pass there will be only a few of the comparatively large incomes left, and what targets they will be for the taxation of the future. There are many who are in favor of the Ruml plan who have not thought the subject through. Now is the time, right now, to collect.

Mr. President, I started out in my own general way in favor of the Ruml plan. Pay-as-you-go appealed to me. I should like to have it even yet, but I cannot take it at the price of waiving a whole war year and substituting in its place a post-war year as a basis for the collection of taxes.

Mr. President, I submit it is simply pure common sense to say that there is no immediate prospect in this Republic for the national income in any of the post-war years in your lifetime or mine equaling the national income of 1942, 1943, or 1944, when everyone is working at the highest wages in all history, not only working for our own needs, but working for the people all over the face of the earth. When the war is over we shall not be supplying people all over the face of the earth to the extent we now are. As we have made demands on the mothers and fathers of this country, as we have made demands upon the wives and the little children for their sons and fathers to go forth and to die, it seems to me not to be the part of patriotism, it seems to me not to be the part of good judgment, it seems to me not to be the part of intelligent self-interest on the part of anyone to cast aside as a basis for Federal taxation a year when the national earnings are the greatest in the history of our country, and to substitute some will-o'-the-wisp, as yet undisclosed, unknown year in the future, to take its place, when we know that great unemployment is bound to come after this war, and that all the world's hardships, now covered over, now behind the walls of war, will break out to command our attention and the burdens of government will be very heavy indeed, and the national financial structure be less strong to weather the storm than it now is.

Mr. President, although I started out in a vague way to be for the Ruml plan, I could not in good conscience feel that I would have kept the faith with those who are making the great sacrifice during this period of time if I were to wipe out these great incomes—by great I do not mean large ones, I mean great in the sense that everyone is enjoying them—and not vote to provide that the Government shall receive taxes from them now rather than in the future.

Mr. President, I have no quarrel with any Senator who thinks otherwise. I did not intend to say anything in the debate, but, after listening to the debate, and finding what, in my opinion, is the essence of the whole dispute, I cannot cast my vote in any other way than I have stated I shall cast it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall not trespass very long on the time of the Senate, and, because of the importance of having this measure passed at the earliest possible moment, I probably should not say any more than I have heretofore said in the course of questions and answers exchanged between me and Senators who have spoken on the bill. But, after listening to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] whose amendment is before the Senate, and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] discuss this very important measure, I feel that I must say a word or two.

In the beginning, I should like to say that I do not know whether anyone is "demagoguing" on this measure or not, but, so far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, there is a great principle involved, and upon that principle I stand or fall. That principle is placing the taxpayers of America upon a pay-as-you-go basis.

The Senator from Texas admitted in the colloquy which took place in the Senate today that his proposal would not place the taxpayers of America upon a pay-as-you-go basis. That is the issue with respect to the bill. If Senators believe in a theory or a philosophy which is new in the field of taxation they can vote for it, and if they do not they can vote against it. I regret that every Senator could not have heard the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] discuss this very question.

Mr. President, under the amendment now before the Senate we cannot get away from the question which I posed a moment ago, insofar as the year 1946 is concerned, assuming that the war ends the last of December 1945.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am sorry I did not hear all the argument on this point, because I am quite convinced that the taxpayers of this country will be current in the payment of their taxes this year. Statistics produced today show that less than 1 percent of the taxpayers are in default of payment of taxes due March 15, this year. Let us consider the case of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. He paid his taxes for 1942. So from July of this year until January next year he will have 20 percent deducted from his salary. That deduction of salary for 6 months will be applied on 1943 taxes. Those who are behind in their payments——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator——

Mr. WILEY. I should like to have the Senator clarify the situation presented by that case.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not know that I can clarify it. I think I am in more of a muddle now than I was when I rose to my feet. There is no

question that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas does not place the taxpayers on a pay-as-you-go basis. I do not think the Senator will deny that. That is all there is to the question.

What will happen in 1946 when the President of the United States tells Ford and Chrysler and the shipbuilders, and so forth, in line with the example which was given by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], that the factories must stop making munitions of war? Then millions of men employed in those factories will go—where? They will go back to the farms, they will go back to the small cities, they will go back to their own friends and neighbors. They will go everywhere. What will be hanging over them in 1946? It will be the tax bill assessed against them in 1945. All the employer can do in 1946 is to collect by way of a tax on whatever he may be making to apply upon the 1945 assessment; and in millions of millions of cases that collection will be absolutely nothing. In other words, if the amendment of the Senator from Texas shall become the law of the land, after the war is over that debt anxiety will hang over the heads of millions upon millions of defense workers.

Mr. President, that is one of the things in which I am tremendously interested at the moment. I am attempting to look far down the mountainside at the post-war conditions which our Nation will have to go through. In the post-war period we cannot afford to have millions of men with debt liabilities hanging over their heads. It will be hard enough to get along without having the tax collectors hanging around and annoying millions of men here and there and everywhere else—levying upon this automobile, upon this bedstead, upon this set of furniture, and upon that set of furniture in order to collect a tax which was assessed in 1945, when the man was making perhaps the highest income he ever made in the course of his career. That is the danger which exists in attempting to write into the law the kind of withholding tax the Senator from Texas wants the Senate to adopt.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In other words, the pending proposal coming from the committee is an insurance against having a bankrupt citizenship some day; is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in my opinion the Senator is 100-percent correct.

We have to look to the future of our citizens and of our country, and we cannot afford to enact any type of legislation which will have a tendency to bankrupt, or which will bankrupt, any citizen or a great portion of the citizens of the country, especially at that particular time. Mr. President, it seems to me to be as clear as anything can be that we cannot under any circumstances afford to adopt such an amendment as that offered by the Senator from Texas.

Now to go back to the beginning, let me say that it is merely a question of principle as to whether we want to put the people of the country on a pay-as-you-go basis or whether we want to leave the system as it is at the present time. We do not need any law such as the amendment of the Senator from Texas would embody. I should prefer to leave the system as it is, rather than to place a withholding tax on the people under the system and arrangement contemplated in the amendment now under consideration.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Illinois has just referred to a pay-as-you-go basis. I should like to state that during the debate I have heard various Senators refer to the amendment as an amendment which would put the country on a pay-as-you-go basis. Would the amendment of the Senator from Texas do that?

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, it would not. The amendment of the Senator from Texas would not put the country on a pay-as-you-go basis in any way whatever. For instance, as to 1944 incomes, it would withhold from salaries and wages a certain amount to be applied to the assessment for 1945.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator and I were both correct a moment ago, and I think our disagreement was occasioned by a different interpretation of what was involved. Let me see if I cannot straighten it out.

My contention is that the withholding tax is taken out of earner's wages as he earns them. The Senator's contention was that even though they are taken out while the wage earner is earning the big salary, they are applicable to the salary earned in the preceding year.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct; and when I inadvertently disagreed with him as to that phase of the matter I was in error.

However, I still maintain that the 20-percent withholding tax is an effort on the part of the Government to place the worker or the salaried man, regardless of what his salary may be, in such a position that he will be able to pay his income taxes at the time when he is making the high income.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me answer the Senator's observation in this way: A great deal has been said about what we shall lose and what we shall forgive in connection with the pending bill; but, Mr. President, as the Senator from Georgia so correctly stated, we have the power to write a tax bill that would take care of any amount of money the Treasury might lose in connection with the Ruml plan.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. We have the right to take care of any amount the Treasury might lose; but we do not have the right to put the same amount back on the same persons, do we?

Mr. LUCAS. That may be true; the Senator may be correct; but, insofar as the collection of taxes is concerned, we can assess in taxes all that the people can stand; we can take it all, if it is necessary to do so, in order to carry on the Government in this crisis.

Mr. President, nothing will be lost by the Ruml plan; but as I stand on the floor of the Senate, I say that even if the Treasury should lose something, the result of putting the people of America on a pay-as-you-go basis would be worth it. I am speaking now in the light of the post-war era; because that will be the time when we shall need the best possible morale on the part of our people in order to keep the wheels of the American way of life turning; and we cannot afford to have tax snoopers or tax collectors going around in 1946 harassing and annoying men who forgot to pay their taxes, and making bad citizens out of them, at a time when we shall need all the good citizens we can possibly have. Our citizens will continue to be good citizens if we let them pay their taxes at the time when they have the money with which to pay them. That is what would be done by the Ruml plan.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understand that the Senator's proposition is that we should forgive the 1942 taxes because sometime in the future there might be a bad year when the wage earners of the country could not pay their taxes. Is that the Senator's point—that we should forgive the 1942 taxes in order to have taxes on a current basis in the poor years?

Mr. LUCAS. That is one of the arguments which has been made, and I judge from the remarks made a moment ago by the Senator from Maryland, when he spoke about factories shutting down and employment decreasing and the difficulties the country would have to go through that that was the point he made. Mr. President, I take up that point and discuss it. I hope the country will stay on a national-income basis of $150,000,000,000 or $160,000,000,000 forever, so far as I am concerned. I hope the time will never come when a million of our men will be out of employment.

I do not base the argument on those considerations at all; I base it on the fact that people ought to be on a pay-as-you-go basis, so that we shall have the tax money in our pockets when the time comes, and not have tax collectors going around, annoying the people.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is the argument the Senator made, is it not?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator's argument was that for 1942, the year in which our people had the greatest income of any in our history, we should forgive $9,000,000,000 of taxes because of a rainy day the Senator sees in some future year.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, I cannot possibly see so far ahead as can the Senator from Utah, Mr. President.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is the argument the Senator makes, and I ask him to stay with it.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, I shall stay with it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Like the Senator from Maryland, I, too, started out against the Ruml plan. Yesterday I heard the argument made by the able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Committee on Finance. It seems to me that the point is whether we want to put the American taxpayers on a basis on which they can pay their taxes as they earn them—on a current basis. The Senator from Georgia said that if we decide to do that, 30,000,000 of the 44,000,000 American taxpayers will be able to pay their taxes currently, out of salaries and wages. He went further, and said:

> I would not hesitate to abate 100 percent of the tax if I believed it was necessary in order to put the American taxpayer on a current basis with his Government, and I would do so under the firm conviction that that was the best course for the Government to pursue, and was certainly the best course for the taxpayer, if the Government should follow it.

Mr. President, from all the debate which has occurred, I take it that no Senator will say he does not want to put the taxpayers on a current basis. Of course, we have different ideas of how to do it. The chairman of the committee wants to do it on a 75-percent basis, because he thinks we should carry over 25 percent of the taxes. However, as he said—and I repeat it, because what he said convinced me—there is no such thing as forgiving the taxes owed to the Government. I quote the Senator's statement:

> Forgiving! What does it amount to when the Government can in any one year impose any tax on its people that it wants to impose? This is not a question of debtor and creditor. If, as a creditor, the Senator from Alabama forgives me something, he cannot make me pay it next year unless I become indebted to him again. In the narrow, technical sense only, is there the relationship of debtor and creditor between the Government of the United States and the taxpayer, because the Government has the absolute power to change, modify, shift, or increase its tax rates so as to meet its necessities.

Mr. President, all of us owe the Government; we owe it for everything we have—and that is the basis of obligation—and the Government can take everything we have if the Government needs it.

So far as giving back anything is concerned, we are not proposing to do any such thing. The Government can assert its right to have all the taxes it needs for any purpose, either now or at any time in the future.

Mr. President, I would not support the amendment of the Senator from Texas, because it would put us on a temporary pay-as-you-go basis, from July 1 to the end of the year, and then from the 1st of January to the 1st of July we would still be on the present basis and would be liable for 1942 taxes.

As the Senator from Georgia said yesterday, the average taxpayer is, perhaps, a soldier boy now in the Solomons, and I know some of them who made $15,000 or $20,000 a year before the war, but now make $50 a month. How are they going to pay taxes? Are we going to permit their homes to be taken, and liens to be established on their property? Millions of people in the United States cannot pay taxes now. There are too many of them to put in jail. Are we going to force them into bankruptcy? The Senator from Georgia convinced me that we ought to put them on a pay-as-you-go basis, wipe out the obligation, and start over again.

I wished to add these remarks to the statement of my friend, because it seems to me that that is the proper basis for our action.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky. That is all there is to this problem. It is as simple as A B C. The question is whether or not we want to place the taxpayers on a pay-as-you-go plan. There is no answer to the great argument which was made yesterday by the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long. I wish to make a very brief statement.

There is an old saying in Washington that, "If you do not like the weather in Washington, just wait a while." [Laughter.] That is almost true of the proposals to change the tax law. We have so many amendments that if we will only sit around and wait a while, the proposal we want will come along and we can get on the band wagon.

The proposal I like more than any other has come along in the form of the O'Daniel amendment. I have made a long study of all these proposals. I am a member of the Finance Committee, and I have listened to the testimony and arguments pro and con on all of them. I find that so far all the proposals have some very definite weaknesses, and all of them have elements of strength. Some of them are more attractive than others.

The proposal which the junior Senator from Texas is making has its weaknesses. I will admit that I have been greatly disturbed by the arguments made by the chairman of the Finance Committee to the effect that the time has come when we must put the taxpayers on a current basis. Of course, the proposal made by the Senator from Texas would not put them on a current basis. We would not catch up the year we would be behind. We simply would not be 2 years behind. That is the difficulty, unless we have a withholding tax. A withholding tax would not catch up the year we are already behind, but it would make it impossible for us to get 2 years behind. That is its virtue.

If we are to make our taxes current, we can do one of two things: We can skip a year, or we can double up and pay 2 years' taxes in 1, or spread the payment of 1 year's taxes over a period of years.

We had before us the Ellender plan, which did not skip a year, but doubled up the taxes. Then we had the Connally plan to skip half a year and double up the remaining half a year. We have the plan of the Senator from Georgia, to skip 75 percent of the 1942 taxes, and bring forward, 25 percent of the 1942 tax. Then there is the Ruml plan, to skip a whole year and not double up anything.

There are two proposals before the Senate not to double up taxes. It seems to me that it is absolutely impossible, with the heavy load the taxpayer is carrying at the present time, to double up his taxes. Neither of the two plans to which I refer would double up any taxes. I like the O'Daniel proposal best of all.

Strange as it may seem, I select the Ruml plan as the next best. I voted against the Ruml plan in committee. I started out very much opposed to it. I felt that we ought to go along as we had been doing for 30 years, and not worry very much about making our taxes current, and enact a withholding tax so as not to get 2 years behind. No one would be hurt very much. In the matter of property taxes we expect to be a year behind. There is no proposal before the Congress at the present time to make corporation taxes current. They will still be a year behind. Even though we should adopt the Ruml plan and make personal income taxes current, the majority of income taxes would not be made current, because corporation taxes would not be current. I know, of course, that corporations subject to examination by a certified public accountant are compelled to carry a balance to take care of their taxes. I know that most of our heavy personal taxpayers do the same thing. It seems to me that the Treasury could greatly assist in keeping taxes current by working out a system of bonds to sell to the people on an installment plan a year ahead. The people could buy the bonds, and at the end of the year the bonds could settle the tax account. It seems to me that the Treasury could work out something of that kind and make it as attractive as possible, even though a discount were allowed on the bonds, so that taxpayers could become current by making installment payments.

Of course, under the O'Daniel plan, any taxpayer who wished to become current could become current simply by setting aside a certain sum of money. It seems to me that the Treasury should encourage him to do so.

As I say, I have been greatly impressed by the statement of the chairman of the committee as to the necessity of becoming current. I was greatly impressed by the statement which he read today from the high-finance officer of Canada on the same subject. I was quite impressed in committee by the following colloquy between the chairman and Mr. Paul, the expert from the Treasury:

> Mr. PAUL. If you once adopt a current collection system, then all the increases would go along with the other taxes, and the taxpayers would be current, but the number

of dollars taken out of their pockets would be greater.

Senator TAFT. Unless they had to borrow money to pay the taxes. Then they would not be current.

Mr. PAUL. They are current so far as the Government is concerned.

This is what the chairman said:

If you are to get $16,000,000,000 more money out of the taxpayer, take it out of the stream of earnings or of income, you have got to get most of the taxpayers current or they cannot stand it.

Mr. Paul replied:

I agree with you.

So the Treasury believes that taxes should be made current. There is no question about that. It was brought out more forcefully in some questions which I asked the Treasury representative.

As I say, I should prefer to go along as we have been operating for 30 years, and as I believe we could go along for 30 more years, remaining a year behind. I am reminded that last October—I believe it was about the middle of October—Congress enacted a tax bill which was made retroactive to the first of the calendar year in which it was enacted. I believe that if we look up the record we shall find that most tax measures are made retroactive for many months. So there is not such a great problem in making taxes current as we might think. I shall support the O'Daniel amendment, and if that is defeated, I shall support the Ruml plan.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, as a member of the Finance Committee, I wish very briefly to state my position on the pending bill. I will not discuss the pending amendment.

Mr. President, practically all proposals that have been made preceding the reporting of the pending bill by the Finance Committee have agreed that there is no better or more sensible plan of taxation than the pay-as-you-go system. The Treasury Department has indicated the desirability of eliminating for the great mass of taxpayers the 1-year lag which now exists in our present system of individual income-tax payment. In other words, everyone appears to favor relating tax payments to the year of income, and letting income and the payment of taxes go up and down together.

The system under which we have been operating has not been particularly objectionable in the past because incomes were low and taxes were comparatively low.

With the tremendous increase in the income of taxpayers, and the number of taxpayers, and with the war causing wide and abnormal fluctuations in income, and with the prospect of a strong decline in the current income of many taxpayers, the Government is likely to lose heavily because many taxpayers will be unable to pay taxes a year after their large incomes have disappeared. Taxpayers cannot pay taxes past due after they have spent their incomes. It is best for the taxpayers, and most advantageous to the Treasury to have taxes paid on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Assuming that the soundest tax system is one in which the tax liability is geared to current income, as we practically all agree, the only question is, How are we going to accomplish it?

It is my judgment, after studying the various proposals, that the fairest way to accomplish this objective is to treat all taxpayers alike, by providing that all taxpayers will be placed under this system, without any distinction as to the amount of tax paid or the income received.

The tax rate system now in operation is based upon the principle that persons are taxed on their ability to pay. This well-established graduated system of taxing incomes will continue, and when increased taxes are to be levied in the future this plan will be continued.

Suggestions have been offered and bills and amendments have been presented that seeks to differentiate between various classes of taxpayers. All these proposals either seek to increase the present taxes out of line with the present graduated tax system or to increase the tax burdens rather substantially in the case of certain taxpayers for this privilege. Under these proposals increased current taxes must be paid, and a substantial carry-over tax will have to be levied in the future, which will be a serious handicap to many taxpayers, and in many instances will exceed their income.

I have no objection to increasing the taxes on incomes in all tax brackets on the basis of ability to pay, but I do not favor this being incorporated in a bill intended to put all taxpayers on a pay-as-you-go basis or penalizing some of the taxpayers and not all, for adopting a system of collecting taxes on the current income basis. Any system other than treating all taxpayers alike is discriminatory and in the nature of a penalty in the form of additional taxes on certain taxpayers.

A bill containing new tax rates on incomes is soon to be presented to Congress. At that time the rates must be increased and they should be increased along the lines of the graduated scale already fixed in our tax laws. I favor substantial increases in the estate and gift taxes, as well as graduated increases on the incomes of all taxpayers who are now, under the law, obliged to pay income taxes.

Mr. President, I have concluded the prepared concise statement of my views, reached after studying all the proposals which have been submitted. I inquire, why not treat all taxpayers alike, in view of the fact that we are primarily considering changing to a system of having taxes paid upon a current basis? I do not believe any other claim can be justified. The poor man, the man with a small income, would be placed on a current basis. It is desirable for him and it is desirable for the Treasury, but it is proposed by some that those in the higher brackets shall be discriminated against and shall be asked to pay something for the privilege of being put upon a current basis. I cannot follow such a theory of class distinction, much as my sympathies go to the hard-pressed small taxpayers of this country. If we desire to get more taxes from taxpayers who are in the higher brackets, let us impose heavier taxes upon them and heavier rates, and let us increase the taxes upon estates. In the case of deceased persons with more than $60,000 a graduated estate tax is levied. Let us meet the problem of determining what the Public Treasury may need in increased taxes by dealing with the rates and by increasing the estate and gift taxes.

Let us now enact a law such as the committee has recommended which will put everyone on a current basis without discrimination, without going into the question of rates; and when the rate bill shall come before us for consideration if the most prosperous of our people can afford it let us increase their rates, even though they may have to go into their capital to pay the cost of this war. But do not punish, penalize, or persecute them when we are undertaking here only to change from an antiquated tax system which may have been all right in the past to a modern pay-as-you-go tax system which would give the people of this country an opportunity to pay their taxes currently.

Mr. President, what would you think of paying the pew rents in your church a year after you occupied the pew?

Who would think of paying the rent for the tenement which he occupies in the following year when he does not know what his financial condition or his income may be?

It seems to me to be clear, definite, and just that the course for us to pursue is to put the taxpayers of this country on a current tax basis, and to leave the question of rates, the question of discrimination, and the question of penalties, as well as every other question, for consideration when the rate bill shall come before us. Therefore I shall support the Finance Committee bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not desire to delay the vote of the Senate on this amendment. I desire only to say that in observing the course of the debate on the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] to the substitute proposed by his colleague, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I have been reminded of a certain story told by a former President of the United States, that great American, Woodrow Wilson.

We all recall that this afternoon the Senator from Texas made a so-called explanation of his amendment. At the end of the remarks of the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] rose and made a 15- or 20-minute speech. At the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Maryland the Senator from Texas said, "The Senator from Maryland is absolutely correct, and I thank the Senator for his explanation."

Later, when the Senator from Maryland took nearly an hour in his own time to explain his conception of the amendment of the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Texas repudiated it, but when the Senator from Maryland first rose and injected his explanation of the amendment of the Senator from Texas,

the Senator from Texas said, "The Senator from Maryland is eminently correct, and I thank the Senator."

Whereupon the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], my dear friend, rose and beat his breast, tore his hair, and screamed for nearly an hour in the time of the Senator from Texas, enunciating an essentially different theory of the amendment of the Senator from Texas than that which had been expounded by the Senator from Maryland.

The Senator from Washington reduced me to tears, as he always does when he reaches the heights of oratory. I am always sensible to the fiery eloquence of the Senator from Washington. His eloquence is always fiery. As I have said, he reduced me to tears, as he did nearly every other Senator. However, his theory was essentially different from that which had been expounded by the Senator from Maryland. At the conclusion of his remarks, the Senator from Texas said:

> I thank the Senator from Washington. He has completely explained and expounded my theory of the amendment, and I thank him for his eloquence.

Then the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] rose. He had a different theory, which he expounded at some length, with great vehemence and very ably. If I had not heard the other explanations which had been made, as well as the explanation of the Senator from Texas himself, I might have arrived at some conclusion as to what was the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

The Senator from Utah proposed an entirely different theory in explanation of the amendment of the Senator from Texas, and after he had concluded the Senator from Texas rose and said:

> I thank the Senator very sincerely. He has completely and adequately explained my amendment.

Then the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] stuck his oar in and gave an entirely different explanation than any which had theretofore been made. Various other Senators, including the Senator who now occupies the chair [Mr. HATCH], made explanations. The Senator from Texas thanked each one, and said. "That was a complete and adequate explanation of my amendment."

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, that would have been all right if the Senator from Maryland had not insisted on further expounding his theory of the amendment of the Senator from Texas. When he put the Senator from Texas on the stand as a witness in his own behalf, the Senator from Texas repudiated the explanation of the Senator from Maryland, saying that he did not understand the amendment in the same way as did the Senator from Texas.

I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The only one of his colleagues the Senator left out was the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who explained the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There were so many witnesses, so many testifying, the Senator from Texas agreeing with so many, that I may have lost track of one or two, perhaps three or four, in the course of the remarks.

What I started out to say was——

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I believe the Senator from Arizona was in on it, too. I did not mean to leave him out. [Laughter.]

Mr. MCFARLAND. I merely desire to remind the Senator from Missouri that we are talking about the Ruml plan.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; we are now talking about a plan which cannot be named.

Mr. MCFARLAND. But we are "rumbling" a great deal, anyway. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; we are talking about the plan which was introduced, at least, by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], but the Senator from Maryland, the Senator from Arizona himself, the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Utah, the Senator from Louisiana, and several other Senators have had a say in putting their own construction on the amendment, and no one has yet been able to tell the Senate exactly what it means.

Mr. President, as I have said, I do not desire to detain the Senate from a vote on the amendment, but I do wish to say that the debate on it reminds me of only one thing I have ever heard about in my life, and that is a famous story told by that great American, Woodrow Wilson, concerning a fellow who went to see his "gal" and stayed kind of late. He finally came out and mounted several horses and rode off in all directions. [Laughter.] So the present status of the O'Daniel amendment is that its proponents have mounted a number of different horses and ridden off in a number of different directions. Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Nye
Austin	George	O'Daniel
Bailey	Gerry	Overton
Ball	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Green	Reed
Barbour	Guffey	Revercomb
Bilbo	Gurney	Robertson
Bone	Hatch	Russell
Brewster	Hayden	Scrugham
Bridges	Hill	Shipstead
Brooks	Holman	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Capper	Lodge	Tunnell
Caraway	Lucas	Tydings
Chandler	McClellan	Vandenberg
Chavez	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Walsh
Connally	Maybank	Wheeler
Danaher	Mead	Wherry
Davis	Millikin	White
Eastland	Moore	Wiley
Ellender	Murdock	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] to the committee amendment, as amended. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCNARY (when his name was called). Referring again to my pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote, and I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business for the Special Committee To Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] was called from the Chamber on official business. He has a pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. If the Senator from Idaho were present he would vote "nay." I am not advised how the Senator from Florida would vote if present.

I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] has a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. Both of these Senators are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—29

Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Caraway	La Follette	Scrugham
Chavez	Langer	Shipstead
Connally	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Maybank	Tydings
Green	Mead	Wagner
Guffey	Murdock	Wheeler
Hayden	O'Daniel	Wiley
Hill	Overton	

NAYS—48

Aiken	Bilbo	Bushfield
Austin	Brewster	Butler
Bailey	Bridges	Capper
Ball	Brooks	Chandler
Bankhead	Buck	Clark, Idaho
Barbour	Burton	Clark, Mo.

Danaher	Lodge	Robertson
Davis	Lucas	Stewart
Ferguson	McNary	Taft
George	Maloney	Tobey
Gerry	Millikin	Tunnell
Gillette	Moore	Vandenberg
Gurney	Nye	Van Nuys
Hatch	Radcliffe	Walsh
Holman	Reed	Wherry
Kilgore	Revercomb	White

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Barkley	McKellar	Truman
Byrd	Murray	Wallgren
Downey	O'Mahoney	Willis
Glass	Pepper	Wilson
Hawkes	Reynolds	
Johnson, Calif.	Smith	

So Mr. O'DANIEL's amendments to the committee amendment, as amended, were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Georgia wishes to offer a perfecting amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I have one other amendment to offer, Mr. President. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 100, after the period in line 20, it is proposed to insert "That portion of the compensation which is received or accrued in the taxable year 1942 (if the tax for such year is less than that for the taxable year 1943), or in the taxable year 1943 (if the tax for such year is equal to or less than that for the taxable year 1942), and which under section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code is, for the purposes of that section, attributed to the base year, shall for the purposes of this subsection be excluded in computing the surtax net income for the taxable year 1942 or 1943, as the case may be, and be included in computing the surtax net income for the base year."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not think there can be any valid objection to the amendment from the standpoint of equity. All the amendment means is that, under section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code, a taxpayer—for instance, an author who has worked for a number of years, more than 3, 36 months or more—in the production of a particular work, and who receives in 1 year more than 80 percent of the compensation for that work, may spread or prorate the compensation over the period of time in which the actual creative work was in progress—in other words, the time when the bonus or royalty or fee or what not was being earned.

All the amendment means is simply that with respect to the second windfall provision if an unusually large fee or compensation has been received by a person who has spread the work represented by the fee over a period of 3 years or more, in determining his base year income, plus $10,000 which is provided under the second windfall provision, it shall be taken into account if such income is attributable to a base year, for the purpose of increasing the base or normal year's income.

That is all the amendment would do, and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Would the amendment apply to extra earnings, all of which were earned and accrued during the year 1942?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; only if the period in which they were earned went back into 1938, 1939, or 1940, and only if the work extended over a period of at least 3 years or more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment to the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am not going to make a speech, a statement which ought to draw some applause. [Loughter.] The amendment I have offered is what is known as the House Ways and Means Committee bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The one reported on what date?

Mr. CONNALLY. Reported on April 30, let me say to the Senator from Missouri, if that date has not yet permeated his intellect. I hammered it into it some time earlier in the day. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am always glad to accept the Senator's designation of the bill on which we are asked to vote. However, I think he should always specify the date—either January 5, February 15, April 15, or April 30—the various dates of the House Ways and Means Committee bill and the Doughton bill; because there are various versions, and we should be able to tell which one is meant.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is right; the Ruml plan shot it in the pants so often that every time it scratched it had to get a new place to scratch. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, my plan is the current-payments plan, the same as is the Finance Committee plan or the Ruml plan. My plan provides for withholding at the source, the same as does the Finance Committee plan and the Ruml plan. Under my plan, people who want to withhold can withhold, and can do so on the basis of the same rates of exemption which applied for 1941. My plan provides for a 3-year period for payment of the tax.

However, my plan would forgive only $4,500,000,000, instead of the $9,000,000,000 which would be forgiven under the Ruml plan. The forgiveness would be distributed more fairly under my plan than under any of the other plans of which I am aware, because under my plan all the forgiveness would not be given to the large taxpayers.

For instance, under my plan a man with an income of $1,000,000 would get a rebate of $121,000. Under the House plan he would get a rebate of $189,000; under the plan of the Senator from Georgia he would get a rebate of $624,000; and under the Ruml plan he would get a rebate of $854,000.

Mr. President, I do not want to take up any more of the Senate's time, and I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment. The amendment has been printed in the RECORD earlier in today's proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to the committee amendment, as amended, on which the yeas and nays have been demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. If the Senator from Kentucky were present he would vote "yea." I transfer my vote to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and will vote. I vote "nay." If the Senator from Indiana were present, he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has asked me to state that on the amendment he is paired with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES]. If the Senator from Virginia were present, he would vote "yea"; and if the Senator from New Jersey were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises. I am advised that, if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, referring to my previous announcement, if the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] were present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—29

Bankhead	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Scrugham
Bone	Kilgore	Shipstead
Caraway	La Follette	Stewart
Connally	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McFarland	Tydings
Ellender	Maybank	Wagner
Green	Mead	Wheeler
Guffey	Murdock	

NAYS—50

Aiken	Danaher	O'Daniel
Austin	Davis	Overton
Bailey	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Ball	George	Reed
Barbour	Gerry	Revercomb
Brewster	Gillette	Reynolds
Bridges	Gurney	Robertson
Brooks	Hatch	Taft
Buck	Holman	Tobey
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Bushfield	Lodge	Vandenberg
Butler	Lucas	Van Nuys
Capper	McNary	Walsh
Chandler	Maloney	Wherry
Chavez	Millikin	White
Clark, Idaho	Moore	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Nye	

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Barkley	McKellar	Truman
Byrd	Murray	Wallgren
Glass	O'Mahoney	Willis
Hawkes	Pepper	Wilson
Johnson, Calif.	Smith	

So Mr. CONNALLY's amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, as amended, was rejected.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I assume that we have now reached the stage of voting on the substitution of the Senate committee plan for the bill as it passed the House. Unless Senators wish to present other amendments, I should like to go directly to that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 88, at the beginning of line 17, it is proposed to strike out through line 14, on page 104, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 5. Current payment of basic tax not withheld at source.

(a) In general: The Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out sections 58, 59, and 60, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 58. Declaration of estimated basic tax by individuals.

"(a) Requirement of declaration: Every individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien subject to withholding under section 143 (b)) shall, at the time during the taxable year prescribed in subsection (d), make a declaration of his estimated basic tax for the taxable year if his gross income from sources other than wages (as defined in section 1621)—

"(1) in case such individual is single or married but not living with husband or wife; can reasonably be expected to exceed $100 for the taxable year and his gross income to be such as will require the making of a return for the taxable year under section 51; or did exceed $100 for the preceding taxable year and such individual either was required to make a return under section 51 for such preceding taxable year or would have been so required if he had been single during the whole of such preceding taxable year; or

"(2) in case such individual is married and living with husband or wife; can when added to the gross income which can reasonably be expected to be received by husband or wife from such sources, reasonably be expected to exceed $100 for the taxable year and the aggregate gross income of such husband and wife can reasonably be expected to be such as will require the making of a return under section 51; or did, when added to the gross income of such husband or wife from such sources for the preceding taxable year, exceed $100 for such preceding taxable year and such individual would have been required to make a return under section 51 for such preceding taxable year if he had been married and living with husband or wife during the whole of such preceding taxable year.

"(b) Contents of declaration: In the declaration required under subsection (a) the individual shall state—

"(1) the amount by which his estimated net income for the taxable year exceeds the greater of the following:

"(A) the amount of his estimated wages as defined in section 1621, the withheld tax on which is allowable as a credit for such taxable year under sections 35 and 466 (e);

"(B) the amount of his estimated aggregate amount of the credits for the taxable year allowable under section 25 (b);

"(2) the amount equal to 20 percent of the amount determined under paragraph (1), which for the purpose of this chapter shall be held and considered to be the estimated basic tax for the taxable year."

The declaration shall also contain such other information for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this chapter as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe, and shall contain or be verified by a written statement that it is made under the penalties of perjury.

"(c) Joint declaration by husband and wife: In the case of a husband and wife living together, a single declaration under this section may be made by them jointly, in which case the liability with respect to the estimated basic tax shall be joint and several. No joint declaration may be made if either the husband or wife is a nonresident alien. If a joint declaration is made but a joint return is not made for the taxable year, the estimated basic tax for such year may be treated as the estimated basic tax of either the husband or the wife, or may be divided between them.

"(d) Time and place for filing: The declaration required under subsection (a) shall be filed on or before the 15th day of the third month of the taxable year, except that if the requirements of subsection (a) are first met after such date, the declaration shall be filed on or before the 15th day of the last month of the quarter of the taxable year in which such requirements are first met. An individual may make amendments or revisions of a declaration filed under this subsection, under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. If so made, such amendments or revisions shall be filed on or before the 15th day of any quarter of the taxable year subsequent to that in which the declaration was filed and in which no previous amendments or revisions have been made or filed. Declarations and amendments and revisions thereof shall be filed with the collector specified in section 53 (b) (1).

"(e) Extension of time: The Commissioner may grant a reasonable extension of time for filing declarations, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe with the approval of the Secretary. Except in the case of taxpayers who are abroad, no such extension shall be for more than 6 months.

"(f) Persons under disability: If the taxpayer is unable to make his own declaration, the declaration shall be made by a duly authorized agent or by the guardian or other person charged with the care of the person or property of such taxpayer.

"(g) Signature presumed correct: The fact that an individual's name is signed to a filed declaration shall be prima facie evidence for all purposes that the declaration was actually signed by him.

"SEC. 59. Payment of estimated basic tax.

"(a) In general: The estimated basic tax shall be paid in four equal installments except that

"(1) if the declaration is filed (otherwise than pursuant to an extension of time) after the fifteenth day of the third month of the taxable year, the estimated basic tax shall be paid in equal installments the number of which is equal to the number of quarters remaining in the taxable year (including the quarter in which the declaration is filed); and

"(2) if any amendment or revision of a declaration is filed, the remaining installments shall be ratably increased or decreased, as the case may be, to reflect the increase or decrease, as the case may be, in the estimated basic tax by reason of such amendment or revision; and

"(3) at the election of the individual, any installment of the estimated basic tax may be paid prior to the date prescribed for its payment.

Payment of the estimated basic tax shall be considered payment on account of the tax for the taxable year.

"(b) Assessment: The estimated basic tax shall be assessed only to the extent paid.

"SEC. 60. Special rules for application of sections 58 and 59.

"(a) Farmers: In the case of an individual whose estimated gross income from farming for the taxable year is at least 50 percent of the total estimated gross income from all sources for the taxable year, in lieu of the time prescribed in section 58 (d), the declaration for the taxable year may be made at any time on or before the fifteenth day of the last month of the taxable year.

"(b) Application to short taxable years: The application of sections 58, 59, and 294 (a) (3), (4), and (5) to taxable years of less than 12 months shall be as prescribed in regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"(c) Application to taxable years beginning in 1943: If the taxable year is the calendar year 1943, the 15th day of September 1943 shall be substituted for the 15th day of March for the purposes of section 58 (d). If the taxable year begins in 1943 after January 1, the date which shall be substituted for the 15th day of the third month of the taxable year for the purposes of section 58 (d) shall be prescribed by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary."

(b) Additions to tax: Section 294 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to additions to tax in case of nonpayment) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(3) Failure to file declaration of estimated basic tax: In the case of a failure to make and file a declaration of estimated basic tax within the time prescribed, there shall be added to the tax $10 or an amount equal to 10 percent of the tax, whichever is the greater.

"(4) Failure to pay installment of estimated basic tax: In the case of the failure to pay an installment of the estimated basic tax within the time prescribed, there shall be added to the tax $2.50 or 2½ percent of the tax, whichever is the greater, for each installment with respect to which such failure occurs.

"(5) Substantial underestimate of estimated basic tax: If 16 percent in the case of individuals other than farmers exercising an election under section 60 (a), or 13⅓ percent in the case of such farmers, of the net income in excess of the amount of wages

as defined in section 1621 (the withheld tax on which is allowable as a credit under sections 35 and 466 (e)), or the amount of the credits against net income allowable under section 25 (b), whichever is the greater, exceeds the estimated basic tax, there shall be added to the tax an amount equal to 6 percent of such excess."

(c) Penalties: Section 145 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to criminal penalties) is amended (1) by inserting after "return" wherever appearing therein the words "or declaration", and (2) by inserting before "tax" wherever appearing therein the words "estimated basic tax or".

(d) Payment of tax: Section 56 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Installment payments.—

"(1) Corporations, estates and trusts, etc.: In the case of (A) a corporation, (B) a trust, (C) an estate, or (D) a nonresident alien subject to withholding under section 143 (b), the taxpayer may elect to pay the tax in four equal installments, in which event the first installment shall be paid on the date prescribed for the payment of the tax by the taxpayer, the second installment shall be paid on the 15th day of the third month, the third installment on the 15th day of the sixth month, and the fourth installment on the 15th day of the ninth month after such date.

"(2) Other individuals: In the case of all other individuals, the taxpayer may elect to pay the tax in four installments in which event the first installment shall be an amount equal to the sum of the following:

"(A) the basic tax;

"(B) one-fourth of the amount by which the tax imposed by this chapter computed without regard to the credit provided in section 466 (e) exceeds the basic tax.

The amount of the first installment as computed hereunder shall be reduced by the sum of the amount of the credit allowable under sections 35 and 466 (e) plus the amount of estimated basic tax paid during the taxable year and in case such sum is equal to or in excess of the amount of the first installment as computed hereunder, but is less than the tax imposed by this chapter (computed without regard to the credit allowable under sections 35 and 466 (e)) such sum shall constitute the amount of the first installment. The amount of an installment other than such first installment shall be one-third of the difference between the tax imposed (computed without regard to the credit allowable under sections 35 and 466 (e) and the amount of such first installment. The first installment shall be paid on the date prescribed for the payment of the tax by the taxpayer, and the balance of the tax shall be paid in three equal installments, the second installment on the 15th day of the third month, the third installment on the 15th day of the sixth month, and the fourth installment on the 15th day of the ninth month, after such date.

"(3) Definition of basic tax: For the purposes of paragraph (2) of this subsection the term 'basic tax' means—

"(A) in the case of a taxpayer making a return under Supplement T, the sum of (i) the tax imposed under section 400, (ii) the tax imposed under section 450 (adjusted for the credit allowable under section 453) and (iii) any additions to the tax for which the taxpayer is liable under the provisions of section 294 (a) (3), (4), and (5).

"(B) in the case of all other taxpayers to which paragraph (2) of this subsection is applicable, the sum of (i) the normal tax imposed under section 11, (ii) an amount equal to a percentage of the surtax net income at the first bracket rate of surtax, (iii) the tax imposed under section 450 (adjusted for the credit allowable under section 453), and (iv) any additions to the tax for which the taxpayer is liable under the provisions of section 294 (a) (3), (4), and (5).

If any installment is not paid on or before the date fixed for its payment, the whole amount of the tax unpaid is to be paid upon notice and demand from the collector."

(e) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

SEC. 6. Relief from double payments in 1943.

(a) Effective date: This section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning in 1942 but shall not take effect until September 1, 1943.

(b) In general: In the case of an individual who makes a return for a taxable year beginning in 1942, the tax imposed under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code shall, in lieu of that otherwise imposed, be the tax computed without regard to this section less an amount equal to the sum of the normal tax plus 13 percent of the surtax net income for such year.

(c) Supplement T taxpayers: In the case of an individual who makes a return for the calendar year 1942 under Supplement T, the liability for the tax imposed under section 400 of the Internal Revenue Code for such year is canceled and discharged.

(d) Short taxable years: The provisions of this section shall not apply to any taxable year which consists of a period of less than 12 months.

(e) Reduction where credit for foreign tax: In computing the amount by which the tax is reduced under subsection (b) the tax imposed under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code shall be the tax imposed under said chapter prior to its diminution by credit available to the taxpayer under sections 31 and 131 of such chapter. In computing the net tax liability for any such taxable year the amount of such credit shall be computed after taking into account the reduction in tax effected by this section.

(f) Individuals excluded: The provisions of this section shall not apply to (A) an estate, (B) a trust, (C) a nonresident alien subject to withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(g) Refund or credit of reduction in tax: The amount by which the tax is reduced under subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall, if the taxpayer elects to pay the tax installments, be prorated to the four installments of such tax. The amount so prorated to the installments of the tax falling due after September 1, 1943, shall be applied in reduction of each such installment.

(h) Treatment of payments prior to September 1, 1943, of amounts by which 1942 tax reduced: Any payment (other than interest and additions to the tax) made prior to September 1, 1943 (or on or after such date pursuant to any extension of time granted by the Commissioner before such date), of an amount by which the tax imposed under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is reduced under subsection (b) or (c) of this section for a taxable year beginning in 1942 shall be held and considered as a payment on account of the estimated basic tax for the taxable year beginning in 1943. In the case of any extension of time for the payment of such tax granted by the Commission prior to September 1, 1943, payment of the portion thereof which, if such extension had not been granted, would have been payable under section 56 (b) prior to September 1, 1943, shall be paid notwithstanding subsections (b) or (c) of this section.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered is intended to bring the House bill into line with the Senate committee amendment on the two subjects covered by the amendment, namely, relief from doubled payments and current payment for basic taxes not paid at the source. The author of the bill in the House thought that the Senate committee provision on these two subjects was preferable to the House bill, and in order to have the issue presented squarely on the subject of double payments, whether they should be made in part or entirely, and on the subject of current payments of basic taxes not paid at the source, this amendment is proposed, substituting for sections 4 and 5 of the House bill sections 5 and 6 of the Senate committee bill.

In brief, Mr. President, this is what is known as the Robertson bill, which, as we all know, passed the House and is the basis of the pending measure.

At this late hour I shall not enter upon a detailed discussion of the provisions of that bill. I think it is unfortunate that this issue has not had more attention, and has not been more fully considered by this body before reaching the stage of a final vote.

Mr. President, as we all know, there are two fundamental subjects in question. One of them is the importance of the collection of the tax at its source—the pay-as-you-go or pay-as-you-earn plan—at the same time bringing as many taxpayers as possible into a position of currency, so that they will not be liable for obligations carried over to make their payments current. In order to save time, I wish to take the liberty of reading a rather brief statement——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, before the Senator does so, will he permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As I understand the purpose of the Senator's amendment, the Senator is proposing, in essence, the House bill, the so-called Robertson bill—not the Ways and Means Committee bill in the House, but the bill finally passed by the House—as a substitute for the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the effect of it. The Senator understands that the House bill cannot be displaced without a vote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand. The Senator will give me credit for understanding that the Senate committee amendment would have to be adopted to displace the House bill. However, if I understand what the Senator is proposing to do, as I see it, it is the somewhat redundant proposition of offering the House bill as a substitute for the Senate committee amendment to the House bill. If so, let me say that I welcome that issue, because we did not find a single member of the Finance Committee, Democrat or Republican——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I think the Senator ought to allow me to make my statement, rather than to make an argument.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator can cut me off at any time he desires to do so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not wish to cut the Senator off.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was about to say that not a single Senator on the

Finance Committee ever raised his voice in favor of the bill to which the Senator refers, and I am glad to have the issue raised here.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That raises the issue as to whether we will pass the measure reported by the Senate committee, which is known generally as the Ruml plan, or whether we will stand by the bill which was passed by the House, with the changes in the House bill which I have indicated by my amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, the Senator from Alabama is not doing exactly what I gained the impression the Senator from Missouri thought he was doing. He is not trying to obtain a preliminary vote on the House bill as it passed the House, as against the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. What the Senator is trying to do, if I correctly understand, is to take the so-called improvements which the Senate committee has made in the withholding features of the House bill and embody the fundamental principle of the House bill in connection with those improved withholding features. Is that correct?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is exactly correct. With that preliminary statement, we may understand that the vote about to be taken is on a choice between two programs because the amendment proposes to substitute fundamentals not contained in the Senate committee bill with respect to the amount to be paid, the method of payment, as well as the time of collection.

Mr. President, I am not an expert, as all Senators know, nor a technician on tax questions, but one of the authors of the bill made a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3, 1943, a portion of which, merely for explanation of the provisions of the bill, I read:

> Under the plan the gentleman from Rhode Island, Representative FORAND, will offer tomorrow—

That is the one now pending before us—

> 90 percent of the taxpayers are put on a completely current basis and approximately 99 percent are put in a position of at least 75 percent currency. This degree of currency is achieved without any doubling up of tax payments or any interruption of the flow of tax money into the Treasury. Moreover, the great inequities resulting from the complete forgiveness of a year's tax liability contemplated in the Ruml-Carlson bill are avoided. Tax forgiveness under H. R. 2577 operates equitably to confer on all taxpayers an equal amount of tax reduction for 1942 in proportion to their respective net incomes, whereas the eventual benefit which would result from the tax forgiveness under the Ruml-Carlson bill would be heavily weighted in favor of persons with large incomes.

The statement continues:

> The plan of H. R. 2577 is, briefly, as follows: Individual income tax liability would be divided into two parts, the great bulk payable currently, and the balance payable in the year following the receipt of income. The amount paid currently, whether it be by withholding and collection at the source or by quarterly payments of estimated liability on the basis of an annual declaration, would approximate the basic tax for which all taxpayers are liable, namely, the 6 percent normal tax, plus the surtax at the first bracket rate of 13 percent, and the net Victory-tax liability. The balance of the tax liability not covered by the current collection at the source or quarterly payments would be payable as under existing law in the year following the receipt of income. In order to achieve this currency the basic tax on 1942 individual income would be canceled. This would avoid doubling up of payments, since the portion of tax liability canceled for 1942 is comparable to that part of the 1943 tax which is collected currently. That part of the first two 1943 quarterly payments—on 1942 incomes corresponding to the basic tax for that year—would be considered a payment with respect to 1943 liabilities.

He then proceeds to state the advantages of the plan which, to my mind, are sound, but I shall not detain the Senate longer by reading them. I recognize that there is very little interest in those particular points. Senators have made up their minds.

Mr. President, it is evident—and it has been so stated on both sides of the Chamber, and we are here at this late hour because of that general understanding—that unless there be great speed in getting the pending bill to the White House, or whatever bill may be passed and approved, we may as well abandon the whole effort. It will be too late, as stated by the senior Senator from Michigan, and I think by the senior Senator from Georgia. At least, we have been so assured on the highest authority, and we all believe it to be true. We are therefore gladly waiting here now to complete action upon the bill.

What is the situation from the realistic standpoint? The Ruml plan was before the House on two occasions. It was defeated both times. The last time it was defeated by a close vote, but it was defeated. There will be conferees on the House side. No one is authorized to speak for them, but we are familiar with the public declarations which have been made by those who will be conferees. We know of his hostile attitude from many expressions of the great chairman of the committee who will be the head of the House conferees. In the attitude he is likely to assume on the subject, he has the endorsement and support of the Members of the House who took action upon the bill which is now pending before the Senate.

As realistic, practical, and sensible men should we expect any quick action which will bring about an agreement in the House upon the bill, for a complete and satisfactory abatement of a year's tax? If the conferees of the House do not accede to the Senate's attitude, is there any reason to believe that a vote in the House would force them to vote against the previous action of the House on the subject?

On the other hand, it is likely that the Senate conferees will not readily recede from the position taken by the Senate if it shall vote for 100-percent abatement. Then where shall we stand? Everyone recognizes the importance of having a pay-as-you-go law.

According to the Treasury Department, if my amendment shall be agreed to by the House conferees, the Government would receive in 1943 the same amount of money it would receive under the present law. So there would be no reduction in the income of the Treasury. The adoption of my amendment would result in placing 90 percent of all taxpayers upon a current basis; 6 percent would be placed almost on a current basis. Practically 96 percent would be placed upon the pay-as-you-go basis. Here is a compromise that was worked out on the House side after not only weeks, but months of serious and earnest effort by the members of the Ways and Means Committee and by the votes in the House itself upon the various phases of pay-as-you-go legislation.

The House would not vote for the complete abatement of a year's tax; it would not vote for the committee bill presented by the Ways and Means Committee, which provided for some abatement, but not nearly so much as the other bill. So this is the only bill on which a majority vote in the House could be secured, after literally months of trial and effort, and then it was passed by a vote of 313 to 85. That is the support the bill I am now advocating finally had in the House, after various other bills had been presented and rejected.

Is it important enough to get on a pay-as-you-go basis to make some concessions in the amount to be abated? Most of us, certainly a majority in the Senate, believe that there should be substantial abatement. There are strong reasons for it. The people were not advised in time that this program was going to be imposed upon already existing taxes to enable them to adjust their finances and adjust their savings accounts accordingly. Millions of voters who never before paid taxes were brought under the operation of the tax. So there are equitable reasons, in the interest of the taxpayers, for not forcing double payments upon them. There are economic reasons why it should not be done. So I stand firmly for the idea that there should be substantial abatement if we are to impose additional burdens and bring about the payment of taxes now in addition to the taxes already levied for 1942.

What amount should it be? The Ruml advocates say 100 percent. The Senator from Texas, with a large support behind him, says not a dime. All agree we should get on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Should we stand in stubbornness, should we take a position that this desirable result must be accomplished in the way that each individual stands for or shall not be accomplished at all?

I heard the views expressed by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], for whom I have the greatest respect. He said that he preferred no abatement or complete abatement, and was not entirely satisfied as between them. He is a man of ability, a member of the committee, a man of sincerity and of good judgment. If Members of the Senate occupy a position of "all or none" in the matter of abatement, in order to bring about a pay-as-you-go system, how

can we expect to accomplish real legislation on the subject? I have pointed out the difficulty which would come in the conference on the bill, if it should get to conference. The political issue has also been raised in the debate. We heard the distinguished Senator from Washington and the distinguished Senator from Texas, and perhaps others—whether they said it or not, we know they have thought it—raise the question as to what the people were going to do in the next election to those who voted for the Ruml program, with its complete abatement.

We have not heard the matter made a political issue on the other side of the aisle, but we have seen Senators on that side vote practically as a unit for the Ruml plan. We have seen the Republicans in the House vote practically as a unit for the Ruml plan. I am not criticizing them for it. I believe in responsible party Government, and if the Republican Party desire to take a position, as they have evidently done in this matter, without declaring it, and if they feel that is the right position for them to take, and that is a philosophy which is consistent with their political principles, I have no criticism of them for taking the position; but they have taken it, and no one will deny it. We have seen all sorts of publications about the Republican leadership in the House and elsewhere calling upon the Republican Party to acquiesce in the Ruml plan. They have that right.

Who knows what is going to happen after we send the Ruml plan to the White House? I have no right to speak for the President, and I have heard nothing from him or from any person who has any right to speak for him on the Ruml plan, but it has been intimated and stated in various quarters that if the Ruml plan went to the President he was likely to veto it. I do not know whether he would or not. We know the possibility of such action on his part. When he reads or hears of the speeches made here, about those who have made millions getting away without paying any tax, I do not know what he will do. If he vetoes the bill, where will we stand with reference to getting on a pay-as-you-go basis? Every sensible man knows the President's veto could not be overridden. Not so long ago I tried to have overriden a veto having to do with another subject, and found it was not so easy to accomplish. But certainly with the votes in the House about evenly divided, and with not two-thirds of the Members of this body supporting the Ruml plan, could anyone think, with any reasonable expectations, that a veto could be overridden?

Then the issue would go into the election. That result may be desired by our friends across the aisle, I do not know. There are some able men, some smart men, some fine politicians, over there, and they may seek such an issue on which to go to the country. But I think it is unhappy and unfortunate to have a political party division on a fundamental tax question, on the principles of which we are in complete accord. The difference is as to the amount of abatement to the different taxpayers in order to bring about the desired result.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator states that our friends across the aisle are in favor of the Ruml plan, and so far have voted practically as a unit on various amendments, with a view to adopting the Ruml plan.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has not the Senator been so impressed?

Mr. OVERTON. I have been, and I am impressed by another fact which I should like to call to the attention of the Senator. There was an amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] which I supported, and which I think the Senator from Alabama supported.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I did.

Mr. OVERTON. That amendment removed all objectionable features; that is, under the amendment there would be no double taxation, and there would be no abatement. It incorporated a feature which all agreed upon——

Mr. BANKHEAD. It would treat all alike.

Mr. OVERTON. It provided for collection at the source or withholding taxes. That amendment was voted down. Does not the Senator think it is just as well for us to surrender now to the Republican Party, as we are probably going to do in 1944 anyway?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; we will not surrender.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not know about that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; we will not surrender, but we certainly have a political issue here, according to the declarations of other people.

I regret that sort of an issue. It has been raised, first, by declaration, and will be completed by vote when we finish our action in the Senate. It may be completed further if the Senate conferees shall ever succeed in pushing the bill past the House conferees, and having it sent to the White House. But, Mr. President, I should like to know how any Senator who understands the true situation thinks that can be done? The House was divided on the question by a very close vote. A majority of the Members of the House have always voted against the Ruml plan. The House bill before us was adopted by a vote of 333 to 85. I should like to know what Senator really thinks the Senate conferees will succeed in wresting a conference report from the House conferees which carries with it the Ruml plan, and will even get it started to the White House? No, Mr. President; this question will again be tied up in conference.

I wanted to expedite this proposed legislation as much as possible, but I have agreed to expedition with the full knowledge that the haste is a false haste, that, in my opinion, the Senate conferees are not going to obtain a favorable report for their plan from the House conferees during this week.

Mr. President, I am not seeking to tie up the conferees. I am not bitterly opposed to the large abatement contained in the so-called Ruml bill, though I think it goes entirely too far, but I have been in favor of a substantial abatement all the way through from beginning to end. I favored this plan 6 or 8 weeks ago. I declared for it at a luncheon meeting of the Alabama delegation 6 or 8 weeks ago. So I am taking no new position with respect to the matter. I have been bewildered, as other Senators have been, by this debate. I have been rather confused and made uncertain. If it were not for the fact that the Ruml plan was so completely rejected by the House, and that a majority of the conferees who will act on the part of the House will be supported by a majority of the House Members who are bitterly opposed to that plan, it is possible I would not have pursued the subject to the extent I am now pressing it. But I beg of the Senate to act on this question without political feeling. I beg of the Members of the Senate, who realize the importance of establishing a pay-as-you-earn basis, to give up personal and individual views to the extent of working out a compromise such as the House worked out and adopted by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. President, if Senators believe they can secure a favorable conference report and get the measure signed, or if through pride of opinion or by reason of political party allegiance, they persist in going ahead, as all indications show they are determined to do, then there is of course no recourse, unless the issue shall go to the American people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks tables 3 and 4 taken from Representative ROBERTSON'S address to the House, which appear on page 3851 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 3.—*Amount of tax that would be forgiven under H. R. 2577*

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption [1]	Income tax, present law [2]	Amount forgiven [3]
$1,200		
$1,500	$48	$48
$1,800	103	103
$2,000	140	140
$2,500	232	232
$3,000	324	324
$4,000	532	508
$5,000	746	692
$6,000	992	876
$8,000	1,532	1,244
$10,000	2,152	1,612
$15,000	4,052	2,538
$20,000	6,452	3,488
$25,000	9,220	4,438
$50,000	25,328	9,188
$100,000	64,060	18,688
$500,000	414,000	94,688
$1,000,000	854,000	189,688
$5,000,000	4,374,000	949,688

[1] Maximum earned income assumed.
[2] Excludes Victory tax.
[3] The basic liability of 6 percent of normal tax net income plus 13 percent of surtax net income.

TABLE 4.—*Effective income-tax rates, under present law and under H. R. 2577* [1]

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption	Income tax under present law	Tax after canceling normal tax and surtax at first bracket rate
	Percent	*Percent*
$1,200		
$1,500	3.2	
$1,800	5.7	
$2,000	7.0	
$2,500	9.3	
$3,000	10.8	
$4,000	13.3	0.6
$5,000	14.9	1.1
$6,000	16.5	1.9
$8,000	19.2	3.6
$10,000	21.5	5.4
$15,000	27.0	10.1
$20,000	32.3	14.8
$25,000	36.9	19.1
$50,000	50.7	32.3
$100,000	64.1	45.4
$500,000	82.8	63.9
$1,000,000	85.4	66.4
$5,000,000	87.5	68.5

[1] All figures exclude the Victory tax.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not rise to argue the amendment submitted by the Senator from Alabama. I rise to thank him for presenting the issue in this shape, because it enables me to record the vote which I am under my conscience compelled to record. As I understand the Senator's amendment, it is really the bill as passed by the House, perfected or modified to incorporate all the changes which were made by the Senate Finance Committee in connection with the withholding provisions and soldier and sailor relief. That is my understanding.

Mr. President, the bill as passed by the House does what I tried so earnestly to prevent in the Senate. It forgives 76 percent or nearly 77 percent of the aggregate tax liability of individual income-tax payers. Unfortunately, it forgives some 40,000,000 taxpayers wholly, and it leaves some 4,000,000 or more under the old system with respect to their liability above the first bracket, so that the 4,000,000 taxpayers who pay from 60 to 65 percent of the total income taxes paid by all individuals in the United States annually will have to make out two returns; they will be partly on a past year, partly on a current year basis, but they will lack being upon a current basis.

The House bill starts at the bottom and makes taxpayers up to married men with four children who have incomes of $4,600 a year entirely current. It forgives 100 percent of those below that figure. It leaves an upper bracket liability for the past year upon all the taxpayers of the country who earn more than that amount.

Not only that, Mr. President, but all the 4,000,000 taxpayers who pay 60 to 65 percent of the total income taxes of this country will be required to file a return for the preceding year, and make adjustments therein of their basic liability for that year, and also they will be required to estimate their income for the current year in order to pay the basic rate for the current year. It is a complicated and, I think, a most unjust provision.

Mr. President, when I presented my amendment, which I sincerely regret was not accepted by the Senate, I tried to say that I was willing to do what the House had done in forgiving 75 percent, but to apply the forgiveness equally among all taxpayers, and not to engage in a preferential treatment of one group as against another group of taxpayers. If there is any reason on earth for making 40,000,000 American taxpayers current by forgiving them 100 percent, that same reason will compel any fair-minded man to say that the other 4,000,000 American taxpayers should likewise be made current by an equality of treatment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator recognizes, I am sure, that the House bill abates uniformly to every taxpayer the same tax, that is 6 percent normal tax and 13 percent surtax.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, I realize that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It does that all the way up.

Mr. GEORGE. It begins at the bottom and——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Goes all the way up.

Mr. GEORGE. No. It does not go very far. It does exactly what I suggested. It forgives 100 percent in the case of 40,000,000 taxpayers, and it forgives in reducing percentages to the 4,000,000 taxpayers who pay 60 percent of the total income taxes of the country.

No principle of equity of tax treatment is involved in the amendment because our taxes are levied on a progressive system and on a progressively ascending and rapidly ascending scale. If we are to cut off anything, the cut should be made through all the brackets, so as to leave all on a basis of equality.

More than that, Mr. President, referring to the much-controverted questions of forgiveness and of how the Treasury is to be treated, the proposal would cancel within $900,000,000 of the amount which would be canceled by the Senate Finance Committee plan—by the Ruml plan, if you please, with the two windfall provisions; and for the next fiscal year it would bring into the Treasury $1,989,000,000 less than would the Ruml plan, as embraced in the Senate Finance Committee proposal.

Mr. President, the Government can be unjust, through discrimination in conferring benefits upon its citizens, as well as through its decision to impose unequal burdens upon citizens. I do not believe in injustice, and I do not want to treat the American taxpayers in that way.

I am very happy that the Senator from Alabama has presented this issue in the way he has presented it, so that the question comes directly on the acceptance of the bill as it passed the House, modified to include amendments made by the Senate Finance Committee to the noncontroversial sections and provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, I believe that the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I stated from memory that under the House bill the forgiveness would be 54 percent. My attention has been called to the fact that it would be 76 percent—not 100 percent, as in the Ruml plan, but 76 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, yesterday when I addressed the Senate on the amendment offered by myself. I stated that I would not vote for the cancelation or abatement of any taxes. When the Connally substitute was voted upon by the Senate a short time ago I voted for the substitute because I felt it was the lesser of two evils. I propose to vote for the pending amendment because I feel that it is the lesser of two evils. If the pending amendment is agreed to—and I think that is very doubtful—I expect to vote "nay" when the vote is finally taken on the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to the committee amendment, as amended. On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). Mr. President, again referring to my pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], I am advised that if the Senator from Kentucky were present he would vote "yea." I transfer my pair with him to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and will vote. I vote "nay." If the Senator from Indiana were present, he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is absent conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises. I am advised that, if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada

would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS]. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am authorized by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to state that on this vote he is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES]. If the Senator from Virginia were present, he would vote "yea," and if the Senator from New Jersey were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—27

Bankhead	Hayden	Murdock
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Caraway	Kilgore	Shipstead
Connally	La Follette	Stewart
Downey	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McFarland	Tydings
Green	Maybank	Wagner
Guffey	Mead	Wheeler

NAYS—52

Aiken	Danaher	Overton
Austin	Davis	Radcliffe
Bailey	Ferguson	Reed
Ball	George	Revercomb
Barbour	Gerry	Reynolds
Bone	Gillette	Robertson
Brewster	Gurney	Scrugham
Bridges	Hatch	Taft
Brooks	Holman	Tobey
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Burton	Lodge	Vandenberg
Bushfield	Lucas	Van Nuys
Butler	McNary	Walsh
Capper	Maloney	Wherry
Chandler	Millikin	White
Chavez	Moore	Wiley
Clark, Idaho	Nye	
Clark, Mo.	O'Daniel	

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Barkley	McKellar	Truman
Byrd	Murray	Wallgren
Glass	O'Mahoney	Willis
Hawkes	Pepper	Wilson
Johnson, Calif.	Smith	

So Mr. BANKHEAD'S amendment to the committee amendment, as amended, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the amendment of the committee in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the question of adoption of the committee amendment simply raise the question over again on which we have just had a yea-and-nay vote? Should not the last roll call be on the bill, and not on the committee amendment? Are we not wasting time?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we are not wasting time, because the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] modified his amendment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentary inquiry is directed to the Chair.

The Chair will state to the Senator from Ohio that the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] was not identical with the House provision.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). Referring again to my pair, I am advised that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] would vote "nay" if he were present. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] who, if present, would vote as I intend to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY (when the name of Mr. THOMAS of Idaho was called). If the junior Senator from Idaho were present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea", and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea", and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. CONNALLY. I am authorized by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to say he is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES]. If the Senator from Virginia were present he would vote "nay." If the Senator from New Jersey were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—48

Aiken	Bridges	Butler
Austin	Brooks	Capper
Ball	Buck	Chandler
Barbour	Burton	Chavez
Brewster	Bushfield	Clark, Idaho
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Scrugham
Danaher	Maloney	Stewart
Davis	Millikin	Taft
Ferguson	Moore	Tobey
Gerry	Nye	Tunnell
Gillette	Overton	Vandenberg
Gurney	Radcliffe	Van Nuys
Holman	Reed	Walsh
Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb	Wherry
Lodge	Reynolds	White
Lucas	Robertson	Wiley

NAYS—31

Bailey	Guffey	Murdock
Bankhead	Hatch	O'Daniel
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Shipstead
Caraway	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Langer	Tydings
Eastland	McClellan	Wagner
Ellender	McFarland	Wheeler
George	Maybank	
Green	Mead	

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Barkley	McKellar	Truman
Byrd	Murray	Wallgren
Glass	O'Mahoney	Willis
Hawkes	Pepper	Wilson
Johnson, Calif.	Smith	

So the amendment of the committee, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). Referring again to my pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], if he were present, he would vote "nay." I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], who, if present, would vote as I intend to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY (when the name of Mr. THOMAS of Idaho was called). If the junior Senator from Idaho were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri (when Mr. TRUMAN'S name was called). My colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], is necessarily absent on important public business. I am authorized by him to say that if he were present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am authorized by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is necessarily absent, to say that he is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES]. If the Senator from Virginia were present, he would vote "nay," and if the Senator from New Jersey were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS],

the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent conducting hearings in the West on behalf of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business for the special committee to study and survey problems of small business enterprises. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea", and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is paired with the the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea", and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—49

Aiken	Davis	Revercomb
Austin	Ferguson	Reynolds
Ball	Gerry	Robertson
Barbour	Gillette	Scrugham
Brewster	Gurney	Stewart
Bridges	Holman	Taft
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Buck	Lodge	Tobey
Burton	Lucas	Tunnell
Bushfield	McNary	Vandenberg
Butler	Maloney	Van Nuys
Capper	Millikin	Walsh
Chandler	Moore	Wherry
Chavez	Nye	White
Clark, Idaho	Overton	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Radcliffe	
Danaher	Reed	

NAYS—30

Bailey	Green	Maybank
Bankhead	Guffey	Mead
Bilbo	Hatch	Murdock
Bone	Hayden	O'Daniel
Caraway	Hill	Russell
Connally	Kilgore	Shipstead
Downey	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Langer	Tydings
Ellender	McClellan	Wagner
George	McFarland	Wheeler

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Barkley	McKellar	Truman
Byrd	Murray	Wallgren
Glass	O'Mahoney	Willis
Hawkes	Pepper	Wilson
Johnson, Calif.	Smith	

So the bill H. R. 2570 was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) this act may be cited as the "Current Tax Payment Act of 1943."

(b) Meaning of terms used: Except as otherwise expressly provided, terms used in this act shall have the same meaning as when used in the Internal Revenue Code.

SEC. 2. Collection of tax at source on wages.

(a) In general: Chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to employment taxes) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subchapters:

"SUBCHAPTER D—COLLECTION OF INCOME TAX AT SOURCE ON WAGES

"SEC. 1621. Definitions.

"As used in this subchapter—

"(a) Wages: The term 'wages' means all remuneration (other than fees paid to a public official) for services performed by an employee for his employer, including the cash value of all remuneration paid in any medium other than cash; except that such term shall not include remuneration paid—

"(1) for services performed as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, other than pensions and retired pay includible in gross income under chapter 1, or

"(2) for agricultural labor (as defined in section 1426 (h)), or

"(3) for domestic service in a private home, local college club, or local chapter of a college fraternity or sorority; or

"(4) for casual labor not in the course of the employer's trade or business; or

"(5) for services by a citizen or resident of the United States for a foreign government or for the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines; or

"(6) for services performed by a nonresident alien individual, other than a resident of a contiguous country who enters and leaves the United States at frequent intervals; or

"(7) for such services, performed by a nonresident alien individual who is a resident of a contiguous country and who enters and leaves the United States at frequent intervals, as may be designated by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary; or

"(8) for services for an employer performed by a citizen or resident of the United States while outside the United States (as defined in section 3797 (a) (9)) if the major part of the services for such employer during the calendar year is to be performed outside the United States; or

"(9) for services performed as a minister of the gospel.

For the purpose of paragraph (8) services performed on or in connection with an American vessel (as defined in section 1426 (g)) under a contract of service which is entered into within the United States or during the performance of which the vessel touches at a port in the United States, or on or in connection with any vessel as an employee of the United States employed through the War Shipping Administration, shall not constitute services performed outside the United States.

"(b) Pay-roll period: The term 'pay-roll period' means a period for which a payment of wages is ordinarily made to the employee by his employer, and the term 'miscellaneous pay-roll period' means a pay-roll period other than a weekly, biweekly, semimonthly, monthly, quarterly, semiannual, or annual pay-roll period.

"(c) Employee: The term 'employee' includes an officer, employee, or elected official of the United States, a State, Territory, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing. The term 'employee' also includes an officer of a corporation.

"(d) Employer: The term 'employer' means the person for whom an individual performs or performed any service, of whatever nature, as the employee of such person, except that—

"(1) if the person for whom the individual performs or performed the services does not have control of the payment of the wages for such services, the term 'employer' (except for the purposes of subsection (a)) means the person having control of the payment of such wages; and

"(2) in the case of a person paying wages on behalf of a nonresident alien individual, foreign partnership, or foreign corporation, not engaged in trade or business within the United States, the term 'employer' (except for the purposes of subsection (a)) means such person.

"(e) Single person: The term 'single person' means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that such person is single, or is married and not living with husband or wife, and is not the head of a family.

"(f) Married person: The term 'married person' means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that he is married and living with husband or wife.

"(g) Married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding: The term 'married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding' means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that for the purposes of this subchapter such person claims all of the personal exemption and that for the purposes of this subchapter his spouse is claiming none of the personal exemption.

"(h) Married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding: The term 'married person claiming half of the personal exemption for withholding' means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that for the purposes of this subchapter such person claims half of the personal exemption and that for the purposes of this subchapter his spouse is claiming not more than half of such exemption.

"(i) Married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding: The term 'married person claiming none of the personal exemption for withholding' means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) making no claim with respect to the personal exemption for the purposes of this subchapter.

"(j) Head of family: The term 'head of a family' means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that he is the head of a family.

"(k) Dependent: The term 'dependent' means a person included in a withholding exemption certificate in effect under section 1622 (h) as a person dependent upon and receiving his chief support from the employee and either under 18 years of age or incapable of self-support because mentally or physically defective.

"SEC. 1622. Income tax collected at source.

"(a) Requirement of withholding: Every employer making payment of wages shall withhold and collect upon such wages a tax equal to the greater of the following:

"(1) 20 percent of the excess of each payment of such wages over the family status withholding exemption allowable under subsection (b) (1) (A), or

"(2) 3 percent of the excess of each payment of such wages over the Victory tax withholding exemption allowable under subsection (b) (1) (B).

"(b) Withholding exemption.—

"(1) In computing the tax required to be withheld under subsection (a), there shall be allowed as a withholding exemption with respect to the wages paid for each pay-roll period—

"(A) in computing the tax required to be withheld under subsection (a) (1), a family status withholding exemption determined in accordance with the following schedule:

"*Family status withholding exemption*

"Pay-roll period	Single person	Married person claiming whole of personal exemption for withholding or head of family	Married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding	Married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding	Each dependent, other than the first dependent in the case of the head of a family
Weekly	$12	$24	$12	0	$6
Biweekly	24	48	24	0	12
Semimonthly	26	52	26	0	13
Monthly	52	104	52	0	26
Quarterly	156	312	156	0	78
Semiannual	312	624	312	0	156
Annual	624	1,248	624	0	312
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.70	3.40	1.70	0	.85

"(B) in computing the tax required to be withheld under subsection (a) (2), a Victory tax withholding exemption determined in accordance with the following schedule:

"Pay-roll period:	*Victory tax withholding exemption*
Weekly	$12.00
Biweekly	24.00
Semimonthly	26.00
Monthly	52.00
Quarterly	156.00
Semiannual	312.00
Annual	624.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.70

"(2) If wages are paid with respect to a period which is not a pay-roll period, the withholding exemption allowable with respect to each payment of such wages shall be the exemption allowed for a miscellaneous pay-roll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days in the period with respect to which such wages are paid.

"(3) In any case in which wages are paid by an employer without regard to any pay-roll period or other period, the withholding exemption allowable with respect to each payment of such wages shall be the exemption allowed for a miscellaneous pay-roll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days (including Sundays and holidays) which have elapsed since the date of the last payment of such wages by such employer during the calendar year, or the date of commencement of employment with such employer during such year, or January 1 of such year, whichever is the later.

"(4) In any case in which the period, or the time described in paragraph (3), in respect of any wages is less than 1 week, the Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, may authorize an employer, in computing the tax required to be withheld, to use the excess of the aggregate of the wages paid to the employee during the calendar week over the withholding exemption allowed by this subsection for a weekly pay-roll period.

"(5) In determining the amount to be withheld under this subsection, the wages may, at the election of the employer, be computed to the nearest dollar.

"(c) Wage bracket withholding.—

"(1) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employee shall deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee a tax determined in accordance with the following tables, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be withheld under subsection (a):

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is weekly

And the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
		Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents		
		Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependent	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents		
		Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents				
		Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—									
At least	But less than	No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents				
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$10	$1.00									
10	15	2.50	$1.30	$0.10							
15	20	3.50	2.30	1.10	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20
20	25	4.50	3.30	2.10	.90	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30
25	30	5.50	4.30	3.10	1.90	.70	.50	.50	.50	.50	.50
30	40	7.00	5.80	4.60	3.40	2.20	1.00	.70	.70	.70	.70
40	50	9.00	7.80	6.60	5.40	4.20	3.00	1.80	1.00	1.00	1.00
50	60	11.00	9.80	8.60	7.40	6.20	5.00	3.80	2.60	1.40	1.30
60	70	13.00	11.80	10.60	9.40	8.20	7.00	5.80	4.60	3.40	2.20
70	80	15.00	13.80	12.60	11.40	10.20	9.00	7.80	6.60	5.40	4.20
80	90	17.00	15.80	14.60	13.40	12.20	11.00	9.80	8.60	7.40	6.20
90	100	19.00	17.80	16.60	15.40	14.20	13.00	11.80	10.60	9.40	8.20
100	110	21.00	19.80	18.60	17.40	16.20	15.00	13.80	12.60	11.40	10.20
110	120	23.00	21.80	20.60	19.40	18.20	17.00	15.80	14.60	13.40	12.20
120	130	25.00	23.80	22.60	21.40	20.20	19.00	17.80	16.60	15.40	14.20
130	140	27.00	25.80	24.60	23.40	22.20	21.00	19.80	18.60	17.40	16.20
140	150	29.00	27.80	26.60	25.40	24.20	23.00	21.80	20.60	19.40	18.20
150	160	31.00	29.80	28.60	27.40	26.20	25.00	23.80	22.60	21.40	20.20
160	170	33.00	31.80	30.60	29.40	28.20	27.00	25.80	24.60	23.40	22.20
170	180	35.00	33.80	32.60	31.40	30.20	29.00	27.80	26.60	25.40	24.20
180	190	37.00	35.80	34.60	33.40	32.20	31.00	29.80	28.60	27.40	26.20
190	200	39.00	37.80	36.60	35.40	34.20	33.00	31.80	30.60	29.40	28.20
$200 or over		20% of the excess over $200 plus									
		$40.00	$38.80	$37.60	$36.40	$35.20	$34.00	$32.80	$31.60	$30.40	$29.20

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $1.20 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall (or if the wages paid are $200 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $12, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is biweekly

And the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
		Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents		
		Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents		
		Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents				
		Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—									
		No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents				
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$20	$2.00									
20	30	5.00	$2.60	$0.20							
30	40	7.00	4.60	2.20	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	9.00	6.60	4.20	1.80	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	11.00	8.60	6.20	3.80	1.40	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	14.00	11.60	9.20	6.80	4.40	2.00	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40
80	100	18.00	15.60	13.20	10.80	8.40	6.00	3.60	2.00	2.00	2.00
100	120	22.00	19.60	17.20	14.80	12.40	10.00	7.60	5.20	2.80	2.60
120	140	26.00	23.60	21.20	18.80	16.40	14.00	11.60	9.20	6.80	4.40
140	160	30.00	27.60	25.20	22.80	20.40	18.00	15.60	13.20	10.80	8.40
160	180	34.00	31.60	29.20	26.80	24.40	22.00	19.60	17.20	14.80	12.40
180	200	38.00	35.60	33.20	30.80	28.40	26.00	23.60	21.20	18.80	16.40
200	220	42.00	39.60	37.20	34.80	32.40	30.00	27.60	25.20	22.80	20.40
220	240	46.00	43.60	41.20	38.80	36.40	34.00	31.60	29.20	26.80	24.40
240	260	50.00	47.60	45.20	42.80	40.40	38.00	35.60	33.20	30.80	28.40
260	280	54.00	51.60	49.20	46.80	44.40	42.00	39.60	37.20	34.80	32.40
280	300	58.00	55.60	53.20	50.80	48.40	46.00	43.60	41.20	38.80	36.40
300	320	62.00	59.60	57.20	54.80	52.40	50.00	47.60	45.20	42.80	40.40
320	340	66.00	63.60	61.20	58.80	56.40	54.00	51.60	49.20	46.80	44.40
340	360	70.00	67.60	65.20	62.80	60.40	58.00	55.60	53.20	50.80	48.40
360	380	74.00	71.60	69.20	66.80	64.40	62.00	59.60	57.20	54.80	52.40
380	400	78.00	75.60	73.20	70.80	68.40	66.00	63.60	61.20	58.80	56.40
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus									
		$80.00	$77.60	$75.20	$72.80	$70.40	$68.00	$65.60	$63.20	$60.80	$58.40

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $2.40 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 percent of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $24, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly

And the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
				Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
				Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
At least	But less than					Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—					
						No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
						Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—					
						No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$20	$2.00									
20	30	5.00	$2.40								
30	40	7.00	4.40	$1.80	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	9.00	6.40	3.80	1.20	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	11.00	8.40	5.80	3.20	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	14.00	11.40	8.80	6.20	3.60	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
80	100	18.00	15.40	12.80	10.20	7.60	5.00	2.40	1.90	1.90	1.90
100	120	22.00	19.40	16.80	14.20	11.60	9.00	6.40	3.80	2.50	2.50
120	140	26.00	23.40	20.80	18.20	15.60	13.00	10.40	7.80	5.20	3.10
140	160	30.00	27.40	24.80	22.20	19.60	17.00	14.40	11.80	9.20	6.60
160	180	34.00	31.40	28.80	26.20	23.60	21.00	18.40	15.80	13.20	10.60
180	200	38.00	35.40	32.80	30.20	27.60	25.00	22.40	19.80	17.20	14.60
200	220	42.00	39.40	36.80	34.20	31.60	29.00	26.40	23.80	21.20	18.60
220	240	46.00	43.40	40.80	38.20	35.60	33.00	30.40	27.80	25.20	22.60
240	260	50.00	47.40	44.80	42.20	39.60	37.00	34.40	31.80	29.20	26.60
260	280	54.00	51.40	48.80	46.20	43.60	41.00	38.40	35.80	33.20	30.60
280	300	58.00	55.40	52.80	50.20	47.60	45.00	42.40	39.80	37.20	34.60
300	320	62.00	59.40	56.80	54.20	51.60	49.00	46.40	43.80	41.20	38.60
320	340	66.00	63.40	60.80	58.20	55.60	53.00	50.40	47.80	45.20	42.60
340	360	70.00	67.40	64.80	62.20	59.60	57.00	54.40	51.80	49.20	46.60
360	380	74.00	71.40	68.80	66.20	63.60	61.00	58.40	55.80	53.20	50.60
380	400	78.00	75.40	72.80	70.20	67.60	65.00	62.40	59.80	57.20	54.60
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus									
		$80.00	$77.40	$74.80	$72.20	$69.60	$67.00	$64.40	$61.80	$59.20	$56.60

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $2.60 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $26, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is monthly

And the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
				Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
						Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—					
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
						Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—					
						No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
						Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—					
						No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
At least	But less than	The amount of the tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$40	$4.00									
40	50	9.00	$3.80								
50	60	11.00	5.80	$0.60	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10
60	70	13.00	7.80	2.60	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40
70	80	15.00	9.80	4.60	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70
80	100	18.00	12.80	7.60	2.40	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
100	120	22.00	16.80	11.60	6.40	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
120	140	26.00	20.80	15.60	10.40	5.20	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30
140	160	30.00	24.80	19.60	14.40	9.20	4.00	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90
160	200	36.00	30.80	25.60	20.40	15.20	10.00	4.80	3.80	3.80	3.80
200	240	44.00	38.80	33.60	28.40	23.20	18.00	12.80	7.60	5.00	5.00
240	280	52.00	46.80	41.60	36.40	31.20	26.00	20.80	15.60	10.40	6.20
280	320	60.00	54.80	49.60	44.40	39.30	34.00	28.80	23.60	18.40	13.20
320	360	68.00	62.80	57.60	52.40	47.20	42.00	36.80	31.60	26.40	21.20
360	400	76.00	70.80	65.60	60.40	55.20	50.00	44.80	39.60	34.40	29.20
400	440	84.00	78.80	73.60	68.40	63.20	58.00	52.80	47.60	42.40	37.20
440	480	92.00	86.80	81.60	76.40	71.20	66.00	60.80	55.60	50.40	45.20
480	520	100.00	94.80	89.60	84.40	79.20	74.00	68.80	63.60	58.40	53.20
520	560	108.00	102.80	97.60	92.40	87.20	82.00	76.80	71.60	66.40	61.20
560	600	116.00	110.80	105.60	100.40	95.20	90.00	84.80	79.60	74.40	69.20
600	640	124.00	118.80	113.60	108.40	103.20	98.00	92.80	87.60	82.40	77.20
640	680	132.00	126.80	121.60	116.40	111.20	106.00	100.80	95.60	90.40	85.20
680	720	140.00	134.80	129.60	124.40	119.20	114.00	108.80	103.60	98.40	93.20
720	760	148.00	142.80	137.60	132.40	127.20	122.00	116.80	111.60	106.40	101.20
760	800	156.00	150.80	145.60	140.40	135.20	130.00	124.80	119.60	114.40	109.20
$800 or over		20% of the excess over $800 plus									
		$160.00	$154.80	$149.60	$144.40	$139.20	$134.00	$128.80	$123.60	$118.40	$113.20

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $5.20 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $800 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $52, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

If the pay-roll period with respect to an employee is a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period

And the wages divided by the number of days in such period are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
		Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
		Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—									
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
						Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—					
						No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
						Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—					
						No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
At least	But less than	The amount of tax to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period									
$0	$1	$0.10									
1	2	.30	$0.15								
2	3	.50	.35	$0.15							
3	4	.70	.55	.35	$0.20	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05
4	5	.90	.75	55	.40	.20	.10	.10	.10	.10	.10
5	6	1.10	.95	.75	.60	.40	.25	.10	.10	.10	.10
6	7	1.30	1.15	.95	.80	60	.45	.30	.15	.15	.15
7	8	1.50	1.35	1.15	1.00	.80	.65	.50	.30	.15	.15
8	9	1.70	1.55	1.35	1.20	1.00	.85	.70	.50	.35	.20
9	10	1.90	1.75	1.55	1.40	1.20	1.05	.90	.70	.55	.35
10	12	2.20	2.05	1.85	1.70	1.50	1.35	1.20	1.00	.85	.65
12	14	2.60	2.45	2.25	2.10	1.90	1.75	1.60	1.40	1.25	1.05
14	16	3.00	2.85	2.65	2.50	2.30	2.15	2.00	1.80	1.65	1.45
16	18	3.40	3.25	3.05	2.90	2.70	2.55	2.40	2.20	2.05	1.85
18	20	3.80	3.65	3.45	3.30	3.10	2.95	2.80	2.60	2.45	2.25
20	22	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.70	3.50	3.35	3.20	3.00	2.85	2.65
22	24	4.60	4.45	4.25	4.10	3.90	3.75	3.60	3.40	3.25	3.05
24	26	5.00	4.85	4.65	4.50	4.30	4.15	4.00	3.80	3.65	3.45
26	28	5.40	5.25	5.05	4.90	4.70	4.55	4.40	4.20	4.05	3.85
28	30	5.80	5.65	5.45	5.30	5.10	4.95	4.80	4.60	4.45	4.25
$30 or over		20% of the excess over $30 plus									
		$6.00	$5.85	$5.65	$5.50	$5.30	$5.15	$5.00	$4.80	$4.65	$4.45

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $0.15 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the product of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall and the number of days in the period (or if the wages paid are $30 or over, of the excess of the wages) over the product of $1.70 and the number of days in the period, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.05 to the nearest multiple of $0.05.

"(2) If wages are paid with respect to a period which is not a pay-roll period, the amount to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of a miscellaneous pay-roll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days in the period with respect to which such wages are paid.

"(3) In any case in which wages are paid by an employer without regard to any pay-roll period or other period, the amount to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of a miscellaneous pay-roll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days (including Sundays and holidays) which have elapsed since the date of the last payment of such wages by such employer during the calendar year, or the date of commencement of employment with such employer during such year, or January 1 of such year, whichever is the later.

"(4) In any case in which the period, or the time described in paragraph (3), in respect of any wages is less than 1 week, the Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, may authorize an employer to determine the amount to be withheld under the tables applicable in the case of a weekly pay-roll period, in which case the aggregate of the wages paid to the employee during the calendar week shall be considered the weekly wages.

"(5) In determining the amount to be withheld under this subsection, the wages may, at the election of the employer, be computed to the nearest dollar.

"(d) Tax paid by recipient: If the employer, in violation of the provisions of this subchapter, fails to withhold and collect the tax under this subchapter, and thereafter the tax against which such tax may be credited is paid, the tax so required to be withheld and collected shall not be collected from the employer; but this subsection shall in no case relieve the employer from liability for any penalties or additions to the tax otherwise applicable in respect of such failure to withhold and collect.

"(e) Nondeductibility of tax in computing net income: The tax withheld and collected under this subchapter shall not be allowed as a deduction either to the employer or to the recipient of the income in computing net income for the purpose of any tax on income imposed by act of Congress.

"(f) Refunds or credits.—

"(1) Employers: Where there has been an overpayment of tax under this subchapter, refund or credit shall be made to the employer only to the extent that the amount of such overpayment was not withheld and collected under this subchapter by the employer.

"(2) Employees: For refund or credit in cases of excessive withholding, see section 322 (a).

"(g) Included and excluded wages: If the remuneration paid by an employer to an employee for services performed during one-half or more of any pay-roll period of not more than 31 consecutive days constitutes wages, all the remuneration paid by such employer to such employee for such period shall be deemed to be wages; but if the remuneration paid by an employer to an employee for services performed during more than one-half of any such pay-roll period does not constitute wages, then none of the remuneration paid by such employer to such employee for such period shall be deemed to be wages.

"(h) Withholding exemption certificates: Every employee receiving wages shall furnish his employer a signed withholding exemption certificate relating to his status for the purpose of computing the withholding exemption, or if the employer exercises his election under section 1622 (h) (relating to wage bracket withholding), for the purpose of computing the amount to be withheld under such subsection. In case of a change of status, a new certificate shall be furnished not later than 10 days after such change occurs. The certificate shall be in such form and contain such information as the Commissioner may, with the approval of the Secretary, by regulations prescribe. Such certificate—

"(1) If furnished after the date of commencement of employment with the employer, shall take effect with respect to the first payment of wages made on or after the first status determination date which occurs at least 30 days from the date on which such certificate is furnished to the employer, except that at the election of the employer such certificate may be made effective with respect to any previous payment of wages made on or after the date of the furnishing of such certificate. For the purposes of this paragraph the term 'status determination date' means January 1 and July 1 of each year.

"(2) If furnished on or before the date of commencement of employment with the employer, shall take effect as of the beginning of the first pay-roll period ending, or the first payment of wages made without regard to a pay-roll period, on or after the date on which such certificate is furnished to the employer.

A certificate which takes effect under this subsection shall continue in effect with respect to the employer until another such certificate furnished by the employee takes effect under this subsection. If no certificate is in effect under this subsection with respect to an employee, such employee shall be treated, for the purposes of the withholding exemption, or in case the employer exercises his election under section 1622 (c) (relating to wage bracket withholding), for the purpose of computing the amount to be withheld under such subsection, as a married person claiming none of the personal exemption for withholding.

"(i) Overlapping pay periods, and so forth: If a payment of wages is made to an employee by an employer—

"(1) with respect to a pay-roll period or other period, any part of which is included in a pay-roll period or other period with respect to which wages are also paid to such employee by such employer, or

"(2) without regard to any pay-roll period or other period, but on or prior to the expiration of a pay-roll period or other period with respect to which wages are also paid to such employee by such employer; or

"(3) with respect to a period beginning in one and ending in another calendar year,

the manner of withholding and the amount to be withheld under this subchapter shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary under which the withholding exemption allowed to an employee in any calendar year shall approximate the withholding exemption allowable with respect to an annual pay-roll period.

"(j) Withholding on basis of average wages: The Commissioner may, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, authorize employers (1) to estimate the wages which will be paid to any employee in any quarter of the calendar year, (2) to determine the amount to be withheld and collected upon each payment of wages to such employee during such quarter as if the appropriate average of the wages so estimated constituted the actual wages paid, and (3) to withhold and collect upon any payment of wages to such employee during such quarter such amount as may be necessary to adjust the amount actually withheld and collected upon the wages of such employee during such quarter to the amount required to be withheld during such quarter without regard to this subsection.

"SEC. 1623. Liability for tax.

"The employer shall be liable for the payment of the tax required to be withheld and collected under this subchapter, and shall not be liable to any person for the amount of any such payment.

"SEC. 1624. Return and payment by governmental employer.

"If the employer is the United States, or a State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more o the foregoing, the return of the amount withheld and collected upon any wages may be made by any officer or employee of the United States, or of such State, Territory, or political subdivision, or of the District of Columbia, or of such agency or instrumentality, as the case may be, having control of the payment of such wages, or appropriately designated for that purpose.

"SEC. 1625. Receipts.

"(a) Requirement: Every employer required to withhold and collect a tax in respect of the wages of an employee shall furnish to each such employee in respect of his employment during the calendar year, on or before January 31 of the succeeding year, or, if his employment is terminated before the close of such calendar year, on the day on which the last payment of wages is made, a written statement showing the wages paid by the employer to such employee during such calendar year, and the amount of the tax withheld and collected under this subchapter in respect of such wages.

"(b) Statements to constitute information returns: The statements required to be furnished by this section in respect of any wages shall be furnished at such other times, shall contain such other information, and shall be in such form as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe. A duplicate of such statement if made and filed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary shall constitute the return required to be made in respect of such wages under section 147.

"(c) Extension of time: The Commissioner, under such regulations as he may prescribe with the approval of the Secretary, may grant to any employer a reasonable extension of time (not in excess of 30 days) with respect to the statements required to be furnished to employees under this section.

"SEC. 1626. Penalties.

"(a) Penalties for fraudulent receipt or failure to furnish receipt: In lieu of any other penalty provided by law (except the penalty provided by subsection (b) of this section), any person required under the provisions of section 1625 to furnish a receipt in respect of tax withheld pursuant to this subchapter who willfully furnishes a false or fraudulent receipt, or who willfully fails to furnish a receipt in the manner, at the time, and showing the information required under section 1625, or regulations prescribed thereunder, shall for each such failure, upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(b) Additional penalty: In addition to the penalty provided by subsection (a) of this section, any person required under the provisions of section 1625 to furnish a receipt in respect of tax withheld pursuant to this subchapter who willfully furnishes a false or fraudulent receipt, or who willfully fails to furnish a receipt in the manner, at the time, and showing the information required under section 1625, or regulations prescribed thereunder, shall for each such failure be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $50.

"(c) Failure of employer to file return or pay tax: In case of any failure to make and file return or pay the tax required by this subchapter, within the time prescribed by law or prescribed by the Commissioner in pursuance of law, unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect, the addition to the tax shall not be less than $10.

"(d) Penalties in respect of withholding exemption certificates: Any individual re-

quired to supply information to his employer under section 1622 (h) who willfully supplies false or fraudulent information, or who willfully fails to supply information thereunder which would require an increase in the tax to be withheld under section 1622, shall, in lieu of any penalty otherwise provided, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 1627. Other laws applicable.

"All provisions of law, including penalties, applicable with respect to the tax imposed by section 1400 shall, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this subchapter, be applicable with respect to the tax under this subchapter.

"SUBCHAPTER E—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 1630. Verification of returns, etc.

"(a) Power of Commissioner to require: The Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, may require that any return, statement, or other document required to be filed under this chapter shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, and such declaration shall be in lieu of any oath otherwise required.

"(b) Penalties: Every person who willfully makes and subscribes any return, statement, or other document, which contains or is verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, and which he does not believe to be true and correct as to every material matter, shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be subject to the penalties prescribed for perjury in section 125 of the Criminal Code.

"SEC. 1631. Use of Government depositaries in connection with payment of taxes.

"The Secretary may authorize incorporated banks or trust companies which are depositaries or financial agents of the United States to receive any taxes under this chapter in such manner, at such times, and under such conditions as he may prescribe; and he shall prescribe the manner, times, and conditions under which the receipt of such taxes by such depositaries and financial agents is to be treated as payment of such taxes to the collectors."

(b) Technical amendments.—

(1) Amendment to section 34: Section 34 of the Internal Revenue Code (cross-reference) is amended by striking out "453, 454, and 466 (e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "453 and 454."

(2) Amendment to section 322: Section 322 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code (cross-reference) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Tax withheld at source: For refund or credit in case of withholding agent, see section 143 (f). For refund or credit in case of employer required to withhold tax on wages, see section 1622 (f)."

(c) Expiration date for withholding at source on wages under subchapter D of chapter 1: Section 476 of the Internal Revenue Code (prescribing the expiration date for the taxes imposed by such. D) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 476. Expiration date.

"The tax imposed by part I of this subchapter shall not apply with respect to any taxable year commencing after the date of cessation of hostilities in the present war. The tax imposed by part II of such subchapter shall not apply with respect to any wages paid after June 30, 1943."

(d) Effective date: The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect July 1, 1943, and shall be applicable to all wages paid on or after such date.

SEC. 3. Credit for tax withheld at source.

Section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the credit for tax withheld on wages) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 35. Credit for tax withheld on wages.

"The amount withheld and collected as tax under subchapter D of chapter 9 during any calendar year upon the wages of any individual shall be allowed as a credit to the recipient of the income against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year beginning in such calendar year. If more than 1 taxable year begins in any such calendar year such amount shall be allowed as a credit against the tax for the last taxable year so beginning."

SEC. 4. Refunds.

(a) Excessive withholding, etc.: Section 322 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to excessive withholding) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Excessive withholding: Where the amount of the tax withheld at the source under part II of subchapter D or subchapter D of chapter 9 exceeds the taxes imposed by this chapter against which the tax so withheld may be credited under section 35 or 466 (e), the amount of such excess shall be credited against any income tax or installment thereof then due from the taxpayer, and any balance thereof shall be refunded immediately to the taxpayer.

"(3) Credits against estimated tax: The Commissioner is authorized to prescribe, with the approval of the Secretary, regulations providing for the crediting against the estimated tax for any taxable year of the amount determined by the taxpayer or the Commissioner to be an overpayment of the tax for a preceding taxable year."

(b) Presumption as to date of payment: Section 322 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to presumption as to date of payment) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Presumption as to date of payment: For the purposes of this section, any tax actually withheld and collected at the source during any calendar year under part II of subchapter D or under subchapter D of chapter 9 shall, in respect of the recipient of the income, be deemed to have been paid by him on the 15th day of the third month following the close of his taxable year with respect to which such tax is allowable as a credit under section 35 or section 466 (e); except that in the case of a nonresident alien individual, it shall be deemed to have been paid by him on the 15th day of the sixth month following the close of such taxable year. For the purposes of this section, any amount paid as estimated tax for any taxable year shall be deemed to have been paid not earlier than the 15th day of the third month following the close of such taxable year."

(c) Delegation of authority to collectors to make refunds: Section 3770 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to authority to make refunds) is amended (1) by striking out "(4)" at the beginning of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "(5)"; and (2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

"(4) Delegation of authority to collectors to make refunds: The Commissioner is authorized to delegate, with the approval of the Secretary, to collectors any authority, duty, or function which the Commissioner is authorized or required to exercise or perform under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection, or under section 322 or 1027, where the amount involved does not exceed $1,000."

(d) Overpayments: Section 3770 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to authority to make credits and refunds) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(c) Rule where no tax liability: An amount paid as tax shall not be considered not to constitute an overpayment solely by reason of the fact that there was no tax liability in respect of which such amount was paid.

"(e) Cross-reference: The last subsection of section 3771 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to interest on overpayments) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Estimated tax and tax withheld at source: For date of payment in respect of estimated tax and of tax withheld at source on wages, see section 322 (e)."

(f) Review of allowance of interest: Section 3790 of the Internal Revenue Code (prohibiting administrative review of Commissioner's decisions) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "In the absence of fraud or mistake in mathematical calculation, the allowance or nonallowance by the Commissioner, of interest on any credit or refund under the internal revenue laws shall not, except as provided in chapter 5, be subject to review by any other administrative or accounting officer, employee, or agent of the United States."

SEC. 5. Current payment of tax not withheld at source.

(a) In general: The Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out sections 58, 59, and 60 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 58. Declaration of estimated tax by individuals.

"(a) Requirement of declaration: Every individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien) shall, at the time during the taxable year prescribed in subsection (d), make a declaration of his estimated tax for the taxable year if—

"(1) his gross income from wages (as defined in sec. 1621)

"(A) in case such individual is single or married but not living with husband or wife: can reasonably be expected to exceed $2,700 for the taxable year; or did exceed $2,700 for the preceding taxable year; or

"(B) in case such individual is married and living with husband or wife: can when added to the gross income which can reasonably be expected to be received by such husband or wife from wages (as so defined) reasonably be expected to exceed $3,500 for the taxable year; or did when added to the gross income of such husband or wife from wages (as so defined) for the preceding taxable year, exceed $3,500 for such preceding taxable year; or

"(2) his gross income from sources other than wages (as defined in section 1621)

"(A) in case such individual is single or married but not living with husband or wife: can reasonably be expected to exceed $100 for the taxable year and his gross income to be such as will require the making of a return for the taxable year under section 51; or did exceed $100 for the preceding taxable year and such individual either was required to make a return under section 51 or 455 for such preceding taxable year or would have been so required if he had been single during the whole of such preceding taxable year; or

"(B) in case such individual is married and living with husband or wife: can when added to the gross income which can reasonably be expected to be received by husband or wife from such sources, reasonably be expected to exceed $100 for the taxable year and the aggregate gross income of such husband and wife can reasonably be expected to be such as will require the making of a return under section 51 or 455; or did, when added to the gross income of such husband or wife from such sources for the preceding taxable year, exceed $100 for such preceding taxable year and such individual would have been required to make a return under section 51 or 455 for such preceding taxable year if he had been married and living with husband or wife during the whole of such preceding taxable year.

"(b) Contents of declaration: In the declaration required under subsection (a) the individual shall state—

"(1) the amount which he estimates as the amount of tax under sections 11 and 12,

or 400, as the case may be, and section 450, for the taxable year, without regard to any credits under sections 32, 35, and 466 (e);

"(2) the amount which he estimates as the credits for the taxable year under sections 32, 35, and 466 (e); and

"(3) the excess of the amount estimated under paragraph (1) over the amount estimated under paragraph (2), which excess for the purposes of this chapter shall be held and considered the estimated tax for the taxable year.

The declaration shall also contain such other information for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this chapter as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe, and shall contain or be verified by a written statement that it is made under the penalties of perjury.

"(c) Joint declaration by husband and wife: In the case of a husband and wife living together, a single declaration under this section may be made by them jointly, in which case the liability with respect to the estimated tax shall be joint and several. No joint declaration may be made if either the husband or wife is a nonresident alien. If a joint declaration is made but a joint return is not made for the taxable year, the estimated tax for such year may be treated as the estimated tax of either the husband or the wife, or may be divided between them.

"(d) Time and place for filing: The declaration required under subsection (a) shall be filed on or before the 15th day of the third month of the taxable year, except that if the requirements of subsection (a) are first met after such date, the declaration shall be filed on or before the 15th day of the last month of the quarter of the taxable year in which such requirements are first met. An individual may make amendments or revisions of a declaration filed under this subsection, under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. If so made, such amendments or revisions shall be filed on or before the 15th day of the last month of any quarter of the taxable year subsequent to that in which the declaration was filed and in which no previous amendments or revisions have been made or filed. Declarations and amendments and revisions thereof shall be filed with the Collector specified in section 53 (b) (1).

"(e) Extension of time: The Commissioner may grant a reasonable extension of time for filing declarations and paying the estimated tax, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe with the approval of the Secretary. Except in the case of taxpayers who are abroad, no such extension shall be for more than 6 months.

"(f) Persons under disability: If the taxpayer is unable to make his own declaration, the declaration shall be made by a duly authorized agent or by the guardian or other person charged with the care of the person or property of such taxpayer.

"(g) Signature presumed correct: The fact that an individual's name is signed to a filed declaration shall be prima facie evidence for all purposes that the declaration was actually signed by him.

"(h) Publicity of declaration: For the purposes of section 55 (relating to publicity of returns), a declaration of estimated tax shall be held and considered a return under this chapter.

"SEC. 59. Payment of estimated tax.

"(a) In general: The estimated tax shall be paid in four equal installments except that—

"(1) if the declaration is filed (otherwise than pursuant to an extension of time) after the 15th day of the third month of the taxable year, the estimated tax shall be paid in equal installments the number of which is equal to the number of quarters remaining in the taxable year (including the quarter in which the declaration is filed); and

"(2) if any amendment or revision of a declaration is filed, the remaining installments shall be ratably increased or decreased, as the case may be, to reflect the increase or decrease, as the case may be, in the estimated tax by reason of such amendment or revision; and

"(3) at the election of the individual, any installment of the estimated tax may be paid prior to the date prescribed for its payment. One installment of the estimated tax shall be paid at the time of making the declaration, and an installment thereof shall be paid on the 15th day of the last month of each succeeding quarter of the taxable year. Payment of any installment of the estimated tax shall be considered payment on account of the tax for the taxable year.

"(b) Assessment: The estimated tax shall be assessed only to the extent paid.

"SEC. 60. Special rules for application of sections 58 and 59.

"(a) Farmers: In the case of an individual whose estimated gross income from farming for the taxable year is at least 80 percent of the total estimated gross income from all sources for the taxable year, in lieu of the time prescribed in section 58 (d), the declaration for the taxable year may be made at any time on or before the 15th day of the last month of the taxable year.

"(b) Application to short taxable years: The application of sections 58, 59, and 294 (a) (3), (4), and (5) to taxable years of less than 12 months shall be as prescribed in regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"(c) Application to taxable years beginning in 1943: If the taxable year is the calendar year 1943, the 15th day of September, 1943, shall be substituted for the 15th day of March for the purposes of section 58 (d). If the taxable year begins in 1943 after January 1, the date which shall be substituted for the 15th day of the third month of the taxable year for the purposes of section 58 (d) shall be prescribed by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. In either case installments of the estimated tax for such taxable year payable after September 1, 1943, shall be ratably decreased to reflect the payments on account of a taxable year beginning in 1942 which are treated as payments on account of the estimated tax for a taxable year beginning in 1943."

(b) Additions to tax: Section 294 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to additions to tax in case of nonpayment) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(3) Failure to file declaration of estimated tax: In the case of a failure to make and file a declaration of estimated tax within the time prescribed, there shall be added to the tax an amount equal to 10 percent of the tax.

"(4) Failure to pay installment of estimated tax: In the case of the failure to pay an installment of the estimated tax within the time prescribed, there shall be added to the tax $2.50 or 2½ percent of the tax, whichever is the greater, for each installment with respect to which such failure occurs.

"(5) Substantial underestimate of estimated tax: If 80 percent of the tax (determined without regard to the credits under sections 32, 35, and 466 (e)), in the case of individuals other than farmers exercising an election under section 60 (a), or 66⅔ percent of such tax so determined in the case of such farmers, exceeds the estimated tax (increased by such credits), there shall be added to the tax an amount equal to such excess, or equal to 6 percent of the amount by which such tax so determined exceeds the estimated tax so increased, whichever is the lesser. This paragraph shall not apply to the taxable year in which falls the death of the taxpayer."

(c) Penalties: Section 145 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to criminal penalties) is amended (1) by inserting after "return" wherever appearing therein the words "or declaration", and (2) by inserting before "tax" wherever appearing therein the words "estimated tax or."

(d) Payment by installments: Section 56 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to installment payments) is amended by striking out "The" at the beginning thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "Except in the case of an individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien), the."

(e) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

SEC. 6. Relief from double payments in 1943.

(a) General rule: The liability of any individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien) for the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code for the taxable year 1942 shall be discharged as of September 1, 1943, except that (1) interest and additions to such tax shall be collected at the same time and in the same manner as, and as a part of, the tax under such chapter for the taxable year 1943, and (2) this subsection shall not apply in any case in which the taxpayer is convicted of any criminal offense with respect to the tax for the taxable year 1942 or in which additions to the tax for such taxable year are applicable by reason of fraud.

(b) Special rule where 1942 tax greater than 1943 tax: In the case of a taxpayer any part of whose tax for the taxable year 1942 is discharged under subsection (a), if such tax (determined without regard to such subsection, without regard to interest and additions to such tax, and without regard to credits against such tax for amounts withheld at source) is in excess of the tax for the taxable year 1943 (determined without regard to this section, without regard to interest and additions to such tax, and without regard to credits against such tax for amounts withheld at source), the tax for the taxable year 1943 shall be increased by such excess; except that if such taxpayer is in active service in the military or naval forces of the United States at any time during the taxable year 1942 or 1943, the tax for the taxable year 1943 shall not be increased by any portion of such excess which is attributable to earned net income (as defined in section 25 (a) (4), as determined under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

(c) Special rule where increased income.—

(1) Tax for 1942 less than that for 1943: In the case of a taxpayer whose tax for the taxable year 1942 is discharged under subsection (a), and (in cases in which the tax for such taxable year, determined in the same manner as under subsection (b), is less than that for the taxable year 1943, similarly determined) whose surtax net income for the base year plus $10,000 is less than that for the taxable year 1942, the liability discharged under subsection (a) shall be limited to an amount equal to a tentative tax computed as if the portion of the surtax net income for such taxable year which is not greater than the sum of the surtax net income for the base year plus $10,000 constituted both the surtax net income for such taxable year 1942, and the net income for such taxable year after allowance of all credits against net income;

(2) Tax for 1942 not less than that for 1943. In the case of a taxpayer whose tax for the taxable year 1942 is discharged under subsection (a), and (in cases in which the tax for such taxable year, determined in the same manner as under subsection (b), is equal to or greater than that for the taxable year 1943, similarly determined), whose surtax net income for the base year plus $10,000 is less than that for the taxable year 1943,

the liability discharged under subsection (a) shall be limited to an amount equal to a tentative tax for the taxable year 1943 computed as if the portion of the surtax net income for such taxable year which is not greater than the sum of the surtax net income for the base year plus $10,000 constituted both the surtax net income for the taxable year 1943, and the net income for such taxable year after allowance of all credits against net income.

The portion of the liability which is not discharged under subsection (a) by reason of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be discharged, but the tax for the taxable year 1943 shall be increased by an amount equal to such portion. The portion of the liability which is not discharged under subsection (a) by reason of paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be discharged, but the tax for the taxable year 1943 shall be increased by the excess of such portion over the amount by which the tax for such taxable year is increased under subsection (b). For the purposes of this subsection "base year" means any one of the taxable years 1938, 1939, or 1940, to be selected by the taxpayer. The amount by which the tax for the taxable year 1943 is increased by reason of this subsection shall not be held or considered to be a part of the tax for such taxable year for the purposes of sections 58, 59, 60, and 294 (a) (3), (4), and (5) of the Internal Revenue Code. That portion of the compensation which is received or accrued in the taxable year 1942 (if the tax for such year is less than that for the taxable year 1943), or in the taxable year 1943 (if the tax for such year is equal to or less than that for the taxable year 1942), and which under section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code is, for the purposes of that section, attributed to the base year, shall for the purposes of this subsection be excluded in computing the surtax net income for the taxable year 1942 or 1943, as the case may be, and be included in computing the surtax net income for the base year. This subsection shall be applied in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

(d) Extension of time for payment of increase in 1943 tax under subsection (c): At the election of the taxpayer, made under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, the Commissioner shall, except as hereinafter provided, extend the time for the payment of the portion of the tax for the taxable year 1943 equal to the increase therein under subsection (c), in which case such portion shall be paid in four equal annual installments, the first of which shall be paid on the fifteenth day of the fifteenth month following the close of the taxable year, and of the remaining installments one of which shall be paid on the last day of each succeeding 12-month period, except that any installment may be paid prior to the date prescribed for its payment. The Commissioner may condition the extension upon the furnishing by the taxpayer of a bond in such amount, not exceeding the amount of such increase, with such surety or sureties, as the Commissioner deems necessary, conditioned upon the payment of such amount in accordance with the terms of the extension. If the time for the payment of such portion is extended, there shall be collected, as a part of the tax, interest on each installment at the rate of 4 percent per annum for the period beginning with the date prescribed for the payment of the tax for such taxable year and ending with the date on which such installment is paid or the date on which it is payable, whichever is the earlier. If any installment is not paid on or before the date on which it is payable, it and the remaining installments shall be paid upon notice and demand from the Collector. If any installment is not paid on or before the date on which it is payable, there shall be collected, as part of the tax, interest on such installment at the rate of 6 percent per annum for the period beginning with the date on which such installment is payable and ending with the date on which it is paid.

(e) Rules for application of subsections (b) and (c): The credit against the tax imposed by Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code for the taxable year 1943 allowed by section 31 of such chapter (relating to taxes of foreign countries and of possessions of the United States), shall be determined without regard to subsections (b) and (c). Sections 105, 106, and 107 of such chapter (relating to limitations on tax) shall be applied without regard to subsections (b) and (c). If the taxpayer either for the taxable year 1942 or for the taxable year 1943 makes a joint return with his spouse, the taxes of the spouses for the taxable year for which a joint return is not made shall be aggregated for the purposes of subsections (b) and (c), and in case the taxable year for which a joint return is not made is the taxable year 1943, the liability for the increase in the tax for the taxable year 1943 under subsections (b) and (c), shall be joint and several.

(f) Special rule where taxpayer dies in taxable year 1942: If the individual dies during the taxable year 1942, subsection (a) shall not apply.

(g) Treatment of payments on account of 1942 tax: Any payment (other than interest and additions to the tax) made on account of the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code for the taxable year 1942 upon a taxpayer any part of whose liability for such tax is discharged under subsection (a) shall be considered as payment on account of the estimated tax for the taxable year 1943. In the case of any extension of time for the payment of such tax granted by the Commissioner prior to September 1, 1943, payment of the portion thereof which if such extension had not been granted would have been payable under section 56 (b) prior to such date shall be made notwithstanding subsection (a), but the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall apply to any such payment. In case the taxpayer becomes delinquent, prior to September 1, 1943, in the payment of such tax or any installment thereof, subsection (a) shall not relieve the taxpayer of his liability for the tax, but the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall be applicable to payment of such liability. If any payment on account of the tax imposed by such chapter for the taxable year 1942 is made pursuant to a joint return made by husband and wife for such taxable year, and such payment is considered as a payment on account of the estimated tax for the taxable year 1943, such payment may be treated as a payment on account of the estimated tax of either the husband or the wife for such taxable year or may be divided between them.

(h) Use of term "taxable year": For the purposes of this section the terms "taxable year 1938," "taxable year 1939," taxable year 1940," "taxable year 1942," and "taxable year 1943" mean, respectively, the taxable year beginning in 1938, 1939, 1940, 1942, and 1943, respectively; and "taxable year" as applied to the taxable year 1942 or 1943 shall not include any period of less than 12 months unless occasioned by the death of the taxpayer or unless there is no taxable year of 12 months beginning in such calendar year.

SEC. 7. Additional allowance for members of armed forces.

(a) In general: Section 22 (b) (13) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to additional allowance for military and naval personnel in computing net income) is amended to read as follows:

"(13) Additional allowance for military and naval personnel: In the case of compensation received during any taxable year and before the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, by a member of the military or naval forces of the United States for active service in such forces during such war, so much of such compensation as does not exceed $1,500."

(b) Effective date: The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

SEC. 8. Abatement of tax for members of armed forces upon death.

Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after section 404 the following new supplement:

"SUPPLEMENT U—ABATEMENT OF TAX FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES UPON DEATH

"SEC. 421. Abatement of tax for members of armed forces upon death.

"In the case of any individual who dies on or after December 7, 1941, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States and prior to the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, the tax under this chapter (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) attributable to earned net income (as defined in section 25 (a) (4)) received or accrued by him shall not be assessed, and if assessed, the assessment shall be abated, and if collected shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment, in the following amounts and for the following taxable years:

"(1) if such individual entered upon such service before the commencement of the taxable year beginning in 1943:

"(A) the entire amount of the tax so attributable for the taxable year in which falls the date on which he entered upon such service or September 16, 1940, whichever date is the later;

"(B) the entire amount of the tax so attributable for all subsequent taxable years during which he was in such service; and

"(C) that portion of the tax so attributable for the taxable year last preceding the date on which he entered upon such service or September 16, 1940, whichever date is the later, which bears the same ratio to the total tax so attributable as the number of quarters in the taxable year described in subparagraph (A) subsequent to the date on which he entered upon such service or September 16, 1940, whichever date is the later, bears to four; or

"(2) if such individual entered upon such service during the taxable year beginning in 1943:

"(A) that portion of the tax for the taxable year beginning in 1943, reduced by the increase under section 6 (c) of the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, which bears the same ratio to the total tax so reduced as the number of quarters in such taxable year subsequent to the date on which he entered upon such service bears to four, to the extent that such portion is so attributable; and

"(B) the entire amount of the tax so attributable for all subsequent taxable years during which he was in such service; or

(3) if such individual entered upon such service after the close of the taxable year beginning in 1943, the entire amount of the tax so attributable for all taxable years during the whole of which he was in such service. The computations required by this section shall be made in conformity with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. For the purposes of this section, a fractional part of a quarter shall be disregarded unless it exceeds 15 days, in which case it shall be considered a quarter."

SEC. 9. Assistant commissioners.

Subchapter B of chapter 39 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"SUBCHAPTER B—ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS

"SEC. 3905. Appointment.

"There shall be in the Bureau of Internal Revenue two Assistant Commissioners, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"SEC. 3906. Duties.

"The Assistant Commissioners shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Commissioner or required by law."

SEC. 10. Extension of time in connection with release of powers of appointment.

Section 403 (d) (3) of the Revenue Act of 1942 is amended by striking out "July 1, 1943" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1, 1944"; and section 452 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1942 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Release before March 1, 1944.—

"(1) A release of a power to appoint before March 1, 1944, shall not be deemed a transfer of property by the individual possessing such power.

"(2) This subsection shall apply to all calendar years prior to 1944 and to that part of the calendar year 1944 prior to March 1, 1944."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed with the Senate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask unanimous consent that the clerk be authorized to make corrections in the section numbering and lettering, and in the cross references, and to correct any typographical errors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. VANDENBERG, and Mr. DAVIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am so out of sympathy with the action taken by the Senate that I ask to be relieved from service on the conference committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has that right, and the Chair appoints in place of the Senator from Wisconsin, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it adjourn until Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Col. Robert Wood Johnson for temporary appointment as brigadier general, Army of the United States, under the provisions of law; and

Sundry citizens for appointment under the War Manpower Commission in various States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair). Are there further reports of committees?

LYNN R. EDMINSTER

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I report favorably the nomination of Lynn R. Edminster, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1949. This is a reappointment, and there are especially strong reasons why the nomination should be confirmed at once. The nominee is from the State of Illinois, and has been recommended by both the Senators from that State. No objection has been heard, and since this is a reappointment, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the nomination.

Mr. McNARY. In view of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER If there is no objection, the clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lynn R. Edminster to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission.

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sumner T. Pike to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the Public Health Service nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc, with the exception of the nomination of John F. Leonard to be postmaster at Marmarth, N. Dak. At the request of the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] I ask that that nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination of John F. Leonard will be passed over, and without objection, the other postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Capt. Laurance T. DuBose to be rear admiral.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Admiral Charles P. Snyder to be placed on the retired list with the rank of admiral.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE ENGLEBRIGHT, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate resume consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair) laid before the Senate the resolutions of the House of Representatives (H. Res. 235), which were read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
May 13, 1943.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT, a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of eight Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in the absence of the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] due to illness, on his behalf I submit the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 151) were read, considered by unanimous consent and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the

death of Hon. HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of four Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolving clause the Presiding Officer appointed the Senators from California [Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the committee on the part of the Senate to join with the committee on the part of the House to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wish to say that in the death of Mr. Englebright, California has lost one of its most highly respected, able, and popular Representatives. His death will be deplored by all. It was a great shock to all of us who have known him. It is my intention to proceed to California myself for Mr. Englebright's funeral.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], I move that the Senate do now adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative.

The motion was unanimously agreed to, and at 7 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m., the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 17, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 14 (legislative day of May 12), 1943:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Lynn R. Edminster to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1949.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Sumner T. Pike, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1948.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TEMPORARY PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS, EFFECTIVE FROM MAY 1, 1943

To be temporary medical directors

Marion R. King
Walter G. Nelson

To be temporary senior surgeons

Austin V. Deibert
Herman E. Hilleboe
Lee C. Watkins
John A. Trautman
John R. Heller, Jr.
Otis L. Anderson
Frank F. Thweatt, Jr.
Ivan W. Steele
John R. McGibony

To be temporary surgeons

Waldo B. Edwards
Robert A. Hingson

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons

Richard K. Winston
I. Ray Howard
Ralph R. Nix
Trawick H. Stubbs

To be a temporary dental director

William T. Wright, Jr.

To be a temporary dental surgeon

Edwin M. Short

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS, EFFECTIVE ON DATE OF OATH

To be assistant surgeons

James Lloyd Elliott
Lloyd Frederic Summers

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Laurance T. DuBose to be a rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from September 21, 1942.

Rear Admiral Charles P. Snyder, when retired on August 1, 1943, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of admiral.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Warren D. Judd, Fredonia.

ARKANSAS

Scott L. Kirkpatrick, Forrest City.
Harold M. Austin, Murfreesboro.
Robert L. Slaughter, Sheridan.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 14, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, what wilt Thou have us do? Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth. We would be eager to Thy call and strong to comprehend Thy purpose. We thank Thee for this beautiful world, for the flowers at our feet and for the stellar clusters in the firmament, for the birds that sing in the sunshine and for the worlds that roll in light, for the breath of zephyr and for the blast of storm-wind, over all is the majesty of Thy everlasting law.

For all our families, united or separated, we ask our Father's care; grant that all homes may be sanctuaries of love and happiness. Stimulate all our people with those masculine virtues—the obligations of freedom, the spirit of charity and the sense of personal responsibility. Give strength to men who are beset by sharp temptations and to loving women seeking spiritual beauty for home and world.

Dear Lord, a capable and loved Member has passed through the valley and shadow of death; the presiding spirit of a happy home has gone beyond the veil of earth; from his honest and intrepid soul came a character which all men delighted to honor. Comfort all to whose lips has come the cup of a great sorrow and give them peace. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE HONORABLE HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires at this time to recognize Members who were not here yesterday afternoon, and who desire to speak on the life and character of our late colleague.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that I heard last night of the death of our colleague from California, HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT. I regret that I was not present late last evening when the announcement was made on the floor of the House. I want the RECORD to show, however, that I join with his many friends both in and out of Congress in expressing my sorrow at his passing and my sympathy for his wife and son. The friendship between us and our wives began when I came here, for we lived at the same place for several years, and the friendship became more intimate as time wore on.

HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT was a man of the highest character, the finest of principles, a man who knew and understood the value of true friendship. I shall miss him more than I know how to express.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT this body, the country, and particularly the people of the Second Congressional District of California, have suffered a distinct loss.

Harry and I were elected to Congress at the same time to fill unexpired terms. He was elected to fill a vacancy in a district once represented by his distinguished father for a number of years.

He represented the mining sections of the State of California. His district embraced nearly one-fourth of the entire State. It has the largest geographical area of any district in Congress.

He was born and grew to manhood in the section he so well represented. He knew the problems of his people—the miners, the mine owners, and operators.

He fought a great battle for the conservation of the huge redwood and pine forests of the State. The Mariposa grove of giant redwoods, the largest and oldest living things upon this earth, is in his district.

So devoted was he to the interests of the people he represented that the order closing the gold and other mineral mines of his district for the duration of the war bore heavily upon him. Some of these mines extending to a depth of a full mile into the bowels of the earth are threatened with destruction, for when once flooded with water they will be irrevocably lost, and the miners who have followed this work for generations will have lost their means of livelihood. As a mining engineer, HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT knew this as well, or perhaps better, than any man in this Nation.

The men who own and operate those mines and the men who were engaged in this hazardous employment have lost a true and sincere friend.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. TOLAN].

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Hon. HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT died yesterday and we were all deeply shocked and grieved at his passing. An intimate and personal friend of mine for many years I deem it a personal loss.

Harry was one of the kindest, finest, and gentlest gentleman I have ever

known in my life. His high position as minority whip for many years required him to assemble Members for roll and quorum calls and to acquaint Members with pending legislation. These duties made him one of the best known and most loved Member in the House.

I never heard him say an unkind word of another. Harry is gone. We will follow him, but while here, his life will be an inspiration to us in determining how best to carry on.

Harry called hundreds of Members to hundreds of roll calls. He has answered his last call. Who knows but what he is not with us today in spirit for he is certainly entitled to the privilege of the floor to whisper advice from realms eternal.

Our deepest affection and sympathy go out to his loving wife, Grace, and his son, Jackson, who is now with the armed forces somewhere in the Pacific. They have the consolation to know that no finer or lovable husband and father ever walked this old earth of ours than HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret and profound sorrow that I learned of the sudden death of our colleague, the Honorable HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT. Each of us who had the privilege of being one of Harry's friends, and his friends were legion, has suffered a keen personal loss. It will not be possible to fill the void that has been caused by his untimely passing.

I well recall how HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT took me under his wing when I first came to Congress, a freshman in every sense of the word. His kindly advice and sound counsel were extremely helpful in guiding me along the proper course. I had the honor of serving for 4 years as an assistant to him in the minority whip organization, and I shall never forget that privilege.

Many Members have spoken of his courteous and gentlemanly ways. What finer tribute can be paid to any man than to say that he was a true gentleman and a loyal and devoted friend. He served his people, his State, and his country with honor and distinction. To his family we extend our sincerest sympathy. The Congress has lost a real statesman and I have lost a friend.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, California lost one of her most distinguished sons, the Nation an outstanding leader, and thousands of individuals like me a very dear friend.

In all truth and sincerity he loved his fellow man. His was the smile and the clasp of friendship. He needed no assurances, made no demands, exacted no promises. It was enough for him to grant the favor, to do the kindly deed, to extend the helping hand. He labored for his country and all its people in a large way, but in a very definite and active way he served each one of his constituents as legislator, patriot, and friend. Heedless of his personal welfare he labored faithfully to the last.

No Member of Congress, House or Senate, has ever been held in higher esteem, more beloved, or highly respected by his colleagues than HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT. By reason of his passing, the people of California and the Nation have suffered a great loss. We join in sharing the grief of his family and extend to them our deepest sympathy.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The unexpected death of my colleague and valued friend, HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT, on Thursday, May 13, 1943, was a public loss to his district, to the Congress, and to the country, and a great personal sorrow to me. I extend to his devoted wife and talented son my sincerest sympathy.

I served with him for almost 18 years in the House. For many years we have both been members of the Committee on Flood Control. For almost 8 years I have been chairman and HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT has been the ranking minority member of the committee. Our relations have always been most cordial. No chairman ever had a more cooperative member of his committee. Our lots have fallen in similar places through the years, and I numbered him among my closest associates.

HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT was an unusual man. He was a gentleman to the manner born. I have never known a more agreeable Member of the House. He possessed the qualifications of a good Representative. He was industrious in his office and committee work, and attentive in the sessions of the House. He was jealous of the interests of the district he represented and was devoted to the service of the people who elected and reelected him as a Member of the House of Representatives for nine terms. He was effective in the committee and in his contacts on the floor of the House. He thus secured excellent consideration for the district and the people he served.

Our lamented colleague was a friendly man. All entertained for him good will and kindly feelings. He loved his fellow man, and no Member in the years of my service has been more highly personally esteemed by his colleagues.

HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT lived the good life of his time. He loved his State, and he loved his Nation. He was a patriot. He was devoted to his friends and loyal to every trust. The House and the country can ill afford to spare such a man as he. He will be long remembered by his constituents and by his colleagues.

PROGRAM FOR RECRUITING AND TRAINING NURSES

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2664) to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is the bill that was introduced by our colleague the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mr. BULWINKLE. This is the bill that was introduced by her.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman explain the bill to the House?

Mr. BULWINKLE. This bill, Mr. Speaker, provides for the training of nurses for the armed forces, for governmental activities, and for civilian hospitals. We are badly in need of some 65,000 nurses. They have to be trained. It is hard to get these girls to go into the nursing profession with the WAVES, the WAAC's, and industry offering them so much more money. This bill provides for their training at the expense of the Government.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And I understand it was reported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. BULWINKLE. It was reported unanimously from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Gladly.

Mr. JENKINS. I should just like to make this statement: There is probably no person in America better qualified to speak on this problem or who has had more experience with reference to it than the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], and I am glad the committee has unanimously supported her bill.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of assuring a supply of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated sums sufficient to carry out the purposes of this act. Such sums shall be used for making payments to schools of nursing or other institutions which have submitted, and had approved by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service (hereinafter referred to as the Surgeon General), plans for nurses' training, for making payments under section 4, and for all necessary expenses of the Public Health Service in administering the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. A plan for training of nurses may be limited to student-nurse training, or to postgraduate or refresher-nursing courses, or may include both. A plan submitted by any institution may be approved only if it provides—

(a) That no student or graduate nurse will be included under the plan unless in the judgment of the head of the institution such nurse will be available for military or other Federal governmental or essential civilian services for the duration of the present war, and such nurse so states in her application for inclusion under the plan;

(b) That nurses under the plan will be provided courses of study and training meeting standards prescribed by the Surgeon General;

(c) That the institution will furnish student nurses under the plan (without charge for tuition, fees, or other expenses) courses of study and training, uniforms, insignia, and

maintenance in accordance with regulations of the Surgeon General;

(d) That the institution will pay student nurses under the plan a stipend at not less than the following monthly rates: $15 for the first 9 months of study; $20 for the following 15 to 21 months of combined study and practice, depending upon the curriculum of such institution;

(e) That the institution will either afford student nurses under the plan an opportunity to complete their course of training until graduation at such institution and will pay such student nurse a stipend at a monthly rate not less than $30 for the period following the period of combined study and practice and prior to graduation, or will transfer such student, after completion of the period of combined study and practice and prior to graduation, for training in some other institution, but only if such training may be credited toward graduation, and the institution to which the nurse is transferred agrees to pay her a stipend at a monthly rate of not less than $30 until graduation; and

(f) That where extramural credit toward graduation can be given under the law of the State in which the institution is located, such institution will make transfers to Federal hospitals, under the conditions specified in subsection (e), in any case where a student nurse desires such transfer and appropriate request for such transfer is made on behalf of such hospital.

SEC. 3. From the sums appropriated therefor the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay each institution, with a plan approved under section 2—

(1) with respect to items furnished student nurses thereunder, amounts determined by the Surgeon General to compensate such institution for—

(A) reasonable tuition and fees for the courses of study and training;

(B) reasonable maintenance provided pursuant to section 2 for the first 9 months of their course of study and training;

(C) uniforms and insignia, provided in accordance with section 2; and

(D) the minimum rate of stipend specified in section 2 for periods prior to completion of the course of combined study and training referred to in such section; and

(2) with respect to items furnished graduate nurses thereunder, amounts determined by the Surgeon General to compensate such institution for reasonable tuition and fees for postgraduate and refresher courses of study, and reasonable maintenance for graduate nurses undertaking postgraduate courses, or such portion of such amounts as may be determined in accordance with regulations of the Surgeon General.

SEC. 4. The Surgeon General is authorized, with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator, to enter into agreements with nonprofit organizations for the recruitment of student and graduate nurses for training and courses under plans approved pursuant to this act, and to compensate such organizations therefor, but in no case shall such compensation exceed the necessary cost, as determined by him, of rendering such service.

SEC. 5. Determinations under section 3 or 4 of amounts which any institution or organization shall receive shall be conclusive upon such institution or organization and upon any officer or agency of the Government.

SEC. 6. The method of computing and paying the amounts referred to in sections 3 and 4 shall be as follows:

(a) The Surgeon General shall from time to time, on a prepayment or reimbursement basis, estimate or make determination of the amount for each institution or organization, which amount shall be reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which he finds that unadjusted payments with respect to any prior period were greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such institution or organization pursuant to section 3 or 4 for such prior period, and shall certify the amount so estimated or determined and so reduced or increased to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office pay the institution or organization at the time or times fixed by the Surgeon General the amount so certified.

SEC. 7. In lieu of payment therefor under section 3 the Surgeon General is authorized to procure and provide insignia for student nurses under a plan approved under section 2.

SEC. 8. The Surgeon General with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator is hereby authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. Such rules and regulations shall be promulgated after conference with an advisory committee of not less than five members consisting of representatives of the nursing profession, hospitals, and accredited nurses' training institutions. The members of the committee shall be appointed by the Federal Security Administrator. The members of the committee shall not receive any compensation for their services on the committee, but shall be reimbursed for all necessary travel and subsistence expenses (or receive a per diem in lieu thereof not to exceed $10 to be fixed by the Federal Security Administrator) while away from their respective places of residence on the business of the committee.

SEC. 9. This act shall cease to be in effect upon the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war as determined by the President or upon such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate, except for purposes of (a) making computations, payments, and adjustments in payments with respect to recruitment, training, and courses prior to such date, and (b) making computations, payments, and adjustments in payments so as to permit continuance, after such date, of training and courses by graduate or student nurses who were receiving training or courses 90 days prior to such date.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD, and I ask also that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may have permission to extend her own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There was no objection.

H. R. 2664

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes.

EVIDENCE OF NEEDS

A critical shortage of nurse personnel exists today. Unless the situation is remedied within the next few months, both the military and civilian populations will receive inadequate nursing care. Never before in the history of our country have nursing needs so far overshadowed the available supply. Together, the Army and the Navy are currently recruiting 3,000 nurses per month. Many civilian hospitals have been forced to close sections of their institutions because it has been impossible to secure sufficient personnel to care for the patients. Hospitals list nurses first among the most critical personnel shortages. Daily the war industries are requesting additional nurses to help keep their employees well and on the job. In some hospitals, the remaining nurses are attempting to care for twice as many patients as formerly. This is not safe for the patients nor for the nurses whose health will suffer unless they secure relief. Careful estimates of the military and civilian needs during the next fiscal year indicate that the services of at least 100,000 additional nurses will be needed to meet military needs and to maintain for the civilian population standards of nursing care which existed in 1941, and no one admits that those were ideal standards.

The Federal aid program—training for nurses, national defense—which was initiated 2 years ago has helped, but the scope of that program is entirely too limited to solve the present problem. It was based upon the incentive principle—only those schools which could increase their student admissions over peacetime levels were eligible. The measure specifically prohibited the payment of cash allowances to students and the amount of aid for tuition, maintenance, and instructional costs was limited. Two years ago the competition for womanpower was not so keen as it is today. War industries and the uniformed auxiliary services of the armed forces are recruiting many of the young women who were formerly interested in nursing. Therefore, the recruitment of satisfactory candidates for schools of nursing is becoming increasingly difficult.

Nurses are among the few groups which come to the Army trained for their work. Other workers are inducted and paid salaries and expenses during the learning period. For the most part, nurses have paid in cash for their education. At the same time they have been rendering a necessary nursing service in the hospital and have helped to replace graduate nurses who have joined the armed forces.

PROVISIONS OF H. R. 2326

This measure will stimulate recruitment by providing funds to pay her tuition and entrance fees; by furnishing her a distinctive outdoor uniform and insignia which will identify her as one who is rendering a necessary wartime service; by assuring the student an allowance for personal expenses throughout the training period. While the amount of money allowed for personal expenses is limited, it is recognized that the student nurse is being prepared for a lifetime career in a type of work for which there will be a continuing demand during the post-war period.

This measure will also relieve the need for additional nursing service in military and civilian hospitals by requiring that the period of combined study and practice be completed in not more than

30 months, thus making the student available for full-time nursing duty under supervision at an earlier date.

Reimbursement for maintenance by the Federal Government to the hospital or school of nursing is provided for the first 9 months of the training period when the student is participating very little in the nursing service of the hospital. Following this preliminary period the hospital will furnish complete maintenance. The institutions utilizing the services of the student at the completion of the program of combined theory and practice are required to pay the stipend and to furnish the maintenance during that period.

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING THIS BILL

At the hearings on this bill a number of representatives from Government and professional agencies appeared in its support, to quote from Dr. Parran, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service:

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that this proposal has been worked up very carefully by consultation with the various groups concerned—the professional organizations, training schools, the hospital authorities—and I think it fair to state that it represents the consensus of those who are best in position to know the needs and to know the possibilities of meeting these needs.

Brigadier General McAfee, Acting Surgeon General of the Army, testified as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express the approval of the Surgeon General and the Secretary of War of the provisions of this bill.

Naturally the Medical Department of the Army is vitally interested in the training of nurses in the interest of maintaining women in the nursing profession not only to furnish us our required number during the emergency, as long as it lasts, but after the emergency is passed.

We appreciate that there is great competition for women in industry and in the armed services, and that the salary, perhaps the glamor, has attracted from the number of young ladies entering training as nurses.

We believe that this bill will appeal to a large number, but it is directly in the interest of the war effort; identifies them with the war effort and also provides them with a profession which will develop into a career, and be useful to them after the war is passed.

At the present time, under our system of recruiting, we are almost current with our nurse requirements. We appreciate, however, that the local communities are making a marked sacrifice to keep this number up to our requirements, and we feel that there is a limit and that eventually the procurement of nurses from civil life will drop down to a point that will not furnish us what we need.

For this reason we feel that this bill will stimulate nursing and the study of nursing and make available to civil hospitals partially trained women who are in course of training and in that way in some sense relieve the situation in the immediate future. We also appreciate that during the post-war period there will be an unusual demand for nurses both in civil life, public health service, and in the care of veterans of this war, and we feel that it is a protective measure.

The director of nursing, Miss Anna D. Wolf, Johns Hopkins Hospital School of Nursing, Baltimore, Md., endorsed the proposed plan and stated:

In the past we have had very good response to recruitment in our school. * * * However, right now, during the past 4 months of this year, we have noticed a marked decline in both the applicants to the school and the requests for admission to the school and also from the standpoint of the type of student who is asking to be admitted. We have reason to feel that these facts are very significant in relation to the fact that we do not have in nursing a program to offer students similar to that which they may receive in almost any one of the other services of the Government or through industry.

Dr. Claude W. Munger, chairman of the Council on Government Relations of the American Hospital Association, presented a resolution of endorsement from his association. He emphasized the great increase in the use of hospital facilities in this country and the crying need of all hospitals for more nurses. He stated that—

If it were possible for the hospitals to keep and use for themselves the output of their schools of nursing, this bill and the appropriations necessary for it would not be necessary, of course, but the country wants and takes every nurse we can produce and we want our fighting men to have enough nurses, but, of course, the cost of the production of a nurse has to be the responsibility of the Government. I believe this situation is very urgent and the official board of my association, the American Hospital Association, feels the same.

Miss Stella Goostray, president of the National League of Nursing Education and chairman of the National Nursing Council for War Service, presented endorsements of H. R. 2326 from both of these organizations. Miss Goostray explained the program of the National League of Nursing Education in securing the adjustment of the nursing curriculum so that the last 6 months would be free for supervised nursing practice within civilian or military hospitals. She also emphasized the program of the National Nursing Council for War Service in returning inactive graduate nurses to active practice and in recruiting student nurses.

Endorsements were also presented by the United States veterans' facilities, the Catholic Hospital Association, and the National Organization for Public Health Nursing and a number of other professional and lay organizations.

Numerous letters and telegrams from representatives of hospital, nursing, and lay groups from the various sections of the country were read at the hearings and were placed in the record. These communications gave specific examples of acute nursing shortages and recommended the passage of this measure.

THE COST AND DURATION OF THE PROPOSED PROGRAM

In her introductory remarks the gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative BOLTON, author of H. R. 2326, estimated that the total cost to the Federal Government for the entire period of training would be approximately $1,250 per student, and the annual cost of the program would be between sixty and sixty-five millions of dollars, depending upon the number of students who elect to become members of the Student War Nursing Reserve. She emphasized that enrollment in the Student War Nursing Reserve would be voluntary, but that those students who will receive the benefits must agree to serve in some type of necessary nursing work for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. The gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative BOLTON, also emphasized that this was a war emergency measure and that no additional classes will be admitted after the war is ended.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, America at war is facing a serious nursing shortage which threatens to undermine the health of our Nation unless immediate steps are taken to relieve the situation. Inasmuch as this is a condition stemming out of the war, surely it is not unreasonable to feel that the Federal Government should shoulder the responsibility for providing a solution to the problem.

At least 65,000 new student nurses are needed this year to replenish the ranks of graduate nurses who are being called in ever-increasing numbers to the armed forces and essential civilian services. We cannot hope to enroll 65,000 new student nurses without putting them on an equitable basis with students of other essential war professions, trades, and services. We have no right to expect to attract young women to nursing if they must pay the cost of this education while the Federal Government finances the education of students of medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, veterinary, chemistry, physics, and engineering. Nor can we expect to attract young women to nursing when they can go into either war industries or auxiliaries of the armed forces and immediately receive both salaries and subsistence while training.

The purpose of H. R. 2664 is to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, and also to provide refresher and post-graduate courses where they are needed to bring inactive graduate nurses back into active service for the war effort. The bill is an expansion of the present nursing-education program—training for nurses—national defense—of the United States Public Health Service. Although the present Public Health Service program has made a magnificent record, it has not proved adequate because, first, only students needing financial aid are eligible and, secondly, the appropriation has not been large enough to meet the demand. This enlarged program under H. R. 2664 will be administered by the United States Public Health Service, as the previous program has been, thereby assuring our student-nurse body the scientific guidance and experience of the able men and women of the United States Public Health Service. They will have the benefit of an advisory committee representing nursing, hospitals, and educational groups

concerned—all of whom are wholeheartedly in favor of this new plan.

Provision is made in the bill for paying moderate stipends and maintenance to the student nurse throughout her training period. The course of study is to be reduced from 36 months to 24 or 30 months, depending upon the plan chosen by the individual school of nursing.

In return for these benefits the student nurse agrees that upon graduation she will serve her country where needed most, either in the armed forces or in essential governmental or civilian institutions, for the duration of the war. The act would cease to be in effect upon the termination of hostilities in the present war, except that women receiving training 90 days prior to the date of the cessation of the war will be permitted to complete their courses.

Those who fear we may be encouraging an oversupply of nurses for the postwar period should dispel those fears at once. As I look into the future, I believe nursing will be one of the most important activities, requiring an almost unlimited number of nurses; not only will the military, naval, and veterans' hospitals be carrying probably the heaviest load in their history, but the effects of total war will take an unpredictable toll here, and our rehabilitation programs will require highly skilled nurses; nor can we stop at our own frontiers—all the world will need the consecrated, intelligent care that only the professional nurse is equipped to give.

May I take this opportunity of thanking the House for its understanding response to this emergency and the expeditious handling of this bill.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ELLIOTT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a telegram from Mr. Loren H. Voch, director of the Wasco, Calif., Farm Center.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]?

There was no objection.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL—1944

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 446), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

AMENDED REPORT ON S. 796 BY THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have permission to file an amended report on the bill S. 796.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders for today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes and also that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] may also have permission to address the House for 30 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the President of the Ohio Canners' Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRIFFITHS]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GRIFFITHS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RECORD OF NINETEENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA IN SECOND WAR-LOAN DRIVE

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the remarkable record and the outstanding achievement of the Nineteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania in the recent second war-loan drive. The district subscribed for more than double its quota. Indeed, it exceeded doubling by more than $3,000,000. The chairmen in the three counties advise me that this great success was due to complete cooperation from the citizens of every city, borough, hamlet, and township in the three counties.

The allotted quota was $21,553,000; $46,203,582 was subscribed. It is entirely possible later returns will add to this huge sum.

In each of the three counties the allotment was far exceeded.

Cumberland County subscribed $5,160,516 when asked for $3,459,000—50 percent over.

Lebanon County bought $6,309,355, when asked for $4,309,000—50 percent over.

Dauphin $34,733,711, when asked for $13,785,000—about 2½ times the quota.

One of the ladies' divisions with a quota of $60,000 secured over $1,000,000.

In future as in past campaigns the United States of America can count on the Nineteenth District of Pennsylvania doing more than it is asked to do, not only in war-loan drives but in all phases of the war effort.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 447), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, May 18, after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article written by Dr. Charles Wachtl, editor of the Polish Star, published in Philadelphia, on Polish-Russian relations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an essay entitled "Youth Fights for Its Heritage," by Nelson Fisher, of the East Nashville High School.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING IN SMALL NEWSPAPERS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this body fully realizes the impossibility of small newspapers surviving much longer. With no automobile, gasoline, tire, machinery, and scarcely any dry goods or grocery advertisement, how can we expect them long to exist?

We all know that practically every newspaper in the United States has most patriotically donated hundreds of columns of space toward the war effort since Pearl Harbor. The great majority have contributed thousands of dollars in doing this even though they are operating at a loss.

Senator BANKHEAD has introduced a bill in the Senate to aid in the stabilization program and war effort by using paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States War bonds and for other purposes. Newspapers' stock in trade is their space. The Government pays liberally for everything else to carry on the war to a successful conclusion. Why discriminate against

the newspapers? Publicity is most certainly a necessary item. I sincerely hope this body and the Senate in the near future will pass the Bankhead bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VURSELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from letters and telegrams recently received by me.

The Speaker. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith two resolutions adopted by the Argricultural Producers Association of Geary County, Kans., on April 10, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRICE OF CRUDE OIL

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am also interested in the question of increasing the price of crude oil. I am interested because I believe a reasonable increase in price will need be granted in order to provide a sufficient supply for the increased demand of our armed forces. I would like to have the attention, just for a moment, of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], chairman of the Small Business Committee of the House, who has done a great deal of work on this problem in an effort to help solve it.

Does he not think it might be well for a group of Representatives from this House to have a conference with Government officials dealing with this problem together with the President, and have the entire situation properly presented, so there might be a better understanding of the matter and with a view to getting action? I realize the gentleman has been doing considerable work on this problem. Does he not think it would be wise to take such action, in view of the importance of the question?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. PATMAN. There is a resolution pending now, introduced day before yesterday, which is intended to express the sense of the Members of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the House is not in order. I cannot hear the gentlemen; they seem to be carrying on a conversation between themselves.

The SPEAKER. Each of the gentlemen is standing in front of a microphone.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But they are only 6 or 7 feet apart and we cannot hear them.

Mr. PATMAN. When this resolution is passed by the House it will express the sense of the Members of the House on that question.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will what has just taken place appear in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. If it is not deleted by the Member making the statement. Members sometimes make statements on the floor that they do not care to have appear in the RECORD.

PRICE OF CRUDE OIL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to raise my voice along with my colleagues in pointing out the necessity for some action being taken soon to raise the price of crude oil. If oil, gasoline, and the other products coming from petroleum are not essential to the war effort, then I cannot feel that we have much of a war effort. I cannot agree with the reasoning of Mr. Brown as mentioned by the gentleman from Texas. It is very important, it is highly essential to the economy of our country that oil production go on, that new wells be developed, and that new fields be explored. I hope that some definite, positive, constructive action can be taken soon. The way to provide more oil is to raise the price. That is the way to aid in the discovery and development of new fields also.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there have been so many tears shed here for the oil producer that it is only proper that there be something in the RECORD on behalf of the oil consumer. I have already written to Mr. Prentiss Brown protesting any increase in the price of crude oil that might necessitate an increase in the price of fuel oil to the domestic consumer. In the past 4 or 5 years there has been an increase of 50 percent in the price of domestic fuel oil, which, in the opinion of those of us who use it in the large cities, has not been justified. We hope that Mr. Brown will not respond to any pressure from certain sections of the country to the extent that it would oblige him to increase the price of oil to the domestic consumer.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PETERSON of Florida addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very significant letter I have received from Mr. Maurice L. Jones, published of the Johnston City (Ill.) Progress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF BITUMINOUS COAL ACT OF 1937

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed·

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 122) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 122) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. JENKINS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I understand, the gentleman from North Carolina is submitting this request in accordance with the decision of the Committee on Ways and Means this morning.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. It has for its purpose the extension of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days.

It will be recalled that on April 21 this House passed a resolution extending the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for 120 days. That resolution went to the other body and was there amended so that it provided for an extension of only 30 days. This resolution is for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the original resolution. The purpose is to give the Bituminous Coal Division permission to proceed unimpaired during this time, while our committee is considering the bill now before our committee and deciding whether or not we should recommend that the Bituminous Coal Act be extended for a period of 2 years or longer.

Mr. JENKINS. I reserved the right to object, Mr. Speaker, for the reason that no other minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means seems to be here at this instant. As I understand, the agreement made in the Committee on Ways and Means this morning was that a rule would be asked for, but I also understand that since that time it has developed that a rule probably is not necessary because it seems to be the opinion that the matter should be taken up by unanimous consent.

Mr. FISH and Mr. SABATH rose.

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. The Committee on Rules did consider the resolution and reported it, but we have waived the rule by unanimous consent, and the matter is now before this body for decision.

Mr. JENKINS. I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I wanted to make the same explanation as has been made by the gentleman from New York. We have reported a rule on this joint resolution, but in order to save time it has been agreed by nearly everyone who is interested in this needed legislation that we will not call up the rule, provided the request of the gentleman from North Carolina to consider the resolution now is granted.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to make this clear, that the understanding in the committee this morning was that this matter would be brought up a little later today. For that reason, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], our ranking Member on the committee, is not present. He is nearby, and will be here soon, but it strikes me that it is hardly necessary to delay this any further. As far as I know, if the gentleman from Minnesota were present, he would agree to the request made, as would also the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]. Under those circumstances, since I am the only minority member of the committee present, I do not think that I should object to the immediate consideration of the matter.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, the bill as it was originally reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means, when we considered the matter 30 days ago, provided for an extension of 90 days, to give the Committee on Ways and Means an opportunity to have hearings, and determine whether it is advisable to continue the Bituminous Coal Act. The 30 days have gone by, and because the Senate amended the act to 30 days, we accepted that amendment. That time is about to expire, and there is very much trepidation on the part of many people in the United States in respect to this act. There is very much doubt as to the advisability of continuing it. I am fearful that if we negative the action which we took and continue this for another 30 days beyond the date which was originally recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, we are going to create a great deal of opposition to it. I think what the committee should do is to amend the resolution and make it 60 days, which will put it on the basis of the original resolution. I do not think there would be any objection to that.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The original resolution passed the House on April 20 provided an extension of 120 days. The Senate amended that to 30 days. The 90 days provided in the present resolution would bring it to 120 days exactly, so that we are making it as it was originally passed by the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I stand corrected. So, the action is to be exactly in accordance with the position as it was originally recommended.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. DINGELL. It is necessary to take the additional 90 days in order to give the committee time to dispose of pending legislation, which will go to conference, and in the meantime hearings might be in order on permanent legislation, and the matter will be disposed of in proper order.

Mr. WOLCOTT. By adopting this resolution now we are not continuing it beyond the period originally recommended in the House.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to call the attention of the House to the fact that this bill does exactly the same thing that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] who just preceded this discussion, objected to in regard to the matter of oil. The purpose of this legislation is to maintain an artificial price on coal for the benefit of the Nation upon the theory that we need the coal.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to maintain a minimum and not a maximum. That is where the gentleman is wrong in his deduction.

Mr. POAGE. Just one minute. The purpose of the whole bituminous coal set-up is to maintain the price of coal, so that it be sufficient to keep the mines in steady operation. I am not objecting to what the gentleman is trying to do. It is to maintain a maximum price of coal in order that there may be a unified and continuous production of coal, and to prevent a disastrous break in coal prices, such as have occurred in years past, which have resulted in a lessened production of coal. The same thing applies to oil. I am willing to go along with you, to give support to the coal business, but we should also recognize that oil is absolutely essential to the welfare of this Nation, and that the producers of oil, just as the producers of coal, must have reasonable support in prices or else we will be faced with a disastrous failure to produce oil, which is just as essential as coal. All that I am trying to point out is that we need to deal with one industry just as we deal with the other, and that is, deal with them in even-handed justice, and not discriminate any against oil.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) section 19 of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 (relating to termination of the act) is amended by striking out "May 24, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "August 24, 1943."

(b) Section 3527 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to termination of the bituminous coal taxes) is amended by striking out "May 23, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "August 23, 1943."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL BOATS FOR UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 229, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 2581, a bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft, district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval

Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. Pending that I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why this rule and this bill should not be disposed of in the next 20 or 30 minutes, or even less time than that. This is an open rule making in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 2581, which is a bill authorizing the construction of some million tons of auxiliary vessels for the Navy. Immediately following the adoption of this rule and the bill—and we all know they are going to be adopted—there will be an appropriation bill to be considered, when the money will be appropriated for the building of these ships. In other words, there is a three-way discussion of this matter, and in the final analysis you know and I know that, as much as we Members of Congress would like to keep our hands on the pursestrings and as much as we would like to direct the war, in the final analysis you and I have got to rely upon the judgment of the gentlemen who are the so-called "brass hats," who are directing the warfare. They say we must have these boats, which is a kind of a landing boat, and other auxiliary vessels. You and I do not know whether they have to have them or not, so we must take their word for it in the final analysis. But we do know that we are now planning great invasions of Europe and other Axis-held countries. We know we have to have small craft to make landings upon the shores of the enemy.

That is all there is to this proposition. We might quit there, but some of us like to talk, you know, when we get started. Before I close I just want to pay tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. That might have been another argument that I could have made, because he has asked for it and said that we have it, in addition to the "brass hats." So I pay tribute to him and to the Naval Affairs Committee for the expeditious manner in which they handle their legislation. I also want to compliment the gentleman from Georgia and the committee for bringing in this bill. I said a moment ago that immediately following this there would be an appropriation bill that would appropriate this money. That is the way they have been getting these boats heretofore, but the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, backed up by his loyal membership, says that they should be authorized before the money is appropriated. In other words, to protect the legislative committees that we have heard so much about and to be sure that these matters get ample consideration.

So that this is more or less of an innovation, because we have an authorization for this expenditure, whereas heretofore we have not had it. So I salute the distinguished "admiral" from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who has been so industrious in this matter.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I also want to join the gentleman in saluting the distinguished "admiral" from Georgia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. I yield myself 1 additional minute in order that I may yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who always has some constructive suggestions.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I believe both of these measures will be passed unanimously, and I heartily agree with them. The gentleman has covered the matter, to a certain extent, about which I had intended to inquire. We are passing an authorization bill in the House today, and immediately following it we will pass an appropriation bill to cover that authorization, which shows that the House of Representatives, when it is in agreement, can act in a democratic way, according to the rules of the House and the law, and act quickly and with dispatch.

Mr. COLMER. And the House of Representatives is always in agreement when it comes to furthering the war effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is another one of the war measures. It comes before the House with a unanimous report from the Committee on Rules. It is just one of those minor bills that only authorizes the small amount of $1,700,000,000 to build barges and district craft for use at home and abroad. Naturally, having been endorsed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and his committee, it should pass the House unanimously and without a great deal of time spent in debate. However, I do believe that a bill that involves that enormous amount of money should not be passed without having some little consideration by the Congress even in wartime.

I hope that the O. W. I. will take some cognizance of this bill and will try to carry the word or send the information to the Nazis, to the Japanese, and to the Fascists that the Congress of the United States, by a practically unanimous vote, have passed a bill providing for 1,000,000 tons, a large amount of that tonnage in landing craft, aimed to land American troops in Europe, in Italy, and in Japan.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And that will land a great many.

Mr. FISH. Well, that ought to land enough. If I have any complaint about this bill, I will say to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and to his distinguished colleagues, it is that it should have come in a year ago. These landing boats should have been built by this time, for the purpose of conducting a major offensive into Europe and the far Pacific by landing troops in Europe and in Japan. We have been in this war 17 months. In the last war the whole war was over in 19 months and finished by a great Allied victory.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In view of the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from New York, and to keep the record straight, I think I should call attention to the fact that heretofore there have been built 1,100,000 tons of landing craft, by direct appropriation, which was not specifically authorized by the Congress.

That is why the amphibious warfare has been able to be carried on in the invasion at Guadalcanal and on the African coast. We are now insisting that in the future they must come to the committee and come to the Congress to get authorization; but they have already build a large number by direct appropriation for which Congress merely authorized the money.

Mr. FISH. Is the gentleman at liberty to inform the House what percentage has already been built?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I could give the gentleman the number privately, but I prefer not to do it publicly.

Mr. FISH. I am perfectly satisfied as long as I know that in voting for this bill it means that we are providing landing barges in enormous quantities in order to carry the war to Italy, to Europe, and to Japan.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. So that the gentleman from New York and the House can understand what we are doing here today is to let the House and the country know that we are building a particular type of boat which heretofore was merely represented in the appropriation bill as dollars and cents; in other words, we are doing in an orderly manner that which we have heretofore done by direct appropriation without authorization.

Mr. FISH. And I hope the gentleman has some means of carrying that information over the radio through the O. W. I. to our enemy countries so that the people there will know what we are doing and that we propose to do our level best to have sufficient landing barges to invade these countries as soon as possible. That is the purpose of the bill, but I think it might undermine their morale if they knew it cost $1,700,000,000. That might put the fear of God into some of these warlike people and help break their morale, which is a very important feature when we are about to invade their countries.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The country and the world can understand that we

intend by these boats to open up second fronts wherever it is necessary and wherever the military authorities deem it is important to do so.

Mr. FISH. And I hope it will even go as far as to open up a third front, fourth front, or even fifth and sixth fronts, if necessary.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. When I used the phrase "second fronts" it meant more than one place.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that half this money will be used for harbor craft and for district craft that will not be sent overseas but will be held in this country.

Mr. FISH. It is a part of the war effort. It includes many kinds and categories.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I am not certain.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I have the list right here of all the categories.

Mr. FISH. Can the gentleman say what percentage will be district craft?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York I may say that 70 percent of the million tons is for landing craft, 30 percent for district craft. The major portion of it will be used outside of the continental limits of the United States for district craft.

Mr. FISH. So even the district craft, the 30 percent, will largely be used outside continental United States.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I am not certain about that. I challenge that statement, because there are no hearings printed, there is no evidence printed, and the testimony before the committee was not that any of those small craft would be sent out of the United States.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The distinguished gentleman from Kentucky is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. He was present at the executive sessions that the committee held on this bill. He knows that those figures are accurate, because they were given by Navy Department officials.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. I may observe further that this 30 percent of the entire appropriation which goes for district craft goes for craft which are themselves as necessary in their own way to the winning of this war as the actual landing boats. In order to make the record straight on that I just want to read into the RECORD what these district craft consist of.

Mr. FISH. Is that taken from page 2 of the report?

Mr. MOTT. This is taken from page 2 of the report, the first paragraph. I read:

> District craft, including craft of various designs and types which are used in districts, stations, bases, and operating areas at home and abroad. Among such types are tugs of several sizes, oil, gasoline, and water barges, lighters, seaplane wrecking derricks, aircraft rescue boats, aircraft fuel boats, plane rearming launches, plane personnel boats, and bomb target boats, as well as other special designs of craft and boats which are required in war operations at many locations in the continental United States and at practically every advanced base location.

So if we did not have these district craft of course our landing program would be a lopsided one and would not even be workable.

Mr. FISH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. There is no opposition to this bill that I know of.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Naval Affairs has recently through its subcommittee referred to some 207 cases of Navy draft deferments and have severely criticised them. I have spoken repeatedly in this House and pointed out that there were 840,000 Government employees eligible for the draft, and I have pleaded with the Committee on Military Affairs to bring in some kind of legislation to get these men out of Government jobs into uniforms where they can be sent to the battle fronts like other Americans of like age instead of holding these soft jobs here in Washington. Yesterday's paper stated that the Under Secretary of the Interior, a gentleman I do not know at all, by the name of Abe Fortas, 32 years of age, has been given a deferment by the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have never met Mr. Fortas, have never telephoned him, and know very little about him. All I know is that he is 32 years of age and, according to the press, has no children and a wife who is also in the Government service. Now, I am opposed to any deferment except for physical reasons, and I mean any kind of deferment. If we continue to give deferments to men under 38, to men 32 years of age, we will certainly undermine the morale of the people back home. We have a responsibility in this Congress. We voted for the war. We find now that there are 840,000 of these Federal employees of draft age, many of whom are evading military service. I do not see why all of them who are eligible are not put into our armed forces and into uniforms. If they are needed, then we can consider returning them to some positions where they may be essential. But let us not take the higher-ups, the men who were appointed, and certainly not those who are 32 years of age, and ask deferments for them because they may claim to be essential to the Government service. No one is essential to the Government service, including members of the Cabinet. Mr. Fortas can be replaced by an older man or by a woman or someone else who will do the job just as well. If he is needed today he is needed in our armed forces in the greatest war in our history.

Mr. McMURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. McMURRAY. I think it ought to be said here on this floor that Mr. Fortas of Tennessee is in the Government service, that he has been there for some years, that he is recognized by students and teachers of public administration as one of the most outstanding young administrators ever developed anywhere in our country. I happen to know, and I hope Mr. Fortas will forgive me for saying this, that he has wanted to get into the armed services of this country ever since this war started and even before the war started. I happen to know that he wants to wear the uniform of the United States of America. I happen to know that he would immediately give up the top job that perhaps any young man holds in the Government today, he would give it up willingly, and put on the uniform of the United States of America. He did, over the protest of his superiors and his fellow workers, submit his resignation so that he might become a member of the armed forces of the United States. These superiors, whether wisely or unwisely, have made this decision for Mr. Fortas. There is nothing he can do about it. He is an outstanding administrator. He is one of those men of whom we who teach public administration say has a "feeling for the jugular." He knows how to get important things done and his job as Under Secretary of the Interior is an extremely important war job, not in his opinion, not more important than being in the armed forces in his opinion, but in the opinion of his superiors, the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, and the President of the United States, Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. I would like to ask a question of the gentleman who just addressed the House. I do not know anything about Mr. Fortas and I never heard of him before. May I ask the gentleman if there is anything about our Constitution or the laws of our country that forbids a Federal employee from resigning his job if he wants to and joining the armed forces?

Mr. McMURRAY. I know nothing about any laws forbidding his resignation. There is the matter of a sense of obligation which anyone has in this war effort. He has been told by those who direct him, against his own will, let me repeat, to stay on the job. If the President tells one to stay on the job, and he is the Commander in Chief, what does one do?

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman is not quite accurate in that. The President is not my Commander in Chief or your Commander in Chief. He is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy of the United States. The man

you are talking about is not yet a member of the Army or Navy of the United States; therefore the President is not his Commander in Chief in any legal sense whatever.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Fortas was appointed by the President of the United States and the President of the United States is his chief. Whether you want to add "Commander" or not is immaterial. He is working for the President.

Mr. MOTT. You said his Commander in Chief.

Mr. McMURRAY. Franklin D. Roosevelt is my Commander in Chief, and I am proud of it.

Mr. MOTT. I do not want to quibble, but there is nothing to prevent this gentleman from resigning.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The answer to the gentleman's question is "Yes; anybody can resign, even a Member of Congress."

Mr. MOTT. Yes, and some Members of Congress within the military age have resigned from the Congress and have joined the Army.

Mr. McCORMACK. The answer is that anybody can resign.

Mr. FISH. I am glad the gentleman from Wisconsin made the statement he did, as my remarks are not directed against Mr. Fortas but against deferments for Government officials.

Mr. MOTT. If the gentleman will yield further, I might reverse that also and say that some Members of Congress have resigned from the armed service to come to Congress—at least one has.

Mr. FISH. There is nothing personal in this matter. I am glad the gentleman took the floor to say that Mr. Fortas has a good record and wanted previously to go into the armed services. However, it is men like Mr. Fortas who have the opportunity to set a fine patriotic example to the country by taking his place with other Americans of the same age in our armed forces.

What I am complaining about is that we should give any deferment to anyone at all, particularly to a man who has no children and is only 32 years of age, who is physically fit and should have been in the service long before, and not wait until he gets a letter from the President saying he is needed in the Interior Department. I believe everybody who is physically qualified, of draft age, can best serve his country in the Army or Navy no matter what position he holds. I do not know Mr. Fortas nor his politics. He may have an excellent record, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has said, but why make any exception for any public official? They should be the first to enlist and last to claim or accept deferment. I think deferment should be granted only in case of technicians or airplane designers or engineers, and these politicians, these Government - appointed bureaucrats, every one of them ought to be in the service if they are of draft age. That is what I am complaining about. This is a bad precedent to establish and particularly for public officials and bureaucrats. It will tend to undermine morale. What will the people back in my district and in your district think when their sons are called into the service and they learn that a Government official, 32 years of age, with no children or dependents is deferred while holding a $10,000 position as Under Secretary of the Interior and their sons are drafted into our armed forces at $50 a month?

Mr. HOFFMAN. And his wife.

Mr. FISH. Yes, his wife also, although all I know about that is what I read in the papers. I am told that she is being paid $5,000.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I do not believe the gentleman would like the RECORD to show, as would appear by his statement, that public officials in the Government are inferior or can be so easily replaced in every instance, and that their superior efforts are not vital and important to the war effort.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Fortas has held his present position for a comparatively short time. I do not believe any public official is indispensable, from the President right on down, including Members of Congress. I do not believe any bureaucrat is indispensable. And certainly I do not believe anybody who is 32 years of age is indispensable. If he is as good as these gentlemen say he is, he ought to be in the Army or Navy. Put him in uniform, and then, if he is needed, and proves to be indispensable, he can be sent where he is most needed.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I understand very well from the gentleman's statement that this is not a personal matter between him and me, but I should like to make it clear at this point that this person under consideration happens to be working directly under the President of the United States, who happens to be the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States, and he is subject to the President's direction in time of war. It seems to me, as a matter of patriotism, he is subject to the decisions of his Commander in Chief, and he would be only too happy if his Commander in Chief would say, "Mr. Fortas, I prefer to see you in North Africa."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to all these deferments and especially to letting Federal employees stay in the Government service who are 32 years of age without dependents simply because they are good men, because they are needed, or because the President says so. They can perform just as good or better service in our armed forces, where young and able men are needed. President Roosevelt is establishing a bad precedent for the whole country and perhaps the President himself is the one we should criticize and not Mr. Fortas. Mr. Speaker, the Congress should pass a law providing that no one should be deferred, of draft age, if he is physically fit. My point is that it is a bad policy to defer any public official, as it sets a deplorable precedent.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. The President is not asking that we place in a deferred status public officials; the President has not asked that public officials be deferred.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to my distinguished friend from Tennessee, who served with distinction in the last World War.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from New York will agree that every man should serve where he can be of best service to his country, and if those who are in position to judge feel that this particular individual, Mr. Fortas, can be of greater service to this country and greater service to the war effort in the important work which he is now doing, and he is doing important work, then would not the President be justified in having Mr. Fortas remain in his present position?

Mr. FISH. The answer to the gentleman's question is that I am against any deferments whatever. I say, put him in the Army right along with other men and then, if his services are absolutely essential, send him back in uniform at $50 per month. I do not believe in any discrimination because of politics, race, color, or creed for any public official of draft age and without dependents

The gentleman realizes that we now have some 840,000 Government employees under 38. I do not know Mr. Fortas, and I am willing to accept everything that has been said about him, but there are still 840,000 men of draft age in the Federal Government service and if we begin to give deferments, where are we going to stop? That is the question.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. But we have set up a system and the gentleman is speaking in reference to a general policy, is he not?

Mr. FISH. I am opposed to granting deferments except in the case of physical disability. They should not be granted for political reasons. No public official or bureaucrat from Members of the Cabinet down are indispensable. All of them can be replaced. I submit it is the duty of every one of them to come out of the Government dugouts and set an example to all other Americans of draft age. There must be no favoritism, politics, or special privilege in connection with the drafting of American youth. It may be it is the President we should criticize. If so the responsibility is his. It certainly will not promote public morale to have the President grant deferments to his official family when the Nation is being told that we have not sufficient man-

power without drafting fathers and men with dependents

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, let me give just a word of explanation, with the hope that it may arouse a little curiosity. The special order I had yesterday and that is now in the RECORD required a great deal of time in its preparation. It is well documented, so that the conclusions arrived at will be very difficult to get around. In that special order I attempted to prove, and I did to my own satisfaction, that the Socialist program of a something-for-nothing philosophy that is contained in the cradle-to-grave or womb-to-tomb security allusion found in the report of the National Resources Planning Board permeates the whole New Deal program. I offer as exhibits the leading new dealers and use their own words to prove my point. I recommend it as preferred reading to the Members of the House.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I noticed a very good account of the gentleman's speech in the morning papers. I also noticed that the gentleman gives credit for this cradle-to-grave plan to a certain lady.

Mr. MASON. Dr. Eveline Burns.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman believe she is solely responsible for the plan, or are other members of the National Resources Planning Board also responsible for it?

Mr. MASON. No. If the gentleman will read my speech in the RECORD he will find that the report is just one sample of an effort by a group of people in the Government service to bring about that result. I show that while she did that job, behind her is a whole group that is working for the same cause.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman believe Mr. Delano subscribed to the plan?

Mr. MASON. The gentleman does not believe that Mr. Delano subscribed, because Mr. Delano's whole life history proves that he does not believe in any socialistic philosophy. He has had a remarkable career as a practical man at the head of a railroad.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

By unanimous consent, a call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 72]

Arnold	Boren	Case
Balwin, Md.	Buckley	Cochran
Baldwin, N. Y.	Buffett	Cole, N. Y.
Barden	Burdick	Culkin
Barry	Byrne	Cullen
Bell	Cannon, Fla.	Dies
Douglas	Judd	Reece, Tenn.
Durham	Kee	Rodgers, Pa.
Fay	Keefe	Rogers, Calif.
Fernandez	Kennedy	Rowan
Ford	Keogh	Rowe
Furlong	King	Sabath
Gavagan	Kleberg	Satterfield
Gerlach	Klein	Sauthoff
Gibson	Larcade	Scanlon
Gifford	LeFevre	Shafer
Gore	Luce	Sheridan
Grant, Ind.	Lynch	Simpson, Ill.
Green	McGranery	Smith, W. Va.
Guyer	Maas	Snyder
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Magnuson	Stanley
	Mansfield, Tex.	Taylor
Hall, Leonard W.	Merritt	Thomas, N. J.
	Miller, Pa.	Treadway
Halleck	Morrison, N. C.	Voorhis, Calif.
Hancock	Nichols	Weiss
Hébert	Norman	Wene
Heffernan	Norton	White
Herter	O'Konski	Winter
Hess	O'Toole	Wolfenden, Pa.
Holmes, Mass.	Pfeifer	Worley
Horan	Philbin	
Jennings	Pracht	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 337 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mrs. Mary Cain, of Summit, Miss., addressed to both branches of the Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday at my request permission was granted the Commissioner from Puerto Rico to extend his own remarks in the RECORD. I am now informed that those remarks exceed the limit, taking up approximately two and one-third pages of the RECORD at a cost of $105. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding this fact the remarks may be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL BOATS FOR THE NAVY

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2581) authorizing the acquisition and conversion of construction of certain landing craft, district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2581), with Mr. RICHARDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this bill is presented to the House and the committee by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY], who will explain the bill, and to whom I now yield 10 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to authorize the construction of 1,000,000 tons of landing and district craft for the Navy, and to authorize the appropriation of the necessary funds. The estimated cost is $1,700,000,000.

This is the first bill which has ever been reported for such ships as such. Prior to the war, we had no landing ships, and only a relatively small number of district craft. These were principally small craft assigned to naval districts. They included a few landing craft for training in landing operations. The construction of such district craft was not made the subject of special legislative authorization; instead, they were included in the appropriation "Miscellaneous Bureau of Ships."

When the war began, the demand for the special types which this bill authorizes was large and immediate. Ships and craft of special designs, known and classified as landing ships and landing craft of various types, were required to mount our amphibious operations. Specially designed craft and boats of many types were needed to equip and to serve our expanding bases, both at home and abroad. These are classified as district craft, but they embrace many new types and are not confined to those used in established naval districts.

The number to be required in the various types could not be forecast definitely, because that depended on the number of operations to be undertaken, the losses to be experienced in these operations, and in training, the rate at which advanced bases were to be established, and other factors, including the fact that the Navy is the sole source of supply to the Army, and a partial supply to our allies, of amphibious craft.

The Navy Department proceeded under these conditions with the construction of landing and district craft. The general directive in this construction was provided by the combined Chiefs of Staff, and construction went ahead in accordance with the requirements of the tactical situation and the development of our bases, both land and air.

Along shores bordered by the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans and the Mediterranean Sea, these ships and craft have taken their part. The attacking forces, their guns, tanks, and other equipment, have moved ashore swiftly and successfully. In the 17 months since Pearl Harbor, we have gained in experience in the design and use of landing craft, and they have proved their value.

Most of the larger landing ships that have been laid down were charged to the 1,799 Vessels Act of February 6, 1942—

Public Law 440, Seventy-seventh Congress. This authority is now substantially exhausted. The smaller landing craft were constructed against maintenance appropriations for the Bureau of Ships. This placed an extremely heavy drain on those appropriations, a drain not contemplated when such appropriations were made. The construction of district craft, such as tugs and lighters, imposed a similar heavy and unforeseen drain on the Bureau of Ships.

In order to restore the necessary maintenance funds for the Bureau of Ships, the Navy Department requested an appropriation for the purpose when the Supplemental Naval Appropriations Act, 1943, was before the Congress. This request was questioned in committee and was the subject of comment on the floor of the House, particularly on the score that the construction of district craft should be undertaken only on the authority of legislation specifically authorizing appropriations for naval projects of this size and character.

In the opinion of your committee, the legislative procedure which was followed in the past year should not be continued. The established and orderly procedure is for legislation authorizing appropriations for naval construction first to be enacted and to be followed by appropriations. The Navy Department has agreed that this procedure should hereafter be followed, particularly when projects reach the size covered by the bill now before the House.

Under the authorizations and appropriations heretofore made, the Navy has laid down 1,100,000 tons of landing and district craft to cost, in the aggregate, $1,900,000,000. The bill provides for another million tons of such craft, and the Navy Department has estimated that $1,700,000,000 will be required for the purpose.

These ships and smaller craft are of many types and designs. The landing craft range in size from the small rubber boat to the landing ship dock. They include all types designed for amphibious operations, except transports. District craft include such items as tugs of various sizes, oil, gasoline, and water barges, lighters, seaplane wrecking derricks, aircraft rescue boats, aircraft fuel boats, plane rearming launches, plane personnel boats, and bomb target boats. These and other types are needed in operations at many locations in the continental United States and at practically every advanced base.

The smaller units of this program are built quickly. The larger units require a longer time for construction but generally not as long a time as combatant vessels. The numbers required are not subject to exact prediction. Representatives of the Navy Department stated to the Committee that requirements for vessels authorized by this bill are necessarily subject to change, in types, details, and other respects, as a result of war developments, and operations and losses. Your committee is satisfied such changes will occur and that it would be unwise to attempt to specify the particular types or the numbers of each type to be authorized.

The Navy Department's estimate is that this bill will provide a sufficient tonnage of these craft for the next 12 months. This estimate is predicated, among other things, on the experience so far gained in the war. Your committee believes that the estimate is as satisfactory as the uncertainties of the general situation will permit.

None of the types covered by the bill are substitutes for the private craft which the Navy took over in large numbers following the outbreak of the war. That was done because the private craft were then available, and were needed and useful in particular duties, mainly of the shore patrol type. Such private craft cannot serve the purposes for which the craft authorized by the bill are designed.

None of the craft covered by the bill are included in the naval auxiliary vessels authorized by the bill H. R. 1563, which recently passed this House. The present bill provides for two additional types of vessels, namely, landing and district craft, and these types have not previously been provided for specifically. As introduced, the bill provided for a third class, namely, special boats. The committee was advised that the general classification "district craft" includes special boats, and for that reason deleted from the bill the reference to special boats.

The types of craft provided for by this bill will provide the means for speed and efficiency in naval and joint operations. Some of them may be engaged in shore attacks, in new landings to come. Your committee believes this country will deny its fighting forces nothing that they need and that is within its power to produce or supply. The ships provided by this bill are vitally needed, they can be supplied, and the committee, therefore unanimously recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say that in the appropriation bill that was reported to the House either yesterday afternoon or this morning provision is made to make available the money authorized in the program under consideration now.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I thank my chairman for that contribution. Mr. Chairman, there has already been constructed 1,100,000 tons of landing and district craft, by the Navy. I reiterate that because of the statement of the gentleman from New York to the effect that he felt the Navy was a little tardy in coming before the Congress for this program.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman realizes that in modern war, especially the type of war carried on by the vessels the gentleman is recommending, oil is a very much needed commodity.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Oh, I hope the gentleman will not intrude any other matter into the debate on this bill. I wish to confine my remarks to the bill itself.

Mr. PATMAN. But this is germane.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Not at the moment. The gentleman has some other motive in his mind. He is trying to advocate an increase in the price of oil. I am talking about the enactment of the bill authorizing the construction of a million tons of landing craft and district craft necessary for the operation of the war, and that is the only thing that the Naval Affairs Committee is recommending to the House, the speedy enactment into law of this bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I might say to the gentleman that the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations in justification for the landing craft and other similar craft incorporated in the presentation makes this legislation imperative before the appropriation of funds necessary to carry on the work. I compliment the committee on the splendid work it has done in a legislative way and further say to the chairman and other members of the committee that as long as I am the chairman of the Navy subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations we will look to the gentleman's committee for proper authorizations. We are not interested in any endeavor to legislate on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman and I assure the gentleman from California that the members of the committee appreciate his cooperation.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman will recognize that before we can make an invasion of the continent or any of the islands in the Pacific, the Navy must have the type of craft which this bill will produce.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes. This provides not only for naval operations but for joint operation of the Navy and the Army in carrying on the war. We had an executive session on the bill, and many things were told to our committee that we would like to give to the House, but I am confident the House will accept the recommendation of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not know whether this is a proper question, but is the gentleman at liberty to tell the House how many ships this will provide for?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Not exactly, and I doubt if the Navy Department could say how many would be constructed, because its provisions are flexible.

Mr. DONDERO. I join in my colleague's comment on the necessity for speedy action, and I compliment the gentleman and his committee.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania has already told you, this bill comes from the Committee on Naval Affairs with its unanimous approval. I have no doubt it will receive the unanimous support of the House.

The reason landing craft of the kind provided in this legislation is necessary is that, of course, we are carrying on a war beyond our shores, and all operations involve landings, as is, of course, well known to everyone who has followed recent developments in the war. Boats of this kind were used in Africa. They have been used in the South Pacific. In today's paper there is a dispatch from Tokyo quoting a Japanese broadcast to the effect that yesterday Americans landed on Attu Island in force, that island which has been bombed many times within the past few weeks. While we do not know anything about the details it may be supposed that landing craft similar to those provided in this bill were used in that operation.

We hope before long, with the aid of these craft, that landings may be made every place in the world where landings are necessary and that the ships provided for in this bill may bring the war to a complete and victorious conclusion at the very earliest possible date.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT].

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, as far as the landing craft carried in this bill is concerned, I am 100 percent for that provision. But we have here an example of the same thing that has been happening in the Navy Department in the last several bills that have been sent to this Congress. They have a lot of stuff in here that should not be allowed. The record and testimony before our committee does not justify the placing of those other items in the bill.

If you will look at the bill you will see it provides for landing craft, for district craft, and for special boats. Special boats was a little too far for our committee to go and we struck that out in committee. I made a fight to strike out the district boats, which will cost $800,000,000 in this bill. One of the district boats was a yacht that cost $80,000. I challenge any member of the committee or the chairman of the committee to show this Congress what that yacht was to be used for.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Not at this time. We had a closed session of the committee. Why should the doors of my committee be locked when we are talking about harbor boats in our harbors? Yachts? Of course, I know it is spring. I know the urge that these naval officers have to take a pleasure ride on a yacht. A Member of this House a few minutes ago told me he was over in Baltimore a short time ago and he wanted to go out to see *Mars*, the big airplane. In riding on this big, beautiful boat he said, "Does the Navy own this craft?" The officer said, "Yes, the Navy owns this boat." "Where did they get it?" "Why, they bought it from me. I sold them the boat and then had the Navy commission me to look after my own boat."

Now, that is what I am appealing to you about today. I am going to offer an amendment to strike out of this bill the authorization for district craft, which will cost this country $800,000,000. The evidence before our committee does not substantiate the need for those boats. Let our committee go back and see what they need.

The good admiral who appeared before our committee admitted that they bought thousands of these little boats. Oh, it is quite different in November and December than it is in May. They take the boat in May and it is all painted up nice. They have every luxury besides musical instruments, and they operate the boat all summer. When cold weather comes they simply lay it up. Hundreds of our boats have been frozen in the Great Lakes and destroyed in the wintertime, because they do not look after them. There is not the same urge then. There is not the same appealing motive that moves them to go fishing and sailing on the blue waters at that time of the year.

Now, what has that got to do with landing craft? Not a thing in the world. I beg of you now, when the men of this country are being taxed until their shirts are being taken off their backs, let us not pour any more money down a rat hole by furnishing every naval officer with a yacht to sail up and down the coast and to fish in. I appeal to you.

The evidence did not last 15 or 20 minutes before our committee. I was doing my best to find out something about it. I asked about the Astor yacht. Was there any printed testimony? No; no testimony printed. I asked about the Dodge yacht. They had an organ on that yacht that would have sold for plenty of money. It has been wrecked. I asked about the old ship, down at Norfolk. A fellow told me, a naval officer, that they paid $85,000 for that boat. They took it out and spent $65,000 repairing it and then turned around and junked it.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FULMER. Of course, we have the WAAC's and the WAVES and the SPARS, and perhaps it is necessary to have these yachts now.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Of course, that is another story. But I appeal to you now—in a few days the tax bill will be back here. The lieutenant, the ensign, or some of these other officers would not be able to operate one of these boats. What do you do? They go out here, get them a boat, and they have to go and get some fellow, a mechanic, to operate that boat, when the mechanics are so badly needed in industry and when there is such manpower shortage. It takes a mechanic to operate a yacht, to keep the motor repaired. It takes several thousand men to look after the yachts the Navy operates.

It seemed to be the attitude of the men down in the Navy Department that this is their Navy. We ought not to say a word about anything they do, it is their Navy. Down in Kentucky all this time my people have been under the impression that it is our Navy and not their Navy. I do not think you can be charged with being disloyal to your country, not ready to defend it, when you oppose such things. Landing boats?

Yes; let them have all the landing boats they can possibly use; give them a billion dollars to build landing boats. But $800,000 for pleasure craft? No; no; do not do it. I shall offer an amendment that will take those items out of the bill. I think they ought to be taken out of the bill. Our committee has not heard any testimony. I asked Admiral Cochran:

"How many boats have you bought since war was declared?"

"I do not know; I have no record."

"Have you bought thousands?"

"Well, I guess so."

Thousands of them. They bought thousands of them, smashed them up, broke them up; first rented them and leased them, and then had to buy them, because when the owners saw them come back dilapidated and injured they said they did not want them back, that the Government would have to buy them; and the taxpayers of the country are now called on to put up another $800,000 in addition to what you have already soaked into this program to buy district craft, harbor craft, yachts at $80,000 a throw. There is the picture.

It is my duty, and I have made this determination, as long as I am a member of this committee I am going to bring these things to your attention; then you can do as you please about them, but as far as I am concerned I want to give the Navy every boat, every submarine, every torpedo, every plane that is needed, but I do not want to give them a single thing that is not needed when this country is bankrupt, when you cannot pay interest on your bonds.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I do not yield.

When your bond sales are falling off, then to come down here and ask for $800,000 on this record with no printed testimony. Strike it out. Strike it out, and let this committee bring a bill in here for district craft so we can have hearings, and let them justify the expenditure of this money. That is all I am asking for at this time. My amendment is a reasonable amendment. I am offering it for the protection of your constituents, and I believe that I stand here justified in my opposition to the district craft included in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

INCREASE PRICE OF OIL TO AID IN WAR EFFORT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully disagree with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that the type of fuel that would be used in this vessel is not a material subject for discussion—it is. May I invite the gentleman's attention to the fact that the price of oil is not the question involved, the question of putting money in people's pockets is not involved in this. The gentleman from Pennsylvania suggested a while ago that the Navy must have this type of equipment in order successfully to prosecute the war. This type of equipment would be worthless unless you had oil as a fuel to use. Oil therefore is very necessary. Did you know, Mr. Chairman—and I want the Members to think about this seriously—that we are using our oil supply five times as fast as we are discovering new fields? Think that over. Did you know that we have sent to foreign battlefields 80 times—not eight—80 times as much oil during the first year of this war as we sent during the first year of World War No. 1? Did you know that we are using more oil today than ever before in history and that 60 percent of every cargo going across the sea is oil? That should impress us with the great importance of oil.

I am not for a price increase solely to help oil operators, that is not it. The gentleman from Pennsylvania should be just as enthusiastic for a price increase as anyone, because he is interested in winning the war. We cannot win this war without oil and we cannot get the necessary oil unless we have new discoveries.

Did you know that it is going to take the discovery of at least one major oil field a week from now on in order for us successfully to carry on this war? That is exactly right, and we are not discovering them; yet as I said, we are using oil five times as fast as we are discovering it. This should be sufficient to put the gentleman on notice that the whole war effort is in jeopardy and we are facing not only national disaster but the possibility of even losing the war on account of failure to give that incentive to discovering the oil that is necessary to properly and effectively carry on this war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to acquire and convert or to undertake the construction of 1,000,000 tons of landing craft, district craft, and special boats, of such size, type, and design as he may consider necessary and best suited for the conduct of amphibious operations, for service to the fleet and shore-based forces, and for naval districts, stations, bases, and operating areas at home and abroad, such craft to be in addition to all auxiliary vessels or craft heretofore authorized.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the comma, and insert "and" and after the word "craft" in the same line strike out "and special boats."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky: Page 1, line 5, after the word "craft", strike out "and district craft."

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I stated a short time ago I would offer to separate landing craft from district craft. As I told you a Member of this body came to me a few minutes ago and said that he went to Baltimore and rode out on a boat; that the boat had been bought by the Navy, and that the Navy turned around and commissioned the owner to operate his own boat. As was suggested to me a moment ago, I do not know whether they bought the boat to get the man or whether they bought the man to get the boat. Is that not a ridiculous situation?

If it were not out of line, I would like to give you the name of the Member who went over there. I think there were three or four in his party who went over there and if he comes on the floor maybe he will let me give you his name.

Anyway our harbors are filled full of yachts, with hundreds of mechanics who are needed at other places, burning up critical materials, burning up fuel oil operating in these harbors with these little boats, many used at the whims of the officers in charge.

There is no evidence here to support the need for such craft. I do not see how this is a military secret or why we should not be permitted to know how many of these yachts they have already bought. They have bought already thousands of them. Now they want to come along and put $800,000,000 more in them. Is there any military secret that would prevent our committee from having open hearings and having testimony that they need these craft? I would be the first one on the committee to come in here and ask you Members to endorse the program if I were convinced they needed them. I do not believe it is a military secret. I think it is more of a Navy secret.

You cannot take everything from the Navy and swallow it a hundred percent. I want to tell you something else. The other day my good chairman—I suppose he thought he was doing me a favor—introduced a bill in my name. I did not know about it until my secretary came to me and said, "The chairman of the committee has introduced a bill in your name." When I went over to the committee the chairman said, "You come around and get in the chair. This is your bill." I did not know it was my bill, but I went around and got in the chair. Then one of the members said, "This is a bad bill." I had never seen it before. But the Navy Department had sent it up here. Everybody down in the Navy Department was for it. I looked at it myself and I said, "It is a bad bill." Then the chairman looked at it and he said, "This is a bad bill," and other members of the committee said it was a bad bill. Then we proceeded to kill it, a measure that had been drafted and approved by the Navy Department. They are not infallible, they are humar beings, so do not turn them loose to spend money everywhere they want to spend it. One lieutenant will see another lieutenant with a nice shiny boat and he will turn around and want one like it. He will go out in the harbor and see one belonging to an individual and he will say, "I will get that and I will make Bill look like 30 cents." When one buys a boat that justifies another one buying a boat. If a fellow out in San Francisco sees a boat he wants to buy, he will go and buy it, and if a fellow up in Seattle sees a boat he likes, he will go and buy it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What saving would the gentleman's amendment effect?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. They say there will be a billion dollars here for landing craft and I am leaving that in the bill. Let them have that if they need it. But they say $800,000,000 will be for district craft. Well, when they say $800,000,000 I multiply that by two. It will be a billion and a half dollars by the time they get through buying yachts up and down the coast and along the shores of the Great Lakes. Their estimate is $800,000,000, according to their own testimony.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What is meant by "district craft"?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Craft used in the harbors, rivers, and on the Great Lakes.

Now, there you are. There is the program of $800,000,000. If they need it, let them come back to the committee and justify it. They have not justified it so far. They were before our committee only a few minutes, and the fellow who appeared did not know much about it. He said he did not know how many they had already bought. He admitted they bought thousands. He admitted some of them had been wrecked; he admitted some of the boats had rotted; and he admitted they had been cheated. If you strike this out, we can find out how much they need, then let them have that, whatever they need, and no more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT].

Mr. Chairman, I trust this committee will vote down overwhelmingly the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky.

If there is any Member of this House who is very much confused on this question, it is our good friend from Kentucky. It is true the Navy has purchased a great many yachts.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Will the gentleman tell the House how many boats and how many yachts have been purchased?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; I will.

It is true the Navy has bought a great many boats, a great many fishing boats, and a great many yachts, and a great many other types of boats. Every one of these boats that the Navy has bought has been used and is being used for patrolling the coast to combat submarines. Not a single one of them is being used for harbor purposes. Let us see what supporting this amendment will do to cripple the operation of planes and endanger the lives of our sailors. Here is the testimony.

It is true, as the gentleman has said, the bill was heard in executive session and should have been heard in executive session. It is true that a great many of them are heard in executive session, but we always have a stenographic report.

Let me read to you from the testimony of Admiral Cochrane:

> It is impossible to visualize a properly operating naval air base or station, with many valuable planes operating over the water, which does not have—
>
> (a) Aircraft rescue boats to rescue personnel of planes which may crash offshore; and
>
> (b) Seaplane wrecking derricks to salvage available planes or portions of planes which may crash offshore.

And listen to this:

> (c) Means for getting crews, ammunition, and fuel to seaplanes without requiring them to be hauled up on the beach in case of need for replenishment.
>
> It is difficult to visualize a harbor into which vessels of the fleet are supposed to come for replenishment of their fuel, supplies, ammunition, etc., if there are no means of getting these materials to the ships. Those places in the world where any naval vessel can get alongside a wharf and have fuel oil and water hoses connected directly with the ship, and can have ammunition and food loaded into the ship by hand or by plane, are very few. In every other spot where ships replenish their supplies, it is necessary to have craft suitable for transporting fuel oil, gasoline, fresh water, provision, ammunition, and general stores to the ships.

That is what the bill is for, in this particular item, which the learned gentleman from Kentucky proposes to strike out.

How could you operate from Guadalcanal, where there is not a single pier, unless for this type of boat?

Mr. Chairman, I will not trespass upon the intelligence of this committee with any more discussion of the amendment.

May I say, some reference was made to the yacht acquired from Mr. Vincent Astor. His yacht was acquired by the Government for $1 a year and is used in submarine warfare, and every other yacht the Government uses is for that or a similar purpose.

It is true that the Naval Affairs Committee has criticized the Navy in the amount of money that we have had to pay, in some instances. Here is the report filed by the Naval Affairs Committee criticizing the Navy Department for the amount of money that was paid, and the only member who refused to concur in that report and refused to sign it was the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Is it not also true that the Navy has been very vigorously criticized for not making ample payment for the boats that have been taken over?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; certainly. Mr. Chairman, if you do not want the water, if you do not want the ammunition, if you do not want the fuel to go to these ships that cannot get in to the shore, then vote in favor of this amendment and say that if they cannot come up to the pier they cannot have their supplies and their services.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members may not be influenced by the enthusiasm of the gentleman from Kentucky and do anything which would embarrass this bill insofar as district craft is concerned.

As was stated by our distinguished chairman, the yacht which the gentleman from Kentucky referred to has nothing whatever to do with this bill. It is not included in it, it is not included in the category of district craft.

It is true that at the beginning of the war both the Army and the Navy were obliged to buy up every kind and any kind of small craft that they could get, and they used them in patrol duty.

As to the nature of these district craft, the different types of which are named on page 2 of the report, I may say that all of the types are needed at several naval stations. While this debate was going on, I received telephone information that the Secretary of the Navy had approved a sum of $600,000 for implementing the naval station at Astoria, Oreg., where 50 airplanes and some carriers at the Portland yard will be outfitted, and their crews trained and sent to sea this year—50 of them from that one station at Astoria, Oreg. In conditioning these boats, in training their crews, landing of the boats, and taking off from the carriers, every type of district craft referred to in this report will be used. I may say further that not one naval station, either in the continental United States or in the outlying areas, could be operated without having these district craft. They are just as important as the main landing ships that are provided for in this bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that every time we establish a naval operating base, we have to duplicate the district craft that is now supplied in the various naval bases up and down the east and west coasts of this country?

Mr. MOTT. We do, and one of the purposes of the bill is to provide for obtaining more of these craft, so we will not have to duplicate and so we will not have to borrow from one station to supply another.

You recall, of course, that when the Aleutian attack first came at Dutch Harbor they almost had to rob every naval air station on the Pacific coast of their aircraft for awhile. We have got new aircraft since then and these stations have been implemented.

This is an extremely important part of the bill, and I am sure no one will vote to strike it out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky: On page 2, line 2, after the word "authorized", strike out the period and add a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That no vessel, boat, or craft shall be purchased, leased, or rented that was constructed or built prior to January 1, 1943."

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I regret that my chairman did not tell you what kind of report it was he said I would not sign that was reported last year as to war profiteering. I would not sign the report because it left Chip Roberts out. The evidence showed that Chip Roberts had gotten $900,000 out of only a few projects, not including the ones he has gotten since that time. It left out the profits that had been made by Admiral Harris, a retired officer, former Chief of Yards and Docks, who was drawing retired pay from the Government—a pension from the Government—and at the same time getting contracts from the Government. It left out this man Kahn, who has been paid enormous sums. I would not sign the report because it was too weak.

It reminded me of an incident that happened last fall when I went home. Some of my good friends came over to go hunting with me. I took my bird dog out to show them how good he would hunt. The first dive out of the box he ran into a big covey of birds and scared them up and they flew away. We could not even find them. I said, "I'll fix old Bob." I took him around behind a few bushes and I took him by the ear and I made him yell; and I went back and I said, "He won't do that any more. I gave him a good licking." The boys said, "Yes, we watched you. You whipped him with a weed."

That was the trouble with the report that I would not sign. It seemed to me to be whipping fellows that had profiteered with a weed, and I would not sign it. If I am to be condemned for that, I will take great pleasure in receiving the condemnation.

Now, I have offered an amendment that I know will be approved. Admiral Cochrane suggested this amendment in committee. He suggested that no craft be rented or leased that was built prior to January 1, 1943. That will keep them

from going around and buying these old rotten boats. That will see that we get new boats; that we will get our money's worth on this proposition. I am certain that no member of the committee will oppose this, when it was suggested by Admiral Cochrane before our committee.

If we have to spend $800,000,000 for yachts, let us at least get new ones. The boys will like them much better. Now, I hope we will follow the suggestion of the admiral that suggested the language of this amendment.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the trouble about the gentleman's amendment is that the Navy Department would be precluded from acquiring or purchasing any ships that might be suitable or available or that might have been constructed by the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration. We have the understanding with the Navy Department that they are not going to buy any ships unless they are absolutely essential and necessary and meet a certain military requirement. They propose to build as fast as possible nearly everything referred to in this bill, but it might so happen that they find a ship, a tug, or a small boat that has been built by the Maritime Commission that it is necessary to buy. Therefore, it would be a short-sighted policy to say that you cannot buy anything that was built prior to January 1, 1943.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Did not Admiral Cochrane suggest that amendment, in substance?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No, the Admiral says this, and the testimony is right on this table. The Admiral said that it would be unthinkable to go out and buy old ships and not build practically everything that is called for in this bill, but he did point out, as the committee pointed out, that we should have the right to take them from the Maritime Commission if the Maritime Commission has them. What is the use of building one in this emergency if you can go out and buy one that will meet the Navy's requirements? But the committee can understand that there is no intention on the part of the Navy to go out and buy any ship unless it is properly constructed and necessary for Navy needs. Therefore, it would hamstring the Navy and would be a too narrow interpretation of fixing a statute to say that they must have something built since January 1, 1943.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I desire only to reinforce the observation made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], when he discussed the very great need for most careful consideration by the Congress, and by all agencies of our Administration, of the necessity for providing additional oil reserves for the successful prosecution of the war.

I think, even in a discussion of this type, it is well for us to realize that this conflict is being fought on wheels and wings. We are engaged in a mechanized battle. We, in this country, are faced with an acute shortage of oil reserves with which to fuel the planes, tanks, and other units. We realize that today we are consuming approximately 30,000,000 barrels of crude oil each week, yet we are not discovering that crude oil by one-fifth the amount necessary to keep pace with the extreme demands upon us. This may lead to tragic ends. For example, let us consider the raid within the last 36 hours on Duisburg, Germany, engaged in by 1,000 planes of the Royal Air Force. In that one bombing there were consumed more than 1,000,000 gallons of high octane gasoline, and it takes 4,000,000 gallons of crude oil to produce that amount of fuel. These raids will increase in frequency and intensity in the summer and autumn. We will need more and more oil production—yet as of this date no real effort has been made to correct a situation hampering our war effort in this phase.

I think we should all recognize that the Coordinator of our Oil Administration, Secretary Ickes, is absolutely correct when he says that we must stimulate the production of crude oil in this country, and do it now. I regret exceedingly that the Office of Price Administration apparently closes its eyes to the fact that this is a mobile war, and that we must have the crude oil with which to make effective that mechanization.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The present administration of the subject has in no way clarified the situation in which we find oil producing wells in California checked down to the extent that we are losing their productivity, because of the control effected by one agency of the Government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why is that?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Apparently we find a condition existing where the Government, in conflict within its own agencies, will not stimulate the production of oil so necessary to carry forward the war.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the gentleman from West Virginia and I concur in them. However, I presume the gentleman does not contend that this should be written into this legislation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Oh, no. The only reason I presented the matter just now is because of the observation of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] on the subject matter, which so impressed me that I felt I ought to reinforce his views.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. The witnesses before the Rivers and Harbors Committee testified within the last 18 months, that oil wells in Texas have been checked down to 20 percent of their productivity, and for that reason the supply of oil was not being produced up to full extent.

Mr. PATMAN. That question was gone into thoroughly, and taken into consideration by Mr. Ickes. Transportation and other problems are involved in that. Take, for instance, this large 24-inch pipe line. It will not serve all of the oil wells, and some oil wells will still be choked down, because we do not have the transportation. That question has been gone into and given consideration by Mr. Ickes in his recommendation.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the impression left by the statement made by the gentleman from West Virginia is that the question of supply of oil or the resources of surplus oil are cut down, and that we are not producing enough to meet the requirements for oil.

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. What I said is true.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fine statement of the Speaker of the House, made on this floor some weeks ago, in which he pointed out that it is the small independent oil producer who suffers so much when the price of oil is down. He has no profit from refining and distribution and the sale of gasoline and other byproducts of crude oil, when they must operate at a loss in the production of crude oil.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is a correct statement. The price of crude oil has not advanced in 5 years. This is an important matter, and I hope the House will concentrate its attention on it, for a failure to act has implications which could well stay, for months, the ultimate time of victory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the special subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs investigating draft practices, of which I am a member, is rather impatiently awaiting further developments in the case of Abe Fortas. Mr. Fortas, the heretofore little known Under Secretary of the Interior, is the young man who has recently achieved considerable prominence by reason of the strenuous efforts of his chief, Interior Secretary Ickes, and President Roosevelt, to keep him out of military service.

Secretary Ickes, it will be remembered, is the Federal official who arbitrarily told

our committee that he had asked for deferment for too few, rather than too many, of his employees; and who stated that he intended hereafter to request more, rather than fewer, deferments in his department. Following this stated policy, Mr. Ickes had made a quite vigorous case for his Under Secretary. Not only has his boss gone to bat for Mr. Fortas, the President has gone out of his way to state his belief that Fortas is of more value in the war effort as general handy man in the Department of the Interior than he could be in military service. All of this despite the fact that there is apparently nothing in Mr. Fortas' training and brief administrative experience to indicate that he could fill this job of questionable importance any better, if indeed as well, as hundreds of more experienced men well over the age for military service.

I am perfectly willing to accept at face value the report that Mr. Fortas is ready, for his own part, to resign his civilian post and offer himself for induction. In fact, he is to be commended for this attitude and to be consoled for the official attitude which stands in his way to embarrass him. The fault lies not with Mr. Fortas, or other young men in government who may be caught in this difficult situation, but with the administration policy in such cases.

Secretary Ickes' position in the matter, while understandable, is hardly in keeping with spirit which we should expect from government, which certainly ought to set an example of sacrifice for the rest of the country.

As regrettable as is the position taken by Secretary Ickes in this instance, however, the President's action in the matter is even less excusable. President Roosevelt is the highest authority in all draft classification questions. He literally is the court of last appeal. As such, it is unthinkable that he attempts, as he has in the Fortas case, to circumvent regular selective service routine, and to prejudge a case before it comes to him in the regular order of appeal. Whether he so intended it or not, his statement on this case can hardly be interpreted as anything but an attempt to direct the decision of the local draft board which is supposed to determine Mr. Fortas' status.

Mr. Fortas is a young man 32 years of age. He is married, without any children, and his wife an attorney, is employed in the Department of Justice at $5,600 a year. His duties in the Department of the Interior are purely administrative, and innumerable men may be found beyond the draft age to fill that position. I resent the action of the President and the Secretary of the Interior in denying this man the right to enter the service.

Mr. FISH. Does not the gentleman think, even if he is a member of the Cabinet, that it is his duty to enlist as an example to the country?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Certainly. Generally speaking, of course, I believe that the responsibility of an officeholder or a public employee should be measured in exactly the same way as though he were an ordinary citizen in private life. If he is of draft age and physically fit, if he has no greater dependency claims upon him than other citizens being called to service at the time, and if his job can be dispensed with or filled by another not subject to military service, then beyond the slightest doubt he is remiss in his most sacred duty if he avoids service. Of course, the gentleman and I are in agreement that in no case is an individual indispensable; and that only in the rarest cases is it difficult or impossible to replace him in reasonable time.

I say that as a general rule, every man's responsibility should be measured by the same standards. I would agree with the gentleman, however, that the more richly his country has rewarded the individual in public service, the more eager he should be to discharge his full responsibility, the more ready he should be to serve with the armed forces. As a public figure, he should indeed desire to stand as an example to the rest of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. All time has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon the bill and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee arose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2581, and, pursuant to House Resolution 229, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft, for the United States Navy, and for other purposes."

THE LATE HON. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 235, the Chair appoints the following Members of the House to attend the funeral: Mr. LEA, Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan, Mr. CARTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FORD, Mr. ELLIOTT, and Mr. ROLPH.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an address delivered by Brig. Gen. Clayton S. Adams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF ROSE ANN FRENCH

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 237) from the Committee on Accounts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to the estate of Rose Ann French, late an employee of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to 6 months' salary at the rate she was receiving at the time of her death and an additional amount not to exceed $250 to defray the funeral expenses of said Rose Ann French.

The resolution was agreed to.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2714, Rept. No. 447) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

Pending that motion I would like to see if I can arrive at an agreement with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] as to time for general debate. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if we can agree on 2 hours for general debate on the bill itself and an additional 2 hours on the amendment to be offered by the Special Subcommittee on Subversive Activities when it is reached in the reading of the bill?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, personally I think that 4 hours will be sufficient, but I think we might just as well handle the division of that ourselves. I think we can probably use it to better advantage, and I think we can get along with less than 2 hours on the bill itself and allow the Members perhaps a little more than 2 hours for the other. I think it would be better just to have it 4 hours, to be equally divided, and then you on your side can let the ranking Member on that side, and I on my side can do likewise, handle the time that is used on that feature.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill continue not to exceed 4 hours, the time to be equally divided, and to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself, a portion of which is to be yielded to the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Subversive Activities of Government Employees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it proposed to vote on the Kerr committee amendment today?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not believe we will be able to reach a vote on the amendment today.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Reserving the right to object, could the gentleman assure the House that there will not be a vote on that today?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York, I will say that no vote will be taken on the amendment today.

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think it is going to be absolutely impossible to finish general debate today. Probably it will have to go over to another day. My understanding is it will go over until Monday. Is that the understanding of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We will resume consideration of the bill on Monday, and it is our expectation to ask for a record vote on the amendment to the bill on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, with Mr. PATMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us comprises, in effect, two sections, that covered by the report from the subcommittee on deficiencies, which I have just submitted, carrying urgent deficiency appropriations, and that covered by the report from the subcommittee on subversive activities of Federal employees, submitted by the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge Kerr. I shall discuss the appropriations and shall later yield to Judge Kerr to discuss his report when he offers his amendment during the reading of the bill. The need for this bill is due to the necessity of providing money to meet pay rolls due at the end of May and the corresponding necessity of enacting a law making such appropriations available prior to June 1. Due to the fact that we have enacted in this fiscal year four different laws raising the pay of Federal employees, the four bills involving an additional $400,000,000 for pay rolls for the remainder of this fiscal year, the various agencies of the Government affected by this legislation have had to meet their pay rolls out of their regular appropriations which were made prior to the effective date of the new laws and therefore were obliged to incur these deficiencies. This bill is to provide the deficiencies which they, through no choice of their own, have had to create under the operation of laws passed by the Congress relative to overtime pay and to increase of compensation of Federal employees.

These deficiencies make up the bulk of the pending appropriations. Of the $122,000,000 carried in the bill, such deficiencies account for all but $12,000,000.

The remaining $12,000,000 is divided among eight items which Members will find listed on page 2 of the report. They are largely routine and involve appropriations over which we had little latitude. Perhaps the only one of general interest is the provision relative to the emergency fund of the President.

Beginning on June 11, 1940, Congress made the first appropriation of funds to be used to meet urgent and confidential situations arising in connection, first, with the defense program and, later, following Pearl Harbor, to be used in connection with the prosecution of the war. Altogether we have made available since that date a total of $631,533,000 of which there is still on hand and unobligated $89,322,166.23. All allocations from this fund up to the end of the calendar year of 1942 were reported in the hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill which passed the House early in the session. Subsequent allocations from the first of the year up to and including April 30, 1943, the last available date, are reported in the hearings on the pending bill.

The committee recommends the continuance during the fiscal year 1944 of this unallocated balance of $89,322,166.23 and proposes to make available from this fund $25,000,000 for confidential purposes. Funds available for this purpose have been so depleted that only $3,237,000 remain. This transfer will make available to the President for confidential purposes a total of $28,237,000.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that this is a comparatively small sum for the purpose. During the Spanish-American War President McKinley was given $50,000,000 and President Wilson was allotted $150,000,000 for such purposes in the First World War. In consideration of the sums involved and the extent of operations in the field, the proposed reappropriation and allocation are much smaller, by comparison, than the amounts provided for the purpose in the two former wars.

Of course, neither provision calls for more money or appropriates additional funds. We merely continue during the coming year the available balance remaining from the funds carried for this purpose in the current fiscal year.

If there are no questions on the bill, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this deficiency bill accounts for a total of approximately $134,000,000. $122,000,000 out of the $134,000,000 is made up of items required to meet the war bonus that was voted by the Congress to the civilian employees of the Government. Regardless of how anyone voted upon that, the obligation has been established and the pay roll has to be met. There have developed as we have gone along a great many discouraging features in connection with that situation. I have the personnel records of one unit of the Government in my possession showing a group of 450 employees who draw $2,500 and above receiving an average increase of approximately $1,000 in 12 months. The bureaucrats and the Civil Service Commission have gone hog-wild in promotions and advancements and there is going to be no bottom left in the Treasury if this kind of operation is permitted to continue any longer. The only way we have of putting any brakes on that situation is arbitrarily to cut the size of the appropriation for an agency. I feel that it is the duty of the Civil Service Committee to conduct an investigation of all these agencies and to demonstrate the sort of thing that has been done and to bring in such amendments to the Classification Act as will put an end to this kind of wild operation. It is not a question of giving these people fair pay; it is a question as to whether or not the Civil Service Commission is going to have legislation put over it that will make them show some sense of responsibility to the Government of the United States.

The situation is becoming daily more serious. I am going to call attention to it as these different bills come in. The war bonus that was given to these people is a minor item compared with these tremendous day-to-day appropriations and increases that these people are pulling off. I ran into one situation in the Treasury where the personnel officer received an enormous increase and in the reports the committee got on the subject was a memorandum as to the reason assigned for that increase: No reason assigned. If the Civil Service Commission can get by with that continuously, Congress is going to have no respect for itself and get nowhere. I hope we are going to have some action that will help it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I may say to the gentleman from New York that I agree there has been abuse in the matter about which he has just been talking. I think it arises in part from the action of the Civil Service Commission in delegating to the agencies the right to make grade promotions without preaudit on the part of the Classification Division of the Commission. I think that was a mistake and I have so stated to them. I am glad the gentleman's committee is looking into it and I want to assure him that the Civil Service Committee under the resolution authorizing it to investigate civilian personnel is also inquiring into that subject.

Mr. TABER. While we are right on that particular subject, I want to say that the trouble lies not only with the Civil Service Commission, but with the bureaucrats, the ones there at the head of these departments and agencies, who have the nerve to come up before us and try to make out that they have not any responsibility in that connection. May I

say also that I feel that the head of any agency has some responsibility when the Civil Service Commission has rated a man above what the head of that agency knows he ought to have. In that case it is the duty of the head of that agency to see that an appeal is taken and the proper action results.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I agree with the gentleman on that. I think the chief difficulty in the Federal personnel situation is the failure of the supervisory officials in these agencies to exercise the kind of leadership that they should give to the public service.

Mr. TABER. For my part I intend to do what little I can to see that reductions are made in the gross appropriations for salaries of those agencies where the heads of those agencies do not meet their responsibility in order to make them get down to earth and appreciate their responsibilities.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman mentioned a case where an employee had received an increase of a thousand dollars. Did that increase include the wartime bonus?

Mr. TABER. Oh, my, no. I mentioned a case where a group of 452 employees of one agency who were receiving $2,500 and above had received an average increase in that group of a thousand dollars.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Was that exclusive of the bonus?

Mr. TABER. Exclusive of the war bonus. I intend to have that brought out on the floor in detail when the appropriation for that agency comes before the House.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Could the gentleman answer the general question as to whether the overtime-pay bill that the House passed a short time ago was on the basis of the pay received on January 1, 1941, or was it a bonus or increase on the basis of the base pay they are now getting, including all of these promotions?

Mr. TABER. It jumps around just as their regular salary jumps around. If their salary was a thousand dollars on January 1 they would get a certain percentage.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman permit me to explain something to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The question whether or not the increase in pay that the gentleman from New York is talking about would affect the overtime pay depends on what the salary was, because we had a limitation of $2,900. In other words, they get no increased pay on any salary above $2,900, so that if the employees he is talking about were getting more than $2,900, an increase in their base pay would not increase the overtime pay.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The $2,900 is not what that employee or class of employee was getting on January 1, 1941, but the first $2,900 that he gets now. Is that not true?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Of course, the overtime is based on his present salary.

Mr. TABER. On the salary for the month this bonus is figured.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Referring to page 3 of this bill, under "Defense Aid," what number of employees will that involve?

Mr. TABER. Well, I cannot give the gentleman offhand the exact figure. It is a few hundred thousand dollars, two or three hundred thousand dollars, involving the employees in the local office down here.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The amount will be two or three hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. TABER. That is my recollection of what it figures. It is not a big figure. It is a deficiency that will be applicable for about the month of June.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend at the present time, unless I find out something that I do not know about now, to offer amendments to this deficiency bill. It has been cut some. There are some things in it that I do not like too well and some things I was rather hesitant about, but, on the other hand, most of them are urgently needed. As I stated, $122,000,000 out of the $134,000,000 are absolutely required to meet this pay question. Then there are $3,000,000 for ration books in the Office of Price Administration to be used after the first of July. That is an item that really will come out of the 1944 Budget. It is an advance on that year. These have to be printed ahead of time so that they can be made available to take care of the public demand.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is the Public Printer now able to deliver those or are those printed by outside printers?

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean the Government Printing Office?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Today the Government Printing Office does not do a very big percentage of the Government work; just a little here and there comparatively, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and a few things for the old-line Departments; that is about all.

Mr. CRAWFORD. A great deal of the work is farmed out, you might say?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. To outside concerns?

Mr. TABER. Farmed out by the Government Printing Office. There is another item that the gentleman from Missouri referred to, an extension of the so-called emergency fund for the President. Something less than $90,000,000 is available presently; probably there will be a little less than that the 1st of July.

The allotments from that fund since about a year ago, when a conference was had with the Budget with reference to it, have not been of the serious character that they were at one time, and we were assured that there will not be a tendency on the part of the Chief Executive to make allotments for those things that have no relationship to military activities.

Of course, none of us wants to object to anything that is absolutely necessary and immediately urgent for the war effort, regardless of what it is, but, for instance, the allotments from January 1 to May 1, were approximately $1,000,000—a few dollars over that, but not much. There might have been some question as to some of them, as to whether they should have come up through their budget and asked for an appropriation, but there was no question as to any of them that I was able to see where we would not have been compelled to provide money if the request had been made. They consisted of many small items of $15,000 and $20,000. No very large, outstanding items; none for any activity of a brand-new character were included.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The members of your committee are fairly well familiarized with the operations that are carried on with that fund; are they not?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Insofar as your committee is concerned?

Mr. TABER. And as to some of them, of a large character—and I recall one of a very large character—we are advised in advance before the allotments are made and the matter is discussed with the members of the committee before they are made.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman feel that none of these funds, of any consequence, will be used for financing agencies of the Government of certain types of operations or certain agencies of the Government which have no military character?

Mr. TABER. We have not heard of any where that might happen.

For instance, if this bill should not be passed before the 1st of June, that is, if it should not become a law before the 1st of June, in order to meet the pay rolls of several of the regular departments and agencies, perhaps it would be necessary to make allotments from that fund. There is a provision made that if such an allotment should have to be made, the emergency fund should be reimbursed out of these appropriations for the war bonus equal to the amount of that which had been allotted. That would not be strictly a war proposition, in a way. On the other hand, it would be an emergency item that would be justified.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I just came in. May I ask if the gentleman has touched upon the Howard University matter?

Mr. TABER. I have not.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to inform the gentleman that I have had a conference with the War Production Board, and they

told me that was an individual case and they would look into it carefully, because of the fact that, as they explained, the furnaces were not over 7 years old, that they were originally installed as oil burners, and they would have to be unbricked, and I found that through getting an auxiliary burner for coal we might be able to bypass some of their requests, and thereby conserve that valuable installation.

You will remember we covered that in our investigation.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] and I spent a very considerable time last Saturday going into that question, with the idea of trying to fine some way to handle the Howard University boiler situation without a mess being made of it. We were very much distressed to be presented with a proposal to tear down the boilers which were set up in the air 6 or 7 feet, in the way the modern oil burner is, and lower them down to try to put grates under them.

It seemed like a mess of a job and a waste of money, and we went into it very carefully; and I think he and I were convinced that the proper procedure would be for a new boiler or a second-hand, if necessary, to be installed, and there was space enough in the powerhouse so that it could be operated with coal, and simply use enough oil in the oil burner to take care of the peak load. That seemed much more intelligent to us than to wreck that expensive installation.

I want to compliment the way in which the gentleman from Michigan handled the matter, and the knowledge that I feel he possessed and the way he handled it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the President has been allotting money from this fund for several years to the so-called Resources Planning Board, and I am just wondering what assurance we have that he is not going to use any part of this fund or to make allotments of it to that Board?

Mr. TABER. I do not know.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. We have no assurance that he will not use the money to do that?

Mr. TABER. No; we hope that will not happen.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the statement made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] when the Bureau of the Budget was before us on the same question in January of last year.

Speaking of the emergency fund of the President at that time the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] said, and I quote:

> All too many criticisms have been leveled at the Government of the United States, and they were justified in many instances; too many criticisms have been leveled at the Congress and the Chief Executive because some agency set up by an Executive order, without the sanction of the Congress, is financed out of these things and launched on such a grandiose scale, and you put us in the position of either repudiating what the Commander in Chief has done or going on and taking the censure and the responsibility for it; and I for one feel this matter very keenly. I think it is a matter of concern to us and to our system of government. I am speaking very frankly, and I hope it will not occur again. Tremendous criticism is heaped on the Office of Civilian Defense, the Office of Price Administration, and the War Manpower Commission. Those things have created controversy untold and criticism untold on us and on the Chief Executive, and they were all set up by Executive order, and set up under a grandiose scheme without any consultation with the lawmaking body; and then you come before the regular committees for funds to carry on those functions, and I for one do not appreciate it a bit.
>
> * * * I do not think Congress ought to be embarrassed and the country ought to be embarrassed by those things.

The question of the use of the emergency funds has been gone into by the Independent Offices Subcommittee a good many times. For my part, I feel there has been a continual abuse of the use of those funds, and I certainly hope it will not occur in the future.

Mr. TABER. I join in the gentleman's thought.

I think I have probably consumed as much time as I should on the general character of the bill.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. I notice a small item on page 7 for defraying the deficit in the treasury of the municipal government of St. Croix. Why do we do that?

Mr. TABER. Because we never have had a really efficient management of our island possessions. This is the story. The way things are set up, the taxes and the expenditures are under the control of the legislature or the municipal body there. The only product we are sure of harvesting in those set-ups, especially since Secretary Ickes and his crew took over, is bigger and better deficits. After the deficits are incurred there is no way out of meeting them.

It is a problem that calls for the most serious consideration, in my opinion, on the part of the Committee on Insular Affairs, with the idea that the statutes might be changed so that the Federal Treasury would not be continued in the position of having to meet these deficits.

Mr. KEAN. Does the same situation apply to cities in Puerto Rico?

Mr. TABER. They have a separate government there, but St. Croix is practically an entire island. It is one of the Virgin Islands. That peculiar set-up there was made originally out of deference to the people who were there when we first arrived, but practically none of them are there now. It is a very bad situation. It is one that really calls for affirmative governmental action.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman knows, too, of course, that the disturbance of world commerce is really the cause of this item.

Mr. TABER. Not in this particular case. This is a case that has gone on for 20 years.

Mr. RABAUT. I am talking about this $45,000 item here.

Mr. TABER. The only change has been that it has been getting worse and worse as we have gone along. I have been familiar with these appropriations for over 20 years. They used to be in the Navy bill. It has been getting worse and worse from day to day. There has been no getting better about it, and it goes back to the point where it could not be said that I was playing politics.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman might be correct as to the past, I think.

Mr. TABER. I am correct as to the present. Just so long as you let those island folks create a deficit that we have to pay, you are going to have bigger and better deficits. That is not good business from the standpoint of the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman from New York has conservatively stated the situation. I see no way whatever for this Congress to escape appropriating the necessary funds to meet the deficit of the Virgin Islands treasury so long as the laws remain as they are at the present time. At the same time, I see no way on earth to prevent those Virgin Island deficits from growing every year, whether in peacetime or wartime. I think that is the condition we face right at this very hour.

The gentleman has come to a point which I had in mind awhile ago. Let me submit this question in this bold manner. Does the gentleman believe that the President can take the emergency funds such as those here referred to, for instance, and go into Puerto Rico and finance the new socialization schemes in full or in part, directly or indirectly, to any degree whatever, with the Puerto Rican treasury failing to provide the funds for the carrying out of recent laws enacted by the Puerto Rican Legislature, of which this Congress took practically no notice whatever?

Mr. TABER. You would have to do something that I have not had an opportunity to do in order to answer that question. I will try to get to the point where I can answer it before the bill is read for amendment on Monday. It will mean that we must have from the Budget a memorandum indicating what funds remain out of particular appropriations. Some of those appropriations were broad enough to permit that sort of thing. Some of them were not. I will undertake to see that we are provided with the information before the bill is read for amendment along that line, and I will undertake to advise the House with reference to it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will permit a further observation, we have this situation in Puerto Rico, according to the best information we can get from

our Government here in Washington. Mr. Abe Fortas, Under Secretary of the Interior, is directly in charge of Puerto Rican operations. You have the new laws there which call for the socialization of the land, for the socialization of the transportation system and of the water resources, and making public utilities out of private enterprises; in other words, in my opinion the Puerto Rican Administration would immediately proceed with complete socialization if the funds were forthcoming. Of course, they are not forthcoming directly out of the Puerto Rican treasury, in spite of the fact that the Puerto Rican people, citizens of this country, pay no direct levy to our Federal Treasury, in spite of the fact that we let them hold their export duties, for instance, from $15,000,000 to $17,000,000 per annum on the export of rum alone, and in spite of many other advantages they now receive, which they would not receive if they were a State of the Union or an organized territory such as Hawaii.

What is running around in my mind is, if the committee directly refuses to make the appropriations and if the Puerto Rican local budget is unable to meet the expenditures, is there any power whereby the President, operating through the Department of the Interior and Governor Tugwell of Puerto Rico, can take these special funds and go in there and finance those operations?

Mr. TABER. I would not want to say without checking. I will find out.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In connection with the observations made by the gentleman from Michigan, wherein he listed a group of "in spite of this and in spite of that," there is one "in spite" that the gentleman from Michigan omitted, that is, that the people of Puerto Rico have been starving and are now on the verge of starvation, and they have been exploited ever since we took them over. They have no native industries in Puerto Rico because we have not permitted them to have any native industries. They cannot get anything shipped to them because of our shipping monopoly. Under our tariff laws they cannot buy cheaply. They are a colonial country suffering from one of the worst types of colonialism. The least we can do is to appropriate for their betterment, the least we can do is to appropriate to give them at least a decent standard of living.

Mr. TABER. Of course, the situation in Puerto Rico has been immeasurably worse since the Tugwell gang began to operate some time ago, since it began to destroy all private industry that was giving employment and livelihood to the public. As I remember, something like $300,000,000 has been brought into that country in a most ridiculous and wildcat way, and instead of it providing something out of which people could make a living, it has destroyed the possibility of group after group being self-sustaining. It has been a most unfortunate situation, one that has cried aloud for a good, first-class, honest American administrator.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further on that point?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I disagree with the gentleman. I think the gentleman always wants to be fair.

Mr. TABER. I have tried to be fair, and I have been exceedingly fair in what I said last.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman is sincere. I think the gentleman is one of the squarest-shooting men in this House, but I disagree with him on many things. I point out, for the gentleman's information, that in the Island of Puerto Rico there are 250,000 people unemployed out of a population of 1,800,000. When you have an island whose total economy, as is true in Puerto Rico, is a sugar economy, with over 70 percent of the arable land owned by four sugar corporations, with offices in Wall Street, and an annual income for those native Puerto Ricans who do work of less than $200 a year, and when you realize that this situation existed years before Mr. Tugwell and that it still continues to exist, then, certainly, you cannot blame that situation on Tugwell or on the administration. That situation is fundamental; it goes to the very roots of colonialism in Puerto Rico.

Mr. TABER. But, of course, that situation has been accentuated, and it has become much worse in the last few years due to the operation of the molasses trust in which Mr. Tugwell was involved, and due to the Government taking over the Farm Co-op and messing the whole thing up so that a proper market could not be had for the things raised there, due to their taking away from the people the opportunity to raise things for themselves. The Government has been proceeding down there under Tugwell along the Bismarckian philosophy of providing no means to feed those people except through the Government and making them dependent upon the Government. Until we get the idea that those people must have an opportunity to work on productive enterprises instead of depending on state work or upon public works for what they need, our situation is going to become progressively, increasingly worse, and until America provides for the Government of Puerto Rico a new, efficient, effective government, with a Governor who understands business and will try to do things upon a constructive basis, the thing is not going to get any better. There may be palliatives applied, and all that sort of thing, but it wears the people out after awhile. I think probably I have used all the time that I shall use at this time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. I notice by the bill that some $3,000,000 goes to the O. P. A.

Mr. TABER. That is for the ration books that will be required just after the 1st of July.

Mr. CURTIS. What has the gentleman's committee been able to do in the way of inducing the O. P. A. to cut out nonessentials carried on down there, useless departments?

Mr. TABER. We have not had the opportunity of going over that thing in any satisfactory manner. I have personally had many talks with Mr. Brown, and submitted many programs to him, some of which he has adopted, and there has been progress made toward getting rid of some of those things, but the rent control is a very bad situation, and the set-up that he inherited was absolutely impossible. Until he makes the proper changes in personnel, we cannot expect any efficiency on that score.

Mr. CURTIS. Somebody in connection with the O. P. A. might take a great deal of time and spend time getting mimeographs of what George Washington thought about price control, which they could send out by a lot of lawyers that are employed down there.

Mr. TABER. That might indicate that they had too much money for printing and binding.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. On page 2 there is an appropriation of $300 for each Congressman and Senator for stationery.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I tried to find in the hearings some justification for this extra money carried in the bill, and I wonder if the gentleman could give the reason why $300 more is needed?

Mr. TABER. We found that the stationery accounts of the membership were almost all in the red. We found that with the increasing volume of work they have to do, they are unable to keep up with it and take care of their work with the funds that had been allotted to them. This item is just a little bit bigger, but not much, than it was last year. It is on a calendar basis rather than a fiscal year basis. It was thought that the membership is entitled to get funds enough to pay for their stationery out of the allowance which should be made to them. That is the reason that it was done.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to discuss the report of the Kerr committee at this time. I do hope to have an opportunity to talk about the report of the committee on Monday. However, there is one statement in the report which has been issued by the committee today in connection with Dr. Lovett, which I want to challenge, because of the very serious nature of the charges contained therein. I refer you to the first paragraph on page 10, which reads as follows:

> The National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners and National Committee for People's Rights was declared by the Department of Justice to be within the scope of Public Law 135 and Public Law 644, Seventy-seventh Congress.

The following is the sentence to which I want to call your attention:

> It is listed among organizations alleged to have been financed by Amtorg Trading Corporation.

The Amtorg Trading Corporation is an official agency of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is our ally. This statement is not only untrue, but I go further. I challenge the committee or anyone else to produce a single iota of evidence—I repeat that—I challenge the committee or anyone else to produce a single iota of evidence to substantiate that statement. If there is no evidence—and I say there is none—that the Amtorg Trading Corporation ever financed any of these organizations mentioned, then this report contains a serious libel against an ally. I demand to know, and I believe the American people who are engaged in this war demand to know, who put it in; who is responsible for it; who wrote it; where did it come from, and how did it get in the report of the committee? That is the challenge that I make. I make it early in this debate so as to afford the committee or anyone else an opportunity to substantiate the statement contained in the first paragraph on page 10, which says the National Committee for Defense of Political Prisoners is listed among the organizations alleged to have been financed by the Amtorg Trading Corporation. Further, the mere fact that the word "alleged" is used is no justification for making this statement. It is a serious libel against a great ally in this critical period of the war, and, consequently, most injurious to the best interests of the American people. I challenge you to produce the proof now or before the end of the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order on a subject not related to the bill at hand.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, Montana is one of the largest areas of undeveloped oil fields that we have in the country. However, the present price of crude oil is so low that it discourages the development of new wells. We must bear in mind that crude oil now sells in my State for $1.10 per barrel. The cost of production has increased greatly, owing to the increased cost of labor and materials that are necessary to be used in development of oil fields and in the production of oil.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I am glad the gentleman brought out the point about the undeveloped oil fields in Montana, because we do have in the gentleman's district, the largest undeveloped area in the United States. I regret that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] this afternoon said that at the rate we were shipping out our reserves we would have to develop one big well a week from now on. We have oil there, but unfortunately the wells are capped and unfortunately, also, we have too much competition with the California oil companies who have a monopoly in that particular part of the Nation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman. I want to point out that the oil wells that are capped are owned principally by what are called the independent oil producers. The people in my district want the administration, with reference to the production of oil, taken away from the Office of Price Administration and turned over for administration to Secretary Ickes of the Department of the Interior. He has recently advocated raising the price of crude oil 35 cents a barrel, but Mr. Prentiss Brown has vetoed that. I do not think Mr. Brown knows anything about the subject as compared with the knowledge of Secretary Ickes. He is the logical person to have charge of the administration of the production of oil.

It has been suggested that the Government subsidize to the extent of 60 percent the cost of bringing in new wells. In my opinion, this would not be necessary if we raise the price of oil 35 cents a barrel; we will have plenty of people in my State, and plenty of independent producers, men who can get the money, who will go into those fields and bring in new wells.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Does not the gentleman think it would be better if some of the practical, independent producers were called in and their views were considered before these orders would be sent out?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Certainly; it does not make sense to proceed otherwise.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I agree with the gentleman that Mr. Ickes would be a far better coordinator for the oil situation in this country than would the present O. P. A. Administrator.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Not only that, but he is the logical person to have charge of it, because he is not only familiar with the subject, but he is the one who is charged with the responsibility of providing the Nation with sufficient oil to carry on not only for war purposes but for civilian uses as well. All of the authority with reference to the production of oil should be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As the gentleman knows, the administrator for oil in Canada has entire charge of the production, sale, and transportation of oil. And also in Canada, unfortunately for us, Canada has been warm all through the winter, while we have been cold. We shipped 50,000,000 gallons of crude oil to Canada and she refined it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Exactly. We had better stop, look, and listen, then get busy and increase our oil production, and pay the price, if necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON].

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time this afternoon to leave the discussion of this bill for something that seems particularly important and something on which it is necessary to take early action.

I have taken the floor this afternoon to ask of this House what I consider a small favor for a great purpose—a favor in behalf of an oppressed majority—not an oppressed minority of Europeans, but an oppressed majority of loyal, hard-working Americans who are being tried beyond endurance through a tyranny of bureaucratic tommyrot.

I have today introduced a resolution, No. 238, calling for a full investigation of the Office of Price Administration. I hope the Rules Committee will promptly give this House an opportunity to act on this resolution so that the oppressed majority of which I speak may have quick relief.

I do not want to add to the burdens of this Congress nor to the confusion of the Washington scene—and certainly I do not want to detract from our war effort—but if there is one bureau here in Washington which needs the spotlight of public scrutiny it is that confusion-spreading fly in our alphabetical soup, the O. P. A., or, by poetic license, the O. P. U., the Office of Price Upheaval. Some action must be taken to head off further disorder.

I urge immediate congressional action; what form it takes is immaterial just so long as it has a definite objective. My common sense would suggest abolition of the O. P. A., lock, stock, barrel, and "lame duck" Brown. I would suggest that we call upon someone like Mr. Herbert Hoover or Mr. Herbert Lehmann, each of whom has an understanding of humanity and food problems, and give him a small but efficient and politically free staff to effect a true stabilization of the cost of living, based on known facts and not crackpot theories.

Mr. Hoover pointed out recently that whereas we now have 90,000 bureaucrats — count them — regulating the American people on food, he had only 3,000 people to help him feed the whole world in the last war.

The O. P. A., which is just one of our food-control agencies, had over 50,000 employees—count them—on March 31 of this year and wants to add another 20,000 in 1944.

I have only a few minutes to lodge my complaints and make my plea. So, let me suggest here and now that, if necessary, we blot out of existence this circus-like Gargantua, the fantastic and formless freak of foolish government, this colossus of confusion, this monster of muddled management, this alliteration of all of the evils of bureaucratic government.

Price control in America, under the O. P. A., is the greatest hoax ever perpetrated upon a trusting people. The O. P. A. has licensed highway robbery in our stores, mothers the profiteer, has fathered the black market—it has actually driven one Federal department to buy in the black market—has provided the breast at which suspicion and distrust are being nourished among our people and is the basic cause of most of the demands for higher wages.

It is a source of disunity throughout the land. It is sabotaging our efforts to prevent inflation, and is spending hundreds of millions of dollars in the process thereof. It has cured no ills, but it has created evils beyond belief.

If the welfare and the reason and the morale of 135,000,000 Americans was not at stake the crackpot efforts of the O. P. A. to stabilize the cost of living would be funny. Instead they are tragic. Besides the waste of manpower and money, it has begun to affect their hearts and minds and spirits.

Are we to go on feuding and fuming and constantly creating new problems because we have not the courage or the common sense to take drastic steps to solve our most elementary problems at the source? Are Congress and the American people to be made puppets and guinea pigs for an incompetent collection of overpaid young lawyers who hatch crackpot theories in the incubators of socialism they call their minds?

There have been rumors that one of the principal functions of this costly bureau—it wants $175,000,000 for 1944—and its army of lawyers and what nots, has been to devise a method of price control, to set price ceilings, to hold back the cost of living. Apparently they were unfounded rumors, for prices have been thrown far out of control, the ceilings are sky high, and the cost of living goes right on rolling along, just like Old Man River.

The O. P. A. admits it has not been able to enforce ceilings. Good Lord, I doubt if it can even understand them. The public will not complain of ceiling violations because of the red tape involved and because it is more important to have food. The big stores justifiably plead a lack of understanding if they are guilty of violations and the little stores are quietly forced out of business.

Along with many of you I have waited patiently for the O. P. A. to shed some of its earlier confusion and lead the American people out of the wilderness of rationing, and into the protective valley of effective price control.

I need not rehearse our disgust at gas and fuel-oil rationing, and, of course, as for rubber—there has been none to ration. Time after time our hopes have risen with announcements of coming price ceilings. But as our hopes went up so did the price of most important food items and so did the size of the O. P. A. staff.

A few weeks ago the trumpets blew loudly for the announcement of dollars-and-cents ceiling prices on beef and other meats. But, lo and behold, the ceilings raised rather than lowered prices and the schedules had to be called off.

On Sunday of this week the trumpets blew again. The O. P. A. pridefully announced dollars-and-cents ceilings on 278 commodity items—count them, 278 items—but scarcely one of these items had figured in the rapid and ridiculous rise of prices.

Wednesday of this week brought new meat-price ceilings—ceilings that will raise prices by from 20 to 30 percent in the chain stores, where the majority of the lower-income families buy their foodstuffs, but will effect a slight drop in the small independent stores.

What sense is there to price control that raises prices for the many, and finds profits in the wealthy chain-store supermarkets, and knocks them down in the little independent stores for a few customers, where a penny or two profit is often the difference between staying in business or going into bankruptcy?

What sense is there to a price-control program that raises prices in the markets where the average worker buys his food and reduces them in the higher-grade independent stores where mostly the wealthy trade?

What sense is there to a price-control program that defeats its own purpose? That penalizes the buyers and discourages the producer and retailer.

We read that the price ceiling on potatoes is 5 cents a pound in Washington, but housewives must pay 12½ or 15 cents a pound if they want potatoes; cabbage is 20 cents for a pigmy-sized head—you know, just the size of the usual bureaucrats; apples are 15 cents a pound; cucumbers 25 cents a piece; and the lowly spinach 45 cents a peck.

These are not black-market prices. They are botched O. P. A. prices in the so-called supermarkets. The ceilings are way up in the clouds where the bright boys of O. P. A. always are.

Just what is the O. P. A. bringing this Nation to by its bungling? Now that the W. P. A. is gone, and some other agencies that were used to subsidize votes are going, is the O. P. A. to be their successor? It was always in my mind that the political appointment of Brown would be muddied even browner by political results. In other words, hard-hitting, tactless Henderson has given way to baby-voiced political Brown, only Brown comes bearing gifts—gifts of money in the form of subsidies. Can you see the plan?

As someone has put it, O. P. A. is now about to help us pay our grocery bill. That is very nice of O. P. A., but beware, I say, of gift bearers, whether they be Grecian beauties or ugly ducklings, particularly lame ones.

Subsidies may be justified if used with great care and discretion—and because of O. P. A. bungling, perhaps subsidies may be necessary; but does the O. P. A. record to date justify trusting that agency with huge money gifts called subsidies? Who will get the money? What will the public get?

Subsidies are effective only with money; money is secured for government by taxes and taxes come direct from the people—the wage earners, executives, and those who get their living from investments. Subsidies come entirely from the public, but are distributed privately to a few.

Now that it has brought us next door to subsidies, the O. P. A., with very sudden and questionable frankness, admitted on Monday that enforcement of food prices never has existed. Any housewife—without benefit of clairvoyance—could have told them that at any time.

Very naively the O. P. A. suggests that if we add 1,400 persons to the present staff of about 3,500 enforcement inspectors, it can effect a 5-percent reduction in food prices. Five percent, mind you. And these investigators, according to O. P. A. reports, are to be used to "educate unintentional violators." But who is going to educate the educators?

In the 2-year period that the O. P. A. has been exercising its peculiar brand of price control, pot roast has jumped 156 percent in cost; Irish potatoes, 256 percent; cabbage, 200 percent; and eggs, 56 percent.

But now, after 2 years of spending and snooping and issuing directives and conflicting and confusing regulations that even Einstein could not understand, they promise a measly 5-percent reduction in prices if they get another 1,400 investigators.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMPTON. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. Is it not a fact that any directive is un-American, that the American people whose sons are in the service, as most of them are, need to be respected, not inspected? That inspection of the patriotic mother and father is an insult.

Mr. COMPTON. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Besides the 1,400 new investigators they want 18,500 more employees for the whole country to bring the total in 1944 to 70,000. Do you think the O. P. A. should have them? An investigation can best answer that. Of course it is good New Deal Administration practice. Every time a program fails, ask for another and larger appropriation and increase the personnel. That insures that the next failure will be really colossal.

I am not going to dwell on the bungling in connection with gasoline and fuel oil—the discrimination against the people of the East; the unusual and un-American resort to Gestapolike methods of snooping, turning neighbor against neighbor and friend against friend. You are all too familiar, I know, with this phase of O. P. A.'s activities.

Let us look into the O. P. A., particularly the price-control program! Let us evaluate the present policies and reorient or formulate a new working policy which will achieve the principles of price control. Let us root out the theories and develop and substitute a specific, practical, businesslike plan that will control prices on a Nation-wide basis without raising the cost to the consumer and without burdening the taxpayers with too many subsidies.

Rationing must continue, with some exceptions, but must be improved. Its administration to date by the local war price and rationing boards, by comparison, has been effective and conscientious for the most part. Injustices have generally been the result of lack of uniformity in understanding and applying the snowstorm of directives blowing out of Washington.

A constructive and comprehensive investigation will produce suggestions and provide recommendations that, in turn, will develop a definite policy of price control, and possible improvements in the rationing program. If it becomes advisable I am sure this Congress will sanction whatever legislation is necessary to carry out a sensible policy. I hope the Members will support my resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I take advantage of the time allotted to me to speak in regard to the report of the Kerr committee on three men, namely, Dr. Goodwin B. Watson, Dr. William E. Dodd, Jr., and Dr. Frederick L. Schuman, particularly Dr. Frederick L. Schuman, of whom the Kerr committee has this to say:

> Your special subcommittee has examined Dr. Frederick L. Schuman and all evidence pertaining to him as submitted by the committees heretofore referred to and does not find sufficient evidence to support a recommendation of unfitness to serve in the employment of the Government at this time

This is a very important subject and is coming up on an amendment to be offered to this appropriation bill next Monday. I think we should have a general understanding of what is back of the drive to remove some of these men from the pay roll. We hear a great deal said on the floor of the House from time to time about this man's being a Communist or that man's being a Communist. It might be well for us to take just a moment to look at a few of the fundamental principles of communism. I want to establish a foundation on which to judge some of these men.

First of all, we should appreciate that communism is internationalism; in other words, Moscow is the international capital of the world, in effect; any country which chooses to embrace the Soviet Union has its capital automatically moved to Moscow.

The second great fundamental of communism which I think we should take into consideration is the fact that communism is atheism. It may be said that you do not have to be an atheist to become a Communist, or to become a member of the Communist Party. That is true, but it was not true up to 10 or 11 years ago. Then they changed that little ruling, said they would get these people into their organization and then work on them and try to make atheists out of them.

The third principle of communism, and this is the most important, is that communism has as one of its principal objectives the control of the means of production.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I am sorry; I have just a few minutes. I decline to yield. If I can get more time I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman.

As I was saying, the third and important point in the subject of communism that we must consider is the control of the means of production. Before the Communists started helping us in this war program, which was July 21, 1941, they were doing everything possible to gain control of the means of production and take over factories in this country by sit-down strikes and other methods. That was their objective. It makes no difference of course how they take over control of our industries. If they can take them over by different Government bureaus that is just as effective as taking them over by force. The question is this: Is this man a Communist or is he not a Communist?

Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal more respect for the person believing in the principles of communism having the courage to take out a Red card and be a member of the party than I have for these men who teach the theories of communism in the classrooms of this country, who embrace the theories of communism in more ways than one, who are active in various Communist-front organizations but who did not take out a Red card in the party.

Those men I say are tremendously more dangerous than the men whom we know to be carrying a red card. Do you have to carry a card in order to be a Communist? No. I have never carried a card to identify myself as a part of the Republican party, still I call myself a Republican. Likewise I would say there are 20 people in this country who are following the theories and ideologies of communism, who do not have a red card, to everyone who does have a red card.

We received a letter in the mail today from Dr. Frederick L. Schuman, and I hope that some one in this House who happens to be an attorney, and I am not, will take this and analyze it some time before the debate is over, from a legal standpoint. There are one or two things to which I would like to call your attention. It states that he is principal political analyst of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service of the Federal Communications Commission, and "humorously criticized the Kerr committee for its report of last month, in which it cleared Professor Schuman of charges preferred by the Dies committee."

I wish to call to the attention of the House that the Kerr committee did not clear Dr. Frederick L. Schuman because all it stated or all it covered was "His unfitness to serve in the employment of the Government at this time." I am afraid Dr. Schuman will be up for further testimony and investigation.

Dr. Schuman was for many years a professor in the University of Chicago, and I happen to be a resident of the city of Chicago. Back in 1935 we had an investigation out there regarding the red activities in the University of Chicago when Dr. Schuman was a professor. Out of that investigation there was a booklet published known as, How Red is the University of Chicago? I went through this little booklet the other night and I found Dr. Schuman's name referred to on many, many pages. I would like to read some excerpts from that book entitled, "How Red is the University of Chicago?" into the RECORD at this time.

It starts out on page 11 with a paragraph headed "Students attempt agitation in coal fields," and goes on to say:

> Federated Press clipsheet of August 9, 1932, in an article captioned "Midwest students to probe coal fields conditions," stated in part:
>
> "Eighty students, organized as the Midwest College committee for investigation and relief in southern Illinois coal fields, will leave Chicago by motor caravan to study conditions there, Prof. Robert Morss Lovett, of the University of Chicago, announces. Mine locals in Sesser, Johnston City, and the Orient mine have invited the students. * * *
>
> "Profs. Frederick L. Schuman and Louis Gottschalk, of the University of Chicago; Prof. Frank G. Spencer, of the Central Young Men's Christian Association College; and Rev. Victor Siverts, of Meadville Theological Seminary, have joined Prof. Lovett in sponsoring the student enterprise."
>
> This committee was organized by the Student League for Industrial Democracy and the National Student League and was under communistic control. Federated Press of August 17, 1932, reported the stoppage and turn-back of the delegation by legal authorities at Mt. Vernon, Ill., and the arrest of six members of the delegation, among whom was Rev. Victor Siverts; Prof. A. O. Carlson, University of Chicago instructor, spending the summer at Commonwealth College; Joe Hamburger, University of Chicago student, taking a summer course at Commonwealth College; and other Commonwealth College students.
>
> PROFESSOR SCHUMAN PLEDGED TO COMMUNISM
>
> In September 1932 a group of over 50 writers, painters, teachers, and other professional workers declared their support of Foster and Ford and the Communist ticket in the 1932 national election. These 50 professionals pledged their vote to communism, stating in part:
>
> "The Communist Party alone is working to educate and organize the classes dispossessed by the present system, so as to make them an efficient instrument for establishing a new society based on equal opportunity to work, equable distribution of income, and ownership by the people of the national resources.
>
> "We therefore pledge our support in the national elections to the Communist Party and its candidates, William Z. Foster and James W. Ford, and call upon all educators, writers, engineers, social workers, artists, architects, and intellectuals in general to join us in this move and form Foster and Ford committees throughout the country."
>
> Among the signers of this pledge for communism was Frederick L. Schuman, of the University of Chicago. This group adopted the name of the League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford.
>
> UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS ENDORSED COMMUNIST
>
> In January 1933, Communists of the fifth ward, Chicago, formed the Fifth Ward Campaign Committee, with headquarters at the Communist unit headquarters at 1505 Cable Court. A circular was issued in the latter part of January 1933, announcing the candidacy of a Communist functionary and attorney for alderman of the fifth ward, Vladimir Janowicz, and his scheduled talk at Communist headquarters, 1505 Cable Court, on February 5, at 4:30 p. m. The leaflet then listed endorsers of Janowicz as Profs. Robert Morss Lovett, A. Eustace Hayden, Frederick

Schuman, and Martin Sprengling, of the University of Chicago, in addition to a list of Communist subsidiary organizations.

PROFESSORS LECTURE AT COMMUNIST SCHOOL

The official prospectus and program of the Chicago Workers School, official Communist Party training school for Communist Party district No. 8, for the fall, 1932, term lists the instructors and subjects at the school. It states in part:

"One of the extra curricular lecture series will be that of Prof. Harold D. Lasswell, of the University of Chicago political science department. Professor Lasswell will begin his series of six lectures on the Process of Social Change on Monday evening, November 14, 8:50 p. m.

"Prof. Frederick Schuman, of the University of Chicago, and others, will have lectures announced shortly."

"REDS" ORGANIZE PACIFIST COMMITTEE

The Daily Maroon, December 7, 1932, in an article, A. J. Carlson to Lead Discussion at Pacifist Club, stated:

"Anton J. Carlson, militant chairman of the department of physiology, stanch defender of vivisection, and advocate of world peace, will lead the discussion at the first meeting of the Chicago branch of the anti-war committee, which will be held in the social-science assembly room at 8.

"Joseph Cohen, delegate to the World Congress Against War held in Amsterdam last summer, and a student of Brooklyn College, New York, will speak on the Student and War.

"Anti-war committees are being organized in all universities and colleges in the United States to further the work of the National Student Congress Against War, which is sponsoring a national meeting to be held in Mandel Hall December 28 and 29.

"All campus clubs, organizations, and fraternities may elect delegates to the congress.

"The Chicago committee, which has recently been organized, is giving a second lecture December 14, when Frederick L. Schuman of the political science department speaks on the subject Geneva and Moscow Roads to World Peace."

The Daily Maroon, December 14, 1932, reported: "First antiwar congress to be held in Mandel—student delegates to meet December 28, 29." The article went on to state:

"Possibilities and potentialities of world political unity will be discussed tonight by Frederick L. Schuman, assistant professor of political science, at a joint meeting of the National Student League, the antiwar committee, and the Cosmos Club tonight at 8 in social science assembly hall."

The activities of the National Student League got to be pretty raw at the University of Chicago, and Dean William E. Scott denied the use of Mandel Hall for an openly Communist mass meeting to protest police brutality in demonstrations of Communist unemployed council members. The Daily Maroon February 10, 1933, reported the situation as follows:

"More than 200 students' names have been obtained by the committee of eight of the league for the petition. Two faculty members have also signed it—Frederick L. Schuman, assistant professor of political science, and Harold D. Lasswell, associate professor of political science."

PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION CALLED "RED"

The Progressive Education Association is a left-wing educational group that is definitely socialistic if not actually communistic in its program. Otto F. Aken, superintendent of schools, Cook County, Ill., in a petition for a writ of mandamus to restrain Noble J. Puffer, superintendent-elect, from taking office, charged Puffer with being a member of the Progressive Education Association. The Chicago Herald and Examiner of April 27, 1935, quotes Aken as charging in his petition that a county superintendent friendly to communism and communistic ideas would have the appalling effect of exposing such school children and school teachers to the danger of becoming indoctrinated with social and political ideas inimical to and subversive of the American system of government. He charged further that the Progressive Education Association is dominated by men and women of communistic and radical tendencies and that Carleton Washburne, of Winnetka, Ill., a Communist writer and author of various radical textbooks, which he has for some time been endeavoring to introduce into the public schools of this country; Frederick L. Schuman, and A. Eustace Hayden, professors at the University of Chicago and well known as Communists, are among its leaders.

PROFESSORS SPEAK ON COMMUNISM

The March 2, 1933, Daily Maroon in an article, Schuman, Knight, Lasswell Speak on Communism, states:

"Professors Frank Knight, Harold Lasswell, and Frederick Schuman are to present their views on Communism in a symposium sponsored by the National Student League, as a pale pink protest to the recent ruling of the president's office refusing to the league the permission to hold mass meetings. The lecture will be held in Mandel Hall next Wednesday evening.

"In the symposium, entitled 'The Implications of Communism,' Professor Knight will discuss the economic implications, Professor Schuman will point out the political significance, and Professor Lasswell will speak on the psychological significance of Communism.

"Professor Knight in his address will stress especially the need for separating the ideals of Communism both from the creed of Marxian dogma generally associated with the movement and also from any definite inference from events in Russia. Mr. Knight said in a recent interview, 'An advanced industrial nation adopting Communism would certainly present an entirely different picture than Russia.' "

NEGRO SOCIALIST AGITATOR SPEAKS ON CAMPUS

Under the caption of "Negro Socialist to discuss machine-age slavery on Thursday," the Daily Maroon of March 7, 1933, stated:

"Frank Crosswaith, noted Negro Socialist orator and editor of the Negro Labor News Service, will reveal the evils of 'machine-age slavery' when he addresses a Mandel Hall audience Thursday at 4:30. He is brought to campus through the auspices of the Socialist Club. Admission is 10 cents.

"Herman Wolf, one of the leaders of the Socialist Club, characterized Crosswaith's record as one of brilliant and consistent service in behalf of the working people of this country. He came to America in his early teens from Frederiksted, St. Croix, in the Virgin Islands, starting out as an elevator operator. He is now teaching in the Rand School of Social Sciences in New York City, from which he was graduated.

"He is best known through his work as special organizer for the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters in its fight to rescue the Pullman porters and maids from slave conditions and give them the status of men and women."

The Daily Maroon, March 8, 1933, further ballyhoos the debate on communism staged by the Communist National Student League in an article, Knight, Lasswell, Schuman Speak on Communism Tonight, which goes on to state:

"Profs. Frank Knight, Harold Lasswell, and Frederick Schuman will present what has been heralded as the first complete discussion of what communism really means in the symposium on communism sponsored by the National Student League tonight at 8:15 in Mandel Hall. The speakers promise both interesting and humorous presentations of the economic, political, and psychological aspects of the subject.

"All three lecturers have recently been in Russia and have studied their subjects at first hand. Professor Knight, whose lecture on the Case for Communism by an ex-Liberal was published because of its widespread popularity, has been heard to declare that 'the true value of communism is in its religious appeal.' Professor Schuman, who has recently published a volume called American Foreign Relations With Russia, believes that all government is a combination of force plus mysticism. The third speaker, Professor Lasswell, who has written Psychopathology in Politics, will lecture under the handicap of his conviction that 'communication between individuals is impossible unless there is a fortuitous parallelism of his biopsychic elements.' "

SOCIALIST GROUP MEETS AT UNIVERSITY

The Socialist League for Independent Political Action met at the University of Chicago for its regular quarterly meeting on March 9, 1933. Speakers were Garfield V. Cox, professor of finance, and Harland H. Allen, consulting economist. The Daily Maroon, March 9, 1933, describes the League for Independent Political Action as follows:

"The League for Independent Political Action is a national organization endeavoring to unite liberal groups of all parties. Its program advocates broader ownership and control of national resources, wider distribution of the national wealth, a 30-hour week for labor, and international cooperation for the reduction and final abolition of trade barriers."

Describing the symposium on communism under the auspices of the National Student League, the Daily Maroon of March 9, 1933, stated that the speakers—Knight, Schuman, and Lasswell—"romped gaily through a variety of subjects and barely mentioned communism in the symposium, Implications of Communism, sponsored by the National Student League. * * * Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, assistant professor of political science, departed long enough from his avowed communistic convictions to comment on the present political order, saying: 'Would to God the country were governed from Wall Street—but, alas, we have no Wall Street. We are enjoying at this moment the benefits of a New Deal with the old joker and a no-trump Cabinet.' Professor Schuman continued with a detailed outline of the steps in realizing a true communistic state."

SOVIET TOURS ADVERTISED

In the Daily Maroon of April 4, 1933, appears a sizable advertisement announcing Tour Soviet Russia—under the personal leadership of one of the foremost American authorities on the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, of the department of political science of the University of Chicago and author of the book, American Policy Toward Russia Since 1917. Other statements are that "he visited the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in 1928 and interviewed the heads of various government departments. He is particularly qualified on his return visit to evaluate the results of the 5-year plan and the prospects of the second plan."

The tour thus described was under the joint auspices of the Soviet fiscal agent, the Amalgamated Trust & Savings Bank, and the official Soviet tourist agency, Intourist.

PROFESSOR SCHUMAN LEADS TOUR TO UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

The Daily Maroon of April 7, 1933, announced the awarding of a political science fellowship to Prof. Frederick L. Schuman by

the American Academy of Political Science "to enable him to study the control of foreign policy in Germany."

Schuman, a Communist, was enabled to kill two birds with one stone on his German-Russian tour—obtain anti-Fascist material (one of the main Communist objectives) and make favorable propaganda comparison in behalf of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Daily Maroon states further:

"In July, Professor Schuman will lead a small group on a study tour through the Soviet Union, touching Leningrad, Moscow, Kharkov, Kiev, Odessa, the Crimea, the Black Sea, and the Caucasus. Several students from the university are expected to accompany Professor Schuman on his summer trip.

"This will be Professor Schuman's second trip to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics since the establishment of the new regime in Russia. His first experience, combined with his trip this spring and summer through the Fascist states of Europe, should provide an interesting contrast and evaluation of present and past conditions in Italy, Russia, and Germany."

It is to be noted as of especial importance that several students from the university were expected to accompany Professor Schuman on his summer trip.

PROFESSOR SCHUMAN SPEAKER FOR "RED" LEAGUE

On January 18, 1934, the Daily Maroon reported that Frederick L. Schuman would be a speaker at a National Student League tea in Ida Noyes Hall, stating as follows:

"Dr. Frederick L. Schuman, assistant professor of political science, who has recently returned from a trip to Germany and Russia, will speak at a tea today given in his honor by the National Student League in Ida Noyes Hall at 3:30. Dr. Schuman will discuss his trip and the current situation in Nazi Germany. This will be his first public appearance since his return to America.

"Dr. Schuman believes, quoting from a statement to the Daily Moroon, that 'the Nazi war menace can be met only by an unflinching will on part of French bloc to maintain the existing distribution of armaments, territory, and power. The danger of the anti-Semitic and Fascist propaganda on the part of Hitlerite agents in the United States can be met only by a determination to expose and frustrate the schemes of the Nazi Party's foreign bureau.'

"A Soviet film, The End of St. Petersburg, portraying the Russian revolution, will be presented tomorrow under the auspices of the National Student League. The picture will be shown in the social science assembly hall, at 8:30. Admission charge is 20 cents. The events of the last days of the Czar, the World War, and the uprising in St. Petersburg will be depicted."

SOCIALISTS DEFEND AUSTRIAN REVOLUTION

The Austrian revolution of the spring of 1934 was a source of great satisfaction to Socialists in the United States, who acclaimed it as a great step forward in the international Socialist movement and raised hundreds of dollars for the revolting Austrian Socialists. The Daily Maroon of February 20, 1934, announced a symposium on the Austrian situation in which Profs. Maynard Krueger, Frederick Schuman, and Charles S. Ascher were the speakers. All three were defenders and upholders of the Socialist set-up in Austria.

STUDENT PROTESTS COMMUNIST FAVORITISM IN CLASS

Proof that communism is being taught in classes at the university is evidenced by a letter published in the Letters to the Editor column of the Daily Maroon of February 28, 1934, which reads as follows:

"It has seemed very striking to me that in Mr. Schuman's political science 201 course the students have found occasion to laugh at everybody and everything but the short résumé of the Communist Party. When the Silver Shirts and the Social Democrats were discussed there was always something to provoke hilarious laughter from the class.

"Of course, one answer to this question could be that the Communist Party is so rational that there is no room for a joke, and that the other parties are so ridiculous that they are always wide open for rapping.

"However, this is not the only possible answer. Perhaps our worthy and highly sophisticated professor is slightly, or should I say overwhelmingly, biased in the presentation of material. It seems peculiar that a distinguished professor who has been so sweeping and so biting in his criticisms of other phases of politics should suddenly become biased and almost sentimental in his presentation of one political party.

"In Schuman's own words, 'The only reason for emotionalism in the Daily Worker is that the editor has become smart enough to realize the appeal this makes to the average reader.' We say, then, that the editor of the Silver Horde was smart from the beginning.

"I am not on either side—neither in favor of nor opposed to communism. But I abhor a biased presentation in the schooling of undergraduates.

"W. H. S."

PROFESSOR SCHUMAN SCHEDULED FOR "RED" APPEARANCE

Prof. Frederick Schuman's appearance before another Communist group was announced in the Daily Maroon of March 14, 1934, which stated:

"The World Prepares for War will be Mr. Schuman's topic at a lecture sponsored by Pen and Hammer, Friday evening at 8 in Room 440 of the Lyon and Healy Building at 64 East Jackson Boulevard."

* * * * *

"Socialism is probably more dangerous on university campuses than communism because of its sugar coating and its appeal to middle-class students who 'think they think.' On this campus she (Mrs. Dilling) felt this particularly true in reference to the Socialist club. She disdained to discuss the National Student League and considered the recently formed Cosmos Club as only another example of the 'boring from within' tactics of the radicals. Such harsh treatment of this right-wing peace organization was due to the fact that two of its faculty sponsors are assistant professors, Frederick Schuman and Harry Gideonse." (Daily Maroon, May 15, 1934.)

* * * * *

"Speakers at the meeting included Prof. Frederick Schuman who voiced an opinion that although the university is exceedingly liberal in policy, it had erred in judgment in refusing to grant permission for the meeting. He believed that a universal, nondiscriminatory rule concerning circle meetings should be insisted upon." (Daily Maroon, November 15, 1934.)

PROFESSORS SUPPORT KRUEGER FOR ALDERMAN

Following the announcement of Krueger's candidacy for alderman, the Daily Maroon of January 10, 1935, reported the mobilization of support for Krueger, on the campus:

"New developments in the aldermanic campaign arose yesterday when three other members of the university faculty came out in support of Maynard C. Krueger, for alderman of the fifth ward. They are Louis Wirth, associate professor of sociology; Frederick L. Schuman, assistant professor of political science; and Bessie L. Pierce, associate professor of American history.

"Earlier in the week several members of the faculty came out in support of Joseph M. Artman for alderman. Among them are Paul H. Douglas, professor of economics; Harold F. Gosnell, associate professor of political science; Charles Merriam, chairman of the political science department; and Charles W. Gilkey, dean of the chapel.

"The Socialist Club of the university, in conjunction with the Jackson Park branch of the Socialist Party, is backing Krueger in the race. At the meeting of the club yesterday it was decided to organize a group to work with the Socialist Party in carrying on the campaign.

"New officers of the club elected at the meeting are Jesse Reed, Jr., organizer; Anne Gosenpud, secretary; Seymour Baker, treasurer; Truman Kirkpatrick, publicity chairman; and Fred Fortress, arrangements chairman."

COSMOS CLUB SPONSORS SYMPOSIUM ON WAR

The same issue (January 22, 1935) also announced a symposium by the Cosmos Club featuring Harry Gideonse and Fred Schuman on the subject of Economics and War. The article stated:

"Economics and War has been announced by the Cosmos Club as the subject of the Gideonse-Schuman symposium which is to be held Friday afternoon at 3:30 at Oriental Institute. Tickets for the occasion may be obtained at the information office and from Cosmos members.

"A reply will be made to Maj. J. L. Griffith's statement at the Maroon Peace Symposium last week, that students were too young and immature to understand war and that they should follow the advice of those who had been 'over there.' Harry Gideonse, associate professor of economics, stated yesterday, 'If you're young enough to die for old Seawash, you're young enough to know about some of the reasons for doing so.' With this in mind Gideonse intends to point out the problems which young people should understand regarding economics and war.

"What is the relation between the prophets of and the profits in war? is the question which Frederick Schuman, assistant professor of political science, will attempt to answer.

"While both men will speak on the same topic there will be different emphasis in their respective approaches. A discussion from the floor will follow the scheduled talks."

Selections of speakers for the Daily Maroon-Student Union Against War and Fascism symposium were announced in the Daily Maroon of January 24, 1935, as follows:

"Five student organizations yesterday announced the selection of representatives to present the views of their groups before the Daily Maroon-Student Union Against Fascism and War symposium on the prevention of war. The symposium will be held in the Oriental Institute Wednesday evening, January 30.

"Phi Kappa Psi Fraternity and Iron Mask honor society have chosen Ralph Nicholson as their speaker. It is expected that he will voice the opinions of the fraternity men on campus as a group. The Student Union Against Fascism and War has nominated Lewis Soffer as their representative, and the Cosmos Club delegate will be William Sherwood."

PROFESSOR GIDEONSE ATTENDS WASHINGTON CONFERENCE

Also in the same issue of the Maroon (January 25, 1935) appeared a further announcement of the Gideonse-Schuman symposium which stated:

"With more than one-half of the seats in Oriental Institute lecture hall sold, the Cosmos Club is expecting a capacity crowd this afternoon at 3:30 in the symposium which it is sponsoring between Harry D. Gideonse, associate professor of economics, and Frederick L. Schuman, assistant professor of political science, on Economics and War.

"The two men will present different attitudes as to the manner in which economics and war are related. Each speaker will pre-

sent his approach in an introductory talk which will be followed by cross-questioning between the two men. At the conclusion of the arguments the audience will have a brief opportunity for questions.

"Gideonse returned yesterday from Washington, where he attended the National Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, as guest speaker. His subject was Neutrality and War. Schuman is author of a book on American foreign policy toward Russia. He has spent considerable time in Russia observing the Communist experiment.

"The debate is being held in conjunction with the Cosmos Club's peace program on campus. Tickets are 15 cents, and are on sale at the information office."

PROFESSOR SCHUMAN SPOUTS COMMUNISM

Speaking before the Jewish society Avukah, Prof. Frederick Schuman dispensed his usual Communist ideology. The Daily Maroon of February 7, 1935, reported as follows:

"Can peace be maintained in a world where nationalism, as it exists today, prevails? Frederick L. Schuman, assistant professor of political science, denied that it could when he spoke before a capacity crowd at the meeting of Avukah yesterday in social science assembly hall.

"Nationalistic ideology today breeds international and imperialistic wars, in the opinion of Mr. Schuman. 'Peace is highly inconceivable and improbable and can only be maintained by a pacifistic nationalism that would preserve peace between nations.'

"This necessitates the need for a world symbol that has sufficient emotional appeal for 100-percent peace.

"Mr. Schuman stated that there was no idealistic symbol present in the world today that could effect peace. The closest proponent of world unity on an emotional basis was the symbol of Catholicism, whose emotional appeal is effective and international.

"While nationalism makes for peace within a nation, by subduing violent groups within itself, it promotes greater violence between others nations," said Mr. Schuman. "More and bigger wars will result with our present nationalistic ideology, as viewed by Fascist policies, and until there is a world integration and unity on an emotional basis for peace, there can be no peace."

PROFESSORS ON PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION PROGRAM

It has already been pointed out that the Progressive Education Association is considered to be communistic in its objectives. The Daily Maroon of February 7, 1935, reported the attendance of seven Chicago University professors at a Progressive Education Association meeting in Chicago, stating as follows:

"Seven professors from the university will take part in the regional conference of the Progressive Education Association being held tomorrow and Saturday at the Palmer House. The theme of the conference is Modern Education at Work.

"Frank N. Freeman, professor of educational psychology, will preside at the general session on Saturday afternoon, and Grace Abbott, professor of public welfare administration, and former chief of the Children's Bureau, Office of Education in Washington, D. C., will conduct the session on problems of childhood.

"In the meeting of the liberal arts in colleges section, Chauncey S. Boucher, dean of the college, will discuss the University of Chicago plan in terms of the ideals which have motivated it and the practical situation in which it has been developed. George A. Works, dean of students, will preside.

"The parents section of the conference will be addressed by A. Eustace Haydon, professor of comparative religion, on the subject of How Can the Family Fulfill Its Social Responsibility to Its Youth? The problems and questions of social attitudes in the home will be discussed by Robert Redfield, dean of the division of social science, and Frederick L. Schuman, assistant professor of political science.

"Students may attend the conference if they obtain cards from Dean John D. Russell, in gradute education 121."

SCHUMAN DEFENDS RED MURDERS IN UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

In the notices of scheduled meetings in the Daily Maroon of February 8, 1935, upon which no comment was made, appeared the following:

"The Struggle for Academic Freedom. Karl Haessler. Social science 160 at 4:30."

"Debate: Are the Recent Soviet Executions Justifiable? Yes; Prof. Frederick Schuman. No; Attorney Irving Abrams. Lincoln Center, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, at 8:30."

The first, although not mentioned, is the meeting of the National Student League again featuring the Communist, Haessler, on a favorite Communist subject. The second is self-explanatory. Professor Schuman, in good Communist fashion, defended the atrocious Soviet slaughters as justifiable.

FACULTY MEMBERS PROMINENT IN ANTIWAR CONFERENCE

The Communist organized antiwar conference at International House included many of the Red-aiding members of the university faculty, as well as outsiders. The Daily Maroon of February 26, 1935, reported the following:

"Representatives of a majority of the organized student groups on campus will participate tomorrow in the opening session of the 2-day antiwar conference to be held tomorrow and Thursday. The conference will be under the chairmanship of Louis Wirth, associate professor of sociology.

"The first session tomorrow evening will be devoted to a symposium at which speakers will discuss the attitudes of the liberals, Socialists, Communists, labor organizations, and youth organizations on the peace question. The meeting will be held in the assembly hall of International House, beginning at 8.

"Both afternoon and evening programs have been arranged for the second day of the conference, Thursday. Five round table discussion sections, representing various groups of students, will meet from 3:30 to 5:30 in social science research building. Percy H. Boynton, professor of English, will lead the group of fraternity men; A. Eustace Haydon, professor of comparative religion, the theological students; Frederick L. Schuman, assistant professor of political science, the social science students; Serena Lowe the young workers' and students' group; and Robert Morss, professor of English, the group on fascism.

"The final meeting will be held on Thursday evening at 8 in the social science assembly hall. The program will include general discussion on the various phases of the antiwar question and the consideration of resolutions drafted in the round table discussion sections."

"REDS" AND "PINKS" UNITE AT ANTIWAR CONFERENCE

The following report on the antiwar conference, appeared in the Daily Maroon of February 28, 1935:

"Midst a deluge of assorted free and salable literature fired with headlines such as, 'Fight. The revolutionary general strike is labor's only salvation.' 'Fight. Join the labor struggle in a war to end the capitalistic system,' and midst the general distribution of varied 'parties' propaganda, eight speakers opened the first all-campus conference for peace last night at International House. On the only common ground arrived at in meeting, it was agreed that students and labor would have to lead the way to peace.

"'It is not so much where we (the speakers) came from as where we are going,' stated Dean Charles Gilkey of the chapel, in opening the list of speeches. He pointed out that religious groups have been turning toward the left, using religious motives and convictions to combat war.

"Grace Abbott, professor of public welfare administration at the university, precipitating the arguments of the bulk of speakers at the symposium, lifted the wind from their sails by scoring the point that 'Membership in any particular party or organization will not accomplish the end against war.' Going further, she pointed out that no great war issues would be settled by bloodshed—instead, they would be settled by the 'long, slow, hard struggle to get right little by little.' In answering arguments against munitions makers, she vigorously stressed, 'If the American people did not want munitions makers, they would not have them here. It is a poor alibi to blame our war trouble on them—the people are to blame.'

"Arthur McDowell, representing the Young People's Socialist League, advocated that instead of throwing 'spitballs' at the Reserve Officers Training Corps, workingmen and students come out against exploitation of the masses.

"Robert Minor, noted Communist, in flourishing soap-box style, found considerable pleasure in reinterpreting statements of the President in the National Recovery Administration as procapitalistic and against labor as well as statements allegedly made by Army leaders concerning a Fascist coup of Washington. He expressed confidence that the next war would be fought by labor against trade-unionism. Concluding, he recommended a united front by all groups, regardless of affiliations, against imperialistic Fascist wars.

"As speaker for the American Federation of Labor, Serena Lowe criticized her national organization's lack of action against war, although numerous local resolutions have been adopted.

"'Workers must cooperate to prevent industry from shipping munitions in time of war,' summarizes Harry Shaw's views. He spoke for railroad labor which he said had recently in part pledged itself to follow such a move.

"Edward Strong, of the League Against Fascism and War, showed a need for organization and action as well as education of youth against war, while Albert Hamilton, for the Student League for Industrial Democracy, called students 'sheep in caps and gowns,' but pointed to the conference as a step toward intelligent action.

"Louis Wirth, assistant professor of sociology and chairman, announced today's schedule of the conference. At 3:30 four round tables will be held, including Social Science and War, Frederick Schuman, in Social Science 122; Fascism and War, Robert M. Lovett, in Social Science 107; Theological Students and War, A. Eustace Hayden, in Social Science 108, and the Fraternity Man and War, Percy Boynton, in Classics 13."

COMMUNIST PAPER BOASTS OF ANTIWAR CONFERENCE

The official Communist report of the antiwar conference, published in the Daily Worker of March 7, 1935, is also most informative:

"Round table discussions, led by Professors Hayden, Schuman, Boynton, and Harry Shaw, preceded the closing session.

"The conference brought to the fore the existence of a small pro-Fascist bloc among the students. However, the sentiment of the conference was overwhelmingly against them and their influence was negligible."

REDS CAUSE SPLIT IN COSMOS CLUB

The invasion of the socialistic-pacifist Cosmos Club by Communists caused trouble. The Daily Maroon of March 5, 1935, reported the resignation of Schuman as faculty adviser to both the Cosmos Club and the National Student League, as follows:

"Frederick L. Schuman, assistant professor of political science at the university, announced yesterday that he is dropping all his functions as faculty adviser to any student organizations. This action will affect both the Cosmos Club and National Student League.

"In announcing his resignation from these positions, Professor Schuman stated that the action was being taken for purely personal reasons. He will continue in his present capacity as adviser to the Cosmos Club until the end of the week, serving as arbiter in the present dispute between the two factions claiming the name Cosmos Club and the affiliation with the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace. Professor Schuman announced that he would make his decision in this matter within the next few days.

"Professor Schuman had no comment to make on the contentions of H. S. Greenwald, correspondent for the executive committee of the Cosmos Club, to the effect that there was actually no rift in the club. According to Greenwald, strife was external rather than internal between club members and insurgents who wish to reorganize the Cosmos Club with radically changed ideology and membership purged of nonsocialist elements."

PROFESSOR SCHUMAN SPEAKS TO "RED" GROUP

The Daily Maroon of March 28, 1935, announced a meeting of the Student Union Against War and Fascism with Schuman as speaker, stating:

"War Across Europe will be discussed by Frederick L. Schuman, assistant professor of political science, at the first meeting this quarter of the Student Union Against Fascism and War in social science assembly room tomorrow at 3:30.

"Taking his cue from the recent rearmament of Germany, the increase in appropriations for American defenses, the doubling of the period of compulsory military service in France, and the British White Paper, Professor Schuman will deal with the imminence of war in Europe.

"The Student Union, which visualizes itself as the organ of expression of antiwar sentiment on the campus, was organized only a few months ago, but has attracted attention because of its activities in connection with the peace strike, which they hope to help stage April 12.

"Last year on the same date 25,000 students in America went out on strike. This year an attempt is being made to make the strike an international one. April 12 is the eighteenth anniversary of America's entrance into the World War."

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PROFESSORS SPONSOR "RED" THEATER

On April 16, 1932, the League of Workers' Theaters was organized in New York City, as an American section of the International Workers Dramatic Union of Moscow, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In January 1933 the Chicago Workers Theater was organized by the Communist John Reed Club of Chicago, and announcement of the new group appeared in the local Communist paper Workers Voice of January 21, 1933. In March 1933 announcement was made that the Workers Theater of Chicago would stage a Communist play, Precedent, at the Goodman Theater on April 8 and 9, 1933. Sponsors of the Chicago Workers Theater were listed on the announcement as follows. Those marked with an asterisk are members of the faculty of the University of Chicago:

Sherwood Anderson, Malcolm Cowley, Jacob L. Crane, Waldo Frank, Michael Gold, Albert Goldman, *Prof. Eustace Hayden, *Prof. Harold Lasswell, *Mary MacDowell, Prof. Scott Nearing, Dr. Curtis Reese, *Prof. Frederick Schuman, *Prof. Louis Wirth, Prof. James M. Yard, *Prof. Robert Morss Lovett.

ROFESSOR SCHUMAN HEADS BOLSHEVIK-AID GROUP

In April 1933 Prof. Frederick Schuman was announced as chairman of a new group calling itself the Chicago Provisional Committee for Recognition and Normal Trade Relations With Soviet Russia, headquarters of which were located at 105 West Madison Street, room 1901.

PROFESSOR SCHUMAN ON COMMUNIST DEFENSE COMMITTEE

Jan Wittenber, a Chicago Communist, who went into southern Illinois as an organizer for the Communist International Labor Defense was arrested with John Adams, an organizer of the Communist Marine Workers Industrial Union, and held in jail in Hillsboro, Ill., charged with sedition, in June 1934. The Communist magazine New Masses of September 4, 1934, reported the organization of the Jan Wittenber Defense Committee to work for the release of Jan Wittenber and his fellow conspirators. On the committee was Prof. Frederick Schuman of the University of Chicago.

LOVETT AND SCHUMAN SPONSOR RED BALL

An anti-war ball was staged at the Knickerbocker Hotel, Chicago, on May 5 by the Communist organized and controlled American League Against War and Fascism, Chicago branch. A letterhead of the anti-war ball committee, dated April 2, 1934, listed Prof. Robert Morss Lovett and Prof. Frederick L. Schuman as among the sponsors of the affair.

STUDENT AND FACULTY MEMBERS SPONSOR RED CONGRESS

A letterhead of the Chicago arrangement committee of the Second United States Congress Against War and Fascism of the American League Against War and Fascism listed Virginia Bashe, student, and Robert Morss Lovett, chairman Mary MacDowell, and Frederick L. Schuman of the University of Chicago, as members of the committee. Lovett is also a vice chairman of the American League Against War and Fascism, and was one of the principal speakers at the congress held in Chicago, September 28-30, 1934.

PROFESSORS JOIN IN DEMANDS FOR REPEAL OF SEDITION LAW

The Midwest branch of the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners, another Communist organized united front, mass organization, and the Chicago Civil Liberties Committee, joined in sending a delegation to Governor Horner to demand repeal of State sedition laws. The Daily Worker of November 7, 1934, reported as follows:

"A demand for the repeal of the Illinois criminal syndicalism law was presented to Gov. Henry Horner last Thursday in Chicago by a distinguished delegation sponsored jointly by the Chicago Civil Liberties Committee and the Midwest branch of the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners.

"Included in the delegation were Dr. Frederick L. Schuman and Dr. Harold D. Lasswell, of the University of Chicago; Dr. James Maxon Yard, eminent religious educator; Dr. Curtis W. Reese, director of Abraham Lincoln Center; Dr. Felix Levy, prominent rabbi; Dr. Rachelle Yarros, director of the Illinois Social Hygiene Institute and for many years coworker at Hull House with Jane Addams; the Reverend W. B. Waltmire; Miss Jessie Binford, chairman of the Chicago Civil Liberties Committee; Hugh Miller, its executive secretary; Llewellyn Jones, literary critic, now with the Christian Century; Nathaniel Samuels, coeditor with Miss Narcissa Swift of Polity magazine; John Groth, staff artist of Esquire magazine; and Lawrence Lipton, acting secretary of the Midwest branch of the National Committee."

Mr. Chairman, the thought I want to bring to the Members of the House of Representatives at this time is this: Doctor Schuman is just one of hundreds and hundreds of professors who have been jerked from the universities of this country by the New Deal to come down here to Washington in positions that give them the opportunity to work with this problem in a national way rather than with students in the classrooms.

Personally, I have no objections to the subject of communism being discussed and taught in the classroom under the subject of communism, but I do raise my voice in protest against the ideology of communism being taught to the students of this country under the disguise of social science, history, English, political science, or any other title, and not discussing it on its own merits.

I for one am not afraid of the students of this country discussing communism, because I firmly believe if the true principles of communism are taught under the subject of communism that 99 percent at least of the students will appreciate the value of our republican form of government in this country in comparison to the principles of communism.

I cannot forget that one of the most prominent members of the American Legion in the United States sent his daughter to the University of Michigan. She was one of the most beautiful, most loyal and patriotic students who ever enrolled in this institution of higher learning. But when she graduated, she was an avowed Communist, married a Negro Communist and moved to Soviet Russia.

I cannot forget the conversation of my neighbor in Chicago, walking to the station one morning, when he said to me: "Fred, I do not know what has come over my boy. He has just returned from the University of Wisconsin, and he has the strangest ideas. He is telling me that the institution of the home is obsolete and old-fashioned and belongs to the horse-and-buggy days, that religion is the opiate of the people, and many, many other radical thoughts." I said to my friend: "Who are his professors?" To which he replied: "Oh, I do not know, but the University of Wisconsin is recognized as one of the leading educational institutions of this country." I had to sympathize with my friend, but he had lost his boy to the cause of communism.

Under the New Deal administration, Washington has become a paradise for these university professors who embrace the ideology of communism and at the same time appreciate the fact that they can be of more value in promoting the ideology of communism by not taking out red cards in the Communist Party.

Mr. Chairman, I have never at any time had the least fear that this beloved country of ours and our Constitution would ever be destroyed by enemies from without; but under the New Deal administration I have every reason in the world to believe it has a good possibility of being destroyed from within.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely and conscientiously believe that if the subcommittee of which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] is the chairman, will take further time to investigate the statements made against Dr. Frederick L. Schuman that I have outlined in my speech here today, wherein I included certain excerpts from the book, How Red is the University of Chicago? they will concur in my opinion that Dr. Frederick L. Schuman should be eliminated from the taxpayers' pay roll, as well as Goodwin L. Watson, William E. Dodds, jr., and Robert Morss Lovett.

The eyes of all patriotic Americans are focused upon the actions of this Congress. I plead with the Members of this House to have the courage of their convictions and be equal to their responsibilities to the people of this country, in seeing that no one remains on the pay rolls of the Federal Government but those whose Americanism cannot be questioned.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PATMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2788) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Walter A. Allen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] be permitted to revise and extend the remarks that he made this afternoon during the consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1943 and include therein certain excerpts and certain articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address I made over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be granted leave of absence from May 30 until June 7.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

OBJECTIONABLE BOOKS

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Chicago, a few moments ago, mentioned an investigation of the Dies committee. That brings to my mind something that I presented to that committee, but as yet no attention has been paid to it. On Lincoln's birthday I suggested that scandalous books ought to be removed from the libraries of the country where children and young people read them. I think that is far more important in connection with this crisis than all the other investigations, inasmuch as this reaches our youth. The authors of these books, since this request was made, have consented to remove the books from the files, with one exception, Judge Felix E. Alley. One other author, Gaston B. Means, is dead and another cannot be located. I wrote him and asked him if he would see that the publishers of the book did not send it to libraries where the young may read it and he refused and still maintained that the Great Emancipator was illegitimate.

The book states things about the mother of Abraham Lincoln which I should not mention here for the children of the land to read.

I have written to him a second time and he has refused to answer. I have since sought an appointment at his home in North Carolina and he has refused to answer this letter.

I think while we are doing things with reference to the departments we ought to see to it that books of this kind going throughout this country and saying things about a man who has passed on almost a century ago, and about his angel mother, who are not here to defend themselves, should not be placed in a library where young people and the youth of the land read them.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SO-CALLED RUMP COMMITTEE HAS NO OFFICIAL STANDING

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in common with scores of citizens of Pennsylvania, particularly of my own city, I am very much disturbed, as they are, concerning reports appearing in certain newspapers in our city regarding a committee which I understand has no official sanction of the House of Representatives but which, according to the press reports, is spoken of as a congressional committee.

I read from an article published in the press of May 8 in the city of Philadelphia:

> A congressional committee will go to Philadelphia May 17 to study the effects of rationing and to seek methods for its improvement, it was announced today.

Definitely, that is a statement of an official congressional committee going to the city of Philadelphia. Of course, I cannot attach any responsibility to the members of this so-called congressional committee for the statement as it appears in the press, but inasmuch as there were interviews granted to the reporter who wrote this article, it seems to me there is some responsibility attached to those who are posing, if they are, as a committee of the House of Representatives. That is a very, very serious thing. If we are going to be confronted in this House and in this country with Members who have no official sanction, who form rump committees and travel at their own will up and down the country, holding hearings and, with the support that might be given them by certain newspapers, implying and leading the people to believe that they officially represent the United States Government, it is something that this House should certainly take cognizance of and pay some attention to.

I quote further from this article what a Member of this House, my colleague from Philadelphia, a gentleman for whom I have the highest regard and who is a personal friend of mine, but who it was stated will be the chairman of this congressional subcommittee, had to say. I refer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

> "As for the congressional subcommittee," SCOTT said, "it intends to learn at first hand the problems of rationing as they affect the public. We intend to concern ourselves with improvement of and the correction of inequities in rationing," SCOTT said, "and to do what we can to make rationing work."

This so-called hearing is going to be held in the Federal Building of the city of Philadelphia. I am informed that they have received the privilege of utilizing certain space in that building, but I fear that the authorization was not official. However, neither I nor any of my colleagues would protest against their utilization of any space because, after all, they are Members of Congress, and I think it is only right to accord them any courtesy which can be accorded to them, even if they do not proceed in the proper manner in requesting it.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Not at this time. I shall be glad to yield a little bit later for any question my good friend or any other Member of the House may care to ask.

I am informed by many of my constituents and by reputable businessmen of the city of Philadelphia that they have been solicited by certain individuals and certain organizations in the city of Philadelphia to come before this so-called committee to make squawks and to arouse resentment on the part of our people. That is a very serious thing. After all, we are engaged in a war. I know that in the administration of any great undertaking like the Office of Price Administration, with all its ramifications, in a country as large as the United States, with the varied economic interests that require supervision during a war, irritations are inevitable. I know that a great many people protest about gasoline rationing. I am mindful right now that in today's Philadelphia papers there is an article to the effect that the O. P. A. officials have subpenaed or ordered certain individuals before them, 250 of them, who have been apprehended

using their automobiles to go from Philadelphia to the race track at Pimlico in the last week.

We hear a lot of talk about everybody being willing to make sacrifices in this war. There is too much talk about being willing to make sacrifices and not enough of actually making them without squawking and complaining about them.

I do not think the American boys out on the beach heads in Guadalcanal, I do not think those Americans who at such a terrific price in blood have been part of that great victorious army in Africa, I do not think our gallant American airmen in the southwest Pacific or our gallant sailors maintaining a patrol on all the oceans of the globe, are going to be served or helped by any group such as this which is traveling throughout the country and arousing the resentment which an undertaking of this kind will inevitably arouse against the Government of the United States.

If the propaganda agents of the Axis Powers had endeavored to formulate a plan to disrupt our morale, they could think of nothing more effective than a plan of this kind. Of course, I am not going to impugn the motives of my colleagues, my colleague from Philadelphia or the others who may be associated with him in this undertaking. I would not do that. But the very fact that certain groups in Philadelphia have already prepared to make political capital out of this thing certainly shows how dangerous, how serious it is. To my mind, it is just a wee bit—and I am charitable in that respect—reprehensible on the part of anyone who attempts to convey to the people of the city of Philadelphia the impression or the implication that this is an official committee of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Am I to understand from the gentleman that this is an unofficial meeting of a group of Members of Congress, not a subcommittee of any standing committee or select committee of the House?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I read something in the press yesterday, I may say to the gentleman, to the effect that the Speaker of the House was questioned by the reporters at his press conference with respect to this committee, and my recollection of what I read in the press was that the Speaker stated that this was not an official committee, it was not a committee of the House of Representatives, and it had no standing as such.

Mr. RAMSPECK. And it is the impression of the gentleman's constituents in Philadelphia that this is an official committee?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. There is such an impression, because I and my colleagues from that city have received numerous inquiries. We have received letters concerning it, and I know from my personal knowledge that certain people in Philadelphia have been active in soliciting citizens to go before this committee and make complaints about various things, and have told them it is an official congressional committee.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Then I think certainly, if the gentleman will yield further, that our colleagues who are engaged in this activity should be very careful to make it plain to the public that they are not representing any committee of Congress, that they are not representing the Congress itself, but that they are acting in their individual capacities as Members of Congress.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman is right, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman understands that both the gentleman who is speaking and myself certainly can have no impression that it is an official committee of Congress, because nothing has been said either in correspondence or in the newspapers other than what would indicate clearly that this is a Republican food study committee, and I may say that from the reactions that we have already had, that it seems to be very much needed.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I only know what I read in the newspapers about that, which is published as the result of an interview with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. That is all my constituents know, and those constituents see clearly that it is published as a result of an interview with my friend.

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, read the entire article.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I will let the gentleman do that in his own time.

Mr. SCOTT. I am not talking for the newspapers.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I will leave it to the gentleman to read it completely. Let me state this: Of course, it does state that it is a food-study committee of the Republicans in Congress, but it also speaks of it as a congressional subcommittee. In the particular paragraph that I just read the newspaper article says:

> Such a committee, it was suggested—

And I will deviate from the article to say that I do not know who suggested it—

> Such a committee, it was suggested, could make a nonpartisan contribution by its studies of the question of whether the law had been complied with.

Let me tell you something about the rationing of rubber in the State of Pennsylvania before O. P. A. appeared. Members of the tire-rationing boards and other rationing boards in Philadelphia were appointed upon the recommendation of the State council of defense, and in my own congressional district, and in all other congressional districts in our city they were so tinged with politics that it stank to high heaven. In one instance a tire-rationing board was plunged right into politics, openly and viciously. The members were Republican politicians appointed on recommendation of the State council for defense. They were audacious enough to hold their meetings in the Westmoreland Republican Club, in the 25th ward, in my district. And they boldly placed a sign in the window of that club reading "Tire rationing board meets here every Thursday." That is how they handle those things. As I stated, there are bound to be some irritations in a program of this kind, but I do not think any Member of Congress serves any good purpose or does any good to further the war effort by going around stirring up resentment against a program which is being honestly and efficiently administered.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am very glad the gentleman has brought this matter to the attention of the House. All of us know that it is sometimes necessary for the Congress to appoint special committees to make investigations, and in order to have these special committees, action in the House is taken, and always when a committee of that kind is set up, a resolution is passed, which provides funds so that the special committees can operate, so that they can issue subpenas and carry on the proper type of investigation. We all know that special committees have been appointed by the Speaker of the House, but what concerns me in this is whether this rump committee is being financed by some individual or group of individuals, and what group of individuals is furnishing the money, because naturally it costs money to conduct an investigation of this kind.

It is said they intend to go all over the country. I would like to know whether it is for purely partisan political purposes that this rump committee is traveling around the country, and I would like to know definitely how much money they have already expended, and how much they intend to spend.

Mr. SCOTT. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] a question?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Particularly in view of the fact that the reports are carried that this is a congressional subcommittee. To my mind it appears to be a little bit derogatory to the respect in which this House should be held if any group of individuals——

Mr. SCOTT. We expect to go up there and have a full hearing.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If this committee should appear in my city of Pittsburgh, I shall certainly make every attempt I possibly can to inform the public that the committee has no power whatsoever; that it simply has the same power as any group of individuals might have, so that the public will not be misinformed, and no misrepresentations made.

It appears to me that the Membership of this House should maintain its dignity and maintain the respect that the country has for it by exposing this partisan committee which was set up, as I understand, by the chairman of the Republican National Committee. Particularly, I

would like to know where the money is coming from and have an accounting.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am glad my colleague has made that statement, because he asked a very pertinent question that did not occur to me. Perhaps my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], to whom I am now going to yield briefly, because I understand he has his own time, but if he cares to have me yield to answer that, I will yield.

Mr. SCOTT. My question is——

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Is it addressed to me or to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]?

Mr. SCOTT. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] to answer this: The public hearing in Philadelphia will be by a committee of 14 Congressmen, representing 14,000,000 people. Is not the gentleman's intention in taking the floor today to seek to intimidate or terrorize the public or prevent the public from testifying before 14 Members of the United States Congress? Is he not seeking to gag the public?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows that no such intent exists. The gentleman knows that my remarks are made necessary because he and some others very foolishly conveyed to the public through the medium of the press that they constitute an official committee of the House of Representatives. I am glad to learn that they are taking up a whole army—14 Members.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Committees like that have been referred to in the past as rump committees. They have no authority or power, unlike an official committee of the House that goes out and hears testimony and has that testimony printed and sent to each Member of the House and Senate and to all executive departments. A committee such as the gentleman describes has no such power. It can make no report. It has no power to make a report.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Every special committee appointed by the House of Representatives is composed of Representatives of both parties.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Both parties, certainly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The Republican Party and the Democratic Party. But this is an ex parte committee, so that any result of the studies, of course, should be looked upon with the greatest suspicion.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. At that point, I want to read further from the newspaper article, just on the point that my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] brought out. First, I want to emphasize this, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] did not reply to the question asked by my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], as to who was paying the expenses of these members.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am a member of that committee, and whatever traveling I have done with that committee and will do with that committee will come out of my own pocket and not out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. We know that it cannot come out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. SCOTT. The members are paying their own expenses to and from Philadelphia out of their own pockets and are glad to do it because we regard it as a necessary and essential public service.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am glad to hear that because there has been a lot of speculation around Philadelphia on that question, too.

Mr. MYERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I will yield to my colleague after I read this paragraph. This press report says further:

Later he indicated—

Speaking of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]—

Later he indicated the subcommittee will report to the full committee, which in turn will report to Congress, and at the same time will take up with the Office of Price Administration all problems which can be met by changes in administrative regulations. Further, any legislation which may seem advisable as a result of the hearings will be recommended.

Now, if that is not intended to convey to the people that this is a congressional committee, then I cannot interpret the English language.

Mr. MYERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. This Philadelphia meeting may merely carry out the thought that was advanced not so many months ago by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] that they—these 14 Republican Congressmen—are of "the best stock and represent the real brains, grit, and backbone of America."

Mr. SCOTT. That was a pretty dirty crack. That was made solely for the purpose of publishing in the Philadelphia Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] has the floor. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I had yielded to my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] and he had not concluded.

Mr. MYERS. It seems to me that in this Government the Executive is accused of trespassing upon the prerogatives of the Congress, but it seems to me also that the Congress desires to appoint all the personnel of the executive departments and also regulate all of the actions of the executive departments. We have in this Congress a number of committees that have been looking into the food situation and into the O. P. A. Former Senator Prentiss Brown has testified 15 or 16 times before standing congressional committees. I believe he has appeared 3 or 4 times before the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate. I think twice before the Small Business Committee of the House. I think twice before the Small Business Committee of the Senate. He has also personally appeared before several other committees of the Congress. So we have had Mr. Brown down 14 or 15 or 16 times before standing committees of the House and Senate. We have had many other officials of the O. P. A. down numerous times before standing committees of the Congress. In fact, I am of the opinion that the Congress through its standing committees has a complete picture of the entire situation which the rump committee purposes to reinvestigate. I think, Mr. Speaker, that an attempt of this sort, a hearing of this sort, is a bold statement by 14 Republican Members of Congress that they have no confidence in the standing committees of the House. They do not believe that the standing, nonpartisan committees of this Congress have looked into this subject fairly or have looked into it at all, but they believe that they, a partisan group, can accomplish much more than the standing committees of the House and Senate. It is difficult to see how this rump Republican group can study this subject in a nonpartisan way when they refuse to recognize that many of the standing committees of the House and Senate, composed of both Republicans and Democrats, have given this subject of food and rationing much study.

So they are going to bring the officials of the O. P. A. in Philadelphia and the officials of the O. P. A. in other cities and in other States of this Nation before their rump committee, and the time of these officials is going to be taken up in answering the partisan questions of this partisan group. I regret that my colleagues do not have sufficient confidence in the standing committees of this House; I regret that they feel it necessary to go beyond the walls of this Congress and appoint a special committee of their own choosing without consulting the Speaker, without consulting the man who has been elected by this Congress as its Speaker, who is the Speaker of all the Members of this Congress, be they Republicans or Democrats; they did not consult him about the appointment of this committee which they call a congressional committee, but they travel throughout the country and take testimony under false colors, and this Congress should and must resent such actions.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] is to be congratulated because he at least has brought to the attention of the people of Philadelphia the fact that this is a partisan committee.

Only today I met some people from my city, a group of labor representatives who told me that they were going to appear some day next week before a congressional committee on the subject of rationing. I asked them if they knew that it was not a congressional committee but merely a meeting of a number of Republican Congressmen. They said, "Why, no; we thought it was an official congressional committee."

I think it is unfortunate in this time of great national emergency that we should have partisan committees going throughout the country investigating subjects which the Congress itself has already investigated.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I thank my colleague. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absolutely correct. It is a question of the dignity of the House of Representatives; it is a question of the confidence in which the Members of the House have in the Speaker. Definitely this is a rump committee, as my good friend from Texas has so pointedly stated; not only that, it is a committee which I cannot conceive being anything but thoroughly partisan, and I repeat that any partisan undertaking in a matter of this kind at a time when the very life of the Nation is at stake can do no good; it is calculated to do infinite harm, and must be music in the ears of the dictators of the Axis Powers.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. It is my understanding that all these gentlemen favor price control because they know we must have price control to avoid ruinous inflation. It is only a question of how the law should be administered. This being true, there are more Republicans in O. P. A., at least 10 percent more—there are at least 60-percent Republicans in O. P. A. They could probably make better progress if they would confine their efforts to the Republicans in O. P. A. who are making some of these foolish rules and regulations.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman may have something there; I believe there is food for thought in what the gentleman has said. My point in bringing this matter to the attention of the House and to the attention of the people today, is to point out to them that this is not a congressional committee; it is a purely partisan committee, and it is organized and traveling around the country for purely partisan reasons. I think, perhaps, its present visit to Philadelphia is tied up to some extent with the forthcoming municipal election campaign in that city.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I will yield if the gentleman wants to ask a question and provided that if I do not have sufficient time in which to answer that he will yield me some of his time.

Mr. SCOTT. The question can be quickly asked and even more quickly answered. I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania to make reference to some representatives of labor organizations who wish to be heard.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I want to correct the gentleman right there.

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad they do want to be heard and we are going to give them an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Just a moment. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] did not say they wanted to be heard; he said they were under the impression that this was a congressional committee that was sitting in Philadelphia next week with official sanction and authority, but that they did not know it was a rump committee. They will know from this moment on, however.

Mr. SCOTT. This is my question, Does the gentleman have any objection to the representatives of the working people in Philadelphia telling their troubles to a Philadelphia Member and his associates?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am sorry the gentleman asked me that question. I wish the gentleman had not asked me that question because he provokes a reply from me that I would rather not make, but through his insistence on the question he makes me give him this reply: I wish the gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. SCOTT] had been as attentive to labor leaders and labor organizations in Philadelphia in the past when he could have been of assistance to them and when they probably did endeavor to make known their wishes to him when certain legislative and other matters were about to be considered, which vitally affected the workers in our city.

Mr. SCOTT. They have found me very friendly and always glad to talk to them.

Mr. PATMAN. If I understand the gentleman correctly, what he objects to is the attempted use and abuse of the House of Representatives as a sounding board for strictly partisan political purposes?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. That is it exactly, and that is how the people in Philadelphia are going to feel about this committee when the truth is brought home to them fully.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Philadelphia who preceded me spoke to only six Democrats who are now present in the Chamber, three of whom are from Pennsylvania, I think the matter is one in which Philadelphia is interested and I shall have no more to say at this time.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

INVESTIGATION OF FOOD SITUATION IN PHILADELPHIA

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, may I say for the benefit of the very distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], for whom I have the very highest regard, that he and I both know after having had much to do with the Office of Price Administration that the Republican Party is not desirous of laying any claim to the long-haired boys down there, and I do not mean by that that the Democratic Party lays claim to them. They have sort of been born in your basket and there is hardly any way of getting rid of them. The great stream of those bearing professorial togas in O. P. A. belong to a society in America which does not come from either old-line democracy and certainly not old-line or modern-day Republicanism. Whether they come from Philadelphia or not, I do not know.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. PLOESER. May I say, too, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] knows and I know through many months of work with the O. P. A. that there are very, very few Americans in either party who would claim them. He and I both agree they ought to all go back to their college classrooms.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman again.

May I say to the gentleman from Philadelphia, since this particular performance has been instigated by a request for a special order on the part of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY], that I would prefer not to yield for a few minutes, but will agree to yield in plenty of time for him and his colleagues on the other side to catch the dead line of the Philadelphia Record, which has undoubtedly inspired this whole proceeding in order to terrify and, if possible, to gag free American citizens from talking to their own Congressmen, including one of their own Philadelphia Representatives, and including the Congressman at Large from the State of Pennsylvania.

Further, I would like to extend to the gentleman from Philadelphia a full, free, and frank invitation to listen in on the proceedings, because we do not conduct our proceedings along Gestapo lines. We have learned from bad examples not to be influenced by any plea for secret meetings or secret covenants secretly arrived at in bureaucratic headquarters. It is our purpose to hear openly all who wish to be heard, all of those who cannot be terrified by threats to gag them, all of those who cannot be driven away from a free and open opportunity to tell their troubles to their Congressmen by the sudden, concerted, and detrimental efforts to use the local press or that part of it which has instigated this proceeding for a smear attack upon the people of Philadelphia who wish to be heard and upon a group of Congressmen who wish to hear them, a group which has been organized with the full and free consent of the Republican Party in the Congress, not a new thing, but something which has been done many times before and many years before, simply a continuance

of study programs in a determined effort to establish a method of constructive criticism and of constructive research looking toward the improvement of various features of the Government.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it, the purpose of the hearing at Philadelphia is to help people who are hungry get food?

Mr. SCOTT. Precisely.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have followed this somewhat and I hope to be able to dig up enough money out of my own pocket to pay my fare to go along on the trip.

Mr. SCOTT. Since the gentleman and I do not have access to the Federal Treasury, I assume the gentleman will be there by reason of use of his own funds.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It looks to me as if there is need for some kind of a hearing in Philadelphia because I see from the papers that 850 food stores have closed up.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I also note that eight large wholesale poultry dealers were indicted by the grand jury in Philadelphia for violating the O. P. A. laws and for dealing in black-market poultry, tremendously raising the price that the consumers had to pay.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes. These are things, I may say, which they do not want us to bring out.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Briefly.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I will be very brief. I think the gentleman from Minnesota has stated it very well—that these black-market operators have been indicted, which shows that the Federal Government and the O. P. A. is on the job protecting the citizens of Philadelphia. He does not favor their going scot free without indictment or any action on the part of the O. P. A., I hope.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Certainly not.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. That committee is not going up to the city of Philadelphia to help these black-market operators? From what the gentleman says, I am a little apprehensive that that may be their purpose.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The fact that these men have been indicted and 850 food stores have been closed up and the further fact that the people of Philadelphia and the surrounding area are not getting poultry, is evidence that there is something wrong and something should be investigated.

Mr. SCOTT. I agree wtih the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I think that this committee is not only doing something that ought to be commended, but something that is very desirable and very fitting. I imagine that they are going to render service to the people of Philadelphia such as the citizens would like to have.

I would like to know, and I think this is something all of them would like to know, and that is this: Surely it is the duty of the individual Congressman to go into his district, listen to his people, return and make recommendations to the O. P. A. or to a legislative committee. If that is a good thing why is it not a better thing for him to take some of his colleagues along who would like to help with the problem?

Mr. SCOTT. That is precisely what we have in mind. Now, if I may have a few minutes without interruption, I will say to the gentleman that we do welcome the participation at the hearings of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, including our colleagues from Philadelphia and we would urge them, if they do not care to participate in a free and open public hearing, because they cannot stand criticism, then I would suggest that it is better to go to the Rules Committee and ask for a rule establishing a congressional committee to investigate not only the black markets, but the many other complaints which have come in from all over the country, from people who are begging, literally imploring the Members of Congress to come and hear them concerning the operation of the black markets, come and hear them tell that they cannot get food and hear them tell of their difficulties in rationing.

The plain, ordinary, everyday citizen of America has not been given a decent hearing in Washington or before the O. P. A., and he is glad, I am sure, to have the Members of Congress go back to their own home districts, associate with them and give them the full and free hearing to which they are entitled and which they have every right to have without any interference.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply gratified and I am appreciative of the invitation to sit in with my colleague at this meeting in Philadelphia, but I hope the gentleman does not mean to say that these people have been gagged and bulldozed and have not been able to appear before a congressional committee of the House or the Senate.

Mr. SCOTT. I was referring to the O. P. A., if the gentleman will recall; I said the O. P. A. and the departments.

Mr. MYERS. I hope he does not believe that the people who have been complaining have not had a forum; I hope he does not mean that the Members of Congress, or the committee of which the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is chairman, or the Committee on Agriculture of the House, or the Agricultural Committee in the Senate, or the Smith Committee, have not given these people an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. SCOTT. I was pointing out that the chairman of this Republican Food Study Committee has done a great deal to give these people an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. MYERS. Personally I would much rather let this matter be handled in the regular way, through the standing committees. I am not saying that by way of criticism, but I think it is much better for investigations of this kind to be made by the constituted committees of the House and the Senate and I hope the gentleman does not mean this as a reflection on these committees.

Mr. SCOTT. I have great respect for the gentlemen who have just spoken. There seems to be a great deal of misapprehension. If I may proceed, there is one thing I would like to clear up right now. I regard him as one of the finest Members of this House, and I can say the same thing of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY]. But they appear to have considerable fear of revelations they expect to hear in Philadelphia.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, it is very seldom that people living outside of Washington have an opportunity to appear and lay their complaints and troubles before a congressional committee and this gives them such an opportunity.

May I say further that the committee of which my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is chairman, resulted on account of action taken by the minority in appointing a committee to make studies of the business situation in the country; and, the committee of which the very able gentleman is chairman, resulted from that action.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield; I would like an opportunity to complete my statement. Everybody is making this speech except me.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. SCOTT. I am sorry that I cannot yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I simply wanted to say that the action creating this committee was taken a day before.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman has made his point, but his committee was born of the activity of Republicans in demanding aid for the small businessman.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. SCOTT. I cannot yield further. I would like to make a part of this speech myself.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman who has the floor has a right to be protected by the Chair. He has declined to yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania declines to yield.

Mr. SCOTT. The point which I have been seeking to make for some time is this, that despite this effort to frighten the timid and to scare away those people who have sought long to be heard and to testify in Philadelphia, like the people of Boston, where between 30 and 40

witnesses, including consumers, representatives of the great labor organizations, processors, wholesalers, and retailers, all welcomed the opportunity to be heard fully and courteously by this committee, the people in Philadelphia are looking forward to the same opportunity. I am sure they will resent very much an effort to create the impression in Philadelphia that the Members of Congress who are going up there to hear them do not have the right to hear them. They most certainly do have a full and absolute right to hold such a hearing. They expect to go through with it. They expect to hear the people of Philadelphia, including the representatives of the great labor organizations, many of whom have already accepted invitations from the committee to be present. We expect to hear them. We welcome their testimony. We know they do not want prices increased nor do they want the black market. We know that they are in trouble, that they are concerned, that they are worried about where they are going to get food.

I can well understand why some of my friends on the other side of the aisle might not want to hear these representatives of the working people and the consumers generally. I understand that. But I want the gentleman to know we are going to hear them. I want him to know that we are friendly to their point of view, that we are anxious to have them come there and tell us why it is that they cannot buy the necessities of life, why it is that they have to pay exorbitant and outrageous prices which are fixed by the black market, why it is that no committee from the side of the House of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] has ever shown the slightest interest in coming to Philadelphia and holding a hearing of this kind.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman asking me a question?

Mr. SCOTT. If the gentleman can answer that, why he has or why he has not, I shall be glad to hear it, but I do not yield for another speech.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I will tell the gentleman this. Because we have respect for the organization of the House of Representatives, because we have respect for the orderly procedure that has been set down under the rules of this House, and because we have respect and confidence in the Speaker of this House, we would not dare go throughout the country posing as an official congressional committee. That is my answer to the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman has made his reply. It is not a very good one.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman permit me to answer that?

Mr. SCOTT. No; I will not yield at this moment.

No one can have any greater respect for the Speaker of this House or for this great body than I. I have regarded the Congress of the United States with the greatest respect and the greatest awe ever since I was old enough to know what the Congress was. I yield to no one in my respect for this body or for its officers. But I submit the gentleman has not answered the question, because the gentleman has not shown any congressional committee the way to Philadelphia. It is only 2 hours and 20 minutes away, and the gentleman has not shown any committee the way to Philadelphia. You can get there by the railroads, by bus lines, or by your own car, if you were permitted to drive it.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not a well-recognized fact in Washington that next to winning the war the most important problem before the American people is the threatened scarcity of food?

Mr. SCOTT. There is no question about it.

Mr. JENKINS. That is a fact. The gentleman knows that our Food Study Committee has already brought that out on numerous occasions, and that the people of the Nation are aroused everywhere—not only in Philadelphia but in every city and in every hamlet in the Nation. Everybody who has made a study of the proposition knows that there is a dire threat of great inconveniences to come to us because of the failure of the policies relative to food by those who have them in charge. If these two distinguished gentlemen from Philadelphia, if they are not advised on this fact, will attend the gentleman's meeting in Philadelphia next Monday, I am sure they will be awakened to the fact that in Philadelphia the situation is as bad as it is anywhere.

Mr. SCOTT. If they are as much interested as the Republican Food Study Committee is, I am sure they will be present to hear the complaints of their own constituents in Philadelphia. We would like to know why these black markets are not stopped, why these abuses are not corrected. I might add that the O. P. A. officials, some of whom I know personally and for whom I have the highest regard, have been notified by the committee of the holding of these hearings and will be given every opportunity to be present. Also, many people in Philadelphia have voluntarily asked for an opportunity to be heard, including representatives of the great labor organizations.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. For a question.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman stated that they did not have an opportunity. May I say to the gentleman that we have had several hearings before our Committee on Small Business. There are some good men on that committee from the gentleman's side. We have heard everybody who wanted to be heard. In some cases most of them were from Philadelphia. Only next week we have hearings set down for Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday on O. P. A. regulations.

Mr. SCOTT. I said I yielded to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. PATMAN. Some of them involve Philadelphia.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] whether or not he gave an opportunity to be heard to any of these 550 small grocers and feedmen who come from Philadelphia?

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely, yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Did the hearing the gentleman accorded them do them any good?

Mr. SCOTT. The stores are closed down, if that did them any good. They are out of business.

Mr. PATMAN. We can certainly do more for them if both parties are represented and getting all the facts.

Mr. SCOTT. I submit that the crisis is so great that we cannot wait for committees which meet in Washington at the convenience of the chairman, no matter how often they meet. I am not criticizing the gentleman's committee. I must say we cannot wait for him. This is a desperate situation. We are going to go into the country to hear the people in their cities.

Mr. PATMAN. Why does the gentleman go out in the country? Why does he not go down here to the O. P. A.? That is where the trouble is.

Mr. SCOTT. I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield, whether it be in the city of Philadelphia or a city in Michigan even, it seems to me that it is not only untimely, but it is unusual and I am rather surprised at my good friends from Philadelphia who criticize Members of Congress who at their own expense are willing to go to Philadelphia. I am surprised, I say, that my friends are not willing to cooperate with their political adversaries in getting the facts in Philadelphia and bringing those facts back from Philadelphia to the Congress. Knowing my good friend Mr. MYERS and my good friend Mr. EBERHARTER, as I do, I should think that they would rise on the floor and say to their colleagues, if there is anything wrong in Philadelphia, God bless you, go up there, and we will lay everything on the table, and we will advise the newspapers and ask them to give you publicity, and cooperate with you in any investigation you desire to make at your own expense, and we will welcome you and help you in bringing out anything that is wrong in Philadelphia and presenting it to the Congress and asking legislation to remedy that situation. I am surprised at my friends.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. In a moment. I may say in reply to the gentleman from Michigan that I am surprised that my colleagues have not seen fit to extend the hospitality of the very hospitable city, the very friendly city of Philadelphia to 14 visiting Members of Congress who represent 4,000,000 people, who, at their

own time and expense are much interested in investigating this problem. Why this effort to prevent people from testifying and being heard?

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] for a question.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I just wanted to reply to what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] said.

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, no, I can only yield for a question.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Then the gentleman will not yield to me to reply to him?

Mr. SCOTT. I am afraid I cannot yield. The gentleman can take his own time later.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am very glad that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that the gentleman does not want a reply from me.

Mr. SCOTT. I am very glad to have a reply, but not a speech, at the conclusion of my remarks. The gentleman has made reference to soldiers at Guadalcanal. I cannot see why the soldiers in Guadalcanal, or in Tunisia, would not like to know that their families can get enough to eat, and know that their families when they go to the stores will find opportunity to put something in their market baskets and not have to answer a lot of questionnaires to Gestapo queries about every pound of food or meat or vegetables that they buy.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As a matter of fact, due to the fact that from 75 to 95 percent of all the poultry in Philadelphia is in the black market, the soldiers and their families are not able to get any poultry.

Mr. SCOTT. I know that the soldiers would like to know that their families are being taken care of.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. MYERS. Did I understand the gentleman to refer to the Gestapo moves of the O. P. A.?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, or the bureaucrats generally.

Mr. MYERS. Will the gentleman advise me who is the chief counsel for the office of the O. P. A. in Philadelphia?

Mr. SCOTT. He is a very estimable gentleman.

Mr. MYERS. What is his name?

Mr. SCOTT. If the gentleman does not know, I would be very glad to inform him.

Mr. MYERS. Does the gentleman know? Is it a gentleman named Wayland Elsbree?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. MYERS. Would the gentleman inform the House where Mr. Elsbree practiced law before he entered into the O. P. A.?

Mr. SCOTT. If the gentleman thinks it is material. The gentleman went to Swarthmore, and he was a classmate of Leon Henderson.

Mr. MYERS. I wanted to know with whom he was associated before he entered the Government service as chief counsel for the O. P. A. in Philadelphia.

Mr. SCOTT. He was associated with the office of that celebrated constitutional lawyer, Thomas Raeburn White.

Mr. MYERS. Was the gentleman associated with Mr. Elsbree at one time in the practice of law?

Mr. SCOTT. I was associated in the same office, very pleasantly so, but for a brief time.

Mr. MYERS. That is what I want to bring out.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman referred to is not only an able lawyer, but he is a very conscientious man, and I understand, if the gentleman wants to go into it, that he and the entire Philadelphia Democratic delegation protested his appointment because they had somebody more political in mind.

Mr. MYERS. Do I understand that Mr. Elsbree, chief counsel of the O. P. A. in Philadelphia, was associated in the practice of law with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] at the time of his appointment to the O. P. A.?

Mr. SCOTT. He occupied an office with me very near the gentleman's own office. We are all neighbors there in the same building. We are all in the same building, Mr. Elsbree and myself and you.

Mr. MYERS. I do not believe the gentleman should speak of the Gestapo moves in the O. P. A.

Mr. SCOTT. I am sure the gentleman is not ashamed of the fact that he and I once were associated together.

Mr. MYERS. Absolutely not.

Mr. SCOTT. Or that I was once associated with Mr. Elsbree? I do not know what it has to do with this fact, and having answered the gentleman, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. MYERS. He is chief counsel for the O. P. A. in Philadelphia and came out of the same office as you did. You were both associated and had an office together at the time he was appointed.

Mr. SCOTT. I think that is a credit to me and to Mr. Elsbree and a credit to the office. I am glad the gentleman has seen fit to bring it out.

Mr. MYERS. You did not mean to reflect on Mr. Elsbree when you spoke of the Gestapo methods?

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, not at all. I am referring to the little Gestapos all around Washington.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. KELLEY. I am sure that these people, the gentlemen who will accompany you on this mission, do not care to be held out as something which they are not. They do not wish to sail under false colors.

Mr. SCOTT. I spent 30 minutes pointing that out and if the gentleman wants to go to Philadelphia we will be glad to have him. It is an open meeting.

Mr. KELLEY. Why do you not admit it is a rump committee and everybody will be happy?

Mr. SCOTT. I admit nothing of the sort. The gentleman evidently missed the entire point of the committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There was some question about when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] appointed a special small businessmen's committee, which brought about the creation of a special committee in the House. I have looked up the RECORD and I find that on August 11, 1941, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] appointed a special committee and that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] was made its chairman. That was a Republican study committee. I also found that House Resolution 294 was introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] the day after, on August 12, and it passed the House on December 4, 1941, and the committee was appointed on December 11. Now, if there is anything wrong with that I would like to have it pointed out.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; there is something wrong with it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] has expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. There are two other special orders.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders which have been entered today I may address the House for 8 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD a testimonial entitled "Congressman ENGLEBRIGHT," by Horace H. Carlisle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter that I received from the home management supervisor of Richmond County, Wis., in my district, which gives a very wonderful picture of what the Farm Security Administration is doing in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

MINORITY SPECIAL STUDY COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, due to the lateness of the hour I

had intended to yield back the time allotted to me this afternoon, but as long as this matter of the work—and I call it work—of the minority committee, appointed by the minority party to study food problems and the question of rationing has been brought to the floor of the House, I certainly want to make my own position clear as a member of that committee.

As has been intimated earlier, the creation of study committees by the minority party is not a new undertaking. However, this is the first time I have ever heard any criticism of the work done by any of the study committees appointed by our distinguished minority leader [Mr. MARTIN]. It is unfortunate that certain members of the Pennsylvania delegation, sitting on the majority side of the House, do not approve of the activities of the minority party. Judging from the fact that, at the present time, there are but six Democrats on the floor of the House, we can assume that the Members of the House in general have no objection to the creation of these study committees.

One of the finest reports I have ever read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was one prepared by a minority committee, headed by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] in 1939 or the early part of 1940. The Wadsworth committee made certain recommendations as to steps that should be taken by this Government in order that we might make necessary preparations for the war that was just then over the horizon. Reference has been made this afternoon to the work of the select committee created by the House, known as the Small Business Committee. Long before the House saw fit to create a Small Business Committee, the minority party had a special committee studying the problems of small business here in the United States, and the effect that the war would have on small business. After completing its study, the minority committee reported back to a Republican conference. Every one of these committees created by the minority reports back to a party conference so that every member of the minority can have as much information as possible on the various subjects studied. In that way, when legislation relative to these subjects comes before the House, the minority members are better informed than they would have been if we did not have a special committee to dig out the facts. For more than 3 years the minority party has had a study committee on our monetary system. The chairman of that committee is the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. That committee is still functioning.

Following the appointment of the food study committee, referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY]—the creation of which the gentleman from Philadelphia does not approve—the minority appointed a committee to study some of the post-war problems that we will be called upon to solve in the not too distant future.

The minority food study committee that is going to Philadelphia next Monday was in Boston last Monday. If anybody thinks it is fun to travel in a sleeper on Sunday night, spend 16 hours in Boston on Monday, return to Washington via sleeper on Monday night, to be in the office Tuesday morning, he is welcome to make the trip. I am willing to make as many trips as my physical endurance will permit, in order that we can get facts—not to embarrass the O. P. A.; not to embarrass any Member of the House; not with any such thoughts in mind—but simply that we can find an answer to some of these problems.

Rationing of food in a country as large as ours is a mighty difficult undertaking. No one wants to see prices soar, and certainly all of us should do our utmost to check inflation. There is a grave question in my mind as to whether or not the O. P. A. has prevented increases in prices. I wish to take the time of the House just long enough to cite at least one example of how the O. P. A. regulations have increased the price of potatoes from $5.10 to $7.28 per hundredweight.

Memorandum No. 1—and I will insert this memorandum in the RECORD—indicates that O. P. A. set a ceiling price for country shippers of potatoes for April 1943, for United States No. 1 Idaho Russet Burbank potatoes, packed in 100-pound sacks, f. o. b. Idaho, at $2.30. This price includes 25 cents for grading, labor, and bagging. The empty bags cost 15 cents. To the $2.30 paid the farmer, O. P. A. permits a charge of 10 cents per hundredweight additional for labeling, also an additional 10 cents per hundredweight for 2-inch minimum plus 10 cents per hundredweight additional for risk in transit, which takes the price of these potatoes up to $2.60. To that is added the freight to New York, which amounts to $1.10 plus a tax of 3 cents. Cost to service wholesaler, delivered to New York is $3.73. In reselling, the wholesaler takes a mark-up of 21 percent, which includes delivery within the city. This 21 percent—which is not 21 percent of the $2.30 paid the farmer—but 21 percent of all charges permitted by O. P. A. plus 21 percent of the freight charge. This wholesaler then sells the potatoes to a second wholesaler or jobber, who may sell to a retailer, taking an additional mark-up of 21 percent. The retailer is permitted to take a mark-up on a sliding scale of roughly 33 percent, depending on the amount of business he does, thus bringing the price of the potatoes for which the farmer received $2.30 up to $7.28 delivered to the consumer in New York City.

Prior to the establishment of O. P. A., these same potatoes would have been handled as follows: To the country shipper, $2.30; freight to New York, $1.10 plus 3 percent, $3.43; 10 cents for risk in transit, $3.53; wholesaler's delivery and profit charges, 15 cents, $3.68; jobber's profit—without cartage—15 cents, $3.83; retailer's mark-up, 33 percent, $5.10.

At this point I will insert memorandum No. 1, from which I quoted above:

Ceiling price for country shipper for April 1943 of United States No. 1 Idaho Russet Burbank potatoes, packed in 100-pound sacks, f. o. b. Idaho	$2.30
(Includes 25 cents for grading, labor, and bagging)	
10 cents hundredweight additional for labeling United States No. 1 extra, 1351.1017 (a1)	2.40
10 cents hundredweight additional for 2-inch minimum, 1351.1017 (b2)	2.50
10 cents hundredweight additional for risk in transit, 1351.1002 (e)	2.60
Freight to New York, $1.10 plus 3 percent tax	3.73
Cost to service wholesaler delivered New York, $3.73; in reselling he may include 21 percent (which includes delivery within the city; cash and carry, he may add 9½ percent)	4.51
The second wholesaler, who may sell to a retailer, may take a mark-up of 21 percent (Nov. 7, 1942, MPR 271, 1351.1003-3, class 3 (5))	5.46
The retailer may take a mark-up on a sliding scale of, roughly, 33 percent, depending upon the amount of business he does (Nov. 7, 1942, MPR 268, 1351.1116)	7.28

This is but one of the problems in which we are interested, and this is the kind of a problem we are trying to solve. I am willing to spend my evenings and all the time I can possibly find in an effort to help in solving some of these food problems.

I have in my possession reports from the British and Canadian Governments, and I shall be glad to make all of the information I can get available to my colleagues of the food-study committee who in turn will make it available to the House.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. If the gentleman from Texas or anybody else wants to object to what is being done or thinks it is not helpful, certainly I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman favor price control and rationing? He does; does he not?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes; we have to have it on basic commodities.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman realize that there are 1,800,000 different commodities, including grades, classes, styles, and fashions?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes; but there are not 1,800,000 items of food that are so important to the American diet as potatoes. We will study the most important and, if we live long enough, we may get to all the 1,800,000.

Mr. PATMAN. The place to study it is down here in Washington, not out over the country.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No; I disagree with the gentleman. Washington is not the place to study it, for here we have to take what the O. P. A. and other Government agencies give us, and we cannot find out how it is working out in the field. This is not an investigating committee; we are not trying to investigate anybody or anything. It is

a study committee, and in order to study the problem we have got to have the facts, and we do not want the facts if they are put out by the O. P. A. Those can be gotton right here in Washington, but we want to find out how the system is operating back home.

I have here another bulletin, this one put out by the United States Department of Agriculture, Food Distribution Administration, at Presque Isle, Maine, on April 26, 1943. This deals with Presque Isle, Maine, potatoes. I will read just two items from this bulletin, as follows:

Presque Isle, Maine (Aroostook County points): Table stock all sales to armed forces, 100-pound sacks and 50-pound paper sacks, hundredweight basis, various varieties, size A, 2-inch minimum, $2.60; United States extra, $2.70 (armed forces paying 10 cents above ceiling). Many present shipments seed. Warehouse cash to grower bulk, per barrel measure central points, too few sales to establish a market; market nominally around $4.

Weslaco, Tex.: Demand far exceeds supply; market strong at ceiling prices. Carloads, 50-pound sacks, Bliss Triumphs, Victory grade, washed and unwashed, $1.92½, air conditioning and ice extra. Sales to armed forces, $1.97½.

Here is a case of the Federal Government going out and paying 10 cents above the ceiling price on potatoes in Maine. Then going down into Texas, Weslaco, Tex., and paying 5 cents above ceiling price.

How are people going to respect price ceilings established by O. P. A. when those bulletins go out all over the country indicating that our own Government is violating the price ceilings and paying 5 and 10 cents more for 50- and 100-pound sacks?

This is but one of the things this committee is going to bring back to the minority and in turn to the House. If the majority Members are not interested in the facts, they may ignore them. When we make our decision on the necessary appropriation to O. P. A., it is going to be made on the facts made available by these study groups. I am mighty glad we can get 14 men who will spend the time that is being spent on this subject simply because of their interest in the subject and a desire to receive further information.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman has been giving us some information. He made the remark that he found out more in Boston in a day than he could get here, but all the information he has given us has been information that he received from the Department right here.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No. We received this in Boston.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is issued here in Washington.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No. This was not issued in Washington. The gentleman is wrong. I read this bulletin as being issued in Maine.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is a Department of Agriculture circular, and the gentleman said it came from Washington.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No. They have branch offices—oh, Lord, how many branch offices they have all over the country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact many of the people who are engaged in these different types of food business come here to Washington to advise and recommend to the O. P. A. officials certain policies that are necessary to produce food and get it distributed, but those who make the policies refuse to listen or to be guided by experienced men who are engaged in the particular line of business?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That has been my experience. If they do listen, they do not pay much attention.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They tell these businessmen what they are going to do to them rather than listen to constructive suggestions as to how things should be run?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes; that has been my experience.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. At our meeting in Boston we invited the O. P. A. officials, local and State, and we had a lot of them there. We brought out some things they did not know about.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman from Philadelphia objects to our even inviting the O. P. A. officials or taking up their time. Is it not just terrible that 14 Members of Congress should take up the time of an appointed official? Why should anyone object to any Member of the House, or any group of Members, inquiring into the administration of any agency we set up?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say further a meeting which our subcommittee held in New York 2 weeks ago today was attended by O. P. A. officials and by officials from O. W. I. We invited them to come in and listen to what was going on. The meeting was nonpartisan in every respect.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I may say I am sure the O. P. A. administrator of Connecticut will be invited if we go into that State, and I am sure he will accept.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today is the birthday of the WAAC's. In 1 short year they have become the finest women's corps of its size in the world. They have grown to the size of 62,500. They were created on faith, a burning faith in my own heart of long duration, the faith of my associates in Congress who passed the bill, the faith of the Chief of Staff, General Marshall of the War Department, and the faith of the Secretary of War, as well as the faith of the President of the United States, our Commander in Chief, who 1 year ago signed the bill creating the Women's Auxiliary Corps.

They have justified our faith. They are giving a fine performance of their duties. Colonel Hobby, its able director, the officers of WAAC, and the auxiliaries have made a remarkable record. Every woman who enlists knows she is releasing a man for combat duty. She feels it to be not only a duty but a privilege.

The eyes of America have been upon them, and with enemies abroad and at home, I know there have been those who would try to injure the service of the WAAC's, just as they have tried to destroy and hurt every effort that has been made in winning the war. But character is made by sacrifice that will see a job finished and well done. Character is not made by conversation and conversation cannot destroy it.

The WAAC's have the fine heritage of all our brave women from earliest times. In blazing a new trail, a new service of their own, they have followed, in spirit, in the steps of the women leaders, the wives and daughters, who came over in the early days of our country—came over on the *Mayflower* and other ships. They have followed in courage the trail of the pioneer women of the covered-wagon days who went west. They have followed in the footsteps of the brave women of Lexington and Concord and our Revolutionary days, and the brave women of the North and South and East and West who assisted in every war in every way that they could all through the history of our country.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I think a great deal of credit is due to the gentlewoman for her work in connection with the WAAC's. It was my good fortune to talk with a high-ranking Army official with respect to the work of the WAAC's, and he tells me that the work which they are now doing in the War Department has exceeded their expectations; that instead of being able to replace one man, each WAAC has been able to replace a man and a half, because of the stenographic and communications work involved, and in many of the things to which they were assigned, it was found that these young ladies were more adaptable than the boys.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution very much, and that is the sort of testimony that I am receiving from the War Department, from every officer with whom I have talked.

I visited Bolling Field Wednesday and reviewed the WAAC's and talked with the commanding general, and other officers, and they advised me that the WAAC's are doing a splendid job there;

that they have brought into the corps the finest enthusiasm, the finest kind of loyalty, and patriotism. Yesterday at Bolling Field, in talking with the WAAC's, they asked me to convey to the Congress their deep appreciation of the opportunity that it gave them to serve their country.

The Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, made a very fine statement about their answering the call to duty and their adaptability and the fact that he would like to have at least 500,000 of them. He paid them high tribute. They have every right to feel great pride.

I know that the House is just as gratified as I am to them for their efforts in the work.

This morning I met the very fine daughter of our distinguished colleague from New York, Representative KEARNEY, who has joined the WAAC's, and her enthusiasm, her interest, and her unswerving loyalty is typical of the service of all the WAAC's. They are anxious to be given more and more duties and to perform more and more service.

This afternoon I was talking to Mr. Allen, of the National Red Cross, who is just back from Africa. He said that I could quote him. He said that he had just seen the WAAC's and that they are performing the finest kind of service; that they were happy in their duties over there and that he heard nothing but good of them.

That is a very fine statement from a person from the organization that also has women on overseas duty.

He further told me that the Red Cross expected to have, within a year, 11,000 women overseas.

We had 22,000 women during the First World War. And, that is where I first got my idea that a corps of this sort would be extremely valuable.

As these women go on and take on a more important part in winning the war, I believe that the trust, the respect and admiration, the prayers and gratitude of every American goes with them. I know the Members of the House today wish to join with me in saluting these WAAC's and of extending to them every good wish upon their first birthday in their patriotic and splendid work.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 8 minutes.

WE MUST BUY BONDS, MORE BONDS AND MORE BONDS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there probably is not a citizen in the United States who does not realize more or less clearly that the costs of the war we are now engaged in are so stupendous as to be beyond human comprehension. The war itself—and probably all citizens understand this point clearly—is so desperate that there simply is no quitting point short of the utter, complete crushing of all the Axis Powers. Unfortunately, we cannot now stop to count the cost in lives and money. We must go on to victory regardless of the burden of debt or sacrifice the effort may impose.

It is true that we have had to give up many luxuries. We will have to give up many more. It is true that we have had to ration many necessities, and perhaps will find it necessary to ration many others.

We are having to submit to a tax burden which the American people never dreamed could come upon us. We are going to have a still heavier tax burden next year, and perhaps other years. We are going to have to bear a tax burden so heavy that any further increase would pass the point of diminishing returns.

In the face of all these sacrifices, present and prospective, we must buy bonds, and more bonds, and more bonds. There are two reasons for that. One is that it is not possible to raise, by taxation, sufficient money to pay that portion of the war cost which must be borne by those of this generation. At best a terrible burden of taxation will lie upon our posterity yet unborn when they in their turn take up the burden of paying for a war fought before their birth.

Not only must we buy bonds for the purpose of carrying on the activities of the war, we must buy them for another purpose, a purpose just as important to our welfare as is victory in the conflict at arms. We cannot afford to win the war and lose the peace. We dare not allow ourselves to approach the end of the war and the return to peacetime pursuits of the millions of men and women now engaged in war work, and the other millions of men and women now in the armed services, without some backlog—and a very great backlog—of reserve purchasing power. If we were to do such a foolish thing, we immediately would be plunged into an era of unemployment and depression which would cause the pre-war depression to shrink into insignificance in comparison. With the enormous public debt we will have, we cannot embark upon vast W. P. A. programs without further increasing the public debt and thus greatly adding to the burdens we already will be bearing. We would, therefore, face financial chaos and an economic earthquake in this country. That is what is meant by winning the war and losing the peace.

The only practical backlog of purchasing power available to all the people and which can be readily built up at this time is through the purchase of War bonds. Savings of the citizens against the time when munitions plants must be turned back to the production of civilian needs should be invested in this way. Many billions of dollars of these bonds held by our citizens generally will constitute a backlog of purchasing power which can spell for us the difference between economic survival and economic chaos. Even at best with the greatest backlog of Government bond reserve purchasing power we can create, the readjustment from war to peace will be exceedingly difficult and probably very hazardous. There is, therefore, no choice in the matter of our buying bonds. We shall have to buy them voluntarily or else some system of compulsory investment may be considered. It is far better, of course, from every point of view that the people buy these bonds voluntarily and that they absorb them as rapidly as possible.

The threat of inflation contained in the torrent of purchasing power now flowing into the hands of the people, while the goods are being exported for war purposes, hangs heavy over the land. One way to retire—the best way to retire—much of this potentially inflationary purchasing power, to await the time when it will be a boon rather than a threat to the Nation, is for the money to be invested in War bonds.

There is no question but that a very great proportion of the purchasing power now flowing into the hands of the people will have to be retired for future use. The goods and services to be bought at this time with this money simply do not now exist. If rising prices reduce the purchasing power of the dollar, the people will have lost a proportion of their money just as surely as though it were taxed away from them or as though they had not received it at all.

The practical way, the most sensible way is for the people to store up for their future use the money which they now do not actually require for their immediate needs. This money saved now and turned into the channels of trade when the war is over and the wheels of peacetime industry once more provide jobs for those now making implements of war, together with those returning to the pursuits of peace, will do more to bring about a return to normal conditions than 10 times the amount would do if spent while the war is on. I hope every citizen will accept this opportunity to build for himself a degree of future security which he can acquire in no other way. War bonds represent the soundest form of investment possible to secure. They will be a good investment when perhaps every other form of investment may be clouded by uncertainty.

It is the part of wisdom for all of us to buy more and more bonds. Let us in this way register our faith in the future of the greatest and the best country in all this world. If, when we are torn between the desire to buy War bonds and the desire to buy things we do not actually need, let us remember our boys on more than 70 battlefronts scattered all over the world. They are fighting for us. They need the equipment our money will buy. We must not let them down.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. VINSON of Georgia, for 15 days, on account of illness in family.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON, indefinitely, on account of illness in the family.

I AM AN AMERICAN

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, next Sunday, May 16, our people will observe I Am an American Day, therefore I deem

it an honor and a fine privilege, as a foreign-born Member of the House to speak on this occasion. I was born in Wollands, Berwickshire, Scotland.

With my parents I came to America at 2 years of age. I know something of the hardships and limitations of the Old World. I remember the poverty of my parents. I have heard them speak of the bitterness, hatreds, jealousies of Europe.

If some debt collector should attempt to collect what I owe to America, he would have on his hands a job that he could never finish.

My fellow Americans, we should recognize our debt to Columbus for discovering this new world, to the Pilgrim fathers for the faith and righteousness they brought to it, to the founding fathers for our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, and for thousands of other benefactions.

In the language of the poet:

"God helping me," cried Columbus,
"Though fair or foul the breeze,
I will sail and sail 'til I find
That land beyond the western seas!"

And into the vast and void abyss
He followed the setting sun;
Nor gulfs nor gales could fright his sails,
'Til the wondrous quest was done.

Uplift the starry banner;
The best age is begun!
We are the heirs of the mariners
Whose voyage that morn was done.

Measureless lands Columbus gave,
And rivers through zones that roll;
But his rarest, noblest bounty
Was a new world for the soul!

Whatever I may or may not be, I am an American from the ground up—from alpha to omega.

Our history is a romance. Our growth is an eighth wonder. Our achievements border on the miraculous. From the time when the *Mayflower* furled her weather-beaten sails to the present hour, American history is the envy of all other nations.

The United States is a land of romance and reality.

Here in the long ago lived the Indian in the midst of all this wonderful potentiality, leaving behind him the remnants of the stone-age civilization. Here came the English settlers to Jamestown in 1607, 104 in all. Later on followed the Pilgrims, who landed on the stern and rock-bound coast of New England. Inevitable in the movement of affairs, there came the pioneers in the field of religious liberty. Such men as Roger Williams and William Penn injected a new spirit of liberalism and of Christian charity.

The population grew and ideals flourished. A new spirit of freedom was infused into the varied groups here, and respect of law was supreme. In due time discontent arose; out of this came the War of Independence, which lasted 5 years. A great personality was brought to the fore. Because of his devotion and ability George Washington is classed among the immortals. Under his guidance new visions were born, a new venture in government undertaken, democracy as an adventurous experiment was launched.

With democracy came, as was evident, liberty—not license. The individual stood out as a human personality. Conflict of opinion was soon manifest. Out of this came the Civil War which tore the country to pieces. A great soul, Abraham Lincoln, was chosen by Providence to lead. His name is carved on "tablets of imperishable memory." Peace, in due time, settled within the borders of this land of hope and promise which invited down-trodden humanity to find a haven of refuge within its shores.

America is not wholly materialistic for she believes in education. Money is spent in profusion for public schools. Beautiful utilitarian high schools are to be found everywhere. Colleges and universities to the number of 532 dot our country. Opportunity beckons everyone who wishes to get an education.

What shall we say of America, the land of the free and the home of the brave—this land which has had, under God, such wonderful growth and development? We say "Thank God I am an American!"

To me, America means a land in which there is no caste, no aristocracy, no special privilege that sets one human being above or below any of his fellows. It is a land in which a man's destiny is limited only by his ability.

It means a land in which education is free to all the children of all its citizens. All its youth share alike in the intellectual and cultural heritage that is their common possession.

It means a land that recognizes the rights of men—the right to think, to speak, to write, and to print what one believes; the right of peaceable assembly; the right of criticism, protest, and petition; the right to subscribe to any creed or religion without fear of interference or persecution; the right to uncover truth and proclaim it—or the right, if one so chooses, to preach mistaken and false principles. For the right to preach truth is in danger when the right to preach error is denied.

It means a land in which differences and controversies are arbitrated by public opinion, in which the course of national action is directed by the majority will. It means a land which is a product of the will in the hearts of its citizens to be one people.

America means to me a land whose people are united under the ideal of democratic living, who seek to achieve the fullness of the democratic process, whose emerging social order has as its base the simple maxim of a carpenter's son: "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you."

It is wonderful to live in a country where you do not have to grab the baby and dive into the cellar every time you hear the hum of an airplane motor.

To live in a land where you can cast your ballot on election day without feeling one backward step will find you impaled on the point of a bayonet.

To live in a country where a man can start for home at the end of a day's work and know that no bomb has left a crater where his house was standing that morning.

To live in a land where speech is so free a candidate for public office is allowed to talk himself into another man's job—or into political obscurity.

To live in a land where the only persons who go into secret huddles to cover up their mysterious plots are young fellows in football uniforms.

And so, I thank God I am an American. All may not be right with America. There is still with us some of the social injustice and pestilence to the removal of which we dedicated ourselves as a young nation. But the fundamental human rights which are the essence of Americanism are still held sacred by our people and by our responsible leaders. We have all—and much more than the Pilgrim fathers expected to secure for their posterity in the New World. And as we memorialize their first Thanksgiving, so devoutly offered because they had escaped the religious bigotry and international jealousies of the Old World, every one of us can say with even more meaning and fervor than the Pilgrims said, "Thank God, I'm an American."

Then lift up your heads to the horizon and out there, in life you will find new realms to conquer. Greater, more glorious, more worth while than those which have been conquered in the past. This is your challenge and mine today and every day.

It is for you and me and other patriots to put our shoulders to the wheel and continue to work unceasingly until we shall have achieved the goals we know are within reach. Such is democracy. Such is the privilege of Americans.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 17, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

The House Committee on Roads will meet at 10:30 a. m., Saturday, May 15, 1943, to continue discussion of H. R. 2113, a bill to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m., on Tuesday, May 18, 1943, for consideration of housing bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2139, to provide improvement in the administration of parole, and H. R. 2140, to provide a correctional system for adult and youth offenders convicted in courts of the United States, at 10 a. m., on Tuesday and Wednesday, May 18 and 19, 1943, in room 346, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of Subcommittee No. 8 of the Committee on the Post

Office and Post Roads at 10 a. m., Wednesday, May 19, 1943, to consider H. R. 687. Public hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 19 and Thursday, May 20, 1943, on all bills dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act, H. R. 1882, H. R. 2309, H. R. 2428, and H. R. 2429.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, May 20, 1943, at 10 a. m. on H. R. 2612, to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

417. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to prohibit the allowance of credit in the computation of lump-sum payments to Air Corps Reserve officers under the provisions of section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936, as amended, for active service hereafter performed during the present wars and for 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

418. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the classification of the public lands in Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHEPPARD: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2713. A bill making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2714. A bill making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KERR: Committee on Appropriations. Report pursuant to House Resolution 105 authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to examine into and determine the fitness of certain Government personnel to continue in their employment; without amendment (Rept. No. 448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 236. Resolution providing consideration of House Joint Resolution 122, joint resolution extending the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days; without amendment (Rept. No. 449). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 122. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days; without amendment (Rept. No. 450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 879. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy," approved June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 238) without amendment (Rept. No. 451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 2629. A bill to provide an allowance for quarters and subsistence for midshipmen of the Naval Reserve; with amendment (Rept. No. 452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 237. Resolution granting a gratuity to the estate of Rose Ann French; without amendment (Rept. No. 453). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WARD:

H. R. 2715. A bill relating to the classification of substitute post-office clerks and substitute city letter carriers in first- and second-class post offices, and substitute laborers in the Postal Service and Railway Mail Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COMPTON:

H. Res. 238. Resolution creating a special committee to study and investigate the activities of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 239. Resolution to provide for expenses of investigation authorized by House Resolution 238; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, to permit the Commission to grant certain licenses; to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 2716. A bill to provide for the payment of $20,000 to Clarence Leaon Rounds, administrator of the estates of Gerald Rounds, deceased; Richard Gray, deceased; Virginia Grafton, deceased; and Geraldine Titus, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES:

H. R. 2717. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth M. Levering; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 2718 (by request). A bill for the relief of Lillian Woodward; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

758. By Mr. BELL: Petition of Hattie Hallar, of Blue Spring, Mo., and others from Blue Springs and Grain Valley, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082 as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

759. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Rev. Wright M. Horton, and 21 other citizens of Frankfort, Kans., and community, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

760. By Mr. FISH: Petition of 64 residents of Dutchess County, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

761. Also, petition of a committee of 50 from Orange County, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors for the duration of the war, and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

762. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Bronx Council, American Jewish Congress, New York City, endorsing and urging the passage of House bill 2328, introduced by the Honorable WALTER LYNCH; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

763. Also, petition of the Trade Union Council of the American Labor Party, urging the defeat of the Connally bill (S. 796); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

764. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. William H. Young and other residents of the Wheeling area of West Virginia, urging the establishment of a Chiropractic Corps in the armed forces now; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

765. Also, petition of Mrs. Irwin Hamilton and other residents of the Wheeling area of West Virginia, urging the establishment of a Chiropractic Corps in the armed forces now; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

766. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution of the Eldorado Central Labor Union, of Eldorado, Ill., signed by Robert Braddock, president, and William Gallagher, secretary, of said labor union, urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

767. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Mill Shoals, Ill., signed by Vernon Staton and 66 other citizens of that community, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

768. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Clifford J. Durr, petitioning consideration with reference to the Select Committee To Investigate the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

769. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Minnesota, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 17, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, the Father Almighty, in awe and reverence we stand before Thy greatness that we cannot measure. Yet are we grateful that our eyes have seen beauty, our hearts have felt love, our

minds have discovered truth, and our wills have found purposes that lift and ennoble and tie us to causes greater than our own brief span. We give Thee hearty thanks for great souls, great music, and great books, which for us have been mirrors of Thy glory. We who are of the earth earthy do feel the pull of the eternal tugging at our wayward hearts. We are conscious of a heavenly gravitation which lifts us to a mood of penitent aspiration, of unutterable longings, of winged thoughts that wander off into eternity.

As now we front the tasks of a new week give us a vision of the far-off years as they may be if redeemed by the sons of God, that we may take heart and battle more valiantly for Thy children and ours. As we have mastered nature that we might gain wealth and comfort help us now to master the social relations of mankind that we may gain justice, emancipation from want and fear, and a world of brothers. In the Dear Redeemer's name. Amen

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, read the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 17, 1943.*

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LUCAS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, May 14, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Taylor, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2581. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2664. An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 39)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1943, amounting to $20,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 41)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1944, involving an increase of $733,078, in the form of amendments to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 42)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations, fiscal years 1941 and 1942, in the sum of $644,432, and supplemental estimates of appropriations, fiscal year 1943, in the sum of $6,421,800, amounting in all to $7,066,232, for the Post Office Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the classification of public lands in Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT (S. DOC. NO. 43)

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War, Navy, and Agriculture (3); Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and Federal Works Agency (2), which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Immigration:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 43

"Joint resolution relative to increasing the quota for Portuguese immigration from Portugal and the Azores as an aid to milk production in California

"Whereas the dairy industry in the State of California has, by the development of the finest breeds of dairy cattle and through the energetic efforts of producers of milk, become one of the most progressive States in the Union, for the production of dairy cattle and milk; and

"Whereas the great milk-producing areas of the State and the fine herds of milk cows established therein are now by reason of a shortage of labor and of milkers threatened with extinction, with the result that the production of a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk will not be available to the consuming public; and

"Whereas one of the primary reasons for the shortage of the production of milk and consequent shortage of butter, cheese, and other milk products is the lack of suitable and capable labor upon the dairy farms and the shortage of qualified milkers; and

"Whereas in the development of the dairy industry in the State of California, especially in the San Joaquin Valley, Portuguese immigrants from the Azores Islands have played a major role in the development of the dairy industry and in the increased production of milk; and

"Whereas the Portuguese people who have immigrated to the United States from Portugal and the Azores Islands and their children who have been born in California have proven their patriotism and their adherence to the American ideals of government, and have become worthy and sincere citizens of California and the United States; and

"Whereas the restricted immigration quota for the Portuguese people from Portugal and the Azores Islands now precludes the entry into the United States of sufficient numbers of them to successfully continue in their efforts for the preservation and greater development of the dairy industry and the increasing of the production of milk in California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as is necessary to permit the increase in the immigration quotas for the Portuguese people from Portugal and the Azores Islands to the United States, in order that they may come to the State of California to augment and increase the labor on dairy farms and engage as milkers; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the Assembly of the State of California is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Greensburg and vicinity, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1066. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft, district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 241); and

H. R. 1563. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 242).

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1026. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or

death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities of the War Department or of the Army; with amendments (Rept. No. 243).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduce, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1110. A bill providing for the designation of each Monday during the present war as Memory Monday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONE:

S. 1111. A bill for the relief of Arvo Karl, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnson; and

S. 1112. A bill for the relief of Taylor W. Tonge; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1113. A bill to amend Section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 1114. A bill to provide for the adjustment of certain tort claims against the United States and to confer jurisdiction in respect thereto on the district courts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LA FOLLETTE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 60, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

PAN-AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE UNION

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution to establish a committee to provide for the formation of a pan-American legislative union. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, and I wish to quote briefly from it:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be composed of three Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The joint committee is authorized (a) to extend invitations, through appropriate channels, to the national legislative bodies of the Latin-American republics to designate and send representatives to attend a meeting, to be held at such time and place as the joint committee shall determine, for the purpose of joining in the organization of a pan-American legislative union, to be composed of members of such legislative bodies, and having for its purpose the maintenance of closer relations between the legislative branches of the governments of the American nations by consideration of their mutual problems, (b) to make such arrangements as may be necessary for holding such a meeting, and (c) to act as the representatives of the Congress at such meeting.

Mr. President, it has long been my view that the organization of a pan-American legislative union would go far in serving to buttress the "good neighbor policy" which was inaugurated by the present administration, and which I think has received almost universal public support and approval. I feel that it would be a long step in the right direction, by affording an organization which could discuss the mutual problems of the nations in this hemisphere.

Members of the Senate will remember that the President of Bolivia in his address to this Chamber recently suggested the advisability of forming a pan-American legislative union, and I welcome the suggestion coming from the president of one of our sister republics. It is my purpose to press for the early consideration of this joint resolution.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) establishing a committee to provide for the formation of a pan-American legislative union, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be composed of three Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The joint committee is authorized (a) to extend invitations, through appropriate channels, to the national legislative bodies of the Latin-American republics to designate and send representatives to attend a meeting, to be held at such time and place as the joint committee shall determine, for the purpose of joining in the organization of a Pan-American Legislative Union, to be composed of members of such legislative bodies, and having for its purpose the maintenance of closer relations between the legislative branches of the governments of the American nations by consideration of their mutual problems, (b) to make such arrangements as may be necessary for holding such a meeting, and (c) to act as the representative of the Congress at such meeting.

The joint committee shall report to the Congress the results of such meeting, together with its recommendations.

SEC. 3. The joint committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act at such places and times, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. Members of the joint committee shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the joint committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the joint committee held in the District of Columbia during such times as the Congress is in session. The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties; and may request the use of the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the department and agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to pay the expenses of the joint committee and to pay the expenses of any meeting held pursuant to section 2.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2581. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2664. An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

APPOINTMENT AS ENSIGNS OF COAST GUARD ACADEMY GRADUATES IN 1945—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, a few days ago House bill 2486, to authorize the appointment as ensigns in the Coast Guard of all graduates of the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, and for other purposes, was passed by the House and reached the Senate. A similar bill had been introduced in the Senate, and at the request of the Navy was referred to the Naval Affairs Committee. The House bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

After conferring with the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], he agrees with me that the Committee on Commerce should be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that the bill should be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. Therefore, I ask that the Committee on Commerce, before which House bill 2486 is now pending, be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed and to be printed in the RECORD:

At the proper place insert the following:

"No foreign-trade agreement hereafter entered into under the authority delegated to the President by such section 350, as amended, no amendatory or supplementary agreement hereafter entered into under such section, and no duties and other import restrictions specified in a proclamation issued by the President to carry out any such foreign-trade agreement or any such amendatory or

supplementary agreement, shall take effect until the Congress by law has specifically approved such agreement and the duties and other import restrictions so specified to carry out such agreement."

WE ARE ALL AMERICANS—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "We Are All Americans," delivered by the Vice President at a rally in Central Park, New York City, May 16, 1943, in celebration of I Am An American Day, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR SCHOEPPEL, OF KANSAS, AT DEDICATION OF PRATT ARMY AIR BASE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Gov. Andrew Schoeppel, of Kansas, at the dedication of the Pratt Army Air Base, at Pratt, Kans., May 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

REFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO WILLIAM PHILLIPS TO VISIT INDIAN LEADERS

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the editor of the New York Times, by Frances Gunther, Roger Baldwin, and Anup Singh, and published in the New York Times of April 28, 1943, under the heading "Viceroy's action questioned," which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP—ADDRESS BY WATSON B. MILLER

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject American Citizenship, delivered on May 16, 1943, by Watson B. Miller, Assistant Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, before the Americanization School Association of the District of Columbia, which appears in the Appendix.]

MILITARY DECISIONS—ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Military Decisions," by Mark Sullivan, published in the Washington Post of May 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

HELP FOR "LOST" VOTERS—ARTICLE FROM THE CHICAGO TIMES

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Help for 'Lost' Voters," from the Chicago Times of May 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GIVE A GARAND RIFLE CAMPAIGN—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRIDGES

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the give a Garand rifle campaign, which appears in the Appendix.]

BATTLE AGAINST INFLATION—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Has the Administration an Anti-Inflation Policy?" published in the New York Times of May 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF AVIATION—ARTICLE BY MARY HORNADAY

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Strange World Ahead," written by Mary Hornaday and published in the Christian Science Monitor, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ANNIVERSARY OF NORWAY'S INDEPENDENCE—TRIBUTE TO NORWEGIAN PEOPLE

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, today is a day which, ordinarily, would find a great people celebrating. This is the birthday of Norway's independence, but the unhappy lot of that great little country and its inhabitants is doubtless foreclosing opportunity and even desire for celebration.

One cannot know the Norwegian people who have become a part of us in America in considerable numbers without realizing that, whether they are here or in Norway, they come nearer being our kind of people than almost any other race of people on this earth.

My State knows these people from Norway and their descendants better than any other. No people are more readily made a part of the American body than these. They prize American citizenship; they become an active part of American citizenry naturally; and their contributions as a productive element of our population are recognized to be of the highest order. They prize education; they are highly religious; they willingly share responsibility in the duties of citizenship; and they bring into their everyday lives a sincerity of purpose that is singular. Really to know the Norwegian people is to admire and respect them most highly. They seem to fit perfectly into the American scheme of things. This can be only because they and their ancestors must have entertained ideals of society and government on a par with our own.

NORWEGIAN CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPMENT

One look upon the history of their migration leaves no room to doubt their ways of life and of thinking. When they came to America they were not seekers after easy ways to live. They took their families into the wilderness and carved houses and fields for themselves. And always one of their first moves was the building of schools and modest places of worship. Thus they played a major part in the development of some of our States, including my own. The development of the great Northwest is largely the part of the Scandinavian folks who came here to stay, to make their homes and become an actual part of America as Americans. They required no coaxing to become citizens. They qualified themselves for citizenship and went out after it.

So, the lot of Norway on this Independence Day is a thing which we all feel deeply. The conquest of Norway following her resistance to violation of her neutrality has brought to her hours of suffering and great unhappiness which must be deeply felt by all who trace ancestry back to that homeland. A realization of what probably is the lot of men, women, and children in Norway today brings keenest pain.

NORWAY AND THE ALLIED CAUSE

Too few people seem to realize what contributions have been made to the Allied cause in this war by this conquered nation. Could all Americans have access to the information which unfolds before our committees in Congress, information dealing with the conduct of the war, they would openly acknowledge that Norway has contributed mighty factors to the Allied effort. Her shipping contributions have been great, to say the least. Without these ships there might be another story to tell today. Her men in naval operations and those manning her immense merchant marine have accounted for untold Allied advantages. When the story is all finally known and told we shall probably find that Norway has done as much against the Axis as she could have done as an unconquered land.

Mr. President, during recent months studies in the Committee on Appropriations in connection with the first deficiency appropriation bill brought Assistant Secretary of State Breckinridge Long before the committee, in conjunction with certain arrangements which it was desired be made with Norway on the subject of exchanging ships and replacing ships. At that time Mr. Long said:

Vessels and ships were very, very scarce—

Meaning when the war opened—

and we still are finding them very difficult to obtain. The Norwegian Government had one of the largest fleets in the world. Its entire national life is wrapped up in shipping. At the beginning of the war it had 7,600,000 tons of shipping consisting of 1,051 ships. At the time that war broke out, Norway immediately gave concrete expression of her sympathy with what is now the Allied cause.

Senator NYE. Can you tell us how much of the shipping the Nazis had left there?

Mr. LONG. I am just getting into that.

Senator NYE. I beg your pardon.

Mr. LONG. At the very beginning of the war, Norway gave as much of her 7,600,000 tons as she could. She gave to Britain 2,200,000. She kept the others in a pocket and operated them as neutral vessels.

In April 1940, when Norway was attacked, she then had remaining 6,000,000 tons that were free which had not been sunk and which Germany had not captured. Germany took we do not know how many exactly, but somewhere around 50 percent of the difference between 6,000,000 and 7,600,000.

Senator BANKHEAD. When did Germany take those?

Mr. LONG. At the time she attacked Norway.

Senator BANKHEAD. What was the date of that?

Mr. LONG. In April 1940. All of those vessels since that time have been at the disposal of the British except those vessels which are in American control. When we went into the war those that were in American waters were added to the same general fleet. In 1943 Norway had left 3,800,000 tons consisting of 574 vessels, and in their entirety they were placed at the disposal of

the United States and British Governments and operated through the War Shipping Administration on this side and the British Ministry of War Transport on the other hand.

TONNAGE OF NORWEGIAN SHIPS NOW AFLOAT

Now, subsequent to this time, and last July when this pocket of 194 vessels was open, we made the agreement with Norway to which I have referred. There are, as of this date, 3,800,000 tons of Norwegian ships afloat which includes 223,000 tons which have been added to the Norwegian fleet as replacement by Great Britain. Norway has suffered a loss of 44 percent in sinkings, of which 2,100,000 tons are cargo ships and 1,700,000 tons are tankers.

Mr. President, I submit that this contribution to the Allied cause by Norway is all out of proportion to the numbers of people involved on a population basis.

Again during that hearing I asked:

Senator NYE. I would like to come back to recheck to be sure of our figures at the beginning of the war. Norway had over 7,000,000 tons of shipping.

Mr. LONG. That is right.

Senator NYE. She must have had a quarter of the shipping of the world.

Admiral LAND. She was No. 4 as a merchant-marine country.

Senator NYE. How much tonnage did she have?

Mr. LONG. She had approximately one-tenth of the world's tonnage; she had 7,600,000 tons.

Senator NYE. Her contribution has been very real.

Mr. LONG. It has been very real.

Admiral LAND. Greater than was expected.

Mr. LONG. She has the whole wealth of the country tied up in ships and she has made available every ship she had to our cause.

In other words, Mr. President, Norway's entire wealth has been given to the Allied cause.

We should recognize the spirit of this day of Norwegian independence. It is a day marking the spirit of a great people, an ordinarily peaceful, law-abiding, God-fearing people. And when we know that Norwegian independence is as much prized by Norwegian people as American independence is prized by Americans, then we find ourselves wanting to do everything within our power to restore the opportunity for Norway to enjoy again her way of life and her complete independence.

Way open to Norway not easy

The way for Norway may not be easy, even though the Axis be driven from her lands and shores. We hear of late most disturbing accounts of alleged wishes and plans of Russia with respect to the future of Finland, Norway, and Sweden. I hope these accounts are wholly without foundation; that these lands shall all be favored by the victors in this war to the extent of complete freedom and the right to determine their own ways with preservation of the ideals they have long championed. I hope, too, that this day will bring to Norway assurances by all the Allied Nations that Norway need not fear the consequences of a peace dictated by the Allies. Such assurances could play a mighty part in building the right kind of morale with people who will be ready to strike a powerful and decisive blow when the time for it shall be ripe.

Any after-war planning by the Allies that does not honor the independence of Norway is not deserving the name of planning by forces which allegedly are fighting for the very thing which Norway wants most and deserves—freedom from its present oppression and freedom to go forward independently of any strings to be tied to it by any other power.

I AM AN AMERICAN DAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, yesterday was I Am An American Day.

This Nation witnessed the moving spectacle of millions of American citizens of all ages joining in public rallies in honor of those who, by coming of age or naturalization, have attained the status of citizenship in this free country. These public exercises were designed to assist the citizens to understand more fully the duties and opportunities of citizenship and its special responsibilities in a nation at war.

I Am An American Day also witnessed the inauguration of a campaign to rededicate the millions on the home front to all-out support of our fighting forces. This campaign is being undertaken jointly by the I Am An American Foundation and the Good Neighbor Foundation. The pledge of the Victory Volunteer reads as follows:

Victory depends on me just as much as it does upon our loved ones who are sacrificing their lives on the fighting fronts of the world. I will do my best.

To the righteous cause of complete victory over the forces of aggression and enslavement, and to the ideals of the "four freedoms" for the peoples of the earth, I dedicate myself without reservation. I am an American.

This campaign to rededicate ourselves to speed the day of victory is a movement of the people, by the people, for the people. As representatives of the people, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and I join in calling to the attention of the Members of this honorable body the Victory Volunteer campaign to rededicate ourselves to all-out support of our gallant fighting forces.

DEVELOPMENT AND ACQUISITION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. CHANDLER obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a bill which is on the calendar. If unanimous consent be not granted, of course I cannot have the bill considered now, and I shall not occupy any of the time of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of order of business No. 213, Senate bill 33 to provide for the establishment and operation of sampling plants and custom mills as an aid in the development and acquisition of strategic and critical materials which are essential to the national defense.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the bill, but I have every confidence in the distinguished Senator from Nevada. May I ask if the bill has been reported favorably and unanimously by the committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Mr. McNARY. What is the general intendment and purpose of the bill? What will it accomplish?

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill is very succintly described in its title. Throughout the country there are a great many small mine activities in connection with which one or two or three men are working and producing either copper or lead or zinc or other war essential metals. If those men could be encouraged by the Government to bring in their ore in whatever tonnage they may be able to bring it to a market place, where the Government could sample it and take it off their hands, paying cash for it, the Government would then hold it until it had a carload, and would ship it to a treatment plant. The miners as a rule are unable to mine successfully unless they can mine and ship in carload lots, because the rate on less than carload lots is prohibitive. The purpose of the bill is to enable the Government to set up sampling plants throughout the country.

Mr. McNARY. That seems to be a commendable purpose. I observe also that the bill does not carry an appropriation.

Mr. McCARRAN. It carries no appropriation. It is merely an enabling measure.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 33) to provide for the establishment and operation of sampling plants and custom mills as an aid in the development and acquisition of strategic and critical materials which are essential to the national defense, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "critical", to strike out "materials" and insert "minerals"; on the same page, line 6, after the word "such", to strike out "materials" and insert "minerals"; on page 2, line 2, after the words "of the", to strike out "materials" and insert "minerals"; on the same page, line 12, after the word "such", to strike out "materials" and insert "minerals"; on page 3, line 2, after the word "such", to strike out "materials" and insert "minerals"; on the same page, line 4, after the word "such", to strike out "materials" and insert "minerals"; on the same page, line 11, after the word "critical", to strike out "materials" and insert "minerals"; and in line 12, after the word "such", to strike out "materials" and insert "minerals", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to further promote and encourage the development of mines and deposits of strategic and critical minerals within the United States and in order to provide for the acquisition of additional stocks of such minerals, the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Mines, is authorized and directed to establish, equip, operate, and maintain, at such places as are deemed appropriate, sampling plants and

custom mills for the sampling and treatment of ore which contains any of the minerals determined to be strategic and critical by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior, as provided in the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811).

SEC. 2. From appropriations made pursuant to the authorization contained in this act or from any other funds allotted or made available for such purpose, the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Mines, shall purchase, at the time of delivery to any sampling plant, ore which contains any of such minerals, at prices fixed on the basis of the content of the ore and cost of treatment. The purchase price of any such ore delivered to any sampling plant shall be estimated and 60 percent of the price so estimated shall be paid to the owner of such ore when so delivered. The remainder of the purchase price shall be paid to such owner after the treatment of such ore has been completed in order to provide for any variance in the estimated and actual content of the ore and cost of treatment and in order to provide for deductions or additions, if any, on account of any such variances and on account of excesses of deleterious elements in the raw ore or in the finished concentrate.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Mines, shall provide for the storage and maintenance of such minerals and shall, at the request of the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, dispose of such minerals in such manner as shall be requested for the industrial, military, and naval needs of the country.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior shall make an annual report to the Congress of his activities and expenditures under this act, together with the kinds and quantities of ores acquired pursuant to this act, the price paid therefor, and the strategic and critical minerals produced from such ores, and also the disposition of such minerals.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of sampling plants and custom mills as an aid in the development and acquisition of strategic and critical minerals which are essential to the national defense."

USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SILVER FOR WAR PURPOSES

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 225, Senate bill 35, to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States. The bill has been unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. McCARRAN. What is the bill?

Mr. GREEN. The silver bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say Mr. President, that we are trying to work out that matter. We hope soon to have the atmosphere clarified in respect to it. The conference committee on the Treasury Department appropriation bill will probably meet in a day or so, and it is hoped that an amendment in that bill will be stricken. When that is done we hope to make no objection, but will probably assist the Senator from Rhode Island in having the bill to which he has referred passed. Until that shall have been done, however, I must object.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I hope the objection will not be pressed, for the reason that the bill has been under consideration for a long time. It was under consideration for several weeks at the end of the last session, and finally the able Senator was successful in preventing action being taken upon it. The bill was reintroduced on the first day of the present session, and has been considered by the committee. Hearings have been held by a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The subcommittee favorably reported to the full committee. The full committee has unanimously recommended that the bill be passed. Delay at this time is critical. The country's silver stock available for use in the manufacture of munitions is running out. Last week I was informed that there was available a supply adequate for only a week or 10 days. It is very important to the war effort that the bill be acted upon promptly and, I trust, favorably. However, action should be taken without further delay. Delay after delay has been encountered. The committee to which the bill has been referred includes in its membership Senators who represent the same silver interests as those represented by the able senior Senator from Nevada, and they have unanimously recommended its passage.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Rhode Island, as I have already stated, that I am trying, and, since Saturday morning, have been trying, to facilitate matters so that action may be taken on the bill, and may be taken expeditiously. While the form of the bill as it came from the committee may not have been altogether satisfactory to the senior Senator from Nevada, nevertheless the senior Senator from Nevada is ready and willing to go along toward the expedition of the bill to its passage.

There is, however, in the Treasury Department appropriation bill now pending an amendment which was added on the floor of the House while the bill was there under consideration. If the amendment should prevail, it would destroy even the effect of the Senator's bill as it now stands. We want to clarify the atmosphere. We want the amendment stricken out, and we want the House to recede. We hope that will be accomplished. We are working toward that end, and are working continuously toward the end that we may be of assistance.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I am very glad to hear the Senator's statement insofar as it relates to his attitude toward Senate bill 35. However, let me ask how long he expects the delay to be?

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope that we can clarify the matter today and can have the objections out of the way. I hope we can do so either today or at least before the Senate meets again. We are working on it every hour.

Mr. GREEN. That being the case, Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Senators are receiving many letters urging speedy enactment of the bill, as indicated by the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island, and I hope he will press for prompt action upon it.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Taylor, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1041) to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes.

The message also announced that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 17, 18, and 26 to the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. MAHON, Mr. CURLEY, Mr. TABER, Mr. KEEFE, and Mr. DWORSHAK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has been recognized.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, there may be a very good reason for the remarks which the Senator from Illinois desires to make; but the Senator from Kentucky has had the floor for some time for the purpose of making a speech. After he obtained the floor, we proceeded to consider certain measures on the consent calendar. Now we have concluded the consideration of those measures; and at this time I should like to have the regular order. It is a bad practice for a Senator who has the floor to yield until every other Member of the Senate has been satisfied.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is demanded. The Senator from Kentucky will proceed.

FUTURE CONDUCT OF THE WAR

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, with the surrender of the Germans in Tunisia the African campaign has ended in a brilliant victory for the United States and its Allies. According to Mr. Winston Churchill, the President of the United States was the author of this plan and Mr. Churchill, as he said, was his able lieutenant. With the African campaign won, the question now facing the Allies is how to conduct the war in the future.

Conferences are now going on here in Washington and consideration is being

given this matter by the President of the United States and his advisers, and by Mr. Churchill and his advisers. It is the hope of every American and every citizen of the other Allied Nations that plans will be made for the successful prosecution of the war and that the war will be speedily won with the loss of the least possible number of American lives and lives of our Allies.

As an American Senator, deeply interested in America's making its full contribution, and with the full realization of the part our country must play in the peace negotiations after the war, I want on behalf of the millions of people in our country who want to make known their wishes and their desires, to make some suggestions with respect to the future conduct of the war. I do not claim to be a military strategist; but if, when the war has ended, the Senate of the United States is to be called upon to approve peace plans and treaties, it may be well for Senators to be consulted now by the leaders of the Government, and it may be well for them to have some understanding about the kind of world we expect to undertake to make in the future.

When the people of the United States were drawn into the present war by the attack of the Japanese at Pearl Harbor we turned our military forces against Germany, using only minor forces to hold Japan. We did that in spite of the fact that Japan had made the attack on us in the most foul and brutal manner, because we considered it at that time necessary to give Great Britain and the Soviet Union all possible support to prevent Germany from knocking out either one or both of them.

Let us survey the present situation and let us undertake to make plans now in the light of the situation as it exists today. Germany has lost the initiative, perhaps for the first time since the start of the war. The German Air Force is now weaker than the British Air Force alone, and the combined air forces of Great Britain and the Soviet Union are so much stronger than the German Air Force that Germany can no longer even hope to deliver a knockout blow against either Great Britain or the Soviet Union.

Furthermore the submarine threat to the supply lines of Great Britain is being overcome; and additional antisubmarine forces, which are coming into the battle against the submarine, make it probable that the rate of sinkings in the Atlantic will decrease each 6 months. Therefore Germany can no longer hope to win the war by the use of her submarine weapon.

We may, therefore, say with confidence that, together with the British and the Russians, we have made it certain that Germany now cannot knock out either Great Britain or the Soviet Union. Therefore our first objective in the war has been achieved.

By the victory that we and our allies have just won in North Africa, we have gone so far toward opening the Mediterranean that we need only capture now only a few islands—Sicily, Sardinia, and Crete—in order to insure safe passage for our shipping from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean by way of the Straits of Gibraltar and the Suez Canal.

A glance at the map will show that from Tobruk to Crete is about 200 miles; from Derna and Libya to Athens is about 360 miles; from Tunis to Sicily is only 90 miles; from Tunis to Naples is only 350 miles; and it is only 560 miles from Tunis to Genoa. So we have brought the war in Italy under the range of Allied bombers and fighting planes, and by the winning of the African campaign we have literally forged a ring of steel around the German Army and its Government.

We shall be able now to use our control of the Mediterranean either to strike at the Japanese forces in Burma, Siam, and the Malay Peninsula or to strike northward against the southern side of the continent of Europe, and we can, of course, use the British base to strike against the continent of Europe on the north.

Therefore, we in America have now, for the first time since this war began, a genuine choice of major objectives. We can now direct the greater part of our war effort against Germany or we can direct it against Japan. If we attack Germany first, we shall naturally be obliged to leave in the Pacific the relatively small American forces that are now keeping the Japs from advancing farther toward Australia, New Zealand, and Alaska, and if we adopt this strategy we must reopen the Burma Road and reinforce the American air forces in China. If we attack Japan first, we shall, of course, have to keep on giving Great Britain and the Soviet Union the support necessary to keep them going.

In a recent article entitled "How Japan Plans to Win," by Clark Lee, Associated Press Pacific correspondent, published currently in Collier's magazine, he has the following to say, which I believe is significant:

> Having accomplished every one of her major objectives, Japan is satisfied that she has won the war in the Pacific. All that remains, as she sees it, is to complete the unassailable wall of land, sea, and air defenses she is building around her huge, rich, new empire—a wall behind which she can grow fat and strong as she welds her "liberated" peoples together for the coming war of extinction against the white race. All she needs is time—just a little more time, please.

Let me read from the April issue of China at War:

> THE FAR EASTERN FRONT
>
> Japan is making good use of the respite that she is temporarily enjoying. One month after the Casablanca Conference—that is, around the middle of February—Japan started a vigorous consolidation campaign throughout the China front, aiming primarily at destroying the bases for a general Allied counteroffensive before it has a chance to get started. In some places, especially western Yunnan and northern Hunan, the enemy's renewed offensives would have developed into knock-out blows for China had it not been for stiff Chinese resistance. This campaign is now being pushed with increasing vigor in spite of repeated setbacks.
>
> The Chinese troops engaging over a million Japanese forces on these fronts are feeling more and more the strain of waiting after having done so for over 5½ years. But thus far they have held their own against repeated enemy attacks, knowing that they are fighting for the strategic positions that will one day be used to launch an all-out counteroffensive against the enemy.
>
> THE BURMA FRONT
>
> The Burma front remains unchanged. Although the Japanese forces defending southwestern Burma launched stiff counterattacks since March 13, the British troops still hold their positions along the Mayu River, about 20 miles northwest of Akyab.
>
> Meanwhile the Royal Air Force, the Tenth United States Army Air Force, and the Royal Indian Navy kept up their attacks upon enemy air bases and lines of communication in the Akyab area, as well as other parts of Burma. Damages inflicted upon the enemy included a 7,000-ton merchant ship off Rangoon, a troop-loaded launch off the Ramree Island southeast of Akyab, the Pazundung Creek bridge north of Rangoon, the Myitnge highway and railway bridge south of Mandalay, and, most important of all, the famed Gokteik viaduct, the railway link connecting Mandalay and Lashio.
>
> ENEMY PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN
>
> Another act by the Allies that may be considered as an effective countermove against Japanese propaganda was the formation of the Fourteenth United States Army Air Force in China under the command of Brig. Gen. Claire L. Chennault on March 10. Although this air force still remains numerically small at the moment, its becoming an independent fighting unit at this particular moment has the effect of giving the Chinese even in the occupied territories the unmistakable impression that more United States planes are coming and that the United States is not letting China down, as claimed by the Japanese propagandists.
>
> Even more effective would be the actual sending of more planes to China. The incessant explosions of bombs from American planes on Nipponese forces will automatically drown the din of their propaganda machine. Mere pledges of aid, however, will not produce the result.
>
> Still more effective in counteracting Japanese propaganda would be China's participation in the Allied council of war as an equal partner in the full sense of the word. Only by deeds of this kind can the tongues of the Japanese Goebbels be silenced and the people in occupied China be sustained in their resistance against the constant bombardment by the Nipponese propaganda machine.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator speaks of the very serious situation in which the Chinese find themselves. I wonder if the Senator, having investigated the subject pretty thoroughly, knows just how critical it is. My understanding is that it is extremely critical, and that the information coming to this country, both in official and unofficial ways, indicates that the Chinese find themselves in a desperate situation.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think the Senator from New Hampshire is entirely accurate. I think it is barely possible that unless the seriousness of the situation is realized by those who are holding conferences and mapping the strategy in this war, we may find ourselves in a desperate situation. My understanding is that Chennault has reduced his request to 250 planes. He had said that if he were given 500 planes he could drive the Japs out of China, but we have never been

able to find 500 planes to give Chennault to use against the Japanese in China. The reason for his presence here, perhaps, is that someone has finally realized the seriousness of the situation in China. Unless we give her immediate aid she may be forced out of the war. I dislike to think what the future might hold for us if China were completely out of the war.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that, many months ago, China sent a military mission to this country, that it was here in Washington and presented its case as forcibly and plainly as possible, and yet it is understood that it went back without assurances as to what aid could be given China?

Mr. CHANDLER. I know the mission was here. Apparently the results it obtained were not good. They certainly were not satisfactory to China. Over and over again I have said that it seems a shame that Australia, China, and other nations and commonwealths fighting with us are not given a place on a general board of strategy so that they may be able to present their case and get some definite action. I have been told by men high in authority that repeatedly decisions are made, and they hear about them months after the decisions are made. They continue to fight without knowing what has been decided for them. In my opinion, that is a very serious mistake.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has referred to the situation in Australia. I wish to submit this observation to him: The most startling thing I have heard in many weeks was the statement by a very prominent Australian newspaperman to a few of us recently that on the day he left Australia MacArthur had 75 fewer planes than he had 1 year previously. That scarcely seems like rating the Pacific theater according to the importance which it deserves.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree with the Senator. It would be a serious mistake not to provide enough planes for MacArthur and for the defense of Honolulu to stave off attack. I am not sure that we have given them a sufficient number. It is suicide to fail to give them a sufficient number to stave off attack. What MacArthur wants is a sufficient number to conduct an offensive, and he must have it if we are ever going to win the Japanese war.

I am one citizen of this country who believes sincerely that the Pacific cannot wait, that if anything comes out of the conferences being held by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, a major decision should be made to give the Pacific war the consideration which the facts justify it having in the general scheme of world affairs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I noticed yesterday that the goal set by the President for the production of airplanes may be reached. Has the Senator any information as to where this enormous amount of war material is going?

Mr. CHANDLER. I regret to say that I have no accurate information. I have been unable to satisfy myself why we could not supply 500 planes for General Chennault in China, when the need is so desperate. I am quite certain we have not done it. I am quite certain that there have been times when we have courted narrow escapes. The escapes in the Pacific have been so narrow as to make it seem almost foolhardy to court them. We must support China, Australia, and our whole Pacific area. A failure to do so may bring unparalleled disaster to the people of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since the speech of the Senator a couple of weeks ago I tried to obtain information why planes were not sent to China. My information is that it is an easy matter to send the planes there, but the difficulty is in supplying the gasoline and oil properly to operate them. It seems that the transports which are now being utilized must not only carry sufficient gasoline to enable them to go to China but must carry sufficient gasoline to fly back. Because of that fact, the difficulty has been in supplying gasoline. I wonder if the Senator could inform us on that subject.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not underestimate the difficulties involved in transporting war materials, planes, gasoline, and other equipment to China. A little further along I had planned to refer to a certain fact. I will refer to it now, because the Senator's question makes it important that I do so.

There is a British army of 2,000,000 in India. They are being held off from Burma by about 60,000 Japanese. I assert that no determined effort has been made by the British to drive the Japanese out of Burma. In a week or so they will not be able to do it because of the monsoons. I have not been able to find any explanation for the fact that a determined effort has not been made sooner. Until that is done, until we reconquer Burma, we shall not be able to drive the Japanese out of China.

Airfields which could have been built near the Burmese border by the British have not been built. If such airfields had been built they would have helped our airmen in bombing the Japs out of China. While the British have built about 150 airfields in other places, for some reason they have not built them close enough to the border so that they could have been used to carry the war to the Japs in Burma and in China. In my opinion, that was a serious error. I am convinced that if Britain will not build such airfields we must build them, and we must have men who are willing, if necessary, to stand the gaff and make known the needs of the American people with respect to the seriousness of the Japanese menace.

We have received repeated warnings concerning the war with Japan. I should like to refer to a very short speech which was made over the Columbia Broadcasting System by Ambassador Grew. He said:

> Even before Pearl Harbor Japan was strong and possessed a military machine of great power—and when I speak of that military machine I include all branches of the Japanese armed forces, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire address printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR WAR WITH JAPAN

(Joseph C. Grew)

Even before Pearl Harbor, Japan was strong and possessed a military machine of great power—and when I speak of that military machine I include all branches of the Japanese armed forces, the army, the navy, and the air force. That military machine had been steadily strengthened and developed during many years, especially since Japan's invasion of Manchuria in 1931, an act of unprovoked aggression which, in effect, commenced the expansionist movement of Japan in total disregard of the rights and legitimate interests of any nation or of any people that might stand in the way of that movement. In 1937 came Japan's invasion of North China and Shanghai, which led to the past 6 years of Sino-Japanese warfare. The Japanese did not wish to clothe that infamous campaign with the name of war: They called it first the China Incident, and later, when great Japanese armies were trying desperately but futilely, year after year, to destroy the manpower and break the magnificent courage and fighting spirit of the ill-equipped but determined forces of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, the Japanese people, even with their own unbalanced humor, could not fail to perceive the sardonic humor of the term "Incident," and they then, with tragicomical deliberation, dubbed the campaign the China Affair, but never war. So it is today.

But during all these years of their unavailing effort to conquer China and to bring about the surrender of the Chinese National Government those Japanese armed forces were using China as a training ground in preparation for the greater war, already carefully planned, for their eventual conquest and intended permanent control of all of so-called greater East Asia including the South Seas and for the imposition upon the peoples of those far-flung areas of what Japan is pleased to refer to as the New Order and the Coprosperity sphere. We know what that flowery slogan "Coprosperity" means: It denotes absolute overlordship—economic, financial, political—for Japan's own purely selfish interests and the virtual enslavement of the peoples of those territories to do the bidding of their Japanese masters. This statement is not a figment of the imagination: It is based on practical experience in other regions already subjected to Japan's domination. Such a regime will be imposed in every area that may fall under Japan's domination.

During all of this period of preparation the Japanese military machine has been steadily expanded and strengthened and trained to a knife edge of war efficiency—in landing on beaches, in jungle fighting, and in all the many different forms of warfare which it was later to encounter. The jealous personal disputes, endless red tape, and face-saving expedients which characterize the civil life of Japan in times of peace wholly disappear in war; the various branches of their armed forces cooperate in well-nigh perfect

coordination, and their staff work, strategy, and tactics are of a high degree of excellence. Furthermore, in war Japan is wholly totalitarian; her economy is planned and carried out to the last detail. No word of criticism of the Government or its acts is tolerated; the so-called "thought control" police take care of that. Labor unions are powerless. In war Japan is a unit, thinks and acts as a unit, labors and fights as a unit.

With that background, and having in mind the strength and power of Japan even before Pearl Harbor, consider for a moment the scene as it has developed in the Far East. Consider the tremendous holdings of Japan today—Korea, Manchuria, great areas in China proper, Formosa, the Spratly Islands, Indochina, Thailand, Burma, and the Andamans, the entire Malay Peninsula, Hongkong and Singapore, the Philippines, the Netherlands East Indies, and farther to the south and to the east myriads of islands, many of which are unsinkable aircraft carriers.

Those areas contain all the raw materials essential to the development of national power: Rubber, oil, tin, metals, and foodstuffs—everything that the most comprehensive economy can desire; and they contain furthermore millions of native inhabitants who will be enslaved as skilled and unskilled labor by Japan to process those raw materials for immediate and future use. Add to that the stores of scrap iron for the making of steel which have been accumulating these many years in the Japanese homeland and the further stores acquired in the many conquered and occupied ports. There you have a recipe and the ingredients for national strength and power that defeat the imagination even approximately to assess.

Now to this recipe and these ingredients add one further element of grimly ominous purport. During all of my 10 years in Japan I have read the books, the speeches, the newspaper and magazine articles of highly placed Japanese. Sometimes thinly veiled, sometimes not even veiled, has emerged their overweening ambition eventually to invade and to conquer these United States. In their thinking, even the megalomania of Hitler is surpassed. Fantastic if you will, but to them it is not fantastic. It was not fantastic when the foremost Japanese admiral, as recently occurred, publicly stated in all seriousness that he intends that the peace after this war will be dictated in the White House in Washington—by Japan.

It might be 1 year or 2 years or 5 or 10 years before that Japanese military machine would find itself ready to undertake an all-out attack on the Western Hemisphere; they themselves have spoken of a hundred-year war, but one fact is as certain as the law of gravity; if we should allow the Japanese to dig in permanently in the far-flung areas now occupied, if we should allow them to consolidate and to crystallize their ill-gotten gains, if we should allow them time to fortify those gains to the *n*th degree, as they assuredly will attempt to do, it would be only a question of time before they attempted the conquest of American territory nearer home.

What worries me in the attitude of our fellow countrymen is, first, the utterly fallacious pre-war thinking which still widely persists, to the effect that the Japanese, a race of little men, good copyists but poor inventors, are incapable of developing such power as could ever seriously threaten our home shores, our cities, and our homes, a habit of mind which is reinforced by the great distances separating our homeland from the eastern and southern battle fronts today. Second, I am worried by the reaction of our people to the current successes of our heroic fighting men in the Solomons and New Guinea, for after each hard won victory the spirits of our people soar. Moral stimulation is good but moral complacency is the most dangerous habit of mind we can develop, and that danger is serious and ever-present. For 10 years I have watched the aggression of Japan against her neighbors, and her spoliation of American life and property, and I say to you, without hesitation or reserve, that our own country, our cities, our homes, are in dire peril from the overweening ambition and the potential power of that Japanese military machine—a power that renders Japan potentially the strongest nation in the world—potentially stronger than Great Britain or Germany or Russia or the United States—and that only when that military caste and its machine have been wholly crushed and destroyed on the field of battle, by land and air and sea, discredited in the eyes of its own people, and rendered impotent either to fight further or further to reproduce itself in the future, shall we in our own land be free from that hideous danger and be able once again to turn to paths of peace.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not wish to burden the Senate by reading the entire address, but I should like to read the latter part of it:

I am worried by the reaction of our people to the current successes of our heroic fighting men in the Solomons and New Guinea, for after each hard-won victory the spirits of our people soar. Moral stimulation is good but moral complacency is the most dangerous habit of mind we can develop, and that danger is serious and ever present. For 10 years I have watched the aggression of Japan against her neighbors, and her spoliation of American life and property, and I say to you, without hesitation or reserve, that our own country, our cities, our homes are in dire peril from the overweening ambition and the potential power of that Japanese military machine—a power that renders Japan potentially the strongest nation in the world—potentially stronger than Great Britain or Germany or Russia or the United States—and that only when that military caste and its machine have been wholly crushed and destroyed on the field of battle, by land and air and sea, discredited in the eyes of its own people, and rendered impotent either to fight further or further to reproduce itself in the future, shall we in our own land be free from that hideous danger and be able once again to turn to paths of peace?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. What is the date of the speech from which the Senator from Kentucky has just read?

Mr. CHANDLER. I have read from a solemn warning by Ambassador Grew. The address is published in the April issue of the Columbia Broadcasting System's "Talks." The actual date of the speech is not given, but it was made after the return of the Ambassador from Japan.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. In the light of what Ambassador Grew has said in the speech from which the Senator from Kentucky quoted, and in the light of the statements of the Senator, as well as the study of the situation which he has made, is it the judgment of the Senator from Kentucky that day by day Japan is growing richer in war materials and stronger from a military standpoint?

Mr. CHANDLER. The Japanese are digging in. They have control of 300,000,000 people. They have resources which would stagger the mind of the average citizen, who remembers that we used to claim we were blockading Japan. Japan is now really blockading the United Nations. She has oil, petroleum, rubber, tin, and all the other essential materials which she did not have prior to the outbreak of the war.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is it not a fact that if this situation should continue Japan might become a "have" nation, and we might find ourselves among the group which could rightfully call themseives the "have nots"?

Mr. CHANDLER. We face that prospect by a failure to recognize the strength, tenacity, and determination of this enemy.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is it true that the people in many of the conquered lands which the Japs have taken over, instead of being in rebellion in their hearts and souls against the conqueror, as is the case in most of the conquered countries of Europe, are working with their conquerors, the Japs, in developing the resources of the conquered countries, and exploiting many of the assets of the captured lands?

Mr. CHANDLER. I believe it would be safe to say that the Japs are having less trouble with the people they have conquered and subdued than the Germans are having with the inhabitants of the countries which they have conquered.

Under Manuel Quezon, one of the greatest friends the people of the United States have ever had in that section of the world, 90,000 Filipinos stood beside our American soldiers and fought through Bataan to Corregidor and never surrendered. Why did the Japs go to the Philippine Islands? Did they go there because they wanted to fight the Filipinos? Did they go there because the Philippine Islands were rich in materials which they wanted to possess? They did not. They went there because the American flag was flying over the Philippine Islands, and they could not afford to bypass them. It is a singular thing, but Tojo was in Manila on the anniversary of the fall of Corregidor and was trying by appeasement to win the Filipinos back to the Japanese side by telling them, "After all, we are all Orientals and those are white men. We belong to the same country." It is my judgment that except for the determination and spirit of Manuel Quezon, they might do the job.

Of course, if the situation of the Filipinos should become hopeless and they should come to believe that we will never come back, they would have no choice but to aline themselves with the Japanese. So far they have no reason to believe, except from our statements, that we will come back. When MacArthur was taken out of the Philippines he was promised that he would be able to organize, promote, and mount an offensive to recapture the Philippine Islands. More than a year has now intervened since then and the offensive has not been mounted.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Confirming what the Senator has said, in a recent conversa-

tion with an American who had been a prisoner in a Japanese camp in Hongkong, he stated that his duties caused him to travel throughout all the islands in the area which is now a part of the war area of the Pacific, and that he was surprised to find an anti-Allied sentiment among the people to whom the Senator has referred. He said that they had no regard for the Japanese, that they disliked them, but they preferred them to the Allies. I was very much surprised, as he was, to find that to be the general sentiment in the Orient.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am interested to hear the Senator's comment. I am certain that unless we show some determination to mount an offensive those people will perhaps have reason to believe that we shall not be coming back, and that they will be left to their own devices.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. A few moments ago the Senator from Kentucky made the statement that there are 2,000,000 British troops in India, and that they are facing only 60,000 Japanese troops. What is the reason for the fact that 2,000,000 British troops are facing only 60,000 Japanese troops and nothing apparently is being accomplished?

Mr. CHANDLER. I cannot explain it.

Mr. WHEELER. It does not seem possible that that can be a fact, although I have heard upon very good authority that it is the truth. It seems incredible. It would indicate, it seems to me, that the British are not interested in that section of the world, although, from the standpoint of material, I should think they would have far more interest in the Pacific than would the United States, because of their interests in India, Burma, Singapore, and that whole general area. I cannot understand, and I do not think the American people can understand, why the British are not doing something about it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree with the Senator. As we all know, General Stilwell was run out of Burma. He did not like that and wants to go back. He said at the time the war was going on there the Chinese offered to go, but they were not welcomed, at least their offer to go was not accepted promptly enough to make them effective, and the result was Stilwell was driven out of Burma. I have been told that perhaps the British did not make this move because they feared an uprising in India, but 2,000,000 men ought to be able to quell an uprising in India and ought to be able to drive the Japs out of Burma. Two million of our boys could do it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, is it the Senator's opinion that the sooner an offensive against the Japanese is started in the Pacific, the more American lives will be saved?

Mr. CHANDLER. I intend to refer to that, and I should like to have the Senator listen carefully to what I shall say in that connection.

The decision to be made on the question of our net major objectives is one which will affect the life of every American, and we have a right to ask our leaders, now in conference, to make the decision on the basis of the interests of the American people and of world peace, which is our greatest interest.

Our aims in this war, into which we have been drawn by the dastardly attack of the Japanese, are neither complicated nor selfish. If I may be permitted by the Senate to summarize them briefly, the aims of our people in this war are (1) as speedily as possible, with the smallest possible loss of American men and women, to compel the unconditional surrender of Japan, Germany, Italy, and their satellites; and (2) as soundly as possible to lay the foundations for future peace in the world. Is it wiser to attempt to achieve these aims by attacking Germany or Japan first? Those who argue that we should attack Germany first base their argument on a perversion of the old military principle that when you have two opponents in a war you must try to concentrate as great a portion of your strength as possible against one opponent and destroy his force before attacking the other.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is it not a fact that, with the taking of north Africa, and the occupation of Dakar, we have removed the immediate threat to the Western Hemisphere from the European situation, and, therefore, we are freer now to act in the Pacific than we have ever been before?

Mr. CHANDLER. As I have said, I think we have taken the initiative away from Germany; I think we have the choice of the major objective for the first time during the war.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Bearing in mind the question asked by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], does not the Senator feel that it was almost necessary for us to clear north Africa of the Germans so as to ease our shipping difficulties?

Mr. CHANDLER. I think it was highly desirable and timely.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was it not necessary?

Mr. CHANDLER. Many things are necessary that cannot be done.

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly. If we had not put all our might into north Africa, the chances are that the Germans would still be in possession of north Africa; but by concentrating almost our entire forces in north Africa we were able to clear the Germans from that territory. In other words, I feel confident that had we tried to fight the Germans and also the Japs at the same time, it would have been necessary to divide our forces and thereby weaken our striking power. As appeared in the newspapers yesterday and on previous occasions, our victory in north Africa will release in excess of 2,000,000 tons of shipping, which should go far toward relieving the situation of which the Senator complains.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is absolutely right. I have no quarrel with the African campaign. The plans for that campaign, according to Mr. Churchill, were made by the President, and he was his lieutenant, as he said, in helping to achieve that great victory. By doing that it has been made almost definite now that we have taken from Germany the power to carry the fight to us; and in this war if you are on the defensive you lose the power to carry the fight to the enemy and ultimately have but one choice, which is subjugation to the wishes of the fellow who is on the offensive. I agree that the African campaign was a fine thing, and I am glad it terminated as it did.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator had any indication that we will not, from now on, send more oil, more planes, more munitions and other implements of war to India, so as to drive the Japs from Burma and thereby relieve the Chinese?

Mr. CHANDLER. I shall have a little more to say about that later on. Promises will not do; we have to have performance.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator said, and I know he is correct, that Mr. Churchill gave all the credit for the north African campaign to the President, but I noticed the other day that Lord Halifax, in a speech at Chicago, gave the credit to Churchill; so I do not know who is right.

Mr. CHANDLER. There may be some dispute as to whom the credit properly belongs, after the victory has been won.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Are the 60,000 Japanese in Burma the only force that stands between the Allies and China?

Mr. CHANDLER. So far as we are informed that is so.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That force holds the road by which we should go into Burma. As I understand, the Indian Ocean is now clear, so that we can get there by water and can get there by land. Does it not seem rather odd that, with the large force in India right next to Burma, between China and India, 60,000 Japanese can keep us from sending ammunition and supplies to China that could raise, I am told, two or three million men, and clear the way for us to get airports from which to bomb Japan?

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is accurate.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I think those who handle our diplomatic affairs and the war should make plain to the people of the United States and to the British people why that is not done.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think we should have some immediate understanding.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I do not see how Great Britain could render a greater aid to Japan than doing what she is doing now.

Mr. CHANDLER. There are some situations existing which, from the standpoint of partners, are not to be explained. I shall take occasion a little further along to refer to specific instances where we have a friend that is supposed to be fighting with us but who is lending aid and comfort to the enemy that is trying to destroy us. Such things are irreconcilable, and I am not able to answer why that is done; but it is done.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. We have another example of that in Russia and Japan.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. We are informed that a very important decision was made in favor of Japan when Russia gave the Japs a weather station at Kamchatka, which could advise Japanese bombers about the weather when they undertook to bomb Kiska and Attu. I am also informed that our boys at Dutch Harbor have no weather station, but have to fly blindly through the fog.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Russians have just renewed their fishing treaty with Japan, and Admiral Yarnell, who served as chief of the American Fleet in eastern waters for some years, warned the other day that the Japanese fishing vessels were being used to supply weather information to the Japs. That is what has made it so difficult for us in the Aleutians.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I was going to say in connection with what the Senator from Minnesota said as to the Japanese having a weather station in Kamchatka that I am told by military people, who ought to know what they are talking about, because they spent a good deal of time in that area, that with the weather station which was given by the Russians to the Japanses the Japs are able to tell when the weather clears up on our side, but we are not able to tell as to the weather on their side because the warm winds which come up from Japan and China and strike to the north create the fogs. The Japanese can tell when the fogs have cleared up over there, but we cannot ever tell.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand that they have the key to the weather situation whereas we have not, and that is one of the reasons for our great disadvantage in operations in that area.

Mr. WHEELER. That is what I have been told by men who have spent much time in that area, Americans who are familiar with conditions and circumstances, for instance, a resident of my State, who engages in commercial lines and is interested in fisheries and other activities in different sections tells me exactly the same story.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course the Senator realizes that, without knowing all the facts, it is very difficult to discuss strategy on the floor of the Senate; but suppose Russia had not renewed the fishing agreement wih Japan, and, because of that, suppose Japan had attacked Russia from the back or on her eastern frontier, does the Senator feel that Russia would have fared as well as she has fared against Germany?

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, the answer to that would be a guess, and I will not hazard a guess, but I will say that when she renewed the trade treaty with Japan it was not friendly to us.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to make a comment on two statements the Senator from Louisiana has made. One is that there is certainly no indication that Russia has up to date shown any desire to take any hostile step toward Japan, or vice versa, is there?

Mr. ELLENDER. There may not be any on the surface that we can detect, but, I repeat, there is no doubt in my mind that if Russia had not treated Japan in a kind of friendly way, Japan might have struck at her, and if Japan had struck, I venture to say that Russia would be in an untenable position today. That goes without saying, and there should be little left for guesswork. Time will tell, and I venture to say that Russia will strike at Japan when it will be safe for her to do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator then approve the entire relationships which are developing between Russia on the one hand and Japan on the other?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know because I am not in possession of all the facts and circumstances that prompt Russia to follow the course that she is now pursuing. I feel confident that those who are doing it must know what it is all about.

Mr. BRIDGES. When the Senator says "those who are doing it," whom does he mean?

Mr. ELLENDER. If I knew all the facts, I might be able to give the Senator a more complete and intelligent answer, but viewing the situation from the Senate floor, as an "armchair strategist," I would say that it might have been good strategy for Russia to follow her present course.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not mean on the part of Russia and Japan; I mean on the part of this country.

Mr. ELLENDER. I refer to Russia and Japan, not to this country. I am talking about Russia and Japan. I do not know what our country has done in that regard.

Mr. BRIDGES. I was talking wholly from the standpoint of the best interests of the United States, not of Japan or Russia; and I think that is the approach we should make.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, but we "armchair strategists" do not know all the facts, and I do not believe we are in a position to say what should have been done, or what steps our country should adopt unless we know what the facts are. I am willing to trust the President and our Army and Navy officials who are now handling the matter here in Washington and abroad. In the light of our utter lack of preparedness before and soon after Pearl Harbor, I think our country's leaders have done a magnificent job. We are just beginning to fight and I would ask Senators to be patient and to watch the fur fly from now on.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, when the war shall have ended, the Senate of the United States will be confronted with the situations referred to, and it will be unfortunate if there shall be failure to consult Senators of the United States, and failure to apprise them of things about which they do not know. I know about many things, and I do not speak as a military strategist or as an "armchair strategist," I speak as an American Senator, representing the State of Kentucky and the people of the United States, and I say that when Russia made the recent treaty with Japan, it was not friendly to the United States, it was not calculated to help the United States in the war against Japan, and it does not help the United States in its war against Japan.

In spite of the fact that lend-lease material goes by the Japs and goes into Russia—and perhaps some of it comes back; who knows?—there is no showing that indicates, although the Russians are our partners, that they are ever going to fight Japan, and I want our country to fight Japan while we are strong, and while we are able to deliver the strongest possible blow against them.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. We all hope that the war in Europe may be over the coming fall or perhaps the coming winter, and there is quite a substantial rumor to the effect that it will be. I have heard it from authoritative sources, from those who should know what they are talking about. Others tell us quite differently. But it is true that many people in the United States are suspicious as to what Russia is going to do about Japan, and there are a great many people—and I might say that in my judgment they are people who know something about military strategy—who feel that we should do something about Japan, that we should take the offensive against Japan now, and that we should do it now so that we will be in a better position at the peace table than we will occupy if Japan shall still be strong.

Russia has been claiming a large part of Poland. It has been stated to me by those who should know that the Russians are not only insisting on a large part of Poland, but that they want a part of the Balkans; they want freedom of the Bosporus; they want to control the Bosporus, and they even want other portions of Europe. I do not know that my informants are correct, but they are in a position to know what they are talking about.

Let us assume for the sake of the argument, that what they say is true. We would be in a much better position to deal with Russia when we came to the peace table, and to protect Poland, for which England went to war. England went to war to give freedom and independence to Poland. Now suppose Russia comes in and says, "We want a large part of Poland." Everyone who knows

anything about the matter concedes that she is going to insist on a large part of Poland, and that she is going to insist on taking Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. It has even been said that she wants a part of Norway and Sweden, and she wants part of the Baltic states, and wants to control the Bosporus. England has heretofore gone to war over the Bosporus question, and if England went to war to protect the independence of Poland, and went to war to protect Finland and other independent countries of Europe, certainly we should be in a position at the peace table to protect those countries, and we are not going to be in as good a position if there is a strong Japan and we have to concentrate on trying to defeat Japan and turn all our forces against Japan at that time.

I think we should try to do everything possible to defeat Japan, and to weaken her as much as possible. I was shocked when I heard the Senator say that 2,000,000 British soldiers are facing 60,000 Japanese, and are not making headway, but in the last few days have been retreating.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish now to repeat a statement I have already made, and I should like to have Senators who are interested listen to what I am about to say, because at least from my viewpoint, I think the statement will portray the situation as it actually exists.

Is it wiser to achieve our aims by attacking Germany first, or Japan first? Those who argue we should attack Germany first base their argument on a perversion of the old military principle that when you have two opponents in war you must try to concentrate as great a portion as possible of your strength against one opponent and destroy his forces before you attack the other opponent. They argue that since the Red Army is in a death struggle with the German Army and since the Soviet Union is not at war with Japan, the United States and Great Britain should turn all possible forces into the fight against Germany, and then, after the defeat of Germany, the United States and Great Britain and the Soviet Union together will crush Japan.

There would be great strength in this argument if it were not for the fact that the Soviet Union is not at war against Japan, and shows no sign of going to war against Japan, and has made no promise to go to war against Japan. Stalin is a realist, and he promotes with all his strength and vigor what he believes to be the interests of the Soviet Union. He has been cultivating friendly relations with Japan.

If we defeat Germany first, the Soviet Union will be at peace. I want Senators to remember that, if we defeat Germany first, Russia will be at peace.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. What cause would the Soviet Union have for going to war against Japan?

Mr. CHANDLER. I am about to come to that, and explain the reasons, if there are any.

If we defeat Germany first, the Soviet Union will be at peace, and it is difficult to imagine that Stalin will then wish to suffer further losses by attacking Japan if he can sit quietly in peace and watch us defeat Japan.

I am enough of a realist to know that we did not go to war until the Japanese attacked us. Nothing that happened in the European theater of war ever caused the American people, or a majority of its citizens, or its Government, to be willing to go to war. We were always short of war until the Japanese made the attack upon us.

To be sure, if the Soviet Union should go to war against Japan the defeat of the Japs would be rapid, or if Stalin would let us use air bases in Siberia for bombing Japan the defeat of the Japs would come quickly. But that also would mean war for the Soviet Union against Japan, since the Japanese would attack the Soviet Union, and that would be an end of the peace which the Soviet Union would be enjoying and using to repair the ravages of war at home and, as the Senator has said, to extend Soviet control over eastern, central, and perhaps western Europe.

We should, of course, expect that after we had sunk most of the Jap Fleet, and shot down most of the Jap airplanes, and fought our way close to the heart of Japan, and were about ready to make the final stroke, the Russians would come in and attack the Japanese Army in the Chinese province of Manchuria and seize Manchuria. The Russians were not at war with Poland in 1939, but when the Germans went into Poland they found themselves met by the Russians about half way into Poland. Of course, the purpose of the Russians in going into Poland was to establish a buffer in Poland between Germany and Russia, and to extend the territory held by the Russians a little bit farther out, and make it a little more difficult for the Germans in the war with Germany which Stalin knew was coming.

Mr. President, we criticized the Russian Government quite seriously when Russia attacked Finland. All of us know now that the purpose of Russia's attack on Finland was simply to obtain enough territory on the Karelian Isthmus so as to enable the Russians successfully to defend Leningrad. If it had not been for the fact that the Russians seized the Karelian Isthmus before the Germans attacked Russia, the Russians probably would have lost Leningrad.

If we do not press the war against Japan, and if we push in and finish the war with Germany very quickly, I hate to think how little influence the President of the United States will have when Russia and Great Britain begin to develop their spheres of influence on the continent of Europe.

Mr. President, I want all Senators to remember when it was that Woodrow Wilson lost his influence in framing the peace treaty. Everyone knows that he lost influence at the peace conference. Two great failures occurred there. One was the failure to take into account the fact that peace treaties had to be confirmed and approved by the Senate of the United States. There are some in the United States today who ridicule the idea that a Senator can exercise any judgment or has the right to say anything with respect to world affairs, because they contend a Senator is an armchair strategist and does not know anything about the matters involved. A newspaper editor, however, 500 or 600 miles away from Washington, who is very much interested in a certain question, can discuss it freely, and he is considered to be an expert on the subject.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Many persons in the United States have been led to believe that the Senate of the United States killed the League of Nations and the Treaty of Versailles. What killed the treaty? The first thing done in that direction was the repudiation of Wilson's 14 points, which was an important part of our war program. Italy, France, and England repudiated Wilson's 14 points.

The second thing that caused revolt on the part of the people of the United States was the secret treaties through which France and England had brought Japan and Italy into the war. Wilson refused to sanction those treaties; he claimed he knew nothing about them until he went to Paris the first time. The American people resented the fact that certain treaties had been kept secret, and the Congress of the United States resented it because our war program had been based on an entirely different plane. Our slogans were, "No indemnities," and "Peace without victory."

On the other hand, certain small uneconomic governments were set up with our money under the doctrine of self-determination. Members of the Senate knew that some of those new countries were uneconomic, unsound, that they were so small and so poor that they could not support a government or an army. Under certain sections of the League of Nations Covenant, the United States was asked to guarantee the borders of those countries.

Mr. President, Dr. Soong, Minister for Foreign Affairs of China, about 60 days ago in a speech made in New York, told the American people and the world who killed the League of Nations. He said the League of Nations was killed at the time of the Manchurian incident, when Mr. Stimson called upon the League of Nations to enforce the provisions of the Covenant of the League which its members had signed, and to protect the territory they had guaranteed to protect—territory which we had not agreed to protect. Dr. Soong said that that was when the League of Nations was killed. He said it was killed by the two great powers who controlled the Council of the League. The two great powers who controlled the Council of the League of Nations were England and France. Mr. Stimson said to the members of the League of Nations, "Do your duty and we will help you." The members of the League, however, would not do their duty. They appointed a commission to examine into the question.

Mr. President, there is an old saying that when the devil wants nothing done he appoints a commission. In this case nothing was done. Dr. Soong ought to know who killed the League of Nations. He said it was killed at the time of the Manchurian incident, and it was killed by England and France because, he said, they did not think it was necessary to act for their own security. So long as it was not necessary for them to act for their own security they did not care to act in behalf of China under the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota. From reading the history of the times and from speaking with men who were on the spot, I know that a time came when the great President of the United States lost his influence in dealing with the other leaders of the world. I do not want such a thing to happen to the President of the United States this time. I want to strengthen his arm so that he can have a voice in the peace which is to be made. I hope that he will, in his wisdom, consult with Members of the Senate on both sides, and give them some information about what to expect in the matter of a formula for world peace. I think perhaps a failure to consult directly with the Senate in the last war was responsible for at least some of our troubles.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator knows very well that President Wilson lost his influence at Versailles because he sponsored theories which were too idealistic for the practical, poker-playing representatives of other governments who wanted to get for their countries the loot they had promised each other.

Mr. CHANDLER. I appreciate the ideals of Woodrow Wilson as much as I am able to, because I was raised to believe that he was a man of the highest ideals, and believed that we could work out an association of nations which would make for the peace of the world. I regret anything that hindered him in bringing that about, because I believe that if his ideals had been successfully carried out we might have avoided the present war. I want this time to support our President or whoever undertakes to negotiate a peace on our behalf, so that he may not lose his influence and may not be humiliated and embarrassed and repudiated finally by the people of his country, especially if he stands for a principle which is right—the brotherhood of men all over the world.

Mr. President, I think Stalin is a realist. Let us be realists, too, with respect to the matter. It is difficult for me to believe that the Soviet Union will give us any real help against Japan. Others may think the Soviet Union will. I repeat, it is difficult to believe that the Soviet Union will give us any real help against the Japs, and the cost to us of not being able to bomb Japan from Soviet territory will be great. We have not been able to obtain bases in the Soviet maritime provinces from which to bomb Japan. That failure has already cost us, and will cost us in the future the lives of many of our boys in the United States Army Air Corps and the other services. It will greatly prolong the war. Failure to obtain such bases, Senators, will prolong the war. It will put gold stars on many a mother's flag. But realists are realists, and we must face the facts.

What of the help we shall get from Great Britain against Japan after the defeat of Germany? The answer is clear. Great Britain will fight until the unconditional surrender of Japan, but Mr. Churchill has already warned us and promised the British people that after the defeat of Germany there will be at least a partial demobilization of the British Army.

If we fight Germany first and help bring about the defeat of Germany, we will not be able partially to demobilize any section of the American Army. We have a right, then, to ask ourselves just how much fighting spirit the British will put into the war against Japan once the pressure of immediate danger to Great Britain has been removed by the defeat of Germany. We would hope devoutly that the recent campaign—and I refer again to that recent campaign—of the British Army in India against the Japanese in Burma will not be typical. The British have had in India 10 soldiers for every 1 the Japanese have had in Burma, but so little energy has been put into the campaign that the British Army is now back where it started on the border of India, and the same weary lack of spirit has been exhibited in the building of airfields from which airplanes can take off to keep open a faint line to our gallant and isolated ally, China. In all the arguments for striking Germany first, China is our forgotten partner. She is the partner who for 6 long years has borne the burden and the heat of the battle against Japan, and she is our most vital partner in the war against the Japanese; because, inasmuch as we cannot use the Soviet airfields, it is vital to our victory over Japan that we shall have the use of Chinese air fields from which to bomb Japanese shipping from Chinese ports and along the China coast, and ultimately to bomb Japan itself.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I think everyone appreciates the great fight the Russians have put up. They have exceeded anything that anyone in America thought they could do, and I believe the American people are deeply appreciative of the fight of the Russians, and admire the fight the Russians have made. But, as the Senator has well said, Stalin is a realist. He did not meet with the conferees at Casablanca. We do not know the word he sent there, but we know that word was sent there, and we know he did not come. If Europe is in the condition in which we think it is, we know that after this war, regardless of whether Stalin says, "I want these countries," the seeds of communism will have been planted in those countries; and because of the economic conditions which will exist after the war, communism will be very likely to spread throughout Europe. Certainly it will be an extremely difficult matter to prevent it from doing so.

Unless Japan is defeated, no matter how willing England might be to try to help us in the Pacific, she will have a tough job on her hands in Europe, even with the coming of peace there. She will have a very difficult time in straightening out some of the conditions which are bound to prevail in Europe. So she will be at least partially tied up there. Certainly Russia will look after herself; and Russia wants to rehabilitate her own country. In my judgment, the United States of America will be left alone to fight the war against Japan; and Russia and the other countries will be sitting on the sidelines while we are carrying on that war.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I am so much of a realist that I remember that we let them fight alone for quite a long time.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. That was when many of the American people thought it was not to our interest to fight because of another war in Europe, and we literally told them it was not our war. I am enough of a realist to believe that the Russians may tell us that the war in the Pacific is our war. If they do, we shall have to look out for ourselves.

Mr. President, the Generalissimo of China will not surrender. He has a great spirit. That strong man and his good wife, who was educated in the United States, in schools in Georgia and Massachusetts, have a tremendous Christian influence. The heart of every citizen of the United States was thrilled when we watched her, in her return to this country, moving among the people of the United States and telling her story. The Generalissimo and Mme. Chiang Kai-shek are democratic, they are Christian, they are striving desperately in China, almost barehanded, almost without weapons, and almost without food, and with the full realization that millions of their people will be destroyed and starved; but nevertheless they continue the fight, absolutely without fear. Neither one of them fears anything. They do not even fear death, as they have said. Mme. Chiang Kai-shek has said that they will never go until their time comes. She has said that when their time comes they will be ready to go, but that they will live out their lives for their people, and will fight for them until the final tick of the clock. There is not a person in the world who does not approve and appreciate such loyalty and devotion as that. However, Mr. President, sheer exhaustion or starvation too long continued may force them into inaction. There is a limit to human endurance.

No single factor in this war is so essential to the interests of the people of the United States as is the continuance of the fight of China against the Japanese. Since we do not have the use of Russian airfields, we must have the use of Chinese airfields. Without them, it would take us many years to defeat Japan; and it is barely possible that without them we might never accomplish Japan's defeat. The opening of

the Burma Road, therefore, is of vital importance to the people of the United States. As far as my voice will carry, I will say that. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill are making plans for operations as far as the human eye can see; and if my voice could go that far, every step of the way I would say to them, "Open Burma and supply China, because that is vital to the people of the United States, and because we owe it to our gallant ally who has fought so long on our side, who has fought during the heat of the battle, when the sun beat down upon her."

Mr. President, it seems strange to me—and to this moment it is unexplained—why, with 2,000,000 fighting men in India, the British have apparently not so far made a determined effort to open the Burma Road. If they will not do so, we shall have to, in our own interest. If the spirit and the will to open the Burma Road cannot be found in the British in India, we shall have to supply the spirit and the will from America. If the British soldiers and the tribesmen of India will not open it, we shall have to call upon the boys from Kentucky, Massachusetts, Montana, Georgia, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, California, and the other States of the United States, and they must open it; because its opening is of the most vital importance to the interests of our country.

Whether we attack Germany first or Japan first, we must strike in Burma and must strike victoriously; and from our present vast store of equipment we must supply the transport planes, the pursuit planes, and the bombers which are so desperately needed by General Chennault, who has so superbly used the few he has had. He is in Washington. Talk to him and ask him what he needs in China in order to drive out the Japs. Talk to Gen. Joe Stilwell. He is in Washington. See what they say. General Stilwell is one of our finest generals. He said he was chased out of Burma and did not like it. I am sure he would be both willing and able to lead a victorious army into and through Burma.

What, then, are the prospects if we attack Germany before we attack Japan? Let us now consider that question. Of course, we would incur great losses. The defensive positions which the Germans have constructed on the continent of Europe are strong. Anyone who talks to one of the raiders who was in the expedition to Dieppe, as I have done, will get some idea of the terrific fire power of the German defenses on the Continent. Of course, we can overcome those strong defenses; but if we plan to do so we must face the fact that in doing so we shall lose the finest boys our country has produced—the finest tank men, the finest air-corps men, the finest marines, and the finest Navy men. I am convinced—I do not know it, but I am convinced—that the defenses on the continent of Europe, in France and in the provinces north of France, may extend to a depth of hundreds of miles; and in my opinion, judging from what I have learned from men who have been there, it would be almost mass suicide to attack them. The raid at Dieppe cost the lives of more than 50 percent of the Canadians who undertook to make the raid to test the German defenses. Of course, if the order is given, our men will go, and they will succeed; but again they will leave the flower of American manhood and womanhood on Flanders Field, between the channel coast and the Rhine River. I do not want that to happen, except as a final resort.

We have now surrounded Germany. She has lost the initiative. She has lost the position of carrying the fight to the enemy. The only thing she has in store for her in the future is surrender, as she surrendered on the peninsula in Tunisia. The Germans did not fight there as the British fought at Dunkerque. The Germans gave up. They did not fire the last shot. They did not use the last shell. When we carried the fight to them, they gave up. At Bataan and Corregidor our men ran out of food, ammunition, and supplies. They had no chance.

Mr. President, Japan now rules 300 million people. The Japanese are working feverishly to fortify every strategic point they have seized. We know that they are developing improved weapons of war. We know that if we put off our attack against Japan until Germany has surrendered we shall meet a very strong Japan, much stronger than we face today; and we will have suffered appalling losses on the continent of Europe.

We have already taken losses in Africa that we do not know about. The hardest job I ever had in my life was to vote for war. I followed the leadership of the President of the United States because I felt that he wanted to keep us out of war. I still believe that. Last week I wrote 50 letters to men and women in Kentucky, many of whom I know personally. I knew their lads. Some of their fathers had served in the last war. Their boys were lost in Tunisia.

Have Senators any responsibility in this matter? Is it of any concern to us? Ought we to be interested? Whatever the final result is to be, we shall pay for it with the blood of our sons and the tears of their mothers. There will be nothing that we can say or do that will lessen the distress of mothers whose sons have been lost, or strengthen them for the long journey ahead, because when they have lost their sons they have lost all.

Have we not, as Senators, a right to be concerned over where the sacrifices of our men are necessarily made in the cause of victory? I want Great Britain to succeed. I voted for lend-lease and all the other things. I voted for every measure that I thought would support Britain in her gallant stand to preserve her homeland. If Britain had fallen, I still believe she would have prevented a serious menace to the people of the United States.

I have vigorously supported every measure which has been brought here to assist Russia in the war; but I am an American Senator. I am not willing to be silent when the interests of my country are at stake. I do not know whether Senators are attending the conferences which are being held here to map the strategy for 134,000,000 people. I do not know whether they ought to attend or not; but I have an idea that it would be better if they did.

No citizen of this country is more anxious to win the war than am I, and to do everything humanly possible to end it as soon as possible. I claim for myself sufficient determination and sufficient courage to speak out when I feel that it is time to speak. The time is now. In a few days the decision will be made. I want the decision to be made in the interest of the people of the United States. I have a right to ask that. Every other Senator has a right to ask it; and the tough, hard-fisted realist who rules the country across the seas has not the slightest objection. In fact, he has the greatest respect for men who stand up for their own country.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I am particularly glad to hear the Senator take that theme. We welcome Churchill to America. All America feels kindly toward him and respects him because he is a great representative of his country. We admire Stalin because he is a great champion of his country.

The Senator spoke kindly of the fortitude and leadership of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and his delightful wife, who thrilled this body as I have never seen it thrilled during my short period of service here. They are respected because they represent their country. We have been extending our aid to all the world. It is high time for someone to start shouting, louder and louder, for the interests of America. I commend the Senator for taking the lead at this time, when the conference for mapping future strategy is being undertaken in the Capital of America.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall never undertake to be a civilian strategist in connection with the conduct of this war. I do not know whether the able Senator from Kentucky is right or wrong in his technical analysis. If I had an opinion, it would be that he is wholly right. Whatever the validity of his opinion, I wish to give myself the privilege of saying to him that I should be very proud to be making the speech which he is now making.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the tribute of the Senator from Michigan touches me very deeply. Yet I will be accused in some quarters of speaking from the standpoint of emotion. I am a southerner. Southerners are emotional—some more so than others. Southerners sometimes have more emotion than do others. I rather admire

those who do not have so much because they bear just as heavy burdens, and they bear them without a tear. I cannot do that.

I should be ashamed to fail to speak when I should have spoken. Every Senator who heard the speech which I made on the 16th of April, and who is listening to the one I am now making, knows that I was never more earnest in my life with respect to the situation which confronts the people of the only country I have, and the one which I love devotedly.

We have a right to ask that in the conferences which are being conducted in Washington by the leaders of the world, with the exception of the Russian leader, who so far has not agreed to meet in conference with the other two leaders, the interests of the United States shall be given consideration. I wish we might get all the leaders together. I wish the Generalissimo could meet with the others. I hope that some day we may have a peace in Europe which will result in making Europe democratic. We say that we want to have democracy in Europe. I am not certain that that is what we shall get, but it is worth fighting for.

We know that if we put off our attack against Japan until Germany has surrendered, we shall face a very strong Japan, much stronger than we face today, and that we shall have taken severe losses on the continent of Europe.

If we attack Germany first, therefore, we shall suffer all the losses—hear me, Senators; I believe this sincerely—if we attack Germany first, therefore, we shall suffer all the losses that it is possible for us to suffer, both in Europe and the Far East. Does any Member of the Senate disagree with me? One of the fundamental interests of our people in this war is to win it with the loss of the smallest possible number of American soldiers.

What kind of a peace in Europe shall we be able to establish if we have to turn all of our strength into the war with Japan, and if the Soviet Union is at peace, free to use the pressure of all its strength on Europe? We shall have little or nothing to say about the peace in Europe—I believe that—and we shall see set up a Europe divided against itself, divided into an area controlled by Great Britain in western Europe, and an area controlled by the Soviet Union in central and eastern Europe. In such a settlement of Europe there could be no peace. If we are to follow such a course, defeat Germany, and leave Great Britain and Russia with their spheres of influence on the continent of Europe, does any Senator believe that they will consult us if they seek to divide Europe as they see fit? Suppose Russia should want Sweden, suppose Russia should want Finland, suppose Russia should want Estonia, Lithuania, or Latvia, would we be able to do anything about it? Suppose she should want the Bosporus and the Dardanelles, do Senators think the United States could do anything about it after Germany is out of the war?

If we should attack Germany before attacking Japan, therefore, we should have to expect that:

First. We would have no peace, and peace is one of our two chief aims.

Second. We should incur the maximum of American losses, and to defeat Germany, Italy, and Japan, with a minimum of American losses, is our other chief aim.

What if we should attack Japan first? We would, of course, continue to give the British and the Russians support to the extent that they must have it to continue successfully their fight against Germany, but we are strong enough now to do that and still defeat Japan. We must keep China in the fight, and we must bomb Japan from Chinese bases. We must attack Japan across the Pacific, North Pacific, Central Pacific, South and Southwest Pacific, by whatever route seems best to our Naval and military leaders, and attack as well from the Indian ocean. After the defeat of Japan we could return with all our forces to Europe and finish Germany. Germany would be much weaker then than she is today, and we would be able then to have something to say about the settlement in Europe. We might be able to set up a Europe of democracy and peace.

The war in the Pacific must not be neglected. We must, in my opinion, attack Japan first.

If a sufficient number of Senators of the United States, and a sufficient number of the people of the United States would make manifest to the Commander in Chief their wishes and their fears concerning this deadly enemy, we would attack Japan first.

If we should attack Japan first, we would suffer fewer losses than by attacking Germany first, and would have a better chance of achieving peace. If we attack Japan first, we will be acting in the interest of the people of the United States.

The policy of the United States should be controlled by the interests of the people of the United States. The Government of the United States is the servant, not the master, of its people. We are citizens, not subjects. That situation is not true everywhere. In some countries the people are subjects, but in America we are citizens and not subjects, and we have a right to ask our Government to act in accordance with our interests.

I repeat that it is in the interest of every citizen of the United States that we defeat Japan first. We are today a strong Nation.

I speak as an American Senator who has supported loyally the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the people of the United States. I supported his efforts to prepare this country for war before it came upon us. Since we have been in the war upon no occasion have I failed to support vigorous prosecution of the war, and I have not in any wise failed to place in the hands of our Army, or the army of our allies, every possible means successfully to achieve victory. We have a right to ask our Government to take the leadership in deciding how this war shall be fought and when. We have the right to ask our Government to make that decision on the basis of America's interest, which are also the interests of peace.

I therefore ask earnestly that in the conferences now being held that our leaders assert themselves to the extent that when the war is over we shall take our place among the nations of the earth in such a way that we shall have great influence in building a secure and lasting peace. We must not repeat the failures of the last war. China must remain in this war, and she cannot remain in it unless we go quickly to her aid. We must reopen the Burma Road, however difficult the task may be, and I do not underestimate the difficulties involved.

We must establish a lasting peace at the conclusion of this war. The war is not yet over; it is not yet won. I would not undertake from information which I have, and which I can obtain, to forecast a time when the war will be over. In my opinion, it will depend in large measure on the decisions made at the Washington conference which is now being held between Prime Minister Churchill and the President of the United States. If we agree to fight Japan first, the war may be over much sooner. But if we continue first to fight Germany, it may never be over.

I appeal to all Senators—I know they are just as concerned and just as anxious as I am—to see that our aims and objectives shall be achieved, that victory shall come at the earliest possible moment, and at the least cost. I appeal to them to show their concern. It will be too late if we wait. Some day we will be handed a treaty to ratify. We will not know anything about it in advance. It will be too late then. By what we do then affirmatively, or by what we refuse or fail to do, or by acting in such a manner that we shall have no influence, we will, all of us, whether willfully or not, become parties to laying the groundwork for a repetition of this terrible war in another generation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me that a complete and adequate illustration of the point the Senator from Kentucky has so ably made lies in the fact that at the end of the last war the countries which had made up the associated and allied nations, without any of them knowing the reason for it, in the peace treaty put Japan in the possession as mandates of the bulwark, the buttress of islands which the Japanese improved and used as a jumping-off place for their campaign of supremacy and aggrandizement in the Pacific. It seems to me, unless some attention is given to that matter at the proper time, that a similar result may follow after the next war. Japan was with us, or pretended to be with us, in the First World War, but she made no sacrifices and contributed nothing to the common vic-

tory, nevertheless, in the conferences on the treaty, in which the American people took no interest at all, the negotiators of the treaty put Japan in the possession of this invaluable chain of islands which have enabled her to make her attack on the whole world.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Missouri is exactly right. As I say, either knowingly or unwillingly, in many instances, we were persuaded to bring about either by inaction or failure to recognize them, the desperate situations which have been created in the world and which have brought about the terrific losses the whole world has suffered in this war.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. In reference to the statement of the Senator from Missouri about what Japan got out of the last treaty, Clemenceau, after the protest of Wilson, said:

> We had destroyers in the Mediterranean; we had to get them from Japan, we had to pay for them, and we had to give them what we promised them.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Kentucky on the speech he is making. He has several times alluded to the fact that Russia is not represented at the conference now being held and has not participated in other conferences which have to do not only with the conduct of the war but also with the peace. Did it ever occur to the Senator that Russia was an ally of ours in the last war, possibly lost more men than any other nation engaged in that war and yet before the war was over we joined with Japan, Great Britain, and France, and sent an army to Russia and conducted a war against the Russian people for several years? I thought it significant that Stalin in one of his very rare speeches called attention to the fact that the allies of the last war had finally attacked the Russian people, as he claimed, without justification. I thought it significant also that he said the Russian people had not forgotten it. Having had that experience in the last war, they may be a little coy about their allies at this time.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the Senator for his observation.

Mr. President, I desire to close with this word——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before the Senator concludes, will he permit an interruption?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. First of all, I should like to say that, regardless of whether one agrees or disagrees with the position of the Senator from Kentucky, I think no one can fail to appreciate the high courage, the candor, and the basic patriotism which have inspired him to speak out on a subject in a manner which will probably make him a target of attack. I know that everything he says is inspired by an earnest desire to serve the country of which we are all citizens.

As I listened to a portion of the Senator's speech, one thought which occurred to me is to what extent the future military policy of our country is influenced by the advice of our high Army and Navy officers. In the nature of things, of course, there must be a political side to every war; alliances between countries and agreements between countries of one kind or another during a war are inevitable; but, in the last analysis, it would not be wise, in my humble judgment, to take action of a political nature binding this country to any course of action without, at least, the tacit, if not the express, approval of those who have actually the responsibility of fighting the war. One of the disadvantages of a democracy is that in time of war we do not know to what extent the opinion of the military and naval leaders influences the political action of the Government, or vice versa.

I wish there were some way by which we could all be reassured, as it were, concerning what the military leaders think is the best procedure for us, that is, from the standpoint of our own interest, as every other country is thinking of its interest; and, secondly, from the standpoint of the combined allied interest. If I could feel that the high military leaders were in favor of a second front in Europe, largely composed of our own troops, first, with a sort of a mark-time procedure in our war with Japan, I should feel somewhat reassured, because their judgment, in my opinion, would be the best judgment we could employ. But if, on the other hand, they favored a more aggressive war in the Pacific, and were induced to forego what they believed to be a wise strategic and military operation for a consideration which was largely political, I feel, then, that we would be embarking on a road of doubtful worth, and that the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky, if such were the case, would be a very fine warning for us all to absorb.

I am wondering—of course, there is probably no answer to the question—what our high Army and Navy officers feel is the role of the United States in this war, in view of the conditions as they now stand. Are they in favor of making the attack in the Pacific the primary objective, and the opening of a second front in Europe the secondary objective, or vice versa? I have a sort of feeling, which I cannot substantiate, that the military leaders are more inclined to take a larger interest in the Pacific than has been taken up to now; but that, of course, is merely an opinion; and it may not be accurate.

Mr. CHANDLER. First, may I express my deep appreciation to my friend from Maryland for his generous comment concerning this feeble effort of mine. He and I were friends before I became a Member of the Senate, and he knows of my devotion to him and of my sincere appreciation of any compliment which may come from him.

We know how difficult it is to get Army or Navy officers to talk, because if they talk, and make a mistake, and say the wrong thing, they usually become civilians. A military man wants to do his job as best he can, and carry out orders. The Senator from Maryland was a distinguished soldier, and he knows the soldier's business is to do what his superior says should be done, and not to make any question about it; the soldier merely carries out orders. I know that to be so from the standpoint of an Army private. A soldier does just what he is told to do and asks no questions.

However, I have a feeling that the great majority of the high-ranking Army and Navy officers, who, after all, must fight the war and must die for their country if the occasion comes, would like to do what I am urging, if our Commander in Chief and Mr. Churchill would arrange for them to do it. I have the feeling that if that were done, they would approve it, and would go into the fight with a little more enthusiasm, if that were possible, and with a little more spirit of determination, because I have a feeling that they consider in their hearts that that is the course of wisdom for this country to pursue.

The speech I made here on the 16th of April I made on my own responsibility and without any encouragement from anybody. I received some encouragement from some level-headed persons—and one always thinks a man is level headed if he agrees with his own conclusions. I received some discouragement from some who did not agree with me; and I do not complain about that, for men have a right to agree or disagree, and each one of us should figure out as best he can his obligations to his people and his country, and do the utmost he can to represent the country's best interest, and I know my colleagues are doing that. I may be permitted to say that for this speech I received much more encouragement from those from whom I wanted to have encouragement, and I have spoken to the Senate today not only my own feelings but the feeling of quite a number of military and naval men in the United States who think that the course I have suggested is the right one for us to pursue.

If we could somehow exert, not political pressure, not pressure of any kind, but if we could exert such correct influence over the discussions now proceeding that in the long run finally we could cause those who are making the plans for the future, those who have the right to make the strategy, to adopt our suggestions, it would be better for our country. Congress has the right to declare war, or the right to say that a war exists, but under our Constitution, the President of the United States has to make the war. We cannot make it. But I do not think that should mean that we should not be interested. If somehow we could have brought to bear upon the consciences of the men who are conferring that what we suggest is proper, it would be well. They are not all in agreement; I take it there will be quite a contest over many questions, but if we could convince them that it is to the best interests of the United States—convince our leaders first, and then the leaders of the other countries—that we fight Japan and then fight Germany, that such a course would be in the interest not only of the American people, but of the peace of the world, we would have done a good job. I should not like to be a party to a bad job; I should not like to make a mistake.

I want Senators of the United States to be sufficiently interested—and, if it is necessary, to assert their interest—that they will receive from time to time more information, so that when we are confronted with treaties to establish the peace of the world in the future, we will do a better job than our predecessors did 25 years ago. I do not criticize them; they did the best they could under the circumstances, and their action was not influenced by any other than a patriotic motive; but the result was a mistake—indeed, many mistakes were made, and if we learn anything from wars which have to be fought over and over again, we should not repeat the mistakes which have been made time after time.

Mr. President, there is One who holds the destiny of all of us in the hollow of His hand, and without Him and His spirit men fail; they fail all over the earth. I hope that somehow in His wisdom He will give to the leaders of the people of the United States a vision that will show them to path to peace in such a way that we will be able to avoid, in another generation, a repetition of this terrible, destructive war.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator has stated in his very able and patriotic address that he knew he might be attacked for making it. Other Senators have referred to the same possible action. The Senator knows, as does every other Senator, that it sometimes takes as much courage to meet attacks made in forensic battle in the Senate as it takes to meet the bullets of enemies in military ventures. Of course, the Senator may be attacked, but I am very proud of the fact that he has had the courage to say what he has said, that in the Senate today he took the trenches in defense of the Nation and of his convictions. If the Senator should be attacked, let him consider his wounds as wounds of honor, for which he may not be decorated with the Purple Heart, but for which I am sure American citizens of the future will give him due credit.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota, and I say to him that what happens to a single Senator or many Senators is not of great concern, in the long run of the years, to the people of the United States, but what happens to this country is of grave concern to every citizen of the United States.

When I finish my present term, I shall have been in public office almost continuously for 20 years, and I still claim fewer years than many of my colleagues. For the honor I have enjoyed so long I am grateful to the people of Kentucky, and I hope to merit their confidence, and whenever I fail to merit it, I do not want the position longer.

I have undertaken to explain my views as to what, in my opinion, is one of the most serious and desperate situations that has ever faced the people of the United States. Somehow I have a feeling that out of this may come some bit of wisdom and encouragement which may assist our soldiers in prevailing.

Whenever we participate in an international conference, I am reminded of an aphorism by a wise American, and it always frightens me. Will Rogers once said that we never lost a war and never won a conference, and I become nervous every time we engage in a conference. Of course, conferences are necessary, but, in my opinion, out of this conference will come defeat for all the people of the United States if the United Nations do not decide to wage a vigorous war against Japan. Japan is still planning to invade the west coast of the United States. A Japanese admiral said he expected to dictate the peace terms. Where? In Tokio? In Rome? In Berlin? No; but in the White House at Washington. Of course, to the average American that seems foolish and silly, but the Japs have done so many things which we thought they could not do, it is high time we took into account the fact that this is a treacherous, dangerous, powerful enemy, becoming more powerful every day, skilled in the art of what is possible, not the impossible. They believe in the art of the possible.

I wish that at some time when my colleagues have opportunity they would review American public opinion of September, October, and November 1941. Just read the statements and see how they sound. American magazines, American newspapers, Cabinet members, high-ranking Army and Navy officials, said: "The Japs are slant-eyed; they cannot see. Their planes are top-heavy; they cannot fly. Their guns are bad. They have no money. They have no morale. They are worn out with the war against China. If they dare to provoke us, we have our finger on the trigger, and it will not take us more than 2 or 3 weeks—or, at the outside, 2 or 3 months—to brush them off."

Do not think it was not considered by military and naval men that the Japs could probably assault Pearl Harbor, but it was ruled out. It was too far away. We were prepared for what? We had all our ducks on the pond.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. We were prepared at Pearl Harbor for war.

Mr. CHANDLER. I could not agree with the Senator about that, because if we were, we made the poorest showing that was ever made in the history of war.

Mr. HATCH. Let me say to the Senator that he is not being quite fair. Pearl Harbor was prepared for war. The failure at Pearl Harbor was human failure.

Mr. CHANDLER. I cannot agree with the Senator about that. In my opinion we were not prepared for war at Pearl Harbor, because we did not know there was going to be the kind of war which came. Can it be said we were prepared for what happened? We had all our planes out together, with wire fencing, and people standing around looking at them, and everything seemed to be all right, and we had all our ships in the harbor together, as I said, like ducks on a pond. I know the Senator thinks what he said is accurate, but I do not think it is. We were not prepared for war at Pearl Harbor. If we had been prepared, what occurred would not have happened, in my opinion. Mr. President, I do not want anyone to prepare us in a similar way if we are to get into a fight. If we are to have a fight I want our country to be much better prepared to take on an enemy and do a better job than we did that day at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I repeat, Mr. President, we were prepared, we had the men, we had the material, we had the equipment, and I say, as I said before, the failure was human failure, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I simply do not agree with the Senator from New Mexico. I have no objection to the Senator feeling as he does, but I am going to continue to feel the way I do about that matter.

I wish to say to the Senator that we are not now so well prepared for war in the Pacific area as I wish we were, and we are not so well prepared for war in Australia as I wish we were. We were not very well prepared for war in the Philippines. We were driven from the Philippines, and I want the United States to arrange to go back sometime so that we can liberate the followers of Quezon, our devoted friend. If we do not soon prepare to do so, Senators, it may be too late.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I think all of us who are familiar with Civil War history will not forget the proceedings in the Congress at that time, when a committee was created to direct the war operations, at least to direct them so far as they could. My friend the Senator from Kentucky will recall some of that history. The results were awkward, to say the least. Generals were called before the committee and asked why they had not moved in a certain way and in a certain direction. Probably no field officer in the world can tell a Senate or House committee why a commander moved his troops in a certain direction at Chancellorsville.

Mr. President, while I agree to a considerable measure with what the Senator from Kentucky says about the grim necessities in the East, I am wondering how far the Congress should go in giving the Army and Navy directives. I know that I am not prepared to say how many men should be in the Far East or how many should be sent to Europe. I for one have had a very wholesome respect for the Japanese. I know they are a capable fighting people. I have lived among them, and I have no illusions with respect to them. They are a smart people. I recall my flesh almost shrinking on my bones when I heard statements made in this very Chamber that we would clean up the Japanese in a short time and set Tokyo and Yokohama in flames in a matter of days. We all remember hearing statements of that kind.

I wanted to get up and walk out of the Chamber when I heard them, and a sort of feeling of depression came over me, because I knew what we confronted.

Now I notice in the newspapers loud demands, even from military and naval leaders, for an enormous addition to the number of planes we have on European fronts, so that we can bomb Germany out of the war. That pressure comes just at a time when the pressure in the Far East is growing. I am wondering how far those of us in this Chamber and in the Chamber at the other end of the Capitol should now go in pressing a viewpoint which may be persuasive and perhaps dominating to some extent. One hesitates to take on that responsibility. If we could only know the real truth! But even that suggestion does not in any way militate against the argument made by the Senator from Kentucky. It is merely a question which is in my mind, and I know it is in the minds of other Senators. How far are we entitled morally to go in telling the Commander in Chief and the War and Navy Departments what they should do in the disposition of troops and planes?

I think everyone wants this war won on both fronts, and certainly no man dares minimize the seriousness of the far eastern situation, for it is a deadly thing. My own private opinion was that Japan in her Chinese venture was really giving her troops a dress rehearsal, and getting her divisions trained one after the other, for the coup down through the southwest Pacific was one of the most astounding performances in all human history. The speed and certainty with which it was accomplished following the attack on Pearl Harbor will stand out as one of the great military and naval accomplishments of all time.

So we are dealing with a resourceful, purposeful, hard people. One of the ablest men, I think, in defense operations in this country, said to me that the Japanese were good fighters, good navigators, good flyers, and good soldiers, and had good equipment, and that we faced a real, purposeful enemy. The tragedy is that it is almost necessary to kill him, for he will not surrender.

Mr. President, when dealing with such people one feels tempted in contemplation of the situation to go back and freshen ones memory of the Saracen invasion of Europe. Europe then was dealing with a people who were an atavistic throwback to the Dark Ages. They had no fear. They were people the average men of Europe could not understand. The Japanese is like that. He presents a most bizarre and weird picture to the world. It is staggering to contemplate what this thing means with 75,000,000 or 80,000,000 of those people. They are intrenched over there, and they have all the assets of the Far East. The problems is a desperate one, I will admit.

I am sorry I missed most of what the Senator from Kentucky has said. I was called away from the Chamber.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish the Senator from Washington had heard the remarks I made at the outset and during the course of my speech, because he would know that conferences dealing with strategic questions are proceeding now, and in a few days perhaps a decision will be made, a decision which will be of the greatest moment to the people of America and perhaps of the world. I have been urging that that conference decide that it is in the interest of the American people that we fight Japan first.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, is it the Senator's view—and I ask the question because I was called out of the Chamber and did not hear all his remarks—is it the Senator's view that there should be a public announcement of a very momentous and decisive policy—that is, a policy of turning most of our energies toward Japan and easing off our pressure on the European situation—or does the Senator think that that would be the part of wisdom?

Mr. CHANDLER. Oh, no; I would not make any public announcement. I have not asked that public announcement be made, but I ask, and will continue to ask, that our treatment of Japan be in accordance with the facts, as I understand them to be, and as the circumstances justify; that we treat Japan as a No. 1 enemy, because it is in the interest of the people of the United States to do so, and that we make arrangements to fight Japan, because Japan presents an imminent danger to the people of America.

Mr. BONE. And would we furnish that information to the people by telling them or by actually doing it? Ordinarily the chain of events informs us.

Mr. CHANDLER. The information will come to the people all right if we take action. It does not make any difference how much information we give to the people with respect to what has been done in China—and not much has been done.

Mr. BONE. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. We do not know how long China will stay in the war if nothing is done to help her. But certainly the people will receive information respecting that situation if nothing is done, and if something is done, the accomplishment of the job will speak for itself.

Mr. BONE. The only way attitudes of mind can be developed is by giving information to the people. Then a body of public opinion is developed, and people are satisfied one way or the other, or dissatisfied, as the case may be. I do not think there is anyone who does not want the war against Japan carried on aggressively, but I think there is also a feeling in many quarters that if we can smash Germany with tremendous air forces, and perhaps by a sortie on the south coast of Europe, and force Hitler out of the war—if that is even remotely possible—then both nations, Britain and the United States, and perhaps Russia, can turn their attention more completely to the Far East and knock Japan out of the war.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have rather carefully given my view of that question, so I do not wish to go into it any further.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to refresh the memory of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, entirely aside from the moral interest in the questions which he has been propounding, of the fact that we have a direct, sworn obligation in the matter. I am not passing upon the controversial features at all, but I would refresh the memory of the Senator with respect to article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which places on us the duty to declare the war, the duty to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces, the duty to raise and support armies, the duty to provide and maintain a Navy, and the duty to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers thus conferred. These discussions do not rest on a mere matter of persuasiveness or on a mere matter of moral interest. They touch a vital, sworn part of our duty.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree with the Senator from Colorado. I am not one of those who subscribe to the view that a Senator should be disinterested in these questions, that the only time he should be consulted is when another appropriation is wanted for a new battleship or for a new gun, and that on all other matters Senators should not be consulted at all. So far as I am concerned, I am going to have my say when I think I should have it; and when I think I should have it, no one will keep me from having it.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I am sure I agree with the Senator that we should have a vital interest in these questions, both now and in times to come.

At the time when we entered the war, it seemed to me that we should have the greatest responsibility in winning it, and it also seemed to me that if Germany and the other Axis Powers were able to win the war in Europe, we would be in a tremendously dangerous situation in attempting to win by ourselves. Therefore, the attack was made largely on the European front.

I assume that the premise on which the Senator is now proceeding is that we have now gone far enough ahead in Europe so that we can let go there, and can start against Japan.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. Is the Senator satisfied that there is sufficient assurance that Germany will collapse or weaken, to justify us in running the risk that Russia will be able to get along if we do not start a second front? Is the Senator satisfied that we can let go there now?

Mr. CHANDLER. At the outset of my remarks I said that after the campaign in Africa has ended—and it has now virtually ended—the next goals will be the islands in the Mediterranean and the nearby points in Italy. I gave the distances from points in Africa to the next objectives, or to what probably will be or should be the next objectives. I said it was approximately 200 miles from Tobruk to Crete, and only 90 miles from Tunis to Sicily, and only 175 miles from

Tunis to Sardinia. When we reduce those islands, as I assume we will, by means of attacks from airfields along the northern coast of Africa—airfields which probably are now being built—I do not believe the Germans or Italians can stay in those islands. If the Germans and Italians do not have any more air support in those places than they had in Tunisia, I am confident that they cannot stay there. Once they lose those islands, the length of the Allied supply lines to India will be greatly reduced. Then it will be possible to use the route by way of the Mediterranean, through the Suez Canal, and into the Indian Ocean, instead of the much longer route around the southern end of Africa.

Then it would seem to me—I do not claim to be a military strategist or an armchair strategist, but I can read and I can see pictures, and I understand some of the things I read and some of the pictures I see—it would seem to me that we shall have Germany ringed on all sides with hostile forces. I happen to be one of those who believe that Germany is not now in a position—and I have said so—to knock out either Russia or England. There was a time when she might have been in a position to knock out one or the other of them, but she did not knock out either one. If from Dunkerque, when she had 250 divisions, she had gone across the Channel at the time when England had only 1 division, the chances are that she would have knocked out England.

I also believe—but not because I consider myself to be a military strategist—that we cannot win unless we carry the fight to the enemy. In other words, as wars are waged today, I do not think it is possible to win by staying on the defensive.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I share the Senator's enthusiasm for fighting Japan and for being aggressive against Japan.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator has been out there and has seen some of the things I have seen. He knows Japan's quality as a fighter, and knows how narrowly we escaped from having her do to us some of the things she did to others. The Senator knows about those matters.

Mr. BURTON. At the same time I feel that it is essential that we check the enemy on the European front before we go to the other coast, and that we do not leave the European front in danger.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree.

Mr. BURTON. Therefore, I believe that in the present critical situation, as the Senator has described it, we must bear in mind not only our enthusiasm and desire to attack Japan, but the question of what would happen if Germany should win in Europe. Are we ready to take that tremendous chance? If Germany should win after we let go over there, we would have made the wrong guess.

Mr. CHANDLER. The reason why I bring up the matter is because conferences on strategy are now proceeding and those who have the right to decide as to what shall be the strategy will decide it. They may even be making the decisions now. However, I am not one of those Senators who believe that we should be interested only to the extent of taking an active interest. Of course, I do not claim that the Senate can conduct the war; but I do claim that the Senate, as the representative of the American people, has a profound interest in the way the war is conducted, and should make its wishes known if it can do so. Whether in the final analysis the statement of any one man will be found to be accurate, and the statement of another to be inaccurate, only time will tell.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Has the Senator any possible estimate of the total number of British soldiers—not American soldiers—and all others except Americans who now are fully trained and equipped in the British Isles?

Mr. CHANDLER. No; I have not.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not, either; but I think the number is in excess of 2,000,000. I assume it is already recognized by everyone that the rate of production of war planes of the British alone is greater than that of the Axis Powers.

Mr. CHANDLER. I said so earlier today. I said they have a larger air force than Germany has.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is also recognized, I think, that the British have perhaps 50 times the available merchant marine that the Axis Powers have.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it is also recognized that the British have a naval fleet which probably is many times—let us say four or five times—the size of the combined Axis fleets, if all categories of vessels are considered.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is likewise recognized that one of the great difficulties confronting Hitler at the time of Dunkerque was the lack of water transportation to enable his troops to cross to England. At that time it was also rather a matter of conjecture whether, if Hitler did get over to England, the British Fleet might fall into Hitler's hands. That was the reason for lend-lease and for other things—not particularly because the invasion of Britain alone would be bad for the world, but because of the possible resultant effects on the safety of our own country.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand the Senator's position, he is not against supplying airplanes and weapons to Russia or to Britain.

Mr. CHANDLER. No. On the contrary, I said we should do so, and should continue to do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is talking primarily about the sending of additional manpower. If there are, let us say, in Great Britain over 2,000,000 British soldiers who have been there ever since Dunkerque, but who, we assume, have been sufficiently armed only for the last 18 or 24 months, if the British have a navy five times as great as the combined navies of the Axis Powers, if the British now have an air force exceeding in every way that of the Axis Powers, and in view of the fact that a great Russian Army is holding the Germans at bay, the Senator's point of view, as I understand it, is that he does not want either of the two fronts to become so strong that the other might be a danger to us.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. And the Senator has drawn the comparison more or less after the fashion in which I have briefly sketched it, to show that the situation over there is, not that victory is around the corner or that the war is over——

Mr. CHANDLER. No.

Mr. TYDINGS. But that from our standpoint, and viewing the whole picture, at the moment the European front is less dangerous than is the front in the Pacific.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator has stated my position better than I have done, and I believe that what he has said is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I am only asking the Senator these questions because, in view of what the Senator from Ohio said, I do not want to leave in the RECORD the inference that the Senator from Kentucky is in favor of drawing everything from the European front and sending it into the fight against Japan.

Mr. CHANDLER. No.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand the position of the Senator from Kentucky he is perfectly content to let what is at the European front remain there—whatever is there, either in the way of manpower or personnel or matériel—but his wish is that from now on, until the situation on the European front appears to be more dangerous, more of an effort shall be made on the Pacific front, and less on the Atlantic or European front. It is not that the Senator believes at all that the developments on the European front are a certainty; but I understand that the Senator does believe there is today on the European front a great wealth of manpower and of naval power which, since the fall of Dunkerque, 3 years ago, has been employed to a very limited extent.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator has accurately stated the feeling I have with respect to the general situation. We have the Germans completely surrounded. We have superior air power, as was demonstrated in the Battle of Tunisia. The German air force practically disappeared.

Mr. TYDINGS. And in Russia.

Mr. CHANDLER. And in Russia. We have been told by high military authorities that we have superiority in the air over every place where we are fighting. If that is so, and we have a ring around Germany, I think we can strangle Hitler.

The other reason for asking that that situation be not gone into except to the extent I have indicated is that an invasion of the continent of Europe by American boys, British boys, or Canadian boys would, in my opinion, result in terrific losses.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not want to pose as a military expert, because frankly I know very little about the military angles involved. However, let us look at the

beaches in France, Belgium, and Holland. First of all, I think it is reasonable to assume that in the waters near the beaches the Germans have planted many thousands of mines. It is fair to assume that on the beaches themselves they have planted many tens of thousands of land mines. There is no doubt that on the beaches themselves they have erected many miles of barbed wire. There is no doubt that all the way from southern France to the entrance to the Baltic Sea the Germans have built concrete machine-gun emplacements, trench mortar emplacements, one-pounder emplacements, and artillery emplacements. There is light artillery, medium artillery, and heavy artillery.

What we are thinking of is a situation somewhat like that in World War No. 1, when both sides had stabilized their positions and set up all the permanent emplacements which human ingenuity could conceive. The Senator knows that in that case, even with tanks and with poison gas, it was very difficult to drive a wedge in for ever a short distance and hold it. The conquest of the St. Mihiel salient, for example, was very elaborately planned. The element of complete surprise was one of the factors which permitted us to take it. The Senator knows that after Chateau Thierry the reduction of the German thrust which came down from the Vesle River required considerable time. Germany had done her utmost.

Coming back to the beaches, I am not saying that we should make an invasion or that we should not. I do not know. However, I can well recognize the hesitancy of Mr. Churchill, President Roosevelt, General Marshall, and the British generals to jump into an invasion too quickly, because unless the attack is well planned, unless our forces are prepared to the *n*th degree to make such an attack, and unless every factor we can employ is employed, the invasion may fail. If the invasion should fail, we might prolong the war. So for the moment I am not advocating the opening of a second front unless our military experts think it wise.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand the Senator's argument, he is not advocating it or opposing it. What he is saying is that we cannot afford to overlook the Pacific, because the clouds gathering there are so dark that, if we overlook them, we may have to pay a greater price on all fronts in blood and treasure than we would have to pay if we should give more attention to the Pacific from now on.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have said so in the course of my speech. I repeat, the Senator has stated it better than I could. I do not know, but I have an idea that, if we were to talk to any soldier who went with the Canadians on the Dieppe raid, and learn what actually happened there, we should find that the defense in depth is tremendous. An invasion of the channel coast would be almost mass murder. Any force which undertakes it will suffer. If we were to fight Germany first, in my opinion, we should suffer maximum losses everywhere. I have reason to believe that the American fighting men in all services would rather make it a war of attrition. I do not think Germany can defeat any nation now. If we should let her alone, she might defeat some of her enemies, but I believe that the danger of a direct threat to Great Britain and Russia from Germany is virtually past. I think she has lost the initiative. I think we can carry the fight to her from now on. I think it would be best to employ tremendous forces against Japan and knock Japan out of the war. I have said that I am not certain that later we should have much assistance in defeating Japan. I would rather defeat Japan while we have allies than to have to defeat her by ourselves later, perhaps in a situation in which we could not defeat her.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is it the past action of the military authorities which causes the concern of the Senator, or is it knowledge of proposed plans of the military authorities which causes concern?

Mr. CHANDLER. I cannot tell the Senator from Arizona what causes my concern. It would require too long. I am concerned about many things. The Senator has not heard my speech. I do not intend to deliver it again. I gave a rather detailed explanation of my concerns.

Mr. McFARLAND. But what causes the Senator to be concerned?

Mr. CHANDLER. I am concerned because this is my country. This is the only country I have, and I am anxious to raise my boys. For that reason I wish to see policies adopted which will more abundantly succeed, and save the lives of citizens of the United States.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator has made some statements which I have heard, which have caused me considerable concern. One of them was that we are not now as well prepared as we should be at Pearl Harbor. Does the Senator have some knowledge which he has gained through the Military Affairs Committee, or from some other source, in regard to Pearl Harbor, which the rest of us do not possess? The Senator cannot make such statements without causing us to have some concern. Personally I feel that discussions as to what the strategy of the War Department should be are very unfortunate, unless there is some real reason for them.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not feel that way. I make these statements on my own responsibility, and because of my own concern. The Senator can discuss the question or not, as he chooses. I am not urging the Senator to be concerned.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. It was my purpose in interrupting the Senator a little while ago to bring out the point that I was sure the Senator would want to take into consideration, the fact that the authorities who determine our policies must consider the fact that the front in Europe is vital, and that if we were to lose there, the result would be practically fatal in the conduct of the World War. Therefore, the Senator must premise any demand to direct greater attention to the attack upon Japan upon the conclusion that we can hold our own without putting in any additional weight in Europe, because we must not lose there, whatever happens.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand. If I did not believe that we were in a position to give greater attention to Japan, I would not advocate it. To do so would be to advocate something which would be dangerous to the country.

Mr. BURTON. It would be practically fatal if things were to go wrong in Europe. Therefore the opinion of our military leaders on that subject is vital. We do not have that opinion before us. That is precisely the thing on which they are working at this time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the Senator from Ohio means, by the questions he asks, to convey the impression that England now is in grave danger of a German invasion.

Mr. BURTON. No; I do not mean that.

Mr. TYDINGS. There was a time when England was actually threatened with a serious likelihood of such an invasion.

Mr. BURTON. What I wish to emphasize is that it would be practically fatal to us if anything should go wrong on the European front. Therefore we must not let anything go wrong there, and we must be sure not to run any risk of it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me go back to the premise on which we agreed awhile ago. We agreed that as wars are conducted today, no country can win a war on the defensive. Does the Senator still agree to that?

Mr. BURTON. Yes; I agree to that. The question is when to stop the offensive. We have a pretty good offensive now under way.

Mr. CHANDLER. If those who have the right to agree do agree that Germany has at least temporarily lost the offensive, and that at the present time England is not in danger of an invasion from Germany, and that the Soviet Union is not in danger of being overrun by the German Army, then the question is, Where should we turn our attention?

Mr. BURTON. It is at that point that I think it is vital for our military commanders to determine whether we should stop our offensive at this time, because when Germany had the offensive at the time she was attacking England, if she had continued she would have won the war. We must be careful not to stop too soon.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. There are only two points which I wish to reaccentuate. The first is that there are—as I recall without knowing the facts—in excess of 2,000,000 fully trained, fully equipped, ready-for-combat soldiers in the British Isles, plus an air force whose superiority over that of the Axis nations is overwhelming, plus a navy which is four or five times as great as the Axis navies, to say the least, plus the fact that the whole psychology and strategy of the war has gone from one of defeat on our side to defeat on the other side. The Russians are fighting and dying by the hundreds of thousands, and, indeed, by the millions. It seems to me that to supply an invasion army of 2,000,000 men will be a rather big job. It is pretty hard for us to supply a small force which runs only into the hundreds of thousands. It seems to me that if the invasion can be made and is to be made, while the Germans are reeling, the forces which are idle in the British Isles, to the number of two or two and a half million men, who are ready for it, should be utilized. I do not like the idea of having that great force mark time until we can send over two or two and a half million men to make the invasion, while we fight in the Pacific at the same time.

Perhaps I should not have said that. Perhaps what is now being done is the wise thing to do. If General Marshall and Admiral King believe it is wise to do what is now being done, I will retract what I have said. I am for them. They are skilled. But inasmuch as we are debating the subject, I am curious to know what, in their inner hearts and minds General Marshall and Admiral King really think about it as trained and skilled military men, who have the responsibility of winning the war, not only in the Atlantic, but in the Pacific as well.

The second point which I should like to accentuate is somewhat kindred to the first. How much are political considerations—I do not mean election considerations when I use the word "political"—how much, let me say, are political considerations in the international field influencing the better judgment of the experienced and seasoned Army and Navy men who have the real fighting to do, the responsibility to bear, and, as the Senator from Kentucky has said, the possibility of dying in order to prove the substance, merit, and soundness of their views? That is what I should like to know.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will say to the Senator from Maryland that if I had not believed I was speaking in their interest I should not have said a word. When I do think I am speaking in their interest I intend to speak.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator was well within his rights in making his statement, but a situation might evolve—I do not say it exists—in which the high Army and Navy men might be opposed to this policy, but being under the Commander in Chief, even though being opposed, they would do the best they could to carry out the political policies of the country.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator and I know the Army and Navy of the United States will in the future carry out the policies adopted at this conference and not raise a voice in opposition to them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Kentucky have both put their fingers on the particular problem which seems to me to be well worthy of consideration. We hear much about military decisions being made by military men. A short while ago the Senator from Illinois put into the RECORD an article by Mark Sullivan. Everybody who has any sense agrees with the article.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Military decisions are being made and should be made by military men, and no civilian should feel competent to set up his judgment against the best military judgment, with all due respect to some of the columnists and radio commentators who attempt to do that very thing.

The thing which would concern me as being a matter of very great strategy, and which should concern everyone else in the United States, is the question to what extent the best military and naval brains of the Allied forces are free to act and free to make decisions. Take the case of Mr. Churchill, for example. I have great respect and admiration for Mr. Churchill. I think he is one of the greatest orators who has lived, certainly in my time. He has been in the United States a great deal lately, and I am glad always to have him here. Mr. Churchill is one of the greatest English orators in the English-speaking world. Perhaps time will prove that he is one of the greatest statesmen who has ever lived. That is something which only time can settle. He is certainly one of the most attractive, intriguing, and colorful writers we have all been privileged to read during our lifetime. But Mr. Churchill has been notably and tragically unfortunate, both in the last war and in the present war, on occasions when he has made military and naval decisions. We all remember that Mr. Churchill was responsible for the ghastly fiasco at Gallipoli. We all remember when he went to Belgium and almost opened up the channel ports by his faulty strategic decisions as a civilian member of the British Cabinet. Without any reflection on Mr. Churchill's statesmanship, his patriotism, or his great ability as an orator, it rather gives me pause when I stop to think that in a matter of such terrific importance to the whole world as that which the Senator from Kentucky has been discussing here today, these decisions might not be made actually by the responsible military or naval chiefs who, as the Senator from Kentucky has said, would loyally carry out any decision, but the decisions may be made by superiors of the military and naval experts. It seems to me that when we are talking about leaving military decisions to military men and naval decisions to naval men, that is a consideration which should be taken under advisement.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I read Mark Sullivan's article in the Post this morning, and I am not willing that any columnist, or any Senator, for that matter, should tell me when I can speak on a question which is important to the people of my country. I know this conference is going on, and I know someone will make a decision. I do not know who will have the strongest influence in the making of the decision.

I do not know whether Mr. Churchill will make it or whether Mr. Roosevelt will make it. Perhaps both will make it. One may be as strong in his influence as the other. One may be the stronger and have his way. But I have a right to put my oar in. I want to assert my views with regard to the situation in the interest of the people of the United States only, and not because I am a military strategist or claim to be. So long as I am a Senator I am not one of those who will permit anyone to accuse me of trying to run the war by politics or by armchair strategy because I happen to assert what seems to me to be of prime and vital interest to the people of the United States.

I repeat, I have reason to believe that there are thousands upon thousands of soldiers and sailor boys as well as marines, and their officers, who would rather follow the course I have suggested. In the long run, Senators are not going to have to die; those who make the decisions will not have to die. Those in the armed services will have to die, if anyone dies, in the fighting, and they should have a chance, and strategy should be adopted which would give them a chance. I do not assert that any citizen of the United States is more or less anxious to win the war than I am, or more or less anxious to do it with the fewest number of losses, or in the best way, but I repeat that I am just as anxious as any of them, and just as much concerned. If in some way we can strengthen the arm of one who is making arrangements for our side so that he may prevail in the interest of the American people, and if I may have a small part in that success, I shall be very glad; and a small part is all that it will be, if any at all. But I will not let anybody divert me from the purpose I have, which is a good purpose. I think it is right. If I did not think so I would not do it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I simply wanted to say, in connection with the statement of the Senator from Missouri, that, in enumerating the military adventures of Mr. Churchill, he failed to mention the expendition to Russia during the last war after Russia had been our ally. History has recorded that Churchill, more than anyone else, was responsible for the expedition not only to Archangel but to Vladivostock, and was joined by other former allies of Russia. Japan, France, and the United States joined Britain in that expedition at that time. We were told it was a question of saving

the Russian people; afterward it was stated that it was in an effort to make the Kerensky government guarantee the loans which had been made by certain lending institutions in various countries. The expedition was not successful, but our boys died in the snows of Archangel and of Vladivostok.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have the greatest respect for Mr. Churchill. He is a Britisher; he is not an American. I think he represents vigorously, as he understands them, the best interests of the British Government. I recall that he wrote a number of books—While England Slept, and others—in which he undertook to warn his people of the impending danger. They did not pay very much attention to him. It was an ironic incident that when it came to their darkest hour they called him to take them out of their trouble, and he has done a magnificent job.

I do not think Mr. Churchill represents the people of the United States on any council; I think he represents England, and the British Empire, and I do not blame him for that. I do not think Joe Stalin represents the people of the United States on any council, and I do not think he will represent them if he becomes a member of any council. He will represent Russia, and do a good job of it. He is a realist; he really knows how to add! I like to deal with people who know how to add, and I like people to deal with me who know how to add, because such people know what the figures tell them and get the right answer.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield long enough to enable me to read the article by Mark Sullivan to which the Senator from Missouri referred? It will take about 5 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, before the Senator does that——

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish the Senator from Illinois would do that in his own time. I do not want it in my speech. I read it, and if I had wanted it in my speech I would have brought it here this morning.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought the Senator said in his talk to the Senator from Missouri that he would place it in the RECORD.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thought the Senator had placed it in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. I wanted to read it, and I shall do so later.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let the Senator read it in his own time. I do not want it in my speech. I would have put it in my speech if I had so desired.

Mr. LUCAS. It contains a philosophy to which I subscribe.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the article the Senator has mentioned, but I want to ask the Senator a question. He is speaking about the representation of this country by Great Britain and by Russia, and he said Joe Stalin did not speak for the United States?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not think so.

Mr. HATCH. I want to say to the Senator that the Russian armies which have been fighting German armies and have hurled them back in defeat have been representing the people of the United States bravely and well.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not disagree with the Senator on that, and I have not said anything that would indicate any lack of appreciation for the magnificent job the Russian Army has done in defense of the country of Russia. If we got the benefit of it, as I think we did, I have not the slightest disposition to take a single bit of credit away not only from Joe Stalin, but from all the Russian armies for the fight which they have made. I hope they will continue it. But they have not fought Japan as yet. If they will fight Japan for us, then I shall be glad to advocate that we do something in the direction of Germany. At the moment, if they will fight Japan or if they will give us bases in their territory so that we can bomb Japan, I will be much more enthusiastic about it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. In the discussions I have heard during the course of the Senator's speech this afternoon, I have heard the Generalissimo referred to as being a great leader and a great representative of the Chinese people.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes; I think he is.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have heard the Senator say time and time again, and I have heard other Senators mention the fact, that Churchill is over here representing Great Britain and the British Empire and the people of the British Empire. I have heard the fact referred to that Stalin is representing the Russian people and the great Russian Empire. I have not heard mentioned up to this time the name of the great leader who is representing the United States and the people of the United States.

Mr. CHANDLER. Wait a moment. The Senator did not hear my speech.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let me say——

Mr. CHANDLER. Wait a moment; I do not want any more along that line; that is as far as I want the Senator to go. I knew before he got up what he was going to say. He did not listen to my speech. If he had done so, he would know that I started out by saying that I wanted to strengthen the hands of the President of the United States. I do not yield to any other Member of the Senate, either on the Democratic side or the Republican side, in loyal support to him in his effort to prepare this country before we got into the war and to fight it after we got into the war. I claim now that he is doing a good job, and I want his hands strengthened. The Senator did not hear that part of my speech. If he had been here, he would have heard it, for it is in my speech.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am very sorry I have not heard every word the Senator said.

Mr. CHANDLER. So am I.

Mr. MURDOCK. I apologize to him that on two occasions I had to leave the Chamber briefly. I wish to say now that when he speaks of our own great leader he should bear in mind, and so should every other Senator, that of all the leaders in the world today he is the only one who is chosen by the people whom he represents. I am exceedingly proud of the last statement the Senator from Kentucky made—that he wants to strengthen the hands of that great leader, who, in my opinion, is greater than all the others put together.

Mr. CHANDLER. I want him strengthened so that he can show it. Woodrow Wilson was the greatest leader in the world at that time, and very few people disagreed until, as the boy used to say in Kentucky, the butcher cut him down.

Mr. LUCAS. He was not upheld in the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. No; he lost his influence before he got back here, and every student of history knows it. I have said before, and I repeat, the Senator from Utah, who loves the President, has not supported him any more wholeheartedly than I have in his plans and program, not only as he sought to prepare them before we got into the war, but vigorously to prosecute it since we have been in it.

Now, the question which arises is, Are we going to permit the President of the United States now to have happen to him what happened to Woodrow Wilson at Versailles 25 years ago, when suddenly the whole world dropped out from under him? I have not only read the history of it, but I have been told by men who were there that he got along fine up to a certain point, and then suddenly he learned that Clemenceau and Lloyd George and Orlando had made divers arrangements and treaties which he had known nothing about, and then all he could do was to go home because the others had the whole thing arranged. It was a pitiful thing. Woodrow Wilson was a great man; he had great ideals, which I hope some day may be realized, and they ought to be realized for the good of everybody in the world; but he was repudiated by these other men. When he went there he was, I think, the greatest leader man had at that time; there was not any leader greater than Woodrow Wilson at the hour when he left there.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again?

Mr. CHANDLER. Not at the moment. When Woodrow Wilson left there he was broken in spirit, broken in health, and when he came back here he carried his fight to the American people and lost it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator might point out that within a few days after the armistice was signed, and even before Wilson went abroad, the Democratic Party lost the House of Representatives.

Mr. CHANDLER. Oh. yes; I have referred to that before now. I think, perhaps, it was occasioned by failure to consult a sufficient number of influential Members of the Senate of the United States. I hope that mistake will not be

repeated, and I hope those who in their blind loyalty follow the leader without reason or question will not fix it so that the rest of us may also become yes men, because it is necessary to be realistic, it is necessary to be determined, and we have got to try to figure out a thing not as we wish it, but as it is, in order to help this President of ours to keep his influence right down to the last line and right down to the last signature, and it is my judgment—I do not claim it to be accurate, but it is mine, and I have a right to have it, and no one can keep me from having it—it is my best judgment that if we fight Germany and whip her first, he will not have any influence over there, and I do not know of any reason why he should have.

If Russia takes what she wants—and we will not be able to keep her from it, and no one else will—and if England takes what she wants, and they divide up Europe between them, what will happen? Suppose Russia wants Estonia, and Lithuania, and Latvia, and Finland, and Poland, what are we to do about it? We cannot do anything. We may protest, but they will not pay any attention to it. They will divide Europe up, unless a spirit of philanthropy moves them, and they become imbued with a desire to give things away. They have not given away anything yet; we are the ones who have given away. I have no objection to that so long as we are fighting a war with them which threatens us. But matters have shifted. Our danger is in the Pacific, our danger is in the east, and I want to fight a Pacific war vigorously and actively, and if we do not fight it vigorously and actively, we will by our failure create such a situation that we will never win, but will always be in war with Japan, because they are growing stronger every day and every hour.

Mr President, I do not say to someone else, "You do it." I say, "Come on; let us do the job together." That, in my opinion, will strengthen the hand of the President of the United States. It will make him more effective in his dealing with these two strong men, Churchill and Stalin, and we will be more apt not to lose. We always win the wars, but we lose the peace. This time we will not only win the war, but we will win the peace, and have something to say about it.

Mr. President, I have detained the Senate longer than I had intended. I appreciate the interruptions of Senators who have agreed with me, as well as the comments of those who have disagreed. I did not expect that all my colleagues would share my views. I have stated as positively as lies in my power the views I have with respect to the present situation. They may not be important to anyone else, but they are important to me. If they shall be adopted by those who have the right to decide the strategy at the conference now in progress, I believe earnestly and sincerely that the decision will be in the best interest of all the people of the United States.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND THE JUDICIARY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2409, making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no present desire to oppose the motion, but I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gerry	Overton
Bailey	Gillette	Radcliffe
Ball	Green	Reed
Bankhead	Guffey	Revercomb
Barbour	Gurney	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hatch	Robertson
Bone	Hawkes	Russell
Brewster	Hayden	Shipstead
Bridges	Hill	Smith
Brooks	Holman	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lodge	Tobey
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McCarran	Tydings
Chandler	McClellan	Vandenberg
Chavez	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wallgren
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Danaher	Mead	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	Wherry
Downey	Moore	White
Eastland	Murdock	Wiley
Ellender	Nye	Willis
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems on Small Business Enterprises.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is a member of the committee attending the funeral of the late Representative ENGLEBRIGHT of California, and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent on account of illness. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of the death of his wife.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MILITARY DECISIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is certainly not my intention to address the Senate on any matter affecting the policy or conduct of the war. I regret that I did not hear all the address made by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] with respect to what should or should not be done in the Pacific at this particular time.

I doubt that I would have taken the floor had not the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] referred to an article I placed in the RECORD this morning, written by the famous writer, Mark Sullivan, and entitled "Military Decisions." Early this morning I picked up the Post and found this column by Mark Sullivan, which so impressed me that I had it placed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I think it is the only article written by Mr. Sullivan which I have ever placed in the RECORD.

I wish to read what Mr. Sullivan had to say, and discuss it as I proceed because it is diametrically opposed to the theory and the philosophy of the Senator from Kentucky with respect to what should be done in connection with military decisions.

It does not make much difference what we may think about a given situation in respect to the conduct of the war, because in the final analysis we in the United States Senate and the people as a whole must place our trust and confidence in someone. As I have frequently said in the past, this country has spent literally billions of dollars in training men at Annapolis and West Point and throughout this land to defend our security and our institutions and our rights in a great crisis like that through which we are passing at the present time, and, if we cannot trust those men on whom we have spent these billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, then it is just too bad for us all. In the humble opinion of the Senator from Illinois, we must sink or swim with the military, air, and naval leaders of this country.

I am a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and I believe that committee has about as much to do with the Pacific and the problems in that vast expanse as any other committee of the Senate.

Time and time again the best informed men in the United States Navy have come before our committee in executive session with respect to the very problem which has been discussed here this afternoon. Certainly no one can gainsay that the war up to this point has been going quite well for the United States Army, Navy, and Air Corps. When we think how unprepared we were when the Japs struck us in the back at Pearl Harbor in December 1941 and how disunited we were in this country, and honestly so, with respect to the great problems which exist here on the home front, we must conclude—and I think history will show in the final analysis—that one of the greatest miracles of all times has been accomplished not only on the home front by way of production but on the military front, so far as the fighting men are concerned and so far as military strategy and tactics are concerned.

And, Mr. President, we have only begun to produce and we have only begun to fight. Mark Sullivan's article deals with some of the things the military and naval strategists have done in the past and discusses different criticisms and castigations which have been indulged in

by various individuals as the result of a certain type or kind of military policy.

Mr. President, why does anyone suppose that at this very hour generals and admirals from different sections of the world are here in Washington if Churchill and Roosevelt are not going to listen to them, take their advice and counsel, and take into consideration what these men, who have been on the actual fighting fronts, say about the military situation? If Roosevelt and Churchill are going to make decisions, as has been intimated here, for political reasons or for the furtherance of some international policy in the future, then why bring in all these individuals to discuss the tactical, the military, the naval, and the strategic activities of this global conflict?

Mr. President, I cannot believe that such a thing as has been intimated is being done. Franklin D. Roosevelt is Commander in Chief of the American Army, and notwithstanding all the utterances against the third term, the people of the country during the greatest crisis the country has ever experienced, elected him in 1940 to serve another 4 years. Under the Constitution, he is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. H has a right and it is his constitutional duty to make decisions in connection with the military and the naval operations just as Winston Churchill has, as Prime Minister of Great Britain. Of course, President Roosevelt would be foolish and unwise to make tomorrow's decisions in connection with the great world military problems unless he does have before him the advice and counsel of military, naval, and air experts.

Mr. President, I know Admiral King fairly well. He has been before our committee many times. I know Gen. George Marshall. I served with him in the National Guard in Illinois from 1935 to 1938, when he was the senior instructor of the National Guard. During those summer months when I was in training with him I had close contact with him, I saw him, I observed him, and I have heretofore paid him the highest compliment a Senator can pay another on the floor of the Senate. I think he is one of the greatest military men of all time. I hold the same opinion of Admiral King, so far as the Navy is concerned. Thank God, the Army and the Navy are in the hands of men like Marshall and King. It is fortunate for the 137,000,000 people in this country that those men are exactly where they are.

Mr. President, this is what Mark Sullivan says in his article:

> The common assumption in Washington is that President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and their respective staffs are deciding the next move against the Axis.

Is there anything wrong in that? Was there anything wrong in Roosevelt going to Casablanca and meeting Churchill there to make the decision as to what should be done in connection with the military and naval operations in that section of the world? He is still Commander in Chief, even though he goes to Casablanca. Has there been anything seriously wrong with our strategy in sending troops to north Africa? Have not events proved conclusively that, whoever devised the strategy, the north African policy has been a success?

Mr. President, coming back from Bermuda 2 weeks ago I met one of the great journalistic military strategists of this country. He is recognized as being one of the outstanding newspaper writers on military strategy. That was the first time I had met him. I talked to him about what he thought was happening in north Africa, because he had been on the ground for 2 solid months. He told me that he was somewhat disappointed with respect to what was going on over there. I asked him what in his judgment would be the earliest date we could defeat the Germans in north Africa. This newspaper writer on military strategy, this individual who furnishes information to millions of readers about our Army and our Navy and our Air Force, said it would be the middle of June at the latest before we could be able to drive the Germans and Italians out of north Africa, and 1 week's time proved his judgment to be erroneous, although he had spent 2 months over in north Africa on the military front.

Do Senators think that Generals Eisenhower, Alexander, Patton, and other generals told the newspapermen anything about their strategy or their technique in connection with what is going on in that military field of war? Of course not. Here was a man who had spent 2 months in north Africa, an individual who is recognized in this country as one of the leading newspaper military strategists, an individual who speaks over the radio and on radio forums on military matters, an individual whose articles are consistently read by many people, making a bad guess upon strategy. I am not condemning him or criticizing him. I make this statement only to demonstrate how easy it is to be wrong in connection with any military problem which exists in this war of men, planes, bombs, and ships.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Anent what the Senator has said, a month ago I had the good fortune to meet one of the most distinguished military correspondents in this country. He had just returned from north Africa. In fact he had first gone to the southwest Pacific, and had gone from there to north Africa. He was in north Africa with the American forces when they landed in north Africa, and he had stayed there for some months thereafter. Now he had just returned from north Africa. He told me that it was the opinion of the military correspondents in north Africa at that time, about a month ago, that we had only a 50–50 chance to get the Germans out of north Africa by next Christmas. That showed, as the Senator from Illinois has said, that these men who do not know and cannot know exactly what the situation is, cannot arrive at an accurate conclusion.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Alabama. Right at a time when we have achieved the greatest military victory in this war, at a time when we have captured approximately 200,000 Germans and Italians in north Africa, at a time when our victory demonstrates to the conquered countries of Europe, and the despicable Hitler that after all we have done a pretty fair job from the standpoint of strategy and tactics in eliminating these 200,000 Germans and Italians in this area, now certain persons want to change the strategy and let somebody else make the decisions. I cannot understand this type of condemnation of our conduct of the war.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Not only have we won a great victory in taking those 200,000 Germans and Italians out of the war, out of opposition to us but by that great victory we have augmented our own forces by some 300,000 men, because by our victory and our conquest of north Africa we brought to our side, to fight side by side with us, some 300,000 Frenchmen.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for his remark, because it is in line with what Mr. Sullivan says with respect to the military decisions. I will go into that matter in a moment.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will further yield to me—and I do not want to take too much of his time——

Mr. LUCAS. That is all right. These matters are important, and I want the Senator to take all the time that it is necessary to take.

Mr. HILL. Le me say that in connection with what the Senator has said, I hope the Senator will thoroughly discuss the implications of the victory in north Africa. When we speak of the war against Germany and Japan, it seems to me that the war in north Africa was just as much a war against Japan as it was against Germany.

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. President, who knows what the strategy will be from now on? It is possible that when the Mediterranean is cleared and the road to India is open, thousands upon thousands of troops will pour through India into Burma and into China, and toward Japan. No one knows what the strategy will be.

Mr. HILL. And, of course, as the Senator well knows, the first step against Japan was to prevent the Germans and Italians from gaining control of north Africa and of the Suez, and from spreading into India and forming a connection with the Japanese, who have been in Burma and on the eastern edge of India. If that had happened, the Germans and Italians would have been able to send supplies to the Japanese by means of relatively short supply lines, and our task and China's task in the Pacific would have become immeasurably greater.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is precisely correct. When we opened the Mediterranean the overnight effect was to double our tonnage of shipping. Shipping is one

of the vital factors in connection with the sending of supplies to India, to our men, and to the men of our allies, all of whom are fighting side by side in India, in the move toward conquering Burma and the adjacent lands.

Mr. HILL. Furthermore, Mr. President, if we had not opened the campaign in north Africa when we did, and had not forced the Germans to use so much matériel and so many men in that campaign, it might have been necessary for the Russians to withdraw men and matériel from Siberia to such an extent that Japan would have moved into Siberia, and we would have lost all chances of obtaining bases in Siberia.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the Senator is eminently correct, Mr. President.

All those speculations and conjectures can take place, and rightfully so, with respect to what is going on over there; but in the final analysis the individuals who are there, who understand those matters, and who have made a lifetime study of them, are the ones who have to make the decisions; and so far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, I am going to stand with them. I am going down fighting with them if they lose, or I am going to come up with them if they win. Every other individual should take the same position with respect to the type of unity we have to have in order to keep the morale of this country as it should be, and to keep our soldiers and their leaders secure in the knowledge that the American people are behind them.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows, too, that in time of war the Government and its military and naval leaders cannot tell the people what the situation is or what the Army and the Navy are doing. The Senator referred to the election in November 1918. As the Senator will recall, in the campaign before that election, campaign orators went over the country proclaiming and shouting that we should put at least one million men in France. At that very time we had in France, not one million men, but over two million men; and within a few days after the election the Germans signed the armistice.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say that I am in entire accord with what the Senator has said in tribute to the Army and the Navy. There is one question which I should like to ask: Does the Senator feel that unless we defeat the Japanese today we may have to fight them alone later on?

Mr. LUCAS. Not at all.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not feel that way. That is a view I never have entertained; and I should like to ask the Senator what his feeling is in that respect.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, I do not know. The Senator from Kentucky may have better information on that score than does the Senator from Illinois. I do not want to challenge any statement the Senator made. I have discussed these questions with some Englishmen and with some Americans. We have heard what Churchill said with respect to going all the way with us in connection with the fight in the Pacific; therefore, I simply cannot believe, Mr. President, that we are not in this fight to a finish to destroy forever, as Roosevelt and Churchill have said, nazi-ism and Japism and fascism. Certainly England is not going to desert America and become an ally of Japan.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad to hear the Senator say that because I certainly feel the same way.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, Mark Sullivan further says:

> About the decisions, one thing is sure.

He is talking about the conference in Washington.

> They are for the high commands alone to make. The public cannot have information about them, because such information would be valuable to the enemy. Because the public cannot have information, it cannot have judgment.

I think that is a very sound statement. Mr. Sullivan continues:

> This is illustrated by something that went on throughout most of last year.
>
> Beginning early last year there was popular clamor for a second front in Europe—that is, an invasion of the European Continent and an attack upon Germany by a British and American force.

We heard all that. We heard the constant clamor by certain individuals in this country for a second front. Some great men went across the ocean, came back, and went around the country preaching for a second front; we remember that at one time the English tried to open a second front, at least on a minor scale. That was at Dieppe. We all know what happened there. There is no question in my mind that if the British had been successful in landing, and had not lost a large percentage of the some 12,000 men who started on this military venture, they would have continued the invasion. But they found the Germans quite strong at that point and were compelled to turn back.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to have the Senator's response to the following question: Does he think it is quite fair to assume that when the leaders of the Allied Nations meet to decide upon the strategy, they will be working entirely for their own nations, not for the success of the whole cause? I noticed the implication in some of the statements, particularly the statements as to Stalin or Churchill, that they have not been representing the general cause, but instead have been representing their own particular countries. I should like to hear the comment of the Senator from Illinois on that particular point.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, I cannot speak for any of those men. However, my judgment insofar as Churchill and Roosevelt are concerned—they are the two who now are in Washington—is that they are working for the common cause, and for the destruction forever of what I spoke of a moment ago as nazi-ism and Japism and the similar Fascist movement in Italy. I have confidence in Stalin and his great Red Army. We all owe much to their heroism, sacrifice, and bravery. I cannot feel any other way about the matter. Then again, Mr. President, I am willing to take my chances with Franklin D. Roosevelt when it comes to negotiating with Hitler, or Stalin, or any other individual in connection with the war or the post-war problems. He has done a magnificent job to date, and he is not a bad fellow to have around when it comes to dealing with other nations.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. There is a suggestion that there is a fear on the part of some Senators that Churchill and President Roosevelt will be the ones to make the decisions, rather than the military leaders of the country. Does the Senator know of the outcome of any of the strategy heretofore planned that would justify such a fear?

Mr. LUCAS. No. I do not know who has done the planning; but whoever is responsible has done a pretty damned good job. [Laughter.]

Mr. TUNNELL. And, again, should it not be said that under our Constitution there is bound to be someone who is Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy?

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that the Constitution so provides.

Mr. TUNNELL. Prior to the last general election in 1940 it was pretty generally known that there was a possibility of just this situation, and the American people selected Franklin Roosevelt over another great Democrat because they believed that he had more ability for such a situation. Is that not true?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know what the reasons of all the people were for the decision which they made, but the verdict in 1940 was fairly decisive.

Mr. TUNNELL. The precedent as to a third term was set aside, so that the present occupant might have the position which he now has, and the right to make determinations.

Mr. LUCAS. Obviously there is no longer any precedent.

Mr. TUNNELL. I do not know who should have the right to make decisions if he and Churchill do not have it at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. I think they are acting in the best interests of humanity as a whole and the free institutions of the world, and for no other reason. They are trying to do whatever is necessary to win the war in the quickest possible time. They are bringing their military and naval advisers to sit with them for that one purpose.

Mr. TUNNELL. I understand from the newspapers that Mr. Churchill has about 100 strategists with him, who are familiar with the situation. I assume that President Roosevelt, being at home, has at least that many.

Mr. LUCAS. If we are to believe the statements of some persons, he might have brought the 100 along merely to carry his luggage. However, I think they are here for a pretty good purpose.

Mr. TUNNELL. I believe the Senator is willing to admit that the combined judgment of those gentlemen on Army and Navy strategy is equivalent to that of the United States Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. It is, so far as I am concerned. I am willing to yield to them. That is what I am talking about at the present time.

Mr. Sullivan's article further states:

The clamor—

With respect to the second front—

continued in England and America throughout the summer. While some of it was inspired by Communists, a great deal was spontaneous and reflected a genuine popular wish. Toward this popular demand the attitude of the British and American Governments was one of diplomatic stalling. They knew that a second front in Europe in sufficient force to be at once formidable and safe was impossible. But to say that would have been to give valuable information to Hitler. Moreover, continuance of the demand for a second front provided the British and American Governments with camouflage for what they were really about to do Beginning about June the British and Americans knew they would undertake to occupy north Africa. That was as much as they were able to do under the conditions existing last year

What last year's conditions were became known to the public a few weeks ago. By a report of the Truman committee of the Senate, followed by statements from Secretary of the Navy Knox, it became known that throughout last year enemy submarines were sinking a larger tonnage of Allied ships than the number of new ships being built.

Mr. President, that is something that we could not tell the American people at that time, because it would have been giving aid and comfort to the enemy to make that kind of a revelation to the public as a whole.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. If it is the intention of the strategists, at the end of the conference, to attack Japan, might it not be possible that it would be considered wise by them not to notify Japan of what they plan to do, and when they plan to do it?

Mr. LUCAS. Exactly.

The article continues:

The excess of destruction by the enemy was such that at the end of 1942 the Allies had about a million tons less shipping than they had at the beginning. In that condition of diminishing tonnage, a second front in Europe was impossible. This the allied high command knew. The public did not.

Yet, Mr. President, a certain portion of the public was constantly crying for a second front. That was true not only in this country but in England as well. Who could know about the sinkings other than the naval and military authorities? To have given out that information then would have been aiding the enemy.

Another experience of last year is useful to apply now. When American General Eisenhower set out to occupy French north Africa, he expected that the territory would be delivered to him by a French general named Giraud. For this purpose, General Giraud was sent secretly to north Africa, by submarine. It turned out, however, that the French Army in north Africa would not take orders from General Giraud.

To General Eisenhower this was extremely embarrassing. It looked as if he might have to fight and conquer the French Army in north Africa before he could even begin to fight the Axis. Actually, there was some fighting between the American and French Armies with material loss of life.

It happened, however, that there was in north Africa a representative of the Vichy French Government, Admiral Darlan. Darlan offered to order the French Army to cease firing on the Americans, and further to join the Americans in fighting the Axis. General Eisenhower accepted the offer, of course

This decision of General Eisenhower ended the fighting between the Americans and French, saved many French and American lives, and hastened our occupation of north Africa, according to an estimate made by President Roosevelt at the time, by "a month or two."

Nevertheless, as soon as General Eisenhower's arrangement with Darlan became known in America, there was an outcry here, chiefly from liberals and radicals. Their outcry was mainly that American military authorities ought not to enter into any agreement with any official of the Vichy French Government—no matter how valuable the arrangement was in a military sense. Those who took this view kept up for many months a din of criticism against President Roosevelt, Secretary of War Stimson, and Secretary of State Hull.

In other words, Mr. President, because Eisenhower made the military decision to go along with Darlan so as to save thousands and thousands of American boys, many individuals in this country who believe more in some political theory or ideology than in saving the lives of American boys criticized the action. So far as I am concerned, Eisenhower made the correct decision. If I had had anything to do with military strategy at that time on the African front I would have done the same thing. I would deal with Al Capone or any other type of individual on the military front in north Africa or any other front if it would save my army or a great portion of it.

That action did not mean for one moment that Darlan would have charge of north Africa after this thing is over. If I were in a street brawl with three other men, I would be willing to take help from any individual who might come along. The tougher he might be the better I would like it. That was the situation with Darlan. They were dealing with a tough hombre, and a smart, profound man. The result was that they got from Darlan what they did not get from Giraud. It was a great piece of strategy. I do not know who was in on it, but I am for it. That type of a military decision is primarily responsible for having the enemy out of north Africa today.

The article continues:

This Eisenhower-Darlan incident is here told very briefly. It had many ramifications. For some of the opposition to the arrangement, there were appealing reasons.

But the fundamental lesson is plain. Military decisions should be left to military men. When a military high command, or a military leader in the field, has made a decision for a military purpose, for the purpose of bringing the war to an end in the shortest possible time with the least loss of life—when such a decision has been made by a military commander, he should be free from criticism from those who may deplore the decision on grounds of ideology. This lesson is the more important to remember because, when and as we invade Europe, scores of situations will arise similar to the Eisenhower-Darlan one in north Africa.

That is true, Mr. President. When the American, British, and French Armies finally invade Europe and go from one country to another, they will find in the various countries the same type of situation that Eisenhower found in north Africa. They will have to deal with the situation as they find it. Probably that is one of the things now being discussed in the present conference. I do not know. Those in the conference are discussing a great number of things. Whatever they do, I am satisfied that in the final analysis it will be for the best interests of this beloved country of ours and the best interests of free institutions throughout the world. Everything they do will militate against the cruel tyrants in Japan, Germany, and Italy.

I am just as bitterly and viciously opposed to the Japanese as is any other Senator. I can never forget, and nobody will forget, what the Japanese did to us on December 7, 1941. American soldiers will have their day of vengeance. It is a long way out into the Pacific. It is a long way to where our boys are at the present time. Mark Sullivan has told us about shipping. Shipping is the real reason we occupy the position we do today in the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. President, I am not going to suggest what Admiral King, President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, General Marshall, or General Arnold should do on this eventful occasion. They have done an excellent job to date. So far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, he is willing to leave the decision of such questions to the judgment of the military and naval men.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator think that any man in the Senate of the United States, or outside the Senate of the United States, who is not participating in the conference, with all the facts and the full picture before him, with the complete story of the situation in every part of the world as it affects this war, is in a position to make suggestions as to what should be done?

Mr. LUCAS. I can only answer for myself. I believe, as a Member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I have as much knowledge of the situation as have most Senators. Yet under such conditions, if I were to attempt to lay down the strategy and map the plans for the future of this war, I should be hurting the war effort rather than helping it. I believe I would be doing my country a disservice.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND THE JUDICIARY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to proceed to the consideration of House bill 2409.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which

had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I wish briefly to say that this is the regular appropriation bill for the legislative branch and for the Judiciary. The amount of the bill as it passed the House was $40,659,273.

The amount of increase by the Senate committee was $284,505. The amount of the bill as reported to the Senate was $40,943,778. The amount of the appropriation for 1943 was $43,826,092. The amount of the regular and supplemental estimates for 1944 was $41,804,350. The bill as reported to the Senate is $860,572 less than the estimates for 1944. It is $2,882,314 less than the appropriations for 1943.

So there is a considerable saving in the bill. The increase of $284,505 granted by the Senate Committee on Appropriations deals for the most part with a $100,000 item for the revision of the laws. Aside from that, the appropriations are purely routine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Legislative Branch—Senate—Office of the Secretary," on page 3, in line 14, after the figures "$1,440", to insert "and $420 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent", and in line 20, after the words "in all", to strike out "$150,020" and insert "$150,440."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Committee employees", on page 5, line 2, after the figures "$2,220", to strike out "additional clerk, $1,800" and insert "two additional clerks at $1,800 each;"; in line 19, after the figures "$3,900", to insert "assistant clerk, $3,000, in lieu of assistant clerk provided by Senate Resolution No. 321 (77th Cong.), agreed to December 15, 1942;", and on page 7, line 19, after the words "in all", to strike out "$507,740" and insert "$512,540."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Clerical assistance to Senators," on page 8, after line 21, to strike out:

Senators and chairmen of standing committees may rearrange or change the schedule of salaries and the number of employees in their respective offices or committees: *Provided*, That such changes shall not increase the aggregate of the salaries provided for such offices or committees by law or Senate resolution: *Provided further*, That no salary shall be fixed hereunder at a rate in excess of $4,500 per annum and no action shall be taken to reduce any salary which is specifically fixed by law at a rate higher than $4,500: *Provided further*, That Senators and committee chairmen, on or before the first day of the month in which such changes are to become effective, shall certify in writing such changes or rearrangements to the disbursing office which shall thereafter pay such employees in accord with such changed schedule.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Senators and chairmen of standing committees may change the number of employees in their respective offices or committees, and may rearrange the schedule of basic salaries of such employees in multiples of $5 per month: *Provided*, That such changes and rearrangements shall not increase the aggregate of the salaries provided for such offices or committees by law or Senate resolution: *Provided further*, That no salary shall be fixed under this paragraph at a rate in excess of $4,500 per annum, and no action shall be taken to reduce any salary which is specifically fixed by law at a rate higher than $4,500 per annum: *Provided further*, That Senators and committee chairmen, before the day on which they are to become effective, shall certify in writing such changes or rearrangements to the disbursing office of the Senate which thereafter shall pay such employees in accordance with such certifications.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper" on page 10, line 15, after the word "clerks", to insert "one, $3,300."; in line 16 after the figures "$2,200", to strike out "one $2,100,"; in line 19, after the figures "$2,280" to insert "and $120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent"; in line 21, before the words "assistant doorkeeper", to strike out the comma and "one $1,500"; on page 11, line 4, after the figures "$3,360", to strike out "upholsterer and locksmith, $2,600; cabinetmaker, $2,040; three carpenters at $2,040 each;" and insert "cabinetmakers—chief, $2,780; one, $2,300; one, $2,040; finisher, $2,300; upholsterer, $2,040;"; in line 7, after the figures "$2,400", to insert "and $300 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent"; in line 14, after the word "each", to strike out "attendant authorized by S. Res 252, adopted May 13, 1938, $1,500;"; in line 24, after the word "each", where it occurs the first time, to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-eight", and on page 12, line 3, after the words "in all", to strike out "$277,228" and insert "$274,028."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, at the end of line 23, in the item for reporting Senate proceedings, to change the appropriation from $66,340 to $69,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, at the end of line 17, to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$35,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 22, to strike out:

Senate restaurants: For repairs, improvements, equipment, and supplies for Senate kitchens and restaurants, Capitol Building, and Senate Office Building, including personal and other services, to be expended from the contingent fund of the Senate, under the supervision of the Committee on Rules, United States Senate, $35,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Senate restaurants: For payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with the act approved September 9, 1942 (Public Law 709, 77th Cong.), $35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "House of Representatives—Contingent Expenses of the House", on page 27, after line 13, to insert:

For preliminary work in connection with the preparation of a new edition of the United States Code, including the correction of errors as authorized by the act approved March 2, 1929 (45 Stat. 1541), $100,000, to be expended under the supervision of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Architect of the Capitol—Capitol Buildings and Grounds", in the item for Capitol buildings on page 33, at the end of line 9, to strike out "$289,200" and insert "$291,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 11, after the words "in all", to strike out "$313,560" and insert "$306,955: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance on June 30, 1943, of the appropriation of $7,300 for the maintenance of the Senate Office Building, contained in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942, shall continue available for the same purposes until June 30, 1944."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II, the judiciary, miscellaneous items of expense," on page 57, line 2, after the word "assistants", to strike out "$2,542,900" and insert "$2,570,280."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 2, to strike out:

No part of any appropriation in this act shall be used to pay the cost of maintaining an office of the clerk of the United States District Court at Anniston, Ala.; Florence, Ala.; Jasper, Ala.; Gadsden, Ala.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Montrose Colo.; Durango, Colo.; Sterling, Colo.; Newnan, Ga.; Benton, Ill.; Salina, Kans.; Chillicothe, Mo.; Roswell, N. Mex.; Bryson City, N. C.; Shelby, N. C.; Ardmore, Okla.; Guthrie, Okla.; Aberdeen, S. Dak.; Pierre, S. Dak.; Deadwood, S. Dak.; Ogden, Utah; Casper, Wyo.; Evanston, Wyo.; or Lander, Wyo.; but this paragraph shall not be so construed as to prevent the detail during sessions of court of such employees as may be necessary from other offices to the offices named herein.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 8, after the words "provided for", to strike out "$987,100: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks of district judges shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salaries of secretaries, exclusive of the differential allowed for higher living costs in the Panama Canal Zone, shall not exceed that of the senior clerical grade and the salaries of law clerks shall not exceed that of the principal subprofessional grade: *Provided further*, That none of this fund shall be used for the pay of a law clerk appointed by a district judge unless the senior circuit judge

of the circuit (the District of Columbia being considered a circuit) in which the district where the clerk is needed is situated shall certify to the necessity of the appointment" and insert: "$1,137,100: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks to circuit and district judges shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salaries of the secretaries, exclusive of temporary additional compensation, and exclusive of the differential allowed for higher living costs in the Panama Canal Zone, shall correspond with those of the assistant administrative grade (grade 7 of clerical, administrative, and fiscal service) and their basic salaries shall be adjusted by the Director as of July 1, 1943, so that they are given credit for one rate of $100 in grade 7 for each 18 months' prior service as secretary to any Federal judge or other United States Government official: *Provided further*, That the annual basic compensation of the secretary to a circuit or district judge shall not (exclusive of temporary additional compensation) exceed $3,200: *And provided further*, That the salaries of law clerks shall correspond with those of the assistant professional grade."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 8, after the word "issued", to strike out "$390,000" and insert "$391,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am authorized by the committee to offer from the floor an amendment which would require suspension of the rule. The amendment which I offer, as to which I gave notice, is more or less pro forma, but I should like to have it read, and then I will explain it very briefly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland on behalf of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, after line 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the third paragraph under the heading "Clerical assistance to Senators" of section 1 of the Legislative Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928 (2 U. S. C. 92a), in the case of the death of a Senator during his term of office, his clerical assistants on the pay roll of the Senate on the date of such death shall be continued on such pay roll at their respective salaries for a period of not to exceed 60 days: *Provided*, That any such clerical assistants continued on the pay roll shall, while so continued, perform their duties under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate, and he is hereby authorized and directed to remove from such pay roll any such clerks who are not attending to the duties for which their services are continued.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, when a Member of the Senate dies, it has been customary——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I recall the statement which the Senator from Maryland made heretofore. It was very clear. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in order to protect the committee clerks from being included in this provision, it is necessary that there be a further proviso, which reads as follows:

Provided further, That this shall not apply to clerical assistants of standing committees of the Senate when their service otherwise would continue beyond such period.

I believe the proviso speaks for itself, and that no explanation is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified accordingly.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk. I ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

Terms of court at Greenwood, S. C.: Section 105 of the Judicial Code, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "at Greenwood the first Mondays in February and November", in the third paragraph thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "at Greenwood the second Mondays in May and December."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, that amendment is satisfactory to the committee. The Senator from South Carolina has corresponded with the court and has letters from the judges concerning the matter. The amendment would cost no money. It is merely an arrangement for hearings, and I can see no objection to it.

Mr. McNARY. Is that the amendment concerning which the Senator spoke to me earlier in the day?

Mr. MAYBANK. It merely provides for a change in the dates of the court, in the interest of the judges, the district attorney, and those who appear in court.

Mr. McNARY. I understand it is intended as an accommodation in the public interest.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a letter addressed to me from Mr. Henry P. Chandler, Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, under date of May 17, 1943.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: I have just been informed that the United States attorney for the western district of South Carolina is desirous of changing the times of holding terms of the district court for that district in Greenwood, which are now designated by section 105 of the Judicial Code (title 28, U. S. C., sec. 186) as the first Mondays in February and November to the second Mondays in May and December. I am further informed that Judges Wyche and Timmerman, the United States district judges who hold the terms of court in the western district, join in recommending this change.

Although I have had no opportunity to confer about the proposed change with the judicial conference of senior circuit judges under which I act, it is a local matter and in view of the approval of the change by the district judges who are familiar with the conditions, I have no doubt that it is advisable. It would produce a more even spacing of the time between the winter or spring and fall terms of court and lessen the time which persons indicted under the present schedule after February in any year and unable to furnish bail may have to stay in jail awaiting trial.

Hon. John J. Parker, the senior circuit judge of the circuit, happens to be in my office this morning. I have therefore consulted him and he authorizes me to say that he approves the proposed change.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HENRY P. CHANDLER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2409) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. WHITE conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the statement by Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, before the Senate Finance Committee this morning on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the extension thereof.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By this time, it should be crystal-clear to each and every one of us that during the interval between the two wars there were committed some of the most colossal blunders in the experience of the human race. Otherwise, the world would not be in its present critical position.

There never was a time, therefore, when it was more necessary for every one of us to examine and reexamine the nature and causes of mankind's tragic failure in the last two decades to build an enduring structure of law, peace, and prosperity. None of us, who prizes freedom and who has at heart our national interest for the sake of which we are now pouring out blood and treasure, can permit any preconceived notion, however long and strongly held, to stand in the way of an understanding of the crushing blunders of recent years and of resolute effort to make

sure that such blunders will not recur in the future.

This is not the occasion for a thorough and comprehensive examination of this all-important matter in its entirety. But this is an eminently fit occasion for a discussion of one of its essential phases—the problem of international economic cooperation as an indispensable basis both for peace and for prosperity.

For the past 9 years the reciprocal-trade-agreements policy has been carried forward by cooperative action of the legislative and executive branches of the Government. It was originally enacted in 1934, and has been, since then, twice renewed. The House of Representatives, after exhaustive hearings and debate, has just voted, by an overwhelming nonpartisan majority, to renew it again.

In the course of the hearings held by the House Committee on Ways and Means I made a comprehensive statement of the essential considerations involved in the question which is before you. I shall not take your time to reiterate the points presented in it. But I should like, if I may, to dwell upon one or two of these points.

In making its decision at this time whether or not to renew the Trade Agreements Act, the Congress is faced with the first significant test of this country's basic attitude toward the future. The issue is whether or not our country is determined to cooperate with other peacefully inclined nations in economic matters.

After the last war, we, as a Nation, faced the same issue, and we have paid a terrible price for the fact that our answers to some of the questions raised by that issue were neither clear-cut nor consistent. Following the war of 1914–18, international economic relations soon fell into a pattern of rapidly narrowing nationalism. Recovery from the dislocations produced by that first world conflict imperatively required a revival and growth of international trade. Instead, the nations of the world surrounded themselves with ever-mounting barriers to an exchange of goods across their boundaries. To that destructive piling up of trade restrictions, our country contributed its full share.

During the decade of the twenties, the evil effects of trade restrictions were somewhat mitigated and disguised by the vast volume of international loans. Our country supplied billions of dollars in loans, which enabled us to maintain our exports on a relatively high level while we were putting immense obstacles in the path of our imports.

That unhealthy situation could not continue long. And it did not. By the end of the first post-war decade, the structure of international trade became disrupted, and the resultant dislocation served as a powerful contributory factor to the general economic collapse which descended on our country and the world.

In the first bitter days of that profound depression, our country and other countries could think of no expedient, except to intensify and extend the very course of narrow economic nationalism which was so largely responsible for the tragic plight in which we found ourselves. Trade barriers rose to unprecedented heights. The structure of currency and credit was shattered. Countries resorted to a multiplying variety of economic weapons, and all suffered in consequence.

Fortunately for us and for the world, this country, after more than a decade of noncooperation with others, at last had the vision and the courage to shift gears in the all-important field of commercial policy and to move in the opposite direction. That was the historic significance of the original enactment of the trade-agreements policy.

In the trade-agreements program we had a flexible and easily adjustable instrument for dealing with the two great obstacles to a healthy development of mutually beneficial international trade. The first of those obstacles was the immense variety of restrictions on imports—excessive tariffs, quotas, exchange controls, and many others. The second was the use of these devices in a discriminatory manner. By means of trade agreements, we sought to eliminate or diminish these destructive barriers. The trade-agreement method enabled us to accomplish the reduction of trade barriers in other countries through a reciprocal reduction of some of our own tariff rates. It enabled us, by the use of the most-favored-nation principle, to press for an abandonment of discriminatory practices. Amid the growing deterioration of all international relationships during the years which preceded the outbreak of the present war, the trade-agreement program was the most important single support for the hope that the nations might find a way toward cooperative action for the establishment and maintenance of peaceful international relations.

As we face the future, the renewal now of the Trade Agreements Act will have perhaps an even greater historic significance than that of its original adoption.

Our people are fully aware of that fact. For months past, in Congress and throughout the country, there has been discussion of the post-war world and of what should be our part in it, a free give and take of views and ideas in the best American tradition. This is as it should be. Only in this way can public opinion crystallize and the Congress be enabled accurately to register that opinion. We must chart the general direction of our post-war course, begin to make decisions on policies, necessarily leaving until later the working out of details in the better knowledge we will then have of specific conditions. Public opinion has not yet crystallized in regard to some aspects of the extent and nature of our cooperation with other like-minded nations with a view to making the world, after this war, both fruitful and secure. But it has, I feel confident, overwhelmingly reached the conclusion that the minimum indication of our willingness to cooperate with others in the economic field to the mutual benefit of all would lie in the clean-cut extension of the trade-agreements program.

That program has served us well in the past 9 years. There has been an ample demonstration of its usefulness as an effective instrument for the promotion of mutually beneficial trade on a basis of fair dealing and nondiscrimination—the only possible basis of fruitful international cooperation in the economic field. It is thus a practical and tested method which the Congress has already endorsed twice since its original adoption, each time after an exhaustive appraisal of its results. The Congress is being asked, therefore, in making this first decision on post-war policies, not to commit the country to some new and untried experiment, but to reaffirm a proven program, sound in principle and in operation, and essential for a stable economic, political, and peace structure in the post-war years.

We know from bitter experience that trade between countries is the main foundation for any and all economic dealings between peoples. It provides the goods they need, and furnishes employment for industries suited to each country. If it is discouraged by cloudy political skies and mistrust, or made impossible by national shortsightedness, there is no possible sound basis for any of the other economic or financial dealings between the countries.

Without substantial trade, our shipping industry is certain to decline to small dimensions. Without substantial trade, any capital investment that we may undertake abroad would sooner or later end in disappointment and reproach. Without substantial trade, there cannot be certainty or stability in the monetary relationships between countries. These will always be subject to disturbances and disputes. The prospects for maintaining a coordinated international monetary system would be dimmed. Without substantial international trade, the future value of gold is certain to be in doubt, for countries will not indefinitely accumulate gold supplies unless they can freely obtain goods therefor. International trade is thus the key to all our international economic relations—and a powerful factor in our domestic prosperity as well.

The trade-agreements program is the sole practicable method by which we can hope to restore our post-war foreign trade to a healthy basis. It is a method of trade regulation through which obstacles to commerce can be removed with fullest regard for the position and interest of every branch of our production and the general interest of the Nation as a whole. Administered as it has been by experienced and disinterested officials, with infinite care and caution, it is the one method so far devised for constructive action in this vitally important field.

There is no possible effective alternative for it. Our history has shown how strong would be the tendency were the Trade Agreements Act discarded or crippled, to resort to the position of extreme and ruinous trade barriers. Any such course by this country at this time would spur on all countries in the world, many in greater difficulties than we ourselves, to place high barriers and restrictions about their own countries, provoke them into special arrangements from which we would be excluded—and as a consequence of these measures, destroy the interchange of needed goods by which all countries of the world can gradually repair the damage of the war and improve their economic condition.

In the conduct of our trade with the rest of the world and in the administration of the Trade Agreements Act, we, of course, take full and detailed account of our domestic situation, our domestic measures, and the forms of trading abroad. The act is flexible enough to permit all measure of wise adjustment. In fact, without the act we could not meet satisfactorily the changing conditions which will confront us.

Without the Trade Agreements Act we would be thrown back on the kind of extreme policy that culminated in the Tariff Act of 1930.

It has been suggested that the trade-agreements program be retained, but the agreements negotiated under it be made subject to approval by the Congress. Let me recall briefly some pertinent history.

During the entire history of this country, only three reciprocity tariff treaties have been ratified and made effective. All of these were of a special character and were with countries with which the United States had particularly close political or geographic ties: Canada (1854), Hawaii (1875), and Cuba (1902).

Twenty-two other reciprocity tariff treaties have been negotiated by the Executive, 10 under the general treaty-making powers and 12 pursuant to the express statutory provision in section 4 of the Tariff Act of 1897, but not a single one of these became effective. Seventeen of these were either rejected by or failed to come to a vote in the Senate, 1 was rejected by the foreign government because of amendments by the Senate, 1 failed to receive congressional legislation necessary to place it in effect, and 3 were withdrawn.

In contrast to the record of reciprocity treaties requiring Senate, or Senate and congressional approval, is the record of executive agreements negotiated under authority delegated by the Congress and not subject to subsequent approval by the Senate or Congress. Under the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890, 12 reciprocity agreements were made effective, and under section 3 of the Dingley Tariff Act of 1897, 15 such agreements were brought into force.

In 1933 the United States Tariff Commission, after summarizing the reciprocity experiences of this country up to that time, concluded:

"The past experiences of the United States with respect to the difficulty of obtaining reciprocal tariff concessions by means of treaties and the greater success in negotiating executive agreements under previous authorization by the Congress may be significant as a guide to future policy regarding methods of tariff bargaining" (U. S. Tariff Commission, Tariff Bargaining Under Most-Favored-Nation Treaties, p. 13).

Since the Trade Agreements Act has been in operation, 30 agreements have been negotiated and made effective. One agreement, that with Iran, signed on April 8, 1943, has not as yet become effective.

No one in his right senses would dream of asking the Congress for an unlimited grant of authority to adjust our tariff rates. No Congress would ever dream of making such a grant of power—and no Congress ever has. The Trade Agreements Act involves a strictly and specifically limited delegation of power, with the terms of which you are all familiar. Its periodic review by the Congress is a fully effective safeguard against the abuse even of these limited powers. In the light of the record of disastrous experience which I have just recited, a demand for congressional action on trade agreements is a demand for the abandonment of the whole program without which our country's hands will be tied in a field in which it must either act or accept overwhelmingly disastrous consequences.

I shall not dwell on other equally important reasons why it is imperative that the program be continued in its present form, without weakening change. Many of us, both within and outside the Government, including the almost unanimous voice of the public press, have strongly urged such action as an early indication to other nations of our post-war intentions. We have all referred to the interest and anxiety with which other nations would follow the debates in Congress on this question. Developments since the introduction of the legislation in the House have confirmed this. Reports received from country after country, particularly in the neighboring American republics, reveal the marked attention by government officials, the press, and the public to this legislation. The universally expressed hope—except in the Axis countries—is for the trade-agreements program to be extended, both for its practical significance and for the reaffirmation of the principles of cooperation and fair dealing which it embodies.

When post-war economic readjustments are sought we shall need to be in a position, in our own national self-interest, to play our part in establishing conditions favorable to mutually beneficial trade, full employment, and generally to fruitful and friendly relations between the peoples of the world. Only through enlarged market opportunity abroad and at home shall we be able to establish and maintain our peacetime economic activity and the employment and living standards of our people on anything like a satisfactorily high level.

The experience of the two decades which elapsed between the end of the World War and the outbreak of a new war in Europe has brought out in sharp relief the validity of two basic propositions. The first of these is that our Nation, and every nation, can enjoy sustained prosperity only in a world which is at peace. The second is that a peaceful world is possible only when there exists for it a solid economic foundation, an indispensable part of which is active and mutually beneficial trade among the nations. The creation of such a foundation is a primary objective of the trade-agreements program, which seeks the advancement of our domestic prosperity and the promotion of world peace.

These great objectives cannot, of course, be accomplished by trade agreements alone. But they cannot be accomplished without them.

RELIEF OF OWNERS OF RESORT AND OTHER PROPERTIES

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on the 11th of January, last, I introduced a bill—S. 276—for the relief of owners of certain properties rendered inoperative by reason of restrictions arising from the war effort. The bill was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and by that committee referred to Hon. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce. I have had several conferences with the chairman of the committee and Mr. Jones. I think they have reached really a solution of the problem whereby it can be handled under existing law.

Mr. Jones wrote me a letter on May 12 which I ask to have inserted in the RECORD, as well as a statement by him, which indicated that the owners of so-called vacation and resort properties who are now having financial difficulties may be carried over during the period of the war. In order that the matter may be known generally, I am asking that the letter and statement may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

I may add that I received fine support from the chairman of the committee, the able Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and from the ranking Republican member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. To them I want to pay this brief tribute for their great assistance covering a subject matter which has brought distress to hundreds of owners of so-called resort properties.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, May 12, 1943.

Hon. CHARLES L. MCNARY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCNARY: I enclose copy of a release with respect to loans on improved properties that have lost their earning power by reason of wartime restrictions and regulations.

As I understand it, this should meet the situations intended to be covered by S. 276, which you introduced.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, today announced that the RFC Mortgage Company will consider applications for loans against improved real estate with an established net earning capacity including stores, privately owned gasoline and service stations, resort hotels, and business properties generally that have lost their earning power by reason of wartime restrictions and regulations.

The conditions under which such applications will be considered follow:

"A. Participation loans: To the extent the available net income of the owner is insufficient for the purpose, the Mortgage Company will make advances for interest, taxes, special assessments, insurance, and necessary maintenance in instances in which (a) the property is encumbered by a mortgage or mortgages, (b) the total lien indebtedness does not exceed 60 percent of the normal value of the property as determined by the Mortgage Company, and (c) agreements are executed with the mortgagor and all respective mortgagees providing, among other things, that—

"1. The Mortgage Company will make such advances during the period ending with the expiration of the unlimited national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, provided that the total lien indebtedness shall never exceed 75 percent of said normal value of the property.

"2. All advances shall be secured by the first mortgage, except interest on junior mortgages which shall be secured by the mortgages to which advances for interest are applicable.

"3. The Mortgage Company shall have a continuing option to purchase the respective mortgages at par and accrued interest.

"4. The existing notes and the mortgages securing them shall be modified as follows:

"a. During the period terminating 1 year after the expiration of said national emergency, (1) the interest rate shall be 4 percent per annum, and (2) no foreclosure will be made without the written consent of the Mortgage Company.

"b. At the end of such period, (1) the interest rate shall be that of the original notes, and (2) the total indebtedness secured by the respective mortgages shall become due in equal annual installments extending over periods equal to those remaining under the respective notes at the time of their modification but in no event less than 5 years; provided, however, that all of such indebtedness shall immediately become due and payable when the total amount thereof equals 75 percent of said normal value of the property.

"B. Refunding loans: The Mortgage Company will make a loan to refund all or any portion of existing lien indebtedness in instances in which (a) a loan cannot be obtained from private sources; (b) the total lien indebtedness does not exceed 60 percent of said normal value of the property; (c) lienholders decline to cooperate by carrying preferred participations in the loan, or otherwise; (d) the Mortgage Company determines that the property will be capable of producing a post-war income sufficient to amortize the existing lien indebtedness; and (e) all junior lienholders consent to the loan and agree to forbear as required by the Mortgage Company. Thereafter, the Mortgage Company will make advances when necessary for taxes, special assessments, insurance, and necessary maintenance during said national emergency: *Provided*, That such advances, when added to the total lien indebtedness, will not exceed 75 percent of said normal value of the property. Interest shall be at the rate of 4 percent per annum and the principal shall be payable in installments approved by the Mortgage Company commencing 1 year after the expiration of said national emergency.

"C. Care and preservation loans: Where the property is unencumbered, the Mortgage Company will make a loan sufficient to cover taxes, special assessments, insurance, and necessary maintenance during said national emergency to the extent the available net income of the owner is insufficient for such purposes. The proceeds of the loan will be advanced as needed to preserve the property. Interest shall be at the rate of 4 percent per annum and the principal shall be payable in installments approved by the Mortgage Company commencing 1 year after the expiration of said national emergency."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Charles E. Rosendahl to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from July 9, 1942.

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

CHARLES H. CARR

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary this morning unanimously endorsed and approved the nomination of Charles H. Carr, of California, to be United States attorney for the southern district of California, vice William Fleet Palmer, deceased. My information is that, owing to the death of the former occupant, it is very important that this nomination be acted upon at the earliest possible time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be now considered and disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana?

The Chair hears none, and the nomination will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles H. Carr, of California, to be United States attorney for the southern district of California vice William Fleet Palmer, deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. VAN NUYS. I move that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

BEN LEAR—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Ben Lear to be lieutenant general, which had been previously passed over.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination of Ben Lear to be lieutenant general in the Army be passed over until Wednesday. We hope to secure action at that time. I am taking this action at the request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not know whether a date should be fixed for the consideration of the nomination. I have not conferred with the distinguished acting majority leader. I thought that if Mr. Churchill occupied a considerable time on Wednesday, we would probably have time on Thursday to take up the calendar and other matters such as the nomination referred to.

Mr. HILL. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Kentucky, I suggest that he ask merely that the nomination be passed over, which will mean that it will come up the next time the Executive Calendar is called.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should not like to ask that it be taken up at any time sooner than Wednesday.

Mr. HILL. The Senate will adjourn today until Wednesday, so the nomination could not be taken up before that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky that the nomination be passed over? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the other nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John F. Leonard to be postmaster at Marmarth, N. D.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for appointments in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of John D. Talbott, of Kentucky, and the other nominations under the War Manpower Commission be confirmed. I wish to say that John D. Talbott is one of my closest friends, and he is one of the best officials we have ever had in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. I rejoice in his appointment, and predict that he will do a fine job for the people of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations under the War Manpower Commission are confirmed en bloc.

The nominations confirmed en bloc are as follows:

Floyd W. Sharp, of Arkansas, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, Little Rock area office.

John Francis Daly, Jr., of Connecticut, to be senior training supervisor, at $4,600 per annum, Hartford area office.

John D. Talbott, of Kentucky, to be senior manpower field representative, at $4,600 per annum, Cleveland regional office.

Milton G. Young, of Oklahoma, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, Oklahoma City area office.

Nathan H. Gowing, of Virginia, to be area director, at $6,500 per annum, Hampton Roads area office.

Russell A. Rasco, of Florida, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, Miami area office.

Joseph T. Flakne, of Alaska, to be senior placement specialist, at $4,600 per annum, Seattle area office.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of all confirmations made today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVITATION TO VISIT CAMP LEE, VA., AND OTHER MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS

As in legislative session,

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the War Department trip over the past week end to Fort Monmouth, N. J., to Edgewood Arsenal, Md., and to Fort Belvoir, Va., proved most informative and interesting for those who were able to make the tour.

This trip was arranged for the Senate Military Affairs Committee, the Appropriations Committee, the Truman committee, the Murray committee, and several other committees.

Invitations have been sent to the same committees for a second trip to be made on Tuesday, May 25, and Wednesday, May 26, to visit Camp Lee, Va., the Richmond Quartermaster Depot, and the New York Port of Embarkation. As I am told that this trip will be even more interesting than the first, I am planning to take it myself, and I urge all other members of the committees invited, especially the Military Affairs Committee, to take advantage of the opportunity.

Since I feel that this trip will be exceedingly valuable to all Senators, I have arranged with the War Department to take any Senator who would like to make the trip.

As to those who are not members of one of the invited committees, as heretofore mentioned, who are desirous of going along, all that will be necessary is for them to contact Colonel Watt, General Staff Representative with the Military Affairs Committee, and the War Department will reach their respective offices and provide full details in regard to this matter. In other words, Mr. President, the War Department has extended a very generous and kindly invitation; and if any Member of the Senate who is desirous of participating in these interesting trips, and particularly that of May 25 and 26, will let us know, we will see that proper provision is made for their transportation and maintenance while on the tour.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, May 19, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 17, 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

APPOINTMENTS IN THE WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Floyd W. Sharp to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Little Rock area office.

John Francis Daly, Jr., to be senior training supervisor, at $4,600 per annum, in the Hartford area office.

John D. Talbott to be senior manpower field representative, at $4,600 per annum, in the Cleveland regional office.

Milton G. Young to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Oklahoma City area office.

Nathan H. Gowing to be area director, at $6,500 per annum, in the Hampton Roads area office.

Russell A. Rasco to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Miami area office.

Joseph T. Flakne to be senior placement specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Seattle area office.

Joseph G. Dellert to be principal manpower utilization analyst at $5,600 per annum, in the Philadelphia regional office.

Clarence A. McGowan to be housing and transportation specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Philadelphia regional office.

Eugene J. Ronan to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the Philadelphia regional office.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Robert Wood Johnson to be a brigadier general.

POSTMASTER

NORTH DAKOTA

John F. Leonard, Marmath.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 17, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Ellis A. Fuller, D. D., LL. D., president, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., offered the following prayer:

Our gracious and holy Father, we acknowledge Thee as the giver of every good and perfect gift. Let Thy favors be upon this great Nation and upon those who direct its affairs. Let Thy protecting care be about our men in arms. We acknowledge Thee as the giver of every good gift. Forgive us of our sins and give us liberally of Thy wisdom. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 14, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2570. An act to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. DANAHER to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 151):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of four Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MURDOCK, and Mr. SCRUGHAM members on the part of the Senate to the above committee.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BROWN of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CONTESTED ELECTION CASE—JOHN B. SULLIVAN AGAINST LOUIS E. MILLER

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Elections No. 3, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read (H. Res. 240) as follows:

Resolved, That the time allowed for taking testimony in the election contest, John B. Sullivan, contestant, against Louis E. Miller, contestee, Eleventh Congressional District of Missouri, shall be extended for a period of 65 days, beginning May 18, 1943, and the testimony shall be taken in the following order:

The contestant shall take testimony during the first 30 days, the contestee shall take testimony during the succeeding 30 days, and the contestant shall take testimony in rebuttal only during the remaining 5 days of said period.

The resolution was agreed to.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and move to agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LUDLOW, O'NEAL, MAHON, CURLEY, TABER, KEEFE, and DWORSHAK.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from yesterday's Post by Carl Sandburg.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THE LATE JOHN B. TOWNLEY

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein two short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. EBERHARTER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE COAL SITUATION

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I stated on this floor on the 7th day of May that it was my firm conviction agreements could be reached between Harold Ickes and John L. Lewis, and further said I was just as sure that the powers behind the War Labor Board do not want them to agree.

To substantiate those opinions I called to your attention the division of authority within the War Labor Board, and the added authority of other committees and men to deal with this coal situation, a most serious national predicament, none of whom seem to have the power to settle the difficulty between the United Mine Workers of America and the operators.

I challenge the War Labor Board and Judge Byrnes to place the power to settle this matter in the hands of Harold Ickes for 48 hours. If this is done, the operators and the coal miners will settle their grievances and proceed to do the job the Nation expects of them. If this is not done and authority remains divided, no one can be blamed except the power back of all these different committees and individuals. If Harold Ickes was sent in to handle the coal situation, just why was he restricted and his power curtailed in handling the dispute and settling it?

The next few days will definitely disclose whether the administration wants this matter cleaned up, or if the fight between John L. Lewis and the fourth termers is the real issue.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CONTRIBUTION OF FRED M. HOUGHTON AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the pleasant experiences in a Congressman's public career is the fine letters he receives from his constituents back home.

I recently received a letter from a friend of mine in my home village of Clio, Mich. This friend, Fred M. Houghton, has been operating the Houghton Elevator in the city of Clio for many years.

He has always been a thoroughly patriotic American citizen, generous and philanthropic, with a broad view of the responsibilities and duties of citizenship.

In the letter which Mr. Houghton sent me was a certified check for $900, payable to the War Department. This gift came from Fred M. Houghton and his employees, Richard L. Houghton, Verna E. Lembach, Lawrence Pace, Floyd Pace, Eugene Miller, Leonard Verus, and August Yaester, as their contribution to the boys in service. The letter was thoroughly patriotic. The check which was enclosed put that expressed patriotism in action.

It is the voluntary actions of men and women like Fred M. Houghton and employees that renew our faith in the patriotism and soundness of our citizenry.

The American people have one abiding thought, and that is to win the present war. Right at this moment we have approximately 6,000,000 boys in uniform in the Army, more than 1,300,000 in the Navy, and more than 500,000 in the Coast Guard and marines.

These nearly 8,000,000 men in service today have dedicated their lives to the perpetuity of American institutions and to the establishment of freedom throughout the world.

All honor due to our citizens back home who not only pay taxes freely and gladly, but, in addition to that, make substantial contributions for the continuance of our constitutional form of government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, one on the question of insurance in wartime, and in the other to include an address delivered by Col. Oveta Culp Hobby on yesterday before a breakfast given by the Texas State Society.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a tribute paid to the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps by the President of the United States, and one paid by its director, Col. Oveta Culp Hobby.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, on two subjects, and to include in one of them an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE TAX BILL

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. POULSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein two newspaper articles from the Boston Herald on the milk situation in Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a speech by W. S. Hallanan, at an estimated cost of $105.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

NUTS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a statement contained in a radio broadcast made by myself, outlining the contribution of Hawaii to the war effort.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, when the Government took over the coal mines in face of the tragedy that confronted us, the President appointed the ablest available man, in my judgment, to handle that dangerous and difficult situation, Mr. Ickes. Now the War Labor Board, true to bureaucratic instinct and method, has stepped in and is seeking to "defend the sovereignty of this country," meaning, of course, its own sovereignty.

Mr. Ickes said when he got this job that it was a wildcat placed in his lap. When the Labor Board came in, the wildcat had kittens, each more troublesome than its parent. Let us hope that Mr. Ickes will be left in charge, free from bureaucratic meddling, and will succeed in solving this acute problem in honor and satisfaction to himself, the Government, and the people.

The American people are opposed to a coal strike. What they want and what they demand of the Government, since it has taken possession of the coal mines, is a reasonable settlement of this labor dispute which will insure justice to the miners and operators and an uninterrupted and abundant supply of coal for our war purposes and civilian needs at a price which the consumers can afford to pay.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from John Landenfeld, of the West Side Motor Co., Centralia, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE NORWEGIAN CONSTITUTION

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BURDICK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DIRECT OBLIGATIONS OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AS COLLATERAL SECURITY FOR FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1041) to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and ask the gentleman to explain the matter.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Banking and Currency has reported by unanimous vote a bill identical with the bill S. 1041, which was passed by the Senate. The bill simply would extend for 2 years the time within which the Federal Reserve banks may issue Federal Reserve notes covered by the required 40 percent of gold plus the additional required percentage in direct Government obligations, instead of eligible paper, as was the case under the original provisions of the Federal Reserve Act. In 1932 the Federal Reserve banks found that commercial paper had declined in volume until there was not a sufficient amount of eligible paper to afford the required coverage for Federal Reserve notes. They were carrying at that time about 80 percent of gold as security for Federal Reserve notes, and the law was amended so as to permit the use of direct Government obligations, instead of commercial paper or other eligible paper. That act has been extended from time to time, and it will ex-

pire at the end of this fiscal year unless the authority is extended as provided in this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the bill provide any safeguard for the American people against the Federal Reserve banks withdrawing this money from circulation, these Federal Reserve notes, and bringing on another panic as they did in 1921 and 1929?

Mr. STEAGALL. The bill now before us makes no change whatever in the Federal Reserve law, except as I have indicated, but in response to the gentleman's suggestion I call attention to the fact that the very purpose of this legislation is to provide expansion of the currency that is indispensable to the financing of the war program.

Mr. RANKIN. So far as I am individually concerned, I would rather see the Government expand its own currency and hold control of it than to see it expanded through private banks, without Government control. I am not so much worried about the Government controlling its own finances as I am disturbed for fear that we will run into the same trouble we did in 1920, when the head of the Federal Reserve Board and its directors raised the discount rate and called loans all over the country and brought about a depression that almost wrecked business, and did wreck the farmers, in practically every State in the Union, and I should like to have some safeguards thrown around a measure of this kind to protect the American people against repetition of that catastrophe.

Mr. STEAGALL. I will say to the gentleman that the passage of the original act, in 1932, was designed to remedy the condition to which he has referred. Undoubtedly there were mistakes of policy made by those in control of the Federal Reserve System, and we found it necessary to liberalize that act in many particulars, which was done. This particular act was, of course, a liberalization measure as it is today. We are increasing Federal Reserve notes now in the amount of $100,000,000 a week, with something like $20,000,000,000 of Federal Reserve notes that will be issued by the end of this year. We will soon run out of necessary gold to cover them unless some measure is adopted which will permit further issuance of notes to meet the requirements confronting us in connection with the war program.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I appreciate the force of what the gentleman from Alabama has said. In 1919 and 1920 at the close of the last war, currency was circulating at $53.21 per capita. On the 28th of February this year it had reached $118.92 per capita, largely Federal Reserve notes. If this war should close this year, which we hope it will, these Federal Reserve banks could do just exactly what they did in 1920, and if they were to begin to recall those loans, or raise the rediscount rate, they might bring on a panic the like of which this Nation has never seen. For that reason I would much prefer to see my Government issue its own currency against its own securities instead of permitting private banks to put up those same securities of the Government and issue currency against them and have the right to recall that currency and bring about a depression at any time.

Mr. STEAGALL. Of course, the Government is in full and complete control of the issuance of its currency through our control of the Federal Reserve System. I do not think anybody anticipates that we will ever be foolish enough to make the mistakes that were made back during the years of the depression, to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I understand it, this Senate bill is an exact copy of H. R. 2634, which was unanimously reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It simply extends the provisions of section 6 of the Federal Reserve Act for an additional 2 years.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is all.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Without any change at all in the law?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is right. There never could have been any logical objection to the use of Government obligations as cover for Federal Reserve notes upon the same basis as commercial paper, which was simply the obligation of some mercantile establishment somewhere on other private obligations.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman said a moment ago he did not think the Government—I suppose he meant the Congress—would ever be foolish enough to permit a repetition of what happened in 1920. It was not brought on by the administration. It was not brought on by Congress. It was brought on by the Federal Reserve System. I go back to my original proposition. I would much prefer to see my Government issue its own currency against its own securities than to see it sell those securities to private banks and permit them to issue currency against it, to loan us at interest, with the right and power to withdraw that currency, depreciate it, and bring on a panic at any time. I am not going to interfere with the gentleman's program, but I am afraid we are making a terrible mistake in not throwing around the issuance of these Federal Reserve notes ample protection for the American people against bringing on another depression such as we had in 1920 or 1929 as soon as this war is over.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Unless the Congress takes some action for removing the present limitation in respect to rediscount rates and reserve requirements, he should have no fear that the Federal Reserve banks will be able to withdraw this currency by raising the reserve requirements and the rediscount rates, because, as I understand it, they have almost completed their authority in that respect, and we have not seen fit to give them additional authority. So if we do not give them additional authority to further increase their legal reserve requirements and rediscount rates, it will be impossible for the Federal Reserve to take the course which the gentleman cites.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. That is exactly the same thing they told us in 1918 and 1919, and it is the same thing they told us in 1926 and 1928, up to the time of the crash in 1929. But there is absolutely nothing to prevent those men who get this currency issued to them from taking those Federal Reserve notes back and turning them in and having them canceled, and take up their Government securities against which they are issued. There is absolutely nothing, unless you change the law.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say that that is not the danger of this program, because that is regulated at the present time by the Open Market Committee, which can compel the banks to keep those bonds and not put them on the market for sale. The danger of this program was when we originally launched it, and the House was warned at that time——

Mr. RANKIN. When was that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In 1934. The House was warned at that time that if the Federal Reserve used all of the authority which was given to it to create the money with which to buy Federal obligations and then put those Federal obligations up as security for new issues of money, that was the most inflationary practice which we could indulge in, to increase prices. We have been doing that, and do not fool yourself, we have been financing this war through this act, and we are going to continue to finance this war through this act. If you cut off this power today, as I would insist upon doing if the situation were otherwise, you would stop just as precipitously as you can imagine the financing of your war.

That is the only reason I am going along with this program.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will consent to go along with the program following this war to isolate that part of Government obligations which is not essential, isolate the gold and isolate the silver as a base for our currency, Congress will get back the power to coin and issue money and regulate the value thereof and we shall divorce our national debt from our currency; but during this emergency, during this war, because of the financing program of the Treasury you have a lion by the tail and you cannot let go.

Mr. STEAGALL. I may say to the gentleman that the original act was passed with the approval of President Hoover on the 27th day of February 1932.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might add it was for the purpose of inflating, to increase the cost of commodities; we wanted to bring the price of commodities up.

Mr. STEAGALL. No. It was to relieve our gold position.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of course, the gentleman knows that to be the case; that was the justification for it, to increase the price of commodities; and if it was the right thing to do at that time, then when we are entering an inflationary period the process should be reversed.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that I appreciate his invitation for me to wait until after the next panic to try to cure the monetary situation. As I said to the gentleman from Alabama a moment ago I am not going to interrupt this program, but I think the Congress is making a terrible mistake and probably leading to the disasters we had before by not providing safeguards to prevent these private banks from depressing the currency and bringing on another panic.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for the benefit of the House and to be very reassuring to your people I want to read this short statement:

> Dollars are not a problem. Cash for bonds turned in can come from other bonds sold to other investors or to banks. After the war all the holders will not sell their War bonds at once. Furthermore, the Government can create more deposits as fast as bonds are offered for sale, and, if buyers for new bonds can't be found, the Federal Reserve System can step in and buy. The Government has guaranteed to supply dollars in exchange for its bonds, and there is nothing that can interfere with that guaranty.

Take that report and message home, there will always be plenty of dollars. You will not perhaps have dollars that will buy as much, but you will have the dollars.

In closing I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the trouble that you had in 1922 was with the type of loans made. We have not made that sort of loan lately, but you need not worry, even that kind may return again.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; they have made exactly the same kind of loans many times.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, no.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the second paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking therefrom the words "until June 30, 1943" and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "until June 30, 1945".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2634) was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in three particulars: In the first extension to include an article from the Catholic weekly Commonweal; in the second to include an article from a labor leader in my district; and third that I may include an article from the National Geographic magazine by the Governor of Alaska. This latter article exceeds the limit. I have a statement from the Government Printing Office that it will cost $135. Notwithstanding this I ask unanimous consent to place it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman's requests are granted.

There was no objection.

REASONS FOR HAVING PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGIONAL OFFICES OF THE WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION AND THE WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, from June of 1940 through February of 1943, war contracts awarded to the area now covered by the San Francisco regional offices of the War Manpower Commission and War Production Board amounted to approximately $18,300,000,000. Only three other regional offices in the Nation; namely, Detroit, Philadelphia, and New York have jurisdiction over that much war business. Of the total war business governed by the San Francisco offices, contracts amounting to approximately $6,500,000,000 have been awarded to the Pacific Northwest and Alaska. This amount of war business in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska is too great and too important to be administered at long range from San Francisco.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL—1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 455), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MICHENER reserved all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a recent address I made over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor on the Ruml plan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AMENDMENT TO NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar (H. R. 1291) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the first of four bills on the Consent Calendar reported by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. I understand that some of these bills are to be called up under suspension of the rules or that they have a rule.

Mr. MASON. They have a special rule on three of the four bills and this is one of them.

Mr. COLE of New York. What bills have a special rule?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We would like to dispose of these. They are on 22, 25, and 27. We have no rule on 26.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I object.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS NOT CITIZENS WHOSE SONS OR DAUGHTERS HAVE SERVED WITH THE LAND OR NAVAL FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1941, permitting the naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. STARNES of Alabama, RANKIN, and CLEVENGER objected.

REPATRIATING NATIVE-BORN WOMEN RESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1289, to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

PRESERVING THE RESIDENCE FOR NATURALIZATION PURPOSES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1295, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the residence for naturalization purposes of certain aliens who serve in the military or naval forces of one of the allied countries during the Second World War, or otherwise assist

in the allied war effort, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. RANKIN, STARNES of Alabama, VINCENT of Kentucky, and ELLIS objected.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS FOR SERVICE IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 495, to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, in view of the agreement to consider this bill after consideration of a bill from the Naval Affairs Committee dealing with the Women's Auxiliary of the Navy, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

SECOND-CLASS APPLICATION FEES OF NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1004, to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class mailing fees upon resumption of publication.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no newspaper or other periodical publication which has been accorded second-class mail privileges, and which has voluntarily suspended publication, or shall hereafter voluntarily suspend publication, for the duration of the war because of economic conditions directly or indirectly attributable to the war effort, shall be required upon resumption of regular publication to pay any of the fees provided for by the act entitled "An act to provide for fees for entry of a publication as second-class matter, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1932, as amended, if such newspaper or periodical publication resumes regular publication prior to the end of the sixth month following the expiration of the unlimited national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "of", strike out "economic conditions directly or indirectly attributable to the war effort" and insert in lieu thereof "conditions attributable to the war effort."

Page 2, at the end of the bill, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That before any such newspaper or periodical shall be entitled to reentry as second-class matter without payment of any application fee the publisher shall furnish to the Postmaster General satisfactory evidence that the suspension of his publication was because of conditions attributable to the war effort."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class application fees upon resumption of publication."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION TO WOMEN IN COAST GUARD RESERVES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1616, to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR LOCK

The Clerk read the next bill, H. R. 1258, instructing the Secretary of War to henceforth designate the new lock in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the "Gen. Douglas MacArthur lock," and designating the lock at that point now known as the fourth lock as the "Col. L. C. Sabin lock."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, irrespective of any previously enacted legislation and irrespective of any previous regulations or customs, the Secretary of War shall be, and is hereby, instructed to immediately and henceforth designate the new lock in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the "Gen. Douglas MacArthur lock" and designating the lock at that point now known as the fourth lock as "Col. L. C. Sabin lock."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the new lock now in the course of construction by the War Department in the Saint Marys River at the falls, Michigan, shall be designated 'MacArthur lock,' and the lock at that point now known as the fourth lock shall be hereafter designated 'Sabin lock.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

NATIVES OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 329, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to incur obligations for the benefit of natives of Alaska in advance of the enactment of legislation making appropriations therefor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Alaska if there is any limitation as to the amount of such purchases?

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, there is a limitation of 75 percent of the existing appropriation. The cost of materials, supplies, and equipment for any year will not amount to more than one-third of the total appropriations for the services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior may authorize such officer or officers as may be designated by him to incur obligations in excess of appropriations currently available for the benefit of natives of Alaska, whenever said Secretary may determine such action to be necessary in order to insure the proper functioning of activities of the Office of Indian Affairs and of the Fish and Wildlife Service in Alaska during any ensuing fiscal year, payments of such obligations to be made from the respective appropriations for the new fiscal year when they become available: *Provided*, That such authority shall not be exercised earlier than the 1st day of January in any one fiscal year: *Provided further*, That excess obligations may be incurred only for the purchase of supplies, materials, and equipment; the amount of advance obligations so authorized shall not exceed 75 percent of the total available in the current appropriations for such purposes: *And provided further*, That such obligations incurred in connection with the activities of the Office of Indian Affairs may be liquidated from the Indian Service supply fund, which fund shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations, when made, for the ensuing fiscal year.

SEC. 2. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TITLE TO SALINE LANDS IN JACKSON COUNTY, ILL., CORRECTED

The Clerk read the next bill, H. R. 2047, to correct an error and to confirm, as of March 2, 1861, the title to certain saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to Edward Holden.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to correct an error and to confirm, as of March 2, 1861, the title of Edward Holden to certain saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, so much of the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others," approved March 2, 1861, as reads "To Edward Holden, the northeast, southeast, northwest, and southwest quarters of the southeast quarter of section 7, township 9, of range 2; northwest, southwest, and northeast quarters of the northwest quarter of section 1, township 9, of range 3" is amended by striking out the word "northeast" where it appears the second time and by inserting in lieu thereof the word "southeast."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND FOR PARK, RECREATIONAL, OR WILDLIFE-REFUGE PURPOSES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 629, to authorize the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Minnesota to such State for use for park, recreational, or wildlife-refuge purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, upon

payment of a reasonable price set by him, through appraisal or otherwise, to convey to the State of Minnesota the following-described lands located in Morrison County, Minn.: Lot 6, section 10; lots 1, 14, 15, and 16, section 14; lots 9, 10, 11, and 12, section 15; lot 1, section 22; lot 9, section 23; and lots 1 and 5, section 25, township 42 north, range 32 west, fourth principal meridian; lot 4, section 4; and lot 3, section 9, township 130 north, range 29 west, fifth principal meridian; lot 5, section 18, and lots 4, 5, 6, and 7, section 32, township 131 north, range 29 west, fifth principal meridian.

SEC. 2. The lands authorized to be conveyed by the first section of this act shall be conveyed to the grantee for use for park, recreational, or wildlife-refuge purposes. The patent conveying such lands shall provide (1) that such lands or any part thereof may, with the approval of the Commissioner of Conservation of the State of Minnesota, be used by the United States for such military purposes as do not conflict with or are not incompatible with the use thereof for park, recreational, or wildlife-refuge purposes; (2) that the United States and its permittees or licensees shall have the right to occupy, use, or flood any or all of the lands for power development, transmission-line purposes, navigation, flood control, or other allied purposes under any law applicable to the use of the public lands for such purposes and that no claim or right to compensation shall accrue from such occupation or use; (3) that all minerals, including oil and gas, shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior; (4) that the title to the lands shall revert to the United States if the State shall cease to use the lands for park, recreational, or wildlife-refuge purposes, or if the State shall alienate or attempt to alienate the lands.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Page 3, line 2, after the word "lands", strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "(5). *Provided further*, That the grazing privileges heretofore enjoyed by adjacent or neighboring landowners shall not be abridged or interfered with."

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands, of which I am chairman. Several communications have come to us with reference to grazing rights, and it was the feeling of the committee that those rights should not be disturbed at the present time. I think there is no objection to the amendment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Florida has stated the situation correctly. At least, that is the way I understand it. I am glad he is offering the amendment that will safeguard the rights of the neighboring landowners.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I think it is the fair thing to do.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table

ASSIGNMENT OF DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL TO INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2468, authorizing the assignment of personnel from departments or agencies in the executive branch of the Government to certain investigating committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BENDER, Mr. FURLONG, Mr. RAMEY, and Mr. COFFEE objected.

WATERS OF THE REPUBLICAN RIVER BASIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2482, to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, relating to the waters of the Republican River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote flood control in the basin, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] if he will explain briefly the provisions of this bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. The bill has already passed the Senate in identical form.

The bill gives the consent of the Congress to the three States mentioned to make agreements with regard to the distribution of water in an interstate stream. That is very highly desirable in the West, where irrigation is dependent upon the water of streams that cross State boundary lines.

This is unanimously reported favorably from the departments concerned. It is a matter that requires the joint action of the three States, and the program is favored by the legislatures of the three States concerned.

Mr. PRIEST. There is nothing in the bill that would in any way waive jurisdiction of the Federal Government over navigable streams, is there?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think there is not. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] can possibly explain that a little better than I.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. The answer to the gentleman's question, I think, is "No."

The bill has met with the approval of the Department of the Interior, the War Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the divisions concerned. I do not believe that by compact you could take jurisdiction away from the Federal Government if they thought they had jurisdiction.

Mr. PRIEST. In reading that report I came to that conclusion, but I was not quite certain on that particular point. Otherwise I think the bill is certainly in order and should be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that an identical Senate bill, S. 649, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the compact authorized by the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Republican River," approved August 4, 1942 (Public Law 696, 77th Cong.; 56 Stat. 736), signed by the commissioners for the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska at Lincoln, Nebr., on December 31, 1942, and thereafter ratified by the Legislatures of the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, which compact reads as follows:

"REPUBLICAN RIVER COMPACT

"The States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, parties signatory to this compact (hereinafter referred to as Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, respectively, or individually as a State, or collectively as the States), having resolved to conclude a compact with respect to the waters of the Republican River Basin, and being duly authorized therefor by the act of the Congress of the United States of America, approved August 4, 1942 (Public, No. 696, 77th Cong., ch. 545, 2d sess.) and pursuant to acts of their respective legislatures have, through their respective Governors, appointed as their Commissioners: M C. Hinderlider, for Colorado; George S. Knapp, for Kansas; Wardner G. Scott, for Nebraska; who, after negotiations participated in by Glenn L. Parker, appointed by the President as the Representative of the United States of America, have agreed upon the following articles:

"ARTICLE I

"The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the most efficient use of the waters of the Republican River Basin (hereinafter referred to as the 'Basin') for multiple purposes; to provide for an equitable division of such waters; to remove all causes, present and future, which might lead to controversies; to promote interstate comity; to recognize that the most efficient utilization of the waters within the Basin is for beneficial consumptive use; and to promote joint action by the States and the United States in the efficient use of water and the control of destructive floods.

"The physical and other conditions peculiar to the Basin constitute the basis for this compact, and none of the States hereby, nor the Congress of the United States by its consent, concedes that this compact establishes any general principle or precedent with respect to any other interstate stream.

"ARTICLE II

"The Basin is all the area in Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska, which is naturally drained by the Republican River, and its tributaries, to its junction with the Smoky Hill River in Kansas. The main stem of the Republican River extends from the junction near Haigler, Nebr., of its North Fork and the Arikaree River, to its junction with Smoky Hill River near Junction City, Kans. Frenchman Creek (river) in Nebraska is a continuation of Frenchman Creek (river) in Colorado. Red Willow Creek in Colorado is not identical with the stream having the same name in Nebraska. A map of the Basin approved by the Commissioners is attached and made a part hereof.

"The term 'acre-foot' as herein used, is the quantity of water required to cover an acre to the depth of 1 foot and is equivalent to 43,560 cubic feet.

"The term 'virgin water supply,' as herein used, is defined to be the water supply within the Basin undepleted by the activities of man.

"The term 'beneficial consumptive use' is herein defined to be that use by which the water supply of the Basin is consumed through the activities of man, and shall include water consumed by evaporation from any reservoir, canal, ditch, or irrigated area.

"Beneficial consumptive use is the basis and principle upon which the allocations of water hereinafter made are predicated.

"ARTICLE III

"The specific allocations in acre-feet hereinafter made to each State are derived from the computed average annual virgin water supply originating in the following designated drainage basins, or parts thereof, in the amounts shown:

"North Fork of the Republican River drainage basin in Colorado, 44,700 acre-feet;

"Arikaree River drainage basin, 19,610 acre-feet;

"Buffalo Creek drainage basin, 7,890 acre-feet;

"Rock Creek drainage basin, 11,000 acre-feet;

"South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 57,200 acre-feet;

"Frenchman Creek (River) drainage basin in Nebraska, 98,500 acre-feet;

"Blackwood Creek drainage basin, 6,800-acre-feet;

"Driftwood Creek drainage basin, 7,300 acre-feet;

"Red Willow Creek drainage basin in Nebraska, 21,900 acre-feet;

"Medicine Creek drainage basin, 50,800 acre-feet;

"Beaver Creek drainage basin, 16,500 acre-feet;

"Sappa Creek drainage basin, 21,400 acre-feet;

"Prairie Dog Creek drainage basin, 27,600 acre-feet;

"The North Fork of the Republican River in Nebraska and the main stem of the Republican River between the junction of the North Fork and the Arikaree River and the lowest crossing of the river at the Nebraska-Kansas State line and the small tributaries thereof, 87,700 acre-feet.

"Should the future computed virgin water supply of any source vary more than 10 percent from the virgin water supply as hereinabove set forth, the allocations hereinafter made from such source shall be increased or decreased in the relative proportion that the future computed virgin water supply of such source bears to the computed virgin water supply used herein.

"ARTICLE IV

"There is hereby allocated for beneficial consumptive use in Colorado, annually, a total of 54,100 acre-feet of water. This total is to be derived from the sources and in the amounts hereinafter specified and is subject to such quantities being physically available from these sources:

"North Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 10,000 acre-feet;

"Arikaree River drainage basin, 15,400 acre-feet;

"South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 25,400 acre-feet;

"Beaver Creek drainage basin, 3,300 acre-feet; and

"In addition, for beneficial consumptive use in Colorado, annually, the entire water supply of the Frenchman Creek (River) drainage basin in Colorado and of the Red Willow Creek drainage basin in Colorado.

"There is hereby allocated for beneficial consumptive use in Kansas, annually, a total of 190,300 acre-feet of water. This total is to be derived from the sources and in the amounts hereinafter specified and is subject to such quantities being physically available from those sources:

"Arikaree River drainage basin, 1,000 acre-feet;

"South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 23,000 acre-feet;

"Driftwood Creek drainage basin, 500 acre-feet;

"Beaver Creek drainage basin, 6,400 acre-feet;

"Sappa Creek drainage basin, 8,800 acre-feet;

"Prairie Dog Creek drainage basin, 12,600 acre-feet;

"From the main stem of the Republican River upstream from the lowest crossing of the river at the Nebraska-Kansas State line and from water supplies of upstream basins otherwise unallocated herein, 138,000 acre-feet; provided, that Kansas shall have the right to divert all or any portion thereof at or near Guide Rock, Nebr.; and

"In addition there is hereby allocated for beneficial consumptive use in Kansas, annually, the entire water supply originating in the basin downstream from the lowest crossing of the river at the Nebraska-Kansas State line.

"There is hereby allocated for beneficial consumptive use in Nebraska, annually, a total of 234,500 acre-feet of water. This total is to be derived from the sources and in the amounts hereinafter specified and is subject to such quantities being physically available from those sources:

"North Fork of the Republican River drainage basin in Colorado, 11,000 acre-feet;

"Frenchman Creek (River) drainage basin in Nebraska, 52,800 acre-feet;

"Rock Creek drainage basin, 4,400 acre-feet;

"Arikaree River drainage basin, 3,300 acre-feet;

"Buffalo Creek drainage basin, 2,600 acre-feet;

"South Fork of the Republican River drainage basin, 800 acre-feet;

"Driftwood Creek drainage basin, 1,200 acre-feet;

"Red Willow Creek drainage basin in Nebraska, 4,200 acre-feet;

"Medicine Creek drainage basin, 4,600 acre-feet;

"Beaver Creek drainage basin, 6,700 acre-feet;

"Sappa Creek drainage basin, 8,800 acre-feet;

"Prairie Dog Creek drainage basin, 2,100 acre-feet;

"From the North Fork of the Republican River in Nebraska, the main stem of the Republican River between the junction of the North Fork and Arikaree River and the lowest crossing of the river at the Nebraska-Kansas State line, from the small tributaries thereof, and from water supplies of upstream basins otherwise unallocated herein, 132,000 acre-feet.

"The use of the waters hereinabove allocated shall be subject to the laws of the State, for use in which the allocations are made.

"ARTICLE V

"The judgment and all provisions thereof in the case of *Adelbert A. Weiland, as State Engineer of Colorado, et al.* v. *The Pioneer Irrigation Company,* decided June 5, 1922, and reported in 259 U. S. 498, affecting the Pioneer irrigation ditch or canal, are hereby recognized as binding upon the States; and Colorado, through its duly authorized officials, shall have the perpetual and exclusive right to control and regulate diversions of water at all times by said canal in conformity with said judgment.

"The water heretofore adjudicated to said Pioneer Canal by the District Court of Colorado, in the amount of fifty (50) cubic feet per second of time is included in and is a part of the total amounts of water hereinbefore allocated for beneficial consumptive use in Colorado and Nebraska.

"ARTICLE VI

"The right of any person, entity, or lower State to construct, or participate in the future construction and use of any storage reservoir or diversion works in an upper State for the purpose of regulating water herein allocated for beneficial consumptive use in such lower State, shall never be denied by an upper State: *Provided,* That such right is subject to the rights of the upper State.

"ARTICLE VII

"Any person, entity, or lower State shall have the right to acquire necessary property rights in an upper State by purchase, or through the exercise of the power of eminent domain, for the construction, operation, and maintenance of storage reservoirs, and of appurtenant works, canals, and conduits, required for the enjoyment of the privileges granted by article VI: *Provided however,* That the grantees of such rights shall pay to the political subdivisions of the State in which such works are located, each and every year during which such rights are enjoyed for such purposes, a sum of money equivalent to the average annual amount of taxes assessed against the lands and improvements during the 10 years preceding the use of such lands, in reimbursement for the loss of taxes to said political subdivisions of the State.

"ARTICLE VIII

"Should any facility be constructed in an upper State under the provisions of article VI, such construction and the operation of such facility shall be subject to the laws of such upper State.

"Any repairs to or replacements of such facility shall also be made in accordance with the laws of such upper State.

"ARTICLE IX

"It shall be the duty of the three States to administer this compact through the official in each State who is now or may hereafter be charged with the duty of administering the public water supplies, and to collect and correlate through such officials the data necessary for the proper administration of the provisions of this compact. Such officials may, by unanimous action, adopt rules and regulations consistent with the provisions of this compact.

"The United States Geological Survey, or whatever Federal agency may succeed to the functions and duties of that agency, insofar as this compact is concerned, shall collaborate with the officials of the States charged with the administration of this compact in the execution of the duty of such officials in the collection, correlation, and publication of water facts necessary for the proper administration of this compact.

"ARTICLE X

"Nothing in this compact shall be deemed:

"(a) To impair or affect any rights, powers, or jurisdiction of the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, in, over, and to the waters of the basin; nor to impair or affect the capacity of the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, to acquire rights in and to the use of waters of the basin;

"(b) To subject any property of the United States, its agencies, or instrumentalities, to taxation by any State, or subdivision thereof, nor to create an obligation on the part of the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, by reason of the acquisition, construction, or operation of any property or works of whatsoever kind, to make any payments to any State or political subdivision thereof, State agency, municipality, or entity whatsoever in reimbursement for the loss of taxes;

"(c) To subject any property of the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, to the laws of any State to any extent other than the extent these laws would apply without regard to this compact.

"ARTICLE XI

"This compact shall become operative when ratified by the legislature of each of the States, and when consented to by the Congress of the United States by legislation providing, among other things, that:

"(a) Any beneficial consumptive uses by the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, within a State, of the waters allocated by this compact, shall be made within the allocations hereinabove made for use in that State and shall be taken into account in determining the extent of use within that State.

"(b) The United States, or those acting by or under its authority, in the exercise of rights or powers arising from whatever jurisdiction the United States has in, over, and to the waters of the Basin shall recognize, to the extent consistent with the best utilization of the waters for multiple purposes, that beneficial consumptive use of the waters within the Basin is of paramount importance to the development of the Basin; and no exercise of such power or right thereby that would interfere with the full beneficial consumptive use of the waters within the Basin shall be made except upon a determination, giving due consideration to the objectives of this compact and after consultation with all interested Federal agencies and the State officials charged with the administration of this compact, that such exercise is in the interest of the best utilization of such waters for multiple purposes.

"(c) The United States, or those acting by or under its authority, will recognize any established use, for domestic and irrigation purposes, of the waters allocated by this compact which may be impaired by the exercise of Federal jurisdiction in, over, and to such waters: *Provided*, That such use is being exercised beneficially, is valid under the laws of the appropriate State and in conformity with this compact at the time of the impairment thereof, and was validly initiated under State law prior to the initiation or authorization of the Federal program or project which causes such impairment.

"In witness whereof the commissioners have signed this compact in quadruplicate original, one of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America and shall be deemed the authoritative original, and of which a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the States.

"Done in the city of Lincoln, in the State of Nebraska, on the 31st day of December, in the year of our Lord 1942.

"M. C. HINDERLIDER,
"Commissioner for Colorado.
"GEORGE S. KNAPP,
"Commissioner for Kansas.
"WARDNER G. SCOTT,
"Commissioner for Nebraska.

"I have participated in the negotiations leading to this proposed compact and propose to report to the Congress of the United States favorably thereon

"GLENN L. PARKER,
"Representative of the United States."

SEC. 2. (a) In order that the conditions stated in article XI of the compact hereby consented to shall be met and that the compact shall be and continue to be operative, the following provisions are enacted—

(1) Any beneficial consumptive uses by the United States, or those acting by or under its authority, within a State, of the waters allocated by such compact, shall be made within the allocations made by such compact for use in that State and shall be taken into account in determining the extent of use within that State;

(2) The United States, or those acting by or under its authority, in the exercise of rights or powers arising from whatever jurisdiction the United States has in, over, and to the waters of the Basin shall recognize, to the extent consistent with the best utilization of the waters for multiple purposes, that beneficial consumptive use of the waters within the Basin is of paramount importance to the development of the Basin; and no exercise of such power or right thereby that would interfere with the full beneficial consumptive use of the waters within the Basin shall be made except upon a determination, giving due consideration to the objectives of such compact and after consultation with all interested Federal agencies and the State officials charged with the administration of such compact, that such exercise is in the interest of the best utilization of such waters for multiple purposes;

(3) The United States, or those acting by or under its authority, will recognize any established use, for domestic and irrigation purposes, of the waters allocated by such compact which may be impaired by the exercise of Federal jurisdiction in, over, and to such waters: *Provided*, That such use is being exercised beneficially, is valid under the laws of the appropriate State and in conformity with such compact at the time of the impairment thereof, and was validly initiated under State law prior to the initiation or authorization of the Federal program or project which causes such impairment.

(b) As used in this section—

(1) "Beneficial consumptive uses" has the same meaning as when used in the compact consented to by Congress by this act; and

(2) "Basin" refers to the Republican River Basin as shown on the map attached to and made a part of the original of such compact deposited in the archives of the Department of State.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2482) was laid on the table.

TITLES TO LANDS ACQUIRED BY THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], the author of the bill. Does this bill apply to titles to lands acquired by the United States Government through the foreclosure of farm mortgages where there is an error in the description, either by conveyancing or in the foreclosure proceeding? Would it go that far?

Mr. FULMER. I am not sure that I could answer the gentleman to that extent.

For many years the Department of Agriculture has carried on large land-acquisition programs under the authority of various acts of Congress. In connection with these purchases, experience has shown that occasional mistakes will occur, in both direct purchase and condemnation cases.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Secretary to quitclaim the interest of the United States in land subject to his administration upon either of two findings:

First. Is a finding that title to the land is legally insufficient for the purposes for which it was acquired? This finding must be coupled with the fact that no consideration has been paid by the United States for the land involved.

Second. Is a finding that the title was acquired by mistake, misunderstanding, error, and so forth?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The purpose of my question is this: I understand that in the taking of these farm mortgages in the name of the Government there have been instances where the conveyancer, in the drawing of the mortgage, for instance, would include a part of the description of a neighbor's farm. That erroneous description would carry clear through the foreclosure proceedings and not be discovered until after the issuance of the sheriff's deed under foreclosure. My question is whether or not under this bill the Secretary of Agriculture would have the power to execute a quitclaim deed to a farm owner whose property was erroneously included in the description.

Mr. FULMER. According to my understanding, it would. That is one of the real purposes of the bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think it is a very excellent bill, Mr. Speaker, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That if the Secretary of Agriculture shall find within 10 years after the acquisition by the United States of any land or interest therein which is subject to his administration, custody, or control, other than land acquired by exchange of public domain land or resources, but the title thereto is legally insufficient for the purposes for which such land or interest was acquired and no consideration therefor has been paid by the United States, or that title or color of title to such land or interest was acquired through mistake, misunderstanding, error, or inadvertence, he is hereby authorized to execute and deliver on behalf of and in the name of the United States to the person from whom the title was acquired or to the person whom he finds entitled thereto a quitclaim deed to such land or interest: *Provided, however*, That if the person to whom such deed is made is the same person from whom the United States acquired title, or his successor in interest, any consideration given by the United States for such land or interest shall be restored or, in lieu thereof, the value equivalent of such consideration as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture shall be paid to the United States; and any consideration or value equivalent so restored or paid shall, so far as is practicable, be restored to the jurisdiction, or deposited to the credit, of the department, agency, appropriation, or fund from which the consideration was transferred or paid at the time of the acquisition of title by the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRIBUTION OF FERTILIZERS OR SEEDS BY AGENCIES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1396, making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when the Department of Agriculture or any other agency of the United States Government shall distribute seeds or fertilizer, or soil conditioning or fertilizer material to farmers, it shall be the duty of the officers or employees or agents distributing same to comply with and be subject to the inspection laws of the State within which such seeds or fertilizer, or soil conditioning or fertilizer material is distributed with reference to any such seeds or fertilizer or soil conditioning or fertilizer material and such officers, employees, or agents are hereby authorized and directed to comply with such inspection laws.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "or" and insert "livestock and poultry feed, nursery stock."

Line 9, strike out "or" and insert "livestock and poultry feed, nursery stock."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "or" and insert "livestock and poultry feed, nursery stock."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE INAUGURATION OF AIR MAIL SERVICE

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 108) commemorating May 15, 1943, as the anniversary of the inauguration of Air Mail Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this measure designates May 15, 1943, as the day to commemorate the inauguration of the first Air Mail Service by the United States Government. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare a suitable plaque. In view of the fact that that date has already been passed, I am curious to know the reason for continuing this bill.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mainly on account of the plaque.

Mr. COLE of New York. Can the gentleman tell the House the approximate cost of this plaque?

Mr. BULWINKLE. My recollection is that the matter was mentioned in the committee, and that it was stated that the plaque would cost only a nominal amount.

Mr. COLE of New York. Can the gentleman describe the type of plaque that is proposed to be prepared?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No; I cannot.

This bill was introduced on March 31, but was brought up in our committee just last week. It was stated then that May 15 would be passed before action could be taken on the resolution, but that it would give authority for the designation of that date so we would have it in mind that that was the date of the first flight, and also the preparation of this plaque would be authorized. My recollection is that the cost was stated to be under $1,000.

Mr. COLE of New York. No doubt the plaque will be made of bronze or some other critical war material. In view of the fact that the date has already passed, it seems to me rather unnecessary to continue the bill.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I think the gentleman should let it go on, because this plaque is to be placed in the Post Office Department. It would not make any particular difference whether it was put up on the 15th or on the 30th.

Mr. COLE of New York. This will be a posthumous recognition of the twenty-fifth anniversary?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes. We have to do that occasionally when we do not get these bills up for consideration in time.

Mr. COLE of New York. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That May 15, 1943, be designated as a day of commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the inauguration by the United States Post Office Department of the air-mail service, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to prepare a suitable plaque to be presented on that date to the Postmaster General to mark the occasion.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "on that date."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANTA CLARA PUEBLO OF NEW MEXICO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 128, to authorize a per capita payment of $10 to the members of the Santa Clara Pueblo of New Mexico from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to withdraw from the Treasury so much as may be necessary of the funds to the credit of the Santa Clara Pueblo in the State of New Mexico which have accrued under the act of March 4, 1929 (45 Stat. 1586) and to make therefrom a payment of not to exceed $10 to each member of the pueblo, under such rules and regulations as said Secretary may prescribed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CROW INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2105, extending time for repayment and authorizing increase in revolving fund for benefit of Crow Indians.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have an explanation from the gentleman from Montana of the purpose of the bill, since the report is rather incomplete.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The purpose of the bill is to authorize an extension of time for the repayment of loans made from the tribal funds amounting to $50,000. These loans are made to the members of the tribe for the purpose of purchasing seed, farm implements, livestock, and so forth. Such a procedure was authorized by the act of June 4, 1920. The time has been extended from time to time until now it expires in 1945. The purpose of extending it now is so that loans may be made, laying the foundation for their repayment after 1945. In other words, if we did not pass this legislation, all loans would have to be liquidated by that time. When you make a loan to anybody for the purchase of cattle at, say, the present price, or any other price, you will not get any return on that loan, ordinarily, for maybe 2 or 3 years. Also we want to remember all of the time that the money belongs to the Indians, it is in the Treasury of the United States; it is their money, and in addition to the purpose of extending the time for repayment of these loans, this bill provides for an additional sum to be added to the $50,000 out of their tribal fund which they have in the Treasury.

Mr. COLE of New York. How large is this 4-percent fund?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I could not say now how large a sum will be used.

Mr. COLE of New York. As I understand it, in 1920, $50,000 was authorized to be loaned to the Indians for the purpose of crop loans, with the provision that these loans had to be repaid within 5 years, and that 5-year period has been extended to 1925, 1930, 1935, and 1940, and now to 1945. Does that mean that the loan made in 1920 or 1921 is still alive?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, the chances are that all of these loans have been liquidated.

Mr. COLE of New York. What does the record show?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The record so shows, I understand. In addition to that, I might say that the Crow Indians are a very progressive people. They have splendid land in the Crow Reservation, and they raise good crops. I attended a county fair there, a farm exhibit by the Indians, and it was equal to any exhibit I ever saw any place by white people.

Mr. COLE of New York. My interest is as to whether these loans are delinquent.

Mr. O'CONNOR. No. I will say to the gentleman that it is carried on as a revolving fund and is one of the best things ever brought into existence for the Indians by the Department.

Mr. COLE of New York. And in granting this extension, in effect it continues this for another period of 5 years?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes.

Mr. CASE. This revolving fund is solely the revolving fund from the tribal funds belonging to the Indians and has no relation to the general fund set up under the reorganization.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for repayment to the tribe of the $50,000 revolving fund for the benefit of the Crow Indians, created by the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 755), for advance to the Indians for the purchase of seed, animals, machinery, tools, implements, and other equipment is hereby extended from June 30, 1945, to June 30, 1965, for the same purposes: *Provided*, That upon request of the tribal council of the Crow Tribe and the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, any unobligated balances in the Crow consolidated 4-percent fund may be added to the $50,000 revolving fund and become available for the same purposes and subject to the same conditions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND IN NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION, ARIZ.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2143) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to exchange approximately 6 acres of Navajo tribal land located in section 26, township 27 north, range 26 east, Gila and Salt River meridian, Apache County, Ariz., for a tract of Mission land containing approximately 4.14 acres in section 27, township 27 north, range 26 east, Gila and Salt River meridian, Apache County, Ariz., being a portion of the land fee patented to the Woman's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

SEC. 2. Title to the land received in the exchange shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior and shall be taken in the name of the United States of America in trust for the Navajo Indian Tribe.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PURCHASE OF LOGS, ETC., RED LAKE INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2185) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the purposes of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to purchase logs, lumber, and other forest products.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior in some measure to go into the lumber business, and I ask a more detailed explanation from the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, this legislation was suggested by the Secretary of the Interior in a communication dated March 3, 1943, addressed to the Speaker of the House. Thereafter I introduced the bill. The act of May 8, 1916, set up what is known as the Red Lake Forest Reserve, within the Red Lake Indian Reservation in the State of Minnesota, and authorized those Indians to establish mills, and to cut and sell timber from within that reservation. They have been conducting this business since that time, and they are cutting that timber on a sustained basis. In other words, they cut only the portion of the timber that will be made up by growth in the future, so as not to destroy the forests within that reserve. On the outside of this Indian reservation there are some farmers who have some timber. The practice has been for some time to buy some of that timber, process it, and so forth, and it gives employment to in excess of 200 Indians. If we were to cut this operation out, these Indians would have to go on relief or do something else after the war, because it so happens that that is the only business and the only way they have of making a livelihood in that section. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN] is here, and it is within his district. I hope that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] will not put an end to the operation of this mill by objecting to this bill, because it has been very successful. I want to call the gentleman's attention to another thing. It has been doing a splendid work. I understand they have cash on hand $521,000; accounts receivable $31,000; inventories $122,000.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentleman mean to say that those Indians will go on relief with that much money on hand?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will say to the gentleman from Georgia that it does not make any difference what the Indian has, it is in the Treasury of the United States and it is hard to get back to him what belongs to him. I have found that out.

Mr. PACE. But this bill puts Mr. Ickes in the sawmill and lumber business; gives him unlimited authority to continue through the years, buy all the timberland in that section of the State, and go into direct competition with private industry in that section. There is no limit on the bill. He can take the 279 employees—that must be a mighty big sawmill—and cut millions and millions of feet and continue to go out and buy timber from private sources and manufacture it in direct competition with the industry of that section.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The curtailing of the operations is provided for, because it has to be limited to the present transportation facilities. In other words, we cannot go beyond that. They cannot extend that all over the State of Minnesota, for instance.

Mr. PACE. When they are crying for lumber workers all through the Northwest, why does the gentleman think the Indians will go on relief when they can make $10 or $15 a day in the lumber mills of the Northwest, where the lumber is standing and ready to be cut?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The lumber is standing and ready to be cut, right there. Of course, they have their homes there. I certainly hope the gentleman would not want these Indians transferred to the coast to perform work that they can perform, just as serviceably and just as beneficially to the Government under the present situation, as if they were transferred.

Mr. PACE. I certainly would not want to cause any inconvenience to these Indians, but I cannot sit here and consent to have the Secretary of the Interior go into public business in competition with private business of cutting and processing and manufacturing and selling timber.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I believe if the gentleman had a picture of this as we did in the committee, he would feel differently. This was a unanimous report from the committee. By the way, we had a lumber dealer on that committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARNOLD], who raised the identical point that the gentleman raises. After he heard the picture given by the various witnesses who testified in favor of this, he supported the legislation.

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, I entertained the same apprehension that has already been expressed by the gentleman from Georgia, that this intends to put the Secretary of the Interior into the lumber business, which I, as well as many others, want to avoid. However, I can see some urgency for it on account of the war situation and the shortage of lumber. What objection is there to inserting a provision limiting the effect of this act to the duration of the war?

Mr. O'CONNOR. What would the gentleman suggest along that line? Say 2 years?

Mr. COLE of New York. No; for the duration of the war.

Mr. O'CONNOR. For the duration of the war and for 6 months after the war?

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, if that is agreeable to him.

Mr. HAGEN. That would be satisfactory.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If that is agreeable to the gentleman that is agreeable to me.

Mr. COLE of New York. If that is agreeable to those who are interested in the legislation, none of us will have any objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will say to the gentleman we will prepare an amendment and have it submitted.

Mr. COLE of New York. I have the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice there is a provision in the bill that the Secretary of the Interior may be allowed to purchase

this timber under such regulations as he may prescribe without compliance of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes. What is the provision of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes that applies to this matter?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have not investigated that phase of the matter.

Mr. MOTT. Does not the gentleman think he should investigate it?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I suppose we did; but, in the first place, this operation has been carried on, I will say to the gentleman, very successfully by these Indians. In the past, when Indians all over the country and white people all over the country were on relief, this operation was carried on successfully.

Mr. COLE of New York. If the gentleman will yield, section 3709 refers to requiring the Government in making purchases to submit public bids.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; I guess that is the case.

Mr. MOTT. There is one other question I would like to ask the gentleman from Montana. I notice on page 2 of the report this statement:

> The timber operations on the Red Lake Indian Reservation have been planned on a sustained-yield basis, but the amount of timber is inadequate for the maintenance of the present rate of cutting, of approximately 6,000,000 feet per year, which is necessary to take care of the overhead and depreciation charges and to provide employment for a substantial number of Indians.

Now, if this timber is being cut on a sustained-yield basis, how does it come that the timber has been exhausted already on this tract?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The timber is not exhausted, but the plan is to cut it on that basis, and they are running out of timber to keep that basis and that plan in operation. Consequently, they are going on the outside and buying timber from farmers who are located in that vicinity who otherwise would have no market at all for their timber. They are bringing into production timber, and that is necessary in connection with our war effort.

Mr. MOTT. That is not operating on a sustained-yield basis. When you operate a forest upon a sustained-yield basis you must first ascertain what amount of timber per year can be cut in order to make the operation permanent.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct.

Mr. MOTT. And when that figure is ascertained, then that is the annual cut, and if that cut is adhered to, the timber resources of this reservation will be perpetual. So it would appear here that there is some miscalculation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. No; there has not been any miscalculation. I may say to the gentleman from Oregon that we have arrived at the point where if we could not get the timber from the adjacent landowners we would have to stop until a sufficient growth of timber was made in order that we could carry on again the sustained cut.

Mr. MOTT. Then I again say to the gentleman that apparently it is not being operated on a sustained-yield basis, and therefore the statement in the report appears to be in error.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Suppose they stop that mill and close down operations. The country needs lumber. These Indians can get the lumber from adjacent farm owners. Why should not they be permitted to do it?

Mr. MOTT. An operation on a sustained-yield basis never stops; it is perpetual. That is why we have sustained-yield programs. It is evident, therefore, that the annual cut of timber on this Indian reservation has been greater than a sustained-yield cut.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, in view of the proposed amendment limiting this bill to the duration of the war and 6 months after, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representatives, in carrying out the purposes of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), as amended, may purchase in the open market from funds available for the operation of the Red Lake Indian Mills, logs, lumber, and other forest products for processing, manufacture, and sale at said mills on the Red Lake Indian Reservation, Minn. Said forest products may be purchased and sold under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, without compliance with section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: At the end add a new section, as follows:
>
> "SEC. 2. This act shall terminate 6 months after cessation of the hostilities in which the United States is now engaged or at an earlier date by proclamation of the President."

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

This bill deals with logging. I know something about logging, as I come from a logging country. I would like to know some little something about it.

Mr. COLE of New York. This is a bill to authorize a certain Indian tribe out in the States of Minnesota and Montana, which is now engaged in logging operations on its own reservation, to go out into nearby areas and buy logs to be sawed up in its mill. The amendment is to limit that authority to the duration of the war.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABSENTEEISM

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2553, directing the Secretary of Labor to make an investigation and study of the extent and causes of absenteeism and to make available the facilities of the Department of Labor to act as a clearing-house for information on methods to control absenteeism.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is pending on the House Calendar a bill from the Committee on Naval Affairs covering the same subject matter. In view of this fact, I think this bill should go over without prejudice, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GULF COUNTY CANAL, FLA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1403, to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in providing an authorization of $112,000 for a small canal in Florida this bill reauthorizes the cross-Florida canal for which authorization already exists. Will the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, assure me that this will in no way change the status quo of the cross-Florida canal?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The bill has no bearing whatever on the Florida Canal except that it happens to be in the same law that is amended.

Mr. KEAN. It will authorize the appropriation of $93,000,000 that we authorized last year.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. That has already been authorized.

Mr. KEAN. But this bill reauthorizes it. When I first looked at the bill I thought it was one for the authorization of $93,000,000. Section 1 reads:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $93,112,000 to carry out the provisions of the act.

Then I found that it only added $112,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes.

Mr. KEAN. It does not in any way change the present status of the cross-Florida canal.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It does not change the status of that canal. That canal, of course, has already been authorized. This happens, however, to be in the same bill pertaining to the intercoastal canal.

The bill was put through in this manner for the following reason: The engineers already have some money, $6,700,000, or something like that, which was turned over to them last year simply to enlarge the intercoastal canal. By adopting this as a section of that same canal the engineers say they can use this money at once and commence this week to do the work. That is the only reason for this.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable barge channel across Florida, and by deepening and enlarging the Intracoastal Waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border," approved July 23, 1942, is amended by striking out section 2 thereof and adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. The Gulf County Canal and its right-of-way which connects the channel extending from the Apalachicola River to St. Andrews Bay, Fla., with St. Josephs Bay, Fla., shall be acquired by the United States from the Board of County Commissioners of Gulf County, Fla., at a cost not to exceed the sum of $200,000.

"SEC. 3. Upon the acquisition of such canal and its right-of-way, the United States shall maintain it and shall prosecute as speedily as may be consistent with budgetary requirements, under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, the improvements recommended by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in the report submitted in House Document No. 257, Seventy-sixth Congress.

"SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $93,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act."

SEC. 2. The balance of any sums appropriated prior to the enactment of this act for purposes of carrying out the provisions of section 1 of such act approved July 23, 1942, which are not needed for such purposes, shall be available for expenditure for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of such act, as amended by this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, in lines 4 to 9, inclusive, strike out "shall be acquired by the United States from the Board of County Commissioners of Gulf County, Fla., at a cost not to exceed the sum of $200,000."

"SEC. 3. Upon the acquisition of such canal and its right-of-way, the United States shall maintain it and shall prosecute" and insert in lieu thereof "is hereby adopted as a Federal project and authorized to be prosecuted."

Page 2, in lines 11 to 13, inclusive, strike out "the improvements recommended by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors" and insert in lieu thereof "in accordance with the plans and subject to the conditions recommended."

Page 2, line 14, after the word "Congress", insert ": *Provided*, That, with the consent of the Board of County Commissioners of Gulf County, Fla., and pending fulfillment of the condition specified in said document that the existing canal and its right-of-way be conveyed to the United States free of cost, the said canal may be dredged to provide at an estimated cost of $112,000, the dimensions of 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide, as recommended in said document."

Page 2, line 15, change "SEC. 4" to "SEC. 3."

Page 2, line 16, strike out "$93,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$93,112,000."

Page 2, line 23, strike out the word "sections" and insert in lieu thereof the word "section"; and following the numeral "2" strike out "and 3."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REORGANIZATION OF THE MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2583, to provide for the reorganization of the Marine Corps and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following changes are hereby made in the organization of the Marine Corps:

(a) The Adjutant and Inspector's Department and the Office of the Adjutant and Inspector are hereby abolished.

(b) The administration and functions of the Adjutant and Inspector's Department are hereby transferred to the cognizance of a Director of Personnel, Marine Corps.

(c) The Director of Personnel, Marine Corps, shall be a line officer on active duty in the Marine Corps, detailed by the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

(d) In effectuating the transfer of administration and functions herein provided, the Commandant of the Marine Corps is authorized to make such distribution, changes, and reorganization in the functions and duties of the departments and offices of the Marine Corps as he deems necessary for the more efficient administration of the Marine Corps.

SEC. 2. The unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available for use in connection with the exercise of any function herein transferred to the Director of Personnel, Marine Corps, are hereby transferred to the office of such Director for use in connection with the exercise of the functions so transferred.

SEC. 3. All laws or parts of laws so far as they are inconsistent with or in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABOLISHING CERTAIN NAVAL TRUST FUNDS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2584, to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective July 1, 1943, (a) the trust fund, naval hospital fund (48 Stat. 1235 (80) (7s815); 31 U. S. C. 725s (a) (80)), is abolished, and any unobligated balance remaining therein as of that date shall be covered into the surplus fund of the Treasury; (b) moneys theretofore required by law to be paid into such fund from annual appropriations shall remain to the credit of the appropriation concerned; and (c) commencing with the fiscal year 1944, annual appropriations in such amounts as may be necessary are authorized from the general fund of the Treasury for the maintenance, operation, and improvement of naval hospitals.

SEC. 2. Effective July 1, 1943, (a) the trust fund, Navy fines and forfeitures (48 Stat. 1235 (81) (7s984); 31 U. S. C. 725s (a) (81)), is abolished, and any unobligated balance remaining therein as of that date shall be covered into the surplus fund of the Treasury; (b) moneys theretofore required by law to be paid into such fund from annual appropriations, and all pay forfeited by law or by the terms of a court-martial sentence, shall remain to the credit of the appropriation concerned; and (c) commencing with the fiscal year 1944, annual appropriations for "Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy," or "Pay, Marine Corps," as may be appropriate, shall be available for payment of (a) necessary personal allowances of prisoners during confinement, and (b) transportation, gratuity, and civilian clothing of discharged naval prisoners: *Provided*, That savings deposits forfeited by desertion shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 3. Commencing June 30, 1944, there shall be deducted from the pay of each person in the naval service on the last day of each fiscal year the sum of $2.40 to be deposited into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 4. (a) Sections 4808, 4809, and 1614 of the Revised Statutes; and (b) so much of the act approved June 7, 1900 (24 U. S. C. 5), as requires that all forfeitures on account of desertion shall be passed to the credit of the naval hospital fund, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That pensions of inmates of a naval home or naval hospital, heretofore required by law to be deducted from the account of the pensioner and applied for the benefit of the fund from which such home or hospital is maintained, shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That this section shall be effective July 1, 1943: *And provided further*, That all moneys accruing to the trust funds naval hospital fund (7s815) or navy fines and forfeitures (7s984) prior to that date but not credited thereto prior to that date shall be covered into the surplus fund of the Treasury.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 20, strike out all of section 3.

Page 2, line 25, strike out "4" and insert in lieu thereof "3."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO SECTIONS 2 AND 4 OF ACT AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONED WARRANT AND WARRANT OFFICERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2587, to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and Staff Corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and Staff Corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved June 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 621), is hereby amended by adding thereto the following: "*Provided further*, That with respect to those officers who, because of service conditions, (a) are unable to apply for appointment or examination prior to June 27, 1943, or (b) who make such application but are not examined prior to said date, the foregoing limitation shall not apply until June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present war shall terminate."

SEC. 2. That section 4 of said act of June 27, 1942, is hereby amended by adding the following proviso: "*Provided*, That any officer described in the second proviso of section 2 of this act shall, upon appointment, take rank with other officers in the order of seniority that would have been assigned had he been appointed prior to June 27, 1943."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEALING SECTION 3 OF STANDARD TIME ACT RELATING TO TIME ZONE IN PORTION OF IDAHO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1997, to repeal section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 15, sec. 264), which provides for placing a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect at 2 a. m. of the second Monday following the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 73]

Andresen, August H.	Guyer	O'Leary
Anderson, Calif.	Harris, Va.	O'Toole
Auchincloss	Hart	Pracht
Baldwin, N. Y.	Herter	Rolph
Barden	Hinshaw	Sabath
Barry	Holmes, Mass.	Sauthoff
Boykin	Izac	Scanlon
Bradley, Pa.	Jenkins	Scott
Buckley	Jennings	Sheridan
Clark	Jensen	Slaughter
Cochran	Johnson, Calvin D.	Smith, Maine
Costello	Judd	Smith, Va.
Culkin	Kelley	Stanley
Cullen	Kennedy	Thomas, N. J.
Curley	Keogh	Tolan
Dies	Lane	Treadway
Dingell	Lea	Vinson, Ga.
Drewry	Luce	Voorhis, Calif.
Elliott	McGranery	Walter
Fogarty	Magnuson	Welchel, Ohio
Gale	Merrow	Welch
Gallagher	Miller, Conn.	Wene
Gerlach	Miller, Mo.	White
Gibson	Monkiewicz	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gore	Mruk	Wolverton, N. J.
Granger	Myers	Woodruff, Mich.
Green	Norton	Worley

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 353 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the roll call, were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter I received recently from the Governor of my State regarding the motive behind the enlistment of our womanhood in the WAVES.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Baltimore Evening Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article I wrote for the Christian Advocate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a report released by the Tennessee Valley Authority on May 16, concerning the achievements of the T. V. A. during the 10 years of its activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiency appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes. Pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, with the acquiescence of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I ask unanimous consent that, in addition to the time already provided, 1 hour on each side be allotted for general debate when the Kerr amendment is offered, at the close of which a vote shall be taken.

Mr. TABER. And that 1 hour to be under the control of the chairman and ranking member of the committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. To be controlled as provided for the general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I also call the attention of the House to the fact that we find ourselves in the unusual situation of having three major supply bills waiting action by the House at this time: The urgent deficiency bill, which is pending, the naval supply bill for 1944, and the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1944, all of which have been reported to the House and are awaiting disposition this week.

The appropriations provided in those three bills aggregate approximately $30,000,000,000.

In that connection it should also be noted that up to date none of the general supply bills have been enacted into law, and it behooves both this body and a coordinate body to give a little thought to prompt action of all appropriation bills and conference reports.

The status of the supply bills as of May 17 is as follows:

STATUS OF APPROPRIATION BILLS, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Laws:
First deficiency, fiscal year 1943.
Naval supplemental, fiscal year 1943.
Farm labor supply, runs to December 31, 1943.
Urgent deficiencies, fiscal year 1943 (H. J. Res. 82 and 115).
Pending in House:
Urgent deficiency, fiscal year 1943.
Naval, fiscal year 1944.
Interior, fiscal year 1944.
Pending in House committee:
Lend-lease appropriations, fiscal years 1943 and 1944.
Labor and Federal Security Agency, fiscal year 1944.
Military appropriations, fiscal year 1944.
National war agencies, fiscal year 1944.
NOTE.—None of these bills can be reported to the House before June except, possibly, lend-lease.
Pending in Senate: Legislative, fiscal year 1944 (passed House April 8).
Pending in Senate committee:
Agriculture, fiscal year 1944 (passed House April 20).
District of Columbia, fiscal year 1944 (passed House April 20).
Independent offices, fiscal year 1944 (passed House February 17).
State, Justice, and Commerce, fiscal year 1944 (passed House April 7).
Passed both Houses:
Treasury and Post Office, fiscal year 1944 (pending amendments in dispute).
War civil functions, fiscal year 1944 (not sent to conference).

We reported out the Interior bill this morning. The Labor and Federal Security bill and the military appropriations bill remain to be reported by the committee to the House. In addition we expect soon to report the National War Agency bill for 1944 and the Navy bill for 1943 and 1944, in all, four major bills still pending in the House committee.

If the House expects to get away by the 4th of July, as has been intimated, we would like to have the cooperation of both the committee and the House in the prompt consideration and disposition of these remaining bills.

The SPEAKER. As far as the leadership of the House is concerned, the gentleman will have its cooperation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have always had that cooperation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my colleague from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in further explanation of the statement the gentleman is making, several times we have found ourselves on Friday and on Monday with somewhere around 300 Members of the House in Washington. We cannot lose the weekends every week and expect to get this legislation passed and be ready for a recess by July 4. I am impressed with what the gentleman says in his request that all Members stay on the job. I think it is necessary for the interests of our physical welfare as well as the mental ease of the country for us to take a recess.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations have been holding hearings for longer hours than they have ever worked all the way through. There has been no lying down on the job on their part. The House has given more consideration to every bill that has come along than has been its practice. There is in the House, as we all realize, a disposition to try to save a little bit of a part of the Treasury, and that takes a little longer than it would otherwise. We have a very big job to do if we are ever going to get through. Frankly, I do not see how, the way things are going now, we are going to be through by the 1st of July. It can only be done by the other body stepping up its pace and everybody here putting their shoulders to the wheel.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the observation made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is a very good one. The probabilities are that there will be a hesitancy to adjourn over Saturday. In the past there was complete justification for that. The leadership naturally recognizes that the Members work very hard. The situation on the floor is very intense. Before coming here we have our office work to do and after we get through here there is more office work to do.

On Saturdays the Members work very hard in their offices. We all have to look after the demands of our districts. That is only natural. We are living in a democracy, thanks be to God, and we have to look after the requests and the demands of the people of our districts. They have the constitutional right of petition, and many of them exercise that right through us. Therefore, as it applies to the situation from now on, I think there is a great deal to what the gentleman from Virginia has said. While we have adjourned over Friday pretty often in the past, a lot of that consideration has been extended to individual members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, in addition to the list of appropriation bills just filed, a schedule of our hearings on the remainder of the national war agencies, giving an idea of just what progress will have to be made in the committee in order to get that bill out by the 15th of June, which is practically the last date we can hope to report it if we expect to enact it by the 1st of July.

The schedule is as follows:

HEARING SCHEDULE FOR REMAINDER OF NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES

Tuesday, May 18: Office of War Information.
Wednesday, May 19: Office of War Information.
Thursday, May 20: Petroleum Coordinator for War, Office of Scientific Research and Development.
Friday, May 21: Board of Economic Warfare.
Saturday, May 22: War Relocation Authority, National War Labor Board.
Monday, May 24: War Production Board.
Tuesday, May 25: War Production Board.
Wednesday, May 26: Office of Price Administration.
Thursday, May 27: Office of Price Administration.
Friday, May 28: Office of Economic Stabilization, Office of Strategic Services.
Saturday, May 29: Central Administrative Services, liaison office.

This schedule makes no allowance for time lost in marking up the lend-lease appropriation, getting through the conference report on the urgent deficiency, full committee meetings, roll calls, and other House votes and business or time otherwise lost from the schedule in the coming 2 weeks. Even if we are able to follow the schedule as drawn it will hardly be possible to report the national war agencies bill earlier than June 15.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I got the impression from what has been said here by the several gentlemen who have mentioned the subject that in all likelihood the appropriation bills, if they are thoroughly considered, may take up practically all the time between now and the time it is desired to recess. If that is true, I call attention to the fact that the Committee on Military Affairs has two bills awaiting action on the floor of the House now relating to national defense, and it is entirely possible that we shall have two or three more bills that ought not to be delayed beyond the recess period. I hope the leadership will take those bills into consideration in drawing up the schedules.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say to the gentleman that after we dispose of the three pending bills we shall not expect to report further bills, with the exception of the lend-lease bill, before the 1st of June.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. In view of what has been said with reference to the conservation of time, particularly in the consideration of appropriation bills on the floor, it occurred to me, as chairman of a subcommittee trying to expedite the consideration of these matters, that if Members of the House would take the liberty of appearing before the subcommittees and pointing out wherein reductions can be made in appropriations, it might save a great deal of time in the consideration of the bills on the floor.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That would be a very laudable procedure from more than one point of view.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2714, with Mr. PATMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized for such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, it is written, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Let me take just a few minutes to tell the truth—the whole truth and nothing but the truth—about the most maligned, the most misrepresented, and in plain Missouri parlance, the most lied-about man in the world—the American farmer, and legislation in his behalf.

For years the farmer was told that the law of supply and demand governed his prices and there was nothing Congress could do to help him. They said "you cannot legislate prosperity." But the farmer has seen Congress legislate prosperity for everybody else. He has seen Congress increase the wages, the profits, and the income of every other group and industry. He has seen Congress, by law, load this increase on the farmer's cost of production and cost of living. And he has come to realize that Congress can legislate money out of the pockets of any one class and into the pockets of any other class, and has been doing it right along.

What is more to the point, he has noticed that when money was legislated into the pockets of labor, industry, transportation, mining, or business, through higher prices, higher wages, higher freight rates, higher coal, oil, gas, and so forth, a large part of the additional money they got was always out of the farmer's pockets.

But when the farmer himself comes to Congress to ask for the same kind of legislation, he is met with the most determined opposition. Every group and interest that wants to live at the expense of the farmer opposes every bill that will give the farmer the same kind of legislation they have already secured for themselves. They say in effect, "We are going to charge you as much as we can and pay you as little as we can," and although we got through legislation before the war bringing farm prices close to parity, they are using every effort to prevent legislation which will protect parity prices after the war. In addition to everything else that can be done to prevent permanent stabilization of farm prices, they have resorted to the most reckless misrepresentation, and I want to catalog a few of these poison-pen stories they have circulated so industriously.

First. They say there is a farm bloc organization here in Washington.

To my certain knowledge, there is no such organization here and never has been. If anyone is in doubt about it, I suggest that they consult Congressman FULMER, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture; Congressman STEAGALL, author of the Steagall bill; or Congressman PACE, author of the Pace bill, all of whom are sitting here. They will assure you that there has never been any organization or meeting, either permanent or temporary, that by any stretch of the imagination could be termed a farm bloc. It is a foreign word usually applied by hostile columnists and commentators to the Members of the House and Senate who support farm legislation. Their

bias is shown by the fact that they never speak of Congressmen who support legislation in behalf of other groups as blocs. The corridors of this Capitol are filled with paid lobbyists trying to get through legislation and in both Houses of Congress there are large groups of Congressmen voting for such legislation. But no one ever speaks of them as blocs. There is a much larger number supporting labor legislation than is supporting farm legislation. I know, because I have voted for every labor law passed by Congress in the last 20 years. But you never hear anything about a labor bloc.

There was a much larger number supporting the bill to increase the salaries of Government employees passed by the House last week. But nobody said anything about the Government employees bloc. You never hear anything about the Ruml bloc or the sales-tax bloc or any other bloc—although they are all here. It is only when the farmer asks for legislation to protect him after the war from the same drop in prices that ruined him after the last war that they talk of the farm bloc—and they usually add the "stumbling bloc." The farmer not only works longer than anybody else, and gets less per hour than anybody else, and is doing more to win the war than anybody else, but he gets more abuse than anybody else.

Second. They say Congressmen and farm organizations opposing incentive payments and supporting post-war stabilization of farm prices through enactment of the Steagall, Pace, and Bankhead bills do not represent the farmer.

If they do not represent the farmer whom do they represent? They do not represent labor. Both C. I. O. and A. F. of L. are supporting incentive payments and cheap food.

They do not represent the Department of Agriculture. The Department and all its hired hands have been fighting desperately for the last 5 years to hold down farm prices. They do not represent the consumer organizations. The consumer is paying the lowest percent of his income for food in all history—22 percent in 1943 as compared with 38 percent in 1919—and all the consumer organizations are for incentive payments, because incentive payments pay a part of their grocery bills out of the United States Treasury. There is nobody left, then, for the farm Congressmen to represent but the farmers who elected them and to whom they must come for reelection. I am a farmer myself and have lost as much money shipping fat cattle and hogs to the consumer at less than the cost of production as any other farmer in my State. Every vote I have cast on farm legislation has been the vote of a burnt child who was singed in the collapse that followed the last war and wants to keep out of the fire at the close of this war.

The same is true of the farm organizations, the Missouri Farmers' Association, the Farm Bureau, the National Grange, and the National Council of Farm Cooperatives. If they do not represent the farmer, whom do they represent? There are no finer men in the Nation today than F. V. Heinkel, R. L. Brown, Homer Shride, of my own State; Edward A. O'Neal, Albert S. Goss, Ezra T. Benson, Charles W. Holman, Fred Brenckman, and other farm representatives. They are without exception men of the highest character and patriotism. But for them hogs would today be selling at $9 and eggs at 22 cents, and the food supply of the Nation would be even more inadequate than it is. No one has thrown any mud or made any personal attack on Mr. Gompers, Mr. Green, or Mr. Murray or the representatives of the United States Chamber of Commerce or the representatives of the brotherhoods in all the years they have maintained so splendidly the rights of labor, commerce, industry, and transportation. But anyone who represents the farmer bespeaks the same courtesy and consideration for agriculture is the target of the most unlicensed vilification and abuse. The farmer is always the goat whether in the market or in the legislature.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Certainly, the charge against the bill of which I was the author, to include farm labor costs and parity prices, could not be substantiated as a big farmer bill, because it is the little farmer who works his own farm who would get the greatest benefit under that legislation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But that is also true of the other farm measures we have supported. I am certain that the authors of those bills also, as well as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], would likewise testify.

Third. They say these farm measures and the Congressmen and farm organizations who support them are for the big farmer and against the little farmer.

Of all the propaganda they manufacture that is the most transparent. You cannot help the farmer who grows 1,000 bushels of corn without helping the farmer who grows 100 bushels. You cannot increase prices for the man who raises a hundred hogs without increasing prices for the man who raises 10 hogs. You cannot benefit the farmer living on one side of the road without benefiting the farmer living on the other side of the road. If you have attended the meetings of the farm clubs and farm bureaus and farm granges year after year as I have, you would know there could not possibly be any such distinction between members. The membership of these farm organizations throughout the country is made up of the rank-and-file farmers of the neighborhood, and any suggestion at one of their meetings that they were for or against the big farmer or the little farmer would get a big laugh. Just try it out on any local unit of any of these farm organizations anywhere in the country. They always slip in something about the big plantation owner. There is not a big plantation owner in any farm club, farm bureau, or farm grange in Missouri.

And let me take this opportunity to urge any farmer who is not affiliated with a farm organization to immediately join the one nearest to him. This is a day of organization. Everybody is organized and has his representatives here in Washington demanding laws for himself and against everybody else. It is a case of the devil take the hindmost. The consumers in particular are organized and if they had their way would put farm products back where they were in 1921. Government officials in charge of the food program testified that regimentation was infinitely easier this time as they had to deal with over 200 food-distributing agencies in the last war and only 8 chain-store representatives in this war. The farmer must organize in self-defense, or turn this Government over to the control of those who are organized. Some of these organizations are just about running the country as it is. Join your farm organization and support it in season and out of season if you have any regard for the future of your business and your family.

And every merchant, banker, artisan, and professional man in the inland town should cooperate. If the farmer prospers the local businessman prospers. If the farmer must accept starvation prices for his products as in 1922 and 1932, the town businessman depending on the farmer must run his business on starvation patronage. If the farmer does not make it, he cannot spend it.

Fourth. They say the period selected as a basis for parity was a period in which the farmers were getting the highest prices ever paid for farm products. They also say farmers are better off today than ever before. There is not a word of truth in either statement. The period was from 1910 to 1914, when cotton was $12.40, hogs were $7.27, wheat 88 cents, corn 64 cents, and eggs 22 cents. Prices have repeatedly been much better. Hogs have sold as high as $28, wheat $2.40, cotton 42 cents, corn $1.50, and eggs 60 cents.

And yet these devious strategists try to make the public believe the farmers are grabbing for the highest prices ever paid. The farmers are not getting their highest prices by a good deal but everybody else is.

Farm prices today are 10 percent less than in the last war while wages and farm machinery are more than twice what they were in the last war. Here are the Government statistics:

Comparisons of farm prices and industrial wage rates and weekly income with last war and with 1910–14 base period

	1910–14	Peak of first war	January 1943
Farm prices	100	202	182
Hourly earnings, factory workers	100	193	441
Weekly wage income, factory workers	100	182	377
Percentage of industrial worker's family income spent for food		58	[1]28
Percentage of all nonfarm family income spent for food	31	38	[1]22

[1] Lowest on record.

The farmer approves of these wage scales. The more the working man makes the better customer he ought to be. The farmer believes in live and let live. He believes in high wages and high prices. He would not take a penny from

either. But he does insist that when he pays his part of these higher wages and higher prices he is at least entitled to a living wage for his own labor and a parity price for his own products.

Fifth. They say there is a conspiracy to destroy A. A. A.

There is not the slightest foundation for such a charge. It is only necessary to look at the last agricultural appropriation bill to see that ample appropriation is made for A. A. A. notwithstanding the fact that the Department of Agriculture has raised the quotas on wheat and corn, thereby eliminating a material part of the A. A. A. work. Heavy reductions are being made in every appropriation bill this session of Congress. The Interior appropriation bill, reported this morning, cuts practically every item in the bill and reduces the total by millions of dollars. All nonwar expenditures must be curtailed. And yet the committee continued A. A. A. with minor changes and the A. A. A. appropriation stayed in the bill. Notwithstanding this, it has been broadcast all over the country that we were destroying A. A. A. I helped establish A. A. A. We cannot maintain prices after the war without A. A. A. To destroy it would be to destroy everything we have been fighting for the last 10 years.

Sixth. They say the committee in charge of the agricultural appropriation bill is trying to wipe out Farm Security, and that the House voted money for loans out of the bill.

On the contrary, the appropriation bill recently reported to the House, recommended $40,000,000 for loans and $12,000,000 for their administration. In line with the policy of reducing overhead, eliminating duplication, and avoiding overlapping jurisdiction Farm Security was consolidated along with similar activities under Farm Credit but all its activities were preserved. Farmers can still get exactly the same F. S. A. loans and service they have always had. Farm Security was one of the emergency activities established to alleviate depression conditions along with the Work Projects Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Youth Administration, and similar agencies. It was stated at the time they were established that as soon as unemployment and low prices and other depression conditions which brought them about were relieved they would be discontinued. Practically all of them have been eliminated. But an exception was made in the case of Farm Security. Its activities were continued and the committee recommended an appropriation of $52,000,000 to finance them. Newspaper headlines say "Washington voted overwhelmingly to destroy F. S. A." Nothing of the sort ever happened. It was not even voted on by the House. The House would have approved it had there been an opportunity to vote on it. But it went out on a point of order made by a single Member of the House. I have no doubt that it will be restored by the Senate as items eliminated on points of order usually are. The committee which recommended the appropriation has repeatedly explained this, but Government employees who were afraid their jobs would be affected broadcast the statement all over the country that the committee was trying to wipe it out.

Seventh. They say the farm bloc is trying to start the spiral of inflation by increasing the cost of living. Honestly, now, what is starting inflation—the 20 cents worth of cotton in a shirt or the $2.30 worth of processing and distribution? Which is inflationary—the 1½ cents worth of wheat in a loaf of bread or the 8½ cents worth of processing and distribution? The farmers are not asking for increases. All the farmer is asking is to hold what he has and to be given legislation which will protect him after the war as others are already protected. It is not the cost of food that is threatening inflation.

There is a graph just issued by the Government which explains the situation.

Eighth. They say the Department of Agriculture is "supporting" farm prices and there is need of a "price-supporting program."

Comment is hardly necessary. Everyone knows that the Department of Agriculture has been able to hold prices down only by the most drastic manipulation. The claim of the Department that the price of hogs is being "supported" is particularly unconvincing when meat markets throughout the country are usually without pork and even when supplied limit sales of bacon to half a pound to a customer.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does not the gentleman believe that a competition between prices and wages gives security neither to labor nor to agriculture? Does not the gentleman further believe that prices have to be rolled back to the levels of 1942 and that there should be a subsidizing of prices to make up for any injustices?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. To the first question, "No." To the second, "No." And I speak for every farm Congressman and every farm organization in the country when I say that if you want to roll back labor, industry, and agriculture to the beginning, take away all arbitrary laws, all artificial stilts upon which labor and industry are walking today, and put them back to the law of supply and demand, the farmer will be the first to go along with you.

Ninth. They say, farmers are shirking war production and holding out for incentive payments above parity prices.

No more unjust charge could be made. Handicapped as no other industry is—without sufficient labor, machinery, or supplies—the farmer is contributing his part to the war effort more efficiently than any other industry. There are no strikes, no lockouts, no absenteeism, no red flags, and no Monday morning hangovers on the American farm. He will produce all he can regardless of the drop in prices handed to him while other incomes are advancing.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FULMER. Does the gentleman agree with me that it is not the farmer's price in any instance that interferes with or brings about that extreme high consumer's price, but, on the other hand, it is the many useless middlemen between the farmer and the consumer? The purpose of the subsidy now being requested is to pay some of the middlemen so that each one of them will get his regardless of what the farmer gets.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman correctly analyzes the situation. No one can question that statement.

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman has made a very interesting statement and one with which I agree about 100 percent this afternoon. But the thing that is disturbing and alarming to me is this: I would like to have the gentleman say something about it. Undoubtedly the press, and undoubtedly the Office of Price Administration, undoubtedly the administration knows what the attitude of Congress has been and what the attitude of the gentlemen of the committee has been toward this incentive, subsidy program. Notwithstanding that, the gentleman undoubtedly heard an address a week ago over the radio of Prentiss Brown, himself, saying to the people of the United States that they were going to put the program into effect. These gentlemen undoubtedly heard that statement. I would like to ask where they are going to get the money.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The New York Times, and I will insert a quotation in the RECORD, has a comment on the statement to which the gentleman refers to the effect that Mr. Brown told the Nation he proposed to bypass the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. How did the gentleman vote on reciprocal trade agreements?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I voted with a special view to assuring our neighbors that for the next 2 years—and the war is not going to be over in 2 years—that we are willing to meet them on terms of international amity and equality.

It is well to note that all this propaganda comes from the outside, principally from Washington where they are trying to roll back farm prices, and where they have systematically knocked down the price of hogs, eggs, and other farm products in the last few weeks.

Incentive payments mean the defeat of the farm stabilization program for which we have been fighting for 20 years. Our one objective has been to get a legislative floor under farm prices similar to the legislative floor under union wages. It has become imperatively necessary since the war started if we are to escape the collapse in farm prices, farm values, and farm incomes that followed the last war. Thanks to the work of the farm organizations and the farm Congressmen we are about to establish

a system which can be maintained when the post-war test comes. But to substitute subsidy payments means that when the war closes the subsidies will be discontinued and we will again have the 5-cent hogs, 20-cent corn, 35-cent wheat, and 8-cent eggs we had in 1920.

Incentive payments will not do the work and every reputable farm organization has repeatedly adopted planks in their annual platforms opposing them. But I will not refer you to the farm organizations or take farm testimony this time. Let us, instead, consult the great newspapers of the Nation.

In the first place, they will not get results. The Wall Street Journal says:

Subsidy as a national price-control policy is a measure of desperation. The rigid collateral regulation which has facilitated its use in Britain and Canada does not yet exist in the United States and is quite unlikely to be introduced in the near future. Subsidy is the opposite of stabilization. It does not prevent price increases but only conceals them from the general gaze in the debt bookkeeping of the Treasury.

And in a second edition:

Subsidy as a national price-control policy is a measure of desperation. The rigid collateral regulation which has facilitated its use in England and Canada does not exist in the United States and is quite unlikely to be introduced in the near future. Sudsidy is the opposite of stabilizaton. It does not prevent price increases but only conceals them from the general gaze in the debt bookkeeping of the Treasury.

An editorial by the Washington News:

It is dangerously misleading to say that the administration's subsidy scheme will roll back the cost of living. It will only appear to do that. The cost of living will remain the same, but the Government will be paying part of everybody's grocery bill.

But whatever comes off the consumers' bills will be added to the astronomical public debt.

An editorial by the Indianapolis Times:

It has no economic merit whatever. But it has political merit. A reduction of 10 percent in all prices equals an increase of 10 percent in all incomes. The hand is quicker than the eye, maybe, and here is a way to take off some of the pressure for higher pay that still threatens to close our coal mines, and hovers like a storm cloud over all American industry. A way to raise everybody's income, great and small, without seeming to raise anybody's pay.

To be sure a universal rise of 10 percent in income will give everyone 10 percent more to spend with no more merchandise to spend it on, and to be sure that is direct inflation. And that is where a subsidy to roll back prices is taking us.

Even for the two plus two equals five school of economists whose opinions bear so much weight in Washington today, it will be quite a difficult job to inflate just one side of a balloon.

Three excerpts from the New York Times:

The great political and economic danger of governmental subsidies is that they postpone the appearance of inflation while building up the reality. They permit (for a time) high wages with comparatively low living costs. They mean (for a time) high prices for producers with low prices for consumers. This is the politician's paradise. It is not difficult to see why the policy of subsidies seems at the moment the political path of least resistance.

And:

Not the least danger of the subsidy policy is that of increased political control over producers and processors of all sorts. The producer's solvency and economic life depend not on what he gets for his goods in the market but on his Government subsidy. Once this dependence is established, then the Government can tell the producer that his subsidy will not be continued unless he does this or that or the other. It is another step toward authoritarian control. In being deeply suspicious of it, farm groups have shown a sound instinct.

And:

The subsidy plan will not reduce the cost of living. Wage costs, material costs, power costs, and profits will not be diminished. What is to happen is that part of the living cost of the American people will be paid for out of the Treasury. There was something somewhat similar a little while ago. When millions went on relief during the depression, the cost of living wasn't reduced. They just received a subsidy—a 100-percent subsidy for all of their living expenses. The plan Mr. Brown announced on Friday is in some ways more extensive and in others more limited than was the relief scheme. Mr. Brown would place everybody on relief, not for all but for a part of his cost of living.

The Boston Transcript says:

The National Industrial Conference Board completely blasts the fiction that living costs have been running ahead of pay in America's major industries. On the basis of a large cross-section of them, the Conference Board shows that, even using the high levels of January 1941 as a starting point, average weekly income from such wages had risen more than 21 percent by last February as against an increase of 18.4 percent in living costs, while compared with February 1929 (when everything was at the top and nobody but Roger Babson saw what was coming) the wage average last February had increased by more than 50 percent.

Government subsidies can exercise a temporary effect on the superficial evidences of inflation (as it has done in England), but they are like sweeping the dirt under the bed or trying to stem a flood by raising the height of the dam.

The cost of incentive payments as compared with results secured render them prohibitive.

The Indianapolis Times points out:

The original estimate of what it would cost the Government just to roll back prices a few cents on a few food items June 1 was $300,000,000 to $500,000,000, an amount which George Meany, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, calls "peanuts" compared to what he believes is needed really to roll back prices. "Peanuts" is right. To roll back all prices by 10 percent by the subsidy plan would cost around $6,000,000,000 a year, which the Government would have to borrow, and on which the Government would pay interest of about $150,000,000 a year.

Inflation, which is simply a too high price level for merchandise, would not be reduced a penny's worth by paying part of the price in borrowed Government money.

The Chicago Tribune says:

The financial aspects of the plan to have the Government pay a part of everyone's cost of living are interesting. The money for such a vast undertaking can come either from borrowing or taxes. Inflation would result from borrowing money to pay 10 percent of the cost of some of the most important food items. On the basis of experience the banks would have to take half the bonds. The inflationary effect of public borrowing from the banks has been pointed out repeatedly. Another way to accomplish the same thing would be to leave prices where they are and give 10 cents' worth of War stamps away with each dollar's worth of meat, butter, and coffee purchased. This in fact, would be less inflationary than the borrowing of the money to pay a subsidy, for people would probably accumulate the stamps and exchange them for bonds.

But incentive payments would bring about the inflation it is designed to control.

The New York Sun reminds:

The use of subsidies to prevent inflation is equivalent to trying to put out a fire by pouring oil on the flames. The immediate result may be to arrest a price rise, but the billions thus paid out in subsidies add to the excess purchasing power that is the prime source of inflation, and help to swell the public debt that imposes an over-all burden upon taxpayers of the present and coming generations.

And the Times corroborates:

Subsidies are not loans; they are gifts, made in an effort to stabilize cost-of-living prices and thus stave off wage increases which, in turn, produce others and inflate the whole price structure. That in sequence brings new wage increases and steadily mounting inflation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman made an observation a few moments ago that I think perhaps should be enlarged somewhat. He was speaking about the cause of inflation; that is, whether it is the 20 cents in a cotton shirt or the processing cost. The gentleman did not mean to say that either of those elements to which he referred necessarily promotes or causes or abets inflation, did he?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I meant to say that, with a raw material which accounted for only a cent and a half in a 10-cent loaf of bread, for instance, you could not with any minor fractional increase of that cost which could possibly be attributed to the price of the wheat in the bread start a spiral of inflation. In short, incentive payments will not do the work; will cost billions of dollars at a time when we cannot afford to waste money; will start inflation and will destroy effective stabilization of farm prices after the war. There is every reason why they should be avoided and present farm prices continued without increase or variation. And there is no tenable reason why we should resort to so costly and so dangerous an untried expedient which promises so little.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I said that with the preponderance of the cost of that material in the processing and distribution, it was absurd to say that by the addition of a small fraction of 1 percent you could start a spiral of inflation. As a matter of fact it becomes more and more apparent that the granting of parity prices for every farm product cannot possibly start inflation but, on the

other hand, will contribute to the welfare not only of the farmer but of the country as a whole.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will permit another observation, I understand that one of the committees of the House will tomorrow take up a bill through which one of the Government agencies is seeking for subsidies funds to the extent of $1,000,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, we are going to vote this afternoon, I presume, on the so-called amendment offered by the Kerr committee. In that connection, I fear that we are embarking upon something rather dangerous. We should think very deeply before we vote approval of the so-called ouster of liberals from various executive departments of the Government.

As I view it, this is an attempt to discharge certain men in the Government service because of their opinions. It is primarily just that.

If we are going to assume the right to fire, we may as well assume the right to hire, and then this august body would become an employment agency.

The Constitution provides for executive removal. Authority to appoint subordinate civil officers whose methods of appointment are not prescribed in the Constitution may be vested by Congress in the President, the department heads, or the courts—article II, section 2, of the Constitution.

Authority to remove subordinate civil officers in the executive branch is recognized to be a part of the power to appoint. The President, acting independently, may even remove civil officers originally appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate, *Myers* v. *The United States*, 1926 (272 U. S. 52). Congress, however, may not remove civil officers except by the specific process of impeachment—article I, sections 2 and 3; article II, section 4; and article III, section 2, of the Constitution.

Therefore, any legislation barring payment of salary to specifically named individuals who were executively appointed will be invalid, and will not be binding upon the executive branch of the Government. In other words, you can do anything you want with reference to barring the right to pay these men out of the appropriation bills, but those men would still have a right to retain those jobs and the executive head would still have the right to maintain them in those positions; so what you intend to do might be purely abortive.

I do believe that as a result of the war we have developed a sort of hysteria on this subject and are somewhat submerging our well-considered judgment to our emotions. That is why I might term this effort a sort of witch burning, by saying that we hold a gun of threat and coercion at the heads of all the departments and utterly disregard history.

Soon after the Revolutionary War, Thomas Jefferson denounced the concentration of judicial and executive, as well as law-making powers, in the Legislature of Virginia. See the notes on the State of Virginia by Jefferson, page 195. Such concentration, he said, "is precisely the definition of despotic government. It will be no alleviation that these powers will be exercised by a plurality of hands, and not by a single one. Many despots would surely be as oppressive as one. As little will it avail us, that they are chosen by ourselves. An elective despotism," said the author of the Declaration of Independence, "was not the government we fought for."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. By attempting to control the views and the opinions and the payment of salaries because thereof to the various members of the executive branches of the Government, we, the legislative branch, are arrogating to ourselves executive powers. That is the type of union of powers that Jefferson inveighed against.

I remind the Members of the House of the reconstruction era, when a man by the name Thaddeus Stevens assumed almost superhuman power in this very Chamber. He did so by arrogating to Congress vast executive and judicial powers.

He controlled the destinies of the other Chamber and the destinies of the Executive. He sought to impeach the Executive, President Andrew Johnson, and failed by only one vote, and it is interesting to note that all of the articles of impeachment on which he rested his charges against Andrew Johnson were declared invalid subsequently by the Supreme Court. But Stevens cared naught for law. He stubbornly refused to yield to reason. He would have his way at all costs, even at cost of usurpation of Executive powers. I do not want the Congress to embark on that kind of error, but we are indeed establishing a highly dangerous precedent.

If we are going to examine as closely as did the Dies committee and the Kerr committee into the views and opinions of employees in the executive branch of the Government, I venture this assertion, that Thomas Jefferson himself, and Benjamin Franklin and John Quincy Adams themselves, could not have stood the test, and that appropriations for their salaries would have been summarily cut off. Let me remind you that the Declaration of Independence speaks of "all men being created equal." Is there not something collective in this conception. Have we forgotten that John Quincy Adams wished to make our economy collective, and this Republican President—mark the words—sought to develop the national life on a collective, and not on a competitive basis? In other words, if John Quincy Adams today were on our pay roll, the Dies committee and the Kerr committee would say his name should be stricken from the pay roll because he was a Communist and wanted to destroy the profit system, because he believed in the theory of collectivism. Read the history of John Quincy Adams, and you will see that his views are of that sort. Let me go further. Benjamin Franklin wrote to Robert Moore in 1783 as follows:

> All property except the savage's temporary cabin, his bow, his matchcoat, and other little acquisitions absolutely necessary for his subsistence seems to me the creative of public convention. Hence, the public has the right of regulating descents, and all other conveyances of property, and even of limiting the quantity and the uses of it. All the property that is necessary to a man for the conservation of the individual and the propagation of the species is his natural right, which none may justly deprive him of, but all property superfluous to such purposes is the property of the public, who, by their laws, have created it, and who may, therefore, by other laws, dispose of it, whenever the welfare of the public shall demand such disposition. He that does not like civil society on these terms, let him retire and live among savages.

Thus spake Benjamin Franklin, and his words are little different from the words of Messrs. Dodd, Lovett, Watson, and other ultraliberals. Was Franklin a collectivist, or was he not? Franklin and his views, as I have just expressed them in part, was parcel of the patriotism of the Revolution.

I could give many honored names, famous in our history, who could not have stood the test laid down by the Kerr committee or the Dies committee. Time will not permit, except to draw attention to the extreme views of Dr. Edward Everett Hale. Assuredly he was a patriot, this man who wrote the famous The Man Without a Country. In his book We, the People he said, "The people own the roads, the schoolhouses, the lighthouses, why, then, object to the ownership of wealth in common?" And he was Chaplain of the Senate. Was he disloyal? I do not think so. Yet he, if living, and if Chaplain, would come under the Kerr committee definition of one guilty of subversive activity.

I want it understood there is nothing of a personal nature intended by my words so far as the membership of the Kerr committee is concerned. I simply disagree with them. They do not abide by the constitutional procedure. I am not so much interested in the opinions of the men under fire as I am in the improper and fatal precedent we are embarking on. I am more concerned about the method of ouster.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, this proposal to remove certain men from the Government service by means of an amendment to an appropriation bill is extremely dangerous. In my judgment, it violates our American concepts of fair play, freedom of speech, and direct action. It sets up no definite standards as to what is subversive and opens wide the path of intolerance. Under the principle here implied, for example, a Cabinet member could be removed from his position by having Congress disapprove his social or economic views, and then follow up such disapproval by an amendment such as we are discussing today.

Our American history has been an inspiring story away from intolerance toward greater freedom of choice for the

individual. From the witch hunts of colonial days, the persecution of Quakers and Catholics, and the other manifestations of bigotry that characterized our early history, we Americans have been moving steadily in the direction of greater freedom of individual thought and action, as guaranteed under the essence of our Constitution, the Bill of Rights. This amendment we are now discussing would be a serious step backward if it is adopted.

Of the men specifically mentioned, I have met Mr. Watson on one occasion; Mr. Dodd and Mr. Lovett I have never seen. I believe them to be able and honorable American citizens, doing their best as their consciences dictate to play their part in the all-out war effort. If this amendment passes it will not only remove these citizens from the Government service but it will be doing a much graver injustice—that of depriving them of the most precious of all American attributes, their good name.

And what is the basis for this contemplated action? It is simply that they have belonged to organizations or spoken before groups which do not meet with the approval of certain Members of Congress. Thus it becomes a matter solely of opinion, not of law, and we have prided ourselves that in this democracy of ours we are governed by laws, not by the whims of men. Such action smacks far more of the tactics of the Nazis and the Fascists, against whom we are fighting, than of the spirit of American justice and fair play.

Even the organizations mentioned have not been made illegal; they have simply been condemned as subversive, without this charge being substantiated in any way. Let me give one example. Among the organizations to which Mr. Watson belonged was the Consumers Union. Now, my colleagues, I have belonged to the Consumers' Union, and if my membership has lapsed at the present time I certainly intend to renew that membership. I believe this organization to be doing an extremely valuable piece of work in informing and protecting the American buying public. To charge it with being subversive is to reach the depths of the ridiculous. I would not advise any person to call me subversive simply because I belong to it. And yet it is this type of evidence that is being offered to back up the action contemplated by this amendment.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, let us set the example here for the rest of our country in fair play, considered action, and protection to our most cherished constitutional rights. Let us not give way to war hysteria and do things for which we will later be ashamed. Let us do our part in keeping our country moving in the direction of greater tolerance and greater liberty, in keeping with our democratic traditions. Let us vote down this amendment, which is dangerous and essentially un-American.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I begin my remarks by saying that I find myself, after a great battle with myself, unable to vote in support of the amendment to remove from the service certain named individuals, beginning, however, with this observation as I see it. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations is not at all blamable for this situation. It has been brought about by the action of the House itself, of which I am one, and I must bear my share of whatever blame attaches to it. I said on the floor of the House on other occasions that these men who constitute the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations are as outstanding, as fair, as honorable, and as intelligent as could be found anywhere. Perhaps I said in the Congress, but I am willing to go further now and say anywhere. The trouble, however, is, as I see it, that we are launching on a procedure that will not do. We cannot as a body of legislators, Members of an American Congress, legislate in a left-handed way, as in an inquisition or an impeachment proceeding. I have not had the opportunity of reading more than the report that has been filed in this case. I am compelled, however, to convert myself into a juror. I conceive myself to be sworn as a juror. Considering the position that you and I are in, that we must in voting upon this amendment find these accused guilty in fact, unfit to hold office under the Government of America, or say that we do not have sufficient evidence to find them so. That is the American way, and I conceive myself to be bound by this sort of an oath:

> You do solemnly swear that you will well and truly try and true deliverance make between the government and the prisoner whom you shall have in charge and a true verdict give according to the evidence thereon, so help you God.

Until I got to thinking about it I hardly knew why that was at the end of the oath, "so help you God." It is a prayer rather than the administration of an oath that has been embodied in the law of our land. You are embarking upon such an important matter that I charge you that you summon to your aid the help of God in directing you in such an important matter.

I would not, if I could avoid it, be a juror in this case, but by virtue of my membership in this House I am essentially converted into the position of a juror. Mr. Ickes has said concerning this matter—and I get it from the paper—"To brand him"—and he had reference to just one who was in his department—"and kick him out of the Government in the fashion proposed would be an outrage against the Bill of Rights and a travesty on democracy." I call your attention to the fact that Mr. Ickes does not say, "A travesty upon justice," but he says, "The procedure by which it is proposed to arrive at this very serious and important result is a travesty upon democracy."

I am convinced that he is right, but it applies to the House and not to this committee, and I cannot vote to sustain this finding, resulting, as I view it, in doing harm to our democracy and violating the Bill of Rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, it is with great regret that I take issue with a committee of which I am a member in bringing in the report recommending that three gentlemen be deprived of employment by the United States because of opinions which they have been alleged to have expressed or because of some alleged association with organizations denominated by the Kerr committee as subversive, under a definition which they have offered under their own ipse dixit in this Congress.

I read the definition which they have given to the Congress:

> Subversive activity in this country derives from conduct intentionally destructive of or inimical to the Government of the United States—that which seeks to undermine its institutions, or to distort its functions, or to impede its projects, or to lessen its efforts, the ultimate end being to overturn it all. Such activity may be open and direct as by effort to overthrow, or subtle and indirect as by sabotage.

Having set up that definition, having adopted it and hugged it to their bosom, they now proceed to characterize three distinguished intellectuals of the United States as guilty of subversive activity.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Is not that definition quite contrary to the edict of the United States Supreme Court as to what is subversive?

Mr. COFFEE. Contrary to a line of decisions handed down by the United States Supreme Court for a period of 145 years; diametrically and categorically in opposition to the whole line of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield briefly.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Would the gentleman cite one decision?

Mr. COFFEE. Myers against United States is one. I do not have my brief with me at the moment.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Does it define "subversive"?

Mr. COFFEE. No; but I am talking about the whole philosophy about what is subversive activity in the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. You say the Supreme Court has a line of decisions for 145 years?

Mr. COFFEE. I cannot give the exact citations now, but I will get my brief and give them during the discussion on this bill.

One of the gentlemen is Dr. William E. Dodd, Jr., the son of a former Ambassador to Germany, a distinguished son of North Carolina, who is well known to

the members of the North Carolina delegation, a man who came from 250 years of distinguished American antecedents. He is a doctor of philosophy. He is a graduate of leading American institutions. Yet this committee, and the Congress, if the Congress follows it through, would seek to blacken that man throughout his life as being guilty of subversive activities, when perhaps he was just a little more advanced in his thinking than some of the rest of us and saw the dark clouds on the horizon a few years ahead of us and was active in his opposition to fascism, and thereby ran head on into certain people who did not agree with his expressions.

Here is a statement from the Washington Post, which is far from being a radical newspaper, in which it characterizes the proposed action of Congress in this respect as virtually a bill of attainder. An editorial which appeared in the Washington Post under date of May 13 denounces this action of Congress in no uncertain terms. In the same paper in another editorial 2 days later they went into the subject in a little more detail.

What is this crime of which these men are guilty? It is that either they have been the sponsors of some organization, have addressed some organization, donated to some organization which someone, somewhere, somehow said in his opinion was inimical or acting in a manner inimical to the best interests of the United States. There is not a finding anywhere in the report of the Kerr committee that any of the gentlemen so characterized was guilty of advocating the overthrow of the American Government by force and violence. There is no charge anywhere in the committee or in the hearings to the effect that any of these distinguished intellectuals advocated the overthrow of this Government.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman be kind enough to remain when I have the privilege of addressing this House? I think he will learn something, and would not be so exercised and make the statements he is now making, which do not comport with the truth at all.

Mr. COFFEE. I will be glad to remain.

Mr. KEEFE. I will give you some facts instead of a lot of generalities.

Mr. COFFEE. I will be glad to remain and listen to anything the gentleman has to say. My argument is directed to the procedure whereby the Congress, through this subtle manner, if we want to resort to the use of the word—is denying due process of law to Federal employees accused of subversive activity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. My objection is to the procedure and to the precedent we are seeking here to establish. Shakespeare said:

Who steals my purse steals trash; 'tis something, nothing;
'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands;
But he that filches from me my good name
Robs me of that which not enriches him,
And makes me poor indeed.

We in Congress are sitting here as judge, as jury, and as prosecutor. The Kerr committee did not accord to these men who are under examination anything more than permission to come up and present their answers in writing, or orally, to the charges which had been made against them. No opportunity was vouchsafed to the men under discussion to come before the committee with counsel nor to produce their own witnesses, nor to have the right of subpena, nor to have a copy of the transcript of the proceedings, nor an opportunity granted to them therefore to review the charges which were made against them. We are attempting to do something today which is unconstitutional. We are attempting to impeach men by methods other than impeachment. No articles of impeachment have been drawn up in the House of Representatives nor presented to the Senate against public officials of the United States, and these gentlemen are public officials. No attempt has been made to follow constitutional procedure, but an attempt has been made to circumvent the Constitution by adopting legislation which has the effect of a bill of attainder, one of the fundamental things against which our colonial forefathers sought separation from the mother country 160 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, we are proceeding on a dangerous course. One of the "four freedoms" for which this war is being fought is the freedom of speech and yet we are trying to deny the freedom of speech to distinguished citizens who come from as distinguished ancestors as those from which any Member of Congress in this House of Representatives has descended.

How may we rationalize this proposed purge of liberals from Federal employment? This attempted pogrom is congressional usurpation of office. We, as legislators, are trespassing upon Executive prerogatives. See decision of the United States Supreme Court in the famous case of Myers against the United States. Does the Bill of Rights and freedom of opinion have no application to Federal employees? Have we two standards of freedom of speech, one for nonemployees and another for Federal employees?

The editorial from the Washington Post to which I have heretofore referred is as follows:

BILL OF ATTAINDER

The House Appropriations Committee has urged upon Congress a procedure fraught with the gravest danger to American institutions. It has recommended attachment to the next convenient appropriation bill of an amendment providing that "no part of this or any other appropriation shall be used to pay the salaries of Goodwin B. Watson and William E. Dodd, Jr." If Congress follows such a course, it will be guilty at once of legislation in the nature of a bill of attainder and of a gross usurpation of executive authority.

The two men named in this curious provision are employees of the Federal Communications Commission. Responsibility for determining their qualification for public office rests with the Federal Communications Commission. Under the law no Government agency may employ any person who advocates or has "membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States." Neither of these men has been found guilty of, or has even been charged with, such advocacy or such membership. They have merely been accused, through the star-chamber proceedings of a congressional committee, of something vaguely termed subversive activity. The methods pursued by this committee were a travesty on the judicial processes which have enabled Americans to think of themselves as freemen.

Congress may properly write into law standards for the employment of Government personnel. It may properly hold any Federal agency accountable for adherence to such standards. But the proposed amendment goes far beyond such powers. It would dismiss from Government service individual employees on shadowy grounds which have never been enacted into law. This is not the first attempt of its kind. Some months ago the House threatened to deny salary payments to a Treasury Department employee, Dean Pickens, on the basis of similarly tenuous charges by the Dies committee. Happily a regard for civil rights prevailed. Several years ago the National Labor Relations Board was specifically forbidden to pay any of its funds to a particular staff member. The present provision goes to even more fantastic lengths. It declares that no part of any appropriation may be used to pay salaries to these individuals who have incurred congressional displeasure. In other words, this rider may be pasted onto the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior or for the Navy and yet strike at two employees of the Federal Communications Committee.

But the injustice threatened to these individuals is transcended in importance by the threat which such action raises against the tripartite basis of the American system of Government. If Congress removes these men from office through the disingenuous procedure recommended by the House Appropriations Committee, it will be acting at once as legislature, executive, and judiciary. The Constitution vests appointive power in the President. The corollary of this power, authority to remove Federal officials, as the Supreme Court clearly held in the case of *Myers* v. *the United States*, also rests in the Executive. Only through the well-defined impeachment proceedings established by the Constitution may Congress properly remove from office a member of the executive branch of the Government.

This is elementary to the separation of powers which the founding fathers considered essential to liberty. If Congress can oust executive officers at will, then we are subject to nothing short of legislative despotism. Conceivably, by a simple majority vote, the legislature could refuse to appropriate funds for the payment of a salary to members of the Cabinet, or even to the President himself. Its rule would become absolute. The Members of Congress would do well to remember that dictatorship is no less dictatorial and no less alien to American traditions when exercised by many men as when exercised by one man alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, if it came down to a question of firing a Communist or a Nazi—dismissing someone like that—I think both I and the gentleman from Washington, who spoke before me, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and every Member of this House would vote unanimously to dispose of any such individual; but let us have proof that they are Nazis or Communists; let us have definite proof; let us not get down to the position now where this Congress is going to start regulating a man's mind—his way of thinking. Whenever any of us become that great and that important—that he can start regulating a man's thought, his way of thinking—he had better resign from this Congress because he has become too big for the job. What would you think of GEORGE SADOWSKI trying to regulate his colleagues' minds—the mind of the gentleman from Michigan here [Mr. HOFFMAN] or the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] or the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]? These men are educated; they are independent thinkers; they have their own minds; they have studied our problems and certainly know just as much as I do; and it would be too bad for me or any other Member of this body to stand up and try to regulate their minds; try to tell them how they should think; try to tell them what letters they should write; try to tell them what they should put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It all simmers down to this: I am not going to quote any court cases, as did my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]; there is no need to quote a lot of decisions; I do not have them and I do not think it is necessary in this discussion. I think it all simmers down to the use of just a little ordinary horse sense—plain thinking for all of us. We have a lot of people in the United States of America—a lot of people who think differently than you and I do. There are a lot of sections in this country—North, South, East, and West—and we have all had experience with all kinds of people who think differently, but these thoughts are not inimical to the United States of America. These people are not Communists; they are not Nazis; they have a right to think. The people of this country have thought differently for years, and that is what has made this country a great country. Down in Michigan we have a man by the name of Father Coughlin; another famous radio personality, Gerald K. Smith. I do not agree with them. We listen to what they say on the radio and if we do not like it we turn the radio off; but we are not going to come out here and say that all these people who think differently than we do must adjust their reasoning to conform with ours. When a man and his family have lived in this country 250 years he cannot be entirely wrong. I think we had better get down to earth and not let this war get us off our steady thinking here. We better be just a little bit liberal in looking at the other man and at his way of thinking.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The Civil Service Commission denies employment to individuals who are physically ill. Does the gentleman think we ought to deny employment to those who are mentally ill?

Mr. SADOWSKI. If they are mentally ill, I think they should; but I still think if they just do not agree with me I am not going to say, "You are a crackpot," because in 2 or 3 years from now, after giving a little thought to some subject, I might change my mind.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. What worries me is that my constituents do regulate my mind. I do not think I could be elected if I belonged to those organizations that have been mentioned. I do not think they would employ me. I regard this employment matter as not so serious as some people try to picture it. I could not hold my job under those circumstances.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I grant you that you are right. My constituents expect me to represent them properly, and that is what I am trying to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that Congress is forgetting its functions and striving to branch out from the legislative to the executive field. This implies no criticism of the subcommittee delegated to do this job.

If the Appropriations Committee is going to dominate the executive departments through the exercise of its control over the purse strings, then it seems to me that a great deal of time and effort is being wasted by having the regular standing committees of the House meet, discuss measures, vote them out, pass them, only to find that their effort has been wasted motion for the reason that the Appropriations Committee may in its wisdom say, "Sorry, gentlemen, but we do not like the activity you propose or the men engaged in operating it, and so we are not disposed to grant the department charged with the carrying out of the provisions of that particular bill the necessary funds."

I can conceive of that being a legal function of the committee; I can even conceive of its occurring at any time.

But what I cannot conceive is that the Appropriations Committee is legally authorized to say to an executive department, "You may not employ John Jones or Jim Smith or Ed Brown, because in the judgment of this committee they are unfit for Government service because these men have engaged in subversive activities. They have individually at divers times expressed ideas, either orally or in writing, which this committee deems subversive." The committee is a legislative committee; by no stretch of the imagination can it be said to be a judicial body or the agent of a judicial body. True, it holds hearings. It questions these alleged subversive persons. It assumes judicial functions, arrogates to itself the right to act as judge, jury, and executioner. It usurps two functions specifically denied it by the Constitution—the judicial and the executive functions.

If it can remove, by the denial of funds, an executive officer, it can in like manner remove a judicial officer or a judicial district, or all judicial districts. It can say, "We will appropriate no money to pay the salary of Judge Jones or Judge Brown or Judge Smith," an authority which would render the judiciary subject to the whim of any Appropriations Committee. If it can do that it can also say, "We will appropriate money to pay the salaries of Judge Day, Judge Knight, or Judge Spring."

Gentlemen, you are getting into deep water; you would submerge the courts and the executive departments, render them dependent upon your will, and thus, in my opinion, engage in a type of subversive, un-American activity that would actually overthrow our form of government, not by force and violence but by usurpation of all executive and judicial authority through what we are pleased to call control of the purse strings.

I do not charge that the committee would do this, but I insist that you could if your obiter dictum in this particular case is legal and not in contravention of the Constitution.

The Constitution specifically prohibits the passing of any bill of attainder or bill of pains and penalties. Since this bill does not undertake to deprive, the persons involved in this case are not being deprived of their lives, it comes under the head of a bill of pains and penalties.

Mr. Chairman, democracy has its very basis and existence in difference of opinion, just like horse racing. If you are going to go out and say, as one of the other gentlemen so well said, that this man must think the way I want him to think or the way Congress wants him to think or the way somebody else wants him to think, then I say our democracy is undergoing a distinct change and, I fear, not for the better.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY].

Mr. MCMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I might say that I have a duty here to do which I do not exactly relish. I do not know all of the Members of the Kerr

committee. I do know two of them and I regard them very, very highly. I have a great deal of respect for them as individuals and as Members of this House and because I regard these men very highly, these two particular men I am speaking about, this becomes an onerous duty, but duty it is.

There have been a good many arguments made here as to why we in the Congress should not do the thing we are about to do today. I do not fool myself a bit. I think I know as I stand here what this House will do. I think I can give you the verdict now, but I can also tell you a few other things about the result of the action which this House will take. This House will eventually become the laughing stock of the Nation and it will become the laughing stock of all men of good will and intelligence everywhere.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. At this time I want to express my sincere and deep appreciation for the gentleman's warning.

Mr. McMURRAY. I thank the gentleman. Of course, in the brief time I have at my disposal I cannot go into the charges against these men. I do not know them. I did know Mr. Dodd's father. I consider him to be the greatest teacher I have ever had and the wisest man I have ever known and one of the warmest personal friends I ever expect to have in this world. In my opinion, he is the greatest teacher I have ever studied under, and I have studied under the great in a good many universities. I do not know the men under consideration.

Mr. COFFEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. Does not the gentleman think the Congress is taking considerable on itself to assume to disagree with the opinions of some of the greatest and most brilliant minds in America? Does not the gentleman think we are presuming a little bit to say that they are wrong and we are right?

Mr. McMURRAY. I am in agreement with what the gentleman has stated.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman have any idea that these people who made statements criticizing the prospective action on the part of the House have any idea of what the history of this thing has been and what we have been up against on it? Does the gentleman think they have? I know many in that group that have not.

Mr. McMURRAY. I may say in answer to what the gentleman has just stated that I have spent a good many years of my life studying the history of political theory and political thought, and I have studied the history of legislative bodies down through the ages. I know something about what legislatures can do and what legislatures ought not to do. I may say that there is a sincere question here that will be raised in any man's mind who knows anything about political theories or about law, and I do not profess to be a lawyer. This action does violate the separation of powers which is a part of our constitutional system. This Congress has the right to destroy, to refuse to appropriate for, or to abolish any job or any function performed in the Government of the United States, but this Congress, let me repeat, has no right to say that Mr. A can perform a certain function and Mr. B cannot perform this function. This power is executive in its nature and belongs to the President of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I fully appreciate the difficulty of my good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY]. I know he is trying to be as fair as he can be to the Members of this House. I have no quarrel with his attitude, and as far as I am concerned I am not going to quarrel with any Member who brings to the House his views if he feels sincerely that this is an unreasonable proceeding against any man.

I would like to say one or two things as an argument to those who have felt inclined to object to what the Kerr committee has been compelled to do.

You fully realize that a committee on un-American activities was at work for many years. That committee brought in a great many charges. The time of the House was being taken up, time after time, in the consideration of those charges, and the House in its wisdom finally passed a resolution, House resolution 105. I believe that all of the people who have been criticizing this action should take the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 9, when this resolution was adopted, and find out there in what particular they protested against this investigation. I have read the RECORD very carefully and I do not find where there was any protest against the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I recall very definitely when the resolution was adopted, on a voice vote, I voted "no."

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I do not question the gentleman. That is a perfectly safe statement as there can be no evidence on it. But there seemed to be no demand on the part of anyone at that time to go on record on that particular resolution. No one asked for a division. No one asked for tellers or a roll call. There was no opposition to it. It is quite different now.

But let me call your attention to the fact that this resolution delegated to this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee the duty of examining into certain allegations that had been made with a view to finding out what the previous association of these people had been. It has been charged that it was not proper for the committee to determine for itself a definition of subversive activities. I am not a lawyer. Everyone here knows that. I have been assured by the attorney for the committee that nowhere in the citations of the Supreme Court of the United States is there a clear definition of subversive activities. If there is, then I have been misled. If there is not, then certainly the people who know we were required to define subversive activities ought not to complain over the fact that the committee had to decide what a proper definition was.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Is there not a definition declared by the Kerr committee on page 5 of its report?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. It cannot be said you did not adopt a definition as to what subversive activities were.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. In answer to the question of the gentleman from New York: Suppose he was asked to give a definition of corn. He would have to know what corn was. Or suppose he was asked to grade apples, he would have to know what apples were.

When we were asked to find out specifically whether these people had been guilty of subversive activities and we found that there was no clear definition of subversive activities, the committee had to get a yardstick by which to proceed. If its procedure has been wrong the House can correct it. Certainly the House did not mean to say that the people who compose this committee must do a piece of work, and that it has failed to put the material or equipment into the hands of the committee to find out the truth. Certainly the House would not want the committee to come back after weeks of hearings and say it could proceed no further because it had no definition of subversive activities, therefore it could not do the work the House asked to be done.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. McMURRAY. I would just like to say to the gentleman that the criticism that I leveled here was at the legislation and not at the committee; it was leveled at the House and I was trying to do something to correct it. It was trying to do something that it has no legal right to do.

The gentlemen of the committee were given an order and they have carried out that order to the best of their ability; that I am willing to grant. Certainly I know the members of that committee are perfectly honorable men and I am willing to grant that the committee has acted in good faith. But this House, and this ought to be made clear, is undertaking to exercise an executive function through a legislative committee. The committee is not at fault. The House is at fault and it ought to be big enough to acknowledge its mistakes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, perhaps we ought to clarify the issue this afternoon and determine rather precisely what we are going to do. My good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] referred to himself as a juror as he approaches the responsibility of passing upon the fitness of three people now employed in the executive branch of the Government. He is not a juror because this is not a judicial proceeding. Let that be clear. It may be judicial in procedure, insofar as the Kerr committee may have been able to superimpose or abide by rules of evidence, but it is not a judicial proceeding.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a ministerial function.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a ministerial function that was put upon the committee by the Congress.

There has been a great deal of shadowboxing and rather shallow argument here this afternoon that does not enter into the matter one iota or lay down one case as to whether or not the matter has not been gone into correctly, as, for instance, the case that is made for the necessity for impeaching these people.

Go back and read accurately that provision in the Constitution. It does not become necessary to impeach them. Moreover, go back and read a portion of section 2 of article II of the Constitution, where you will find that the appointive civil officers can be roughly divided as constitutional officers, appointed by the President with the consent and affirmation of the Senate, and statutory officers, or inferior officers who are appointed under a law that is passed by Congress. If we have to have the language exactly, here it is:

> whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

These gentlemen have been appointed by heads of departments. It certainly is an ineffective appointing power that cannot reach out and take them back from the pay roll.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is a far more vital issue before us this afternoon, and it is not Goodwin Watson and it is not Frederick Schuman and it is not Dr. Dodd. They are only symbolic of the real issue before us.

The real issue is whether or not this body, that is charged under the Constitution as the keeper of the purse, without whose action not one dollar can go out of the Federal Treasury, can, under that authority, spell out that power to determine who shall be on the pay roll and who shall not.

Let me say to my friends, to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY], to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD], and the rest: Would they say that if Mr. Earl Browder had been appointed, that the Congress could not take him off the pay roll? What a strange result that would be. Certainly, I, as a Member of the legislative branch, do not propose to go along with that kind of an interpretation of my responsibility as a Member of a coordinate branch of this Government.

I said that the issue before us today is important. All the self-immolation of Dr. Schuman in his humorous criticism of the Kerr committee that was released the other day, all the theatrical display is not going to play down the real issue that is before us, and that is, to select for the articulation of governmental functions men who are going along with the perpetuity of our institutions and the sanctity of the traditions of this country.

Their freedom of speech is not involved. Dr. Dodd can go down on Marshall Square tonight and make any kind of a speech he wants to, but I am not going to see him on the pay roll of the Federal Government, the recipient of the taxpayers' money, and do it. That is a different thing.

Dr. Schuman can go down and stand beside the equestrian statue of Andrew Jackson in Lafayette Park this evening, make any kind of a subversive speech he desires, and within reason there will be no arrest and no restraining hand, but he is not going to do it in the terms that he has done it under the interdiction and the record that is before us and remain on the pay roll, if my vote can remove him.

Freedom is not involved here. It is a larger question. It is a question of whether or not the legislative branch in exercising its appropriating power is going to determine what people are fit and what people are not fit to discharge the various functions of government. That is it. That is the real issue.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman apparently sets up two standards, free speech of a person who is not on the pay roll, and free speech of a person who is on the pay roll. Who is going to judge the demarcation, also, between that which is subversive activity and that which is not? Shall we do it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. This body must do it insofar as it relates to an employee of Government.

Mr. CELLER. Where do we get the authority for it? Where is the authority for it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. This body is chargeable under the Constitution, dealing with powers of Congress out of which spring the executive functions. We can destroy every bureau in the executive branch this afternoon, if we can get the Senate to concur in our action. This is the body that has the great residual force in this country today. This is the important body, without which these others cannot exist and cannot carry on their functions. That is the thing we have to keep in mind.

I want to delineate for you what I think is the importance of this thing. First look at the ramifying functions of government today. It is one of the fruits of the World War, namely, control, regulation, economic dictatorship on every hand. It is one of those inexorable things that flow out of conflict. You cannot help it. We have to go along with that sort of thing when we are in conflict. After a while, those controls, those regulations harden into permanency. So more and more there has been that control, and it has been expanded with the years.

Look at the things that have been added since 1932. Go over in your minds some of the agencies, such as the Bituminous Coal Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Social Security Administration, the Federal Communications Commission, and others, all of which are exercising regulation and control over the goings and the comings of people, so that today government reaches closely into the life of every man, woman, and child, even now from the cradle to the grave, long before they ever heard of Sir William Beveridge.

What does it take to express those functions? It takes agencies. Look at the number we have today. Sixty-five years ago we had 7 departments of government and 2 independent agencies. Today we have 10 departments of government with many subordinate bureaus that did not exist before, and we have 80 independent agencies of government.

Think of it in terms of personnel. The documents in the Library will indicate that when this Government was launched back in 1789 we had about 300 people doing all the work; just 300. When we got down to 1861, in the period of the Civil war, we had 49,200. When Abraham Lincoln was the Commander in Chief there were 49,200 civilians on the pay roll of the Federal Government. In 1881 we got up to 107,000. At the peak of the World War we had 917,000. There was a progressive diminution and it got down to 565,000 in 1932, and then it began to go skyward. It is now about 2,606,000.

Think of what that number of personnel, if they are left to their own devices, without direction from Congress, can do. Give me a machine of 2,600,000 who think as I do, who think in this direction or that direction, and I can do much with them. One can do something with that kind of machine, if you give him that many people, and do you not think that you could subvert the Government of the United States?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Does the gentleman not think, in view of what he has said, that the Government can get along very nicely without these people and say for reasons of economy and efficiency that we shall refuse to appropriate money for them?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right. The first thing I want to spell out is this. The expansion of functions will continue as time goes on, with an increase in the number of agencies, with the vast ramification of personnel that runs into millions, and the fact is that that personnel, whether they be subordinates or administrators, give color, give force, give interpretation, give body, give direction to the things that government does today. A law that is passed by Congress is just as inert, as innocuous as that pair of spectacles, until some virility is forced into that law by a personality in the executive branch. They interpret the law. They make decisions. They exercise authority. Those interpretations may be slanted and oblique to achieve a purpose, namely, a modification of the fundamentals of government. It is the old story of the human equation. The beliefs, the convictions, the mental processes of those who administer, interpret, and enforce the law in terms of administrative orders and decrees can go far toward altering the whole structure of government.

The packers and stockyards case is a case in point where an agency can by administrative decree, implemented by a penalty, say what a business enterprise can do or not do, or what it must do.

The order is made effective and then it becomes necessary for the affected parties to go before the United States Supreme Court as suppliants in order to get justice, in order to get some relief from an administrator, notwithstanding the fact that that kind of interpretation was never the intent, never was the spirit of the Congress when it was placed upon the statute books.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mrs. LUCE. Is there any historical precedent in the long life of this body for the Dies committee or the Kerr committee? Has this ever happened before in our Nation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We had the McCormack committee before.

Mr. TABER. And also the Fish committee before that.

Mrs. LUCE. Yes; and has not something new been put in American life?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentlewoman from Connecticut is asking whether there was a committee prior to the Dies committee and the Kerr committee?

Mrs. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There was.

Mrs. LUCE. Doing a like kind of work?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. There was the McCormack committee and before that there was the Fish committee. I think the gentlewoman has in mind whether or not there has been any precedent for the Kerr subcommittee with authority to sit upon these people who have been charged by the Dies committee and then subsequently bring in a resolution to drop them from the pay roll.

Mrs. LUCE. When did the Congress begin to discharge people for their political convictions from the pay roll of the Government?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think perhaps the first person to be discharged——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman 5 minutes more. Will the gentleman yield to me there?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. TABER. The first one I remember was 21 years ago in the District of Columbia appropriation bill, brought in by the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Johnson.

Mrs. LUCE. In the history of our Government?

Mr. TABER. I cannot go beyond that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wanted to make it a little more personal by saying that I offered an amendment several years ago for the removal of David Lasser from the pay roll, which was subsequently agreed to by the Senate, and signed by the President.

Mrs. LUCE. Is this committee a new type of committee in the American Congress?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I don't think so.

Mrs. LUCE. May I ask for the historical reference?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry that I do not have that at the moment. I think there are a number of precedents for this kind of action.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I must continue for a moment. I want to stress this afternoon the importance of this issue. Because of the number of people on the pay roll, and the number of agencies, and the diversity of the functions, and those functions to be authorized by the Congress, will be interpreted by some personality in the executive branch of Government. That makes those personalities in the executive branch all-important. Will anybody be so bold as to say that if we can make the office, if we can set the salary, if we can determine the classification and every qualification, that the Congress cannot then pass upon the fitness from the standpoint of loyalty or otherwise of any person who is on the public pay roll?

Mr. SADOWSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I cannot yield just now.

We pass on qualifications of persons in so many other respects. We say if they are beyond a certain age they cannot hold a job. We say if there is a physical disability they cannot have a civil-service rating. We say if they do not pass a prescribed intelligence test they cannot have a rating. There are many qualifications that are made. Shall we, then, not be able to say that we cannot lay down some kind of standard of loyalty and mental direction? I do not know why we have to go into a court of law after letting a subcommittee of our own body examine into the affiliations of a man on the pay roll who, for instance, is preoccupied with an analysis of foreign broadcasting and not be able to say among ourselves by solemn vote that, in our judgment, in the judgment of a majority of this body, we do not believe he is fit to remain on the pay roll, and therefore we take unto ourselves authority to refuse any funds for the position that he holds. It seems to me that that obtains from the very fact that the job exists by virtue of the action of Congress at some time or other in creating the agency and the position where such a person is employed.

Mr. McMURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield briefly.

Mr. McMURRAY. I should like to say to the gentleman that he is perfectly correct when he says that Congress has authority to lay down general rules applicable to all people employed by the Government that are not laid down specifically in the Constitution. Also it is true that Congress may create or destroy any position that is not created by the Constitution itself. But the Congress may not say, "Mr. A may have this job and Mr. B may not have this job." There is a very clear distinction there. Congress does not have that authority. It is an Executive function, given by the Constitution to the President of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to the gentleman that is not a substantial deduction in seeking to delineate the demarcation between the two branches of government. If the Congress can say that the United States Civil Service Commission shall have authority to make all necessary rules and regulations to put a man in a job or take him out, then the Congress can also say, "The United States Civil Service Commission shall follow the following rules and regulations made by this Congress in qualifying a man, first of all to go on the pay roll and, secondly, to remain on the pay roll after he gets there."

We can delegate a rule-making power or we can spell out in detail the question of fitness for office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall want to allude to only one more thing. We are gradually getting to the fruition of an issue that has been growing for a long time, the issue between the bureaus that seek to branch out beyond the intent of Congress, on the one hand, and the Congress on the other hand in the determination of the policies of government.

It is significant that we see so many bureaus that never have any difficulty. Here is the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, under Mr. Crowley; here is the Veterans' Administration, under General Hines; here is the Federal Trade Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission; here are a great many agencies in Government who carefully go about their business as set down by the legislative branch, and there is never any controversy.

But is it not significant that our controversy is almost always with the same

agencies, such as the Farm Security Administration, the National Labor Relations Board, the Wage and Hour Administration, the A. A. A. on occasions, and some others, but almost invariably those agencies where they seek to spin out and spell out power that is not theirs. The latest instance of it, of course, was the Secretary of Agriculture, who went back to the act of 1938, and then came before us with a long opinion by his solicitor to the effect that in that act that was passed 5 years ago they found all the necessary authority for incentive payments. I never saw such a twisted and tortured interpretation of an act in a long time. That is the difficulty. That is the thing that must be disciplined. When these instrumentalities, these people, these administrators, and their subordinates undertake to go too far, or affiliate themselves with organizations that, by force and violence, or by other means, seek ultimately to destroy the Government of the United States, or are subversive, because they seek to give it an altogether different direction, then it is high time that the Congress of the United States step in.

I say this is a great issue. Either we are going to do this job and do it pretty soon or there is going to be a development of a great and entrenched disrespect for this body.

Not so long ago there came to my desk this pamphlet of about 20 pages in length. It is from the Allowance and Allotment Section, Finance Division, of the War Department. I suppose the youngsters got it out, but let me read to you from page 8. This is under the heading "Fun after hours":

> Meetings of the House and Senate are still the best shows in Washington. The seats are not as comfortable as some, but to any person with a spark of imagination the sight and sound of the country's legislators in one Chamber is excnting enough to make up for the lack of a Mickey Mouse. See your Congressman and Senator, more probably their secretaries, for tickets to the galleries of both Houses.

Sight and sound. The best show in Washington. Great dignity to that, is there not? Great respect on the part of those on the pay roll.

You had better meet the issue now, because bureaucracy will grow to a point where it will lick you if you do not.

Consider the power of Federal personnel to manage public opinion. The Budget Bureau's report presented to the House Appropriations Committee 2 years ago indicated that 153 agencies of Government had a pay roll consisting of 2,995 full-time employees and 31,618 part-time employees on informational work alone at an annual cost of $27,700,000. In a single year these agencies issued 300,000,000 assorted publications of which 283,000,000 were not required by law. There you have evidence of how public opinion can be managed by the Federal Government personnel through the printed word.

In addition to this consider the control of the Federal Communications Commission over radio licenses and the authority of the Postmaster General to exclude from the mails publications which he deems to be unfit or for any other reason.

In addition to the expanding functions of Government, the growth of Federal agencies, the vast increase in Federal personnel, and the potential power to completely manage public opinion, consider the force of administrative decisions which are made by administrators throughout the Federal structure. Farmers can be penalized for failure to comply with 3–A regulations and every citizen is warned on the very ration book which he carries that a $10,000 fine and imprisonment might be imposed.

The War Production Board with control over material can suggest penalties for violation of its regulations. The War Labor Board can enjoin upon an industry the so-called maintenance of membership clause under which an individual worker automatically loses his job unless he complies and joins the unit which has been selected for bargaining purposes. The War Manpower Commission is entrusted with a task of classifying industry and of enforcing its decrees.

Much of this administrative authority is not reviewable by the courts and every Member of Congress knows the heroic and unsuccessful effort which has been made to secure the enactment of the Walter-Logan bill under which Federal courts could review administrative decisions. In a sense we are not so far from that day when a New Jersey pants presser and a York battery manufacturer were punished for violations of the N. R. A. administrative code.

In addition, the essential point about the exercise of administrative power is that it is good or bad in proportions as the administrator, his advisers, and his policy-making subordinates and others interpret and influence administrative decisions. As I pointed out a few moments ago, many agencies of Government like the F. D. I. C., the I. C. C., the F. T. C., the R. F. C., the Veterans' Administration, and others never seem to have any difficulty whereas the F. C. C., the N. L. R. B., O. P. A., O. W. I., O. C. D., F. S. A., and others develop friction with the Congress and with the people.

An administrative decision is, therefore, effected and acceptable in proportion as it is wisely administered in accordance with the Constitution, the statutes and the intent of Congress. The basic truth, therefore, is its personnel that makes government, gives it direction, that subverts government and when such personnel follows a strange ideology which is un-American, which is not in accord with the Constitution, the statute, the intent of Congress, and the traditions of this country, who will say that it is not the responsibility of Congress to remove such a person from the Federal rolls.

No officeholder has a vested interest in a Federal position. In a case of those enumerated in the Constitution, they must be confirmed by one branch of the Congress and provision is made for their removal. That same Constitution also clarifies the method of appointment and vests the power to appoint inferior officers in the President, in the courts, or in the heads of departments. They are, therefore, amenable to the jurisdiction of Congress since those who are before us now are statutory officers.

If we can prescribe the standards of age, intelligence, social behavior, and physical condition by which a person finds his way upon the Federal rolls, certainly Congress possesses the power to pass upon the beliefs and convictions of an individual in determining his fitness to carry out duties, functions, and responsibilities which came into being as a result of Congressional enactment. It would be strange, indeed, if we could prevent a person from becoming a Federal employee or remove him if he did become a Federal employee for reasons of physical disability, and not be able to keep him off of the Federal pay roll or to remove him if he were already on the Federal pay roll because of some strange quirk in his convictions, beliefs, or mental processes. This does not impair his freedom of speech or belief whatsoever, for he is entirely free to advance his gospel and his convictions wheresoever he will. It is only that the Congress determines that he shall not remain on the pay roll because he is deemed unfit in view of his beliefs to translate the responsibilities which have been entrusted to him as a result of congressional enactment.

Let me emphasize once more that it is not a judicial proceeding and need not be. The Bill of Rights is not involved, nor is the question of due process of law involved.

Let me make one further observation with respect to the responsibility of Congress in the exercise of this power over Federal personnel. As I have suggested before, not a single dollar can be appropriated save in pursuance of an act by the Congress. It is the people's money. Congress has the right and the duty to determine how and for whom the people's funds shall be expended and no one will argue that the people of this country intend that their funds shall be expended for the salary of any person whose beliefs and convictions as evidenced by his own statements are not in accord with the spirit, the traditions, the laws, and the Constitution of this Republic.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, if I appear to lack my usual vehemence of utterance this afternoon it will not be because I have any lack of confidence in the position that has been taken either by the Congress or the Kerr committee. The fact is I have not been well for several days and I do not want to become the victim of any undue excitement; but there is not anything about this that should excite anybody, is there?

I have sat here and listened to the statements from the gentlemen who usually have been making the same statements ever since I have been in Congress. They seek in every way possible to find an alibi, to find an alibi some place, no matter how ridiculous it may be, in order to justify the action which they are bound

and determined to take with respect to the present amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman has referred to some of these positions as being somewhat ridiculous. This may be a little extreme in referring to utterances of our colleagues, but it is rather paradoxical to hear these eloquent speeches made defending these gentlemen on constitutional grounds, invoking the great Constitution of the United States to protect people who have no respect whatsoever for that Constitution, who by their associations and utterances show they have no respect for it and who are doing everything they can short of getting in jail to break it down.

Mr. KEEFE. First of all let me say that I did not solicit the position on this committee. I was placed on the committee and would much have preferred not to serve, but I am going to tell you right now that I consider this work important enough that I am going to stay on that committee and see this job through. The people of the United States of America insist that this job be done.

It is going to be done and we are not going to be dissuaded by a lot of academic arguments that have been concocted such as those that have been heard here this afternoon raising constitutional and other questions in order to obstruct the attitude and work of the Kerr committee. I did not hear any of these gentlemen who got up on the floor of this House today raise a single one of those questions when the resolution creating this committee was before the House. I recall that I was one of the individuals who took the floor of this House and asked that there be a committee established, or a forum established, before which these men who have been accused of subversive activities would have a right and an opportunity to come and present their opinions and their defense to those charges. It was because of that attitude that the Congress created this committee and gave it a job to do. You said, "Go out and do this job." We have tried to comply with your directions.

How many of you have read the testimony of Goodwin Watson? Not one of you except the members of this committee. You will be given some of that testimony before this argument is over.

Mr. CELLER. Where is the testimony?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield to the gentleman. He knows the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin declines to yield.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot yield at this time. I stated that I declined to yield.

You have heard that this was a star chamber session; you have heard all sorts of similar accusations, how these people have been denied their constitutional rights, and all that sort of thing. Let me read just a couple of sentences from the testimony of Goodwin Watson. I am going to take up his testimony in detail tomorrow. Let us see what Goodwin Watson told the committee as compared with what he is telling the public today; let us see whether he spoke before us as some of you who are speaking in his behalf are speaking on the floor of the House this afternoon. I asked him this question:

> Professor Watson, there has been some criticism leveled at the committee because of making some charges against you. Now, if you were on such a committee as a Member of Congress and had submitted to you your writings standing alone as they are advocating clearly and definitely the destruction of the profit system and the abolition of the capitalistic state and the substitution of a planned economy in its place, would not you feel that a Congress having the interests and welfare of the American way at heart should be justified in calling such a person to account?
>
> Dr. WATSON. Yes; I would.
>
> Representative KEEFE. Now, you feel, do you not, in view of your own statement admitting these writings and statements and admitting your present attitude, your complete error and renunciation of the philosophy which you expressed repeatedly down to 1937 and 1938, that they, standing alone, would be sufficient to put any government on notice and demand some investigation of that; would you not think so?
>
> Dr. WATSON. I would think so.

At the conclusion of the hearing here is what Dr. Watson said:

> I thank you gentlemen of the subcommittee. I think this has been a very real endeavor to have a meeting of minds on a very difficult problem.

Does that sound as though Dr. Watson was subjected to third-degree star-chamber proceedings? Does it not make it clear to you gentlemen as I shall make it clear before I shall have finished some time tomorrow when this amendment is offered, that Dr. Watson himself well knew that because of his own statements, his own advocacy, his own writings, that the Congress and this committee was fully justified in bringing about this investigation.

Some of you gentlemen have said these men are being persecuted because they have opinions different from those of the majority. Is that true? Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I profess to be a constitutionalist. I will defend any place the right of my colleagues, Dr. Watson, or anybody else to assert an opinion different from my own. Make no mistake about that. I will defend the right of Dr. Watson to advocate the abolition of the profit system if he so desires. I will defend his right to advocate in the proper place the abolition of the capitalistic state if he so desires. But let me tell you where I draw the line and where you ought to draw the line. When Dr. Watson and men of his type are unwilling to wait for constitutional processes to take place to bring about the changes they advocate, but who advocate revolution, or as they are pleased to call it, "a sharp break," then Dr. Watson and I part company and I say to Dr. Watson, "When you advocate this revolutionary process, and when you advocate this so-called sharp break, as you are pleased to call it, then you are not willing to submit to constitutional processes; you want to short-cut them as your friends over in Russia did, through revolution, and you and I are going to part company there." Do you take issue with me?

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield. I do not think the gentleman can add anything to the discussion at this time.

I want to say to you that I have listened to a great many of these professorial intelligentsias and so far as I am concerned, if there are any on the floor here today I suggest that they speak in their own time.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to call attention to one or two things. I will try to give you the whole story tomorrow. This committee listened to the evidence, as you asked them to do. This committee heard from the lips of each of these witnesses their own story and their own explanation. As I stated, I will be glad to yield tomorrow when I go into the evidence. At this time, however, I want to call attention to just one bit of evidence.

Here is an article written by Goodwin Watson entitled "The Great Choice, Reformation or Transformation." Take that article and read it. It is written by Goodwin Watson, by no one else. It is his statement as to what he then believed in 1934. And let me tell you this, there are two lines of thought as expressed by these gentlemen. One is that you can accomplish a social objective by a process of gradualism. That is the New Deal way as he describes it. You can change our social economy step by step. He points with sorrow to the fact that the Socialists over in Austria tried it. He said those Socialists in Austria did the things that F. D. R. talks about in the New Deal. Then he went over there after the revolution in Austria, and he saw everything all changed. He saw how those Socialists there in Austria who had planned housing and who had planned all these betterments of mankind had been crushed by the Fascists at the point of a sword. All gone now, he says. He painted a terrible picture. He said those people felt that they could accomplish those social objectives and retain them by a process of gradualism, and they failed. Then he goes on in this article, and it is here, and states:

> But you never can hope to achieve a real social objective and a real social change in behalf of all the people without—what he calls sharp break—cutting it right off, destroying it overnight.

That is Goodwin Watson speaking, not me. There is his article.

Let me read further:

> There are four major lines of argument—humanitarian, psychological, economic, and political. Each of them leads to the conclusion that the apparent attractiveness of gradualism is fallacious, that only the sharp break brings promise of success.

Read his article. Now, when he is asked about this thing, what does he say? What is his answer?

"Why," he says, "I just do not believe in that any more. That was the effusion of an academic mind written in 1934."

A Ph. D. from Columbia University, a doctor of philosophy, if you please, a teacher of psychology in Columbia University at the time, and he says that it was an academic effusion of an immature mind. He says, "I do not any longer believe in it. I disavow myself of that sort of philosophy."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I could take you down through many more here. There is New America, for instance, which he conceived after he came back from Europe, after he visited over there. He set up this plan to make over America. It is all here. I confronted him with it.

I asked him, "What did you mean by this, Dr. Watson?" He says, "I disavow that now, I repudiate that now, I do not believe in that now." "How do I know that you have repudiated it?" "Have you ever written an article repudiating anything that you ever said from 1932 down to 1938? Have you ever made a speech that has been given publicity in the press showing that that is no longer your position or attitude?"

"No, I did not think it was necessary."

He belonged to some organizations, and had been having contact and affiliation with others. He is following this party line right down until 1941 and yet he thinks that we are so naive as to believe in the face of those statements, which I will read and present to you tomorrow from the hearings on this situation, that Dr. Watson ha- been unjustly accused.

Why, he brings in a whole line-up of people who say he is a great man, and a fine citizen.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman state what position Dr. Watson is holding?

Mr. KEEFE. Dr. Watson is Chief of the Analysis Division in the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service of the Federal Communications Commission. He analyzes and writes the broadcasts coming from foreign countries and interprets them for our Army and Navy, and so on. That is his job.

Let me tell you this story. You hear about these people coming to his defense as they have. You have received his letter listing a whole list of people who say he is a great American, and so forth. I had some of those come into my office the other day. I finally asked them:

"Do any of you people by any chance happen to know a certain professor at the University of Wisconsin, whom I named? He has been there for many years, an outstanding man."

One of them spoke up and said, "Yes, I know him." I said, "What is your estimate of him? If you were asked to write a recommendation now, what would be your estimate of that professor?" He said, "He is an estimable gentleman. Why, he has a fine, Christian character, he has been there for 25 years, he is one of the leading citizens of Madison, Wis." And I said, "You would be willing to dictate such a recommendation to my stenographer now?" "Yes, without question." Then I said, "You would be interested in this," and I showed him a very recent report and clipping from the Milwaukee Journal showing that the police of Milwaukee, in making a routine inspection of one of the hotels, found this professor in a room with a 19-year-old-blonde student. He came into court the next morning and plead guilty to a minor charge of lewd and lascivious conduct.

What becomes of your recommendation? You just do not know the facts. You do not know the facts, and if you did know the facts you would not make that kind of recommendation. So, Mr. Chairman, I say to these people who come in on the floor of this House this afternoon and expostulate their beliefs in the innocence of this man or that man, contending they have not had a fair trial or a fair hearing, let me point out to them that they just simply do not know the facts; they do not know what these people have been thinking or they do not know what they have been doing, or what their associations have been. Before we get through, unfortunately, it will be our duty to tell you something about them.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Let me say to the gentleman that I have refused time and time again to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. McMURRAY. Is it because you are afraid?

Mr. KEEFE. There is nothing about the gentleman or the facts that makes me afraid. I am quite familiar with him and I want no further interruption from him. And let that go into the RECORD, too. I do not like to say that to a colleague from my State, but I know his attitudes and background and I make no bones about that.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I just want to say this in conclusion. Do not get the idea that the Kerr committee is proceeding through prejudice in this matter. Remember this, that that committee is composed of three fine gentlemen from your side, the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]; and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS], and myself.

Every action that this committee has taken up to date has been a judicial action, despite the manner in which we have been picked to pieces by those who do not like the committee's action.

The action of the committee has been unanimous in every single instance that we are presenting to the membership of this House.

In creating this committee you told this committee what you wanted us to do. We have tried to act in a judicial manner in doing the very thing that you asked us to do.

Some of you are here criticizing the committee because it has finally been forced to the conclusion reflected in the amendment to be offered to the pending bill. May I say to you that no other reasonable alternative was possible in the face of the facts presented.

Now listen to this evidence. Do we need any further evidence than the word of the man himself?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot yield.

What could be accomplished by bringing in every Tom, Dick, and Harry and letting him testify. I will submit the record tomorrow of the charges.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with an unusual situation. A distinguished and responsible Member of this House, made statements on the floor in the early part of this year on his own personal responsibility, to the effect he had evidence that a number of people had been employed by the executive branch of the Government whose associations and affiliations with individual, groups, and organizations in the past led him to believe they were unfit for public office.

In the subsequent debates on the floor charges and countercharges were made. In order to handle these charges the House set up the so-called Kerr committee to investigate and report their findings to the House. It is not historically correct to state that the so-called Dies committee, as a committee, made those charges. The record will disclose that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], on his own responsibility as a Member of this House, made the statements and the charges. As a result the Kerr committee has made a careful and complete investigation of the life and background of a number of these employees. They have the files of the civil service, the F. B. I., and the Dies committee before them. They have called the accused, presented them with the charges and evidence. Furthermore they have given the accused a fair and complete opportunity to meet every charge. As a result, we have their findings and recommendations.

Undoubtedly the Congress has the legal right and power to create agencies, prescribe the qualifications and duties of Government personnel, and to provide means for their appointment and discharge. It further has the constitutional right to appropriate or to withhold appropriations for the support of any

agency or employee of the Federal Government. It has the right and power to abolish any agency which it creates; to change the qualifications and duties of officials from that first prescribed; or to remove them from office, by withholding funds for the payment of salaries or compensation. To hold otherwise would be a confession or admission the Congress could create and support agencies and provide funds for employment of personnel but would have no recourse for the abuse of power or subversion of functions by agencies and personnel. This would leave the people helpless and with no recourse for redress of wrongs except by force or illegal methods.

Under such a theory as advocated by self-annointed liberals and self-confessed intellectuals the executive branch of the Government would be immune from control or regulation by the people. Administrative officials appointed by the Executive could violate legislative intent, subvert governmental functions, and change our whole system of economies, and government without let or hindrance by the legislative branch.

I will say to the alluring and attractive gentlewoman from Connecticut, in reply to her question to the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], if the action of the House in this instance was without precedent and constituted a phenomenon in public affairs the phenomenon we are witnessing for the first time is Socialists, Communists, and their followers and defenders, aided and abetted by self-annointed liberals and intellectuals, insisting that Socialists, Communists, and any person who does not believe in our system of government, have a vested interest in appointive public office and can use that office to change our social, economic, and political system without let or hindrance from the Congress of the United States. It is both amusing and distressing to hear Members of Congress, the press, and the executive branch defend the rights of these appointive officials, who have been declared unfit to continue in public office because of their affiliations, associations, or membership in subversive organizations to remain in public office, because forsooth they say the Congress has no right to remove them.

There is no question of a lack of freedom of speech involved. The question involved is whether or not appointive Federal officials, who by their past affiliations, associations, or membership in subversive organizations should be retained as officials of a government they do not support, and in whose principles they do not believe. No person should be employed by our Government to administer its laws or to carry out its functions in war or peace who does not wholeheartedly subscribe to our way of life and our system of constitutional representative government. No appointive official has a vested property right in his position and when found to be unfit should be immediately removed by the proper appointing officer. Failing to do so the Congress is in good conscience duty bound to act for the protection of our Government and our people by removing such person.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT

The appropriation "Emergency fund for the President," contained in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, as supplemented by the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, is hereby continued available until June 30, 1944, and the limitation on the amount which may be expended for objects of a confidential nature is hereby increased by $25,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 2, after line 25, insert the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of the funds continued available by this paragraph shall be allotted to or expended for the National Resources Planning Board or the Farm Security Administration or for any of the functions of either said Board or said Administration."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the emergency fund for the President was created for the purpose of furthering war activities. That is what we had in mind in the House of Representatives when we created that fund. All of us want to further the war activities to the utmost. Therefore, I am assuming that there will be no objection to continuing this fund insofar as it relates to anything of that kind.

However, many allotments have been made out of the President's fund for other purposes than the promotion of war activities. It is my desire to see that two of these activities for which the House has refused funds are not in a position where they can be carried on out of the President's emergency fund.

The National Resources Planning Board was given a Budget estimate by the President. They came before the Independent Offices Subcommittee and were given a hearing. They were refused the recommendation for an appropriation. When the bill came before the House of Representatives, no one stood up and offered an amendment to restore that activity to the independent offices appropriations bill.

The Farm Security Administration was denied an appropriation in the agriculture appropriation bill by the agriculture subcommittee. It was given no appropriation by the House of Representatives.

I hope this amendment will be adopted so that we can confine this activity to the things which will promote the war effort, and that the money that is left, about $89,000,000 at the present time, can be available for the war activities as it is needed. I hope this amendment will be adopted. I had hoped that the committee might accept it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the question raised by the gentleman's amendment is not one which goes to the merits of an appropriation for the Planning Commission or an appropriation for the Farm Security Administration. It is a deeper, more vital, more serious question than that. The House has denied under points of order appropriations for both activities. It has denied in the appropriation bills which it has sent to the Senate funds for the Planning Commission and funds for the Farm Security Administration. Those appropriations may or may not be included in the bill when it reaches the Senate.

The real question raised here this afternoon by the gentleman's amendment is a question of the confidence of this body and of the American people in the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. This is the emergency fund for the President and the sum affected by the amendment is to be used by the President for confidential purposes. The adoption of the amendment would not be construed as a decision adverse to the Planning Commission or to the Farm Security Administration, but as a reflection on the President through imposition of a limitation never before applied to any President in time of war. The only interpretation that would be placed on the adoption of such an amendment by the press and the people of the country would be that an unjustifiable restriction had been imposed. The question before us is whether the Members of the House of Representatives, in time of war, in a period of great national peril, at a time when all loyal citizens and all Members of the American Congress on both sides of the aisle in particular, are supporting American arms, are supporting the Army and Navy, and especially the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States. It will not materially affect these two minor activities, but it will be interpreted both here and abroad, both by our allies and by the Axis, as a lack of confidence in the President and the splendid leadership with which he is winning the war and which entitles him to the gratitude of every American. I do not believe this body will be disposed to adopt such an amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a little intrigued by the argument of my good friend from Missouri, for whom I entertain a real affection, when he says that the adoption of this amendment might be a confession of lack of faith in the Commander in Chief. In the first place, it has nothing to do with the war effort in that sense. It seeks only to restrict the use of emergency funds for the Farm Security Administration and the National Resources Planning Board.

I think we do the President a service by adopting this amendment. He may not have in mind wanting to provide any emergency funds for these functions, but when they come to the White House and exercise gentle pressure on him, too often he cannot very well say "No." We simply hold up his hands and give him an opportunity to say, "I am sorry, but I can give you no funds for that purpose out of the emergency fund because Congress has restricted their use."

We must draw the line somewhere. Maybe you have been curious as to the size of the blank checks we have given the President from time to time. We have given him altogether, since July 11, 1940, $631,000,000. That is a blank check. That is a lot of money, if he could dispose of it in any way he saw fit.

I recognize that the President must have some funds for confidential and strictly emergent purposes. There is an item here of $10,500,000 for confidential purposes for the State Department. I would not care to go in and probe and explore to find out precisely what he is going to do with it, and probably lay out some restrictions that would impede the war effort. He must have some latitude. But there are a great many things on the domestic front that are not emergent in nature, and there is no reason why the Congress should be bypassed.

You will find some of these recited on page 70. Take the travel expenses for the Civil Service Commission, for example. Congress is in session all the time. The Committee on Appropriations is constantly dealing with deficiencies and supplementals. It does not take very long to come up here and say, "Gentlemen, we need $400,000 for travel," and it does not take Congress very long to act on such a request. But every time an allocation is made for anything other than a really emergent or confidential purpose out of the emergency fund, it is bypassing the appropriating power of the Congress.

There is still $89,000,000 remaining in that fund. I am not disposed to cut it. I am not disposed to hamstring the President in his confidential operations as Commander in Chief. But I do believe with respect to these two functions, the Farm Security Administration and the National Resources Planning Board, which have felt the interdiction of this House by a solemn vote, that while the bill is now pending in the Senate it should not be possible to go around the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress of the United States by dipping into a blank-check fund. For that reason, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York should be adopted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. CASE. As a matter of fact, on page 13 of this bill Congress has made an appropriation of funds for the National Resources Planning Board, showing that they have been able to come to the deficiency committee and get funds for this year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly; but for the current year of 1943, to carry on and close up their work. Why, then, should not this restriction be placed in the bill?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. For these two secret funds, of course, there is no evidence in the hearings. Has there been testimony before the Committee on Appropriations justifying these funds, giving some idea as to the necessity for such large amounts?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The House has passed on both of these items, and they have been reported out by the committee. I refer to the funds of the National Resources and Planning Board, under the committee arrangement, and limiting or diminishing the funds for the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. What I mean is as to the rest of the money, the $25,000,000 and the $10,000,000 for the State Department. As to this $25,000,000, has there been some justification for its expenditure?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not a member of this deficiency subcommittee, but I am sure there was some justification.

Mr. TABER. I would say that there was a reason why it should be done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This amendment should be adopted, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 111, noes 68.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers, and move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri demands tellers, and the question before the House is, Shall the Committee rise?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 71, noes 109.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. The vote now is on the question as to whether or not the Committee will rise?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. Tellers are demanded.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. TABER to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 93, noes 124.

So the motion to rise was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on ordering tellers on the Taber amendment.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON of Missouri to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 133, noes 104.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES

Defraying deficits in treasuries of municipal governments, Virgin Islands: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1943, for defraying the deficit in the treasury of the municipal government of St. Croix because of the excess of current expenses over current revenues for the fiscal year 1943, $45,000.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the item just read. It is an appropriation not authorized by law and legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. PACE. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the additional sum of $45,000 is required to meet the deficit in the treasury of the municipality of St. Croix, Virgin Islands, for the fiscal year 1943. This amount is in addition to the sum of $114,800 already appropriated for this purpose. The reason for the increase in the deficit is due, primarily, to the effect of the war on local revenues. In other words, the war has resulted in substantial reductions in income from such sources as the gasoline tax, the import and export duty, wharfage, excise duty, internal revenues, and so forth. Here is a list of these items indicating that the estimated income for 1943 is about $51,000 less than the actual income for 1942:

Defraying deficits in treasuries of municipal governments, Virgin Islands, 1943

Sources of revenues	Actual, 1941–42	Fiscal year 1943 as revised Feb. 1, 1943, based on actual receipts as of that period	Difference
Real property tax	$50,200	$50,000	$200
Income tax	30,400	30,000	400
Automobile tax	7,700	6,500	1,200
Gasoline tax	10,300	6,000	4,300
Import duty	5,600	2,500	3,100
Export duty	18,000	3,500	14,500
Ship dues	2,400	600	1,800
Wharfage	3,900	1,200	2,700
Stamp dues	2,500	1,500	1,000
Vendue fees	45	100	+55
Tax on inheritance	600	300	300
Court fees	5,100	3,500	1,600
Fees from burgher briefs	5,500	4,000	1,500
Excise duty	18,500	13,000	5,500
Internal revenues	17,500	10,000	7,500
Sundry revenues	18,600	16,000	2,600
Total	196,845	148,700	48,145
Expenditures	311,845	314,700	2,855
Deficit	115,000	166,000	51,000
United States contribution	115,000	114,800	200
		51,200	51,200

So, as will be seen, the Federal Government is, in a sense, responsible for this deficiency.

I am advised that every effort has been made to economize and that the rates of pay of municipal employees are at the minimum. The municipality at the present time is operating on funds obtained on loans from local banks with municipal buildings used as collateral. It is absolutely necessary to maintain the local government and to have these funds made available as soon as possible.

The appropriation is subject to a point of order, but this money should be made available at the earliest possible moment. If the point of order is made, and is sustained, the item will be put back in the Senate and the money will be appropriated eventually. The only effect the point of order can have would be to delay it, when it is needed immediately. In view of the serious effect the lack of this appropriation will have, I ask the gentleman from Georgia to withdraw his point of order.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, replying to the chairman of the committee, the only reason I made the point of order is due to the evidence disclosed in the hearings.

It appears that the municipal authorities of St. Croix have a right to fix their own budget. The only thing we have a

right to do is to appropriate the deficit. We have no voice over the expenditure of their funds, how much their salary schedule should be, and so forth. This has been going on for years, since 1927. Mr. Thoron, of the Department, makes this statement:

I have had considerable correspondence with the officials down there to convince them that a deficit was not something that they should expect to have made good, and that they should cut out some of their expenditures.

We have already appropriated for the municipality of St. Croix, in the regular appropriation bill, a deficit of $148,000. Now they come back for another deficit of $45,000 out of a total budget of $300,000.

There are many municipalities in this Nation that would welcome the Federal authorities appropriating their deficit. I see no reason why we should continue to pour money into the Virgin Islands, which has a population of only 25,000 people.

I regret I cannot yield to the request of the chairman, and I insist on the point of order. If these requests are to be made in the future the Department should go to the proper legislative committee and seek appropriate legislation authorizing these deficit appropriations and the terms and conditions under which they may be made.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PATMAN). The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 303. Appropriations contained herein may be used to reimburse the Emergency Fund for the President for advances made therefrom to meet pay-roll obligations for which funds are provided in this act.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KERR: On page 36, after line 23, insert as a new section the following:

"SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to the date of the enactment of this act."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I make a point of order against the language in line 3 of the amendment just offered, as follows:

Which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States—

And so forth. This amendment seeks to limit an appropriation in some other appropriation bill. It goes beyond this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is made in order by House Resolution 105, authorizing the investigation, providing—as shown on page 2 of the report, House Report No. 448—as follows:

Any legislation approved by the committee as a result of this resolution may be incorporated in any general or special appropriation measure emanating from such committee or may be offered as a committee amendment to any such measure notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI.

Under that provision, the amendment is in order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say in reply, Mr. Chairman, that would be true if the amendment offered were limited to this appropriation, but the amendment offered extends to appropriations not made by this bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PATMAN). The language appears to be rather plain and specific to the Chair, "any legislation approved by the Committee as a result of this resolution may be incorporated in any general or special appropriation measure."

Therefore the point of order is overruled.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that under the order of the House, 2 hours' general debate—to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself—is now in order on this amendment, at the close of which 2 hours the final vote shall be taken on the amendment and all amendments thereto?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has correctly stated the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PATMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2714, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944, SENT TO CONFERENCE

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2346) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SNYDER, STARNES of Alabama, KERR, MAHON, POWERS, ENGEL, and CASE.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. REED of New York and Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks.)

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from a bulletin entitled "News and Views."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include in one an article on transportation and in the other an article on labor statesmanship.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Sarasota Herald-Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 18, 1943

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. The first order of business tomorrow will be the sending of the tax bill to conference.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that will be followed by further consideration of the deficiency bill we have been working on today?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a brief pamphlet.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon by including certain editorials and to include a black line graph one column wide and 3 inches long.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] introduced a bill providing for the repeal of the law which authorizes renegotiation of Government contracts. The gentleman from Michigan made several observations at the time to which I should like to reply.

He read a letter saying that renegotiation is a burden on small business. He said that it is creating a great bureaucracy which consumes the time of businessmen and regulates their profits without any legislative standard. He declared that the War and Navy Departments have used renegotiation to provide themselves with funds which Congress would not have appropriated. He insists that businesses have not voluntarily accepted renegotiation settlements. Last of all, he claimed that renegotiation is not necessary because all excessive profits will be eliminated by what he calls a 90-percent excess-profits tax.

I should like to answer the first of these criticisms very briefly, Mr. Speaker, and then pay particular attention to his claim that the excess-profits tax eliminates all exorbitant war profits.

First, the gentleman from Michigan evidently overlooked the fact that any company doing less than $100,000 of war business each year is exempt from renegotiation, and the suggestion has been made to Congress that this be increased to $500,000. That exemption removes from the scope of the act almost all small business and therefore the law cannot be a burden on small business as the gentleman implied. Moreover, if he had looked closely at the figures on the companies which have been cleared by the price adjustment boards, he would have seen that many small businesses have not been required by the boards to renegotiate their contracts because their profits were not excessive. The Navy Department, for example, has cleared without renegotiation 240 companies holding a total of $500,000,000 of contracts, that is, small companies. But it has required about 120 companies to reduce their excessive profits and these 120 companies held $13,000,000,000 of war contracts. In other words, they were big companies. These figures show, Mr. Speaker, that the companies cleared by the boards without renegotiation are usually small companies whereas the companies which are required to renegotiate are usually large companies.

There are big and wealthy interests in this country which would be very happy not to have to renegotiate their contracts. If they could obtain repeal of this law behind the cloak of small business, they would be very happy to do so. I believe, Mr. Speaker, we should be careful not to let big business masquerade behind the name of small business, and I think the record thus far shows that renegotiation has concerned itself primarily with large companies who would be the chief beneficiary if the law were repealed.

The gentleman from Michigan also declared that there is a great bureaucracy administering this law. The total number employed by the Navy Price Adjustment Board is about 75 persons, whereas the Army boards, having a larger volume of work, number about 750. This is not a very large staff to handle a total of about 25,000 companies.

These boards do not take up much of a businessman's time. One typical case was started on September 9, 1942, and closed on October 29, and during this period some of the company's officials had to spend about 3 days on the matter.

The price-adjustment boards do not operate without a legislative standard. The law fixes a standing of reasonableness and any more precise formula is not feasible. As the gentleman himself said, any profit limitation formula smacks of cost-plus and I do not believe that he could suggest to the Congress any formula which would not work hardship on small contractors while it gave windfalls to others.

The gentleman from Michigan also declared that the money recovered through renegotiation is used by the War and Navy Departments for any purpose they see fit, thereby preventing Congress from controlling expenditures. Mr. Speaker, this is flatly untrue. After the War or Navy Price Adjustment Board arranges for a contractor to reduce his price, the money so recovered cannot be spent by the War or Navy Department except for the purpose originally provided in the appropriation act. If the price of airplanes is reduced, the money so saved must be spent for airplanes. It cannot be diverted to buying food, paying personnel, or any other purpose except the purpose specified by Congress. Does the gentleman from Michigan mean to imply that if the Army can get six big bombers out of a million-dollar appropriation instead of four that the Army has circumvented the will of Congress? I do not believe that it has, Mr. Speaker. The Army has stayed within the amount appropriated by Congress and by increasing the purchasing power of its appropriation has reduced the need for further appropriations in the future. The money is spent as we directed, but it goes further.

If the price-adjustment boards get an outright cash refund, that money goes back into the Treasury, as the gentleman from Michigan said, and it cannot be expended for any purpose without a new appropriation from Congress. The gentleman from Michigan belittled the statement that renegotiation agreements have been reached voluntarily, declaring that companies must accept whatever Washington decrees. Mr. Speaker, this is not so. The Under Secretaries of the War and Navy Departments can be appealed to by any contractor who thinks he has not been fairly treated by the Price Adjustment Board. Furthermore, there is no doubt about the legal ability of the contractor to appeal any finding of a price-adjustment board to the courts No contractor has done so.

The gentleman from Michigan declared that the Government's procurement officers should be able to prevent excessive profits by arranging for very close prices in the first place. Well, I agree with that in part. Pricing should improve. Both the Army and Navy are experimenting with target prices which may restrict the need for renegotiation. But there are two reasons why the need for renegotiation will never disappear entirely.

In the first place, we are not buying the same weapons this year that we did last year. The planes, the guns, the escort vessels, the detection devices, even the explosives, which we are buying now are different from those we bought before. And we are not buying these things in the same volume as we bought them last year. Would the gentleman from Michigan, having bought 2,000,000 antiaircraft shells a month last year, be able to fix a fair price for them this year, when we will be buying 40,000,000 a month? What once looked like a reasonable price may easily become an exorbitant price, and this will be true as long as the war lasts.

That is one reason why original pricing will never eliminate excessive profits. There is another. Manufacturers will not take these large war contracts at fixed prices without putting into their prices large amounts for contingencies—contingencies like higher labor costs due to dilution of skilled working forces, contingencies like interruptions in production due to material shortages, contingencies like changes in specifications. Perhaps manufacturers should get this protection. But if the contingencies do not develop—and often they do not—all of the money paid to the manufacturer to protect him against something which did not materialize becomes pure profit unless you renegotiate his contract.

I want to turn now, Mr. Speaker, to the principal claim of the gentleman from Michigan. This claim is that we have a 90-percent excess-profits-tax law, which will prevent any excessive war profits.

At the outset let us clear up one fact. We do not have a 90-percent excess-profits tax. We do have a 90-percent tax rate, which is very different from having a 90-percent tax. In fact, the tax bill provides specifically that the total tax on any company shall not exceed 80 percent of its taxable income. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we have an 80-percent

tax, not a 90-percent tax. Furthermore the law provides that 10 percent of the excess-profits tax paid by any company shall be refunded after the war. Therefore the eventual tax comes down to something like 72 or 73 percent.

This is very different from the impression which the gentleman from Michigan left last Tuesday. He declared that 90 percent of the two and a half billion dollars which has been recovered through contract renegotiation would have been recovered anyway through what he calls a 90-percent tax. He made an error in assuming that there is a 90-percent tax, and he made a further error in assuming that all of this profit would have been subject to excess-profits taxation. There are many relief and exemption provisions in the tax law and there is no reasion at all to assume that all of this money would have been subject to excess-profits taxation.

Therefore the gentleman from Michigan was wrong when he said that, of the two and a half billion dollars recovered be renegotiation, all but $250,000,000 would have been recovered through taxes anyway. He has no way of knowing that the two and a half billion would have paid a 90-percent tax. Indeed, it probably would not. The tax more probably was about 80 percent, because we have an 80-percent-tax ceiling, and the tax may be as low as 75 percent after giving effect to the post-war refunds.

Hence, the amount of excessive profits which renegotiation has recovered but which taxes would have let slip by may run to five or six hundred million dollars for the single year of 1942. No one can fix an exact figure.

The gentleman from Michigan left the impression that $250,000,000 is a small sum of money. Perhaps he also would consider $500,000,000 a small sum. It certainly is compared with the cost of the war. But it is a very large sum compared with the cost of maintaining these price adjustment boards. And—what is more important—it is a very large sum of money in terms of corporate and private incomes. This sum of money which the gentleman from Michigan would not have you worry about can make a few hundred war millionaires in a single year—even after allowance for individual income taxes. Let me show you just how much it would mean to some companies if we forgot about this $500,000,000, forgot about renegotiation, and relied solely on excess-profits taxes.

One war contractor has had his business multiplied 15 times by the war and at the same time has more than tripled his profit margin. Of course, this enormous volume of business and the enormous profit margin on this volume of business has more than offset all wartime taxes. Therefore, in 1942, after paying all of its excess profits and other taxes, this company would have made a net profit equal to 152 percent of its invested capital. This profit would have been 23 times greater than the company's average income during peacetime.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat those facts. In a single year, this company after paying all of its wartime taxes would have recovered its complete invested capital plus 50 percent in addition, and would have earned 23 times more than it did in normal years. That is what the result would have been for this company if we had no renegotiation to supplement our taxes.

Let me tell you about another company. It also has had an enormous increase in business and has increased its profit margin. The result is that in 1942 this company, after paying all of its excess-profits taxes and other taxes, would have had left a profit equal to 130 percent of its invested capital. This profit would have been 13 times greater than the company's average profit during peacetime. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan would admit that this profit is excessive and obviously the excess-profits tax did not prevent it.

Let me tell you about still a third company. This company did a business last year which was 15 times greater than its average volume of business during peacetime and it had a profit margin on that business which was almost 5 times greater than the profit margin which it enjoyed during peacetime. Of course, wartime taxes did not keep up with this company either. In 1942, after paying all of its excess-profits taxes and other taxes, this company had a profit equal to 100 percent of its invested capital and more than 10 times greater than the profit which it had earned in its best peacetime year. In a single year this company would have recovered its complete investment and would have broken its peacetime-earnings record 10 times over. This would have been the result if Congress had relied, as the gentleman from Michigan now proposes, solely on excess-profits taxes, and had not authorized renegotiation of contracts.

Still another company working on war business had a net profit after paying its taxes last year which was equal to 85 percent of its invested capital, and this profit after taxes was about 20 times more than its average earnings during peacetime. Still a fifth company earned 100 percent on its invested capital after taxes and a sixth company earned about 30 percent on its invested capital and had a profit after taxes 4 times greater than it had ever enjoyed in peacetime.

Mr. Speaker, these are only a half dozen examples which could be enlarged upon if the Congress wished to look into the records of the renegotiation boards as I hope the House Naval Affairs Committee will do in its forthcoming investigation. The excess-profits tax does not prevent exorbitant war profits. In fact, it can never do so since it must apply to all businesses—those which have not been inflated by the war, those which have been inflated a little bit, and those which have grown beyond their wildest dreams. Any tax law which must apply to businesses in all circumstances will allow some of the most fortunate ones to make shocking war profits.

I do not believe that the gentleman from Michigan understands what he is doing when he proposes that we repeal renegotiation of contracts and rely on what he calls a 90 percent excess-profits tax. This Congress has recently laid aside legislation which would give farmers higher prices for the crops they grow. This Government is now engaged in an effort to hold the line on wages, telling the workingmen of this Nation that they must be content with the wage rates they now earn. We are drafting men to fight.

I do not believe that this is any time to tell the country that we are going to let some companies earn 80 percent or 100 percent or 150 percent on their investment in a single year after paying all their taxes. I do not believe we want to tell the country that some companies—after paying all their taxes, mind you—will be allowed to earn out of the war 10 or 20 times more than they ever earned before.

That is what we would be telling the country if we repealed the renegotiation of contracts and placed our faith solely in an excess-profits tax. We would be telling the country that although we want to keep ceilings on farm prices and wages and although we draft men, we are going to relax our controls on the earnings of the corporations of this country.

I do not believe that this is what Congress wishes to do and if Congress should listen to those wealthy interests which propose such a step, I am sure that the anger of the people will come down upon the war profiteers after this war just as it did after the last war.

We have dedicated ourselves to preventing war millionaires this time and I believe we should adhere to that goal. Renegotiation, therefore, is a necessary measure to achieve our objective.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PROPAGANDA HAS NO PLACE IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to a very obvious attempt to invade our public-school system with propaganda destined to indoctrinate the youth of our land with controversial economic philosophies.

Propaganda is both a delicate and a dangerous thing. There are times when it can be helpful to our national life and safety, but the line is thin that separates it from a subtle weapon destructive to fundamentals on which our national structure rests securely. We take great pride in our ability as Americans to express ourselves freely, to permit free expression, and to value propaganda accordingly. But, whether we agree with the propaganadists or not, propaganda has no place in our public schools.

I have here an attractive 93-page pamphlet, entitled "My Part in This War." The title is attractive—we all have a part in the war—but the contents deserve careful scrutiny. The background of this publication reveals its effect, if not its purpose, as pure propaganda—a means of economic indoctrination. The publication is copyrighted by the Consumer Education Study of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. It claims the approval of persons outstanding in the field of education. But after reading its

contents one is inclined to wonder if these high-minded individuals could have been aware that they were to be drawn into the field of propagandic controversies—that they were contributing to an invasion of our public schools with propaganda?

Under acknowledgments, Thomas H. Briggs, Director of Consumer Education Study, of N. E. A., appreciates the asisstance given by Dr. Walter D. Cocking, Director of Educational Services Branch of the Office of Price Administration, and of the Department of the Treasury, and says:

> As a result of their suggestions the manuscript was rewritten by Mr. Marcus Rosenblume, of the Office of Price Administration, and Dr. Fred T. Wilhelms, assistant director of the Consumer Education Study.

Mr. Speaker, this publication presents another step in the attempt to popularize new economic philosophies in contrast to established American concepts. Contrary to the contentions of its sponsors it is not a presentation of factual information in an impartial manner. It deals with highly controversial matters in such a way as to give the impression that the individual is left free to choose his own convictions. But a careful study of the method of presentation penetrates the thin veneer of subtlety and reveals the use of a cunning method of establishing a definite conclusion. This creates a condition that must not be countenanced.

The most lasting impressions on the mind are created in the formative age of youth, and are apt to become definite conclusions in the adult. How better to establish future national policies and economic philosophies than to indoctrinate the minds of school children? Are we to resort to methods extolled in Mien Kampf? Shall we permit the curriculum of our public schools to include propaganda? Not unless we as a Nation desire to completely change our standards, to entirely reorganize our economy, and even to change our form of government. I do not believe the American people are ready to do any of those things. But, unless we take counteraction now the time will come when we will be helpless to prevent the change.

I would like to point out just a few of the obvious attempts at propaganda contained in this booklet entitled "My Part in This War."

It praises the F. S. A., an expensive creature of the New Deal, a strong controversial issue of a purely political nature.

It urges that grade labeling be given public support. This is another controversial issue recognized as the brain child of New Deal agencies bent on standardization.

It treats the matter of tax collection methods in a way that denies any just claim to impartiality. In dealing with the pay-as-you-go plan there is evident use of the subtle power of negative suggestion to create a conclusion with this statement:

> Perhaps the most important consideration to think about in regard to such a proposal is that it must not be used as a means of decreasing the total taxes to be paid.

This smacks of the administration's arguments still ringing in our ears. Can this still not be political propaganda?

The administration's frayed and oft-defeated spending tax is dragged from the closet and earnestly extolled.

It speaks of the President's $25,000 salary limitation as still a law of the land, and speaks with approval of Government subsidies and other New Deal created programs which Congress has written off the record by the constitutional method.

By such examples of obsolescence, how can this publication attain its ambition "to meet the schools' need for a single comprehensive teaching aid"? It attempts to minimize the seriousness of strikes in time of war by adroitly handling statistics on man-hours lost by comparison with other causes of absenteeism.

It strongly conveys the impression that the press and radio give unfair treatment to Government announcements by distortion to make the news more interesting, that most editors intentionally passed up what the book terms an outstanding speech by Vice President WALLACE, and that the facts on rubber shortage were grossly and persistently confused, occasionally to the private advantage of those muddying the water.

Fundamentally this publication is not, in spite of the style and treatment of its subject matter, a study of wartime economy. It is heavy-plated pro-New Deal propaganda—a struggle of the bureaucrats against acceptance of the will of the people and the judgment of Congress. It is a desperate attempt of those same bureaucrats to use the National Education Association as a means of indoctrinating the minds of school children with "new order" partisan political philosophies.

Mr. Speaker, this publication is being urged on the public school authorities as a high-school textbook. The announcement has created much public concern. The people are aroused over the prospects, and the press has been outspoken in an expression of public sentiment against the danger involved.

The Indianapolis News editorially labels My Part in This War as the high-school pollution book, and urges that Congress should immediately order the book destroyed and begin an investigation of its authorship for thus attempting to use good American dollars for the destruction of American liberty.

Those are strong words, but clearly indicate the feeling of the fathers and mothers of high-school children. And I would like to concur in the suggestion of this outstanding newspaper that the National Education Association "at once disclaim any responsibility for the propaganda and retire from any circulation commitments that it has made."

The Indianapolis Times says:

> There is some doubt as to how much the National Education Association actually had to do with the preparation of this booklet, since it appears under the imprint of a subdivision of a subdivision of that organization. There is a clear trace of Columbia University Teachers College, noted stronghold of leftist educational theory, across its background.

There can, of course, be no objection to a private organization distributing this booklet, but there is every reason to object to the preparation of the publication by a Federal agency at public expense for a private group. And there certainly can be, and is, a pronounced objection to its being used as a textbook in our public schools.

In the foreword of the booklet it says:

> In this crisis "education as usual" is no more justifiable than "business as usual."

Can the charge of propaganda be denied in view of that statement?

Of course, education suffers in time of war. But why should the usual education not continue, at least well through the high-school grades? What objection can there be to continuing to teach school children the fundamentals of American government? They will only too soon be the ones upon whom the responsibility of the Nation will rest. They are the very ones in whom there should be instilled the concepts of government that their fathers and their fathers' fathers created, builded on, and fought to protect and preserve. Today's school children must continue to be taught that the American way of life is soundly pillared on a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, that our Government is a system of checks and balances divided into three coordinate branches—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—that one cannot function without the support of the others, and, most of all, that if one is permitted to become paramount and independent of the others, democracy is dead.

Wartime economy is transient. If the individual liberties that must be temporarily surrendered in time of war are to be redeemed at the end of the duration, then wartime economy programs must be only temporary. Otherwise they will become a permanent national economy under which liberties will be gone forever.

Education as usual must be continued in as far as possible. Above all, there must be no substitutes fostered upon our public-school system in the guise of war necessity.

Mr. Speaker, the dissemination of such propaganda, thinly disguised as impartial instruction and public enlightenment, must be checked. Our public schools must not be turned into propaganda agencies, regardless of the side taken in controversial political issues by any individual organization or governmental agency.

I have no fear but that the people will do their part to stop it. The vast majority of parents will not hesitate to urge school authorities to carefully and critically scrutinize questionable publications offered as textbooks for public schools. They will be quick to question the authority of an organization sitting in Washington, with its roots in Columbia University Teachers' College, dictating to every State office of education and attempting to direct the curriculum in

every little red schoolhouse, township central school, college, and university in the land.

The people will also expect the cooperation of their Congress.

In this particular case there is a question as to how far the Congress can go in stopping the distribution of this publication, My Part in This War, even when it is evident that a good deal of time, paid for by Federal funds, did go into its preparation. But Congress still controls the public purse strings, and it should very definitely write into every appropriation for Federal agencies a provision prohibiting the use of such funds for propaganda purposes other than for direct prosecution of the actual war effort. By tightening the purse strings Congress can shut off the lifeblood that feeds the cancerous growth that threatens destruction of the very things we are fighting to preserve.

We need our money for our war effort, not for political books to be placed in our public schools to warp the minds of our children. I repeat, propaganda has no place in our public schools.

No doubt I will, because of these remarks, be attacked from some quarters as reactionary. If so, I wish to refer my critics to these words of Alexander Hamilton:

> A dangerous ambition more often lurks behind the spacious mask of zeal for the rights of the people than under the forbidding appearance of zeal for the firmness and efficiency of government. History will teach us that the former has been found a much more certain road to the introduction of despotism than the latter, and that of those men who have overturned the liberties of republics, the greatest number have begun their career by paying an obsequious court to the public; commending demagogs and ending tyrants.

In 155 years those words have lost none of their logic, sincerity, and truth.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mrs. SMITH of Maine (at the request of Mr. FELLOWS), for 3 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. RIVERS), for 1 day, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 18, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 838, H. R. 2209, H. R. 2210, H. R. 2241, H. R. 2527, and various bills for the purpose of taxing Federal-owned land and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m., on Tuesday, May 18, 1943, for consideration of housing bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2139, to provide improvement in the administration of parole, and H. R. 2140, to provide a correctional system for adult and youth offenders convicted in courts of the United States, at 10 a. m., on Tuesday and Wednesday, May 18 and 19, 1943, in room 346, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of Subcommittee No. 8 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads at 10 a. m., Wednesday, May 19, 1943, to consider H. R. 687. Public hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 19, and Thursday, May 20, 1943, on all bills dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act—H. R. 1882, H. R. 2309, H. R. 2428, and H. R. 2429.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, May 20, 1943, at 10 a. m. on H. R. 2612, to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Monday, May 24, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearings pursuant to House Resolution 98 by Congressman HALLECK.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

419. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the estimate of appropriation for the Office of Price Administration for the fiscal year 1944 in the amount of $177,335,000 (H. Doc. No. 204); to the Committee on Appropriations.

420. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

421. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

422. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on lists of papers, recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

423. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of February 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

424. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

425. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting its views upon the amended version of S. 796; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

426. A letter from the Chairman, National War Labor Board, transmitting views of the Board on S. 796; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

427. Joint letter from the War Department, Navy Department, Labor Department, United States Maritime Commission, National Labor Relations Board, and War Production Board, transmitting certain views with respect to the amended version of S. 796; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: Committee on Elections No. 3. Report asking for extension of time to take testimony in case of John B. Sullivan against Louis E. Miller, without amendment (Rept. No. 454). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2719. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 149. A bill to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard for nonfat dry milk solids; with amendment (Rept. 456). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 2720. A bill to amend section 1 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act, to permit joint action by common carriers subject to part I, II, III or IV, respectively, in connection with procedures related to the establishment of rates, and the taking of other action; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 2721. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 2722. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish firing squads, color guards, and buglers for funerals of veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 2723. A bill to authorize the conveyance of Harrison Park in the city of Vincennes to Vincennes University; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 2724. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 2725. A bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 2726. A bill to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2727. A bill to provide that Federal grants for old-age assistance shall match State contributions 4 for 1 as to payments up to $30 and equal State contributions as to additional payments not in excess of $40; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning modification of Executive Order No. 9320, of the United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2728. A bill for the relief of Albert Grady; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 2729. A bill for the relief of Helene Murphy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 2730. A bill for the relief of Mrs. E. B. Neville; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

770. By Mr. KEE: Petition of Elena Hardin and 22 other citizens and residents of Bluefield, W. Va., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until termination of demobilization, through the passage by Congress of House bill 2082, introduced in the House of Representatives by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

771. Also, petition of Mrs. E. B. Wolford and 22 other citizens and residents of Bluefield, W. Va., to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until termination of demobilization, through the passage by Congress of House bill 2082, introduced in the House of Representatives by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

772. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of Hon. Joe Sullivan, mayor of Centerville, Tex., favoring a continuance of the National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

773. Also, memorial of Howell Jones, secretary, South Texas Press Association, San Antonio, Tex., favoring continuance of the congressional committee investigating the newsprint situation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

774. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of Mrs. W. P. Casto and 20 other citizens of the city of Buckhannon, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

775. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of West Virginia to Congress to pass House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

776. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

777. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution of Local 308, United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, of North Tonawanda, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

778. Also, petition of Alta Schweigert and 21 citizens of Newfane, Niagara County, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

779. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 80 citizens of Beaver County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

780. By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri: Memorial of the Missouri State House of Representatives, favoring means of reducing taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

781. By Mr. HOPE: Petition favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

782. Also, petition favoring House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

783. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Walla Walla, Clarkston, Pullman, Touchet, Hay, Sunnyside, Wapato, and other towns an cities in the State of Washington, favoring enactment of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war, and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

784. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Marietta H. Earl, 69 South View Street, Aurora, Ill., and 19 citizens of Kane County, Ill., urging the passage o: House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

785. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Howard Lotz and other citizens of the Wheeling area of West Virginia, urging the establishment of a Chiropractic Corps in the armed forces now; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

786. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from Bunell Feather, of Keenes, Ill., urging the continuation of the Farm Security Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

787. Also, communication from Mr. and Mrs. H. E. Murphy, of Geff, Ill., urging the continuance of the Farm Security Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

788. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the office of the clerk, County of Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the naturalization laws whereby Filipinos may become citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

789. Also, petition of W. E. Edwards, of Honolulu, T. H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 79; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

790. Also, petition of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation concerning benefits for wounded and disabled veterans of the current war; to the Committee on Rules.

791. Also, petition of the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to grazing fees for domestic stock; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 18, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward J. Flanagan, founder and director of Father Flanagan's Boys Home, Boys Town, Nebr., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, we the children of an all knowing and all loving Father, are assembled here to deliberate on many great problems that concern the people of our vast Nation. We recognize, dear Lord, our human frailties and our unworthiness for so important a duty assigned to us. We also realize, dear Lord, because of our faith in Thee, that Thou art our God, our Creator, our Redeemer, and our Preserver, and in Thee, alone, is all knowledge, and all wisdom.

Therefore, dear Lord, we come to Thee this day in all humility and beg of Thee divine assistance to understand the problems that confront our Nation, and we ask for that special light and inspiration to solve these problems for the greater good of our people, and for Thy greater honor.

Dear Lord, our Nation is engaged in a great global war, a war being waged by

powerful forces on the one hand, whose totalitarian philosophy threatens to engulf the world into slavery, and on the other hand, are the forces of democracy striving to uphold and protect the God-given inalienable rights of man. This terrible war, dear Lord, has caused destruction in life and property throughout the world, and we know this has brought great pain to Thy divine and sacred heart, for Thou lovest all men with an intense and holy love. Thou knowest also, dear Lord, that this is a sacred and holy war insofar as it is being fought to preserve those principles of individual freedom for man throughout the world, principles so precious to Thee. We beg of Thee, dear Lord, consequently, to bring about an early consummation of this world tragedy that will insure for the future of man a peace and social security based on man's high dignity, a peace that will enable man to return to Thee, and recognize complete satisfaction and compensation in Thee, his God and his Creator.

We beg of Thee, dear Lord, to bless and guide our worthy President, his advisers, and the Members of Congress on whom depends so much this day. Bless also the members of our armed forces, and those of our allies at home and abroad that they may look up to Thee for help and consolation.

We beg all of this dear Lord, that the world may soon return to Thee, who art the true bulwark of everlasting peace which rests in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. All this we beg through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 33. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of sampling plants and custom mills as an aid in the development and acquisition of strategic and critical minerals which are essential to the national defense.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2409. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of War.
4. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
5. Federal Works Agency.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask what committee has the call?

Mr. McCORMACK. Elections No. 1.

Mr. RANKIN. I withdraw my reservation, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RT. HON. WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the membership I want to announce that the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill, will address a joint meeting of the Members of the Senate and House, tomorrow, Wednesday, May 19, at 12:30 p. m.

I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time tomorrow, such recess to be subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement. After consultation with the majority and the minority leaders of the House and remembering the terrific jams we had upon this floor on previous occasions, with the consent and approval of the floor leaders, the Chair announces that on tomorrow the door immediately opposite the Speaker will be open, and the doors on the Speaker's left and right, and none other. No one will be allowed upon the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday, May 24, upon the conclusion of the legislative business and other special orders, I may address the House for 50 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial on Mother appearing in the Fort Devens Digest, written by Sgt. Philip G. Cushman, of Lynn, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein an article from the Alabama Baptist of May 13, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an editorial from the Scranton Times on Greece.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

BOARD OF VISITORS, COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting of the Board of Visitors of the Coast Guard Academy, held May 2, 1943, at New London, Conn., I was elected chairman of the Board of Visitors, and I ask unanimous consent to file for printing in the RECORD at this point the report of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy held May 2, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The report referred to follows:

CONGRESSIONAL BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY, 1943

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to the act of July 15, 1939 (Public, No. 183, 76th Cong., 1st sess.), the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated in January of this year to constitute the 1943 Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy:

Senators: Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY, of Connecticut; Hon. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON, of Wyoming, appointed by Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, and ex officio member of the Board of Visitors; Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, appointed by Vice President of the Senate; the Honorable PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, was later appointed to serve in place of the Honorable JOSIAH W. BAILEY.

Members of the House of Representatives: Hon. HERBERT BONNER, of North Carolina; Hon. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN, of New York; Hon. JAMES DOMENGEAUX, of Louisiana, all appointed by Hon. SCHUYLER O. BLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ex officio member of the Board of Visitors.

The Honorable AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island, and Hon. KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska, were appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, Hon. JAMES DOMENGEAUX, and Hon. KARL STEFAN were unable to attend. The Honorable JOHN W. GWYNNE, of Iowa, was later appointed in place of Mr. STEFAN; there was not sufficient time, however, to replace Mr. DOMENGEAUX and Mr. BONNER.

Provision was made for the Board to leave Washington on the Colonial at 10 a. m., April 30, accompanied by Rear Admiral Frank J. Gorman, Capt. Ellis Reed-Hill, and Ship's Clerk Sandford C. Smith, officers from headquarters. Senators MCCARRAN, MALONEY,

PEPPER, and Representatives BLAND, GWYNNE, O'BRIEN, and FORAND departed on the above train and were joined in New York by Senator ROBERTSON. Upon arrival in New London at 5 o'clock p. m., the party was met by Rear Admiral James Pine, Superintendent of the academy, accompanied by other Coast Guard officers. Prof. H. L. Seward and Prof. G. E. Russell, members of the advisory committee, also joined the Board. At 8 p. m. the Superintendent entertained the Board at dinner at the Mohican Hotel, which was attended by a number of senior Coast Guard officers attached to the academy and other units at New London. Due to unfavorable weather conditions, the ceremonial evening parade of the cadet battalion was omitted. Following the dinner, service films were shown depicting activities of the academy and life in the Coast Guard.

The next morning, May 1, members met for the formal meeting of the Board at 9 a. m. at the academy. Following the custom of choosing a chairman on alternate years from the House and Senate Members, Congressman JOSEPH O'BRIEN was elected chairman of the Board of Visitors, 1943. Capt. Ellis Reed-Hill, United States Coast Guard, was again designated as secretary of the Board and so served. The Board invited Rear Admiral James Pine, superintendent of the academy, to appear before it. At the same time the members of the advisory committee of the Coast Guard Academy present, namely, Prof. H. L. Seward, of Yale University, chairman, and Prof. G. E. Russell, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, were requested to be present during the meeting of the Board.

Rear Admiral Pine appeared before the Board and explained that in 1932 the academy was designed to house a maximum capacity of 208 cadets. Three years ago prior to the war and anticipating wartime needs, the capacity of the academy was increased to 150 rooms. The cadet corps has now been doubled, while the course has been reduced from 4 to 3 years. He explained how, in addition to regular cadet training, the academy was taking in about 300 reserve cadets per month for a 4-month course. Since June some 1,600 reserve officers have already been graduated and have been commissioned ensigns in the Coast Guard Reserve. He further stated that, by use of 83-foot patrol boats regularly assigned to the academy and of others assigned temporarily, about half of the reserve graduates were being instructed in antisubmarine warfare.

Rear Admiral Pine explained the method in selecting reserve material, which had been limited to college graduates with degrees. Now, however, selections are made from suitable enlisted men already in the service. Mention was made at this time of the reserve officer training at St. Augustine. The training there, similar to the academy's reserve course, is limited to those officers now in the service who have not had previous indoctrination.

Rear Admiral Pine reported at this time that there was an urgent need for additional floating equipment and modern ordnance material for instruction purposes. Although he suggested that at some convenient time Capt. W. J. Moore, Chaplains' Corps, United States Navy, be allowed to appear before the Board in the interest of a chapel, the immediate construction of this was not recommended by Rear Admiral Pine, because of the greater importance of needs directly connected with the war effort.

Prof. H. L. Seward, chairman, and Prof. G. E. Russell, of the advisory committee, were invited to appear before the Board and outlined for it the history of the committee and the part it has played during the last 9 or 10 years in the development of the Coast Guard Academy. They mentioned that the committee had originally been formed as a voluntary body, following the sending of letters to the presidents of Harvard, Yale, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Columbia, asking them to designate a member of their faculties to serve on a voluntary basis. A description followed of how this committee had functioned in an unofficial capacity until an act recognizing the advisory committee as an official body was approved April 16, 1937. It was stated that the original membership had continued to date, with the addition of Judge T. W. Swan, of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, who become its fifth member, to assist in matters connected with law—a subject which is important to the training of a Coast Guard officer. It was related how the advisory committee planned a balanced 4-year curriculum, which eventually resulted in the Association of American Universities' recognition of the Coast Guard Academy, authorizing it to grant the degree of bachelor of science. They also spoke of the very high rating now afforded the academy by the Engineering Counsel for Profession Development, an association inspecting educational institutions where engineering is taught.

In reply to a direct question by the Board as to the cooperation between the administration of the Coast Guard and the advisory committee, both members replied that the cooperation had been satisfactory to the highest degree, both with the academy and headquarters.

Chaplain Moore appeared before the Board and described the importance attached to the religious program at the academy and how each cadet, unless excused, was expected to attend a religious ceremony of his own faith weekly. He informed the present Board, as he had done in the past, of the great need of a suitable chapel to be built when conditions were such as to warrant the undertaking.

Ensign N. S. Dives, of the SPARS, then appeared before the Board and explained that SPARS and WAVES received their uniforms, preliminary indoctrination, were taught military discipline and general training as officers at the United States Midshipmen's School, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. Following this the SPARS took a 3-week intensified course at the academy. Commencing June 24, 1943, however, SPAR officer candidates will receive their entire training at the Coast Guard Academy in a 6-week indoctrination period. She told the Board that both commissioned and enlisted SPARS were intended to relieve trained Coast Guard personnel for combat duty. She told the Board that enlisted girls were used to release yeomen, radiomen, storekeepers, car drivers, and so forth. She explained that enlisted girls were required to have 2 years high school and experience in the line of work for which they desired to apply, while commissioned officers must have at least 2 years college and 2 years training in their professional field. The Cadet Battalion Commander, Cadet Vaughn, appeared before the Board. The superintendent and Captain Reed-Hill were excused so that the Board could hear direct from the head of the cadet organization.

Based on its observations, inspections, and testimony adduced from officers and cadets and after careful discussion and consideration, the Board recommends that sufficient 83-foot fully equipped Coast Guard cutters or corvettes be furnished in order that all reserve cadets may be trained in antisubmarine warfare; that modern ordnance material be supplied in quantities sufficient for the proper instruction of all cadets; that officers and other personnel returning from combat areas with information regarding the war and the Coast Guard's part in it, be ordered to the academy to give lectures and descriptive accounts to the Cadet Corps; and that preliminary steps be taken to negotiate with the city of New London for the transfer to the academy of a strip of land on Riverside Park, adjoining the academy reservation on the south, for the site of the proposed chapel.

The Board continued in session until time to leave for the afternoon train to New York, departing New London at 2:22 p. m., except for adjournment to witness the Coast Guard broadcast in Billard Hall, to view the cadet parade, and to lunch with cadets from their home States. The entire Board departed on the above-mentioned train with the exception of Senator MALONEY, who remained in New Haven. Senator PEPPER and Congressman O'BRIEN left the returning party in New York.

The Board wishes to commend very highly the Coast Guard Academy. It finds this institution to be in excellent physical condition; to be an institution of high scholastic attainments. The cadet corps, which is composed of a group of young Americans selected from every part of the country by a competitive examination open to all, is a body whose esprit and discipline are of the highest order. The Board is particularly impressed by the outstanding work being done by this institution while undergoing great emergent expansion, including the training of 2,400 cadets per year for reserve commissions as deck and engineering officers, as well as 475 SPAR officer candidates.

Congressman O'BRIEN, chairman of the Board, remarked on the splendid cooperation existing between the officers of the academy and the cadets. He stated that in his observation the personal interest of every officer for the welfare and solicitude of each and every student could be readily detected. All of the members of the Board concurred in this opinion, and in the statement that these conclusions were most obvious from the personal attention that Rear Admiral Pine devoted to the students as a body as well as from the personal attention that is given individual students. The Board, in conclusion, desires to register its high opinion of the excellent and invaluable contribution made by the advisory committee in its relationship with the academy. The personnel of the committee and its achievements have made a marked impression on the Board of Visitors.

Respectfully submitted.

Joseph J. O'Brien, Francis Maloney, Claude Pepper, Patrick A. McCarran, Edward V. Robertson, Schuyler O. Bland, Aime J. Forand, John W. Gwynne; Ellis Reed-Hill, *Secretary*.

EFFECTIVE PLANNING

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the question has been asked many times: On what basis are we functioning as a nation? I have emphasized more than once the necessity for some over-all planning.

We do not seem to have any real anti-inflation policy; we do not seem to have any real financial policy; we do not seem to have any real draft policy. If we are going into the drafting of women, the regimenting of women, or whatever you wish to call it, possibly only into the registration of women as an over-all policy, such erratic action as we have been taking does not make for a strong nation, the kind of strong nation we need

to be if we are to win the war, and if we are to contribute strength to the winning of the war and the building of a new and decent world. To clarify my meaning I ask that you read my extension in the Appendix.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Fulton Lewis, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to insert therein a resolution from the mayor and Board of Aldermen of Morristown, N. J.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to call the attention of the House to an important contribution that is being made by the school children of Kansas in the prosecution of the war. These children are, of course, contributing in a number of other ways, but here is one which I think is worthy of special mention. Perry E. Nussbaum, of Wichita, head of the Schools for Victory Program in our State, reports that Kansas schools thus far have purchased more than 1,700 Army jeeps. In a letter to Principal Kuiken, of the Dickinson County High School, of Chapman, Kans., Mr. Nussbaum credits that school with the purchase of 6 Army jeeps. It is one of the typical high schools of Kansas and is located in a rural community. A number of other high schools have also made similar creditable showings in this respect. It has occurred to me that the enthusiasm exhibited by school children of Kansas in support of the war effort is worthy of our recognition as well as our commendation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

By unanimous consent, a call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 74]

Anderson, Calif.	Guyer	Phillips
Barry	Hancock	Randolph
Buckley	Hinshaw	Rolph
Chapman	Izac	Sabath
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Sheridan
Cochran	Judd	Smith, Maine
Costello	Kee	Thomas, N. J.
Culkin	Lea	Vinson, Ga.
Dies	Lemke	Welch
Dirksen	Luce	West
Elliott	McGranery	Whelchel, Ga.
Fogarty	Magnuson	White
Forand	Nichols	Woodruff, Mich.
Gibson	Norton	Worley
Granger	O'Toole	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 388 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

CURRENT TAX PAYMENT BILL OF 1943

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KNUTSON moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H. R. 2570 be, and they are hereby, instructed to agree to the amendment of the Senate to the said bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, with the understanding that we will close the debate on this side.

Mr. COOPER. You have that right, under the rule.

Mr. KNUTSON. I know.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain letters which I have received from Secretary Knox.

Mr. STEWART. I object to the introduction of the letters, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill is substantially the same as the Carlson bill, but there is a difference. The Senate bill has one change that is rather important. It has tightened up the antiwindfall provisions, so that it now applies to the highest of the 3 years 1938, 1939, or 1940 as the base period in determining the amount of windfall.

You will recall that the Carlson bill came within 4 votes of passing the House a couple of weeks ago. The measure we now have before us passed the Senate by a vote of 49 to 30. I call that a pretty impressive vote.

I call the attention of the House to the fact that in the Senate, as in the House, party lines were broken down. It was not made a party issue.

The opposition of the administration to this legislation is nothing new. Do not let them try to stampede you a little later by reading the President's letter. Let us analyze that letter. There is not a word in it to indicate that he is going to veto the bill. This is what he says, in part, and I quote the letter as it appeared in the morning papers:

I am writing you now so that you may know my views and in the hope that a bill may be worked out in conference that I can sign.

I cannot acquiesce in the elimination of a whole year's tax burden.

I call your particular attention to that language. There is nothing in his statement that states that he is going to veto the bill if it comes before him. If I understand the meaning of the English language, the President will allow the bill to become law without his approval.

As I said before, this is not a political question. We divided on it before and we are going to divide on it again.

When the Bureau of Internal Revenue were before the committee during the consideration of this measure they stated they would have to have legislation by May 15 if we were to begin collecting a withholding tax the 1st of July. In order to expedite matters, I have offered the motion you have heard read from the Clerk's desk.

I do not need to argue with you that if this bill goes to a free conference we are going to have a deadlock that will last days and days, and finally end in a stalemate, with no legislation. That will result in the Federal Treasury losing hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars in the form of withholding taxes. That is quite a responsibility, and it is one that I do not think this House would care to assume, especially in view of the urgent need for money that exists at the present time. A free conference means that nothing will be done. You may as well reject the bill right here on the floor and be done with it, and let us get on to other important matters. You are going to be told over and over, as you have been told before, that under the Senate bill, you are going to forgive yourselves a year's taxes, that you are

going to charge off the books $10,000,000,000 in revenue. When will that $10,000,000,000 be charged off? Under the Senate bill or under the House bill, we pay just as much this year as we did last year, and we will pay as much next year as we did this year, and so on indefinitely.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes. Probably someone on the majority side will say that you are voting to forgive yourselves $2,140. Now you will pay the $2,140 this year, next year and the year following, as long as you stay in Congress, and when you are defeated or when you retire, the man who succeeds you will pay $2,140. So there is an uninterrupted collection. Those who are opposed to this legislation very carefully refrain from explaining the fact that under the operation of either the Carlson bill or the Senate bill, the Federal Treasury will no lose anything. I call on those who are to follow me to tell me how much I will be forgiven this year, how much I will be forgiven next year, and the following year. I will pay my full quota of taxes every year from now on, as long as I stay in Congress, or as long as my earnings stay up, or until I die or lose my income and then I am forgiven, and of course it is a crime in the eyes of some people to forgive any debt to a dead man, or to a man out of a job who cannot pay. They would rather pin the badge of a delinquent taxpayer on the breasts of millions of American people in order to enjoy the privilege of indulging in a little cheap politics.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] has asked the House to instruct its conferees to accept a bill, a part of which I am sure he does not understand, and I know I do not understand. In fact I have never found any Member of this body who does understand all of it. I have discussed it with our experts, and they seem to be puzzled over parts of it. The gentleman is asking that the conferees be instructed to accept a bill which has never been considered by any committee of this House, or by the House itself. Revenue legislation is supposed to originate in the House of Representatives.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I have not the time. It is supposed to originate in the House of Representatives, but the gentleman from Minnesota has asked us to set aside that provision, and merely ratify what the Senate has done. The Senate has made several drastic changes in the bill as it passed the House, but the gentleman from Minnesota is asking us, and in doing so he presents an amazing spectacle, to instruct the House conferees to agree to a bill, the substance of which and the principle of which, was rejected by this House on roll calls on two occasions. He is asking us to reject a bill that was passed by this House as a result of his own motion. It was he who moved to recommit the committee bill and to instruct the committee to report back favorably with a bill incorporating the provisions of the Robertson-Forand bill.

In other words, he is asking the conferees to agree to a bill that was rejected on two roll calls in this House, and to reject a bill that he himself proposed. If there has ever been a more amusing or a more absurd or more humiliating proposal made in this House, I have never witnessed it in the more than 30 years of my service in this body.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. FULMER. I paid my taxes for 1942 on the 15th of March. What I want to ask the gentleman is this: If the Senate bill passes, is it not true that they will use that money to pay my 1943 tax?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes, and, of course, you will never pay your 1942 tax if this bill passes. We all understand that; it has been discussed over and over again. Anyone who says differently is straining at a gnat, and swallowing a camel, and is trying to prove something that is an absurdity.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. And the Senate bill treats our soldiers only one-half as generously as the House bill did.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Of course.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Not even half as much. Our bill had an exemption of $3,500 to the soldiers, while the Senate exemption is $1,500.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman says to read the President's letter. I hope everybody has read it, although the newspapers did not carry it in full. He was sure that the President would not veto the Senate bill, if agreed to by the conferees and approved by the two Houses. The gentleman is straining his imagination, because nothing could be clearer than the President's intention if you read on the second page of his letter the following:

> There are limits beyond which I cannot go. I cannot acquiesce in the elimination of a whole year's tax burden for the upper income groups during the war period when I must call for an increase in taxes and savings from the masses of the people.

"I cannot acquiesce." Does not anyone know that if he does not sign the bill and lets it become a law he is acquiescing in it? Any man knows that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield. The gentleman is begging the question.

Mr. KNUTSON. I call upon the gentleman to read from that letter one line where the word "veto" is mentioned or where he says "I will veto it."

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, he did not say "veto." He said he could not acquiesce.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, he did not acquiesce in the salary ceiling bill either.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If he would let it become law without his signature he would acquiesce. The question is whether or not we want a pay-as-you-go bill now, or whether you want an issue, because just as certain as the sun shines and time rolls on if this bill is sent to the President as passed by the Senate it will be vetoed. We are presented with the humiliating spectacle that we are asked to be rubber stamps for the Senate. The Senate did not instruct its conferees. It left them free-handed to do as they deem best. The gentleman from Minnesota is begging the question when he can read anything in this letter from the President which causes him to conclude, or anyone else to conclude, that the President would not veto the Senate bill.

That was the purpose of the letter, to put the House on guard and the Congress on guard, and it was courageous and fair to let the Congress know that if they sent this bill to him, it would not become a law, either by his signature or by his acquiescence. There is nothing that could be plainer than that. The question is, Are we to have a pay-as-you-go bill? If we are, you need not send the Senate bill to the President, because the time would be wasted. All the time we have employed in writing this bill will be lost and you will have no pay-as-you-go tax bill, but you will have an issue. Now, if you want to go before the country on the issue, I welcome it. I deplore seeing politics brought into this tax matter, but if you desire to go before the country on the issue that you vote here today to forgive yourself an entire year's taxes at a time when our soldiers are fighting and shedding their blood and losing their lives all over the world for the preservation of our liberties and the perpetuity of our institutions, if you want to go before the people and explain that and defend it, as far as I am concerned, you are welcome to it, because it is of your own choosing and you will have it to face.

The Senate has not tied or bound its conferees. It has given them the liberty and the responsibility to sit down with us and work out the best possible bill. The Senate spent only about a week on this bill. We spent months. They hurriedly prepared their bill, doubtless believing that many of the provisions which it had hurriedly incorporated and not given the consideration to which they were entitled, would be ironed out in conference. But we become rubber stamps. We close our eyes. We tie the hands of our conferees. We might just as well not go to conference at all. What is a conference for? Why did you not move to concur in the Senate amendments and be done with it? Do you want to meet the Senate conferees hat in hand and get down on your knees and humbly ask them to let us agree and concur in the Senate bill without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" or the changing of a punctuation mark? That is the situation you will have if this motion of the gentleman from Minnesota is adopted today. It is the most unreasonable, the most amusing, the most fantastical and gymnastical proposition I have ever heard.

The gentleman is standing on his head and turning himself wrong side out on

this question. I have never known such a thing to occur before; going back on his own bill. Without his leadership it could not have passed this House. Now he turns his back on those who cooperated with him and says that the Senate knew better how to write a bill in 1 week than this House knew how to write one in 3 months. It is the most absurd and ridiculous proposition that has ever been submitted to an American Congress.

I trust the House will not tie the hands of its conferees and force them to accept a bill that it does not want, as emphatically expressed on two separate occasions. To do so would be a blow directed at undermining our legislative system which we all pledged to uphold.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include some tables and other data.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the House today has an opportunity to hasten early action on pay-as-you-go tax legislation. I do not believe there can be a division of opinion as to the wisdom and necessity of getting our taxpayers on a current basis. Previous House and Senate action has demonstrated by substantial votes in both bodies that we must have pay-as-you-go tax legislation. During recent months there has been a pronounced division of opinion on the method of arriving at the current tax collection. Now that we seem to be agreed on the necessity for placing our income taxpayers on a current basis, the issue has narrowed down to the provisions of the bill as passed the House, H. R. 2570, and the bill as amended by the Senate.

Today the House has an opportunity to hasten final action on this important legislation, and I sincerely hope the House will vote to send the bill to conference and to approve the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], which would instruct the conferees to approve the amendment passed by the Senate.

There are four reasons why we should do this:

First. It is necessary that we complete legislative action on this bill immediately in order that the collector of internal revenue may have time to set up the administrative machinery necessary to begin collections on July 1.

Second. The House should instruct the conferees to accept the Senate amendment because it will bring more money into the Treasury in 1943 than the bill as passed by the House.

Third. The amendment approved by the Senate makes a hundred percent of the personal income taxpayers current, or as nearly current as any bill can make them.

Fourth. The Senate amendment makes the personal income taxpayers of our Nation current without a doubling up or collection of 2 years' taxes in 1 year.

In discussing these points separately I wish to state first that Mr. Guy T. Helvering has advised the committee that it is necessary that legislative action be completed on pay-as-you-go tax legislation by May 15 in order that he might have sufficient time to set up the collection machinery. This is an immense undertaking and we should assist this administrative agency of the Government by approving this legislation today. There can be no question as to the need for the legislation as I think it can be safely said that everyone from the President down has urged approval of this type of legislation. The citizens of our country are demanding it and this is our opportunity to hasten action.

On the second point I wish to state that revenue is most important from a Treasury standpoint and from the standpoint of the individual taxpayer. Much is being said about the necessity of siphoning off certain moneys in order to assist in the fight against inflation. I want to call your attention to the fact that as a result of the windfall provisions and the fact that liabilities on higher incomes will be collected sooner than under the present law by the reason of withholding at the source and current payments, income-tax payments due under the Senate amendment in the fiscal year 1944 are expected to be $2,012,000,000 greater than the amount due under the present law. This is most important and I want to further call your attention to the fact that the approval of the bill that passed the House will result in practically no increase in revenue. Under existing law the estimated income-tax liability for the fiscal year 1944 will be approximately $13,000,000,000. Under the House bill it will be $13,023,000,000, and under the Senate amendment it will be $15,012,000,000. This additional $2,000,000,000 is important to the Treasury and should carry much weight in the discussion here this afternoon.

For fear there are some here who contend that the Senate amendment or Ruml plan is inflationary I would like to call attention to the testimony of Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, as he testified before the House Committee on Banking and Currency on May 10 and 11. He was interrogated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and his testimony reads as follows:

Mr. PATMAN. It is 12 o'clock now, and I have taken too much time, but I would like to ask you just one more question. Since you say it is highly inflationary to have the commercial banks create this money, and since you have pointed out several things that Congress has done that have caused inflation, what do you think of the passage of a bill as proposed in the Ruml plan? What effect will that have on inflation or our power properly to control inflation?

Mr. ECCLES. The proposed tax bill, you mean?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. ECCLES. The tax bill that was passed?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. Suppose we forgive 40 percent or 50 percent. What effect will that have on our power to control inflation?

Mr. ECCLES. I do not get your point. I do not see that the Ruml plan or the Robertson plan or any other plan has any effect on inflation any more than any other tax bill except that it raises more or less money.

Mr. PATMAN. This is a forgiveness bill. What I mean is this: Suppose you release $10,000,000,000 of purchasing power. In other words, $10,000,000,000 is tied up because it is expected to be paid in taxes. If you release it you release $10,000,000,000 worth of purchasing power. Will that have any effect on our power to control inflation or not?

Mr. ECCLES. To the extent that the people who owe that $10,000,000,000 have actually got it in the form of cash reserves or the equivalent, naturally it would increase the inflationary pressure to the extent that they undertook to spend it. Now, I do not believe that even a very small fraction of the people who are subject to taxes have the cash on hand to meet the taxes. I do think that the larger taxpayers do have cash on hand to meet their taxes, or the equivalent in the form of Governments or some other means of paying the taxes. There may be some increase in the expenditures of people with surplus funds of that sort, but the well-to-do people, I do not believe, would possibly spend a great deal more on consumers' goods, whether this bill was passed or it was not passed.

The third point I mentioned deals with the individual taxpayer and the Senate amendment would make personal income taxpayers as current as it is possible to make them. H. R. 2570, as it passed the House, would make 40,000,000 of the 44,000,000 taxpayers current by forgiving them 100 percent of their liability. If there is any reason on earth for making 40,000,000 taxpayers current by forgiving them 100 percent, then the same reason would compel any fair-minded man to state that the other 4,000,000 American taxpayers should be treated likewise.

I do not see how anyone can justify the inequality of tax abatement in the House bill. Why abate taxes for 40,000,000 taxpayers in order to get them current and at the same time abate in reducing percentages to the 4,000,000 taxpayers who pay 60 percent of the total income tax of the country? If our progressive system of levying income taxes is sound and just in the collection of taxes then it does seem to me that it is just as sound to abate the taxes in reverse. Should the House bill be approved in my opinion it would be unjust and discriminatory to a large portion of our taxpayers. I do not want to treat the American taxpayers in that way.

The fourth point I have previously mentioned in regard to the Senate bill is that it makes our taxpayers current without paying 2 years' taxes in one. I think it is generally agreed by every one that the placing of our taxpayers on a current basis must necessarily cost something unless we believe we can collect 2 years' taxes in one. In fact, there is no loss to the Treasury unless you believe we can double up on income-tax collections. The Senate amendment provides for making taxpayers current by moving the tax clock ahead 1 year with amendments which take care of windfall or abnormal incomes in either 1942 or 1943. The Ways and Means Committee has labored diligently with this problem and in fact it has been the crux of our difficulty. There are those who honestly and sincerely believe we cannot abate taxes and as firmly believe we must get our income taxpayers on a pay-as-you-go system. The discussion during the past few months has been clouded with the issue of forgiveness.

One would gather from the discussions and debate that the Federal Treasury would lose $10,000,000,000 of 1942 tax liability. Nothing is further from the truth. The individual taxpayer would benefit only when his income

decreased or when he died. The Treasury would continue to receive increased revenue under existing rates because of increased national income. If the House today approves the Senate amendment and adopts withholding at the source, the income-tax liability for the fiscal year 1944 will be increased by over $2,000,000,000. If we retain the present law, we will collect $13,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1944. If we approve the House bill, we will collect $13,023,000,000. The Senate amendment, if adopted, would produce estimated income-tax liabilities for the fiscal year 1944 of $15,012,000,000. This should convince anyone that there is no loss in current income or revenue to the Federal Treasury. The loss of tax liability would be spread over a generation of time. In the interests of sound fiscal policy for the Treasury, pay-as-you-go tax legislation should be approved.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following table showing the estimated income-tax liability due under the various tax proposals, and a short comparison of the Senate pay-as-you-earn tax bill with the Carlson bill:

Estimated income-tax liabilities due in the fiscal year 1944 under various alternatives

[In millions of dollars]

Present law	13,000
Finance Committee bill	15,012
House bill	13,023
Ways and Means Committee bill:	
Maximum discount taken	18,623
Minimum discount taken	15,724
Carlson bill	15,263

The Treasury Department has furnished the following detailed estimates of liabilities under the bill:

Estimated income-tax liabilities of the calendar years 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945, under present law and under certain pay-as-you-go bills and estimates of the portions of the income-tax liabilities of the calendar years 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945 which are due and payable into the Treasury in the fiscal years 1943, 1944, and 1945 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

	Income-tax liabilities				Income-tax liabilities due and payable into the Treasury		
	Calendar years—				Fiscal years—		
	1942	1943	1944	1945	1943	1944	1945
1. Under existing law	9,815.3	14,715.7	14,715.7	14,715.7	5,459.6	12,909.5	14,715.8
2. Under existing law but with special treatment for members of the armed forces as in the Senate Finance Committee bill	9,815.3	13,956.4	13,956.4	13,956.4	5,459.6	12,619.8	13,956.5
3. Same as 2, but with pay-as-you-go in operation by Jan. 1, 1942	9,815.3	13,956.4	13,956.4	13,956.4	[2]11,328.3	13,956.4	13,956.4
4. Under the Senate Finance Committee bill		15,256.4	13,956.4	13,956.4	5,459.6	15,012.2	14,056.2
5. Under the House bill	2,213.5	13,913.8	13,913.8	13,913.8	5,277.7	13,022.8	13,913.8
6. Under the Ways and Means Committee bill	4,780.2	13,913.8	13,913.8	13,913.8	5,277.7	15,723.6	15,506.9

[1] Total taxable income for a calendar year is assumed to be distributed equally among the 4 quarters of the year. Calendar years 1944 and 1945 income has not been forecast, but has been assumed to be the same as forecast for calendar year 1943.

[2] Note that this is the only estimate for which the effective date of pay-as-you-go provisions is Jan. 1, 1942. The Senate Finance Committee bill, the House bill, and the Ways and Means Committee bill, are all effective July 1, 1943, except that special treatment of the armed forces with respect to 1942 income tax liabilities is reflected in June 15, 1943, payments.

Treasury Department, Division of Research and Statistics. May 11, 1943.

COMPARISON OF SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-EARN TAX BILL WITH CARLSON BILL

The Senate version of the Ruml plan is based upon the Carlson amendment as considered in the House on May 4. The major change is in the so-called antiwindfall provisions.

Under the Carlson substitute for the Ways and Means Committee bill, the 1942 income-tax assessment would have been abated in the case of all taxpayers, subject to the following exceptions:

First. Where the 1942 liability was higher than the 1943 liability, and the taxable income exceeded $5,000, the taxpayer would have been required, in effect, to pay a 1943 tax based on the higher 1942 income rather than the lower 1943 income, and the abatement of 1 year's liability would have been on the basis of the lower income of 1943, rather than the higher 1942 income. The Senate bill eliminates the $5,000 limitation and applies this provision to all taxpayers having a higher income in 1942 than in 1943. In other words, under the Senate bill, the year of abatement will be the lower of the 2 years in all cases. An exception is made in the case of taxpayers who entered the armed forces during the taxable years 1942 or 1943. In their case, so much of their 1942 income as is attributable to earned income will be excluded from consideration in applying this rule. For the purposes of this provision, the first $3,000 of all income is presumed to be earned income, but in no case shall it be considered to be more than $14,000. This exception will prevent this antiwindfall provision from working a hardship in the case of persons in the armed service whose 1942 civilian income exceeds their 1943 service pay.

Second. The Carlson substitute included a second anti-windfall provision designed to prevent swollen war incomes from escaping their fair share of the tax. As amended in the House in committee of the whole, it provided that where the taxable income in the year otherwise abated exceeded the 1940 taxable income by more than $5,000, the excess should be subject to tax at the regular normal and surtax rates. The effect of this provision was to exclude such swollen income from the benefit of the abatement provisions. The Senate bill makes two major changes in this section: First, it uses the highest income of the years 1938, 1939, or 1940 as the base for measuring swollen war profits in the year otherwise abated; and second, it limits the application of the provision to cases where such excess is more than $10,000, instead of $5,000.

Three other important changes are made by the Senate bill, one of which has to do with the withholding tax exemption, and the other two with the sections relating to the special provisions for members of the armed forces.

Under the Ways and Means Committee bill, the Carlson substitute, and the Robertson-Forand bill, two sets of exemptions were provided under the withholding tax. The 3 percent Victory tax withholding applied to that portion of the income in excess of $624 annually, and the 17 percent income-tax withholding applied to that portion of the income in excess of $550 annually in the case of single persons, and $1,320 annually in the case of married persons, plus $385 for each dependent. In order to simplify the collection machinery, the Senate amendment provides for only one set of exemptions, namely, $624 for single persons, $1,248 for married persons, and $312 for each dependent. This change makes it possible to use only 5 withholding-tax tables instead of 25, as in the several House bills.

Under the Ways and Means Committee bill, the Carlson substitute, and the Robertson-Forand bill members of the armed forces, regardless of rank, would have been exempted from income tax on the first $3,500 of their service pay, in lieu of the regular personal exemption and credit for dependents. The Senate bill modifies this provision by granting each member of the armed forces, regardless of rank, an exemption of $1,500 with respect to their service pay in addition to the regular personal exemption and credit for dependents.

Under the Ways and Means Committee bill, the Carlson substitute, and the Robertson-Forand bill, the outstanding income-tax liabilities of any member of the armed forces dying in active service would have been canceled, regardless of the year for which they were assessed. Under the Senate bill the cancelation is limited first to that portion of the tax attributable to earned income and, second, to the taxes due and payable since the individual entered the service.

In other respects the Senate bill is substantially the same as the Carlson substitute.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes allotted to me I shall endeavor to touch briefly upon the Senate bill.

AMOUNT OF FORGIVENESS TOO GREAT

The bill now before us pays an unreasonable and unnecessary price for putting the taxpayer on a pay-as-you-go basis. In the midst of a cruel and costly war and in the face of a $16,000,000,000 revenue request from the President, this bill forgives over $8,000,000,000 in taxes. It foregoes the right to tax the income and war profits for a record war year. In developing a pay-as-you-go program

for the income tax it loses sight of pay-as-you-go in the broader sense, namely, of paying for the war as we go. It leads taxpayers to expect tax relief at a time when the war effort demands tax increases.

WRONG-WAY REDISTRIBUTION OF WAR COSTS

Under the beguiling description of "equality of treatment" it confers a subsidy on the wealthy which the high rates in the upper brackets block us from recovering.

In terms of our actual income—that is, the income which remains at our disposal after paying our income tax—this bill grants the $2,000-income man a gift of less than 4 weeks' actual income. It grants the $5,000-income man a gift of just under 9 weeks' actual income. The man with the $50,000 income gets a little more than 1 year's actual income. The gift bestowed on a $100,000 man is equal to 20 months' actual income, and the gift to a person with a $1,000,000 income equals 6 years' income after taxes. For the average citizen forgiveness is a drop in the bucket. Yet, for a million-dollar man the subsidy is so great that he could enjoy his current level of income without lifting his little finger.

Comparing tax forgiveness with the tax increases imposed to finance the war, we get much the same picture. For all taxpayers with incomes of over $100,000 the Ruml-Carlson plan would wipe out all the war tax increases imposed in the Revenue Acts of 1940, 1941, and 1942. At the $1,000,000 level, this bill would not only wipe out those tax increases but would confer an additional benefit totaling nearly $600,000. I cannot condone such discriminatory enrichment.

The unjust enrichment of the high-income groups will largely go tax free, since their tax rates are capable of very little expansion. For the average citizen whose tax rates can be substantially increased but who gets only a small gain for cancelation, the situation is reversed. His gift is small and is bound to be temporary, while the gift to the upper income groups is large and permanent. In granting a small gift to those subject to the heaviest tax increases and a large gift to those who are not subject to ratable tax increases, the Ruml-Carlson bill results in gross inequity.

CANCELATION TOO GENEROUS TO TAXPAYER

In the course of congressional consideration of the pay-as-you-go issue, I believe that many have lost sight of the basic reason for cancelation, namely, to avoid hardship in shifting from the present system to a pay-as-you-go system. The cancelation now provided by the bill goes far beyond the amount needed to avoid hardship. The House bill went as far as it was necessary to go both in converting to a current collection basis and in forgiving taxes. The Senate changes make it perfectly clear that this bill incorporates forgiveness for forgiveness' sake. It is no longer forgiveness as a means to the end of achieving pay-as-you-go. It is an unwarranted subsidy which increases the assets or the spendings of taxpayers.

ANTIWINDFALL PROVISIONS DO NOT IMPROVE THE BILL

The so-called antiwindfall provisions of this bill do not decrease its inequity. In fact, they do not touch the major windfall which accrues to wealthy taxpayers and they bring in new inequities. By basing forgiveness on the lower of 1942 and 1943 incomes, the bill makes a decline in income the test of war profiteering. It hits the person who has suffered an economic loss in 1943 due to war's dislocations just as hard as it hits the person who has received an economic gain from war in 1942.

The other windfall provision puts a special tax on war incomes which exceed pre-war incomes by more than $10,000. This will hit persons who are legitimately coming into their own just as hard as it will hit persons who are illegitimately profiting from war. These antiwindfalls make no distinction between just and unjust gains. They make a bad bill even worse.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the Ruml-Carlson bill in the first instance, and if the issue were the same today I would vote the same way. The issue now is a parliamentary situation.

The conferees would be bound, except for the fact that the Senate struck out all after the enacting clause, to move between the four corners of the Robertson-Forand bill, passed by the House, and the Senate bill. If you accept the theory they are now permitted to writing anything they please, the proposal to let the conferees act without instruction is a proposal to let them write a new tax bill, which has not been considered in either the Senate or the House.

No one can predict what, if anything, would come out of such a situation. Perhaps a deadlock; delay most certainly. And any delay now threatens the possibility of passing anything that the Treasury can put into operation by July 1.

Now, then, both bills, Senate and House, forgive taxes. Discharge is the word they use. I do not like to discharge tax liability for anyone at a time when general tax-paying ability and revenue needs are the highest in our history. But it is important to get started on a method of collecting taxes where people pay while they have the money to pay. The withholding tax is not ideal; it will not last long. Already employees are figuring their salaries in the amount of "take home money" they get. But the withholding system is the only one we have a chance to get at this time. It is in both bills.

The question, then, comes down to a choice between Senate and House bills. Treasury figures cited here today show that the Senate bill will collect $15,000,000,000, two billion more than the House bill. It will do that by levies on incomes increased by the war. I say that because it establishes a pre-war base and levies at 1942 rates on the excess in the forgiven year. In this vital respect, then, by $2,000,000,000 of additional revenue raised from war incomes, the Senate bill is preferable to the House bill.

Consequently, facing the fact that if anything is to be done it must be done now to make sure the Treasury can make it effective on the 1st of July, and considering the fact that the Senate bill proposes $2,000,000,000 more in revenue, and gets it from war-boosted incomes, the logical thing, it seems to me, is to vote to instruct the conferees for the Senate bill. I shall vote that way.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, twice this House has rejected the committee bill, twice this House has rejected the Carlson bill, the last time by only four votes; once this House has approved the Robertson-Forand bill. The Senate has rejected overwhelmingly the committee bill and the Forand-Robertson bill and has adopted the Carlson bill with some provisions in it that make it an even better bill than the Carlson bill was as it passed the House so far as windfalls or war millionaires are concerned. So it seems to me today we are faced with the question that this House wants above all the proposals that have been presented to it, the Ruml-Carlson plan as modified by the Senate, and that is what the Senate wants and that is what the people want.

The people want to be on a pay-as-you-go basis. They are anxious to get on a pay-as-you-go basis. A few days ago I was talking with a restaurant man in Washington who employs about 11 people. He tells me he has a complete turn-over in employment now every 3 weeks. He said that these men who come in and work for him work at dozens of different places in a year. They make no tax return, they pay no taxes, and there is no way of catching up with them. Unless we increase the pay roll of Federal employees in the Internal Revenue Bureau to the extent of an army we will never get them. He complained that those who paid taxes are paying the bill and he made the statement that if we were on a pay-as-you-go plan he could deduct their taxes from their pay every week end.

The principal objection to the Carlson-Ruml plan from the beginning was the possibility that under it war millionaires could be created. The Carlson-Ruml plan, the last one, largely took care of that. The Senate version of the Carlson-Ruml bill now before us does an even better job than the last Carlson bill. It will be impossible to have war millionaires under the Senate version of the Carlson-Ruml plan.

Under the Senate bill as it now stands we get three things. First, our taxpayers will be immediately current; second, it will bring into the Treasury more money in 1943 than under the present tax program as it has been; and, third, it will prevent doubling up. That is, there will be no doubling up under it,

whereas under the committee proposal which we may yet have to face again if it goes back to conference, we will have doubling up for at least a part of 1942 taxes.

The question before us then is, Shall we adopt the Senate amendment and end the controversy today or shall we send it back to conference and go on all summer?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement made by Randolph Paul, general counsel of the Treasury, before the Senate Finance Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it should be apparent to all that in our effort to make this tax transition there is no perfect plan and there is no simple plan. The bill passed by the House is as simple as any of them, although all of them are complex. Take the anti-windfall provision of the Senate, for instance; the taxpayer in the high group takes as his base period 1938, 1939, and 1940; he takes the highest of those 3 years, adds $10,000 to it, and then subtracts from the lowest of 1942 or 1943.

There is nothing simple about that. You have got to take into consideration 5 years of income taxes, the last year of which has still 7 months to go.

It is a tribute to the fairness and the patriotism of the Republican Members of this House that they have been uneasy about the windfall provision of the Ruml plan. They notched it 5 different times in the House, including the amendment by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] and the Senate notched it again. Six different efforts to eliminate windfalls. They are not yet all out by any means. The two windfalls which Mr. Ruml said should by all means be taken out have not been taken out. He said you should not forgive the capital gains of the man who gambled on war contracts on Wall Street. That is still in the Senate bill. He said there should be a special estate tax for the rich who made large war incomes and then died. That is not taken care of. You cannot take care of those two items unless you send this measure to conference. It is absurd to appoint conferees and give them no chance to improve the bill. The motion to instruct the conferees should be voted down.

It should be a source of gratification to the 313 Members of this House who voted for the bill that was passed by the House and which incidentally had no consideration whatever in the Senate Finance Committee, that the press, on the whole, has been favorable to it. If we accept the Senate bill I do not know whether the President will veto it or not, but that is not our major concern. We ought to do what we think is best and fairest for the country. There is no Member of this House who is more desirous than I to be fair to the rich, but I tell you the passage of the Ruml bill will not be for the best interest of the rich in the long run. I fear an attack upon them if the masses feel they have secured an unfair tax advantage. That attack most likely would be made upon the corporations in which the poor as well as the rich have their savings.

I worked for months last year to get a fair and logical corporate-tax structure that corporations might survive after the war. I do not want to see them the target for attack in the next tax-rate bill. Now, let us consider other windfall provisions of the Senate bill. You cannot ignore this windfall provision. It forgives a man with a $2,000 salary, 7½ percent of income after taxes. It forgives the $100,000 man 178 percent of his net income after taxes. It forgives the millionaire 315 percent over and above taxes. If you vote for that, vote with your eyes open, because sooner or later the people of this country are going to know what that means. The Senate bill redistributes the 1942 tax burden. You have lost an asset of the Government and you can never recover it. The present top rate is 90 percent. To recover the forgiveness of 1942 tax liability you would have to add 28.5 percent for 3 years.

Under the House bill the maximum forgiveness of war taxes, those accumulated from 1940 to 1942, inclusive, was 77 percent. That war tax on the millionaire was $268,000. When you forgive him $854,000 you forgive him three times his war taxes, and you forgive him the equivalent of his net income for 6 years and you cannot get that back. In discussing making taxpayers current the Ruml tears were shed for the wage earner. It is absurd to say you must forgive all taxpayers a full year of wartime taxes in order to do that.

Mr. Speaker, this motion should be voted down.

STATEMENT OF RANDOLPH E. PAUL, GENERAL COUNSEL FOR THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE ON THE CURRENT PAYMENT OF THE INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

I. INTRODUCTION

The House of Representatives on May 4, 1943, passed a bill providing for current payment of the individual income tax. While some features of the bill were the subject of extensive controversy, large areas of agreement prevailed throughout the deliberations in the Ways and Means Committee and in the House. The provisions of the three leading bills, the Ways and Means Committee bill, the Ruml-Carlson bill, and the bill adopted by the House—reflect essential agreement on the major issue of current payment. All three bills provide for collection at source from wages and salaries starting July 1 at a rate of 20 percent above exemptions. All three bills adopted the same techniques for collection of other liabilities payable currently, but not collected at source. Only with respect to the transition to the new system was there controversy and this was principally with respect to the amount and distribution of tax cancelation for 1942.

Before this committee I need not dwell on the importance of placing taxpayers on a pay-as-you-go basis and eliminating for the great mass of taxpayers the 1-year lag which now exists in our present system of individual income-tax payment. With rates at wartime levels, taxpayers, especially those in the lower income groups, find it difficult to accumulate in advance the funds needed for quarterly lump-sum payments. They may suffer actual hardship in the case of a drop or failure in income because of the lag in income-tax payments. It is now universally recognized, I believe, that tax payment will be made easier, and that hardship will be avoided if tax liabilities are discharged currently out of pay envelopes instead of waiting until the year following the receipt of income. At the same time, current collection will more adequately protect Treasury revenue, and will guarantee a more prompt and more certain flow of revenue to the Government than does the existing method of collection. By promptly withdrawing purchasing power from the income stream before it can exert an upward pressure upon prices, a pay-as-you-go system will strengthen the Government in its critical fight against inflation.

The advantages stated accrue both to taxpayers and Government. With overhanging income-tax debt eliminated for the great majority of taxpayers, and with taxes budgeted more certainly and smoothly, taxpayers are better prepared to meet the demands that may be made on them by the necessities of war finance. An income tax payment system putting the great majority of taxpayers on a current basis will better prepare the income tax for its role in the enormous job of financing this total war. These points, I believe you will agree, settle beyond dispute the importance of the pending legislation.

2. COLLECTION AT THE SOURCE

The withholding provisions of the three major bills considered by the House are identical. Withholding from wages and salaries at a rate sufficient to cover the Victory tax, the normal tax, and 13 percent of surtax net income is to begin on July 1, 1943. In general, the withholding system now in effect for the Victory tax, modified to take account of personal exemptions, is utilized. The withholding rate is 17 percent on the amount of wages over the income tax withholding exemption and 3 percent on the wages over the Victory tax withholding exemption. Thus withholding is required not on a gross basis but only on the excess of the total wages over exemptions and an allowance for normal deductions.

The reduction of the Victory tax withholding rate from 5 to 3 percent is made to avoid overcollection of the Victory tax liability which, after taking account of credits, more nearly approximates 3 than 5 percent. The 17 percent rate for the income tax is designed to collect approximately the normal tax of 6 percent, plus the minimum surtax rate of 13 percent. The withholding rate is slightly lower than the sum of the normal tax and the first bracket surtax, in order to make partial allowance for deductions. The rates are thus designed to minimize as far as possible overwithholding and the consequent necessity for making refunds.

The amount of each wage or salary payment subject to withholding is determined by subtracting from the gross payment the withholding exemptions allowable. The withholding exemption for the Victory tax is $624. The withholding exemptions for the income tax are the regular personal exemptions of $500 for a single person, $1,200 for a married person, and an additional $350 for each dependent, each increased by 10 percent to allow for average deductions. These exemptions are prorated according to the length of the pay period, that is, weekly, semimonthly, monthly, or other pay periods.

For example, the weekly Victory tax allowance is $12, while the weekly income tax allowance is $11 for a single person, $26 for a married couple, and $8 for each dependent.

To enable the employer to determine the proper amount of tax to be withheld, the employee is required to furnish a signed withholding exemption certificate showing whether he is single or married and the number of his dependents. If his marital and dependency status changes, the employee is required to file an amended certificate to take effect for future pay periods. The employer is entitled to rely on the exemption certificate furnished him by the employee in computing the amount to be withheld from the employee's wages, and if the employee fails to furnish the required certificate, no personal exemption or dependency credit is to be allowed. Thus, the employer is not placed under a duty to ascertain the status of an employee, and the responsibility in this regard falls upon the employee.

The House bill gives employers the option of either directly computing the amounts of tax to be withheld or using wage-bracket tables. If the employer chooses the computation method, he subtracts the Victory tax withholding exemption from the wage payment and applies a rate of 3 percent to the balance, and subtracts the income-tax withholding exemption from the wage payment and applies a rate of 17 percent to the balance; the sum of the two resulting amounts is the amount to be withheld. If the employer uses the tables which the House bill provides for the standard pay-roll periods, he determines the amount to be withheld by reading it from the tables. Knowing the person's marital status and number of dependents, the employer needs only to locate the bracket in which the given wage falls and to read off the corresponding amount to be withheld.

Under the House bill the employer is required to make quarterly returns and pay over the tax withheld from his employees in each quarter on or before the last day of the month following the close of the quarter. He is also required to furnish each employee a written receipt showing the wages paid during the year and the amount withheld. If the employee's services are terminated before the close of the calendar year, the receipt must be furnished on the day on which the last payment of wages is made, except that an extension of 30 days may be granted by the Commissioner. In lieu of the present information return with respect to wages, the employer is required to attach to the last quarterly return for the calendar year copies of the receipts which he gives to his employees so that they may be checked against the returns filed by the individual wage earners.

After the close of the year, wage earners are required to file returns showing their actual income and final liabilities for the year. The tax withheld at source is allowed as a credit against such final liability, and adjustments to such liability are made by additional payments or refunds. For the vast majority of wage earners these adjustments will be minor in amount.

Collection at source applies only to compensation for personal services. However, certain types of employment are excluded from withholding under the bill. The principal types excluded are domestic servants, members of the armed forces, and farm labor.

The House bill will discharge by collection at source substantially the full tax liability for persons whose income consists of wages not exceeding $2,700 if single and $3,500 if married, and correspondingly higher amounts if the employee has dependents. Seventy percent of all taxpayers will have their entire tax liability withheld at source and an additional 10 percent will have part of their liability withheld at source.

Since the provisions of the House bill with respect to withholding were drafted, conferences with representatives of employers have produced several suggestions, tending to simplify the burden on employers which is involved in the mechanics of applying the system of collection at the source. Suggested changes of this nature will be described in a separate statement.

3. CURRENT PAYMENT OF TAX LIABILITIES NOT COLLECTED AT SOURCE

Collection at source will discharge the tax liabilities for most taxpayers. There are two types of cases where collection at source does not discharge the total tax liability. One is the case where incomes are not from wages and salaries. The other case is where incomes extend into brackets with rates higher than those covered by collection at source.

With respect to incomes not subject to collection at source the basic technique is the same for all three bills. This technique involves a declaration by the taxpayer of his estimated tax liability for the current year by March 15. This estimated tax is to be paid at quarterly intervals thereafter, or earlier if the taxpayer chooses. The taxpayer may revise the declaration of the estimated tax each quarter and ratably increase or decrease remaining installments.

In the case of the Ruml-Carlson bill and the Ways and Means Committee bill this technique was also to be applied to the balance of the tax liability on incomes subject to source collection but falling in the higher surtax brackets, and to higher surtaxes on incomes not subject to collection at source. It would thus achieve current collection of the total tax liabilities of all taxpayers, except for necessary year-end adjustments. The House bill, however, provides for current collection only of an estimated basic tax of 20 percent. Any balance of tax liability over this amount is payable in the year following the receipt of income in the same manner as under present law.

Declarations of estimated basic tax are required only of those individuals who have more than $100 of income not subject to withholding and whose total gross income would require them to file income-tax returns at the end of the taxable year. Thus, persons whose entire income consists of wages subject to withholding and only a nominal amount of other income are not required to file declarations.

A special rule, common to all three bills, applies to farmers who fulfill the requirements with respect to gross income. Farmers are defined as individuals whose estimated gross income from farming amounts to at least 80 percent of the total estimated gross income from all sources. In their case the declaration of the estimated tax may be made at any time on or before the 15th of December. Farmers are not required to pay in installments, but they may voluntarily elect to do so.

Under the House bill, to prevent substantial underestimates of the estimated basic tax, a penalty is added to the tax. The penalty is 6 percent of any amount by which 16 percent of the actual net income less wages subject to withholding or the personal exemption, whichever is the greater, exceeds the estimated basic tax paid during the year. In other words, this penalty applies only if the individual underestimates by more than 20 percent the net income on which the estimated basic tax is computed. A special rule applicable to farmers who elect the end of the year filing date provides a tolerance limit of 33⅓ percent of actual net income over wages or personal exemption, whichever is the greater.

Additional penalties are provided to safeguard the current payment system. In the case of a failure to file a declaration of estimated tax within the time prescribed, the penalty is $10 or 10 percent of the tax, whichever is greater. In the case of a failure to pay an installment of the estimated tax within the time prescribed, the penalty is $2.50 or 2½ percent of the tax, whichever is greater, for each installment with respect to which such failure occurs.

This system of current payment of tax not collected at source is to come into operation in the third quarter of 1943 to parallel the new collection-at-source system which begins July 1, 1943. The March and June installments of 1942 tax payable in 1943, insofar as an amount equal to the forgiven basic liability is concerned, will be treated as current payments of estimated basic tax for 1943. When the taxpayer files his return in March 1944 adjustments will be made for overpayment or underpayment of the 1943 liability.

4. EXTENT TO WHICH TAXPAYERS ARE ON A CURRENT BASIS UNDER THE THREE MAJOR BILLS

The current payment features of the House bill place 90 percent of taxpayers on a fully current basis except for minor year-end adjustments. The great majority of the remaining 10 percent of taxpayers are made substantially current. Less than 1 percent of all taxpayers would not be at least 75 percent current, and only about 700,000 taxpayers out of nearly 44,000,000 will have a liability exceeding $90 carried over beyond the close of the current year. The House bill achieves current collection for the taxpayers in the lower brackets to whom it is most essential and falls short of fully current collection for only the 4,000,000 taxpayers who have surtax net incomes in excess of $2,000—that is, in excess of the first surtax bracket. In the case of higher-bracket taxpayers, a very substantial part of the tax is discharged currently because the bill applies current collection to the basic tax on the entire income regardless of the surtax bracket into which it falls.

Under the Ruml-Carlson bill all taxpayers would be fully current almost immediately. Under the Ways and Means Committee bill, all taxpayers would be on a current basis with respect to their taxes on current income before the end of 1943. The 7,000,000 taxpayers who had no liability on 1942 income at 1941 rates and exemptions would be current as to all liabilities, while the remaining taxpayers would be required to pay their reduced 1942 tax concurrently with their taxes on current income during 1944, 1945, and 1946.

5. TREATMENT OF 1942 TAX

Although all three bills before the House provided the same methods of collection at source and current payment, the amount of forgiveness of 1942 taxes and the distribution of the forgiveness were a major subject of controversy. The House bill cancels the 6-percent normal tax and 13 percent of surtax net income on 1942 individual incomes. No problem arises on account of the unforgiven 1942 tax. Since only the basic liability for any year is payable currently and since this corresponds to the amount of 1942 tax forgiven, there can be no doubling up of payment.

The Ruml-Carlson bill cancels the entire tax on 1942 income except for certain offsets intended to prevent windfall gains to some taxpayers. One of these antiwindfall provisions applies where 1943 income is less than 1942 income while the other applies when both 1942 and 1943 incomes are greater than 1940 income, the year 1940 having been substituted for the year 1941 by floor amendment. Under the Ruml-Carlson bill there would in general be no doubling up, since, while the whole tax is payable currently each year, the entire 1942 tax is correspondingly forgiven. An exception is presented in those cases where the second of the above antiwindfall provisions is applicable, since the amount of tax not forgiven under the antiwindfall provisions is payable in 1943, unless an extension of time is granted by the Commissioner in cases of hardship.

The bill reported by the House Ways and Means Committee recomputes the tax on 1942 income at 1941 rates and exemptions

and the difference is canceled. Under this bill the unforgiven 1942 tax liabilities require special treatment. Provision is made for collecting them in three annual installments beginning March 15, 1944. To encourage advance payment of the later installments, provision is made for a discount of 6 percent of the reduced 1942 tax if full payment is made by March 15, 1944, and a discount of 2 percent of such tax if the 1944 installment is paid and the balance is paid by March 15, 1945. The Commissioner is authorized to grant an extension of time up to 3 years in those cases where payment of any installment would result in undue hardship.

6. PROVISIONS RELATING TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The House bill contains two provisions relating to members of the armed forces. One provision exempts from income tax the service pay of most members of the armed forces. The second provision abates outstanding income-tax liability for members of the armed forces who die while on active service. The provisions in the House bill are identical with those contained in the Ruml-Carlson bill and in the Ways and Means Committee bill.

Under present law there is provided an exclusion from gross income in the case of personnel below the grade of commissioned officer in the military and naval forces of the United States. The amount excluded under this provision is not to exceed $250 in the case of a single person and $300 in the case of a married person or head of a family and applies only to salary or compensation received for active service in the armed forces during the present war. These exclusions are in addition to the personal exemptions.

The House bill proposes to amend this provision by increasing the exclusion from gross income in the case of military and naval personnel, without distinction as to rank, with respect to the compensation received during any taxable year for active service during the present war. The amount so excluded is not to exceed the excess of $3,500 over the personal exemption claimed by the member of the military or naval forces. If such member of the armed forces is married and living with his spouse on the last day of the taxable year and his spouse is not a member of the military or naval forces, the amount of the exclusion is not to exceed the excess of $3,500 over the personal exemption claimed by both the spouse and the member of the military or naval forces. Thus, under this provision, the amount of service pay which may be excluded from gross income in the case of a married person is the same regardless of whether joint or separate returns are filed and regardless of the property law of any State. The amendment would apply with respect to all compensation received after December 31, 1941, by a member of the armed forces of the United States for active service in such forces, and is thus retroactive to the year 1942.

Under another provision of the House bill, members of the armed forces who die in active service are relieved from income taxes for the taxable year in which falls the date of death. In addition, there is abated all income taxes (including interest and additions to tax) which are unpaid as of the date of death. If the amount of any such liability which was unpaid as of the date of death is collected subsequent to such date, provision is made that the amount so collected shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment. This amendment becomes effective with respect to members of the armed forces dying in active service on or after December 7, 1941.

7. REVENUE EFFECTS UNDER THE THREE MAJOR BILLS

The 1942 tax liabilities under present law are estimated at $9,815,000,000 before giving effect to the special provisions relating to the armed forces and at $9,451,000,000 after giving effect to these special provisions. The House bill would cancel $7,238,000,000. The Ruml-Carlson bill would cancel the entire $9,451,000,000 but would recoup through windfall provisions $1,133,000,000, resulting in a net cancelation of $8,319,000,000 after giving effect to these special provisions. The Ways and Means Committee bill would cancel $4,672,000,000. Thus, of the 1942 liabilities there would remain only $2,214,000,000 under the House bill, $1,133,000,000 under the Ruml-Carlson bill (this entire amount being due to the special windfall provisions) and $4,780,000,000 under the Ways and Means Committee bill.

Under the House bill the tentative estimates of income-tax liabilities due in the fiscal year 1944 would not be appreciably different from the income-tax liabilities due under the present law. The liabilities due in each case would amount to approximately $13,000,000,000. The increase of over a half billion dollars in liabilities due in the fiscal year 1944 under the House bill as a result of subjecting the higher levels of income in 1943 and 1944 to current tax payment insofar as the basic liability is concerned is offset for the most part by the decrease in liabilities resulting from the relief for the armed forces.

Under the Ruml-Carlson bill the liabilities due in the fiscal year 1944 would amount to $15,263,000,000 and under the Ways and Means Committee bill to $15,724,000,000 if no discounts are taken, and $18,623,000,000 if the maximum discounts are taken. The larger collections under the Ways and Means Committee bill and the Ruml-Carlson bill in that particular year are due in part to a doubling up of certain liabilities with respect to 1942 taxes and in part to a more complete dependence of the liabilities due in the fiscal year 1944 upon the higher level of current income than under the House bill, since under the House bill the liabilities with respect to the upper surtax brackets are based upon the preceding year's income.

In the fiscal years 1945 and 1946 the Ways and Means Committee bill will continue to produce larger amounts of revenue than the other two bills to the extent that the 1942 tax is not fully paid in 1944. The revenue under the Ruml-Carlson bill and the House bill will be equal in fiscal year 1945 if 1944 and 1945 incomes are at the same level as 1943 incomes. If the trend of income continues upward the yield under the Ruml-Carlson bill will be somewhat higher than under the House bill since current collection applies to the whole tax instead of to the basic tax, which accounts for about three-fourths of the total. On the other hand, if income trends should turn downward the yield under the Ruml-Carlson bill would, for the same reason, be less than the yield under the House bill.

The estimated income tax liabilities due during 1943 and 1944 and the amount of 1942 taxes canceled under the Ruml-Carlson bill are given in exhibit 5. Corresponding estimates under the House bill and the Ways and Means Committee bill are given in exhibits 6 and 7.

8. DISTRIBUTION OF FORGIVENESS

The three plans differ not only with respect to the aggregate amount of tax forgiven but also with respect to the distribution of forgiveness among the various income brackets. Superficially each of the three bills distributes its forgiveness on a uniform pattern. The Ruml-Carlson bill forgives the whole tax from the lowest income to the highest income. The House bill forgives the normal tax and 13 percent of surtax net income uniformly from top to bottom. The Ways and Means Committee bill shifts the rates and exemptions from the 1942 levels to the 1941 levels for all taxpayers. Thus on its face each bill appears to apply its forgiveness on a uniform basis for all taxpayers.

This apparent uniformity, however, does not mean that in actual operation each of the three bills distributes the benefits of forgiveness in an equitable manner. The relative distribution of forgiveness among different income brackets differs widely under the three bills. The assumption, which many people make, that uniform treatment is afforded when the same percentage of tax is forgiven to all taxpayers fails to take account of several very important considerations.

A usual method of comparing the fairness of tax provisions is to measure the distribution of tax burdens imposed among the various income levels. On this basis of comparison, both the House bill and the Ways and Means Committee bill distribute the remaining 1942 tax burden in the form of progressive tax rate schedule although they differ as to exemptions and the pattern of the rate schedule. The Ruml-Carlson bill, however, leaves no burden at all on 1942 income, except as to the anti-windfall provisions. This pattern of burden is obviously not equitable in a year of wartime income.

A second method of measuring the fairness of the distribution of tax forgiveness is based on the amount of income which a taxpayer has at his disposal to spend or to save—not income before taxes, but income after payment of taxes. The Federal income tax has been in operation for 30 years. During every year of that time the receipt by an individual of a dollar of net income above exemptions has concurrently created a tax liability which must be subtracted to reflect the actual income. It is this actual income after tax and not the income before tax which is the proper standard for measuring the effects of tax forgiveness on persons in different income levels. Forgiveness adds wealth to the taxpayer, or reduces his liabilities, which is in effect the same thing. How do the amounts of the forgiveness under the three bills compare with respect to income remaining after the taxes which are prescribed for 1942 by existing law?

The answer to this question may be seen in the following table showing for the three bills the relation of the amount of the forgiveness to the income after tax:

Net income before personal exemption	Income tax, present law (married person, no dependents)	Income after tax	Amount forgiven under—		
			Ruml-Carlson bill	House bill	Ways and Means Committee bill
$2,000	$140	$1,860	$140	$140	$100
$3,000	324	2,676	324	324	192
$5,000	746	4,254	746	691	388
$10,000	2,152	7,848	2,152	1,614	860
$25,000	9,220	15,780	9,220	4,437	2,396
$100,000	64,060	35,940	64,060	18,690	11,357
$1,000,000	854,000	146,000	854,000	189,750	121,126

Net income before personal exemption	Income after tax	Amount forgiven as percent of income after tax under—		
		Ruml-Carlson bill	House bill	Ways and Means Committee bill
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
$2,000	$1,860	7.5	7.5	5.4
$3,000	2,676	12.1	12.1	7.2
$5,000	4,254	17.5	16.2	9.1
$10,000	7,848	27.4	20.6	11.0
$25,000	15,780	58.4	28.1	15.2
$100,000	35,940	178.2	52.0	31.6
$1,000,000	146,000	584.9	130.0	83.0

From the above table, it is clear that while all three bills are more generous to the higher income groups than to lower income groups, the Ruml-Carlson plan is much more

extreme in this effect. This may be perhaps clearer from the following illustrations:

A person with an income before taxes of $2,000 whose actual income after taxes is $1,860, under the Ruml-Carlson bill, would have $140 added to his $1,860 or slightly less than 4 weeks' actual income.

A person with $5,000 income before taxes whose actual income after taxes is $4,254 would have $746 added by the Ruml-Carlson bill or slightly less than 9 weeks' actual income.

The person with $10,000 income before taxes whose actual income after taxes is $7,848 would have $2,152 added, or nearly 14 weeks' actual income.

The person with $50,000 income before taxes whose actual income after taxes is $24,672 would have $25,328 added or a little more than 1 year's actual income.

The person with $100,000 income before taxes whose actual income after taxes is $35,940 would have $64,060 added or about 20 months' actual income.

The person with $1,000,000 before taxes whose actual income after taxes is $146,000 would have $854,000 added or about 6 years' actual income.

Thus, the Ruml-Carlson plan would add actual incomes ranging from 4 weeks for the $2,000 man to 6 years for the $1,000,000 man.

A third measure of the fairness of tax forgiveness is the comparison of the amounts of forgiveness with the amounts of tax increases which have been imposed to finance the defense and war efforts. These increases were contained in the Revenue Acts of 1940, 1941, and 1942. They were intended to impose fair and equitable wartime tax increases according to the judgment of Congress. What portion of these increases would be wiped out by tax forgiveness under the three bills at various levels of income? The answer to this question is seen in the following table for a few income levels:

Net income before personal exemption	Tax increases under acts of 1940, 1941, and 1942 for married person, no dependents	Amount forgiven as percent of tax increases under—		
		Ruml plan	House bill	Ways and Means Committee bill
$2,000	$182	76.9	76.9	55.0
$3,000	469	69.1	69.1	40.9
$5,000	991	75.3	69.7	39.2
$10,000	2,740	78.5	58.9	31.4
$25,000	12,460	74.0	35.6	19.2
$100,000	62,833	102.0	29.7	18.1
$1,000,000	267,006	319.8	71.1	45.4

From the above table, it is seen that in terms of taxes imposed for the war effort, the Ruml-Carlson bill would wipe out the whole increase as of January 1, 1943, for taxpayers with incomes of over $100,000, and at the $1,000,000 level would confer additional benefits amounting to nearly $600,000. The other two bills avoid canceling a greater amount than the wartime tax increases, with respect to all taxpayers.

A fourth measure of the fairness of distributing forgiveness relates to the problem of increased taxes to finance the war. In the January 1943 Budget message, the President asked for "not less than $16,000,000,000 of additional funds by taxation, savings, or both." In whatever form additional taxes are imposed, it is inevitable that by and large the increases will fall proportionately most heavily on the lower and middle incomes since it is not feasible to raise the rates on the higher incomes proportionally. The increased taxes will apply to periods subsequent to 1942. If 1942 taxes are to be forgiven for the purpose of getting the great mass of our taxpayers on a pay-as-you-go basis, it would seem obvious justice that insofar as possible those who benefit by the forgiveness should be subject at least to an equal amount of additional burdens. It would be grossly inequitable to forgive taxes to income groups on whom future tax increases cannot be imposed and then to impose heavy tax increases on other income groups.

With respect to the possibility of reimposing the canceled taxes on the same income levels, the following table shows the effective rates of tax increase which would have to be applied to selected net incomes under each plan to recoup over a 3-year period the tax forgiven on those amounts of income:

Net income before personal exemption	Effective rates of income and net Victory tax liability, present law	Effective tax-rate increase necessary to recoup canceled taxes at same income levels over a 3-year period		
		Ruml-Carlson bill	House bill	Ways and Means Committee bill
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
$2,000	9.4	2.3	2.3	1.7
$3,000	13.5	3.6	3.6	2.1
$5,000	17.9	5.0	4.6	2.6
$10,000	24.7	7.2	5.4	2.9
$100,000	68.6	21.4	6.2	3.8
$1,000,000	89.9	28.5	6.3	4.0

From the above table it is apparent that the effective rates necessary under the Ruml-Carlson bill necessary to offset the forgiven taxes by rate increases applied over 3 years would exceed 100 percent for the higher income brackets. The bracket rates of tax would have to be even higher.

In the light of these facts, whatever other objections may be brought against the House bill and the Ways and Means Committee bill, these bills cannot properly be criticized as distributing 1942 tax forgiveness less uniformly and less fairly among taxpayers than the Ruml-Carlson bill. On the contrary they are much more equitable in their distribution of forgiveness than the Ruml-Carlson bill, which would result in a substantial redistribution of income in the direction of the higher income levels.

9. SUMMARY

With respect to the collection at the source and the current tax payment provisions, the Treasury believes there is little room for choice between the three major bills. All three provide for the fundamental change in tax payment methods which is necessary in our tax law. While the House bill does not place the higher surtax bracket incomes on a fully current basis, it must be recognized that the taxpayers in these brackets are best able to provide in advance for taxes.

Any choice between the three bills must, therefore, be based primarily upon the treatment provided with respect to the 1942 tax liability. Insofar as the distribution of forgiveness is concerned, the Treasury Department believes that both the Ways and Means Committee bill and the House bill distribute the cancelation of the 1942 tax on a reasonably equitable and fair basis. However, the smaller amount of cancelation under the Ways and Means Committee bill results in a substantial increase in the revenue collections in the next few years at a time when such an increase is vitally necessary. The Treasury therefore believes that the Ways and Means Committee bill possesses a definite advantage over the House bill. With respect to the Ruml-Carlson bill, as has already been indicated, the distribution of forgiveness is thoroughly inequitable and unfair. While this bill would produce some additional revenue in the fiscal year 1944 this aspect is more than offset by the factor of inequitable treatment of the 1942 tax. The Treasury therefore believes that the Ruml-Carlson bill is definitely inferior to both the Ways and Means Committee bill and the House bill.

Finally, I should like to emphasize an aspect of which your committee is fully aware, as indicated by the promptness with which these hearings have been commenced. This is the importance of prompt action in order to permit current collection to start by July 1 of this year. The Bureau of Internal Revenue has already taken preliminary steps to prepare for speedy inauguration of the current collection system should the Congress complete its action by May 15. I think it is vitally important both from the standpoint of the taxpayer and the standpoint of the Government to have collection at source under way by July 1. I therefore hope that the committee will take action on this bill in time to permit accomplishment of this objective.

EXHIBIT 1

Amounts of individual net income tax and effective rates of tax for 1942 under (1) present law, (2) Ruml-Carlson bill, (3) House bill, and (4) Ways and Means Committee bill, for selected levels of net income

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption [1]	Tax on 1942 income				Effective rates			
	Present law	Ruml-Carlson bill	House bill	Ways and Means Committee bill	Present law	Ruml-Carlson bill	House bill	Ways and Means Committee bill
					Percent		*Percent*	*Percent*
$1,200								
$1,500	$48				3.2			
$1,800	103			$22	5.7			1.2
$2,000	140			40	7.0			2.0
$2,500	232			86	9.3			3.4
$3,000	324			132	10.8			4.4
$4,000	532		$25	236	13.3		0.6	5.9
$5,000	746		55	358	14.9		1.1	7.2
$6,000	992		117	505	16.5		2.0	8.4
$8,000	1,532		289	861	19.2		3.6	10.8
$10,000	2,152		538	1,292	21.5		5.4	12.9
$15,000	4,052		1,513	2,705	27.0		10.1	18.0
$20,000	6,452		2,963	4,581	32.3		14.8	22.9
$25,000	9,220		4,783	6,824	36.9		19.1	27.3
$50,000	25,328		16,143	20,393	50.7		32.3	40.8
$100,000	64,060		45,370	52,703	64.1		45.4	52.7
$500,000	414,000		319,290	345,294	82.8		63.9	69.1
$1,000,000	854,000		664,250	732,874	85.4		66.4	73.3
$5,000,000	4,374,000		3,423,930	3,922,844	87.5		68.5	78.5

[1] Maximum earned net income assumed.

Source: Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, May 5, 1943.

EXHIBIT 2

Amounts and percents of 1942 tax canceled under Ruml-Carlson bill, House bill, and Ways and Means Committee bill for selected levels of net income

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Net income before personal exemption [1]	1942 income tax	Amount of 1942 tax canceled			Percent of 1942 tax canceled		
		Ruml-Carlson bill	House bill	Ways and Means Committee bill	Ruml-Carlson bill	House bill	Ways and Means Committee bill
					Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
$1,200							
$1,500	$48	$48	$48	$48	100	100.0	100.0
$1,800	103	103	103	81	100	100.0	78.6
$2,000	140	140	140	100	100	100.0	71.4
$2,500	232	232	232	146	100	100.0	62.9
$3,000	324	324	324	192	100	100.0	59.3
$4,000	532	532	507	296	100	95.3	55.6
$5,000	746	746	691	388	100	92.6	52.0
$6,000	992	992	875	487	100	88.2	49.1
$8,000	1,532	1,532	1,243	671	100	81.1	43.8
$10,000	2,152	2,152	1,614	860	100	75.0	40.0
$15,000	4,052	4,052	2,539	1,347	100	62.7	33.2
$20,000	6,452	6,452	3,489	1,871	100	54.1	29.0
$25,000	9,220	9,220	4,437	2,396	100	48.1	26.0
$50,000	25,328	25,328	9,185	4,935	100	36.3	19.5
$100,000	64,060	64,060	18,690	11,357	100	29.2	17.7
$500,000	414,000	414,000	94,710	68,606	100	22.9	16.6
$1,000,000	854,000	854,000	189,750	121,126	100	22.2	14.2
$5,000,000	4,374,000	4,374,000	950,070	451,156	100	21.7	10.3

[1] Maximum earned net income assumed.

Source: Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, May 5, 1943.

EXHIBIT 3

Income and net Victory tax payments due in calendar year 1944, and effective rates under the Ruml-Carlson bill, House bill, and Ways and Means Committee bill at selected levels of net income [1]

MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS

Tax payments due

Net income before personal exemption [2]	Under both the Ruml-Carlson bill and the House bill	Under the Ways and Means Committee bill	
		If no discount is taken	If 6 percent discount is taken [3]
$1,200	$21	$21	$21
$1,500	79	79	79
$1,800	144	151	165
$2,000	188	201	226
$2,500	297	326	378
$3,000	405	449	529
$4,000	647	726	869
$5,000	894	1,013	1,231
$6,000	1,173	1,341	1,648
$8,000	1,780	2,067	2,589
$10,000	2,467	2,898	3,681
$15,000	4,533	5,435	7,076
$20,000	7,100	8,627	11,406
$25,000	10,035	12,310	16,450
$50,000	27,075	33,873	46,244
$100,000	68,584	86,152	118,125
$500,000	440,747	555,878	765,417
$1,000,000	[4] 899,000	1,143,291	1,587,902
$5,000,000	[4] 4,499,000	5,806,615	8,186,473

Effective rates

	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
$1,200	1.8	1.8	1.8
$1,500	5.3	5.3	5.3
$1,800	8.0	8.4	9.2
$2,000	9.4	10.1	11.3
$2,500	11.9	13.0	15.1
$3,000	13.5	15.0	17.6
$4,000	16.2	18.2	21.7
$5,000	17.9	20.3	24.6
$6,000	19.6	22.4	27.5
$8,000	22.3	25.8	32.4
$10,000	24.7	29.0	36.8
$15,000	30.2	36.2	47.2
$20,000	35.5	43.1	57.0
$25,000	40.1	49.2	65.8
$50,000	54.2	67.7	92.5
$100,000	68.6	86.2	118.1
$500,000	88.1	111.2	153.1
$1,000,000	[4] 89.9	114.3	158.8
$5,000,000	[4] 90.0	116.1	163.7

[1] Net income for 1942, 1943, and 1944 assumed to be same. For Victory tax purposes, gross income assumed to be ten-ninths of net income. Net Victory tax is used on assumption that taxpayer receives current benefit of post-war credit.

[2] Maximum earned net income assumed.

[3] Under the Ways and Means Committee bill a discount of 6 percent is allowed if the entire amount of the reduced tax for 1942 is paid on or before March 15, 1944.

[4] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 90 percent on combined net income and Victory tax.

Source: Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, May 5, 1943.

EXHIBIT 4

Approximate distribution of income recipients by percentage of total liabilities discharged currently under the House bill

[Calendar year 1943]

Percentage of total liability discharged currently	Number of taxable income recipients (millions)	Percentage of all taxable income recipients	Cumulative percentage of all taxable income recipients	Maximum amount of tax not discharged currently
100	38.7	88.8	88.8	0
90 to 100	4.2	9.6	98.4	$90
75 to 90	.3	.7	99.1	550
50 to 75	.3	.7	99.8	4,200
25 to 50	.1	.2	100.0	115,000
Less than 25	.002	.005	100.0	
Total	43.6	100.0		

EXHIBIT 5

Estimated income-tax liabilities due under the Carlson amendment, as amended, to H. R. 2570, as voted on in the House of Representatives May 4, 1943, which would—

1. Remit to all taxpayers the net income-tax liabilities on calendar year 1942 income, as modified in provision (2).

2. Allow any member of the armed forces in active service an exclusion from base pay received after December 31, 1941, equal to the excess of $3,500 over the personal exemption claimed by such member (and by his spouse if such member is married and living with his spouse on the last day of the taxable year, and such spouse is not entitled to the benefit of this allowance).

3. By June 15, 1943, require payment of at least one-half of proposed net income-tax liabilities on income of the calendar year 1942, to be treated as payments toward income-tax liabilities on calendar year 1943 income.

4. Withhold after June 30, 1943, from salaries and wages in excess of the withholding allowance (110 percent of the personal exemption and dependent credit) at a rate of 17 percent; and, in addition, withhold from salaries and wages in excess of an annual rate of $624 at a rate of 3 percent in lieu of the 5-percent Victory tax now withheld on salaries and wages.

5. For those taxpayers whose calendar year 1942 and calendar year 1943 surtax net incomes exceed calendar year 1940 surtax net income by more than $5,000, compute an additional calendar year 1943 tax liability as follows: From the smaller of the surtax net income of the calendar years 1942 and 1943, deduct the sum of $5,000, plus the calendar year 1940 surtax net income. The additional tax is the sum of 6 percent of such difference, plus the surtax computed on such difference at present law rates, and is due by December 15, 1943.

6. For those taxpayers whose present law calendar year 1942 net income-tax liability is both greater than $1,050 and greater than the calendar year 1943 tax liability, add to present law calendar year 1943 net income-tax liabilities the smaller of the excesses of present law calendar year 1942 net income-tax liabilities over (a) $1,050 or (b) present law calendar year 1943 net income-tax liabilities. This additional tax is due by December 15, 1943.

7. Require that total proposed tax liabilities (comprising the proposed net Victory tax and the proposed net income tax but excluding the two additional taxes described in provisions (5) and (6) on incomes of the calendar years 1943 and subsequent years be paid currently. Quarterly payments are required on September 15 and December 15, 1943, to discharge such part of the proposed tax liabilities on income of the calendar year 1943 required to be paid currently as is not withheld during the calendar year 1943 or discharged by payments prior to June 15, 1943. Quarterly payments are required in subsequent years in such amounts that, together with the amounts withheld, tax liabilities will be paid currently.

	In millions of dollars
Estimated income-tax liabilities due: [1]	
Last 6 months of fiscal year 1943	5,277.7
First 6 months of fiscal year 1944	8,383.3
Last 6 months of fiscal year 1944	6,879.8
Total, 18 months, Jan. 1, 1943–June 30, 1944	20,540.8
Calendar year 1943	13,661.0
Fiscal year 1944	15,263.1
Reconciliation of total proposed income tax liabilities, 18 months, Jan. 1, 1943–June 30, 1944, with total tax liabilities under present law on incomes of the calendar years 1942, 1943, and 1944:	
Total income-tax liabilities, 18 months period, Jan. 1, 1943–June 30, 1944	20,540.8
Amount withheld but not received until after June 30, 1944 (3 months' withholding)	1,462.6
Proposed net income tax and Victory-tax liabilities through Dec. 31, 1944, not withheld or paid through June 30, 1944	6,957.0
Reduction proposed in tax liabilities of the armed forces on incomes of the calendar years 1942, 1943, and 1944 [2]	1,967.7

[1] Total taxable income for a calendar year is assumed to be distributed equally among the four quarters of the year. Calendar year 1944 income has not been forecast, but has been assumed to be the same as forecast for calendar year 1943.

[2] The loss with respect to tax liabilities on income of the calendar year 1944 should be somewhat greater, but has been assumed to be the same as on income of the calendar year 1943. Calendar year 1942 and calendar year 1943 net income tax liabilities are reduced by $363.9 millions and $670.1 millions, respectively. Calendar year 1943 net Victory tax liabilities are reduced by $131.8 millions.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.

	In millions of dollars
Reconciliation of total proposed income tax liabilities—Con.	
Proposed net income-tax liabilities remitted in addition to the special exclusion allowed to the armed forces	9,451.3
Elimination of additions to 1943 net income tax liabilities:	
Windfall provision	—455.9
Excess-profits tax	—676.9
Total tax liabilities under present law on income of the calendar years 1942, 1943, and 1944	39,246.6
Total tax liabilities under Carlson proposal on income of the calendar years 1942, 1943, and 1944	28,960.4

Treasury Department, Division of Research and Statistics, May 5, 1943.

EXHIBIT 6

Estimated income-tax liabilities[1] due under H. R. 2577 as passed by the House of Representatives on May 4, 1943. The estimates assume that H. R. 2577 would—

1. Remit the basic tax liabilities on income of the calendar year 1942 (normal tax plus 13 percent of entire surtax net income).[2]

2. Allow any member of the armed forces in active service an exclusion from base pay received after December 31, 1941, equal to the excess of $3,500 over the personal exemption claimed by such member (and by his spouse if such member is married and living with his spouse on the last day of the taxable year and such spouse is not entitled to the benefit of this allowance).

3. By June 15, 1943, require payment of at least one-half of proposed net income-tax liabilities (prior to remission of basic tax liabilities) on income of the calendar year 1942.

4. Withhold after June 30, 1943, from salaries and wages in excess of the withholding allowance (110 percent of the personal exemption and dependent credit) at a rate of 17 percent; and in addition withhold from salaries and wages in excess of an annual rate of $624 at a rate of 3 percent, in lieu of the 5-percent Victory tax now withheld on salaries and wages.

5. In case gross income from sources other than salaries and wages can reasonably be expected to exceed $100 for the current calendar year, require certain current payments to be applied toward basic tax liabilities and net Victory-tax liabilities not withheld at source.[2] Such current payments are equal to 20 percent of the excess of estimated net income over the larger of (a) estimated salaries and wages or (b) personal exemption plus dependent credit.

6. Require that any basic tax liabilities or net Victory-tax liabilities not paid currently be paid by March 15 of the following year.[2]

7. Require payments of "balance tax liabilities" (the excess of total net income-tax liabilities over liabilities for basic tax[2] equal to normal tax plus 13 percent of entire surtax net income) to be collected as under present law; namely, in the year following the calendar year in which the taxable income is received.

	In millions of dollars
Estimated income-tax liabilities due:	
Last 6 months of fiscal year 1943	5,277.7
First 6 months of fiscal year 1944	5,102.5
Last 6 months of fiscal year 1944	7,920.3
Total, 18 months, Jan. 1, 1943–June 30, 1944	18,300.5
Calendar year 1943	10,380.2
Fiscal year 1944	13,022.8
Reconciliation of total income-tax liabilities, 18 months, Jan. 1, 1943–June 30, 1944, with total income-tax liabilities under present law on incomes of the calendar years 1942, 1943, and 1944—	
Total tax liabilities, 18 months period, Jan. 1, 1943–June 30, 1944	18,300.5
Amount withheld but not received until after June 30, 1944 (3 months' withholding)	1,462.6
Proposed tax liabilities through Dec. 31, 1944, not withheld or paid through June 30, 1944:	
Calendar year 1943 liabilities	1,375.6
Calendar year 1944 liabilities	8,902.3
Total	10,277.9
Reduction proposed in tax liabilities of the armed forces on incomes of the calendar years 1942, 1943, and 1944[1]	1,967.7
Proposed calendar year 1942 basic tax liabilities remitted in addition to the special exclusion allowed to the armed forces	7,237.9
Total tax liabilities under present law on income of the 36-months' period, Jan. 1, 1942–Dec. 31, 1944	39,246.6
Total tax liabilities under H. R. 2577 on income of the 36-months' period, Jan. 1, 1942–Dec. 31, 1944	30,041.0

[1] The loss with respect to tax liabilities on income of the calendar year 1944 should be somewhat greater, but has been assumed to be the same as on income of the calendar year 1943. Calendar year 1942 and calendar year 1943 net income tax liabilities are reduced by $363,900,000 and $670,100,000, respectively. Calendar year 1943 net Victory tax liabilities are reduced by $131,800,000.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.

Source: Treasury Department, Division of Research and Statistics, May 5, 1943.

EXHIBIT 7

Estimated income-tax liabilities[1] due under H. R. 2570 as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, April 24, 1943, which would—

1. Remit to all taxpayers the difference between the net income-tax liabilities on calendar year 1942 incomes as modified in provision (2) and such liabilities computed under a rate schedule applied to calendar year 1942 tax liabilities which approximates the yield derived by using the lower tax rates and the larger personal exemptions and dependent credit of the Revenue Act of 1941.

2. Allow any member of the armed forces in active service an exclusion from base pay received after December 31, 1941, equal to the excess of $3,500 over the personal exemption claimed by such member (and by his spouse if such member is married and living with his spouse on the last day of the taxable year and such spouse is not entitled to the benefit of this allowance).

3. By June 15, 1943, require payment of at least one-half of proposed net income-tax liabilities on income of the calendar year 1942.

4. Withhold after June 30, 1943, from salaries and wages in excess of the withholding allowance (110 percent of the personal exemption and dependent credit) at a rate of 17 percent; and in addition withhold from salaries and wages in excess of an annual rate of $624 at a rate of 3 percent, in lieu of the 5-percent Victory tax now withheld on salaries and wages.

5. Require the unremitted 1942 tax liabilities to be paid over a period of 3 years, one-third being due by March 15 of each of the years 1944, 1945, and 1946.

6. Allow a discount of 6 percent of the unremitted tax if paid in full by March 15, 1944, and a discount of 2 percent if paid in full by March 15, 1945.

7. Require that total proposed tax liabilities (including the net Victory tax) on incomes of the calendar year 1943 and subsequent years be paid currently. Quarterly payments are required on September 15 and December 15, 1943, to discharge such part of the proposed tax liabilities on income of the calendar year 1943 as is not withheld during calendar year 1943 or discharged by payments prior to June 15, 1943. Quarterly payments are required in subsequent years in such amounts that, together with the amounts withheld, tax liabilities will be paid currently.

[In millions of dollars]

	Maximum discounts taken	No discounts taken
Estimated income tax liabilities:		
Last 6 months of fiscal year 1943	5,277.7	5,277.7
First 6 months of fiscal year 1944	7,250.5	7,250.5
Last 6 months of fiscal year 1944	11,372.8	8,473.1
Total, 18 months, Jan. 1, 1943–June 30, 1944	23,901.0	21,001.3
Calendar year 1943	12,528.2	12,528.2
Fiscal year 1944	18,623.3	15,723.6
Reconciliation of total tax liabilities, 18 months, Jan. 1, 1943–June 30, 1944, with total tax liabilities under present law on incomes of the calendar years 1942, 1943, and 1944:		
Total tax liabilities, 18 months period, Jan. 1, 1943–June 30, 1944	23,901.0	21,001.3
Amount withheld but not received until after June 30, 1944 (3 months withholding)	1,462.6	1,462.6
Proposed tax liabilities through Dec. 31, 1944, not withheld or paid through June 30, 1944	6,957.0	10,143.5
Reduction proposed in tax liabilities of the armed forces on incomes of the calendar years 1942, 1943, and 1944[1]	1,967.7	1,967.7
Proposed calendar year 1942 net income-tax liabilities remitted	4,671.6	4,671.6
Discount allowed for prepayment of unremitted tax liabilities on calendar year 1942 income	286.8	----------
Total tax liabilities under present law on income of the calendar years 1942, 1943, and 1944	39,246.7	39,246.7
Total tax liabilities under H. R. 2570 on income of the calendar years 1942, 1943, and 1944	32,320.6	32,007.4

[1] The loss with respect to tax liabilities on income of the calendar year 1944 should be somewhat greater, but has been assumed to be the same as on income of the calendar year 1943.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.

Treasury Department, Division of Research and Statistics, Apr. 30, 1943.

[1] Total taxable income for a calendar year is assumed to be distributed equally among the four quarters of the year. Calendar year 1944 income has not been forecast, but has been assumed to be the same as forecast for calendar year 1943.

[2] The bill includes the net Victory tax liability of the calendar year 1943 and subsequent years as a part of basic tax liability. For convenience in estimating, net Victory tax liabilities are treated separately.

[1] Total taxable income for a calendar year is assumed to be distributed equally among the 4 quarters of the year. Calendar year 1944 income has not been forecast, but has been assumed to be the same as forecast for calendar year 1943.

EXHIBIT 8

Estimated receipts under present law[1]

[In millions of dollars]

	Last 6 months of fiscal 1943	First 6 months of fiscal 1944	Last 6 months of fiscal 1944	Total, 18 months, Jan. 1, 1943–June 30, 1944
Net income-tax liability, calendar year 1942, in quarterly payments	4,907.6	4,907.6		9,815.2
Net income-tax liability, calendar year 1943, in quarterly payments			5,994.6	5,994.6
Present law withholding	552.0	1,104.0	1,104.0	2,760.0
March 1944 adjustment:				
Net Victory-tax liability, calendar year 1943 $2,726.5				
Total withholdings $2,208.0				
Withholdings in excess of net Victory-tax liability 740.0				
Withholdings not set against net Victory-tax liabilities —1,468.0				
Net Victory-tax liability of calendar year 1943 not paid in calendar year 1943 1,258.5				
Payment in first 6 months of calendar year 1944 of one-half of net Victory-tax liability of calendar year 1943 not paid in calendar year 1943			629.3	629.3
Refund to those having excess of Victory tax withholdings over sum of net income tax plus net Victory-tax liability			—175.0	—175.0
Excess of withholdings over net Victory tax liability which is offset against net income-tax liability on income of calendar year 1943			—565.0	—565.0
Total receipts	5,459.6	6,011.6	6,987.9	18,459.1
Reconciliation of total receipts, 18 months, Jan. 1, 1943–June 30, 1944, with total tax liabilities under present law on income of the calendar years 1942, 1943, and 1944:				
Victory tax withheld but not received in the first 6 months of calendar year 1944				552.0
Victory tax which will be withheld in last 6 months of calendar year 1944				1,104.0
Victory tax withholdings in excess of net Victory-tax liability for calendar year 1944				—740.0
Calendar year 1943 Victory-tax liability not received before July 1, 1944				629.3
Calendar year 1944 Victory-tax liability not due until 1945				1,258.5
Net income tax liability on calendar year 1943 income not received before July 1, 1944				5,994.6
Net income tax liability on calendar year 1944 income not due until 1945				11,989.2
Total				39,246.7

[1] Total taxable income for a calendar year is assumed to be distributed equally among the 4 quarters of the year. Calendar year 1944 income has not been forecast, but has been assumed to be the same as forecast for calendar year 1943.

Treasury Department, Division of Research and Statistics, Mar. 25, 1943.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL].

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, if this procedure proposed here today should be adopted, we should immediately amend the Constitution so that bills of this type may originate in the Senate. We have heard a lot in recent years about Members of Congress being rubber stamps, but I do not think there could be a more deplorable instance than for this House to "rubber stamp" Senate legislation of this type.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to face a stupendous task the best we can so when the war is over to discharge the obligations resting upon the Government of the United States with the multiplied billions of dollars we will owe and to maintain an orderly national economy. This proposal means—and it ought to be a warning to those who are responsible for the plan—the first step toward repudiation of the national debt, and it comes, not after the war, but while the war is on. If we are not willing to honor this obligation during the time of conflict and for the year that brought us the most enormous earnings and income in all our history, when will we b ready to pay?

Who knows how long we are to have such earnings and income; what becomes of our efforts to prevent inflation if we release all the billions of 1942 tax money with its vast inflationary pressure? If one of our boys at the battle front criticizes his superior officer he is court martialed. If he deserts, he may be shot. I do not say that anybody in this House is a deserter; I do not say that those represented by the advocates of the motion now before us are deserters but we are asked to withhold the financial support to which the Government is entitled and which is necessary to supply food and equipment for our soldiers who are fighting the war. Our boys are dying and risking their lives for us. If we fail in the discharge of the lesser responsibilities that rest upon us in the great struggle in which the perpetuity of our institutions is involved, we prove ourselves unworthy of the heroic sacrifices that are being made for us. We ought not to do it. It cannot be defended. The patriotic people of this country will not stand for it when they understand it. When they have had more time to consider and to understand what is back of this, they will repudiate it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. And as the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], has pointed out in the Senate, is it necessary or desirable to forgive the millionaire $854,000 in order to protect his chauffeur or clerk?

Mr. STEAGALL. No; and we ought not to forgive anybody at this time of national peril——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I have opposed all of the tax measures that have been voted on in this House. I felt and still feel that they were an inadequate expression on our part, on the home front, to be worthy of our boys on 40 fronts around the world. I feared that by indirection we were now making the same errors that we made following the First World War.

On the other hand, the feeling exists, and it is quite general, that many who now enjoy high incomes are escaping their full taxable share of paying for this damnable war. These citizens, of course, have to be made current, and I do not propose to stand further in the way of achieving that; but in accepting the pay-as-you-go feature, I want to protest against the other evils that I feel are inherent in this action. I feel that our struggles with these tax matters merely serve to point out the need for a wide and wise recognition of the mushrooming growth of local, State, and National tax duties and burdens of all of our people. If we are ever to achieve fiscal security we will have to achieve that type of tax legislation which recognizes ability to pay, ease of collection, and which, by its width of assessment, promotes zealous economy. I yield back my time.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like at the outset to reply to the two arguments made by my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina. I think it is fair to him to say that if his speech were boiled down we would find in it only two arguments. He would have you believe that there is much involved in this bill that is new and strange and different. I am sure that anyone who has studied this bill will agree with me that there is absolutely no new principle involved. Every principle involved is found in the Carlson bill and in other bills that this House has heretofore considered.

The next argument he used was that this is an unusual parliamentary proceeding that we are following in offering this motion. I wish you to know that this is the general and the usual proceeding. The fact of the matter is, it is the only proceeding that we could follow.

Let me proceed to reply to the argument made by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. He finds himself in a very peculiar position today. The bill that he fathered and fostered in this House was passed by this House. It was passed principally by Republican votes—I dare say that 90 percent of the votes received by the Robertson-Forand bill were cast by Republicans. But still we see him standing up here today advocating the

same course as those who refused to vote for his bill and opposing the course advocated for those who voted for his bill. He will find that when this matter goes to the conference that he is so anxious about that there will not be a single conferee among the Democratic conferees who will support his bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The gentleman will be on that committee of conference, will he not?

Mr. JENKINS. I do not know, for that will be a matter for decision by the Speaker. I want to emphasize to the gentleman the position he stands in now. The four conferees on the Democratic side have at all times been unalterably opposed to the Robertson plan but the three on the Republican side have voted for the Robertson plan. It is strange that the gentleman should want to present the argument he did present today.

Let me stress this one fact. Up until today we, the Members of this House, have had our arguments between and among ourselves, and no other individuals were involved. Today, however, another branch of the legislative branch of our Government has come into play. That other branch is endowed with power equal to our branch as far as the passage of legislation is concerned. We, the House, initiated the bill as is our constitutional right and duty to do. We gave it much careful consideration in the House and in the committee. In due course it went to the Senate and today we are considering what the Senate did. Henceforth this bill, as it wends its way is a creature of both branches of Congress.

Let us see what the Senate did while it had this tax matter under consideration. It considered almost every one of the several plans that we considered in the House. But before I consider them, let me mention the remarks of the last speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]. He said there should be no forgiveness, and he was cheered lustily by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. Again this is strange on the part of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], for his plan gives more forgiveness than any other plan except the pure Ruml plan. Was not that a strange situation? Now, let us see how the various plans were received in the Senate, and what the vote was.

Senator ELLENDER offered the plan that provided that there should be no abatement. That is the plan after Mr. DOUGHTON'S own heart. How many votes did it get? It got 21 votes for and 57 against. This should be conclusive that the people want to pay their taxes currently and should like to have their back taxes abated. Let us consider the makeshift bill offered to the House for consideration by the Democratic Members of the Ways and Means Committee. You will recall that the House defeated that bill overwhelmingly. Senator CONNALLY presented that bill to the Senate. How much luck did he have with it? He got only 29 votes for it while there were 50 votes against it. It was more unpopular in the Senate than in the House.

What happened to Senator GEORGE'S bill in the Senate? His bill provided for 75 percent forgiveness. The vote in the Senate was 32 for it and 50 against it. I cite this with especial emphasis. I want you to remember that the Senator George plan was defeated in the Senate by 50 to 32. Let us go on to the withholding tax alone—a straight-out withholding tax with no other provisions. That fared badly also. It was defeated by 29 for and 48 against. Senator O'DANIEL proposed the plan.

Senator BANKHEAD offered the Robertson plan and it fared worse than the other one. It got only 27 as against 52. I want to call this situation especially to the attention of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND]. Their bill was ignominiously defeated in the Senate.

Let us see how the Carlson plan stood in the Senate. It must not be forgotten that the Carlson bill carried this House every time it had a fair chance free from the whip and lash of the New Deal administration. It then carried the House twice on a teller vote, only to lose by a close margin when the New Deal whip was cracked. In the Senate the straight-out Carlson plan got a vote of 48 to 31. This is a tremendous majority. This is the plan that has carried both Houses. No other plan has carried both Houses. It should therefore be recommended by the conferees.

The modified Carlson plan, with the additions and refinements which the Senate put on it, was the bill that was finally passed by the Senate. It was passed by a larger vote than any of the other bills. The final vote was 49 for and 30 against. Now, my colleagues, we have the situation of the House and Senate both passing a bill largely the same in substance. Therefore, if you are one who wants a pay-as-you-go tax bill, now is your time and chance to get it.

You gain nothing by trying to place the blame on someone else. The responsibility is yours, and now is your chance.

There is no doubt that the large majority of the people of the country are anxious to see Congress pass some kind of a tax bill. The people have been patient with Congress. They have waited for months while we have fiddled around with this tax program. The Ways and Means Committee and the House always had plenty of votes to defeat any measure, but it took many votes before it finally agreed. The House did the same. But the Senate acted quickly and decisively. Now the question is, Are we going to finish up this task by passing Mr. KNUTSON'S resolution, or are we going to reject it and thereby put the bill into conference, from which nobody can reasonably guess what will be the outcome.

Mr. Speaker, this may be a political issue here in this House, but I assure you it is not a political issue with the people. There is no question that a very large majority of the people of the country favor some form of the Carlson-Ruml plan. But the Democratic and New Deal Members of the House have declined to pass it. The Senate is willing. If Mr. KNUTSON'S motion carries, the tax problem will have been settled. If it fails, we are back where we were 6 months ago, and the Democrats and New Dealers must be held responsible. Those who have been demanding the passage of the Carlson-Ruml plan have a right to feel aggrieved, and they should not hold him guiltless who is responsible. Those who yield their conscience and their judgment to the whims of the President should be prepared to admit their inability to make up their own mind. Those who put party before the people cannot be held guiltless.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

A FURLOUGH FOR BIG INCOME TAXPAYERS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the trouble is that there are too many people in America who look on this war as a joy ride. They do not include the soldiers, the small businessmen, or the hard-working farmers of this Nation.

But I did not think that, in addition to this joy ride, the Congress of the United States would grant a furlough of 1 year to the big taxpayers of the Nation, when they might just as well grant that furlough of 1 year to every man in our armed forces.

Not only that, but you might as well grant a furlough of 1 year to the farmers of this country. If this motion is adopted, and this measure becomes a law, it will forgive the big income taxpayers of this Nation almost twice as much as all of the wheat, all of the corn, and all of the cotton produced in America this year will bring. You might just as well give the farmers of this country a furlough for 1 year and pay them for the crops they did not make. Besides, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] pointed out, you are giving some of these big income taxpayers a furlough for 6 years, or giving them back taxes to that amount.

You may say that we could not give the soldiers a furlough, because they have to fight the war. But who is going to finance it? You are endeavoring to give the big taxpayers a furlough of 1 year, and pretending that they will pay it in the future. You do not know where some of them will be next year, or the year after next. When they get this rake-off, they may migrate to one of those countries that have no income taxes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, briefly.

Mr. MAY. Our records and findings in the Military Affairs Committee show that last year is when they made the biggest profits.

Mr. RANKIN. That is correct.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, this proposition did not come from the toiling farmers. They get no benefit from it. It does not come from the industrial laborers. It did not come from the men in our armed forces. It came from those men in the higher income-tax brackets who can pay for this propaganda and can promise big campaign contributions.

If this bill passes and the President does not veto it, I shall be greatly disappointed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing about the motion offered by our Republican friends is the fact that if adopted, it constitutes an abdication on the part of the House of Representatives to the Senate of its constitutional duty and responsibility of initiating tax legislation. We hear our Republican friends talking daily about bureaucracy. We hear them talking about abdication by the Congress, and yet here they are offering a motion today that constitutes, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned, on this constitutional question, an abdication to the Senate of the United States of the responsibility and the duties of the House of Representatives.

One of the Republican speakers made the argument that three of the Democratic conferees on the part of the House will be against the Robertson-Forand plan. Without regard to what their personal views might be, every one of us knows that when the House conferees on both sides go into a conference, Republicans and Democrats, they are going to vote for the House position and do their best to have the House bill accepted. I think that answers clearly the argument made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Various Members have made arguments as to the unjustness of this legislation. I am not going to enter into that argument today. I have referred to it in speeches that I made when this bill was pending in the House on two occasions previously, but I call the attention of the House to a bill that I consider to be a companion bill to the Ruml plan, namely, H. R. 2698, which was dropped into the hopper last Wednesday by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN], a Republican Member of the House of Representatives. It is a bill entitled "To repeal section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act 1942, as amended, relating to renegotiation of war contracts, and to promote the national war effort." Its author indicates that there was no need of a renegotiation, upon the specious theory that 90 percent of excess profits are supposed to be put into the Treasury by way of income taxes.

Enacting of the pending Ruml plan, forgiving vast sums of income taxes, plus the repeal of the present law providing for the recapture of unjustified and excessive profits on war contracts certainly points to a concerted movement to protect the huge profits made by some persons during this war. The Ruml plan takes care of the individual taxpayer, who has had huge incomes. The Jonkman bill takes care of corporations who have made huge incomes out of the war. It certainly is difficult to understand wherein repeal of the renegotiation law will promote the national war effort, as set out in the bill's title, and neither will such legislation aid small businessmen as some might argue since renegotiations apply only to contracts of $100,000 and over. Already renegotiations has resulted in refund (voluntary return of excessive profits) and reductions arranged by the Price Adjustment Boards of the War, Navy and Maritime Commission in an amount of over two and a half billion dollars ($2,539,000,000). This is only a small part of the billions still to be recaptured by the action of the above-mentioned boards as well as those recently created by the Treasury Department's Procurement Section, and the War Shipping Administration. Almost 10,000 contractors are holding Army-Navy and maritime contracts. Of this number 1,478 have had renegotiation action completed, with 5,647 in process of renegotiation.

The Committee on Military Affairs, under the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] has done a great job, and the Naval Affairs Committee, under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has done a great job in exposing these huge war contracts and the tremendous profits made therefrom. The Ruml plan now takes care of individuals who have made immense individual incomes out of war contracts, and it is now proposed by this companion bill, the Jonkman bill, to take care of the corporations. The movement is exposed. Let us send this bill to conference. Let us do the orderly thing, and let the conferees in the manner provided by the rules work out a bill and bring back a fair bill that will put in operation in an effective and reasonable manner, pay-as-you-go legislation that the people of the country want.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the House for the very few minutes allotted to me I shall appreciate it. We might reflect that just 156 years ago this month a convention met in Philadelphia in Independence Hall. Fifty-five fearless and courageous men decided that they were going to frame a government that would work, and it has worked for more than a century and a half. This is what they said:

By the Constitution of the United States, money bills originate in the House of Representatives. The reason is that as that House are more numerous than the other, and its Members are elected more frequently, the most local and recent information of the circumstances of the people may be found there. But, as the Senate derive their authority ultimately from the same origin with the other House, they have a right to propose and concur in amendments in these as well as in other bills.

That is precisely what has been done in this case. We have heard a great deal about the terrible sin of abatement of taxes. Anything to befog the issue. The issue is that the American people want to become current in their taxes, and they know it will be disastrous to their war effort unless they do become current. What about this so-called sin of abating taxes? The House bill that they want us to take in place of the Senate proposal abates 75 percent of the taxes, and still it does not make the taxpayers current. Why not do the job in the open, manly, American way?

The distinguished chairman said there had been no hearings on this proposition of the Senate. I reply to him that there has been a hearing in every one of 44,000,000 homes from which this revenue must flow. The taxpayers know the provisions in this bill. The vote in the Senate reflects the will of the American people, and they are sovereign.

I say there is presented at this time a very fundamental issue that must not be overlooked. What further did those 55 men say in convention when they organized our Republic under our Constitution?

The power of conferring nobility is a source of influence which the Crown possesses over the House of Commons, as well as over the House of Lords. A coronet and all the proud preeminences and gilded glories which encircle a coronet are objects of ambition, whose tempting charms few—very few, indeed—are capable of resisting. Even the great commoner wishes and sighs to be something more. Will not his views be directed to that power by which alone his wishes can be gratified? Will not his conduct receive a bias from the longing, expecting turn of his mind? When his towering hopes of elevation are suspended on the crown, will he easily run the risk of seeing them dashed to the ground by speaking and voting and acting in opposition to its views and measures?

We are now arrived, in our progress, at another fountain, from which, in Great Britain, the waters of bitterness have plentifully flowed—I mean the fountain of office. We reprehend not the nature of this power, nor the place, where, by the British Constitution, it is deposited. In every government there must be such a power, and it is proper that it should be lodged in the hands of him who is placed at the head of the executive department. What we censure is that this power is not circumscribed by the necessary limitations. It may be—it is—exercised in favor of the members of both houses of Parliament. Offices of trust and profit are scattered, with a lavish hand, among those by whom a return, very dangerous to the liberties of the nation, may be made, and from whom such a return is but too often expected.

That was the evil they were fighting against in that day. It is the same evil of executive influence which hampers free government here and now. We have an opportunity as Americans today to establish the independence of this legislative body. That is what the people want. They want to recapture their powers. They want to write the laws of this Nation through their chosen representatives, and they are asking to be

made current in the only way it is possible to do it, which is by the votes of uncoerced representatives.

The fact is this: The American people will pay every dollar of taxes—earn every dollar of taxes—to finance this war. They want the home front sound and they will keep it sound. They will supply the money. We are not supplying it. They are supplying it with their toil on the home front.

Now, what is the situation? You load your soldiers down a little at a time until they can carry a large load and fight effectively. The home front wants the same treatment. In 1940 their tax load was $5,387,000,000; in 1941 it was $7,607,000,000; in 1942 it was $12,799,000,000 plus; in 1943 it was $22,976,000,000; in 1944, $33,081,000,000 plus; plus $16,000,000,000 additional taxes required by the President in his last Budget message and $10,000,000,000 of State and local taxes, which, all told, makes a total tax load for the people to bear within a short period of time amounting to $59,081,000,000. They cannot carry such a load unless you give them a fair opportunity to become current. This motion must be carried in order to give them an opportunity.

The New Deal fiscal record [1]

Fiscal year ending June 30—	Net receipts [1]	Net expenditures [2]	Net deficit	Gross public debt
1933	$2,080,000,000	$3,864,000,000	$1,784,000,000	$22,539,000,000
1934	3,116,000,000	6,011,000,000	2,896,000,000	27,053,000,000
1935	3,800,000,000	7,010,000,000	3,209,000,000	28,701,000,000
1936	4,116,000,000	8,666,000,000	4,550,000,000	33,779,000,000
1937	5,029,000,000	8,177,000,000	3,149,000,000	36,425,000,000
1938	5,855,000,000	7,239,000,000	1,384,000,000	37,165,000,000
1939	5,165,000,000	8,707,000,000	3,542,000,000	40,440,000,000
1940	5,387,000,000	8,998,000,000	3,611,000,000	42,968,000,000
1941	7,607,000,000	12,711,000,000	5,103,000,000	48,961,000,000
1942	12,799,000,000	32,397,000,000	19,598,000,000	72,422,000,000
1943 (estimated)	22,976,000,000	80,437,000,000	57,461,000,000	134,830,000,000
1944 (estimated)	33,081,000,000	104,129,000,000	71,048,000,000	210,549,000,000

[1] Figures on receipts and expenditures and on public debt through 1942 taken from annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury. Figures for 1943 and 1944 are Budget estimates.
[2] Excluding pay-roll taxes for old-age insurance, from 1937 on.
[3] Exclusive of debt retirement.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion submitted by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KNUTSON. As I understand it, a vote "aye" is to pass the resolution and a vote "no" is against it. Is that right?

The SPEAKER. That would be presumed to be true.

Those in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota to instruct the conferees will, when the names are called, vote "aye"; those opposed, "no."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 194, nays 202, answered "present" 4, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—194

Allen, Ill.	Brehm	Cunningham
Andresen, August H.	Brown, Ohio	Curtis
Andrews	Buffett	Day
Angell	Busbey	Dewey
Arends	Butler	Dirksen
Arnold	Canfield	Ditter
Auchincloss	Cannon, Fla.	Dondero
Baldwin, N. Y.	Carlson, Kans.	Douglas
Barrett	Carson, Ohio	Dworshak
Barry	Carter	Eaton
Bates, Mass.	Case	Ellis
Beall	Chenoweth	Ellison, Md.
Bender	Chiperfield	Ellsworth
Bennett, Mich.	Church	Elmer
Bennett, Mo.	Clason	Elston, Ohio
Bishop	Clevenger	Engel
Blackney	Cole, Mo.	Fellows
Bolton	Cole, N. Y.	Fenton
Bradley, Mich.	Compton	Fish
	Cravens	Gale
Gallagher	Kean	Rees, Kans.
Gamble	Kearney	Rizley
Gavin	Keefe	Robsion, Ky.
Gerlach	Kilburn	Rockwell
Gifford	Kinzer	Rodgers, Pa.
Gilchrist	Knutson	Rogers, Mass.
Gillette	Lambertson	Rohrbough
Gillie	Landis	Rowe
Goodwin	LeCompte	Schiffler
Graham	LeFevre	Schwabe
Grant, Ind.	Lewis, Ohio	Scott
Griffiths	Ludlow	Shafer
Gross	McCowen	Short
Guyer	McGregor	Simpson, Ill.
Gwynne	McKenzie	Simpson, Pa.
Hale	McLean	Smith, Ohio
Hall, Edwin Arthur	McWilliams	Smith, Wis.
	Maas	Springer
Hall, Leonard W.	Martin, Iowa	Stanley
	Martin, Mass.	Stearns, N. H.
Halleck	Mason	Stefan
Hancock	Merrow	Stevenson
Harness, Ind.	Michener	Stockman
Hartley	Miller, Conn.	Sundstrom
Heidinger	Miller, Mo.	Taber
Herter	Miller, Nebr.	Talbot
Hess	Miller, Pa.	Talle
Hill	Monkiewicz	Taylor
Hoeven	Morrison, La.	Tibbott
Hoffman	Mott	Towe
Holmes, Mass.	Mruk	Treadway
Holmes, Wash.	Mundt	Troutman
Hope	Murray, Wis.	Van Zandt
Horan	Norman	Vorys, Ohio
Howell	O'Brien, N. Y.	Vursell
Jeffrey	O'Hara	Wadsworth
Jenkins	Philbin	Weichel, Ohio
Jennings	Phillips	Wheat
Jensen	Ploeser	Wigglesworth
Johnson, Anton J.	Plumley	Willey
	Poulson	Wilson
Johnson, Calvin D.	Powers	Winter
	Pracht	Wolcott
Johnson, Ind.	Ramey	Wolfenden, Pa.
Johnson, Ward	Reece, Tenn.	Wolverton, N. J.
Jones	Reed, Ill.	
Jonkman	Reed, N. Y.	

NAYS—202

Abernethy	Boren	Cannon, Mo.
Allen, La.	Bradley, Pa.	Capozzoli
Andersen, H. Carl	Brooks	Celler
	Brown, Ga.	Chapman
Anderson, N. Mex.	Bryson	Coffee
	Buckley	Colmer
Baldwin, Md.	Bulwinkle	Cooley
Barden	Burch, Va.	Cooper
Bates, Ky.	Burchill, N. Y.	Courtney
Beckworth	Burdick	Cox
Bell	Burgin	Crawford
Bland	Byrne	Creal
Bonner	Camp	Crosser
Cullen	Johnson, Okla.	Priest
Curley	Kee	Rabaut
D'Alesandro	Kefauver	Ramspeck
Davis	Kelley	Randolph
Dawson	Kennedy	Rankin
Delaney	Keogh	Richards
Dickstein	Kerr	Rivers
Dilweg	Kilday	Robertson
Dingell	Kirwan	Robinson, Utah
Disney	Klein	Rogers, Calif.
Domengeaux	LaFollette	Rowan
Doughton	Lane	Russell
Drewry	Lanham	Sadowski
Durham	Larcade	Sasscer
Eberharter	Lemke	Satterfield
Fay	Lesinski	Sauthoff
Feighan	Lynch	Scanlon
Fernandez	McCord	Schuetz
Fisher	McCormack	Sheppard
Fitzpatrick	McGehee	Sheridan
Flannagan	McMillan	Sikes
Folger	McMurray	Slaughter
Forand	Madden	Smith, Va.
Ford	Mahon	Smith, W. Va.
Fulbright	Maloney	Snyder
Fulmer	Manasco	Somers, N. Y.
Furlong	Mansfield, Mont.	Sparkman
Gathings		Spence
Gavagan	Mansfield, Tex.	Starnes, Ala.
Gearhart	Marcantonio	Steagall
Gibson	May	Stewart
Gordon	Merritt	Sullivan
Gore	Mills	Sumner, Ill.
Gorski	Monroney	Sumners, Tex.
Gossett	Morrison, N. C.	Tarver
Grant, Ala.	Murdock	Thomas, Tex.
Green	Murphy	Thomason
Gregory	Murray, Tenn.	Tolan
Hare	Myers	Vincent, Ky.
Harless, Ariz.	Newsome	Voorhis, Calif.
Harris, Ark.	Nichols	Walter
Harris, Va.	Norrell	Ward
Hart	O'Brien, Ill.	Wasielewski
Hays	O'Brien, Mich.	Weaver
Hébert	O'Connor	Weiss
Heffernan	O'Konski	Wene
Hendricks	O'Neal	West
Hobbs	Outland	Whitten
Hoch	Pace	Whittington
Holifield	Patman	Wickersham
Hull	Patton	Winstead
Jackson	Peterson, Fla.	Woodrum, Va.
Jarman	Peterson, Ga.	Wright
Johnson, Luther A.	Pfeifer	Zimmerman
	Pittenger	
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Poage	
	Price	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Johnson, J. Leroy	Kleberg	O'Leary
	Kunkel	

NOT VOTING—32

Anderson, Calif.	Hagen	Rolph
Bloom	Hinshaw	Sabath
Boykin	Izac	Smith, Maine
Clark	Judd	Thomas, N. J.
Cochran	King	Vinson, Ga.
Costello	Lea	Welch
Culkin	Luce	Whelchel, Ga.
Dies	McGranery	White
Elliott	Magnuson	Woodruff, Mich.
Fogarty	Norton	Worley
Granger	O'Toole	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

Mr. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. Izac against.

Mr. Rolph for, with Mr. Costello against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

Mr. Magnuson for, with Mrs. Luce against.

Mr. Culkin for, with Mr. Kunkel against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Dies against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Johnson, J. Leroy against.

Mr. O'Leary for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Kleberg for, with Mr. Worley against.

Mr. Woodruff of Michigan for, with Mr. McGranery against.

General pairs:

Mr. Bloom with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Welch.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recorded as voting "aye."

Mr. COLMER. It is an error, Mr. Speaker; I voted "no."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi changes his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY]. Were he present he would have voted "no." I therefore change my vote from "aye" to "present."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I entered the Chamber as my name was called. I wish to qualify and vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman from New York in the Hall listening and failed to hear his name?

Mr. BLOOM. I came in just as my name was called. I did not know what the vote was on.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman say he was in the Hall?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; I said I came in just about when my name was called.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Just about; that does not qualify.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman was not here but rushed in after his name was called.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York state that he was in the Hall listening and failed to hear his name called? Otherwise he does not qualify.

Mr. BLOOM. No.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I was here but was talking and did not hear my name called until too late to answer. I think I qualify.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall?

Mr. HAGEN. I was and I wish to vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name was called and failed to hear it?

Mr. HAGEN. I was talking; I did not hear.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must hold, as the Chair held in the case of the gentleman from New York who said his name was called as he came in, that the gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Minnesota said he was in the Hall listening but did not hear his name called.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota said he was in the Hall when his name was called but that he was talking. The Chair propounded the question: "Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name was called and failed to hear it?" And the gentleman did not say he was.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we are setting the precedent that even though a Member is sitting in the Hall listening for the roll call but does not happen to hear his name he is disqualified.

The SPEAKER. The rule is that the Member must qualify that he was in the Hall listening and failed to hear his name called on the supposition that the Clerk failed to call his name.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman rises to a point of order the Chair will let him state the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are three things, Mr. Speaker, that are essential in order to qualify a Member to vote after the conclusion of the roll call: First, the gentleman must have been in the Hall; second, he must have been listening; and third, he must not have heard his name called. If he was not in the Hall he does not qualify; if he was not listening he does not qualify; and if he heard his name called and did not answer he does not qualify.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has ruled on two-thirds of that proposition.

Mr. HENDRICKS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York, therefore I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. I would like my vote changed to "present."

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Speaker, I entered into an active pair with the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]. If present she would have voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. BATES of Kentucky changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. COOPER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion was rejected was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. DOUGHTON, COOPER, DISNEY, DINGELL, KNUTSON, REED of New York, and JENKINS.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiency appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2714, with Mr. PATMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The order of business is, there are 2 hours' general debate, 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the other hour to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on the pending amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is my understanding that at the end of those 2 hours a vote will be taken on the amendment and all amendments thereto?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has correctly stated the proposition.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, there was so much confusion in the chamber we did not hear exactly what the retort was to the inquiry, whether or not the 2 hours would be confined to the amendment offered by the Kerr committee and all amendments thereto, or just to the amendment offered by the Kerr committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote is to be taken at the end of 2 hours' debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee will recall that in February, during consideration of an appropriation bill, a situation arose on the floor in which the House—almost by concert and with practical unanimity—proposed to summarily arraign, try, condemn, and execute, without benefit of clergy or legal process, certain Federal employees charged with subversive activities.

Those charged were to be given no opportunity to be heard. They were to be tried without notice on hearsay and rumor and by what practically amounted to mob action.

In that crisis, by agreement and direction of the leadership on both sides of the aisle and both ranking members of the committee in charge of the bill, I submitted to the House a resolution providing for the appointment of a subcommittee to investigate the charges, hear testimony, give accused opportunity to be heard, and thereupon, in due time, to bring the result of its deliberation before the House.

The resolution was agreed to unanimously and when I appointed the subcommittee, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I selected five of the ablest members of that committee whom I consider to be five of the ablest Members of the House, every one of them experienced men who have the confidence of the House; men of exceptional probity, ability, and fairness. The chairman of the committee had had many years' experience as an attorney and had served for many years on the bench and, indicating his impartiality, had voted twice against continuation of the Dies committee, in which committee the charges had originated. That committee has been in session ever since.

It has heard full testimony, has given all those against whom charges were brought an opportunity to have their day in court. The subcommittee has made a report of its findings which has been offered by the Committee on Appropriations and is now available to the Members of the House.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman wishes to submit a question as to the report, may I suggest that he reserve it for the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], who will now take the floor.

Does the gentleman from New York care to take time before the chairman of the subcommittee is recognized?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman after things came to an impasse in the House last February, the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], H. R. 105 was adopted as a result of which this subcommittee was appointed for the purpose of going into the charges that had been and might be submitted by the Dies Committee against different individuals in the employ of the Government. That the Congress has the absolute power to say that any man shall not be on the pay roll of the Government is beyond question. These people are charged with being unfit to be on the pay roll of the United States. This committee was named by the chairman, after consultation with me, and I say to you that the men selected were the very best we could find for that purpose—of open and judicial mind. In my own opinion they are five of the very ablest, finest, and keenest Members of the House of Representatives.

Before they started the hearings they were told by the chairman and by me that they were expected to go over the evidence, give these people a fair hearing, and render judgment accordingly, which should be sent to the full committee and later to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield myself one additional minute.

Some of these men on the committee started off with a complex in favor of those that were accused, but all of them with an open mind. When they were through they agreed unanimously that these three names that are presented here should go off the pay roll of the United States Government. For my own part I can do nothing but support wholeheartedly and down the line the judgment of that committee, because I know that it is honest, I know that they have leaned over backward in trying to be fair to these people and there is nothing of a prejudicial character about the verdict.

I am going to yield to the members of that committee, on this side, so far as I can, so that the House may have the complete facts of these cases.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. As I understand, the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member, have stated they will yield all their time to members of the Kerr committee, all of whom have signed this report, and I assume all of whom support this report. Does that mean that those who are opposed to this amendment will be deprived of every bit of time and will have no opportunity to make a statement in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. My statement was that I would yield first to the members of the subcommittee, as provided under the rules of the House, and after they have been allotted time it is my intention to yield to the gentleman from New York and to other Members of the House who are opposed to the resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, 15 minutes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I cannot neglect to thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the distinguished ranking Member of the minority side for their complimentary remarks concerning the work of this committee.

Pursuant to House Resolution 105, which has been referred to here, five members of the Appropriations Committee were authorized by this House to investigate certain charges that have been made with reference to certain employees of this Government and to report their findings, first to the whole Committee on Appropriations, and then the whole committee to report its findings to the House.

I do not hesitate to say that this committee has been conscientious and diligent in its endeavor to do the duty assigned to it and to do that duty well. It has not been a pleasant duty; in fact, frankly, it has been an unpleasant duty. It involved the consideration of a large amount of evidence, much more than this House thinks. It involved the consideration of the probity of that evidence, the weight of the evidence, and other things which had to be taken into consideration by the committee in respect to this important matter.

We discovered after organization the fact that there had never been declared judicially or by any legislative body what constituted subversive activities in respect to this Government. Subvert means to turn over, and the committee, in order to have something to go by, undertook to write what it thought constituted subversive activities in respect to the overthrow of this Government.

I may say that the committee fully understood the seriousness of this matter. It understands how serious it is to remove a man from his office and understands that a stigma may be placed upon him when that act is done. I think the committee fully understands the implications involved in one branch of the Government in attempting to remove an employee of another branch. Those things we took into consideration and those things we attempted to handle justly and properly in the light of the evidence in this matter.

You must understand that your subcommittee was not employed to remove anybody from office. We were not delegated to remove anybody from office. This House simply requested this committee to examine the facts and the charges made against various people here who had been charged with activity which was subversive of our form of government and which had for its purpose its overthrow and destruction. The Committee on Appropriations is not undertaking to remove anybody from office. The House Committee on Appropriations is simply bringing here to this Congress and giving you the facts as it has found them, saying to you, "Gentlemen, these are the facts. The duty devolves upon you now to say whether or not these men named in the amendment are fitted to be employees of the United States Government."

The wording of resolution 105 was that the subcommittee should investigate the matter referred to it and make a report to this Congress through the whole committee, and submit recommendations. That is what it has undertaken to do. It becomes the duty of the House then to say whether certain employees of the Government by reason of their association—and I read the words of the resolution—"by reason of their present association or membership or past association or membership in or with organizations whose aims or purposes are or have been subversive to the Government of the United States," are fitted for service in this Government.

That is what you have to find, that is what this House has to find, that is what the representatives of the people of this country have to find. This House speaks for the people. You are to determine whether or not the people of this country want certain men who are guilty of association with organizations and who are members of organizations in this country whose purpose and object is subversive to the institutions of this Government and who are willing to associate and organize with those whose purpose it is to overthrow it, to hold positions of responsibility in this Government.

I contend that the proposition before the House is an elementary one. It does not involve the question of impeaching anybody. Under any judicial act of our country, it is simply a question of whether or not the people of this country want men who are not in sympathy with the institutions of this country to run it. You can impeach a public official in this country for high crimes and misdemeanor or for malfeasance or misfeasance in office. The question involved in this determination and in this inquiry does not involve a consideration of that kind at all. I repeat what it is. It involves the question of whether the people of this country want men who are not in sympathy with this form of government and philosophy of life to run the affairs of this Nation and to be employees of it.

The men who founded this Nation of ours placed in the hands of this Con-

gress, placed in the hands of its Representatives, the purse strings of this Nation, reserving the right the Commons had under the old English laws, when they built the great British Empire. The English people were able to get justice and consideration and extend the power and the glory of that great Empire, because the Commons of that great nation held the purse strings, and they were not afraid of the man who held the sword as long as they held the purse strings.

The people of this country have never seen fit to remove the right from this Congress and from its Representatives to hold the purse strings of this Nation. To say that they do not have that right is so elementary from a legal or any other point of view that it does not need any discussion.

This Congress has the right to say to whom the people's money shall be paid. Congress will not be denied and should never be denied that right. The question involved here is one that simply involves that proposition and that statement.

The employees named in the amendment have been reported as being connected with organizations or having been members of organizations or of making statements which appeared to be subversive of our form of government. These organizations have been thoroughly investigated. They have been looked into, not by this subcommittee alone, but by various other committees of this Government, and the evidence has been brought and laid in the lap of our subcommittee. We have thoroughly deciphered it and thoroughly gone over it. If this committee decides that a person is not entitled to hold an office in this Government, and this Congress, the representatives of the people, adopts that decision, then I challenge anyone to deny the statement I make, that there is no power on this earth or in this Government that can take away that right and can keep a man in office when this Congress says that he cannot be kept in office.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman care to yield? I do not want to interrupt the gentleman if he does not want to be interrupted.

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The question was asked yesterday whether there was any precedent for taking people off the pay roll because you did not agree with their political philosophies. There is a direct precedent for it. Some of us may have forgotten it. In 1939 the Communists of the city of New York took charge of the Federal Theater project and the Federal Writers project. After a long and tortuous hearing in the House during which the gentleman from New York and I were burned in effigy in the public square in New York for our political beliefs, this House and the Senate passed and the President signed a bill that took literally thousands of Communists off the Federal pay roll.

Mr. KERR. This very question as to whether the Congress has a right to deny an appropriation or take a man off the pay roll has been decided as many as three times, twice in an opinion of the Supreme Court, and once in an opinion of the Attorney General. Your committee has been diligent and has looked into the law in respect to this matter.

In the case of Hart against United States, which is a case that arose in the Court of Claims and appears at volume 16, page 484 of the Court of Claims Reports, a case which was afterward affirmed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the One Hundred and Eighteenth United States Reports, page 62, the Court said, in an opinion by Judge Davis of the Court of Claims:

> The absolute control of the moneys of the United States is in Congress and Congress is responsible for its exercise of this great power to indicate a class of persons who shall not be paid out of general appropriations, but shall come to Congress for relief.

In an opinion found in the Opinions of the Attorneys General of the United States, volume 7, page 215, the following appears:

> While the power of appointment to office is essentially an executive function, Congress has the power to prescribe conditions to the complete investiture of an office and qualifications for office and it may control appointments through the control of appropriations and salaries. This control may take effect in the refusal of appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. KERR. The question arose in another case in the United States courts, and I quote an excerpt from the opinion:

> An officer appointed for a definite time, or during good behavior, has not any vested interest or contract right in his office, from which Congress cannot deprive him. Such an officer enjoys a privilege revocable by the sovereignty, at will, and one legislature cannot deprive its successor of the power of revocation (*Chenshaw* v. *U. S.*, 134 U. S. 99).

Mr. Chairman, it looks as if when we approach this matter from a legal standpoint, the proposition that we have brought before this Congress, and that Congress must consider, is elementary.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. For a question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. To inquire of the gentleman whether any member of his committee, or the committee, found anything in these men's record as public servants that indicates they are not performing their duty working for the Government in their respective jobs at the present time?

Mr. KERR. I do not think we looked into that. The gentleman can see that if we had gone afield to look into that, how much more time we would have had to take. I stated what we were delegated to do, and this House fully understands it. Nobody asked us to see whether these men were conducting themselves properly.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Did the gentleman's committee find whether these men or any one of them is doing anything that, in the committee's judgment, would obstruct the winning of the war or interfering with it at the present time?

Mr. KERR. We did not go into that phase of the question.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Did the inquiries made by the gentleman's committee disclose how these people for whom the Democrats are constantly being compelled to apologize affixed themselves to the Federal pay roll, how they became a part of this administration?

Mr. KERR. As a matter of fact, I will say that we did not make inquiry into that. We found them on the pay roll, under suspicion.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. No. I call to the attention of the House that there is another question involved in this matter which deserves to be considered, and I think it is fundamental. These employees under investigation have no property rights in their offices. There are some offices in which the holders have a property right, and it may take impeachment to remove them, but these people under investigation have no property rights in these offices. One Congress can take away their rights given them by another. Therefore, you do not have to resort, and Congress does not have to resort, to instituting impeachment proceedings in order to remove from office those who have no property rights in the office, but are simply employees of the Government. We maintain that the head of a department has no constitutional prerogative in its appointments.

Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to cover the law involved in the determination of this matter. Other members of the committee will argue the evidence pertaining to the various cases for you to consider.

I cannot refrain from mentioning a picture I was familiar with when a boy, a long number of years ago. In my grandfather's library there was a large picture of George Washington, and almost every man in this country 100 years ago had in his home a picture of George Washington. I shall never forget that picture. It was a picture of Washington mounted on his white horse at Valley Forge and he was pointing down to one of his generals and giving the following command, "Put none but Americans on guard tonight." That command should inspire every true American to be on guard at this perilous period of our national life.

As a further authority to sustain the position of the subcommittee in the matter I quote from the speech of Hon. John Randolph Tucker, one of the ablest of American Constitutional lawyers, which he made in Congress about 65 years ago, reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of the first session of the Forty-sixth Congress.

He says that—

> The power over the purse of the people is a part of those inherited privileges vested by the people in this House and in the Senate,

by means of which the people's representatives in the legislative department may check executive usurpation and constrain a redress of grievances. This money power was the lever by which the Saxon people upheaved the solid centralism of the Norman polity and transferred the monarchy of the Conquest into the noblest type of constitutional government in the Old World. This power over the purse in the hands of the Commons made the sword impotent in the hands of the king. The power was used there—in England— as the medicine of the constitution; the Tudors and the Stuarts demanded supplies for their schemes of ambition in war and peace; the Commons halted on grievances; the crown sent messengers to them to hurry up supplies and adjourn without redress of grievances; but the Commons said, the purse is ours to give or to withhold; to give absolutely or on condition, abandon dangerous power and practices. Let go your hold on our liberties and we will give you money. This weapon for a people's defense, well and wisely wielded, has reformed the British monarchy, purged away its despotic principles, enlarged popular authority, secured personal liberty, and the personal rights of man by the splendid muniments of law and an independent judiciary, and brought the whole government under the influence and control of the will of the people. It was the light of civilization which banished the night of barbarism from the kingdom.

Sir Erskine May, in his Constitutional History of England, volume 1, page 440, says: "One of the most ancient and valued rights of the Commons is that of voting money and granting taxes to the Crown for the public service. From the earliest times they have made this right the means of extorting concessions from the Crown and advancing the liberties of the people. They upheld it with a bold spirit against the most arbitrary kings, and the bill of rights crowned their final triumph over prerogative. They upheld it with equal firmness against the Lords."

The struggle in England to obtain control of the money of the Government was long and obstinate and extended over a period of more than a thousand years. The Commons first obtained the right to sit separate from the House of Lords. They then demanded the privilege of originating the revenue bill, and when they had once gained this power they used it as a defense against any encroachment upon their rights, and as a means of destroying the prerogative of the King wherever it encroached upon the rights of the people. The King came to them and demanded supplies. The Commons said, "We will give you money, but you must redress grievances." The right which the people have today through their general assembly to determine what appropriations shall be made and how, what claims against the state shall be paid and when, is a right derived from this great struggle between the Commons and the King, and is crystallized and preserved in that article of the Constitution to which we have referred—that no money shall be withdrawn from the Treasury, except in consequence of appropriations by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask not to be interrupted until I have finished the presentation of the case I am about to present. I want it clearly understood at the beginning that I am not an attorney. I suppose many Members of the House are aware of that fact.

First, I shall go into just a little bit of the history of the Kerr committee and advise the membership just what might have happened if the Kerr committee had not been brought into existence. About 3 months ago there was what might be called a concerted effort to remove from the pay roll several score employees who had been investigated by the Dies committee. The method of their removal was to be merely an amendment offered to an appropriation bill, including them all, and removing them. Many of us here in the House thought, firstly, that such a procedure was un-American, and, secondly, that every man, no matter who he is, no matter of what he is accused, has a right to a hearing. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in collaboration with my distinguished colleague, the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] decided upon the procedure which ultimately brought about the Kerr committee. If it had not been for the formation of this committee, I say unhesitatingly this afternoon, that in the frame of mind the House was in 3 months ago, all of these ladies and gentlemen who had been cited by the Dies committee would probably not have been on the pay roll today. I, unfortunately—unfortunately from a personal standpoint—was appointed a member of the Kerr committee under protest. It has been one of the most unpleasant and distasteful tasks I have ever undertaken. I say for the Kerr committee, that I have never sat with four men quite as patriotic, quite as fair-minded, as meticulous as were the members of this committee.

The reports we have brought before you call for removal of three employees from the Federal pay roll. We have heard seven in all. We have made a determination in six cases, removing three. No determination has been made in the seventh.

It is my unpleasant duty this afternoon to take the case of Dr. Robert Morss Lovett, secretary of the Virgin Islands. Dr. Lovett has a very complete file in the hands of the Dies committee, which file we obtained. Dr. Lovett has a very complete file in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which file we obtained. He has a very complete file with the Interdepartmental Committee, Civil Service Commission, and we have obtained them all. We examined the files very carefully. Dr. Lovett was called before the committee and questioned at some length, and the committee came to the conclusion that Dr. Lovett is not a fit person to remain on the Government pay roll.

I am not going to argue with anyone this afternoon whether this House has a right to remove anyone from the pay roll, or whether it has not. I think it has and I am so voting. I am not accusing Dr. Lovett of any crime, but I am saying this from a layman's standpoint. If in private industry I happened, for the sake of argument, to be president of General Motors Corporation, we will say, and I had a man the type of Dr. Lovett as the superintendent of my Pontiac plant or my Chevrolet plant, and I and my board of directors had laid down a certain design, a certain type of manufacture for this automobile, and I turned it over to Dr. Lovett, superintendent of the plant, and if Dr. Lovett went through the plant and said, "Powers, the president of this plant, and the board of directors, who are about crazy, tell me that this is the design of this automobile. I am telling you workmen this design is rotten. I am telling you workmen we should not have such a design. I just do not like it. If you have to build this design do this to it and do the other thing to it."

That is the way I am looking at this problem. I would not have Dr. Lovett or the other two gentlemen mentioned in this report on my pay roll for 15 minutes.

Again, let me tell you this: We are not accusing Dr. Lovett of anything criminal, but we are saying that because of his past and his present affiliations, his membership in certain organizations, he should not be on the pay roll. Dr. Lovett, in my opinion, was a professional joiner. He joined several score of organizations, and among those organizations were six which came under the scope of the mandate of Public Law 135 and Public Law 644 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. Those six organizations which Dr. Lovett admitted either membership in or association with are: First, the American Peace Mobilization, later known as American People's Mobilization; second, American Youth Congress; third, League of American Writers; fourth, National Committee for People's Rights; fifth, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; sixth, International Labor Defense.

I am not in favor of stifling free speech and I say that Dr. Lovett has the right to go anywhere and speak in any way he sees fit, but he is not going to do it along the lines he has been doing while he is on the public pay roll, if I have anything to do with it.

Back in 1936 Dr. Lovett was quite active in Norman Thomas' campaign. I want to read you an extract from a speech he made during that campaign, and you can judge for yourself. To quote Dr. Lovett:

> I shall vote for Norman Thomas for President because he is the only man who will take the control of this country away from the capitalists and place that control in the hands of the people. The Socialist Party is a party of poor and working classes. The Communist Party is also a party of the laboring or working classes and their candidate, Earl Browder, stands for the same things as does Norman Thomas, but I believe the Socialist Party has the best approach to the problem that confronts us today * * *. The worker today must either be a Communist or a Socialist, for neither of the older parties offer any hope. President Roosevelt has been in power for 4 years and has done nothing. It is still the same old system under which the workers are taxed to help the capitalists get more money and more power. Vote for Norman Thomas, and through him you will be voting for yourselves.

That is from one of Dr. Lovett's speeches, and it is verbatim.

Back in 1935 the Illinois State Legislature made an investigation of Dr. Lovett, and during that investigation there came to light a letter he had written to one Morris Gordin. I am going to quote that letter:

DEAR GORDIN: I have your book, Utopia in Chains, and am sending it to Dr. Jerome Davis, the best reviewer I can think of for books and the early days of the Russian revolution. I hope it will be very successful. I assure you there was no "reversal of attitude" on my part. I was anxious to have the book published as a human story, not caring in the least whether it reflects on the Russian governments, or the United States Government, or any other—all, in my opinion, being rotten. Houghton, Mifflin will undoubtedly handle the book as a counterrevolutionary document, and obviously I cannot associate myself with such a campaign.

Most sincerely,

ROBERT M. LOVETT.

Then when the Illinois State Legislature finished the investigation they published the following as one of their findings, on June 26, 1935:

Fair consideration of all evidence received by the committee compels the conclusion that Prof. Robert Morss Lovett has pursued an unpatriotic course of conduct for a period of 8 or 10 years. From the testimony and exhibits considered by the committee, he is not loyal to the spirit or letter of the Constitution of Illinois or the United States.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the few moments I have left, let me summarize by saying I believe I have touched the high spots of the Lovett hearing and I feel quite strongly in this matter. I am hopeful the votes for the Kerr amendment will be almost unanimous.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. I yield.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Is it not a fact that Dr. Morss Lovett, when questioned under oath, admitted membership in associations and affiliation with a number of these designated Communist front organizations?

Mr. POWERS. Oh, definitely; he was proud of it, very proud of it.

Mr. TABER. He was vice president of one.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Was Dr. Lovett given a full opportunity to be heard before the committee himself?

Mr. POWERS. He certainly was; he had a full hearing, and before the hearing was over he was asked if there was anything he wanted to say or add in connection with the record, and if he wanted to make a general statement, which he did. He had every opportunity to present his case to the Kerr committee.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. For the RECORD, I should like to state that the report from which the gentleman read of the investigation by the Illinois State Legislature on Dr. Lovett was the report of a committee composed of three men who opposed more vigorously than any other three men in the entire State legislature any investigation of the University of Chicago at that time.

Mr. POWERS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me call this to the attention of the membership of this body: In my very humble opinion, this Government is now being loaded down with people of this type. The people who employ them will not get rid of them; no one can get rid of them unless the Congress itself does the job. I am hopeful they will do the job.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey yields back 1 minute.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] to extend his remarks.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, under our system of representative democracy, the people who are the source of all governmental power, speak through their chosen representatives.

Under our system of representative democracy, the voice of the representative is supposed to be the composite voice of the people he represents; the ballots he casts here on the floor are but the composite ballots of the people back home.

Under our system of representative democracy, if governmental changes are to be made those changes are submitted to the people, and the people after free and open discussion pass judgment upon the changes and by their ballots commission us, their representatives, to vote for or against them.

And, Mr. Chairman, believing with all my heart in our system of representative democracy, I am ever willing to follow the mandate of the people.

But, Mr. Chairman, believing as I do in our system of representative democracy, I am unwilling to sit idly by and let go unchallenged the placing in directive positions those who share views that are inimical to every concept of the Government I love and have sworn to uphold, and who by reason of the offices they hold are in position by devious ways and insidious methods to bring about changes in our system of government that would undermine the very foundation stones upon which this democracy rests.

Here in Congress I see no evidence of a desire to change our system of government. If such a desire existed to any appreciable extent that desire would manifest through the representatives of the people demanding a change. That the Representatives in Congress, practically to a man, are strong believers in and defenders of our representative democracy, is strong and conclusive evidence that the people are satisfied with our system. Further evidence that our people are satisfied is reflected in another and convincing way. While the Dies committee has made mistakes, there is one thing that it has done that atones for all mistakes and that thing is the fact that it has uncovered the subversive influences that are seeking to undermine our Government and arouse our people to the seriousness of the situation. And the strong and practically unanimous sentiment of our people in approving the work of the Dies committee demonstrates to the world that the American people are united in their effort to preserve and hold inviolate the system of government the founding fathers conceived and brought into being.

While I see no evidence of a desire to change our system of government, either among the people or among the representatives of the people, I do see such evidence among some of those holding directive positions in our bureaus and departments.

No one familiar with what has been going on in Government lately will question my statement. If they do, while I could give many concrete examples, it will suffice, I believe, in this discussion to present but one glaring example that came to my attention just a few days ago. I am a member of the committee to investigate the Farm Security Administration. With respect to the traditional American land policy of private ownership in fee simple, what did I find? Now, my colleagues, when you question the wisdom of private ownership of land in fee simple in this country you are questioning one of the fundamental principles upon which our Government rests. And when you find in our bureaus and departments those who are attempting by insidious circumvention to undermine this great American principle the time has arrived for action, immediate and drastic action. While we like to boast that our forefathers came over seeking political and religious freedom, the fact is that probably more came over seeking land freedom than political and religious freedom, knowing that land freedom has, some way, ever carried with it most of the other freedoms. Yes; they came, the great majority of them, because they could own their own lands and upon them erect their homes, in the conscious understanding that howsoever humble those homes might be they would be their castles and would be sacred from the invasion or molestation of any man, however powerful or lordly that man might be—a place so sacred that not even the law could enter without proper warrant—and that here conscience would be the only master of their speech, their politics, their religion.

Here is what the committee found:

The Farm Security Administration succeeded to the activities of the Resettlement Administration. The Resettlement Administration was administered by one Dr. Rex. G. Tugwell, who, according to his own written utterance, entertains these views with respect to the private ownership of land. I quote:

Everyone familiar with American agriculture must know that the most hazardous

situation possible to a man of family is to have the fee simple ownership of land. (Excerpt from report by Rex. G. Tugwell to Secretary of the Interior, dated December 1941.)

One Dr. George S. Mitchell is at present, and has been for some time past, Assistant Administrator of Farm Security Administration. Dr. Mitchell's views with respect to the private ownership of land are as follows, and I quote:

According to Dr. George Mitchell, Assistant Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, now visiting in San Juan, this fee-simple ownership of property is the greatest detriment to our national prosperity. Dr. Mitchell believes that long-term leases including sometimes the right to pass on land to heirs, would probably benefit the situation. (Excerpts from Puerto Rico World Journal of May 22, 1941.)

We further found, without congressional authority, but to the contrary in plain violation of the express mandate of Congress as expressed in the Jones-Bankhead Farm Tenant Act, that the Farm Security Administration, in furtherance of these foreign bureaucratic ideas was attempting to get around the traditional American land policy of private ownership in fee simple by making 99-year leases. Think of it, my colleagues, making governmental serfs out of American freemen. Yes, my colleagues, it looks like a deliberate and studied effort is being made by these bureaucrats to undermine our time-honored land system and set up in its place some kind of paternalistic system whereby we would substitute Government ownership for private ownership of land and force the unfortunate occupants to become forever and eternally wards of the Government. Moreover, we found that the Farm Security Administration, without authority from Congress, had set up numerous collective farming projects.

I have only cited the above instance, my colleagues, to show the insidious workings of those who entertain these foreign philosophies and who hold directive positions, in order to bring the seriousness of the situation to your attention. Now, what are the issues? Let me state them simply:

First. Shall governmental changes be brought about by the people through their chosen representatives or by bureaucrats, some of whom entertain strange and foreign philosophies, by insidious usurpation.

Second. Shall only those who love our Government, respect its constitutional powers, and are in sympathy with the democratic concept, hold governmental positions, or shall we throw the bars down and permit the employment of those whose philosophies of government are foreign to the democratic concept and who foster and associate with organizations that would overthrow our Government or substitute in its place another form.

WE ARE TO DECIDE THESE QUESTIONS TODAY

Oh, I know a lot of sophistical tears will be shed in the name of the Constitution, especially in the name of that part of the Constitution known as the Bill of Rights. In answer let me say: No man who attempts to circumvent the constitutional right of the people to formulate and establish governmental policies through their chosen representatives, as some of the bureaucrats have and are attempting to do, should be allowed to escape the consequences of his act by invoking the protection of the very instrument he seeks to destroy.

Congress, the representative of the people, is the policy-making body of our Government, and whenever it becomes known to the Congress that there are those who are attempting to thwart the will of Congress, or that there are those whose concepts of government are foreign to our system holding directive positions and who are likely to attempt to thwart the will of Congress by fostering their beliefs by insidious methods upon an unsuspecting people, it is the duty of Congress to take such action as may be necessary to safeguard its prerogative, even if that action calls for prohibiting appropriated funds from being used to pay the salaries of such persons. If Congress, under the Constitution, acts as the policy-making body for the people, it naturally follows that it is the duty of Congress to see, as far as possible, that the administration of those policies are in safe hands. Ever remember that the representatives of the people are directly answerable to the people, while the only way the people can reach the bureaucrat is through their Representatives. Yes, my colleagues, Congress is the bulwark that stands between the bureaucrat and the people. If we do not stand firm then, perchance, representative government in this country may be lost. If direct constitutional authority of the Congress is asked for then I refer you to sections 1 and 8 of article I of the Constitution.

Just one other thought on the subject: The bureaucrat occupies an entirely different position to the Government than that occupied by the ordinary citizen. The ordinary citizen who entertains strange and un-American philosophies of government can do a lot of talking without doing very much harm, because he is not in position to put his beliefs into practice. Usually the very best treatment to give such men is to let them talk themselves to death. But when we come to the bureaucrat, especially those holding directive positions, we are dealing with men who can put their un-American doctrines and philosophies into practice. Most of these subversive bureaucrats are smart, and, my colleagues, do not for one moment discount their shrewdness. And being smart and shrewd make them all the more dangerous, because they will sugar-coat their pet un-American changes with an American flavor that, until the sugar-coating wears off, will fool the very elect.

Now, my colleagues, if these bureaucrats who hold Government positions want to preach their un-American doctrines and philosophies, let them get out of the Government service, and then, so far as I am concerned, they can exhibit their foreign views from every soap box in America so long as they do not advocate the overthrow of our Government by force. Believing as I do in free speech, I think the best cure for these wild-eyed, misguided souls is to let them freely exhibit their views to real every day Americans. They will find out in a short time, in my opinion, that the only effect of their fulminations is an impairment of their vocal cords.

So much for the first question. As to the second question, let me say that no man who does not love this Government and cherish its institutions should be permitted to be upon the Government pay roll. The only safe way to follow in perpetuating and holding inviolate our democratic system is to see that everyone connected with our Government, from President to water boy, not only believes in but has the love of our Government in his heart. While we ever welcome constructive criticism that has for its end improvement of our system, we should not tolerate men in the service of our Government who indulge in destructive criticism that has for its end the overthrow of our system or the substitution of another form in its place. The words of the Master, "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad" are peculiarly applicable, and should be the yardstick by which the fitness of those in Government service should be measured.

Now I ask your indulgence for just a few minutes while I discuss the procedure we have adopted in weeding out these subversive bureaucrats.

The first instance in which the House attempted to rid the Government service of those holding subversive views was in the case of David Lasser back in June 1941. In that case an amendment was offered from the floor to the emergency appropriation bill prohibiting the use of any of the funds carried in the bill to pay the salary of Lasser. The proceeding impressed me as being so manifestly unfair and unconstitutional, due to the fact that Congress had never investigated the case, nor had it given Lasser an opportunity to answer the subversive charges, that although I did not know Lasser at the time and what I had heard about him was unfavorable, I came to his rescue in quite a lengthy speech which appears in the RECORD of June 19, 1941. My effort, along with the efforts of others, resulted in the appropriations committee giving Lasser an opportunity to be heard. Lasser was heard and the appropriations committee after the hearing decided that an injustice had been done, and the prohibition against him was repealed. My attitude in the Lasser case clearly shows that I believe in the constitutional guaranty that the accused should be furnished with a statement of the charges against him and should be given an opportunity to be heard and present his defense. This end was accomplished in the cases now before the House for consideration and determination by the House appointing a special committee of the Committee on Appropriations to examine into the charges preferred against the parties involved. The report of the special committee sets out clearly the procedure followed in arriving at its de-

cisions. The procedure was as follows, and I quote from the report:

The special subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations created pursuant to House Resolution 105, Seventy-eighth Congress "* * * to examine into any and all allegations or charges that certain persons in the employ of the several executive departments and other executive agencies are unfit to continue in such employment by reason of their present association or membership or past association or membership in or with organizations whose aims or purposes are or have been subversive to the Government of the United States" have procured and examined the evidence in the cases of employees of the Federal Communications Commission named by the chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives, February 1, 1943, and now submit the following report in regard to these employees.

The special subcommittee understands the purpose of House Resolution 105 to be that said committee shall procure the evidence in each individual case from each department or agency of the Government having any such evidence, and from such evidence, supplemented by direct testimony from the employee, arrive at a proper determination of the matter within the provisions of the resolution.

Your committee secured the services of the Honorable Matt H. Allen, of North Carolina, as attorney, and has assembled in the cases above mentioned evidence from the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the United States Civil Service Commission, the Interdepartmental Committee, and the Federal Communications Commission. It is voluminous. After an examination of the available evidence by members of said committee, each employee was invited to appear, and did appear, and explain under oath in detail his answer to the various allegations.

In my opinion, the procedure followed by the special committee gave the accused every right to which they are entitled.

No one can challenge the high standing and patriotism of the members of the special committee. They are all men of ability and unimpeachable integrity. A better, a fairer, a more judicious committee could not have been selected. I am willing to abide by the findings of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me say that the thing that disturbs me most in connection with these men of questionable Americanism securing directive positions with our Government is this: Who is responsible? Now, I am not so dumb as to think that it just happened. Someone caused the happenings, and what I am interested in is finding out who that someone is. I hope the scope of the special committee will be broadened and the special committee directed to make investigation into who is responsible for these happenings. We will have an endless job if we have to continue to weed out what someone else is doing. Let us get at the source of this thing and put a curb on the party or parties responsible for placing such people in the Government service.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] to extend his remarks.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, it is clear that before the House can take action on the proposed amendment to this deficiency appropriation bill to ban salaries for Goodwin Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett, we must consider two questions of major issue.

The first such question is the definition of subversive activities by which the Kerr committee has seen fit to report that these men are unfit for public service.

It seems clear that this Congress cannot in all conscience take action on the basis of legislative definitions which will not stand the test of Supreme Court scrutiny.

Let us then examine the Kerr committee definition from the point of view of how it would withstand such scrutiny. I quote the first part of the definition:

Subversive activity in this country derives from conduct intentionally destructive of or inimical to the Government of the United States—

The question underlying this section would seem to be this: In what way does this alter consideration of any activity which would ordinarily fall within the jurisdiction of the courts of our land as coming within the scope of our statutory handling of sedition and treason? It would seem that this makes no change.

Does this not signify then, that Congress by attempting to legislate such activity to its own jurisdiction may be invading the province of the judicial branch of our Government?

We must, particularly in this time of war, take heed lest by such action we undermine the very foundation of our democracy—our Constitution, which has unmistakably set forth the separation between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

I continue with the definition—

that which seeks to undermine its institutions, or to distort its functions, or to impede its projects, or to lessen its efforts—

Mr. Chairman, I urge the members of this House to recall the number of times they have used phrases such as "impede its projects," "distort its functions," "lessen its efforts." And in what connection have such phrases been used? Not in the sense of undermining our Constitution or Government. Not at all. They have used these expressions time and time again to characterize their opinion of certain legislative proposals: The establishment of the Office of Price Administration, the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act, the proposal for unemployment compensation and social security, the setting up of the 8-hour work day, the proposal to register trade unions, outlaw the right to strike, and countless others.

At one time or another, by one group or another, all of these have been considered moves to "distort the functions," "lessen the efforts," "impede the projects" of the Government of the United States.

Can we then convict men on such vague, nebulous characterizations of—not their activities—but their utterances and opinions? How many of us, by that same definition, would find ourselves unfit for government service?

The sentence ends—

the ultimate end being to overturn it all.

Mr. Chairman, time and time again the Supreme Court of the United States has indicated that charges of utterances inciting to violence against the United States Government must also show "clear and present danger."

The eminent jurist, Mr. Zechariah Chafee says in his book, Free Speech in the United States, page 81, in discussing *Schenck* v. *United States* (249 U. S. 47 (1919)), I quote:

This desire to head off actual injury to the government is, we have seen, the basis of all suppression of discussion, unless it is limited very narrowly. In order to give force to the first amendment, Justice Holmes draws the boundary line very close to the test of incitement at common law and clearly makes the punishment of words for their remote bad tendency impossible.

Mr. Chairman, I again urge that we give grave and serious consideration to branding men "unfit for Government service" because of their opinions and utterances. We dare not lay ourselves open to the charge that our war against the Axis in the name of democracy and freedom will go to naught if Congress itself denies clearly granted constitutional liberties to employees of the Federal Government.

The second question of major issue on which we must ponder is that raised by the report of the Kerr committee on page 3. The report states that the question of responsibility for who shall run the Government, and who shall not be entrusted with official responsibility has been settled, and I quote, "at the bar of public opinion."

Mr. Chairman, can we seriously convict men on the basis of any such judgment? Who shall say that my interpretation of the "bar of public opinion" has any more validity or is a more accurate evaluation than that of my neighbor?

One of the freedoms for which we are engaged in this great struggle is that men shall have the right to lawful trial when they are accused; that they shall not suffer conviction at the arbitrary whim of opinion; that they shall not be branded "traitors" for dangerous thoughts.

Mr. Chairman, Goodwin Watson, William Dodd, and Robert Morss Lovett are branded "unfit for Government service"; not because of their inability to do the work assigned to them, but because they have opinions. Such opinions may differ from yours or mine. But can we convict them of disservice to their country because they believed enough in their opinions to exercise their American right to express them? Surely not.

I hope that the House will take serious cognizance of the possible consequences of the action proposed in this amendment. I hope that we shall once more reaffirm to ourselves and to the world that America is, in truth, fighting a war for freedom and democracy, and that this great Congress of the United States

clearly understands its obligation to defend the rights of the individual, whose exercise is under the intent examination of the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

Two interesting decisions of the United States Supreme Court discuss what limitations may be placed on freedom of speech in the United States:

SUPREME COURT ON FREEDOM OF SPEECH

1. *Schenck* v. *United States* (249 U. S. 47, 39 S. Ct. Rept. 247):

"The question in every case of the alleged infringement of the constitutional freedom of speech and press is whether the words used are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent; it is a question of proximity and degree."

2. *Herndon* v. *Lowry* (301 U. S. 242, 57 S. Ct. 732):

"The power of a State to abridge freedom of speech is the exception rather than the rule; and any limitation upon individual liberty must, to avoid unconstitutionality, have appropriate relation to the safety of the State."

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the Kerr amendment.

The Federal Communications Commission, which employs Messrs. Dodd and Watson, has issued a considered opinion and analysis of the Kerr committee report, relative to Drs. Watson and Dodd. In order that the accused may have something more directly in their own behalf in the record I include that statement hereinbelow emanating from those who should know them best, their employers:

REPORT BY THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION (COMMISSIONERS CASE, CRAVEN, AND PAYNE, DISSENTING) IN THE MATTER OF GOODWIN WATSON, FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN, AND WILLIAM E. DODD, JR.

The Commission has before it the question of the continued employment of Goodwin Watson, Frederick L. Schuman, and William E. Dodd, Jr. The occasion for the present reconsideration of the qualifications of Watson, Schuman, and Dodd is the Report of the Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations Acting Pursuant to House Resolution 105, Seventy-eighth Congress, filed April 21, 1943. This report finds that Watson is "unfit for the present to continue in Government service"; that there is not sufficient evidence concerning Schuman "to support a recommendation of unfitness to service in the employment of the Government at this time"; and that Dodd is "unfit for the present to continue in Government service."

We are keenly aware that, subject to Civil Service and other legally imposed restrictions, the responsibility for determining the qualifications of its own employees for employment and for their continuance in employment rests upon the Commission itself. Under the law, we may not employ or continue in employment any person who has "membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of Government in the United States" (act of Aug. 2, 1939, sec. 9 (a), 53 Stat. 1148); nor can we employ or continue in employment "any person who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence" (Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, sec. 4, — Stat. —). In selecting employees the fullest care is exercised by the Commission to see to it not only that they meet the statutory qualifications above mentioned and have the required skill and training but also that they have no loyalty of any kind which would conflict with their loyalty to this country or with the proper performance of their duties as employees of the Commission. Our determination today is arrived at with a full awareness that under the law the primary responsibility is ours.

The records of Watson, Schuman, and Dodd were carefully examined before they were employed. They have been even more carefully investigated since their employment. The report of the subcommittee contains no information or charges which the Commission has not previously considered, and there is nothing in the report which would warrant the Commission in changing the conclusion it has reached that these men are qualified for the work assigned them.

All three men are native-born citizens, admirably qualified for the positions which they hold. Watson, before joining the Commission, had taught for 16 years at Columbia University and was widely recognized as one of the outstanding social psychologists in the country. He has been a student of world affairs. He is an ordained minister of the Methodist Church; has served in various Methodist pulpits and as director of research for the national council of the Young Men's Christian Association. Schuman taught at the University of Chicago, as well as at Harvard University and the University of California; from 1936 until his employment with the Commission he was Woodrow Wilson professor of government at Williams College. Dodd is a graduate of the University of Chicago and has taught at the University of North Carolina and at William and Mary College; he served as secretary to his father, the late Ambassador to Germany, during his ambassadorship, and edited his father's official diary for publication. All three, without question, are eminently qualified, both by training and actual practical experience, for their Commission duties—the analysis of foreign broadcast propaganda.

These men have been on the job and under our observation for a substantial time. No question has at any time been raised concerning the competence, accuracy, or objectivity of their work. Their reports come under the daily scrutiny of their supervisors and of responsible officials of Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, Office of Strategic Services, State Department, Office of War Information, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Board of Economic Warfare, Lend-Lease, Department of Justice, etc. It is inconceivable that any bias, distortion, or subversion could escape the attention of these agencies. They have frequently commended the quality of the work performed.

Letters cited below from many eminent citizens whose character is unimpeachable and who are in a position to know the facts show the high respect in which the loyalty, trustworthiness, and competence of these men are held.

Watson, Schuman, and Dodd enjoy the full respect and confidence of their superiors, associates, and subordinates. The removal of any one of them would result in a direct reduction in the efficiency and quality of the essential war activity carried on by the foreign broadcast intelligence service.

All three, by reason of their close contact and exhaustive study of world affairs, perceived earlier than many of their countrymen the rising menace of the Nazis, Fascists, and Japanese. Spurred on by this insight, they sought by speech, by writing, and by cooperation with others working toward similar ends to awaken their countrymen to the peril which became manifest to all Americans at Pearl Harbor. We do not, of course, endorse every word these men have uttered or every action they have taken, but we believe that the right of freedom of speech which the Constitution guarantees to every person embraces even those with whom we disagree.

Nothing contained in the report of the special subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations acting pursuant to House Resolution 105, Seventy-eighth Congress, filed April 21, 1943, has caused us to abandon this belief. Nowhere does the subcommittee report charge that these employees "have membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States"; nor does the subcommittee report find that any of them "advocates, or * * * is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence." Nor does the subcommittee report set forth any other reason in law, in fairness or arising out of the exigencies of the present war for the dismissal of these employees at this time. In practical effect these men have only been farsighted and aggressive in opposing nazism and fascism. Their citizenship and the legality of their conduct have not been brought into question in any court of law. We are confident that the Congress desires to assure the maintenance of our traditional legal processes.

As Commissioners, we are sworn to uphold the Constitution and the laws of the United States. We are obligated to preserve their orderly processes. We cannot in good conscience take a course of action which, however politic and easy, may violate the constitutional guaranties of due process of law and of free speech.

RECORD OF GOODWIN WATSON

We originally employed Goodwin Watson as Chief of the Analysis Section of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service (P–6, $5,600) on November 17 1941. His record showed that he was 42 years old, and a native of Whitewater, Wis.; that for the past 16 years he had been a member of the faculty of Columbia University; and that he was widely considered to be one of the foremost social psychologists of the United States. He had enlisted as apprentice seaman and student of engineering in the Naval Training Corps, United States Navy, in 1918, and had served until honorably discharged. He had pursued graduate studies at the Union Theological Seminary; was an ordained minister of the Methodist Church; and had held pulpits in the Methodist Church in Parkerville, Wis., the Washington Park Community Church in Denver, Colo., and the St. James Methodist Episcopal Church in New York City. Thereafter he was instructor in religious education at the Union Theological Seminary, and principal of its Union School of Religion; and from 1925 to 1931, he was director of research for the National Council of the Young Men's Christian Association. He was editor of the yearbook for the Psychological Study of Social Issues and also editor of the Journal of Social Psychology; and he had contributed widely to professional journals on subjects in his field. The post for which Watson was then under consideration involved the analysis of foreign propaganda; and hence we ascertained with particular care his foreign experience, which included study at the Universities of Berlin and Vienna and travel in Europe during periods totaling about 3 years.

Watson did not seek a job with the Commission; but rather, on the basis of the above data, the Commission sought Watson as the man best suited by professional education, training and actual practical experience in propaganda analysis to head its propaganda analysis section. Leaders in his profession unqualifiedly recommended to the Commission that Watson be appointed. The Watson appointment was approved by the Civil Service Commission.

From the begining Watson's work proved eminently satisfactory, as attested by the opinion of his immediate superior, his associates, his subordinates, and representatives of the armed forces and of other Government agencies to which the reports of Watson's section were circulated.

Thus, for example, on July 29, 1942, the War Shipping Administration, Recruitment and Manning Organization, wrote to Watson:

"The kind of material which you have sent over for our scrutiny is just what we are looking for. The examples you have marked seem to fall into four categories. These four, which are: news of survivors, news of ships sunk, news of shipping problems in the United States, and the morale of seamen, fit our problem exactly. I do not know how you can break these down so that your problem will be simplified. But, if it is possible, without too much trouble for you, the Recruitment and Manning Organization would certainly appreciate this service.

"The advantage of this material from our point of view is obvious. It gives us the foreign reaction, sometimes gives us information about approximate location of survivors, and gives us foreign propaganada in regard to United Nations' shipping."

On December 28, 1942, Mr. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, wrote to the Director of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service:

"As the year draws to a close, I would like to express our appreciation for the fine cooperation which the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service of the Federal Communications Commission has given to our Radio Division during 1942. The assistance of Dr. Goodwin Watson, Mr. Harold Graves, and Mr. John Gardner has been particularly helpful, and I hope you will convey to them our sincere gratitude."

Under date of July 15, 1942, the Chief of the Army General Staff, Military Intelligence, Southern Section, European Branch, wrote:

"DEAR PROF. WATSON: The Vichy broadcast is exactly the kind of thing we want. Thank you very much for sending it and please be sure to send anything else of the sort."

On September 25, 1942, the Office of Strategic Services, Foreign Nationalities Branch, wrote to Watson:

"I want to thank your division again for its splendid cooperation on all matters of interest to us."

On September 11, 1942, the War Department General Staff, Military Intelligence Division, wrote to Watson:

"I am following up an informal inquiry made through my friend, Mr. Telford Taylor, concerning a recent item in your weekly bulletin dealing with Japanese cabinet changes. Mr. Taylor tells me that the coauthors of this item, which was much admired by this office, edit a weekly summary of limited distribution and, if it is permitted by your regulations, I would request that we be put on your list to receive this publication. If this is possible, the publication should be addressed to Colonel Carter W. Clarke, Chief, Special Service Branch, M. I. S., Room 3309, Munitions Building.

"Mr. Taylor also informed me of weekly luncheons on Wednesday, conducted by the authors of this study, and if it is permissible, I am sure that one or two members of our staff would like to attend. I am certain that Col. Alfred McCormack and I would be glad to avail ourselves of this opportunity."

These letters are typical of the favorable comments evoked by Watson's work from the various agencies to which it goes—State Department, Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, Office of War Information, Office of Strategic Services, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Board of Economic Warfare, Lend-Lease Administration, Department of Justice, etc. Equally significant is the total absence of a single complaint from any of these agencies that Watson's work is in any way incompetent, biased, or subject to criticism in any other way. That any subversive matter could possibly have escaped the close scrutiny which these naval and military intelligence and other agencies give to Watson's work is inconceivable.

The Commission has also received many letters testifying to Watson's loyalty, competence, and integrity. For example, Dr. William F. Russell, dean of Teachers College, Columbia University, wrote on January 27, 1942:

"I have been dean of Teachers College for 15 years and during all of that time Professor Watson has worked under my administration. I know him very well.

"I can testify to the professional competence of Goodwin Watson for the work that he is doing for the Federal Communications Commission. I know that he was employed in this work upon the recommendation of the leading psychologists in the United States, who are competent to judge.

"I wish further to testify to the loyalty of Prof. Goodwin Watson to the Government and Constitution of the United States and to the American ideal and way of life.

"I make this statement not because of my personal affection for Professor Watson, nor by guesswork, but rather because my administration in Teachers College has been twice under attack by the Communist organization of New York City. This I definitely know. On each occasion Professor Watson openly supported me and my administration and opposed the position which I knew was taken under influence of Communist headquarters. On many social and educational questions I have not agreed with the position taken by Professor Watson, but I have never found him lacking either in competence or loyalty."

On January 28, 1942, Harold D. Lasswell, the expert witness called by the Department of Justice in sedition proceedings and cited by the Dies committee itself as an authority on subversive activities, wrote:

"That Professor Watson is a thoroughly loyal American, who has at no time been associated with the Communist Party, is a fact. However, Dr. Watson is an outspoken friend of democracy, willing to 'stick his neck out' on behalf of truth as he sees it. Several times, therefore, he has come in the open on behalf of unpopular causes. Sometimes this has meant that his associates were persons whose motives were less high-minded than his own; but no genuine American, accustomed to the rough-and-tumble of political life, expects to avoid strange bedfellows. These activities by Professor Watson testify to his character and integrity as a citizen of our democracy and should be regarded as evidence of his fitness for a responsible position in the service of the Nation."

Letters commending Watson's competence and loyalty were also received from the following:

Dr. George F. Zook, president of the American Council on Education and formerly United States Commissioner of Education; Prof. Mark May, director of the Institute of Human Relations, Yale University; Frederick L. Redefer, secretary of the Progressive Education Association; Prof. Frederick C. McLaughlin, University of Missouri; Mrs. A. W. Clevenger, president, Illinois State Division, American Association of University Women; Dr. Edward W. Jones, Director of Personnel, University of Buffalo; Dr. Arthur Upham Pope, New York; Jay A. Urice, associate general secretary, National Council of the Y. M. C. A.; Prof. Arthur L. Swift, Jr., Union Theological Seminary; Prof. Hadley Cantril, Princeton University; Prof. Floyd Allport, Syracuse University; Prof. Gordon Allport, Harvard University; Prof. John Dollard, Yale University; Prof. Paul R. Farnsworth, Stanford University; Prof. Arthur I. Gates, Columbia University; Prof. James Gibson, Smith College; Prof. J. P. Guilford, University of Southern California; Prof. Donald W. MacKinnon, Yale University; Prof. Douglas McGregor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Prof. M. A. Merrill, Stanford University; Prof. H. A. Murray, Harvard University; Prof. L. M. Terman, Stanford University; Prof. Edward C. Tolman, University of California; Prof. Franklin Fearing, University of California; Prof. W. C. H. Prentice, University of Vermont; Prof. L. Joseph Stone, Vassar College; Profs. David A. Grant, Harry F. Harlow, Delos D. Wickens, and W. J. Brogden, all of the University of Wisconsin; Prof. L. M. Hanks, Jr., University of Illinois; Prof. J. B. Rhine, University of North Carolina; Prof. Arthur W. Kornhauser, University of Chicago; Prof. A. R. Gilliland, Northwestern University; Prof. S. Stanfield Sargent, Barnard College; Prof. Daniel Leary, University of Buffalo; Prof. Margaret S. Quayle, State Teachers College, Buffalo, N. Y.; Profs. K. W. Oberlin and Mary Henle, University of Delaware; Prof. Irving E. Bender, Dartmouth College; Prof. Robert R. Sears, University of Iowa; Prof. Ray H. Simpson, University of Alabama; Profs. Horace English, Sidney Pressey, Carl Rogers, Harold Edgerton, Francis Robinson, Floyd Dockeray, Robert Williams, Francis Maxfield, Harold Burtt, and Henry Goddard, all of Ohio State University; Prof. T. F. Lentz, University of Washington; Prof. Leo B. Fagan, St. Louis University; Prof. J. F. Dashiell, University of North Carolina.

RECORD OF FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN

Frederick L. Schuman was employed by the Commission on October 21, 1942, as a principal political analyst (P-6, $5,600) in the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service. His record showed that he was 38 years old, and was born in Chicago, Ill. He was graduated from the University of Chicago in 1924, and had received his doctor's degree in political science in 1927. He had been employed by Butler Brothers and by Marshall Field & Co., and subsequently he was instructor and assistant professor in political science and international relations at the University of Chicago. Since 1936 he had been Woodrow Wilson Professor of Government at Williams College, Williamstown, Massachusetts; and he had been visiting lecturer in international relations at Harvard University and at the University of California.

Various letters of recommendation were received concerning Schuman. For example, Maj. Paul Birdsall, of the War Department General Staff, Military Intelligence Division G-2, wrote:

"I regard Dr. Schuman as a brilliant analyst of international relations and almost a pioneer in his diagnosis of the danger to this country and the entire world in the Nazi developments in Europe since about 1934. He combines with his intellectual qualities a loyal and honest character devoted to democratic principle and service of this country. In ability and loyalty I can think of no candidate better qualified for the post in your organization which you describe."

Beardsley Ruml, treasurer of R. H. Macy & Co., Inc., wrote concerning Schuman:

"I have no hesitancy in commending him from the standpoint of loyalty, judgment, and trustworthiness. In fact, as a person to do a penetrating job of analysis, I can think of no one who would be Dr. Schuman's equal."

Harold D. Lasswell, the expert witness called by the Department of Justice in sedition proceedings and cited by the Dies committee itself as an authority on subversive activities, wrote:

"There is no question of Dr. Schuman's thorough loyalty to the ideals of our country. He is a man of the highest personal integrity

and is in every way an outstanding citizen and specialist.

"I think you would be very fortunate to secure the assistance of Dr. Schuman in the extremely important and delicate work that you have in hand."

Charles E. Merriam, of the department of political science of the University of Chicago, wrote:

"I am writing to say that I have the very highest regard for Dr. Schuman's loyalty, judgment, and trustworthiness."

Letters of recommendation were also received from J. P. Comer, chairman of the department of political science, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.; Richard A. Newhall, Williams College; Walter B. Smith, chairman of the department of economics, Williams College; Donald E. Richmond, chairman of the department of mathematics, Williams College; John Hawley Roberts, chairman of the department of English, Williams College; Edgar A. Mowrer, Office of War Information; Tyler Dennett, Pulitzer prize biographer and former president of Williams College; Edgar J. Nathan, Jr., president of the Borough of Manhattan, City of New York; Robert R. R. Brooks, Office of Price Administration; and James P. Baxter, 3d, Deputy Director of the Office of Strategic Services.

Schuman's work is deemed excellent by his superiors, his associates, and his subordinates. As in the case of Watson, no criticism has ever been received from Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, or any of the other Government agencies which regularly scrutinize his work.

RECORD OF WILLIAM E. DODD, JR.

On December 1, 1941, we employed William E. Dodd, Jr., as editorial assistant (CAF-7, $2,600) in the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service. Dodd's record showed that he was 36 years old and a native of Virginia; that he was a graduate of the University of Chicago; and that he held a master's degree from Harvard University. He had taught English, American and European history at the University of North Carolina and at William and Mary College. He was especially qualified for reporting on foreign broadcast material by virtue of the fact that he held a doctor of philosophy degree from the University of Berlin; that he had served as secretary to his father, the late American Ambassador to Germany, during the ambassadorship; that he had edited his father's official diary for publication; and that he was versed in both French and German.

As in the cases of Watson and Schuman, it is significant that no criticism has ever been received concerning Dodd's work from any of the intelligence or other agencies which regularly scrutinize his reports.

The quality of the work of the three men under consideration is indicated by a memorandum, dated February 6, 1943, from Robert D. Leigh, Director of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service. Dr. Leigh wrote:

"As Director of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service during the last 7 months, I have been directly responsible for recommending to the Federal Communications Commission the appointment to our staff of Dr. Frederick Schuman, for recommending an increase of salary for Dr. Goodwin Watson as reclassified by the Civil Service Commission, and for recommending assignment of Dr. William E. Dodd, Jr., to our London office. I am glad to assume full responsibility for these recommendations. Each was made after full and careful investigation regarding fitness for the post designated.

"The removal of any one of the three would result in a direct reduction in the efficiency and quality of the modest but essential war activity carried on by the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service. The loss would be felt by the military, diplomatic, and war information agencies we exist to serve.

* * * * *

"I have examined all the evidence in our own files regarding Watson, Schuman, and Dodd, and all that has been yet made available to us by members of the Dies committee. It makes a clear, consistent pattern of people who because of close contact with, and exhaustive study of, the European scene (Dodd from the vantage point of the American Embassy in Berlin, Schuman and Watson from frequent visits to the Continent throughout the twenties and thirties) saw earlier than many of their fellow countrymen the rising menace and warmaking plans of the Nazis, Italians, and Japanese. They strove by speech, by writing, by cooperation with any and every group working toward similar ends to arouse their fellow countrymen to prevent the oncoming struggle by organizing with anti-Fascist nations a strong system of collective security. They advocated boycott of Japanese goods to aid China; they advocated aid to the Spanish Loyalist Government against the German-and-Italian-aided Franco government; they favored Russian anti-Nazi policy and then they roundly condemned Russia when the Russian-German pact of 1939 was signed and Russia subsequently invaded Finland.

"They were actively and aggressively trying to prevent the catastrophe of war by arming us materially and morally against the Nazis and Fascists. This is their record. They spoke at meetings with people of different beliefs—but always for the objectives outlined above. It was no fault or dereliction of theirs, but a historical accident that Communists in the United States during this period of the thirties were equally active against the Nazis and Fascists.

"To me such a record indicates political background and insights which recommend an expert for a position editing or analyzing enemy broadcasts in time of war rather than to disqualify him. I know the work, background, and character of these men well enough to feel that there is almost no likelihood of any additional evidence changing the essential picture, although evidence on any member of our staff is always welcomed.

"The purpose in writing this memorandum is to indicate my judgment as a responsible officer in charge of this Service, that Drs. Watson, Schuman, and Dodd are very well qualified for their posts, that they are using their expert knowledge skillfully, honestly, and faithfully in behalf of the war effort in this sector, and that their removal from the Service would be a direct, serious blow to our essential operations—let alone morale."

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS ACTING PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 105, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, DATED APRIL 21, 1943

We now have before us the report of the above subcommittee. This report finds that Watson is unfit for the present to continue in Government service, that there is not sufficient evidence concerning Schuman to support a recommendation of unfitness to serve in the employment of the Government at this time; and that Dodd is unfit for the present to continue in Government service.

Unfortunately, we have been unable to determine with any precision the grounds for the subcommittee's findings. Our general counsel was directed to attend the hearings before the subcommittee as an observer for the Commission, but permission to attend was refused him by the subcommittee The testimony was in closed session No transcript of the testimony has been made available. Nor do the general comments prefixed to the subcommittee's report aid us further.

The subcommittee states that this Nation has achieved its greatness through the ideals and philosophy of freedom written into its charter and Constitution; that it takes pride in those people who have always been and are now willing to offer their lives to protect these inalienable rights so well defined in our Declaration of Independence. those rights and duties which have made us great and strong and which we will never willingly surrender; that the Constitution of the United States rests upon public opinion; and many other statements of like purport with which we are in the fullest possible agreement.

The subcommittee also supplies a definition of subversive activity:

Subversive activity in this country derives from conduct intentionally destructive of or inimical to the Government of the United States—that which seeks to undermine its institutions, or to distort its functions, or to impede its projects, or to lessen its efforts, the ultimate end being to overturn it all. Such activity may be open and direct as by effort to overthrow, or subtle and indirect as by sabotage.

The general comments contained in the subcommittee's report, however, fail to specify wherein Watson and Dodd have run afoul of this definition, or wherein Schuman has avoided its bans. Was Watson's and Dodd's conduct destructive of the Government of the United States, or was it on the other hand inimical to the Government of the United States? Did they seek to undermine its institutions? Or did they seek to distort its functions? Was their activity open and direct as by effort to overthrow? Or was it on the contrary subtle and indirect as by sabotage?

No answers to these questions are afforded by the subcommittee. The subcommittee report states that Watson has admitted association or affiliation with 12 or more organizations which it lists, but it fails anywhere to define either "association" or "affiliation." The kind of contact which the subcommittee includes under "association" or "affiliation" however, is indicated by the following examples:

International Workers Order

Watson states that he is not now and never has been a member of this organization and that he does not know its officers or activities. He states that he does not remember any activity whatever in connection with the International Workers Order, but that if, as alleged, he agreed to sponsor some contest which they promoted to provide recreation for children, he would certainly have cooperated in any legitimate attempt to provide better play opportunities for underprivileged children. This admission hardly appears to be a ground for the statement that Watson admits association or affiliation with the International Workers Order.

The League of American Writers

Watson states that his only connection with this organization was to contribute an article entitled "Anti-Semitism in American Psychology," to a book designed to promote better race relations. On this basis he is said to have admitted association or affiliation with an organization of which he is not and has never been a member.

American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom

Watson states that he sponsored a meeting held at Carnegie Hall in New York to oppose a measure then being considered by the New York State Legislature to reduce appropriations for public schools; and that as an educator and strong believer in the American public-school system, he was opposed to any reduction in appropriations which would impair the efficiency of the

public schools; and that this was his sole interest in the matter and his sole contact with the organization with which he is said to have admitted "association or affiliation."

The subcommittee report states that "a number of these organizations have been designated by the Department of Justice as 'front organizations' and others as 'questionable.'" It does not state which of these organizations have been found to be "front" organizations, which have been found to be "questionable," or which have been found to be neither. Nor does it find that Watson maintained an "association or affiliation" with any of these organizations after the Department of Justice had published any findings. The question thus arises whether Watson, a private citizen without the Department of Justice's facilities for research and investigation, is expected to foresee in advance a determination by the Department of Justice which he could hardly have reached by his own efforts.

The subcommittee points out that the organizations with which it is alleged Watson was or is associated or affiliated "have not been adjudged by the courts or by Congress as subversive," but adds that the "'court of public opinion' of the United States has passed judgment upon them and has found them subversive and un-American." We hold public opinion in high regard, and we believe that the conclusion of public opinion over a period of a century and a half has been that men shall be afforded due process and not convicted upon the basis of rumor or public opinion.

The Constitution establishes legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government, each with its own powers, and guarantees to all persons due process of law. Nowhere does the Constitution sanction trials before a so-called court of public opinion by which the committee has found Watson unfit.

Moreover, there is good reason to believe that public opinion has not in fact passed judgment upon the organizations listed in the subcommittee report and found them subversive or un-American. For example, among the persons who have had "association or affiliation" identical with Watson's association or affiliation with one or more of the 12-named organizations are Henry A. Wallace, Vice President of the United States; Associate Justice Robert H. Jackson, Supreme Court of the United States; the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior; Representative John M. Coffee, State of Washington; Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York; William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; Lewis E. Lawes, former warden, Sing Sing Penitentiary, and Dorothy Thompson, noted columnist and commentator; all of whom, like Watson, contributed statements on anti-Semitism to the publication of the League of American Writers entitled "We Hold These Truths."

Also, Professor Irving Fisher, Yale University; Professor Harold Urey, Nobel Prize winner; President Emeritus William Allen Neilson, Smith College; Dr. Henry Smith Leiper, foreign secretary, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; and Oliver LaFarge, well-known writer; all of whom, like Watson, filed an open letter on the Dies committee sponsored by the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights.

Also, the then presidents of the Milwaukee State Teachers College, Atlanta University, the University of Wisconsin, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, University of Minnesota, Colorado State College of Education, Western College, University of Louisville, University of Newark, and the presidents emeritus of Smith College, Northwestern University, and Mt. Holyoke College; all of whom, like Watson, filed a petition to discontinue the Dies committee on behalf of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.

It should be noted, that in addition to the 12 organizations with which Watson is allegedly associated or affiliated, he is or was actually a member, in good standing, of the following:

American Association for the Advancement of Science.
American Association for Applied Psychology.
American Association of University Professors.
American Civil Liberties Union.
American Education Research Association.
American Farm Bureau Federation.
American Federation of Teachers.
American Orthopsychiatric Association.
American Political Science Association.
American Psychological Association.
American Red Cross.
American Society for Public Administration.
American Sociological Society.
Automobile Club of New York.
Child Study Association of America.
Citizens Union of City of New York.
Consumers Union.
Cleveland Conference (Educators).
Committee for National Morale.
Foreign Policy Association.
Hamilton's School (director).
Institute for Propaganda Analysis.
Methodist Church.
Morningside Consumers Cooperative.
National Conference for Social Work.
National Education Association.
National Geographic Society.
National Planning Association.
National Society of College Teachers of Education.
New America.
Progressive Education Association.
Religious Education Association.
Scholia Club.
Spring Conference (Educators).
Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues.
Young Men's Christian Association.

The subcommittee finds that Watson "for several years past has associated himself on many and frequent occasions with men * * * whose aims and purposes were subversive to this Government, and has associated with men who advocated the overthrow of this Government." These men are nowhere named nor is his relation to them stated.

The subcommittee also finds that Watson wrote for several magazines reputedly controlled by subversive interests but fails to indicate that these magazines are in fact so controlled. Watson stands convicted of disloyalty to his country in time of war. It is true that the offense, as phrased by the subcommittee, does not require infliction of the physical punishments imposed for treason; but, without accepting the subcommittee's findings that either he or the organizations listed have been convicted in the "court of public opinion," public opinion is invoked to administer the punishment. To a citizen of even ordinary self-respect and sensitivity such punishment may be as harsh, if not harsher, than the physical punishments imposed by courts of law. We do not believe it is right, fair or in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution to convict on rumor or mere repute.

The subcommittee further finds that in his writings Watson has "made unfavorable comparisons between other governments and our Government," and that he has "criticized our capitalistic and profit system and advocated its overthrow." It cites no specific quotations, nor does it indicate that it has measured his writings by the constitutional yardstick of a free press.

It is not necessary that we should agree with or endorse everything that Watson has written in his more than 200 publications, nor is it likely that he himself retains all of his former views. But, as the courts have held, writings must be "considered as a whole" (*Cain* v. *Universal Pictures Co.*, 47 F. Supp. 1013, 1017), and not by means of isolated fragments torn from their context (*U. S.* v. *Levine* (83 F. (2d) 156)). It does not appear from the subcommittee report that Watson's writings, taken as a whole or in context, transgress in any way the right of free speech guaranteed by the Constitution or indicate any disloyalty to the United States or its form of government.

The subcommittee states that it has not found sufficient evidence for a recommendation against the fitness of Schuman.

With respect to Dodd, the subcommittee finds that he once belonged to the American League for Peace and Democracy but resigned in 1940; that he belongs to the Washington Book Shop; that he once entertained Harry Bridges; and that he lectured under the auspices of or was associated with "a long list of organizations," further unspecified. Among the organizations under whose auspices he lectured or with which he was associated were the following:

Methodist Church, Williamsburg, Va.
International Association of Sales Executives, New York City.
Institute of Public Affairs, Charlottesville, Va.
Loudoun County Junior Board of Trade, Leesburg, Va.
Women of Duke University, under the auspices of the Young Women's Christian Association, Durham, N. C.
Foreign Affairs Forum, Reading, Pa.
Central Bergen Unit in Adult Education, Leonia, N. J.
Book and Authors' Luncheon of the Herald Tribune Forum, New York City.
Lions' Club, New York.

In the light of the foregoing, we find no basis or reason for the dismissal of Watson, Schuman, or Dodd from employment by the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, the issue before the House this afternoon is whether or not certain individuals now on the Federal pay roll, holding responsible key positions in government, are fit and proper persons to hold such positions. They were appointed. They were not elected by the people. They hold office under the President in his executive department of government.

A committee was appointed by the House of Representatives consisting of three Democrats and two Republicans, of which the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, was made chairman to investigate and examine the records and the philosophies and statements of the persons in question.

That committee acting as the agent of this body has reported unanimously that the individuals named are not fit to hold their positions in the Government and their removal from the Federal pay roll is recommended.

This situation, in my judgment, presents a sad commentary on the present administration under our form of government. The great Congress of the United States, elected by the people and directly responsible to the people, finds it necessary to select a committee to

examine the records of those holding key positions in the Government whose loyalty to our form of government is doubted, must suspend or defer other legislative duties to the country for 2 hours to pass upon the question presented.

Who is responsible for such a condition? We all know that the President of the United States—and I believe it is fair to say so—cannot personally know the record and background, the utterances, and philosophies of every individual on the Federal pay roll in the 3,000,000 now registered, or even 2,000,000, or 1,000,000, or 500,000, or even 100,000. But I believe the President is responsible in failing to instruct the policy-making officials in his department, appointed by him, to see to it that men and women who have no sympathy with our form of government, who are known to entertain radical and subversive ideologies directly opposite to the free institutions of our Government, should not be appointed to places of trust and responsibility in our Government, or any other place for that matter, at public expense. As a matter of fact, the people who entertain and who are publicly known to be radical in their views and subversive in their activities, whether communism, fascism, or any other "ism" opposed to the American system of government, have been unduly encouraged by officials high in this administration and under the present administration, in their attitude and so-called liberalism and all at Government expense.

When this country was going through its darkest night in an effort to form a government of freedom, which we now enjoy, it was Washington who gave the order that none but Americans should be placed on guard. The country was then at war to achieve its independence. Now the Nation is again at war—a war which threatens the very destiny and fate of the American people; a war to preserve this land of freedom and justice. It is as crucial and critical an hour as the darkest hour at Valley Forge, and there is just as much reason that those who serve the Government now should be as loyal and devoted to the American people and their Government as the devotion and loyalty demanded by Washington when he insisted that "none but Americans be placed on guard."

The people of this Nation are losing faith in those who guide the Nation when a spectacle of the kind presented to the House this afternoon is brought to their attention. The men and women who serve the Nation in this hour should be of such unquestioned loyalty as to make it unnecessary to take the action we are about to take today.

Not only the individuals we are to pass on within a few minutes, but all others whose records should even raise a question as to their devotion to the cause of the United States, should be removed by the administration at once without making it necessary for the Congress of the United States to remove them from the pay roll in order to get rid of them.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] to extend his remarks.

WAS THOMAS JEFFERSON SUBVERSIVE?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, during the hearings of the Treasury appropriation bill, an amendment was offered which provided that none of the funds appropriated should be used to pay the salaries of 39 individuals. After 3 days of debate, this general indictment of 39 people without proper presentation of testimony or proper trial was refused by a majority vote of the House.

The Kerr subcommittee of the Appropriation Committee was authorized by House resolution to thoroughly investigate these accused people and bring back a report to the House. This report has been made and an amendment offered to the current appropriation bill in which three men are indicted as guilty of subversive activities. The committee in its report further states that not having a legal definition of "subversive" they were constrained to set up their own definition of the meaning of this word.

I do not wish at this time to criticize the honesty of the Kerr committee. I believe all the members of the Kerr committee are honest, conscientious Members of the House. Several of them have expressed their regret at their being instructed by the House and appointed by the Speaker to do this job.

I do not know whether these three men are loyal American citizens or not. I do not believe that such a determination is the prerogative of a Member of Congress or a committee thereof. The transcript of the testimony before the committee was withheld, or unavailable, to the general membership until the time of voting. We were asked to vote on a punitive legislative amendment which was directed against three individuals. In my opinion, any legislation passed by Congress should be general in its impact and not directed either for or against an individual. The civil and Federal courts are the proper places to determine the punishment of an individual. I believe this legislative rider on an appropriation bill is an attempt to punish three individuals. I believe that any punishment of individuals is clearly the prerogative of the civil and Federal courts of our Nation.

In this time of war hysteria it is the solemn duty of every representative of the people to defend the civil liberties of our citizens. It is a time when the three branches of government should be maintained inviolate. We have given up many of our civil privileges as a necessity to the war effort, but we should be on guard for the first attack on the Bill of Rights, even if that attack is instituted and authorized by a congressional resolution.

In the speech of one member of the Kerr committee [Mr. KEEFE], certain passages of writings of Goodwin B. Watson were read such as:

> Gradualism has always failed * * * and only the sharp break brings promise of success.

He elaborated at great length and interpreted the meaning of "sharp break" according to his own ideas of what Mr. Watson meant. I respectfully request the gentleman from Wisconsin to compare those writings upon which he condemned Mr. Watson as being subversive, with the following principles which occur in the letters of Thomas Jefferson to James Madison, Mrs. John Adams, and W. S. Smith under date of 1787:

> I hold it that a little rebellion, now and then, is a good thing, and as necessary to the political world as storms are in the physical. (To James Madison, Paris, 1787.)
>
> The spirit of resistance to government is so valuable on certain occasions, that I wish it to be always kept alive. It will often be exercised when wrong, but better so than not to be exercised at all. (To Mrs. John Adams, Paris, 1787.)
>
> What country can preserve its liberties if its rulers are not warned, from time to time, that the people reserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms. The remedy is to set them right as to facts, pardon and pacify them. (To W. S. Smith, Paris, 1787.)

After comparing the above writings with those of Mr. Watson, I wonder if the gentleman from Wisconsin and the other members of the Kerr committee would not agree that these writings of Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, is not stronger and more revolutionary language than the writings upon which they have condemned Mr. Watson and punished him by separating him from his livelihood.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I shall not discuss the question of procedure, or constitutional questions, except that on the question of procedure I wish to point out that while we may not be sitting here strictly as jurors, we are sitting here as legislators considering an amendment to an appropriation bill. This amendment comes before us as a result of hearings. We have not been furnished with hearings as is done with all legislation, and we have before us nothing but the report of the subcommittee and statements made by the members who constitute that subcommittee. I repeat, we do not have before us the hearings. I do not question the veracity of these gentlemen on the committee; I do, however, question their construction and interpretation of the words and writings of these people whom we are asked to purge from the Government pay roll.

We are adopting a most unusual procedure here in that no Member of this House has before him the hearings on these cases so that he as a legislator can study them and pass upon the merits of the issues involved.

We have a most fantastic situation. We are to vote on an amendment to an appropriation bill, to expel three people from the Federal Government without a single word of the hearings before us. All we have before us is what we are told by the gentlemen who are on the committee. How can any Member do justice to these men without having before us what they said to the committee in their own defense?

Something more fundamental is involved here, however, and that is that the issue which we have before us is as old as the history of our own Nation.

Five minutes do not permit me time enough to review the entire question and its history, but it is the age-old conflict between those few who have concentrated wealth and power in their hands, and the common people who have been opposing the abuses of the concentration of wealth and power. It is the age-old contest between the forces of freedom and tyranny. This same struggle was the heart of the conflict between President Adams and Hamilton on one side and Jefferson on the other. Then as now those who controlled concentrated wealth sought to restrict and limit the democratic processes by oppressive legislation so as to bar from public office and proscribe from the public forum the men and women of that period who challenged, criticized, and fought in the interest of the common people—the few who had concentrated wealth and power in their hands, and who were using it to exploit and impoverish the masses of Americans who had fought for freedom and equality.

Today again we are dealing with the few who control monopoly capital.

During the debate yesterday, through the fog of constitutional and legalistic arguments there emerged one honest, forthright statement, and that was the one made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who stated what motivates his support of this amendment; and that is that he felt that these three Federal employees in their attitude and in their conduct were challenging the status quo which the gentleman from Illinois has been consistently advocating in this House, a status quo of monopoly capital, the status quo of the concentration of wealth in the hands of the few, the status quo of the Government by the rich and the well born; and that therefore they should be removed from the Government pay roll. It is precisely because these men took that attitude, that they are now being thrown off the pay roll.

What method do we employ for this new suppression? We inveigh against them the charge of subversiveness. Hitler used the Reichstag trial, he used the Communist bogey, the same pattern that we employ here for the present restriction and subsequent destruction of democratic rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, the spokesmen of monopoly capital have always used this device to restrict and destroy democratic rights, so as to strangle that freedom of thought and criticism which is so necessary for the common people to beat down and defeat the evils of concentrated wealth and monopoly capital. The committee uses the term "subversive." Has anyone established that these men have actually done anything toward or advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence? No one can do it. Their only crime has been that of associating with organizations that have been militantly anti-Fascist. What is subversive about defense of democratic rights, or defense of labor, or boycott of Japan, or aid to China? That is exactly the nature of the activities of these organizations. It is because of the anti-Fascist character of these organizations that we find this enmity against these Federal employees on the part of many who support this amendment.

The only thing that Dodd, Watson, and Lovett have advocated has been the overthrow of fascism, and this Congress, the Senate, and the President of the United States, and 5,000,000 soldiers, and 130,000,000 Americans today are advocating the overthrow of the Hitler government, the Mussolini government, and the Hirohito government by force and violence. We are making the most tremendous collective effort in history with which to do that. But you use the word "subversive." By that you mean opposition to fascism and to the evils of monopoly capital. Thus you take the position of Hamilton; you take the position of the Tory of yesterday, and the domestic Fascist of today. You take the position of those who have sought to destroy the democratic process and establish fascism just as it occurred in Italy and in Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, we are using this device of charging anti-Fascists with being subversive to take away from the common people their freedom of expression, their freedom to exercise their democratic rights to challenge and criticize the injustice of monopoly capital and to destroy the evils that result from it. In Germany they used the same formula. They used the Communist bogey, they used that vehicle to first destroy the Communists, then destroy the Jews, then destroy labor, then destroy the Social Democrats, then destroy the liberals and so on down the line to the Protestants and the Catholics. Here we are today repeating the same formula. Consciously or unwittingly we are using the same vehicle and traveling the same tragic road. We are using the Communist bogey, we are using the term "subversive" to destroy the Communists, then to destroy the liberals, then labor and all the way down the line, thereby establishing domestic fascism in these free United States. The decision of this committee, I am confident, will be overruled by the American people who are today engaged in this anti-Fascist war. To them their task is clear; the overthrow of fascism all over the world including domestic fascism in these United States. They are resolved that with the extension of democracy all over the world our own democracy must be preserved in these United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the gentleman from New York has stated the issue before the House correctly. In order to oppose with all our might and with all our moral force this ugly specter of fascism in Europe I do not believe we have to embrace one equally as ugly, which is the Communist philosophy and faith.

Let us see what the precise issue before the House is today. The issue is whether or not we as Americans are going to permit people on the Government pay roll whose professed philosophy as evidenced by their writings is that this form of government should be overthrown and that we should have a revolution of violence. Can we not confine ourselves to that precise issue without attempting to become emotional in our discussion? I personally would not be in favor of burning the books published by these men, I am not in favor of putting them in jail for their ideas, but as a representative of the people I think that I certainly have the right to say that we are not going to turn the Government of this country over to the enemies of the country, over to people who say that our form of government is rotten and that the only way it can be cured is by a class revolution.

In my opinion, some of the gentlemen on my own side of the House who have voted along what might be called liberal lines are wasting their sympathy on these men that we intend to dismiss from the pay roll. I do not doubt that some of these employees have been competent servants insofar as the duties of their particular positions go, I think they are probably very intelligent, but I am rapidly coming to the opinion that brilliance of intellect is not sufficient in the Government unless you have that brilliance of intellect harnessed to good, ordinary, common American sense, unless you have this brilliance of intellect tempered by a love and understanding of our institutions. I do not feel that such people are capable of guiding the destinies of this great Republic at the present time in which revolution is in the air, at this time when our very existence is being threatened.

I voted against the Dies committee because I felt that the Dies committee had accused a lot of people of subversive activities who were not guilty of those activities, who were merely liberal; but now we have a committee that has been set up in this House, the Kerr committee, and I agree with those who have praised the personnel of this committee. They are probably some of the finest men in the House. They are not witch hunters, they are not people who are trying to prosecute somebody. They are trying to do a task honestly and fairly, and I thoroughly believe the gentleman from North Carolina [Judge KERR] when he said that it is an unpleasant duty to brand some person and remove him from the pay roll because he is unpatriotic. He knows full well that this stigma will follow the man down through his life. But we are faced with that stern obligation. Are we going to refrain because of the

fact that we do not want to do an unpleasant act or one that is harmful to an individual? Are we going to refrain from dismissing from our pay roll and from the seat of our Government those people who are the enemies of our Nation? For my own part I do not intend to refrain from doing my duty and I shall support the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for consideration the Kerr amendment, offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. JOHN H. KERR, Democrat, chairman of the special subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House. This amendment proposes to strike from the pay rolls of the Government Dr. Goodwin D. Watson, of New York City, chief analyst, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, United States Federal Communications Commission, whose salary is $6,500; Dr. William E. Dodd, assistant news editor, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, United States Federal Communications Commission; and Dr. Robert Morss Lovett, United States Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands, under the Department of Interior, who is receiving $5,800 a year.

One or more committees created by the House of Representatives in making investigations of subversive activities on the part of persons living in this country and those on the pay roll of the United States Government, covering a period of several years, reported that hundreds and hundreds of persons who do not believe in our American way of life and belong to one or more subversive organizations have been and are holding important positions in the United States Government.

This investigation was confirmed by an investigation made by the F. B. I., and many disclosures were made by the Department of Justice, but only a very few, if any, persons who were charged with these subversive activities have been separated from the Government pay roll. Scores of them hold important key positions in the Government today.

The Congress has from time to time warned these various departments, bureaus, and agencies of its wishes that all such persons be discharged, but these warnings have gone unheeded. Finally the House adopted a resolution which authorized the Appropriations Committee of the House to make investigations and to determine how many, if any, of such persons were still on the pay rolls. The Dies and other committees report there are about 3,000 persons belonging to subversive groups on our pay rolls.

The Appropriations Committee of the House appointed a special subcommittee of their number, headed by the Honorable JOHN H. KERR, of North Carolina, to make a special investigation, and Mr. KERR was ably assisted by our colleagues, Mr. GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee; Mr. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico; Mr. POWERS, Republican, of New Jersey; and Mr. KEEFE, Republican, of Wisconsin. Judge KERR served for many years as a circuit judge in North Carolina. All of the other members of the committee are men of splendid ability, honest, and fair.

They investigated Dr. Watson, Dr. Dodd, and Dr. Lovett, as well as others, and were of the unanimous opinion that these three public officials were connected with a number of front organizations, or subversive groups, and were not suitable persons to be in the employ of the Government.

The amendment before us proposes to strike their names from the pay rolls of the Government. All of them appear to have been "joiners." Dr. Watson admitted associating or affiliating with 12 or more of these organizations. A number of the organizations to which Dr. Watson belonged have been found and designated by the Department of Justice as front organizations and others as questionable.

What we understand by front organizations are organizations with fine American names, such as American League for Peace and Democracy, American Youth Congress, Descendants of American Revolution, National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, and so forth, but which are, in truth and in fact, merely fronts for the Communist Party or some other subversive group in this country. They are officered or controlled by the Communists or other subversive groups.

Dr. Watson, as pointed out, admitted associating or affiliating with 12 or more of such organizations, and this committee's report points out Dr. Watson associated with various subversive groups who advocated the overthrow of this Government; in fact, one of the great objections to the Communist Party is it has always advocated the overthrow of this Government by force and violence.

Dr. William E. Dodd admitted he associated or affiliated with a number of front organizations; in other words, with organizations affiliated and controlled by the Communist Party. He, too, has associated with persons who have actively affiliated with the Communist front organizations.

Let us keep before us the fact that Dr. Watson is Chief Analyst of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service of the United States Federal Communications Commission, and that Dr. Dodd is Assistant News Editor of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service of the United States Federal Communications Commission. Anyone can see at once that these men occupy key positions in our Foreign Intelligence Service. They could do this country immeasurable harm. Memberships in these front and other subversive organizations and their writings and letters clearly indicate they do not believe in the American way of life. Many of these organizations and associations and other subversive groups have been and still are advocating the overthrow of this Government by force and violence.

Dr. Lovett is holding an important position as United States Government Secretary in the Virgin Islands, one of our colonial possessions and outposts.

I am not personally acquainted with any one of these men. I know something of some of their writings and activities, and the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, and this committee has, after thorough investigation, definitely found and so stated in their written signed report that these men are connected with these front organizations and these subversive groups, and that they are unfit to serve our Government in this critical period.

No one should be on the pay roll and have their support out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this Nation, and be in position to do great harm to this country if they desire, who do not believe in our American way of life, in our Constitution, and American ideals. Such persons should not hold positions in this Government in time of peace, and they certainly should not have such key positions in time of war, and therefore, I shall vote for the Kerr amendment to remove each one of these men from the pay roll.

THE ADMINISTRATION FAILED TO ACT

It is most unfortunate that the Congress must take the time and incur the expenditure of thousands of dollars to investigate and disclose the names of persons in our Government service who do not believe in the American way of life and belong to associations and groups engaged in subversive activities and some of which advocate the overthrow of this Government by force and violence.

The Dies committee, the F. B. I., and other agencies of the Government have disclosed many of these persons holding important and key positions in the Government. In fact, the heads of various departments and bureaus were advised by the Civil Service Commission from time to time that many of these persons were unfit because of their beliefs and associations to hold these important positions of trust in our Government. With this knowledge, many of these persons were employed and hundreds and hundreds of others were retained on the pay roll, and now Congress must step in and do the job that the various departments, bureaus, and agencies in the executive branch of the Government should have done.

In fact, a number of those in high places in our Government have encouraged these front organizations. The First Lady of the land gave special encouragement to the so-called Youth Congress. Many of the officers and members of this front organization were identified with and active in the Communist Party. It was only recently that the First Lady of the land denounced this particular front organization. One of the serious objections to the activities of the Communists and other subversive groups in this country is that their identities, as far as possible, were concealed. They assume some fine, high-sounding, patriotic name and they carry on their subversive activities under the cover of this name. At one time it was found that more than 6,000,000 people in this country belonged to one or more of these front organizations and subversive groups.

We are in a great war. Millions of our fathers and sons are fighting on every land and on every sea to preserve our American way of life and uphold our Constitution and the ideals of the American people. As pointed out by the Kerr committee, we would not think of placing in command of any part of our fighting forces men who belong to these Communists and other subversive organizations and groups to lead our fighting men in this great war. In our opinion, we shall fail in our patriotic duty if we do not remove men, especially like Dr. Watson, holding these important key positions. Congress has time and again emphasized that in the employment of persons in continental United States, only American citizens should be employed, and even in the most humble positions no one should be employed who is a member of these front organizations or belongs to any subversive group.

We have Communist, Fascist, and Nazi fronts and groups. The Communist groups are much greater than any other. We brought on ourselves a lot of trouble when President Roosevelt, in 1933, renewed diplomatic and commercial relations with Russia. We opened the gates wide and told them to come in and they did come in, and they did establish many of these front organizations which for a long time deceived the American people. President Wilson refused to recognize Russia because of the world-wide program of the Russian Communists to overthrow this and any other country that did not believe in or accept communism. President Harding followed the policy laid down by President Wilson, and so did President Coolidge and President Hoover. After President Roosevelt again recognized Russia, communism grew by leaps and bounds in this country. I have no quarrel with Russia's form of government whatever it may be. That is a matter for the people of Russia themselves. I do strenuously object however when they try to foist upon our people their conceptions of government. I have and shall continue to oppose with all of the vigor I have the placing of Communists, Fascists, or Nazis in public office and have them supported by the taxpayers of this country. We have plenty of loyal Americans to hold these positions, and at this particular time no one should hold these offices or be placed on guard except loyal Americans who believe in the American way of life.

If the way of life of the Communists, Fascists, and Nazis is so splendid and fine, may I suggest that Dr. Watson, Dr. Dodd, Dr. Lovett, and others go to those countries where they can sail under their own colors and receive their positions and pay from the people who believe in their philosophy of government.

In adopting the Kerr amendment, we are giving warning to the appointing officials of our Government to scrutinize carefully each appointee so that none but loyal Americans be placed on guard, and if they persist in following the course they have in the past, an amendment should be offered to cut off the salaries of those who are responsible for the appointment of men like Dr. Watson, Dr. Dodd, and Dr. Lovett.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, many here bemoan the fact that a few Members have seen fit to raise the question of the constitutional right of the Congress to pass a law denying the salary of an officer and thus deprive him of his right to hold office. If ever there was a constitutional question involved in any legislation, it is involved in this amendment. One of the cornerstones of our democracy is attacked—the right of free speech and the freedom of the press. If free speech can be denied in this case, it can, by the same token, be denied in any case.

There is no question raised as to the general qualifications of the men involved. They are citizens of the United States, they are competent and capable of filling the positions they now hold. They have not been convicted of any crime. The sole charge against them is that they have expressed opinions—either orally or in writing—which some Members of this Congress think makes it necessary for the Congress to deny them the offices which they now hold. There is no charge whatever that these men are guilty of treason or any other offense described in the statutes of the United States. Their sole offense is that they have expressed opinions that some Members think dangerous to our Government. I do not know these men. I have never seen them. Let us see what they have said or written that warrants this House in forcing them out of office.

The substance of what they said and wrote is that the capitalistic system in the United States is not a good thing. They said this system should be supplanted by some other system. There is no charge here that they have made any overt attempt to destroy any system in vogue in this country. They have simply stated that our present system ought to be replaced. That is their opinion and unless the expression of that opinion is accompanied by an attempt or by a conspiracy to overthrow the Government, they have merely exercised their right of free speech.

In *Schenck* v. *United States* (1918, 249 U. S. 47), Justice Holmes, delivering the unanimous decision of the Court, said:

> We admit that in many places and in ordinary times the defendants in saying all that was said in the circular would have been within their constitutional rights. But the character of every act depends upon the circumstances in which it was done. * * * The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting "fire" in a theater and causing a panic. It does not even protect a man from an injunction against uttering words that may have all the effect of force. * * * The question in every case is whether the words are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent. It is a question of proximity and degree.
>
> When a nation is at war many things that might be said in time of peace are such a hindrance to its effort that their utterance will not be endured so long as men fight and that no court could regard them as protected by any constitutional right.

In time of war many of the privileges we enjoy as citizens are revoked for the general good. But in this case there is no evidence that any of the statements or any of the writing occurred after we declared war. They were peacetime expressions and merely expressions of opinion not accompanied by any act to carry the opinion into execution.

If this Congress can deny the privileges of these citizens for expressing opinions, then anyone can be dealt with in like manner. If any citizen holding a position in this Government should happen to say or write something that a majority of the Congress did not like, then that citizen could be removed from office by a vote of Congress.

In my opinion—and I almost feel like apologizing for expressing this opinion for fear that my salary may be taken away—this Congress does not have the constitutional right to legislate any citizen out of his property, or his salary, which is the same thing, merely because he has expressed an opinion which is not approved by a majority of this Congress.

Heretofore the Supreme Court of the United States has zealously guarded the right of free speech and no opinion can be found to support the intended action of this House. There is little likelihood that the present Supreme Court will fail to protect that right.

Suppose we do pass this amendment and the department paying these men brings action to set this act aside as unconstitutional. Does anyone in this Chamber think the Supreme Court will sustain the action of this House?

If we have anything of value left in this democracy, it is the right of free speech and the liberty of the press. The anomalous situation now presents itself that this Congress is attempting to abridge these rights. Much has been said about the oath we took to support the Constitution. Does not that oath bind us to protect the right of free speech? Is this Congress the first to rise up in its dignity and violate the plain provisions of our Constitution—the Bill of Rights and the laws and decisions of the Nation?

We have no more right to attempt to direct the opinions of a citizen than we have to tell him what form of worship he may follow. We do not want to fall into the position of expressing our own opinions—immune from civil liability—and at the same time deny that right to others.

There is absolutely no authority to be found anywhere—from the Constitution to the latest Supreme Court opinions—to justify the House in passing this amendment.

This is not the first time that the Appropriations Committee has attempted to write the laws of the country, and

there is more danger to the Nation in not curbing this practice than there is from any opinion expressed by either or all of the men involved here.

If the day ever comes in this country when citizens cannot express their opinions, it will be the beginning of the end of this Government. Legislation will not stop ideas, and the more we attempt to do it the more certain is our final collapse as a nation. If we want to destroy this Government and make it easy for any other scheme of government to take its place, we are contributing to that end in the passage of this amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take much time talking today because a few weeks ago I offered an amendment to strike these very same men's names from the pay roll of the Government and we discussed that amendment for about 3 days. So I believe I have said about enough.

I want to compliment the Kerr committee for the fine work that it has been doing. I think they have been very fair in securing all the evidence and in judging these men to be unqualified to serve this Government. The fact of the matter is that I believe they have been much more liberal than I probably would have been, because I take this position: Even though you cannot prove these men are Communists, you can still say they are not qualified to serve this Government. If you had a bank and you had a teller in that bank who, you found out, had been keeping company with bank robbers, you would tell him you were through with him, and you would dismiss him, and you would not wait to try to find out whether he was a bank robber or not.

I say that in every instance where these men have associated with Communists or Communist front organizations, they have no right to their position and they have no right to be placed in the position where they can sponsor such doctrines as are supported by the organization with which they were associated.

Yesterday and today and at other times we have heard that these men have not had a fair day in court. So far as I am concerned this is not a court trial. We are simply determining whether the Congress of the United States feels these men are qualified to serve and whether they are entitled to their jobs and as long as this committee continues with the same course it has followed I am going to continue to support it.

The fact of the matter is that we have had a number of heads of departments to attack the Congress because of the fact that we are trying to get rid of Robert Morss Lovett. Secretary Ickes said, in a press release, in defense of Robert Morss Lovett, that he would retain him in that post so long as "I have legal power to do so."

That is all right; we are going to make it illegal for him to do so.

He went on to say:

> Under the Constitution, the Congress has no power to remove an officer of the executive branch and cannot undertake to accuse a judge or to remove an officer on the grounds and through the proceedings used here.

Well, maybe that is what he thinks, but after we have eliminated this man from the pay roll he has the right to go into court and we will find out whether the Congress has the right to eliminate him or not.

He further stated:

> These witch hunts of Congressman DIES will bring, in the years to come, blushes of shame to the faces of all Americans, just as the recollection of the witch hunts of old Salem, or of the last war, does among us today.

He further stated:

> I have read the report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the report of the Kerr subcommittee and the charges made by Congressman DIES against Dr. Lovett. In all these I have seen no evidence of subversive activity or of sympathy of Dr. Lovett for anything of the sort.

If Mr. Ickes has read all these reports and he does not find any evidence of subversive activity, I suggest to you that Mr. Ickes ought to be removed, because there is evidence, and I do not think anyone could doubt that he has been active in subversive activities.

All I have to say today is this: That I would like to ask the Kerr committee and every Member of this House just to remember one thing, that these men were not elected to office; they were merely appointed by the heads of the departments. The heads of those departments have had called to their attention these men's names and have been told that they are not qualified to serve this Government and they have taken no action, and yet when we attempt to take action the heads of the departments are ready to defend them. I have no doubt but what this House is going to uphold the Kerr committee's recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] a moment ago made one of the finest statements I have heard in the course of the debates on this subject.

The charges were made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] personally that these men, Dr. Lovett, Dr. Watson, and Mr. Dodd, were unfit for public office by virtue of their past associations and their affiliations with subversive organizations, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] offered an amendment to the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill in February seeking to strike them from the pay roll. After tumultuous debate in the House the matter was referred and has been handled as has been outlined by the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee this afternoon. Gentlemen have inadvertently been inaccurate in their statements to the effect the charges were made by the Dies committee. The charges were made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. They were not brought by the committee. The charges were made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] personally, and he stated they were his personal views and were not necessarily those of the committee nor was he speaking for the committee at the time he made the charges.

The sole question involved here is whether or not the charges made that these men are unfit for appointive public office by virtue of their writings, declarations, membership in or past associations and affiliations with known subversive organizations. And, if this question is answered in the affirmative, should they be removed from the Federal pay roll as employees of the Government? Whether in war or in peace, no man or woman should be employed in an administrative capacity in the Government of the United States who does not wholeheartedly believe in the system of government which he or she is undertaking to administer.

You will find that each of the three men who are involved in this proceeding admitted under oath that he had been a member of, had publicly associated himself with, or had been publicly affiliated with numerous organizations which have been denominated subversive and un-American by the Attorney General of the United States, by the interdepartmental committee which he set up, by the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, an agent of this House since 1938, or the special committee set up in the Committee on Appropriations.

The charges have been made, the testimony has been submitted, a fair hearing has been given to each of the accused. The records of the special Appropriations Subcommittee will show in each instance these gentlemen stated they were satisfied they were given a fair trial and an impartial hearing before that group.

That being true and the findings being before us, what is our duty? Shall we embrace some of the strange doctrines that have been promulgated by self-anointed liberals and self-confessed distinguished intellectuals, or shall we follow our consciences and vote to remove these men from the pay roll by withholding funds for their compensation and for their salaries?

Who are these self-anointed liberals and these self-confessed distinguished intellectuals? By what yardstick do they measure their liberalism and their intellectual attainments? Many of these self-anointed liberals would have us embrace communism or some other form of state socialism as an antidote to what they term "domestic fascism." What a strange pronouncement we heard on the floor of the House a moment ago by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is there any difference in the world between communism and fascism?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. None whatever, except in degree.

Mr. TABER. It is a question of who is the dictator, that is all.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Yes.

I want to say of these self-confessed intellectuals, they may have certain peculiar intellectual attainments, but their skulls house a vacuum insofar as common sense and patriotism is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I am exceedingly loath to oppose the pending amendment. I honor and respect the judgment both of our great Committee on Appropriations and also the special subcommittee on whose reports this amendment stands. I am devoted to the men who compose those committees and in many cases I would bow to their superior wisdom. But in a case such as this, wherein the amendment is clearly unconstitutional, in my opinion, I simply cannot follow their leadership, much as I would like to.

The pending amendment is a bill of pains and penalties within the meaning of the constitutional prohibition:

> No bill of attainder * * * shall be passed (art. I, sec. 9).
>
> A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. If the punishment be less than death, it is a bill of pains and penalties. As the term "bill of attainder" is used in the Federal Constitution, it includes both bills of attainder particularly, and bills of pains and penalties. (*Cummings* v. *Missouri* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277, 18 L. Ed. 356); *Drehman* v. *Stifle* (75 U. S. (8 Wall.), 595, 601, 19 L, Ed. 508); *Pierce* v. *Carskadon* (83 U. S. (16 Wall.), 234, 239, 21 L. Ed. 276)).

If, then, the amendment now being considered inflicts punishment, it is a bill of pains and penalties, since there has been no judicial trial. This is not to say that the legislative hearings given by the Kerr committee were not judicial in a sense, but this committee was certainly not a court, and nothing short of a trial by a court constitutes a judicial trial.

The only question open for discussion and decision, therefore, is, Would this amendment, if it should become law, inflict punishment?

Throughout the debate of yesterday and today it has been frankly admitted that this admendment is intended to and will, if enacted, effectively exclude Watson, Dodd, and Lovett from the Government service.

That is punishment.

Take the cases of *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277, 320), and *Ex parte Garland* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 333, 377). These are State cases, not Federal. But the provisions of the Federal Constitution are almost identical as to State and Federal limitation of power. As to congressional power, the Constitution of the United States reads:

> No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed (art. I, sec. 9).

As to State power, the Constitution of the United States reads:

> No State shall pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts (art. I, sec. 10).

So the Cummings and Garland cases are perfectly in point as authorities in our consideration of the pending amendment, under the above quoted limitation upon congressional power.

In the Cummings case the defendant was a Roman Catholic priest who was indicted and convicted of the crime of teaching and preaching as a priest and minister of that denomination without first having taken the oath prescribed by the constitution of the State of Missouri, and was sentenced to pay a fine of $500 and to be committed to jail until said fine and costs of suit were paid. This prosecution was under the constitution of Missouri of 1865 which provided that no person shall be permitted to practice as an attorney or counsellor at law nor be competent as a bishop, priest, deacon, minister, elder, or other clergyman of any religious persuasion, sect, or denomination, to teach, preach, or solemnize marriages, unless such person shall have first taken, subscribed, and filed said oath—which oath required a statement that the affiant had never been in armed hostility to the United States or been in sympathy with rebellion or, except under overpowering compulsion, submitted to the authority or been in the service of the so-called Confederate States of America.

The Supreme Court of the United States in its decision in the Cummings case said:

> The disabilities created by the Constitution of Missouri must be regarded as penalties—they constitute punishment. We do not agree with the counsel of Missouri that "to punish one is to deprive him of life, liberty, or property, and that to take from him anything less than these is no punishment at all." The learned counsel does not use these terms—life, liberty, and property—as comprehending every right known to the law. He does not include under liberty freedom from outrage on the feelings as well as restraints on the person. He does not include under property those estates which one may acquire in professions, though they are often the source of the highest emoluments and honors. The deprivation of any rights, civil or political, previously enjoyed, may be punishment, the circumstances attending and the causes of the deprivation determining this fact. Disqualification from office may be punishment, as in cases of conviction upon impeachment. Disqualification from the pursuits of a lawful avocation, or from positions of trust, or from the privilege of appearing in the courts, or acting as an executor, administrator, or guardian, may also, and often has been, imposed as punishment (*Cummings* v. *Missouri* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277, 18 L. Ed. 356)).

In the Garland case the defendant was an attorney and counselor at law and was prosecuted under the same section of the Missouri Constitution of 1865 as was the defendant Cummings in his case.

The Supreme Court of the United States in the Garland case said:

> And exclusion from any of the professions or any of the ordinary avocations of life for past conduct can be regarded in no other light than as punishment for such conduct. The exaction of the oath is the mode provided for ascertaining the parties upon whom the act is intended to operate, and instead of lessening, increases its objectionable character. All enactments of this kind partake of the nature of bills of pains and penalties, and are subject to the constitutional inhibition against the passage of bills of attainder, under which general designation they are included (*Ex parte Garland* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 333, 337, 18 L. Ed. 366)).

In the Cummings case the exclusion was from the priesthood. In the Garland case the exclusion was from the practice of law. In the cases now before us the exclusion is from the Government service. The decisions from which the above quotations have been taken are directly in point, and condemn any such enactment as the amendment we are considering, as a bill of pains and penalties subject to the constitutional inhibitions against the passage of bills of attainder.

But the pending amendment not only violates the constitutional mandate against bills of attainder but it also violates the doctrine—implicit throughout the Constitution—of separation of powers, and the explicit creation of a government composed of three separate but coordinate branches, legislative, executive, and judicial.

The power to "fire" an employee of the executive branch of the Government belongs to the Executive exclusively. *Meyers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52). In the Meyers case the Supreme Court further held:

> The power to remove inferior executive officers, like that to remove superior executive officers, is an incident of the power to appoint them, and is in its nature an executive power. The authority of Congress given by the excepting clause to vest the appointment of such inferior officers in the heads of departments carries with it authority incidentally to invest the heads of departments with power to remove.

The Supreme Court recognized in the case of *United States* v. *Perkins* (116 U. S. 483) that Congress, in committing the appointment of such inferior officers to the heads of departments, may prescribe incidental regulations controlling and restricting the latter in the exercise of the power of removal; but the Court never has held, nor reasonably could hold, that the excepting clause enables Congress to draw to itself, or to either branch of it, the power to remove or the right to participate in the exercise of that power. To do this would be to go beyond the words and implications of that clause and to infringe the constitutional principle of the separation of governmental powers.

Further quoting from the decision of the Supreme Court in the Meyers case:

> Assuming then, the power of Congress to regulate removals as incidental to the exercise of its constitutional power to vest appointments of inferior officers in the heads of departments, certainly so long as Congress does not exercise that power, the power of removal must remain where the Constitution places it, with the President, as part of the Executive power.

When Congress abolished the Radio Commission and created in its stead the Federal Communications Commission—United States Code Annotated, title 47, section 154—it authorized the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint the seven Commissioners and gave to the Commission the power to appoint the employees of the Commission subordinate to the Commissioners. Congress did not prescribe incidental regulations controlling and restricting the Commissioners in the exercise of the power of appointment or removal.

The exclusive right of the Executive to remove officers within the executive branch of the Government was reiterated in the case of *Morgan* v. *T. V. A.* (115 Fed. (2d) 990, certiorari denied, 61 Sup. Ct. Rep. 806).

The doctrine of separation of powers is reemphasized in the case of *Humphrey's Executor* v. *U. S.* (295 U. S. 602):

> The fundamental necessity of maintaining each of the three general departments of Government entirely free from the control or coercive influence, direct or indirect, of either of the others, has often been stressed and is hardly open to serious question. So much is implied in the very fact of the separation of the powers of these departments by the Constitution; and in the rule which recognizes their essential coequality. The sound application of a principle that makes one master in his own house precludes him from imposing his control in the house of another who is master there. James Wilson, one of the framers of the Constitution and a former justice of this Court, said that the independence of each department required that its proceedings "should be free from the remotest influence, direct or indirect, of either of the other powers" (Andrews, the Works of James Wilson (1896), vol. 1, p. 367). And Mr. Justice Story in the first volume of his work on the Constitution, fourth edition, section 530, citing No. 48 of the Federalist, said that neither of the departments in reference to each other "ought to possess, directly or indirectly, an overruling influence in the administration of their respective powers" (295 U. S. at pp. 629–630).

The argument on the purse strings premise is blasted by an opinion of former Attorney General Mitchell, as follows:

> Congress holds the purse strings, and it may grant or withhold appropriations as it chooses, and when making an appropriation may direct the purposes to which the appropriation shall be devoted and impose conditions in respect to its use, provided always that the conditions do not require operation of the Government in a way forbidden by the Constitution. Congress may not, by conditions attached to appropriations, provide for a discharge of the functions of government in a manner not authorized by the Constitution. If such a practice were permissible, Congress could subvert the Constitution. It might make appropriations on condition that the executive department abrogate its functions. It might, for example, appropriate money for the War Department on condition that the direction of military operations should be conducted by some person designated by the Congress, thus requiring the President to abdicate his functions as Commander in Chief (37 Op. Atty. Gen. 56, 61 (1933)).

Supporters say with twinkling eyes and a smile, "Yes, but this is not firing; this is merely denying the money to pay his salary. We do not say he cannot work for the Government; we simply say no Government money can be used to pay him."

Specious sophistry. What of the law we passed that no one can work for nothing?

The more serious minded supporters add: "Seriously, though, Congress has the power to abolish the whole outfit, including Watson, so, if we were to do that, we'd be getting him just the same."

The answer to this is also obvious. Granting that Congress might abolish the Federal Communications Commission, and that if that were done, that would get Watson, that is not what is being done. Maybe the Federal Communications Commission should be abolished. Congress has the power, undoubtedly, to abolish it, why not act within our power and do so? I challenge any and all of you who think that should be done, because of the employment of Watson and Dodd, or for any other reason, to do it. But do not forget your oath of office to uphold the Constitution and trample it under contemptuous feet by passing this bill of attainder which intrudes into the inviolable province of the Executive.

Who made it possible to employ Watson and Dodd? Congress did. We granted the Commissioners the power to appoint whomsoever they might please. The only restriction we have ever placed upon this grant of power is the requirement that no one who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of our Government by force or violence, shall be paid. We so wrote the law. Under that single restriction these men were employed. No contention has been made that they, or either of them, come within that condemnation. After they were employed, we, very wisely, changed the criterion. The special subcommittee constituted to investigate and report to the House how Government employees squared with the new criterion has made two reports which show judicial poise and careful analysis. The gentlemen who compose this subcommittee are estimable, careful, honorable. Their reports are entitled to the full faith and credit their judgment and honesty of purpose demand. Those who have the power to hire and fire should give the most respectful and serious consideration to these and any further reports, and only the weightiest evidence contra should cause them to fail to follow the report that they are unfit for the present to continue in Government employ, and discharge all that "cap fits." But ours is not the power to hire or fire, nor have we the right to go out of our own house into theirs and rule.

It is true that the resolution creating the Kerr committee provided:

> Any legislation approved by the committee as a result of this resolution may be incorporated in any general or special appropriation measure emanating from such committee or may be offered as a committee amendment to any such measure notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI.

But, of course, this meant any legislation within the power of Congress to enact; that is, not in conflict with the Constitution.

We can abolish the Federal Communications Commission. We can prescribe incidental regulations to control or limit the appointing powers or the powers of removal we grant, but we cannot violate the Constitution by passing a bill of attainder, such as the pending amendment, nor usurp the power of either separate and coordinate branch of our Government. The power of removal of officers or of employees in the executive branch of our Government is in the Chief Executive. Congress may remove its own but not those of the Executive.

What has been said as to Watson and Dodd applies for the most part and just as cogently to Lovett.

The fact that Congress adopted the method of removal now proposed in the case of David Lasser neither changes the Constitution nor justifies the procedure. One wrong never justifies another.

The claim has been made that thousands of Communists were taken off the Government pay roll when the Federal Theater Project of the W. P. A. was abolished. But that was the abolition of a project, not the mere removal of employees. Congress may abolish any organization it creates or authorizes, and such abolition kills the jobs of the employees of the agency abolished. But that is in accord with the Constitution, not in violation of it.

Just as fiercely as we resent attempts to encroach upon our exclusive province, does the executive branch of our Government have the right to resent this encroachment attempted by us. Why cannot we of each separate, coordinate branch of our Government learn and practice the truth that the only road to the sunlit highlands of happiness and success is cooperation?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I will not attempt to get into any argument with the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] who has just left the well of the House. He is a distinguished lawyer, but may I say that sometimes distinguished lawyers disagree, and were it not so, we would not have the lawbooks in the libraries of the country that we now have. All I care to say in reply to the argument made by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama is that so far as I am concerned, and I speak somewhat as a lawyer myself, having gone into this question of bills of attainder, and pains and penalties, I am in complete and utter disagreement with the distinguished gentleman in the conclusion which he has reached. I do not conceive that under any circumstance the amendment now under consideration could be held by any court to be either a bill of attainder to constitute a bill invoking pains and penalties, such as the gentleman has just described. Let us see if we cannot reduce this thing down a little bit. Who are these people that are involved in this amendment?

Are they officers of the United States Government? If they were, there might be some reasonableness to some of the arguments that have been made. These men are in the category of pure and simple employees of the United States Government. For men to contend that the Constitution requires impeachment proceedings to remove an employee is building up an argument that in my judgment has no basis in the law or in fact. Is there any man of standing here who has put out his shingle to practice law any place in the United States who would contend for one moment that this Congress would be required to institute impeachment proceedings in order to dismiss a Federal employee? Why, the gentleman from New York has said in his statement that this is a most unusual procedure. I agree with him. It is a most unusual procedure.

It is certainly an unusual procedure that the Congress of the United States should be compelled to appropriate hundreds of thousands of dollars for investigations and to spend months of its time in an effort to purge employees from the pay roll that the Congress and the people of the United States deem unfit to be governmental employees. There is a distinction between an employee and an officer. There are constitutional officers in the judiciary, in the legislative, and in the executive branches of Government. There are officers who are placed in office by and as the result of the enactment of legislation by the Congress creating those offices and fixing their tenure of office and fixing their salaries. As to these officials may I say that I would not contend for one moment that this Congress has the right to, in effect, remove them by refusing to appropriate money to pay their salaries. Congress has the undoubted right to abolish functions and agencies but not to in effect remove officials in this manner. But do not make that argument against this procedure where it merely involves a simple employee of the Government. As to that question our committee, as the gentleman from North Carolina, JUDGE KERR, so ably stated in his remarks, has canvassed this situation.

Mr. MURPHY rose.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not care to yield at this time. Those legal aspects have been gone over, and I think it is the mature and considered judgment of the committee—and we have some fairly good lawyers on the committee, and we have good counsel to advise the committee—that we are strictly within the rights of this Congress, and we are pursuing what appears to the committee not only to be our right, but our sovereign duty as Members of Congress.

Now let me talk a moment about Mr. Goodwin Watson. I discussed him a little bit yesterday. I never met Mr. Goodwin Watson until he came before our committee. I had heard about him as a professor of psychology up at Columbia University. Mr. Watson was given every opportunity to tell the committee anything that he wanted to tell them in explanation of his attitudes, his conduct, his association, his affiliations, and his utterances. Let me take first the viewpoint that he expressed back in 1934. This article that he wrote for a magazine, called Common Sense magazine, published in August 1934, contains this foreword. He is not chargeable with it, but this is what the editor of the magazine says, and it appears as a foreword to Mr. Goodwin Watson's article:

> The average citizen thinks that the advocates of swift change by revolution are merely hotheaded to make war on the tragedy that has stalked the footsteps of gradual reformers in Europe, and he is inclined to think that this country is different, and that we move slowly by nature. In this article a well-known professor of psychology says that not only has gradualism always failed in this attempt to uproot the profit system, but from the humanitarian psychological points of view, the methods of reformation are often inadequate. Nature, he points out, by no means always evolves. Nor need a rapid transformation be violent if well planned.

Now, let us see what he said in his article. Understand, I am not critizing Goodwin Watson in the exercise of his right of free speech guaranteed by the Constitution to preach the abolition of capitalism, or to preach the abolition of the profit system, if that is his philosophy of government. The Constitution in the Bill of Rights guarantees him that right of advocacy, if he so desires, but I find nothing in the Constitution that secures and guarantees to him tenure as an employee of the United States Government. This is what he said:

> How is it with the present necessity to replace the broken-down profit system with one designed to produce and distribute all the goods and services the public can use? Shall we work for an all-or-none change, leaving the old order definitely behind us and building the new on a different foundation, or shall we work for gradual modification and improvement of the old, trusting that the net effect of many lesser changes will equal the greater ones?

There he was expressing the plain question that was in his mind. Shall we continue to be motivated by a policy of gradualism or not? I quote further:

> There are four major lines of argument, humanitarian, psychological, economical, and political. Each of them leads to the conclusion that the apparent attractiveness of gradualism is fallacious, that only the sharp break brings promise of success.

What do you mean by sharp break, Goodwin Watson? What is this sharp break you are talking about? I will tell you what it means. It means nothing more or less than the intelligentsia medium of expressing what some people would say revolution—a sharp break.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot yield at this point.

Then he finally ends up his argument and he says:

> Only Soviet Russia has gone up to the left in an oxcart that was nearly wrecked before the trip started, but they report now that the road is getting better. Our machines are more powerful but more delicate than oxcarts. Can't we stand the rough beginning if we prepare the road, the cars, the drivers, and passengers?

What is he talking about? What does he mean to say? I ask you, Members of the Congress—is it not perfectly clear what this man was advocating when he wrote this article in 1934?

Now, let us see what he said when he came back from Europe in 1934 and assisted in organizing this organization entitled "New America." I have it before me. I have its platform, its program, its goals, its guiding principles. I defy anybody to take that document which he subscribed to in 1934 and read it without coming to the conclusion that a man who preached the philosophy expressed in that document ought not to be serving in the position of chief analyst of foreign broadcasts down here in the office of the F. C. C. or in any other governmental position as an employee. Let him submit his advocacy to the people and run for Congress and then he will learn the attitude of our people.

I do not have time to read this whole document. May I say to you that the committee which you appointed has done so. I have gone through it. He admitted fully that he fully believed in the statements contained in this dissertation on the organization of this group called New America in 1934. However, he said that in the latter part of the thirties, "I changed my mind. I no longer believe that philosophy."

When I read section after section out of this statement which was so repugnant to the membership of the committee that I know all of us were very much concerned, I said, in substance, "Dr. Watson, you believed that in 1934 when you approved that article or when you collaborated in writing it, did you not?"

"Yes."

"You say you have now changed your mind. When did you change your mind?"

"Why, I did it in the latter part of the thirties."

"Well, what evidence have we that you have changed your mind?"

He said, "Some talks to some of my classes up at Columbia University."

"Have you ever written an article for any newspaper; have you ever written an article for any magazine; have you ever made any public statement at any place, disavowing that philosophy, a plain, simple, Communist philosophy?"

He said, "No; I did not think it was necessary."

I find no concrete evidence of any change of heart except his bare statement before the committee. Let us look further——

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. My colleagues, the evidence disclosed that he had been taking college professors and students on trips over to Europe and making studies over there. In 1933 and in 1936 and in 1937 they visited the countries of Europe to make studies. The last 2 trips they went under the auspices of what they call the Open Road, which we all know

was an organization that was designed and set up to get these people over to Russia. So they went to study Russia. There were 30 of them in the party. They went over there for the purpose of looking over the Communist scene in Russia, and to make a study of it. This was in 1937.

When they came back, Goodwin Watson wrote an article and it is titled "We Study the Soviet Union." It was published in the Social Frontier magazine of February 1937. He tells about the wonders and glories of Soviet Russia. He tells of some of the things they found that were not so wonderful and so glorious. But he finally ends up his article with these words—and I want you to listen carefully. This shows the attitude of the man in 1937:

For each of us there were sights which we approved and others we disapproved.

Understand, this fellow has been claiming that these people who are condemning him just take little isolated sentences out of his works. I am going to read the whole paragraph or two paragraphs so that I will not be charged with the same offense:

For each of us there were sights which we approved and others we disapproved, but how about the balance of judgment on the new civilization as a whole? One became skeptical and remained rather unfavorable toward Soviet life. A half dozen who came prepared to find a bad situation had been transferred into warm admirers of the Communist scene. None who came with high expectations had been disappointed. The sum total would be more than 95 percent favorable, influenced by this brief study. We had not always been comfortable, but we had been aware of a society directed toward the sustenance of major human values.

One question lingered in our minds. Anna Louise Strong had stated it for us. "I wish I knew," she said, "whether it will take longer for the Russians to develop efficiency or for America to develop socialism. Then I'd know where I want to live."

What did he mean by that? Is it not perfectly clear to anybody? Oh, how he tried to flounder around when I cross-examined him upon that statement.

How he tried to claim that he was merely quoting a statement of Anna Louise Strong, but he finally had to admit that any sensible person reading that article could come to but one conclusion, and that was that he was stating the feelings of the entire group of 30 who went there and that it was the consensus of the group that they were concerned as to whether it would take longer for Russia to develop efficiency or for America to develop socialism, and upon that answer depended the question as to where they wanted to live. Is it not perfectly clear that his mind was made up; that unless we developed his brand of socialism, in the event Russia developed efficiency, he would prefer to live there? I say to him and all of his associates of similar mind: Go to Russia and enjoy life there and allow those who believe in our system to perfect and run America.

This fellow that was in that frame of mind in 1937 is down here analyzing foreign broadcasts for you and turning them over to the Army and the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. In 1938 he made a speech promoting world citizenship through social relations. That is the title of it. I have the whole speech; I have read it carefully, but I have not time now to read all of it to you. In this speech he is very critical of the United States Government. He says:

So long as power to control business and government rests with our present small, reactionary ruling class—

Does that sound much like the speech that was made by the gentleman from New York a little while ago? Almost the identical language, almost the identical philosophy. It runs through all these speeches; they all use the same language:

So long as the power to control business and government rests with our present small, reactionary ruling class we must expect enormous discrepancy between ideals of world peace and actions taken far more with a view to profits. Our Government and that of France and England may pretend to be democracies, but they are in truth plutocracies. The foreign policies of plutocracies will seldom advance peace and world cooperation. In the present economic crisis, foreign policies of all capitalistic nations will necessarily be far more concerned to keep plutocrats in power than to build world democracy.

That is the speech he was making in 1938.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Briefly.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman please explain to the House why it is that the committee reached a decision to withhold from the membership a transcript of the evidence taken by that committee involving the future welfare of these people? Why has that been suppressed?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know as there has been any suppression of it at all.

Mr. COOLEY. Why has it not been made available?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know any reason why there should be any suppression. I have it here, and if the gentleman from North Carolina or any Member interested will come down I will show it to him.

Mr. CELLER. Was it printed?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further; I do not intend to have my time taken up on collateral issues.

Mr. COOLEY. That is not a collateral issue at all.

Mr. KEEFE. This House appointed these members of this committee to serve in a semijudicial capacity. The membership expected them to hear the testimony and to make a recommendation to this Congress. We have proceeded absolutely in accordance with the instructions given us in the resolution you passed. May I say to the gentleman and to the House that much of the material furnished by the F. B. I. and Army and Navy Intelligence was regarded as highly confidential and we assured them that if we used it in our examinations it would not be made a public record.

I have given just three or four illustrations of the attitude of this man Watson. I have not time to go through the whole situation, but let me call your attention to the fact that from 1932 right on down through we find Goodwin Watson hobnobbing with the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, one of the organizations which he himself said membership in by one of his associates, Prof. Franz Boaz, of Columbia University, led him to the belief that Professor Boaz was a "fellow traveler." We find him endorsing and sponsoring the American Congress for Peace and Democracy, another Communist-front organization.

We find him sponsoring what is called the American Investors' Union, Inc., another one of these fringe Communist outfits. We find him sponsoring the aims and objectives of the American League for Peace and Democracy, which is also an organization that has been condemned by the Attorney General and the Interdepartmental Committee. We find him endorsing the principles of the American Student Union, another Communist front organization. We find him affiliated and associated with the American Youth Congress. We find that this gentleman was associated with and one of the sponsors of Pan-American Democracy, another Communist organization; all down through the years, organization after organization, committee after committee. He denied membership in many of them. He admitted membership in three of the organizations. He denied that he had been a member, but he served on sponsoring committees. He, for instance, sponsored a plays-for-children contest put on by the International Workers' Order, a well-known Communist organization. We find him in association and affiliation right up to the time he came on the Federal pay roll with that type of organization. Oh, yes; he belonged to many reputable organizations also.

All I have to say, Mr. Chairman, is this: You can find little faults in connection with this matter if you so desire; you can ask questions why was not this testimony all printed. Perhaps it should have been; in any event, it was not, and for what the committee considered sufficient reasons, but do you think that any member of your committee would come here and willfully suppress any information? Is there any Member of this House who thinks we are suppressing any evidence? Are you not convinced that this committee is giving you the truth and the facts which we found?

Let me tell you something else. We had this man before us. I have tried many lawsuits; I have argued many cases from the printed brief in the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court never has before it the witness to observe his candor or lack of candor.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. They never have before it the witness to observe the fairness or lack of fairness of the witness. But we had these people before us.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is a member of the committee.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman want to ask a question?

Mr. COOLEY. I want to ask a question.

Mr. KEEFE. All right. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, the gentleman is a distinguished lawyer. In presenting cases to an appellate court the gentleman well knows that every case carries with it a transcript, which is a statement of facts upon which the conclusions of law are based.

Mr. KEEFE. Let us not get into such an argument as that. The distinguished gentleman who has addressed me has confidence, does he, in the committee which was appointed?

Mr. COOLEY. Almost, but not quite, implicit confidence.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman believe the statements that have been made by the members of that committee on this floor?

Mr. COOLEY. I accept the gentleman's statement and the statement of every member of the committee.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman believe the statements that have been made as to the proof that has been presented thus far? And if so, does the gentleman want to keep that kind of an individual on the pay roll of the Government?

Mr. COOLEY. My answer is this: I am not willing to sit in judgment upon the welfare and the future of these men based upon evidence, all of which has been completely suppressed by this committee, none of which has been made available to the Members of this House until a moment ago, when the gentleman offered me a transcript to read when he knows I am faced with having to vote within 5 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman, he has had an opportunity to know these facts for years. These men have been charged by the chairman of the Dies committee, and the evidence has all been printed, and if the gentleman wanted the facts, they were available to him. I do not know whether he supported the Dies committee or not.

Mr. COOLEY. I have consistently supported it.

Mr. KEEFE. Why did the gentleman support it?

Mr. COOLEY. Because I believed that the people on the pay roll of the Government who entertained subversive intentions should be investigated and exposed, but I did not understand when this House created the present committee it intended for that committee to conduct a star-chamber session and to try these people and to convict these people, and then to try to get the House to confirm that conviction without having evidence to support it.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that he is just as much in error as any man has ever been on this floor. This committee has convicted no one. This committee has brought a report to you and you are to judge from that report what your attitude may be. If the gentleman is not convinced by the proofs that have been submitted, then why in the name of God did he vote to continue the large appropriation for the Dies committee? Why continue to spend money to gather facts which you do not intend to use? In my humble judgment, the gentleman is searching hard for justification for his present attitude.

Mr. COOLEY. Is this the report to which the gentleman refers?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina just complained because there was no transcript of evidence. However, he voted for the National Labor Relations Act, which distinctly provides that on appeal the appellate court and the Supreme Court must accept the findings of the National Labor Relations Board without any transcript.

Mr. COOLEY. I did not agree to accept the findings of this committee on that proposition.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to join in what the gentleman from North Carolina said. We all have the utmost confidence in this committee.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Personally I feel this testimony should have been taken by a reporter.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not care for any observations.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And the testimony should have been written and submitted to the Members of the House.

Mr. KEEFE. I am one of those who feels this committee is being killed and poisoned by faint praise. I do not care for that sort of praise from the gentleman from Montana or anyone else. May I say to my friend, however, that all of the testimony was under oath and taken by a reporter and I have the transcript before the House today. The reasons for not publishing the same have heretofore been given.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY. When I asked the gentleman to yield before I wanted him to discuss the facts. I hope someone else will give us some more facts about this man Dodd. I want to hear the facts about Dodd.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to my distinguished friend that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] will discuss Dodd. When he does I am sure he will give you facts.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think any Member who was sufficiently interested to approach any of the members of this committee could have done so and could have discussed this matter. I did so in order to try to find out the facts and I found a disposition on the part of the committee to disclose the facts completely when I talked to several of the members.

Mr. KEEFE. If we had published all of these facts and scattered them to the world, we would have been condemned by the same people who are now condemning us for not publishing the facts. They would say that we were blackening the character and reputation of these fine men by publishing this testimony. Any member who really wanted to know the facts has had ample time and opportunity to obtain them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] the remainder of the time on this side.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I recognize this afternoon the difficulty of this amendment. I am not particularly happy over my position here today. I realize that it was not so long ago that a magazine of this country was referring to me as a liberal, and now I find myself referred to as a "witch hunter." That is a designation that I do not like.

I want to say to the Members of this House that my position on this Kerr committee was not sought by me. I can say to you in all candor that I have sat through many of the sessions of that committee against the advice of a physician. I have not enjoyed that. But I felt the mandate from the Speaker and from the chairman of the Appropriations Committee required this, insofar as I could comply.

I desire in my own way to report to the House this afternoon, not as a lawyer, which I am not; not as a member of some intellectual group, which I do not claim to be, but as the son of a Swedish immigrant who enjoyed some of the blessings of this land of ours and as one who wants to keep available to coming generations of Americans the same opportunities that my father found here.

There has been a lot said today as to why the hearings of this committee were not published. Again, in my own way and without the blessing of the committee, I want to make my own explanation to you.

This committee had before it confidential and secret information supplied to it by the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. If we could have obtained permission to have printed every bit of that testimony, I would have been glad for it all to have been printed, but I submit to you it was not fair nor just nor wise to take only the materials that were presented to us as the explanation of these accused persons and print that and not print the whole story. I want to remind you also, when you talk about our printing something, that the investigation of the Dies committee has been printed and every

Member of the House who was interested in the proceedings on un-American activities had the right to read the Dies reports from cover to cover.

I want to suggest further that a Senate committee had a prolonged investigation of Goodwin Watson. My friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] took the trouble to read it. I took the trouble to read it. If Members of this House wanted to find out about Goodwin Watson before the case reaches the "supreme court," as this House has been called, they have had access to those reports.

Do not blame the Kerr committee. Four different groups have investigated most of these people, and if you had wanted the record of what they have been doing, our records could have been made available to you individually. I saw in the Chamber a moment ago the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]. He came to me and said that he was not too happy over some of these things, and I recognized that because there is not a finer, more lovable, more conscientious Member of this House than that gentleman. I said to him that there was not a bit of testimony before our committee that he could not take and examine. If the gentleman from California would contradict or deny that statement, I would resign my membership in this House.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman does not mean to say that I would deny the statement.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. No; I said that, by way of supporting what I have said, because I have so much faith in the gentleman, I know that it could not have happened that the gentleman would deny it.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania referred to the fact that at one time he came to a member of the committee, and I plead guilty as being the member of the committee, I believe, and at that time I tried to tell him what we had to face and what we had to consider.

Other Members—many of them—have come to me, and what I have tried to say to them is that there were certain of these persons that I could not believe should be removed from the Federal pay roll, but that there are other cases where the testimony showed they should be removed.

I want to deal with one of those cases, but I want to deal first, if I may, with one or two questions. The question was raised by the very fine gentleman from Alabama, one whom all of us love, as to why we could not have merely referred this to the House. I would have been delighted to do that, but unfortunately the House adopted a resolution which says that any legislation approved by the committee as a result of this resolution may be incorporated in any general or special appropriations measure as an amendment to any such measure. That is why a mere report is not enough.

I, like other members of the committee, feel our job was not done until we had completed the duty which the House had assigned to us. There was no misunderstanding as to what we were to do; it was clearly explained to the House.

When this resolution was before the House on February 9 many people spoke; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], both the majority and minority leaders, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], whom I so greatly admire.

May I read to you what that very splendid constitutional lawyer said on that day, and I am reading now from the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]:

This resolution—

He refers to the resolution under which we bring this proceeding—

This resolution gives us a chance to do legally what Mr. DIES advocates. That is, to base separation from the pay roll upon evidence showing membership in, or association with, subversive organizations.

The adoption of this resolution will change the rule, as we have a perfect right to do. Its passage would relieve us of the high degree of proof now required. Adopt this resolution, and instead of being required to prove advocacy of or membership in an organization that advocates the overthrow of our Government, it will then be required to prove that an employee is unfit to continue in such employment by reason of his present association or membership or past association or membership in or with organizations whose aims or purposes are or have been subversive of the Government of the United States.

If you wish to liberalize the rule so as to assure our Government far greater protection from the employment of the disloyal and the unfit, pass this resolution, and be fair.

I submit to you that on the basis of those instructions we had a right to proceed as we did; moreover, we had a duty to proceed as we did.

One of the gentlemen asked that we may hear something about Mr. Dodd. I am not particularly pleased to make comments on anybody in this RECORD, but I am quite willing to do it upon request. Let me suggest to you first of all that we had some other people before our committee. Mr. Fahy, for example, was one of them. The committee found as to Mr. Fahy:

The committee has received testimonials as to the ability and character of Mr. Fahy from an exceptional variety of persons, and your committee is of the opinion that Mr. Fahy has not been guilty of any subversive activity, but that on the contrary he has and is rendering to the Government a loyal service in the handling of the vexatious economic and supply problems of the Territories of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Does that sound like witch hunting?

We had before us Mr. Goldschmidt, and we found as to him, and I quote:

There is no evidence tending to show any subversive activity on the part of this employee at any time during his entire life, but, on the contrary, evidence shows that this employee is a patriotic, loyal, hard-working American and that he is now and has been rendering to the United States Government a high degree of service, and that he is a young man of the highest integrity and standing among his fellows and friends.

Does that sound like witch hunting? No; we were trying to go through these cases and pick out the people who deserve to be criticized and the people who deserve to be praised. Bear in mind that 38 people are on this Dies list. One of the things this Congress is trying to do is give a certificate of character to those people who we believe do not belong in this list, as well as to point the finger at those that we do believe belong in it.

Now as to Mr. Dodd. On April 21 Mr. Dodd issued a statement in which he claimed to be "shocked at the nature of the duties which this committee takes upon itself," referring to the Kerr committee, and said of this committee, "It in effect sets up a star chamber procedure which places upon a black list members of the Government, and, without any attempt to determine the facts, makes it impossible for such employees to ever hold a Government job."

Let us see what Mr. Dodd told the Kerr committee on the 13th day of April under oath. At the conclusion of a long hearing in which every effort was made to determine the facts, he was asked by the chairman whether he had any further statements that he wanted to make, and he replied in the negative. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] then said:

Do you believe that you have had a fair opportunity to present your views and opinions as to these charges that have been made with reference to you?

Mr. Dodd replied:

Yes, I feel so.

Mr. KEEFE continued:

You have been fairly and reasonably treated by this committee?

Mr. Dodd replied:

Certainly.

Then the gentleman from Wisconsin asked:

And have been given every opportunity to make any statement that you desired to make?

Mr. Dodd replied:

Yes, sir.

Does that sound like a star-chamber proceeding without any effort to determine the facts? The answer is, of course, that the newspaper release reports Mr. Dodd under fire and the testimony I have read is Mr. Dodd under oath.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY. On page 7 of the committee's report it is stated that the particular reason the committee was against Mr. Dodd was "his admitted statement quoted in the World Hails the Twentieth Anniversary of the Soviet Union." What was the statement? What I want to know is the facts.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Let me move on, first.

The testimony of Mr. Dodd given before our committee is that he was an employee of the American League for

Peace and Democracy, an organization which the Department of Justice has found to be within the mandate of our public law that was passed by the Seventy-seventh Congress to investigate these very things. There is a man who not only was a member of it but who was its very employee, going around and trying to get other people in trouble as he was himself in trouble. We asked if he was a member of it or was an employee of it and he said, "I was both." He resigned from it in March in order to go to Virginia to run for Congress. He testified before the committee that he did not resign from it because he did not believe in its policies but because he did not want to be identified with it while he ran for public office.

He testified he was a member of the Washington Bookshop, that he knew that organization had been branded by the Attorney General of the United States as a front organization for subversive movements, but he did not think it was subversive. He told us he was still a member of it, in spite of the fact that the Attorney General had designated it as a front organization; that he had spoken before it, and that he seemed well satisfied with his whole connection with it.

He testified before the committee that he had spoken under the auspices of the American Friends of the Soviet Union, that he had spoken under the auspices of Medical Aid for China, an off-shoot of the American League for Peace and Democracy, that he spoke for the American Friends of the Chinese People, and that he gave a cocktail party for Harry Bridges at the time that the Attorney General had deportation proceedings pending against Bridges.

The committee was naturally interested in the fact that Mr. Dodd testified to us that Harry Bridges came to his apartment for a cocktail party and conference in 1940 or 1941 at a time when the Attorney General of the United States was recommending that Bridges be deported; that he knew there were deportation charges against Harry Bridges but they were not discussed that afternoon. He told us that the bills for the party were paid by the Harry Bridges defense committee.

To go on, he told us that he lectured under the auspices of the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy. He admitted that he permitted his name as a sponsor of the conference on pan-American democracy which was also found by the Attorney General to be within the scope of Public Law 135 and Public Law 644 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. He wrote for Champion magazine which has been listed as under Communist influence.

Now I want to deal just a little with an answer which James Lawrence Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, filed with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] in the early part of this year. When asked about this Mr. Dodd replied to us that he had a copy of it but was not very familiar with it. Subsequently he told the committee that the statements that Mr. Fly made were made on what he told Mr. Fly, so that he, Dodd, was the real author of the letter.

In Mr. Fly's letter to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] a statement is made that at a meeting in February 1938 which was an Aid to China rally sponsored by the American League for Peace and Democracy, the William E. Dodd whom the Dies committee had charged as being a sponsor on that occasion was not William E. Dodd, Jr., employed by the Federal Communications Committee, but his father. When Mr. Dodd was questioned by the Federal Bureau of Investigation he included in his testimony the same typewritten statement and initialed it, saying that the person who made the speech was not William Dodd, Jr., but his father and yet, under questioning before the Kerr committee as to whether the speaker was young Dodd or his father, he replied "That was undoubtedly me." I maintain that it was wrong for any son to try to hold his position in the Government by throwing on to his dead father the reputation for his own acts.

Again take the Community Council for the Defense of American Democracy. In answer to questions as to this, Mr. Dodd told our committee, and I quote him directly, "I know that Mr. Fly said it was my father." He might have added that he told the F. B. I. it was his father. He might have added that he told Mr. Fly that it was his father, but when he got before our committee under oath and said "I know that Mr. Fly said it was my father" and was asked, "But you do not subscribe to that here?" he replied, "I would not say that I did not speak for it." Then he was asked, "Do you remember your father speaking for it?" and he replied, "I do not know."

Take another one. This was item 17 in the Fly reply to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] and in the F. B. I. memorandum. It referred to a booklet called These Americans Say, issued by the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo and carried a statement by Mr. Dodd. Mr. Fly says the statement was made not by William E. Dodd, Jr., but by his father. Mr. Dodd told us that he gave Mr. Fly this information. He told the F. B. I. on February 24, 1943, that it was his father, but when he was before our committee under oath and was asked whether he himself had written it, he replied: "I might very well have written it because I was in favor of lifting the embargo."

Take item 18 in the Fly response to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]. It refers to a publication of November 15, 1938, called News You Don't Get. It related that Mr. Dodd had signed the call to a Conference on Pan-American Democracy. The record should show that the Attorney General has listed the Conference on Pan-American Democracy as one of the organizations having possible subversive activities. The letterhead of that organization lists Mr. Dodd as a sponsor of the conference. Mr. Fly told the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] that it was not William E. Dodd, Jr., but his father. Mr. Dodd told that to Mr. Fly. He told that to the F. B. I. but before our committee he testified that he was identified with that organization, that he is now identified with it, and when he was asked specifically whether he or his father signed the publication he replied: "I don't know". The next question was: "You could not say specifically?" His answer was "No". Yet he could state to the F. B. I. that it was his father, and Mr. Fly could state that to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Let us go to item 23 of Mr. Fly's memorandum to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] which Mr. Dodd filed with the F. B. I. That had to do with an article in the Daily Worker of January 24, 1938, reporting that Mr. Dodd attended a party sponsored by the League of Women Shoppers espousing a boycott against Japanese goods. The Fly memorandum says "Mr. Dodd did attend this party, which was a fashion show held in the home of former Governor and Mrs. Pinchot of Pennsylvania." Mr. Dodd supplied Mr. Fly with that information. He testified to it before the F. B. I. and when questioned about it under oath by our committee as to his connection with the League of Women Shoppers, he said, and I quote him directly, "I had no connection with that." "None whatever?" And his answer was "No." So he was told that there was mention of this meeting espousing a boycott on Japanese goods. I asked him, "You did not attend that?" He said, "Not that I recall." I told him it was staged at Governor Pinchot's home. He replied, "That was here in Washington. I know it was my father. I recall now specifically."

I hope you get the significance of that. Mr. Fly was willing to pat Mr. Dodd on the back for his foresight in supporting a boycott against Japanese goods. Mr. Dodd patted himself on the back before the F. B. I. as to his sponsorship of this worthy cause, but when he gets under oath, he has to put the credit back where it belonged, to his deceased father who was not able to defend himself in any other way.

So we went back at him and said, "Now, Mr. Dodd, before going further with the list, I would like to remind you that Mr. Fly's reply to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] said you did attend the meeting at Governor Pinchot's place. Previously you said you furnished him with the information. Now you testified that you did not attend the party." Mr. Dodd asked, "Governor Pinchot's?" and received an affirmative answer. He then said, "I did not attend." He was asked if Mr. Fly was then just guilty of a misstatement, and he replied, "I don't know how he could have stated that. There is a possibility of typographical errors." But it was pointed out to him that he had given the description of the party to Mr. Fly which Mr. Fly had put in his answer to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], and Dodd commented by saying, "I am sorry, but I was not there."

Now we come to item 24 in the Fly memorandum to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] which sets

forth that the New Masses on April 22, 1941, reported that Mr. Dodd had signed the call to the Fourth Congress of the League of American Writers. This League of American Writers has been listed by the Attorney General as one of the organizations found to be within the scope of Public Law 135 and Public Law 644. There are some good Americans who belong to the organization, so the Fly memorandum says "Mr. Dodd did sign this call." He was asked about this under oath before our committee, and he said, "I did not sign; no." So he was asked, "That was your father?", and he replied, "No; my father was dead then." I said to him, "That was April 22, 1941; you did not sign it?" He replied, "No, sir; I did not."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman 4 minutes more.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York. I submit to this House that a man who is as unstable in his recollection of occurrences of events as this, is a very poor person to have on a public pay roll. It was very convenient to blame his father, who was in his grave, but it was hardly what most of us conceive to be proper respect which a son should bear toward his own flesh and blood.

I suggest that Mr. Fly has not done the cause of the Federal Communications Commission any good by passing on to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] such misleading information over his own signature when by the testimony of Mr. Dodd before our committee, Mr. Fly had never talked to Mr. Dodd and had no personal knowledge whatever of what his answer to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] correctly should have been.

I would like further to refer to an additional item which may have no bearing on his connection with subversive organizations but does give us an index as to how valuable an employee he is to the Federal Government. The Federal Communications Commission, through the administrative officer of its Foreign Broadcasts Monitoring Service, Thompson A. Moore, swore on the 29th of June 1942, that William E. Dodd, Jr., was essential to the war effort and on the basis of that the local draft board of Loudoun County, Leesburg, Va., was asked to defer Mr. Dodd and place him in class B-2 as a necessary war worker. On March 29, 1943, he was reclassified as a result of the appeal taken in his case. Mr. Dodd told us and others who investigated him that he was an assistant wire editor for the Foreign Broadcasting Intelligence Service of the Federal Communications Commission. Under examination before our committee he testified that he was doing editorial work. Let me give you his exact words:

> You take broadcasts, summaries of broadcasts, or text of broadcasts made by various radio stations in the world. They come in on paper; carbon copies come in and you have to edit it. In other words, you put in the "the's" and "and's" and divide it up into paragraphs and give it a slug line. It is newspaper work. It is copy editing.

This, my friends, is essential war work for which he should be deferred from the operations of the Selective Service Act in the opinion of the Federal Communications Commission.

So he was asked what newspaper experience he had had in questions like these: "Did you ever work on a city desk?" "No, sir." "Have you ever been a reporter?" "No, sir." "Have you ever been a copy chopper?" "No, sir." "What particular qualifications did you feel you had to be a news editor?" Here is Dodd's answer:

> I was brought into the Federal Communications Commission in the report section. They put out a mimeograph report summarizing German broadcasts; that is, the main news items that are put out on the Berlin radio. There were four or five of us who sat in a room and simply picked out the items which were new each day and threw away the old items. We were simply doing an editing job in the sense that we were making it readable, putting in the's and and's and paragraphing it. We don't change the meaning. It is not the duty of the editorial report section to ever change the meaning of any reports that come in. We quote them directly as they come in over the radio.

Notice the difference in the affidavit to support claim for occupational deferment which was filed for Mr. Dodd. Question 7a requires the Commission to give an accurate and full description of his duties. Here is the wording which they gave:

> Summarizes and analyzes intelligence, military, economic, and political which may be received through foreign short-wave broadcasts giving factual surveys of their overt content; examines and is charged with digesting and evaluating broadcasts; selects and composes bulletins to be issued at shorter than daily intervals.

Now let us ask how honest Mr. Dodd was when he said he had no newspaper experience. In the files of the Government there is confidential information which shows clearly that Mr. Dodd was the publisher of United States Week, a midwestern version of the Daily Worker, which was taken to Milwaukee, Wis., and I quote now directly from the Government files:

> For the express purpose of exploiting the German isolationism in that section.

One of the editors of the paper was Richard O. Boyer, who is now an editor of New Masses, a Communist Party paper.

Mr. Dodd leased an apartment at 231 East Seventy-sixth Street, New York City. The files of your Government contain information as to meetings steadily held in this apartment. When Mr. Dodd leased the apartment he gave as a reference Richard O. Boyer, this editor of the New Masses, and said that his own business address was U. S. Week, Milwaukee, Wis.

May I close by pointing out that in Soviet Russia today there is a quotation from William E. Dodd, Jr., which he admits that he wrote, which reads:

> Twice I have made flying trips to the Soviet Union, and after each one I have left with the feeling that here is a nation which carries the future of our civilization. Here there is hope, justice, and progress. The heroic struggle which the Soviet Union has made for world peace is just beginning to be realized, and other democratic nations are recognizing that her way is the only way to preserve peace.

Those who believe that the Russian Government represents the only way to preserve peace should naturally sustain Mr. Dodd. Those who believe that the United Nations, of which Britain and America are parts, can contribute to the peace of the world by the preservation of their existing governments, will want to sustain the committee.

I submit this man has no place on the Government pay roll.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has again expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment by Mr. CASE to the amendment offered by Mr. KERR: Line 12, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury, or as a member of the armed forces of the United States, nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Strike out all of the Kerr committee amendment as amended and insert "SEC. 304. Only the executive branch of the Government may remove any employee in the executive departments, because under the dictum of *Myers* v. *United States* the Supreme Court says, 'Removal of executive officials from office is an Executive function, and that the power to remove, like the power to appoint, is part of the Executive power—a conclusion which is confirmed by the Presidential obligation to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.'"

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is legislation on an appropriation bill, and not in order under rule XXI.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard?

Mr. CELLER. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] desire to be heard further?

Mr. TABER. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that it is not germane and the point of order is sustained. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PATMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2714 and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question will be ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Kerr amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Taber amendment, and also on the amendment respecting subversive activities.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Insert, page 2, after line 25, the following: *"Provided*, That no part of the funds continued available by this paragraph shall be allotted to or expended for the National Resources Planning Board or the Farm Security Administration or for any of the functions of either said Board or said Administration."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 155, noes 101.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KERR: On page 36, after line 23, insert as a new section the following:

"SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States, nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 318, nays 62, answered "present" 1, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

YEAS—318

Abernethy	Fulmer	McLean
Allen, Ill.	Gallagher	McMillan
Allen, La.	Gamble	McWilliams
Andersen H. Carl	Gathings	Madden
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gavagan	Mahon
Andresen, August H.	Gavin	Maloney
Andrews	Gearhart	Manasco
Angell	Gerlach	Mansfield, Tex.
Arends	Gibson	Martin, Iowa
Baldwin, Md.	Gifford	Martin, Mass.
Barden	Gilchrist	Mason
Barrett	Gillette	May
Barry	Gillie	Merritt
Bates, Ky.	Gore	Merrow
Bates, Mass.	Gossett	Michener
Beall	Graham	Miller, Conn.
Beckworth	Grant, Ala.	Miller, Nebr.
Bennett, Mich.	Grant, Ind.	Miller, Pa.
Bennett, Mo.	Green	Mills
Bishop	Gregory	Monkiewicz
Blackney	Griffiths	Monroney
Bland	Gross	Morrison, La.
Bolton	Hagen	Morrison, N. C.
Bonner	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mott
Boren	Hall, Leonard W.	Mruk
Bradley, Mich.	Halleck	Mundt
Bradley, Pa.	Hancock	Murphy
Brehm	Hare	Murray, Tenn.
Brooks	Harness, Ind.	Murray, Wis.
Brown, Ga.	Harris, Ark.	Newsome
Brown, Ohio	Harris, Va.	Norman
Bryson	Hartley	Norrell
Buffett	Hébert	O'Brien, Ill.
Burch, Va.	Heidinger	O'Brien, N. Y.
Busbey	Hendricks	O'Hara
Butler	Hess	O'Neal
Byrne	Hill	Pace
Camp	Hoch	Patman
Canfield	Hoeven	Patton
Cannon, Fla.	Hoffman	Peterson, Fla.
Cannon, Mo.	Holmes, Mass.	Peterson, Ga.
Carlson, Kans.	Holmes, Wash.	Philbin
Carson, Ohio	Hope	Phillips
Carter	Horan	Pittenger
Case	Howell	Ploeser
Chenoweth	Jarman	Plumley
Chiperfield	Jeffrey	Poage
Church	Jenkins	Poulson
Clason	Jennings	Powers
Clevenger	Jensen	Pracht
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Anton J.	Price
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Calvin D.	Priest
Colmer	Johnson, Ind.	Rabaut
Compton	Johnson, J. Leroy	Ramey
Cooper	Johnson, Luther A.	Ramspeck
Courtney	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Randolph
Cox	Johnson, Okla.	Rankin
Cravens	Johnson, Ward	Reece, Tenn.
Crawford	Jones	Reed, Ill.
Cunningham	Jonkman	Reed, N. Y.
Curley	Kearney	Rees, Kans.
Curtis	Keefe	Richards
D'Alesandro	Kennedy	Rivers
Davis	Kerr	Riziey
Day	Kilburn	Robertson
Dewey	Kilday	Robsion, Ky.
Dirksen	Kinzer	Rockwell
Disney	Kleberg	Rodgers, Pa.
Ditter	Knutson	Rogers, Mass.
Dondero	Kunkel	Rohrbough
Doughton	Lambertson	Rowe
Douglas	Landis	Russell
Drewry	Lane	Sasscer
Durham	Lanham	Satterfield
Dworshak	Larcade	Sauthoff
Eaton	LeCompte	Schiffler
Eberharter	LeFevre	Schuetz
Ellis	Lesinski	Schwabe
Ellsworth	Lewis	Scott
Elmer	Ludlow	Shafer
Elston, Ohio	McCord	Sheppard
Engel	McCormack	Sheridan
Fay	McCowen	Short
Feighan	McGehee	Sikes
Fellows	McGregor	Simpson, Ill.
Fenton	McKenzie	Simpson, Pa.
Fish	McLaughlin	Slaughter
Fisher	McLeod	Smith, Ohio
Flannagan	McMillen	Smith, Va.
Forand	Maas	Smith, Wis.
Ford, Leland M.	Magnuson	Snyder
Ford, Thomas F.	Marcantonio	Somers, N. Y.
Fuller	Martin, Colo.	Sparkman
Gallagher	Miller, Mo.	Springer
Gamble	Mills	Stanley
Gathings	Monkiewicz	Starnes, Ala.
Gavagan	Monroney	Steagall
Gavin	Morrison, La.	Stefan
Gearhart	Morrison, N. C.	Stevenson
Gerlach	Mott	Stewart
Gibson	Mruk	Stockman
Gifford	Mundt	Sullivan
Gilchrist	Murphy	Sumner, Ill.
Gillette	Murray, Tenn.	Sumners, Tex.
Gillie	Murray, Wis.	Sundstrom
Gore	Newsome	Taber
Gossett	Norman	Talbot
Graham	Norrell	Talle
Grant, Ala.	O'Brien, Ill.	Tarver
Grant, Ind.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Taylor
Green	O'Hara	Thomas, Tex.
Gregory	O'Neal	Thomason
Griffiths	Pace	Tibbott
Gross	Patman	Towe
Hagen	Patton	Treadway
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Peterson, Fla.	Troutman
Hall, Leonard W.	Peterson, Ga.	Van Zandt
Halleck	Philbin	Vincent, Ky.
Hancock	Phillips	Vorys, Ohio
Hare	Pittenger	Vursell
Harness, Ind.	Ploeser	Wadsworth
Harris, Ark.	Plumley	Walter
Harris, Va.	Poage	Ward
Hartley	Poulson	Wasielewski
Hébert	Powers	Weaver
Heidinger	Pracht	Welchel, Ohio
Hendricks	Price	West
Hess	Priest	Wheat
Hill	Rabaut	Whitten
Hoch	Ramey	Whittington
Hoeven	Ramspeck	Wickersham
Hoffman	Randolph	Wigglesworth
Holmes, Mass.	Rankin	Willey
Holmes, Wash.	Reece, Tenn.	Wilson
Hope	Reed, Ill.	Winstead
Horan	Reed, N. Y.	Winter
Howell	Rees, Kans.	Wolcott
Jarman	Richards	Wolfenden, Pa.
Jeffrey	Rivers	Wolverton, N. J.
Jenkins	Riziey	Woodrum, Va.
Jennings	Robertson	Wright
Jensen	Robsion, Ky.	Zimmerman
Johnson, Anton J.	Rockwell	
Johnson, Calvin D.	Rodgers, Pa.	
Johnson, Ind.	Rogers, Mass.	
Johnson, J. Leroy	Rohrbough	
Johnson, Luther A.	Rowe	
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Russell	
Johnson, Okla.	Sasscer	
Johnson, Ward	Satterfield	
Jones	Sauthoff	
Jonkman	Schiffler	
Kearney	Schuetz	
Keefe	Schwabe	
Kennedy	Scott	
Kerr	Shafer	
Kilburn	Sheppard	
Kilday	Sheridan	
Kinzer	Short	
Kleberg	Sikes	
Knutson	Simpson, Ill.	
Kunkel	Simpson, Pa.	
Lambertson	Slaughter	
Landis	Smith, Ohio	
Lane	Smith, Va.	
Lanham	Smith, Wis.	
Larcade	Snyder	
LeCompte	Somers, N. Y.	
LeFevre	Sparkman	
Lesinski	Springer	
Lewis	Stanley	
Ludlow	Starnes, Ala.	
McCord	Steagall	
McCormack	Stefan	
McCowen	Stevenson	
McGehee	Stewart	
McGregor	Stockman	
McKenzie	Sullivan	
McLaughlin	Sumner, Ill.	
McLeod	Sumners, Tex.	
McMillen	Sundstrom	
Maas	Taber	
Magnuson	Talbot	
Marcantonio	Talle	
Martin, Colo.	Tarver	
Miller, Mo.	Taylor	

NAYS—62

Baldwin, N. Y.	Furlong	LaFollette
Bender	Gale	Lemke
Bloom	Gordon	Lynch
Buckley	Gorski	McMurray
Burchill, N. Y.	Gwynne	Mansfield, Mont.
Burdick	Hale	Marcantonio
Capozzoli	Hart	Myers
Celler	Hays	O'Connor
Coffee	Heffernan	O'Leary
Cooley	Hobbs	Outland
Crosser	Holifield	Pfeifer
Delaney	Hull	Rogers, Calif.
Dickstein	Jackson	Rowan
Dilweg	Kean	Sadowski
Dingell	Kee	Scanlon
Domengeaux	Kefauver	Smith, W. Va.
Ellison, Md.	Kelley	Stearns, N. H.
Fitzpatrick	Keogh	Voorhis, Calif.
Folger	King	Weiss
Ford	Kirwan	Wene
Fulbright	Klein	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Burgin

NOT VOTING—51

Anderson, Calif.	Fogarty	Norton
Arnold	Goodwin	O'Brien, Mich.
Auchincloss	Granger	O'Konski
Bell	Guyer	O'Toole
Boykin	Harless, Ariz.	Robinson, Utah
Bulwinkle	Herter	Rolph
Chapman	Hinshaw	Sabath
Clark	Izac	Smith, Maine
Cochran	Judd	Spence
Costello	Lea	Thomas, N. J.
Creal	Luce	Tolan
Culkin	McGranery	Vinson, Ga.
Cullen	Maas	Welch
Dawson	Magnuson	Whelchel, Ga.
Dies	Miller, Mo.	White
Elliott	Murdock	Woodruff, Mich.
Fernandez	Nichols	Worley

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Herter against.

Mr. Miller of Missouri for, with Mr. Cullen against.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mrs. Luce against.

General pairs:

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Izac with Mrs. Smith of Maine.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Rolph.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Welch.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Goodwin.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Arnold.

Mr. McGranery with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Culkin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk to the committee may be authorized to correct section numbers in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill just passed may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole at the point I made them and include therein quotations from authorities and certain citations of authorities and other matters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Chicago Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VOORHIS of California was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with the remarks I made on the bill just passed there may be appended a statement of the Federal Communications Commission. That statement exceeds the quota and I have an estimate from the Public Printer that it will amount to $180. I renew my request notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon Friday, after the conclusion of the legislative business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders, I may proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SPORTS IN WAR

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose today to call your attention to the part sports are playing in our American victory drive—to bring you up to date, perhaps, on how sports must serve all of us as we prosecute the most heroic task ever assigned to the American people.

The point I will make is that sports on the American scene—instead of being curtailed for the duration—should be encouraged on a wider scale, with all of us engaging in some kind of physical activity.

I could preface my remarks by reminding you that we are fighting to preserve the American way of life—and insist that it is the American way of life that will lead us to eventual and complete victory. Sports, I contend, are so much a part of our American way of doing things that to abandon them now—or even curtail them—would work a serious set-back in our drive to victory.

Sports are the backbone of American physical fitness.

All of us today need exercise more than ever before. We are convinced that we must have physical strength and endurance to meet the physical chores assigned to us each day—but more than that, we must have additional strength and endurance to cope with any emergency that will require extra physical endeavor.

The leaders of the armed forces subscribe to this theory of physical development. Our soldiers, sailors, marines, and coast guardsmen must have more than 100 percent physical fitness. They must be 110 to 125 percent physically fit to be ready to carry on beyond the requirements of physical perfection, as we have understood the term in the past.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DILWEG. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentleman now speaking has more right to speak on American athletics than almost anybody in America. For years he played on the Green Bay Packers as end and was All-American professional end for 3 years.

Mr. DILWEG. I thank the gentleman.

We on the civilian front must also be more than 100 percent physically capable, so that we will be ready to meet any emergency.

Now—and I can cite a wealth of authority for this statement—the only way that we can attain a high level of physical strength and endurance is through hard physical work—strenuous exercise that will build muscle structure which will carry the physical load assigned to us—and at the same time give us the agility to better perform our tasks.

It may sound ridiculous on the face of it to say that a man doing what we call hard manual labor today needs exercise after he completes his day's work.

But that happens to be the case, because there is hardly such a thing today as hard work. There is tedious work, of course, but machines have so usurped the drudgery of heavy lifting and other strenuous jobs that even the hardest-working laborer today gets only exercise that develops certain parts of his body, at best.

Total fitness depends upon a totally fit human physical structure. Every part of the body—the hands, the arms, the shoulders, the back, the legs, the feet—must be able to function at prescribed daily tasks without undue fatigue—and have a little left to carry the physical burden of emergency assignments.

Exercise is the answer.

Now, exercise can be work or play.

If we accept it as work, few of us will get all the exercise we need.

If we make our exercise play, it comes in enjoyable doses.

That is where sports come in. Sports are the American way of getting exercise and making it fun.

It follows, then, that America must play harder and oftener right now than ever before.

We must impress upon the American people that it is patriotic to play—since through play we get exercise—and through exercise we attain that physical endurance so necessary in every individual today.

This play serves a dual role. In addition to affording us physical expression, it serves, too, as a change of pace—a release through relaxation — that makes us better fit emotionally, if not mentally, to meet the challenge of our daily tasks and accept new tasks with enthusiasm.

And here is a point I would like to interject. Providing the body is physically sound—that is, if the heart and other organs are not aggravated by disease—an individual cannot overexercise, according to the latest authentic physiological opinions.

Those of us, for example, who have played golf in the past, should play more golf today. We should play harder at golf to utilize the game for its contributions to physical fitness. If we do not play golf, we should find some other physical hobby—some sport, some game—that we will play for enjoyment and from which we will derive physical work.

This theory of physical fitness may be something new to most of us, but it has been practiced by physical trainers for many years. A boxer, using extra heavy gloves, will punch a heavy bag and do grueling road work to develop his wind, his strength, and his endurance to take something extra physically into the ring with him. Track athletes run distances longer than their competitive requirements for the same reason. A baseball player will swing two or three bats before he goes up to hit, knowing that the extra weight will make the single bat he uses at the plate seem much lighter. Football players, engaging in the roughest of all American games, will run laps around the goal posts after formal practice to get that something extra physically.

We in civilian life must profit by the experience of the men in our armed forces and our athletes, who are supermen physically. All of us must take up some physical sport, whether it is golfing, swimming, bowling, handball, wrestling, walking, tennis, softball, horseshoe pitching, or any of scores of games, determining beforehand the condition of our heart and other organs, and choosing a physical hobby, a sport, that befits our age.

We must play hard at that sport every day to reap the full benefits of physical fitness.

My remarks, so far, have been for the adults of this Nation, the folks who have taken the easy way out for a number of years when physical exertion could be sidestepped.

You do not have to tell the American youngster, the lads of elementary school, high school, and college age, to take up sports. Our American youngsters play, and play hard, at games, from which, if the elements of fun, competitive fight, individual expression, and teamwork were removed, would be regarded as the hardest kind of work.

These youngsters must have these games more today than ever before, since participation in these sports gives our American boys plus values that make them the best soldiers and sailors in the world. If you are inclined to doubt this point, ask any of our military leaders on the battle fronts.

Take the American game of football, for example. It is warfare on a friendly scale. The very nature of the game requires physical perfection, physical power that allows the boy to put out just that much more when the chips are down.

And what does the boy get in addition? He develops a will to win that brooks no defeat. He is exposed to strategy which impresses upon him the value of discipline and teamwork and allows him to think for himself in emergency situations which are not covered in the book. He is taught leadership; he learns to take orders; he is urged on by an inspiration to excel individually, to become the best, a champion.

And what is more important, perhaps, that American kids playing football learn to "take it," to "dish it out," as they say on the sports fields, and then come back for more.

Those are the qualities we want in our American fighting men today, and we are getting them through American sports. It is a matter of record that during the last war, when a German officer was killed, the German enlisted man was confused, bewildered, for the lack of leadership. Nothing in his experience taught him to take the initiative—to assume leadership.

On the other hand, if an American officer were killed, there was always someone ready to step out of the ranks and assume intelligent command. Maybe he was a youngster who captained a high-school football team. Maybe he directed the strategy of play on a college basketball floor. Maybe he was a lad who managed a sandlot baseball team.

At any rate, much of the self-reliance of our fighting men in the last war was attributed to their competitive experiences on the sports fields of America.

Therefore, I insist that these American sports which give our youngsters plus values that make them better fighting men must be encouraged on the American scene for the duration. Football, basketball, track and field, baseball, soccer, boxing, wrestling—all other competitive sports—provide the basic training for our American youngsters who are facing call by the armed forces.

And, let me remind you, sport is not asking any favors. College and high-school programs have continued since Pearl Harbor under handicaps resulting from needed war restrictions. Nevertheless, these sports programs have carried on in a vast majority of cases—even though the star college football player is called up by his draft board and even after the high-school star becomes of draft age.

I am confident that we in Washington want them to continue; that we will do all in our power, as it is compatible with the prosecution of a victorious war, to keep those American games that make our youngsters better fighting men.

Part of our job is to impress upon the general public the value of these sports—and more particularly to charge school and college administrations with their responsibility in keeping these games going, even in the face of certain needed restrictions.

Even in peacetime, these sports were working for American victory. They built into our boys qualities that make them superior fighting men today. And, in addition, college football, for example, bought and paid for and developed facilities and leadership that are being used by units of the armed forces today. Hundreds of athletic leaders are now instilling into fighting men the same plus values they gave our boys on the athletic fields. Scores of college athletic plants—gymnasia, field houses, athletic fields, and even academic buildings, paid for in part out of football revenues—are being used to train members of the armed forces.

When I say these sports must remain on the American scene, they must remain not only for their contributions in developing the kind of men we want, they must also remain as spectator sports, for their indispensable contribution to our national morale.

What a concession it would be to the Axis if we were to abolish spectator sports from the American scene. How Germany and Japan—which have kept their sports—would cheer if we abandoned spectator sports. How the Axis propagandists would gloat if they could report that the morale was so low in America—that the Nation was so jittery—that we gave up one of the most popular elements in our American way.

The spectacle of college football games in the fall and major league baseball in the spring, summer, and early fall, are most important parts of our American way. They serve to dramatize American sporting endeavor in general. They give us a chance to glory in the exploits of champions. The same is true of basketball, hockey, horse racing, professional football, golf tournaments, bowling congresses, boxing shows, and other events where the rank and file of sports-conscious America gather to watch stars perform.

College football, major league baseball, bouts between boxing champions, traditional horse races, and other outstanding events belong to the American Nation. High-school sports, minor league baseball, local tournaments in other sports, belong to the community or to a specific section of the country.

Well do I know what football means to my home community in Green Bay and other towns of my district. Football in my section belongs to the corner druggist, the garage mechanic, the butcher, the baker, and even the candlestick maker, if we have any up our way. Football, as well as other sports in my community are the rallying grounds for a wholesome community consciousness, where the war worker, the business executive, the housewife, the school teacher, and others come to relax, to cheer their favorites, to give vent to their emotions, as they jeer the opposition and ballyrag the officials.

Where can you get a better example of a community rallying around a spectator sport than in Brooklyn, where the exploits of the "Beloved Bums" on the baseball diamond are the personal concern of every fan in the most rabid baseball community in America?

Major league baseball, I contend, is an essential industry. So is college football and other spectator sports.

Our chief concern now—our only concern, in fact—is winning this war. To do so we must utilize every ounce of manpower, to direct our manpower resources into channels that will work best for American victory.

I repeat, no sport has asked for favors. If a major league baseball player is eligible for the draft, he goes. There are no "ifs" or "buts." The selective-service board, however, has seen fit to defer scores of baseball men for the same reasons that they have deferred men in other business pursuits.

The question now comes up, What are we going to do with baseball players deferred by selective service? They are specialists in one field of endeavor. Few, if any, are trained to skilled work in war industry. Few, if any, can do work that the bartender, the orchestra leader, the grocery clerk, the barber, could not do just as well.

Believing these statements to be true, I contend that 500 men playing major league baseball—and with draft deferments—can do more good for this country in time of war than the same 500 men could if the national pastime were abandoned and these baseball artists were given menial jobs in some other essential industries.

What does baseball do for America? Well, first of all, it provides an opportunity for hundreds of thousands of war workers to relax in the fresh air and sunshine—and to continue to enjoy something that has been a significant part of American life for almost 100 years.

But more important than that, it provides refreshing newspaper reading for millions of war workers who buy the late afternoon papers at the end of a day's work to get the latest sports results, and who buy the morning paper on the way to work for more recreational reading.

Baseball news is a refreshing balance against the worrisome news that we are

fighting a war. War news is "must" reading—it is work. Sports news is refreshment—it is fun.

What holds true for baseball, holds true for all other spectator sports—for colleges and prep football, college and prep basketball, professional football, fights, hockey, horse racing—any sport that commands news attention and accounts of which are read avidly by the American people.

These, I believe, are sound, logical arguments for the maintenance of spectator sports on the American scene, but the strongest argument of all, perhaps, is that men in our fighting forces—men in the fox holes, men who have achieved glorious victory in Africa, men who are battling the Japs to a standstill in the Pacific, awaiting only the day when they will launch the victory offensive, and men who are poised for the victorious invasion of Europe—want spectator sports to continue on the home front and hungrily await news of sports results.

In substantiation of this latter contention, let me read an excerpt from a letter I have just received from England:

Fred Corcoran, of the Red Cross Division, has reported that the "favorite topic of conversation of American soldiers in England is sports."

Now, in conclusion, let me repeat that sports are contributing to American victory. They must remain on the American scene. They must be encouraged rather than curtailed.

Sports are the American way for achieving that physical fitness through exercise, which is a must requirement of everyone of us on the home front today.

Sports, American competitive games, are giving our youngsters basic training—plus values—that make them the greatest fighting men in the world.

Spectator sports are a national tonic, a change of pace, a relief from the more serious aspects of total war.

The sports way is the American way. Let us keep our sports on the American scene for their contributions to American victory.

And let all of us remember that it is patriotic to be fit, patriotic to play and play hard for the physical strength and endurance that will allow us to take our daily physical tasks in stride, with enough in reserve to accept additional physical burdens, when and if necessary.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DILWEG. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I should like to congratulate the gentleman on a very thoughtful and comprehensive and informative statement on the sports situation in wartime. Let me add for the benefit of my colleagues that no one can do this more properly than the gentleman who has just addressed us. He is a famous athlete in his own right. He practices what he preaches in that he has preserved to his older years the fine physical fitness which characterized him in his youth. He has also preserved the fine sense of sportsmanhip that he learned on the football field.

Mr. DILWEG. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DILWEG. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. I think the gentleman is probably making the best argument that could be made on this subject in that he himself is proving his point by his attitude in Congress. I have noticed the gentleman on the floor of the House at almost every session; I have noticed the physical vigor which he has and which is being applied to his work as Congressman, the fine intelligence which I think most often goes with fine physical fitness.

Let me say also that the district which sent him here is making a real contribution to the work of Congress and to the health of Congress because the gentleman from Wisconsin is a constant attendant at the gymnasium. He is an inspiration to some of us older men who go there to take exercise, and I believe in addition to making his contribution from many other standpoints for the good of the country and his district that he is making a distinct and outstanding contribution to the health of Congress and thereby to the work that Congress does.

Mr. DILWEG. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky. I might add that he did not mention who wins the games down there.

Mr. O'NEAL. I have reason for not mentioning it.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DILWEG. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I wish to add my compliment to those extended by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky and to say that it is with pleasure that I have listened to this address on the subject on which he has spoken.

Mr. DILWEG. I thank the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DILWEG. I yield.

Mr. McMURRAY. I should like to add a word to what the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Montana have just said. We in Wisconsin who know LA VERN DILWEG know that he is an outstanding example of all that is best in sports and sportsmanship, and we are mighty proud of him.

Mr. DILWEG. I thank the gentleman very much.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I waived the special order I had for today. I ask unanimous consent that on Wednseday, May 26, I may address the House for 20 minutes after the business on the Speaker's desk has been disposed of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MAAS, for 18 days, on account of official business on behalf of the Naval Affairs Committee.

To Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MONKIEWICZ), for 4 days, on account of business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 33. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of sampling plants and custom mills as an aid in the development and acquisition of strategic and critical minerals which are essential to the national defense; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (as 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, May 19, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2139, to provide improvement in the administration of parole, and H. R. 2140, to provide a correctional system for adult and youth offenders convicted in courts of the United States, at 10 a. m., on Tuesday and Wednesday, May 18 and 19, 1943, in room 346, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of subcommittee No. 8 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads at 10 a. m., Wednesday, May 19, 1943, to consider H. R. 687. Public hearings will be held.

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Thursday, May 20, 1943, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 2250, H. R. 2419, H. R. 1169, H. R. 1565, and H. R. 2080.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 19, and Thursday, May 20, 1943, on all bills dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act—H. R. 1882, H. R. 2309, H. R. 2428, and H. R. 2429.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, May 20, 1943, at 10 a. m. on H. R. 2612, to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Monday, May 24, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearings pursuant to House Resolution 98 by Congressman HALLECK.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

428. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the exercise by the United States of certain jurisdiction over persons within areas in the Republic of Panama, the temporary use of which for defense purposes is granted to the United States, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 457. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 458. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Committee on Naval Affairs. House joint resolution 118. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct, and the President of the United States to present to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, on behalf of the people of the United States, a hospital, dispensary, or other memorial, for heroic services to men of the United States Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2427. A bill to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2562. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to the State Hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 461). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 986. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct; with amendment (Rept. No. 462). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 2703. A bill to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2731. A bill to facilitate the award and payment of just compensation for property requisitioned under the authority of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 2732. A bill to provide for the observance of Monday of each week as Memory Monday in tribute to those members of the armed forces who have given their lives for their country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 2733. A bill authorizing the Snake or Piute Indians of the former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon to sue in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 2739. A bill to establish a food administration in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 241. Resolution to empower the Judiciary Committee of the House to study, investigate, and examine into the trial and punishment of the Axis war criminals; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to adopt the perpetual calendar and all nations at the peace conference adopt it also; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give the fullest support in punishing those responsible for the horrible crime against humanity and to continue the development of a Jewish national home in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a law naturalizing the said Peter Buck and conferring American citizenship upon; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take every step in finding even temporary havens of refuge for those homeless and hounded Jews who can be rescued immediately from the Nazi; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Kingdom of Iraq, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States expressing its most sincere congratulations for the brilliant victory won by the Allied Armies and its confidence that final victory will be on the side of the armies of democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 2734. A bill for the relief of Kathleen B. Maier; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 2735. A bill for the relief of Harvey Canal, Land and Improvement Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2736. A bill for the relief of E. Sullivan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2737. A bill granting a pension to Jack N. Nelson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 2738. A bill for the relief of Edward Letchford; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

792. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from W. G. Cisne, of the Southern Illinois Normal University, of Carbondale, Ill.; one from Lucy K. Woody, dean of women at said university; and also one from Nella Matthews, student at said university, urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

793. Also, resolution of Harrisburg Trades and Labor Assembly, of Harrisburg, Ill., presented by P. J. Herron, president, and Frank McIntosh, secretary, urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

794. Also, resolution of the Harrisburg Kiwanis Club, of Harrisburg, Ill., signed by Eugene V. Morris, president, and Steward Radford, secretary of said club, urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

795. By Mr. HOPE: Petition submitted by sundry citizens of Great Bend, Kans., favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

796. Also, petition submitted by citizens of Oxford, Kans., favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

797. By Mr. FORD: Resolution of the Los Angeles Parlor, No. 45, Native Sons of the Golden West, requesting Congress to investigate the Japanese activities of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America and the conduct of the War Relocation Authority, also that the Japanese in the United States be kept in concentration camps under the supervision of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

798. By Mr. CASE: Petitions of F. E. Stelom, commander, and Fred Gellerman, camp adjutant, John W. Laughlin Post, No. 12, United Spanish War Veterans, Pierre, S. Dak., urging action on House bill 2350, to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain; to the Committee on Pensions.

799. Also, petition of Mrs. Iry Rene Voegtle, president, and members of Battle Mountain Auxiliary, United Spanish War Veterans, urging action on House bill 2350, to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain; to the Committee on Pensions.

800. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of sundry citizens of Ohio petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

801. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of the National Association of Postal Supervisors, Branch 43, Boston, Mass., favoring the passage of Senate bill 277 and House bill 988; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

802. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of J. G. Elliott and other residents of the Wheeling

area of West Virginia, urging the establishment of a Chiropractic Corps in the armed forces now; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

803. Also, petition of Ida Remick and other residents of the Wheeling area, West Virginia, urging the establishment of a Chiropractic Corps in the armed forces now; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

804. By Mr. SHAFER: Petition of Mabel G. Jacobs and 220 other citizens of Battle Creek, Mich., supporting House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

805. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of 16 residents of Franklin County, urging enactment of adequate laws to speed production of materials and supplies for our men in service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

806. Also, petition of 62 residents of Franklin County, urging enactment of adequate laws to speed production of materials and supplies for our men in service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

807. Also, petition of 65 residents of Franklin County, urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

808. Also, petition of 130 residents of Franklin County, urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

809. Also, petition of 47 residents of Franklin County, urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

810. Also, petition of 21 residents of Franklin County, urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

811. Also, petition of 42 residents of Franklin County, urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

812. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Office of the city clerk of Springfield, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Americans all-immigrants all program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

813. Also, petition of Francis Jean Reuter, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to petition No. 221, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

814. Also, petition of Francis Jean Reuter, petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to petition 221, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

815. Also, petition of Francis Jean Reuter, petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to petition No. 221, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

816. Also, petition of Francis Jean Reuter, petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to petition No. 221, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God, author of liberty, across the struggling years, again and again hast Thou used human voices as the silver trumpets of Thy purposes and decrees. As here this day in this shrine of each patriot's devotion is heard the clarion tones of a great captain of his time, the pillar of a people's hope, we give Thee hearty thanks that Thou hast raised him up for such a time as this. We remember with gratitude that in dark days of crisis and alarm the words of this mighty man of valor—winged words which girdled the earth—dispelled panic and despair; that his phrases have kept men on their feet; that it has been given to him to utter words gushing from the deepest springs of our common language, words of faith, fortitude, memory, hope, pride, humility, terrible as an army with banners, as they have voiced the righteous wrath of outraged peoples and pronounced the sure doom of those who have defiled and blasphemed the holy of holies in the temple of human freedom.

As partners in this crusade to make men free, may Thy blessing rest upon Britain and America, and upon all the global strategy now being planned by the leaders of the two Commonwealths. We thank Thee for our shared ideals of decency, honor, and chivalry, for the roots of our Christian culture reaching deep into the rich soil of the storied island which is the garden whence came the seeds of our own freedom. Through our shared blood and sweat and tears bring us the common victory for the inalienable rights of all men everywhere. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 17, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 649) to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska relating to the waters of the Republican River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote flood control in the basin, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 629) to authorize the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Minnesota to such State for use for park, recreational, or wildlife-refuge purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2346) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STARNES of Alabama, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. POWERS, and Mr. ENGEL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DISNEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. JENKINS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control;

H. R. 128. An act to authorize a per capita payment of $10 to the members of the Santa Clara Pueblo of New Mexico from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 329. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to incur obligations for the benefit of natives of Alaska in advance of the enactment of legislation making appropriations therefor;

H. R. 1004. An act to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class application fees upon resumption of publication;

H. R. 1258. An act to name certain locks in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan;

H. R. 1396. An act making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States;

H. R. 1403. An act to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla.;

H. R. 1997. An act to repeal section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone;

H. R. 2047. An act to correct an error and to confirm, as of March 2, 1861, the title to certain saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to Edward Holden;

H. R. 2105. An act extending the time for repayment and authorizing increase of the revolving fund for the benefit of the Crow Indians;

H. R. 2143. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.;

H. R. 2185. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the purposes of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to purchase logs, lumber, and other forest products;

H. R. 2583. An act to provide for the reorganization of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2584. An act to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2587. An act to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes";

H. R. 2714. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution commemorating May 15, 1943, as the anniversary of the inauguration of Air Mail Service.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications, which were referred as indicated:

ESTIMATES AND SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. Doc. No. 44)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia, amounting to $11,628.29, fiscal year 1942 and prior fiscal years, and supplemental estimates of appropriations, fiscal year 1943, amounting to $976,603.41 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 45)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1943, amounting to $400,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following petitions, etc., which were referred as indicated:

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of Missouri; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 10

"Whereas the conscience of the civilized world has been outraged by the continued persecution and extermination of many peoples in the conquered countries of Europe; and

"Whereas at the conclusion of this war a great number of the oppressed and downtrodden people of Europe will find themselves homeless, despoiled, and desperately in need of a refuge to reconstruct their shattered lives; and

"Whereas the Jewish people of Europe are victims of Nazi oppression and attempted extermination, not only in occupied Europe but also within Nazi Germany; and

"Whereas pursuant to the treaties of peace terminating the First World War a mandate was issued and approved by 52 nations, including the United States, for a Jewish national home in Palestine; and

"Whereas this policy was concurred in by a joint resolution adopted unanimously by both Houses of the Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, and approved by the President on September 21, 1922: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second General Assembly of Missouri (the senate concurring therein) express its most profound sympathy toward the victims of Nazi religious persecution and racial hatred; and be it further

"Resolved, That we urge the fullest cooperation of the United States in punishing those responsible for this horrible crime against humanity and to alleviate suffering through an international rescue agency; and be it further

"Resolved, That we favor the continued development of a Jewish national home in Palestine for the absorption of as many Jews as may be required by the urgent need of the Jewish people and the development there of a Jewish commonwealth as an integral part of the new democratic world order in accordance with the principles for which the United Nations are now fighting; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the President of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Approved May 12, 1943, at 11:46 a. m.

"FORREST C. DONNELL,
"Governor."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Texas; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 85

"Whereas the persecution and attempted extermination of the Jews in occupied Europe by Nazi Germany have outraged the conscience of the civilized world; and

"Whereas on the basis of authentic information in the hands of the United States Department of State, at least 2,000,000 Jews have been ruthlessly annihilated, and the remainder of the Jewish communities in Europe stand in immediate danger of similar extermination unless prompt action is taken by the United Nations to provide havens of refuge for them; and

"Whereas tens of thousands of Jews are stranded in European ports desperately seeking rescue; and

"Whereas the Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917, guaranteeing the establishment of a Jewish National Homeland in Palestine was approved by 52 nations, including the United States, and incorporated into the treaties of peace terminating the First World War; and

"Whereas this policy was concurred in by a joint resolution adopted by both Houses of the Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, and approved by the President on September 21, 1922, and implemented by the Anglo-American treaty of December 3, 1924: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That we express our most profound sympathy toward the victims of Nazi religious persecution and racial hatred; and be it further

"Resolved, That the United Nations be urged to take steps to find even temporary havens of refuge, through an international rescue agency, for those homeless and hounded Jews who can be rescued immediately; and be it further

"Resolved, That we urge that all barriers on Jewish immigration into Palestine be now removed so that those Jews who can find escape from Axis-dominated Europe have permanent haven in the land of Israel in their urgent need; and we view with favor the absorption of all Jews into Palestine after the war who need or desire to go there, not only as an act of justice to the Jewish people, but as an integral part of a new democratic world order in which every people shall have the right to self-government and self-determination in accordance with the principles for which we now fight; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Mr. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to the British Embassy in Washington for transmission to the proper authorities in London.

"Approved April 8, 1943.

"COOKE R. STEVENSON,
"Governor."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Immigration:

"House Concurrent Resolution 42

"Whereas Peter Henry Buck, for many years an honored resident of Honolulu, T. H., a British subject, part white and part Polynesian, is in every way qualified for American citizenship except that he is ineligible for naturalization under presently existing law; and

"Whereas said Peter Henry Buck is thoroughly imbued with the principles of democracy, is attached to the Constitution of the United States, and is desirous and ambitious to become a citizen of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be earnestly and respectfully requested to enact a law naturalizing the said Peter Henry Buck, and conferring American citizenship upon him; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Delegate in Congress for Hawaii."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 20

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, to permit the commission to grant certain licenses

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-second Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby requested to amend section 207 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, by adding thereto a new paragraph to be designated (c), which shall read as follows:

"'(c) The commission is also authorized to grant licenses to churches, hospitals, public schools, and stores (the latter to be owned by lessees or by organizations formed and controlled by said lessees) for lots within the district in which agricultural lands are leased under the provisions of this section'; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 14

"Concurrent resolution declaring that the Territory of Hawaii shall be made a State, and requesting and urging the Congress of the United States of America to pass an enabling act authorizing the people of the Territory of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii is an integral part of the United States of America and for a long period of years has demonstrated its ability to govern itself; and

"Whereas no less an authority than the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, has given public recognition of the qualities of Hawaii's citizens, saying in an interview to the press in Washington that the administration has full confidence in the ability of the citizens of Hawaii to regulate their civil affairs in closest harmony with military requirements and continue to bear proudly the responsibilities of their geographical location; and

"Whereas the population and wealth of the Territory exceeds that of several of the States of the Union; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii contribute in income taxes to the Federal Government a larger amount than many of the States of the Union; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory desire to participate in the Government of the

United States freely, fully, and loyally as a sovereign State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii (the house of representatives concurring), That the people of the Territory of Hawaii desire that said Territory shall become a State and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States;

"That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, requested and urged to pass an act enabling the people of the Territory of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States."

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors for the County of Hawaii, T. H., endorsing the senate concurrent resolution adopted by the Senate of the Twenty-second Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting the Congress to modify the naturalization laws so as to provide machinery whereby Filipinos may become citizens of the United States by naturalization; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 332. A bill for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen; with amendments (Rept. No. 244).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 787. A bill for the relief of Samuel Jacobs, Bertha Jacobs, and Harry Jacobs; with amendments (Rept. No. 245).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1025. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; with amendments (Rept. No. 246).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. Res. 147. Resolution to pay certain expenses incurred in investigating health conditions and fire escapes in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 254), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days; without amendment (Rept. No. 248).

By Mr. BUSHFIELD, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 777. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia," approved February 24, 1914; with amendments (Rept. No. 249); and

H. R. 2115. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 250).

By Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 2159. A bill to provide for special assessments for the laying of curbs and gutters; without amendment (Rept. No. 253).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 2486. A bill to authorize the appointment as ensigns in the Coast Guard of all graduates of the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 251); and

H. R. 2581. A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 252).

REPORT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, for the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably, with amendments, House bill 1762, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 247) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, also for the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], in this connection, in accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to House bill H. R. 1762, the independent offices appropriation bill, which has just been reported, certain amendments, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments above referred to by Mr. McKELLAR are as follows:

On page 32, in line 24, after the figures, insert the following: ": *Provided*, That the salary of the Assistant Comptroller General shall be at the rate of $10,000 per annum effective on the date of enactment of this act, so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

And on page 42, in line 25, before the period, insert ": *Provided further*, That the Administrator may, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transfer to this authorization or to an authorization of a constituent unit from funds available for administrative expenses of the constituent units or the Office of the Administrator of the National Housing Agency such additional sums as represent a consolidation in the Office of the Administrator or in a constituent unit of any of the administrative functions of the National Housing Agency; but no such transfer of funds shall be made unless the consolidation will result in a reduction in manpower and a savings in administrative expenses, which savings shall not be used for administrative expenses but instead shall be returned to or remain in the funds from which administrative expenses are drawn under this authorization."

Mr. McKELLAR (for Mr. GLASS) also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1762, the independent offices appropriation bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice and amendments.)

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Several officers for appointment as first lieutenants in the Medical Corps, Regular Army, under the provisions of law; and

Sundry cadets, graduates of the United States Military Academy, to be second lieutenants, all in the Regular Army.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1115. A bill to provide for the exercise by the United States of certain jurisdiction over persons within areas in the Republic of Panama, the temporary use of which for defense purposes is granted to the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1116 (by request). A bill to provide for the classification of the public lands in Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 1117. A bill for the relief of Chi-Kwong Leung Tom; to the Committee on Immigration.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 6. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control; and

H. R. 1396. An act making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 128. An act to authorize a per capita payment of $10 to the members of the Santa Clara Pueblo of New Mexico from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the United States;

H. R. 329. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to incur obligations for the benefit of natives of Alaska in advance of the enactment of legislation making appropriations therefor;

H. R. 2105. An act extending the time for repayment and authorizing increase of the revolving fund for the benefit of the Crow Indians;

H. R. 2143. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.; and

H. R. 2185. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the purposes of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to purchase logs, lumber, and other forest products; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 1997. An act to repeal section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third time zone; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 1004. An act to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class application fees upon resumption of publication; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads

H. R. 2047. An act to correct an error and to confirm, as of March 2, 1861, the title to certain saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to Edward Holden; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 2714. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 2583. An act to provide for the reorganization of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2584. An act to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2587. An act to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes"; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 1258. An act to name certain locks in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan;

H. R. 1403. An act to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla.; and

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution commemorating May 15, 1943, as the anniversary of the inauguration of Air Mail Service; to the Committee on Commerce.

FEDERAL GRANTS IN AID OF TRAINING OF NURSES—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, House bill 2664 to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes, came over from the House of Representatives and was referred to the Committee on Commerce. As indicated, this is the nurses' training bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] introduced a companion bill in the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. Hearings have been held on the Senate bill, and the committee has acted upon it. I have talked with the Senator from North Carolina, who is the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, and he asked me to request that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 2664, and that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the change of reference will be made as requested by the Senator from Utah.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. MALONEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. LUCAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32, as amended, of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1935, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, funds appropriated by or for the purposes of section 32 of said act shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the maintenance, expansion, and operation of a school milk and lunch program under clause (2) of said section 32: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available for such purposes without regard to the requirement therein relating to the encouragement of domestic consumption."

POST-WAR PLANNING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on post-war planning delivered by Senator ROBERTSON in Washington May 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION BY STATUTE—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Changing the Constitution by Statute," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of May 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gerry	Overton
Bailey	Gillette	Pepper
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barbour	Gurney	Revercomb
Barkley	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hawkes	Robertson
Bone	Hayden	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Lodge	Tobey
Butler	Lucas	Tunnell
Byrd	McCarran	Tydings
Capper	McClellan	Vandenberg
Caraway	McFarland	Van Nuys
Chandler	McKellar	Wagner
Chavez	McNary	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wheeler
Connally	Mead	Wherry
Danaher	Millikin	White
Davis	Moore	Wiley
Eastland	Murdock	Willis
Ellender	Nye	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent, attending the funeral of the late Representative Englebright, of California.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of the death of his wife.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

REQUEST TO BE EXCUSED FROM SERVICE AS CONFEREE ON TAX BILL

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, when the tax bill was passed last Friday, the Chair honored me by appointing me one of the conferees on the part of the Senate. I feel that I am wholly out of sympathy with the Senate's attitude on the tax bill, and I request that I be excused from serving as a conferee.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESS TO MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS BY RT. HON. WINSTON CHURCHILL, PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as we all know, the Right Honorable Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain, is to address the Members of the two Houses today. It is desired that the Members of the Senate leave the Chamber at once in order to arrive in the House and give time for the necessary preliminaries to be attended to before Mr. Churchill shall begin his address. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, and that the Members of the Senate proceed in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until

tomorrow, Thursday, May 20, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Members of the Senate, headed by the Vice President, the Secretary (Edwin A. Halsey), and the Sergeant at Arms (Wall Doxey), proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 19, 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

William R. Langdon, of Massachusetts, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Rollin R. Winslow, of Michigan, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Daniel V. Anderson, of Delaware, now a Foreign Service officers of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Basil Manly, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1948 (reappointment).

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM JUNE 1, 1943

Corps of Engineers

John Calvin Bell, Jr.
James Allen Betts
Roland Alfred Brandt
Robert Emmet Burrows, Jr.
John Francis Buyers
Ernest Arthur Buzalski
David Smith Chamberlain
Boyd Blaine Chambers, Jr.
Joseph Vincent Chaufty
Howard Beverly Coffman, Jr.
David Baldwin Conard
James Franklin Deatherage
Francis John Dirkes
Clyde Tener Earnest
Thomas William Essen
William Daniel Falck
Clare Francis Farley
Jesse LeRoy Fishback
Hiram Garrett Fuller
William Mitchel Glasgow, Jr.
Walter James Hutchin
Glenn Paul Ingwersen
Walker Jamar, Jr.
John Joseph Kelly, Jr.
Lansford Franklin Kengle, Jr.
Bruce Carlton Koch
Edward Francis McCabe
Robert Bruce McDowell
William Hill McKenzie 3d
Robert Edward Mathe
Donald John Mehrtens
Richard Hemmig Meyer
John Woodland Morris
Robert William Newman
Harold Robert Parfitt
Norman Erland Pehrson
Milton Keith Pigg
Samuel Williams Pinnell
Fred Beaver Proctor
Charles Sumner Reed, Jr.
Richard Henry Reitmann
Frank William Rhea
Warren Rogers
Henry Romanek
William Fredrick Roos
Kenneth Trevor Sawyer
Gordon Albert Schraeder
Frank Bertram Smith
Richard Concklin Snyder
Milton Ernst Steinbring
Arthur Thurston Surkamp
Lawrence Edwin Swank
Duane Paul Tenney
Lorres Charles Thomas
Ranald Otis Whitaker
Bernard Nathaniel Wiener
Crawford Young

Signal Corps

Mike Bedwell Davis
Harold Warren Gingrich
Peter John Ryan
John Patrick Schatz

Cavalry

Clarke Tileston Baldwin, Jr.
John Stanley Brady
Robert Douglas Danforth
Robert Daspit Dwan
Herman Turner Hunt, Jr.
Edwin Milton Rhoads
Stanley Marcell Staszak
Warren Leigh Taylor

Field Artillery

George Louis Alexander
Robert John Barickman
Raymond Carlton Blatt, Jr.
LeVerne Edwin Blount
William Harold Brabson, Jr.
James Alexander Brice
Stephen Oliver Brown
Edward Burr 2d
Robert Hansen Campbell
Austin James Canning, Jr.
Hamlet Robinson Carter, Jr.
John Henry Cochran, Jr.
Reginald Bifield Cocroft, Jr.
William Worthington Cover
Charles Leonard Crane, Jr.
Fearn Field
Kenneth Edgar Freed
Stephen Ellison Gordy
Bobbie Allen Griffin
Leslie Boone Hardy
Ralph Julian Hill
Ernest Hinds
Ralph Kilbreth Jones
John Russell Lloyd, Jr.
James Norris Lothrop, Jr.
Jack Patrick Loughman
John Porter Lucas, Jr.
Wallace Clifton Magathan, Jr.
William Francis Malone
Walter George Mitchell, Jr.
John Wills Moses
Edward Stanley Ott, Jr.
Nicholson Parker
James Walter Phillips
Robert Ernest Plett
William Earnest Pulos
Robert Lee Rooker
Francis Wingate Saul
Henry John Schroeder, Jr.
Leon Sembach
Gordon Lord Smith
Donald Calhoun Spiece
George William Thompson, Jr.
Jonathan Sawyer Vordermark
Joseph William Weyrick
Richard Frank Wilhelm
LeRoy Waring Wilson, Jr.
Richard Marshall Winfield, Jr.
Jack Coleman Winn, Jr.
Lucius Featherstone Wright, Jr.
Ivan Willard York, Jr.

Coast Artillery Corps

Charles Richard Abel
William Bruce Arnold
Charles Edward Benson
George Betts
Quellen Denis Boller
John Buchanan Bond
Joseph Francis Boyle
Frank Peter Breitenbach
John Metcalf Broderick
George Thomas Campbell, Jr.
Robert W. Clark
Edmond Harvey Curcuru
Paul Joseph Curtin
Lawton Davis
John Taylor deCamp, Jr.
Charles Wendell Dickinson
Bernard Joseph Dyla
Thomas McGahey Elgin
Albert Murray Ellis
Lawrence Michael Fitzpatrick
Louis Sterling Francisco
Robert Galbreath Gadd
Edward Joseph Geaney, Jr.
Stewart Shepherd Giffin, Jr.
Thorpe Coalson Grice
Joseph Wentworth Hartman
Leo Victor Hayes
Robert Milton Holmes
William Patrick Hunt, Jr.
Page Spencer Jackson
Donald Joseph Jalbert
Sidney Katz
Norman Jay Keefer, Jr.
James Francis Keenan
Edward Anthony Kreml
Arthur Joseph Lacouture, Jr.
James Douglas Langstaff, Jr.
William Clyde Linton, Jr.
Robert Hamilton Mattox, Jr.
Harry Mazur
Charles William Milmore
Jesse Herschell Nash
Harold Alexander Neill
Douglas Francis Parham
Laurent Dupre Pavy
Paul James Reinhalter
Ralph Joseph Renzulli
Walter Leo Roe
Hal Thomas Rose
Edward Rumpf, Jr.
Russell Faux Scott, Jr.
Edward Fondren Shaifer, Jr.
Alton Martin Shipstead
Eduardo Miguel Soler
Basil Dennis Spalding, Jr.
Max Verne Talbot, Jr.
Jack Teague.
William Holmes Tomlinson.
Louis Blanton Umlauf, Jr.
Wendell Grant VanAuken, Jr.
James Kuykendall Wade
Charles Donovan Warburton
Howard Tilghman Wickert, Jr.
Reading Wilkinson, Jr.
Charles Allan Wilson, Jr.
Stanley Livingston Wilson, Jr.
Franklin Wood
Ralph Edgar Young

Infantry

Harold Robert Aaron
John Edward Abbott, Jr.
Edward Mallory Almond, Jr.
Quintus C. Atkinson 5th
John Blair Beach
William Lawrence Bibby
Garland Cuzorte Black, Jr.
Mark Mayo Boatner 3d
Alexander Russell Bolling, Jr.
John Klotz Brier
Heber Cowan Brill
James Edward Browning
George Gordon Bugg
Allen Mitchell Burdett, Jr.
James Webster Cain
William Michael Calnan
George Gordon Cantlay, Jr.
David Marston Chase
James Vincent Christy
Edward Ryan Cleary
Francis Harold Cloudman, Jr.
John Hiley Cobb, Jr.
Caleb Allen Cole
John Walter Collins 3d
Roger Leon Conarty
Robert Sherman Culbertson
Daniel Bernard Cullinane, Jr.
James Richard Darden
Robert James Davenport
William Paul DeBrocke
William Cleveland Deekle, Jr.
Frank David Derouin
Argonne Call Dixon
Harold Haisey Dunwoody
Joseph Harry Eastmead

Bethell Edrington, Jr.
Mayo Jack Elliott
Robert Charles Foisey
Seth Roderick Frear
Edgar Jesse Fredericks
Robert Joseph Gilles
James Keith Glendening
Ronan Calistus Grady, Jr.
James Franklin Greene, Jr.
William James Greenwalt
Archelaus Lewis Hamblen, Jr.
Robert Hanna
Herbert Pierre Harper
Harold Sears Head
Warren Robert Hecker
Albert Carl Hegenberger
Fred Willard Herres, Jr.
Roger Hilsman, Jr.
Benedict Francis Hoffmann
Jarrett Matthew Huddleston
John Bowler Hull
Thomas Lea Hutchings, Jr.
Gabriel Alexander Ivan
Thomas Terrell Jackson
Samuel Wright Jenkins
Earle Albie Johnson, Jr.
Alan Walter Jones, Jr.
Charles Myers Jones, Jr.
Frank Williams Jones, Jr.
Harry Jesse Kenyon
James Donald Kidder
Thomas James Laudani
Bernard Thomas Lewis
Robert Louis McCanna
Dale Fletcher McGee, Jr.
John Price Mattfeldt
Weston Fisher Maughan
Albert Caswell Metts, Jr.
James Cleveland Miller, Jr.
George Robert Moe
Henry Grady Morgan, Jr.
Roule Cole Mozingo
Robert Wells Neilson, Jr.
John Henry Nelson
George Edward Newman
John Henry Norton
Alvin Ernest Orlian
Richard Cameron Orphan
William Oliver Peak 3d
Donald Charles Pence
Del Sullivan Perkins
Phil Roy Phelps, Jr.
Charles De Puckett
Randell Jacob Purcell
Arthur Henry Rasper, Jr.
Roger Ray
William Johnson Ray
Harry Langdon Reeder, Jr.
Clarence Walter Richmond, Jr.
Bernard William Rogers
Harold Jacob Saine
James Harvey Short
David Lester Smith
Robert Daniel Sonstelie
William Joseph Spahr
Burrowes Goldthwaite Stevens, Jr.
John Buchanan Stockton
Jeptha Charles Tanksley
Thomas Kelly Tannler
Hubert Edward Tansey
Arnold Robert Tucker, Jr.
Alfred Ferdynand Tyrala
Arthur William VanSchoick, Jr.
Fletcher Read Veach, Jr.
William John Welsh, Jr.
Clarence Richard Westfall
Norman Lewis Williams
Karl Everett Wolf
Owens Herbert Yeuell

Air Corps

Millard Othello Anderson
Paul Gregory Atkinson, Jr.
Frank Putnam Ball
Roger Clawson Ball
Ben Butler Barnes
Gordon Winthrop Barrett, Jr.
Richard Edward Beck
Thomas Archer Beckett
Walter Rae Beckett, Jr.
Richard Nichols Berry
Jonas LeMoyne Blank
Andrew Boreske, Jr.
Ernest Francis Boruski, Jr.
Tonnis Boukamp
James Alfred Bower
Albert John Bowley
Freeman Wate Bowley, Jr.
William Jasper Brake
Cullen Albert Brannon, Jr.
William Paul Brierty
Leo Cooper Brooks
Alston Law Brown
Thomas Huntington Brown
Oliver Boone Bucher, Jr.
Edward Burke Burdett
Walter Neal Burnette, Jr.
William Hunter Burns 3d
Charles William Carson, Jr.
Benjamin Buckles Cassiday, Jr.
John Seymoure Chandler, Jr.
Marvin Edward Childs
Robert Herman Clark
Heston Charles Cole
Edward Hanson Connor 3d
Leo Eugene Conway
Clifford Charles Cornell, Jr.
Richard Ray Coursey, Jr.
Ernest Thorpe Cragg
William Edward Cramsie
Alan Francis Crump
Ronald Dennis Cullen
Edward Wellage Cutler
William Joseph Daner
Donald Salmon Dargue
Jack Talmadge Davis
John McArthur Davis
Douglas Lipp Deal
Donald Alburtus Detwiler
William Bradford Dudley
Anthony Raymond Durante
John Wyeth Earhart, Jr.
Preston Warham Easley
Phillips Eastman, Jr.
Oliver Richard English
William Earl Evers
James Thomas Fitz-Gerald, Jr.
Henry Merritt Fletcher, Jr.
James Dixon Fore
Tom Bond Foulk, Jr.
Norman Horace Frisbie
Charles Arthur Gaignat
David Emanuel Galas
Thomas Simons Garrett 3d
Vincent Augustus Gaudiani, Jr.
Eaton Arthur Gorelangton
William James Greene
Allen Wyant Gullion, Jr.
Alfred Dale Hagen
Ralph Junior Hallenbeck
Jack Willming Hammel
Robert Maxwell Hancock, Jr.
Burton Clement Hanish
Teague Gray Harris, Jr.
Frank James Harrold, Jr.
Martin Lee Harter
Paul Andre Hederstrom, Jr.
Harry Ludwick Heintzelman 3d
Richard Tilghman Hemsley 3d
Robert Alvin Hersberger
Edward Jerome Hertel
Robert William Hoffman
Henry Leon Hogan 3d
Arthur William Holderness, Jr.
John Mahlon Hommel
Luther Walker Hough, Jr.
Richard Hugh Houser
Joseph Hipolito Huau, Jr.
John Bell Hudson
Ullin Lee Hudson
Herschel DeMent Hughes
Paul Joseph Hurley
George Howard Ingham
Clare Thompson Ireland, Jr.
Felix Andrew Kalinski
James Moulton Keck
William Joseph Kilpatrick, Jr.
Harold Ferguson Knowles
John Roger Kullman
Harvey Haroldson Latson, Jr.
Hanford Nichols Lockwood 3d
Thomas McAdoo Love
William David Lutz
Richard Curry McAdam
Thomas Eugene McCabe
Donald DeForest McClure
Robert Dugald McClure
Richard David McCord
Jack Kenneth McGregor
Jack Mann McGregor
Frank McCoy McMullen
John Robert McNiel
Laurence Ronald MacDonnell
Robert John MacMullin
Gayle Eugene Madison
Maurice Langhorne Martin
William Wintle Martin
Russell Lowell Maughan, Jr.
Richard Victor Miracle
William Clarence Moore
Christopher Henry Munch
David Duncan Munro 3d
John Walter Myrtetus
William Edward Naylor, Jr.
Louis Konrad Nesselbush
John Jacob Neuer
Jack Conrad Novak
Edmund Francis O'Connor
Robin Olds
Thomas Kilbury Oliver
Earl Oren Olmstead, Jr.
Robert Evans Orr
Norbert Joseph Oswald
Stanley Carter Pace
Richard Henry Parker
Jammie Mendal Philpott
John Charles Piebes
Waldo Franklin Potter
Ernest Collier Price
James Rival Pugh, Jr.
Robert Duncan MacGregor Randall
John William Rawlings, Jr.
James Cabell Reed
Edward Julius Renth, Jr.
Anthony Henry Richard, Jr.
Coleman Cabell Richards
Zaccheus Camp Richardson
Scott Brewer Ritchie, Jr.
Robert John Rooney
Joseph Henry Rosness
Francis Earle Rundell 2d
George LeRoy Russell
Ned Schramm, Jr.
David Gibbon Schwartz
Ralph Meloy Scott
William Fontaine Scott
Richard Francis Shaefer
Daniel Francis Shea
Stephen Huntting Sherrill, Jr.
Albert Raymond Shiely, Jr.
Lindsey McDonald Silvester
Eber Eugene Simpson
Elwood Frank Smith
Hubert Smith, Jr.
J. Weller Smith
Kenneth Bates Smith
Lowell Blair Smith
William Wayne Snavely
Charles Spieth, Jr.
Gordon Hall Steele, Jr.
Paul Leonard Steinle
Richard Carlton Stickney, Jr.
Richard Williams Stoddard
Marion Scott Street
Richard Donald Sullivan
Firman Edward Susank
Dale Sidney Sweat
John James Swisshelm
Franklin Woody Taylor
Ralph Jamison Teetor, Jr.
Junior Craig Teller
James Robert Thomas
Albert Sidney Johnston Tucker, Jr.
Vernon Richard Turner
Francis Veazy Walker
James Harper Walker
Charles Skillman Waller
Edward Joseph Walsh, Jr.
Edward Menefee Watkins, Jr.
James Howard Watkins
Lawrence Middleton Watson
William Glenn Watson

Lewis Frazer Webster
Marston Thorn Westbrook
J. Duane Wethe
William Joseph Whalen
Richard Vincent Wheeler
Keith Albert Whitaker
Jack Henderson Whitson
Warren Tanner Whittemore
Fred Ordway Wickham, Jr.
Louis Charles Wieser
Richard Bocock Willis, Jr.
Harold William Woodson
Edmund Augustus Wright, Jr.
Howard Greenlees Yeilding
Michael Zubon
Lloyd Zuppann, Jr.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM JUNE 3, 1943

Corps of Engineers

Thomas Matkins Johnston

Air Corps

Edgar Knowles Parks, Jr.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the 9th day of June 1943:

Alden W. Adams, Jr.
Carl J. Adams
Donald L. Adams
John C. Adams, Jr.
Ollie B. Adams
Robert E. Adamson, Jr.
Alfred H. Ahrens
Herbert S. Ainsworth
Baret V. Ajemian
Douglas R. Aldrich
James H. Aldrich
Robert J. Alexander
Stewart P. Alexander, Jr.
William H. Alexander, 2d
James R. Allen, Jr.
Charles B. Almy
Lawrence M. Amburgey
Delano Ames 3d
William C. Amick, Jr.
Kenneth LeR. Anderson
Robert E. Apple
Paul E. Arbo
Ernest S. Arnold
Julian Arnold, Jr.
Jerome L. Ashcroft, Jr.
Raymond H. Aull, Jr.
Robert K. Awtrey, Jr.
Americus V. H. Bacon, Jr.
Robert G. Bagby
David H. Bagley
Charles E. Bagwell
John J. Bailey, Jr.
Robert E. Bailey
Gage L. Baker
James G. Baker
Lorenzo W. Baldwin, Jr.
Salvatore Balestrieri
John A. Ballard, Jr.
Henry S. Barbour
Bernard B. Barila, Jr.
Frank O. Barrett, Jr.
William B. Barrow, Jr.
Robert P. Bartlett
James S. Bartman
Francis D. Barton
John R. Bass
Arthur LaG. Battson, Jr.
Wesley O. Baumann
Harold E. Baumberger
Charles Becker
Frank J. Behounek
William W. Behrens, Jr.
Louis E. Benitez
George O. Bennett
William L. Bennett, Jr.
Harry Benoit, Jr.
William C. Bergstedt
Joseph L. Berry
Robert C. Biché
Edward Biddle
Francis N. Biewer
Robert A. Bird
Joseph E. Bissanti
Elmer E. Blackburn
Ralph R. Blaine
Russell E. Blalack
Raymond E. Bock
Lewis F. Bogan
Norman C. Bohan
William F. Bond
William R. Boose
Robert J. Booze
Robert A. Boscole
Robert L. Bothwell
Donald H. Bourque
Harland R. Bowdey
Richard E. Bowe
Rodney H. Bowman
Joseph L. Boyd, Jr.
Laurel B. Boyd
William F. Boyer, Jr.
Gordon R. Boyes
Jon L. Boyes
Robert C. Brand
Robert I. Bristow
Stanley H. Brittingham
Clarence C. Brock, Jr.
David M. Brooks
Daniel P. Brooks
Albert M. Brouner
James E. Brown
Thomas H. Brown
William E. Brown
John I. Bryan, Jr.
Thomas W. Budd, Jr.
Joseph H. Buescher
William R. Bulloch
Raymond W. Burk
John L. Burke, Jr.
Thomas P. Burke
Harry W. Burkhart, Jr.
Chares W. Burlin, Jr.
Fletcher H. Burnham
Kirk L. Burns
Carl W. Burrows, Jr.
Hugh D. Butler
Cyrus H. Butt
Harold M. Cahn
Harry H. Caldwell
Warren L. Caldwell
Alan R. Cameron
Charles B. Campbell, Jr.
Norman F. Campbell
William C. Campbell
Anthony T. Capriotti, Jr.
Richard W. Carkeek
Thomas L. Carlin
Albert P. Carpenter
John E. Carr
Robert T. Carr
Albert C. Carson
George D. Casey
Martin M. Casey, Jr.
William C. Casey
Vincent L. Cassani, Jr.
Pierre R. Cassidy
Hal C. Castle
William H. Catha
James H. Chadwick, Jr.
Walter D. Chadwick
William C. Chapman
James M. Chase
Luther T. Chesnut 3d
Dan G. Christiansen
Thomas J. Christman
Robert W. Clack
James J. Clancy
Gilbert L. Clark
Graham M. Clark
Morris Y. Clark
William P. O. Clarke, Jr.
Frank W. Clift 3d
Alvin L. Cohen
Lanier G. Cole
William B. Collett 3d
David H. Collins
Jesse R. Collins
Benjamin H. Colmery, Jr.
Robert P. Coogan
Creighton W. Cook
Robert H. Cook
Thomas H. Cooper 3d
Lawrence A. Corcoran
Ernest S. Cornwall, Jr.
Theodore A. Coronel
Roy B. Cowdrey
Donald V. Cox
Elmer F. Crain, Jr.
Shannon D. Cramer, Jr.
Charles N. Crandall, Jr.
John J. Creamer
Oreal J. Crepeau
Alfred R. Croft, Jr.
"J" "J" Crowder, Jr.
William H. Cruise, Jr.
Paul W. Crutchfield, Jr.
John J. Cryan
Matthew A. Cullen, Jr.
John I. Cumberland, Jr.
Harry A. Cummings
Lawrence D. Cummins
Henry O. Cutler
Thomas P. Cutler
Theodore P. Dankworth
Nicholas Dashko
Donald C. Davis
John F. Davis
Shirley A. Davis
Howard W. Dawson
Edward W. Day
Ronald A. Deal, Jr.
Claude N. DeBuhr
David DeHuff
Stephen T. DeLaMater, Jr.
John M. De Largy
Lowell F. Dennis
Richard J. DePrez
Richard A. DeSantis
Henry V. DeWitt, Jr.
Walter J. Dixon, Jr.
John S. Donaldson
William E. Donnelly Jr.
John F. Donovan
Hayes A. Dorr
Allan E. Douglas, Jr.
Herschel M. Downs
Edwin N. Drake
John F. Driscoll
Richard H. DuBois
Frank K. Duerst
Kenneth B. Duke, Jr.
Glenn I. Dumas
Gordon Duncan
Jolly V. Dwyer, Jr.
Joseph E. Dyar, Jr.
Harry D. Eagar
Joseph H. Earnest, Jr.
Russell S. Eaton, Jr.
Henry A. Eimstad
Edgar A. Eldridge
George W. Elliott
Michael M. Elliott
Alfred G. Elpern
Charles S. Ely, Jr.
Junius P. Epps
William P. Etter
Nicholas A. Evans
Ernest G. Fanning, Jr.
Louis A. Farber
Richard D. Faubion
Richard C. Fedon
Henry J. Feltus
John C. Feltus
Emmet F. Ferguson, Jr.
Joseph A. Fernald
Louis B. Fields
Alfred C. Filiatrault, Jr.
Wayne N. Fitzpatrick
William R. Flanagan
William J. Flannery
Charles C. Flowerree
Roger E. Fontaine
Albert T. Ford
Raymond E. Ford
Robert P. Foreman
Newton P. Foss
Willard "B" Fouts
Hardy B. Fowler
Ralph W. Frame, Jr.
Hilton R. Frank
Guy A. Freeling, Jr.
John L. From, Jr.
Richard Gaibler
Charles V. Gardiner
James L. Gartner, Jr.
Edward R. Gaskin
Wilbur F. Gasner
Herman J. Gerdes, Jr.
Edgar J. Gerloff, Jr.
Robert K. Gess
Edgar H. Gibbons, Jr.
Robert E. Gibbons
Richard H. Gibson
William C. Gibson
Robert C. Gibson
Theodore McE. Gilliland
Arthur W. Gillis
Maurice I. Glad
Bruce E. Glendinning
William L. Glodt
Jack E. Godfrey
James R. Goodykoontz, Jr.
Henry Gorman
Gene Goudie
Joseph A. Grace 2d
Leonard G. Graning
William W. Grant, Jr.
Lenson W. Graves
Howard E. Greer
Robert T. Gregory
Jack W. Griffith
Harold J. Grimes
Albert P. Gross
Homer L. Grosskopf, Jr
Kenneth C. Gummerson
Harry B. Gunther
Boyd E. Gustafson
Robert B. Gustafson
George E. Gyongyos
Rufus B. Hailey
Francis H. S. Hall
William R. Hamaker
Charles E. Hamlin
John J. Hancotte, Jr.
Henry R. Hanssen
John S. Hardy
John A. Harkins
Robert B. Harper
George G. Hart
Maurice C. Hartle
John D. Hartley
Robert L. Harvey
Kenneth H. Hausman
Paul L. Havenstein
Robert A. Hawkins
Lorin W. Hay
Charles H. Hayden
Charles L. Hayen
Joseph F. Heald
John J. Heimark
John W. Heintz
Walter A. Helm, Jr.
Russell H. Helsel
David W. Henderson
Stanley W. Henderson
Theodore J. Hennes, Jr.
Daniel W. Herlong
John J. Herrick
Rodger B. Herrington
Adam A. Herron, Jr.
Robert E. Hickle
Thomas P. Higgins
John P. Hilburn
Clarence A. Hill, Jr.
Horace M. Hill
Russell S. Hill
Thomas K. Hill
Harold W. Hiller
Stetson P. Hills
Ernest C. Hipp, Jr.
Horace C. Hogan, Jr.
Leonard A. Hoke, Jr.
James L. Holbrook
Carl F. Holden, Jr.
Ernest W Holloway
Ernest E. Hollyfield, Jr.
McHenry H. Holt
Ralph K. Holter
Walter W. Honour
John H. Hooper
Dean A. Horn
William G. Horton
Thomas B. Howard
Jay S. Howell
Russell A. Hughes
Robert G. Hutzel
Harold N. Hval
Wilmer J. Ilsley, Jr.
Thomas W. Ireland
Dart O. Irwin
Earl J. Isaac, Jr.
Donald G. Jackson
Ralph F. Jackson
Thaddeus J. Jakubowski
Robert L. Janes
Carl R. Jennings
Joe C. Jennings
Kenneth H. Johns
Benjamin F. Jones
Roy E. Jones, Jr.
Russell M. Jonson
Charles L. Joslin, Jr.
George F. Jubb
John C. Kane, Jr.
Eustratios N. Karangelen
Ralph J. Kauffman
William E. Keightley
George A. Keller 3d
John G. Keller
Robert M. Keller
Edmond L. Kelley
Francis J. G. Kelly, Jr.
Donald H. Kelton
Charles K. Kemmell
Robert J. Kendall
Charlton R. King
Evangelist W. King
Randolph W. King
Robert S. Kirby
William P. Kiser
Robert B. Kitt
James B. Klay
Theodore G. Klein
James L. Knight
Sanford L. Knotts
Arthur C. Knox
William H. Knull, Jr.
Alfred G. Kohn
Roald E. Kolstad
Samuel K. Kreutzer, Jr.
Richard J. Krotkiewicz
William E. Kurtz
John F. Laboon, Jr.
Warren C. Lamb
Glenn E. Lambert
Leslie N. Landes
James B. Landon
Jack S. Laney
Peter W. Lang
Norman E. Leach
William F. Leahy
Alan S. Lee
Jonathan Leff
Werner Lendenmann, Jr.
Ben B. Levitt
Robert S. Lewellen
Floyd E. Lewis
James C. Lieber
Donald S. Lindberg
Richard G. Lindsley
Richard B. Linnekin
Joseph D. Lister
John C. Little
John B. Livingston, Jr.
Edward A. Livingstone
Harry H. Loeffler, Jr.
James L. M. Logan
Robert L. J. Long
Malcolm McF. Longinotti
Robert J. Loomis
Harry C. Lowe
Kelton L. Lowery
James J. Lowry
William J. MacGowen
Alan R. MacLeod, Jr.
Robert B. Madsen
George H. Mahoney
Mack C. Maison
Arthur Major
Edgar E. Mallick
Milton G. Malmquist
Herbert K. Manship
Edwin R. Marcus
John M. Martin
Walter F. Martin
James C. Mason
Marvin M. May
Lawrence A. Mayer
Donald W. McCarthy
James E. McCauley
Joseph L. McClane, Jr.
Robert E. McCloskey
Lynde D. McCormick, Jr.
John H. McDonald
John J. McDonald 3d
Robert R. McDonald
John B. McElroy
John L. McGehee, Jr.
Herbert N. McGough
Michael G. McGraw
Richard K. McKibben
Andrew T. McKinney
Warren J. McNamara
Paul C. McNiel, Jr.
William J. McVey
Richard B. Mears
William L. Mellott
Ralph F. Merrill
Charles W. Meshier
James R. Methvin, Jr.
Frederick W. Miehe, Jr.
Donald B. Millar

Charles C. Miller
Charles L. Miller
Donald M. Miller
James Miller
Paul Miller, Jr.
Rupert S. Miller
Donald J. Moe
Eugene J. Monsport
George P. Montgomery, Jr.
Warren G. Montgomery
Walter R. Moore, Jr.
George F. Moran
Edmund R. Morgan
Joseph A. Morgan
Robert L. Morris
Lawrence V. Mowell
Warren R. Mullen
Ragnwald Muller
Walter E. Muller
Douglas Y. Munnikhuysen
Edward D. Napier
Earle A. Nason, Jr.
William N. Nelson, Jr.
Dale V. Ness
Robert W. Netting
Albert M. Neumann
Robert W. Newell
James T. Nicholson, Jr.
Oscar F. Nicholson
Robert E. Nolop
Robert P. Norton
Gordon H. Ochenrider, Jr.
Arthur C. O'Leary, Jr.
Everett J. Olinder
William H. Olsen
Francis J. O'Malley
Lindley M. Osborne
Arthur H. Osgood
Robert E. Osth
Robert F. Oulton
Emil A. Ozimek
Guy V. Padgett
Prescott W. Palmer, Jr.
Dominic A. Paolucci
Andrew J. Papageorge
Benjamin "F" Park
James M. Parker, Jr.
Ivan W. Parkins
Bill B. Parks
Arthur E. Patch
Urey W. Patrick, Jr.
Joseph Patterson, Jr.
Nathan H. Patterson
William A. Patterson, Jr.
William E. Payne, Jr.
Robert N. Pearce
Jack R. Peat
George G. Peery, Jr.
Jack H. Pennington
John E. Perry
Oliver H. Perry, Jr.
John E. Peterson
Robert B. Pettitt
Roy S. Phillips
Paul W. Pinson
William M. Pitcher
John D. Plawchan
Richard L. Ploss
Willard A. Pollard 3d
Leland E. Preston
George D. Prestwich
Harold B. Price
William B. Prigmore
John M. Prosser
Palmer A. Quarles, Jr.
Carey K. Quinn
Richard D. Quinn
Warren H. Raber
William V. Rafferty, Jr.
Wayne P. Ramay
Clyde B. Randall, Jr.
Robert R. Randolph
Hans S. Rasmussen
Frederick E. Rau
Thomas F. Reddington, Jr.
Jerome A. Rehberg
Don B. Rentschler
Robert M. Replogle
James M. Reyback
Ernest E. Reynolds, Jr.
Tom H. Reynolds
Thomas R. Rhees
Francis P. Rhett
Theodore C. Rice
Laurence B. Richardson, Jr.
Henry V. Richardson
Raymond E. Richey
Dan "J" Rienstra, Jr.
William S. Riley
Joseph R. Riordan
Clayton J. Roberts.
Irving A. Robinson
David M. Roney, Jr.
Hugh J. Rosania
Sidney Rose
Hector J. Rosso
Hugh G. Rounds
Charles P. Rozier
Robert L. Rubel
Richard E. Rudisill, Jr.
Alfred G. Russillo
Richard A. Ryzow
Stuart T. Sadler
Edgar B. Salsig
Thomas W. Saltmarsh, Jr.
Elroy C. Sandquist, Jr.
Otho C. Sappenfield
John S. Saxon
Frank G. Schettino
Gerhard W. Schlierf
Charles K. Schmidt
Fred A. Schnurr
Edwin D. Scorza
Maylon T. Scott
Norman Scott, Jr.
Richard E. Seacord
Thomas M. Searles, Jr.
Billy F. Seeger
Aubrey R. Seiler
Joseph F. Sharkey
Hildreth G. Sherman
John O. Sherman, Jr.
Wilbur G. Sherwood
Jack E. Shields
Horatio G. Sickel, Jr.
Clyde W. Siegfried
Joseph J. Silhavy, Jr.
Cecil H. Simpson
Pfaeffle Simpson, Jr.
Coleman W. Sims
Harry E. Sims
William L. Siple
Basil D. Slaymaker
Richard P. Slaymaker
Augustine W. Smith
Charles B. Smith
Edward P. T. Smith, Jr.
Harold J. Smith
Kenneth F. X. Smith
Leon I. Smith, Jr.
Norman S. Smith
William R. Smith, Jr.
Bernard B. Smyth
Edwin K. Snyder
Harry E. Snyder
Thomas A. Sofos
Thomas J. Soisson
James S. Sorrels, Jr.
Joseph A. Southworth
William H. Spratling
William B. Stanard
Roy E. Standard
John C. Standish
John Stanko
William R. Stanton
Philip Steiner
John B. Stetson
James H. Stevens, Jr.
Glenn M. Stewart, Jr.
Albert L. Stickles 2d
Roger A. Stiller
Edward J. Stock
Jackson A. Stockton
Charles R. Stokes
Donald E. Storey
Fred E. Stout, Jr.
John R. Strachan
Raymond W. Strassle
John P. Street
John W. Stribling, Jr.
Jack C. Stuart
Alvin T. Strubel
Louis H. Sugg
Francis J. Suhre
Wayne D. Surface
Charles K. Sutton
Myron B. Sutton
Morton T. Swarth
Charles S. Swift
Joseph W. Talbott
George C. Talley, Jr.
Edward J. Taylor
James W. Taylor
James G. Tench
Scott E. Terrill, Jr.
Arnold G. Thalhamer
Robert R. Thoe
Thomas G. Thomaides
Alvin Thomas
Arthur J. Thompson
Ejnar N. C. Thompson
Joe W. Thornbury
Henry E. Thornhill, Jr.
Jack E. Tingle
Charles H. Tisdale, Jr.
John H. Torbert
Salvatore J. Trapani
John R. Trautmann
Martin J. Travers
Troy R. Trim
Albert R. Trottier
Walter A. Truxler
Charles E. Tucker, Jr.
Charles R. Tucker
William H. Turner
John F. Twigg
Ernest W. Tyler
Charles W. Ullrich
William W. Upshaw
Albert Van Acker
Friend C. Van Fleet, Jr.
Robert G. Van Horne
James C. Van Pelt
Alvin T. Vaughan
Benjamin D. Vaughan
Allen A. Vaughn
Albert H. Vito, Jr.
Frank A. Wadsworth
Charles W. Wakefield
William R. Wakeland
Charles C. Wales
Charles D. Walker
Harold R. Walker
Thomas W. F. Walsh
Hilmon E. Walters, Jr.
Vance R. Wanner
John G. Ward
Thomas G. Ware, Jr.
Donald R. Warfield
David T. Warner
Richard L. Warren
Paul M. Warrington
Charles F. Wasson
George C. Watkins
George W. Watson
David A. Webster
Robert D. Weimer
Howard P. Weirich
Ralph S. Wentworth, Jr.
Thomas S. Westcott
Wynn V. Whidden
Leslie E. White
Willett E. White
Joe L. Whitley
Leo G. D. Wiemer, Jr.
Robert L. Wilcox.
Norman L. Wilky
Victor F. Williamson
Gordon C. Willis
Rodney W. Wilson
John Windheim, Jr.
James M. Windsor
John B. Winningham, Jr.
James R. Wish
Jack L. Wohler
Robert L. Wolf
Garwood R. Wolff
Robert J. Wooten
William T. Wootton
Robert S. Wright
William F. Wright, Jr.
George M. Wrocklage
Robert A. Wulf
Elston Wyatt
Donald L. Wyckoff
Earl P. Yates
Lloyd G. Yeich
Robert J. Young
Robert J. Young, Jr.
David S. Zachry, Jr.
Ernest J. Zellmer
Daniel Zwilling

In the Marine Corps

The following-named midshipmen to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, to rank from the 9th day of June 1943:

John C. Alexander
Robert L. Allen
Paul M. Beard
John W. Beckett, Jr.
James C. Camp, Jr.
Arthur D. Challacombe, Jr.
Peter A. Cipriano
Sam A. Dressin
James A. Grant
James W. Judy
Edwin F. Kallenberg, Jr.
William J. Kanewske, Jr.
Robert C. Knauf
Henry S. Lawrence, Jr.
Alan B. Lemlein
Gordon D. McPherson
Carlton K. Perkins
Bruce A. Rushlow
Cornelius Scheffer
Norman R. Stanford
Joseph L. Svejkosky
Byron C. Turner
James E. Victor, Jr.
Paul B. Watson, Jr.
Harold A. Wright

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS

Arthur F. Torgler, Jr., a citizen of New York, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, from the 6th day of August 1942.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 1st day of December 1942:

Edwin B. Glass, a citizen of Colorado.
Everett P. Pope, a citizen of Massachusetts.
Geary R. Bundschu, a citizen of California.
Fenwicke W. Holmes, a citizen of California.
Donald C. Baker, a citizen of New York.
Richard A. Munger, a citizen of Washington.
Conrad M. Fowler, a citizen of Alabama.
Charles D. McPherson, a citizen of Florida.
Maurice C. Goodpasture, a citizen of Texas.
Adrian F. Pilliod, Jr., a citizen of Ohio.
Raymond V. Fridrich, a citizen of Ohio.

Edward E. Hammerbeck, a citizen of Minnesota, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of January 1943.

Staff Sgt. Roland H. Makowski, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, from the 20th day of January 1943.

George W. Holmes III, a citizen of North Carolina, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, from the 20th day of January 1943.

Peter J. Mulroney, a citizen of Iowa, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, from the 10th day of February 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 23d day of February 1943:

John I. Warner, Jr., a citizen of Alabama.
Arthur L. Adams, a citizen of New York.
Webster R. Hood, a citizen of Maryland.
William J. McLeod, a citizen of Florida.

Platoon Sgt. John Mesko, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, from the 24th day of February 1943.

The below-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 24th day of March 1943:

Platoon Sgt. James R. Johnson
Platoon Sgt. Theodore H. Robbins

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 24th day of March 1943:

Rogers Blood, a citizen of New Hampshire.
Walter G. Bender, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Dwain L. Lengel, a citizen of Kansas.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of April 1943:

James L. Sizemore, a citizen of Kentucky.
Rolfe Jenkins, a citizen of Indiana.
Robert M. Butler, a citizen of Mississippi.
Herbert R. Merrick, Jr., a citizen of Iowa.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of May 1943:

Charles P. Lewis, Jr., a citizen of West Virginia.
Robert U. Skibinski, a citizen of Oregon.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Mark C. Clayton, Cedar Bluff, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Edgar Petree Thompson, Russellville, Ala., in place of J. R. Moody, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

Ralston S. Woodruff, Gustine, Calif., in place of A. E. Bradley, retired.

George S. Simpson, Van Nuys, Calif., in place of N. R. Messerly, resigned.

GEORGIA

John A. McLeod, Valdosta, Ga., in place of C. U. Young. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

German L. Warren, Waycross, Ga., in place of A. O. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

HAWAII

Jack Y. Ouye, Hakalau, Hawaii, in place of J. Y. Ouye. Incumbent's commission expired June 19, 1941.

Kaku Sakai, Hawi, Hawaii, in place of Kaku Sakai. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

John A. Robello, Kalaheo, Hawaii, in place of M. R. Jardin, resigned.

Kwai Chew Lung, Kilauea, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Alexander Cameron, Papaaloa, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

James Takeo Yabusaki, Papaikou, Hawaii, in place of J. T. Yabusaki. Incumbent's commission expired June 19, 1941.

Ethel Koi Leong Lau, Pearl City, Hawaii. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Timothy Wong, Waipahu, Hawaii, in place of Timothy Wong. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1941.

ILLINOIS

Abraham M. Boyenga, Ashton, Ill., in place of P. R. Buschbacher, resigned.

Marguerite F. Senesac Bourbonnais, Ill., in place of N. L. Marcotte, deceased.

Leslie B. McCaffrey, Fort Sheridan, Ill., in place of L. B. McCaffrey. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1940.

Wilbur A. Woods, Pawpaw, Ill., in place of L. M. McBride, deceased.

William O. Butler, Saybrook, Ill., in place of H. D. Stine. Incumbent's commission expired June 19, 1941.

INDIANA

Harold E. Thomas, Austin, Ind., in place of J. R. Winkelmann, retired.

IOWA

LaVaun B. Raymond, Garrison, Iowa, in place of H. R. Merchant, transferred.

KANSAS

Glenn Harold Diggs, Lorraine, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

KENTUCKY

Ople Ann Akers, Lynch, Ky., in place of E. R. Walton, removed.

LOUISIANA

Ava T. Honeycutt, Dry Prong, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Felix J. Orgeron, Harvey, La., in place of F. J. Orgeron. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Olivier Dufour, Marrero, La., in place of Olivier Dufour. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Camile F. Hoffmann, Thibodaux, La., in place of A. G. Boudreaux, removed.

Arthur Deshotels, Washington, La., in place of Arthur Deshotels. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

MAINE

Helen H. Hurd, Lincolnville, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

MASSACHUSETTS

Arthur W. Bennett, Island Creek, Mass., in place of G. W. Nathan, resigned.

Edward J. Redmond, South Deerfield, Mass., in place of F. M. Merrigan, resigned with prejudice.

MICHIGAN

Alva A. Jones, Blanchard, Mich., in place of M. C. Smead, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Svend Petersen, Askov, Minn., in place of Svend Petersen. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

Joseph R. Dunn, Brainerd, Minn., in place of E. J. O'Brien, removed.

Charles J. Larson, Cosmos, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Frances G. Mushel, Foley, Minn., in place of B. H. Mushel, deceased.

Inga O. Berget, Holt, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Nicholas D. Schons, Nicollet, Minn., in place of N. D. Schons. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1942.

Michael E. Gartner, Preston, Minn., in place of M. E. Gartner. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1942.

Irene T. Cowie, Rothsay, Minn., in place of R. S. Cowie, resigned.

Ernest F. Schroeder, Wells, Minn., in place of E. F. Schroeder. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

MISSISSIPPI

Carrie E. West, Caledonia, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

MISSOURI

Ollie Bullock, Catron, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Charles D. Hyde, Niangua, Mo., in place of Lula Young, removed.

James H. Anders, Risco, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Frank P. Anthony, Wright City, Mo., in place of C. H. Oney, transferred.

MONTANA

J. Francis Murray, Plentywood, Mont., in place of J. W. McKee, resigned.

Vivian M. Matthews, Walkerville, Mont., in place of M. M. Colligan, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Orlon E. Jerner, Lincoln, Nebr., in place of R. E. Fenton. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

NEW JERSEY

Edward C. Bowe, Barrington, N. J., in place of R. H. McKinney, removed.

William T. Johnson, Point Pleasant, N. J., in place of W. T. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Bertha S. Agnew, Titusville, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NORTH CAROLINA

Sam H. Lee, Monroe, N. C., in place of Gillam Craig, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mary J. Nagel, Edgeley, N. Dak., in place of W. E. Ravely. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

OHIO

Silvio Zancanella, Adena, Ohio, in place of C. S. Irvin, resigned.

John M. Hudson, Big Prairie, Ohio, in place of J. M. Hudson. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1942.

Homer D. Cole, Marion, Ohio, in place of L. L. Lamborn. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

OKLAHOMA

Charles N. Combs, Dawson, Okla., in place of L. C. Rhyne, retired.

Joseph L. McKinney, Eufaula, Okla., in place of M. H. Wright, transferred.

Jesse W. Phillips, McAlester, Okla., in place of Hiram Impson, removed.

Roland F. Butler, Pryor, Okla., in place of T. C. Bowling, resigned.

Mary H. Dunagan, St. Louis, Okla., in place of G. B. Hilton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

OREGON

Charles W. Abbott, Central Point, Oreg., in place of H. T. Pankey, deceased.

Jack R. Strauss, Falls City, Oreg., in place of J. R. Strauss. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

PENNSYLVANIA

LeRoy A. Starr, Adamsdale, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Claude H. Strickland, Hop Bottom, Pa., in place of A. G. Murray, resigned.

Alfred R. Warner, Waynesboro, Pa., in place of A. R. Warner. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

PUERTO RICO

Vicenta Correa Aviles, Vega Baja, P. R., in place of V. C. Aviles. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1942.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rufus H. Gaines, Anderson, S. C., in place of J. E. Wigington. Incumbent's commission expired December 7, 1941.

Edward O. Reynolds, Summerville, S. C., in place of E. O. Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

SOUTH DAKOTA

George B. Brown, Clark, S. Dak., in place of G. B. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Nicholas W. Tobin, Wentworth, S. Dak., in place of V. R. Zimmermann, transferred.

TEXAS

B. Elizabeth Proctor, Grand Saline, Tex., in place of Willard Proctor, deceased.

Laura K. Tondre, Marion, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

George E. Blair, Mexia, Tex., in place of Philpott Karner, deceased.

Sallie Tilton, Point, Tex., in place of O. N. Buchanan, removed.

William J. Stringer, Teague, Tex., in place of Frank Folsom, deceased.

Ollie V. Gregorcyk, Woodsboro, Tex., in place of Brett Hargrove, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Randolph H. Perry, Charlottesville, Va., in place of J. S. White, retired.

Frank J. Safley, Mineral, Va., in place of D. E. Bumpass, Jr., transferred.

WASHINGTON

Clara May P. St. John, Concrete, Wash., in place of L. R. Reynolds, transferred.

Kenneth L. Mannen, Port Blakely, Wash., in place of M. E. Seward. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1941.

Elizabeth J. Wallace, Roy, Wash., in place of J. A. Wolf, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Leyman R. Friend, Ameagle, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

WISCONSIN

Mark J. Finnegan, Beloit, Wis., in place of J. J. Riordan, retired.

Charles T. O'Brien, Necedah, Wis., in place of J. R. Bernard, removed.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of all power and mercy, whose years never fail, open afresh the fountain of inspiration and revitalize our land with its cleansing waters. Only the onrush of Thy spiritual power can save this poor, sick world; can plant orchards for hungry wayfarers and turn deserts into gardens. Make us channels of strength and might for crushing the plagues of anarchy and for the slavery of the human spirit.

In the name of Him whose cross is the center of the dome of God, we pray for all councils and the appointed advisers who are toiling for the peace and comfort of a world broken with its shattered sanctuaries of faith. Unite their dreams, unify their hopes, direct their aspirations, and when all is completed, O give us the chivalry of our fathers that we may pass on, unimpaired, to our children's children the institutions they founded and achieved in sacrifice and blood. We pray for our own dear country; unified by a common truth and inspired with one spirit may all our citizens assemble again in industry, home, and church and magnify the name of the Lord for His goodness and wonderful

works and Thine shall be the praise forever. In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess, subject to call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Speaker.

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

At 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper, Mr. Ralph R. Roberts, announced the Vice President of the United States and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Members rose.

The Vice President took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

At 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m. the members of the Supreme Court entered the Chamber and took the seats assigned to them.

At 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m. the members of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Chamber and took the seats assigned to them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that on behalf of the House the Chair appoints the following Members to conduct our distinguished guest to the Chamber: The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints on behalf of the Senate to escort the Prime Minister of Great Britain into the Chamber the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

At 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper, Mr. Ralph R. Roberts, announced the members of the President's Cabinet.

The Members rose.

The members of the President's Cabinet entered the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper, Mr. Ralph R. Roberts, announced the Right Honorable Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain.

The Members rose.

The Prime Minister of Great Britain, Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House and stood at the Clerk's desk, amid prolonged applause.

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, today is a high mark in the history of the Capital of our country and of the Members of the Senate and House and their guests, because today we receive as our guest one of the outstanding figures of all the earth. [Applause.]

It is my great pleasure, my high privilege, and my distinguished honor, to present to you the Right Honorable Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain. [Applause.]

Mr. CHURCHILL. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, 17 months have passed since I last had the honor to address the Congress of the United States. For more than 500 days—every day a day—we have toiled and suffered and dared shoulder to shoulder against the cruel and mighty enemy. We have acted in close combination or concert in many parts of the world—on land, on sea, and in the air. The fact that you have invited me to come to the Congress again—a second time—now that we have settled down to the job, and that you should welcome me in so generous a fashion, is certainly a high mark in my life, and also shows that our partnership has not done so badly. [Applause.] I am proud that you should have found us good allies, striving forward in comradeship to the accomplishment of our task without grudging or stinting either life or treasure or indeed anything we have to give.

Last time I came at a moment when the United States was aflame with wrath at the treacherous attack upon Pearl Harbor by Japan and at the subsequent declarations of war upon the United States made by Germany and Italy. For my part I say quite frankly that in those days after our long, and for a whole year lonely, struggle I could not repress in my heart a sense of relief and comfort that we were all bound together by common peril, by solemn faith and high purpose to see this fearful quarrel through at all costs to the end. That was an hour of passionate emotion, an hour most memorable in human records, an hour, as I believe, full of hope and glory for the future.

The experiences of a long life and the promptings of my blood have wrought in me the conviction that there is nothing more important for the future of the world than the fraternal association of our two peoples in righteous work, both in war and in peace. [Applause.] So, in January 1942, I had that feeling of comfort and I therefore prepared myself in a confident and steadfast spirit to bear the terrible blows which were evidently about to fall on British interests in the Far East, which were bound to fall upon us from the military strength of Japan during a period when the American and British Fleets had lost for the time being the naval command of the Pacific and Indian Oceans. One after another in swift succession very heavy misfortunes fell upon us and upon our allies, the Dutch, in the Pacific theater. The Japanese have seized the land and islands they so greedily coveted. The Philippines are enslaved. The lustrous, luxuriant regions of the Dutch East Indies have been overrun. In the Malay Peninsula and at Singapore we ourselves suffered the greatest military disaster, or at any rate the largest military disaster, in British history.

Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, all this has to be retrieved and all this and much else will have to be repaid. [Applause.]

And here let me say this: Let no one suggest that we British have not at least as great an interest as the United States in the unflinching and relentless waging of war against Japan; and I am here to tell you that we will wage that war side by side with you in accordance with the best strategic employment of our forces while there is a breath in our bodies and while blood flows in our veins.

A notable part in the war against Japan must, of course, be played by the large armies and by the air and naval forces now marshalled by Great Britain on the eastern frontiers of India. In this quarter there lies one of the means of bringing aid to hard-pressed and long-tormented China. I regard the bringing of effective and immediate aid to China as one of the most urgent of our common tasks. It may not have escaped your attention that I brought with me to this country and to this conference Field Marshal Wavell and the other two commanders in chief from India. Now they have not traveled all this way simply to concern themselves about improving the health and happiness of the Mikado of Japan. I thought it would be good that all concerned in this theater should meet together and thresh out in friendly candor and heart to heart all the points that arise, and there are many. You may be sure that if all that was necessary was for an order to be given to the great army standing ready in India to march toward the Rising Sun and open the Burma Road that order would be given this afternoon. The matter is however somewhat more complicated and all movements or infiltration of troops into the mountains and jungles to the northeast of India is very strictly governed by what your American military men call the science of logistics.

But, Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, I repudiate, I am sure with your sympathy, the slightest suspicion that we should hold anything back that can be usefully employed, or that I and the Government I represent are not as resolute to employ every man, gun, and airplane that can be used in this business as we have proved ourselves ready to do in other theaters of the war.

In our conferences in January 1942, between the President and myself, and between our high expert advisers, it was evident that while the defeat of Japan would not mean the defeat of Germany, the defeat of Germany would inevitably mean the ruin of Japan. The realization of this simple truth does not mean that both tasks should not proceed together, and indeed the major part of the United States forces is now deployed on the Pacific fronts. In the broad division which we then made of our labors in January 1942, the United States undertook the main responsibility for prosecuting the war against Japan and for aiding Australia and New Zealand to defend themselves against a Japanese invasion, which then seemed far more threatening than it does now. On the other hand, we took the main burden on the Atlantic. This was only natural. Unless the ocean life line which joins our two peoples can be kept unbroken,

the British Isles and all the very considerable forces which radiate therefrom would be paralyzed and doomed. We have willingly done our full share of the sea work in the dangerous waters of the Mediterranean and in the Arctic convoys to Russia, and we have sustained, since our alliance began, more than double the losses in merchant tonnage that have fallen upon the United States.

On the other hand, the prodigious output of new ships from the United States building yards has for the 6 months past overtaken and now far surpasses the losses of both allies, and if no effort is relaxed there is every reason to count upon a ceaseless progressive expansion of Allied shipping available for the prosecution of the war.

Our killings of U-boats, as the Secretary of the Navy will readily confirm, have this year greatly exceeded all previous experience, and the last 3 months and particularly the last 3 weeks have yielded record results. This, of course, is to some extent due to the larger number of U-boats operating, but it is also due to the marked improvement in the severity and the power of our measures against them and of the new devices continually employed. While I rate the U-boat danger as still the greatest we have to face, I have a good and sober confidence that it will not only be met and contained but overcome. The increase of shipping tonnage over sinkings provides, after the movements of vital supplies, food, and munitions have been arranged, that margin which is the main measure of our joint war effort.

We are also conducting from the British Isles the principal air offensive against Germany, and in this we are powerfully aided by the United States Air Forces in the United Kingdom, whose action is chiefly by day as ours is chiefly by night. In this war numbers count more and more, both in night and day attacks. The saturation of the enemy's flak, through the multiplicity of attacking planes, the division and dispersion of his fighter protection by the launching of several simultaneous attacks, are rewards which will immediately be paid to the substantial increases of British and American numbers which are now taking place. There is no doubt that the Allies already vastly outnumber the hostile air forces of Germany, Italy, and Japan, and still more does their output of new planes surpass the output of the enemy.

In this air war, by which both Germany and Japan fondly imagined they would strike decisive and final blows and terrorize nations great and small into submission to their will, in this air war it is that these guilty nations have already begun to show their first real mortal weakness. The more continuous and severe the air fighting becomes the better for us, because we can already replace casualties and machines far more rapidly than the enemy, and we can replace them on a scale which increases month by month.

Progress in this sphere is swift and sure, but it must be remembered that the preparation and development of airfields and the movement of great masses of ground personnel, on whom the efficiency of modern air squadrons depends, however earnestly pressed forward, is bound to take time.

Opinion, Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, is divided as to whether the use of air power could, by itself, bring about a collapse of Germany or Italy. The experiment is well worth trying, so long as other measures are not excluded. There is certainly no harm in finding out. But however that may be, anyhow we are all agreed that the damage done to the enemy's war potential is enormous. The condition to which the great centers of German war industry, and particularly the Ruhr, are being reduced is one of unparalleled devastation. You have just read of the destruction of the great dams which feed the canals and provide power to the enemy munition works. That was a gallant operation, costing 8 out of the 19 Lancaster bombers employed, but it will play a very far-reaching part in German munitions output.

It is our settled policy, the settled policy of our two staffs and war-making authorities, to make it impossible to carry on any form of war industry on a large or concentrated scale either in Germany, in Italy, or in the enemy-occupied countries. Wherever these centers exist or are developed, they will be destroyed and the munitions population will be dispersed. If they do not like what is coming to them, let them disperse beforehand on their own. The process will continue ceaselessly, with ever-increasing weight and intensity, until the German and Italian peoples abandon or destroy the monstrous tyrannies which they have incubated and reared in their midst.

Meanwhile, our air offensive is forcing Germany to withdraw an ever-larger proportion of its war-making capacity from the fighting fronts in order to provide protection against air attack. Hundreds of fighter aircraft, thousands of antiaircraft cannon, and many hundreds of thousands of men, together with a vast share in the output of the war factories have all been assigned to this purely defensive function. All this is at the expense of the enemy's power of new aggression or of the enemy's power to resume the initiative. Surveying the whole aspect of the air war, we cannot doubt that it is a major factor in the process of victory. That, I think, is established as a solid fact. It is similarly all agreed between us that we should at the earliest moment bring our joint air power to bear upon the military targets in the homelands of Japan. The cold-blooded execution of United States airmen by the Japanese Government is a proof not only of their barbarism but of the dread with which they regard this possibility. It is the duty of those charged with the direction of the war to overcome at the earliest moment the military, geographical, and political difficulties and begin the process, so necessary and desirable, of laying the cities and other munition centers of Japan in ashes. For in ashes they must surely lie before peace comes back to the world.

That this objective holds a high place in the present conference is obvious to thinking men, but no public discussion would be useful upon the method or sequence of events which should be pursued in order to achieve it. Let me make it plain, however, that the British will participate in this air attack on Japan in harmonious accord with the major strategy of the war. That is our desire. And the cruelties of the Japanese enemy make our airmen all the more ready to share the perils and sufferings of their American comrades.

At the present time, speaking more generally, the prime problem which is before the United States, and to a lesser extent before Great Britain, is not so much the creation of armies or the vast output of munitions and aircraft. These are already in full swing, and immense progress and prodigious results have been achieved. The problem is rather the application of those forces to the enemy in the teeth of U-boat resistance across the great ocean spaces, across the narrow seas, or on land through the swamps, mountains, and jungles in various quarters of the globe. That is our problem. All our war plans must, therefore, be inspired, pervaded, and even dominated by the supreme object of coming to grips with the enemy under favorable conditions, or at any rate tolerable conditions—we cannot pick and choose too much—on the largest possible scale at the earliest possible moment, and of engaging that enemy wherever it is profitable and, indeed I might almost say wherever it is possible to do so. Thus in this way we shall make our enemies in Europe and in Asia burn and consume their strength on land, on sea, and in the air with the maximum rapidity.

Now, you will readily understand that the complex task of finding the maximum openings for the employment of our vast forces, the selection of the points at which to strike with the greatest advantage to those forces, and the emphasis and priority to be assigned to all the various enterprises which are desirable, that is a task requiring the constant supervision and adjustment of our Combined Staffs and of the heads of governments. This is a vast and complicated process, especially when two countries are involved directly in council together, and when the interests of so many other countries have to be considered, and the utmost good will and readiness to think for the common cause of all the United Nations is required from everyone participating in our conference. The intricate adjustments and arrangements can only be made by discussion between men who know all the facts, and who are and can be held accountable for success or failure. Lots of people can make good plans for winning the war if they have not got to carry them out. I dare say if I had not been in a responsible position, I should have made a lot of excellent plans, and very likely should have brought them in one way or another to the notice of the executive authorities. But it is not possible to have full, open arguments about these matters. That is

an additional hardship to those in charge—that such questions cannot be argued out and debated in public, except with enormous reticence and even then there is great danger that the watching and listening enemy may derive some profit from what they hear. In these circumstances, in my opinion, the American and British press and public have treated their executives with a wise and indulgent consideration, and recent events I think have vindicated their self-restraint. Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, it is thus that we are able to meet here today in all faithfulness and sincerity and friendship.

Geography imposes insuperable obstacles to the continuous session of the Combined Staffs and executive chiefs, but as the scene is constantly changing, and lately I think I may say constantly changing for the better, repeated conferences are indispensable if the sacrifices of the fighting troops are to be rendered fruitful and if the curse of war which lies so heavily upon almost the whole world is to be broken and swept away within the shortest possible time. I therefore thought it my duty with the full authority of His Majesty's government, to come here again with our highest officers, in order that the Combined Staffs may work in the closest contact with the Chief Executive power which the President derives from his office, and in respect of which I am the accredited representative of the Cabinet and His Majesty's government.

The wisdom of the founders of the American Constitution led them to associate the office of Commander in Chief with that of the Presidency of the United States. In this they followed the precedents which were successful in the case of George Washington. It is remarkable that after more than 150 years this combination of political and military authority has been found necessary not only in the United States, but in the case of Marshal Stalin in Russia, and of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in China. Even I, as majority leader in the House of Commons in one branch of the Legislature, have been drawn from time to time—not perhaps wholly against my will—into some participation in military affairs. Modern war is total, and it is necessary for its conduct that the technical and professional authorities should be sustained and if necessary directed by the heads of governments who have knowledge which enables them to comprehend not only the military but the political and economic affairs at work, and who have the power to focus them all upon the goal. These are the reasons which compelled the President to make his long journey to Casablanca, and these are the reasons which bring me here. We, both of us, earnestly hope that at no distant date we may be able to achieve what we have so long sought—namely, a meeting with Marshal Stalin and if possible with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. But how, when, and where this is to be accomplished is not a matter upon which I am able to shed any clear ray of light at the present time, and if I were I should certainly not shed it. [Laughter and applause.] In the meanwhile, we do our best to keep the closest association at every level between all the authorities of all the countries who are engaged in the active direction of the war, and it is my special duty to promote and preserve this intimacy and concert between all parts of the British Commonwealth and Empire, and especially with the great self-governing Dominions, like Canada, whose Prime Minister is with us at this moment [applause], and whose contribution is so massive and invaluable.

There could be no better or more encouraging example of the fruits of our consultations than the campaign in northwest Africa which has just ended so well. [Applause.]

One morning in June last, when I was here, the President handed me a slip of paper which bore the utterly unexpected news of the fall of Tobruk and the surrender of its garrison of 25,000 men in unexplained circumstances. That, indeed, was a dark and bitter hour for me. I shall never forget the kindness, the delicacy, the true comradeship which our American friends showed me and those with me in such adversity. Their only thought was to find the means of helping us to restore the situation, and never for a moment did they question the resolution or the fighting quality of our troops. Hundreds of Sherman tanks were taken from the hands of American divisions and sent at the utmost speed around the Cape of Good Hope and Egypt. When 1 ship carrying 50 tanks was sunk by torpedo, the United States Government replaced it and its precious vehicles before we could even think of asking them to do so. The Sherman tank was the best tank in the desert in the year 1942, and the presence of these weapons played an appreciable part in the ruin of Rommel's army at the battle of Alamein and in the long pursuit which chased him back to Tunisia.

At this time also, in June 1942, when I was here last, there lighted up those trains of thought and study which produced the memorable American and British descent upon French northwest Africa, the results of which are a cause of general rejoicing today. We have certainly a most encouraging example here of what can be achieved by British and Americans working together heart and hand. In fact, one might almost feel that, if they could keep it up, there is hardly anything they could not do, either in the field of war or in the not less tangled problems of peace. [Applause.] History will acclaim this great enterprise as a classic example of the way to make war. We used the weapon of sea power, the weapon in which we were strongest, to attack the enemy at our chosen moment and at our chosen point. In spite of the immense elaboration of the plan and the many hundreds, thousands even, who had to be informed of its main outline, we maintained secrecy and effective surprise. We confronted the enemy with a situation in which he had either to lose invaluable strategic territories or to fight under conditions most costly and wasteful to him. We recovered the initiative, which we still retain. We rallied to our side French forces, which are already a brave—and will presently become a powerful—army under the gallant General Giraud. [Applause.] We secured bases from which violent attacks can and will be delivered by our air power on the whole of Italy, with results which no one can measure, but which most certainly will be highly beneficial to our affairs. We have made an economy in our strained and straitened shipping position worth several hundreds of great ships, and one which will give us the advantage of far swifter passage through the Mediterranean to the East, to the Middle East, and to the Far East. We have struck the enemy a blow which is the equal of Stalingrad and most stimulating to our heroic and heavily engaged Russian allies.

All this gives the lie to the Nazi and Fascist taunts that parliamentary democracies are incapable of waging effective war. Presently we will furnish them with further examples.

Still I am free to admit that in north Africa we builded better than we knew. The unexpected came to the aid of what was designed and multiplied the results. For this we have to thank the military intuition of Corporal Hitler. We may notice, as I predicted in the House of Commons 3 months ago, the touch of the master hand. The same insensate obstinacy which doomed Field Marshal von Paulus and his army to destruction at Stalingrad has brought this new catastrophe upon our enemies in Tunisia. We have destroyed or captured considerably more than a quarter million of the enemy's best troops, together with vast masses of material, all of which had been ferried across to Africa after paying heavy toll to British submarines and to British and United States aircraft. No one could count on such follies. They gave us, if I may use the language of finance, a handsome bonus after the full dividend had been earned and paid.

At the time when we planned this great joint African operation we hoped to be masters of Tunisia even before the end of last year. But the injury we have now inflicted upon the enemy, physical and psychological, the training our troops have had in the hard school of war, and the welding together of the Anglo-American Staff machine—these are advantages which far exceed anything which it was within our power to plan. The German lie-factory is volubly explaining how valuable is the time which they bought by the loss of their great armies. Let them not delude themselves. Other operations which will unfold in due course, depending as they did upon the special instruction of large numbers of troops and upon the provision of vast technical apparatus, these other operations have not been in any way delayed by the obstinate fighting in northern Tunisia.

Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, the African war is over. Mussolini's African Empire and Corporal Hitler's strategy are alike exploded. It is interesting to compute what these performances have cost those two wicked men and those who

have been their tools or their dupes. The Emperor of Abyssinia sits again upon the throne from which he was driven by Mussolini's poison gas. All the vast territories from Madagascar to Morocco, from Cairo to Casablanca, from Aden to Dakar are under British, American, or French control. One continent, at least, has been cleansed and purged forever from Fascist and Nazi tyranny.

The African excursions of the two dictators have cost their countries in killed and captured 950,000 soldiers. In addition, nearly 2,400,000 gross tons of shipping have been sunk and nearly 8,000 aircraft destroyed, both of these figures being exclusive of large numbers of ships and aircraft damaged. There have also been lost to the enemy 6,200 guns, 2,550 tanks, and 70,000 trucks, which is the American name for lorry [laughter] and which I understand has been adopted by the combined staffs in northwest Africa in exchange for the use of the word "petrol" in place of "gasoline." [Laughter.] These are the losses of the enemy after 3 years of war. At the end of it all what is there to show? The proud German Army has by its sudden collapse, its crumbling, and breaking up—unexpected to all of us—the proud German Army has once again proved the truth of the saying: "The Hun is always at your throat or your feet." [Applause.]

That is a point which may have its bearing on the future. But for our part at this milestone in the war we can say: "One continent redeemed." [Applause.]

The northwest African campaign, and particularly its Tunisian climax, is the finest example of the cooperation of the troops of three different countries and of the combination under one supreme commander of the use of sea, land, and air forces which has yet been seen. In particular, the British and American staff work, as I have said, has matched the comradeship of the soldiers of both our countries striding forward side by side under the fire of the enemy. It was a marvel of efficient organization which enabled the Second American Corps, or rather Army, for that was its size, to be moved 300 miles from the southern sector, which had become obsolete through the retreat of the enemy, to the northern coast, from which, beating down all opposition, they advanced and took the fortress and harbor of Bizerte. [Applause.] In order to accomplish this march of 300 miles, which was covered in 12 days, it was necessary for this very considerable army, with its immense modern equipment, to traverse at right angles the communications of the British First Army, which was already engaged, or about to be engaged, in heavy battle, and this was achieved without in any way disturbing the hour-to-hour supply upon which that army depended. I am told that these British and American officers work together without the slightest question of what country they belong to, each doing his part in a military organization which must henceforward be regarded as a most powerful and efficient instrument of war. There is honor, Mr. President and Mr. Speaker, for all; and I shall at the proper time and place pay my tribute to the British and American commanders by land and sea who conducted or who were engaged in the battle. This only will I say now: I do not think you could have chosen any man more capable than General Eisenhower [applause] of keeping his very large, heterogeneous force together through bad times as well as good, and of creating the conditions of harmony and energy which were the indispensable elements of victory.

I have dwelt in some detail, but I trust not at undue length, upon these famous events, and I shall now return to the general war for a few minutes in which they have their setting and proportion. It is a poor heart that never rejoices. But our thanksgiving, however fervent, must be brief. Heavier work lies ahead, not only in the European but, as I have indicated, in the Pacific and in the Indian spheres; and the President and I and the Combined Staffs are gathered here in order that this work shall be, as far as lies within us, well conceived and thrust forward without losing a day. Not for one moment must we forget that the main burden of the war on land is still being borne by the Russian Armies. They are holding at the present time no fewer than 190 German divisions and 28 satellite divisions on their front. It is always wise, while doing justice to one's own achievements, to preserve a proper sense of proportion, and I therefore mention that these figures of the German forces opposite Russia compare with the equivalent of about 15 divisions which we have destroyed in Tunisia after a campaign which has cost us about 50,000 casualties. That gives some measure of the Russian effort and of the debt which we owe to her. It may well be that a further trial of strength between the German and Russian Armies is impending. Russia has already inflicted injuries upon the German military organism which will, I believe, prove mortal. But there is little doubt that Hitler is reserving his supreme gambler's throw for a third attempt to break the heart and spirit and destroy the armed forces of the mighty nation which he has already twice assaulted in vain. He will not succeed. [Applause.] But we must do everything in our power that is sensible and practicable to take more of the weight off Russia in 1943. [Applause.]

I do not intend to be responsible for any suggestion that the war is won or will soon be over. That it will be won by us I am sure. [Applause.] But how or when cannot be foreseen, still less foretold. I was driving the other day not far from the field of Gettysburg, which I know well, like most of your battlefields. It was the decisive battle of the Civil War. No one after Gettysburg doubted which way the dread balance of war would incline. Yet far more blood was shed after the Union victory at Gettysburg than in all the fighting which went before. It behooves us, therefore, to search our hearts and brace our sinews and to take the most earnest counsel one with another in order that the favorable position which has already been reached, both against Japan and against Hitler and Mussolini in Europe, shall not be let slip. If we wish to abridge the slaughter and ruin which this war is spreading to so many lands and to which we must ourselves contribute so grievous a measure of suffering and sacrifice, we cannot afford to relax a single fiber of our being or to tolerate the slightest abatement of our effort. The enemy is still proud and powerful. He is hard to get at. He still possesses enormous armies, vast resources, and invaluable strategic territories. War is full of mysteries and surprises. A false step, a wrong direction of strategic effort, discord, or lassitude among the Allies might soon give the common enemy the power to confront us with new and hideous facts. We have surmounted many serious dangers. But there is one grave danger which will go along with us until the end. That danger is the undue prolongation of the war. No one can tell what new complications and perils might arise in 4 or 5 more years of war. And it is in the dragging out of war at enormous expense till the democracies are tired, or bored, or split that the main hopes of Germany and Japan must now reside.

We must destroy this hope, as we have destroyed so many others; and for that purpose we must beware of every topic, however attractive, and every tendency, however natural, which divert our minds or energies from the supreme objective of the general victory of the United Nations. By singleness of purpose, by steadfastness of conduct, by tenacity and endurance, such as we have so far displayed, by these, and only by these, can we discharge our duty to the future of the world and to the destiny of man. [Applause.]

At 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m., the Prime Minister of Great Britain retired from the Hall of the House.

At 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m., the President's Cabinet retired from the Hall of the House.

At 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m., the members of the Supreme Court retired from the Hall of the House.

At 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m., the members of the Diplomatic Corps retired from the Hall of the House.

At 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m., the Speaker announced that the joint session was dissolved.

Thereupon the Vice President and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired (at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.), the Speaker called the House to order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings held in the Chamber during the recess will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

THE LATE JAMES WHITSON DUNBAR

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of sorrow that I bring a message to the older Members of this House. Jim Dunbar died this morning. I think he would like to have me say "Jim Dunbar." James Whitson Dunbar was

a Republican Member of this House in the Sixty-sixth, Sixty-seventh, and Seventy-first Congresses. He was a great American. He had a tremendous sense of loyalty and honesty. Above all, he was a simple man. It was said of him, when he left, there was little doubt that he was as popular if not the most popular man in this House.

Jim Dunbar was born in 1860. He got out of a sick bed, practically, to attend some meetings that were held in my district this year. He did that not only because of his loyalty to his party, but, typical of Jim Dunbar, he told me that my grandfather had rendered him a service when he was a young boy 15 years of age, and this man's sense of obligation was so strong that, despite the fact he had been the victim of a tremendously bad heart for years, he felt that, in some measure, in helping me he was repaying that favor which had been paid him by my grandfather some sixty-odd years ago.

There is little more that I can say, but I know it is with regret that this message is received by all who knew Jim Dunbar.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my distinguished colleague [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] in paying my humble tribute of respect to James W. Dunbar. I had the privilege of an intimate acquaintanceship with Mr. Dunbar, who was a Member of this House during the Sixty-sixth, Sixty-seventh, and Seventy-first Congresses. He brought to the public service the valuable asset of a ripe business experience and a sound judgment in respect to fiscal operations both public and private. In his service here he was an outstanding member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Much of the banking and currency legislation that was enacted during his service here bears the stamp of his brilliant mind. He was a friendly character who had in his heart a great love for human kind. As a citizen and as a representative of citizens he was a credit to his district, to the State of Indiana, and to the Nation which he served so well. He will be widely missed and mourned.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a digest of the National Youth Administration war-training program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Lord Halifax.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article called My Son and a letter in connection therewith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Mark Sullivan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Independent Jewish Press Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Admiral Landis to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House, dated May 15, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article showing how the Sioux Steel Co., of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., has met the problem of labor shortages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the propaganda film Mission to Moscow, and to include therein a short editorial from one of the leading newspapers in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on old-age pensions and to include therein a statement by an attorney, Mr. Leonard Eriksson, of Fergus Falls, Minn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an extract of the Indiana law with respect to the veterans as compiled by Mr. Omer Stevens, National Service Officer and Department Adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New York Times in support of anti-poll-tax legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the Honorable Herbert Bell, former Minister to Portugal and Hungary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes. Pending that, I ask unanimous consent, pursuant to an understanding I have had with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, that general debate be limited to 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I understand that debate is to be limited to the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is agreeable to me, Mr. Speaker, and I so modify my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2713, with Mr. GAVAGAN in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as your chairman on Navy appropriations, I am presenting a measure today which I am persuaded to believe will largely bring to fruition programs that will enable the Navy to perform its share in the drive that lies ahead to bring about complete victory.

We have just cause today to be proud of the achievements of our arms. The riddance in north Africa of our enemies was an accomplishment paralleling any

successful military operation that history records. The victory there will stand as a lasting tribute to those who conceived and planned the campaign, to those who actually conducted it, and to those who actually fought it, including, do not forget, those upon whom the onerous and dangerous task devolved for matériel and personnel transport. That was a Navy and air responsibility, shared with our British Allies, and I include in Navy the Coast Guard and the merchant marine. For sheer courage and utter disregard of danger from submarines and enemy aircraft, we must ever share our gratefulness with the officers and men on the merchant marine.

Like its contribution to the north African campaign, it is the Navy upon which we must rely for getting munitions and men to the theaters of land operations on the continent of Europe, and it is to the Navy we must look, in conjunction with air power, both Army and Navy, for making possible the movement of land forces into the areas we shall take or retake from the Japanese.

I say "shall," and I mean "shall," and I look for that to happen much earlier than some who lean toward conservatism and advocate waiting until Hitler is stopped. I do not agree with the waiting policy, and compliment Senator CHANDLER for his recent speech on the subject on the Senate floor.

It is this job to the westward, my friends, which will impose the biggest load on our sea arm. We are preparing adequately for that, and, at the same time, doing everything possible to facilitate the accomplishment of the knock-out punch in Europe.

The areas for naval employment are vast and the nature of the employment is extremely diversified, making necessary a very large number of many different kinds of operating units. Their provision, including their equipment, takes much time, and they call for much preparation for operating and basing facilities, and for a large, fully trained force of officers and men. These factors, plus, and, mark you, a very big plus for aviation, have demanded the very large sums we have been called upon heretofore to provide, and it is such factors which are responsible for the size of the measure we bring to you today.

One gratifying part of the measure to me is the amount it carries—something over 10 billions of dollars, for liquidating programs heretofore authorized. That means approaching actual deliveries, and that means nearer the day of reckoning for our enemies. Another gratifying feature of the bill is that it includes but $40,000,000 for the completion of the huge naval airplane program upon which we embarked in the fiscal year 1940. We have, with the exception of that $40,000,000, appropriated for over 55,000 airplanes for the Navy, including the Marine Corps, and that whole program will have been consummated before the end of the ensuing fiscal year, with still others, for which this bill makes provision, coming along. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Navy will have reached its objective of 27,500 program airplanes, and they will comprise naval types or types peculiar to naval aerial warfare, presently unequaled anywhere.

Mr. Chairman, I am not any happier about the size of these necessary defense or war budgets than any of my colleagues. They have begun, however, to pay dividends—a very sizable one a few days ago at the "south shore banks" of the Mediterranean, and I am sure we shall see increasingly bigger ones in the not distant future.

The size of these budgets and just what they mean from a dollar-and-cents angle recalls a yarn I think will bear repeating:

Two tramps were riding the rods of a freight train. The train came to a stop at a desert water tank where a brakeman kicked them off and left them there when the freight pulled out. A passenger train passed at high speed and a deck of cards fell at the feet of one tramp and he suggested to the other that they play some poker to kill time. Neither of them had a dime; it was all for fun. After a few deals, one drew a king-high straight flush and the other four aces. The chap with the straight flush started off with a hundred-dollar bet, and the other tramp raised him $500. There followed a succession of raises until a million dollars was bet. The chap with the four aces then bid a billion dollars and he got a return of a trillion. The man with the four aces came back with a septillion and the tramp with the straight flush threw down his cards and said, "You win; you are too damned educated for me."

We may know numeration terminology, but I doubt if we completely comprehend the full significance of the vast sums we have been making available. They are vast, but must be vast successfully to carry on a war such as we are in, and there is but little we can do about it other than to give thorough scrutiny to the requests that are presented, and to challenge those which cannot be completely justified as essential to the war effort. I can assure you that has been the approach of the naval subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. We insist upon justifications in very great detail.

Ships and airplanes, Mr. Chairman, basically determine the bounds of the naval budget. They determine the personnel strength; they determine the nature and capacity of shore establishments; and they determine maintenance and operational costs. Ships are costly weapons, particularly ships of the larger categories, and airplanes, considering their floating landing fields, and tenders in the case of amphibian planes, their equipment with modern offensive weapons and ammunition, detection and communication outfits, and so forth, and their maintenance and operational costs, run the bill into astronomical figures. It is planes, I might add, that have sent further skyward the cost of surface craft in the way of protection against planes.

The personnel strength, occasioned by our ship and airplane programs, is a very sizable factor in the measure before you, made more so by the liberality of Congress in raising pay rates. Naval personnel, directly and indirectly, account for about 16 percent of the amount in the bill we have presented. We have set the numbers out for you on page 5 of the committee's report.

The bill, Mr. Chairman, proposes direct appropriations of $27,463,687,198 and contractual authority of $2,000,000,000, plus an additional amount of contractual authority of $2,779,880,000, contingent upon the enactment of legislation which the House has passed authorizing additional auxiliary and small-craft tonnage.

The cash part of the bill, while $3,830,000,000 in excess of current year appropriations, is $2,022,107,802 less than the Budget estimates, but of that amount $1,991,000,000 represents a substitution of contractual authority for cash. Actually, therefore, we have made a net cash reduction of $22,107,802, and that sum you will find itemized, commencing at the bottom of page 5 of our report.

We actually have effected reductions of $95,627,950, all told, but $50,000,000 of that is a deferment, agreed to by the Navy Department, and something in the neighborhood of $23,000,000 we have employed to finance certain increases you will find enumerated in the statement in the report to which I previously directed your attention.

The general uses of the funds proposed are enumerated on page 4 of the report. I hope those of you who are doing me the honor to hear my presentation have a copy of our report before you. They are available here at the desk on my left.

The increases we have made apply for the most part to subsistence. The Budget ignored actual costs, and, if we adhered to the estimates, we simply would be writing a bill which we knew would not meet the demands. The Army budget, yet to be considered, I am advised, is based upon the prevailing cost of the ration. Why a different budget procedure as to the Navy I do not know. Possibly the Budget Bureau had in mind reverse lend-lease and some tangible returns from the efforts being made to curb food wastage, of which there has been considerable. The committee believes, however, after making allowances for such considerations, that the subsistence estimates are not adequate to meet the cost that will be necessary during the fiscal year 1944.

We found under the Marine Corps that the Budget omitted to provide for the Marine Corps' college training program. The Budget included funds under the Bureau of Naval Personnel for a part of the cost of such program, but neglected to take care of pay, subsistence, clothing, and transportation costs chargeable to Marine Corps appropriations.

We also found that the Marine Corps will be short of funds for certain phases of its operations for the current fiscal year, and we have made provision therefor, making the amounts immediately available. That will save a further hearing by the Appropriations Deficiency Subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, and, possibly, the passage of a special resolution.

I do not wish to pass the Marine Corps without a word about the grand job the marines did at Guadalcanal and are doing elsewhere. It is a real fighting out-

fit, my friends, and you may confidently expect, before this war is over, to hear of many more really great accomplishments.

Another item of increase, under the head of "Miscellaneous expenses," pertains to a survey of war production plants, including equipment, with a view to having information readily accessible as to that which may be released, upon the conclusion of the war, for such uses as then may be detremined to be desirable without disrupting the national economy. Strange as it may seem, all of that information is not presently centered in Washington. The Navy Department, the War Department, and the Defense Plant Corporation, and, possibly other Federal agencies, the committee understands, are going to undertake such a survey and use the pattern the Navy is suggesting. The value of such a compilation, it seems to me, is obvious. The Navy's part of it will be in the very efficient hands of Rear Admiral Harold G. Bowen, to whom the Navy and the country are deeply indebted for his large contribution to the superior propulsive machinery presently being installed upon naval vessels, and for highly technical developments, by reason of his direction of the Naval Research Laboratory, that are playing a large part in the prosecution of the war.

On the reduction side, Mr. Chairman, we have not touched a single matériel or personnel project. It would just not make sense to cut into purely naval projects at this time. The means and the implementation necessary for bringing the enemy to terms—our terms—I submit, are not matters for our determination. We must abide by the judgment of our naval leadership, or be prepared to share with them or assume the responsibility for any setbacks that may occur. Using the words of the Navy's distinguished naval commander in chief, Admiral King, "the Congress automatically shares the responsibility for the conduct of the war in respect to the funds appropriated."

The Navy's airplane program, beyond that for which provision heretofore has been made, was submitted in a supplemental estimate. It calls for a total of $4,868,725,000. The airplane production program, both Army and Navy, upon which we have been engaged, looks to a total of 185,000 useful airplanes on hand by the end of December 1943. We are going to fall somewhat short of that objective. It will not be wholly realized before the end of June 1944—a 6 months' delay, in other words. Production beyond that point must be provided for at this time in order that industry may plan accordingly and produce efficiently.

It is estimated that we shall reach a peak production capacity of about 11,000 planes per month. That ceiling will be imposed by the availability of essential materials. It has been determined to provide for that capacity for the period commencing July 1, 1944, although the construction of some planes will be undertaken prior to such date to fill out diminishing programs in some production plants.

The Navy's part of the whole program, which will consist of some one-hundred-and-thirty-thousand-odd planes, is 27,642, estimated to cost the amount I already have indicated, namely, $4,868,725,000.

Unless wastage—that is, crashes, battle damage, battle losses, and obsolesence go way beyond reasonable expectation, there is no question but that the Navy will be surfeited with airplanes. There is this to be said, however: That no matter how the planes may be financed, allocation will be determined by the Munitions Assignment Board, and, I might add this observation: That until we can rather definitely approximate the time of complete and final victory, we cannot afford to permit of any diminution in airplane output. This is a must part of our program.

We have made a number of defense-aid reductions, Mr. Chairman, amounting all told to $20,675,000. We have taken money out of "Welfare and recreation," "Fuel and transportation," and "Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," for objects, if the reports we get have any factual basis, as to which there should be some reflection of reverse lend-lease in naval expenditures. The committee felt that it was time to anticipate and capitalize upon such a result. In this connection, I invite your attention to the small-type matter on page 11 of the committee's report on the bill, which is a release by the Navy Department upon reverse lend-lease and is pertinent. Further justification for the committee's action is contained in the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the bill extending the Lend-Lease Act. You will find it in House Report No. 188. My information is the Army took reverse lend-lease into account in building its 1944 estimates, and we feel that the Navy, while acknowledging reciprocity, should present something in the way of tangible evidence; in other words, some reduction in its money requests.

The House will be interested in knowing that the committee made inquiry into the matter of building up unnecessarily large inventories. It has the assurance that the matter is being carefully watched and that excesses over current needs are held to such quantities as constitute a reasonable reserve to meet any disruption of inflow to replace expenditures. Of course, as to combat expendables, and particularly that which takes much time to produce and that which cannot be closely approximated by reason of unpredictable contacts or engagements with the enemy, such as ammunition, there must be substantial reserves available at all times.

On the cost side of production I am glad to say that an improved situation prevails. That is largely due to renegotiation, which means savings under completed contracts, under going contracts, and under contracts being executed, which latter reflect costs, plus reasonable profits, growing out of renegotiation. In this connection I invite your attention to the yearly report of the chairman of the Navy's Price Adjustment Board, which is the Navy's renegotiation agency, reprinted commencing on page 776 of the hearings on the bill. It is a very illuminating statement, and should make us feel much easier about inordinate profits.

Mr. Chairman, renegotiation is the brain child of our distinguished colleague from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. It was his provision, offered as a floor amendment to the sixth supplemental national defense appropriation bill, which became law on April 28, 1942, that culminated in the legislation finally carried in that bill with respect to renegotiation. These are the results so far:

For the Navy: The end of March 1943 price reductions and cash refunds arranged by the Navy Price Adjustment Board amounted to more than $950,000,000. That total does not take into consideration the very substantial amount which will be saved through the lower prices which will prevail upon subsequent business.

For the Army for the period ended March 31, 1943, price reductions and cash refunds totaling $1,527,000,000 were effected by the War Department. Price reductions were $967,000,000 and cash refunds were $560,000,000.

The country rightfully may be proud of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I may say to him that his colleagues certainly are.

I do not know as there is any need for me, at this time, to say more about this bill, Mr. Chairman. I have endeavored to touch upon its salient features. Our report is in more detail and I commend it to your attention. This bill has the unanimous endorsement of your entire committee.

I do wish, before closing, to express my deep appreciation of the fine help I received from my subcommittee colleagues, and the fine work of Mr. John Pugh, who worked long hours on details and always is cooperative; also of the very able contribution of the senior minority member of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]. He has had long experience on the naval subcommittee and his aid and counsel have been most helpful and are deeply appreciated. They are a splendid group of gentlemen to work with.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman spoke of the rather astounding size of this appropriation. Does the gentleman recognize that for the Navy alone, since 1940, or including 1940, there has been appropriated about $64,000,000,000, exclusive of this appropriation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes, I do.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if the committee went into the extent of this program? It is my understanding when the last large naval appropriation bill which was passed, that it was stated by the committee or by the subcommittee members that that would provide for the largest Navy in the world, that it would exceed the British Navy in size, with the authorization for appropriations that were made up to that time. Is my memory correct upon that?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not recall a statement exactly in that way. We have, however, been providing for a

Navy that would be unsurpassed by any in the world. Of course, it is a large program and appropriations are provided as and when funds are needed for its accomplishment.

Mr. O'HARA. I understand from the report of the committee that of sums previously appropriated, approximately $14,000,000,000 have not been used as yet.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Not expended, but committed or obligated.

Mr. O'HARA. How many years of the program will this prvoide for?

Mr. SHEPPARD. We are passing this appropriation for the anticipated disbursement needs during the fiscal year ending in June 1944. How much provision will need to be made beyond that point depends upon authorized ship construction yet to be undertaken and, also, the progress of the war.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. I have two or three questions that I would like to have the gentleman's opinion about. First, referring to page 22, the item identified as "Transportation of things," calling for an appropriation of $200,000,000. I wonder if the gentleman would care to explain just what that activity is. The amount of money involved is rather large.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is intended to take care of all of the Navy's matériel transportation, which we are providing for under one head, previously set up in different appropriations—all matériel transportation of all types and character are involved in that item.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COLE of New York. I imagine that this transportation is related to the war effort.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very largely; yes. Normally the amount would be much less.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am curious to know whether the transportation of all military equipment, whether used by the Army or the Navy, is chargeable to the Navy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; the Army's transportation account is provided for separately.

Mr. COLE of New York. And this $200,000,000?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is confined strictly to naval operations.

Mr. COLE of New York. And no transportation cost relating to lend-lease is chargeable to the naval appropriation?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Only such as pertains to lend-lease or defense aid financed out of naval appropriations

Mr. COLE of New York. And with regard to the item for replacement and construction of ships, can the gentleman tell me whether in connection with the construction of new combatant ships, they are chargeable against replacement of ships sunk due to war effort, or whether they are charged against the general authorization?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would say against the general authorization.

Mr. COLE of New York. Perhaps the gentleman did not understand me. The present law authorizes the size of our Navy to be of a certain number of tons. What I would like to know is whether if one of our combatant ships is sunk, the replacement of that vessel is charged against the original authorization, or is kept on the books as a replacement vessel.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is charged against the gross authorized tonnage, whether it be replacement or otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLE of New York. I have one other question if the gentleman would care to answer it. I am personally interested in the items relating to the Seneca Lake Training Station, which I notice carries an appropriation of $3,300,000. Can the gentleman advise me what has been the total appropriation for that training station up to date?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Approximately $55,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, since this is a very important bill, I think we should have a quorum present.

Mr. DITTER. I hope the gentleman will withdraw any such request.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, it may seem to be a commonplace, yet I feel that I would be remiss were I to fail to acknowledge to my distinguished chairman and to the majority members the appreciation of the minority for the uniform courtesies which were extended to the minority throughout the entire course of the hearings and the discussions in connection with the bill. Without attempting any undue flattery I should like to add that I believe the chairman of the subcommittee deserves not only the support but the appreciation of the House for the faithful way in which he has addressed himself to the tremendous tasks that were his and the way in which he has discharged the responsibilities that fell to his lot.

Then again I shall not permit the occasion to pass without paying a word of well deserved tribute to the very able clerk of the committee. As long as I am a member of the appropriations committee for the Navy I shall not let the opportunity pass of saying that John Pugh's contribution to the Navy program is something that cannot be measured. Words fail me in expressing to him what I believe is the appreciation of the country for his devotion to duty.

One other word. In these days of expanding personnel in connection with the Naval Establishment, it seems to me the temptation is to overemphasize the civilian administrative force identified with the Naval Establishment. I think that temptation also offers the opportunity of slighting, to some extent at least, the old-line seadogs of the Navy. I want to commend the officer personnel, the bureau heads, those who in the days of peace, in the days of preparation, continued to hold before the country the need of the Navy as the first line of defense, and who now, when larger responsibilities come to them, are discharging those responsibilities with credit to themselves and with credit to the Nation. The bureau heads, the officer personnel, the enlisted men—those are the men, after all, upon whom the safety of the Nation depends insofar as the Navy goes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield briefly to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. In connection with what the gentleman said with reference to the services of the clerk to the committee, I was simply going to remark that it should be noted also for the RECORD that in addition to handling the greatly enlarged financial program of the Navy, as clerk to the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Naval Affairs, Mr. Pugh also is clerk to the Committee on Appropriations for the War Department and has carried on. How he has done it no one knows, but he has done a double job in these important times, and what the gentleman has said for the Navy can also be said for the War Department.

Mr. DITTER. I am glad my friend has added that contribution, which, of course, I know is well deserved. Nothing could be said but the best for the able clerk of the committee.

It is a significant coincidence that we are considering today the largest naval appropriation bill in the history of the country immediately after having heard the challenging address of the Prime Minister. I cannot hope to quote verbatim but I did gather from the Prime Minister's statement to us that while we could be satisfied with the military successes in Africa at the present time, nevertheless there still lies before us a difficult and arduous task. I believe I at least give you the substance if not the exact form of the Prime Minister's statement when I say there can be no abatement in the effort that we should put forth to bring about a speedy and successful conclusion of the war effort. It is with that determination, that there can be no abatement, no lessening of effort, no let up, that I today support wholeheartedly the bill now before us.

May I say here and now that I am not unmindful of those who feel that the Navy may at times be accumulating too much in the way of munitions and materials of war. I am not unmindful of those critics who are willing to eye skeptically the stores that are being accumulated for a possible eventuality.

I realize that the Navy as such is the trustee of the commitments of confidence made by the American people. I believe this trustee will discharge honestly, faithfully, and well the stewardship that has been committed to it. For myself I am not ready to try to limit the accumulations of materials that may be

sorely needed in the future before this war is won; I am not willing to put my judgment as a layman against the judgment of the men who have been trained and who are skilled in the strategy, the conduct of the war. I may be mistaken, but I would rather by far be mistaken on the safe side than to be sorry on the dangerous side if an eventuality should develop. I can say for the Republicans of the House that they have committed themselves, unreservedly, wholeheartedly, for the prosecution of the war. But we sound the warning that incompetencies and dishonesties will come to shame those who are not equal to the trust that has been imposed upon them.

For the minority I make the declaration that we are not going to pinch pennies in the prosecution of the war. With that goes the challenge to the majority that it is in charge of the Government and accountable for mismanagement and extravagance. The majority is responsible to the country for every executive agency. The country looks to the majority to clean house, to clear up the wastes, the mismanagements, and the abuses of confidence. But even though we hold you to the high degree of responsibility, we of the minority are going as far as we can go so that the charge may not be lodged against us of hampering in any way the war effort. The treasure of the country is yours, and in the commitment of that treasure there goes the highest degree of responsibility of stewardship; and God help you, God help you, the majority, if you are not equal to the trust of a free people. After all, as we think of these dollars it seems to me that it is the least the Nation is giving. The Prime Minister of Great Britain said we were giving of our treasure; yes, we are giving generously of our treasure, but we are giving more than that: we are giving of our boys; we are giving of the strength and the sinew of the home; we are giving of those things that cannot be replaced if lost by material things or by the accumulation of treasure. "Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." The richest treasure that America has—not gold, but men—is being given unselfishly and without stint. We can answer the Prime Minister today by the solemn declaration that we are giving without reservation all that we have for the victory of our common cause.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I must always yield to my distinguished friend from Kentucky; I have never refused him.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If it disturbs the continuity of the gentleman's thought or statement, I would not want to intrude.

Mr. DITTER. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I notice the bill calls for $29,494,795,000. Is it contemplated that this sum is to be reduced by amendment? I am not asking that it be reduced, but is this supposed to be the amount of the bill that will be approved?

Mr. DITTER. Answering the gentleman, my hope is that there shall not be one penny of reduction made in the appropriation that the committee is bringing to the floor. I believe every penny has been justified insofar as justification can be made in the light of the possible eventualities of the future.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I join in the gentleman's desire that we do everything possible to win this war at the earliest possible date, and that every dollar be spent to accomplish this high purpose; but I rose also to say that the Prime Minister of Great Britain must take some comfort on this occasion that the action that is being taken by the House today, because the budget of Great Britain provides for an expenditure of $20,500,000,000 this year. In one single appropriation here for our Navy we propose to expend $29,494,795,000 and we shall soon have around 11,000,000 men in our armed forces. As I understand, this will be twice as many men as Great Britain or the British Empire has; so we are spending many times as much money as the British Empire and have perhaps twice the number of men in our armed forces. So it cannot be said that the United States is not contributing her full share either in treasure, blood, or in effort to win this war.

Mr. DITTER. I am so glad my friend brought that contribution. May I say that, of course, it does not come within the province of the Committee on Appropriations to determine the matter of policy. Ours is only the duty of appropriating after the authorizations have been made. Certainly the charge cannot be made that the United States is failing in any way to give in toil, tears, blood, and treasure more than its share in the waging of the war.

I join with the gentleman from Kentucky in looking with some degree of—I was about to say suspicion—at least with some degree of question at the comparative contribuitions in dollars, at least, that are being made by our own people and those of some of our allies. However, may this be a reasonable excuse for the superload that we are carrying: We as a people prize the possessions that are ours, and in the measure by which we prize those possessions as a people, we are willing to make our contribution the greater for their preservation.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Taking the sum that we have in this bill—$29,494,795,000—counting that in, what, all together, has been appropriated for the United States Navy in this war?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, answering the gentleman's question, I do not have the figures available, but I should say, in the last 3 years, that our appropriations for the Navy have been somewhere in the neighborhood of $60,000,000,000. I will stand correction at the hands of any of the members of the committee if I am in error. I am simply making a very quick estimate of this, and if I am incorrect in that I should like to have correction.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I think the gentleman's estimate for the last 3 years is quite accurate. From 1940 through the fiscal year 1944 the total appropriations to the Navy have been approximately $95,000,000,000.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman from Texas is including the amount carried by this bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Yes; including 1944.

Mr. DITTER. Yes. So that roughly my figures were about right up to the fiscal year 1943.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes; but counting the sum in this bill, are authorizations included?

Mr. DITTER. No. There is very little in the way of contractual authorizations. In other words, the figures that I gave you are, I feel, sufficiently comprehensive and all-inclusive that further inquiry of the gentleman as to contractual authorizations would hardly be in order.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. May I make this further observation to the gentleman from Kentucky? We should never dismiss from our mind as we estimate these costs, as we try to figure what this program has meant in dollars and cents, that the administration persisted when the war boom came on to continue a program of domestic economy geared to depression days. It is my own conviction that had the administration forsaken the domestic economy to which it has clung very tenaciously, the economy of the depression days, and had adopted an economy geared to war production, the figures we have just given you might have been cut very materially. If we are to build ships, if we are to build planes, if we are to be on a 24-hour schedule, and if with that program we are to hang to a 40-hour week and 8 hours overtime, and all of the other segments of a domestic economy geared to depression days, then of necessity this war business, this naval program, will cost us more money. To that extent, may I say to the gentleman from Kentucky, I feel that a very just criticism can be lodged against the administration. I hope I have the support of the gentleman from Kentucky in that observation.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I greatly appreciate the argument the gentleman has made. I have great faith in his good judgment. He is one of the very ablest Members of this body. He is always well informed on the facts and is always fair, clear, and convincing. This is such an enormous sum, $95,000,000,000, nearly five times the cost of the first World War from the beginning of that war until the signing of the armistice, nearly five times I repeat. This enormous sum is for the Navy only. I know the gentleman is fair and he makes a fair statement. He knows the facts and I appreciate very much the information the gentleman is giving the House and giving to me.

There is no man in the House I listen to with more interest as well as profit. We are fortunate to have him on this great committee.

Mr. DITTER. I repeat that in my opinion the program could have been conducted, especially in the earlier days, with more care and probably less expense.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Would it complete the picture when I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in answering the question the gentleman from Kentucky asked that the authorizations and appropriations, the total for the entire war up to this time, are approximately two hundred and forty-three to two hundred and forty-four billion dollars. Would that complete the picture?

Mr. DITTER. That probably is a good estimate.

Mr. STEFAN. And the probability is it might reach to three hundred or four hundred billion dollars before we complete the entire story. Is that true?

Mr. DITTER. I do not believe any of us are prophetic enough to be able to bring down to dollars and cents what it might be. I feel I need make no professions to this House with reference to my opposition to extravagance and waste and my support of economy measures. I am confident that I need make no loud protestations with reference to my position in this regard.

As economy-minded as I am, I want to repeat what I said before, that no matter what the price may be in dollars, that price can well be paid by the people if in the spending of money we save of the richer treasures—the lives of American boys and the winning of the war.

I ask no one to join me in that. It is purely a personal conviction. I am making no plea for it. I am not asking you to join the profession of my own faith. I am making a declaration of what is in my inmost soul. My program is to win the war, save all that we can in lives and preserve the fundamental faith upon which the Republic was founded.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, the gentleman realizes that practically every man, in fact, every man in the House joins him in that premise. There is no sacrifice that we can make at this time that is too big to win this war.

Mr. DITTER. Or to lessen the suffering of those that are engaged in the war.

Mr. STEFAN. Our ambitions in this House have been to lessen the days of the war, to lessen it a month, lessen it a week, lessen it 1 hour.

Mr. DITTER. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. If the spending of this money will do that, it is money well spent, the gentleman will agree.

Will the gentleman now answer one question that is very, very dear to the hearts of the people in many States? Referring to the training program, on page 39 of the hearings, I notice that the C. A. A. preflight training schools are cut to 100. I have been told recently that you have been going to cut those pre-flight training schools to 85. Is that correct?

Mr. DITTER. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Will that mean that you are going to close a number of war-training programs that the Navy is carrying out in some of the schools? Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. DITTER. I know of no man in whom I have a greater degree of confidence than Admiral Jacobs, who is in charge of the Bureau of Personnel of the United States Navy, and to whom is given the great task of furnishing the men. I place my confidence in his judgment, and I believe that he has due regard for the needs of the pre-flight training group and of other groups as he envisions the need for a big navy of the future. I am sure that the committee supports completely the recommendations of Admiral Jacobs.

I had intended making some observations with reference to certain administrative features of the Naval Establishments. Time will not permit.

In supporting the bill now before us and in urging your support I can lay claim to consistency. I have always supported the proposition that we should have a navy second to none. In this critical hour, this time of testing, the Navy is vindicating the confidence of every American. It is living up to the best traditions of the Navy. It is making certain the perpetuation of the Republic.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to and about the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania who has just spoken that in my humble judgment there is not a man in Congress who knows more about the Navy than does he.

Mr. Chairman, including 1940, through the fiscal year 1944, the Congress has appropriated to the Navy about $95,000,000,000, of which $29,494,795,000 are included in the bill under consideration. This astronomical sum has been used through the past 4 years to build the greatest Navy the world has ever seen. When 1944 funds have been spent, we will have, not a one-ocean Navy, but a Navy that can and will fight on all seven seas. Much work and planning have gone into the building of this navy. Besides ships which had to be constructed, there were guns and torpedoes, radio and radar equipment, and ordnance items to be fabricated. There were airplanes to be designed, and then built; there were shipyards and airfields, and training stations, and many, many other types of public-works projects, including housing and utilities that had to be constructed. There were food and clothing to be purchased. And, last but by no means the least, men, to man the ships and fly the planes had to be procured and then trained.

For doing the magnificent job of building this Navy, too much credit cannot be given to Admiral E. J. King, Commander in Chief of the United States Fleet; Vice Admiral F. J. Horne, Vice Chief of Naval Operations; Vice Admiral Samuel M. Robinson, Chief of the Bureau for Procurement of Materials; Rear Admiral Randall Jacobs, Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Rear Admiral E. L. Cochrane, Chief of the Bureau of Ships; Rear Admiral W. H. P. Blandy, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance; Rear Admiral Ben Moreell, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks; Rear Admiral W. B. Young, Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts; Rear Admiral J. S. McCain, Chief of the Burear of Aeronautics; and to Admiral Ross McIntire, the greatest Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery the Navy has ever had. Credit for building this great Navy goes to these patriotic, hard-working, efficient bureau chiefs.

Let us examine a few of the high points of the bill under consideration and see how it carries forth the Navy's program, which was started long before Pearl Harbor. The huge sum of twenty-nine and one-half billion dollars is made necessary for the fiscal year 1944 because of the ever-growing size of the Navy. The peak of Navy personnel for the calendar year of 1943 will be reached sometime in the fall; it will be composed of 1,588,013 officers and men. That number will be increased by an additional 823,987 in 1944. The peak of the Marine Corps for 1943 will be 300,661 officers and men. That number will be increased by 59,554 during the fiscal year 1944. The peak of the Coast Guard in 1943 will be 156,910 officers and men, and will be increased by 13,415 in 1944. Women—officers and enlisted personnel—in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, will reach the peak of 35,840 in 1943, and will be increased to 63,560 in 1944.

The bill carries $1,002,691,000 for the marines. And from the way they have been fighting, that sum is very little. The marines have rendered great service in the Pacific, and I am sure, after listening to the Prime Minister's speech this morning, it will not be long until they will be called upon in the Atlantic. Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, the Commandant, says the spirit of the corps was never higher. We can all rest assured that the marines will live up to their high standards and noble traditions.

A provision of $467,756,000 has been made for the Coast Guard. As you all know, in peacetime the Coast Guard operates under the Treasury Department. But in time of war it becomes a part of the Navy. Its functions and duties are to protect our harbors, our merchant shipping, and our shore lines. For all practical purposes, as far as budgetary matters are concerned, the Coast Guard is separate and independent of the Navy. It builds and procures its own ships, trains its own personnel, and buys its own ordnance and supplies. In my humble judgment, much consideration should be given to retaining the Coast Guard in the Navy after peace

comes. Its functions are purely naval, and it should be as much a part of the Navy as is the Marine Corps. In making it a permanent part of the Navy, I am convinced that many millions of dollars could be saved.

The bill carries $9,118,120,000 for new ships. The Navy has some 30 to 40 different type ships. Many of these different types are auxiliary craft which serve our fighting ships. At the end of the fiscal year of 1943 the Navy will have 26,326 ships of all types in commission. That number at the end of the fiscal year 1944 will be increased to 41,179. We have today approximately 2,674 combat ships, and that number will be increased to 4,153 in 1944. The remainder of the ships come under the classification of district and yard craft, small landing craft, and special boats. Funds are made available in this bill at the proper time for 1,000,000 tons of auxiliary ships and 1,000,000 tons of landing and district craft. About one-half of the 1,000,000 tons of auxiliary craft will be allocated to the construction of auxiliary aircraft carriers, which will be somewhere in the neighborhood of 50. As Vice Admiral Horne well stated: "Aircraft carriers are now the backbone of the fleet." These small auxiliary carriers are in addition to the many large combat carriers that are now near completion.

Rear Admiral Cochrane, Chief of the Bureau of Ships, has estimated that the life of a landing ship is indeed very short, and that we lose from 25 to 50 percent of the landing craft used in every operation. It should be noted that such heavy losses of these ships does not indicate in the slightest that the men in them are lost in the same proportion.

All of us know that it is the Navy's job to convoy safely our merchant ships and our transports. Considering the head start that Hitler had in the construction of submarines, I think the Navy has done a magnificent job in combating that menace. During the month of March the Allies' ship losses in all oceans were perhaps the greatest that we have suffered since the war began. During the month of April those losses were whittled down to about one-half of those in March. Of the number of ships lost in April, about one-third were cargo ships belonging to the United States. The indications for the month of May are that our cargo-ship losses will be about the same as April. We are looking for sizable losses until the month of September. From then on they should begin to materially dry up. Beginning in September, the Navy will commission about 35 or 40 destroyer escort vessels per month. These DE's plus auxiliary aircraft carriers will be the death knell to Hitler's submarine menace.

One of the biggest items in the bill is for ordnance in the sum of $3,476,800,000. It covers armament and munitions which is broken down into at least 15 to 20 classifications, ranging all the way from torpedoes, guns, radio equipment, gunpowder, and TNT. Rear Admiral Blandy told the committee that it was wise to keep large supplies of ordnance on hand. Millions of dollars' worth of spare parts must be available at all times. The exact needs of the fleet are in some degree speculative; no one can foresee just how much battle damage there will be to the ships and just how much ammunition will be used. If ammunition and guns are not available when the Navy needs them, lives and ships will be lost. Then all we can say is, "Too little and too late." But we have about $3,500,000,000 surplus ordnance on hand now. It is encouraging, though, that 90 percent or more of the needs of the Navy ordnance facilities are now in operation, and very few, if any, new facilities will be constructed. During the past 5 years the Bureau of Ordnance has spent $750,000,000 for tools and facilities, either in its own plants or in plants operated by private enterprise for the use and benefit of the Navy.

This bill carries funds for 27,642 airplanes to be constructed in 1944 and 1945, at a cost of $4,847,725,000. We are now making provision for these planes because the War Production Board requires that the needs of the Navy be scheduled 15 months in advance so a proper allocation of materials can be made in order to insure delivery. Provision has heretofore been made in the recent naval deficiency appropriation bill for the needs of the Bureau during 1944.

It is a fair statement that the Government, through the Navy and the Army, has completely subsidized the airplane industry. The Navy alone has spent, up to date, $625,309,000 for airplane and engine facilities. Very little expansion of the industry will be made in the future.

To take care of, and to service these planes the Navy has some half dozen mechanics schools from which it has turned out 21,000 mechanics, and will be turning out 5,700 per month by the 1st of July of this year. The men receive from 4 to 6 months' training. Not only are airplanes expensive—they range from $90,000 to $5,000,000 per plane—but their equipment, such as radio and radar, is also expensive. It costs about $20,000 to equip a large plane with radio and about $30,000 for radar.

About 125,000 planes will be delivered this year to the Army and the Navy, which represents our total production. Although this figure is huge, it indicates we are about 6 months late in our schedule. It is generally agreed that today we are building some two and one-half to three times as many planes as Germany. During the month of April our production was about 6,500 planes. We shall reach our maximum capacity in the month of December of this year, which will be about 10,500 to 11,000 planes per month. Our monthly production will level off with that figure, which means some 132,000 planes will be built during the calendar year of 1944.

In talking about our great Navy, oftentimes we forget about perhaps one of the most important features of it; namely, the health of the men who do the job. That is the task of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery; it also handles all naval hospital facilities. Admiral McIntire says the health of the Navy is excellent, and all of us know that to be a fact. There have been no epidemics in the Navy. The ideal rate of doctors for every 1,000 men in the Navy is 6.5. On that basis the Navy should have 20,000 doctors by the end of 1944. However, today it has only 9,000, and Admiral McIntire says he doubts if it will have more than 12,000 by the end of 1944. There are not enough doctors to go around; but the admiral is confident those he has will be more than equal to the task. The Navy will not have much trouble in procuring dentists. One dentist is required to every 500 men.

The Navy now has 16 temporary hospitals and 15 permanent ones, with a total of about 40,000 beds. Twenty thousand additional beds will be provided during the fiscal year of 1944. The funds for the new beds were provided for in the last Navy deficiency bill.

I should like to discuss for a few minutes the question of looking toward reductions in future appropriations for the Navy. The Congress has not failed to provide the Navy with practically all the funds, with a few minor exceptions, it has requested. It has been estimated that if the war were to end late in 1944 the Navy would have on hand over $60,000,000,000 in surplus materials, supplies, ordnance, ships, tools, and plant facilities. We all know we are not now fighting for dollars, but we are fighting for our very lives, and our freedom, and our homes. If ships and guns and ammunition and planes are not provided when they are needed, we may well lose the war. But, on the other hand, there must be a point somewhere within reason, between that amount of munitions, ships, airplanes, and supplies generally that are absolutely needed and the amount that we are building today. The time has come when serious consideration should be given to reducing all future appropriation bills, especially if surpluses are being accumulated. This is a delicate question, I know, and the very best judgment will have to be used. However, I am firmly convinced that many millions—yes; several billions—of dollars can be saved.

I am afraid that we are paying too much for many implements of war. Take, for instance, airplanes. I am just wondering if we could not get a little more for our money than we are now getting from that industry, which I have stated before is 100 percent subsidized by the taxpayers. Take, for example, the airplane FM-2, which is a standard fighter plane that has been in production for 3 years. That plane cost $75,825 in 1941, $79,851 in 1942, and $112,205 in 1943. In 1944 it will drop to $97,365, which is about 13-percent decrease. Prices of materials and labor, so the Bureau of Aeronautics says, made the plane advance in price from $75,825 in 1941 to $112,205 in 1943. It seems that with mass production, after 3 years of effort, the price should be lower than it was in 1941, when the plane first went into production.

The Bureau of Supplies and Accounts is the quartermaster for the Navy, and buys millions upon millions of dollars worth of food, clothing, and all types of supplies needed by the Navy. It should

watch very carefully for signs of collusion between bidders. Where it finds evidence of price fixing whereby the taxpayers of the United States are forced to pay a price higher than the normal, competitive price because of collusion and price fixing, the Department of Justice should be called into action.

This bill calls for an expenditure of $750,000, the purpose of which is to take an inventory of tools and facilities of the various plants operated by the Navy, and in all plants under its direction. The Navy admits $750,000 is only a starter. Frankly, I do not like the idea. It rather smacks of a Navy W. P. A. project. The Navy now has in its possession a list of all of these tools and the prices paid for them. If it has not, there should be a wholesale firing in the Navy today. What condition the tools will be in 6 months from now, or a year and a half, or 2 years after constant use, is a question that cannot be determined more than 2 or 3 months in advance. What disposition will be made of all the tools and equipment in all facilities and plants owned by the Navy and the Army will be a subject to which the Congress will give much consideration when the present need for them has come to an end. Any study of tools and facilities which does not include housing, and the personnel that operates them, and other kindred subjects, will be of very little use and benefit. The Navy does not include in its proposed survey the problems affecting civilian workers, but only seeks to count the machinery. In my judgment, this $750,000 is thrown away. The plan will call for the expenditure during the next 2 years of several millions more for the same purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, little remains for me to discuss, and I do not intend to take much time in general debate. I do desire to reassert that, notwithstanding the size of this bill in dollars, your subcommittee studied carefully each proposal of those in charge of supporting the Nation's war effort from the standpoint of the Navy. We recognized that we were at war. We undertook to eliminate from the estimate and requests for appropriations every item we thought to be extravagant, unnecessary, or unwise for the general conduct of the war, from our standpoint as the representatives of the people, out of whose pockets must come first the wherewithal measured monetarily, and from whom must come the men and women to carry out the program to win the war.

The report supports and justifies the national and common ideal to see the war effort pushed with the utmost vigor and efficiency to the end that the unconditional surrender of the common enemies of mankind may be accomplished at the earliest possible date.

There were no petty or partisan politics involved in our long and tedious and responsible discussions of each and every and all the items. All of us had but one end in view, and that to bring you a bill which we were and are satisfied sufficiently covers the present necessities.

We need not be complacent, however, for we may have underestimated our needs even at that.

At Boston day before yesterday Secretary Knox, while declaring the Allied Nations were acquiring greater and greater domination over the enemy's lines of communications, emphasized that a stiff fight lay ahead.

This can only mean a swift increase—

He said—

in the number of human lives sacrificed, heavier and heavier expenditures of wealth to support the forces, more and more restrictions, strain, and sacrifices on the home front.

That means more and bigger appropriations.

I am sure that whatever it may take, those things we are fighting for are worth the price; that this is the sentiment of every American there can be no question. I shall briefly undertake to answer in part, the question.

Why is the Navy bill so large?

This is a question which my constituents repeatedly have asked me and one which I thought I had to investigate. The size of the figures, running as they do—$25,500,000,000 in 1943 and almost thirty billion this year without regard to the figures for the War Department, which are about double this size—makes the question of where these huge sums are coming from a matter of constant moment to the people and the Congress.

I have studied and investigated the subject and find that the reason the sums have reached the totals they have in this war is due to changes that have taken place in the character of the war we are pursuing. In the last World War the Japanese and Italians were allies and the Mediterranean was open and there was no active theater in the Pacific. In this war we are not only confronted with the problem of the supply of the British Empire, which alone approximates the problem of supply we undertook in the last World War in maintaining two and one-half million men overseas, but we are also confronted with the supply lines to Australia and the control of the Pacific Ocean. We not only have the life line across the North Atlantic to Great Britain but also lines of supply to South America and the African coast. The demands, therefore, upon the Navy have probably increased fourfold over what they were in the World War No. 1, in 1917–19 days. This is without regard to the fact that modern warfare has become more mechanized even afloat and that the machines and devices which have been invented cost more money. Air warfare has complicated sea warfare.

If you examine the Navy bill you will find that the bulk of the money is going into the construction of ships, the procurement of aircraft, and the provision for ordnance for these subjects. The munition procurement phase is passing and in this year and next the continuous expansion of the Navy will result in a shift of funds from procurement to operation. However in the current bill, which totals $29,485,795,000, almost one-third of it is still for new ships and one-fifth of it is for aviation. The figures are ship construction, $9,000,000,000; aviation, $6,500,000,000; ordnance, $3,500,000,000, and the maintenance and equipment charges of the Bureau of Ships are almost $2,000,000,000. I will discuss these subjects in detail.

The following table I have prepared permits of a quick analysis, by general objects, of the Budget estimates for 1944, the amounts by which they differ from current appropriations, and the amounts proposed by the committee:

Object	1944 estimates	Increase (+) decrease (−) compared with 1943	Committee proposals
New ships	$9,024,000,000	+$2,227,739,615	[1] $9,118,120,000
Aviation	[2] 6,574,725,000	+1,316,743,530	[3] 4,583,725,000
Public works	1,870,000,000	+543,994,970	1,855,317,405
Pay, subsistence, transportation, training, education, and welfare	4,260,174,000	+2,017,885,804	4,271,114,384
Maintenance, Bureau of Ships	1,830,000,000	+121,020,065	1,735,880,000
Ordnance and ordnance store	3,476,800,000	−477,365,413	3,476,800,000
Floating drydocks	210,000,000	+200,000,000	160,000,000
Defense installations on merchant vessels	57,000,000	−43,000,000	57,000,000
Transportation of things	200,000,000	+200,000,000	200,000,000
Miscellaneous	554,159,000	−427,493,059	535,282,165
Marine Corps	961,058,000	+211,032,308	1,002,691,484
Coast Guard	467,879,000	−38,370,610	467,756,760
Total	[4] 29,485,795,000	+5,851,187,219	[4] 27,463,687,198

[1] And contingent contractual authority of $2,779,880,000.
[2] And contractual authority of $9,000,000.
[3] And contractual authority of $2,000,000,000.
[4] And contractual authority of $2,000,000,000 and contingent contractual authority of $2,779,880,000.

The total appropriation requested for the Navy for the fiscal year 1944 amounts to $29,400,000,000 in round numbers. The total amount appropriated for the Navy in the fiscal year 1943 was roughly $25,500,000,000. This represents an increase of $4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1944.

There are two methods by which we can portray the necessity for such an increase: One, a tabulation of appropriation titles by the two fiscal years and a summary of the justifications for each increase; two, a break-down showing the major items that cause the increase and a brief statement covering each of these. The former method can be obtained in the hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee. These justifications are too voluminous to present here so we

will discuss the major items making up the increase.

These major items are: Ships, ordnance, aviation, personnel, training, and public works. Under the heading "Ships" there are two subdivisions: (a) Ship construction, and (b) maintenance.

The Navy will commission about 2,000 new vessels during the fiscal year 1944, an increase of 20 percent over the number commissioned in fiscal year 1943. Considering landing craft and special small boats, nearly 20,000 units will be under construction. In addition, the number of ships in operation at the end of the fiscal year 1944 will be 4,682, an increase of 1,499 ships over those operated at the end of fiscal year 1943. The upkeep and operation of this expanding fleet, overhauls and dockings, major repairs and alterations, ship materials, maintenance of shore establishments, investigations and tests, and miscellaneous operating costs amount to $1,735,880,000. The ship-construction estimate is $9,118,120,000. Hence ship construction and maintenance will total $10,854,000,000, almost 33⅓ percent of the total appropriation of twenty-nine billion five hundred million.

The Navy is proceeding with the building of a well-balanced fleet. As the strategic situation changes the pattern must be changed accordingly. It has become imperative to place emphasis on immediate procurement of special type vessels to meet demands. Much of the increase in ship construction this year is the result of these demands. The destroyer escort vessel is a type developed specifically for antisubmarine work. The auxiliary aircraft carrier is another type being acquired in large numbers. Landing craft need no description in view of the publicity attendant to their use in Guadalcanal and north Africa. The need for small craft, special boats, and district craft becomes greater as continental and advance bases expand.

The aviation estimate is $6,583,725,000, including $2,000,000,000 contract authority. This amount represents an increase of $1,325,743,530 over current 1943 appropriations. Delivery will increase roughly 100 percent this year. By the end of fiscal year 1944, the total number of aircraft on hand, even excluding losses, will be double the present number. Aviation requirements comprise instruments, maintenance, experiments, and construction of aircraft. Instruments include navigational, aerological, testing, and photographic equipment. The maintenance item covers the cost of overhaul and operation of aircraft, aviation gasoline, special equipment and major repairs at air stations and various other similar requirements. The value of experimental work in aircraft and development of new types is so well known that it is believed nothing need be offered in the way of explanation. Of course, the subhead Construction of Aircraft is also self-explanatory in view of the increase in numbers of planes.

The next item is ordnance. To cover ordnance for aircraft and ships both with the increase in the number of ships mentioned above there must be a large increase in the ordnance equipage and ammunition. This equipage includes not only the repairs and alterations to the original equipment and spares for installations afloat and ashore, but also the replenishment of ammunition and the upkeep and operation of such shore establishments to complement this equipment. Modern war consumes large quantities of ammunition. The amount requested under this heading was roughly $3,500,000,000. An analysis of this will develop that approximately $3,125,000,000 were earmarked for new equipment items. This fact is indicative of the enormous increase in the offensive power of our Navy. On top of this program it is necessary to provide armament for all the 20,000,000 tons of vessels of the merchant marine being built this year. The ordnance equipment, both original and replacement, of aircraft is furnished from this appropriation. This equipment includes bombs, bomb details, pyrotechnics, and aerial and surface-craft torpedoes. The increase in the tempo of aerial warfare in all spheres of action is so evident that further comment appears unnecessary.

I have mentioned ships, ordnance, and aviation. These are only the tools of war. The most important task is that of procurement and the training of personnel to man and use these tools of war efficiently. A ship is, in effect, simply a gun platform. The best armament on a ship is useless if it is not brought to bear on the enemy in effective range or if the ship it is on is listed over so that the guns cannot bear on the foe. An airplane on the ground is a useless exhibit of the manufacturer's skill. To make them effective, they must be manned and operated by skilled personnel. In the fiscal year 1944 the Navy will increase its enlisted personnel by approximately 55 percent. The money requested for the fiscal year 1944 for the procurement, training, food, pay, and indoctrination of the personnel of the Navy is the best type of national insurance.

An enormous training program for both officers and enlisted men has been developed. This program has embraced the major portion of 1,700 schools or colleges throughout the Nation. This program has been integrated with the needs of the service as indicated by the operating ships, the planes delivered, the stations and advanced bases placed in commission and the various directives placed in effect by the chief of naval operations. New methods of training have been developed and their efficacy has been demonstrated under battle conditions.

The Public Works request amounts to $1,855,317,405. This will provide for the construction of advance bases in the areas of operations, for additions to existing stations beyond the continental limits, and comparatively minor work on the continental establishment necessary to complement the fleet. It will be noted that this past year we have reached the peak in construction in the United States. From now on, the bulk of funds will be expended on the procurement of materials and equipment for the establishment of supporting bases in the active theaters of war. The expansion of these will depend on the speed of our offensive action, the zones of attack, and other factors that cannot be predicted at present.

The supply and maintenance of bases set up throughout the world is a problem that can be readily appreciated.

The program for fleet facilities is based on the needs of the expanding active operating forces. It would be futile to increase the fleet and then deny it the facilities near the operating areas that it requires for effective action.

The aviation program of the Public Works makes provision for the expanding aircraft strength of the Navy. Before new units of aircraft can be joined to the fleet organization, they must be thoroughly trained for combat. With the large increase in aircraft and personnel, the existing aviation shore establishment, here and abroad, must be expanded to meet their needs.

We have listened and interrogated and investigated and inspected. The bill we have brought you is reduced in amount to the lowest figure we as Americans dare to drag it down as safe for security. There is no item of expenditure which anybody will discuss that has not had our fullest consideration, our best judgment, and the report is unanimously made. I, for one, will assume full responsibility for the astronomical figures it carries as completely necessary in order that we have the wherewith to meet and to back the will of the people who pay the bills to win the war.

I have already used more time than I intended to use, Mr. Chairman, and while there is much more I might say, I yield back my time, for I am sure it will be better used by those who will follow me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. No; I will not yield. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it not necessary to at least have one Member on the floor for each billion dollars contained in an appropriation bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, it is a great privilege and a pleasure for me to serve as a member of the Committee on Appropriations subcommittee having to do with appropriations for the Navy Department. I had a few preconceived notions concerning the Navy and its personnel, prior to the inception of my service on this committee, which I am pleased to report were largely disabused. In other words, those preconceptions of the Navy Department which were slightly unfavorable to it, which I had erroneously entertained prior to the time

that I was a member of the committee, were driven out of my mind by reason of my contact with the officers, enlisted men, and with my colleagues on the committee; and I am happy to report that my impression of the Navy Department is one of inspiration, something that would buoy up any patriotic Member of Congress or citizen of the United States. It would be an act of remissness on my part, were I to fail to pay what I believe to be a condign tribute to my colleagues on the committee. Particularly do I wish to pay tribute to the ranking member of the committee on the Republican side, and the chairman and ranking member on the Democratic side, all three of whom devoted tireless efforts and energy to the important work of the Navy subcommittee.

It would be a work of supererogation were I to attempt to characterize in adequate language and in feeling terms the great ability and devotion to duty of our Clerk, Mr. John Pugh, to whom fitting tribute was paid some time ago by the erudite and able Republican Member from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] revealed by his work on the committee, a remarkable grasp and understanding of the recondite programs and ramified operations in the Navy Department. He gave unremittingly of his energy and of his limitless ability to the work of the committee in such a way as to merit the enthusiastic support of all Members of this Congress, were they there to see him work. The questions he propounded to the various witnesses who appeared before the committee were couched in such language and brought out such information as was of invaluable service to the committee, to the Congress, and to the country. The same can be said of the eminent chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. HARRY SHEPPARD], who expended unselfishly his time and versatile abilities day and night in the work of this committee. In fact, the committee worked throughout the recent recess in day-long sessions, while other Members were able, in some cases at least, to go home. They put consideration of their country and the needs of the Navy ahead of their own personal desires, and hence continued with those hearings, during the Easter vacation. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the chairman of this subcommittee, deserves the support and the poignant thanks of all of us for the superb work he performed. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALBERT THOMAS], the ranking Democratic member of the committee, has earned the same thanks and support of the Congress and the country, as do the other two gentlemen. Rather than repeat what I have said I would merely add that the same encomiums apply to them. I am proud to be associated, likewise, with the brilliant, witty, and erudite gentleman from Vermont, CHARLIE PLUMLEY, and with the outstanding and gifted Republican Member from Indian, Mr. NOBLE JOHNSON, and also that agreeable young man from the State of Mississippi, Mr. JAMES WHITTEN, a new member of the committee, whose impressive and remarkable grasp of the law was revealed graphically by the questions which he propounded so well and intelligently during the deliberations of the committee.

I had not had the pleasure heretofore of knowing the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] very well, but after having associated with him on the committee, I entertain for him a profound respect, affection, and admiration. I might say parenthetically that I believe all of us are benefited by our association on these committees with our colleagues in Congress. We are not often vouchsafed an opportunity to become well acquainted with our colleagues, and unless and until we become associated with them intimately in committees, in that capacity, we may not discover that all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have attainments and possess attractive qualities of which we may not theretofore have been aware. We become, in a sense, sort of fraternity brothers or close associates and in my judgment it makes service in this Congress all the more agreeable and all the more to be valued.

The work of the Navy Subcommittee on Appropriations is of tremendous importance. Here we are about to appropriate the greatest sum of money ever provided in any appropriation in the history of the world for any navy department of any nation—$29,000,000,000. It seems such an astronomical sum as to baffle our imagination, as to shock our inner sensibilities. It is impossible for one to realize just how much is embraced within that sum. Nevertheless, here we are engaged in battle against the most formidable foes that were ever arrayed against a civilized nation in the history of the world. Here we are arrayed against Germany and Japan, whose male citizens have engrafted in them an appreciation and devotion to the military prowess that no other country has approached up to this time. We must be prepared, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] so well said, to give generously and self-sacrificingly of the national treasure in order that we may decisively, shatteringly, and successfully cope with those tremendously formidable foes—Japan, Germany, and Italy.

It is a rather difficult thing to come before Congress with a bill such as this, because necessarily a good portion of the printed hearings do not embrace much of the most interesting and gripping testimony which took place before the committee. I should venture the assertion that at least half the total testimony which was received is unavoidably off the record and cannot be printed, because of the danger of apprising the enemy of secret information or suggestions or technical approaches which would not be proper and would be highly dangerous. Therefore all the greater responsibility rests upon the seven members of the Navy Subcommittee on Appropriations, and our colleagues are compelled, whether they like the practice or not, to repose prodigious confidence in us. As I asserted, the major portion or at least a substantial portion of the testimony cannot be made available to you in the form of printed hearings, and you have to accord to us confidence in our reasoned judgment as to whether each or all of these appropriations are justified. Likewise, we must have faith in the integrity of our Navy officers and the directing officials of the Navy.

The committee had no substantial differences. There were not any party feuds. There was spirited discussion among the members, but we agreed upon every portion of the bill as reported to the House. We were satisfied that the Navy, to the fullest extent possible, under the stress and strain of wartime, was endeavoring sedulously to secure a dollar's worth of value for a dollar spent, recognizing, of course, that in time of war when speed is the primary motive and consideration, one cannot always get full value for the money spent.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I have understood that your committee made a very thorough investigation. This is the largest naval appropriation bill ever made in this country, and I guess anywhere in all the history of the world.

Mr. COFFEE. In all the history of the world.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this report came from his committee unanimously?

Mr. COFFEE. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. How many members compose the committee?

Mr. COFFEE. Seven members; four Democrats and three Republicans.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The subcommittee consists of seven members?

Mr. COFFEE. Seven members.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And it unanimously reported this bill?

Mr. COFFEE. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The full committee has how many members?

Mr. COFFEE. I believe 43.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Did it have the unanimous support of the full committee?

Mr. COFFEE. It did indeed.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Those 43 members of the full Committee on Appropriations come from all sections of the country?

Mr. COFFEE. That is correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I think it is remarkable that this subcommittee and the full committee bring in by a unanimous report the greatest amount ever appropriated in the history of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. COFFEE. I appreciate very much the statement just made by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, whom we all recognize as one of the leaders in thought in the House of Representatives. I think it is a tribute to the

regard entertained for their colleagues by the Members of the House and for the integrity of the Navy itself that we were able to bring out a bill, unanimously reported by the subcommittee and the full committee, and that the Congress generally, in my judgment, will support this bill without any amendments being added to it. Our colleagues have to repose confidence in us because, as I mentioned awhile ago, we have to leave out a large portion of the testimony which they might have had if it were printed, not that we do not trust the Members of Congress, but that the printed hearings would become available to the country, and we know that regardless of the care with which we try to get at the spies and saboteurs from other countries, there are bound to be a few within our borders who would pick up and transmit to the enemy something of that nature.

I am deeply impressed with the officer personnel of the Navy.

The bureau heads of the Navy Department are men in whom we may repose the utmost confidence. Just to cite an example, Admiral Ben Moreell, one of the outstanding bureau heads of the Navy in charge of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, a man who has demonstrated time and time again a devotion to duty and a marvelous and inspiring grasp of the many and ramified problems in that field of the Navy, as the Secretary of the Navy has said, has been offered several times a job at $100,000 a year, which he promptly declined because he patriotically wanted to devote his great experience and skill to the people of the United States. We have comprising the various department heads men of similar character, such as Admiral Ross McIntyre, the head of the Medical Department of the Navy, who has an international reputation and who has done a masterly job in providing the medical and hospital facilities needed for the men of the Navy. If time permitted and your patience lasted, one could discuss in detail and pay fitting tribute to each of these admirals and men who are too often the butt of criticism on the part of unthinking or unknowing people. These officers would far rather be out on the scene of action, they would far rather be on the field of glory and the danger great, than to be here at home doing this work which is so necessary. Those of us who have talked with them know that, yet they are content to do this indispensable work, although it deprives them of the fame and glamor and publicity in the newspapers and press of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

OREGON CELEBRATES AFRICAN VICTORY

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am sure we all will gladly support this Navy bill. We must provide the finances for victory on every front.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of my native State of Oregon. Today, pursuant to a proclamation issued by Gov. Earl Snell, the State of Oregon is holding a celebration, rejoicing over our all-out victory on the African front. Arrangements are made so that the war activities will not be required to close down or be interfered with by Oregon's celebration. Governor Snell issued the following proclamation:

I, Earl Snell, Governor of the State of Oregon, do hereby designate and set aside Wednesday, the 19th day of May 1943, as African Victory Day—as an occasion on which the people of this State will celebrate the redemption of the continent of Africa—the first continent reclaimed from our enemies.

The occupation of northwest Africa was an American program. The command of the African campaign was vested in our General Eisenhower. America's ground, aerial, and naval forces played a spectacular and vital part in the final battle of Tunisia.

Britain has rung its church bells and rejoiced throughout the land over the liberation; Russia and China have rejoiced. It is improper for America to leave to its comrades in arms the observance of the first decisive and absolute victory of the Second World War.

It is my hope that on the 19th of May every community in Oregon will join in this observance, in every way that it can be managed without interference with the war effort. And Oregon invites the States of the Union to join with her in celebration of the victory of our armed forces and the accomplishments of our home front.

On from Africa to the redemption of Europe and Asia!

EARL SNELL,
Governor, State of Oregon.

In issuing this proclamation Governor Snell said:

Freedom-loving people throughout the world are rejoicing over the decisive allied victory in north Africa. American Army, air, and naval forces made notable and decisive contributions to the success of the campaign. It is occasion for rejoicing and celebration. We must not detract from our all-out war effort. Further, we have a long and difficult road yet to travel to final and conclusive victory, but let us not leave the observance of this notable victory alone to the boys of our armed forces. Indeed it is an occasion for prayer and thanksgiving.

Mr. Chairman, from time to time I have had the honor and distinction of calling to the attention of the Members of the House the all-out war effort that has been made by the people of my State. I am certain that no State in the Union has evidenced more patriotic fervor or a more effective program in assisting in the prosecution of the war than have the people of my State. As we all know, in the construction of ships Oregon has led the Nation. The Kaiser yards have established the outstanding record of completing a Liberty ship in 8 days and a half. We have had no labor troubles. We have worked the clock around—men and women alike—bending their energies to the production of equipment necessary to bring success to our war effort. I doubt not that many of the ships, much of the equipment, and many of the airplanes which brought destruction to our enemies in Africa and success to our Army, were produced in the Northwest. The great hydroelectric plants on the Columbia River have been in operation day and night, furnishing the hydroelectric power for the production of aluminum and the turning of the wheels in the shipyards and other plants in making possible air superiority for the Allies, not only on the African front but on the European Continent as well.

Mr. Chairman, I join with my fellow citizens in Oregon in the celebration of this outstanding victory we have achieved on the African front, and our humble acknowledgment to Almighty God that He has willed that victory might be ours.

I trust that our military authorities and those who have the direction of the strategy of the campaigns will appreciate the necessity and the importance of concentrating our efforts upon an all-out offense against the cruel and dastardly Japanese, who are now digging in on the thousands of conquered islands and the other subjugated territory which they have seized, stretching from Australia to the Aleutians. We must assume the offensive in this great theater of war operations—the Pacific—and bring the war to the Japanese in their homeland. If we play a waiting game and relegate the Japanese conflict to second place and permit the resourceful and crafty Japanese to increase their resources and strength, marshal their assets in the conquered territories, and provide air bases, military outposts, and war installations and industries for future activities against us, we will later pay a fearful price for our complacency. Every hour we wait means the loss of additional American lives and the expenditure of millions of American dollars. May we not hope that the conferences now being held in Washington between our President and his staff and the Prime Minister of Great Britain and other high British officials may result in a plan to place the Japanese conflict of equal importance with the European battle front, requiring an all-out concentration of the strength of the Allies for immediate operation.

Mr. Chairman, we were all inspired today, I am sure, by the forceful historic address of the Prime Minister at the joint session just concluded, and the assurances and forthright promise he gave us that our British allies in this great struggle will stand by our side to the end in an all-out offensive against Japan until that barbarous nation is crushed to earth and her military establishments lie in ashes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is unavoidably out of town today. He has asked me to read a statement in his behalf because of his personal interest in this particular measure. As you know, the gentleman from Georgia has the enviable record of having served on the House Legislative Committee on Naval Affairs during World War No. 1, and has served on that committee continuously since that time, and since 1930 has been chairman of the committee. He commands the respect and admiration of every Member of this

Congress, I am sure. So, Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to read the statement which the gentleman from Georgia handed to me, which he prepared prior to his departure.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I read as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I shall be constrained to be absent when the House undertakes consideration of the 1944 naval appropriation bill. I have asked my colleague, Mr. COLE, a minority member of the Naval Affairs Committee, to express my approval of the measure that has been reported.

Owing to the courtesy of Chairman SHEPPARD, in charge of the bill, I have had an opportunity to examine both the original draft and the draft which the Committee on Appropriations has presented to the House, and it is my judgment that it is a generally good measure, well balanced, and thoroughly justified by the programs already legislatively approved.

Ships and airplanes control the measure basically, and the part pertaining to ships follows authorizations considered by the Naval Affairs Committee and which the House has approved. With respect to airplanes, the Naval Affairs Committee has lifted the ceiling upon the number of airplanes with which the Navy might be provided, for the duration of the war. The appropriation bill in the two respects indicated, therefore, is based upon proper legislative authorization.

The provision in the bill for enlisted personnel has been studied by the Naval Affairs Committee, at the instance of Chairman SHEPPARD, because he felt that by reason of the considerable increase the Department is advocating he would feel better about it and be in a better position if he had the views of the Naval Affairs Committee as to the matter.

The Naval Affairs Committee has had a hearing upon the matter, and we are thoroughly in accord with the number for which the bill provides.

I agree absolutely with the committee's report that the Navy's job ahead is a tremendous one, and that the Navy must be provided with every essential to make its accomplishment less difficult and absolutely sure and decisive. The cost is large, but so are the stakes, and, whatever the costs, we are out to win and we are going to win.

I wish to compliment Mr. SHEPPARD for the masterly way in which he has handled this measure and the 1943 supplemental naval appropriation bill, which he sponsored a few weeks ago. It is a new responsibility that has fallen upon him and the way he has discharged it is deserving of the highest commendation.

Mr. SHEPPARD has seen fit to counsel with me and the members of my committee, and in that way a better product is certain to ensue. We must have teamwork in providing for the war effort and I can assure the House that there never has been better teamwork between the Naval Affairs Committee and the Naval Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations than presently prevails. I might say that it would be a distinct improvement in the interest of better legislation and congressional procedure if there were more of that kind of cooperation.

I trust that the House will give approval to the bill presented by Mr. SHEPPARD, which I hope will be supported by the members of the Naval Affairs Committee.

My judgment is that we shall reap handsome dividends not far hence from the legislation and appropriations we have been providing.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York yields back 5 minutes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the lack of controversy which is apparent in the House on this appropriation bill of such a tremendous figure, twenty-nine and one-half billions, to my mind clearly demonstrates the unity of purpose we have in this country. It further substantiates the belief which I have found exists not because the Appropriations Subcommittee on Naval Affairs has found fit to recommend it to you, not because it has been brought to you by the whole committee, but because of the confidence the people of this country have in those who are leading us in our war efforts. The founding fathers of our country saw the advantages and wisdom of having the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, and the Commander in Chief selected from people in civil life.

They did that believing that the armed forces would be kept separate from the leadership of our country in a political or officeholding capacity. The civilian heads of these Departments have wisely seen fit then to leave the operation of the Navy and the War Department to the trained officers in those respective Departments who have the necessary training and experience to qualify as professional military men.

We on this committee have followed the same course.

Today as we come to you with this appropriation bill we are here as a subcommittee, not saying to you that we know that this money is necessary, but we come to you saying that we have had before us the trained military leaders as in the Navy Department who have charge, who have the experience, and who of necessity must lay the plans and carry on the operation of the plans for the conduct of this war. It may be that we should determine or designate this bill not as the Navy appropriation bill but as the cost-of-transport bill, the cost of transporting troops and supplies, the cost of defending our coast line during this war, and the cost of getting together the various elements that are necessary for the successful prosecution of the war and having them at the proper place at the proper time. That is the kind of bill we have brought here.

This morning you heard the Prime Minister of Great Britain say to you that we were getting ahead so far as preparation and the raising of a sufficient army is concerned, you heard him say we were getting ahead just as fast as we need to so far as the manufacture of munitions of war are concerned, but he further said any man who has knowledge of the matter will tell you that the big problem today is that of transportation, that of getting these armies together with ample machines of war and supplies to whip the enemy on the ground where we must wage the battles.

As stated the civilian heads of the Army and Navy have shown, I am glad to say, the good judgment of leaving the planning and running of this war in the hands of those expert officers who are trained and versed in the preparation and prosecution of the war. I take that credit for this committee because we too have followed that policy. We have diligently investigated each application for funds. We have required the proper officers of the Navy to justify the appropriations, much of the justification of necessity being off the record, but in each instance we have come back to the planning of the high naval officers to whom in the final analysis we must look for the proper preparation and handling of the Navy's part of this war.

Many items look unduly large in this appropriation bill. Frankly the amount of money involved passes human understanding. In that connection let me add, however, that the work of our Navy, the seven seas it must patrol, the number of troops it must transport and supply to the four corners of the globe, the miles of shoreline it must patrol is also so large as to practically be beyond human comprehension. Yet we must be prepared. We must have enough ships, enough ordnance, enough planes, enough men properly trained to beat the enemy to the punch on many fronts. God knows that we cannot risk having too little and being too late.

When this war is over, in all probability, we will ask ourselves how it was that we could ever have thought it necessary to amass the amount of munitions, planes, ships, and other materials as we will then have on hand. But Mr. Chairman, we cannot and must not raise that question at this time other than to be sure that we do not have more than enough to meet the planning of our admirals and our generals together with our allies to whom we must look for the winning of the war.

While we have worked hard, my association with the members of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations has been most pleasant. I, together with the distinguished Member from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], constitute the new members of the subcommittee. Of necessity we have had to spend much time in learning our work and in acquainting ourselves with the Navy set-up, its organization and operation. I believe I have learned much and give due credit to the senior members of the committee, the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], and to the minority, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER], the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], who have been most helpful to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] and myself in our attempt to master this subject and work. It was a privilege to remain here during the Easter recess to expedite this work, if by so doing we could help a little more in this time of stress.

I sincerely hope that the time will soon come when the membership of this House will want to know how it could have appropriated this huge sum for the defense of our Nation and to carry on

this war. For when that time comes it will mean that the war is over and we are once again turning our mind to peaceful pursuits. In the meantime we must of necessity supply every ship, every gun, every trained member of the Navy, every plane, and ample supplies of provisions and medical supplies to protect those men as may be necessary to win the war. Unless we do that we have been derelict in our duty. It is a pleasure for me to note that every Member of this House subscribes to that same view.

Mr. KNUTSON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Minnesota rise?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to call attention to the fact that this bill carries nearly $30,000,000,000 and there are only seven Democrats on the floor. I shall not make the point of no quorum because that is incumbent upon the majority. I am merely making that observation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, we are considering this afternoon a bill that provides for an expenditure of more than $29,000,000,000, the biggest appropriation bill ever presented to a Congress. It is all to be expended under the authority of the Navy Department, and since it is for the prosecution of the war, even though it is a tremendous sum, there will be no objection on either side of the aisle so long as the funds are spent judiciously. The first and paramount thing to be considered is that everything be done to bring this war to a successful conclusion at the earliest possible date and with the least possible loss of life.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the statement of the gentleman from Texas, who spoke a few moments ago, that in his judgment we should scrutinize every item of expenditure of public funds that does not contribute to the prosecution of this war. Following his statement, I believe it might be worth while to call your attention to a situation that I do not think is necessary or commendable. I have just observed in reading a press report with regard to the International Food Conference being held at Hot Springs, Va., that one of our Government departments has approved a permit calling for the delivery of 2,400 pints of liquor to be used at that conference. The report further states that each delegate and attaché is allowed in addition thereto to bring in at least 1 gallon of liquor on his own account. Personally, I do not think it should be necessary for a group of representatives, meeting in the United States for the purpose of considering the question of providing food for the people in various parts of the world, to be furnished a supply of intoxicating liquor. I just do not see how the furnishing and the use of liquor will contribute in attempting to bring about a solution of such an important problem.

Mr. Chairman, I observe that we do have some members of the Appropriations Committee on the floor, some of whom are in charge of this measure. I would like to know if someone who has the information can tell me whether or not the funds used to buy the liquor really comes from the Federal Treasury; and if so, from what particular fund? I ask this question for two reasons: First, because the press says that the request for permit to provide the liquor for the conference was by an official from the office of the Secretary of State; second, because, on other occasions, I have questioned the necessity of providing funds for our representatives abroad in the name of representation and entertainment. Only a few weeks ago I questioned an item in an appropriation bill of approximately $400,000 that was to be used, according to the report in the bill, for representation abroad.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the question of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] regarding information as to the mechanics in which whisky is purchased by our State Department for the activities at the food conference in Hot Springs, Va., I will state for the RECORD and in order to clarify the situation that the request for this liquor was made by the Department of State solely for the purpose of the entertainment of the approximately 500 delegates participating in the conference. I am assured that none of this liquor will go to any individual delegate but will be used entirely for the formal and official entertainments such as the official banquets for these delegates.

The gentleman is inquiring for information as to just where this money for the purchase of the 2,400 pints of whisky for the Hot Springs conference is coming from. For his information and for the information of the House, I will state that I am officially informed that this money comes from the $7,000,000 State Department emergency fund which is under the control of the President. It does not come from the President's discretionary fund or from lend-lease, but from the $7,000,000 emergency fund contained in the regular appropriation for the regular functions of the Department of State.

I want to repeat again that so far as the State Department is concerned and because of the laws of Virginia, the Department of State made the formal request from the officials of Virginia and received a courteous reply and is receiving courteous cooperation. Without giving my personal approval of these activities, but merely for the sake of giving official information, I want to repeat again that I am assured that none of this liquor is to go to any individual but to be used exclusively for the formal and official entertainments and banquets which are customarily held in connection with such conferences. I agree that we should eliminate funds for liquor. Sobriety is so important now.

I am informed that foreigners expect to have liquor served at these official functions and that they do serve liquor at similar functions in foreign countries, and the Department of State is merely reciprocating in order to meet the usual foreign customs which are carried out at these official gatherings.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to know whether they drink it out of a glass or a bottle.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This connects up pretty well with the representation fund that we discussed a while ago.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman knows that I have fought against a large representation fund and that we did secure some cut in the appropriation for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman. Yes, I do know about the effort the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has made to cut these funds. I commend him for it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman thoroughly appreciates the fact that there is not a dime in this bill for what he is discussing, does he not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am sure that is correct, but we did have before this House a few weeks ago an appropriation bill carrying such an item.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; not in this bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I had members of the Appropriations Committee before me at that time and I called attention to the question of "representation" funds on the floor of the House at that time, but I could not get a satisfactory answer as to how and where these so-called representation funds were spent. I thought now that some of the members of the Appropriations Committee are present, that they might explain if they have the information whether or not any of the money spent for the liquor I mentioned was so-called representation money, to which I directed the attention of the committee some weeks ago. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has furnished the information.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman should know now that there is no money in the measure before us for the uses to which the gentleman has reference. That is definite.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I understand there are no such funds in this bill before us. I simply presented the matter because of the discussion by a member of the committee on the general question of making sure that our Government should be careful about the expenditure of funds not required for the prosecution of the war. Since I had some of the members of the Appropriations Committee before me, I thought they might be able to supply the information.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement by the gentleman from

Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], a member of the Appropriations Committee, that this money comes from the $7,000,000 State Department emergency fund under the control of the President. Mr. Chairman, I realize that there are instances where the problems affecting international policies may not be discussed in public but I do not understand why a meeting that is purported to be held for the purpose of discussing the food problems of the world should be held in secret. Even if the public, generally, are not admitted I do feel that the least that could be done would be to permit Members of Congress, who are, after all, representatives of the people, to sit in on the conference and have first-hand information. I think the people of this country are entitled to that consideration and should have it because such problems, insofar as this country is concerned, will finally need to come to Congress for consideration. As I have said before, I do not believe any good reason or justification has thus far been given why representatives of the press should be barred from this meeting. If there are military secrets involved: of course, that is different but nothing of the kind, so far, has been suggested. It appears, Mr. Chairman, that John Barleycorn is admitted to the conference but not John Q. Public.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will this bill be read for amendment; and if it is read for amendment, will there be opportunity for the offering of pro forma amendments under the 5-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be read for amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot tell. I thought that was right, but I did not know.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill is being considered under the general rules of the House and will be read for amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

WE FOLLOW AN UNSOUND FISCAL POLICY

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, one of the most impressive statements made by any member of the subcommittee is the one made by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] in which, I believe, he stated he was in position to assume full responsibility, insofar as he is individually concerned, for the amount appropriated in this bill, the said appropriations to be used for the successful prosecution and winning of the war.

This bill calls for machinery, equipment, and supplies and other objectives against which none of us protest, and for all of which we agree. But there is another statement I wish to make in connection with the bill, and that is this, that so far as I am personally concerned I am in position to assume full responsibility as a Member of this House for whatever steps are necessary to be taken toward soundly financing this $29,500,000,000 and the other billions of dollars which we have appropriated and which we shall appropriate, and for the successful prosecution of the war. And this job I do not believe we have as frankly approached as have we for the appropriations.

The Prime Minister of the British Empire addressed us today. The most impressive thing he said to me, in effect, was that it is important to prosecute this war quickly and bring it to a successful conclusion, because in the game of war or a long fight certain things might develop which might create complications and bring about defeat, or at least make it supremely more difficult to win.

Mr. Chairman, we are playing with fire. We are playing with inflationary financing when we proceed to make appropriations of this type with no more than 25 or 30 Members on the floor of this House, Republicans and Democrats combined; and this, to me, is not partisan in the least, when I say we appear to be unconcerned about the cost of these objectives upon which we agree.

I wish to point out that during the year 1940 the gross savings of the people were approximately $16,100,000,000; in 1941, $25,000,000,000; in 1942, $38,900,000,000; and for the first quarter of 1943, $11,800,000,000, after paying the largest tax bill in our history; and the most significant feature or pattern of savings during the first quarter of 1943, and as for prior quarters, was the unusually high proportion of income that the public continues to put into current and demand deposits.

If such funds continue to grow at the present rate, the control over the inflationary tendency will become increasingly difficult. It may become impossible. I am going back now to what the Prime Minister said—if we let inflation take hold of this country, we will have economic, social, political, and industrial chaos. That is the point I want to make. Such a dislocation could cause defeat for our cause.

Mr. Chairman, it is my firm opinion that this Congress is not doing its duty with reference to the prevention of the operation of these inflationary forces, which, if permitted to continue to run, can bring about the disaster to which the Prime Minister of Great Britain referred this morning.

Permit me to say, Mr. Chairman, that Britain finances well; Britain finances soundly; Britain has no fear about financial chaos flowing from inflationary forces. And this is true because Britain, in her wide experience extending over centuries knows how to finance wars and at the same time preserve her internal economy. For instance, let me remind you that in 1933 the gross debt of Britain was $33,300,000,000; and as Hitler rose to power and England prepared for the great contest she well knew was ahead she had financed so soundly that in 1939 her gross debt amounted to only $36,800,000,000. But look at our situation, Mr. Chairman. Our Federal funded debt rapidly moves upward. May 7 it was $135,000,000,000 compared to $61,000,000,000 November 3, 1941, only a few days before our declaration of war. Present schedule calls for this debt to top $210,000,000,000 June 30, 1944. Some now advocate a cut-back in war production and resumption of manufacture of certain articles for civilian economy. Two elements may alter all this: First, a shorter war in Europe, and, second, the trek of international spokesmen to Washington seeking financial support for their future plans of world-wide scope.

United Kingdom—British—gross debt: March 31, 1939, Britain's debt was $36,000,000,000. After approximately 3½ years of war this debt had advanced to only $67,000,000,000—an increase of $31,000,000,000—while our Government debt, direct and guaranteed, advanced $74,500,000,000 the first 18 months we were in war. It is evident to any student of our fiscal policy and planned economy that England is doing a grander job at financing her war than we are. There is no need for confusion or misunderstanding about the miseries in which we are involved as related to price ceilings, rationing, wage levels, coal strikes, black markets, and other directly related factors. We suffer the consequences of our deliberate actions as a people, as a Congress, as an administration. If we are to pursue our present course, our miseries will increase.

We are following a highly destructive fiscal policy these days. To the successful prosecution of the war and the preservation of our enterprise system all that I have in material goods is available to the Government upon call. I make no mental or other reservation. I have never been, nor am I now, one of those who deems it unnecessary to count the cost of the attainment of the objectives—which objectives we all agree are desirable.

In my humble opinion we, as an administration, as a Congress, and as a people, proceed along disastrous economic lines. Here, I specifically refer to the manner in which we conduct our fiscal affairs.

We are participating in too much inflationary financing. We are overlooking the absolute necessity of our having fiscal stability if we are to win the war and preserve our enterprise system through the post-war storms. We know that we are not preventing inflation. We know that we follow a course which promotes inflationary forces with their distorting effects on our price and wage structures. In doing this we know that we promote social and political instability. We further know that we prepare the way for a break-down in our economy in the post-war period; that we make it more and more impossible for long-term commitments to be made, all of which will be so necessary if our private enterprise system is to give employment to the men and women when they return from the war fronts. We are not unacquainted with the fact that uncertainty as to taxes, the financing policy of Government, the instability of the buying power of the dollar are all great and powerful deterrents to investment and the promotion generally of the private-enterprise system.

Shall we further travel the road toward Government debt repudiation? Shall we further finance Government expenditures through commercial bank inflation?

Just why we follow such policies I am unable to specifically answer. Perhaps

there is too much politics in the approach. But, this whole question is an issue. On one side we have millions of people who support the present policy, and on the other side we have millions of people who seriously question even if they do not aggressively oppose, the policy we now follow. In due course we shall have to settle the issue and solve the problem, but when this will occur I am unable to say.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Miscellaneous expenses

For traveling expenses of civilian employees, including travel of dependents of employees to and from navy yards or stations outside the continental limits of the United States; expenses of attendance, at home and abroad, upon meetings of technical, professional, scientific, and other similar organizations when, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy (hereafter in this act referred to as the Secretary), such attendance would be of benefit in the conduct of the work of the Navy Department; physical examinations by civilian physicians and in other than naval hospitals of civilian employees engaged in hazardous occupations; expenses of courts and boards; purchase of law and reference books; expenses of prisoners and prisons; clerical assistance; witnesses' fees and traveling expenses; promoting accident prevention and safety in shore establishments of the Navy, to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary; newspapers and periodicals for the naval service; all advertising of the Navy Department and its bureaus (except advertising for recruits for the Bureau of Naval Personnel); costs of suits; maintenance of attachés and others abroad, including office rental and pay of employees, and not to exceed $900 for any one person for allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a); contingencies for the Director of Naval Intelligence, to be expended in his discretion, not to exceed $2,000; collection and classification of information pertaining to Naval Intelligence, and pertaining to the legal, physical, and engineering characteristics of naval facilities provided for the conduct of the war, including, for such latter purpose, personal services at the seat of government or elsewhere; telephone, telegraph, and teletype rentals and tolls (including not to exceed $300 for extension telephones between the telephone switchboards at the official stations of naval officials and the living quarters of such officials), telegrams, radiograms, and cablegrams for the Navy Department and the naval service; postage, foreign and domestic, and post-office box rentals; microphotographic services; necessary expenses for interned persons and prisoners of war under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, including funeral expenses for such interned persons or prisoners of war as may die while under such jurisdiction; payment of claims for damages as provided in the act approved July 11, 1919 (34 U. S. C. 600); necessary expenses for maintenance and operation of a security inspection force (including personal services at the seat of government or elsewhere, by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, or the civil service or classification laws); and other necessary and incidental expenses; in all, $32,423,605, of which $200,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 4, line 2, strike out "$200,000" and insert "$250,000."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, no Member of this body, so far as I know, is opposed to this bill. Perhaps that is the reason why the time for debate was limited and why some of us were unable to get time without offering these various amendments.

In view of the fact that the Navy Department and the War Department and four other departments of the Government have seen fit, within the last few days to send up to the Congress a joint protest against the consideration or the enactment of the Smith-Connally bill as reported out by the Committee on Military Affairs, it would seem that some attention should be paid to the method of the expenditure of the money we appropriate, to the surrender of our Army and Navy politicians—not the fighting men—to the unions.

Here is a bill for $29,500,000,000. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [MR. DITTER] said that it does not make very much difference what the bill calls for. Someone on the minority side said you could transpose the figures and make it $92,000,000,000 instead of $29,000,000,000, and if that move were made by the subcommittee at the request of the Navy Department, it could be put through just as quickly as if it provided $29,000,000,000. That I think is true. Let us pause to consider, in connection with the bill, that just a few hours ago this Chamber was packed. Some of us—and I happen to be one—were unable to get seats on the floor.

I tried to get from the Doorkeeper one of these step seats so I could get members of my family into the gallery. I got one ticket but I could not get another. Even if they wanted to sit on the floor in the gallery I could not get one. I do not know where all those seats went. I do not know why it is that a Member of Congress cannot get at least one or two members of his own family in the gallery, especially when he has members serving in the armed forces.

When I came back someone said, "Now don't be afraid to go in, the chairs and the carpet are still on the floor;" and they were. I was not surprised, because I did not think they were going to get that part of the country's resources out from under the Representatives. But I know this—I will take that back, I do not know this—I was told here that this bill carried more in one appropriation than Great Britain had appropriated in a year. If I am wrong, I will be glad to have the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill tell me, because we do not want erroneous statements to go in the RECORD. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the information I have, it does exceed the British budget.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It does?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not finding any fault with that. Apparently we are to fight this war and win it, and when it is over we are to hold the bag.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I might say that the official figures which are available in the Congressional Library show that during the first 3½ years of the war the United Kingdom increased its debt $31,000,000,000 and during the first 18 months that we were engaged in this war we increased our debt about $72,000,000,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. No one finds any fault with the English statesman——

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not at all.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the Prince and the Princess, or the Duke and Duchess, or whatever you call them, coming over here, but I do wish that when they travel up from their islands down in the southern sea, where they are doing whatever they are doing, I do wish they would come on their own boats and pay their own expenses, and not have my farmers work from the coming up of the sun to the going down of the sun to pay those expenses. There is altogether too much traveling by the higher-ups, so-called.

I wish when you buy 2,400 pints of liquor—the gentleman says they do not drink it individually—the cost did not come out of United States taxpayers. I never before heard of collective drinking of hard liquor. I do not see how it can be done unless you put four or five straws in a tub or a trough and go at it. The gentleman who made that statement about how the liquor is paid for is on the floor. Is it not a fact that that liquor was paid for by the tax money that comes out of the citizens of the United States?

Mr. STEFAN. Is the gentleman addressing his remarks to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. In reply to the gentleman, I took the floor in answer to a question of the gentleman from Kansas merely to explain where the money came from.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want the gentleman to answer my question.

Mr. STEFAN. In order to answer the question the gentleman has propounded to me now, and that is——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not the money for that coming from the citizens of the United States?

Mr. STEFAN. The money does come from the taxpayers, of course. The bill or appropriation was in the State Department supply bill. You all voted for it because no one could know what the special fund was to be used for.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, now, did I?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes. The bill passed the House of Representatives a few months ago.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just a minute.

Mr. STEFAN. Let me answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am voting against blank checks to the President and I intend to vote against them hereafter and I do not intend to vote money to buy liquor for anyone as a matter of entertainment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that this question of the purchase of liquor for an official conference has come up in the debate on a naval appropriation bill which has nothing to do with the appropriation from which funds were taken for the purchase of the beverage under discussion.

I merely took the floor in answer to a question propounded to me by the gentleman from Kansas, who asked where the money for this beverage came from. I believe my previous statement answers that question. We had no way of knowing to what use the special funds were to be put. Our people do not condone the purchase of liquor from public funds and I agree with them.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the fact that no such item is contained in this bill. I rose for the purpose of securing the information about which I inquired. I thought I had before me members of the committee that would know the answer, and I got the answer.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman agree with me that I have consistently endeavored to cut down representation allowances? I am not defending this item. I am merely giving official information.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I know the gentleman, who is one of the distinguished Members of this House, has consistently demanded that items for this purpose be materially reduced. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] does not approve such things, and he is sincere about it.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course not. I have fought against it consistently. We must have sobriety in the conduct of the war. Sobriety is necessary now more than ever before.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I do not intend to use 5 minutes. I ask this time for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question.

I wonder if you can tell me how much money the Navy Department has in its possession now that they have secured under the renegotiation-of-contracts program?

Mr. SHEPPARD. At the end of March 1943 price reductions and cost refunds arranged by the Navy Price Adjustment Board amounted to more than $950,000,000.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. My real purpose in asking the question was to inquire for what purpose that money can be spent. Is there any restriction on it at all?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That portion representing cost refunds goes back into the Federal Treasury.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is what I wanted to clear up. I have had information from different departments in direct conflict. Some say it remains under the control of the Navy and others say it goes into the Public Treasury.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is my understanding that it goes back to the Treasury into "Miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. And they cannot spend that without an appropriation act on the part of the Congress?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is my understanding.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

I was extremely interested in the discussion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] when he pointed out to this Congress that 2,400 pints of liquor are being purchased for the Food Conference at Hot Springs, Va., where newspapermen and Members of Congress are barred.

It was not very long ago that the new Members of this Congress were entertained at the White House by the President. I think those new Members really have a "kick" coming. They bought, in addition to the 1 gallon each they are permitted to bring in, 2,400 pints of liquor for this Food Conference, from which we are barred, as well as the newspapermen, but all the freshmen Members of this Congress received when they were entertained at the White House was beer and pretzels. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, during the debate, for purpose of information, I addressed one or two brief questions to the chairman of the subcommittee, the able and distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]. I think perhaps if I have any criticism of our national defense policy in the past—and I have often so expressed myself—it has been that we have not maintained the size Navy we should have maintained in peacetime. The same applies to our Regular Army. There have been many references made in the speeches to the fact that there has been such a limited membership on the floor this afternoon. There will be a time in the not too distant future when there will be a great deal of attention paid to the situation which will confront us.

I will vote for this appropriation. I do not think there is a Member of this House who is not willing to vote every dollar of money that is necessary for the defense of our country. My own personal feeling is that if it is necessary to use whatever I have in the way of dollars or property or whatever I may have, for the defense of this country, that is the perfectly proper thing. I think all of us feel that way. But I do want to call to your attention the fact that since July 1, 1940, we have appropriated for national defense, or authorized, between two hundred and forty-five and two hundred and fifty billion dollars. That does not include this appropriation, nor does it include the sum of $70,000,000,000, approximately, that will be asked for in the appropriation for the Army.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman inform us whether or not this $30,000,000,000 and the approximately $70,000,000,000 in the military item that is coming through roughly constitutes the $97,000,000,000 covered in the Budget for the coming fiscal year? Are those the two principal items?

Mr. O'HARA. I cannot tell the gentleman. I have no way of knowing. Perhaps the gentleman knows, but I do not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I cannot answer that question, but I think perhaps the chairman of our subcommittee may tell us.

Mr. O'HARA. Does the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee know whether the $30,000,000,000 which are included in this bill and the approximately $70,000,000,000 being requested for the Army have been included in the Budget?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Army estimates have not come in yet.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I submit the question in this way: May we assume that this $30,000,000,000 in round figures is the naval portion of the Budget message as of January last for the coming fiscal year, substantially?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; substantially. That is true.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I believe the gentleman is perhaps mistaken. I think the $29,500,000,000 included in this appropriation bill is included in the approximate total of $245,000,000,000 of over-all war appropriations and authorizations up to this time.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman probably is correct. I may have been misinformed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT, NAVY

For all emergencies and extraordinary expenses, exclusive of personal services, in the Navy Department or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices at the seat of government, arising at home or abroad, but impossible to be anticipated or classified, to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government, and for examination of estimates for appropriations and of naval activities in the field for any branch of the naval service, $185,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 4, line 14, strike out "$185,000" and insert "$190,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recog-

nized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], who answered the question as to where that money came from to buy the 2,400 pints of liquor, took 5 minutes to answer that question, and the substance of his answer, as I got it, was that it was taxpayers' money. That was all I wanted to know. In brief, we are spending that money because the State Department is doing business as usual, is using liquor for the entertainment of foreigners who come asking for lend-lease money, and it was customary before, when we had entertainments for these foreign guests, to furnish liquor. Very well; but I do not believe in it.

The gentleman also said that I voted for the expenditure of this money to buy this liquor. If it was in a defense bill, then I did vote for it, but I did not know it was to be used to purchase liquor. It shows how impossible it is for a man to protect the taxpayers' money while new dealers are handling it. It shows the folly—the viciousness, may I put it that way—of giving blank checks to the President, to the executive department, or to any department, unless we try to safeguard it to the best of our ability; and even when we try we do not succeed because they do not follow our orders. Witness the expenditure of some $70,000,000 by the War Department when we told them to construct the Pentagon Building at a cost of not more than $35,000,000.

I knowingly would not vote one red cent to the State Department or to any other department to purchase liquor when our boys over in the South Pacific are without the things they need, the food, or the medicinal supplies. Let them go back home and get something to drink. That is my answer to those from foreign lands who want liquor.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I cannot. I know it is delightful to hear the gentleman, but I want to point out something else, which is this: The Navy has sent up here this request that Congress should vote down this Connally-Smith bill, which has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

I remember distinctly that more than 3 years ago—in October of 1939—the Navy Department had ordered castings that they wanted for the navy yard in Philadelphia. These castings were in Detroit and were ready for delivery, but for a period of 41 days the C. I. O. refused to permit the Navy of the United States to send in its trucks and take out its own materials which were needed and which were going into defense ships and planes.

At that time, Acting Secretary of the Navy Edison said over his signature in a letter sent up to the committee that the Navy Department was not doing anything to end that practice.

That was the situation 2 years and more ago, yet today the Navy comes along and asks for $29,500,000,000, and also asks that we do not oppose activities of the unions which are costing unnecessary millions when we try to get munitions of war.

I ask you if it is not time we passed some legislation which cut the cost of construction of all our munitions of war? Do they not realize that, if we take $29,000,000,000 and spend it all on Sunday, we get but half as much material for the money? If it is spent on Saturday, you get just two-thirds of the material in those industries which are on a 35-hour week, as they are in the mines; that in producing materials over and above the 35 hours you get just two-thirds as much material.

Can you not figure it out and yet here come these six departments of the Government and say to the Congress, when they themselves have said time and time again that their construction was being held up, they come in now and tell us they must not adopt any of this legislation which has been favorably, yes unanimously, reported out by the Committee on Military Affairs. What is the matter with them? Are they under the thumb of the administration politicians? Have they anything in mind at all looking toward saving money to purchase more and more war materials to carry on the war? Or do they want that money to go into the union treasury?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. Chairman, my opposition is not germane and only develops from the fact that none of the discussion with reference to this particular matter is or has been germane to the bill that we are now undertaking to pass.

A controversy arose here originating in a discussion that was not germane, subject to a point of order had one been made, when certain questions were asked, and out of which has grown all of this much ado about nothing, having nothing to do with this bill.

I am neither for nor against this pending amendment.

I think the gentleman from Nebraska in undertaking to defend his subcommittee on State and Justice and having to do with the State Department appropriation bill properly and fully explained that it was impossible when the committee acted upon a certain blank-check method, so-called, to tell where that identic money appropriated for diplomatic and representation purposes was going to be spent, was going, or to whom it was going. So much for that; it was a complete statement.

So much for that, I say, but here is another thing, and while I am not the father confessor of anybody, nor assuming to be, nor trying to lecture anybody, I do get kind of sick and tired and a bit fed up with all this talk about nothing, and probably I am adding to it. The reason not so many Members of the House are present this afternoon, and everybody knows it, is due to the fact that most of those particularly interested in this bill have read the hearings, have read the report, have examined both with a fine-tooth comb, know what it is all about and the reasons therefor, and they are satisfied not to be here to make useless amendments. They would vote if they were here—which is not necessary as they will vote if they are called—for the bill, and any effort to get a quorum or to stop passage of the bill is purely dilatory and obstructive.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY

For necessary work of the Naval Research Laboratory for the benefit of the naval service, operation and maintenance of a laboratory, additions to equipment, maintenance of buildings and grounds, temporary employment of such scientific and technical civilian assistants as may become necessary at rates of pay not exceeding $25 per diem for any person so employed, and subscriptions to technical periodicals, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary, $2,475,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 4, line 21, strike out "$25" and insert "$20."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, far be it from me to attempt to enlighten the gentleman from Vermont as to whether or not any of these amendments are germane or whether the discussion is pertinent. If I might be so presumptuous, however, I would call his attention to the fact that the committee saw fit in its wisdom to limit debate on this bill carrying $29,500,000,000 to 1 hour on a side. It was impossible to obtain any time to discuss this matter when general debate was had on the bill. So now it becomes necessary to offer amendments to get into the RECORD certain ideas which I have.

I do regret that the gentleman should think that this first amendment which was offered by me adding $50,000 to the $200,000 to be made immediately available for plant security was not germane. The gentleman just is not aware of the situation which exists in many plants. The gentleman is not aware of the facts.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Will the gentleman read my remarks? I did not have anything to say about his amendment. I said I did not rise to oppose it except in a pro forma way. I said I was opposed to a discussion of those things which were not germane.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot yield any further. The matters I am discussing are in my opinion germane. Here is the point: Although there is a law on the books forbidding members of the armed forces to belong to a union in these plants where this security force mentioned in the paragraph to which I offered an amendment is employed, those men, although they belong to the armed forces, are members of unions and some

of those men I have been advised have stated that, if it came to a conflict between the order of the union and the order of a Navy man or an Army man who is charged with the security of the plant, they would have to follow the union.

And do you know that in one of these large plants being operated under the supervision of the Navy, the navy men in charge, officers of the Navy, have no authority to remove a guard from over there and put him over here, and direct his conduct? That the captain who is in charge of those guards follows the orders of the union rather than the orders of the Navy? It is unbelievable, is it not?

Mr. Chairman, it is about time that somebody made an investigation to learn whether or not construction is being carried on under the orders of the unions or under the orders of the armed forces. I pointed out when on the floor before how they defied the Navy back in 1939. They are at it again today, yet the Congress sits here and lets that situation go on.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment and to bring this matter to an end, I ask unanimous consent that that amendment may be considered now with this one, and then I will not take further time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 5, line 6, strike out "$50,000" and insert "$55,000."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask the gentleman this question. I think he has given me some very interesting information I did not have before. Let us assume, for instance, that a strike develops in plant A in city X, we will say, Are those uniformed officers in charge of the security of that plant force, under the procedure which is now in force, under orders to carry out the instructions of the union leaders instead of the military authorities or Navy, whichever may be in charge of that plant?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; the gentleman did not get me clearly. I did not mean that the Army or the Navy officials had to carry out the orders of the union. What I meant was this, as an illustration: Here are 50 or 60 women in a lavatory.

They are shooting craps and smoking cigarettes. Here is another woman who is a member of the guard or who is acting in a supervisory capacity. She goes up to the lavatory. Now, remember she must ultimately join the union. She goes up there. She is on probation. She tells them to get to work and then along comes the union and says, "We want her discharged." The Army or Navy man cannot protect her on that job and out she goes; that is all there is to it.

When it comes to production, the union in the end tells how rapidly the workers shall produce, how much shall be turned out and, in all too many instances, neither the Army nor the Navy nor any Federal official has anything to say about it.

All too often, any suggestions or orders from the Army or the Navy as to who should be employed, where they should work, how fast they should work, and how they should conduct themselves are disregarded by union members. Shop stewards rule the plants, determine the amount of production.

Of course, it hinders efficiency.

Mr. Chairman, with due respect to the opinion of my friend from Vermont, this amendment has to do with the adding of a certain amount—that is, $50,000—which shall be made immediately available. The purpose of this particular paragraph of the bill is to get oil. It has to do with the getting of oil brought into the eastern seaboard, so that those living there will not freeze to death or get cold or be hindered in the production of war materials.

Down here in Missouri, and I have told you about this two or three times before, they have been trying, since the 28th of April, to throw a pipe line across the Mississippi River. That line, if it were made available today, would carry 300,000 barrels of crude—that is, if it could be constructed—and 250,000 barrels of high-test octane gas. Why has its construction been delayed? Because Buck Newell, who was convicted back in 1937 of defrauding the Government—think of that, defrauding the Government—has ordered a strike down there, and the American Federation of Labor Hod Carriers Union and some A. F. of L. engineers went on strike and have carried on that strike. They get away with it because of politicians in the Navy Department; in the War Department, not because of the fighting men, not with the consent of the fighting officers; oh, no. There is a distinct difference. It is the politicians in the Navy Department who say that we must say nothing in respect of that pipe line, whether it could be constructed, or whether its construction is to continue, whether it should be completed expeditiously.

Is it not about time that this Congress got out from under?

It occurs to me that the President, having once before said he would not have anything to say about what we should do with respect to legislation, and then having yesterday it was, I believe, told us what to do about the Ruml plan, and having made Congress jump through the hoop, Democrats and some Republicans, and put on that exhibition as the ring master, now should take on John Lewis, of the United Mine Workers, and make him do a little exhibition jumping through the hoop.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendments were rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Instruction: For postgraduate instruction of officers in other than civil government and literature, including such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act approved January 16, 1936 (34 U. S. C. 1073), and special instruction and education, including rental, maintenance, and operation of property for instruction purposes, and individual training of officers and enlisted personnel at home and abroad, including maintenance of students abroad, except aviation and submarine training otherwise appropriated for, $37,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for or on account of any expense incident to giving special educational courses or postgraduate instruction to officers with view to qualifying them or better qualifying them for the performance of duties required to be performed by or in pursuance of law by officers of the Supply Corps, the Corps of Civil Engineers, and officers assigned to engineering duty only, except present students and except such officers who are commissioned in such corps or have been assigned to engineering duty only or who have not been commissioned in the line of the Navy more than 3 years and 4 months prior to the commencement of such educational courses or postgraduate instruction;

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been corrected on some information which I gave the House. Let me say to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] that the figure which I gave as the appropriation for national defense for the Army and the Navy ranged from $245,000,000,000 to $250,000,000,000 and includes moneys appropriated in this bill.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I did not quite hear the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman from Nebraska inquired of me when I was giving some figures on moneys appropriated for national defense.

Mr. STEFAN. And I was correct?

Mr. O'HARA. You were correct in your statement.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman made a fine contribution and I did not want to be critical, but I took the information from the Appropriations Committee records.

Mr. O'HARA. I thought I was correctly informed.

Mr. STEFAN. Then our total war appropriations apparently are between $240,000,000,000 and $248,000,000,000?

Mr. O'HARA. Two hundred and forty-five billion dollars to $250,000,000,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Including the $29,500,000,000 carried in this bill?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes; and may I say to the gentleman from Nebraska, and to the House, that I want to correct my

statement, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from Minnesota will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GAVAGAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order a moment?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WASIELEWSKI, for 2 days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. O'LEARY, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. CAPOZZOLI, indefinitely, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 649. An act to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska relating to the waters of the Republican River basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote flood control in the basin, and for other purposes; and

S. 1041. An act to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 20, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Thursday, May 20, 1943, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 2250, H. R. 2419, H. R. 1169, H. R. 1565, and H. R. 2080. Public hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m., on Thursday, May 20, 1943, for consideration of housing bills, in room 356, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Thursday, May 20, 1943, on all bills dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act—H. R. 1882, H. R. 2309, H. R. 2428, and H. R. 2429.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, May 20, 1943, at 10 a. m. on H. R. 2612, to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Monday, May 24, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearings pursuant to House Resolution 98 by Congressman HALLECK.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 2740. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act so as to place the various States on an equal basis with respect to contributions of employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2741. A bill to lower the rate of tax imposed with respect to the transfer of certain small-game guns; and to lower the rate of tax imposed upon manufacturers and dealers in such guns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 2742. A bill to provide for increased assistance payments under the Social Security Act during the present unlimited national emergency to meet increased costs of living, to protect the interests of recipients of such payments who work during such emergency, and to provide special Federal aid to low-income States for their public assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GAVAGAN:

H. R. 2743 (by request). A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Marie Geiler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2744. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to set aside the trial-board conviction of Herbert E. Brodie and Leo Murray and their resultant dismissal and to reinstate Herbert E. Brodie and Leo Murray as privates Metropolitan Police Department; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

817. By Mrs. BOLTON (by request): Petition of sundry citizens of Lakewood, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, providing for a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

818. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 315 citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, favoring enactment of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

819. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 20 members of the West Liberty United Presbyterian Church, Slipper Rock, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

820. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Marietta, Ohio, petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

821. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolutions adopted at the annual town meetings on March 2, 1943, in 10 towns in Vermont, pledging to help win at whatever cost the victory which will erase forever from the minds of all men ideas of master races and of people who have the destiny and power to dominate and enslave other peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

822. Also, resolutions adopted in town meeting March 2, 1943, in 38 towns scattered over the State and 16 in Windsor County, pledging unstinting efforts to further food production, and petitioning the Federal Government to take necessary steps to provide sufficient labor, machinery, fertilizers, and other production factors, together with fair returns; to the Committee on Agriculture.

823. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of the Association of West Virginia Live Stock Auction Markets, protesting against policies and regulations of Office of Price Administration relative to small packers and slaughterers as tending to discourage production of meats for the future and cause present slaughtering of cattle not ready for market; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

824. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of J. A. Burdette, commander, and S. W. Rife, adjutant, James C. Russell Camp, No. 11, Department of West Virginia, United Spanish War Veterans, Huntington, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2350, to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

825. Also, petition of Charles L. Kettler and a number of other residents of the First Congressional District of West Virginia, urging the establishment of a Chiropractic Corps in the armed forces now; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

826. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from R. D. Bowden, head, department of sociology, Southern Illinois Normal University, Carbondale, Ill., urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

827. Also, resolution of Local Union No. 152 of Progressive Mine Workers of America, at Harrisburg, Ill., signed by Claude Winkleman, president, and Dennis Moore, secretary, urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of our life, fountain of our being, we thank Thee for the light of Thy countenance which illumines our pathway with eternal splendor. Without that light we walk in darkness; without Thee as guide our boasted progress but leads to the quagmires of futility and oblivion; without Thee our science but whets the sword to a sharper edge and destroys us with our own wheels and wings; without Thee commerce cannot save us, for selfish trade but lifts the hunger of covetousness to a higher pitch; without Thee even education cannot redeem us, for we know now that the mere sharpening of the intellect, the massing and mastery of facts and figures, may but fit men to be tenfold more masterful in the awful art of slaughter.

In all our ways may we not miss the way. Shatter our delusions, shine through our blindness, shame our pride, that we stray not in folly away from Thee. Bring us without fear to meet the flaming of eternal dawn. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 19, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 649. An act to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska relating to the waters of the Republican River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote flood control in the basin, and for other purposes; and

S. 1041. An act to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREE ON TAX BILL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces the appointment of the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] as a member of the conference committee on the part of the Senate on the tax bill, in place of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

NOTICE OF MEETING OF CONGRESSIONAL WAR PARENTS ASSOCIATION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that there will be a meeting of the Congressional War Parents' Association at 4:30 p. m. on Monday afternoon, May 24, in the room of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives in the Capitol Building. Members of the Senate and House who have sons in the service and are members of the association are invited to attend.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and a letter, which were referred as indicated:

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, WAR PRODUCTION BOARD (S. Doc. No. 46)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1943, in the form of an amendment to the supplemental estimate previously submitted for the War Production Board, amounting to $100,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS, BITUMINOUS COAL DIVISION, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT, AND OFFICE OF BITUMINOUS COAL CONSUMERS' COUNSEL (S. Doc. No. 47)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Bituminous Coal Division, Department of the Interior, and the Office of Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, fiscal year 1943, amounting to $800,000 and $16,000, respectively (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law (and making reference to his letter to the Congress dated January 7, 1942—H. Doc. No. 541), a report stating all the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 412 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION (S. DOC. NO. 48)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, submitting an additional report of the joint committee relating to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures just laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred to the Committee on Appropriations be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, and also printed as a Senate document. The report relates to the liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report referred to by the Senator from Virginia will be printed in the RECORD, and also as a Senate document.

The report is as follows:

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—REPORT ON THE HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION—REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

In accordance with title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, an additional report herewith is presented by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

In this report the committee will concern itself with the functions and activities of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. First the history of that corporation will be outlined. Then there will be presented the results of the committee's investigation and pertinent evidence adduced at the hearings on February 25 and March 29, 1943. Conclusions and recommendations will be made in the light of this evidence as it relates to con-

gressional intent when the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was created.

At the outset the committee wishes to commend those who have been charged with the duty of administering the Home Owners' Loan Act, because it is believed that had not those persons been imbued with the desire to act quickly in the face of a national emergency the American home owner would not be in as favorable a position financially as he is today. However, the committee believes that the Federal Government should respond to a period of national economic prosperity just as quickly as it did to a period of depression and, therefore, it now seeks to determine when, in the best interests of the people, the government should withdraw from the field of real-estate credit.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended:

1. That the Home Owners' Loan Corporation completely liquidate all of its holdings by the end of the fiscal year 1945 (June 30, 1945). Also, that such forced liquidation be legislatively guaranteed by an act of Congress, prescribing generally the manner in which it shall be effected.

2. That the Home Owners' Loan Corporation immediately plan, and for the next 2 years and 2 months execute, an intensive campaign among their mortgagors and lessees to induce them to increase their equity in their homes, to buy them outright, or to transfer their loans to a local home-financing institution.

Liquidation protects home owner: In making its recommendation for an early liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation the committee was careful to provide that the home owner did not suffer. Under the proposed legislation, or through independent action of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the transfer of the mortgages and vendee accounts to private lending institutions will be accomplished so that the terms of the contracts are not changed in the least. In other words, under the method hereinafter outlined the only change, insofar as the home owner is concerned, will be that the same payments now being made to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation will thereafter be made to local home-financing institutions.

Also, under the proposed method of liquidation the present occupants of the properties owned by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation are given an opportunity to purchase them at current appraised values with down payments as low as 10 percent and terms not exceeding 15 years. Occupants who do not wish to take advantage of the offer will not be prejudiced, because these properties will be transferred to the Federal Housing Administration to be disposed of by that agency in the same manner as other properties held by that agency.

Liquidation will not increase Home Owners' Loan Corporation personnel: Under the proposed method of liquidation the Home Owners' Loan Corporation need not increase its personnel. Provisions may be made for the utilization of personnel of other departments and agencies who can assist in the sale and transfer of the mortgages and vendee accounts to local private home-financing institutions. Upon complete liquidation the employees of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation will be transferred to other departments and agencies of the Government more closely connected with the war program.

History of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation: Prior to the passage of the Home Owners' Loan Act, 1933, the Nation's home owners faced the imminent danger of great numbers of foreclosures, because of the absence of long-term real-estate credit at low interest rates. When the depression descended upon the country it was clear that the average citizen could not afford to continue the high payments which were customary in times of prosperity. Therefore, Congress set up the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to enable the home owner to save his property by extending to him the type of credit he needed. The hearings on the original bill show that there was no intent on the part of the legislators to have the Government enter the real-estate credit field in competition with private enterprise. The United States was then faced with a condition, not a theory, which called for immediate action and a practical approach. It is believed that the same practical approach has been taken by the committee in this report.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation was created by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board[1] under statutory authority given the Board by the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933.[2] The Federal Home Loan Bank Board was authorized to create a corporation which would be an instrumentality of the United States; which would have authority to sue and be sued in any court of competent jurisdiction; and which would be under the direction of such Board and operated by it under bylaws, rules, and regulations as the Board would prescribe for the accomplishment of the purposes of the act. The creating section also provided that the members of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board should constitute the board of directors of the Corporation.

The provisions of the original Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act of 1933 have been amended by the acts of Congress of April 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 643), guaranteeing the bonds of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and for other purposes; June 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 1264), defining the terms "home mortgage" and "real estate"; and August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1403), allowing the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to extend the period of amortization of home loans from 15 to 25 years.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation was grouped with other agencies to form the Federal Loan Agency by Reorganization Plan I, part 4, section 402 (c), effective July 1, 1939 (4 Fed. Reg. 2730; 53 Stat. 1429), and later was transferred to the National Housing Agency under the immediate direction of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration,[3] also a part of the National Housing Agency, by the terms of Executive Order 9070, dated February 24, 1942.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act of 1933 expressly provides that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation shall operate under a board of directors composed of the members of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and that the "members of the Board shall constitute the board of directors of the Corporation and shall serve as such directors without additional compensation." However, under the direction contained in Executive Order 9070, of February 24, 1942, the exclusive functions, powers, and duties of the board of directors of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation were given to the Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, leaving the Corporation without a board of directors, whereas the language of the original enactment specified and still requires that there shall be a board of directors for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Under the terms of the First War Powers Act, 1941 (Public Law 354, 77th Cong., approved December 18, 1941), the Presidential authority extended to the "redistribution of the functions among the executive agencies," including "governmental corporations"; however, a further proviso in the same act states, that "the authority by this title granted shall be exercised only in matters relating to the conduct of the present war." Prior to the present conflict the termination date of the activities of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation had been provided for by two provisions of law[4] specifically relating to its liquidation. It is difficult to conceive that the Corporation is connected with the conduct of the war in such a manner as to come within the provisions of the First War Powers Act with respect to the redistribution of its functions and duties. Subsequent Executive action had the theoretical effect of dissolving the Home Owners' Loan Corporation as such, because of the abolition of the board of directors.

Purpose of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation: The general purpose of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was to grant long-term mortgage loans, at low interest rates, to distressed home owners who were unable to procure financing through normal channels, and to help stabilize the real-estate and home-mortgage field during the depression. Refinancing was accomplished by exchanging Home Owners' Loan Corporation bonds for home mortgages. Loans were made by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation only to those who were otherwise unable to procure needed financial assistance and such loans were secured on dwellings valued at not more than $20,000 and accommodating not more than four families. Originally, loans were written for a term not to exceed 15 years, but by an amendment to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act, dated August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1403), this period was extended to a maximum of 25 years in cases where the borrower's circumstances and the condition of the security justified such an extension.

Interest rates: Practically all loans were originally made at an interest rate of 5 percent per annum. In 1939 the corporation made provisions to accept, until further notice, interest at the rate of 4½ percent per annum on all payments due on and after October 16, 1939, on the indebtedness of home owners to the Corporation arising from any loan, advance, or sale of property. On all purchase-money obligations taken on or after October 1, 1939, in connection with the sale of real property by the Corporation, interest was to be charged at the 4½-percent rate until otherwise directed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner.

Lending operations: In accordance with law,[5] the Home Owners' Loan Corporation terminated its lending activities on June 12, 1936, at which time 1,071,824 loans had been made, which represented $3,093,451,321 for mortgage-lending purposes.

Since June 12, 1936, the date when its lending period ceased, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has advanced approximately $175,000,000 more to its borrowers to help them meet tax payments, and its work has been that of assisting borrowers to keep their homes, liquidating its own loans, and disposing of properties it has been forced to acquire.

[1] The Federal Home Loan Bank Board itself was created under the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of 1932 (12 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 1421, approved July 2, 1932, 47 Stat. 725).

[2] 12 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 1461, approved June 13, 1933 (48 Stat. 128).

[3] Formerly Federal Home Loan Bank Board; became Federal Home Loan Bank Administration under the terms of Executive Order 9070, dated February 24, 1942.

[4] 12 U. S. C. 1940 ed. 1463 (k), approved June 13, 1933, 48 Stat. 129; and 15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 712a, approved June 22, 1936, 49 Stat. 1647.

[5] 12 U. S. C. (1940 ed.) 1463 (d), (e), (f), and (g).

On March 31, 1942, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was collecting on approximately 820,000 accounts, comprising 626,000 original borrowers and 134,000 purchasers of repossessed properties. However, 140,251 loans had been paid in full, which represented receipts amounting to $341,710,854.

Evidence adduced at hearings: On February 25 and March 29, 1943, Mr. John H. Fahey, Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, appeared before the committee and presented evidence showing the present activities of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and to what extent it had liquidated since 1936.

Mr. Fahey stated that at its inception the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was authorized $200,000,000 for capital stock, which later was legislatively supplemented by a bond-issue authorization of $4,750,000,000. This allowed the Corporation to expand its investments to $4,950,000,000. Of this, $400,000,000 was authorized to be used in financing necessary repairs and reconditioning of homes securing the Corporation loans. Also, $300,000,000 was set aside by Congress for investments in the shares and deposits of qualified home-financing institutions.

The Mead-Barry amendment to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act passed in 1939, explained Mr. Fahey, was particularly timely, because it authorized the Home Owners' Loan Corporation to extend its loans under certain circumstances from the original 15 years up to as much as 25 years from the date such mortgage was written, and forestalled the necessity of great numbers of foreclosures. The extension of the amortization period of 253,565 borrowers under the Mead-Barry Act, and thus eliminating their delinquency, Mr. Fahey believed, operated to retard the rate of liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, because the payments on their loans were reduced by about 40 percent over what was necessary to liquidate within the original 15 years.

It was pointed out that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation between June 13, 1933, and June 12, 1936, received a total of 1,886,491 applications, and approved 1,017,821 loans. However, by June 12, 1936, the Corporation had completed its lending operations, and had in its portfolio mortgages of distressed home owners secured by properties in every community with a population of 2,500 or more and in all but 64 out of the total of 3,072 counties in the United States, and in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska, as well.

Liquidation: From 1936 until the present time, Mr. Fahey said the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has been engaged in an orderly process of liquidation. Original borrower and subsequent vendee accounts which amounted to $3,278,000,000 had been reduced to $1,567,000,000 by December 31, 1942, a reduction of 52 percent of the total loan amount, and the number of accounts had been reduced to 780,000 (appendix 1).

The present status of these accounts is as follows:

Mortgage loan and vendee accounts, classified by amortization

Percentage of principal reduced	Number	Estimated amount of balance
None	12,000	$46,023,720
10 percent	28,600	103,918,100
10 to 20 percent	114,000	355,261,600
20 to 30 percent	132,900	351,017,200
Over 30 percent	462,500	588,779,380
Total	750,000	1,445,000,000

During the Corporation's existence it acquired 194,163 properties, but has sold 164,236 properties, which leaves 29,927 properties on hand. Fifty-one of these properties have been charged off for various reasons. On December 31, 1942, 1,745 properties were in the process of acquisition. The 31,621 properties owned or in the process of being acquired by the Corporation on December 31, 1942, had a capitalized value of $226,925,000.

Analysis by the committee: Mr. Fahey stated the crux of the problem when he said, "No one can foresee the future," in order to ascertain at what time the Corporation should liquidate its holdings. The committee agrees. The only purpose of this investigation is to determine when the most opportune time should be.

At the hearings Mr. Fahey submitted the Corporation's December 31, 1942, condensed balance sheet (appendix 1) and a projection of estimated losses from forced liquidation over a 5-year period (appendix 2). This projection was based upon current trends and present real-estate values. Mr. Fahey estimated that forced liquidation would result in the following losses for the years indicated:

Net loss from forced liquidation

1944	$440,114,000
1945	351,214,000
1946	285,046,000
1947	229,913,000
1948	180,449,000

As shown in appendix 2, Mr. Fahey estimates that total net loss from forced liquidation at the end of 1945 would be as shown below:

1. Debtor accounts	$212,654,000
2. Property	78,960,000
3. Bond interest	6,500,000
4. Total losses	298,114,000
5. Less net income	12,500,000
6. Net losses	285,614,000
7. Add previous net losses	65,600,000
8. Total net losses	351,214,000

The committee carefully reviewed the estimated losses from a forced liquidation (appendix 2) It was stated that aproximately $212,000,000 would be lost on debtor accounts if liquidation was within 2 years. Assuming that the Corporation is allowed 2 years and 2 months to liquidate as recommended by this report, and considering the fact that about 96 percent of the vendee accounts are current or less than 90 days delinquent, and the fact that the average loan balance is approximately $2,000, the committee believes that liquidation by June 30, 1945, will not result in a loss of over $100,000,000 on debtor accounts.

The Corporation estimates property losses in a 2-year liquidation period to be $78,000,000. This appears reasonable if the property is disposed of at 30 percent off the book value of $226,925,000. Recognizing, however, that the book value of this property is a highly controversial item, and cannot under any circumstances represent the market value, it is conceivable that the properties might be sold higher than at 30 percent off book value, particularly if the resident is given an opportunity to purchase the property with the Home Owners' Loan Corporation selling the paper (vendee account) along with the remainder of its assets.

The same table (appendix 2) shows that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation estimates a bond interest loss of $6,500,000 if liquidation occurred within 2 years. It is pointed out that by June 30, 1943, the following unmatured bonds will be outstanding:

3-percent series A, callable for payment May 1, 1944	$778,578,075
1½-percent series M, callable for payment June 1, 1945	754,904,025
1-percent series Q, callable for payment at any time	225,000,000

Thus by June 30, 1945, all bonds may be retired, and the Federal Treasury will benefit to that extent. The committee believes that insofar as the Federal Government as a whole is concerned this loss item should be eliminated entirely, because at no time are these funds idle. From investments in mortgages the funds move directly to the United States Treasury. There is no loss to the United States Government. Further, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation does not carry this as a loss item if liquidation is assumed to occur in 1946.

The estimated loss statement carries an item of $65,000,000 designated as "previous net losses." Since the 1944 column in the Home Owners' Loan Corporation estimate contains an item of $63,000,000 opposite "previous net losses," it is illogical to assume that a $65,600,000 loss will be sustained by liquidation in 1945 as compared with any other year. It distorts the true picture of the liquidation process to show past cumulative net losses as a part of the loss which will be sustained by liquidating on any date prior to the time such losses could be wiped out by a net profit as a result of shrewd business operation.

From the estimates furnished by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation the committee was unable to determine which of the entries in appendix 2 included costs for operating the Home Owners' Loan Corporation for each of the years during the 5-year period. However, if it is assumed that this expense is taken into consideration under "net income," then the true picture should include an additional item of $10,000,000 (estimated annual operating expense), which brings the gross income up to approximately $22,500,000.

From the foregoing analysis the following table shows what the committee believes is a more correct picture of loss to the Federal Government if liquidation is ordered by June 30, 1945:

Estimated losses from liquidation by June 30, 1945

1. Debtor accounts		$100,000,000
2. Property		78,000,000
3. Bond interest		
4. Total losses		178,000,000
5. Gross net income	$22,500,000	
6. Operation expenses	10,000,000	
7. Less net income		12,500,000
8. Net losses from forced liquidation		165,500,000
9. Add cumulative net loss		65,600,000
10. Total net loss		231,100,000

In other words, the committee believes that possibly the estimated losses computed by the officials of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation are excessive by $120,000,000. Therefore, it is clear that discounting the original $200,000,000 appropriated by Congress the complete liquidation of the Corporation would result in a loss of only $31,000,000.

Manner of liquidation: The committee has been aware throughout its consideration of this problem that the Government would sustain a loss, regardless of when liquidation took place, but agrees with Mr. Fahey when he said:

"The influence which the Congress exerted by the Home Owners' Loan Act has had far-reaching effects in revolutionizing the home-mortgage business in the United States. It gave a very definite impetus to the development of the sound, long-term, amortized mortgage, at a reasonable rate of interest. As a result, the amortized mortgage principle is now pretty generally accepted over the country and, when the Federal Housing Administration was set up, that organization followed the same principle.

"The immediate effect, of course, was to end the mortgage panic and to check promptly the threat of foreclosure on millions of homes. Real-estate values were stabilized, mortgage-lending markets were strengthened, and help was given to towns and cities which

found themselves financially mired because of excessive tax delinquency."

Mr. Fahey has said, and the committee agrees, that liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation presents a difficult problem. The real question, however, is whether the task will be any easier or any more advantageous to the Government at a later date than at present. The committee thinks not.

The committee believes that the time has come to put the liquidation machinery into full operation, and trusts that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation will carry out the recommendations of the committee in the same courageous and intensive way in which the affairs of that Corporation have been administered in the past.

Therefore, a bill is proposed to be introduced which will facilitate the liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation through the transfer and cash sale of its assets to individuals and to local banks, mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations, cooperative banks, trust companies, insurance companies, and other mortgage institutions. Legal consideration for such transfer and sale shall be either cash or United States bonds. The Corporation, upon the effective date of the act, should list all pertinent data concerning their holdings, and accept bids thereon which are equal to or in excess of the present balance, and the terms and conditions of these contracts shall not be changed. The Corporation should allow the present occupants of Corporation properties the opportunity of purchasing at current appraised values upon reasonable terms. All properties not sold should be transferred to the Federal Housing Administration. The Corporation when expedient should utilize personnel from all Government agencies which could lend aid in the interests of a more orderly process of liquidation. The complete liquidation should be effected by June 30, 1945.

APPENDIX 1

Home Owners' Loan Corporation condensed balance sheet Dec. 31, 1942

ASSETS

Mortgage loans and vendee accounts	$1,567,366,913.24
Interest receivable	4,678,420.87
Property owned and in process of acquiring title	226,925,126.92
Total	1,798,970,461.03
Less reserve for losses	45,796,223.76
Total	1,753,174,237.27
Investments, at cost	252,311,210.00
Bond-retirement fund	13,923,872.16
Cash	64,430,494.99
Fixed assets, less reserve	2,642,606.83
Other assets	655,378.67
Deferred and unapplied charges	112,158.12
Total	2,087,250,158.04

LIABILITIES

Bonded indebtedness	1,951,942,975.00
Accounts payable	25,757,855.35
Accrued liabilities	5,040,639.27
National Housing Agency home-conversion funds	13,263,383.93
Deferred and unapplied credits	3,778,090.35
Reserves	717,850.33

CAPITAL STOCK

Authorized, issued, and outstanding	200,000,000.00
Less deficit	113,250,636.19
	86,749,363.81
Total	2,087,250,158.04

APPENDIX 2

Home Owners' Loan Corporation estimated losses from forced liquidation

	1944 (1)	1945 (2)	1946 (3)	1947 (4)	1948 (5)
1. Debtor accounts	$242,514,000	$212,654,000	$185,706,000	$157,993,000	$127,949,000
2. Property	120,000,000	78,960,000	47,040,000	23,520,000	12,600,000
3. Bond interest	27,100,000	6,500,000			
4. Total losses	389,614,000	298,114,000	232,746,000	181,513,000	140,549,000
5. Net income	12,500,000	12,500,000	11,500,000	11,000,000	10,000,000
6. Net losses	377,114,000	285,614,000	221,246,000	170,513,000	130,549,000
7. Previous net losses	63,000,000	65,600,000	63,800,000	59,400,000	49,900,000
8. Total net loss from forced liquidation	440,114,000	351,214,000	285,046,000	229,913,000	180,449,000

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association (and affiliated Chinese associations), New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2076) to authorize the deportation of aliens to countries allied with the United States; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-second Session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested and urged to propose that the perpetual calendar be adopted by all nations at the peace conference and to propose to all nations that they now appoint a national committee to study the perpetual calendar with a view toward its acceptance at the peace conference.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 26

"Joint resolution relative to deduction of earnings from agricultural labor from old-age assistance

"Whereas House Joint Resolution 96, as passed by the Senate of the United States, included, as subdivision (f) of section 5 thereof, provisions that no person should be deemed not to be a needy individual by reason of remuneration paid to such person for any agricultural labor performed by him from the enactment of the resolution until 6 months after the termination of hostilities in the present war; and that no State should be required, in determining need in the case of any individual, to take into consideration any income or resources derived by him from agricultural labor; and

"Whereas conference reports amending House Joint Resolution 96 were adopted by both Houses of Congress, whereby the benefits of the subdivision were withheld from any State which had increased the amount of aid payable to recipients of old-age aid since April 30, 1943; and

"Whereas the State of California has at the present session of the legislature increased the maximum monthly individual grant of aid to the aged from $40 per month to $50 per month; and the State of California is the only State which has increased the amount of aid payable to recipients of old-age assistance since April 30, 1943; and

"Whereas House Joint Resolution 96, in the form in which it was put by the amendments made by the conference report, is flagrantly discriminatory against the State of California, and penalizes this State for its action in increasing the amount of aid to an amount more nearly adequate, under present conditions, for the maintenance of health and decency; and

"Whereas the farm-labor shortage in the State of California is no less severe than in other States whose contributions to the production of food and other agricultural products do not surpass, nor even equal, the contribution of the State of California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California does hereby protest the action of the Congress of the United States in passing legislation so unfair and unjust to the State of California, and does most urgently request the Congress of the United States to take such measures as may be necessary immediately to correct their ill-advised and discriminatory action; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from California."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Resolution 142

"Resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact S. 971 or H. R. 2426, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, providing for Federal participation in financing of a post-war highway construction program

"Whereas two measures are pending in the Congress of the United States, namely, S. 971 and H. R. 2426, to authorize Federal assistance to the States in financing a post-war construction program on rural and urban highways; and

"Whereas such legislation is designed to, and will, provide useful employment for those returning from services in the armed forces, or released by war industries after the war, and will, accordingly, tend to prevent unemployment, and the necessity for unemployment relief; and

"Whereas necessary wartime restrictions on gasoline and highway transportation have resulted in curtailment of revenues received by the highway departments of the States, and restrictions on use of materials have curtailed construction and reconstruction of needed highways during a period in which many highways have been damaged by heavy wartime truck traffic, engaged in transportation for the war effort; and

"Whereas such legislation will assist the States in bringing their highway systems and their highway-construction programs back to normal, and in making up the time lost due to necessary deferment of highway construction during the war; and

"Whereas there will be particular need to provide employment in California, following

the war, due to the large number of war industries in this State; and

"Whereas there will be particular need in California for reconstruction of highways due to such war conditions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be, and the same is hereby, memorialized to enact either S. 971 or H. R. 2426; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the chairman of the House Committee on Roads, and to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from California."

By Mr. WALSH:

Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"Resolutions in favor of the amendment of the Federal Motor Carrier Act, 1935, so-called, now part II of the Interstate Commerce Act

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact, and the President of the United States to sign, an act amending the Federal Motor Carrier Act, 1935, so-called, now part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to limit to actual producers and private carriers the exemption of vehicles transporting farm produce and fish and to make said Motor Carrier Act applicable to vehicles transporting such commodities for hire or compensation and to the owners and operators of such vehicles; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth forthwith transmit copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

By Mr. BROOKS:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 53

"Whereas it is essential to the successful prosecution of the war that the national morale be kept at the highest possible level; and

"Whereas this purpose can be achieved only if all parts of the population have an effective voice in the Government and are permitted to live free from fear of unlawful incursions upon their personal safety: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Illinois House of Representatives, That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact into law House bills 7 and 51, popularly known as the poll-tax and antilynch bills, respectively; and be it further

"Resolved, That a suitably engrossed copy of this preamble and resolution be forwarded immediately by the secretary of state to each Member of the House of Representatives and Senate of the present Congress now representing the State of Illinois."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens, members of the Fourth District Kansas Federation of Women's Clubs, praying for the enactment of pending legislation extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens, members of the First Methodist Church, of Hays, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 1900. A bill to prevent the payment of excessive fees or compensation in connection with the negotiation of war contracts; without amendment (Rept. No. 255).

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 1702. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 256).

By Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 1731. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.; without amendment (Rept. No. 257).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 2077. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Croix River at or near Hudson, Wis.; without amendment (Rept. No. 259).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 1670. A bill to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 260).

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1063. A bill to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 261).

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I report back favorably with an amendment House Joint Resolution 111, to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that I may have the privilege of filing a report during the adjournment of the Senate, if it cannot be prepared before the Senate adjourns this afternoon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not know just what House Joint Resolution 111 is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Mr. McNARY. What is the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GEORGE. I am merely reporting the joint resolution from the Finance Committee for the calendar, but the request was for permission to file a report during the adjournment, if the Senate shall adjourn before the report is ready for filing this afternoon.

Mr. McNARY. On the theory that the Senate might adjourn until Monday, the Senator desires to have opportunity to file a report?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. A majority report and minority views?

Mr. GEORGE. The request is for permission to file a report on the joint resolution, and I may file minority views for the minority. I should like to say that, according to previous announcement, the measure will not be called up in the Senate before Monday.

Mr. McNARY. I should not wish at this time to agree to have it called up Monday.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall make a motion Monday to bring it up. I give notice that I will do that.

Mr. McNARY. If that is the attitude of the Senator, I do not know that I desire to grant the permission that the report be filed.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well, Mr. President; I withdraw the request, and I will either file the report or not file it during the afternoon.

Mr. McNARY. That is the Senator's privilege, of course.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. McNARY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day, for substantial reasons, I objected to the request of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to file during the adjournment of the Senate a report—either a majority report or minority views—from the Committee on Finance on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Georgia, and I think we have come to an agreement as to the date when the measure may be considered in the Senate. For that reason I withdraw all my objections, so that the report may be submitted at any time between now and the next session of the Senate, on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Georgia is agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE subsequently, from the Committee on Finance, submitted a written report (No. 258) on House Joint Resolution 111, heretofore reported by him with an amendment.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably Senate Resolution 146, and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, agreed to March 1, 1941, and Senate Resolution 6, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, agreed to January 25, 1943 (relating to the investigation of the national defense program), is hereby increased by $100,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection of the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McNARY. May we have some explanation of the nature of the resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is a resolution submitted by the so-called Truman committee. They are asking for another $100,000 to carry on the activities of the committee. I have conferred with the minority members of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and they are favorable to the adoption of the resolution. I have also conferred with the majority members. There does not seem to be any question about furnishing funds to the so-called Truman committee, and that committee is now asking for the amount carried in this resolution, and the Committee to Audit and Control, think they should have this sum in order to continue the magnificent work they have been doing throughout the country.

Mr. McNARY. Did the committee report unanimously after the matter had been fully considered?

Mr. LUCAS. I conferred by telephone with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and I could not reach the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. The Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Illinois agree that the work should go on, and that the amount asked for should be appropriated. I have enough proxies in my pocket on the majority side to handle that situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. How much has the committee had up to date?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not sure how much has been appropriated for the investigation, and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is not present this morning.

Mr. HATCH. I think it is in the neighborhood of $200,000.

Mr. LUCAS. I think that is correct. I believe originally the sum of $15,000 or $25,000 was appropriated, and later perhaps $60,000, I think $200,000 all told.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 150) submitted by Mr. TRUMAN on May 4, 1943, was considered and agreed to.

MARBLE PEDESTAL FOR BUST OF FORMER VICE PRESIDENT GARNER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably Senate Resolution 150, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 150) submitted by Mr. CONNALLY on May 14, 1943, was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved That the Architect of the Capitol hereby is authorized to procure a marble pedestal for the bust in the Senate wing of the Capitol of former Vice President John N. Garner, the expense thereof, not exceeding $300, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Library.

VERNON L. TALBERTT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably Senate Resolution 144, which is a resolution recommended by our committee, authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Senate to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Vernon L. Talbertt, son of William B. Talbertt, late a laborer of the Senate, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 144) submitted by Mr. BARKLEY on May 3, 1943, was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Vernon L. Talbertt, son of William B. Talbertt, late a laborer of the Senate under supervision of the Sergeant at Arms, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 1118. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, providing for loss of nationality; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1119. A bill imposing additional duties upon the postmaster at Lincoln's New Salem, Ill.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1120. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the posthumous appointment to commissioned or noncommissioned grade of certain enlisted men and the posthumous promotion of certain commissioned officers and enlisted men," approved July 28, 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 1121. A bill to provide for the return of unabsorbed premiums for war damage insurance, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises):

S. 1122. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1123. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish headstones to mark the honorary burial places of deceased members of the armed forces who are buried at sea, in foreign lands, or at unknown places; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BONE:

S. J. Res. 61 (by request): Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMPARISON OF MEAT PRICES IN CANADA AND WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I have in my hand a photostatic copy of an advertisement in the Montreal Daily Star of Thursday, May 13, 1943. I also have a copy of the Washington Post of the same date. In these newspapers are given meat prices in Montreal, Canada, and Washington, D. C., on May 13, when the new "roll-back" prices were established by the Office of Price Administration.

On May 13, the Office of Price Administration brought out a new price schedule on meats in Washington, D. C. As advertised in the daily press, the new O. P. A. meat prices were "roll-back" prices.

On the same day, May 13, the daily press of Montreal, Ottawa, and Toronto, Canada, published the grocery advertisements for meat prices in Canada.

A comparison of these prices shows that O. P. A. "roll-back" prices on meats in Washington, D. C., overtop meat prices at 12 leading retail grocery houses in Montreal, Ottawa, and Toronto by from 30 percent to as high as 90 percent.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Am I correct in understanding the Senator to say that meat prices are as much as 90 percent higher in Washington than they are in Canada?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes; according to the advertisement of the grocery stores in Montreal and the announcement in the Washington Post for the same date, giving the new prices under the schedule of the O. P. A.

The average increase of O. P. A. meat prices over and above Canada approximates 50 percent.

Take porterhouse and sirloin steak and roast. In Washington, D. C., the O. P. A. ceiling price for porterhouse and sirloin was jumped from the former price top of from 50 to 59 cents a pound to 66 cents for choice steak at grocery chain stores and 70 cents at smaller independent stores, the advertised "roll back" being an increase or "roll up" of from 10 to 15 cents a pound.

But the true roll back appears in Canada. Of eight leading grocery houses or chains in Montreal, Ottawa, and Toronto, advertising on May 13 in the daily press, porterhouse and sirloin, the average porterhouse price was 39 cents, or approximately 30 cents a pound below the O. P. A. roll-back price in Washington.

Now comes the big story. A. & P. Food Stores, the leading chain retail grocery of Montreal, advertised porterhouse, boneless sirloin, and boneless round, both steak and roast, at 35 cents a pound—and I have a photostatic copy of their advertisement—on the same day that the Office of Price Administration in Washington set the top price for porterhouse in Washington at the so-called roll-back price of 66 cents a pound, or 90 percent above the Montreal price.

The O. P. A. roll-back swindle not only jumps Washington prices by something like 20 percent over the former retail price level, but it climbs Mount Ararat with meat prices one-half again higher than in the cities above our northern border.

I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief tabulation of O. P. A. meat prices effective in Washington, D. C., beginning May

13, and, in parallel column, an average of Canadian retail prices as advertised in leading dailies of Montreal, Ottawa, and Toronto, all on the same day, May 13, 1943.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The table is as follows:

Meat cut	Washington price (Office of Price Administration "roll-back")	Price in Canada, average	Office of Price Administration excess	
			Cents per pound	Percent
BEEF	*Cents per pound*	*Cents per pound*		
Porterhouse	66	39	27	70
Sirloin (boneless)	62	38	24	59
Round (boneless)	55	37	18	50
Chuck (bone in)	35	24	11	45
Flank	46	28	18	64
Rib roast	45	32	13	45
Hamburger	33	22	11	50
VEAL				
Loin chops	51	40	11	29
Cutlets	56	42	14	30
Leg of veal	40	30	10	33
LAMB AND MUTTON				
Loin	70	42	28	65
Rib chops	54	40	14	35
Lamb leg	47	35	12	34

NOTE.—Independent store price given for Washington, choice grade.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senate note that the O. P. A. meat price "roll back" in the District of Columbia rises upward of 40 degrees above the normal prices of Canada.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the advertisement from the Montreal Daily Star and the price list published in the Washington Post, to both of which I have referred, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement and price list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Montreal Daily Star, May 13, 1943]

A. & P. HIGH-QUALITY STEAKS AND ROASTS

A. & P. guaranteed beef is all Government inspected—buy with confidence. One price—the low price. Special and commercial quality.

Porterhouse, wing sirloin, boneless round or boneless sirloin tip, 35 cents per pound.

Prime rib roast, first five ribs, 32 cents per pound.

Blade roast, meaty, 23 cents per pound.

Short-rib roast, 27 cents per pound.

Fresh haddock fillets, 33 cents per pound

Halibut steaks, 39 cents per pound.

Brome Lake ducks, choice, 37 cents per pound.

Sauerkraut, 4 pounds for 25 cents.

FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

California seedless navel oranges, size 200's, 49 cents per dozen.

Florida Valencia oranges, large size 176's, 46 cents per dozen.

All-purpose B. C. fancy Newtown apples, size 198's, 25 cents per dozen or 11 cents per pound.

California carrots, original large bunches, three for 19 cents.

Imported selected tomatoes, 19 cents per pound.

Hot-house cucumbers, large size, 19 cents each.

Imported spinach, young and tender, 2 pounds for 29 cents.

New carrots, 3 pounds for 19 cents.

A. & P. Bokar coffee, custom ground, 35 cents per 1-pound bag, two coupons; 18 cents per ½-pound bag, one coupon.

Ann Page vitamin B bread (Canada approved). Ann Page white, whole wheat, cracked wheat, two 24-ounce loaves for 15 cents.

Butter, Silverbrook first grade, 36 cents per pound.

Sugar, fine granulated, 37 cents per 5-pound package.

Quaker muffets, two packages for 17 cents.

Corn flakes, Quaker, two packages for 15 cents.

Catelli spaghetti, macaroni, or vermicelli, two 1-pound packages for 17 cents.

Princess flakes, 24 cents per large package.

Quaker oats, 19 cents per large package.

Keen's blueing, 8 cents per package.

Old Nippy cheese, 37 cents per pound.

Cornstarch, Durham, 9 cents per package.

Beans, Van Camp's precooked, 14 cents per 12-ounce package.

Extra special—A. & P. special blend black tea, 17 cents per 4-ounce package, 31 cents per ½-pound package. A. & P. Nectar orange pekoe tea, 22 cents per 4-ounce bag, 39 cents per ½-pound package. Two coupons for 4-ounce bag, four coupons for ½-pound package.

Odex soap, two cakes for 11 cents.

Soap, Woodbury's facial, four cakes for 29 cents.

Soap, Jergen's carbolic, three cakes for 14 cents.

Soap, Many Flowers, four cakes for 17 cents.

Ivory gloss starch, 10 cents per package.

Nutrim, 29 cents per 9-ounce package 49 cents per 18-ounce package.

Mustard, Heinz yellow, 9 cents per 6-ounce jar.

A. & P. FOOD STORES,
Owned and operated by the
Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Ltd.

[From the Washington Post of May 13, 1943]

MAXIMUM PRICES ANNOUNCED BY THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION ON BEEF, VEAL, LAMB, AND MUTTON, TO BE EFFECTIVE MONDAY

The prices listed below are the ceilings which will go into effect Monday in all types of chain stores and in independent stores with an annual business of more than $250,000 in the district of Maryland.

The maximum prices, appearing after each cut of meat are listed by Agriculture Department grades, which are indicated at the head of each column. The grade markings must be stamped on all cuts of meat except inside cuts. Also, retailers are required to post the grades sold in their stores and to segregate the different grades in their display.

Retail ceiling prices for beef, veal, lamb, and mutton—fresh, cured, and frozen (for stores in classes 3 and 4).

(AA—Choice. A—Good. B—Commercial. C—Utility. D—Cull. S—Prime, choice, and good. M—Commercial. R—Utility and culls.)

BEEF

[Cents per pound]

	AA	A	B	C	D
Steaks:					
Porterhouse	63	59	51	44	40
T-bone	63	59	51	44	40
Club	63	59	51	44	40
Rib:					
10-inch cut	38	35	34	30	26
7-inch cut	43	41	37	32	28
Sirloin	47	45	38	33	29
Pin bone	47	45	38	33	29
Sirloin (boneless)	59	55	47	41	37
Round (bone in) (full cut)	49	45	41	35	31
Round (boneless) (top and bottom)	52	48	43	36	32
Round tip	52	48	43	36	32
Chuck blade (bone in)	34	31	30	26	22

BEEF—continued

[Cents per pound]

	AA	A	B	C	D
Steaks—Continued.					
Chuck arm (bone in)	34	31	30	26	22
Flank	43	43	43	43	39
Roasts:					
Rib standing (chine bone in):					
10-inch cut	38	35	34	30	26
7-inch cut	43	41	37	32	28
Round tip	52	48	43	36	32
Rump (bone in)	33	30	27	23	19
Rump (boneless)	52	48	43	36	32
Chuck blade pot roast	34	31	30	26	22
Chuck arm pot roast	34	31	30	26	22
Chuck or shoulders (boneless)	44	41	39	34	30
English cut	34	31	30	26	22
Stews and other cuts:					
Short ribs	24	24	23	23	19
Plate (bone in)	24	24	23	23	19
Plate (boneless)	29	29	28	28	24
Brisket (bone in)	30	30	27	27	23
Brisket (boneless)	40	40	35	35	31
Flank meat	32	32	32	32	28
Neck (bone in)	31	29	28	25	21
Neck (boneless)	36	34	32	27	23
Heel of round (boneless)	36	34	33	30	26
Shank (bone in) (hind and fore)	22	22	22	22	18
Shank (boneless) (hind and fore)	30	30	30	30	26
Soup bone	03	03	03	03	03
Suet	05	05	05	05	05
Ground beef	32	32	32	32	32
Retail prices of wholesale cuts:					
Round beef (whole)	30	28	25	22	18
Sirloin beef (whole)	34	32	28	25	21
Short loin beef (whole)	45	42	36	31	27
Flank beef (whole)	18	18	18	18	14
Rib beef (whole)	32	30	28	25	21
Regular chuck (whole)	26	25	24	21	17
Short plate (whole)	19	19	19	19	15
Brisket (whole)	22	22	20	20	16
Shank (whole)	16	16	16	16	12

VEAL

[Cents per pound]

Steaks and chops:					
Loin chops	48	45	42	37	31
Rib chops	44	43	40	37	30
Shoulder chops (arm and blade)	33	31	28	25	22
Round steak (cutlets)	53	50	45	40	36
Sirloin steaks or chops	41	40	38	35	29
Roasts:					
Rump and sirloin (bone in)	38	36	32	29	26
Rump and sirloin (boneless)	55	52	46	41	37
Leg	38	36	32	29	26
Leg (rump off)	38	36	32	29	26
Leg (shank half)	38	36	32	29	26
Leg (rump half)	38	36	32	29	26
Loin	48	45	42	37	31
Rib	44	43	40	37	30
Blade and arm	33	31	28	25	22
Round	53	50	45	40	36
Shoulder (bone in) (square cut)	32	31	29	27	22
Shoulder (boneless) (square cut)	40	39	36	34	27
Stews and other cuts:					
Breast (bone in)	23	23	21	20	16
Breast (boneless)	33	31	28	25	22
Flank meat	33	31	28	25	22
Neck (bone in)	23	23	21	20	16
Neck (boneless)	33	31	28	25	22
Shank (bone in) (hind and fore)	23	23	21	20	16
Shank and heel meat (boneless) (hind and fore)	33	31	28	25	22
Ground veal and patties	34	34	34	34	34
Kidneys	33	33	33	33	33
Retail prices of wholesale cuts:					
Hindquarters	31	29	26	23	21
Forequarters	25	24	23	21	17

LAMB AND MUTTON

[Cents per pound]

	Lamb				Mutton		
	AA	A	B	C	S	M	R
Steaks and chops:							
Loin chops	67	63	58	52	39	36	34
Rib chops	51	49	45	42	27	24	21
Leg or sirloin chops	51	49	45	42	27	24	21
Shoulder chops, blades or arm chops	46	44	41	38	24	21	19
Roasts:							
Leg (whole, half or short cut)	44	42	38	34	28	26	24
Sirloin roast (bone in)	51	49	45	42	27	24	21
Yoke, rattle or triangle (bone in)	31	31	30	29	17	16	14
Yoke, rattle or triangle (boneless)	47	46	45	43	24	22	20
Chuck or shoulder, square cut (bone in)	41	40	40	39	22	20	18

LAMB AND MUTTON—continued
[Cents per pound]

	Lamb				Mutton		
	AA	A	B	C	S	M	R
Roasts—Continued.							
Chuck or shoulder, cross cut (bone in)	33	32	32	30	18	16	15
Loin	67	63	58	52	39	36	34
Rib	51	49	45	42	27	24	21
Stews and other cuts:							
Breast and flank	24	23	22	20	13	12	11
Neck (bone in)	24	23	22	20	13	12	11
Neck (boneless)	36	36	36	36	22	22	22
Shank (bone in)	24	23	22	20	13	12	11
Patties (ground meat)	36	36	36	36	22	22	22
Kidneys	32	32	32	32	18	18	18
Retail prices of wholesale cuts:							
Leg	38	37	35	32	24	23	21
Loin	38	35	29	25	20	19	17
Hotel rack	42	39	34	29	22	20	17
Yoke	25	25	24	23	13	12	11

INDEPENDENT STORES, UNDER $250,000 CLASS

The following prices represent the ceilings which will go into effect Monday in independent stores with an annual business of less than $250,000 in the District and Maryland:

(AA—Choice. A—Good. B—Commercial. C—Utility. D—Cull. S—Prime, choice and good. M—Commercial. R—Utility and culls.)

BEEF
[Cents per pound]

	AA	A	B	C	D
Steaks:					
Porterhouse	66	61	53	45	41
T-bone	66	61	53	45	41
Club	66	61	53	45	41
Rib:					
10-inch cut	40	38	35	31	27
7-inch cut	45	42	38	33	29
Sirloin	50	47	40	35	31
Pin bone	50	47	40	35	31
Sirloin (boneless)	62	58	49	43	39
Round (bone in) (full cut)	52	48	43	37	33
Round (boneless) top and bottom	55	51	45	38	34
Round tip	55	51	45	38	34
Chuck blade (bone in)	35	34	33	28	24
Chuck arm (bone in)	35	34	33	28	24
Flank	46	46	46	46	42
Roasts:					
Rib standing (chine bone in):					
10-inch cut	40	38	35	31	27
7-inch cut	45	42	38	33	29
Round tip	55	51	45	38	34
Rump (bone in)	34	32	28	24	20
Rump (boneless)	55	51	45	38	34
Chuck blade pot roast	35	34	33	28	24
Chuck arm pot roast	35	34	33	28	24
Chuck or shoulder (boneless)	46	44	42	37	33
English cut	35	34	33	28	24
Stews and other cuts:					
Short ribs	25	25	24	24	20
Plate (bone in)	25	25	25	25	21
Plate (boneless)	30	30	30	30	26
Brisket (bone in)	32	32	29	29	25
Brisket (boneless)	42	42	37	37	33
Flank meat	33	33	33	33	29
Neck (bone in)	33	32	29	27	23
Neck (boneless)	37	36	34	29	25
Heel of round (boneless)	38	37	35	32	28
Shank (bone in) (hind and fore)	24	24	24	24	20
Shank (boneless) (hind and fore)	32	32	32	32	28
Soup bone	03	03	03	03	03
Suet	05	05	05	05	05
Ground beef	33	33	33	33	33
Retail prices of wholesale cuts:					
Round beef (whole)	30	28	26	22	18
Sirloin beef (whole)	35	33	28	25	21
Short loin beef (whole)	46	43	37	31	27
Flank beef (whole)	18	18	18	18	14
Rib beef (whole)	32	31	28	25	21
Regular chuck (whole)	26	25	24	22	18
Short plate (whole)	19	19	19	19	15
Brisket (whole)	22	22	20	20	16
Shank (whole)	17	17	17	17	13

VEAL
[Cents per pound]

Steaks and chops:					
Loin chops	51	47	44	39	36
Rib chops	46	45	43	39	32
Shoulder chops (arm and blade)	35	33	29	26	24
Round steak (cutlets)	56	52	47	42	38
Sirloin steaks or chops	43	42	40	37	30

VEAL—continued
[Cents per pound]

	AA	A	B	C	D
Roasts:					
Rump and sirloin (bone in)	40	38	34	30	28
Rump and sirloin (boneless)	57	54	48	43	39
Leg	40	38	34	30	28
Leg (rump off)	40	38	34	30	28
Leg (shank half)	40	38	34	30	28
Leg (rump half)	40	38	34	30	28
Loin	51	47	44	39	36
Rib	46	45	43	39	32
Blade and arm	35	33	29	26	24
Round	56	52	47	42	38
Shoulder (bone in) (square cut)	33	32	31	28	23
Shoulder (boneless) (square cut)	42	41	38	35	29
Stews and other cuts:					
Breast (bone in)	24	24	23	21	17
Breast (boneless)	35	33	29	26	24
Flank meat	35	33	29	26	24
Neck (bone in)	24	24	23	21	17
Neck (boneless)	35	33	29	26	24
Shank (bone in) (hind and fore)	24	24	23	21	17
Shank and heel meat (boneless) (hind and fore)	35	33	29	26	24
Ground veal and patties	35	35	35	35	35
Kidneys	34	34	34	34	34
Retail prices of wholesale cuts:					
Hindquarter	31	30	26	24	22
Forequarter	25	25	23	22	18

LAMB AND MUTTON
[Cents per pound]

	Lamb				Mutton		
	AA	A	B	C	S	M	R
Steaks and chops:							
Loin	70	66	61	55	40	38	35
Rib chops	54	51	48	44	28	25	23
Leg or sirloin chops	54	51	48	44	28	25	23
Shoulder chops, blades or arm chops	48	46	43	40	25	22	20
Roasts:							
Leg (whole, half or short cut)	47	43	40	36	29	27	26
Sirloin roast (bone in)	54	51	48	44	28	25	23
Yoke, rattle, or triangle (bone in)	33	32	31	30	18	16	15
Yoke, rattle, or triangle (boneless)	49	48	47	45	25	23	21
Chuck or shoulder, square cut (bone in)	43	42	42	41	23	21	19
Chuck or shoulder, cross cut (bone in)	34	34	33	32	19	17	16
Loin	70	66	61	55	40	38	35
Rib	54	51	48	44	28	25	23
Stews and other cuts:							
Breast and flank	25	24	22	21	14	12	11
Neck (bone in)	25	24	22	21	14	12	11
Neck (boneless)	38	38	38	38	23	23	23
Shank (bone in)	25	24	22	21	14	12	11
Patties (ground meat)	38	38	38	38	23	23	23
Kidneys	33	33	33	33	19	19	19
Retail prices of wholesale cuts:							
Leg	38	37	35	32	25	23	22
Loin	39	35	30	26	21	19	17
Hotel rack	43	40	35	29	22	20	18
Yoke	25	25	24	23	14	12	11

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the Senator has said on the subject of meat prices. I understand that in Canada the Canadian Government is subsidizing some of these set-ups, and I am wondering if the Senator has any information, for instance, as to how much a product costs a store, how much the farmer gets for his product in Canada and what he gets here, and what is the spread between what the producer gets and what the retailer gets. It seems to me, in order properly to judge the situation, one has got to take into consideration what we have generally been told, namely, that Canada and Great Britain both have put into operation a system of subsidies.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. On top of that there is the question also of wage control in Canada, which we have not had here. For instance, we have seen in this country that in certain areas as high as $5,000 a year has been paid for milk delivery, whereas the milk-producing farmer in our section is getting about 6 cents a quart; and whereas a cheese-producing factory in our section sells its cheese at 27 cents a pound, we here in Washington are paying about 55 or 60 cents a pound for it.

If we took that picture, and put into it the subsidy, and the difference between the wages being paid, it seems to me it would be important.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WILEY. A parliamentary inquiry. What is the regular order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business has not been concluded. The introduction of bills and joint resolutions is the present order.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Chair. I thought we had passed that order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The introduction of bills and joint resolutions is still in order. If there be no further bills or joint resolutions, the presentation of amendments and concurrent and other resolutions is in order.

AMENDMENT TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1762, the independent offices appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 66, line 7, before the period insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes, except for cooking purposes; but if the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs finds at any time that the procurement of an adequate butter supply is not feasible, this appropriation shall be available for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes to the extent that such Administrator finds to be necessary to meet the requirements of the Veterans' Administration facilities for other than cooking purposes."

W. J. KING—REFERENCE TO COURT OF CLAIMS OF SENATE BILL 1017

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on April 19 I introduced Senate bill 1017, a bill for the relief of W. J. King. Mr. King has a claim, not exceeding $100 in amount, arising out of a cotton certificate matter under one of the earlier agricultural adjustment acts.

At this time I desire to have the claim referred to the Court of Claims, in order that the Court of Claims, under section 151 of the Judicial Code, may consider the claim along with a number of other claims which have already been sent there, not with the idea of the court making any award of money to Mr. King, but only with the idea that the Court of Claims may make a report to the Senate on the character and nature of the claim,

so that the Senate may have the information for such action as it may see fit to take on the bill.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I now submit, which is a routine resolution for the reference of a bill to the Court of Claims, to obtain this information for the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 152) was read, considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1017) entitled "A bill for the relief of W. J. King" now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims pursuant to section 151 of the Judicial Code, as amended; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act and report to the Senate, giving such conclusions as shall be sufficient to inform Congress of the nature and character of the demand, either as a claim, legal or equitable, or as a gratuity against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant; and the said court shall so proceed with the same and report to the Senate, irrespective of any statute of limitations bar, and irrespective of any administrative requirement as to filing claim therefor.

THE GLOBAL ALPHABET (S. DOC. NO. 49)

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed as a Senate document a manuscript entitled "The Global Alphabet" by former Senator Robert L. Owen, of my State of Oklahoma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the manuscript presented by the Senator from Oklahoma will be printed as a Senate document.

REPORT OF BERMUDA CONFERENCE ON THE REFUGEE PROBLEM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a release which has been agreed upon by the American and British Governments in the same general terms, in connection with the recent Bermuda conference on the refugee problem.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The delegates appointed by the American and British Governments to confer at Bermuda upon the refugee problem have now terminated their discussions and have submitted a report to their respective Governments. The two Governments have received this and are at present engaged in carrying out its recommendations. Throughout the discussions at Bermuda the United States and British delegations as well as the two Governments worked in complete harmony and in a spirit of mutual cooperation. The report was submitted as a joint report and contains no divergence of opinion.

While the details must be regarded as confidential so long as a knowledge of the recommendations contained therein would be of aid or comfort to our enemies or might adversely affect the refugees whom all are trying to aid, certain facts may now be made public.

The two delegations accomplished the useful task of dividing suggestions and proposals for the solution of the refugee problem into two categories: (1) What was possible under existing war conditions, and (2) what was impossible under these same conditions.

All suggestions were measured by two strict criteria. In the first place, nothing could be recommended that would interfere with or delay the war effort of the United Nations, and, secondly, any recommendation submitted must be capable of accomplishment under war conditions.

The shipping problem was recognized to be of the utmost urgency and it was agreed that any plan looking to the diverting of Allied shipping from the war effort to remove or care for refugees would present considerations of a military character which would disclose almost insuperable difficulties. It was also agreed that no negotiations with Hitler could be undertaken since his entire record has left no doubt that he would only agree to such solutions as would be of direct aid to the Axis war aims.

The conference was, however, able to recommend measures both for removing refugees from neutral countries and, in those cases where such removal was not possible, for giving assurances of international cooperation in the future of the refugee problem so far as it affected them.

It also recommended a number of temporary refugee havens to which refugees could be transported and maintained if and when shipping should become available. At least one such movement has been effected.

Certain measures of a financial nature to cover necessary expenses and a declaration of intention to provide for repatriation upon the termination of hostilities were also recommended.

The conference also submitted a plan for an expanded and more efficient intergovernmental organization with increased authority to meet the problems created or likely to arise under war conditions.

Some of these measures are now being put into effect and others, it is hoped, will soon be possible. It is therefore believed that the practical results of the recommendations submitted by the conference will soon become apparent.

WORK, PEACE, AND HEALTH—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Work, Peace, and Health, delivered by the Vice President at an American Labor Party dinner held at the Commodore Hotel, New York City, Sunday, May 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROADS TO LASTING PEACE AND THE RESOLUTION TO WIN THE PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Roads to Lasting Peace and the Resolution to Win the Peace," delivered by him in Columbus, Ohio, April 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT ACTS — SUMMARY OF STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary of a statement on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act made by Senator O'MAHONEY before the Senate Finance Committee on May 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement on the bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, made by Senator O'MAHONEY before the Senate Finance Committee, on May 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXCERPTS FROM DIARY OF WELSH SOLDIER AT GETTYSBURG

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the diary, written during the battle of Gettysburg, of a soldier of Welsh ancestry and correspondence relating thereto, which appear in the Appendix.]

MR. CHURCHILL'S PLEDGE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Churchill's Pledge," from the New York Times of May 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED NATIONS FOOD CONFERENCE—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials from the New York Times and the Washington (D. C.) News, dealing with the United Nations Food Conference now being held at Hot Springs, Va., which appear in the Appendix.]

THE RUML TAX PLAN—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorials from the New York Times and the Washington (D. C.) News dealing with the present status of tax legislation in Congress, which appear in the Appendix.]

DISTRIBUTION OF GASOLINE IN THE SOUTHERN STATES

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by him to Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Administrator, and an advertisement appearing in the May 16, 1943, issue of the Greensboro Daily News, Greensboro, N. C., both on the subject of distribution of gasoline in the Southern States, which appear in the Appendix.]

CONDUCT OF THE WAR—LETTER FROM MRS. LOUISE H. MERRITT

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Mrs. Louise H. Merritt, of Mount Holly Road, Charlotte, N. C., under date of April 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

YES, WE HAVE NO POTATOES—ADVERTISEMENT FROM WASHINGTON EVENING STAR

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an advertisement entitled "Yes, We Have No Potatoes," published in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, May 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLITICS NEEDS WOMEN—ARTICLE BY EVE GARRETTE

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Eve Garrette, on the subject Politics Needs Women, published in the May 1943 issue of the Woman's Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

WILL THE STATES STAND AGAINST FEDERAL POWER?—EDITORIAL FROM THE ARKANSAS GAZETTE

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Will the States Stand Against Federal Power?" written by J. N. Heiskell, editor of the Arkansas Gazette, and printed in the Arkansas Gazette for May 12, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECOND ARMY MANEUVERS—EDITORIAL FROM MEMPHIS COMMERCIAL APPEAL

[Mr. CHANDLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial in the nature of a tribute to the Second Army, published in the Memphis Commercial Appeal for Sunday, May 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

NAVY NIGHT—ADDRESSES AT MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL SOCIETY

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Navy Night addresses by Mr. Hamilton Owens, the editor of the Baltimore Sun; Hon. James V. Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy; and Rear Admiral W. H. P. Blandy, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, United States Navy, delivered before the meeting of the Maryland Historical Society, at Baltimore, Md., on May 10, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 208.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield, if I have the floor.

FLOODS AND FOOD PRODUCTION—BUTTER AND OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the Senate for a few moments in relation to the matter of food production throughout the country. Senators may have noticed in reading the newspapers today that throughout Indiana and other sections of the United States floods are taking a tremendous toll. We heard the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Winston Churchill, yesterday vividly describing the work of the Royal Air Force in attacking certain areas in Germany and destroying dams, thus flooding great acreages and driving some 150,000 persons out of their homes. During the present spring season all over the United States nature has gone on a rampage. In certain areas there have been serious droughts. In other sections we are now having great storms. The result is that the production of foodstuffs has been delayed, and the question is what the percentage of loss will be compared to the total production. This situation, Mr. President, calls for serious consideration on the part of everyone.

There came to my desk this morning a letter from one of our county agents saying that in the area he represents the farmers are in need of farm help and that many of the old folks on the farms who thought they could get through this period are now giving up. I sent that letter to one of the Government departments in Washington and hope that a remedy will be found.

Mr. President, today I received a letter from the Wisconsin Cheese Makers Association, at Plymouth, Wis. Plymouth, of course, is known all over the country as one of the great centers for the production of that important food. My attention has been called to the fact that less milk is now being produced than was produced a year ago. Butter production is below the production of last year, and the trend of production is downward. The production of Cheddar cheese is 24 percent below the 1942 production. Some sections of the United States are showing as much as 63 percent less production of Cheddar cheese than a year ago. It has been estimated that Wisconsin will produce about 19 percent less Cheddar cheese this year than last. It is not simply a question of fields which should be in production, but we find a great production front—to wit, the cow—which is not producing as it should. This is a subject which merits consideration by Congress. I have said as much on previous occasions.

In this connection, Mr. President, I wish to call attention to something which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 17 by a colleague of mine, Hon. REID F. MURRAY, Representative in Congress from the Seventh Wisconsin Congressional District. He called attention to the fact that one Edward Sard, an employee of the O. P. A., a graduate of Cornell, 29 years of age, was going through the Middle West—think of it, Senators—this young man whom we are paying under O. P. A. was going through the Middle West using public funds to promote the idea or advisability of the people of the Middle West eating oleomargarine instead of butter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to have submitted to the Senate for action my unanimous-consent request that we proceed to the consideration of unobjected-to bills on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky has made a request for unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar beginning with calendar No. 208.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky yielded to me, and I shall take but a short time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought the Senator from Wisconsin had concluded.

Mr. WILEY. No. I shall not take very long. I expect the usual courtesy to which a Senator is entitled. I thought we had arrived at the point where, if a Senator obtained the floor, he was entitled to proceed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I propounded a unanimous-consent request to take up the calendar, but that request has not as yet been acted upon.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator let that request bide a wee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will let it abide; I do not know whether I will let it bide a wee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have already yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask the Senator from Kentucky to yield so I may ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I understand, the Senator from Wisconsin is denouncing oleomargarine.

Mr. WILEY. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is complaining that someone has to eat oleomargarine instead of butter from Wisconsin. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that scientific analyses and statistics show that oleomargargine does not have tuberculosis, nor does it catch it either in the form it is caught by the cow or the milk which comes from the cow. [Laughter.] The producers of oleomargarine contend that it has been discriminated against by the Government by reason of the imposition of discriminatory taxes in order to try to force butter down the throats of people who may not want it. So I want to express my resentment at the Senator's attack on one of the staple vegetable products of this land, healthful and invigorating. Those who try it usually prefer it to old, greasy, sour butter which has been retreated two or three times to make people think it is fresh. I wanted the RECORD to show that I resent this attack on a great industry of this country.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am surprised at the distinguished Senator from Texas, who usually exercises much wisdom in his statements on the floor, but who now shows his ignorance in no small manner about the value of butter. I have not attacked oleomargarine. I am attacking a policy of government which will permit taking the people's money and using it to send out agents to propagandize one article which is produced in this country as against another article produced here. I say again that the Senator from Texas either was deaf or dumb, or simple; he did not hear what I said on the subject. What I said was that the O. P. A. sent out one of the little eastern boys who graduated from Cornell recently, one of the chaps who come out with initials after their names, but no experience in life, and no knowledge of the real problems which confront the people of the country, to instruct our people what to eat.

Mr. President, I do not have to apologize for butter. I say that when the Government sends one of its agents into the West, and pays his salary and permits him to become a propagandist in favor of one product which is made out of cottonseed and against the product that comes from the udder of the cow, then Government becomes a menace to society. That is the point I was making.

Mr. President, I am extremely sorry that the distinguished citizen from Texas interjected into this picture the element of filth——

Mr. CONNALLY. The element of what?

Mr. WILEY. Of filth, I repeat, at the time I spoke of the product of the cow. For centuries the cow has been the

mother of the race. Its product has nourished the babe and the man. And because I object to Government using the people's money, which you, Mr. President, and I and the people on the farm contribute, to send forth into the West for purposes of propaganda a little lad who recently came out of college, who probably never saw a cow—because I object to that procedure is no reason why the distinguished Senator from Texas should attempt to jump on the cow. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Wisconsin complains because the Senator from Texas was speaking in behalf of a product from his section. Yet this whole colloquy arose by reason of the Senator from Wisconsin reading from a letter he received from a cheese factory in his State of Wisconsin complaining about the situation that now exists. I was deeply touched by the Senator's reference to the cow as being the mother of the race, and in view of the Senator's speech I may also suggest that the cow is the mother of lots of "bull." [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to hear that bit of Socratic wisdom from the gentleman from down by the Rio Grande. If there is any place in the world where they handle bull, it is that section. Bull comes from that section, both literally and figuratively; and we have seen it here. In the last 4 years and 6 months I have seen no "bull" peddling exponent greater than my distinguished friend.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I think the bull factory is the range of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] where 19 bull calves came in quick succession and only 1 heifer calf. I say to the Senator that I need not defend that cow. I have many cows in my own State; and I think the Senator forgets one great truth about the source of both oleomargarine and butter—namely, that both have one common source of production. Oleomargarine comes from cottonseed which comes from green grass, and the milk in the udder of the cow also comes from green grass. They both come from green grass which comes from Republican air and sunshine; is not that true? [Laughter].

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I will not disagree with that conclusion, and I am sure the Senator from Texas will not disagree. I want to make it clear, and I think the RECORD will demonstrate it, that I said nothing obnoxious or obscene about the State of Texas. I even like the "bull" which comes from the other side of the aisle. It is real "bull." Generally it is clear-sighted and goes to the point.

Mr. President, let us see just what the situation is.

Does the dairy industry want oleomargarine abolished? Decidedly not. Oleomargarine has its place, but that place is not as an imitation of butter, which is simply—and I am speaking of butter—the fatty constituent of milk separated by agitation after a lactic fermentation in the cream. Oleomargarine is not butter. It has its own characteristics, just as butter has its own characteristics and color.

Even under the new standards, oleomargarine will not contain certain fatty saturated acids which, according to a widely known biochemist of the University of Wisconsin, are exceedingly important to the growth of human beings. What the dairy industry wants is to see that oleomargarine is definitely sold on its own merits, that it does not masquerade as butter, and that its sales are not promoted by government—I repeat, promoted by government—to the detriment of the post-armament dairy market. In this age of synthetics and ersatz products, that is a problem which may confront other segments of agriculture; and that is why all agricultural interests are concerned with this precedent, and that is why the public is also concerned.

Mr. President, millions of persons are engaged in the dairy industry, producing milk and butter and cheese, and millions more are engaged in handling the products thereof; and government, which is supposed to lend a helping hand, instead employs such standards and promotional methods as this to interfere with the established right of this segment of the farm industry.

Nothing that I said today can be interpreted as a personal attack upon any other industry.

We know that oleomargarine—whether it is fortified or not—does not contain certain specific saturated fatty acids which are important to growing individuals.

But, with Representative MURRAY, I say, "Why is O. P. A. using public funds for such a purpose?"

Mr. President, I now ask to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred the resolutions adopted by the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association, at Fond du Lac, Wis., on April 15, 1943. I shall leave the matter of "throwing the bull" to the Senator from Texas.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I

Whereas subsidies have been, and are now being, paid to producers for a twofold purpose—first, to effect prompt increase in the production of essential products; and second, a means of preventing inflation; and

Whereas since December 1, 1942, a subsidy has been paid on all Cheddar cheese to the producers of milk used in the manufacture thereof; and

Whereas current reports indicate the failure of the subsidy to increase production and the amount involved insufficient to affect, much less prevent, inflation: Therefore

Resolved, That the cheese makers of Wisconsin, manufacturers of over half of the Nation's cheese, urgently recommend the immediate removal of the subsidy on Cheddar cheese and raising the ceiling price to at least 28 cents per pound; and

That this recommendation be promptly forwarded to the proper Federal officials.

II

Whereas cheese in general, and Cheddar cheese in particular, have been projected into the spotlight of selected foods by this emergency because of their valuable food elements, advantages in shipping space, keeping qualities, palatability and potential production, and consequently subjected to regulatory measures intended to accomplish a variety of objectives—the subsidy to increase production, the set-aside order to assure Government requirements and equalize the obligation of sellers and rationing to insure equalization of consumer supplies, all of which require the preparation of separate monthly reports of production coupled with deliveries; and

Whereas these reports could be simplified and much valuable time saved the cheese maker if they were based on the month's production without affecting their accuracy: Therefore

Resolved, That we recommend revision of present cheese factory production reports by eliminating the deliveries during the month and report only the month's production.

III

Whereas it has become necessary in the conservation of critical materials to standardize and simplify all manufacturing equipment, and a committee of the War Production Board is now studying all types of equipment for the purpose of recommending the standardization thereof, including cheese factory equipment; and

Whereas it appears the standardization of certain cheese factory equipment will neither conserve materials nor labor in the manufacture thereof, and will directly interfere with the efficient and economic equipping of cheese factories: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the cheese makers of Wisconsin respectfully petition the Special Standardization and Simplification Committee of the War Production Board for opportunity to be heard before action is taken changing the present standards of cheese factory equipment, and that the proper officials be informed of the action taken at this conference; and further, that our sincerity of purpose and desire to aid the war effort be tested by examination of our record of production.

IV

Whereas producers delivering milk to cheese factories customarily get their families' cheese requirements at the cheese factory and records show such requirements in the past do not exceed 1 percent of the factories' total production; and

Whereas such factory patrons must hereafter surrender ration points for all cheese, thereby adding more clerical work to the cheese-makers' steadily increasing labors: Therefore

Resolved, That we recommend that cheese factories be permitted to sell or deliver cheese to patrons of the plant in an amount not exceeding 1 percent of the total production without the surrender of ration points.

V

Whereas the Federal Government has authorized the purchase of cheese on the Wisconsin Cheese Exchange and is now buying thereon; and

Whereas there is doubt as to the policy to be followed in the future;

Resolved, That this conference of Wisconsin cheesemakers record its confidence in the Wisconsin Cheese Exchange and urge the Food Distribution Administration to continue buying thereon for the duration of their purchase program.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has requested that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected-to measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 208. The request calls for unanimous consent. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	Overton
Andrews	George	Radcliffe
Austin	Gerry	Reed
Bailey	Gillette	Revercomb
Ball	Green	Reynolds
Bankhead	Guffey	Robertson
Barbour	Gurney	Russell
Barkley	Hatch	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hayden	Smith
Bone	Hill	Stewart
Brewster	Holman	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	La Follette	Tobey
Buck	Langer	Tunnell
Burton	Lodge	Tydings
Bushfield	Lucas	Vandenberg
Butler	McCarran	Van Nuys
Byrd	McClellan	Wagner
Capper	McFarland	Wallgren
Caraway	McKellar	Walsh
Chandler	McNary	Wheeler
Chavez	Maloney	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	White
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Wiley
Connally	Moore	Willis
Danaher	Murdock	Wilson
Davis	Murray	
Eastland	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM[are absent, attending the funeral of the late Representative Englebright, of California.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is out of the city conducting hearings on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of the death of his wife.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, my colleague the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent in Detroit, Mich., where he is attending to his duties as a member of the Truman committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

WAR LABOR BOARD DECISIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 130, directing the War Labor Board to furnish certain information respecting the decisions made by that Board. The information furnished, Mr. President, in my judgment, was totally inadequate. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I have written to Mr. W. H. Davis, Chairman of the War Labor Board, at Washington.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 20, 1943.

Hon. W. H. DAVIS,
War Labor Board, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DAVIS: With respect to your letter of May 10 and with reference to the report filed by the War Labor Board on that date responding to Senate Resolution 130, asking for certain information from the War Labor Board, I wish to state that by careful analysis of the report made to the Senate, it is clear to me that the information furnished was neither adequately nor properly submitted in compliance with the direction of the resolution. In addition to the information given to the Senate by your report of May 10, the following information requested was omitted:

First. A statement of the changes expressed in amounts in the basic hourly rates of wages and the average weekly earnings which have resulted from your decisions and orders in the case of each employer or industry affected thereby.

The Senate directed you to submit a list of all decisions and orders with the name and address of each employer or industry affected and a statement showing in each instance the changes that resulted from your order in the basic hourly rates and the average weekly earnings. Your report gives only the average change in basic hourly rates, while the resolution specifically requests the changes in the hourly basic rates for each industry or employee. It follows that with the change in the hourly basic rate of wages in each case decided by the War Labor Board, the average weekly earnings can be fairly accurately estimated, as you say.

Second. The Senate resolution requests a definition of policy upon which substandard wages and inequalities have been decided, together with illustrative examples of decisions made in conformity with such policy. The report submitted does not clearly give such a definition, which is of primary importance to establish the policy of the Board in such decisions.

Third, the resolution further requested a statement of each individual case, with reasons therefor, in which wage increases have been authorized or provided by the Board, which constitute a departure from the so-called Little Steel formula.

This was not given. Your report is not by any means adequate to provide the basis for a clear understanding of the effect of the decisions of the War Labor Board, nor does it enable a checking of the actions of the Board so as to determine the full effect of such decisions.

Your statement that the wage adjustments approved by the War Labor Board have had only a microscopic effect upon prices cannot be determined without full and complete information in each individual decision as made by the Board. It is, of course, true that a decision made by the War Labor Board establishes a precedent just as does a decision made by the Supreme Court of the United States, and that when such a decision is made, a number of voluntary wage increase requests by employers may follow, because the War Labor Board has already given a decision in a case that may be on a comparable basis. Therefore, it cannot be assumed that the effect of the decisions of the War Labor Board are confined only to those instances when a controversy is submitted as between employees and employers.

Resolution 130 passed the Senate unanimously, and I ask that the information which was omitted in your report be promptly furnished in a supplemental report.

With best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

CONTINUATION OF FARM PROGRAMS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Idle Acres Will Help Enemies, F. S. A. Head Says," published in the Landsford (N. Dak.) Leader; also, a letter from Arthur T. Boyd, secretary and treasurer of the Medora Grazing Association, of Medora, N. Dak.; and a letter from Engel A. Stafne, son of the former railroad commissioner of North Dakota, written from Hettinger, N. Dak., under date of April 20, 1943, together with an article entitled "FSA Has Successful Year."

There being no objection, the articles and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Landsford (N. Dak.) Leader]

IDLE ACRES WILL HELP ENEMIES, FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION HEAD SAYS

The patch of ground that could produce food but is not in production is doing its bit for the enemy, believes George E. Lawrence, county Farm Security supervisor for Bottineau County. Its failure to produce robs America and the Allies of just that much food energy and makes it just a speck easier for Japan, Germany, and Italy to fight us effectively.

Idle acres is a name applied to productive land not in production, or only in partial production due to "scrap farming" practices. Bottineau county has its quota of such acres, according to reports from farmers who are lining up to put these acres to work. Perhaps the farmer himself is the only one who knows about his idle acres. Maybe his neighbors know about them. Lawrence believes there are hundreds of idle acres in this county—acres wholly or partially idle. The State total runs into hundreds of thousands of acres. Every idle acre is a potential threat to the success of the war effort. Although idle acres constitute a national problem, they are first of all a local problem. Correction of the evil is entirely local, a problem for the home folks to take care of. The farmer himself has the best chance to change idle acres into fighting acres.

The Secretary of Agriculture has asked each community to help fight the idle acre menace. The county United States Department of Agriculture war board is directed to assist in mobilizing such land in each community for maximum productive use. County and community Agricultural Adjustment Administration committeemen are asked to keep a weather eye open for productive pieces of land in their own neighborhoods that need attention. They are using their own initiative to work out adjustments to put this land into full production. Cases they cannot handle are to be reported to the county war board, then the board will help locate people who will farm the acres. When necessary, the board can finance operations through available loan programs, and can help operators obtain labor or machinery if that is what it takes. All member agencies of the war board, the extension agent, Farm Security Agency county supervisor, and

others, are helping in the program. The county war board selects a member to serve as a clearing center for farmers with idle acres they cannot farm themselves and for those who could sell them.

The county Farm Security supervisor is expected to aid a great deal, Lawrence said, because he has much to do with tenure problems, group services, and loan supervision.

MEDORA GRAZING ASSOCIATION,
Medora, N. Dak., May 6, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: It has been brought to my attention that the House has passed the agricultural appropriations bill, eliminating parity payment, incentive payments, crop insurance, and greatly restricted soil-conservation payments and loans on war-risk crops.

As I understand this bill, it restricts any one cooperator from earning through these various means more than $500. In a broad sense, this appears justified, and no doubt it would eliminate continuance of some undesirable features of the program, but in our particular case, and no doubt in others similar to ours, it creates a different picture.

Two years ago we earned through compliance with the Agricultural Adjustment Act approximately $2,500. This money was earned and spent for the construction of dams, well, springs, etc. This work was done on lands leased by the association from various sources, namely, railroad, State school, county, nonresident-owned, etc. We earned only $720.20 last year, due to the shortage of labor and materials.

This summer we plan on drilling an artesian well, development of several springs, and the construction of as many dams as time, labor, and our allowance will permit. If we are restricted to the maximum amount of $500, we will be unable to accomplish any of this. The water developments made through compliance with the Agricultural Adjustment Act are used in common by our 148 members and forty-odd temporary permittees.

It is for the above-mentioned reasons that we would like to see this bill amended making it possible for nonprofit cooperative associations such as ours to continue to improve and develop a sound conservation and utilization program and at the same time make any desired adjustments that may be needed to the agricultural program.

I do not wish to convey to you the idea that we are asking for special favors or privileges not granted to other citizens. I am writing to you only to explain how this restriction would affect us.

We fully realize the responsibilities placed upon you and Congress and the sacrifices necessary to ordinary operations for the successful prosecution of the war and realize that this matter is controversial in all respects, and we ask that you give this your usual careful consideration when this bill appears before the Senate.

With thanks and personal regards, I remain,

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR T. BOYD,
Secretary and Treasurer.

HETTINGER, N. DAK., *April 20, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I have served on county committees of many different Federal agencies and have been on the Farm Security Administration Rural Rehabilitation Committee since 1936.

My observation has been that the local community, county, State, and Federal Governments have received greater returns from the Farm Security Administration loans than from the money spent by any other Federal or State agency and respectfully ask your help and cooperation to have the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration continued.

Sincerely yours,

ENGEL A. STAFNE.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION HAS SUCCESSFUL YEAR

Obert Thorson, Chairman of the Farm Security Administration Rural Rehabilitation Committee, reports that since the beginning of the fiscal year July 1, 1942, 17 standard-loan borrowers and 21 emergency-loan borrowers have paid their loans in full. Total collections from July 1, 1942, to March 1, 1943, amount to $67,860.35. From the beginning of the Farm Security Administration program to March 1, 1943, 286 nonstandard and 42 standard borrowers have paid their loans in full and 21 of the 42 paid-up standard borrowers own their farms, he stated.

From July 1, 1942, to March 15, 1943, seven new standard loans have been made to farm families who had no other source of credit. These loans were made largely for livestock and poultry, which will help to produce essential war foods. The standard borrowers, according to their 1943 farm and home plans, expect to produce the following percentages in comparison with 1942 actual recorded production:

	Percent
Calves to be dropped	116
Pigs to be farrowed	146
Eggs to be produced	113
Butterfat	115
Chickens to be raised	141
Cows to be milked	117
Acres of garden	129
Vegetables to be canned	145
Fruit to be canned	161
Potato acreage	136
Flax acreage	337

These borrowers, believes Mr. Thorson, will show the greatest gains in production—first, because they are on family-size farms and utilize their own labor; second, because in the past they have not been properly equipped with machinery, livestock, wells, and buildings; third, there has been lack of food reserves; fourth, the family labor was not fully utilized; fifth, because many are sharing equipment and labor and reducing cost by buying cooperatively.

Ninety percent of the low-income farmers, when properly assisted with equipment, livestock, and tenure, will not only repay their loans but will be substantial citizens of the community. Of the 42 standard paid-up loans, 24, or 57 percent, will be paying Federal income tax this March. Of the 90 present standard borrowers, 28, or 30 percent, will be paying Federal income tax this year.

This over-all picture, based on facts, remarked Mr. Thorson, speaks well for the usefulness of the Farm Security Administration.

I AM AN AMERICAN DAY CELEBRATION AT PHILADELPHIA—DANGER OF POLLUTION AND FLOOD FROM SCHUYLKILL RIVER

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, on Sunday last I had the distinct privilege of addressing an I Am an American Day gathering of some 20,000 citizens in the great city of Philadelphia. On that day 1,500 men and women who stood among that throng received their citizenship papers—a clear title to the most precious of all possessions—citizenship in the Republic of America.

There in the city of Philadelphia, that historic landmark of American history, those 1,500 men and women, like those venerable men of another age who signed those immortal documents of human liberty, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, turned their backs upon the oppression and tyranny of the old world and went forward to embrace a new world—a world of freedom, justice, and equality. There in the shadows of Independence Hall, which enshrines the Bell of Liberty which first pealed out its toll of freedom more than a century ago; there where such undying patriots as Jefferson, Franklin, Hancock, and Washington struck their great and resounding blows against compulsion and took up for themselves and for their fellows a citizenship in America—that land where liberty, tolerance, and growth still abide; there in the city of Philadelphia, the essence of America stands enshrined forever in the works and deeds of immortal men.

I have stood in the great square of Philadelphia on many another occasion; but truly, Mr. President, there has never been another occasion like that. All America was assembled there. Men and women of all races, creeds, and colors were gathered there—dressed in the garbs of the respective nations from whence they came to take up the mantle of citizenship in America. Those people were immigrants and descendants of immigrants. They were Catholic, Protestant, Jew, and gentile. They were old and young. They were merchant and banker, soldier and worker. They were at once the diversity and strength of an America united.

There in that crowd the courageous faith of those honored dead who built America was more than justified. There the productive powers of an industrious and thrifty people gave ample credence to the impassioned claims of Alexander Hamilton that only when enterprise is free, only when the paths of progress are open to all, will men achieve unto the utmost of their talents. Mighty are the blows which free enterprise has struck against oppression and regimentation. But none more mighty than those which are being struck today as the materials of war, produced by free labor and free management in the free economy of America, speed to the battle fronts of the world in ever-increasing numbers, there to rain blow after blow upon the distraught and harried forces of tyranny and aggression. This is a crisis for all men, but the free-enterprise system in America has shown that it can overwhelm the efforts of all other economies combined. The men and women gathered under the shadow of the flag stood grateful that those who founded this Republic founded with it an economy based upon free enterprise. For they know and we all know that the creations of free enterprise will sustain our liberty and redeem the world.

Those citizens felt the rich wisdom and high courage which men like Washington and Jefferson displayed when they proclaimed the majesty of the individual man. For here in this land, unfettered by the yoke of regimentation, the people of America remain sovereign and supreme. No power, no force, no issue can strike them down, nor depose them of the constitutional rights which

have helped them to a stature of attainment unequaled in all the world. Freedom of religion has kept them faithful and made them tolerant. Freedom of person has kept them independent and made them cooperative. Freedom of the press has kept them informed and made them vigilant; and all these together have kept and shall keep them free.

Mr. President, a man without a country is a man without a destiny. But an American is a man whose own destiny and whose country's destiny are unlimited. For, as the march of freedom is eternal, so, too, is the march of America and its citizens eternal. One had only to look out upon that throng of American citizens to realize this truth. For they are the apostles and defenders of mankind. They march in the cause of justice. Theirs is the destiny of triumph—such a triumph as shall extend to all peoples and encompass all lands.

The truth of these words is spoken in the fact that among that crowd were 1,500 men and women who had just become citizens of this great Republic. It was a proud day for them, and it was a proud day for America. I am sure that those new citizens felt as my own father felt when he received his citizenship papers more than 60 years ago—a citizenship of which I have been the proud and fortunate beneficiary. His eyes shining and his heart proud, he held those papers up for all men to see and said, "This is the greatest diploma in the world; it is the latchkey to freedom and to progress." Today there are 1,500 new American citizens in the State of Pennsylvania; 1,500 more latchkeys to freedom and progress.

Those who have come here to embrace this citizenship—one of whom was Eugene J. Houdry, that enterprising American of French descent, who has developed a revolutionary process for making rubber out of oil—have come here to accept the opportunities extended by free economic enterprise, the enduring heritage of constitutional government, and the full responsibilities of complete American citizenship. For they know and we all know that these truths are eternal: That freemen shall liberate the world; and liberated, the world shall go forth into the peace and progress of a new, inspiring day.

I was privileged on that occasion, Mr. President, to tap the historic Liberty Bell 13 times in commemoration of those Thirteen Original Colonies which, in high resolve and deep determination, first took up the struggle for American freedom and independence more than a hundred years ago. As I felt and heard the vibrations of that great bell, I felt and knew something of the deep inspiration which the tolling of the bell had given to those honored American patriots of another day when its mighty peals first sounded "to proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." Mr. President, the privilege of tapping out the call to freedom on this time-honored Liberty Bell is indeed a signal honor—such an honor as I who am a foreign-born American had never dared hope would ever come to me in my lifetime.

As I beheld this occasion, and as I listened to the inspiring remarks of Mr. Houdry and the other distinguished speakers, I was grateful to God that my parents had possessed the foresight and vision to leave the ways of the Old World behind and to take up their abode and secure their citizenship in this great land of freedom and opportunity which is America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the address which I delivered on the occasion of I Am an American Day in Philadelphia on Sunday, May 16, 1943—an occasion which was admirably presided over by Mr. Charles Grakelow, director of the department of supplies and purchases for the city of Philadelphia—and an occasion which was heightened by the memorable addresses delivered by the Honorable Bernard Samuel, mayor of the city of Philadelphia and the Honorable John Bell, Lieutenant Governor of the State of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is with deep honor and abiding hope that I meet with you today—you citizens of America—you sons and daughters of freedom—who pause for a moment in this grave hour of crisis to pay homage to that greatest, most inspiring heritage that the minds of men have ever known—citizenship in the Republic of America.

The enduring history of this America is always brought home to me in all its awesome fullness whenever I come to the great city of Philadelphia. Here in this eternal monument to America, here where the spirit of the founding fathers still abides, here where the tolls of American liberty first resounded across the countryside, here where men and women alike first took up the fight for freedom and humanity, here in the very surroundings and spirit of the times the significance of America comes home to me.

More than a hundred years of human progress look down upon this citadel today—more than 100 years given to the building of hope and human decency in America. Here in those hundred-odd years people of every race, creed, and color have been welded together in an unshakable solidarity. Here under the empowering incentives of republican government, free enterprise, and productive competition this America has grown into the most powerful and enduring citadel of human rights and material progress that the world has ever known.

And well it has. For today that citadel stands imperiled—its principles, purposes, and validity challenged by the forces of tyranny and barbarism. Today, the American people are being called upon to vindicate democracy, to restore freedom, and to insure justice. Today, as in years previous, the American people have resolved to secure their freedom and to preserve their way of life.

The misguided and violent leaders of fascism have thrown down their gauntlet on the altar of war. They have cried out to the world: "America is doomed! Her people are soft. They cannot work. They will not fight. They grovel in the lap of luxury. They are decadent and dead. The forces of regimented power, under the unfailing leadership of one master shall destroy their world."

Oh, what travesty on prophecy were those words. What futile and aimless misconception of the power and purpose of freemen. What was a love of peace was taken by our enemies to be a fear of force. What was an abiding tolerance was presumed to be a lack of decision. What was an inner confidence was presumed to be a pervading weakness. Swathed in a sea of misconception, these diabolical demons unleashed the force and fire of their hellish fury upon the people of America. In a dastardly stroke of treachery which was Pearl Harbor, they sank our ships, they killed our men, and they laid waste our creations. But that America which was to fall asunder and cry out for mercy did not fall asunder and it did not cry out for mercy.

In the face of this infamy, the power of freemen, the power of America was mustered into an unswerving unity. This land of freemen went forward as it has always gone forward in the cause of right and justice.

And so it was that our great industrial empire built up over the years by the inspired hands and hearts of freemen turned toward the tasks of war. And so it is that in this short time those same men and women who were too soft to work are producing more of the implements of war than all the rest of the world combined. These men and women who toil in America are freemen; they are not shackled; they are not driven; they need no fuehrer. For theirs is the strength of freemen, theirs is the strength that has made and shall keep the world.

But it is not only on the production front that the power of freemen is being felt. Young American men from the field, the factory, and the forests have gone forward to meet the enemy. Theirs is not an army of professionals, schooled in the traditions of militarism and conquest; theirs is an army of the whole people, moving forward with the heartbeat of the Nation. They go forward to destroy the enemy, and they shall not fail.

Only this week in north Africa we beheld the force and power of freemen. There on the hills and plains of Tunisia a vast army of Hitler's supermen laid down their arms in abject surrender. When they were confronted with the righteous wrath of freemen, these German supermen, these Axis invincibles, quit cold. They surrendered. And they surrendered to that same generation of free Americans which the Axis had called poor weaklings.

Well, the Nazis and the Japs will meet more of these poor weaklings. They will meet them in Tokyo and Berlin. They will continue to meet them until those Axis brigands surrender themselves, their tanks, their guns, and all their war material. They will continue to meet them until the forces of America take that one thing—the only thing we want from our enemies—unconditional surrender.

These Axis leaders no longer question the ability of the American people to fight, for they have read the record—that glorious record written in the rock cliffs of Bataan, the steaming jungles of New Guinea, and the endless sands of north Africa. They shall continue to read that record until the final chapter is written with the outright capitulation of Toyko and Berlin.

As the Axis leaders no longer question the ability of America to fight, neither do they doubt our ability to work. For they have seen the creations of Americans at work, and they have trembled at the sight. They have seen our aircraft overhead. They have heard the whistling of our bombs as they loose destruction on the war plants of the Reich. They have beheld and felt the power of our tanks, guns, and aircraft in Africa, in Russia, in Britain, and in China. They see our ever-increasing naval and merchant fleets moving endlessly across the seas. They see all these things, and they shall see more. For these are the works of freemen, and they are

limitless. Our enemies shall behold a constant flow of men, materials, and munitions which shall continue across the high seas of the world in an ever-ascending crescendo until the resultant force and power which shall be wrought upon them shall bring them down into an absolute, final, and overwhelming defeat. How can it be otherwise? Freemen have answered the challenge! Free Americans are in the fight.

It will not, it cannot, be otherwise. For this I Am an American Day finds all Americans standing, working, and fighting in one all-encompassing unity, and we shall stand in unity until the end. We shall each continue with high resolve at our appointed task. We shall let no issue, no grievance, no disaffection interfere with our great work even for a split second. For we Americans know that wars are not won and victories are not fashioned save on the anvils of unity and cooperation. We have that unity and we have that cooperation. And through them we shall redeem the world.

As we Americans stand in unity today, may we also highly resolve to stand in unity tomorrow. For in so doing we shall add immortal luster to the spirit and significance of this day. We shall make clear to the world that the skill, ingenuity, and determination of free Americans are united—to the end that this suffering, this injustice, this unbridled chaos shall never again rise up to plague the bastions of human liberty or the outposts of universal justice, and that all men shall go forward together in progress and in peace until the end of time.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Pennsylvania how much more time he expects to take. We have not even started the call of the calendar.

Mr. DAVIS. I shall take only 2 minutes longer.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator will not take any longer. I wish to proceed with the call of the calendar. Senators are waiting to take action on the measures on the calendar.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, it was only after leaving this inspiring American Day celebration that I had occasion to learn of another, less inspiring adjunct to the city of Philadelphia. I speak now of the deplorable state of the Schuylkill River, part of whose waters are used to power many of the important industrial plants in the Philadelphia area, and part of whose waters are used for domestic consumption by a great number of the good American citizens in this area.

Now, Mr. President, by reason of the fact that this stream has been necessarily used by certain large industrial concerns as a dumping and draining ground, this very strategic region is faced with two imminent and menacing dangers—epidemics and floods. First, by reason of the tremendous amount of filth already dumped into this stream, the dangers of pollution to this necessary water supply are both obvious and alarming. Moreover, the continued accretion of silt and refuse has almost completely destroyed the channel of the stream—a condition readily conducive to serious and damaging floods.

If either of these disasters should occur—and, if present conditions continue, there is strong likelihood that one or both of them shall certainly occur—the war effort of this Nation, not to mention the safety and welfare of vast numbers of its citizens and many of its industries, would be in grave peril.

In this strategic area millions of dollars' worth of essential war materials are being produced every single day. Coal is being mined. Steel is being made. Ships are being built, and other war materials too numerous to mention are being fashioned in the many hundreds of industrial plants which mark this region. Should floods strike this area, the mine properties would be flooded; hydroelectric stations, which supply power to many war plants and buildings, would be damaged or washed away. Production would be halted, and the war effort of this Nation would be dealt a heavy and a serious blow.

Should an epidemic occur in this area, the effects would be very grave, indeed. It is a populous area. Homes are close together. Thousands upon thousands of people work side by side in great war plants. Schools, churches, and other public buildings, as well as all transportation facilities, are crowded to the utmost, bringing many thousands of people into close and almost constant personal contact. To fight an epidemic in such surroundings as these would constitute an almost insuperable task. Countless lives would be lost; homes would be broken; and the entire region clothed in a tragedy bordering upon complete ruin. Furthermore, the productive efforts of millions of skilled and ardent workers who reside in this area and produce the vast stores of war materials which flow from this area, would be threatened with a complete halt, and the war effort of the entire Nation would be seriously undermined.

While it is true that the Schuylkill River as such is completely confined within the borders of the State of Pennsylvania, and while, because of this fact, the control of the stream is regarded as purely a State matter, since the Federal Government concerns itself only with those streams which are interstate in nature, I should like to point out that the Schuylkill River has interstate ramifications of the first order, and that for the following reasons, the control and conditions of this stream should be subjected to the utmost scrutiny and concern of the Federal Government:

First. This river — the Schuylkill — flows into and is a tributary of the Delaware River, which, in turn, flows through three States—New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland—before it empties into Chesapeake Bay. It is obvious that any pollution of the Schuylkill River might very easily lead to pollution of the Delaware River. Such pollution would extend the probable danger of epidemic throughout the heart of one of the most populous and productive regions on the entire Atlantic seaboard—the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland. An epidemic of those proportions would certainly be a matter of interstate concern, and a matter of concern to the Federal Government.

Second. The products which are fashioned by the power generated by the Schuylkill and the products transported on that river are concerned not only with interstate commerce, but with international commerce as well, for many of the products which it carries are the very sinews of war which are finding their way across the oceans of the world to numerous and far-flung battle fronts where our citizens and allies are fighting the battles which shall liberate the world. These materials and these battles are certainly a matter of concern to the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I submit that it is a sad and stinging commentary on the war effort of the United States that the Federal Government lifts not a hand to correct the grievous conditions which now attend the Schuylkill River, and which bid fair to undermine the health and welfare of the many millions of American citizens who are dependent upon this river for the very water which they drink. I submit also that it is neither wise decision nor legal necessity which permits these conditions to go uncorrected, for one day a raging flood may rise up from this very stream and blackout a considerable portion of this Nation's productive strength—a strength sorely needed by us and by our allies in this hour of peril.

Mr. President, these people and these industries are serving their Government to the utmost of their abilities in the present crisis. Their ingenuity, skill, and toil are given to the fashioning of the materials of war which are so necessary to the attainment of that complete and final military victory which their Government has pledged itself to attain in the great military struggle which now engulfs the world. Is it asking too much of that Government, Mr. President, to request that action necessary to protect the health and welfare of these American citizens, as well as to secure the continued productivity of these industries be taken—especially in view of the countless millions of dollars which have been appropriated to that Government for this and related purposes?

Mr. President, I ask that immediate action be taken by this Government to resolve the serious problems which the Schuylkill River in its present condition poses for the millions of patriotic American citizens in the Philadelphia area.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Pursuant to the order heretofore entered, the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar, beginning with Order No. 208.

CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION OF THE PACIFIC SALMON FISHERIES

The bill (S. 74) to assure conservation of and to permit the fullest utilization of the salmon fisheries of the Pacific and for other purposes, was announced as first in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this bill and the one which follows, which affect the crustacean resources of the country, were prepared by the Fish and Wildlife Service, and recommended by the Special Committe on the Conservation of Wildlife Resources. They are bills to conserve the salmon industry on the

coasts and the crustacean resources along the Gulf, the Atlantic, and the Pacific coasts. I have filed a full report from the committee. A similar bill passed the Senate last year without any objection. It was too late, however, to be acted upon in the other House, though the House committee reported favorably upon it. That is the reason the bills are on the calendar at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 74) to assure conservation of and to permit the fullest utilization of the salmon fisheries of the Pacific and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Special Committee on the Conservation of Wildlife Resources, with an amendment, on page 3, line 18, after the words "license or permit", to insert a semicolon and the words "and may make such other regulations as may be found necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall be known by the short title of the Pacific salmon fishery law.

SEC. 2. That in order to assure conservation of and to permit the fullest utilization of the salmon fisheries of the Pacific consistent with the maintenance and reasonable development of such fisheries from year to year—

(a) It shall be unlawful at any time, by any means, or in any manner, to fish for, or catch, or attempt to fish for, or catch any salmon, or any species thereof, found in the offshore waters of the Pacific coast south of 50° north latitude, unless and except as permitted by regulations made, as hereinafter provided; and

(b) It shall be unlawful to land on or bring into any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, for any purpose whatsoever other than for personal use, any salmon, or any species thereof, taken in the waters of the Pacific Ocean south of 50° north latitude, unless and except as permitted by regulations made as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 3. That subject to the provisions of this act, and having due regard to the distribution, abundance, economic value, natural history, and the times of occurrence and recurrence of such salmon as are found normally in the waters heretofore referred to, the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, is authorized and directed to conduct such investigations as may be necessary to determine when, where, to what extent, if at all, and by what means the fishing for, or capture of, any such salmon or species thereof may be permitted, and to what extent, if at all, the landing on or bringing into any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States of salmon taken in the waters of the Pacific Ocean south of 50° north latitude may be permitted, and to adopt regulations from time to time permitting and governing the same in accordance with such determinations, which regulations shall be effective when published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 4. That the regulations herein provided for shall (a) divide the offshore waters of the Pacific coast into fishing areas; (b) require, without discriminating between those eligible, every person, company, corporation, or association engaged in fishing to obtain a license or permit prior to engaging in such operations; (c) require the owner of any vessel or boat employed or engaged in the fishery industry to obtain a license or permit covering the use of the same; and may (d) specify the number and type of boats, nets, and other gear or apparatus that may be employed in each fishing area; (e) specify reasonable terms and conditions of such permits or licenses, including a provision for temporary suspension or revocation thereof for violation of the provisions of this act or regulations authorized hereunder; (f) require the payment of a fee of not to exceed $5 for any such license or permit; and may make such other regulations as may be found necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. That any person, company, corporation, or association establishing, in accordance with reasonable requirements to be prescribed by the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, that he was actually engaged in fishing, during any of the calendar years 1939, 1940, 1941, or 1942 with any boat, net, or other gear or apparatus, the maximum number of which is specified by regulation authorized under this act, shall be entitled to file, prior to January 25, 1943, application for a permit or license to fish with such boat, net, or other gear or apparatus, and the Director, subject to the provisions of this act and any regulations authorized hereunder, shall grant such permit or license. If, subsequent to January 25, 1943, and in succeeding years, the Director shall determine that additional permits or licenses may be issued, he shall give public notice of such determination, and application for such additional permits or licenses may be received up to February 15 of that year, and shall be issued for each area by lot from among the applications complying with the requirements prescribed by the Director.

SEC. 6. That every person, company, corporation, or association engaged in catching salmon in the offshore waters of the Pacific coast shall make such detailed reports thereof to the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, on blanks furnished by it, as the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service shall deem necessary to determine the distribution, abundance, economic value, and natural history of such salmon.

SEC. 7. (a) That within 20 days after publication in the Federal Register of any regulation adopted by the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, any person, company, corporation, or association whose fishery operations, including employment, are affected directly by such regulation, shall be entitled to have the same reviewed by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with such reasonable procedure as the Secretary shall prescribe, including the right of both the applicant and the Director to appear in person or by representative to introduce pertinent evidence and to be given a reasonable opportunity to be heard.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall have authority to affirm, set aside, modify, or refer back to the Director for modification in conformity with his decision, any regulation that shall be found unreasonable for carrying out the purposes of this act and his decision shall be final.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to render a written decision upon each and every matter presented to him in accordance with the provisions of this section within 20 days after the presentation thereof.

SEC. 8. (a) Any person, company, corporation, or association violating any of the provisions of this act or of any regulations made under authority of this act shall be fined, upon conviction thereof, for each offense, and each day's continuance of such a violation shall constitute a separate offense, not more than $5,000 nor less than $50, or shall be imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or may be fined and imprisoned, or both.

(b) All fish taken or captured contrary to the provisions of this act or of any regulations made pursuant thereto, shall be forfeited; upon a second violation, any vessel, boat, gear, or other apparatus used in capturing or taking such fish may be forfeited and all fish so captured or taken shall be forfeited; upon a third violation by any person, company, corporation, or association of any provision of this act or of any regulation made pursuant thereto, any vessel, boat, gear, or other apparatus used in the capturing or taking of such fish and such fish shall be forfeited.

SEC. 9. That any employee of the Department of the Interior authorized by the Secretary of the Interior to enforce the provisions of this act shall have power, without warrant, to arrest any person committing a violation of this act or of any regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of this act in his presence or view and to take such person immediately for examination or trial before an officer or court of competent jurisdiction; and shall have power to execute any warrant or process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction for the enforcement of the provisions of this act. The several judges of the courts established under the laws of the United States, and the United States Commissioners, may, within their respective jurisdictions, upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause, issue warrants in all such cases. All fish taken or captured and any vessel, boat, gear, or other apparatus used or which may be used in the capture or taking of fish, or any species thereof, contrary to the provisions of this act or of any regulations made pursuant thereto may, when found, be seized by any such employee, or by any marshal, or deputy marshal, and subject to the provisions of subsection 8 (b) of this act, upon conviction of the offender or upon judgment of a court of the United States that the same were captured or taken, used, or capable of use, contrary to the provisions of this act or of any regulation made pursuant thereto, shall be forfeited to the United States and disposed of as directed by the court having jurisdiction: *Provided,* That any such fish, vessel, boat, gear, or other apparatus seized as aforesaid shall be released upon the posting of a bond in lieu thereof in the value of the thing so seized as fixed by the court having jurisdiction.

SEC. 10. That it shall be unlawful for any person to deliver or knowingly receive for transportation, or knowingly transport, by any means whatsoever, from any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, to or through any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or to or through any foreign country, any salmon or any species thereof, if such salmon has been either caught, killed, taken, sold, purchased, possessed, or transported, at any time, contrary to the law of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia in which it was caught, killed, taken, sold, purchased, or possessed, or from which it was transported; and no person shall knowingly purchase or receive any such salmon which has been transported in violation of the provisions of this section; nor shall any person receiving any shipment of salmon transported in interstate commerce make any false record or render a false account of the contents of such shipment.

SEC. 11. That the violation of any provision of this act may be prosecuted in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the defendant. And it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to enforce the provisions of this act and the rules and regulations made thereunder. It shall be the duty of the United States attorney to whom any violation is reported by any agent or representative of the Department of the Interior to institute proceedings necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 12. That there is authorized to be appropriated, from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and to accomplish the purposes of this act and regulations made pursuant thereto, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, out of such moneys, to employ in the city of Washington and elsewhere such persons and means as he may deem necessary for such purpose and may cooperate with other Federal agencies and with local authorities in the protection, preservation, and development of the salmon fisheries of the Pacific Ocean and make the necessary investigations connected therewith.

SEC. 13. That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect any existing treaty or convention to which the United States is a party.

SEC. 14. That if any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this act shall, for any reason, be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder thereof, but shall be confined in its operation to the clause, sentence, paragraph, or part thereof directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

SEC. 15. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INVESTIGATION AND SURVEY OF CRUSTACEAN FOOD RESOURCES

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 11) providing for an investigation and survey of certain crustacean food resources of the United States, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, through the Fish and Wildlife Service, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and survey with respect to the life history and habits of shrimps, crabs, common lobsters, spiny lobsters, oysters, and commercial varieties of clams, their distribution in the coastal waters of the United States, the various methods by which they are caught or taken, their economic importance and value for food purposes, the causes of their depletion in recent years, and the most feasible and practical methods that may be used for their proper conservation in the public interest. The Secretary of the Interior shall report annually to the Congress the results of such investigation and survey, together with his recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000.

AUTHORIZATION TO SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO SETTLE CERTAIN CLAIMS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 364) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle certain claims, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept the surrender of any lease issued pursuant to any of the provisions of the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 181 and the following), or any amendment thereof, where the surrender is filed in the General Land Office subsequent to the accrual but prior to the payment of the yearly rental due under the lease, upon payment of the accrued rental on a pro rata monthly basis for the portion of the lease year prior to the filing of the surrender. The authority granted to the Secretary of the Interior by this act shall extend only to cases in which he finds that the failure of the lessee to file a timely surrender of the lease prior to the accrual of the rental was not due to a lack of reasonable diligence, but it shall not extend to claims or cases which have been referred to the Department of Justice for purposes of suit.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENTS UNDER NONMINERAL LEASES OF PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 328) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, because of military operations, to defer or waive payments under nonmineral leases of public lands in Alaska, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, to strike out the words "during the present national emergency" and insert "occurring prior to the end of 6 months after the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CUMBERLAND GAP NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

The bill (H. R. 1896) to amend sections 1 and 2 of the act approved June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 262), relating to the establishment of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia, and to grant the consent of Congress to such States to enter into a compact providing for the acquisition of property for such park, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NOTICE OF INTEREST OF UNITED STATES IN REALTY OR PERSONALTY UNDER FACILITIES CONTRACTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 215) to authorize the filing of certain notices to serve as constructive notice of the interest of the United States in realty or personalty under facilities contract, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, at the end of the bill to add a new section, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this act the term "governmental agency" means any executive department, commission, independent establishment, corporation, created, owned, or controlled by the United States or any agency thereof, board, bureau, division, service, office, authority, or administration, in the executive branch of the Government.

SEC. 2. In order to protect the interest of the United States under certain contracts without incurring the danger of disclosing information pertinent to war or defense through recording or filing such contracts in full pursuant to local laws, the governmental agency which is authorized to enter into and to file of record any contract which provides for the construction, acquisition, establishment, enlargement, or extension of facilities for or in connection with the manufacture, construction, reconstruction, reconditioning, outfitting, processing, handling, storage, or repair of articles, supplies, materials, or equipment of any kind (including, but not limited to, buildings, vehicles, aircraft, vessels, watercraft, machinery, machine tools, any parts or components thereof, or any spare parts, plans, or equipment therefor) and by which the United States, through any governmental agency, acquires an interest in realty or personalty owned by, or in the possession of, the other party or parties to such contract, may file a notice of such contract, whether heretofore or hereafter executed, in the office of the clerk of the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the property is situated, or in the office of the clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, if such property is situated within said District. Each such notice shall contain the names of the parties, the date and Government file number of the contract, and a description of the realty, and a summary or generalized description or identification of the personalty, involved in such contract. Whenever any such notice shall have been so filed, a like notice shall also be filed in the office of record prescribed by the law of the State, Territory, or possession in which such property is located. Notices of any amendment, alteration, or modification in any such contract may be filed in the same manner as in the case of original notices.

SEC. 3. The filing of such notices shall serve as constructive notice that the property referred to therein is subject to an interest of the United States, and such interest of the United States shall be valid as against any right, title, or interest in such property acquired by any person subsequent to such filing.

SEC. 4. Whenever the interest of the United States in any property referred to in any such notice terminates, the governmental agency which filed such notice shall immediately file notices of the termination of such interest in the offices in which the original notices were filed.

SEC. 5. The provisions of this act shall remain in force and effect only until December 31, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXPEDITION OF PAYMENTS FOR LAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 919) to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 3, line 2, after the words "December 31, 1944", to strike out ", or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President, may designate.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the act of April 26, 1888, entitled "An act to facilitate the prosecution of works projected for the improvement of rivers and harbors" (25 Stat. 94; 33 U. S. C., sec. 591); section 2 of the act of August 1, 1888, entitled "An act to authorize condemna-

tion of land for sites of public buildings, and for other purposes" (25 Stat. 357; 40 U. S. C., sec. 258); the act of July 2, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize condemnation proceedings of land for military purposes" (40 Stat. 241; 50 U. S. C., sec. 171), as amended; section 4 of the act of May 15, 1928, entitled "An act for the control of floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, and for other purposes" (45 Stat. 536; 33 U. S. C., sec. 702d), or other provisions of law, in every case instituted in any court of the United States in the continental United States and Alaska, except the District of Columbia, for the condemnation of property, or any interest therein, by the United States, any department, agency, commission, or board thereof, or Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation, except the Tennessee Valley Authority, the issues shall be determined only by the court: *Provided, however,* That any party may demand a trial by jury of the issue of compensation by filing with the clerk of the court a demand therefor in writing at any time after the commencement of the condemnation proceeding and not later than 10 days before the trial. In the event that a jury trial is demanded, the jury shall be selected and impaneled as in other civil actions.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect upon its approval and shall apply in all cases hereafter instituted and in all pending cases except those in which the commissioners or other persons by whom the amount of compensation is to be determined shall have been appointed and qualified and shall have entered upon the performance of their duties.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall remain in force and effect only until December 31, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 875) to provide for the preparation of high-school students for wartime service was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

USE OF AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS IN TIME OF ACTUAL OR THREATENED WAR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 676) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war," which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That effective from December 5, 1941, the act of April 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 90; 36 U. S. C. 10, 11), entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war," is amended to read as follows:

"That whenever in time of war, or when war is imminent, the President shall find the cooperation and use of the American National Red Cross with the land and naval forces to be necessary, he is authorized to accept the assistance tendered by the said Red Cross and to employ the same under the land and naval forces in conformity with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

"SEC. 2. That when the said Red Cross cooperation and assistance with the land and naval forces in time of war or threatened hostilities shall have been accepted by the President, the personnel entering upon the duty specified in section 1 of this act shall, while proceeding to their place of duty, while serving thereat, and while returning therefrom, be transported and subsisted at the cost and charge of the United States as civilian employees employed with the said forces, and no passport fee shall be charged or collected for any passport issued to such personnel so serving or proceeding abroad to enter upon such service, and the Red Cross supplies that may be tendered as a gift and accepted for use by the land and naval forces shall be transported at the cost and charge of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEMORIAL DAY FOR DECEASED FIREMEN—JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 26) authorizing the President to proclaim the Sunday before Memorial Day as a day for memorial services for deceased firemen was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, apparently Senate Joint Resolution 26 was called up in the Judiciary Committee at a time when I was necessarily absent. I know that there was considerable objection to it in the committee. The committee, as a matter of policy, has unanimously frowned upon the addition of new memorial days.

I have been informed by one of the members of the committee that when action was last taken in the committee on this joint resolution the words "as a memorial to deceased firemen" were stricken from the joint resolution. I do not know whether that is a fact. I do know, Mr. President, that if we are to have a special memorial day, and this joint resolution is to apply to deceased firemen, I should wish to be recorded as being strongly in favor of suitable recognition of all the magnificent services which are rendered by firemen during the performance of their duties. However, I should equally hope that we might amend the joint resolution to include policemen and detectives. I believe we should also make some mention of our loyal school teachers and our faithful nurses.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PAY AND TRAVEL ALLOWANCES UNDER THE WAR DEPARTMENT

The bill (S. 966) to provide for the payment in advance of pay and travel allowances to persons in or serving with the military and naval service and to civilian officers and employees in or under the jurisdiction of the War Department was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to ask for an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator who reported the bill [Mr. CHANDLER] is not now present in the Chamber, and the bill will be passed over for the time being.

Mr. CHANDLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Senate bill 966, which was passed over a few moments ago.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I inquire what is the calendar number of the bill?

Mr. CHANDLER. It is Calendar No. 222, Senate bill 966.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if I may obtrude my opinion, I think it is more logical to complete the call of the calendar consecutively, then return to bills, consideration of which is desired.

Mr. CHANDLER. This will take but a moment. I wish the Senator would not object.

Mr. McNARY. I think I might wish to ask some questions about the bill. It disturbs the sequence of the order to leave the calling of the calendar and go back under unanimous consent to some bill which has been passed over.

Mr. CHANDLER. It will take but a moment.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator will not have to wait long. The moment the Senator is now occupying is only putting off the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Connecticut has concluded.

Mr. McNARY. I think the other practice is very much better, and I will cooperate with the Senator after a moment.

Mr. CHANDLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I repeat the request I made a few moments ago, that the Senate recur to Calendar No. 222, Senate bill 966.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, when the able Senator from Kentucky proposed returning to this bill a moment ago, I objected, and I shall always object to breaking into a call of the calendar for such purpose, but in this instance I am advised that the Senator is compelled to leave the Chamber on important public business, and that being an emergency situation, I shall not persist in my objection.

Mr. CHANDLER. I appreciate the statement of the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 966) to provide for the payment in advance of pay and travel allowances to persons in or serving with the military and naval service and to civilian officers and employees in or under the jurisdiction of the War Department or the Navy Department under certain conditions, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, during the present war and for 6 months thereafter, under such regulations as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, not to exceed pay for 3 months may be advanced to any person in or serving with the

military or naval service and to any civilian officers and employees in and under the jurisdiction of the War Department and the Navy Department when ordered to or from sea duty, or to or from duty at any place beyond the continental limits of the United States, and to and from Alaska. Any such person traveling under orders outside of the United States and entitled to expenses of subsistence or per diem in lieu thereof may be advanced an amount for such expenses or per diem in lieu thereof, as authorized by law and his orders, for a period equal to the estimated time of absence from the United States, not exceeding 1 year. Any excess advanced under this act over and above the actual amount legally due, if not otherwise refunded, may be collected from any amounts otherwise due or accruing from the United States to the person to whom the advance was made.

SEC. 2. Necessary adjustments of advance payments made under authority hereof shall be made on subsequent vouchers and pay rolls and any overpayments to persons no longer in the service of the United States and occurring solely by reason of payments made under authority of this act, if proper and timely efforts have been made to collect, or provide for collecting, any excess over amounts legally due, shall be passed to the credit of, or shall not be charged in the accounts of, the disbursing officers involved.

UTILIZATION FOR WAR PURPOSES OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SILVER—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 35) to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and myself, I wish to make a statement.

I am sure that all Senators from the so-called silver States favor the passage of Senate bill 35 at the earliest possible date. However, some time ago the House passed what was called the Celler amendment to the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, which would practically repeal the present silver legislation. The Senator from Nevada is working with Members of the House leadership and is making fair progress in his efforts to have the Celler amendment stricken from the appropriation bill.

I have talked with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], who is a member of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, regarding Senate bill 35, sponsored by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and I understand that he has kindly agreed to allow the bill to go over for the present in the hope that during the day, or by tomorrow, the Senator from Nevada will know definitely what can be done with regard to the Celler amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, in this connection I should like to say that my acquiescence in the request of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] was given with great reluctance. This measure is one of much importance. The departments in Washington that are in need of the authorization to provide sufficient silver for the war effort have been constantly pressing the Senator from Connecticut, as have others. The bill was unanimously reported by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and subsequently by the full committee.

There is, as I understand, no objection to the bill; but, unfortunately, there is a situation particularly disturbing Senators from the so-called silver States. I am very hopeful that the Senator from Nevada will come to a realization of his hopes today, because I intend to try to move, not later than Monday next, that the Senate consider this proposed legislation which is very important to our war program.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, we are fully cognizant of the situation and are just as anxious as is the Senator from Connecticut to have the bill passed. I think, not later than Monday, that can be done.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in my opinion, one statement just made is not substantiated by the facts. I refer to the statement that the departments downtown are in need of this proposed legislation in order to make silver available to the war effort. That is not, as I understand, correct.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The statement I made is correct. Whether or not the departments need the silver I cannot be absolutely certain, but they have advised me and other members of the committee that they need it very badly and at once. So I assume the Senator is not saying that my statement is incorrect.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; I make the statement to this effect: That there is no legislation needed to enable the Treasury Department to make available to the War Production Board all the silver that is necessary for the purposes of that Board. The proposed law is not necessary, for the obvious reason that the Treasury Department has already made available to the War Production Board approximately a billion and a half ounces of silver, and every department of the Government that wants silver and can show a need for silver is getting silver. So there is no particular need for this bill, and there is no pressure being exerted upon Congress to pass it in order to get the silver, for the silver is already available.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator has just stated that the departments of the Government are able to get all the silver they require if they can prove a need for it. I am not sure that covers the situation with which we are confronted. There are many industries engaged in the war work that have a great need for silver, and I am wondering if the Senator from Oklahoma is excluding that particular group?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; not at all. I understand that the silver industry are getting the silver they need. If they can make a showing that it is necessary in their business to have the silver they are getting it. Not only are they getting the silver, but the War Production Board is getting the silver it needs for use in making and fabricating machinery, planes, and necessary war equipment. Not only that, but the foreign nations that need silver for coinage purposes are getting it, and foreign nations that want silver for use in the manufacture of equipment for war purposes are likewise getting it.

I am not objecting to the passage of this bill, I will say to the Senator from Connecticut, but I did not want the RECORD to show that the failure to pass the bill was holding up any necessary use of our stock of free and unobligated silver.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I think technically the able Senator is correct, that up to this moment they are getting silver, but the supply of available silver is dwindling so very rapidly that in a matter of days, so I am advised, the situation, without the passage of this bill, might become very acute.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, under the present policy the only silver the Treasury Department wants to retain is the silver which is used as backing for the outstanding currency in the form of silver certificates. We have in circulation now something over $1,900,000,000 of silver certificates and the Treasury Department is holding as a backing for those certificates silver to the extent that is necessary on the basis of its monetary value of $1.29 an ounce. That leaves free or unobligated silver in the Treasury that has heretofore been accumulated under the Silver Purchase Act of almost 1,500,000,000 ounces. The Treasury Department can use all that silver that it deems proper and in the public interest under existing law because it is free and unobligated. The silver that is being furnished to foreign governments is on a loan basis—that is, the silver loaned is to be returned ounce for ounce. The silver being used domestically is, in the main, in a nonconsumptive manner, hence the silver to be used will not be destroyed and will be reclaimed and returned to the Treasury.

I repeat, I am not objecting to the passage of this bill and shall vote for it upon final passage, but I wanted to make this statement for the RECORD.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, are the departments able to get the silver at the prices fixed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I shall be very glad to answer the question of the Senator from Louisiana if I can do so by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Oklahoma ask?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Merely sufficient time to answer the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Oklahoma may proceed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. They are now able to get the silver at the prices and under the conditions specified in the bill.

COMMISSIONED RANK FOR WARRANT OFFICERS IN THE NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

The bill (S. 973) to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that Calendar No. 256, House bill 2587, is identical with the Senate bill.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill and be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2587) to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, at that point I rise to ask the Senator from Massachusetts how long it is intended the operations of the proviso contained in the bill may be availed of?

Mr. WALSH. This bill is an amendment to previous legislation which permits warrant officers to apply for commissions in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard within a certain period of time if they come within the age limit prescribed. It has developed that certain warrant officers who are eligible to take advantage of the law are in remote sections of the world and have not been able to make application within the time specified. This bill simply permits such officers who have had the misfortune to be located where they could not make application or as to whom the age limit had been passed to make application as provided by the original law.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. As I read the proviso, it says that if such warrant officers are, because of service conditions, unable to present themselves or even to apply for appointment or examination prior to June 27, 1943, they would, under this proposed act, be permitted later so to apply. Having applied, let us say, in the fiscal year 1945, is it the intention of the Senator or the department which sponsors the bill that commissions granted in the fiscal year 1945 shall date back to June 27, 1943, and the men so commissioned shall be allowed to take rank as of that date?

Mr. WALSH. In my opinion, yes. If a warrant officer is stationed somewhere in the Pacific Ocean, away from the central government, had no knowledge of the original law and was unable to communicate his wishes, the pending bill would permit such an officer, who would otherwise be denied that right, under regulations prescribed by the Navy, to make application, to be given the rank he was entitled to and would have had, if he had been in America and was within the age limit.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. The bill is not limited to a certain period, but proposes permanent legislation. Assume a state of facts where, let us say, war has been concluded by July 1, 1945, would it then be the Senator's understanding that warrant officers who by virtue of service conditions were unable to present applications before June 27, 1943, should have their commissions date back to this year?

Mr. WALSH. It is my opinion that they would, and that they should. If, by reason of causes beyond their control, there was delay in making their application, they should not be denied the right as warrant officers to receive commissions providing they meet the requirements of age and of education.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 973 will be indefinitely postponed.

PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF NAVAL REGULATIONS

The bill (S. 995) to provide a penalty for violation of regulations or orders with respect to persons entering, remaining in, leaving, or committing certain acts within or upon vessels, harbors, ports, and water-front facilities was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever shall enter, remain in, leave, or commit any act within or upon any vessel, harbor, port, or water-front facility, contrary to any regulation or order for the security or protection thereof, promulgated or approved by the Secretary of the Navy, pursuant to authority conferred upon him by any Executive order or proclamation of the President, shall, if it appears that he knew or should have known of the existence and extent of the regulation or order and that his act was in violation thereof, be liable to a fine of not to exceed $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

REORGANIZATION OF THE MARINE CORPS

The bill (S. 1064) to provide for the reorganization of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I know nothing of this bill other than what is contained in the title printed in the calendar. I should like to have the able Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, discuss the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, first of all, we should have an identical House bill substituted. I move that House bill 2583, Calendar No. 258, be substituted for the Senate bill, and be now considered.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2583) to provide for the reorganization of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the bill has for its purpose a coordination and consolidation of certain activities connected with administration in Headquarters, United States Marine Corps. It would abolish the Office of Adjutant and Inspector and the Adjutant and Inspector's Department, and transfer the functions of that department to a director of personnel, Marine Corps.

The bill authorizes the appointment of a line officer on active duty in the Marine Corps to be director of personnel. Funds now available to the Office of Adjutant and Inspector are transferred to the newly created director of personnel. It also authorizes necessary changes in the administration of the Marine Corps to streamline the functions into the newly created office. Inconsistent or conflicting laws are repealed.

By placing the activities of the existing Adjutant and Inspector's Department and of certain other independently operating divisions in Marine Corps Headquarters under one head, a redistribution of duties will be accomplished that will effect a saving in personnel and will eliminate duplication of certain records and files that are now necessitated by the existing administrative organization.

The various sections of the Adjutant and Inspector's Department will be regrouped and reorganized with the existing Division of Recruiting, the Division of Personnel, and the Division of Reserve under one administrative head.

A study of the proposed reorganization by the management engineers of the Navy Department indicates that the proposed organizational change in headquarters will effect a saving in personnel.

The enactment of this bill will result in no additional cost to the Government.

Mr. McNARY. There is no over-all reorganization of the Corps intended?

Mr. WALSH. Not at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1064 will be indefinitely postponed.

ALLOWANCES TO MIDSHIPMEN OF THE NAVAL RESERVE

The bill (S. 1067) to amend the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to provide for allowances to midshipmen of the Naval Reserve for quarters and subsistence when not furnished in kind was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment

Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 363; 37 U. S. C. 110), is hereby amended by adding after the period at the end thereof the following:

"Midshipmen of the Naval Reserve when not furnished quarters or subsistence in kind shall be granted the same allowance for quarters and subsistence as is granted hereunder to enlisted men not furnished quarters or rations in kind."

PAYMENTS UNDER CONTRACTS FOR HEAVY ORDNANCE

The bill (S. 972) to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 (c) of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417; 31 U. S. C. 686), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) Orders placed as provided in subsection (a) shall be considered as obligations upon appropriations in the same manner as orders or contracts placed with private contractors. Advance payments credited to special working funds shall remain available to the procuring agency for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year or years for which the appropriation involved was made and thereafter until said appropriation lapses under the law to the surplus fund of the Treasury."

SEC. 2. Section 8 of the act approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1648), is hereby repealed.

EXTENSION OF BITUMINOUS COAL ACT

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask, out of order, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 253, House Joint Resolution 122, to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days. The joint resolution was reported unanimously from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and, as I understand, there is no objection to it, and I ask for its consideration at this time because I have to leave the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator's statement complies with what I believe to be the best practice. If the Senator can demonstrate to me that an emergency exists involving the public service, I shall be willing to accede to his wish.

Mr. WHEELER. I have to leave the Chamber immediately, since several persons are waiting for me right now in connection with a hearing, and I was wondering if we could not take up the joint resolution out of order.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is referring to a meeting before the Committee on Interstate Commerce?

Mr. WHEELER. No; a number of people are waiting in my office in reference to a hearing in one of the departments in this city on a very important matter.

Mr. MCNARY. I think that statement takes the case out of my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 122) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign, during the adjournment of the Senate following today, the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 122) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LT. (J. G.) SVEND J. SKOU

The bill (S. 397) for the relief of Lt. (J. G.) Svend J. Skou, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the retired pay of Lt. (J. G.) Svend J. Skou, United States Navy, retired, shall be three-fourths of the highest pay of his grade: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued under the provisions of this act prior to the date of its enactment.

SIMPLIFICATION OF NAVAL ACCOUNTING PROCEDURE

The bill (S. 1065) to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 257, House bill 2584, is an identical bill and, without objection, will be substituted for the Senate bill and will be now considered. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2584) to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to amend the bill by adding to the House bill section 3 of the Senate bill, and renumbering section 3 of the House bill to read section 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 19, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Commencing June 30, 1944, there shall be deducted from the pay of each person in the naval service on the last day of each fiscal year the sum of $2.40, to be deposited into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 20, after "Sec.", to strike out "3" and insert "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1065 will be indefinitely postponed.

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AT ST. LAWRENCE, NEWFOUNDLAND

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 16) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct and the President of the United States to present to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, on behalf of the people of the United States a hospital, dispensary, or other memorial, for heroic services to men of the United States Navy, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to undertake the construction at St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, of a hospital, dispensary, or other memorial, such authorization to include the acquisition of land necessary therefor, at a cost of $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to effectuate the purposes of this joint resolution.

SEC. 2. The President of the United States is authorized to present such hospital, dispensary, or other memorial to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, in token of appreciation of the United States of America to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, of their heroic action in saving the lives of officers and men of the U. S. S. *Pollux* and the U. S. S. *Truxtun*, wrecked near St. Lawrence in the year 1942.

REIMBURSEMENT OF ENLISTED MEN FOR LOSS OF PROPERTY ON THE "HUGH L. SCOTT"

The bill (S. 954) for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men of the Navy for personal property lost in the loss of the *Hugh L. Scott*, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the aggregate sum of $462.25, to reimburse certain enlisted men of the Navy for the loss of their personal property, as herein next provided, to wit: The sum of $268.50 to reimburse Donald Robert Leighton, water tender, first class, United States Navy, and the sum of $193.75 to reimburse Libero Quiero, machinist's mate, first class, United States Navy, for the value of personal property on board the *Hugh L. Scott* lost by them, respectively, as a result of the loss of the *Hugh L. Scott* on or about November 18, 1942, in the north African action: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REIMBURSEMENT OF LT. COL. FRANK P. SNOW

The bill (S. 1086) to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel," was con-

sidered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $1,333.33, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, Lt. Col. Frank P. Snow, United States Marine Corps, for the value of personal property lost or damaged in the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

JACK LECEL HAAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 391) for the relief of Jack Lecel Haas, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon persons honorably discharged from the United States Navy, their widows, children, and dependent relatives, Jack Lecel Haas shall be held and considered to have been discharged with a good discharge, under honorable conditions on April 27, 1928: *Provided*, That no pension, pay, bounty, or other benefit shall be held to have accrued prior to the enactment of this act by reason of its enactment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts tell us what a "good" discharge is? In line 7 of the bill it appears that this particular claimant would be held entitled to a "good" discharge. Is there something technical or descriptive about the use of that language?

Mr. WALSH. There are several forms of discharge, as the Senator knows. There is an honorable discharge, a dishonorable discharge, a discharge for the good of the service, a discharge for physical disability, a discharge at the request of the applicant in the service. This man was given an unsatisfactory discharge, and the Navy Department, feeling it made a mistake, has submitted this bill to the Committee on Naval Affairs to correct its own error, and to give this enlisted man a "satisfactory" or "good" discharge.

Mr. DANAHER. The man is not being reenlisted in the Navy, is he?

Mr. WALSH. No; he is not.

Mr. DANAHER. Apparently he was discharged for falsification of his enlistment record.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; he said he was not married, when in reality he was married.

Mr. DANAHER. He said that only a week after he had been married. Moreover, within a very short time thereafter he asked to be discharged on the ground that his wife was dependent on him. Yet the facts are that she was trying to get a job, and under the civil-service rules could not get a job unless her husband was not providing support for her. I am wondering whether the term "good" discharge means that it is good for something special from the Treasury. I should not like to think that as a matter of policy we were making this man the only holder in the whole world of a "good" discharge.

Mr. WALSH. It means it is not a dishonorable discharge.

Mr. DANAHER. Does it mean that he is going to be entitled to benefits under the Veterans' Administration law?

Mr. WALSH. If he can make out a case; yes.

Mr. DANAHER. It is stated in the report that it is probable that the Veterans' Administration would be involved. What is the man's physical condition now that might entitle him to some special relief, perhaps?

Mr. WALSH. I personally do not know. The Navy Department, in reviewing this man's application and case, reached the conclusion that on all the facts he was entitled to a discharge of a different character from that given to him. It is their recommendation, and it is upon their recommendation that the bill has been reported.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 375) for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MAJ. GEORGE E. GOLDING

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 426) for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 11, to strike out "$2,175.76" and insert "$2,161.31", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George E. Golding, major, United States Marine Corps, retired, who was relieved from active duty because of physical disability on August 2, 1941, and who was returned to active duty for the period from November 12, 1941, to April 1, 1942, for appearances before a board of medical survey and a Navy retiring board, the sum of $2,161.31, representing pay and allowances for such period of active duty: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES T. DULIN

The bill (H. R. 761) for the relief of Charles T. Dulin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEADOW BROOK CLUB

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1001) for the relief of the Meadow Brook Club, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, at the end of the bill to add a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of the Meadow Brook Club, of Westbury, Long Island, N. Y., for reimbursement of the cost of removing a 160-foot flagpole from its premises on or about December 20, 1941, at the request of the commanding officer at Mitchel Field, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim not to exceed $500. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the claim: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. DOUGLAS E. LAWSON

The bill (S. 929) for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Work Projects is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money available for the payment of compensation to officers and employees of the Work Projects Administration, to Dr. Douglas E. Lawson, of Carbondale, Ill., the sum of $134.50, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for payment of the unpaid portion of the compensation agreed upon for the services rendered by him during the Wyoming Adult Education, Recreation, and Nursery School Workers Training Conference held at the University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo., from August 18 to 30, 1941, inclusive: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 897) to amend the act known as the Insecticide Act of 1910 (36 Stat. 331), approved April 26, 1910, was announced as next in order.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN AUXILIARY VESSELS FOR THE UNITED STATES NAVY

The bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is a House bill. Is it similar to the bill immediately following, Senate bill 1066? I notice that both bills provide for acquisition and conversion or construction of certain vessels.

Mr. WALSH. No, Mr. President. House bill 1563 provides for authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels. The bill following on the calendar would authorize the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and special boats for the United States Navy. One bill provides for authorization in connection with certain auxiliary vessels and the other for a new type of landing boats which are used for invasion.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator discuss the two bills briefly?

Mr. WALSH. I shall be glad to do so. First of all, as the Senate knows, auxiliary vessels are vessels of various types which are auxiliary to the combat vessels of the fleet. They consist of auxiliary aircraft carriers, ammunition ships, refrigerator ships, mine sweepers, transports, evacuation transports, rescue tugs, tank landing ships, tankers, repair vessels, hospital vessels, and supply vessels which at sea supply the naval vessels with the fuel and necessities of transportation which they would receive from shore if they were in a harbor.

Bills of this nature frequently come before Congress. By the act of June 14, 1940, we authorized the construction of 75,000 tons of these vessels. Money has been appropriated under that authorization, and all the vessels constructed. On June 19, 1940, an act was passed providing for the authorization of 100,000 tons of vessels. By the act of May 24, 1941, we provided for 550,000 tons. By the act of December 17, 1941, we provided for 800,000 tons, and by the act of July 9, 1942, we provided for 1,200,000 tons.

Mr. McNARY. What is the authorization in money requested under House bill 1563, and also under Senate bill 1066, which immediately follows it on the calendar?

Mr. WALSH. Approximately $1,250,000,000 for this bill and approximately $1,700,000,000 for the next bill. Let me say a word about the type of vessels provided in the other bill, Senate bill 1066. In this bill landing craft and district craft are authorized. Landing craft are a new type now employed by the Navy. They are the vessels which have been designed and are being constructed for the purpose of landing soldiers upon foreign soil. They are of a particular type which can be run ashore on a beach, and the invaders, whether they be marines or of the Army, can land from them. They also carry ashore the invaders' war paraphernalia. Already some of these vessels have been built. Heretofore they have been built under a general authorization, without any specific authorization being made for this particular type of vessel. This is the first time an authorization is asked of Congress for the Navy to pursue a program of building such landing boats.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I may say to my colleague that quite recently I had the privilege of seeing the personnel that are manning the landing craft which are referred to in this bill. This is a new and adventurous service in which the Army and Navy work together in the most complete brotherly union. It embraces men from all the different States of the Union, and I am glad to take advantage of this opportunity to pay my compliments to them, and thank the Senator for giving me this opportunity to do so.

Mr. WALSH. As my colleague knows landing from boats against enemy opposition is one of the most hazardous undertakings of the war. I venture to say that possibly several Senators have received a few requests from enlisted men, and perhaps also from officers in this particular branch of the service, asking for transfers. The service of manning these small boats is not one which is particularly congenial to all officers and enlisted men, and it is considered to be very hazardous and dangerous. My colleague very properly commends the type and personnel who are undertaking this most difficult and most dangerous and most hazardous part of the whole war effort. The personnel, I agree, is doing a fine job and is entitled to high commendation. It is important that these vessels be built as speedily and quickly as possible, in view of the constant assertion that we are preparing to open up a new front in Europe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 9, after the word "conversion" to insert the following proviso: *"Provided,* That the authority contained in this section shall be limited to the tonnage authorization contained in section 1 hereof and to similar authorization heretofore or hereafter enacted."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] has an amendment to the bill which he desires to offer.

Mr. BAILEY. I send forward an amendment to House bill 1563, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 1, after the word "which", it is proposed to strike out the words "was heretofore or."

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to take a moment to explain the amendment. The effect of the amendment when we strike out the word "heretofore" is to strike out the retroactive effect of the proposed legislation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am disposed to accept the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina, because he raises a question on which there is a difference of judgment between the Maritime Commission and the Navy Department. I informed the Senator that I thought an effort ought to be made, if possible, to bring together these two Departments of the Government, and that therefore I would accept the amendment and allow it to go to conference, where it might be possible to hear both parties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in connection with the bill which has just been passed, I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point a memorandum which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] will have a chance to peruse later.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NECESSITY FOR SECTION 2

Several months ago the Navy Department drafted a bill authorizing the President of the United States to acquire and convert or to undertake the construction of 1,000,000 tons of auxiliary vessels for the Navy. This proposed bill was forwarded to the Bureau of the Budget with the request that the Navy Department be authorized to submit this bill to the Congress for its consideration. The officials of the Bureau of the Budget did not approve of the Navy Department's request. Senators know that the Navy Department is not authorized to request the Congress to enact legislation or to make appropriations without receiving prior approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

A Member of the Congress obtained a copy of the proposed bill and introduced it on his own initiative. This bill was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives. The House also adopted an amendment which provided that the Navy should have the sole right to the possession of vessels built or acquired for it by the Maritime Commission.

The officials of the Bureau of the Budget were convinced that the Navy Department needed an additional million tons of auxiliary vessels for the effective prosecution of the war. Instead of following the usual procedure in authorizing the Navy Department to request the Congress for legislative authority to construct or acquire these vessels, they proposed that the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration transfer or loan vessels to the Navy Department, and

that additional funds be requested of the Congress to build additional ships for the Maritime Commission. It is understood that the decision of the officials of the Bureau of the Budget to follow this method of procuring additional vessels was based upon a proviso contained in an appropriation act approved July 25, 1942, which reads as follows: "*Provided*, That when vessels are transferred or assigned permanently by the War Shipping Administrator to other departments or agencies of the United States Government for operation by them, funds for the operation, loading, discharging, repairs, and alterations, or other use of such vessels may be transferred from the War Shipping Administration fund to the applicable appropriations of the department or agency concerned in such amounts as may be approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget."

Senators know that the normal procedure established by the Congress is as follows: The legislative committees of the two branches of the Congress consider, and the two Houses then enact legislative authority to undertake certain projects. The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses thereafter recommend and the two Houses appropriate the necessary funds for the construction of these projects. The decision of the Budget Bureau to transfer or loan vessels built for or acquired by the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration to the Navy Department circumvents the procedure established by the Congress. If the decision of the Bureau of the Budget is allowed to stand it will mean that the Naval Affairs Committees of the two Houses, the Navy Department, and the Congress itself will have little or no control over the Navy's auxiliary ship programs. It means, furthermore, that the control of naval auxiliary vessels will be to a great extent in the hands of the civilian officials of the Bureau of the Budget and the civilian officials of the War Shipping Administration and the Maritime Commission.

The purpose of section 2 of the present bill is to reestablish the normal procedure giving Congress and the Navy Department control of the Navy's auxiliary ships by requiring that the Navy Department obtain legislative authority to construct auxiliary vessels and thereafter obtain the necessary funds to build these vessels from the Appropriations Committees of the Congress and by providing that the Navy Department shall have the sole right to possession of all vessels built or acquired for it by the Maritime Commission.

When hearings were held on the bill by the Senate committee the Chairman of the Maritime Commission requested that the word "heretofore," on page 2, line 2, be deleted from the bill. The Navy requested that this word be retained in the bill. If the word "heretofore" is deleted from the bill it will mean that the Navy Department may or may not have the right to sole possession of the vessels built for it by the Maritime Commission between the dates of July 25, 1942 (the date of the act under which the officials of the Bureau of the Budget deem that they have a right to control the Navy's auxiliary ship program) and the date of the approval of this act. If the word "heretofore" is retained in the bill it will mean that the Navy Department will have the right to sole possession of all vessels built for it by the Maritime Commission.

The committee recommends that the word "heretofore" be retained in the bill.

The amount of money required to be appropriated by the Congress will remain the same regardless of which method is adopted. If the method proposed by the Budget Bureau is adopted, the funds will be appropriated to the Maritime Commission and the vessels constructed or acquired by the Commission may or may not be transferred or loaned to the Navy Department at the discretion of the Bureau of the Budget. In other words, if this method is adopted, the Navy Department will not have absolute control over its own auxiliary vessels.

If section 2 of the present bill is adopted, it will mean that the long-established procedure of the Congress is followed; that the money will be appropriated to the Navy Department; that the vessels will be transferred by the Maritime Commission to the Navy; and that the Navy will have full and complete control of its own auxiliary vessels. The committee is of the opinion that the Navy cannot operate efficiently unless it has auxiliaries in sufficient number and under the absolute control of naval authorities.

It recommends therefore that section 2 as now worded be retained in the bill and that the bill be approved by the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. DAVIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

LANDING CRAFT AND OTHER NAVAL VESSELS

The bill (S. 1066) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that House bill 2581, Calendar No. 251, is an identical bill. Without objection, the House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill, and will be considered at this time.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2581) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1066 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. WALSH subsequently said: Mr. President, in view of the interest in Senate bill 1066, Calendar 244, a bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft, district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, and in view of the fact that it is in the nature of an authorization of a new type of naval vessel, I ask that the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs be printed in the RECORD in connection with the discussion of the bill.

There being no objection, the report (No. 241) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1066) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft, district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments, and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

Amend the bill as follows:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out the comma after the words "landing craft" and strike out the words "and special boats," and insert the word "and" between the words "landing craft" and "district craft,".

Amend the title to read as follows: "A bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes."

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the acquisition and conversion, or construction, of 1,000,000 tons of landing craft and district craft, of such size, type, and design as the Secretary of the Navy may consider necessary and best suited for the conduct of amphibious operations, for service to the fleet and shore-based forces, and for naval districts, stations, bases, and operating areas at home and abroad. Such craft are to be additional to all auxiliary vessels or craft heretofore authorized. The bill authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to effectuate its purposes.

The types of ships and craft covered by the bill are all required in the conduct of the war and are generally as follows:

Landing craft which include the various types designed for amphibious operations, except transports. They range in size from the small rubber boats to the landing ship dock. Transports are classified as auxiliaries.

District craft, including craft of various designs and types which are used in districts, stations, bases, and operating areas at home and abroad. Among such types are tugs of several sizes, oil, gasoline, and water barges, lighters, seaplane wrecking derricks, aircraft rescue boats, aircraft fuel boats, plane rearming launches, plane personnel boats, and bomb target boats, as well as other special designs of craft and boats which are required in war operations at many locations in the continental United States and at practically every advanced base location.

This is the first bill providing for the authorization of landing craft and district craft as such. Prior to the present war, the number of craft of the type covered by the bill was small. No large landing craft were built. Only enough landing boats were built to provide for training in landing operations. These boats, together with district craft and special boats, were generally built under authority of appropriations made available for "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships." With but a few exceptions, no separate authorizing authority for such craft and boats was secured, but the necessary authorization was incorporated in appropriation bills. This method worked satisfactorily in peacetime, because the number of such craft and boats and the amounts of money involved were small. In the case of district craft, construction was little more than sufficient to maintain the Naval Establishment, i. e., very little expansion of this type of craft took place.

With the commencement of the war the need for ships and craft of these types was large and immediate. They were required to mount our amphibious operations and to equip and supply services to our expanding bases, both at home and abroad. The number required was necessarily indefinite, depending as it does on losses in training, the number of operations undertaken in a year, the losses in these operations, the rate at which advanced bases are established and developed, and other factors. Other factors are that the Navy is the sole source of supply of amphibious craft to the Army and a partial source of supply thereof to our allies.

In the past year the Navy Department has constructed craft of the types authorized by the bill without authorization by legislation specially enacted for the purpose, its authority having been derived from various appropriations and authorizations. These types have been constructed under the general directive of the projects of the combined chiefs of staff, and as required by the tactical situation and the development of our bases, both land and air. Operations with which the Congress is familiar have been successfully

undertaken with craft so built. Most of the larger landing craft were charged against the 1,799 Vessels Program Act of February 6, 1942, which authority is now substantially exhausted. The small landing and special craft were constructed against maintenance appropriations for the Bureau of Ships, and placed on the moneys so appropriated an extremely heavy drain which was not contemplated when the appropriation was made. The construction of district craft imposed a similar heavy and unforeseen drain on the Bureau of Ships.

It was therefore necessary for the Navy Department, at the time the Supplemental Naval Appropriation Act, 1943, was before the Congress, to seek funds to recuperate the maintenance funds of the Bureau of Ships which had been expended for these craft. The committee is of the opinion that the procedure which has heretofore been followed in connection with the construction of this type of craft is not satisfactory and recommends that hereafter construction of this nature be undertaken only on the basis of authorization by legislation enacted for that purpose according to the regular procedure for naval authorizations preceding naval appropriations.

The type of boat under consideration is generally small and quickly constructed. The numbers required and the losses suffered are not subject to exact prediction. The Navy Department representative stated to the committee that requirements for the vessels contemplated in this bill, especially landing craft, are necessarily subject to change, in details, types, and other factors, as a result of war developments, including operations and losses. The committee is satisfied that such changes will occur and that it would therefore be unwise to fix at this time the particular types of craft or numbers of each type to be authorized.

The Navy Department has estimated, on the basis of experience so far in the war, that the total tonnage authorized by the bill will be sufficient through the next 12 months. This estimate is believed to be as satisfactory as the uncertainties of the general situation permit.

The speed and efficiency of naval operations, including operations of the joint services, depends upon the availability of all types of the marine equipment required at the different locations and for the different operations in which the Navy is or may be engaged. The effectiveness of such operations depends frequently upon the availability of the several types of craft authorized by the bill, to service the fleets, auxiliaries, and air arm, as well as the merchant shipping involved.

These craft are not substitutes for private craft which the Navy took over in large numbers following the outbreak of the war. Such private craft were taken because they were then available and needed, and could be used, in particular duties, mainly of the patrol type. While not specially designed for the purpose they were useful and filled a need at the time. Such craft cannot serve the purposes for which the craft authorized by the bill are designed.

The Navy Department has estimated that the aggregate cost of the 1,000,000 tons of landing craft and district craft authorized by the bill would be $1,700,000,000. This would be additional to approximately 1,100,000 tons of such craft previously authorized at an approximate estimated cost of $1,900,000,000, substantially all of which has been committed.

The tonnage authorized by this bill is different from the tonnage covered by the bill H. R. 1563, authorizing the acquisition and conversion, or construction, of naval auxiliary vessels, which has also been approved by the committee.

The present bill provides for two additional types of vessels previously described and which are not included in H. R. 1563.

The committee is of the opinion that the authorization of the tonnage of landing craft and district craft provided for in the bill is necessary for the effective prosecution of the war.

The following letter from the Secretary of the Navy addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives sets forth the views and recommendations of the Navy Department on this bill. This letter is hereby made a part of this report:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 1, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft, district craft, and special boats for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

The general purpose of the proposed legislation is as stated in the title.

Up to the present time, the construction of district craft, smaller types of landing craft, and special boats has generally been undertaken under the authority of appropriations made available for "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships." With but few exceptions, no separate authorizing legislation has been secured, but the necessary authorization has been incorporated in the appropriation authority. The construction of the larger types of landing craft, e. g., LST's, LCI(L)'s, and LCT(5)'s, has been undertaken under the authority of the act of February 6, 1942 (Public Law 440, 77th Cong., 2d sess.), or the act of July 9, 1942 (Public Law 665, 77th Cong., 2d sess.).

The procedure which has been followed in the past with district craft, smaller types of landing craft, and special boats has proved to be especially difficult owing to the inability to determine the numbers of craft required sufficiently in advance to permit funds in adequate amounts to be set up in the annual appropriations requested from Congress. The Bureau of Ships, from time to time, has been given directives to procure large numbers of craft for which no appropriation authority had been requested. In order to meet these directives, the Bureau has been forced to utilize appropriation authority which has been set up to meet other items of the programs as originally outlined for which directives have not yet been received in full, or, in case such authority has not been available, it has been obliged to draw on funds which had been secured for some other phase of the Bureau's maintenance program.

In consequence of this action, taking into consideration all directives which have been received for the types of craft here under consideration, there is now remaining a total of only $5,966,500 in funds available for future programs under 1943 appropriations for "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships." Of the program originally outlined in the justification presented to the Bureau of the Budget and Congress for funds which were made available under the 1943 maintenance appropriations (title IV), there still remain items amounting to $94,985,000 for which directives have not yet been received. Since less than $6,000,000 remains available, it is obvious that the remainder of the program as originally laid down cannot be undertaken without risking failure to secure the necessary additional appropriations from Congress.

A similar situation exists in the case of future directives for larger types of landing craft. As indicated above, the construction of such craft has previously been included under the act of February 6, 1942, or under authorized auxiliary tonnage. All but a small percentage of the authorization under the former act has been fully allocated, and the slight balance still remaining has already been planned for allocation. As of April 7, 1943, a total of 421 vessels had been completed, 1,267 were building, 10 had been approved, but not yet awarded, and the balance of 101 had been determined by types but no directive had yet been issued ordering their construction.

A critical shortage of naval auxiliary tonnage is imminent as a result of the nonenactment to date of the bill H. R. 1563, which passed the House on April 21, 1943. This shortage makes it impossible to borrow on this source for any further authorizations of the larger types of landing-craft construction. Moreover, the enactment of H. R. 1563 will not solve the problem so far as it concerns future landing craft programs, since all but 99,000 tons of the 1,000,000 tons covered by H. R. 1563 have already been planned for various types of auxiliary-vessel construction.

It is believed that the principle involved in the bill H. R. 1563, authorizing auxiliary vessels by specific legislation, is applicable to the landing craft, district craft, and special boats, and that it will be equally insisted upon in Congress when additional appropriations for these types are requested.

The same circumstances which in the past have made it difficult to forecast requirements for landing craft and district craft, so as to make it possible to secure adequate advance appropriation authority, also make it difficult to determine tonnages in amounts which can readily be justified by Congress. Computations made of the programs undertaken during the calendar year 1942 and representing the total of the actual completions in 1942 plus the completions predicated for 1943, show for the various types of landing craft 14,400 units of an estimated tonnage of 813,240, and cost of $1,422,976,000. For 1,000 district craft the tonnage will amount to 360,000 at a cost of $390,000,000; while 4,000 special boats of a tonnage of 40,000 will cost $80,000,000.

The above totals represent approximately the obligations made by the Bureau of Ships to carry out directives received from the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations during the past year. In view of the foregoing, it is considered essential to orderly planning, and to an ability to remain within the limits of authorizations and appropriations, that the present uncertain condition be terminated and that the authorization requested be obtained.

The Navy Department considers the proposed legislation to be both necessary and urgent. The urgency is all the greater at this time because of the lack of authorization for the 1,000,000 tons of naval auxiliary vessels now pending in Congress.

The majority of the tonange in the proposed legislation will probably be allotted to landing craft. A blanket tonnage for this purpose is imperative. The war moves at such a speed that the requirements a year from now cannot be decided. Consequently, no program can be furnished on which to base requests for tonnage by specific types of craft or fixed sums of money.

The Navy Department strongly recommends enactment of the proposed legislation at the earliest possible date.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK KNOX.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1026) to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death, caused by military per-

sonnel or civilian employees or otherwise incident to activities of the War Department or of the Army, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think the bill should be explained and discussed. If no Senator now present in the Chamber is able to do so, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

VELMA PIKKARAINEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 332) for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$900", and insert "$825"; and in line 6, before the words "North Dakota", to insert "Towner County", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $825 to Velma Pikkarainen, of Towner County, N. Dak., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for the value of a Ford automobile seized by agents of the Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, on June 22, 1939, and sold on November 10, 1939, the basis for such seizure and sale being that such automobile allegedly had been used by O. V. Pikkarainen, the husband of the said Velma Pikkarainen, to facilitate a violation of the customs laws, although the criminal case against the said O. V. Pikkarainen was dismissed: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF DISBURSING OFFICERS OF ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1025) for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, in section 13, on page 7, line 13, after the word "payments", to insert the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of the following disbursing officers of the Army of the United States the amounts set opposite their names: Lt. Col. L. M. Edwards, Finance Department, $2.90; Lt. Col. H. G. Foster, Finance Department (now retired), $150.97; Lt. Col. E. C. Morton, Finance Department (now retired), $46.98; Lt. Col. K. S. Olson, Finance Department, $67.03; Col. F. Richards, Finance Department, $85.63; Lt. Col. H. B. Turner, Finance Department, $37.95; Col. E. W. Wilson, Finance Department, $7; Lt. Col. G. S. Woolworth, Judge Advocate General's Department, $9.64; Lt. Col. H. R. Priest, Finance Department, $35.60; and Col. L. H. Sims, Finance Department, $123.11; the said amounts representing erroneous payments of public funds for which these officers are accountable, such erroneous payments having resulted from minor errors in the computations of pay and allowances due former members of the Civilian Conservation Corps, former members of the Army of the United States, civilian employees, and commercial firms or individuals from whom collection of the overpayments cannot be effected, and which amounts have been disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sgt. Hendrik Dolleman, the amount of $67; to Sgt. Anthony J. L. Morency, the amount of $24; to First Sgt. Charles W. Sharbonneau, the amount of $88.25; and to Staff Sgt. Clarence E. Steele, the amount of $74.01; such amounts representing the value of personal effects lost by them when in the course of the evacuation of the United States Antarctic Service Expedition's Antarctic bases it became necessary in March 1941 to resort to an emergency abandonment of East Base, in Neny Fjord, Marguerite Bay, Palmer Peninsula, Antarctica.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Pvt. (1st cl.) Rex E. Dally the amount of $6.57, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount paid by him from personal funds for the transportation of Government property.

SEC. 4. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. W. T. Delihant, Finance Department, the sum of $27, public funds for which he is accountable, which were lost by his agent officer, Capt. John J. Abbott, Medical Administrative Corps, when the car in which he was carrying the said funds skidded from the road and upset in a stream: *Provided*, That no part of the said sum shall be charged to the said Capt. John J. Abbott.

SEC. 5. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. W. E. Harris, Corps of Engineers, the sum of $19.25, public funds for which he is accountable, which sum represents the difference between per diem of $5 erroneously paid to Master Sgt. Frank Zinn and the monetary allowance of $2.25 per day to which he was entitled for a period of travel on duty under orders: *Provided*, That no part of the said sum shall be charged to the said Master Sgt. Frank Zinn.

SEC. 6. That the Comptroller General of the United States, be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Col. C. B. Lindner, Finance Department, the sum of $3,974.50; and in the accounts of Maj. F. J. Stagliano, Finance Department, the sum of $1,487, public funds for which they are accountable and which were paid by them on fraudulent vouchers prepared by their deputy.

SEC. 7. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Col. T. G. McCulloch, Finance Department, the sum of $14.09, public funds for which he is accountable, such sum representing the unrecovered balance of payments totaling $64.34 made to civilian employees for periods of absence of annual leave, to which leave said employees were not entitled by reason of having been engaged for work in connection with Work Projects Administration projects: *Provided*, That no part of said sum shall be charged to Maj. Robert E. Cron, Jr., Corps of Engineers.

SEC. 8. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. E. C. Morton, Finance Department (now retired), the sum of $182.31, public funds for which he is accountable and which were paid by him on fraudulent vouchers prepared by a former employee of the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 9. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Capt. H. L. Oldenburg, Finance Department, the sum of $55.17, public funds for which he is accountable and which were stolen from the locker of his agent officer, Second Lt. B. C. Halton, Coast Artillery, by a person or persons unknown: *Provided*, That the said Second Lt. B. C. Halton shall not be held pecuniarily liable for any part of such sum.

SEC. 10. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. H. R. Priest, Finance Department, the sum of $32.40, public funds for which he is accountable, such sum representing commutation of furlough rations which was paid to an enlisted man and to which he was not entitled by reason of not having returned to his duty station when his furlough was terminated by sickness and subsequent discharge without such return: *Provided*, That no part of the said sum shall be charged to Maj. Charles L. Driscoll, Medical Administrative Corps.

SEC. 11. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Lt. Col. R. L. Scott, Finance Department, the sum of $264.82, public funds for which he is accountable and which were lost while being carried for pay-roll purposes from one building to another in the custody of his agent officer, Capt. Ralph L. Wilkerson, Air Corps: *Provided*, That the said Capt. Ralph L. Wilkerson shall not be held pecuniarily liable for any part of such sum.

SEC. 12. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of Col. Lee R. Watrous, Jr., Finance Department, the sum of $1,268, public funds for which he is accountable and which were paid by him on fraudulent vouchers.

SEC. 13. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Advertiser Co., Montgomery, Ala., $8; to the Light Publishing Co., San Antonio, Tex., $5.72; to the Houston Press Co., Houston, Tex., $8.40; to the Houston Printing Corporation, Houston, Tex., $11.38; to Carter Glass & Sons, Lynchburg, Va., $12.32; and to the Evening Star Publishing Co., Inc., Radford, Va., $8.79, which amounts are due to the several publishing companies mentioned above for advertising ordered and published for and in the interest of the United States without the prior approval of the Secretary of War as required by Revised Statutes 3828 (44 U. S. C. 324): *Provided*, That no person shall be held pecuniarily liable

for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payments: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL JACOBS, BERTHA JACOBS, AND HARRY JACOBS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 787) for the relief of Samuel Jacobs, Bertha Jacobs, and Harry Jacobs, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,743.18; to Bertha Jacobs, his wife, the sum of $4,000" and insert "$1,743.18", and in line 9, after the word "damage", to strike out "and personal injuries sustained" and insert "medical and hospital expenses incurred", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Samuel Jacobs, of Baltimore, Md., the sum of $1,743.18 and to Harry Jacobs, his son, the sum of $900, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, medical and hospital expenses incurred by them as a result of being struck by a vehicle operated by the United States Army, at the intersection of North Avenue and Mount Royal Terrace, Baltimore, Md., on December 6, 1941, at 12:05 a. m.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Harry Jacobs."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1762) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the bill, with a report from the Appropriations Committee, was laid on our desks this morning. I stated to the acting chairman of the committee, the able senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], that I desired to have an opportunity to study the bill, and I asked that it go over until Monday. My request was agreed to. So I desire that the bill not come up before Monday. As I stated, I have no objection to its consideration on that date. However, at the present time I must ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

APPOINTMENT OF COAST GUARD ACADEMY GRADUATES AS ENSIGNS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2486) to authorize the appointment as ensigns in the Coast Guard of all graduates of the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is simply to insure that the present members of classes at the Coast Guard Academy who will not graduate until 1945 and thereafter will be appointed ensigns following their graduation. Otherwise, because of the limitation as to the number of ensigns who can be appointed in the Coast Guard, there is no assurance without this legislation that the midshipmen referred to, who will graduate from the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, will become ensigns.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate, and is open to amendment. If there be no amendments to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS FOR LAYING OF CURBS AND GUTTERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2159) to provide for special assessments for the laying of curbs and gutters.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, in order to clarify the RECORD as to this particular bill, I wish to point out that the title reads "special assessments for the laying of curbs and gutters." The bill does cover that matter as it relates to the District of Columbia, but its primary effect is to relieve the owners of abutting property from the necessity of paying assessments for the paving of streets, with the exception of the assessments for the laying of curbs and gutters. The provisions of the bill are in accordance with the necessary trend in these days of shifting the burden of payment of assessments from the owners of abutting property to the users of the highways. In order that the record may be clarified in that connection, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point the report of the committee.

There being no objection, the report (No. 253) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2159) entitled "An act to provide for special assessments for the laying of curbs and gutters," having considered the same, report favorably upon it and recommend that the bill do pass, without amendment.

The title of the bill is misleading in that the bill is concerned primarily with relieving abutting property from assessments for roadway improvements and deals only in a minor degree with the revision of the basis for the assessment of abutting property for the laying of curbs and of gutters. However, since the body of the bill is clear and the title of it will not change the interpretation of it, and there is need for action on the bill, the committee does not request a formal change in the title.

Under existing law abutting property is assessed one-half of the cost of paving roadway improvements within the District of Columbia upon which the property abuts, subject to certain restrictions as to maximum assessments designed to prevent inequities. Curbs or gutters, if constructed in connection with a roadway improvement, are now treated as part of the roadway and the cost of them is assessed in the same manner as the cost of the roadway improvement. These include what are referred to in the bill as combined "curbs and gutters."

This bill recognizes that a roadway is primarily for the use of the general public. The bill, therefore, eliminates all assessments against abutting property for the construction of roadway improvements as distinguished from the construction of curbs and gutters. It retains the present plan of assessment for the cost of curbs and gutters with slight modifications to prevent inequities. Where a gutter is constructed as an integral portion of a permanent type of roadway, that portion of the roadway lying within 2 feet of the curb line is considered a gutter for the purposes of the act.

In effect the bill shifts from the owners of abutting property to those paying gasoline taxes, registration fees, motor-vehicle permit fees, and other special taxes into the general highway fund of the District of Columbia, that portion of the cost of roadway improvements now paid for by assessments on abutting property. While under existing law, abutting property in the normal case has been assessed on the basis of 50 percent of the cost of the roadway improvement, the net effect after applying the several limitations in the existing law and after deducting assessments that fall upon governmentally owned and other property which is exempt from taxation, is that abutting property has in fact paid for only about 22 percent of the cost of the roadway improvements.

In the early days when roadways were constructed primarily as a means of ingress to and egress from abutting property, the assessment plan was appropriate. Today, however, when roadways are constructed primarily for the use of the general traffic, the assessment of a substantial part of the original cost of the roadway upon abutting property loses much, if not all, of the equity originally characteristic of it. Road specifications today usually call for roadways that are much wider and pavement that is much heavier than would be required for a roadway to serve largely as a means of ingress to and egress from abutting property.

The District of Columbia, in particular, is so laid out that practically all parts of it are easily accessible. The residential, business sections, and Government buildings are so situated that most of the city streets are used for through traffic even though the abutting property may contribute little to that traffic.

Gasoline taxes in the District of Columbia were increased by Public Law No. 383 of the Seventy-seventh Congress approved December 26, 1941, from 2 cents a gallon to 3 cents a gallon. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia at that time also recommended that if the increased revenues derived by the highway fund from this tax would permit it, provision should be made to pay from the highway fund the entire cost of the construction of roadway improvements such as is proposed in this bill. They recognize that this situation has now arrived.

The loss in revenue from special assessments for roadway construction in normal times which would be eliminated by this bill is estimated by the Director of Highways of the District of Columbia at $225,000. The revenue from gasoline taxes from the current

fiscal year have been officially estimated at $3,000,000, of which $1,000,000 results from the increase in the gasoline tax from 2 cents to 3 cents. In normal years the revenues from gasoline taxes on this basis would be about $4,000,000. The highway fund also derives revenues from other sources, and the Director of Highways estimates that it will be able to absorb without difficulty the additional cost of roadway improvements shifted to it by the elimination of special assessments for their construction. No part of the highway fund is derived from general property taxation in the District or from Federal taxation. It is all derived from special taxes relating to the use of the highways.

At present there is little roadway construction and, therefore, little burden would be placed on the highway fund now by this bill.

While the practice varies in different jurisdictions, there is a growing tendency elsewhere in the country to follow the policy of paying more and more of the cost of roadway construction out of funds derived from highway users as a whole rather than out of assessments against abutting property.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have approved this bill, as evidenced in the following letter:

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit to you herewith a draft of a proposed bill "To provide for special assessments for the laying of curbs and gutters."

At the last session of Congress the Commissioners, under date of June 17, 1941, recommended that the District of Columbia motor-vehicle tax be increased and that if this were done the existing law relating to assessments for roadway improvements should be modified. The first recommendation was adopted (see Public, No. 383, 77th Cong., approved December 26, 1941). However, no action was taken upon the second recommendation. The Commissioners are still of the opinion that the present paving assessment law is unjust. It levies, with certain exceptions, upon the abutting property assessments equal to one-half of the cost of paving the roadway of the street upon which the properties abut and also one-half of the cost of the laying of curbs and gutters. In the past the character of street paving has been determined primarily by the needs of the abutting properties. Today, however, the character of the paving is determined more by general traffic conditions. Formerly the cost of the paving bore a direct relation to the benefit received by the property from the paving. Today, in many cases, it does not. The Commissioners believe that with the increase in the gasoline tax property owners should be relieved of assessments for the paving of the roadway of a street. The situation with respect to the laying of curbs and gutters is different. They are laid primarily for the benefit of the abutting property and assessments should be levied therefor. The Commissioners append hereto a bill to carry their recommendation into effect.

Section 1 of this proposed bill provides that when any curb or gutter is laid or any curb and gutter are laid of a permanent type of construction in any highway one-half of the total cost thereof shall be assessed against abutting properties by the front-foot method but no assessment is to be levied on account of the replacement of any such curb or gutter.

Section 2 contains a formula whereby the assessments will be reduced in the case of shallow lots and lots of small value.

Section 3 of the proposed bill contains a formula to reduce the assessments in the case of lots abutting two or more streets so so that no undue hardship will result.

Section 4 of the proposed bill provides that no assessment shall be levied under the existing Paving Assessment Act of February 20, 1931, for any improvements completed subsequent to the passage of this bill.

The Commissioners consider this legislation desirable and recommend its enactment.

A similar report on H. R. 5308, Seventy-seventh Congress, was referred by the Commissioners to the Bureau of the Budget and returned without objection to its submission to the Congress.

Respectfully,

C. W. KUTZ,
Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 2115) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this bill and the following bill on the calendar are of some importance. I think they should be discussed. Is any member of the Committee on the District of Columbia now in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] reported the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Is the report from the committee unanimous?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair has no knowledge as to that.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the Committee on the District of Columbia was unanimous in reporting both bills favorably. Both bills are important. Does the Senator from Oregon desire that I comment on them?

Mr. McNARY. Yes; I should like to have the Senator comment upon them briefly, if he will do so. I should like to have a notion as to what they contemplate.

Mr. BURTON. House bill 2115, which is Calendar No. 254, provides for a reenactment of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act; and it proposes to insert in the Code of the District of Columbia a provision for recognition of the merit of the individual insurer, so that if there is an individual record of employment in his particular case, he will have the benefit of it in his insurance rating. Such a provision is in accordance with the trend throughout the country. I think over 40 States have such a provision. I know that the State of Ohio has a similar one, and it has proven satisfactory.

Hearings were held on the bill by the Senator from South Dakota and he recommended the change. I think the proposed step is a sound one in insurance policy; and it meets with the aproval of the Committee on the District of Columbia and, I understand, with the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The bill is the so-called merit rating bill; is it?

Mr. BURTON. That is correct.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2115) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, under the heading "Definitions", in section 1, subsection (b) (5) (G), on page 6, line 3, before the word "service", to strike out "effective January 1, 1936"; in line 9, after the word "individual", to strike out the comma and the words "and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation"; and in line 14, in subparagraph (H), after the word "under", to strike out "an", and insert "any other", so as to make the subsections read:

"(G) service performed in the employ of a corporation, community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(H) service with respect to which unemployment compensation is payable under any other unemployment compensation system established by an act of Congress.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Disqualification for Benefits", in section 10, subsection (g), on page 44, line 3, after the word "under", to strike out "an", and insert "any other", so as to make the subparagraph read:

"(g) An individual shall not be eligible for benefits for any week with respect to which he has received or is seeking unemployment compensation under any other unemployment compensation law of another State or of the United States: *Provided*, That if the appropriate agency of such other State or of the United States finally determines that he is not entitled to such unemployment benefits, this disqualification shall not apply.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD the committee report on the bill, so that the bill may be fully explained in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report (No. 250) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill H. R. 2115, an act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the bill do pass, with the following amendments:

On page 6, line 3, strike out "effective January 1, 1936."

On page 6, beginning on line 9, change the comma after the word "individual" to a period and strike out "and no substantial part of

the activities of which is carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation."

On page 6, line 14, strike out "an" and insert "any other."

On page 44, line 3, strike out "an" and insert "any other."

This bill if enacted would replace the present District Unemployment Compensation Act and result in a District unemployment compensation law similar to those in effect in most States. By its provisions the coverage of employment is made to conform as nearly as possible with the coverage of employment under the Social Security Act, thus minimizing confusion and promoting uniformity of coverage under the District act and the Social Security Act.

This bill changes the contribution rate from the present flat rate of 2.7 percent to an experience-rating system under which the rate of contributions will range on a sliding scale from 2.7 percent down to one-tenth of 1 percent. It provides that each employer's total current contributions paid since June 30, 1939, less the total benefits paid to his former employees, will be compiled by the Board and will be called the employer's reserve. The percentage which each employer's reserve bears to such employer's average annual pay roll for the preceding 3 years then will determine the employer's contribution rate. By thus basing each employer's contribution rate upon his individual unemployment risk, unemployment compensation costs are more equitably distributed among employers.

Individual employer reserve accounts are created. When an employer's reserve account reaches a certain percentage of his annual pay roll, he becomes entitled to a reduction of his contribution for unemployment compensation.

EXPLANATION OF EXPERIENCE RATING

Experience-rating systems are provided for in the unemployment-compensation laws now in effect in 37 States and in the unemployment compensation law to become effective January 1, 1944, in Nevada. (For two studies of the operation of experience rating in the various States of the Union, see exhibits A and B, attached hereto and constituting a part of this report.)

Under this bill the standard contribution of all employers is fixed at 2.7 percent of the annual average wage. If the employer continues to make this contribution for a period of 36 consecutive calendar months and his individual reserve has not been depleted, then he is entitled to the reductions provided in the bill.

If his reserve is less than 1 percent of his average annual pay roll, the rate of contribution shall be 2.7.

It shall be 2 percent if such reserve equals or exceeds 1 percent but is less than 1.5 percent of his average annual pay roll.

It shall be 1.5 percent if such reserve equals or exceeds 1.5 percent, but is less than 2 percent of his average annual pay roll.

It shall be 1 percent if such reserve equals or exceeds 2 percent but is less than 3 percent of his average annual pay roll.

It shall be 0.5 percent if such reserve equals or exceeds 3 percent but is less than 3.5 percent.

It shall be 0.1 percent if such reserve equals or exceeds 3.5 percent of his average annual pay roll.

If as of any computation date the total amount of benefits paid out and chargeable to the employer's account is more than the total contributions credited to his account with respect to employment subsequent to May 31, 1939, then his contribution rate for the ensuing calendar year or remaining portion thereof shall be 2.7 percent.

Under this bill the employer's contribution rate normally would be computed as of June 30 each year. However, for the balance of the calendar year which remains after the enactment of this act, should the effective date be any date other than January 1, the computation date will be the last day of the third calendar quarter immediately preceding the effective date of the act. With this computation date settled upon, the act may be made effective during the course of the year in which enacted, without causing any complications.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Contributions provided for, by this bill, are made a lien upon each employer's assets. The Board is made a body corporate, and, as such, is given authority to sue and to be sued. Substituted service of process on nonresident employers is provided for. Provisions for refund of contributions are changed to permit employers to file application for refund within 3 years from the date upon which the contributions were paid, instead of within 1 year from the date upon which the contributions became due, as provided by the present law. The Board is given authority to determine to what extent its decisions shall have retroactivity, and authority to compromise tax obligations, on the same basis on which the Commissioner of Internal Revenue determines such matters for social-security tax purposes. The bill authorizes the Board to enter into reciprocal agreements, with other State unemployment compensation boards or with the Federal Government, in connection with benefit rights and coverage.

SOLVENCY OF FUND PROTECTED

To protect the solvency of the fund, two provisions are made. (1) If the balance in the fund as of the computation date is less than 5 percent of the total taxable pay rolls for all employers (the equivalent of approximately 2 years' contribution under the present rate) the contribution for each employer will be increased by the percentage differential between said 5 percent of such total pay rolls and said fund's percentage of such pay rolls, but in no event shall the contribution rate for any employer be more than 2.7 percent. (2) If, on December 20 of any calendar year, the amount in the fund becomes less than 2.4 percent of the total annual pay rolls subject to contributions for the 12-month period ending the preceding June 30, each employer's rate for the succeeding calendar year will be 2.7 percent.

RESERVE IN FUND

At the end of 1942 the amount in the District unemployment-compensation fund was $32,196,075.26, which represented an increase of $7,595,911.57 in the reserve fund during the calendar year. As of February 28, 1943, this reserve had increased to $34,320,397.49. On May 15, 1943, the reserve was up another $2,285,000, and stood at $36,605,256. Even in 1941, when unemployment-compensation benefits paid totaled $2,128,329.10, the highest amount of benefits paid in any calendar year, the District unemployment-compensation fund accumulated an additional reserve of almost $5,000,000. By the end of the present calendar year the report undoubtedly will exceed $40,000,000.

It is clear from the record of benefit payments heretofore made, together with the annual contributions received into the fund (see table below) that the fund has now reached such proportions as to be beyond threat of depletion by reason of any expected depreciation. There is enough in this reserve fund at the present time to carry the District for over 15 years at the present rate of payments without taking any contributions from employers. Your committee, therefore, believe that experience rating as incorporated in this bill should be adopted to lighten the load of the employers within the District of Columbia.

Receipts and payments under District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act

For the year—	Receipts	Payments
1938	$6,362,353	$1,673,208
1939	6,763,150	1,437,104
1940	5,753,796	2,117,375
1941	6,493,570	2,128,329
1942	8,248,788	1,157,521

CEILING ON BENEFITS RAISED

The ceiling on benefit rights of unemployed individuals is by this bill raised from $18 per week for 19 weeks to $20 for 20 weeks, and the waiting period is reduced from not more than 2 weeks to 1 week. The "dependent relative" group, from which benefits are paid, is enlarged to include a spouse and any child, regardless of age, whom the claimant is morally obligated to support. These benefit provisions are extremely liberal in comparison with those in other States. In fact, laws in most other States provide for a lower benefit amount and shorter duration.

BENEFIT RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS IN ARMED FORCES

Unlike the present law, this bill preserves benefit rights of individuals in the armed forces of the United States. An individual who entered or enters the armed forces after March 31, 1940, has at least 90 days of continuous service, and is discharged from such forces within 6 months after termination of the present war will have his benefit rights preserved as of the time he entered the armed forces.

NEW EXEMPTION

The bill provides a new exemption for services of real-estate salesmen, solicitors, and agents, if compensated for solely by way of commission. This is the same basis upon which inurance agents are exempted under the present law.

Authority to recover, recoup, or waive recovery, under certain circumstances, of benefits erroneously paid to unemployed individuals, is vested in the District Unemployment Compensation Board by this bill.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Subdivision G of section 5, page 6, reads as follows:

"(G) Effective January 1, 1936, service performed in the employ of a corporation, community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation."

There is no valid reason for making this provision retroactive. By it the contribution requirement would be moved back 7 years. It is of doubtful constitutionality in the opinion of your committee, who therefore recommend deletion of the words "effective January 1, 1936."

The final clause of this subdivision G, "and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation," is, in the opinion of your committee, unnecessary and inadvisable. In the case of *International Reform Federation* v. *Unemployment Compensation Commission of District of Columbia*, decided September 2, 1942, in which the ruling of the Social Security Board that the above-named complainant was liable for the contribution, the United States court of appeals for this district made the following statement:

"In the case now under consideration as we have seen the statute, in precise terms ex-

cepts from its provisions service in the form of a corporation operated exclusively for religious, charitable, literary, or educational purposes. Nothing is to be found in this paragraph which pronounces the group less charitable, less religious, or less educational because it seeks to accomplish its purpose in corridors of the Congress as well as in the homes or churches of the people, nor can any such interpretation be implied with any degree of reason."

Likewise the Supreme Court of the United States has just rendered a decision in the case of *Roscoe Jones* v. *City of Opalaka*, holding that a tax upon the distribution of religious literature is unconstitutional.

Your committee does not know the origin of the above clause attached to subdivision G, nor why it was attached, but in our judgment it is inappropriate and should be eliminated. We therefore recommend that the final clause of the above-named subsection as printed in italic and reading as follows: "and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation," be eliminated from the bill.

Subdivision H of paragraph 5 reads as follows:

"Service with respect to which unemployment compensation is payable under an unemployment compensation system established by an act of Congress."

Use of the word "an" is misleading, because we already have an unemployment compensation system within the District. Your committee recommend that this subdivision be amended by striking the word "an" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any other."

In subdivision G of section 10 we recommend a similar amendment by striking the word "an" in the third line thereof and inserting the words "any other."

Those approving the enactment of this legislation include practically every business enterprise within the District. Letters from more than 200 business houses and industries within the District were filed in support of this bill and in particular in support of the experience rating provision. Also your committee received letters from many employers both within and outside of the District supporting the bill.

The only organizations or individuals opposing the bill so far as your committee has been able to ascertain are the American Federation of Labor, represented by Frank J. Coleman, who presented a statement at the hearings held by your committee; Sidney R. Katz, representing Congress of Industrial Organizations; Willie Arnheim, representing Road, Highways, and Heavy Construction Laborers Union Local No. 546; William G. Wheeler, chairman of the joint conference against merit rating, secretary of Building Employers Association; and the National Association of Contractors.

Each of these opposing organizations presented objections to the experience rating provisions of the bill. Their ground of objection may be stated briefly as demanding a continuation of the piling up of the reserve fund without let-up. In the judgment of your committee, such objections are not well founded.

Full and complete hearings were held upon this bill in the District committee room in the Capitol. Everyone desiring to be heard was given an opportunity. With the exception of those specifically above-mentioned there were no objections to the provisions of the bill as here reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

HOURS OF EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 777) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia," approved February 24, 1914, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 9, after the words "during the", to strike out "existence of the present war in which the United States is engaged and 6 months thereafter" and insert in lieu thereof "period ending June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may determine."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "or more than 6 days."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, had desired to take up the independent offices appropriation bill today; but it has been agreed that the bill shall go over until Monday.

There is one item in that bill with which I am concerned, and with which I hope the majority of the Senate will be concerned when it comes up. I refer to the item regarding the National Resources Planning Board. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations recommended to the full committee an appropriation of $534,000 for the next year, which is practically half the sum which the Board had available last year, or $1,100,000.

In the full committee, on a tie vote, the amount was reduced to $200,000. I am informed that when the bill is taken up the Senator from Tennessee will offer an amendment restoring the figure favorably reported by the subcommittee, that is, $534,000. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

However, that is not what I rose to discuss. In a conversation with Dr. Charles E. Merriam, who is Vice Chairman of that Board, my attention was called to certain misunderstandings with respect to the attitude of the Board toward two subjects. One is the subject of an expanding economy, and the other is the subject of deficit financing. The impression seems to have been created that the National Resources Planning Board had advocated and was in favor of deficit financing, and was opposed to what is called an expanded economy.

I have before me a very brief memorandum from Dr. Merriam, which I should like to read into the RECORD for the benefit of the Senate, before the bill comes up on Monday, because while it has nothing to do with the amount of the appropriation, it is desirable that the attitude of the Board be clarified on these two subjects, as the misunderstanding might be transmitted to the floor of the Senate.

I read the memorandum regarding one of these subjects, the expanding economy:

It has been suggested that the National Resources Planning Board believes that we are no longer in an expanding and dynamic economy. For 10 years the Board members individually and collectively have been preaching the doctrines of an expanding economy. It was this Board which established goals of national income 20 percent above anything previously achieved. We were called idealists and dreamers because we talked expansion and were unwilling to be limited by the levels of living previously attained. We published volumes such as Technological Trends and National Policy as far back as 1937 in our push for an expanding economy and higher living standards.

In its most recent report the Board stated, "accordingly we plan for a dynamic expanding economy on the order of one hundred to one hundred and twenty-five billion dollars national income." (P. 4, National Resources Planning Board development report for 1943, pt. I.)

I now read the memorandum on the subject of deficit financing:

It has been charged by those who apparently misunderstand the National Resources Planning Board's attitude that the Board advocates so-called deficit financing as a continuous policy of the Federal Government. The National Resources Planning Board has advocated, and who has not, Government borrowing at certain times. When and how much the Government shall borrow is not something which can be settled in advance for extended periods of time, but will be determined by various situations, such as war, depression, or other national need. This is the position of the Board. (See National Resources Planning Board Development Report for 1943; Part I: Post-War Plan and Program, p. 13.)

In connection with this matter, Mr. President, Mr. Beardsley Ruml, who is a member of the National Resources Planning Board, and whose name has become famous in the past year or so in connection with taxation, found it necessary to issue a statement to the press on last Tuesday, May 18, which reads as follows:

Beardsley Ruml, treasurer of R. H. Macy & Co. and adviser of the National Resources Planning Board, in the course of remarks on Business Organizations Look Ahead, made today before the American Association of Planning Officials, stated, "Dr. Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution, writes in his book, New Philosophy of Public Debt, that the National Resources Planning Board advocates a new conception that continuous deficit spending is essential to the economic prosperity of the Nation.

"Dr. Moulton's reference to the Board is an uninformed misstatement of the Board's recommendations on fiscal policies. These

are clearly set forth on page 13 of part one of its recent report for 1943, in part as follows:

"'It is our national policy (as it has been since the beginning of our history) to accept as a suitable role of government, positive effort to foster and encourage the free activities of private individuals and agencies in advancing their well-being through productive enterprise.

"'Accordingly the fiscal and monetary policies of the Federal Government should be conceived and administered to complement and supplement these activities of private enterprise in the maintenance of adequate effective demand.'"

Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter which I received from Dr. Merriam transmitting the memorandum regarding the Board's attitude on the two subjects to which I have referred. I am sure Senators will be interested because it clarifies the situation, and some Senators seem to have been laboring under a misapprehension with regard to the matter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1943.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
United States Senate,

MY DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: Referring to our telephone conversation this morning, I am sending you a brief memorandum regarding the topic we discussed, namely An Expanding Economy and Deficit Financing.

I am also enclosing a release of Dr. Ruml's speech in New York City on Tuesday, May 18.

I hope that these statements will clarify the position of the National Resources Planning Board, which is evidently misunderstood in certain quarters.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
CHARLES E. MERRIAM,
Vice Chairman.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Ensign Leslie G. Haverland to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast Guard, to rank from May 29, 1942.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE ARMY—BEN LEAR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ben Lear to be lieutenant general.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD several telegrams which have come to me relative to the nomination of General Lear. One comes from Stuart H. Perry, publisher of the Adrian Daily Telegram, of Adrian, Mich. Another comes from Mr. Roane Waring, national commander of the American Legion. Mr. Waring's telegram was sent from New Orleans, La. Both telegrams relate to General Lear, whose nomination is now before the Senate. I ask that the telegrams and also a copy of General Lear's military record be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegrams and records were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADRIAN, MICH., *May 16, 1943.*

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Effort to block confirmation of General Lear is amazing and unworthy. It reflects personal rancor and lack of understanding of proper Army discipline. General Lear's action was absolutely sound. Refusal to confirm or even a large vote against confirmation would be discreditable to the Senate and prejudicial to the morale of both officers and soldiers.

STUART H. PERRY,
Publisher, Adrian Daily Telegram.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *May 16, 1943.*

Hon. ROBERT REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee,
United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

I understand that there is opposition to confirmation of General Lear. I deeply regret this. I have observed and admired the ability with which he has commanded the Second Army during the time that his headquarters were in Memphis, my home. I am very familiar with the "yo-ho" incident. I have talked to a number of gentlemen who were with General Lear when it occurred. I have not discussed it with him. I know that the action of these soldiers was far more serious and reprehensible than simply yoo-hooing. The newspaper stories did General Lear a great injustice, but whether right or wrong in the severity of his punishment of them, this is no time, when our Army needs discipline, and strict discipline, to question a disciplinary act of a superior officer except that it be done in proper channels. If these soldiers were unfairly treated, which, I understand, they have said they were not, then there is a proper method of redress. I regard this effort to now punish General Lear as unfortunate, wrong, and a very serious blow to the proper administration and disciplining of an army.

ROANE WARING,
The National Commander of the American Legion.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, April 30, 1943

MILITARY HISTORY OF BEN LEAR (0-1179) LIEUTENANT GENERAL (CAVALRY), FROM OCTOBER 1, 1940. BORN MAY 12, 1879, AT HAMILTON, CANADA. SERVICE: 45 YEARS

Present Assignment: Commanding General, Second Army, Central Defense Command, Memphis, Tennessee, since October 20 1940. Assumed temporary command of the Army Ground Forces, April 26, 1943.

Manner of Performance: "Superior" Rated by Lieutenant General L. J. McNair.

1. Schools Attended: Graduate: Mounted Service School, 1911; School of the Line, 1922; General Staff School, 1923; Army War College, 1926.

2. Decorations, Awards, and Ratings: Silver Star, October 9, 1899; Distinguished Service Medal, March 28, 1943.

3. Efficiency Record:

(a) Annual Efficiency Rating: 1926, Excellent; 1927, Excellent; 1928, Excellent; 1929, Superior; 1930, Excellent; 1931, Excellent; 1932, Excellent; 1933, Excellent; 1934, Superior; 1935, Superior.

(b) General Efficiency Rating: None.

(c) Efficiency Reports as General Officer:

Chief of Staff, 9th C. A., from May 1, 1936, to June 19, 1936. Rated "Superior" by Brig. Gen. C. H. Conrad, Jr.

C. G., 1st Cav. Div., from Oct. 1, 1936, to June 30, 1937. Rated "Superior" by Maj. Gen. H. J. Brees.

C. G., 1st Cav. Div., from July 1, 1937, to June 30, 1938. Rated "Superior" by Maj. Gen. H. J. Brees.

C. G., 1st Cav. Div., from July 1, 1938, to Nov. 21, 1938. Rated "Superior" by Maj. Gen. H. J. Brees.

C. G., Pacific Sector, P. C. Dept., from Dec. 9, 1938, to June 30, 1939. Rated "Superior" by Maj. Gen. David L. Stone.

C. G., Pacific Sector, P. C. Dept. from July 1, 1939, to Jan. 7, 1940. Rated "Superior" by Maj. Gen. David L. Stone.

C. G., Pacific Sector, P. C. Dept., C. G. Ft. Clayton, C. Z.; C. G., Panama Mobile Force (Provisional) from Jan. 8, 1940, to June 30, 1940. Rated "Excellent" by Maj. Gen. Daniel Van Voorhis.

C. G., Pan Mobile Force; C. G., Ft. Clayton, C. Z., from July 1, 1940, to Sept. 19, 1940. Rated "Superior" by Lt. Gen. Daniel Van Voorhis.

Comdg. 2d Army, from Mar. 20, 1942, to Dec. 31, 1942. Rated "Superior" by Lt. Gen. L. J. McNair.

4. Previous service:

(a) Grades held: 1st Sgt. Colo. Inf., May 1, 1898; 2d Lt., Colo. Inf., Apr. 1, 1899; 1st Lt., U. S. Inf., July 5, 1899; 2d Lt., Cav., R. A., Feb. 2, 1901; 1st Lt., Dec. 9, 1901; Capt., Aug. 10, 1912; Maj. (temp.), Aug. 5, 1917; Lt. Col. (temp.), Jan. 26, 1918; Col., Cav., U. S. A., Aug. 31, 1918; Lt. Col., R. A., July 1, 1920; Col., Sept. 19, 1929; Brig. Gen., May 1, 1936; Maj. Gen., Oct. 1, 1938.

(b) Assignments:

On duty with Co. C, 2d Regt., N. G. of Colo., Apr. 1898 to June 1898.

On duty with the 36th Inf. U. S. Vols., P. I., July 1898 to Apr. 1903.

Post Adj. and Adj., 15th Cav., Ft. Mason, Calif., Sept. 1903 to Nov. 1903.

Post and Sq. Adj., 15th Cav., Ft. Ethan Allen, Vt., Nov. 1903 to Sept. 1906.

Int. Off. and Post Adj., 15th Cav., Province of Santa Clara, and Post of Cienfuegas, Cuba, Oct. 1906 to June 1908.

On D. S. with the Army Cav. Rifle Team at various stations in the U. S., July 1908 to Feb. 1911.

Stu. and later Instr., Mtd. Serv. Sch., Ft. Riley, Kans., Mar. 1911 to Dec. 1912.

On duty with the 27th Inf., Ft. Sheridan, Ill., Jan. 1912 to Feb. 1913.

Sq. Comdr., 15th, 8th, and 3d Cav., Big Bend and Fabens Cav. Patrol Dists., and Ft. Bliss, Tex., Feb. 1913 to Apr. 1916.

Instr., Army Serv. Sch., Ft. Leavenworth, Kans., Apr. 1916 to Oct. 1917.

G. S., War Plans Div., Wash., D. C., Nov. 1917 to Aug. 1918.

Instr., Cav. Tr., Camp Stanley, Tex., Oct. 1918 to Dec. 1918.

Dir. and Instr., the Cav. Sch., Ft. Riley, Kans., Jan. 1919 to Aug. 1921.

Instr., the G. S. S., Ft. Leavenworth, Kans., Sept. 1921 to Aug. 1925.

Stu., A. W. C., Wash., D. C., Aug. 1925 to June 1926.

C. O., 1st Sq., 14th Cav., Ft. Sheridan, Ill., Aug. 1926 to Oct. 1927.

Chief, Inspections Div., Wash., D. C., Nov. 1927 to Dec. 1930.

Post Comdr., Presidio of Monterey, Calif., Jan. 1930 to June 1933.

C. of S., 9th C. A., Presidio of San Francisco, Calif., July 1933 to June 1936.

C. G., Hq. 8th C. A., Ft. Bliss, Tex., July 1936 to Nov. 1938.

C. G., Pacific Sector, Panama Canal Dept., Quarry Heights, C. Z., Dec. 1938 to Sept. 1940.

5. Recommendations:

In November 1938 Maj. Gen. H. J. Brees, C. G., 1st Cav. Div., said, "A man of decisive views and action. Positive in his views, works hard for his command. Very active and in excellent physical condition."

In January 1940 Maj. Gen. David L. Stone, C. G., Pacific Sector, P. C. Dept., said, "An able officer, very active, and has fine judgment and initiative. A very valuable general officer. Absolutely loyal in all things."

6. Court martials, reprimands, and derogatory remarks: None.

7. Efficiency record:

(a) Annual efficiency rating: 1926, Excellent; 1927, Excellent; 1928, Excellent; 1929, Superior; 1930, Excellent; 1931, Excellent; 1932, Excellent; 1933, Excellent; 1934, Superior; 1935, Superior. (No numerical ratings available.)

(b) General efficiency rating: None.

By authority of the Secretary of War:

J. A. ULIO,
Major General,
The Adjutant General.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to delay the Senate unduly in taking action upon the nomination of Ben Lear to be lieutenant general in the Army of the United States. I desire, however, to make it a matter of record that my vote will be cast against the confirmation of the nomination of General Lear, and I deem it incumbent upon me to make a brief statement of the reasons which impel me to take this action and the reasons why I believe General Lear to be unfit to hold the high rank of lieutenant general in the United States Army.

Mr. President, in the 10 years during which I have been a Member of this body, so far as I recall I have never before had occasion to vote against or raise my voice against confirming the nomination of any man to be an officer in the Army or Navy of the United States. I do so at this time with great reluctance, particularly as it occurs at a time when the country is at war.

My observation of the record of General Lear leads me to believe that his promotion to the rank of lieutenant general would not be justified by anything in his record. On the contrary, the oppressive character of some of his actions as commanding general of the Second Army should militate against his promotion.

Let me say, Mr. President, as forcefully as I know how to express myself, that I would be the last to interfere with proper discipline or proper training of the armed forces of the United States. Discipline is not only necessary but absolutely imperative in any military or naval organization. However, Mr. President, in order to be effective and fair, the discipline to be administered should be equitable. It should be in accordance with the Articles of War and the Army regulations, under which the officer is supposed to exercise his authority.

I do not believe it can be successfully controverted, that in his capacity as commanding general of the Second Army, General Lear has in many instances been oppressive to the extreme and, in some instances, one of which I am about to relate, has proceeded in violation of the Articles of War in administering discipline. To a large extent his effort was directed toward discriminating against National Guard divisions, National Guard organizations, and unfair treatment of National Guard officers and enlisted men.

Because it has received a great deal of publicity, I desire to call attention particularly to an incident which occurred adjacent to a country club at Memphis, Tenn., while the Thirty-fifth Division was returning from the Army maneuvers of 1941. For many weeks the troops had been engaged in those maneuvers under most adverse conditions of weather and terrain. They were being conveyed back to Camp Robinson at Little Rock, Ark. In passing by the most prominent golf club near the city of Memphis, it has been alleged that as they were rolling along in trucks returning from these very arduous maneuvers, some of the men saw some young ladies in shorts playing golf on the golf links. It was also alleged that some of the soldiers made remarks to the young ladies. It is said they called to them. It has been alleged in some quarters that they gestured to the young ladies.

An elderly gentleman in civilian clothes, wearing no mark or insignia, but who, it subsequently developed was General Lear, happened to be playing golf on the links of the country club on that Sabbath morning while the Second Army as a whole was marching back from maneuvers. He ran over and began to shout at the soldiers who were returning in the trucks. Most of them, of course, had never seen General Lear, the Army commander. Many of them had never heard of him. They apparently did not receive the shouted orders of this apparent civilian with the reverence to which he thought he was entitled. It is possible that when he yelled out, "I am General Lear; I am General Lear," one of the irreverent young men may have replied, "Yes, and I am Julius Caesar" or, "I am Napoleon Bonaparte." It is quite possible that one of these young men said, "Oh, go roll your hoop, Grandpa," or words to that effect. Certainly there was nothing to impress upon these young men the fact that General Lear was the lieutenant general in command of the Second Army.

General Lear took very grave offense at this lack of recognition of himself and his sacred person, even though he was in civilian clothes, and apparently he became determined to punish the whole organization.

Mr. President, if any members of that organization were guilty of misconduct—if it was misconduct to hail a group of pretty girls as the truck train rolled along the road, which I have never heard was a military offense—there were means at General Lear's disposal for correcting the situation and punishing the guilty men. He was on the ground. He could have made himself known. As commanding officer of the Army he could have required the officer in charge of the truck train to ascertain the guilty parties and bring them to punishment. He could have stopped the train, and if the train did not stop at his order, he being in civilian clothes, he could have sent a staff guard to stop the train, made an investigation of the matter, and brought about the punishment of the guilty parties. He could have pursued the ordinary course dictated by military policy and military custom and ordinary military courtesy. He could have directed the commanding general of the Thirty-fifth Division to conduct an investigation and bring the guilty parties to punishment. He did not see fit, however, to do that. He was anxious to get his name in the newspapers; he was anxious to show his great authority; so, instead of stopping the truck train and making an investigation on the ground, or instead of proceeding through military channels, as is the universal practice and custom in the Army, he proceeded to let the train roll on to Little Rock, 125 miles away, and then, in the most flamboyant fashion, he ordered the truck train to retrace its course 125 miles back, and then ordered the men out in the hottest weather of the summer to march a portion of the distance on foot, in order that he might be given more publicity as a stern disciplinarian.

Mr. President, that is in violation of the one hundred and fourth article of war. It was General Lear's duty, if he thought that punishment should be administered, to ascertain the guilty parties and punish them. Instead of that, he saw fit to punish a whole organization, the innocent with the guilty, and to put a stigma on the whole organization in order to bring publicity and glory to himself.

I call attention to the one hundred and fourth article of war particularly, because that article specifies what summary punishment can be administered by a commanding officer or a commanding general. It does not include punishment of a whole organization, of the innocent as well as the guilty, for derelictions if there were derelictions, on the part of a few men. I say that a general officer who would pursue such a course as that demonstrates unfitness for the exercise of the high command to which he has been appointed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would the Senator object to reading the one hundred and fourth article of war? I am not familiar with it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am somewhat familiar with the incident which occurred at the time, but I should like to know just what the one hundred and fourth article of war provides.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to read it. The one hundred and fourth article of war is as follows:

Disciplinary powers of commanding officers: Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, the commanding officer of any detachment, company, or higher command may, for minor offenses impose disciplinary punishments upon persons of his

command without the intervention of a court martial, unless the accused demands trial by court martial.

There is no evidence at all in this case that General Lear ever advised men of this command that they were being subjected to punishment, or that he advised them of their right not to permit punishment without being tried by court martial, in order that the innocent might have a chance to establish their innocence.

The disciplinary punishments authorized by this article may include admonition, reprimand, withholding of privileges for not exceeding 1 week, extra fatigue for not exceeding 1 week, restriction to certain specified limits for not exceeding 1 week, and hard labor without confinement for not exceeding 1 week, but shall not include forfeiture of pay or confinement under guard; except that in time of war or grave public emergency, a commanding officer of the grade of brigadier general or of higher grade may, under the provisions of this article also impose upon an officer of his command below the grade of major a forfeiture of not more than one-half of such officer's monthly pay for 1 month. A person punished under authority of this article, who deems the punishment unjust or disproportionate to the offense, may, through the proper channel, appeal to the next superior authority, but may in the meantime be required to undergo the punishment adjudged. The commanding officer who imposes the punishment, his successor in command, and superior authority, shall have power to mitigate or remit any unexecuted portion of the punishment. The imposition and enforcement of disciplinary punishment under authority of this article for any act or omission shall not be a bar to trial by court martial for a crime or offense growing out of the same act or omission; but the fact that a disciplinary punishment has been enforced may be shown by the accused upon trial, and when so shown shall be considered in determining the measure of punishment to be adjudged in the event of a finding of guilty.

The point I make, Mr. President, is that if these men were guilty of dereliction of duty, they were subject to court martial or they were subject to summary punishment, if they did not object to summary punishment and demand a court martial. But what General Lear did was to make no effort whatever to ascertain the guilty parties and punish them. He made no effort whatever to get a statement from the commanding officer of the truck train or the commanding officer or noncommissioned officer of any particular truck, but he punished the whole organization and forced them to countermarch and waste many gallons of Government gasoline at a time when the Government was urging people to save gasoline, for he allowed the train to proceed to Little Rock, then ordered its return from Little Rock, and then to go back again to Little Rock, in order to satisfy his pique.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator if there is any evidence that the soldiers who were thus punished as the Senator says ever complained of their punishment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have had complaints, I may say, from some of the men in the organization.

Mr. McKELLAR. But they made no official complaint.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The sentence had already been carried out; they had already been forced to undergo the punishment, and they had no opportunity of complaining.

Mr. McKELLAR. They could have complained at the time, it seems to me. May I say to the Senate that I had never met General Lear——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have never met him.

Mr. McKELLAR. Until he came to Memphis; indeed, I never met him until after this incident occurred, and the incident, as the Senator recalls, was extensively advertised by the newspapers of the country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That evidently was General Lear's purpose in administering that form of punishment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think so. I think, so far as the publicity angle is concerned, it came about particularly because, as the Senator suggested a few moments ago, pretty girls, dressed in shorts were brought into the picture and the soldiers took notice of them as they passed along. Whatever may have been the facts about that, General Lear was there; he heard and saw the whole performance; and I have no doubt in my mind from what I learned at home and from what I have learned since that the incident was greatly exaggerated by the newspapers of the country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The countermarch was not exaggerated, was it, and forcing the men to march in extremely hot weather was not exaggerated?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; but it was never stated that the soldiers themselves had complained of the summary punishment which was visited upon them.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator must realize that it is difficult for enlisted men in the Army to complain of the conduct of a lieutenant general.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator, of course, is familiar with Army matters because he served with distinction in the Army of the United States in the past, and I am one of his greatest admirers for the service he render in the first World War. But I want to say a word for General Lear. Since that incident occurred I have been introduced to General Lear and I have met him a number of times; in fact, I think perhaps every time I have gone to Memphis since the incident occurred. I have known a great many generals of the Army, among them many of the highest rank and filling most important positions, but I think I never knew a more dignified or kindlier general or one who seemed to be more careful in the discharge of his duties, more alive to the obligations of his high position, more courteous, and more determined to perform faithfully his duty as an officer than General Lear.

At first I had the idea that the incident referred to by the Senator from Missouri was a newspaper flare-up, one of those things which frequently occur, and that General Lear might have been remiss in some way. But from everything I have heard and have since learned in the city of Memphis concerning the incident I do not think I recall a single solitary criticism of General Lear on the part of the people of Memphis or the people of that section of the country whom I met. I do not think I ever heard the general criticized in the slightest degree because of the incident. Most people thought it was largely a matter of glaring and tremendous headlines in the newspapers.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I realize that General Lear was very popular in the city of Memphis, particularly with the country club element, with whom apparently he spent a good deal of his time. I have had many letters from prominent citizens of Memphis, members of the country club, familiar with General Lear's high character and conduct on the golf links, who deplored any criticism of the General. I have not received communications from any of the men who served under him, I have not had any from any member in the Thirty-fifth Division.

I think the Senator is bound to agree that if General Lear had wanted to handle that matter in an entirely adequate way, without getting his name in the newspapers and stirring up a great deal of trouble, the natural thing for him to have done, the normal thing for him to have done, the customary thing for him to have done, according to Army regulations and Army custom, would have been to notify the commanding general of the Thirty-fifth Division, General Truman, as to what had taken place. First, he could have stopped the truck train and admonished the commanding officer of the train to make an immediate investigation on the ground, in order to ascertain the men guilty, and to place them under arrest, or punish them, or, if he desired, to let the truck train proceed on to Little Rock. The customary thing for him to have done, the proper thing for him to have done, would have been to notify General Truman, commanding general of the Thirty-fifth Division, and officer of long service, certainly as distinguished service as that of General Lear himself, and let General Truman, well known as a disciplinarian, entirely competent to run his own division, make the investigation, let him fix the guilt as to the men who were in dereliction, and administer adequate punishment to them, instead of punishing the whole organization, at considerable Government expense, innocent men along with the guilty, for what a few in a whole command may have done.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am always glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not been at the office constantly lately, but so far as I know I do not recall receiving a letter concerning this matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; and let me say that I have received a number of letters from Memphis, some of them from people the Senator and I both know very well, and for whom we have a very high regard.

Mr. McKELLAR. It may be that letters have come to my office, but I have not

seen any such letters. I am one of those who associate with all classes of people in my home city and my home State, and I have heard General Lear discussed by all classes of our people. I have heard him discussed by the ex-service men of the First World War; I have heard him discussed by businessmen; I have heard him discussed by some members of the country club to which the Senator refers. But from none of these have I heard any criticism of what the general did at the time spoken of. None have written me about it, and as I have talked with them, none have told me about it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I never suggested that the members of the country club ever wrote about the countermarching of the battalion.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have a very large World War veterans' organization in Memphis, one of the largest in the country, I think, and, so far as I recall, from the head of the veterans' organization, Col. Roane Waring, on down through all its members, I have never had any request to take any action against General Lear because of the incident referred to. I am wondering whether the Senator has heard from any of the veterans. The Senator is a veteran himself, and has many friends among the veterans.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have had many telegrams and letters from veterans, not veterans of Memphis, but veterans of Missouri, the sons and kinsmen of some of whom were in the long, arduous countermarch which General Lear ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. In my judgment, from what I heard of General Lear in Tennessee he certainly stands very high.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand General Lear was exceedingly popular with the civilian population of Memphis.

Mr. McKELLAR. He certainly was.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know General Lear, never saw him——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not know him, either, and never saw him.

Mr. BARKLEY. I never knew much about him until this episode took place about the girls.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I never heard of him until he got command of the Second Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me to be admitted on all sides that over a long period of years General Lear has been a good officer. Prior to this time, I never heard anything against his record, and never heard of anything since.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I intend to refer in a moment to some other things in relation to General Lear.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was about to ask the Senator if it is true that since General Lear has been in the Army, which has covered practically his whole adult life, he has had a good record, and admitting that in connection with the episode about which the Senator has been talking General Lear's conduct was arbitrary and capricious, that it was a mistake on his part, would we be justified in rejecting his promotion on that account assuming that he had a good record generally?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I intend to refer to some other conduct of General Lear in a moment.

General Lear was relieved of his command of the Second Army, of course, and lost the automatic status of lieutenant general, which he had occupied by virtue of being commander of the Second Army, and was ordered for retirement, I think, in about 3 weeks. The promotion we are considering merely restores him to duty as a lieutenant general, promotes him to the rank of lieutenant general. I do not know whether it affects the time of his retirement or not.

I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Kentucky to some other conduct of General Lear with regard to National Guard organizations which were under his command. I am particularly interested, of course, in the Thirty-fifth Division, which is the division to which the Missouri National Guard belongs, and the division in which I myself served during the last war, and in which I put in a good many years after the war in the National Guard.

In the particular instance I am about to cite, I shall choose an example from the Thirty-fifth Division of a man I happened to know very well, to show General Lear's attitude of oppression and arbitrariness, his overbearing and insulting attitude, applying not only to the Thirty-fifth Division, but all the other divisions under his command.

I do not blame General Lear personally for the effort which has been made and is being made to disorganize the National Guard, an effort made by the War Department to disorganize the National Guard, relieve all the senior National Guard officers, and encompass the destruction of the National Guard organization, so that it cannot be reconstituted after the war. General Lear is not responsible for that policy. That is a War Department policy, and that policy has been carried out in all armies. The Department has broken up most of the National Guard divisions. They have relieved practically all the senior officers of the National Guard, and that is the same mistake they made in the last war, which was responsible for much of the trouble the Regular Army had after the war. They never seem to learn anything from experience. As I have said, Mr. President, I do not blame General Lear for that personally, because apparently it happens to be the universal policy of the War Department. What I do blame General Lear for is the peculiar, arbitrary sort of way in which he carried out that policy with regard to the National Guard.

I do not desire to detain the Senate unduly, but I do wish to cite the case of one officer whom I happen to know, because he and I served in the same regiment during the last war. I know he is a good officer, as good an officer as ever stood in shoe leather. He happens to be a first cousin of my colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]. It so happens that I know General Truman's military record, at least as well and probably better than does his cousin, the Senator from Missouri, because while all three of us served in the same division in the last war, Senator TRUMAN was in the artillery, and General Truman and I served in the same infantry division. I wish to take time simply to tell the Senate something about General Truman's record.

A great deal was said about the fact that General Lear started in as an enlisted man back in 1898, and is today a general officer, having come up through all the grades in the Army. So did General Truman. Both entered the Army in May 1898. Lear was an enlisted man in a Colorado volunteer outfit. Truman enlisted in the Regular Army in 1898. Truman served at Santiago, Cuba, as a private in F Company of the Twentieth United States Infantry from May 21, 1898, to May 20, 1901. He fought at San Juan Hill. He was in the trenches before Santiago until Santiago surrendered. From February 23, 1899, to May 20, 1901, he was in Luzon. He served in the Philippine Islands as a corporal of the same company in the campaign of the Philippine Insurrection.

The dates I shall now give overlap, but they cover the complete period of his enlistment:

Cuba campaign before Santiago, June and July 1898.

Battle at San Juan Hill, July 1898.

Served in the trenches until the Spanish surrender, 1898.

Philippine Islands, served in the trenches, battle of La Loma Church, February 1899.

The battle at San Pedio McCapi, March 12 and 13, 1899.

Battle of Guadalupe, March 13 and 14, 1899.

Battle of Pasig City, March 15, 1899.

Patrol of northern Luzon, February to May 1900.

In the Philippines General Truman was wounded in action. He made an excellent and commendable record.

General Lear served in the Philippines either as a volunteer or as a Regular during very much the same period. Unlike General Lear—and I am not criticizing General Lear for it, because a man in the Army goes and serves where he is told to go—but unlike General Lear, General Truman was a distinguished combat officer in the First World War. General Lear has been so situated, through his orders, that he has not heard a gun go off in anger for 40 years. General Truman was an excellent combat officer in the One Hundred and Fortieth Infantry of the Thirty-fifth Division during the last war, entering as a second lieutenant and coming out a major. He rendered excellent service on the Mexican border. He has risen through all the ranks from lieutenant to major general, including chief of staff of the Thirty-fifth Division. He is a graduate of many Army schools. His efficiency, his integrity, his loyalty, and his ability have never been questioned. As commanding general of the

Thirty-fifth Division Truman was early slated to be "rolled." While all the National Guard officers were slated for it, Truman was early slated to be "rolled" because there was a general feeling in the Regular Army that General Truman played too rough and he did not cooperate in maneuvers as much as he might have been expected to do, and that, Mr. President, came about in this way:

The Thirty-fifth Division was ordered to Minnesota on maneuvers at that time, before we got into the war. The division was to take part in certain maneuvers which the War Department had planned to prove the tremendous efficiency of the armored forces, to show how easily they could roll up and cut in two an ordinary infantry division. In such maneuvers the commanders of the opposing forces will receive at about 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning information which is assumed to be equivalent to what would come in through organization commanders in the field, and then the commanders must make their own dispositions and take care to protect themselves or carry out their missions in this assumed warfare.

Being in Minnesota and being deployed, Truman received information as to the enemy at about 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning. He immediately recognized from the information which was furnished him from the umpires and the corps headquarters that his division was about to be rolled up by the armored forces and cut to pieces. So instead of tamely sitting by and permitting this demonstration to take place at the expense of his division, and thinking that they were simulating war conditions, he did what any sensible, energetic, aggressive, confident division commander would do. Seeing what was about to happen to him, he aroused his men in the middle of the night, left a rear guard to maintain the appearance of still being in camp, to lull his opposing forces into a trap, and fell back 4 or 5 miles, where he placed his troops in an impregnable position, with one flank resting on a deep lake and the other flank resting on an impenetrable swamp, so that the next morning, when the two armored forces came in to roll up Truman's division and cut it in two, they met head-on in front of Truman's division, and were theoretically annihilated.

The War Department did not like that. They did not like to think that Truman would do such a thing as he would naturally do if he were in actual combat. From that time on everyone knew that Truman's number was up, and no one was surprised when he was relieved of his command in the fall of 1941.

Mr. President, I am not blaming General Lear for that. That happened before Truman fell under Lear's command. Everyone who followed the situation knew that Truman would undoubtedly be relieved as soon as those in authority could get a chance to relieve him, in spite of the fact that he had, according to the Army's own report, one of the finest and most efficient divisions in the Army.

What I complain about is the way Lear proceeded in the relieving of General Truman. Truman came back from the Army maneuvers to which I have just been referring, and proceeded to Camp Robinson, Little Rock, which was the headquarters of his division, and was about to proceed on his way to Jefferson City, Mo., where he was scheduled to appear on October 6, by permission and under orders from the commanding general of the Second Army and from the commanding general of the Air Corps, to make an appearance and an address at a large patriotic gathering at the capital of Missouri.

I may say that I am familiar with these facts, not because my colleague has called them to my attention and not because General Truman has asked me to take any action about the matter, but the case was called to my attention originally by General Lear himself at the time of General Truman's resignation, and I investigated it and obtained these facts and am speaking from my own original memorandum.

When Truman arrived in Little Rock he discovered that a message had just been sent over the telephone to the officer who happened to be in charge of division headquarters, a lieutenant colonel. It was simply a telephone message notifying Truman that he had been relieved as division commander. There was not the ordinary courteous procedure of Army routine of sending General Truman an order relieving him. There was not even the courtesy of calling General Truman himself on the telephone. It was simply a message delivered to a lieutenant colonel notifying Truman that he had been relieved and ordering him to proceed to Memphis on the next day to become head of a reclassification board of the Second Army.

General Truman communicated with Army headquarters, called their attention to the engagement he had made by authority and instructions of the commanding general of the Second Army and of the Seventh Corps to appear at Jefferson City on the 6th, and further called attention to the fact that for the 10th of October a large celebration had been arranged by the city of Little Rock, in the State of Arkansas, to celebrate the homecoming of the Thirty-fifth Division to its home camp. He asked that he be permitted to remain in command of the division—he had had a great deal to do with the arrangements for the celebration—until the 10th, to attend the celebration in honor of the division, of which he had been the only commander during his tour of Federal service, and that he might have the privilege of receiving the customary final review given to an outgoing division commander. That request was refused, and he was ordered to report to Memphis on the 9th of October, the day before the review was to take place. He did so. He then asked if he could be permitted—mind you, he was a major general in the Army of the United States—to take his aide with him to Memphis. He was told that he did not need an aide, and not to bring one.

When he appeared in Memphis on the 9th of October, he discovered that General Lear was out of town. He was told that General Lear had sent two representatives from his own headquarters to attend the celebration, the homecoming and review of the Thirty-fifth Division, in Little Rock, the celebration which General Lear had refused to permit General Truman to attend.

On the 10th of October, General Truman reported to headquarters and asked as to the duties of the reclassification committee of which he had been appointed the head, by orders; and he asked who the other members of the committee were. He was informed that the other members of the committee were holding a session at Little Rock, the headquarters of the Thirty-fifth Division, but that they did not desire him, as the head of the reclassification committee, to proceed to Little Rock or to attend the hearings of the committee of which he was supposed to be the head.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to inquire who issued the order relieving General Truman of his command.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. General Lear.

Then, Mr. President, having been baited and insulted—and, mind you, that was some time before Pearl Harbor—and it being perfectly evident that not only was he relieved of his command of the Thirty-fifth Division, but it was not the intention of General Lear to permit him to render any further service, and it was the intention of General Lear to humiliate him and bait him, General Truman resigned.

Mr. President, I do not ask the Senate to take my word or the word of my colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], General Truman's cousin, as to the efficiency of General Truman. I call as a witness as to the efficiency and satisfactory record of General Truman, Major General Ben Lear, the commander of the Second Army. After General Lear had finally baited General Truman into resigning, General Lear voluntarily sent me the following telegram—and the first time I knew that General Truman had resigned was when I received it—and also sent a similar telegram to my colleague the junior Senator from Missouri, General Truman's cousin. In the telegram General Lear said:

> Maj. Gen. Ralph E. Truman has just tendered his resignation to be effective after leave of absence beginning October 29. General Truman has done splendid and outstanding service with his Thirty-fifth Division and his departure will be regretted by Second Army Headquarters.

That statement was made in the face of the record I have just recited. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the telegram and my response thereto may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMPHIS, TENN., *October 11, 1941.*
Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK:

Maj. Gen. Ralph T. Truman has just tendered his resignation, to be effective after leave of absence beginning October 29. General Truman has done splendid and outstanding service with his Thirty-fifth Division and his departure will be regretted by Second Army Headquarters.

LEAR.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 11, 1943.*
Lt. Gen. BEN LEAR,
Headquarters, Second Army,
United States Army, Memphis, Tenn.:

I am in receipt of your telegram. I am not in the least surprised that Maj. Gen. Ralph E. Truman has done splendid and outstanding service with his Thirty-fifth Division. Well acquainted with General Truman as I served in the same outfit with him overseas during the World War. If his services were as satisfactory as you indicate why did you personally relieve him of command. It is of course the old Army game which does not intend to leave a National Guard officer, no matter how efficient, in command of National Guard division. You are trying to blame the tactical defeat which your army suffered on Truman and various other National Guard officers which is exceedingly unfair. You should retire yourself rather than make General Truman the goat.

CLARK.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, as I say, I do not blame General Lear, and cannot hold him responsible for the general policy of breaking up the National Guard and relieving the senior officers of the National Guard. I spoke of only one illustration of the application of that policy. I could speak for a long time with respect to other instances of a similar character. I do say that a man who has done such arbitrary and unfair things does not deserve to have his nomination to a higher rank confirmed. While I do not desire to delay the Senate in the matter, I do desire to make my opposition a matter of record.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if the Senator does not blame General Lear for the order relieving General Truman of his command, who would be responsible for it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I say I do not blame General Lear. I cannot hold General Lear personally responsible for a policy of relieving National Guard division commanders—a policy which extended throughout the Army. I do blame General Lear very severely for the manner in which he executed that policy and for the manner in which he baited General Truman into resigning. The blame for the general policy is hard to lay at anyone's feet; but General Lear was responsible for the arbitrary and unfair way in which the policy was carried out.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator say who is responsible for the general policy?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I take it that the General Staff of the Army is responsible for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Missouri if he has the military record of General Lear before him, and if he will lend it to me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I have it before me, and I am glad to lend it to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in rising at this time I feel that I should say a few words—a very few words—about this nomination. First let me say that I owe the Senate an apology. I had heard that the nomination was before the Senate, but I did not know when it was coming up; and I was surprised, when I walked into the Senate Chamber a few minutes ago, to hear the distinguished Senator from Missouri talking about it, because I did not know it was on the calendar for consideration at this time.

Mr. President, I have not the slightest notion where General Lear came from. If any other Senator knows, I wish he would tell me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to tell the Senator. General Lear was born in Canada, came to the United States as a youth, and enlisted in the Colorado volunteers in the Spanish-American War.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. As I said, Mr. President, I had not the slightest idea where General Lear came from. He has never mentioned the matter to me directly or indirectly, either by letter or through friends or in any other way, so far as I know. My only reason for rising a while ago and for rising now is to say that in my very brief associations from time to time with General Lear I formed a very high opinion of him as a man and as an officer. He certainly looked the part; and his dignity and his good sense, apparently, and his fairness and his judgment seemed to betoken the kind of man whom we would expect to find at the head of an army, known as the Second Army, with headquarters at Memphis, Tenn.

I was greatly impressed with his ability, carefulness, good intentions, and practices. I saw nothing about him that was unbecoming. I had a number of conversations with him, which were purely personal in nature, and not official in any way. I do not know that I ever made a request of him of any kind, and I am sure he never made a request of me of any kind, nature, or description.

So far as his relation with General Truman is concerned, I have nothing in the world but the highest confidence, esteem, and admiration for the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and I have no doubt that General Truman, his cousin, a member of the same family, is of the same high character that we all know Senator TRUMAN to be.

As to what the differences were between General Lear and General Truman I could not say. Men high up in the Army have differences of one kind or another. If they did have such differences, I do not know that that would be a reason for voting against the confirmation of the nomination of this distinguished soldier of the American Army. So far as I am concerned, from what I know of him, and my observation of his work as head of the Second Army in Memphis, Tenn., and his conduct in every particular while he was there, I feel that his nomination should be confirmed, and I hope the Senate will confirm it.

The Senator from Missouri has very kindly given me General Lear's military record. I should like to read portions of it in the very short time I shall be on my feet.

Ben Lear was born at Hamilton, Canada, on May 12, 1879. He enlisted in the First Colorado Infantry Volunteers and served as sergeant in Company C from May 1, 1898, to March 30, 1899, during the Spanish-American War.

Certainly that shows a fine spirit. He had made this country his home. He was born in Canada. Soon after he came here he enlisted in the Army of the United States and was a sergeant in Company C of the First Colorado Infantry Volunteers during the Spanish-American War.

He was commissioned a second lieutenant, First Colorado Infantry Volunteers, on April 1, 1899.

He earned a place in the commissioned ranks after having served as a noncommissioned officer.

He was commissioned a second lieutenant, First Colorado Infantry Volunteers, on April 1, 1899, and first lieutenant on July 5, 1899. During his service in the Volunteer Infantry he served in the Philippine Islands, where he participated in the following engagements during the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection: Capture of Manila on August 13, 1898; at Mariquina on March 31, 1899; at Guadaloupe Hill on June 7, 1899; at Bacolor and San Antonio on August 9, 1899; at Porac on September 28, October 17, and November 2, 1899; at Floridablanca on October 9, 1899; at Mabalacot on November 8, 1899; and at Banbon on November 11, 1899. He was mustered out of the service on June 11, 1901, and was commissioned a second lieutenant of Cavalry in the Regular Army on February 2, 1901.

Surely, if that is not an honorable record in the Spanish-American War, I have never read one.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator will not understand that I said there was anything dishonorable about General Lear's service in the Philippines or anywhere else. I think I pointed out that General Truman had a parallel record during the Spanish-American War, except that General Truman served in Cuba and was at the Battle of San Juan Hill, while General Lear was not. Of course, a soldier goes where he is ordered to go. I certainly did not reflect on General Lear's record in the Philippines or anywhere else. What I objected to was his arbitrary action as commanding general of the Second Army.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct; he has not criticized General Lear's record. This is the first time I have ever

seen it. It is a splendid record of a young soldier and officer in the Spanish-American War.

Reading further from General Lear's military record:

PROMOTIONS

He was promoted to first lieutenant on December 9, 1901; to captain on August 10, 1912; to major (temporary) on August 5, 1917; to lieutenant colonel (temporary) on January 26, 1918; and to colonel (temporary) on August 31, 1918. He reverted to his permanent rank of captain on September 25, 1919; and was promoted to lieutenant colonel on July 1, 1920; to colonel on September 19, 1929; to brigadier general on May 1, 1936; to major general on October 1, 1938; to lieutenant general on October 1, 1940.

SERVICE

His first service in the Regular Army was in the Philippine Islands where he served with the Fifteenth Cavalry at Davao until April 17, 1903 participating in the engagement at Bacalod, Mindanao, on April 8, 1903. He returned to the United States on May 20, 1903, and was stationed at Fort Mason, Calif., where he served in various capacities until November 20, 1903, when he rejoined the Fifteenth Cavalry which was stationed at San Francisco, Calif. He accompanied his regiment to Fort Ethan Allen, Vt., in December 1903, remaining at that post until July 12, 1906, when, together with his regiment, he was transferred to the camp of instruction at Mount Gretna, Pa., where he served until September 27, 1906.

He sailed for Cuba in October 1906, and upon his arrival there was stationed at Santa Clara to November 8, 1906; and at Cienfuegos, to July 21, 1908. He returned to the United States and competed in the rifle and pistol competition at Fort Sheridan, Ill., from August 4 to 13, 1908. He returned to Habana, Cuba, on September 5, 1908, and rejoined the Fifteenth Cavalry at Cienfuegos, where he served until February 5, 1909. He returned to the United States with his regiment, and was stationed at Fort Myer, Va., to June 4, 1909, when he was transferred to Fort Ethan Allen, Vt., in connection with the selection of the Army Cavalry team in the national matches, where he remained until July 17, 1909. He then competed in the Atlantic rifle competition at Fort Niagara, N. Y., until July 26, 1909, and served at Boston, Mass., in connection with the field exercises of the National Guard from August 11 to 22, 1909. He rejoined the Fifteenth Cavalry at Fort Myer on August 23, 1909, where he was stationed until June 3, 1910. He served with the Cavalry rifle team at Fort Ethan Allen, Vt.; Camp Perry, Ohio; and Sea Girt, N. J., to September 7, 1910.

After attending the Mounted Service School at Fort Riley, Kans., until June 30, 1911, he was in charge of Training School for Farriers and Horseshoers there to June 7, 1912. He participated in the Olympic games at Stockholm, Sweden, from June to July 21, 1912. Upon his return to the United States he attended the second-year class at the Mounted Service School at Fort Riley, Kans., to December 15, 1912. He served at Fort Sheridan, Ill., with the Fifteenth Cavalry to November 10, 1913, part of which time he was with Troop I, Fifteenth Cavalry, at Camp of Instruction, Winchester, Pa. He was stationed at Fort Bliss, Tex., to December 11, 1913; at Presidio, Tex., on border patrol duty to August 5, 1914; at Fort Bliss, Tex., to January 3, 1915; and at Fort Hancock, Tex., to June 15, 1915.

He rejoined the Fifteenth Cavalry at Fort Bliss, Tex., serving at that post until August 3, 1915, when he was placed on detached service for duty with the Panama-Pacific Exposition at San Francisco, Calif., where he remained until October 22, 1915. He was then transferred to the Eighth Cavalry and stationed at Fort Bliss, Tex., to January 15, 1916. He accompanied his regiment to Fort Hancock, Tex., remaining there until March 13, 1916, when he was ordered to Ysleta, Tex., in connection with purchasing horses for the cavalry and artillery. Upon completion of this duty on April 22, 1916, he attended the Army Service School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., to October 4, 1917, and then served with the War Department General Staff at Washington, D. C., to September 6, 1918.

He was instructor, Cavalry Training Camp, Camp Stanley, Tex., to December 12, 1918, and inspector-instructor, Texas National Guard, Austin, Tex., to January 15, 1919. He was acting commandant, Mounted Service School, Fort Riley, Kans., to July 7, 1919, and Director, Department of Horsemanship, at the Cavalry School there until August 19, 1921. He then attended the School of the Line at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and after graduation, on June 20, 1922, served at Camp Lewis, Wash., until July 25, 1922. He returned to Fort Leavenworth, and attended the General Staff School from which he was graduated on June 17, 1923. He served at Camp Knox, Ky., to July 24, 1923, and as instructor, the General Service Schools, until June 29, 1925. He attended the Army War College in Washington, D. C., until June 30, 1926, and after graduation assumed command of the First Squadron, Fourteenth Cavalry, at Fort Sheridan, Ill., where he remained until October 17, 1927.

He was Chief, Inspections Division, in the Inspector General's Office at Washington, D. C., until November 10, 1930. He then commanded the Presidio of Monterey, Calif., to June 30, 1933, and was inspector, headquarters, Ninth Corps Area, at the Presidio of San Francisco, Calif., to November 3, 1934. On November 4, 1934, he became chief of staff, headquarters, Ninth Corps Area, in which capacity he served until June 24, 1936. On July 2, 1936, he assumed command of the First Cavalry Division at Fort Bliss, Tex. He sailed on November 29, 1938, for the Panama Canal Zone, where he assumed command of the Pacific sector at Balboa.

On October 1, 1940, he was assigned to command the Second Army. In April 1943 he was ordered to Washington, D. C., to take temporary command of the Army Ground Forces.

DECORATIONS

He has been awarded the Silver Star, and Swedish Medal commemorating the V Olympiad at Stockholm which was conferred on him by the King of Sweden.

In April 1943 he received the Distinguished Service Medal, with the following citation:

"Lt. Gen. Ben Lear, United States Army. For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service in a position of great responsibility as commanding general, Second Army, from October 1, 1940, to April 1, 1943. To his excellent judgment, forceful leadership, untiring efforts, and high professional attainments are largely due the success and efficiency of the Second Army." (War Department, May 5, 1943.)

Mr. President, I did not know of that remarkable record of this distinguished soldier who came up through the ranks and reached a position next to the highest in the Army of the United States. A short time ago he attained the age of retirement, and by confirmation of this nomination he would remain on active duty as a lieutenant general. It seems to me that under the circumstances, the incident to which reference has been made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Missouri is not sufficient, whatever people may think of the facts, to warrant rejection of the nomination of General Lear on that account alone.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator has stated that the record of General Lear is a remarkable record. I should like to suggest to the Senator that the most remarkable part of it is that a man is able to serve 42 years without hearing a shot fired.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; he took a very active part in the Spanish-American War in 1898.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is not denied. I was merely calling attention to the fact that there was a period of 41 years during which this remarkable record was being compiled.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, and a great many persons work 42 years without so much success. I think I, myself, am one of those who have worked for about that length of time without achieving anything like the success which has attended this distinguished Army officer.

Mr. President, I again apologize to the Senate for taking time to read the record of General Lear, as well as taking the time of the Senate in expressing my own views. I have done so only out of a sense of duty to a man whose residence I did not know, whose birthplace I did not know, whose State I did not know, and whose record, which I have just received, I did not know. I believe the incident of which so much was made at the time by the newspapers of the entire country—an incident which would naturally bring about publicity—was not sufficient to justify us in rejecting the nomination of this distinguished officer of the United States Army to be a lieutenant general. I shall vote for confirmation, and I hope the Senate will confirm the nomination.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am not acquainted with the several incidents to which the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has referred, and so I shall not discuss them. But what is involved here today is the question of whether or not we shall confirm the nomination of General Lear, and I believe to that subject I can make one or two contributions which, indeed, I feel I should make.

I participated in the Louisiana maneuvers in 1941, as well as the maneuvers which were held during the same year in North and South Carolina, in which maneuvers, indeed, most of the American troops who have since distinguished themselves in north Africa received their field training. So in that sense I was one of the many who served under General Lear. I had only a glimpse of him once or twice from a distance, and I do not wish to give the impression that I was in any way in Army headquarters, because I was not. But I was in an ideal position, as were thousands of others, to tell whether or not the exercises were well conducted, and to know whether or not the officers and the enlisted men derived benefit from them.

I think there is no question that those maneuvers were well conducted. That does not mean that many mistakes were not made, for a great many mistakes

were made. One of the objects of the maneuvers was to develop mistakes and correct them in Louisiana or the Carolinas instead of having them develop in Africa.

When General Lear was opposing General Krueger in those maneuvers, first one side made mistakes, then the other side made mistakes. As I have said, to correct mistakes is what we have maneuvers for. Parachutists would drop in and threaten one general's command post, and tanks would come around and threaten the command post of another general. There were numerous incidents of that kind. But the fact of the matter is that everyone who took part in those maneuvers came out of them a much better soldier than when he went in. He learned by the mistakes which he made. He learned by the mistakes which he saw others make. There is no doubt that those maneuvers were a tremendous asset to the country, and that General Lear deserves recognition for the part which he had in making them successful. He had an important part in them. He had very broad supervision over the exercises, and to my mind he showed qualities of energy, organization, thoroughness, and drive, all of which are vital in a job of that kind. It is an administrative job. It is an instructing job. It is not, of course, a combat job.

The fact, as my good friend, the Senator from Missouri has alleged, that General Lear has not been under fire for a good many years does not in the least disqualify him for a big training job of this kind.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, of course I stated that I did not in any way criticize General Lear for the fact he has not been engaged in any wars in which the United States has been engaged since about 1900, because any soldier goes wherever he is ordered to go. It is no reflection on any officer in the Army that his service has not been utilized in field combat, and I did not wish to be so understood.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is a very fair statement of the Senator, and I am glad he has made it.

The manner in which the present maneuvers are conducted is that the knowledge and experience gained on the battlefields where the war is now being fought are brought back to the troops on maneuvers by means of observers and often by general officers who have returned to this country for that purpose. Throughout all these units that are now having maneuvers there will be found sprinkled officers and enlisted men who have had combat service overseas and who come back and give the other men that actuality of war which is so essential.

General Lear's role in that scheme has been the broad supervisory, administrative, instructional role. As one who had first-hand participation in the maneuvers which he conducted, I felt it incumbent upon me to say to the Senate that I think he did an extremely efficient job, and, on the basis of my own personal experience, it is my belief that his nomination should be confirmed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the nomination of Ben Lear to be lieutenant general in the Army of the United States comes to the Senate with the approval of the Committee on Military Affairs. I desire to make a brief statement of General Lear's qualifications and the esteem in which the Army holds him because of his services. Then, I desire briefly to answer the two cases to which my friend from Missouri has referred, and then to permit a vote, if there is no objection.

General Lear has had a long and illustrious career, first entering the Federal military service as an enlisted man with the Colorado Infantry in 1898. Since that time, 45 years ago, he has risen from the ranks to one of the highest positions in our Army by virtue of outstanding ability and leadership. Throughout the years he has been given ever-increasing responsibilities, and has discharged these responsibilities in a most superior manner.

General Lear served with the Colorado Infantry during the Spanish-American War, and in the Philippine Islands during the period of their pacification. He has been stationed in Cuba, Hawaii, and on the Mexican border. During the last war he served with distinction on the War Department General Staff. He is a graduate of the Cavalry School, Command and General Staff School, and the Army War College, and has been instructor at two of these schools. From 1936 to 1938 he commanded the First Cavalry Division at Fort Bliss, Tex., and later the Pacific sector in the Panama Canal Department. For the past few years, he has been the commanding general of the Second Army, training numerous divisions for overseas duties. In each succeeding assignment he has produced results, and the effect of his guiding hand in the training of our Army is being, and will continue to be, felt on the battlefields of the world. General Lear has always been known as a strict, but wholly just and fair, disciplinarian, and his success in training our citizen Army is partially due to this worthy characteristic.

Of the two incidents mentioned by my friend from Missouri, I shall first advert to the relief from active duty of Maj. Gen. Ralph E. Truman in January 1942. On October 10, 1941, General Truman voluntarily tendered his resignation from his commission directly to the Secretary of War, effective December 1, 1941; later requesting that the effective date be changed to January 15, 1942. The resignation was accepted by the Secretary of War, and General Truman was ordered to his home on terminal leave of absence and to await separation from active service, as he had requested.

Immediately upon the outbreak of war, however—it will be recalled that the resignation was tendered prior to the outbreak of the war—General Truman, prompted by patriotic motives, requested withdrawal of his resignation and immediate reassignment to duty. Withdrawal of his resignation was approved, but as there was no appropriate vacancy to which General Truman could be assigned, he reverted to an inactive status as a major general, National Guard of the United States, on January 15, 1942, the date his resignation was to become effective.

Acceptance of General Truman's resignation, approval of its later withdrawal, his relief from active service and nonassignment to active duty, were all acts of the War Department, with which General Lear had no connection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator's statement, I understand, is from a memorandum furnished by some fellow in the War Department which is more or less anonymous.

Mr. CHANDLER. It was furnished by the War Department.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Furnished by some one in the War Department, and sent to the Senator. It is not official, I take it, and is not signed by anybody in the Department who is responsible for it. It is substantially in line with the facts which I stated, except that, of course, it does not include the fact that, after the orders relieving General Truman were issued, more or less informally by General Lear that Lear deliberately tried to bait, insult, and humiliate Truman until he brought about his resignation. It is also true, is it not, that the request for a change in the effective date of the resignation was made by Truman at General Marshall's own request? I have a copy of General Marshall's letter if it is material.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have no information about any conduct of General Lear.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I stated the facts with some detail—I do not know whether the Senator was in the Chamber—and I do not think that General Lear or anybody else will deny them.

Mr. CHANDLER. I heard the Senator's statement, and, of course, I would not be a party to approving any conduct on the part of one officer toward another which was not gentlemanly and in good faith. I do not approve such conduct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is familiar with the fact, is he not, that under the ordinary practice and military courtesy when an officer is relieved of the command of his regiment he is permitted to turn the command over to his successor, and to be able to transmit to him any information he may have? In this particular case Truman, as I say, was relieved by telephonic communication to a junior officer and was not permitted to turn the command of the division over to his successor. He was instructed to leave the camp immediately and turn over the command of his division to a junior brigadier, who, later, turned it over to his successor.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope my friend from Missouri understands that I do not approve of any discourtesy upon the part of one officer toward another.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am sure that what the Senator says as to his own attitude is correct. I merely desire to call attention to the fact that the author

of this anonymous communication is hardly stating the facts accurately when he undertakes to make it appear that Truman voluntarily resigned. Truman did resign voluntarily, of course, when it was made apparent to him by the conduct of General Lear and Lear's headquarters that he was to be insulted and humiliated and not permitted to perform the duties to which he had been assigned.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I was interested in what the Senator from Missouri repeatedly stated as to an anonymous communication. I thought the Senator from Kentucky was giving us his own views and thoughts and information.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am giving the facts as I understand them to be from the War Department in a communication which I have from the War Department, and which is presumed by me to be accurate because the statement was taken from the records of the War Department.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Kentucky has no personal information?

Mr. CHANDLER. I have no personal knowledge or information. I asked for the facts, and the statement purports to be a statement of the facts. Personally I do not know the circumstances which brought about General Truman's resignation.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator from Kentucky will excuse me for saying so, anything the Senator might state on his own initiative as his own statement, I would accept——

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. HATCH. But I do not accept what the Senator passes on second-hand.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, I would not know the circumstances under which General Truman wanted to submit his resignation, and I would not know whether General Lear had brought it about. I was not a member of the Army in that sector at that time, and the event did not pass under my observation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. Wait a moment. My friend from Missouri has indicated that General Truman did voluntarily tender his resignation because somebody wanted it brought about and he was going to be squeezed out. I do not know about that. The record shows that he voluntarily tendered his resignation from his commission directly to the Secretary of War, effective December 1, 1941. That was before the war, and he later requested that the effective date be changed to January 15, 1942. On December 8, 1941, we became involved in the war, and meanwhile he got patriotic again. He was prompted by patriotic motives, and I have no disposition to deny that perhaps he did not know we were going into the war, and he decided, for some reason not known to me, voluntarily to tender his resignation, which he did, and he asked for it to be made effective on a certain date, and the Department agreed to do it, and then, when the war came, he said, "I want to be back in." I do not know why.

Mr. HATCH. It is very laudable, when war comes, for a man to want to get back in.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes; he was prompted by patriotic motives, just as every other Missourian is. My father came from Missouri, and all Missourians have patriotic motives. I would be the last man to infer that a Missourian had any other than a patriotic motive.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the Senator think that for a man who has put in over 40 years' service in the Army, who started as an enlisted man, and served with great gallantry in Cuba and the Philippines, in the Mexican border service, and in France, it is the most natural thing in the world, when his country becomes engaged in war, to want to get back on the active list? But that does not indicate he was not forced out of the service before the war by the harsh and arbitrary conduct of General Lear, which I stated to be the fact.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator does that, and it is all right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly know more about it than does the Senator from Kentucky, although I was not personally present at the interview between General Lear and General Truman.

Mr. CHANDLER. I take it that the Senator knows to be correct what he has stated, but I say that the War Department states that the acceptance of General Truman's resignation, approval of its later withdrawal, his release from the active service, and nonassignment to active duty, were all acts of the War Department.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I stated that.

Mr. CHANDLER. With which General Lear had no connection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me, I stated that in my original remarks, and I said I did not hold General Lear responsible for relieving General Truman, or the other National Guard division commanders who were relieved. What I do hold him responsible for is his insulting and harsh treatment to force their resignations after they had been relieved of command.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course I do not approve on the part of any officer any conduct that is harsh; I do not approve any discourtesy or any attempt to "roll" a man out without any cause at all, but as I understand, what I have just stated is a statement of the facts.

Now let us get to the Memphis Country Club "yo-ho" incident.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that same point?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In view of the statement the Senator has made as to the request submitted by General Truman to change the date of his resignation, let me say that was done at the suggestion of General Marshall himself. General Marshall wrote a letter on October 11, 1941, to General Truman, as follows:

> DEAR GENERAL TRUMAN: I have just seen your telegram of October 10 to the Secretary of War tendering your resignation effective December 1, and requesting "my 32 days of leave of absence due me" beginning on October 29.
>
> I am sending you this note by air mail to find out if you might possibly prefer to be either given immediate orders to your home on detached service without specific duties, or possibly have you change the date of your resignation from December 1 to say January 15, and your being ordered on detached service now, or October 29, to your home or other point that you might prefer.

As to the date of the resignation, the suggestion came from the War Department, through General Marshall himself.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I now come to the Memphis Country Club "yo-ho" incident. The detachment of troops involved in this incident consisted of a provisional battalion of the One Hundred and Tenth Quartermaster Regiment, a detachment of the One Hundred and Tenth Medical Regiment, and the Thirty-fifth Military Police Company. These troops were proceeding from a maneuver area in the vicinity of Manchester, Tenn., to their home station at Camp Robinson, Ark., by motor convoy. General Lear noted that as the convoy passed the Memphis Country Club the soldiers in practically every truck were waving and shouting at people on the streets and golf course. The remarks made by the soldiers were seriously objectionable, and give evidence of a deplorable lack of discipline, in marked contrast to that of a majority of the troops of the Second Army.

Prior to this time other similar incidents had been brought to General Lear's attention, and he had found it necessary in one case to reprimand a regiment for shouting vulgar remarks at people in Manchester as it passed through that town. Therefore, when this incident at Memphis occurred within his sight and hearing, it was incumbent upon him to take immediate action to curb any tendency toward rowdyism or lack of discipline.

General Lear had the convoy intercepted, and the officers and noncommissioned officers assembled at his headquarters. That is not quite the understanding of my friend the Senator from Missouri, I think, but I am informed General Lear had the officers and noncommissioned officers assembled at his headquarters. He spoke to them concerning the necessity of each one doing his part to maintain discipline, and informed them that the conduct of their soldiers, which he had just witnessed, was a reflection on their company, their regiment, and division. I wish to emphasize that; they did not return immediately, as I think has been believed by some. The convoy remained at Memphis that night, and was directed to proceed to Camp Robinson the following morning; the officers and men to march a total of 15 miles the following day, using the shuttle method; that is,

alternately riding in a truck and marching on foot.

Mr. President, I wish to refer briefly to a dispatch from Memphis written by Clark Porteus, and published in the Washington Daily News of Saturday, May 15, 1943. It is an eye-witness account of this "yo-ho" incident. It says:

No one here——

That is, in Memphis—

No one here holds the "yo-ho" incident against General Lear.

It was peacetime—July 1941—when the incident occurred. General Lear, in civilian clothes—not in shorts, as Senator CLARK said—was golfing at the Memphis Country Club.

Three hundred and fifty soldiers of the Thirty-fifth Division were returning from maneuvers in middle Tennessee, riding trucks. The convoy passed the golf links, and what General Lear saw caused him to make the 350 men return to Memphis later from Camp Robinson, Ark., and march 15 miles in temperatures that topped 100.

As I recall, the country club is just on the outskirts, and the general made the soldiers go back into town.

However, the men marched no more than 5 miles without riding a while.

Much ado was made of the matter then. Now that the war has come, however, citizens here understand why the general would not let unsoldierly conduct pass unnoticed.

But another reason citizens here support General Lear is the evidence, brought out by a businessman 11 days after the incident, that the soldiers indulged in more than mere "yo-hoing" at pretty girls. There was some lewdness and "obscene gesturing" on the part of the soldiers, said Raynor Allen, the Memphis businessman. This story, perhaps, was seen by fewer people than read the original story.

Mr. Allen, who served 2 years with the Three Hundred and Eighth Combat Engineers in the First World War, had this to say after the "yo-ho" incident had brought criticism of General Lear:

"I did not see the exact circumstances which aroused the general's ire, but I know him, and I know he is the type of officer who will stand for a reasonable amount of tomfoolery.

"I had been following the convoy in my car, and quite a few of the men on the trucks ahead of me were acting in a manner that passed the limits of even mildly good taste. I do not mean to say that they were all doing this—some were behaving in an entirely proper manner—but there was an appreciable group who had got into very high gear.

"The young ladies were not amused. I do not think their fathers, even if they had been ex-Army men, would have been pleased."

The soldiers who had to march did so in good spirits. I walked part of the way with them.

Many of the men who had to make the march expressed resentment at the criticism by Congressmen and others concerning their punishment promenade.

General Lear himself never discussed the incident publicly, though he did send a telegram to Representative KILDAY (Democrat, Texas), who had criticized him. The general explained in his wire that "loose conduct and rowdyism cannot be tolerated among the personnel of the Army. I am responsible also that members of the Second Army treat the civilian population with respect and consideration."

Mr. President, I submit that while mistakes may seem to have been made in connection with these two incidents, I do not believe they should seriously affect this man's very fine record, which covers 45 years, from the position of an enlisted man in the National Guard of Colorado to the rank of lieutenant general in the United States Army, a record so fine that he has been recently called, because of the serious wound suffered by the chief of the ground forces, to one of the most important positions in the Army of the United States. General Lear is considered by the War Department to be an excellent soldier, and is highly recommended for the important position to which he was called. I hope the Senate will approve the recommendation of the Military Affairs Committee, and that the nomination of Gen. Ben Lear to be lieutenant general will be confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, since General Lear began his very remarkable military career in the State of Colorado, I think it is no more than proper for me to add something to the debate on his confirmation. General Lear came up the hard way. He went into the Army as an enlisted man, as has already been stated. He went through two wars. He went through all the different ranks in the Army from the very lowest. He came to Colorado when he was a young man, and at the age of 19 went into the National Guard, and then served in the War with Spain.

As I have said, he came up the hard way. He did not have the opportunity to go to West Point, as many other young men have. He had a fine military education, but he received it in the Army. The Army was his schoolmaster. The Army itself was his West Point. The fact that he is highly regarded and enjoys the esteem of all Army officers, so far as I know, from the top to the bottom, ought to prove his worthiness.

General Lear has many relatives in the State of Colorado. These relatives are my close personal friends, so I have a somewhat personal interest in this matter.

Mr. President, a day or two ago I received a telegram from Roane Waring, from New Orleans, which reads as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
May 16, 1943.

HON. EDWARD C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I understand that there is opposition to confirmation of General Lear. I deeply regret this. I have observed and admired the ability with which he has commanded the Second Army during the time that his headquarters were in Memphis—my home. I am very familiar with the yo-ho incident. I have talked to a number of gentlemen who were with General Lear when it occurred. I have not discussed it with him. I know that the action of these soldiers was far more serious and reprehensible than simply yo-hoing. The newspaper stories did General Lear a great injustice, but whether right or wrong in the severity of his punishment of them, this is no time when our Army needs discipline and strict discipline to question a disciplinary act of a superior officer except that it be done in proper channels. If these soldiers were unfairly treated, which I understand they have said they were not, then there is a proper method of redress. I regard this effort to now punish General Lear as unfortunate, wrong, and a very serious blow to the proper administration and disciplining of an Army.

ROANE WARING,
National Comander of
the American Legion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say that Colonel Waring, who sent the telegram the Senator just read, is a citizen of Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A member of the country club?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think he is, though I do not know. I never saw him at the country club in my life, though he may be a member. If he were, he certainly would be a very worthy member, because he is a grand man, he is a fine lawyer, and stands high in Memphis. He is acquainted with General Lear. Ever since the last war he has taken the greatest interest in all military and veterans' affairs, and the confidence the American Legion has in him is evidenced by the fact that he was elected its national commander.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. There is no doubt of Mr. Waring's deep interest in the enlisted men who served in the last war as well as those who serve in this. He is not only interested in this country winning the war, but because of his position at the head of the American Legion he takes a particularly great interest in the welfare of the men rather than in the high generals who command them.

I also have received a telegram from a very distinguished former Member of the United States Senate, who served in the Philippines with General Lear, former Senator Rice W. Means, who telegraphed to me in part:

The members of the Colorado Infantry who served in the Philippines loved him like a brother.

Meaning Gen. Ben Lear.

I have also received a telegram from Mr. James MacPherson, who is the manager of the largest radio station in the Rocky Mountain region, who telegraphed to me at some length in behalf of Gen. Ben Lear and urging that the Senate confirm his nomination.

Mr. President, I have talked with a great many of the officials in the War Department with reference to Gen. Ben Lear and I find that without a single exception they regard him as a very great soldier.

When General McNair was wounded in Africa Senators will recall that the Chief of Staff selected General Lear to be commander of the Ground Forces here. Prior to that time General Lear had the responsibility of training hundreds of thousands of American soldiers who have afterward distinguished themselves on the battlefields in Tunisia and on other fronts.

Mr. President, there is no denial that General Lear is a strict disciplinarian. He knows that to be soft is not a kindness to the soldier.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly have not criticized anyone for having maintained strict discipline. I believe in strict discipline. I also believe, however, that the discipline should be fair, should be for the guilty and not for the innocent, and should be administered in accordance with the Articles of War and Army regulations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I agree with the Senator from Missouri on that point, but I do not concede that that is a point at issue in this debate at all.

I have before me a report giving the military history of General Lear, and I notice that his efficiency record is high. In 1926 it was given as excellent. In 1927 it was excellent, and in 1928 was excellent. These reports are made in each case, of course, by his superior officers. In 1929 his record was superior. In 1930 excellent. In 1931 excellent. In 1932 excellent. In 1933 excellent. In 1934 superior. In 1935 superior.

I note that from July 1, 1939, to January 7, 1940, he was rated superior by Maj. Gen. David L. Stone; that from January 8, to June 30, 1940, he was rated excellent by Maj. Gen. Daniel Van Voorhis. From July 1, to September 19, 1940, he was rated superior by Lt. Gen. Daniel Van Voorhis. In his service from March 20, to December 31, 1942, he was rated superior by Lt. Gen. L. J. McNair. In November 1938 Maj. Gen. H. J. Brees, commanding general, First Cavalry Division, said of General Lear:

> A man of decisive views and action. Positive in his views, works hard for his command. Very active, and in excellent physical condition.

In January 1940 Maj. Gen. David L. Stone, in the Pacific sector department, said:

> An able officer very active, and has fine judgment and initiative. A very valuable general officer. Absolutely loyal in all things.

Mr. President, we are in a very difficult war. As a matter of fact, we are in two very difficult wars simultaneously. We need all the military skill we can get. It is almost impossible to estimate the value of an able, experienced, tried, and proven general. We know how much we prize the capture of an enemy general. We know how the generals are guarded from capture because of their great value. Many a battle has been lost because of the lack of ability, and many a battle has been won because of the ability of a general who has been in the right place at the right time.

Mr. President, I should like to present my own summation of the facts upon which the Senate should consider the confirmation of General Lear's appointment. I have taken the trouble to study this matter in some detail and to inquire of many high-ranking officers their opinion of General Lear. I have made this investigation quite informally and purely in the interests of justice.

No military man I have questioned has indicated any but the highest regard for General Lear's military ability.

What other type of evidence should the Senate consider in passing upon an appointment of this character? I see no justification for seeking further than the military career of the man and the estimate in which he is held by those best able to appraise him.

During the past few years General Lear has been commanding general of the Second Army. In this important capacity he has been responsible for the training of literally hundreds of thousands of American soldiers, many of whom have already distinguished themselves on the plains and in the hills of Tunisia. This was an assignment of the greatest importance, not only to the men who came under General Lear's command for the combat seasoning they required, but to the parents of those men, who have the right to expect that their training will adequately prepare them for the shock of battle.

I have heard it said that General Lear is a strict disciplinarian. If that be true, I can only say, Thank God for men like General Lear in our training forces. Mr. President, we cannot be soft with the Army, for we are playing with men's lives. The officer who lets his men get away with things rather than having the forthright courage to call them to account is betraying his trust to those men and to the families from which they come.

The other day General McNair, whose place General Lear is now filling temporarily as commanding general of the Army Ground Forces, had something to say about training which bears directly upon the subject of discipline.

General McNair said:

> In combat along the front lines, I feel that while our troops have been taught and taught and taught certain do's and don'ts, when they get into the excitement and strangeness of battle, especially in the early stages, they seem to forget. They don't do the things instinctively that they would be able to answer correctly in an examination or quiz. When they get on the battlefield they forget these things and do foolish things. In other words, sound practices in battle are not instinctive. They are not ground into them so that they will apply them without thinking.

Mr. President, I am not a soldier, but as a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs I have constant opportunity to talk with Army officers, and I have learned from them that implicit discipline is the only basis upon which you can build a fighting Army. If men think they can get away with something, or if they think their officers will not insist on their carrying out promptly and with unquestioning obedience the orders that are issued, the men become lax and they do not develop alertness, which is of the most critical importance on the battlefield.

I know what General McNair was talking about. He meant that, rigorous as is the training which our troops receive—and most of the men he saw had been trained with General Lear's leadership—it must be still more rigorous before our men become instinctive soldiers.

I mention this in connection with General Lear because General Lear has been accused of being the kind of man who exacts the highest degree of efficiency from his officers and men. If we are to consider General Lear's strictness as a reason for questioning his reappointment as a lieutenant general, we shall not only be doing a grave injustice to a great soldier, but we shall be serving notice on the military leaders of this country that we want our men coddled in their training. At a time when the entire emphasis of our maneuvers is directed toward a stricter and more rigorous program to make our men better soldiers and therefore better able to take care of themselves in battle, we shall be saying that the Senate disapproves of the very measures which would bring about this result.

I feel sure that the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] does not desire to say that he favors an undisciplined army, and I feel sure that this body does not wish to go on record as concurring in any such shortsighted course.

We have recently had irrefutable evidence of the high regard in which our military leaders hold General Lear. We all know that General McNair was wounded in north Africa during the discharge of his duty while observing the course of the final decisive battle for Bizerte. During General McNair's convalescence from his wounds, Lt. Gen. Ben Lear was the choice of the Chief of Staff to carry on the important work of directing the Army Ground Forces. He holds that temporary appointment now. Until General McNair's return to duty General Lear will carry out the important duty of serving as commanding general of the Ground Forces.

I call this fact to the attention of the Senate because it is the most convincing argument which could be presented of General Lear's abilities. Mr. President, I have not always seen eye to eye with the programs of the War Department, and when I differed from the General Staff I have felt it my duty to express my opposition freely. But my study of military problems has given me constant opportunity to observe the strictness with which the Army scrutinizes the ability of any officer before he is assigned to an important duty.

Friendship and the easy-going preferment which may be responsible for the advancement of men to posts of responsibility in civilian life have no place in the Army. High-ranking officers have been relieved of their commands, without respect to how many friends they may have had in high places, either in the Congress or in other influential quarters, because the Army felt they were unfit to remain in positions of responsibility. Men are advanced to high positions of trust in the Army, not because they are good comrades, but because their demonstrated capacity recommends them.

General Lear is a man in whom the Army has the most implicit confidence. What further test can this body make of his right to the high rank which the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army, has proposed for him? I have heard only the most frivolous reasons advanced for opposing the three stars

which he now wears on his shoulders and which he should be permitted to retain.

General Lear has been made to suffer because of an unimportant episode which would never have been given currency even in the press had it not caught the eye of some clever reporter who expanded it out of all proportion to its significance or merit, and it caught on and swept the country.

Mr. President, soldiers can be boisterous, and when this trait is kept within proper bounds it causes no criticism. But the police of our cities do not permit young men to stand on street corners and make objectionable remarks at women who are forced to pass by them on the streets. No officer of our Army should permit his men to engage in such conduct as that which called forth the reprimand and punishment meted out by General Lear. If this episode, forgotten overnight by the soldiers who were brought to a realization of their own responsibilities as members of our Army, were considered as the basis for refusing General Lear's appointment, then I say that this body would be derelict in its duty not only to the electorate but to the all-important fight for victory.

Mr. President, we are called upon to confirm the reappointment of an efficient, colorful, and illustrious soldier. For 45 years General Lear has been known to his associates as a soldier devoted to duty. He has held the highest military posts with honor; and now that the law forces his retirement from active command in the field, the Commander in Chief and the Chief of Staff wish to retain his services for the Nation in a rank commensurate with the importance of his new duties.

I feel that this body should overwhelmingly confirm his appointment. By so doing, we should not only be recognizing a great soldier. In these critical times the Nation cannot afford to be without the full and appropriate service of a man who has proved by his record his value to our military fortunes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I desire to concur heartily in everything my distinguished colleague [Mr. JOHNSON] has said about General Lear. In Colorado we regard the general as one of our citizens. I do not know him personally, but I do know men from Colorado who went to war with him in the Spanish-American War. Over all the long years which have elapsed since then they have retained their respect and admiration for him. I shall be honored to vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the remaining nominations on the calendar.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the postmaster nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles E. Rosendahl to be rear admiral, for temporary service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it seems that in connection with the long list of nominations for appointments in the Army, two of the names have been incorrectly listed. Under the circumstances, I ask that the nomination of William David Lutz, to be second lieutenant, Air Corps, and the nomination of Thomas Matkins Johnston, to be second lieutenant, Corps of Engineers, be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs, in order that the names may be corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination of William David Lutz, to be second lieutenant, Air Corps, and the nomination of Thomas Matkins Johnston, to be second lieutenant, Corps of Engineers, are recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the remaining nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remaining nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 24, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 20, 1943:

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Ben Lear to be a lieutenant general.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps, with rank from date of appointment

Sumner Yale Andelman
William Clark Doak
George Sharpe
Gerhard Thurston Shearer

To be second lieutenants with rank from June 1, 1943

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

John Calvin Bell, Jr.
James Allen Betts
Roland Alfred Brandt
Robert Emmet Burrows, Jr.
John Francis Buyers
Ernest Arthur Buzalski
David Smith Chamberlain
Boyd Blaine Chambers, Jr.
Joseph Vincent Chaufty
Howard Beverly Coffman, Jr.
David Baldwin Conard
James Franklin Deatherage
Francis John Dirkes
Clyde Tener Earnest
Thomas William Essen
William Daniel Falck
Clare Francis Farley
Jesse LeRoy Fishback
Hiram Garrett Fuller
William Mitchel Glasgow, Jr.
Walter James Hutchin
Glenn Paul Ingwersen
Walker Jamar, Jr.
John Joseph Kelly, Jr.
Lansford Franklin Kengle, Jr.
Bruce Carlton Koch
Edward Francis McCabe
Robert Bruce McDowell
William Hill McKenzie 3d
Robert Edward Mathe
Donald John Mehrtens
Richard Hemmig Meyer
John Woodland Morris
Robert William Newman
Harold Robert Parfitt
Norman Erland Pehrson
Milton Keith Pigg
Samuel Williams Pinnell
Fred Beaver Proctor
Charles Sumner Reed, Jr.
Richard Henry Reitmann
Frank William Rhea
Warren Rogers
Henry Romanek
William Fredrick Roos
Kenneth Trevor Sawyer
Gordon Albert Schraeder
Frank Bertram Smith
Richard Concklin Snyder
Milton Ernst Steinbring
Arthur Thurston Surkamp
Lawrence Edwin Swank
Duane Paul Tenney
Lorres Charles Thomas
Ronald Otis Whitaker
Bernard Nathaniel Wiener
Crawford Young

SIGNAL CORPS

Mike Bedwell Davis
Harold Warren Gingrich
Peter John Ryan
John Patrick Schatz

CAVALRY

Clarke Tileston Baldwin, Jr.
John Stanley Brady
Robert Douglas Danforth
Robert Daspit Dwan
Herman Turner Hunt, Jr.
Edwin Milton Rhoads
Stanley Moreell Staszak
Warren Leigh Taylor

FIELD ARTILLERY

George Louis Alexander
Robert John Barickman
Raymond Carlton Blatt, Jr.
LeVerne Edwin Blount
William Harold Brabson, Jr.
James Alexander Brice
Stephen Oliver Brown
Edward Burr 2d
Robert Hansen Campbell

Austin James Canning, Jr.
Hamlet Robinson Carter, Jr.
John Henry Cochran, Jr.
Reginald Bifield Cocroft, Jr.
William Worthington Cover
Charles Leonard Crane, Jr.
Fearn Field
Kenneth Edgar Freed
Stephen Ellison Gordy
Bobbie Allen Griffin
Leslie Boone Hardy
Ralph Julian Hill
Ernest Hinds
Ralph Kilbreth Jones
John Russell Lloyd, Jr.
James Norris Lothrop, Jr.
Jack Patrick Loughman
John Porter Lucas, Jr.
Wallace Clifton Magathan, Jr.
William Francis Malone
Walter George Mitchell, Jr.
John Wills Moses
Edward Stanley Ott, Jr.
Nicholson Parker
James Walter Phillips
Robert Ernest Plett
William Earnest Pulos
Robert Lee Rooker
Francis Wingate Saul
Henry John Schroeder, Jr.
Leon Sembach
Gordon Lord Smith
Donald Calhoun Spiece
George William Thompson, Jr.
Jonathan Sawyer Vordermark
Joseph William Weyrick
Richard Frank Wilhelm
LeRoy Waring Wilson, Jr.
Richard Marshall Winfield, Jr.
Jack Coleman Winn, Jr.
Lucius Featherstone Wright, Jr.
Ivan Willard York, Jr.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

Charles Richard Abel
William Bruce Arnold
Charles Edward Benson
George Betts
Quellen Denis Boller
John Buchanan Bond
Joseph Francis Boyle
Frank Peter Breitenbach
John Metcalf Broderick
George Thomas Campbell, Jr.
Robert W. Clark
Edmond Harvey Curcuru
Paul Joseph Curtin
Lawton Davis
John Taylor deCamp, Jr.
Charles Wendell Dickinson
Bernard Joseph Dyla
Thomas McGahey Elgin
Albert Murray Ellis
Lawrence Michael Fitzpatrick
Louis Sterling Francisco
Robert Galbreath Gadd
Edward Joseph Geaney, Jr.
Stewart Shepherd Giffin, Jr.
Thorpe Coalson Grice
Joseph Wentworth Hartman
Leo Victor Hayes
Robert Milton Holmes
William Patrick Hunt, Jr.
Page Spencer Jackson
Donald Joseph Jalbert
Sidney Katz
Norman Jay Keefer, Jr.
James Francis Keenan
Edward Anthony Kreml
Arthur Joseph Lacouture, Jr.
James Douglas Langstaff, Jr.
William Clyde Linton, Jr.
Robert Hamilton Mattox, Jr.
Harry Mazur
Charles William Milmore
Jesse Herschell Nash
Harold Alexander Neill
Douglas Francis Parham
Laurent Dupre Pavy
Paul James Reinhalter
Ralph Joseph Renzulli
Walter Leo Roe
Hal Thomas Rose
Edward Rumpf, Jr.
Russell Faux Scott, Jr.
Edward Fondren Shaifer, Jr.
Alton Martin Shipstead
Eduardo Miguel Soler
Basil Dennis Spalding, Jr.
Max Verne Talbot, Jr.
Jack Teague
William Holmes Tomlinson
Louis Blanton Umlauf, Jr.
Wendell Grant VanAuken, Jr.
James Kuykendall Wade
Charles Donovan Warburton
Howard Tilghman Wickert, Jr.
Reading Wilkinson, Jr.
Charles Allan Wilson, Jr.
Stanley Livingston Wilson, Jr.
Franklin Wood
Ralph Edgar Young

INFANTRY

Harold Robert Aaron
John Edward Abbott, Jr.
Edward Mallory Almond, Jr.
Quintus C. Atkinson 5th
John Blair Beach
William Lawrence Bibby
Garland Cusorte Black, Jr.
Mark Mayo Boatner 3d
Alexander Russell Bolling, Jr.
John Klotz Brier
Heber Cowan Brill
James Edward Browning
George Gordon Bugg
Allen Mitchell Burdett, Jr.
James Webster Cain
William Michael Calnan
George Gordon Cantlay, Jr.
David Marston Chase
James Vincent Christy
Edward Ryan Cleary
Francis Harold Cloudman, Jr.
John Hiley Cobb, Jr.
Caleb Allen Cole
John Walter Collins 3d
Roger Leon Conarty
Robert Sherman Culbertson
Daniel Bernard Cullinane, Jr.
James Richard Darden
Robert James Davenport
William Paul DeBrocke
William Cleveland Deekle, Jr.
Frank David Derouin
Argonne Call Dixon
Harold Halsey Dunwoody
Joseph Harry Eastmead
Bethell Edrington, Jr.
Mayo Jack Elliott
Robert Charles Foisey
Seth Roderick Frear
Edgar Jesse Fredericks
Robert Joseph Gilles
Jame Keith Glendening
Ronan Calistus Grady, Jr.
James Franklin Greene, Jr.
William James Greenwalt
Archelaus Lewis Hamblen, Jr.
Robert Hanna
Herbert Pierre Harper
Harold Sears Head
Warren Robert Hecker
Albert Carl Hegenberger
Fred Willard Herres, Jr.
Roger Hilsman, Jr.
Benedict Francis Hoffmann
Jarrett Matthew Huddleston
John Bowler Hull
Thomas Lea Hutchings, Jr.
Gabriel Alexander Ivan
Thomas Terrell Jackson
Samuel Wright Jenkins
Earle Albie Johnson, Jr.
Alan Walter Jones, Jr.
Charles Myers Jones, Jr.
Frank Williams Jones, Jr.
Harry Jesse Kenyon
James Donald Kidder
Thomas James Laudani
Bernard Thomas Lewis
Robert Louis McCanna
Dale Fletcher McGee, Jr.
John Price Mattfeldt
Weston Fisher Maughan
Albert Gaswell Metts, Jr.
James Cleveland Miller, Jr.
George Robert Moe
Henry Grady Morgan, Jr.
Roule Cole Mozingo
Robert Wells Neilson, Jr.
John Henry Nelson
George Edward Newman
John Henry Norton
Alvin Ernest Orlian
Richard Cameron Orphan
William Oliver Peak 3d
Donald Charles Pence
Del Sullivan Perkins
Phil Roy Phelps, Jr.
Charles De Puckett
Randell Jacob Purcell
Arthur Henry Rasper, Jr.
Roger Ray
William Johnson Ray
Harry Langdon Reeder, Jr.
Clarence Walter Richmond, Jr.
Bernard William Rogers
Harold Jacob Saine
James Harvey Short
David Lester Smith
Robert Daniel Sonstelie
William Joseph Spahr
Burrowes Goldthwaite Stevens, Jr.
John Buchanan Stockton
Jeptha Charles Tanksley
Thomas Kelly Tannler
Hubert Edward Tansey
Arnold Robert Tucker, Jr.
Alfred Ferdynand Tyrala
Arthur William VanSchoick, Jr.
Fletcher Read Veach, Jr.
William John Welsh, Jr.
Clarence Richard Westfall
Norman Lewis Williams
Karl Everett Wolf
Owens Herbert Yeuell

AIR CORPS

Millard Othello Anderson
Paul Gregory Atkinson, Jr.
Frank Putnam Ball
Roger Clawson Ball
Ben Butler Barnes
Gordon Winthrop Barrett, Jr.
Richard Edward Beck
Thomas Archer Beckett
Walter Rae Beckett, Jr.
Richard Nichols Berry
Jonas LeMoyne Blank
Andrew Boreske, Jr.
Ernest Francis Boruski, Jr.
Tonnis Boukamp
James Alfred Bower
Albert John Bowley
Freeman Wate Bowley, Jr.
William Jasper Brake
Cullen Albert Brannon, Jr.
William Paul Brierty
Leo Cooper Brooks
Alston Law Brown
Thomas Huntington Brown
Oliver Boone Bucher, Jr.
Edward Burke Burdett
Walter Neal Burnette, Jr.
William Hunter Burns 3d
Charles William Carson, Jr.
Benjamin Buckles Cassiday, Jr.
John Seymoure Chandler, Jr.
Marvin Edward Childs
Robert Herman Clark
Heston Charles Cole
Edward Hanson Connor 3d
Leo Eugene Conway
Clifford Charles Cornell, Jr.
Richard Ray Coursey, Jr.
Ernest Thorpe Cragg
William Edward Cramsie
Alan Francis Crump
Ronald Dennis Cullen
Edward Wellage Cutler
William Joseph Daner
Donald Salmon Dargue

Jack Talmadge Davis
John McArthur Davis
Douglas Lipp Deal
Donald Alburtus Detwiler
William Bradford Dudley
Anthony Raymond Durante
John Wyeth Earhart, Jr.
Preston Warham Easley
Phillips Eastman, Jr.
Oliver Richard English
William Earl Evers
James Thomas Fitz-Gerald, Jr.
Henry Merritt Fletcher, Jr.
James Dixon Forc
Tom Bond Foulk, Jr.
Norman Horace Frisbie
Charles Arthur Gaignat
David Emanuel Galas
Thomas Simons Garrett 3d
Vincent Augustus Gaudiani, Jr.
Eaton Arthur Gorelangton
William James Greene
Allen Wyant Gullion, Jr.
Alfred Dale Hagen
Ralph Junior Hallenbeck
Jack Willming Hammel
Robert Maxwell Hancock, Jr.
Burton Clement Hanish
Teague Gray Harris, Jr.
Frank James Harrold, Jr.
Martin Lee Harter
Paul Andre Hederstrom, Jr.
Harry Ludwick Heintzelman 3d
Richard Tilghman Hemsley 3d
Robert Alvin Hersberger
Edward Jerome Hertel
Robert William Hoffman
Henry Leon Hogan 3d
Arthur William Holderness, Jr.
John Mahlon Hommel
Luther Walker Hough, Jr.
Richard Hugh Houser
Joseph Hipolito Huau, Jr.
John Bell Hudson
Ullin Lee Hudson
Herschel DeMent Hughes
Paul Joseph Hurley
George Howard Ingham
Clare Thompson Ireland, Jr.
Felix Andrew Kalinski
James Moulton Keck
William Joseph Kilpatrick, Jr.
Harold Ferguson Knowles
John Roger Kullman
Harvey Haroldson Latson, Jr.
Hanford Nichols Lockwood 3d
Thomas McAdoo Love
Richard Curry McAdam
Thomas Eugene McCabe
Donald DeForest McClure
Robert Dugald McClure
Richard David McCord
Jack Kenneth McGregor
Jack Mann McGregor
Frank McCoy McMullen
John Robert McNiel
Laurence Ronald MacDonnell
Robert John MacMullin
Gayle Eugene Madison
Maurice Langhorne Martin
William Wintle Martin
Russell Lowell Maughan, Jr.
Richard Victor Miracle
William Clarence Moore
Christopher Henry Munch
David Duncan Munro 3d
John Walter Myrtetus
William Edward Naylor, Jr.
Louis Konrad Nesselbush
John Jacob Neuer
Jack Conrad Novak
Edmund Francis O'Connor
Robin Olds
Thomas Kilbury Oliver
Earl Oren Olmstead, Jr.
Robert Evans Orr
Norbert Joseph Oswald
Stanley Carter Pace
Richard Henry Parker
Jammie Mendal Philpott
John Charles Piebes
Waldo Franklin Potter
Ernest Collier Price
James Rival Pugh, Jr.
Robert Duncan MacGregor Randall
John William Rawlings, Jr.
James Cabell Reed
Edward Julius Renth, Jr.
Anthony Henry Richard, Jr.
Coleman Cabell Richards
Zaccheus Camp Richardson
Scott Brewer Ritchie, Jr.
Robert John Rooney
Joseph Henry Rosness
Francis Earle Rundell 2d
George LeRoy Russell
Ned Schramm, Jr.
David Gibbon Schwartz
Ralph Meloy Scott
William Fontaine Scott
Richard Francis Shaefer
Daniel Francis Shea
Stephen Huntting Sherill, Jr.
Albert Raymond Shiely, Jr.
Lindsey McDonald Silvester
Eber Eugene Simpson
Elwood Frank Smith
Hubert Smith, Jr.
J. Weller Smith
Kenneth Bates Smith
Lowell Blair Smith
William Wayne Snavely
Charles Spieth, Jr.
Gordon Hall Steele, Jr.
Paul Leonard Steinle
Richard Carlton Stickney, Jr.
Richard Williams Stoddard
Marion Scott Street
Richard Donald Sullivan
Firman Edward Susank
Dale Sidney Sweat
John James Swisshelm
Franklin Woody Taylor
Ralph Jamison Teetor, Jr.
Junior Craig Teller
James Robert Thomas
Albert Sidney Johnston Tucker, Jr.
Vernon Richard Turner
Francis Veazy Walker
James Harper Walker
Charles Skillman Waller
Edward Joseph Walsh, Jr.
Edward Menefee Watkins, Jr.
James Howard Watkins
Lawrence Middleton Watson
William Glenn Watson
Lewis Frazer Webster
Marston Thorn Westbrook
J. Duane Wethe
William Joseph Whalen
Richard Vincent Wheeler
Keith Albert Whitaker
Jack Henderson Whitson
Warren Tanner Whittemore
Fred Ordway Wickham, Jr.
Louis Charles Wieser
Richard Bocock Willis, Jr.
Harold William Woodson
Edmund Augustus Wright, Jr.
Howard Greenlees Yeilding
Michael Zubon
Lloyd Zuppann, Jr.

To be second lieutenants with rank from June 3, 1943

AIR CORPS

Edgar Knowles Parks, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Charles E. Rosendahl to be a rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from July 9, 1942.

POSTMASTERS

MINNESOTA

Edward T. Gibbons, Sherburn.

MISSISSIPPI

Ola Chandler, Braxton.
James O. Waldrop, Newton.
Robert A. Dean, Okolona.
R. Ben Linn, Pickens.

PENNSYLVANIA

Marvin F. Birely, Blue Ridge Summit.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 20, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Father of Mankind, we pray that Thy spirit may arouse in us the feeling of unused powers and the consciousness of responsibility. We rejoice that Thou dost pour out of Thy infinite fullness an overflow transcending all human need. As the humblest flower by the way breathes an unconscious fragrance, so may we by gentleness and humility show forth the spirit of our Saviour, nor ever let an unhallowed day pass.

Most graciously regard our country; humanity with all its burdens seems to be wandering between two worlds—the old one dying and a new one struggling to be born. Teach us again and again that life is more than livelihood. Make us to learn the discipline that the world can be saved only by submitting to righteous law, rather than wielding the bludgeon of force. We pray for a gale from heaven, a rushing of a mighty wind, carrying light to those in darkness and life to those in death.

Blessed Lord, we pray for those in sorrow and for those in joy; for those who are cast down and for those exalted; for those in barren lands, weary and worn; and for all in the battle lines of freedom. Almighty God, make us worthy of the sacrifice and the victory on which the rights of man can be restored. In the name of Thy Son, our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEND-LEASE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, Friday, following disposition of business on the Speaker's table, it shall be in order to consider, under the rules of the House, the defense and lend-lease supplemental appropriation bill, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the passage of the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHEPPARD) there were—ayes 62, noes 0.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. This is an automatic call. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 360, nays 0, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—360

Abernethy	Domengeaux	Johnson, Ind.
Allen, Ill.	Dondero	Johnson,
Allen, La.	Doughton	J. Leroy
Andersen,	Douglas	Johnson,
H. Carl	Drewry	Luther A.
Anderson, Calif.	Durham	Johnson,
Anderson,	Dworshak	Lyndon B.
N. Mex.	Eaton	Johnson, Okla.
Andresen,	Eberharter	Johnson, Ward
August H.	Ellis	Jones
Andrews	Ellison, Md.	Jonkman
Angell	Elmer	Kean
Arends	Elston, Ohio	Kearney
Arnold	Engel	Kee
Auchincloss	Fay	Keefe
Baldwin, Md.	Feighan	Kefauver
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fellows	Keogh
Barden	Fenton	Kerr
Barrett	Fernandez	Kilburn
Barry	Fish	Kilday
Bates, Ky.	Fisher	King
Bates, Mass.	Fitzpatrick	Kinzer
Beall	Flannagan	Kirwan
Beckworth	Fogarty	Kleberg
Bell	Folger	Knutson
Bender	Forand	Kunkel
Bennett, Mich.	Ford	LaFollette
Bennett, Mo.	Fulbright	Lambertson
Bishop	Fulmer	Landis
Blackney	Gale	Lane
Bland	Gamble	Lanham
Bloom	Gathings	Larcade
Bolton	Gavagan	LeCompte
Bonner	Gearhart	Lefevre
Boren	Gerlach	Lesinski
Bradley, Mich.	Gifford	Ludlow
Bradley, Pa.	Gilchrist	Lynch
Brehm	Gillette	McCord
Brown, Ga.	Gillie	McCormack
Brown, Ohio	Gordon	McCowen
Bryson	Gore	McGehee
Buffett	Gossett	McGregor
Bulwinkle	Graham	McKenzie
Burch, Va.	Grant, Ala.	McLean
Burchill, N. Y.	Grant, Ind.	McMillan
Burdick	Green	McMurray
Burgin	Gregory	McWilliams
Busbey	Griffiths	Madden
Butler	Gwynne	Magnuson
Camp	Hagen	Mahon
Canfield	Hall,	Maloney
Cannon, Fla.	Edwin Arthur	Manasco
Cannon, Mo.	Hall,	Mansfield,
Carlson, Kans.	Leonard W.	Mont.
Carson, Ohio	Hancock	Mansfield, Tex.
Carter	Hare	Marcantonio
Case	Harless, Ariz.	Martin, Iowa
Chapman	Harness, Ind.	Martin, Mass.
Chenoweth	Harris, Ark.	Mason
Chiperfield	Harris, Va.	May
Church	Hartley	Michener
Clason	Hays	Miller, Conn.
Clevenger	Hébert	Miller, Mo.
Coffee	Heidinger	Miller, Nebr.
Cole, Mo.	Herter	Mills
Cole, N. Y.	Hess	Monkiewicz
Colmer	Hill	Monroney
Compton	Hobbs	Morrison, N. C.
Cooley	Hoch	Mott
Cooper	Hoeven	Mruk
Cox	Hoffman	Mundt
Cravens	Holifield	Murdock
Crawford	Holmes, Mass.	Murphy
Creal	Holmes, Wash.	Murray, Tenn.
Crosser	Hope	Murray, Wis.
Cullen	Horan	Newsome
Cunningham	Howell	Norman
Curtis	Hull	Norrell
D'Alesandro	Izac	O'Brien, Ill.
Davis	Jackson	O'Brien, Mich.
Dawson	Jarman	O'Brien, N. Y.
Day	Jeffrey	O'Connor
Delaney	Jenkins	O'Hara
Dickstein	Jennings	O'Konski
Dilweg	Jensen	O'Neal
Dingell	Johnson,	Outland
Dirksen	Anton J.	Pace
Disney	Johnson,	Patman
Ditter	Calvin D.	Patton
Peterson, Fla.	Satterfield	Tarver
Peterson, Ga.	Sauthoff	Thomas, Tex.
Philbin	Scanlon	Thomason
Phillips	Schiffler	Tibbott
Pittenger	Schuetz	Tolan
Ploeser	Shafer	Towe
Plumley	Sheppard	Treadway
Poage	Short	Van Zandt
Poulson	Sikes	Vincent, Ky.
Price	Simpson, Ill.	Voorhis, Calif.
Priest	Simpson, Pa.	Vorys, Ohio
Rabaut	Slaughter	Vursell
Ramey	Smith, Maine	Wadsworth
Ramspeck	Smith, Ohio	Weaver
Randolph	Smith, Va.	Welchel, Ohio
Rankin	Smith, W. Va.	Weiss
Reece, Tenn.	Smith, Wis.	Wene
Reed, Ill.	Somers, N. Y.	West
Reed, N. Y.	Sparkman	Wheat
Rees, Kans.	Spence	Whelchel, Ga.
Richards	Springer	Whitten
Rivers	Stanley	Whittington
Rizley	Starnes, Ala.	Wickersham
Robinson, Utah	Steagall	Wigglesworth
Robsion, Ky.	Stearns, N. H.	Willey
Rockwell	Stefan	Wilson
Rodgers, Pa.	Stevenson	Winstead
Rogers, Calif.	Stewart	Winter
Rogers, Mass.	Stockman	Wolcott
Rohrbough	Sullivan	Wolfenden, Pa.
Rowan	Sumner, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
Rowe	Sundstrom	Woodrum, Va.
Russell	Taber	Wright
Sadowski	Talbot	Zimmerman
Sasscer	Talle	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—72

Boykin	Guyer	O'Leary
Brooks	Hale	O'Toole
Buckley	Halleck	Pfeifer
Byrne	Hart	Powers
Capozzoli	Heffernan	Pracht
Celler	Hendricks	Robertson
Clark	Hinshaw	Rolph
Cochran	Judd	Sabath
Costello	Kelley	Schwabe
Courtney	Kennedy	Scott
Culkin	Klein	Sheridan
Curley	Lea	Snyder
Dewey	Lemke	Sumners, Tex.
Dies	Lewis	Taylor
Elliott	Luce	Thomas, N. J.
Ellsworth	McGranery	Troutman
Furlong	Maas	Vinson, Ga.
Gallagher	Merritt	Walter
Gavin	Merrow	Ward
Gibson	Miller, Pa.	Wasielewski
Goodwin	Morrison, La.	Welch
Gorski	Myers	White
Granger	Nichols	Woodruff, Mich.
Gross	Norton	Worley

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Costello with Mr. Rolph.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Buckley with Mr Scott.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Dewey.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Schwabe.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Pracht.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Hale.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Judd.
Mr. O'Toole and Mr. Lewis of Ohio.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Troutman.
Mr. Robertson with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Hart with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Miller of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Gallagher.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks upon the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address entitled "America's Aviation Tomorrow," by Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president, Air Transport Association of America; also a statement by 18 air lines, being a joint reply to certain questions by the Civil Aeronautics Board, including a reply by question and answer; together with a letter from the President of the United States to Mr. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the first air-mail flight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

C. K. LAWSON AND THE RUML PLAN

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from an outstanding constituent of mine, Mr. C. K. Lawson, of Cedartown, Ga., which I conceive to be a patriotic, open, frank expression representing the attitude of a majority of the laboring men in this country concerning what is known as the Ruml plan. Mr. Lawson writes as follows:

CEDARTOWN, GA., *May 13, 1943.*

Hon. MALCOLM TARVER,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a cotton-mill man, working 7 days a week, putting more than 10 percent of my income in bonds and trying to pay for a home to enjoy when I get too old to work. And I need every dollar I can earn. But Uncle Sam went head over heels in debt last year just to protect my home and my job and my right to enjoy them. And since his income is derived from taxes, I don't see how honest men can talk about canceling his income unless they are going to cancel his debts.

Personally I want to get on a pay-as-you-go tax basis, but I don't want to beat my country out of what I owe for last year's protection, nor have a lot of debts for my grandchildren to pay interest on.

Let us have a pay-as-you-go tax bill and forget about that forgiving and forgetting.

Respectfully,

Mr. AVERAGE CITIZEN,
C. K. LAWSON.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] be granted leave of absence for today on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE FOOD SITUATION

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that our country is in the midst of a very serious food problem. From all indications this problem is getting worse rapidly. This is due largely to the bungling of the food authorities of the Government.

About a month ago the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the Republican leader in Congress, set up from among the Republicans in the House a committee to study the food situation. This committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has been at work diligently, and is alarmed at the seriousness of the food situation. A day or two ago, under the order of this committee, I introduced in the House a bill which, if passed, will bring order out of chaos. This bill provides for the establishment of one single food administrator to have full and complete charge of all of the food departments of the Government. It is our hope that such a measure might be passed by the Congress immediately because the situation warrants immediate action.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by David Lawrence, appearing in today's Washington Star, on the income tax.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD, and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] may extend his remarks in two particulars.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BRYSON was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POLL-TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. NEWSOME addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HARRIS of Virginia was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Aviation News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GLENN HAMMOND CURTISS

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, 65 years ago tomorrow, on the 21st day of May 1878, in the quiet country village of Hammondsport, nestled in the hills of the Finger Lake region of New York State, Glenn Hammond Curtiss was born. Named, first, for a site of local scenic beauty and, second, for the founder of the community which gave him birth, "G. H.," as he was wont to be called by his contemporaries, was destined to become one of the great pioneers in the field of aviation. Though credit for having made the first flight in America has been given to others, Glenn Curtiss was the first man to give a public demonstration of a successful flight in what was then known as the flying machine.

Holder of pilot's license No. 1 of the Aero Club of America, he was the first man to complete a sustained flight of 1 kilometer, slightly more than half a mile, in a flimsy crate dubbed the *June Bug*. Somewhat later he made the first flight from a water take-off in the *Loon*.

Both in conception and development of the aircraft engine and in the plane itself Curtiss has no peer in American history. To commemorate his great contribution to this modern science, I have today introduced a measure providing for the erection of a suitable memorial at Hammondsport, N. Y., as a fitting tribute by a grateful nation for the work done by Glenn Curtiss and his associates.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, my home town is fairly bristling with war industries. Among them is a large rayon plant. This plant was recently visited by two men from the Office of Price Administration. The manager took them through this plant. They were interested in every detail that goes into the manufacture of rayon, so much so that when the manager took them back into the office it was with fear and trepidation in his heart that he faced them. But much to his surprise and amazement and utter relief, one of these so-called experts proffered his hand and said, "Mr. Manager, I want to thank you for this wonderful tour of inspection, for this is the first time I have ever been in a mill in all my life."

Now, that would be funny if it were not the essence of irony.

The soldiers who fight our battles take time out to delouse themselves. It would be well that certain bureaus emulate their example and delouse themselves of some of the vermin that have wormed their way into high offices of trust.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a telegram from Mr. George C. Thierbach, president, National Coffee Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PITTENGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CONGRESSIONAL WAR PARENTS' ASSOCIATION

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, if I may have attention for just a moment to make an announcement. The Congressional War Parents' Association, which is such an informal thing that we do not even send out notices of meetings, will meet Monday afternoon at 4:30 in the Appropriations Committee room opposite the barber shop. I think the Members can all find it. We hope there will be a good attendance.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution of the National Catholic Council.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial that appeared in the Chicago Daily Times entitled "Copernicus and Hitler."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Fowler McCormack, president of the International Harvester Co.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to address the House for 30 minutes on May 26. In view of the fact that May 26 has been set aside as memorial day I ask unanimous consent that my time be transferred to Thursday, May 27, after the disposition of the legislative business of the day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization may have the right to sit during the sessions of the House on May 26 and May 27.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain the gentleman's request at this time. Some time ago the Chair made the announcement that when bills were being read for amendment in the House the Chair would not entertain a request of a committee to sit.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, may I not make the request subject to the condition that the committee would suspend its sitting if a bill were being read?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would prefer that the gentleman withdraw his request at the present time.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a statement I made yesterday before the House Committee on Small Business.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

O. P. A. SUBSIDIES

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, the O. P. A. has recently announced a new subsidy program involving the rolling back of prices on many commodities, including butter. I should like to read a telegram at this time I have received from Mr. E. S. Trask, chairman of the Idaho Dairy Products Council:

BOISE, IDAHO, *May 15, 1943.*

Congressman HENRY DWORSHAK:

Idaho dairy products council, made up of Idaho farmer-owned cooperative creameries, with more than 16,000 active patrons, protests the proposed subsidy program to be applied to butter as announced by the Office of Price Administration. Urge you actively oppose this program. Believe that more fruitful results in preventing inflation would be secured by absorbing through increased taxes and enforced savings that portion of purchasing power for which goods and services are not available. Farmers definitely interested in avoiding the calamity of uncurbed inflation, but do not wish to accept a consumers' subsidy when large portion of consumers amply able to pay prices that will maintain badly needed production. Consumers now certainly more able to pay reasonable prices than loading costs of subsidy program on posterity.

IDAHO DAIRY PRODUCTS COUNCIL,
E. S. TRASK, *Chairman.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. Frank E. Gannett.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

O. P. A. AND SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. VURSELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE MAY 26

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request; I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization may sit during the session of the House on May 26 unless there be general debate in the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman would not want to do that if his committee had a bill up; would he?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a very brief article from the Chicago Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WARTIME ATHLETICS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. WEISS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate continue not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2719, with Mr. BARDEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 54 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in presenting the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1944, from the Committee on Appropriations, let me preface my remarks with a few general statements.

In its deliberations on the pending bill the committee was without the services of several members who have served with distinction for a great many years. I refer, of course, to the present Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], Judge Leavy, who was a tower of strength as Members will recall, and who has been appointed by the President to a Federal judgeship, our colleague and present chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, and Mr. Rich, of Pennsylvania, a sincere and capable gentleman who voluntarily retired from Congress.

The gentlemen who have succeeded these able legislators, Mr. KIRWAN, of Ohio, Mr. NORRELL, of Arkansas, and Mr. JENSEN, of Iowa, have displayed a keen interest in the work of the committee and have contributed much to whatever success we may have achieved.

The present distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee was present during the opening session of our hearings and made several valuable contributions to the record and interrogated the witness, the Secretary of the Interior, as to several important matters including the Department's food production program, concerning which I wish to refer later on in my remarks today.

I must not overlook mentioning those hold-over members of the subcommittee. We would not have been able to bring to this House a bill which is as well balanced and at the same time severely reduced, without the valuable and experienced assistance of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK], the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Let me say here that this is the first time during the years I have been a member of this committee that there have been no controversial items in the bill.

In my opening statement to the subcommittee at the begining of the hearings, after discussing several other matters, I urged that the committee secure all the available information possible concerning the many bureaus and agencies, and then eliminate or drastically reduce every item we could, especially

those which did not bear on the war effort. Let me quote one paragraph from that statement as follows:

And finally, when the hearings have been concluded, let me presume upon the valuable time of the committee further by suggesting that members of this subcommittee make every effort to cut these appropriations to the bone without seriously impairing the efficiency of the various departments and agencies. But let me also suggest that the committee members fight out their differences of opinion here behind closed doors and endeavor to reach an agreement on which they can present a united front both in the full committee and on the floor. Members may be assured of my full cooperation to that end.

A little later I shall give the figures showing how successful the committee was in achieving the ends suggested by me at the opening of the hearings.

I feel that it is correct and accurate to state that we finally agreed unanimously on every item in the bill and that we are all now unanimously behind the bill and every item in it. This does not mean that when we wrote the bill we did not have differences of opinion as to individual items. In fact, there were many such differences of opinion and we spent considerable time in reaching a decision. But we have reached that decision and the bill you have before you represents, so far as I can recall, the first time an appropriation bill has been reported to this House on which all members of the committee were in unanimous agreement.

The subcommittee, of which I have the honor of being chairman, held daily hearings, morning and afternoon, covering a period of about 6 weeks. These were long, tedious, and somewhat nerve-racking hearings. Despite the fact that we heard many witnesses from the various departments, Members of Congress, representatives of pressure groups, and others, your committee has succeeded in keeping down to a minimum the size of the hearings by insisting that much of the discussion not directly related to the appropriation be off the record. Through this procedure we were able to reduce the number of pages by 140.

You will recall that there are 26 agencies and activities in the Department of the Interior. And the committee heard representatives from each of them. There were a total of 88 departmental representatives, including officials from the Department of Agriculture and the War Production Board. In addition, we heard 3 United States Senators, 37 Members of Congress, and 12 representatives of outside organizations.

It is significant that the total cost of all their requests for additional funds would run into hundreds of millions of dollars.

It is also significant to note that not one witness who appeared before the committee asked for a reduction in appropriations for the next fiscal year, but, on the other hand, each and every witness, save possibly one, urged and demanded increased appropriations, despite the fact that there was no Budget estimate for the proposed increases. I might say here that many if not all of the requests made by Members of Congress and others had considerable merit. In fact, many of the projects proposed involving the expenditure of millions of dollars, undoubtedly should be considered seriously in the post-war program that we hope is not far distant. But your committee recognized the fact that this Nation is engaged in a desperate war that will decide the future of our beloved country for many generations to come, and feel it is a solemn obligation to cut and slash all appropriations not directly related to the war effort and to refuse to seriously consider any and all new projects pending the duration of the war.

Before going into a discussion of the various agencies and activities in the bill permit me to give you a few facts and figures as to the revenues being taken in as a result of the activities carried on by the Interior Department.

For the fiscal year 1942, the actual total of all general and special revenue funds accruing to the Department of the Interior amounted to $42,063,846. The estimated revenues for the fiscal year 1943 are $47,593,420, and for the fiscal year 1944 the revenues are estimated at $54,450,420. This latter sum is only $18,410,896 less than the total amount contained in the pending bill. If you add the trust funds amounting to nearly $9,000,000 to general and special funds, the revenues of the Interior Department for the next fiscal year would nearly equal the entire appropriation for this Department, which, it must be agreed, is a remarkable showing. This is especially true when we realize that for the fiscal year 1933 the actual total of all general and special fund revenues accruing to the Interior Department amounted to only $9,356,678. It is interesting to note that the increase in revenues during the 10-year period of 1933 to 1943 reflects a net increase of $45,093,742.

Members may be interested in knowing what is primarily responsible for such a remarkable increase in revenues for this Department. The primary reason is, of course, that revenues are now coming in from the operation of huge power and reclamation-development projects which were opposed by many both in and out of Congress, several years ago. It will be recalled that such projects as Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, Parker Dam, and Central Valley were repeatedly referred to as "white elephants."

The fact is, these projects are now beginning to pay back their cost to the Government, not only from a financial standpoint, but, what is more important, some of them are furnishing electric energy and agricultural products, without which our war program would be seriously hampered. Severe criticisms were made in some quarters against all of the Colorado projects, which of course include Boulder Dam, yet it is estimated that revenues from Colorado dam projects, including interest on Colorado dams and other funds, will amount to a sum in excess of $9,000,000 during the fiscal year 1944. Collections from reclamation projects will exceed $10,000,000, and revenues from the sale of power from Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams are estimated to be approximately $17,000,000. Members will find a complete list of these revenues on page 26 of part 1 of the hearings.

REDUCTIONS RECOMMENDED BY COMMITTEE

At this time when the taxpayers are being called upon to finance the most far-reaching war in all history, I know that Members of the House as well as the country at large will be primarily interested in the reductions in the bill.

The committee considered estimates totaling $82,188,000.

The bill recommends appropriations totaling $72,861,000.

The amount recommended is a reduction under the 1943 appropriation of $119,999,000.

The bill also shows a reduction in the Budget estimates of $9,327,000.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It will be recalled that that includes the amount that was designated in the 1943 appropriation bill to go for war purposes, $70,000,000; is that not true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It includes not only that but a number of other reductions in operation and maintenance, including administrative expenses.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I want to separate the amount that was used in the 1943 appropriation bill designated specifically for power devoted to war purposes. You have not that in this bill. As I understand it, there is not much in this bill, if anything, for power for war purposes; is that not correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, yes. The bill contains funds for continuation of construction of the Central Valley project, for which $11,500,000 is recommended and which, together with the unobligated balance, will provide a total of $38,500,000 for this project. This item is for the development of power necessary to the war effort.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that in last year's bill the specific power appropriation was not separated from the general reclamation work. There would be a dam serving power and irrigation purposes and the appropriation would be made for the construction of that dam. Eventually it will be allocated as between irrigation and power. In this bill there is an item of over $11,000,000 for carrying on the work of the Central Valley project which will be expended largely in the construction of the Shasta Dam, the Shasta powerhouse, the generators and transmission lines in connection with it, and this appropriation was made this year because the War Production Board said that the development of that power there fits into their power program and they wanted that power developed for war purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The only reason I raise the question is the gentleman from Oklahoma will recall that I asked specifically the question what amount of this appropriation is intended for power development specifically, and you will recall that the gentleman from Washington, Mr. Leavy, answered by saying about $70,000,000. That is the only reason I raise the question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman, but, as the gentleman from California has also explained, the power and the reclamation projects are usually tied together.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. It is a fact, is it not, that upward of 95 percent of the power developed in the Columbia River area is being used for war purposes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think that is true.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. May I ask the gentleman whether any of the funds that are available for the Bureau of Reclamation for investigation of projects are available for the investigation of projects under the Water Conservation and Utility Act or are they limited to strictly the original type of reclamation projects?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not believe that there are any funds in here available for the purpose that the gentleman suggests; however, the committee has suggested, and I will be glad to discuss that a little further, that all these reclamation projects that have been stopped by the War Production Board be seriously considered with other projects for the purpose of providing for the war effort.

Mr. CASE. I understand that is for the type of project that can produce quickly needed crops.

Mr. COFFEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. I believe in the hearings there is a section devoted to a discussion of the Shipshaw development in Canada, is there not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE. I want to compliment the gentleman and the members of the committee on the advanced and sound stand they take with reference to the Shipshaw development wherein they showed by their sentiments, as they expressed them here, that they thought where priorities were to be granted, certainly we should give priority to our own public and private power development first before we give them to a development in a neighboring country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and I may say that the committee stated itself very specifically along that line.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I think it is well to have the RECORD show on this Central Valley project, that we are in this bill spending a comparatively small amount in order to get the power and in order to get the revenue flowing into the United States Treasury, and until we can get this work done there will not be any revenue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct. The Government has already spent millions and millions of dollars, and it would not be good business to let the project stand idle at this time.

In other words, the bill shows a cut of 60 percent from the current appropriation and a reduction of more than 11 percent in the Budget estimates.

Of course, the reduction of nearly $120,000,000 below the 1943 appropriation is mainly due to the fact that construction appropriations in the bill have been drastically reduced.

Members will be especially interested, I am sure, in hearing of some of the larger reductions recommended by the committee. They are as follows:

	Reduction	Percent of reduction
Secretary's Office	$322,340	7½
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,158,000	5
Bureau of Reclamation	5,636,200	27
National Park Service	835,000	18
Fish and Wildlife Service	855,000	15

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I should like to ask the gentleman if there is any provision made for an appropriation for the development of these projects by the Bureau of Reclamation in the event the War Production Board will relax its order on steel.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No; there is no appropriation in this bill for that thing. But, of course if the War Production Board should change its attitude and decide that some of these projects are essential to the war effort—and I will say to the gentleman I think that is in the making—there are two things that can be done. The bill will go over to the other body and will be considered there. I can assure the gentleman that if it is provided for over there the committee will give sympathetic consideration to such projects as the War Production Board finds are essential.

Of course, we have a deficiency committee, in the event this bill is out of the way, that could take care of it.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman. The people of Wyoming are particularly interested in this matter. There are a number of projects in my State that the people could use for the development of food, so vitally needed at this time in the war effort, and we are hoping the War Production Board will relax its restrictions in the matter of steel for these projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I was just about to discuss these War Production Board projects.

REMOVAL OF STOP-WORK ORDERS BY WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

As members will recall, the War Production Board issued stop orders against certain construction features of about 23 reclamation projects. Whether or not we agree with these orders, they have been issued and there is no affirmative action that your committee or this House can take in the matter now. That authority, as Members know, is in the War Production Board. Our committee did hold somewhat lengthy hearings as will be shown in the record, and I am glad to say that the Department of Agriculture has recommended that stop orders on at least some of these projects be lifted. And I might add here that I confidentially expect this to be done in connection with some of these more important projects in the near future. The testimony as to the need of food which can be produced on these projects was convincing.

During the hearings with representatives of the Department of Agriculture the committee questioned the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Grover B. Hill, as to the seriousness of the food situation, and he advised the committee, in part, as follows:

> Regardless of how much food we will produce, it will not be enough. Even though we could produce twice as much food as we will be able to produce, we could use it all.

The committee is deeply impressed by the frank statement of the Assistant Secretary and with the testimony of many others who are in agreement with him, and it urgently recommends, in view of Mr. Hill's testimony as to the probability of a food shortage, that the War Production Board promptly reinvestigate and seriously consider allowing priorities which will permit resumption of work on some of these reclamation projects which have been in a deferred status since last October. While some justification may have existed for the issuance of stop orders in October 1942, when the food shortage was not so apparent, the committee is strongly of the opinion that the time for optimism and complacency on the part of responsible officials has passed. These stop orders have involved a serious delay in the development of 877,500 acres of new land and 2,085,000 acres of existing land for which a supplemental water supply is needed. In view of the fact that we must feed our own civilian population, our armed forces, and are now being called upon to shoulder the major portion of the burden of feeding our allies it was and is the unanimous opinion of the committee that the Agriculture Department and the War Production Board should not only consider removing existing stop orders, but that they should also consider the desirability of undertaking a program of new and supplemental reclamation projects referred to by the Commissioner of Reclamation in his testimony which may be found in some detail in the committee hearings.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I understood the gentleman from Oklahoma to say that there is an item in here for the Central Valley project?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. On what page does it appear?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It appears on page 66 of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Does it provide for the building of transmission lines?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It provides for the building of transmission lines to a substation; not as much as was asked for by the Bureau of Reclamation, but it does make provision for the building of transmission lines.

If the gentleman will turn to page 66 of the bill, under the caption "General fund, construction," he will see the item which reads:

Central Valley project, California, $11,500,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Do you know to whose substation; who owns the substation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will refer to the report, page 10, he will find this statement:

Central Valley project, California: The committee considered in connection with this item a supplemental estimate of $16,400,000, in House Document No 180, for continuation of construction of certain features of the project. This supplemental estimate provided funds to expedite completion of construction of the Shasta Dam, Shasta power plant, including the installation of two 75,000-kilovolt-ampere generating units and appurtenant transmission and switching facilities, all items enumerated having received the approval of the War Production Board. The committee has included in the bill a total of $11,500,000 for continuation of construction of all features of the project referred to in the Budget estimate with the exception of the proposed transmission line from the Shasta substation to Oroville. It is the recommendation of the committee that no funds in the bill and no funds heretofore provided therefor shall be used for the construction of a transmission line by the Government from Shasta substation to Oroville and that funds which have been heretofore provided for that purpose be reallocated for construction in connection with other features of the project. The use of funds necessary to construct the transmission line from Shasta Dam to the Shasta substation—

Which I understand is owned by the Government—

estimated at between $400,000 and $500,000, is recommended by the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. But the amount for transmission lines in former bills was not reappropriated?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The gentleman is familiar with the Lugert-Altus Dam in Oklahoma where the Bureau has spent a lot of time. I wonder if the gentleman, who is familiar with that project, does not feel that it would be worthy of any additional expenditure above the amount obligated by the district at Altus to carry the project to completion, as it really involves the use of only a small amount of strategic materials.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I agree fully with the gentleman. The gentleman knows I have been very much interested in that and many other similar projects. I was rather severe in my criticism of the stoppage orders on 23 projects because I felt, as did the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, that regardless of how much food we might attempt to produce we would not produce enough. The Altus project is one of the outstanding projects in the country and offers a great deal in the matter of producing food for the soldiers and civilians.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Why was this transmission line to Oroville left out this time? It was shown before that it was necessary, and it was appropriated for. It has not been constructed, and it seems to me that it would be absolutely necessary to carry this power to be generated by Shasta Dam. Why was it left out of this bill?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California, who is much more familiar with the project than I.

Mr. CARTER. I think the gentleman is in error in saying that this particular line was ever appropriated for. An appropriation was made for a transmission line that was going direct from the Shasta power plant to the San Francisco Bay region.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. Now, during the war emergency it was decided to tie into the already established line there owned by a private company. There are two different places into which it might be tied. One is at the Shasta substation and the other is at Oroville. You are going to tie into the lines of this company regardless of which place the transmission line is built to.

Mr. RANKIN. Then you are hedging this project about with the private power company and shutting out, we will say, for instance, the public power system in Sacramento and probably San Francisco from the benefit of the power development at Shasta Dam.

Mr. CARTER. Not at all. The gentleman perhaps is aware of the order made by the War Production Board in reference to the utilities tying their lines together. I recently visited the Northwest and found there that they use a network over the Northwest at Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and the privately owned power companies that are all interconnected. The War Production Board issued an order more than a year ago saying that this interconnection should be made where possible in the interest of saving. The line to Oroville was never contemplated for a permanent line. It was to be made on wooden poles, as I recall.

Mr. RANKIN. I am also aware of the tie-up of the public utilities in the War Production Board. That is what alarms me about this movement to strangle the distribution of the power to be generated at this Central Valley project, the Shasta Dam. I hope that if the House does not see fit to put this appropriation back in the bill it will be put in the bill in the Senate. If this Government can supply the money to build a dam in Quebec as large as Boulder Dam, surely we can find materials to transmit the power we are producing at our own dams.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would like to refer to several other agencies in the Interior Department.

GRAZING SERVICE

We have recommended a moderate reduction in the Grazing Service. The Budget proposed funds to establish four additional grazing districts and we allowed funds for only two. We believe this service is doing a good job and helping to provide food by improving the grazing areas for cattle. As many of you will recall, this activity was started several years ago under the Taylor Grazing Act, and you will also recall the fervor with which our beloved former chairman and sponsor of this legislation supported this proposal. Its headquarters have been moved to Salt Lake City, and it is my definite impression that the move has proved so satisfactory that they will not return to Washington after the war.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

The Bonneville Power Administration is provided for only on an operation and maintenance basis, all construction work having been stopped by the War Production Board. They have an unexpended balance of about $46,000,000. There are obligations which will reduce this balance to about $30,000,000 by June 30, 1943. It is also expected that an additional war construction program will be approved by the War Production Board involving the expenditure of $16,000,000 for new transmission lines and substations.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE

The General Land Office has made an excellent record and has increased its receipts over previous years. Receipts during the fiscal year 1942 were $9,014,172. The total amount recommended in the bill for this office is $2,119,350. In spite of this splendid showing, we believe that a reduction can be made in the item for surveying the public lands, although the Land Office is surveying land for the Army and Navy. We feel that the Army and Navy should supply such funds as are necessary to survey bombing ranges, camp sites, and so forth.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

The next item is the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We have made some drastic reductions in several items for this service. First, I would like to give you a few facts with reference to the participations of the Indians in the war effort:

Out of a total Indian population of 400,000, 13,000 have entered the armed forces. The Navajo Tribe alone have contributed 1,400 men, 350 of them volunteers, out of a total population of 50,000.

Many thousands of them are engaged in war work, including work in airplane factories and on the farms.

The first Distinguished Service Cross awarded on Bataan Peninsula went to an Indian, Pvt. Charles Ball, of the Fort Belknap Reservation in Montana.

I believe I have referred before to the late Maj. Gen. Clarence L. Tinker, an Osage Indian and commanding general of the American forces in Hawaii who was killed in action.

An unsolicited contribution of $1,000 for Navy relief came from a Kiowa Indian woman of Cement, Okla., who signed the check with a thumbprint. This woman not only lives in the district which I represent in Congress, but resides in a humble home on a farm a few miles from my own home in Oklahoma.

These are only a few of the contributions the Indians are making to the war effort. Suffice it to say that the Indians of all tribes and in all States are not only joining with other Americans of all races and creeds in buying war bonds but are giving their sons, the most precious heritage that any of us have, to promote the war effort and to keep America and the world a decent place in which to live.

A few of the major reductions we have recommended in connection with Indian Service appropriations are as follows:

Industrial assistance, which includes agriculture and stock raising, has been cut $135,000. These are worthy activities and have assisted the Indian in becoming self-supporting, but they are not of great value to the war effort, so we have reduced them substantially.

We have cut the estimate of $925,000 for Indian relief to $700,000. Because of the fact that opportunities for employment in war activities have greatly reduced unemployment, the committee felt justified in making this substantial reduction.

We have reduced the estimate of $1,200,000 for road construction and repair to $750,000 for similar reasons. Undoubtedly, the building of roads will become an important part of the post-war building program.

I see my friend, the Delegate from Alaska, Mr. DIMOND, is here. He appeared before the committee and made a very fine appeal for relief in Alaska. A pitiful condition does exist there. Yet all in all, we felt that we should make a rather sizable reduction in Indian relief.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. DIMOND. If the gentleman will permit, I should like to point out to the gentleman and to the House that the amounts appropriated for relief are not for the people who are able to get jobs under any circumstances, the relief is designed for those who are not employable, most of whom cannot earn a cent no matter what the conditions are in the country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I realize there is much merit to what the gentleman says. For that reason, we did leave in the bill $700,000 for Indian relief.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

As I have stated heretofore, funds are provided in the bill for only a few reclamation projects as compared with previous years. Appropriations generally in this bill are for operation and maintenance of existing projects.

One exception is the Central Valley project in California. The War Production Board has very recently given the go signal and the committee has included $11,500,000 in the bill for continuation of construction of certain features of the project essential to the war program. The amount we have recommended reflects a reduction of $4,900,000 in the Budget estimate.

We have also included $775,000 in the bill for installation of an additional generator at Boulder Dam. Power generated at the dam is being used by war plants in that area. Revenue from the sale of power is about $7,000,000 annually.

Funds are provided in the bill for the first time for operation of the Grand Coulee Dam which is the hub of industrial activity in the Pacific Northwest. Power from the dam is used extensively by war plants in that area engaged in producing aluminum and other important war minerals.

There are three 108,000-kilowatt generators in operation at Grand Coulee Dam at the present time and two 75,000-kilowatt generators. Three additional 108,000-kilowatt generators are being installed, 1 of which will be in service in August, 1 in November, and 1 shortly after the first of the year. That makes a total of 8 generators with a generating capacity of 798,000 kilowatts. Ultimately it is planned to install a total of 18 generators with a generating capacity of 1,944,000 kilowatts.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I notice there has been no money appropriated for certain projects on which there are stop orders from the War Production Board.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I wondered just what position that would place these projects in. Suppose that during the next 4 or 5 or 6 months we can release these stop orders and proceed with these projects. Does not that leave these projects without any money whatever to proceed with?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Does the gentleman believe that is a fair way to deal with the projects that have been approved?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct, with the exception of some unexpended balances that, of course, would be available, but, as I said a moment ago, I am hopeful that the War Production Board will change its attitude. It may be that there was some reason or excuse for these stop orders last fall, but the situation has changed materially since last fall, so we are hopeful and we have reason to believe that a great many of these stop orders will be removed within the next few weeks, not the next few months, but the next few weeks.

Some of them are in the making now. As I suggested a moment ago, this bill goes to the other body, and if these stoppages are lifted there will be an opportunity to get funds in this bill. If not, Congress will be in session with the exception of a possible vacation in the summer, and in that event the deficiency committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, will, in all probability, be in session. It should not be difficult in a matter like this, which is essential to the war effort, to secure prompt and careful consideration of any deserving items.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this committee should set up some funds for these projects in case the stoppage order is removed. Take the Provo River project: We have been attempting to get the War Production Board to remove the stop order on that for several months, and are expecting to have it removed at any time. But suppose we do not get this removed until this bill is passed. Then will not this put us in the position where the War Production Board can say to us, that we do not have any funds to proceed with, and therefore it would be of no value for them to release their stoppage order? It seems to me the gentleman's committee is putting these projects in a very unusual and a very precarious position by not appropriating money to proceed with them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It may seem to the gentleman that this committee is derelict in its duty, but I think it is not this committee, but the War Production Board, which is all-powerful.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. This particular project I might say that it is 49 percent completed, that is, the Provo River project. It has been stopped because it uses a certain amount of steel, and steel right now is a strategic material which is needed in the war effort. For several months we have been trying to have the project approved in such a way that it would not require that much steel, and that it would be satisfactory to proceed with the completion of the project. I might say that the completion of this project is essential to the lives of practically all of the people in Salt Lake City, and the surrounding territory, if we happen to have a shortage of water. We have not been able to procure from the War Production Board as yet a release of this stoppage order. My question is, suppose this bill is passed without any appropriation for this project, then, right after the bill is passed, we go to the War Production Board again, trying to get a release. They are then in a position to say to us, "You have not any money to proceed with this project."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman think that this committee would be in a very awkward position to begin making appropriations for projects that have been stopped by the War Production Board? Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the particular project to which the gentleman refers is an extremely important project, and I agree with all he says. However, there is now in the general fund $1,217,771 for the Provo project available now. If they lift the War Production order, the gentleman knows that there is $1,217,771 available.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. But it would take $10,000,000 to complete the project.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, yes; it will take more, but in the meantime, I find that Members of Congress, as well as the department heads, know and others know the way at the other end of the Capitol, and they often get what they want over there. I think that if this stop order is not lifted until after this bill becomes a law, the deficiency subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which, as I have said, is in session nearly all of the time, can consider the matter. The gentleman with his persuasive powers would still have an opportunity to come before his own colleagues, and tell them that this is essential.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to have the statement that when we go back to the deficiency appropriation subcommittee, that we will at least have a favorable consideration of this project, because I feel that this one project is absolutely essential to the war effort. It will not be very long before we can convince the War Production Board that that is a fact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Along the same line, with regard to the same character of item, do I understand the gentleman to say that the appropriations herein made are really token appropriations or sustaining appropriations and may be added to as circumstances warrant, later? I am hopeful that the stop order will not need to remain in effect long on some of these projects.

Mr JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will look at these items he will see that they are very much more than token appropriations. They amount to millions and millions of dollars, much more than token appropriations.

Mr. MURDOCK. Certain appropriations here seem to me too small even under war conditions, for reclamation works mean power production and food production vitally necessary in war.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would like next, to refer to the Geological Survey.

We have recommended a total cut of only $72,702 in this activity. A considerable portion of the work of the Survey is of direct value to the war and it is for this reason we have not made greater reductions in this activity. Let me give you one or two instances of what they have accomplished.

One geologist employed by the Survey was exploring deposits in the State of Idaho when he discovered ore containing tungsten, which is essential for the hardening of steel. This deposit has been developed and is now producing over 10 percent of our total need. It is valued at between $15,000,000 and $20,000,000.

Another outstanding accomplishment of the Survey, with the cooperation of the Bureau of Mines, was the location of chromite deposits in the Stillwater region of Montana. Chromite is also used in the manufacture of steel alloys and as a rust resistant. As a result of this discovery, plants are now in operation capable of supplying about two-thirds of our total needs.

BUREAU OF MINES

The Bureau of Mines is, without doubt, more actively engaged in the war effort than any other bureau in the entire Department. For this reason, your committee recommended a reduction of slightly less than $200,000 in the estimate of $8,835,130. Let me call attention of Members especially to the fact that the Bureau's experimental and research work in connection with strategic minerals, pilot plant experiments, and the development of helium wells are all directly and materially aiding in the war program.

In connection with the item under the Bureau of Mines for oil and gas investigations the committee was particularly interested in a new estimate of $33,000 to stimulate oil production by secondary recovery methods which method is proving very successful. In view of the vital importance of oil in connection with the war effort, the committee is impressed with the urgency of this program and recommends that the Bureau of Mines exert every effort to carry the work forward to a successful conclusion.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

We have recommended a reduction of $835,190 in funds for this activity, a cut of about 18 percent, as heretofore stated. While this is a drastic reduction, we felt this was one activity which could be reduced during the present emergency without seriously impairing the administration, protection, and maintenance of the national parks of the country. Travel in the parks will undoubtedly be cut in half or more during the coming season, and large numbers of resignations to enter the war effort and the ever-increasing demand for manpower will make it impossible for this Service to secure qualified personnel to fill vacancies as they occur.

It is probable that some of the parks will be used to rehabilitate our men who have been disabled in the service of their country. In fact, park officials advised the committee that this is not only seriously contemplated, but that arrangements are now being made to use some of the parks for such purpose. Yosemite National Park is one of them. We feel that this is a very commendable undertaking on the part of the Park Service, and that several parks of the country would make ideal homes in which our war-weary, shell-shocked, and otherwise disabled veterans may be able to rest and recuperate.

To utilize the present parks, in our judgment, would be much more practical as well as far more economical than to build additional Federal hospitals. And one or the other must be done in view of the losses we have thus far suffered and the heavier losses we are fearful our Nation must suffer, according to those in a position to know, if and when we invade the continent of Europe and the islands of Japan.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. When are we going to get to the Fish and Wildlife Service?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I shall be very glad to discuss that now, and I will say to the gentleman that I have long been a believer in the Fish and Wildlife Service. I have long been a member of the Izaak Walton League. It is a great league and has done a great deal for the country in promoting fish and wildlife. I know the officials in charge of the Fish and Wildlife Service. Dr. Gabrielson is a great expert and efficient officer. And my friend Mr. Jackson, the assistant director, is doing a fine job. But some of the activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service are not directly connected with the war effort. Therefore, the committee felt that pending the duration it would be possible for the Fish and Wildlife Service to take a rather drastic cut, along with the Indian Service, along with the Bureau of Reclamation, and along with many other departments. There are 26 agencies of government in this department and we made substantial reductions in every one of them.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Now let me interrogate the gentleman. I appreciate the gentleman's membership in the Izaak Walton League and the sportsmanship angle of it, but what we are interested in is the commercial fishing industry. Those of us who live in that part of the country where these industries are located are constantly getting complaints about their inability to get information or advice or any kind of cooperation worthy of the name to maintain and build up the fishery organizations in this country. What I would like to ask the gentleman is whether or not in this appropriation any substantial cut has been made in the fishery-industry item?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. And whether or not the officials in charge of the Division of Fisheries are taking some notice of the complaints of the fishery organizations all over the country in respect to their inability to get information, advice, and cooperation from that department?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I must say to the gentleman that this item is cut, and cut drastically; cut more than some members of the committee felt it should be cut.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Has the fisheries-industry item been cut?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Why?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Because of the general feeling that it could be cut without doing any great injustice to the service and without greatly impairing the efficiency of that particular activity.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. When Dr. Gabrielson appeared before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries last week in respect to a bill that had as its objective the transferring of the Fish and Wildlife Service from the

Interior Department to the Department of Agriculture, he said then that he had not been able to give, or the Division had not been able to give as much service to the commercial fisheries as they would like, because they are limited. The gentleman says they have ample funds. They say to us they are interested in the fisheries industry, but that they are limited. What are the facts?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I made the statement at the outset that this was cut drastically along with every other agency of Government. All 26 agencies are cut. This is not the only agency that took a reduction. I made the further statement that it was cut more than some of the members thought it should be cut. We are in a desperate war, a war that will decide the future of this country for generations to come. I would rather be charged with cutting a little too drastically during these perilous times than to say the committee has spent too much money.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman of course knows that the fishery industry is one of the basic food sources of the country. Last year we suffered a loss of over a hundred million pounds of fish below the year 1941. If we are going to build up our food supply, certainly we ought to lend every encouragement we can to that department of Government that has charge and has authority and has the machinery and the personnel to maintain that source of food supply.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Now the gentleman has made a very excellent speech and I appreciate it and I agree with him, but I hold in my hand a list of 37 Members of Congress who came before our committee, every one of them just as interested as is the gentleman in this particular industry; everyone of them showing us that their particular item was in the interest of the war effort. They were just as enthusiastic about it as is the gentleman. I will say to the gentleman that I think in most cases they were as much justified in asking for an increase as is the gentleman. Thirty-seven Members of Congress and three United States Senators and twelve pressure groups—everyone of them asking us for money, money, money. "Give us money." And, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Rich, used to say, "Where are you going to get the money?" If the committee had given those 37 Members of Congress, and the 3 United States Senators, one-tenth of what they asked, this committee instead of coming here and saying, "We have reduced the Interior Department bill 60 percent this year under what it took to operate last year," we would have to tell you that we had increased it more than 60 percent. So I will say to the gentleman, as important as it is, as much as I agree with him that this is an important item, there are other items and other people who were demanding additional funds.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. As I understand from reading the hearings the only reduction made in this appropriation is $172,000, an appropriation which was made a year ago for the purpose of making some sort of a substitute for tin for containers. That is the only reduction that is made in this item.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is not the only thing. We reduced the Budget estimate $68,540 because the committee was not convinced that it was connected with the war effort.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is that in the "Fisheries industry" item?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It is not shown here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The Budget cut out $172,000.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. $172,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Then the committee reduced the item an additional $68,540.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is the committee going to have any meeting at a subsequent date?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. This is the annual appropriation bill. There will not be another such bill until next year.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is the deficiency committee meeting?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It is meeting today. As the gentleman, I am sure, knows, it meets during this emergency almost daily. It meets almost every day. We should be glad to have the gentleman come before the committee. He talks very persuasively.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Yes; I must be making an impression.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to state to the gentleman from Oklahoma that in some sections of New England our people have not had meat for over a week, and they can get no fish. I should like very much to appear before the gentleman's committee at a later date. I am hoping that the gentleman from Oklahoma will join in supporting the Senate's action when it puts the item back in the bill. We have simply got to maintain the strength of our workers; they must have the necessary food, especially when they are working in heavy industry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that I am certain the Committee on Appropriations would always be glad to hear her, for she, too, is very persuasive. I noticed that instead of saying: "If the Senate puts the item back" she said: "When it puts the item back." I may say that she is probably correct in her statement of the situation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree, and I am sure the gentleman will agree with our need.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have a few more remarks which I would like to make in connection with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

For the second consecutive year, the committee has been faced with the duty of making rather severe reductions in some very worthy items for this activity. Doubtless they can and will be restored when the war is over. We have recommended a total reduction of $855,015 in the estimate which, as I have said, is a cut of 15 percent.

Under the heading, "Biological Investigations," we have eliminated an item of $87,500 for studies under the heading "Life History, Interrelation, and Distributional Studies of Wildlife." We felt that this was one item which could be deferred at least for the duration.

PITTMAN-ROBERTSON FUNDS REDUCED

The item of Federal-aid to wildlife under the Pittman-Robertson Act has been reduced by $500,000. The committee is aware of the fact that funds for this particular purpose are secured from a special tax on small arms and ammunition and that a bookkeeping credit on the books of the Treasury in excess of $9,000,000 is available for appropriation. However, in recommending a reduction of $500,000 the committee believes it is not asking too much of the sportsmen and conservation authorities of America to accept further retrenchment in this activity during the war period. While the committee is in sympathy with the purpose of the Pittman-Robertson Act, it wishes to point out that the fund will remain intact and be available for appropriation at a later date, particularly during the post-war period when millions of men returning from the armed forces will be desperately in need of work. This fund will provide a reservoir of peacetime projects which will assist in giving employment to such men.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I am after some information, Mr. Chairman. I have not been able to go through all these hearings as yet, but I notice where the committee took testimony on the Bonneville Authority. Was any statement made before the gentleman's committee about extending Bonneville power up into Idaho and Montana, specifically up into the Flathead Lake region?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that from time to time that suggestion has been made. I believe I am not giving away any secret when I say that it is actually contemplated as soon as it is humanly possible to do so. Whether it can be done during these wartimes I do not know.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. What justifications do they offer for raising the level of Flathead Lake, for example, and raising the level of Lake Pend Oreille?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I cannot tell the gentleman, but I shall be pleased to see if I can get the information for him.

GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES

Funds are provided in the bill for administrative expenses and other obligations in the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands.

You will be interested to know that the Alaska Railroad is now operating without a deficit which we had to meet annually up to a few years ago. For one period of time, covering several years, the deficit amounted to approximately $1,000,000 annually. It is estimated that

there will be a profit of $1,500,000 during the next fiscal year. Profits for the current year are estimated at about $2,300,000.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

The last matter which I wish to call to your attention is the appropriation for salaries and expenses in the Virgin Islands, in which was contained an estimate of $5,800 for the salary of the Secretary of the Virgin Islands, Mr. Robert Morss Lovett. As you know, the House on day before yesterday approved the action of the Kerr subcommittee and the whole Appropriations Committee in recommending that no part of any appropriation, allocation, or other fund should be available for payment of compensation to this employee. The committee received a vote of approval of its recommendation by adoption of the amendment, the vote being 318 to 62.

While the Interior Department subcommittee was not charged with the duty of investigating subversive activities in the case of this individual, we were interested in the matter so widely publicized inasmuch as his salary was contained in the Interior Department appropriation bill. It is significant that in a personal letter from the Secretary of the Interior to Mr. Lovett under date of April 25, 1941, a copy of which was furnished the committee, the Secretary severely criticized this employee in a rather lengthy and sharply worded letter to him because of his alleged membership in certain subversive organizations. The Secretary, according to the letter, stated that the Department had frequently been called upon to defend Lovett against charges, first, that he was a Communist and, second, that he was sympathetic to communism and therefore in effect a so-called fellow traveler.

The committee made no effort to try this employee. But it did hear the present occupant of the office, who appeared at the request of the committee and expressed his opinions and so-called philosophies. It was the unanimous opinion of the committee that the salary, amounting to $5,800, could be eliminated from the bill, especially in view of the present occupant, without impairing to the remotest degree the efficiency of the administration of the Virgin Islands. The committee reached this deliberate conclusion despite a lengthy communication from the Secretary of the Interior defending the record, activities, and general conduct of the present occupant of the position recommended for elimination.

RÉSUMÉ OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY COMMITTEE

In conclusion and in summing up, permit me to remind Members of the House again that drastic reductions have been made in some instances. But, frankly, I would rather be charged with reducing some of these activities, especially nondefense activities, too drastically during this desperate emergency than to be charged with being too liberal with the various activities affected. It is one thing to talk about economy in government and it is entirely another thing to vote for drastic economies, especially when there are so many pressure groups, departmental heads, and others who are demanding more and more funds.

If you will examine the bill and the report you will find that all of the 26 agencies in the Department of the Interior have been rather severely cut. It cannot be successfully charged that the committee has picked on any one particular agency or activity. Let me remind Members also that this bill represents a 60-percent reduction under the current year, that it is reduced more than 11 percent below the Budget estimates, and that the Interior Department is now operating on an operation-and-maintenance basis. There are no new construction projects in the entire bill, and except for Central Valley, which the War Production Board and the Department of Agriculture tell our committee has become increasingly urgent for the war effort, there are no funds even for the continuation of projects heretofore approved by Congress and on which construction work had heretofore been undertaken.

It is with more than an ordinary degree of pride that your committee presents the Interior bill today, and it is our sincere hope that the bill can be expedited through the House without delay and without any material changes.

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What happened in connection with the Central Valley project, Shasta Dam, and those items?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] will go into some detail about those items. The Budget estimate was for $16,400,000. It was urged by the War Production Board as well as other Government agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, and while the committee did make a considerable cut in it, there is an item of nearly $12,000,000 in the bill for it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That was a supplemental request which was not contained in the original Budget estimate.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wish to compliment the gentleman and his committee and state that I believe that the War Production Board stop orders as to work necessary for the food program should be lifted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. FORD. It had been my intention to offer a proviso containing a declaration of policy that by reason of the hooking up of this authority and private power in this particular case that the private corporations should have no vested right which they could assert after the emergency was over, but the Parliamentarian informs me that it would be out of order and could not be done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman from California that private power certainly would not receive any vested right simply because of the action of the committee. I think the committee made itself plain, and the gentleman knows my position. I supported Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, and the Parker Dam. In my statement here I show that the revenue from these dams has been very gratifying and that those gentlemen who called them white elephants and ridiculed the idea of those dams as power projects are now admitting that they were not "white elephants."

Mr. FORD. I simply wanted to get the intent of Congress in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my thanks to the chairman of the subcommittee for the very fair and impartial manner in which he conducted the hearings. We of the minority were given every opportunity to examine witnesses and any other evidence that was presented. I also want to say that Mr. William Duvall, clerk of the committee, was very helpful at these hearings. He is a most capable clerk and renders a splendid service.

This bill is cut nearly $120,000,000 below the 1943 bill. Of course, we have got to do a lot of cutting in order to reduce the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1944 nearly $120,000,000 under what it was for 1943. After the Bureau of the Budget had used the pruning shears on this bill, the committee considered it and cut an additional $9,227,226 off the bill below the Bureau of the Budget estimate.

That is going to make cuts in matters in which many of us are interested. It made cuts in matters in which I was interested, I know. While I have been a member of this committee I have endeavored to hold the appropriations down; however, may I say that I am more satisfied with this bill than any bill that I have ever had anything to do with bringing on the floor of the House. I did not have my way in all respects. There are some items in this bill that I believe could stand even greater cuts. There are some items, a few, one in particular, that I feel have been cut too much, but you must appreciate that we cannot have our way in all these matters. We have to work cooperatively and we have to give and take. So for the first time since I have been on the Appropriations Committee I stand here on the floor of this House prepared to defend every item in this bill. I have never made that statement before, but I am here to do that in reference to this bill because it has been cut to somewhere near the place that I feel it should be cut.

Considerable was said a few moments ago about the matter of reclamation. I

know the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] is very much interested in that, and I am, too. May I say to the gentleman that a number of those recommended projects are being studied at the present time and I am hopeful that the stop orders will be removed as to a number of them. The fact that we did not make an appropriation for them in no way militates against the consideration that is being given them at the present time. I have talked with members of the War Production Board about these reclamation projects. I have talked to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and others who are interested in them from a food point of view. The question of their not being appropriated for has never been raised. In fact, as was pointed out a few minutes ago, there is money available at the present time to carry on some of that construction work. To be sure it is not enough to finish it, but may I say to the gentleman from Utah and to the other Members who are interested in reclamation, as I am, that the minute these stop orders are removed immediate steps will be taken to provide the money. May I say further that I will be one who will be helping those who are out to get the money so that the work can be carried on with the greatest dispatch.

Mr. Chairman, considerable has been said here about the reduction of the appropriation for the Fish and Wildlife Service. May I say that personally I am very much in sympathy with the work that that Service is carrying on. I believe that Dr. Gabrielson and Mr. Jackson and their efficient staff are carrying on that work and doing a very splendid job. But if you will turn to page 2 of the report you will find there that of the various items set out there is not one single item but what received a good cut. Perhaps our cuts were too drastic at times in connection with some of these particular items, and, as I told you awhile ago, I think they were in reference to one which I want to speak about a little later. While I feel they were very drastic, I think that all of us must take our cuts in good spirit. We have to work out this problem as best we can. May I say that I have been advocating cutting, so my colleagues on the committee endeavored to demonstrate to me in connection with an item I was especially interested in what might be accomplished when it came to real cutting.

The Bureau of the Budget was late in getting in their report on the Central Valley project, and when it finally reached our committee they approved an item amounting to $16,400,000. As the bill originally came to the committee there was not 1 cent in it for the Central Valley Authority, but this supplemental estimate was sent up after the hearings closed, and at my request the committee held a special meeting, considered that item, and then to demonstrate to me what good cutting was they cut it down to $11,500,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think it is fair to say, however, that there was cash available, unexpended, in that particular fund of $26,500,000. I think the gentleman is going to have to agree that I was one of the members opposed quite violently to the full request of $16,400,000.

Mr. CARTER. I will agree that the gentleman was violent when it came to cutting that particular item. He will not have any trouble in getting me to agree to that.

Mr. JENSEN. Very well. It had been shown they got more money than they could expend because there was $26,500,000 left in that fund. They asked for an additional $16,400,000, which the committee finally cut down to $11,500,000. If it had not been for the fact that so much money had been expended on this project a different attitude might have been taken, but this was originally supposed to cost only $170,000,000, while to date we have spent over $300,000,000. Somebody's figures were wrong, and, in my opinion, the committee was justified in cutting down this amount in the light of those facts and figures which we had.

Mr. CARTER. May I say in reply to the gentleman from Iowa, it is true that they have a carry-over of $26,500,000 as of January 31 of this year, and that is one reason why I reluctantly accepted this cut; otherwise, I would have been down there battling for the rest of it yet. But the gentleman is in error in one statement. He said the original estimate on the project was $170,000,000, which is true. However, the gentleman said that around $300,000,000 had been spent up to this time. The gentleman is in error in reference to that. It is now estimated it will cost, when finished, about $333,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. I did make that error.

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. It is now estimated to cost $333,605,000.

Mr. CARTER. I will say a part of the additional cost has been by reason of increasing the height of the Shasta Dam so that more power could be generated; a part of that is brought about by reason of the fact that they propose to build a steam plant costing between $15,000,000 and $20,000,000, something I had never heard of until a couple of years ago; a part of it is for transmission lines, costing approximately $25,000,000, that I am not sure should be built. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that if it is demonstrated the steam plant and this additional power line are necessary I am going to be down here advocating them, even though the project does ultimately cost $333,000,000, instead of $170,000,000 as originally estimated, because I believe it is worth that to this country, and I believe the power generated at Shasta Dam will largely amortize the entire project—irrigation, flood control, salinity control, and navigation combined.

Mr. JENSEN. If those facts had not been stressed and established before the committee, certainly he would not have got even the $11,500,000.

Mr. CARTER. Yes. I hope the gentleman from Iowa will study this Central Valley project carefully. I know he is sincerely interested in it, and I hope that I may have his support in the future in reference to other appropriations.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I appreciate it very much, and I am very sure that the gentleman will feel sympathetic to restoring the fisheries item when the bill comes back from the Senate. You know fish is a good brain food, and at the same time it provides physical strength, and there is need for all the brains and all the physical strength we can have today; there is a shortage of both fish and meat today.

Mr. CARTER. I am just wondering if the gentlewoman is suggesting fish as a diet for the speaker of the present moment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman from California has a very fine mind. He does not need fish for that purpose; but there is a shortage of both meat and fish, and I know he would like to have it in order that the population of the country may maintain its full strength during these critical war days.

Mr. CARTER. I have a large fisheries industry in my own district, and I am interested in that. When this bill is in conference and this item of the fisheries industry is being considered, I will, as she requests, assume a very sympathetic attitude toward that item.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. For which we all thank you very much.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not true that the same virtues that applied to the Central Valley project, all of which are very true, do not apply to most of the reclamation projects.

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I think the gentleman's statement is correct; I think that is true. These reclamation projects, generally, are projects that pay by their ultimate cost into the Treasury of the United States. In addition to that, they increase property values and stabilize communities and are very beneficial to the country generally.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman said he would be glad to answer any question as to the reasons for the decrease of any item within the bureaus. May I ask the gentleman if he can inform us why they cut $68,540 out of the fisheries industry item, when it was admitted that they cannot carry on the work of that organization with that amount?

Mr. CARTER. As has just been said, and the chairman also answered that question, and as I called to the attention of the Committee a few minutes ago, we cut every item. There is not a bureau or an agency in here that, perhaps, could not take care of its work better if it had more money. They have just got to work a little harder. As I stated awhile ago, I have a great deal of faith in Mr. Gabrielson and Mr. Jackson, and I

believe that even with the reduced funds they can carry on and do a very splendid work.

It may be that we hit that item a little hard. The gentleman is on the Appropriations Committee and he knows we must cover a large number of items, often in a short time, and it may be that we were a little unduly hard. I thought we were unduly hard about the Central Valley project itself, but, as I stated a few moments ago, if that item should be increased in the Senate, I would look with sympathy on the matter when we get in conference.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I can join with other members of the subcommittee that brought in this bill in saying that I firmly in my heart believe it to be a good bill. There are some items I should like to cut considerably more. Without hunting very far, I think I could find an additional cut of $1,000,000. I do not, however, propose to offer any amendments because this appropriation bill is such a departure from the bills I have worked on in the past that the improvement, I think, is worthy of a little support even from a humble Republican member of the economy bloc.

In the first place, this bill dramatizes some fights we have had on the floor in the past. You recall that for the fiscal year 1941 the appropriation for the Interior Department was $155,000,000. For the fiscal year 1942, upon which we voted in the summer of 1941, the committee brought in a bill of $177,000,000. At the time that bill was brought before the House for consideration, I presented a motion to recommit the bill to the subcommittee for a cut of approximately $20,000,000 because I felt we should be gearing the Interior Department to war. In 1941, the Secretary of the Interior was running around the country telling the people to get ready to get into World War No. 2, and I felt that if the Secretary of the Interior was aware of impending war his Department ought to be one of the first to gear itself to war.

During the hearings of 1941 I asked the Interior Department to prepare for me a statement of the actual amount that was for national defense. Out of the Budget estimate of $183,000,000 for the fiscal year 1942, only $43,420,400 was for national defense. That prompted me to make the motion in 1941 to cut $20,000,000 from the 1942 fiscal year appropriation bill. This attempt to hold the line against inflation and to hold the line against Government boondoggling, leaving the bill at the 1941 figure of $155,000,000, was wholly unappreciated by the majority of the membership.

The motion to recommit was overwhelmingly defeated and the bill went to conference, was raised considerably, approved by the Senate and House, and signed by the President.

Last year a considerable effort was made, especially by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Rich, to successively amend the bill, and I confess I was not a shrinking violet in offering economy amendments to the Department of the Interior appropriation bill. I see here now the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], who offered several amendments at the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment last year. The first amendment the gentleman from Ohio offered, as I recall, was to cut the nondefense items of the Interior bill by 50 percent.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The amendment was to cut the nondefense portion of the bill—$92,000,000—by 50 percent, which would have been $46,000,000. That would have amounted actually to a reduction of 28 percent in the entire appropriation. In this bill the subcommittee made a reduction of nearly 60 percent of the 1943 appropriation.

That amendment received 5 votes in the affirmative. I then offered an amendment cutting the nondefense portion of the appropriation, $92,000,000, by 25 percent. That amendment received 14 votes. Then I offered an amendment cutting the nondefense portion by 10 percent, and that amendment, if I recall correctly, received approximately 38 favorable votes.

I am happy to see that a change has come upon the Members of this House, especially the members of the appropriations subcommittee having this particular portion of the Interior Department appropriation under consideration. It is truly gratifying.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I know that our former colleague from Pennsylvania, who many times stood on the floor of this House and asked "Where are you going to get the money?" would be pleased today if he were here to see the subcommittee reporting the bill as you find it today, recommending to the House for appropriation the total sum of $72,861,316 for the entire Department of the Interior.

Now I want to turn to the portions of the bill in which I think I could save another $1,000,000 if I were writing it myself. I want to pay my humble tribute to the other members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle for the fine spirit with which we approached the writing of this bill. There was never a time when we disagreed to the point of becoming disagreeable on any provisions regarding the amounts to be appropriated for any bureau or agency within the Interior Department.

The portion with which I find fault is in the authorization to allow unexpended funds of last year to be used for administrative purposes this year. The amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget was $3,287,000. The committee allowed $3,200,000 for administrative expenses. The cut of $87,000 was for these purposes, and I quote now the committee report:

> There was a total unexpended balance of $46,600,000 available as of January 31, 1943, and it is estimated there will be an unallocated balance of $30,000,000 as of June 30, 1943. Of this latter sum the committee has recommended that $3,200,000 be made available for expenses of marketing, operation, and administrative costs, a reduction of $87,000 in the Budget estimate. The committee has applied the major part of this reduction to funds for district offices and has apportioned the remainder to miscellaneous administrative expenses, and particularly to such items as involve informational activities.

I hope the language of the committee in this report will be adhered to by the Bonneville Power Administration. I think this is the heart of the waste perpetrated upon the American people. I think the $87,000 is a meritorious cut, made at a strategic place.

If you will turn to the hearings, you will find a statement placed in the record showing the difference between the administrative costs for 1943, with a sizable construction program, and the 1944 administrative costs, with zero construction. The 1943 total figure, with the enormous amounts that were appropriated for construction, included only $3,525,000 for both construction cost and operating cost. The operation limitation, the major activity for the fiscal year 1944 with zero construction, was $1,655,112. If they could get along with an allocation of $1,655,000 for the administration of the Bonneville power operation during the present fiscal year, then they should not have a sizable increase for the 1944 fiscal year.

At page 482 you will find a table describing exactly what I mean. The table is prepared by Bonneville Administration officials:

Division	Requirements 1943			Estimated requirement, 1944 zero construction
	Construction funds	Operation limitation	Total	
Administrative	$56,411	$188,854	$245,265	$206,578
Accounting	142,894	174,647	317,541	180,664
Engineering	577,204	984,171	1,561,375	1,791,768
Information	24,701	27,359	52,060	31,917
Land	64,483		64,483	24,619
Legal	43,540	92,522	136,062	101,046
Office service	208,472	35,050	243,522	196,846
Defense guards	398,620		398,620	367,000
Personnel	108,225	15,480	123,705	52,854
Procurement	75,400	5,770	81,170	36,187
Power management	170,000	131,259	301,259	297,521
Total	1,869,950	1,655,112	[1] 3,525,062	3,287,000

[1] Represents fiscal year total requirements and gives effect to reductions in staff already accomplished.

I have not heard anybody, outside of Dr. Raver, estimate there would be more than $16,000,000 for construction next fiscal year. I doubt if W. P. B. will release material for that much expenditure. So, if you cut $1,000,000 from the $3,200,000 that we have allowed to Bonneville, and leave this authorization at $2,200,000, there will still be a $600,000 leeway for whatever construction W. P. B. may allow, and Congress will still be in session, certainly, as in the past, to bring in a deficiency appropriation bill for any emergency that we do not foresee now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. JONES. I think this is a logical approach to cutting another million dollars from this appropriation bill, and that it should be made, because the type of personnel they have at the Bonneville Administration is the type that the Army and the Navy need—skilled personnel men, skilled engineers. We certainly need to enlist all of these people in the war effort.

I call attention to another item that bears reflection, and that is the number of personnel in the Interior Department by years. In 1944, for the fiscal year 1944, with the reductions that we have made, I do not know what the final amount of personnel will be, but I can say that if the Interior Department does what it should these cuts will find their way to the personnel that should be shaved in the war effort from the ordinary peacetime functions of the Interior Department.

I asked the Secretary to put a statement in the record of the number of personnel necessary to run the Interior Department by years. You will find the information tabulated on page 33 of the hearings. As of June 30, 1940, there were 48,947 employees in the Interior Department; as of June 30 1941, there were 48,569; as of June 30, 1942, 47,823; as of December 31, 1942, 13 months after Pearl Harbor, there were 39,774. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this record is a challenge to the great problem of manpower for the battle fronts, and on the home fronts. It seems to me that if the Secretary of the Interior had been as alert to gear his agency into the war effort as he has been advising others to gear themselves into the war effort, that we could have cut this personnel 1 year ago somewhere near the same proportion that the committee has cut the dollar sign in this bill today.

There is another item that seems to me very important and that is the cost of information in the Interior Department. Every year there is a battle to find out how much the Interior Department is spending for press releases and publicity. Two years ago I asked them to give me information as to the entire cost to the Interior Department and they gave me something near the figure of $76,000. Then a year later I was able to get a report from the Bureau of the Budget showing that the entire information cost of the Department of the Interior was something more than $2,400,000. This year I presented Mike Strauss, one of the Assistant Secretaries of the Interior, with these Budget figures. They are not prepared by any partisan, or by me. They were prepared by the Interior Department itself, who confessed that they had spent $1,429,878 for publications and $69,076 for press releases alone.

I asked them, first, to put a table into the record showing where any of this 1941 information personnel had been eliminated. You will not find the statement of that. Then I told them to break down the figures, category by category, on the same blanks and forms, so that the membership would have a basis to compare the 1944 fiscal year costs of the information service with the 1941 costs which Interior prepared and gave to the Bureau of the Budget. To this date they have not sent any letter containing the information to either the clerk of the committee or to members of the subcommittee containing the amount. This flagrant denial of information for the committee is a challenge to the integrity of the House. I must confess it has a New Deal pattern not wholly without precedent. If we want to know how much money the Interior Department has spent for information, certainly Congress or Congressmen ought to be able to get it. We should be the judge of what we should or should not get. Certainly it is not within the discretion of any agency in the executive branch of the Government to deny us any material for which we ask. At this moment the Department has not given us the figures that they have or should have, and I am sorry that the committee did not eliminate the entire amount for information service in the Secretary's office, because of this flagrant denial of the rights of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, the House has designated the Committee on Appropriations to investigate, prepare and report the necessary appropriation measures for consideration. This is a tremendous responsibility.

Your committee on appropriations is making every effort to be fair, reasonable and economical in the discharge of its duties; especially is this true of your subcommittee on Interior Department appropriations headed by our very able and considerate Chairman, Hon. JED JOHNSON, and Messrs. FITZPATRICK, KIRWAN, CARTER, JONES, and JENSEN. These other members of the subcommittee are also very able and conscientious. I endeavor to be helpful.

We are presenting for your consideration today the annual appropriation for the Department of the Interior, your division or branch of government having jurisdiction or custody of the Nation's natural resources.

At this particular time this Department is of very great importance. This war will be won by and with our courageous soldiers and our natural resources. This Department is mobilizing our resources—such as minerals, fuels, power and other critical and strategic materials for our war program.

At the time Germany invaded Norway in 1940 the Anglo-Saxon peoples controlled approximately 75 percent of the world's metals supply. Within a short time, Germany acquired the iron of Norway, the coal and iron of France and Belgium, the copper and aluminum-bearing bauxite of southeastern Europe and, in addition to this, the amount of metal available to us was reduced by Axis raids on our shipping. I think it can be said now that through the very outstanding accomplishments of the Geological Survey and Bureau of Mines, the United Nations can and will be supplied with sufficient critical and strategic resources for all our needs.

We have allowed the Grazing Service the sum of $856,700, which is $26,000 below Budget estimates, to continue the administration, management, and protection of grazing resources on more than 140,000,000 acres of public range lands in grazing districts established in 10 Western States. These services make it possible for this section of our Nation to produce 9,000,000 head of sheep; approximately 2,000,000 head of cattle, 130,000 head of horses, 150,000 head of goats, and approximately 400,000 head of big-game animals. Other appropriations are for construction and maintenance, $75,000, and for leasing of grazing lands, $8,000. The domestic livestock are owned by more than 21,000 operators who receive licenses and permits for public-range privileges and they actually paid to the United States Treasury in fees, $334,790 last year.

Your committee has recommended the sum of $225,000, which is $22,030 less than was appropriated last year, for the Petroleum Conservation Division which is necessary for continuing the work as contemplated by Executive Order No. 7756 of December 1, 1936.

The sum of $1,198,200, which is $141,800 less than last year's appropriation, has been provided for soil and moisture conservation. This amount is necessary to finance soil and moisture conservation operations on lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior as authorized under provisions of the Soil Conservation Act of April 27, 1935. Approximately 450,000,000 acres of land or 23 percent of the total area of the continental United States remain in Federal ownership. Of this area 280,000,000 acres are under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. Reports indicate that about 230,000,000 acres are in a condition requiring conservation treatment if the lands are to be kept in production and the badly eroded areas rehabilitated. Something like 60,000,000 acres under the jurisdiction of this Department is in a serious state of erosion. This program is partly self-sustaining. I believe last year they collected in excess of $812,305 for services rendered.

The above and some other divisions are located in the Secretary's office. The total appropriation for all these activities in the Secretary's office last year amounted to $6,855,365, whereas, this year the total amount recommended is $4,026,480 which is $2,828,885 less than it was a year ago.

I wish to call your attention at this point that no direct appropriation of new money is provided for the Bonneville Power Administration. It is, however, authorized to use not in excess of $3,200,000 of its unobligated balance of the current appropriation.

The sum of $97,200 is recommended for the High Commissioner of the Philippine Islands. This is $66,300 less than the appropriation last year. This reduction is due to cessation of activities in the Philippines. Personnel detained by

the enemy in the Philippines are paid salaries and wages totaling $62,800 per annum. This amount is frozen as an obligation under the provisions of Public Law No. 490—Seventy-seventh Congress. The balance of the appropriation covers necessary funds for salaries and expenses of other officers, presently located in this Nation.

The sum of $850,000 has been recommended for the Solid Fuels Administration for War, which was created by Executive order under date of April 19, 1943. Under the terms of the order this organization absorbs the office of Fuel Coordinator for War. This amount is $70,000 less than the amount provided in the last appropriation bill.

The General Land Office has been provided with the total sum of $2,119,350. This is $201,110, less than was provided in the last appropriation measure. In this connection I call your attention to the fact that the earnings of this Department for the fiscal year for 1942 were $9,014,172.87. Their income approximately was four and one-half times as much last year as their expenditures.

Your committee recommends an appropriation of $1,388,500 for the Bureau of Reclamation, which is $1,258,560 less than the amount that was provided last year, and $12,100,000 for general construction funds which is $67,279,340 less than last year. The Bureau played a very important role during the fiscal year. It functioned as chief supplier of electric power, foodstuffs, and water—three basic essentials of national existence in war or in peace. Stored water irrigated more than 3,000,000 acres of productive land, and the gross value of 1941 crops on land served with Reclamation water was $159,885,998. These values do not, of course, include the livestock fattened on Reclamation projects, nor dairy products which, if included, would increase the production by approximately 25 percent. The Bureau is the principal Federal agency engaged in the construction and operation of water projects for irrigation and power. Its activities are confined to 17 western States. The rainfall in this region is insufficient for crop production. Without water conservation and irrigation it would be impossible for the 15,000,000 people who live in that area, to sustain themselves or maintain their great military centers and other war activities. Last year the Bureau supplied irrigation water to 37,000,000 acres of western land which produced two and one-half million 100-pound sacks of beans, about 36,000,000 bushels of potatoes, and they were able to feed their dairy herds which yielded to the Nation 144,000,000 pounds of beef and 1,709,000 pounds of milk. The gross revenue in 1942 from power plants on 10 projects operated by the Bureau exceeded $9,000,000. Receipts from landowners whose lands were irrigated by Reclamation Bureau amount to $6,122,430.56.

This committee has recommended for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds, the sum of $26,926,421. which is $1,845,320.43 less than was provided in the current appropriation bill. In addition to this sum, we have recommended a total for the Bureau of Indian Affairs from tribal funds the sum of $1,577,655. This is $20,205 more than was spent last year but this money belongs to these tribes and they have recommended this method of expenditure. I do not believe that the Indians are receiving as much consideration at the hands of Congress as other citizens of the United States, but these services do offer some measure of equality and the appropriation is much less than was provided last year.

We have recommended for the Geological Survey the total sum of $4,474,600, which is $216,490 less than the amount provided last year. During the past several years with the gathering of war clouds in Europe, the outbreak of war on that continent, its rapid spread to other parts of the world, its close threat to our peace and security, and finally our entry into the conflict, it became necessary for the Geological Survey to mobilize its facilities and its strength and shift its energies from peace to wartime activities. No agency of the Government has been of more vital service to the war effort than the Geological Survey and practically all its work presently is being done for the military services. The hearings are complete and I wish all Members would read the outstanding accomplishments of this great department. They have done very outstanding work in Arkansas in the exploration of zinc deposits in southwest Arkansas; quartz crystals in central Arkansas. Our quartz crystals are now being developed in greater quantity, and tests heretofore made of a small amount of crude crystals turned out to be higher in grade than that from Brazil. The Metal Reserve Corporation has leased certain areas containing quartz crystals in the Ouachita National Forests and this corporation proposes to do very extensive mining. Bauxite, of course, is our No. 1 mineral. More men and more money have been devoted by the Geological Survey on this mineral than all other minerals in Arkansas. More extensive geological surveys are planned for the future with money provided in this bill, and it can be said now that Arkansas will give forth to the Nation sufficient bauxite from which aluminum will be made to supply our needs.

We have recommended for the Bureau of Mines a total appropriation of $8,835,130, which is a decrease over the budget estimate of $194,905. It is hard to discuss separately the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey, because their work is to some extent in the same field. The Geological Survey makes the necessary surveys and the Bureau of Mines makes the necessary investigations and tests. Extensive studies and investigations, however, have been made of practically all of Arkansas' minerals as well as the minerals of other States. The hearings are very extensive. Sixty million tons of bauxite and "potential ores" depending on the perfection of the extraction process have been discovered in Arkansas: 6,835,000 tons grade A; 8,941,000 tons grade B; 10,439,000 tons grade C; and the balance of 34,000,000 which cannot presently be processed; and extensive investigations are planned for the ensuing year, by which it is believed that additional large deposits may be discovered. Arkansas produces presently 97.3 percent of the bauxite produced in the United States. Other strategic minerals, such as manganese, mercury, nickel, tungsten, chromium, tin, and a multiplicity of other critical materials have been discovered throughout the Nation, and these deposits assure us of victory insofar as the mobilization of strategic and critical materials are concerned.

The National Park Service has been provided with $3,957,810, which is $1,529,555 less than they had last year, and many of our parks are now being used exclusively by our military services. Others are being turned over to the military services, soldiers from the battlefields are going to have the exclusive use of many of our best and most beautiful parks for their enjoyment. The Park Service has rendered a very great contribution to the war effort.

This committee recommended $4,897,350 for the Fish and Wildlife Service, which is $1,014,220 less than last year. This Service is also engaged in the war effort and they are making a tremendous contribution toward solving the food supply of this and the other United Nations.

For all activities in Alaska we have recommended $1,392,600, which is $607,720 less than they had last year. Alaska has become a strategic area. For the first time in my knowledge the Alaskan Railroad has been more than self-sustaining. It may be said that Alaska is, so far as this Nation is concerned, the most strategic area at the present time.

We have recommended $21,600 for Hawaii, which is $46,800 less than the amount they had last year—the total amount for last year being $68,400. The Virgin Islands have been given $125,000.

I have not agreed with all of the reductions made in this bill. I do not agree with all items that have been allowed. However, as a whole, I think the bill represents the very careful and considerate judgment of this committee, and while very drastic cuts have been made in practically all items I wish to compliment the various departments and other witnesses for being charitable with this committee in its endeavor to honestly extend in this bill the economies so desired by the people in all matters and more especially in those items which do not make some contribution to the war effort.

Also, I would like to call your attention to the fact that while we have reduced the total appropriation from $192,860,791.43, allowed last year, to the sum of $82,188,576, which is the amount recommended this year, "making a net reduction of $119,999,475.43," I wish to call your attention to the fact that of the amount allowed for expenditures for the next fiscal year, all but approximately $19,000,000 will be expended from receipts of the various divisions of the Department of the Interior. In other words, the taxpayers of the United States, for the maintenance of all these

activities, shall not be called upon to pay more than approximately $19,000,000. This is an excellent record, and, in my judgment, all sections of the Department of the Interior from its director to its minor officers should be highly complimented.

We think we have done a reasonably good job. We hope the House may reach such conclusion from a very careful study and consideration of the bill, and we believe the amounts finally allowed by the House should be sustained, bearing in mind the historic function of the House of Representatives with reference to making appropriation bills.

Summing up the status of the bill, I advise that the amount for the next fiscal year is $119,999,475, below the 1943 appropriation. This represents a very drastic reduction in practically all funds for the many activities of the Department of the Interior. The reduction in Budget estimates recommended by your committee is $9,327,260. The bill as reported to the House through voluntary cuts by the Department of the Interior, reductions made by the Bureau of the Budget, and reductions made by your committee, all told, reflects a 60-percent cut from the current appropriations.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to congratulate my colleague and the other members of the subcommittee for the splendid job they have done in bringing this appropriation bill to the House at a considerably less amount than was contained in the bill last year. I feel that the action of the subcommittee can be followed by some of the other subcommittees. It is a splendid example and I hope the example set will be contagious.

Mr. NORRELL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, before covering the subject matter pertaining to the Bonneville item in this bill, I wish to point out the great contribution to the common defense made by this committee. This contribution has resulted from the committee's early vision in providing transmission capacity from the Bonneville plant, which is in my district. The War Department subcommittee also shares in this contribution by their early vision in authorizing the last eight generating units. It is with a high degree of satisfaction that I refer to the committee's contribution, as I can speak with intimate knowledge.

The facts are that when our Nation entered this war, we were ill prepared to fight a modern war. Such wars are based on highly developed electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries. Through the operations of international cartels, during the period from 1920 to 1941, this Nation was relegated to an inferior position in this field of activity. Those of us who have investigated this matter early knew that Germany was expanding such industries by 1,000 percent of the capacity available in 1933.

It is hard to realize how this Nation would have been able to cope with the existing situation without the early provision for Federal hydropower. It is apparent to those of us who are familiar with the situation, that our Nation's expenditure of blood and treasure, would have been far greater if we had no early expanded electrical capacity, so as to make electrometallurgical and electrochemical processes early available.

At least 75 percent of the light metals going into our air program comes from the Federal power plants in the Pacific Northwest, in California, the Western States, and the Southeast. The largest portion of these light-metal requirements comes from the western plants. Appropriation provisions for these western plants comes within the jurisdiction of the Interior committee. It has been stated on several occasions that preparedness depends on foresight. Without the foresight of this committee, our country would have been ill-prepared.

When the factual history of our war effort is written the work of this committee will stand out as an outstanding example of vision. The sad part of the story is that the men in the war agencies did not have vision or make full use of the authority and funds that Congress provided. Congress was way in advance of the war agencies on the light metal, rubber, mineral, and power problems when it passed the Thomas Act and provided funds for Federal hydro plants and the necessary investigations and processes connected therewith. What is more remarkable still, this vision was exercised in the midst of highly conflicting points of view growing out of the public-private power controversy. These controversies, from my observation point, are secondary to the proper utilization of our resources, both in peace and war. I take pride in the fact that I early urged what this committee approved. I pointed out the basic facts on the power, metal, and rubber situation when I addressed this House in May 1940—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, page 5786. This was 8 days before the President addressed both Houses on the emergency and what lay ahead.

From this observation point it can be plainly seen that the prime industries of the future will be those engaged in the production of electrochemical and electro metals. Airplanes and our future commerce will not be possible without such productivity. In addition, we, as the arsenal for the world, are drawing on our own resources at a rate higher than any of us can visualize. We must find substitutes, if we are to hold our own as a first-class nation.

It is clear that to Congress belongs the task of post-war planning. In the consideration of such planning this House will find that they will have to consider two approaches to the resources phase. These approaches will be concerned with an inventory and use of the national resources that should be dedicated to future new competitive commercial uses, and secondly, such planning must cover necessary substitutions for those resources entering the depletion cycle.

Energy and power will play an important part in such future planning. Base metal electroproduction must come from low-cost power. The post-war unemployment problem is definitely tied up with adequate and proper resource utilization.

I deem it advisable for the membership of this House to be fully acquainted with the war-power developments in the Axis countries of Norway, and especially in Japan. We on the Pacific coast are especially interested in what Japan has and will be doing. Such an investigation will bring out the advanced preparations of all of these countries to secure world domination.

The South American situation also needs close study. That continent has nearly 50,000,000 horsepower of potential hydropower which is largely unused. This South American power is extremely high class on account of great falls and heavy, steady rainfalls. In the hands of unfriendly competitors, it can become a threat to our position. Nearly half of this South American potential power lies in Brazil in close proximity to high-quality and extensive mineral deposits. Another highly important study should cover the depletion of our own resources and an inventory of what we have and what we need. The growing pains experienced by our war agencies bespeak the necessity of a worth-while inventory.

I have been impressed particularly by these agencies' part in the shipbuilding program now being carried on by Henry J. Kaiser in the Pacific Northwest region. I doubt if there is any question in anyone's mind as to the importance of the Kaiser shipyards.

I think too many of us have not realized the importance of electric power in ship production. We hear of ship production always in terms of the large number of workers required. We usually hear of ship production in terms of astronomical man-hour figures, but it is quite apparent to anyone who delves into the subject that the modern, high-speed shipbuilding, which may prove the salvation of the United Nations, is at least equally dependent upon high-speed electrically operated tools, such as heavy duty cranes, presses, drills, lathes, and particularly the electric welding arc. These tools have been the instruments through which ship fabrication has been reduced from the World War No. 1 record of 236 days to less than 10 days at present in some cases. The yards in my district lead the country in ship production speed.

One kilowatt of electric power is necessary to make every five shipyard workers effective. A yard employing 50,000 men must have at least 10,000 kilowatts of electricity. If the electricity is not available, the 50,000 men must work under the obsolete methods of 25 years ago.

The figures given by Department of the Interior officials to the Appropriations Committee show that the Northwest region as a whole, and particularly the area around the city of Portland where the

Kaiser shipyards are located would be a power shortage area if it were not for Bonneville Dam and Grand Coulee Dam, and for the system of transmission lines and substations through which the electric power from those two dams is transmitted to the industrial sections.

The power companies established in the Portland area have for several years been dependent upon Columbia River power which has been made available to them. Without this power they would be unable to meet the rapidly growing needs of their normal market, to say nothing of the added demands for power placed upon them by the shipyard developments. In view of this fact I am convinced that the present is no time to deny the reasonable request of the Department of the Interior for the use of funds for operation and maintenance.

On the basis of the committee's evidence I believe the Department of the Interior has been cooperating with existing privately owned utility systems in the region. It is pouring its power without stint into practically all of these systems. Through these interconnections Columbia River power is being made available not only to the shipyards in the Portland area but in the Puget Sound area as well.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the following excerpts from the hearings, page 470, showing the operations of the Bonneville agencies:

The vital role being played by the Administration in the war program is indicated by the fact that the region will be producing about 30 percent of the total aluminum pig capacity of the Nation, utilizing more than 625,000 kilowatts of power, which is more than the ultimate capacity of Bonneville Dam when completed—518,400 kilowatts; an aluminum rolling mill capable of producing 240,000,000 pounds of aluminum sheet annually, and using approximately 50,000 kilowatts of power; production of tremendous tonnage of new ships, 1 shipyard alone turning out 113 Liberty ships during 1942, with a dead-weight tonnage of over 1,000,000 tons; a steel-rolling mill capable of producing 72,000 tons of steel annually, requiring 14,000 kilowatts of power; the production of magnesium requiring 57,000 kilowatts of power; and many other essential products, such as calcium carbide, sodium chlorate, and ferroalloys. In addition, many other types of industries which are not direct customers of Bonneville have developed in the region in the war production effort, all of which development would have been impossible had not these power projects been built by the Federal Government. The war strategy has also required the construction of many airports, Army camps, naval stations, and other similar establishments of the War and Navy Departments in this area. The Administration has undertaken the servicing of all these activities, including defense housing projects, which have been necessary because of the tremendous increase in the number of defense workers required for this expanded production program.

As a result of recommendations made by the Administration for the acceleration of construction of electrical facilities in the region in anticipation of the present crisis, Bonneville Dam, which was scheduled for completion in 1946, will now be completed in 1943, and installation of generators at Grand Coulee Dam has been advanced so that six units will be in operation by February 1944, in addition to two Shasta units loaned to Grand Coulee for the duration of the war. Three more generating units have been authorized at Grand Coulee by Congress, but their completion date thus far is indefinite due to priority difficulties.

The present rated generating capacity at these two dams of 626,000 kilowatts will be increased by the end of the calendar year 1943 to more than 1,200,000 kilowatts, approximately 100 percent increase in capacity during this calendar year. The increasing tempo of the Administration's part in the war effort is reflected in its power deliveries since 1940:

Year	Kilowatt-hours	Increase over previous year
1940	354,208,000	
1941	1,568,728,000	1,214,520,000
1942	3,939,600,000	2,370,872,000
1943 [1]	7,637,800,000	3,698,200,000
1944 [1]	9,647,533,000	2,009,733,000

[1] Estimated.

To meet these large increases in load, a rapid expansion of transmission facilities to take the tremendous quantities of power from the generating plants to the load centers was required. The construction of electrical facilities, accelerated in 1941 in anticipation of these new loads, was interrupted upon the declaration of war in order to conserve critical material. Only such lines and substation requirements were continued as were necessary to maintain minimum service to war plants. The rapid expansion of these facilities is best illustrated by the following data:

Fiscal year—	Mile-years of line in operation	Substations	Kilovolt-ampere-years capacity
1940	52.1	3	14,910
1941	614.6	25	265,029
1942	1,403.6	34	840,625
1943 [1]	2,228.9	50	1,639,369

[1] This includes only projects authorized as of Jan. 1, 1943.

* * * * *

FINANCIAL STATUS

The accomplishments of the Administration and the effect of contracts and new commitments are being reflected in the revenues being returned to the Treasury. A summary of actual revenues received to June 30, 1942, with estimated revenues for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944, follows:

1940, actual	$367,900
1941, actual	1,874,645
1942, actual	6,160,368
1943, estimated	12,003,519
1944, estimated	18,007,166
Estimated total June 30, 1944	37,413,598

The Bonneville Agency, which is under consideration, operates the transmission facilities, markets the power, and collects the revenues. The Corps of Engineers, another agency, operates the Bonneville generating plant. Its power costs have been allocated as provided by law. The Grand Coulee plant is operated by another agency, the Bureau of Reclamation. It is not completed, and its first costs have not been allocated as provided in the reclamation law. Therefore in approaching a pay-out cost determination we can deal with absolute figures as far as Bonneville power plant and Bonneville Power Administration are concerned and estimated figures for Grand Coulee. This will be close enough for the purposes at hand.

I will not deal with this over-all figure by combining the figures given in the hearings with citation thereto. The figures I am covering apply to the fiscal year 1944 as given in the RECORD. Revenues and expenses are given for other years also, but for brevity I will cover the 1 year:

The gross revenue given on p. 480 is	$18,085,500
Operating and depreciation expenses, Bonneville Power Administration alone, p. 481	4,271,990
Net Bonneville Power Administration operating income, p. 481	13,813,510
Interest on Bonneville Power Administration Federal investment, p. 481	2,145,696
Net income available for power cost and surplus, and operating expenses at generating stations, p. 481	11,667,814
The operating expenses at stations, p. 521	1,344,675
Net for interest and amortization of two dam plants	10,323,139

The only item that need be covered to complete the over-all pay-out calculation is the interest and amortization of the plant costs allocated to power. This is given on page 518 of the hearings, and when considered with the generating plant operating expenses I have just cited, shows surplus over-all charges of all kinds of $3,267,000 for the fiscal year 1944. These figures definitely answer the question of returns as given from the balance sheet figures submitted by the Administrator.

I must add a word of caution at this point, and that is not to take random figures scattered throughout the hearings. The only correct approach is via the balance sheet route as given on pages 480 and 518 of the record.

The real control must not be lost in any discussion. This control is the requirement of the basic act that requires rate reviews every 5 years to insure a balance sheet return to the Federal Treasury. It is mandatory for the Administrator to charge rates which will insure a full return.

I need to point out that the War Production Board has not used these facilities to their fullest extent. If they had we would have had more planes in the hands of General MacArthur. The testimony of Mr. Krug, as given on pages 959 to 983, is misleading as there is a gap of 2 years in W. P. B. recited activities, which is ignored. The record is complete in the appropriation hearings on the Senate side.

If this record is compared with the House Krug testimony, the gaps will be obvious.

The Department of the Interior is asking for no new appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration in 1944. It is asking only for congressional approval to reallocate $3,287,000 of moneys already appropriated so that the Bonneville Administration can carry on its operation and management functions effectively during the next fiscal year.

Such funds are to be used primarily for the purpose of transmitting power to war industries in the Pacific Northwest with a combined metal-plant valuation in the neighborhood of $300,000,000. Those plants are all being operated by private enterprise and their combined value is roughly equal in amount to the

total investment thus far in Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams and the Federal electric power transmission system which takes the power from those dams to market.

I should like to point out that power, when it is made in the generators at Grand Coulee Dam and at Bonneville Dam, is of little value to anyone. There are no big cities close to either of those dams. There are no industries located at either of those dams. Bonneville and Grand Coulee power is of value only when it can be delivered to the industrial centers and the military zones of the Northwest.

That is what the Department of the Interior, through the Bonneville Power Administration, is doing, and that is the purpose of the requested funds.

I am informed that 95 percent of all Bonneville and Grand Coulee power will be delivered to war industries during the next fiscal year. These war enterprises include pig aluminum plants capable of producing more than 600,000,000 pounds of raw metal annually, one of the largest sheet rolling mills in the country, a new magnesium metal plant with 800 electric furnaces, several chemical plants devoted to the manufacture of explosives and other war materials, a number of alloy plants which make materials vital in the production of armor plate and other hard-steel products, and at least 1 dozen military installations such as Army and Navy airfields, depots, and encampments. All of these enterprises are war enterprises; and all of them require electric power which they would be unable to receive if it were not for the Federal development of the Columbia River. For the delivery of power to all of these enterprises and to others which will be established during the fiscal year 1944, the Bonneville Administration will collect more than $15,000,000—perhaps as much as $20,000,000—which will be paid into the Treasury of the United States. These power sales will more than double the volume of sales by the Bonneville Administration during the past 12 months.

The Bonneville Administrator has testified before the Appropriations Committee that he will require $3,287,000 to operate his agency. More than 10 percent of that money is required for armed guards to protect the system against accident and sabotage.

According to the Bonneville Administrator's figures 3,287,000 operating dollars will put into the United States Treasury more than $15,000,000.

That sounds like good business. I urge the approval of this item in the pending bill.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, over a period of years I have entertained some difficulty about the ramifications of the various power agencies in the Federal Government. As a result of some studies in that field I dropped a bill in the hopper today to consolidate all power activities of the Federal Government in a so-called Federal Power Administration, under the direction and supervision of a Federal Power Administrator.

One never realizes the diffusion of power operations in the Government until he sets himself about it for a little while and determines how far they go. Nor do we have an adequate conception of the immensity of our power operations and the investment in public power today. We ought to make up our minds that public power is here to stay. It is like administrative law. It is here to stay, and it has to have some good direction. It has to have some coordination when necessary. But I start from the broad premise that public power is here to stay. So the thing to do is to coordinate these activities wherever possible, that we may more intelligently legislate and appropriate in this field.

It occurs to me we are appropriating something in excess of $300,000,000 a year or more on power projects and that our investment in public-power projects is well in excess of $2,000,000,000. You cannot minimize that kind of an investment, and it certainly needs the attention of Congress.

I doubt very much whether there is a single individual in Congress or out, or in any place in the Government today who has a truly comprehensive understanding of our power activities. We have already consolidated in some other fields. We have taken the security agencies and put them under the Federal Security Agency. The Federal loan functions have been placed under the Federal Loan Agency. Public works functions have been placed under the Federal Works Agency. By the same token it occurs to me that all power activities ought to be put under a single power administration for better direction and development.

Let us take a look at the ramifications of power throughout the Government. In the field of planning for power projects we have the National Resources Planning Board. We have the War Production Board, which deals with the allocation of power supply. We have the Army and Navy Munitions Board and the National Power Policy Committee.

In the field of power generation, marketing, and distribution we have the Bureau of Reclamation, which is considered in the instant bill, which includes Grand Coulee, Fort Peck, and others. In fact, the Bureau of Reclamation has charge today of some 28 power projects on 17 reclamation projects, and its installed capacity is 1,447,000 kilowatts. In the field of generation you also have the Indian Bureau. Next, you have the Tennessee Valley Authority, with 1,300,000 of installed kilowatts. Finally, you have the Federal Works Agency, which has control of the construction of a power project on the Santee-Cooper and also supervises the Grand River Dam in Oklahoma, and a number of projects in Nebraska.

Here then are two categories, namely, those agencies dealing with planning in the power field and those that deal with generation. Next, you have those that are lending agencies on public power. That includes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It includes the Defense Plant Corporation and the Rural Electrification Administration. There is a fourth category—the control agencies that deal with the regulation of power. That would include the War Production Board, as it relates to allocations of power supply. It would include the Federal Power Commission, which deals with rates and applications. It would include the Securities and Exchange Commission, which deals with regulation of holding companies and securities.

It is a rather interesting thing that if you go about looking for all these power agencies you will find them in four different departments of government and in six or more differentiating agencies. Obviously, no legislator can keep that whole complicated picture in mind.

If we consider it from the standpoint of legislation, think of the legislative committees that deal with the subject. First of all, the Committee on Military Affairs has jurisdiction over certain power activities—all legislation dealing with the Tennessee Valley comes under that committee; second, there is the Flood Control Committee; third, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, where power is involved; fourth, there is the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which deals with power as it relates to control, through the Securities and Exchange Commission; next, you have the legislative Committee on Agriculture, which legislates on matters that pertain to the Rural Electrification Administration; finally, when it comes to the lending functions involving power, the Defense Plant Corporation and the R. F. C. customarily appear before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There you have six legislative committees of the Congress that deal with this question of power legislation.

When it comes to appropriations for power it is the same bewildering labyrinth of authority. The Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations deals with appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration. This Interior Department bill from the Interior Subcommittee deals with the Bureau of Reclamation, Indian Affairs, and National Park Service, including Bonneville, Grand Coulee, Fort Peck, and others. The Independent Offices Subcommittee has jurisdiction over T. V. A., the Federal Power Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. The War Department Civil Functions Committee has jurisdiction over the Army and Navy Munitions Board and the planning activities of the War Department in the field of power. Finally, if there is any deficiency or supplemental requests that the other five subcommittees did not catch, then you still have the deficiency subcommittee. Here, then, are six subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations and six legislative committees that deal with this whole question of power.

There is not only duplication in the field of public-power activities but there is duplication right here in Congress in handling problems relating to the power

activities of government. We must spell out this whole program of consolidation. I am persuaded that we have got to consolidate. We must unify these activities if we are going to have a harmonious and effective public power policy; so the bill which went into the hopper today sets up the Office of Power Administration under the supervision and direction of a Federal Power Administrator. Consolidated therein will be Bonneville, Tennessee Valley Authority, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Federal Power Commission, the R. F. C. activities insofar as they relate to power loans, the Securities and Exchange functions that relate to the control and consolidation of power activities, and similar functions of the Federal Works Agency. In addition thereto, it sets up an advisory committee consisting of the chairman or the administrative heads of every one of these agencies, who, taken together, shall be a Federal public-power advisory committee in wartime and in peacetime.

The National Power Policy Committee and the Power Division in Interior would be abolished. I propose to bring about a transfer of those functions in the interest of economy, in the interest of efficiency, in the interest of a coordinated public power policy, and in the interest of a development in the future that will be coordinated, that will have good substantial direction, and that will make it possible then for the Congress to intelligently deal with this whole ramifying and complicated subject.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Has the gentleman included anywhere in his bill coal or oil? They are a form of power that is increasingly tied up with the public interest and increasingly subject to Federal regulation. It seems to me some day we have got to have some sort of coordinated regulation of these competing forms of power that compete between each other and we have got to have regulation that will include both public and privately owned sources of these three competing kinds of power.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not include them for a very good reason. I realized first that they are competitive, and secondly there has been a good deal of controversy already over regulation of these competing fuels whether we call it power, oil, coal, hydro, or something else; and for that reason I leave it as a sort of separate domain because each of them is already being separately dealt with by different agencies of the Government.

Several years ago, I served on the special committee of this House on the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. It was a fruitful and constructive experience. The studies of that committee were persuasive of the need for more and more reorganization of Federal agencies in the interest of economy, better policy, and improved public service. Here is a field in which the reorganization technique can be applied in the interest of consolidation of these activities that should prove most salutary. I believe that this proposal merits the immediate consideration of the appropriate committee of the House.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa, a very valuable member of the committee [Mr. JENSEN.]

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, most of the items in this bill have been covered quite thoroughly by our very able chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], and by the very able ranking Member on our side, the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], and also by my colleague on the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]. I wish to say here that every member of the committee worked hard and long to bring out a bill that we could support on the floor unanimously. For almost 6 weeks we met daily. We listened to over 100 people who came before us to testify. After that we marked up the bill, which was no small job. Generally speaking, the workings of the Interior Department are carried on very efficiently. Nevertheless, there was room for saving and so we did cut this bill to what we thought necessary, but leaving enough money for every branch of the Interior Department to carry on the work of the Department and carry it on efficiently. I possibly got a little tough on occasion, but I am not apologizing for it, because under present conditions it is necessary to cut all nonwar expenditures to the bone. Our Treasury is in mighty bad shape right now, and it is going to be in worse shape as this war goes along; so it behooves everyone of us to save every dime we can without detriment to our war effort. It is not pleasant to me to have to take sharp issue with the ranking Member, the distinguished and able gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER]. I appreciate his position in regard to the Central Valley project in his State. The argument was developed quite thoroughly and we finally decided to permit an expenditure of $11,500,000.

Mr. Chairman, some disturbing things were brought up and aired quite thoroughly in the committee, part of which had to be off the record because it was of such a nature as to be military secrets. The disturbing thing that came before our committee was the fact that there seems to be a disposition on the part of some high officials in this Government to hinder the development of our national resources.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I hesitate at this time during this war emergency to bring this out too forcibly, but I can say in all honesty and sincerity that it just does not make sense when we need every kind of strategic war material, when we stop projects of all kinds, reclamation, power, and every other kind of Government project and many private projects and industries from getting the necessary steel and other materials that they need to carry on their business that at the same time something should be stopping these mines and our domestic resources from being developed.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman on the fine statement he is making. I would like to ask one question, however. On page 27 of the report which accompanies the bill I find that attorneys' fees for certain Indian tribes of the Flathead Indian Reservation in Montana have been increased $18,400 over the amount which was awarded in 1943. Will the gentleman explain that large increase in attorneys' fees for those Indian tribes?

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. May I say that the attorneys' fees for the Indians comes out of the tribal fund.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. CARTER. They have a tribal council that carries on the business of the tribe and it has requested this. As I recall they pay the attorneys for a period of 10 years. I have forgotten the exact number of years, but it is over a number of years. May I say further that the committee has scrutinized these attorneys' fees very carefully in this bill and in every other bill since I have been on the committee because we did not want unscrupulous attorneys taking advantage of the Indians. I think the gentleman will find upon investigation that there is ample justification for every cent that is allowed for attorneys' fees.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask this additional question of the distinguished gentleman now speaking and also members of the committee: Is it the opinion of the committee that this increase of attorneys' fees is fully justified by the testimony which was heard by the committee?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. In fact, proven to our satisfaction, I may say to the gentleman. There was need for this additional attorney's fee and consequently we all agreed on it. I do not think there was a dissenting vote on this particular item.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I was speaking about these metals that we have which are not being developed. Since the time our report has been made public and our hearings have been made public just a few days ago I have received numerous letters from people in different sections of the United States who have private metal deposits. They all tell me how they have been given the walk-around and have not had an opportunity to develop their mines right at a time when we need these metals so badly, not only for our war effort but also to produce food. Our farmers are being stymied to a marked degree because they cannot get the necessary machinery, consequently our food-production program suffers while at the

same time this is permitted to go on. Some individuals in high places are holding back the development of our own natural resources and I promise right now that I shall not stop until I have a pretty good idea who the fellows are who are guilty of what I call sabotaging our war program. I invite every good American to assist me in correcting this thing at the earliest possible moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, the bill we now have before us carries appropriations involving some $72,000,000. It makes appropriations for at least 6 unrelated subjects and has over 100 separate and distinct items. To my mind this raises the question of the desirability of a separate item veto in our procedure here in Congress. In the past various Presidents, including President Grant, President Hayes and, I believe, President Taft, have recommended a separate item veto by constitutional amendment. Thirty-nine States in the Union have a program under which the Governor may veto an item separately or in some cases he may reduce an item.

I think the principal question here, perhaps the only question, aside from the desirability of the program, is whether or not it can be accomplished without amending the Constitution. It is my view that it can be. In order to stimulate a little thought on this subject I am today introducing a bill which is very simple and provides in substance that each item of an appropriation bill shall be considered a bill within the meaning of article I, section 7, and may be vetoed by the President separately. The item vetoed would be returned to the Congress for further consideration just as other bills are considered under such circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief statement I have prepared on the constitutionality of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, in his budget message several years ago President Roosevelt directed the attention of Congress to the desirability of a power in the Executive to veto separate items in an appropriation bill, and called upon Congress to decide whether this result should be accomplished by a constitutional amendment or by legislation. A constitutional amendment would, of course, make this practice obligatory on all future Congresses. However, it would seem that the desired result could be attained without the necessity of a constitutional amendment.

Article I, section 1, of the Constitution pfovides as follows:

> All legislative power herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.

In construing this section, it is necessary to consider other pertinent sections as well as the general intent of the instrument as a whole. While the section provides that "all legislative power * * * shall be vested in a Congress," it is clear that the framers were referring here only to affirmative legislative power. In article I, section 7, they gave legislative power to the Executive in the following language:

> Article I, section 7: Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections, to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If, after such reconsideration, two-thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of that House, it shall become a law. But in all such cases, the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the journal of each House respectively. If any bill shall not be returned by the President within 10 days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law, in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress, by their adjournment, prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law.

The Courts have held that this provision confers upon the Executive legislative power. The legislative power of the Executive is purely negative in character, and even that power of negation is subject to being overruled by a two-thirds vote of Congress. In brief, Congress is the sole repository of affirmative legislative power; that is, the power to say what the law shall be. The Executive has only the power to say that a certain measure adopted by Congress shall or shall not be the law. However, the right and duty of the Executive to exercise this negative power as his judgment dictates, is as clearly expressed in the Constitution as is the right and duty of Congress to perform its part of the legislative function. This is clearly borne out not only by the language of the Constitution, but by the history of the veto power in Anglo-Saxon government.

In an early day in England, the Crown possessed all the powers of legislation. The rise of the English Parliament first restricted this power of legislation to a negative power of veto, and finally abolished it altogether, the last veto being by Queen Anne in 1708. In the American Colonies, the veto power had a different history. In all the Colonies, the Governor could veto legislation, and in all but Maryland, Rhode Island, and Connecticut the King could veto a bill, even after it had been approved by the Governor. The King used the veto power freely to prevent acts of the Colonies injurious to the mother country. This abuse of the veto was complained of in the Declaration of Independence. After the beginning of the Revolutionary War, the American Colonies limited the veto power of their respective Governors. In no State but Massachusetts did the Governor have even a qualified veto over legislation, and that not until the Constitution of 1780 was adopted. Under the Articles of Confederation there was, of course, no Executive veto.

The framers of the Constitution were, of course, familiar with this history. They knew both the advantages and disadvantages of the Executive veto, and the subject was very carefully discussed at the Constitutional Convention. It was their general purpose to create a Government consisting of three coordinate branches, legislative, executive, and judicial. In order to maintain such a government, it was necessary not only to carve out the place of each branch in the whole scheme, but also to declare certain fundamental principles for keeping each in its respective sphere. The power of veto was given to the President as a check on the law-making powers of the Congress. The delegates evidently had in mind two main purposes; first, the protection of the executive branch from encroachment by Congress; second, the prevention of hasty and ill-advised legislation. This was well expressed by Alexander Hamilton in the following language:

> It establishes a salutary check upon the legislative body, calculated to guard the community against the effects of faction, precipitancy, or of any impulse unfriendly to the public good, which may happen to influence the majority of that body (Federalist, No. 73).

Beginning in 1820, the use of the rider—often attached to an appropriation bill—became prevalent and often reduced the Executive veto to a nullity. By rule, the House of Representatives subsequently prohibited this practice. However, the practice of assembling appropriations in large bills containing hundreds of separate items on wholly unrelated subjects is rapidly accomplishing the same result.

Many of the States, confronted with this problem, have met it by constitutional provisions definitely giving the Executive the power to veto a separate item of an appropriation bill. Thirty-nine States have taken such action. As opposed to this plan of protecting the integrity of the Executive veto by constitutional provision, the Federal Constitution leaves the matter to the good faith of Congress. The Constitution is, after all, not a mere compilation of legalistic rules. It is rather the pattern of a certain philosophy of government. It states general principles rather than detailed procedure. The fundamental object of the Constitution was to create a government of laws as distinguished from a government of men. It sought to accomplish this by dividing the powers of government among three independent and coordinate branches, each one of which should be a check on the other. It is to this fundamental principle rather than to any mere declaration in the Constitution that the citizen must look for the protection of his property, his liberty, and even his life. The Constitution does little more than to create these three branches and draw the line between them. It seeks to maintain that division for all time by setting up certain

checks and balances. In the last analysis, however, the preservation of that form of government is not to be sought in any mere words written on paper, but rather in the acceptance of that philosophy of government of which the words themselves are the mere evidence. Such a government can only be maintained if each independent branch thereof recognizes the rights and duties of the others and protects them as actively as it protects its own.

In the matter of legislative procedure, the Constitution simply says:

Article I, section 5: Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings.

This was intended as a broad and comprehensive grant of power and has so been recognized by all three branches of the Government. In construing the right of Congress to make rules, the Supreme Court has said, in *United States* v. *Ballin* (144 U. S. 1):

It—

The House of Representatives—

may not by its rules ignore constitutional restraints or violate fundamental rights, and there should be a reasonable relation between the mode or method of proceeding established by the rule and the result which is sought to be attained. But within these limitations, all matters of method are open to the determination of the House, and it is no impeachment of the rule to say that some other way would be better, more accurate, or even more just. It is no objection to the validity of a rule that a different one has been prescribed and in force for a length of time. The power to make rules is not one which once exercised is exhausted. It is a continuous power, always subject to be exercised by the House and within the limitations suggested, absolute and beyond the challenge of any other body or tribunal.

In that case, the Supreme Court called attention to the fact that the Constitution required the presence of a quorum, but set up no method of making this determination and that it was therefore within the power of the House to prescribe any method which would be reasonably certain to ascertain the fact. The right of Congress to make rules for the purpose of legislation is so broad and final that the Supreme Court accepts the complete law as it has passed Congress and been signed by the President and deposited with the Secretary of State, as the law which passed the House in accordance with their rules, and will not have recourse to the Journals of the respective Houses to prove the contrary.

Attention has been called to article I, section 7, which provides that "every bill shall be presented to the President of the United States." Webster defines a bill as follows:

A form or draft of a law presented to a legislature but not yet enacted, or before it is enacted; a proposed or projected law.

The term "bill," as used in the Constitution, does not have any definite or technical meaning and apparently had none at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. It is simply a vehicle for carrying proposed law through the legislative bodies. There is no constitutional requirement that it shall be in any particular form, or that it shall contain any designated elements. It is simply a device by which the legislative will is expressed concerning suggested legislation. Neither usage nor constitutional limitation requires us to attach any technical or restricted meaning to the word "bill" which will prevent the carrying out of the real intent of the framers in adopting the Executive veto. We must, as in all construction of the Constitution, look to substance and not to mere form.

In *State* v. *Platt* (2 S. C. 150), in discussing the meaning of the term "bill," the court says:

In a technical sense, the term "bill" is applicable properly to the enactment as a whole. Although the technical use of words should prevail where not inconsistent with the clear intent of the instrument, yet when such intent requires that words should be used in the larger sense, it is competent so to regard them. If we should hold that the Constitution regards the enactment as a whole, in an exclusive sense, we would be led to the inevitable conclusion that to become a law, all the substantial parts of the measure must have together passed through all the requisite stages. The consequence of this would be that alteration in a substantial part during such progress would be fatal to the whole bill.

* * * * *

Forced upon the opposite construction that every substantial part of a bill is to be regarded as a bill in the sense of the Constitution, we find nothing in our way but the technical import of the term "bill." It is not easy to perceive why, if any detached part of a statute is a law within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States forbidding States passing laws impairing the obligation of contracts, any part of a bill is not a bill under a clause intended to secure deliberation in the passage of legislative enactments. Such a conclusion is inevitable if regard is had to the fixed principles governing constitutional construction. The objects had in view by a constitution in government are habitually substantial; matters of form are usually left to the legislative body as subject to change with the progress of ideas and events. The great objects in view in framing a constitution are the division and distribution of the powers of government, the establishment of limits and boundaries beyond which they shall not be exercised, and the creation of an efficient responsibility, tending to restrain and furnish the means to correct neglect or abuse of public authority. Clauses having for their object the creation of responsibility in the exercise of political functions are, to a large extent, intended to act upon the motive, either by way of creating inducement for right action or removing the temptation or opportunity to such abusive exercises. This is in part accomplished by fixing the responsibility for all political action in some definite person, or body of persons, by securing deliberation in the performance of public acts, and by ascertaining modes of authentication and action in important cases vitally affecting the welfare of the state. It is obvious that, in construing clauses of this class, substance rather than form is to be considered. The object to be secured is to be sought for not alone in the formal expressions of the Constitution, nor yet in the technical character of the means employed to serve its ends, but in the nature of the subject intended to be acted upon through such means. In a word, the language of the Constitution in such cases is to be construed in the largest sense fairly attributable to it, and that will best subserve the objects it has in view.

Article I, section 7, simply means that all legislation which has passed the Congress must, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President. The intent of the Constitution is that legislation shall be a result of the meeting of the minds of the Congress and of the Executive—the former affirmatively creating the legislation and the President exercising his right of affirming or denying.

The method by which this result is to be accomplished is left largely in the discretion of Congress. For example, a provision could be put in each appropriation bill stating definitely that for the purpose of the Executive veto, each item shall be considered as a separate enactment of the Congress and subject to a separate veto. There are, no doubt, other ways by which this result could be obtained.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill for amendment be dispensed with and that it be in order at this time to offer amendments to any part of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, on page 93, line 5, makes an appropriation of $125,000 for the fisheries industry. The Bureau of the Budget recommended $193,540, while the appropriation for 1943 was $365,540.

I respectfully submit that the item should be increased from $125,000 to $193,540. This is an increase of $68,540 over the amount provided in the pending bill, but it is a decrease of $172,000 under the appropriation for 1943. The increase I request conforms identically with the suggestion of the Bureau of the Budget.

I think the item is most important, and while I realize it cannot be considered adequately at this time, I hope that the item may be restored in the Senate and that it may receive sympathetic support of the subcommittee, with acceptance in conference, if increased by the Senate.

I know the deep interest manifested by the subcommittee in matters pertaining to fisheries. This particular item has to do with the production of food for war purposes. I do not think that was generally understood by the subcommittee at the time of its consideration, and I believe that the subcommittee would be sympathetic upon due consideration.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. I said earlier in the day on the floor of the House that perhaps some of the items were cut more than they should have been cut, and I referred to this item in particular. I think this: That the committee exercised its very best judgment at the time, but perhaps was not aware of the facts and circumstances, and I would be inclined to follow the suggestions of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia and consider this item very sympathetically in conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I gladly yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have been very much interested in the general information the gentleman is giving the House. I think what the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], the ranking minority Member, has said is the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee handling the bill.

Mr. BLAND. I thank both the gentlemen.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman stated that the reduction in this item will considerably interfere with the production of food. I think one of the sources of information that came to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was that about 100,000,000 pounds less of fish was caught in 1942 than in 1941.

Mr. BLAND. Something like that. I am going to ask permission to extend and revise my remarks, which will contain that very statement.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It is very important that we should keep that item in the bill and I am glad to see the Chairman of the Committee having jurisdiction over fisheries, here to support it.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I agree heartily with what the gentleman has said. I am a member of the special Committee on the Conservation of Wildlife Resources. We have held extensive hearings and we went at some length into the question of conservation of food fish, and we found in some reports that were submitted to us that there was an immense quantity of food in the fish and wildlife that we could make use of in the war effort if we give it proper protection. On the basis of information that came to us, I think it would be a very grave mistake at this time to make the reduction proposed under the Budget estimate.

Mr. BLAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I gladly yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, we must never lose sight of the fact that there are many groups of people that are asking for appropriations, great, huge appropriations, to produce everything imaginable in the way of food.

Mr. BLAND. I thoroughly agree with what the gentleman says.

Mr. JENSEN. We have cut the agricultural appropriation bill and other bills. We cut that bill down by the hundreds of millions of dollars, and we are cutting out expenditures for reclamation projects, irrigation projects, at the request of the War Department and the War Production Board, and we had to be fair about this thing.

Mr. BLAND. I am not criticizing the committee; I appreciate its task.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, if this matter does not go in in the Senate, I certainly hope that everyone who asks for an increase will exercise discretion, because I am sure if they do not exercise discretion the conferees are liable to turn them all down.

Mr. BLAND. I simply ask that it be given full consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it is necessary in arriving at the best economy, the important thing is the selection of the items where economies are effected. This particular item, it occurs to me, involves the very foundation of the work of the Fisheries and Wildlife Service and if economies are necessary I think they might come from some other item.

Mr. BLAND. This is a highly important item.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question?

Mr. BLAND. I gladly yield for that purpose.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois where we are going to draw the line.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a matter for the subcommittee to determine, after it has heard the justification for the items.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right, but this is one of the border line cases.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The determination rests with the committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Just as in the selective service.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. It is quite a problem.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, the fishing industry has been asked to produce some 6,000,000,000 pounds of fish and fishery products during 1943 as its contribution to the war effort. The highest peacetime production has been about 5,000,000,000 pounds, with production during recent years ranging between three and one-half and four billion pounds.

The Department of the Interior has been given the responsibility for fish production in the war food program and of coordinating the activities of all war agencies affecting fisheries. In this work the Division of Fishery Industries is the focal point for basic information regarding the commercial fishing industry; thus the Nation's wartime food program, insofar as it pertains to fish and fishery products, is influenced by the functions performed by this small but essential unit.

The Appropriations Committee has recommended a reduction of $68,540 in the item for fishery industries in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill for 1944. This represents a 35 percent cut below the Budget estimate and strikes at the heart of the Nation's wartime fishery program since the major portion of these funds are used for the employment of highly specialized fishery experts.

It is with this appropriation that the Government maintains a record of some 37,500 fishing vessels of the commercial fishery and provides the basis for the withdrawal and return of fishing craft by the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and War Shipping Administration.

It is with this appropriation that the Government maintains record of the some one hundred and thirty thousand fishermen in our commercial fisheries, providing data for the War Manpower Commission, Selective Service, and United States Employment Service.

It is with this appropriation that the Government maintains record of the production and prices of fishery products for guidance in allocating food for military, lend-lease, and civilian needs, and for establishment of price ceilings.

It is with this appropriation that the Government obtains data on the materials and equipment requirements of the fishing industry for guidance in the allocation of essential materials and equipment to an industry vital to the war program.

It is with this appropriation that the Government obtains data to guide the fishing industry in the care and more effective use of its fishing gear.

It is with this appropriation that the Government obtains information necessary in guiding the Nation in making adjustment to wartime food shortages.

It is with this appropriation that the Government obtains the necessary technological information to guide the fishing industry in obtaining more efficient and effective utilization of its products during wartime.

It is with this appropriation that the Government obtains necessary information on the nutritive value of fishery products and recommends the best methods of preparation so as to conserve nutritional properties in a diet being affected by war.

Knowing first-hand the importance of the work coming under this item, I am convinced that inadvertently a mistake has been made in reducing this item. I note that, commenting upon the appropriation for the Fish and Wildlife Service, the subcommittee, on page 15 of the report, says:

> In considering estimates for this activity the committee for the second consecutive year was faced with the necessity of making deductions in many deserving and valuable projects which are not related to the war. It is hoped that many of them may be restored to their former level when the existing emergency has passed.

The entire amount of $193,540 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget is used exclusively to carry on the Government's fish-production program. It is an essential part of our war food program, the fisheries being one of the principal sources of vital protein foods needed by our soldiers and sailors on the battle fronts, by our allies, and by our people at home.

In view of the serious effect the reduction in the item for fishery industries would have on functions so essential to the Nation's war program, I hope that the amount of the item be restored to the Budget estimate. I realize that there is no opportunity now for the subcommittee to consider the full effect of this reduc-

tion. I am hoping that the Senate will restore the item and that the subcommittee in conference will accept the item.

Much of the attention of Congress has recently been centered on the food situation. The Nation's fisheries are of vital importance, both as a source of food and of other products essential to the prosecution of the war. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has given close attention to fishery problems for many years, and it is intensifying its study of these problems under the guidance of its subcommittee on fisheries, which consists of Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON of Florida; Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD of Texas; Hon. JAMES DOMENGEAUX, Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON, Hon. CECIL R. KING, Hon. FRANCIS D. CULKIN, Hon. FRED BRADLEY of Michigan, Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH of Wisconsin, and Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL of Ohio.

Our fisheries have never been organized. The truth is that the various groups are distinctly individualistic, and there is lacking that unity of effort which is essential to a satisfactory solution of existing problems.

The Coordinator of Fisheries, Mr. Harold Ickes, has issued a statement to the effect that although the production goal for our fisheries has been set for 1943 at an all-time high, the best information is that the catch will not be greater than 3,650,000,000 pounds. This is 2,000,000,000 pounds less than we will require. The industry must find the remedy.

It may be reasonably assumed that the fish may be caught if the fishing industry has the boats and the manpower with which to do the catching, and if the labor and equipment to process the catch can be found.

There are very many disturbing factors in the present situation. One of these is that hundreds of vessels, including a very large percentage of the most efficient deep water craft, have been taken over by the armed services. Every boat taken over has meant that much less production. There has been enacted into law H. R. 2238, which it is hoped will facilitate the return to private ownership for fishing purposes of some of the fishing vessels and similar craft that have been acquired by the United States and other vessels adaptable to the fisheries. It was realized that the withdrawal of vessels from the fisheries had meant a curtailment in the catch and the need to implement the fisheries with whatever equipment can now be made available is obvious. Secretary Ickes and Admiral Land recommended the passage of the legislation.

Appearing in support of the bill, and speaking of the efforts of the Coordinator of Fisheries, Mr. Charles E. Jackson, Deputy Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, said:

> Without floating equipment it is impossible for the fishing industry to produce. This is borne out by the fact that in a single year's time the production of fish dropped from 4,900,000,000 in 1941 to 3,700,000,000 pounds in 1942, a drop of approximately 25 percent. It was not until toward the end of 1942 that the drain of manpower from the fishing industry further seriously curtailed production. The industry today is faced with two serious problems; first, the shortage of floating equipment, and, second, the reduction in manpower. The Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries has been working on these two major problems since the very beginning of the war.
>
> Little success was obtained in the early part of the war in securing the return of vessels, the military situation being such that floating equipment simply could not be returned to the fishing industry. In the last few months, however, the situation has improved materially. On last October 30 the War Shipping Administration wrote the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries, advising that as of that date the War Shipping Administration would submit all requests for fishery floating equipment to the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries for it to pass on. This policy has consistently been followed, and only a few fishing vessels have been taken out of the fishery. These few were not suitable for fishing or had not been engaged in fishing for a number of years. The Army, Navy, and Coast Guard have gradually shifted their demands so that needed vessels are recruited from sources other than the fisheries.
>
> Such a serious situation with regard to floating equipment for the production of Alaska salmon was confronting the industry for the coming season that the Secretary of the Interior directed a letter to the Secretary of War on January 18, 1943, a copy of which is submitted for the record, together with a copy of the reply from the Secretary of War of January 25, both of which are self-explanatory. Suffice it to say that the War Department is cooperating in every way with the Coordinator of Fisheries and the War Shipping Administration to supply sufficient floating equipment to obtain the maximum production of Alaska salmon this coming season.
>
> In a coordinated plan, the War Shipping Administration, the Army, the Navy, and the Coordinator of Fisheries have gradually undertaken a program of returning vessels and floating equipment to the fishing industry. It is not difficult to return those vessels that were taken on a charter basis, but in those cases where fishing vessels have been purchased outright it is impossible under present laws to return these vessels to the original owners. The legislation proposed here is designed to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. Jackson also testified that in order to expedite the return of fishing craft to the fishing industry, the War Shipping Administration had arranged with the Navy to set up a committee composed of a naval officer, a representative of the War Shipping Administration and the Coordinator of Fisheries to proceed to the various naval districts for the purpose of working out an arrangement with the commandants of the naval districts to release the fishing vessels. Mr. Jackson said that this committee was then, March 18, 1943, on the west coast.

Another disturbing factor in the fishery situation is that until recently the Selective Service System did not regard fishing as an essential occupation and consequently many of the best fishermen were drafted. It takes time and experience to make a good fisherman, and the removal of skilled captains and engineers has been a blow to the industry at many points. I hope that this will be rectified.

Another disturbing factor has been and is that wages and salaries in industrial plants doing war work have attracted hundreds of men and women who formerly helped to process and handle fish products.

It is also feared that either entire or partial restrictions imposed on many productive areas may contribute to a shortage.

Other factors enter. Rope, twine, and netting are essential to fishing and are difficult to obtain. Food rationing detains many boats in port because of the difficulty of obtaining sufficient points to supply the food these men need at sea. It must be realized by those administering food priorities that if adequate supplies of fish are to be caught, these obstacles must be removed. It is of paramount importance that those agencies which have placed restrictions on the fishing industry should remove them at once. The removal of present handicaps will result in immediate increased production. Sympathetic consideration is being given to these problems by those who have them in charge and it is hoped they may be solved.

It is becoming increasingly obvious to all that if we are to have sufficient food for our armed services, for our allies, and for our own people we cannot neglect this vital industry. The importance of the fisheries in the war effort becomes clear when we recall that fishery products rank fifth in the essential food list besides supplying vitamins, oils, and fish meal byproducts for livestock and poultry feeds. During 1941, 4,900,000,000 pounds of fish were sold through commercial channels for human consumption and for industrial uses, while more than 12,000,000 sport fishermen took with hook and line and consumed at home, or gave to their friends, another 300,000,000 pounds of nutritious fresh-water fish.

Fish utilization has been increased. Some personnel have been assigned to the task of developing uses for fishery products not now popular as food on American markets. There has been developed from menhaden, a canned food product. Menhaden were formerly used only for making fertilizer and oils. This new use should result in the production of 15 to 20 million pounds of food for domestic and export use. A total of 150,000,000 pounds of new sea-food products can be made available next year as a result of developing methods of utilizing common sea mussels, never before marketed in the United States in commercial quantities, but long popular in European countries. I am informed that, based on the work of the Fish and Wildlife Service, approximately 10,000,000 pounds of the common fresh-water smelts of the Great Lakes for which there was formerly a very limited market, will go to the armed services and civilian trade for the first time. More than 200,000 pounds of fillets from the Great Lakes herring are now being marketed for the first time, and this yield can be increased materially in the future. Similar studies may result in great new quantities of clams, of carp, and of other species being used as food to serve the United States and for lend-lease.

The Fish and Wildlife Service reports that the fish hatchery program has been

realined to produce more food fishes for the duration and that the soil and water conservation programs of recent years have been responsible for the construction of thousands of new ponds that can produce an estimated 100,000,000 pounds of pan and game fish after stocking.

The Fish and Wildlife Service also reports that in order to provide essential food for war purposes personnel of the Service have been loaned to friendly South and Central American republics to make surveys of their coastal fishing grounds and to assist in organizing operations to take the fish locally so as to reduce long, expensive shipments of cured fishes from distant waters. These surveys have been made in the Caribbean, in Mexico, the British West Indies, in waters of the Pacific off Peru, and within the past 60 days, of the South Pacific where our troops are now fighting.

The situation demands organization and cooperation between individuals, local groups, State associations, the State officials, and the Federal officials. By intelligent cooperation and organization far more can be accomplished in the future than in the past. One thing needed to be learned by all groups of fishermen in the United States is that "In unity there is strength."

For more than 25 years I have been a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. During all of that time, I have been peculiarly interested as the fishing industry is the most important in my district.

It is gratifying for me to report that there is a greater manifestation of interest shown in the fisheries by the Department of the Interior and the Fish and Wildlife Service than ever before in the period of my service.

Recently, Secretary Ickes, head of the Department of the Interior, appeared before the committee and discussed its problems. Secretary Ickes manifested a comprehensive and keen interest in the fisheries and a knowledge of fishery problems, which in my opinion promises well for the future. Certainly, it is a much greater interest than has ever been shown before, for during my 25 years of service, this is the first time that the Secretary of a Department having jurisdiction over the fisheries has appeared to discuss the problems of the fisheries, and its related industries.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 2 words.

Mr. Chairman, I am addressing my remarks principally to the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma. I note that the bill provides a total of $15,118,500 for reclamation purposes, which is a reduction of $74,554,770 from the 1943 appropriation and $5,636,200 less than the Budget estimates. Of course, this can mean but one thing, and that is that many of our reclamation projects that are in the course of development in such States as my own will have to be stopped. I cannot understand why the War Production Board has stopped the construction of many of these works.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of the $5,200,000 to which the gentleman refers, $4,000,000 was cut out of the Central Valley projects, so that the other reclamation projects are cut but very little.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course that applies only to the reduction in Budget estimate. May I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma this? Do I correctly understand that all work has been stopped by the War Production Board on the reclamation projects, except in minor matters, unless priorities are secured from the War Production Board for the necessary materials with which to complete these projects?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that he is correct. Of course, $55,650,000 is carried over in the reclamation fund, and then there is some money in the general funds. It would not stop all the reclamation projects, but it would stop some of them, and certainly would slow up many others. On the other hand, the War Production Board issues its stop orders, and during this emergency it is supreme and there is just nothing that our committee or this House can do about it until those stop orders have been suspended. As I said in my opening remarks, I hope they will be suspended within a few days or a few weeks.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I regret very much that funds are not provided in the bill to carry on the development of what is known as Buffalo Rapids No. 2 in eastern Montana. It is a pumping project on the Yellowstone River.

Buffalo Rapids No. 2 is under construction. No. 1 has already been constructed. It is a water conservation and utilization development where labor was contributed by the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps. Of course, since the C. C. C. and W. P. A. folded up we now have a camp consisting of 150 men, what we call a conscientious objector's camp, and they work on this project. This project is just about two-thirds completed.

The construction of Buffalo Rapids No. 1 has been completed and the project turned over to the Department of Agriculture, which under the water conservation and utilization law will supervise its operation. No. 2 is two-thirds completed.

The two projects can bring 8,100 acres under irrigation in 1943, in addition to the 12,000 acres now under ditches, and 6,800 acres in 1944.

Now, the amount of steel required to complete these undertakings is insignificant, 31 tons in 1943 and 100 tons in 1944. From this small expenditure we would reap 40,350 tons of alfalfa in 1944, and 80,700 tons in 1945, which is important to the livestock industry in that section of my State.

It will require $345,000 from the Department of Agriculture and $515,000 from the Bureau of Reclamation to complete this project.

Also there is the Canyon Ferry project. I am going to give a brief outline of this project. It is over in the First District, and my understanding is that this proposed Canyon Ferry project will bring a supplemental supply of water by 1945 for 50,000 acres now periodically affected by water shortages. When fully developed it will irrigate 300,000 acres of new land and provide a partial supply of water to an additional 150,000 acres, plus generating 35,000 kilowatts of power. Through its power plant and regulation of the river for the benefit of power developments downstream, the output of electrical energy along the river will be ultimately increased by 150,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year.

This is a pretty big project. It is on the Missouri River.

The area in which the Canyon Ferry development will be constructed is already settled, having a farm population of 42,000 people, and an annual crop production of $9,500,000. The power development would be deferred.

On the additional 50,000 acres to be provided supplemental water by 1945 could be grown 50,000 tons of alfalfa, 1,000,000 bushels of potatoes and 112,500 hundred-pound sacks of dry edible beans.

During 1943 the construction would require 300 tons of steel. The new facilities needed for irrigation would cost about $8,749,000. The cost of the power plant and transmission lines, to be constructed later, is estimated at $2,655,000.

Now, there is another project known as the Missoula Valley development, near the city of Missoula, Mont. This is also over in the other district. But I understand it is a distinctly worth-while undertaking.

The Missoula Valley development near the city of Missoula in western Montana and the Bonanza and N-Bar-N projects in northeastern Montana are water conservation and utilization projects where investigations have been completed and work could be begun promptly. They are small undertakings and under an accelerated program could be completed within 1 or 2 years.

Now, to complete the Missoula Valley project would require but 17 tons of steel in 1943 and 60 tons in 1944; again, relatively small amounts. The completed facilities will water 2,100 acres of land by 1944, on which can be grown 9,450 tons of alfalfa in 1944. The estimated cost of the project is $360,000.

Only 21 tons of steel in 1943 and 26 tons in 1944 are required to complete the Bonanza development of 910 acres. The construction costs would total $75,000.

Then, we have what is known as the N-Bar-N project at a cost of $500,000, located below Fort Peck. This project would consume only 55 tons of steel in 1943, 200 tons in 1944, and 100 tons in 1945, and bring in 1,000 acres of new land in 1944, and 6,380 acres in 1945. Livestock in this area would be fed 12,720 additional tons of alfalfa that can be grown there by 1945.

In addition to the projects included in the program, I wish to call the Committee's attention to the need for work to improve the Milk River and Sun River projects in my State to prevent crop loss and to restore to productivity areas damaged by drainage. Only small amounts of material would be required.

The wood-stave Pishkin Canal siphon crossing of the Sun River development is in extremely poor condition and must be replaced with a steel conduit. The construction, estimated to cost $50,000, would provide a greater water supply and remove the hazard of a serious crop loss through a system failure.

It is also urgent that drainage of Greenfield Lake on this project, which has been rising steadily with run-off water from increased irrigated acreage, be provided. The development will restore to agricultural use considerable lake-shore land and will remove a seepage threat from adjacent and somewhat higher lands. An appropriation of $40,000 is required. About $100,000 will be needed to continue the present drainage program of the Sun River project, where seepage has been increasing steadily as more land is irrigated.

The Milk River project is also affected by a major drainage problem. About 3,200 acres of the Fort Belknap irrigation district of the Chinook division has been taken out of production as a result of seepage. Drainage of this idle land, capable of producing as good crops as any land in northern Montana, is essential if the district is to survive. Much of the area is only slightly affected and can be placed in production immediately. The cost of this improvement is about $100,000.

The Montana areas in which there are investigations yet to be completed are the Bitter Root, Marias, the Yellowstone, Big Horn, and Powder River, the Kalispell, Milk River, and Sweetgrass. In connection with the Yellowstone River survey, there is the Laurel-Park City area where an important agricultural section needs attention.

The construction or completion of these various projects would require very little steel, yet we were unable to secure such priorities. I repeat again that this is a mighty short-sighted policy of the War Production Board and the O. P. A. That there is a shortage of food no one will deny, and it is going to get mighty keen before this emergency is over. Already we are told that there are many places where the farmers are flooded out.

Along the main stem of the Missouri River from Fort Peck to Kansas City over 800,000 acres have been flooded out. The number of acres would run into millions if we take into account the flooded acres along the tributaries which flow into the Missouri River.

In other places they are being frozen out by late frost and snows. In my own State my understanding is that 45 percent of the fall wheat crop has been already destroyed. It is impossible to predict just what is going to happen.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Did the gentleman take up any of those projects with the War Production Board?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I did, and I could not get any priority either, so I am not blaming the committee. But I am pointing out that it is a mighty short-sighted policy. I do not care whether it comes from the War Production Board, or where. We must have food in this country.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Our committee has been very sympathetic with reclamation projects, but under the circumstances the committee could not recommend an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I say to my distinguished colleague from New York that I have pointed out to my friends in the West that the West has no better friend than the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK]. He has always been a supporter of our reclamation projects. We appreciate the splendid work he has done. As a matter of fact, we appreciate all the members of this committee, and in fact all the members of the Committee on Appropriations, because they have treated us very fine in the past. But whether this policy is a War Production Board policy or not I do not care. I repeat that it is a short-sighted policy. If they do not change their ways, we may find ourselves short of food right here in this country in the not very far distant future.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I should like to have the chairman of the subcommittee make an explanation as to why the Central Valley project in California is receiving an appropriation here of $11,000,000. If all the other reclamation projects have been eliminated, why has this been left in the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that that is obvious. The War Production Board has lifted the stoppages on this particular project. A representative of the War Production Board appeared before our committee and urged that this item be included. It was stated that they were giving very serious consideration to other items. We are hopeful that the stop orders will be canceled against many of the other projects.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. So the War Production Board is granting priorities in this particular case?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. May I ask the subcommittee if it investigated priorities and releases of material now being made by the War Production Board to build reclamation projects in South America and Africa, at a time when they deny them in this country?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That was entirely without our province. Our committee could not investigate a matter of that kind.

Mr. CURTIS. It is taking place, though, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

THE AMAZING AND INCREDIBLE SHIPSHAW TRANSACTION

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

DENIAL OF PRIORITIES TO AMERICAN PROJECTS CONTRASTED WITH WAR PRODUCTION BOARD TREATMENT OF SHIPSHAW OF CANADA

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, because of the question propounded by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] just a moment ago and because in the minds of many of the Members there is some doubt about this granting of priorities to plants outside of the United States and the denial of priorities to plants in this country, I take this time to discuss the matter in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill. I direct your attention to page 486 of the hearings under the title "Loan to the Aluminum Co. of Canada," wherein will be found a very illuminating discussion by the distinguished members of the committee with Dr. Paul Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE EXHIBITED COMMENDABLE SKEPTICISM OF SHIPSHAW

In that section of the hearings there are statements made by the members of the subcommittee who participated, questioning the advisability of the War Production Board granting at times higher priorities to the Shipshaw project on the Saguenay River in the Dominion of Canada, than to power projects in the United States. I have introduced a resolution in this Congress seeking to have the transactions making that development possible, and similar transactions investigated. House Resolution 212, to investigate the supplying of equipment and facilities for furnishing electric power and energy for war purposes, is now pending before the Committee on Rules.

WE UNDERWROTE SHIPSHAW

Let me give you briefly the history of this Shipshaw scandal. The whole thing was kept very secret until this year, approximately 2 years after the first agreements were entered into between Metals Reserve Company of the United States and the Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd. The New York Times on January 31 gave the first public intimation that the United States Government was financing a branch of the Aluminum Trust in Canada. I quote from the New York Times:

> Not the least amazing thing about it is that it is already paid for. The $65,900,000 cost of the new plant was financed by the

Aluminum Co. of Canada out of contracts for sales of aluminum to Britain and to the United States, which were in some measure paid for in advance so as to encourage this enormous new power development so essential to war.

NO INTEREST ASKED ON LOAN TO CANADIAN PLANT

By a series of four contracts, two in 1941, two in 1942, Metals Reserve Company of the United States, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, advanced $68,500,000 to the Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd. That money was an advance payment on 1,370,000,000 pounds of aluminum to be delivered by the end of 1945. The first two contracts provided for interest to be paid on the advance until it was amortized by the delivery of aluminum. That is the usual procedure. The 1942 contracts, however, provided that, not only would no interest be paid on additional advances provided for therein, but that interest already paid on the first advances would be returned. In other words, the end result was that $68,500,000 was advanced the Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd., without interest at all.

SHIPSHAW A SECRET UNTIL RECENTLY

In October 1941 construction began on the Shipshaw power development in Canada. As I have pointed out, it was kept very secret until recently. The project will have cost $65,900,000 when it is completed in November of this year. In other words, our advance payment completely covered the cost of that power development.

WHY CODDLE THE ALUMINUM TRUST?

The Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd., is controlled by exactly the same interests as control the Aluminum Co. of America. They are both part of the international Aluminum Trust, with I. G. Farbenindustrie of Germany. The Canadian branch was established in 1928 by the American company as "Aluminium, Ltd." to develop certain properties of the Aluminum Co. of America. The Aluminum Co. of Canada is a wholly owned subsidiary of Aluminium, Ltd. May I quote from page 2725 of the Canadian House of Commons debate of May 14, 1943, on this matter:

The Canadian company obviously was organized originally as a separate corporation to escape the United States antitrust laws in order that this company might be able to play its part in the international cartel, whose agreements restricted production in the democratic countries and allowed Germany greatly to expand her aluminum production before the war.

A HIGHLY DUBIOUS POLICY

The United States has financed, interest free, a power project for this international cartel, which will enable it to produce aluminum in such quantities and at such a low price as completely to prevent light-metals production in competition anywhere in the world.

WE SUPPLIED CRITICAL MATERIALS AS WELL AS MONEY

The financing of this project by an American agency is a disgrace in itself. That is, however, by no means the end of the story. Materials for the construction of this Canadian project were sent from the United States. The War Production Board has admitted that shafts and certain other items were sent to Shipshaw. Power projects in this country vitally needed the same materials. It is claimed that most of the fabrication for Shipshaw was done in Canada by Canadian firms. It develops, however, that those Canadian firms are Canadian subsidiaries of American firms—Canadian General Electric, Canadian Westinghouse, Canadian Allis-Chalmers, and so forth. I have reason to believe that these Canadian plants are not capable of building the large fabrications required for this huge project. How much material was fabricated here in American plants and merely distributed through the Canadian subsidiaries?

POWER PROJECTS HERE WERE STOPPED WHILE THIS GREAT CANADIAN ENTERPRISE WAS GIVEN ALL HELP

While we were helping build Shipshaw, the erection of power projects in the United States was being stopped by War Production Board, which denied priorities sufficient to enable them to go into the oper market and secure the material with which to carry on. I have here a description of many of the projects in the United States against which the Board issued stop orders.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes.

Mr. OUTLAND. Was not one of the projects stopped the Central Valley project?

CALIFORNIA POWER PROJECTS AFFECTED ADVERSELY

Mr. COFFEE. Yes. And the need for power in that area is particularly acute because of the fuel-oil shortage. At Keswick Dam, three 25,000 kilowatt units were cut out by W. P. B. stop order. At Shasta Dam, unit No. 5, with 75,000 kilowatt planned capacity, was also stopped. These units, if they were all allowed to go to completion, would replace annually about 2,000,000 barrels of fuel oil now being used to run steam-generating plants. There is a tight oil situation in that area now, which development of hydro power projects would greatly relieve. When the major emphasis of this war shifts to the Pacific, as it must if we are ever to defeat Japan, the situation will be a great deal tighter. As a matter of fact, it has been suggested that with increased demand for oil for fighting craft in the Pacific, it may be necessary to shut down war production plants in California now using oil.

Yet construction of these hydro plants in California was stopped while construction of the Shipshaw project in Canada went on.

These California plants were not to be used for power alone. If completed, they would have enabled supplemental irrigation water to be furnished to 2,000,000 acres of land. That land is not now growing food at top capacity.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. I call attention to the fact that that stop order was only partially issued.

Mr. COFFEE. That is correct. Construction was allowed to go on under low priorities on facilities for fish protection and that sort of thing. The generating units I've mentioned were not allowed to go to completion, however.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr' COFFEE. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. And is the Grand Coulee project not one of them also?

GRAND COULEE HELD UP

Mr. COFFEE. Yes. Construction of generating units 7, 8, and 9 was stopped. At Grand Coulee, a dam and a powerhouse are already built to hold these three new generating units. Their construction has been authorized by Congress, and shafts for two units were nearly completed when their construction was stopped last year. Each unit had a rated capacity of 108,000 kilowatts. All existing capacity is now being used and new loads are being located in the area.

SHIPSHAW ADVANCES WHILE GRAND COULEE IS ORDERED TO STAND STILL

I have the names of the companies, where generator shafts were being manufactured for Grand Coulee, before the order went out to take them out of production. Shafts for Grand Coulee Units 7 and 8 were taken out of the production schedules of the Mesta Machine Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., after some work had been done on them. Why were they removed from the production schedules of one of the few machine shops in the country capable of handling such large shafts? Presumably because of a shortage of critical materials. Yet a letter from Hon. Donald M. Nelson, chairman of the War Production Board, answering some questions I asked him, admits that shafts for generators and turbines at Shipshaw were put in the production schedules of Camden Forge Co. and the Midvale Co. in the United States.

Power engineers say that shafts are the bottleneck in power plant construction. Every shaft sent to the Shipshaw project, owned by the Aluminum Trust, meant one less shaft for badly needed projects in this country, Government owned, and privately owned.

Not only were production schedules shifted around, but priorities higher than those for power projects in this country were given to materials to go to Shipshaw. Mr. Nelson, in his letter to me, says this "was part of the uprating to AA-1 of the entire aluminum program." Why were materials meant for this power project in Canada considered more a part of the aluminum program than materials going to power projects in this country, equally vital to aluminum production?

GRADES IN PRIORITIES

Nelson's letter belittles the amount of materials given high ratings and sent to Shipshaw. As a matter of fact, at the time that the blanket priority for the power program was AA-3, men within the Power Branch of the War Production Board itself expressed great concern for the completion of the scheduled projects on time, if the policy of giving higher priorities to certain projects were

continued and allowed to interfere with regular production schedules. All assurances given to the President and to the Secretary of War, and others, as to the adequacy of our war power supply, were based on the assumption that all projects scheduled for completion would be completed on time. Uprating of particular units was interfering with the schedules. It would seem that not only did materials go to Shipshaw, but the uprating of Shipshaw construction in this country interfered directly with our own war power program.

STOPPAGE OF GRAND COULEE CONSTRUCTION HAS GREATLY INTERFERED WITH OUR WAR POWER PROGRAM

Mr. ANGELL. And is it not a fact also that they are in need of additional power in that area—I mean the Pacific Northwest—where 30 percent of the aluminum will be manufactured?

Mr. COFFEE. The gentleman is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, the situation is too tight right now, that with a dry year, war plants may have to cut down.

DAVIS PROJECT DISCRIMINATED AGAINST

Mr. MURDOCK. Can the gentleman say whether the Davis project in Colorado was also one of those against which a stop order was issued?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes. I have a complete break-down of the whole proposition. Davis Dam, which would have an initial installation of 180,000 kilowatts which would have augmented the supply of power in southern California, southern Nevada, and Arizona, where large war plants are located, was not allowed to go to completion. Congress had appropriated $8,000,000 for construction which was proceeding under low priorities. By a stop order, the project was abandoned and must, in the future, start from scratch. Yet, as I have pointed out, materials, time, and manpower went into the construction of shafts and forgings for Shipshaw in Canada.

OTHER AMERICAN ENTERPRISES DENIED PRIORITIES

I could enumerate many more projects that have been stopped while construction of Shipshaw went on. Work on the Colorado-Big Thompson project on the Continental Divide has been stopped. The power plants originally to be built would have generated a total of 103,000 kilowatts. Work on the third generating unit of Douglas Dam and the third generating unit at Cherokee Dam, both in east Tennessee—part of the T. V. A.—was stopped in December of last year. Each unit would have had 30,000 kilowatts capacity.

Smaller power projects all over the country, serving Army camps, or small communities, or rural electric cooperatives, have not been allowed to go to completion. Some of them lack only small amounts of steel or fabrications.

These are mentioned because they are pertinent to the Interior Department appropriation bill, because the subcommittee manifested an interest in the fact that we have for some peculiar reason sent materials, under high priorities, to this project in Canada while our own projects are being cut out.

What I say here I do not want to be construed in any sense as reflecting upon our good ally, one of the United Nations, the Dominion of Canada. There have been heated discussions in the Canadian Parliament on Thursday and Friday of last week, on this same matter. The matter has been discussed in the Canadian press. The Canadians are not sold on this deal any more than we are. They do not like the war emergency to be used as an excuse for giving the international aluminum trust a power project that will enable it to control the aluminum market after this war.

CANADIAN MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT DENOUNCES SHIPSHAW FINANCING METHODS

Let me quote from a speech the Honorable M. J. Coldwell, M. P., made in the Canadian House of Commons on May 14. This will indicate how Canadians feel about this project:

On March 23 the Minister of Munitions and Supply said that in the dim and distant future the Aluminum Co. may obtain some benefit from the Shipshaw development and there may be some post-war value in it for them. I say that these powerful aluminum interests have obtained in effect the greatest power resources at present available in the world, virtually as a gift; and thus they can, if they will, effectively block, in Ontario and New York State and eastern North America as well, any government-owned public power development because their plant will be paid for during the war, and any plant which the Province of Ontario or the government of New York State, or the Government of Canada or that of the United States, or both, may wish to build, will have to be paid for over a period of years. Not only that, but they will be able, through the cheapness of power, to control the price of aluminum almost everywhere on earth, and when we realize that we are entering upon an age of light metals and that they have entered into the field of magnesium production as well, we can understand how dangerous a monopoly we are building up by our public funds and war activities in this country.

I wish I had time to go into all the details with reference to this project. I have spent considerable time in attempting to ferret out all the facts.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I want to compliment the gentleman for calling this to the attention of the House, and remind him that when we passed the reciprocal trade agreements we placed an amendment in that bill this year urging the President to take cognizance of these cartel arrangements which threaten every business interest in our Nation. It is time that our Nation stopped and considered what is happening to it under these cartel arrangements.

INTERNATIONAL CARTELS ARE INDEFENSIBLE

Mr. COFFEE. I thank the gentleman for bringing up this matter of cartel arrangements. It is part of this whole situation I am bringing to your attention today. In January of 1941 a Federal grand jury brought in indictments against the Aluminum Co. of America and several other companies for conspiring and combining with the German firm, I. G. Farben Industrie, to keep the price of magnesium artificially high by restricting production. Magnesium is a lighter metal than aluminum. The two metals together make a very strong alloy used in the construction of airplanes. Aluminum Co. of America (Alcoa) and these other companies conspired to prevent the proper development of our light metals program.

As I have pointed out, the Aluminum Co. of America and the Aluminum Co. of Canada are controlled by the same interests. They are the two biggest branches of the International Aluminum Trust. Is this most recent transaction another big step toward complete monopolization of the light metals market of the world? That is exactly what it is.

CANADIANS WAKING UP TO THE IMPLICATIONS OF SHIPSHAW

I should like to discuss the way the Canadian Government has been taken in on this deal. That is, of course, a matter for the Canadian Government to investigate, if it sees fit, but I think it should be brought up here just to emphasize the fact that the investigation I am urging is not, by any stretch of the imagination, meant as a reflection on our good neighbor and ally, Canada. As a matter of fact, you will find that some gentlemen in the Canadian House of Commons have already indicated a desire to have this whole thing investigated from their side of the border.

I think I may conclusively demonstrate the benefits the aluminum trust has gained in agreements with the Canadian Government, by quoting rather extensively from remarks by Hon. M. J. Coldwell, whom I have quoted before:

It is to this giant corporation that the governments concerned have given or advanced hundreds of millions of dollars to enable them to build a huge plant at Shipshaw and to expand their aluminum monopoly. How was this huge expansion financed? This is where we enter more directly into the provisions of the bill we are now discussing. Part of Canada's contribution, although not all, is covered by P. C. 11745, which provides for a special write-off or accelerated depreciation of $154,500,000 * * *. I have the prospectus of the company, and it has the following to say about Canada's contribution:

"Normally such capital expenditures for plant additions are written off for tax purposes over a period of years. In order to give effect to the fundamental basis of the contracts, permission has been granted the company to amortize these capital expenditures by a special deduction from income at a stipulated rate per pound of all aluminum delivered, * * * the effect being to amortize the estimated cost of the additional aluminum producing facilities and 60 percent of the estimated cost of the additional power facilities by the time all deliveries have been made under the war contracts."

A GREAT CANADIAN STATESMAN FEARLESSLY EXPOSES SLIMY RECORD OF SHIPSHAW

Mr. Coldwell then goes on to discuss some other projects of this company, Aluminum Co. of Canada, costs of which have been written off by accelerated depreciation. He concludes:

It seems to me therefore that the total is not $154,500,000, as we were told in the house this year, but nearer to $175,000,000.

A STRANGE OFFERING OF ALUMINUM TRUST SECURITIES

The prospectus from which Mr. Coldwell quotes is the prospectus of the Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd., published in conjunction with the issuance of $15,000,000 preferred stock. Mr. Coldwell discusses this stock issue:

Why are the preference shares being offered now for the first time in the company's history? * * * I am advised by people who have made inquiries that if one wants to get preferred shares the limit is 25 shares. Why? Because they want to give the small investor a chance to get in first, they say. In my opinion what they really wish to do is to spread some of the preferred shares over the country in order that there will be public opinion favorable to the aluminum company. That is a trick of utility corporations everywhere.

I might point out that the prospectus mentioned above, says, on the front cover:

This prospectus is not, and under no circumstances is to be, construed as, an offering of any of this issue for sale in the United States of America or the territories or possessions thereof, or an offering to any resident thereof or a solicitation therein of an offer to buy any of this issue.

That is very clear is it not? Why does the company not want shares sold in the United States? Because then the company would come under the prying eyes of the Securities and Exchange Commission of the United States. It evidently does not want that.

WHY SHOULD UNCLE SAM FINANCE THE ALUMINUM TRUST?

We can see from this little bit of information I have given the House this afternoon, some of the ramifications of this huge advance the United States has given to the Aluminum Trust. We can see some of its effects upon our war power program now, and on our light metals development program. We can see its probable effects on the light metals market after the war. We can see its effect on any further power development in the St Lawrence region of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this whole matter should be investigated by Congress in the interests of effective prosecution of the war, and in the interests of proper development of the natural resources of this country when the war is over. House Resolution 212 provides for the establishment of an investigatory committee to do just this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. First, I want to compliment this committee for the statesmanlike job they have done in matters of wartime economy concerning progress very close to my own heart.

Secondly, I would like to talk about the Columbia River which enters the United States in my own State and travels to the sea. It never leaves the State of Washington. During that travel it falls hundreds of feet, and constitutes, to my knowledge, today the greatest single source of water power in the Western Hemisphere.

When we speak of water power in the United States it might be wise for us to realize that nearly 40 percent of all the water power is to be found in the State of Washington. We have there, when we shall have fully developed all the water power possible in the State of Washington, nearly 50,000,000 horsepower. I mention this for only one reason. When we speak of developing our water power as a national resource; when we speak of our national investments in water power; when we speak of that investment as an obligation against our national integrity, let us remember that to liquidate that obligation will require the sweat and purpose of the people who will live near our rivers, those who use that water power to create useful things for the rest of the Nation. Specifically, in the case of the Columbia River, it will be paid for through the service that the people whom I now represent can render to the rest of the Nation. We should not forget that. In any bill, such as the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has introduced today, which would allow Federal jurisdiction over that vast amount of water power, out there along the Columbia and elsewhere in the Nation, we should not lose sight of the fact that those people should be allowed wide latitude in the use of that water power through the trying years, the lean as well as the fat. Their voice should be dominant in matters of policy. Their continuous industry demands it. Their continuous industry spells part of our security.

I also want to compliment this committee for calling attention to the discriminatory act in the matter of the Shipshaw affair and to call the attention of this House to the printed proceedings of the committee, particularly pages 486, 487, 488, and 489, as well as the letter to be found on page 539, which is Jesse Jones' letter to Senator TRUMAN, who investigated it. It should be investigated further. If we want to have healthy international relationships it must be by open covenants openly arrived at. There is entirely too much secrecy in what is to be found in these hearings. I want to quote, if I may, something that the able chairman of your subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], said during these hearings. He said:

Referring to the story that was in the paper that morning about the Shipshaw affair, I have just heard about it. Frankly, I was not only amazed, but shocked at the story. I have known and admired Secretary Jones for many years. I have also admired his businesslike methods, as well as his quick and definite decisions. I shall, of course, not pass final judgment until I hear his side of the controversy, but the story, to say the least, calls for a clear-cut explanation, or else there must be a thorough investigation of the whole transaction.

My colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] has introduced a resolution calling for such an investigation. I believe it should be allowed to come to the floor of this House by the Rules Committee and this matter at least have some light thrown on it.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I want to compliment the gentleman for his statement and for the vigor with which, as a new Member, he is representing his district. But I also call attention to the fact that the Columbia River is not entirely in the State of Washington. It is the boundary line between Oregon and Washington, and the great Bonneville project, a portion of which lies in my district, is in the State of Oregon. I know the gentleman agrees with that.

Mr. HORAN. I want to assure my able friend, the gentleman from Oregon, that the things I said in behalf of the people of Washington I would certainly not deny to the people he represents. We can work together out there, I assure him.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, he will, of course, realize that Washington was originally part of the Oregon country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, when I asked this question about irrigation projects in foreign lands I was not aware of the facts about the Shipshaw project. It, of course, will have to stand or fall on whatever the facts are. It is alleged that the United States is now supplying materials for irrigation works in South America and Africa. If this is true, it should be stopped so long as our own projects are held in abeyance. I do not believe it is a safe proposition to turn the future of reclamation over to the War Production Board. I have the greatest respect for many of the eminent businessmen on the War Production Board; they are doing a good job; they have many problems, many things on their minds, but they are not familiar with the reclamation program. Unless someone has lived with it and has seen reclamation projects work, they do not know how vital they are to the economy of our country. As one Member of this House, I seriously object to letting the War Production Board write the ticket so far as the future development of irrigation is concerned, for the simple reason that the top-notch men down there do not know about irrigation matters. I realize, of course, that there will have to be restrictions of material, but I do say that this splendid subcommittee which has given so many hours of careful study and has been fair in its consideration of these matters in times past should continue to handle this matter. We should not make our program of appropriations dependent upon the will of any executive bureau. Personally, I hope that before this bill is sent to the White House a few changes can be made.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. The gentleman is familiar with the particular problem that affects the Great Plains States as far as irrigation projects are

concerned. I wonder if he has any thought as to what might be done to give consideration to this area by way of small projects in view of the decisions of the War Production Board?

Mr. CURTIS. Without a doubt the studies should go on. There are many projects which could be built even during wartime and which should be built. Chester Davis has made the statement that if we produced all the food possible through using every avenue of production we still would not have enough to meet the demands being made on this country. A certain amount of construction should go on as a part of the war program, but by all means a full program of studies and investigations for post-war irrigation projects should be carried on.

The gentleman is interested in the same valley I am, the Republican River and its tributaries. These projects should be advanced, for they will make a great contribution to the war effort. I want all parts of that great valley to have the benefits of flood control and irrigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that this subcommittee has been diligent and has been motivated in its activities in presenting this bill to the committee with a desire to effect savings of public funds wherever possible, particularly those which do not have to do with the prosecution of the war. However, I regret that the committee has seen fit to drastically curtail the appropriation requested by the Fish and Wildlife Service for Federal aid in wildlife restoration and for funds to permit the Fish and Wildlife Service to carry out its activities.

The total amount recommended for this service is $4,897,350, which is a reduction of $1,014,220 below the 1943 appropriation and $855,015 less than the Budget estimates.

I am a member of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources and we have held extensive hearings considering the activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service in the conservation program and particularly its functions which have to do with the furthering of our war efforts. I call the committee's attention to the testimony given by Dr. Gabrielson, who heads this department of Fish and Wildlife Service, appearing in the hearings on page 627. Here is given the evidence disclosing that this department is making an unusual contribution toward supplying the Nation with fish and game for food during this critical time.

Fishing is an essential war industry. In 1941 the commercial production of fish for food and other purposes reached an all-time high of approximately 5,000,000,000 pounds. It fell materially last year due to interference of the war in our commercial fishing efforts. The Fish and Wildlife Service reports that it could if provided with the staff and the necessary funds produce safely over 6,000,000,000 pounds of fish products in a year without depleting this resource. They estimate that there could be safely taken this year 2,000,000,000 pounds more than was taken last year. They point out that fish and wildlife constitute a resource that costs very little so far as the Federal Government is concerned and the only investment of the Federal Government for the production of this great natural resource is the funds provided to the Fish and Wildlife Service. Last year hunters alone during the open season took about 255,000,000 pounds of meat from game birds and game animals. Dr. Gabrielson points out that during the last 5 years his department has been able to take more than 50,000,000 pounds of salmon per year out of the Alaskan waters than each of the first 5 years after the passing of the 1924 act, known as the White Act, establishing a system of regulations of the commercial fisheries of Alaska. With rationing and the extreme shortage of meat we should not curtail this supply of fish and wild game.

In March of this year I asked Dr. Gabrielson to give me a short report on the activities of his department and received in reply the following letter, which I include as a part of my remarks:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
Washington, March 20, 1943

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANGELL: In accordance with our telephone conversation, I am submitting the following information concerning the activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service in connection with the fisheries and the war food program.

Normally, we have no regulatory authority over the commercial fisheries with the sole exception of that exercised with regard to the aquatic resources of the Territory of Alaska. There our jurisdiction is directly comparable to that exercised by the individual States through their State conservation authorities and organizations. Our activities with regard to the commercial fisheries carried out under authorization of organic legislation and annual appropriation acts, consists of biological investigations with a view toward recommending conservation and management measures, methods of increasing the populations, and means of restoring depleted resources; the collection and analysis of statistical information on the fisheries and its publication; the collection, compilation, and daily publication and dissemination of market news information at seven field offices in important commercial fishing regions, and technological studies to improve handling, processing, and refrigeration practices, to develop new fishery products, as well as to conduct investigations on net preservatives and improvements of fishing gear. These are the only services which the Federal Government ever has provided for the fishing industry, and in this respect the United States is far behind the other main fish-producing nations such as Great Britain, Norway, and Japan.

Even before the declaration of war we realized that some conservation of our fishery activities to an emergency basis was necessary in order that we might be able to render more effective assistance to other agencies concerned with fishery matters and production, and such conversion was undertaken as necessity demanded. Immediately upon the establishment of the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations, the War Production Board, and the Office of Price Administration, we were called upon to perform special services in order to provide these agencies with the information they needed. We have furnished these agencies regularly and promptly basic information upon which many important plans, decisions, and orders were based.

On July 21, 1942, the President signed Executive Order 9204 (7 F. R. 5657) designating the Secretary of the Interior as Coordinator of Fisheries and establishing the office of the Coordinator of Fisheries. The primary duty of this office originally was to coordinate the plans, policies, and programs of Federal and State agencies, and the commercial fishing industry in the interest of maintaining an adequate fishery production program. At the outset we found that 21 different Federal agencies were carrying on work or issuing orders that affected the fishing industry. Through work with a liaison committee composed of representatives of each of the 21 agencies, and our continuous insistence and efforts to insure that the fisheries be recognized as an important, essential, and indispensable food producing industry, we now have overcome many formerly troublesome problems and cleared away some confusing issues and uncertainties. Some examples of the type of work we have been doing will show the diverse nature of our activities:

Upon the outbreak of war the Navy, Army, and the Coast Guard began at once to purchase, requisition, or charter fishing vessels both along our coasts and in Alaska. The fleets were reduced so greatly that production of fishery products declined. By constant effort we have finally effected an arrangement whereby the armed services may not take over any fishing vessel without the approval of the office of the Coordinator of Fisheries. During recent weeks progress has been made in effecting return of purchased and requisitioned vessels to the industry.

Through our negotiations with the War Manpower Commission on the subject of occupational deferment of skilled men in the industry, Occupational Bulletins 18 and 20 recently were issued by the Director of the Selective Service System. These bulletins declare commercial fishing to be an essential war industry and list as eligible for deferment from induction men holding the majority of the important positions in the fish-producing and processing industries.

With the recent rationing of canned foods, fishing vessels began at once to experience difficulties in obtaining adequate supplies for their crews. Through work with the Office of Price Administration, amendments to General Ration Order No. 5 (institutional users) and Ration Order No. 13 (individuals) have just been issued which classify the major fishing vessels as "institutional users" and which list fishermen as eligible for supplemental supplies of rationed foods. Adequate provisioning of fishing vessels is thus assured.

The controlled materials plan soon to be substituted for the priorities system by the War Production Board, as it will affect the fishing industry, has been based on our estimates and recommendations.

Pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order 9280 (7 F. R. 10179), the Secretary of Agriculture, on February 8, 1943, issued Food Directive No. 2 (8 F. R. 1777) delegating to the Secretary of the Interior responsibility for those phases of the war food program concerned with the production and processing of fishery commodities. Prior to that time the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries served as an investigative and advisory agency, but was without any regulatory authority. Food Directive No. 2 confers authority to issue such orders as may be necessary to insure the maintenance of an adequate fishery production program. The Directive was issued by the Secretary of Agriculture because of the fact that the desired personnel and facilities for administering the production and processing phases of the war food program existed in

the Department of the Interior. The Secretary of Agriculture also recognized that utilization of these facilities instead of setting up units and personnel in his own Department for the purpose of administering the fishery program would result in greater efficiency and economy of funds and personnel. Arrangements have been perfected so that the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries, handling production and processing, works closely and in complete harmony with the Food Distribution Administration of the Department of Agriculture which is responsible for distribution of fishery products and purchases for Government requirements.

We have worked out a program designed to increase production with a view toward meeting the requirements stipulated by the Food Distribution Administration for the coming year. At the present time prospects for large increases in production are not too good because of the shortage of boats and manpower. Unless these shortages are alleviated production may fall as much as 2,000,000 pounds below the fish requirements for 1943 desired by the Army, Navy, Office of Lend-Lease Administration, other Federal agencies, and the civilian population. There are plenty of fish available and new sources have been explored successfully for producing substitute processed fishery products to compensate somewhat for the great demands for such items as canned salmon, canned sardines, and salted codfish that are in short supply.

On March 1 and 2, at the invitation of Secretary Ickes, 17 representatives of the fishing industry, labor, and consumers, met with our staff in Washington to discuss industry's problems, devise means of solving them, and to develop a practical production program for 1943-45. The meeting served to focus attention upon many important problems, facilitated exchange of information, and has led to the development of methods of offering to the industry direct assistance in meeting their problems. To accomplish the latter objective, the country has been divided into 11 principal areas and a man with the best overall knowledge and widest experience has been placed in charge of each area to serve as area coordinator. Local representatives will be stationed in the major fishing ports, under the supervision of the area coordinator, and local industry committees will be appointed soon in order that the local representatives and the area coordinator may bring into their work the benefits, advice, and collaboration in solving the industry's problems. The local committees will be especially helpful in devising means of utilizing existing facilities, equipment, and manpower to better advantage, and in some instances short-cut methods of increasing production undoubtedly may be devised.

For the first time we have the authority to set up and operate an effective fishery program The production program which has been outlined is constructive and is designed to effect healthy developments in the industry and substantial increases in yield. We are working on a 3-year program rather than a program for the present year only, inasmuch as food will be a badly needed item until long after the war. We shall have to supply food to the war-torn countries until they have had time to reestablish their own agriculture, cattle raising, dairy industries, and fishing enterprises.

The cooperative arrangement between the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture for handling the fishery war program, referred to above, is functioning efficiently. All of the most able men in both departments are hard at work and things are moving satisfactorily as never before. There appears to be no justification for disturbing the existing arrangements at the present time, especially since serious interruptions in important work and loss of valuable time are always coincident with organizational transfers and revisions.

Sincerely yours,

IRA N. GABRIELSON,
Director.

Mr. Chairman, I express the hope that the Senate will restore the appropriation requested and approved by the Bureau of the Budget and that our conferees will support the restorations when the matter is returned to the conference committee.

The committee has seen fit also, Mr. Chairman, to reduce the allowance for Federal aid in wildlife restoration. This activity is under the provisions of the Robertson-Pittman Act. In 1943 there was an appropriation of $1,250,000. The Budget estimate for 1944 is a like amount. The funds from which this appropriation is paid are provided by a special tax paid by sportsmen under the provisions of the Robertson-Pittman Act. There is at the present time over $9,000,000 in this fund. It is in the nature of a trust fund. Dr. Gabrielson testified with respect to it, hearings, page 706, as follows:

That fund, as you know, comes from a special tax on sporting arms and ammunition, the collections from which are set aside in the Treasury by act of Congress in a special fund known as the Federal aid to wildlife-restoration fund. A great many of the States have built up programs based on that act, for land purchase, and various other things that they are doing, so it would be very difficult for them if appropriations were suddenly discontinued.

The appropriation has been cut very materially, from $2,750,000 for fiscal year 1942 down to $1,250,000 for the current fiscal year, largely because the States could not continue some of the previously planned development work; but they are anxious to keep enough of this fund so that they can keep up their commitments on land acquisition and keep their key personnel now employed on essential wildlife management fact-finding work.

Under the provisions of this law the State matches funds provided by the Government, and, as Dr. Gabrielson testified, they have built up programs based on a continuing policy with the expectation of receiving their proportion of these funds.

It is not only unfair to the sportsmen who have contributed the funds, but to the States which have been induced to provide projects under the act, and they will suffer great loss if the appropriations are cut off and they are not allowed to proceed with their programs.

I include as a part of my remarks the following excerpts from the testimony and a statement presented by Dr. Gabrielson which appears in the hearings, page 707:

FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION

When this Federal aid in Wildlife restoration program started functioning almost 5 years ago, the majority of the States were badly in need of factual information on how best to manage their wildlife. This undesirable condition stemmed from the fact that funds were not available to enable them to procure such information. With funds that have been made available, the cooperators have stressed wildlife management fact-finding. The program has been highly successful and much of the success has come from the technically trained men employed as project leaders. These men have accomplished splendid results in the field of wildlife conservation and restoration by furnishing information and advice on how State wildlife resources can be increased and more effectively administered.

Wildlife populations are not static and certain species of game birds and mammals, such as ring-necked pheasants and cottontail rabbits, which have high reproduction potentialities, under favorable conditions can quickly produce populations that are capable of assuming pest proportions if they are not held in check. Likewise big game ranges must be investigated annually and their populations inventoried to ascertain whether hunting pressure must be increased or decreased in order to insure sound utilization of available ranges and the wildlife inhabiting them. Through the assembling of factual information by trained workers and the translation of that information into appropriate seasons and bag limits, perpetuation of the Nation's wildlife resources is assured, along with assurance that maximum utilization is obtained.

Outside of birds classed as migratory, in treaties with Canada and Mexico, the States are responsible for the management of the Nation's wildlife. In normal times the pursuit of wildlife is most important in providing healthful outdoor recreation for more than 10,000,000 licensed and unlicensed hunters. While the recreational benefits are paramount even in times of war, wildlife does provide a very useful supplemental supply of highly nutritious meat. During the last hunting season more than one-quarter billion pounds of usable meat was harvested by the Nation's sportsmen. This is a solid contribution to the present inadequate meat supply of the Nation.

In the Southeast particularly, and to a considerable extent elsewhere, the State game departments, through this program are cooperating with organized Soil Conservation Service districts in providing supplies of seed of perennial legumes, particularly for strip plantings adjacent to woodlands. Farmers thereby are not obliged to plow to the edge of the woods and cultivate land that is not productive, due to the shading and leeching action of bordering trees. These wildlife strips provide food and cover for farmland wildlife but most important to the farmer, they insure permanent cover on a strip of nonproductive land, which has had to be cultivated heretofore to prevent the encroachment of woodlands. Through such cultivation in the past, serious soil erosion has frequently resulted. In Virginia last year seed distributed to the farmers permitted the establishment of field border strips 1 rod wide for a distance of 300 miles.

As the result of studies carried on under this program, the Missouri Conservation Commission last year inaugurated a farm pond construction program. Thereby more than 650 demonstration farm ponds were constructed and as a result of that demonstration it is reported that 4,500 of these one-half to 2-acre ponds were constructed by farmers last year. Through the fencing of these ponds with a margin of land around them, wildlife seed stock refuges have been established. Through this work the farmers are assured of a dependable water supply for livestock and culinary use during drought periods and in adition, through stocking the ponds with fish, a supplemental food supply of a high protein value is being produced. Encouraged by Missouri's successful efforts, Ohio has undertaken like work under its Federal-aid program.

A number of States are engaged on fur-management studies designed to increase returns from this natural resource which annually provides around $50,000,000 in raw pelts. Surveys and investigations are being

conducted to determine methods of improving environments of fur animals, to find ways to trap and prepare the skins for the market so that better utilization will be made of fur bearers, and to trap and distribute fur animals to suitable but vacant areas. For example, Louisiana, which annually harvests around 6,000,000 muskrats, is conducting studies on its extensive coastal marshes to determine how the productivity of those marshes can be increased.

A number of the States, especially in the West have undertaken the live trapping and transplanting of beaver. These animals stabilize stream flow, impound water, improve environmental conditions for wildlife, and in addition are real assets to the livestock industry in providing dependable water supplies in areas which otherwise could not be used for the summer grazing of livestock. Idaho, through this program has trapped and transplanted more than 3,700 beaver, most of which have been placed on lands administered by the United States Forest Service and the Grazing Service. Those two services have requested the planting of these valuable fur bearers in selected locations with the view of expanding grazing opportunities for range livestock.

Many of the participating States have emphasized the acquisition of lands for wildlife use. In the West, particularly, lands have been acquired in order to provide a badly needed balance between summer range and winter range for deer and elk. Lands of no value to agriculture have been purchased for waterfowl usage by a number of the States in order that the waterfowl population, which has been greatly increased through sound management in recent years, may be spread out and harvested more effectively by the Nation's sportsmen. During the fiscal year, which ended June 30 last, the 46 participating States had 301 projects approved. Of the money obligated thereby, 41 percent was for the acquisition of land, 30 percent was for wildlife restoration development activities, 24 percent was for wildlife management research and 5 percent was for wildlife management coordination.

With the decrease in the appropriation from $2,750,000 for the fiscal year 1942 to $1,250,000 for the current fiscal year, together with the war and the impossibility of obtaining materials for construction work, the 47 participating States are stressing wildlife management investigations more than has heretofore been the case. Their object is to assemble facts for translation into action to insure that the maximum wildlife populations may be harvested without impairing the basic resource and concurrently to institute measures to make certain that wildlife populations are maintained at maximum levels consistent with prudent management so that they will be able to bear the greatly increased hunting pressure that can be anticipated after the war is over. Estimates as to increased pressure are predicted on the 30-percent increase in hunting licenses sales immediately following the termination of World War No. 1, notwithstanding that during that war more hunting licenses were sold progressively from 1916 through 1918.

The recommended appropriation of $1,250,000 for carrying on this cooperative wildlife restoration program in which the State game departments participate to the extent of 25 percent of project costs will enable the several State game departments to carry forward well conceived long-range wildlife restoration fact-finding and management programs on a reduced scale. It will enable them to maintain a nucleus of trained and experienced wildlife technicians who will be available after the war to counsel and advise State game administrators on the multitude of problems pressing for solution in connection with the management of the Nation's wildlife, a product of the soil, the supply of which in normal times is never equal to the demand of those who desire to participate in its taking.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. This is an item that does not reflect in the Budget estimate. What would happen if we cut this half in two? That proposal has been made seriously, and I would like to know what objection there is to it.

Dr. GABRIELSON. You will notice that it has been cut very drastically from a $2,750,000 appropriation in 1942. This really should not show in our appropriation either, because we do not get this money; we just distribute it to the States. We get a small portion of whatever is appropriated for the administration of the act, but not to exceed 8 percent of the appropriation for administration.

TAX ON SPORTING ARMS AND AMMUNITION

This money is collected through a special tax on sporting arms and ammunition. It was imposed for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act. It comes out of a special tax which a special group of people pay. The money is distributed to the State game departments under a formula set up by Congress.

The work under this appropriation is carried on in the various States.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the Senate will restore this item as recommended by the Budget so that this useful service and wildlife restoration may go forward and by so doing help in the winning of the war, and that our conferees will agree thereto when it goes to conference.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest today, as I do whenever we have an appropriation bill before us. It seems to me that we have reached the state of mind in regard to these appropriation bills that many seem to think all we have need to do is to appropriate enough money and we can produce all the food we can possibly need. We are in a much more embarrassing position as far as food is concerned than most people realize.

Today I received the report showing the downward trend, as far as butter is concerned. Butter production is more than 7 percent below 1 year ago. Day before yesterday I had the weekly report on cheese. Cheese is 24 percent below last year's production. We sit here appropriating money but at the same time we let these agencies for whom we also appropriate money run hog-wild and some of these agencies are doing more harm to food production than all the money we appropriate and our efforts here can remedy.

WHY IS THE AVERAGE BUSINESSMAN NOT DESERVING OF SIMILAR CONSIDERATION TO THAT AFFORDED OTHER GROUPS?

I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to two situations. First, I wish to remind you of the Ways and Means Committee bill to allow the increase in the public debt with the special amendment attached to it preventing the Executive Department of our Government from placing a $25,000 limit on salaries. The reason given for the amendment was that the Executive had exceeded his authority, and this assumption of power was corrected by the amendment. This amendment had majority sponsorship, as well as majority and minority support.

Secondly, I wish to call your attention to the following section of the same Price Control Act—paragraph (h) of section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act (Public Law No. 421):

> The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act.

If there is a Member of this House who believes that this section of the Price Control Act has been followed by the O. P. A., I wish to yield to him to so state at this time. Everyone knows that the O. P. A. has disregarded, not only the spirit of this law but the word of the law as well. We have seen hundreds of small businesses hampered, hamstrung, and, in fact, put out of business. The small packing plants and the canneries of our country are two good examples of what the O. P. A. has done to prevent the orderly marketing of food products and to prevent the maximum food pack for this season.

This O. P. A. outfit, since its inception, has seemed to be more interested in making America over than in making America strong. They now seem more interested in putting through their particular schemes than they are in providing for maximum food production in 1943. The question resolves itself around to this point. If the Congress was justified in correcting the Price Control Act so that the executive department could not place a $25,000 ceiling on the salaries of a limited number of people in the higher income brackets, why has it not by corrective legislation action clarified the provisions of this same Price Control Act so that this O. P. A. outfit will not continue to ruin one small business after another? There surely was no more assumption of power by the executive branch in regard to the $25,000 salary limitation than there has been by the machinations of this O. P. A. outfit. What is fair for one group is fair for the other.

We have had enough committees, we have had enough hearings—but where are the legislative proposals to do anything about it?

We passed the Wolcott amendment to protect all our citizens from the O. P. A. This provision was eliminated by the other body. We should not be put in the position of advising our constituents that they must continue to suffer from the unfair rulings and the assumed powers of the O. P. A.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. I want to pay my tribute to the gentleman from Wisconsin as being one of the leading agricultural experts in the Congress of the United States. He is one of the most valuable Members of Congress. Now, he does not have to answer this question, but if he wishes, he can. I think the Department of Agriculture is equally at fault with the O. P. A. in connection with this food shortage. I think the O. P. A. has done more harm than good in its effort to ruin small business. Does the gentleman agree with me, and he may answer or not.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I always answer if I have the time. First, I humbly thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his kind words. My answer is that the Agriculture Department has had a lot of criticism that it should not have had. We must realize that the Department of Agriculture has not been able to put through a program that it wants any more than you or I can put through the kind of program that you or I may want.

Taking the whole picture into consideration, I personally must stand here and defend what the Agriculture Department has tried to do, though I know they have made mistakes. Covering as many fields as does the United States Department of Agriculture, it is not humanly possible to avoid mistakes. There is one thing about the Department of Agriculture, and that is this—if you have a grievance, you can present your grievance to them and you get sympathetic consideration of it, but as far as the O. P. A. is concerned, all you get is a promise. The Agriculture Department has been most cooperative with me ever since I have been a Member of this House. They furnish the facts and do not add their interpretations unless asked to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last eight words.

Mr. Chairman, this is one appropriation bill in which I always take much interest because I come from one of the great western States which has much public land and a large proportional interest in the Interior Department appropriation bill, with regard to Indian reservations, reclamation, and the like.

I expected this cut. We anticipated there would have to be a severe cut on account of war conditions, although it is a little heavy in spots. I want to add my word of commendation of the fine work of the committee and I want to sanction what my friend from Montana said about the gentleman from Manhattan who has always been so considerate of us in the great open spaces of the West. May I also join with the gentleman from Utah in what he said earlier today. I feel that the War Production Board has stopped work on some mighty important reclamation projects which would have contributed very powerfully to the war effort.

There is one matter which I did not mention to the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I shall mention it here. Uncle Sam is a great land owner. Two-thirds of the area of my State is in the public domain, or at least under the control of the Forestry Department, the Indian Service, or some such agency. Throughout the entire West a great deal of the public domain has been used for war training purposes, bombing ranges, and that sort of thing, having been taken over by the War or Navy Departments.

I hope that some provision will be made either in the Interior bill or in some military appropriation bill for the rehabilitation of those vast areas which have served as a proving ground for tanks, bombing ranges, and so forth, before they are turned back to us, as we hope they will eventually be turned back to the livestock people for grazing purposes and other uses of that kind.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I may say for the RECORD that 54.6 percent of all the land in the gentleman's State is owned by the Government.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is a little less than I thought, but it confirms what I just said.

Mr. JENSEN. On page 227 of the hearings, the gentleman will find a table showing the percentage of land and the acres owned by the United States Government in every State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes, I notice that; but the column to which the gentleman refers is administered by the Interior Department. However, that confirms my statement that Uncle Sam is a great landowner, and we hope he will continue to be a good husbandman. It is in such appropriation bills as the Department of the Interior appropriation bill that we look to Uncle Sam to take good care of his resources and develop them to the limit.

Mr. JENSEN. I may say further that Uncle Sam owns 14.5 percent of all the land in the whole of the United States.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, much of that great area is forest land and mineral ground and we are interested in roads. Especially do we need access roads to tap the forests and the new mines that are being developed and more which ought to be developed. Right now we are called on to furnish more and more critical materials. The great Rocky Mountain region is the treasure chest of America and that is where we need development.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I wish to again advert to the subject I mentioned this afternoon when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] so graciously yielded to me.

It will be recalled the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1943 called for the amount of $162,000,000. Perhaps some of you will also remember I offered 3 amendments to reduce that amount. The first called for a reduction of approximately 28 percent. When I offered this amendment, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] opposed it and questioned my sincerity in offering it. That amendment received 5 affirmative votes, including my own, and had 82 votes against it.

My second amendment called for a reduction of 14 percent and it received 14 "aye" votes and 76 "no" votes.

My third amendment called for a reduction of the amount requested—that is, $162,000,000 of 5-plus percent and it received 37 affirmative votes and 86 negative votes.

Now just a year hence, the Appropriations Committee has brought in this bill which calls for a reduction of 56 percent of the amount requested in the appropriation bill last year. Strange to say, this reduction has had the unanimous approval of the Appropriations Committee and will probably have the unanimous support of the House. What a change of spirit must have come over the Appropriations Committee and the Members of this House. It is encouraging, to say the least. Now if the Congress can only come to realize the need of making comparable savings in other governmental departments it will be truly wonderful.

How my heart throbbed with joy as I sat here this afternoon listening to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] so vigorously and enthusiastically making the same speech, in substance, I made a year ago—the speech wherein he questioned my sincerity.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want this bill to pass without calling attention to one more item in it. I shall not offer an amendment today to this bill, but I am expecting that the Senate will offer an amendment and I want to say just a word concerning it.

On page 96 is what we generally speak of as the Robertson-Pittman Act. For those who are not familiar with this act I want to say that there is a 10-percent tax on munitions for civilian use which goes into a fund, which is used for the preservation of wildlife. Up to last year there was about $2,500,000 a year appropriated out of that fund but last year the amount was cut, on account of the war, to $1,250,000. It was hoped that at least an equal amount would be put into the bill this year, but the committee decided to cut it $500,000 from last year's appropriation, or a cut to about one-third the amount provided in normal times.

That particularly affects my State of Colorado. In my particular district, in just one little section, over 2,000 elk and deer died this past winter because they lacked proper feed and too much segregation resulting in disease. There was over $4,000,000 worth of wild game killed in my State last year, and more than that will probably be killed this year. This is important when our civilians do not have sufficient meat. This section of the bill should appropriate sufficient money to properly protect this wildlife.

I mention this item particularly because it does not cost the Treasury anything. The money is already in a fund which has accumulated to some $10,000,000; it is increasing all the time and I ask the committee, when and if the Senate increases the appropriation to

somewhere near what it ought to be, that they be sympathetic to it.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. It is true, is it not, that this is really a trust fund, a fund provided for the sportsman and is not out of the public Treasury; it is money that is paid by the sportsmen, who are glad to put it up, in order that this very fine work may be carried on?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is true.

Mr. ANGELL. For the protection of wildlife.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I want to endorse what the gentleman has said regarding the attitude of sportsmen; I am sure that is quite true all through the West, and I know, particularly in my State, exactly what the gentleman has indicated is correct. The sportsmen gladly pay this money into this fund, and I think the major proportion of it ought to be expended for the purposes for which it is collected.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I wonder if the gentleman is entirely correct that this money in the Treasury is not usable by the Treasury for other purposes. I am interested in this fund. As a matter of fact, the first year I came to Congress I offered an amendment to increase the appropriation bill which made the first $1,000,000 available under the Pittman-Robertson Act. The House accepted it. The explanation was given at that time that this tax was a tax which had been put on with some other nuisance taxes, and this particular tax on ammunition was not repealed with a sort of gentlemen's understanding that it would be the measure of appropriations that might be made under the Pittman-Robertson Act. However, I think the money is in the Treasury and could be appropriated for other purposes, except that from a bookkeeping standpoint the appropriations that are made under the Pittman-Robertson Act are measured against it.

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is not my understanding. My understanding is, as the gentleman from Oregon says, that a trust fund has been created and can be used for no other purpose. The committee, in its report, states that the money will stay there and accumulate. Their idea is that it will all be spent after the war, if the money is not spent now. My contention is that it is an economy to spend enough of it now to keep going in a small way the work that has been done up to this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, America is today the strongest country financially in the world. Nevertheless, we are headed toward an economic Pearl Harbon infinitely more disastrous than the defeat at Oahu unless we begin immediately to put government finances in order.

I am no alarmist. But I know of no greater disservice to America than to remain silent about the administration's policy of financial appeasement. Their financial failures parallel with deadly exactness the events leading to Pearl Harbor. When China was attacked in 1937 the President talked about quarantining aggressor nations, but war exports to Japan increased. After we had babied Japan with war materials, what happened? The strongest fortification in the world, America's bastion of strength that dominated the entire Pacific, was smashed to pieces in a few hours.

Mr. Roosevelt's policy on inflation has followed the same pattern that produced Pearl Harbor. To keep this discussion clear, let us define the term "inflation": inflation is a major decline in the purchasing power of the dollar. In 1932 Mr. Roosevelt campaigned with energy on the theme that the country was going into bankruptcy because of the deficits of those years. Those deficits of 1931 and 1932, of which he talked so eloquently, were $901,959,080 and $2,942,051,451, respectively. Today, every 12 days, on the average, our deficit is greater than was the shortage then in a full year. Think of it! An increase in our shortage of about 3,000 percent from a condition which Mr. Roosevelt represented as the road to bankruptcy. I say this with no partisanship, because the cost of living and the arithmetic table are nonpartisan. Inflation, like rain, falls on the just and the unjust alike. But when we are making a mistake that Mr. Roosevelt has said will lead to disaster, and then he enlarges that mistake 30 times, either we are going to wake up promptly or calamity will befall us.

Here we encounter the alibis for this fantastic situation. It is explained that because we are at war, the budget of America must be unbalanced as it is today. That simply is not true. Practically all our expenditures are being paid to American people in dollars. These dollars could be collected from them in proportion to the increase in Government expense if the administration willed it. There will never be as good a time to do this task as now. Certainly the willingness and ability to pay heavy taxes will not increase after peace has arrived. Then the fervor of our war patriotism will have cooled.

England is collecting over 50 percent of her war expenditures in taxes. In the year ended April 1, Canada collected about 48 percent of her governmental costs. But what is the record in America? During the 1943 fiscal year to date, only 25 percent of our expenditures have been collected in taxes. Unfortunately, there is no way of accurately portraying the ominous consequences of this failure of America's leadership. Like floating downstream in the Niagara River above the falls, the signs of disaster are recognized only by those who have explored the end of the journey. So it is with a financial policy of collecting only one-fourth of the cost of this war, while our allies are doing 100 percent better on this vital front. Frantic skirmishing on the price-fixing front cannot conceal the danger or substitute for action in the decisive field of taxation.

In his message to Congress the President asked for $16,000,000,000 in new taxes for the coming fiscal year. So far Congress has made no progress on this task. With all the earnestness at my command, I plead with the majority leadership of this House to prepare a tax program immediately that will raise not less than $16,000,000,000. What should those taxes be? Frankly, as a new Member of this body, I am not a tax expert. But I have some ideas. No political cowardice will keep me from presenting them in this hour of national crisis. Let me suggest them briefly: first, a Federal sales tax on goods and services, possibly excepting basic food commodities; second, a special Victory tax on gasoline and other motor fuels and oils, replacing rationing and black markets; third, additional or new taxes on tobacco, coffee, chocolate, and beverages generally; fourth, some increase in personal income-tax rates. Any large increase in personal tax rates will black-out the middle class. It will masquerade as a soak-the-rich policy. Actually, it will result in making "poor whites" out of everyone except the bureaucrats and the idle rich. Other specific taxes could be designed to absorb excess income before it produced explosive inflation in the market places of the Nation.

My suggestions may not provide the right answer and certainly not the full answer. But I say this—either levy new taxes in proportion to our expanded spending or curtail our commitments abroad to fit our resources. Whatever taxes we levy will be labeled unfair and unjust. They can result in general defeat at the polls for those with the courage to vote for them. But if America is to be saved we here must exhibit moral courage that will match the physical courage of our boys on the battle fronts. Taxes commensurate with Government expenditures are one of the prices of liberty. Actually, liberty with high taxes or slavery with high taxes is the choice confronting us. Can we see that truth in time?

To do this job, Congress must have genuine help from the Executive department. The blame for our present plight does not rest alone on the shoulders of Congress. Mr. Roosevelt has taken credit, and rightly, for the overdue social gains of the past 10 years. The credit is due the President because he dominated Congress and controlled its efforts. So then it is only correct and logical that the economic crisis existing today be charged up to the President who has controlled the actions of Congress. Just as the social reforms are a New Deal achievement, the financial errors and today's inflation are likewise his failure. Let me be specific.

Following the first major inflationary act, breaking the gold pledge, the New Deal, quite like a spendthrift who finances his riotous living by loans from his friends and relatives, kept borrowing steadily until the war danger threatened us. The insidious progress of this financial sickness was never effectively challenged. The forces for upright financial practices could not effectively combat such tricky arguments about debt as, "We owe it to ourselves," and other sleight-of-hand financial phrases. Compare that kind of leadership with what Churchill said to England a few weeks ago, and I quote:

> These savings of the nation arising from the thrift, skill, or devotion of individuals are sacred. The state is built around them and it is the duty of the state to redeem its faith in an equal degree of value.

The policy here of evading and confusing the problem fooled many of the people but it did not entirely mislead Congress. Occasional attempts were made in this legislative body to levy taxes that would balance the Budget. A Federal sales tax, higher personal taxes, and other special taxes have been proposed from time to time. But for 10 years the Executive has had practically absolute control of legislation. Programs to tax adequately have been pettifogged by the Executive branch again and again, just as the Administration has blocked pay-as-you-earn taxation for many months. It is clear that the failure to prevent inflation by higher tax levies is not alone the failure of Congress. It is important that that responsibility be squarely placed.

For we are now nearing the crisis in our financial affairs. Strong measures to preserve the value of the frugal savings of the common people of America must be enacted, or else the same formula that has produced dictatorship in other parts of the world will produce it here. First would come social dissensions, resulting from the disruption of home life and skyrocketing of prices. These disorders would take the form of food riots, sectional strife, or recurrent labor disputes. Whatever their apparent nature, the underlying cause would be the protest of the people against destruction of the America they love by unsound economic practices. Should that day arrive, it will provide an alluring setting for the Executive power to seize all the reins of government. All that would be necessary then would be to shrewdly charge that the Congress had caused the crisis by failing to enact adequate tax legislation.

Special powers would be arbitrarily assumed, based on the necessity for preserving order and stopping dissension. That old alibi for despotism is hard to combat in a critical hour. It has been used wherever democratic nations have been destroyed from within. Always the primary cause has been inflation and economic distress. The first act of the dictator has always been to dissolve the legislative body, claiming that the legislature is incapable of dealing with prevailing conditions. Likewise, the promise is always made that once the emergency is over, the Reichstag—Hitler—the Chamber of Deputies—Mussolini—or whatever the legislative body is, will resume its functions. This sort of tragedy need not happen here. If it does happen, every American boy who dies in this war will have died in vain.

It will not happen if Congress will enact tax levies commensurate with the present national expenditures.

The people of America are counting on the Members of Congress to preserve their liberty. Victory in this battle does not rest on our brave soldiers and sailors but on us at home. With you and me rests the final decision between solvency and liberty or inflation and slavery. Before the judgment seat of God each of us must some day answer for our actions during this critical hour.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, 10 minutes to be reserved to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] who desires to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. STEWART: On page 39, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following: "Presbyterian College at Durant, Okla.: For 100 pupils, $40,000; for pay of principal, drayage, and general repairs and improvements, $7,000; in all, $47,000."

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to reinstate an appropriation for a college, the Oklahoma Presbyterian, a going institution heretofore supported by the Interior Department for the past 40 years. My own daughter attended this college.

To give you a little better background, my father came to the Indian Territory in 1894 as a Presbyterian missionary to the Choctaw Indians. Somehow, someway this college failed to receive an appropriation 2 years ago. Yet it has produced some of the most outstanding Indian citizens in all America. I hope you will not forget that our very freedom which we enjoy today was brought about by the cooperation of the Choctaw Indians. In the Congressional Cemetery stands a humble monument to Pushmataha, an ally of General Jackson, who was the only full-blood Indian who ever rose to the rank of a general, and the only Indian statesman that was ever successful in getting all of the Indian tribes together. When the great war with England was raging in 1812, Tecumseh gathered many tribes, and it was the answer of this great general who brought the Choctaws over on the side of the United States, whom this Government gave military honors for his contribution to our very freedom today. Let us keep faith with our solemn agreements. I appeal to you to reappropriate this money. I am just as strong for my Catholic brethren, my Methodist brethren, and my Baptist brethren as I am of my own religion in this respect. Do not discriminate. I thought enough of this college that I sent my own beloved daughter there. She attended this school. We are pioneer folks, and this school was one of the trail blazers of our civilization.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Was there a Budget estimate or request for the item involved in your amendment?

Mr. STEWART. I am sorry I cannot give you that information. I have never been able to have any information.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CARTER. I regret to inform the gentleman from Oklahoma that there was no Budget request presented for this item, and that may be the principal reason why it was not favorably considered by the committee.

Mr. STEWART. Possibly that is so, but I am appealing to you as Members of Congress, because some ideologists went in there to shear the wings of a great institution—to prevent the appropriation for this school. The gentleman from Oklahoma, the chairman of this subcommittee [Mr. JOHNSON], knows the picture as well as I know it, and I ask him to express himself at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will yield——

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say I am very familiar with the history and the record of this school. It is one of the outstanding schools of the entire United States. It has turned out some of the finest citizens of the country, and as a member of the committee I opposed closing the school. That is still my position.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you for your contribution. I just wanted to get that picture before the Members of Congress. Sometimes the Members of Congress do not get a clear picture of the country as a whole. I feel I am as tolerant as any man in Congress. I would go as far for a man who opposes my religious or political views, if he were honest and conscientious in his convictions as I am in mine. I am going to ask you few Members who are here this afternoon to restore this appropriation.

I might add as I go along, I read in a trade journal that we had in one department here in Washington 2,700 attorneys, controlling the affairs of that department, and England was able to cope with 10 attorneys with a like branch of government. I want you to figure that out. I am appealing to you. I believe that you men will see that these cold-hearted experts, if you please, are in error. They would pass judgment on an institution that has served America for 50 years, and one man of Indian blood has served three terms in the United States Senate, Senator Robert L. Owen and two others, Charles D. Carter and Bill Hastings in Congress. Please do not pass judgment on this institution until you learn of the great good it has done. I hope you do not oppose me. I beg of you your support, because I believe we all see eye to eye. I hope that you recant and reconsider and forget the ideologists who are

trying to destroy one of the greatest institutions in the United States, even though it is a small church school.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BENDER. How large a body has this institution?

Mr. STEWART. It is a very small school—100 or 200. It has never had over 200.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that it is less than 100 today?

Mr. STEWART. It is far less, because no appropriation was made 2 years ago, and it has been carried on by public subscription.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that it is less than 25?

Mr. STEWART. I do not know what the number is.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield, I can give the exact figures.

Mr. STEWART. All right; go ahead.

Mr. CARTER. Somebody said just 16 students.

Mr. STEWART. I do not know, but he may be like some of these others. I want to restore the institution; that will take care of 100 or more and they will have the enrollment if you vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I regret to find myself in opposition to the genial gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART]. He has made a very fervent plea for this school, but his plea, with all due deference to him, comes a little too late. This committee held hearings for a number of weeks. Many Members of this House who were interested in various matters appeared before the committee. The gentleman from Oklahoma never appeared to present his case. We have no estimate from the Bureau of the Budget on this matter, and I say that this matter was called to the attention of the committee by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], who presented communications that had been written in behalf of the institution. The chairman of this subcommittee was very much in favor of the support of this school, and I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART], that when it came time to vote, although the chairman of the subcommittee favored it, the remainder of the committee was unanimously against it under the conditions under which it was presented. Had the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] gone to the Bureau of the Budget, or had he come to the committee and presented the matter with the fervor and devotion he has presented it here on the floor of the House, he might have appealed to us in such a manner that we would have put the school in, but I ask him now to withdraw his amendment so that we can get on with the bill.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I wrote a letter to the committee asking for the privilege of appearing on this matter and it is in your files. I wanted to make a clear case, and I hope the gentleman will withdraw his remarks and support this matter instead of opposing it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Was the gentleman notified to appear?

Mr. STEWART. I never had notice to appear. But I wrote a letter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I understand that the gentleman was notified to appear.

Mr. STEWART. If I was, it was missed in the mass of correspondence that comes to my desk.

Mr. CARTER. I am sure that if the gentleman wrote a letter to the chairman of this subcommittee or to the clerk of the committee asking to appear, that he would have received a prompt reply. I saw but two letters in connection with this school, neither of which was written by the gentleman from Oklahoma. I might say that we have taken pretty good care of the gentleman's district, so far as schools are concerned. We have provided for two other schools.

Mr. STEWART. The subcommittee chairman just left the room, but I wrote him a letter asking him the privilege of appearing before the committee and presenting this matter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would like to say that I think the gentleman was notified to appear before the committee. I am so informed by the clerk.

Mr. STEWART. I do not care what the clerk told the gentleman. I was not told.

Mr. CARTER. I do not yield further. If the gentleman applied for permission to appear before the committee and did not get it, that is regrettable and I say that I hope he will withdraw his motion, and that next year he will present the matter to the Bureau of the Budget and let it be brought up in an orderly way.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. A remark has been made here about one of the clerks of the Committee on Appropriations. If there is a group of men in this whole Capitol that is devoted to the office which they hold that group is the clerks of the Committee on Appropriations, with which I have been connected for a long time. They are most devoted to their duty, and I am sorry to hear anything said derogatory to any one of them. If a letter was sent to the committee, there will be evidence of it.

Mr. CARTER. I agree with the gentleman. The clerk of this subcommittee is most efficient and courteous.

Mr. RABAUT. And I hope that the evidence will be produced.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time only for the purpose of making some remarks pursuant to what was said by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] a little while ago about national finances, and then to ask some questions of the members of the committee.

It is true of course that the only real cure for the problem of inflation is additional taxation. A nation cannot bring into balance the available supply of goods with the available purchasing power of the people, so long as it permits billions of dollars of new money in the form of deposits to be created by the banks and loaned to the Government at interest month by month.

As long as that condition prevails the attempt to control prices by means of O. P. A. will be of itself a most difficult and hazardous procedure. As a matter of fact, I have put into a short volume called Out of Debt, Out of Danger my own thoughts about this whole problem of our national debt and national financial structure. A copy of that book I am going to take the pleasure of sending to each Member of Congress in a day or two. I rise at this time only to say that one of the chapters in this book points out that in time of war the kind of financial policies that should be followed by a nation are quite the opposite of those that should be followed in peacetime and that the thing we need to do above all others is to have sufficiently courageous taxation including, if necessary, a compulsory savings program so that we can avoid the creation of a single dollar of new money by the banking system of this Nation.

I should now like to ask one or two questions of members of the committee. In the first place I should like to say that I saw recently a statement to the effect that the War Production Board had lifted its stop order against the completion of the Friant Dam in California and also the Madera Canal. I realize this action on the part of the War Production Board is somewhat late from the standpoint of this particular bill, but I should like to ask some member of the committee, perhaps the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], what effect that might have on future actions.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Gladly.

Mr. CARTER. While I have received no official notice, I understand that that is the case, that the stop order so far as the Madera Canal and the Friant Dam has been removed. This appropriation bill carries an item of $11,500,000 in addition to the carry-over which was $26,500,000; so there is a considerable amount of money with which to work at the present time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And could that be used on the Friant Dam or any portion of the Central Valley project?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; there may be a very small portion that is earmarked, but it would not in my opinion amount to more than $3,000,000 which could not be used for these purposes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will a portion of it be used for the completion of the Shasta Dam and the installation of power units there?

Mr. CARTER. It will be used immediately and continuously until that power

is brought in which will probably be soon after the first of next year.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And how about the transmission of that power?

Mr. CARTER. There is plenty of money provided in this bill for the transmission line and it is the opinion of the committee that the only transmission line the Government should build is from the Shasta power house to the Shasta substation about 25 miles away.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It would have to be turned over to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. unless the transmission line authorized by Congress were completed from Shasta Dam to load center at Antioch.

Mr. CARTER. There is no hope of having that done for many years.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But there is no prejudice against that being done as soon as possible?

Mr. CARTER. No; not if it is decided it should be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we have been discussing a bill making appropriations for the Interior Department. During this time there has been some consideration of the question of food supply. I see on the floor the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] who has just returned from a visit to that great interior hinterland, Hot Springs, Va., where I understand he crashed the gate and was admitted to the food conference.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I want to make it perfectly clear that I did not crash any gates; as a matter of fact, I was welcomed very cordially, as I expected to be, by our former esteemed and distinguished colleague the Honorable Marvin Jones.

Mr. CASE. I am sure that the gentleman was treated nicely by Mr. Jones, who was a former distinguished Member of this body. If the gentleman at this time cares to elaborate on what he discovered, I shall be pleased to yield to him further.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I shall be very happy to tell the gentleman and the Committee what I found down there.

The United Nations Food Conference convened at Hot Springs, Va., last Tuesday, the 18th. As you all will remember, the Government originally ruled that the press of this country would be barred from covering the conference with the exception that they would be permitted to attend only the opening and closing sessions. In order that the American people would not be kept completely in the dark on developments at this conference, I introduced, on April 13, in company with our own Senator HOMER FERGUSON, House Concurrent Resolution 18. This resolution was designed to permit the Congress to have full knowledge of all discussions, all transactions, and all decisions which may be arrived at during the course of the sessions by having in attendance a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives—to consist of three Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, two of whom shall be members of the majority party and one who shall be a member of the minority party; five Members of the House, to be appointed by the Speaker, three of whom shall be members of the majority party and two of whom shall be members of the minority party.

This resolution further sought to permit the vitally interested people of this Nation to be kept informed of the happenings of this historic meeting through daily attendance of representatives of at least the three major wire-press services, namely, the Associated Press, International News Service, and United Press. It is provided in that resolution that the gentlemen of the press are subject to a reasonable amount of censorship to prevent the disclosure of military secrets which might bring aid and comfort to the enemy.

No action having been taken upon this resolution by the Rules Committee up to April 27, I addressed a letter to its chairman, the Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH, urging the imperative necessity of prompt action immediately upon the reconvening of the House on May 3. I pointed out to the chairman that if, as we had been led to believe, nothing of a military nature was to be discussed at this conference, there should be no objection raised to the adoption of my resolution and further that if discussions are to be had and decisions arrived at or commitments made which might affect the post-war security and economy of this Nation, then by all means it was imperative that favorable action be taken immediately on this resolution.

I became concerned about what appeared to me to be an obvious muzzling of the press and I became worried about some possible deliberate attempt on the part of the sponsors of this conference to keep valuable information away from the people of the United States or from we Members of Congress, who are the duly elected representatives of the people. Consequently, I continued to push for action before the Rules Committee. Republican members on that committee caused our resolution to be brought up for discussion last Friday. I was not called in before the committee at that time but I was promised that I would be called before the committee to testify early this last week. Not having been called and no action having been taken on my resolution, immediately after Mr. Churchill finished speaking on Wednesday, I jumped into my car and drove 220 miles down to Hot Springs, Va., to look into this conference personally. I consider it my duty to my constituents and my country to keep myself as fully informed as possible on all matters which pertain to the general welfare.

Some newspapers have carried the story that I crashed the gate at this historic conference. Even though it be true that I was the first and only Member of Congress to go to the trouble of seeking entrance to this conference up to the third day of its sessions, nevertheless I was very courteously received. Here is what actually happened.

On my arrival I was, of course, stopped by one of the military police, of which there are some 200 posted very wisely all around to protect the safety and welfare of these hundreds of representatives of the 43 Allied Nations that have honored us with their presence at this historic international conference.

Upon presenting my official identification as a Member of Congress, I was promptly and courteously sent to the main guard desk at the front door of the famous and beautiful huge Homestead Hotel, where my credentials were again examined and I was promptly escorted to the office of the secretariat, Mr. Michael J. McDermott, of the State Department, and was given a daily visitor's pass. I was permitted to register and fortunately able to obtain a room in the very much overcrowded hotel. Huge as it is, this hotel is not able to accommodate all of the delegates and some of them are of necessity occupying rooms in buildings nearby.

Following my assignment to a room, the captain of the guard was good enough to take me up to meet my former esteemed colleague—a Member of the House for 24 years and recently chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and now a judge in the Court of Claims, the Honorable Marvin Jones, duly elected chairman of this historic conference.

I talked with Judge Jones for a long while about the aims and purposes of the conference and was very pleasantly received indeed. Following that session, Mr. McDermott took me all over the building, through the various meeting rooms, and so forth, and later I went down to the press room for an interview by members of the press in attendance.

On Thursday morning I returned to Washington for the purpose of repeating to my colleagues in the House the warm assurances of Judge Jones that all Members of Congress were welcome at any time to attend any and all sessions of the conference and that nothing whatsoever will be kept from them. In my humble opinion, it is most imperative that the Members of Congress accept this invitation whenever their time permits and sit in on these historic meetings. After all, I have been told that this conference is but the first of a number of such international conferences that it is expected will be held between now and the peace to follow this devastating war. These conferences are looking toward the post-war period and it seems to me that we as Members of Congress are woefully remiss in the discharge of our duties if we fail to profit by our mute attendance at these conferences and get the viewpoints of the international delegates who are thus assembled. It seems to me this is a golden opportunity for the Members of Congress to interview these delegates—statesmen and economists—from all over the world and get their outlook on the post-war world, in order that we may be in a better position to pass upon the various questions that will be presented to us and thus render decisions which in our

humble opinion will be for the best interests of our Nation and the post-war world in general. Furthermore, we are more than remiss in our duties if we do not indicate by our presence that we are alive to our responsibility as the people's representatives by being willing to keep ourselves thus informed. Obviously, if we do not attend this conference in some numbers, it seems to me that it is perfectly logical for the administration officials, charged with the responsibility of arranging for the conference, to feel that Congress is disinterested and therefore there is no reason to issue any invitation to Members to attend any future conferences which may be held. In other words, this conference might well be regarded as setting a precedent and it is up to us in the public discharge of our duties to see to it that Congress is actively included—not necessarily as voting delegates—but certainly as observers in any and all of these future conferences.

Now, as to the aims of this particular conference, let me quote from the opening address of the since-elected chairman, Judge Marvin Jones:

> The fact that representatives of 44 nations, from every part of the earth, have traveled long distances under wartime difficulties to be here bespeaks your earnestness and the importance of the subject we are to discuss. More important, it reflects a genuine desire on the part of all free peoples for a better understanding of our common problems and a united approach to their solution.
>
> This conference has rightfully been referred to as a forerunner of other conferences which unquestionably will have a part in shaping the post-war world in which freedom will again rule.
>
> Thinking people everywhere now realize that what we have called surpluses are, for the most part, not surpluses at all, but are the results of accumulations caused by defects in the systems of distribution and the inability of the masses to purchase the food they need. The peoples of the world have mastered the machinery of production to a far greater degree than they have mastered the machinery of distribution.
>
> If by the exchange of views and a consideration of these questions we can produce a better understanding and promote the flow of farm commodities and the articles produced therefrom into the markets of the world; if we can leave the peoples of the world freer and more able to produce and secure the things they need; if we can make it possible for surplus products to be distributed and used and thus prevent them from overloading and overwhelming the distribution machinery of the countries in which such surpluses have been backed up for lack of a market, we will not only have achieved a great world-wide humanitarian objective, but each of us will have helped to promote the economic and social betterment of his own country as well.

Now, I earlier referred to the very justifiable indignation of the press at the original decision which was to bar them from all excepting the opening and closing sessions of the conference. Considerable modification has since been made in the initial regulations. Here is the actual situation as I saw it on my arrival Wednesday evening.

Press headquarters have been set up in the Hotel Casino, which is located about 100 yards distant from the hotel proper. In this rather spacious building, the many reporters covering the conference have their work tables, their press wire outlets, and so forth. One of the major wire press services—International News—has set up an electrical printer. In another section of the city two blocks away, the news photographers have been provided with a temporary darkroom for developing their photographs. These boys, however, are operating under considerable difficulty in that they have to drive some 20 miles to Covington in order to get their pictures on the wire transmission services. This is no fault of the conference.

It is true that so far the members of the press have been denied permission to enter the hotel proper, where all the sessions are being held, for the purpose of either attending the various sessions or for interviewing the delegates. My own personal opinion is that the press should be permitted reasonable representation at all open sessions and should be given an opportunity to interview the various delegates within the hotel proper, if the delegates themselves are willing to be interviewed. Now, of course, this much is true: The conference has in no way whatsoever attempted to restrict the utterances of any of the delegates and has made it perfectly clear that not only can they step outside of the hotel proper to talk to reporters but they can also at their request call the reporters into a special press conference room which has been arranged in the hotel proper. So far—and the conference is only a few days old—it is natural to assume, and it is a fact, that some of the delegates—unaccustomed to American press procedure—are perhaps somewhat backward in accepting press invitations to be interviewed. On the other hand, it is likewise but natural to assume that these individual delegates desire and expect full press coverage back in their own nation and our American press stands ready to give them that coverage and can do it very quickly if permitted to thus promote international good will.

In all fairness, I think I should say that Judge Jones and Mr. McDermott, of the State Department, who has been designated chief press officer of the conference, are both hopeful that some method can be worked out to better the press relations with this conference. Both join me in very sincere regrets that there has developed an unfortunate lack of understanding of the press situation on all sides. Certain it is that we still have a free press in America—we are told we are fighting to preserve the freedom of speech—and certain it is that we do not have today at Hot Springs a free press. There still remains in America a power of the press and if this and future conferences are to be successful, then that power of the press to influence public opinion in America must be fully respected and so far as I am concerned, I intend to continue to exert every influence that I can bring to bear to see to it that the American people get freedom of the press at all times and on every occasion.

In conclusion let me just add one word of caution to any of the Members who may desire to attend the conference sometime between now and its closing, which has definitely been set by resolution for June 3. Hot Springs is temporarily in the same position as many other cities in this country. It is woefully short of accommodations. The Homestead Hotel itself, headquarters of the conference, is overcrowded beyond its capacity—in fact, to such an extent that some of the delegates have had to be quartered elsewhere. Judge Jones, therefore, has suggested to me that I call the attention of the Members to the reasonably good rail accommodations which are presently available. One can leave Washington at 11:30 at night on the Chesapeake & Ohio pullman and arrive in Hot Springs early the next morning in plenty of time to attend the sessions, which generally start at either 9 or 10 o'clock and continue throughout the day and into the evening. Returning, one can leave there on the sleeper at 8 o'clock and arrive in Washington about 3:30 a. m. Of course, I appreciate this is an early hour to land here—and I understand it is a through sleeper for New York—but the fact remains, and I am sure the membership appreciates, that if one will go to bed early, as is the habit of the membership, one can still get a full 7 hours' sleep and upon arrival in Washington can go directly to the office and get in several hours of work free from interruption by telephone or presence of constituents.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan, and I ask unanimous consent that he may have permission to extend his own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the gentleman to yield in these last few minutes of debate in order to secure opportunity for a word of commendation for the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee handling the bill. This is one of the most important of the annual supply bills and one of the most difficult. And in all the years I have been on the committee I do not recall seeing it disposed of with such dispatch and general approval, in the committee and in the House. That is all the more notable in view of the fact that the bill as reported has been reduced 60 percent below the current expenditures of the Department and 11 percent below the Budget estimates. It is a record which has not been equaled this year—if ever before in the history of the Congress—and I wish to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] who probably knows more about the affairs of this Department than any other man in the House, and with him the members of his subcommittee, including

especially the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] and the members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle. The reductions in the bill are in keeping with the national program of retrenchment and the subcommittee in recommending them have contributed in that respect to the successful prosecution of the war program. I congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma, Chairman JOHNSON, and his committee on the conduct of the bill, throughout the hearings and particularly on its management and passage without amendment on the floor here this afternoon.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has just made, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the limit on time that has been given, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] may be accorded as much time as was used by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman that time has been previously fixed by unanimous consent and can only be changed by unanimous consent.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, that is my request, that notwithstanding the fixing of time, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] may be accorded an extension of time equivalent to that used by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CARTER. Is that the desire of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I only want about 3 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given enough additional time to make up 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my word of commendation of the members of the subcommittee for the effective manner in which they have demonstrated in a realistic way how economy should be applied to the administration of the Federal Government. They have reduced the current year's budget by $120,000,000, and, while I am sincerely interested in the Interior Department and the effect of its work in the development of the great West, I think that this same pattern of economy should be carried throughout other appropriation bills which will come before the House.

I want to call attention to the fact that last October some stop orders were issued by the War Production Board which affected most, if not all, reclamation projects which were then in process of construction.

I did not check the record, but I presume that approximately $60,000,000 remains unexpended of the 1943 appropriations for various projects. I have checked the appropriation bill for the current fiscal year, and I find that all of the amounts appropriated 1 year ago are to remain available "until expended," and that applies both to the reclamation fund and the general fund.

I simply want to make that observation because I believe that the House, having control over the purse strings of the Nation, will not transfer this control over the reclamation projects or various activities of the Bureau of Reclamation to the War Production Board or to any other wartime agency.

I believe that as soon as this war emergency shall have passed the House should demonstrate that it has control and insist upon seeing that neither the War Production Board nor any other agency shall bypass or divert the expenditure of funds which have been appropriated by the Congress for the various activities of the Department of the Interior, and particularly for the Bureau of Reclamation.

Reclamation projects throughout the West are contributing materially to the production of essential foodstuffs, and this important Federal program is proving its worth in this emergency. It is unlikely that many projects under construction can be completed until after the termination of the war, but then there should be resumption of the program directly controlled by the Congress, and no interference should be permitted by Federal agencies not charged with supervising this work.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Does the gentleman feel that if we continue to spend, as we are spending, until the war is over, we will have anything to conserve on?

Mr. DWORSHAK. We will have to take that chance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BARDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Duke, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed, H. R. 2719.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. CARLSON of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative business and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include therein certain data.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an appeal issued by the United States Christian Council for Democracy for the passage of anti-poll-tax legislation.

I have been informed that this will exceed the usual two pages and will cost $135.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor at this time because I feel the Members of this House are entitled to know exactly what happened last Monday during my appearance before the House Committee on Military Affairs, a proceeding which older and more experienced Members have told me was one of the most unusual hearings that any committee ever conducted in the history of our Congress. As you realize, I, as a Member of Congress, was recently charged by Drew

Pearson, radio and newspaper commentator, with intent to receive a bribe in connection with the sale of two boilers to the Aluminum Co. of America.

I testified before the House Military Affairs Committee on that matter, giving a full statement and showing that I had neither received nor was I going to receive any bribe, fee, or commission of any nature whatsoever, but did of my own free will attempt to assist one of my constituents who had purchased two boilers from the New Orleans Public Service at New Orleans and had got entangled in Government red tape here at Washington while trying to sell them to the Aluminum Co. of America.

Drew Pearson, the man who made the bribery charge over a Nation-wide radio hook-up, testified immediately after me to the Military Affairs Committee. He failed to produce the slightest support of his lies about me, but this is what I wish the Members of the House to know about the Military Affairs Committee and its chairman. Immediately after Pearson testified, the hearing was continued without ever calling the principal witness, namely, Mr. E. A. Jumonville, of Plaquemine, La., the man who was subpenaed by the committee and came all the way from Louisiana with all his files to tell in detail this boiler transaction. Mr. Jumonville was told by the committee's attorney to go home, as his testimony would not be taken.

Mr. John P. Monroe, 2101 R Street, was charged by Drew Pearson as the one who purchased the boilers. I insisted that Mr. Monroe be subpenaed, but Chairman ANDREW MAY refused to do so. I then asked Mr. Monroe for an affidavit, which I have given to the committee. In this affidavit Mr. John Monroe swears that he did not have anything to do with this boiler transaction, either directly or indirectly.

Mr. Jumonville, in a sworn statement and under oath, said that I was representing him as his Congressman, that I had received no fee nor was I to receive any fee in connection with the boiler transaction. Mr. Jumonville further swore that all he wanted was the price as set by the O. P. A. for those two boilers, which he knew he was entitled to, just as every other businessman in America today gets the O. P. A. price whenever he sells a commodity. This evidence I had to force into the hands of the committee, with the chairman refusing to accept it from the witnesses in person.

Mr. Drew Pearson, whom I defined as a claptrap, fly-by-night columnist, testified under oath to the committee that he received his first information in connection with this boiler transaction from an anonymous phone caller. The person who informed him of my alleged fee, Pearson said, was an alleged friend of mine, whose alleged name he refused to divulge, allegedly giving same to Chairman ANDREW MAY in executive session. It is my understanding that Chairman ANDREW MAY has refused to give that alleged name to the other members of the committee. Evidently Mr. MAY is not very consistent, because information that he secured in another hearing approximately 2 weeks ago in executive session was given by him to every newspaper in America that would bother to ask him for it.

Personally, I know Drew Pearson lied on the radio and I know he lied on the witness stand, which, down where I come from, is perjury, and that the person's name he gave Chairman MAY was either manufactured and is fictitious, or else he conspired with somebody to agree to give this synthetic and bogus information.

I have had occasion to check into the record of Drew Pearson to see what kind of reputation he has for telling the truth. I find that United States Senators, Members of Congress, Cabinet members, generals, and even the secretary to the President have in no uncertain terms labeled him as a downright liar and garbage-can collector of filthy, manufactured, synthetic lies.

But Drew Pearson has not spent all of his time blackmailing, intimidating, and lying about public officials and Congressmen. His vocations describe a thwarted and frustrated man with a warped, twisted, and diseased idea of mankind and life. Among his minor contributions to society of which he boasts—and just ask him if you want to hear more in detail—was the illegal representation by the aid of an accessory or bag man, namely, a Mr. John Henshaw, of the Irish sweepstakes, which gave him a vile start in his obsessed, putrid craze for money.

I want the Members of this House to know that Pearson, who poses as a great liberal, is at heart a money miser and one of the greediest men for cash I have ever met anywhere any time. If he cannot get it honestly, look out for the blackmail. And as for his reputation for truth and accuracy, listen to this:

Congressman Martin Sweeney, of Ohio, who sued Drew Pearson in practically every court from coast to coast, branded Pearson as an unmitigated liar and a falsifier of facts. He said:

> I intend to pursue the matter to the very end, because I believe all persons in public life are concerned with the extent to which the "free" press may go in attributing to public officials false acts or un-American motives.

He then brought against Pearson the longest, largest number of libel suits in American history, which I understand still to be in process of settlement.

Jesse H. Jones, a high-ranking Cabinet member and Secretary of Commerce, stated frankly that Drew Pearson was a liar.

Secretary of State Cordell Hull, in referring to Drew Pearson, said he is only one-third right one-tenth of the time.

Senator ROBERT REYNOLDS said of Drew Pearson and Robert Allen:

> The truth is not in them.

Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland, said, "There was not an atom of truth in this libelous statement by Drew Pearson and Robert Allen," when in a broadcast Drew Pearson charged Senator TYDINGS had had the W. P. A. build a road and yacht basin on his private estate to keep W. P. A. workers busy. On another occasion, the Washington Post had to publish a two-column full apology and retraction of false charges Pearson made against Senator TYDINGS.

Here is what Representative HAMILTON FISH, of New York, in answer to an attack made on him by Drew Pearson in his column on October 6, 1942, said:

> Drew Pearson in my opinion is the most contemptible, dishonest, and dishonorable smear propagandist in America, and by inference the most colossal liar in the Nation.

Senator GERALD P. NYE stated in answer to an attack on him in the Merry-Go-Round that it was a deceitful falsehood published by Drew Pearson.

Senator GUY GILLETTE, of Iowa, said a statement by Drew Pearson is absolutely without foundation.

Senator ROBERT REYNOLDS said on another occasion:

> Unfortunately the only way a public official can avoid vilification by these two men, namely, Robert Allen and Drew Pearson, is to bow to their will and the will of those they serve.

Senator ELLISON D. SMITH, of South Carolina, stated that an article in connection with him by Drew Pearson falsely insinuated things and was without foundation and is maliciously false.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana, stated Pearson had not only lied about him but had lied about Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones, Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, of Maryland, stating that Drew Pearson was a little black animal with a white stripe down his back—must be a skunk. WHEELER declared that this very crowd in Washington, meaning Drew Pearson and his crowd, had been taught to smear every Senator and Member of the House who does not agree 100 percent with the New Deal bureaucrats.

Colonel Harrington, former head of the W. P. A., proved a statement of Drew Pearson's to be an outrageous, unjustifiable and bold-faced lie. In a column by George D. Riley and Page Huidekoper in the Washington Times-Herald on January 10, 1943, it was stated that there was nothing true about Pearson's claim of President Roosevelt prevailing upon Ambassador Joe Kennedy to refrain from publishing a book.

Here is what Cordell Hull said about one of Drew's articles appearing in the Merry-Go-Round April 14, 1939:

> Those parts of it of which I have knowledge are so thoroughly inaccurate and misleading that they could not, in my judgment, be sustantiated by anyone.

Senator NYE said:

> Pearson is a master of the half truth. When a direct lie does not suit his purpose because it might be too dangerous, he can lie by inference by merely leaving out qualifying remarks and explanation.

The gentleman from Alabama, Congressman FRANK BOYKIN, said:

> Drew Pearson is the damnedest liar that ever lived.

The powerful Rules Committee of Congress branded as "a false, malicious lie" statements made by Drew Pearson about the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman COLMER.

White House Secretary, Stephen T. Early, described as a complete lie a story printed in the Washington Merry-Go-Round column written by Drew Pearson and Robert Allen on the recent slaying of an agent of the F. B. I. by two Army deserters in Virginia. "There is no truth in any detail of this story," said Secretary Early.

The gentleman from Oregon, Congressman JAMES W. MOTT, in a statement to the House Naval Affairs Committee, said:

Drew Pearson and Robert Allen are a pair of journalistic polecats.

The gentleman from Minnesota, Representative MELVIN P. MAAS, speaking of Pearson and Allen, declared:

Whoever gave out the scurrilous story is guilty of the grossest kind of contempt.

Here is what Drew Pearson said in a letter about General MacArthur which he himself manufactured:

DEAR GENERAL: You have done a great job and I am going to see that you are rewarded. When Congress convenes I am going to write my Congressman and have him take steps to give you another medal. This medal will have a ribbon on it down the middle of which will be a broad streak of yellow with a piece of baloney on the end.

Think of this, Members of the House, America's No. 1 hero, one of the greatest generals that ever lived, being subjected to this filth and abuse by Drew Pearson.

Drew Pearson, in an issue of Liberty magazine, said:

As the fierce battle around Manila neared a climax, an old friend of Douglas MacArthur's remarked, "Douglas may have to swim for it and he can still do it. But he will have to leave his medals behind, total estimated weight 13 pounds, 16 ounces."

The Washington Times-Herald, the largest newspaper in Washington, which ran Drew Pearson's Washington Merry-Go-Round for a long time, finally threw it out and stated:

We dropped the Washington Merry-Go-Round out of the Times-Herald because of the poisonous attempts Pearson and Allen have made, and are still making, to smear the reputation of a great soldier, and in our opinion one of the greatest Americans of all time, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Here is another crack that Drew Pearson made about General MacArthur, and I quote:

Wire pulling is one of the general's greatest arts. From his first days in West Point he learned how to get on in the Army.

Here is another quotation by Pearson:

But during the World War—

Meaning World War No. 1—

MacArthur won the confidence of Secretary Newton D. Baker, suddenly was promoted from major to brigadier general, was the only brigadier general below the grade of colonel to keep his temporary war rank afterward.

Here is another bit of slime from the pen of Pearson:

MacArthur got in wrong at the White House from the way he slid out of responsibility for the air-mail fiasco. Also the grand jury investigating Army purchases smeared him for rowing with Woodring.

MacArthur was forced to sue Drew Pearson for libel, and if the Members of this House knew the way Pearson responded to that libel suit to get it dropped not one decent, self-respecting Member of Congress would ever speak to Pearson again.

And now, Members of the House, just let us see the contrast between the war record of General MacArthur and Drew Pearson. General MacArthur served in World War No. 1. General MacArthur is serving again in World War No. 2, having displayed such indescribable courage and ability that today he is unanimously acclaimed as America's No. 1 hero, who is still fighting, still giving his all for his country. Drew Pearson was not in World War No. 1. Drew Pearson, who was young, able-bodied, and single, waited until a few weeks before the end of World War No. 1 to join what—not the Army, but the "Saturday Afternoon Tea Club," which is a slang expression for Student Army Training Corps, one of those bomb proofs from the draft in World War No. 1, almost as popular as Government jobs are today. That was in World War No. 1. Drew Pearson therefore did not fight in World War No. 1, nor is he a member of the armed forces now, nor is he fighting in World War No. 2, though he is one of those who howled loudest for us to get in. But rather his contribution to the war effort is based on a low-down, degrading, cowardly, yellow, stinking pen to defame, to vilify, to humiliate, and to attempt to destroy America's No. 1 hero, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. And, incidentally, the man he is accusing in this boiler transaction, E. A. Jumonville, is too old to be in the armed service, yet he has one son in the armed forces and another son leaving in 1 week for the Army Air Corps. Drew Pearson has no sons in any service.

Now, my friends, I regret that I have had to take up this time in the House of Representatives, but as you know, I thought that perhaps I was the only person that ever had trouble with Drew Pearson until I checked his record. My only comment, therefore, is this: Seldom do I have the unpleasant task of skinning a skunk. I hope I have done the job well.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks I made this afternoon in Committee of the Whole I may include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an address by Hon. Jesse Jones.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ROBERTSON, for 2 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. MCCORD, for Friday, Saturday, and Monday, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 21, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on investigation of civil-service policies and practices of civilian employment in governmental departments at 10 a. m., Friday, May 21, 1943, room 246, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m., on Friday, May 21, 1943, for consideration of housing bills, in room 356, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Monday, May 24, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearings pursuant to House Resolution 98 by Congressman HALLECK.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

1. Thursday, May 27: Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, will open the hearings with any statements and recommendations he desires to submit covering national flood control and the projects that should be included in the bill to be reported, especially as they are related to national defense and as they will be important following the existing war to provide sound flood-control projects and desirable public works. He will be followed by Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Assistant Chief of Engineers, who has previously advised the Flood Control Committee during hearings and who will also appear before the committee and submit his views and discuss generally the projects that have been favorably reported since the hearings were conducted on H. R. 4911, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, reported on June 19, 1941, which became the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941. Col. George R. Goethals, Chief of the Flood Control Branch, Office of Chief of Engineers, will attend the hearings and will furnish to the members of the committee in detail any and all available information respecting the said projects on

which favorable reports have been submitted by the Chief of Engineers.

The district engineers and the division engineers have furnished to the Chief of Engineers data and information respecting major floods since August 18, 1941, and particularly with respect to recent major floods in the various drainage basins of the country, which will be submitted to the committee.

2. Friday, May 28: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects for the New England region including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers and the middle Atlantic region including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

3. Tuesday, June 1: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents, on projects in the upper and lower Ohio River and tributaries, and on projects of the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

4. Wednesday, June 2: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents, on projects along the Missouri River and tributaries and the upper Mississippi River and the Great Lakes region.

5. Thursday, June 3: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents, on projects in the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, including the Arkansas and White Rivers, and on rivers flowing into the Gulf, west of the Mississippi River, and in the Western Rocky Mountain region, including Texas and Colorado, and in the Pacific Northwest region, including the Willamette River and the Columbia River and tributaries.

6. Friday, June 4: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents, on projects in the Los Angeles area and in the State of California, including the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kern River valleys, and on projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

7. Tuesday, June 8: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

8. Wednesday, June 9: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

429. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the posthumous appointment to commissioned or noncommissioned grade of certain enlisted men and the posthumous promotion of certain commissioned officers, and enlisted men," approved July 28, 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

430. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting budgets for the fiscal year 1944 for the military and departmental activities of the War Department, containing estimates of appropriations amounting to $59,425,586,500, and for the Office of Strategic Services in the amount of $38,476,000, and proposed provisions affecting said estimates (H. Doc. No. 205); to the Committee on Appropriations.

431. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 2745. A bill providing for the erection of a monument at Hammondsport, N. Y., in commemoration of the contribution of Glenn-Hammond Curtiss in the development of aviation; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2746. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work, made necessary by the flood of 1943, on the Missouri River between Pierre, S. Dak., and the mouth; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2747. A bill to amend the act to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 2748. A bill to increase the maximum amount of any deposit or trust fund which may be insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 2749. A bill to authorize for the duration of the war the establishment of zones prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors around plants engaged in the production of war materials, and prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors on property of the United States, and to men and women in uniform, for the duration of the war, and prescribing penalties for the violation of any of the provisions of this act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2750. A bill to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2751. A bill authorizing a per capita payment of $10 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from any funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to their credit; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 2752. A bill to authorize the acquisition of additional lands and flowage easements for the Pleasant Hill Reservoir, Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 2753. A bill making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 2754. A bill to establish the Office of Power Administration for the coordinated administration of all Federal functions pertaining to the generation, distribution and sale of electricity and the regulation of electric utilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GWYNNE:

H. R. 2760. A bill to amend an act approved August 26, 1842, relating to appropriation acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 2426 and Senate bill 971; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation authorizing the people of the Territory of Hawaii to form a constitution and state government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Motor Carrier Act, 1935, so-called, now part II of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. R. 2755. A bill for the relief of Howard H. Thames; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2756. A bill for the relief of Dr. V. H. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2757. A bill for the relief of Margaret Hamilton; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2758. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherine Higgins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 2759. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice E. Shinnick; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

828. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 20 citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

829. Also, petition of sundry citizens of New Wilmington, Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

830. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Dressmakers Union, Local No. 22, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, urging the defeat of the Connally bill (S. 796); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

831. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Frances G. Teichmann, of Aurora, and 19 citizens of Aurora and Evanston, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

832. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles Schulhafer, of Aurora, and 19 citizens of Kane County, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

833. By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Huntington, N. Y., in advocacy of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

834. By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois: Resolution of the Illinois House of Representatives, urging enactment into law of House bills 7 and 51, known as the poll tax and antilynch bills, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

835. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of Mrs. Philip Male and 53 other residents of Schenectady and Niskayuna, N. Y., appealing for the passage of House bill 2082, for by its enactment untold amounts of money, food, materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

836. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, urging the passage by the Congress of the United States of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

837. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Mabel E. Eid and 79 other citizens of Canby, Oreg., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

838. By Mr. LANE: Memorial in the nature of a resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the amendment of the Federal Motor Carrier Act, 1935, so called, now part II of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

839. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 20 citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

840. Also, petition of 20 citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

841. Also, petition of 20 citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

842. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of the East Bay Sponsoring Committee for Public Protest, of Oakland, Calif., against extermination of Jews and other minorities in occupied Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

843. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Michigan, Seventeenth Congressional District, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

844. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Rev. Elizabeth R. Choate and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

845. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Alice Girdwood, of Aurora, Ill., and 19 citizens of Kane County, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

846. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., urging the Congress of the United States to establish a Chiropractic Corps in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

847. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of R. J. Bennett and 21 other citizens of the city of West Union, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

848. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of L. E. Armel and 72 other citizens of Holton, Kans., urging that the Congress of the United States pass House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

849. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from Wanda N. Gum, director of student employment, Southern Illinois Normal University, Carbondale, Ill., urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

850. Also, communication from Elizabeth Myrna, corresponding secretary, Business and Professional Women's Club, Harrisburg, Ill., urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

851. Also, resolution of Local Union No. 117 of the Progressive Mine Workers of America, Eldorado, Ill., signed by Wm. Gallagher, president, and Leonard Smith, secretary, urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

852. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of St. John, Kans., favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

853. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Sharon, Kans., favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

854. By Mr. RAMSPECK: Petitions sponsored by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Georgia, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

855. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition favoring passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

856. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the amendment of the Federal Motor Carriers Act, 1935, so-called, now part II of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

857. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Perth Amboy Smelter and Refinery Workers Union, Perth Amboy, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to labor legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

858. Also, petition of the Building and Construction Trades Council, Oakland, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House Joint Resolution 96; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord of life and power, we would not plead for ourselves alone, but for all who serve Thy cause by word and deed. In fashioning our conception of Thee, we pray that it may be resplendent of justice and august in truth; how much more bravely we would march forward, catching the light that is absorbing the shadow of doubt. In seeking the solution of our problems, give us to understand that calmness is might and candor is the nobility of labor.

With faith in Thy fatherhood as a blessed inheritance, we would have sacred access to Thee as a comfort in all trial and as guide in all wisdom, as an illumination in all darkness and as stability when we need rest. When men and nations live by envy and rivalry, by vanity and physical appetite, O Lord, have mercy on their pauperized souls. We praise Thee for the uncalendared and nameless millions of our country whose industry, sacrifice, and patriotism give abiding assurance to the glory of our common democracy. Spare our land from the selfish rich who disregard the poor and from the discontented poor who envy the rich. Deliver us from these vain tempers which disenchant many a

worker and make labor loveless and joyless. Keep our souls strong and clear and may we recognize vividly the claims of high character. In our Master's name, Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of Charles T. Dulin;

H. R. 1896. An act to amend sections 1 and 2 of the act approved June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 262), relating to the establishment of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia, and to grant the consent of Congress to such States to enter into a compact providing for the acquisition of property for such park;

H. R. 2159. An act to provide for special assessments for the laying of curbs and gutters;

H. R. 2486. An act to authorize the appointment as ensigns in the Coast Guard of all graduates of the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2581. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2583. An act to provide for the reorganization of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2587. An act to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 328. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, because of military operations, to defer or waive payments under nonmineral leases of public lands in Alaska;

H. R. 777. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia," approved February 24, 1914;

H. R. 2115. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2584. An act to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 74. An act to assure conservation of and to permit the fullest utilization of the salmon fisheries of the Pacific, and for other purposes;

S. 215. An act to authorize the filing of certain notices to serve as constructive notice of the interest of the United States in realty or personalty under facilities contracts;

S. 332. An act for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen;

S. 364. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle certain claims;

S. 391. An act for the relief of Jack Lecel Haas;

S. 397. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Svend J. Skou;

S. 426. An act for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding;

S. 676. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war";

S. 787. An act for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Harry Jacobs;

S. 919. An act to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period;

S. 929. An act for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson;

S. 954. An act for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men of the Navy for personal property lost in the loss of the *Hugh L. Scott;*

S. 966. An act to provide for the payment in advance of pay and travel allowances to persons in or serving with the military and naval service and to civilian officers and employees in or under the jurisdiction of the War Department or the Navy Department under certain conditions, and for other purposes;

S. 972. An act to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417);

S. 995. An act to provide a penalty for violation of regulations or orders with respect to persons entering, remaining in, leaving, or committing certain acts within or upon vessels, harbors, ports, and water-front facilities;

S. 1001. An act for the relief of the Meadow Brook Club;

S. 1025. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department;

S. 1067. An act to amend the first paragraph of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to provide for allowances to midshipmen of the Naval Reserve for quarters and subsistence when not furnished in kind;

S. 1086 An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941;

S. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution providing for an investigation and survey of certain crustacean food resources of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct and the President of the United States to present to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, on behalf of the people of the United States a hospital, dispensary, or other memorial, for heroic services to men of the United States Navy.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1563. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. DAVIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BYRD a conferee on the part of the Senate to the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2570) entitled 'An act to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes," to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation therefrom of Mr. CONNALLY.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 2346) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HON. J. BUELL SNYDER

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am certain I express the sentiment of the House in extending warmest felicitations to our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], who has just been awarded the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws by Waynesburg College.

Waynesburg College is one of the oldest educational institutions west of the Alleghenies. Sixteen of its graduates have become Governors of States of the Union and it numbers among its alumni some of the most eminent physicians, jurists, educators, and ministers of the day.

We congratulate both Dr. SNYDER and the college on this well-deserved recognition of the great service rendered by the chairman of the committee in charge of military appropriations to his district, his State, and especially to the Nation at large.

LEESVILLE, LA.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include in my remarks a statement from the mayor of Leesville, La., a statement from the head of the State health department, and several other statements, the whole constituting a little less than four pages. I have obtained an estimate from the Government Printing Office that it will cost $171. Notwithstanding the rule, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks and place these statements in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MARTIN DIES], who is ill down in Jasper. He requests that I request in his behalf unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD two very delightful little themes written by some high-school boys in his district.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars: First, that I may include in one extension two articles by the distinguished columnist, Mark Sullivan; and, second, that I be permitted to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein certain quotations from Supreme Court decisions and from other lawbooks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE BEVERIDGE PLAN OF SECURITY AGAINST WANT

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, last night the weekly meeting of the Southern Policy Committee was addressed by Sir William Beveridge on what is commonly known as the Beveridge plan of security against want.

In a simple, clear, and convincing way Sir William explained the main purposes of the plan. His address made a deep impression upon all who were so fortunate as to hear him.

All civilized nations, I am persuaded, sooner or later, are going to adopt some plan to provide security against want. I would like to see America take the lead. As the Beveridge plan fits into a free-enterprise system of government, such as ours, and, in my opinion, the Congress will be considering before long some plan of security against want, I have introduced a resolution authorizing the Speaker to extend to Sir William Beveridge an invitation to address the House. I am sure that his address will furnish a great deal of food for sober thought.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter dealing with living standards in Nazi Europe.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in order to pay tribute to one of the war heroes in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDSTROM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked and was given leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, but I neglected to say how much these remarks exceeded the regular allowance. I understand I must do that, and I make the statement that the total of this extension will be $135, and I ask that they be included, notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Tyler, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HEIDINGER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this afternoon, at the conclusion of other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GRANT of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT'S SHARE IN LOCAL COMMUNITIES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, this week I listened to Mr. Fahey, Director of the H. O. L. C. testify before a committee of this House that they had foreclosed about 195,000 homes in the United States under H. O. L. C. mortgages. A vast majority of them have been resold. While those properties belong to the Government it is not taxable. In addition to that the United States is acquiring many parcels of real estate in various sections of this country on which it is erecting huge buildings in connection with our war effort. All of that real estate is removed from the tax rolls. In addition to that, these factories and other Federal war projects produce problems of sewer, school, sidewalk, light, water, and other municipal services which result in an additional burden on those municipalities and towns where they are located.

It would seem to me that the Federal Government should adopt a uniform policy of allowing those communities a service charge which will equal the tax that is lost by reason of such real estate being removed from the tax rolls. Some of the problems created through our war program have been met by Federal appropriations but not all of them. Very recently the Michigan Real Estate Association after some investigation and study have by resolution emphasized the urgent need of the Federal Government to share with other real-estate owners in paying the costs of necessary services rendered.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article entitled "Nothing Else Matters" by Dr. J. Raymond Schmidt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today at the conclusion of other special orders, and I also ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

THE UNITED NATIONS VICTORY IN AFRICA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the completeness of the victory in Africa is the best news that we have received at any one time since our country went to war. What the next move for Allied arms will be, of course, no one knows or ought to know except the top military leaders. From the moment, however, that American soldiers set foot on European soil they will be regarded as an Army of liberation and there will be tremendous potential strength available among the people of the nations which have been occupied by the Nazis which can be drawn upon if our own action is right. It is of the greatest importance, therefore, that we recognize as representatives of the people in liberated nations only those who have loyally stood by the people, who have had no traffic or deals with the conqueror, and who therefore have proved themselves worthy of their own people's trust. Ultimately, of course, there must be established as soon as possible in these nations governments which will truly represent the freely expressed will of the people themselves.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GILLIE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include the letter to which I referred in my remarks just now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous consent requests, one that our colleague, the gentleman from Vermont, [Mr. PLUMLEY] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article, and the other that I may be given permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by Mr. Frank W. Herring, Assistant Director, National Resources Planning Board, before the annual meeting of the American Road Builders' Association at Chicago, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GROSS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, May 26, at the conclusion of the legislative business and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, May 27, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address recently made by our distinguished former colleague, Hon. William L. Nelson, of Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INDIAN PROPERTY

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress a condition that is usurping the tax structure of Oklahoma.

We have many restricted Indians. Some of them have become very wealthy from the discovery of oil on their allotments and the Interior Department has been reinvesting the proceeds in the purchase of lands. The Supreme Court has held that such property is not subject to State ad valorum tax. This law is impairing very materially the ability of local governments to operate. I wanted to bring the matter to your attention at this time. I plan to offer a remedy to reimburse the State for these losses in taxes when you will have an opportunity to pass upon the question later.

With the removing of heretofore not exempt tax property from the tax rolls will so impair local government to where many small subdivisions cannot function.

The removing from the tax rolls of real property bought for them through the Interior Department bears the same relation to a community as if the United States Government should buy the land for a military project.

With already failing revenues for the various States, if relief is not given, the Federal Government should assume the loss to the States to where the States can carry on local and State governments with the enforcement of laws and maintaining their institutions.

The loss from the building of a military project might be overcome somewhat, but not so with the change in title from a taxpayer to a nontaxpayer.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Secretary of the Interior on the Puerto Rican independence bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEVASTATING FLOODS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and editorial on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE AID (LEND-LEASE) SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes; and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from New York if we can agree on, say, 3 hours for general debate.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. First, Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve all points of order on the bill, if that has not already been done.

In reply to the gentleman from Missouri, I may say that I understood from the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that the tentative agreement was for 4 hours of general debate, or a maximum of 4 hours.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We had a tentative conversation on the subject and I thought possibly we would be able, after consultation on both sides, to arrange for 3 hours of debate, in view of the fact that we hope to finish the bill today. However, I leave that to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think if we could agree on a maximum of 4 hours, perhaps we might not use all the time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill proceed, not to exceed 4 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—and, of course, I shall not object—is it the intention to finish the bill today?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We expect to finish it today, I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The reason I make the inquiry is that if the bill is finished today I shall ask unanimous consent later in the day to adjourn over until Monday. Otherwise, I understand it is the desire of the members of the subcommittee that the consideration of the bill continue tomorrow.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Following the wishes of the leader, Mr. Speaker, we will make every effort to complete the consideration of the bill before adjournment today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2753, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized for such time as I may consume.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is a proposition to shorten the war and to reduce the over-all cost of the war, both in money and men. The title of this bill might very appropriately be "a bill to bring the war to an early and successful conclusion." It provides for food, industrial commodities, the charter hire, repair, and procurement of boats, and many other commodities and articles essential to the war program, with the exception of finished munitions.

Food is the most essential munition of war. We were told by General Marshall in the early days of the war that as between an army without food and an army without gunpowder he preferred the army without gunpowder; that the army without gunpowder might win, but the army without food could not win. On that distinguished evidence we are supplying here, through the appropriation provided by this bill, the most essential and the most indispensable munition of war. It is more important than guns, tanks, planes, and ships, because without it our armed forces cannot operate guns, tanks, planes, or ships. Already, Mr. Chairman, with funds appropriated for this purpose, we have cast a heavy weight into the scales of war in favor of the Allies. It is hardly to have been expected that Russia could have held, at least not so effectively, without the assistance which we have given and are giving through this efficient agency. Certainly the Allied Nations could not have cleared the continent of Africa, so promptly and so completely and at such comparatively small cost, without the cooperation of funds provided for this purpose. The valiant Chinese Army, fighting with its back to the wall, against incredible odds, could not have maintained so successfully and so admirably its morale and its position without the supplies and munitions furnished through lend-lease operations.

It is hardly necessary at this late date to go into the details of lend-lease activities. Its policies, its methods, and routine are familiar. Twice we have exhaustively debated the establishment of the policy in the consideration of bills reported by the legislative committee.

Three times before, because this is the fourth lend-lease appropriation bill, we have fully discussed, considered, and approved money for this purpose. And this bill differs from other appropriation bills in which we have supplied lend-lease funds in only one respect. Whereas we formerly included finished munitions, now that we have authorized the transfer of munitions by the Navy and War Departments from funds appropriated to them for that purpose, there is no longer need to include money for munitions in this bill. Otherwise the bill is in every respect, and especially in policy and purpose, identical legislatively with the lend-lease bills heretofore enacted. There is this possible further exception, that we are providing money in larger sums and spending it more rapidly and effectively. As the days go by and the theater of war widens and the number of men in the field increases, the amount of our lend-lease expenditures is mounting. The allocation and administration of lend-lease is now largely standardized. In order to estimate the amounts of money disbursed, the purposes for which expended, and the countries to which allocated, the Lend-Lease Administration invites the Allied Nations to submit estimates of character and amounts needed. When all estimates are received, the lend-lease authorities in consultation with other departments and officials of the Government who are in a position to give counsel and advice screen them with a view to eliminating in the light of all the relevant facts—priorities, supply, and the difficulties of assembly and transportation.

The approved estimates then go to the Bureau of the Budget, where all requisitions are again scrutinized. The revised estimates then come to the Congress, the court of last resort. Even here they are subject to revision and reduction, a prerogative exercised by the Committee on Appropriations in this instance, in the reduction of the final estimates by the comparatively small amount of $150,000,000.

So the bill comes to the floor today, carrying, as the committee believes, the irreducible minimum of $6,273,629,000. This is not, in our opinion, the full measure of the allied requirements. It is the considered conviction of the committee that if supplies were available and could be delivered, many times this amount would be money well invested. As it is, we heartily approve the amount reported and recommend the appropriation as provided by the bill. We fix the total amount needed for the 14-month period, commencing May 1, 1943, and ending June 30, 1944, at $8,331,125,000, but we still have on hand in the custody and under the jurisdiction of the Lend-Lease Administration, an unexpended balance of $2,057,496,000. So striking the funds on hand from the amount required, we recommend today the appropriation of $6,273,629,000.

One thing that impressed the committee particularly, one thing which, judging from newspaper and editorial and radio comments, has impressed the Nation, is the efficiency, the economy and the effectiveness with which the lend-lease funds have been administered. It is impossible to place too high a rating upon the services rendered by Mr. Stettinius in this difficult position, or to express too strongly the confidence of the committee and the American people in him and in his administration. This confidence is reflected in the fact that this is a unanimous report of the subcommittee, the unanimous report of the Committee on Appropriations, and I trust the bill will meet with the unanimous approval of the Congress.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman also recall the fact that under the law the lend-lease issues a quarterly report to the Congress and that that fully sets forth their operations, and in addition to that we have very full hearings lasting for a number of days, and we went into the whole matter in great detail. Much of it had to be off the record of course, on account of its very high military significance, but I believe that it is the unanimous opinion of the committee that they made a very fine showing, and gave a very fine account of their stewardship in the administration of this act.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Virginia calls attention to a striking feature of the hearings and the consideration and report by the subcommittee and committee of the entire record of the Lend-Lease Administration under the very capable management of Mr. Stettinius.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Everything has been so favorable in this matter that this appropriation is almost sacrosanct, but, after all, we do hear rumblings of discontent. I want to ask the gentleman if in the hearings there has been anything brought out about the activity of the Board of Economic Warfare in asserting authority over or influencing that fund, for purposes that the gentleman himself might criticize? If I might further illustrate, we are making several nations of the United Nations rather prosperous under this lend-lease. Sometimes we fear that their manpower is not fighting the war as a partner with us. We do not ask them to fight our war for us, but we do ask them to use their manpower in connection with us, as well to furnish strategic materials which this fund provides. I repeat, you must have noticed that there has been some fear or criticism of the activity of the B. E. W. in the use of these funds.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am very glad to have the gentleman call attention to that phase of the matter, as it affords opportunity to say that the committee went thoroughly into the use of these funds. After most exhaustive and comprehensive investigation we determined that there was no foundation whatever for such charges. Of course it must be recognized that such rumors are inevitable and indispensable in any nation of 130,000,000 people, of many and diverse political convictions and opinions.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] speaks of the Board of Economic Warfare. They do not have any control whatsoever over lend-lease operations or their funds. They have no connection with it whatsoever.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentlewoman of Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It was brought out in our hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs that the Board of Economic Warfare acted in an advisory capacity in the matter of agreements under lend-lease, which the State Department handles. So I should think they do have quite a good deal to do with the funds.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The decisions on lend-lease, on what goods, commodities, and implements of war are to be ordered on lend-lease account for the nations who apply for them are made by the Lend-Lease Administration, under the advice and in consultation with other agencies including the Army and Navy. Of course, in reaching those conclusions they obviously consult with the Board of Economic Warfare and the War Production Board, and various other agencies, as to the ability to get certain materials and the quantities; but I wanted to point out, because of the observation of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] that the decisions, operations, and responsibilities for these lend-lease funds are on the Lend-Lease Administration, and I am sure there has been nothing there that would reflect on them. We yet have to have before us the Board of Economic Warfare, and certain inquiries and explorations we expect to make as we go along in connection with that agency.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman will get all that information then.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman permit me to read from an Executive order on the connection between the Board of Economic Warfare and Lend-Lease, because I think it is important to have it in? Executive Order 9128, dated April 13, 1942, provided—

(1) In addition to the responsibilities and duties heretofore conferred, the Board of Economic Warfare is authorized and directed to * * * (c) advise the State Department with respect to the terms and conditions to be included in the master agreement with each nation receiving lease-lend aid.

(d) Provide and arrange for the receipt by the United States of reciprocal aids and benefits, other than arms, munitions, or weapons of war, from the government of any country whose defense shall have been determined by the President of the United States as vital to the defense of the United States.

So B. E. W., by Executice order, does have rather important lend-lease functions.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It has important functions, of course, and the War Production Board has important functions, because before lend-lease can process or promise delivery of any certain critical materials they have to go to the War Production Board to see whether or not those things are available and can be manufactured, and all of that. There are many agencies. But what I wanted to point out was that the Lend-Lease Administration, under Mr. Stettinius, is responsible for this appropriation, and we should not confuse that with anything that anyone may have in his mind for the Board of Economic Warfare, because we have yet to have offered their appropriation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Great tribute has been paid and should be paid to Mr. Stettinius. A great deal of the favorable results under lease that have been accomplished have come from his fine work. Mr. Mack, Administrator of the Procurement Division, has done a fine piece of work. I notice in the hearings the interrogation of Mr. Mack and his replies. I would like also to ask if the committee considered the taking over of certain supplies that Procurement might have in storage under lease for use in this country. I notice Mr. Mack said they have quite large supplies of some materials that have not already been used. Did the gentleman take that up, because, for instance, we need steel and other supplies for use in the United States?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to have the lady from Massachusetts make this very well deserved commendation of Mr. Mack. I heartily agree with her in her approval of the excellent service he has rendered.

The committee took into consideration every criticism which might be suggested in connection with the procurement of supplies, every possibility of the exercise of undue influence or possibility of unauthorized expenditure of funds, some derelection of duty, and found no justification of the slightest criticism. The fact that both the subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations are made up of some of the most alert and vigilant Members of the House, on both sides of the aisle, who worked on these estimates almost day and night, and then directed a unanimous report, is sufficient answer to all who entertain any misgivings whatever.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The gentleman has made some remarks about China which sounded very good, but in reading the report of the proceedings it would appear that China is going to get only a very small part of the total funds to be appropriated for the furtherance of lend-lease; and it appears also that there was a question in the minds of the chairman as well as members of the committee about the possibility of more aid being sent to China. We all know, of course, that China is one of our most important allies. I am wondering if the chairman could not give us a little more information as to what we intend to do to help her?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I think that if we could take a plebiscite of the convictions of the American people it would show that while we are in heartiest accord, and entertain the warmest sympathy for all our allies, the average American citizen has in his heart a deeper admiration for the magnificent struggle under adverse conditions by the Chinese people than any other beleaguered nation. Of course there is no real distinction or difference in our regard for all our allies. Certainly public sentiment in this country favors rendering every possible help to China, but there are two conditions which must be taken into consideration in connection with the sending of supplies to China. There is, of course, the relative need. Russia, for example, with her battle line extending more than two thousand miles and opposed by a German army of 198 divisions of the best troops the world ever saw and 28 additional divisions of Axis allies, necessarily has greater needs than allies with shorter lines and less dependent.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In just one moment if the gentleman will permit. Second, we cannot ignore the facilities for delivery. Since the Burma Road closed access to China has been by plane over the Himalayas rising to an all but prohibitive height for laden airplanes. But every effort is being made, and perhaps a greater and more sustained effort, to deliver to China such supplies as she requires and delivery facilities permit than to any other of our allies if there is any distinction at all.

I yield now to the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and my special political mentor.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman. Do we understand—and I do understand—from the gentleman's statement in a sentence this: That the responsible agencies having to do with lend-lease do of course avail themselves of all the information and all the advice that they can get from other agencies of the Government having any conduct that is related to the tasks which they have to perform and, after all, the lend-lease organization, headed by Mr. Stettinius, has to arrive at the determination with reference to the distribution of these various things. On the contrary, as I understand the gentleman's statement, with reference to the quantity that goes to China or anywhere else the quantity must be determined by the General Staff, because Mr. Stettinius is not fighting this war; the General Staff is responsible for that. We understand that to be the gentleman's statement as to the situation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly. It is a matter of coordination and cooperation on the part of all branches of the service, both civil and military, each in its own particular field.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I wish to supplement and commend what the gentleman has just said about the efficient administration of lend-lease funds. The hearings lasted 2 weeks, or possibly longer, when we considered the resolution to extend the life of lend-lease. Mr. Stettinius, the Administrator, was present during the entire proceedings and testified on numerous occasions. He impressed the entire membership of our committee as being one of the ablest and best administrators in the entire Government, and I am sure he made that same impression upon the committee presided over by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, because his record has been very outstanding.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is in a particularly advantageous position to pass judgment following the long investigation which he and his committee made during consideration of the legislative bill.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Missouri knows as much about the farm machinery shortage in this country as any Member could possibly know. Much of the money appropriated in this bill is for food and some of the money in the bill is for agricultural equipment for our allies. I note from the report that only 3 percent of our farm machinery production will go to our allies.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true.

Mr. MAHON. I also note from reading the hearings and the report that our allies are doing pretty good in increasing food production. I should like to have the gentleman's comment on the advisability of our taking from our own supply of agricultural equipment this 3 percent and giving it to our associates in this war.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman renders a service in calling attention to the provision of agricultural machinery. One of the great problems of the war is the matter of transportation. If we could, from the doors of our factories and from the portals of our granaries, deliver available material to the front lines where it is needed, without interference, the war would be over in a short time. But we are separated by thousands of miles of inaccessible territory and boundless wastes of ocean, teeming with submarines and with every obstacle which the enemy can put in our path. Delivery and transportation is the bottleneck.

Africa has been termed the bread basket of Europe. North Africa can produce supplies of food to feed Allied armies and civilians. That is the source from which a large part of Europe's food has come for many centuries. Even in England, where a comparatively small proportion of agricultural lands have been devoted to the production of food, cultivation by modern machinery can produce large quantities of food. If we can send them the machinery to produce it there instead of growing it here and shipping it across we have solved one of the pressing problems of the war. With American machinery they are already producing food which otherwise would monopolize invaluable shipping space and the program for which we are providing machinery in this bill contemplates increasing and expanding production to care for both our allies and our own armies. It stands to reason, and no one can raise an issue on the question, that the economical thing, the sensible thing, the logical thing to do, is to help these people produce their own food at the point of consumption. That is what we are endeavoring to do in this bill. As the gentleman from Texas very well says, we are delivering only 3 percent of our entire national production, an infinitesimal amount in its effect on production in our own country but of far-reaching importance in the European economy.

The same is true of industrial equipment which we are providing.

One of the imperative needs in Russia is oil. The German Army swept across the Donets Basin and took those great oil fields, destroying all oil-producing and refining facilities. When they retreated they left nothing but wreckage. Russia must have machinery with which to recondition her wells and plants, with which to provide her own oil, to supply gasoline and lubricants, not only for her own vast fleet of airplanes and motorized war equipment but for American planes and equipment. Russia has also suffered as no other nation has suffered in the destruction of electrical machinery. The damage recently wrought upon German power dams in the Ruhr is nothing as compared with the complete obliteration of similar facilities in Russia. The Russian industrial organization built in the last 10 or 15 years was motorized entirely by electrical energy. She must have electricity to operate her plants. The hydraulic electric generators have been destroyed. We are trying to supplement that deficiency in this bill.

Again, one of the great needs of the war is coal. There is not sufficient coal in England, in North Africa, in any allied country in Europe. We are here providing the machinery to supplement England's production of coal in order to permit her to supply her own needs, for the needs of the Allies.

In China, which has been dependent upon us up to this time almost entirely for facilities for the manufacture of small arms and munitions, we must provide replacement machinery and spare parts. It has just been said that we were fattening our allies. That is certainly a sad misconception. If the gentleman had gone through, as we have gone through, this list of materials he will find nothing in there that is not for use during this war. We are providing some electrical equipment for Russia, including mobile units, which follow the Russian armies as they move forward and without which they cannot effectively continue the fight. But we have provided no facilities for the use of any of our allies which are not to be used until after the war.

Just one more point and I will yield to the gentleman. Lend-lease is not a one-way street. We are not giving everything and receiving nothing. I want to say frankly and am certain everybody will agree, that we do not expect repayment at the rate of 100 cents on the dollar, or anything like it. We are getting value received if we do not get back a penny. But our allies are not asking gratuities. They are paying when and where they can. It is impossible to repay in full, sometimes even in part. They do not have it. They never will have it. But if we can help them win the war, and preserve themselves, and a free world, it will be worth every cent we can spend.

But our allies are doing their part. In every country and on every front they are contributing in return everything they have to give, everything that the military situation permits. You will be surprised when you go into it at the amounts and at the source of some of it.

In Australia and in New Zealand, where the length of lines of supply is all but incalulable, practically all of the food of the American forces is supplied as reverse lend-lease. The same thing is true in England. Out of her scanty larders, her own people under rigid rationing, England is furnishing food to our men today; the English are providing for our men every morsel of food they can supply. Let me urge every Member of the House to take the hearings and turn to page 30. No Members of the House should permit the consideration of this bill to pass without reading carefully the statements beginning on page 30 of the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, you will find there some surprising things. They surprised the committee. You will find that even India, in the desperate straits in which she finds herself, even India is contributing to the American forces such as she has. It is reminiscent of a very ancient day on which the widow dropped her mite into the treasury and the Great Teacher reminded that it was not the amount contributed, but the spirit in which it was given.

All of these nations are giving to us in return such as they have, and we are receiving it likewise in a spirit of deep appreciation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Reverting back to the farm machinery item, I notice this language:

> This about represents only approximately 3 percent of the estimated United States production for the appropriation period on the basis of presently anticipated production schedules, which may be increased.

Under that provision, that is, in view of that statement, do I understand that the Administrator of the lend-lease program may enlarge or increase the percentage of farm machinery to be shipped to the Allies?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That refers to the increased production expected here in America. And in that connection, it was brought out in the hearings—

I do not know whether it was made a part of the record or not—but the fact is that our war facilities are producing more efficiently and voluminously than expected; even the most optimistic did not foresee the rate of production and the flood of war materials pouring out of American factories today. I believe I am not far wrong in saying we are producing today more airplanes in the United States than are being produced by all of the enemy Axis Powers. That is true of many other articles. We are producing so far ahead of schedule that it is now found we will be able to turn some of the production facilities to the manufacture of supplies needed by the civilian population. And among other civilian supplies on which production is to be resumed will be farm machinery.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the War Production Board, according to the best information offered to the committee, made an allotment of only six-tenths of 1 percent of steel for the production of new farm machinery this year, which, as the gentleman knows, is wholly insufficient, because that is one of the primary things today, so vital that it enters into an obstruction and interferes with the production of food for the year 1943.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit, that is not a matter germane to the proposition before us; it does not touch lend-lease.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to compliment the gentleman, chairman of the committee, on his splended opening statement on this appropriation. He has admirably stated the part which is ours in this global task by a division of labor in which America is the arsenal of democracy.

May I say that I have been one of the critics of the fact that only a small amount of our steel has been allotted to the production of farm machinery. I am glad to hear the chairman of the committee say that any lease-lend farm machinery we are sending abroad is not for the purpose of fattening or building up a foreign country but for the purpose of furthering the war effort by producing food abroad wherever it can be best produced.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The contribution of machinery is a measure of economy. We will save money in transportation, in cost of purchase, in processing, and will provide a larger and more timely supply than otherwise.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I agree with the gentleman that the most important items we have to furnish anybody are the transportation and the food items, the agricultural items. May I ask the gentleman who determines what shall be allocated to lease-lend, or does the Lease-Lend Administration determine what it shall request from our transportation, our shipping, and our food supplies? Does the Lease-Lend Administration determine what that amount shall be, or who does determine it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As has been explained, the Allies are invited to submit estimates of their most urgent needs. All the estimates are assembled and analyzed by the Lease-Lend Administration, which, in consultation with all who may be in a position to advise, agrees upon the amount, the volume, and the destination of the supplies. Judging the future by the past, I do not believe we could submit it to a more competent authority than the Lease-Lend Administration.

Mr. O'HARA. Who represents the needs of the Army and Navy as to shipping and food, and who represents the civilian population as to their needs of food in this consideration?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Those best qualified to pass upon the subject, the highest-ranking officials of the Army and the Navy, the Department of Agriculture, the Food Administration, and all others are in a position to contribute authoritatively to the solution of the problems involved.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman will find on page 15 of the report this statement:

> Food requirements are determined by the War Food Administration of the Department of Agriculture after consultation with the Food Advisory Committee on which the Army, Navy, and Lend-Lease are among the agencies represented.

The Secretary of Agriculture, of course, is on that Advisory Committee, and he is the civilian representative.

Mr. O'HARA. Under subparagraph (a) of this appropriation appears the rather broad, general language that the amount of $4,452,623,000 is to be appropriated for agricultural, industrial, and other commodities and articles. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the item of farm machinery alone. We know when Lend-Lease started they took a lot of farm machinery and sent it across the water for our allies. I happen to know that in my district there are farmers who cannot get implements with which to produce the food or harvest it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If they could get the machinery, if they could plant the food, and if they could harvest it, it would not serve the purpose of this war as well as that produced in England and Africa. We are adopting a plan which, in the considered judgment of those best qualified to decide, and in whom this Congress and the American people have confidence, is best calculated to serve the Nation. I know there are men who have never been out of their own townships who can tell you how this war ought to be fought.

There are those who say we should send this kind of food and that kind of food, this kind of machinery and that kind of machinery, or that we should not send any at all; but the American people would not be willing to place the destiny of the Nation in the hands of such critics. They prefer to leave it to those who are in a position, through training and ability and tried experience, to direct the war, to decide these questions and who up to this time have registered 100-percent scores in their decisions. The Lend-Lease Administration has made that record up to date.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman will also find on pages 8 and 9 of the report filed by the committee the statement that only $16,000,000 in dollar-value of machinery is contemplated to be included in this program. That is 3 percent of our production of farm machinery from the standpoint of implements, and 25 percent of that 3 percent is spare parts.

It was shown in the hearings that a very urgent request was sent to the Lease-Lend Administration by General Eisenhower that everything possible be done to send farm machinery and spare parts for the farm machinery we have had over there, because they had the labor there and they had the land there, and they could raise the food there so much more easily and in so much vaster quantities, thus avoiding the bottleneck of shipping. So the committee felt, and the Lend-Lease Administration felt, naturally, that the intelligent thing to do was to send what we could send and still not cripple American industry.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Exactly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This is regarding food, but not farm-produced food. I notice that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] asked Mr. Stettinius a question relating to assistance to the fishing industry both in this country and abroad, and Mr. Stettinius replied that the Navy Department is releasing certain ships in order to aid the fishing industry, that we may have more fish. That is a very constructive thing, I feel, because we need it very much in New England as well as in other parts of the country.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Our fisheries are one of our great national assets in time of peace, and doubly so in time of war. They are especially important as a source of food at this time when meat is at a premium. The Government through the Navy is cooperating in every way possible to supply facilities for this purpose even at the risk of neglecting other demands for shipping.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very glad to get that information.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has persuaded me that it is well for us to furnish farm machinery to our allies for their production of food. If the gentleman will permit, I should like to accompany that statement by saying that I should like to see the prisoners taken in this war employed and put to work at the place they are now located in the production of food which is needed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Such a plan would possibly render a service to prisoners who would prefer healthful, active, outdoor life, and at the same time contribute to the national economy. But, of course, the care and disposition of prisoners of war is under the strict interpretation of international law.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will pardon me, but I still have some questions to ask in respect to China, which I hope can be answered. First, however, I want the gentleman to know that I have nothing but the greatest respect for Mr. Stettinius and his staff, and that as far as aid to England and Russia is concerned, I think it is both necessary and advisable. However, I think the Pacific area is just as important as the other areas in this war, and out there China is our most important ally. What are we going to do—send them one-half of 1 percent of our lend-lease goods again, with a lot of sympathy? You cannot fight a war with sympathy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may have permission to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Let me ask the gentleman from Montana what he would suggest, and wherein he thinks the Lend-Lease Administration has been deficient.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I think it has been doing a good job, but I am a little bit disappointed at some of the remarks included in the report. For example, we were told at the beginning that if it required doing the impossible to send aid to China, it would be attempted, and now the words are that "we want to do for China as much as could be done" and that "we are going to send to China as much as could be sent her," and that we are requesting only so many dollars for China. Certainly there must be some way in which we can get to China by means of transport planes, caravan routes, or otherwise.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will supply that information to those in charge of the Allied campaign, he will become world famous overnight. Our contributions to China are limited only by our opportunities. We are sending to China everything we can get to her and whatever can be done is being done despite the incredible difficulties to be surmounted. There is only one line of access to China, and that is over the highest range of mountains in the world, at an altitude which it is difficult for planes to reach with unladen, much less with an appreciable cargo. We must be able to control both air and sea, and not until we can control the Indian Ocean as well as the Burma Road can we hope to supply the heroic armies of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek with even a modicum of the supplies they need. In the meantime, we shall deliver to China every dollar's worth of material and every ounce of supplies we can get through, and we will continue to increase it as rapidly as the military situation permits.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman also point out that the amount of money allowed here for allocation of munitions and commodities and food to China, of course, is not limited in respect to what lend-lease can use, because under their present form of operation, they can divert anything anywhere.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. They have a reserve fund?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Not only lend-lease, but the military authorities, out of military funds, realize the urgent need of doing everything possible for China, and the only limitation is the matter of transportation, which, of course, is terrific. The only way we can get in there now is by transport planes. All of us will be happy when we are able to do more for China.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion may I call attention to the fact that the end of this war is not in sight. It is true we have won for the time being a victory in north Africa, but that victory has been after months more than we originally calculated it would take. It has been a victory over an enemy far removed from its source of supplies, and with total manpower of only 15 divisions. We must now attack the Continent, where there are 226 divisions of crack Axis troops on the Russian line alone. We now enter upon the real campaign, against hundreds of divisions securely entrenched adjacent to bases of supplies, and on the defensive on their own hearth stone. A long war is ahead of us, a very expensive war. It will require men and money, and will involve staggering losses. The smallest thing we can do is to provide food and supplies for our allies when they are giving their lives. If their troops were not there our troops would have to be there; if their boys were not dying our boys would be dying; and I know I speak for every father and mother in America when I say they are welcome to all we can give if it means sending back our boys. If by providing these supplies for our allies at the front we can shorten the war a single month, a single week, a single day, it will be worth all its costs. I trust this bill to that end will have the unanimous approval of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I am very proud of the record of my home county, Gaston, in North Carolina, whose quota for the Second War Loan was $1,891,200. The people of the county subscribed for $4,059,426.25, and I shall read the letter of Mr. Allen H. Sims, county chairman for the War Loan Committee, giving full facts in regard to the sales in the county:

> The reason I have not written you sooner regarding the Second War Loan campaign in Gaston County was that the final figures have just come in.
>
> On a quota of $1,891,200, our total sales were $4,059,426.25. Total sales were 214 percent of the county quota.
>
> While the campaign was going on and after we had raised our original quota, the ladies of the county put on a special campaign to sell $350,000 of Series E bonds to purchase a bomber and name it Miss Gaston County. Total E bonds sales amounted to $573,506.25, which was more than one and one-half times the amount necessary to purchase the bomber. These E bond sales are included in the total given you above.
>
> From these figures, I know you will get a just pride in the way your home county went over the top in this campaign. The remarkable thing about it is that there was practically no solicitation other than by the ladies on E bond sales. People just came in voluntarily.
>
> With kindest regards, I am
>
> Cordially yours,
>
> ALLEN H. SIMS,
>
> *County Chairman, War Loan Committee.*

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. KEARNEY. Circumstances over which I have no control will prevent me from being in this Chamber when this bill is voted on. If I were present, I certainly would vote for the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill calls for an appropriation of $6,273,629,000. This bill, with the funds that we have heretofore been providing for the military authorities, and for lend-lease, and one way and another, makes a grand total of appropriations and contract authorizations of about $33,000,000,000. The expenditures for this fiscal year for war purposes are going to be just a little over $70,000,000,000. The public debt, as of this date, is approximately $135,000,000,000. This bill marks a new departure in handling lend-lease appropriations. Down to the 30th of April there were certain expenditures entered into for munitions, ammunition, airplanes, tanks, trucks, and other implements of war provided by both the Army and the Navy for those who are fighting with us.

Beginning with the 1st day of May those things will all be supplied out of the regular appropriations made direct to the Army and the Navy, and there will be nothing to show whether or not those things are to be chargeable to lease-lend in the long run, until actual delivery of the article. In other words, the Army and the Navy will contract for the articles of war and will get delivery of them, and there will be nothing what-

ever upon their books which will absolutely commit their purchase to lease-lend, until delivery is actually made. Of course, that same rule applies to anything that is purchased under lease-lend appropriations. If our soldiers or our war activities require the use of any of the things that are purchased with lease-lend funds, those things can be diverted by the Government to our own forces.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I notice in Mr. Stettinius' report to the committee, at page 159, a statement regarding the use of money for China. I gather it is an added statement after the hearing. He speaks of a contingent fund of $377,000,000 and that some of that could be used for goods going to China. I think the response that Mr. Churchill received from the Congress the other day shows the intense and interested approval of any measure of aid for China and the great delight that England, through Mr. Churchill, has promised to go along with us in aid to China.

Mr. TABER. I can only say this, that down through the 11th of March only $158,000,000 of merchandise was shipped to China, lease-lend. Shipments since that date have been on a smaller scale than they were before the Burma Road was closed. According to my understanding, there is every disposition on the part of both the Army and the Navy and the Lease-Lend Administrator to provide anything that we can possibly get to China. There is a very general realization on the part of everyone connected with the war effort, including the Congress, of the absolute necessity of providing the Chinese with everything we can to permit them to carry on the war.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am delighted to have the gentleman's statement.

Mr. TABER. I am sure before things go too far we will be able in some way to get a lot more goods and articles of war into China than we have been in the last year. Of course, in the first place, it probably means a breaking down of the Burma Road obstacles. Ultimately it means that perhaps we will have to find some way of breaking up, as soon as we can, the Japanese means of communication with their own homeland.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Of course, planes can be sent from some other area.

Mr. TABER. Planes may be sent in other ways, but not in every way, because the difficulties are quite severe.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Flying over the Himalayas, for instance?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that Russia is paying England for everything she gets from England—paying cash at the moment? I have been told that many times.

Mr. TABER. I have not heard that. It may be so.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman will find that is correct.

Mr. TABER. I did not know that; but it may be so. I will find out and put it in the RECORD at this point. I find that England has an arrangement with Russia similar to lend-lease.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. That figure of $158,000,000 which you gave as the total amount of lend-lease aid to China represents, I believe, an increase of only $2,000,000 since the lend-lease report ending on the last day of December last year, according to the newspapers. It was my impression that lend-lease aid was being stepped up all over the world. That would show, I believe, in comparison, that aid to China has been going down instead of going up.

Mr. TABER. Except for this, that planes might be sent out of the Army appropriation. That is where they will be sent, together with all munitions and guns that it is possible to send them from this time forward, except for a very few minor deliveries, of such things that have not yet been delivered to lease-lend.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. In the gentleman's opinion, then, these figures would not necessarily give the true story?

Mr. TABER. Not the complete story. On the other hand, there is no question but that the volume is nothing like what we wish it was.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. One further question. A number of remarks have been made today about there being only one route into China by means of which supplies could be sent and that is by planes over the Himalayas. I should like to call to the gentleman's attention that there is another route from Russia via the Turk-Sib Railway into the western Province of Sinkiang, and from there by caravan down to Chungking itself. Furthermore, it is my impression that all Allied planes being used over the Himalaya Mountain route have been the larger transport planes, and consequently should be able to carry more in the way of supplies, which, of course, would include gasoline.

Mr. TABER. Of course, it takes a lot of gasoline to operate these planes. They do not have as much pay load as they have going to some other places.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. Can the gentleman give us the figures on the total amount that has been appropriated and expended or used by lease-lend up to this time?

Mr. TABER. Down to the 11th of March there had been something like $9,300,000,000 actually delivered.

At the time we held our hearings there had been approximately $11,000,000,000. This, of course, does not mean that that much goods has been delivered; it means that we have spent that much out of the appropriation. For instance, of this appropriation, $6,273,000,000, $1,500,000,000 is for the transportation of goods on the high seas and $270,000,000, or approximately that, is for the repairs to ships, either transport ships or warships of other nations that are repaired in our shipyards.

The amount of expenditures in 1941 was $1,366,000,000; in 1942, $6,993,000,000; in 1943 through March, $1,261,000,000; a total of approximately $9,000,000,000; and then there is the month of April. So these expenditures added together would amount to something more than probably $10,000,000,000 right now.

Mr. ANGELL. May I ask what are the over-all figures of authorizations and appropriations for lend-lease?

Mr. TABER. The total lend-lease appropriations to date are $18,400,000,000. This might not be the right number of millions, but it is approximately correct.

Authority to the Army and the Navy to transfer goods runs into approximately $36,000,000,000 and to the Maritime Commission to lease ships to quite a considerable item, perhaps five or six billions. The Navy has the right in addition to that to transfer ships that have a cost or book value not exceeding $3,900,000,000; so probably there are forty-six or forty-eight billion dollars on top of the $18,000,000,000 that might be used.

Mr. ANGELL. One further question: If I remember the figures when we had this matter up before it was around $63,000,000,000.

Mr. TABER. It is not far from that. I think it is a little above that which might be used.

Mr. ANGELL. And would not include the amount carried in this bill.

Mr. TABER. No; that would make a total of $70,000,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to page 139 of the hearings if he has them handy.

Mr. TABER. Yes; I have them open here.

Mr. KNUTSON. I call the gentleman's attention to the fourth column of the table: India, China, Australia, New Zealand, with a grand total of $1,155,000,000 in round figures. Can the gentleman state for the information of the House just what part of the $1,155,000,000 went to China?

Mr. TABER. I have not the exact figures in mind, but they are in the hearings somewhere. As of the 11th day of March I have figures which I can give. They are these: China $158,000,000; India $595,000,000, Australia $452,000,000, and New Zealand $139,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does that seem to the gentleman to be an equitable distribution? China of all the countries that the gentleman has named, China is the only one that might be termed a battleground; Australia is not, India is not, New Zealand is not. Would the gentleman refresh my memory by reading the figures again?

Mr. TABER. Certainly; China $158,000,000, India $595,000,000, Australia $452,000,000, and New Zealand $139,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. China has had less than 10 percent of the amount that has gone into that territory.

Mr. TABER. Not less, but not much more.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is no wonder that she is just on the verge of giving up. We ought to have a better distribution of war material over in the Orient.

Mr. TABER. It is perfectly apparent that the British and the United States forces underestimated the power of the Japanese. I do not know as they are blameworthy for it, but it is perfectly apparent; and the Japanese at the present time have gone so far into the approaches to China both by sea and by land that it is absolutely impossible at the present time for us to get any more to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I should like to pursue this just a little further if the gentleman has the time.

Mr. TABER. I will take the time. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is possible at least to fly planes into China even though the Burma Road is closed.

Mr. TABER. Yes; and it is being done just as much as possible with what facilities we have available. Large transport planes are being flown in there from India; large quantities of materials are being carried into India and we are trying the very best we can to get equipment to China; but until we can break the Japanese control of the Burma Road or make an approach by sea, which probably will be more difficult, we cannot get a lot more material into China.

Mr. KNUTSON. How in the world are we ever going to open the Burma Road as long as we withhold supplies from China?

Mr. TABER. We have got to open up the Burma Road in order to get in there.

Mr. KNUTSON. You can fly some of it in, at least.

Mr. TABER. Well, we are; just as much as the transport planes will permit.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Is it not true that 2,000,000 English are now being held at bay by 60,000 Japs which prevents the opening of the Burma Road? If that is true we are never going to get into China.

Mr. TABER. I do not believe the situation is quite on that scale.

Mr. BREHM. According to the papers it is.

Mr. TABER. I doubt if that is the picture.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Referring back to the amount that has been heretofore appropriated and carried in this bill for lend-lease purposes, I would like to be clear upon that point. Did I understand the gentleman to say that heretofore we have appropriated in excess of $11,000,000,000? Then I see this bill carries $6,200,000,000 more.

Mr. TABER. We have heretofore appropriated $18,400,000,000, or a little more than that, but not much, and this bill carries $6,273,000,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. A total appropriation of approximately $24,000,000,000?

Mr. TABER. Twenty-five billion dollars.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We will have available when this bill is passed in the neighborhood of $8,000,000,000 out of that fund to carry on this program, according to the report?

Mr. TABER. Operating from the 1st of May. The allotments for obligations are set up at about $750,000,000 a month right through to the end of 14 months, or the 30th of June 1944.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Carrying that through, we then have used in the neighborhood of $16,000,000,000 for this purpose?

Mr. TABER. No; $25,000,000,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. As I understand, we have already appropriated $18,000,000,000?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and this makes $6,000,000,000 more.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Which total $24,000,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Yes; eighteen and one-half billion dollars and six and one-half billion dollars.

Mr. O'CONNOR. According to the report, we will have available after we pass this bill $8,000,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Which will carry us through to the 30th of June next year.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Showing that we have used between sixteen and seventeen billion dollars.

Mr. TABER. We have not used it yet, but we will have to as the goods are delivered which have already been ordered.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Here is what I am getting at: Can the gentleman give me these figures—and I have a lot of faith in the gentleman, because I know he watches the Treasury—can the gentleman give me the figures as to the value in money of the imports on lease-lend account that we have received from these various countries to whom we have been shipping these lease-lend goods?

Mr. TABER. I have not those figures in my head. I do know that there are a lot of things that I did not know about when I started these hearings. For instance, when we started to operate on our appropriations 2 years ago Great Britain was raising approximately 40 percent of her foodstuff. Today, as the result of the opening up of a lot of her land, she is raising 60 percent. On top of that she is supplying such things as potatoes and fresh vegetables to our troops that are quartered over there.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Maybe we could get some potatoes from her after the soldiers are fed.

Mr. TABER. We used to get lots of them from Ireland in the old days.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We ought to get some from Ireland. We cannot get them at home.

Mr. TABER. They seem to have tightened up. I do not know what is the matter with them.

Mr. O'HARA. Can we get a little gas, too?

Mr. TABER. Australia at the present time is providing all the meat to feed our troops that are quartered over there. New Zealand is providing for those that are in her territory. It is absolutely impossible, the way the thing is run, to say very much about the dollar value. Probably the dollar value of the meat that we are getting out of Australia will run in this fiscal year to somewhere around four or five hundred million dollars, almost as much as our lease-lend contribution in that direction.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that I appreciate the splendid work he does on the Appropriations Committee. He has given us some very worth-while information as to the amount of money which has been appropriated for national defense purposes and for lease-lend purposes, which I understand is around $330,000,000,000. I wonder if the gentleman can give us any information as to what the future policy or expenditures are going to be as to national defense with reference to lease-lend, as to the length of the war, and so forth? What I am getting at, as the gentleman realizes, is this: Just how far can we go?

Mr. TABER. When we stop going, now that we are all wound up, we have enlisted in Mr. Hitler's slave army. I am not ready to get to that point yet. I am going to keep going just as long as I can. I will be perfectly frank with the gentleman. I cannot figure how we are going to bear the debt. On the other hand, we have done a lot of things that could not be figured out in days gone by and I am not enough of a pessimist to believe it is time to quit.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman does not mean to infer I am willing to yield or to give up?

Mr. TABER. Oh, no; not for a minute.

Mr. O'HARA. What I am getting at is the debt situation.

Mr. TABER. Oh, the debt situation is terrible and I will be perfectly frank with the gentleman, it staggers me. We are not going to have any more than $30,000,000,000 of taxable income in the Treasury. How about that, Mr. KNUTSON?

Mr. KNUTSON. We are raising now about $25,000,000,000. They want $16,000,000,000 more. That means we will have to get a priority on some printing presses.

Mr. TABER. That may be.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will there be enough money left in the Treasury when this thing is over with which to build a monument to the author of our misfortunes?

Mr. TABER. I do not believe anybody would become excited about building monuments, because after all, after the war is over, we will be busy taking care

of our own recovery to meet our future needs.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CURLEY. We seem to be laying tremendous stress on the importance of opening up the Burma Road. I have been informed by very competent Chinese authorities who are familiar with the terrain of that part of the country, and have been for years, that it is possible to bring in more by planes in a single day than has ever been brought in over the Burma Road in an entire month.

Do you find any particular group that is hostile to an all-out program for China?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. CURLEY. Under lend-lease, or under any other Allied program?

Mr. TABER. No. Mr. Stettinius, when he was before our committee, expressed great interest in doing our part toward getting things to China.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield myself 8 additional minutes.

Mr. CURLEY. I might add, with the gentleman's permission, I have been informed by one of the Chinese generals who has been in the war all the time, from the beginning, that if they had 500 bombers and fighting planes they could drive the Japanese out of China.

Mr. TABER. That would be a great accomplishment.

Mr. CURLEY. And they could do it in 6 weeks, and we could move in through the back door and save the lives of hundreds of thousands of American boys; and I wonder if you could tell us the position of those having something to do with providing aid, whether aid is being given to China in the proportion that should be given because of the importance of that great country and of its manpower in winning the war.

Mr. TABER. I could not answer that.

Mr. CURLEY. I would like to know.

Mr. TABER. I wish I could, but I am afraid I cannot.

Mr. Chairman, I have one or two more items I would like to cover.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Several days ago the newspapers published a table showing that the United States is spending more money in the war than all the other belligerents combined. Did your committee look into that phase of it?

Mr. TABER. I did not look into that phase. I did look into the question as to how much other nations were spending and how much we were spending, and this is the information as I have it.

The United States, $70,000,000,000; the British, approximately $19,600,000,000; Australia, $5,258,000,000; Canada, $4,900,000,000; Germany, is about $30,000,000,000.

That is as far as I went into it.

Mr. KNUTSON. What period does that cover?

Mr. TABER. It is for the annual expenditures for the fiscal year 1943, similar to our fiscal year.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. That does not include Russia?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. How does that total up?

Mr. TABER. It totals up to about six-sevenths of ours. These United Nations total up, without Russia, to about half of ours. Germany and the other United Nations, exclusive of Russia, would total up to just about half of what ours is.

Mr. KNUTSON. Then it may be proper to say that we are spending fully as much as the belligerents combined?

Mr. TABER. Oh, no; no; I do not think so, because when you come to figure in Germany and Russia, it would probably be some 50 per cent more than ours, figuring the total figure, over-all.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is that exclusive of the lend-lease money?

Mr. TABER. No; lend-lease money is figured in ours.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it figured in there?

Mr. TABER. No, not as an expenditure by them.

Mr. KNUTSON. How do they carry lend-lease in these countries if they do not carry it as an expenditure?

Mr. TABER. As a receipt.

Mr. KNUTSON. A receipt.

Mr. TABER. I have one more thing I must say. In checking up on something appearing in the paper with reference to the lend-lease, in the last few days, I have contacted Mr. Stettinius about those things. I have found this, that the radios that were referred to in that article in the newspaper, that were sent to India, were sent to India, and they are now being sold there for the account of this Government, and that that was done as soon as it was brought to Mr. Stettinius' attention. The other items where India was referred to in the article, went to India for military purposes. Mr. Stettinius advises me that he is prepared to furnish any information to any Member of Congress at any time he can do so. He told me that when he was unable to furnish information, it was because he was required to be before the Committee on Appropriations on the hearings, and that he could not do two things at once.

Of course, there are some of these figures that have to be given to the committee in confidence. It would not do to tell our enemies just exactly what we intend to do, but any Member of Congress is entitled to have the books opened for his benefit, with the understanding that it will be kept confidential. I am sure that no one would have a right to find fault with the attitude which Mr. Stettinius has expressed to me, and my hope is that when any Member of the House who feels that he has any question which should be asked of Mr. Stettinius, that he will approach him with that in mind.

I might add that I have been over with Mr. Stettinius the questions which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] asked of Mr. Stettinius in a letter—68 questions—and that I have here the answers insofar as they are available. Some are of confidential information and some cannot be answered, but I am sure that Mr. Stettinius has no desire to keep any of us in the dark as to the actual operations of lease-lend.

Of these figures brought here, approximately $2,800,000,000 are for food, $7,200,000,000 for industrial products; $1,500,000,000 for transportation by sea, and about $250,000,000 for repairs and outfitting the vessels that have to be made as the result of wear and tear that comes to them.

I have tried to yield as I have gone along and cover the ground as thoroughly as possible, and to answer any questions that might be asked. Personally, I do not see how we can avoid meeting our responsibility to provide for those things which will keep our allies fighting—Russia, Great Britain, China, India, Australia, and all the rest of our allies. I hope that this bill will receive the approval of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out, this bill carries a total of $6,273,000,000, or $150,000,000 less than recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Added to $2,057,000,000 unobligated funds from prior appropriations, the bill will make available for a 14-month period commencing with May 1 of this year the sum of $8,331,000,000.

As the Members will note from the report, there have heretofore been made direct lend-lease appropriations amounting to $18,410,000,000. Of this total $16,300,000,000 has been obligated or committed, leaving an uncommitted balance for reappropriation amounting to $2,057,000,000.

The record indicates that to date there has been actually exported under Lend-Lease $9,800,000,000 from direct appropriations and an additional $1,200,000,000 under the authorizations accorded the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission in previous acts, or a total of $11,000,000,000.

This total is roughly divided between commodities, $9,100,000,000, and services, $1,900,000,000.

Speaking very roughly, distribution has been made to the United Kingdom to the extent of about 40 percent, to Russia to the extent of about 30 percent, and to our other allies to the extent of 30 percent. It is very encouraging and heartening, I think, to note the statement by Mr. Stettinius to the effect that to date less than 5 percent of lease-lend shipments have been lost by sinkings.

The committee will find a brief statement as to reciprocal lend-lease in the committee report and a more detailed statement in the committee hearings, pages 30 to 35, inclusive. You will note

among other things that the United Kingdom has provided something over 1,362,000 tons of articles and equipment exclusive of construction materials, and something over 2,177,000 tons of construction materials in addition to airfields, barracks, hospitals, and various other items specified in the hearings.

You will note that Australia and New Zealand are said to have provided more food per capita under reciprocal lend-lease than we have provided per capita under lend-lease proper; also that Australia and New Zealand are said to have provided more beef, veal, lamb, and mutton than we have provided to all lease-lend countries. The contributions of Russia and India are also referred to briefly at this point in the hearings.

The request before us represents a slash by the Lend-Lease Administration equivalent to 19 percent in dollars and 30 percent in tonnage. That is to say, the original Allied requests upon the Lend-Lease Administration amounted to something over $10,000,000,000 and called for about 26,000,000 tons of dry cargo. The requests were reduced by the Lend-Lease Administration to $8,481,000,000 or thereabouts and to about 19,400,000 tons of dry cargo. A further reduction has been made by your committee as already stated amounting to $150,000,000.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point two or three tables from the hearings, one a brief summary entitled "Why We Are Asking for Additional Funds," prepared by the Lend-Lease Administration; the second, "A Statement of New Funds Requested," by categories; and the third, a statement entitled "Budget Details by Fiscal Code," which goes into somewhat more detail:

WHY WE ARE ASKING FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS

	In billions of dollars
1. Since March 1941 there has been appropriated to the President specifically for lend-lease purposes, a total of	18.4
2. By Apr. 30, 1943, we had placed contracts totaling 14.5 billion and an additional 1.8 billion had been committed for projects in process. Thus we had used a total of	16.3
3. This left us with "free funds" amounting to	2.1
4. For the next 14 months, from Apr. 30, 1943, through June 30, 1944, we estimate that our requirements will be	8.5
5. We are therefore requesting new funds amounting to	6.4

6. We are going to use this money to buy food, industrial materials, and other essential items and services, for lend-lease countries. The amounts going to each will depend upon the strategical conditions when the goods are ready for delivery. The tentative break-down is as follows:

	Millions of dollars	Long tons	
		Dry cargo	Wet cargo
Russia	2,500	5,000,000	200,000
United Kingdom	4,213	8,800,000	14,200,000
Australia and New Zealand	328	700,000	2,500,000
Other British	167	700,000	100,000
India and China	252	800,000	300,000
Other countries	637	2,800,000	500,000
Total	8,097	19,400,000	17,800,000

7. The money will be used in about the following proportions:

	In millions of dollars
Shipping and other services	$2,345
Agricultural products	2,860
Industrial materials:	
Petroleum products	752
Iron and steel	713
Nonferrous metals	392
Machinery and equipment	504
All other commodities	915
Total	3,276
Grand total	8,481

Tonnage of agricultural products and industrial materials is as follows:

	Dry cargo *Long tons*	*Wet cargo*
Agricultural products	9,000,000	
Industrial materials:		
Iron and steel	6,500,000	
Nonferrous metals	500,000	
Other (exclusive of petroleum products)	3,400,000	
	19,400,000	
Petroleum products (22,100,000 ship tons)		17,800,000

Fourth lend-lease appropriation—statement of new funds requested

[Thousands of dollars]

Category	(1) Available funds as of Apr. 30, 1943 (before transfer)	(2) Requirements May 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944 (14 months)	(3) Available funds as of Apr. 30, 1943 (after transfers)	(4) 1944 estimates available immediately
1. Ordnance and ordnance stores	335,407			
2. Aircraft and aeronautical material	114,403			
3. Tanks and other vehicles	99,208	58,162	58,162	
4. Vessels and other watercraft	127,002	1,679,661	127,002	1,552,659
5. Miscellaneous military equipment	12,141			
6. Production facilities in United States	8,190			
7. Agricultural and industrial commodities	963,720	6,077,530	1,474,907	4,602,623
8. Servicing and repair of ships, etc	19,952	279,300	19,952	259,348
9. Services and expenses	377,473	377,473	377,473	
10. Administrative expenses		8,999		8,999
Total	2,057,496	8,841,125	2,057,496	6,423,629

Budget details by fiscal code

Fiscal code	Description	Total
241	Trucks	$31,440,000
243	Other automotive vehicles	1,585,925
244	Miscellaneous automotive supplies, etc	25,136,316
	Total, category 3	58,162,241
310	Watercraft	81,907,000
320	Equipage, services and supplies	183,000,000
330	Rental and charter of vessels	1,414,754,000
	Total, category 4	1,679,661,000
611	Dairy products and eggs	643,222,000
612	Meat, fish, and fowl	1,061,616,000
613	Fruits and vegetables	168,202,000
614	Grains and cereal products	364,174,300
615	Sugar, chocolate, and saccharine	163,441,300
616	Lard, fats, and oils	281,777,000
619	Other foodstuffs	12,099,000
	Subtotal, food	2,694,531,600
621	Cotton	113,445,000
623	Tobacco	40,645,000
629	Other nonfoodstuffs	11,572,100
	Subtotal, agricultural nonfood	165,662,100
632	Agricultural implements	16,642,320
633	Road-building equipment	23,768,800
634	Electrical equipment	185,489,937
635	Fire-fighting equipment	4,217,449
636	Railroad equipment	62,429,000
639	Other machinery	153,376,000
641	Iron and steel	713,255,097
642	Copper and brass	200,472,775
643	Aluminum	81,755,551
644	Zinc	18,505,100
645	Lead	1,067,100
648	Other metals and alloys	73,031,943
649	Nonmetallic minerals	17,000,293
652	Phosphates	8,100,562
659	Other chemicals	110,453,729
660	Petroleum products	752,020,000
670	Textiles and clothing	289,756,775
680	Timber products	88,486,558
686	Civilian medical supplies	98,000,000
690	All other commodities not otherwise classified	319,503,000
	Subtotal, industrial and other commodities	3,217,335,989
	Total, category 7	6,077,529,689
710	Servicing of vessels, total, category 8	279,300,000
	Grand total, all categories except 9 and 10	8,094,652,930
	Total, category 9	377,473,002
	Total, category 10	8,999,000
	Grand total	8,481,124,932

The Committee will note that no funds are to be expended under this appropriation in respect to category 1, ordnance; category 2, aircraft; or category 5, miscellaneous military equipment, as these items will be provided out of War and Navy Department appropriations; or category 6, production facilities in the United States.

Funds are to be expended for administrative expenses, under category 10, about $9,000,000; for trucks to be shipped to China, under category 3, $58,162,000; for what is really a reserve against contingencies, under category 9, $377,473,000; for repairs and charter hire, under categories 4 and 8, $1,900,000,000, or thereabouts; and for food, agricultural implements, and industrial commodities, under category 7, $6,077,530,000.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did the gentleman take up with Mr. Stettinius the fact that it is possible for the British to use some of the money and supplies that are going to India to construct more airfields for sending planes to China and some of the war equipment, planes, and so forth; also that every month at the present time some 2,500 tons of freight are carried over the Himalaya Mountains, and almost every day without exception a plane or planes flies into China and from China back to India? It seems to me that it is a matter of plain arithmetic. If we send more airplanes and if the British would help build more landing fields in India, we could send more planes to China. It has been pointed out by a very reliable authority, it is true, that 2,500 tons of freight a month are flown from India to China. If the planes go in daily and come out daily, I can see no reason why we cannot give the Chinese more planes and get more supplies in there. The C. N. A. C. and our Ferry Command fly planes constantly from India to China over the mountains and during the monsoon.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to my colleague that I am in entire sympathy with her desire and with the desire of the Congress as a whole to do everything humanly possible to help China as much as possible. I do not think I can add anything specifically in answer to her question that has not already been covered in the course of this debate.

Generally speaking, the record indicates that the principal demands of China are for heavy fighting equipment, that provision of that type of help depends largely on transportation facilities, and that the Lend-Lease Administration and all others in the picture are prepared to do everything within their power consistent with available facilities.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman have available figures as to the amount of money that is going to India or as to the type of supplies?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not have those figures.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman have any objection to my putting them in at this point if I can secure them?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No; I have no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

(Figures not supplied.)

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In connection with the money for charter hire under the Maritime Commission, I should like to call attention in passing to the testimony of Admiral Land at page 63 of the hearings referring to the Red Sea charters and the enormous profits made under them which have been discussed previously in this House. It will be noted that the admiral expresses his chagrin in this connection and indicates that some readjustment has been made and that further readjustments are likely to be made with a view to improving the picture.

Members of the committee will note that the food item, category 7, is divided into three parts; first, for food itself, $2,694,000,000 plus; second, for agricultural implements, $16,642,000 plus; third, for industrial commodities $3,275,000,000 plus.

The record indicates that the total food furnished under lend-lease for the current fiscal year amounted to something like 6 percent of our total production, and that it is hoped to increase this percentage to 10 percent in the coming fiscal year.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point in the RECORD a table showing lend-lease shipments of principal food items in relation to our national supply in 1942 and in the first 3 months of 1943:

Lend-lease shipments of principal food items in relation to supply for 1942 and the first 3 months of 1943 are shown by percentages in the following table:

	1942	First 3 months, 1943
All meats (dressed-weight basis)	5.0	7.7
Beef	.2	1.0
Veal	0	0
All meats—Continued.		
Lamb and mutton	.4	18.2
Pork	9.7	12.8
All milk products (fluid-milk equivalent)	3.4	1.9
Dry whole milk	6.1	3.1
Dry skim milk	23.0	40.0
Condensed and evaporated milk	7.2	18.9
Butter	.7	.5
Cheese	23.1	4.6
Fats and oils	13.2	13.3
Eggs, dried (shell-egg equivalent)	10.0	15.3
Fish, canned and frozen	7.1	12.9
Canned vegetables	.8	.7
Canned fruits and juices	1.7	1.2
Corn and corn products	.1	.1
Wheat and wheat products	.3	.4
Dried beans	5.0	16.8
Dried peas	6.0	10.8
Dried fruit	15.7	21.8

To me it was amazing to be told that despite lend-lease shipments the people in America as a whole had more food in 1942 than in any year in our history. Apparent shortages are explained by Secretary Wickard, as the result of increased consumption by those in the armed forces, and by those in the lower-income brackets, who have been earning increased compensation. I include at this point a table furnished by the Secretary in this connection:

United States: Civilian consumption of food products, per capita, in 1941 and 1942 compared to 1935–39 average

Item	Per capita consumption			1941, as percent of 1935–39	1942, as percent of 1935–39
	1935–39 average	1941	1942		
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*		
Meats (dressed weight):					
Beef and veal	63.1	69.0	69.5	109	110
Lamb and mutton	6.7	6.9	7.3	103	109
Pork	56.5	68.0	62.8	120	111
Total	126.3	143.9	139.6	114	111
Fish (dried weight):					
Fresh frozen	6.6	6.0	5.7	91	86
Canned	5.2	4.9	3.3	94	63
Cured	1.2	.9	.8	75	67
Poultry products:					
Eggs	37.5	39.3	40.0	105	107
Chickens	18.0	19.5	21.9	108	122
Turkeys	2.7	3.6	3.8	133	141
Dairy products:					
Total milk	806.5	814.0	854.1	101	106
Butter	16.8	16.0	16.0	95	95
Cheese	5.6	6.1	6.4	109	114
Condensed and evaporated milk	16.8	18.4	19.7	110	117
Ice cream	9.6	13.7	15.2	143	158
Dried whole milk	.13	.17	.13	131	100
Malted milk	.11	.13	.15	118	136
Fluid milk and cream	342.3	350.1	381.1	102	111
Fats and oils:					
Lard	11.0	14.3	14.0	130	127
Compounds (fat content)	11.9	10.5	8.9	88	75
Margarine and oils	2.3	2.2	2.3	96	100
Other fats	6.3	8.4	8.5	133	135
Total (fat content)	31.5	35.4	33.7	122	107
Fruits:					
Fresh (except melons):					
Citrus	48.2	57.5	55.2	119	115
Apples	43.1	36.3	32.9	84	76
Other	59.1	60.3	46.1	102	78
Canned fruits	15.0	20.0	15.5	133	103
Canned juices	5.2	10.6	6.1	204	117
Frozen	.7	1.2	1.5	171	214
Dried	6.1	3.7	4.1	61	67
Vegetables:					
Fresh:					
Leafy, green, and yellow	82.1	78.6	81.7	96	100
Tomatoes	23.7	25.7	25.9	108	109
Melons	39.5	38.5	33.3	97	84
Other	61.5	63.6	65.9	103	107
Canned	30.0	42.4	40.9	141	136
Potatoes	130.7	127.1	125.1	97	96
Sweetpotatoes	23.4	20.9	21.4	89	91

United States: Civilian consumption of food products, per capita, in 1941 and 1942 compared to 1935–39 average—Continued

Item	Per capita consumption			1941, as percent of 1935–39	1942, as percent of 1935–39
	1935–39 average	1941	1942		
Vegetables—Continued.					
Canned—Continued.	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*		
Beans, dry	8.9	8.8	8.4	99	94
Peas, dry	1.2	1.2	.9	100	75
Sugar	97.0	105.1	87.3	108	90
Grains:					
Wheat	222.4	220.1	224.2	99	101
Rye	3.9	3.8	3.9	97	100
Rice	5.8	5.5	6.2	95	107
Corn	57.3	64.8	74.7	113	130
Oats	6.9	7.1	7.9	103	114
Barley	21.6	22.6	27.2	105	126
Coffee	14.0	16.1	13.5	115	96
Tea	.7	.8	.5	114	71
Cocoa	4.4	4.8	3.4	109	77
Index of food consumption 1935–39=100	100.0			111	109

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a difficult bill to present on the floor of the House. It is difficult to present because of the fact that only part of the evidence appears in the hearings of the commmittee. A large part of the evidence is necessarily off the record, necessarily confidential, and available only through the confidential files of the Committee on Appropriations.

I can say, however, as far as the past is concerned, that the committee has been furnished with a detailed statement. There is a general summary in the eighth quarterly report to Congress on lend-lease operations dated March 11, 1943, but a statement in much greater detail was furnished your committee in confidence, showing by country, by commodity, and by dollar value lend-lease expenditures made heretofore. That statement and every item in that statement, we were advised, has supporting documents in the files of the Lend-Lease Administration.

As far as future expenditure is concerned, your committee was also furnished by the Lend-Lease Administration with a very complete and very detailed statement. It was 59 pages in length, showing by country, by commodity, by unit, and by dollar value just what is expected to be done with the appropriation now under consideration. The percentage of total production was shown for every item included in its statement. Of course the statement is not binding. It is an estimate, but it is a very careful and a very detailed estimate. That statement is contained in the confidential files of the committee.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. CLASON. The gentleman stated that some of the evidence given to the committee does not appear in the printed hearings. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not any petroleum products—gasoline or fuel oil—is to be shipped out of this country under the lend-lease program for use of civilian populations in other countries?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman from Massachusetts will find in the concluding pages of the hearings, commencing at page 183, a statement by Mr. Duce, Foreign Division, Petroleum Administrator for War, in this connection. The answer is that a certain amount of petroleum products is to be shipped out for military purposes, but Mr. Duce testified that in his opinion, whatever these shipments might amount to, there would be available in addition enough for essential minimum domestic needs.

Mr. CLASON. Does the whole testimony before the committee satisfy the gentleman that there is going to be sufficient fuel oil and gasoline for the people of New England during the coming year and the next winter?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not suppose the gentleman or I or anyone else can predict with accuracy what the demands of the Army and Navy are going to be, but I think this is an authoritative statement, which came in answer to the question which I asked Mr. Duce specifically. His answer indicates, in the light of foreseeable Army and Navy demands, sufficient oil for essential minimum domestic needs, including the east coast.

Mr. CLASON. But insofar as petroleum products going abroad for civilian consumption, it seems to me that before any of it comes under this lend-lease program, consideration should be given to the needs of our own people, and at the present time our share of all kinds of petroleum products.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think that all the petroleum products contemplated here are for the war effort.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman described the elaborate confidential statements filed with the committee, but the gentleman did not say whether the committee had gone over those statements and had given consideration and study to the flow of lend-lease materials all over the world. In the hearings before the Foreign Affairs Committee, when extension of lend-lease was under consideration, although the Administrator offered to give us detailed statements and descriptions of lend-lease, country by country, the committee never saw fit to avail itself of the offer, so that the extension of lend-lease was made without any detailed study by any committee of the House. Of course, we must place great reliance on the administration of lend-lease and the Army and the Navy Combined Staff.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Of course, we must rely on the Lend-Lease Administration in large measure, but what concerns me is that no one in the Congress may be actually reviewing the records that they are willing to submit in confidence. Those of us on the floor—I myself—must take the record on faith because the record is not available to me here. When it was available my committee did not avail itself of it. Can the gentleman give us any assurance as to the analysis and study that the gentleman and his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee and subcommittee have given to the flow of lend-lease materials, war materials, and other kinds to various countries?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Answering the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], I may say that Mr. Stettinius furnished the committee with a statement, to which I have referred; a statement only recently completed; a statement almost as large as the table from which I am speaking, 59 pages in length, with every item in detail as I have described, according to the estimates for the next 14 months. He also furnished the committee with various charts, exhibits, and statistics in addition to this statement. Your committee spent several days going over this secret document, page by page and item by item, obtaining the best possible picture they could obtain under the conditions by which we are confronted to which the gentleman from Ohio has already referred.

I want to supplement this statement by saying, as I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has already stated, that Mr. Stettinius has stated to me personally that he will be happy to furnish any Member of Congress with any information concerning lend-lease that he may desire, just so long as the request falls outside the limits necessarily prescribed by military and naval secrecy. I regret it is impossible to bring the details to the Members of the House, but we are necessarily in that position, as we have been heretofore.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. As I understand, there has heretofore been appropriated directly for lend-lease purposes $18,400,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Eighteen billion four hundred and ten million dollars.

Mr. RIZLEY. How much of that has been actually expended?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Of that, $9,800,000,000 has been actually exported, as I understand it. That is, spent and turned over to the Allies. Of the total, $16,300,000,000 has been obligated or committed. So of the total there remains a balance of $2,057,000,000 which are free.

Mr. RIZLEY. In addition to the direct appropriation of $18,410,000,000, we have also indirectly appropriated, earmarked for lend-lease, about $45,000,000,000, have we not?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It depends a little on how you look at it. The gentleman will find at page 47 of the last lend-lease quarterly report, dated March 11, a break-down of all categories.

Mr. RIZLEY. I have studied that report, but I was unable to ascertain from the report just what it is.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The report shows $18,410,000,000 of direct appropriations. It shows $35,970,000,000 of authorizations to the War Department or Navy Department for transfer purposes.

Mr. RIZLEY. Is that $35,000,000,000 earmarked for lend-lease purposes?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It is not earmarked for lend-lease purposes, but the two Departments are authorized to use up to that figure, should they see fit to do so. As a matter of fact, the total transfer against that authorization to date amounts to $1,200,000,000.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is the point I was trying to get at. Why do we have both the direct and indirect? Why is it necessary to have a direct appropriation of $18,000,000,000 and then this additional direct appropriation of $6,000,000,000 when we have the War Department authorized to expend for lend-lease out of the funds that we appropriate for the War Department?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In a word, because the War Department and Navy Department could not provide the items that the direct appropriations are planned to provide.

Mr. RIZLEY. What item, for instance?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Food, for instance.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is what I am getting at. Does the War Department have authority from the funds earmarked for lend-lease in the appropriations that go to them, to spend any of that money for food, for instance?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the answer is no. What the War and Navy Departments may provide are items which we have specifically made available to them—arms and munitions, for instance. We have included in appropriations for the Army and the Navy authorizations to use up to a certain limitation arms or munitions and other articles procured from the appropriations for transfer to our allies.

Mr. RIZLEY. Can the gentleman give me any definite figure, whether by direct or indirect appropriation, the amount of money we have actually expended to date for lend-lease purposes?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Eleven billion dollars.

Mr. RIZLEY. How much in addition to that have we authorized for lend-lease purposes?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There are three classes authorized—$18,410,000,000 in direct appropriations, $35,970,000,000 in authorized transfers, and over and above that, about $5,000,000,000 applicable to the leasing of ships by the Maritime Commission and an unlimited authority applicable to the leasing of ships by the Navy.

Mr. RIZLEY. How much have our allies, on reverse lend-lease, in dollars and cents, contributed up to date to the lend-lease fund?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not think anybody knows the answer to that question. If they do, it has never been made public.

Mr. RIZLEY. If we are going to make our figures public so that the world may know how much we are contributing to lend-lease, why is it that we are unable to get the amount that other nations, in dollars and cents, are contributing to lend-lease?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If the gentleman will read the recent hearings on the extension of the lend-lease law he will see a very detailed discussion on that question. As I understand it, insofar as possible, every item of reverse lend-lease is recorded in terms of pounds, tons, or other units. There is not in existence, however, as I understand it, any over-all statement which converts those pounds or tons or other units into dollars and cents.

Mr. RIZLEY. I understand that.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The reason advanced is that the items are so numerous and so complicated that it would take an unwarranted amount of manpower at this time. In fact, in the hearings referred to I think an expert from the lend-lease administration testified it would take the equivalent of half a division of men for a certain period of time to bring all the material together. Mr. Stettinius assures us, however, that there is a record in one form or another, that is in tons or pounds or other units, so that if in the future it is desired to make the computation and convert into dollars and cents it can be done after the war is over.

Mr. RIZLEY. I can understand that; but, on the other hand, I assume that the things we are supplying under lease-lend also are broken down into pounds, tons, or what not; then we carry it out and show it in dollars and cents. What I cannot understand is why it should require so much more manpower for other countries to give us the same kind of accounting, the same kind of statement we give to them; I just cannot understand it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I confess to the gentleman the difficulty involved has never been made clear to me, but I do think it is a good deal more complicated matter than we might think it is, because of the very varied nature of the items of lend-lease in reverse that are being furnished, and because of the fact that they are being furnished all over the face of the globe.

Mr. RIZLEY. Am I correct in saying that the Commodity Credit Corporation is one of our purchasing agencies for lend-lease?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not think so. I think that lend-lease purchasing is done by the Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission, the Department of Agriculture, and the Treasury Procurement Division; there are five procurement agencies.

Mr. RIZLEY. I am under the impression that I read a statement in the hearings that in addition to the agencies the gentleman has mentioned, the Commodity Credit Corporation was also one of the purchasing agencies employed by lend-lease, and that they purchased, not only in this country but abroad, for lend-lease purposes. Am I wrong about that? If I am, I wish the gentleman would correct me.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It is conceivable that the Commodity Credit Corporation is employed by the Department of Agriculture to aid in its purchasing; I cannot answer the gentleman definitely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me say that the request before us, as I have already pointed out, represents a slash of 19 percent by the Lend-Lease Administration and a little more by your committee. Every dollar requested we are advised will be obligated before July 1, 1944; every dollar requested we are advised will be expended within a very few weeks of that date. The rate of spending during the last few months which has run around $600,000,000 a month tends to substantiate the request that is made.

The Department of Agriculture, the War Production Board, and the other agencies of the Government which are responsible for the allocation of our production in the light of the needs of the Army, the Navy, and our civilian economy have all approved the request that is before us. The War Shipping Administration has advised us that in the light of the foreseeable, shipping will be available for the request that is before us. We are advised that the combined chiefs of staffs have had an opportunity of passing upon every item that is contemplated under this bill.

Under these circumstances I do not see how the House can do anything but support the appropriation that is before us as vital to the war effort. I shall vote for the bill on final passage.

In making this statement, however, Mr. Chairman, I cannot refrain from a final word emphasizing the tremendous responsibility of the Lend-Lease Administration. I feel that the country and the Congress are very fortunate in having Mr. Stettinius as our Lend-Lease Administrator. He commands the confidence of the Congress by reason of his fine capacity and high character. I am sure that he fully appreciates the responsibility which is his.

Maximum lend-lease aid to our allies is absolutely vital. Proper control over lend-lease expenditures is also absolutely vital. We must do everything in our power to contribute to the war effort, but what we do, Mr. Chairman, must be done in the light of the economic and financial capacity of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, food is probably the most challenging problem in America today. Food will win the war and it will also win the peace. Our producers, the farmers, broke all records in food production last year. However, this year the food outlook does not appear so good. The things that may cause a food shortage are lack of experienced farm help, too much regulation from Washington, misunderstanding of farm problems in Washington, need for profit insuring prices, lack of farm machinery, early frosts, and lack of proper transportation facilities. Of course, weather conditions will have a great bearing upon the final results of the 1943 crop.

We have a real food problem facing us in feeding our armed forces, our civilian population, our allies, and the small democracies. There are about 5,000,000 children in Belgium, Holland, and Norway who need food at the present time. There are also destitute and unemployed men and women who need food. In Belgium the available daily ration is about 950 calories as against the minimum need of 2,200 calories to maintain health. More than 50 percent of the children are tubercular and have no resistance to disease. If these countries are to survive this food must be imported. They will need 30,000 to 40,000 tons of food monthly. In order to feed ourselves and help these countries we will have to produce more than we did in 1942. This is a real problem facing America and the world.

In the past there has been too much confusion between the Agriculture Department, the W. L. B., and the O. P. A. There has been too much red tape and delay. I understand the O. P. A. is using about 90,000 employees to administer the act, while it was handled by Mr. Hoover in the First World War with 3,000 employees. The chief objections to the present O. P. A. set-up are: The O. P. A.'s lack of confidence in American business, a poor fundamental policy, complexity of the program, and a personnel with little or no experience about the practical problems involved in agricultural production and distribution. What America needs is a food administrator with complete authority to handle the food program from the farmer to the consumer. He should have authority on production, distribution, rationing, and price fixing of food products. Unless the present system is changed immediately we will have a critical shortage in vegetables, canned goods, protein feeds and meat in 1944.

PRICE CEILINGS

The O. P. A. has been too slow in determining price ceilings. Many acres have not been planted in vegetables, due to this delay. Some price ceilings that have been set are too low to cover the cost of production. The ceiling prices which have been applied to certain fruit and vegetables have caused a tremendous amount of confusion and actual chaos both at the shipping point and in the receiving markets. In the case of certain commodities, such as potatoes, this has resulted in the development and operation of the worst black market in history. It is common knowledge among the wholesalers and retailers in most of the larger cities that the consumers are finding it necessary to purchase their supplies of potatoes and certain other commodities from these black markets at almost prohibitive prices from which the producer benefits very little, if any. Unless something is done immediately the production of food is going to be jeopardized and business which has been built up over a great many years is going to be in bankruptcy.

In discussing price ceilings with a number of processors and distributors I have learned the following facts: The O. P. A. has announced ceiling prices for the 1943 pack of corn, peas, tomatoes, and green beans. These prices have been specified at a specific dollar-and-cents price for each size can of each grade of each of these products for each area. The areas are divisions of the country intended to conform with the variations in announced support prices by the Department of Agriculture for raw products involved.

These ceilings have been determined by assuming that a subsidy was going to be paid to the canners by the Commodity Credit Corporation in an amount equal to the increase in raw product cost for 1943 over the cost in 1942. These ceilings do not reflect any increased labor costs in view of the freeze on wages directed by the President. The O. P. A. insist that the ceiling prices, thus announced, reflect their idea of the cost plus 10 percent on the basis of last year's raw material cost and wage rate. These prices are not high enough to reflect a fair return above the cost to a great number of the canners of these products. In fact they are amounts which will be definitely less than cost for many canners.

The O. P. A. has been furnished many statements of costs by canners which show that the 1943 ceilings are lower than the 1942 costs for many items. In some instances this discrepancy is so large that the 1942 ceiling is less than the 1942 cost would have been if the canner had not paid anything in 1942 for direct labor, boxes, labels, sugar, or salt.

There will be many increases in cost in 1943 as compared to 1942 other than wage rates and raw material. A reduction in volume necessarily will increase per unit overhead and administrative costs. This reduction is bound to result from the reduction in the amount of permitted containers, the reluctance of farmers to oblige themselves to as large an acreage of canning crops as in 1942, the discouragement of canners by the lack of good faith upon the part of the O. P. A., and the decrease in acreage yield of canning crops which is to be anticipated this year in comparison with last year. Also that the O. P. A.'s insistence that the canners use A. M. A. grading methods, which will increase costs by requiring increased factory and warehouse labor, loss of an increased number of samples used in grading, factory slow-up to await Government grading, and the charges for Government grading. Minimum wages will be increased and factories will be running on machinery which will be 1 year older. The Army will buy more canned goods which will force the canner to give free storage and insurance on the goods until shipped. Fuel, cases, and label costs are higher than last year. Local taxes have increased. The result will be decreased efficiency with a resultant increased cost. Therefore, if canners lose substantial sums in 1943, their resultant reduction in canned food packs in 1944 may be critical.

The personnel in the O. P. A. has not been up to par. This agency needs competent officials who have faith and confidence in private enterprise. I believe that the O. P. A. is on its way out unless it gives immediate relief to the producers, processors, and distributors. If the bungling, red tape, and delay of this department continues it will cause a food shortage in 1944.

Mr. Chairman, I have just introduced a bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act which shall provide that the President may thereafter, notwithstanding any other provision of this act, provide for making adjustments with respect to prices of perishable agricultural commodities, or perishable commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, to the extent necessary to avoid waste or spoilage of such commodities.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I have not had the opportunity of preparing for this debate on this particular bill that I should like to have had. I attended this morning the meeting of the full committee wherein the subcommittee reported to the full committee the Budget request for this item. I must state, however, that I did have an opportunity to get hold of the hearings last night; and over night and until this hour, taking time out to listen to other Members in the debate, I have not had the opportunity of covering the entire hearings and giving them the attention I should like on this bill which appropriates $6,000,000,000. Heretofore we have always reported out from the full committee a bill and have taken it to the floor a day after the full committee acted upon it. I must confess I tried my best this morning to have the full Committee on Appropriations follow that procedure. I was of course ridden down by the multitude. I doubt if there would be any change at all in the results of the consideration of the bill if we had considered it Monday instead of today, but in fairness to anyone who is trying to present accurately a different point of view from the majority it seems to me that the House of Representatives should vouchsafe to any minority in the House

a fair and equal opportunity to prepare to present their views for the consideration of the House. Freedom of expression carries with it equal opportunity to debate the issues. I am debating with a subcommittee that has heard testimony off the record and on the record for several days. Our boys are fighting on sixty-odd battle fronts for the freedom of expression and I am therefore encouraged to give my views as a contribution to winning the war.

I hope I may depend upon my opponents accepting criticism of this bill as Winston Churchill would were he here today. Mr. Churchill said on the floor of the House of Commons January 22, 1941:

> I think I have said before that to try to carry on a war, a tremendous war, without the aid and guidance of the House of Commons would be a superhuman task. I have never taken the view that the debates and criticisms of this house are a drag and a burden. Far from it. I may not agree at all with the criticism—I may be stunned by it, and I may resent it; I may even retort—but at any rate debates on these large issues are of the very greatest value to the life trust of the nation, and they are of the very greatest assistance to His Majesty's Government.

I have no rancor in my heart because we are considering this bill within 3 hours of the time that the full Appropriations Committee considered it. I shall do my very level best to discuss the issues as I see them, from the standpoint of winning the war, for the benefit of the House. I hope that you will grant to me that my difference of opinion with the majority of the committee is from a patriotic and a sincere standpoint.

In the first place, this bill does not carry any funds in it for finished munitions, guns, planes, tanks, and matériel. Mixing finished munitions with food and secondary items misleads the membership in the lend-lease quarterly reports and in previous requests for funds. Finished munitions that will win the war will be in the appropriations spent by the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission. It seems to me that from a good business standpoint, from a fair standpoint, and to keep the country advised, and to keep the Congress advised, when Mr. Stettinius is presenting his request for funds he should not request funds for food and argue that these funds will save boys' lives and discuss it in terms of munitions and finished munitions products. The whole presentation should be segregated for clarification so that the membership may know that they are voting upon items such as food and machine tools, which I hope the membership will distinguish as I go along with my argument.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Am I to understand from the gentleman's remarks on this that the country is more interested in material things than it is in the lives of our boys?

Mr. JONES. I will answer the question if the gentleman will yield me more time.

Mr. RABAUT. It will not take much of an answer. The gentleman just made a statement.

Mr. JONES. I decline to yield. I am sorry. I have for my beloved chairman the greatest admiration and respect.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not want any compliments. I just want an answer.

Mr. JONES. I am coming to an answer to his question, and I will answer it fully, have no fear of that. There is an answer.

The American people are interested in winning this war and they think that lend-lease by the publicity that has been given to it means planes, guns, tanks, machinery, and equipment. This bill today has other items in it such as food. I think there should be possibly a consideration of whether or not other countries are riding a willing horse to death. I do not know, but I have asked Mr. Stettinius in several letters which I have sent to him for basic facts upon which to make a logical argument today and upon which we could narrow down the issues for a satisfactory conclusion, and I have been refused. It is all very well for gentlemen on the subcommittee to say: "If you ask Mr. Stettinius anything he will tell you." Well, try it some time. Ask him. He gave me 3 excuses for denial of the answers to 68 questions and I am very glad to have this opportunity to talk to him in public.

Mr. McCORMACK. How many questions?

Mr. JONES. Sixty-eight questions.

Mr. McCORMACK. How long do you think it would take to answer the 68 questions?

Mr. JONES. I may say to the majority leader that if he cannot answer those 68 questions, then, certainly, he is not capable of programing, buying, and of handling the job of Lend-Lease Administrator. Certainly if he has the administrative personnel to do the job of reporting what he claims is factual in the Lend-Lease report to Congress and in the hearings, he certainly has the material, the personnel, and the equipment, to answer my humble 68 questions.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JONES. I am sorry. Let me emphasize that some of the 68 questions related to a speech I made on March 10. I used the December 30 report of lease-lend allocation of supplies to the United Nations. I asked Mr. Stettinius for factual information and he told me in my office that he would get it. I relied upon his promise. Then he sends me a reply full of more speeches and I wrote him back, as a part of my 68 questions: "Mr. Stettinius, give me the basic facts." If it is argued that Members of Congress cannot have confidential information, my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] knows we have had many, many days of confidential testimony and I have in my files many letters marked "Confidential" that I have never given to anybody. I challenge anyone in this House, the majority or the minority leader or anybody on this subcommittee on the majority or minority side to show one instance where I have exposed anything that was confidential. If the membership of this House is asked is vote "yes" or "no" on a provision of this kind it certainly should have the basic facts in the hands of Mr. Stettinius in order to come to a conclusion based upon reason.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman challenged the majority leader. Will the gentleman state how long it took him to frame those 68 questions?

Mr. JONES. It took me about two and a half hours.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then the gentleman is a wonder. If it took him only 2½ hours to frame those 68 questions he is possessed of an ability that is extraordinary and amazing.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman very much for the compliment. If he would care to see the stenographic notes on the questions I think the gentleman will see it could easily be done in a couple of hours.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I cannot yield any further.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is the gentleman going to put the questions in the RECORD?

Mr. JONES. I would like to point out the difference in conception of aid given to other countries by Great Britain as compared with the United States. I will refer to a photostatic copy of the Soviet War News of July 1, 1942, prepared by the Soviet Embassy in London, and I hope the majority leader will remain here and listen to this because I am talking about basic facts now. They report:

> On June 27, 1942, an agreement was signed in Moscow between the Governments of the U. S. S. R. and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on financing deliveries of war materials and other military aid accorded by the British Government to the Soviet Government.
>
> On behalf of the Soviet Union the agreement was signed by A. I. Mikoyan, People's Commissar for Foreign Trade, and on behalf of Great Britain by Sir Archibald Clark Kerr, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Great Britain.
>
> Under this agreement the British Government agrees to insure to the Soviet Government deliveries of war material and other military aid, the deliveries to the Soviet Union of armaments manufactured in Great Britain or in the British Dominions and Colonies being effected without payment. Provision is thus made for further improvement of British deliveries of war materials to the Soviet Union.
>
> The agreement points out that the Soviet Government desires that all aid made by one party to the other should be on a basis of reciprocity. The agreement is retrospective and will be considered as having come into force from June 22, 1941.
>
> This agreement does not affect the financing of British deliveries of raw materials and equipment of a general character regulated by the agreement concluded on August 16, 1941.

To the best of my knowledge today, the agreement referred to in the last paragraph above is one that I quoted October 10, 1941, from the Department of Commerce publication entitled "Foreign Commerce Weekly" as follows:

> A payments agreement between the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was signed and became effective

on August 16. It provides that the two governments agree to deliver goods to one another at world prices with contracts in sterling. All payments will be made through an account in the Bank of England in the name of the State Bank of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. * * * The account shall be balanced quarterly.

Any debit balance shall be discharged as follows: (a) 40 percent by sterling received by the State Bank of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by the sale to the Bank of England of United States dollars or gold or by the delivery of platinum up to specified amounts; sales of United States dollars shall be made at the official middle rate of exchange for United States dollars in London on the day of sale.

I attempted to verify this information in detail through Mr. Stettinius' office and I have not received information desired from him. I now place in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Stettinius on this subject.

Hon. ROBERT F. JONES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JONES: Thank you for your letter of April 23.

You are completely right about our failure to confirm our telegram of November 11, 1941. Good business practice as well as courtesy to you should have made such a confirmation automatic on our part.

I have reviewed with interest the references in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which you cited. (Incidentally, we do not have a librarian on our pay roll.) I shall write to you further on this whole subject as soon as I receive the current report which I have asked the Harriman Mission in London to prepare after investigating the present situation thoroughly on the other side.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,
E. R. STETTINIUS, JR.

These are facts that Mr. Stettinius' office should know and I should have had the complete data by the time this bill is on the floor for consideration.

Great Britain sells for cash, payable quarterly, to Russia, the same material, according to my understanding for which we are appropriating today.

Now, let me say to the gentleman from Michigan, I voted, since Pearl Harbor, for every item of so-called lend-lease made direct to the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission and expect to continue so to do. I am willing and anxious to give to the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission every bit of material that they need or think they need. I would deny no boy on the fighting front, fighting by the side of the British, the Dutch, or the Chinese, who are fighting by the side of our boys, the planes, the guns, the tanks, and matériel necessary to save their lives and win victory over our enemies. Let us assume that there is an American dump of ammunition right close to where British, Australian, Chinese, or New Zealand troops are fighting. Through military maneuvers the British troops are near that ammunition dump, do you think I would say they would have to wait until Mr. Stettinius gets an authorization through before they could make use of that ammunition, or from General Marshall, or Admiral King? Certainly not. Why, I would not even put it down on the books. I do not think you or anyone would question the use of appropriations by our Army, Navy, and marines for all on the common battle fronts. You do not need a device with the name of lend-lease on it to get cooperation between United Nations fighting forces, and I think that is the practical point of view we should use in approaching a vote on this bill.

I think the items in this bill are things that might well be paid for, as far as possible, with obligations of the several United Nations governments if they have credit available.

With further reference to the 68 questions, let me call them to your attention and let us see if they are hard to answer. In one of the questions I pointed out there was lend-lease material and certain products going to one of the richest concerns in India. I said to Mr. Stettinius:

Give me the full details of that transaction; let me know to whom it is sent; what kind of arrangement we have, whether it is charged to the British Government, the United Kingdom, or India. If the equipment is finally installed in this company's plant that has a capitalization of 104,000,000 rupees, whom does the corporation pay?

Now, it is treasonable to ask direct questions from these lend-lease officials concerning the value of this lend-lease equipment that expands the productive capacity of these private companies? Is that kind of information a military secret? In this country Treasury, Army, and Navy officials are renegotiating the contracts with the corporations of this country who have been expanding their war plants with Defense Plant Corporation funds. I insist it is a fair and timely inquiry. Domestic corporations must agree to pay Jesse Jones, of R. F. C., or to the Treasury of the United States, for the value of the equipment they receive. Is it treasonable to ask whether or not foreign companies receiving lend-lease goods sign obligations for them? Are lend-lease funds reimbursed for any funds paid by foreign corporations to United Nations? I would like to have answers to those questions. Would it take much manpower to answer that kind of a question in detail? We certainly should not conclude so in view of the fact that we are harassing every corporation in this country building various war machines for our troops to renegotiate their contracts. Who considers manpower in Washington when we are renegotiating war contracts? Certainly no Washington official. The people of the United States will be vitally interested in this inquiry, and I am sure, Mr. Administrator, that they will be vitally interested in more details in the days to follow.

Yes, you can get the answer to anything you want if you do not ask the questions. Now, the gentleman from New York, and the gentleman from Michigan, my colleague on the other side, said Mr. Stettinius was willing to answer my questions, but he was tied up with these committee meetings. He did not so advise me.

I am anxious that the United States bear its fair share of the burden of winning this war. I notice in one of the reports of lend-lease there is this general statement:

If each country devotes roughly the same fraction of its national production to the war, then the financial burden of war is distributed equally among the United Nations in accordance with their ability to pay.

There is not any mathematical formula to guide the Members of the House as to how much each shall bear.

Another question that I took up with Mr. Stettinius when he was in my office, was the question of whether or not good will, as a result of the present policy of lend-lease giving, or of lend-lease aid, from the Administrator, will result under the present set-up. Is Mr. Stettinius building up American good will, for this kind of materials for which we are appropriating? That is what I am trying to find out.

As of December 31, in the report of the Lend-Lease Administrator to Congress, there is on pages 36 and 37 a category in the table of the December 31, 1942, report, which covers the countries of Australia, New Zealand, India, "other British territories," and Egypt.

I called the lend-lease office, Mr. Stettinius was out, his office referred me to other lend-lease officials. I asked "who are 'other British territories' in this table." I was given the following list:

Aden, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, Arab Shiekdoms, Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomons, British Somaliland, Canada, Ceylon, Cirenaica, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Falkland Islands, Fiji Islands, French Somaliland, United Kingdom, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellis Islands, Gold Coast, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Leeward Islands, Malaya, Malta and Gozo, Mauritius and dependencies, Newfoundland, New Guinea, New Hebrides, Nigeria, Northern Borneo, Northern Rhodesia, Union of South Africa, Nyasaland, Palestine, Sarawak, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles and dependencies, Sierra Leone, Southern Rhodesia, St. Helena and dependencies, Syria, Tanganyika, Tonga, Transjordan, Trinidad and Tobago, Tripolitania, Uganda, Windward Islands, Yemen, Zanzibar.

These 56 territories, countries, or possessions entitled "other British possessions" do not present their own requisitions. The British Purchasing Commission, I am informed, present the requisitions and I think earn their good will during this war with our lend-lease aid. I presented this thought to Mr. Stettinius when he was in my office on April 14 and he agreed with me that this was causing us some trouble.

These 56 governments are in contradistinction to the 44 countries in the report at page 8 which are supposed to be eligible for lend-lease aid.

I wish to point out to the members of the committee that lend-lease requisitions should be made by the countries for and in their own behalf.

Briefly, here is the main criticism, on which I think the Administrator will agree with me, that is, losing the good will through British presentation of requests. I think there has been some improvement along this line, but it has not come fast enough and certainly the present arrangements should not continue another day.

Let me say again that I am interested in winning this war and giving to the Army and the Navy and the Maritime Commission anything that they think they want for the use of the other countries of the United Nations that will help to save boys' lives. I will vote for all the guns, planes, and tanks the Army and Navy think they or the United Nations need, as I have done in the past.

I think, as I said on March 10, 1943, that the lend-lease transfers are in inverse proportion to the victories won. I think MacArthur, the New Zealanders, and the Aussies have held the line in the southwest Pacific in spite of the fact that they are the forgotten men of lend-lease. The long-suffering Chinese hold on and on, well knowing that lend-lease officials had a one-track mind centered in Europe before the Burma Road was closed. Now that the Burma Road is closed they must surely apologize to the American people with the disclosure that $158,000,000 is the cumulative total of lend-lease supplies for China. Bear in mind that the December 31 report showed China receiving $126,260,000. The differential of $31,740,000 is lend-lease to China so far in 1943. That ought to be comforting to the Japs.

Suppose the membership of the committee and the Lend-Lease Administrator put a table in the next lend-lease report of the Chinese, Australians, New Zealand, and American lives they saved in the southwest Pacific and the Far East.

It might be significant to point out here the testimony on page 5 of the hearings:

> About $1,200,000,000 of additional lend-lease aid has been provided from appropriations made directly to the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission for finished munitions and ships.

The Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission still have approximately $43,000,000,000 for guns, planes, tanks, and matériel for the fighting fronts of the world.

Lend-Lease Administration is a pre-war agency. The type of materials they propose to buy with these appropriations are the type of materials that Great Britain sells to the United Nations, according to my best information and belief. Most of the countries can pay for these items. The committee has not had an adequate, specific explanation, country by country, for which these funds are to be allocated. Under the broad grant of power of the lend-lease law there are no restraints on the use of the funds. The Lend-Lease Administrator, on page 29 of the hearings, says:

> Well, sir, that is military strategy, on which I am an amateur.

He is sincere and well-thought-of, but by virtue of this admission I think ill-equipped for the kind of a job that ought to be done.

All aid that our generals and admirals say the United Nations need to save lives and win victory that contribute directly to the war, I am for. I intend to vote against this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, not for the purpose of entering into a controversy with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], but to correct his remarks in the RECORD in some respects, the gentleman admits that he asked 68 questions and he referred to 2 questions on the floor. I heard only 2 of the 68, but I could see that it might take several days to make a pretty good answer to one of those questions.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I yielded to him.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I should have been glad to have more time, but the limitation of time to 20 minutes kept me from continuing with those questions. I hope the gentleman will be fair to me. I should be glad to put the 68 questions in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman can get that permission in the House. I would be very much interested in reading the questions myself. However, I do not desire to enter into a controversy. I think it is a good idea for all of us to get off our chests some of the things that bother us. My friend from Ohio probably got a little chip on his shoulder several days ago against Eddie Stettinius. It is good for him to get it off his chest now. I know that he and Ed Stettinius will meet each other in the lobby shortly after this and will be shaking each other's hands, and that they will be most pleasant in the future.

Mr. JONES. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman has.

Mr. JONES. I always have had; but I think he is autocratic in denying the answer to a question. I shall still be friends with him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman stand by that statement that he is autocratic?

Mr. JONES. I think so. I do not have the answer yet.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall not even discuss that. All I want to say is that I have received assurances from Mr. Stettinius and he has given me a pledge to give to any Member of Congress any information of any kind that he can on lend-lease at any time, that is not limited by military secrecy.

The gentleman from Ohio talked about his being autocratic. The members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, Republicans and Democrats both, unanimously felt that he made one of the finest witnesses that ever appeared before them when he testified before that committee in the early part of the year. Mr. Stettinius is a man who has made great sacrifices to come down here to serve and to assist in preserving our country in this crisis. He is a man who was chairman of the board of directors of the United States Steel Corporation, receiving $100,000 a year. He resigned that job. He is not continuing to receive $100,000 a year from the United States Steel Co. and working down here at a dollar a year. He terminated his connections with the United States Steel Co. in June of 1940. He is in the complete service of the Federal Government. I think the RECORD should show these facts.

I am not going to discuss this matter further, because the gentleman from Ohio is wrong in stating that Mr. Stettinius would not give the information. He will give it to any Member of Congress. I do want to state further that there is no man in this country who has evidenced a finer spirit of patriotism in this crisis than Edward R. Stettinius.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the pending lend-lease appropriation bill deals with the prosecution of the war by all the United Nations. I am a great admirer of military strategy. I have confidence in the weapons we are using. I respect our military and naval leadership. I cannot forget, however, a weapon of World War I that was worth great armies. It was the moral persuasion in Woodrow Wilson's 14 points. He spoke to the common people in the lands of the enemy. He spoke their hopes and their dreams so plainly that he wedged the German people from their leaders, and when all the people of the world were put on one side, fighting for the common ideals of humanity itself; the war ended sooner than it would have otherwise.

The fact that some of those peoples felt let down later makes our task more difficult today. That does not lessen, however, the value of that kind of a weapon. Indeed it makes even more necessary that the idealism of the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter should be given a clear and unmistakable application in the policies of the United Nations.

We can bludgeon our way through to victory solely by relying upon the blood of our boys and the cold steel of our machines—but if we can shorten the road to, and the cost of, victory we should do it.

Now, we probably can count upon revolutionary assistance in Europe whenever we give the signal with an invading army. In Asia, however, Japan preaches the doctrine of liberation from the white man's rule. We like to believe that the Japanese are so clumsy and so cruel that in time the peoples of the lands she occupies will rise up against her. We hope she is making a bad job of civil and military administration. We cannot count upon that, however; and we must do more than wait. Nothing in the situation gives us any reason to think that Japan will collapse. Nothing in the picture gives us any reason to think that the Philippines and the Americans in the Philippines will ever be free again unless we free them.

Everywhere men speak of the great population of China and India, of the manpower that is there. Everyone knows that China needs guns and ammunition, and tanks, and perhaps above all,

air power, air power in that overwhelming degree of superiority which paved the way for the success in Tunisia.

We are told that there are 2,000,000 soldiers of the British Empire in India and we are also told that only fifty or sixty thousand Japanese hold the Burma Road. It is no wonder that a distinguished Member of the United States Senate has called for action to throw those Japanese out of Burma and reopen a way to take the supplies into China, where we would have the land bases necessary for successful operations against Japan.

Now, then, why do fifty or sixty thousand Japanese soldiers stand off an army of 2,000,000, or even 1,000,000, in India?

Most of those Empire soldiers in India are men of India. They wrote a notable chapter in the victories of World War I. Why are they inactive today?

No man can be sure of an answer under the limited and censored conditions of communication and information today. But I, for one, cannot escape the thought that the probable reason is that the people of India do not feel that this is their war. Indeed, I cannot escape the feeling that too many people of India feel that the promises made them during World War I have not been fulfilled, and that they simply are not going to fight for the perpetuity of an empire in which they are not accorded the voice and the freedom which they believe is rightfully theirs.

The bill before us proposes to make available more than $6,000,000,000 worth of additional lend-lease goods. It is a mighty amount of money to throw into the conflict. But it seems to me that if there could be put into the conflict at this time the complete productive capacity of India, our efforts in this bill would be insignificant in comparison.

Indeed, if, through the efforts of that portion of the British Empire which is India, the Burma routes to China could be reopened, the effectiveness of all of our lend-lease efforts would be multiplied many times over.

I recognize that I am speaking on a subject which has a good deal of official taboo. What I say has been prompted by nobody. It comes only out of my earnest conviction that if the people of India could feel that the high idealism of the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter were real for them, they would put all of their energies and efforts behind the war as they would in a war for freedom itself. In fact, it would become the great cause by which the people of India would come to a place of sovereignty and domain status within the British Empire alongside of other great parts of that great Commonwealth.

I know that men say, "Oh, those things must be put off until the war is over." That kind of counsel was the counsel which Lincoln spurned in the Civil War. You will recall that when Lincoln proposed to issue the Emancipation Proclamation, many of his advisers counselled against it. Lincoln saw, however, that nothing would write the human purposes of the war into reality as much as the issuance of that proclamation—yes, while the war was on.

Some of you must have been impressed as I was impressed by that statement which appeared on the back page of the Washington Post, May 19, under the caption "India." I quote:

> Now the eyes of the world are on India because India is the key to victory over Japan.
>
> To defeat Japan we need China—a China that is not simply resisting heroically but is fighting offensively.
>
> To sustain China we need Burma.
>
> To regain Burma we need India.
>
> To mobilize India fully we need to free the imprisoned democratic leaders of the Indian people who alone can arouse them to action for victory.
>
> India's millions want the opportunity to fight for freedom. If only a fraction of India's vast manpower and resources are in action today, it is because Indians—like other men—can fight for freedom only if they are themselves free.
>
> We—the United Nations—must break the political deadlock in India which is a repudiation of all we are fighting for.
>
> Now—while President and Prime Minister are talking face to face—is the time to set in motion the machinery that will mediate the problem, translate freedom from a word to an act, and give all Asiatic peoples the essential motivation they lack today; faith in our profession of the "four freedoms" of all people.

Not one person of the many names signed to the declaration has spoken to me about this subject. I know nothing about the Indian League of America save what was given in that page advertisement.

But, I too believe that now is the time to face this problem. To defeat Japan we need China. To sustain China we need Burma. To regain Burma we need India—India with the full strength of that great country freely enlisted in a battle for the freedom of the world; enlisted in a cause where the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter are not words, but indeed the very weapons of victory.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I was quite surprised a moment ago to hear my distinguished friend from Ohio say some things that were completely wrong, in my conception and knowledge.

Mr. JONES rose.

Mr. KLEBERG. The gentleman refused to yield to me, and I cannot yield in the 3 minutes I have.

The remarks were made directly at the administration of Lend-Lease and its Administrator. I have known Ed Stettinius a long time. He has never failed to answer any inquiry I have addressed to him. It is true I have never asked him to divulge a military secret. I repeat that my surprise has occasioned in me a desire to say just one or two things about Lend-Lease and its Administrator. My opinion is that in the entire Government set-up, and it is of a pretty good size, probably the Lend-Lease Administration is run more on the American way than any other agency of the Government. I have had occasion to deal with most of them, and I am sure the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] if he will recall the many inquiries that he must have made of the Lend-Lease Administration and the courteous answers that he received, will find that probably the Administrator, with reference to the questions that he has in mind, has not had opportunity to reply, or at least can give some really definite and good and sufficient reason for not having done so. I think it only fair that the gentleman from Ohio should permit the Administrator to furnish him with these reasons, and then I think that he would be very glad to retract some of the rather unfortunate inferences in the statement that he made.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I am in no way apologizing for my vote against the extension of lend-lease in its present form some 3 months ago.

I felt then and I still feel today that any measure which in my opinion will have such a far-reaching effect upon our social and economic life as this measure undoubtedly will have should have been then, and even now, taken out of politics before this Congress was called upon to vote.

The vote asking for extension of lend-lease was brought up, by those who are responsible for our legislative program, 4 months before the present act would have expired, and while there was still sufficient funds available to guarantee its continuation during those 4 months.

There is no doubt in my mind but what this was a smart political move on the part of those who feared that if the extension was asked for at the same time an additional eight or ten billion for its existence was requested—and that is the amount Mr. Stettinius has said he would request—that the vote for its extension might not have been as overwhelming as desired.

No one objects to the basic principle of aiding our fighting allies, but I for one do object with all my energy to scattering our resources among some thirty-odd nations at the expense of some of our own American soldiers, as well as our own citizens here in America.

I have never refused to feed a panhandler who has called at my house, but I have never felt so magnanimous as to give him all of the white meat and give my own family the part which goes over the fence last, just because I feared that it might offend him and that he might not come back for more.

I also feel that when the sordid details and the ramifications of this huge spending program are some day brought into the light of day that the Teapot Dome scandal will resemble a Sunday-school picnic in comparison.

Now, in spite of my own personal feelings in the matter, I intend to go along with this additional appropriation. I attempted by my vote to stay its extension until it had been amended, but I failed. Therefore, since by an act of this Congress it will be in operation for another 12 months, far be it from me to be accused of putting even one stone in the road to impede any tentacle which might contribute even remotely to the war effort.

I only pray that more supplies will reach our own boys so that I will not hear from the lips of wounded soldiers, who have returned from Africa and the south Pacific, the condemnation of their Government which I have heard because they were bypassed in favor of some of those who would take our Government over tomorrow if the opportunity presented itself.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I hope my patriotism will not be questioned when I make the statement on the floor that I feel the welfare of our men in the armed services is fully as important as any lend-lease appropriation that we are making here today. Yet when I stopped to count the number on the floor a little while ago, during the most serious debate that should be devoted to this great question, there were only 40 Members here. That is quite a contrast, I say, compared with the number that the administration rushed in to vote against the Hall amendment a year or so ago when I proposed to give free transportation to the men in the service, so that they would be able to enjoy visiting home at least once a year and see the people they love, their fathers and mothers, their wives and children. I hope this House, before many more months, will begin to realize that we owe a great deal to the men in the armed services, and that legislation which I propose from time to time will not be referred to as "mushy" legislation, as my distinguished friend from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] referred to the Hall amendment, to give the boys furlough transportation. Before very long I am going to propose the doubling of the allotment to dependent children of men in the armed services. I am going to make a number of other proposals for the dependents of our boys at the front. I sincerely hope that the membership of this House will give serious consideration to what I believe to be one of the most important angles that the Government of the United States must face from now on. I refer to the treatment of the greatest armed force that ever fought an aggressor, the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps of the United States. I hope that everything will be done to see to it that their welfare is looked after, and I am sure that I am not talking out of order at this time, even though we are considering a $7,000,000,000 appropriation bill, which I expect to support, when I advocate that everything in the world be done for the boys who are giving their all for this great Nation and for freedom and liberty throughout the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, at this time I join with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] in backing up their sentiments in regard to the Administrator of Lend-Lease, Mr. Stettinius. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I can state that he was honest and courteous to us at all times, and furthermore I can recall one occasion when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] submitted a number of questions to the Administrator on the night before the final meeting of our lend-lease hearings, and Mr. Stettinius and his staff stayed up until 3 o'clock in the morning to get the answers to the committee the next day.

However, I did not intend to speak on that in the short time allotted to me. I do want to say a few words about China. I have nothing but the greatest respect for the way that lend-lease has been administered today, but I think that something more should be done to aid our gallant Chinese allies. I wonder how many people who are so sympathetic with China actually realize the desperate plight in which the Chinese find themselves today. They have what is known as an infantry army. They fight mostly with rifles and machine guns. They have very few tanks, almost nothing in the way of airplanes except what General Chennault has, and nothing in the way of heavy artillery. They have been fighting for almost 6 years against one of the most highly organized military machines in the world, and while the Chinese have been defeated on numerous occasions, they have not and will not be conquered. However, Mr. Chairman, there is a limit to human endurance, and you cannot expect this unequal struggle to continue unless we can give to these gallant allies of ours the aid they should and must have.

Some remarks have been made about the difficulty of getting supplies into China. That is true, but there are more routes than over the Himalayas into China, because we do know that an average of 2,000 tons a month of supplies are coming into China from Russia. We do know also that since the fall of the Burma Road the Chines have been building by hand, mind you, a road from Sadiya in northeastern India to connect with Chungking, the Chinese capital. That road is far more difficult to build than was the Burma Road, but the Chinese are showing determination, courage, and tenacity. They are willing to do all they can, but because of the lack of resources they have to have help from the outside. The Chinese have munition factories, but they do not have much in the way of machinery. The Chinese have gasoline, but not a great deal because of lack of developed oil areas. What gasoline they have they must develop from vegetable oil. The Chinese have also developed a means by which they can protect themselves against bombings, which used to come quite regularly against Chungking. But those people, despite their fine leadership, despite the inflationary trend which has been taking place in that country in the past 4 years, despite the magnificent resistance of the Chinese armies, must have outside help. It is up to us to do all we possibly can to get just as much aid to China just as quickly as we possibly can, because China is one of our major allies, and China is going to figure very strongly in our final activities against the Japanese Empire.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with what the gentleman has said with reference to giving greater assistance to China, and I am sure other Members appreciate the very interesting and informative speech he has made. If the gentleman will permit, let me say that although China is still desperately in need of supplies and materials, information has come to the Committee on Appropriations that China is actually getting additional supplies and will soon be getting much more. The gentleman knows, I am sure, that all supplies that go to China now, because of transportation difficulties, must go by air, and that is an extremely difficult problem to overcome.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma. I repeat, I have every confidence in the administration of lend-lease.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, ever since the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] discussed his parable of the 68 unanswered questions we have had men from the majority side rising to the defense of Mr. Stettinius. I do not think that that should be an exclusive Democratic privilege. I want to join in the testimonials which have been paid to Mr. Stettinius concerning his highly cooperative spirit in dealing with Members of Congress. I do not know whether I am paying tribute to a Democrat, a New Dealer, or a Republican, because I have never inquired into the politics of the Administrator of lend-lease.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can give the gentleman some information about that some day.

Mr. MUNDT. I will be glad to have it. He looks like a Republican. He acts like a Republican, and I would be willing to wager a compressed-food sandwich against a horse-meat steak, which the more-abundant life of the New Deal has made abundant in Washington, that he has some Republican antecedents. But, be that as it may, and it is unimportant, I feel sure that if the gentleman from Ohio would break up those 68 questions into homeopathic doses he would have better success in getting satisfactory answers from the Administrator of lend-lease. I do know that when Mr. Stettinius was before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs he was extremely gracious, courteous, and informative in replying to the questions directed to him.

I might add that in the work I have been doing on the compressed-food program I have probably asked Mr. Stettinius 68 questions in the aggregate and have had answers to all of them, and I am proud of the way in which the lend-lease

Administrator has gone into this new food-development program which today is rendering tremendous benefits in ship savings to America.

I hope the Members have read on page 8 the paragraph of the committee report dedicated to the concrete savings in ship space already accruing from the compression and dehydration program, and I am hopeful that when the quarterly lend-lease report comes out next week additional information will be made available along that line. I think we should give credit where credit is due. It is eminently due to the type of administration being given the colossal and difficult problems of lend-lease under the able and alert direction of Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in opening the debate referred to this bill as "a bill to bring this war to a more speedy and victorious conclusion." I perhaps have not inquired as much as I should have into the operation of lend-lease. I think most of our people approve of the program that was adopted by Congress to provide our allies, the United Nations, with not only war materials but foodstuffs and other supplies that they will need to bring this war to a speedy end. I am willing to accept the recommendation of the subcommitee both on the majority and minority side, and will follow their recommendation that this appropriation be passed.

If we are going to provide the United Nations with the foodstuffs they need, it makes it doubly important that we make the best possible disposition of every ounce of food remaining in the United States not needed by our own armed forces. I say with all sincerity that I wish we were making as wise a disposition of foodstuffs to our own civilians as is being made under the lend-lease program. I am compelled to say that our distribution system under O. P. A. is breaking down, if it has not already broken down.

I have before me a few letters and telegrams—not that I am accumulating them, because every one of them came to my office within the last 24 hours—typical of many letters and telegrams that I am receiving from men in the retail grocery trade. One of them that I will quote from is from the owner of one of the largest department stores in the State of Connecticut.

Another comes from the owner and operator of a very successful grocery store and meat market. These men are wiring to me, as I know others are wiring to other Members of the House, simply telling us their story of what they are up against; and all of them are reaching the same conclusion.

It has been said many times that it is impossible today under O. P. A. regulations for a grocer or a handler of foodstuffs to stay in business, keep honest, and respect and abide by the O. P. A. regulations. If we are going to have any food to send abroad under lease-lend we have got to take better care of such supplies we have on hand here in the United States.

I have this wire from the Hartford County Retail Grocers' Association:

HARTFORD, CONN., *May 20, 1943.*

Representative WILLIAM J. MILLER,
House of Representatives.

HONORABLE SIR: Retail grocers of this county condemn the action of the Office of Price Administration in reducing mark-ups to a point where you can only operate in the "red." "Recent action reducing mark-up to 1.19 on baby foods, canned or bottled fruits and juices, canned or bottled vegetables or vegetable juices."

Urgently request you to fight it out to get some sane, reasonable regulations, which all honest merchants can abide by. Ask the Office of Price Administration who promulgated these regulations, and what experience they have had in the food field. Seriously doubt if Congress in passing original act intended to grant such broad powers to anyone to tear to pieces the greatest industry of the world—the feeding of the American people.

Very truly yours,

THE HARTFORD COUNTY RETAIL GROCERS' AND MARKETMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
GEORGE GROSSO, *President.*

Along that same line, I want to read a letter from a very successful distributor of foodstuffs in Connecticut:

I don't know that I should bother you again, but I do want to say that the condition which you mention in your letter of May 7 distresses us here at home terribly. I cannot for the life of me understand why this man, John L. Lewis, apparently has such a tremendous influence. When it comes to the point where one man is more important than our Government, it certainly is time that something was done about it.

As I interpret the situation, it was John L. Lewis that upset the carefully worked-out mark-up plan, and now they are coming through with a mark-up that we simply cannot abide by and meet expenses * * * some of them so ridiculous that they are almost funny.

One illustration: We now have to sell 2 bars of large Ivory soap for 19 cents. This soap costs us $9.20 a box of 100 cakes, and we buy it direct at that. This gives us six-tenths of 1 cent profit on a 19-cent sale.

Crisco costs us a fraction over 23 cents a jar, and we have to sell it for 24 cents; butter on an 8-percent mark-up; flour and flour mixes, 15-percent mark-up.

All of these percentages are based on the cost, and every merchant that I know of figures his expenses on his total sales, which, in our case, with social-security tax, unemployment insurance, and everything else, runs about 20 percent or approximately 24 percent or better on the cost.

I do not know if there is anything that can be done about it at this time. I am surprised that none of our merchants has written you, but that is one point where we are weak. It is so blamed hard to get the grocerymen together. We do have our National Grocers' Association, and they are working hard. In fact, I have a copy of a telegram that they have recently sent to the President, which may or may not help.

"There are one or two points that I would like to have cleared up. In the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, title I, section 2, paragraph H—

"* * * The powers granted in this section shall not be used, or made to operate, to control * * * changes in the business practices, or methods, or means, or aids to distribution established in any industry; except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act.'

"My question is, Are the regulations now being put into force legal or not?

"Another question—we hear a great deal about the Sherman antitrust law—in fact, many merchants have been fined under this law, which has to do, of course, with price fixing; and yet we are told that a certain class must sell at one price and another class at another, which certainly is fixing prices for each class.

"The third question: Isn't it discriminatory as well, fixing various prices for various classes?

"If some time you have a few leisure moments to advise me, I shall greatly appreciate it. On the other hand, if I am asking too much, just forget it."

I have submitted the questions asked by the writer of this letter to the O. P. A., but I rather doubt if they will admit that they are ignoring the intent of Congress. We do not have to know much about the operation of the grocery business to know that under these regulations it is impossible to stay in business. Certainly this Congress has a responsibility. We created the Office of Price Administration and if the O. P. A. cannot be administered fairly and the law we wrote fairly interpreted so that men who have been successful merchants over a period of years can stay in business, then it seems to me that this Congress should review, and possibly revise, the Price Control Act of 1942. Certainly we do not want to drive successful merchants out of business.

I also have a letter from the owner of one of the largest department stores in Connecticut that I would like to read at this time:

Despite the country-wide protest of reputable merchants and manufacturers, the Office of Price Administration has evidently insisted on the enforcement of their hosiery order. The modifications which they have granted are too trivial to pay heed to. The principles involved are definitely wrong and contrary to the intent of the Congress insofar as they attempt to change established methods of doing business.

Dr. Galbraith, in his radio speech of last night, asserts that a considerable saving to the American public will ensue. Definitely, this is contrary to the facts and is purely wishful thinking. Dr. Galbraith's background and inexperience in trade and mercantile practices unfit him for his present position. The hosiery order not only will not save the consumer money, but will definitely increase the price of the general run of rayon hosiery to the consumer.

The Congress should curb all visionary reform propositions of the Office of Price Administration, and, furthermore, should insist that the Office of Price Administration perform its functions along the lines laid out by the Congress, without attempting to reform business or change established business practices.

It might be well to remember that history shows that the German defeat in the first World War was due to the crack-up of the morale on the home front.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Briefly.

Mr. ROWE. And the most of these people who are being put out of business

are fathers of soldiers, just like myself. Would there not be a great deal more food produced if the American people were respected instead of inspected?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I have said I do not know the answer. I know that we have a very serious situation before us, and I think the Congress should deal with it. I am not using this discussion of lease-lend as a subterfuge to bring the question before the Congress, but I think it ties into lease-lend, because, after all, it is simply dealing with the balance of the commodities we have on hand.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman know that under this bill there is $40,000,000 worth of tobacco for the Allies?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I have no objection to that, for I full well realize the value of tobacco to those under stress in either our own military forces or those of our allies. If we can send some tobacco to those people, and they get solace from it, whatever solace they can get, I am satisfied.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has a very gallant record.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I use my share of tobacco, unfortunately.

I also have a letter from a farmer in my district who has successfully operated a poultry farm for several years. This letter speaks for itself and I quote it herewith:

I don't spend my time writing to Congressmen, but when they start to put me out of business it is time something was said. I grow poultry, supposed to be a war industry.

Had 2,400 birds last fall. Government wanted big egg production. This spring came a slap in the face, no feed for 3 weeks, just wasn't any. Finally came through, but the chickens had gone into a molt and production dropped. Had to sell half the flock. Feed prices went up anywhere to a dime a hundred each week and are still going.

Contents of the feed changed. Much more bran and cheap ingredients. Couldn't get oystershells and eggs were smashed by the hundreds for weeks. Oystershell boats being used for essential purposes, they said. Chickens are essential, but poor grade of feed was furnished.

The Office of Price Administration came along and set a ceiling price on poultry. Decided the price was too high. Price of feed didn't seem too high or the increased labor costs, equipment costs—take a look at the increases for yourself—disgusting, no ceilings there.

Chick orders this spring are only a couple of months off schedule on delivery and some are being canceled. Feed deliveries are all off. Read the enclosed letter from our cooperative. The present price ceilings in view of increased costs make a fellow sick.

Can you blame the fellows for quitting and going into defense jobs? I have had to take such a job to keep going. The situation is more serious than political chair dusters realize. We have had offers of 50 to 75 cents a pound black market and everyone knows the price ceiling has made this situation. Note the enclosed cooperative letter on poultry sales, 362 crates in 1942 and 104 in 1943. A few weeks ago only 10 percent was not being sold on the black market.

No one was kicking when we were allowed a reasonable price for our chickens and eggs and there was no black market. We would not kick if a reasonable ceiling price had been set. Premium wages are paid in defense industries, but in the billion-dollar poultry industry we are being played for a bunch of suckers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to enable the President, through such departments or agencies of the Government as he may designate, further to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941 as amended, and for each and every purpose incident to or necessary therefor, the following sum for the following respective purposes:

(a) For the procurement, by manufacture or otherwise, of defense articles, information, and services, for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, and the disposition thereof, including all necessary expenses in connection therewith as follows:

Vessels, ships, boats, and other watercraft, including the hire or other temporary use thereof, and equipage, supplies, materials, spare parts, and accessories, $1,552,659,000.

Agricultural, industrial, and other commodities and articles, $4,452,623,000.

(b) For testing, inspecting, proving, repairing, outfitting, reconditioning, or otherwise placing in good working order any defense articles for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, including services and expenses in connection therewith, $259,348,000.

(c) For administrative expenses, $8,999,000: *Provided*, That transfers may be made from this appropriation to the consolidated appropriation for "Necessary services and expenses" to the extent necessary to reimburse such appropriation for transfers made pursuant to the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943.

(d) In all, $6,273,629,000, to be available until June 30, 1944.

(e) Each of the foregoing appropriations shall be additional to, and consolidated with, the appropriations for the same purposes, contained in the same respective categories of appropriation in the Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941, the Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1942, and the Second Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1942, and the appropriations contained in the foregoing acts, are hereby continued and shall be available until June 30, 1944: *Provided*, That with the exception of the appropriation for "Administrative expenses," not to exceed 20 percent of any of such consolidated appropriations may be transferred by the President to any other of such consolidated appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased more than 30 percent thereby: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the foregoing proviso (1) balances, unobligated as of April 30, 1943, and balances subsequently released from obligation, of appropriations contained in the foregoing acts for "Ordnance and ordnance stores, supplies, spare parts, and materials, including armor and ammunition and components thereof," may be transferred by the President to and consolidated with the appropriation provided above for "Agricultural, industrial, and other commodities and articles," and (2) balances, unobligated as of April 30, 1943, and balances subsequently released from obligation, of appropriations contained in the foregoing acts for "Necessary services and expenses" may be transferred by the President to and consolidated with any of the appropriations provided above, except the appropriation for "Administrative expenses."

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to pay my tribute to the manner in which the lease-lend fund has been administered. Lease-lend has been one of our most potent weapons in waging a fight for existence as a free people. First, the emphasis of lease-lend was upon arms, munitions, tanks, planes, ships, guns, and so forth. Now that a portion of the industrial life of Britain and Russia are again able to function and to take part of this load off of our shoulders, the emphasis has been placed on food. Certainly food is a vital weapon of war. At long last some of the members of this administration have learned that food is a vital and essential weapon in war. It feeds and sustains the armies and the civilian populations of the countries involved. Without it we would not be able to wage a war successfully.

Mr. Chairman, my main purpose in taking this time is to pay tribute to an honest, efficient, capable, and courageous Administrator, Edward Stettinius, who administers the lease-lend. We see in this man a shining example of what good, decent, clean, honest, and efficient administration can do in order to make a legislative program effective and in order to win the confidence and the support of the people of the United States. Mr. Stettinius has administered lend-lease for the purpose of winning a war as quickly as possible, not to further some social reform nor to harbor a group of self-anointed liberals and self-confessed distinguished intellectuals.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE. My friend from Alabama would not suggest that those other purposes have dictated the course of administration in any other agencies, would he?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I am not making any suggestions at all. I am merely paying a tribute to honest, decent, efficient, capable administration, to a man who administers the affairs of his office in keeping with congressional intent, to a man who does it with no purpose in mind except to save and to serve his own country, to a man who believes in and has devoted his life to preserving a government of the people and by the people such as was conceived by our founding fathers and which has been brought down to the present decade along those concepts.

Mr. CASE. I am certainly glad to have the distinguished gentleman from Alabama place emphasis upon those virtues which are too often forgotten these days and to place them where they are deserved.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman. May I say further that we have found that a businessman, an honest, sincere, progressive businessman, can administer efficiently and capably the affairs of a governmental agency, and that he can do it with credit and distinction and without any ground for just criticism. This man deserves the praise of every man who believes in free competitive business enterprise under a capitalistic system, a profit-motive and a constitutional representative democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I shall not dwell at length on the original basis upon which lend-lease was predicated. We are far removed from the day assurances were given that if America provided the tools—if it became the arsenal of democracy—our present allies would provide the men and do the job. The future will pass a dispassionate judgment on the circumstances which permitted these assurances, as well as upon the information available to our national leadership for the endorsement of these inducements. Suffice it to say that the memory of these assurances lingers with many of our people and that the memory will be the more haunting as we contemplate the comparative contribution in dollars and cents of our own people with those of Great Britain.

I am aware that in the actual theaters of war—in the field of actual operations—a joint venture, such as we are presently engaged in, requires a mutual give and take by our forces and those of our allies. Obviously this is necessary. However, it occurs to me that an entirely different condition prevails where aid is rendered by us in places far removed from the actual theaters of war. Great Britain has wealth, the Empire has resources. And yet the war budget of Great Britain is insignificant when compared with ours. Recent reports indicate that the annual British war budget is approximately $20,000,000,000 while our own war requirements are in excess of $100,000,000,000 for 1 year.

Why, I ask, would it not be possible to have Great Britain pay directly for repairs to her merchantmen and to the units of her fighting fleet which are provided in American shipyards? Why, I ask, would it be unreasonable to require Great Britain to pay directly for the sustenance, housing, and care of her men quartered here in America? Why, I ask, would it be unfair to expect Great Britain to pay directly for the services and assistance rendered by us which are not involved in any immediate contact with military operations, such as the millions of ounces of silver being made available for coinage purposes?

Prime Minister Churchill, and rightly so, has contended for the interests of his Empire. Can it be said that we are lacking in devotion to our common cause if we, with similar fervor and with equal enthusiasm, contend for the interests of our Republic. I yield to no man in my desire to win the war. I yield to no man in the prayer which I voice for a speedy victory. But I sense a duty to the country in urging that a comparative contribution be made by all those who will share in the benefits of the victory which will be ours.

The Prime Minister eloquently declared in this Chamber that during the past 17 months—

> We have toiled and suffered and dared shoulder to shoulder against the cruel and mighty enemy. We have acted in close combination or concert in many parts of the world—on land, on sea, and in the air. I am proud that you should have found us good allies, striving forward in comradeship to the accomplishment of our task without grudging or stinting either life or treasure or indeed anything we have to give.

The great British statesman might appropriately have referred to the contributions which are being made on the economic and financial battle fronts. We must not jeopardize our military cooperation or in any way impair our united effort against the Axis Powers. However, this should not mean that we must be unmindful of the hardships and sacrifices of our civilian populations. The Prime Minister has won the admiration and esteem of Americans because insistently and unremittingly he upholds and advances policies which are most beneficial to his Empire. Surely, the exemplification of these same characteristics by our own leaders would inevitably command the respect and admiration of our allies. And certainly such courage and loyalty would have a psychological effect on our own people and would be implied as a pledge that American interests are being given every consideration to which they are entitled in the whole United Nations' war program.

The distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, in his remarks this afternoon, declared that we want our boys to return after the war and that lend-lease operations provide greater assurances of this likelihood. American boys are willing to fight and to die, if necessary, to win this war, but when they return we must be sure that they do not discover we have lost at home the things for which they are crusading abroad. This Congress is obligated so to direct the financial affairs of our Nation that our Government will remain solvent. Our sons will not be content to return to a demoralized and financially bankrupt country.

During wartime it is not too difficult for allies to cooperate in the attainment of mutual objectives. But there will ultimately come an armistice and peace, and then it will be just as essential to have complete understanding and good will among the United Nations to insure a victory at the peace conference. Now is the time to clarify financial aspects of the lend-lease program and to forestall embarrassing developments which may have a devastating effect on the peace negotiations.

If lend-lease is designed to win the war, we must not permit it to lose the peace. This is something over which the Congress still has some control, if it has the courage and foresight to discharge its duties and to direct the fiscal policies of our Government.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the eloquent address just delivered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]. As the son of an Italian immigrant boy who reached these shores nearly 90 years ago, I join with him and other Members of Congress in exerting every effort possible to preserve in the United States a government of justice, freedom, hope, opportunity, and free enterprise which the founding fathers established here more than a century and a half ago.

My primary purpose, however, in taking the floor is to ask the chairman of the committee a question. It has come to my attention recently, from a source which I consider dependable and trustworthy, some information as to the method by which the United States Government is extending lend-lease aid to our allies and accepting in return certain goods and services. I believe that information warrants the question I now desire to ask. I have been informed that the method used in lend-lease purchases is this: That when we extend aid to any of our allies, whether it be munitions, tanks, guns, or food, it is charged upon the ledger with a dollars-and-cents price, but when we receive goods in return from our allies, whether it be food, services, or materials, such aid is marked on the ledger as a credit, but without any price being attached thereto.

This leaves the matter in an uncertain condition. I do not know whether it is true or not, but I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], what is the system being employed of extending lend-lease aid to our allies, so far as keeping records is concerned?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will turn to the hearings he will find a full discussion of the matter. As will be noted there, the system referred to has been adopted and followed whenever lend-lease goods are delivered to an ally. On delivery a charge is made on the ledger, and whenever goods or services are received by us from our allies, a credit is entered on the ledger.

We are not always able to determine, at the time of delivery, the exact dollars-and-cents value to be credited. Many things that enter into it have to be determined. Unexpected deliveries must sometimes be made on short notice. Often the theater of action shifts so rapidly that accompanying inventories and other documentary material are delayed, misplaced, or incomplete, and it is impossible to say immediately what the exact value is.

Mr. DONDERO. Does that system work both ways?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It does; and in either event, an acknowledgment

of receipt is entered upon the ledger, and a tracer is set in motion immediately with the view to determining as soon as possible the value of the services or goods, and when authoritatively adjudicated, the ledger entry is completed.

Mr. DONDERO. In dollars and cents?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; that is impracticable. It was testified before the committee that the force of accountants required to make such transition in England alone would be prohibitive; but a full and complete and detailed record is kept in terms of commodities and services, so that at the close of the war they will offset goods and services in kind, and where that is inconvenient, they can and will be reduced to terms of dollars and credited to account.

Mr. DONDERO. I think that is the answer to the question I asked and should be a part of the record.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman has afforded an opportunity to place it in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Any defense article, information, or service procured from funds appropriated by this act or prior acts appropriating funds to the President for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of said act of March 11, 1941, as amended, shall be retained by or transferred to and for the use of such department or agency of the United States as the President may determine, in lieu of being disposed of to a foreign government, whenever in the judgment of the President the defense of the United States will be best served thereby.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 6, line 16, change the period to a colon and insert: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for the payment of any subsidy on agricultural products."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the question was raised here this afternoon by someone who came to the table where I was sitting, whether the funds contained in this bill could be used for the payment of subsidies on agricultural products. In order that I might make no mistake I referred the question to Mr. Stettinius and asked him if that could be done. I was advised that he understood that it was intended that it should be done.

If we are going to make any appropriation or to provide any authority in any way for subsidies on agricultural products, it should be done directly and not indirectly; it should be done where we specify in the legislation that we pass that is to be the case.

For my own part I feel that these subsidies are highly inflationary and in the long run create a debt which is going to be much more dangerous to the people than any temporary benefit that is handed to them as a result of lower prices resulting from a subsidy. I think that we should take every precaution to see that there is nothing passed surreptitiously that will in any way provide for subsidies.

The Committee on Banking and Currency is now holding hearings, and I understand that the hearings so far have not resulted in any intelligent statement on how the thing could possibly work out to the benefit of the country.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I have heard it estimated at various times by responsible persons that the incentive payments, or subsidy payments, that would be required really to roll back the prices and put into effect the program that is contemplated might run anywhere from $2,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000. When Mr. Stettinius told the gentleman this afternoon that he understood it was intended to use part of this appropriation for that purpose, did he give the gentleman any idea as to the amount?

Mr. TABER. He did not. For that reason, I feel we should adopt an amendment prohibiting it. If any legislation is going to be adopted that provides for any such thing as that, the administration should come to the Congress and give an intelligent reason why it should be done, and we should have it in a straight-forward piece of legislation.

Mr. RIZLEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. If the gentleman's amendment is not adopted, it would simply mean that this bill would be usurping the powers of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. TABER. And the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. FISH. You might just as well abolish both committees, because this involves a huge sum of money.

Mr. TABER. I agree with the gentleman. I do not want to be mixed up in that kind of a deal.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am in complete agreement with the position of the gentleman in opposition to subsidies, and I am in thorough accord with his opinion as to the futility of subsidies under such circumstances. But, Mr. Chairman, I fail to see where there is any possible application in this connection. This is an appropriation for the procurement by manufacture or otherwise of defense articles. This money cannot be used for any other purpose. It is not appropriated to pay subsidies, and if there is any question as to what are defense articles, it is stated in section 2, subsection (a) of the Lend-Lease Act that the term "defense article" means—and I refer to the only meaning applicable in the present case—"any agricultural, industrial, or other commodity or article for defense." That is all that can be secured with this money. That is the only purpose for which this appropriation can be expended. So there is no occasion to impose the limitation proposed by the amendment.

Then, to make it a little more emphatic, it is stated that the President may, when he deems it in the interest of national defense, authorize the Secretary of War or the head of any other department or agency of government—which would include Mr. Stettinius—to manufacture in arsenals, factories, and shipyards under their jurisdiction, or otherwise procure to the extent to which funds are made available therefor, or contracts are authorized from time to time by the Congress, or both, any defense article.

I think it is very clear that none of this money could be legally used to pay subsidies. However, I may say that in view of what seems to be the prevailing opinion of the Congress as repeatedly expressed in record votes in opposition to subsidies, the committee has no objection to the amendment.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. I did not hear the reading of the amendment, but would that amendment go so far as to say that this Government could not subsidize some agricultural development in north Africa where food might be grown close to the base of operations of the American troops? I should like to know if the amendment would go that far. If so, I think it would be a most serious mistake to have any such amendment. If it is only for the purpose of prohibiting a subsidy in this country of the type we have discussed heretofore, I can see very well why it would be an excellent amendment, but if it goes so far as to prohibit any development of agriculture in other countries where our troops are located, where it might save millions of dollars in shipping and in food costs, it would be a most fatal blunder to agree to such an amendment.

Mr. TABER. It would not be a subsidy if there was a direct contract for goods with people in foreign countries.

Mr. O'NEAL. The soil we have just conquered is some of the most fertile soil in the world. Certainly it would be a tremendous mistake if this country did not go in there and do what it could to increase food production. I did not hear the amendment read, and I am not sure whether it does or does not prohibit that.

Mr. TABER. It simply prohibits the use of any funds provided in this bill for the payment of any subsidy on agricultural products.

Mr. O'NEAL. If that is what it states, in my opinion that would make it impossible to go into north Africa and start the development of agricultural work there through the support of the United States.

Mr. TABER. No; it would not prohibit them from going into north Africa and contracting for the production of goods in a straightforward way. It would prevent the payment of funds as subsidies, that is true, but it would not prevent the purchase of goods in a straightforward manner.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. It is obvious to me that the entire House is in sympathy with the purpose of the amendment. May I ask the gentleman from New York if he could not draft a phrase or two that would clarify the matter so as to make the amendment specifically applicable only to subsidies paid in the United States? I think he would then have an amendment that would be agreeable to the House. Would not the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. TABER. I would not object to that particular situation, but I do not see how there would be a requirement that there should be a subsidy.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes in order to yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Two questions arise in connection with this. The method of paying subsidies out of the lend-lease funds might very well be, in fact, I have no doubt it would be, about this: The Lend-Lease authorities would make purchases of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation in purchasing the desired goods would guarantee to canners or others from whom the goods were purchased prices above those set by the O. P. A. to take care of the prices the producers may have paid. And in the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation it has frequently been suggested that the subsidy program would be accomplished, so that it seems to me it is in order to put in this kind of a restriction without definitely curtailing the operations of lend-lease. I am entirely in sympathy with the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that this issue ought to be clearly in the open when the House passes upon it, but it is not going to be, understandingly, if passed under the present situation. If it be true that it is intended that some of these funds are to be used for the purpose of paying subsidies either directly or by the purchase of Commodity Credit Corporation goods, then we ought to know the amount of that, and, to make the amendment effective, that amount should be deducted from the bill. It seems to me that we have reached a situation here that would make it difficult to legislate understandingly unless we have further information.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield with pleasure to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. My understanding is that the Government through its appropriate agencies, I think the Commodity Credit Corporation, has agreed to take over from the canners of the country the entire pack of certain types of vegetables, peas, and sweet corn, for example, at a certain fixed price, and then to turn over to the retail trade a sufficient amount for civilian consumption. The ceiling price, however, fixed on the retail trade is lower than can be met by the canners if they so contract. So, some agency of the Government is to step in and pay the canners the difference. In other words, it is a subsidy, and all the canned goods that are to be purchased in this country of these categories are to be purchased by the Government under some sort of subsidy.

Mr. CASE. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Lend-Lease is helpless in the matter. Lend-Lease does not do the purchasing, does not fix the price, does not distribute the subsidy, but this appropriation must be used of course in helping the Government to buy canned goods for Lend-Lease, and under the policies of other branches of the Government Lend-Lease would be the only agency of the Government whose money could not be used in this subsidy business, with which I entirely disagree, while all other agencies of the Government would be free to do so. We are getting into a difficult situation. I am in sympathy with the objective, but I wonder if it will work in this case.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the situation the gentleman outlined is correct in some degree, but Lend-Lease takes the product at a price. If that price is lower than what the producer can put it on the market for, then the Commodity Credit Corporation steps in and makes up the difference. You might call it a subsidy, you might call it anything you want, but it is a fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation is attempting at this time to enable Lend-Lease to buy these products at a price they feel they can pay, and take care of the difference. We had this matter up before our committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this question did not arise in the hearings or in the committee. Mr. Stettinius at no time made any statement on it, or any reference to it, and the information which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has and his statement are the first intimation that the matter was under consideration. As I have said before, under the provisions of the bill, the amendment is apparently inapplicable, but the committee, out of an abundance of caution, is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I wonder what the effect of this amendment will be so far as section 5b of the original Lend-Lease Act is concerned, which provides as follows:

> The terms and conditions upon which any such foreign government receives any aid authorized under subsection (a) shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefit to the United States may be payment or repayment in kind or property or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory.

Is it not in direct conflict with that, regardless of any amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I appreciate the suggestion of the gentleman, but in view of the circumstance that particular provision is not applicable to the present situation. As a matter of fact, it seems entirely unlikely that the pending amendment is applicable. Under language of the bill no money carried by the bill can be used for subsidies. However, to expedite consideration we are willing to agree to the amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, the gentleman from Missouri takes the responsibility for agreeing to the amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do so only——

Mr. McCORMACK. I want the RECORD to show that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do so only after consultation with and by direction of a majority of the members of the subcommittee reporting the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, the gentleman from Missouri after collaborating and consulting with other members of the subcommittee, takes the responsibility of accepting this amendment. I want the RECORD to show that fact.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. May I say that the committee takes, and has always taken, all responsibility for the bills it reports to the House and for every amendment which it accepts on the floor. In this instance, I have conferred with a majority of the members of the subcommittee reporting the bill on this side of the aisle—all but one of whom are sitting within reach of the table here and I am directed by them to accept the amendment.

Mr. O'NEAL. Not unless it is limited, as I have indicated.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Kentucky agrees conditionally, a condition which I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will meet.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to amend the amendment by inserting the word "domestic" before the word "subsidy."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it seems to me that that raises the issue that the membership should know something about. If the amendment is to apply to all production, that is one thing; but if it is confined to prohibiting subsidies for domestic production, that is something else. The truth is that we do not nave enough information before us on the

point that has been raised. It is evident that the program that is proposed to be operated through purchases by the Commodity Credit Corporation might be directly affected, and the purchase program of Lend-Lease might be crippled or otherwise affected. I question very much that the House has sufficient information to pass upon these questions intelligently. It seems to me we should have assurance from the chairman of the committee, who will be a member of the conference committee, that the whole question will be thoroughly gone into in conference. Today we do not have the information; we do not know what amount is proposed to be used for subsidies directly or through purchases from the Commodity Credit Corporation. If we did, and the House favors the amendment, then we should deduct that amount from the bill. But whatever we do, I do not think we should go on record as opposing subsidies for domestic production and inviting them for foreign production. I object to the modification of the amendment as requested.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that the word "domestic" be inserted before the word "subsidy."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri to the amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Insert the word "domestic" before the word "subsidy" in the Taber amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to the amendment. I want to point out that the effect of that is to say it is all right to use this money to subsidize foreign production but you are not going to use any of this money to subsidize domestic production. It puts us in an impossible position.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman that if there was any intention whatever to use any of these lend-lease funds for the payment of subsidies on agricultural products, in the sense in which we have lately become accustomed to thinking of subsidies, and on which Congress has lately expressed its disapproval, we heard nothing of it in the committee hearings, although we had very careful and very detailed hearings. I am sure that Lend-Lease did not intentionally conceal anything, but if that was the purpose and the intention, certainly it did not develop. Personally I would be much opposed to such subsidies, and have voted against them. I do not think this matter is very clear, the way we have it here, but I think there will be ample opportunity at the later consideration of the bill for it to be easily worked out in the other body, where hearings could be had and the conferees on the part of the House could take it up. I would like to see the amendment go in.

Mr. CASE. I have no objection to the original amendment going in, for the purpose of raising the question in the other body and insuring that the issue will be before the conference with the Senate, but the adoption of the amendment to the amendment would put this House on record as saying it is all right to use this money for foreign subsidies, but we will not use it for subsidizing domestic production.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would like to see the amendment adopted in its original form.

Mr. CASE. Yes. I have no objection to the amendment in its original form, so that the question will be raised and considered as I have stated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the majority members of the Deficiency Subcommittee which reported out this bill are sitting about me here. I have consulted them and believe I express the opinion of all when I say we are willing to accept this amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not like the idea at all of writing an amendment like this on the floor of the House. This is a far-reaching amendment, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has said. I am sorry that we do things in this fashion. It is true, it never came up in the committee; but just because it did not come up in the committee is no reason that it may not be a dangerous amendment at this time. I really object to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then all approve except one.

Mr. TABER. The amendment has already been agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is merely a matter of approval by the subcommittee on this side of the aisle. The question has not been raised before, and this is the first opportunity to secure the views of the committee.

Mr. O'NEAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. O'NEAL. The Senate might disappoint us and accept it, and then we would be in a fine condition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. This act may be cited as the "Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1943."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Speaker resumed the chair, and Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 75, noes 41.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 214, nays 96, not voting 122, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—214

Abernethy	Disney	Hope
Andersen, H. Carl	Ditter	Horan
Anderson, Calif.	Dondero	Howell
Andresen, August H.	Doughton	Jarman
Andrews	Douglas	Jeffrey
Angell	Durham	Jenkins
Arends	Dworshak	Jennings
Auchincloss	Ellis	Johnson, Anton J.
Barden	Ellison, Md.	Johnson, Calvin D.
Barrett	Ellsworth	Johnson, Ind.
Bates, Mass.	Elston, Ohio	Johnson, J. Leroy
Beall	Engel	Johnson, Okla.
Bell	Fellows	Johnson, Ward
Bennett, Mich.	Fenton	Jones
Bennett, Mo.	Fish	Jonkman
Bishop	Fulmer	Kean
Blackney	Gale	Keefe
Bland	Gamble	Kerr
Boren	Gavin	Kilburn
Brehm	Gearhart	Kilday
Brown, Ohio	Gifford	Knutson
Bulwinkle	Gillie	Kunkel
Burch, Va.	Gore	LaFollette
Busbey	Gossett	Lambertson
Butler	Graham	Landis
Canfield	Grant, Ala.	Lanham
Cannon, Mo.	Grant, Ind.	LeCompte
Carlson, Kans.	Griffiths	LeFevre
Carlson, Ohio	Gross	Ludlow
Carter	Gwynne	McCowen
Case	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McGehee
Chenoweth	Hall, Leonard W.	McGregor
Chiperfield	Halleck	McLean
Church	Hancock	McWilliams
Clason	Hare	Manasco
Clevenger	Harless, Ariz.	Mansfield, Tex.
Cole, Mo.	Harris, Va.	Martin, Iowa
Compton	Hartley	Martin, Mass.
Cooley	Heidinger	Mason
Cravens	Herter	Merrow
Crawford	Hess	Michener
Curtis	Hill	Miller, Conn.
Day	Hoffman	Miller, Mo.
Dirksen	Holmes, Mass.	Miller, Nebr.
	Holmes, Wash.	

Mills	Robsion, Ky.	Stockman
Monkiewicz	Rockwell	Sullivan
Mott	Rodgers, Pa.	Sumner, Ill.
Mruk	Rogers, Mass.	Sumners, Tex.
Mundt	Rohrbough	Sundstrom
Murdock	Rowe	Taber
Murray, Tenn.	Sasscer	Talbot
Murray, Wis.	Satterfield	Talle
Newsome	Schiffler	Towe
Nichols	Schwabe	Troutman
Norman	Shafer	Van Zandt
Norrell	Sheppard	Vorys, Ohio
O'Hara	Short	Vursell
Pace	Sikes	Walter
Peterson, Fla.	Simpson, Ill.	Weichel, Ohio
Pittenger	Simpson, Pa.	West
Ploeser	Smith, Maine	Wheat
Plumley	Smith, Va.	Whitten
Poage	Smith, Wis.	Whittington
Powers	Snyder	Wickersham
Price	Spence	Wigglesworth
Ramey	Springer	Winstead
Rankin	Stanley	Winter
Reece, Tenn.	Starnes, Ala.	Wolcott
Reed, N. Y.	Steagall	Wolverton, N. J.
Rees, Kans.	Stefan	Woodrum, Va.
Rizley	Stevenson	

NAYS—96

Allen, La.	Fulbright	Murphy
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gilchrist	O'Brien, Ill.
	Gordon	O'Brien, Mich.
Bates, Ky.	Gorski	O'Connor
Beckworth	Green	O'Konski
Bloom	Gregory	O'Neal
Bonner	Hagen	Outland
Bradley, Pa.	Harris, Ark.	Patton
Brooks	Hays	Poulson
Brown, Ga.	Hobbs	Priest
Bryson	Hoeven	Rabaut
Burdick	Holifield	Ramspeck
Burgin	Hull	Robinson, Utah
Camp	Jackson	Rowan
Chapman	Johnson, Luther A.	Russell
Coffee		Sadowski
Cooper	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Scanlon
Creal		Schuetz
Crosser	Kee	Sheridan
Cullen	Kefauver	Sparkman
Cunningham	Kelley	Stewart
Curley	Kleberg	Tarver
D'Alesandro	Larcade	Thomas, Tex.
Dilweg	Lemke	Thomason
Dingell	Lesinski	Vincent, Ky.
Eberharter	McCormack	Voorhis, Calif.
Feighan	Madden	Wadsworth
Fernandez	Magnuson	Weaver
Fisher	Mahon	Whelchel, Ga.
Fitzpatrick	Mansfield, Mont.	Willey
Flannagan		Wright
Fogarty	May	Zimmerman
Forand	Monroney	
Ford	Morrison, N. C.	

NOT VOTING—122

Allen, Ill.	Gathings	Marcantonio
Baldwin, Md.	Gavagan	Merritt
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gerlach	Miller, Pa.
Barry	Gibson	Morrison, La.
Bender	Gillette	Myers
Bolton	Goodwin	Norton
Boykin	Granger	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	Guyer	O'Leary
Buckley	Hale	O'Toole
Buffett	Harness, Ind.	Patman
Burchill, N. Y.	Hart	Peterson, Ga.
Byrne	Hébert	Pfeifer
Cannon, Fla.	Heffernan	Philbin
Capozzoli	Hendricks	Phillips
Celler	Hinshaw	Pracht
Clark	Hoch	Randolph
Cochran	Izac	Reed, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Richards
Colmer	Judd	Rivers
Costello	Kearney	Robertson
Courtney	Kennedy	Rogers, Calif.
Cox	Keogh	Rolph
Culkin	King	Sabath
Davis	Kinzer	Sauthoff
Dawson	Kirwan	Scott
Delaney	Klein	Slaughter
Dewey	Lane	Smith, Ohio
Dickstein	Lea	Smith, W. Va.
Dies	Lewis	Somers, N. Y.
Domengeaux	Luce	Stearns, N. H.
Drewry	Lynch	Taylor
Eaton	McCord	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	McGranery	Tibbott
Elmer	McKenzie	Tolan
Fay	McMillan	Treadway
Folger	McMurray	Vinson, Ga.
Furlong	Maas	Ward
Gallagher	Maloney	Wasielewski
Weiss	White	Woodruff, Mich.
Welch	Wilson	Worley
Wene	Wolfenden, Pa.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Goodwin for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia for, with Mr. Domengeaux against.

Mr. Harness of Indiana for, with Mr. Cox again.

General pairs:

Mr. Dies with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Hoch with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Klein with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Furlong with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Randolph with Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Kinzer.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Folger with Mr Pracht.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Lewis of Ohio.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Tibbott.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Miller of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Culkin.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Rolph.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Elmer.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Dewey.

Mr. Kirwan with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Fay with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Ward with Mr. Hale.

Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. CULLEN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 309, nays 4, answered "present" 1, not voting 118, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—309

Abernethy	Barden	Boren
Allen, La.	Barrett	Bradley, Pa.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bates, Ky.	Brehm
	Bates, Mass.	Brooks
Anderson, Calif.	Beall	Brown, Ga.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Beckworth	Brown, Ohio
	Bell	Bryson
Andresen, August H.	Bennett, Mich.	Bulwinkle
	Bennett, Mo.	Burdick
Andrews	Bishop	Burgin
Angell	Blackney	Busbey
Arends	Bland	Butler
Arnold	Bloom	Camp
Auchincloss	Bonner	Canfield
Cannon, Mo.	Holmes, Mass.	Peterson, Fla.
Carlson, Kans.	Holmes, Wash.	Pittenger
Carson, Ohio	Hope	Ploeser
Carter	Horan	Plumley
Case	Howell	Poage
Chapman	Hull	Poulson
Chenoweth	Jackson	Powers
Chiperfield	Jarman	Price
Church	Jeffrey	Priest
Clason	Jenkins	Rabaut
Coffee	Jennings	Ramey
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Anton J.	Ramspeck
Compton		Rankin
Cooley	Johnson, Calvin D.	Reece, Tenn.
Cooper		Reed, Ill.
Cravens	Johnson, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.
Creal	Johnson, J. Leroy	Rees, Kans.
Crosser		Richards
Cullen	Johnson, Luther A.	Rivers
Cunningham		Rizley
Curley	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Robinson, Utah
Curtis		Robsion, Ky.
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Okla.	Rockwell
Day	Johnson, Ward	Rodgers, Pa.
Dilweg	Jonkman	Rogers, Mass.
Dingell	Kean	Rohrbough
Dirksen	Kee	Rowan
Disney	Keefe	Rowe
Ditter	Kefauver	Russell
Dondero	Kelley	Sadowski
Doughton	Kerr	Sasscer
Douglas	Kilburn	Satterfield
Drewry	Kilday	Scanlon
Durham	King	Schiffler
Dworshak	Kirwan	Schuetz
Eberharter	Kleberg	Schwabe
Ellis	Knutson	Shafer
Ellison, Md.	Kunkel	Sheppard
Ellsworth	LaFollette	Sheridan
Elston, Ohio	Lambertson	Short
Engel	Landis	Sikes
Feighan	Lanham	Simpson, Ill.
Fellows	Larcade	Smith, Maine
Fenton	LeCompte	Smith, Va.
Fernandez	LeFevre	Smith, W. Va.
Fish	Lemke	Smith, Wis.
Fisher	Lesinski	Snyder
Fitzpatrick	Ludlow	Sparkman
Flannagan	McCormack	Spence
Fogarty	McCowen	Springer
Forand	McGregor	Stanley
Ford	McLean	Starnes, Ala.
Fulbright	McMillan	Steagall
Fulmer	McWilliams	Stefan
Gale	Madden	Stevenson
Gamble	Magnuson	Stewart
Gathings	Mahon	Stockman
Gavin	Manasco	Sullivan
Gearhart	Mansfield, Mont.	Sumner, Ill.
Gifford		Sumners, Tex.
Gilchrist	Mansfield, Tex.	Sundstrom
Gillie	Martin, Iowa	Taber
Gordon	Martin, Mass.	Talbot
Gore	Mason	Talle
Gorski	May	Tarver
Gossett	Merrow	Thomason
Graham	Michener	Towe
Grant, Ala.	Miller, Conn.	Troutman
Grant, Ind.	Miller, Mo.	Van Zandt
Green	Miller Nebr.	Vincent, Ky.
Gregory	Mills	Voorhis, Calif.
Griffiths	Monkiewicz	Vorys, Ohio
Gross	Monroney	Vursell
Gwynne	Morrison, La.	Wadsworth
Hagen	Morrison, N. C.	Walter
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mott	Weaver
	Mruk	Weichel, Ohio
Hall, Leonard W.	Mundt	West
	Murdock	Wheat
Halleck	Murphy	Whelchel, Ga.
Hancock	Murray, Tenn.	Whitten
Hare	Murray, Wis.	Whittington
Harless, Ariz.	Newsome	Wickersham
Harris, Ark.	Nichols	Wigglesworth
Harris, Va.	Norman	Willey
Hartley	Norrell	Winstead
Hays	O'Brien, Ill.	Winter
Herter	O'Brien, Mich.	Wolcott
Hess	O'Connor	Wolverton, N. J.
Hill	O'Neal	Wright
Hobbs	Outland	Zimmerman
Hoeven	Pace	
Holifield	Patton	

NAYS—4

Crawford	O'Hara	Thomas, Tex.
Jones	O'Konski	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Clevenger

NOT VOTING—118

Allen, Ill.	Baldwin, N. Y.	Bender
Baldwn, Md.	Barry	Bolton

Boykin	Guyer	O'Toole
Bradley, Mich.	Hale	Patman
Buckley	Harness, Ind.	Peterson, Ga.
Buffett	Hart	Pfeifer
Burch, Va	Hébert	Philbin
Burchill, N. Y.	Heffernan	Phillips
Byrne	Heidinger	Pracht
Cannon, Fla.	Hendricks	Randolph
Capozzoli	Hinshaw	Robertson
Celler	Hoch	Rogers, Calif.
Clark	Hoffman	Rolph
Cochran	Izac	Sabath
Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Sauthoff
Colmer	Judd	Scott
Costello	Kearney	Simpson, Pa.
Courtney	Kennedy	Slaughter
Cox	Keogh	Smith, Ohio
Culkin	Kinzer	Somers, N. Y.
Davis	Klein	Stearns, N. H.
Dawson	Lane	Taylor
Delaney	Lea	Thomas, N. J.
Dewey	Lewis	Tibbott
Dickstein	Luce	Tolan
Dies	Lynch	Treadway
Domengeaux	McCord	Vinson, Ga.
Eaton	McGehee	Ward
Elliott	McGranery	Wasielewski
Elmer	McKenzie	Weiss
Fay	McMurray	Welch
Folger	Maas	Wene
Furlong	Maloney	White
Gallagher	Marcantonio	Wilson
Gavagan	Merritt	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gerlach	Miller, Pa.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gibson	Myers	Woodrum, Va.
Gillette	Norton	Worley
Goodwin	O'Brien, N. Y.	
Granger	O'Leary	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Clevenger for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.

General pairs:

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Kinzer.
Mr. Hoch with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Heidinger.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Furlong with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Folger with Mr. Pracht.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Lewis of Ohio.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Tibbott.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Miller of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Culkin.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Rolph.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Dewey.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Ward with Mr. Hale.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Hart with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. SMITH, and I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their own remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

DISTRIBUTION OF FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. NICHOLS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (Report No. 477) authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to make a study and investigation of the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products, and so forth, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a study and investigation of the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products from rural areas through the various marketing agencies to the ultimate consumer, as it affects farmers, the various types of middlemen, wholesalers, retailers, and consumers, with a view to ascertaining, among other things:

(a) The effectiveness of the present system of marketing, and the adequacy of present marketing facilities, with particular regard to the protection of farmers and consumers;

(b) The effect of transactions on the futures grain and cotton exchanges upon such system and upon farmers and consumers:

(c) The existence of any practices in connecting with the grading, storing, processing, transporting, distributing, or marketing of farm products, which adversely affect farmers and consumers;

(d) The present and prospective development of the types and methods of transportation for farm products, and the existence, if any, of discrimination in railway freight or in motor-carrier rates on farm products in the various areas; and

(e) The feasibility of establishing an up-to-date marketing and distributing system from the rural areas through local, State, and national marketing agencies under a farm cooperative program that would provide facilities for proper grading and distribution, necessary storage, and for other essential activities of an orderly marketing program.

The committee shall make a report to the House as soon as practicable after its study and investigation has been concluded, and in its report the committee shall make such recommendations as it may deem proper, including recommendations with respect to any legislative action necessary to effectuate its recommendations.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman. Oaths or affirmations may be administered by the chairman or any member of the commitee designated by him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. O'CONNOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and also that my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] may be allowed to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter to himself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the reques of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inquire of the majority leader if he can inform the House as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, as we all know, the anti-poll-tax bill comes up for consideration on motion to discharge the committee, with 20 minutes' debate. If that motion is adopted, immediately thereafter there will be a vote on adoption of the resolution. Then, of course, the bill goes over for 2 hours' general debate and for reading under the 5-minute rule until the next day, Tuesday.

After that matter is disposed of on Monday, it is the intention to call up a conference report on the civil functions appropriation bill. A complete report has been filed today and it is intended to call that up Monday afternoon.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman have any confidence that the poll-tax bill will be finished on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. There are two parts to the legislative consideration of the bill. There is discharge of the committee and adoption of the resolution. When that is done then the 2 hours' general debate comes up the next day under the rule.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is obliged to go over a day?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. On Tuesday there will be debate on the anti-poll-tax bill under the rules.

Wednesday will be taken up with memorial services.

On Thursday the House will consider House Resolution 38, authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to investigate the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products. That has been reported out of the Rules Committee and it is intended to bring that up on Thursday. Also a bill from the Military Affairs Committee in relation to the WAAC will be brought up on that day. Unanimous consent was obtained a few weeks ago for the consideration of that bill.

If there is any time left on that day and on Friday, there are three bills reported by the Committee on Immigration to be considered: H. R. 1291, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; H. R. 1295, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the residence for naturalization purposes of certain aliens serving in the armed forces of our allies; and also H. R. 1941, to permit naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons or daughters are serving in the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. GREEN. Do either of those bills pertain to the Chinese?

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I ask the majority leader, is it the purpose of the leadership to be in session on Memorial Day, May 31?

Mr. McCORMACK. Before answering that, may I say that a conference is going on now on the tax bill. With the exception of Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, those days being definitely set aside for the consideration of certain bills, there would have to be taken into consideration the fact that action may have to be taken on the tax bill that is now pending in conference. I want it understood by the House that will have priority of consideration.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have not consulted with the Speaker or my distinguished friend from Massachusetts as to whether the House should meet on Memorial Day or not; I have no definite comment to make.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the Members of the House would like to know at the earliest possible moment whether the House is to meet on Memorial Day, ir order to enable them to arrange such speaking engagements as they may have.

Mr. McCORMACK. So far as I am personally concerned, I think that is such an important day in the life of our Nation, so intimately connected with honoring the dead who have served in our various wars, and of particular significance at this time with the war on, that it might be well for the Congress of the United States to honor the heroes of the various wars in which the country has engaged by not sitting on that date.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I wonder if the majority leader can inform us concerning the antistrike bill which has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Military Affairs and on which a rule has been granted; when will it come up for consideration?

Mr. McCORMACK. As far as my program for next week is concerned, it is not on the program. After the rule is out for 7 legislative days any member of the Rules Committee can call it up.

Mr. SHORT. But it will not be brought up next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot answer that now. As far as the program I have announced is concerned, it is not on it. I understand quite a number of Members have made plans in connection with a trip for the information of the House relating to war activities, and that is one of the considerations which prompted making the program for next week as light as possible.

Mr. SHORT. That is just the reason I asked the question of the majority leader, but the measure is of such vast importance and is so timely that I think the sooner we can bring it up for consideration the better it will be for the country as a whole.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will not enter into the question of timeliness with my friend.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, following the disposition of the legislative business on the Speaker's desk, and after other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, May 25, at the conclusion of the legislative business and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONKIEWICZ] may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend the remarks I made today and include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. O'KONSKI and Mr. SADOWSKI asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a letter from Dr. Townsend.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Chicago Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

A FUMBLED FOOD PROGRAM—QUACK GRASS AND BIND WEED IN WASHINGTON CHOKE FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, now that the so-called abundant life has shed its sheep's clothing and come out in its true colors as the rationing of scarcity, it is high time for all of us—not only those who hail from farming areas, but also and indeed more especially, those who seldom set foot off the concrete wherein no Victory Garden ever has or ever can grow—it is high time, I say, for all of us to look face to face at some facts which are fundamental to food production in this country.

Let me remind you that no baby ever was successfully nursed from the corner of a ration card; nor was any starving child lulled to happy slumber by the reading of a directive, however plausible the phraseology in which it is couched, nor how soothing the voice whereby it may be promulgated.

Today we face the stark fact of scarcity and impending malnutrition, yet we live in what is normally the greatest food producing country in the world.

During the last recess, it was my privilege to meet and talk again with many of the farmers of southeast Wisconsin, one of the finest agricultural areas in the United States, and, for that matter, the world. In spite of lack of labor, lack of farm machinery, lack of fertilizer, and other obstacles to maximum production, they assured me of their best efforts to produce the necessary feed for livestock and food for human beings so essential to winning the war.

Their fields in many instances, they told me, were ready to plant, but they did not have needed new machines for planting and seeding. Many of them had permits to buy new farm machines but did not know when delivery would be made.

They could not understand why it was so difficult to obtain machinery, especially when they are so short of labor. At the last minute, many of them were forced to change their production plans because they knew not what to depend upon in the way of new equipment.

Some had to give up their hemp contracts, because they could not obtain necessary fertilizer grain drills; others had to reduce corn acreage because they were not certain of obtaining cultivators.

The information given me on lack of farm machinery was so surprising—in a few cases, so startling—that I have investigated further in other States as well as Wisconsin, also right here in Washington, in addition to a considerable study over the last 3 months of the farm-machinery situation.

To date, Mr. Speaker, the authorities in Washington have taken only a few halting steps to correct the mistakes

made in L–170, the limitation order so drastically limiting the manufacture of new farm machines and of repair parts so important to satisfactory use of implements already on the farm.

While much has been said about the lack of farm machinery, not yet has sufficient emphasis been placed publicly on the almost unbelievable blunders made in rationing the pitifully small quantity of new machines to be manufactured for 1943. Again it is the old, old story—too little and too late.

Do you know that completed farm machinery, ready for use, has stood in the warehouses collecting dust for months, with farmers begging for new equipment?

Before discussing the failure of the U. S. D. A. in rationing farm machinery, I want to pay tribute to the farmers of this country—in Wisconsin and in all other States of the Union.

Farmers have lost much of their competent help. More is being lost. On tens of thousands of farms, farm machinery would alleviate the labor situation if farm machinery were available in sufficient quantity. Farmers are planting crops, which at this time they do not know how they can harvest. However, they are taking a chance, in the hope that somehow, someway, they will be able to save the crops when grown.

In this war, as in all wars this country has ever been engaged in, farmers' sons were among the first to volunteer. With skilled help largely gone to the armed services, to war plants, and to shipyards, farmers once retired are returning from village, town, and city, to active duty on the farm.

Farmers' wives, the young children, and in many instances, the aged grandfather and grandmother all help out as best they can in agricultural production.

The physical weaknesses of old age, and the inexperience of youth, will not hold them back. Too many, especially the older people, will overtax their strength. They will become war casualties in the fight for food, just as their sons and grandsons will be casualties on the field of battle.

This year, as last, farmers will be working 60, 70, and 80 hours a week. The farmers of this country do not indulge in slow-downs; cows will not wait nor will the crops. There is no pegged production on a farm. Farmers will produce food in quantity in spite of all obstacles. They would like to produce more, and could do so if we did our duty here in Washington.

Yes, the farmer, universally, works hours unknown in the cities. The farmer appreciates the importance of food, if Washington does not. His sons, brothers, nephews, cousins, and younger friends are offering their lives on land, sea, and in the air, that we might enjoy freedom at home.

Their boys are flying planes, operating tanks, and ships; firing rifles, machine guns, and cannon in North Africa, the Solomon Islands, New Guinea, Australia, Europe, and Asia, also on the seven seas. Their boys, as well as the people back home, and our allies to a large extent, must be fed by food grown on American farms. With the march on Berlin, Rome, and Toyko the responsibility of feeding the undernourished and already starving civilians of now-occupied countries will fall upon American farmers.

With all due credit to the A. E. F. in Europe a quarter of a century ago—and I was one of the boys who fought in the fields of France—hunger, more especially of the civilian population had much to do with bringing Germany to her knees.

The boys on Bataan were forced to surrender April 9, 1942, now a little over a year ago, because they lacked sufficient food. They were short of quinine, guns, ammunition, and especially planes. But the end came when it did from physical exhaustion resulting from lack of food.

Yes; I agree with you: History records that starved armies and hungry nations do not win battles or wars.

The farmer, gentlemen, is going to do his utmost to produce the food required by the people at home, the armed forces, and our allies, in spite of all obstacles, man-made or from natural causes.

The least we can do is to make certain that unnecessary difficulties, arising from ignorance, mental obsession, or willful disregard of the facts, are minimized here in Washington.

And what have we done about farm machinery? Before giving you some figures on the measure of our bungling in that connection I want to clear up one clouded concept of farm buying. Many people here in Washington, some of them unfortunately in positions of power, harbor the quaint and utterly false notion that farmers buy new machines because they can afford to. They think that tractors are bought from the same motive as Easter hats; that farmers get new manure spreaders for the same reasons that most folks, farm and city alike, get new-model cars.

The idea alone is enough to brand its possessor as utterly ignorant of farming and of farmers. Because farming is a way of life as well as industry, every item of farm equipment competes with a host of other things the farmer and all of his family want. If the farmer wants a new tractor, three others of the family would rather have a new car. If he thinks of buying a hay baler, they all vote to install a bathroom. Very often the farmer himself leans more to the lure of modern living than to the latest in modern farming—and who among us shall cast a stone at him for that? If Jesse Jones could see no need for a stock pile of rubber or of plants to produce synthetic substitutes, how could Bill Brown out in the hinterland have seen the need for a stock pile of plows and planters?

Until recently, one of the worst and most widespread enemies of food and feed production was the bindweed, also known as the wild morning-glory, or creeping jenny. Not only does the bindweed sap the substance of the soil and starve out the cultivated crop, it also entwines itself around the growing stalks, choking them and dragging them down. So far as farm machinery is concerned, the worst case of bindweed is right here in the District of Columbia. Some call it red tape, others call it bureaucracy.

This bureaucratic bindweed took its time to flourish, flower, and bear seed. It went to seed in that incredible document known as L–170, probably the most horrible example of too little and too late in the record of this or any other nation during the present war. The best that can be said for this, the second crop of Washington bindweed, is that it was not quite as late in the fall of 1942 as it was in 1941, although the results were far worse.

For those of us who live in the artificial climate and air-conditioned comforts of this city, it is hard to sense the importance of timing in agriculture. A week's delay in planting will curtail and a week's delay in harvesting may lose all or nearly all of the results of an entire year's use of land and labor. Nothing in all nature is so sensitive as the reaction of plants to temperature and moisture, and even the lengthening or shortening of the sunlight cycle from one day to the next.

Under the efficiency of private enterprise, machinery manufacturing begins in the spring, a year or so ahead of the season of use. After the production schedules are planned, materials are ordered in May or June for manufacturing operations which begin in July or August. Shipments start moving in September and October. Only by beginning in July or August and dovetailing together the production of varied types and sizes of machines can factory capacity be used to the full and labor be kept steadily employed.

Every interference with this orderly, highly evolved timing is a waste of productive capacity, which in these times comes close to treason. Now, let us see how our bungling bureaucracy has thus interfered.

In 1941, the farm machinery industry was deprived of private initiative, its wisdom thrown into the discard. Everything had to await issuance of an edict saying what machines might be built, who might build them, who should get the necessary materials. That edict did not come in April or May, in time for proper planning of schedules and placing of orders. It had not come on July 1, when materials should have been delivered and manufacture begun. Even on November 1, which the bureaucrats in their dubious discretion had designated to be the official beginning of the farm machinery year, the edict was not forthcoming. Not until December 31, the last day of the last month, did the industry learn what it would be permitted to do for American agriculture during the year of which 2 months already were gone.

Taking the industry and its products as a whole, that edict, known as L–26, allowed for 1942 new machines aggregating an average of 83 percent of 1940.

Just why it was based on 1940, instead of 1941, is something of a mystery, unless it was that the bureaucrats wanted to camouflage the fact that they were cutting down the supply of farm machinery to about one-half of what farmers bought in 1941.

Farmers did not feel the full impact of this reduction in 1942, as the number of machines manufactured was augmented by a considerable inventory of machines carried over from 1941 by manufacturers, branch houses, and dealers. But, by the fall of 1942, warehouses, with the exception of a few items which will be mentioned later, were swept clean and serious shortages of several machines had appeared. The stage was set for the blow which was to follow.

So disastrous were the difficulties due to delay in release of the 1942 program that it was determined that the 1943 program was to be decided and announced in the spring of 1942, in order that materials might be secured and manufacture begun by midsummer. But, Limitation Order L–170 was not issued until October 19, 1942. Southern farmers were already in the field planting crops for harvesting this summer.

By October 19, the shortages in new machines had become a famine, forecast of what was to come to consumers of the food produced with farm machines. So desperate was the need of farmers for equipment to harvest their crops, that they were and are paying for old machines much more than they cost when new. Here are some typical actual examples which have been brought to my attention:

A 3-year-old combine sold for a third more than it cost when new.

A 3-year-old tractor which had cost $1,200, sold for $1,725.

A corn picker, 2 years old, brought better than 40 percent more than its price when new.

In the face of this famine, what did L–170 allow the farm-machinery industry to do for American agriculture? With Secretary Wickard invoking all the persuasion of his oratory to spur farmers toward new and higher goals of food production in 1943, what did bureaucracy do about replenishment of the tools wherewith food is produced?

It may seem incredible, Mr. Speaker, but L–170 cut farm machinery manufacture down to 23 percent of the 1940 average.

Whose idea was this? Surely not the farmers. In a letter sent last June to Secretary Wickard and Mr. Nelson of the War Production Board, the four major farm organizations joined in advising that new machinery made available should be at least two-thirds of 1940. Nor was it the notion of the United States Department of Agriculture. Based on data drawn from its extensive and experienced field organization, it recommended the minimum, the very minimum, to be 50 percent.

And now, gentlemen, we come to a significant coincidence. Early last summer, the Farm Equipment Branch of the War Production Board, counseled by technical consultants, drafted from the farm machinery industry, men fitted by years of actual working experience to analyze and appraise the machinery needs of the American farmer, also recommended as an absolute minimum a figure of 50 percent.

But, did the War Production Board heed any of these recommendations? It did not. It ignored the advice from the three best informed sources and obeyed the behest of the Office of Civilian Supply, chairmaned at the time by Joseph L. Weiner. The O. C. S. has little or no knowledge of agriculture and, admittedly, made no field survey to find out what were the actual needs of farmers for machines to raise the foods we now find so scarce. I am told that few, if any, of its personnel ever drove a tractor or milked a cow. It is headed by a man whose agricultural experience was confined to the sidewalks of New York and Greenwich Village.

Just how and why the Office of Civilian Supply was able to overrule all the other recommendations appears to be something of a military secret, or maybe a political secret.

A report of the Truman Committee of the Senate, issued as of January 11, 1943, called the attention of Congress to some of the difficulties brought about by the mistakes of the Office of Civilian Supply.

> America faces the grave danger of not reaching its food production goals for 1943 and 1944, instead of obtaining the increases required by wartime demands. The effect of the farm labor shortage has been intensified by the drastic limitation on production of farm machinery in 1943. Responsibility for this limitation rests squarely on the Office of Civilian Supply of the War Production Board. The Office erroneously regarded farm machinery as semiessential. In fact, farm machines are the machine tools of agriculture. An adequate supply is vital to maintain an increased food production.
>
> The American farmer must overcome tremendous obstacles in attempting to meet the 1943 food goals set for him by our Government. One of the most serious of these is the farm labor shortage. If the farmer loses his labor and at the same time is deprived of the machine tools which he needs to produce his crops, his plight will be desperate.
>
> In rejecting the recommendations for production of needed farm machinery made by the Department of Agriculture and the Farm Machinery and Equipment Branch of the War Production Board, the Office of Civilian Supply has gambled dangerously and unwisely with our Nation's food supply.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this indictment comes from a coordinate branch of the Government and cannot be said to be a biased report.

Do you know that last July, at a meeting of the Farm Machinery Branch of the War Production Board for final consideration of L–170, that a member of the Labor Division of W. P. B. told the assembled group, as he banged the table with his fist—

> There'll be no farm machinery limitation order issued until it includes a provision for concentration.

And there you have it—concentration. Yes; concentration and control. So, L–170 was not issued until October 19, with disastrous results, as the country well knows at this time.

Do you know that one Oscar Meier, of of the Office of Civilian Supply prepared and circulated charts to indicate that farmers needed but little, if any, farm machinery, when as a matter of fact they were desperate for new machines, as shown by their eagerness to pay more for second-hand machines than they cost when new, if they could only get them?

Yes, I know about Joseph Weiner, and Oscar Meier, and their responsibility for L–170 being too little and too late, also for the so-called concentration plan.

Joseph Weiner and Oscar Meier, the farm machinery saboteurs, are still on the Government pay roll. I would like to ask you and other Members of this body, How does that happen and what are we going to do about it?

But too little and too late was not enough for the saboteurs of American agriculture. L–170 proposed to concentrate the manufacture of farm machines mainly in the hands of small companies, and force the large companies into the manufacture of munitions. The concentration idea was borrowed from our British brethren, despite repeated warnings by those same Britons that it might not work as well for us as it had for them, due to drastic difference in conditions between the two countries.

This so-called concentration of the farm machinery industry was not even plausible on paper, let alone in practice. It overlooks entirely three facts:

First. The smaller companies manufacture a short line.

Second. These concerns build for and sell in limited areas to meet the soil, topography and crop conditions existing in those areas.

Third. The smaller companies have neither dealer distribution nor repair stocks outside the limited areas in which they have been operating for years.

Concentration was and is unnecessary hardship on established, experienced dealers. Everybody who knows agriculture, whether in the Department of Agriculture, in the implement industry, out on the farms, or in the ranks of the dealers themselves, agrees that chaos would be the result should experienced service dealers fall by the wayside. Our only hope of getting anywhere near our food production goals with overage machinery, patched up to run another year, is to preserve intact the genius of these homespun wizards of plow and planter, binder and baler. The service dealer is every bit as essential to food production as the manufacturer of farm machinery.

That brings up the question of what provision our bureaucracy saw fit to make for the patching up or repairing process. Just as the cobbler puts on more half-soles when new shoes cannot be obtained, so must implement dealers sell and install more renewal parts than usual, when farm machines cannot be replaced at the end of their normal life.

But what did our bureaucracy, led by the Office of Civilian Supply, do about repair parts? They decreased the 150 percent of 1940 allowed in 1942 to 130 percent for 1943. This repair allowance was measured, not by items or by tonnage, but by dollar volume. In the fall

of 1941, repair parts prices were raised by 10 percent, certainly a modest increase for the advance in manufacturing costs. But it had the effect of making the announced 130 percent of 1940–41 average, authorized for 1943, approximately 120 percent as many items or tons as were available to farmers in 1940, before there was any curtailment of new machines or any war demand for food.

On January 29th of this year, the 130 percent of the 1940–41 average was raised to 160 percent but, as previously pointed out, the shift from weight to price makes this approximately only 145 percent of 1940. Once more too little and too late.

One more comment on repair parts, so necessary to continued use of farm machines already in the hands of our farmers. Why should there be any restriction on the manufacture of repair parts? I do not know of one single reason to justify any limitation.

About the only public explanation given for this obviously weird concentration program was the excuse that under it the larger manufacturers could devote most of their facilities to war production.

Without exception the larger farm machinery manufacturers are engaged in making war goods, but at no time has the manufacture of farm machinery interfered with the production of munitions of war, and vice versa. Recently, furthermore, many of their war contracts have been reduced.

The claim that large farm machinery companies cannot built in quantity both war goods and farm machines is not true. The manufacturers of farm equipment must maintain facilities to manufacture parts for machines now in the hands of farmers. They have the necessary facilities to manufacture both complete machines and repair parts in any quantity needed by the farmers, but they have been prevented from using them, to the detriment of our future food supply. The real reason behind this so-called concentration program was to subject the manufacturers to control and regimentation, of which this country has already seen too much.

Too many people in positions of power throughout bureaucracy apparently regard the war not as a fight against autocracy abroad but as a delaying action while autocracy and regimentation entrench themselves at home.

Many of us, Mr. Speaker, have wondered about the New Deal's approach to the farmer and the farm problem. A few days ago my attention was called to a column in the May 1943 issue of Farm Journal and Farmer's Wife entitled "All of Us." It points out the attitude of a prominent New Dealer, Jay Franklin, columnist, and cites a passage in his book, What We Are About to Receive. Farmers who are puzzled over some of the treatment they are now getting will be much interested, I am sure. I quote:

> The farmer has arrogated to himself all virtue and all knowledge; he has voted against progress, against civilization, against the city, against science, against art. He has made and unmade Presidents in the image of Main Street, he has exhausted our soil as he will exhaust our treasury if given half a chance. He is the great obstacle to human progress, the great threat to political stability. Sooner or later we shall discover—as England discovered, as Soviet Russia discovered—that the pagan, the landed proprietor, the kulak, is simply so much mud on the path of progress and must be swept aside if society is to advance.
>
> These are harsh words but they are justified. The American farmer as a political institution is a danger to our civilization. Some day, some leader or some party will be compelled to rouse the people against the farmer and crush him as an obstacle to the national welfare, as he has been crushed in every nation and age, which has experienced his predominance. The fact that it is good politics now to help the farmer is going to make it better politics in the future to injure him. It is a shame that he cannot be changed by less drastic methods, but he has taken to politics, and the problem of farm relief will become, not how shall we relieve the farmer, but who shall relieve us of the farmers?

Here, Mr. Speaker, is the reason for the concentration and rationing of farm machinery.

Bad as all this Washington bindweed is, it is not all that Washington has done to discourage and frustrate the farmer in his harassed struggle to feed the United Nations. There was an early freeze, worse than the freeze last fall, which damaged so many soybeans in several of the principal soybean States. Early in the fall of 1942, there came an order "freezing" all stocks of complete farm machines, no matter whether in the factory, branch house, or on the dealer's floor.

As you may have surmised, this fall "freeze" was only a preamble to a form of rationing against which the rationing advocates to be found in the United States Department of Agriculture and elsewhere were repeatedly warned. With that superb egotism which assumes that a bureaucrat in Washington can dictate the details of a business more wisely than it can be managed by the men who have spent a lifetime creating it, an order came forth decreeing that all the experience of manufacturers, branch houses, and dealers should be thrown into the discard. All the "frozen" farm machines, plus the number to be manufactured, were to be available to farmers only after making application to a county rationing board and being granted a permit to buy.

In the effort to regiment industry, commerce, and agriculture, it was decided to allocate machines by Government decree among the 3,000 counties of the country. Not even in theory does this look good, but in practice it reminds us of the way Hitler picks out hostages to face the firing squad.

L–170 was issued on October 19, 1942. But it was not until the middle of January, 3 months later, that the first county allocation directives were received by the manufacturer.

From that time to the middle of April allocation directives dribbled out of Washington. Many of them did not reach the manufacturers until after the machines should have been delivered to users. It was late in February, for instance, before manufacturers could ship tractor mold-board plows and tractor disk plows. Even after they received a directive they had to make a further study of requirements in order to know how and where to ship.

One result of this Washington delay is the shipment by local freight over much longer distances of a vastly increased percentage of machines thereby delaying delivery and adding to the cost of farm machinery.

The hay harvest was on in Arizona before the hay tool directives were received by manufacturers.

Some time after the first of the year, the rationing board discovered that county rationing by Washington could not be final, so they then permitted the managers of implement branch houses to sit down with the State war board chairmen to rearrange county allocations, to make them more satisfactory. This of course, took time and manpower, both of which are increasingly scarce.

Rationing brought many queer as well as unfortunate results. In one State, a certain manufacturer was allotted 200 more plows than tractors, and another company 400 less plows than tractors. One company was allotted 18 plows in a certain county and only 1 plow in an adjoining county. Another plow manufacturer was allotted no plows in the first county mentioned, and 15 in the second.

Machines have been allocated to counties where there are no dealer distribution nor parts stocks, and consequently shipment has not been made. In too many instances, machines accumulated in the warehouses until a better pattern of distribution was granted from Washington.

On the very day Governor Hickenlooper, of Iowa, told the Conference of Midwest Governors, meeting March 15 in Des Moines, that several thousand combines were to be found unsold in the manufacturers' warehouses, thousands of acres of last year's soybeans were still unharvested. Farmers needing combines could not buy them. A distribution directive on combines was not issued by Washington until early last month.

It must be remembered that the manufacturers were denied the right to deliver machines to dealers for sale until after allocation directives were received. Many of these directives did not reach the manufacturers until late in March and early in April, long after the machines should have been in the hands of farmers and in use. For one important machine, at least, no directive had been issued as late as April 30. Furthermore, directives covering the additional output of farm machines as authorized early in March are yet to be made known by Washington.

There is a distressing shortage of meat and dairy products. Rationing of these and other items apparently has become necessary in what was once the greatest food-producing country in the world.

Yet, because of the utter ineffectiveness of farm machinery rationing, one small company was unable to deliver

several hundred hammer mills last fall, when the cattle feeders and dairymen were begging for hammer mills with which to grind feed and roughage to fatten livestock faster, to make feedstuffs already alarmingly short go further, and to increase milk production.

Other companies, likewise, carried over hundreds of hammer mills from November to the latter part of March. Think of it—these machines, when properly used, would have added thousands of pounds of meat and milk to the production of the last few months. Instead, they have been collecting dust in warehouses—all because of rationing.

With the coming of spring and the growth of grass and pastures, grinding of feed decreases. Not until next fall will farmers again be using hammer mills in quantity. So a year's time has been lost in the use of several thousand of these machines.

Plows which were on hand last November 1 could not be moved until the latter part of March or early April—plows that might have been in use in many of the States before the allocation was ever issued.

The movement of corn and cotton planters already made up was delayed pending an allocation from Washington.

Fertilizer drills were allocated to plain drill territory. So the delivery of drills to farmers was postponed.

In this connection, I wish to read from an editorial appearing in the April 17 issue of the Farmer, of St. Paul, Minn., regarding a warehouse full of spike-tooth harrows on hand in Minneapolis, none of which could be shipped a Minnesota farmer needing such a harrow:

> And so because of Washington bullheadedness, stupidity, indifference, inefficiency, and red tape, farmers are unable to obtain desperately needed machinery which is lying unused in warehouses. This is no way to win a war. Knowing that such things are going on, it is hard to speak or write temperately. In Nazi Germany bungling officials who hinder the war effort are sent to concentration camps, and some are even shot. Thank heaven, we don't do things that way in this country, but at least those responsible in Washington should have the good sense to arrange for delegation of authority to State and regional officials so that they can handle emergency situations such as we have this spring with farm machinery lying unused in warehouses.

The editor should have concluded by pointing out that no one in Washington can ration farm machinery, and the manufacturers greatly prefer to ship what the farmer wants, not what someone else thinks he should have.

I have no criticism of the men here in Washington who have attempted to ration farm machinery. Undoubtedly they have done all they could at a perfectly impossible task. But somewhere in this city is a group or clique insistent upon farm-machinery rationing in the face of overwhelming proof that such rationing is a dismal failure and consequently less food will be produced in 1943 than would otherwise be available. They persist in rationing farm machinery when proof of its failure is overwhelming.

The rationing of farm machinery for many weeks has been in a state of collapse. They deny the farmers necessary new machines they should have. They bungle the rationing of equipment so that machines and implements already built collect dust instead of being in the hands of farmers who know how to use them to produce the food of which we so urgently want more, not less.

For further examples of the horrible mistakes which characterize the rationing of farm machinery, I recommend the reading of Tags and Rationing Red Tape in the April 24 issue of Implement and Tractor, of Kansas City, and Implement Rationing Proves Fiasco in the April issue of Farm Machinery and Hardware, of St. Louis.

When the final story is written on farm machinery and repair parts, so vital to 1943 farm production, we will find nothing but a story of delay—

Delay in issuing L–170.

Delay in supplying materials.

Delay in recognizing the need for more machines and repair parts.

Delay in rationing.

Delay in shipments.

Delay in delivery of implements and parts.

Delay in the proper use of needed farm machines.

In the meanwhile, our farmers from coast to coast, in spite of all man-made and natural obstacles, are planting to their utmost, not knowing how they can harvest the crops when grown.

The least we can do here in Washington is to make certain that nothing is done by administrative bodies to throw unnecessary obstacles in the paths of the farmers striving to do so much with so little help and inadequate supplies of machines.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House appreciates the great responsibility resting upon War Food Administrator Mr. Chester C. Davis and Deputy Food Administrator Mr. M. Lee Marshall, who is in charge of supplies, machinery, equipment, materials, and facilities. It is the sincere wish that these men will get something done with this vital and necessary program. Already there comes a confession from these men that lack of machinery is the main farm problem and that the outlook for 1943 is not "entirely satisfactory," but there comes a promise that for 1944 the farm machinery program will be doubled.

To Mr. Chester Davis, War Food Administrator, it is suggested that at the earliest possible moment he take the necessary steps to discontinue all rationing of farm machinery, except from dealer to farmer, this rationing to be based on the number of machines and implements to be received by the dealers from the manufacturers.

We might also suggest for next year, no limitation on the manufacture of repair parts; an adequate supply of new farm machines; and at the earliest possible moment, no rationing of farm machinery of any kind. This year's experience proves that rationing of farm machinery, except possibly at county levels, is a complete failure.

So-called concentration of the manufacture of farm machines should long since have been openly repudiated, but certainly for 1944 that mistake need not be repeated.

The farmers will do their part. They will work twice as many hours a week as most men in business and industry. The least we can do is to remove the quack grass and bindweed of too little, too late, concentration, and rationing of farm machinery, which are choking food production. We can see that farmers have the necessary equipment with which to produce the food we must have for our people at home, our boys abroad, and many of our allies.

Food we must have, in huge quantities, but it cannot be grown without sufficient supplies of farm machinery and repair parts, properly distributed by methods proven successful by a 100-year-old industry.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, May 24, at the conclusion of the legislative business and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ELK HILL OIL RESERVE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest dangers to true freedom in America is monopoly control of national resources. Monopoly control has increased, not decreased, as the result of the war. It will be with us after the war in aggravated form.

It is, therefore, nothing short of alarming to discover that last November an agreement was entered into between the United States Government generally and the Navy specifically with the Standard Oil Co whereby the Standard Oil Co. was given the exclusive right and privilege of developing the Elk Hills Navy oil reserve in California. This is the largest oil reserve in the world, except only the one in Arabia.

It is true that approximately one-third of the lands in the Elk Hills field belonged to the Standard Oil Co. prior to the signing of this contract and that those lands are deeded to the Government under its terms. In return for this, however, the Standard Oil Co. not only receives a monopoly of the right to develop and market all the oil in this whole great reserve but it receives other concessions of the most far-reaching nature.

Under the terms of this contract, the United States Navy and the Standard Oil Co. are to share both the expenses of operation and the oil derived therefrom on the basis of the oil-land value held by each. This would entitle the Navy to two-thirds of such oil and the Standard Oil Co. to one-third of it in the zone which has already been developed.

But the Standard Oil Co. is to receive for a period of 5 years the entire pro-

duction, with no obligation to pay the Navy anything whatsoever during that period. Here are the words of the contract:

1. Primary period: That for the duration of the war emergency but for not less than a period of 5 years from date hereof, Standard may produce and take without current payment to Navy, but as hereinafter provided, Navy's percentage share of production from the shallow oil zone.

This will constitute giving to the Standard Oil Co. about 18,000,000 barrels of Navy oil, worth approximately $20,000,000 at present prices and will amount to providing the Standard Oil Co. with approximately $20,000,000 of capital at no interest whatsoever. Even after the 5-year period is up, repayment to the Navy for the 18,000,000 barrels of oil just referred to will be made in one of two ways. Either Standard will assign to Navy one-third of the one-third of production which, under the contract will belong to Standard or else, at the oil company's option, it can make payment in its own refined products at the going prices at that time.

In other words, the Navy is to advance to Standard oil belonging to the Navy worth approximately $20,000,000 for a 5-year period at no interest charge to the oil company, and is to give to the oil company the right to make repayment over an extended period of time in its own refined products, thus enabling the company to compute as a part of its repayment all the profit involved through its whole operation of producing and refining the oil. This $20,000,000 advance to be made by the Navy to the Standard Oil Co. is supposed to be for the purpose of financing exploration costs but it is doubtful that those costs will amount to more than a minor fraction of that figure. Furthermore, the Standard Oil Co. is to receive a royalty of 50 percent of the Navy's share of wet gas to pay for processing. This I am informed is several times the ordinary cost of processing in the industry.

Not only for 5 years but as to the future life of this oil field this contract provides as follows:

Disposal of products: That Standard will buy and Navy will sell Navy's share of production (except that taken by Standard under provisions of section 4 (b) hereof, and that taken in payments for Navy's share of actual cost) at the average posted market price offered and paid by the major oil-purchasing companies for crude oil and natural gasoline of similar grade and quality in Kern County, Calif., and at the highest price per thousand cubic feet (M. C. F.) for dry gas currently paid to Standard by gas-purchasing companies for dry gas in Kern County, Calif.

If I understand English—and I hope sincerely that I do not in this case—this provision means that the Navy itself can get no oil from its own reserve except by selling it to Standard and then repurchasing it. And this means, of course, that Standard will have complete control of the marketing and disposal of all this oil.

There is a ceiling on crude-oil prices, so the company is protected, but there is at present no ceiling price on gasoline fixed in the contract or elsewhere to protect the Navy or the Government, or the consumer, in spite of the fact that the Standard Oil Co., under this contract, can apparently develop and produce gasoline from this oil reserve just about as rapidly as it desires.

The all-important paragraph in this contract, however, is the following one:

Navy hereby grants to Standard the exclusive right and privilege, subject to the conditions hereinafter provided: (1) To drill for, mine, extract, remove, and dispose of the oil, gas, and other hydrocarbon deposits in or under said lands, together with the right to redrill and repair any wells thereon and to use all property thereon belonging to the Navy.

I am no oil expert and am therefore not in a position to judge the techincal details of this contract. But it is apparent on its face from the language just read that it gives to one of the largest of the major oil companies of America a monopoly of the largest reserve in America. It is those words "exclusive right" that are the meat of this whole bitter nut. Every independent, every small oil company, every competitor of Standard, is shut out from any opportunity of having a part in the development of this great field.

It is quite impossible for me to believe that we could not have obtained such production from this oil reserve as is required by the war without increasing the strangle hold of the oil monopoly upon the Nation. And I rise at this time to protest with all the force at my command against this contract.

I am informed that the naval subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee recently turned down an item for the implementation of this contract. That fact speaks more eloquently on this matter than my whole speech. I congratulate the subcommittee on its forthright action.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], be given permission to extend his remarks and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, for Monday, May 24, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 74. An act to assure conservation of and to permit the fullest utilization of the salmon fisheries of the Pacific, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 215. An act to authorize the filing of certain notices to serve as constructive notice of the interest of the United States in realty or personalty under facilities contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 332. An act for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 364. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to settle certain claims; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 391. An act for the relief of Jack Lecel Haas; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 397. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Svend J. Skou; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 426. An act for the relief of Maj. George E. Golding; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 676. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 787. An act for the relief of Samuel Jacobs and Harry Jacobs; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 919. An act to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period,

S. 929. An act for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 966. An act to provide for the payment in advance of pay and travel allowances to persons in or serving with the military and naval service and to civilian officers and employees in or under the jurisdiction of the War Department or the Navy Department under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 972. An act to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1001. An act for the relief of the Meadow Brook Club; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1086. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941; to the Committee on Claims.

S. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution providing for an investigation and survey of certain crustacean food resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of Charles T. Dulin;

H. R. 1896. An act to amend sections 1 and 2 of the act approved June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 262), relating to the establishment of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia, and to grant the consent of Congress to such States to enter into a compact providing for the acquisition of property for such park;

H. R. 2159. An act to provide for special assessments for the laying of curbs and gutters;

H. R. 2486. An act to authorize the appointment as ensigns in the Coast Guard of all graduates of the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2581. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain

landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2583. An act to provide for the reorganization of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2587. An act to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes"; and

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 24, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Monday, May 24, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearings pursuant to House Resolution 98 by Mr. HALLECK.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 27, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2750, to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, relating to experience of radio operators.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2731, to facilitate the award and payment of just compensation for property requisitioned under the authority of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

1. Tuesday, June 1: Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, will open the hearings with any statements and recommendations he desires to submit covering national flood control and the projects that should be included in the bill to be reported, especially as they are related to national defense and as they will be important following the existing war to provide sound flood-control projects and desirable public works. General Reybold is now on an airplane tour of inspection of the flood areas and will submit a first-hand report covering recent major floods along the Missouri, Arkansas, White, Mississippi, Illinois, Wabash, Ohio, and other rivers in the recent flood areas. He will be followed by Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Assistant Chief of Engineers, who has previously advised the Flood Control Committee during hearings and who will also appear before the committee and submit his views and discuss generally the projects that have been favorably reported since the hearings were conducted on H. R. 4911, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, reported on June 19, 1941, which became the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941. Col. George R. Goethals, Chief of the Flood Control Branch, Office of Chief of Engineers, will attend the hearings and will furnish to the members of the committee in detail any and all available information respecting the said projects on which favorable reports have been submitted by the Chief of Engineers.

The district engineers and the division engineers have furnished to the Chief of Engineers data and information respecting major floods since August 18, 1941, and particularly with respect to recent major floods in the various drainage basins of the country, which will be submitted to the committee.

2. Wednesday, June 2: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects for the New England region including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers and the Middle Atlantic region including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

3. Thursday, June 3: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, othe representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the upper and lower Ohio River and tributaries, and on projects of the South Atlantic region including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

4. Friday, June 4: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects along the Missouri River and tributaries and the upper Mississippi River and the Great Lakes region.

5. Tuesday, June 8: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the lower Mississippi River and tributaries including the Arkansas and White Rivers, and on rivers flowing into the Gulf west of the Mississippi River, and in the Western Rocky Mountain region including Texas and Colorado, and in the Pacific Northwest region including the Willamette River and the Columbia River and tributaries.

6. Wednesday, June 9: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the Los Angeles area and in the State of California, including the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kern River Valleys, and on projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

7. Thursday, June 10: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

8. Friday, June 11: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

432. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 so as to provide for the payment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2753. A bill making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 997. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, relating to the Medical Department of the Regular Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 2527. A bill to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah," and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NICHOLS: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 38. Resolution making an investigation of the present system of distribution of farm products; without amendment (Rept. No. 477). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 1947. A bill to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209); with amendment (Rept. No. 479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. S. 282. An act for the relief of Walter C. Blake; without amendment (Rept. No. 465).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. S. 520. An act for the relief of Freddie Sanders and Edd Harris; without amendment (Rept. No. 466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. S. 625. An act for the relief of A. C. Blount and Oscar Williams; without amendment (Rept. No. 467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. S. 695. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Bolger; without amendment (Rept. No. 468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. S. 776. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co. against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GREEN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 305. A bill for the relief of Howard Morgan; with amendment (Rept. No. 470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2152. A bill for the relief of Rafael Torres; with amendment (Rept. No. 471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2439. A bill for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men of the Navy for personal property lost in the loss of the *Hugh L. Scott;* without amendment (Rept. No. 472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2508. A bill to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special counsel in the case of United States against Standard Oil Co. of California; without amendment (Rept. No. 473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2575. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 2761. A bill to establish a Civilian Supply Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 2762. A bill to assist State and local public agencies to complete certain projects of the Work Projects Administration; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 2763. A bill to provide for increased assistance payments under the Social Security Act during the present unlimited national emergency to meet increased cost of living, to protect the interests of recipients of such payments who work during such emergency, and to provide special Federal aid to low-income States for their public-assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 2764. A bill to authorize the President to adjust prices of perishable agricultural commodities, or perishable commodities processed or manufactured from any agricultural commodity, in order to avoid waste or spoilage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2765. A bill to prohibit the allowance of credit in the computation of lump-sum payments to Air Corps Reserve officers under the provisions of section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936, as amended, for active service hereafter performed during the present wars and for 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 2766. A bill amending the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 2767. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution authorizing the Speaker to invite Sir William Beveridge to address the House; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for relief of Floridians who suffered loss in the campaign to eradicate the Mediterranean fruitfly in 1929; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish the Fort Caroline National Monument at St. Johns Bluff, in Duval County, Fla., as a part of the post-war program for recreational centers; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in regard to House Resolutions Nos. 226, 232, 257, 284, and 289, as adopted by the California Legislature; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRANT of Alabama:

H. R. 2768. A bill for the relief of Lanford C. Cook; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2769. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lillian W. Timmerman, mother of Ann Timmerman, a minor, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 2770. A bill granting a pension to Kathryn M. Baker; to the Committee on Invali Pensions.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 2771. A bill for the relief of R. W. Rex; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2772. A bill for the relief of Edwin Foley; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

859. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Charles Okey and other residents of the Wheeling area, urging the establishment of a chiropractic corps in the armed forces now; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

860. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 20 citizens of Lawrence County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

861. By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Hempstead, Hicksville, Glendale, Copiague, and other cities in New York, favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

862. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mary E. Berry and 11 members of Topeka Central Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Topeka, Kans., urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

863. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of Rev. Ward E. Hall and 64 other citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

864. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Rev. M. Alice Durham and 37 other citizens of Leavenworth, Kans., urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

865. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of Paul R. Capehart and 63 other citizens of the city of West Union, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

866. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of 32 residents of Franklin County, urging the enactment of adequate laws to speed production of materials and supplies for our men in service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

867. Also, petition of 41 residents of Franklin County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

868. Also, petition of 63 residents of Franklin County, Ohio, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

869. By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Petition of sundry citizens of Tennessee, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

870. By the SPEAKER: Petition of sundry citizens of Dorchester, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference

to establishing peace and providing food for the millions that are starving; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

871. Also, petition of the American Legion, Post No. 8, Jose Ferandez Pinero, Juncos, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the statehood of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 24, 1943

The Reverend Jacob S. Payton, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, whose wisdom triumphs over all human follies and whose mercies are visited upon the erring generations of men, we bring to Thee our praise and adoration.

As citizens we acknowledge with thanksgiving our national heritage bearing the cost mark of the unbroken endurance of the brave. As believers we offer continual thanks for the faithful examples of all those who have made religion the bulwark of our liberties and the glory of our national character.

Hear our prayer, O Lord, for those who in this hour of trial direct our country's destiny. May they be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might. Attend those who are in their country's service through every peril and sacrifice, through all sufferings and hardships; and may they be victors not only over their mortal enemies but more than conquerors over the foes that beset the soul.

Hold in Thy sacred keeping the institutions of America. May her churches abound in true religion, and her schools extend their enlightenment. May her courts reflect the divine justice, and her legislative halls be known for the primacy given Thy statutes. And may the homes of America, with their family circles sundered by war and with their hearthsides thronged with anxieties, know the sustaining presence of the Great Comforter. May Members of this body fully dedicate their services toward making America a country worthy of Thy continued favor, and may their deliberations this day contribute thereto.

This prayer we offer in the name of Jesus Christ, our Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 20, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting and withdrawing certain nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2713. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2719. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2753. An act making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of Charles T. Dulin;

H. R. 1896. An act to amend sections 1 and 2 of the act approved June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 262), relating to the establishment of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia, and to grant the consent of Congress to such States to enter into a compact providing for the acquisition of property for such park;

H. R. 2159. An act to provide for special assessments for the laying of curbs and gutters;

H. R. 2486. An act to authorize the appointment as ensigns in the Coast Guard of all graduates of the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2581. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2583. An act to provide for the reorganization of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2587. An act to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 20th instant,

On May 21, 1943, the Vice President signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 122) to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

THE ABDICATION OF CONGRESSIONAL POWER—NOTICE OF ADDRESS TO BE DELIVERED BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is unavoidably detained today, I announce for the benefit of Senators who are interested that he is to deliver a radio address on Wednesday evening, May 26, at 10:35 p. m., on the National Forum of the Air, on the subject The Abdication of Congressional Power.

Let me add, Mr. President, that the Senator from Wyoming will speak at the invitation of the Washington Evening Star, and that his address will be a continuation of his long-time fight to preserve the right of legislative review of all trade agreements.

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION AS TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESSIONAL FAMILIES SERVING IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been circularized twice for information relative to members of their families in the armed services. If any Member has failed to furnish such information or has since become eligible for membership in the Congressional War Parents' Association, it is requested that such Member please notify immediately either Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Representative in Congress from Ohio, president, or Senator BRIDGES, secretary, of the Congressional War Parents' Association, and furnish them the desired information.

INSURANCE FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I request permission to have inserted in the RECORD a letter I have received from the Navy Department, which contains information with respect to the manner and method of obtaining personal insurance for Members of the Senate and House who may, on official business, travel outside the country.

Civilians have been unable to buy personal accident insurance affording coverage for aviation and war risks, so the Navy Department has sought to develop a market for this insurance, and now two markets are available, which are set forth in the letter.

The Navy Department has suggested that I give the information contained in this letter to such persons in the Senate and House of Representatives who may be assigned to missions entailing travel by air outside the continental United States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 22, 1943.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: I am sending the information hereinafter set out to you to be passed on to such persons in the Senate and the House of Representatives as should have this information available for any Members of the Senate or House who may travel outside the country on official business.

The Navy Department, upon finding that its civilian employees and employees of its contractors, assigned to missions entailing travel by air outside the continental United States, were unable to buy personal accident insurance affording coverage for aviation and war risks and giving the desired security as respects information vital to the war effort, sought to develop a market for this insurance.

There are now two markets available, both affording coverage in such manner as to reduce to a minimum the possibility of leakage of vital information.

1. Aviation Insurance Groups, Aero, Associated, and United States Aircraft now offer a policy affording coverage against hazards of air travel and war. The coverage may be written in a member company of any one of these groups but the risk will be shared by all the groups. United States Aviation Underwriters, Inc., 308 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (Mrs. E. L. MacDonald, telephone, National 0709), will act as underwriters and issue policies and will be the sole office having knowledge of details of any mission. No information will leave that office excepting reports of premiums and losses.

2. The Peerless Casualty Co. (Mr. M. R. H. Garnett, of Marsh & McLennan, Inc., 1508 H Street NW., Washington, D. C., Executive 1825, special representative for this coverage) policy affords insurance against normal as well as war and air and surface travel risks.

Enclosed are copies of policies and application forms for each market, together with rate sheets and pertinent information concerning the securing and issuance of policies. You will note that in both markets a policy may be obtained on a world-wide coverage basis and upon completion of the trip and reporting to the insurer the details of the trip a return premium representing the difference between the trip basis and the world-wide basis will be allowed. This arrangement is made so that complete secrecy can be maintained concerning points of destination and departure.

Where the policy is to specify points of destination and departure it is recommended that the policy be held by the Government agency or contractor by whom the assured is employed and that his beneficiaries be advised that such coverage is in effect and the policy will be delivered to the assured or the beneficiary in event that a claim is to be made.

Very truly yours,

L. F. BECK,
Chief, Insurance Division.

INTERNATIONAL AVIATION ACCIDENT POLICY

Effective as of this date the United States Aviation Insurance Groups' Washington office is ready to issue international aviation accident policies in behalf of Aero, Associated, or United States Aviation Insurance Groups in designated companies of each such group. Inasmuch as many of the missions on which applicants for this coverage may be sent are secret or confidential and vital to the war effort, acting in accordance with instructions from the Navy Department, we are advising all concerned that the following secrecy restrictions are imposed:

1. Mrs. E. L. MacDonald, 308 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., telephone National 0709, has sole authority to quote rates other than as displayed in instructions for completing the application form, to process applications, to correspond in any way in connection with this coverage, or to issue policies for Aero, Associated, or United States Aviation Insurance Groups.

2. This coverage is available for civilians only.

3. Application forms will be placed in the hands of representatives of each of the three groups with instructions that a copy thereof may be given to any prospective purchaser of the coverage. The forms are not to be filled in by the agent, broker, or other representative. The prospective purchaser should be advised that the application is to be completed by him and forwarded directly to Mrs. MacDonald by the assured or his employer.

In emergencies not allowing for completion of coverage by mail prior to applicant's departure, upon telegraphic advice to Mrs. MacDonald, stating only

(a) Name of applicant;

(b) Amount, type, and period for which insurance required;

(c) Government agency for which applicant or his employer is performing services;

(d) That completed application with check in payment of premium will be forwarded direct and immediately by the applicant, telegraphic binder of world-wide coverage will be given. Such advices should not state points of departure or destination.

4. Checks in payment of premium should be drawn payable to that underwriting group of which the company in which the coverage is placed is a member.

5. Neither the home offices of the three groups nor any branch will have supplies, other than application forms, rate cards, or other details of the coverage.

6. Except as provided in paragraph 3 above, all inquiries concerning this coverage are to be referred directly to Mrs. MacDonald. Binders will not under any circumstances be issued from other than the United States Aviation Insurance Groups' Washington office.

Strict compliance with these instructions, which are issued in accordance with requirements of the Navy Department, will react in the long run favorably for the insurance industry and be of untold assistance in promotion of the war effort. These factors should overshadow any temporary competitive disadvantage or feeling on your part that this procedure is unusual and not commensurate with good service.

FEDERAL AID PLANNING FOR PUBLIC WORKS, ETC., IN POST-WAR PERIOD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 22, 1943.

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President of the Senate.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It has been more than 2 years since I first called the attention of the Congress to the need for preparing in advance plans for public works and improvement projects to be undertaken in the post-war period. During the war we are deferring the construction of every project not vitally needed for war purposes. By so doing we are storing up a reservoir of work that can be undertaken when the war is over and thus be useful in providing employment opportunities and demands for materials. But if such projects are to be ready for rapid inauguration in the post-war period, the plans and specifications must be prepared during the war.

I hope the Congress will approve the necessary legislation to make my recommendation in this matter effective. To aid it in its consideration of the matter I have asked the Federal departments and agencies concerned to submit to my Executive Office the necessary information upon which I can base a recommendation to send to the Congress at an early date covering a coordinated program of the appropriations and legislation that will be necessary to enable the Federal Government to be prepared for a rapid start on a Federal public works and improvement program. A copy of my memorandum to the Federal agencies concerning this matter is attached for your information.

In the meantime, I hope the Congress can give consideration to the enactment of legislation that will authorize the appropriation of funds that can be granted to the States and local governments in order to encourage and support them in their preparation of plans for their own post-war public works and improvement projects. I believe that a grant to support the more general planning activities of these governments along with reimbursable advances to cover the detailed planning for their individual projects would be an effective means to assure that plans will be ready when they are needed.

To this end, I am attaching hereto a suggested draft of a bill providing such Federal aids for planning. This suggested draft is a modified version of title II of H. R. 1898 now pending in the House of Representatives. Title I of H. R. 1898 pertaining to Federal agencies will, I believe, be necessary in view of the action that I propose to take as outlined above.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 50)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1944, amounting to $5,906,975, in the form of amendments to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—CIVILIAN PILOT TRAINING (S. DOC. NO. 51)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce—Civilian Pilot Training, fiscal year 1944, amounting to $27,874,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF AVAILABILITY OF AN EXISTING APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 52)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of a proposed provision extending the availability of an existing appropriation for the Department of Commerce to June 30, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 53)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $25,000,000, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, NAVY DEPARTMENT AND NAVAL SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 55)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $30,000,000 and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $143,539,000, for the Navy Department and naval service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 56)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency, fiscal year 1943, amounting to $16,000, to cover the cost of additional compensation granted by law to certain Federal employees (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

PLACER MINING CLAIMS ON PUBLIC DOMAIN—PHOSPHATE, SODIUM, POTASSIUM, OIL, OIL SHALE, OR GAS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to placer mining claims for deposits of phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, or gas on the public domain (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

FEBRUARY 1943 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Corporation for the month of February 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Navy and Agriculture (3), and The National Archives which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interests, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES — NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 54)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting an additional report of the joint committee relating to the National Youth Administration, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report just laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred to the Committee on Appropriations be printed as a document and also printed in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that order will be entered.

The report above referred to is as follows:

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—REPORT ON THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures was established pursuant to title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941 (Public Law 250, 77th Cong.), approved September 20, 1941, which directed it to "make a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal Government with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all such expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential, and to report to the President and to the Congress the results of its study, together with its recommendations."

Pursuant to this authority the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has constantly sought facts which reveal the essential or nonessential character of Federal spending, and which have been the basis for numerous recommendations to Congress.

One such organization which has been scrutinized is the National Youth Administration. On the basis of studies and hearings, hereinafter described, the committee is able to make the following recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that the National Youth Administration be abolished on June 30, 1943, and that its equipment and facilities be made available either to essential war agencies or through sale to private industry at the discretion of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget as provided for in Executive Order 9235.

2. It is recommended that the personnel be transferred to necessary war work.

3. It is recommended that the Department of Labor and the War Manpower Commission make every effort to assist the war industries to carry on their own industrial training programs.

ELIMINATION OF NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION FROM 1944 BUDGET

Consequently the committee believes that no part of the $59,304,000 requested for the National Youth Administration as a part of the War Manpower Commission budget should be granted for the fiscal year 1944.

The basis for the foregoing recommendations is to be found in the following pages. From these it will be seen that the training program of the National Youth Administration is very similar to that of the Office of Education and of a number of other Federal bureaus. Moreover, it will be seen that in a comparison of cost, personnel, the number of trainees, and the number of training stations, the National Youth Administration does not compare favorably with similar groups; that waste in the National Youth Administration is evident in the use of funds, equipment, and manpower; and that duplication and overlapping of functions occur among the war-training programs of the National Youth Administration, the Office of Education, and other Government bureaus.

THREE-FOURTHS BILLION TO THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

The total amount allotted and appropriated to the National Youth Administration from 1935 through 1943 cannot be estimated to the penny, but it is possible to state that the following table reasonably approximates the appropriations and allocations made since its inception in 1935.

Total appropriations and allocations to the National Youth Administration

Emergency Relief Acts appropriations, 1935–38	$335,501,239
Administrative expenses paid from Works Progress Administration, 1935–38	9,847,358
Total	345,348,597
Less amount returned to master account	5,373,152
Total	339,975,445
Regular appropriations, 1939–43	431,439,000
Total	771,414,445

Thus, during its varied career under the Works Progress Administration, the Federal Security Administration, and the War Manpower Commission, the National Youth Administration has been appropriated $771,414,445. This sum includes $61,274,000 the appropriation for 1943. That there is no longer any need for such expenditures is apparent from the following discussion.

DUPLICATION OF PURPOSE

It may be stated unequivocally that the National Youth Administration does in effect duplicate, overlap, or perform functions similar to those of six other Government bureaus as well as conduct training for which the Federal Government is already paying large sums of money to private industry. By reason of this multiple duplication of effort, manpower, equipment, and money, if for no other reason, the National Youth Administration no longer seems to justify the appropriations it receives.

To prove that the National Youth Administration is duplicating other bureaus in its functions, it will be necessary to examine the programs of a number of agencies performing similar duties. The War Manpower Commission has published a bulletin revealing that the following groups under its control deal with war training:

"1. Training Within Industry Service advises on over-all on-the-job training problems and is specifically assigned to promote production training through specific training programs for supervisors, instructors, and training directors.

"2. Apprentice and Training Service advises on over-all training problems and is specifically assigned to promote production training through development of complete training programs which provide on-the-job training coordinated with the training services supplied by other agencies.

"3. Vocational Training for War Production Workers (formerly Vocation Education, National Defense), United States Office of Education, in cooperation with State and local vocational schools, is specifically assigned to give training of less than college grade to war production workers.

"4. Vocational Training for Rural War Production Workers, in cooperation with State boards for vocational education and local departments of vocational agriculture, is specifically assigned to give training of less than college grade in the production of farm commodities and in the repair, operation, and construction of farm machinery and equipment.

"5. Engineering, Science, and Management War Training, United States Office of Education, in cooperation with colleges and universities, is specifically assigned to offer training of college grade in engineering, chemistry, physics, and production supervision to train professional and technical workers for war industries.

"6. National Youth Administration is specifically assigned to provide training to unemployed, out-of-school youth between the ages of 16 and 25, in skills required in war industries.

"7. The United States Employment Service is specifically assigned to deal with labor supply, make recommendations regarding training needs and on the most effective use of personnel in terms of the prevailing and anticipated labor requirements. The Employment Service will direct industry to the service assigned to give the training assistance needed."

In addition, according to testimony presented before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by Mr. Aubrey Williams, Executive Director of the National Youth Administration, it is understood that industry itself is being paid in some instances as much as 2 percent on war contracts for the specific purpose of training apprentices or recruits in courses similar to, or supplementary to, those given by the National Youth Administration and the Office of Education. The Government apparently is paying industry to train youths and men for war jobs while it is at the same time carrying on similar training programs in its own organizations.

Specifically the program of the National Youth Administration duplicates that of the Office of Education in its defense training work as well as that of those other Government bureaus and industry itself. This is evident when one compares the functions of the National Youth Administration with those of that Office. The original purpose of the National Youth Administration—to provide work relief for persons no longer in regular attendance at school—has largely been supplanted by the purpose outlined in the provisions of the appropriation act for the National Youth Administration:

"To provide employment and work training for unemployed young persons of the ages of 16 to 24, inclusive, on resident and nonresident workshop and other projects approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as needed in the prosecution of the war in furnishing work experience and work training preparatory to employment in occupations in which there is a present or potential shortage of labor."

Similarly, the United States Office of Education assists the States in organizing and conducting vocational courses of less-than-college graduates through—

"(a) Courses supplementary to employment in occupations essential to national defense;

"(b) Preemployment courses; and

"(c) Refresher courses for workers with some previous occupational experience."

In addition to the foregoing, the Office of Education has within its scope the following:

"To assist the States in the organization and conduct of vocational courses and related or other necessary instruction for out-of-school, rural, and nonrural persons; cooperate with the States in determining the necessary equipment and supplies to be purchased from Federal funds. Appropriating Federal funds among the States for such programs. Approve or disapprove proposed expenditures for the purchase or rental of additional equipment and rental of additional space for such programs. Administer an appropriation of $5,000,000 to help, by loans, needy college students who can complete in 2 years their study of physics, engineering, medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy."

Obviously, then, there is a duplication of purpose in the stated objectives of the two organizations. This duplication becomes alarming when viewed from the standpoint of cost.

DUPLICATION IN 1944 BUDGET ESTIMATES

In addition, it must be noted that the 1944 appropriation estimate for the National Youth Administration contains the following provisions:

1. It entirely removes appropriations for school-work programs.

2. It provides that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission may issue exemptions from the age provisions previously designated.

The first of these two provisions, in deleting the school-work appropriations, removes the principal purpose for which the National Youth Administration was originally established and places it entirely in a field of duplicating activity. The second provision, in providing for the removal of the age limitation, completes the duplication of purpose with other Government agencies which the National Youth Administration had previously avoided in part at least by limiting its training to youth between 16 and 24 years of age.

COSTS COMPARED

It is impossible to estimate the costs to the Government resulting from the training clauses written into war contracts with private industry. Much of the war-training program is in the hands of private industry and, with contracts running up to the multiple millions of dollars, it would not be surprising to find that relatively large sums of money are being paid by the Government to private industry for its training program. The total amount expended may be conjectured when it is remembered that, according to testimony presented before the committee, as much as 2 percent on some war contracts is paid for training purposes.

Compared to this the amounts appropriated to the National Youth Administration and to the Office of Education dwindle into insignificance. Indeed one may well wonder what benefit such amounts can possibly produce when compared to the large amount which the Government is evidently paying to industry for the same work.

Of the $61,274,000 appropriated to the National Youth Administration for the fiscal year 1943, $49,729,000 or 80 percent goes directly into the war-production training program. In addition, $8,000,000 is earmarked for student aid, while the remaining $3,545,000 goes for salaries, administrative expenses, and printing and binding.

The Office of Education was appropriated $141,240,000 for defense training during the fiscal year 1943. Of this sum, at least $109,000,000 duplicates the sums spent by the National Youth Administration in similar enterprises. In addition to this, other large sums of money have been directed into uses comparable to or complementary to those appropriated to the National Youth Administration and to the Office of Education. From a study of the following table it may be discerned that a large portion of $302,783,051 is allocated through Government bureaus to national defense training, and that this does not include such sums as are provided in defense contracts with private industry.

Division:	*Appropriation*
Training within industry	$1,145,000
Apprentice training	915,501
National Youth Administration	61,274,000
Vocational education	14,301,140
Office of Education, education and training:	
1. Payments to States, etc., for national defense:	
(a) Cost of vocational courses of less-than-college grade	94,000,000
(b) Short courses of college grade	30,000,000
(c) Vocational courses, rural	15,000,000
2. Visual aids for training, national defense	1,000,000
3. Salaries and expenses, national defense	1,240,000
Social Security Board: Selecting, testing, and placement of defense workers	2,467,670
Bureau of Employment Security: Salaries	1,816,740
Grants to States for unemployment-compensation administration appropriations necessary to operate U. S. Employment Office facilities, and appropriations for services essential to national defense program	79,650,000
Total	302,810,051

HOW THE MONEY IS SPENT

A comparison of the National Youth Administration expenditures with those of the Office of Education reflects the more excessive cost of the former. The table below, while it does not present the whole picture, does provide some basis for comparison.

Expenditures of the National Youth Administration and the Office of Education compared

	National Youth Administration	Office of Education
Youth work	$49,729,000	
Short courses of less-than-college grade		$94,000,000
Rural training		15,000,000
Total defense training	49,729,000	109,000,000
Student aid	8,000,000	
Courses of college grade		30,000,000
Visual aids training		1,000,000
Salaries and expenses	3,500,000	1,240,000
Printing and binding	45,000	

Thus it will appear that although the National Youth Administration spends approximately only half as much on defense training as does the Office of Education, yet its salaries and expenses are three times as high. Judging from the Budget estimate for the coming year no substantial cut is anticipated. However, it must be borne in mind that the Office of Education does not meet all the expenses borne by the National Youth Administration. The cost of equipment, rent, and instruction is frequently taken care of by arrangement with school authorities. Nevertheless this adverse ratio of 6 to 1 must be considered in evaluating the relative training value of the National Youth Administration.

Moreover, the cost of training in the National Youth Administration program is much higher than similar costs in the Office of Education training program. This difference is found principally in the items of youth wages and subsistence and in administration and supervision costs. This the following tabulation makes clear:

Costs of the National Youth Administration training compared with cost of Office of Education training

	National Youth Administration	Office of Education
Salaries	$13.75	$16.60
Supervision and administration	13.23	3.74
Youth wages and subsistence	19.88–38.34	
Other costs	12.48	8.78
Total	59.34–77.80	29.12

These figures, actually in a 2½-to-1 ratio, while perhaps not presenting an absolute comparison by which to judge the relative expenses of the National Youth Administration and the comparable training offered by the Office of Education, do reflect the excessive costs of the National Youth Administration in wages and subsistence and in supervision and administration. Because the Office of Education it not dependent upon creating its own establishment and its accompanying equipment, the costs of administration are not so high. The flexibility must not be overlooked in comparing the merits of the two programs.

Yet the relatively high cost of the National Youth Administration training must be still further increased if this agency is to augment its training program. According to testimony presented before the committee, there are two ways in which the number of National Youth Administration trainees may be increased. One is by removing the present enrollment restriction, but this would in effect place the National Youth Administration in a position of duplicating the training programs of the other Government agencies and those of private industry to an even greater extent than at present. The other method of increasing enrollment and thus bringing back into use the idle work stations is by an increased incentive to trainees—higher pay. The present rate of 16 cents per hour the National Youth Administration proposes to boost 150 percent to an average wage of 40 cents an hour for youth training. Such a high rate of pay for training will, of course, inevitably raise the cost of the National Youth Administration program tremendously and will make comparisons with the present Office of Education training costs much more unfavorable than they now are.

BUREAUCRATIC OVERSTAFFING

At least a partial explanation of the high cost of the National Youth Administration training is to be found in the excessive number of supervisory and administrative personnel. From a viewpoint of personnel there is revealed a disproportionate number of administrative employees which the number of trainees and the number of direct-shop supervisors do not justify.

Number of nonyouth personnel in pay status

Administrative personnel:	
National offices	236
Regional offices	708
Project personnel:	
Project management	3,143
Direct shop supervision	4,771
Subsistence activity supervision	2,094
Property, transportation, and maintenance supervision	854
Total	11,806

The above tabulation shows that on October 28, 1942, the National Youth Administration had 11,806 paid employees in its administrative personnel to train 53,000 youths. This is about 1 paid employee to every 4½ trainees. There were 7,035 persons engaged in administration, project management, and subsistence and property supervision while there were only 4,771 persons doing actual shop supervision of trainees. In other words only 44 percent of the administrative and project personnel were in direct shop supervision.

DRASTIC DECLINE IN TRAINEES

The National Youth Administration estimates that, with the present funds available, it could maintain a monthly youth employment of approximately 70,000. Since the average training time is 2 months, approximately 420,000 youths could be trained during the course of a year. Actually the number of youth in training during the present fiscal year has approximated more closely 60,000 or 65,000 during any given month. This is borne out by Mr. Williams' testimony that 30,000 young people enter the National Youth Administration every month and 30,000 go out. Of this daily turn-over of 1,000 approximately 500 go into war industry.

These figures indicate a constant drop in the number of trainees, both resident and nonresident, from a high of 281,477 on July 30, 1941, to a low of 53,603 on November 25, 1942:

National summary—Out-of-school work programs: Number of youth under active assignment as of the last Wednesday of the month

	Combined programs	Training program [1]	Regular program
Last Wednesday of month:			
1941—July 30	281,477	57,297	224,180
Aug. 27	261,901	75,861	186,040
Sept. 24	239,829	76,752	163,077
Oct. 29	257,318	80,681	176,637
Nov. 26	263,621	77,358	186,263
Dec. 31	195,130	64,101	131,029
1942—Jan. 28	189,636	68,246	121,390
Feb. 25	182,851	67,736	115,115
Mar. 25	169,004	72,359	97,245
Apr. 29	139,579	70,464	69,115
May 27	128,254	70,661	57,593
June 24	123,579	82,327	41,252
July 29	83,580	83,580	----------
Aug. 26	68,030	68,030	----------
Sept. 30	53,912	53,912	----------
Oct. 28	53,327	53,327	----------
Nov. 25	53,603	53,603	----------

[1] During the fiscal year 1942 the training program was called Youth Work Defense Program. During the fiscal year 1943 the program is called War Production Training Program. No separate training program was operated during the fiscal year 1941 or prior years.

It is apparent from this tabulation that there has been a drastic decline in the National Youth Administration training program and that this decline has brought the total number of trainees well below the number which may be adequately trained by the supervision and training stations now on hand. To offset this, the National Youth Administration has made every effort to recruit trainees, even going so far as to place advertisements in the newspapers and to make announcements over the radio.

Much of this falling off of the program has been attributable to the loss of male enrollees for which the number of female trainees has been unable to compensate. The 53 percent males who are trainees are predominately in the younger-age groups as the following testimony of Mr. Williams suggests:

Male trainees, by age groups

	Percent of total
16 years old	5.7
17 years old	28.2
18 years old	26.5
19 years old	15.3
20 years old	9.0
21 years old	5.6
22 years old	4.0
23 years old	2.
24 years old	2.8

This tabulation as of October 14, 1942, indicates the decline in the number of draft-age males enrolled in the National Youth Administration programs and suggests the probable effect on the 18- and 19-year-old group when draft regulations take full effect. With 66 percent of the male trainees in the draft group, it is probable that the National Youth Administration faces complete breakdown of its defense-training program.

On the other hand, the United States Office of Education program is much more extensive. This Office trains a total of 345,000 of which 162,000 are in preemployment training, 101,000 in supplementary employment training, and 82,000 in regular vocational employment. Because of the very nature of the organization the matter of securing trainees is not a problem to the same extent found in the National Youth Administration.

COMPARISON OF TRAINING STATIONS

According to the United States Office of Education figures, it supports 56,053 training stations, of which 36,489 are rovided by Federal funds and 19,564 by local and State funds. These training stations supply the needs of 85,915 preemployment trainees and 43,000 supplementary employees for a total of 128,920 trainees. In other words, the Office of Education program averages 2.3 trainees per station per day. According to the latest surveys of work stations and employees, the National Youth Administration had 53,722 trainees for 56,534 work stations. Of these stations 17,655 are now in storage.

Consequently, the average number of trainees per work station may be compared as follows:

Work station and trainee comparison

	Work stations	Trainees	Percent trainees per station per day
Office of Education	56,053	128,920	2.3
National Youth Administration:			
Total	56,534	53,722	.95
In use	38,879		1.4

Thus the National Youth Administration is using its total equipment less than half as efficiently as is the Office of Education, while from compilations based on stations actually in use, one finds the National Youth Administration training almost one person less per day per station than does the Office of Education.

There is a total number of 56,534 work stations owned by the National Youth Administration, 31 percent of which are not in use. Following is a table illustrating the large percentage of National Youth Administration work stations which are now in storage, not being used principally because of a lack of trainees.

National Youth Administration work stations in operation and in storage by States

State	Total number of work stations (adjusted)	Number in use (Oct. 28, 1942)	Number not in use (July 1942, adjusted)	Percent not in use	Number of youths under active assignment (Nov. 18, 1942)
Connecticut	300	300	0	0	372
Maine	914	724	190	21	776
Massachusetts	3,801	806	2,995	79	901
New Hampshire	202	127	75	37	126
Rhode Island	50	50	0	0	16
Vermont	208	208	0	0	205
New York	3,852	2,505	1,347	35	3,093
Delaware	24	24	0	0	16
New Jersey	1,168	839	329	28	639
Pennsylvania	3,170	3,170	0	0	6,065
District of Columbia	118	118	0	0	477
Maryland	543	487	56	10	402
North Carolina	1,380	1,079	301	22	1,879
Virginia	4,228	937	3,291	78	1,213
West Virginia	1,112	896	216	19	2,09
Kentucky	1,113	1,009	104	9	2,375
Michigan	1,368	1,330	38	3	1,773
Ohio	1,979	1,769	210	11	2,714
Illinois	3,580	2,302	1,278	36	3,691
Indiana	1,075	1,075	0	0	1,595
Wisconsin	3,834	2,786	1,048	27	1,826
Alabama	807	769	38	5	1,223
Florida	740	654	86	12	987
Georgia	1,437	1,091	346	24	1,758
Mississippi	586	586	0	0	1,006
South Carolina	393	393	0	0	642
Tennessee	1,267	924	343	27	1,008
Iowa	1,099	1,085	14	1	809
Minnesota	978	884	94	10	1,250
Nebraska	380	324	56	15	253
North Dakota	315	259	56	18	342
South Dakota	325	325	0	0	354
Arkansas	796	740	56	7	1,362
Kansas	1,029	695	334	32	597
Missouri	1,312	1,081	231	18	1,400
Oklahoma	2,232	2,040	192	9	2,466
Louisiana	613	557	56	9	1,001
New Mexico	136	98	38	28	163
Texas	2,528	1,726	802	32	2,733
Colorado	880	193	687	78	292
Idaho	368	312	56	15	411
Montana	200	88	112	56	101
Utah	204	204	0	0	257
Wyoming	406	190	216	53	64
Arizona	119	119	0	0	182
California	1,743	628	1,115	64	523
Nevada	221	0	221	100	0
Oregon	200	162	38	19	86
Washington	1,201	211	990	82	158
Total	56,534	38,879	17,655	31	53,722

From the above tables it is evident that there is an amazingly small number of youth in defense training in certain States. The industrial State of Rhode Island has only 16; Delaware has a like number; Wyoming has 64; and Oregon 86.

Particularly notable is the number of work stations not in use. Massachusetts with only 806 work stations in use out of a total of 3,801 indicates the extent to which such disuse has taken place. California with 61 percent, or 1,115 of 1,743 work stations not in use, and Virginia with 78 percent, or 3,291 of 4,228 work stations in storage, are other outstanding examples. Of 221 stations in Nevada, not one is in use. Clearly, despite examples of full use, such as in Pennsylvania, where every work station is filled on an average of 2 shifts, the fact that 17,000 of these stations are in storage in the country as a whole is indicative that the National Youth Administration is not performing at capacity. With only two-thirds of its stations in use by an average of slightly more than 1 person per day the efficiency training rating of the National Youth Administration must fall somewhere about the 33-percent level if one were to take the Office of Education figure of 2 trainees per station a day as a tentative average.

PUBLIC CRITICISM

Despite the defense purpose of most of the National Youth Administration work, the committee has continued to receive numerous letters from a wide variety of sources, indicating indignation at the continued expenditure of public money for the National Youth Administration. These criticisms, for the most part substantiated by factual examples, were based on the following:

1. The National Youth Administration is duplicating work performed by other Government agencies, private business, and trade schools.

2. Waste of equipment needed in war industries has been observed.

3. Administrative and instructive ineptitude has disgusted student and instructor alike.

4. The desire to perpetuate the National Youth Administration rather than to preserve an efficient training program has been observed.

CENSURE FROM EDUCATORS

According to experts in the field of education it is apparent that the National Youth Administration has gradually developed into a self-perpetuating agency distinct from the original purpose of providing relief and work relief. Consequently leading educational organizations have become alarmed at attempts to make the National Youth Administration a continuing agency because they think it now duplicates the program of the Office of Education and suggests the beginning of national bureaucratic control of education.

Local, State, and national education groups believe the National Youth Administration is now competing with the regular school program for vocational school training. They believe it will work toward centralized national control of education; that it will prove both more costly and less effective; that it will create inefficient use of the school plant; and that the National Youth Administration's original purpose is no longer followed. The report on the National Youth Administration by the Educational Policy Commission of the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators as of October 1941, states on page 76:

"The United States Commissioner of Education says the Nation has invested about $1,000,000,000 in buildings and equipment for trade and industrial education and that 15,000 of the 22,000 teachers of industrial courses are qualified to train workers for defense industries and that there are 1,000 experienced supervisors available, and that the school plant can accommodate 750,000 additional trainees. These figures suggest the futility of duplication. Many of these instructors have been giving part training to National Youth Administration enrollees and should be familiar with its administration and its effectiveness."

The National Education Association has repeatedly voiced this duplication as expressed in the following testimony before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor (quoted from p. 13):

"We of the National Education Association are therefore unable to see any fundamental difference between the National Youth Administration and the public schools in this matter of the kind of training which they provide. 'Work experience,' it seems to us, is not a matter of working for National Youth Administration wages or of producing some useful goods. It is a matter of learning to apply oneself continuously and industriously to a job, learning to work under supervision, learning to meet high standards of performance. These learnings, we believe, can and do take place in vocational school shops quite as well as in National Youth Administration shops. A boy in a public-school class, who receives no pay but wants to qualify for a job, will work just as industriously and just as skillfully as a boy in a National Youth Administration shop who is paid for his work and who also wants to qualify for a job. And if neither boy wants to qualify for a job, neither is likely to learn much about 'work habits,' wages or no wages. If the public-school boy needs money to pay his expenses while he is completing his training, that can be furnished through a student-aid program.

"It is therefore our conviction that the entire National Youth Administration training program, with its attendant production and service projects, should be transferred to the State and local educational agencies at the earliest possible date. Funds necessary for the operation of the program should be allotted to the United States Office of Education, for distribution to the States. The activities transferred from the National Youth Administration should be made an integral part of the national defense training program, which is already being operated in public schools throughout the Nation. Resident centers, which are remote from the larger school systems, or which serve youth drawn from many communities, can be efficiently operated by State departments of education or State boards for vocational education. The shops and equipment purchased by the National Youth Administration can be turned over to State or local educational authorities and utilized in the national defense training program during the war and in the schools' permanent program of vocational education in the post-war period."

CONCLUSIONS

From the foregoing discussion certain inferences may be made regarding the National Youth Administration:

1. The National Youth Administration activities duplicate those training programs of various Government bureaus as well as those of industry itself. Although it is true that the National Youth Administration has carried its present training program to places where there are no vocational training facilities of a similar nature, nevertheless this does not necessarily argue for the continuance of the National Youth Administration, for other Government training programs can be carried to these very places should the expense and the results seem justified.

2. The cost of the National Youth Administration training is much higher than necessary. This cost would be more than doubled under the present proposed program to increase the number of trainees.

3. Recent figures indicate that the enrollment in the National Youth Administration has fallen off markedly while the number of female trainees is rapidly overtaking the number of males.

4. The National Youth Administration has been forced to depend more and more on boys beneath the draft age of 18 for its male trainees.

5. The equipment of the National Youth Administration is not being utilized to an extent commensurate with satisfactory results.

6. Only 50 percent of the youth trained by the National Youth Administration utilize these skills in war industry.

7. Educational groups fear that the National Youth Administration presages centralized educational control.

The committee's investigation of National Youth Administration has been thorough. Every fact obtainable of its administration, need, and cost is in the recorded testimony. Evidence challenging the National Youth Administration's continuance because of duplication, extravagance, and ineffective results came to the committee from all parts of the country. Some of it is submitted in the appendix of this report. The committee has examined every possible justification for the continuance of the National Youth Administration. It must confess it has found none.

Other vocational groups, in the Government and out, are at present covering the entire field that has been allocated to the National Youth Administration during the fiscal year 1943. The scope of this includes, as indicated above, all the functions of the National Youth Administration dealing with national defense. Consequently it is difficult to see why the National Youth Administration should not be liquidated as of July 1, 1943.

APPENDIX

The following are excerpts from a few of the many letters received from people in a position to observe the operation of the National Youth Administration from the standpoint of cost, duplication, and effectiveness. The committee has not attempted to investigate these statements but, in view of their sources, feel they deserve to be added to this report:

FROM MINNESOTA

"I am taking the liberty to inform you that in the State of Minnesota the so-called war production training projects that are now carried on by the National Youth Administration are just a duplication of the war production-training program for war production workers carried on under the auspices of the United States Office of Education. As I see it, the only difference between the two is that our trainees are expected to attend the classes in the public schools without pay; on the other hand, the National Youth Administration pays their trainees for attending.

"If the above situation is to be continued indefinitely, we will find that our public schools with facilities far better than those possessed at the National Youth Administration centers being vacated and our students attending the National Youth Administration centers in order to receive $25 a month for taking training." (Harry C. Schmid, acting State director of vocational training for war production workers, St. Paul Minn., December 14, 1942.)

FROM MASSACHUSETTS

"If the history of the National Youth Administration were ever written, I would say that it would be one of the most vicious attacks on the rights of the taxpayers of this Republic that we have ever known. This school has at the present time the most modern, up-to-date machine-shop equipment together with the most modern tools. There are instructors there drawing $12 and $15 a day who have had during the past month as few as two pupils some days, and some days those pupils would not come in. The attendance for the week of February 8 under the National Youth Administration: Five pupils on Monday, February 8; six pupils on Tuesday, February 9; six pupils on Wednesday, February 10; six pupils on Thursday, February 11; and eight pupils on Friday, February 12.

"This is the best attendance they have had in some time. There are 49 stations.

"We have in the city of Quincy a trade school with an enrollment of 254 pupils, which is adjacent to the Quincy High School with an enrollment of 1,600 pupils. In the Quincy Trade School we have regularly from 62 to 72 pupils taking machine shop practice. We are obliged to go out and get third- and fourth-rate lathes which should be sold for junk, while this up-to-date machinery is standing idle. If we had this machinery we could put it to work for defense purposes. It could be used to advantage. The large Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation is

clamoring for machinists." (James N. Muir, superintendent, Quincy public schools, Quincy, Mass., March 15, 1943.)

FROM CALIFORNIA

"National Youth Administration has set up a defense training school in Compton for boys age 16 and over, paying these boys $24.80 per month for 2 months while going to school. Add to this, bus transportation is furnished to haul Long Beach boys to Compton.

"Continuation high school here (Long Beach) gives defense training for 16-year old boys, but we do not pay $24.80 a month for our boys to go to school, nor do we furnish bus transportation. We thought it patriotic to prevent duplication of effort, save money and do away with unnecessary transportation." (Excerpt from a letter to Congressman JOHNSON, January 19, 1943.)

FROM KANSAS

"At the outset I wish to make it clear that I did not condemn the National Youth Administration in its original purpose, namely, that of providing subsistence and work experience for needy youth. Pursuant to that thought I record at the beginning of this statement that fact that I was perhaps the first school man in Kansas who offered to cooperate with the State director of the National Youth Administration in our State.

"So far as supervisory, clerical, and administrative staff is concerned, it would be very easy for the vocational schools to absorb all of the training programs of the National Youth Administration for those who are capable of being trained to employability. While it is true that employers have lowered their physical and educational standards for employability, it is still true that the National Youth Administration, for some reason, is attempting to train a great many young people who, for one reason or another, are almost incapable of being trained to employability.

"While my sympathies are always with youth, and while I feel that we are apt to spend too little rather than too much in preparing them for their life work, I am still convinced that the National Youth Administration in Kansas has been notoriously extravagant. It has done so many things for youth that youth should have done for itself. It has been extravagantly overstaffed, and in many cases overequipped.

"One case of notoriously extravagant and bad planning was the building of a fine machine shop and foundry at a lake several miles from a railroad and several miles from a main highway. It is out in what we call the Flint Hills of Kansas, where not much of anything grows except bluestem grass, jackrabbits and white-faced cattle. It was about as far from any industry as it could be. At one time they were operating classes at that location for as few as three and four students. These few students were transported by bus from Topeka—a distance of about 30 miles. At that time they were running two shifts. The teacher was on duty but idle while the bus made a trip to Topeka to bring the three or four students and take back three or four more. On one occasion one of our workers inadvertently found himself trailing a National Youth Administration bus of the 48-passenger type. It was carrying not to exceed 5 passengers. Another such bus was following him with no more than that many passengers. He observed that they drove from Independence to Parsons, Kans., a distance of approximately 30 miles. We were told that they were reporting full loads, but we cannot verify that statement. We do know that for months they have been transporting students as much as 50 and 60 miles to their machine shop at Parsons, Kans. We do not believe there is justification for such expenditure of transportation facilities when they are so badly needed in such war production areas as exists around Parsons and Wichita, Kans.

"It is significant that for many months the National Youth Administration had thousands of dollars' worth of the very best of equipment lying in crates in a warehouse in Wichita, Kans., while at the same time the vocational school was in very great need of just such equipment and making every possible effort to get it.

"It is no secret that the National Youth Administration has resorted to just about every form of solicitation to keep its schools in operation. It has used the radio and the press. It has circularized high-school students. It has sent out house-to-house solicitors. A solicitor came to my own home soon after my son was graduated from high school to get him to enroll in the National Youth Administration training program. At Emporia, Kans., the National Youth Administration is installing equipment in the city auditorium to operate what they call a War Manpower Commission school. They are attempting to enter into arrangements to give shop training for high-school boys and girls for high-school graduation credit.

"This interesting thing came to our attention recently. In the December 28, 1942, issue of the Coffeyville (Kans.) Journal appeared a blind advertisement appealing to young men and women to train for employment. The director of our vocational school in Coffeyville sent his secretary to investigate this blind ad. He reports as follows:

"'As we were interested to find out just what this might be, I sent the girls from the office down to make application and we find this is a National Youth Administration setup with the title of "War Manpower Board." The girls were given quite a build-up for the training in the various centers. They were told they had 33 sign up at Independence yesterday.'

"Independence, incidentally, is a city only a few miles from Coffeyville.

"I am very certain that no worth-while thing is being accomplished by the National Youth Administration nor that could not be accomplished by the vocational schools of Kansas, and at only a fraction of the cost. With practically no increase in administrative cost, the vocational schools of Kansas could absorb any part of the National Youth Administration training program that is worth while. I do not hesitate to say that there are a great many Kansans who would pay income tax and buy bonds more cheerfully if they did not see such extravagance as is evident in the National Youth Administration training program.

"Within 4 blocks of my office, 2 big 48-passenger National Youth Administration busses stand idle the greater part of every day in order that those young people may have immediate transportation, while the high-school students by the hundreds walk to and from school and working men and women either walk or hang on a strap in an overcrowded city bus.

"The vocational schools of the State are right now approaching the very peak of training demand. We need more equipment. We're getting the trainees. Much of the metalworking equipment that belongs to the National Youth Administration could be used effectively in both Wichita and Kansas City war-production training program. The aircraft factories of both those cities are begging for workers. Our training program is geared to their needs. We have combed the State of Kansas and picked up every piece of second-hand equipment available, while at the same time the National Youth Administration had new machines sitting idle.

"I hesitate to record such an indictment against any Government agency. I have done so only because I feel it to be my patriotic duty at this critical time to speak up vigorously concerning an institution or activity that, in my opinion, has outlived its usefulness." (C. M. Miller, director, Kansas State Board for Vocational Education, Topeka, Kans.)

FROM KENTUCKY

"It is my considered opinion that the National Youth Administration set-up as now maintained is contrary to the best interest of the people of this country.

"The training given by the National Youth Administration is a duplicate of the training given in our public high schools and consequently is in direct competition with them. The result is that neither program is as efficient as it would be if under a single administrative agency. The public school system as maintained in our States is the proper place for the control and administration of the National Youth Administration program.

"At the present time the National Youth Administration is enticing from the high schools and grade schools boys and girls that by all standards should remain in public schools. These students are taken away from home and housed under conditions that cannot be as satisfactory as home conditions." (V. O. Turner, principal, Maytown Consolidated School, Langley, Ky., January 29, 1943.)

FROM TEXAS

"We have a situation in regard to National Youth Administration that is apparently very vicious. Mr. J. C. Kellam invited some members of the State department of education and school administrators together on Wednesday, January 6, and proposed to them that they endorse a plan whereby the National Youth Administration would furnish their shop facilities and take over school shop facilities outside the regular hours and permit the high school students, who were 16 years of age or over, to attend the National Youth Administration program for 3 or 4 hours and go to school the other part of the day, and while attending the National Youth Administration shop, they would be paid $12 per month. The group he called to meet him, which did not include any vocational people, refused to endorse the program unless he agreed to pay those students regularly enrolled in day trade shop programs the same rate of pay as those attending the National Youth Administration shop. Mr. Kellam stated that he had approximately a million and a half dollars for this type of a program. Mr. Kellam and the National Youth Administration authorities are already again approaching school administrators with this proposition. We have had several inquiries from school superintendents as to whether or not they would be permitted to use the vocational shops and their regular day trade teachers to handle this National Youth Administration program.

"Now it so happens that we have amended our State plan and provided for an extra 3-hour section of all our day trade shop sections in this State to permit youth enrolled in other schools to attend and obtain training outside of regular school hours that will meet military objectives and prepare for industrial employment also. These classes have been set up by and with the permission of the United States Office of Education and are part of our regular vocational program. The National Youth Administration apparently is attempting to duplicate this and to needlessly pay $12 per month to the youth.

"As you can see, if they carry through this type of a program, our day trade students would, in large numbers, quit their present class and enroll in the National Youth Administration class to receive the $12 per month. To me, this is gross carelessness in the expenditure of Federal funds. Money is being spent needlessly and uselessly. If these youth want to attend classes of this type, we have them available and have regular

educational funds available to support them. I do not believe that Congress ever intended for the money appropriated in paragraph I of the National Youth Administration section of Public Law, 647, to be used to train students regularly enrolled in high schools.

"I am wondering if they are not attempting to do this same thing in other sections of the country. Their enrollments are very low in their regular out-of-school war-training programs. Apparently this is a move to build up enrollments to justify their further existence at the expense of the public school systems of this country." (James R. D. Eddy, State director of vocational education, Austin, Tex., January 19, 1943.)

FROM KENTUCKY

"As a result of the present emergency, when our people are having the heaviest tax burden in our history imposed upon them, they are naturally becoming much more concerned about the manner in which this money is spent by their Government. I do not wish to stipulate that our people object to taxes, however steep they may be, so long as the money obtained is used wisely in preserving our American way of living.

"The general public sentiment today is becoming more and more critical of the misuse of Federal funds in promotion of such organizations as the now abolished Work Projects Administration and the still-existing National Youth Administration. The prevalent sentiment is that the present National Youth Administration is in direct competition with and a duplication of the efforts of our public and vocational school systems. There is not the slightest reason to doubt that with the equipment and money allotted to the National Youth Administration our public schools would do a far better job than any such organization.

"I have personally made a study of the activities of the National Youth Administration by direct contact for the past year. In a recent survey I found 42 percent of the trainees enrolled in one shop to be under 18 years of age and the average grade level of this group to be 7. The only logical assumption we can make is that these boys and girls have been enticed away from the public schools and from under home influence, where they rightfully belong." (Fred A. Martin, coordinator, Prestonburg shop, Mayo State Vocational School, Prestonburg, Ky., January 31, 1943.)

FROM COLORADO

"Cooperative relationships between the National Youth Administration and the public schools of Colorado, so far as the field of vocational education is concerned, may be summarized as follows:

"1. We now have many vacant training stations in the war-production program in vocational schools. Though women are coming into the classes in increasing numbers, a recent survey indicates that we can easily accommodate an additional 3,000 trainees with present equipment and instruction staff. In other words, we are running a minimum program when we should be running a maximum program. The National Youth Administration operates 3 vocational training centers in Colorado—at Denver, Trinidad, and Colorado Springs. In each instance enrollment is low in both the public-school classes and the National Youth Administration classes in subjects in which the National Youth Administration is duplicating the vocational-school effort.

"2. The vocational schools of Colorado could absorb the trainees in the National Youth Administration war-production-training program immediately if authorized to do so. This would include absorption of machine shop, foundry, and patternmaking trainees in Denver by the Denver Opportunity School, and absorption of the machine shop, radio, electrical, and sheet-metal trainees in Colorado Springs by the Colorado Springs Vocational School.

"3. The duplication of these National Youth Administration vocational-training programs in centers where we have well-established local vocational schools, seems to us to be an extravagant waste of money. Full details regarding this duplication of work can be secured from Mr. Roy Hinderman, director of vocational education, Denver public schools; or Mr. Charles E. Greene, superintendent of schools, Denver, Colo.; and from Mr. A. C. Erickson, director of vocational education, Colorado Springs, Colo.; or Superintendent Roy J. Wasson of the Colorado Springs public schools; and from Mr. P. P. Mickelson, president of the Trinidad Junior College, Trinidad, Colo.

"4. The National Youth Administration has solicited, and is soliciting, high-school students for National Youth Administration recruiting purposes. We have not objected to this because the Congress authorized the National Youth Administration in Public Law 647 to offer vocational training for war-production workers. Some school districts refused to permit this solicitation although generally it was accepted with the feeling that it was a duplication of service but that in wartimes it might be tolerated, at least on a temporary basis.

"5. This office is of the opinion that National Youth Administration trainees and qualified instructing personnel, as well as the shop equipment, should be transferred at the earliest opportunity to the local school districts maintaining vocational-training programs in the public schools. There is no function now performed by National Youth Administration that has not and that cannot be done by the public-school system. Furthermore, the present plan of operation sets up a duplicate vocational-training system in the United States, one a cooperative Federal-State local program, the other a Federal system of vocational schools operated by National Youth Administration.

"The above information is submitted on the basis of personal experiences and observations made during the past several years in administering the war production training program in the State of Colorado. I hope that something can be done to get the Congress to realize the situation and that an effort will be made to correct the administrative difficulties now existing." (H. A. Tiemann, State director of vocational education, Denver, Colo., January 21, 1943.)

FROM OKLAHOMA

"The following information is submitted relative to the vocational-training program of the National Youth Administrtaion. The high points of the program in several cities will be given.

"In a general over-all view of the program at the present time, note should be taken of the fact that on the 30th of June 1942 there were 2,459 white youth and 41 Negroes, or 2,500 National Youth Administration youth, receiving training in the cooperative program with the vocational education authorities. Since that time enrollment has dropped steadily and it has been necessary for us to discontinue many of the classes due to very small enrollment. The National Youth Administration continually operates classes with 2, 3, and 4 trainees per supervisor. It has been our policy to call this condition to their attention and give them a week or 10 days to increase the enrollment before closing the class and combining shifts. * * *

"The vocational schools could easily absorb the National Youth Administration trainees in the war production training program. In fact, there is a demand for people at this time that is not completely filled. The National Youth Administration is duplicating the vocational training programs in Oklahoma City, Tulsa, and Muskogee. In many cases youth go to those centers, begin their training, and as soon as they become informed as to the type of training going on in the vocational schools they drop out of the National Youth Administration and complete training in the vocational schools.

"The National Youth Administration classes are generally small in the State. The program at Tonkawa is the only one which carries a full load consistently for all instructors and supervisors. As has been pointed out that program has lost enrollment in the last 2 or 3 months. This has been very noticeable since the Signal Corps has reduced the civilian training program. * * *

"National Youth Administration machine-shop equipment is needed by vocational-training programs in the public schools. The situation in this State is becoming serious. If the equipment were transferred to the State board of vocational education it could be used to augment shops and increase training capacity so as to meet the very great demand for machine operators in war plants. There is also a need for expanding aircraft sheet metal at Tulsa and Oklahoma City, and there is approximately enough National Youth Administration equipment of this type in the State to supply the needed equipment.

"There is a demand by a large welding contractor for paid training for arc welders, for which training the State board of vocational education will not have sufficient machines. It will be necessary for the contractor to take portable machines off the pipe line in order to provide facilities for training pipe-line welders. Twenty additional arc-welding machines would certainly help this situation." (M. L. Powers, State supervisor, trade and industrial education, Stillwater, Okla., January 26, 1943.)

FROM KENTUCKY

"The National Youth Administration work is a duplicate of effort in this area. Busses are hauling children 35 miles through Madisonville to Providence now for the National Youth Administration course. All of these children could take the same type of courses in our regular school work in Madisonville at much less cost and expense.

"I understand that in the United States there are 50,000 National Youth Administration training stations but not that many trainees. It has been our observation that many of the trainees from the National Youth Administration school at Providence have been turned down by the employers of labor at Evansville because they are not 18 years of age. It has also come to our attention that the training which is given to the trainees in this shop is not particularly helpful to them after they enter industry.

"No reason has ever been presented to me why better learning could not be obtained in public schools at less training cost and expense." (Harper Gatton, superintendent, Madisonville city schools, Madisonville, Ky., January 19, 1943.)

FROM NEW JERSEY

"The number of National Youth Administration trainees in the State of New Jersey has dropped during the past 6 months, and at the present time only five small centers are in operation. All of the enrollees could be absorbed in the existing war production training program. All of the National Youth Administration enrollees could be absorbed in the war production training program in New Jersey even if all of the available stations were filled. This could be done by arranging shop classes and related subject instruction that could be staggered in such a fashion that one group could be occupying the shop while the other group could be receiving instruction in mathematics, blueprint reading, etc.

"I have in my files a complete set of reports on National Youth Administration activities in the Newark center. These reports extend over a period of more than 6 months, and I am quoting the following statements from the reports.

" 'That milling machine that came in last April stands still, rusting away, never turned a wheel.'

"The milling machine that was referred to was secured with two others at a time when it was difficult to obtain equipment of this kind.

" 'During the week of December 26 there were 23 in attendance in the center, 6 in the welding unit, and 17 in the machine shop. To instruct this group of 23 youths there was 1 welding instructor, salary $225 per month, 1 shift supervisor, salary $250 per month, and 2 supervisors, salary $225 per month each. With a total day and night enrollment of 75 students there was an overhead of 25 supervisors and foremen.' " (John A. McCarthy, assistant commissioner of education, Trenton, N. J., January 13, 1943.)

FROM MICHIGAN

"If authorized by Congress, the vocational schools of Michigan could absorb trainees now in National Youth Administration programs without any difficulty and with very little, if any, additional administrative or supervisory expense.

"I consider National Youth Administration training a duplication of effort and training which could be absorbed by vocational schools. There is no justification for paid work project experiences at the present time since trainees can be quickly placed at work after intensive training at wages prevailing in war production industries.

"It seems to me that there is no place for the two training programs—one or the other should be discontinued. Naturally, I believe that all such training should be carried on through public schools that have had a long-time established program, and therefore, experiences necessary to meet the situation. Furthermore, public schools are unbiased in their desire and effort to meet their obligation to serve the youth and adults of the country. The public schools have demonstrated their ability to carry on effective training during this war emergency at a cost which certainly cannot be questioned. The program as operated through the public schools, even though subsidized by Federal funds, is more in line with our democratic practices. * * *

"I am frank to admit that since two programs cannot be justified, it makes the cost to the taxpayer high, the programs should stand on their own merit and one or the other should be discontinued.

"If the National Youth Administration program is transferred to the public schools, these schools should be given the opportunity to transfer needed equipment for training purposes from the National Youth Administration shops. In many cases the National Youth Administration has had priorities on securing equipment, and thus has always had first choice. Any surplus of equipment could certainly be absorbed by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps.

"National Youth Administration students are only supposed to be enrolled in National Youth Administration projects which are reimbursed in part through a cooperative plan with the State board for a period not exceeding 3 months. We have cases where trainees will be enrolled in the National Youth Administration in one resident project, for example, Traverse City, and at the end of 3 months the same trainees will be transferred to Cassidy Lake for an additional period of time. The individuals will also be enrolled twice on National Youth Administration enrollment figures. We have been advised that some trainees in National Youth Administration projects have been enrolled for periods as long as 14 months."—(George H. Fern, director, State board of control for vocational education, Lansing, Mich., January 19, 1943.)

FROM KENTUCKY

"We have information of where the National Youth Administration superintendent dissuaded National Youth Administration boys from taking employment with the Simms-Drake Co., of Puget Sound. Mr. H. S. Hendersen, who was recruiting officer with the above company, whose address is 2929 Sixteenth Avenue, SW., Seattle, Wash., could probably give you further information. Boys who had taken employment and already had their tickets in possession to go to work for this company were talked into returning tickets in order that the National Youth Administration quotas might not be diminished. Mr. Alexander Smith, National Youth Administration camp superintendent, made the statement that he personally dissuaded the boys from taking employment. The statement was made before Mr. Henry C. Turner, United States Employment Service, Frankfort, and before the author of this letter. The National Youth Administration enrollment at Camp Lake Reba is about 125 trainees. The Lafayette Trade School, Lexington, Ky., can accept many more trainees at work stations which are now open." (Charles V. Youmans, supervisor-coordinator, Fayette County vocational schools, Lexington, Ky., January 23, 1943.)

FROM WEST VIRGINIA

"The National Youth Administration spends millions of dollars duplicating the work of the Office of Education in the field of vocational education. It runs schools in our States which are thoroughly federalized and pays students during these prosperous times to go to school. The money spent by the National Youth Administration would get better results if it were channeled through the United States Office of Education, regularly organized State departments of education, and the local public-school systems. More real educational results could be had this way for a fraction of the present cost." (W. W. Trent, State superintedent of free schools, Charleston, W. Va., January 15, 1943.)

FROM IOWA

"The writer wishes to call your attention to the enormous equipment placed in the National Youth Administration center at Clinton, Iowa, and the comparison with it of the number of trainees which are being produced. The capital outlay is such that the results do not warrant the maintenance by this agency.

"In the attached list you will notice 4 planers, the largest of which has a 30-foot bed. The attached list of equipment is only the heavy equipment. The total installation exclusive of building will cost approximately $250,000 to $275,000. At the time of the visit of the writer to Clinton there were 11 trainees only.

"In the conduct of the duties of my office I often find it necessary to contact the National Youth Administration agency and on several occasions I have found it their desire to use youths less than 16 years of age to bolster their enrollment. This matter has been taken up with them.

"The national emergency which has eliminated their span of operation should make the continuance of this work of the National Youth Administration unnecessary. There is a Federal channel through which this training can be accomplished; I refer to the department of vocational education as it is now organized for the production of war workers.

"The National Youth Administration has been able to secure delivery of costly equipment while the department of vocational education for war production workers has had to wait and is still waiting for delivery of similar equipment which is now standing idle in many National Youth Administration shops across the country.

"This equipment of the National Youth Administration which has been acquired at such enormous amounts should be transferred to the Vocational Education of War Production Workers. Your efforts to discontinue the National Youth Administration and the subsequent assignment of this costly equipment to a present successfully operating organization within the Government would be appreciated and be highly useful in the war effort.

"Clinton National Youth Administration heavy machinery: 4 planers, 6 shapers, 10 lathes, 5 milling machines, 3 cutter grinders, 6 drill presses, 1 gear cutter, 1 vertical mill (Vernon), 2 radial drills, 2 bench lathes, 1 Doall band saw, 1 Vernon milling machine." (L. E. Wass, director, war training, Independent School; district, Davenport, Iowa, January 27, 1943.)

FROM MASSACHUSETTS

"At a Washington conference with Aubrey Williams and Dr. Judd as far back as 1938 or 1939, we took issue over the federally financed and directed 'schools' of National Youth Administration, set up independently from the United States Office of Education, State and local authorities. Springfield, Mass., was particularly pointed to at that time as typical of what was going on and a published account of what National Youth Administration called their 'school' in Springfield was quoted from. Both Mr. Williams and Dr. Judd denied that there was any plan or intent on the part of National Youth Administration to establish a rival system of Federal vocational schools within the States. Whatever their plan or intent may have been the resulting effect of National Youth Administration has been to do just that: They have an organization which results in Statewide duplication and competition in the field of vocational education.

"Under various terminology, duplication of plants, equipment, and personnel with competition for trainees has gone on since that time and is going on now. It cannot possibly be otherwise as long as Congress appropriates funds for such a program to be administered from Washington by an independent agency. The person has not yet been born who could administer it without duplication and competitive phases arising. A study of National Youth Administration activities in this commonwealth, as to their various establishments, closures, shifts, carting off equipment, devices for securing trainees, and other ranges of manipulations, disclosed desperate efforts to administer an impossible program." (R. O. Small, assistant director of vocational education and director of war production training, Boston, Mass., January 22, 1943.)

FROM MINNESOTA

"* * * There is a very strong possibility that in doing away with the National Youth Administration, their entire facilities, personnel, and general set-up will be placed under a new agency, keeping the same politically minded but inefficient personnel that is at present in control to do an important job for which they have had neither experience nor training. If this is done, we will still have our dual system of education steeped in politics and subsidized beyond reason by the Federal Government.

"We believe that when the National Youth Administration is terminated, the department of education should be ordered to take over all training centers for the duration for the following reasons:

"1. A trained personnel is immediately available to do a good job.

"2. Training would be removed from politics.

"3. Economy.

"4. Efficiency in training.

"5. Better standards and a definite goal.

"6. Perfect cooperation with the Manpower Commission.

"7. All facilities immediately available for Army or Navy trainees.

"There is no selfish motive promoting this letter. I have been a superintendent of schools for 15 years and now plan on leaving the educational field entirely." (John A. Metcalf, superintendent, Shakopee public schools, Shakopee, Minn., January 11, 1943.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have been advised that the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, has filed an additional report with the President of the Senate dealing with the National Youth Administration. I ask unanimous consent that I may file my individual views and that they may be treated in the same manner as he requested his report to be treated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the views submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, printed as a document, and printed in the RECORD.

The individual views submitted by Mr. LA FOLLETTE are as follows:

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Trained manpower is now one of the acute bottlenecks of the war-production program. Maintenance of production schedules depends upon a steady flow of trained men and women going into war industry.

The National Youth Administration program is daily turning out 700 potential war workers with basic training in mechanical skills so desperately needed in war industry. Such a contribution to the war effort cannot be regarded as a "nonessential" expenditure of the Federal Government.

The War Manpower Commission has estimated that an additional 4,600,000 persons will have to be employed in essential industry in the period from July 1943 through June 1944. After making due allowance for additions to the work force from the depleted ranks of the still unemployed, and by transfer of workers from less essential industries to war or war-connected industries, most of whom will require training or retraining, at least 2,500,000 of the additional number will be workers without any previous shop experience.

To provide retraining for the unemployed and those transferred from the less essential industries, and preemployment training for the 2,500,000 new workers who are without any shop experience, will require the maximum utilization of all available training agencies.

It is apparent that more, not less, training of war-production workers is needed.

Industry itself must undertake a great deal of the burden and is doing so. But it is important that an employee have the basic knowledge of machine skills before he steps into a production plant. To slow down vital war production while a foreman or a skilled machinist takes the time and ties up a vital machine needed in the production line to teach him the rudiments of machine work is wasteful and unnecessary.

There lies the essential function of the National Youth Administration's training program. The National Youth Administration is no longer a relief agency. It has converted to war production. No training is being offered not directly usable in the war effort.

In the fiscal year 1942 it provided preemployment training for approximately 900,000 persons. Of that number, 386,000 are known definitely to have taken work in the skilled and semiskilled phases of war production, and another 300,000 have gone into other related phases of war industry. In the light of present employment conditions, and the curtailment of nonessential lines of production of all kinds, it is reasonable to assume that most of those persons on whom the National Youth Administration does not have definite record have also found their way into war production of some kind.

Scores of outstanding firms engaged in war production have expressed their gratitude and praise for the work National Youth Administration has done in helping to provide a reservoir of potential employees with basic mechanical training.[1] In line with Federal manpower policies of the armed forces and the selective service, it has long been emphasizing the training of women for war production jobs to take the place in industry of men needed by the armed forces.

The general charge that National Youth Administration has been wasteful of funds, equipment, and manpower is not borne out by the facts presented to the committee.

The cost per youth-month on the National Youth Administration war production training program is $65.86, including a nominal wage of 16 cents per hour as compared with customary wages of 60 cents or more received by trainees of private industry. This average total cost per youth-month also includes the cost of subsistence for thousands of trainees living at resident training centers as well as all administrative costs.

It seems evident that a fair comparison cannot be made between the entire cost of National Youth Administration training, which is completely supported by Federal funds, and the Federal Government's share in the grant-in-aid program of the Office of Education.

It must be remembered that the National Youth Administration is also producing, as a part of its training program, a significant quantity of war matérie' for the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission. For the Portsmouth Navy Yard alone it produced 311,000 specific items in a year's time.

It is true that National Youth Administration facilities are not being used to maximum capacity. The National Youth Administration officials themselves are concerned about that. They state that they have the equipment to handle another 50,000 trainees per month, and are asking that the restrictions in the present law be modified by Congress so that they can provide full use of their facilities.

The question of duplication of function upon which the recommendations of the majority of the committee are based is in the last analysis extremely academic at this time when it is clear that with both the National Youth Administration program and that of the Office of Education the future needs for preemployment training in war production will not be met as full as they should.

The delay and expense of dismantling a going and tested program and fitting it into a different organization operating on a different basis, the grant-in-aid system, should not be attempted in this critical emergency when there is no showing that the operation of one is in any way impairing the effectiveness of the other. Both organizations are engaged in vocational training, but they are training different people. In that sense there is no duplication.

Unlike other vocational training programs, the National Youth Administration has developed in its 8 years of experience a system of resident centers where the trainees from remote areas can live while receiving their training. This has in effect expanded the recruiting area of war industry. It is doubtful that these resident centers could or would be preserved under a grant-in-aid program.

The fact that the National Youth Administration shops are completely controlled by the Federal Government has allowed a flexibility of program and a mobility of facilities that would be difficult under a grant-in-aid program where ownership of facilities is vested in local authorities.

This flexibility has been of great value in allowing immediate shifting of training curriculum to meet sudden shifts of war-industry needs for specific skills. The mobility of facilities has made it possible to move training shops into areas where skilled-labor shortages threaten and to concentrate training facilities where they are needed most.

In this way the National Youth Administration program has been a highly effective agency complementing the vocational training program of the schools.

Congress should give full support, financially and morally, to both the National Youth Administration and the Office of Education in promoting the full utilization of their facilities. It is highly essential to war industry and the war effort.

This is no time to delay the training of war workers simply to straighten out the organization charts of the executive branch of the Government.

The question of integrating the two programs can be left for later consideration when time can safely be allowed for the readjustments that would be required.

In the meantime, instead of abolishing the National Youth Administration, Congress should authorize 100 percent utilization of its facilities by removing the present age limit and other restrictions on the selection of trainees and by providing the necessary funds.

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.

APPENDIX

The following are a small, representative sample of letters received by the National Youth Administration from business firms engaged in war production, attesting to the value of National Youth Administration training in providing a source of manpower with basic mechanical training and reducing their own training problems:

WORTHINGTON PUMP & MACHINERY CORPORATION,
Holyoke, Mass., August 1, 1942.

Mr. LEON J. KOWAL,
Regional Youth Administration,
Region No. 1, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: May I take this opportunity of expressing my opinion of the very fine work the Holyoke National Youth Administration have been doing for the war effort.

One of our largest departments of manufacture is the weldery, and I doubt very much that without the wholehearted cooperation that we have received from both Mr. Fitzgibbons and his instructors and others that we would have been able to accomplish the tremendous schedule we have undertaken in this war effort.

My congratulations for such a fine piece of work.

Very truly yours,
WORTHINGTON PUMP & MACHINERY CORPORATION,
A. F. JEVONS, *Personnel Manager.*

---

[1] In his testimony before the committee Mr. Williams read from a few of the letters received and supplemented this with a list of concerns from which such letters had been received. At my request more of those listed have been submitted for examination, and copies of some of the representative ones are contained in the appendix to this report.

A. A. JOHNSON MACHINE TOOL CO.,
Syracuse, N. Y., December 28, 1942.
NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION,
Syracuse, N. Y.
(Attention Mr. S. Ciciarelli.)

GENTLEMEN: We believe that at this time we should write you a letter regarding the work you are doing and what a great benefit to industry in general the National Youth Administration must be to the war effort. As you know, through your cooperation we have had the benefit of the services of some of your trained boys. Boys who never had, before going into your places, any mechanical training of any kind and, after being at your place here in Syracuse but a short period of time, they were able to come into our plant, where we are rebuilding machine tools.

Some of the machines that we rebuild with almost zero tolerances, and we were able to adapt these boys for not only machine work, but also in a short period o time develop them into scraping hands where they had to work to the very finest tolerances.

We, therefore, take this opportunity of again thanking you for your cooperation and of commending you on the fine type of work you are doing. It is quite noticeable that this training includes not only things that are mechanical, but also you certainly must devote some time toward personality and character training.

The boys' behavior and actions in our shop were very much beyond the usual employee that we hire.

Very truly yours,
A. A. JOHNSON MACHINE TOOL CO.,
A. A. JOHNSON.

BARNES-DULUTH SHIPBUILDING CO.,
Duluth, Minn., November 10, 1942.
Mr. CARL F. MAHNKE,
Project Manager,
National Youth Administration,
Duluth, Minn.

DEAR SIR: In the course of the past few months we have employed approximately 90 welder trainees from your training center, situated at 4832 Grand Avenue, Duluth, Minn

We have found them to be very satisfactory and they have shown that they have had exceptional training in their respective fields.

We would like to recommend that the present age limit of trainees be increased to permit the training of older people in order to meet the demands which will be brought about by the drafting of the 18 and 19-year-old men.

In the course of the next 6 months we contemplate on enlarging our welding force from 150 to 200 additional welders.

Yours very truly,
WALTER J. BARTHOLDI,
Director of Personnel.

NEW BRITAIN-GRIDLEY
MACHINE DIVISION,
THE NEW BRITAIN MACHINE CO.,
New Britain, Conn., September 26, 1941.
Mr. RICHARD A. BARRETT,
State Administrator,
National Youth Administration,
New Haven, Conn.

DEAR MR. BARRETT: I would like to take this opportunity to write you on how the boys whom we have hired from the National Youth Administration in Nepaug and Rocky Hill have turned out. At the present time we have approximately 30 boys in our employ who are working on machines or machine assembly. According to all reports that I have received from the foremen these boys are turning out excellent work and are working conscientiously. They are industrious and ambitious without being too aggressive.

I have read where the National Youth Administration has been under some criticism for importing these boys from out of State. We feel that it is necessary to do so, as the supply of trained or semitrained men is practically negligible in Connecticut, and it has been necessary for us to hire men from wherever and whatever source we are able. These National Youth Administration boys have had more training than the graduates of the local defense schools and thus are more valuable to us. However, the supply of local trade-school boys has been depleted and now we must draw from the outside. The unemployed now remaining in the State are not of the caliber or do they have the experience or training that we are looking for.

In general, I can say that we are well pleased with the type of boy that we have obtained from your centers and hope that we may obtain more in the future.

Yours truly,
NEW BRITAIN MACHINE CO.,
JAMES L. BISHOP,
Personnel Manager.

LAISTER-KAUFFMANN
AIRCRAFT CORPORATION,
St. Louis, Mo., September 14, 1942.
Mr. WYATT,
War Production Training Project,
National Youth Administration,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. WYATT: As you know we have been using your woodworking classes to train people for our work in glider manufacturing. We have found so far from our experience with those whom we have placed that the training that they have there, and your recommendations as to their special qualifications, has been a decided benefit both to us and the trainees.

As prime contractors we have also placed some of your trainees with two of our subcontractors here in St. Louis, and from reports to date they have worked out quite well, although probably none of them have been employed more than a month so far

We want to continue to use your training classes for this purpose, and are depending upon these classes to a considerable extent as far as training women in the future is concerned.

We thank you for your very kind cooperation in helping us and sincerely hope that we will be able to continue this program in the future.

Yours very truly,
LAISTER-KAUFFMANN
AIRCRAFT CORPORATION,
GORDON G. LEWIS,
Assistant Personnel Director.

SOUTHEASTERN SHIPBUILDING
CORPORATION,
Savannah, Ga., January 4, 1943.
Mr. GILBERT C. MCLEMORE,
Project Manager, National Youth
Administration, War Production
Training Center, Savannah, Ga.

DEAR MR. MCLEMORE: I have recently discussed with Mr. May, personnel director of your center, the fact that during the coming year the Southeastern Shipbuilding Corporation will need numbers of men and women to complete and maintain our personnel in the building of Liberty ships.

We are unable to give specified numbers of workers who will be needed, but we wish to indicate that we will desire to employ a number of young men and women trained by the National Youth Administration.

Since July 1, 1942, approximately 500 young men and women trained at your center have been employed by our company as welders, ship fitters, pipe fitters, sheet-metal helpers, machinist helpers, boiler maker helpers, bolter-up helpers, and in other fields.

We have employed every welder you have trained who has passed our entrance test. At present, we are continuing to accept all who meet our requirements. Some of our foremen have been impressed by National Youth Administration workers and have requested their employment.

We have been grateful for your cooperation and interest. Your assistance has been of very definite value in meeting our scheduled production.

Yours very truly,
SNYDER ATWELL,
Personnel Director.

RICHMOND SHIPYARD NO. 1, OF THE
PERMANENTE METALS CORPORATION,
Richmond, Calif., January 9, 1943.
Mr. LEONARD SEIDENMAN,
National Youth Administration,
Richmond, Calif.

DEAR MR. SEIDENMAN: This is to advise you that the Richmond shipyards will employ all the sheet-metal, coppersmith, machinist, and welder trainees you can train.

We have found a definite shortage in skilled men within these crafts and, with the anticipation that we will hire approximately 20,000 additional employees within the next 3 to 4 months, we believe the shortage will become still more acute. This figure might also be enlarged by the inroads made on our personnel because of selective service, enlistments in the armed forces, etc.

These shipyards appreciate the work your organization has been doing in the past and thank you for your continued cooperation.

Very truly yours,
RICHMOND SHIPYARDS, NOS.
1 AND 2, OF THE PERMANENT
METALS CORPORATION,
RICHMOND SHIPYARDS, NOS.
3 AND 3-A, OF KAISER CO., INC.,
JAMES C. EGAN,
Director of Labor Relations.

CONSOLIDATED AIRCRAFT
CORPORATION, FORT WORTH DIVISION,
Fort Worth, Tex., August 12, 1942.
Mr. J. C. KELLAM,
Regional Administrator,
National Youth Administration,
Austin, Tex.

DEAR MR. KELLAM: Consolidated Aircraft Corporation is now faced with a critical shortage of new employees, and schools in this area anticipate an early lack of potential trainees. For this reason we feel that every effort should be made to reinitiate negotiations for the establishment of a National Youth Administration resident youth center in this area.

We understand from Mr. John B. Manning that it might be possible to bring into Fort Worth prefabricated buildings which could be used as a "hold over" station, and that youths from other National Youth Administration centers in the State could be brought here and housed until they receive their first pay check from Consolidated and find permanent living quarters.

I would like to ask that you give serious consideration to this proposal, and that every effort be made to work out some arrangement with the local schools for sponsorship of this plan.

Very truly yours,
CONSOLIDATED AIRCRAFT CORPORATION,
FORT WORTH DIVISION,
VAN A. FRANCE,
Educational Supervisor.

HIGGINS INDUSTRIES, INC.,
New Orleans, December 1, 1942.
Mr. C. O. EMMERICH,
Regional Personnel Officer,
National Youth Administration,
Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR MR. EMMERICH: I visited the National Youth Administration resident unit in Hattiesburg, Miss., and talked to Mr. Deen

about the possibility of our using your resident unit in an allocated training program for Higgins Industries in New Orleans, La.

He suggested that I write you about the possibility of expanding to four shifts on the training facilities and of peak capacity in youth recruits to be used by Higgins Industries after they are trained by the National Youth Administration.

I hope it will be possible to use the four resident units over the entire State of Mississippi to their fullest capacity on this allocated training program for specific wartime production at Higgins Industries.

I am assured that the United States Employment Service and Higgins can recruit sufficient numbers of youth to fill these four units provided you will accept and make room for them.

The organization of the aviation plant of Higgins is now taking place and we expect to use 20,000 women in the construction and assembly of planes. I hope that you will be able to house and train at least 2,000 youths for us by March, which is the time they will be needed.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Mr. J. C. Flowers, of Jackson, Miss., and I can proceed no further until I know what you both will be able to do in this wartime training program. Please let me hear from you at your earliest opportunity.

Yours very truly,
HIGGINS INDUSTRIES, INC.,
(MRS.) SALOME D. SEVIER,
Coordinator of Vocational Training.

PARACHUTE CO. OF UTAH,
Manti, Utah, August 11, 1942.

Mr. AUBREY WILLIAMS,
National Youth Administrator,
National Youth Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: It has come to our attention that the National Youth Administration sewing project at Ephraim, Utah, is about to be discontinued. We feel that this project has made a definite contribution to national defense, and the purpose of this letter is to ascertain whether there is not some way of continuing its valuable work.

The Parachute Co. of Utah, a subcontractor for Standard Parachute Corporation, of San Diego, was organized solely for, and is engaged exclusively in, the manufacture of parachutes and parachute spare parts for the United States Army and Navy. When this company came to Utah about the 1st of May the only women in southern Utah who were familiar with power sewing were those who had been trained in the National Youth Administration sewing project at Ephraim. Each week the National Youth Administration has sent us some prospective employees with a basic knowledge of power sewing. Some of the best operators we have on our pay roll at the present time are young women who were originally trained in power sewing on the National Youth Administration sewing machines. We find that a woman who has had experience on a power machine has mastered the first step in parachute making, i. e., overcoming fear of the machine.

This company made its first shipment of parachutes to the United States Army on June 17. In the 8 weeks since that time we have shipped 1,600 parachutes, 895 harness assemblies, and 300 spare packs. This, of course, is just a small beginning. The State of Utah is presently constructing a State armory building in Manti, to be occupied exclusively by the Parachute Co. of Utah. This building is 8 times larger than the building we are now occupying and in which we are now running 3 shifts per day, employing approximately 300 women. With the completion of the new building, our total personnel requirements will be around 800 women.

If the National Youth Administration project were discontinued, we feel that we would lose a very valuable source of personnel. We believe that the Federal Government could make no better contribution toward national defense in this community than by continuing to train young women in power sewing. The industry is here to employ them when they have completed their training with the National Youth Administration. It is the only defense industry within a radius of 100 miles and it is doing a 100-percent war job.

We respectfully seek your cooperation in maintaining the National Youth Administration sewing project at Ephraim, Utah.

Very truly yours,
PARACHUTE CO. OF UTAH,
By M. J. BROWN.

The following two letters are from representatives of Government services on the value of National Youth Administration training:

UNITED STATES MARITIME SERVICE,
ENROLLING OFFICE,
Minneapolis, Minn., August 20, 1942.

Mr. C. B. LUND,
Administrator, National Youth
Administration, Regional Office,
St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR SIR: During the last several months a number of radio trainees from your shops have enrolled in the Maritime Service after receiving basic training in your shop.

Additional trainees are needed and because of the continued demand for radio operators we shall appreciate if you will refer youth to our agency from your radio shops in Duluth, Minn.; Warren, Minn.; Sand Lake, S. Dak.; Fargo, N. Dak.; and other radio shops operated by our agency in this region.

Sincerely yours,
O. P. SWENSON,
Boatswain, United States Coast Guard,
Enrolling Officer.

ASSEMBLY AND REPAIR DEPARTMENT,
UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS AIR STATIONS,
Quantico, Va., October 16, 1942.

Mr. J. P. ROYER,
Youth Personnel Officer, Manassas
War Production Training Project,
National Youth Administration.

DEAR MR. ROYER: Up to the present time we have placed 38 girls in our overhaul shops, who have received their training at the National Youth Administration school in Manassas.

These young ladies are working in the engine-overhaul, metal-spray and bake-enamel shop, machine shop, instrument shop, accessory shop, carburetor shop, metalsmith shop, and erection shop.

To date they are all getting along fine and the quality of their work is very satisfactory.

We hope that in the future you will be able to continue to supply us with such well-trained shop personnel.

Sincerely,
R. J. BRITTEN,
Second Lieutenant,
Unites States Marine Corps,
Personnel Officer.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I make the request that I be allowed to file a statement of my individual views upon the National Youth Administration if, after reading the report, which I have not had an opportunity to read, I think I should state a different viewpoint.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring amendment of the Federal Motor Carrier Act, 1935 (now pt. II of the Interstate Commerce Act); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. WALSH on the 20th instant, p. 4646, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A memorial of the Legislature of Florida; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Memorial 8

"Memorial requesting Congress to continue the appropriation for the work of the Farm Security Administration

"Whereas the Farm Security Administration is rendering a much-needed service to a great underprivileged class of our citizens; and

"Whereas no other agency, either governmental or private, will probably assume the task of elevating this large group to financial stability and responsible citizenship; and

"Whereas the need for more and more food and related farm produce will be best served by continuing this worthy agency: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida,* That the Congress of the United States of America in its wisdom continue the appropriations for the activities of the Farm Security Administration; be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this memorial under the great seal of the State of Florida be immediately forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and copies be forwarded to the delegation representing the State of Florida in both the House and Senate of the United States Congress; be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this memorial be spread upon the journal in both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Florida, and that sufficient copies be furnished to the press.

"Approved by the Governor May 20, 1943."

A memorial of the Legislature of Florida; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

"House Memorial 3

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States, requesting that provision be made for the establishment of a national monument at the site of Fort Caroline at St. Johns Bluff, on the south side of the St. Johns River, about 5 miles from the mouth of said river

"Whereas St. Johns Bluff and the area immediately adjacent thereto is of tremendous historical interest, yet has been ignored and neglected by United States Government, for some inexplicable reason; and

"Whereas this was the site of Fort Caroline, a colony and fortification established by the French in 1564, was the birthplace of the first Protestant white child on the North American Continent, was the site of the first battle between the armed forces of two European nations in the New World, when the Spaniards, under Pedro Menendez, captured the fort, killing most of the French garrison, and of the battle 2 years later when the French, under DeGourgues, recaptured the fort, killing most of the Spanish garrison, and it is probably the only spot in the United States which was actually fortified by five different nations, France, Spain, England, the Confederate States of America, and the United States of America; and

"Whereas this site is a place of great natural beauty: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida,* That the Congress of the United

States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to establish the Fort Caroline National Monument at St. Johns Bluff, in Duval County, Fla., as a part of the post-war program for recreational centers; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, and to each of Florida's Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Director of the National Park Service, and to each member of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, said copies to be under the great seal of the State of Florida.

"Approved by the Governor May 17, 1943."

A memorial of the Legislature of Florida; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Memorial 10

"Memorial endorsing the bill that has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress providing for the relief of Floridians who suffered loss in the campaign to eradicate the Mediterranean fruitfly in 1929

"Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress a bill providing for the relief of Floridians who suffered loss in the campaign to eradicate the Mediterranean fruitfly in 1929; and

"Whereas it is just and equitable that the persons who suffered loss as aforesaid should be compensated for such loss; and

"Whereas such relief should be provided by an act of the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

"SECTION 1. That the Legislature of the State of Florida does hereby unanimously endorse the bill that has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress for the relief of Floridians who suffered loss in the campaign to eradicate the Mediterranean fruitfly in 1929 and requests the Members of Congress to enact the same into law.

"SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Florida Members of Congress.

"Approved by the Governor May 17, 1943."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 46

"Joint resolution relative to repair facilities and materials for agricultural machinery and implements

"Whereas the production of a sufficient food supply is essential to the continued health of the Nation and its successful prosecution of the war; and

"Whereas such production cannot be maintained unless necessary farm machinery and equipment is kept in working condition; and

"Whereas shops devoted to the repair of such machinery and equipment are being forced out of operation because of inability to get supplies: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress and President of the United States and the War Priorities Board are memorialized to make such laws, rules, or orders as may be necessary to make available to shops engaged in the repair of farm machinery adequate supplies of welding rod, acetylene, oxygen, and other essential materials; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is requested to forward copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California, and to the members of the War Priorities Board."

A resolution of the Assembly of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Resolution 289

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact necessary legislation to permit the reuse of bottles used as containers of alcoholic beverages

"Whereas under the provisions of Federal law the reuse of bottles containing bonded alcoholic beverages is prohibited, and compliance with the Federal laws requires a complete destruction of bottles used for the purpose of containing alcoholic beverages once filled and stamped; and

"Whereas replacement of bottles so destroyed constitutes an extravagance and waste of essential manpower, manufacturing equipment, production facilities and raw materials that would be of inestimable value in production for war; and

"Whereas the Federal legislation is designed and intended to protect Federal revenue under internal-revenue statutes and adequate provision to safeguard such revenue could be made without the necessity of destruction of containers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the House of the State of California hereby respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to so amend the provisions of the Federal law to permit for the duration of the war the reuse of bottles used for the purpose of containing alcoholic beverages; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States are respectfully requested to urge the legislation set forth in this resolution."

A resolution of the Assembly of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Resolution 232

"Relative to the Post-war International Economic and Food Conference

"Whereas the State Department of the Government of the United States has announced that a Conference of the United Nations will be held at Hot Springs, Va., on Tuesday, May 18, to discuss, study, and plan the problems of freedom from want, post-war interests, in full employment, free enterprise, the lightening of government controls, relief of devastated countries, international currency arrangements and trade reciprocity; and

"Whereas this recital of the agenda of the Food and Economic Conference marks it as one of the greatest national and international importance and of paramount interest to the world and to the people of the United States; and

"Whereas 42 nations have been invited to send representatives to this noted conference; and

"Whereas it has been declared by those in charge of the arrangements for the holding of the said conference that all representatives of the press will be barred from attendance at all meetings of the conference: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the members of the assembly protest the closing of the conference to representatives of the press as undemocratic, declare it to be a breach of the American principle of freedom of the press, deplore it as a reversion to star chamber procedures and an infringement of the right of a free people to know in full and complete detail the daily happenings of this world-important conference; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk be directed to prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President, Vice President, and Secretary of State of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and each Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Assembly Concurrent Resolution 56

"Concurrent resolution relative to settlement of Jewish refugees in Palestine

"Whereas the intolerable sufferings of the Jewish people in Europe at the hands of the ruthless dictators of the Axis Powers make an irresistible appeal to the Christian world and to the enlightened conscience of the United Nations, and make clear the need for a home land where stricken and persecuted Jewish people may settle in peace; and

"Whereas the favor with which Great Britain viewed the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people was evidenced by the Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917; and

"Whereas the United States of America expressed concurrence in this policy by joint congressional resolution adopted on June 30, 1922, and by the provisions of the Anglo-American Treaty of December 2, 1924: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California (the senate thereof concurring), That we favor the continued establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine and its further development for the absorption of as many Jewish refugees as may be called for by the exigencies of the situation be commended to the considered judgment of the United Nations, not only as an act of justice to the Jewish people, but as an integral part of a new democratic world order in which every people shall have the right to self-government and self-determination in accordance with the principles, to perpetuate which we are now engaged in the fiercest struggle of all time; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to Senators WAGNER and MCNARY, co-chairmen of the American Palestine Committee, and to the British Embassy in Washington for transmission to the proper authorities in London, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 19

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing and petitioning Congress to enact legislation giving to draftees and others entering the military and naval service of the United States adequate insurance protection for themselves in the form of permanent total disability insurance as well as life-insurance protection

"Whereas from 1919 up to and including October 8, 1940, persons entering the military and naval service of the United States were given the privilege of applying for United States Government (converted) life insurance, including the permanent total disability features thereof, which protected the soldier himself; and

"Whereas Congress in the passage of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940,

approved October 8, 1940, provided in section 611 of said act that "No United States Government life insurance shall be granted hereafter to any person under the provisions of section 300 of the World War Veterans Act of 1924, as amended"; and

"Whereas the National Service Life Insurance Act does not provide permanent total disability benefit features or protection for the soldier himself and protects only the dependents and near relatives of the soldier; and

"Whereas it is estimated that 90 percent of those now in the military and naval service are without dependents and therefore not in need of such insurance but are in need of insurance with permanent total disability features protecting the soldier himself; and

"Whereas experience during and since the World War has adequately proved and demonstrated the merits of permanent total disability features of Government insurance, particularly as relates to the so-called misconduct cases, which are noncompensable for both compensation and pension, thereby taking care of these unfortunates who would otherwise be thrown upon local communities for care and sustenance; and

"Whereas it appears that in the passage of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, including section 611 thereof, which prevented further application for United States Government life insurance with total permanent disability features thereof, those persons, including National Guard units entering Federal service after October 8, 1940, were discriminated against and were denied the privilege of taking out United States Government (converted) life insurance with permanent total disability features thereof, whereas those persons, including National Guard units entering Federal service prior to October 8, 1940, were allowed and permitted to take out such insurance; and

"Whereas we believe in order to give to every commissioned officer and enlisted man and every member of the Army Nurse Corps (female) and the Navy Nurse Corps (female), when employed in active service under the War Department or Navy Department, proper protection for themselves and their dependents, the United States should again permit such persons, including draftees, the opportunity to apply for and be granted either national service life insurance or United States Government (converted) life insurance with permanent total disability features as now constituted: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby memorializes and petitions Congress to enact legislation which will provide that such persons so entering the military and naval service of the United States, including draftees, shall be given the opportunity of taking either national service life insurance or United States Government (converted) life insurance, at their option, including the permanent total disability features thereof; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this joint resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, and to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, and that the Senators and Representatives representing the State of California in Congress be urged actively to support such legislation."

A resolution of the Assembly of California; to the Committee on the Library:

"House Resolution 226

"Resolution relative to the Spirit of Freedom Monument as designed by Mr. Amos A. Wyckoff

"Whereas the flag of the United States of America and the Liberty Bell are symbols of the highest American ideals; and

"Whereas no monument has been erected to personify the ideals and spirit for which the American flag and the Liberty Bell are fitting emblems; and

"Whereas one Amos A. Wyckoff, of Oakland, has designed a monument which is known as Spirit of Freedom, which would be a most fitting, imposing, and inspiring memorial to the people of the United States, and which monument is more particularly described as follows:

"1. The 13 steps represent the Thirteen Colonies.

"2. There are 48 columns, 1 to represent each State.

"3. The gear wheel represents the power of our United States.

"4. There are 48 cogs, 1 for each State in the Union, to represent the power of each State. Inside each cog will be the exhibit room for each State.

"5. Between each cog there will be placed a statue of the pioneers who fought their way here to make it possible for our people to live.

"6. The building is constructed of four cross-like sections with niches in which to place statues.

"7. On top of the building will be the statue of the California bear.

"8. Facing the east will be a statue of the first mother of California, holding a child, which represents as the sun rises the newborn is coming to light.

"9. Facing the west will be a statue of the first emigrant scout to California.

"10. The Liberty Bell forms the dome. Inside the dome will be the paintings of war scenes. Also a statue of the man who rang the Liberty Bell so hard he cracked it

"11. Then comes the tower rising to a great height of approximately 800 feet. In this tower will be elevators running to the observation room, where visitors will pay a small fee to have a view of beautiful cities and surrounding area, as well as the beautiful blue Pacific Ocean. The income can be used for the upkeep.

"12. On the top of the tower will be a powerful light for protection and guidance of airplanes.

"13. Four large American eagles, representing the keenness of vision of our United States will face the north, south, east, and west. The eagles, to be outlined in neon lights, are guarding the American flag, which is flying high over their heads.

"14. On the point of each cog shall be a duplicate of each State seal.

"Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the members of this assembly hereby commend Mr. Amos A. Wyckoff as the originator and designer of the artistic and symbolic 'Spirit of Freedom'; and be it further

"Resolved, That the members of this assembly do recommend the construction of this symbolic monument on a suitable site to any commission for post-war reconstruction or planning as a project worthy of their most careful consideration; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be instructed to prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to any commission for post-war reconstruction or planning and to the commission in charge of the celebration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the State of California, as a project worthy of their most careful consideration, to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and each Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States and to the aforesaid Mr. Amos A. Wyckoff, of Oakland, Calif."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; to the Committee on Immigration:

"Assembly Joint Resolution No. 45

"Joint resolution relative to facilitating the employment of Mexican citizens in agriculture

"Whereas the United States of America is sorely in need of skilled agricultural labor and has entered into arrangements with the Government of the Republic of Mexico for permitting its citizens to engage in agricultural pursuits in the United States; and

"Whereas, there reside within close proximity of the borders of California and other States bordering upon the Republic of Mexico, a large number of citizens of the Republic of Mexico who, if existing governmental arrangements permitted, could either continue to reside in Mexico and work in the United States, or reside intermittently in the United States for agricultural purposes; and

"Whereas existing regulations governing recruitment of Mexican citizens for agricultural labor in the United States require application for such work in Mexico City; and

"Whereas, The President of the United States on Tuesday, March 30, 1943, stated that importation of Mexican agricultural workers was one of three means of relieving the farm labor shortage in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, and Hon. Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator of the United States of America, be and they are hereby memorialized to enter into negotiations which will, for the duration of the current emergency, permit the citizens of Mexico residing in proximity to the borders of the United States to enter the United States freely for the purpose of engaging in agricultural pursuits, without the necessity of making application personally in Mexico City; and be it further

"Resolved, That Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, and the Honorable Earl G. Harrison, Director of Immigration, be and they are hereby requested to make such adjustment in the immigration regulations of the United States as will, for the duration of the current emergency, facilitate the free ingress and egress of such Mexican citizens for the purpose of engaging in agricultural pursuits; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, to Hon. Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator, to Hon. Earl G. Harrison, Director of Immigration and Naturalization, and to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Assembly of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Resolution 257

"Resolution relating to the return of gold mines to partial production

"Whereas the complete stoppage of gold mining is resulting in the destruction in the economic life of the communities engaged primarily in this industry; and

"Whereas if the industry were permitted to continue on a limited scale during the war, an income sufficient to defray taxes and maintain essential businesses could be produced; and

"Whereas under such conditions of partial production the existence of the communities located in the gold-mining areas could be continued to the benefit of their residents and of the State in general: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Congress and the President of the United States and the War Production Board are memorialized to make

such laws, rules, or order as may be necessary to provide for the return of the gold mines of this State to partial production during the continuance of the war; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is requested to forward copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California, and to the Chairman of the War Production Board."

A resolution of the Assembly of California; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"House Resolution 284

"Resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact S. 971 or H. R. 2426, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, providing for Federal participation in financing of a post-war highway construction program

"Whereas two measures are pending in the Congress of the United States, namely, S. 971 and H. R. 2426, to authorize Federal assistance to the States in financing a post-war construction program on rural and urban highways; and

"Whereas such legislation is designed to, and will, provide useful employment for those returning from services in the armed forces, or released by war industries after the war, and will, accordingly, tend to prevent unemployment and the necessity for unemployment relief; and

"Whereas necessary wartime restrictions on gasoline and highway transportation have resulted in curtailment of revenues received by the highway departments of the States, and restrictions on use of materials have curtailed construction and reconstruction of needed highways during a period in which many highways have been damaged by heavy wartime truck traffic, engaged in transportation for the war effort; and

"Whereas such legislation will assist the States in bringing their highway systems and their highway construction programs back to normal, and in making up the time lost due to necessary deferment of highway construction during the war; and

"Whereas there will be particular need to provide employment in California, following the war, due to the large number of war industries in this State; and

"Whereas there will be particular need in California for reconstruction of highways due to such war conditions: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California*, That the Congress of the United States be, and the same is hereby, memorialized to enact either S. 971 or H. R. 2426; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk shall transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the chairman of the House Committee on Roads, and to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from California."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of California; ordered to lie on the table:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 44

"Joint resolution relative to the appointment of the Honorable Jesse Tapp as Assistant to the Food Administrator of the United States

"Whereas the State of California has been called upon to increase its agricultural production goals during 1943 although it is faced with an agricultural labor supply which is less than that available in 1942; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has appointed the Honorable Chester C. Davis as Food Administrator with the duty, among others, of obtaining adequate agricultural labor for this year's crops; and

"Whereas the Honorable Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator, has appointed the Honorable Jesse Tapp as his assistant, thereby recognizing the need of having in Washington, someone familiar with the problems of western agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Honorable Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator, be commended for his recognition of the problems of western agriculture in appointing the Honorable Jesse Tapp as his assistant; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Honorable Jesse Tapp be congratulated upon his selection for this important assignment; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to Hon. Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator, to Hon. Jesse Tapp, Assistant to the Food Administrator, to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. ELLENDER:

A resolution of the Central Labor Union, of Bogalusa, La., favoring a Congressional investigation relative to the present activities and affiliations of Capt. Edward V. Rickenbacker; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A letter signed by J. Howard Rusco, secretary-manager of the Kansas Press Association, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1073 relating to payment for advertising the defense program in daily and weekly newspapers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—PROTEST AGAINST AMENDMENT OF PENDING MEASURE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a telegram in the nature of a memorial which I have received from Mrs. Howard Naylor, legislative chairman of the Kansas League of Women Voters, Topeka, Kans., opposing any changes in the present trade agreements program.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., *May 19, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Kansas League of Women Voters opposes any alteration in present trade-agreement program. Feel Taft proposal neither needed nor necessary. Please vote against this proposal and any such damaging amendments.

KANSAS LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
Mrs. HOWARD NAYLOR,
Legislative Chairman.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 249. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; with an amendment.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 131. A bill to provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 262).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

H. R. 2664. A bill to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 263).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on May 20, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 649. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska relating to the waters of the Republican River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote flood control in the basin, and for other purposes; and

S. 1041. A bill to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1124. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to provide for the establishment of a uniform classification and uniform scale of class rates for railroad freight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. MEAD):

S. 1125. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, for the purpose of clarifying its provisions with respect to its application to certain officers in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 1126. A bill for the relief of the city of Grand Forks, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1127. A bill for the relief of the Washington Park Yacht Club; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1128. A bill to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

S. 1129. A bill to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah introduced Senate bill 1130, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LODGE introduced Senate bill 1131, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1132. A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 so as to provide for the payment of a uniform gratuity to certain officers recalled to active duty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], I introduce a joint resolution

giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky, establishing a boundary between those two States.

By Mr. WILLIS (for himself, Mr. VAN NUYS, Mr. BARKLEY, and Mr. CHANDLER):

S. J. Res. 62, Joint resolution giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky establishing a boundary between said State and said Commonwealth; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

PROVISION FOR CARE OF CHILDREN AND MOTHERS IN UNITED STATES WAR AREAS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I introduce a bill and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. I make this request because if the bill shall be considered, it will be considered in connection with the Hayden bill on the same subject, which the Committee on Education and Labor is now considering.

The bill (S. 1130) to provide for care of children of mothers employed in war areas in the United States, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS ALLOWANCE ACT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 so as to provide for an increase of 15 percent in the amount of the Government's contribution to the dependents of enlisted men entitled to family allowance under this act.

Under my bill an enlisted man with a wife but no child would receive $32.20 from the Government instead of $28 as is now the case. If he has a wife and one child he would receive $46 from the Federal Government instead of $40 as is now the case.

The Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 became a law on June 23, 1942, and the rates prescribed in that bill have not been changed since that time.

On the other hand, many things have happened since that time which imperatively indicate the need for increasing the rate:

First, there has been an increase in living costs recognized by the President in his message to the President of the Senate on December 11, 1942, wherein he stated:

> The Government of the United States, which is the largest single employer in the Nation, has permitted a condition to develop regarding rates of pay, hours of work, and overtime compensation, for its civilian employees, which is grossly unfair.
>
> It is * * * a bad situation and should be avoided.

Secondly, this increase in living costs has been recognized by the Congress in its passage of legislation increasing the pay of Federal employees. One of these acts applying to the overtime compensation of Government employees as a whole was approved May 7, 1943, and another providing additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service was approved April 9, 1943. Furthermore, in the monthly report of employment by the United States Civil Service Commission for March 1943, it is shown that the average monthly salary as of March 31, 1943, has increased 15.4 percent over the salary paid in June 1942. In fact, the average monthly salary for June 1942 was $160.11 and for March 31, 1943, it was $184.77. This is an increase of $24.66 or 15.4 percent.

Thirdly, indications multiply that the number of dependents of servicemen who are receiving various forms of public assistance is growing. I am advised that in Massachusetts, for example, in the period from September 1941, to June 1942, there were 33 aid-to-dependent-children cases attributable to the fact that the father had entered the service. A survey of general relief cases undertaken in May 1942, listed 78 families with members in the service. On the other hand, in March 15 of 1943 a report covering 90 percent of the State, listed 1,481 cases of servicemen's dependents receiving it as follows: 616, old-age assistance; 446, aid to dependent children; 419, general relief.

Fourthly, we have the statements of every responsible public authority that the rate of induction of men with dependents will increase in the near future and we have, therefore, not only the justification afforded by the increase in living costs, the action of the Federal Government in the case of its own employees, and the experience in my own State of Massachusetts, but we have also the duty of exercising common ordinary foresight in meeting a situation which is sure to arise in the near future when the number of servicemen's dependents is greatly increased.

This bill does not change the present law in any way except insofar as the rates are concerned. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I hope that prompt action may be taken so as to avoid unnecessary suffering. Congress has established the principle that, of all men, the serviceman should be the least troubled by family distress at the very moment that he is risking his own life for his country. We must keep faith with that policy, and we cannot keep faith if the rates are not maintained on a basis which is adequate to do the tasks to which we are committed.

The bill (S. 1131) to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, so as to provide for an increase of 15 percent in the amount of the Government's contribution to the dependents of enlisted men entitled to family allowances under such act, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 2713. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2719. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2753. An act making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WHEELER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, in the item for investigation of raw material resources for western steel production (national defense), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 78, line 8, to strike out "$149,000" and insert in lieu thereof, "$300,000."

UNUSED-LEAVE COMPENSATION TO MEMBERS OR FORMER MEMBERS OF CAPITOL POLICE FORCE ENTERING ARMED FORCES

Mr. MEAD submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives are authorized to pay from the contingent funds of the Senate and the House of Representatives, upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Capitol Police Board, to members or former members of the Capitol Police force entering the armed forces, such sums as may be necessary to reimburse them for unused leave accumulated under regulations of the Capitol Police Board while serving as members of the Capitol Police Force assigned to duty in the Capitol Building.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 153), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That, until otherwise provided, the Committee on Claims is authorized to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $3,600 per annum, and Senate Resolution No. 18, agreed to January 23, 1939, is hereby repealed.

REAR ADMIRAL CHARLES E. ROSENDAHL

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on Thursday last, while I was unavoidably absent from the Senate Chamber, the Senate confirmed the nomination of Capt. Charles E. Rosendahl to be a rear admiral in the Navy. The nomination had been sent to the Senate by the President and approved by the Committee on Naval Affairs. If I had been in the Chamber when the nomination was reached on the Calendar I would have made a statement relative to Captain Rosendahl's service in the Navy, and particularly in connection with his experience with lighter-than-air craft.

Capt. Charles E. Rosendahl, United States Navy, Washington, D. C., a veteran of 20 years lighter-than-air experience, has been promoted to the rank of rear admiral, and has been assigned to duty as the first chief of naval airship training.

The new naval airship training command under his direction will combine all airship training under a single functional unit.

Headquarters of the new command will be located at the Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, N. J., and the command will also include the experimental and flight-test department and the training center. In addition, the command will cover the naval airship training center at Moffett Field, Calif., and such other units as may be assigned by the Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

Requirements for airship-training candidates are as follows: Cadets must be between 18 and 27 years old, unmarried, American citizens of 10 years standing, graduate of an accredited high school, and meet physical and other general requirements identical with heavier-than-air standards. Officer candidates must be of rank of lieutenant, junior grade, under 31 years of age, must have had at least 1 year of sea duty as an officer in the Navy or merchant marine, and must meet the same physical requirements as those established for cadets.

The contribution of blimps to the present system of safely escorting merchant vessels has resulted in sharp expansion of procurement and training since early in the war. Acquisition of a fleet of 200 of the airships was authorized by the Congress, and training activities were increased proportionately.

At present pilot courses are 4 months long; enlisted courses last 3 months. This represents a shortening and intensification of the peacetime courses. Upon successful completion of training cadets are commissioned ensigns, while enlisted men are designated either chief aviation pilot or aviation pilot, first class.

Captain Rosendahl, who has just returned from a 7-month tour of duty in the Pacific, was born in Chicago May 15, 1892. He was graduated from the Naval Academy in 1914, and trained as a naval aviator—airship—7 years later. He was navigator of the rigid airship U. S. S. *Shenandoah,* and was senior surviving officer when that dirigible crashed in 1925. With six others, he free-ballooned the forward section safely to the ground.

He later became commanding officer of the dirigible U. S. S. *Los Angeles* for 3 years, followed by 1 year as commander, Rigid Airship Training and Experimental Squadron. In 1928 he observed trials of the German airship *Graf Zeppelin,* and made the first North Atlantic crossing in that ship. In 1929 he was a guest aboard the *Graf Zeppelin* during its world cruise. He became commanding officer of the U. S. S. *Akron,* a rigid dirigible, which later was lost. He was commanding officer of the Lakehurst Naval Air Station during the 1936 North Atlantic operations of the German airship *Hindenburg,* and also when that airship was consumed by hydrogen fire on May 6, 1937. He is the author of several books and articles on the airship.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, our able Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, has made a very effective statement regarding the Danaher amendment to the bill relating to trade agreements and as I concur in his expressions, I wish to ask that his statement be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks, along with an article by Mr. Arthur Krock published in the New York Times.

I also ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an address on the subject of trade agreements, delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

There being no objection, the statement, article, and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

The Danaher amendment relates to the following provision of the existing Trade Agreements Act:

"Every foreign trade agreement concluded pursuant to this act shall be subject to the termination, upon due notice to the foreign government concerned, at the end of not more than 3 years from the date upon which the agreement comes into force, and if not then terminated, shall be subject to termination thereafter upon not more than 6 months' notice.

The trade-agreements program is a cooperative undertaking between the Congress and the executive branch of the Government, having for its purpose the carrying out within definite Congressional instructions and limitations of the policy prescribed by Congress.

Congress, of course, may at any time terminate any part or all of the authority entrusted to the executive department under the existing cooperative arrangement necessary for carrying out the trade-agreements policy. The suggestion by some that the Danaher amendment would not affect the power of Congress is wholly beside the point. Everyone knows that the power of Congress would not be affected. The real and the dangerous point is that the proposed amendment would give notice to the world that 6 months after the termination of the war it, Congress, may wipe out all of the existing 29 trade agreements by joint resolution. This notice of such possibility or probability naturally creates at home and abroad a state of doubt and uncertainty as to the future life of all trade agreements, and in fact of the entire trade-agreements policy itself. Such destruction of the trade agreements would restore automatically the original rates of the Hawley-Smoot Act, and head this and other nations away from international economic cooperation and straight back to the narrowest policies of economic nationalism, with serious effects upon both the domestic and international situations.

[From the New York Times]

DANAHER PLAN MENACES OUR TRADE-PACT POLICY—DEFENDERS OF SECRETARY HULL'S PROGRAM WARN INNOCENT-SOUNDING CLAUSE COULD SCUTTLE LEGISLATIVE SHIP — OLD HIGH-TARIFF DANGER RISES

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 22.—The amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, sponsored by Senator DANAHER, of Connecticut, and affixed to the statute in committee by a combination of Republicans and Democrats, is the most innocent-appearing paragraph that was ever devised to scuttle a legislative ship or cut a legislative throat. It seems merely to state the obvious, to emphasize the coordinate powers of Congress in a time when popular opinion favors the reassertion of these powers after a long period of prodigal loans to the Executive.

The Danaher amendment, so far as its language goes, simply provides that the President, or Congress by joint resolution, 6 months after the President proclaims the end of the war may terminate any trade agreement entered into between the United States and any other nation.

Congress, of course, always possesses the power to repeal all or any part of a statute, and this includes the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Congress may pass such a statute one day and repeal it the next, and one Congress cannot bind another. Although a repeal in this form would not necessarily disturb the legal tenure of agreements previously made, its effect would be to kill them in operation and prevent the making of any others. This being so, what is the real purpose of the Danaher amendment, and why did Secretary Hull and Chairman GEORGE of the Senate Finance Committee unite in the statement that it will emasculate the entire trade-agreements program?

ANSWER TO THE ISSUE

The answer, by the consensus of those who have been most active in making the pacts with other countries, is simple and easily demonstrable:

1. There is an influential Republican group which has never accepted the theory of the Hull agreements and hopes to return after the war, to that economic nationalism, best expressed in the Smoot-Hawley tariff law, which many charge with large responsibility in bringing on the present conflict between the have and have-not nations. This group is counting on a Republican victory in 1944 and wishes to be ready to junk the reciprocal agreements program and the 29 pacts already made. The Danaher amendment provides the means to do this when and if the opportunity arises.

2. There are Democrats in Congress who, fearing the growth of Executive power and anxious to weaken it against the fourth-term drive, seize upon any chance that presents itself to delimit that power. Their support of the Danaher amendment is not aimed at Secretary Hull or his economic policies; it is a blow at the scope of Executive authority.

3. Mr. Hull's program is not unpopular in Congress, and the Secretary himself enjoys more respect and admiration, and wields more influence at the Capitol than any other member of the administration. Therefore, a frontal attack on his Trade Agreements Act would fail. Accordingly, the Danaher amendment was fixed on to accomplish the same eventual purpose, but on the flank and in disguise.

PERIL TO WHOLE PROGRAM

4. Its adoption would emasculate the program because (a) it would be undoubtedly taken as notice by 29 nations, some of them partners in the war against the Axis, that a change in the party control of the United States Government would mean the end of the program. (b) This would be tantamount to notifying them that, as soon as the war is won with their help, the most powerful economic nation in the world intends to return to the Smoot-Hawley policy. (c) That would mean the restoration of embargo rates against these nations, calling for restoration on their part of the barriers and other discriminations against our exports which Mr. Hull through his agreements has gradually been eliminating. The world would go back to the economic policies of the early 1930's.

5. So far as new agreements are concerned, if any can be negotiated during the war, the conferees would meet under a congressional sword of Damocles. That is not a very hopeful decoration for conference rooms. And meanwhile the existence of the Danaher amendment in the law would begin to sap

the vital qualities of the agreements now in operation.

That is the case which supporters of the Secretary and his program make against the Danaher amendment. This correspondent has put the case before the economic representatives of certain other nations, and they agree that the effects abroad would probably be as forecast.

In reply, advocates of the amendment say the post-war prospect is so uncertain that the United States should have an anchor to windward, that it should not leave itself bound to long-enduring reciprocal trade arrangements when these might prove disastrous to our national economy. They contend that the post-war prospect possibly includes a European trade union, organized against the United States, and that the Danaher amendment gives to the country a club in the closet.

ESCAPE CLAUSE

This would be persuasive in a hard-boiled way—despite its foundation on distrust of allies—if the trade agreements already entered into did not have a number of escape clauses and if all new pacts would not contain the same. These clauses are designed to meet any such conditions or emergencies as are envisioned in the post-war world. Congress put limits to the Executive power when it delegated the authority to make the agreements and required the very safeguards which have been erected. To reshape these provisions into a constantly suspended threat is to leave the impression that the threat is a fixed promise.

After the war the products of American farms and factories will be seeking foreign markets and production will be turned from the items of war to those of peace if the system of free enterprise continues. Instead of opening more doors abroad to these products, the Danaher amendment is a warning to the nations to close their doors before the United States can close its own. If the Hawley-Smoot law and the economic policy for which it was spokesman are sound and what the Nation wants to restore, then the Danaher amendment lays down a broad road on which to return to them. But if that law and policy are unsound and no longer wanted there is no good foundation for the amendment.

HOUSE COMMITTEE VIEW

In its report on renewing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act the Ways and Means Committee majority wrote:

"The testimony * * * from all sources is overwhelming on the side of viewing these very (post-war) uncertainties as one of the reasons which make it imperative that this act be given a clean-cut continuance. * * * Our interest is in doing all that we can do to make sure that post-war conditions are not permitted to lapse into chaos. Of course, there are uncertainties about many things in the post-war period. But the important point is that unless we and other like-minded nations take a position now on certain agreed policies, and establish procedures for making these policies effective, the uncertainties which we fear will become certainties of past sad experience."

The House cut down the extension of the act from 3 years to 2. That would seem to have been sufficient provision against unpredictable economic consequences of the war.

ADDRESS OF HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS, AT THE CONVENTION OF ILLINOIS POSTMASTERS, PEORIA, ILL., MAY 22, 1943

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a pleasure for me to leave for a few days the manifold responsibilities which are with me in the Nation's Capital at a time when free government is on trial.

I bring to you the greetings of the Honorable Frank Walker, Postmaster General of the United States, who through his wisdom, industry, and understanding, is doing a magnificent job in the handling of the mail in America's most trying and difficult period.

I should also like to take this opportunity to commend the postmasters, the postal clerks, and all of the postal employees of the country for the high degree of patriotism and the unusual skill they have manifested throughout the length and breadth of this land as they carry into execution the high resolve of national duty.

My friends, it must be crystal clear to the reasonable and prudent mind that America is moving through the most critical military, economic, and political period in all of her history. Many reasons can be assigned as to why this world at the moment is in such a state of flux and chaos. But anyone who is familiar with the economic policy of the world during the last two decades must necessarily conclude that blunder after blunder was made in the international economic field or the world would not be in the present critical condition.

The Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, was one of the first men to visualize the necessity of a complete change in the attitude of nations toward one another insofar as their economic policies are concerned.

Back in 1934 the Congress at his behest enacted what is known as the reciprocal trade program. These programs have been renewed by the Congress every 3 years since that time. The Hull reciprocal trade agreements fit hand in glove with the good-neighbor policy which was promulgated by this administration, both of which have been the basis of peace and understanding with our neighbors in Central and South America. Never in our 150 years of experience has our relationship with the countries south of the border been so encouraging and friendly as it is at this moment. You will recall prior to World War No. 1 that we were compelled to send our soldiers to the Mexican border. We were compelled to, to protect the Panama Canal. We had few friends anywhere in that part of the world, and that primarily was due to the dollar diplomacy of exploitation which had been the policy of this Nation for many decades.

It is my firm conviction that if in 1920 the reciprocal trade agreements or some compacts similar thereto had been the policy of this Nation and the policy of the world, World War No. 2 might have been averted. Under such a mutual arrangement and understanding, I seriously doubt that a maniac like Adolf Hitler could ever have reached the top in a nation like Germany.

This brief statement is preliminary to the discussion of current legislation and one of the most important problems insofar as the future of this country is concerned that has been considered by the Senate since the beginning of World War No. 2. Next week the Senate of the United States will vote "yes" or "no" on the continuation of reciprocal trade treaties. The continuation of these trade pacts is vital and necessary, if we are to have the international economic cooperation which is indispensable from the standpoint of the peace and prosperity of the world.

Before I proceed further, perhaps I should say that under no circumstances do I want you people to regard my remarks here as a political speech. Politics in this emergency insofar as I am concerned is out of the window. While you and I know that there will be primary and general elections next year, I submit with complete sincerity that the time is not apropos for either Democrats or Republicans to be talking from the public platform the political problems or probabilities of 1944. Every individual, regardless of his political affiliations, should have only one purpose in mind and that is the winning of the war at the earliest possible moment in order that our soldiers, sailors, and marines may return safely to their homes. The votes I have cast upon important measures before the United States Senate have been in line with what I conceive to be my duty as a public servant of the people of this great State.

My friends, you may wonder why I am discussing the reciprocal trade agreements tonight. There is only one reason and that is an amendment that was offered before the Finance Committee of the Senate on last week which seeks to terminate all present trade treaties 6 months after hostilities cease. As a member of the Finance Committee, I voted and spoke in the committee against this amendment. It was reported out favorably by a vote of 11 to 10, and next week the Senate will either approve or disapprove this amendment, which seeks to emasculate the trade agreements.

It should be remembered that the trade agreements have been in existence for 9 years. Congress has endorsed these agreements upon two different occasions after full and comprehensive debate. These trade pacts have demonstrated beyond the peradventure of a doubt that they are effective instruments for the promotion of international trade on a basis of fair dealing and nondiscrimination. This trade program which has proved sound in principle and operation is the basis for a stable economic, political, and peace structure in the post-war years. To write into the law now an amendment which means the emasculation of these trade treaties 6 months after hostilities cease is advising the world that we will retreat back to the high protective wall of abominable Hawley-Smoot tariff.

My friends, if that course is pursued, there will be in the future no economic stability from the world standpoint. There will be no stability from the standpoint of the military. There will be nothing but chaos and disorder that will lead to another world war within less than 20 years. Civilization cannot withstand the present global conflict without being seriously crippled for several generations to come, and if in the course of our reformation another world war should come, then there is nothing that can save humanity. Civilization will perish.

This new proposal to destroy the trade agreements comes from the Republican members of the Finance Committee. It would change the underlying law so that all agreements passed in the future would terminate at one time, 6 months after the present shooting stops. In my judgment this amendment is the most dangerous and destructive amendment that could be devised. Even though it may be repetition, may I say just a word or two more in detail about this delusive and deadly amendment.

The proposal comes to this: We are being asked to say, by legislative action, that we want arrangements made whereby all the trade agreements may be ended at one time. If this were followed out it would occur during the most critical period of post-war reconstruction. This proposal, if it became the law, would advise the world that we are thinking seriously of canceling them all at once, thereby abandoning all of the reductions in other countries' tariff rates which those countries have made at our request, and on our part returning to the Hawley-Smoot rates of 1930, and the added special rates of 1932. If this emasculatory amendment becomes a law, it would mean that our talk about international collaboration in trade matters, and the general good-neighbor policy of which trade collaboration is an absolutely necessary part, are good for the war only, and may be canceled just as soon as it is over. We are asked to confirm formally that what Hitler's radio has said all along is true: That we are getting ready to run out on our friends as soon as the shooting stops.

The adoption of this amendment would be pleasant music to the ears of the Axis groups. Through the power of the radio they would make the most of this amendment in attempting to disturb the pleasant and peaceful relationship we have with our neighbors to the south.

If there is any better way to start the break-up of the United Nations, so far as their alliance depends on trade collaboration, I don't know it.

What else will this proposed amendment do if we adopt it? It will force every other nation in the world, including all our present friends, to plan their post-war trade without us. Every nation has to make some plans for post-war trade. They can't avoid some action. If we announce that we will make no promises that are good beyond the war, they will have to plan to get along without us. What will they do then? What would we do if the situation were reversed? Everyone of them will try to work out an economy based upon its own resources, and on collaboration with such others as are willing to collaborate. There will be regional trade blocs, and intensified empire preference schemes, international cartels, and exclusive arrangements between groups of countries, all over the world, and we will be excluded, and it will be our own fault. What will our cotton and wheat farmers do then, or our hog raisers, or our manufacturers of export products, or our shipping people, or our aircraft industry? And what chance will there be of avoiding international rivalry and jealousy and imperialist schemes, with depression, unemployment, and another world war at the end of the road? I tell you this proposal is very far reaching and very damaging and very dangerous indeed.

Some Senators who may vote for this amendment naturally will not say that they are trying to destroy the program. They will say that conditions after the war are unpredictable and that they want to retain enough liberty of action to protect legitimate American interests from destructive competition. That is all right, but what an absurd way to do it.

Other Senators who have consistently and persistently been against the trade program from the beginning will say as one of the Republican Senators did in the Finance Committee the other day, "I never have been very strong for the trade agreements." Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, the distinguished chairman of the committee, replied: "This amendment you are now supporting certainly is proof of that."

The American people should know that every one of the agreements we have now was negotiated with great care. Every one of them can be changed if need be by renewed negotiation. Every one of them contains careful escape clauses for use in case of need. And if we should have to use these clauses, and the other country objected, we could nevertheless take the necessary action even if that meant terminating an agreement on relatively short notice, in no case more than 6 months. It is absurd to say that a general reservation of the right to cancel everything at once is necessary to protect us. It is not; its only real purpose can be to start the destruction of the program now and finish the job of wrecking it as soon as possible after the war.

You should know that at this very moment there are 31 of these trade agreements. Twenty-six of these trade agreements have been in existence over 3 years, and under the present terms of those agreements the executive branch of Government can terminate those agreements on a 6 months' notice. It should also be understood, and there is no dispute about the fact, that Congress still retains the power to terminate these trade agreements at any time. Even with these safeguards, nevertheless we have this backdoor amendment that seeks to destroy the far-reaching and constructive work which has been accomplished over a period of years through these trade pacts.

What this country needs in its international commercial policy is some conception of its own real national interests. It is time that we forgot the local rivalries and fears and prejudices which continuously hamstring us when we attempt to set up a consistent international position. The United States is a great and powerful country, and it has many powerful friends throughout the world. If we can show that we are willing to work in real collaboration with those friends, not just today in war, but afterward in peace, in the practical matters that affect our national prosperity and theirs, then there is real ground for hope that we may have a peaceful world when this war is over, and great prosperity at home. But if the Senate says next week, by adopting this amendment, that the United States plans to withdraw into its aconomic shell 6 months after the war ends, then we are headed straight for chaos.

The road is before us. We can either become the leading and dominant figure in the post-war planning, or we can forget the rest of the world, isolate ourselves, antagonize other nations by our refusal to cooperate, and ultimately find ourselves alone in a dislocated economic world. I submit that the bomber and the fighter plane have destroyed every hope and illusion that any nation in this small world can stand alone.

Therefore, my friends, as one of the Senators from Illinois, upon my return to Washington next week, I shall do everything within the limitations of my power to make the trade treaties effective by defeating this unworthy amendment. This great economic problem transcends all political lines. I am firmly convinced that the continuation of those treaties without change will serve as the real basis for the future peace, security, and prosperity of the world.

COL. ROBERT McCORMICK OF THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a newspaper article from the New York Times of May 19, 1943.

This unusual news story coming from the enemy through Tokyo radio beamed to the North American continent, vitally concerns the people of this hard-working, hard-fighting nation. The article portrays the admiration of the Japanese Government for Col. Robert McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Tribune.

We may rest assured that all such broadcasts have governmental sanction in Japan and that the Japanese war lords have no McCormicks opposing them or obstructing their war efforts.

All of us can well imagine what would happen to this type of publisher, publishing an obstructionist paper, say, in the city of Kobe. Kobe would be literally forced to do without his cosmic dissertations upon the issue of the day, the truth of the past and the low-down on tomorrow. Chicago newspapers have renamed Colonel McCormick—Colonel McCosmic.

It seems almost too good to be true in this cynical world that the foreign enemies of this nation should have, without tremendous expenditures of money and risk to the lives of those engaged in this sort of work, domestic enemies of this Government doing such a commendable job for them.

A newspaper in my own State of Pennsylvania headlined this same story with the words—"Hon. McCormick, Hon. Wonderful, says Tokyo." I ask to have that article included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks; and I further ask consent to have printed in the RECORD, as well, as a part of my remarks, an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of a later issue, entitled "The Japs Praise McCormick, Promoter of Disunity."

If the Honorable McCormick has any explanation to offer for this friendly gesture from Japan, I would be very pleased to put it in the RECORD any time he publishes it.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 18 and 19, 1943]

JAPAN LAUDS PLAN OF COLONEL McCORMICK—PUBLISHER'S IDEA TO HAVE UNITED STATES TAKE BRITISH EMPIRE HAILED

An English-language broadcast from Tokyo radio beamed to North America said yesterday that "Mr. McCormick's plan for the absorption by America of all the British countries may perhaps be the best plan to safeguard American interests," the Columbia Broadcasting System short-wave listening station reported. (Col. Robert McCormick is the owner of the Chicago Tribune.)

Excerpts of the talk follow:

"Just as you and I, Colonel McCormick * * * has both friends and enemies. His enemies brand him as a British-hating archisolationist, a publicity-thirsty megalomaniac. To his friends, however, Colonel McCormick is a man of independent will, a man of action, a fearless foe, ready to express himself regardless of consequences. I also assume there must be a group of neutrals who has no definite likes or dislikes about the colonel.

"At any rate, there is no doubt that Robert McCormick is an extremely charming character. I think America today needs many more characters like this Chicago veteran. You will recall that a little more than 3 weeks ago the fighting Chicago newspaper publisher declared that he would start a Nation-wide editorial campaign for the absorption by the United States of all the British countries.

"Remember that Colonel McCormick's Chicago Tribune has no less than 1,000,000 circulation. * * * Moreover, there is the possibility that other influential newspapers, such as the New York Daily News and the Washington Times-Herald also may join the colonel's annexation campaign. * * * They will have tremendous influence over the reading public."

HON. McCORMICK HON. WONDERFUL, SAYS RADIO TOKYO—AMERICA NEEDS MORE LIKE HIM, SAYS BROADCAST AIMED AT UNITED STATES

"Robert McCormick is an extremely charming character. I think America today needs many more characters like this Chicago veteran."

Tokyo radio speaking. And complimenting the owner of the Chicago Tribune for his editorial suggestion that the United States absorb all British countries.

PLAN WINS JAP PRAISE

An English-language broadcast beamed to North America Sunday by Tokyo radio said the plan "may perhaps be the best to safeguard American interests."

The broadcast was picked up by Columbia Broadcasting System's short-wave listening station in New York, which made public these excerpts:

"Just as you and I, Colonel McCormick * * * has both friends and enemies. His enemies brand him as a British-hating arch-isolationist, a publicity-thirsty megalomaniac.

SEE CAMPAIGN SPREADING

"To his friends, however, Colonel McCormick is a man of independent will, a man of action, a fearless foe, already to express himself regardless of consequences. I also assume there must be a group of neutrals who has no definite likes or dislikes about the colonel. * * *

"You will recall that a little more than 3 weeks ago the fighting Chicago newspaper publisher declared that he would start a Nation-wide editorial campaign for the absorption by the United States of all the British countries.

"Remember that Colonel McCormick's Chicago Tribune has no less than 1,000,000 circulation. * * * Moreover, there is the possibility that other influential newspapers, such as the New York Daily News and the Washington Times-Herald Daily News and the colonel's annexation campaign. * * * They will have tremendous influence over the reading public."

CALLED TRUE AMERICAN

Tokyo radio also said McCormick is conducting a "one-man crusade for the defense of true Americanism and for the salvation of the United States from the hands of the * * * radical internationalists led by Mr. Roosevelt."

THE JAPS PRAISE MCCORMICK, PROMOTER OF DISUNITY

A lot of Americans got a laugh out of the latest proposal of Col. Robert R. McCormick, publisher of the Chicago Tribune.

The proposal called for the United States absorbing the British Commonwealth of Nations (all but South Africa) and the British Empire. England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, he suggested, would become four more States of our Union.

But the proposal was no laughing matter. Some of the British took it seriously and began to wonder whether we really planned to take over the British Empire, as the Axis radio had beel telling them.

The Montreal Gazette declared the idea was no joke in Canada. It said: "In the McCormick plan, with its specious imitation of a world outlook, there may well be a weapon for power isolationism."

Now Japan proves that McCormick was more sinister than facetious by openly praising him.

The Tokyo radio, in a broadcast beamed to North America, declared: "Robert McCormick is an extremely charming character. * * * America today needs many more characters like this Chicago veteran."

It touted the plan as "safeguarding Americanism" and attacked the "radical interventionists led by Mr. Roosevelt."

Tokyo reminded Americans of something that the scoffers often forget—that the Chicago Tribune has a circulation of 1,000,000 (daily), and there are other powerful papers owned by the McCormick-Patterson dynasty peddling the same brand of poison—the New York Daily News and the Washington Times-Herald.

Some of us may think that McCormick belongs in a comic book. Japan knows better.

This latest proposal to create disunity between Britain and the United States is only one of a long series of Roosevelt-hating, isolationist, anti-United Nations tactics by the McCormick-Patterson press.

It has sneered at Britain, attacked lease-lend, accused Roosevelt of dragging us into the war even after Pearl Harbor, warned of "dictatorship" and cancelation of elections, cast aspersions at Russia, and so on, ad nauseam. It had already won the commendation of the Berlin radio. Now Tokyo adds its congratulations.

This comes very close to "giving aid and comfort to the enemy," as defined in the treason clause of the Constitution—closer than John L. Lewis came in calling a wartime strike.

We suggest for McCormick not only an iron cross but the Japanese order of the rising sun or the order of the golden kite. As Churchill is a symbol of United Nations unity, McCormick is a symbol of disunity.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS AT MASS MEETING TO WELCOME PRESIDENT BENES

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator LUCAS at the mass meeting to welcome President Benes, of Czechoslovakia, at Chicago Stadium, May 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

GLOBALITIS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR NYE

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Globalitis," delivered by Senator NYE at a Republican rally in the Crystal Ballroom, Morrison Hotel, Chicago, Ill., on Thursday evening, May 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CAN AMERICA DO BUSINESS WITH RUSSIA?—ARTICLE BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article prepared by him relating to conditions in Russia, to be published in the July issue of Scoop, which appears in the Appendix.]

CITATION FOR HEROISM TO FRANCIS A. DALES, CADET-MIDSHIPMAN, UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the citation issued to Francis A. Dales, cadet-midshipman, in connection with the presentation to him of the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE COAL STRIKE—EDITORIAL FROM ST. TAMMANY FARMER

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Tammany Farmer, of Covington, La., of the issue of May 21, 1943, relative to the view of soldiers in New Guinea concerning the coal strike, which appears in the Appendix.]

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION — EDITORIAL FROM IL PROGRESSO ITALO-AMERICANO

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fair Play for All," published in the Il Progresso Italo-Americano of the issue of May 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FOURTH TERM—EDITORIAL FROM LONG ISLAND DAILY PRESS

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Fourth Term," published in the Long Island Daily Press of April 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO MRS. BALLINGTON BOOTH

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post in tribute to Mrs. Ballington Booth, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 21, 1943, entitled "Senator VANDENBERG's 'Compromise,'" relating to the subject of reciprocal trade agreements, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE G. O. P. AGAINST CORDELL HULL—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS STAR-TIMES

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of May 22, 1943, entitled "G. O. P. Against Cordell Hull," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE JAPANESE "OUR PARTICULAR FOE"—INTERVIEW WITH LT. COL. JAMES ROOSEVELT

[Mr. CHANDLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to the war with Japan, containing an interview with Lt. Col. James Roosevelt, published in the Louisville (Ky.) Times, of May 21, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLL TAX DANGERS: FEDERAL USURPATION—ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Mark Sullivan, entitled "Poll Tax Dangers: Federal Usurpation," which appears in the Appendix.]

ESTIMATED AMOUNTS OF TAX CANCELATIONS

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, showing the estimated amounts of tax cancelation under House bill 2570, as affecting States and Territories, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with, in view of the fact that the calendar was called Thursday last.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bushfield	Ellender
Andrews	Butler	Ferguson
Austin	Byrd	George
Bailey	Capper	Gerry
Ball	Caraway	Gillette
Bankhead	Chandler	Green
Barbour	Chavez	Guffey
Bilbo	Clark, Idaho	Gurney
Bone	Clark, Mo.	Hatch
Brewster	Connally	Hawkes
Bridges	Danaher	Hayden
Brooks	Davis	Hill
Buck	Eastland	Holman

Johnson, Colo.	Murdock	Truman
La Follette	Murray	Tunnell
Langer	Nye	Tydings
Lodge	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
McCarran	Overton	Van Nuys
McClellan	Radcliffe	Wallgren
McFarland	Reed	Walsh
McKellar	Revercomb	Wheeler
McNary	Reynolds	White
Maloney	Robertson	Wiley
Maybank	Russell	Willis
Mead	Smith	Wilson
Millikin	Stewart	
Moore	Thomas, Utah	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are detained on important public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is absent because of the death of his mother.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of the death of his wife.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 1762 making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the motion is not debatable.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that, Mr. President. I do not propose to debate it. I wish to make a statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the motion made by the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Oregon for the purpose he stated.

Mr. McNARY. No, Mr. President; I am not asking the Senator to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield to the Senator for the purpose he stated. I have moved that the Senate proceed to consider the bill.

Mr. McNARY. I know that motion is not debatable, Mr. President. I shall wait till Senate action is taken on the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 1762.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1762) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I did not rise for the purpose of opposing the motion made by the able Senator from Tennessee. I know full well that a motion made before 2 o'clock today is not debatable. But I hoped the Senator in charge of the bill would be willing to defer action on the bill until Thursday or Friday. The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator that I understand the item on page 4 of the bill providing for the National Resources Planning Board is a matter of dispute among Senators, and that the Senator from Ohio is unavoidably away from the Senate today because of very sad circumstances in his family.

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. But I should like to have all the other items voted on today.

I wish to say to the Senator——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not wish to yield any further.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator had stated what I intended to state very much better than I could, and I appreciate his courtesy. I was going to say that the senior Senator from Ohio, for the reason assigned by the Senator from Tennessee, made the request that the item relating to the National Resources Planning Board be put over until Thursday. More than that, Mr. President, there are a number of Senators absent because of official business, and it might be well to defer action on the bill in its entirety until Thursday. However, I am not asking for that at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. I am simply repeating the request made to me by the Senator from Ohio and by other Senators. I shall leave the matter so far as that is concerned to the wise judgment of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it seems to me we ought to proceed with consideration of the bill. If Senators will look at "Status of appropriation bills, first session, Seventy-eighth Congress," on the back page of the calendar they will note that we have a great deal of work to do on appropriation measures if we are to get them through by the 1st of July. For that reason, and especially in view of the fact that I am told by our acting leader that we cannot have sessions tomorrow and the next day because of the absence of a great many Senators, I think it would be most wise to proceed with all the items of the bill except the one on page 4 which has been referred to, which I shall be glad to have go over until Thursday.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, personally, as I stated before the session convened, I have no objection to that arrangement. Other Senators may have. I think the able junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] would probably like to have the whole measure go over until Thursday.

Mr. BYRD. I will say, Mr. President, that I think by all means the senior Senator from Ohio should be permitted to make his argument with respect to the item dealing with the National Resources Planning Board. It occurs to me that perhaps no great progress would be made now, and that it would be well to have the whole bill go over.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we have the whole day before us, and I know of nothing else, at the present moment at any rate, which will come up, and if we can proceed with consideration of the bill and dispose of the other items in the bill—and I think we can dispose of them very quickly—I hope that may be done, because we must make progress with the appropriation bills if we are to pass them all by July 1. Our committee is doing everything it can to get the bills before the Senate as rapidly as possible, and we want the Senate to act as speedily as may be on the bills as they come before it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course, the only alternative is to take up the measure relating to the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and there was some discussion whether that might be done today. So far as I am concerned, as the ranking Republican member of the Finance Committee which has dealt with the subject, I agreed to that suggestion. But I do not think it would be fair to spend 2 or 3 hours today on one bill, and then ask the Senate to proceed to consider the other bill. If the bill dealing with the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is to be taken up today I think it should be taken up immediately.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it will take the Senate but a few moments to act on all but one of the items of the appropriation bill. There are very few controversial matters other than the item in the bill dealing with the National Resources Planning Board.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then what advantage is there in considering the bill at all until we can go straight through with it?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Michigan knows the usual procedure in getting bills through the Senate. The sooner we get the noncontroversial items passed upon and behind us, the better it is. Long experience has shown me that we ought to move as rapidly as we can now. I hope the Senate will agree to proceed with consideration of the items of the bill other than that dealing with the National Resources Planning Board, and I shall ask that it do so.

Mr. McNARY. We might have the understanding, Mr. President, that if we strike any controversial amendment—the minute it is detected that an item is controversial—it be allowed to go over, and that we simply pass on items which are not the subject of debate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if it shall unexpectedly appear that some good reason shall be advanced for asking that an item in the bill, other than the one heretofore referred to, be passed over, I should not object to that being done.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that I intend to move to strike out section 102 which provides that—

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, the salaries of the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Commissioners of the United States Maritime Commission, with the exception of the Chairman so long as the office is held——

Mr. McKELLAR. On what page does the section appear?

Mr. WHEELER. On page 66. It is the section which fixes the salaries of the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission at $10,000. Under the law of 1920, their salaries were fixed at $12,000; but during the depression they were cut down to $10,000, and the item providing for that amount has been carried in the bill. I shall want to take up that matter. However, I do not think there will be much controversy over it, for I think everyone will concede that particularly at this time the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission should receive the salaries which were fixed for them in the law. In the Commission there now are directors who receive $10,612, and in addition are paid overtime; so that the directors and some of the employees of the Commission are receiving more money than the Commissioners themselves are receiving.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that matter was brought up before the committee, and the committee decided to leave the item as it has been for a number of years. Let me say to the Senator that we can discuss it when the time comes.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered, beginning with the amendment commencing on page 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Executive Office of the President—Bureau of the Budget", on page 3, line 23, after the word "amended", to strike out "$1,655,000" and insert "$1,450,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 16, to insert:

EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT

Defense housing: The unexpended balance of the appropriation made under the heading "Emergency fund for the President, defense housing," contained in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, is continued available until June 30, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the next amendment is on page 4, and relates to the National Resources Planning Board. By agreement, the amendment is to go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 10, to insert:

BOARD OF INVESTIGATION AND RESEARCH—TRANSPORTATION

Board of Investigation and Research: For all necessary expenses to enable the Board of Investigation and Research to perform the duties authorized under part 1 of title III of the Transportation Act of 1940 including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $500 for periodicals and newspapers; not to exceed $12,000 for travel, including attendance at meetings or conventions of societies or associations concerned with the problem of the board; contract stenographic reporting services; lawbooks and books of reference; rents in the District of Columbia; and payment of actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence to persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Board; and including not to exceed $20,000 for printing and binding; and not to exceed $10,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, or the civil service or classification laws, to remain available until September 18, 1944, $350,000, which amount shall be added to and merged with the unexpended balance as of June 30, 1943, of the appropriations under this head in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, and the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943: *Provided*, That of this amount not to exceed $50,000 shall be available for economy and fitness studies.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Power Commission—Salaries and expenses", on page 17, line 4, after the word "services", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$150,000" and in line 5, after the word "exceed" to strike out "$76,670" and insert "$115,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Trade Commission," on page 18, line 17, after the figures "$1,900,000" to insert a comma and "of which not less than $172,410 shall be available for the enforcement of the Wool Products Labeling Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Works Agency—Office of the Administrator", on page 19, line 24, after the words "classification laws," to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$275,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Strategic highway network," on page 30, line 15, after "55 Stat.", to strike out "821–822" and insert "765."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Access roads," on page 30, line 24, after "55 Stat.", to strike out "821-822" and insert "766–767."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Surveys and plans," on page 31, line 10, after "55 Stat.", to strike out "821–822" and insert "767."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I can scarcely keep up with the very rapid reading of the gracious clerk of the Senate. What was the last item?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is merely a statute reference.

Mr. McNARY. Where is it?

Mr. McKELLAR. On page 31, line 10, at the beginning of the line. The proposal is to strike out "821–822," and insert "767." The item is merely a reference to a statute; it has no other meaning.

Mr. McNARY. I was not questioning the item; I simply wanted to know where it could be found in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is entirely correct in inquiring, and I am very happy to give him the information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 31, line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Interstate Commerce Commission—Salaries and Expenses", on page 37, line 18, after the word "act", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert $3,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Housing Agency—Federal Home Loan Bank Administration", on page 43, line 2, after the words "total of," to strike out "$8,310,734, and such corporation shall be liquidated as provided by section 4 (k) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to the extent necessitated by the reduction of administrative personnel herein required, and the expenses incident to such liquidation shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation shall not incur for administrative expenses in excess of $833,333.33 for any month from July to December 1943, inclusive, nor in excess of $208,333.33 for any month from January to June 1944, inclusive" and insert "$12,142,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 15, after the numerals "1936", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That,

notwithstanding any order or regulation issued by the Office of Price Administration, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation is authorized to dispose of any real property to which such corporation has title upon such terms and conditions as the Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner determines will expedite the orderly liquidation of such real property."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 21, to insert:

The appropriation under the head "National Housing Agency" contained in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1942, is hereby continued available until June 30, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Securities and Exchange Commission," on page 52, line 7, after the figures "$4,000,000", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to promulgate or enforce any rules or regulations known as the proposed rule or regulation F-9 and F-10, and providing in substance (1) that engineers' reports shall be mandatory, (2) requires a disclosure of the cost or purchase price, and (3) an abridgment of the right to appoint an agent, all with reference to the sale of oil and gas royalties and leases, under the jurisdiction of the Oil and Gas Division of the Securities and Exchange Commission."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Tariff Commission", on page 55, line 11, before the words "of which", to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$825,000."

The amendment was agreed to

The next amendment was, under the heading "Veterans' Administration", on page 63, line 4, after the word "facilities", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That notwithstanding the limitation in section 106 of this act, this appropriation shall be available for the purchase of legal newspapers in an amount not exceeding $200."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment explained by the Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the item is a very small one of $200 for the purchase of legal newspapers. Let me say that I felt the same way about the item as the Senator did when it was presented to the Senate. I shall read the amendment:

That notwithstanding the limitation of section 106 of this act—

I need not read the proviso further.

General Hines, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, stated that the Comptroller General had ruled that legal newspapers were newspapers within the scope of section 106 and, therefore, within the $50 limitation. The Administrator stated further that the need of these legal publications arises out of the necessity for their chief attorneys receiving due notice in connection with actions pending in the State courts, in guardianship cases, and being currently informed on the status thereof. Such information could be secured by laborious and time-wasting search of the court records, but this would cost, in time of salaried employees, far more than the subscription price of the publications, and would be much less efficient as to results.

The publications are technical legal periodicals. They are newspapers only in the sense that they are so styled for the purpose of qualifying under State statutes for publication of legal notices. No one but a practicing lawyer would subscribe to any of them and then only for the technical aspects—not for the general news value.

For the reasons given by General Hines, the committee added the $200 limitation for legal newspapers. As the Senator will notice, in line 7, instead of saying "Purchase of newspapers", it says "Purchase of legal newspapers." They are in a class by themselves. Their only value is with reference to legal notices, court notices, and things of that sort.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. These are newspapers which, under State statutes, carry notices in guardianship proceedings, estate proceedings, and matters before probate and surrogate courts. They bring to the Veterans' Administration a knowledge in which it has a real interest in matters of that sort.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. McNARY. I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 63, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, after line 18, to insert:

Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief: For payment of claims as authorized by article IV of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act Amendments of 1942, $70,000, to be immediately and continuously available until expended: *Provided,* That any moneys received under said article IV shall be credited to this appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 1, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$887,017,000" and insert "$887,087,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—General Provisions," on page 70, after line 24, to strike out:

SEC. 205. Unless otherwise specified and until July 1, 1944, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States, or of any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States, whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person is a citizen of the United States or a person in the service of the United States on the date of this enactment who, being eligible for citizenship, had theretofore filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen or who owes allegiance to the United States.

And insert:

SEC. 205. Unless otherwise specified and until July 1, 1944, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this act who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, or (3), is a person who owes allegiance to the United States.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill what class of persons is included in the third category—

(3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States.

What persons, besides citizens and persons who have filed declarations of intention to become citizens, owe allegiance to the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. Section 205 as passed by the House seemed to members of the Senate committee to need clarification. The amendment which the Senate committee added was for the purpose of clarifying the language of the House bill. It did not change it, as we understood it. It appears that no suggestion was made as to the definition of a person who owes allegiance to the United States. I am in doubt about it myself.

This language has been carried in the law for a number of years, and we left it there. I am not sure what it means.

Mr. GILLETTE. I cannot conceive of any person who is not a citizen and who has not filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen, who owes allegiance to the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Possibly it refers to a person from the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, or Puerto Rico, who owes allegiance.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think this amendment comes under the head of controversial amendments, and I ask that it go over.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

That completes the committee amendments, with the exception of those passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, line 24, after the figures "$2,531,000", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: *"Provided,* That the salary of the Assistant Comptroller General shall be at the rate of $10,000 per annum effective on the date of enactment of this act, so long as

the position is held by the present incumbent."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee and on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the committee and the Senator from Virginia will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, before the period at the end of line 25, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That the Administrator may, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transfer to this authorization or to an authorization of a constituent unit from funds available for administrative expenses of the constituent units or the office of the Administrator of the National Housing Agency such additional sums as represent a consolidation in the office of the Administrator or in a constituent unit of any of the administrative functions of the National Housing Agency; but no such transfer of funds shall be made unless the consolidation will result in a reduction in manpower and a savings in administrative expenses, which savings shall not be used for administrative expenses but instead shall be returned to or remain in the funds from which administrative expenses are drawn under this authorization."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the only knowledge I have of the amendment is from hearing it read. It seems somewhat complex. I ask that it be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Does the Senator from Tennessee wish to offer further amendments at this time?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no further amendments to offer.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing to pass over until Thursday the amendment on page 43, line 2, and the amendment on page 46, line 15, relating to the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration? I may wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to do so, of course. The amendments have already been agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to move to reconsider the votes by which the amendment on page 43, line 2, and the amendment on page 46, line 15, were agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator can move to reconsider either now or on Thursday.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 43, line 2, and the amendment on page 46, line 15, were agreed to, so that they may be subject to discussion and amendment on Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall not object, but I wish to say to the Senator that, as he knows, the House put in a limitation, and that limitation was stricken out by the Senate committee. The Senate committee provision would not change the present course of liquidation, except that there is a proviso at the end of the section which requires the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to sell, as rapidly as possible, approximately 31,000 houses which it has on hand. It had on hand 265,000 houses. It has already sold approximately 235,000 houses, and the time is so propitious for selling houses in most places in the country that the committee felt that the properties should be sold as rapidly as possible. Testimony was given by members of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation both before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of which the distinguished Senator from Virginia is chairman, and in connection with which he has done such a wonderful job, and before the Appropriations Committee. The testimony shows that their collections are excellent. I am very much in hope that the Senator will not insist upon reconsideration. He heard fully the testimony which was presented before his committee, and I hope he will not conclude to offer his amendment on Thursday. However, I am perfectly willing to have the amendments go over.

Mr. BYRD. There is nothing in the appropriation bill, as I understand it, which would in any way control the liquidation.

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has recommended that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation be liquidated not later than July 1, 1945. I desire to confer with the Senator with respect to some provision to be inserted in the bill which would indicate that Congress is in favor of reasonably prompt liquidation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, one of the reasons which actuated our committee was the fact that the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] came before our committee and said that the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, which had this matter in charge, would probably make a recommendation along the line suggested by the Senator from Virginia, and we thought that the legislative committee had better do it.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if the amendments are to go over, I make the point that we can argue them when the question is again presented next Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] that the votes by which the committee amendment on page 43, line 2, and the committee amendment on page 46, line 15, were agreed to, be reconsidered.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be passed over.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, on page 66, line 9, after "1944" and the comma, I move to strike out the words "of the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission", so that the salaries of the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission will be returned to the level originally fixed in the act of 1920.

When the Transportation Act of 1920 was passed——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I ask that the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana be passed over. We can take it up later when we consider the bill.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Oregon will not insist upon his request for the reason that it will be impossible for me to be present on Thursday next when the bill is to be taken up again. This amendment should not be a very controversial issue.

Mr. McNARY. I am assuming, from the attitude of the able Senator in charge of the bill, that the amendment will be controversial. I am not expressing any view; but the committee has acted adversely, and I can see the possibility of controversy. I merely asked that the amendment be passed over. However, I do not wish to inconvenience the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall soon leave for Chicago, and it will be impossible for me to be here on Thursday next. Otherwise I should not have offered the amendment at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment being taken up, but I wish to explain the situation as it appeared to the committee when the matter was before it for consideration.

Mr. WHEELER. I have the testimony taken before the committee. The chairman of the committee said that so far as he was concerned he thought the original salary provision should be restored. Let me give the history.

Under the original act of 1887 to regulate commerce, the Commissioners' salaries were fixed at $7,500 per annum. They were increased to $10,000 in the 1906 amendment to the act to regulate commerce known as the Hepburn amendment. Under the Transportation Act of 1920 the salaries were increased to $12,000. They were never changed by any act amending the Interstate Commerce Commission Act.

Effective July 1, 1932, under the act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1933, commonly known as the Economy Act (47 Stat. 402) the salaries were reduced to $10,000. The provision reducing the salaries was continued in effect for the fiscal year 1934 by Section 4 (a) of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act, 1934 (47 Stat. 1513) as amended by Section 4 (a) of an act to maintain the credit of the United States (48 Stat. 13).

Sections 2 and 3 of this latter act provided for a further reduction in the Commissioners' salaries of 15 percent per annum which made the Commissioners' salaries, as of April 1, 1933, $8,500 per annum. This salary remained in effect until January 31, 1934, when the reduction was made 10 percent or to $9,000, under Section 21 (a) of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1935 (48 Stat. 521). Eective July 1, 1934, the reduction was made 5 percent and the Commissioners' salaries were made $9,500 until March 31, 1935, when Public Resolution No. 3, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, eliminated the reduction entirely. Thus, the Commissioners' salaries would have been restored to the statutory figure of $12,000, but for a provision carried in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1935 (48 Stat. 521) and subsequent years, which continues the provision that for the then current fiscal year the Commissioners' salaries should not exceed $10,000.

I call attention to the fact that the salaries of other Government employees were returned to their normal base. However, the salaries of the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission were not so restored.

With reference to the Interstate Commerce Commission Act, allow me to say that since the Transportation Act was passed in 1920 we have added to the duties of the Interstate Commerce Commission by providing that it should regulate the operation of trucks and busses throughout the United States. Approximately 2 years ago we again added to the duties of the Interstate Commerce Commission by requiring it to regulate water transportation in interstate and foreign commerce. So today we are imposing upon the Interstate Commerce Commission greater burdens than are imposed upon any other commission in the United States Government. It regulates billions of dollars worth of property in the United States and deals with one of the most important subjects coming before the Congress and the people of the United States year in and year out.

I also invite attention to the fact that the effect of the law which was recently enacted increasing the salaries and overtime pay of employees of the Government was to increase the salaries of some of the directors in the Interstate Commerce Commission above those of the Commissioners themselves. I submit that while we are spending billions of dollars for everything under the sun, the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission should receive the salaries which were provided for them when the act was originally passed. There can now be no excuse for reducing their salaries. The only excuse for reducing them in 1933 was the condition of the Treasury and the fact that salaries generally were being reduced under the Economy Act. Other salaries which were reduced under the Economy Act have been restored, but those of the Interstate Commerce Commissioners have not been restored.

Mr. McKELLAR. In the beginning I was rather inclined to take the view the distinguished Senator from Montana took, but the committee, as I recall, rather overwhelmingly voted in favor of leaving the provision as it was and I do not think we are now in a position to raise the salaries. They were reduced by law in 1932, as the Senator from Montana has said, and the law now provides that the salaries shall be $10,000 a year.

I am inclined to think that the amendment of the Senator from Montana is subject to a point of order because the salaries have been fixed at $10,000 a year by act of Congress, known as the Economy Act, and for that reason the amendment would not be in order. I may interpose a point of order later, but waiving it for the moment——

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. If the statement made by the able Senator is correct then why the necessity for the provision in the appropriation bill that during the next fiscal year the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be paid at the rate of $10,000 per annum? Is it not correct that the statutory law is the provision to be found in the Interstate Commerce Commission Act which fixes the salaries at $12,000 per annum, and this appropriation is a limitation on the statutory salary and a reduction?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not certain about that.

Mr. OVERTON. I am not certain either, and am asking for information.

Mr. McKELLAR. For that reason I have not interposed a point of order.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me interrupt the Senator, if I may, to say that the statement of the Senator from Louisiana is exactly correct. The Transportation Act of 1920 fixed the salaries of the Commissioners at $12,000 a year.

Mr. McKELLAR. I remember that, but it was amended afterward.

Mr. WHEELER. It was never amended, and if this provision were stricken out then the salaries of the Commissioners would immediately be restored to $12,000 a year.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; but leaving that for the present, the reason these salaries were reduced in 1932 was because of the peculiar situation so far as finances were concerned which existed at that time. I remember that what he said was entirely correct and, if there was necessity for such action at that time, it is a million times greater today. I have long felt that Senators and Members of the House of Representatives ought to have more salary than they receive.

Their work has been vastly increased, but I would not think of offering an amendment to increase the salaries of Senators and Members of the other House at a time such as this, and I am rather inclined to think the committee was entirely correct in not increasing the salaries of the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the members of the Maritime Commission, and the members of the Tariff Commission. If the amendment of the Senator from Montana as to the Interstate Commerce Commission should be agreed to, a similar amendment ought to be made to apply to the members of the other two Commissions, for they ought to be treated alike. But, Mr. President, I do not believe now is the time to increase salaries. Due to the increase in the cost of living, brought about by the war, it was right that the salaries of low-paid employees should be increased, but to increase salaries of $10,000 is not necessary now in order that the Commissioners may live. They may have to live more economically, just as we have to live more economically on our salaries of $10,000. We get $10,000 a year and we have to live more economically on that sum than was the case some years ago. I am inclined to think that the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the members of the Tariff Commission, and the members of the Maritime Commission will unquestionably have to pinch themselves a little and tighten their belts, just as these times require Senators to pull their belts in a little bit; but they can manage to get along.

The great thing we ought to consider now is to win this war. I do not think it is a good time to raise salaries of $10,000 or more. I do not think that these particular salaries ought to be reduced; and if it were any other time except a time of war there would be no opposition on my part to restoring these salaries; indeed, when I first considered the matter, I was inclined to think that these salaries ought to be restored to $12,000 a year, but I am not so sure about it now. I do not know whether it would really meet the approval of the country if we were to increase salaries of $10,000 to $12,000 at this time.

So I am asking the Senate to uphold the committee in its action in leaving the salaries as they are. The House of Representatives have already done so. As I remember—and I have asked the clerk of the committee to verify my memory—the Senate for a number of years has uniformly voted to increase these salaries, and has stricken out a provision similar to the one in question, but, nevertheless, it has been retained in the bill every year. The House insists upon it; and there we are.

Mr. President, I simply do not believe this is a good time to raise salaries, and I hope the Senator from Montana will not insist on his amendment. As soon as the war is over I shall be perfectly willing to restore these salaries; I think the committee will be willing to do so, and I think the other branch of Congress will be willing to do so. It is true the work of the Commissioners has been increased, and they are doing good work; in fact, all three of these Commissions are doing good work; there is no doubt about that; but I think the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives are also doing good work, but their salaries are not

being increased and they have salaries of only $10,000 a year.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, it is not a question of raising the salaries of the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is a question of restoring their salaries to the amount fixed in the original Transportation Act of 1920.

Now, I shall read what the Senator from Tennessee said in the hearings:

Senator McKELLAR. The next item is on page 61 and refers to the salaries of the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. BARTEL. That is the matter of the Commissioners' salaries, previously discussed?

Senator McKELLAR. Frankly I think that the law ought to be carried out, so far as I individually am concerned.

Then he said:

My recollection is that the House conferees—I believe I was on the conference committee—just stood out against any raise in those salaries.

So the acting chairman of the committee himself says they ought to be increased. As I have pointed out, in view of conditions, I agree that we should not go ahead and raise salaries generally, but we have in the Interstate Commerce Commission at the present time a curious situation, which, I am inclined to think, does not prevail in the case of any other commission, in that directors who are getting $10,000 a year as their base salary, with the increase which has been recently granted by the Congress of the United States, with their overtime and otherwise, will be receiving more money than are the Commissioners themselves. When we have employees getting more money that the heads of the Commission, there is bound to be created some little friction, some difficulty. I say that the salaries of the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission ought to be increased and restored to the original amount.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. NYE. I rose merely to say that, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I moved to strike from the bill this restriction upon the salaries of the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, for the reason which the Senator has so ably stated. I mean to support his amendment this afternoon, and I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield the floor to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, with reference to the observations made by the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee in charge of the bill, I wish to state that the position taken by the committee on this bill is not in accordance with his conception of what ought to be done because it carries with it an exception. The bill declares that "with the exception of the Chairman"—of the United States Maritime Commission—"so long as the office is held by the present incumbent," and so forth. Of course, we know we have a very able Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, but I do not think anyone disputes the statement that the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission are very able men, and have just as much work to do as does the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission. If we are to follow the argument made by the able Senator from Tennessee to its logical conclusion, the committee should have stricken out of the bill the provision making an exception of the salary applying to the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission.

I do not think any comparison can be instituted, so far as the volume of work and the responsibility now attaching to the offices are concerned, between the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Commissioners of the United States Tariff Commission, because the work done by the United States Tariff Commission has abated considerably. On the other hand, responsibilities which from year to year have been imposed on the Interstate Commerce Commission have increased. As the Senator from Montana has pointed out, we have added to their duties, and only 2 years ago, as I recall the date, we added to their jurisdiction the regulation of transportation over inland waterways, and a few years before that we gave them jurisdiction over transportation by busses. So their duties and responsibilities have increased, while those of the United States Tariff Commission have decreased because of the war; yet no distinction is made. The duties of the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission are just as great as those of the chairman of the Maritime Commission, the responsibilities are as heavy, and an exception is made in his case, and none in reference to the memoers of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. Is it not correct to say that the salaries of members of the Interstate Commerce Commission are fixed at $12,000 by a statute passed many years ago?

Mr. OVERTON. It was passed in 1920, according to my recollection.

Mr. STEWART. And that Congress has fallen into the practice, in the last few years, of merely not appropriating the full amount of the salary?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STEWART. So, after all, it would not be a matter of raising or increasing salaries; it would be a matter of appropriating a sufficient amount to pay salaries already fixed?

Mr. OVERTON. We are reducing a salary below the statutory limit.

Mr. STEWART. I wish I could persuade my colleague not to oppose the amendment. This is a very meritorious proposal.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Montana, it is merely to strike out the reference to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator think that if we are to strike out the reference to the Interstate Commerce Commissioners, we should strike out the reference to the members of the Tariff Commission and the members of the Maritime Commission, as well? The law provides the Commissioners shall receive $12,000 a year, and if we are to obey the act of 1920 in the way the Senator from Montana asks as to one commission, then, in all fairness, the members of the three commissions should be put on the same basis. That is the way the matter strikes me. The question of work is relative, of course, and the Congress has fixed the salaries by act, and I think that if the reference to one commission is stricken out, the reference to all should be stricken out.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not sure that the salaries of the Tariff Commissioners were fixed at $12,000 a year. They may have been.

Mr. McKELLAR. They were.

Mr. WHEELER. I do know what the situation is with reference to the Interstate Commerce Commission. I happen to be thoroughly familiar with the activities of that Commission. Work has been piled on that Commission in the last 3 or 4 years. The salaries of the Commissioners were fixed at $12,000 a year in 1920, when they had only the railroads to deal with. Since then we have added to their burden by including the regulation of busses and trucks, and, in addition to that, the regulation of transportation over inland waterways.

Mr. Eastman is now the head of the O. D. T., and that, again, has increased the work of the Interstate Commerce Commission tremendously.

I say that there is not a commission in the city of Washington which has duties so complicated as those of the Interstate Commerce Commission, nor one which has to deal with the regulation of transportation running into the billions of dollars, as does the Interstate Commerce Commission.

There is one thing which has not been said about the Commission. Other commissions have been criticized; and in the last few years young men, just out of college, have been brought to this city and put in one department or the other and paid $10,000 a year, but in the Interstate Commerce Commission we have responsible men, who have had great experience in their line of endeavor. One member of the Commission resigned about 2 years ago because he could not afford to remain on the Commission. Mr. Eastman has been a member of the Commission for over 20 years. I do not know just how much longer he has been a member of the Commission, but it has been ever since I have been in the Senate, and his salary is fixed by law at $12,000. We are not proposing to increase his salary. What is proposed is to strike out a limitation under which he cannot receive the

salary which was fixed by the Congress more than 20 years ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I agree with all the Senator says, and I should be glad to do what he suggests if we were not in a war in which the very life of our Government is at stake. I wish to be frank. In my opinion Commissioner Eastman is one of the best officials of the Government. The members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the members of the Maritime Commission, the members of the Tariff Commission are all doing fine work; I agree with every word that has been said about them, and I wish it were so that we could increase their salaries, but I still am of the opinion, the matured opinion—for, as the Senator has just indicated, when the matter first came up I took a different view of it—that any of us who are receiving as much as $10,000 a year should be satisfied at this critical time in our history and not ask for more. That is what I think about it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and of the subcommittee which handled this matter. I usually go along with the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee. I did not happen to be present at the time the vote was taken on the provision we are now discussing. I had left my proxy with the ranking Republican, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and I understand he cast it in the affirmative, to strike the language out.

I wish to address myself to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and to the objection presented by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. I speak in support of the amendment.

The Interstate Commerce Commission was the first administrative commission created in our Government, away back in 1887, and from that day to this the Commission has set the mold of practice for all administrative commissions. The practice established in its administrative, quasi judicial work by the Interstate Commerce Commission has been the pattern for other commissions. Always the Interstate Commerce Commission has outranked in importance the other commissions.

In the Transportation Act of 1920 Congress fixed the salaries of the Commissioners at $12,000 a year. I am not sure, but I am under the impression that that salary was above the average paid members of other commissions, and perhaps it was the only commission the members of which received $12,000 a year.

The fixing of the salaries of the Commissioners at $12,000 a year was a recognition of the importance, the dignity, and the scope of the work handled by the Interstate Commerce Commission. There is no other commission, no other administrative body in this Government, which handles work of the scope, of the magnitude, and the importance of the work handled by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and, without being critical of any other Government body, I do not think the work of any other body or commission in the Government compares with that of the Interstate Commerce Commission. There is certainly no other administrative body which commands the confidence of the people of this country to the extent that the Interstate Commerce Commission does.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with all the Senator from Kansas has said, but I wish to make a suggestion. We have 195 United States district judges in the United States. Those judges are the busiest persons in the world. They are at work nearly all the time. Yet they receive only $10,000 a year.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not wish to get into an argument with the Senator from Tennessee, but I wish to express my opinion on that point. We have been constantly increasing the number of Federal judges all through the years, while litigation has been decreasing. Therefore in most cases we have more Federal judges than we know what to do with. So much for that.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I will venture the assertion that anyone who is familiar with the work of the Federal judges—and I think I am familiar with their work—knows that the average Federal judge in the United States does not put in one-half the time put in by the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The members of the Interstate Commerce Commission—and I know of what I am speaking—do not take vacations. They are on the job and have to be on the job from early morning until late at night, day in and day out, year in and year out. Unless they are constantly on the job they cannot possibly handle the problems which constantly confront them, whereas it will be found wherever one may go, that the Federal court judges do not sit more than 6 months out of the year, if that much, and the judges take long vacations.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana is correct in his statement. I happen to have the dockets of all the district courts in the United States. There are a few, but not many, busy district courts.

Mr. WHEELER. We know that one judge who was appointed to the Federal bench in Texas, is now sitting in the food conference at Hot Springs, Va., because, apparently, there is not enough for him to do in the district to which he has been appointed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to confine myself to the point immediately before the Senate. In 1920 the Congress of the United States fixed the salaries of the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission at $12,000 a year. Since 1920 the work of the Commission has easily doubled in scope and importance. As the Senator from Montana has stated, we have added to the Commission's work the supervision of motor vehicles on the highways; we have also added to it the supervision of the inland waterways and the intercoastal waterways and the coastal waterways. By legislation recently passed we have, as the Senator from Montana will remember, added to the work of the Commission, supervision of freight forwarders. So whereas originally the Commission had supervision over one carrier, the railroads, it now has supervision over four. First, it has supervision over the railroads; second, it has supervision over motor vehicles on the highways; third, it has supervision over inland and intercoastal and coastal waterways; and fourth, it has supervision over freight forwarders.

Mr. President, we have continued to pile work and responsibility upon the Interstate Commerce Commission and upon the Commissioners. I have had intimate contact with the Interstate Commerce Commission for over 20 years. I can bear witness to the fidelity, the industry, the dignity, and the integrity with which the Commission as a whole has performed its duties. So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will prevail.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am very anxious to have action taken on as many items of the bill as possible at this time, and I am willing to have the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana agreed to and take it to conference.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee very much.

Mr. REED. And I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] in section 102, page 66, line 9, after the words "salaries of", to strike out the words "the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, under the agreement had with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], further consideration of the bill will now go over until Thursday next.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it was agreed that all amendments which were not controversial be acted on today, and that list of amendments has been completed. The bill now goes over automatically until Thursday next, and at the same time it is agreed that the joint resolution under the charge of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] will be taken up next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, further consideration of House bill 1762 will be passed over until Thursday next.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO REPORT BILLS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I understand that it is the purpose of the acting majority leader to move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday. The Appropriations Committee may be able to report tomorrow or Thursday the lend-lease bill and the urgent deficiency bill. I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment or recess of the Senate fol-

lowing today's session the Appropriations Committee may be authorized to report the two bills and have them placed on the calendar.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I desire to cooperate to the extent that we may complete our legislation as rapidly as possible. I am willing to consent to the proposal provided that if the bills are reported and any Senator finds he has not had an opportunity to read either of them and the hearings on them, upon request the consideration of the bills will go over for the day.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, I shall always be glad to cooperate with the Senator in that respect. I am sure, as was the case today, that we shall not undertake to take up any bill in a peremptory manner. However, I think consent should be given to having the bills reported and placed on the calendar.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection. However, I desire to retain to myself or to any other Member of the Senate who may not be familiar with the provisions of the bills or the hearings or the report on them, the right, when confronted by a motion to proceed to consideration, to object, and move that consideration go over until a subsequent day. With that understanding, I think the proposal is a fair one, and I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] for unanimous consent that, during the recess or adjournment of the Senate following today's session, the Committee on Appropriations shall be authorized to report the lend-lease bill and the urgent deficiency bill and have them placed on the calendar. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 111, to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, be considered by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after "1943", to insert the following proviso: "*Provided*, That every foreign trade agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of said act, as amended, shall be subject to termination 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as fixed by proclamation of the President, pursuant to joint resolution of the Congress or by the President."

THE MISSION OF EVERY AMERICAN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, now that Rommel's war plans in north Africa have miscarried, and Ruml's tax plans in the United States of America are still being considered by the conferees of both Houses; now that the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] has advisedly advised the strategists; now that the fourth-term issue is soon to burst upon this fair land, plans being under way to carry it through to fruition; now that my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has graciously conceded the superiority of butter as a food, by feasting the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Churchill, the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Mackenzie King, the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles, and his own associates of the Senate and the House, on Wisconsin butter and cheese—deeds speaking louder than words; now that the Senate will soon be considering the McKellar bill; now that the Senate and the people will soon be further aroused by a debate on the subject of the reciprocity treaties; now that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate has not acted on my resolution to create a liaison committee between the Executive and the Congress to consider plans and ideas relating to post-war international cooperation and collective security; now that the Congress will soon have before it another mammoth appropriation bill; now that Yamamoto, who was to make peace, is gone, and Stalin has dissolved the Third International, and Attu is ours again, and the United Nations are on the march, an offensive march on all fronts; now, I thought it opportune to express a few ideas which I think are pertinent on the subject of the statesmanship of peace and American leadership and responsibility.

Two years ago, I spoke on the subject, The Nation's Job. I said that the Nation's job then—and those were halcyon days—was defense in its broadest aspects, not only a military defense but an economic defense, a social defense, and an individual defense. It meant not only the steel armor plate of mechanized defense, but also the building of bombproof barriers of mental and spiritual defense.

Since that day in June 1941 much water has gone over the dam. Today we look back on Pearl Harbor, Bataan, Corregidor; the capture of Attu and Kiska by the Japs; the invasion of Africa by our troops, and the magnificent victory there; the battle of the Solomons; the saving of Australia; the sinking of 3,000,000 tons of Japanese shipping; the German submarine warfare; the tremendous offensive put on by the Russians; the bombing of Germany and here satellites; 6,000,000 men already in our armed forces and 5,000,000 more yet to be inducted, making 11,000,000 total; our home economy being more and more turned over to the war effort; a 2-ocean navy now in being, soon a 3-ocean navy; the shifting from the defensive to the offensive; 135,000,000 people now engaged in a war effort.

That, Mr. President, is quite a change from those almost halcyon days of 2 years ago.

The fight we are engaged in is not one of our own choosing. As a people, we had hoped to keep out of it. A majority of the American people never were in favor of intervention. But after Pearl Harbor that issue was solved. The Axis Powers intervened in our affairs, and now it is our job to win through to victory. Why? The issue is plain. We are fighting, literally, to preserve our freedom. We know what happened to nations that were taken over by the Axis Powers. We are fighting to preserve our way of life. We call it the democratic way under the Republic. We know that the Axis Powers have no time for the democratic processes or for the American way of life. They say that our way breeds weaklings. We are demonstrating to the world that free people are the strongest people.

Let me relate an incident of which Ambassador Grew tells. He says he was told by one of the highest officials in Japan that Japan would conquer America, would take over America, "Because," that man said, "Americans cannot play ball together; they are disunited; they are weak; they love luxury; they will not fight."

Certainly by this time the eyes of the Japanese must be opened. If they are not, as the war goes on they will be opened. We know that the only answer is to defeat the Axis.

We are fighting to maintain religious freedom. Under the Republic since its inception, man has been free to explore the way that leads up to God. Under the Axis he is told what to believe and what faith he shall follow. We know that if we were to lose this war, not only the physical man but the mental and spiritual man would be regimented. We know that the Axis Powers have a deep conviction that the totalitarian way is the only way of life. We know, now that our way of life is jeopardized, that our way—the way of the free press, free speech, the right of assembly the processes of law under the Republic freedom of religion—is the way; and we have a conviction on that subject now; and the battle goes on. There is no halfway mark. There is no turning back.

All this is so well understood that it is almost axiomatic, and yet it is well for us to review the facts and to realize that each of us has a great job to perform. In the performance of it, our efforts may be unheralded and unsung. The world may not recognize our individual efforts, but we know that individually we have to play our part, a great part, in a great age—a turning point in the history of the race. The workers in the plants of our cities, the tenement-house mothers, the small-town priests, the cross-roads doctors, the little businessmen, the farmers at the plows—all are contributing to the winning of the war, provided they do their jobs well. Each one is as important on the home front as are our sons on the battle front.

The "man of Japan" who spoke to Ambassador Grew said there could be no unity in America. Our first job, then, is to demonstrate an absolute unity in the war effort. To do so calls for dedication and sacrifice. Then unity will result. In spite of our mistakes, our Nation has done the impossible in the last 2 years. It has done what the Axis Powers, at least, said was impossible. We have

changed from a peacetime economy to a wartime economy. In taking that stride there has been a great deal of disorganization, and there have been too many mistakes by our servants. But we cannot take time to review a lot of those mistakes. We can only return to them now and then in order to profit by them. If we continually stress them, or spend our time dwelling on them, we are like the old American of German stock up my way who said, "If you keep your nose in the limburger all the time, you smell nothing but limburger."

That does not mean that we should not indulge in constructive criticism if the object is to better the administration. But it does mean that we have to keep our eye on the ball and carry it through the enemy's goal to victory.

We have nothing to fear, if we prove ourselves adequate. We do not aid our cause if we doubt our ability to finish the job before us—the war and the post-war period. We may at times become perplexed, but not downhearted. There is too much to be grateful for, for us to lose our mental rudders.

As long as man lives, there will be work to do.

While our boys are fighting on the seven seas, on all the continents of the globe, and we at home are producing the planes, the war matériel, the ships, and the arms that are needed to carry on the conflict, we have another job to do—one of equal importance. I call it "the mission of every American."

Included in this mission are the following:

First. Do our part to see that we do not have a runaway inflation. This calls for no stampede buying, no buying in black markets, insisting on paying 50 percent of war costs in taxes, and financing the balance by individual buying of bonds. Let me say parenthetically that, last year, at the time when the Senate was considering the question of spending $80,000,000,000, when I insisted that we pay half of it in taxes, one distinguished Chicago newspaper called me a radical Tory. Yet, Mr. President, last year we raised about $33,000,000,000 in taxes.

Second. Do our part to see that there will not be created class hatred or race hatred in this country. That, too, sounds simple. Let me say, Mr. President, that it is very important that we stop the march toward the creation of such hatreds. There are plenty of people who want to create in this country division between groups, between races, between labor and management; and it is too bad that, frequently, persons who are not aware of what is being done take the hook.

Mr. President, let me relate another story that Mr. Grew tells. He said that all those who were in the Embassy in Tokyo expected to be massacred, that a mob came up shrieking and yelling, and that those in the Embassy were prepared to sell their lives dearly; that one person in the Embassy opened one of the windows and waved a little flag, or handkerchief, and started to laugh. Pretty soon one and then another of the Japanese in the street also began to wave and laugh. Then, catching the idea, all the others in the Embassy opened their windows and waved their handerchiefs and laughed and laughed—and the mob did the same thing and soon dispersed.

Let us on the home front apply the lesson contained in that story to the problems existing between labor and management, and between different racial groups of our citizens. It is the lesson of reason, of balanced thinking, of understanding.

Third. We have to do our part now to prepare for the post-war era. We have to think this matter through. That calls for clear thinking, simplified thinking, unbiased and poised thinking. There is no place in this picture for any hysteria. There will be a challenge in America to our system of free enterprise. There will be continual pressure in trying to centralize more and more activities in Washington. Our Government in its inception was built upon the republican basis of checks and balances in the National Government, and a system of checks and balances between the States and the Federal Government. It has worked well. It will continue to work well if each of us on the home front works well.

The post-war era will have great economic challenges, great social challenges, and great international challenges. There will be room for the idealist, and room for the practical man. They must learn to work together for the benefit of the Republic.

Right now in Washington and all over the country the question of post-war collaboration between nations is being debated. There is much name-calling. That is a dangerous sign. My mail indicates that condition.

In this country we walk down the street together, you and I, on Sunday—you go to your church, and I go to mine, and we are friendly. We have learned that much. But when great national issues arise, and when men see things differently, then in many instances the human mind, instead of trying to get the other man's viewpoint, starts to abuse him. That does not make for clarity of vision, nor does it make for a correct solution.

I have felt that the problem is one of getting cooperation—not merely talking it. Many persons feel that adopting a certain plan or passing a certain resolution will do the job. If we simplify our thinking, we know if we enter into a contract with several parties, that is only the beginning. After that there must come the moral, economic, and physical responsibility of the contracting parties to carry the obligations of the contract into effect. We know that wishful thinking will not do the job. The same principle applies to international matters. We know that the resolution of a branch of one government will not create collective security. We must know what can be done to get the nations to cooperate to get rid of the causes of war. In every community we have a police force, but that is not the big factor in the maintenance of law and order. The big factor is that the majority of the people in that community cooperate toward the end of maintaining law and order. It is the moral attitude of the people that determines the peace of the community. In thinking this international problem through, we must watch our logic.

We know that after the last World War, after the League of Nations had been established, the members of that League, if they had had the necessary wisdom and moral strength, could have prevented this war. It might have been nipped in the bud. It started as a European war; and to say that if America had joined the League we would have had sufficient wisdom and moral responsibility to have done better than the European nations did, is begging the question.

We hope the intervening years since 1914 will have burned out the fevers of race hatred and lust for dominion and power, and that the wisdom and guidance of the Almighty will dwell among men. We shall see.

In preparing for the post-war era which will come sooner or later, we must constantly think in terms of economics. As we know, we plan to spend this year in the war effort more than $100,000,000,000. We should raise at least half of that by taxation, but it is estimated that we shall raise only thirty-five billion. If this war lasts through 1944 we shall have a national indebtedness of $250,000,000,000. We shall probably have a national debt in excess of three hundred billion before we are through. That will cost us at least $6,000,000,000 a year to finance. This will not be an insuperable load if we exercise the brains and mental acumen which I think we possess, but it calls for straight thinking and collective cooperation in America. This is the first requisite for world collective security.

At the rate we are going now we shall probably have between 11,000,000 and 15,000,000 men and women in our armed forces when the war ends. Speaking yesterday, Secretary Knox stated that we shall not demobilize all at once. That means that over an extended period we shall be constantly demobilizing our forces and feeding them into the economic machinery which must be available to meet the great needs. We shall probably keep in the armed forces—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—a million and a half men. We shall keep them for some time. The first item we shall have to consider will be the maintenance of the Army and the Navy.

This year we shall have a national income of approximately $130,000,000,000. To operate the Government, pay interest, and maintain the Army, Navy, and Air Force in the post-war period will require $15,000,000,000. If we are realists, we will raise this amount and at least $10,000,000,000 more, and start liquidating the national debt.

But, it may be asked, Where is this money coming from? It will not come from the war effort, because that will be largely over. That presents the problem which we must think about realistically. By the end of 1944, a great many of the

highways and railroads of this country will have to be rebuilt. We shall have to build superhighways. We shall have to meet a housing need. We shall have a great commercial airplane industry. We shall have great public improvements. We shall have a reservoir of savings of the people which they will use to create a great market for consumer goods from the automobile industry, the air-conditioning industry, and the luxury trade. There will be a greatly increased demand for food, clothing, and other things. There will be new inventions, new methods of building.

All this means employment and an enlarged national income. It means employment for those who must step out of the war industry into the ordinary industry which will then be operating. It means employment for those who come out of the armed forces.

The question arises, How is all this to be financed? I believe that most of it can be handled through private enterprise. Of course, public improvements will be done by the counties, States, and the Nation. I think we may find something new happening in America in relation to financing. We may even see a new type of organization come into being. It has existed in other nations. The State and private enterprise join in a business adventure. But that creature must meet the same responsibility as any private enterprise meets. This Government now owns more than $16,000,000,000 in plants and equipment. The new creature will probably come into being, owned partly by Government and partly by the citizens of Government. But that creature must not be privileged. It must not create unfair competition. It must not be in a position where it can sabotage the initiative, enterprise, and capital of the citizen otherwise invested.

We shall see a great demand on America for exports of her goods. China with her 400,000,000, will be calling for our every consideration in order that she may set up her own industries. We shall see that the devastated countries will have to be rebuilt, which will call for a tremendous amount of our goods. Here again we must think through the matter of financing these demands. The result may be that we may have a national income of $150,000,000,000; and if we do we can cut the terrific tax load we are now undergoing and yet have a surplus to apply upon the national debt.

I see only one danger in this picture, and that I characterize as loose thinking. We must be on guard. We must have no economic Pearl Harbors. We do not want impractical theorists running the Government. This war ought to teach us that work, cooperation, industry, saving, application, invention, initiative, courage, and so forth, are the qualities which make for victory, whether the battle be economic, social, political, or war itself.

Mr. President speaking in the Parliament of Norway at the Interparliamentary Union Conference in August 1939, I said:

> From every land in Europe America has received its bloodstream. Your great culture has enriched our lives. Your music, your literature, your drama, some of your great ideas in economics, philosophy, and religion we have made our own. But, Mr. President, you have something we do not want. I refer to those barriers analyzed by the psychologists as fear, hatred, and distrust. Yes, we owe you much. We know the world is small. We are neighbors. We want to help. Your problems are intricate. There are many equations that we do not understand. I say we want to help, but we want to help you to help yourselves to the end that your problems may find solution through you.

The atmosphere was charged. War was only a few days away.

Mr. President, after making those remarks in the Norwegian Parliament, in a private audience with the King of Norway a day later, I suggested what Churchill has since suggested—a council of Europe. Let me read what Prime Minister Churchill said lately in his clear thinking on the subject of the post-war problem:

> One can imagine that under a world institution embodying or representing the United Nations, and some day all nations, there should come nto being a council of Europe and a council of Asia. It is upon the creation of the council of Europe and the settlement of Europe that the first practical task will be centered. In Europe lie most of the causes which have led to two world wars.
>
> This council must eventually embrace the whole of Europe, and all the main branches of the European family must some day be partners in it. What is to happen to the large number of small states whose rights and interests must be safeguarded? It would seem to me that side by side with the great powers there should be a number of groupings of states or confederations which would express themselves through their own chosen representatives, the whole making a council of great states and groups of states.

Europe is the pot which boils over. Two world wars started there. We are now in the midst of one of them.

Commenting on what Churchill said, former President Hoover and Hugh Gibson have recently said:

> The major scene of danger of war has always been Europe. Yet the League never had a European policy, even at the moment when every European nation was in its membership. For instance, there seems to have been no serious consideration of the crisis generated by the rise of the Axis. That is, the major danger to the world was ignored by the League.
>
> The whole experience would seem to indicate that one of the first functions in the prevention of war is the development of regional policies in the different major areas of Europe, Asia, and the Western Hemisphere.
>
> Mr. Churchill's regional plan simplifies the problem of detailed organization of the world institution to preserve peace.

I believe that when the war is over Mr. Churchill's idea in relation to a European council will be accepted by those nations which sense the need of cooperating on the European front. But let us bear in mind that out of Europe have come the two world wars, and the reason for that is that Europe has not solved her own problems. As I stated a few days before the outbreak of the war, in speaking to the representatives of the republics of the earth, we are ready to help them to help themselves. That seems to be what Mr. Churchill, that clear-thinking Englishman, has in mind. Undoubtedly the occupied nations, after having gone through their Gethsemane of suffering, will see the need of pulling together.

We must approach this problem realistically. We must leave all frustration behind us, and accept the responsibility of world leadership. We possess the spirit of liberation. When I use the phrase "the responsibility of world leadership," I mean that the world will look to us for the ideas, and the helpfulness which we must be ready to give.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Mr. GEORGE obtained the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Murray
Andrews	George	Nye
Austin	Gerry	O'Daniel
Bailey	Gillette	Overton
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barbour	Gurney	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hatch	Reynolds
Bone	Hawkes	Robertson
Brewster	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Smith
Brooks	Holman	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	La Follette	Truman
Butler	Langer	Tunnell
Byrd	Lodge	Tydings
Capper	McCarran	Vandenberg
Caraway	McClellan	Van Nuys
Chandler	McFarland	Wallgren
Chavez	McKellar	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	White
Connally	Maybank	Wiley
Danaher	Mead	Willis
Davis	Millikin	Wilson
Eastland	Moore	
Ellender	Murdock	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to enter into a discussion of the Trade Agreements Act this afternoon further than to say that the original act was passed in 1934 after serious debate; it was renewed in 1937, and again renewed in 1940. So the act will have been in operation for 9 years on June 12 of this current year. The act will expire on June 12 unless it shall have been renewed, and, therefore, the necessity for the prompt consideration of the pending joint resolution.

The House of Representatives in passing upon the renewal joint resolution has made one amendment which limits the life of the Trade Treaty Agreements Act to 2 years rather than 3, the latter being the usual period of extension heretofore approved by both the House and the Senate.

In the Finance Committee one amendment was made to the joint resolution. That amendment reads as follows:

Provided, That every foreign-trade agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of said act as amended, shall be subject to termination 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as fixed by proclamation of the President, pursuant to joint resolution of the Congress or by the President.

That amendment was carried by the close vote of 11 to 10.

Another amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] was rejected by the committee. Other amendments had been submitted on the floor but were not presented to the committee and were not passed upon by the committee, leaving the proponents of such amendments free to urge them on the floor, if they see fit to do so, without committee action.

Mr. President, in opening this debate—and I shall not do more than open it—I desire to read about two pages which shall, I think, state the issue. I have tried to state the issue fairly on the amendment, which is the pending question.

Mr. President, I do not believe that any Senator who is at heart in favor of the effort to mitigate excessive international trade restrictions by methods of international collaboration will be able, after analyzing the amendment, to persuade himself into the belief that the amendment would do other than seriously cripple, if not destroy, the trade-agreements program.

It will be noted that I am stressing this one thought, that any of us who profess to believe in the mitigation of excessive international trade restrictions by the method of international collaboration will be unable to persuade himself that this amendment will do other than cripple or emasculate the whole act.

I do not quarrel with any Senator who is not willing to pare down excessive international trade restrictions by international collaboration and who insists upon the old unilateral principle which had its full fruition in the nationalism which breathed in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act.

The amendment has been proposed as a means for reserving to the United States complete freedom of action in the post-war world. The sponsors of the amendment say that they favor reciprocity, that the amendment would not interfere with true reciprocity. They say that after hostilities it may be necessary to impose higher import duties or other restraints in order to preserve our essential domestic interests. They say that the amendment is necessary to safeguard, above all things, the national interests of the United States.

No one will deny that the primary objective of the Congress in every piece of legislation coming before it must be the maintenance and upholding of our essential national interests first and foremost—that all measures which may result in benefit to our good neighbors must be judged primarily from the basis of their benefit to the United States. Proceeding on this premise, I vigorously deny that the amendment of the Committee on Finance is the way to uphold the essential interests of the United States.

Granted that in the post-war world economic dislocations throughout the world may necessitate additional protection to our local national interests, granted that factor must be borne in mind in the consideration of the joint resolution now before the Senate, my position is that we should endeavor to safeguard these national interests by means of a workable program of international cooperation and collaboration. Our 9 years' experience under the present program has shown that it is a workable one. We may disagree with particular details of the program, but I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of Senators feel that the program is in the right direction. I am further convinced that the program is readily adaptable to safeguard our national interests in the immediate post-war period, so far as international trade controls are concerned.

It is clear to me that the text of the Finance Committee amendment negatives the declarations of its sponsors that they favor international trade reciprocity. If the objective is to safeguard our essential national interests and at the same time pursue a reciprocity program, a program of international collaboration and cooperation, why should not the attempt be made to safeguard our interests through the program? Why destroy it? Why reserve the right to destroy it? Why reserve the right to destroy it 6 months after the termination of the war, in the most chaotic period that any human mind can imagine or grasp?

Mr. President, the committee amendment clearly gives notice of an intention to terminate the program at the first moment when domestic interests may require additional protection because it reserves the right to do precisely that, and that is the argument upon which it is based—to wit, to leave us with our hands completely untied at the time of the greatest chaos perhaps that ever settled upon the world, 6 months after the termination of the war.

The committee amendment gives notice to our allies that the Congress approves international economic cooperation only during a period when it can have no substantial economic effect. How can it have any effect during the war period? How many trade agreements is it possible to negotiate? Practically all the countries in this hemisphere have united in trade agreements with us. We all know that it is impossible to carry on commerce, under any circumstances, during this war period.

The trade agreements program has developed various safeguards for domestic producers and other essential domestic interests. Agreements are originally negotiated after painstaking study of all pertinent competitive factors. Concessions are not made when the facts indicate that they are likely to result in substantial damage to domestic interests. Safeguarding features are provided in agreements so that if unforeseen contingencies should result in such damage, appropriate action may be taken to prevent them.

Reference is particularly made to article XI of the trade agreement with Mexico, which became effective on January 30 of this year, and which I shall later in the debate insert in the RECORD. This general safeguarding clause is the outgrowth of years of effort to incorporate in our trade agreements program adequate provisions by which unforseeable damaging circumstances during the operation of the agreements may be offset. Earlier agreements also contained safeguarding provisions but of a narrower scope, such as those directed against the major benefit of concessions accruing to third countries to the detriment of domestic industries, and those to offset exchange dislocations.

Reservations have also been made to permit appropriate adjustment in import treatment when necessary to prevent imports from sapping the vigor of domestic controls program. These and many other types of possible damaging circumstances are fully covered in the present general safeguarding clause exemplified by article XI of the agreement with Mexico.

The language of the amendment is:

Provided, That every foreign-trade agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of said act, as amended—

All that have been concluded through the years, and all that may be hereafter concluded—

shall be subject to termination 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war—

by the President, or by joint resolution of the Congress.

That is the language of the amendment. It would be begging the question to say that no one intends to terminate these trade agreements. It would be begging the question to say that neither the President nor the Congress has in mind to terminate these agreements, but under this provision every foreign-trade agreement, 31 in number, thus far made, and that hereafter may be made, "shall be subject to termination 6 months after the cessation of hostilities."

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MCNARY. Would it not be so irrespective of this reservation?

Mr. GEORGE. No; not if the trade agreement is made for 3 years, as all of them have been made, except, I believe, the Peruvian agreement and perhaps one other, which have been made for 2 years. As a matter of domestic law, it would be in the power of Congress to do it, but in international law, where good morals must obtain, it would be a very definite breach of the agreement to terminate it in less time than 3 years.

I now come back to what I first said. After having read the language of this amendment, I pose a statement to every Senator who thinks that he is willing to depart from the new method of tariff making and go back to the unilateral method, the old type of tariff making

with which most of us are very familiar. If Senators are willing to agree to the amendment, then I pose this statement: It is clear, it is unmistakable, that our allies, all nations associated with us in the present war, can construe the amendment of the Finance Committee only as a present refusal—let me emphasize that—as a present refusal to commit the United States to economic collaboration in the post-war period. I stand upon that premise. I stand upon that statement. By that statement it will be determined whether anyone is in favor of economic cooperation and collaboration in the post-war period or whether by repealing all the trade agreements he wants to go back to the high rates of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, and to the old method of tariff making.

Mr. President, I reserve further argument so far as I am concerned upon this amendment, if I should care to make any further argument, until a later period.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I wanted to clear up in my mind one matter which has to do with the language of the amendment which the Senator from Georgia has been discussing. I should like to state this proposition and ask the Senator from Georgia if he thinks my understanding of it is correct. The language would indicate that any termination of the trade agreements law as it would be amended by this proposal, would have to be accomplished in one of two ways, either by a joint resolution of the Congress or by act of the President himself. It is my understanding that a joint resolution differs from a concurrent resolution in that a joint resolution requires the signature of the President, and a concurrent resolution has a somewhat dubious status. I have always doubted whether we could enact legislation by concurrent resolution. So that if the Congress should pass a joint resolution and it should be vetoed by the President, it would require two-thirds of the Members of both Houses to upset the Presidential veto. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes; certainly.

Mr. BONE. So that it would require two-thirds of both Houses to eliminate the law if Congress felt disposed to do it?

Mr. GEORGE. If the President saw fit to veto it.

Mr. BONE. If the President saw fit to veto it.

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly.

Mr. BONE. The second bracket of my question is this: Is it the view of the able Senator from Georgia that under the language of the amendment the President himself, without any act of Congress, could wipe away the statute by a proclamation? It seems that, according to the language of the amendment, the law may be done away with by joint resolution of Congress or by the President, and I take it that that is intended to mean that the President himself by his own act, without any reference whatever to Congress, may literally abolish the statute?

Mr. GEORGE. I think that was the intent of those who proposed the amendment.

Mr. BONE. I wanted to be sure that I have the correct understanding.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I assume that is the correct interpretation of the amendment.

Mr. BONE. It would seem to be the purpose of the drafters of the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. With reference to the point raised by the Senator from Washington, as I understand, his query referred to the termination of the act by proclamation of the President, but as I interpret the amendatory provision it refers to the cessation of hostilities, of the war, as fixed by proclamation of the President. The President cannot by proclamation terminate the act. The President can declare a cessation of hostilities by proclamation.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not draw the amendment, and I am not sponsor for it, but I interpret it to mean that the right is reserved to cancel or to terminate an agreement 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as fixed by proclamation of the President, and that the termination of each and all foreign-trade agreements made under the act, as amended, may be brought about pursuant to a joint resolution of the Congress or by the President himself. I take that to be the clear meaning of the amendment. I do not think there is any question about its meaning.

Mr. OVERTON. That is probably the intention, but it certainly is doubtful whether the proclamation refers to a proclamation declaring a cessation of hostilities.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the proclamation declaring the hostilities to be at an end is, under this amendment, in the hands of the President, but the termination of any or all trade agreements made under the act, as amended, both before this proposed renewal or hereafter, may be accomplished by a declaration by the President or through a joint resolution passed by Congress.

Mr. OVERTON. I see. I agree with the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is the clear meaning.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Perhaps I was guilty of using unfortunate language in making my inquiry. When I referred to abrogating the statute I did not precisely mean that the President or the Congress could wipe out the foreign-trade agreements and not the act. Of course the effect would be the same. I am sorry that I did not use very happy language in describing what I meant.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I regret that the measure providing for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act could not have been presented in a form which could have produced substantial agreement at this particular time for the sake of its impact upon the general war situation. Some of us earnestly sought to create this result in spite of our predilections. I think the extension of the act with the one single amendment asserting the constitutional rights of Congress in a modest way, avoiding all reasonable offense, would have achieved this desirable conclusion. I think it should have achieved this conclusion if we could have been dealing with reasonable men. I think it has been a mistake on the part of the present administration to resist this useful and constructive achievement, and I think that when the Senate has approved the pending amendment the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will still stand in a position of effective and formidable endorsement.

At the moment, however, I am forced to present the case for the amendment, inasmuch as the amendment is being resisted. The amendment to which I refer is the one reading as follows:

Provided, That every foreign-trade agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of said act, as amended, shall be subject to termination 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as fixed by proclamation of the President, pursuant to joint resolution of the Congress or by the President.

Mr. President, in determining the question of the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, elaborate efforts have been made to clothe it with a sanctity it has no right to claim and to make it the conclusive and the exclusive symbol of our post-war attitudes. I respectfully submit that this pretense is without justification; and that to embrace it is to wholly distort the appropriate trend of the discussion. I submit that three definite and far different problems are alone involved.

First. There have always been deep-seated convictions in Congress and the country (1) against the constitutionality of this delegated trade-agreements power, and (2) against the economic wisdom of permitting the State Department, which is essentially a political rather than an economic arm of government, to make unchecked decisions which may spell life or death for various sectors of industry, agriculture, and labor within our own United States. These convictions—having nothing whatever to do with so-called and usually miscalled isolationism—long antedated the issues of this war, and will continue to postdate them as long as the Republic lives. It is absurd to pretend that citizens must abandon their independent thinking in this respect in order to prove that they will be progressively broad-minded in their attitudes toward the infinitely larger problems of the post-war world. Why hamper the legitimate cause of legitimate post-war cooperations by any such needless and unjustified constriction?

Second. In charting our ultimate contribution to this post-war world, we have a right to be free agents at the peace

table so that—in the face of these subsequent realities—we may not only serve the aspirations of a new and happier international society but we may also be dependably sure that we have adequately conserved the rights and the interests of our own America. Shall trade agreements, or any other instruments of indirect control, be allowed to tie our hands in advance of full post-war knowledge? That is the second question involved in this debate.

Third. On the other hand, when we are in the midst of desperate war, must we not avoid every needless interruption to our interallied relationships so that no distractions shall interfere with our triumphant interallied unity?

Mr. President, particularly in view of the fact that international trade is largely an academic subject for the duration, I can wholeheartedly underwrite this third consideration; and that is what I propose, substantially, to do. I shall support the extension of the act for the duration. But I shall undertake to prove that the former considerations need not be abandoned in order to sustain the latter.

Since most of the debate on this subject, however, has been largely keyed to the self-serving notion that we are here really settling the larger questions of general post-war destiny, which I emphatically deny, I want, at the outset, to say a few things about my own post-war attitudes which certainly cannot be tied down to the relatively narrow issue involved in the mere extension of this Trade Agreements Act which has been seeking a synthetic importance wholly out of focus. I do it as a background against which to proceed, lest our global zealots find, in my ultimate suggestions, the mistaken notion that I fail to sense the real necessities for intelligent, international cooperation in this foreshortened post-war world.

So, Mr. President, I assert the faith that is in me upon this score.

First. America must maintain this present fraternity of battle—without any interruptions by previctory arguments or premature peace quarrels between us—until this war is unconditionally won wherever our arms are challenged. The first need is to end the Axis. This need must have uninterrupted and triumphant right-of-way.

Second. America must join in whatever organized post-war sanctions are necessary in order to prevent by mutual force the recurrence of criminal, military aggression in the world. International security must ever reflect scrupulous justice. But it must never again lack whatever international force is necessary in order to make its authority incontestable.

Third. America must cooperate to the limit of her resources in rebuilding the stricken liberties and resources of the Axis victims, and in perpetuating a more effective economic comity between the nations of a new and better world.

Fourth. America must be realistically world-minded in its external vision, but America also must never forget that its first duty is to 130,000,000 Americans and to the enlightened welfare of its own homeland, and it must never neglect to proceed by due process of law in making its commitments. Mr. Churchill has made it plain in his candid moments that he will look out for Britons, and I honor him for it. Mr. Stalin has made it plain that Moscow comes first with him. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, America is worth an equivalent fidelity, her sovereignty, her Constitution, her people, and her destiny. And it will not much longer be considered treason to say so.

There is disagreement among earnest citizens as to post-war details. For example, upon the same day I read Dorothy Thompson saying:

> The failure of the United States to project a constructive vision of the future of Europe may prolong this war unnecessarily. * * * It is intellectual cowardice.

On the same day, I repeat, I read the distinguished University of Michigan historian, Dr. William A. Frayer, saying:

> The notion widely voiced in this country that we shall determine the European settlement after the war is incredibly naive.

Yes; there is disagreement as to details. But never mind the details. If the world is waiting for a message from America regarding our post-war attitudes—while carefully and cannily refraining from its own commitments upon this score—I know what I would say if it were within my power. I would say: "Do not doubt for an instant that we shall do our full cooperative part hereafter in peace as well as war in the creation of a better, a safer, a happier world, and that we want this mutuality of battle to carry over into a mutuality of peace all down the fruitful years to come; but do not expect for an instant that we intend 'to give America away.'"

If I may sum it up still differently, Mr. President, I should say that our course probably lies somewhere midway between the extremists, upon the one hand, who would devote our globally dissipated resources exclusively to a wishful world society, and those upon the other hand, who would entrench us behind a Chinese wall. We shall find the national middle ground of enlightened common sense. We shall vigorously cooperate with the forces of international progress; but we shall remain irrevocably the independent and sovereign United States of America.

Now, having asserted this basic prospectus, I come back to the relatively incidental issue now pending before the Senate.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I favor the extension of the Trade Agreements Act for the duration of the war because I am opposed to any needless interruptions in our interallied relationships while we are still engaged in the military pursuit of total victory. We want no internal diversions or divisions within the United Nations while our mingling bloods are sanctifying the military altars of our common faith—nor afterward, so far as they may be avoided.

I think the importance of this extension has been insufferably exaggerated by those who self-servingly seek to make it the telltale sign, the token and the omen of all post-war things to come. It is nothing of the sort; and, in my humble view, it is illy serving the superlatively vital post-war cause to deliberately invite the world to misjudge the decisions of Congress in respect to the domestic phases of this legislation. Some of those, for example, who deeply believe that these trade agreements are in fact treaties requiring Senate ratification are among the most forward-looking of our post-war planners. It is disingenuous—to put it mildly—to invite the world to believe that their failure to desert the Constitution would be proof of their intention to desert the broadest, practical post-war cooperation. Let us have done with such sophistry. Let us quit trying to fool either ourselves or our neighbors.

Certainly Mr. Walter Lippmann is no narrow-visioned provincialist. He says in respect to this specific question:

> The imprudence of posing the biggest issues on a test of this small issue is evident.

He then proceeds to prove it incontestably.

That is the whole thing in a nutshell so far as this pretense is concerned. The imprudence of it, from the standpoint of the State Department and the spokesmanship of America, is that the biggest issues are thrown to a test upon relatively small and inconsequential issues.

I repeat, I favor the extension of the Trade Agreements Act primarily for the very practical reason which I have indicated. Frankly, I care very little whether the extension be for 2 years, as voted by the House, or 3 years, as sought by the State Department. International trade will be largely an academic subject for the duration and immediately thereafter. I shall vote for the shorter term solely because I think it is sound democracy to have these delegated powers under continuous scrutiny by those to whom they constitutionally belong, namely, the people speaking through their Congress.

Now, the next point. Very few trade agreements remain to be made. We have already completed 31 with all the major powers of the globe. Therefore, the question whether, under the Constitution, Senate ratification or general congressional consent is required is also largely academic for the time being, although great principles of functioning democracy can never be really dismissed as academic. But here again I am willing to yield my judgment for the duration to what I believe to be the dominant desirability that we shall raise as few questions as possible regarding our interallied relationships until this war is done and won. I shall not personally press the point. But if it is raised and if we are denied the right to make the simple, modest, constitutional assertion which is recommended by the Senate Finance Committee and is now pending at the bar of the Senate, I certainly shall find it impossible to surrender my constitutional convictions.

But, Mr. President, there is one point at which I do insistently urge an addition to the joint resolution to extend the Trade Agreements Act. I am referring to the Senate committee amendment. The proposal has nothing to do with what happens ahead of inter-Allied victory. It has nothing to do with our

economic attitudes toward the post-war world. It has solely to do with permitting America to be a free agent at the peace table unhampered by any advance, specific contracts which tie its hands in respect to the economic pattern of things to come. This is not an indictment of advance planning. We need to be planning ceaselessly—we and our international associates—for any and all of the contingencies which will require post-war answer in behalf of a more practical world exchange of goods and services. I favor all possible planning. But "planning" and specific, advance commitments, by those who have no authority to bind America, are two totally different things. Upon this score I recommend to my own American fellow-citizens the sage and prudent and always safety-first advice of Mr. Churchill to his Britons:

> We must beware of attempts to overpersuade or even coerce his Majesty's government to bind themselves or their unknown successors in conditions which no one can foresee and which may be years ahead, * * * and to make them pledge themselves to particular schemes without relation to other extremely important aspects of our post-war needs.

Mr. President, I confess that I should like to hear equally sturdy and equally practical advice to our own Americans from our own Chiefs of State. It is not enough to hear from Santa Claus.

Shall Mr. Churchill be convicted of deserting "the brave, new world" which is in all our dreams because he says "Stop. Look. And do a lot of listening." No indeed. He is guilty only of total candor in his practical loyalties.

Mr. President, when a trade agreement has been made under the original act, it is subject to termination upon due notice at the end of not more than 3 years. If not then terminated, it shall thereafter be subject to termination upon not more than 6 months' notice. In the absence of notice, it runs forever. Who gives the notice? The President. So long as any President wishes, the law, on its face, permits him to make any trade agreement perpetual. Congress never actually regains the power it has parted with. What difference does it make whether the act itself expires in 2 or 3 years? The agreements made under it never expire except at Presidential option. Therefore the agreements definitely involve our post-war commitments, and I shall undertake to demonstrate that they are intended to be used for this precise purpose. Thus America is doing exactly what Churchill warned the Britons not to do—

> Binding ourselves and our unknown successors in conditions which no one can foresee.

Therefore, as a matter of elementary prudence, as a matter of elementary constitutional fidelity, some of us are proposing that these agreements shall be revocable upon the order of a joint congressional resolution 6 months after the cessation of hostilities.

Please note that we do not propose actually to revoke them. If they commend themselves to our post-war judgments, they may be maintained. Please note that any revocation action is through a joint resolution which also requires the signature of the President. This is no assault upon the Executive. It is no assault upon trade agreements. We are simply adding the Congress of the United States—speaking for our whole people—to the authoritative power which can speak for America in respect to the ultimate peace formula. I doubt whether any totalitarian voice in Washington would be so bold as to assert that the President alone is entitled, under our form of Government, to write the peace without congressional approval. Yet if you deny us this amendment, Senators, you are subscribing to that amazing and totally un-American policy. If this is a people's war, the peace to follow certainly must also be a people's peace. This is still a representative Republic, and please God that it may always be.

Mr. President, there can be no question about the purposes for which the State Department is using, and intends to use, these trade agreements. I have great respect for the State Department. I have proved it many times. I have both respect and affection for Secretary of State Cordell Hull, who is one of the noblest characters who has risen to high public responsibility in my time. I testify, also, to his ingenuity in inventing a scheme to put his country as close as possible to free trade without running the adverse gantlet of a public opinion which never has, and never will, approve his total heart's desire. The State Department frankly says, in its Bulletin of February 20, 1943, that "this method was chosen as more practicable and more effective than general downward revision of the United States tariff alone." Apparently, we have to learn all over again by bitter experience each generation that legitimate tariffs, equalizing the honest difference in costs of production at home and abroad, are indispensable to the maintenance of our American wage and living standards, and our American way of life.

But when Mr. Secretary Hull and his Department deliberately propose to use their judgments—and not one of them holds an elective commission from the people of the United States—to influence now what shall be our economic decisions in the post-war world which has yet to disclose its form and challenge, I oppose their extra-legal, extra-constitutional activities with every protest of which I am capable. They use their trade agreements as a springboard from which to leap into post-war commitments pursuant to their ideas of what the post-war world ought to be. By this device, intended ostensibly for quite another purpose, they seek to tie our hands at the peace table. I do not presume to pass upon the inherent merits of their objective. That is beside the point. I comment only upon the obvious fact that they would—or at least they could—use their trade agreements now to prejudge and predetermine our place in the post-war economic world. I submit that this is without a shred of constitutional justification since not even they, in their wildest moments of bureaucratic power, could fancy themselves entitled to settle our peace commitments without the approval of the Senate, speaking under the Constitution for the American people.

I submit also that such a course is without a shred of economic justification, since no one can today foresee what America will confront in the international business of the post-war world. And mark this, Senators. Any such procedure is already categorically repudiated by the Senate itself in literal fact in connection with the recent report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the extension of the lend-lease law. It would be a sham, a delusion, and a hypocritical offense to international good will to sanction illegal post-war commitments here and now which, under directly related circumstances, have already been rejected by the unanimous, bipartisan voice of the Senate and its Foreign Relations Committee. This is not a question of whether reciprocal trade agreements are good or bad. It is solely a question whether the people of the United States of America, and their economic future in the post-war world, are entirely and exclusively at the mercy of Dr. Sayre, and the other distinguished gentlemen who actually manipulate these trade agreements to suit themselves. That is not democracy under law, and no one can tell me that it is.

Let us consult the record.

I again quote from the February 20 Bulletin of the State Department, at page 173:

> The agreements provide valuable insurance, now, against a repetition of the tidal wave of trade barriers and discriminations that swept over the world after the last war.

Perhaps there should be no such conditions after World War No. 2. I would agree that there should not. But this is the fundamental economic question at the peace table; and the men to settle it are the men who represent America at the peace table, subject to the ultimate approval of the United States Senate as provided by the Constitution. As between Dr. Sayre, in charge of trade agreements and speaking for the State Department, which, in turn, speaks for the President—as between him and the Constitution—well, I humbly confess to an unregenerate and unreconstructed loyalty to the Constitution.

I continue the quotation from the State Department Bulletin:

> An active trade-agreements program during the war strengthens the determination of the United Nations to win a victory that will be worth the cost; it inspires confidence that the United States will do its share in creating conditions favorable to prosperity and security after victory.

"After victory," Mr. President, God only knows what the global economic state will be. "After victory" we shall confront inevitable international responsibilities beyond anything which we have heretofore assumed. I do not run from them. But "after victory" we shall also confront the need "to create conditions favorable to prosperity and security" for our own America, as well as for our blood brothers in this inter-Allied conflict, all round the earth. As Timothy of Holy Writ once put it, "If

any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."

"After victory" it will be the responsibility of the then Government of this country to meet our full international obligations while equally—and always equally—protecting the enlightened self-interest of our own United States. It is all "after victory." I, for one, however wrong I may seem to some, do not intend to let this State Department decide now, in total ignorance of subsequent realities, what our post-war course shall be.

I know of no reason why we should be less realistic in this regard than is the magnificent Mr. Churchill, whom I have already quoted, in speaking for his Britons. After all—as was eloquently said 23 years ago in this same Senate Chamber—"Unshared idealism is a menace." I do not intend to send our negotiators to the peace table—there to meet free agents of every other power on earth—with their hands tied behind their backs by presently negotiated and permanently frozen trade agreements, no matter how nobly meditated.

But let us be even more specific. I quote again from the State Department Bulletin:

> In article VII of the lend-lease agreement, the Government of the United States and of the United Kingdom agreed that * * * the terms and conditions (of the final settlement) shall be such as not to burden commerce between the two countries * * * and shall include provision for agreed action * * * directed to the expansion * * * of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods * * * to the reduction of tariffs, etc.

Now, Mr. President, please note that we are invited to view these long-range commitments under so-called trade agreements in the same light and to the same end as similar commitments in article VII of the master agreements under the Lend-Lease Act. All right. I accept the battle on the terrain chosen by the State Department. The Senate has already spoken on that subject and in no uncertain terms. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, by unanimous, bipartisan consent, has already notified the world where it stands in respect to this same article VII of the master agreements under the Lend-Lease Act. In its report of March 9, 1943, the unanimous Senate committee says—

> Article VII indicates the type of economic action which may be contemplated. It is not a commitment which binds either of the legislative bodies of this Government. For example, article VII does not authorize the reduction of tariffs or commit the United States to other measures which under the Constitution must be adopted by the Congress or by either branch thereof. * * * The committee believes that there is no authority in the Lend-Lease Act to warrant any general post-war commitments or post-war policies.

That, Mr. President, I repeat, is the unanimous, bipartisan, considered judgment of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It is a historic reassertion of indisputable constitutional doctrine. It has already repudiated any attempts to commit the United States to post-war economic policies with particular identification of tariff policies, without the consent of Congress. Yet the State Department tells us in its official bulletin that such is the precise purpose of its use of the Trade Agreements Act. Shall we approve, in its new disguise, the very thing which we officially rejected 60 days ago? It is inconceivable to me that the Senate, speaking for the people of the United States, should be guilty of any such crass inconsistency. What we could not allow under cover of lend-lease agreements, we cannot condone under color of so-called reciprocal trade agreements. This is still our country. It does not belong exclusively to the State Department. It does not belong to the President. The Constitution is not just a nuisance. It is a God-blessed reality. The Senate did not hesitate to say so when it extended the Lend-Lease Act, with my entire approval. Why should it hesitate to say so again today in connection with the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?

Mr. President, let me be even more specific and I think this well identifies the thing I am talking about. In its agreement with Mexico—which, under the most-favored-nation process means an agreement with the whole world—we have agreed to bind guayule rubber on the free list. If they can do that with one kind of rubber, they can do it with all rubber. Indeed, they have already done it with crude rubber, in the British and Peruvian agreements. If that is to be our post-war policy, what, then, becomes of the vast synthetic rubber development which, at the expense of literally billions of dollars, the Government has fostered in continental United States in order to make us self-contained. The estimable and always philanthropic Vice President has indicated his hope that, in post-war days, we may again revert to our reliance upon imported rubber. That could mean the scrapping of our vast synthetic rubber development after the war, unless we can produce rubber cheaper than it is produced by the cheapest of all foreign labor elsewhere. Is that satisfactory to the American people? I doubt it, but I do not know. But this I do know: that question is for the Congress, speaking for the whole American people, to decide when we reach the post-war economic world. It is not for Secretary Hull and Dr. Sayre to decide now. Yet they use reciprocal trade agreements to prejudice the answer ahead of time—and without any authority whatsoever to speak, under the Constitution, for the ultimate American decision. It makes no difference what the decision ultimately may be. It may fully indicate the generosity of our amiable Vice President. That is beside the point. The point is that these estimable gentlemen, none of whom bears a commission from the people of the United States, are assuming to use trade agreements to bind us to these post-war commitments to suit their own unauthorized predilections.

They cannot do it, Mr. President, no matter how hard they try. This is still a free country in which the people have the last word, no matter how annoying it may be. It is an imposition upon the rest of the world to pretend otherwise. The world should know—in this instance as in the case of so-called master agreements under the Lend-Lease Act—that the Constitution still lives and that at least a prospective majority of the American people still intend that it shall prevail. And we should say so here and now lest unrequited hopes precipitate the worst of all post-war disillusionments. That is the purpose of the amendment for which I speak.

Please let it be understood, Mr. President, that I do not even remotely intimate any sinister purpose or motive on behalf of these splendid public servants in the State Department. The difference between us is solely one of a point of view. The Secretary of State was very frank to say, in his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee, that such subjects as the one to which I now refer, namely, the future of the synthetic rubber industry of the United States, ought to be in the hands, ultimately, of Congress for decision. All I am saying, Mr. President, is that, unless the post-war hands of Congress be untied it cannot be in the hands of Congress, except as we subsequently violate the moral obligation of having reenacted the Trade Agreements Act and sanctified again the agreements under it which, I repeat, so far as the face of the law is concerned, run perpetually except as the President of the United States alone may intervene.

Since we have already contracted these trade agreements with almost every power on earth, and since they can be indefinitely extended by the President without regard to Congress, it seems to me that as a practical proposition it is far less important at the moment to seek congressional ratification for future trade agreements than it is to make certain that a definite procedure is now provided to assure, if desired, an optional review of all trade agreements when we plan our part in the post-war world. But if any Senators, who heretofore have always asserted their conviction that these trade agreements are treaties constitutionally requiring Senate ratification, feel that they must reassert this opinion in the pending joint resolution, they certainly have the right and they may not be justly condemned as post-war obstructionists because they use it.

War does not suspend constitutional rights or the privilege of asserting them. That is fundamental in the American doctrine. To argue that a renewal of this act, without a constitutional reassertion of this constitutional belief, is necessary and essential to a proper disclosure to our allies of our post-war purposes, is to argue that our victory is to be at the permanent expense of our Constitution and that we must now thus tell the world.

Mr. President, if our actions here today are to be subjected to extraneous implications, I think it would be far fairer and far more honest frankly to tell the world that while we have every disposition to cooperate across the seven seas in greater post-war degree than ever heretofore

contemplated, we have no disposition—now or hereafter—to ever depart from due process of constitutional law in implementing these fraternal objectives. We should not enlighten—we should merely deceive—the world to tell it otherwise.

We are not fighting this war to tear down our checks and balances. We are not fighting for the suppression of constitutional loyalties, no matter how controversial their discussion may be. We are not fighting for permanent surrender to government by executive decree. The proponents of the doctrine that we dare not here reassert our constitutional beliefs lest we thereby discourage post-war hopes leave its opponents with no alternative except to reassert their views. It is they, not we, who precipitate this situation if and when they try to brand our pending action as determinative of our post-war attitudes and patterns.

Be frank about it, Senators. What is it they ask? They demand that we here set the precedent, upon which the world may rely, to demonstrate our general post-war purposes in respect to international cooperation. What is the precedent? That we shall cooperate without regard to constitutional limitations and constitutional protections—as these limitations and protections are solemnly viewed by a large and constantly growing congressional minority and by millions of our people. That we shall cooperate without regard to the viewpoints of these great minorities—if they be in fact minorities—and that these minorities must now be suppressed! Is that the pattern of things to come? Is that the general rule of post-war settlements to which we are invited to commit ourselves? Is that the price of glory in this new and better world for which we die? If so, Mr. President, then in my humble conviction we could lose this war at home even before we have won it abroad.

Let us have no mistake about the issue I discuss. It transcends all lesser considerations. It has nothing whatsoever to do with a choice of tariff-making methods. It has nothing whatsoever to do with encouragements to greater export trade. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the economic interdependence of a foreshortened post-war world. It has nothing whatsoever to do with whether our reciprocal-trade agreement program has been good or bad. It has solely to do with the general pattern of our post-war settlements which we are told will be foreordained by this presently pending decision upon this little amendment, recommended by the Finance Committee. Shall it be a pattern which requires American citizens to forego their constitutional rights? Shall it be a pattern which requires Congress to forego a consistent reexpression of these rights? Is that to be the precedent and pattern of the peace for which we fight?

We are told that we shall destroy the hopes of men for a happier, better, freer post-war economic world unless we extend this Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act without changing the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." Ah, Mr. President, how poignantly reminiscent that is of the tragic error made by the great President Woodrow Wilson in the aftermath of World War No. 1. Have we learned nothing from history? Why is it assumed that the mere existence of a constitutional congressional veto will destroy legitimate trade agreements? It is a very modest veto, because it requires either the signature of the President or a two-thirds vote in both Houses of Congress. Why is it assumed that wisdom and patriotism stop at the portals of the White House and the State Department? Why is it assumed that the direct representatives of the American people are no longer to be trusted? Why is it assumed that the people will not irresistibly dominate the thinking and the actions of their elected representatives? Why is it that this pending tariff act—for that is exactly what it is—suddenly expands to the magnitude almost of the Sermon on the Mount? When did the hopes of men for a happier, better world become estranged from a rugged assertion by any American citizen of his belief in the God-blessed Constitution of the United States?

No, Mr. President, this false hypothesis just does not make sense. So far as tariffs are concerned, I assert here and now that so far as I am concerned, I hope there is never another general congressional revision. It would be an imponderable mess. I hope we establish scientific tariffs under which an independent tariff commission writes the levies according to general standards laid down by general statute and subject only to a congressional veto upon major changes. So far as reciprocal foreign trade is concerned, I hope we pursue it to the last possible, practical degree which does not destroy domestic production essential to the preservation of American wage and living standards. I hope for continued legitimate reciprocal activity in this direction, subject only to the maintenance of final, constitutional responsibility in the Congress. But I hope, also, Mr. President, that I shall never see that dark day when world trade is dearer to our hearts than are constitutional rights, and when world planners, no matter how noble may be their cloistered meditations, can totally silence American planners—and that is the essence of this particular demand.

Mr. President, I do not intend to spend any time today on the inherent economic merits of the reciprocal trade agreements that have been negotiated since this Act was first passed on June 12, 1934. In my view, the value of these reciprocal agreements has been greatly exaggerated by their friends and the damage has been greatly exaggerated by their critics. As is usually the case, truth and wisdom are probably to be found somewhere between. I would be the last to deny that we want the maximum exports which we can profitably acquire; but I also would be the last to consent that exports are profitable if gained only at the expense of imports which displace essential domestic production and employment. I repeat that a rule of reason must balance these factors on a realistic basis.

A great and highly respected friend of mine in Detroit, who is one of the most enthusiastic devotees of this Trade Agreement Act, pointed out the other day—as if it were the last word upon the subject—that "800 industries in Michigan are engaged in exporting" and "in peacetime $1 of every $7 spent in this area is derived from foreign trade." Very well; let us ungrudgingly concede that this establishes the importance of exports and the complete desirability of fostering them—which I completely concede. But does it establish the automatic virtue of any and every device to foster export trade? Suppose I state his very same facts just as accurately but differently. Suppose I say it this way: "Every industry in Michigan except a very few engaged exclusively in exporting, is primarily dependent upon domestic orders right here at home for its existence; and $6 out of every $7 spent in this area is derived from domestic trade." Logically, using my friend's formula, I have made out six times as good a case for the rugged protection of domestic industry and domestic employment and domestic agriculture so as to preserve this rich domestic market for our home producers. But does it establish the automatic virtue of all tariffs, and does it automatically condemn all reciprocity? Certainly not. I repeat that a rule of reason must balance these factors on a realistic basis. I should say, in a word, that we want the widest possible international trade not inconsistent with the essential protection and maintenance of legitimate American domestic production upon which American standards of living, of income, and of wages irresistibly depend. A prostrate America, Mr. President, cannot richly aid a prostrate post-war world.

I am frank to say that I do not know—and no one else can know—what the post-war economy will demand of us in these respects. That is why I refuse to gamble with so tremendously vital a speculation involving the post-war livelihood of every man, woman, and child under the flag. We must see and know this post-war world before we can intelligently and prudently specify our economic part in it. If we are to level ourselves off to a common, global standard, it requires no seer to anticipate the complete demolition of traditional American wage and living concepts. I suppose none but a confirmed international communist would confess to any such aspiration. Yet some of our global dreamers, wittingly or otherwise, seem to face at least in that direction. Of course, the American people will never, allow such hari-kari. On the other hand, if we shall attempt to wall ourselves off into all but total economic exclusion, we shall, by our example, stimulate a world-wide economic nationalism which will make a pacific, happy world impossible. I repeat again that a rule of reason must balance these factors on a realistic basis.

But what is a post-war "realistic basis"? Who can say what will be the impact on our American economy of the utter demoralization of much of the balance of the world's economy? Who can

promise that for years to come cheap foreign labor will not be cheaper foreign labor than ever before? Who can prophesy that with foreign production costs lower than ever, and our own production costs higher than ever—as they will be—who can prophesy that this rivalry will not unavoidably drive us to greater rather than less protections? And how can we sell abroad at all—trade treaties or no trade treaties—if we cannot compete in price? Who can say what Mr. Churchill's plans will be for the British in this post-war economic world—except that we know he will always and forever look out for Britain. That is not a criticism; it is a compliment. Who can anticipate Mr. Stalin's plans? No, Mr. President, when we contemplate these imponderables, and at the same time try now to chart the details of our American post-war economic course, it is like trying to see in a dark room; like trying to breathe in a vacuum.

I am perfectly willing, for whatever it may be worth, to tell the world in general terms that we have no wish to withdraw unto ourselves when this war is done; that we intend in suitable fashion to support whatever sanctions are necessary to prevent the criminal rebirth of military aggression; that we shall cooperate in the broadest possible economic society consistent with our own economic institutions. But, for myself, I am not willing to write blank checks now against the inheritance and the destiny of our children and our children's children.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am driven to the irresistible conclusion that our peace makers must face these ultimate realities with a free hand. They must not be hamstrung by commitments, no matter how warming to our hearts, which we might now forge for them in the absence of full knowledge. I am driven to the irresistible conclusion that these trade agreements should pass in review—or be eligible to do so—within 6 months or a year after the cessation of hostilities. Perhaps we shall then want more and bigger and better reciprocity. Perhaps, on the other hand, we may find some of these commitments highly irksome and embarrassing. I do not prejudge the issue. But I insist that no one else should pre-judge the issue either.

The idea that we must go ahead with this program, without limitations and without regard to the ending of the war; the idea that we must rubber stamp this particular and specific formula right now in order to guarantee the world's hope for peace and to prove our good faith in the things for which we fight is an utterly fantastic bit of frantic, self-serving propaganda unworthy of the merits of the cause in which it is pathetically invoked. It is just one more sample of the extravagance, of which I have previously spoken, with which extremists either praise or condemn the Trade Agreements Act.

We were solemnly told in 1934 that this act was the new charter of world peace. It was heralded by a symphony of doves. Of course, it was nothing of the sort. It did not produce peace at all. It was followed by the greatest war in human history. That was just a coincidence. The Trade Agreements Act did not produce the war; but certainly it did not stop it. It just had no conclusive bearing on the subject. And so it is with this current pretext that somehow or other the Congress casts the final dice of destiny when it deals with the pending act. Thus the distinguished Under Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles, speaking on May 8 at Toledo, said:

> If the United States repudiates the idea of economic nonaggression, it will have destroyed the stuff of which peace is made. It will have struck a heavy blow at the hopes of mankind for ridding this world of the scourge of war and for creating a just, a workable, and a lasting peace.

Echoes of 1934 and 1937 and 1940. The same old line. Almost word for word what the State Department said when the Trade Agreements Act was born—

> To create the kind of international economic relations upon which a structure of durable peace can be erected.

The parallel suffices as a dismissal of the exhibit. Mind you, no one in his right senses is going to deny that economic pressures cause wars. Of course they do. But, Mr. President, the economic pressures which cause wars are of a magnitude compared with which this recommended cure in these trade agreements is not even a passing palliative. The Trade Agreements Act did not cause the juggernaut of war so much as to hesitate. Why fool ourselves into thinking it could do so again? It is a pigmy in the presence of Mars. It is ridiculous to try to make it seem a giant. Yes; it has its contributory usefulness in this good cause—and for what it is worth, it is entitled to plead this virtue. But to attempt to build it up to the paramount sanctity of the very Ark of the Covenant is to ridicule its realities. So I plead once more that we get down to earth in this argument; and that we base our contemporary decision on things as they are, both at home and abroad.

Now, Mr. President, I sum up. We are at war against the most malignant curse the world has ever known. Our paramount obligation is to win the war as swiftly and as completely as possible. At no point in this triumphant process should we needlessly disturb any of our existing inter-Allied relationships. The Trade Agreements Act is a small part but nevertheless an integral part of this relationship. But for the duration it is only an academic part. Therefore any disturbance of it is needless; and therefore I shall vote for its extension.

After we have won the war, we must win the peace. America must and America will cooperate in the post-war sanctions necessary to prevent the rebirth of aggression. We shall not "withdraw into our shells," if you want to put it that way. To the utmost limits of our own sovereign rights and our own unexpendable needs, we shall cooperate in establishing a better world economy. But we are entitled to look before we leap. We are entitled to assess our own position against the as yet undisclosed position of others. We are entitled to deal with realities instead of dreams. We are entitled to be free-handed at the peace table. Therefore, insofar as these trade agreements extend into and color our post-war status, we have a right to insist that they be revocable by joint action of Congress and the President in the post-war era; and therefore I shall vote for such an amendment to the resolution.

War necessarily involves a tremendous temporary expansion of Executive authority. The return of peace demands a faithful return to constitutional checks and balances in every aspect. The peace role—the broad, helpful and sympathetic peace role—which we shall play in this post-war world must and will be decided by due process of American law. Therefore, it can never be out of place for us to assert our constitutional fidelities.

The pending issue in the Senate is a very small part of this total climacteric. But my prayer would be that every part shall be governed by these principles, with the national—yes, the "national"—anthem in our hearts and with every reasonable international objective in our souls.

Mr. President, the pending issue is confined to the very narrow one submitted by a majority of the members of the Senate Finance Committee in respect to the pending amendment, which merely provides that, hereafter, 6 months after the cessation of hostilities, trade agreements shall be revocable not only by the President, as is the existing law, but also by a joint resolution of the Congress, which requires the signature of the President and which, therefore, would require a two-thirds vote of the Congress in the event the President disagreed. If the amendment is subject to legitimate attack it would be by those who believe that it is an inadequate expression of the constitutional duty and responsibility of the Congress in respect to revenue legislation. It is said that the amendment would destroy the act because no nation would be willing to make a 3-year trade agreement in the presence of the possibility of revocation within 6 months. Yet, Mr. President, we have already made 26 agreements which have already lived their full 3 years, and which at this good hour are subject to revocation upon 6 months' notice given by the President. Five more trade agreements—and making a total of 31—which have been made will have lived their full 3 years before the time arrives when the amendment would become effective. Therefore, every trade agreement now in existence is already subject and eligible, or will be before the proposed amendment could become effective, to revocation upon 6 months' notice; and I do not see that the existence of the 6 months' notice provision has ruined the entire purpose and advantage of reciprocal trade cooperation.

It is said that we shall scare our international neighbors by this expression of a very mild congressional constitutional right. Mr. President, they are not scared by the existence already of the right in the hands of the President to give 6 months' notice of revocation; and I submit that in their right minds they would not be scared by the existence of another 6 months' notice privilege which

would be in the hands of the Congress and the President jointly, and which could not be exercised against Presidential objection except by a two-thirds vote of both the House and the Senate. I submit that if any trade agreement negotiated under those auspices is ever so bad that it wins the condemnation of two-thirds of the House and the Senate, speaking for the people of the United States, it must be the kind of trade agreement which should be denounced.

Just one word further: It is said that Congress already has the power to denounce these agreements. Probably that is literally true as respects domestic law. But, Mr. President, as the law stands, I think we have invited our international neighbors to believe that the right of 6 months' notice rests exclusively with the President. So far as concerns any intent on our part to use the congressional power at any time, under any circumstances, as we are told we are free to do if we wish, I think that if we have any such thought or purpose or objective in mind the way to establish successful international good neighborliness is to be totally frank and candid in our textual relationships with our partners around the world.

So, Mr. President, I submit that the action of the majority of the Senate Finance Committee is entitled to the approval of the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in the latter part of his remarks the Senator from Michigan somewhat qualified some of his previous statements upon which he predicated much of his argument; to wit, that after a trade agreement has run 3 years it is not terminated by an act of Congress and that it can be terminated only by the President. I take very definite issue with the Senator on that point.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator misunderstood what I said. I say that that is the textual fact on the face of the Reciprocal Trade Treaty Act. I say that in fact we do have the right, but that, in my judgment, it would not be fair to exercise it without notice.

Mr. GEORGE. After 3 years?

Mr. VANDENBERG. At any time when notice is eligible.

Mr. GEORGE. I thought I understood the Senator's argument. I simply wished to make it clear that later in the debate I shall undertake to demonstrate, beyond all doubt, that after a treaty has operated for 3 years it may be terminated by the Congress

CONVEYANCE OF MINNESOTA LANDS FOR PARK, RECREATIONAL, OR WILDLIFE-REFUGE PURPOSES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 629) to authorize the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Minnesota to such State for use for park, recreational, or wildlife-refuge purposes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HATCH, Mr. WALLGREN, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2346) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, there is nothing new or revolutionary about the philosophy of reciprocal trade. The urgency and validity of this policy were recognized by President William McKinley many decades ago. I was a firm supporter of the policy of reciprocal trade as it was set forth by McKinley in its original form; and though the entire question of tariffs and international trade remains a question of serious and continued controversy, I am still convinced of the necessity and validity of a reciprocal trade policy among the nations of the world.

At this very hour this Nation and nearly every other nation in the world is engaged in a tremendous and worldwide armed conflict. The burdens cast upon the administration in the prosecution of this war are heavy indeed. It will require the fullest cooperation of every agency of our Government and every unit of our population to bring us through this hour of trial successfully. It is of the utmost importance, then, that the closest cooperation should exist between the legislative and executive branches of our Government in the definition and execution of the policies to which this Nation shall adhere during these emergent times. It would indeed be a helpful and encouraging sign if such cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of our Government could be reflected in the passage of a measure on the present question which would be mutually and completely acceptable to both these branches of the Government, for it would serve notice on the world that we in America are and will remain completely united on all major aspects of policy, both at home and abroad, during and immediately following this great struggle and in the prosecution of the great tasks which will face us in the momentous times which lie ahead.

Mr. President, the enactment of a measure which will be mutually acceptable to the executive and legislative departments with respect to this very vital matter of reciprocal trade is by no means an impossible task. Indeed, we are very close to such an agreement already. I know that I for one will find it possible to vote for the enactment of the joint resolution, provided the committee amendment is included. Certainly this amendment should cause no great controversy, for both Secretary Hull and Assistant Secretary Sayre, in their testimony before the committee, stated that the Congress possesses the very same powers which are announced by the committee amendment. It is not, therefore, a question of whether or not the Congress has this power. It is merely a question as to whether or not a statement describing such power should be written into the law. Surely the resolution of that particular question will prove no stumbling block to the Government at a time when unified action is the paramount need.

Mr. President, it lies beyond the province of any man or any group of men to foresee what the conditions of the world will be when the present hostilities come to an end. Indeed, a study of history shows us that every war is followed by a period of grave and far-reaching unrest. Unanticipated problems arise. Economic, social, and political difficulties occur. The resolution of such difficulties requires prompt and effective action. I well recall that when I became Secretary of Labor more than 3 years after the close of the last war, this Nation and every other nation were in the throes of violent and challenging post-war reactions. Millions of American men were unemployed. Industries were listless. Cheap foreign goods flooded our markets. That was indeed a dark hour—an hour which required prompt and thoroughgoing Government action.

It is true that we are laying plans to prevent a recurrence of these dreaded conditions at the close of this war; and well we should, for the lives and welfare of many millions of American citizens make such action imperative. But, again, Mr. President, how are we to know that the plans now being laid will prove adequate in the post-war world? Surely unforeseen events and unexpected developments may well pose problems for which no adequate provisions have been made. In view of the admittedly numerous and complex problems which we shall be called upon to face at the close of this war, it is imperative that this Government be prepared to face those problems on a realistic basis, and that we be in a position to take action if and when action is needed.

Mr. President, I submit that the American people should not go forward to meet the problems of the post-war period without a clear and frank statement of the policy to which their Government shall adhere—a policy which bears the approval of both the legislative and executive departments, and a policy which is clear, frank, and complete in all its terms and implications.

Mr. President, I submit that this country and its people are far too honorable

to embark upon a policy which is not fairly and fully expressed. Yet that is exactly what we shall be doing if we enact the pending bill without including the committee amendment. In their testimony before the committee, both Secretary Hull and Assistant Secretary Sayre agreed that the Congress possesses the very powers set forth in the committee amendment. For us to withhold fair and frank notice of such powers from all the nations negotiating with us represents a type of duplicity and obscurity which may well serve to bring damage to our policies and disrepute to our name among the various nations of the world.

Mr. President, I submit that this Nation should enter into no agreement unless that agreement is prefaced by a full and complete statement of the terms by which such agreement shall be governed.

I submit that we should not enter into any commitments without first stating the terms under which such commitments may be adjusted or resolved. We should conceal no terms, when such concealment may serve to aggravate rather than to assuage the serious problems which we shall be called upon to face in the post-war world.

This sentiment of apprehension as to just what our position in the post-war world shall be is being reflected by every part and parcel of our Nation today. The farmer, the worker, and the merchant—yes, every citizen in our land—is greatly concerned with the matter of post-war developments. I do not wish to see this Government enter into any commitment which shall serve to bring distress, want, and unemployment to those able and patriotic citizens of America who are now striving to the utmost of their capacity to bring victory to our cause in this grave and pressing hour.

As I am a firm believer in the principle of reciprocity, so, too, am I a firm believer in and a stanch defender of American constitutional government. Inasmuch as any policy of international trade exerts a definite influence upon the economic and social development of the American Nation, and hence upon American agriculture, American industry, American wages, and American standards of living as well, it is my unalterable belief that any such policy should be entered into only in accordance with the fundamental constitutional precepts of our Government, and that the people of this Nation, through their duly elected representatives in the Congress, should exert a definite and constructive force upon any policy or agreement which this Government undertakes or enters into.

Mr. President, the American Government is like no other government in the world. It is a government of divided powers, a type of government which demands the utmost cooperation between its various departments if the utmost efficiency is to be attained. We must manifest such cooperation in the enactment of this bill today.

We are not a parliamentary government. In such a government the executive branch, drawn from the legislative branch, is dependent upon the support of the legislature for its official life. Mr. President, we all know what happens in a nation governed by a parliamentary form of government when any policy is entered into which does not have the majority support of the legislature. That government fails, new elections are held, and the entire policy is placed in the hands of the newly elected parliament. We have no such arrangement in our Government. Each of our functional departments is independent. The members of each branch hold office for a definite and stipulated time. Such an arrangement, therefore, requires the utmost cooperation among the various branches of the Government. We must, therefore, agree upon a policy which not only will reflect such cooperation but also reflect a respect for the constitutional framework of our Government.

Under this act we have negotiated trade agreements with 30 nations. Of these 30 nations, 26 have required some type of approval by the legislative bodies of their governments before the agreements became operative. Because of this requirement of legislative approval, we have not seen fit to denounce those nations as either protectionists or isolationists. Indeed, on the contrary, we have cited them for their neighborly and cooperative spirit. Why, then, would they, as has often been charged, lose confidence in us if we were fully to announce the policy which governs these agreements instead of leaving—as we now do—a major part of the policy unstated and unexplained. We do this when we fail to make clear to these nations the power which the Congress of the United States possesses with respect to this particular policy.

Mr. President, the acceptance of the committee amendment would not mean that the Congress is bent upon the destruction of our reciprocal trade policy. No Congress would be so rash as to countenance such a step. Indeed, it would require a majority of both Houses of Congress, together with Presidential approval, to take any effective action under the committee amendment. Should the President veto such resolution, it would require a two-thirds majority in both Houses to override the veto and make the provisions of the amendment operative. Obviously, only such an act as was in the best interests of the country, and supported by an overwhelming public opinion, could successfully emerge from such a wise and powerful mechanism as this. In view of the overwhelming majorities which the administration's party has enjoyed in both Houses of the Congress over the years, it is, of course, extremely doubtful that any action could be taken on this matter, unless such action bore the approval of the administration and its party.

The committee amendment only seeks to write into the law a constitutional power which now remains unwritten so far as this particular law is concerned. The committee amendment serves only to make clear the fact that the Congress of the United States is empowered to act, should a condition arise in the post-war world which would make it imperative that it so act in order to preserve and protect our people.

Mr. President, there is need in the world today, as there never was such need before, to restore full confidence and meaning to representative, constitutional government. The rise of totalitarian regimes and the recrudescence of undemocratic principles, have posed problems of grave concern for all societies of freemen, as well as the governments which function under them. This challenge cannot be met, and these problems cannot be solved by the abdication of representative bodies, nor by the shirking of legislative responsibilities. If constitutional government is to be maintained in the United States, and its forces strengthened throughout the world, it remains for the elected representatives of the people to maintain the balance of power, and to lay claim to and exert dominion over the powers granted them by the instrument of government under which this Nation functions—the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, the eyes of a troubled world are turned upon us today. They seek to learn whether a democratic government can continue to function as such in this new and involved area in which we live. We can reaffirm their faith in constitutional government if we but enact a law today which reaffirms the validity of those principles. The committee amendment to the pending measure is nothing more nor less than a restatement of a fundamental principle of American constitutional government. I say that we could make no more enduring contribution to the world than to enact this amendment, for by so doing we would make clear to all men everywhere that the United States of America, its people, and its Government, recognize and affirm the principles of constitutional government, and that they are capable of meeting all problems and developing all policies within the framework of such a government. If we do not succeed in meeting this problem within such a constitutional framework, we shall have dealt a heavy—yes, a mortal—blow to the forces of all constitutional governments, not only in our own Nation, but in every nation throughout the world.

Mr. President, I shall vote to sustain the amendment recommended by the committee.

Mr. MALONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the thoughtfulness of the Senator, but I prefer not to yield for that purpose. However, I am very grateful to my colleague.

Mr. President, I very much enjoyed the eloquent, and articulate address of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I believe his address was deserving of much more than that which he asked.

Three years ago I supported the amendment offered by the late Senator Pittman to a joint resolution similar to the one now being discussed. I have heretofore submitted an amendment in connection with the pending joint reso-

lution. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. —. Effective on the date of enactment of this act, section 2 of such act of June 12, 1934, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) No foreign trade agreement hereafter entered into under the first section of this act shall take effect until the Senate of the United States shall have advised and consented to its ratification, two-thirds of the Senators present concurring."

Mr. MALONEY. When the Pittman amendment was defeated, I opposed the joint resolution then pending and voted against it, as I had done on two previous occasions. During that debate I set forth, at some length, my reason for opposing the extension of the law permitting so-called reciprocal trade agreements. My reason then, as it is now, was that I refused to abandon the provisions of the Constitution concerning the making of treaties with foreign powers.

Circumstances have changed greatly since that time. The changes, however, for reasons which I shall state, do not remove my objections to ignoring or bypassing the Constitution in order to accomplish admittedly noble objectives.

Three years ago I expressed to this body my opinion that the power to make trade treaties without the concurrence or approval of the representatives of the American people would be a dangerous concentration of power in the hands of a few men. The power to make trade treaties includes the power to affect or control the entire relationship of this Nation with other nations. I think that no sensible person will deny that those having the power to alter the economic relationship between nations will have also the power to influence profoundly their political relationships. To say that a treaty dealing with a subject of such basic importance is not a treaty but an agreement does not change the fact of the matter. It is the same thing as calling a war an "incident."

Just as the makers of so-called agreements, which are really treaties, can control our foreign policy to a large extent so can they greatly affect our domestic economy. The well-being of every American citizen can be influenced by those who control our foreign trade. One industry can be favored and another injured by these trade treaties. One section can be given an advantage over another. The manner and form of our entire national economic development can be altered.

Transcending in importance even the economic results and the effect on foreign policy is the effect on our American system if we continue this path away from representative government. No one denies that concentration of authority often seems attractive. It is easier to act in secrecy and without the interference of the representatives of the divers interests that constitute America. Other peoples have tried the easier and more expeditious way of the authoritarian government. They have avoided the inconveniences and annoyances of democratic methods. Yes, to be frank, they have avoided even some of the faults and failures of democracy. They have, however, found the easy path a dangerous one. They escape their relatively minor troubles at the expense of overwhelming disaster. Mussolini made the trains run on time and Hitler even abolished unemployment, but those peoples who gave up, who abandoned all power to the heads of their governments are paying and will pay a price terrible beyond imagination.

Mr. President, it does not seem to me to be necessary to review in detail the objections which I have to the extension, without restrictions, of this measure. In previous debates others have covered the ground with complete clarity and ample evidence. Nor do I think it necessary for me again to enlarge on what I have said concerning the integrity and nobility of purpose of the proponents of this program. I have said, and I repeat, that I do not fear a dictatorship of our present national leadership, nor do I fear that that leadership intends to use the powers here requested to the detriment of this Nation or of other nations. I take pleasure in again attesting to my profound respect for Secretary of State Hull. My objection is no narrow resistance to present policies or persons. It was expressed as well as lies within my power 3 years ago when I said:

> Never let it be said that each Chief Executive of this Nation, or any Secretary of State, is entitled to exercise and practice his philosophy of tariff and treaty making and his own ideas on the method of stimulating foreign trade, without adherence to the directional signs of the Constitution.

All this, in substance, was said when this program was discussed previously. I have purposely ignored, until this moment, the changed circumstances to which I referred earlier in these remarks. I would be less than frank if I did not agree that we have a new problem of vast importance. That problem is the necessity of planning today for the establishment of a lasting peace. I am completely convinced that no lasting peace is possible without a sound and equitable foreign trade policy. I will go further and say that our indicated intentions are of immediate importance to the successful prosecution of the war.

I make these statements, Mr. President, because I wish to answer directly the most powerful arguments which are being offered by the proponents of the pending joint resolution. They claim that its rejection or amendment would be a repudiation of the idea of economic nonaggression. They claim that the world would thus be discouraged in its hopes for creating a lasting peace. Let me say that I cannot agree. Let me say that I do not admit, in fact I deny, that opposition to the pending measure implies opposition to a fair, a just, and a workable program of trade among nations. Let me say further and with great emphasis, that if any foreign nation believes that the opponents of this joint resolution favor a destructive and selfish policy of economic aggression, the blame for such an interpretation will lie with those who have misstated our position.

Other nations require that these so-called trade agreements be approved by the representatives of their people before they become effective. Why, in the case of the United States, should a demand for equal protection be called economic aggression? Who makes this accusation? tion? Not foreign statesmen—but representatives of our own Government. The reason, of course, is clear enough. The proponents of this measure seek votes for its passage. They wish to make it appear that its opponents are voting against international economic cooperation. They, not we, say that this is the interpretation that should be placed on our positions. They, not we, are saying that we repudiate the idea of economic nonaggression. This is a common political stratagem. Used on domestic issues it is fairly well understood and not too damaging. On matters affecting our relationship with foreign powers such tactics are dangerous. The persons who have stated to the world that we oppose this joint resolution on a narrowly nationalistic basis will be responsible if the interpretation which they profess to fear is generally accepted.

I would suggest that the Members of the United States Senate who find it necessary to speak in opposition be permitted to express their own reasons for so doing. For myself, I very much resent the charges on the part of those downtown in the State Department who undertake to make a diagnosis or an analysis or an appraisal of the position of Members of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I have outlined the reasons why I have consistently opposed this sort of extension of power. I have recognized the special atmosphere today. Because of this atmosphere I find it necessary as an opponent of this measure to state, in rather general terms, my own position on our foreign trade policy.

I am heartily in favor of the "idea of economic nonaggression." More than that I favor a policy of mutual helpfulness in the economic relationship among nations. I do not believe that a profitable foreign trade must be carried on at the expense of other nations. On the contrary, I believe that recent economic history has shown that trade which is not beneficial to all will certainly not be beneficial to us or to any other one nation.

The idea that we can consistently sell abroad more than we are willing to buy from abroad is simply foolish. To look at the matter, for a moment, only from the viewpoint of our own national economic interest, why should we want to sell more than we buy? It does not make much sense that we should want to deliver out of our own production every year a far greater value of goods than we receive in exchange for those goods.

If any nation were to propose such an arrangement on a barter basis, we would regard the proposal as an insult to our intelligence. And yet we call such a situation a favorable balance of trade. The very use of the words "favorable" and "unfavorable" has tended to confuse our

thinking on this fundamentally simple question. Of course, when we have a favorable balance of trade we receive something in addition to the lesser quantity of goods or services which our people receive in return for their own exports. What we receive, in simple language, is a claim, for future use, against the goods or services of foreign nations. Such claims may seem to have a value. Actually, the value is so remote as to be practically nonexistent. If we want a favorable balance of trade we obviously cannot use the claims developed from the trade of former years, since in each year we insist on delivering more than enough to pay for what we receive in that particular year.

Of course, we can, and have, in the past, used some part of our accumulation of foreign exchange or gold to loan abroad. It takes little thought to understand that such a remedy cures the symptom while aggravating the disease. These investments are intended to be repaid. They must draw interest as well, so that our purchasing power or claim against goods produced in foreign countries grows at an accelerated rate.

Such a condition is an absurdity. It is as though an individual worked hard and sold his neighbor all his surplus goods, accepting in payment some token which could be used only to purchase goods in turn from that neighbor, and then refused year after year to make use of these tokens, lest he be forced to restrict his own activities and slacken the accumulation of an imaginary wealth which his own policies made worthless.

I know that this sounds like almost too simple a statement. I know that it seems incredible that our foreign-trade policy, when reduced to its essentials, could have been so completely unintelligent. Yet I must insist that it is completely true that we are giving away the goods which we are producing in our farms and factories when we persistently sell more abroad than we are willing to accept in exchange.

The mere loss by our own people of the goods making up our excess of exports is by no means all the damage which we here suffer from lack of an intelligent foreign-trade policy. Having built a false prosperity on a foreign trade, the basis of which was unsound and which could not possibly continue, we suffered a terrific depression partly due to the inevitable disappearance of that trade. Unquestionably, the severe contraction of our exports was a major cause in starting the downward spiral which has caused this country since 1929 unprecedented human and economic suffering.

Certainly, feeling as I do about the damage wrought by an unwise foreign-trade policy, I object most positively to any attempt to classify me as one who would wish this country to pursue any policy so stupid as that of economic aggression. The effect on our own country should be ample reason for all of us to wish to see a new and more intelligent approach to our economic relationship with the nations of the world.

Another compelling reason exists, however. That reason lies in the effect our policies will have on our hopes for peace and security. Certainly, I am not so foolish as to believe that a permanent peace is possible unless the nations of the world are permitted and even assisted to enjoy economic well-being. Fair and equitable trade among nations will be our greatest guaranty of a lasting peace.

The present war was not caused by our international economic policies. It was caused by the mad ambitions of the rulers of the aggressor nations. Sound policies on foreign trade would not alone have prevented the war. But it must be said, as we look back, that our policies did not serve in any way to lessen the danger of war.

As long as we persisted in selling more to other nations than we were willing to buy, it follows necessarily that the other nations of the world in sum total must have bought more than they were able to sell. As our unused claims against world production increased, theirs diminished. The lack of foreign exchange in many countries forced the adoption of various expedients which served only to aggravate an already bad situation. Devaluation of currencies, elaborate foreign exchange controls, barter arrangements, subsidies, and efforts to accomplish national economic self-sufficiency were evidences of an effort to secure artificially the foreign exchange which was lacking in every great nation except our own. The mistakes were not all ours. Certainly our policies were by no means the sole cause of the break-down of international trade, but I think we cannot deny that we contributed to that breakdown.

This is a pretty bad picture, so bad that it is a little hard to believe. One is forced to ask, "How could such a situation have been allowed to develop?" Of course, the general facts are pretty well known. During the First World War our heavy shipments abroad to our allies, our loans, and the liquidation of foreign-owned investments in this country, transformed us into a creditor nation. After the war we reacted to our new position in a perfectly natural way. We started to loan and invest money abroad in substantial amounts. Other creditor nations in the past have prospered under a similar program, but there was an important difference. Those nations had need of large quantities of goods which they could not produce and must obtain abroad, and it was advantageous to them to maintain and increase their claim on these goods in the form of foreign trade balances developed from their investments, as well as from their actual exports.

During the expanding prosperity of the 1920's the inherent danger in our unbalanced program was well concealed. The picture that was obscure then is very clear now, and no great credit can be claimed by anyone for recognizing at this late date the dangers which were generally ignored during that period.

Surely, however, no one who understands at all what led to disruption of international trade would be willing to assist in a repeat performance. The proponents of the pending joint resolution to extend so-called reciprocal trade agreements make a grave mistake if they assume that we who oppose are blind to the dangers of "economic aggression."

I have wanted to state my opinion of the results of our former mistaken policy, so that my opposition to this measure will not be misunderstood. I have stated before and I will state again that I believe that these "agreements" or treaties have been useful. I do not believe, however, that they are the whole answer to the establishment of a fair and balanced foreign trade policy. I think I have made it clear that I believe that our policy should be based upon a complete acceptance of the idea that we should be willing to receive in goods and services an amount approximately equal to the value of the goods and services which we provide to foreign nations.

Our policy must take into account the fact that any transaction in foreign trade is a dual transaction. It is a transaction between individuals or corporations in the different countries. It is also a transaction between the economic societies that exist within those different countries.

We have, until recently, operated on the axiom that the whole is the sum of the parts. That is, if we help each manufacturer and each farming section by tariff protection, the result will necessarily benefit our whole economy. Unfortunately this theory as applied to foreign trade has been proven false. It is true that tariff protection helps an individual manufacturer, other things being equal. It is likewise true that protection helps the farmer, other things being equal. But other things are not equal if the total of our tariff restrictions collapses our foreign trade and dwarfs our domestic economy.

Every foreign sale seems good. It brings to the seller pounds or pesos, to be exchanged for dollars. Every foreign purchase seems bad. It takes business from a farmer, or a manufacturer, and work from his employees. Taking the viewpoint of each individual producer, and taking the total of producer opinions, each as to his own product, as an opinion on a national policy, we arrive at an absurdity. Sell everything and buy nothing.

I have already attempted to show that such a policy makes no sense whatever on a national basis. The National Government must have its say in the dual transaction to which our national economy is a party. The interests of each of a large number of producers cannot be permitted to destroy the interests of our whole economy—yes, and destroy the very persons who have unwisely sought individual protection at the expense of the country as a whole.

We must have a balanced foreign trade. How great that trade should be I do not pretend to know. Certainly, it should be considerable, and with equal certainty I say that it should not be unlimited. We are potentially nearly self-sufficient. We could conceivably restrict our foreign trade to a very low figure. If we did so, however, we would certainly fall back, eventually, from our leadership in world production. We would sacrifice the comparative advantage of exchanging the goods which we produce most efficiently

and cheaply for those which are most difficult and expensive for us to produce. We would, furthermore, turn our back on an opportunity to assist the rest of the world. Many countries produce goods which we need, and the same countries badly need our products.

I think that this country honestly wants to help other peoples in their efforts to raise their own standards of living. But even from a selfish viewpoint an extreme nationalistic policy would be dangerous and perhaps fatal. We might well find ourselves isolated in a world in which no nation will be safe from sudden and devastating attack as new and more terrible weapons are constantly developed.

When I say that our foreign trade should not be unlimited I mean that I do not believe in free trade for this Nation. We are fortunate. We cover a large and varied area. We have a great productive and a great consuming capacity within our own borders. We enjoy, therefore, most of the advantages which less fortunate nations could obtain from a completely free trade. Every section of this country grows or manufactures the products in which it enjoys an advantage. It distributes these products to the entire country and receives in return the products which each other section can produce most cheaply. Some additional advantage could be gained by free trade in that we would concentrate more completely on the goods in which we have an advantage over the rest of the world, receiving in turn at a very low cost the products of those countries. However, the relatively slight additional advantage to be gained by us would not justify the cost. We would immediately suffer a tremendous disruption of our economic organization. Sections and industries would be ruined while others would expand and prosper enormously.

The people of Connecticut, for instance, would not wish to be forced to raise cattle in the Southwest. Nor would western wheat farmers care to move into a greatly expanded steel industry if those moves happened to be the ones which would result from a complete readjustment of our economy to free trade. Furthermore, I do not believe that we would want to be completely at the mercy of world economic shifts which may take place. Certainly, this would be one of the results of a free-trade policy. No, I would not give up a large measure of protection for our great continental economic society.

Our society can, however, well afford a substantial volume of foreign trade. It can, in fact, considerably benefit from a large but limited volume. I believe that it will be the function of the Government of this country to develop policies which will result in our foreign trade being carried on in a manner which will be beneficial to us and to our friends and neighbors in other lands.

A determination must be made as to what volume of foreign trade in proportion to our total business is most beneficial to us. Within that volume it must be determined what goods we can most profitably accept and what goods we can most profitably ship abroad. The basis of decision must be the welfare of the country as a whole and not the narrow interest of any section or group. I say now that I will support such a program as long as I am a Member of this body. I have already said that I favor reciprocal trade treaties although I do not favor the abandonment of the constitutional rights of Congress to pass upon such agreements.

So, Mr. President, I find myself in the unusual position of being ever so anxious—I think as anxious as any other Member of this body can be—that the joint resolution be passed to the extent that we continue our present tariff-making policy. I would not return under any circumstances which I might control to the log-rolling practices of another day. I hope that such procedure is gone forever. But, Mr. President, as I said in a lengthy discussion of this subject in the Senate three years ago, and perhaps on earlier occasions, when I voted against the so-called reciprocal trade agreements measure, I will not yield an inch on this constitutional question.

When I started my discussion some little time ago I gave applause to the eloquent and splendid address made by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who made an ardent plea that we protect the provisions of the Constitution, that we hew to the fundamental law, although it seems to me that after making that excellent constitutional address he asked ever so little. I can quite understand his position. I think that I might be willing to support the proposal of my distinguished colleague, Mr. DANAHER, which the Senator from Michigan advocated and supported. It does not go far enough for me, but even with the inclusion of the Danaher resolution and any of the other amendments proposed here, I would not support this over-all joint resolution unless and until it was so perfected as to keep faith with the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, it must be said, however, that in themselves these trade treaties do not constitute a policy. We could have an unbalanced trade in spite of reciprocal trade agreements. In fact, improperly used, these agreements could well cause the lack of balance. They could even be used as instruments of "economic aggression." Certainly, I do not believe that this administration would make any such use of the powers it now seeks. I merely point out that we are not here being asked—and I should like to emphasize this, Senators—to pass judgment on a policy. We are being asked to pass judgment on a method by which a policy—any policy—may be put into effect. I think we know, in general, the policy of this administration in respect to foreign trade, although I must say at this point, Mr. President, that the leaders of the party of which I am a member have changed their opinions and their attitudes to a considerable extent in recent years.

Mr. President, I said that I think I know in general the policy of this administration in respect to foreign trade. We may approve this policy. But my warning is that the method here sought can be used equally well to promote some entirely different policy, and I do not think that this is a case where the end can be said to justify the means.

There can be only one reason for an insistence on the extension without restriction of the Trade Agreements Act. That reason must be a lack of confidence in the intelligence and unselfishness of the Congress of the United States. I must repeat that the proponents of this measure are not urging the approval of a foreign-trade policy. They are not even requesting the approval of specific trade agreements. What they are asking is one thing and one thing only, namely, that Congress surrender its constitutional and traditional prerogatives to make tariffs and approve treaties.

True, it is proposed to set a time limit once again on the extension of these powers. I think that we should pay very little attention to the qualification. Extensions have previously been asked and granted twice since the powers were first bestowed. Now, more than ever before, we are warned that a refusal to extend the powers will disrupt an established policy. This argument will grow more and more formidable with the passage of the years. If Congress is to recapture its legitimate powers it must do so without further delay. In my judgment, Senators, it must do so now. The reason for that opinion is obvious to every Senator.

I have but one more thought to add to this discussion. I desire to point at what I consider to be the basic fallacy in the methods which we are asked to approve. That fallacy appears to me to be the idea that policies of overwhelming national importance can be carried on without the approval and acquiescence of the American people acting through their chosen representatives.

Can anyone believe that a foreign-trade policy which lacks the approval of the majority of the American people can actually endure and be successful? If an unpopular policy is put into effect, it is only fair to say that its eventual repudiation will create discord and disorder in the delicate field of international relations.

If it be said that the American people will approve the policy, but that their representatives cannot be trusted to reflect public opinion properly, then an argument is presented against the very basis of the democratic form of government of this Republic. Certainly, we know that democracies make mistakes. We know that representative government is sometimes cumbersome but we know, also, that the very necessity of securing widespread public support for all major policies is the final safeguard of a free people.

We have faith in democracy, and we are giving proof of our faith as we fight to defend it. This is hardly the time when we should show a lack of faith in our own democratic methods and an approval of any part of an alien philosophy.

I know that we have made mistakes in tariff-making and in our foreign-trade

policies. There is no doubt that in the past our people have been misled and mistaken in this respect, but no more so than have the heads and leaders of our Government.

Today, I am convinced that this Government, and, I believe, any government which might succeed it, has a broadened and more intelligent understanding of the essentials of our foreign-trade relations. I believe we are mistaken, however, if we do not realize that the people of this country have also learned the lesson of the past twenty years.

I am not an expert on matters pertaining to foreign trade, but I believe I can understand the fundamentals. I have outlined my ideas on this subject in simple language, and I do not think that they differ greatly from those of our average citizen. I have expressed these ideas in an effort to make it as clear as I possibly can that I and other opponents of the joint resolution do not base our opposition on a selfish and nationalistic viewpoint.

I think it is not too much to ask that the people of this country be trusted to support a fair, sound, and intelligent foreign-trade policy. I believe that the Members of this Congress can be trusted in like manner, and that the welfare of this Nation does not require the surrender of our constitutional authority.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RADCLIFFE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing several nominations in the Regular Army) which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nominations withdrawn, see the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry citizens and several meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps; and

Sundry midshipmen, graduates of the Naval Academy, to be ensigns in the Navy or second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

The following appointments in the Regular Army:

Thomas Matkins Johnston, to be second lieutenant, Corps of Engineers, with rank from June 1, 1943; and

William David Lutz, to be second lieutenant, Field Artillery, with rank from June 1, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leslie G. Haverland, to be lieutenant (junior grade).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am advised that earlier today the committee on Naval Affairs reported some routine nominations of midshipmen at the Naval Academy to be ensigns in the Navy or second lieutenants in the Marine Corps. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I am also advised, is very anxious to have those routine nominations confirmed at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if the nominations are in fact entirely routine, I have no objection.

Mr. HILL. I am advised that they are. The nominations are those of midshipmen at the Naval Academy to be ensigns in the Navy or second lieutenants in the Marine Corps; and it is necessary that the nominations be confirmed in order that the midshipmen may graduate from the Naval Academy.

Mr. McNARY. Then I have no objection.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none. The nominations will be read.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of midshipmen to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 a. m. on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, May 27, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 24, 1943:

THE JUDICIARY

Gerald McLaughlin, of New Jersey, to be Judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, vice William Clark, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Abe D. Waldauer, of Memphis, Tenn., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 43, with headquarters at Memphis, Tenn. (reappointment).

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Raymond Kenny, from the State of West Virginia, to be regional manpower director, at $8,000 per annum, in the Washington regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, WITH RANK FROM JUNE 1, 1943

Thomas Matkins Johnston

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT, FIELD ARTILLERY, WITH RANK FROM JUNE 1, 1943

William David Lutz

PROMOTIONS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral William A. Glassford, Jr., United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 19th day of May 1943.

Rear Admiral Raymond A. Spruance to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of May 1943.

Capt. Wilder DuP. Baker to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 13th day of July 1942.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate May 24, 1943:

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, WITH RANK FROM JUNE 3, 1943

Thomas Matkins Johnston

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT, AIR CORPS, WITH RANK FROM JUNE 1, 1943

William David Lutz

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 24, 1943:

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Leslie G. Haverland to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast Guard to rank from May 29, 1942

IN THE NAVY

To be ensigns

Alden W. Adams, Jr., et al.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be second lieutenants

John C. Alexander, et al.

NOTE.—In the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 19, 1943, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Alden W. Adams, Jr., on page 4616 and ending with the name of Harold A. Wright on page 4617, may be found a list of the midshipmen who were confirmed today, as ensigns in the Navy or second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

POSTMASTERS

KENTUCKY

Donald B. Hughes, Hardin.
W. Randolph White, Kuttawa.

MICHIGAN

Alva A. Jones, Blanchard.

NEVADA

Imogene West Van Camp, Ruth.

NEW YORK

David L. Churcher, Big Flats.
Raymond C. Nellis, Hastings.

OHIO

Clyde M. Bartlow, Felicity.

WEST VIRGINIA

Marion L. Taylor, Ansted.
Virgil Y. Given, Clendenin.
Joseph V. Emig, Wellsburg.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 24, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Immortal Love, within whose righteous will all is peace and rest, have mercy upon us and cause all passions to cease. Into the chalice of quiet faith let us pour the sins and fears which doth so easily beset us, and make every tear a sacrament and behold the sign of the cross on human anguish. We rejoice in wonder that the Christian Evangel in a waiting world is the mighty pillar on which we build serene confidence. We do not dream nor suffer alone; the links to which we are bound are many and mighty.

Great God, teach us that Christian civilization is infinitely more than personal comfort; it is interpreted as another's need and right. We pray Thee to inspire us with care and diligence for others as we tread our easy ways. At the altar of complete dedication, make our souls to feel the challenge of a new vigor, beckoning us onward to the heights toward which the ages have been struggling. In the name of Him whose song surpasses all other voices, may we speak out of the depths of an invincible conscience, entranced by hope, faith, and love. Blessed Lord, in strength and wisdom do Thou abide with our Speaker and the Congress in the spirit of cooperation, and Thine shall be the praise in the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 21, 1943, was read and approved.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 80]

Andresen, August H.	Fenton	Nichols
Boykin	Fulmer	Norton
Bradley, Pa.	Gale	O'Brien, N. Y.
Buckley	Gibson	O'Leary
Burgin	Gore	Reed, Ill.
Camp	Granger	Rivers
Cannon, Fla.	Guyer	Rockwell
Capozzoli	Hale	Rogers, Calif.
Clark	Hancock	Rolph
Cochran	Hart	Russell
Cole, N. Y.	Hendricks	Sabath
Cooley	Hinshaw	Shafer
Costello	Holifield	Sheppard
Courtney	Izac	Sheridan
Culkin	Judd	Smith, Ohio
Curtis	Kilburn	Smith, Va.
Dies	King	Stearns, N. H.
Disney	Kleberg	Taylor
Ditter	Lea	Vinson, Ga.
Eaton	McCord	Welch
Eberharter	McGranery	Whelchel, Ga.
Elliott	Maas	Woodruff, Mich.
Elmer	Miller, Mo.	Worley
	Miller, Pa.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 361 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings, under the call, be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under rule XXVII of the House, I call up the motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from the further consideration of House Resolution 131, pursuant to discharge petition No. 3.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the day succeeding the adoption of this resolution, a special order be, and is hereby, created by the House of Representatives, for the consideration of H. R. 7, a public bill which has remained in the Committee on the Judiciary for 30 or more days without action. That such special order be, and is hereby, created, notwithstanding any further action on said bill by the Committee on the Judiciary, or any rule of the House. That on said day the Speaker shall recognize the Representative from Washington, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, to call up H. R. 7, a bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, as a special order of business, and to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of said H. R. 7. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Member of the House requesting the rule for the consideration of said H. R. 7 and the Member of the House who is opposed to the said H. R. 7, to be designated by the Speaker, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, and the amendments thereto, to final passage, without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit. The special order shall be a continuing order until the bill is finally disposed of.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Does that resolution refer to the Marcantonio bill?

The SPEAKER. It is H. R. 7.

Mr. RANKIN. Is that the bill introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish today to discuss the pros and cons of this resolution or the bill whose consideration it makes in order. I do think, however, that the House should be informed of the legislative procedure involved so that we may all thoroughly understand what is going to happen on the bill and so that both sides can be heard and thus have a fair and equitable debate on the matter.

I am very glad my friend from Mississippi submitted the parliamentary inquiry he did.

Mr. RANKIN. I was trying to absolve the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am very glad he did, because I think I should report to the House, and as the Members here know, that the poll-tax matter has been an issue in this body for a long time. It is not a new matter. Many of us have interested ourselves in it. I personally wrote a bill pertaining to the subject 3 or 4 years ago. I was away for some time, and the gentleman from California, Mr. Geyer, who is now dead, took the matter up. The last-session debates on the question are well known to all the Members.

At the beginning of this session several of us on both sides of the aisle agreed that we would get together and see if we could not work out a sort of a coalition in order to push this cause forward. That we have. It so happens, I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi, that I, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN], yes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]——

Mr. RANKIN. That is enough.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I decline to yield.

We all introduced identical bills. The pending bill is identical with the bill that left the Judiciary Committee of the Senate last session. It so happens that the immediate bill was one of many on the subject and introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], but it is the same bill that I introduced, that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] introduced, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN] introduced, and that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN] introduced. It is no one person's bill. It is the anti-poll-tax bill only. We have so all agreed.

We have 10 minutes of debate today on each side on the rule, and tomorrow the Chair will recognize someone in opposition and we will have an hour of debate on each side. I am sure we shall be very glad to hear the gentleman from Mississippi at that time.

Mr. RANKIN. Would the gentleman like to yield me some time now? I should

be glad to give the House some information now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The opposition will have 1 hour. I do not know who will have charge of the time.

Mr. RANKIN. I shall be glad to take some time now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I decline to yield.

The situation today, under the rule, is that automatically after 20 minutes debate there will be a vote on the motion to discharge the Committee on Rules, and tomorrow we shall continue with general debate, and in order to be fair we have stipulated an open rule. So the debate will be followed by reading of the bill for amendments. Everyone will have a chance to present his case. I hope that the debate will proceed on that high plane and on the cold logic and facts—legal and otherwise—on both sides of this question. The issue does not involve personalities nor should it involve sectionalism. I know I shall not consciously yield myself in handling the bill for the proponents to any such tactics. I am sure my southern friends will do likewise.

The SPEAKER. Does any member of the Committee on Rules on the majority side desire time in opposition? If so, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I will take the time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to myself. Speaking for the Rules Committee, the committee has never seen this bill. Speaking for myself, I would say that it is the new despotism, interested in recreating man according to the superior plan of man's nev. vision that is sponsoring this measure. No one believes it to be constitutional, therefore, it somewhat surprises me that my Republican friends who claim that their party is now the constitutional or States' rights party, should be lending aid in the perpetration of this unconstitutional act. While you gave the Negro his freedom you lost him to those in the Democratic Party operating in the name of the New Deal who came along with more alluring promises and took him away from you, and where finding a large alien element talking about the great brown race of tomorrow. I think he will stay. This is a sorry bid for the Negro vote. Remembering what the Negro cost you following the Civil War, I am surprised that you want him back. He made it forever impossible that you should wield any sort of political influence in the Southern States as long as you hold to the name Republican Party.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. The New Deal tore a leaf out of your own book and licked you unmercifully. Have you forgotten that your party abandoned your name in 1862 and again in 1864? The name Republican Party did not go on the ticket, and if the New Deal persists in heaping indignities upon the States that have kept the Democratic Party alive in the years gone by, then you can imagine what might happen in those Southern poll-tax-ridden States, if the people should have the opportunity to vote for an American or for a constitutional party.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish it were possible for me to say something in these brief 3 minutes that would appeal to your reason. I know your political sense has already been appealed to and I wish it were possible for me to make a reasonable appeal, an appeal based on reason which would influence you. Our boys from the poll-tax States, and the boys from other States, are fighting and dying in Guadalcanal, in Africa, in Attu, and on the seven seas. Here at a time when unity is the most prized thing that we seek, we find the sad and sorry spectacle of the House of Representatives, a branch of the National Congress, bringing up an issue that is calculated more than anything else to bring about disunity. I know that you have gotten your orders from John L. Lewis, from Earl Browder, from the Association for the Advancement of Colored People, from the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], and I know that you have gotten your orders from the First Lady of the land. I know that politically you feel you have to vote for this detestable thing, but in the name of the one objective of winning this war, for God's sake, one time let us rise above political expediency and vote to uphold the Constitution and the integrity of this Congress, and contribute to the national unity so necessary in winning this war.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief because we are not debating the bill. We are debating the rule; what I think is the American system of permitting this House to discuss important legislation. I do not think any one here has seen or heard from any of the people mentioned by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], much as I respect his opinion. I do not think there has been any politics in it, so far as I am concerned, until it was injected by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]. I sympathize entirely with the problems concerning some of my neighbors from the South. I would not be for this bill if I thought it was going to interfere with State rights, and their handling of their own State governments. That is their business. This is the national legislative body, and in the bill we propose national legislation affecting Members of Congress, the Federal Government, and only the Federal Government. The question of constitutionality will be handled tomorrow by people more competent than I am of handling it. That will be done by some of our legal friends on both sides.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman says that he does not think it interferes with the affairs of the States. I wonder what the gentleman thinks it will do. Evidently he has not read the bill.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I have read the bill, and it affects Federal offices, and I hope there will not be injected into this debate personal questions, because it is not on a personal basis, certainly not as far as I am concerned.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman from New York know that the Constitution of the United States provides that State election laws shall apply to the election of Congressmen and Senators, the same as they apply to the election of the members of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures? You are attempting to tear down not only the Constitution of the United States, but the constitutions of the various States.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am not a lawyer. I have studied the question and I think the gentleman is in error. That is my personal opinion.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this so-called antipoll tax bill is sponsored by the Communist Party, which, according to press reports, Stalin has just destroyed, so far as Russia is concerned, by abolishing its governing body known as the Comintern.

While that was a fatal blow to the head of the tarantula, let us not forget that its poisonous tentacles are spread throughout this country, extending into various Government bureaus and wielding a pernicious influence upon some Members of the Congress of the United States.

Step by step Russia has been getting away from the Third International, as is evidenced by the fact that she not only has reopened the churches of Russia, but has put a stop to the persecution of Christianity, abolished the Commissars so far as the army is concerned, and has now dissolved the Comintern.

But the trouble is that communism still wields a powerful influence in this country, and in my opinion it is responsible for bringing this measure to the floor of the House, when everyone knows that it violates the Constitution of the United States as well as that of the various States affected.

Section 2 of article I of the Constitution of the United States says:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

This measure would wipe out that section of the Constitution.

The seventeenth amendment to the Constitution, which provides for the elec-

tion of United States Senators by the people, says:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

This bill would wipe out that provision. Not only that, but it would open the way for congressional invasion of every State in the Union, and the interference, not only with its elections, but with its nominating primaries and conventions.

This is purely an attack on certain Southern States and an attempt to harass them at a time when their people are bending every effort in this war emergency and when their sons are fighting and dying all over the world in order to protect the very Constitution this measure would tend to destroy.

The appeals for this legislation did not come from the Southern States, but from communistic intermeddlers from other sections of the country.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] while pushing this measure, that is designed to stir up race trouble for we people in the Southern States, might well remember that unless conditions change he is going to have a more serious race problem with the Japanese on the Pacific Coast than we have ever had with the Negroes in the South; and the only friends those people in the West have ever had in Congress who were willing to stand up for them under any and all circumstances on this Japanese question, were the southern Democrats whom he is now going out of his way to harass and annoy.

While communism is being driven from Russia under the scorpion lash of an outraged public opinion and patriotism of the Russian Army, it has been powerful enough in this country to force this measure to a vote, and probably to force its passage.

Let me remind each and every one of you who vote for this measure that you are not merely harassing the white people of the South, but you are setting a precedent that will likely commend this poison chalice to your own lips—and that particularly applies to the far western States that are now threatened with the Japanese menace.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO].

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has been at war for almost 18 months and we are just beginning to get our heads above the water. Prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor by the Japanese, public opinion was divided into two camps. One camp wanted to do everything short of war to aid the so-called democracies. The other camp, commonly referred to as isolationists, wanted to play hands off and await our fate if the Axis Powers were victorious. There was great bitterness between the two camps. Untrue and unpatriotic charges were hurled from one to the other, but the bitterness was wiped out on December 7, 1941. No Nation in the history of mankind was more unified and stirred to concerted action to bring the terrible war to a successful conclusion. Capital and labor united to convert a peacetime economy to full war production. It is true, mistakes were made and useless delays occurred. But our production record today cannot but convince the most pessimistic that our country is producing more armament than all our enemies combined.

Our enemies are smart and have had years of experience in sowing the seeds of dissension among the peoples whom they would conquer. For several months an underground attack has been made against capital. To believe some of the rumors going the rounds one would soon reach the conclusion that capital intended to enslave all our people and return to feudal control. On the other hand, rumors have been spread throughout the land that labor was going to take control of the country and destroy capitalism. These rumors, unless stopped, will have dire results. All admit that our American system is the best, for where else in the world is the standard of living so high. Both capital and labor must have their virtues or we could not have accomplished in 18 months the greatest production miracle ever known.

There is another force working to destroy unity. All the advocates of racial equality lose sight of the immutable law that so long as the political and military power of a heterogeneous nation remains in the hands of one component part so long does that nation endure. When this control becomes diffused and minority groups given equal power, political dissension and territorial disintegration begins. China is an excellent example. We now know the reason for the anxiety of the people on the west coast due to the presence of Japs in their midst. In our Nation's Capital we are witnessing serious friction caused by pampering minorities. In a heterogeneous nation, one racial group must, by the law of nature, be the dominant group, or the nation will fall. We can keep our Nation intact only so long as the ruling power is held by a homogeneous group. It is for us to decide what group that will be. Unless we make this decision now, sooner or later the Republic will be destroyed by political parties catering to petty ambitions which will result in endless controversies and bids for votes.

What group in our country started this agitation? We do not have to look far to place our finger on the right group. It is the same group that urged strikes by W. P. A. workers; the same group that made organized marches on Capitol Hill when legislation was pending to strengthen our national defense; the same group that promoted slow-downs and strikes in defense plants prior to Russia's entry into the war; the same group that spread malicious propaganda among the youth of this country that they were to be sent to war to make more millionaires; the same group that coined the slogan "The Yanks are not coming"; the same group that termed the war an imperialistic war before Germany attacked Russia; and the same group that would sabotage our war effort tomorrow if Russia were to secure a satisfactory peace with Germany. It is needless for me to name the group, for we all know it to be the American Communist—the party that hates everything American and is too "red" for Stalin, who has just dissolved the Communist International.

The enemies of our way of life have been very cagey in spreading their vicious propaganda. Many Americans have innocently fallen for their line. The so-called isolationists were honest in opposing an increase in our armed strength. The enemies of our country took advantage of this honest position and spread all kinds of unfounded rumors. They printed leaflets asking the question "Why should we build up our Army and Navy? Whom are we going to fight?" This sounded good to the average American who was convinced that the two oceans constituted an impregnable defense. This same group of Communists who worked in season and out of season to prevent the training of men and officers to defend our country were the first to make violent demonstrations demanding a second front when it appeared that Russia was in close quarters. In a republic the military cannot long refuse the demands of an overwhelming public opinion. The Communists realized this and attempted to influence public opinion to demand the opening of a second front in Europe. To have acceded to these demands would have resulted in the cold-blooded murder of thousands upon thousands of our boys. It would have been nothing short of slaughter to send untrained troops and untrained officers against a military machine the like of which the world had never seen.

Soon after the war is over this same group of Communists will advocate disarmament, knowing full well that we will be the only country to do so. They will find their way into our churches and schools, the press, and the radio. They will foster all kinds of organizations under the guise of patriotism. Many Americans will be misled and will bring pressure on the Congress to carry out a program that will result in the destruction of America as a world power. Twenty-five years from now, or probably sooner, there will be another war. With the rapid advance in the production of machines of destruction, it is highly probable that we will again be attacked by a ruthless enemy who will not give us 18 months to train and equip our forces.

The Communists who are so active in behalf of the anti-poll-tax bill say they want to rid the country of the southern Members of Congress. They accuse us of being domestic Fascists. They accuse us of being feudal barons. They do not tell you who these southern Members of Congress are. If a check were made I think it would be found that over half the southern Members of Congress are sons of tenant farmers, sharecroppers, or small landowners. My father was a tenant farmer and I know that all the Members of the Alabama delegation are sons of people who were considered to be in the low-income group. The Communists are not nearly so anxious to extend voting privileges as they are to replace southern Members with Members of their own ilk. Fortunately for

our country, there are not many southerners who would fall for communism, regardless of their economic status.

The sponsors of the bill make the appeal that we must pass it now to show that we are for the Atlantic Charter and to prevent some of our allies from withdrawing from the war. Could any intelligent American fall for this tripe? Every sane person knows the reason China is fighting is to protect her own homeland, not ours; every sane person knows that Russia is fighting to protect her homeland, not ours; every sane person knows that Great Britain is fighting to protect her vast empire, not ours. We seem to be the only member of the United Nations who is fighting for the interest of others, but I have an idea that we would not be in the fight if we had not been attacked by the ruthless Japs and I still believe that we are fighting to protect our own homeland and to preserve our way of life instead of attempting to force our system of government on the other nations of the world. I do not object to being called a chauvinist for thinking my country is the greatest Nation on earth.

Failure to pass the anti-poll-tax bill will not make Stalin want to stop resistance and leave the Germans in possession of some of the richest land on the face of the globe. It will not cause the British to sue for a separate peace The gallant Chinese are just as anxious to annihilate the Japs as we are. I doubt if failure to pass the bill will cause Gandhi to go on another hunger strike.

Every organization, every leader in America, is urging unity on the home front. Are we bringing about unity by terming 15,000,000 people in the South traitors? Some day some smart politician will come to realize that there are 120,000,000 white people in this country. He will organize a political party composed only of whites, and some of you today would be scared out of your political hides if you know how many followers he could muster. I hope we never see the day in this great country of ours when anyone will be mistreated because of his race, color, or creed, but such action is not at all improbable. There are millions of Americans who do not want to see this country mongrelized. When we attempt to force an employer to employ a person against his will, we are treading on dangerous grounds. Sooner or later there will be so much resentment of this invasion of rights that serious trouble will ensue.

The unconstitutionality of this measure was very ably pointed out in a brief by Hon. Abraham P. Staples, attorney general of Virginia, and placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator BYRD on September 22, 1942.

Our founding fathers in their wisdom saw fit to reserve all powers, not specifically granted to the Federal Government to the several States. They delegated to the Federal Government the duty to defend the Nation; to coin money and regulate the value thereof; to conduct relations with foreign governments; to regulate commerce between the several States and foreign governments. They reserved to the States self-government in domestic matters, for they feared control from the Federal Government.

Our courts have recognized for over 100 years the rights of States to fix electoral qualifications for all officers, national as well as local. Until a few years ago the Congress has recognized this right, for when any change in suffrage has been attempted, it has been done by submitting a constitutional amendment.

If we can repeal the poll tax as a requirement for voting, we can also invade the rights of the States to fix qualifications of voters, and can abolish by an act of Congress all the State laws requiring registration of voters. We could also establish voting qualifications by Federal statute. We could provide that any person who was a property owner could not exercise the right to vote; we could provide that a member of a labor organization could not vote; we could provide that only men with college educations could vote. Sooner or later this procedure could result in complete Federal control of all our States.

Some States have provisions in their constitutions prohibiting paupers from voting. If this bill is constitutional, we could change this limitation by Federal statute.

Representation in Congress is based on population. Representation in the New York Legislature is based on citizenship. If this bill is constitutional, we could say to New York that it must base its representation in the legislature on population, thereby giving New York City firm control over the legislature.

Some Western States prohibit Asiatics from voting. Today there is a strong movement to break down all our immigration laws and let all the peoples in the earth come to our fair land. If the States are not given the full control over their elections, we might awaken some day and find our Congress controlled by aliens.

There is no denying the fact that this measure would never have reached the floor of the House if it had not been for the two major political parties playing for votes. There is a petition on the Clerk's desk to bring to the floor a bill that will pay to our old people a mere pittance to keep them from hunger. This bill would help thousands of Negroes throughout the Nation. Have you seen a parade of Members to sign this petition? No! But, if it would help in a political way instead of a humane way, the Sergeant-at-Arms would have difficulty preventing a stampede of would-be signers. I make the prediction that both major parties will be left at the switch if this bill passes and that the Communist Party will take the ball from here out.

If you want to destroy private enterprise, if you want to turn our country over to those who openly admit they hate everything American, if you want to open the gates to all the peoples of the earth and destroy our immigration laws, if you want to destroy our Republic, if you want every heartbeat controlled from Washington, vote for this bill.

On the other hand, if you still believe in the principles of States' rights, if you still believe that our country is the greatest Nation on earth, if you still believe a republic is the best form of government, vote against the bill.

Our military forces will win this struggle, but we hope that our boys will not return home to find that we have lost the war on the home front. Will you preserve by your vote what our boys are trying to preserve with their lives?

I appeal to you as a lover of America to vote for the best interests of our country. If we can keep unity on the home front, our goal, complete victory, will surely be ours.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the resolution for which the pending motion blasts the way might well be entitled "A resolution to invite the Members of Congress to forget their oaths of office; and to prevent the Senate from functioning as a legislative body for an indefinite time, possibly months, in this most critical period of our Nation's history, when the highest duty of Congress and every citizen is to make every moment count toward the furtherance of our war effort."

These are solemn words, but as God is my witness, I believe them to be literally true. I invite your attention to this resolution from those two aspects. It is indisputably unconstitutional. This last fortress of States' rights, the control of the ballot, is the only vestige left of the original pattern of States' rights.

Once upon a time there was in our fair land an omnipotent queen—the States. The whole empire of sovereignty was hers. But in her wisdom she felt the need of a prince consort who could fight her battles, protect, defend, and guard her from foreign foes, and serve her constituents in those manly ways ill-befitting a queen. So she created such a prince, joined him to herself by sacred vows in holy wedlock, made him king in the sphere she had allotted him, and with him shared her throne. By their vows he was to be supreme in the field of power she delegated him, she in all else. It was to be a perfect partnership.

He had his scepter—the Army and Navy. She had hers—the army of her intelligent, virtuous voters selected by her.

From time to time, as desirability became apparent, she gave him more and more of her power. He kept all of his and ever exercised more.

In spite of the beneficence of his queen, he became jealous of her scepter. He never asked her to surrender it to him. This he might have done, for it was an important part of their agreement that he might propose any amendment of the constitution of the government at any time. His yearning for his queen's scepter grew out of the knowledge that without her scepter she would be but his chattel. The more clearly he came to realize this the more desirable it seemed. But he never once proposed, in the agreed way, that she give it him Now, however, this king of her creation, this beneficiary of her generosity, is trying to take her scepter by force.

The defeat of this effort to deprive our queen of her scepter is the only hope left for American democracy. It is the only chance of preserving the dual system of government which the States created when they wrote their constitution. The bill about to be brought to the floor is a clear threat of invasion of the rights of every State, not simply of the seven or eight States that have the poll tax as a condition precedent to voting, but of the four other States that have the poll tax without such a condition. If the Federal Government can overstep the bounds, if we as Members of Congress can violate our oath of office to uphold the Constitution, there is absolutely nothing which cannot be done here in Washington to draw all power here, and emasculate the power of every State.

Read the excellent article by Mark Sullivan in this morning's Washington Post.

But in the immediate future the pressure for the passage of this bill will deprive our Nation of its Senate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], who has just addressed you, implies that gentlemen in the other Chamber may filibuster to prevent the passage of this bill in the event that we fearlessly and courageously adopt this rule and finally adopt the measure. If the gentlemen on the other side of the Capitol wish to filibuster and fail to invoke cloture, the crime is at their door and not ours.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Just a moment, please.

I am one of those who feel, after mature study, that this act will be declared constitutional by the Supreme Court. I urge those who wish to study the question further to peruse the most recent decision on the subject of elections and primaries issued by the Supreme Court of the United States, United States against Classic, volume 313, United States Reports, page 311. That case holds that there are limits beyond which States' rights cannot go. The implications and reasoning of that decision are that States' rights cannot be stretched so far as to disenfranchise millions. There are National or Federal rights, too. Is it fair that New York, New Jersey, and California be legislated for—their national interests administrated by Representatives and Senators elected by undemocratic franchise? If States like Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, and Texas go too far, as they do with poll taxes, and disenfranchise vast segments of our people by unfair, unjust exactions, the Congress must step in and interfere. The Federal power must step in to protect a "republican form of government" as guaranteed by the Constitution.

If a State can impose a poll tax of $1 or $2 as a condition precedent to voting, then indeed a State could impose a tax of $1,000 or $10,000. There must be some limitation, runs the ruling in this Supreme Court case of United States against Classic, with the majority decision written by Chief Justice Stone.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. In just a moment.

As a matter of fact, in one of the poll-tax States the cumulative tax runs as high as $47.47. If the State can go to any extremes, as the advocates of poll taxes say, then a State could say one could not vote because the prospective voter did not go to church every Sunday; could say, "You cannot vote unless you give proof that you paid all your private debts." "You cannot vote unless you wear a red necktie." Any kind of arbitrary standard could be laid down as a prerequisite to vote. The Classic case overrules the famous Newberry decision. It gives us plenary powers to act to prevent fraud and corruption and unjust exactions in primaries as well as in general elections.

Chief Justice Stone holds that by section 4 of article I of the Constitution we have ample authority to act. The section 4 reads:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

The words "manner of holding elections," according to the reasoning of the Chief Justice, go far and affect not only the periphery but also the core of the subject matter of elections.

He says not only does said section 4 of article I authorize the "manner of holding elections, but article I, section 8, clause 18, gives Congress power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers," and so forth. "This leaves to the Congress the choice of means by which its constitutional powers are to be carried into execution.

I maintain the pending measure is an authorized "means" of carrying out the right of Congress to regulate the "manner" of electing Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I had no letter from John Lewis. I did not hear from Earl Browder. Nor did I have a letter from Eleanor Roosevelt in support of this measure. I say this in reply to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]. However, I received hundreds of letters, from organizations and individuals everywhere in support of this measure.

As was stated by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], this comes before you as petition No. 7, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]. He presented a bill similar to five other bills introduced. Four of the Members who introduced like bills, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN], the gentleman from New York [Mr GAVAGAN], and myself, joined together and agreed on a course of action. This bill comes before you as a result of that coalition.

I had among others a communication signed by 250 clergymen from almost every State in the Union. Among these names are the following: Rev. H. P. Almon Abbott, bishop of Lexington—Episcopal—Lexington, Ky.; Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, of New York City; Rev. Wilbur C. Allen, Ebenezer Presbyterian Church, Kimball, W. Va.; Rev. Benjamin V. Andrews, Presbyterian, Indianapolis, Ind.; Rev. Eugene M. Austin, Tioga Baptist Church, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Sam H. Franklin, Jr., Presbyterian, Cruger, Miss.; Rev. Edward G. Ernst, Congregational Church, Troy, N. Y.; Rev. L. E. Grubaugh, superintendent, Colorado Congregational-Christian Conference, Denver, Colo.; Bishop Francis J. McConnell, the Methodist Church, New York, N. Y.; Rev. John Paul Pack, Disciples of Christ, Chattanooga, Tenn.; Rev. F. E. Reissig, Washington Federation of Churches, Washington, D. C.; Rev. D. F. Putman, Lutheran, Gettysburg, Pa.; Rev. S. D. Press, Evangelical and Reformed, St. Louis, Mo.; Rev. Robert Murray Pratt, Unitarian, Quincy, Ill.; Rev. J. Barnard Walton, Society of Friends, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. O. M. Walton, Cleveland Church Federation; and several hundred others.

Mr. Speaker, there is one issue before the Nation today—to win the war in which we are engaged with the utmost speed.

The American people are for every step that will win the war and that will strengthen our national morale.

The existence of any restriction on the suffrage or on the exercise of any democratic right cannot but materially weaken the will of the American people to fight this war. For it is democracy, the right of freemen to select their own form of government and their representatives, for which we are fighting. Donald Nelson, prior to the elections of last November, urged every worker to go to the polls, because, he said, "The right to vote is what this war is all about."

The Federal Government has the duty, the responsibility, and the power to protect the Federal franchise. At no time in our history has it been more important than today that the Congress protect the purity of the ballot and guarantee the free democratic right of every citizen to vote. Last year we enacted legislation to permit our citizens in the armed forces to vote. Many people today urge that we enact legislation to permit 18-year-olds to vote.

How can we deny to millions of our own citizens at home a free ballot when we are asking them to give their lives for the defense of this Congress, this country, and our free institutions?

I urge the House to adopt the motion before it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired, all time has expired.

The question is on the motion to discharge the committee from further consideration of House resolution 131.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAGNUSON) there were—ayes 183, noes 83.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This roll call is on the adoption——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington is propounding a parliamentary inquiry, he said, and the Chair has to pass on that after he propounds the inquiry.

The gentleman from Washington will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. My inquiry is whether or not this roll call is on the motion to discharge or on the resolution proper.

The SPEAKER. It is on the motion to discharge.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 268, nays 110, answered "present" 1, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—268

Allen, Ill.	Dworshak	Jeffrey
Andersen, H. Carl	Eberharter	Jenkins
Anderson, Calif.	Ellis	Jennings
Anderson, N. Mex.	Ellison, Md.	Jensen
Andrews	Ellsworth	Johnson, Anton J.
Angell	Elmer	Johnson, Calvin D.
Arends	Elston, Ohio	Johnson, Ind.
Arnold	Engel	Johnson, J. Leroy
Auchincloss	Fay	Johnson, Ward
Baldwin, N. Y.	Feighan	Jones
Barrett	Fernandez	Jonkman
Barry	Fish	Kean
Bates, Mass.	Fitzpatrick	Kearney
Beall	Fogarty	Kee
Bender	Forand	Keefe
Bennett, Mich.	Ford	Kelley
Bennett, Mo.	Furlong	Kennedy
Bishop	Gale	Keogh
Blackney	Gallagher	Kinzer
Bloom	Gamble	Kirwan
Bolton	Gavagan	Klein
Bradley, Pa.	Gavin	Knutson
Brehm	Gearhart	Kunkel
Brown, Ohio	Gerlach	LaFollette
Buckley	Gifford	Lambertson
Buffett	Gillette	Landis
Burchill, N. Y.	Gillie	Lane
Burdick	Goodwin	LeCompte
Busbey	Gordon	LeFevre
Butler	Gorski	Lemke
Byrne	Graham	Lesinski
Canfield	Grant, Ind.	Lewis, Ohio
Cannon, Mo.	Griffiths	Luce
Carlson, Kans.	Gross	Ludlow
Carson, Ohio	Gwynne	Lynch
Carter	Hagen	McCormack
Celler	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McCowan
Chenoweth	Hall, Leonard W.	McGregor
Chiperfield	Halleck	McLean
Church	Hancock	McMurray
Clason	Harless, Ariz.	McWilliams
Clevenger	Harness, Ind.	Madden
Coffee	Hart	Magnuson
Cole, Mo.	Hartley	Mansfield, Mont.
Compton	Heffernan	Marcantonio
Crawford	Heidinger	Martin, Iowa
Crosser	Herter	Martin, Mass.
Cullen	Hess	Merritt
Cunningham	Hill	Merrow
Curley	Hoch	Michener
Curtis	Hoeven	Miller, Conn.
D'Alesandro	Hoffman	Miller, Mo.
Dawson	Holmes, Mass.	Miller, Nebr.
Day	Holmes, Wash.	Monkiewicz
Delaney	Hope	Monroney
Dewey	Horan	Mott
Dickstein	Howell	Mruk
Dingell	Hull	Mundt
Dirksen	Jackson	Murphy
Dondero	Jarman	Murray, Wis.
Douglas	Jeffries	Myers
Durham	Jenkins	Norman
Eaton	Jennings	Norton
Elliott	Jensen	O'Brien, Ill.
Ellis	Johnson, Anton J.	O'Brien, Mich.
Ellison, Md.	Johnson, Calvin D.	O'Connor
Ellsworth	Johnson, Ind.	O'Hara
Elmer	Johnson, J. Leroy	O'Konski
Elston, Ohio	Johnson, Ward	O'Toole
Engel	Jones	Outland
Fay	Jonkman	Pfeifer
Feighan	Kean	Philbin
Fernandez	Kearney	Phillips
Fish	Kee	Pittenger
Fitzpatrick	Keefe	Ploeser
Fogarty	Kelley	Plumley
Forand	Kennedy	Poulson
Ford	Keogh	Powers
Furlong	Kinzer	Pracht
Gale	Kirwan	Rabaut
Gallagher	Klein	Ramey
Gamble	Knutson	Randolph
Gavagan	Kunkel	Reed, Ill.
Gavin	LaFollette	Rees, Kans.
Gearhart	Lambertson	Robinson, Utah
Gerlach	Landis	Robsion, Ky.
Gifford	Lane	Rockwell
Gillette	LeCompte	Rodgers, Pa.
Gillie	LeFevre	Rogers, Calif.
Goodwin	Lemke	Rogers, Mass.
Gordon	Lesinski	Rohrbough
Gorski	Lewis, Ohio	Rowan
Graham	Luce	Rowe
Grant, Ind.	Ludlow	Sadowski
Griffiths	Lynch	Sasscer
Gross	McCormack	Sauthoff
Gwynne	McCowan	Scanlon
Hagen	McGregor	Schiffler
Hall, Edwin Arthur	McLean	Schuetz
Hall, Leonard W.	McMurray	Schwabe
Halleck	McWilliams	Scott
Hancock	Madden	Shafer
Harless, Ariz.	Magnuson	Sheridan
Harness, Ind.	Mansfield, Mont.	Short
Hart	Marcantonio	Simpson, Ill.
Hartley	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Maine
Heffernan	Martin, Mass.	Smith, W. Va.
Heidinger	Merritt	Smith, Wis.
Herter	Merrow	Snyder
Hess	Michener	Somers, N. Y.
Hill	Miller, Conn.	Spence
Hoch	Miller, Mo.	Springer
Hoeven	Miller, Nebr.	Stanley
Hoffman	Monkiewicz	Stefan
Holmes, Mass.	Monroney	Stevenson
Holmes, Wash.	Mott	Stockman
Hope	Mruk	Sullivan
Horan	Mundt	Sumner, Ill.
Howell	Murphy	Sundstrom
Hull	Murray, Wis.	Talbot
Jackson	Myers	Talle
Jarman	Norman	Thomas, N. J.
Jeffries	Norton	Thomason
Jenkins	O'Brien, Ill.	Tibbott
Jennings	O'Brien, Mich.	Tolan
Jensen	O'Connor	Towe
Johnson, Anton J.	O'Hara	Troutman
Johnson, Calvin D.	O'Konski	Van Zandt
Johnson, Ind.	O'Toole	Voorhis, Calif.
Johnson, J. Leroy	Outland	Vorys, Ohio
Johnson, Ward	Pfeifer	Vursell
Jones	Philbin	Wadsworth
Jonkman	Phillips	Walter
Kean	Pittenger	Ward
Kearney	Ploeser	Wasielewski
Kee	Plumley	Weichel, Ohio
Keefe	Poulson	Weiss
Kelley	Powers	Wene
Kennedy	Pracht	Wheat
Keogh	Rabaut	White
Kinzer	Ramey	Wigglesworth
Kirwan	Randolph	Willey
Klein	Reed, Ill.	Wilson
Knutson	Rees, Kans.	Wolcott
Kunkel	Robinson, Utah	Wolfenden, Pa.
LaFollette	Robsion, Ky.	Wolverton, N. J.
Lambertson	Rockwell	Wright
Landis	Rodgers, Pa.	Zimmerman

NAYS—110

Abernethy	Gibson	O'Neal
Allen, La.	Gossett	Pace
Baldwin, Md.	Grant, Ala.	Patman
Barden	Green	Patton
Bates, Ky.	Gregory	Peterson, Fla.
Beckworth	Hare	Peterson, Ga.
Bell	Harris, Ark.	Poage
Bland	Harris, Va.	Price
Bonner	Hays	Priest
Boren	Hébert	Ramspeck
Bradley, Mich.	Hobbs	Rankin
Brooks	Jarman	Reed, N. Y.
Brown, Ga.	Johnson, Luther A.	Richards
Bryson	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rizley
Bulwinkle	Johnson, Okla.	Robertson
Burch, Va.	Kefauver	Satterfield
Camp	Kerr	Sikes
Case	Kilday	Simpson, Pa.
Chapman	Lanham	Slaughter
Colmer	Larcade	Smith, Va.
Cooper	McGehee	Sparkman
Cox	McKenzie	Starnes, Ala.
Cravens	McMillan	Steagall
Creal	Mahon	Stewart
Davis	Maloney	Sumners, Tex.
Dilweg	Manasco	Taber
Domengeaux	Mansfield, Tex.	Tarver
Doughton	Mason	Thomas, Tex.
Douglas	May	Vincent, Ky.
Drewry	Mills	Weaver
Durham	Morrison, La.	West
Fellows	Morrison, N. C.	Whitten
Fisher	Murdock	Whittington
Flannagan	Murray, Tenn.	Winstead
Folger	Newsome	Winter
Fulbright	Norrell	Woodrum, Va.
Fulmer		
Gathings		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Wickersham

NOT VOTING—53

Andresen, August H.	Fenton	Nichols
Boykin	Gore	O'Brien, N. Y.
Burgin	Granger	O'Leary
Cannon, Fla.	Guyer	Reece, Tenn.
Capozzoli	Hale	Rivers
Clark	Hendricks	Rolph
Cochran	Hinshaw	Russell
Cole, N. Y.	Holifield	Sabath
Cooley	Izac	Sheppard
Costello	Judd	Smith, Ohio
Courtney	Kilburn	Stearns, N. H.
Culkin	King	Taylor
Dies	Kleberg	Treadway
Disney	Lea	Vinson, Ga.
Ditter	McCord	Welch
Eaton	McGranery	Whelchel, Ga.
Elliott	Maas	Woodruff, Mich.
	Miller, Pa.	Worley

So the motion to discharge was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Mr. Izac for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

Mr. Ditter for, with Mr. Hale against.

Mr. Capozzoli for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Cannon of Florida against.

Mr. Costello for, with Mr. Clark against.

General pairs:

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. King with Mr. Rolph.

Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Miller of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Lea with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Whelchel of Georgia with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Disney with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Russell with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Welch.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I had a pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. CAPOZZOLI, who if present would have voted "aye." I therefore withdraw my vote of "no" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the question recurs on agreeing to the resolution which the Clerk will report:

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the day succeeding the adoption of this resolution, a special order be, and is hereby, created by the House of Representatives for the consideration of H. R. 7, a public bill which has remained in the Committee on the Judiciary for 30 or more days without action. That such special order be, and is hereby, created, notwithstanding any further action on said bill by the Committee on the Judiciary, or any rule of the House. That on said day the Speaker shall recognize the Representative from Washington, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, to call up H. R. 7, a bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, as a special order of business, and to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of said H. R. 7. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Member of the House requesting the rule for the consideration of said H. R. 7 and the Member of the House who is opposed to the said H. R. 7, to be designated by the Speaker, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, and the amendments thereto, to final passage, without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit. The special order shall be a continuing order until the bill is finally disposed of.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, this roll call now is on House Resolution 131; is that correct?

The SPEAKER. Yes; the resolution just read.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 265, nays 105, answered "present" 1, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

YEAS—265

Allen, Ill.	Graham	Mundt
Andersen, H. Carl	Grant, Ind.	Murphy
Anderson, Calif.	Griffiths	Murray, Wis.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gross	Myers
Andrews	Gwynne	Norman
Angell	Hagen	Norton
Arends	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Brien, Ill.
Arnold	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Brien, Mich.
Auchincloss	Halleck	O'Connor
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hancock	O'Hara
Barrett	Harless, Ariz.	O'Konski
Barry	Harness, Ind.	Pfeifer
Bates, Mass.	Hart	Philbin
Beall	Hartley	Phillips
Bender	Heffernan	Pittenger
Bennett, Mich.	Heidinger	Ploeser
Bennett, Mo.	Herter	Plumley
Bishop	Hess	Poulson
Blackney	Hill	Powers
Bloom	Hoch	Pracht
Bolton	Hoeven	Rabaut
Bradley, Pa.	Hoffman	Ramey
Brehm	Holmes, Mass.	Randolph
Brown, Ohio	Holmes, Wash.	Reece, Tenn.
Buckley	Hope	Reed, Ill.
Buffett	Horan	Rees, Kans.
Burchill, N. Y.	Howell	Robinson, Utah
Burdick	Hull	Robsion, Ky.
Busbey	Jackson	Rockwell
Butler	Jeffrey	Rodgers, Pa.
Byrne	Jenkins	Rogers, Calif.
Canfield	Jennings	Rogers, Mass.
Cannon, Mo.	Jensen	Rohrbough
Carlson, Kans.	Johnson, Anton J.	Rowan
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, Calvin D.	Rowe
Carter	Johnson, Ind.	Sadowski
Celler	Johnson, Ward	Sasscer
Chenoweth	Jones	Sauthoff
Chiperfield	Jonkman	Scanlon
Church	Kean	Schiffler
Clason	Kearney	Schuetz
Clevenger	Kee	Schwabe
Coffee	Keefe	Scott
Cole, Mo.	Kefauver	Shafer
Compton	Kelley	Short
Crawford	Kennedy	Simpson, Ill.
Crosser	Keogh	Smith, Maine
Cullen	Kinzer	Smith, Ohio
Cunningham	Kirwan	Smith, W. Va.
Curley	Klein	Smith, Wis.
Curtis	Knutson	Snyder
D'Alesandro	Kunkel	Somers, N. Y.
Dawson	LaFollette	Spence
Day	Lambertson	Springer
Delaney	Landis	Stanley
Dewey	Lane	Stefan
Dickstein	LeCompte	Stevenson
Dirksen	LeFevre	Stockman
Dondero	Lemke	Sullivan
Dworshak	Lesinski	Sumner, Ill.
Eberharter	Lewis	Talbot
Ellis	Luce	Talle
Ellison, Md.	Ludlow	Thomas, N. J.
Ellsworth	Lynch	Thomason
Elmer	McCormack	Tibbott
Elston, Ohio	McCowen	Tolan
Engel	McGregor	Towe
Fay	McLean	Troutman
Feighan	McMurray	Van Zandt
Fernandez	McWilliams	Voorhis, Calif.
Fish	Madden	Vorys, Ohio
Fitzpatrick	Magnuson	Vursell
Fogarty	Mansfield, Mont.	Wadsworth
Forand	Marcantonio	Walter
Ford	Martin, Iowa	Ward
Furlong	Martin, Mass.	Wasielewski
Gale	Merritt	Weichel, Ohio
Gallagher	Merrow	Weiss
Gamble	Michener	Wene
Gavagan	Miller, Conn.	Wheat
Gavin	Miller, Mo.	White
Gearhart	Miller, Nebr.	Wigglesworth
Gerlach	Monkiewicz	Willey
Gilchrist	Monroney	Wilson
Gillette	Mott	Wolcott
Gillie	Mruk	Wolfenden, Pa.
Goodwin		Wolverton, N. J.
Gordon		Wright
Gorski		Zimmerman

NAYS—105

Abernethy	Baldwin, Md.	Bates, Ky.
Allen, La.	Barden	Beckworth
Bell	Grant, Ala.	Pace
Bland	Green	Patman
Bonner	Gregory	Patton
Boren	Hare	Peterson, Fla.
Bradley, Mich.	Harris, Ark.	Peterson, Ga.
Brooks	Harris, Va.	Poage
Brown, Ga.	Hays	Price
Bryson	Hobbs	Priest
Bulwinkle	Jarman	Ramspeck
Burch, Va.	Johnson, Luther A.	Rankin
Camp	Johnson, Lyndon B	Reed, N. Y.
Case	Johnson, Okla.	Richards
Chapman	Kerr	Rizley
Colmer	Kilday	Satterfield
Cooper	Lanham	Sikes
Cox	Larcade	Simpson, Pa.
Cravens	McGehee	Slaughter
Creal	McKenzie	Smith, Va.
Davis	McMillan	Sparkman
Dilweg	Mahon	Starnes, Ala.
Domengeaux	Maloney	Stewart
Doughton	Manasco	Sumners, Tex.
Douglas	Mansfield, Tex.	Taber
Drewry	Mason	Tarver
Durham	May	Thomas, Tex.
Fellows	Mills	Vincent, Ky.
Fisher	Morrison, La.	West
Flannagan	Morrison, N. C.	Whelchel, Ga.
Folger	Murray, Tenn.	Whitten
Fulbright	Newsome	Whittington
Fulmer	Norrell	Winstead
Gathings	O'Neal	Winter
Gibson		Woodrum, Va.
Gossett		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Wickersham

NOT VOTING—61

Andresen, August H.	Gore	Nichols
Boykin	Granger	O'Brien, N. Y.
Burgin	Guyer	O'Leary
Cannon, Fla.	Hale	O'Toole
Capozzoli	Hébert	Outland
Clark	Hendricks	Rivers
Cochran	Hinshaw	Robertson
Cole, N. Y.	Holifield	Rolph
Cooley	Izac	Russell
Costello	Johnson, J. Leroy	Sabath
Courtney	Judd	Sheppard
Culkin	Kilburn	Sheridan
Dies	King	Steagall
Dingell	Kleberg	Stearns, N. H.
Disney	Lea	Taylor
Ditter	McCord	Treadway
Eaton	McGranery	Vinson, Ga.
Elliott	Maas	Weaver
Fenton	Miller, Pa.	Welch
Gifford	Murdock	Woodruff, Mich.
		Worley

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Mr. Izac for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

Mr. Ditter for, with Mr. Hale against.

Mr. Capozzoli for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Cannon of Florida against.

Mr. Costello for, with Mr. Clark against.

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. King with Mr. Rolph.

Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Miller of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Disney with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. McGranery with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Russell with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. J. Leroy Johnson.

Mr. Steagall with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Weaver with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have a general pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Had he been here he would have voted "aye." I voted "no." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recorded as not voting. Was the gentleman in the Hall?

Mr. DINGELL. I was in the telephone booth and listening.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman was not in the Hall and failed to hear his name called?

Mr. DINGELL. I was in the cloakroom. Is not that a part of the Hall?

The SPEAKER. No; that is not a part of the Chamber. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced, as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. EATON, for 24 hours, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on the resolution just adopted.

Mr. RANKIN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

PERMISSION TO COMMITTEE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF HOUSE

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee established pursuant to Resolution 98 be permitted to sit while the House is in session throughout the week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask what committee is referred to?

Mr. BOREN. The committee established under House Resolution 98.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What was the request?

Mr. BOREN. I ask unanimous consent that the committee may sit throughout this week, during the general debates, when the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. The request is made only for the period of general debate?

Mr. BOREN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

EMPLOYMENT OF FEMALES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 777) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia," approved February 24, 1914, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, and page 2, line 1, strike out "existence of the present war in which the United States is engaged and 6 months thereafter" and insert "period ending June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may determine."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "or more than 6 days."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2115) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 6, line 3, strike out "effective January 1, 1936."

Page 6, line 9, strike out all after "individual" down to and including "legislation" in line 12.

Page 6, line 14, strike out "an" and insert "any other."

Page 44, line 3, strike out "an" and insert "any other."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the gentleman from West Virginia tell us something about this measure.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am delighted to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania ask about this legislation, because it is of great importance to the District of Columbia that the bill be passed.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania and other Members will recall that this measure passed the House several weeks ago by a unanimous vote. It passed the Senate last week by a unanimous vote. In the Senate four amendments were added. They are found on pages 6 and 44 of the House bill.

The first amendment would strike the words "effective January 1, 1936," from the bill; in other words, under the House measure we would have made the contribution period retroactive for 7 years. The Senate felt that that was unnecessary because it went to a provision of the bill which had to do with certain organizations that were charitable, religious, scientific, literary, and educational.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Under the bill as it passed the House, these institutions and business concerns would have gotten credit for all the money they paid in since 1936?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It would have made the provision retroactive; that is, the contribution requirement.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The contribution to the unemployment compensation fund?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No, not the contribution to the unemployment compensation fund.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The contribution to which fund?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It would have moved back the period of contribution to 1936 of the organizations I have outlined.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It refers only, of course, to the definition of employment. In that definition of employment we carried, for instance, the inclusion of those who work for charitable, religious, scientific, and philanthropic organizations. That is the only place where this amendment applies. We had not collected from them before. Why that particular date was put in there I do not know; as a matter of fact, I never did find out. I think it was inserted in the House bill in the first instance only to satisfy the corporation counsel. The Senate, however, went into it far more thoroughly than we did and they could find no particular reason for having that date in that paragraph of the bill. It does not relate to taxes, however, but a definition of employment that comes within the purview of the bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, we have the gentleman's assurance that it does not have anything to do with the contributions already made to the compensation fund?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Absolutely; it has nothing to do with those contributions.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is right, although I do want to say in further response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that in some instances certain amounts, small, to be sure, have been paid in by such institutions as are referred to in this section of the bill but have been returned.

The second amendment that was made by the Senate is in the same paragraph (g). These words carried in the House bill, "No substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation," were stricken by the Senate. The minority and majority Members have discussed the matter, and believe we can readily accept the Senate provision because, after all, where can we draw the line when a literary, scientific, or religious organization is interested, and properly so, in legislation pending before this body?

The third amendment would simply insert the two words "any other" so that the phrase would read "any other employment." It is simply a perfecting amendment. I may say that it is also found on page 44.

I appreciate the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The main purpose of this bill is to reduce the amount of contribution by employers to the unemployment compensation fund, is that correct?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is one of the main provisions.

Mr. EBERHARTER. How much does it reduce the employer's contribution to the unemployment compensation fund, by what percentage?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It will approximate a saving of $3,500,000 to $4,000,000 a year.

I know the gentleman's interest in this legislation and his discussion of its provisions when it was on the House floor earlier. May I also call to his attention that we are stepping up the rate of payment to the unemployed in the District of Columbia as well as reducing the amount of contribution by the employer. We are also including a provision whereby the law will act more quickly than it has in the past.

We have at the present time a surplus of approximately $34,000,000 in the unemployment compensation fund of the District. We feel that that is top-heavy, that it is tying up funds that should be used for the legitimate purposes of business. By and large, we find not only the employers but the employees of the District of Columbia, with certain exceptions, to be sure, favorable to this legislation. The merit rating, a feature embodied in the bill, has been adopted, and successfully so, in approximately 35 States of the Union.

Mr. EBERHARTER. How much does it reduce the contribution by the employer? Does it reduce it from 2 percent to one-half of 1 percent?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. It is put on an automatic basis, depending on the amount that the employer will have in the fund. Every employer has to have so much in the fund to maintain its solvency. When he has a percentage of that amount in the fund, then of course his payment goes automatically down until it can get as low as one-tenth of 1 percent. Normally, however, he must pay more whenever the residual amount in that reserve fund is below a certain safe line that has been determined under this formula. So the thing works out automatically under this experience formula.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, the employer that has a steady pay roll and does not have seasonal employment gets a great advantage under this bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is meant to stabilize employment and create an incentive for stabilizing employment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. But it does not stabilize insofar as the employer who has seasonal activities is concerned. He is penalized at the expense of the person who happens to have the type of business that can keep the same number of employees all the time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yet oddly enough, those who are engaged in seasonal employment in the District were among the first to come up and put their support behind this bill.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I know that was not true a couple of years ago.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That was true this time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman says that the representatives of the employees are in favor of this legislation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I said with certain exceptions. We did have testimony against the bill in the House hearings, and also in the Senate hearings, but I point out that the legislation was reported unanimously from the House committee before being brought to the floor, and unanimously also by the Senate committee before it was brought before that body, even after certain objections had been raised. I come back for a moment to the matter of the progressive payments. The contribution by the employer ranges from a top 2.7 percent to one-tenth of 1 percent, and that feature of the measure was gone into very thoroughly, and it was believed that it is equitable. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] that I know his interest in this legislation from the standpoint of a proper reserve fund for the employees, and yet we must realize that the conditions within the District of Columbia are not as they are in other States, particularly perhaps in the State of Pennsylvania, because from time to time, by and large, we have the same employment in Washington year in and year out, in peacetime and under the impact of war, and that is different from the situation in other States, particularly, perhaps, the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman tell me what representatives were before the committee objecting to this? Who appeared in opposition to this measure, and what organizations did they represent?

Mr. RANDOLPH. They represented certain groups within both the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Certainly.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The important feature of this bill is that it does away with the tremendous revenue each year from the pay rolls, which in 1942 amounted to over $8,000,000, with an expenditure of only $1,157,000. There is a surplus of $34,000,000 in the fund today, and at the end of this year it will be over $40,000,000. With a collection of $8,000,000 and an expenditure of $1,150,000, obviously something should be done about it this year.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. While there were certain groups that objected to this bill, the majority of the workers involved are well satisfied with it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct, and I want to make that plain to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that there were certain groups within the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., who objected. We made a very careful canvass, and we were interested in the employee as well as the employer.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Would the gentleman be willing to let this go over for a little while? This is important legislation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. These are only clarifying amendments. There is no reason to go to further conference. If we did, we would only come back with the same report, and it will be privileged. I see no reason why there should be delay.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. And ought it not to be explained also, to those who are interested in the rights of labor, that this legislation increases the benefit payments to labor?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It does.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. And increases the period during which they can receive compensation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. And it does everything that labor wants to have done.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes. The gentleman is correct. I sincerely hope that the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not insist upon delaying the matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENTS UNDER NONMINERAL LEASES OF PUBLIC LANDS, ALASKA

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 328) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, because of military operations, to defer or waive payments under nonmineral leases of public lands in Alaska, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "during the present national emergency" and insert "occurring prior to the end of 6 months after the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 2346) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2346) "making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 5, and 6, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and, in addition, $3,000,000 of the unobligated balance on June 30, 1943, of the appropriation 'Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works', is hereby made available for the execution of detailed investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore or hereafter authorized"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and, in addition, $3,000,000 of the unobligated balance on June 30, 1943, of the appropriation 'Flood control, general', is hereby made available for the preparation of detailed plans and specifications of authorized flood control projects, and for rescue work or the repair or maintenance of any flood-control work threatened or destroyed by flood, pursuant to section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941, for reimbursement to the city of Hartford, Connecticut, as authorized by the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941, and for construction of the flood-control projects heretofore authorized for the Mermentau River, Bayou Teche, and Vermilion River, Louisiana,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOE STARNES,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2346) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $1,230,058, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $605,643, as proposed by the House, for "Cemeterial expenses."

Amendment No. 2: Makes available $3,000,000 of the unobligated balance on June 30, 1943, of the appropriation "Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works," for detailed investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for river and harbor projects heretofore or hereafter authorized, instead of $2,000,000 for such purposes, as proposed by the House, and such an amount as the Secretary of War might determine to be necessary, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Makes available $3,000,000 of the unobligated balance on June 30, 1943, of the appropriation "Flood control, general," for (1) detailed plans and specifications of authorized flood-control projects; (2) for rescue work or the repair or maintenance of any flood-control work threatened or destroyed by flood, pursuant to section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941; (3) for reimbursement to the city of Hartford, Conn., as authorized by such Flood Control Act; and (4) for construction of the flood-control projects heretofore authorized for the Mermentau River, Bayou Teche, and Vermilion River, La. The House proposed the amount of $2,400,000 for projects 1 and 2, and the Senate proposed projects 3 and 4 and such an amount as the Secretary of War might determine to be necessary for all four projects.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5: Makes a transposition of an amount.

Amendment No. 6: Makes a reappropriation in connection with the Sacramento River flood-control project of the appropriation "Flood control, general," as proposed by the Senate, instead of the appropriation "Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works," as proposed by the House.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOE STARNES,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield first to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before us is the kind of legislation to which, in my opinion, we should be giving our time and attention, today, rather than to bills which no one expects to become law at this time.

Now, I am not in favor of poll taxes. I shall vote for passage of the anti-poll-tax bill when it comes up for passage tomorrow under the rule adopted today. I have voted for similar legislation on previous occasions. I did think, however, that when we have a big war on our hands, and when we have such problems as those created by the gigantic flood in the Missouri and Mississippi Valleys that we might use our time better than by arguing over a bill which can only stir up race feeling and will not become law at this time. The House is on record on the subject of poll taxes; nothing is gained by going over the subject again, until there is a prospect of passage in the other body.

We have here, however, a bill that deals with the civil functions of the War Department, embracing appropriations for emergency river work as well as flood control generally. Today's papers report that millions of acres of farm lands are under water or are threatened with inundation, and that thousands of people are homeless. And very recently we had a flood higher up, in the main valley of the Missouri river, that caused great damage. This would be an appropriate time for a thoroughgoing review of our river and flood work. We should be studying the comparative effectiveness of various forms of flood control.

The battling of floods is important to the war effort, itself. Every acre of farm land that is washed out now means reducing the food harvest next fall. Much of the land will be ruined not only for this season but for many seasons, gouging and washing on the one hand, deposits of sand and gravel on the other. Every industrial plant that is cut off from power, every mine that is flooded, reduces the production of metals and machines needed for victory.

It would appear today, Mr. Speaker, that the building of levees in the long run, often has worked against solving the very problem to meet which they are designed. When levees are built and channels are straightened, the velocity of the water increases. While true that levees are the quickest way to meet one flood, over a period of time, the real solution seems to be the construction of flood-control reservoirs; and in my opinion, the best way to get the greatest return on the money expended, is to put the stored water to beneficial use by the construction of multiple-purpose reservoirs. Then we harness the floodwaters and make the forces of destruction become agents of good.

A month ago I visited a town in my district, Fort Pierre, where the Missouri's unexpected flood had put 3 feet of water into the electric-power plant and endangered the city's water supply. Fortunately the town escaped without an epidemic but the peril was there. The Army's division engineer, the regional engineer for the reclamation service, and the Governor of the State participated in that inspection. We also looked at lands that only need water to produce tremendous crops. I do not want to anticipate the recommendations of the engineers, but I think it is in order to say that all of us were impressed by the desirability of eliminating floods by upstream reservoirs that would put the water to beneficial use.

The people of the Middle West and Northwest have their minds on these problems, Mr. Speaker. Last Friday in Omaha, delegates from 8 States formed a permanent organization to cooperate with other bodies and to coordinate the activities of individuals working for a permanent and statesmanlike solution of the flood problems on the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. From time to time, you will hear of their work.

Next week the House Committee on Flood Control will conduct hearings on this subject. I urge Members generally to attend. These floods on the principal inland waterways and river valleys in the heart of the continent constitute a national problem.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the conferees is sufficient explanation of the matter, and I move the previous question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With respect to amendment No. 3, the conferees have agreed substantially on the language as it was carried in the House bill, except that the amount of $2,400,000 has been increased to $3,000,000.

Mr. SNYDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. To provide for reimbursing the city of Hartford, Conn., and to provide for the initiation of some projects in Louisiana.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; made necessary by the war effort.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. My question is this: By the substitution of $3,000,000 for $2,400,000 carried in the House bill, it is not contemplated that any of the funds made available in the House bill for rescue and emergency work under section 5 would be reduced?

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The full amount carried in the House bill would be available for that purpose?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think that is very important in view of the threat of floods now in the Midwest.

Mr. SNYDER. That will be taken care of in a similar way.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is being brought home to us in the most cruel and costly way that the weather is indeed a treacherous ally. Right at the time when we must exceed all previous agricultural production records by a large margin if our own people and those of our allies dependent upon us are not to suffer actual want, we are experiencing widespread and devastating floods which inevitably are destroying a serious percentage of production in the great Middle West, the very heart of American agriculture.

Millions of acres of our richest farm lands are under water and tremendous acreage of early crops is totally destroyed. The farmers may still get to their land to plant the later crops, but at very best such important crops as corn cannot be expected to return a normal yield. Even if the farmers manage to get their corn in the ground soon, the crop is going to be a month or more late, and must depend upon ideal weather much later into the fall than usual to produce something near normal returns.

The devastation is by no means, of course, falling only upon agriculture. It just happens that the damage to farm production is the most serious because it is irreparable. The damage and loss to industrial production, transportation and communication facilities, and the suffering which the people are sustaining generally is certainly most critical. We can work without regard to the seasons, in restoring these losses, but when a planting and growing season passes, it is gone forever.

My own State of Indiana, and the district which I represent are suffering most seriously. The Wabash and White Rivers and their tributaries are ravaging great expanses of land as productive as any in the world.

Nature is beyond our power to predict and control, even though the frontier planners, who for 10 years have tried to order and regulate American agriculture, may not yet be ready to admit it. Much more could have been done, however, to minimize the losses. If the money which has been wasted by this administration for a thousand and one kinds of boondoggling, social experimentation and planless planning had been used to forestall just this sort of a disaster, countless lives and an inestimable amount of property and potential production could very well have been saved.

I made persistent efforts during those wasteful years to promote the flood control work in my district which has long been acknowledged as necessary and desirable.

I offered a bill, which was promptly enacted, authorizing urgently needed work on the Wabash River and its principal tributary in my district, the Mississinewa. Year after year these rivers and the small streams which feed them overflow that fertile valley. Even though the damage is usually localized, it is recurrent and it is serious. In bad years such as this, the devastation is widespread.

The shame is that the loss in ordinary years could be almost wholly prevented and the terrible damage in such extreme instances as this could be greatly reduced at such comparatively small expense. It is principally just an ordinary project of channel dredging and straightening at the outset, and a modest job of maintenance thereafter. Unlike so many projects undertaken in recent years, it is one which would have paid large annual dividends indefinitely.

My proposal, along with numerous other equally worthy flood projects, was approved long ago by Congress but, unfortunately, it has been tied up in surveys and administrative red tape.

It may do little good now to criticize the ineptitude and shortsightedness which squandered billions on all kinds of cloud-walking schemes and neglected the practical, constructive work that cried to be done. I fervently hope, however, that the lessons of this crisis will remain with us, and that we will keep high on the calendar of work which must be done a comprehensive program of flood control and protection which will make these terribly costly disasters impossible.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

STORAGE RESERVOIRS ARE NEEDED FOR FLOOD CONTROL—LEVEES AND FLOODWAYS ARE NOT ENOUGH

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, once more disastrous floods have demonstrated that levees and floodways are not enough to guarantee protection against the torrents of unruly rivers. Those safeguards are effective only when they supplement a system of control by storage reservoirs which hold the waters back on main streams and on tributaries until their force can be released with safety and usefully employed.

We have been slow to learn that lesson, although on one river system the effectiveness of such a plan has been proved in practice. On the Tennessee a system of multipurpose dams operated under unified control gives us almost complete protection now and makes feasible erection of the additional protective works required to give total safety to every community. When the plan was outlined by the Congress in 1933 it was opposed by traditionally minded engineers, who put their faith in higher levees, larger floodways. But when T. V. A.'s tenth birthday was recognized last week this system was praised throughout the world. It will not only give protection to the valley of the Tennessee in times of flood, it will hold back the surging waters which would otherwise rush to join Ohio floods and threaten greater desolation on the lower Mississippi. In the flood of 1937 we learned how effective the system on the Tennessee would ultimately be.

That flood resulted almost entirely from high flows on the Ohio River. Paducah was almost inundated by its raging waters. Fortunately, because stream flows on the Mississippi above Cairo, in Illinois, were below normal, as were those on the Arkansas and other rivers below Cairo, the flood on the Mississippi itself was kept within existing main-line levees, although the Birds Point-New Madrid floodway had to be used for the first time. From Cincinnati to Cairo, however, the flood exceeded all previous crests by 10 feet, and at Cairo the entire city was surrounded by water, held back only by the levees which encircle it. At its crest the water topped stretches of the concrete sea wall forming a part of the levee system and was held back from the city only by means of mud boxes hastily erected on top.

At the time the T. V. A. had only two reservoirs in operation, Norris and Wheeler, which had been completed in 1936. Norris, which had the largest reservoir space, was more than 700 river-miles from Cairo. Yet the two dams were operated to reduce the flow of the Tennessee at the time of the flood crest by 32,000 second-feet, lowering the level by 5 to 6 inches, enough to hold the narrow margin of safety provided by the mud boxes improvised to save Cairo.

If the Ohio threatens safety on the lower Mississippi again, the system created by the T. V. A. will be prepared to give a greater measure of protection. For since the 1937 flood, T. V. A. has added about 42,000,000 acre-feet of storage on the Tennessee River system of which about 700,000 acre-feet in Pickwick Landing and Guntersville Reservoirs are in the lower half of the river.

Next year Kentucky Reservoir will make available 4,500,000 acre-feet of additional flood storage and at a strategic location for control on the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. The Kentucky Reservoir alone is capable of reducing flood heights by 2 feet at Cairo, and the benefits will extend downstream two-thirds the distance to New Orleans, or to the mouth of the Red River. Kentucky Reservoir, plus the upstream storage provided by other T. V. A. projects, would enable the T. V. A. to reduce a flood of 1937 proportions by at least 3 feet, probably more. The T. V. A. system of reservoirs will make it possible for the levee systems on the Mississippi to protect some 6,000,000 acres of cultivated land, now jeopardized by every high water flow.

With storage reservoirs upstream, those levees will be effective. They cannot do the job alone. Since 1927 this has been obvious, but change in settled habits comes as hard to engineers as any other profession.

Early in 1928 reports were submitted to Congress by the Mississippi River Commission and the United States Army engineers—after the disastrous flood on the Mississippi which inundated 12,000,000 acres, drove 700,000 people from their homes and caused $220,000,000 damage. Both reports proposed diversion floodways down the west side of the Mississippi River to relieve the main channel from the mouth of the Arkansas River to the Gulf, and the United States Army engineers report suggested an additional floodway from the mouth of the Ohio about 30 miles downstream to lower flood stages at Cairo, Ill.

The Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, adopted the Jadwin plan, submitted by Maj. Gen. Edgar Jadwin, Chief of Engineers, to construct floodways and raise levees to take care of a 25 percent greater flood than 1927 at an expenditure of $325,000,000. By 1936, all but $53,000,000 of the sum had been appropriated.

Recognizing that these protective measures might be insufficient, section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1928 directed the Secretary of War, through the Corps of Engineers, to—

> Prepare and submit to Congress * * * projects for flood control on all tributary streams of the Mississippi subject to destructive floods which projects shall include * * * the effect on the subject of further flood control of the lower Mississsippi River through the control of flood waters in the drainage basins of the tributaries by the establishment of a reservoir system.

In response to this provision, the Secretary of War on July 29, 1935, submitted a report—House Document No. 259, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, Comprehensive Report on Reservoirs in Mississippi River Basin—outlining two plans for reservoir systems, one aimed chiefly at protection on the lower Mississippi, the other chiefly at control of the tributaries. The second plan was recommended by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and by the Chief of Engineers.

The recommended plan based on the conviction that operation of the reservoir system for control of floods on the tributaries would lower the floods on the main stream to controllable levels, proposed 151 reservoirs, including 81 on the Ohio—excluding the Tennessee—14 on the upper Mississippi, 7 on the Missouri, 4 on other tributaries above Cairo, 26 on the Arkansas and White Rivers, 7 on the Yazoo, and 12 on the Red and Ouachita, providing a total of 98,677,900 acre-feet of storage for $1,125,807,000.

The Chief of Engineers reported that "the group of reservoirs on the Arkansas

and the White are by far the most effective in controlling the floods on the main stem of the Mississippi."

With that recommendation the Chief of Engineers abandoned the earlier contention that levees and floodways would give adequate protection. The experience on the Tennessee supports that theoretical position. Those vast reservoirs will make complete protection feasible by the addition of a modest expenditure for local protective works. They assure us a constant channel for navigation, and they give us further vast amounts of electric power.

The plan Congress adopted for the Tennessee in 1933 has almost been completed. We know it works. The distinguished engineering staff of T. V. A. are enthusiasts for multipurpose structures. Not much has been accomplished to carry out the plan submitted by the Army engineers. Norfolk Dam, one of the most important recommendations, was authorized in the Flood Control Act of June 1938. According to the annual report of the United States Army engineers for the fiscal year 1941, "the office and garage, access road, and construction railroad are complete. Construction of the dam was 5 percent complete at the end of the year." About 5 percent of the reservoir area—14 tracts—had been purchased. The report estimated that the project will be 59 percent complete at the end of the fiscal year 1943.

Things move more slowly when a labyrinth of contracts and subcontracts must be let, when there is no integrated regional agency to vitalize the program. But we are moving in the right direction when we build storage dams to hold the water in the tributary streams.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX.]

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, we have before us a matter of utmost importance to my section of Louisiana and one which also has a very close bearing on the war effort. It is a matter in which the people of my District are looking to their national Government for long-needed relief and their cause is most deserving and just.

I refer to the appropriations asked for the Teche-Vermilion and Mermentau waterway improvement projects in south Louisiana. Efforts have been made for some time to secure the necessary funds for this purpose. Our people have been patient and long-suffering in waiting for these improvements, and they are surely entitled to assistance without further delay. They are deserving of this aid not only for themselves, but because they seek the opportunity to develop properly one of the richest and most productive areas of our Nation; a section which is in a position to contribute much to the food program and other phases of the war effort.

The people of my section are progressive and industrious. They are most patriotic and loyal to their Government. Thousands of their sons and daughters are in military service while the folks at home are lending every aid. Everyone is doing his or her part to help win the war and they will meet every sacrifice asked of them. All they are seeking from their Government is the opportunity to be of still greater assistance and particularly to be given the chance to grow the many crops which that area can produce under favorable conditions.

For the past 50 years, my section of Louisiana has been visited at frequent intervals by floods caused by lack of proper drainage facilities. Several of these floods have been of major proportions, such as those of 1940 and 1941. The United States Department of Agriculture estimates that the 1940 flood alone caused more than $10,000,000 in damages.

These floods are due to the streams becoming clogged by the accumulation of silt, preventing normal drainage. The country is flat, with rich alluvial lands. Because of the stoppage of normal flow, even a comparatively small rainfall, under present conditions, is sufficient to inundate thousands of acres adjacent to these streams. In the flood of 1940, the water ran upstream for some 4 weeks, while fertile farm lands were inundated for 2 months.

The solution to this trouble is the cleaning of these streams, which is a simple matter. The cost is small, in fact, a paltry sum when the great benefits to be derived are considered.

Army engineers estimate the cost of the Teche-Vermilion project at $1,390,000, and the Mermentau at $970,000, or a total of $2,360,000, a fraction of the many millions of dollars in losses incurred by our people through these many years and the probable greater loss that will result in the future unless this situation is remedied.

The area affected by the projects covering improvements for the Vermilion and Mermentau Rivers and Bayou Teche involves all or parts of 12 parishes, having an area of 9,904 square miles and a population of approximately 450,000. It contains more than two and one-quarter million acres of farm lands, and, as previously stated, this area is one of the most productive in the United States.

More than a third of all the rice produced in the United States is grown in the area drained by these streams. My section is also a sugarcane-producing center, growing most of the sugarcane in this country with the exception of production in Florida. It is one of the leading cotton regions, while corn, sweetpotatoes, and vegetable crops are grown on a large scale. The livestock and poultry industries are making great strides. The sea-food industry is extensive and within my district are found the larger number of the world's supply of muskrat furs. Untold mineral, oil, and chemical resources are available.

Steady progress has been made in the development of agriculture and livestock production and in the utilization of the natural resources of this section. However, it is only the beginning of the possibilities that are waiting to be realized. Our people welcome the opportunity to develop this area as they know it can be developed if unhampered by the threat of floods that can so easily be eliminated.

Our citizens, through their own efforts, have done much to improve drainage, but their industry and initiative will be of little avail unless the major problem is solved. Large numbers of drainage districts have been created, and more recently several parishes have voted, or have prepared to vote, large bond issues for parish-wide drainage programs. These bond issues total into the millions of dollars. Despite this readiness to do their part, however, our people hesitate, and rightly so, at spending this money unless the Teche, Vermilion, and Mermentau are improved in order that the necessary outlets can be assured. To spend this money, unless the principal source of the difficulty is removed, would be practically useless.

I have spoken of the agricultural possibilities, and I wish to stress the importance of permitting full production of crops as a means of helping the war effort. I know of no section that can do more to help relieve the food shortage than the one in which the Teche, Vermilion, and Mermentau are located. But production will necessarily be curtailed as long as drainage conditions remain as they are. From this standpoint alone the improvement of these streams is more than justified. But there are other considerations.

Louisiana has many Military Establishments and defense plants, a number of which are situated in the southern part of the State. Adequate transportation facilities are required. Highways must be kept open for moving of troops and equipment and for other military operations. Floods have on several occasions inundated highways of south Louisiana, including U. S. 90—the Old Spanish Trail, transcontinental highway—and the Lafitte Cut-Off, from New Iberia and Lake Charles into Houston, Tex. We all realize the extreme necessity of keeping the highways open for military purposes. We can picture the disaster that might result if military movements by highway are halted in an hour of crisis. If for no other reason than this, the threat of frequently recurring floods and the blocking of these arteries of traffic should and must be eliminated.

Oil production is another important item in national defense. Oil development has been extensive in my area and one of the most productive fields is at Anse la Butte, 8 miles from my home town of Lafayette. During these floods this field, as well as others, has been under water for as long as 3 weeks and in fact these floods have tied up the whole oil industry of that section for long periods.

The major factors to be considered in the Teche-Vermilion and Mermentau projects are their importance to the safety, health, and economic welfare of the people I represent, and the importance of these projects to the war effort. Also worthy of much consideration is the matter of navigation. Improvement of these streams will offer transportation facilities which mean much to the commercial progress of the area. It should also be borne in mind that these facilities could serve, if need be, for military purposes.

Army engineers have made an extensive study of the necessity for these wa-

terway projects and have approved them. It is certain that every cent spent under these appropriations will be spent wisely and well. No investment could yield greater returns and Federal funds could not be spent to better advantage.

The Army engineers advise us that these projects can be completed within a year. They also state that very little critical materials will be required. The work will be largely dredging. A number of dredge boats are already in that vicinity, working on the intracoastal canal, and several others are expected to be sent there this year. Dredge boats of the type necessary for this work are becoming more and more available, and there will be no difficulty in getting the equipment as soon as funds for the projects are available.

The Chief of Engineers recommended more than 2 years ago that these improvements be made. At the present time there is an unobligated balance of existing appropriations heretofore made for flood control, general, of some $36,000,000. The War Department and the Office of the Chief of Engineers approve the use of $2,360,000 of that amount for these improvements, along the lines of the original recommendations. In other words, these vital improvements will not involve the appropriating of new money, but only the use of a small portion of the unobligated balance of the flood-control funds.

When we consider the matter of national defense, the needs of the people of this rich and productive area, and the numerous other factors involved, there can be no doubt of the wisdom, necessity and justice of providing these improvements. The finest food area of America is being jeopardized for lack of the expenditure of an insignificant sum.

My people are entitled to these improvements and the Nations is entitled to the gains that will result from opening the way to full development of this outstanding section, abundant in beauty and tradition as well as in resources; a land famed for its friendly and hospitable citizens; truly a garden spot, offering the best in life to all who are privileged to share in its wealth of possessions.

Our cause is most worthy; our appeal most urgent. I am confident my colleagues appreciate the need and will meet the situation by approving these projects. In so doing they will receive the heartfelt thanks of an appreciative people and the reward of knowing they have faithfully and conscientiously performed their duty.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOUNT VERNON, ALEXANDRIA & WASHINGTON RAILWAY CO., A CORPORATION

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1667) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after "determine", insert "whether or not a cause of action for damages exists in connection with."

Page 1, line 6, after "and" insert, ", if such court determines that such cause of action does exist."

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "consequential, incidental, or otherwise."

Page 2, line 10, strike out all after "any," down to and including "tortious," in line 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. M. REID & CO.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2067) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. M. Reid & Co., of Macon, Ga., with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, after line 12, insert:

"SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph 'Twentieth' of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALVA BURTON RICKEY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1160), for the relief of Alva Burton Rickey, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$4,443.15" and insert "$2,943.15."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

O. T. TRAVIS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 170) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. T. Travis, with a Senate amendment and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the claim against the United States of America of O. T. Travis of Newport News, Va., owner of the power boat *Dorothy Frances*, for damage to said vessel, sunk on June 12, 1937, by striking what is alleged to have been an improperly and insufficiently marked wreck, in navigable water, on the west side of lower Chesapeake Bay, southeast of Black River, Va., light may be sued for by the said O. T. Travis in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia sitting as a court of admiralty and acting under the rules governing such court, and such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such suit, and to enter a judgment or decree for the amount of such damages, interest, and costs, if any shall be found to be due against the United States in favor of the said O. T. Travis, upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases in admiralty between private parties, and with the same rights of appeal: *Provided*, That such notice of the suit shall be given to the Attorney General of the United States as may be provided by the order of the said court, and it shall be the duty of the said Attorney General to cause the United States Attorney in such district to appear and defend for the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. SAMUEL AZER

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1468), for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Azer, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$750" and insert "$500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORDIE UNDERWOOD AND WILBUR KEA

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1153) for the relief of Cordie Underwood and Wilbur Kea, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$500" and insert "$400.50."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$500" and insert "$394.50."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOWARD E. DICKISON

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 940) for the relief of Howard E. Dickison, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DONNA PITTEL

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 535) for the relief of the legal guardian of Donna Pittel, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, after "sustained", insert "and all medical expenses that now exist or that might be incurred in the future."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORREST W. DICKEY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 235) for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. PATTON, and Mr. PITTENGER.

FLORENCE E. HUTCHINSON

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of Florence E. Hutchinson, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. PITTENGER.

LEONARD L. GAY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1784) for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and he appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McGEHEE, PITTENGER, and PATTON.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH].

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter written by me to the Postmaster General and a reply to the same, in reference to the Postal Service personnel.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan appearing in this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the State of Michigan Chronicle.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, just because we sometimes forget, may I further remind those who have sons or daughters in the service that we are trying to meet this afternoon at half past 4 in the room downstairs opposite the barber shop.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article written by E. R. Ziff, as published in the Washington Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

O. P. A. AND DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers this morning are full of more dire predictions by the O. P. A. Such phrases as "our indicated short supply of milk" and "our limited supply of milk" and the extension of cheese rationing are evidently meant to prepare us for rationing of milk throughout the country. And yet, Mr. Speaker, this same O. P. A. has so disturbed, by directives and interferences, the milk market in New England that it has already put out of business 7 percent of the milk producers of that area.

Why the O. P. A. is so intent on bringing about conditions throughout the Nation and certainly in New England to so curtail milk production as to make rationing necessary is beyond my comprehension. This is one of the questions that could be settled to the satisfaction of the people generally and certainly of this Congress if my resolution, No. 238, now in the Rules Committee, for an investigation of O. P. A. could be reported out and approved by this body. I strongly urge every Member here to prevail upon the Rules Committee to begin hearings at once on my resolution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article published in the New Orleans Picayune regarding the Teche-Vermilion-Mermentau flood-control project.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include two short resolutions from the Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a soldier.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of merchant marine personnel and to include therein a statement by the President of the United States, certain quotations pertinent to the subject, and certain editorials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter from Governor Black of the Farm Credit Administration.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from a newspaper in my city.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the four-hundreth anniversary of the death of Nicholas Copernicus, the great Polish genius.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address I recently made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial by Frank Waldrop appearing in this morning's Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD and to include a joint resolution on the United Nations of the World, adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today after all other special orders have been concluded, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address I made to the women of the county and city of New York on Saturday, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial taken from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE MRS. ALLEN T. TREADWAY

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to violate any of the traditions of this House, nor to establish any new precedent, but I think that when the wife of the dean of the minority of this House lies dead in the city it ill becomes us not to express to him as Members of the House our sympathy in his bereavement.

So, unrequested and on my own responsibility, I say to you, ALLEN TREADWAY, the membership of the House extends to you and yours in your bereavement its heartfelt sympathy.

That loss is common would not make
My own less bitter, rather more:
Too common! Never morning wore
To evening, but some heart did break.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the other special orders for today I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO ATTEND SESSIONS OF INTERNATIONAL FOOD CONFERENCE AT HOT SPRINGS, VA.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, 10 days ago I was assured by the gentleman from Illinois, Chairman SABATH, of the Rules Committee, that he would call a meeting of the committee last Monday or Tuesday to consider the Bradley resolution (H. Con. Res. 18) creating a joint committee to attend the sessions of the International Food Conference at Hot Springs, Va., and that it is the sense of the Congress that three major press wire services, the Associated Press, the International News Service, and the United Press, shall be permitted to be represented at any and all sessions of the conference by one representative from each service.

Since then I have been unable to reach the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and have been informed that he was away from Washington. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] has by his diligence and perseverance shown the necessity for action by the Congress. Time is of the essence.

The officials of the International Food Conference at Hot Springs have virtually destroyed the freedom of the press, and are deliberately withholding from the American people information vitally affecting their interests, which they are entitled to have.

The tactics pursued by the Food Conference are patterned on Nazi and Fascist totalitarian systems. Free speech and a free press are the foundation stones of our Republic. Without them free America ceases to exist, and the sacrifices made by the American people in the war will have been in vain. It is more important that, while fighting for the "four freedoms" all over the world, we maintain them in America.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to address the House on Wednesday next for 15 minutes. I have discovered since making the request that that day will be devoted to memorial exercises for our late colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next, 1 week from today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of making iron without coke.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a press release.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] is recognized for 50 minutes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] asked me to yield when we had the conference report up for consideration. I did not want to disturb the continuity of that debate and I told him I would yield 10 minutes of my time to him at this time. I therefore yield to the gentleman now.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, May 28, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPARKMAN). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by Hon. Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, before the Swedish Colonial Society at Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUPERHIGHWAY

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago, in 1936, I introduced in the House of Representatives my first transcontinental or superhighway bill. It was on February 2, 1937, that I first addressed the House, giving a brief outline of what I had in mind with reference to a superhighway system for the Nation. Many Members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle at that time, and since that time, have given me encouraging support. In fact, the entire Nation has been interested in such a system of highways.

You will find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of 1938 excerpts from many of the leading newspapers throughout the Nation—newspapers such as the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune, the San Francisco Times, the Atlanta Journal, the Pittsburgh Press, the Washington Star, the Washington Post, and scores of other papers, commenting favorably on such a procedure at that time.

But since that time they have not only commented favorably, but they have become emphatic in their statements that such a Nation-building highway system must be constructed in order to take care of the future needs of the Nation. Only through such transportation can we hope to meet the needs of our democracy in the future.

I want to quote from my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2, 1937:

Mr. Speaker, as long as we have a nation we will have economic, social, and industrial problems to solve.

As we drift from an agricultural nation into an industrial nation, our problems become more complex and each generation finds that new procedures must be set up in order to take care of the needs and the activities of the people in their generation.

Among the problems that will always confront the people of the United States, are the problems of (a) transportation, (b) unemployment, (c) national defense.

It is believed by many of our best engineers and farsighted nation builders that we can, in a large measure, solve the three problems mentioned above, by building a national system of highways.

The first act of Congress relative to the building of national roads was a bill passed by Congress during Jefferson's administration and signed by him March 29, 1806. This bill carried with it an appropriation of $30,000 for the preliminary survey running from Baltimore, Md., via Cumberland, Md.; Uniontown, Pa.; Wheeling, W. Va.; Columbus, Ohio. This road was known as the National Pike; now we speak of it as the Old National Pike or Route 40. I might say at this point also that Congress for 40 years thereafter appropriated each year money for the improvement and upkeep of the Old National Pike; the sum appropriated totaled $6,324,919.33.

It was President Polk who vetoed the appropriation in 1846. The history of this phase of road building is very interesting and I will insert at this pont a copy of the first public document authorizing the beginning of work on the Old National Pike, now Route 40. I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of this public document in Thomas Jefferson's own handwriting.

I further quote from my remarks of February 2, 1937, because I think they are appropriate today, the same as they were at that time. I quote:

The two major things that I have briefly mentioned as to why these highways should be built, namely transportation and absorption of the unemployed, would be sufficient. However, the most outstanding and the one feature embodying the greatest saving in dollars over a period of years, is the use of these highways in our national defense scheme.

We all agree that the type of national defense equipment that we need today and will need in the future is not the same national defense equipment that we needed 10, 20, 30 years ago. I further assume that everybody believes with me that our first line of national defense is made up of our homes, our schools, and our churches.

However, as long as other nations fly at the throats of each other, so long must we provide adequate defense to protect our shores and our possessions in case a foreign foe should choose to disturb our people.

Just as our rubber wheeled units in our national defense equipment are replacing our horses and mules, so large mobile units on rubber wheels and other large and small units with wings, will take up the major load of our national defense in the years immediately ahead of us.

I mean, Mr. Speaker, that if we had these roads built as set forth in this bill, completed at this time, we could and would save millions of dollars on national-defense expenditures each year and at the same time have greater strength, efficiency, and flexibility in our national defense set-up.

I quoted from my remarks from this floor in presenting this bill 6 years ago. Each year since then the horizon expanded. In 1939 and 1940 when I presented my bill here on this floor, I said it would cost in the neighborhood of $8,000,000,000 to build this 16,000 miles of highway.

My bill called for then, and calls for now, highways eight lanes wide or 100 feet, to be constructed of concrete or other material just as durable, if not more so. It also calls for the right-of-way to be at least 600 feet—leveled off on level with the highway—that is 250 feet on either side of the highway proper shall be leveled off except at such places where it would be absolutely unwise or unprofitable because of cost and usability. It also requires that there shall be no grade in the highway greater than 3½ percent. It also stipulates that these highways should be built so as to be equipped with electric light equipment from end to end—this equipment to be at the outer edge and not higher than the curb itself.

This equipment would enable us to have three main streets across the Nation and six up and down across the Nation. These highways would be spotted with radio stations every so many miles. They would be divided off in sections like railways. There would be landing strips across the Nation for any type of airplane 24 hours a day, just as the pilot today radios from the vicinity of Baltimore, we will say, stating that he will land at Bolling Field, in 10 minutes, and Bolling Field in turn clears the runways for that landing, so the pilot if he would get in trouble and wish to land any place on these highways, night or day, would merely radio to the station nearest to him, that he would land in section so and so in 5 minutes, or 3 minutes, or what not, and the ground crew at this radio station would stop all traffic both ways immediately and you would have your two 3-mile runways for a safe landing.

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOCH. The gentleman will agree that if the other gentlemen who are listening to him do not understand what a superhighway is, that his Commonwealth has built a highway which demonstrates just what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I want to say that in Pennsylvania we are very proud of that highway and its contribution to the war effort at this time, especially in the transportation of commodities by trucks.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to compliment the gentleman for being consistent in his program for "dream" roads all down the line. The gentleman will recall that he and I went before the House Committee on Roads in 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939.

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. At the time the "dream" roads were under discussion.

The gentleman just referred to the Pennsylvania turnpike, over which many of us travel frequently. It is known as Highway No. 30 to us in Nebraska. I notice the gentleman has a map here demonstrating his ideas as a basis upon which the gentleman would proceed.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I notice the highway as projected misses the Pennsylvania turnpike going west, and, of course, the gentleman does not want to tell us that this is the proposal which he is submitting

for the construction of a four-lane highway; that is, it does not represent an accurate picture of the proposal?

Mr. SNYDER. No; this is not an accurate map. As previously stated, my bill provides that there should be a commission appointed by the President of 10 people, 5 of whom must be Army engineers with at least 10 years' experience. Under such a plan, when the war is over, we could immediately put 3,000,000 men to work in building these desired highways.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, the gentleman knows I agree with him.

Many of us recently attended the annual convention of the American Road Builders Association, which was held in Chicago, where there was discussed the post-war road-building program. There were approximately 1,500 people attending that convention, people who represented manufacturers of road-building machinery, contractors; engineering people from all parts of the United States were gathered at that convention to go into the fundamentals of a road-building program as a means of solving our economic problems which will devolve upon us in the post-war period. They agreed there that the construction of highways was of first importance in the solution of the post-war economic problem.

I want to ask the gentleman, however, whether, in his treatment of the four-lane highways of tomorrow, he has given consideration to this fact.

Mr. SNYDER. This happens to be an eight-lane proposal.

Mr. STEFAN. It was my privilege a little more than 3 years ago to travel over many hundreds of miles of the four-lane highways of the German Reich. I noticed, and I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, the fact that in the construction of the highways in that country they did not forget, first of all, the construction of farm to market roads.

Mr. SNYDER. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. That is, secondary highways in order that raw materials could be brought to market more quickly, and to the superhighways for rapid transportation.

In the program of farm-to-market roads and secondary highways in Germany, they took into consideration the military expediency, and in building the farm-to-market, or allegedly secondary roads, north of what we might call the Maginot Line, from which they made their attacks on the Allies.

I would like to ask the gentleman if the plans which he has set up in his program calls for a farm-to-market road system or secondary highways as a part of his four-lane highway system?

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman very much for his splendid contribution. My plan calls for an eight-lane highway clear across the Nation, as indicated on this map, with a roadway 700 feet wide. These rights-of-way to be cut down level with the road, so that all across and up and down the Nation, on 18,000 miles of road, wherever you would be, you would have a landing field. We are talking about landing strips. There would be no obstructions for 700 feet, 350 feet on either side of the middle of the highway. The lighting system would be no higher than the curb. No longer would there be any planes diving into the hills around Salt Lake City or in Pennsylvania. They would have a main street across the Nation here and here and here, and up and down at all times.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman be generous enough to yield further?

Mr. SNYDER. With pleasure.

Mr. STEFAN. The House Committee on Roads has under consideration the planning of roads for the post-war period. In that plan they are taking into consideration landing strips.

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. I call the attention of my colleague to the fact that in Europe, in connection with planning superhighways and landing strips—the gentleman, coming from a mountainous section of the country, may be interested to know this—they began constructing their hangars under the hills, in caves, and there they stored their airplanes.

May I ask the gentleman if his bill has been looked over by Mr. MacDonald and by the Chief of Army Engineers, who are also interested in this plan, and by Charlie Upham, of the American Roadbuilders' Association?

Mr. SNYDER. They looked over my former bill. The one I introduced today is approximately the same.

With reference to the airports my bill calls for an air base at each of the 18 intersections, to be at least 2 miles square, it to be left to the judgment of the War Department and the Navy Department whether they should be underground or above ground.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I know that the record that has been made by the turnpike in Pennsylvania has been an inspiration to the entire country. The gentleman who is speaking has certainly followed this idea and this dream tirelessly and is deserving of commendation for the vision he has shown.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CASE. I hope the gentleman will explain in connection with the possible use of these highways for landing strips his idea about radio control for the clearance of the highways when airplanes want to come down.

Mr. SNYDER. May I make that statement right now?

As we know in connection with railroads, they have a section every so often for the running of trains and a section for the care of tracks. This highway would be laid off in sections, starting, we will say, at New York. I would not know and you would not know whether a section should be 20 miles, 50 miles, or what not. In each of these sections there would be a radio station to communicate both with those in the air above them and those involved in the regular traffic, serving 24 hours a day. Those of us who know something about radio equipment in planes, trucks, tanks, and what not today know how efficiently such a system could be operated.

In case a plane should be flying over that section, just the same as has been done in Germany since the war started, and that plane got in trouble, it would merely radio down to station 17 or 640 or whatever station it happened to be over, "Land in section 6 in 3 minutes." Then traffic would be stopped at both ends of that section, and you would have a runway there 100 feet wide, made of concrete or black top, whichever would be used for building there, and 700 feet wide, so there would be no interference with the plane's landing. In other words, you would have an emergency landing field 18,000 miles long.

I may say that three different planes, one of them a B–18 bomber, have been forced to land on the Pennsylvania Turnpike or near by, and they took off again on the turnpike; and the Pennsylvania Turnpike is only four lanes wide. An 85-foot-span plane could not take off from that highway at all points, but on the highways which I suggest that could be done.

Let me say this about the Pennsylvania Turnpike which will be of interest to you in connection with the war effort. I was up there a couple of weeks ago. If we had not had this war, that turnpike would have paid for itself in 10 years—that is, it would have paid the $40,000,000 we borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It is paying for itself and much more today, and there is hardly anything on it but truck traffic. The truck traffic comes on at Pittsburgh and runs to Harrisburg, 162 miles. Instead of having just one truck carrying, say, 10,000 gallons of gasoline toward the east coast, it will hook on a trailer and take another 10,000 gallons along. If they would go over Route 30 and go up and down the mountains, they could take only one truck at a time. While it takes 10 hours to go up and down the mountains, it takes only 5 hours for the truck to go over the superhighway, where the grade does not exceed 4 percent or a fraction thereof.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. May I ask the gentleman if it is not true that commercial truck lines are finding that they can pay the cost of the tolls and use the turnpike and save as much again as the tolls cost them?

Mr. SNYDER. A very splendid contribution.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. I am wondering if the gentleman has any estimate of the amount per mile this highway would cost, and how many miles of construction is contemplated. Has the gentleman made a study of that matter?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes. It is contemplated to build 18,000 miles of highway. It would cost $12,000,000,000 to build it

now, but if we had built it in 1937 it would have cost $8,000,000,000. That is $500,000 a mile.

Mr. JONES. Is the bill authored by him, to which he is referring, the one that the Committee on Roads has been considering and is going to report out?

Mr. SNYDER. I suppose the Committee on Roads has in its bill many features the same as this. If I recall correctly the recommendation of Mr. MacDonald when he submitted his road program, it sort of "turkey-footed" into the different cities. My bill states that all cities shall be bypassed on these highways.

I have been studying and getting information from all parts of the civilized world, and I believe it ought to be left to the States and municipalities to get these highways to the cities. It may pass close to Philadelphia and close to New York, but it would not run through, and this one pointing to the Eastern Shore should run from the shores the whole way through, from a national defense standpoint, so the Army could use it, and would keep in from the shore, say, 30 to 60 miles.

Mr. JONES. In the report that the Roads Committee is going to bring out, does it contemplate these 18,000 miles of highway?

Mr. SNYDER. I cannot answer the gentleman. I started this in 1937.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Can the gentleman at this time advise as to the attitude of the Department of Roads and likewise of the War Department in respect to his bill?

Mr. SNYDER. No and yes. They are both in favor of the system of superhighways across the Nation of this general plan, and I know that Mr. MacDonald would not favor this sort of squared-off system plan here, according to their report.

Mr. THOMASON. I know that the gentleman has done a lot of hard work on this matter and that he has and deserves the commendation of his colleagues in the House and likewise of the people of the country. In connection with this whole program, I ask the gentleman whether he has borne in mind the matter of air freight after the war, because that will be a big factor along with highways.

Mr. SNYDER. May I answer my friend from Texas, who has contributed so much to the war effort? I have great faith in our country. Think of the population back 40 or 50 years ago and then attempt to visualize 50 years from now what will be the population of our country, and what are going to be its demands. I may say that I believe within 10 years after the war is over we will be flying planes leaving New York with 200 tons that will reach San Francisco or Los Angeles within 12 hours, but I still believe that there will be ample use for all of this highway procedure at the same time our population grows. I want to say this further about bypassing cities. We can make all the laws that we want to and still you will have slums in cities. I heard a preacher say last Sunday that man made slums, while God made trees. I go out here toward the Soldiers' Home, and I see that they are building whole rows of houses. To me in 40 years from now those will be slum districts. It is only natural, if I may state it, that in Baltimore, Pittsburgh, New York, Cincinnati, and wherever else big cities exist that the railroads came into the town close to the river front, where the railroads were obliged to go along the river level, and it was there that they built factories adjacent thereto, and all other business houses.

Naturally they had no transportation in those days, and the men walked to work, and it was natural they should build their homes in there. That is now your slum district in every city. If you build these roads bypassing the cities, with the electric power we have these days, and thinking of the percentage of manufactured commodities made from electric energy, you will find that automatically these factories would move away from the crowded river fronts, and the slum districts, and move out along these highways half a mile back or so.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Gladly.

Mr. STEFAN. Is not that the objective of the House Committee on Rules, and the Army engineers, and Mr. McDonald, that when you start building these networks of great highways and connect them up with the farm marketing and secondary highways, you will eliminate slums and bring the processing of raw materials closer to the source of production?

Mr. SNYDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. WHITE. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this would be under the supervision of the Army engineers? Is that right?

Mr. SNYDER. No. I said the Secretary of the Interior and the Army engineers and others. There will be a commission of ten.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman not think that the Bureau of Public Roads is better qualified than the Army engineers to take charge of this.

Mr. SNYDER. No; not necessarily.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman recognizes the fact that in building the Alaska Highway, it was built by the Army men, but was under the supervision of Mr. McDonald.

Mr. SNYDER. Surely, and it should be under his supervision. The Army engineers laid it out. I believe they know more about the engineering work in building highways and waterways than any other group.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman think that they are superior to the engineers of the Bureau of Roads?

Mr. SNYDER. No, but I think they are their equals.

Mr. WHITE. In laying out roads?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I notice there has been a little change in that northern route, crossing my State of Idaho. There is no road now where that road is supposed to go. Is it contemplated to use the famous old Lewis and Clark Trail, or does the gentleman know about that?

Mr. SNYDER. This does not say that it goes between this point or this town and that town. This is a general plan and it may vary 50 miles or 100 miles

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman appreciate there is a place in the United States over 500 miles long where there are not any access roads, and this road contemplates the crossing of that section, which will be 200 miles either way to the nearest east and west road?

Mr. SNYDER. That would be fine.

Mr. WHITE. That will be down the Lewis and Clark trail, as I understand it, one of the strategic defiles across the Rocky Mountains. Is it contemplated to use that?

Mr. SNYDER. I assume they would look into it at least.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to my distinguished friend from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I have seen the gentleman year by year working on his good roads program. I felt prior to the beginning of the war that he was making substantial progress in putting over the superhighway program. The war is going to be over some day and as the gentleman has said, we want a program to begin on again. I know nothing closer to the hearts of the people of America than good roads. I want to ask the gentleman this question: The gentleman referred to the fact that people would be inclined to move their homes away from the cities.

Mr. SNYDER. From the slum parts of the cities.

Mr. BROOKS. Do you not think also from the standpoint of industry that industry would be inclined to more or less decentralize, get away from the hot spots of industry, you might say, so that in time of war as well as in time of peace, they would be better protected and better able to carry on?

Mr. SNYDER. A very acceptable thought, indeed. I am sure that would follow.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Referring to your main strip east and west, even allowing 50 or 100 miles' variation as to where it would go, why did you choose to cross the Rocky Mountains at that particular spot?

Mr. SNYDER. Well, I did not know the Rocky Mountains, so I just left it for them to choose. Of course, you understand there will be a great many tunnels in this, just as in Pennsylvania. In 162 miles we have seven tunnels.

Mr. CURTIS. Of course, those tunnels are different from tunnels through the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. SNYDER. That may be so.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. Most assuredly.

Mr. STEWART. I notice that these two northern east and west routes are near together. There is a great white space farther south. Is it your intention that it be designed that way?

Mr. SNYDER. No. My thought was that all this region around the Great Lakes, the manufacturing center, starting at New York, going through Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, is densely populated. The population from New York to Chicago is greater than the population farther south.

Mr. STEWART. That is not the case around Oklahoma.

Mr. SNYDER. That may not be the case there.

Mr. STEWART. Because it is just the reverse. The population starts there.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Is it not entirely possible that if some concept like this developed there would be another east and west highway demanded, which would supply that condition down there, reaching the gentleman's State of Oklahoma?

Mr. SNYDER. I thought of that before I presented this map, but that is a new angle of it that would come in as the Nation grows.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I notice a white strip on the map. Has that any particular significance?

Mr. SNYDER. No. That just happens to be a defect in the map.

Mr. KEEFE. Did you formerly have a strip across there? That crosses my State.

Mr. SNYDER. Oh, is that it?

Mr. KEEFE. You have eliminated that from your plan?

Mr. SNYDER. No; not necessarily so.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CASE. Is it not entirely possible that Wisconsin will receive the same consideration as Oklahoma?

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman will yield further——

Mr. SNYDER. I gladly yield to my distinguished and able colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Those strips that extend out into the Pacific Ocean and down into the Gulf do not mean anything particularly, do they?

Mr. SNYDER. I do not imagine so. I think the secretary that pasted that on just forgot to clip them off.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. I understood the gentleman to say a moment ago that the average cost of this highway would be about a half million dollars a mile?

Mr. SNYDER. In 1938 it would have been that. Now it would be about $750,000.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. About $750,000 a mile?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. What would be the average cost of a railroad? About $140,000 a mile?

Mr. SNYDER. I do not know.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. The economics of it appealed to me. I thought perhaps if you could build a railroad for $140,000 a mile and subtract the difference between $140,000 and $750,000, you could take that money and invest it and permit everybody in the country to ride free on the railroads and use the facilities for freight free.

Mr. SNYDER. Well, I have not figured that out. At least, that is interesting.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Has the gentleman given any thought to the idea of financing the project or do you care to go into that at this time?

Mr. SNYDER. I would say that immediately after the war it could be built in a number of different ways. Perhaps the way Pennsylvania built its highway, by getting a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and paying it back over a space of years by tolls. I was not in favor of tolls, but since we have the Pennsylvania Highway and since we have educated our people the way we have educated them to be 5-and-10-cent people, we have done that for 20 or 30 years now in a big way, and we find that the people do not object to paying the toll. If a man in Pittsburgh has $5 in his pocket, and that is all he has, and he wants to go to Harrisburg, he can go over the William Penn or the Lincoln, parallel routes, and not use his $1.50 to go 162 miles on the superhighway, but he will go over the superhighway just so he can drive 60 or 70 miles an hour. I believe we have so educated our people in their spending of nickels, dimes, and quarters for all kinds of "gadgets" that that could be considered a reasonable way to pay for such a project. I do not say it should be the way to pay for it, but at least it seems to me it would pay for it within a reasonable time.

After the war—we hope it will be next month, or 3 months—but whether it is 6 months, a year, or 5 years, we must have something for our boys to do. Nobody knows how long the war is going to last. I heard someone say recently that it all depended on morale, whether or not we could break the morale of the other nations. Seventy-five percent of the influence in all war is morale. When the war is over, as I say, there will be millions of the boys who will not have anything to do. As was so well said, I do not know of anything more valuable and worth while on which we could put men to work than a Nation-wide road-building program similar to this which would create something of so much value for the generations yet to come. I do not confine my thinking of post-war programs entirely to this one road plan I have proposed; I know there will be many changes in it at the time we start to survey it; but these boys will come back home looking for work and we should have work to give them. It was said of Germany that had she had nation-building work immediately after the other war for her soldiers, at reasonable wages, there would have been no Hitler.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. After the other war Germany, of course, did a lot of foolish things, but one thing was doubtless a very wise policy, and that was to require every employer of labor of more than 100 persons to employ at least 1 percent of the personnel who were veterans of that war, that is men who had lost maybe an arm or a leg, but who were still not incapacitated to do many of the duties which had to be performed. They did not have any large rehabilitation program. Does not the gentleman believe we could very well commence now to make arrangements to take care of these men after this war is over, not necessarily in that particular way but in some similar way? There should be post-war planning and I presume the policy which the gentleman is outlining would be one of the ways of taking care of a large number of these men.

Mr. SNYDER. Absolutely. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I may say that our committee, of which my friend, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is a member has already set aside, and the Army engineers are at work making plans and blueprints for projects to the extent of $800,000,000. They will be ready. That is what I call planning.

This matter of getting up on the floor and making a talk or giving out a newspaper statement from one's office is not planning; that is just talking. But when the Army engineers and other governmental agencies get to work and make blueprints which they have in their files, that is what I call real constructive planning to put men to work after this conflict is over which we hope, as I said before, will be soon. My committee is starting to hold hearings on a war budget that calls for quite a few billions more and I am sure we all feel that we have got to take steps to prepare for the future regardless of whether the morale of our enemies is broken down in 6 months, a year, or 2 years; we have got to go at this big-scale program that we have already started out on.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania for bringing this matter to the attention of the House, and also for the record I want it noted that in my judgment this plan discriminates against the Middle West, for three of the north-south highways are located in what might be considered the east coast. It seems to me those roads out to be a little farther apart so that the Middle West and the West would share in the program a little better than it does.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of this session of Congress, I have tried—at times with some difficulty—to maintain a discreet and admirable silence. No doubt this has been pleasing to some people who differ with me, and perhaps it has been a bit disappointing to those who concur in my views. I trust that my reluctance to speak will not be interpreted as cowardice on my part, but rather a willingness to go along with the party in power and to cooperate in every possible way in prosecuting to a successful termination, the terrible war which now engulfs us and threatens civilization. When our house is on fire there is no time for us to quarrel among ourselves, but it is imperative that we forget our minor differences and join in one courageous and determined effort to defeat the common foe. Perhaps we have had too much talk and not enough action. If I have made any mistake it is that I have bent over backward to go along with the administration and voted for some measures, about the wisdom of which I entertained certain pronounced doubts. One of the first things a man learns in politics, and certainly in time of war, is: He must do some things that he does not personally want to do.

Nevertheless, as Thomas Jefferson said, in effect, we need the Constitution as a rallying point and need to adhere to it more in times of storm and stress than in times of ease and peace. And it was Woodrow Wilson who said that, "We need more criticism in time of war, not less." If what I have to say this afternoon shall be interpreted as criticism, I want to assure my colleagues that it is offered only in the spirit to be helpful and constructive.

Mr. Speaker, sinister rumors are spreading all about Washington that somebody is trying to play politics with the conduct of the war and the armed services. I do not like idle rumors and I despise curious gossip. At this critical hour when barbarism is riding roughshod over the world; when the liberties of freemen are placed in jeopardy; when small nations are robbed, raped, and murdered by ruthless marauders; when all the spiritual values of life are challenged and assaulted by the unconscionable force of might and materialism, it is too bad that we have to pause to turn our scrutiny on such rumors as are now threatening to divide our efforts, disturb our unity of action, and that will, unless stopped, lead us inevitably to catastrophe. It is inconceivable, sir, that when we are spilling our blood and pouring our treasure on every continent and on every sea for our own survival that anyone in our own country would dare play politics with the conduct of the war and the armed services. Whether or not such rumors have any foundation in fact, I do not know. I cannot deny nor affirm the truth of any of them, but I certainly do not like to hear them. They are dividing our people at home and creating doubt among our allies abroad. If this be the work of the enemy, it ought to be uncovered and stopped. If the rumors are unfounded, their very falsity, when revealed, will put an end to them. If, on the other hand, there is any element of truth in these rumors, the fathers and mothers of the men and women who are fighting and dying on battle fronts all over the world in this tragic hour, should be apprised of it. The only way to stop such ugly and dangerous rumors is to uncover the reasons for them, be they true or false, and the people who are fighting this war and who are paying for it should know the facts.

Mr. Speaker, if we imagine for one moment that these rumors can float all around Washington, in Congress and out of Congress, in clubs and hotel lobbies, on the street corner, and practically every place else, and not reach our Allied command, we are wrong. Our allies are shrewd and intelligent. If any high command officers are going to be removed from the theaters of war in order to preclude a premonition they might become politically dangerous, that is a damnable thing and is breaking faith not only with the people back home but also with the sons and daughters of American fathers and mothers, out on the fighting line. If any high command officers at home are going to be shelved, sidetracked, or replaced because they will not be rubber stamps for the Rasputin of the White House, or because they will not heed the rustle of the silken robes of a Richelieu, it should be known. In order to maintain unity of purpose and strength of action to win this war these rumors, if false, should be spiked, branded a lie, and buried, and those who purvey them ought to be punished; if true, the causes for such rumors should be revealed and the persons responsible properly dealt with.

Mr. Speaker, usually where there is a lot of smoke, there will be found a little fire. There is a suspicion among many of our citizens, perhaps not wholly without grounds, that some exalted, appointed politicos in Washington are more concerned in spreading their strange social doctrines and perpetuating themselves in power than they are in immediately winning this war. Is it possible that certain social reformers and professional uplifters should form a conspiracy to remove some of our ablest commanders merely because they do not accept their strange social theories, and to supplant these tried and true men with others who would perpetuate a military dictatorship after the war? Can it be that a little coterie of self-seeking and cunning conspirators would take advantage of the present crisis and under the pressure of war attempt to make America over in such a fashion as they could not do in times of peace? Would the followers of the Rasputin, close to our Executive, and of our silken robed Richelieu—and there are many of their disciples sitting in high and important places of our Government today—would these apostles of the Tugwellian philosophy, which would roll up its sleeves and make America over—use this war as a smoke screen to saddle upon America a type of government and a kind of economy entirely foreign and contrary to those we have ever known? Representatives, you duly elected servants of your people, it is an inexpressibly dreadful thing when a nation's peril is used as a veil to hide from a free people the political machinations and socialistic schemes of these modern Machiavellis.

If there be a dark plot to remove any commanders from the theaters of war or to replace any high command officers at home by these professional politicians who get their power by appointment, rather than by election of the people, the American people would like to know. The American people are entitled to know. Mr. Speaker, the American people are disquieted by these disrupting rumors. It is no difficult or long complicated task to still these rumors. A forthright statement from any one of several persons in high places would, at once, resolve this whole situation. If our people seem to be uneasy, and lacking some of the enthusiasm of the First World War, could it be because they feel that some motive besides a single-minded will to win this war quickly and conclusively may exist in some quarters?

Mr. Speaker, the causes for these rumors must be removed. Back of any successful effort of a free people in war must lie the absolute and unbounded faith in those who are directing that war. Nothing could so quickly shatter the spirit of the phalanxes of freedom as the destruction of morale behind the lines on the home front. Shot and shell, bomb and bullet, are material. They inflict physical wounds. Morale, confidence, courage, the will to win—are things of the soul. When you injure these, you have grievously wounded the spirit and a wounded spirit never wins a struggle. Faith and courage win wars; munitions are merely implements. Anything, including these rumors, which can wound the soul of America must be stamped out and unity of the people must rest upon their confidence in those who are directing the war efforts. Mr. Speaker, the causes for these rumors must be removed.

Mr. NORRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I want to compliment the gentleman for his sincere and outstanding interest in maintaining unity at this special time and I want to concur in what he said. But in further pursuance of that thought I would like to have the gentleman express his sincere idea as to the advisability at this time of creating additional disunity by bringing up the kind of a bill that we had here today. Does not the gentleman believe that that will also contribute to disunity in this country and to the happiness and peacefulness of the Axis Powers?

Mr. SHORT. I think perhaps there is more truth in what the gentleman has said than most of the Members would be willing to admit.

Mr. NORRELL. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include the text of the message from the President of the United States to the delegates to the Conference of the United Nations on Food and Agriculture and to include also the text of the address of Hon. Marvin Jones.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House tomorrow afternoon for 15 minutes at the conclusion of the business of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session the minority leader was good enough to appoint me to the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee and asked me to take the chairmanship of the subcommittee dealing with the distribution and rationing of food. In the last few weeks a large part of my time has been devoted to study of this subject, and I have asked for the opportunity of addressing you today because there are certain observations with respect to the way in which the Nation's food program is being conducted that should, I believe, be made at this time.

My home State is the State of Massachusetts—a State in which the citizens are dependent for three-quarters of their entire food supply from outside of the State. In addition, my own district is completely urban, being without a single commercial farm of any importance within its boundaries. It is only natural, therefore, that I should concern myself with the consumer angle of the food problem.

At the outset I should like to make one observation which I think applies to every consumer in the United States. The consumer would much prefer to have some food at any price than no food at a fixed price. This statement may sound cynical, but its purpose is to convey the impression that a consumer's first concern in the food problem is to be assured of an adequate supply and to be assured that the producers of the Nation will produce the maximum that is possible under existing conditions.

The second observation I have to make is that the black market exists only because of the inability of the consumer to obtain food through legitimate channels, a situation in which he is an unwilling victim.

The third observation is that if the consumer were assured of sufficient nutritive food in sufficient variety at a reasonable price, he would not be greatly concerned in regard to high prices on unnecessary or fancy food commodities.

What is actually happening to the consumer today? He finds that certain articles are rationed. He has no complaint whatever to make in regard to the rationing of scarce articles of food, such as meat, or butter, or cheese, or certain categories of canned goods, but he is very seriously concerned when he finds that the rationing coupons which are his purchasing medium frequently cannot buy for household use the foods to which he is entitled. He is faced with shortages and prices which, in spite of hundreds of regulations, seem to have gotten out of hand entirely. He is also faced with a psychology among all of his neighbors which is the very antithesis of a proper psychology with respect to sacrifice and the winning of the war—a psychology resembling closely that of the prohibition era. Everywhere the talk is of food, and everywhere neighbor is telling neighbor how, by this means or that, he or she has been able to obtain some food item which has disappeared from the regular markets. This attitude of mind is not due to plain cussedness on the part of the American people. It is due to confusion, distrust, and complete bewilderment.

Let me be specific. The story of potatoes has been told so often and experienced by so many of you that it need not be gone into at length here. However, there are certain aspects of the potato problem that require repetition. A few days ago the gentleman from Connecticut, CONGRESSMAN MILLER, a member of our committee, introduced into the RECORD a statement with respect to the O. P. A. price regulation on Idaho potatoes sold in the New York market, which indicated quite clearly that, if there were potatoes available, they would cost the consumer 35 percent more than they need cost him without the O. P. A. regulations, provided they had been handled through the regular channels of distribution and with the cooperation of the distributing trades. The margins which the O. P. A. was allowing in the handling of these potatoes to two sets of wholesalers were an absurdity, as the wholesalers themselves have been the first to point out. In contrast, milk sold in the large centers of population has been priced in such a way that hundreds of middlemen or independent distributors are being destroyed. Similarly, the small packer of meats and the meat jobbers are being squeezed completely out of the American system of economy. The rule of ordinary common sense in pricing seems to have been forgotten completely.

Our committee has received testimony from the President of the National Poultrymen's Association to the effect that 75 to 90 percent of all poultry is today in the black market. Two weeks ago, for the first time in 115 years, not a bird could be purchased in Boston's historic Faneuil Hall market. There have been many days when not a bird was available in Washington to the ordinary householder, yet more than the usual number of birds have been slaughtered and marketed somewhere. Hotels and restaurants have been serving chicken and turkey regularly, because of the excessive demands on them to substitute this form of meat for red meat.

Even had chickens been rationed, the consumer would have had no chance to buy at any price. Lunch meats for the industrial worker are prohibitive from the point of view of coupon value. Red meats, and particularly choice cuts, are prohibitive in point value for small families. Among unrationed commodities, prices have borne little relation to published ceilings, and an army of enforcement officers would have had great difficulty in trying to pull them together. Only recently the Department of Labor announced with some pride that in the areas where the coal miners were living, prices of food were only 5 percent above ceilings—the first frank admission that in figuring living costs, ceilings in most foodstuffs are a most ineffective guide.

Behind the consumer, the last line of distribution is the small grocery store. We have learned, on excellent authority, that 35,000 to 50,000 small grocery stores have gone out of business in the last year. Some of these, of course, represented normal casualties. The greater number, however, representing perhaps 10 percent of all the grocery stores in the country, have thrown up their hands, because multiple regulations have made continuing operation impossible. Back of the retailers stand the wholesalers. As I have indicated, in some lines wholesale margins have been absurdly excessive In others they have not allowed the industry to survive, but most difficult of all the problems of the whole set-up has been the question of operating legitimately at prices approved by the O. P. A., regardless of the spread allowed. The wholesaler has had to buy from the country shipper or from the farmer. The farmer has sold at whatever price he could command, inasmuch as, with the exception of a few commodities, his prices were never ceilinged. The country shipper and the wholesaler, however, were told what prices they could pay, and in many lines those prices could not compete with the prices which were being offered directly to the farmer by black-market operators. Here the machinery of distribution began its complete breakdown—a break-down which has now assumed such serious proportions as to come close to being a major catastrophe not alone from the point of view of its injury to the morale of the American

people, but even more so from the aspect of the uneven and unfair distribution of the foodstuffs available. Probably the most serious aspect of the whole situation is that the break-down has occurred at a time when the Nation has had the largest crops in its history, and can hardly hope that providence will repeat the miraculous weather of the last 3 years.

Anyone who tried to prescribe all the remedies in this situation would be foolish, but it seems to me that there are certain obvious things that can be pointed out at once. In the May issue of the Atlantic Monthly there appears an article by Ambassador Winant, in which he discusses very frankly the British success in the handling of their food problem. Two of his statements are of special significance in relation to our own policies. After commenting on the fact that food rationing, pricing, and distribution is an outstanding success in the British war economy, he makes these important statements:

1. Control of supplies, control of prices, and rationing are placed in the same hands.

2. British administrators have little faith in price ceilings with legal penalties for violations unless at the same time government control is established for supplies and distribution and is administered through the department which controls the prices.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is doing a very splendid job on the committee to which he has been named and the membership of the House is deeply grateful to him for the extra time he is putting in on the work he is doing in order to bring about a better situation in food distribution. I wonder if the committee is giving any consideration to our next year's food supply with thousands, yes, millions of acres of our best land under water? As a result of ceilings beet sugar planting is down 35 percent and vegetable planting is down 40 percent. I am wondering where it is all going to lead. Does not the gentleman fear we are headed for a serious food shortage in this country?

Mr. HERTER. I agree with the gentleman, we are headed for a very serious food shortage from the point of view not only of rationing but production and distribution, all of which need a very complete overhauling.

The British unified control policy to which Ambassador Winant attributes their success in dealing with their food supply, contrasts with the multiheaded and divided controls that have featured the handling of the food supply problem by our own Government. I believe we should adopt the unified control method. That view is shared by all the members of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee. It has found expression in a bill, H. R. 2739, which was introduced in the House on May 18 by the gentleman from Ohio, Representative JENKINS, the chairman of our committee, and which proposes to place entire control of food in a single agency. That bill is now before the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I hope that in the interests of making a constructive beginning in bringing order out of the present chaos, it will be given a hearing at the earliest possible date.

Let me review briefly the principal features of that bill. It provides for a Food Administrator who shall be the Secretary of Agriculture and who shall have control of the entire problem of food production, distribution, pricing, rationing, and governmental purchasing. The need for such centralized and responsible control is only too obvious. Mr. Chester Davis, who carries the title of Food Administrator, has been given control over four Divisions of the Department of Agriculture. However, Mr. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, still has control of the rest of the Department, is still a member of the War Production Board, and is still the food representative on the Combined Food Board. Insofar as rationing and price ceilings are concerned, responsibility is divided three ways. Mr. Prentiss Brown, of the O. P. A., is supposed to ration and fix prices after consultation with Mr. Davis, but apparently neither of them is able to operate without the sanction of the Economic Stabilizer, Mr. Byrnes. Responsibility is shuffled from one to the other, and the results have been satisfactory neither to the producer, the processor, the distributor, nor the consumer. I am also firmly convinced that the result has not been satisfactory to any one of the individuals who has to share responsibility with the others. The fixing of responsibility under one man is absolutely essential as a first step.

The bill specifically provides that once responsibility has been fixed, it cannot be reshuffled by the President. The bill likewise provides for a single purchasing agency in the hands of the Food Administrator, which shall control, either directly or indirectly, all purchases of foodstuffs for account of the various agencies of this Government, for Lend-Lease, and for foreign governments. It likewise places in the hands of the same Administrator control over all exports and imports of food. No one who is familiar with the competition between the Army and Navy in the purchase of foodstuffs and who realizes what a tremendous stabilizing factor a single governmental purchasing agency can become, both with respect to supply and price, can deny for a moment that this centralized authority is absolutely essential.

Next, the bill provides that in the fixing of prices, wherever it is found necessary to fix them, this shall be done after consultation with the industry affected.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I wish to say to the gentleman that since we have introduced the bill the gentleman refers to it has had an almost phenomenal interest all over the Nation, with the result that you cannot get a copy of the bill from the document room. I think we put our finger on the right spot when we decided it was the proper thing to correlate all of these widespread and far-flung activities of government. As they operate now the consumer is the man who suffers the most and the next man the real producer. In the wide scope in which these agencies have operated the result has been that things are practically chaotic, and from the information I have today it indicates the O. P. A. is about to scatter and they will have to repose that activity in someone's hands.

Mr. HERTER. I thank the gentleman.

The principal complaint which is today levied, and properly levied, against the administrative practices of the O. P. A. comes from the fact that many of the individuals who fix prices and draft ceiling orders are completely unfamiliar with the practices or trade customs of the particular industries affected. The bungling on poultry orders, on meat orders, and so forth, of which example after example could be given, are only too clear proof of this fact. Furthermore, section 5 of the bill lays down a general policy with regard to stabilizing of prices, in order to protect the consumer, and at the same time safeguard the existing channels of distribution. Theoretically the latter were supposed to be safeguarded under the terms of the Price Control Act, but in actual administration, as I pointed out before, thousands of retailers, wholesalers, and processors have been forced to the wall. It is worth while at this point to quote the pertinent section of that act, section 2 (h):

The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices, cost practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act.

In view of what has happened in the last 6 months, this particular mandate of Congress seems to have been forgotten altogether.

There is no mention whatever of subsidies in the Jenkins bill. Under the existing powers which have been transferred to the Food Administrator, subsidies may still be granted in accordance with existing law. Subsidies may be necessary because of the severe dislocations in our economy which have already taken place. But if subsidies are undertaken, they should be undertaken in such ways and in such amounts as the Congress itself prescribes, after receiving the benefit of the recommendations of the Administrator. I was shocked to learn in our debate last week that the administration was contemplating the utilizing of lend-lease appropriations for subsidy purposes. I was even more shocked to find that suggestions have been made

that the existing appropriations of lend-lease, the War Department, and the Navy Department might be drawn on to piece out Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds for subsidy purposes, at the very same moment that Mr. Chester Davis was appearing before a congressional committee to ask for an additional billion dollars for subsidies through the Commodity Credit Corporation. Just what form subsidies would have taken from these other Government agencies I do not know, but perhaps they would have taken the form indicated in the recent Department of Agriculture release, which showed that the War Department was paying 10 cents a hundredweight over ceiling prices for potatoes in the State of Maine, and 5 cents per 50-pound sack over ceiling prices in the State of Texas, thereby creating in this scarce commodity a governmental black market. Is it any wonder when the Government itself is allowed to pay higher prices in open-market operations than are the legitimate trades, that hoarding should result and that farmers should feel entirely free to sell to the highest bidder, whoever he may be?

The creation of a single control over food administration, as provided for in the Jenkins bill, does not guarantee a solution of our problem of food supply and distribution, but it certainly represents the first and basic step in our approach to a solution of this problem. The bill would allow of an administrative set-up which could function. The present set-up cannot function, even though it were manned by the greatest experts in the world. The Jenkins bill is a stable base from which unified policies could be directed. It is quite possible that the major pricing policies of the O. P. A. will have to be reconsidered as a whole. It is quite possible, in accordance with the British and Canadian experience, that the Government will have to take complete control of a few essential foodstuffs and carry them from the farm through to the consumer, with or without subsidy, in order to insure even distribution and a noninflationary price to the consumer. No one can be didactic, as no one knows with certainty as to what the supply of foodstuffs in this country will be after the coming crop season. The British experience is not necessarily a criterion for our own administrative policies, because the British begin with the fundamental knowledge that they must count on shortages in all foodstuffs. We hope that our situation will not be as drastic as this. We do know that there will be shortages in meat and dairy products. We do know that we shall probably have some surplus of cereals, but even the latter are being eaten into rapidly and a poor crop season might well wipe out the accumulated stocks on which we had counted as our principal background for the feeding of starving populations in the liberated countries. However, there are some things that we can foretell with accuracy now.

As long as the O. P. A. keeps a ceiling price of $1.05 on corn and a ceiling of between $13 and $14 a hundred on hogs, just so long will all the corn stay on the farms and be fed to the hogs. With a ratio of this kind, corn fed to hogs is worth $1.40, and no form of compulsion can force a farmer to ship it to the dairy herds of the East while it brings that price fed to the hog. The dairy farmer in the East cannot get the requisite feed for his dairy herds. He is told that he must produce milk at a price which, in my State at least, returns him no more than 89 percent of his cost of production. In the face of these disparities, to mention only one glaring example, the consumers of milk, including the hospitals and our children, may soon find themselves faced with acute shortages—shortages which a more intelligent administration and distribution of our food supplies could easily have avoided.

In the brief time at my disposal it is obviously impossible to cover the whole field of rationing and distributing of foodstuffs. I hope soon again, either in person or with the aid of my colleagues of the Food Study Committee, to bring to the attention of the Congress the vital need of our making a start at once in the direction indicated by the Jenkins bill. We as Congressmen cannot administer—we can only point out faults in administration and suggest remedies. We can, however, legislate, and legislate quickly, to create a sound administrative set-up, which is the first requisite at the present time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my own remarks in the RECORD at this point with regard to the Copernicus quadricentennial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

There was no objection.

NIKOLAUS COPERNICUS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this day of May 24, 1943, marks the passing of the great Polish scientist and astronomer Mikolaj Kopernik, known to the world under his latinized cognomen as Nikolaus Copernicus.

This day Mr. Speaker is known as the Copernican Quadricentennial, in which hundreds of colleges and universities throughout the United States and Canada upon the initiative of the Kosciuszko Foundation are taking part. All scientific men and women throughout the world pause today to pay tribute to his memory.

It is unfortunate that at this time the crafty and boastful Germans would blasphemously claim this great Polish scientist who established the heliocentric system and who became the father of modern astronomy.

In spite of any attempt to rob the Polish people of the glory which the world bestowed so gratefully upon the name and person of one of her many great sons and daughters throughout the ages, the world of science does not recognize the spurious claim of the Germans and rejects it as worthless and without foundation.

I should like to quote excerpts of tribute, so eloquent and forceful which I garner from—

[From Elbert Hubbard's Little Journeys to Homes of Scientists]

Nicholas Copernicus was born of Polish parents in the quaint old town of Thorn, February 19, 1473.

The portraits of Copernicus reveal a man of most marked personality—proud, handsome, self-contained, intellectual.

Copernicus at 21 was teaching mathematics at Cracow, and by his extraordinary ability in this direction had attracted the attention of various learned men. Copernicus invented the science of trigonometry. A college professor from Bologna traveling through Cracow met Copernicus, and, greatly impressed with his powers, invited him to return with him to Bologna and there give a course of lectures on mathematics.

Copernicus accepted, and at Bologna met the astronomer, Novarra. In listening to lectures by Novarra, he perceived at once how mathematics could be made valuable in calculating the movements of the stars.

He knew what all other great astronomers had taught, and out of them all he had built a science of astronomy that he knew would stand secure. For 40 years he worked at his book, The Revolution of the Heavenly Bodies. For 27 years, he himself says, not a day or a night had passed without his having added something to it.

He was stricken with fever and died on the day that he received a copy of his printed book. He died May 24, 1543.

And again let me quote:

[From the introduction of Three Copernican Treatises by Copernicus]

Copernicus was competent in canon law; he practiced medicine; he wrote a tract on coinage; he served his cathedral chapter as an administrator and diplomatic representative; he painted his own portrait; he made many of his own astronomical instruments; and he established the heliocentric system on a firm basis.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, May 28, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 1 hour on the Republican Food Study Committee objective.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article from the Chicago Herald-American and containing a prayer by the Most Reverend Samuel A. Stritch, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Chicago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a report by Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, on the recent bond sales.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS FOOD CONFERENCE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, to say the least, it is a matter of record that I was admitted to the United Nations Food Conference last Wednesday evening, and, as I fully expected, very graciously received officially by the Chairman of the Conference, our friend and former colleague for 24 years, the Honorable Marvin Jones.

When I was ushered into Judge Jones' room I was likewise very cordially received by Mr. Michael J. McDermott, of the State Department, who has been duly designated as the chief press relations officer for the conference.

Both of these gentlemen, in addition to extending their cordial greeting to me on behalf of the conference, went out of their way to express to me their personal regret at the unfavorable press comments upon this historic conference and indicated to me their earnest desire that it be clearly known that there was nothing to conceal from the American public in this conference and expressed their concern that perhaps the hostile press, which had developed by reason of the unfortunate, and, in my opinion, very ill-advised limitations imposed upon the press from the highest authorities in Washington, was, to say the least, not only detrimental to United Nations' unity, but was, in fact, bringing aid and comfort to the enemy, more particularly in the person of Herr Goebbels of the Nazis.

Mr. Speaker, very frankly, I was so impressed by the apparently obvious sincerity of the gentleman who received me, that I felt it my unbounded duty not only to the conference and those in responsible charge of the conference, but to the American people to do my utmost to clarify this confusion. In making this statement, may I make it perfectly clear to this House, that I have always been taught from babyhood by my parents to take everyone's statements at their face value until those statements were proven false, and to thereafter discount their statements. I believe in playing fair with everyone at all times. That is why I am making this speech today, because I want to play perfectly fair with the Congress of the United States and especially my colleagues in the House.

As a result of my conference with the chairman and the chief press-relations officer, I returned to Washington and on Thursday afternoon, May 20, when the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was good enough to yield to me, I clearly explained to the House my appreciation of the cordial reception I had received and conveyed to the House my understanding of a very clearly expressed invitation extended to the membership of the Congress by the chairman of the conference.

Let me repeat several of the statements which I made.

First of all, I referred to a resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 18—introduced by myself in the House and by my colleague the junior Senator from Michigan, Hon. HOMER FERGUSON, on April 13, which was "designed to permit the Congress to have full knowledge of all discussions, all transactions, and all decisions which may be arrived at during the course of the sessions * * * of this conference." If I may, I want to verbally underline the several words "all" and for purposes of reference thereto later, let me underline the word "sessions."

I went on to explain in my remarks that our resolution not having been acted upon in the House since April 13, I addressed a letter on April 27 to the chairman of the Rules Committee, requesting immediate action on our resolution and stating that in effect "If everything was aboveboard, that there was no harm in Members of Congress being able to obtain any and all such information by attendance at any and all sessions of the conference," and likewise that the press should be given an opportunity to have reasonably full coverage of this conference.

Not having had even the courtesy of an acknowledgment from the chairman of the Rules Committee up to the convening of the conference on May 18, and in fact not having had any since, I was determined to find out whether I, myself—as a Member of Congress—might be permitted attendance at this conference, and hence my trip to Hot Springs.

As previously noted, I was cordially received and as a result of this cordial reception, and on my return to Washington May 20, I made this statement:

I returned to Washington for the purpose of repeating to my colleagues in the House the warm assurances of Judge Jones that all Members of Congress were welcome at any time to attend any and all sessions of the conference and that nothing whatsoever will be kept from them.

Again I want to verbally underline "any" and "all" sessions of the conference.

In my humble opinion, it is most imperative that the Members of Congress accept this invitation whenever their time permits and sit in on these historic meetings. After all, I have been told that this conference is but the first of a number of such international conferences that it is expected will be held between now and the peace to follow this devastating war. These conferences are looking toward the post-war period and it seems to me that we as Members of Congress are woefully remiss in the discharge of our duties if we fail to profit by our mute attendance at these conferences and get the viewpoints of the international delegates who are thus assembled. It seems to me this is a golden opportunity for the Members of Congress to interview these delegates—statesmen and economists—from all over the world and get their outlook on the post-war world, in order that we may be in a better position to pass upon the various questions that will be presented to us and thus render decisions which in our humble opinion will be for the best interests of our Nation and the post-war world in general. Furthermore, we are more than remiss in our duties if we do not indicate by our presence that we are alive to our responsibility as the people's representatives by being willing to keep ourselves thus informed. Obviously, if we do not attend this conference in some numbers, it seems to me that it is perfectly logical for the administration officials, charged with the responsibility of arranging for future conferences, to feel that Congress is disinterested and, therefore, there is no reason to issue any invitation to Members to attend any future conferences which may be held. In other words, this conference might well be regarded as setting a precedent and it is up to us in the public discharge of our duties to see to it that Congress is actively included—not necessarily as voting delegates—but certainly as observers in any and all of these future conferences.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I tried to be eminently fair in this matter and I have tried to be eminently conscientious in the discharge of my duties as a duly elected Representative in Congress of my constituents and as a Member of the Congress of the United States. I have no intention nor desire, I assure you, of casting any reflections personally upon either our former colleague, Judge Jones, or Mr. McDermott or anyone else who is fulfilling an official capacity at this conference, I care not what their name be, because in addition to being duly appointed servants of the American people they are at one and the same time serving as duly selected and responsible officials of the United Nations Food Conference. Based upon the assurances

which had been given to me and which, as previously noted, I transmitted to this House—and with which the chairman of the conference told me on Saturday morning, after his personal examination of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he found no fault whatsoever—I returned to Hot Springs by train Thursday evening. I was accompanied by my colleague from Ohio, the Honorable FREDERICK C. SMITH, who is intensely interested in this entire subject and who, because of his professional experience, is not only interested but extremely capable of scientifically considering what we are told are among the paramount problems being presented to this conference—namely, the questions of nutrition and malnutrition.

By virtue of proof that my statements on the floor Thursday, May 20, were made in all good faith, let me quote from an article which appeared in the New York Times of Friday, May 21, written by one Russell B. Porter, in which he said:

A blanket invitation was extended today to Members of Congress to come down to this fashionable pleasure and health resort in the Allegheny Mountains, stay overnight in the luxurious Homestead Hotel, and even attend executive sessions of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture.

Judge Marvin Jones, permanent president of the conference, made the invitation public with the comment that it proved there was no secrecy or concealment about the conference. He said that Members of Congress who attended executive meetings and talked with delegates in the hotel lobby, which was barred to the press by armed soldiers except on stated occasions, would not be pledged to secrecy. The hotel manager, he added, had been asked to take care of any congressional visitors, although the building was crowded.

I do not have before me, as I prepare this speech, any copy of the official press release of the aforementioned press statement which I understand Mr. Jones made to the press following my departure from Hot Springs Thursday morning, but I will say that Mr. Porter has quoted substantially the statement which has been repeated to me over and over again by other members of the press in attendance. I will go further, Mr. Speaker, and say to you that the president of the conference did not deny to either Dr. SMITH or myself that he had issued, or intended to issue, any such statement. On Friday, he excused the statement by saying that perhaps he had gone "too far" in extending his invitation.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, Dr. SMITH and myself were, to say the least, very much taken aback when we arrived in Hot Springs on Friday morning; where we were again cordially received by the president of the conference and were again assured that we could attend any and all sessions of the conference—and again I want to verbally underline "any and all sessions of the conference." We were, however, in a matter-of-fact manner, casually informed "that the Friday sessions were all executive committee sessions and, of course, we were not permitted to attend them." From later inquiry of the executive secretary of the conference, we learned that indeed all business of the conference would hereafter be transacted in executive committee sessions. Indeed, this very interesting fact was later substantiated by the president when he told Dr. SMITH and me personally on Saturday that the only two sessions of the conference that had so far been scheduled were plenary sessions to which we were cordially invited and which were indeed the opening and closing sessions. Now again I want to underline the word "sessions."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly frank to confess that I am a "babe in the woods" when it comes to splitting hairs in politics and statesmanship, but I am firmly convinced that I am not entirely a "babe in the woods" when it comes to a matter of ethics, honesty, and sincerity.

On Friday night Dr. SMITH and I sought a clarification of this previously cordial—and I quote the word "cordial"—invitation to Members of Congress to attend any and all sessions and to repeat the words of Russell Porter:

The permanent president of the conference made the invitation public with the comment that it proved there was no secrecy or concealment about the conference.

Now, gentlemen and ladies of the House, I regret exceedingly that I feel it necessary to take the floor today and inform you that I was apparently intentionally or unintentionally misinformed last Thursday. It has been my understanding from reading the press since my return that several delegations of Members will be going to Hot Springs in the near future, and I think that is fine. I want to say to them that you will see a beautiful resort hotel, possibly the finest in the land; you will be well fed at a dinner, in the presence of food rationing in America, and served such foods as half grapefruit, maraschino; fresh sea-food cocktail russe; cream of tomatoes; consomme paysanne; baked fillet of sole, bonne femme; broiled breast of guinea hen, maitre d'hotel; braised prime beef Canadienne; roast baby lamb, currant jelly; cold fresh lobster remoulade; puree of broccoli; wild rice in butter; stewed tomatoes; steamed new potatoes; heart of lettuce; pear pie; homestead ring, chocolate sauce; fresh strawberries; peach ice cream; Camembert cheese; coffee.

Or perhaps if you are hungry at lunch you can feast on this menu: Chilled tomato juice; grape juice cocktail; potage cressonniere; consomme vermicelli; broiled sea trout, hoteliere; half chicken saute, home style; fresh spareribs with sausage and sauerkraut; roast milk-fed veal with chutney; cold Philadelphia capon salad; fresh string beans; macaroni au gratin; buttered carrots; whipped potatoes; chef's salad; chocolate chiffon pie; hot diplomatic pudding; fresh cherries; marshmallow sundae; cottage cheese; coffee, tea, or milk—all this for $5 a day, with Uncle Sam paying the difference between that and the usual rate of $14, which I noted posted on the door of my room.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. Did I understand the gentleman from Michigan to say they had potatoes at the conference?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. They did, nice new potatoes.

Mr. BUSBEY. That is something we have not had in Washington for some time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Do I understand that my good friend ate all those things?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Not all of them.

Mr. McCORMACK. But you partook of them?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I certainly did; I just made the statement that I did whatever I considered necessary in the discharge of my duties. After all, one does have to eat—be he delegate or even a lowly Member of Congress.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Can the gentleman advise the House as to the number of delegates enrolled and what nations were represented at the conference?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. There were 43 nations who have accepted the invitation to attend the conference. There were 44 nations all told including the United States. There were about 220 delegates and about the same number of advisers or assistants with them; about 500 altogether.

Mr. DONDERO. Did you obtain any information as to the real reason or purpose of the conference that you might be in position to divulge to the House?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. There is a published agenda, but I am sure the published agenda did not cover everything that was under discussion, and which I will bring out a little later on.

But for your committee it remains that after you have had a wonderful day at Hot Springs you will have had a glorious show put on for you, staged by the State Department; you will come away with a full "tummy" and a fully satisfied feeling that everything is hotsy-totsy; but let us not kid ourselves.

We Members of Congress some day in the not too distant future are going to be called upon for heretofore unheard of appropriations to make good on the commitments or the veiled promises to which we have committed ourselves in this conference and in the dozens to follow. The whole world looks to America as the Promised Land, and you Members of Congress will be called upon to vote for the appropriations to substantiate and make effective those promises, and I personally am not going to face my constituents and pass my approval on those promises unless I know how they were arrived at; and I have sought for and

been denied the access to what we are told are the free discussions from which those promises will be forthcoming.

Being a "babe in the woods" in politics and statesmanship, I have suddenly awakened to the fact that there is decidedly a distinct difference between "any and all sessions" of a conference and "any and all sessions of the committees," which go to make up that conference.

How long are we going to continue this obvious attempt to kid the American people? How long are the American people going to stand for this sham and delusion?

Furthermore, may I say to you this: That I have personally talked with the members of several delegations of our fighting allies in this present conflict, who not only have been most cordial in their reception of us and desirous of exchanging their views but who have at the same time expressed their personal astonishment at the fact that we as Members of Congress, who will be asked to pass upon the appropriations necessary to put into effect any programs which may either be arrived at or have their inception at this historic conference, are not permitted to have free and open access to all the deliberations which bring these decisions or these recommendations to a head. Mr. Speaker, let us not kid ourselves, nor kid our constituents—the American people. It is openly said in Hot Springs that this is but the first of many, many such international conferences that will be held on various post-war and, indeed, during-the-war problems. When this House passed the lend-lease appropriation the other day, it became obvious that we are being called upon—and, if necessary for victory, we are willing—to expend appropriations which exceed the total of those of our Allied Nations. I am not raising that issue here excepting to say this, to remind this House and you, Mr. Speaker, that we as Members of this House have a very grave responsibility to our constituents. We should seek to know any and every reason behind the demand for these appropriations; and if my observation is correct, and I have sought to approach the matter with a strictly open mind and with all fairness and honesty, then I say to you that a Member of Congress, attending the Hot Springs conference today is nothing more than a glorified news reporter whose only distinction, as a duly elected representative of the people of the United States, is the privilege of eating and sleeping in the famous Homestead Hotel, if he is lucky enough to find a room, and to interview the delegates when they are at leisure in any part of the hotel, and even to have the privilege of being invited to their rooms or inviting them to his room. There is no other distinction whatsoever and yet it is we who have the responsibility of approving the appropriations which will make this post-war world Utopia possible—if possible.

I feel a very grave concern over what decisions or what recommendations may be arrived at in this conference. I was told by newspapermen that last Wednesday night when Mr. Paul Appleby, Under Secretary of Agriculture, held a press conference he stated that our present food rationing is not a temporary matter; that our present difficulties with food rationing are not a matter simply confined to the duration of the war but rather that in assuming our responsibility in the post-war world and in contributing to the feeding of other nations, the American people might just as well make up their mind that they are in for the rationing of food and other essentials of life for many years to come in the post-war world. I am not so sure that the American people are going to take that with any too much grace, and one thing is certain, in my opinion, the American people are going to expect their representatives in Congress to have something to say about arriving at any such decision or in making the appropriations necessary to pay for this food which apparently it is proposed to give to other nations.

I am not so sure either that the American people approve of the holding of such an international conference, to the delegates of which is denied free access to the daily press of America when such papers might be critical of the administration or of the conduct of the conference itself; and this was done at least temporarily and was still being done to some extent even Saturday. For instance, one newspaperman told me that en route to the conference he happened to meet a newspaper distributor from that area in whose car were stacked up in considerable quantities the editions of several leading papers of this country, such as the Washington Times-Herald, New York Journal-American, the Chicago Tribune, and others, which had been taken off the newsstand in the Homestead Hotel. We questioned the chairman about this matter and he said no papers were barred from the press stand; and on Saturday that was perfectly true—these papers did make their reappearance because I happened to be at the stand when the stacks of morning papers were unwrapped and placed on sale. It was inescapable, however, to notice that in the case of several of these papers—as, for instance, our Washington Times-Herald—the edition placed on sale was limited to less than a dozen copies, whereas its contemporary Washington morning paper was stacked up in considerably greater volume, and this was true of various other competitive papers from different sections of the country.

Indicative of some of the broad aspects of the subjects under consideration in Hot Springs are a few statements taken from the official press release of the British delegation this morning. They effect the formulation of an international production program and the maintenance of some kind of machinery for the coordinated purchase, allocation, and transportation of such commodities. Then after discussing the various differences in the dietary habits of the various nations occasioned by difference in climate, soil conditions, and so forth, and their normal habits of life, we find this statement which could well be applied to our own country:

> In highly industrialized countries, on the other hand, where the consumer buys practically everything he eats, much can be done by subsidizing the production and consumption of protective foods like milk, by the provision of hot communal meals for school children and factory workers, and by price adjustments which encourage the consumer to buy nutritionally desirable foods. Further, it is possible to improve diets considerably by applying minimum standards of quality and nutritive value to staple foods, as for instance, by adding vitamins to margarine. * * * Hence, education and persuasion are essential components of any better food program.

Later on in referring to proposals of dealing with the variations in yield, we find this statement:

> A method of getting over this difficulty which we believe would be most effective in many cases is the creation of an internationally held balancing or buffer stock which could be increased when production for the time being outruns demand, and drawn upon when it falls short. * * * It should be possible to achieve this aim through variations in the prices at which the authority controlling the buffer stock is a buyer and a seller.

It looks to me like they might be effecting some kind of a superworld state and I wonder just how far we may be going in committing our Government to such programs because later we read this:

> We believe the authorities responsible for the regulation of the various commodities should keep in close contact and should be subject to the policy direction of a representative international coordinating body.

Then later, again referring to some international organization, we find:

> We believe that the most appropriate mechanism for dealing with such cases would be an international body with funds to purchase the commodities in question and give them to populations in need.

Then, lastly we find that it is the British view that this conference must take on a very broad scope because we find:

> Food and agricultural policy are therefore closely interrelated with international economic policy—that is with monetary arrangements, with commercial policy and with the future of international investment. All these things are parts of a single whole and we cannot tackle one of them satisfactrily without paying some attention to the rest. We believe that the study of food and agricultural problems at this conference must include reference to these wider economic problems and that if the conference reaches sound conclusions on the specific questions raised in its agenda, it will have simplified, and provided a valuable introduction to, the consideration of those economic problems to which the United Nations will have to devote their urgent attention in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is most imperative that whether or not some action is taken by the Rules Committee or passage is gained on our resolution—House Con-

current Resolution 18—nevertheless it is the duty of Members of Congress to pay very careful attention to what is going on down there at Hot Springs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think this matter can well be looked into carefully by the Congress. Therefore, the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. SMITH, and I had intended introducing a resolution today authorizing the creation of a special committee for that purpose. However, in reading over House Resolution 102, setting up the committee known as the Smith committee, I am frankly convinced that this existing committee has full authority to look into this entire matter and, therefore, I am hereby filing a complaint with said committee that by their actions, rules, regulations, procedure, orders, or directives those American officials, charged with the conduct of this conference, are acting beyond the scope of the power or authority granted to such department or independent agency by the Congress or by Executive order in that they are invading the constitutional rights, privileges, or immunities of citizens of the United States, by denying freedom of the press.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman would not like to have read into his remarks at this time the official statement of the American delegation, which I have obtained and which has been made public but not carried fully in the press reports that I have seen, and I quote:

> The conference should create a continuing commission (and provide for the designation of its membership by the member government) charged with the duty of carrying on functions and securing action in support of the declarations and recommendations of the conference, and particularly with reporting on the coordination and expansion of existing forms of international organization in the field of food and agriculture and the possibilities of new types of international collaboration. The conference should also recommend to the member governments that they take appropriate national action to carry out the recommendations and declarations of the conference.

That is the end of the quotation. So, it is quite clear that the American delegation has in mind long and continuing international action which will require action by our Government, and therefore the official statement on the part of the American delegation bears out the gentleman's contention that commitments are being made which will require action ultimately by our Government.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. May I say that in my own personal opinion, without a question of doubt, some members of the American delegation are whole-heartedly in favor of, and I believe it is true, would be more than glad to advocate a super-world state.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. May I announce very briefly, and it is in connection with food, that tomorrow I hope that each of my colleagues will go to the House restaurant downstairs and have some very choice and very good Florida-grown new Irish potatoes.

They are not black market potatoes either. They were given to me by Mr. Earl Brown, of De Land, and by Mr. Z. D. Holland, of Bunnell, Fla., and they come from the famous Hastings potato section of Florida. They are free.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I assure the gentleman I will be very glad to accept that invitation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FOOD CONFERENCE NOT A PART OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the address delivered by the gentleman from Michigan. I shall not criticize the gentleman from Michigan, neither shall I at this time or ever criticize any Representative of the Congress, because I feel that each Representative has an individual responsibility to his own constituents and is answerable to them and not to me or to anyone else.

This question of the Food Conference is a matter of great concern. The question the gentleman brings up is especially a great one at this time, because he says it is intended as a precedent which he expects to establish for future conferences and future deliberations.

The gentleman stated that he wanted Members of Congress to be privileged to attend all sessions of the conference, to interview delegates if they wanted to, to get information about questions that come up, that we as Members of Congress should be alive to our responsibilities, that we should attend each conference in such numbers that it would not be presumed that we are disinterested, that we should be observers at this conference and all future conferences, that Judge Marvin Jones is a duly appointed servant of the American people, and that the menu down there is quite enticing and appetizing. I am glad the gentleman from Florida made that announcement because after he told us we would have potatoes down here tomorrow, probably we will not all try to go down to Hot Springs to have potatoes down there.

Mr. GREEN. It will all be free.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman stated we should discharge our duty by attending these conferences.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. No matter how one feels about the conference, the fact is that these various nations have sent distinguished citizens of those countries to this conference, and they are the guests of the United States.

Mr. PATMAN. I concur in the statement made by our distinguished majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK].

JUDGE MARVIN JONES

Who is chairman of this conference? Judge Marvin Jones, one of the finest and best men in all America, one of the most honorable legislators I have ever known. I do not know of any man who has the respect of the Members of Congress with whom he served more than Judge Marvin Jones. The President of the United States could not have made a better selection. He could have looked this country over, the 135,000,000 people, and he could not possibly have found a person to be chairman of that conference who would meet with more universal approval than Judge Marvin Jones. He is an able man, he is a wise man, he is intelligent, he is genial, he is a diplomat; yet he is courageous and he will do absolutely the right thing. If Congress wanted a representative there, Congress should certainly be satisfied with Judge Marvin Jones, because his judgment will meet with the approval of the Members of this Congress, I am sure.

Mr. McCORMACK. Judge Jones served in this House for 16 or 18 years.

Mr. PATMAN. He was the author of more bills to help the submerged groups of the people—poor folks, farmers, and other groups—than any other one man who served during the 15 years I have been in this body.

What will be the result of this conference? Will we have to pass a law? No. You know that probably a treaty may come out of it, but that means, since the House does not pass on a treaty, that it does not come to us at all. A treaty goes only to the Senate. Therefore it looks a little bit unbecoming for a Member of the House to insist on attending some meeting, some conference, when the only thing that can probably grow out of it is a treaty, that he, himself, will have nothing on earth to do with, because the Constitution says the President shall make treaties by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and not the House of Representatives. This brings up the very question that I would like to discuss, and that is about the different branches of our Government. You know that we have a certain duty to perform. It is not our duty to try to run the Executive's business. We should stay on our own side of the fence. We should read the Constitution now and then, which says that the legislative branch of our Government shall make the laws, and that the Executive shall enforce them. Do you find anything there which says that it is our duty to attend conferences called by the President? Where is that our duty? Let me show you where our duty is. Suppose we were to go to Hot Springs to attend this conference under the laws passed by Congress. We could not even collect pay for each day that we were away. We would be violating our own laws, because it is not our duty to go down there. It is our duty to be here, and to make laws. It is our specific duty

to raise money to pay the cost of this war and prevent inflation, and such a bill can originate only here in the House of Representatives, and then to insist that the House should move away and go to a conference, called by the Chief Executive, according to my view, would be outside of my responsibilities and duties, and I would feel that I was going outside of my duties if I attempted to do so.

Why are these meetings executive? We know that certain meetings must be secret. Suppose the meeting is wide open and the newspapers began to report what one delegate said, which we may not understand. We don't know the manners and the customs of all of these different peoples and we might not understand their language, and possibly make improper interpretations upon it, and the first thing we would know, they would leave there and break up this conference, and they would not want to come back to another conference. It is likely to grow into such a disturbance that it might cause the losing of this war. This thing is serious. Do you want to insult people who come here from other countries? Do you want to encourage fighting among our allies? If we have any right to attend this conference, we might want to go into the military conference of the United Nations. If we claim it is our duty to attend that food conference, because it is international, why can we not consistently insist that it is our duty to attend this United Nations conference that is determining the strategy of the war?

Mr. CURTIS rose.

Mr. PATMAN. I cannot yield now. So, if you are going to set a precedent here, do not stop here, but why not go on down there to Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt and the representatives of all of the other governments, and just as consistently and just as logically insist upon attendance there.

Judge Jones is not the servant of the American people, representing them as chairman of that conference. He is representing an arm of our Government, the executive branch, in trying to get some agreement with 44 nations of the world. We must have a better feeling between the legislative and the executive branches of our Government. If we try to crash these gates and intrude as Members of Congress into private conferences, is that the way to create a fine relationship and a cordial comity between the two branches of our Government? Certainly not. Suppose we did not get along with the Senate. We would never have any laws passed. We would be fighting among ourselves, and the people would get disgusted with us. Suppose we got into a fight with the Executive, to a point where the relationships are such that they are unbearable. The people would lose respect for us and would lose respect also for the executive branch of the Government. Therefore, it is our duty, instead of trying to stir up trouble with the Executive, to have fine relationship existing between the two departments of government, so that the Executive can perform his duty, and we can perform our duty, and gentlemen should not overlook this particular part of our Constitution which says that the President shall faithfully execute all the laws. He takes an oath to do that. You do not; I do not. That is his duty. Let us permit him to perform his duty, and let us stay on our side of the fence and perform our duty.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Suppose we got into a fight among ourselves. Say that the members of the Appropriations Committee insisted on going into an executive session of the Ways and Means Committee. How long does the gentleman think that that would be tolerated?

Mr. PATMAN. Not long. The gentleman is right. May I say that this request comes with rather poor grace, without criticizing the gentleman, because it is his responsibility and he looks at it in a different way, and I am not criticizing his motives, but if he were to start breaking into secret meetings, why not start in Congress? Every meeting of the Committee on Appropriations is secret. There is where we spend billions and tens of billions of money of the taxpayers, and just let him try to get into one of the secret meetings of the Committee on Appropriations. He would not have to go to Hot Springs to be turned down or turned out. He can be refused admittance on Capitol Hill. Take, for instance, the Committee on Ways and Means. They have executive sessions, and I venture to say that the committees on which the distinguished gentleman from Michigan himself serves have secret meetings, and that other committees of Congress have.

It is not unusual to have certain things secret, and of all the things on earth that should be secret and carefully guarded now, it is international conferences, involving our allies. If it is not carefully guarded, it could mean the losing of this war.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield briefly.

Mr. CURTIS. Why is it that you on the majority take the attitude that you cannot trust the American people by giving them the facts and letting them choose the course that is wisest and best to win this war?

Mr. PATMAN. Now I do not yield further. I only have a few minutes left and I do not have time to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I would be glad to have you answer my question.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPARKMAN). Is there objection?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. PATMAN. You can ask.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is it the purpose of the gentleman's request so that he can yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; that is it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I wanted to comment on this matter of executive sessions of the Congress, in cooperation with the Executive at the other end of the Avenue. Of course, it is necessary to have executive sessions in Congress and executive sessions of international conferences, but we have here executive sessions of the committees, with the official of the Executive sitting in the conference. I have had the experience of having a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations sit down with United States naval officials when I could not get in, but they could.

Mr. PATMAN. That is the difference. The difference was, they were invited to the meeting. If you are invited to a food conference, I think you should go, but if you are not, I do not think you should attempt to go. There is a big difference.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The first conference, the refugee conference, had Members of Congress designated as delegates. Does not the gentleman feel there ought to be some way in which Members of Congress—not ex-members, but present Members of Congress, could be brought into the picture so that the Congress can be kept familiar with the deliberations?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, if they serve a good purpose, but in this case would a good purpose be served?

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. This idea of waving the flag when criticism is made, of course, is a fallacious statement. It is the objection to unfair, unreasonable, and unwarranted criticism. Furthermore, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is calling attention to the fact that a Congressman, because he is elected by his people, is not above the law, and is not supreme in himself, and cannot go floating around the country butting in every place he feels his curiosity permits him to butt in.

Mr. PATMAN. Why, a Member of Congress is not even an officer of this Government. They represent the people. They are not officers of the Government. What right have we to say that we are entitled to intrude at every place where an executive has a meeting? Certainly we are not. If you are going to assume that attitude, why do you not insist on going to the secret conferences held in the Department of Agriculture? They hold secret conferences there every day. Why do you not go to the secret conferences in the O. P. A. and the War Production Board? Why do you not insist on going to the Cabinet meetings? They have secret conferences down there involving the entire world, involving the rights and liberties of 135,000,000 people.

If you are right in saying we are entitled to go to the food conference, this same logic dictates that we have the right to go to the Cabinet meetings. So, if this is just a precedent, I presume the next step will be to go down there and sit by the side of Winston Churchill to see what the strategy of the war is, and go to the next Cabinet meeting and see what they are discussing there.

You cannot make an argument in favor of one without making an argument in favor of another. The point is that our duties are legislative. Our duties are here. Any Member of Congress has plenty to do right here. He does not have to go to any other place. His duties and obligations are here. He is paid his salary to be here and not there. His salary cannot legally be paid if he is there. Is that not the test? What better test do you need than that? Therefore no Member of Congress has the right to insist that he should be allowed to attend this conference, whether it is open or whether it is an executive meeting, because it is the executive branch of the Government and not the legislative branch of our Government. If something should come out of this conference that would require the passage of a law upon which this House would pass judgment, then we would find out all the facts about it. But that is quite different from allowing 435 Members of the House to run down to this hotel and button hole every diplomat and representative of the nations in this food conference and get into conversation with him and find out what he wants and what he is expecting to get.

We would certainly have a fine fix; we cannot have that. I believe my official duty is here and I am not going to try to crash any gates of the executive branch of our Government. Let me say now as one humble Member of this House that it is my belief that anyone who goes out to go into the executive meetings is doing so upon his own individual responsibility, not as an officer of the Government, because a Member of Congress is not an officer of the Government; he is doing it as a private citizen only and he is not representing the House of Representatives, because the House of Representatives has not in the past and will not now appoint introducers to try to seek entree or entrance into meetings held by the Executive about food or about anything else. That is not our duty. Our duty is here.

CONGRESS BLAMED FOR SHUFFLING RESPONSIBILITY

Something was said about O. P. A. awhile ago that I wanted briefly to mention. The gentleman made a very interesting statement about the shuffling of responsibility between the O. P. A. and Agriculture. I am glad he mentioned that. He said it should be under one centralized authority. I think he is right, but do you know who is to blame for that? It is Congress. Congress did that, made a grievous mistake when we did it. Why blame O. P. A.? We said in that price-control law that passed here, that O. P. A. could not fix the price of agricultural commodities, including livestock—that phrase "including livestock" was inserted—without the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture; and we have seen dozens and dozens of little packers go out of business because there was a dispute between O. P. A. and the Department of Agriculture on the price squeeze. One wanted to fix the price of live animals; the other wanted rationing. They have had a dispute for months, and months, and months. That is the cause of this trouble. Why were they shuffling it from one to the other? Because Congress said they had to. So if you want to correct that, start right here, introduce a bill. You do not have to break into some conference down there, you can start right here in your own committee and then, if you are successful, you will get that centralized authority which I will be for. We made a mistake and we should correct it. Congress is to blame.

O. P. A. NECESSARY

Sometimes we have to take something bad to keep from taking something worse. O. P. A. is necessary; do not get it into your minds that O. P. A. should be abolished. I venture to say that there would be 435 Members of the House who would vote against abolishing O. P. A.; by that I mean abolishing price control. If we did not have price control our money would not be worth 15 cents on the dollar in a few months. We must have price control for we know there are several dollars available in the pockets of the people to purchase every dollar of merchandise available; every informed person knows that. Every informed person knows that O. P. A., price fixing, and rent control are absolutely necessary, and without them our domestic front would be absolutely destroyed; it would be equal to losing a war here at home. So now I join you, not just criticising them about the mistakes they make—and they make a lot of them, but let us not go to the point to where we say that we ought to destroy price and rent control in this country, for if we did we would be in favor of destroying our country. If we changed the organization down there that would not mean mistakes would not be made; certainly they would be made. As long as we have human beings administering laws there will be mistakes made, but those mistakes should be corrected quickly when they are discovered. That is one thing for which I blame some of these agencies: Not quickly correcting their mistakes. But the main reason I think is failure to delegate power to the regional State and district offices. They keep too much power here in Washington.

I can tell you a lot of things wrong with O. P. A., W. P. B., Agriculture, and a number of others, but they are minor when compared to the great objective of preventing inflation, preventing the destruction of our money; that is the main objective aside from winning the war, and they have been rather successful in price fixing—not 100 percent, no—and in rent control. Inequalities? Yes. Injustices? Lots of them. Mistakes? Many of them, but remember this: There are 8,000,000 different commodities in this country including grades, classes, styles, fashions, and designs—over 8,000,000. You cannot deal with any substantial number, evaluate millions of different commodities, without making a large number of mistakes.

HAS MINORITY LEADER APPOINTED A GATE-CRASHING COMMITTEE?

May I say in conclusion that the Republican leader, our distinguished, able, and sincere friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has appointed a committee, I am told, a food conference committee that is holding hearings over the country to hear these complaints. I hope that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader, has not appointed these gentlemen to go down to this food conference. Since he appointed this other committee I think that the gentleman from Massachusetts ought to say that these gentlemen do not represent the minority in trying to force entrance to the food conference. That is something on which he should make a public statement and say that he has not appointed them for that purpose. I believe that is justified because he has appointed other committees to go to different places, and since he has done that I think he ought to deny that he is trying to force the entrance of these gentlemen into that private food conference.

So let us send word back down to Judge Marvin Jones, in whom we have the utmost confidence, full and complete, that if any Member of Congress comes down there, he comes on his own individual responsibility as a citizen only, that he has not been appointed by the House of Representatives to represent us in any way, shape, form, or fashion.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. A moment ago the gentleman referred to this conference down at Hot Springs as a private food conference.

Mr. PATMAN. I made a mistake. It should not have been that way. I am glad the gentleman calls that to my attention. That was just a slip of the tongue if I said private food conference.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to ask one other question. Are agricultural statistics generally withheld in this country because of their military value?

Mr. PATMAN. No; neither are the hearings of the committees of Congress, like the Appropriations Committee. They are printed at the right time later on. You will find out everything that was said down at Hot Springs later on, but now is not the time.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not also true that this conference is dealing with post-war production, which goes into the question as to what we can and what we cannot produce in this country, and it is not confined to the military aspects of food to win the war?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, suppose it is. It is an executive function. We can deal with post-war problems here if we want

to. We do not have to go down to Hot Springs. Then we would be within our rights.

Let us send word back to Judge Marvin Jones that the Congress of the United States is for him in whatever action he takes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may now utilize the special order that was given to me for earlier in the day. I did not have opportunity then to utilize it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I shall try to briefly bring before you this afternoon for your consideration the imperativeness of increase in milk producers' ceiling price in Florida. Florida dairymen have practically ever since the application of ceiling price by O. P. A. endeavored to obtain O. P. A.'s favorable consideration for milk producers' ceiling price increase.

The Florida congressional delegation and the Honorable Paul H. Ficht, administrator, Florida Milk Commission, have cooperated every way possible with the Florida producers in an endeavor to obtain this necessary relief. We have held meetings with the O. P. A. price-fixing officials and they have given us respectful, attentive, and extensive audiences. We have written to them, wired them, talked with them, telephoned them and in every way humanly possible tried to impress upon them the imperativeness of the situation. These O. P. A. officials from some cause probably best known to themselves have thus far declined to give relief.

In the milk and dairy industry in Florida wages during the past 2 or 3 years have increased from 100 to 150 percent; feed has advanced 30 to 75 percent; every article which the dairyman buys and uses in his business, industrially manufactured or otherwise, has increased in price from 10 to 50 percent. Owing to the rapid shift in dairy labor in many instances experienced and skilled workmen have necessarily been replaced by those with less skill, less experience, and less efficiency.

Prior to the present war Florida dairymen were making considerable progress toward their goal eventually of supplying Florida's people with their dairy-product requirements. The percentage of local products for local consumption was increasing. We, however, at all times in Florida have imported substantial quantities of our dairy-product requirements. Milk and cream in carload lots have for many years been shipped to Florida from other States to supplement our local but ever-increasing supplies. Our dairymen have performed a Herculean task in building up this industry, improving their herds, maintaining sanitary requirements, and efficient and economic service to the public.

Prior to the war and the incidental tremendous increase in production cost our dairymen were breaking even and some of them showing reasonable profits. Since O. P. A.'s ceiling-price application on their products, the price paid to them has been frozen while their production cost has ever increased. The result is that our local dairies are being liquidated; their valuable high milk- and butter-producing herds are being slaughtered for beef. The net result is that if we do not get some substantial relief from O. P. A.'s ceiling price for the producers, the entire dairy industry of my State threatens to be confiscated.

It does seem that men presumably of reasonable judgment and of at least average information in O. P. A. could see the dastardliness of their refusal to cooperate in this matter and offer relief. The milk demand in Florida is greater, of course, than ever. In my own town of Starke, Fla., local dairymen have been forced to discontinue local home delivery of milk and the local housewife is forced—even if she is able to obtain fresh milk at all—to go to her local grocery store and buy it across the counter for a very high price, and in this connection, my colleagues, it is strange to note that deliveries of nonessential products, nonfood products, and non-war-effort products go on unabated and, I believe, without ceiling prices in their deliveries.

I read yesterday a most interesting story in the Bradford County Telegraph, a newspaper published at Starke, Fla., my home town, as follows:

GROCERYMEN DEPLORE MILK SHORTAGE

The near critical shortage of canned milk for babies in Starke was the subject of much discussion at a meeting of grocerymen and restaurantmen held in the courthouse Monday morning and attended by Donald W. Powell, representative of the Food Distribution Administration, 204 Dyal-Upchurch Building, Jacksonville. The Food Distribution Administration is an agency of the United States Department of Agriculture, and its object is to try to avert critical food shortages in any part of the country.

The meeting was called and presided over by W. M. Edwards, chairman of the Bradford County Defense Council.

Mr. Powell urged local merchants to tell him their troubles so that he could relay them to Washington. The chief cause for complaint seemed to be the shortages of canned milk of the two varieties most popular with mothers to give their young babies—Carnation and Pet.

All grocerymen stated that they were practically out of these two brands and were having difficulty getting replacements. "Mothers actually have to stand in line waiting for canned milk and then we often have to disappoint them," one groceryman said. "It makes them awfully mad when they can't get milk for their babies."

Another groceryman stated that matters would grow steadily worse in Starke from present indications. "I counted 116 pregnant women in my store last Saturday," he said.

Mr. Powell seemed greatly concerned over the local shortage of canned milk and promised to do what he could to have the situation relieved.

The local meat situation was described by grocerymen as serious, although not critical. "This is a salt-pork town, and we can't get it any more," one groceryman complained.

Mr. Powell emphasized the danger of purchasing meat in the black market and urged grocerymen to unite and refuse to pay more than the ceiling price for what they buy. "If all grocerymen would do that, the black market would soon be broken," he said.

He also urged consumers to report retailers who charge more than the ceiling price for meats and other food items.

Now my colleagues this gives you a portion of the drastic picture which exists in many places in Florida and I judge, in other communities in other parts of the country. I have received innumerable communications from our Florida dairymen on this and will not take your time to present many of these; however, you should know from my constituents direct their plight and I will read you two or three of their communications. Here is a copy of a telegram recently sent by Mr. Alfred C. Ulmer, president, Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce, to the Honorable Prentiss Brown, as follows:

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., *May 21, 1943.*

Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator, Office of
Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.:

Jacksonville milk situation desperate. Requires prompt relief on price to save it. Distributors are squeezed into a loss and producers in spite of their advance in January are again finding difficulty in paying increased feed prices and labor costs. Approximately one-fifth of dairy barn capacity not now operating. Other sales of dairy herds impending. Shortage now almost 50 percent of sales which is temporarily relieved by Minnesota milk at prohibitive price. Some immediate encouragement necessary to save industry. We recommend that your organization take prompt action in granting such increases as will save this industry from further break-down and assure our people of an adequate supply of milk.

ALFRED C. ULMER, *President,*
Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce.

Here is a telegram today received by me from the Winter Haven Cooperative Dairies, Winter Haven, Fla. It indicates their desperate plight:

WINTER HAVEN, FLA., *May 22, 1943.*

Representative LEX GREEN,
Washington, D. C.:

Some months ago we informed you of the dire necessity for an increase in the resale price of our milk. We have as yet received no relief, our prices being frozen on a pre-Pearl Harbor basis. Labor costs are up 100 percent, feed prices 70 percent, dairy equipment and other costs are up proportionately.

The situation now has become so acute that unless we receive a substantial increase at once we will be forced out of business. Appeals to the Office of Price Administration have brought no results. It is too late now to wait for Office of Price Administration surveys. We appeal to you as our Representative to get us relief at once.

WINTER HAVEN COOPERATIVE DAIRIES.
J. W. HANSSEN.
EDGAR MELVIN.
Dr. J. E. CRUMP.
C. O. GERBER.

Here is a communication from the Honorable Horace L. Smith, secretary of the Marion County Chamber of Commerce, Ocala, Fla., including a communication from the Gold Medal Dairy Products of Ocala, Fla.:

MARION COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Ocala, Fla., April 7, 1943.

Hon. R. A. GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Subject: Letter from Gold Medal Dairy Products, Ocala, Fla., to the Office of Price Administration, Washington, March 18, 1943, copy of which is herewith enclosed.

DEAR LEX: Since Mr. Burgdorff petitioned the Office of Price Administration for relief

on March 18, the situation to which he refers has grown steadily worse.

The dairy industry of this community is on the verge of being a thing of the past. Please understand I am not speaking figuratively. One of our largest dairies has already sold its entire herd to another section of the State and two other of our largest and longest established herds will likely be closed out within the next week unless the Office of Price Administration is willing to come to our rescue—this they could do without any encroachment on the policies on which it operates. May we suggest the way by which this could be done would be for the Office of Price Administration to offer a directive to its regional office in Atlanta requesting prices in the States in which it operates to be equalized at once.

If you can be helpful in having this done, you will be helping to save an industry and render a real service to the food production program, which our Government is requesting of its citizens.

Sincerely yours,

HORACE L. SMITH,
Secretary.

GOLD MEDAL DAIRY PRODUCTS,
Ocala, Fla., March 18, 1943.

DAIRY AND POULTRY DIVISION, OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Inasmuch as the Jacksonville, Fla., and some of the other Florida areas have been petitioning for an increase in retail and wholesale prices in order to allow the producers more money, we have refrained from petitioning ourselves. It has been our understanding that the Office of Price Administration would take a favorable action on these above-mentioned areas, thus setting a precedent to be followed throughout the State.

Inasmuch as no relief has been granted, we now find it necessary to state our own particular case and sincerely hope that immediate action to relieve this condition will be given.

November 1, 1941, there was in effect in this area a delivered milk price as follows: Wholesale milk in quart containers, 14 cents; retail milk in quart containers, 17 cents. (Our sales of delivered milk are approximately 32 percent retail and 68 percent wholesale.) To date this price is still the same. At that time we paid our producers a blended price of 56 cents per pound of butterfat. Today we are paying them 72 cents per pound of butterfat. Our local milk supply, because of good herds, runs from 4.2 to 5 percent of fat and averages about 4.7. You can readily see that we have increased our producers' prices approximately 30 percent without any increase to our consumers whatever. It is true that our fluid-milk business has been on the increase and today but a small percentage of our producers milk is used for manufacturing purposes.

In nearby areas the retail price of milk is 19 cents, with wholesale milk 17 cents. Many of these localities have water freight rates on feed which we do not have here. Starting in the county south of here, where prices are 19 cents and 17 cents, citrus pulp is available from canning plants as a feed 5 or 6 months out of the year free for the hauling. Our producers must either buy or produce hay to take the place of citrus pulp. Feeds have gone up in some instances to almost double over what they were in November 1941. Very few have gone up less than 33 percent. The wages of dairy labor, as well as the wages paid our help and plant supplies, have gone up constantly, as you know.

One of our producers sold his entire herd the other day to a buyer in the area immediately south of us operating under this 19-cent and 17-cent price schedule as mentioned above. Two more of our milk producers are on the verge of selling their entire herd to buyers in this higher-price area.

Unless the Office of Price Administration sees fit to set a schedule of prices of 19 cents and 17 cents for retail and wholesale milk in this area permitting us to raise our milk prices to our producers commensurate with their present fat standards to 40 cents per gallon for milk to be bottled, 80 percent of the production of fluid milk in this area will, to say the least, be cut in half. It is understood that surplus milk for manufacturing purposes should be below the above level and would have to be purchased on a competitive basis of shipped-in cream. In other words, whatever prevailing prices are set for the Jacksonville area covering wholesale and retail delivered milk, as well as producers' prices would be demanded by our producers, inasmuch as they consider their production costs at least as high as Jacksonville.

We earnestly solicit your immediate assistance in the above matter in order that we may be able to hold production in this area intact. We again assure you that unless you take immediate action, production in this vicinity will fall fully 50 percent within a matter of weeks.

Very truly yours,

GOLD MEDAL DAIRY PRODUCTS,
WM BURGDORFF.

N. B.—Attached is a schedule of prices in this area on date shown. For your information, we handle about 80 percent of the milk sold in this area.

Here is a most interesting communication just received by me from Dr. J. G. DuPuis, of Miami, Fla. He is a member of the Broward-Dade Counties Milk Producers Association. He is an excellent businessman and is operating his dairy in a business-like manner. His surplus products have been converted into the production of hogs, chickens, eggs, and other marketable produce. He has cultivated a portion of his land to supplement food requirements of his dairy herd and, in fact, has managed his entire business diligently. He is a man of unquestioned integrity, excellent reputation as a businessman, and is regarded as one of the most prominent and successful members of the medical profession in my State:

THE WHITE BELT DAIRY,
Miami, Fla., May 21, 1943.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: I wish to acknowledge receipt of copy of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which you addressed your colleagues on the floor on the Irish potato and milk situation by Office of Price Administration rulings on these two divisions of agriculture and the hardships imposed thereon. Every word you have spoken is commendable and to the point expressing the truth as to the deplorable conditions existing. It is my opinion that unless the dairy industry in this area of Florida is given relief at a very early date that the dairymen here will lose their business and all they have accumulated over the past years due to negligence, indifference, and maybe willful design of the officials operating the Office of Price Administration.

The following is a concrete example of what I am individually confronted with in the operation of my own dairy.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation made me a loan of $160,000 on my dairy farm, including buildings, land, cattle, and all chattels in 1939. Since that time I have only been able to reduce this loan to $139,000. Up to date the interest is paid. In the operation of my business and dairy farm I have been an employer of from 150 to 200 employees routinely. Due to the notorious milk market racketeering conditions in this market prior to Office of Price Administration creation, it was impossible to earn any profit under the price set by the Florida Milk Commission in the production and distribution of milk and dairy products.

In 1940–42 wages began to jump up until they have reached 100 to 150 percent increase with only untrained and indifferent labor today to select from to operate my farm. Feeds have advanced from 30 to 75 percent, and every article which we buy and use in our business industrially manufactured or otherwise has increased in price from 10 to 25 percent.

The Office of Price Administration comes into existence and freezes the prices of our dairy products to the public, promises us relief many months ago after being petitioned by every dairyman in this area and show exhibitors giving proof of the tremendous increase in the cost of production and distribution showing tha we are being discriminated against by the low prices which we are being forced to sell our products. However, no relief has been received.

In addition to all the above-mentioned increases in the cost of production and distribution of our products, the Social Security and Unemployment Compensation excise tax on the processing, packaging and delivery and marketing of our products has been imposed even though the law sets forth that these operations are exempt from this tax. This burdensome tax has forced me to pay out of my operations approximately $40,000 in which I am not permitted to even obtain cost over the past few years.

On May 1, 1943, legal proceedings by the Jacksonville Loan Agency of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the foreclosure of the mortgage which they hold against my dairy, including the land, buildings, cattle and all chattels thereto, was filed in the Federal court of this district. Even though the security covered by this mortgage aggregate from three to four times the amount of said mortgage.

Now, Mr. Green, as my representative at large from the State of Florida, I desire to ask you the following question: Are we fighting for liberty or are we building up a dynasty to destroy individual effort and honesty of purpose of individual small business men of this nation?

I have written this letter and recited my individual case to you that you may know directly what the Federal Government and the many legislated boards are doing to me as an individual. I again wish to congratulate you and wish you success, and anything I can do in supporting you in bringing about relief for the dairymen of this area, including myself, though the Office of Price Administration before the industry is completely destroyed, it will be a pleasure to do so.

Yours very truly,

J. G. DUPUIS, M. D.

The following represents the various farm products produced and marketed by J. G. DuPuis and his immediate family during the year 1942:

Three hundred eighty-nine thousand and forty-four gallons of milk produced and marketed.

Fifty thousand one hundred and twenty-four gallons of ice cream produced and marketed.

Two hundred head of calves and young dairy stock raised on the farm.

Eighty-five thousand five hundred and six pounds of Hampshire hogs bred, raised, and marketed.

Twenty-six thousand chickens raised and marketed.

Fourteen thousand six hundred dozen eggs produced and marketed.

One hundred and fifty to 300 tons of hay produced on the farm and fed to dairy stock.

One hundred acres of sugarcane grown and fed to dairy stock.

Ten to 30 acres of vegetables, tomatoes, squash, peppers, potatoes, strawberries, citrus, and garden truck farmed and marketed.

One hundred and ten acres of hog feed, chufas, and peanuts farmed and fed to growing stock.

One thousand one hundred bushels of corn produced.

Three hundred and twenty-five bushels of sweetpotatoes produced.

Seventy-five gallons of sirup.

Thirty bushels of peanut seed produced.

Twenty-five bushels of chufa seed produced.

In carrying out the operations and activities of J. G. DuPuis, there are 207 regularly employed employes.

In addition to the above production in an effort to assist in the war effort to protect our liberty, I wish to state that I have worked from 10 to 16 hours per day in the practice of my medical profession to relieve suffering and sickness of the people in this community for more than the past 44 years.

With the above production and effort on my part to assist in every way in winning the war, I am at a loss to know whether liberty is to be preserved in my case or if my business will be annihilated completely by the bureaucratic bureaus operating by acts of Congress.

Respectfully,

J. G. DUPUIS, M. D.,
Owner, White Belt Dairy.

Now, my colleagues, are you surprised that our Florida milk producers are going out of business and that they are fighting against insurmountable odds and that the odds in this case is their own Federal Government? Here is one of the many communications which I have received from Mr. Brady S. Johnston, vice president of the Dinsmore Dairy Co., of Dinsmore, Fla.:

DINSMORE DAIRY CO.,
Jacksonville, Fla., May 19, 1943.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEX: Many thanks for your letter of May 13, and also thanks for sending me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have read with intense interest your speech regarding the agricultural situation in Florida.

You have certainly been our friend and we shall never forget it.

Don Anderson, of Office of Price Administration, promised to wire me just as soon as he could get something rolling on the Jacksonville order, and he expressed his appreciation, when I called him the other day, for the additional information I gave him on the phone. He stated it would help him to get the order rolling.

It is beginning to look like some of us will have to make another trip to Washington if we ever expect to get results. The peculiar thing about this whole situation is that they are raising the price of everything else here and elsewhere; even canned milk has practically doubled in price in the last year or so. They have raised the price of milk in most places. They have even gone as high as 19 cents in some places, for instance, Norfolk, Savannah, and maybe some other places that I don't know about, and yet they have been unwilling to go up even one penny in Jacksonville on fresh milk.

The public is perfectly willing to stand even a 2-cent increase. Maybe if you would go over and plead with Don Anderson he might get something started. I believe he wants to get something started if he just knew how. He claims that the President's directive has not yet been clarified, but the War Labor Board has received the power since the directive to adjust inequities, and we certainly have an inequity here with regard to the milk prices.

We are just letting our equipment go down each day because we cannot afford to keep it up, and we are fast reaching that day when we will not be able to continue.

If you possibly can spend a little while with Mr. Anderson, please do so and write me.

Thanks again.

Sincerely,

BRADY S. JOHNSTON,
Vice President.

P. S.—Even the newspapers here have made the second increase in approximately 1 year. Note the attached clippings.

B. S. J.

Mr. Johnston has one of the finest and one of the most selected dairy herds in the world. He is recognized as one of the most prudent, honest, and efficient dairymen of our State.

Here is a telegram just received from Messrs. B. B. McArthur, R. G. Goolsby, and other members of the dairy industry of Dade-Broward Counties area:

MIAMI, FLA., *May 12, 1943.*

Congressman LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Undersigned members dairy industry of Dade-Broward area in meeting today wish to extend our sincere thanks for your efforts in our behalf. Following wire being sent O. P. A. Atlanta today: "We have received no answer to our numerous and repeated letters, pleas, and petitions for a fair price to producers and distributors in Dade and Broward Counties. Our industry in a critical condition. Immediate action imperative; both producers and distributors must have relief now. Milk supply in danger. Reply to B. B. McArthur, president of grade A milk producers, 769 Northwest Eighteenth Terrace." Any further support you can give will be deeply appreciated.

R. G. Goolsby, S. W. Goolsby, Earl Goolsby, W. P. Waldrop, J. C. Pereno, B. B. McArthur, Frank Thomus, Ed Anderson, Henry Perry, E. J. Melton, D. Bostick, R. Dressell, John Dupuis, B. W. Butler, E. G. Graham, R. McCormick, W. G. Rucks, J. W. Christiansen, Frank Holt, G. B. Certain, J. N. McArthur, G. Wachstetter, E. G. Williams, L. H. Brown, J. C. Gentile, Foremans Dairy, D. R. Smith.

Here is one of the several communications which has been received by me from the Honorable James Jennings, of Jacksonville, Fla., secretary and treasurer of the Florida Dairymen's Association. He indicates in figures his excessive cost of production and the impossibility of his continuing in milk production unless relief is granted. He is another gentleman whose integrity cannot be questioned. His communication is as follows:

FLORIDA STATE
DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
May 5, 1943.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
Congressman from Florida,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEX: It is more than helpful to know that we have a friend like you in Washington, and we do appreciate what you have been doing up there for us, but it seems that every effort is going to be useless with the kind of men we have at the head of the Office of Price Administration.

On top of other troubles the feed man has solved the method of going around the Office of Price Administration in this way: In March I got a load of feed from the Checkerboard feed store here in Jacksonville as I have been doing for years. The ingredients I mix as a balanced ration for my dairy herd; but in April the Checkerboard feed store informed me that I could no longer get the ingredients to make my own mix, as they did not have enough of these ingredients only to make a mix of their own of which they would gladly take my order for what I needed.

Now when I bought to make my own mix it cost me $2.29 per 100 pounds. Now I have to buy their mix and it costs me $3.13 per 100 with 4 percent less protein.

From a gallonage way in figuring, it costs me 2½ cents more per gallon to use their mix.

And still Office of Price Administration says we are sitting on top of the world.

Mr. Prentiss M. Brown compares us with 106 large cities in throughout the country; I wonder if Mr. Brown has ever thought of the freight that we pay on our grain down here.

He also says that there are more cows here now than in 1942. Does he know that our President of these United States asked the farmers to produce more milk, as there are over 60 Army camps here? We have made every effort to do our part, but all we get is a letter every now and then saying that you will get relief in the near future.

Sixteen thousand quarts of milk are being shipped weekly to Panama City from Minneapolis; 8,000 quarts to the car in paper bottles, packed in dry ice. The value of milk produced in Florida during 1942 increased by more than $2,000,000; still there has been 1,000,000 gallons of milk imported into the State during the first 3 months.

Regardless of what the Office of Price Administration thinks we are operating on depreciation now.

Sincerely yours,

JIM JENNINGS,
Secretary and Treasurer,
Florida State Dairymen's Association.

Now, my colleagues, I know that you will be interested in having the views of the Honorable Paul H. Ficht, administrator, Florida Milk Commission. Following is a communication just received by me from Mr. Ficht; also copy of letter addressed to him by Mr. N. W. Green; also communication addressed to Mr. J. V. Varnadore, by the dairy division, State of Florida Department of Agriculture; also communication from Mr. J. V. Varnadore, of the Varnadore Dairy, Bartow, Fla., to Mr. Scott; also copy of communication from the dairy division of the Department of Agriculture for the State of Florida to Mr. T. S. Haselton, and communication copy from Mr. Haselton, of the Lake View Dairy Farm, Eustis, Fla., to Mr. John M. Scott, chief dairy supervisor, Gainesville, Fla.:

STATE OF FLORIDA MILK COMMISSION,
Jacksonville, Fla., May 18, 1943.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: Many thanks for your letter of May 15, which followed copy of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, May 7, 1943. It appears by the RECORD that your statements were heartily supported by others who seem to have the same trouble in their respective States. Certainly, I agree with you on everything you said and most particularly do I agree that the President did not

mean his directive order to result in a complete collapse of so vital industry as that of the milk, and if this should be true then I see no reason why the President cannot so instruct his Office of Price Administration Administrator in this regard. In any event it should be taken into consideration that all of the requests made by the Florida milk industry and all of the facts and figures presented by them were so done many months ago and action should have been taken many months ago which certainly could not have been interpreted to be included in any recent Presidential order.

Certainly, Office of Price Administration has not stopped the increase on feed prices since the President's order, as they have continued to advance substantially on a weekly basis and there are indications that these advances are expected to continue for an indefinite period. It does not seem reasonable to believe that the President would mean to definitely curb the milk industry when they are already strained to the breaking point and at the same time permit the costs of dairy feed to continue a skyrocketing course. The dairymen in Florida have almost reached a point where there will be a choice taken between a complete stoppage of milk production or an open revolt in defiance of Office of Price Administration regulations. Either course is, as you know, a very dangerous and unhealthy procedure, but they feel that since the Government will not make a decision as to whether milk shall be produced or not, then they, the dairymen, will be forced to make this decision regardless of the consequences. Most everyone in Florida abhors the attitude of Mr. John L. Lewis, but on the other hand if his requests are legitimate and he has received the same type of consideration as the dairy industry in Florida, then, of course, we here rather appreciate the stand taken by him. The only difference in milk production and almost any other production problem is that if milk production is stopped today it cannot be resumed tomorrow or next week or even next month, but it will take a full year to freshen those cattle dried up, and it will further take some 3 to 4 years to replace those cattle sold for beef purposes.

I just received a letter from Mr. N. W. Green, De Land, Fla., who is one of our very best class of dairymen and who has made an honest effort to keep his herd in production, but seems to be at that turning point which requires the decision which every dairyman in Florida will soon have to make. I have enclosed a copy of this letter for your files.

I am also enclosing copy of letters just received from two other dairymen who seem to be in the same postion as Mr. Green.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

PAUL H. FICHT,
Administrator.

MAY 13, 1943.

Mr. PAUL H. FICHT,
Administrator, State Milk Commission, Jacksonville, Fla.

DEAR SIR: The milk situation in the DeLand area, insofar as I am concerned, is getting worse every day. The purpose of this letter is to ask you to write me and tell me frankly if there is any relief in sight. As it stands today, it is a losing proposition to operate and unless I can get relief sometime in the near future, I will be forced, as much as I dislike to, to disburse my herd and sell them to someone who is in better position to make a go of it than I am. The price of dairy feeds is continually increasing as well as labor, which makes it impossible to operate and break even at today's price of milk.

I do not expect any money out of this, and would not care if I only broke even for the duration, as I am willing to do everything possible to help win this war. However, I don't think that it could be expected of me to operate at a loss. Therefore, will you kindly write me and tell me what the prospects are for an increase in the price of milk and when. It will enable me to make my plans for the future.

So far as I know, this goes for the other dairymen in this vicinity.

Yours very truly,

N. W. GREEN.

THE STATE OF FLORIDA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Gainesville, May 15, 1943.

Mr. J. V. VARNADORE,
Varnadore Dairy, Bartow, Fla.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Scott will be away from the office for about 3 weeks, but as soon as he returns your letter of May 14 will be brought to his attention.

We appreciate receiving the information on the number of cows milking, but we are very sorry to learn that you are having such a difficult time making your receipts take care of your expense of operation. This condition is rather general throughout the State, and the Milk Commission has made a great effort to get some relief for the dairymen. However, the Milk Commission has not been able to raise the price of milk above the price established by the Office of Price Administration in Washington.

We are mailing copy of your letter today to Mr. Paul H. Ficht, administrator, Florida Milk Commission, Jacksonville, with the request that he write you if he can give you any encouraging information.

Yours very truly,

DAIRY DIVISION,
By DOROTHY GRIFFITH,
Secretary to Mr. Scott.

BARTOW, FLA., *May 14, 1943.*

DEAR MR. SCOTT: I am milking 30 cows. All the cows that has milked are 39 head. I have 9 head of heifer calves, 3 to 6 months old, but if we don't get a raise on the milk or adjustment on the fee, I am afraid they won't be any milked after the 1st of June.

Since January feed has gone up 75 cents on the hundred. I don't want to be a quitter, but I cannot pay my feed bill.

Please help us, for I don't want to quit; if there is any way you can help, please do. If there is a chance of getting the milk raised, please give me some answer back.

Yours truly,

J. V. VARNADORE,
Varnadore Dairy, Bartow, Fla.

THE STATE OF FLORIDA,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Gainesville, May 51, 1943.

Mr. T. STIN HASELTON,
Lake View Dairy Farm, Eustis, Fla.

DEAR SIR: We appreciate your prompt reply to our request for the number of cows milking on the 1st of April and at the same time last year. We are getting some interesting information from the dairymen throughout the State.

We are sorry, but Mr. Scott will be away from the office for about 3 weeks so we cannot call your letter of May 13 to his attention until that time. However, we are taking the liberty of sending copy of your letter to Mr. Paul H. Ficht, administrator of the Florida Milk Commission in Jacksonville, and if he has any information to give you, you will hear from him sometime soon. The commission is not permitted to raise the retail price of milk above the ceiling established by the O. P. A., but they have made considerable effort to get some relief for the dairymen. You ask if you are the only producer in trouble; no, it seems that practically every producer in the State is in the same kind of trouble.

Yours very truly,

DAIRY DIVISION,
By DOROTHY GRIFFITH,
Secretary to Mr. Scott.

LAKE VIEW DAIRY FARM,
Lake County, May 13, 1943.

Mr. JOHN M. SCOTT,
Chief Dairy Supervisor, Gainesville, Fla.

DEAR MR. SCOTT: Your request for information received and answered. I have a good herd with better than average production. However, war conditions make production costs so high, and Office of Price Administration regulations keep the retail and, consequently, the producer's price so low that there is little above production costs to take care of taxes, insurance, interest, replacements, or improvements to say nothing about War bonds.

Is there any relief in sight? Is there anything the dairymen can do? Am I the only producer in trouble? When demand for a product is good, it is discouraging to be limited to little more than cost of production.

Your advice would be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

T. STIN HASELTON.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it will be appropriate for the House to have substance of responses received by me from the Honorable Prentiss Brown, O. P. A. Administrator, same dated May 17, 18, and 19, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1943.

The Honorable LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your letter of May 10, in which you refer to correspondence received from Mr. Brady S. Johnston, vice president, Dinsmore Dairy Co., Jacksonville, Fla.

It appears that my recent communication to Mr. Johnston is self-explanatory with regard to the action which will be taken in the Jacksonville market. An order establishing specific maximum prices is in the process of clearance, and it is anticipated that this regulation will be issued shortly.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that the request made by the distributors in Jacksonville for an increase in prices was based on an increase in prices paid to fluid-milk producers. The increase in prices paid to producers was required by the Florida Milk Commission, effective January 11. The forthcoming order, therefore, will in no way affect fluid-milk producers inasmuch as the price paid to farmers has already been increased.

Thank you for bringing this matter to my attention.

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1943.

The Honorable LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your letter of May 7 and supplementary telegram of May 12, relative to the problems confronting milk producers and distributors in Broward and Dade Counties, Fla.

The problem which exists in the Dade-Broward area, as well as in a number of other markets throughout Florida, have been brought to the attention of this office. Our Atlanta regional office has completed a survey of milk prices throughout the State and a price regulation is being prepared which will establish specific prices for fluid milk sold throughout Florida. Due to the complexity of the problems encountered, a number of delays have occurred which have prevented the issuance of this regulation as promptly as previously anticipated. However, I am advised by our Atlanta regional office that the regulation may be expected in the very near future.

I am sure you realize that the determination of correct price relationships among markets is of the utmost importance. The purposes of the forthcoming regulation will be to establish a greater degree of uniformity in the price structure of the entire area and I trust this action will prove the solution to the problem of insuring a fair and equitable distribution of the limited available supplies among competing markets.

A further purpose of the regulation will be to provide a fair and equitable price for producers and distributors. In certain areas, it will be possible to permit substantial relief to milk producers without corresponding increases in retail prices. In accordance with the President's recent directive, this office is not authorized to permit further increases in retail prices which will adversely affect the general level of prices and increase the cost of living and which are not imperatively required by law.

I can assure you that the problem which you have so kindly brought to my attention is receiving the active consideration of our Atlanta regional office and that office has been instructed to move as quickly as possible to correct the situation insofar as possible within our present authority.

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1943.

The Honorable LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your letter of May 7 and supplementary telegram of May 12, relative to the problems confronting milk producers and distributors in Broward and Dade Counties, Fla.

The problems which exist in the Dade-Broward area as well as in a number of other markets throughout Florida have been brought directly to he attention of this office. Our Atlanta regional office has completed a survey of milk prices throughout the State and a price regulation is being prepared which will establish specific prices for fluid milk sold throughout Florida. Due to the complexity of the problems encountered, a number of delays have occurred which have prevented the issuance of this regulation as promptly as previously anticipated. However, I am advised by our Atlanta regional office that the regulation may be expected in the very near future.

I am sure you realize that the determination of correct price relationships among markets is of the utmost importance. The purpose of the forthcoming regulation will be to establish a greater degree of uniformity in the price structure of the entire area and I trust this action will prove the solution to the problem of insuring a fair and equitable distribution of the limited available supplies among competing markets.

A further purpose of the regulation will be to provide a fair and equitable price for producers and distributors. In certain areas, it will be possible to permit substantial relief to milk producers without corresponding increases in retail prices. In accordance with the President's recent directive, this office is not authorized to permit further increases in retail prices which will adversely affect the general level of prices and increase the cost of living and which are not imperatively required by law.

I can assure you that the problem which you have so kindly brought to my attention is receiving the active consideration of our Atlanta regional office and that office has been instructed to move as rapidly as possible to correct the situation insofar as possible within our present authority.

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator.

A significant sentence in the above communications from Mr. Brown is the following:

In accordance with the President's recent directive, this Office is not authorized to permit further increases in retail prices which will adversely affect the general level of prices and increase the cost of living and which are not imperatively required by law.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if O. P. A. officials are without authority in this, it is obvious that we must go to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Chairman and Director of the Economic Stabilization Board. This, I plan to attempt to do tomorrow. I know that Administrator Byrnes has his hands full in his high and multiplied duties, but I know also that he undoubtedly is concerned relative to whether or not the American people may have food. If we cannot obtain relief promptly from Administrator Byrnes and/or the Office of Price Administration, I shall introduce legislation repealing all O. P. A.'s powers insofar as food producers' ceiling price fixing is concerned. I have contended from the beginning that ceiling prices on food products at their source of production are unnecessary and are not compatible with the best interest of feeding America. I do not believe that American producers of food will be able to produce food in sufficient quantity for the American people if O. P. A. officials continue to exercise power of ceiling prices on producers. Ceiling prices already fixed on producers are already drying up food production in America, cutting down the number of acres planted of Irish potatoes and other crops, causing dairy herds to be slaughtered, and food producers to give up in despair and chagrin. Now, if these Administrators lack the power or the wisdom for relief in this situation, it is time for the Congress to act and to act now and to repeal by law existing power exercised by O. P. A. in their fixing of ceilings on milk producers, Irish-potato producers, and other food producers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include excerpts from newspapers, letters, telegrams, and other communications.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SHEPPARD, for 10 days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. RUSSELL (at the request of Mr. POAGE), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, for May 25 and May 26, on account of business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address by the Hon. Robert Brennan, Irish Minister to the United States, made in Boston on May 5. I am informed it will take two and three-quarters pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and will cost $123.75. In view of the significance of the remarks made by the Irish Minister, I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of Charles T. Dulin;

H. R. 1896. An act to amend sections 1 and 2 of the act approved June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 262), relating to the establishment of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia, and to grant the consent of Congress to such States to enter into a compact providing for the acquisition of property for such park;

H. R. 2159. An act to provide for special assessments for the laying of curbs and gutters;

H. R. 2486. An act to authorize the appointment as ensigns in the Coast Guard of all graduates of the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2581. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2583. An act to provide for the reorganization of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2587. An act to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 25, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 25, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearings pursuant to House Resolution 98 by Congressman HALLECK.

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

This committee will hold public hearings on investigation of civilian employment in governmental departments, Wednesday, May 26, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m. in Room 246, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 26, Thursday, May 27, and Friday, May 28,

1943, for consideration of housing bills, in the Caucus Room, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 26, and Thursday, May 27, 1943, on all bills dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act—H. R. 1882, H. R. 2309, H. R. 2428, and H. R. 2429.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 27, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2750, to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, relating to experience of radio operators.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2731, to facilitate the award and payment of just compensation for property requisitioned under the authority of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

1. Tuesday, June 1: Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, will open the hearings with any statements and recommendations he desires to submit covering national flood control and the projects that should be included in the bill to be reported, especially as they are related to national defense and as they will be important following the existing war to provide sound flood-control projects and desirable public works. General Reybold is now on an airplane tour of inspection of the flood areas and will submit a first-hand report covering recent major floods along the Missouri, Arkansas, White, Mississippi, Illinois, Wabash, Ohio, and other rivers in the recent flood areas. He will be followed by Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Assistant Chief of Engineers, who has previously advised the Flood Control Committee during hearings and who will also appear before the committee and submit his views and discuss generally the projects that have been favorably reported since the hearings were conducted on H. R. 4911, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, reported on June 9, 1941, which became the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941. Col. George R. Goethals, Chief of the Flood Control Branch, Office of Chief of Engineers, will attend the hearings and will furnish to the members of the committee in detail any and all available information respecting the said projects on which favorable reports have been submitted by the Chief of Engineers.

The district engineers and the division engineers have furnished to the Chief of Engineers data and information respecting major floods since August 18, 1941, and particularly with respect to recent major floods in the various drainage basins of the country, which will be submitted to the committee.

2. Wednesday, June 2: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects for the New England region including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers and the Middle Atlantic region including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

3. Thursday, June 3: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the upper and lower Ohio River and tributaries, and on projects of the South Atlantic region including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

4. Friday, June 4: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects along the Missouri River and tributaries and the upper Mississippi River and the Great Lakes region.

5. Tuesday, June 8: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the lower Mississippi River and tributaries including the Arkansas and White Rivers, and on rivers flowing into the Gulf west of the Mississippi River, and in the Western Rocky Mountain region including Texas and Colorado, and in the Pacific Northwest region including the Willamette River and the Columbia River and tributaries.

6. Wednesday, June 9: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the Los Angeles area and in the State of California, including the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kern River Valleys, and on projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

7. Thursday, June 10: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

8. Friday, June 11: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

433. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to placer mining claims for deposits of phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, or gas on the public domain; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

434. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on lists of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

435. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting recommendations and suggested draft of a bill providing Federal aids for planning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 480. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 481. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 2250. A bill to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees into the Postal Service; with amendment (Rept. No. 482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PRICE: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 2419. A bill to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "assistant clerk"; with amendment (Rept. No. 483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 484. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2773. A bill to provide for the repair of certain roads and highways in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Roads.

H. R. 2774. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in Hilo, Hawaii, T. H.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2775. A bill to amend section 207 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, to permit the Commission to grant certain licenses; to the Committee on the Territories.

H. R. 2776. A bill to permit the naturalization of native-born Filipinos; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2777. A bill making an appropriation for the endowment and maintenance of the Agricultural Experiment Station of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 2778. A bill to further amend Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1935, as amended by Act 23 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1937, Act 58 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1939, and Act 20 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii 1941, to extend the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered to June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Territories.

H. R. 2779. A bill providing for the temporary service of circuit judges with the Supreme Court of Hawaii in case of vacancies in such court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2780. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 2781. A bill to grant free postage to veterans while being furnished hospital treatment, institutional, or domiciliary care in institutions operated by or under contract with the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2782. A bill to grant Government employees who are members of certain military units leaves of absence for periods of active service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 2783. A bill to provide for post-war planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2784. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, to certain maimed soldiers, to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1926; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 2785. A bill relating to certain lands released to the United States by carriers by railroad pursuant to section 321 (b) of the Transportation Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2786. A bill to extend further time for naturalization of alien veterans of ineligible race who served in the armed forces of the United States during World War No. 1; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States forbidding any State or political subdivision thereof to deny or abridge the right of any citizen to vote on account of failure to pay a poll tax or property tax assessed against him; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution designating August 1, 1943, as Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of the military and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2787. A bill for the relief of Phyllis Lee; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2788. A bill for the relief of Frank Baptiste; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2789. A bill to permit the naturalization of Peter Henry Buck, Honolulu, T. H.; to the Committee of Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 2790. A bill for the relief of John Thomas Blair, disabled war veteran; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R 2791. A bill for the relief of John N. Ruffin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 2792. A bill for the relief of Arvo Kari, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnston; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R 2793. A bill for the relief of W. Clayton Kellogg; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

872. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of 165 citizens of Troy, Mo., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

873. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of the Woman's Society for Christian Service, Spring Methodist Church, of Aiken, S. C., favoring the continuance and expansion of the Farm Security Administration under its present leadership; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

874. Also, petition of the Woman's Society for Christian Service, Methodist Episcopal Church, Piedmont, S. C., favoring the continuance and expansion of the Farm Security Administration under its present leadership; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

875. Also, petition of the Woman's Society for Christian Service, Warrenville Church, Warrenville, S. C., favoring the continuance and expansion of the Farm Security Administration under its present leadership; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

876. By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of sundry citizens of Arizona, favoring passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

877. By Mr. CLASON: Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact, and the President of the United States to sign, an act amending the Federal Motor Carrier Act, 1935, so-called, now part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to limit to actual producers and private carriers the exemption of vehicles transporting farm produce and fish and to make said Motor Carrier Act applicable to vehicles transporting such commodities for hire or compensation and to the owners and operators of such vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

878. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Maude Vance, of Aurora, and 19 citizens of Kane County, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

879. By Mr. ANGELL: Petitions of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

880. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 43 members of the Methodist Church, East Brook, Lawrence County, Pa., urging passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

881. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of Rev. L. P. Cassel and 38 other citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

882. By Mr. KEE: Petition of Mrs. R. R. Jones and 19 other citizens and residents of Bluefield, W. Va., urging the passage by Congress of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

883. Also, petition of Mrs. J. C. Lovelace and eight other citizens and residents of Bluefield, W. Va., urging the passage by Congress of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

884. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Oral McGown and members of the First Methodist Church of Newell, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

885. Also, petition of Rev. O. O. Boggess and members of the Church of God of Wheeling, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

886. Also, petition of Mrs. C. Richard Hall and members of the First Methodist Church of Fairmont, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Love Divine whose riches are unsearchable, continue to be our shield and portion. When shadows gather about our understanding, we pray that we may go back to our childhood "where prayer was wont to be made"; when the skies were cloudless and Thou, dear Lord, was an emblem for the fullness of joy. We rejoice that Thou goest not down with the years, but art with us through the fleeting days, the shifting scenes, the

varying fortunes, and when the changeless blue sky fades at evening time.

Heavenly Father, the world over is pleading for release; empower us with masterful determination to send the message that shall mock these tearful days and fulfill the hunger for justice and freedom which no swine-husks can satisfy. O for the spirit of our Saviour; He came and the blind caught the light, the lame began to walk, the sick heard His song, and the rejected of earth found the radiance of the upper world. From the contagion of an atmosphere breathing poison with diversified and monstrous horror, almighty God, deliver this appealing world. With a vision that abhors all greed and brute forces, enable us to toil on until they are dull and pulseless and those who have sown in tears shall reap more abundantly in joy. Through Christ, our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on Friday, May 21, 1943, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 for a period of 90 days.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 629) entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Minnesota to such State for use for park, recreational, or wildlife-refuge purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HATCH, Mr. WALLGREN, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. National Archives.

ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 83]

Anderson, N. Mex.	Gibson	O'Leary
Burgin	Gore	O'Toole
Byrne	Granger	Rolph
Cannon, Fla.	Guyer	Russell
Capozzoli	Hale	Sabath
Clark	Hinshaw	Sadowski
Cochran	Holifield	Sasscer
Cooley	Izac	Schwabe
Costello	Johnson, Calvin D.	Sheppard
Culkin	Johnson, Luther A.	Sheridan
Curley	Kilburn	Short
Davis	Kilday	Sikes
Dies	Kleberg	Smith, Ohio
Dilweg	Lea	Snyder
Disney	Lemke	Stearns, N. H.
Durham	McGranery	Treadway
Eaton	Maas	Vinson, Ga.
Elliott	Martin, Iowa	Welch
Elmer	Monroney	Whelchel, Ga.
Fenton	Morrison, N. C.	Woodruff, Mich.
Fernandez	Nichols	Worley
Gale		Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty-seven Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. MCCORMACK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 131, the Chair designates the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] to control the time in opposition to the bill H. R. 7.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I personally consider this one of the most important bills that has come before this House. It is my profound personal hope that it will not become political. It crosses both sides of the aisle. The State of Tennessee, one of the greatest States in the Union, recently repealed its poll tax law, through its legislative body, a State which has sent more distinguished people to this House, perhaps, than any one single State in the Union.

It is not political nor is it going to do away with States rights, in my opinion. And it is not unconstitutional, in my opinion. There are Members on my side of the House who will take up these questions much better and more ably than I can. My statement is simply for the purpose of appealing to all of us to listen to the debates and discussions and to vote on the merits.

This measure does not apply only to Negroes. It applies to a great many whites. If it applied only to Negroes, there are many arguments that might be forthcoming. They fight in the armed forces and are dying for us as soldiers, and if they are good enough to fight for us, I think they are good enough to vote for us. But that is another question entirely.

There are just as many whites as there are negroes who are affected by this measure. Where do we intend to draw the line on voting?

I admit that the States themselves have the right to say how they themselves will be governed. That is a constitutional right. But when it comes to the Federal Government I claim the Federal Government has the right to decide, and this Congress has the right to decide how we should elect our Members and the people who handle the affairs of the Federal Government.

The charge has been made that this bill is communistic. Yesterday one of my distinguished colleagues read a list of names, or started to read a list of names of ministers who had signed a petition in support of this measure. He named Dr. Fosdick, minister in the city of New York, and I assume all of us know who Dr. Fosdick is. He is the pastor of the church built by John D. Rockefeller. I suppose it is going to be said here that Mr. John D. Rockefeller is communistic, because he supports this bill.

It has nothing to do with communism; it has to do with the rights, under the Constitution, of every American, no matter what his creed or color, to express himself concerning the officials of the Federal Government.

I know that most of us do not believe that this legislation is inspired by any organization, whether it be Communist, Socialist, Republican, Democratic, or anything else that you want to name. This is not a partisan measure. I assure you that certainly it is not political in my constituency. I represent a district which certainly cannot be accused of being communistic, nor can it be accused of being Negro, nor can it be accused of being partisan, because the Republicans and the Democrats are about evenly split in that district. If I take the action that I do on this bill, it is because I sincerely believe it is for the best interests of our community and our Nation. I hope we will approach it in that state of mind and that we will listen to this debate and take in good faith the remarks and the points that are made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, let me say to you that I do not believe in a poll tax. I am opposed to a poll-tax limitation to any voter.

It so happens that during the last war I served with colored troops. Some of the time I had a company and part of the time overseas I was in command of a battalion of colored troops. One of the things I treasure is the fact that I look back over my service with those men with pride, because these colored soldiers went far beyond the ordinary course of their duty to discharge their job as soldiers in the last war. But I am against this bill, and I shall be very happy to tell you briefly why I am against this bill.

I do not know in this democracy of ours how many shocks constitutional government or democracy can take without having a complete break-down of our form of government. I am very seriously concerned about that today. I think perhaps we should think about that sometimes in connection with some of the matters that come before us.

For example, if the Congress has the right to change or fix the qualifications of voters of the several States—and that is what this bill does—by a simple act such as this, how far can we go? What qualification may be attacked next? Personally, I should like to have this matter presented to the country as the question of women's suffrage was presented to the country, by a constitutional amendment, voted upon here first by the Congress, then submitted to the legislatures of the States in the orderly processes of our constitutional form of government.

I should like to call your attention very briefly to some comments made by Mr. Mark Sullivan recently in a column by him. He said this, and I think it is fundamental:

> If Congress passes an act abolishing the poll tax, and assuming the Supreme Court should uphold it, then an immense step would be taken toward an ominous end. The result would establish a precedent and a principle. The precedent would be this—that voting qualifications in the States can be changed by the Federal Government at Washington.
>
> Once this precedent were established voting qualifications now existing in any or all the States could be abolished by the Federal Government. New voting qualifications, binding on the States, could be set up by the Federal Government.
>
> There is going on in America a broad movement tending toward a revolutionary effect. The effect is, mainly, centralization of power.

Let us consider my State, for example. We have a voting qualification that deals with the time of residence, 6 months in the State, 30 days in the precinct. Assume some group felt that that was a harsh qualification for the people of my State to impose. Let us assume there was an organization outside of the State of Minnesota which said, "We should have some different Senators and we should have some different Representatives from the State of Minnesota, and we want to transport voters in there in time to defeat those men. We want to elect a new Governor in the State. Therefore, we shall say to Minnesota or we shall say to Iowa or we shall say to Alabama, 'You shall change your qualifications to meet that which we think does not conform to the centralized form of government.' " The implications of this bill are most serious and far-reaching.

I believe this bill is unconstitutional, and I am voting against it on that ground.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY].

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to take the few minutes I have at my disposal to talk to my fellow Members of the House about the action which we will take here today. We are dealing with an issue about which men disagree. It is a great public issue, an issue which ought to be debated until it is thoroughly understood by all of the people who must vote upon it. However, I want to point out that this issue has been thoroughly debated. There will be nothing said today on the floor of this House that is new. We understand the issue. There are some who will vote for this bill because of principle, and I suppose there are those who will vote for this bill for other reasons, call it political expediency, if you want to. There are some who will vote against this bill because of principle, and there may be those on that side who will vote as they shall vote because of political expediency. The words spoken here will not affect or change a single vote in this House. This issue is set. Men have made up their minds about it. There is a sincere constitutional question involved, as there was a sincere constitutional question raised by an amendment passed last week, against which I spoke and voted. Yet this House passed that amendment, and I thank God that the Supreme Court still sits. That issue and this issue will be resolved in the courts.

Let me say just a few words to the members of my own party. We should not let this issue create a division among us. We should not let our opposition use this to drive a wedge between us.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. It is too bad that the gentleman did not think about that when he was trying to get this issue to the floor. It comes a little late to raise this question today, does it not?

Mr. McMURRAY. I did think about it, I say to the gentleman from Mississippi. Let us not let this issue be used by our political opponents to divide us. We have, according to an ancient custom and under the rules of this House, learned to address each other here as gentlemen and gentlewomen. I make this plea. Let us live up to the words we use. Let those who must on either side put their words into the RECORD and transmit the copies of those speeches to their constituents. But let us be reasonable here.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMURRAY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is talking about a division. Does he not know that this is a part of the Communist program to destroy State governments, to create a bureaucracy and have this Government ruled through a bureaucracy centered in Washington? The gentleman is a little late now about getting up and saying, Do not let us be divided. I submit that the gentleman is already now following the communistic lines.

Mr. McMURRAY. May I say in answer to the gentleman that I got my views on this issue from Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman did not get them from Thomas Jefferson or Abraham Lincoln. I have seen his campaign documents, and I know where he got them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, the Connally-Smith antistrike bill, S. 796, will be considered, under a rule, next Wednesday, June 2. I expect to oppose the rule.

I voted for the Smith bill in the last Congress in view of the Communist-inspired strikes at that time. I feel, however, that it would be a serious mistake for the Congress to adopt such restrictive and coercive legislation, imperiling the legislative gains of labor, at a time when labor has contributed a tremendous part in the war effort. It might even be the cause of provoking strikes and impeding the production of necessary war weapons.

Labor, as a general proposition, has abided loyally by its pledge to refrain from strikes in war industries for the duration of the war. Many of the department heads, including the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, and Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. McCloy, have requested the defeat of the bill. I would prefer no action on it at the present time, and would support it only in case of a Nation-wide strike in a war industry.

The following is a copy of a letter I sent to Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 24, 1943.*

Mr. WILLIAM GREEN,
President, the American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: Replying to your letter, I am hopeful that the Smith-Connally bill will not be brought up in the House, but if it is, my present inclination is to oppose it as a member of the Rules Committee, and to urge defeat of the rule.

The following is a copy of a telegram I have forwarded to some of the labor organizations in my district: "I have faith in the patriotism of labor and am a strong advocate of collective bargaining and freedom of speech in war and in peace, and see no necessity at the present time for the enactment of coercive legislation, such as the

Connally-Smith bill, in view of the no-strike pledge of organized labor."

Thanking you for your letter, and assuring you of my cooperation, provided there is no drastic change in the labor situation, such as a Nation-wide strike in the midst of the war, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, it is true that this bill raises a very interesting constitutional question. The question that we must decide here has not yet been decided by our Supreme Court. Therefore, in arriving at a conclusion, we must consider the Constitution, and the decisions under it, and also the trend of judicial decisions. It is true there are many cases on this general subject. There are many cases having to do with the interpretation of State statutes, and many cases where a petitioner came before the Supreme Court and claimed that a certain State statute or the conduct of a certain State election official deprived him of his equal rights under the law as laid down in the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution. The Court held in many of these cases, and rightly so, I think, that those statutes did not deprive the petitioner of any right under the fourteenth amendment. It has been pointed out by the Court many times that a different question would be presented if the Congress had exercised or sought to exercise its right to legislate upon this subject of the election of its own officers. We are now legislating on this subject, and the only constitutional question here is this—Do we have authority under the Constitution to pass this particular legislation? Some years ago this Congress passed a Corrupt Practices Act, and we sought to make it apply to primary elections as well as to general elections. The question of the constitutionality of that law came before the Supreme Court in the case of *Newberry* v. *U. S.* (236 U. S. 232). Four members of the Court, as then constituted, decided that the only authority in Congress to legislate on the subject of the elections of its own officials was contained in this provision of the Constitution:

Article I, section 4: The time, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, and the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations.

They held that it grants all the power we have to legislate on the subject. If that be the law, then I admit that we have no authority to pass this bill. Four members of the Court, in that case, held that a primary is not an election within the meaning of the above-quoted clause in the Constitution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. Not now. Those four members of that Court pointed out that the Federal Government is a sovereign government, that it acts through chosen officials, and has the right to regulate the manner of the election of those officials. They pointed to this part of the Constitution:

Article I, section 8: Congress shall have power * * * to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

This question came before the Court again in the case of *U. S.* v. *Classic* (313 U. S., p. 299). They held in that case in line with the statement made by the four judges above referred to in the Newberry case, that Congress had authority under article I, section 8, to regulate the election of Members of Congress and to protect the right of the citizen to vote for Members of Congress. They also held that a primary is an election within the meaning of the provisions of the Constitution I have referred to.

Now someone has, or someone will, point out this provision of the Constitution:

Article I, section 2: The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors of each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Now, what does that mean? Of course, in determining what that means you must construe it in connection with the other provision I have just read, about the general power of Congress to direct its own elections.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GWYNNE. I think the proper construction to be put upon that, and I think the court will put that construction upon it, is this: The legislative body of the Federal Government has complete authority to regulate the election of its own officials. If that be not so, then we are not a sovereign government. True, the Congress might not choose to legislate. It might choose to adopt the qualifications as laid down by the States. It might choose to do nothing, in which event it will be deemed to have adopted the qualifications laid down by the States.

Now, I have come to that conclusion for several reasons. In the first place, the courts have now very definitely come to the conclusion that the right to vote for a Member of Congress is not a right conferred by the States at all. It is a right based upon the Federal Constitution. I think the whole thing is summed up in the statement made by the Chief Justice in this Classic case, which is this:

While in a loose sense the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States, this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject, as provided by article I, section 2, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under article I, section 4, and its more general powers under article I, section 8, clause 18.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, if the facts concerning the poll tax were generally known there would be an overwhelming demand that we rid our democracy of this undemocratic anachronism.

The poll tax is a levy on the citizens of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia, that requires a payment ranging from $1 to almost $50, depending on whether the taxes have accumulated, before they can exercise their right to vote. Let me give you an example of what cumulative poll taxes mean. Let us say the poll tax in a particular State is $1 a year. That seems cheap enough. Now, if a voter, because of economic distress does not pay the dollar, he not only cannot vote, but the second year he finds himself with double the amount to pay, plus 7 percent interest and an additional fine of $1. If he does not pay the third time, the fee is three times as high, and so forth. This may be pyramided so that he may be compelled to pay as much as $47.47 before he can cast his vote. When you take into consideration the wages paid in some of the Southern States, it becomes apparent that the exercise of the right to vote is prohibitive, and signifies nothing. The effect of this requirement is clear from the fact that in the Presidential election of 1940 only 27 percent of the population otherwise qualified voted in the poll-tax States, as compared with 76 percent in the other States.

Repeal of the poll tax has been opposed on the grounds that it is unconstitutional and that it is an invasion of States' rights.

Since the best legal minds are divided on the constitutional question, it would seem the sound and democratic procedure to pass the bill for which there is so much sentiment, and let the Supreme Court finally determine the issue.

As for the claim that to repeal the poll tax by Federal action would invade States' rights, the Congressman who is elected from a poll-tax State legislates concerning the interests of the citizens, not only of his own district and his own State, but of the entire United States. Further, as Members of Congress are Federal officers, their salaries being paid by the Government of the United States, not by the State governments, the Federal Government should eliminate any undemocratic voting restrictions imposed by the States. Whether this can be done by an act of Congress, or in the form of an amendment to the Constitution, can be decided by the Supreme Court.

In these perilous times it becomes an ever-present necessity to remind ourselves again and again what this war is being fought for. We all know and believe that its purpose is to perpetuate our way of life, to destroy fascism, and

to spread democracy throughout the world. It is, therefore, the duty of every thinking citizen and especially those who have it within their power to act, to see that the fight is carried on, not only on the battlefields of the world, but wherever democracy is challenged.

The poll tax is a grave injustice, and serves only to provide the enemies of democracy with material with which to criticize and destroy it. In this country we must set an example for the rest of the world.

Our position at the peace table, and in discussing the post-war world, is considerably weakened, in my opinion, if here at home we tolerate a condition which permits of the denial to millions of people of the right to freely express their choice in the selection of their Government officials.

The 10,000,000 disenfranchised citizens of the poll-tax States must have the right to vote if democracy is to prevail in this country.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, the vote on yesterday to discharge the committee and to adopt the rule clearly indicates the futility of debate today to change any votes. But I am not willing to see this bill pass the House today without registering my protest as I did last year against its passage and restating the grounds for my opposition.

I am opposed to the bill because it is clearly unconstitutional. For 150 years it has been generally conceded by all who had even a reading acquaintance with the Constitution that in the framing of their election laws the States were sovereign and the Federal Government had no constitutional right to invade that local jurisdiction. I again invite attention to the able and unanswerable brief filed last year on this subject by the distinguished attorney general of Virginia, the Honorable Abram P. Staples, to be found in the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 88, page A3349.

The first time an effort was made to have the Congress legislate on the subject of controlling State elections was shortly after the War between the States, when passion ran high and a Republican leader, blinded by partisan prejudice, sought to further humiliate the States of the Confederacy by the passage of what was known as the Force bill. But even under those circumstances, and with the Republican Party in full control of the Congress, a majority was unwilling to violate its oath to uphold and support the Constitution in order to secure a temporary political advantage. So far as I know, not until a bill similar to this passed the House last year was any serious effort made to uphold the constitutionality of the proposed action.

Last year, and again this year, we will have the sorry spectacle of seeing distinguished Members of this House voting for a measure which in their hearts they do not want and in which they do not believe; the sorry spectacle of distinguished Members of this House yielding in a craven way to group pressure, and in yielding knowing that they are selling their self-respect for a mess of pottage. In voting today on this measure we are not voting on whether or not it is desirable to help support public education by means of the most ancient form of taxation known to civilized men. We are not voting on the merits of the question of whether or not the imposition of a poll tax unduly or improperly restricts the electorate. On those issues I would have no objection at all to the General Assembly of Virginia submitting to a direct vote of the people of Virginia an amendment to our State constitution dealing with the poll-tax question.

The section of our State constitution which requires the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting was framed by that distinguished statesman, CARTER GLASS, in 1901. That constitution was submitted to and ratified by the voters of Virginia when no one was prevented by a poll tax from voting. The same was true of the Constitution of Mississippi and other Southern States. For many years Virginia and other Southern States imposed a freehold or property-tax requirement as a prerequisite to voting. The substitution of a poll tax for such a requirement was a definite step in the interest of a freer democracy. It is now contended, and no doubt with some merit as the movement has been so widespread, that it would be in the interest of a still freer democracy to abolish the poll tax as a voting requirement, although with all due deference to the 41 States that have done so, we in Virginia have been unable to observe in any one of them any improvement in their State and local government over that enjoyed in the Old Dominion. While we have not been the last to lay the old aside, we have likewise not been the first by whom the new is tried. In other words, we do not make fundamental changes in Virginia merely for the sake of change.

But some of our northern and western friends are proposing to change our State constitution for us and to accomplish that end through the process of nullification of our State constitution and State laws enacted pursuant thereto. The fact they have no constitutional right to do so apparently deters them not. Even if the Congress had the constitutional right to pass such a bill as this I would still be opposed to it because I am a firm believer in the doctrine of States' rights. The pending bill strikes at the heart of that doctrine. In a representative democracy the most valuable, the most precious right any State can possess is the right to control its own election laws. Take that right away from the States and they become helpless pawns in the hands of a Federal bureaucracy. Last month we celebrated the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of our Nation's greatest political philosopher, our Nation's ablest and clearest expounder of the principles of representative democracy—Thomas Jefferson. There may be, and possibly are, a few Members of this House who do not believe in the principles of Thomas Jefferson, but the overwhelming majority on both sides of the aisle not only believe in those principles but lose no opportunity to publicly confess that faith. What a hollow mockery they make of that profession of faith in Thomas Jefferson when they vote for such a measure as this! They have seen a so-called Fair Labor Standards Act, claimed by its author to be limited to interstate commerce and strictly complying with the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, deliberately construed and applied in a manner that has completely wiped out the last vestige of State control over intrastate commerce—a valuable and important right which the sovereign States reserved to themselves in ratifying the Constitution which conferred upon the central authority the power to regulate interstate commerce.

They have seen the Central Government tell or attempt to tell our farmers when to sow and when to reap, in violation of Jefferson's admonition on that subject. They have seen the Federal Government, on the pretext that private enterprise have broken down, move into competition with private enterprise on such a broad front it is now seriously contended that in the post-war era the only way to preserve the American standard of living and prevent mass unemployment is to engage, on a vaster scale than ever before, in a public-works program, supplemented perhaps by the Government operation of Government-owned plants built or financed by the Government in a grave war emergency to step up the production of essential war materiel. They have seen as a necessary war measure the adoption of vast Federal control through priorities and price fixing. These agencies may not be reluctant to continue and perpetuate their control of private enterprise in the post-war era and long after the expiration of the emergency which brought them into being.

In the face of these well-known trends in the field of Federal control and the destruction of State sovereignty, it is not only surprising to me, it is downright alarming, that an overwhelming majority of this House is willing to put its stamp of approval upon the most radical step yet proposed or undertaken to make the power of the Federal Government supreme. What boots it to praise the action of Marshal Stalin in disbanding the Comintern and stopping the operations of that communistic organization known as the Third Intertional if we propose to do here today to the 48 States of our Nation what the Comintern sought to do to the sovereign nations of the world, namely, dictate their domestic policies from Moscow? For, as pointed out in the article of last Monday by that outstanding news commentator, Mark Sullivan, the implications of the pending bill go far beyond the abolishment of the poll tax in just seven States. Unless the rights of the States be protected by the Supreme Court, the fundamental meaning of the pending bill is that the Congress feels it has the power to control the election laws of all of the States in any way which, at the moment, it may see fit to do. An old Virginia farmer used to tell me "The tendency of everything is to be more so." I defy anyone to deny the

present trend toward complete Federal domination of the States and their local subdivisions.

The Communists who are the prime supporters of the anti-poll-tax movement in this country are not concerned with enlarging and improving our system of representative democracy. They do not believe in representative democracy; they wish to destroy it. The present bill is but one step to that end. Do not say to yourself in justification we will take this step today but we will draw the line on taking the next one. There was never a wiser saying than the old Chinese proverb, "A journey of a thousand miles is commenced by one step."

Our representative democracy is a priceless heritage. No nation as large and as diversified as ours can be successfully ruled and governed from Washington, in all of its local undertakings. No statesmen we have produced have been wiser than those who framed the checks and balances of our Federal Constitution, in which all powers not specifically granted or by necessary implications granted to the Federal Government were reserved to the States that agreed to form a Federal Union. You are being called upon today to plunge a knife into what next to the Bill of Rights is the most vital and essential provision of our form of government, and without which the essential Bill of Rights would soon become a dead letter on our statute books. I beg you not to take that step unless you can successfully answer these questions propounded by Daniel Webster on the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of George Washington:

> Who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites National sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity?

The answer Daniel Webster gave to his own questions was—

> If these columns fall, they will be raised not again.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER].

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, the very able gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] has referred to judicial decisions and judicial constructions. It is a primary rule of law, as every Member of this House who is a lawyer knows, that the only time you need a construction is where there is ambiguity. I challenge any Member who feels that this act is constitutional to explain away the plain and simple words of article I, section 2, of the Constitution and the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution, adopted in 1913.

It has always been the rule in this country, and it has always been the feeling as shown by the framers of the Constitution, that the right of suffrage and the qualifications to be laid down in connection therewith belong to the States. How can there be anything ambiguous in that section of the Constitution that provides that the qualifications for voters or electors for the House of Representatives of the United States shall be the same as the qualification for voters of the most numerous house of the State legislature? That was back in the days of the founders, but it was reiterated and readopted in 1913 when the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution was adopted, that amendment providing for the direct election of United States Senators; and the wording is identical. Yet this bill, if adopted, would wipe out the provisions of the seventeenth amendment in the same way that it would article I, section 2, of the Constitution itself.

There is a perfectly legal and perfectly proper way to approach this problem and that is by constitutional amendment. I hold no brief for the poll tax. I do not come from a State that has a poll tax. If I were a member of the legislature of a State that had a poll tax I would be the first to vote to abolish it or to speak against it, and that is the place to start, unless the proponents of this sweeping change are willing and ready to go about it in the regular and orderly manner and submit and propose a constitutional amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

As you all know, when that is done there is no change, no matter how sweeping, that cannot be proposed, but to try to do it by the ipse dixit of this body, by statute, if you please, which in one fell swoop tries to wipe out two of the most vital parts of our organic law, goes right back to the proposition that my friends on the Republican side of the aisle are crying about every day—and I agree with them—in their frequent attacks on bureaucracy. If this body presumes by a bill to override and wipe out and completely ignore the constitutional provisions provided for in the Constitution of this country and the amendments thereto, there is nothing that we cannot do. It seems to me that this is an old-fashioned principle involving the oath of office—our oath to support the Constitution. One of the gentlemen—I believe it was the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY]—was very frank when he said that some Members are motivated by personal political expediency. To those Members I will say there are worse things than being defeated for reelection to Congress, and in the last analysis we have to live with ourselves and with our oath of office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCANLON].

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this measure. We have heard considerable debate, and, before the time allotted for debate expires, we shall hear considerably more debate on this bill from the constitutional standpoint. The RECORD will be full tomorrow of legalistic discussion. I am not a lawyer. It would be foolish for me to attempt to argue that this bill is either constitutional or unconstitutional from the standpoint of the legal technicalities of that great document. But as a layman—as the proverbial "man in the street," if you please—this bill is constitutional.

To me the Constitution means one thing and one thing only. It is the pact between the several States to effect in the most practical manner the principles of our Government as laid down by the Declaration of Independence. That great statement of human principles is based upon an equality of privilege and rights. This bill to repeal the poll tax as a qualification for voting, to me, a layman, further implements these principles and is, therefore, constitutional.

Our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution grew out of a war fought, among other things, to eliminate "taxation without representation." The poll tax is taxation without representation, and this bill to repeal it is one more step to bring about those ideals for which our founding fathers fought and died.

Under the poll tax, before a man can vote, he must pay a tax. In many States he must pay all accrued taxes before he can cast his vote. It seems clear to me that this is "taxation without representation."

The poll tax also places a penalty on those who have been less fortunate, economically. It discriminates against that man in favor of the man who has been fortunate in business, or whose crops turned out well, or who has been able to get a job and keep it. Our Constitution and our Declaration of Independence both intended just the opposite.

There is still another reason why I favor this bill to repeal the poll tax. We are today fighting a desperate war on two fronts. One of our enemies, Japan, has conquered vast territories and an equally vast number of people, all of whom are not members of the white race. They are brown and yellow. The Japanese are clever propagandists, and they appeal to these subjugated peoples that this war is a war to end the domination of the white races. Their appeal is strictly on a color basis. Nothing we here can do in the way of legislation can stop Jap propaganda. That can only be accomplished by crushing blows administered by our fighting forces. But we can give the lie to their propaganda by proving to the world that racial discrimination in official business does not exist.

The poll tax is aimed directly at circumventing the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution—to impose voting restrictions on the basis of race. Opponents of this measure inferentially admitted this yesterday here on the floor when it was charged that this measure was an effort on the part of Republicans to wean the Negro vote. I am a Democrat and a politician, and I do not believe I am naive enough to be taken in on a Republican trick—but that is at present beside the point. As long as we have laws, either on the Federal statute books or on the statute books of any of the States, which are discriminatory toward one race—a colored race—the Japanese can point to these laws and tell the subjugated peoples of the Asiatic islands and countries, "The United States is not interested in liberating you. In the United States itself they discriminate against all those who are not white. Join

the Japanese new order in Asia and help kick out the hated whites."

When the Japanese say we discriminate they speak the truth, and the people to whom they speak know it. How easy it would be to kill the effectiveness of their propaganda by repealing every law in our land which is discriminatory on racial bases! Of course, it would not stop the propaganda, but the propaganda would be based on a lie. On the other hand, our counterpropaganda would be given more teeth.

Mr. Chairman, when we begin to apply the pressure on the Japanese we are going to need all the help we can get from these presently subjugated peoples, and we here in Congress should do everything in our power so that MacArthur, Halsey, and Stilwell will get that aid.

I would favor this present measure if there were no war, but because there is a war, I favor it more strongly. And for this reason I appeal to my friends from the South who oppose it to withdraw their opposition so that we may drive one more spike into the Japanese propaganda machine.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, before we can appreciate whether or not this bill would be constitutional, it would be well to dip into the Constitutional Convention and examine something of the debates and the proceedings that led it finally to the adoption of article I, section 2, and article I, section 4. Beyond question, those articles are the results of compromise and clearly indicate that the States can have no unlimited right to determine the qualification of the electors in the States and that Congress has a perfect right to intervene to prevent injustices, abuses, or discriminations. It has the right to pass the pending bill.

Article I, section 2, as finally adopted, reads as follows:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

You cannot read section 2 of article I in a complete vacuum, without considering it as a part of the Constitution, containing, as it does, other provisions, notably article I, section 4; but before we go to article I, section 4, I should like to give you a bit of the history that led up to the adoption of article I, section 2, relative to the qualifications of electors in the various States. On June 6, 1787, Mr. C. C. Pinckney moved:

> That the first branch * * * be elected by the State legislatures and not by the people.

That is a clear indication that he wanted the Constitutional Convention to say that the legislatures have supreme control over the qualifications of electors and elections of Members of Congress. That provision was rejected.

On Thursday, June 21, 1787, the proposition was brought forward again and, according to Mr. Madison—

> General Pinckney moved "that the first branch, instead of being elected by the people, should be elected in such manner as the legislature of each State should direct."

After considerable discussion that proposal was rejected, since that proposal involved untrammeled power in the State to determine the qualifications of electors.

Finally, on August 7, the question of qualifications of electors was again considered. The Committee of Detail proposed the following:

> The qualifications of the electors shall be the same, from time to time, as those of the electors, in the several States; of the most numerous branch of their own legislatures.

Had that proposal of the Committee of Detail actually been adopted by the founding fathers, it would have been very clear that the State qualifications would control in Federal elections, and I would admit that we could not pass the pending bill because it would be branded unconstitutional. Mr. Madison states that in the discussions of that proposal of the Committee of Detail Gouverneur Morris advanced serious objection. Madison reports him as making the following statement:

> Another objection against the clause, as it stands, is that it makes the qualifications of the National Legislature depend on the will of the States, which he thought not proper.

The proposal of the committee on detail was not accepted.

Finally and conclusively the Convention on June 21, 1787, flatly rejected another proposition that would have placed the qualifications of voters exclusively within the discretion of the State legislatures. On that date, for example, Pinckney moved:

> That the first branch instead of being elected by the people should be elected in such manner as the legislature of each State should direct.

Hamilton opposed that; Wilson opposed it; King opposed it with these words——

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Just a moment.

King objected. He said that he—

> supposed the legislatures would constantly choose men subservient to their own views, as contrasted to the general interest, and that they might even devise modes of election that would be subversive of the end in view. He remarked several instances in which the views of a State might be at variance with those of the General Government.

Finally that proposal was also turned down, and we find that the constitutional fathers adopted the proposal as we now find it in article I, section 2, of the Constitution. It was the result of a compromise, but it was adopted, also, be it remembered, only after the fathers had agreed to put into the Constitution article I, section 4, which provides as follows:

> The time, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senators.

So when we consider the Constitution in toto and particularly those two clauses, we cannot escape coming to the conclusion that there was a direct limitation placed upon the States as to voting in Federal elections for Members of Congress and the Senate.

Much has been made in the debates as to the meaning of the words "manner of holding elections," as contained in article I, section 4. It has been argued that they should be restricted to the mechanics of election, and that they cannot apply to the substance thereof nor to the qualifications of electors. This view is totally unacceptable in the light of the history of article I, section 2, as I have given it. It was never the intention of the founding fathers to give to the National Government the right only to tinker with the mechanics of election, and at the same time leave within the discretion of the States complete power over the substance of elections of Representatives and Senators. If that were the case, we could readily charge that the fathers were rather short-sighted.

In the Newberry case, Justices Pitney and Brandeis held that the words "manner of holding elections" goes to the whole procedure and essence and not merely the form of conducting elections.

Finally, if there was any question that the founding fathers did not intend to surrender completely to the States the fundamental democratic power of determining the qualifications of voters, it is erased by the plain language of article I, section 8, subsection 18:

> The Congress shall have power * * * to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution * * * all * * * powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States.

Since the requirement of a payment of poll tax before voting is an abridgment of the right to vote, and many are thus disenfranchised, there is denial of the constitutional right of "equal protection under the law." With reference to the denial of that right visited particularly upon Negroes, there is a violation of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution. Finally there is a denial of a republican form of government. Any kind of property qualification is a denial of that form of government. In fact, the rich may not need the vote. To the poor, the vote is the greatest weapon of assurance of rights. Payment of money is a property tax.

Such matter of poll taxes existed in the Northern States many years ago. They have been since discarded. It is interesting to note that Tennessee is about to discard completely its imposition of the poll tax.

We boast of universal suffrage. That boast is hollow when tens of thousands are disenfranchised by the payment of poll taxes as a condition precedent to voting.

The compliance of such condition may be an effective method of collection of the tax. That poll-tax payment can be no excuse for its existence as a qualification for voting.

Frankly, I fail to see how payment of a tax can be considered a qualification. It is really a restriction on voting. It is unlike the literacy test, as in New York. That is a qualification.

In general, the poll tax does not apply to the deaf, blind, dumb, and incapacitated. They are exempt. The so-called qualification is thus inapplicable to them. If it is a qualification, it must apply to all. Otherwise the imposition of the tax is discriminatory. Since the poll tax in seven States is discriminatory, Congress has the right under article I, sections 2 and 4, of the Constitution to intervene and prevent discrimination.

In Mississippi the highest court of that State has declared that the tax—poll tax—is intended there as "a clog on the suffrage" (*Ratcliffe* v. *Beale* (20 So. 868)).

See page 37, hearings on anti-poll-tax bill before the Senate Judiciary Committee, where we read:

A reliable witness from Alabama reported that after the poll-tax provisions had been safely enacted in that State that they were intended to bring about the ultimate disenfranchisement of voters. (F. G. Gaffey, Suffrage Limitations in the South, Political Science Quarterly, March 1905.)

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, we have before us, as has been said by a number of speakers, one of the most serious pieces of legislation that has come to this House in many years. In spite of the suggestions that have been made that those of us who are for this measure were acting solely in a political capacity, I should like to preface my remarks by saying that there is such a thing as an American point of view; there is such a thing as a patriotic American desire to see America true to herself.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I cannot yield; I am sorry. I am quite aware that there may be criticism of many of us at future times when the constitutionality of bills is questioned. We will be accused of having tried to emasculate the Constitution and we will be accused of not having been faithful to our oath of office. But I must take that chance, Mr. Chairman. I am in the position where I propose to let the Supreme Court decide the constitutionality of this measure, if that becomes necessary.

Now I ask you to follow me in a rather different point of view from those that have been expressed: To my mind this issue is one that transcends every other issue we have had because it takes up the great problem that will face the world after this war—Race. Whatever we do is going to affect our children's children far more than most of the Members of this House appreciate. If we cannot change our attitude about race, we are going to bring upon the heads of our children or upon the heads of their children, a cataclysm that will make this present war pale in comparison.

Races are the result of biological changes brought about by climate, by food, and so forth. What is man? He is the product of his food, of the climate he is subjected to, he is the wind that blows through his nostrils, he is the result of sunlight or the dearth of it. Let us remember also that as a man thinketh, so is he.

Though this legislation affects a great many white people throughout certain sections of our country, the main problem, one most of our people are afraid to touch on frankly, is the problem of the Negro. I know something of this problem. I have worked with Negroes for many years. I have great respect for them. I know their weaknesses and they know that I know those weaknesses, and they honor me and respect me for my frank statement of what I consider them to be. I know also some of the weaknesses of my own kind. I hold no brief for the things the North did to the South after the Civil War, and I also hold no brief for the South that continues, in certain parts of her land, to live in a past that is dead or should be.

Let me remind you gentlemen that the so-called Negro problem is no longer a southern problem, but a national and an international one. In his transplanting to the harsh northern climate the Negro died in great numbers. But in a generation he has hardened and in the hardening of his body he has learned many things and he has developed in all phases of his being. You tell us of the North to keep out of your affairs. I beg to tell you what is self-evident to us: That they have become our affairs, too.

Perhaps because it is a new problem to us we approach it with different eyes from yours. What we see is that America cannot be less than herself once she awakens to the realization that freedom does not mean license and that license can be the keeping of others from sharing that freedom. Even at painful cost, America must be true to her own vision, to her own soul, to her responsibility to tomorrow's world. We talk so much of democracy, of freedom. Can we have either so long as great sections of our land withhold freedom? Is not such withholding just as real a form of license as any other? Might does not make right under the great laws of evolution.

You will never help the matter if you press them down. That just puts a whole lot more steam under the cover that you are trying to lock down and makes it all the more dangerous. Bitterness begets bitterness; intolerance produces intolerance.

I beg you to look at this thing from a very much larger point of view than you are inclined to. Look at it from the ageless, from the timeless experiences. Evolution has taken hold of one race after the other. It has taken hold of the Negro race. You people talk about making these people happy in the South. Happy? Happy when you cannot come here and you cannot go there. Is it happiness that a Negro from my district, being sent down under the draft to the South, is arrested because he goes down a certain street, taken in charge because he cannot go here and he cannot go there?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman 3 additional minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the time has come when the South must recognize that the North, also, has a right and the responsibility to strive to meet this great problem of races. It seems to me it is time when all Americans must recognize their responsibility to the world at large in connection with the whole problem of race. Who are we that we talk democracy and freedom if we permit freedom to be licensed? And what is the difference between the license which knocks somebody over the head in one way or does it in another? Is it freedom for one group to suppress and repress another group? I am not saying that the adjustment that lies ahead is going to be pleasant. I am not saying that the innocent are not going to have a very difficult time of it and that they will not carry a great deal of the burden, which they always have to do, but I am saying that until we face this whole problem of race from one end of this world to the other we are not facing life realistically and we are not facing the laws of God with any kind of humility, with any kind of good sense, or with any intelligence. And I plead with you to recognize the great laws of the Infinite far more than you are inclined to do. If we do not do so, Mr. Chairman, the laws of evolution are going to roll over us inevitably. We have a light to give to the world, but we must keep the light burning with decency and clarity and we must not be afraid to face the iniquities of our own souls frankly. We must be willing to take the results of what we have done and say, "We have been wrong here, right there, wrong there, and right here. Now let us clean it up and start again together."

That is all the Negro asks, to work together. He plays his part in the sun beside us, he is dying beside us, and he is dying with the flag of our country at his lips if he can get it. What do we do? Ah, we should be ashamed that we do so little. We draft him and send him out to his death, we expect his loyalty, his patriotism. Gentlemen I beg you to enlarge your vision and look at this from the broad aspect of a world which is a part of the universe of Almighty God.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the speakers who have preceded me that this is one of the most important questions which has come for a long time before this Congress. Especially is that

true when we consider the circumstances under which it comes. The country is at war. We have had poll-tax requirements for many years. That requirement is rapidly disappearing by State repeal.

I will say to my good friend who has just left the floor, that for a nation fighting for its life, which needs the strength that unity gives, this preachment on the part of people behind this bill that an able-bodied citizen is being abused and disfranchised because each voter by the action of the legislature of his State, or a provision in its constitution, is required to pay a dollar or two toward the expenses of his government before participating in the election of those who are to be its public officials, is a bad thing. Going over this country trying to arouse in the hearts of patriotic colored people in the country the notion that they are being abused, being mistreated, because they are required before voting to do exactly what their white neighbors are required to do, driving the lines of racial cleavage when every interest of the country requires that we stand in solidarity, is a bad thing. There may be good reasons for the abandonment of this tax, but it is not a good service in a democracy to establish the notion among any class of the able-bodied citizens that they are being abused if they are required to pay a little part of the expenses of maintaining their government.

There is another thing that makes this an important matter. I wonder if everybody in this country is not conscious of the danger resulting in this Nation from a concentration of power in Federal organizations? This is remarkable legislation at this time when we know that it is an open question in this struggle between democracy and bureaucracy as to which is to survive. In such a situation as that, without constitutional warrant, are we willing to take from the States, in which the hope of our democracy to survive is centered, this fundamental power incident to sovereignty and transfer it to the Federal Government—that one of the most important rights preserved to the States? Regardless of what may happen in the Senate or in the Supreme Court such an indication of willingness on the part of the House of Representatives to make this shift of power from the States to Washington would be mighty important now when we are on the pivot with the possibility of reestablishing democracy on the one side and the certainty of bureaucratic government on the other if we permit our States to be destroyed as the sovereign units of general government.

The language of the Constitution is plain. Its construction by those who participated in its formation is plain. The decisions of the Supreme Court all hold against the constitutionality of this bill, and yet it is here.

These are the applicable provisions of the Constitution:

Article I, section 2: The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Article I, section 4: The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

The time of holding the elections for Members of Congress, the place of holding such elections, and the manner in which they are to be held Congress may determine. That is provided by this latter section of the Constitution.

Mr. Madison and Mr. Hamilton wrote under the common title "Publius." In the Federalist of February 19, 1788, this appears under that title:

Who are to be the electors of the Federal Representatives?

They are to be the same who exercise the right in every State of electing the corresponding branch of the legislature of the State.

On February 8, 1788, in the Federalist, this appears written by either Madison or Hamilton or both, under their common pen name:

The first view to be taken of this part of the Government relates to the qualifications of the electors and the elected.

Those of the former are to be the same with those of the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of republican government. It was incumbent on the Convention, therefore, to define and establish this right in the Constitution. To have left it open for the occasional regulation of the Congress would have been improper for the reason just mentioned. To have submitted it to the legislative discretion of the States would have been improper for the same reason, and for the additional reason that it would have rendered too dependent on the State governments that branch of the Federal Government which ought to be dependent on the people alone. To have reduced the different qualifications in the different States to one uniform rule would probably have been as dissatisfactory to some of the States as it would have been difficult to the Convention. The provision made by the Convention appears, therefore, to be the best that lay within their option. It must be satisfactory to every State, because it is conformable to the standard already established, or which may be established by the State itself. It will be safe to the United States because, being fixed by the State constitutions, it is not alterable by the State governments, and it cannot be feared that the people of the States will alter this part of their constitutions in such a manner as to abridge the rights secured to them by the Federal Constitution.

Mr. King, of Massachusetts, served with Hamilton on the Committee on Style and this is what he says—volume 2, page 51, Elliot's Debates:

The power of control given by this section (art. I, sec. 4), extends to the manner of election, not to the qualifications of the electors.

The word "manner" is sought in this debate to be twisted into some sort of relationship to qualification.

Mr. Nicholas, of Virginia, a delegate to that State's convention—volume 3, page 8, Elliot's Debates—to the same effect says the following, and these were the people who helped to construct the document and the people who sat in the State conventions and passed on the question of whether or not it would be approved:

In this plan there is a fixed rule for determining the qualifications of electors, and that rule the most judicious that could possibly have been devised, because it refers to a criterion which cannot be changed. A qualification that gives a right to elect representatives for the State legislatures, gives also, by this Constitution, a right to choose representatives for the general government. As the qualifications of electors are different in the different States, no particular qualifications, uniform through the States, would have been politic, as it would have caused a great inequality in the electors, resulting from the situation and circumstances of the respective States. Uniformity of qualifications would greatly affect the yeomanry in the States, as it would either exclude from this inherent right some who are entitled to it by the laws of some States at present, or be extended so universally as to defeat the admirable end of the institution of representation.

In the North Carolina convention—volume 4, page 71, Elliot's Debates—Mr. Steele said:

The power over the manner of elections does not include that of saying who shall vote (that never left State control): the Constitution expressly says that the qualifications (are those) which entitle a man to vote for a State representative.

Mr. Davie, in the same convention—volume 4, page 61—said:

They may alter the manner of holding the election. * * * They cannot alter the nature of the elections; for it is established, as fundamental principles, that the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature shall elect the Federal representatives, * * * power is given to Congress, and extending only to the time of holding, the place of holding, and the manner of holding the elections. Is this not the plain, literal, and grammatical construction of the clause? Is it possible to put any other construction on it, without departing from the natural order, and without deviating from the general meaning of the words, and every rule of grammatical construction? Twist it, torture it, as you may, sir, it is impossible to fix a different sense upon it.

The ratification of the seventeenth amendment was the last expression of popular judgment as to what should be the qualification of electors. It was the identical arrangement as to the electors of the Members of the House of Representatives embodied in article I, section 2, of the Constitution. It is as follows:

The electors in each State—

Of Senators—

shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

With the clear, uninvolved language of the Constitution squarely against the construction which the proponents of this bill would have us accept, and with the clear-cut statements of such contemporaries as Madison and Hamilton, King, Nicholas, Steele, and Davie, which I have quoted, clearly against its constitutionality, this is a most remarkable proceeding, remarkable even if there were no pronouncements by the courts of the land against its constitutionality. Many times the shadow of this question

has come within the notice of the courts. Not once insofar as I know has the court indicated a belief in its constitutionality.

I direct consideration now to a clear-cut decision of the Supreme Court of the United States against the constitutionality of this bill with the identical question here indicated squarely before it. I refer to the case of *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277), a unanimous opinion, delivered by Mr. Justice Butler. The case arose in Georgia. I quote from the opinion:

A Georgia statute provides that there shall be levied and collected each year from every inhabitant of the State between the ages of 21 and 60 a poll tax of $1, but that the tax shall not be demanded from the blind or from females who do not register for voting (Georgia Code, 1933, sec. 92-108). The State constitution declares that to entitle a person to register and vote at any election he shall have paid all poll taxes that he may have had opportunity to pay agreeably to law (art. II, sec. 1, par. III; Code, sec. 2-603). The form of oath prescribed to qualify an elector contains a clause declaring compliance with that requirement (sec. 34-103). Tax collectors may not allow any person to register for voting unless satisfied that his poll t s have been paid (sec. 34-114). Appellant brought this suit in the superior court of Fulton County to have the clause of the constitution and the statutory provisions above-mentioned declared repugnant to various provisions of the Federal Constitution and to compel appellee to allow him to register for voting without payment of poll taxes. The court dismissed his petition. The State supreme court affirmed (183 Ga. 189; 188 S. E. 140).

The pertinent facts alleged in the petition are these: March 16, 1936, appellant, a white male citizen 28 years old, applied to appellee to register him for voting for federal and State officers at primary and general elections. He informed appellee he had neither made poll-tax returns nor paid any poll taxes and had not registered to vote because a receipt for poll taxes and an oath that he had paid them are prerequisites to registration. He demanded that appellee administer the oath, omitting the part declaring payment of poll taxes, and allow him to register. Appellee refused.

Appellant maintains that the provisions in question are repugnant to the equal protection clause and the privileges and immunities clause of the fourteenth amendment and to the nineteenth amendment.

You are all familiar with the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment and also with the nineteenth amendment, the woman's suffrage amendment:

1. He asserts that the law offends the rule of equality in that it extends only to persons between the ages of 21 and 60 and to women only if they register for voting and in that it makes payment a prerequisite to registration. He does not suggest that exemption of the blind is unreasonable.

Then follows some discussion of the history and nature of the poll tax, which I will omit, though very interesting and illuminuating and is of weight. I further quote from this opinion at page 281, as follows:

2. To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate. *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall. 162, 170 et seq.); *Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 651, 664-665); *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1, 37-38); *Guinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 347, 362). The privileges and immunities protected are only those that arise from the Constitution and laws of the United States and not those that spring from other sources (*Hamilton* v. *Regents* (293 U. S. 245, 261)).

Next the Court makes some analysis of the contention that this Georgia law violates the nineteenth amendment and holds—bottom page 283:

Its purpose is not to regulate the levy or collection of taxes. The construction for which appellant contends would make the amendment a limitation upon the power to tax. (Cites cases.) The payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting is a familiar and reasonable regulation long enforced in many States and for more than a century in Georgia.

The Supreme Court was then composed of Chief Justice Hughes and Associate Justices McReynolds, Brandeis, Sutherland, Butler, Stone, Roberts, Cardozo, and Black.

Since that decision this identical question, stripped of every detail which could possibly aid the most skilled expert in the art of confusing, reached the Supreme Court of the United States by application for a writ of certiorari. That case is *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (118 F. (2) 218). It was decided March 8, 1941, by the circuit court of appeals. On July 19, 1941, Senator PEPPER, of Florida, appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee in support of S. 1280, "a bill concerning the qualification of voters or electors within the meaning of section 2, article I, of the Constitution, making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or general election for national offices," the same subject matter as the bill here under discussion.

I quote from Senator PEPPER's statement found on page 7 of the Senate hearings:

In the Pirtle case the question was squarely presented as to whether or not the State could condition the right of a citizen to vote for a Congressman in an election, not the primary, but a special election called to elect a Member of the House of Representatives, because that citizen had not complied, or had failed to pay a poll tax, thus allowing him to vote. Notice that this was not for a State election nor any primary and that it was admitted that he had done everything to qualify but pay the poll tax.

Now, that is Senator PEPPER's explanation of the facts.

I continue to quote from Senator PEPPER, page 9, Senate hearing:

Behold the suggestion that the right to vote for a Member of Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, the Vice President, or the electors, is conditioned by the State upon such terms as the State wants to impose; that the right "is conferred by the State and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments" regarding race, color, or previous conditions of servitude and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate. * * *

So that in that case the Circuit Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, held that the State still had the right to condition the exercise of the franchise in any way it wanted to do so.

I continue to quote from the Senate committee hearings; this colloquy took place:

Senator O'MAHONEY. Was there any dissent in that case?

Senator PEPPER. No; it was a unanimous decision of three judges, and now it appears that there is a writ of certiorari pending before the Supreme Court relative to that case, and I venture to predict that that petition for certiorari will be granted, and I do not expect that decision to stand.

On the 13th day of October 1941, the Supreme Court of the United States, with the application of the writ of certiorari seeking to bring the questions involved in the Pirtle case before it, refused to grant the writ. It could not do otherwise.

Whatever may be the opinion of members of that Court with regard to the poll-tax qualification, it is their business to interpret the Constitution as it is written. As it is written the States cannot deprive a person of the right to vote on account of sex, because the Constitution has been amended. The Supreme Court so holds, of course. The States cannot deprive a person of the right to vote because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The Supreme Court so holds. The States cannot deprive a person of the right to vote for Members of Congress if he is qualified to vote under the laws of his State for the members of the most numerous branch of the legislature. The Supreme Court so holds.

By the decision in the *Classic Case* (313 U. S. 299) it was held that included in the rights secured by the Constitution are the rights of a qualified voter to have his physical opportunity to vote undisturbed and to have his vote counted, within the protection of sections 19 and 20 of the Federal Criminal Code.

The citizen is entitled to Federal protection as to the time of holding elections, the place of holding elections, and the manner in which elections are conducted, conditioned only that the voter is qualified to vote for a member of the most numerous branch of his own State legislature. Now it is contended that even though he may not be qualified to vote for a member of the most numerous branch of his own State legislature—that standard of qualification which is set up in the Constitution—Congress can get rid of that standard by making it unlawful. That seems to be on the theory that its enforcement would deprive the non-poll-tax payer of a Federal constitutional right which Congress would have the right to enforce by appropriate legislation.

Deleting from section 20 of the Criminal Code that part thereof made nonapplicable by the decision in the Classic case, it reads as follows:

Section 20 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., title 28, sec. 52):

"Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects, or causes to be subjected, any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the

Constitution and laws of the United States * * * shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

In other words, if this bill is constitutional, corrective legislation, from the standpoint of the proponents of this legislation, is already on the statute books. If a person has a constitutional right to vote without paying a poll tax, he is protected by existing law. Whatever constitutional rights the citizen has to vote without complying with the poll-tax requirement of a State have been protected. Furthermore, existing legislation covers the whole field of the citizen's constitutional rights.

Each time where in our governmental history before this effort it has been deemed advisable to establish a new limitation upon the power of States to control election qualifications it was recognized that it could not be done as here attempted, by act of Congress, but had to be done by the States themselves.

After the Supreme Court refused to disturb the circuit court's holding in the Pirtle case, the proponents fell back on the Classic case. But in the Classic case there was not involved one single question which could arise in a case testing the general constitutionality of this proposed legislation.

So we have this situation. We have the clear language of the Constitution and we have the interpretation of the men who helped to fashion the Constitution and the men who discussed it when the States ratified it. We have the philosophy of democratic government and we have the clear-cut decision of the Supreme Court holding that this proposed legislation is unconstitutional.

Now, let me make this observation, and I do this in all earnestness and seriousness. If you do succeed in breaking through the constitutional barrier, ignoring the interpretation made by the contemporaries of the Constitution, its practical interpretation and the decisions of the Supreme Court, and should secure judicial approval you would then have a situation under which there would be no effective restraint upon the power of Congress to fix the qualifications of those who vote. The power to fix it down is the power to fix it up. You would be putting into what is coming to be a great Federal bureaucracy the power to deny the States the right to control suffrage. They are the organizations that are close to the people.

This attack is being made upon the Constitution in the name of the poor man. I want to call to witness the history of the ages, that they are the sort of people who suffer most when constitutional government is destroyed.

Men and women of America, if we hold our Constitution in disrespect, the Constitution is doomed. You think it could not happen to us. How can we maintain constitutional government without a constitution? How can we maintain a constitution unless the people hold it in reverence and unless those who are charged with the solemn responsibility of guarding it, protect it? You think you have only a few States to deal with now. You think you are strong enough to do it now, because you have the might of votes now, but whenever the constitutional rights of the few are not respected, the time is not far distant when those who were strong at the moment will appeal in vain for the protection of the Constitution that they have destroyed. If the constitutional rights of the meanest persons are not maintained and protected, the constitutional rights of the best are not safe.

That is true. The men who fashioned this Constitution and who read deeply into the mysteries of life knew that there would come a time when the institutions of freedom would be imperiled. They did the best they could. They required that before we entered this Chamber we pledge ourselves by our solemn plight that we will defend the Constitution. Now is the time and this is the hour.

Mr. Chairman, I look over my country. I see the picture in the world today. I recognize that my country, perhaps, stands as the last great independent constitutional government in the world. I see a time that has come now in the history of my country when the Constitution is no longer revered among the people—not much. I wonder, too, if your Nation and my Nation is to be added to the list of those from which freedom has departed. It departs with the departure of constitutional government.

I know from all that I have been able to learn that freedom cannot endure among any people who do not have fundamental laws that hold them true to the course of that destiny against the pressure of expediency and the whim of the moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Let me call your attention to another thing: The statement that is being made that these poll-tax laws are a disfranchisement of the colored people of this country I say to you is a reflection upon the colored people themselves because it is a statement that these millions of colored people cannot or will not contribute a dollar or two in the course of a year to the maintenance of their State governments. They say that this requirement that each person, white or colored, shall pay say a dollar and a half or two dollars to maintain the free schools of this country, disfranchises them. That is bad talk. That is not true. It is not calculated to develop self-respect, a sense of responsibility, a pride of citizenship, a fitness to be a citizen in a great democracy, anxious to pay something, however small, for the maintenance of his government. A democracy is simply a group of people who get together to operate a system of self-government, somewhat like a club or a lodge. There is some expense about it. If we are going to maintain a democracy in this country, we have to maintain it by people who have some self-respect and willingness to pay something. I doubt that an individual who is not willing to pay a dollar and a half or two dollars in the course of a year to maintain the government where his children are educated, and where he gets police protection, and so forth, is quite fit to be a citizen in a free democracy, white or black. I know this is not in line with the style of these times when we have armies of people running around over this country doing their best to make us a nation of panhandlers. It is not a good thing for any able-bodied person to get a free governmental ride. Paying a little something is good for him, even if the Government does not need it.

The States are abolishing this particular tax. There may be good reason why that tax ought to be abolished, but that reason is not because each citizen, before he may sit in the council of the Nation, is required to make some contribution to the Government. It makes a better citizen of him.

It is less difficult for me, and I am not strutting my courage, I do not want to be offensive, but I have examined our drift in this country. I believe I know what is happening to our democracy. I am sure we must decentralize governmental powers, reestablish our States, or be governed by a great Federal bureaucracy. We have a chance now; none too good a chance, but there seems to be coming up from the body of the American people that thing which Mr. Wilson said he saw as he examined history.

May I quote what he said:

> When I look back on the processes of history, when I survey the genesis of America, I see this written over every page: That the nations are renewed from the bottom, not from the top; that the genius which springs up from the ranks of unknown men is the genius which renews the youth and energy of the people. Everything I know about history, every bit of experience and observation that has contributed to my thought, has confirmed me in the conviction that the real wisdom of human life is compounded out of the experiences of ordinary men. The utility, the vitality, the fruitage of life does not come from the top to the bottom; it comes, like the natural growth of a great tree, from the soil, up through the trunk into the branches to the foliage and the fruit. The great struggling unknown masses of the men who are at the base of everything are the dynamic force that is lifting the levels of society.

Are we doing our part to help this movement? In which direction does this proposed legislation move? That is the question that is involved in this matter.

Think of a Member of Congress who comes up from a State, elected by the people of a State, who want to transfer this power of theirs to a great Federal bureaucracy. We do not know what is going on in this great Federal Government now. There is not a man or woman here now who knows what is going on in it. It is too big. There is too much governmental power here now. This is not just dealing with the poll tax, this is an attempt to establish a principle and a policy of government under which the Federal Government takes charge of the qualification of the voters in this country. Are you willing to do it?

As I see it, we are going the only route which we could go and effect the destruction of our democracy. I do not mean it is intended, but the operation of the laws of cause and effect is not controlled by intentions. The conviction that we are moving toward disaster for our democracy impels me to say these things on

this occasion, which I wish I could avoid without the sacrifice of duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, on one other occasion I have addressed this House since becoming a Member. The reason for doing that at that time was that I knew the person involved and I believed that I knew more about the subject matter than any other man in this assembly.

I am standing before you once again believing that I know more about what is the real ground of this subject matter than any man in this assembly.

I am a Negro. I am an American. I was born in Georgia. Down my way when I was a boy public schools were opened only about 3 or 4 months out of the year—when they did not need the kids in the fields. I had to go to a missionary school, a pay school, in order to obtain the fundamentals of learning. My mother and grandmother worked and slaved to pay the necessary fee that I might get an education such as that school afforded. I went from there to college, and I paid my way by working on the railroads and in the hotels.

I say that I, like thousands of other American Negroes, took advantage of all opportunities that were offered, whether freely given or whether they had to be paid for, to try to get into position to be all that an American citizen should be in spirit, in mind, and in thought.

I can stand here before you now in this fifty-seventh year of my life and tell you that I do not believe that in all America there are those who have a deeper love and appreciation for the country of their birth than does the American Negro.

Why should we put a school tax on a man's right to vote? Let us be honest about this thing. This Congress is not going to become a bureaucracy because it undertakes to make the Constitution a living thing. You know that that same Constitution meant to give every citizen in this country the right to vote. You know that. You know that any method used to try to keep a citizen from exercising that right is against the true spirit of the Constitution of the United States. You know that.

I am a lawyer, but I shall not attempt to argue the constitutionality of this question because I know that the shelves are full of lawbooks where those steeped in the knowledge of the law have differed over what is constitutional or what is not constitutional. I will leave that matter to the Supreme Court to decide. I want to talk to you about the human side of this thing.

A democracy is that government that exists by the consent of the governed, and that is the thing we are trying to do here today—to give certain citizens the right to say who shall govern them. As I look over this body, I believe that after this law will have been passed the same men who are here now will return here, because I believe they will face that situation and with the milk of human kindness in their hearts and understanding in their minds will gain the confidence of their voters wherever they may be. In the cause of the 13,000,000 patriotic and loyal Negro citizens I beseech the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank those in charge of yielding time on this measure for kindly extending to me the allotment just granted. I deeply appreciate this courtesy. Directing your attention to the measure which is now before the House, H. R. 7, which is commonly referred to as the anti-poll-tax measure, I wish to say that this bill presents a question of the construction of our Constitution—and especially is this important since those of the opposition have laid particular stress upon the contention that this measure is unconstitutional. I, however, take issue with all those who declare this pending measure to be in conflict with our Federal Constitution—because to my mind there are at least three specific provisions of our Constitution which give both vigor and life to this pending bill under its provisions, and which undoubtedly assure the constitutionality of this proposed legislation. I refer to the fourteenth amendment, to article I, section 4, and to article I, section 2, of our Federal Constitution.

Under the fourteenth amendment to our Constitution, we find the provision that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States"; and this amendment further extends that protection to all citizens of the United States by the further provision "nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." There can certainly be no doubt of the full protection of "all citizens" under that amendment. It is my opinion that the pending measure is afforded full constitutional protection under this amendment, and that the proposed legislation comes squarely within the provisions of our fundamental and organic law.

The second provision of our Constitution, to which I have referred, is article I, section 4, which refers to the time, place, and manner of holding elections, all of which shall be "prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof." And, the third constitutional provision, to which I have directed your attention, is article I, section 2, which commands that Congressmen shall be chosen by the people of the several States by electors the qualifications of which it prescribes.

Mr. Chairman, under the pending bill, by its very terms and provisions, it is sought to outlaw the requirement that poll tax be paid by the citizens as a prerequisite to voting for Federal officers. This is a very important matter, and this legislation should command the very careful attention of every Member of the House of Representatives. We have before us the question as to whether or not certain of our citizens, who have not paid their poll tax, in those States where that payment is required before the citizen has the right to vote, can be deprived of the right of voting, in that manner, under our Constitution? That is the precise question that is to be determined by the pending measure.

In those States in which a provision of law exists which prohibits any citizen from voting at any election at which Federal officers are to be chosen, unless conclusive evidence is furnished by which it is shown that such citizen has paid his or her poll tax has, undoubtedly, prevented many citizens and voters—all of whom were qualified voters in every other respect—from casting their votes at such elections. Therefore, this measure directly affects the right of the people—the common people—to participate in our governmental affairs. Many people in our Nation who are honest, sincere, and patriotic Americans—who are facing the eternal struggle to earn their livelihood and to support those who are dependent upon them for support—yet, if they have failed to pay their poll tax, either by reason of their inability, or by inadvertence, in the amount assessed against them, then they are denied that inherent right of an American citizen to cast their vote on election day.

Mr. Chairman, we have ever looked upon our elections in the same light of their reference—that they are free and equal among our citizens. The right of franchise is a natural one, and it is respected as an inherent right in all of our people who have reached the required age and who have attained their residence at a fixed place for the required length of time. The age and the length of residence constitutes the legal requirements of the voters. These determine the qualifications of the voter to vote. Any other rule or regulation imposed by any State is only a matter respecting the manner or method of holding an election. Those States which have sought to add additional regulations which upon their face are strong evidence of the fact that the same is intended as a bar against certain classes or individuals exercising their right to vote, and the same operates as a discrimination against those citizens and classes of our citizens who, by reason of misfortune or inability, are unable to comply with the stringent requirements imposed. Such a policy should not obtain in this country in elections in which Federal officers are to be voted upon and elected. All elections should be entirely free and equal, and no elector or class of electors should be required to suffer the penalty of losing his or her vote for Federal officers because they have not been able to pay their poll tax.

Let us pursue this argument further, and let us analyze the length to which this policy may be extended. If a State may legally require the payment of poll tax as a prerequisite to voting for Federal officers, then many other abridgements might be imposed—the requirement that one belong to a certain church or lodge or that he or she be identified

as following a certain and specific avocation might be established as a prerequisite to voting for Federal officers.

No one will seriously contend that any such abridgements would be countenanced by our Federal Government, although there is no constitutional prohibition which directly prevents it. We are at a loss to know why the poll tax was selected as the barrier which stands between the citizen and the right to vote. May I say that it might as well have embraced the payment of all taxes; or it might have been predicated upon the payment of all personal property taxes; or, perhaps, to the payment of all taxes assessed against the real estate owned by that certain person. I am very confident no one will make any attempt to justify either, or any, of the latter suggestions as a basis upon which to predicate the right to vote only when the same are fully paid and discharged. If those suggestions cannot be justified, then, pray tell me, how can anyone justify the requirement that all poll taxes be paid before the citizen can be considered as a legal voter for Federal officers in elections? And, pray tell me where the line of demarcation will be drawn, and what abridgements, if any, could be established in such cases which would meet the positive pronouncements of the Constitution? If the prerequisite to voting can be predicated upon the payment of the poll tax, then there is no limit to which that barrier or requirement may be extended. Such a prerequisite was never in contemplation under our Constitution, and that is certainly not the proper construction to be placed upon our Constitution now.

Mr. Chairman, the case of *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299), decided on May 28, 1941, is directly in point on the question here presented. It is claimed by some of our Members that this proposed measure is unconstitutional, because it would be an impingement upon the right of the several States to fix the qualifications of electors. The distinction comes at this point—and may I urge that the payment of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting is certainly not a qualification of a voter. That certainly, at most, is merely a regulation respecting the method and manner of holding elections. When the voter has attained the age, as fixed, and the length of residence as required, then he or she is a legal voter. Any other requirement can relate only to the method or manner of holding elections; that is merely a regulation which points out those whose ballots are entitled to be placed in the ballot box at the voting place. The age and residence fully determines the qualifications of all voters, if they are citizens of this country.

Mr. Chairman, in the Classic case, above cited, the Court says:

> Section 2 of article 1 commands that Congressmen shall be chosen by the people of the several States by electors, the qualifications of which it prescribes.

That language is certainly conclusive. There is no doubt remaining. The Federal Constitution prescribes the qualifications of Federal electors.

And in that same case—United States against Classic, supra—the Court holds both decisively and finally that—

> The right of the people to choose * * * is a right established and guaranteed by the Constitution.

This being true, Mr. Chairman, we must inevitably conclude that it is "a privilege or immunity of citizens of the United States" within the meaning of the first section of the fourteenth amendment, and, as such, under the fifth section thereof—

> Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article, including abridgements of privileges * * * of citizens of the United States.

This language is both strong and positive. No doubt can remain after reading that language. This language certainly distinguishes the cases of *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277, decided in 1937), and *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (118 Fed. (2d) 218, C. C. A. 6, 1941). Thus, we are confronted with the law as it is—that the State cannot abridge the right or privilege of citizens of the United States to exercise the right of franchise in Federal elections.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is my firm conviction that H. R. 7, which is now pending before the House, is wholly within the provisions of the Constitution, and that the same is constitutional, and that this measure should be enacted into law. We must remember as we ponder over this measure that our people who are qualified voters by reason of age and residence should not have the right of franchise taken away from them to vote for Federal officers by the unauthorized action of any State. It is my hope that this measure will be passed by the House, and that the right to vote for Federal officers at our elections will not be limited or abridged by the State in its efforts to place added regulations regarding the method and manner of holding elections. Let our elections be forever free and equal among all of our citizens.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, this is not a race question we are trying to settle today, but one far more important and far reaching in its objective. If it were a race question, as some would have us believe, it would affect only about 10,000,000 people, which approximately represents the colored population in the United States. However, it is a question in which the security of 130,000,000 people, the population of the entire United States, is involved. It is a question which goes to the very heart and core of our constitutional and representative system of Government provided for by the people of the Thirteen Original States when they ratified the Constitution establishing our dual system of government, one generally referred to as the Federal Government and the other known as the State system of government. I am sure that any student of political history knows that in ratifying the Constitution the people intended to grant the Federal Government with delegated powers and stated definitely within the Constitution that powers not delegated therein to the three coordinate departments of government were definitely reserved to the several States and the people.

One of the powers reserved was that the States would retain the right to determine and fix the qualifications of electors by the States themselves and not until last year when this body undertook to pass what is known as an anti-poll-tax bill that the right referred to was ever questioned. Should this bill, which undertakes to deprive the States of the right to fix the qualifications of electors be enacted and become a law, it will mean the hasty disintegration of our constitutional and democratic system of government and I cannot believe but that there are only a few Members who would welcome the transition. However, in view of the action taken on yesterday by the House of Representatives it is purely and solely a political movement coupled with the hope that it may never become law; yet if the Senate, the Chief Executive, and the Supreme Court should be similarly motivated in their actions if an opportunity were afforded the crime of murdering or destroying the Constitution will have been consummated.

I am quite certain that no argument that I or anyone else might make would obviate the action that this body will take today and my primary purpose in requesting this time is not to argue the question in any great detail, but that I might disabuse to some extent the unprejudiced mind which unfortunately has allowed itself to be influenced and guided by misinformation and propaganda so adroitly disseminated within the last few years.

We were very much disturbed a few weeks ago upon reading press accounts purporting to be the result of a survey made among college students throughout the country showing the lack of information among such students in respect to the history of the United States, but as I listened to the speeches on this subject today I am not greatly alarmed over the college students' ignorance of history, because this is not a difficult subject, and these college boys will have plenty of time to fully advise themselves from the time they finish college until they get to Congress, where they will be able to demonstrate as much familiarity with the political history of our country as has been displayed here this afternoon. It has been suggested by several speakers that the poll-tax law in some of the States was designed and enacted primarily for the purpose of disfranchising the colored man. Those of you who are familiar with United States history know that for 10 years after the Civil War my home State, the State of South Carolina, along with a number of others, was under military rule. Martial law prevailed. During that time the colored people and their political friends, whom we often refer to as carpetbaggers and scalawags, had control

of the State legislature. Now, in 1868 they adopted and ratified a constitution, and for the benefit of those who may be in the same grade of the college students referred to in the survey to which I have alluded, I desire to read article IX, section 2 of that constitution. It is as follows:

The general assembly may provide annually for a poll tax not to exceed $1 on each poll, which shall be applied exclusively to the public-school fund, and no additional poll tax shall be levied by any municipal corporation.

That constitution was prepared, adopted, and ratified by the colored people of my State and not by people who wanted to deprive them of their right of suffrage, as has been alleged here this afternoon.

They did not stop there because they had control of the legislature for 8 years after that, and I am still referring to the colored people and their professed political friends. In 1873 they passed a law providing that it would be unlawful for any one to refuse to pay a poll tax, and if after he failed and refused to pay the tax, white or black, he could be arraigned before a commissioner and found guilty of a misdemeanor and sentenced to jail for a term of not less than 10 days.

This was the first time in the history of that Commonwealth that the State legislature enacted a law levying a tax and making it a criminal offense not to pay it.

For the benefit of those who claim to be familiar and greatly interested in the solution and correction of the illegal and unlawful imposition of the poll-tax law on the colored people in my State I want to quote this statute found on page 357 of a publication obtained from the Congressional Library entitled "South Carolina Laws 1872–1873," purporting to record the "acts and joint resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina passed at the regular session of 1872–73. Printed by order of the general assembly, and designed to form a part of the fifteenth volume of the Statutes at Large, commencing with the acts of 1871–72, Columbia, S. C., by Republican Printing Co., State printers, 1873. The statute explains itself. It is as follows:

TO ENFORCE THE PAYMENT OF THE POLL TAX

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, now met and sitting in general assembly, and by the authority of the same, that there shall be assessed on all taxable polls in the State an annual tax of $1 on each poll, the proceeds of which shall be applied to educational purposes; and if any person shall refuse or neglect to pay said tax, before the expiration of the time fixed for the payment of all taxes, the county treasurer shall, within 20 days thereafter, furnish a list of all delinquent polls to the county commissioners of the county. Where the persons so taxed and delinquent have no property to be distrained for the payment of said poll tax, as authorized in the act providing for the assessment and taxation of property, approved September 15, 1868, the person or persons so delinquent shall be subject to a penalty of double the amount of their poll tax; and on failing to pay the same, when notified of the fact, within 10 days after such notice, such person or persons shall be required to work upon the highway or roads, in their respective counties; as the county commissioners may direct, not exceeding 3 days.

SEC. 2. That said county commissioners shall, after receiving the delinquent poll lists, summon such delinquents to appear at their office and then and there give them the opportunity to pay the double tax; and, on failing to do so, such delinquents shall be required to work upon the highways and roads of their respective counties as the county commissioners may direct; and if the said delinquents, being personally warned by the said commissioners, or by written notice, served at their place of residence, shall refuse or neglect, having had 10 days' notice, to attend by themselves, or substitutes equally able to perform said duties as themselves, or to pay the double tax in lieu of said duties, or, having attended themselves, shall refuse to conform to the requirements of this act, or obey the directions of the county commissioners, they shall be considered guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, be imprisoned for the same, in a county jail, for a term not less than 10 days (Public Law 287 A. D. 1873).

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in reading the law and giving the source of my authority is to prove to the unprejudiced mind that the poll-tax law in my State was not enacted by that class of people referred to here today as the oppressor of the colored man, saying that we enacted a law primarily for the purpose of disfranchising him and then requiring him to present a poll-tax receipt in an election before he is allowed to vote.

I listened with a great deal of interest to the gentlewoman from Ohio when she attempted to revile those of us who happened to be from the South and to admonish us what we should do, to which I will not attempt to make reply. I prefer to follow the example of Him, "who, when he was reviled, reviled not again."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH].

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration would make it unlawful for any State, municipality, or other governmental subdivision to require payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting at a Federal election. This proposal is clearly an invasion and violation of the rights of the sovereign States. It violates and is in direct conflict with article I, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States, which reads:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The right of suffrage is a privilege granted by the States. Each State has the constitutional authority to prescribe the qualifications of voters. These qualifications may include limitations as to age, residence, tax payments, and citizenship. Tests as to literacy and education may also be prescribed. Poll taxes are levied in many States and as a requisite for voting in seven. In Virginia the revenue derived from this tax is used for educational purposes.

The United States Supreme Court has held that the poll-tax requirement is not in violation of the Constitution and as late as 1937 specifically held that the privilege of voting is not derived from the United States but is conferred by the States. The proponents of this legislation are wrong in advocating a Federal statute to abolish the poll-tax requirement.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 22, 1942, there was inserted an able argument by the Honorable Abram P. Staples, the attorney general of Virginia, in opposition to the proposal to abolish State poll taxes. Mr. Staples was invited to discuss the constitutional power of Congress to enact legislation of this kind. Because of the transcending importance of the question and its vital effect upon the integrity and even continued existence of the governments of the States as established by the Constitution, Mr. Staples felt it his duty to undertake to maintain the following propositions:

First. The Constitution reserves in the States the exclusive power to determine the manner of choosing its electors to vote for President or Vice President of the United States and confers no power whatever on Congress to legislate on this subject.

Second. Article I, section 2, of the Constitution, and the seventeenth amendment, reserve unto the States the exclusive power to prescribe the qualifications of the electors for Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, and this power is in no way modified or impaired by the power delegated to Congress by article I, section 4, to regulate the time, place, and manner of holding elections.

Third. The requirement of the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to the right to vote is a qualification of an elector within the meaning of article I, section 2, of the Constitution and of the seventeenth amendment.

Fourth. Even if the requirement of the payment of a poll tax be deemed not to be a qualification of electors it is nevertheless a proper exercise of the reserved powers of the States over suffrage, as well as of the taxing powers of the States.

Fifth. The Constitution protects the right to vote of only those who are qualified to vote under State statutes.

Sixth. Whether a State has exercised its constitutional power to prescribe the qualifications of electors in an unconstitutional manner so as to deprive citizens of rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution is a judicial question, and is for the courts, not the Congress, to determine.

The foregoing propositions were clearly discussed by Mr. Staples in the order set out and I earnestly invite my colleagues to read his able and convincing argument which, as stated, is in the Appendix of the RECORD of September 22, 1942. He concluded his argument with the following:

The Constitution has not delegated to Congress any regulatory power whatever over suffrage requirements prescribed by the States. The courts possess ample power to protect against any denial of constitutional rights which might result from voting qualifications

or conditions which the States may impose. The proposed bill is clearly unconstitutional.

There is no race discrimination in Virginia by reason of the poll-tax requirement. No person is disfranchised by the levy. All persons must meet other requirements before becoming eligible to vote. Such requirements obtain in States other than poll-tax States. The payment of a poll tax as prerequisite to vote is as legal as the requirement that a prospective voter must pass a literacy test. No one is advocating the abolishment of the literacy test in such States where same is required. The payment of $1.50 is no serious obstacle to anyone who wishes to exercise the solemn right of franchise.

Each State and locality has its peculiar problems. The Federal Government should not interfere in matters of this kind when it is plain that the question of States' rights is involved. This is a flagrant infringement on the rights of the States.

Unity is greatly desired in this critical period. It is imperative that we have unity. Let us handle this matter in an orderly manner and pursuant to constitutional procedure.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, it is generally conceded that voting is a State function; that suffrage is not a matter of right, but a privilege to be conferred by the States. In Federal elections qualifications of voters for Members of Congress are in article 1, section 2, of the Constitution. They are the qualifications for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Those qualifications are to be prescribed by the State, but it is said under article 1, section 4, where Senators are mentioned, although not referred to in article 1, section 2, that under the power to regulate the time and place and manner of choosing Senators and Representatives, the Congress reserved the power, under the term "regulation," to prescribe qualifications.

I assert that if that argument were true, for 123 years the Congress would have had the power to prescribe qualifications of members of the State legislatures, or electors for members of the State legislatures, who voted for United States Senators. It never undertook to exercise any such power. It thus admitted it had no such power. It must follow that Congress has no such power as to voters for Representatives.

Among the qualifications for voting are sex, residence, age, taxes, including poll taxes. It has been said that, under the Classic case, for the first time the Supreme Court of the United States has indicated that it would go into the matter of the qualifications of voters. That case involved a primary election on the facts in that case. That case decided that under the necessary and proper clauses of the Constitution, under the clause of the Constitution guaranteeing a republican form of government, the Federal Government would protect a citizen in the exercise of his right to vote for Representatives.

I call attention to this language in the Classic case:

> Obviously included within the right to choose secured by the Constitution is the right of qualified voters within a State to cast their ballots, and have them counted in congressional elections.

There was no question of the qualifications of voters involved. It was a question there whether a man who is qualified would be permitted to cast his vote.

The Supreme Court has decided that State poll taxes are not unconstitutional. In 1937 the Supreme Court of the United States in the Breedlove case upheld the validity of a statute requiring the payment of a poll tax to vote in a Federal election. After the Classic case the Supreme Court of the United States, as constituted at present, in the Pirtle case, involving the poll tax in a Federal election refused a writ of certiorari, thus upholding the doctrine in the Breedlove case, to wit, that the qualifications of voters in senatorial and congressional elections is a matter for the States.

The bill under consideration undertakes to say that that which has been deemed to be a qualification from time immemorial, to wit, the payment of a poll tax, shall not be a qualification. It is admitted, therefore, that section 4 of article 1 does not apply. The bill admits that poll taxes are a qualification, and under the guise of denominating the payment of a poll tax a hindrance, the advocates of the pending bill are hard pressed to declare that payment of taxes, that sex, that age are in the same category as fraud, intimidation, and corruption. We cannot make white black by calling it so.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we took an oath to support the Constitution. If we believe that a bill is unconstitutional we should oppose it. We cannot salve our conscience by saying, "We will pass it up to the Supreme Court." The Congress of the United States has held that only by constitutional amendment can qualifications of voters be changed. Sex was abolished as a qualification by the nineteenth amendment, and the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting can only be abolished by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The bill not only admits that poll taxes may be a qualification for voting by providing that such a requirement shall not be deemed a qualification, but the bill also provides that such a requirement shall be deemed an interference which is the equivalent of a pernicious activity. As stated, Congress has never undertaken to restrict or limit qualifications except by constitutional amendment. The fifteenth amendment provides that the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The nineteenth amendment prescribes that the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex.

In the pending bill the qualifications for voting in seven of the States are proscribed. If Congress can proscribe, then Congress can prescribe. If Congress can prescribe poll taxes in 7 of the States, then Congress can prescribe qualifications in all of the 48 States. The functions of the States with respect to suffrage would thus be abolished.

I revise my remarks by saying that the bill is in violation of the rights of the States. It is in violation of the Constitution of the United States which Members of Congress have sworn to uphold. We cannot discharge our obligations under our oaths by lightly passing by the unconstitutionality of the pending measure and saying that we leave that question to the Supreme Court. We cannot thus salve our consciences. We make sorry spectacles of ourselves when we ignore the question of constitutionality. Poll taxes, like sex, as a qualification for voting can only be abolished by an amendment to the Federal Constitution. They cannot be abolished as proposed by statute.

In the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, the House considered and passed H. R. 1024, known as the Geyer bill. At that time there was pending in the Senate S. 1280, known as the Pepper bill. The Geyer bill was amended by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, and as amended was reported to the Senate. The bill, however, was not passed by the Senate. The Judiciary Committee of the Senate substituted an entirely new bill for the Geyer bill. The pending bill, H. R. 7, is an exact copy of the substitute proposed by the Senate Judiciary Committee of the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, for the Geyer bill.

I made a number of speeches in the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, in opposition to the Geyer bill. In revising my remarks I can do no better than repeating substantially, word for word, the remarks I made when the Geyer bill was before the House on October 12, 1942. My argument in opposition to the Geyer bill applies with equal force in opposition to the pending bill. I spoke in opposition to the Federal control of elections on September 6, 1942, and July 23, 1942. I also spoke in opposition to Federal anti-poll-tax bills on October 13 and on June 8, 1942.

I call attention to the fact that the proponents have not attempted to submit any authorities in support of the validity of the bill. I opposed the rule, and I oppose the bill. I am gladly giving my reasons for my opposition. I shall confine myself to a discussion of the bill and shall undertake to demonstrate beyond a doubt that suffrage is a State function.

I shall call attention to the pertinent constitutional provisions, including provisions respecting Senators, Representatives, and Presidential electors. I shall show that qualifications can only be changed by constitutional amendment, as was done by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments. I shall show that the Classic case did not involve the qualification of voters. I shall emphasize that registration for voting is required in many States and that a small vote is no reason for the passage of the bill. I shall show in reason and upon authority that voting is a State privilege and that legislation changing or abolishing the

qualification of voters is not permissible under the Constitution.

I shall undertake to demonstrate that under the Constitution the qualification of voters for Senators and Representatives is in the States and that the anti-poll-tax bill is in violation of the right accorded to the States by the Federal Constitution. I shall further demonstrate that the poll tax is universally recognized as a qualification and that Congress is without power to provide that it shall not be requred as a requisite for voting.

I. SUFFRAGE A STATE FUNCTION

The whole subject of the regulation of elections, including the prescribing of qualifications for suffrage, is left by the National Constitution to the several States, except as it is provided by that instrument that the electors for Representatives in Congress shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and as the fifteenth amendment forbids denying to citizens the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Participation in the elective franchise is a privilege rather than a right, and it is granted or denied on the grounds of public policy. (Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, 8th ed., vol. 2, p. 1360.)

Suffrage is not a universal right but is a privilege to be extended or denied by the States. (Story's Commentaries on the Constitution, vol. 1, 5th ed., secs. 579-584.)

The privilege to vote is generally derived from the States. The right is not conferred but is protected by the Federal Constitution. The fourteenth amendment does not have the effect of conferring such rights.

Subject to the limitation contained in the fifteenth amendment of the Constitution, the power to fix qualifications of the voters is vested in the States. (McCrary's American Law of Elections, sec. 1.)

The right of suffrage is not a natural right nor it is an absolute unqualified personal right. (McCrary, sec. 3.)

The elective franchise is not a right, privilege, or immunity incident to citizenship. The Constitution left to the States the qualification of voters. (Paine Law of Elections, secs. 76 and 78.)

At the time of the adoption of the Constitution, all of the Thirteen Original States not only prescribed qualifications for voting, but they were jealous of the exclusive rights of the States as to suffrage. The qualifications, while similar, were by no means uniform. Among those generally required in the Thirteen Original States, as well as among the States today, are citizenship, residence, age, in some States the payment of taxes, and in many States, registration.

There was much debate in the Constitutional Convention as to the qualifications of the electors for Members of Congress. The members of the convention could not agree upon uniform qualifications for voters for Representatives in Congress and the matter of qualifications was, therefore, left to the States, with the restriction that Members of Congress should have the same qualifications required for those voting for Members of the most numerous branch of the Legislature.

The Constitution provided for the election of Members of Congress, and while the qualifications of electors was left to the States, Congress was given the power of making or altering the regulations as to the time, place, and manner of the election of Representatives and Senators, with no power to change the places of choosing Senators. Such power was essential to enable Congress to function or to exist, or to exercise the powers that had been conferred upon it.

A compromise was adopted at the convention. The supreme power of the States in suffrage was recognized by Congress, and to guarantee that the qualified electors would be protected in their voting and Congress was given power to alter or change the time, place, and manner of elections.

II. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Article I, section 2, is as follows:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

There is common consent and agreement that the States have the right to prescribe the qualifications requisite for electors of Members of Congress, but it is maintained that the poll tax is not a qualification but a regulation.

Article I, section 4, is as follows:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

By some it is maintained that poll taxes are a restriction or condition or regulation and not a qualification. It is maintained, therefore, that Congress may eliminate poll taxes. It is asserted by others that poll taxes are a pernicious activity and that they may be eliminated by act of Congress under the guise of preventing pernicious political activity. Statutes preventing pernicious activities have been approved by Congress under section 4 in congressional elections, under the necessary and proper clause, and under the constitutional guaranty of a republican form of government.

Article I, section 8, clause 18, is:

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

Article IV, section 4, provides, among other things:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

There is a difference between fraud, corruption, ballot-box stuffing, and other pernicious practices and the qualifications of electors. Among the oldest of the qualifications in the mother countries and in the Colonies was ownership of property and payment of taxes. Tax and property qualifications obtained in varying degrees in all of the Colonies at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. The poll tax is probably the oldest of all taxes. Like many other taxes it may not be popular and it may be restrictive. Taxes, whether property taxes or poll taxes, have been the cause of uprisings and of revolutions. The poll tax or head tax was the cause of a peasant uprising in England under Wat Tyler in 1381, and taxation without representation was largely responsible for the Revolution.

It is a prostitution of language to say that a qualification of taxes, whether property or poll, shall now be declared to be a pernicious political activity. Fraud, intimidation, corruption, ballot-box stuffing are crimes. Taxes may be onerous—they may be unpopular—but they are not in the same category with pernicious political activities. The proponents are hard pressed when they now ask Congress to declare a tax that has obtained through the centuries to be a pernicious political activity. No better proof could be desired of the weakness and invalidity of the anti-poll-tax bill.

The Constitution was not only mindful of the rights of the States with respect to suffrage, and not only recognized these rights, but it recognized the rights of the State legislatures. The language in article I, section 4, "except as to the places of choosing Senators" is unique.

The Constitution left to the State legislatures the places for their meetings. The rights of the States were again safeguarded. (Story, vol. 1, sec. 828.)

The language giving to Congress the power to make or alter such regulations does not seem to have attracted much attention or to have encountered any opposition during the Convention, but the provision was assailed in the State conventions, and a majority of the Original Thirteen States tentatively proposed amendments to the effect that the Congress would not be authorized to make regulations unless the States failed or refused to provide the qualifications of electors or for the elections. It was finally agreed that Congress should have the regulation as provided in section 4 to provide for its preservation. The debates on this section are most informative.

Neither the members of the Convention or the Thirteen States in their ratifying conventions purported to take away entirely the alterative power of Congress, but proposed to restrict it to cases where a State neglected, refused, or was disabled to exercise the power of regulating elections. (Story, vol. 1, sec. 827.)

Mr. Madison, in commenting on article I, section 4, said, and I quote:

To give the National Legislature a power not only to alter the provisions of the States but to make regulations in case the States should fail or refuse altogether. (Fifth Elliot's Debates, 402.)

Madison's reasoning is easily explained. The States would not have ratified the Constitution if it had not been generally understood that the qualifications of electors would be the function of the States. In the Federalist, Hamilton said that the propriety of the clause in question rested, and I quote:

Upon the evidence of the plain proposition that every government should contain in itself the means of its own preservation.

In the ratifying conventions, as I have stated, a majority of the States proposed to limit the action of Congress to cases of neglect or refusal, but that proposal was abandoned upon the ground that

there would be no occasion for congressional interference so long as the States performed their duty.

In the Virginia Convention, Madison, who had kept a record of the debates in the Constitutional Convention, advocated the ratification of the Constitution. Alexander Hamilton, who really favored a more centralized government, is responsible for the ratification of the Constitution by New York. In all of the conventions, section 4 of article I was assailed. It was most bitterly attacked. Hamilton's interpretation leaves no room for doubt. I quote from him:

> Its authority would be expressly restricted to the regulation of the times, the places, and the manner of elections. The qualifications of the persons who may choose or be chosen, as has been remarked upon other occasions, are defined and fixed in the Constitution and are unalterable by the legislature. (The Federalist, LIX, LI.)

> The history of the times indicates beyond reasonable doubt that if the Constitution makers had claimed for this section the broad regulation for which some now contend, the Constitution would never have been ratified (Story on the Constitution, vol. 1, sec. 814, et seq.)

As Justice Field in his dissenting opinion pointed out in *Ex parte Clark* (100 U. S., p. 418), and I quote:

> And the regulations as to the manner of holding them cannot extend beyond the designation of the mode in which the will of the voters shall be expressed and ascertained.

Again I quote from the same page:

> The power does not authorize Congress to determine who shall participate in the elections or what shall be the qualifications of voters. These are matters not pertaining to or involved in the manner of holding the election, and their regulation rests exclusively with the States. The only restriction upon them with respect to these matters is found in the provision that the electors of Representatives in Congress shall have the qualifications required for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and the provision relating to the suffrage of the colored race. And whatever regulations Congress may prescribe as to the manner of holding the elections for Representatives must be so framed as to leave the election of State officers free.

The language employed in section 4 is simple and easy to understand. I quote from Chief Justice Fuller, in *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S., p. 27):

> The framers of the Constitution employed words in their natural sense and, where they are plain and clear, resort to collateral aids to interpretation is unnecessary and cannot be indulged in to narrow or enlarge the text; but where there is ambiguity or doubt or where two views may well be entertained, contemporaneous and subsequent practical construction are entitled to the greatest weight.

In all the 153 years of the history of the United States, Congress has never previously undertaken by statute to prescribe the qualifications of voters for Senators and Representatives. The seventeenth amendment provides for the election of Senators, but the same language with respect to the qualifications of electors that obtains in article I, section 2, is found in amendment XVII. I quote from amendment XVII:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

> There is a difference between manner and qualifications. Constitutional authority given to the legislature to prescribe the time and manner does not include the power to determine what shall constitute a legal voter (*Livesly* v. *Litchfield*, 83d Pac. 142; 47 Oreg. 248; 114 American State Repts. 920; Words and Phrases, vol. 26, p. 358).

Under article I, section 4, Congress has the right to make either new regulations or add to or modify State regulations. *Ex parte Seybold* (100 U. S., p. 371). This involved the enforcement acts passed May 31, 1870—Sixteenth United States Reports, page 144—and amended on July 14, 1870—Sixteenth United States Reports, page 254—and again amended on June 10, 1872—Seventeenth United States Reports, page 347. These acts relate to elections of Members of Congress and were passed to secure purity of elections and the right of citizens to vote without molestation.

Following the ratification of the Constitution, there was no effort on the part of Congress to regulate time, place, and manner of elections until 1842. Some States elected their Representatives in Congress by districts and others from the State at large. Some nominated by districts and elected all Members from the State at large. But uniformity with respect to elections was desired, and the act of 1842 (5 Stat., p. 491) provided for the election of Members of Congress by districts. It was not until after the War between the States and after the ratification of the fifteenth amendment that Congress undertook to pass regulations with respect to the time, places, and manner of electing Representatives. Congress had provided immediately following the War between the States, for uniformity of date as to the election of Senators (14 Stat., p. 243). I may remark in passing that after passing the seventeenth amendment Congress passed a temporary law that expired in 3 years for the election of Senators (38 Stat., p. 384). But when passions were high following the War between the States, with freedom for former slaves, the enforcement acts were passed to prevent fraud, corruption, ballot-box stuffing, and intimidation in connection with congressional elections. Temporarily the landmarks of the fathers were forgotten. There was strife, and, finally, on February 8, 1894 (28 Stat. 36), the enforcement acts were practically repealed, and Congress again left to the States, as it had for 80 years previous to the passage of the acts, not only the qualifications of voters for Members of Congress but the times, places, and manner of elections. Human nature is very much the same. The results in the Southern States were not what the advocates of the enforcement acts anticipated. There was reflex action. The same rules obtained in all of the States, and there was undesirable interference and intimidation with elections in other States than in the South, all of which resulted in the repeal of the enforcement acts, except the conspiracy sections, which remain.

These acts were based upon section 4 of article I. There was never any attempt to eliminate taxes, either poll or property, as all agreed Congress had no power to prevent the States levying taxes. There was never any attempt on the part of the Congress, when passions ran high following the War between the States, to prescribe qualifications for voters in congressional elections. The whole purpose was to guarantee that the legal and qualified voters in the several States should be protected in their right to vote. In its fundamental sense the privilege of suffrage is derived from the States, but the right of voting for Members of Congress is also found in the Constitution. Electors owe their right to vote to the Constitution, but the qualifications must be prescribed by the State (*Ex parte Yarbrough*, 100 U. S. 651; American Jurisprudence, vol. 18, p. 210).

No one disputes now that in State elections a poll tax may be required before the citizen can vote. While the requirement has been abandoned in many States, poll taxes and property taxes still remain, and these taxes obtain under the heading of qualifications. (American Jurisprudence (1938, vol. 18, p. 212, 226, 227, and 228.)) I may remark in passing that literacy, and the ability to read or understand the Constitution, are among the qualifications in many States, including Massachusetts and New York. If Congress can eliminate the qualification of the poll tax requirement, it can eliminate the qualification of literacy, or the educational qualifications.

Under section 4 of article I, Congress may make regulations as to the conduct of elections or may supplement the State regulations. It may impose additional penalties. Our legislative history from 1870 shows that except for a period of about 24 years it was the policy to leave regulations to the States for the first 80 years of the history of the Republic (*U. S.* v. *Mosely* (238 U. S., p. 383); *U. S.* v. *Gradwell* (243 U. S., p. 476); American Jurisprudence, vol. 18, p. 187).

The enforcement acts following the War between the States confined themselves to elections for Members of Congress. There was no reference to Presidential electors and there was a reason why Presidential electors were not included within the terms of the statute. The justification for the enforcement statutes was the regulation authorized by section 4 of article I. There was no such regulation authorized with respect to Presidential electors.

III. PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS

Article II, section 1, provides, and I quote:

> Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in Congress; but no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector.

The legislature appoints the electors. It may appoint them directly, as was done in the early history of the country, or it may provide for their election. The State legislature is vested with the power of appointment or election. It is significant that Congress was not authorized to make or change the regulations with re-

spect to the appointment of electors. Congress was authorized to determine the time of choosing the electors and the day on which they shall give their votes, which day shall be the same throughout the United States (art. II, sec. 4). Congress has passed an act to provide for the time of choosing electors. All of the States complied, including the State of Maine, but Congress did not undertake to regulate the manner of the election of Presidential electors. It did not undertake to supervise such elections. No such power is given to Congress with respect to electors. Hence, I repeat, the enforcement acts following the War between the States made no reference to Presidential or Vice Presidential elections, or the elections of Presidential and Vice Presidential electors. Under the Constitution the legislature of each State directed the manner of appointment of Presidential electors. It is significant that in the Constitution the power to regulate the appointment or election of Presidential electors is not given to Congress (*In Re Green*, 134 U. S. 377). The legislatures have exclusive power to direct the manner of Presidential elections (*McPherson* v. *Blacker*, 146 U. S., p. 1). I quote from the opinion by Chief Justice Fuller, on page 38:

> The fifteenth amendment exempted citizens of the United States from discrimination in the exercise of the elective franchise on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The right to vote in the States comes from the States, but the right of exemption from the prohibited discrimination comes from the United States. The first has not been granted or secured by the Constitution of the United States, but the last has been (*U. S.* v. *Cruikshank*, 92 U. S. 542; *U. S.* v. *Reese*, 92 U. S. 214).

As I have stated, in 1866 Congress provided for a uniform time for the election of Senators by the legislatures—Statutes at Large 14, page 243. But it is significant that Congress, in passing the statute for congressional elections, recognized the right of the States, and the act of Congress fixing the time for the election of Representatives distinctly provided that it did not apply to any State whereby under the constitution State officials were elected at another time. Hence it is that Maine, where under the constitution State officials are elected in September, still elects her Senators and her Representatives during the month of September. The act of 1875—Eighteenth Statutes, page 400—provided for a uniform time for the election of Representatives, but exceptions were made that enable Maine, because of the constitutional September election, to elect Senators and Representatives at a different time from any other State in the Union. However, in Maine, because the Constitution authorizes Congress to provide a certain day for Presidential electors, Maine still votes for Presidential electors in November.

The bill embraces not only senatorial and congressional elections but elections for Presidential electors. The same may be said of the Hatch acts, the original of which was passed in 1939.

A statute was passed in 1907 preventing contributions by corporations in elections of Presidential electors, as a pernicious political activity. The acts of 1910, 1911, 1912, and 1918 were confined to pernicious political activities in senatorial and congressional elections. The Corrupt Practices Act of February 28, 1925, which repealed practically all of the prior acts, applied to expenditures and practices in connection with the election of Senators and Representatives, but it also prohibited contributions in connection with any election of Presidential electors.

Presidential elections are authorized, as are the election of Representatives in Congress, by the Constitution. There is the power of regulating the time, place, and manner of the elections of Representatives and Senators, but no power for regulating the time, place, and manner of elections of Presidential electors, under article I, section 8, clause 18, and I quote:

> To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

Congress thus has a right to protect and safeguard from fraud and corruption the election of Senators and Representatives as well as Presidential electors, but the power in Presidential electors does not come from the power of regulation, as in the case under article I, section 4, which is limited to Senators and Representatives.

If the advocates of the bill who assert that poll taxes are regulations are correct, then I maintain that Congress is without authority to provide for the elimination of poll taxes in the election of Presidential electors. The argument that a poll tax is a condition, a restriction, or a regulation and not a qualification falls to the ground, for if it be sound then the bill is unconstitutional in undertaking to regulate the election of Presidential electors. On the other hand, if Congress has a right to pass legislation to prohibit and prevent pernicious activities in congressional and Presidential elections, section 4, article I, is not applicable or the source of power. If the power of regulation for congressional elections is derived from section 4, then there is no power of regulation for Presidential elections.

IV. NINETEENTH AMENDMENT

It is universally agreed that the States can prescribe qualifications for voting. Women were qualified in some States. In other States they were disqualified. It would be just as logical to have maintained that Congress could have passed an act prohibiting disqualification on account of sex, and call it pernicious political activity as it is to say that Congress can denounce the payment of poll taxes as a political activity. It took a constitutional amendment to enfranchise women. It will take a constitutional amendment to eliminate the poll tax. Congress cannot change the qualification of voters in the States. The advocates of the pending bill limit the poll tax to Federal officials. They deny that the poll tax is a qualification. This is a mere ruse. The fact is that when the Constitution was adopted all of the States had property or tax qualifications for voters. It was a qualification and not a manner at the time the Constitution was adopted, and it is a qualification still.

If Congress has the right to strike down a qualification for voting prescribed by the State, then it is in the power of Congress to impose additional qualifications for voting for Members of Congress. If Congress has the right to restrict, it has the right to broaden. Article I, section 2, provides that the States shall prescribe the qualifications. If Congress now attempts to say that persons not qualified to vote under the State's laws may vote for Members of Congress, it would be equally in violation of the fundamental law. The bill is unconstitutional in dealing with qualifications under the guise of pernicious activity.

V. POLL TAX A STATE QUALIFICATION

Poll taxes as qualifications for voting have been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277). *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (118 Fed. 2, 218), certiorari was denied by the Supreme Court (62 Sup. Ct. Rept. 64, 314 U. S. 621). The privilege of voting in the State is conferred upon the State except as the same is limited by the fifteenth and the nineteenth amendments of the Federal Constitution. The State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

VI. CLASSIC CASE

The proponents of the bill rely upon the recent case of *United States* v. *Classic* (313 U. S. 299). This case, however, is not important. It does not involve the qualification of voters. It is a criminal prosecution to prevent a conspiracy to deprive a citizen of Louisiana from voting in a congressional election. In Louisiana the primaries elect the choice. The State conducts and pays the cost of the primary elections. The primary election was involved in the Classic case. The Court held in the Classic case that a citizen had a right to be protected in having his ballot cast and counted in a primary election for Representative in the State of Louisiana under the facts in that case. It is sometimes loosely said that the Classic case is authority for the passage of the pending Geyer bill. I quote from the opinion of the Court, from page 315 of the Superior State Court in that case:

> While, in a loose sense, the right to vote for Representatives in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States (see *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall. 162, 170), *United States* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214, 217–218), *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1, 38–39), *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277, 283)), this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2, of article I, to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its powers to regulate elections under section 4, and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers." (See *Ex parte Siebold* (100 U. S. 371), *Ex parte Yarbrough*, *supra* (663, 664), *Swafford* v. *Templeton* (185 U. S. 487), *Wiley* v. *Sinkler* (179 U. S. 58, 64).)

Obviously included within the right to choose, secured by the Constitution, is the right of qualified voters within a State to cast their ballots and have them counted at congressional elections. This Court has consistently held that this is a right secured by the Constitution (*Ex parte Yarbrough*, supra; *Wiley* v. *Sinkler*, supra; *Swafford* v. *Templeton*, supra; *United States* v. *Mosley*, supra; see *Ex parte Siebold*, supra; In re *Coy* (127 U. S. 731); *Logan* v. *United States* (144 U. S. 263)). And since the constitutional command is without restriction or limitation, the right, unlike those guaranteed by the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, is secured against the action of individuals as well as of States (*Ex parte Yarbrough*, supra; *Logan* v. *United States*, supra).

The court was passing upon the legality of a prosecution for conspiracy to prevent a citizen voting in a congressional election. The qualifications of the voter were not involved. It was admitted. There is no justification in the language quoted from the Classic case for the pending bill. The right to vote is derived from the States. The right to vote for a Member of Congress is guaranteed by the Federal Constitution, but the qualifications of electors is prescribed by the State. I call attention to the fact that the rights of qualified voters were under consideration. As stated, the right of qualified voters within a State to cast their ballots and have them counted at congressional elections was involved. The fact that then Chief Justice Stone spoke, as I have quoted, in the Classic case of the rights of qualified voters to be protected shows conclusively that while any statement as to qualifications of voters would have been obiter dicta in that case, nevertheless the opinion in expressed terms referred to qualified voters. Qualified voters are the voters qualified by the States.

VII. QUALIFICATIONS OF VOTERS FOR THE STATES

The Supreme Court of the United States in the Breedlove case, decided in 1937, held that the payment of a poll tax as a requirement or qualification for voting in elections for Representatives is not in violation of the Federal Constitution and is within the power of the State. The Court, as now constituted, in the Pirtle case denied a writ of certiorari, and thus affirmed the doctrine announced in the Breedlove case.

The bill forbids the collection of a poll tax in Federal elections, to insure honesty and to prevent pernicious political activities, as an amendment to the Hatch acts. The bill prevents the collection of a poll tax as a qualification of voters within the meaning of section 2, article I, of the Constitution. The proponents of anti poll taxes are thus not agreed upon the power of Congress to pass anti-poll-tax legislation. The bill proceeds upon the theory that Congress can prevent the collection as a pernicious political activity. The bill recognizes the right of the States to prescribe qualifications and declares that poll taxes shall not be a qualification. The bill is really "fishing" legislation. The evident purpose is to undertake to secure favorable consideration before the Supreme Court as now constituted.

Some advocates of the bills have asserted that no State constitutions provide the collection of poll taxes as a qualification for voting. They are in error. The constitutions of Mississippi and Alabama, as well as the constitutions of the other States where poll taxes are now required, provide that poll taxes shall be a prerequisite and a qualification. The payment of taxes as a qualification obtained when the Constitution was adopted. They now obtain in the constitutions of at least eight of the States. The wisdom of the poll tax is for the States to decide. The question is whether Congress has the power to change or modify by adding to or taking from the qualifications prescribed by the States. The champions of the antipoll tax are experimenting with the courts and with the Constitution.

Hearings were conducted by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate on the Pepper bill. A subcommittee submitted an unfavorable report. Senator O'MAHONEY, chairman of the subcommittee, introduced Senate Joint Resolution 164 on October 5, 1942, proposing a constitutional amendment forbidding the collection of any tax or property qualification by the States. It is thus admitted that poll taxes cannot be abolished by Congress and that an amendment to the Federal Constitution is necessary to prohibit the States from prescribing the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting.

The Federal Constitution provides that the States shall determine the qualifications for voters in Federal as well as in State elections. Poll taxes now obtain in 32 States, but in only 8 of the States are they required as a prerequisite for voting. Congress is now asked to denounce as a pernicious political activity the payment of poll taxes as a qualification when such taxes have been prescribed as qualifications for voters from time immemorial. They are among the oldest of all taxes. The contention that poll taxes are a regulation or a restriction or a condition is a mere play upon words. They are qualifications in the constitutions and in the statutes in the States where they are required. They are denominated as qualifications by Story, Cooley, and by all the leading authorities on the Constitution and elections. The requirement may be regrettable, but unconstitutional action is no remedy for the alleged evil. It would be much wiser to rely upon the people to repeal without compulsion from the Federal authorities. The States were jealous of Federal constitutional encroachment at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. The States are still jealous of the rights reserved to them and the threat of unconstitutional encroachment is likely to hinder rather than promote the elimination of poll-tax requirements. At all events, the only remedy is to amend the Federal Constitution as was done in the case of the women's suffrage amendment to the Constitution.

Congress should set the example. No legislation in violation of the fundamental law of the land, no matter what the alleged excuse may be, should be passed by Congress. The people will have little regard for the statesmanship of Congress if Congress itself treats the Constitution as a scrap of paper. The refinements and the alleged distinctions in view of the plain language of the Constitution as to qualifications, including the payment of poll taxes, are distinctions without difference. If Congress can take from the qualifications of voters in Federal elections, it can add to such qualifications. Clearly there is no authority for such procedure under the Federal Constitution.

VIII. SMALL VOTE

Proponents of the bill refer to the small votes in general elections in the eight Southern States where poll-tax requirements still obtain. In Mississippi and the other Southern States the contests are settled in the primary elections. There are no contests in the general elections. In the primaries there are bitter contests. It is as difficult for a candidate to be nominated in a primary as it is for a candidate to be nominated and then elected in many other States. There are bitter contests in the primaries, but generally the primaries are decisive. The votes in the general elections are mere formalities. It is the primary vote that counts.

The number of voters participating in the primary elections in Mississippi and other States, where the poll tax obtains, compares favorably with the participation in primary elections in the States where there is no poll tax. Again, the percentage of qualified voters participating in primary elections in States like Mississippi compares favorably with the number participating in other Southern States like North Carolina and Louisiana, where there are no poll-tax requirements.

The poll tax does not discriminate against the Negro. The Supreme Court would not have upheld it if such had been the case. All are treated alike. Under the constitution of Mississippi voters were required not only to pay their poll tax but to pay all of their taxes before they are permitted to vote, prior to a constitutional amendment adopted in 1934, which only requires now the payment of poll taxes. Under the amendment, Mississippi passed in 1935 a statute requiring only poll taxes to vote. The remedy to eliminate poll taxes, however, is not with the Federal Government. It is a State function. Mississippi has provided that the payment only of a poll tax is requisite to vote in a primary election and that no poll tax shall be required of the man in the armed services.

Small votes, unfortunately, obtain not only in the South but in other parts of the country. This is regrettable, but, after all, democracy will be better promoted by an informed and enlightened franchise than by a numerous franchise. Intelligent voters in small numbers can be more helpful than ignorant voters in large numbers. Informed voters are more important than numerous voters.

Again, indifference in elections obtains not only in the South but, as I have suggested, in other parts of the country. In

1942 generally not more than one-third of the registered voters throughout the country participated in the primary elections. It is estimated that there are 42,191,179 registered voters and that 14,937,346 voted. The percentage of those who did vote is around 33⅓ percent. It varied in several States.

There are a number of factors responsible for the small vote:

First. There are always fewer votes than in Presidential contests. If it be said that voters in the World War No. 2 are apathetic, so were they in the World War No. 1. Then again, the absence of acute issues in many States is responsible.

Second. Millions of voters are away from home in the Army and in the Navy, and millions of voters will not stop working in munitions plants to vote.

Third. There has been much migration of defense workers from one State to another.

Fourth. Long hours of work in war factories tend to keep voters away from the polls.

The Southern States to date have made a far better showing than have been made in many States. Texas, Georgia, South Carolina, and Tennessee stand at the top, with percentages of the registered voters participating in the elections ranging in these Southern States from 59 to 82 percent.

It is easy to charge. It is difficult to prove. With the latest information available, a larger percentage of voters have participated in the primary elections in the South than any other part of the country.

IX. REGISTRATION IS REQUIRED

There are other requirements in addition to age, residence, and the payment of taxes in Mississippi, as well as in other States. Under the Constitution the voter must be able to read or write the Constitution or to understand the Constitution when it is read to him. A literacy test obtains as it does in Massachusetts and many other States. If the Negro does not qualify it is not because of the poll tax. It is primarily because of the literacy test, and the literacy test applies to both whites and blacks. Educational qualifications not only obtain in Mississippi, but in practically all of the States of the Union. I do not recall an exception.

In Mississippi and other States registration is a qualification. The Supreme Court of the United States has recognized that registration is a qualification (*Wiley* v. *Sinkler*, 179 U. S., pp. 58, 62, and 64). Whether registration is a qualification or not, it was required and the requirement was upheld. It does not change the requirement by calling it a condition or a regulation. The distinction is without difference. They are all prerequisites to voting, and prerequisities of all kinds are generally qualifications.

X. REASONABLE CONCLUSION

While there have been divided courts and decisions with dissenting opinions, in many of the cases in the Supreme Court of the United States involving pernicious political activities under the Enforcement Acts first passed in 1870 and the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, the question of the constitutionality of the poll tax in Federal elections has never been passed upon by the Court. No Federal statute preventing the payment of poll taxes has ever been passed, but the decisions of the Court in all of the cases involving pernicious political activities and regulating the time, places, and manner of conducting senatorial and congressional elections lead to the inevitable conclusion that the intent of the founding fathers was to leave the qualifications of senatorial and congressional electors with the State with the power in Congress to make or alter regulations with respect to the time, places, and manner of elections so as to prevent pernicious political activities, in order that the Senators and Representatives, President and Vice President might be honestly elected and that the voters might be protected. The inevitable conclusion is that Congress is without power to prescribe or to abolish any qualification of electors for Senators and Representatives and for Presidential and Vice Presidential electors.

The anti-poll-tax bill is in violation of the rights of the States, vigorously asserted at the time of the adoption of the Constitution and upheld by the Congress for 153 years. The right to vote in a congressional election for Senators and Representatives and Presidential electors is guaranteed by the Federal Constitution. If such a right is secured by the Constitution, Congress can protect the manner of holding the election, but the States must prescribe the qualification of the voters.

It has been said that a right may exist although it has not been exercised. The answer is, however, that acquiescence for more than a century and a half means consent. The States claim the right to prescribe qualifications. The Federal Constitution gave the States the right. Congress has assented by refusal to undertake for a century and a half to prescribe qualifications.

XI. NOT PERMISSIBLE UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

The qualifications of voters are reserved to the States. They are among the powers not delegated to the United States and reserved to the States under the tenth amendment. Members of Congress cannot violate their oath to uphold the Constitution by voting for an unconstitutional bill.

The bill embraces elections for President and Vice President. No persons have a right to vote for President and Vice President. If Congress assumes the power to supervise elections, at least Congress should use accurate language. It is true that similar language is used in the Hatch acts, but I hold no brief for the Hatch acts. Mistakes and errors should not be repeated. The remedy is to eliminate them.

As I have pointed out, Presidential electors are not national officers.

They are no more officers or agents of the United States than are the members of the State legislatures when acting as electors (Green, 134 U. S. 379).

As I have pointed out, the power and jurisdiction of the States as to the qualifications of Presidential electors are exclusive—*McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 35). The inclusion in the bill of Presidential electors or elections for President and Vice President is without constitutional authority.

The bill declares that the payment of poll taxes is detrimental to the integrity of the ballot. There is no proof of such a claim. It charges the States where poll taxes are required with fraud. It convicts them of corruption without a trial. It has not been shown that they are evil, but at most only that evil is possible under them—*Williams* v. *Mississippi* (170 U. S. 213).

Does Congress have jurisdiction to convict States of fraud? If the State laws operate as a fraud on the United States, the courts have ample jurisdiction. They are authorized to apply the remedy. But the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Breedlove case, has upheld the power of the States to levy poll taxes. Congress would be thus in the position of convicting the Southern States and the court of last appeal of fraud by providing that poll-tax requirements are detrimental of the ballot. It is admitted that poll taxes obtained for 153 years, but it is asserted that conditions have changed and that Congress will be justified in providing that poll taxes are an interference. If they are—if they result in fraud—Congress has ample power under section 4 to regulate the manner of the election. The remedy is not to deprive the States of their rights respecting qualifications.

With the poll tax, the United States has existed and prospered for 153 years and has become the richest and most powerful Nation in the world. The poll tax is not impeding or destroying. The poll-tax States have a better government than they had preceding the poll tax.

The Federal Government has no power to prevent the levy of taxes by the States, and especially taxes for the promotion of public education.

If poll taxes are unconstitutional, if they have violated any rights of citizens, rich or poor, white or black, the Supreme Court of the United States would have so held. The right to vote for Senators and Representatives is derived from the Constitution, but the qualifications of voters are for the States.

The Constitution protects the right to vote only of those who are qualified under the State laws. If he is qualified, his right to vote in congressional elections will be protected. The Classic case so holds.

It is asserted that the poll tax is not a qualification and that it has nothing to do with the capacity of the voter to vote. It has as much to do with his qualifications as residence and as sex. These are among the universally admitted qualifications. At least it was the case with respect to sex before the nineteenth amendment.

The word "qualification" is thus defined by Webster:

A condition precedent that must be complied with for the attainment of a status,

the perfection of a right, etc., * * * as the qualification of citizenship.

A "qualified voter" is defined as:

One who possesses certain specific qualifications for voting, especially as to citizenship, age, and residence, and sometimes also as to literacy and the ownership of property.

In the constitutional and ratification debates, Alexander Hamilton used the expression in connection with suffrage "prescribing qualifications of property." In the Yarbrough case the Court said:

It adopts the qualification of those furnished as the qualification of its own electors for Members of Congress.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the States have the right to prescribe who may vote.

The word "qualification" with respect to suffrage both before and after the formation of our Government and continuously down to the present date has been used in the sense of defining the persons who were entitled to vote. The word was so interpreted by the members of the Constitutional Convention. They used the term "the right of suffrage." They used it in connection with the qualification of electors, as it finally appeared in section 2 of article I. And the interpretation of qualifications of voters has persisted to the present time. Volume 29, Corpus Juris Secundum, 1941, in the article on elections and under qualifications of voters includes—section 29, page 51—property, payment of taxes, and, at page 52, the payment of poll taxes. The same thing is true of 18 American Jurisprudence. Among other qualifications it includes "poll and other taxes." In Story, Cooley, and other works on the Constitution, taxes appear among the qualifications. They appear among the qualifications in State constitutions, including the eight Southern States where poll taxes obtain. They appear among qualifications in all of the leading textbooks on elections.

The States have the power to tax, Congress has no veto over the power of the States to tax. Congress has no power to interfere with the collection of State taxes. The repeal of the poll tax would be a prohibition of the collection of such taxes.

When the Constitution was adopted, each State possessed unlimited power over suffrage and generally prescribed qualifications, including property and taxes—*Miner* v. *Happersett* (88 U. S. 162):

Whether the requirements to be met in each State be termed qualifications of electors or be referred to by any other term, the State possessed and exercised the unlimited power over suffrage and the granting of the privilege of voting.

In adopting the Federal Constitution the States did not grant to Congress any of their powers over suffrage. They did, however, in article I, section 2, limit their own power over suffrage requirements for Senators and Representatives. If the payment of a tax as a prerequisite of the right of suffrage is a qualification, then the State must prescribe the same for both Senators and Representatives and members of the State legislature. Under the inherent power of suffrage, if the poll tax is not a qualification, then the States have the power to require the payment of the tax for Senators and Representatives without requiring it of those voting for members of their legislatures. The power of the States to impose conditions or requirements for suffrage, other than qualifications, is in no way restricted by either section 2 or any other provision of the Constitution as originally adopted. The absolute power of the States over suffrage, except as it is restricted by article I, section 2, and the fifteenth amendment, has been repeatedly upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States.

In the case of Breedlove against Suttles, the privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but it is conferred by the State. The right of voting is guaranteed by the Constitution to qualified voters. Congress has no power to regulate or interfere with the exercise by the States of their power to prescribe suffrage requirements or their power to levy and collect a poll tax.

The power of suffrage is in the States—*Guinn* v. *U. S.* (23 8 U. S. 362):

The States have the exclusive power to determine the manner of choosing its electors to vote for President or Vice President of the United States, and confers no power on Congress whatsoever to regulate on the subject.

For this reason the bill is invalid. Under the second clause of article II, the legislature appoints the electors. No power of supervision or regulation is given to Congress. Under the fourth clause, Congress can fix the time of meeting. It has no other power—*McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1).

Under article I, section 2, and the seventeenth amendment, the States have the exclusive power to prescribe the qualifications of electors of Members of the Senate and of the House. As I have stated, power under section 2 of article I was a restriction upon the powers of the States. The States had these powers. They reserved them. The Constitution never conferred any power except that of regulating the time, places, and manner of elections upon Congress.

As I have stated, the proponents of the bill undertake to discredit Breedlove against Suttles, and particularly the following language of that decision:

Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but it is conferred by the State and save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

The right to vote is based upon article I, section 2, but the proponents overlook the distinction between privilege and right. The suffrage laws of the State determine those who are privileged to vote. The Constitution of the United States protects the right of those who are privileged in the exercise of that privilege—*Ex parte Yarbrough* (110 U. S. 651).

The Classic case, so often and so much relied upon by the advocates of the bill, recognizes the distinction between the right to vote by qualified voters and by those disqualified under the suffrage laws of the States. That case did not involve the question of the power of suffrage. Qualifications were not involved. The question was whether the Constitution extended protection to qualified voters.

The Breedlove case was decided in 1937. The Court, as now constituted, decided the Pirtle case in 1941. The supreme courts of numerous States sustained the validity of the poll-tax qualification. No decision has ever struck it down. American Law Reports, annotated, volume 139, page 572, states:

The courts are unanimous in holding that failure to pay a valid poll tax if imposed as a condition of voting has the effect of disqualifying and rendering his voting invalid.

Innumerable decisions from many States of the Union are cited in support of the announcement.

As shown by the statements of the framers of the Constitution, by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, and by the decisions of the highest courts of the States, by the actions of Congress and the actions of States with respect to constitutional amendments, the States reserved full and unlimited powers to prescribe who may vote at all elections except as restricted by the provision that the qualifications to vote for Senators and Representatives should not be different from those prescribed for voters of the most popular branch of the State legislature. The fact that Congress has never undertaken to interfere with the qualifications of voters except by constitutional amendment is conclusive that Congress is without authority to modify or repeal State qualifications for voting. It took the fifteenth amendment to prohibit the denial of the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. It took the nineteenth amendment to prohibit such denial on account of sex. It will take a constitutonal amendment to prohibit the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting in senatorial or congressional elections.

XII. FEDERAL AND STATE RIGHTS

The United States is but an aggregate of all the States in the Union. What exalted patriotism do Members of Congress possess that is not possessed by the members of the State legislatures? What virtues has Congress, not possessed by the citizens of the State? Who will say that the Congress of the United States is more interested in the welfare and representation of the State of New York than the citizens and the Legislature of New York? By what right does the Congress of the United States assume that the public interest will be better promoted by the assertion of a Federal right to control Federal elections than by the assertion of the guaranteed right of control in the States?

The old landmarks are often the best. Even if Congress possessed the power to regulate and prescribe qualifications in congressional elections—which I deny—it is a power that should be exercised only as a last resort to preserve the Government. We have had enough centralization. The States are closer to the people than Congress. In peace and in war there are functions for the States.

The Federal Government should not encroach upon these functions. The States pass laws for the descent and distribution of property. They possess the power of life and death over the citizens in the exercise of their police powers. They protect the citizen in the enjoyment of life and property. Such protection is guaranteed by the States. Are these rights and privileges less sacred than the right of voting or the privilege of franchise? The States that have the power of life and death are wisely trusted to provide with the qualifications of voters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN].

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] that this is really one of the most important issues facing this Congress; but I disagree with him in toto in his conclusions as to the unconstitutionality of this bill. It depends more or less upon the particular philosophy of government one adopts whether this type of bill is constitutional or otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who believe that our forefathers were men who lived in no vacuum of inner speculation, nor were they those who climbed the ivory tower of esoteric dreaming; they were men who strove diligently, intelligently, and inspiredly to form a Federal Constitution. Every word in the Constitution controls the Federal Government. Our forefathers, by the Constitution, created a Congress of the United States, and it delegated to the State legislatures, in the first instance, mind you, so far as the membership of this body is concerned, the power to define and declare the qualification for membership, but only in the first instance.

Philosophically, historically, and constitutionally any tax, any money requirement for the right to exercise the suffrage for election to this body, is unconstitutional.

Let us define the Constitution itself.

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications required for electors in the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Have what? Qualifications.

How do the dictionaries define "qualifications"? This is the way they define it:

> Any natural endowment or acquirement which fits a person for a place, office, or employment.

Any natural endowment. That is all they have the right to establish, a natural endowment. I deny that a money requirement is a natural endowment for the exercise of the right of suffrage.

Let us see, historically, what was meant by this section of the Constitution. What did Hamilton say on this question? This is what he said:

> Nothing can be more evident than that exclusive power of regulating elections for the national Government in the hands of the State legislatures would leave the existence of the Union entirely at their mercy.

That is what Hamilton said.

Stated another way, the question for us to determine is whether this section of the Federal Constitution having defined a federal electorate in terms of a State electorate the Federal Government is bound to accept anything no matter what its nature that a State chooses to call a qualification for voting. I say to you and I submit to you that in the nature of things no national government was intended to be so supine and so weak that it could not protect itself from the unlawful requirements of any State legislature and that when a State legislature requires an unnatural qualification this body may repudiate it constitutionally.

Recently, the Supreme Court of the United States in the Classic case discussed the question of the right to vote for a Representative in Congress and derivative nature of that right. The Court said:

> While in a loose sense the right to vote for Representative in Congress is sometimes spoken of as a right derived from the States, this statement is true only in the sense that the States are authorized by the Constitution to legislate on the subject as provided by section 2 of article I to the extent that Congress has not restricted State action by the exercise of its power to regulate elections under section 4 and its more general power under article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution to make all laws which may be necessary and proper for carrying into existence the foregoing powers.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that any constitutional democracy established under the Constitution of these United States may not constitutionally require a money test or a property test as a qualification of the right to exercise the franchise in the election of Members of the Congress. If the Federal Congress has no such constitutional power, can it be true the power rests in the States? A statement of such a proposition seems to be all that is required as answer. If such a power rests in the States then the States may ultimately suspend the existence of the Federal Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN].

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Chairman, we may strive to limit the power, the arbitrary, the autocratic power of a State government in the denial to its citizens of just constitutional rights in the election of Members in this House.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVAGAN. No, I cannot yield in the limited time at my disposal.

Mr. Chairman, we are a legislative body; we are not a judicial body. This act is certainly within the purview of our constitutional authority to legislate. Pass this act and then let these people from the poll-tax States take it in an American judicial manner to the Supreme Court of the United States, and I am willing to risk my reputation as a lawyer, a reputation I cherish, that the Supreme Court of the United States will give short shrift to any argument against its constitutionality.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] and I have the utmost respect for him—let the cat out of the bag in his argument against this bill. He spoke of the great constitutional principles that we were about to lynch, then he proceeded to tell us and openly declare that it is proper to require a voter to pay for his right to vote, and he asked: "Why should we give them a free ride?" That is neither historically, philosophically, nor constitutionally correct. That is a philosophy that I deny and in which I want no part.

I am interested in the fullest exercise of the right to vote, believing as I do that the great sense of the people generally is the best guaranty for the continuation of our system of government. Neither Congress nor the States should aim by restriction to deny or deprive certain classes of citizens of the right to vote. It is safer and wiser to educate citizens to the appreciation of the right to vote and a realization of their great responsibility. Artificial restrictions magnify existing problems and never solve anything. I believe that the exercise of the voting privilege gives pride and responsibility to citizenship and tends to safeguard the perpetuation of our system of government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly the question of poll tax as a prerequisite for voting is again being considered by this House, and bringing about a sharp controversy and attempting to by-path the Constitution of the United States. I gave you my views on the constitutionality of this proposed legislation when it was before the House last October. I endeavored to prove to you that it is clearly in direct contravention with our Constitution.

I am amazed at the advocates of this bill, who claimed to be so strong to uphold the Constitution a few days ago when we had under consideration a limitation on an appropriation bill that would prohibit the employment of certain parties found by the special committee on appropriations to be unfit for employment by the Government. I ask you who signed the discharge petition and advocated the adoption of legislation of this kind and in this manner, what has happened to your zeal to uphold and sustain that great document, that has guided the destiny of this country for more than a century and a half?

Mr. Chairman, I would not impugn the motives of any Member of this House, but I am asking you, you who are attempting to force this legislation upon the seven States of this Nation, to search your hearts and ask yourself if you conscientiously believe that you are within your constitutional prerogative. Do you realize what you are doing? I urge you today to lay aside political thinking for just a moment and set your feet on a

sound and solid principle, one that if continued to be the basic action and fundamental policy of the States running their own affairs locally will continue to make us a greater nation as the years roll by.

This legislation if finally adopted by this Congress will not do what you think it will. I know what you are thinking and I know why you are playing into the hands of this unconstitutional attempt, but I say to you today it will not in the seven States affected achieve a goal that many of you have been led to believe. You think that by adopting such legislation in this manner it will bring about more intensive voting by the Negro people in these Southern States, but it is not so simple. I ask you to go into the Southern States where the poll-tax requirement is not prerequisite and see what percentage of the Negroes vote in that State and compare them with the percentage that vote in the States where the poll tax is a prerequisite.

Mr. Chairman, this matter has been played up in those States where your problems are different, and in an effort to try to revolutionize the people in other States, and in place of bringing harmony, cooperation, and better results, you are doing nothing but breeding serious and bitter controversy.

If the States involved deem it wise and by their own actions discard the poll-tax system, I would have no fault or criticism of their action. This means would be the regular procedure to bring about such changes.

Mr. Chairman, there is another way, and if the advocates of this legislation want to bring about this change in the regular and orderly process, the Constitution of the United States could be amended to take care of this situation just as it was amended to take care of woman suffrage and a great many other matters of national importance. If a sufficient number of States approve such an amendment to our Constitution that would prohibit the poll-tax requirement you would find a much better and more practical solution to the problem you advocate, but in the manner attempted here you are only bringing about an embarrassment to these seven States, and I seriously question the motives behind such an attempt. With the motives behind this legislation and the manner it is proposed if adopted, you are not building but destroying.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the objectives of H. R. 7 are worthy and commendable. I believe in extending the privileges of voting in our elections to individuals, regardless of their economic status. I am willing to trust the people. The more people participate in their government, the better are they qualified to enjoy self-government.

Upon a study of this question, I am of the opinion that the objectives of this bill cannot be accomplished without amending the Constitution of the United States. I think it should be so amended. I am not attempting to decide this question for anyone other than myself. As for me, I cannot support this measure because I believe that it clearly violates the provisions of our Constitution.

The right to determine the qualifications of an elector is a right that is vested in our States. Section 2 of article I of the Constitution provides:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

I think no one contends that this Congress can determine the qualifications of an elector for the State legislature of any State. That is a function that belongs to the State government. If this Congress can by law say that an elector in the State of Mississippi shall not be required to pay his poll tax before voting, a later Congress, possessing opposite views, might enact a law saying that an elector in the State of Nebraska must have paid his poll taxes before he votes. I am not willing to attempt to assert such authority over my State, because I have no such authority.

I contend that it was the very clear intent of the writers of our Constitution that each State shall determine the qualifications of its electors. I can attach no other reasonable interpretation to the above-mentioned section. During the writing of the Constitution and throughout the period of its adoption, the accusation was made that certain provisions favored the so-called wealthy and well-born. In writing on this subject on February 26, 1788, in an article in the New York Packet, now referred to as Federalist No. LX, Alexander Hamilton said:

> The truth is that there is no method of securing to the rich the preference apprehended, but by prescribing qualifications of property either for those who may elect or be elected. But this forms no part of the power to be conferred upon the National Government. Its authority would be expressly restricted to the regulation of the times, the places, the manner of elections. The qualifications of the persons who may choose or be chosen, as has been remarked upon other occasions, are defined and fixed in the Constitution, and are unalterable by the legislature.

I well realize that the proponents of this measure contend that section 4 of article I, which provides—

> the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators—

furnishes a justification for this measure. Their attention should be directed, however, to the fact that the foregoing section refers only as to the time, place, and manner of holding an election, and does not at all refer to the qualifications of the electors. The foregoing quotation from the Federalist indicates that that was the intention at the time those words were inserted in our Constitution.

This Government and the people of the United States have always proceeded upon the theory that the States had the sole power of determining the qualifications of electors. When the people of the United States wanted to prohibit the States from denying the right to vote on account of race or color or previous condition of servitude, they did so by amending the Constitution. Section 1 of amendment XV provides:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

When the people of the United States wanted to prohibit the States from denying the right to vote to any person on account of sex, they did so by amending our Constitution. Amendment 19 provides:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

If this Congress has the lawful authority to prohibit the States from denying the right to vote on account of a nonpayment of poll tax, then these provisions of amendments XV and XIX were totally unnecessary. That is not the situation. The Constitution clearly provides that the States shall determine the qualifications of electors, and we have recognized that principle by twice amending our Constitution.

The argument is made that the moral and economic principle involved here are so great that we should depart from the purview of the Constitution and enact this measure. I believe that we can serve humanity best by staying within the confines of constitutional government. The problem we are wrestling with today can be met in a constitutional way, and it should be done. I will gladly vote for House Joint Resolution 126, offered by that able Tennesse lawyer, JOHN JENNINGS, Jr. That bill will take care of this problem constitutionally.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY].

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, when the founders of our Government assembled in convention, there was one fundamental principle uppermost in their minds. Therefore, they laid the foundation of our Government upon this principle, namely, that there should be no encroachment upon the domestic and internal affairs of the respective States by the Federal Government. The governmental structure was planned upon that foundation. It is only by their votes that the people of the States can protect their natural civil and political rights in a republican form of government. The regulation of the suffrage was all-important to the States and it was unanimously thought that such regulation should not be yielded.

In article I of the Constitution they laid down the legislative powers of the Congress. Then when the adoption of the Constitution was referred to the States, certain amendments were proposed. Amendment X was added, evidencing the determination of the people of the country and their leaders to retain all power within the States that was necessary to their existence as States and for the government of their own internal affairs. This amendment read:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited

by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

I contended in a previous statement made on this floor on legislation similar to this now before us, that the power of regulating suffrage within the respective States was a matter which was reserved by the States and not delegated to the United States. I will not, therefore, go into a long discussion of the unconstitutionality of this bill, but will respectfully refer to you my previous remarks on the subject. To my mind, this measure is clearly unconstitutional, for the qualifications of electors in the respective States were not "delegated to the United States nor prohibited by it to the States" as set forth in said Constitution. If that be true, then Congress has no power to act in this matter.

Alexander Hamilton, who took a leading part in the making of the Constitution, in the Federalist, No. LII, writes:

I pass on to a more particular examination of the several parts of the Government. I shall begin with the House of Representatives.

The first view to be taken of this part of the Government relates to the qualifications of the electors and the elected.

Those of the former are to be the same with those of the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures. The definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of republican government. It was incumbent on the Convention, therefore, to define and establish this right in the Constitution. To have left it open for the occasional regulation of the Congress would have been improper for the reason just mentioned. To have submitted it to the legislative discretion of the States would have been improper for the same reason; and for the additional reason that it would have rendered too dependent on the State governments that branch of the Federal Government which ought to be dependent on the people alone. To have reduced the different qualifications in the different States to one uniform rule would probably have been as dissatisfactory to some of the States as it would have been difficult to the Convention. The provision made by the Convention appears, therefore, to be the best that lay within their option. It must be satisfactory to every State, because it is conformable to the standard already established, or which may be established, by the State itself. It will be safe to the United States, because, being fixed by the State constitutions, it is not alterable by the State governments, and it cannot be feared that the people of the States will alter this part of their constitutions in such a manner as to abridge the right secured to them by the Federal Constitution.

The argument can be definitely summed up by the words of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the *Newberry Case* (256 U. S. 232):

The Government, then, of the United States can claim no powers which are not granted to it by the Constitution, and the powers actually granted must be such as are expressly given, or given by the necessary implication.

I call your attention, also, to the Pirtle case, decided 2 or 3 years ago, in which the United States District Court of Tennessee and the United States Circuit Court of Appeals took the view that a citizen who was prevented from voting in a congressional election because he had not paid his poll tax, had not had his rights transgressed in any way. The United States Supreme Court refused to hear argument, indicating, it would seem, that the constitutionality of the poll tax in such circumstances was not sufficiently involved to open the case to further discussion.

However, far beyond the consideration of poll-tax legislation, and far more important, is the principle involved in this question, and it is to this that I wish to direct your attention.

The Government of each State depends upon the suffrage of its citizens. It is the essential of good government, under our form of government, that the people shall decide by their vote what kind of government they want. No State could manage its own affairs without the control of the suffrage of its citizens. This power is necessary to its existence as a democratic form of government within itself. If such a power could be referred to Congress, then the several States could be interfered with at any time by the varying views and opinions of the Representatives, who might change their opinion from time to time. No State, so far as suffrage is concerned, could have a stable form of government. Each State government, therefore, is at liberty, under the Constitution, to decide this all important question for itself. Virtually the entire construction of government depends upon the suffrage of the people.

This legislation, if passed and approved, would affect not only the 7 States which have the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting, but would affect every State in the Union; and if the control of the internal affairs of a State is to pass out of its hands and be lodged in Congress, such a principle, if translated into our form of government, would mean the taking away of State autonomy from the smaller States and placing that power in the hands of the larger States. There are today 7 States in the Union which have this poll-tax qualification for its electors. They are: Alabama, with 9 Representatives; Arkansas, with 7 Representatives; Georgia, with 10 Representatives; Mississippi, with 7 Representatives; South Carolina, with 6 Representatives; Texas, with 21 Representatives; and Virginia, with 9 Representatives—a total of 69 Representatives. On the other hand, New York has 45 Representatives, and Illinois 26 Representatives, making a total of 71. Therefore, it follows that if a matter of legislation concerning the domestic affairs of one of these States should arise and be referred to the House of Representatives, we would find, if the principle of this poll-tax legislation be adhered to, that the combined vote of New York and Illinois would have more voice in regulating the affairs of said State than the total vote of the 7 Southern States, using the poll-tax legislation for illustration. Surely the founders of this Government would raise their hands in holy horror if they had been told that such a pecular state of affairs could happen under the Constitution which they brought forth. If the State of Rhode Island, with 2 Representatives, should desire and pass legislation affecting the sole interests of that State, say the qualifications of its electors, if you please, then under the principle of this proposed bill, Virginia would have more votes from its total representation than the State of Rhode Island would have, although it is a matter solely for the internal government of the State of Rhode Island.

Let us examine some of the qualifications of electors in some of the States for further illustration of the working out of such a principle as is set out in the proposed legislation.

Take New York for example. Once New York required a property qualification of $250. It was repealed. A property qualification for voting is to me abhorrent. There seems no justice in such a qualification. Suppose when that qualification existed in New York, I, a resident of Virginia, should have introduced a resolution to nullify the law of New York State. My objections to such a qualification might have been sound and sensible, but every Representative of that great State would, very properly, have risen to his feet and demanded that I be rebuked, for such legislation was the function of New York State and no other. Yet, such a law was probably more of a restriction on suffrage than the payment of $1.50 is by a person in Virginia.

Take New Hampshire. The abstract given me by the Library of Congress reads:

Poll tax requirement: Persons excused from paying taxes at their own request may not vote. No person may be deprived of his right to vote by reason of having been excused from paying taxes in any town at his own request if he tenders payment of all taxes assessed against him during the year prior to the election. A poll tax of $2 is assessed against all persons between the ages of 21 and 70.

With certain exceptions, it would appear from this that a poll tax is a qualification in certain cases. This regulation is the concern of the State of New Hampshire and no other.

Take Vermont. A qualification there is contained in the words that a voter, to qualify, should be "of a quiet and peaceable behavior." Some might think that this was an unconstitutional restriction on their right to vote—but that is not the point involved. The principle that we are discussing is whether Congress has the right to say that Vermont shall not have such a restriction. It is the business of the State of Vermont and no other. I have never attended an election in Vermont, but I can very readily see that such a restriction, if enforced, would certainly tend to the orderly conduct of their elections.

There may be other examples, but these are sufficient to illustrate my point that each State has the right to fix the qualifications of its voters within the Constitution so long as there is preserved an equality of the privilege of voting.

Some may object that in the case of Virginia the qualifications of electors are not equal as between the white persons and the Negroes. A great deal has been

said on this subject that is inaccurate. Some claim that it is an attempt on the part of the white people of the Southern States to deprive the Negro of his vote, and that the qualifications of electors do not apply equally. This is not true in Virginia. Every Negro in the State of Virginia has the same identical qualifications for voting that I, or any other white person has. A qualification for voting in Virginia is that every man or woman 21 years of age or over shall pay $1.50 poll tax as a prerequisite to voting. This applies to every person regardless of color or race in the State of Virginia, it being understood, of course, that other qualifications also apply, such as residence, and so forth.

If you will permit a personal allusion, I have in my district a very large proportion of Negroes. I have not received, as far as my recollection serves me, one single request from any Negro to vote for this legislation. The Negroes are not behind this agitation for they know their rights and they know that their rights are respected, and they know also that they must comply with the law governing others as well as themselves. In my reading I ran across a curious fact in reference to the history of the poll tax in the State of Virginia. As to the Negro race, prior to the constitution of 1902 when the payment of a poll tax was in no way related to the matter of suffrage, 126,000 of them were assessed with a poll tax, and only between 50 and 60 percent of this number paid it; and keep in mind that this was at a time when it was absolutely unrelated to the question of suffrage and when there was no obligation on the Negro in respect to it other than the obligation which rested upon every other citizen of the State of Virginia to pay his taxes. Now the proportion of Negroes paying the poll tax is much smaller. So that we find that a larger percentage paid the poll tax when it was not related to the suffrage than they do now when the payment of it is a prerequisite to voting.

The obvious conclusion is that the Negroes are not at all concerned with the question of paying a poll tax as related to their suffrage, or else that they are not sufficiently interested in their suffrage to pay the $1.50 a year which the law requires. The letters that have come to me asking that I support this matter have come from the leaders of labor unions. I do not know why this peculiar condition exists. Certainly it is an indication that it is not a matter of race, for the labor unions of the South do not have in their membership many Negroes. Why should the leaders of the labor unions be so interested in the matter, when the Negroes, apparently, care little about it? This qualification is not ar attempt to deprive the Negro of his vote.

If the people of any State desire to change their suffrage qualifications, they can do it within the State, themselves, or it might be done by a constitutional amendment, as provided in article V of the Constitution. In my opinion, each State should have the right to fix its suffrage qualifications, for the people of the State know better its needs than the people of other sections of the country far removed from knowledge of the affairs of any particular State.

The payment of a poll tax of $1.50 as an evidence of the citizens' interest in the political affairs of this State is negligible in amount, but the total received from poll-tax payments in Virginia goes to a fund for the maintenance and improvement of the educational system to the benefit of every citizen. By evidencing such interest, the requirement of a poll tax should tend to increase participation in elections. In reading the history of the past, we find that one great weakness of democracies is that the citizen fails in his duty to exercise the privilege of voting. As far back as 430 B. C. we find that Pericles said, "We regard a man who takes no interest in public affairs as a useless character." Today much money and time and labor is spent in getting the voter to the polls. Certainly a person who would not pay $1.50 to exercise his privilege of taking part in his government has not much interest in his government. He deserves the characterization bestowed upon certain citizens of Athens by Pericles. It is characteristic of human nature to value most the things that cost us something.

I contend that the principle underlying this proposed legislation would seriously affect the present equality of the citizens of the respective States; that it would destroy the balance between the States themselves, which is such a fundamental principle in our governmental structure; that it is unconstitutional as shown by reading the Constitution itself and the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States; that it will disturb party political relations, for it is true, of course, that this is no time for partisan politics. "But," as said by a well-known commentator, with whose statement I agree, "it is a time for the election of courageous, intelligent, hard-working and public-spirited men, whether they are Democrats or Republicans"; that it will tend to injure the unity of the war effort in agitating sectional differences, for the seven States affected are deeply moved by what they consider an unwarranted attack upon their State sovereignty.

I know of nothing that would be more gratifying to Hitler and the enemies of our country than the efforts of those sponsoring this legislation at this serious time in our affairs.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am against H. R. 7. If this bill becomes a law it is the beginning of the end to local self-government. Bills similar to this one have been up practically every year for a number of years and have been fully discussed, and nothing new can be said for or against the poll-tax law.

If this bill is passed, you are opening the way for Federal control of elections in every State, county, and militia district of the country. I hope you will not establish this dangerous precedent.

There are other qualifications for voters of my State and other poll-tax States, such as literacy and educational tests, registering a certain length of time before election, and so forth. If you are successful in abolishing the poll tax, which is now one of the qualifications, you could with the same propriety abolish the literacy tests and all the other qualifications. As I have said before, the abolition of the poll tax will not enfranchise voters of my State and the other poll-tax States.

Those supporting this bill admit that Congress has no power to fix or alter the qualification for voters in elections for State officers. The proposal seeks to abolish the poll tax for election of Federal officials.

The author of the bill undertakes to get around the constitutional prohibition by stating that the poll-tax requirement is not a qualification of voters but an interference with the manner of holding a Federal election. It could be well said that this subterfuge is an indirect attack on the Constitution, and everyone knows or should know that the poll tax is one of the qualifications of a voter in the poll-tax States.

The Constitution clearly states that the register of voters at the Federal polls must coincide with the State register. You must amend the Constitution if you desire the poll-tax laws abolished in the several States. I do not believe that 5 percent of the lawyers in this Chamber disagree with me in this statement.

We have the same qualifications in the poll-tax States for State, county, and Federal candidates and one ballot for all candidates, so if this bill becomes a law you will have to separate the ballots and have one ballot for those qualified to vote for all State candidates and another ballot for those who are qualified only to vote for Federal candidates, and forced to have two separate poll holders. Those who desire to vote for Federal candidates without paying poll tax would have to comply with all the State laws relative to other qualifications for voters, such as registration, and so forth—a certain length of time before the election.

The bill negatives the idea of interfering with the qualification of the voters or electors, but asserts that the requirement to pay a poll tax is an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections. This manner and method of legislating by saying that a poll tax interferes with the manner of holding an election is a feeble effort to get around the Constitution and will not hold water. The power to determine the qualifications of a voter was never delegated by the States to the Federal Government.

We are united in winning this war, and all sections of the country are putting everything they have in it to win, their young boys, their money, their self-denial, and sacrifice. This is no time for disunity. The people who are advocating this bill know the people of

the South have always had great pride in their local self-government, and why would you want to offend these people during this great emergency in order to satisfy a few grumblers who belong to no party?

When the Democratic Party was in the minority for a long series of years, the Democrats of the South kept the fires of democracy burning, and since our party has been in the majority for the past 10 years we are confronted annually with this issue of interfering with local self-government, this issue brought about by some new converts. The attitude of many of the new Democrats is resented by the loyal Democrats of the South. If the Democratic tree is getting top-heavy, such tactics as this will create a desire among the loyal Democrats of the South to shake the tree and let a few citizens who vote Democratic one year and Republican another year fall out.

As I stated last year, when a similar bill was being considered in this Chamber, I never thought that the people of my State would be called upon to ask the crusaders of New York and other large cities of the North and West to purify the ballot box of my State. Since then and recently the great State of New York, through its State legislature, passed a resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to speedily enact this bill that is to abolish the payment of the poll tax as a qualification for voting for candidates for office in the Federal Government. I am reliably informed that the great State of New York has a requirement that a new voter must produce a high-school diploma or pass the literacy test; also that a voter coming from another State to reside in New York must do the same, and that the voter must reside in the State and voting precinct a certain length of time before he is eligible to vote, and there are many other restrictions. Under the voting qualifications of New York, many more people are disfranchised than under the poll-tax qualifications of some of the States of the South.

I wonder how many voters of the district of the author of this bill are disqualified on account of the high educational test. We are not asking that you change your educational test because this is none of our business.

I agree with the philosophy of someone who spoke against a similar bill last year that the seven States of the Union which do now require the payment of a poll tax before voting have no right to require the other States to pay poll tax as a requisite for voting. By the same token the other 41 States have no right to require the poll-tax States to abandon the poll tax as one of the qualifications for voting. I challenge you gentlemen of the large cities of the North and West to show me that your ballot is purer or fairer than the ballot of the poll-tax States.

During all these years while the Democratic Party was in the minority the Republicans never put across any bill of this character. I will take the old Tammany Hall, with many of its alleged irregularities, in preference to some of the modern-day crusaders who are now trying to engender strife during this great emergency and violate what we people of the South hold dearest in our hearts, local self-government.

If poll tax is wrong morally, why not submit this question as a constitutional amendment and let the people vote on it at a time when all our citizens are not busily engaged in putting their all into winning this war? You are not offering to submit it to the people because you know the people will not vote for it, as nothing is more vital to our good people than the function of fixing the requirements for voting by the several States.

Who has called upon Congress at this time to interfere with State rights and repeal the poll tax as a requirement to vote? The Navy has not called on us. The Army has not called on us. The Commander in Chief has not called on us. Why do you people who claim to be loyal Democrats desire to embarrass the Commander in Chief to the point where he will be forced to veto this bill because it is contrary to certain provisions of the Constitution? We are at war, and this is no time for sectional differences, especially in view of the fact that if the bill passes and none of the other qualifications for voters in the poll-tax States are changed, the law will not enfranchise any voters.

Therefore, we are brought to the conclusion that this is purely a political bill, men in both great parties bidding for a small minority group who has no party affiliation, and in order to satisfy this group you will have to pass another bill next year to abolish some other qualification of the voters and repeat this annually until there are no State laws for holding Federal elections. Surely you do not want all the elections of the respective States to be held and supervised from Washington.

You sympathizers of this movement are paying a great price and establishing a dangerous precedent. Some of you boys are putting on an interesting Punch and Judy vaudeville, in the daytime flirting with this small minority group who desire to do away with State rights and local self-government, and in the evening you repent, apologize, and ask permission to get back into bed with your loyal party advocates in order to again be in position to seek and obtain all honors that go with your party affiliation.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss briefly H. R. 7, which has been introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], and which has for its purpose the abolition of the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in national elections. This measure is clearly in open violation of our Federal Constitution and its unconstitutionality should be apparent even to the layman who knows nothing about the legal profession. Of course, any first-year law student can readily see why it is unconstitutional. Our Constitution has denied to Congress any jurisdiction or control over the subject of qualification of voters in national elections, as it states specifically and directly that in each State those voting for Members of Congress "shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

The States fix the qualifications of voters for members of the State legislatures and these qualifications govern those who may vote in national elections. No act of Congress can override or supersede this provision of the Constitution. To those who want to repeal the poll tax as a requisite for voting I wish to say that the only approach or way to gain their objective is through an amendment to our Constitution.

The Marcantonio bill is aimed directly at seven States in the South which now require the payment of poll tax as a requisite for voting in general elections. My State, Tennessee, repealed its poll-tax provisions last February; however, the constitutionality of the repeal measure is now before our State supreme court for consideration. The orderly and proper way to handle the poll-tax situation is to let each State reach its own decision in the matter without outside interference.

Why is the movement to repeal the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting brought up at this time? Do the proponents believe it is essential to our war effort that the same be repealed? Do they think that the repeal will promote unity, solidarity, good will, and a better state of feeling? Why is it that the Communists, the Socialists, the radicals, and those who want to overthrow our democratic system of government are unanimously in favor of the repeal of the poll tax? Why is it that all those with strange ideas, philosophies, and doctrines that are inimical to our form of government favor the repeal of the poll tax? Why is it that the clamor and demand for the repeal come from those people outside of the States requiring poll tax rather than from the citizens within such States?

There are certain communistic, alien, undemocratic influences behind the effort to repeal the poll tax which have ulterior motives in view. They talk about giving democracy to the poll-tax States when they themselves do not believe in our democratic system of governernment and hope to overthrow it. They are simply using the poll-tax movement as a cloak or cover for their sinister purposes. They hope to revolutionize the South through appealing to racial hatred. The Communists are saying that they are going to inaugurate a different order or a new day in the South. They expect to use the Negro as an opening wedge for stirring up racial strife and dissension and for spreading their communistic ideas in the South.

Well, I am afraid that the Communists do not know the spirit or temper of the South. Today it is the living symbol of democracy and the Communists will

never be able to infiltrate that section of the country with their diabolical plans. You will not find a more loyal, a more patriotic, a more liberty loving, or a more democratic section of the country than in the seven poll-tax States. The people of the South believe sincerely in their democratic way of life and will forever and eternally fight to maintain and preserve it. Communists had better leave the South alone if they know what is healthy for them. The South will not tolerate for 1 minute its invasion by any alien, undemocratic, communistic element.

Why all this agitation for the repeal of the poll tax right in the midst of the most serious war in which our country has ever been engaged? Our efforts, our thoughts, our attention, and our labors and energies should be directed primarily to the winning of the war at the earliest possible moment, and nothing should be done at this time to cause disunity, strife, or division among our people. However, of course, the Communists care nothing about causing dissension and strife among our people if they think it will help to overthrow our democratic system of government.

The South is the best, finest, and most loyal friend the Negro ever had. Today the Negro is happy and contented in the South and our races there are living in harmony, peace, and happiness. This fine relationship between the races in the South does not suit the Communists. They want to create discord and friction between the races so as to divide them. What real interest has the Communist Party in the welfare or happiness of the Negro in the South? The Communists care absolutely nothing about him except to use him as a tool or pawn. The Negro of the South cannot and will not be misled or deceived by the Communists in their pretense to help him by having the poll tax repealed.

For the sake of unity, harmony, good feeling and racial cooperation, why not drop this effort to repeal the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting? Let us forget the poll-tax question now and concentrate all of our efforts in winning the war. Why should other sections of the country be interested in the poll-tax repeal? Why should they want to tell certain Southern States how they may conduct their elections? Why should they desire to interfere in the requirements of voters in the States now having the poll tax? Have these States ever attempted in any way to impose their ideas about elective franchise on other States?

The poll-tax repeal is not being encouraged by the Negro in the South. If Congress abolishes the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting, then it is the death knell for local control of elections. It is just the forerunner of a strong, centralized government in the future.

I appeal to the membership of the House to weigh carefully the question of the constitutionality of this measure before they cast their vote. If they believe that it is in violation of the Constitution, of course, they will vote against the bill regardless of what they think of its merits. I am sure that political expediency will have no consideration in passing upon this important matter. The bill should be rejected by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, in voting for this resolution Members are striking a serious blow at not only the seven States in the South who levy a small poll-tax on adults for the purpose of common school education, in which group my own State of Georgia is included, but they are striking a heavy blow at the constitutional rights of every State in the Union. The right to levy a poll tax is not involved, for the levying of poll taxes for educational purposes originated in the New England States long before the South ever levied one, and many of the New England States still collect them, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and others. The question, of course, is the right of the States to fix and prescribe the qualifications for voting, and if the other 41 States of the Union do not happen to prescribe the payment of tax obligations due the State as a prerequisite to voting, they certainly have prescribed other prerequisites which they consider very important, such as citizenship, length of residence, and naturalization of aliens.

If Congress can invade this right of the States on the subject, it can nullify all the others.

The collection of poll taxes in my State began long before the War between the States, and until after the first World War, our State made the payment of all taxes due to the State a prerequisite to voting.

Mark Sullivan in his editorial in the Washington Post of Monday, May 24, has expressed the danger in this resolution and I wish to quote at length from him. He has given his article the title "Federal Usurpation" and says, as follows:

> This dispatch is about a bill scheduled to come before Congress this week, H. R. 7. From the point of view of the structure of American government, this is by far the most important measure now pending. But before dealing with this measure in Congress, and in order to make this measure clear, turn for a moment away from the Government in Washington and consider something going on among State governments.
>
> The State governments are alarmed—alarmed about their very existence. They are determined to save themselves. Preservation of the functions and integrity of the States as units of government is in the air. Not only is it a concern of the thoughtful; there is popular emotion behind it. Expressions of it emerge with increasing frequency and rising earnestness.
>
> Last week, at Chicago, was held a meeting of a committee of the Council of State Governments. The spirit of the meeting was expressed in a speech by Gov. Herbert R. O'Conor, of Maryland. He said: "We must take every care that the Federal Government does not step in and take over functions and prerogatives that are essentially the functions and prerogatives of the States themselves."
>
> And the week before, at Albany, N. Y., Gov. Thomas E. Dewey spoke: "The time has come for a complete and searching reappraisal of the relations between the people of the United States and their various governments—local, State, and national. * * * For 10 years now the Federal Government has been absorbing the functions of the States; also, to some extent, the functions of the local communities. * * * All of this was the direct outgrowth of a mistaken political philosophy. * * * The day is at hand when the people are being compelled to call a halt and take stock."

Very well, the welkin has been sounded. We are going to guard the functions of the States, preserve them against encroachment.

Of all the functions of the States, the most fundamental is their fixing the qualifications of voters. This is at present an exclusive function of the States—the States alone say what qualifications a citizen must have in order to vote.

Now we come to the bill in Congress, H. R. No. 7. The purpose and effect of this measure is to take away from the States a part of their function of fixing qualifications for voters. This measure asserts that Congress has power to fix, in every State, the qualifications of voters for candidates for Federal offices. The measure proceeds to exercise this power as respects one qualification, which now exists in some States.

The meat of H. R. No. 7 is: "It shall be unlawful for any State * * * to * * * [require] the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives; and any such requirement shall be invalid and void."

Now the reader may think this applies only to the States which have poll taxes—there are seven, in the South. Carelessly thinking that accounts for much of the thoughtless support of the bill in Congress, or the indifference about it. But the fact is, this measure applies to every State. It applies to New York and Pennsylvania and Illinois and Iowa—to literally every State—just as it applies to seven Southern States.

Here again the reader may think carelessly. If he is a New York reader, or an Illinois one, or an Iowa one, he may think: "We don't have a poll tax and we don't want one—so why worry?"

But if these States outside the South do not have the poll tax as a qualification for voting, they have other qualifications, which they cherish strongly. They have qualifications about length of residence, about citizenship, about naturalization.

And—here is the menace to all the States—if Congress can forbid one qualification, it can forbid any other qualification. By forbidding the poll tax as a qualification, Congress would set up a precedent and principle by which some future Congress could, if it chooses, forbid qualifications about residence and citizenship.

If the council of State governments, if the 48 State Governors, and all the other persons and organizations concerned about loss of State functions have vigilance in proportion to their earnestness, if they have energy to act in behalf of what they believe—they will take steps at once against H. R. 7. It is scheduled for action in the House this week, in the Senate later.

Mr. Chairman, one by one the rights of the sovereign States are being invaded and governmental powers are being centralized. I feel that I would not be doing my duty today if I failed to raise my voice in protest at this flagrant attempt to violate the Constitution.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON].

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this measure and desire to condemn it and the source from which it was born.

We who yet love and respect the democracy of Jefferson realize that the cards are stacked against us and that nothing said or done can stop this damnable piece of legislation in the House. Therefore, I shall consume but little time as no argument, regardless of its logic, will be of any avail. I do know that there are but few Members who at heart want to support this legislation, but are forced by political expediency to do so. I see so plainly the filthy hand of communism at work bringing this Nation step by step into despotism until I must go emphatically on record on the question. When I look into the shadows and see the skeletons of Earl Browder and John L. Lewis and others of their creed standing guard over the sponsors of this measure, pushing day by day for the destruction of liberty and freedom, I shudder at the thought of the state your children and mine will live in if the spirit of Jefferson and the other founders of this great Republic does not rise from the grave and run from the face of the globe every trace of communism and cause to burn again in the breast of our people a love for democracy, yes, old time simple democracy, the only kind that will let you be your brother's keeper.

When I think of the part the courage of the South has played in pre-war preparations for the struggle we are now engaged in, and its military record from the beginning of hostilities, it is difficult to understand the attacks made on the South from the floor today. I must not permit myself to go into this subject or I will use language beneath the dignity of the House.

I do want to say, however, that a man who will bring before this House and agitate a measure as controversial and sectional as this, that has no bearing on our war effort, is compromising the blood of our boys at the front, and is more concerned in the efforts of tyrants to destroy this democracy from within than he is to successfully prosecute the war.

This is not a measure concerned with poll tax, but the beginning of an organized effort by those persons among us who hate democracy, and have as their purpose to destroy it, to federalize elections throughout the Nation. If they are not stopped it will not be many years until there will be no such thing in America as the free ballot. It is a bitter fact that the party the South nurtured through its starving years, now reinforced by the Communist of the North will raise its head as a monster and condemn the South and all its traditions. Shame and pity on those who are so rich in ingratitude, and may they live to meet their sins face to face and have to bow before the result of their disloyalty.

If the Georgia Legislature wants to abolish poll tax in that State it is perfectly agreeable with me, but God forbid that New York shall ever dictate the political life of Georgia. When I think of the political corruption of the city of New York and then think of one of its very own presuming to say to the God-fearing, liberty-loving people of Georgia what they may and what they may not do, I am brought to where I must stop or I will use language that would be far beneath the dignity of this floor. But in conclusion, let me say and may it be heard throughout the land, that the man in New York, Illinois, or California who wants to dictate the political life of Georgia, or the man in Georgia who wants to dictate the political life of either of those States, is at heart a political gangster, bigot, and dictator.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, on every radio and from every Government communication as well as from every periodical, we hear the admonition of unity and the necessity for unity if this Nation is to emerge victorious in the present sanguine, mortal combat. Yet today we witness on the floor of this House a fiasco which has tragic portents.

We see a bill presented to this Congress to abolish the poll tax in the several States, a bill which is clearly and unmistakenly unconstitutional. We see a bill presented to Congress which threatens the unity of this war effort more than any one single thing. Yet for political expediency we will witness in a few moments Members of this House passing this bill because they fear for their political hides at the hands of the howling minority. Many of the arguments which I have heard today, I have heard before. I fear that the future will point to you, the would-be crusaders and champions of this new order to abolish the State lines and substitute therefor out-and-out centralized government as not friends of the people and of the Constitution but as those who shattered the pillars of constitutional government of our own day in exchange for oblivion for the future.

In this connection I am enclosing an editorial from my newspaper. This article, which may be a voice crying in the wilderness, points to you the direction in which this legislation leads us.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of May 24, 1943]

THE WAY OF POLL-TAX REPEAL

Are the advocates of poll-tax repeal striving to deprive the American States of their historic power of defining and regulating the suffrage and to transfer it to the Congress and the Federal Executive?

If that be the purpose of their campaigning, why do they not say so? Why are they not frank? Why, in their New Dealing, do they not deal plainly?

Hear one of them, the New York Times: "Yet it seems obvious that if a State can impose a poll-tax requirement of $3, it can impose one of several hundred dollars or even several thousand dollars, and that at some stage the Federal power must intervene to protect the 'republican form of government' guaranteed by the Constitution."

Granting so much, what guaranty have these people that the Federal power would not enact a requirement of a poll tax of "several hundred or even several thousand dollars"?

If centralization of power in the Federal Government at the expense of the several States is what they are after, why don't they say so?

Every State has its peculiar problems and circumstances. Shall New Mexico and Mississippi be made Provinces subject to Washington, as the Virgin Islands are? Who gave a nation now controlled by herded voters in great cities wisdom superior to Oregon's wisdom in the management of the State of Oregon?

Qualifications for voting in the States have been and are infinite in variety. Educational tests were operative in Northern States a century ago. Shall the test by decree of Congress and the President, be a diploma from a college, from a high school a grammar school? The tests in the States widely differ. Landholding, home owning, might be made the test, and the Congress not less than the States might confer suffrage on "potwallopers" if it so should choose.

In South Carolina we had the poll tax in the Reconstruction period, and it has been retained. It did not suffice to disfranchise illiterates, black and white, when South Carolina had a Negro majority. In 1895, under the domination and virtual dictation of B. R. Tillman, a constitutional convention adopted an alternative literacy and property qualification for voting. The Republicans assailed its Federal constitutionality, the provision was carried to the highest Federal courts, and those courts sustained it. Long afterward, the South Carolinians abolished the property alternative which allowed many illiterate persons to register and vote. Illiteracy was disappearing; the presentation of tax receipts at the polls was inconvenient, and Negroes, though they paid poll taxes, ceased to register and to go to the polls. That is the plain and simple story of suffrage in South Carolina.

If authorities advocating poll-tax repeal are not insincere, they are grossly and pitifully ignorant of the history of suffrage in the United States. One had thought better of the New York Times' fund of information.

Who would the Congress and the Executive have to vote were the making of voting laws placed exclusively in their hands?

Would they make a literacy test uniform in the 48 States?

Or would they abolish literacy tests, too?

Would they have men, women, boys, and girls of 18 to vote? Why not? They might if they had the power.

Would they have nontaxpayers, propertyless persons, to vote? Would they open the polls to paupers and Indians not taxed? What is a pauper anyway? If 5,000,000 or 10,000,000 persons receive largesse, or doles, old-age pensions, call them what you may, from the taxpayers, to save them from hunger and cold, would the New York Times confer upon them the balance of power in elections to save the constitutional Republic?

Pauperism is an incident of great cities, of congested populations. It is incidental to unemployment in them. No able-bodied man is a pauper on 10 or 20 acres of land in the country or in a village. The pauper vote is huge in New York in depression. We had depression in South Carolina 8 years before October 1929. It was in those 8 years that 300 of our 450 banks closed. No Government helped us South Carolinians, and we South Carolinians did not starve or crawl on our bellies to Washington for help.

Then, when Government began to give and give to save the crowded cities and industrial districts, we too accepted doles, we, through our leaders, pleaded for sops, and our leaders sold themselves and their State body and soul for pittances, they have no better sense than to believe that the wealthy and ruling States, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the rest, would elect a Congress and a President who would tax them to enrich the poorer States to solve the problem of "the Nation's economic problem number one." The News and Courier is wanting in that so great faith in Americanism.

The proposal to repeal the poll tax as a voting requirement is a step in the campaign

to create the one big State, the socialized State, to destroy the powers of the several States, and it originates in and is engineered by the great cities of herdable votes. They are in mortal terror of demobilization of city populations, of the partial disintegration of cities, of their consequent bankruptcy. The stars in their courses, by distribution of electric power, the internal-combustion engine, the new inventions of communication and transportation, fight against the congested cities and industrial districts, and we have had a Government 10 years whose main effort has been to postpone, to make gradual, the approach of their inevitable fate.

That is why the New York Times and its fellows would repeal the poll tax as a suffrage requirement. It would be a step toward the erection of the one big State.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER].

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Chairman, in opposing this bill I know that I am out of step with most of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle. But when I came to Congress over 4 years ago I subscribed to an oath that I would defend and support the Constitution of the United States to the best of my ability. Frankly, I cannot do that and support this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINTER. I prefer not to yield at this time.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is not out of step with the thinking people on the other side.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking as a great constitutional lawyer but just as a little, old country-town lawyer from a little country town down in Kansas where we do not believe in the poll tax, as a condition precedent to voting, nor do we believe in a poll tax for any purpose.

But we, insofar as my district in Kansas is concerned, do not believe that we have any right, nor do I believe that I have any right as the Representative of the Third Congressional District of Kansas, under the Constitution of the United States, to cast a vote in this body that will take away from any State the right to regulate its elections, insofar as the qualications of electors are concerned. There is, in my opinion, no question in the minds of most of the lawyers of this body that I have talked to on this issue. Frankly I think that most of the votes that are going to be cast for this bill are going to be cast for purely political expediency. I do not think there is any question about that.

There has been much argument here that the bill is constitutional. Let us see what the Constitution says. It has been read here time and time again, but I want to call it to your attention again.

Section 2 of article I of the Constitution provides that the House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. This section reads: "shall have"; it does not say "may have."

Amendment No. 10 to the Constitution provides:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

My contention is that the States, in setting up the Constitution, never, by the delegation of constitutional authority or amendment, delegated to the Federal Government the power to interfere in the manner in which they shall choose their various officials from within the State. There cannot be any question about that.

Section 4 of article I has been read to you times without number. It provides:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislatures thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

The Congress has the right and power and authority to alter regulations as to the time, place, and manner of holding elections, and nothing else. There is no place in the Constitution that gives the Congress the right to do anything other than the three things specifically set out. And the authors of this bill have very cleverly tried to say that the qualifications of voting are related to the manner of holding elections and, to my mind, there could be nothing further from the truth than that argument. The manner of holding elections refers to such matters as to determine whether the polls shall be opened at 7 o'clock in the morning, 8 o'clock, or 10 o'clock; whether certain type of ballots should be used; or voting by machine. If Congress has constitutional authority to enact such legislation as this, it can also enact legislation depriving States of the right to require residence as a prerequisite to vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to use this time to engage in any colloquy with anyone who has resorted to vituperations and very pointed insinuations against me. I am not concerned with that. The character of these attacks reveals the bankruptcy of the opposition. I deal with those remarks with the contempt that they deserve and prefer the justice of our fight for this legislation to remain as the best answer, as the complete and final defense to desperate vilification.

I prefer to confine myself to the salient phases of the very fundamental issue involved in this debate. First of all let us see just what the poll tax does. No one can deny here that it has resulted in the disfranchisement of approximately 10,000,000 Americans—some 4,000,000 Negroes and about 6,000,000 whites. It has resulted, by the very nature of this discriminatory practice, in disunity. It divides into two classes the people of these poll-tax States, the enfranchised and the disfranchised. In the poll-tax States you have divided the people into two groups: One group which has the right to vote and another group which is forbidden to vote by this poll-tax device. That is a reality, an established fact. So, therefore, by the very nature of the poll tax itself it makes for division. And when you speak of unity and of its necessity at this time, I say to you that you cause disunity by continuing a practice which permits a relative of one soldier to vote and forbids the relative of another soldier who is fighting alongside the other from voting; you are thereby causing division and disunity and you are proclaiming a discriminatory practice throughout the land which is most injurious to the morale which is so necessary to win victory in this war. Unity can best be achieved by restoring to the people the rights which you have usurped from them. We again have here the issue of Oppression versus Freedom, the issue of Tyranny versus Democracy.

You are seeking to perpetuate this fascistic system which has been making oppression possible, which contributes to the worst kind of exploitation of both Negro and white, a system which gnaws at the very heart of fundamental democratic concepts. The abolition of the poll tax is an extension of democracy to 10,000,000 Americans. The abolition of the poll tax is a reassertion and a reaffirmation of the Constitution and of the very principles upon which our Government rests. It is extending democracy within the boundaries of our own land. It is a blow at fascism against which Americans are fighting everywhere in the world.

The fundamental issue involved in this bill today is democracy. The contest is between those who want a government of the rich, the few, and the well-born and those of us who believe in a government of the people. It is an issue of whether or not the principle of equality shall live everywhere in America. That is the issue. It is not an issue monopolized by any group; it is not an issue monopolized by any political party; it is an issue on which every believer in American democracy stands up against bias and prejudice, against tyranny and domestic fascism, and once again in the Congress of the United States reaffirms the proposition of the Declaration of Independence, that all men are created equal and, like a true patriot, refuses to bow and kneel before the false god of race or color supremacy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER.]

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the hour has come for plain speaking. All of us know that we are engaged in a war for the preservation of this Nation, and we know, too, that only the will of the American people will drive that war through to a victorious conclusion. Washington bureaucracy will

not do it, questionnaires, paper work, appropriations, taxes, this Congress, the judiciary—none of these will win the war. Only the organized will of the American businessman, the American worker and farmer, and the American soldier, will do the deeds of heroism which are necessary on the industrial and fighting fronts—necessary to victory.

This bill before the House today is needed to strengthen our national will to fight to the finish for democratic institutions.

The Negro people have been mentioned in this debate. Let us be frank. Several million Negroes do not vote in the South because of poll tax and registration restrictions. Yet one-tenth of our American population is Negro. Would any of us here deliberately throw away the support of 13,000,000 Americans for the war effort? Who is it that plows the fields and digs the coal and works at heavy labor in the North and the South? This labor is essential to the preservation of American democracy. Do we not draft Negro soldiers? Do we not ask them to give their lives for democracy? The simple fact is that the preservation of democracy demands that we extend democracy to all American citizens.

Let us be clear. The passage of this bill will not guarantee that Negroes vote in the South. On the contrary, all of us know that the existing registration laws of the South will prevent Negroes from voting even if the poll tax is abolished. The percentage of Negroes voting in North Carolina, in Florida, and in Louisiana, where we do not have a poll-tax requirement, is no higher than the percentage of Negroes voting in the poll-tax States. Therefore, when our Southern friends mention the Negro vote they are raising a false issue. The people who will vote in the South as a result of this legislation will be the five to six million poor white people who are disfranchised at the present time by this outrageous, exorbitant, and cumbersome tax.

Anyone who wishes to fight reaction in this country and to maintain a liberal conservative democracy must recognize that the democratic rights of the people must be established in the South.

For millions of American citizens, for dependent people throughout the world, particularly in South America, this measure is the symbol of our sincerity and willingness to practice what we preach to others. In times of crisis, it becomes the paramount duty of the National Legislature to act with courage on basic matters of principle.

This bill is such a cause. I trust the House will reject every amendment offered to this bill today and pass it by a large majority.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I take this occasion as a long time friend of the family to pay a tribute to the memory of a charming, gifted, outstanding American woman, Mrs. William Howard Taft, the widow of one of our ablest and most famous Americans who held the highest offices in our Nation, both that of President and Chief Justice of the United States. He also served as Secretary of War and Governor General of the Philippines. Mrs. Taft raised a family of three children who occupy important and useful positions in our country today. She was one of the most intelligent, interesting, gracious, and beloved First Ladies of the Land.

The funeral services will be held at 2 p. m. this afternoon at St. Johns Church in Washington, to be followed by the interment at the Arlington Cemetery, where former President Taft is buried.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, the result of this legislation is inevitable, so far as this body of our legislative branch of the Government is concerned. It could be debated from now until fall and I sincerely do not believe such would change the attitude of this body in the very slightest.

But, nevertheless, may I point out one thing to the Members of the House, which I think is a reflection upon the poor white and colored people of the South, whom the proponents of this bill contend are disfranchised because of our poll-tax laws. The poll tax in Mississippi is fixed at $2 per year. Is there a man or woman here today who will argue with me that a citizen whose earning capacity is so nominal that he cannot pay 2 small dollars per year is competent to participate in an election? There are many poor people in my State, to be sure. But it is an insult to even the poorest to insinuate that he is disfranchised because of the levying of a $2 poll tax. Why, there is not a man or woman in my State, white or black, nor in any other Southern State, who cannot by some means or another meet this qualification for voting, and thus contribute that much to the support of our schools.

This attack, which I charge is inspired by the Communist Party, is the spearhead to break down the voting qualifications in every State of this Union. Uphold this bill and you immediately open to Federal legislative attack every voting qualification in your respective States. Thus you centralize your State government in Washington—the very issue which many of this body, and especially you Members on the Republican side, have been fighting in these very recent years.

Of most importance to us and our Nation today is unity. We are now facing the most powerful enemy in all of our noble history. We may not be able to defeat him without the united effort of all. Certainly a successful end will be prolonged without such. Everyone knows that this bill has created ill feelings between the Members of this body and the States as well. This certainly serves us no good. And those who sponsor this measure full well know that it has no more chance of passing the Senate than has a one-legged man in a foot race. There sits on this floor today as a visitor the senior Senator of my great State. He, I can assure you, has the power, the lungs, the stamina, and the determination to filibuster this iniquitous bill to an inglorious death, which the parliamentary rules of this House do not permit.

You who author and insist on this bill have known all of this time that the measure would, in the Senate, be filibustered into oblivion, and when it does mire down in the Senate, and important legislation is then and there automatically stalled, those of you who insist on this measure; in the face of an inevitable filibuster in the Senate, must assume the full responsibility for that legislative stalemate which is certain to prevail.

I am sorry that the wife of our President has publicly injected herself into this issue. It is universally known that this measure is directed at the South. She should recall the loyalty of the Southern States to the Democratic Party. She should recall that the South stood by and saved the Democratic Party from complete disintegration in the decade between 1920 and 1930. She should recall that as a result thereof her husband became President not for one term but three terms. What a reward we of the South are the recipients of today.

I end where I began. We know that passage by this body of this bill today is inevitable. But you gentlemen will look back on your acts with shame. And you Democrats who support the bill should certainly hang your heads in shame for the "reward" you will have handed your southern brothers of the Democratic Party.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Listening to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], one would assume that the only man who did not have a dollar was the Negro. There are some whites who do not have a dollar on occasion.

I cannot sympathize very deeply with some of my friends from the South when they complain of this measure being before the House at this time because they took in and adopted the New Deal. This measure would not be here were it not for New Deal support and because of the support given it, as pointed out by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], by the wife of the President. This is just one of the chickens that is coming home to roost. More accurately, one of the chickens hatched from the New Deal eggs.

Neither can I sympathize greatly with some of my Republican friends who have been talking about the iniquity and the wickedness and the viciousness of bringing powers to Washington and centralizing the powers of Government here and who then vote to divest the States of the power given them by the Constitution and vest that power in the Federal Government.

Now, how come? Far be it from me to suggest for one moment or even to think way back in the recesses of my own mind that there are any political implications in this bill. Oh, no; no, no. I am sure of that, because I recall how the gentleman on the majority side [Mr. GAVAGAN] brought out this bill on a previous

occasion, coming as he does from a district where there are a large number of Negroes. And then I remember how some Republicans, desiring that all people should vote, supported that bill, expecting, so someone from the majority side most unjustly said, that we Republicans hoped we would reap some political benefit from its passage. I know better than that. I am not deceived by any such charge coming from the majority side. None of us is acting today with hope of obtaining a political advantage, is he? Oh, no. Perish any such thought.

As a matter of fact, this bill is a delusion and a snare insofar as it is thought it will give the right to vote to any Negro or poor white in the South. I hope that no one on the minority side is so dumb as to think for one moment that by wiping out the poll-tax requirement we are going to do away with some educational requirement that the legislatures in these Southern States may put into the law if they desire to erect barriers against voting on the part of the Negroes or poor whites. You know they will if that be their purpose. Perhaps if we in the North were in the same situation, and needed the poll tax for educational purposes as they do we might do the same thing. There was a time when Michigan had a poll tax, but as the State grew in wealth and taxes increased it was abolished.

Let us not pretend that we are doing something that we are not doing; that we are conferring upon the poor—both white and black—in the poll-tax States the unqualified right to vote. This bill in its present form does not do it and, when the bill is read for amendment, one will be offered by me, providing that lack of education shall not bar a man from voting.

It has been said by the proponents of this bill that, if a man fights for his country, even though he lacks the money to pay a $2 poll tax, he should be permitted to vote. It is equally true that, if he fights for his country, he should be permitted to vote, even though he can neither write nor read.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, in this debate, as it has raged or run, there has been perfect agreement only on one point. There is universal lament that disunity is being produced both in Congress and in the Nation. All say they deplore this divisive influence, but each side blames the other for it. It reminds me of the old question, so popular in college hazing debates: Which came first, the hen or the egg? However, in this instance there is no question whatever but that those who introduced the bill, discharged the committee, and precipitated this debate by forcing its consideration on the floor, are they who have thereby prevented consideration of measures for the furtherance of our national war effort and disrupted our unity.

Surely those who act in sorrowful defense of the United States and their Constitution cannot be said to be provocateurs and aggressors. Repelling an assault with intent to murder cannot be twisted into causing the fight. MARCANTONIO, GAVAGAN, BENDER, and MAGNUSON can no more succeed in their attempt to fix war guilt upon us of the opposition than could Japan.

The disunity forced by this quartet and their abettors, as serious as it is, is not the only wound they have inflicted. They have paralyzed the House in its war functioning for a day or two, but inevitably they will paralyze the Senate for a much longer season, possibly for months, in time of war, when Congress and every citizen should be dedicated solely to the prime consideration of the furtherance of America's war effort.

I want to say a word or two with regard to the Classic case. You notice that is the only case about which proponents talk, and it is the only case about which they can talk without being laughed out of court. You would think from the way the distinguished gentleman from Indiana and others harp on it, especially the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and another distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN], that the case is in point, but it just simply is not. It is neither the latest word of the Supreme Court on the subject of poll taxes, nor does it even mention poll taxes.

I want to read you what was taken down as the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] said it yesterday, about the Classic case. I asked him to yield and he said he could not at that moment. He never did. He said:

> That case holds that there are limits beyond which States' rights cannot go. The implications are that if a State can impose a poll tax of $1 or $2 as a condition precedent to voting, then indeed a State could impose a tax of $1,000 or $10,000.

No such implication is to be found in the Classic case. There is not even a hint or suspicion of any such implication.

Now would you not think from that speech that he actually made—and, of course, he deleted from his remarks as they appear in the RECORD the major part of the quotation I have just read you, although he said every word of it, here in the well yesterday—that the Classic case had something to say on the subject of the poll tax? You might think so, but, as a matter of fact, it does not. In all the 22 pages of that opinion and 12 pages of dissent not one single time is the poll tax mentioned. It has no more to do with the poll tax than it has to do with the price of eggs on Mars. What is the Classic case—this cornerstone on which their preposterous edifice of sophistry is built? It had to do with a crooked election commission in New Orleans that stole ballots, and those that they did not steal, they counted falsely. The question in that case was whether or not those criminals could be punished under the pertinent Federal criminal statute. Sections 19 and 20 of the Criminal Code applied, under article I, sections 2 and 4 of the Constitution of the United States. Of course, the Supreme Court held the manifest truth that the Constitution guarantees that Members of Congress—and a candidate for Congress was being voted on in that primary—shall be chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and that the right to choose, guaranteed by the Constitution, means not only the right to vote, if qualified under the State statute to do so but also the right to have the vote honestly counted. That is exactly what the Classic case holds. I challenge anybody in this House to dispute that, and I pause for a reply to my challenge.

(No one replied.)

I reread that decision this morning, and I speak with all the positiveness of certainty, when I say, that the poll tax is not mentioned once in that long decision, and that it deals with an entirely different question from the question of the right of a State to require a poll tax or any other qualification for voting.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir, I am delighted to yield.

Mr. CELLER. The implications are that the reading of the Classic case clearly indicates that the reasoning of that decision is applicable to poll taxes, although "poll tax" is not mentioned in the decision.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman for his admission. I caught the point of the word "implications" when the gentleman used it, and I knew why he was using it. You hid behind the word "implications" because you knew that the Classic decision said nothing about poll taxes, yet you plainly intimated that its "implications" dealt with the subject of poll taxes when there is nothing in the decision justifying such an intimation.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN] called attention to the fact that the Legislature of Tennessee has recently repealed the statute of that State requiring the payment of the poll tax. Just to keep the record straight, may I call attention to the fact that a Chancery Court in Tennessee has held that repeal of the Tennessee poll-tax law to be unconstitutional and void? That case is now pending on appeal in the Supreme Court of Tennessee.

The sailor who interrupted these proceedings a few minutes ago, when he jumped up onto the balustrade of the gallery, and erroneously claimed his Constitutional right of freedom of speech, typifies the proponents of this bill, and his perch was no more precarious than is theirs. Our sailor friend was just as earnest and honest and mistaken as are they. Both he and they are wrong when they assert the right to speak, in the Congress of the United States, in advocacy of robbing the States of their power to levy poll taxes. He had, of course, no such right at all. They have a mere color of right, and even that should be subject to their oath of office to uphold the Constitution which their efforts and arguments would violate. This is the proper forum for no such argument. The legislature of a State is the place where such speeches should be made and by the duly elected legislators.

Now, let us consider this iniquitous bill.

Universal suffrage has never existed anywhere in the history of the world. Every sovereignty has fixed its own qualifications prerequisite to the privilege of the exercise of the elective franchise. The poll tax is one of these qualifications; age, residence, property ownership, and registration are some of the others most common. That the poll tax is a qualification made a prerequisite to the privilege of voting by some sovereignties is too clear for argument. Section 178 of the Constitution of Alabama, for instance, reads, in its pertinent part, as follows:

To entitle a person to vote in any election by the people he shall have * * * paid all poll taxes.

Whether or not there should be a poll tax may be debatable, but not in this forum except on the question of submitting a constitutional amendment to the States for ratification. The fixing, vel non, of such a requirement is exclusively for each State to determine for itself. There never has been a Federal election; nor a Federal vote. All elections have been and are State elections, and only those who have qualified under State law are eligible to vote therein.

The exclusive right of a State to fix the qualifications prerequisite to the privilege of voting is well recognized and established:

DISTINGUISHED TEXT WRITERS

"Among the absolute, unqualified rights of the States is that of regulating the elective franchise; it is the foundation of State authority; the most important political function exercised by the people in their sovereign capacity." Whilst "the right of the people to participate in the legislature is the best security of liberty and foundation of all free government," yet it is subordinate to the higher power of regulating the qualifications of the electors and the elected. The original power of the people in their aggregate political capacity is delegated in the form of suffrage to such persons as they deem proper for the safety of the commonwealth; Brightly Election Cases (*Anderson* v. *Baker*, 32, 33, 34, 23 Maryland 531).

Story, treating of this subject, says:

Every constitution of government in these United States has assumed, as a fundamental principle, the right of the people of the State to alter, abolish, and modify the form of its own government according to the sovereign pleasure of the people. In fact, the people of each State have gone much further and settled a far more critical question by deciding who shall be the voters entitled to approve and reject the constitution framed by a delegated body under their direction. (1 Story Constitution, ch. 9, sec. 581.)

From this it will be seen how little, even in the most free of republican governments, any abstract right of suffrage, or any original and indefeasible privilege, has been recognized in practice (ibid.). In no two of these State constitutions will it be found that the qualifications of the voters are settled upon the same uniform basis, so that we have the most abundant proofs that among a free and enlightened people convened for the purpose of establishing their own forms of government and the rights of their own voters the question as to the due regulation of the qualifications has been deemed a matter of mere State policy, and varied to meet the wants, to suit the prejudices, and to foster the interests of the majority.

The exclusive right of the several States to regulate the exercise of the elective franchise and to prescribe the qualifications of voters was never questioned, nor attempted to be interfered with, until the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States was forced upon unwilling communities (the States then lately in rebellion) by the military power of the general Government, and thus made a part of our organic law; a necessary sequence, perhaps, of the Civil War, but nonetheless a radical change in the established theory of our Government. (Brightly Election Cases, author's note, pp. 42, 43.)

The right to vote is not of necessity connected with citizenship. The rights of the citizen are civil rights, such as liberty of person and of conscience, the right to acquire and possess property, all of which are distinguishable from the political privilege of suffrage.

The history of the country shows that there is no foundation in fact for the view that the right of suffrage is one of the "privileges or immunities of citizens." (McCrary Elections, p. 3.)

"The right to vote is not vested, it is purely conventional, and may be enlarged or restricted, granted, or withheld, at pleasure, and without fault."

In *Blair* v. *Ridgely* (41 Mo. 161), the question at issue arose out of the provision of article II, section 3, of the Constitution of 1865 of the State of Missouri. By this section it was provided that no person should be deemed a qualified voter who had ever been in armed hostility to the United States or to the government of the State of Missouri; that every person should, at the time of offering to vote, take an oath that he was not within the inhibition of this section, and that any person declining to take such oath should not be allowed to vote. The plaintiff, at an election held in the city of St. Louis on November 7, 1865, offered to vote, but refused to take the oath prescribed by the constitution. His vote being rejected, he brought his action against the judges of the election for damages. The case was taken to the Supreme Court of Missouri, where it was argued exhaustively, and with much learning, by eminent counsel, and the argument is to be found in full in the Reports of the Supreme Court of Missouri, volume 41. It was contended by the plaintiff that the section of the constitution in question was in violation of the Constitution of the United States, being a bill of attainder and an ex post facto law within the meaning of that instrument, and, in consequence, null and void. But the court held against this contention, drawing the distinction between laws passed to punish for offenses in order to prevent their repetition and laws passed to protect the public franchises and privileges from abuse by falling into unworthy hands. It is said by the court that—

"The State may not pass laws in the form or with the effect of bills of attainder, ex post facto laws, or laws impairing the obligation of contracts. It may and has full power to pass laws, restrictive and exclusive, for the preservation or promotion of the common interests as political or social emergencies may from time to time require, though in certain instances disabilities may directly flow in consequence. It should never be forgotten that the State is organized for the public weal as well as for individual purposes, and while it may not disregard the safeguards that are thrown around the citizen for his protection by the Constitution, it cannot neglect to perform and do what is for the public good."

It was argued in *Blair* v. *Ridgely* that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (4 Wall. 277), where it was held that this section of the Missouri Constitution, so far as it provided an oath to be taken by preachers, was in the nature of pains and penalties, and consequently void, was decisive of the Blair case. But the distinction between the right to practice a profession or follow a calling and the right to vote is clearly stated in the opinion of Judge Wagner, as follows:

"The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Cummings case proceeds on the idea that the right to pursue a calling or profession is a natural and inalienable right and that a law precluding a person from practicing his calling or profession on account of past conduct is inflicting a penalty, and therefore void. There are certain rights which inhere in and attach to the person, and of which he cannot be deprived except by forfeiture for crime, whereof he must be first tried and convicted according to due process of law. These are termed natural or absolute rights. * * * But is the right to vote or to exercise the privilege of the elective franchise a right either natural, absolute, or vested? It is certain that in a state of nature, disconnected with government, no person has or can enjoy it. That the privilege of participating in the elective franchise in this free and enlightened country is an important and interesting one is most true. But we are not aware that it has ever been held or adjudged to be a vested interest in any individual.

"Suffrage in the United States not being a vested right, it results that persons who have enjoyed and exercised the privilege, and who have been qualified electors, may be entirely disfranchised and deprived of the privilege by constitutional provision, and such persons are entirely without a remedy at law." (McCrary, Elections, p. 9.)

"The whole subject of the regulation of elections, including the prescribing of qualifications for suffrage, is left by the National Constitution to the several States, except as it is provided by that instrument that the electors for Representatives in Congress shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and as the fifteenth amendment forbids denying to citizens the right to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Participation in the elective franchise is a privilege rather than a right, and it is granted or denied on grounds of general policy, the prevailing view being that it should be as general as possible consistent with the public safety." (Cooley's Constitutional Limitations, 8th ed., Carrington, vol. 2.)

Also, the following treatises are to the same effect:

Morse, Citizenship, section 3.

Pomeroy, Constitutional Law, section 535.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Article I, section 2:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Article I, section 4:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Article I, section 8, clause 18:

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of

the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER COURTS

To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite of voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State, and, save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate. The privileges and immunities protected are only those that arise from the Constitution and laws of the United tates and not those that spring from other sources (*Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277, 283); *Pirtle* v. *Brown* (118 Fed. 2d 218, certiorari denied by Supreme Court, 62 Sup. Ct. Rep. 64); *Huber* v. *Reiley* (53 Penn. St. 112); *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall. U S. 162, 170); *United States* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214, 217, 218); *United States* v. *Cruikshank* (92 U. S. 542); *McPherson* v. *Blacker* (146 U. S. 1, 38, 39); *Anderson* v. *Baker* (23 Md. 531); *Ex parte Yarborough* (110 U. S. 631, 664, 665); *Blair* v. *Ridgely* (41 Mo. 63); *Guinn* v. *United States* (238 U. S. 347, 362, L. R. A. 1916 A. 1134); *Ex parte Stratton* (1 W. Va. 305); *Kring* v. *Missouri* (107 U. S. 221); *Hamilton* v. *Regents* (293 U. S. 245, 261); *Washington* v. *State* (75 Ala. 582)).

The proponents of this measure rely for support of their contention almost exclusively upon the case of *United States* v. *Classic, et al.* (313 U. S. 299). They contend very artfully that this case justifies the Congress in the enactment of the Geyer bill but they do not mention the fact that the Classic case was a criminal prosecution against commissioners of elections for willfully altering and falsely counting and certifying the ballots of voters cast in a primary election for a Representative in Congress, among others. Based on article I, section 2, of the Federal Constitution, quoted supra, the majority decision of the Supreme Court holds:

Obviously included within the right to choose, secured by the Constitution, is the right of qualified voters within a State to cast their ballots and have them counted at congressional elections.

We concede the soundness of this holding.

The majority opinion further holds: That since by law in Louisiana, primaries are made an integral part of the procedure for the possible choice of Congressmen and since in Louisiana the nomination resulting from the primary is equivalent to election, the criminal statute covers interference with the right to vote and have the votes honestly counted and certified, in primaries as well as in general elections.

Mr. Justice Douglas, with Justices Black and Murphy, dissented as to primaries. The dissenting opinion is powerful, if not unanswerable the particular case. We leave the members of the Supreme Court to their quarrel on this point as it is not germane in the consideration of the Geyer bill.

Neither the majority nor minority of the Supreme Court question congressional power to protect by appropriate legislation the right secured by the Constitution to a vote and an honest count and certification. They agree that this is assured by article I, section 2, quoted supra, with article I, section 8, clause 18, which gives Congress the power—

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof.

It may be questioned whether or not the right to vote and to an honest count is a power vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof. This question, however, has no bearing upon our instant inquiry. The vital question of law pertinent to the debate of the constitutionality, vel non, of the Geyer bill is, not whether Congress has constitutional power to pass a criminal law, to punish interference with the right of a qualified voter to vote and to have an honest count, but has Congress the constitutional power to pass a law usurping the admittedly exclusive power of a State to prescribe the qualifications of its qualified voters?

No matter what interpretation they may seek to put on the Classic case, no matter how critical they may be of the Breedlove case, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, in the case of *Pirtle* v. *Brown et al.* (118 Fed. Rep., second series, p. 218), followed the Breedlove decision, quoted from it, and cited it approvingly, and the Supreme Court denied certiorari, thereby refusing to upset the decision in the Pirtle case, after the decision by the Supreme Court in the Classic case had been handed down (62d Sup. Ct. Repts., p. 64).

So the Supreme Court, since its decision in the Classic case was handed down, has refused to review the decision in the Pirtle case, which was handed down after the decision in the Classic case and which agrees fully with the holding in the Breedlove decision.

The Breedlove and Pirtle cases were both poll-tax cases. The Classic case had nothing to do with the poll-tax question. The sole question in the Classic case was:

May State election officials steal ballots cast by duly qualified voters for a candidate for Congress in a State primary election, in violation of a Federal criminal statute condemning all such rascality, without being subject to prosecution and punishment by the Federal Government?

The Supreme Court held: That the right granted the Federal Government by article I, section 2, of the Federal Constitution, to have its Congressmen chosen in a State election, meant the right to have them honestly chosen; and that the right granted the Federal Government by article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Federal Constitution, "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof," authorized the making of the law violated by Classic and his partners in crime. In other words, the Classic case dealt not with who was a qualified voter under Louisiana law, but with the right to have an honest count of the ballots of admittedly qualified voters.

The United States of America was created by the Thirteen Crown Colonies. It existed long before the Constitution. As far as external sovereignty in international affairs was concerned, it was a sovereign nation. It functioned through the Continental Congress composed of delegates from the Thirteen Colonies. The Colonies became free and independent States by virtue of the Declaration of Independence, in the making of which they united, and which was validated by force of arms. Each State was sovereign, supreme, free, and independent except as they, in the exercise of their sovereignty, banded themselves together and delegated by their own free will and accord, certain of the powers of their sovereignty to the limited union they agreed upon and formed. This union, according to the Articles of Confederation, was to be perpetual and in international affairs was given sovereignty. It had no power whatsoever in domestic affairs. It could not even levy taxes for its own support, being dependent upon contributions made by the States. The sum total of all domestic sovereignty was in the respective States and has been diminished from time to time only as the absolutely sovereign States saw fit to make further delegations of parts of their sovereign power. After becoming convinced that the union existing before and under the Articles of Confederation was impracticable, the Constitution was ordained and established "in order to form a more perfect union." The Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *U. S.* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp. et al.* (299 U. S. 304, 315) says:

The broad statement that the Federal Government can exercise no powers except those specifically enumerated in the Constitution, and such implied powers as are necessary and proper to carry into effect the enumerated powers, is categorically true only in respect of our internal affairs. In that field, the primary purpose of the Constitution was to carve from the general mass of legislative powers then possessed by the States such portions as it was thought desirable to vest in the Federal Government, leaving those not included in the enumeration still in the States.

There never has been a Federal election held nor a Federal vote cast. The States existed before the Federal Government. They created it. They gave it life and such limited powers as it possesses. The power to hold elections and to authorize people to vote was never delegated to the Federal Government. It has always been and remains in each State.

In the Constitution of the United States, however, the States—absolutely sovereign in this field as well as in all domestic affairs—changed the form of their Federal Government and provided in article I, section 2:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

In 1913 the seventeenth amendment became a part of the Constitution of the United States, providing for the election

of Senators in exactly the same way. But both Senators and Representatives were to be elected, not by the people of the United States nor by the votes of persons authorized to vote by the United States, but "by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature," fixed by the State.

When the States in convention assembled agreed to undertake to hold elections for the Federal Government, the way it was to be done was merely by admitting candidates for Federal office into the regular State elections. All elections are State elections. They always have been, are now, and should so continue. In agreeing to admit candidates for Federal office to State elections, the States did not stipulate what qualifications they would fix as prerequisite to the privilege of voting. They did not limit themselves. They did not confer any right whatever upon their Federal Government except that its candidates could run in their elections and be voted on by the voters of the States—those who had been given the franchise of suffrage in each State by the law of the State. But in assuming this obligation they gave this pledge:

> And the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

In other words, wrote the States, we pledge you that as our guest in our political homes you will be treated as well as we treat members of our own political family; we will give you the best we have, judged by the same standards and safeguards we have erected for our own safety. But we will use for you only the same servants we employ for ourselves, and we do not agree to make you master, nor to employ more nor different servants because of this hospitality we cordially extend you.

The principle dominating this field of thought is that "the law guarantees every citizen the right to be justly governed, but not the privilege of being one of the governors."

We are perfectly familiar with the distinction sought to be drawn by the supporters of this measure between qualifications and conditions. In the last analysis, however, this seems to be a distinction without a difference. Whether the requirements fixed by the law of a State as prerequisites to the privilege of voting be conditions or qualifications is unessential. Whatever they may be called, the State alone has the right to fix them. The Federal Government has no such right. We are, of course, also familiar with section 4 of article I of the Constitution of the United States, the pertinent part of which reads as follows:

> The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

While this does delegate to Congress a certain veto power, it is only as to regulations prescribed by a State as to "the times, places, and manner of holding elections." It has nothing whatever to do with the paramount right of a State to fix conditions or qualifications prerequisite to the privilege of voting. It has to do exclusively with the "how" of the election, not with the "who" of the electors.

You may say that a poll-tax requirement is unfair and unwise, but you have no vestige of authority or right to outlaw the poll tax by statute as here proposed.

The caste system of India may be all wrong and indefensible, but the Congress of the United States has no power to change it. We have just as much power over India as we have over Alabama.

England may, in our judgment, be foolish in keeping her King, but no one would suggest that we have any semblance of power to fire their King, yet we have even less power over Alabama or any other State of this Union than we have over England. The reason is plain. We are oath-bound to respect the sovereignty of every State of the United States, whereas we took no such oath with respect to England.

Germany's treatment of the Jews is barbarous, but no one of us has ever sponsored a measure here to stop this rape of right, this inhuman murder of law, realizing that, so far as this Congress could legislate, Germany's internal affairs were Germany's business and not ours.

I want to call your attention to the propaganda which has been flooding the Capitol of late, much of which has come to my desk, issued by organizations that are supporting this measure, calling attention to the fact that there is no race question presented here because more white are disenfranchised by the poll tax than colored people. Whether that be true or not makes no difference. There certainly is no distinction made, and no discrimination is practiced or possible under any of the poll-tax statutes or constitutional provisions.

May I read to you what the Constitution of Alabama says on that subject, contained in section 178 of the Constitution of Alabama?

> To entitle a person to vote in any election of the people he shall have—

Then deleting the provisions as to age, residence, and registration—

> paid all poll taxes.

Could any words be devised or used which would more clearly evidence the fact that that is a primary qualification fixed for all who would vote by the Constitution of Alabama?

It is a requirement of a condition precedent to the privilege of voting. I maintain that there are no words that would have evidenced such an intent more clearly. So it is that if we are to comply with our oaths of office, if we are to uphold and maintain the Constitution of the United States, as we have sworn to do, we cannot thus impinge upon the sovereignty of the State of Alabama.

This bill would override and violate the sovereignty of those States which have seen fit in their wisdom to adopt the poll tax as one of the prerequisites to the privilege of voting in elections held in and by those States.

But not only is the poll-tax requirement a qualification made a prerequisite to the privilege of voting, it is also a fair and reasonable test.

There can be no escape from the conclusion that this refers not to the "how" of the election but to the "who" of the electors. It certainly has nothing whatsoever to do with the time, nor place, nor manner of holding any election. It certainly provides a reasonable test of qualification in that its payment is left purely voluntary and all money received, without deduction of any fees or other costs, goes to the public schools. So the poll-tax requirement tests a citizen's interest in the financial support of the public schools of his State and also tests his interest in obtaining for himself the franchise of suffrage. One really desiring to vote, one who would take an interest in voting, one who would take the trouble to post himself upon the merits or demerits of candidates and issues, has never minded and will never mind paying $1.50 a year in order to qualify as an elector. If one desiring to vote values the privilege of voting less than $1.50 a year, it is doubtful if he could be a good elector. Therefore, since section 4 of article I of the Federal Constitution is the only grant of power to Congress over suffrage and elections, Congress has no power at all to pass a law overriding this requirement of State law. This was the holding of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Breedlove case and again in the Pirtle case.

The appeal that I am making to you Members of the House today who are honoring me with your presence and attention and to those who may, as I certainly hope they will, read my remarks in the RECORD, is that this thing be not done, particularly at this time.

In conclusion, therefore, I invite your particular and special attention to those passages of Washington's Farewell Address wherein he expressed his parental solicitude for the future of the Nation of which he was father:

> That your Union and brotherly affection may be perpetuated.

And this primary injunction:

> The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so, for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence, the support of your tranquillity at home, your peace abroad, of your safety, of your prosperity in every shape, of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that from different causes, and from different quarters, much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed, it is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the immense value of your National Union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it, accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity, watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety, discountenancing whatever

may suggest even a suspicion that it can in ary event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

The mighty mind of our first President, as he let it run down the long years of the future, saw clearly that from time to time there would be legislation proposed and administrative policies considered which would tend toward disintegration of the unity which he conceived to be and which we all must admit is essential to the preservation of our form of government, the dual system of government, the States supreme in their realm of internal affairs, the Federal Government supreme in its exclusive sphere of itnernational affairs.

No one can deny that the South has taken its rightful place and performed well its full part in every foreign war which this country has waged. In the War of the Revolution the blood of southern patriots reddened the soil of New England and wrote thereby a plea against sectionalism. The ragged heroes who followed Washington across the Delaware and to Valley Forge were Americans all. There was no sectional partisanship among the boys who fought at Chapultepec nor San Jacinto. The forces of the Republic in our war with Spain were not clad in blue or gray, but in the uniform of the Nation. The boys who sleep on San Juan Hill or in the trenches around Santiago were from every part of the Union.

Those men who "gave the last full measure of devotion" in France in World War No. 1 and their buddies who, thank God, came back to live among us, were Americans—not northerners nor southerners nor easterners nor westerners.

The same thing is equally true in this desperate struggle for survival in which we are now engaged. Every one of those wars of the Republic has been nonsectional, and united we stood, fought, and won.

More than a year before the Declaration of Independence was adopted by the Continental Congress at Philadelphia, a similar declaration of independence was adopted by a convention which met in Charlotte, N. C. It is known as the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. From a pamphlet preserved in the Library of Congress we learn:

Therefore on the sd. 19th May 1775 the sd. committee met in Charlotte Town (2 men from each company) vested with all powers these their constituents had or conceived they had.

After a short conference about their suffering brethren besieged and suffering every hardship in Boston and the American blood running in Lexington, the electrical fire flew into every breast.

These men of the South felt keenly the afflictions of their brethren in Boston, and the news of the American blood running in Lexington caused the electrical fire to fly into every breast. Would that we were so closely knit in bonds of brotherhood and sympathetic regard today. The ground that we have lost in this respect may be regained but not without mutual respect and confidence.

Every one of those hardy pioneers loved his fellows engaged in the common struggle to build here "a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." We have a rich, common heritage from these founding fathers. There is much to love in the citizens of every part of our great Nation. We may look on this and be drawn closer together. We may look on the divisive elements and become hostile camps. The future is in our hands today to mar or to make. The South asks and will have no part in the local problems of other sections. We have full confidence in our brethren that they will work out their own difficulties wisely and well. We may consider the things that will make us one or the things which divide. My plea is not made as a southerner nor as the Representative of a great district of Alabama, but as a humble citizen of this great Republic. I plead with you, my colleagues, and with all who have ears to hear, that we set ourselves against consideration of those things which tend to divide us and give our best thought to those things which unite. There are many measures challenging our best united thought.

The war must be won. We must be united in its prosecution. It is a war for survival. We are all in the same boat. None should be thrown out. Let us press forward toward our glorious destiny in unity, "discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts."

I am appealing to the membership of this House to think on these things. There is no reason why we should adopt the unconstitutional statutory way when we have a perfect right to submit a constitutional amendment which might do legitimately what the proponents of this heinous bill want done. I beg of you, whether you support the objective of this bill or not, that it be defeated, because it is illegitimate, and its passage would assassinate interstate comity. I beg of you to think on these things and be on your guard lest plausible arguments, artfully advanced, should sway your better judgment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and other elections for said national officers and a tax upon the right or privilege of voting for said national officers.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that instead of separating the amendment into several amendments dealing with each section separately, the subject matter being absolutely the same, simply striking out primary elections from this bill, that it be considered as one amendment to the whole bill as read, and not several amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object, but I did not hear what the gentleman said.

Mr. HOBBS. I have offered an amendment to strike out all reference to primary elections from the bill wherever that reference occurs, and I am asking unanimous consent that instead of adding it to each section I be permitted to insert one to the whole bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the amendment which he offers to section 1 and other sections that have been read may be considered as one. Is there objection?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALTER. Is it in order to offer any amendment whatsoever to the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. It is. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: Page 1, line 4, strike out "primaries or other", and in lines 8 and 9 strike out "or registering to vote at primaries or other" and insert the word "at"; on page 2, line 2, strike out the words "primaries and other"; on page 2, in line 7, strike out "or registering to vote", in lines 8 and 14 strike out "primaries or other", in line 17 strike out "such primary or other election" and insert "such elections", in lines 19 and 20 strike out "such primary or other" and insert "any such", and in line 25, strike out "or registering to vote at any primary or other" and insert "at any"; and on page 3, in lines 8 and 9, strike out "or registering to vote in any primary or other" and insert "at any"; amend the title to read as follows: "An act making unlawful requirements for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to vote in elections for national officers."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, the sole purport of this amendment is to strike out all reference in the bill, wherever it occurs, to primary elections, and to registration as a prerequisite to voting.

In the dissenting opinion in the Classic case, written by Justice Douglas and concurred in by Mr. Justice Black and Mr. Justice Murphy, it was held that the majority opinion is in error in holding that the United States Criminal Code sections, under which the prosecution of Classic and his codefendants was instituted, could be applied to primary elections. You will find this dissenting opinion unanswerable.

Now, what is a primary? A primary is a family fight. The family is split and divided as to which one of the boys shall represent that party before the voters at the polls in the general election. That is all it is. Repeatedly it has been held by courts of last resort, even the Supreme Court of the United States, that the sovereign power of the Federal Government had nothing whatever to do with local affairs; that its sovereignty was primarily in external affairs. I cite you the case of Curtiss-Wright Corporation as the indisputable authority for that. They held that as to primary elections, which are family quarrels within the Democratic, Republican, or any other party, the Federal Government has no more to do than with private, personal affairs.

I am asking you just as a common-sense proposition, if you have read the dissenting opinion on the subject of primaries in the Classic case, how can you discharge your duty under your oath as a Congressman if you vote to go that much further than the main illegal invasion of States' rights to control their own general elections. There never has been in the history of this land a Federal election. There never has been a Federal elector. All elections have been and are State elections. All that the States did was to grant the opportunity to those who were running for Federal office to participate as candidates in the State elections. Even then it was hedged about with the qualification that the States had the right to fix the qualifications for those who might seek to vote.

So, in all fairness, without any animus, I know that the motives that prompt gentlemen who are proposing this bill and who are supporting it on the floor will not require that you go as far as this bill now goes. I am begging you not to intrude yourselves into the family quarrels of the primaries, and that you let those fights be settled among the boys down in the States, wherever they occur. The House bills on this subject that have passed the House before did not cover primaries. You doubt your right to pass this bill even if this amendment be adopted. I challenge your right to pass it in any form; but you certainly do not need to go this second mile into iniquity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Is it the purpose of the Chair to recognize members of the Judiciary Committee in preference to nonmembers of that committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will use his own discretion.

Mr. CELLER. Is the bill to be considered as though it came from the Committee on the Judiciary?

The CHAIRMAN. The management of the bill is in the hands of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to be brief in my opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]. In listening to the gentleman from Alabama, I could not help but think, if I should ever be on the wrong side of a case in court and had some desire to present that wrong side in the best possible manner as a lawyer, I am sure I would go to Alabama and seek out the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]. He is an excellent lawyer, a learned lawyer, but, of course, I think the facts are clearly against him on the primary angle of this subject. But the gentleman said to leave it to the poll-tax States to settle their own family fight. The amendment would not only settle their own family fight but it would settle this piece of legislation, because all his amendment does is negative the effectiveness of this bill regarding the southern primaries. Of course, the southern primary is all the election there is, and so there would be no poll-tax bill. It is a very astute amendment, and I think one of the purposes of the bill is to abolish poll taxes so that these so-called family fights will be a little more peaceful and every one in the Southern States will have their say regarding them.

I hope the amendment will be voted down. The gentleman, in all seriousness, does bring up a question of law, but he determines to decide the constitutionality of this bill in his amendment, and I do not believe the House wishes to do that at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the primary elections in the anti-poll-tax States are as important or far more important than the elections themselves. If there is any doubt on that score permit me to read from the majority opinion by Justice Stone in the so-called *Classic Case* (313 U. S., at p. 314):

> Interference with the right to vote in the congressional primary * * * for the choice of Democratic candidates for Congress is thus, as matter of law and in fact, an interference with the effective choice of the voters at the only stage of the election procedure when their choice is of significance, since it is at the only stage when such interference could have any practical effect on the ultimate result, the choice of the Congressman to represent the district. The primary in Louisiana (and it is so in all poll-tax States)—

Goes on to say Justice Stone—

> is an integral part of the procedure for the popular choice of Congressman. The right of qualified voters to vote at the congressional primary in Louisiana and to have their ballots counted is thus the right to participate in that choice.

This indicates how essentially important primaries are; if therefore we take out the word "primary" in the bill we cut out the very heart and soul of the bill and there is no reason even to consider further the pending legislation.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. Is it not a fact that in the Classic case every judge held that a primary was an election and that the dissent of Mr. Justice Douglas was based on the fact that the Congress had not legislated as to primaries and there being no common-law crime therefore he thought the defendant could not be convicted?

Mr. CELLER. This is so. Of course, the reasoning of the minority opinion by Justice Douglas did not prevail.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. The bill, which has been before the House in every Congress has never had this provision as to primaries in it before. This is a Senate amendment engrafted upon the bill that the gentleman praised so highly each time it was before us. I do not see why, therefore, you cannot go back to your original grip and not seek to take an underhold.

Mr. CELLER. I understand the bill now before us is in the form in which it came out of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

It is quite probable that if you indicate your views to some of the Members from the poll-tax States they will always tell you that only primaries in the South count, that elections do not count. I have some interesting figures on the primaries to show how even in the South only a modicum or at least only a minority of the qualified voters come out to vote for various reasons and I assume among them there is the imposition of the poll tax. I got these figures from Emory Forbush, of the Editorial Research Reports.

In Georgia, for example, in the 1932 primary, only 37.7 percent of the voters came out to vote. In Texas in the 1938 primary only 37 percent voted; in the Mississippi 1935 primary it was 34.4 percent; in the Virginia 1936 primary it was 26 percent; in the Alabama 1932 primary it was 33.4 percent.

What is the situation in some of the other States—non-poll-tax States? The average vote in the Presidential elections of 1928 and 1932 in, for example, the neighboring non-poll-tax States of Kentucky and West Virginia were in contrast 68 percent and 79 percent, respectively.

In view of the fact that even in primaries there is a cutting down of the primary vote—and I am sure the cutting down has some relationship to the imposition of the poll tax as a condition precedent to voting—and we find the average between 37.7 and 23 percent, we must in fairness vote down the amendment. I am sure the Members do not want to vote for this amendment, otherwise all our efforts yesterday and today will have been wasted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. Chairman, I happen to come from the State of North Carolina, where long years ago we abolished the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting. I am not so much concerned about that issue as I am over some of the arguments and precedents which we are about to set in this House. I expect today about the only crime I am guilty of in the eyes of some, and personally I am very proud of it, is the fact that I happen to be from the south side of the Potomac River. I am astounded at the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] being so anxious to be such a gratuitous benefactor to the people below the Potomac. Why does he persist in bringing up the North-South issue by abusing the South and its people?

I thought we were at war. I thought the North, East, South, and West were engaged in a war for the preservation of democracy, and yet I hear such inflammatory statements as came from the charming lips of such a very delightful person as is the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]. And here is the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN] immaculately dressed, who for the first time has exhibited such great interest in our people. Charming and convincing as he is, with an affidavit face, he seems to want to give us advice. I was almost charmed as I first observed him here in the Hall, with his hair combed so slick. He will never miss it when he goes bald-headed. What a team, Mr. MARCANTONIO carrying the Constitution, Mr. GAVAGAN and Mr. BALDWIN of New York running interference, while the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] uses her charm to attract the attention of the defending team so that one more score can be marked up against State governments.

We have the galleries here crowded with Americans today and we have about 6,000,000 men in uniform, perhaps 2,000,000 of them engaged in mortal combate, yes, fighting and dying. What are we doing while thousands and thousands are striking at the rubber plants? Thirty thousand this morning, I believe. Here we are 400 men and women in a so-called poll-tax fight. I could give it another name. I must confess I am not very proud of the picture.

Mr. Chairman, there are about six States in the Union that have the poll-tax law. Those States had that law when their boys left to go across the pond. For God's sake, Mr. Chairman, let us preserve as much of this Government in as nearly the same shape as was intact when those men donned the uniform.

They left this Government in our hands as trustees, praying God that we would preserve this end of it while they defended and protected it from attack by the vandals and enemies who are attempting to destroy it from without. I for one propose to keep faith with them.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not voting from political expediency. I do not have to. Withdraw that charge. I have heard the boys who are fighting the war used as a whipping post lately on many issues. I think I am voting so that many of those who now are fighting may get a chance to vote, rather than otherwise. In my opinion, they deserve that privilege no matter in what section they may reside.

I have been here a long time. Constitutional questions have always interested me. I was here when you gentlemen cut the gold dollar in half, and the constitutionality of that and many other issues did not seem to trouble you very much. With that record, you now plead constitutionality on a close issue. We are only attempting to take care of Federal officials, leaving the other candidates for office in your own States to your own tender mercies. You may well be forced to grant officials of the Federal Government an untrammelled election. But constitutionality does not lie in the mouths of many of you now pleading that issue here today. My memory is too green to regard you as consistent. There were many much more important matters on which you were willing to risk constitutionality. There was the one in which your own leader pleaded, "Do not worry about constitutionality. Pass the law and that feature will be determined later." You remember that never-to-be-forgotten letter and most of you jumped through the hoop.

In closing may I say that if a $2 poll tax prevents the people in your district from voting, why do you not follow the New Deal example that we have had so long and give them $2 to vote? You might even expect them to vote right.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment. I shall not discuss the constitutionality of this so-called anti-poll-tax bill today more than to quote article I, section 2, of the Constitution:

> And the electors in each State (for Members of Congress) shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Article I, section 4:

> The time, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations except as to the place of choosing Senators.

The Congress can by law have to do with the time and the place and manner of the election; but the States retain control over the qualifications of the electors. This right of the States has been recognized for more than 150 years.

I think it is agreed by everyone here opposed to this bill that it is unconstitutional. Every other man, in my opinion, agrees that there is some question about its constitutionality.

Only one thing bothers me today, and that is the fact that you would bring a bill of this nature to the House at this time, a very controversial issue, and occupy the time of the House for its consideration. Furthermore, as has been so well said by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], if this bill passes it will not be responsible for one single Negro voting in the State of Mississippi. If that is so, then I ask you, What in the name of God are you trying to do? You admit it will not permit them to vote. Then just what is your purpose?

Mr. Chairman, I have been here for 5 months now. I have waited patiently and I have listened to the older Members on both sides of this House give advice from time to time. I believe it is high time that some of us who came here for the first time advise the leadership of both parties that this is no time to play politics while our boys are dying on the battlefields.

If this will not permit the Negro to vote in the South, what will it do? I want to refer for a moment to the speech made by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] today. I attended a meeting of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee, of which I am a member. She came before that committee. She knows all about the desire of herself and others for flooding this country with immigrants from all sections of the world. I attended a session of my Committee on Indian Affairs this morning, and she was before that committee. She knows all about what should go on in the State of New Mexico. Today in the Well of this House she told you what would happen to the northern Negro sent down into the Southland of this country. She knows nothing about the South. May I tell you that no Negro from either the North or South who behaves himself will be arrested in Mississippi, and no Negro or white man has ever been punished in my State when he was behaving himself. I challenge any of you to dispute that statement.

All you do is stir up confusion. Does the Negro in the South want this bill brought before you? I say "No." You cannot submit the names of any people from my State, either colored or white, who have asked for this damnable legislation. I may say also to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] that he will find just as much suppression in his State, he will find just as much poverty in the case of both whites and colored up in his State as he will in mine. Clean up your own doorstep before you come down to Mississippi to tell the people of that State what to do. If you do not want a poll tax, do not have it, but, my God, let those States alone where there is no confusion or racial strife.

I have been working with the Negroes of Mississippi for the past 7 years and I say to you that you are insulting the intelligence of the southern Negro when you throw your political love arms around his neck with this bill. He knows you will choke him to death in the dark night should your interest ever demand.

The small minority in both races who misinterpret the meaning of this legislation, will impose hardships on the honest people of both races, and only confusion, hatred, and bloodshed will be the result.

We hold no ill will for the Negro, but we appreciate his problem and he in turn appreciates ours. We, members of both races, of the South, want to be left alone to solve our own problems in a manner that we know to be for the best interest of all concerned. At a time like

this, why should self-styled intellectual geniuses who know nothing about the South try to force upon a people something that is unconstitutional and which would help to destroy all local self-government in violation of the Constitution upon which our great democracy was founded.

During the days of the reconstruction, after the Civil War, when officials were imported into the South who imposed every hardship upon the white people of the South, our grandfathers battled this problem without assistance but with every hindrance from the Federal Government. After many years, by exerting special effort to forget those horrible days, we of both races recognized our problems and started in a progressive manner to solve them. We of the South were the first to see the deplorable condition of the Negro. His problems became our problems. We met those problems with action rather than words. We rescued him from a bondage that was far more detrimental than the chains of slavery. We freed him from the hands of the imported white man who came to our Southland, not because he was interested in the welfare of the Negro race, but to exploit him for personal gain. For this deed alone, we of the South have received the everlasting gratitude of the colored race of the South. We learned to work out our problems confronting both races for the advancement of all.

Let me say to you with all the sincerity of my soul that he does not want this bill passed. He knows that future welfare of his people depends upon the understanding that exists between the two races in my section of the country. This bill will in no way whatsoever increase or enlarge his citizenship. It will only create misunderstanding, and where misunderstanding reigns, confusion and chaos exist. He knows that under this bill he has everything to lose and nothing to gain.

Today we see our Nation catering to minority groups as never before. It is right to treat all minorities fairly, but by reason of the necessities of war, with the attention of our leaders directed in the prosecution of the war effort, we find many minorities demanding more than fair treatment. This movement today has reached the place where minorities, highly organized, practically have control. The pendulum will continue to swing, however. If this group, agitating this measure, succeed in passing it, the minute this war is over, I feel sorry for minority groups when the reaction sets in. Many innocent people will suffer, many innocent races will feel the effects of the 100,000,000 white people of this Nation, whom you and I know built a great Nation and will continue to dominate it.

Today the Members of this Congress are criticizing every day the operations of government from Washington, the O. P. A., the W. P. A., and every other way in which our people are being maltreated by learned reformers attempting to run something they know nothing about. You say they should not run your district because they know nothing about it. I say to you here, in this measure you are attempting to do the same thing. Almost without exception the Members of the House from poll-tax States are opposed to this measure, yet you with no knowledge of the situation which we have, having made no first-hand study of it, set yourselves up just as have the expert social reformers in our Federal departments, to run our affairs from Washington. The day will come when you will regret it.

Two hundred and eighteen Members of the House signed the petition which brought this measure before us. That is more than half the membership, and I know that what I say here will not prevent the passage of this measure, but I do want to say to you, you know not what you do. You are stirring up more trouble on the Negro race, not alone in my State but in Detroit, Chicago, New York, and, yes, in Washington than has been known in this Nation since reconstruction days.

We have no objections to your assisting the Negro race. You may aid his education, you may improve his social and economic welfare, but we in the South expect to continue to enforce segregation. We will not have amalgamation of the white and black races in the South. As to what you want in the North, that is for you to decide. I feel that it is your privilege under the Constitution, and you may retain it by voting against this bill, leaving the control of the suffrage to the various States.

Today in this most critical period of world conflict and local confusion, when local self-government has been definitely challenged on every hand, we find ourselves face to face with some of the most dangerous, most unnecessary and inopportune legislation that has ever been brought before this body.

During this time, even at this particular moment, our boys are offering and giving their lives on practically every battle front, while our home front is being overrun with bureaucratic government. Selfish groups are studying ways and means of making this war a stepping stone for their own selfish accomplishments. Certain labor racketeers favor this bill and have, by their previous actions, hampered the war effort, and almost made it mandatory that this body take drastic steps which might be unjust to the honest laborer who has proven himself loyal by being opposed to strikes in wartimes. In my opinion, we should be putting the proper harness on such labor racketeers instead of discussing this bill when there is no time, place, or condition to justify the passage of it.

I wish to discuss with you another section of the country, where another 40,000 are walking out, on strike, where you labor boys are willing for men to pay more than $2 per month for dues to a labor union before they can work in the industrial factories of the country to produce materials so badly needed by our boys at the front, but you squeal and yell if someone is asked to pay $1.75 or $2 as a poll tax that goes into the common school fund.

Certain so-called social reform groups who are not interested in the welfare of true Americans are demanding the passage of this bill. These pressure groups from certain sections who are advocating no social discriminations have, in reality, without raising their voices, permitted their section to discriminate against the South for time immemorial in freight rates and Government expenditures of every kind.

Those who are willing to open the doors and flood this country with immigrants from all parts of the world and those who want to use their vast wealth in taking advantage of all underprivileged people who will play any game to further their own interest, regardless of principle or how it might affect the Government are also favoring the passage of this bill.

If you want to be fair, why do you not give a little more consideration to the farmers of the poor lands of the South; why do you not give a little more consideration to raising the standard of living for both the colored and the white; why do you not give some consideration to extending Federal aid to schools?

The poll tax in my State is a vital source of revenue. Do not be misled into believing that the money derived from this source of taxation goes into the election funds to disfranchise the Negro. It goes into the common school fund of the State for the education and advancement of all the people. It is uniform taxation and applies to all alike.

I only ask each of you to weigh the facts and circumstances surrounding this bill and ask yourselves who will be the beneficiary and what will it accomplish? After that careful consideration has been given, do your duty. What enjoyment in this world can be so great, and what consolation can be so sweet as the consciousness of duty performed? I ask you, with malice toward none, to defeat this so-called anti-poll-tax bill that the two racial elements of the South, armored with a great weapon of understanding, may march on to victory and the making of a better world.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it was shocking to me, I am bound to confess, to hear the offensive insinuations against the white people of the South made by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] who evidently gets her information about the people of that session through being a trustee of a Negro school in Alabama. The conditions she described do not exist. Her ideas of race amalgamation, if I understood her correctly, were even more shocking than her slander of the South.

I was also shocked to read on yesterday, in one of the local papers, this statement:

> NEW YORK, May 23.—Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt advocated repeal of all poll taxes in an address tonight inaugurating New York's second annual city-wide Harlem (Negro) Week observance.

When I realize the damage these women are doing by thus waving the red flag in the face of the white people of the South, and stirring up race trouble throughout the country, when I realize the number of white women who have paid with their lives at the hands of Negro rapists here in Washington, and throughout the South, as a result of such

agitation on the part of these trouble-makers, I am compelled to agree with Rudyard Kipling when he said, "The female of the species is more deadly than the male."

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] seems to be very much disturbed about the primary elections in the South. So far as he is concerned, the condition is entirely hopeless; for if every Member of Congress with a pencil and a map were to work from now until the next election, they could not mark out a congressional district south of the Potomac River in which the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] could be nominated to Congress on either ticket—poll tax or no poll tax.

He now tells us that this measure is directed at the primaries in the Southern States. We do not have to have primaries, in any State. We could go back to the convention system overnight, if necessary.

All they are doing here is stirring up race troubles throughout the country, and using the Negro as a smoke screen.

We noted the other day that Stalin had abolished the Comintern in Russia—a consummation devoutly to be wished.

But, we face the fact that the Frankfurter comintern is still operating in America. We might as well be frank about it. This is my country. I am a Member of Congress representing more than 250,000 people, for whom it is my duty to speak, and I tell you now that that program calls for the destruction of the States and the Government of the country by a bureaucracy, and this is one of the first steps.

If by your votes you invite them to come in and interfere with elections in the various States, you will also invite them to come in, and control or abolish elections altogether. Then you will have destroyed the Federal Government as an indivisible union of indestructible States. You will then have established a bureaucracy to be controlled by some one man in power, or some one behind the throne, one of those Rasputins of yesterday.

I am appealing to you, Democrats and Republicans alike, to vote for this amendment and to vote against this bill.

In New York they have an educational test. In order to vote one must be able to read and write English. Under those circumstances I wonder how the supporters of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] ever get to vote at all.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be adopted, and the bill should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in coming here to speak to you I want to ask you to listen to my statement, not that it is going to affect your vote. One of the tragic things that I find in coming here as a Representative from Mississippi is that you good men of this House, and ladies too, from other sections believe anything in God's world that is told you about conditions in the South. I say to you that if matters came up affecting your district, particularly where I know you and respect you, I would be glad to talk to you and learn something about those conditions. If things were as bad in your district as you think they are in mine, I could not respect you, and I know I could have no comradeship with you. You have heard my State slandered here today by Members who, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] said, represent districts where the people do not speak the English language, who describe conditions in the South, and who know nothing about our conditions, but I want to tell you something that I know of my own knowledge.

I served 8½ years as a district attorney in the South, in Mississippi. I tried to represent the State fairly and impartially. I believe I did that. On one occasion I appeared for the State of Mississippi in my district and prosecuted a white man who had killed a negro who had been indicted by a white grand jury on a charge of murder. This defendant's attorney came to me and asked to plead him guilty on condition that I recommend life imprisonment. I refused to do it. I went to trial on that case, and 12 white men from my district, 12 average farmers, if you please, tried that man and brought in a verdict fixing the maximum punishment. The verdict in this case was affirmed by the supreme court of my State. I say to you that happened, and that is the type of justice we have tried to mete out in our State. You may say that I was an exception, that the people of my section were not behind this action, because the only people in my State that vote in your opinion are the people that have plenty of money and can pay a $2 poll tax in order to vote. I say to you I was elected three times district attorney, and lost only 62 votes in my county when I was elected to this body after that occurred. That is the kind of justice we have and mete out there.

Let us see about the poll tax in Mississippi. The poll tax was not passed for the purpose of keeping anybody from voting. In 1890, when it was first adopted, you people do not realize the poverty you had left in Mississippi. We had nothing which we could tax. Much of the property had been destroyed or gone into the hands of the scalawags and carpetbaggers who had come down there and ravished our land, taking away our wealth. We had to pass a poll tax, and every other type of tax, in order to raise the revenue to run that government.

The poll tax is levied on everyone, whether or not he ever votes. The only requirement in regard to voting is this: In order to vote a man must have paid that poll tax by the 1st of February of the year in which he offers to vote. Why did we do that? To keep the Negro from voting? No; to keep some irresponsible, crooked politician from coming along just before the election and paying poll taxes in order to control votes. That is the reason for it.

You who have gone astray should come back and realize that we have not done and do not do what you have been led to believe.

When we were taken in as Members of this Congress we subscribed to an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. Each of you did that. How in the name of God can you shut your eyes to the Constitution and say, "I will leave it up to the Supreme Court"? I say to you that if you have studied the question and are in doubt, perhaps you have some reason to leave it to the Supreme Court, but if you shut your eyes and pay no attention to whether or not it is constitutional and then follow that course, you are liable to vote for some other law which will do just as much to your section as we think you are doing to the State governments in this Nation. There will be those among you, I know, who think that you may rise above the Constitution of the United States. There is just as much chance for the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] to rise above Hamilton and Jefferson, the framers of the Constitution, as there is for the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] to contribute more to our war effort than his colleague, Joseph Stalin.

From the propaganda which reaches my office from certain labor unions, and politicians in sections far removed from my State, most of whom have never been there, it appears to me that these folks are trying to use this so-called crusade against the seven Southern States not to improve the lot of the Negro in the South but to add to the Negro membership of their labor unions in the North and East, to appeal to the Negro vote in those sections, in other words to exploit him, to use him for their own purpose. They are not friends of the Negro of the South, nor really of the Nation. I know that those very persons come from sections where by the use of zoning ordinances, and limitations on building permits, they discriminate more against the Negro than has been thought of in the South. They do not like the Negro; they do not live with them, they do not permit the Negro to live in the white residential districts. Most of them are for Negroes in the abstract, but do not want anything to do with them personally, and privately will tell you so.

If it were truly the purpose of those behind this bill to benefit the Negro of the South, I can assure you that the approach here cannot and will not have that effect. There are some things which cannot be done by any law. The heart and mind of a people cannot be changed by law nor by force. Hitler is trying this in Europe today and we know it will not work. The Negro leaders sponsoring this measure are not interested in political equality; what they want is social equality or rather social intermingling—and you know it. Today the Negro of the South can place his social life on the highest plane he may desire. We, of the white race, merely believe in and demand that he may go his way and that we may go ours. We will have no part of social intermingling in the South.

I tell you this shall not take place in the South. After the Civil War you turned loose in our midst hundreds of thousands of ex-slaves, wholly untrained in citizenship; then without perhaps intending to you sent sufficient carpetbaggers and sorry white men to make use of their votes and to exploit them and

our country. Only in recent years has all this feeling engendered in our people completely died down.

We do not have now the racial strife which exists in Washington, Baltimore, Detroit, or Chicago. To be sure, we prevent the Negro from forcing himself into the white man's home, his place of worship and public places and accommodations which are limited to white trade. At the same time we provide separate accommodations for the Negro. What you do not see is that we protect the Negro from being disturbed by the white people of our section in his places of worship, in his home, and in public places which are exclusively for Negroes.

In Mound Bayou, Miss., an exclusively Negro town, we have a splendid example of how the Negro can get along if left to himself and that is what is desired by the southern Negro. His social standards and life there compare favorably with that of any other race. The Negro has his own schools, officers, and social life, unmolested by white social reformers. The people of the town are happy, the section prosperous. The Negro of the South has come far since the War between the States.

We have taxed ourselves greatly and now spend a much larger percentage of our State's income on education of the Negroes than any State from which come you fellows who intend to reform the South. There are two Negro colleges in my own district and many others in the State. We are spending more on the protection of the Negro's health and to improve his living conditions in proportion to our ability than any other section of the Nation. The Negro of the South is in better shape financially and economically than ever before.

To be candid, at this time we do not want the Negro to control our politics and our government any more than the people of Detroit would want the Negro section of the city to select the officers of the entire city. We had a taste of that through the dark years following the Civil War. We know the scum, both white and black, that were selected and ruled our country. It has taken many years for us to recover from that blight and to overcome the antagonisms which were developed.

We will not have social intermingling. The white people of the South want separate accommodations and separate social life. The Negro of the South wants his separate accommodations and social life. We believe he should have them free from the meddling of white exploiters. Frankly, we expect to see that the two races remain segregated for the good of both. To force us to do otherwise would lead to civil strife the like of which has never before been seen.

If the agitators of this question continue their present tactics you shall have all the Negroes in the North. Then the Harlem district of New York will furnish the officers for that city. The Negro city of Detroit will control Michigan politics, and the Negroes of Chicago will furnish the officers for the State of Illinois. Then, when it is too late, you will learn what we learned during the terrible days of reconstruction.

If you are opposed to discrimination, why is it you have not voted to abolish the discriminatory freight rates which have been a hold-back to the South since the beginning of our Nation's transportation began? If you want to help the Negro of the South, why have you opposed aid to education in the South? Why have you excluded the Negro from living in white residential sections of your cities? Why is it that you do not have him in your homes and working for you in your offices? You may help him in any way you like, but you shall not cause our great Nation to be referred to as that great mongrel nation of the Western Hemisphere except over the opposition of the entire Southland, both white and black.

I shall not go at length into the constitutional question involved for I learned last year that such discourse is wasted breath. Those of us who are opposed to this measure know it is unconstitutional. Those who support it are not interested, apparently, in whether it is constitutional or not, believing that they have a Supreme Court which will find it so. When this bill was before us last session, full, and to me, unanswerable briefs were filed showing this act to be unconstitutional. These briefs appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September and November 1942. I shall not repeat them here, but earnestly request those conscientious Members of this House who signed the discharge petition bringing this measure designed to disunite the people of the South from the Nation and to reach out the tentacles of an ever-growing Central Government so as to take away the last vestige of State government, to read those briefs.

Suffice it to say here, that prior to the adoption of the Federal Constitution, the country was composed of free and equal sovereign States loosely bound together by a confederation. When the Constitutional Convention was held, these sovereign States surrendered to the National Government as the Central Government certain rights and powers deemed by them necessary for the operation of the Federal Government, all of which are enumerated. All other powers were reserved to the States. Thus we have a Federal Government, intended by the States to have limited powers and considered a Government of limited powers for 150 years. And, in regard to the franchise, held to be limited by the Congress no later than 1920, for then, when women were first permitted to vote, such change was brought about by amendment to the Federal Constitution, ratified by the States, and not as here suggested by act of Congress. In other words, the statesmen of that period did not for one moment believe that the Federal Government could remove the restrictive qualifications fixed by the States which prohibited women from voting, except by constitutional amendment as authorized under the Federal Constitution.

The provisions of the Federal Constitution, article I, section h, are as follows:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States; and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Certainly, there is nothing in that provision which provides for its change by action of the Congress. That provision fixes the requirement for electors voting for Members of the House of Representatives. The writers of the Federal Constitution knew and accepted the fact that the various States fixed the qualifications for electors voting for the most numerous branch of their State legislature and the Federal Constitution by adopting such requirements as may be fixed by each State as the requirements for electors voting in national elections, can be changed only by amendment of the Federal Constitution.

This matter has been passed on many times by the Supreme Court of the United States and in each instance the Court has in no way stated that article I, section 2, can be changed except by amendment to the Constitution.

Voting has always been a privilege rather than a right. The right to vote comes from the grant of the privilege. We find this clearly stated in the case of *Breedlove* v. *Suttles* (302 U. S. 277), as follows:

> To make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite for voting is not to deny any privilege or immunity protected by the fourteenth amendment. Privilege of voting is not derived from the United States, but is conferred by the State, and save as restrained by the fifteenth and nineteenth amendments and other provisions of the Federal Constitution, the State may condition suffrage as it deems appropriate.

I call your attention further to the fact that when article I, section 2, was incorporated in the Federal Constitution, all States restricted the privilege of voting. That provision of the Federal Constitution was adopted with full knowledge that such restrictions were being exercised by the States, most of which had property qualifications, poll tax, and various educational requirements which must be met before the privilege of voting could be granted.

By amendments Nos. 14, 15, and 19, to the Federal Constitution, it was declared that State qualifications prerequisite for voting based on race, color, previous condition of servitude, and sex must no longer deny or abridge the right of citizens to vote. There, also, we find that it was recognized that the proper approach was by constitutional amendment.

So in the present case, if the proponents of this measure want to get rid of the poll tax in the seven Southern States, the proper course is to have the Constitution amended so as to provide that payment of a poll tax shall not deny or abridge the right of a citizen to vote.

Today, with our boys fighting on the battle fronts of the world, with a greater percentage of those boys coming from

the South than from any other section, at a time when above any other we need the united efforts of all our citizens, this bill is brought out to stir up the people of my section. Many of the group, particularly of the Democrats, who signed the discharge petition which brought this matter up, are the very ones who represent districts dominated by labor unions, and this fact, together with the propaganda with which they flood our offices, leads one to the belief that the bill to some extent is aimed at the independent Members of Congress from the South who have consistently stood for the outlawing of strikes in war industries in time of war. I am advised that some Members signed this discharge petition to get even with Members from the South who voted for the Hobbs bill prohibiting highway robbery in the name of labor unions. It is all wrong to require the payment of $2 for the privilege of voting, but all right with such Members of the House to require the payment of $50 to a labor union for the privilege of working.

The right-thinking Members would do well to spend their time in correcting the ills with which certain labor union leaders have beset our war effort and leave alone matters of the kind involved in this bill, at least until we have won this terrible war in which our Nation is engaged.

The Representative from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], chairman of the Labor Committee in the House, last year inserted a table in the RECORD supposedly showing that we had very little vote in Mississippi because of the poll tax. The figures she cited are those of the general election in November. Why, in the general elections we have no contest. Our election is the Democratic primary. The only time we have Republican opposition to the Democratic nominee is when the few Republicans in the State believe that party may get into power and they want to control the patronage. We actually have not enough Republicans to furnish postmasters when that party is in power.

The gentlewoman from New Jersey, Representative NORTON, in her statement, cited the fact that in her own district, which incidentally is that of "Boss" Hague, that out of a total population of 271,807 there were cast 131,654 votes. I shall not repeat here the newspaper stories which have appeared about the elections in that district. From all accounts, we still have a more uncontrolled free use of the ballot in my district in a poll-tax State than they have in Jersey City. I have heard the gentlewoman from New Jersey say on this floor that she was not worried about elections; that she had been told she could stay here as long as she liked. That could never happen in my State. Those of us from the South are not designated for office. We run for office because we want to. If we are elected it is because we get a majority of uncontrolled, individual votes from the people of the district. One certain way for defeat would be to try to have anyone or any organization dictate the choice of a Representative in Congress. I do not profess to know of my own knowledge, but most of the charges of rotten politics about which I read in the newspapers is to be found where there is a large Negro, or foreign population of the kind which would not have enough interest in their Government to pay a $2 poll tax for the privilege of voting. As to Jersey City, I do not know, but doubtless the facts are known to the Republicans here who are helping the Democrats from such sections to reform the politics of the South.

I say to you more is involved in this bill than the racial question. The very bedrock upon which our Nation was founded is involved. If the Federal Government can control the qualifications of electors and thus control elections, the State and the last vestige of State government is gone.

I say to you it is a serious matter to us. It is a serious matter to you, whether you realize it or not. You have seen the Federal Government, through pressure, gradually usurp practically every function of State government. By grants of money on condition, through the use of judicial construction, through the O. P. A., the W. P. A., and in every other conceivable way, your States are losing control to a Federal Government with its board of economists, theoretical experts, long-haired dreamers and college professors who have infested its departments and who cling on like leeches. I hate to believe that they and their actions are approved. I hate to believe you members of this House are willing to tie another stone around the neck of State government, already having a struggle to exist. Do you not know that if by act of Congress you can remove the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting, that by the same token the Congress can pass restrictive provisions and some group interested in continued control of the Nation will do just that.

The governing body of the county in my State is the board of supervisors, some members of which have held to the belief that they can run the affairs of the county better than the citizenship. Some years ago I served in the State legislature of my State. I found there members who believed that they could run the counties better than any board of supervisors and the affairs of municipalities better than its officers, because they felt they knew more about it and the local officers could not be trusted. Since coming here to Congress I find that it is the idea and belief of many Members of Congress and of all appointed officials of the Federal Government that they know it all, that the State government cannot be trusted and that control had better be vested in the Federal Government, where the Federal departments can run the affairs of our people.

Frankly, I find that people differ very little. Each thinks his crowd can do better than any other. My State legislative body showed me little that would lead me to believe that they would in any way be an improvement over the local officers in running the affairs of our cities and counties, but frankly convinced me to the opposite. So it is here with all due deference to this House of Representatives and the various departments of the Federal Government. You have not shown me anything to indicate that the country will be better off run from Washington. Rather have I been further convinced that local government is the best. I am sold to the belief that local self-government, the people at home, without dictation from on high, will save the country, if given the opportunity. Not only in this instance of meddling with State control of elections are you interfering, but you are permitting it to be done every day. I hope the strong Members of this House, real Americans who believe in the original American form of government, who believe in the days when the Constitution meant something—and there are many—will wake up and force the return of the Government to the people. You can take a forward step along that line by voting against this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I am among those southerners who have opposed the poll tax in their own States. I realize that many of my southern friends do not agree with my attitude. In 1938, I was identified with the campaign in Arkansas to repeal the poll tax. We secured a pretty good vote, but 85,000 people, a majority of the voters, decided that we were wrong, that there are certain merits about the poll tax that they want to retain.

I am convinced by this time that both the merits and the demerits of the poll tax have been overemphasized, yet I have not abandoned the stand that I took at that time. I believe in wide participation in the franchise. I believe the poll tax is a device by which that is discouraged. If this bill were the right kind of bill—that is, covering the whole problem of the franchise in a proper way—I would be tempted to join you, because I have been engaged in too many fights to end corruption in politics, yet I am thinking about the rights and the interests and the attitudes of the 85,000 people who differ with me in my own State. I am thinking about the fears that are created now on their part and are being created by us because we are indifferent to a constitutional provision.

I am not surprised that the debate over the Constitution has loomed large, for it is important, but I am amazed at the indifference to the Constitution of some with whom I have stood in the larger battle for participation in elections. If this were in reverse, they would now be invoking the Constitution as a defense. If instead of providing an extension of the franchise the bill were to limit it, they would be talking about the Constitution in an entirely different way, I am sure of that.

Now, I know the stock answer. The answer is that this deals with basic human rights, so we must have a broad interpretation. I believe in a liberal interpretation, too, but I do not believe in a complete disregard of the Constitution, and certainly at this time when our people are fearful that there is some-

thing going on in Washington that endangers fundamental democracy.

So the real issue, it seems to me, is not the merits or the demerits of the poll tax but whether or not we are to be consistent on this fundamental principle.

There is another question. If I am wrong about its being a local and a State problem, certainly I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] in his statement that this is not the time to bring this matter before the Congress. The people of the South are doing everything this Nation asks them to do, even surrendering the lives of their loved ones. They are fearful of the things that are taking place here. We have made progress in this difficult and complicated problem of the franchise, and you are going to make it much more difficult for us who consider ourselves liberals in the South as we struggle to free the poor people of the South and admit them to the economic life of the region and to a participation in its political processes. Do not do this cruel thing to the South. I know you are not doing it intentionally, but I tell you it is a cruel thing. You are not only doing that but you are doing violence to a fundamental principle in democracy. The upsurge of democratic sentiment all over the globe will receive a set-back if we destroy faith in constitutional government.

I believe the ministers of this Nation who sent the message to you would not have done it if they had known the attitude of the people of my section. If you have done violence to their feelings, it is not a moral, no, it is an immoral thing you do, when you say that the States within constitutional limits may not settle their own problems. So because of those things, I take my stand with those who oppose this bill, believing that progress can better be made in the other direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief. It is my personal opinion that if this amendment is adopted, it means the destruction of the purpose of the bill, because it has borne out that the family party to which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] referred is nothing but a family party, and that the primaries are the real elections. I can quote from some of the States, and it is interesting to see that in the gentleman's own State—and I pay tribute to the gentleman from Alabama because in his own district he did have some opposition—but out of 9 districts, only 4 had any opposition, and that was of a negligible sort. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] says he represents 250,000 people, but he was elected by the large vote of 7,000 votes. I wish I could get elected in that way in my district.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not that an indication that they are completely and thoroughly satisfied with the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Seven thousand votes out of 250,000 people? I would be rather doubtful about it.

Mr. BARDEN. Is the gentleman complaining about the quality of the representation in that section?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Certainly not, Mr. Chairman. I think I paid my tribute to that this morning.

Mr. CRAVENS. Are the figures the gentleman gives general election figures or are they the primary election figures?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I was reading the general election figures.

Mr. CRAVENS. Oh, that does not show.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Yes.

Mr. FULMER. Referring to those figures, in respect to the primary and the general election, we have a poll tax in South Carolina. You do not have to have a poll-tax receipt to vote in the primary election, and that principle in my State applies much the same to all of the other States. How can the gentleman account for this? I would get 75,000 votes in the primary, and get 5,000 in the November election.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I cannot account for that. I am not sufficiently informed upon the elections in those States.

In conclusion, I hope this amendment will be defeated, and if the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] will vote with me, I shall change the way in which I wear my hair.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that anything I can say will change a vote this afternoon, and I want to be as charitable as I can in anything that I may say or any thoughts that I may have relative to the reason why this bill is before the House this afternoon. As far as the poll tax is concerned, and its payment as a prerequisite to vote, I do not think any one of us cares so much for that, yet I am against the repeal of it in my own State. That little sum that we get from the poll tax goes to the educational fund, and many thousands of our people contribute nothing to it or taxes in any other form, yet their children have access to and are educated in our schools the same as those who pay; but I want to go deeper than that. The fundamental question before us is that this bill invades the rights of States under the Constitution of the United States.

I refer to the powers delegated to the States. I know that this phase of the bill has been tripped lightly over this afternoon. I know that sentimental speeches have been made, especially by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], which is characteristic of all good women. They appeal to sentiment and not to reason. Statements were made with reference to the condition of the Negro, not only in Mississippi but throughout the South, as though this bill will only affect the Negro and its passage bestow on them greater political power and intimation of social privilege. I say this to the membership, no matter from what section they come, there is no deeper feeling for the Negro in the hearts of any people than in the hearts of the people of the South. It is they who have carried on and preserved the democratic principles of this country since the foundation of the Nation. Ah, I remember when you gentlemen on the Republican side were in power and there was hardly enough to make a ripple on the Democratic side, and they were always from that section which I represent, carrying on our democratic principles.

But I say to you now, as I said in the beginning, I do not want to become harsh in my statements, but it appears to me the majority on both sides of this House today are departing from those principles, departing from the mandates of our Constitution, upon which this great Government was founded, and are going ahead with the view that it will penalize those of us who live south of the Potomac River. I do not know your motives, but I am hoping that you are sincere, and that they are coming from the depths of your hearts, but I fear that that hope is in vain. What does our Constitution say? Section 2 of article I is the following:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Mr. Chairman, I know that this bill is unconstitutional, but may I further remark, I know that if you pass it and it goes to the Supreme Court as it is now constituted it will be declared constitutional, for they have roped it at every opportunity for the past 4 or 5 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE] is recognized.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal about the Negro being deprived of his right to vote or being disfranchised. I happen to be from a State where we have no poll tax and I would like to give you the facts as far as we are concerned.

The payment of poll tax as a prerequisite for voting was abolished in the 1937 legislature in Florida; and in my home county of Duval, where we have the largest Negro population in the State, we naturally expected a large increase in Negro voters in our first election when no poll tax was required. However, in 1938 there were only a few more Negroes who registered and no noticeable increase in voting. In our county, at that time, it was necessary to register every 2 years in order to vote, even though no payment of poll tax was required. Then in 1940, this being the Presidential election year, we expected to have a large increase in Negro registration and voting. However, only about 5,000 registered in comparison with 6,000 in 1936, the previous Presidential election. Then, out of the 5,000 registered in 1940, less than 500 actually voted. And this registration was due to a campaign waged for several months by

a white Republican who enlisted the help of all the Negro churches and their ministers. They told the Negroes that they would lose their jobs on the W. P. A. and all sorts of things if they did not register and vote. In spite of this vigorous campaign, not 10 percent of the Negroes eligible to register did so, and then not 10 percent of those registered really voted, and those who did vote were almost forced to do so.

My purpose in this statement is to show that the Negroes of the South are not clamoring for the abolishment of the poll tax, neither will they vote if the poll-tax requirement is removed. Therefore, I see no reason for the Federal Government interfering with the States in this matter in any way.

There is another very practical reason why the payment of poll tax should not be abolished by the Federal Government and that is that the States can, naturally, require the payment of poll taxes for voting for all State and other local offices. If this is done in order to hold an election where Federal offices are concerned, it will be necessary to have two lists of voters at each polling place and two sets of ballots. We hear a great deal about our Government being run by bureaucrats with no practical experience and the confusion caused by such. Now, we as the Congress, are about to be liable for the greatest confusion ever thrust upon the people.

The Negroes in the South do not want to vote. If they do, they can pay a poll tax and do so. In fact, the Negroes of the South do not want to do many things, that you hear so much up here about them being deprived of down South. They do not want to live with the whites, they do not want to eat with the whites, they do not want to go to the same hotels, shows, and other places with the whites. In fact, the situation down South is much more to their liking than the condition you find here or elsewhere in the North.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAGNUSON) there were—ayes 75, noes 131.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 1, line 3, after the word "paid", add a comma and the words "or that any educational qualification be required."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, now, if the House really wants to do something for the poor white of the South as well as for the poverty-stricken Negro, why not write into this bill the requirement that no educational qualification shall be required to vote? Why not be fair about it? Why not give the Negroes and the poor whites of the South the unqualified opportunity to vote? As was said by me a few moments ago, we know very well that, if we strike out this qualification of a poll tax, the legislatures of those States which so desire may and will put in an educational qualification. Are we sincere about this? Do we really want to make it possible for the poor—those who cannot afford to spend $2 or $3 for the privilege of taking part in the election of candidates to Federal office, who are too poor to get an education—do we want them to vote? If we do, here is our opportunity.

Some of us—and I will not name anyone—as a matter of fact, hundreds of thousands of former supporters of the President—businessmen who have been put out of business, small manufacturers who cannot compete successfully with the monopolistic practices of the bureaucrats, farmers who now find themselves unable to cultivate the soil, workers who are disgusted and their sense of justice outraged by the President's lack of labor policy, by his extension of special privileges through administrative agencies to John L. Lewis and his cohorts, consider the New Deal to be the greatest danger to our way of life, to our constitutional form of government.

Republicans in this House, ever since the last election, have been appealing, we have been coaxing, we have been begging, members of the majority who see the danger in the New Deal, who believe in constitutional processes, to come along with us and vote with us on some of the constructive measures, which we have advocated, and we have had them with us. With their help we have won on several occasions. Yes, on many occasions we have won with their help, many an appropriation bill has been reduced, many an unnecessary item cut out entirely.

But we did not win alone. We had to have help from the majority side. Sometimes they helped by voting with us, sometimes, when the pressure from the administration was too great, they helped by being absent from the Chamber when the vote was taken. It cannot be denied that they have helped. We know and the country knows that the Republicans are not strong enough in this Congress to win anything except as we receive aid from Democrats—not new dealers—who feel and think and believe on fundamental questions as do the more conservative on the Republican side.

Now, the first time in the history of this Congress, when an issue which is vital to them arises, which means political life or death to them, which means continuing their way of life, the American way of life under the government as established by the forefathers, we come along as Republicans, try to make this a political party issue—join hands with the new dealers and kick our Democratic friends, those who have voted with us in spite of administration pressure, on the shins. What do we get by that procedure? Where shall we go when once again the vote is close and we need their help? The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] was not the only one who listened with a great deal of emotion to the Member from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

The Member from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] spoke as she always does, with sincerity, with a great deal of emotion. Her words and her phrases were extremely pungent. While they carried a sting, coming from her heart as they did, they were appealing. Almost, but not quite, they brought tears to my eyes; and, as she pictured the plight of the poor whites and the unfortunate Negroes in the South, who were prevented from voting by the iniquitous poll tax of $2 or $3 per year which is required in seven or eight of the States in the South, my heart went out to her and to the subjects of her solicitude.

I agree with the Member from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] that no individual—black, yellow, or white—should be unjustly prohibited from participating in the activities of the government under which he lives.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] followed the same line of thought and made arguments somewhat similar to those made by the Member from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Often have I listened with respect and admiration to the informative and instructive discourses made on the floor by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] and by the Member from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]. Many, many times have I profited by their observations. Often has each of them held forth eloquently, very eloquently, upon the necessity of Congress scrupulously giving heed to the provisions of our Constitution.

Often today have the applicable provisions of that document been read. Because my judgment forces me to part company with my Ohio colleagues on this bill—and as a reason—although not offered as an excuse—for what might be termed my stubbornness, and as it can do no harm, let me again quote the pertinent words in section 2 of article I.

The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Then there are two amendments which bear upon the question. One is the ninth, which provides that—

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

That is an admolition to the Congress that just because certain rights were enumerated as being retained by the people, we were not to assume that all other power not specifically reserved to the people was vested in the Federal Government.

The other amendment is the tenth, which reads:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

While the Constitution and the amendments may have been written by lawyers, both were written for the benefit of the layman—the average man, the

so-called common man—and presumably the lawyers meant what they said; intended what the average, ordinary man would gather from the words which they used.

If that rule of construction be applied, how then can it be said that the Congress of the United States has authority to determine the qualifications of the electors who choose either members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature or who choose officials of the Federal Government?

It is not my purpose to enter into any profound discussion as to the constitutionality of this bill. Let that question, if the bill become law, be determined by the constitutional authority created for that purpose—the Supreme Court of the United States. Being a New Deal Court, that question may—and it probably will—as was said today by one Member of this body from the Well of the House—be decided in the affirmative, that is, that the legislation is constitutional. On that question, no opinion is expressed by me.

Permit me to return to the line of argument made by the two Members from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON and Mr. BENDER]. Addressing the House, the former stated that she was speaking from the American viewpoint. Those are her words "the American viewpoint." It was my understanding that she also said that she was not afraid and that we should not be afraid to vote for this bill.

Let me repeat. Neither the sincerity, the good judgment nor the freedom from political motives of either of the Members from Ohio is in any way questioned. If asked, it would be my opinion that each and every Member here today, in considering and voting upon this legislation, will act from the American viewpoint; that each and every Member will vote without fear of political consequences or hope of political reward.

Neither the Member from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] nor any other Member of this or any other body has any monopoly of either patriotism, loyalty, or the American viewpoint. She has two sons with the armed forces, but she is not the only Member of this body who has sons, brothers, or other relatives with the armed forces. Before me I see my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY], whose son at the moment is serving in Australia and whose last letter was dated back in April.

If the conclusion reached by the Member from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] that it is iniquitous to require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to the exercise of the privilege to vote for the election of Federal officials is correct, what can be said of the practice of requiring the payment by a common laborer of $25 for the right to work in a factory engaged in war production?

It may be that everyone should be given the right to vote. Perhaps some who are barred by the poll tax would like to vote. But certain it is that everyone not only likes to eat, but that everyone, if he would live, must eat.

To the poverty-stricken Negro of the South, to the poor white man of the South—yes, or to the poor of any other locality—which is the more important? That he have the right to vote every 2 years for a Congressman, or every 4 years for a President, or that he from day to day have the right to work to earn the money to feed himself and his family?

Yes, the hearts of those who advocate the abolition of the poll tax bleed for the unfortunate who is not permitted to vote because he does not value that privilege enough to pay $2 or $3 or $4 per year in order that he may exercise it. But some of those hearts are as cold as stone when legislation is before this body which would open the door of opportunity, the door to a job, sought by an American citizen, but who is denied that job because this Government of ours has backed the unions in their practice of compelling the nonunion man to join and pay, not $2 a year but $1 or $1.50 each and every month of the 12 and sometimes as much as $100 or more for membership in that organization.

When $132,000,000 in dues alone are collected by unions from American workers each year for the privilege of earning the money to buy the food necessary to keep life in the body, I find difficulty in joining with those who weep so copiously over the collection for educational purposes of $2 per year by some of the Southern States from those who wish to vote.

In all charity, with all humility, permit me to call attention to the fact that there is a strike at Akron, Ohio; that that strike is in a plant of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. which is engaged in making gas masks, barrage balloons, life belts, airplane de-icers, tank treads, anti-aircraft-gun and machine-gun clips; that thousands of the employees of that company want to work, but that pickets—not employees of the Goodyear Co., but employees of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. and of the B. F. Goodrich Co.—are marching shoulder to shoulder at the gates of the Goodyear Co. and so, by threats and by violence, preventing the employees of Goodyear from performing their tasks. Free-for-all fights between the pickets and the workers attempting to return to their jobs occurred day before yesterday.

Would it be improper for me to suggest to my Ohio friends that they shed a few tears, say a few words, and do a few things to open the gates of the Goodyear Co.'s plant; to remove from those gates the pickets who have come in from the other plants; that something be done to induce the some 40,000 strikers in those three plants to return to their jobs?

While my friends are shedding tears; while their hearts are bleeding for the poor in the southern poll-tax States, I have been thinking of our soldiers on the fighting fronts, who need the anti-aircraft-gun and machine-gun clips, the life belts, the tank treads, the airplane de-icers, which might be manufactured in the Goodyear plant.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] insists that a poll tax should not be prerequisite to the exercise of the franchise. Perhaps he is correct. Entertaining that view, it is difficult for me to reconcile his action approving the practice of the teamsters union of extorting from every nonunion truck driver, seeking to take a load of food to the gentleman's constituents in the city of New York, the sum of $8.41 if the truck be a small one, $9.42 if it be a large one.

How his constituents would rejoice, if they learned that a truck farmer from one of the poll-tax States, seeking to take a load of potatoes into New York was stopped at the city limits, and because the union insisted that he come across with $8 or $9, turned back and delivered the potatoes here in Washington.

What rejoicing there would be on the "East Side, the West Side, all around the town," when the gentleman's constituents knew that he supported the union in its practice of extortion.

When we sought to end the teamsters union practice of requiring everyone who drove a truck to pay an initiation fee and monthly dues; when we tried, in brief, to stop extortion, my two good friends and colleagues from Ohio could not see the injustice of requiring the farmer to pay $8 or $9 for the privilege of entering a city. But today they are greatly concerned over the poll-tax requirement of the payment of $2, even though the money goes not into the pocket of a racketeer but into an educational fund.

If my remarks seem unduly critical, let me apologize and state that I mean no harm, no criticism of any Member or of the manner in which any Member casts a vote. Far be it from me to question the right of any Member of this body to vote as he pleases. That I never have done; that I will not do.

But I do reserve the right, when an argument is on and when it is intimated that fear may govern my action or that a lack of understanding guides my determination, to call attention to the inconsistencies of those with whom for the moment I disagree.

It is impossible for me to go along today. Tomorrow many of us who are now opponents may be voting together. We cannot all think alike at all times, and legislation, as well as politics, makes strange bedfellows.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to prevent any person from voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, on the ground that such person has not paid a poll tax, and any such requirement shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified to vote in such primary or other election. No State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision shall levy a poll tax or any other tax on the right or privilege of voting in such primary or other election, and any such tax shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports

to disqualify any person otherwise qualified from voting at such primary or other election.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama to proceed for 5 additional minutes?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, one finds it difficult to speak with dignified and restrained language when one perceives the unusual situation which obtains here in the House on this bill. Article I, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States reads as follows:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The seventeenth amendment to the Constitution, providing for the election of the Senate by the people, adopted the following provision with reference to the qualifications of electors:

> The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

What could be more concise and explicit than the language in the original Constitution as to the qualifications of electors of National or Federal officers, and the language dealing with the election of Senators by the people as set forth in the seventeenth amendment which became effective in 1913 or more than a century after the adoption of the Constitution? This language has never been questioned until the past decade, when the Communist Party, the C. I. O., and numerous left-wing organizations have contended the Congress had the right to set aside these plain constitutional provisions by the passage of a statute nullifying them.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members to read those two integral portions of our Constitution prescribing the qualifications of electors for Federal offices, and to read and recall the oath of office they took here in January last to uphold and to defend that Constitution.

The question involved here is whether or not the Congress of the United States can by statute set aside an express constitutional provision with reference to the qualifications of voters in the elections of Federal officials. If the Congress of the United States can set aside or negative an express constitutional provision with reference to the qualifications of voters in the Federal elections then the Congress can by statute set aside all qualifications of voters in the respective States. If the Congress can set aside these constitutional provisions fixing the qualifications of voters, then it would follow naturally that the Congress could fix whatever qualifications it desired for the voters and Congress could impose a poll tax or could fix any qualification it desired without any safeguards or limit on its powers for voters in the Federal election.

Mr. Chairman, voting is a privilege. Universal suffrage does not mean democracy. There is universal suffrage in Germany, but not even the gentleman from New York, the erudite young Member [Mr. MARCANTONIO], would say there is democracy in Germany today. Suffrage is universal in Russia, yet I do not think there is more than one Member in this House, if there is one, who would say that democracy prevails in Russia. I believe there is no one here who would say that although they have universal suffrage in Italy there is democracy in Italy. The fact, therefore, that a people do exercise universal suffrage in a country does not necessarily mean that that country subscribes to democracy as you and I know it. Voting is a privilege and it should be exercised only by men, regardless of race, creed, or color, who have the God-given intelligence to form an intelligent opinion on public issues, on public characters, and on a sound public program. A man or woman who does not have that God-geven intelligence is a tool in the hands of the political racketeer rather than an advantage to the cause of democratic government.

You say you do not object to the representation the South has in this House. That is not what your sponsors say. In the printed word and in the spoken word the Communist Party, which is the only political party in America to adopt the abolition of the poll tax as a plank in its national political platform, calls upon you for the passage of this bill so that there may be a political purge of the Members of the Congress from the South.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I cannot yield.

John L. Lewis, Philip Murray, and others of that ilk and character have stated they wanted the poll tax abolished so that they could rid the country of representation like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and many others. Those of you who say you do not object to the type of representation we have in the South are going hand in hand with these forces in an effort to dictate to the people of that section of the country who shall represent them in the Congress of the United States. Yet Mr. Lewis, Mr. Murray, and many of the congressional proponents of this bill would deny the right to work to the American people who do not pay a heavy work tax or fee to a labor racketeer or organizer—they dictate who shall work and dictate the amount to be paid to them and to a private organization for the exercise of the God-given right of an American citizen to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, many very appropriate statements have been made here today but I am impressed that outstanding among them and most deserving of emphasis were the two indulged in by the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER]: One, when he said practically every lawyer who would confide in you would express the opinion that this measure is unconstitutional, and the other when he said that very few votes would be cast for it except for political expediency. I wish to thoroughly agree with and emphasize those statements.

Sixty-nine of us represent these 7 poll-tax States. I exclude Tennessee, because they are abolishing the poll tax of their own accord, which is the right way. No one of these 69, of course, signed the petition to bring this measure to the floor; only one of them voted to bring it to the floor yesterday. In discussing it here today and yesterday, no one of us has labored under the delusion that anything we might say, any argument we might make would cause you, ladies and gentlemen, to indulge toward us and the people we represent a gracious, a fair, a reasonable, a sportsmanlike attitude. No; that is not our idea. We know you will not do so just as we did last year. When the alleged soldiers' vote bill was under consideration then, I made the statement that its primary purpose was not really a desire that the soldier on the battlefield be permitted to vote, which I think I unequivocally proved, but that it had become the entering wedge of those determined to prevent the people of 7 Southern States from managing their own internal affairs, particularly their elections. I am very confident that, had this matter not come up in the other body during a period of quasi rest when many Members were not in Washington, it would not have passed there without the elimination of the poll-tax phase of it. As it was, it passed and this anti-poll-tax thrust at the South soon followed. As you know, it also passed the House, but the rules of the other body again protected the Southland as has so frequently heretofore occurred. I wish to thank our Maker for this rule which protects minorities against thoughtless, domineering, and frequently unsportsmanlike efforts of the majority.

My main idea in requesting this time is to pay my respects again to the method by which this measure reached the floor. You are thoroughly familiar with the way this House functions, with the fact that it is entirely too large now to do so as a strictly deliberative body. You know that we must rely very largely on our 47 committees, and they are good ones, who take legislation referred to them by the Speaker, go into it pro and con, subpena witnesses if necessary, hold hearings, and perhaps appoint subcommittees. Then they either return the legislation to the floor with the approval of the Committee or say it is no good. In this instance, two great committees of this House have said this legislation is no good, yet 218 Mem-

bers absolutely slap in the face, and I think insult, the members of those committees by saying to them by their signatures to this petition "you are either unable or unwilling to attend to your duty and, although I am not on your committee and have nothing whatever to do with it, I shall take over and perform your duty for you." Mr. Chairman, I say that is no way to legislate. It is not the reasonable, orderly, the regular way to bring legislation on the floor.

Furthermore, the fact that 218 Members so stated does not mean that it is really the wish of the majority of this House that this legislation be considered. On the other hand, it is the will of 218 Members, not spontaneously or simultaneously, but some influenced by this pressure months ago, some by this insistence weeks ago, others by another entreaty days ago, one now dead, and others undoubtedly serving their last term. I spoke last year of having signed one such petition when I was a freshman and unaware of its meaning. I repeat that I never intend to sign another one and that it is not my purpose to vote for legislation brought on the floor in that way whether I would otherwise favor it or not, because I am not in favor of mob legislation any more than I am of any other mob action.

Let us briefly analyze the names on this petition. As illustrative of how the ranking Members of this House feel toward petitions, I call attention that the name of no Member of the leadership on either side of the aisle appears thereon. Among the 218 names are found only 15 of the 47 committee chairmen, only 2 of whom preside over major committees of which, as you know, there are 11. These facts I think indicate substantial agreement with my attitude toward petitions, which attitude I repeat, not with any idea of influencing the vote on this legislation, but with the hope that this discussion may influence some Members of the House to take this position relative to signing petitions in the future. Let us firmly resolve to permit orderly, regular, normal legislation not only by not signing these petitions but by regarding any item of legislation which so reaches the floor as already having 2 strikes against it whether we would otherwise favor it or not.

As a patriotic citizen, not only of the South but of America, I urge you to think twice when next one asks you to sign a petition which is so antagonistic to the rights, the opinions, and the beliefs of any section of this country whether it be the North, South, East, or West.

Now, to refer to a new argument which has developed since last year. While discussing the matter then I stated that Tennessee would probably soon abolish the poll tax in the proper way by State action which would leave only seven States, the election machinery of which would be so tampered with by this legislation. The Tennessee Legislature did abolish the poll tax. I notice, however, that a State court ruled several weeks ago that it was without authority to do so because, since the poll-tax requirement appears in the constitution, a constitutional amendment would be necessary.

If the people of Tennessee are sufficiently desirous of eliminating the poll tax, I am sure such an amendment will be submitted, which will be the proper, the regular, the legal, and the sportsmanlike way to handle the matter. The poll-tax requirement also appears in the Constitution of Alabama and doubtless in those of all other States concerned. Certainly if the legislature of one of these States is unauthorized to repeal it, the National Legislature should not consider tampering with it in any way and those who wish such repeal should follow the regular constitutional amendment method.

Consequently I say to you, my colleagues, in the name of constitutional government, in the name of law and order, in the name of fair play, and in the name of consideration for your fellowman, please remove your hands from the affairs of these Southern States and permit them to govern themselves as they wish, as they have every right to do, and as they are so thoroughly capable of doing, without any interference from this Congress or from you of other States whatever. I repeat, we do not attempt to interfere in your local affairs and only ask reciprocal treatment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to interfere with the manner of selecting persons for national office by requiring the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, and any such requirement shall be invalid and void.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, I make this motion for the purpose of calling attention to one of the most remarkable things connected with this whole legislation that I have observed in connection with any legislation during my long period of service in this Congress. You are familiar with the provisions of this bill.

Let me read you the existing law now on the statute books. I read section 20, and listen to this language:

Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects or causes to be subjected any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or district, to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States, * * * shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than a year, or both.

There are two other similar provisions, one that punishes conspiracy and the other which gives the person deprived of a constitutional privilege or right, a right to bring civil suit against the person who does the depriving. The remarkable thing about it is that these provisions that I have read are now on the statute books and were on the statute books when the decisions were rendered by the Supreme Court holding that the poll tax could not be interfered with by the Federal Government.

Think of that for a minute. Here is the existing law, and I may say it is identical almost with the provisions of this bill, and yet they bring in this poll-tax bill undertaking to impose a penalty upon an agency of the Government for attempting to interfere with constitutional rights by doing that which the decisions of the Supreme Court say is no interference with a constitutional right. If the persons in these States do not have the constitutional right to vote where the poll tax is levied without paying the tax, that poll tax does not interfere with that constitutional right. I shall be interested to hear what gentlemen on the other side have to say about that.

Mr. Chairman, I feel mighty deeply about this. I do not want to see the House of Representatives, with all the power that is being taken away from the States and concentrated in Washington, declare its judgment as a matter of public policy that the Federal Government should lay its hands on this State power despite the clear-cut decisions of the Supreme Court. It is not a good thing to manifest a disposition here to violate the reserved rights of the States and to disregard the limitations imposed by the Constitution.

If I believed as some gentlemen seem to believe that the States ought to be deprived of this constitutional power, then I would vote for this bill. If I believed as some gentlemen seem to believe that the States ought to be destroyed as responsible agencies of democratic government, I would vote for this bill. But there are some of us in this House who think that democratic government ought to be preserved; that the States, as the only machinery of our system which a democracy can operate, ought to be preserved. The very idea, in this crucial time in this struggle between bureaucracy and democratic rights, for us by this method of questionable powers to say the least of it even from the viewpoint of the proponents, to undertake to deprive our sovereign States of their reserved rights is a remarkable thing to happen in this great democracy.

Something has been said about Thomas Jefferson in this debate. In his inaugural address he said:

It is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration * * * the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies.

Jefferson had great respect for the people, great confidence in the people. He wrote to du Pont de Nemours these words:

You love them [the people] as infants whom you are afraid to trust without nurses, and I love them as adults whom I freely leave to self-government.

A few years before this Washington, in his Farewell Address, gave us this advice:

If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. Chairman, the House, in my opinion, should adopt the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, and I hope it will do so.

There is one further and concluding statement I wish to make about this whole subject. This afternoon is the first time I have ever discussed it in the 10 years I have been in the Congress. I think probably 10 minutes will not be imposing too much on your good nature to discuss this particular subject, although I may be mistaken in my judgment.

I cannot let two statements made here today pass without some answer or refutation. I admit my inability to handle the English language sufficiently to permit me to adequately reply to the unjustified, unfounded, and slanderous remarks made about that section of the country from which I come and in which my forebears have lived since the foundation of this Republic. I deny with all the vehemence of my soul the implication from any source, particularly by those who do not know what they are talking about, there is a lack of justice or maladministration of justice in the State from which I come because of a man's race, creed, or color. You will find as great a degree of tolerance, justice, and genuine liberty there as any place under our flag. I deny that there is any lack of loyalty for democracy in that area.

In Alabama and other States in which the poll tax is levied today a greater percentage of our young men volunteered to defend this democratic way of life and this system of government than any other seven States in the whole glorious Union in the present World War. The ashes of volunteer soldiers from this area from Washington's day to this good hour have hallowed the earth and their blood has sanctified the principles for which it stood for more than 100 years before the gentleman from New York and his people ever saw the Statue of Liberty beckoning them to this fair land. They knew what democracy was and they fought for its preservation long before he and millions of other first generation Americans had the opportunity to enjoy the blessings of free speech and free press and freedom of religion and freedom of action.

Mr. Chairman, I resent with all of my soul the imputation that there is any lack of patriotism, any lack of regard for the democratic way of life and democratic institutions in this particular area simply and solely because the electorate of that particular section of the country saw proper to throw certain safeguards around the exercise of the ballot. I want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] and to others I believe we would have a better government, a more democratic government, more intelligent legislation and a more intelligent exhibition of legislative behavior in the National Congress if all of the 48 States would exercise more precautions and throw stronger safeguards around the privilege of the ballot.

Think that over. I do not care who New York wants to send to Congress. That is New York's business. I do not care who Ohio wants to send to Congress; that is Ohio's business. But who Alabama wants to send is the business of Alabama.

I want to say to those of you who imply lack of patriotism throughout these seven poll-tax States, God bless your souls, we do not have 49,000 men out on strike imperiling the war effort. Such a state of affairs exists in the home State of the gentlewoman from Ohio in the rubber industry at this very hour. The Army and Navy have not found it necessary to come to the poll-tax States to plead for workers to return to work to save the country. Right at this moment of dire tragedy and peril, out in Ohio and Michigan, where many proponents of this bill reside, rubber plants, tank plants, and other plants vital and necessary in our war effort are closed by strikes. The leaders of these unions have appealed to Congress to abolish the poll tax as a means of winning the war, yet they countenance strikes which imperil our war effort and the lives of our men on every battle front with not a word of protest, not a word of indignation or condemnation nor a suggestion from the two Members from Ohio who so bitterly assailed the seven Southern States for safeguarding the ballot. Let the gentlewoman from Ohio go home and see if she can assist in having her own people return to work producing equipment and supplies needed for her sons and mine who are fighting to save us from destruction by a foreign foe. This would be a far more effective means of saving democracy than shedding tears concerning payment of a poll tax to our States for educational purposes.

Down in Alabama more than a billion dollars have been invested in munitions plants, shipyards, power facilities, and so forth, to manufacture weapons to preserve our freedom. Not a single plant has been closed nor production halted on account of strikes since our country has been plunged into war. Think these things over, and check the records in your various States before offering advice on democracy to the South.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take time to answer the personal attacks and implications against me; they are best answered by the record, by the overwhelming majority of the American people, and by time and events. As for the slurring remarks made about the people I represent, the records of the War Department tell the story of my people's patriotism. They show the casualties and the number of men from my district who are engaged on every battlefield, fighting for democracy. This is the best answer to the gentleman from Alabama.

May I say further that while my people did not come over on the *Mayflower* or on ships on which the gentleman's ancestors came over, my people have always fought for liberty and their sons are today again fighting and dying for liberty. It is because we are an integral part of the living flesh and blood of our country that we insist that democracy be extended to every man, woman, and child living in these United States irrespective of his race, color, or creed.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful for any person, whether or not acting under the cover of authority of the laws of any State or subdivision thereof, to require the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, pursuant to House Resolution No. 131, reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOBBS moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 1, in line 4, strike out "primaries or other"; and in lines 8 and 9, strike out "or registering to vote at primaries or other" and insert the word "at"; and on page 2, in line 2, strike out the words "primaries and other"; on page 2, in line 7, strike out "or registering to vote"; and in lines 8 and 14, strike out "primary or other"; and in line 17, strike out "such primary or other election" and insert "such elections"; and in lines 19 and 20, strike out "such primary or other" and insert "any such"; and in line 25, strike out "or registering to vote in any primary or other", and insert "at any"; and on page 3, in lines 8 and 9, strike out "or registering to vote in any primary or other" and insert "at any"; and amend the title to read as follows: "Making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in any election for national officers."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOBBS) there were—ayes 90; noes 167.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, on the passage of the bill I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 265, nays 110, answered "present" 3, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—265

Allen, Ill.	Furlong	Lynch
Andersen, H. Carl	Gale	McCormack
	Gamble	McCowen
Anderson, Calif.	Gavagan	McGregor
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gavin	McMurray
	Gearhart	McWilliams
Andresen, August H.	Gerlach	Madden
	Gifford	Magnuson
Andrews	Gilchrist	Mansfield, Mont.
Angell	Gillette	
Arends	Gillie	Marcantonio
Arnold	Goodwin	Martin, Mass.
Auchincloss	Gordon	Merritt
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gorski	Merrow
Barrett	Graham	Michener
Barry	Grant, Ind.	Miller, Conn.
Bates, Mass.	Griffiths	Miller, Mo.
Beall	Gross	Miller, Pa.
Bender	Gwynne	Monkiewicz
Bennett, Mich.	Hagen	Monroney
Bennett, Mo.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mott
Bishop		Mruk
Blackney	Hall, Leonard W.	Mundt
Bloom		Murdock
Bolton	Halleck	Murphy
Bradley, Pa.	Hancock	Murray, Wis.
Brehm	Harless, Ariz.	Myers
Brown, Ohio	Harness, Ind.	Norman
Buckley	Hart	Norton
Buffett	Hartley	O'Brien, Ill.
Burchill, N. Y.	Heffernan	O'Brien, Mich.
Burdick	Heidinger	O'Connor
Busbey	Herter	O'Konski
Butler	Hess	O'Neal
Byrne	Hill	O'Toole
Canfield	Hoch	Outland
Cannon, Mo.	Hoeven	Pfeifer
Carlson, Kans.	Holifield	Philbin
Carson, Ohio	Holmes, Mass.	Phillips
Carter	Holmes, Wash.	Pittenger
Case	Hope	Ploeser
Celler	Horan	Poulson
Chenoweth	Howell	Powers
Chiperfield	Hull	Pracht
Church	Jackson	Priest
Clason	Jeffrey	Rabaut
Clevenger	Jenkins	Ramey
Coffee	Jennings	Reece, Tenn.
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Anton J.	Reed, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.		Rees, Kans
Compton	Johnson, Calvin D.	Robinson, Utah
Crawford		Robsion, Ky.
Crosser	Johnson, Ind.	Rockwell
Cullen	Johnson, J. Leroy	Rodgers, Pa.
Cunningham		Rogers, Calif.
Curley	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, Mass.
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Ward	Rohrbough
Dawson	Jones	Rowan
Day	Jonkman	Rowe
Delaney	Judd	Sadowski
Dewey	Kean	Sasscer
Dickstein	Kearney	Sauthoff
Dilweg	Keefe	Scanlon
Dingell	Kefauver	Schiffler
Dirksen	Kelley	Schuetz
Ditter	Kennedy	Schwabe
Dondero	Keogh	Scott
Dworshak	King	Shafer
Eberharter	Kinzer	Simpson, Ill.
Ellis	Kirwan	Smith, Maine
Ellison, Md.	Klein	Smith, W. Va.
Ellsworth	Kunkel	Smith, Wis.
Elmer	LaFollette	Snyder
Elston, Ohio	Lambertson	Somers, N. Y.
Engel	Landis	Spence
Fay	Lane	Springer
Feighan	LeCompte	Stanley
Fernandez	LeFevre	Stevenson
Fish	Lemke	Stockman
Fitzpatrick	Lesinski	Sullivan
Fogarty	Lewis	Sundstrom
Forand	Luce	Talbot
Ford	Ludlow	Talle
Taylor	Vursell	Willey
Thomas, N. J.	Walter	Wilson
Thomason	Ward	Wolcott
Tibbott	Wasielewski	Wolfenden, Pa.
Tolan	Welchel, Ohio	Wolverton, N. J.
Towe	Weiss	Wright
Van Zandt	Wene	Zimmerman
Voorhis, Calif.	Wheat	
Vorys, Ohio	Wigglesworth	

NAYS—110

Abernethy	Grant, Ala.	Pace
Allen, La.	Green	Patman
Baldwin, Md.	Gregory	Patton
Barden	Hale	Peterson, Fla.
Bates, Ky.	Hare	Peterson, Ga.
Beckworth	Harris, Ark.	Poage
Bell	Harris, Va.	Price
Bland	Hays	Ramspeck
Bonner	Hébert	Rankin
Boykin	Hendricks	Reed, N. Y.
Bradley, Mich.	Hobbs	Richards
Brooks	Hoffman	Rivers
Brown, Ga.	Jarman	Rizley
Bryson	Jensen	Robertson
Bulwinkle	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Satterfield
Burch, Va.		Simpson, Pa.
Camp	Kerr	Slaughter
Chapman	Knutson	Smith, Va.
Colmer	Lanham	Sparkman
Cooper	Larcade	Starnes, Ala.
Courtney	McCord	Steagall
Cox	McGehee	Stewart
Cravens	McKenzie	Sumner, Ill.
Creal	McMillan	Sumners, Tex.
Curtis	Mahon	Taber
Domengeaux	Maloney	Tarver
Doughton	Manasco	Thomas, Tex.
Douglas	Mansfield, Tex.	Vincent, Ky.
Drewry	Mason	Wadsworth
Fisher	May	Weaver
Flannagan	Mills	West
Folger	Morrison, La.	Whelchel, Ga.
Fulbright	Murray, Tenn.	Whitten
Fulmer	Newsome	Whittington
Gathings	Norrell	Winstead
Gibson	O'Brien, N. Y.	Winter
Gossett	O'Hara	Woodrum, Va.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Fellows	Kee	Wickersham

NOT VOTING—54

Boren	Guyer	Rolph
Burgin	Hinshaw	Russell
Cannon, Fla.	Izac	Sabath
Capozzoli	Johnson, Luther A.	Sheppard
Clark		Sheridan
Cochran	Kilburn	Short
Cooley	Kilday	Sikes
Costello	Kleberg	Smith, Ohio
Culkin	Lea	Stearns, N. H.
Davis	McGranery	Stefan
Dies	McLean	Treadway
Disney	Maas	Troutman
Durham	Martin, Iowa	Vinson, Ga.
Eaton	Miller, Nebr.	Welch
Elliott	Morrison, N. C.	White
Fenton	Nichols	Woodruff, Mich.
Gallagher	O'Leary	Worley
Gore	Plumley	
Granger	Randolph	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Davis against.

Mr. Izac for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

Mr. Stefan for, with Mr. Russell against.

Mr. Capozzoli for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Mr. Rolph for, with Mr. Fellows against.

Mr. O'Leary for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Troutman for, with Mr. Cannon of Florida against.

Mr. Costello for, with Mr. Clark against.

Mr. Kee for, with Mr. Luther A. Johnson against.

Mr. Randolph for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Boren against.

General pairs:

Mr. McGranery with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Morrison of North Carolina with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Granger with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Gore with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Burgin with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Kilday with Mr. McLean.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Had he been here he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea" on the roll call just concluded, but I have a pair with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, who is absent, but whc if present would have voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and ask to be recorded as "present."

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Califonia, Mr. ROLPH. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill today may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD and include therein quotations from the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of any States and from the statutes and court decisions, and also to include citations and authorities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] be granted an unlimited leave of absence, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief Associated Press dispatch and a few brief extracts from public documents and letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, House Resolution 242, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That HARRIS ELLSWORTH is hereby elected to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDING SECTION 32 OF THE EMERGENCY FARM MORTGAGE ACT

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2427) to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from South Carolina to explain the purpose of the bill?

Mr. FULMER. The purpose of this bill is to extend the authority of the Federal Land Bank Commissioner for 2 additional years. In accordance with a bill we passed some time ago, his authority expires on the 1st of July, and this is to extend it for 2 additional years.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This will permit the Federal Land Bank Commissioner to make Commission's loans for the next 2 years?

Mr. FULMER. Yes. As the gentleman understands, we have a major bill before our committee as well as an investigation in connection with the Farm Security Administration, and this bill will give us plenty of time in the future to deal with all of this matter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have no objection, and withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the tenth sentence of section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1943" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1945."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the distinguished head of the F. B. I., J. Edgar Hoover, at the commencement exercises at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, N. J.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

TERM OF OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to ask permission of the House to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the introduction of a resolution to change the Constitution of the United States?

The SPEAKER. It would be.

Mr. DONDERO. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of office of the President and Vice President. The resolution reads as follows:

SECTION 1. The President and Vice President shall hold their offices during the term of 6 years. No person shall be eligible to the office of President who has previously held such office.

SEC. 2. The ratification of this article shall not affect the term in progress, or to which a President and Vice President have been elected, at the time of the ratification of this article, nor the eligibility to the office of President for such term.

SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.

One of the most controversial questions that confronted the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia in May 1787, and which Convention created the Constitution of the United States, was the question relating to the Chief Executive, his election, his powers, and the length of time that he should continue in office.

I shall deal solely with the question of the tenure in office of the President. The purpose of my resolution is to limit the term of the President to one of 6 years without right to succeed himself.

Since the beginning of the Government, Washington, our first President, established by his example the custom of refusing a third term. That custom has been respected and followed by every President until 1940.

The hope and aspiration expressed by Thomas Jefferson "that should a President consent to be a candidate for a third election, I trust he would be rejected upon this demonstration of ambitious views," was destroyed by the election in November 1940.

If a President can be elected a third, fourth, fifth, and sixth term there is no reason why the office should not become one for life and thereby destroy constitutional government in the United States. It was that danger of perpetuation in office which the delegates to the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia sought to prevent.

I desire to point out that this subject caused much heated debate, was most controversial, and was before the Convention almost continuously from the time the Convention convened in May until the following 6th day of September, but 12 days before the Constitution was finally adopted by the Convention. For the major part of the time the Convention was in session the proposal of a 6-year term or a 7-year term for the Chief Executive without right of succession or reelection seemed to have the majority opinion of the Convention. The truth is that it was agreed to by the committee of details and adopted by the Convention.

It is known that the Virginia plan provided for a Chief Executive to serve one term of 7 years with no right to a second term. The New Jersey plan, while it did not specify the length of the term of office, specified that the Chief Executive should be ineligible for a second term. The New York State convention on adoption of the Federal Constitution on July 4, 1788, passed a resolution, in spite of the fact that the national convention which created the Constitution provided otherwise, that—

Resolved, That the President of the United States shall hold his office during the term of 7 years and shall not be eligible for a second term.

It is quite evident from this resolution that there was much opinion in the country that a President should hold office for a longer term than the one finally adopted, and that he should have no right to succeed himself.

Gouverneur Morris, member of the convention, was for a short term to avoid impeachments; while Mr. Butler, another delegate, was against frequency of elections because he said it was "too far to send electors often"; while other delegates to the convention thought if elections were too frequent the best men would not undertake the service and those of inferior character would be liable to be corrupted.

For reasons well known now, when the Confederate States of America adopted their constitution, they provided that the President should hold office for a term of 6 years and that he should not be reeligible. Three or four years ago Jefferson Davis, the great grandson of the Confederate War President, came to Washington to testify before a Senate committee dealing with this same subject. In discussing the matter with him he called my attention to the fact that while Lincoln was compelled to stand for

reelection in November of 1864, his grandfather, under the Constitution of the Confederate States, did not have to do so because of the 6-year term to which he had been elected. His term would not expire until 1867.

Reasons may be assigned both for and against the 6-year limitation of one term with ineligibility for a second term. Never before in the history of our country since the adoption of the Constitution has the question of a third term been raised until the election of President Roosevelt in 1940, and now with the ambition to succeed himself for a fourth term. This is a challenge and a threat to our republican form of government.

The adoption of the resolution which I have introduced limiting the term of the President to one of 6 years and making him ineligible for a second term, would remove forever the threat which now faces the people of the United States.

OUR DUTY TO PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 496, and to include therein certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1943, I introduced H. R. 496, which has for its purpose the providing for the education of all types of physically handicapped children. Under the bill the program will be carried on by each individual State with assistance provided pursuant to the terms of this proposed legislation. There is a direct grant to each State of $40,000 which will not be required to be matched and which will be used to establish, extend, and improve services for educating physically handicapped children. An additional sum is provided to aid the States in such program on the basis of the ratio of the number of their inhabitants aged 5 to 20 years, inclusive, to the total number of inhabitants of the same ages of all the States as determined by the most recent United States census.

I introduced a similar bill in the Seventy-seventh Congress, but the demand upon the Congress for war legislation did not permit consideration of the legislation.

The latest statistics I have before me show, according to reports made to the United States Office of Education up to March 15, 1937, that of the physically handicapped children in the United States there were only 166,248 receiving special education in city public schools and in residential schools, while the estimated total number of physically handicapped children needing special education was 1,873,231.

On April 8 and 9, 1937, hearings were held before the Committee on Education and Labor in the United States Senate in the Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, on Senate bill 1634, which was similar to my bill, H. R. 496. From these hearings it is disclosed that the major type of handicapped children are as follows:

(a) The blind and the partially seeing, who are without vision or without sufficient vision to read ordinary print even with the aid of glasses.

(b) The deaf and the hard of hearing, who cannot hear ordinary instruction as given in the classroom.

(c) The crippled, who must have special equipment and treatment to succeed in school.

(d) The defective in speech, who stammer or who have some other serious speech difficulty which makes it impossible for them to participate normally in classroom instruction.

(e) Delicate children or children of lowered vitality, who suffer from invisible physical handicaps; the pretuberculous, the tuberculous, the cardiac, the anemic and the malnourished. These children cannot follow the regular program of the school day without further injury to their physical condition.

The hearings further disclose that the numbers of physically handicapped children in the several types were approximately as follows:

(a) Blind and partially seeing	52,868
(b) Deaf and hard of hearing	370,069
(c) Crippled	105,736
(d) Defective in speech	1,057,368
(e) Delicate (lowered vitality)	264,342
Grand total	1,850,393

Mr. Speaker, we in America are proud of the great storehouse of natural resources we have in our own country. In the great struggle in which we are now engaged, which is a contest to determine whether or not our civilization shall endure, we depend largely upon the utilization of these vast resources and the manpower we possess in the successful prosecution of the war. We are coming to realize, day by day, that we must depend ultimately upon the human element to achieve success. In the mobilization of our people for carrying forward our war activities, as well as building up our fighting forces on land, air, and sea, we have learned that success is dependent upon a strong, virile citizenship. We have been shocked to learn that many thousands of our young citizens of draft age have been rejected by reason of physical defects or lack of educational qualifications. This is a severe indictment against our civilization and educational program.

While the education of the physically handicapped is a problem separate and apart from the education of our normal children, it, nevertheless, is a social duty resting upon our society of great importance to the building up and maintenance of a strong, dependable race. It is an obligation resting upon the States which has been woefully neglected. The purpose of this legislation is to establish and promulgate a program throughout the States to be carried on by the States themselves which will meet the problem and give to this large group of our children an opportunity for education and to become self-supporting and useful members of society.

The Creed of the Cripple well expresses the objective of this legislation, which reads:

Not sympathy, not pity, not charity—just an equal chance with other men. To see pity in the eyes of my friends replaced with commendation—to work, to produce, to provide; and to feel that I have a place in the world, seeking no favors and giving none—to become a man among men in spite of my handicap.

There appears in the hearings to which I referred on S. 1634 some verses written by a crippled boy which reveal the feelings of these handicapped children and which are worthy of our consideration. The boy wrote:

God takes the clean, moist earth to make us of,
The loam that wind and sun breathe blessings on.
He makes the meadows green to race, hills to climb, and paths to pace.
He makes you lads to run, so neatly framed and swift in flight.
Your footsteps come and go. They mock me all the time.
They keep my heart just burning to follow where they go—
But pain! You are my master. You bind my feet, my spirit blight.
How is it I can never dance and run in merry sprite?
Did God's great hands just tremble, then, when He made me?

Mr. Speaker, let us, the Representatives of this great American Nation, believing in the equal opportunity for all, unbind the feet, release the spirit, and vouchsafe to the thousands of these youthful Americans held down by physical handicaps the opportunity to become self-supporting, useful American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 496 is pending before the Committee on Education and I most sincerely beseech the cooperation of all of my colleagues to the end that a hearing may be held upon this important legislation so that a complete record may be made of the facts surrounding this important problem which will in my judgment convince us all that legislation of this general type should be enacted so that we may deal fairly and justly with this great group of our handicapped children.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on either Thursday or Friday next to consider the bill (S. 495) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States, and that the time for general debate be fixed at 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs and the ranking member on the minority side of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes in opposition to the Smith-Connally bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered last night at the Library of Congress by Mr. Jean Hersholt on Hans Christian Andersen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Baltimore Evening Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS—LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Public Lands may be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House when the House is on general debate during the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. SUNDSTROM] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from Ellen Gowen Hood.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include excerpts from a letter from the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a poem by Horace C. Carlisle, entitled "Churchill Speaking From England's Heart."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on three different subjects, and in two to include short articles, and in the third an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Ten Years of the T. V. A."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the New York Times of Saturday, May 22, 1943, entitled "The Tax Muddle."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter to the citizens of Leesville, La., by my friend and constituent, Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Manchester Union, Manchester, N. H., May 24, 1943, in regard to the ban on pleasure driving.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a bill I am introducing today to create a permanent medical corps in the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement by Hon. Marvin Jones, chairman of the American delegation at the press conference at Hot Springs, May 22, 1943, at the food conference, and also include a statement of Hon. Marvin Jones made today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a short newspaper item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a short article from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE PARKER CORNING

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I was very much shocked this morning when I read of the passing of my predecessor, Mr. Parker Corning. He came to Congress in 1923 and remained for seven terms, leaving in 1936, when I came to Congress as his successor.

Mr. Corning was born on the 22d of January 1874. He was the son of Erastus and Mary Parker Corning. He was educated in Albany Boys Academy and St. Paul's School at Concord, N. H., and graduated from Yale in 1895. He was first elected to the Sixty-eighth Congress and was elected to each succeeding Congress, including the Seventy-fourth.

Mr. Corning was a businessman in Albany. He came from a long line of old residents of our State. In fact, his grandfather was the organizer of the city known as Corning, N. Y. The Susquehanna Railroad was the result of the efforts of Mr. Corning's great-grandfather as a leader in the industrial and railroad world.

He was a man of sterling qualities; a man of great force of character and independence. He has been for many years a leader in our social, industrial, and mercantile life. Only about 7 weeks ago his wife passed away. This unquestionably broke his spirit. Unquestionably it affected his health and hastened his death.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNE. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I desire to say that for many years I served upon the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with Mr. Parker Corning. Mentally sound, physically fine, I never knew a more gentle man than Parker Corning. He had the elements of a real American. He was a patriot. He was wise enough to know how to exercise citizenship and be a patriot, in the highest and best sense of the word.

With my friend, I shall grieve always at his passing.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank you from the bottom of my heart for your fine contribution to this memorial service. I am sure the family of Parker Corning and his friends appreciate everything you have said of him because of your long years of association with him and your knowledge of his fine merits and qualities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNE. I am glad to have the majority leader say something at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. The information that our distinguished friend gives to the House is a source of great regret to me. Every one of us who served with Parker Corning will always remember the fine example that he set and the outstanding character of service that he rendered to our country during his years as a Member of this House.

I join in everything that my distinguished friend from New York has said and the remarks that the distinguished Speaker of our body has so ably and eloquently made about our late beloved colleague and friend. I join with the gentleman from New York and members of the New York delegation in extending to those whom our distinguished late friend leaves behind, the members of his family, my profound feelings of sympathy.

Mr. BYRNE. I am very grateful to the majority leader for his contribution to this service. I wish to say that the nephew of our deceased colleague is now mayor of Albany, N. Y., Erastus Corning, a son of the deceased brother of Parker Corning—Mr. Edwin Corning. Edwin Corning was lieutenant governor of our State and also chairman of the Democratic State Committee for a number of years.

Unfortunately Parker Corning leaves surviving only a sister, the wife of one of our prominent physicians in Albany, and a daughter, Mrs. Igelhart. As I recollect, those are the only immediate survivors of our colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand, and will ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, a very fine obituary that I found in today's New York Times. I ask that this be printed in full in addition to the remarks that have been made by the Speaker and the majority leader and myself.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. I take leave of my dear friend and former colleague and also my former associate in many activities in my community. I wish to leave upon the RECORD my prayer to God Almighty that He will give him and also his dear wife eternal happiness on that other shore.

The article referred to follows:

PARKER CORNING, EX-LAWMAKER, DIES—SOCIAL LIFE OF ALBANY HAD LONG CENTERED AT HOME OF THE EX-CONGRESSMAN—REPRESENTATIVE 14 YEARS—FAMILY NOTABLE FOR CENTURY—GRANDFATHER FIRST HEAD OF NEW YORK CENTRAL ROAD

ALBANY, N. Y., May 24.—Parker Corning, Representative in Congress for the Twenty-eighth District of this State from 1923 to 1937, died today in Albany Hospital after a brief illness, at the age of 69. His wife, the former Anne Cassin McClure, who was prominent as a patroness of thoroughbred-horse racing, died 7 weeks ago.

Member of a family prominent in the political and business life of Albany and the State for more than a century, Mr. Corning had been in poor health for several weeks, but he did not enter the hospital until yesterday.

Much of the social life of Albany centered at the Glenmont, 1,000-acre farm home of Mr. and Mrs. Corning. Many notable affairs were given for their large circle of friends. A large dairy business was conducted on the farm. Recently Mr. and Mrs. Corning turned over to the Glenmont Red Cross a stone house on the farm.

GRANDFATHER HEADED NEW YORK CENTRAL

Born in Albany, Mr. Corning was a son of the late Mr. and Mrs. Erastus Corning. His grandfather, Erastus Corning, was the first president of the New York Central Railroad.

Mr. Corning attended the Albany Academy and St. Paul's School at Concord, N. H., and was graduated from Yale in 1895.

In that year he and the late James W. Cox founded the Albany Felt Co., one of the largest concerns in its line in this part of the State. While his brother, the late Edwin Corning, former lieutenant governor, was president of the Ludlum Steel Co., Mr. Corning served as its vice president. He also was a vice president and a director of the State bank, a trustee of the Mechanics and Farmers Bank and a director of the City Safe Deposit Co. In recent years, however, Mr. Corning confined his activities to the felt company.

HIS ELECTION TO CONGRESS

Mr. Corning in 1922 defeated Charles M. Winchester for the seat in Congress then held by Peter G. Ten Eyck. That was the year the O'Connell-Corning faction of the Democratic Party took control of county affairs. He was re-elected six times, and in 1936 declined a renomination. While in Congress he opposed many of the New Deal ideas.

In Congress Mr. Corning was a member of the Interstate and Foreign Affairs Committee. He put through the legislation for the construction of the Menands Bridge and the Parker Dunn Bridge over the Hudson River at Albany.

Mr. Corning was a member of the Fort Orange Club, the Albany Country and University Clubs of this city, the Racquet and Tennis of New York, and the Saratoga Golf Club.

Surviving are a daughter, Mrs. Philip Igelhart, of Westbury, L. I., the former Mary Parker Corning, and a sister, Mrs. Arthur W. Elting, wife of Dr. Elting, noted Albany surgeon.

A private funeral service will be held at the Corning farm.

AGAINST CONTINUING NATIONAL RECOVERY ADMINISTRATION

ALBANY, May 24.—Parker Corning, while in Congress, fought attempted continuation of the National Recovery and Agricultural Adjustment Administrations and the Guffey Coal Act before their invalidation by the United States Supreme Court. He differed with President Roosevelt on some banking policies and on tariffs as threats to home industries. His brother, the late Edwin Corning, was a one-time chairman of the Democratic State Committee and later lieutenant governor under Governor Alfred E. Smith. Parker Corning fostered legislation which created the port of Albany, and helped bring about erection of a new Federal building here.

Besides his 1,000-acre farm at Glenmont, he maintained a home at Bar Harbor, Maine.

Mrs. Corning was owner of topflight thoroughbreds and of a breeding stable at Glenmont. Best known of the horses which carried the Corning colors was Attention, which in 1941 beat Whirlaway by a length and a half to win the Arlington classic.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—REPORT TO CONGRESS ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS (H. DOC. NO. 209)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed, with illustrations:

PRESIDENT'S LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

To the Congress of the United States of America:

As I transmit to the Seventy-eighth Congress a Report of Operations under the Lend-Lease Act from March 11, 1943, to April 30, 1943, the last members of the once vaunted Afrika Korps and their Italian allies are streaming into prison camps. The peoples of Tunis and Bizerte are hailing their liberation—and Italians among them are as enthusiastic as any for their deliverance.

An entire continent—the continent of Africa—has now been cleared of the enemy. Its people have been freed from Nazi and Fascist rule. In Africa we have dealt a blow which is sorely felt in Berlin and Rome and Tokyo; and we have brought hope to millions still to be liberated. Liberation of Africa is a forerunner of the future.

In the coming battles for Germany and Japan, we shall need the full support and the full resources of the peoples of the newly liberated areas. This is a military and political necessity of the first order. Their fields can produce food not only for their own people but for the United Nations' forces. Their factories and mines can supply not only themselves but our armies as well.

The peoples in liberated areas are enlisting in support of the United Nations' cause. Their support will reflect itself in active cooperation at the proper time by millions still to be liberated. They appreciate, as only those who lost freedom can appreciate, the compelling necessity for overthrowing tyranny.

Our lend-lease operations in north and west Africa—the first of the liberated areas—have demonstrated how a freed people can aid in the defeat of the Axis. In this victory, our military operations have been backed up by the friendly support of the peoples behind the lines. We also were aided by the new French armies. They were equipped with lend-lease weapons. They were and are an important part of the United Nations' fighting forces. Aid has also been given us and the other United Nations by the liberated peoples of French Africa in the production and shipment of strategic and critical materials for our war-production program.

As we progress to victory, the United Nations have brought and are bringing food for the starving and medicine for the sick in the areas which we set free. Our promises are being fulfilled in deeds. Our integrity is enlisting the peoples and resources of these areas as effective fighting partners in the common fight against Axis aggression and tyranny.

While Axis prisoners have streamed into captivity at the end of our campaign of liberation in north Africa, lend-lease has shipped greater and greater quantities of war matériel into the battle areas—and into the other countries allied with us.

In my lend-lease report to the Congress on September 11, 1941, I stated that "it is our task to turn the workshops of our industry into mighty forges of war—to outbuild the aggressors in every category of modern arms."

Today, we are outbuilding the aggressors in every category of modern arms. And we are delivering them in the amounts necessary to build up the striking power for offensives that will end only in Berlin and Tokyo.

As lend-lease moves ahead in its third year, our armed forces, our supplies, and the combined efforts of the United Nations are driving ahead to complete victory over the enemy.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 25, 1943.*

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without, objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POST-WAR READJUSTMENT

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from

Connecticut [Mr. MONKIEWICZ] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I take this time this afternoon to call to your attention a matter that should be of great importance to us. While there are numerous problems arising out of the prosecution of the war that occupy our minds, there is one which I believe to be as important as any.

A major internal problem which will confront our country at the close of this war will be the readjustment of millions of men from the armed services of our country into our civilian economy at a period when most of our important industries will be struggling with their own readjustment problem—that of reconverting their factories from war production to peacetime production.

We have heard from persons in high official positions of vast and grandiose plans for the rehabilitation and readjustment of the peoples of many lands; vast projects which administration officeholders are already preparing to put into effect—not only after the war but immediately—and all of these projects, as far as we can learn, are to be paid for substantially by the American taxpayers.

But from these world planners we have heard very little of any concrete plan to aid the American soldier, sailor, marine, Coast Guard man, or other members of our armed forces, other than some vague hints at a bigger and larger form of W. P. A., N. Y. A., or some such projects.

I say care should be taken that there should be no "boondoggling," no leaf raking, no use of our fighting men to build up a political machine. We owe our fighting men better than that. These men should be given the guidance, training, and jobs to aid them to resume and continue on in the American way of life—the American way of life which gives to each man and woman the spirit of individualism and personal independence—that spirit which makes a man or woman take just pride in being self-supporting and thereby self-respecting. We owe it to our fighting men that we provide this guidance, training, and jobs for them and we must oppose any attempt by anyone to make State wards of these men, or to attempt to break the free morale of these men by throwing them onto relief or what some people have called "made work."

But if the administration theorists have been too busy planning the rehabilitation of the distant parts of the earth to look around at home, there are those in this country who have been looking with thoughtful view toward the internal future of this Nation. One of these men is Carl A. Gray, of Farmington, Conn.

Mr. Gray is not a wishful dreamer. He is a man who has accomplished things by brain and work. As a boy in Worcester, Mass., he arose at 2 o'clock each morning and peddled the Worcester Telegram through the streets of his city during his high-school years. He attended the trade school and received a solid, practical shop training at that school. After graduating from trade school, he worked for a year in a steel and wire mill before entering Dartmouth College. After graduating from college, he went to work in a car foundry and later served his time as an apprentice machine operator. Since then he has worked his way upward in industry. He has held high executive positions with great manufacturing companies and at this time is president of the Grenby Manufacturing Co. of Plainville, Conn., and president of the Newton, Thompson Co., Inc., of Brandon, Vt.

In 1939 employment conditions were very bad in Connecticut. Many thousands of men were out of work in my State. Gov. Raymond E. Baldwin, in April 1939, asked Mr. Gray to accept the chairmanship of a committee to study employment. Mr. Gray accepted and went to work. He conceived and put into operation what afterward became nationally known as the Connecticut plan.

The plan was simple; he sums it up thus:

1. Find out who the unemployed are by communities. It does no good to speak in round numbers of 100,000 or 10,000,000 unemployed. It is a question of who these people are, classified by experience and background and what can be done for each group.
2. Make a survey of job opportunities, the kinds of jobs in given communities.
3. Form local committees of businessmen and other interested citizens with the will to do something about it.

Now, let me remark: In March of 1939, Mr. Gray wrote to Mr. Harry Hopkins offering to come to Washington at his own expense to discuss this plan with him and offered to devote some time without remuneration to setting up the plan and making it work on a national scale. After some time, he received a letter from a secretary—a form letter. He again wrote to Mr. Hopkins and received a letter telling him to take it up with the assistant secretary. He did and received a courteous, but noncommittal reply; but no encouragement.

I guess Mr. Gray did not know the way these things were done by some people around here. Can you imagine their conception of a man who was willing to do something for the Nation at his own expense? Why such a man must appear heretical according to the gospel of "Tax and tax, spend and spend."

But Governor Baldwin listened to Mr. Gray, and the Connecticut plan was put into operation in Connecticut. Job-training was given to men who were untrained and 45,000 men were given jobs. The plan was based upon specific training, highly intensified, upon specific machines in connection with which a known demand, current or expected, for workers existed.

Now, this plan was put into operation early in 1939. It produced jobs, real jobs, productive jobs for 45,000 men in Connecticut. These men were trained through the plan to operate machines and produce in factories. These men today are working at machines in factories producing war materials. When Japan struck, these men were ready, trained workmen. How different this plan and training was to the boondoggling, leaf-raking, money-wasting, and man-wasting projects of the taxers and spenders.

Now, Mr. Gray has come forward with another plan, which I will briefly outline and for which I humbly ask your consideration. He is looking toward the time when the men of our armed forces shall have accomplished their world-saving task. When victory shall be theirs they will wish to return to their homes and their families. But they must have a means to support themselves and their families. And this must be a means of support which will enable each of these men to maintain his self-respect and his pride. We do not want any repetition of the treatment given to the veterans of World War No. 1; we do not want them to feel that they are an object of charity, receiving what amounted to little more than tobacco money.

Mr. Gray's plan eliminates bureaucracy. It includes provision that all men returning home from the armed services who shall have jobs to which to return shall be released from the armed services. Those who prefer other jobs than the jobs they had prior to their war service and those who will not have jobs to which to return would be placed in the reserves but allowed to return to their homes. Then they would be assigned to a district occupational board nearest their homes and remain on the Government pay roll. The occupational board, in cooperation with existing agencies and personnel, will then start making a complete analysis of all returning soldiers through its corps of guidance experts. A corps of trained guidance experts would be assigned to each district to begin the work of interviewing, checking records, and analysis-testing of each man. These experts would not be theorists; they would be experienced men and women who were trained in their respective fields, who would have a thorough knowledge of skills required in each of many occupations, and who would be versed in vocational guidance, vocational education, occupational therapy, personnel administration, psychology, and psychiatry. After a complete examination and analysis the combined judgment of both the candidate and board would be filed. In these examinations and interviews each man would state what occupations he would like to follow and his aptitudes for these and other occupations would be analyzed.

Vestibule schools would be set up in each district to which the man would be transferred while still under the regional occupational board. His Government pay continues and he is given time to try out courses agreed upon mutually with the guidance experts, in which the student or his instructors can decide for what job he is best fitted. Once the man is graduated from a vestibule school, he goes to a special vocational school in which he will receive the basic training in the occupation he has chosen. The length of the course at the vocational school may take from 6 months to 2 years, depending upon the type of job for which the man shall be trained.

If the aptitude and other tests show a man is qualified for college or professional training, then that man would be given this type of education at Government expense.

When a man is placed in a job, after completion of the vocational training, he then will be released by the occupational board and discharged from the reserve branch of the armed services. Also, if a man shows a tendency during training to shirk his work and collect his Government pay without taking his vocational training seriously as a member of the reserves, it might be understood his case would be disposed of in some proper manner.

Occupational opportunities and types of courses would be continually studied by a national research board and district boards, which would guide the schools and vocational advisers as to the field of occupations where job opportunities are the most likely to exist and courses could be changed according to the current needs.

This is a brief outline of the Gray plan. Mr. Gray has received many letters from members of the armed services and from women who have brothers or sons in these services, commending his plan and urging him to go ahead with it.

The Gray plan could be put into operation now. It need not await the end of this war. It could be put into operation immediately to aid those men who have been discharged because of wounds or other honorable reasons.

I say, while we are planning for remaking the world after this war, this might be a proper time to give some consideration to the future of those who are fighting for our security and our way of life.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

UTILIZATION OF WOOD WASTE

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker. The United States was richly endowed by nature with abundant natural resources. Of all of these resources, probably the most important one is unique in the respect that it can be replaced. This resource has found a multitude of uses in our wartime economy, and has contributed more tonnage to war production than the basic commodity, steel. It is our most plentiful resource, possesses the widest range of utilization, and yet is the most wasted of all of our raw materials. This important natural resource is the timber supply which is found in our vast forests. It is this same resource that has been largely instrumental in keeping the Axis powers in critical chemicals, fuels, rubber, and food materials. In this country, we are today wasting an estimated 67 percent of the wood from our forests. This waste annually runs into millions of tons.

The horn of plenty is running out in the United States. A few short months ago, we talked of surpluses; we talked of winning the war with food; we talked of feeding the world; we had everything—so we thought.

But the word "surplus" went out of circulation with new model cars, Nylon hosiery, and ice cream on the dinner table. We are seriously afflicted with the economic disease of shortages. Shortages operate in a vicious cycle—each new symptom making the others worse, with a corresponding rise in the industrial and civilian fever chart. The customary remedy for shortages is an economic aspirin issued under the trade names of rationing, priorities, scrap drives, overtime hours, and pep talks. But the real trouble always remains. There is but one real way of relieving shortages and that is to find something that we have plenty of, but which we are not using. Wood waste happens to be just such a material, and vast quantities are available annually in this country. Figuratively speaking, we can feed a cow wood waste and get milk. We can feed hens sawdust and get eggs. We can make tires out of sawdust.

The Axis Powers are getting meat, eggs, milk, butter, alcohol, glycerine, explosives, and plastics out of wood waste. It is time that we become nationally conscious of this wasted raw material, and promote its utilization to relieve our shortages in industrial materials and in our food supply.

The entire subject of food, including production, manufacture, distribution, and price control, is often under discussion by Members of this House, and we have heard numerous remarks on the subject on the floor.

Our food situation is critical now, not that there is any immediate danger of people going hungry, but the situation is critical because the muddling and bungling now, unless it is corrected, may easily lead to hunger in our country within 12 months.

It is not, however, the immediate problem that concerns me today, but it is concerning our lack of recognition of certain fundamental facts, and our failure to lay plans for the future that I speak.

It is a strange thing, but one of the serious difficulties in the German economy in the previous World War, is almost exactly the same difficulty that may confront us in the near future. The collapse of Germany in 1918 was due in no small part to the break-down of the German supply of protein feed necessary to produce meat, milk, cheese, and eggs.

Let me give you a short quotation from the book entitled "Germany's Master Plan," by Joseph Borkin and Charles A. Welsh:

> The lack of cattle feed was the principal problem of the whole war food program. By far too much cattle was bred, considering the amount of feed produced in Germany. This brought about a vicious circle. If the breeding of cattle was reduced because of the lack of feed, the meat, fat, and milk supply suffered. If, on the other hand, the number of cattle was maintained, then the breeder was apt to feed the cattle bread grains in order not to let his cattle starve, instead of having the grain for direct human consumption.

In several hearings before subcommittees of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, of which I am secretary, I have heard it stated repeatedly by men of undoubted responsibility that the animal population of this country now exceeds, or shortly will exceed, our ability to feed it. The actual shortage is variously estimated in percentage, but there seems to be a general agreement in the neighborhood of 20 percent. This statement does not refer to concentrated protein which is even more seriously short.

On March 15 Herbert Hoover, who was the Food Administrator in the previous war, told the Midwest Conference of Governors that the United States has ceased to be a great food-surplus country; that, with the exception of the extraordinary harvest of 1942, we were in fact a food-importing country; and that enemy activity has cut off imports of vegetable oils; and that our protein feed for cattle is very short.

I am also reliably informed that there is not actually in sight much more than half enough concentrated protein food for cattle, hogs, and poultry for the next 12 months.

Germany collapsed in 1918 because she had no solution to the problem. We are extremely fortunate in that we do have a solution. We know the process by which adequate supplemental protein feed may be obtained at low cost from material now going to waste.

The tragedy is, at least it seems a tragedy to me, that, although the facts of our impending shortage seem clear, to date little or nothing has been done to meet the situation.

I refer simply to the fact that protein yeast can be inexpensively and easily made from wood waste; that there is ample wood fiber now going to waste, especially in the forests of the West, which, if utilized, would more than meet our need for protein feed and our additional need for alcohol for the rubber program.

The method of utilization of wood waste is a process for the production of wood sugar. Quantities of small particles of wood are packed into a percolator where the wood is subjected to high temperature and pressure by the admission of steam. When the proper conditions are reached, a weak solution of acid is forced through the wood waste and wood sugar is drawn off in solution. From each ton of wood waste, almost 1,100 pounds of wood sugar is produced and nearly 600 pounds of lignin.

From the wood sugar, by fermentation processes, it is possible to produce numerous other products. Each ton of wood waste will thus produce about 50 gallons of alcohol. Or it will produce 450 pounds of high-protein feeding yeast, which is superior to soya meal for livestock food. The lignin, through chemistry, yields a number of vital materials.

Before we can fully appreciate what the utilization of wood waste can mean to this country, we should understand the importance of alcohol and protein feeds to our wartime economy. The

plenty of these materials that existed a few months ago has turned into shortages. Alcohol is the foundation of our synthetic-rubber program. Production in 1941 was 150,000,000 gallons. Our requirements for 1944 are 600,000,000 gallons, an increase of 400 percent; 90 percent of this alcohol will be produced by the use of feeding materials, such as grains and sirups. Two hundred million bushels of grain will be used in the process.

As already mentioned, our concentrated protein feeds for livestock are about half what they should be. The Department of Agriculture has done everything possible to encourage the production of soya beans and other high protein crops. Due to these feed shortages, farmers have had to resort to feeding wheat for protein to live stock and nearly 225,000,000 bushels have been so consumed in the past year. With the alcohol program and the live stock feeding burden thrown on our grain supplies, it is little wonder that it was recently announced that it may be necessary to plant 16,000,000 additional acres of wheat for 1944. Obviously, however, these acres must take from other needed production. Meantime, the Nation's meat production is falling off and our production of eggs and dairy products threatens to be substantially below that of last year. We appear to be entering the vicious cycle that brought Germany to her knees in 1918. We have been told that we can win the war and write the peace with food. We will accomplish neither if we allow ourselves to be forced to choose between using our available supply of grain for food or for the production of rubber and the feeding of live stock.

It must be said for the German militarist, he does not knowingly commit the same error twice if it can be avoided. The wood-sugar process was perfected in Germany and when the Nazi high command saw its possibilities, they immediately made it a cornerstone for their wartime economy. In their wood waste heaps, they envisioned bacon and beef, eggs and butter, alcohol and glycerine, synthetic rubber and plastics, fuels and chemicals. The government immediately moved to acquire a 50 percent interest in the process. Additional plants were built until there were nearly 20 by 1941. It proved to be such a good thing that high German officials could not resist temptation. With the usual Nazi skill, the owner of the other half interest was "Muniched" out of his property by concentration camp treatment. It was a good thing among rascals and Axis partners Italy and Japan also built plants.

Immediately the question comes to mind, Would such plants be practical in the United States? Available estimates indicate that a plant using 360 tons of wood waste per day would cost about $1,500,000 and would yield annually 5,000,000 gallons of alcohol and 40,000 tons of lignin. Figures I have seen indicate that a plant designed to produce high-protein feeding yeast would be cheaper and would yield 30,000 tons, the equivalent of 50,000 acres of soya beans, plus 40,000 tons of lignin. If the alcohol is valued at 20 cents per gallon or the protein feed at soya meal prices and the lignin considered of no value, either plant would pay operating costs, interest on the investment, and 10 percent amortization, and still leave a profit. If the lignin is sold for 2 cents per pound, all the above charges could be paid, the alcohol or protein feed given away, and seemingly a very good profit realized.

Lignin, the principal by-product of wood-sugar production, is a chemist's Chinese puzzle. It is predicted that when chemists are able to reveal the secret of lignin a multitude of products will be produced from it, approaching possibly the variety produced from coal. As a fuel, it burns ash free with a heat value of good coal. From it is now produced a plastic which is used in battery boxes as a substitute for hard rubber. By chemical treatment, tanning materials, cosmetics, dyes, vanilla flavoring, heavy oils, and phenol, a critical material in the plastic industry, are produced. Insulating and fireproof building materials, road binders, and fertilizers are other products.

How much alcohol or food protein and other desirable materials are we losing annually by failing to use our wood waste? Our annual waste in sawdust alone is about 25,000,000 tons. Sawdust is only a small portion of total waste. If all our wood waste were processed, we could produce 4,000,000,000 gallons of alcohol, or 16,000,000 tons of food protein, plus 20,000,000 tons of lignin.

Fortunately the Office of Production Research and Development has taken preliminary steps toward the development of wood sugar production in the United States. Under their authorization a small pilot plant is ready to begin operations to furnish a basis for the construction of large plants in this country. It is not an idle dream that at some future date, when our supplies of oil and coal are exhausted, we may have to look to our forests for many of the things we derive from those resources.

Our forests are already the heaviest contributor of raw material to our war effort. In 1942, 120,000,000 tons of wood were used as compared to 100,000,000 tons of steel. For the military services, wood has found utility in nearly 1,500 items made wholly or partially of wood. Vast quantities of plywood have found their way into all types of military construction. The finest airplane propellors are made out of "compreg," which is a plastic impregnated laminated compressed wood developed by the Forest Products Research Laboratory of the Forest Service. Wood pulp plastic impregnated products for airplane construction have been produced, having weight and strength similar to aluminum, and having other desirable properties not possessed by the metal. Wood cellulose is one of the principal raw materials for the production of rayon, which has many wartime uses.

In summary, it is clearly apparent that our forests are one of our most important resources, not only to our wartime, but to our peacetime, economy. It is a resource, the utility of which we have barely begun to employ. We should not allow false economies to prevent us from adequately protecting our forest resources against fires and insects. We should be intelligent and foresighted enough to realize the loss to our Nation in the continuing waste of 67 percent of our wood supply. In view of our national emergency and our prospective food shortages, we should double our efforts to protect this vital resource and to utilize this waste material to insure our Nation against a real emergency in our food needs.

The use of our forests for building material and fuel is common and well known. I think I have just sketched for you a new and extremely vital future use of our forest areas. Now I want to call your attention to the fact that these great material assets of ours must be protected, not only from our foreign enemies, but from normal human carelessness. If these forests are burned, and they are all too susceptible to loss by fire, we cannot have them either for building material, alcohol, or stock food.

I call your attention to the fact that there is now pending before the Congress an appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, which, as it was passed by the House, does not carry a sufficient appropriation for emergency forest-fire protection. Hearings are now being held by the Senate Appropriations Committee, and I am hopeful that a suitable amount for this purpose will be included in the bill. In conclusion, I strongly urge that the Members of the Congress give full consideration to the vital part our forests must play in our wartime and future economy, and do everything possible to save them from fire.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MERRITT, for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

To Mr. KING, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. MAHON) for May 25 and May 26, on account of important official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 26, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10 o'clock a. m. Wednesday, May 26, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 2241. To abolish the Jackson Hole Monument—Wyoming, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and For-

eign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Wednesday, May 26, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearings pursuant to House Resolution 98 by Congressman HALLECK.

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

This committee will hold public hearings on investigation of civilian employment in governmental departments, Wednesday, May 26, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m. in room 246, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 26, Thursday, May 27, and Friday, May 28, 1943, for consideration of housing bills, in the caucus room, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, May 26, and Thursday, May 27, 1943, on all bills dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act—H. R. 1882, H. R. 2309, H. R. 2428, and H. R. 2429.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 27, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2750, to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, relating to experience of radio operators.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2731, to facilitate the award and payment of just compensation for property requisitioned under the authority of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

1. Tuesday, June 1: Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, will open the hearings with any statements and recommendations he desires to submit covering national flood control and the projects that should be included in the bill to be reported, especially as they are related to national defense and as they will be important following the existing war to provide sound flood-control projects and desirable public works. General Reybold is now on an airplane tour of inspection of the flood areas and will submit a first-hand report covering recent major floods along the Missouri, Arkansas, White, Mississippi, Illinois, Wabash, Ohio, and other rivers in the recent flood areas. He will be followed by Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Assistant Chief of Engineers, who has previously advised the Flood Control Committee during hearings and who will also appear before the committee and submit his views and discuss generally the projects that have been favorably reported since the hearings were conducted on H. R. 4911, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, reported on June 9, 1941, which became the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941. Col. George R. Goethals, Chief of the Flood Control Branch, Office of Chief of Engineers, will attend the hearings and will furnish to the members of the committee in detail any and all available information respecting the said projects on which favorable reports have been submitted by the Chief of Engineers.

The district engineers and the division engineers have furnished to the Chief of Engineers data and information respecting major floods since August 18, 1941, and particularly with respect to recent major floods in the various drainage basins of the country, which will be submitted to the committee.

2. Wednesday, June 2: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects for the New England region including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers and the Middle Atlantic region including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

3. Thursday, June 3: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the upper and lower Ohio River and tributaries, and on projects of the South Atlantic region including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

4. Friday, June 4: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects along the Missouri River and tributaries and the upper Mississippi River and the Great Lakes region.

5. Tuesday, June 8: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the lower Mississippi River and tributaries including the Arkansas and White Rivers, and on rivers flowing into the Gulf west of the Mississippi River, and in the Western Rocky Mountain region including Texas and Colorado, and in the Pacific Northwest region including the Willamette River and the Columbia River and tributaries.

6. Wednesday, June 9: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the Los Angeles area and in the State of California, including the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kern River Valleys, and on projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

7. Thursday, June 10: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

8. Friday, June 11: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

NOTICE

The Members of the House and Senate have been circularized twice for information relative to members of their families in the armed services.

If any Members have failed to furnish this information or have become eligible for membership in the Congressional War Parents Association since, will they please notify either the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], president of the association, or Senator BRIDGES, secretary, furnishing the necessary information immediately.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

436. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 in the form of an amendment to th Budget for the Office of Civilian Defense, changing the estimate from $5,949,550 to $5,746,522, and reducing the limitation on traveling expenses by $35,000 (H. Doc. No. 207); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

437. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 412 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months (H. Doc. No. 208); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and ordered to be printed.

438. A letter from the Director of Selective Service, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 4 of the act of December 29, 1941, so as to make the provisions of said act applicable to officers or employees certifying to pay rolls of the Selective Service System for payment by Army disbursing officers; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCKENZIE: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 2080. A bill to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service, with amendment (Rept. No. 485). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2612. A bill to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 496). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. S. 170. An act for the relief of W. Cooke; without amendment (Rept. No. 486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. S. 241. An act for the relief of

Rachel Acerra; without amendment (Rept. No. 487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. S. 252. An act for the relief of Philip Kleinman; without amendment (Rept. No. 488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. S. 373. An act for the relief of Charles Favors; without amendment (Rept. No. 489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. S. 410. An act for the relief of James B. Lewis, Jarvis T. Mills, and Richard D. Peters; without amendment (Rept. No. 490). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. S. 510. An act for the relief of Inez Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 491). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. S. 516. An act for the relief of the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railway; without amendment (Rept. No. 492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. S. 628. An act for the relief of Lawrence Anthony, R. E. Murphy, Mary E. Armstrong, and R. E. Murphy as administrator of the estate of Ella Murphy; without amendment (Rept. No. 493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. S. 743. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter H. Kindon; without amendment (Rept. No. 494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. S. 765. An act for the relief of Viola Dale; without amendment (Rept. No. 495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 2794. A bill to approve and consent to the compact entered into by Iowa and Nebraska establishing the boundary between Iowa and Nebraska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 2795. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land or buildings and facilities or fixtures appurtenant thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2796. A bill dividing the State of Florida into two judicial districts, defining the territory embraced in each, and fixing the time of holding terms of court therein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 2797. A bill exempting from the tax on transportation of property amounts paid by States and political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 2798. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 2799. A bill to provide for the location, survey, and building of a system of three superhighways east and west and six north-south highways; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 2800. A bill to provide for cooperation with State agencies administering labor laws in establishing safe and healthful working conditions in industry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2801. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2802 (by request). A bill amending the act of March 14, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for vacations to Government employees, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BELL:

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution designating June 26 of this year as National Baseball Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res 130. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the terms of President and Vice President; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky establishing a boundary between said State and said Commonwealth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. Res. 243. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Roads, as a whole or by subcommittees, to investigate the Federal road system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, requesting Congress to continue the appropriation for the work of the Farm Security Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the appointment of Hon. Jesse Tapp as assistant to the Administrator of Food of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give more thought to a closer association of the United Nations in regard to post-war planning and further the speedy termination of the war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 2803. A bill for the relief of George Roberts and his wife, Mrs. George Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 2804. A bill for the relief of Ruth E. P. Phillips; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2805. A bill for the relief of Robert Judson McGarry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 2806. A bill for the relief of Hugh M. Gregory; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

887. By Mr. ANGELL: Petitions of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

888. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Anna Spring and 20 citizens of Ohio, urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

889. Also, petition of Mrs. E. B. Pease and 56 other citizens from Livingston and Glasgow, Mont., favoring the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

890. Also, petition of 282 citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to remove one of the chief causes of absenteeism, to conserve shipping space, and to prevent the waste of untold amounts of money and huge quantities of food, coal, iron, rubber, and gasoline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

891. Also, petition of Rachel A. Hunt and 25 other citizens of Pasadena, Calif., favoring the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

892. Also, petition of Mrs. Jean P. Lincoln and 42 other citizens of Athens, Pa., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

893. Also, petition of Florence S. Bergin and 97 other citizens of Beaverton, Oreg., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

894. Also, petition of the First Scandinavian Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Chicago, Ill., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

895. Also, petition of Mrs. Harold M. Auld and 84 citizens of Oakdale, Ill., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

896. Also, petition of Annie Hargrove and 59 citizens of Equality, Ill., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed

production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

897. Also, petition of a committee of 50 of Buffalo, N. Y., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

898. Also, petition of Mrs. Jerome J. Rosenstiel and 20 citizens of Freeport, Ill., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

899. Also, petition of Frank Pyatt and 20 citizens of Pinckneyville, Ill., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

900. Also, petition of 124 citizens of Elkhart, Ind., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

901. Also, petition of Mae Whitford and 50 citizens of Alfred Station, N. Y., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

902. Also, petition of Mary Etta Watts and 220 citizens of Richmond, Va., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

903. Also, petition of Mrs. Norman A. Black and 25 citizens of Portland, Maine, urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the wininng of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

904. Also, petition of Hattie V. King and 34 citizens of Tillmore, Calif., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

905. Also, petition of 32 citizens of Lewisburg, Pa., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

906. Also, petition of Mrs. G. S. Barons and 14 citizens of Haltville, Calif., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

907. Also, petition of Mrs. R. L. France and 60 members of the First Methodist Church of South Bend, Ind., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

908. Also, petition of Ada B. Wooden and 123 citizens of Hampstead, Md., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

909. Also, petition of the Hagerstown district of Woman's Division of Christian Service, Hagerstown, Md., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

910. Also, petition of Mrs. A. Mills and 67 residents of Centralia, Wash., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

911. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of Mrs. B. H. Hannah and 40 other citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

912. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Examiners' and Floor Workers' Union, Local No. 82, I. L. G. W. U., urging the defeat of the Connally bill (S. 796); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

913. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition signed by Nora J. Borden, president of the Waterloo Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and many others, urging the enactment of Senate bill 860 and House bill 2082, the O'Daniel and Bryson bills, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

914. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of sundry citizens of Valparaiso, Ind., and vicinity, favoring the prompt enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

915. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of the Arkansas Association of Social Work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

916. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of Syracuse, Kans., favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

917. Also, petition favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

918. Also, petition favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

919. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Dodge City, Kans., regarding House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

920. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Attica, Kans., regarding House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

921. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Bazine, Kans., regarding House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

922. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Ulysses, Kans., regarding House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

923. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mrs. Jesse Lines and 11 other citizens of Sabetha, Kans., urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

924. Also, petition of Alma Sanders and 55 other citizens of McLouth, Kans., and vicinity, urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

925. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition urging the Congress of the United States of America to establish a chiropractic corps in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

926. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Joseph A. Lang, adjutant, Col. C. L. Smith Camp, No. 10, Department of West Virginia, United Spanish War Veterans, Fairmont, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2350, liberalizing the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

927. Also, petition of Charles W. Bruemmer and a number of citizens from the Wheeling area of West Virginia, urging the establishment of a chiropractic corps in the armed forces now; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

928. By Mr. CASE: Petition of Mrs. V. C. Swander and 102 other citizens of Rapid City, S. Dak., urging Congress to pass House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of the demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

929. Also, petition of Mrs. Harry Blunt and 21 members of the Congregational Church of Belle Fourche, S. Dak., urging that Congress pass House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war and until the termination of the demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration

of Thy Holy Spirit that we may perfectly love Thee and worthily magnify Thy Holy Name. Amen.

The reading of the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, without objection, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 231, the Chair declares the House to be in recess for the purpose of holding memorial services as arranged by the Committee on Memorials.

Accordingly the House stood in recess to meet at the call of the Speaker.

MEMORIAL SERVICE PROGRAM

ORDER OF MEMORIAL EXERCISES IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1943, AT 11:45 A. M.

Prelude, sacred selections (11:30 to 12)---- United States Army Band Orchestra
Presiding officer---------- The Speaker of the House of Representatives
Invocation---------- The Chaplain Dr. James Shera Montgomery
There Is No Death (Geoffrey O'Hara)---- Doris Doe
Scripture reading and prayer-- The Chaplain
Roll of deceased members-------- The Clerk of the House of Representatives
Devotional silence.
Goin' Home (Anton Dvorak)---- Doris Doe New World Symphony
Address---------- Hon. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM Representative from the State of Virginia
Address---------- Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN Representative from the State of Illinois
Hymn---------- Doris Doe
Taps---------- Sgt. William Lamb
Benediction---------- The Chaplain

IN MEMORIAM—HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Hon. FRANK HENRY BUCK, Third Congressional District of California. Died September 17, 1942.

Hon. PHILIP ALLEN BENNETT, Sixth Congressional District of Missouri. Died December 7, 1942.

Hon. HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT, Second Congressional District of California. Died May 13, 1943.

COMMITTEE ON MEMORIALS

JOHN R. MURDOCK, chairman; MARY T. NORTON; JAMES V. HEIDINGER.

Doris Doe (Mezzo-soprano)----Metropolitan Opera Association (Kurt Hetzel, accompanist)
United States Army Band Orchestra------ Capt. Thomas F. Darcy, conducting

MEMORIAL SERVICES

The Speaker of the House of Representatives presided.

The Chaplain, Dr. James Shera Montgomery, D. D.:

May the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer.

The Lord is my Shepherd; I shall not want.

He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me beside the still waters.

He restoreth my soul; He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake.

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff, they comfort me.

Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin:

And yet I say unto you, That even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.

Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which today is, but tomorrow is cast in the oven, shall He not much more clothe you of little faith?

Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in Me.

In My Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.

And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.

Peace, I leave with you, my peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you.

"Yet Love will dream and Faith will trust
(Since He who knows our need is just),
That somehow, somewhere, meet we must.
Alas for him who never sees
The stars shine through his cypress trees!
Who, hopeless, lays his dead away,
Nor looks to see the breaking day
Across the mournful marbles play!
Who hath not learned in hours of faith
The truth to flesh and sense unknown
That Life is ever lord of Death,
And Love can never lose its own."

"Still, still with Thee when purple morning breaketh
When the bird waketh, and the shadows flee;
Fairer than morning, lovelier than daylight
Dawns the sweet consciousness, I am with Thee.

"When sinks the soul, subdued by toil, to slumber,
Its closing eyes look up to Thee in prayer
Sweet the repose beneath Thy wings o'er shading,
But sweeter still to wake and find Thee there.

"So shall it be at last in that bright morning,
When the soul waketh and life's shadows flee;
O in that hour, fairer than daylight dawning,
Shall rise the glorious thought, I am with Thee."

Heavenly Father, our minds are arrested as we pause to meditate upon the brevity of this life and the immortality of the human soul. Again the silver cord is loosened, the golden bowl is broken, the pitcher at the fountain, and the wheel at the cistern. As life and death walk the ways of earth, we rejoice that the pulse-throb of eternity is mighty within us and that mortality cannot kill the unconquerable soul. Accept our deepest praise for Thy providential care which towers above the horizons of human need, revealing the ultimate blessing to those who pass this way. O God, would that our lips were nigh to full speech, that faith eternal and hope wondering and pensive could give expression to their fullest and most secret joys.

The workman dies, but the work goes on; today we give grateful tribute to those whose brotherly companionship we have shared. They rose to high levels of conscientious thinking, of patriotic devotion, and have bequeathed to their generation those strong, manly virtues, enduring and altogether worthy of emulation. Blessed Lord, give us courage in all that is good, aversion to all that is evil, and power to resist all temptation. To all who are in sorrow and all who tarry here, be like music floating through the highlands, like a sweet fragrance wafted over the valleys, and ever like a soft shaft of light breaking through the clouds and Thine shall be the praise forever—through Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

Doris Doe sang There Is No Death (Geoffrey O'Hara).

ROLL OF DECEASED MEMBERS

Mr. Irving W. Swanson, reading clerk of the House, read the following roll:

FRANK HENRY BUCK, Third Congressional District of California: Born September 23, 1887; lawyer; businessman; fruit grower and farmer; received degree of bachelor of letters, University of California, 1908, and degree of bachelor of laws, Harvard University, 1911; delegate to the Democratic National Conventions in 1928, 1936, and 1940; Member of the Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses; died September 17, 1942.

PHILIP ALLEN BENNETT, Sixth Congressional District of Missouri: Born March 5, 1881; educator; editor and publisher; businessman; graduated from the Springfield (Mo.) Normal and Business College, 1902; delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1912; member of the State senate, 1921–25; served as Lieutenant Governor of Missouri, 1925–29; Member of the Seventy-seventh Congress and Member-elect of the Seventy-eighth Congress; died December 7, 1942.

HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, Second Congressional District of California: Born January 2, 1884; mining engineer; attended grammar and high schools and the University of California; mineral inspector for the field division of the general land office and engineer for the State Conservation Commission of California, 1911–14; member of the American Mining Congress; Member of the Sixty-ninth to Seventy-eighth Congresses; served as minority whip, Seventy-third to Seventy-eighth Congresses; died May 13, 1943.

Mrs. NORTON, a Representative from the State of New Jersey, standing in front of the Speaker's rostrum, placed a memorial rose in a vase as the name of each deceased Member was read by the Clerk.

Then followed 1 minute of devotional silence.

Doris Doe sang, Goin' Home (Anton Dvorak).

Hon. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, a Representative from the State of Virginia, delivered the following address:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, once again we meet to bow in reverence and awe to the inevitable visitation of the Grim Reaper. Since we last met upon such an occasion he has been in our midst—before we shall meet again he will return—not once, but again and again—to the great, the humble, the rich and the poor, the old and the young. To each he shall return in his own appointed time.

Leaves have their time to fall,
And flowers to wither at the north wind's breath;
And stars to set,
But thou hast all seasons for thine own, oh Death!

And so on this day of memory, we recall with deep and tender emotion those colleagues whom we have "loved and lost awhile."

This ceremony is essentially one of deep emotion and feeling. As we gather here the years pass before us in panorama—friends and dearly loved ones—great, warm souls that brightened our lives as they passed by. There they go, one by one. Each with his own individuality, his charm, his spirit, his frailties, perhaps. They were our friends and companions. Their lives and experiences furnished the varicolored strands that when woven into the completed form have made the fabric of life. As each life has touched our own, there has been left some tender thought, some sweet recollection.

This occasion must impress us with the inevitable certainty of time—the ticking clock, the chimes in the tower, the fast falling pages from the calendar upon the wall, the bending form, the faltering touch, the failing step. These tell us that time marches on and takes his passing toll.

In the year just passed, three of our colleagues have answered the last roll call. Each in his own appointed time heard the fall of the gavel, and the stern voice of the Speaker, "The time of the gentleman has expired." We miss them today.

In addition to these comrades, we have lost from this body two of the most distinguished and colorful colaborers—Joseph J. Sinnott and William Tyler Page. For many, many years these two distinguished public servants wrought and labored in the service of their country. Today we salute their memory. Their names deserve and shall have a place high on the scroll of those who have rendered valuable public service.

As we turn back the pages of memory and recall that never-ending throng that all too quickly passes through these portals, I think we must often feel that we do not embrace the full opportunity to really know and appreciate each other. We are so busy—official acts are so demanding—we just haven't the time. Ah, my comrades, do we not often in our mad rush day in and day out, miss some of the real solace and joy of this service by not knowing each other better?

We nodded as we passed each day
And smiled and went along our way;
I knew his name, and he knew mine,
But neither of us made a sign
That we possessed a common tie;
We barely spoke as we passed by.

How fine he was I never guessed.
The splendid soul within his breast
I never saw. From me was hid
The manly kindly deeds he did.
His gentle ways I didn't know
Or I'd have claimed him long ago.

Then trouble came to me one day
And he was first to come and say
The cheering words I longed to hear;
He offered help, and standing near
I felt our lives in sorrow blend,
My neighbor had become my friend.

How many smiles from day to day
I've missed along my narrow way;
How many kindly words I've lost,
What joy has my indifference cost!
This glorious friend that now I know,
Would have been friendly years ago.

The bud but very little shows
To tell the beauty of the rose,
And him we greet in passing by
With scarce a nod, the day we sigh,
May blossom as the storms descend
With all the beauty of a friend.

—*Edgar A. Guest.*

As name after name of our departed colleagues has been called here today, our memories have been traveling back to many scenes and incidents connected with our associations and their service in this body. We felt the impression of his activities and watched his labor in the interest of the cause he espoused. But, my brethren, imperceptibly at times, silently often, but always surely and inevitably, the passing years take their toll. Under the heavy load and strain we saw that once agile form bend under its burden; the eye that once sparkled with ambition grow dim with the strain, and the raven locks yield to the biting frosts of passing winters; and one day we were saddened by the news that this friend, this comrade, this colaborer, had answered the last roll call, had embarked upon life's greatest adventure. We had witnessed, my friends, the drama and tragedy of life, with its sunshine and shadows, its hopes and disappointments, its victories and defeats, its life and death.

There is no more honorable mission than to be chosen to represent a constituency in the United States House of Representatives. It is an honor that may well be coveted by our fellow citizens. The Congress is the most distinctly representative legislative body in the world. Here we find literally and actually a cross section of the American people. Every school of thought, every political philosophy has in this Hall its representative, as it has the right to have. If we at times seem to be in confusion and wandering in a wilderness of conflicting objectives, then it is largely because the American people are unsettled and undetermined. This Congress is just what the American people wish it to be. Individually and collectively, its membership compares most favorably with any other group of American citizens. Upon the roster of the Congress we find the names of men who have been leaders in the business, professional, and the commercial life of the Nation as well as those who have served their communities and their States and the Nation in places of high honor and great responsibility, both the judicial and the executive branches of government. Every type and every calling is represented here. Let us not forget for an instant that every Member of this House holds his commission only because a majority of the citizens of his district, entitled to suffrage, desired that he represent them. He will be kept here or retired, rewarded or condemned, according to whether that same constituency shall feel that he has served them well or ill. This is representative government in its truest sense. So long as that continues, the Republic is safe. It seems to be a popular pastime to ridicule and criticize the national legislative body. It is always open season on Congress. I suppose this is no different today from what it has been in other days; nor do I make any complaint. Undoubtedly, we often deserve and merit criticism.

Unquestionably, the casual visitor in our galleries, noting a scarcity of attendance, a lack of interest, and oftentimes bedlam and confusion will form a very erroneous and unjustifiable opinion of this body and its work. He perhaps has not taken into consideration the fact that the speeches being made upon the floor, under the rule of general debate, have little relation to the legislation under consideration, and that the particular bill or resolution, which will ultimately pass, and probably without contest, has been the subject of weeks and months of careful thought and patient study by a responsible committee of the House. He does not take into account the fact that the real work, the determining battles are in committee work, and that often the issues are settled before the legislation comes up for consideration. There may be found in the Membership some of the most conscientious and hard-working men I have ever known—men who literally grind out and spend their very life's energy in an effort to serve. We are made up of just plain human beings, with all of the frailties and imperfections of the race. I do say, however, that the Membership of this House individually are men of honor and capacity, striving, according to their own individual opinions and the understanding that they have to serve their constituents and their country; and I say very deliberately and emphatically that if you give this House the true facts, and sufficient time for deliberate and orderly consideration, its ultimate determinations will generally be in keeping with American ideals and for the best interests of our people.

As I meditated upon this occasion, my mind went back 18 years to a day when

a great man stood upon the Speaker's rostrum, about to relinquish voluntarily the high robes and office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The day was March 4, 1925, and Mr. Speaker Gillett, of Massachusetts, was leaving the House of Representatives after 32 years of service to accept a commission as a Member of the United States Senate. Today, as I have done before, I commend to you, my colleagues, the entire remarks of Mr. Speaker Gillett on that occasion. For the purposes of this ceremony, however, I desire to quote briefly from his address:

It is the fashion to sneer at Congress, as it always has been the fashion, and I have no doubt always will be, because Congress is expected by legislation to put into concrete and definite form the hazy and contradictory ideals of the people, and as realization generally falls short of expectation, "as man never is but always to be blest," so congressional action must always be disappointing. * * *

This House becomes in time a pretty infallible judge of a Member's merit. It learns to appraise motives. It discriminates between the modest men who with sincerity are trying to render service and the men who are working only for display and self-advancement.

And it is refreshing to note that although the home folks may often be deceived by the fake statesman who is always playing to the gallery, yet the sincere and industrious and modest man has his recognition and reward. I would deem the genuine esteem and respect and confidence of this body the highest tribute a man could earn. * * *

You may remember when first elected Speaker I said that I had attained the goal of my desires and my ambition was completely satisfied. I feel exactly now as I did then. Thanks to you, my friends, my enjoyment of it has been equal to my anticipation. I would rather be Speaker of this House than hold any other position in the world, and it was no ambition or initiative of my own that led me to relinquish it.

Such, my friends, were the sober reflections of a great man who had rendered a great service to his country.

Service in the Congress of the United States at this critical hour carries a great responsibility. Decisions are being made that may vitally affect the very perpetuity of our institutions. This service calls for courage.

I sought from Socrates, the sage,
Whose thoughts will live through every age
A motto to direct my life,
A hero make me in the strife
Socrates said, "Know thyself."

To know myself would not suffice,
To make me truly great and wise,
I sought Aurelius, good and great,
Wise ruler of the Roman State—
Aurelius said, "Control thyself."

O Nazarene, Thou who didst give Thy life
That men might truly live—
What motto dost Thou leave for me,
That I may truly follow Thee?
The Master said "Deny thyself."

Deny thyself—self-sacrifice, self-abnegation. A willingness to spend and be spent for one's country. A willingness, if need be, to lay our political ambitions upon the altar of sacrifice. That is the call of the hour in this body. It matters not too much how long I serve here. It may matter very much what I do while here. May we not upon this occasion, when we pay tribute to our friends of yesterday, resolve in our hearts to rededicate our efforts to this great job at hand.

Time moves on apace, my friends. Seasons come and go, but a quick swing of the horolog of time, and other voices, will resound in this sacred Chamber.

Those friends of yesteryear have gone—on what voyage, or to what shore, I know not. But I am a follower of the faith that believes they have reached a harbor where there is anchorage safe from storm and gale. Toward that harbor of peace and rest, all of us do devoutly turn our eyes.

Sometime at eve, when the tide is low,
I shall slip my moorings and sail away,
With no response to the friendly hail
Of kindred craft in the busy bay.
In the silent hush of the twilight pale,
When the night swoops down to embrace the day,
And the voices call in the water's flow—
Sometime at eve, when the tide is low,
I shall slip my moorings and sail away.

Through purple shades that darkly trail
O'er the ebbing tide of the unknown sea,
I shall fare me away with a dip of sail
And a ripple of waters to tell the tale
Of a lonely voyager, sailing away
To mystic isles, where at anchor lay
The craft of those who have sailed before,
O'er the unknown sea to the unseen shore.

A few who have watched me sail away
Will miss my craft from the busy bay;
Some friendly barks that were anchored near,
Some loving souls that my heart held dear,
In silent sorrow will drop a tear.
But I shall have peacefully furled my sail
In moorings sheltered from storm and gale,
And greeted the friends who have sailed before
O'er the unknown sea to the unseen shore.

Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, a Representative from the State of Illinois, delivered the following address:

DAY FOR REMEMBRANCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, we meet for remembrance.

What a divine endowment it is.

It is one of the most ennobling attributes of mind and spirit.

What tragedy if we could not remember.

Suppose each moment and the substance of each moment were blacked out when it had been spent on the wings of time.

How impoverished would be the spirit if we could not recall the echoes of some lilting refrain when the last note had died away?

If we could not recall the refreshing melody of some stirring hymn which gave fire to the soul and resolve to the heart?

If we could not recall the tenderness of a caressing hand on a fevered brow?

If we could not recall a soft whisper of long ago that spoke of love and hope?

If we could not recall a gentle voice which was like a spring-scented zephyr to a weary spirit?

If we could recall no golden smile, which like a lovely sunburst, warmed all within its aura?

If we could not recall a noble deed, the very doing of which brought a new faith in the dignity and goodness of man?

If we could not conjure up the gracious fellowship of a good man, whether great or humble, whose very goodness was like an elixir to ebbing hope,

If we had no power to reach into the inexhaustible storehouse of remembrance to order forth a gaily caparisoned cavalcade of sweet and gracious and lovely memories of men and deeds, smiles and laughter, of melodies and voices, of tenderness and goodness to rekindle waning hope, surcharge faith, and make plain the continuity of past and present, of present and future?

Remembrance is the light which makes the way ahead less tortuous and lonely.

It makes us kin to the endless pattern of the Republic.

It makes us a fixed part of the golden tapestry of mankind, for in that tapestry we too have been privileged to weave a golden thread.

As we meet for remembrance of those who for a brief time have slipped away from this Chamber, we pay testimony to that divine gift of memory which makes us a part of all that has gone before, and gives hope that we shall be a part of all that comes after.

THE QUEST FOR ASSURANCE

There can be no memorial without the living and the dead.

What shall we the living find in this memorial?

We can find comfort, faith, hope, and inspiration.

Since time's dawn, men have sought comfort in the hour of transition from the known to the unknown.

The afflicted Job, surrounded by Zophar, Bildad, and Eliphaz, contemplated the end of all things and then phrased the deathless question: "If a man die, shall he live again?"

From the unlettered cave man to the scholarly philosopher has come that eternal question.

It is echoed at every graveside.

It tumbles through the thoughts of all the world at Eastertide, when the earth is touched with the sweet breath of resurrection and men ask, "If a man die, shall he live again?"

COMFORT

A swelling faith choruses the answer.

Today, in remembrance, we find comfort in the conviction that our colleagues live, and live again.

They whisper to us from the crannies and vaulted spaces of this Chamber.

Their hushed whispers respond to every calling of the roll.

They are a deathless part of the endless stream of our national life.

Consider the host which has gone before—which has marched through the legislative design of this Republic!

Consider the golden stars, woven in deathless luster upon the flag of this House by the hand of time and what pride it evokes in the continuity of the Republic.

Stars are there for Madison, Monroe, and Randolph.

Stars are there for Muhlenberg and Baldwin.

Stars are there for Harrison and Breckinridge.

Stars are there for Calhoun, Clay, and Webster.

Stars are there for Sherman and Blaine, for Lovejoy and Stephens.

Stars are there for Hoar and Garfield and McKinley.

A burnished star is there for Lincoln.

Stars are there for Reed and Gillette, for Crisp and Clark, for Wadsworth and Cochran.

Stars are there for Underwood and Payne, for Mann and Madden, for James and Sherley, for Vreeland and Longworth.

Stars are there for Rainey, Byrns, and Bankhead.

Stars are there for each generation.

Short days ago time's hand has woven other stars upon the banner of this body—the stars of FRANK BUCK, PHILIP BENNETT, and HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT.

They are a part of the imperishable genius of the Nation.

Each in his own way has impressed himself upon the institutions and the welfare of this our common country.

With delicate tracery, each has woven his golden thread upon the design of our living and forsook the loom only for a brief while when touched by the moving finger.

How enriching to the spirit to find comfort in remembrance of them.

From this remembrance comes belief in the abiding truth that human personality is indestructible.

It is but transmuted into a new and living force at a spiritual level.

The Creator creates all and destroys nothing.

From a plane I have looked down upon Pentagon and Panama, upon Empire State and Mount Rushmore, upon Boulder Dam, and T. V. A.

What massive monuments they are to human ingenuity.

Yet basically no part of these was created by the hand of man.

Man but took what the mystic force of creation provided, transmuted it into new forms, new shapes, new compounds.

None of it did he create.

None of it can he destroy.

Stone may be wrenched from stone, but still they remain stones.

Wood and fiber, metal and alloy, may be burned or consumed, but it is only transmuted into a new force, a new energy.

The falling leaf becomes the plant food for a lovely flower.

Thus does nature follow her own cycle of indestructibility.

Who can believe that human personality, fashioned in the image of the Creator can be destroyed, can be lost, can be blacked out and extinguished forever?

Everywhere about us is the shining proof that they live to perfect the work which they have undertaken and thus in the hour of remembrance we find comfort.

RESURRECTION IS THE RULE OF LIFE

Resurrection is the rule of life.

Look from the window of this Capitol upon the magnificence of nature and there find the answer to Job's question.

But a brief while ago, the earth was brown and sere.

And lo! there came the mystical magic of the resurrection.

It is the miracle of spring, the irresistible conqueror.

Spring zephyrs caress the inviting bosom of the earth and new life swells.

Trees have been pruned and scrubbed by snow and rain and wind. The sap rises. Swelling buds unfold with dainty leaves. Winter's sleep is over. The new life is at hand.

There comes the grass like a green mantle over all the earth.

Lilac and syringa, hydrangea, and azalea extend their slender arms in suppliance to a mystic power and then comes fulfillment of the promise of new life.

Star flower and wake robin, tulip and pansy, violet and honeysuckle flaunt their majesty upon each passer-by like a colorful salute to departing winter and a new life.

The holiness of beauty is at hand.

In this magnificent panoply there is resurgent hope, a new faith.

Here is the rule of life.

It is the resurrection.

It brings comfort in this hour of remembrance.

As one beholds this majesty of new life in the domain of all nature, can he believe that the end of human personality, of human fellowship, and human endeavor is but a dismal black-out?

Can he believe that the mystic force which sheds its beneficence upon the earth as the sun crosses the vernal equinox, cannot awaken human personality that it might carry on its work at a higher unseen level?

This is the ordered majesty of the universe which brings comfort and affords the answer to the query of Job.

FAITH

In this hour of remembrance, we find precious comfort in the continuity of all things living and in the conviction that dust is not the goal.

But we find something more.

We find a resolute and stimulating faith to carry on in a tumultuous world.

From the first day of the first Congress of the Republic, we have been beset with problems foreign and domestic.

Without precedent or example, our legislative predecessors were confronted with the problem of spelling out the new-found powers of the Constitution.

They saw the Nation expand.

They saw a centrifugal force hurl a growing population toward the Allegehenies, toward the Mississipppi, toward the Rockies, toward the placid Pacific, and saw the frontier close upon itself.

With this expansion came problems of transport and communication, of agriculture and the public domain, of commerce and industry.

They saw the phenomenon of a centripetal force siphon families and individuals into growing centers of population and bring with it problems of subsistence, security, and protection.

In their generation, as in ours, there came for solution the unsolved problems of the Constitution, bringing with them bloody conflict and a more compact Union.

Each of the thousands in that shadowy host who have gone before and for whom a star is fixed upon the banner of this body, met the problems of his own generation, in his own good way and so contributed to the march of national progress.

FRANK BUCK, PHILIP BENNETT, and HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT, each in proportion to his light and talent, fought the good fight. Each met the issues of his day and generation with resolution and courage and so joined that galaxy of redoubtable souls who for more than 150 years have given direction and force to the progress of our country.

Quietly and unobtrusively they labored diligently in the common cause.

From them we find a revitalized faith to carry on and do our share.

These are days for men with faith, with courage, and with vision, who can catch the sound of the universal voice.

The Lord, speaking from the fiery mist to a prostrate Ezekiel, said: "Son of man, stand upon thy feet and I will speak with thee."

With faith born of remembrance, we shall stand boldly upright and carry on.

HOPE

In this hour of remembrance we find comfort and faith. But we find something more. We find hope. It is the greatest of all spiritual forces. How vital it is in a dark hour.

I think of Abraham Lincoln, standing on the balcony of a hotel in Washington watching the troops go by, and then saying to a stripling girl who had been presented to him, "My child, what a world we live in today."

We can reecho that sentiment. What a world we live in today.

There is the tramp of a hundred million booted feet, the drone of planes, the swish of tin fish, and the roar of guns. Millions of young bodies have been bruised to eternal sleep.

The casualty lists are at once messages of glory and of sorrow and despair.

The ordeal of battle brings with it sacrifices, dislocations, and maladjustments, which completely reorder and reshape our daily living.

Like incredulous children, we take account of increasing expenditures, mounting debt, regimentation, and the ever-growing dislocations in our economic structure.

As we envision that future day when the stalwart sons of America return from far-flung battle lines and the healing processes of peace are resumed, we grow apprehensive over the solvency of the world, the integrity of our own institutions, and the perpetuity of the Republic and its traditions.

We are assailed with doubts and fears of the future.

And then in remembrance of those who have gone before, we find hope.

They, too, encountered fears and doubts in other days.

They met each doubt and fear, each problem and situation, with courage and resolve, and the Nation still lives.

The annals of other days are redolent with gloom and despair.

One hundred and six years ago a Louisiana publication observed that "all is darkness, doubt, and despair."

Eighty-five years ago one could have read in Harpers that "Not in the lifetime of most men who read this paper has there ever been so much grave and deep apprehension."

Seventy years ago one could have read in a New York newspaper that "There are those who believe that the days of the Republic are numbered."

Fifty years ago one might have read in a New York editorial that "The perspective of the year is a study of shadow and prevailing gloom."

Thirty-five years ago there appeared in a leading publication the observation that "The ship of state is on the verge of sinking."

Only 5 years ago an editorial stated that "It was a twelvemonth of gloom, uncertainty, and apprehension. Are there still men of good will? Perhaps; but they are hard to find."

Here is the recurring pattern of fear and doubt, spread over 100 years of national life.

But the Nation still lives. And the Nation will live.

From the pages of history and from the fellowship of our beloved colleagues we shall find a stimulating hope to aid us in resolving the doubts of today and the fears of tomorrow.

When conflict becomes wearisome; when the fatigued spirit cries for relief; when faith is bruised and the cup of frustration seems full to overflowing; when the way is dark and the future seems but a yawning void, let us but think of them and of the glorious tradition to which they belong and find a resplendent and invigorating hope with which to meet the problems before us and do our full part to preserve the heritage which is ours.

INSPIRATION

In remembrance we find comfort, we find faith, and we find hope.

But we find something more. It is inspiration.

What would they have us do?

If they could speak from the vastness of their shadowy world, what would they say?

They would with all the fervor which comes from a larger perspective enjoin upon us the defense of freedom as the only true moral climate in which there can be true progress.

They would have us preserve the Republic in a world where the virus of total government is at work.

They would have us requite the sacrifices for freedom abroad with a determined defense of freedom at home.

They would have us search our souls for the way which leads to better living through real brotherhood.

They would have us sternly pursue the moral law and stand on that side which is right and just.

They would have us affirm and reaffirm our courage and capacity to bring about a better world.

They would have us seek enduring peace by giving peace a chance to endure.

They would have us sing God Bless America and work to make it worthy of every blessing.

With rapture born of fervor and high purpose, they would have us say:

Our father's God, to Thee,
Author of liberty,
To Thee we sing.
Long may our land be bright,
With freedom's holy light,
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King.

Doris Doe sang Consolation (S. Webbe).

Taps was sounded by Sgt. William Lamb.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., pronounced the benediction:

The Lord bless you and keep you, the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you, the Lord lift the light of His countenance upon you and give you peace, both now and evermore. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord and our Saviour. Amen.

AFTER RECESS

At the conclusion of the recess, the Speaker called the House to order, and then, pursuant to House Resolution No. 231, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, declared the House adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 27, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

This committee will hold public hearings on investigation of civilian employment in governmental departments, Thursday, May 27, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m. in room 246, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Thursday, May 27, and Friday, May 28, 1943, for consideration of housing bills, in the caucus room, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Thursday, May 27, 1943, on bills dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act—H. R. 1882 and H. R. 2309.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing Thursday, May 27, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2750, to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, relating to experience of radio operators.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2731, to facilitate the award and payment of just compensation for property requisitioned under the authority of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

1. Tuesday, June 1: Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, will open the hearings with any statements and recommendations he desires to submit covering national flood control and the projects that should be included in the bill to be reported, especially as they are related to national defense and as they will be important following the existing war to provide sound flood-control projects and desirable public works. General Reybold is now on an airplane tour of inspection of the flood areas and will submit a first-hand report covering recent major floods along the Missouri, Arkansas, White, Mississippi, Illinois, Wabash, Ohio, and other rivers in the recent flood areas. He will be followed by Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Assistant Chief of Engineers, who has previously advised the Flood Control Committee during hearings and who will also appear before the committee and submit his views and discuss generally the projects that have been favorably reported since the hearings were conducted on H. R. 4911, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, reported on June 9, 1941, which became the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941. Col. George R. Goethals, Chief of the Flood Control Branch, Office of Chief of Engineers, will attend the hearings and will furnish to the members of the committee in detail any and all available information respecting the said projects on which favorable reports have been submitted by the Chief of Engineers.

The district engineers and the division engineers have furnished to the Chief of Engineers data and information respecting major floods since August 18, 1941, and particularly with respect to recent major floods in the various drainage basins of the country, which will be submitted to the committee.

2. Wednesday, June 2: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects for the New England region, including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers, and the Middle Atlantic region, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

3. Thursday, June 3: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the upper and lower Ohio River and tributaries, and on projects of the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

4. Friday, June 4: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects along the Missouri River and tributaries and the upper Mississippi River and the Great Lakes region.

5. Tuesday, June 8: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, including the Arkansas and White Rivers, and on rivers flowing into the Gulf west of the Mississippi River, and in the western Rocky Mountain region, including Texas and Colorado, and in the Pacific Northwest region, including the Willamette River and the Columbia River and tributaries.

6. Wednesday, June 9: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the Los Angeles area and in the State of California, including the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kern River Valleys, and on projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

7. Thursday, June 10: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

8. Friday, June 11: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

NOTICE

The Members of the House and Senate have been circularized twice for information relative to members of their families in the armed services.

If any Members have failed to furnish this information or have become eligible for membership in the Congressional War Parents Association since, will they please notify either the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], president of the association, or Senator BRIDGES, secretary, furnishing the necessary information immediately.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

439. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury and managing trustee of the trust fund—Secretary of Labor—Chairman, Social Security Board, transmitting the third annual report of the board of trustees of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 636. A bill for the relief of C. J. Toole; with amendment (Rept. No. 497). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1334. A bill for the relief of J. Frank Meador; with amendment (Rept. No. 498). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1498. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Ruckman; with amendment (Rept. No. 499). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1637. A bill for the relief of Fred Hunter; with amendment (Rept. No 500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1790. A bill for the relief of Wymer Bowlin; with amendment (Rept. No. 501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1835. A bill for the relief of Frederick Lee Littlefield; with amendment (Rept. No. 502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1890. A bill for the relief of the Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2088. A bill for the relief of John Rhoden; with amendment (Rept. No. 504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2556. A bill for the relief of Burton S. Radford; with amendment (Rept. No. 505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2807. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works, viz: Waterway from Punta Rasa to Fort Pierce and Stuart, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. Res. 244. Resolution for saving the starving children and adult civilians of Europe's Nazi-ridden countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

930. Petition of Glenn W. Ely and 56 citizens of Kingsley, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

931. Also, petition of Lottie M. McConnell and 22 citizens of Pinckneyville, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

932. Also, petition of Grace Rose and 40 citizens of Harrisburg, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

933. Also, petition of Mary E. Huston and 40 citizens of Peoria, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

934. Also, petition of 73 citizens of Brunswick, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

935. Also, petition of Mrs. Wilfred C. Malan and 20 citizens of Pinckneyville, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

936. Also, petition of Frank Goodknecht and 18 citizens of Midland, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

937. Also, petition of Mary L. Creveling and 72 citizens of Montoursville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

938. Also, petition of Reyburn L. Fritz and seven citizens of Lock Haven, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the committee on the Judiciary.

939. Also, petition of Bertha M. Tyson and 70 citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, introduced in the Congress as a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

940. Also, petition of Myrtle Pifher and 15 other citizens of Midland, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, introduced in the Congress as a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

941. Also, petition of Mrs. A. A. Pickering and 88 citizens of Rowlesburg, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to

reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

942. Also, petition of Clara Winkler and 53 citizens of Midland, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, introduced in the Congress as a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

943. Also, petition of Miss S. Catharine Thompson and 20 citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

944. Also, petition of Rev. E. P. Nelson and 71 citizens of Lake Norden, S. Dak., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

945. Also, petition of A. H. Lutz and 54 ctizens of Webster, S. Dak., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

946. Also, petition of Florence V. Doumaux and 101 citizens of Wellsboro, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

947. Also, petition of Mattie Brumfield and 245 citizens of Winchester, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

948. Also, petition of Austin Marriage and 35 citizens of Pasadena, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

949. Also, petition of Circle One, Central Methodist Church, Winona, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

950. Also, petition of Nellie Stanford and 63 citizens of Midland, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

951. Also, petition of Mrs. Paul Hedberg and 17 citizens of New London, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

952. Also, petition of Mrs. Bill Hardin and 18 citizens of Conley, Ga., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

953. Also, petition of Mrs. Arnold, Mr. Replogle, and 47 citizens of Tunkhannock, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

954. Also, petition of River Dale Farm and 38 citizens of Marion, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

955. Also, petition of 508 citizens of Pennsylvania, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

956. Also, petition of Mrs. George Radliff and 30 citizens of New York City, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

957. Also, petition of Emily McCutchen and 20 citizens of Bakersfield, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

958. Also, petition of 81 citizens of Maryland, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

959. Also, petition of G. A. Barber and 20 citizens of Gainesville, Fla., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

960. Also, petition of H. E. Chappell and 22 citizens of Whitefish, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

961. Also, petition of Sara Etta Boyd and 40 citizens of Pennsylvania, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

962. Also, petition of Mrs. Clarence Cramer and 50 citizens of Troy, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

963. Also, petition of Edgar M. Powell and 26 citizens of Midland, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

964. Also, petition of Mrs. A. V. Gross and 22 citizens of Iron River, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

965. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Charles W. Bruemmer and a number of other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., and vicinity, urging the establishment of a chiropractic corps in the armed forces now; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, open to us, we pray Thee, the gates of the morning as at its swinging portals we bow here at this wayside shrine of Thy grace, for these

are troublous times; the margin of our inner strength seems often perilously low; we stand in dire need of courage and fortitude and stability. Grant us now the grace of a quiet heart and an humble mind. With Thy light upon our ways send us forth contrite, forgiven, and cleansed.

May the gates of the morning shut out the failures and mistakes of the yesterdays—the concern for transient and trifling things which have so often, we confess, turned our minds from high pursuits and set our hearts upon unworthy ends. Save us from spoiling the music of this new day by cherished hates, remembered slights, and corroding resentments. Let no unguarded word of ours bruise the rightful self-respect of any traveler by our side. As we turn to our waiting tasks may the love of friends, the confidence of those who believe in us, the inner vision of the soul, the spur of conscience, and the commanding call of goodness be the high white stars to lead us on. So may we follow the gleam until the gates of the morning open into the light of the eternal day. In the Redeemer's Name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, May 24, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 25, 1943:

S. 1041. An act to extend the period during which direct obligations of the United States may be used as collateral security for Federal Reserve notes.

On May 26, 1943:

S. 649. An act to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska relating to the waters of the Republican River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote flood control in the Basin, and for other purposes.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GERALD McLAUGHLIN—CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, THIRD CIRCUIT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in accordance with a rule of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to make an announcement.

The Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Gerald McLaughlin, of New Jersey, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination, and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that Saturday, June 5, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., has been set for a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee room on this nomination. At that time and place all interested parties may make representations to the committee.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Reed
Bailey	Guffey	Revercomb
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hatch	Robertson
Bilbo	Hawkes	Russell
Bone	Hayden	Smith
Brewster	Hill	Stewart
Bridges	Holman	Taft
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Langer	Tobey
Bushfield	Lodge	Truman
Butler	Lucas	Tunnell
Byrd	McCarran	Tydings
Capper	McClellan	Vandenberg
Caraway	McFarland	Van Nuys
Chandler	McKellar	Wagner
Chavez	McNary	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wheeler
Danaher	Mead	White
Davis	Millikin	Wiley
Eastland	Moore	Willis
Ellender	Nye	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Daniel	
George	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent due to the death of his wife.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 58)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation, fiscal year 1944, Department of Commerce, in the form of amendments to the Budget for that fiscal year, amounting to $1,948,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND

A letter from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund (signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor, and the Chairman of the Social Security Board), transmitting, pursuant to law, the third annual report of that board of trustees (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF THE CERTIFYING OFFICERS' ACT

A letter from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4 of the act of December 29, 1941, so as to make the provisions of said act applicable to officers or employees certifying to pay rolls of the Selective Service System for payment by Army disbursing officers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (3), Post Office, Navy, Commerce, and Labor; The National Archives (2), National Housing Agency, and Federal Works Agency which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—TRAVEL AND COMMUNICATIONS IN THE GOVERNMENT (S. DOC. NO. 57)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting a report relating to travel and communications in the Federal Government, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that the report just laid before the Senate by the Vice President be printed as a document and also be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

In accordance with title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, an additional report herewith is presented by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

This report reflects the continued governmental extravagances in travel and communication expenses of a nonmilitary nature which the committee has noted since its initial investigation of this matter in 1941. Based on total of the 6-month period between July 1, 1942, and January 1, 1943, it is possible to estimate that the total travel and communication expenditures for the Executive branch of the Federal Government in the fiscal year

1943 will exceed $100,000,000, excluding the War and Navy Departments.

The committee believes that this figure can be drastically cut in view of the present emergency. With the public at large obliged to reduce travel and communications it is no more than fair to expect their Government to do likewise. When agencies not essential to the war effort allow their travel and communication expenses to double—treble—even swell to nine times their peacetime levels, when departments and agencies allow increases totaling hundreds of thousands of dollars—then it is time to call a halt to such wasteful and unpatriotic expenditures.

COMMUNICATION EXPENSES

A total of $15,573,833.91 was spent for communications by the Federal Government, excluding the War and Navy Departments, in the 6-month period between July 1, 1942, and January 1, 1943, according to reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Of this amount $4,147,941.50, or 27 percent, was spent for local telephone calls; $3,538,024.29, or 23 percent, was spent for long-distance calls; $3,590,717.44, or 23 percent, was spent for telegraph and cable communication; $1,482,096.01, or 9 percent, was spent for teletype expense; $1,830,610.88, or 12 percent, was spent for special services; and the remainder went to miscellaneous expenditures. All of this expense was of a nonmilitary nature.

Eight departments and agencies far outstripped the rest in communication expenditures. They are as follows:

Communications expense for the 6-month period between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1942

Department	Amount	Percent of total
Office of War Information	$1,812,061.78	11.6
War Production Board	1,735,071.46	11.1
Commerce Department	1,415,609.88	9.1
Agriculture Department	1,153,937.00	7.4
State Department	1,054,732.13	6.1
Office of Price Administration	940,443.42	6.0
Justice Department	936,442.00	6.0
Treasury Department	811,967.66	5.2

In other words, over 60 percent of the entire Federal communications expense (bearing in mind the exception of the War and Navy Departments) may be placed in the hands of eight Government agencies and departments.

Certain striking examples of large expenditures may be noted. For example, computing the long-distance calls on the average night-rate basis, one finds that the Government might make 488 3-minute calls around the world at the equator daily and have the cost no greater. Again, the War Production Board spent nearly a million and a half dollars in the 6-month period on telephone expenses, two-thirds of which was in long-distance calls. No other agency remotely approached this total. The tremendous proportions of this figure may best be judged when one realizes that for the same yearly cost, at night rates, the War Production Board could put in hourly 3-minute telephone calls to the moon, 221,463 miles away, every hour in the day, every day in the year.

The departments and agencies having the telephone bills over $100,000 are as follows:

Telephone expense for the 6-month period between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1942

	Amount	Percent of total
War Production Board	$1,346,093	17
Agriculture Department	736,556	9
Office of Price Administration	690,480	9
Justice Department	536,625	7
Treasury Department	506,043	6
Selective Service System	413,608	5
Post Office Department	398,779	5
National Housing Agency	266,779	3
Commerce Department	253,312	3
Interior Department	[1] 237,736	3
Tennessee Valley Authority	235,000	3
Federal Security Agency	222,976	2
U. S. Maritime Commission	195,568	2
Veterans' Administration	112,853	1
Central Administrative Service (Office for Emergency Management)	100,179	1

[1] Incomplete.

Those establishments having the highest telegraph and cable expense are as follows:

Telegraph and cable expense for the 6-month period between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1942

	Amount	Percent of total
State Department	$851,020	23
Office of War Information	480,994	13
War Production Board	330,432	9
Agriculture Department	270,793	7
Commerce Department	199,241	5
Office of Price Administration	140,123	4
Treasury Department	137,570	3
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	119,651	3
Federal Communications Commission	116,012	3
Justice Department	102,894	2

At 30 cents per telegram the State Department would average thus 15,500 such telegrams a day.

Those establishments having the highest teletype cost are as follows:

Teletype expense for the 6-month period between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1942

	Amount	Percent of total
Commerce Department	$659,201	44
Justice Department	190,066	12
Federal Communications Commission	152,382	10
Office of War Information	99,948	6
Agriculture Department	93,358	6
Office of Censorship	87,759	5

High postage costs were found in the following establishments:

Postage expense for the 6-month period between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1942

	Amount	Percent of total
Treasury Department	$100,210	13
Office of Price Administration	72,328	9
Justice Department	62,596	8
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	58,498	8
Agriculture Department	45,171	6
Central Administrative Service (Office for Emergency Management)	45,060	6

Considering the franking privilege allowed to Government agencies, the cost of postage is extraordinarily high, including as it does only the purchase of stamps for special delivery, air mail, bulk packages, investigators' reports, etc., and not including regular correspondence.

High special-service costs were found in the following establishments:

Special-service expense for the 6-month period between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1942

	Amount	Percent of total
Office of War Information	$1,104,684	60
Commerce Department	273,720	14
Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	198,090	10
State Department	73,065	4

By the very nature of their functions many establishments have peculiarly distributed communications expenses. However, generally speaking, it seems normal to assume that long-distance telephone calls should not be in excess of local departmental expenses and that telegraph and cable expenses, with specific exceptions, should not outweigh telephone expenses.

Long-distance call costs exceeded local costs in the following departments and agencies: Office of Civilian Defense, National War Labor Board, Office of Scientific Research and Development, War Production Board, War Relocation Authority, War Shipping Administration, Office of Price Administration, National Labor Relations Board, National Mediation Board, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Tennessee Valley Authority, United States Maritime Commission, Justice Department, and Labor Department. Outstanding examples are War Production Board, whose long-distance calls cost $50,000, as compared with $395,000 for local calls, a ratio of more than 2 to 1; Reconstruction Finance Corporation, whose long-distance calls cost $126,000, as compared with $59,000 for local calls; and Justice Department, with $345,000 for long-distance calls, as compared with $190,000 for local calls.

COMPARISON WITH 1941 EXPENDITURES

During the entire fiscal year 1941 the expenses for communication service for the executive establishments of the Government totaled $14,805,993. This amount, compared with the $15,573,833 spent in the 6-month period between July 1, 1942, and December 31, 1942, shows a more than 100-percent increase in these communication expenses. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that these expenses do not include those of the War and Navy Departments in either instance.

Following is a table of communication expenses for those Federal establishments in which a comparison is made of expenditures of the two periods. To effect a comparable situation the expenditures between July 1, and December 31, 1942, were projected to June 30, 1943, by doubling the 6-month total now available. The percentage of increase is indicative of trends in Government communication expense.

Comparison of travel expense for the fiscal years 1941 and 1943

Establishment	Fiscal year 1941	Estimated fiscal year 1943 [1]	Increase	Percent of increase
Lend-Lease Administration	$871	$88,937	$88,066	10,111
Federal Communications Commission	40,116	636,308	596,192	1,486
Alley Dwelling Authority	944	8,313	7,369	780
U. S. Maritime Commission	76,853	586,806	509,953	664
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	143,160	731,803	588,643	411
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	150	660	510	340
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	10,291	31,102	20,811	202
Department of Justice	880,107	1,872,884	992,777	113
Bureau of the Budget	13,409	27,225	13,816	103
Export-Import Bank	2,800	5,698	2,808	97
Civil Service Commission	113,050	205,174	92,124	81
U. S. Tariff Commission	3,216	5,429	2,213	69
Selective Service System	579,034	961,594	382,560	66
Railroad Retirement Board	37,405	63,581	24,176	64
Department of State	1,321,677	2,109,464	787,787	59
Smithsonian Institution	5,682	9,059	3,377	59
Panama Canal	102,217	159,691	57,474	56
National Archives	6,904	10,720	3,816	55
Tennessee Valley Authority	322,304	498,396	176,503	55
General Accounting Office	8,661	13,125	4,464	51
Employees Compensation Commission	10,635	16,038	5,403	50
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	35,130	52,057	16,927	48
Federal Power Commission	17,945	24,689	6,744	37
Department of Agriculture	1,740,813	2,307,874	567,061	33
Department of the Interior	475,004	595,920	120,916	25
Department of Labor	172,455	213,880	41,425	24
National Labor Relations Board	83,610	100,621	17,011	20
Treasury Department	1,369,022	1,623,935	254,913	19
National Resources Planning Board	13,876	16,122	2,246	16
Interstate Commerce Commission	38,120	42,296	4,176	10
Veterans' Administration	292,737	313,369	20,632	7
Department of Commerce	2,678,781	2,831,219	152,438	6
Federal Trade Commission	11,795	12,544	749	6
Post Office Department	817,174	841,473	24,299	3

[1]Projected on basis of actual expenditures of first 6 months of fiscal year 1943.

TRAVEL EXPENSES

According to figures submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government a total of $35,672,858.84 of a nonmilitary nature was spent on travel expenditures in the 6-month period between July 1 and December 31, 1942. Tnis does not include amounts spent by either the War or the Navy Departments. Of this amount by far the largest item was that of per diem expenses, this amount running to $18,527,694, or 52 percent. Railroad expenses accounted for 18 percent of the total, or $6,379,630. Automobile expenses amounted to 14 percent, or $5,119,045. Airplane expenses amounted to 7 percent, or $2,640,208. The remainder were miscellaneous expenses or unproportioned totals.

Of this total 52 percent of the expenditures are found in just six agencies. The list follows:

Travel expense for the 6-month period between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1942

Agency	Amount	Percent
Agriculture Department	$5,175,796	15
Justice Department	3,434,998	10
War Production Board	3,415,953	10
Treasury Department	2,671,691	7
Federal Security Agency	1,935,001	5
Office of Price Administration	1,723,151	5

Following is a list of those agencies which spent the largest sums in each category. The following five agencies accounted for 45 percent of the total railroad expenditures:

Railroad expense for 6-month period between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1942

Agency	Amount	Percent
War Production Board	$1,029,387	16
Justice Department	637,164	10
Agriculture Department	543,326	9
Veterans' Administration	339,917	5
Treasury Department	319,498	5

The following five agencies accounted for 59 percent of all automobile expenses:

Automobile expense for 6-month period between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1942

Agency	Amount	Percent
Agriculture Department	$1,459,329	29
Treasury Department	516,203	10
War Production Board	366,872	7
Justice Department	350,567	7
Selective Service System	289,171	6

The following five agencies accounted for 61 percent of the total airplane expenses:

Airplane expense for 6-month period between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1942

Agency	Amount	Percent
War Production Board	$800,834	30
State Department	437,658	17
Board of Economic Warfare	134,979	5
Office of Strategic Services	133,490	5
Federal Works Agency	122,691	4

The following five agencies accounted for 47 percent of all per diem expenses:

Per diem expenses for 6-month period between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1942

Agency	Amount	Percent
Agriculture Department	$2,926,582	16
Justice Department	1,802,027	10
Treasury Department	1,631,824	9
Commerce Department	1,190,172	6
Interior Department	1,132,221	6

The following five agencies accounted for 51 percent of all other expenses:

Other travel expense for 6-month period between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1492

Agency	Amount	Percent
Justice Department	$528,823	24
Agriculture Department	213,421	10
Treasury Department	164,306	7
Federal Works Agency	125,065	5
Veterans' Administration	120,264	5

The following departments and agencies show an estimated increase in travel expense over the fiscal year 1941:

Comparison of travel expense for the fiscal years 1941 and 1943

Department or agency	Total, fiscal year 1941	Estimated total fiscal year 1943 [1]	Increase	Percent
Board of Economic Warfare	$24,727	$634,574.12	$609,847	2,466
National Capitol Park and Planning Commission	103	1,039.74	936	909
Alley Dwelling Authority	298	1,315.74	1,017	341
U. S. Maritime Commission	175,881	620,742.22	444,861	253
Federal Communications Commission	89,097	296,277.94	207,280	232
Tariff Commission	21,237	61,185.50	39,948	188
Civil Service Commission	325,457	889,196.96	563,739	142
Bureau of the Budget	39,495	90,491.90	50,996	129
General Accounting Office	175,282	350,187.02	174,905	99
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	40,203	77,208.38	37,005	92
Employees' Compensation Commission	28,171	53,948.00	25,776	91
Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel	2,361	4,371.88	2,010	85
Department of Commerce	1,682,942	3,083,789.46	1,400,847	83
Panama Canal	691,197	1,195,850.70	504,653	73
Department of State	982,724	1,646,034.56	663,310	67
Tennessee Valley Authority	604,339	975,352.20	371,013	61
National Labor Relations Board	270,854	421,011.60	150,157	55
Federal Trade Commission	111,645	167,066.98	55,421	49
Department of Justice	4,648,690	6,869,995.00	2,220,306	48
Department of Labor	1,408,705	2,053,945.42	645,240	46
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	532,261	667,515.74	135,254	25
Treasury Department	4,191,490	5,343,382.00	1,151,892	27
Department of the Interior	2,875,280	2,917,360.62	42,080	1

[1] Projected on basis of actual expenditures of the first 6 months of fiscal year 1943.

The committee believes that the travel and communication expenses for most branches of the Federal Government are inordinately high. The committee feels that, considering the specific exclusion of the War and Navy Departments from these computations, no small group of departments and agencies should completely dominate each category of travel and communication expenditures. For example, it is believed that no group of five agencies and departments of a nonmilitary type should comprise from 45 to 61 percent of the total of each of the types of travel expenditures of the entire Government.

It further believes that responsibility rests jointly with the departments and agencies involved and with the Bureau of the Budget to take necessary measures to reduce immediately such excessive expenditures.

The following tables indicate in detail the tremendous amount the various branches of the Government are spending on travel and communication expenses. It must be remembered that the amounts stated are for the 6-month period between July 1 and December 31, 1942, and not for the entire fiscal year.

Communications expense for the 6-month period between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1942

Department or agency	Telephone			Telegraph and cable	Teletype	Postage	Other	Special services	Grand total
	Local	Long distance	Total						
Bureau of the Budget	$12,176.11	$509.00	$12,685.11	$412.27	$459.00	$56.50			$13,612.88
National Resources Planning Board	5,274.22	1,350.72	6,624.94	876.94		559.34			8,061.22
Office for Emergency Management:									
Liaison Office	436.13	.70	436.83		8.32			$0.15	445.30
Division of Central Administrative Services	57,466.05	42,713.40	100,179.45	21,298.79	7,947.43	45,060.51	$39.58	4,511.92	179,037.68
National War Labor Board	5,073.79	21,435.11	26,508.90	14,457.18	291.12	1,795.26			43,052.46
Office of Alien Property Custodian	13,701.74	7,628.87	21,330.61	1,641.37	3,381.92	589.42	33.75	8,927.92	35,904.99
Office of Civilian Defense	32,247.89	41,301.69	73,549.58	12,951.14	1,541.49	2,784.74	42.02	10,208.30	101,077.27
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	18,702.12	13,949.68	32,651.80	61,911.22	43,080.21	3,270.28	1.25	198,090.34	339,005.10
Office of Defense Transportation	40,237.97	36,908.43	77,146.40	34,451.05	1,947.60	3,572.01		756.26	117,873.32
Office of Economic Stabilization				2.89					2.89
Office of Lend-Lease Administration [1]	11,882.45	3,410.96	15,293.41	27,989.30	280.66	15.57		889.88	44,468.82
Office of Scientific Research and Development	7,683.42	22,986.68	30,670.10	5,314.82	12.79	1,532.01		355.48	37,885.20
Office of War Information	58,290.19	36,917.04	95,207.23	480,994.43	99,948.44	30,839.33	387.95	1,104,684.40	1,812,061.78
War Manpower Commission [2]	26,952.40	25,425.59	52,377.99	9,446.25	456.31	2,621.95		101.85	[3] 235,353.02
Selective Service System	279,287.27	134,320.82	413,608.09	48,032.41	731.23	17,618.03	659.17	148.15	480,797.08
Rubber Survey Committee	270.10	42.91	313.01	18.28		34.14		36.31	401.74
War Production Board	395,646.49	950,447.44	1,346,093.93	330,432.70	18,666.35	19,648.62	.75	20,229.11	1,735,071.46
War Relocation Authority	6,308.43	11,013.70	17,322.13	7,316.94	1,079.00	1,776.39		142.94	27,637.40
War Shipping Administration	9,939.36	19,283.58	29,222.94	47,914.34	1,547.17	2,422.14	615.37		81,721.96
Board of Economic Warfare	21,335.67	17,266.14	38,601.81	69,521.47	450.00	2,353.92	552.50	2,479.09	113,958.79
Office of Censorship	37,782.00	2,745.00	40,527.00	3,454.00	87,759.00	16,956.00		2,427.00	151,123.00
Office of Price Administration	332,615.28	357,865.51	690,480.79	140,123.50	19,737.98	72,328.85	.75	17,771.55	940,443.42
Office of Strategic Services	19,496.96	11,853.30	31,350.26	47,079.35	4,138.00	2,003.60		6,576.00	91,147.21
Alley Dwelling Authority	3,880.06	142.35	4,022.41	79.77		54.69			4,156.87
American Battle Monuments Commission	88.34		88.34	9.00					97.34
Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel	688.15	85.05	773.20	18.54		5.00	3.87		800.61
Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation	1,378.83	168.30	1,547.13	26.66		10.00			1,583.79
Civil Aeronautics Board	1,497.70	1,411.07	2,908.77	187.73		58.10			3,154.60
Civil Service Commission	46,405.87	18,976.69	65,382.56	37,144.81		60.00			102,587.37
Commission of Fine Arts	50.00	38.55	88.55	49.00		6.00			143.55
Employees' Compensation Commission	3,079.00	894.00	3,973.00	1,648.00		2,398.00			8,019.00
Federal Communications Commission	18,498.31	8,800.44	27,298.75	116,012.15	152,382.82	14,075.45	846.50	7,538.75	318,154.42
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	8,627.14	6,937.13	15,564.27	1,411.05	1,451.16	656.83		6,945.63	26,028.94
Federal Power Commission	7,133.06	1,929.58	9,062.64	2,023.12		1,136.01	123.00		12,344.77
Federal Security Agency [4]	188,295.57	34,681.40	222,976.97	65,370.70	1,850.00	40,088.85	7,088.00	49,188.00	386,562.52
Federal Trade Commission	3,920.54	965.25	4,885.79	1,140.48		246.00			6,272.27
Federal Works Agency	60,776.83	38,610.86	99,387.69	44,211.68	450.00	10,706.09	414.98		155,170.44
General Accounting Office	5,992.19	96.42	6,088.61	204.47		269.67			6,562.75
Government Printing Office	4,853.78	4,317.81	9,171.59	4,399.61		1,377.52			14,948.72
Interstate Commerce Commission	14,890.23	1,404.48	16,294.71	4,035.32		818.20			21,148.23
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,221.30	5,173.90	11,395.20	3,538.23		618.00			15,551.43
National Archives	5,105.09	43.55	5,148.64	186.36		25.00			5,360.00
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	323.57	6.60	330.17	.29					330.46
National Gallery of Art	1,503.50	109.95	1,613.45	50.04					1,663.49
National Housing Agency	155,673.78	111,105.73	266,779.51	51,171.21		31,024.34			349,317.21
National Labor Relations Board	10,980.77	21,661.50	32,642.27	10,358.72		7,310.00			50,310.99
National Mediation Board	204.17	719.75	923.92	2,265.26		80.00			3,269.18
Panama Canal	54,275.77	1,831.06	56,106.83	12,258.12	2,160.00	9,321.00			79,845.95
Railroad Retirement Board	11,559.30	4,608.92	16,168.22	2,065.50	8,240.89	5,316.31			31,790.92
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	59,123.71	126,898.67	186,022.38	119,631.78	1,245.00	[5] 58,498.36	504.06		365,901.58
Export-Import Bank of Washington	1,336.62	412.25	1,748.87	696.39		404.00			2,849.26
Securities and Exchange Commission	18,852.61	7,366.91	26,219.52	1,949.26	1,279.55	1,677.16		6,582.20	37,707.69
Smithsonian Institution	2,086.86	68.50	2,155.36	73.20		105.70		2,195.55	4,529.81
Tariff Commission	1,639.90	463.43	2,103.33	383.16		48.58		179.79	2,714.86
Tax Court of the United States	2,085.71	4.75	2,090.46	32.44		9.09	6.00		2,138.19
Tennessee Valley Authority	100,776.35	134,223.71	235,000.06	9,467.37	1,579.74	2,632.11	519.09		249,198.37
U. S. Maritime Commission	66,517.25	129,051.63	195,568.88	68,949.90	8,767.27	19,320.43	797.20		293,403.68
Veterans' Administration	107,179.67	5,673.80	112,853.47	18,205.08	5,781.00	19,845.40			156,684.95
Department of Agriculture	400,430.00	336,126.00	736,556.00	270,793.00	93,358.00	45,171.00	4,467.00	3,592.00	1,153,937.00
Department of Commerce	127,569.86	125,742.23	253,312.09	199,241.00	659,201.56	7,902.58	22,232.00	273,720.65	1,415,609.88
Department of the Interior [6]	174,616.24	63,120.23	237,736.47	36,622.66	8,914.26	11,369.53	1,615.57	1,701.54	297,960.03
Department o. Justice	190,842.00	345,783.00	536,625.00	102,894.00	190,066.00	62,596.00	38,872.00	5,389.00	936,442.00
Department of Labor	26,862.14	39,578.66	66,440.80	31,296.46	450.00	[7] 8,752.85			106,940.11
Department of State	62,385.75	29,391.44	91,777.19	851,020.32	503.19	38,261.65	104.39	73,065.39	1,054,732.13
Treasury Department	359,458.28	146,585.00	506,043.47	137,570.06	44,189.60	100,210.68	1,778.31	22,175.73	811,967.66
Post Office Department	386,517.46	12,261.62	398,779.08	14,910.87	6,761.95	285.09			420,736.99
Library of Congress	5,995.71	144.05	6,139.76	115.71		1,294.68			7,550.15
Administrative Office of United States Courts	44,956.49	11,031.80	55,988.29	1,358.12		163.35			57,509.76
Total	4,147,941.50	3,538,024.29	7,685,965.79	3,590,717.44	1,482,096.01	725,468.91	81,705.06	1,830,610.88	15,573,833.91

[1] Does not include expenses of other agencies which have received allocations of funds from Lend-Lease appropriations.

[2] Includes grants to States for U. S. Employment Service for December 1942, only.

[3] This includes for National Youth Administration: $12,192.88, departmental; $158,155.79, field; $170,348.67, total. National Youth Administration is not included in itemized break-down.

[4] Includes testing and placement, defense workers, and grants to States for unemployment compensation administration (U. S. Employment Service) for the months July to December 1942.

[5] No records to distinguish cost of mailing packages and letters, etc.

[6] $55,541.03 recoverable from borrowers and others.

[7] Major portion covers postage for transferring beneficiaries' case files, records, and issuance of stamps to indigent hospitalized beneficiaries.

[8] Does not include the Office of Indian Affairs. Includes some expenditures of Geological Survey repaid by States, counties, and municipalities.

Travel expense for the 6-month period between July 1 and Dec. 31, 1942

Department or agency	Railroad	Airplane	Automobile, reimbursable	Per diem	Other expense	Total
Bureau of the Budget	$9,727.95	$2,431.72	$204.58	$31,227.73	$1,653.97	$45,245.95
National Resources Planning Board	22,961.33	4,903.64	491.54	20,812.74	2,086.07	51,255.32
Office for Emergency Management:						
Liaison Office	82.28	115.55		55.00	12.10	264.93
Division of Central Administrative Services	28,111.83	13,563.15	3,018.44	35,568.39	3,474.16	83,735.97
National War Labor Board	36,103.34	11,693.44	510.50	62,365.28	4,540.12	115,212.68
Office of Alien Property Custodian	32,092.93	5,641.53	680.30	51,793.33	3,652.56	93,860.65
Office of Civilian Defense	68,253.80	24,501.23	[1]46,264.24	124,676.07	19,984.71	283,680.05
Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	28,565.34	55,391.00	1,209.00	97,800.20	7,548.87	190,514.41
Office of Defense Transportation	61,018.64	14,367.36	11,670.40	103,374.85	6,740.75	196,572.00
Office of Economic Stabilization	10.30	152.17		12.00	6.55	181.02
Office of Lend-Lease Administration	3,926.43	4,035.19	104.05	10,444.33	831.17	19,341.17
Office of Scientific Research and Development	70,233.19	25,181.70	851.16	55,760.10	5,251.39	157,277.54
Office of War Information	64,301.57	50,032.05	8,439.46	98,037.60	19,573.07	240,383.75
War Manpower Commission [2]	64,390.46	23,900.01	63,268.32	154,194.32	14,099.97	[3]1,081,795.25
Selective Service System	45,595.17	1,605.79	289,171.70	171,836.79	12,704.06	520,913.51
War Production Board	1,029,387.45	800,834.81	366,872.88	1,135,182.33	83,676.49	3,415,953.96
War Relocation Authority	29,318.74	10,667.20	3,941.57	46,706.35	3,118.22	93,752.08
War Shipping Administration	5,746.26	6,924.45		35,080.85	746.04	48,497.60
Rubber Survey Committee	1,165.44			1,500.35	36.08	2,701.87
Board of Economic Warfare	30,891.57	134,979.08	1,844.03	135,391.91	14,180.91	317,287.06
Office of Censorship	20,655.61	4,331.60	1,450.08	32,540.96	1,622.44	60,600.69
Office of Price Administration	340,225.23	50,127.90	253,362.71	998,513.60	80,922.40	1,723,151.84
Office of Strategic Services	36,703.59	133,490.59	482.83	144,803.75	13,468.80	328,949.56
Alley Dwelling Authority	45.26		69.96	76.50	466.15	657.87
American Battle Monuments Commission					16.00	16.00
Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel	1,134.24	24.40	31.75	915.55	80.00	2,185.94
Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation	517.20			2,085.00	502.51	3,104.71
Civil Aeronautics Board	2,465.01	1,136.96	346.45	29,957.37	3.80	33,909.59
Civil Service Commission	43,701.04	4,460.54	93,382.06	274,794.54	28,260.30	444,598.48
Commission of Fine Arts	232.87	317.32	43.50	96.18	7.10	696.97
Employees' Compensation Commission	6,184.00	2,548.00	48.00	15,182.00	3,012.00	26,974.00
Federal Communications Commission	24,001.99	21,304.14	6,139.34	93,254.10	3,439.42	148,138.97
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	24,668.92	1,013.10	29,539.72	266,712.13	13,824.00	335,757.87
Federal Power Commission	19,258.15	1,765.40	866.31	69,849.70	973.35	92,712.94
Federal Security Agency [4]	352,511.54	54,895.18	456,736.60	871,708.23	119,150.41	1,935,001.96
Federal Trade Commission	11,725.50	34.05	7,501.31	59,037.00	5,235.63	83,533.49
Federal Works Agency	413,874.28	122,691.27	30,592.28	489,156.77	125,065.86	1,181,380.46
General Accounting Office	18,529.98		7,248.84	148,349.25	965.44	175,093.51
Government Printing Office	1,067.50	708.32	78.85	4,499.95	207.84	6,562.48
Interstate Commerce Commission	60,685.25	1,439.76	17,686.30	238,442.00	16,063.15	334,316.46
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	16,264.69	4,065.86	1,241.16	15,379.25	1,653.23	38,604.19
National Archives	233.45		29.85	1,038.35	83.34	1,384.99
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	346.67			158.20	15.00	519.87
National Gallery of Art	405.75		13.71	488.67		908.13
National Housing Agency	199,394.59	52,118.18	282,943.13	515,632.85	52,551.23	1,102,639.98
National Labor Relations Board	58,435.27	7,282.19	31,988.22	102,604.38	10,195.74	210,505.80
National Mediation Board	2,499.82		428.33	11,984.63	77.00	14,989.78
Panama Canal	235,898.41	143,156.75	1,274.00	61,389.40	156,206.79	[5]597,925.35
Railroad Retirement Board	22,167.82		21,140.70	37,989.00	3,333.50	84,631.02
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	180,599.66	71,951.52	79,621.23	742,784.80	24,955.03	[6]1,099,912.24
Export-Import Bank of Washington	400.30	2,951.83		1,864.43	367.97	5,584.53
Securities and Exchange Commission	38,400.48	3,895.20	3,372.86	73,974.34	8,542.55	128,185.43
Smithsonian Institution	95.26			210.75	29.50	335.51
Tariff Commission	8,371.57	942.90	197.32	20,061.24	1,019.72	30,592.75
Tax Court of the United States	3,052.15			1,616.51	1,835.41	6,504.07
Tennessee Valley Authority	54,496.36	4,110.25	28,603.48	392,022.61	8,443.40	[7]487,676.10
U. S. Maritime Commission	29,363.07	2,072.09	8,389.96	256,121.29	14,424.70	310,371.11
Veterans' Administration	339,917.52	1,265.50	100,176.58	96,352.00	[8]120,264.63	[9]657,977.13
Department of Agriculture	543,326.00	33,138.00	1,459,329.00	2,926,582.00	213,421.00	5,175,796.00
Department of Commerce	82,117.50	50,940.84	202,774.01	1,190,172.10	15,890.28	1,541,894.73
Department of Interior [10]	174,771.67	35,421.59	82,694.96	1,132,221.85	33,570.24	1,458,680.31
Department of Justice	637,164.00	116,417.00	350,567.00	1,802,027.00	528,823.00	3,434,998.00
Department of Labor	246,402.01	32,845.42	101,074.44	582,916.48	63,734.36	1,026,972.71
Treasury Department	319,498.65	39,858.00	516,203.26	1,631,824.72	164,306.37	2,671,691.00
Department of State	91,670.96	437,658.40	3,547.11	197,724.09	92,416.72	823,017.28
Post Office Department	20,816.83	4,646.18	94,698.51	447,385.36	29,800.45	597,347.33
Library of Congress	3,029.09	4,261.15	14.50	7,685.00	568.20	15,557.94
Administrative Office of United States Courts	60,420.00		44,384.00	165,687.00	1,389.00	271,880.00
Total	6,379,630.73	2,640,208.45	5,119,045.38	18,527,694.30	2,245,122.22	35,672,853.84

[1] Includes $20,966.80 military mileage.
[2] Includes grants to States for U. S. Employment Service for December 1942 only.
[3] These include for National Youth Administration: $21,368.85, departmental; $740,573.32, field; $761,942.17, total. National Youth Administration not included in itemized break-down.
[4] Includes testing and placement, defense workers, and grants to States for unemployment compensation administration (U. S. Employment Service) for the months July to December 1942.
[5] Does not include $18,411.69 travel and per diem paid to other Government departments for service.
[6] $48,345.79 recoverable from borrowers and others.
[7] Includes $96,867.50 reimbursable travel for other Federal agencies.
[8] Includes $91,093.20 estimated cost of shipping household effects of transferred personnel.
[9] Travel expense of employees and beneficiaries.
[10] Does not include the Office of Indian Affairs. Includes some expenditures of the Geological Survey repaid by States, counties, and municipalities.

RESOLUTION OF CUBAN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES — PUERTO RICAN INDEPENDENCE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of State together with copy of a motion or resolution of the Cuban House of Representatives, which, together with the accompanying motion or resolution, was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 26, 1943.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Chargé d'Affaires of Cuba at Washington, under instructions of his Government, has forwarded to the Department the text of a motion approved April 7, 1943, by the Cuban House of Representatives, with the request that it be transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

I transmit the text, in accordance with the request of the Chargé, and a translation for your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

[Enclosure: As stated above.]

[Translation]

REPUBLIC OF CUBA,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER,
Habana, April 7, 1943.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The house of representatives in session on this date has adopted by unanimous vote the resolution which reads literally as follows:

"To the House:

"Upon drafting in 1892 the platform of the Cuban Revolutionary Party, its founder, an apostle of our liberties and a distinguished American patriot, José Martí, set forth in article 1 that: 'The Cuban Revolutionary Party is constituted for the purpose of gaining, by the united efforts of all men of good will, the absolute independence of the island of Cuba, and to foment and aid that of Puerto Rico.' Once the independence of our island was obtained, the Cubans were obligated, both morally and materially, to continue the struggle for that of Puerto Rico. The Democratic Senator, MILLARD TYDINGS, chairman of the Territories Committee, proposed on the 2d day of April last, in the United States Senate, the granting of complete and absolute independence to Puerto Rico. TYDINGS declared, upon announcing the presentation of the bill in the Senate, that 'When Puerto Rico obtains its independence, the American Government will have demonstrated modern conceptions of civilization that are in accord with the highest aspirations of the human race.' And he added: 'There is no reason why the independence of Puerto Rico, considered within the concepts of modern practicality, should not be as successful as the independence of Cuba and the approaching independence of the Philippines.' With the independence of Puerto Rico, there will be broken the chain which fetters the sister island, and on the American continent, illumined by the sun of freedom, will shine another star on the day when a flag like ours floats proudly as a symbol of the growing nation: The Republic of Puerto Rico. On the basis of the high democratic ideals of humanity and with a feeling of solidarity with the Puerto Rican patriots who long for and desire the liberty of their people, the undersigned representative submits to the consideration of the House the following resolution: That the House of Representatives of Cuba send to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America a message expressing the sympathy of the Cuban representative and the people of Cuba for the bill of Senator TYDINGS to grant total and absolute independence to Puerto Rico, and making known in the same message a plea for the liberation of the Puerto Rican nationalist leader, Pedro Albizu Campos, and of others who likewise are suffering imprisonment. Session chamber of the house of representatives, the 5th day of April 1943.

"Dr. A. INOCENTE ALVAREZ."

I have the honor to bring the foregoing to the knowledge of the distinguished body through your official intermediary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Grand Parlor of the Native Sons of the Golden West assembled in annual session at San Francisco, Calif., favoring the exchange of disloyal interned Japanese of American birth for either civilian or military prisoners now held captive by Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Grand Parlor of the Native Sons of the Golden West assembled in annual session at San Francisco, Calif., favoring prompt amendment of the Constitution providing that a child born of Japanese parents shall not be a citizen of the United States, notwithstanding such birth occurs or occurred in United States territory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Grand Parlor of the Native Sons of the Golden West assembled in annual session at San Francisco, Calif., favoring the continued internment of all Japanese irrespective of place of birth and nominal American citizenship; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the City Commission of Ironwood, Mich., favoring continuance of the National Youth Administration or some other worth-while youth training program; ordered to lie on the table.

A telegram from Palfrey Perkins, secretary of the American Unitarian Association, of Boston, Mass., embodying a resolution favoring continuance of the work of the National Resources Planning Board; ordered to lie on the table.

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Resolution 71

"Whereas December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor proved America cannot stay out of war because she wills it so; and

"Whereas the radio and the airplane have obliterated distances and brought all the world into close and related contact, thereby destroying our former isolation and rendering necessary dealing with global problems as part of our own; and

"Whereas it has, therefore, become necessary for us to be thinking of world peace because it will be part of our own peace and we must not be unprepared for that peace as we were for the war: Therefore be it

"*Resolved (if the senate concurs)*, That the Congress and the people of the United States give more thought to a closer association of the United Nations to further the speedy termination of the war and the winning of the kind of peace that will rid the world once and for all of the banditry and aggression that have made life intolerable for all people who believe in liberty and justice and the dignity of mankind."

By Mr. LODGE:

Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring amendment of the Federal Motor Carrier Act, 1935 (now pt. II of the Interstate Commerce Act); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. WALSH on the 20th instant, p. 4646, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens, members of the First Christian Church, of Holton, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RECOGNITION OF PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT OF KOREA—LETTER FROM REV. RALPH H. JENNINGS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter from the Reverend Ralph H. Jennings, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Kansas City, Kans., expressing himself in favor of recognition of the provisional government of Korea.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Kansas City, Kans., May 13, 1943.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: I would urge you to enact the Resolution 49 providing for the recognition of the provisional government of Korea. The Korean people have been dominated by the Japanese since 1905. Our recognition of 23,000,000 Koreans at this time would bring encouragement and hope for enslaved peoples everywhere.

Very truly yours,

RALPH H. JENNINGS.

PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC AND ALSO OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred resolutions adopted by the board of directors of the Anti-Saloon League of America, urging the passage of legislation that will control liquor and vice conditions in Army camps.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. We appeal to the President of the United States as the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, to whom have been given most sweeping wartime powers, to take action to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors, including beer, on any property controlled by the Government, or to any man or woman in United States uniform; to create dry zones around all military and naval establishments and around industrial establishments which are engaged in the production of any form of equipment or material being manufactured for war purposes; and to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors, including beer, on railroad trains.

2. We recommend that the Presdent use his war powers so that no food products, metals, rubber, or any other products or facilities, whose use is essential in the carrying on of the war, be diverted to the manufacture, sale, or distribution of beer, or of any alcoholic liquors.

3. That the President is hereby urged to follow the example set by Canada, to pro-

hibit any form of advertising which will promote the continued and increasing drinking of intoxicants while the Nation is at war, as wasteful and detrimental to both civilian and military manpower and morale.

4. We recommend that the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors anywhere in the Nation as a genuine help in the promotion of sobriety and consequent physical, mental, and moral activities.

5. We call upon the Congress of the United States to cooperate with the President in meeting his great responsibility by passing any additional legislation which may be necessary for him most effectively to prevent during wartime the evils growing out of the use of intoxicating liquor.

6. We favor the passage of any and all legislation which will aid in the accomplishment of the great aim of the Anti-Saloon League of America, namely, the extermination of the beverage liquor traffic.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in the absence of the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and at his request, I ask consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD, under the rule, and appropriately referred, resolutions adopted by the California State Senate and the California State Assembly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions presented by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD under the rule.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (two resolutions):

Assembly Joint Resolution 46

Joint resolution relative to repair facilities and materials for agricultural machinery and implements

Whereas the production of a sufficient food supply is essential to the continued health of the Nation and its successful prosecution of the war; and

Whereas such production cannot be maintained unless necessary farm machinery and equipment is kept in working condition; and

Whereas shops devoted to the repair of such machinery and equipment are being forced out of operation because of inability to get supplies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress and President of the United States and the War Priorities Board are memorialized to make such laws, rules, or orders as may be necessary to make available to shops engaged in the repair of farm machinery adequate supplies of welding rod, acetylene, oxygen, and other essential materials; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is requested to forward copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California, and to the members of the War Priorities Board.

Assembly Joint Resolution 44

Joint resolution relative to the appointment of the Honorable Jesse Tapp as Assistant to the Food Administrator of the United States

Whereas the State of California has been called upon to increase its agricultural production goals during 1943 although it is faced with an agricultural labor supply which is less than that available in 1942; and

Whereas the President of the United States has appointed the Honorable Chester C. Davis as Food Administrator with the duty, among others, of obtaining adequate agricultural labor for this year's crops; and

Whereas the Honorable Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator, has appointed the Honorable Jesse Tapp as his assistant, thereby recognizing the need of having in Washington, someone familiar with the problems of western agriculture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Honorable Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator, be commended for his recognition of the problems of western agriculture in appointing the Honorable Jesse Tapp as his assistant; and be it further

Resolved, That the Honorable Jesse Tapp be congratulated upon his selection for this important assignment; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to Hon. Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator, to Hon. Jesse Tapp, Assistant to the Food Administrator, to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

House Resolution 296

Resolution relative to memorializing the Office of Price Administration in relation to gasoline allowances for the purposes of taking deer

Whereas the State of California annually produces over 40,000 mature deer which may be, and ordinarily are, taken by sportsmen; and

Whereas, it may be conservatively estimated that such deer will produce over 400,000 pounds of meat, and that the hides will produce over 14,000 coats or over 130,000 pair of gloves; and

Whereas the Federal Government needs buckskin for many military uses for which no suitable substitute has been found; and

Whereas deer hunting is a form of recreation for thousands of sportsmen who solely because of gasoline rationing will be forced to spend their vacations otherwise; and

Whereas by the simple expedient of allowing each deer hunter a maximum of 12 gallons of gasoline, the deer hunters of the State, through share-the-ride programs, could take the normal share of the State's annual crop which otherwise will not be taken; and

Whereas the unchecked multiplication of large game animals is not in the best interests of the agricultural and livestock industries of the State; and

Whereas a plan has been worked out by the sportmen's organizations of the State whereby each deer hunter in return for the allowance of such additional gasoline will agree to ship the deer skins to fixed receiving points to be processed and made available to the Federal Government, to save the surplus fat and tallow for sale to local butchers for rendering it usable for making explosives, and to utilize all of the meat for human consumption; and

Whereas all these desirable results can be obtained by allowing prospective deer hunters only 12 additional gallons of gasoline each: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Office of Price Administration is hereby respectfully requested to give consideration to the allowance of an additional 12 gallons of gasoline to each deer hunter to be used by him under such conditions and restrictions as will result in the utilization of the meat, hides, tallow, and fat in the manner most conducive to the war effort; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C., the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior of the United States, and to each Representative and Senator from California in the Congress of the United States.

To the Committee on Commerce:

House Resolution 289

Resolution memorializing Congress to enact necessary legislation to permit the reuse of bottles used as containers of alcoholic beverages

Whereas under the provisions of Federal law the reuse of bottles containing bonded alcoholic beverages is prohibited, and compliance with the Federal laws requires a complete destruction of bottles used for the purpose of containing alcoholic beverages once filled and stamped; and

Whereas replacement of bottles so destroyed constitutes an extravagance and waste of essential manpower, manufacturing equipment, production facilities and raw materials that would be of inestimable value in production for war; and

Whereas the Federal legislation is designed and intended to protect Federal revenue under internal revenue statutes and adequate provision to safeguard such revenue could be made without the necessity of destruction of containers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the House of the State of California hereby respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to so amend the provisions of the Federal law to permit for the duration of the war the reuse of bottles used for the purpose of containing alcoholic beverages; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Congressmen from California in the Congress of the United States are respectfully requested to urge the legislation set forth in this resolution.

To the Committee on Finance (four resolutions):

Senate Joint Resolution 1

Joint resolution relative to old-age assistance

Whereas it is the desire of the Legislature of California to make sufficient provision for the needy aged of this State; and

Whereas prior to July 1, 1941, the old-age security law of California permitted a recipient of aid to receive up to $15 per month from certain specified sources, including the earnings of the recipient, without deduction thereof from the amount of his aid, and it was with the greatest reluctance that the Legislature of California in 1941 amended the California law to deny the aged this privilege, which amendment was made solely to enable the State to comply with the Federal Social Security Act as that act was construed by the Federal Social Security Board, and so to continue to receive Federal old-age assistance; and the Legislature of California believes that this privilege should be afforded to the aged, and that the withdrawal of the privilege was hasty and ill-advised; and

Whereas, at the present time a recipient of aid in California may receive income in addition to the aid only by showing excess

need therefor, and submitting to the most detailed and onerous supervision of his personal budget, and so is discouraged from engaging in gainful employment despite the well-recognized need for the maximum utilization of the services of every American in the furtherance of the war effort; and

Whereas the maximum amount of old-age assistance granted to an eligible aged person which the Government of the United States will recognize for the purpose of reimbursing the State to the extent of one-half of the assistance granted is $40, which sum is entirely inadequate under present conditions to provide an aged person with the necessities of life or to permit him to maintain a proper standard of living: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly). That the President and Congress of the United States are hereby memorialized to amend the Federal Social Security Act to provide for Federal participation at the present rate in the payment of aid in the amount of $60 to any eligible individual in any month, or, if this is not possible, to amend the Federal Social Security Act to permit the State agency, in determining need, not to take into consideration other income and resources of an individual claiming old-age assistance to the extent of $20, or such greater sum as the President and Congress may determine to be proper and just; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Assembly Joint Resolution 19

Joint resolution relative to memorializing and petitioning Congress to enact legislation giving to draftees and others entering the military and naval service of the United States adequate insurance protection for themselves in the form of permanent total disability insurance as well as life insurance protection

Whereas from 1919 up to and including October 8, 1940, persons entering the military and naval service of the United States were given the privilege of applying for United States Government (converted) life insurance, including the permanent total disability features thereof, which protected the soldier himself; and

Whereas Congress in the passage of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, approved October 8, 1940, provided in section 611 of said act that, "No United States Government life insurance shall be granted hereafter to any person under the provisions of section 300 of the World War Veterans' Act of 1924, as amended"; and

Whereas the National Service Life Insurance Act does not provide permanent total disability benefit features or protection for the soldier himself, and protects only the dependents and near relatives of the soldier; and

Whereas it is estimated that 90 percent of those now in the military and naval service are without dependents and therefore not in need of such insurance but are in need of insurance with permanent total disability features protecting the soldier himself; and

Whereas experience during and since the World War has adequately proved and demonstrated the merits of permanent total disability features of Government insurance, particularly as relates to the so-called misconduct cases, which are noncompensable for both compensation and pension, thereby taking care of these unfortunates who would otherwise be thrown upon local communities for care and sustenance; and

Whereas it appears that in the passage of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, including section 611 thereof, which prevented further application for United States Government life insurance with total permanent disability features thereof, those persons, including National Guard units entering Federal service after October 8, 1940, were discriminated against and were denied the privilege of taking out United States Government (converted) life insurance with permanent total disability features thereof, whereas those persons, including National Guard units entering Federal service prior to October 8, 1940, were allowed and permitted to take out such insurance; and

Whereas we believe in order to give to every commissioned officer and enlisted man and every member of the Army Nurse Corps (female) and the Navy Nurse Corps (female) when employed in active service under the War Department or Navy Department, proper protection for themselves and their dependents, the United States should again permit such persons, including draftees, the opportunity to apply for and be granted either national service life insurance or United States Government (converted) life insurance with permanent total disability features as now constituted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby memorializes and petitions Congress to enact legislation which will provide that such persons so entering the military and naval service of the United States, including draftees, shall be given the opportunity of taking either national service life insurance or United States Government (converted) life insurance, at their option, including the permanent total disability features thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this joint resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, and to each Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, and that the Senators and Representatives representing the State of California in Congress be urged actively to support such legislation.

Assembly Joint Resolution 30

Joint resolution relative to an increase of pay for employees of the department of employment

Whereas by the passage of senate bill No. 15 the Legislature of the State of California has indicated its policy is to provide for increases in the salaries of State employees to offset the increase in living costs caused by war conditions; and

Whereas the increase provided for State employees amounts to $25 per month for employees whose salaries do not exceed $300 per month and $20 per month for employees whose salaries exceed $300 per month; and

Whereas such an increase in compensation is just and equitable; and

Whereas the employees of the department of employment do not participate in said increase, although the necessity and propriety of granting such increases is equally applicable to them; and

Whereas the department of employment lacks the necessary funds to provide for such an increase for the employees of that department: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the regional board of the Social Security Board is hereby requested to transmit to the Social Security Board at Washington, D. C., a statement of the facts hereinabove recited, and that said Social Security Board is hereby memorialized and petitioned to make an allocation to the California unemployment administration fund of sufficient money to pay to the employees of the department of employment salary increases equivalent to those granted State employees pursuant to said senate bill No. 15; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly shall transmit to the regional board of the Social Security Board, Humboldt Building, San Francisco, and to the Social Security Board, Washington, D. C., copies of this resolution and copies of said senate bill No. 15 as enrolled; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly shall send copies of this resolution to each Member in the Congress of the United States from California.

Assembly Joint Resolution 32

Joint resolution relative to auditing the accounts of the department of employment

Whereas the receipts and disbursements of the benefit fund of the State department of employment receiving vast sums of money from employers and employees of California have never been audited by any State or Federal agency; and

Whereas the employers of this State, subject to the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, normally pay 2.7 percent of the wages paid by them into the Treasury of the United States; and employees pay 1 percent of their wages to that source; and

Whereas it is desirable and necessary that every agency of Government expending money have a periodical audit of its books and accounts; and

Whereas the Federal Social Security Board has made no allowance to the State of California for auditing the accounts of the department of employment, and has declined itself to make such audits for the California Department of Employment or a similar department in any other State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to pass such legislation as will make it mandatory upon the Social Security Board to allocate funds to the various States of the Union, and particularly to this State, for a proper audit under the supervision of the State department of finance, of the funds and accounts of the State department of employment; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, every Member of the Senate and House of Representatives from California, the Social Security Board, and every Governor and State legislature.

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

House Resolution 232

Resolution relative to the Post-War International Economic and Food Conference

Whereas the State Department of the Government of the United States has announced that a conference of the United Nations will be held at Hot Springs, Va., on Tuesday, May 18, to discuss, study, and plan the problems of freedom from want, post-war interests in full employment, free enterprise, and the lightening of government controls, relief of devastated countries, international currency arrangements, and trade reciprocity; and

Whereas this recital of the agenda of the Food and Economic Conference marks it as one of the greatest national and international importance and of paramount interest to the world and to the people of the United States; and

Whereas 42 nations have been invited to send representatives to this noted conference; and

Whereas it has been declared by those in charge of the arrangements for the holding of the said conference that all representatives of the press will be barred from attendance

at all meetings of the conference: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the members of the assembly protest the closing of the conference to representatives of the press as undemocratic, declare it to be a breach of the American principle of freedom of the press, deplore it as a reversion to star-chamber procedures and an infringement of the right of a free people to know in full and complete detail the daily happenings of this world-important conference; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk be directed to prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President, Vice President, and Secretary of State of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and each Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States.

To the Committee on Immigration:

Assembly Joint Resolution 45

Joint resolution relative to facilitating the employment of Mexican citizens in agriculture

Whereas the United States of America is sorely in need of skilled agricultural labor and has entered into arrangements with the Government of the Republic of Mexico for permitting its citizens to engage in agricultural pursuits in the United States; and

Whereas there reside within close proximity of the borders of California and other States bordering upon the Republic of Mexico a large number of citizens of the Republic of Mexico, who, if existing governmental arrangements permitted, could either continue to reside in Mexico and work in the United States or reside intermittently in the United States for agricultural purposes; and

Whereas existing regulations governing recruitment of Mexican citizens for agricultural labor in the United States require application for such work in Mexico City; and

Whereas the President of the United States on Tuesday, March 30, 1943, stated that importation of Mexican agricultural workers was one of three means of relieving the farm labor shortage in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, and Hon. Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator of the United States of America, be, and they are hereby, memorialized to enter into negotiations which will, for the duration of the current emergency, permit the citizens of Mexico residing in proximity to the borders of the United States to enter the United States freely for the purpose of engaging in agricultural pursuits, without the necessity of making application personally in Mexico City; and be it further

Resolved, That Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, and Hon. Earl G. Harrison, Director of Immigration, be and they are hereby requested to make such adjustment in the immigration regulations of the United States as will, for the duration of the current emergency, facilitate the free ingress and egress of such Mexican citizens for the purpose of engaging in agricultural pursuits; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly transmit copies of this resolution to Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State; to Hon. Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator; to Hon. Earl G. Harrison, Director of Immigration and Naturalization; and to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States.

To the Committee on the Library:

House Resolution 226

Resolution relative to the Spirit of Freedom Monument as designed

Whereas the flag of the United States of America and the Liberty Bell are symbols of the highest American ideals; and

Whereas no monument has been erected to personify the ideals and spirit for which the American flag and the Liberty Bell are fitting emblems; and

Whereas one Amos A. Wyckoff, of Oakland, has designed a monument which is known as Spirit of Freedom, which would be a most fitting, imposing, and inspiring memorial to the people of the United States, and which monument is more particularly described as follows:

1. The 13 steps represent the Thirteen Colonies.

2. There are 48 columns, one to represent each State.

3. The gear wheel represents the power of our United States.

4. There are 48 cogs, one for each State in the Union, to represent the power of each State. Inside each cog will be the exhibit room for each State.

5. Between each cog there will be placed a statue of the pioneers who fought their way here to make it possible for our people to live.

6. The building is constructed of four cross-like sections with niches in which to place statues.

7. On top of the building will be the statue of the California Bear.

8. Facing the east, will be a statue of the first mother of California, holding a child, which represents, as the sun rises, the newborn is coming to light.

9. Facing the west will be a statue of the first emigrant scout to California.

10. The Liberty Bell forms the dome. Inside the dome will be the paintings of war scenes. Also a statue of the man who rang the Liberty Bell so hard he cracked it.

11. Then comes the tower rising to a great height of approximately 800 feet. In this tower will be elevators running to the observation room, where visitors will pay a small fee to have a view of beautiful cities and surrounding area, as well as the beautiful blue Pacific Ocean. The income can be used for the upkeep.

12. On the top of the tower will be a powerful light for protection and guidance of airplanes.

13. Four large American eagles, representing the keenness of vision of our United States, will face the north, south, east, and west. The eagles to be outlined in neon lights are guarding the American flag, which is flying high over their heads.

14. On the point of each cog shall be a duplicate of each State seal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the members of this assembly hereby commend Mr. Amos A. Wyckoff as the originator and designer of the artistic and symbolic Spirit of Freedom: and be it further

Resolved, That the members of this assembly do recommend the construction of this symbolic monument on a suitable site to any commission for post-war reconstruction or planning as a project worthy of their most careful consideration: And be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be instructed to prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to any commission for post-war reconstruction or planning and to the commission in charge of the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the State of California, as a project worthy of their most careful consideration, to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and each Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States and to the aforesaid Mr. Amos A. Wyckoff, of Oakland, Calif.

To the Committee on Military Affairs (two resolutions):

Assembly Joint Resolution 40

Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation to establish a military and a naval academy on the Pacific coast

Whereas the United States is to have a great Army and Navy and will need twice and three times the number of officers that West Point Military Academy and Annapolis Naval Academy can produce because these institutions have reached the limit of expansion at their present sites, cannot provide needed room for airplanes to fly and tanks to maneuver and can not teach adequately more students than they have taught in the past; and

Whereas there are many miles of coast along the Pacific which would afford the country ideal locations for both a military and a naval academy; and

Whereas world conditions and the war have made it advisable that cadets and midshipmen can be made familiar with the Pacific coast as well as with the Atlantic coast; and

Whereas Army and Navy traditions could be maintained by having cadets and midshipmen receive their first 2 years of training on the Pacific coast and complete their training at West Point or Annapolis and in so doing become familiar with the west coast and the Pacific as well as with the east coast and the Atlantic: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized immediately to enact legislation to establish a military and a naval academy on the Pacific coast; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States, and that the Senators and Representatives from California are hereby respectfully requested to urge such action.

House Resolution 257

Resolution relating to the return of gold mines to partial production

Whereas the complete stoppage of gold mining is resulting in the destruction in the economic life of the communities engaged primarily in this industry; and

Whereas if the industry were permitted to continue on a limited scale during the war an income sufficient to defray taxes and maintain essential businesses could be produced; and

Whereas under such conditions of partial production the existence of the communities located in the gold-mining areas could be continued to the benefit of their residents and of the State in general: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Congress and the President of the United States and the War Production Board are memorialized to make such laws, rules, or order as may be necessary to provide for the return of the gold mines of the State to partial production during the continuance of the war; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is requested to forward copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California, and to the Chairman of the War Production Board.

To the Committee on Naval Affairs (two resolutions):

Assembly Joint Resolution 21

Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Secretary of the Navy to name a Navy cruiser of the United States Fleet for the city of Long Beach, Calif.

Whereas the city of Long Beach, State of California, is now and for many years has been a home port of the Pacific Fleet of the United States; and

Whereas the said city of Long Beach has recently presented to the United States Government a tract of oil-bearing land consisting of 105 acres of an estimated value of more than $10,000,000, situated along the water front to be used for a great permanent naval base; and

Whereas the Navy Department has located a large naval hospital near the city of Long Beach; and

Whereas many of the homes of the officers and men of the Navy are located at Long Beach, and the citizens thereof are all interested in the welfare and progress of the Navy; and

Whereas throughout many years of loyal support the city of Long Beach, and its citizens, have from time to time extended numerous benefits and favors upon the Navy; and

Whereas it is the custom for the President, through the Secretary of the Navy, to christen the naval cruisers for some prominent city of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the President and the Honorable Secretary of the Navy are hereby respectfully solicited and requested that one of the naval cruisers of the United States Fleet, now under construction, or to be constructed, when launched, be christened "Long Beach" in honor of the city of Long Beach in the State of California; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to the Honorable Secretary of the Navy and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of California in the Congress of the United States.

House Resolution 246

Resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Secretary of the Navy to name a Navy cruiser of the United States Fleet for the city of San Pedro, Calif.

Whereas Fort MacArthur is situated at the city of San Pedro, State of California, and is now and for many years has been a home port of the Pacific Fleet of the United States; and

Whereas Fort MacArthur, at San Pedro, at the city of San Pedro, aforesaid, is a supply base for the Navy; and

Whereas many of the homes of the officers and men of the Navy are located at San Pedro, and the citizens thereof are all interested in the welfare and progress of the Navy; and

Whereas the citizens of San Pedro have loyally supported the Navy and, from time to time, have extended numerous benefits and favors upon the Navy; and

Whereas it is the custom of the President, through the Secretary of the Navy, to christen naval cruisers for some prominent city of the United States; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the President and the Secretary of the Navy are hereby respectfully solicited and requested that one of the naval cruisers of the United States Fleet now under construction, or to be constructed, when launched be christened "San Pedro" in honor of the city of San Pedro, State of California; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk, chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to the honorable Secretary of the Navy, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of California in the Congress of the United States, and an engrossed copy to the San Pedro Junior Chamber of Commerce.

To the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

House Resolution 284

Resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact S. 971 or H. R. 2426, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, providing for Federal participation in financing of a post-war highway construction program

Whereas two measures are pending in the Congress of the United States, namely, S. 971 and H. R. 2426, to authorize Federal assistance to the States in financing a post-war construction program on rural and urban highways; and

Whereas such legislation is designed to, and will provide useful employment for those returning from services in the armed forces, or released by war industries after the war, and will, accordingly, tend to prevent unemployment, and the necessity for unemployment relief; and

Whereas necessary wartime restrictions on gasoline and highway transportation have resulted in curtailment of revenues received by the highway departments of the States, and restrictions on use of materials have curtailed construction and reconstruction of needed highways during a period in which many highways have been damaged by heavy wartime truck traffic, engaged in transportation for the war effort; and

Whereas such legislation will assist the States in bringing their highway systems and their highway construction programs back to normal, and in making up the time lost due to necessary deferment of highway construction during the war; and

Whereas there will be particular need to provide employment in California, following the war, due to the large number of war industries in this State; and

Whereas there will be particular need in California for reconstruction of highways due to such war conditions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Congress of the United States be and the same is hereby memorialized to enact either S. 971 or H. R. 2426; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk shall transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the chairman of the House Committee on Roads, and to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from California.

REPORTS OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 24th instant, Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which were referred the following bills, reported them on May 26, 1943, and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 2714. A bill making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 264) and

H. R. 2753. A bill making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 265).

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1106. A bill to prohibit the allowance of credit in the computation of lump-sum payments to Air Corps Reserve officers under the provisions of section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936, as amended, for active service hereafter performed during the present wars and for 6 months thereafter; without amendment (Rept. No. 266).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BREWSTER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma introduced Senate bill 1133, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LUCAS introduced Senate bill 1134, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 1135. A bill to amend section 215 of the Judicial Code, relating to the quorum of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1136. A bill to amend section 22 (b) (2) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah introduced Senate bill 1137, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1138. A bill declaring certain lands to be a part of the public domain; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1139 (by request). A bill relating to placer mining claims for deposits of phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, or gas on the public domain; and

S. 1140 (by request). A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

PROVISION FOR POST-WAR FEDERAL AID PLANNING

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for post-war planning, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] will be received and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The bill (S. 1137) to provide for post-war planning, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PAYMENT FOR CERTAIN NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING IN CONNECTION WITH SALE OF BONDS—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1073) to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

"FREE CZECHOSLOVAKIA" — STATEMENT PREPARED FOR BROADCAST

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, 25 years ago the 29th day of May, Secretary of State Robert Lansing issued a statement in which he officially expressed America's approval of the efforts which the Czechs and Slovaks were then making to free themselves from Austro-Hungarian domination. To commemorate that event in part I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this place a statement entitled "Free Czechoslovakia," prepared for broadcast in America and over short-wave radio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

Twenty-five years ago today Secretary of State Robert Lansing issued a declaration in which he officially expressed America's approval of the efforts which the Czechs and Slovaks were then making to free themselves from Austro-Hungarian domination.

The military and political events which rapidly followed that declaration resulted in the creation of Czechoslovakia—a bold experiment in whose success many people doubted. The new state contained many diverse ethnological elements, was bounded by bitter external enemies, and was led by rather untried statesmen. But in spite of these handicaps Czechoslovakia proved to be one of the most promising republics in modern history. It was the chief bulwark of democracy in central Europe; it enabled all its citizens to enjoy freedom such as that part of the world had never known; it rapidly raised their material and cultural standard and it worked for international harmony.

The two chief ethnological groups in the new state were the Czechs and Slovaks. The government's most outstanding achievement was what it did for the Slovaks. It enabled the Slovaks to make greater progress in 20 years than they had made during any previous century in their whole millenial history.

In the first place, the number of Slovaks grew very rapidly. During the 30 years from 1880 to 1910 under Hungarian domination, the Slovak population in Slovakia had increased by only 5 percent—that is, one-sixth of 1 percent a year. They had remained practically stationary, due to the fact that they were being Hungarianized.

After the creation of Czechoslovakia, the Slovaks increased by more than 1 percent each year. The total population of Slovakia swiftly rose, both in town and country. From 1920 to 1938 the population of the chief Slovak cities practically doubled, and general progress, both material and cultural, kept pace with the advance in population.

For instance, the number of voters in Slovakia increased by 900 percent, namely, from 200,000 to 1,790,000. Complete adult suffrage was granted, and all men and women of all nationality origins participated in political life.

In 1910, under the Hungarians, the Slovaks had two national representatives in parliament. As citizens of Czechoslovakia, they had 58 representatives in parliament and 30 senators, an increase from 2 to 88.

They also had mayors, city councilors, city clerks, prosecuting attorneys, judges, ministers, and other state functionaries by the scores of thousands.

The improvement in education was no less phenomenal. The number of Slovak primary schools increased from 140, under the Hungarian masters, to 3,277 in free Czechoslovakia. Under the Hungarians the Slovaks had no secondary Slovak school, no Slovak normal school, and no Slovak industrial or trade school, but in Czechoslovakia they had 246 Slovak secondary schools, 14 normal schools, and 69 trade schools of various kinds. The number of Slovak primary teachers increased from 390 to 8,726; the number of Slovak high-school teachers from 2 to 493; the number of university professors from none to 53. All that in 20 years.

During that period literacy among the Slovaks mounted from 57 to 93 percent.

The number of Slovak newspapers in the Slovak language increased from 22 to 289.

Such was the cultural advance the Slovaks made in free Czechoslovakia. But their material advance was no less striking. In the first place, the great Hungarian feudal estates were broken up and almost 2,000,000 acres of farm land were distributed among the peasants, to a large extent among Slovak peasants.

Improvements in industry paralleled those in agriculture. The number of persons in Slovakia living from trade and industry increased by 23 percent during the first 10 years after the creation of Czechoslovakia.

The number of persons engaged in mining increased by 19 percent, in building by 88 percent, in stone work by 82 percent, in electric plants by 136 percent, in the food industry by 23 percent.

Slovakia, in free Czechoslovakia, was covered with new buildings. One-fifth of all the homes were new as well as half the school houses and many public buildings.

The production of electricity mounted from 68 million kilomatts annually to 410 million kilowatts, namely 600 percent.

The number of communities supplied with electricity increased by 400 percent.

Transportation facilities improved rapidly. The number of persons engaged in transportation increased by 50 percent. More than 1,000 miles of new roads were constructed and 250 miles of new railroads were built in very mountainous areas.

Bank deposits and savings increased by 300 percent.

The number of cooperative credit institutions for the common people increased from 233 to 927; their capital from 56 million to 1,132 million.

These figures may seem dull, but they show the extraordinary progress which men, women, and children made in free Slovakia during the 20 years it was a part of free Czechoslovakia.

They became self-respecting, better educated, more prosperous, self-governing. They read their own papers written in their own language, elected their own officials, studied in their own schools, from their own text books, worked in their own shops or in their own fields. All these statistics were compiled by Slovaks.

Hitler, aided by a handful of stupid or wicked Slovak traitors temporarily destroyed that state. Hitler's so-called free Slovakia is deprived of every breath of freedom, and a worthy people has been tied to the chariot of the world's most terrible despot, who is rapidly moving to his doom. When he is crushed by the irresistible power of the United Nations, among whom are Czechs and Slovaks, the Czechs and the Slovaks will again be free. They will again take their place near the head of Europe's procession moving toward prosperity and enlightenment. Once more they will show the people of Danubia and of all the world the blessings of true Democracy.

REPORT TO CONGRESS ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS FOR PERIOD ENDED APRIL 30, 1943 (H. DOC. NO. 209)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States of America:

As I transmit to the Seventy-eighth Congress a report of operations under the Lend-Lease Act from March 11, 1943, to April 30, 1943, the last members of the once vaunted Afrika Korps and their Italian allies are streaming into prison camps. The peoples of Tunis and Bizerte are hailing their liberation—and Italians among them are as enthusiastic as any for their deliverance.

An entire continent—the continent of Africa—has now been cleared of the enemy. Its people have been freed from Nazi and Fascist rule. In Africa we have dealt a blow which is sorely felt in Berlin and Rome and Tokyo; and we have brought hope to millions still to be liberated. Liberation of Africa is a forerunner of the future.

In the coming battles for Germany and Japan, we shall need the full support and the full resources of the peoples of the newly liberated areas. This is a military and political necessity of the first order. Their fields can produce food not only for their own people, but for the United Nations' forces. Their factories and mines can supply not only themselves, but our armies as well.

The peoples in liberated areas are enlisting in support of the United Nations' cause. Their support will reflect itself in active cooperation at the proper time by millions still to be liberated. They appreciate, as only those who lost freedom can appreciate, the compelling necessity for overthrowing tyranny.

Our lend-lease operations in north and west Africa—the first of the liberated areas—have demonstrated how a freed people can aid in the defeat of the Axis. In this victory, our military operations have been backed up by the friendly support of the peoples behind the lines. We also were aided by the new French armies. They were equipped with lend-lease weapons. They were and are an important part of the United Nations' fighting forces. Aid has also been given us and the other United Nations by the liberated peoples of French Africa in the production and shipment of strategic and critical materials for our war production program.

As we progress to victory, the United Nations have brought and are bringing food for the starving and medicine for the sick in the areas which we set free. Our promises are being fulfilled in deeds.

Our integrity is enlisting the peoples and resources of these areas as effective fighting partners in the common fight against Axis aggression and tyranny.

While Axis prisoners have streamed into captivity at the end of our campaign of liberation in north Africa, lend-lease has shipped greater and greater quantities of war material into the battle areas—and into the other countries allied with us.

In my lend-lease report to the Congress on September 11, 1941, I stated that "it is our task to turn the workshops of our industry into mighty forges of war—to outbuild the aggressors in every category of modern arms."

Today, we are outbuilding the aggressors in every category of modern arms. And we are delivering them in the amounts necessary to build up the striking power for offensives that will end only in Berlin and Tokyo.

As lend-lease moves ahead in its third year, our armed forces, our supplies, and the combined efforts of the United Nations are driving ahead to complete victory over the enemy.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 25, 1943.*

WINNING THE PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HATCH

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a Win the Peace radio rally, New York Times Hall, New York, May 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ABDICATION OF CONGRESSIONAL POWER—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Abdication of Congressional Power," delivered by him on May 26, 1943, on the National Forum of the Air, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN PROGRESS AFTER THE WAR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "American Progress After the War," delivered by him at the Fifty-fourth Annual Congress of the Sons of the American Revolution, May 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

UTILIZATION OF FOREST AND WOOD PRODUCTS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLMAN

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address recently delivered by him on the subject The Availability and Utilization of Forest and Wood Products in the War Effort, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESULTS OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE PRICE RENEGOTIATION LAW—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRIDGES

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him summarizing the results of a nationwide survey relative to the administration of the price renegotiation law, which appears in the Appendix.]

"CAPITALISM ON CRUTCHES"—ADDRESS BY SAMUEL CROWTHER

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Capitalism on Crutches," delivered by Samuel Crowther before the Rotary Club of New York, on May 20, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY ADMIRAL GAYLORD CHURCH PRESENTING ARMY-NAVY E AWARD TO GILPANE BUILDING CO., OF PROVIDENCE, R. I.

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Admiral Gaylord Church at the presentation ceremony of the Army-Navy E award to the Gilpane Building Co., of Providence, R. I., on May 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOCIAL SERVICE AND SOCIAL REFORM—ADDRESS BY RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN A. RYAN, D. D.

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, D. D., to the graduates of the National Catholic Social Service School on May 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES AND LETTER FROM ROBERT H. PATCHIN

[Mr. MEAD asked and otbained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of May 3 relative to reciprocal trade agreements and a letter addressed to the New York Times by Robert H. Patchin, which appear in the Appendix.]

CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION BY STATUTE—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Changing the Constitution by Statute," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of May 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION FOR PEACE—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time by the Forelock," published in the Washington Post of May 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY AT THE FIFTH ANNUAL HOLY COMMUNION AND BREAKFAST OF THE ST. GEORGE ASSOCIATION

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the fifth annual holy communion and breakfast of the St. George Association, United States Post Office, New York, May 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed consideration of House bill 1762, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I understand that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] intends to address the Senate on the subject matter of the committee amendment on page 4, beginning in line 23, and dealing with the National Resources Planning Board. Before he begins to speak I wish to ask unanimous consent to strike certain language from the committee amendment. In the first place, on page 5, beginning at the end of line 3, I desire to strike the words "acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services of officers and employees of any State or political subdivision thereof."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Tennessee would have the right to modify his own amendment, but if it is a committee amendment, that is quite a different situation, and the matter should be referred to the committee. I ask the Senator if the amendment in question is a committee amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, Mr. President, it is a committee amendment, and I have no authority from the committee to make the request. There are certain items in the amendment which I am convinced should not be in it, and I should like to put the amendment in such shape that it can be discussed properly, and so that there will not be any question about it. I hope the Senator from Oregon will not object. Of course, I understand he has a right to object.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am quite conscious of that right. If the Senator can demonstrate the validity of his request I should make no objection, but it is rather unusual for such a request to be made without reference of the matter to the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is. The Senator is exactly right. The language I read is one of two phrases or subdivisions appearing on the same page which I shall ask leave to strike out. Both subdivisions appear on page 5. The first is the language I have read from the end of line 3 to the beginning of line 6.

Mr. President, on page 5, line 10, after the word "Nation" and the semicolon, I propose to insert the words "not to exceed $20,000 for"; then I propose to strike out the following language, beginning in line 10:

> Not to exceed $20,000; payment of actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Board; and not to exceed $20,000 for temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709, of the Revised Statutes, or classification laws.

As to the latter part of that provision I am advised by the Parliamentarian of the Senate that it may be subject to a point of order. Of course, I do not want to have before the Senate any provision which is subject to a point of order. The Parliamentarian is of the opinion that it is legislation, and that is why I am making the request at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on what page does the language appear?

Mr. McKELLAR. On page 5. The Senator will understand what I desire to do if the Senator will look first at line 3, beginning with the word "acceptance" and ending with the word "thereof", in line 6, and put a parenthesis around that portion; and then, in line 10, after the word "Nation" and the semicolon, insert the words "not to exceed $20,000 for"; and in the same line, after the word "expenses", insert a colon and strike out the words, beginning with "not" and ending with the word "laws" and the comma following it in line 18.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I understand the reason for the request of the able Senator is that the language is in

violation of the rule against the insertion of legislation in an appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is a part of the reason.

Mr. McNARY. That is the basis of the objection, I believe.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I have no doubt that the request is a worthy one, because the language is wholly subject to a point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. May the request be put, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McNARY. Of course, Mr. President, strictly under the rule, when legislation is found in an appropriation bill, and when a point of order is made, the bill automatically goes back to the committee. But I shall not make that point.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to do so, I desire to offer an amendment so that it will be pending at the time when the Senator from Ohio discusses the matter. The amendment is one which I propose to offer as an individual. The reason why I offer it is because the substance of the amendment was defeated by a tie vote in the committee, and I feel that it is my personal duty to offer the amendment. Therefore, I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 18, it is proposed to strike out the numerals "$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$534,422"; and on the same page, in lines 22 to 25, inclusive, to strike out the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used except for correlation and coordination of planning with State governments and with political subdivisions in such States"; and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That of this appropriation not less than $300,000 shall be used for correlation and coordination of planning with State governments and with political subdivisions of such States."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS ADMINISTERED BY THE WAR DEPARTMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2346) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 5, and 6; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and, in addition, $3,000,000 of the unobligated balance on June 30, 1943, of the appropriation "Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works", is hereby made available for the execution of detailed investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore or hereafter authorized"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and, in addtion, $3,000,000 of the unobligated balance on June 30, 1943, of the appropriation "Flood control, general", is hereby made available for the preparation of detailed plans and specifications of authorized flood-control projects, and for rescue work or the repair or maintenance of any flood-control work threatened or destroyed by flood, pursuant to section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941, for reimbursement to the city of Hartford, Connecticut, as authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, and for construction of the flood-control projects heretofore authorized for the Mermentau River, Bayou Teche, and Vermilion River, Louisiana"; and the Senate agree to the same.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOE STARNES,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the House conferees accepted the Senate amendments, save in two particulars. The House bill originally provided that the Board of Engineers should have $2,000,000 with which to make plans and specifications for improvement of rivers and harbors, and $2,000,000 for making plans and specifications for flood-control works.

We removed the $2,000,000 limitation, and left the amount to be fixed at the discretion of the Secretary of War. In the conference committee the House conferees were unwilling to leave the matter so wide open, and insisted upon having a limitation placed on the two items. So the committee agreed to a $3,000,000 limitation, which is $1,000,000 more than the House originally put in the bill.

So, as the matter now stands, the Board of Engineers will have $3,000,000 for making plans for river and harbor improvements, and $3,000,000 for making flood-control specifications, so that when the war is over the engineering surveys may be ready to give employment to such of our citizens as may need employment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is not that the same subject which is supposed to be handled by the National Resources Planning Board?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The bill covers only the money for the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the War Department, and has no relation to the National Resources Planning Board, as such. As to whether the work is being duplicated, I am not fully advised.

Mr. President, I submit the conference report and ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the conference report, with a view to submitting a concurrent resolution. I do so because at the present time, devastating floods throughout the Central West and the Southwest, covering some 6 or 8 States, have flooded some 4,000,000 acres of land and made some 80,000 persons homeless. In my State of Illinois we have in the Illinois River the highest water known in the history of the State. In 1844, the records show, the highest water previous to now occurred; and yet in the floods which have just reached their crest along the Illinois River, I am advised that the water is some 3 feet higher than it was at that earlier day.

Mr. President, under section 5 which is referred to in the concurrent resolution, the Army engineers in making plans and specifications for the rebuilding or the reconstruction of any walls or levees along the Illinois River can replace such walls or levees only at the same height at which they are at the present time, or at the same height at which they were immediately prior to the present floods. That is exactly what section 5 would do.

The concurrent resolution I propose to submit would not only give the Army engineers more money to spend in connection with the flooded areas, but also would give them the immediate right to start their planning for the future, not in connection with what the height of the walls of the present projects is or recently has been, but for any height they deem to be necessary as a result of the experience they have had in the presently flooded areas. This is probably the most important part of the resolution, but let me return to the floods in my native State.

Mr. President, in Illinois alone, for example, we have 1,250,000 acres totally inundated. That means that probably 750,000 crop-acres have been totally destroyed as a result of the breaking of the levees and the overflowing of the land. That does not include thousands of acres of land on the prairies east and west of the Illinois River, where the water has stood for days, and in some places weeks, on the wheat, oats, and rye, and some of the corn which has been planted thereby destroying the germ of the plant, which means that no wheat, oats, or rye will be harvested upon those lands. If anything is done at all it will be necessary to replant those wheat and oat fields in

some crops which may be harvested, provided the weather is favorable through the summer and fall.

Eleven thousand farmers are affected in Illinois as a result of this flood. The Red Cross is on the job doing its duty in connection with the refugees. There are 11,500 being cared for in Red Cross shelters in my State. This represents about one-fifth of the total families affected.

I wish to commend the War Production Board for its liberality in granting priorities to the Red Cross for building materials and fences which are necessary in connection with the rehabilitation of these flooded areas.

Mr. President, as I said in the beginning, the concurrent resolution would permit the Secretary of War, who, under section 5, is authorized to spend not to exceed $1,000,000 for any one fiscal year in rescue work or the repair and maintenance of any flood control work threatened or destroyed by flood, to use discretionary power with respect to the spending of the unobligated balance because of the damage which has been done. He would be authorized to spend any portion of the unexpended balance.

In addition, the elimination of section 5 by the passage of the concurrent resolution would accomplish two further objectives. No provision is made under section 5 for improving flood-control operations damaged in a flood. For example, if the water should rise 4 feet above the wall, in repairing that wall the Army engineers could not build the wall higher than it was originally constructed. Certainly this legislation should be amended. To now start plans and specifications for the rebuilding of levees under the old plan would be little less than criminal. That is particularly true when we realize that the present high water breaks all previous records. Also, as section 5 now reads, there would be no authority, even temporarily, until the necessary legislation authorizing it were enacted, to take any flood-control measures at any place where flood-control operations did not exist before, even though such measures are vitally necessary in view of the existing emergency. The language of the concurrent resolution takes care of that point.

Mr. President, I submit the concurrent resolution and ask that it be read.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois what caused the flood?

Mr. LUCAS. The flood which came down the Illinois Valley was caused by heavy rains. In the month of May we had the heaviest rainfall on record there. It was not caused by diverting water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Valley, if that is what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. LANGER. If it rains in the North, does not the water all come down the Mississippi River and other streams from the North?

Mr. LUCAS. One watershed is in the Illinois Valley. The waters which have come into the Illinois River and overflowed some 60 counties along that river have been entirely from the rainfall during the month of May and the latter part of April.

Mr. LANGER. But if it rained in the northern part of the country, would not the water flow south?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. If that be true, why does not the Senator amend his concurrent resolution so as to provide enough money for the Missouri River diversion, to dam some of the streams so that the water may be held back?

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator that that is not what I am trying to do at the moment. This is an emergency; and if the engineers of the War Department are now beginning to replace the levees, or to set the levees back, under the present law they are compelled to plan and specify in line with the present height of such levees. As I stated a few moments ago, as a result of the floods the Illinois River is 3 feet higher than it has ever been at any time before in history, at least so far as any record is concerned.

That is the primary purpose of the concurrent resolution, plus the fact that it would give the engineers the right to spend more than $1,000,000, which is now the limit under section 5 of the Flood Control Act.

What the Senator is talking about has merit; but it seems to me that it should come a little later, probably in connection with an over-all program to take care of the entire matter.

Mr. LANGER. I wished to be certain that the Senator had in mind the Missouri River diversion.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad the Senator called attention to it, because I am extremely interested in the flooded areas. I visited my home State last week. I have never seen anything like what I saw there with respect to the high water and the damage and ruin which was being wrought as a result of it. I wish to do anything that is possible so far as legislation is concerned to make certain that such a thing shall not happen again if we can control it in any way.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Under the rule, of course, a conference report cannot be amended; but I am in sympathy with the statements made and the relief suggested by the Senator from Illinois.

During the past 5 days, in company with Major General Reybold, Chief of Engineers, I traveled over six States in the flooded area. We flew over Indiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Kansas, Illinois, and a part of Oklahoma. In some sections of those States, Mr. President, during the past 5 days the waters have been higher than they have been since 1844, or 99 years ago. During the past 5 days I have seen tens of thousands of acres of the finest lands in the central West entirely covered with water. All that can be seen from an airplane is the tops of houses and barns. On the outskirts of the towns could be seen the fine lands adjacent to the flooded areas. From the tops of buildings which could be seen, I know the character of improvements on the land.

Yesterday there was a group meeting in St. Louis, seeking to provide some plan for the relief of stricken farmers in that area. In the past 5 days I saw towns entirely under water. They are not large cities, but small towns, in which there is no building without water on the first floor, the second floor, or even the roof. So, of course, those towns are wholly destroyed for the time being. The residents of those towns must have some kind of relief from the Red Cross, the Public Health Service, the States, and the Federal Government. The farmers in those areas must likewise have relief.

Three things must be done: First, the people in those areas must have relief, and must have it now. Second, we must provide some plan for rebuilding the roads and bridges. Across the rivers the bridges are gone. In some places half the spans are gone. In other places the approaches are gone. In some places the roads are entirely destroyed. So in addition to helping the farmers and the residents of the towns we must help rebuild roads and bridges.

Third, as a result of this experience we must devise some plan for controlling floods to the extent they can be controlled. I am of the opinion that no reasonable amount of flood-control works would have saved the land in this emergency, because the rains have been unprecedented.

To summarize, the three points which must be given attention by the country are: First, to take care of the people in those areas; second, to rebuild roads and bridges; and third, to provide plans for the control of flood waters in the future.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill proposing to remove the restrictions of the Department of Agriculture against the planting of certain crops. The bill would permit the people in those areas, as soon as the flood waters recede, to plant whatever crops they can plant this year. I ask that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee and printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1133) for the relief of farmers and to increase production of farm commodities during 1943, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of existing law or rules or regulations promulgated by any agent or agents of the Government, the owner, lessee, tenant, or operator of any farm land which has been inundated by floodwaters since March 1, 1943, caused by the overflow of any lake, river, stream, or canal, causing the destruction of any growing crop or crops thereon, or causing the delayed planting of any crop or crops on any such land, may, at their discretion, plant or replant any such land in any crop or crops that will mature during the growing season of 1943: *Provided,* That the provisions of this section shall apply to any farm lands on which the growing crops have been destroyed by green bugs: *And Provided further,* That the crops so grown and produced on any such farm land shall not be governed with respect to the sale

thereof by any existing law or rules or regulations made or to be made by any agent or agents of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma subsequently said: Mr. President, at the end of the statement just made by myself, I ask permission to insert a news item descriptive of the damage being done by floods.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The news item is as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 26, 1943]

1,000-MILE FLIGHT OVER FLOOD EMPHASIZES VAST DESOLATION—PEOPLE, FLEEING OVER ANGRY WATERS, CAN COME BACK, BUT CAN 1943'S CROPS?

(By Walter McCallum)

CHICAGO, May 26.—A windmill, futily beating useless arms as at waste of waters in a groove where a turbid river lapped at the eaves of abandoned homes. Cattle, abandoned on a yet dry tongue of land in the middle of yellow flood. Houses careening unoccupied down the snarling waters of an inland empire. Chickens marooned on the roof of floating barns, huddled in terror.

These were the sights seen by a group of newspapermen who flew in an Army flying fortress 1,000 miles along the course of raging rivers above the confluence of the mighty Mississippi with some of its satellite streams.

PEOPLE FLEE IN BOATS

In the picture were villages all but abandoned, residents fleeing across the face of rising waters in small boats, groups of abandoned automobiles isolated on a levee top, a cresting roar of angry waters as the rain-fed flood poured through dozens of breaks in the levee holding back the Mississippi, Illinois, and Ohio Rivers between Memphis and Peoria.

We left Washington on a routine training flight in the post midnight chill, flying through rain over the Great Smokies, over the sleeping towns of Roanoke and Asheville, reaching Memphis as dawn broke. Capt. Spencer Treharne, pilot of the big B-17, based at Hendricks Field, Fla., throttled the ship down and roared above Memphis for long minutes as he awaited daylight to fly above the flooded areas.

Memphis has not yet been badly hit. The river is high, but not outside its banks at the Tennessee city. But soon, as we flew barely 200 feet above the flood, gasoline pumps began to appear in the middle of hundreds of yards of muddy waters, roads abruptly came to a stop as the water lapped at hilltops, bridges creaked at the weight of water, and trains crept through inches of the flood.

One hundred miles above Memphis the raging waters began to get rough. The flood spread out for miles on either side of the normal river channel. Submerged houses showed roof tops, factories stood in the middle of the raging river. Devastation and desolation ruled the waters.

AIRPORT HANGARS SUBMERGED

We flew low over villages whose houses showed only their upper floors, whose church spires stuck out starkly above the flood. We flew over a new airport whose new hangars, fresh-cut wood showing yellow in the dawn were buried under water, and barracks were completely submerged. Gas tanks and gravel dumps loomed above the waters. At St. Louis, where floods are an old story, not much damage was visible. The flood was controlled between banks of concrete.

But above St. Louis we flew for miles over drowned country, where railroads stopped at the edge of the flood and frightened householders waved from upper stories as the big Fortress dipped low at 175 miles an hour.

A hundred miles north of St. Louis, where the muddy Illinois emptied its waters into the Mississippi, we saw barns and houses floating in a great inland lake whose waters spread out over a wide plain between high bluffs. At Cape Girardeau, Mo., the devastation was almost complete.

MAN'S POWER FUTILE

As a scene of waste and destruction it was impressive. As a commentary on the inability of man to handle nature on the rampage it showed man to be the futile tool of raging rivers.

The four-motored bomber thundered through the bleak valley, Captain Treharne, a veteran of Pearl Harbor, turned over the controls to one of his students.

"Not since December 7 have I seen such destruction," he said. "And this hurts almost as much."

"Gosh," said one of the young navigators, "there's more farmland and crops ruined down there than all the victory gardens in the country can produce."

The flood may not be as bad as that of 1926, although some claim it is. It may recede faster than did that one. But it has done a complete job of submerging a tremendous sweep of the most fertile farmland in America.

IMMENSE CROP DAMAGE

Damage is counted in many millions of dollars, although in spots the water has only lapped thinly over fields where the green of crops has just begun to show. They may come back. But in other places the surging river has completely covered thousands of acres with a yellow flood which will leave nothing but a coating of mud when it recedes.

America's farm production is going to be hard hit here. The humans will come back to their ruined homes, sweep out the mud, and resume living. But will the crops come back in time for this critical war year of 1943? No one knows yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The parliamentary situation is that the conference report must first be adopted before there can be consideration of the concurrent resolution. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 2346) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to substitute the following language for that proposed to be inserted by Senate amendment No. 3, as amended: "and so much of the unobligated balance on June 30, 1943, of the appropriation 'Flood control, general,' as the Secretary of War determines to be necessary is hereby made available for the preparation of detailed plans and specifications of authorized flood-control projects, for rescue work or the repair or maintenance of any flood-control work threatened or destroyed by flood, for improvements to any such flood-control projects or flood-control work, for necessary flood-control measures where the Secretary of War, upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, determines that an emergency exists, for reimbursement to the city of Hartford, Conn., as authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, and for construction of the flood-control projects heretofore authorized for the Mermentau River, Bayou Teche, and Vermilion River, La."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before any objection is made to the concurrent resolution in the way of a point of order, I wish to speak for just a moment on the bill which was introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma with respect to the removal of all restrictions so far as the planting of crops is concerned.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Do I understand correctly that the Senator desires immediate action upon the concurrent resolution, or is it to be referred to a committee?

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, a point of order will be raised against the concurrent resolution because it provides for legislation upon an appropriation bill, and I cannot very well object if the point of order is made. I hope it will not be made, but I understand it will be, and obviously I shall abide by the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt, but I shall assume the responsibility of making the point of order. I think the Senator should know that.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. Certainly I cannot object to it, because I am aware that the concurrent resolution is subject to a point of order. However, I wish to make a record so far as concerns what I claim to be necessary in connection with these floods, that is we need speed in enacting appropriate legislation. I present this concurrent resolution in order that I may apprise the Senate and the country of the urgency and immediate need of flood relief legislation.

Now I wish to say a word or two in connection with the bill which was introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. I have contacted Chester Davis, in the Department of Agriculture, who advises me that he has removed practically all the restrictions in the rules of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration which have prevented the expansion of crops. In the conference which I had with Mr. Davis he assured me that all doubtful rules and regulations which might be construed as restrictions upon the planting of crops would be looked into immediately with the view of having them removed.

Mr. President, that is very important. My only reason for mentioning it is that I should not like to have the farmers of the Nation get the notion, as a result of the bill which has been introduced by the able Senator from Oklahoma, that the Agricultural Department, through Mr. Davis, is not attempting by rules and regulations to give to the farmers in my section of the country, as well as in every other section where lands are flooded, the right to plant practically any crop which they can plant, provided the floods sufficiently recede and the lands dry up to such a point that they can plant soybeans, or 90-day corn, or any other crop which they desire to plant. In my judgment, that is one thing about which the farmers are not apprised at the present time.

I believe that sooner or later Mr. Davis will make a statement in connection

with this important problem, and the statement should be made as soon as possible with respect to the removal of restrictions and regulations concerning the planting of crops.

Mr. President, there is one other thing which I should like to have the country know: The Disaster Loan Corporation, which was set up a few years ago by the Congress, is now on the job in these flooded areas, ready to take over when the floods recede to such a point that they can move in and fairly appraise the damage which has been done to the individual home owners in various towns and cities throughout the country, as well as the owners of farm homes.

The Disaster Loan Corporation was a great success in the Ohio Valley, and in every other flooded area where it operated. It now has representatives in the flooded areas contacting the people where necessary, urging them to make applications for loans if they need aid in the rehabilitation and repair of their homes.

I should also like to add that insofar as the loaning of money to the farmers for seed purposes is concerned, I was advised yesterday, in talking with officials of the Farm Credit Administration, that they are on the job in St. Louis, which is the central area of the flood, and that they have plenty of money with which to make all necessary loans in connection with any seed which may be necessary to replant any of the crops which have been inundated and destroyed as a result of this unprecedented flood. It would seem to me that this is extremely important, and I am sure that if they need more money for that purpose the Congress would not hesitate to grant it.

The Federal Housing Authority is also looking into the program with respect to sending trailers into the flooded areas. I understand they have frozen, or have on hand, some 400 or 500 trailers which are available for any of the flooded areas in the event the citizens of a community might find it necessary to use them in connection with the housing of employees or the housing of those who have been evacuated from the flooded area. At least, the trailers might be of considerable help.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the explanation of the able Senator from Illinois with regard to the Disaster Loan Corporation loaning money to farmers, because the same situation exists in the Northwest. I have not had a chance to read the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Illinois. Does it apply to a particular area or the entire United States?

Mr. LUCAS. It covers the entire United States.

Mr. LANGER. From what the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has said, am I to understand that the maintenance of roads which is to be provided for would include new bridges where the old bridges have been destroyed?

Mr. LUCAS. No; the concurrent resolution which I have in mind would have nothing to do with that problem. To meet such a proposal we would necessarily have to enact additional legislation. As the Senator from Oklahoma has said, millions of dollars of damage will result from the destruction of bridges and roads. Among the cities which have been inundated as a result of floods are municipalities which will not be able to take care of the replacement and repair of municipal equipment and property. It will be necessary for the Federal Government to step in and make grants to a number of towns and cities. It may be necessary to rehabilitate completely communities where the destruction of waterworks, streets, and similar utilities has resulted from the floods. Provision for such aid will have to come in a separate measure. It is not included in the proposal now before the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may I inquire if it is the intention of the distinguished Senator to introduce such legislation to provide for the building of bridges?

Mr. LUCAS. It is. I have already taken it up with the Federal Works Administration, and it is my understanding that they will ask to appear before the Lanham committee next week when the committee will hold hearings on a bill to aid and promote the war effort. I am advised that the Federal Works Administration will ask a minimum of $25,000,000 for that particular purpose. I can whole-heartedly support that measure, and if necessary, if what is expected to be done by the House is not done, I will introduce proposed legislation here to that end.

Mr. LANGER. Would that proposed legislation cover floods all over the country?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. Everything I have done here covers the situation all over the United States. The only reason I pointed out Illinois was because it is my home State, and the floods there are so devastating and ruinous that my attention has been focused on conditions there; but I shall leave no stone unturned to give all the legislative help that is necessary to alleviate suffering and the damage throughout the Nation which has been caused by an act of God.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to assure the Senator that he will have all the help I can give him.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that we have in North Dakota some 15 or 17 counties that are not in shape to build bridges. Many bridges are out. One bridge is out on the main highway across the State farther west at Fallon, Mont., with the result that it is necessary to haul war materials 70 or 80 miles south in order to get them across the State. I hope that legislation on this subject will be energetically pushed, and I will do all that I can to help the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The legislation I have in mind would cover the situation disclosed by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in the interest of the proper and appropriate control of legislative procedure, and in deference to the rules of the Senate, I think our legislation should always follow a proper and appropriate line. I am in very deep sympathy with the proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois; indeed, I shall support prudent legislation at the proper time to give relief to the distressed people now suffering from this great disaster; but, Mr. President, it cannot be done in this fashion.

This is an effort to amend an appropriation bill after a conference report has been acted upon by the Senate. One would have to proceed without any regard to the Senate rules if he did not make a point of order, which I now do, first, that the resolution can only be received by unanimous consent, and to that I object.

Secondly, it is an effort to attach legislation to an appropriation bill which has passed both Houses of Congress, and is now the product of a conference committee. So I make the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rules of the Senate, the point of order made by the Senator from Oregon is sustained.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I recognize the validity of the point of order, and I ask at this time, out of order, to introduce a bill to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941, which will accomplish what I proposed in the concurrent resolution. I request that the bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred as requested.

The bill (S. 1134) to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Reed
Bailey	Guffey	Revercomb
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hatch	Robertson
Bilbo	Hawkes	Russell
Bone	Hayden	Smith
Brewster	Hill	Stewart
Bridges	Holman	Taft
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Langer	Tobey
Bushfield	Lodge	Truman
Butler	Lucas	Tunnell
Byrd	McCarran	Tydings
Capper	McClellan	Vandenberg
Caraway	McFarland	Van Nuys
Chandler	McKellar	Wagner
Chavez	McNary	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wheeler
Danaher	Mead	White
Davis	Millikin	Wiley
Eastland	Moore	Willis
Ellender	Nye	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Daniel	
George	O'Mahoney	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF HIS EXCELLENCY, HON. EDWIN BARCLAY, PRESIDENT OF LIBERIA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in a few minutes President Barclay of Liberia will visit the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that the Chair name a commit-

tee to escort him to the floor of the Senate, and that then the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], as the committee to greet the President of Liberia and escort him into the Chamber.

Pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement, the Senate will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess, at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m., His Excellency, Hon. Edwin Barclay, President of Liberia, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. Hill, Mr. McNary, Mr. Wagner, and Mr. Capper, preceded by the Secretary, Edwin A. Halsey, and the Sergeant at Arms, Wall Doxey, entered the Chamber and took the place assigned him on the rostrum in front of the Vice President's desk.

The members of the party accompanying the President of Liberia, including Hon. W. V. S. Tubman, President-elect of Liberia; Capt. Alford Russ, the military aide to President Barclay; Brig. Gen. Benjamin Davis, United States Military Aide; Mr. Fred Hibbard and Mr. Stanley Woodward, on behalf of the United States State Department; and Mr. Walter Walker, Liberian Consul General, New York City, entered the Chamber and were escorted to the seats assigned them on the floor to the left of the Vice President's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate, ladies and gentlemen, I introduce to you the President of Liberia. [Applause.]

President BARCLAY. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I wish to express to you my high appreciation of the courtesy shown me in permitting me to observe for a few moments the processes of lawmaking in the United States. [Applause.]

Following his salutation, the President of Liberia and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were escorted from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m. the Senate reassembled, when it was called to order by the Vice President.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 170. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. T. Travis;

H. R. 328. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, because of military operations, to defer or waive payments under nonmineral leases of public lands in Alaska;

H. R. 535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Donna Pittel;

H. R. 940. An act for the relief of Howard E. Dickison;

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Alva Burton Rickey;

H. R. 1468. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Azer; and

H. R. 2067. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. M. Reid & Co., of Macon, Ga.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 777. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia," approved February 24, 1914;

H. R. 1153. An act for the relief of Cordie Underwood and Wilbur Kea;

H. R. 1667. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation; and

H. R. 2115. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House; asked conferences with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. PATTON, and Mr. PITTENGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conferences:

H. R. 235. An act for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey; and

H. R. 1784. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. PITTENGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7. An act making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; and

H. R. 2427. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 170. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. T. Travis;

H. R. 328. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, because of military operations, to defer or waive payments under nonmineral leases of public lands in Alaska;

H. R. 535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Donna Pittel;

H. R. 777. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia," approved February 24, 1914;

H. R. 940. An act for the relief of Howard E. Dickison;

H. R. 1153. An act for the relief of Cordie Underwood and Wilbur Kea;

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Alva Burton Rickey;

H. R. 1468. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Azer;

H. R. 1667. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria, & Washington Railway Co., a corporation;

H. R. 2067. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. M. Reid & Co., of Macon, Ga.; and

H. R. 2115. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 7. An act making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2427. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1762) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] desires to make a speech on the bill at this time, and I therefore yield to him.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield long enough for me to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. At the meeting of the Senate on Monday an amendment was offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], which was agreed to, providing for the restoration of the salaries of the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission to their statutory level.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It left out the members of the Tariff Commission——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. And of the Maritime Commission.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. This is a question to be settled in conference, and since the same action was not taken in regard to the members of the other two commissions, would it be out of harmony with the ideas of the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if I should ask unanimous consent that the members of the Tariff Commission and the members of the Maritime Commission be

treated as were the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, so that the whole question may go to conference and be considered as an entirety, instead of the amendment probably being thrown out because one commission is treated in one way and the others in another?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator was present on Monday last, and will recall that in the discussion which then arose between the Senator from Montana and me I suggested, as I recall, that the members of the other two commissions named in section 102 were in exactly the same attitude, insofar as the law enacted by Congress in 1932 was concerned, as were the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I suggested, then, that if the salaries of the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission were increased, by the same token the salaries of the members of the two other commissions should be increased, and if the Senator asks unanimous consent thus to amend section 102, on page 66 of the bill, I shall not object.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that section 102 may be amended by removing the limitation on the salaries of the members of the Tariff Commission and members of the Maritime Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I am not sure that I will, I think that the suggestion made by the Senator from Utah fits in with the provisions of the bill. I will ask the Senator from Tennessee whether that is correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it does fit into the bill. The language of the bill, on page 66, section 102, is as follows:

SEC. 102. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, the salaries of the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Commissioners of the United States Maritime Commission, with the exception of the Chairman so long as the office is held by the present incumbent, and the Commissioners of the United States Tariff Commission shall be at the rate of $10,000 each per annum.

The unanimous consent request made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] refers to the language of section 66 on page 102.

I wish to say that these salaries were changed through an act of Congress, and, by the way, in an appropriation bill, in 1932, and they have continuously since that time remained at $10,000. I am very frank to say that I do not think that members of the Government, even though their duties are increased, who are receiving as much as $10,000—what I say does not apply to the lower paid employees—should ask or expect an increase of salary, but if the salaries of the Interstate Commerce Commissioners are increased, the same action should be taken with respect to the members of the Maritime Commission and the Tariff Commission.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, may we have a ruling on my unanimous consent request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]?

Mr. REED. Yes, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yielded only for the purpose of a question; not for the purpose of a unanimous consent request being made.

Mr. President, I rise to oppose the proposed increase in the appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board offered by the Senator from Tennessee, and also to oppose the committee amendment which would appropriate $200,000 for the National Resources Planning Board, after all appropriations for that board have been eliminated by the House of Representatives. In opposing the proposed amendment and the proposed appropriation I wish to make it clear that I am not opposed to the making of post-war plans. I strongly supported the resolution creating the George post-war planning committee, and I am a member of that committee. I believe the George committee will undertake to develop as constructive a program as possible, with some relation to the realities, and I believe that the making of post-war plans in a broad way should be left to that committtee It is not as if the National Resources Planning Board were going to make any detailed plans. They do not make detailed plans. A few moments ago the Army engineers were granted $6,000,000 for the making of actual plans for public works on the rivers and harbors. The National Resources Planning Board is merely trying to do with Government appropriations what the George committee can perfectly well do.

Mr. President, I am not opposed to planning by private organizations, no matter what they may be. I should be glad to have plans made by communistic organizations, or Socialist organizations, or even Fascist organizations, insofar as they are merely private organizations, but I oppose this proposed appropriation because of the kind of planning which the National Resources Planning Board has done, and is doing, and is proposing to do, and the kind of plans which they are making for the people of the United States.

I cannot understand why a Congress which believes and constantly reasserts its beliefs, in one philosophy of government, approximately the same philosophy which has guided this country for the last 150 years, should provide hundreds of thousands of dollars promiscuously for the making of plans by an agency which believes in an entirely different philosophy, which appears to be partly socialistic and partly the product of a dangerous financial imagination. Why should the Congress finance a propaganda which is aimed directly at the principles and convictions of a large majority of both Houses of Congress? Why should we give the agency in question 10 times or even 4 times the amount of money we have given to the George post-war problems committee? If there is to be an administrative agency to deal with planning, a new one should be created, its powers and duties carefully defined, and the appointment of its members confirmed by the Senate of the United States. There is no legislative authority for this board except in one small respect, and the members, so far as I know, have never been confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the planning of the National Resources Planning Board, because after reading practically all the documents which they have prepared, I find they are based on two principles which I thoroughly disapprove and which I believe are disapproved by a majority of the Congress of the United States in both Houses.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him in order that I may comment about the statement just made that there was no statutory authority for the National Resources Planning Board I should like to explain to the Senator that in 1939 a point of order was made against a similar appropriation on the ground that there was no statutory authority for it. That point of order was overruled by the Senate. In the debate it was explained that the legislative authority for the Board is contained in the Federal Employment Stabilization Act of 1931 which was passed under the administration of President Hoover, and in a joint resolution of July 7, 1939, public resolution No. 20, Seventy-sixth Congress. It is found on page 230 of the Senate hearings on this bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, probably I overstated the fact when I said there is no legislative authority. There is nothing in the statute which authorizes the writing of this kind of legislation or which authorizes any of the activities in which the National Resources Planning Board has engaged. The statute contains a carry-over authority of some kind from the Federal Employment Stabilization Committee. Strictly speaking I may be wrong, but as a practical matter I am correct, when I say that the Congress has never passed a planning law, has never created a planning agency, and has never given the Board authority to do the kind of things it is doing, unless by the appropriation of money from time to time.

As I have said, I have read the reports. I cannot claim that I have read every word of them. I have gone through them page by page. In my opinion, they are based on two policies and theories. The first is the theory of unlimited public spending and the constant increase of the public debt after the war. A policy of deficit spending is implicit in the measures the Board proposes and in its attitude toward the spending of Government money. In the second place, the Board's plans are based on unlimited Government interference in and regulation of all business activity, plus a very large amount of Government regulation of what is now private

industry. I intend to review the reports in order to support those conclusions.

I note the letter from Mr. Charles E. Merriam, vice chairman and member of the Board, which was inserted in the RECORD of May 20 by the distinguished majority leader. In that letter Mr. Merriam denies that the Board advocates deficit spending as a continuous policy of the Federal Government. In spite of Mr. Merriam's denial, I think I can show that the Board has taken just that position. Mr. Merriam further denies that the Board believes that we are no longer in an expanding and dynamic economy. I do not know who criticized him for that, but certainly the criticism was justified. The real fact is that the Board is in favor of an economy expanding like a balloon, and just as certain to be blown up if we keep following the program it has advocated.

I wish to have printed in the RECORD at this point, Mr. President, in fairness, the letter I have received from Mr. Frederic A. Delano, chairman of the National Resources Planning Board, in which he also denies that a policy of deficit spending is advocated by the Board. In the letter he says:

> The position of the Board is that public financing should be used as an instrument of public policy and whether financing by deficit or otherwise, it should depend upon the condition with which Government must deal at the time.

It seems to me that that statement itself is an equivocal one. It seems to say that deficits are wholly unimportant except as instruments of public policy. I think that position is reflected by the complete absence from all the Board's reports of any answer to the question with respect to where the money is coming from.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR TAFT: I have just read with much interest a report in the New York Times for May 20 of an address delivered by you to the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.

I found your remarks very interesting. In many particulars the position taken by you on questions of government policy is substantially the same as that taken by the National Resources Planning Board. I refer especially to what you had to say about private enterprise, the appropriate role of Federal loans, a social security program, etc.

I am sure you will not object, however, to my calling your attention to a part of your address which, unfortunately, charges the National Resources Planning Board with advocating policies which in fact the Resources Board advocates no more than do you. I refer to the statements you made regarding deficit financing. No doubt you were misled into the statement you have made by the recent book published by Dr. Moulton. Mr. Beardsley Ruml, one of the Board's consultants, recently said in New York "Dr. Moulton's reference to the Board is an uninformed misstatement of the Board's recommendations."

It is the policy of the Board, and in that the Board merely accepts the policy which this country has adhered to from the beginning, that there are conditions in which public expenditures must exceed the revenues, and deficit financing must be resorted to. The present war provides one of those conditions, and no one would deny the appropriateness of deficit financing at this time This is far from saying that continuous deficit financing is either necessary or proper, for the Board neither advocates nor believes in such a policy. Quite the contrary, there are times when the revenues of government should exceed expenditures—sometimes by wide margins. It is possible that shortly after the end of this war conditions will develop wherein the tendency to inflation will have to be controlled by collections in excess of expenditures and sharp reduction in debt.

One of the statements quoted by Dr. Moulton in itself states this position. It is as follows:

"Whether taxes should equal, fall short of, or exceed expenditures must be decided according to economic conditions" (p. 17, National Resources Development, 1942 report, National Resources Planning Board).

The position of the Board is that public financing should be used as an instrument of public policy and whether financing by deficit or otherwise, it should depend upon the condition with which Government must deal at the time.

Personally, I write thus fully because I know that you will not at any time willfully misrepresent our position, and I am sure you realize also that at this time it is most important that all good Americans understand one another.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERIC A. DELANO,
Chairman.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I turn now to the reports of the Board itself. Up to the year 1940 the Board's reports were comparatively harmless. In February 1940 we discussed the appropriation for the Board; and about all the Board said it was going to do was to inaugurate a study of national relief policy and a study of transportation. The only question before Congress at that time, 3 years ago, was whether the Board was the proper agency to do that work or whether other agencies were already engaged in it. Even at that time the motion of the senior Senator from Louisiana to reduce the appropriation to $100,000 was rejected in the Senate by only one vote; but in 1941 the Board started on its course of advanced thinking, and its program reached its culmination in the recent 1943 report. Let me say that also in 1940 the Board was recommending a program of Federal public works. It had very limited ideas or figures at that time, and the total program it was submitting was one calling for approximately $6,000,000,000 of expenditures. A large part of the works recommended were actually planned by the Army engineers and consisted of the same kind of public works we had previously undertaken.

But the general method pursued by the Board in its reports is to state broad ideals with which no one would disagree as general objectives of public policy, then to belittle all past efforts to reach those ideals, and finally to promise the American people that the reaching of those ideals is a simple matter if we merely follow the methods proposed by the National Resources Planning Board. The actual methods presented are vague and indefinite; but no argument is admitted to exist in opposition to the Board's proposals. The proposals are plausible because no analysis of them is made.

The difficulties of carrying out the proposals are never mentioned, and the unfortunate results of abandoning certain basic American principles are completely disregarded. The result is that the general effect of the reports is to make false promises to the people, to assure them of obtaining results which cannot possibly be secured, and which at best can only be a far-distant goal.

In order to show what I mean, I shall read first from the 1942 report. In that report the Board says that the American Bill of Rights and the Constitution are more or less outmoded, and that the Board has drawn up a new bill of rights to take their place.

The 1942 report proposes, therefore, a bill of rights. It follows up the "four freedoms" in general:

> Any new declaration of personal rights * * * here and now must include:
>
> 1. The right to work, usefully and creatively through the productive years.
>
> 2. The right to fair pay, adequate to command the necessities and amenities of life in exchange for work, ideas, thrift, and other socially valuable service.
>
> 3. The right to adequate food, clothing, shelter, and medical care.
>
> 4. The right to security, with freedom from fear of old age, want, dependency sickness, unemployment, and accident.
>
> 5. The right to live in a system of free enterprise, free from compulsory labor, irresponsible private power, arbitrary public authority, and unregulated monopolies.
>
> 6. The right to come and go, to speak or to be silent, free from the spyings of secret political police.

That right is already guaranteed in the Bill of Rights.

> 7. The right to equality before the law, with equal access to justice in fact.

That is a right which our people have had for 150 years.

> 8. The right to education, for work, for citizenship, and for personal growth and happiness; and
>
> 9. The right to rest, recreation, and adventure; the opportunity to enjoy life and take part in an advancing civilization.

The Bill of Rights which is set forth in the report is a new Bill of Rights. Of course, most of the rights are perfectly proper goals. Everyone would like to attain them. But to promise every citizen of the United States those rights is to promise something which a large number of people may never succeed in securing.

In the 1943 report, that program is joined with the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." On pages 6 and 7 of the report we find:

> It is time to outline more sharply a program through which democratic ideals may be more perfectly realized in the affairs of the community in the post-war period. The broad bases of such a program have already been stated in the "four freedoms" and

in the Atlantic Charter. We have previously endeavored to spell out the program in greater detail in the new Bills of Rights and in the five specific objectives presented in our report for 1942.

In the 1943 report the rights are again stated, and with the statement that—

The Board further believes that it should be the declared policy of the United States Government:

To underwrite full employment for the employables;

To guarantee a job for every man released from the armed forces and the war industries at the close of the war, with fair pay and working conditions;

To guarantee and, when necessary, underwrite:

Equal access to security,

Equal access to education for all,

Equal access to health and nutrition for all, and

Wholesome housing conditions for all.

It is proposed to underwrite and guarantee every one of the rights in the new bill of rights which is set out in the 1943 report. The language in the 1943 report is large and global. It is attractive; but it either states principles which everyone has admitted, or it states as rights and promises something that we cannot possibly in good faith promise the American people.

We look to and plan for:

1. The fullest possible development of the human personality, in relation to the common good, in a framework of freedoms and rights, of justice, liberty, equality, and the consent of the governed.

There is page after page of that sort of language. It has been written before. So far as substance is concerned, if any of these reports could not be written with one-fourth the space and paper used, I should be very much mistaken.

As a means of protecting justice, freedom, and democracy:

2. The fullest possible development of the productive potential of all of our resources, material and human, with full employment, continuity of income, equal access to minimum security and living standards, and a balance between economic stability and social adventure.

There we have the ultimate goal. We are to assure everyone a balance between economic stability and social adventure. The United States Government is to make this world an adventurous world, in which everyone shall have a tremendously good time and the opportunity to enjoy all the adventures which he may witness on the silver screen.

I read further:

As means of insuring the peaceful pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness:

III. An effective jural order of the world outlawing violence and imperialism, old or new fashioned, in international relations—

The Board is stepping out a little when it departs from the domestic field. I do not believe it claims to have any power to make post-war international plans—

and permitting and energizing the fullest development of resources and rights everywhere.

The three factors—democracy, dynamic economy, and peace—never in the history of our time have been united in a political system.

But the National Resources Planning Board finds no difficulty in doing so. It says:

This is a novel combination never before attempted as a whole, although tried in part, nor ever before possible in man's history until the present time.

All previous rules are to be set aside; all the difficulties involved are to be overcome; and we are to step into a complete Utopia.

Mr. President, I have studied the reports with some care, and I have yet to find any specific recommendations to explain, for example, how the Government can underwrite a full and useful job for every citizen of the United States, which the Board says we must guarantee. Certainly we must guarantee some relief, but how can we guarantee a full and useful job for every person in the United States? Suppose there are 15,000,000 people in need of a "full and useful job." How are we to find useful things on which to employ them? How are we to find the money to pay them $1,500 or $2,000 a year each, which would amount to $20,000,000,000, to give every man a full and useful job?

Does the Board say where the money is to come from? It does not. There is no suggestion anywhere as to how this vast promise is to be carried out.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should be interested to be advised, if the Senator has the information, as to what becomes of the reports and suggestions, couched in such beautiful generalities. I do not recall that any bill sponsored by the National Resources Planning Board to carry out any one of these recommendations, whether good, bad or indifferent, has ever been submitted to the Congress. Of course, we have had legislation dealing with the various topics to which the Board refers; but, so far as I know, no bill or plan has been presented to the Congress to carry out any of the objectives to which the National Resources Planning Board refers. I am wondering whether or not it is a waste of time, paper, and good literature to prepare and submit such reports, and have nothing done about them.

Mr. TAFT. I believe the Senator to be correct. I do not know of any bill which the National Resources Planning Board has ever prepared, except one, proposing the appropriation of more money to provide State planning associations to work in cooperation with the National Resources Planning Board. I know of no actual legislation.

Furthermore, I do not think anyone who might actually set out to write a statute would find any help in anything I have read from the National Resources Planning Board's reports. The reports may give one a global idea of the situation; but so far as getting down to brass tacks is concerned, so far as real legislation and the creation of real work is concerned, I do not think the reports would be of any assistance.

Mr. OVERTON. I thoroughly agree with the Senator.

There is another phase of the matter. Does the Senator know of any particular project which has been recommended by the National Resources Planning Board as such, which has come before the Congress for authorization?

Mr. TAFT. I should not like to say that there were none. There have been measures relating to some of the matters recommended by the Board. My impression is that those bills have come from the departments more directly interested.

Mr. OVERTON. I am familiar, for example, with the work done by the Army engineers with reference to rivers and harbors, flood control, and various other projects. They make their recommendations made by the Chief of Engineers with respect to those projects. However, I understand—I may be in error—that there was an Executive order that all the projects approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors should be submitted to the National Resources Planning Board before any report thereon was made by the Chief of Engineers. Nevertheless the Commerce Committee of the Senate and the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House act upon the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers. We do not wait for any recommendation to be made by the National Resources Planning Board in respect to any such projects.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. With reference to the Senator's inquiry about any of the plans suggested by the Board being written into legislation, I think we should understand, first, that the National Resources Planning Board is not what might be termed a "line" agency; it is not an executive or administrative agency. It is a staff agency for the coordination and correlation, in large measure, of the plans of other agencies. It serves very much the same purpose for planning as does the Bureau of the Budget for appropriations or financing.

Take the subject of social security as an example. The National Resources Planning Board would not come to Congress with a bill in connection with social security. It would help coordinate and correlate the plans of agencies dealing with social security. However, any proposed legislation would very likely come from the administrative or line agency having to do with social security, which is, of course, the Federal Security Administration.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the development of a proper social-security program—and I am in favor of it—can best be accomplished in the most constructive way by the George committee preparing a social-security program, and the Finance Committee of the Senate developing such a program. I do not believe they will receive much assistance from the report on Security, Work, and Relief Policies issued by the National Resources Planning Board. They may receive some assist-

ance from it, but so far as specific measures are concerned, I doubt it.

Mr. HILL. I disagree with the Senator. Since I have been a Member of Congress I have not found that the Congress has been able to draft any comprehensive legislation dealing with a fundamental, over-all subject such as social security. It must have the benefit of the advice, opinions, and studies of those at the other end of the Avenue who have the time to make such studies, which the Congress and its committees do not have. The Congress does not have time to make studies and investigations, and bring forth expert advice.

Mr. TAFT. Perhaps Congress can do better in the future than it has done in the past, now that the Senator from Alabama is a Member of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. To be perfectly frank, in my opinion, no group of men anywhere work harder, more devotedly, or more indefatigably, than Members of Congress. However, the average Member of Congress, be he in the Senate or in the House of Representatives, has so many things to do that he cannot become an expert on the various phases of social security in the same way that a man in the Social Security Administration, who devotes his full time to one particular thing, can become expert.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, whether or not Congress can do it, it is certain that the National Resources Planning Board will not do it. The department concerned with the matter will do it. If it is not done in Congress, the Social Security Board will prepare and present a measure, as it has presented a number of social-security measures heretofore.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. In that connection, may I inquire of the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Alabama, or any other Senator, if he knows whether the Chairman or any member of the National Resources Planning Board has ever appeared before the Senate committee dealing with social-security legislation and made a recommendation or submitted any concrete plan for legislation?

Mr. TAFT. So far as I know, he has not appeared before the Finance Committee since I have been a member of that committee.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, it is not the function of the officials of the National Resources Planning Board to appear before congressional committees. The so-called line agencies, the executive and administrative agencies having jurisdiction of the particular matter, come before Congress to present proposed legislation on the present testimony. Much of what they present may well be based on plans which have been correlated or coordinated for them, or provided for them, by the National Resources Planning Board.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to read a few more of the global promises, so to speak, of the National Resources Planning Board before proceeding to a discussion of their financial policy.

The report states:

Enough for all is now possible for the first time in history.

Mr. TOBEY. Enough of what?

Mr. TAFT. Enough food and everything else for all for the first time in history. There is always a reflection on the past. No one really did anything before the Board came into existence.

I continue reading:

With the will to act it is possible to reach this peacetime goal with no great departure from the pattern of life and enterprise that we have enjoyed. Government can and should underwrite effective demand for goods and services. * * *

The Government need not, and should not, alone undertake the attainment of such high national production, but can underwrite it and cooperate in its attainment. * * *

In peace no less than in war, leadership must come from the stout-hearted, the buoyant of spirit, and the fertile of mind.

I do not know whether the Board was referring to the present administration, or whether it was referring to the members of the Board. In any event, it is certainly promising something big when it asserts that:

In peace no less than in war, leadership must come from the stout-hearted, the buoyant of spirit, and the fertile of mind.

The report continues:

The best discipline, the highest morale, the greatest productivity are alike the products of good will, mutual confidence, and genuine cooperation among men. The loftier values of life are not fostered by brutality and violence, but by reason and justice.

The Board certainly has made an extraordinary discovery. All this language is along that general line. It seems to me to be a pure waste of time. So far as it is merely a promise to create this condition and a statement that it can be done without the slightest difficulty, I think it is most unfortunate in its results.

Mr. President, I have studied the reports with some care, and I have yet to find any specific recommendation explaining, for instance, how the Government can underwrite a full and useful job for every citizen of the United States. I have yet to find any method proposed by which we can guarantee to every man social adventure or the right to fair play. In short, the reports are a combination of "hooey" and false promises which can only prove a snare and a delusion to those who take them seriously.

Coming to the financial policy implied in these reports, I think it is fair to say that they endorse the theory that there is no limit to Government spending because I can find nowhere any suggestion as to how the money is to be raised. In one place the reports contain a recommendation that corporate taxes and consumption taxes should be reduced, although at the same time they recommend a large increase in peace-time expenditures.

In the 1941 report we find the first reference to the general theory which underlies the remainder of the reports. On page 4 there is a kind of paean of joy at the results of the war spending. For the first time the Government has spent a considerable amount of money.

The 1941 report states:

The barrier that stands between us and the attainment of what we have looked on as the American standard of living is in part a psychological barrier. It is the notion that only through a vast national abstinence can we provide heeded capital improvements or public works; that if we wish to provide these things we shall have to tighten our belts; that is, reduce our standard of living.

In other words, it is no longer necessary for anyone to accumulate savings or save capital. All we need to do is to allow the Government to provide it.

The report continues:

The current and dramatic example, the decision by the Congress and the Executive to do the things required in our defense program—

This was back in 1941—

has set in motion a connected series of forces which will in time go far toward attaining the goal of full employment. Given our resources, equipment, techniques, and skills, only that decision—only that courageous implementation of the will-to-do—was required to release the log jam of idle plants and idle men.

Just spend enough Government money.

True, many of those "logs" will be long in reaching the mills, will require time in reaching their final stage of finished products, but the jam has been broken. It is an instructive commentary on our times that only under the threat of external aggression could we as a people summon the courage to implement this will-to-do.

There is no suggestion or mention of the fact that the will-to-do is implemented by a $6,000,000,000 Government deficit which since that time has become a $60,000,000,000 Government deficit.

There is no suggestion whatever that there is any problem in financing any of this program. All we have to do is to go ahead and spend the money, and everything will be Utopian. The clear implication is that since employment was produced by a Government deficit in wartime, it should be produced by a Government deficit in peacetime.

In the fall of 1941 the Board issued a pamphlet called After Defense—What? On pages 3 and 4 thereof I find the following statement of its views:

When we organize for maximum production on the basis of full employment, without being stopped by the costs, we discover, as have other nations, that increased production pays the real costs involved. Doing the job pays the bill. In other words, the central problem is not money: it is manpower, resources, and organization. At last we are beginning to see that finance was made for man, and not man for finance.

A modern nation cannot avoid balancing its total production-consumption budget.

When the Board says that "doing the job pays the bill," it can mean only one thing. Obviously it does not pay the Government debt. It means that the Government debt makes no difference. If deficits make no difference, there is no object in avoiding deficits, and we are bound to have a continuing deficit policy, in spite of Mr. Merriam's denial.

On page 15 of this pamphlet there is a reference to the President's request for a plan of financing post-war activities, but neither here nor elsewhere has any plan been suggested.

> The President has asked the Board, in cooperation with other departments and agencies, to study how the needed activities of the post-defense period are to be financed and what devices can be evolved for appropriate sharing of the costs.

That is the only reference I can find anywhere to the question as to where the money is to come from to pay for this "courageous implementation of the will to do."

All these reports, like the 1941 quotation regarding the "courageous implementation of the will to do," are based on the theory that we can prime the pump by public works and Government spending; that such spending is a good thing, no matter whether the public works are valuable or not. As Mr. Yantis, one of the members of the Board, testified several years ago before a House committee, the Board believes that "even leaf-raking creates wealth." If leaf-raking creates wealth, that means, in effect, that Government spending itself creates wealth, and that we do not need to do anything else; we do not need to worry about anything further.

In my opinion, public works should be undertaken for the value they give the public or as a means to furnish absolutely necessary relief. They should not be undertaken for the purpose of spending money.

I shall make a brief reference to Prof. Alvin H. Hansen because he is the economic adviser of the Board, and probably the most influential adviser of the Board. I quote briefly from some of his views on the same subject. He says:

> We shall come out of the war debt-free. We shall have no external debt, only an internal debt. A public debt internally held has none of the essential earmarks of a private debt. A public debt is an instrument of public policy. It is a means to control the national income, in conjunction with the tax structure, to regulate the distribution of income. An internal debt is, in fact, so different from what we commonly think of as debt * * * that it should scarcely be called a debt at all.

He says further:

> The attack on chronic unemployment by means of public expenditures financed by a continually rising public debt is essentially a conservative proposal and—

The Board has not endorsed Mr. Hansen in every respect, but, nevertheless, he is a guiding factor in their financial economy.

I have already referred, Mr. President, to the many rights which the Government is required to guarantee and underwrite. This implies that the Government must provide all these rights, no matter what the cost. The cost would be staggering, probably half the total income of the people of the United States in normal times. There is not even a hint in the reports of the tremendous cost of guaranteeing these rights, and underwriting them, even if it were desirable to do so.

The next element of spending proposed is found on pages 6 and 7 of the 1943 report. On those pages there is discussed spending for foreign or international purposes after the war. I quote from the report:

> The United States must gear its agriculture and industry to the tasks involved, and perhaps apply some form of lease-lend, use its shipping facilities, and supply technicians and organizers on a scale unknown heretofore.

The report further states:

> Whatever domestic policies we adopt for insuring full employment might, therefore, be adjusted to the fact that there will be a large-scale development and growth of our capital goods industries for a number of years in order to aid in the development of Europe, China, Latin America, or other areas.

They are going to spend Government money in order to aid the development of all the rest of the world.

While I am on this point, I read a little reference to immigration:

> Another question of external-internal relations which will rise again is that of migration and population resettlements after the war. The United States can maintain its present restrictive migration policy with a clear conscience only to the extent to which we help to maintain employment and production elsewhere so as to make need for immigration less urgent.

In other words, we either have to spend a great amount of money helping other nations to support their unemployed, or we have to let them come here and work in the United States.

When we come to the industrial part of the 1943 program we find countless proposals for spending Government money in industry. First of all, we have the numerous public-works projects. We are going to spend, so far as I can estimate, on public works anywhere from three to six million dollars a year; and when we come to the industrial proposals we find that we are going to finance practically all industry. I will refer later to the different regulations; but every single proposal that is made involves the spending of Government money on industry.

When we come to the social-security report on security work and relief policies, there is not even an estimate of the expense. I estimate that the Beveridge plan in England as applied to this country would cost about $21,000,000,000 a year. The program of the National Resources and Planning Board would certainly cost all of that, plus a number of billions for education and various other services not included in the Beveridge report.

On page 15, without any real study of housing needs, the Board advocates "a large public-housing program." Anyone with any sense would advocate a housing program that is financed, so far as possible, by private money, supplemented only to the extent absolutely necessary by public funds; but the Board is in favor right off, quickly, without any further consideration of a large public-housing program.

Surely a board that can propose all this Government spending, and suggest nothing in the way of taxes except a reduction both of corporation and consumers taxes, is really advocating a continuous taxation policy. There is not the slightest evidence to discuss the dangers of Government spending.

We shall come out of this war with a public debt of at least $300,000,000,000. That presents the most serious threat to our entire economy; the problem of meeting that threat is the most serious problem that any post-war planner could confront; and yet the National Resources Planning Board passes it off without a word.

Instead of that, we are asked for a continuation in peacetime of the tremendous spending of war and after the war a constant increase of the public debt for peace expenditures as well as to replace those of war. Incidentally, apparently, we are going to continue the war expenditures at the rate of some $20,000,000,000 a year for 2 or 3 or 4 years to come. There can be only two results of such a spending policy. The first is tremendously to increase taxation. Such taxation would be a heavy burden on every worker. It would choke industrial activity; it would start every new enterprise with two strikes against it before it started. The alternative to a tremendously burdensome tax system, practically choking further development of the country, is inflation, taxing the wage-earner in the increased wages which he pays for food and clothing. We have seen how difficult it is even in war-time to prevent inflation resulting from vast Government spending. In peace-time, when the people would simply refuse to submit to the fierce regulation of wages and prices, there would be no possibility of stopping the indefinite rise of prices and the destruction of the value of money, savings, life insurance, and all the accumulations of a lifetime.

Mr. President, apart from this spending philosophy which underlies every suggestion of the National Resources Planning Board, and will underlie everything they do hereafter, we find now another plan to create prosperity. That plan is Government action to stimulate industry or to operate industry. That is a new feature of the 1943 report. Up to that time it was largely a question of private enterprise, and even in the 1943 report lip service is constantly paid to private enterprise and at the same time that socialistic plans are advanced to regulate and socialize and governmentize all industry. I quote briefly from the 1943 report which sets forth this philosophy, beginning with page 10.

In dealing first with the demobilization of war plants, machines, and war contracts, the Board is to plan "for a more desirable regional distribution of manufacturing from the standpoint of national defense and local diversification, by retaining in operation selected plants, financed in new industrial areas during the war by the Defense Plant Corporation or directly by Government allowance of rapid depreciation." Other plants are to be checked up.

The Government is to decide where industry is to be and where industry is not to be. At one point the Board indicate that they wish to have industry

arranged so that there will not be as much hauling on the railroads, or cross hauling. It is all to be arranged. They are to give "technical assistance to private operators of war plants to find the most appropriate peacetime use for their buildings, equipment, and labor skills." Then they will only lend money, apparently, to those plants which take their advice. In other words, they are going into the post-war period and declare what kind of industries shall be engaged in, where they shall be, and what kind of machinery shall be employed.

Placing of orders for new major development projects, especially in the fields of urban reconstruction, river-basin development, agricultural rehabilitation, and modernization of transportation, by Government agencies, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or the modified form of Federal Development Corporation suggested below. (The procedure would stimulate activity in such basic industries as steel and light metals, other construction materials, machinery, and machine tools, as well as in the construction industry itself.)

In other words, they are going to direct just exactly how industry is to be made over, and how it is going to start in the new world.

Provision for plant rehabilitation grants to be used for diversion of plant to peacetime production.

In my opinion, Mr. President, there will be no difficulty whatever in the post-war world for plants to finance themselves. If we only have a free capital market, if it is not suppressed, if the Government keeps out of business, I do not think they will have any difficulty in financing themselves. I do not believe there is any necessity for Government financing, except, perhaps, in the case of smaller industries and the small plants which have not access to proper financing, and if we make proper plans to secure financing fror the public it seems to me that even such plants should be able to secure it. It has not been difficult in the past; and I believe that through a proper organization of private capital, and the investment of capital in small plants, Government assistance can be eliminated even in that field. I read further from the report:

Granting of low-interest-rates Government loans to projects approved for conversion.

In other words, it is proposed that we subsidize industry, but as an accompaniment of subsidizing industry, it is proposed that we decide exactly what industries shall go ahead and what industries shall not go ahead.

Then the Board proceeds to the general question of Government operation. They say:

Extension and new forms of joint private and governmental partnership, through use of mixed incorporations, granting or insurance of loans, or other joint ventures, etc. Government is already taking considerable part in the management of the many war industries which have been greatly expanded by the use of Government funds. Consideration should be given to the desirability of various types of partnership in the direction of those industries of crucial importance in both a wartime and a peacetime economy and in which the Government has made great investments In this category are aluminum, magnesium, shipbuilding, and aircraft. Government has a direct responsibility and should participate in the decisions as to what areas and what concerns should continue to operate in these industries.

That idea is developed further. They say:

Wartime experience has indicated the public importance of certain industries and the desirability of continued Federal control of their operation. Industries based on scarce raw materials, or those with rapidly diminishing reserves, and industries supplying power and fuels, fall into this category. Transportation and other public services may likewise be more closely controlled in the interest of national defense and the public welfare. The Government should retain control over patents and properties seized from enemy aliens, and operate them directly or license their use in such a way as to encourage competitive development.

Further on it is indicated th..t the Government should develop a general plan on the question of real estate in cities. On page 35 of the report it is said:

We can accomplish the rebuilding of urban America in our generation if we will make and use the tools that are needed. Enlarged powers and programs of action will be necessary at all levels of government.

In localities we shall need:

* * * * *

Public power to construct, lease, sell or manage housing, commercial, or industrial structures, transportation terminals of all kinds including automobile and aircraft parking and storage facilities; to acquire terminal rights of all forms of transportation for redevelopment, relocation, or consolidation.

There is not any practical limit to the recommendations toward Government participation in industry. Nowhere do I find any suggestion that there should be any lessening of regulation of private industry. There is nothing said in any way about relaxing any of the controls which have practically choked the American people in wartime. In fact, we are warned specifically against relaxing a good many of the wartime controls. It is said:

It is possible that some whole industries created to meet the Nation's need will appropriately be the Nation's charge as they retool and convert for peacetime pursuits.

I do not know exactly what the Board meant by that, but it sounds again like Government control. All these existing agencies are to be continued. They say:

Administrative organization must be provided for the execution of this legislative authority and to assure the people of an orderly devolution of forms of economic, fiscal, and social controls required by war but which should be modified or relaxed. These forms will involve institutions which will be governmental, private, and mixed. They will be the instrumentalities through which the people will achieve the fruits of a democratic victory.

Then they suggest that all the existing agencies would better look out for their own work and their own jobs.

Some existing agencies of administration, regular and emergency, probably will be instruments for the execution of post-war programs.

They are going to continue these emergency organizations.

They should, without neglecting their supreme job of winning the war, plan now for their own conversion to meet the needs of cessation of war, the transition period, and then, for democracy, dynamic economy, and peace.

I think this warning has been taken seriously, because there is hardly an emergency organization in Washington that is not planning for its permanent continuation for the purposes of democracy, dynamic economy, and peace—and jobs.

Finally, Mr. President, it must be clear that if the Government enters into industry either by itself or in partnership with others, competition will soon cease, and private enterprise vanish from industry. Anyone who will read the report on transportation, which is very voluminous, must come to the conclusion that the idea is for Government operation of railroads, the Government taking over all the elements of transportation. It is suggested—at least there is the hint—that it should run bus lines, and develop the highways and use them for that purpose, and the hint at least that it should run all the air lines and that they should be coordinated into one grand operation. Of course, they recommend public ownership of power, but that is not any longer an extreme step.

Mr. President, after reading the other reports, I turned to the report on security work and relief policy, hoping that here, under a well qualified technical committee, there would be a constructive proposal to solve our social welfare problems. I can only say that my hopes were disappointed. The report apparently is written by Dr. Eveline M. Burns, a graduate of the London School of Economics and a socialist disciple of Mr. Harold Laski.

I was interested in reading in this morning's Times-Herald the following about Mrs. Burns, who directs the social-security program of the National Resources Planning Board:

Washington's best known family of former aliens are the Drs. Burns. Mrs. Burns is Eveline M. Burns, Ph. D., University of London School of Economics. She is employed by the National Resources Planning Board at $7,000 a year. The board is headed by Frederic A. Delano, uncle of President Roosevelt.

In 1932 Mrs. Burns wrote a campaign tract for the Socialist Party in which she said that methods of preventing indiscriminate use of resources should be devised by the Government which would call for "the imposition of controls that would refuse individuals to make what use they wish of their own labor and their own property." She now writes the Resources Board reports, such as the American version of the Beveridge cradle-to-the-grave security plan, which appear under the signature of Uncle Frederic.

NATURALIZED ONLY RECENTLY

Mr. Burns is Dr. Arthur R. Burns, also doctor of philosophy, London University, chief labor adviser to the War Production Board at $8,000 a year. The Burnses are natives of England and were not naturalized until recent years.

As I have said, they are both disciples of Mr. Harold Laski, whose views are extreme socialism, if not communism, so perhaps I should not be surprised in the result of the report.

The report is an unpleasant contrast with the Beveridge report in Great Britain. I read the Beveridge report with interest and admiration. Whatever one

may think of the wisdom of some of the policies set forth in the Beveridge report, they are stated definitely and concisely, their cost is calculated, and the people and the House of Commons are left to judge and select such parts of the report as they may wish to accept. Compared to the Beveridge report, the National Resources Planning Board report is pure propaganda.

The Planning Board's report takes up and reviews all the various emergency agencies established from 1932 to 1942. It defends each one of those agencies and fails to mention their excesses or the criticisms which were so justly directed against many of them.

The program for post-war relief, finally, if one can cull it out from some 600 pages, appears to be a bigger and better P. W. A., a bigger and better W. P. A., a kind of combined and enlarged N. Y. A. and C. C. C., and all kinds of other agencies added thereto. It advocates the return of unlimited Federal grants to States, cities, school districts, and other local bodies for public works. It advocates a Federal work program, practically superseding all State activities in relief. It advocates Federal support of education on a program very similar to the National Education Association's plan, which would cost the Federal Government $3,000,000,000 a year.

Nowhere in the report is there suggested any possibility that the expense will be greater than the people can bear. Nowhere is there any recognition of the fact that all this social security must be financed by the people who work, and must, to some extent, reduce their standard of living. There is no way by which people can be supported without working; there is no way by which people can be given money, medical care, or any other care, except out of the wages or earnings of people who are working at approximately that time. There is not any other method of doing it. We cannot pull rabbits out of the air; we cannot get something for nothing. It cannot be done. Yet the whole report absolutely ignores the question whether or not the social-security program is more expensive than the people of the country can bear.

Nowhere is there any recognition of the fact that Government beneficiaries will in many cases be far better off than the men who earn their living and support their own families, and try to build homes for themselves. It seems to me obvious that in any social security program we must see to it that the people who are just above the underprivileged group we are helping must also receive some assistance. We must see to it that the man who saves enough to provide a home for himself should be able to obtain just as much as the loafer who has not worked 1 day up to the time he is 65 years old, and then draws $45 a month. We must have some recognition of the fact that the system of incentive must be retained. If some incentive to work is not given the people of the country, then there will be an end to all progress, and there will be no possibility of going forward with any kind of dynamic economy or any other kind of economy. Incentive to work is reward for work properly done. Incidentally, for the two-thirds of the people who are the most progressive and intelligent, and willing to work harder, the incentive must be retained if we are going to achieve any progress in this world or in America.

In this Planning Board report, as throughout all the reports, it is assumed that Government spending is a good thing in itself, and will itself create prosperity. Undaunted by the example of the 1930's, it is assumed that unemployment will disappear if the Government only spends sufficient money.

Mr. President, I think it is perfectly possible to work out a post-war program. I think it can be done within the four corners of the American Constitution. I think it can be done by encouraging private enterprise by relaxing a part of Government control, by permitting a free capital market, by holding down the S. E. C. to its problem of preventing fraud, instead of trying to control the flow of capital in the United States, by eliminating regulation so far as regulation can be eliminated, by taxation which will permit a man to take a chance with some hope that if a new enterprise is successful, he can retain some part of the money he puts into the enterprise; that he does not lose everything when he loses; and that the Government does not get everything when he gains. It all can be done within our Constitution. We can go ahead with a social program and a practical program. But when the Planning Board lays this tremendous report before the people of the United States and assures the people that all that is necessary to do is to order that it be done and it will be done; when it assures them that financial obligations can be disregarded to pay when it is due the bill which is incurred—all this is but a snare and a delusion, and the board which undertakes such a policy ought to be abolished, and ought to be abolished now.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the independent offices appropriation bill is particularly important at this time since it contains items dealing with so many agencies which are supposed to be contributing to and assisting war production and the war effort generally. Some justify their wartime roles, while others, on the basis of the records of our hearings, are merely using the war needs of the Nation as a cloak for the retention or expansion of their bureaucratic domain.

I favor the action of the Appropriation Committee in confirming the action of the House in reducing the appropriations for the Federal Power Commission. However, were I free to do so, I would, for reasons which I shall disclose, enforce a much deeper pruning of this bureaucratic plum tree.

The Federal Power Commission maintains that it is charged with primary responsibility for seeing to it that our vastly expanded war industries are adequately supplied with electric power.

There is a good deal of doubt in my mind as to the validity of this assumption because of the War Production Board's directive of February 13, 1943, creating the Office of War Utilities as a major branch of the War Production Board, under J. A. Krug, chief power engineer of the Tennessee Valley Authority, on loan to the War Production Board.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a copy of the directive of February 13, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BRIDGES. The date on which this directive was made public—February 17—is of primary importance. It is important because that was the very day on which the House passed the independent offices appropriation bill.

It follows, then, that the House passed this appropriation without knowledge that another agency had been given sweeping powers duplicating, superseding, and greater than the supposed duties and responsibility of the Federal Power Commission.

The House Appropriations Committee gave this appropriation very serious consideration, and in the face of the Commission's plea of its indispensability to the war effort that committee still cut the appropriation by some 10 percent. How the Federal Power Commission would have fared had the House committee been advised of this edict of February 13, which robs it of much of its wartime justification for existence, is a matter of conjecture, but I am of the opinion that if the Senate should still further reduce the House appropriation the House conferees, in the light of the new situation, would gladly accede to the Senate's economy position.

Mr. President, I think it is time that the Senate should take a greater initiative in seeking out ways to reduce expenditures not directly in aid of the war effort.

The distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is doing a splendid work of fact finding. But it is in matters of appropriation of funds that we can actually get action in reducing the enormous tax load and bond load which are burdening the national economy.

In this connection I think that it is eminently worthwhile to consider the relative merits of the Federal Power Commission on the one hand and of the Office of War Utilities on the other.

The Office of War Utilities is under the direction of J. A. Krug, as I have stated. Mr. Krug is an electrical engineer of national standing among electrical engineers, both public and private.

After a brief period in telephone communications work, Mr. Krug became chief engineer of the Wisconsin Public Utilities Commission. While there he became acquainted with David Lilienthal, who was a member of that commission. When Mr. Lilienthal became one of the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority he recommended employment of Mr. Krug as chief power engineer for that project. In that capacity, Mr. Krug operated the largest electric power system in the world. Hence he is a man with operating experience as well as regulatory experience.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply wanted to say to the Senator that in the hearings on one of the proposed appropriation bills he will find a letter from Mr. W. L. Batt, saying that Mr. Krug is not an engineer at all, and never graduated from any school as an engineer.

Mr. BRIDGES. In other words, he has been operating the great Tennessee Valley Authority project just as a practical engineer, not as a graduate engineer.

In passing it might be noted that Mr. Leland Olds, on a direct question before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, as to his knowledge of Mr. Krug's experience, made a remark that can only be taken as disparaging of Mr. Krug. He stated he thought that Mr. Krug had had some experience in regulatory economics. Mr. Olds was avoiding an invidious comparison of qualifications as between himself and Mr. Krug, although he must have known of Mr. Krug's operating experience as power chief of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. Krug has never been employed, so far as I know, by any private utility corporation. Supporters of Mr. Olds are therefore robbed of the threadbare and antiquated argument that there is some contamination in a man's life if he was once a success in the private business world. Therefore, the public power advocates cannot consistently raise any objection to Mr. Krug on ideological grounds. In fact, he was chosen to head the old O. P. M. utility division to succeed a private utility executive to whom many public power advocates objected.

I hold no brief for J. A. Krug. But I must assert that in comparison with the qualification and experience for the job of Leland Olds, Mr. J. A. Krug has by far the greater actual experience. With the Office of War Utilities functioning under the directive of February 13, the Federal Power Commission, insofar as the war effort is concerned, is largely a bureaucratic fifth wheel.

Senators from various sections of the country who recall the caucus of House Democrats which rejected membership to an important committee desired by a member of the American Labor Party will be interested to know that Mr. Olds received his position on the Power Commission, not as Democratic patronage, but as a political payoff to the American Labor Party of New York State.

In his biography in Who's Who, Mr. Olds maintains a thunderous silence as to his political affiliations. But the facts are that his political heart lies with the American wing of the Communist-minded group known in the State of New York as the American Labor Party.

Mr. Olds was temporary chairman of the New York State Convention of the American Labor Party in New York City on October 3, 1938. In that capacity Mr. Olds made the keynote speech of the convention. In that speech he repudiated the Democratic Party for asking the question "How can I escape war and find peace? He answered as follows:

> The old parties—that means the Democratic Party as well as the Republican Party—cannot answer this fundamental question of the people because their organizations are still based upon selfishness.

The only point I am seeking to establish here is that this man is not a member of the Democratic Party, and has been active in a third party of the extreme left-wing variety. It so happened that in that year, 1938, the American Labor Party did support certain Democratic candidates, and that support is said to have been sufficient to cause the defeat of Republican candidates. Mr. Olds was the American Labor Party county chairman for Rockland County, New York.

Mr. Olds became a member of the Federal Power Commission in 1939, after almost a decade on the pay roll of the State of New York, largely with the New York Power Authority, of which he was chairman at the time of his appointment to the Federal Power Commission.

If one did not know anything about the nature of the New York Power Authority, one would assume that this 10 years of experience would have given Mr. Olds a large practical background in the highly technical problems of electric generation, transmission, and distribution.

This is not the fact, however. The New York Power Authority does not now, and never did, own a generating plant of any kind whatsoever or a transmission line, distribution line, substation, or meter. It is an authority without authority, a paper agency in more than one sense of that word. It is an agency whose activity has been largely to propagandize the Nation and, from its ample funds, lobby in Congress in favor of the St. Lawrence Seaway, so-called.

Leland Olds never in his life, so far as I know, pulled an electric power switch as a part of his duty. Not once, so far as I know, has he bought or sold a kilowatt-hour of electric power except the electricity he buys for his own home. His record is so typical; it is unblemished by any stain of practical experience. He is one of the finest examples of simonpure, unadulterated theorists to be found within the framework of the New Deal. That is a high achievement against strong competition.

What did Mr. Olds do for a living before he came to the New York State Power Authority? What is his background of experience, qualification, and training prior to 1929? On this subject there is very little literature that is generally available to the public. It will be of interest, therefore, that I spread upon the record some additional facts about Mr. Olds' background prior to 1929.

This high New Deal executive earned his spurs as an electrical expert as a writer throughout most of the 1920's for the official daily newspaper of the Communist Party, the Daily Worker. I have here for Senators who may care to see them photostatic copies of Mr. Olds' writings for the Daily Worker. Here, for example, is an article on page 5 of the January 12, 1924, issue of the Daily Worker. The author's title is as follows: "By Leland Olds, Federated Press Industrial Writer." The article, which carries a 3-line, 2-column head, is a general attack on the capitalistic system all over the world. The heading is:

"Review of foreign labor status shows instability of capitalism the world over."

Here is another one on page 5 of the February 2, 1927, issue of the Daily Worker, an attack on the United States Steel Corporation, listed as "By Leland Olds, Federated Press." A year later, on March 20, 1928, on page 3, we have an article attacking the public utility industry, signed "By Leland Olds, Federated Press."

Skipping back to 1924, on February 20, we have a 4-column article on the editorial page of the Daily Worker, by Leland Olds, entitled "Yes, Capitalists Have No Brains."

I did not go to the expense of photostating each and every article by Leland Olds appearing in the Daily Worker from 1924 to 1929, but I have before me 6 typical examples spread over a period of 4 years. Olds' articles in the Daily Worker were usually signed "By Leland Olds, Federated Press."

This leads to the question, What is, or was, the Federated Press? In the Seventy-first Congress there was appointed by the Speaker of the House in the second session a Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities in the United States. Mr. Laurence Todd, who at that time was the Washington correspondent for the Federated Press, and simultaneously was listed in press gallery section of the Congressional Directory as Washington correspondent for the Telegraph Agency of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—as he still is—submitted a detailed statement at the request of this committee.

This statement disclosed, among other things, that one of the members of the executive board of the Federated Press was none other than Earl Browder, chief of the Communist Party in the United States, then and now.

However, we must search elsewhere for the record of Olds' connection with the Federated Press, which appears to be a sort of Communist-directed propaganda clip sheet circulated to labor newspapers and magazines. All its material appears to be class-conscious and devoted to the promotion of strikes and industrial unrest.

Here, for example, is a typical quotation appearing in the Federated Press news letter of April 14, 1926:

> The new age is being ushered in by revolutions in Russia, Italy, Mexico, Turkey, and China. History will bear witness to Lenin, Mussolini, and perhaps Sun Yat Sen, when the Coolidges and the Baldwins are forgotten.

As of 1926, Benito Mussolini was as much the darling of this left-wing ideologist as was Lenin himself.

Here is Olds' program for class conflict and his endorsement of David Saposs, and here I quote:

> To re-form rank under fire and carry the attack into the stronghold of big business is

what American labor must do in the next 10 years. This should be helped by the study of left-wing unionism made by David Saposs of Brookwood Labor College. (From the Federated Press news letter of May 19, 1926.)

It will be recalled that the House Appropriations Committee not long ago recommended that David Saposs' name be severed from the Federal pay roll. Saposs, however, is a New Deal pet and has been kept on the pay roll in spite of the Congress. At the present time he is employed in the Labor Division of the War Production Board.

Now, who financed the Federated Press? I may state categorically that over these years Olds was supported in his propaganda activities by grants from the American Fund for Public Service, Inc., popularly known as the Garland fund. If I may digress a moment for the purposes of clarity, I will explain a little about this fund.

Back in 1922 young Charles Garland inherited a fortune of $900,000 in the stock of the First National Bank of New York City. He was persuaded by certain radical friends—whose self-interest is not above suspicion—to give away all his worldly wealth. So he set up this fund called the American Fund for Public Service, dedicated to the advancement of the radical movement in America.

I have here a copy of a financial report of this fund for the years 1925 through 1928, and a summary of operations of the first 6 years.

According to this report, Leland Olds received $3,640 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1925, as a gift from the Garland Fund. He received $3,600 the following year, and again the same amount from the same source in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928. Inasmuch as his writings extend before and after the period shown in the report, it is fair to assume that Mr. Olds' remuneration remained about the same for the entire period of his work for the Federated Press. The Federated Press received additional grants, to a total of $13,000, according to the same report for the same period.

The character of the source of Olds' income is best revealed in this report by the type of activities which shared with Olds the benefactions of the Garland fund during this period.

Through a grant of $28,000 a weekly magazine, the New Masses, which is the official party line magazine in the United States, was founded during this period by the Garland fund.

In addition, the Daily Worker received advances from the Garland fund.

It is not my purpose here to make a personal attack upon Leland Olds, for personally he is a very likeable person and I have nothing against him personally.

My purpose is to show that the man is disqualified to act officially without prejudice between public and private enterprise because of his political bias.

My purpose is to show, further, that he is a political ideologist without the practical experience upon which he could base sound judgment in the many critical situations that must come before the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

It is indeed unfortunate that we did not have these facts at hand at the time Mr. Olds appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee.

By the record of our hearings, Mr. Olds is responsible for the wastage of millions of pounds of copper in the so-called Ark-La line which was built in the name of national defense at the instance of Olds, when in fact its true purpose was the advancement of public ownership in Arkansas.

According to this record Olds demanded the construction of this big line on the grounds that an aluminum plant down there could not be served by the capacity of existing private utilities.

The record further shows that Mr. Olds, theorist that he is, was as wrong as he could be when the matter was put to a practical test. This Ark-La line broke down on one occasion for 84 hours, beginning the day after Christmas at the season of longest nights and peak loads of the year. Had his assertion that this line was essential proved true, this aluminum plant would have suffered irreparable loss when in fact private companies were able to supply the additional load without the loss of a kilowatt hour. The same test occurred for 5 hours on January 19 of this year with the same result.

The record shows that Mr. Leland Olds has made wrong predictions of power shortages for the national defense load. His opposite number, Mr. J. A. Krug has stated there is not now, never has been, and is never likely to be a shortage of power.

It has been shown that electric power is the one commodity that is not rationed and need not be rationed due to lack of capacity. The record shows that electric power is the only commodity necessary to our standard of living which has actually decreased in price in several instances since the war began. It further shows that Mr. Olds and the Federal Power Commission, not once but many times, have made the Federal Government look ridiculous by their insistence that a power shortage was impending. The ulterior motive behind these predictions probably was political and ideological. But the result has been to discredit the Federal Power Commission to a point where some day if they are right in a prediction of power shortage, neither the public nor the industry will give credit. It's the old story of crying "Wolf! Wolf!" once too often.

Olds recently addressed a group of farmers interested in rural electrification. These farmers were a cross section of rural America, dedicated to the uplift of the standard of living in rural America. They were working for and believed in the rural electrification cooperative, even as you and I. As a cross section, most of them are church-going, upstanding members of their community.

In his appeal to these farmers for a class-conscious attack on the system of private enterprise, he was much more subtle and clever than in the days when he was writing class-conflict propaganda for the Daily Worker. He indicted the American system by saying the obvious, that selfishness has made America the richest Nation in the world. Actually the incentive to gain established security may be a selfish thing, but it is also the instinct that has covered the plains with pioneers and brought forth the riches of our soil from agriculture, forests, and minerals. Selfishness is another word for the natural human desire of man to achieve security for his loved ones.

Not satisfied with inducing the War Production Board to grant priorities on the Ark-La line to waste several millions of pounds of copper on a project which, by actual tests, need never have been built, Mr. Olds took it upon himself to override States' rights, to override the Arkansas Public Utility Commission, and to institute a rate investigation which was beyond his legal province and which wasted thousands of man-hours of important war-production executives. The animosity of F. P. C. toward States' rights is clearly demonstrated in this bureaucratic witch hunt into the Southwest power pool.

As a former State public service commissioner, I am entirely familiar with the issues involved in this case. I should like to append as part of my remarks two exhibits in connection with it. The first is a letter from the special counsel for the Arkansas Department of Public Utilities, and the second is an amicus curiae brief for the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners representing all but two of the regulatory commissions of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits B and C.)

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, to all friends of the American system of government, to all who are interested in the preservation of the sovereignty of the individual States which comprise our Federal Union, I recommend that these two documents be read in full. They are a shocking revelation of the inroads being made by this Federal bureaucracy in the name of the war effort on the rights of the States to govern themselves in the role cast for them by the founding fathers.

As a former member of a public-service commission, I have viewed with grave doubts the encroachment of Federal bureaucracy into the fields that properly, under our Constitution, belong to the jurisdiction of the sovereign States.

I long ago realized that only healthy, legal State regulation of noncompetitive industries such as gas and electric supplies, could destroy the spectre of State ownership and socialism.

In preparation for the hearing before the Senate Appropriations Committee I wrote a general letter to State public-service commissions to discover, if possible, the real situation between the State regulatory bodies and the Federal Power Commission.

The replies were candid. But I was shocked that so many of them, written from old friends who put their trust and confidence in me, gave me information

under seal of strictest confidence. They asked that their identity be not revealed lest they and their independent sovereign States be subject to prosecution by the Federal Power Commission, or by other agencies of Federal bureaucracy.

One State commissioner says that a representative of the Federal Power Commission approached him on the simple basis of bureaucratic reciprocal back scratching. This representative of the Federal Power Commission urged that it would be helpful to the Commission's case for bigger and better appropriations if the State in question should request assistance of the F. P. C. in a certain rate case.

His purpose was not to serve the people's interest, it was to help maintain and enlarge his bureaucratic pay roll. He wanted some bureaucratic "leaf raking."

It is a sad commentary on the state of the Nation when officers of sovereign States will reveal information as to the infiltration and encroachment of Federal bureaucracy upon States' rights only under seal of confidence in fear of retaliation.

The Federal Power Commission has no legal right to regulate local electric rates, its powers under the law being confined to interstate wholesale rates. In fact, its spokesmen before the Appropriations Committee stated that the Commission had been unable to effectuate noticeable reduction in retail rates. Nevertheless it has usurped many of the functions of State regulatory commissions in fact finding.

Recently the Midwest Utilities Commissioners' Committee, headed by A. B. Hill, chairman of the Arkansas Utilities Commission, undertook a manpower survey of 58 major utility companies in the 5 States of Oklahoma, Kansas, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, and part of Texas. This area represented approximately 2,154,000 electric consumers, or about 6½ percent of the 31,600,000 consumers of the Nation. The survey covered only the first 8 months of the year 1942. More than 843,805 man-hours were consumed by these utilities in this area in 8 months, at a cost in excess of $5,000,000 annually to fill out reports and questionnaires required by the Federal Power Commission.

On a yearly basis this would amount to about 1,263,000 man-hours and $7,500,000 added to the operating costs to the consumers in those areas alone, as the hidden burden of bureaucracy padded onto their electric-light bills in addition to what they pay for this agency in the form of taxes. As against this huge sum of money and time—which in manpower is now more precious than money—State and municipal regulatory bodies in the same period required only 38,583 man-hours, or about 3 percent of the work required by the F. P. C.

If the same proportion should be maintained for the Nation, as it is reasonable to suppose, approximately 22,000,000 man-hours annually will be diverted from the war effort and dedicated to the pursuit of useless information at the behest of the Federal Power Commission, to say nothing of approximately $120,000,000 which is thus added to the operating costs of electricity to consumers of the Nation. These, of course, are estimates based on the case history of five States, but there appears no reason why the same situation should not prevail everywhere.

Mr. President, the purpose of my discussion today has been threefold:

First, I have shown conclusively that the Federal Power Commission functions, in relation to the war effort, are in complete duplication, by its own admission in hearings and by the War Production Board directive of February 13, of the work of the Office of War Utilities, and are as unnecessary to the war effort as a fifth wheel on a baby buggy.

Second, it has been demonstrated that as between the Office of War Utilities and the Federal Power Commission the former is far more competent by comparison.

Third, it was my purpose to show that in the midst of war, the Federal Power Commission aggressively pursues its policy toward obliterating State boundaries and in fact uses war necessity as a means of obtaining that objective. The Federal Power Commission has clearly demonstrated itself to be an enemy of the doctrine of sovereign States as enshrined in the Constitution of this Federal union.

I might have added a fourth reason for this discussion.

While I take the position that the Appropriations Committee is to be congratulated on its "hold the line" resistance to bureaucratic pressure and on retaining generally the reductions contained in the House bill, I felt that this was an appropriate occasion to reveal publicly some of the information which has come to me as a result of my personal investigations in relation to the recent hearing.

There are a number of investigating bodies in the House and Senate which no doubt will find this material dealing with bureaucratic wastage and duplication in wartime under radical leadership to come within the scope of the resolutions which empower them to act

Mr. President, no real remedy for this situation can result from a single speech in the Senate; but, with faith in the integrity and courage of the several investigating committees of this Congress, I suggest that the wildness of the Federal Power Commission bureaucracy invites investigation and remedial legislative action.

EXHIBIT A

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION,
WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Wednesday, February 17, 1943.

An administrative order and regulation providing the detailed administrative arrangements under which the new Office of War Utilities will operate have just been issued by Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board. The decision to create the new office, with J. A. Krug as its Director, was previously announced.

Mr. Krug will report directly to the Chairman on all policy matters and will be charged with the functions and responsibilities of the war production in the fields of electric power, natural and manufactured gas, water, central steam heating and communications services, except radio. The stated objective of the new orders is "to unify the War Production Board's authority and responsibility for war utilities, in order to assure the adequacy of war utilities to meet demands of the war-production program and essential civilian demands."

Mr. Krug today announced two appointments: Edward Falck as Deputy Director of the Office of War Utilities, and Barclay J. Sickler as Director of the Power Division in the new organization. Mr. Krug said no other changes in staff are contemplated.

Mr. Falck joined the Office of Production Management in July 1941 on loan from the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York. He became Chief of the Power Supply Allocation Section in October 1941: Assistant Deputy Director General for Priorities Control, War Production Board, in August 1942; and Assistant Deputy Director General for Distribution last November. Mr. Falck was associated with the Tennessee Valley Authority from 1933 to 1937 and subsequently with the Consolidated Edison Co., from which organization he has resigned.

Mr. Sickler became a consultant for the Office of Production Management in September 1941 on loan from the Bonneville Power Administration. He became Chief of the Priorities Section of the Power Division, War Production Board, in February 1942, and Deputy Director of the Power Division in August. Mr. Sickler has recently resigned from the Bonneville Power Administration. Prior to his association with the Bonneville Administration, he was on the staff of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD MANUAL OF POLICY AND PROCEDURES

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER NO. 2-78—FEBRUARY 13, 1943—OFFICE OF WAR UTILITIES

SECTION 1. Establishment of Office of War Utilities:

.01. There is hereby established within the War Production Board the Office of War Utilities headed by a Director who shall be responsible on policy matters to the Chairman, and on administrative matters to the Program Vice Chairman.

SEC. 2. Definition of war utilities:

.01. The term war utilities as used in this order shall be defined as including generation, transmission, and distribution of electric power; transmission and distribution of natural gas; production, transmission, and distribution of manufactured gas; pumping, storage, transmission, and distribution of water; production, transmission, and distribution of central steam heating; and communications services, except radio.

SEC. 3. Objective:

.01. It is the purpose of this order to unify the War Production Board's authority and responsibility for war utilities, in order to assure the adequacy of war utilities to meet demands of the war production program and essential civilian demands.

SEC. 4. Functions:

In achieving this objective, the Director shall perform the following functions:

.01. Obtain from Federal agencies, the appropriate industry, and other sources, data on and estimate requirements for war utilities. The Director shall establish, to the extent necessary, standard terms, methods, and techniques to be used in measuring these requirements.

.02. Obtain from Federal agencies, the appropriate industry, and other sources, data on and estimate available war utilities supply. The Director shall establish, to the extent necessary, standard terms, methods, and techniques to be used in measuring such available war utilities supply.

.03. Develop and take all appropriate steps to anticipate, forestall, and overcome shortages in war utilities supply which threaten to impair the war program. This will involve, among other things:

1. Programming the use of existing facilities, the interconnection of systems, and the coordination of operations of systems where such activities will provide greater availability of such war utilities.

2. Taking the appropriate steps to develop, to the extent that existing facilities are inadequate, the construction and installation of additional facilities necessary to correct such inadequacies with a minimum expenditure of critical materials.

.04. Develop and administer curtailment and allocation programs for war utilities in times and areas of shortage.

.05. Act as a claimant agency with respect to the materials required for war-utilities programs.

.06. Take the proper steps to insure that supplies, materials, and equipment necessary to construct, operate, and maintain facilities for war utilities are scheduled, produced, and delivered on time.

.07. Advise the appropriate agencies regarding the availability of war utilities supply to accomplish their proposed construction and production programs.

.08. Recommend to the Office of Production Research and Development the programming and execution of technical research and development activities which will lead to more efficient utilization of facilities and critical materials by war utilities.

.09. Keep the Chairman, Program Vice Chairman, and Production Vice Chairman currently advised as to the adequacy of war utilities to meet the need for war production and essential civilian requirements, and of the measures taken and progress made toward meeting actual or potential shortages.

SEC. 5. Authority:

.01. The Director shall exercise all powers contained in section 2 (A) of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by the act of May 31, 1941, and by title 3 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as delegated to the Chairman of the War Production Board so far as they relate to war utilities.

.02. The Director is authorized:

1. In his own name to issue, amend, revoke, and administer regulations, orders, and directions relating to (1) producing, transmitting, and distributing electricity, manufactured gas, water, and central steam heating, (2) transmitting and distributing natural gas, (3) furnishing of communications services, except radio, (4) redistributing materials and equipment owned by, in the possession of, or held for the account of, persons engaged in such activities and services and (5) the construction of new facilities or the remodeling of existing facilities of persons engaged in the foregoing activities and services.

2. In his own name to issue, amend, repeal, and administer preference rating orders for the construction, maintenance, repair, and operation of facilities for such persons, and to make allotments of material to such persons under and to the extent authorized by the Controlled Materials Plan. No rating of Agricultural Adjustment Administration shall be authorized by the Director without prior approval by the Distribution Bureau.

3. To amend, repeal, and supersede any existing orders and directions of the War Production Board relating to the foregoing subject matter. All such existing orders and directions shall remain in effect until so amended, repealed, or superseded.

.03. All actions taken by the Director pursuant to this administrative order, or pursuant to Regulation No. 1 of the War Production Board, as amended, shall be in conformity with any program determinations of the Program Vice Chairman hereafter issued, and with any preference rating standards and materials allocations established by existing program determinations of the Program Vice Chairman.

.04. All orders of the types currently issued in the E, M, L, and P series (except individual orders in the present P-19 series) and amendments and supplements thereto issued by the Director pursuant to paragraph .02 above shall be circulated prior to issuance in the manner specified in Administrative Order No. 14, Office of the Program Vice Chairman, except in emergency situations. After such circulation has been completed, and after considering the views of any interested divisions or agencies, the Director may issue such orders without further clearance or approval. Any division or agency which dissents from a decision of the Director may appeal the decision to the Chairman of the War Production Board, or the Program Vice Chairman.

.05. Subject to the general supervision of the production vice chairman, and pursuant to general administrative orders Nos. 2-71 and 2-73, the Director shall continue to have responsibility for the production and scheduling of the equipment heretofore produced and scheduled under the direction of the Power Division and the Communications Equipment Division, and for the allotment of materials for the production of such equipment. All actions taken under this subparagraph .05 shall be issued in the name of the official formally authorized to take such action. Basic orders shall be cleared through the distribution bureau in the manner specified in administrative order No. 14. Administration of such orders will be carried on by the Director under delegations of authority.

.06. No action shall be taken by the Director to authorize or initiate the construction of facilities, other than facilities for the production, transmission, or distribution of electricity, manufactured gas, water, and central heating, furnishing of communications services, or for the transmitting or distribution of natural gas, without prior approval by the facilities bureau.

.07. The Director shall exercise such authority in regard to administrative, personnel, and Budget matters as is provided by general administrative orders and instructions.

SEC. 6. Relationships:

.01. Nothing herein shall be construed to be in conflict with existing arrangements between the War Production Board and the Board of War Communications nor with the provisions of the agreement between the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission dated April 24, 1942.

SEC. 7. Organization:

.01. There shall be in the office of the Director one or more utilities requirements committees, of each of which the chairman shall be the director, ex-officio, and the vice chairman a person designated by the chairman.

.02. Each utilities requirements committee shall consist of a single representative of each claimant agency concerned with the matters within the jurisdiction of the particular committee.

.03. Each utilities-requirements committee shall perform the functions of an industry division requirements committee with respect to the particular activities and services assigned to it by the director.

.04. The Power Division and the Communications Equipment Division are hereby abolished and their functions, records, personnel, and funds are hereby transferred to the Office of War Utilities.

.05. The functions heretofore vested in the Facilities Bureau, Facility Clearance Board, Facility Review Committee, and Resources Bureau, insofar as they relate to the functions hereby delegated to the Director, are transferred to the Office of War Utilities.

.06. The Director shall prepare a plan of organization of the Office of War Utilities and submit it for approval of the Chairman of the War Production Board.

.07. Orders or parts of orders, the provisions of which are inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this order, are hereby rescinded or modified accordingly.

.08. Except as expressly limited in this order, the Director shall have the sole and exclusive responsibility within the War Production Board for performing the functions and exercising the authority vested in him by this order.

.09. The effective date of this order shall be February 13, 1943.

DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD—W. P. B. REGULATION 1—FEBRUARY 13, 1943

PART 903—DELEGATIONS OF AUTHORITY

(W. P. B. Regulation 1, as amended February 13, 1943)

Delegating powers with respect to priorities to Director General for operations; and ratifying actions of Director of Priorities and Director of Industry Operations

SEC. 903.0. Regulation 1. (a) (1) The Director General for Operations shall perform the functions and exercise all the powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon the President by section 2 (a) of the Act of June 28, 1940, as amended by the Act of May 31, 1941, and by the Act of March 27, 1942, including the power of the Chairman of the War Production Board under paragraph (e) of Directive 1 of the War Production Board (§ 903.1) to delegate to the Office of Price Administration additional powers with respect to the exercise of rationing control and to amend the delegation with respect thereto contained in said Directive 1.

(2) The Director General for Operations shall review, clear, and approve for execution all requests or proposals originating from other Federal agencies, private industry, or other sources for priority action with respect to the procurement, production, transmission, or transportation of materials, articles, power, fuel, and other commodities; issue or provide for the issuance of all priority orders, warrants, certificates, or ratings with respect to the supply, production, transmission, or transportation of materials, articles, power, fuel, and other commodities, and, with reference to specific priority authorities vested by law in established departments and agencies of the Government, certify to such departments and agencies, when he deems such action necessary to the most effective prosecution of war procurement and production, that preferential treatment is essential for certain materials, commodities, facilities, or services.

(3) The Director General for Operations shall, in consultation with the United States Maritime Commission, determine when, to what extent, and in what manner, priorities shall be accorded to deliveries of material as provided in section 2 (a) (3) of Public, No. 46, 77th Congress, First Session, entitled "An Act to Make Emergency Provision for Certain Activities of the United States Maritime Commission, and for Other Purposes," approved May 2, 1941. Deliveries of material shall take priority as provided in said Act in accordance with such determinations and the orders issued in pursuance thereof by the Director General for Operations.

(4) The Director General for Operations shall perform the functions and exercise all the powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon the Chairman of the War Production Board by Executive Orders 8942, 9024, 9040, and 9138, under the act of October 10,

1940, as amended, and the act of October 16, 1941, as amended, except the power, authority, and discretion conferred upon the Chairman of the War Production Board by paragraph 1b of Executive Order 9040 to establish policies and to issue rules and regulations with respect to requisitioning under said acts.

(b) The Director General for Operations may exercise the powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by this regulation through such officers of the War Production Board and such other officials of the Government (including the contracting and procurement officers and inspectors of the War and Navy Departments) and in such manner as he may determine.

(c) All existing rules, regulations, orders, directions, certificates, and other actions of the Director of Industry Operations or of his predecessor, the Director of Priorities of the Office of Production Management, are hereby ratified and confirmed and shall remain in full force and effect until they expire by their terms or are revoked or amended, and any references therein or in any rule, regulation, order, direction, certificate, or other action issued on or after July 9, 1942, or taken, to the Director of Industry Operations, or to his predecessor, the Director of Priorities, shall be deemed to be references to the Director General for Operations. Any such rules, regulations, orders, directions, certificates, and other actions issued on or after July 9, 1942, or taken in the name of the Director of Industry Operations in any manner heretofore authorized shall be valid for all purposes to the same extent as if issued or taken in the name of the Director General for Operations, unless such authorization shall have been specifically revoked.

(d) In addition to, and without limitation upon, the foregoing delegation of authority, the Rubber Director of the War Production Board is hereby authorized to perform the functions and exercise the powers, authorities, and discretion conferred upon the President by section 2 (a) of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676) as amended by the act of May 31, 1941 (Public Law No. 89, 77th Cong.) and title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (act of March 27, 1942, Public Law No. 507, 77th Cong.), to the extent necessary for the performance of the following duties and functions:

(1) To allot rubber among the War Department, Navy Department, Maritime Commission, Aircraft Scheduling Unit, Office of Lend-Lease Administration, Board of Economic Warfare, Dominion of Canada, the Domestic Requirements Section of the Office of Rubber Director, and any other public or private agency authorized to act as a claimant agency before the War Production Board, and also to allot rubber for civilian requirements;

(2) To allocate and apportion rubber among the users thereof, including all allocations and apportionments from the rubber stockpile;

(3) To issue, administer and, where necessary, amend or repeal new orders regulating the production, distribution, and use of rubber and rubber products, and to amend, repeal, and supersede any existing orders heretofore issued by the War Production Board regulating such production, distribution, and use: *Provided, however,* That all existing orders of the War Production Board affecting such production, distribution, or use shall remain in effect until specifically amended, repealed, or superseded. The authority hereby delegated shall not include authority to regulate or control the distribution of any material or products other than rubber and rubber products, even when such other material or products are for use in the production of rubber.

(e) The Rubber Director may exercise the duties and functions referred to above, either in his own name, through the Director General for Operations of the War Production Board, or through such other official, agency, or person as he shall designate.

(f) The Director of the Office of War Utilities of the War Production Board shall be directly responsible to the Chairman on policy matters, and to the Program Vice Chairman on administrative matters. In addition to, and without limitation upon, the delegations of authority set forth above, the Director of the Office of War Utilities of the War Production Board is authorized to perform the functions and exercise the powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon the President by section 2 (a) of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by the act of May 31, 1941, and title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, so far as they relate to (1) producing, transmitting, and distributing electricity, manufactured gas, water, and central steam heating; (2) transmitting and distributing natural gas; (3) furnishing of communications services except radio; and (4) redistributing materials and equipment owned by, in the possession of, or held for the account of persons engaged in such activities and services.

The Director of the Office of War Utilities shall also have the authority to issue, amend, repeal, and administer (1) preference ratings for the construction, maintenance, repair, and operation of facilities for such activities and services, (2) allotments of material under the controlled materials plan, (3) other orders and directions to control the use of material and equipment owned by, in the possession of, or held for the account of persons engaged in the foregoing activities and services, including, with respect to all of the foregoing, authority to amend, repeal, and supersede any existing orders and directions heretofore issued by the War Production Board relating to the foregoing subject matter.

(g) The Director of the Office of War Utilities may exercise the duties and authority referred to above, either in his own name or through such other official, agency, or person as he shall designate.

Issued this 13th day of February 1943.

DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT B

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES,
Little Rock, March 31, 1943.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: At the request of Mr. A. B. Hill, chairman of the department of public utilities, I am replying to your letter of March 26. As indicated by Mr. Hill in his letter to you of March 30, the Federal Power Commission has not cooperated with this department to the extent contemplated by the Public Utilities Act of 1935. In addition to its failure to cooperate, it has injected itself into several matters exclusively within the jurisdiction of the department.

When the aluminum plant was located in Arkansas, the question of adequate power for it was paramount in all of our minds. The principal operating utilities in Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas had pooled their generating facilities for the purpose of supplying the Arkansas Power & Light Co. with sufficient power for the operation of the plant. The Federal Works Agency had control of the hydro facilities known as the Grand River Dam, located in eastern Oklahoma and on the watershed of the Arkansas River. With small expense the power from this dam could have been delivered to the pool, and the pool offered to transmit that power, less a small line loss, to the aluminum plant free of charge. Notwithstanding this offer, Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives organized a supercooperative under the laws of Louisiana and entered into a contract with the Federal Works Agency for power from the dam, and through the efforts of Mr. Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and Mr. Slattery, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, this supercooperative entered into a contract with the Defense Plant Corporation for the sale to it of 32,500 kilowatts of power for use at the aluminum plant.

In order to carry out this contract it was necessary for the supercooperative to build approximately 200 miles of high-tension transmission line from the dam to the plant. It had to make application to the Department for authority for this construction. At that time there was under construction by the Government a dual-purpose dam near Norfolk, Ark., on White River, which it then appeared would be in operation the latter part of this year.

The pool proposed to link up the various companies in it by the construction of lines that would give them a two-way circuit into the aluminum plant. One of these lines, while not paralleling the proposed route of the Rural Electrification Administration line, could very well be treated as being parallel, and would have been located in such a way as to furnish an outlet from the Norfolk project.

The supercooperative filed an application before the Department for a certificate. At that time the applications of the private companies were also pending before the Department. They were not set for hearing at the same time as the supercooperative application.

Mr. Olds appeared as a witness at the hearing on the supercooperative's application and on the witness stand, while admitting that there was at that time no matter pending before his Commission involving the construction and operation of this line, he felt like he ought to have been called in on the matter, notwithstanding the fact that his Commission had no jurisdiction whatever. He further said, while on the witness stand, that the line would be built.

After the hearing the Department entered an order denying the application so far as it was concerned, but submitted the entire record to the War Production Board and to the Army and Navy Munitions Board. A copy of the order issued by the Department is attached.

The Army and Navy Munitions Board made an exhaustive and complete examination of the record and recommended that the line not be built, but, notwithstanding this recommendation, the line was built as Mr. Olds indicated in his evidence it would be, and one of the lines of the pool was eliminated.

A copy of the report of the Army and Navy Munitions Board is also attached.

The Grand River Dam was a dual-purpose project designed to operate at 735 feet for power, leaving 20 feet for flood control. In order to secure the amount of firm power from this dam which the supercooperative had agreed to sell the aluminum plant, it was necessary to raise the elevation of the water in the reservoir to 742.5 feet. The Federal Power Commission authorized this increase, notwithstanding the fact that it would destroy 40 to 50 percent of the flood-control capacity of the reservoir.

The lower Arkansas River Valley, a vast alluvial area devoted almost exclusively to agriculture and the production of food, was menaced by this increase in the elevation at the dam. The theory advanced for this increase was that the area did not have sufficient power for the aluminum plant and it was necessary to raise the water level in the dam to secure the power necessary for the operation of this plant.

After the line was built and the aluminum plant was in operation, the supercooperative's line went out and could not be used for 86 hours. Notwithstanding this outage, the power pool picked up the entire aluminum plant load immediately and carried it for approximately 36 hours without any aid from the Grand River Dam power. The remainder of the 86-hour period Grand River power was delivered to the aluminum plant through the pool's facilities.

This was an actual demonstration that the Federal Power Commission was wrong in asserting that the pool did not have the power for the aluminum plant and that that plant could not be operated without the construction of the line for the cooperative.

At a recent hearing held in Little Rock before the Federal Power Commission, about which more will later be said, it was developed that with the cooperation of the Federal Works Agency and the Federal Power Commission, Federal Works Agency was undertaking to spend more than $1,000,000 on this dam, install additional facilities for power and utilize the entire capacity of the dam for power, completely destroying all of its flood-control capacity. The excuse for doing this was that power was needed for defense purposes.

This action further menaces the entire Arkansas River Valley at a time when, if a flood should occur, it would not only be a local disaster but a national disaster, with food now assuming the importance that it has in the defense program. The Federal Power Commission, working with the Federal Works Agency, is responsible for this condition and in the judgment of this department there never has been any occasion for increasing the water level above 735 feet in this dam. To do so is certainly not in furtherance of the defense of this Nation, with food and agricultural products as critical as they are now.

Some 10 or 11 of the principal operating companies in the States hereinbefore mentioned formed what has been termed the "Southwest power pool," for the purpose of supplying power to the Arkansas Power & Light Co., which, in turn, has contracted to furnish this power to the aluminum plant. Much of this power had to move in interstate commerce. Therefore, the contract had to be filed with the Federal Power Commission.

Because of the imminence of the operation of the aluminum plant the Federal Power Commission temporarily approved the contract and, on September 1, 1942, of its own motion directed an investigation of the rates. A copy of the order directing the investigation is enclosed. On October 20, 1942, the cause was set for hearing in Little Rock.

At the time the Commission directed the investigation it sent out a form letter to the commissions of the several States in which the pool members operated. The Oklahoma commission and the Arkansas department, in response to this invitation for cooperation, asked that they be permitted to take part in any conferences or other matters pertaining to the investigation. The Federal Power Commission ignored the requests of the Oklahoma commission and the Arkansas department.

The hearing was opened in Little Rock and the respondents were required to go forward with their testimony first. After observing the progress of the hearing and what it apparently was leading to, the Arkansas department intervened in the cause and, in addition to its intervention, its counsel made a formal statement which was incorporated into the record. A copy of this statement was sent to you by Mr. Hill. The hearing was characterized, by some of the reporters who were present during its early stages, as being like unto the French inquisition.

The respondents put on their proof in the first 6 or 7 days of the hearing. A recess was taken until the 14th of January in order to enable counsel for the Commission to study the direct evidence and prepare themselves for cross-examination. The hearing resumed and cross-examination began on the 14th of January and continued until the 5th of February in daily sessions, with very few exceptions. Most of this time was taken up, with the exception of a few days, in cross-examination.

It has been estimated that this hearing cost the several companies involved an aggregate of $125,000, all of which must be borne by the companies or their rate payers.

Representatives of the commissions of Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma were present much of the time during the hearing. The commissioners of these States, together with the representatives of the Arkansas department, had formed an association for the purpose of dealing with situations that might arise out of the pool operations. At the instance of a representative of the Oklahoma commission, the commissions of these States requested the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners to intervene in support of the Arkansas department's position, set out in its intervention. The executive committee of the national association determined to file a brief amicus curiae before the Commission in support of the Arkansas department's position, that the Commission had no jurisdiction of the local rate. That brief has been prepared and is being printed. It will be filed in the next few days.

At the time the pool rates were filed with the Federal Power Commission the rate of the Arkansas Power & Light Co. to the aluminum plant was filed with this department. The engineering staff of the department made a hasty investigation to determine the reasonableness of the rate of the Arkansas Power & Light Co. to the aluminum plant, an intrastate rate, and recommended to the department that the rate be permitted to take effect by operation of law, notwithstanding the fact that it was too low to take care of operating expenses, amortization of special facilities constructed exclusively for the use of the service, and a reasonable return upon the property involved in the service.

The department does not know what field investigation the Federal Power Commission made before ordering the hearing. Had it shown any disposition to cooperate with the department or to have sought information which this department, and the commissions of other States, had concerning the facts, the conclusion would have been irresistible, as was later demonstrated by the testimony developed at the hearing, that the investigation would be futile. The information developed at the hearing could have been secured, in the judgment of this writer, in a week's time by sitting around a conference table.

Shortly after the conclusion of the hearing, the examiner conducting it set the time for filing briefs as of March 9. This time was later extended to April 9 and to May 9. The reason for these extensions has not been disclosed.

Counsel for the Federal Power Commission has suggested a conference between the pool members and that Commission for the purpose of trying to settle the matter in an informal way. Pool members have indicated their willingness to sit in on such a conference, but at this time it has not been called.

The Federal Power Commission, assuming to act under a letter from the President to it and a few of the war agencies interested in securing power for emergency purposes, has taken over the question of finally passing upon the reasonableness of all rates for war industries and war agencies in Arkansas. The department has taken the position that it has exclusive jurisdiction over rates to consumers in Arkansas, whether they be war industries or not.

The War Emergency Pipeline Company, with a 20-inch pipe line extending through the State, is one of these agencies. Engineers of the Federal Power Commission have been investigating the power supply and rates for energy to this line for the operation of pumping stations. These engineers made their investigation without calling upon the department or otherwise conferring with it or its staff, and undertook to dictate a rate between one of the utilities operating in Arkansas and the War Emergency Pipeline Co., which was not in keeping with the policies or practices of, or permitted by, this department. When the contract calling for this rate was filed with the department, as is required by law, it suspended the rate and set the matter for hearing, but directed the utility to supply the power, to be paid for at the rate that would later be fixed.

A copy of the suspension order was mailed to the Federal Power Commission and other parties interested. Upon the receipt of this order, the Federal Power Commission, for the first time, asked for a conference, which was readily granted. As a result of this conference a rate which would cost the pipe-line company some $3,500 a year less than that formerly approved by the Commission was agreed upon. A contract embodying the agreement has not at this time been filed with the department.

I hope you will pardon the length of this letter, but because of the information requested in your letter it was not possible to shorten this report unless ultimate facts, which involve opinions, had been submitted. It is not the purpose of the department nor of this writer to do other than state the facts.

Because of conferences the writer had some time ago with Senator REED, of Kansas, and Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, a copy of this report is being sent them, since in each of these conferences some of the questions discussed herein were discussed, and they each requested that I submit a statement to them.

Yours very truly,

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES,
P. A. LASLEY, *Special Counsel.*

EXHIBIT C

BEFORE THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, WASHINGTON, D. C.: IN THE MATTER OF ARKANSAS POWER & LIGHT CO. ET AL.; DOCKET NO. 5802

PETITION OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RAILROAD AND UTILITIES COMMISSIONERS

The National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners respectfully petitions your honorable Commission for leave to file the brief attached hereto as amicus curiae in the above-entitled proceeding and to participate in oral argument, if oral argument shall be made; and in support of said petition respectfully represents as follows:

1. Said association represents in its active membership the regulatory commissions of the several States of the United States, except two, one of which has no State regulatory commission. Such membership includes also the members of the regulatory commissions of the Territories, not yet admitted as States, and of the District of Columbia.

2. Most of said commissions exercise regulatory jurisdiction as to the services and rates of public utilities engaged in the sale of electric energy in their respective jurisdictions.

3. By reason of the jurisdiction of said State commissions, said association has an interest in the above-entitled proceeding.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN E. BENTON,
FRANK B. WARREN,
Attorneys for said Association.

BEFORE THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, WASHINGTON, D. C., IN THE MATTER OF ARKANSAS POWER & LIGHT CO. ET AL., DOCKET NO. 5802

BRIEF OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RAILROAD AND UTILITIES COMMISSIONERS—PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

This brief is filed by the direction of the executive committee of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, hereinafter referred to as the Association, appearing as amicus curiae. That association, in its membership, is representative of the regulatory commissions and boards of the several States of the Union, except two, one of which has no regulatory commission. Most of these regulatory commissions and boards, hereinafter referred to as State commissions, exercise jurisdiction to regulate the rates and services of electric utilities, engaged in supplying electric service in intrastate commerce, and to consumers in interstate commerce, within their respective States.

By the constitution of said association, authority is vested in the president of the association, and also in its executive committee, to direct representation of the association in any matter pending before any Federal regulatory commission, or in the courts, in which the Association is deemed to have an interest. Said Association is deemed to have an interest in this case by reason of the facts hereinafter stated, and because, to enable said State commissions effectively to exercise the regulatory powers vested in them, it is necessary that the line of demarcation between the jurisdiction of said State commissions and of this commission shall be kept clear, as established by the Federal Constitution, or by Federal legislation enacted in conformity thereto.

This brief is accordingly filed, in the name of said association, in the general public interest, as distinguished from the interest of any particular commission, and for the purpose of aiding this commission to make such determination and disposition of the issues which may be before it as shall be in accord with the law, under which it acts, and as shall most contribute to the effective and well-coordinated regulation of electric utilities by this commission, and by the State commissions aforesaid, acting within the respective spheres to which they have been assigned by the Federal Constitution, and by the laws by which they are respectively governed.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The facts of this case, so far as they are essential to an understanding of the matter discussed in this brief, are as follows:

On September 1, 1942, the Federal Power Commission instituted the above-entitled proceeding by an order which, so far as material to the discussion contained in this brief, was as follows:

"ORDER INSTITUTING INVESTIGATION

"It appearing to the Commission that:

"(a) On December 18, 1941, Arkansas Power & Light Co. and the Defense Plant Corporation entered into an agreement for the sale and purchase, respectively, of electric energy to be used at the aluminum plant constructed by the Defense Plant Corporation at Lake Catherine, Ark., as an emergency war measure;

"(b) On August 1, 1942, Arkansas Power & Light Co. filed copies of an agreement and supplement designated Arkansas Power & Light Co. Rate Schedule, Federal Power Commission No. 12 and Supplement No. 1 thereto, providing for the rates, charges, and other arrangements in connection with the pooling of power resources of Arkansas Power & Light Co., Kansas Gas & Electric Co., Louisiana Power & Light Co., Mississippi Power & Light Co., Nebraska Power Co., Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., Public Service Co. of Oklahoma, Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Southwestern Light & Power Co., Texas Power & Light Co., to enable Arkansas Power & Light Co. to supply electric energy to the Defense Plant Corporation under the above contract of December 18, 1941 (copy of which is attached to the rate schedule as exhibit A thereto):

"The Commission, upon its own motion, orders that:

"An investigation be, and it is hereby instituted, for the purpose of enabling the Commission:

"(1) To determine whether any rate, charge, or classification, demanded, observed, charged, or collected by (the companies named in paragraph (b) above are here separately named) for the transmission or sale of electric energy under Arkansas Power & Light Co. Rate Schedule, Federal Power Commission No. 12 and Supplement No. 1 thereto, subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, or whether any rule, regulation, practice, or contract affecting such rate, charge, or classification, is unjust, unreasonable, unduly discriminatory, or preferential; and

(2) If the commission shall find that any such rate, charge, classification, or any rule, regulation, practice, or contract affecting such rate, charge or classification, is unjust, unreasonable, unduly discriminatory, or preferential, to determine the just and reasonable rate, charge, classification, rule, regulation, practice or contract to be thereafter observed and in force, and to fix the same by order."

The Arkansas Power & Light Co. hereinafter called the Arkansas Co., is an electric utility operating in the State of Arkansas. It is engaged in the generation and in the transmission and sale of electric energy at wholesale in interstate commerce, and is thus subject, as to such transmission and sale, to the jurisdiction of this commission. It is also engaged, in the State of Arkansas, in the sale of electric energy to consumers, as to which it is subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Public Utilities of the State of Arkansas, hereinafter referred to as the Department, or the Arkansas Department. The Southwestern Gas & Electric Co. and the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., respondents herein, also operate within the State of Arkansas, and as to their intrastate operations, and as to their sales to consumers in that State, are subject to the jurisdiction of the said Department. They likewise are engaged in the transmission and sale at wholesale of electric energy in interstate commerce, and are accordingly subject to the jurisdiction of this commission as to such transmission and sale. The other electric companies, named as respondents herein, are electric utilities operating outside the State of Arkansas. All of them are subject to the jurisdiction of this commission by reason of the ownership and operation of facilities used in the transmission or sale of electric energy at wholesale in interstate commerce, except the Texas Power & Light Co. That company does not engage in the transmission or sale of electric energy in interstate commerce aside from the service rendered by it under the pooling agreement referred to in the above-quoted order of investigation. The interconnection of the electric system of that company with the electric systems of other companies provided for in that contract has been found by this commission to be of an emergency nature within the meaning of section 202 (d) of the Federal Power Act, and does not have the effect of bringing that company under the jurisdiction of this commission.

The respondent electric companies, as a group, own and operate a preponderant part of the generating facilities of the States in which their plants are located. The contract between said companies, mentioned in the Commission's order of investigation, is a so-called pooling agreement which provides in part as follows:

"Whereas Defense Plant Corporation proposes to construct an aluminum reduction plant in southern Arkansas, which will comprise, among other facilities, electric generating facilities * * * and * * * desires to purchase power and energy for the operation of a portion of such proposed aluminum reduction plant as a temporary emergency supply * * * and,

Whereas Arkansas Co. desires to submit a proposal to Defense Plant Corporation to supply the amount of power and energy required by Defense Plant Corporation * * * and * * * (its) electric system * * * is now or can readily be interconnected with the systems of the other parties to this agreement;

Now, therefore, * * * the parties * * * agree as follows:

Arkansas Co. will proceed with negotiation with Defense Plant Corporation to the end that a contract (hereinafter called proposed industrial contract) be entered into, wherein Arkansas Co. will agree to purchase after construction of said aluminum reduction plant and during said interim period, at a rate of 4 mills per kilowatt hour for all energy taken, plus an amount equivalent to or more than $130,000 per month for 16 months certain, a temporary emergency supply of power and energy for use in the operation of Defense Plant Corporation's said aluminum reduction plant * * *."

Said pooling agreement further provides that "* * * as soon as the proposed industrial contract becomes a valid and binding agreement on both the parties thereto," each of the parties agreeing to construction facilities to enable the contract to be performed, will proceed with the construction, and use due diligence to complete the same at the earliest practicable date.

The pooling agreement further provides; "Each of the parties hereto, except Arkansas Co., will sell to Arkansas Co.," any energy which it can generate or purchase for resale which is required by Arkansas Co. to enable it to fulfill its obligations under its contract with Defense Plant Corporation.

Article IX of the agreement provides that payments to each of the parties thereto, in accordance therewith, "shall be made by Arkansas Co. from, and only from, the revenues received from Defense Plant Corporation." Elaborate provisions for determining the payments to be made to the several companies, based upon the contract and upon the energy supplied by them respectively, are set forth in the agreement. A statement of the same, however, is not essential for the purposes of this brief. Article XII of the agreement provides:

"This agreement is essentially a several and not a joint sale or service contract as between Arkansas Co. and each of the other parties respectively, and nothing herein shall be deemed to constitute any of the parties hereto partners with, or agents of any other party hereto * * * nor to confer on or create in any third party, not a party hereto, any rights as against any party hereto * * *."

In pursuance of the pooling agreement, a contract was made by the Arkansas Co. for a sale of electric energy to Defense Plant Corporation, which, after modification by a supplement thereto, was filed with the Department, as a rate schedule, under Arkansas law. After such investigation by said Department as was deemed essential, said schedule was permitted to become effective by operation of law in August 1942.

The aforesaid pooling agreement, covering sales at wholesale in interstate commerce to Arkansas Power & Light Co., by the other electric companies, parties thereto (with the contract between Arkansas Co. and Defense

Plant Corporation attached as an exhibit), had theretofore been filed with this Commission as a rate schedule covering such sale and transmission of electric energy at wholesale in interstate commerce as was provided for therein. On September 1, 1942, this Commission permitted the same to take effect, by operation of law, designating the same as "Arkansas Power & Light Co. Rate Schedule F. P. C. No. 12 and Supplement No. 1 thereto." On the same date the Commission instituted this proceeding of investigation.

On October 20, 1942, the Commission assigned this proceeding for hearing to be held at Little Rock on November 2, 1942. The hearing, thus assigned, from time to time was postponed, and was begun on December 14, 1942.

Upon the opening of the hearing, appearances were made for the department and for the State commissions of Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. Except for the Arkansas department, however, said commissions took no part in the hearing, either by the presentation of evidence, or by the examination of witnesses.

The hearing was prolonged, continuing, with adjournments, from December 14, 1942, to February 5, 1943.

While the Arkansas department at the opening of the hearing took the attitude of an observer, assuming that the order of investigation was designed to bring under investigation only the interstate wholesale rates of companies selling to Arkansas Co. under the pooling agreement, the course which the hearing took made the department apprehensive lest this Commission entertained the purpose to go beyond the determination of the reasonableness of interstate wholesale rates subject to its jurisdiction, and to investigate and pass judgment upon the reasonableness of the rate provided for in the contract between Arkansas Co. and Defense Plant Corporation, which rate, under applicable law, is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Arkansas department.

The Arkansas department, accordingly, intervened as a party in this proceeding, for the purpose of protesting any disregard of the rights and powers of the State of Arkansas, and for the further purpose of protesting against any action by this Commission to bring about a reduction of payments to the Arkansas Co. to a point which would result in throwing upon those citizens of Arkansas who are patrons of said company a portion of the cost of service supplied by that company to Defense Plant Corporation.

The occasion for the apprehension felt by the Arkansas department, which led to its intervention, may be briefly indicated by references to the record of the hearing.

At the opening of the hearing, the trial examiner stated the purpose of the hearing as follows:

"In general, we are here to conduct an investigation, an objective investigation for the purpose of the discovery of facts. It seemed necessary to the Commission to set the hearing at this time. It seemed desirable to do it. The Commission indulges the hope as I understand its purposes and desires, that all of us here may cooperate in the spirit of mutual helpfulness to develop that whole body of facts which will enable the Federal Power Commission to discharge its own duty, to examine into every phase of this rate contract that is before us in the public interest, and to reach such a determination as to policy and as to the disposition of the matter, as will upon study of the whole record appear to the Commission to be the wisest course and meet the ends of justice.

"If all the parties here will cooperate, Commission's counsel will cooperate and if very fortunately we could get along without any evasion or any too legalistic jockeying for advantage, without fighting too much over nonessential—we lawyers are a little prone to that sort of thing, I think all of us will admit—but if we get along without that in this investigation and let us develop all the facts that are relevant and pertinent that the Commission ought to know about and ought to have before it when it comes to discharge its duty of passing upon this contract, and perhaps of determining any matter of policy in connection with it, with which the Commission may feel itself charged, as a presiding officer, I desire to express the hope that that will be the spirit of the investigation."

This statement was open to the construction that the trial examiner understood the matter to be investigated to be the contract which constituted the rate schedule filed with the Arkansas department, naming the rate payable for service supplied thereunder to a consumer in Arkansas, which rate had been investigated and permitted to become effective by the Arkansas department.

Following this statement by the trial examiner, however, Mr. Lock, counsel for the respondent power companies, sought to elicit some more definite statement for the purpose of the hearing, but without success, beyond that which is indicated by the following colloquy:

"Mr. LOCK. We are ready to go forward, and to go forward in a cooperative attitude such as you have requested * * *. However, we would be very glad to have any information that it would be proper for the Commission to give us in accordance with its rules, if it wishes to do so, with respect to the facts and conditions and circumstances which in its opinion warranted the public hearing. We are perfectly willing to proceed. It would be helpful to have the information on that subject if it could be given us.

"CHIEF TRIAL EXAMINER. May I inquire of Commission counsel if he would desire to respond to that and make an opening statement.

"Mr. MCALISTER. Well, I never realized that there was any mystery about the purpose of the investigation or that there was anything to be disclosed. I dont have a single thing in my mind that I could say in response to the inquiry. The only thing I did want to say was that as far as I know, as far as I am concerned, the only desire that I have, the only information I have, is that the Commission would like to have the necessary facts back of these various arrangements, from a consideration of which the Commission can determine their fairness, propriety, and reasonableness.

"CHIEF TRIAL EXAMINER. The Commission's order of investigation and its order setting the case down for hearing, of course, speak for themselves * * *."

While these statements of representatives of this Commission were rather far from being explicit, the declaration of Commission's counsel was taken to indicate his understanding that the purpose of the investigation was to develop "the necessary facts back of these various arrangements" setting forth the payments the various pool members were to receive for their respective contribution toward supplying electric energy at wholesale to Arkansas Co. "from a consideration of which the Commission can determine their fairness, propriety, and reasonableness."

In the course of the hearing, however, much evidence was brought into the record by counsel for the Commission by interrogation which, in the estimate of the Arkansas department, related solely to the fairness, propriety, and reasonableness of the rate to Defense Plant Corporation, subject to the jurisdiction of said Department, and in effect under a rate schedule on file with it, as aforesaid. Counsel for said Department accordingly made a motion, the essential part of which was as follows:

"that all evidence, documentary and parol, bearing solely upon the reasonableness of said aluminum plant rate, be excluded and stricken from the record and all evidence, irrespective of its nature, be confined and limited solely to the unreasonableness of the rates and matters over which the Federal Power Commission has jurisdiction, to wit: The rates of the pool members for power transmitted and sold in interstate commerce to the Arkansas Power & Light Co."

This motion was denied, and upon the following day counsel for the Arkansas department again presented the motion in alternative form saying:

"In the motions yesterday to exclude the evidence and to limit evidence, which was overruled by the examiner, both of those motions were addressed to the theory that the Arkansas Power & Light Co. was itself serving the aluminum plant, and the motions presupposed that the sale by the power pool members to the Arkansas Power & Light Co. was a complete sale within itself. There has developed and is in the record in three or four places questions and answers implying that the Arkansas Power & Light Co. in delivering current to the aluminum plant may be an agent of the other pool members and that the other pool members from Texas, Oklahoma, and other States are delivering current themselves to the aluminum plant through the agency of their agent, the Arkansas Power & Light Co.

"On the theory that the contract in the pool agreement might be susceptible of such a construction, it is the theory then of the Department of Public Utilities of Arkansas that if the Arkansas Power & Light Co. is not making the delivery upon its own accord, but as an agent merely of the other companies, that jurisdiction to regulate the rate of the other companies' sale to the aluminum plant, even though it moved in interstate commerce, and since the aluminum plant is the consumer, that those rates are exclusively within the jurisdiction of the department of public utilities and not within the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission, and I would like to have my motion addressed to that theory of the contract.

"In other words, it is an alternative."

This motion was also denied.

In connection with the discussion of the evidence referred to by these motions and in connection with the rulings made thereon, and in the denial of said motions, no statement by the chief trial examiner, or by any representative of this Commission was at any time made which negatived the apprehension entertained by the Arkansas department that this Commission was about to assert a claim of regulatory jurisdiction under the Federal Power Act to pass judgment upon the reasonableness of the rate for electric energy supplied by Arkansas company to Defense Plant Corporation, which rate had been permitted to take effect by the Arkansas department in the exercise of its jurisdiction under the laws of Arkansas.

It was after a hearing of this character and upon a state of facts thus appearing from the record that this proceeding was brought to the attention of the executive committee of the association by the Arkansas department, and by other State commissions interested in the proceeding, with the result that the committee instructed that this brief be offered for filing.

Contentions discussed herein

While the situation brought under investigation by the Commission's order is a complex one, and while determination of the matters which the Commission undertook to investigate and determine may be difficult, the issues properly before the Commission for decision do not seem open to doubt.

The respondents are the Arkansas company and nine electric utilities with plants outside Arkansas. These nine companies generate and transmit, or join in the transmis-

sion, of electric energy to the Arkansas company, which in turn sells the same, together with electric energy generated in its own plants, to Defense Plant Corporation.

The compensation received by each of the respondents, selling to the Arkansas Co., is fixed by the pooling agreement, which was filed with this Commission as a rate schedule, and was permitted to become effective as has been stated. The rates thus fixed are plainly rates for the transmission or sale of electric energy in interstate commerce at wholesale, and are plainly subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission under the Federal Power Act.

This has been at all times recognized by the Arkansas department, and is expressly recognized on behalf of the association at this time.

1. It is the contention of the Arkansas department, in which this association joins, that the only rates brought under investigation by the Commission's order of September 1, 1942, and the only rates over which it has regulatory jurisdiction, are those interstate wholesale rates fixed by the rate schedule on file with this Commission as "Arkansas Power & Light Co. rate schedule F. P. C. No. 12 and supplement No. 1 thereto," for those electric utilities which sell or transmit electric energy to Arkansas Power & Light Co. at wholesale in interstate commerce.

2. The record at various places indicates that the contention may be made that the sale of electric energy to Defense Plant Corporation by Arkansas Co. is, in legal effect, a joint sale by all of the 10 electric utilities which are parties to the pooling agreement.

The association supports the position which was taken by the Arkansas department in the presentation of its alternative motion, that if such can be held to be the legal effect of the pooling agreement, such sale is not a sale at wholesale within the definition of that term as contained in section 201 (d) of the Federal Power Act, and that the rate therefor is accordingly a local rate, subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Arkansas department, and hence not within the scope of the investigation order of the Commission in this proceeding, nor within its regulatory jurisdiction.

3. Because it may possibly be argued that the Commission may exercise jurisdiction in this case under section 206 (b), this brief will anticipate such possible argument.

It is the contention of the association that the order of investigation, by which this proceeding was instituted, determines the scope of the investigation. That order specified the rates to be investigated as those rates which are subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission under Federal Power Commission. Under that order the Commission cannot properly undertake to exercise jurisdiction under section 206 (b).

It is furthermore the contention of the association that, in any case in which the Commission makes an investigation under said section 206 (b), the jurisdiction which the Commission may exercise is limited to the determination of "the cost of the production or transmission of electric energy," and does not exceed to the point of determining the reasonableness of the rate at which the same shall be sold, such determination being for the exclusive determination of the regulatory commission vested with jurisdiction thereover.

4. Because there have been suggestions, altogether outside the record in this proceeding, that the Commission, in making this investigation, is acting under a directive from the President of the United States, we shall anticipate any possible argument to that effect by a statement of the position of the Association with respect thereto.

ARGUMENT

The Commission's determination and order can not extend beyond the rates of those respondents which transmit or sell energy to Arkansas Power & Light Co. under the pooling agreement

Section 206 (a) of the Federal Power Act, under which this Commission exercises power to fix reasonable rates, provides that action of the Commission must be "after a hearing." The right to a hearing includes the right to a reasonable notice thereof. The Commission, by its order of September 1, 1942, gave such a notice in this case; and that notice establishes the limits of the Commission's regulatory action in this proceeding.

The Commission's order gave notice that the hearing was to be held for the purpose of determining:

"(1) * * * whether any rate, charge or classification, demanded, observed, charged, or collected by (the respondent companies severally named) for the transmission or sale of electric energy under Arkansas Power & Light Co. Rate Schedule FPC No. 12 and Supplement No. 1 thereto, subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, or whether any rule, regulation, practice, or contract affecting such rate, charge or classification, is unjust, unreasonable, unduly discriminatory, or preferential; and

"(2) If the Commission shall find that any such rate * * * or contract affecting such rate, charge, or classification, is unjust, unreasonable, unduly discriminatory, or preferential, to determine the just and reasonable rate, * * or contract to be thereafter observed and in force, and to fix the same by order."

The phraseology of this order may have contributed to the apprehension which brought about the intervention of the Arkansas department, since it purports to bring under investigation not only the rates of companies under the pooling agreement, for transmission or sale of electric energy, "subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission," but also any rate or contract "affecting" any such rate, and further states the purpose of the Commission, if any such rate or "any contract affecting such rate" shall be found unjust or unreasonable "to determine the just and reasonable rate * * * or contract * * * to be thereafter observed and enforced, and to fix the same by order."

The fear might be entertained that this order, so phrased, was intended to have reference to the contract between Arkansas Co. and Defense Plant Corporation, and to announce the purpose of this Commission to set aside that contract, if found to be unreasonable, and to prescribe another in its place. The statement of the chief trial examiner, hereinbefore quoted, indicating that the Commission would "examine into every phase of this rate contract, and * * * reach such a determination as to policy, and so forth" may have been taken to indicate that such was the understanding of the chief trial examiner.

Upon consideration, however, it is clear that such was not the intent of the order. The reference in the order of investigation is to the pooling contract, and to that contract only.

Read in its entirety, the order declares the purpose of the Commission to investigate rates "subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission" for which the Commission has jurisdiction to substitute just and reasonable rates, if the rates investigated are found unjust and unreasonable. The rates which are thus subject to the Commission's jurisdiction are all determinable by reference to the pooling contract, filed as a rate schedule with this Commission. To the extent that such a contract is a rate schedule applicable to interstate wholesale electric service, it is subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission. Accordingly, the reference in the Commission's order to any contract "affecting such rate" plainly was designed to relate to the pooling contract, under which all rates which are "subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission" are determined.

This commission has no jurisdiction respecting the contract for service to Defense Plants Corporation, a consumer purchasing electric energy for use in Arkansas. Its power to regulate rates under section 206 (a), by the express terms of that section, extends only to rates "for any transmission or sale subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission." Such jurisdiction, by the provisions of Section 201 (b) is restricted to "the transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce and to the sale of electric energy at wholesale in interstate commerce."

By Section 201 (b), a sale at "wholesale" is defined as a sale of electric energy to any person "for resale." Unless a sale is shown to be a sale "for resale" it does not fall within the jurisdiction of this Commission, even though interstate in character, and regardless of the quantity of energy supplied under the sale.

In this case the electric companies, respondents herein, other than the Arkansas Co., are engaged in the transmission or sale of electric energy to Arkansas Co. at wholesale in interstate commerce. The rates of those companies for that service (except of the Texas Power & Light Co.) are unquestionably subject to the jurisdiction of this commission.

(The Texas Power & Light Co., not being engaged in transmission or sale at wholesale in interstate commerce, aside from its participation in service under the pooling contract, and that company having been granted an order under section 202 (d) establishing exemption from the Commission's jurisdiction by reason of anything done under that contract, its rates, even under the contract, we assume to be beyond the Commission's jurisdiction. Touching that matter, however, the Association makes no argument. What is said hereinafter in this brief with respect to rates of the respondents, is not intended to have reference to the rates of that company.)

With respect to this matter of interstate wholesale rates, the Arkansas department has at no time questioned the jurisdiction of this Commission. This was made clear at the hearing, both by counsel for the Department, and by Mr. Flanders, rate expert for the Department.

The prime purpose of the Federal Power Act was to bring interstate wholesale power rates under regulation to fill the gap in the regulation of electric utilities which had been disclosed by the decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Public Utilities Commission* v. *Attleboro Steam and Electric Co.*, 273 U. S. 83. The Association supported the enactment of that act, asking only that it be so drawn as not to encroach upon the regulatory powers theretofore exercisable by the States.

As the act was passed by Congress, there is a clear line of demarcation as respects the rates and service of electric utilities between the jurisdiction of this Commission and the jurisdiction which is reserved to the States. Over the interstate sale at wholesale of electric energy, as hereinbefore defined, this Commission has absolute and unquestioned jurisdiction. On the other hand, sales to consumers, whether for domestic, commercial, industrial, or other use, are local in character, and subject only to regulation by the States, even though made across State lines.

That it was the definite purpose of Congress thus to circumscribe this Commission's jurisdiction was made very clear by the congressional committee reports, upon which the

bill, which became the Federal Power Act, was presented to the Congress.

The Senate committee in its report upon the bill, said, in part:

"Subsection (a) * * * declares the policy of Congress to extend that regulation to those matters which cannot be regulated by the States and to assist the States in the exercise of their regulatory powers, but not to impair or diminish the powers of any State commission.

"Subsection (b) defines the scope of this part of the act and the jurisdiction of the Commission. * * * This subsection leaves to the States the authority to fix local rates even in cases where the energy is brought in from another State. In *Pennsylvania Gas Co.* v. *Public Service Commission* (252 U. S. 23), the Supreme Court held that such rates may be regulated by the States in the absense of Federal legislation. The present bill carefully refrains from asserting Federal jurisdiction over these rates. The rate-making powers of the Commission are confined to those wholesale transactions which the Supreme Court held in *Public Utilities Commission* v. *Attleboro Steam & Electric Co.* (273 U. S. 83), to be beyond the reach of the States." (Senate Report No. 621, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session.)

The House committee in its report upon S. 2796 said:

"The new parts (II and III) are designed to meet the situation which has been created by the recent rapid growth of electric utilities along interstate lines. * * * Under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Public Utilities Commission* v. *Attleboro Steam & E. Co.* (273 U. S. 83), the rates charged in interstate wholesale transactions may not be regulated by the States. Part II gives the Federal Power Commission jurisdiction to regulate these rates. A 'wholesale' transaction is defined to mean the sale of electric energy for resale and the Commission is given no jurisdiction over local rates even where the electric energy moves in interstate commerce. * * *

"The bill takes no authority from State commissions and contains provisions authorizing the Federal Commission to aid the State commissions in their efforts to ascertain and fix reasonable charges. * * * Probably no bill in recent years has so recognized the responsibilities of the State regulatory commissions as does title II of this bill." (House of Representatives, Rept. No. 1318, 74th Cong., 1st sess.)

The sole interest of the association in filing this brief is to guard against any decision or order which shall encroach upon the jurisdiction of the States, which Congress so carefully undertook to preserve.

With respect to the reasonableness or unreasonableness of these interstate wholesale rates, which are subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission, the association has no disposition to make argument. We urge simply that it was those rates only which were placed under investigation by the Commission's order, and that it is only those rates which may be made the subject of any decision or order by the Commission in this proceeding.

The association urges that, in any opinion or order which may be rendered or entered herein, it be made clear that the Commission deals with these interstate wholesale rates only, and that such opinion or order is not designed to control the rate charged to Defense Plant Corporation by Arkansas Co., which rate is subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Arkansas Department.

The Commission cannot assert jurisdiction over the sale to Defense Plant Corporation upon the theory that it is a joint sale made through the agency of the Arkansas Co.

The record at various points may be construed to indicate that counsel for the Commission may make the contention that the sale of electric energy to Defense Plant Corporation was in fact a joint sale made on behalf of all the 10 companies which are parties to the pooling contract, through the agency of the Arkansas Co.

We do not believe that contention will be made. If it shall be made, however, the argument heretofore presented under the last preceding caption of this brief will be applicable.

In connection with the motion made by the Arkansas department to strike out all evidence relating solely to the rate covering the sale to Defense Plant Corporation, counsel for the Arkansas department made clear the contention of that department that, even if the sale to Defense Plant Corporation be held to be a joint sale, made on behalf of all of the parties to the pooling agreement, nevertheless such sale is beyond the jurisdiction of this Commission to regulate. The association supports that contention of the Arkansas department with entire confidence.

Undeniably all energy sold to Defense Plant Corporation was for use by it in the operation of its aluminum reduction plant at Lake Catherine. It was a sale of power for consumption and not for resale. Accordingly, it was subject to the jurisdiction of the Arkansas department, which jurisdiction the Congress intended should not be disturbed by the creation of this Commission, and by the jurisdiction granted to it.

In addition, we direct attention to article XIII of the pooling agreement, hereinbefore set out in the statement of facts, whereby any construction of the pooling agreement which would give to any other party than the Arkansas Co. any right to receive the service provided for from the several parties to the contract, is expressly negatived.

This Commission cannot adjudicate the reasonableness of the rate to Defense Plant Corporation in this proceeding under section 206 (b)

There is perhaps the possibility of argument that, even though this Commission has no jurisdiction to fix the Defense Plant Corporation rate, the Commission may nevertheless make a decision as to what that rate should be under Section 206 (b) of the Federal Power Act. That Section provides:

"(b) The Commission upon its own motion, or upon the request of any State Commission whenever it can do so without prejudice to the efficient and proper conduct of its affairs, may investigate and determine the cost of the production or transmission of electric energy by means of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Commission in cases where the Commission has no authority to establish a rate governing the sale of such energy."

We do not expect that Counsel for the Commission will undertake to argue that Section 206 (b) authorizes any action by the Commission in this proceeding. The Commission's order declares the purpose, and fixes the scope, of the Commission's investigation, and of its decision. As we have before pointed out, the only rates thus brought under investigation were the interstate wholesale rates which are "subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission."

Furthermore, Section 206 (b) does not give this Commission jurisdiction to determine and declare the just and reasonable rate for electric energy sold to Defense Plant Corporation or to any consumer. That section was enacted to enable this Commission to be of aid to State commissions in a cooperative manner, but not to usurp their functions.

To determine the just and reasonable rate for service supplied to consumers is the function of the State commission, exercising jurisdiction in the locality where the service is supplied. For the commission to undertake to determine and announce what that rate ought to be would be an invasion of the province of the local commission, which can have no other effect than to tend to hamper and embarrass that commission in the exercise of the jurisdiction to regulate, which has been by law vested in it.

If this Commission should assume to determine and declare what a consumer's rate ought to be, either the State commission, vested with jurisdiction must abdicate its authority and substitute the judgment of this Commission for its own judgment, or, if its conclusion as to what is reasonable differs from the opinion promulgated by this Commission, it must make its order subject to the handicap of an announced opinion by this Commission that the State commission opinion is wrong.

It is not the purpose of section 206 (b) to give this Commission any authority for a pronouncement of that character. The section was designed to open the way to helpful cooperation between this Commission and State commissions, to enable them to coordinate the exercise of their powers in the interest of ultimate consumers.

A State commission called upon to fix a rate for electric energy sold to a consumer within the State, but generated outside the State, may encounter difficulty in determining important factors affecting the rate to be fixed, viz, the cost of producing the energy and the cost of transmitting it from the point of production into the State by means of facilities not subject to the jurisdiction of the State commission. This difficulty arises from the fact that the State commission can exercise no power beyond the borders of the State.

To supplement State power, Congress enacted section 206 (b); but the authority given to this Commission by that section goes no further than to authorize the Commission "to investigate and determine the cost of the production or transmission of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Commission." Costs other than those of such production and transmission are for the determination of the State commission; and it is for the State commission to determine what margin of profit, above the aggregate of all costs, it is just and reasonable to permit the selling company to include in the selling price. The ultimate finding of a just and reasonable rate for the service supplied is the exclusive function of the State commission.

This association certainly has no disposition to do anything else than to encourage the use by this Commission of the authority granted to it in section 206 (b) whenever the action of this Commission under that section can be of aid to the local rate-making authority. Furthermore, the record in this case makes it plain that such is the attitude of the Arkansas department.

For the past 25 years this association has undertaken to promote the practice of cooperation between State and Federal commissions, both by securing the enactment of provisions of law authorizing such cooperation, and by encouraging the use of such provisions after their enactment. Said section 206 (b) is a provision of law which can be made of great value to the public if it shall be used in the manner designed by Congress.

In this connection, it may not be improper to observe that a larger degree of cooperation in this proceeding might have avoided the apprehension on the part of the Arkansas Department which led to its intervention as a party herein, and might perhaps even have obviated the occasion for any formal hearing.

All of the activities of the Federal and State commissions with reference to any rate directly or indirectly involved or affected by this proceeding look toward the establishment of a just and reasonable rate to the ultimate consumer, the Defense Plant Corporation. That rate had been agreed upon by the parties, and upon filing with the Arkansas Department had been permitted to take effect, without a rate hearing.

In order to perform its contract with Defense Plant Corporation, it was necessary for the Arkansas Co. to buy power generated outside Arkansas. The payments to be made to the companies supplying that power, fixed in the pooling agreement, were the principal factors underlying the rate to Defense Plant Corporation. Those rates, having been filed with this Commission, were permitted to take effect without hearing in the same manner as the Arkansas rate had been permitted to take effect in Arkansas. It is obvious that both commissions considered that Defense Plant Corporation should not be impeded in its arrangements to supply itself with power.

Inasmuch as these interstate wholesale rates, however, were such important factors in the making of the Defense Plant Corporation rate, it would seem plain that the Arkansas Department had as much interest as this Commission in being assured that those rates were not too high.

Here was a complicated situation involving exercise of the jurisdiction of both State and Federal Commissions. It was exactly the kind of case in which cooperation, such as the Federal law makes possible, would have been most desirable.

These observations are made without any intent to allocate blame for the absence of cooperation either to the Federal or to the State commissions, or to imply that there is blame which might be allocated. The absence of cooperation has doubtless been the result of oversight or misunderstanding and not indisposition to cooperate. These observations are made by this amicus curiae with the thought that they may possibly contribute toward the handling of analogous situations in the future in such manner that there may be a joinder of the efforts of the commissions in forwarding the common purpose of bringing about just and reasonable rates and service to all consumers.

When the commission felt that an investigation of these rates was perhaps desirable, if it had invited a conference with the Arkansas department concerning the situation, it does not seem open to doubt that the Arkansas department would have readily joined in such a conference, and would have cooperated in any investigation which might have seemed advisable after a consideration of the situation in the light of all the information in the possession of the two commissions, or which might have been assembled through an informal inquiry.

The result might have been a joint conclusion that there was no occasion for a formal hearing, or both commissions might have instituted investigations, each of the rates under its jurisdiction, and a joint hearing might have been held.

Instead of such a proceeding, however, this hearing was instituted by an order which might easily have been misunderstood as designed to bring under investigation by this Commission the reasonableness of the Defense Plant Corporation rate, already established under an Arkansas department tariff.

Upon the institution of this proceeding, it is true that the customary notice called for by the cooperative agreement was sent by this Commission to the commission of each State in which energy was to be generated or transmitted under the pooling agreement; and it is true that, under the Commission's standing rule, the commissioners from those States might have taken part as cooperators. Had they done so, it is to be believed that they might have had a helpful part in determining the course of the hearing and in developing the record by appropriate interrogation of witnesses, and they might now be in a position to consider with this Commission the decision to be made.

Apparently no State commission, except the Arkansas department, has considered that the matters immediately involved in this case were of any considerable interest to it, and the Arkansas department has seemingly considered that the proceeding looks toward a review of its action in permitting the defense-plant rate to become effective. In such a proceeding, obviously, it could not cooperate. It could only protest. Hence its intervention as a party herein.

While State and Federal commissions can perform their functions proceeding independently, we submit that their effectiveness can be greatly increased if they will work in cooperation in matters such as that which led to this proceeding. We are satisfied that the State commissions can profit greatly from the cooperation of this commission, and from the understanding of the policies and purposes of this Commission in its proceedings, which such cooperation might afford them. On the other hand, we are satisfied that this commission loses an opportunity to increase its effectiveness, and to increase, as well, the public understanding of the value of its work, when it permits a proceeding of this character to be instituted with no preliminary understanding, or adequate effort to insure an understanding, with State commissions affected.

It is, of course, plain that the Arkansas department has a very vital interest in the interstate wholesale rates paid by Arkansas Co. for the power purchased by it from companies in other States. It is beyond the jurisdiction of the Arkansas department to investigate or to fix those rates. If they are too high, and hereafter shall be established on a lower basis, it is the province and the duty of the Arkansas department to take that changed situation into account, and to reflect the same in an appropriate rate to Defense Plant Corporation. It is not necessary to assure this commission that it need not be concerned lest the Arkansas Commission neglect its duty. This commission will assume that.

There need, however, be no assumption about the matter. This record shows the attitude of the Arkansas department. It will welcome whatever aid this Commission may give to it toward the effective exercise of the powers of the Arkansas department. This is shown by the testimony of Mr. Flanders, the department's rate expert, when under interrogation by Mr. McAllister, from which we quote excerpts as follows:

"Question. Can you now, Mr. Flanders, under the existing Arkansas Power & Light Co. contract with Defense Plant Corporation, from a consideration of that contract alone, make any determination as to the reasonableness of the rate between Defense Plant Corporation and Arkansas Power & Light Co. without giving basic consideration to the intercompany agreement which is an agreement over which the Federal Power Commission has jurisdiction?

"Answer. I couldn't make what might be termed an exact cost study without knowing the cost that the Arkansas Power & Light Co. would incur through the intercompany agreement, and considering that as a purchase of energy by the Arkansas Power & Light Co.

"Question. A cost study is not an exact study, is it? It is the best you can do with what you have. Isn't that right?

"Answer. That is correct, and rates are never exactly determined on the basis of cost studies. They are used as an indication.

"Question. So that, in reality, according to your testimony here, there is every need for close cooperation between the Federal Power Commission and the department of public utilities of the State of Arkansas if the utilities in your State are to receive their proper proportion or proper share of the revenue derived from this contract, and the department of public utilities of the State of Arkansas operating by itself and considering a contract that is on file there can't independently control that situation on one contract now on file. Isn't that right? I mean, from the study you have made.

"Answer. Yes, sir; that is a more or less two-part question, and I will answer it that way. There is every reason in the world for cooperation, yes, sir; and it should have that. The last part is that we cannot make the determination to any degree of exactness without knowing the final decision or the decision of the Federal Power Commission in relation to those matters to which you refer, namely, the inter-company agreement. I think that maybe I have answered your question, although I am not sure.

"Question. I think that is right. You have a supply of power coming from a great number of sources for your load?

"Answer. Yes, sir.

"Question. No one of those States, considering the authority which you have, can adequately deal with that pool arrangement; is that right?

"Answer. That is correct; yes, sir" (transcript, pp. 3237–3238).

In this proceeding the Commission is not acting under the President's directive

It may possibly be argued that the Commission in this proceeding may act under the President's directive, of which announcement was made from the White House on October 27, 1942.

We do not choose to make argument on that point for three reasons:

First, the Commission by its order of investigation, made long before the issuance of the directive, confined the scope of the heading to rates within its jurisdiction; and no notice or intimation was at any time given that the scope of the hearing was subsequently enlarged, and,

Second, the President's directive does not impose upon the Commission any duty to determine the reasonableness of a rate which has been established in accordance with a State regulatory law. If the directive might be so construed as to impose upon the Commission such duty, it does not appear probable that the Commission would proceed to determine a rate thereunder without notice to the State commission of the State involved of its intent to make such determination, and without affording opportunity to such State commission to be heard respecting the matter to be determined.

The State, in any case falling within the directive, has an interest in any rate which may be brought about by Federal action, by reason of the likelihood that, if an inadequate rate is fixed, the burden of resulting loss therefrom will fall upon other rate payers within the State.

The position of the Arkansas department upon this matter was stated by Judge Lasley, counsel for the department, at the hearing on February 2, 1942, as follows:

"The Department will insist that none of the companies under its jurisdiction—Arkansas Power & Light Co., Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., and Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co.—should be required to serve any war industries at rates which merely cover the incremental cost of the service with nothing allowed for maintenance, depreciation, and return upon investment. To do so will, in the opinion of the department, penalize the rate payers of these companies who for years have paid for the carrying of any facilities made use of during the emergency. These rate payers are carrying their just proportion of the war burden and should not have inflicted upon them heavier or additional burdens of the war that are not borne by other citizens of this Nation."

The Commission will recognize the soundness of the view urged by the Arkansas department, and would not intend to foreclose the department from being heard, by failing

to give notice that the Commission was proceeding to determine a rate under the directive.

The very direct interest which the people of Arkansas have in avoiding the imposition of unremunerative rates upon utilities serving that State is very strikingly shown by exhibit No. 134, presented by the Arkansas department in this proceeding. The exhibit is a copy of an order made by the Arkansas department dated November 27, 1942, requiring the Arkansas Co. to refund to its electric patrons in Arkansas the full amount of revenue received from such patrons in the year 1942 in excess of operating expenses and such amounts additional thereto as the department had considered to make just compensation for the service supplied by said company to said electric patrons. Under that order refunds actually made by the Arkansas Co. were estimated to aggregate $625,000 for the year 1942, the order having been sustained by the State court in Arkansas. If Arkansas Co. shall be compelled to serve Defense Plant Corporation at an unremunerative rate, the resulting loss would, in the ultimate result, be borne not by the company but by its patrons.

The Commission will, of course, construe the President's directive in the light of the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in *Penn Dairies, Inc., et al.* v. *Milk Control Commission of Pennsylvania*, decided on March 1, 1943, and in cases cited therein, the court having, in the Penn Dairies, Inc., case, upheld the price regulation of the Pennsylvania Milk Control Commission, as effective to prevent sales to the United States Department of Agriculture at less than the price fixed by the Pennsylvania Milk Control Commission, notwithstanding Federal statutes directing the War Department to advertise for bids, and to accept the lowest bidder.

The Commission, also, in construing the directive, will have in mind the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, enacted January 30, 1942, and the amendment thereto, enacted on October 2, 1942, as bearing upon the probability or improbability that the President can have intended to direct the Commission to make any changes in rates fixed under State law.

Third, this Association has no interest in any action taken by this Commission by virtue of a directive from the President, whereunder the Commission assumes to exercise powers aside from and beyond those granted in the Federal Power Act. With respect to any such action, the Association asks only that it be made clear that this Commission does not claim that its action is in the exercise of authority vested in it by Congress, but instead that it is taken under an asserted war power of the President.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN E. BENTON,
FRANK B. WARREN,
Attorneys for said Association.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 23, 1943.*

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, from 1937 to 1941 it was my privilege to be Governor of my State of Vermont. During those 4 years it was frequently my duty, and usually my pleasure, to do business with persons who represented the Federal Government and whose work would bring them occasionally into my State. I wish to say to the Members of the Senate today that of the Federal officials who have impressed me as being conscientious, honest, hard-working, and sincere, one of the foremost of them all is Leland Olds, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. He did have work to do in my State, as he had work to do in all New England, and as there was work for his Commission to do. I think he did it well in forcing down some of the outrageous write-ups in utility values which existed in Vermont and in other States. I know of one single instance where property valued at $50,000 for the purposes of assessment was written on the books of the utility company at a million and a quarter dollars; and that was not an isolated instance.

Mr. Olds came there or sent his men there, and I think they did remarkably good work, which has resulted in saving the people of northern New England millions of dollars every year.

I always found Mr. Olds to be courteous; I always found him to be considerate of the rights of the State, and, unlike some other Federal officials, he never tried to trample over the people whom he was supposed to serve.

I feel that I ought to say this to the Senate today because I can regard the speech of the Senator from New Hampshire only as an attack upon Chairman Olds. I have never known Mr. Olds to take an unfair advantage of any man. I believe him to be one of the most honest, courageous and hard-working public servants we have today. He has always been there fighting for the rights of those who pay his salary by their tax money.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to add a word of praise for Chairman Olds. During the time I was Governor of North Dakota I repeatedly called upon the agency to help me. Partly because of the fine work they did, we reduced the flat rate for the public institutions in Bismarck, N. Dak., from 9 cents a kilowatt-hour to 1 cent. Time and time again I telegraphed for advice from them and they were always helpful. So far as I am concerned, I do not think that the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was warm enough in his praise. Chairman Olds and his commission did a remarkable job during those years.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I always find it difficult to disagree with my very dear and close friend, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], but I rise to oppose the amendment he has offered to the committee amendment which increases the appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] covered very thoroughly my conception of the fundamental objections that many of us have to the continuation of this Board.

The creation of the National Resources Planning Board has never been approved by Congress. It was created as a part of the Executive Office of the President on September 8, 1939, by Executive decree. It has a complicated history.

The Federal Employment Stabilization Act of February 3, 1931, provided for the preparation by the Secretary of Commerce of a comprehensive public works program to combat the widespread unemployment which then existed. As a result, the Federal Employment Stabilization Board was created to carry out the act. This agency was abolished, and its successor, the Federal Employment Stabilization Office, was established on March 1, 1934. The primary purpose of this agency was to advise the President of trends in unemployment and to plan for a continuous 6-year public-works program.

Then the National Planning Board of the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works was created by the administrator on July 20, 1933. Then on July 30, 1934, the President created the National Resources Board as an independent agency to supersede the National Planning Board. The National Resources Board then became the National Resources Committee on June 7, 1935, and continued to operate under this name until it was merged with the Federal Employment Stabilization Office to form the National Resources Planning Board on July 1, 1939, by Executive order and not by the action of Congress. Then the National Resources Planning Board was created as a part of the Executive Office of the President on September 8, 1939.

I doubt if any other agency of the Government has had such a complicated history as the National Resources Planning Board has had. This complicated and circuitous procedure in establishing an agency of government demonstrates the great evil of permitting costly agencies of the Government to be established by Executive order without approval of Congress.

Up to this date the National Resources Planning Board and its predecessors have spent $9,068,617, and asks $1,400,000 for the next fiscal year.

At least 15 agencies of Government are now conducting post-war planning, and also 2 congressional committees. The agencies of the Government include the Treasury Department, the Federal Reserve Board, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the National Housing Agency, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, the War Manpower Commission, the Federal Security Agency, the Department of Commerce, and the Board of Economic Warfare.

If the National Resources Planning Board is permitted to plan for our post-war period, we will have the same kind of a post-war program presented to Congress that has been previously given us by the Executive prior to the war. This will mean a plan based on the premise that the more we borrow and spend the greater our prosperity and the greater the purchasing power of the people will be.

Under this plan we succeeded in increasing nearly five times the public debt for nonmilitary expenditures in time of peace, and then we were faced with the most colossal war expenditures in all history. We built up a bureaucracy, the like of which the world has never known, and which has now become so gigantic and unwieldly as to present a very serious obstacle to the full utilization of the manpower and resources of this country in winning the war.

The trend of the policies of the National Resources Planning Board is on the theory that the Government should become a continuous borrower of the savings of the people and should use such funds to spend on various kinds of projects for the purpose of creating na-

tional income. This has been demonstrated time and time again by the reports made by the Board. Such a policy involves a continuous increase in the national debt, but the Board argues that a large public debt continuously increased is not dangerous, first, because it increases the national income; and, second, the interest is not a burden because it is collected from the people in the form of taxes and paid back to them in the form of interest. According to this line of reasoning national deficits of five, ten, twenty, or more billions of dollars a year are not a condition to excite alarm.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to cover the same ground the very able Senator from Ohio has covered, but I wish to make reference to a memorandum with respect to the National Resources Planning Board prepared by Mr. John T. Flynn, who is a very able economist and student of Government affairs. I desire to call attention to a few paragraphs of this memorandum prepared by Mr. Flynn when he says:

> There is abundant and, indeed, conclusive evidence that the National Resources Planning Board has adopted this theory—
>
> The theory is spending for spending's sake—
>
> which might be called the national debt theory of abundance, but which is called by its sponsors dual consumptive economy.
>
> In Germany before Hitler, and since Hitler, it is called planned consumption. It is sometimes referred to as that here.
>
> The theory of deficit financing by the Government was first invoked in 1933. It was, however, a different theory. The development of it in this country is extremely interesting and important.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement by Mr. Flynn be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The National Resources Planning Board and the Board of Economic Warfare are engaged in post-war planning activities. The National Resources Planning Board is limiting itself generally to planning for the United States. The Board of Economic Warfare is concerned more with the post-war economic international picture. The National Resources Planning Board has given some publicity to its plans. The Board of Economic Warfare has given very little.

Stated generally, both of these Boards are proceeding on the theory that with the end of the war this Government must embark upon a program of public spending in order to avert widespread unemployment and an economic crisis. And in accordance with this, numerous blueprints are being prepared for extensive projects involving the spending of many billions of dollars.

However, it is not the projects proposed which are of most importance but rather the philosophy underlying the plans. Up until recently public spending has been defended as a device to be utilized by the Government in periods of economic lethargy or crisis to restore balance. That is to say, it has been treated as an emergency device. The great importance of the activities of the National Resources Planning Board lies in this fact: That this Board is proceeding upon the theory that public spending of borrowed money must not be considered as an emergency device but as a permanent instrument of public policy.

Unless this fact is understood, the whole seriousness and significance of this movement will be lost upon the mind of Congress. I offer the following brief and simple statement of the economic theory upon which these Boards are operating:

"The present capitalist system or system of free enterprise as we know it is no longer capable of functioning effectively. The reason for this is as follows:

"The dynamic element in the capitalist system has been private investment. Since millions of people save billions of dollars yearly, these savings must be brought back into the stream of spending. This can be done only through investment. When private investment is either curtailed or halted, the capitalist system goes into a depression. Nothing, therefore, can revive the present system save a revival of investment.

"Private investment cannot be revived on a scale sufficient to absorb the savings of the people. Hence, recovery through private investment is hopeless.

"Private investment cannot be sufficiently revived for one reason, and that is because there are no longer open to the savers opportunities for investment. Therefore the savings must remain inert.

"Opportunities for investment are not open for three reasons: (1) Because the frontier has gone, with its great opportunity for territorial and resource expansion; (2) because population increase has slowed down to a snail's pace; (3) because technological development has matured. That is to say, there are no longer in sight any such great inventions as the railroad, the automobile, etc., which will change all the arrangements of our social life and call for huge money expenditures and investment.

"For these reasons, therefore, the present capitalist system is helpless to recover its energy. This is not a mere emergency condition, but a characteristic of the present system which will continue indefinitely.

"For this reason we must adopt a new type of economic organization. This new type is called the dual system. Under this system the Government will become a continuous borrower of the savings of the people and will use these funds to spend on various kinds of projects for the purpose of creating national income. What we must look forward to, therefore, is a long-range program of Government projects financed by borrowed funds.

"Such a policy involves a continuous increase in the national debt. But this is not a condition to be feared. Apprehensions about huge public debt are a form of old-fashioned superstition comparable to the aversion to interest in the Middle Ages. A large public debt, continuously increasing, is not dangerous, first, because it increases the national income; second, the interest is not a burden because it is collected back from the people in the form of taxes and paid back to them in the form of interest.

"For this reason national deficits of five, ten, twenty, or more billion dollars a year are not a condition to excite alarm."

Adopting these principles as the underlying policy of planning, it is easy to see why the planners offer with complete confidence programs for spending countless billions permanently. This helps us to understand much that has been said by very influential persons like Vice President WALLACE and others about the manner in which abundance is to be brought not only to America, but to the whole world when the war ends. Their plans, which seem a little disturbing to others, appear quite feasible and reasonable to them because they believe they have discovered the secret of abundance and of continuous prosperity through the manipulation of national debt as an instrument for creating national income.

EVIDENCE OF ADOPTION BY NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD OF THE DEBT THEORY

There is abundant and indeed conclusive evidence that the National Resources Planning Board has adopted this theory, which might be called the national-debt theory of abundance, but which is called by its sponsors the dual consumptive economy. In Germany, before Hitler, and since Hitler, it is called planned consumption. It is sometimes referred to as that here.

The theory of deficit financing by the Government was first invoked in 1933. It was, however, a different theory. The development of it in this country is extremely interesting and important:

1. The first phase came when Mr. Hoover, as Secretary of Commerce, posed the idea of a public-works reserve. That theory, which had been worked out by a commission appointed by the Government, was as follows: The Government should, in times of normal or boom production, abstain from public-works expenditures, but should prepare plans for needed public works and put these plans into execution on the appearance of a depression for the purpose of supplementing the income of private business. This theory, however, did not involve the borrowing of money by the Government. Its whole purpose was to produce a condition of balance by which the Government would not add to the boom tendencies during a period of expanding production but would save its expenditures for a period of shrinking production.

2. The second phase came in 1933 when the pump-priming theory was advanced. Then it was proposed to have the Government spend money to create national income and to do so with borrowed funds. The theory was that the Government would pour large quantities of new income into the pump of private business and set it working again. This, however, was limited wholly to the crisis and was a purely emergency device to be discontinued as quickly as possible when the private enterprise pump began to work. The President held this view and repeated it many times, and as late as 1929 Mr. Marriner Eccles, one of the leaders in that movement, declared emphatically that he favored Government deficit spending only in times of depression.

3. The third phase made its public appearance in 1938. Dr. Alvin H. Hansen, a widely known economist, littauer professor of economics at Harvard University, began to enunciate the principle set out at the beginning of this memorandum. This principle discarded the pump-priming theory. It discarded the theory that deficit spending was necessary only during depression. It adopted the theory that in the free-enterprise system depression is a chronic and not an occasional phenomenon. Dr. Hansen turned to the theory that the free-enterprise pump was hopelessly inadequate to create the necessary national income and there must be a second pump—a Government pump—which would supplement the stream of national income by borrowing in large volume and pouring the funds out into the stream of business through national public expenditures. This Dr. Hansen called the dual consumptive economy as distinguished from a dual productive economy. In other words, he did not propose to have the Government borrow money and take over industries to operate them either in competition with or to the exclusion of private industry. Private industry is to go on producing the goods and services required by the people. The Government "will assume responsibility to assure a sustained consumption" by providing all the additional income necessary.

Dr. Hansen is a professional economist and his discussions were largely inside the profession. In 1938 a little volume was issued called an Economic Program for American Democracy, by seven Harvard and Tufts economists. This small volume set out the principle of this new form of economy very much in the language used in this memorandum above, and this book began to be passed around among the persons and agencies in the Government most interested in this whole spending policy. Six of the seven economists who wrote this book—disciples of Dr. Hansen—were brought to Washington and put into key positions as economists of various bureaus, and as economic advisers of even such important agencies as the War Production Board. Dr. Hansen was made economic adviser of the Federal Reserve Board by Marriner Eccles, who had become impressed by this theories and by the little book of the Harvard and Tufts economists. In 1939, when the President requested the National Resources Planning Board to prepare plans and blueprints for the post-war world, Dr. Hansen became one of the advisers of the National Resources Planning Board. He became, indeed, the chief inspiration of the Board for the underlying principles or philosophy upon which it proceeded. He is not on the pay roll of the National Resources Planning Board, but of the Federal Reserve Board, his services thus being made available to the National Resources Planning Board.

The position of Dr. Hansen in Washington in reference to planning is described in the New Republic, December 29, 1941, by Mr. Richard Lee Strout, as follows:

"The economic and fiscal thinking of this distinguished professor of economics permeates the New Deal. But for one thing he would be the Felix Frankfurter of the administration's financial policy, the Corcoran-Cohen of its economic philosophy. What stands in the way is the fact that Dr. Hansen does not give a whoop about the New Deal, one way or another. What he cares about is his revolutionary vision of a brave new America after the war. An America in which factories work overtime on peace goods and there are jobs for all.

"Dr. Hansen takes the Federal Express out of Boston every Tuesday night. He stays in Washington 2 days and is back for his graduate seminars in Cambridge again on Friday morning. In the two days of his commuter's stop at the capital his telephone rings constantly. A stream of visitors comes to his door. His discussions go on through lunch and dinner, then after dinner. They are with top-rank men in the Government. He is one of the most influential men in Washington.

"Recently he flew on a semiofficial mission to England. And in Washington, the genial and stocky professor, Keynes' counterpart in America, swings into a 30-cent taxi at the Union Station every Wednesday morning and goes to the marble home of the Federal Reserve Board on Constitution Avenue.

"In Washington he is a close adviser of Marriner S. Eccles, of the Federal Reserve System, and an intimate of Vice President Wallace. He is on the United States-Canadian joint economic commission. He first came to Washington as a State Department adviser in connection with the reciprocal-trade agreements. Today, as he puts it, he dabbles in many things. He is a consultant of the National Resources Planning Board and is working on post-war urban development plans with a Reserve Board assistant. He is an adviser on Federal-State-local fiscal matters. But most of all he is concerned with the new America after the war."

About his thesis, the article continues:

"It is a post-war blueprint, being compiled today by Keynes in London and Hansen in Washington. Dr. Hansen has been trying to tell about it in his difficult books; and has got the academic world half convinced, and the New Deal 90 per cent sold."

When Harper's magazine printed an article by Dr. Hansen in April, 1942, outlining his Dual Economy and his debt thesis of prosperity, Harper's said of the article: "In view of his great prestige with the Government, it might be called a semi-official vision."

When the National Resources Planning Board was ready to sell its ideas to Congress and the public, it made a report to Congress and issued a series of pamphlets for public consumption. Referring to these pamphlets, the Board said:

"In reports transmitted to the Congress and the President the Board has set forth certain objectives of post-war planning. The Board believes that it will be helpful to put these objectives before the American people in a series of short statements. The realization of these objectives will require the support of public opinion everywhere and action by State and local authorities as well as the Federal Government; it seems appropriate, therefore, to put forth guiding ideas even before details and plans are worked out." (Post-War Agenda pamphlet issued by National Resources Planning Board, November 1942.)

The Board then lists the pamphlets issued "to this end". One of the earliest is entitled "After the War—Full Employment" published in January, 1942. This pamphlet was prepared for the Board by Dr. Alvin H. Hansen and is so labelled. This is one of the pamphlets officially described by the Board in November, 1942 as offering its "underlying objectives" and "guiding ideas".

In this pamphlet Dr. Hansen lays down the proposition outlined in his book, namely, the principle of the Dual Consumptive Economy, in which private business will produce the goods and the Government will assume responsibility to assure a sustained consumption (p. 3). He describes this on pages 3 and 4 of the pamphlet thus:

"We know from past experience that private enterprise has done this for limited periods only. It has not been able to insure continuous and sustained demand * * * Private industry and government together must act to maintain and increase output and income sufficiently to provide substantially full employment."

Throughout the pamphlet appear the well-known arguments that appear in Dr. Hansen's book Fiscal Policy and Business Cycles and the Harvard and Tufts book An Economic Program for American Democracy—namely, that (1) public debt is something very different from private debt because private debts must be paid and public debts need not; public debt is not a burden since it increases income; the taxes collected to meet interest charges are not lost as they are paid right back, largely to institutions that benefit the community as a whole; public debt should be used as an instrument of public policy to control the magnitude of the national income, while taxes are used to effect its distribution.

Dr. Hansen suggests a post-war national income budget as follows:

Consumption	$80,000,000,000
Net capital formation (including public works and housing)	10,000,000,000
Defense (including International Reconstruction Finance Corporation)	10,000,000,000

Since the Board has offered this pamphlet by Dr. Hansen, its most influential adviser, as containing a statement of underlying objectives, and guiding ideas, there is little room left to doubt that the theories of Dr. Hansen are those which lie at the bottom of all the Board's planning.

But this is not all. Throughout almost all the reports and pamphlets is the recognition of this theory as the underlying principle of all that is being done by the Board.

Mr. Rexford Tugwell said in 1940 that our spending program had failed to produce full recovery because we had not spent enough. We had spent only around $3,000,000,000 a year whereas the Government should spend $12,000,000,000. In its pamphlet The Future of Transportation issued in September 1942, the Board said:

"Inevitable readjustments following the present war will require far-reaching participation in productive investments designed to stimulate and maintain a high level of national income. Although billions of dollars have been spent in the past to provide emergency relief employment on transportation projects, results have been grossly inadequate in the light of what might have been attained."

Throughout all the pamphlets and reports is the idea that we have built up our national income during the war by vast public expenditures and that the same devices can produce the same results in peace. Thus, in the pamphlet, After Defense—What?, issued in January 1942, the Board says:

"The full employment and prosperity which is coming with the defense effort proves that we can have full employment system and balance the production-consumption budget at a high level if we are determined to do so."

Indeed, various members of the administration confirm this, for they continually assert that we are going to accomplish all the miracles of abundance when the war ends by "a bold use of the public credit." Mr. WALLACE and Mr. Milo Perkins, of the Board of Economic Warfare, have said this

It is necessary to report, however, the most important fact respecting these opinions, and that is that all this is suggested not as a mere emergency device to tide us over the post-war transition period but as a permanent instrument of public policy to create a high level of national income, and it therefore means a continuously rising public debt. We are assured by the President that the national debt will be $210,000,000,000 in June 1944. If the war should end at that time, we must look to at least 1 year of spending as great as during 1943-44. The peak of spending in the last war was reached in the year following the war. It is coming to be generally recognized that the national debt will be swelled by the war effort to not less than $300,000,000,000. It is at this point, with a debt of $300,000,000,000, that the Planning Board proposes to launch a vast program of public expenditures with borrowed funds, adding each year to the stupendous debt and doing this permanently.

The idea has been expressed by the Hansen group sponsoring this theory thus:

"The notion that Government spending can be resorted to only as a temporary emergency device must be abandoned. A program must be developed which recognizes the necessity for permanent public investment."

Again they say:

"We advocate a long-term program of Government investment financed through borrowing of savings which would otherwise go to waste."

Dr. Hansen admits a limit to public debt. He thinks that there must be some proportion between debt and national income but he does not believe that national income can be increased without increasing the debt, and he says in his book Fiscal Policy and Business Cycles that we cannot look forward ever again to the balanced budget for any considerable period.

How all this money is to be spent is not yet made very clear. The National Resources Planning Board has made a list of public works projects which are already available for

what it calls its 6-year plan, thus going Germany two better on the 4-year plan and Russia one better on the 5-year plan. This is only a beginning, however. A careful reading of all the pamphlets and reports indicates that the Board supports another theory, namely, that public funds must be used to invest in private industries, purchasing the bonds or stock of railroads, utilities, or other industries in order to supply the credit which they believe is not forthcoming from private sources.

JOHN T. FLYNN.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish also to call attention to a document which has recently been issued by Mr. Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution, which takes the same view of the policies of the National Resources Planning Board as that taken by Mr. Flynn. Mr. Moulton says in his report that there are two opposing philosophies with respect to public finance. He continues:

The first, which may be called the traditional view, is that a continuously unbalanced Budget and rapidly rising public debt imperil the financial stability of the Nation. The second, or new conception, is that a huge public debt is a national asset rather than a liability and that continuous deficit spending is essential to the economic prosperity of the Nation. According to this view, the conception of a balanced Budget belongs in the category of obsolete economic dogma, the fallacy of which has been clearly demonstrated in recent years.

SUPPORT NEW PHILOSOPHY

The traditional view, the report said, is held by the United States Treasury, by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, by the President, by numerous congressional leaders both in the House and in the Senate, and by many individuals occupying important positions in the administration.

The new conception is advocated by the National Resources Planning Board, by numerous individuals high in the councils of the Government, and by various groups not connected with the administration.

So, Mr. President, while we want post-war planning, in my judgment we do not want the same kind of post-war planning we have had from the National Resources Planning Board in the past 10 years, which has brought us to the brink of disaster by the continuous recommendations which have been made for deficit spending.

I hope very much that the Senate will reject the amendment proposed by the very able senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], and not increase the appropriation, and then I hope that the entire National Resources Planning Board will be abolished, that the Senate will concur in the action of the House of Representatives, which struck out from the appropriation bill all appropriations for this agency of the Government.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I have had the pleasure of serving on a joint committee which included members of the National Resources Planning Board. The joint committee was created for the purpose of studying labor conditions and the mine situation in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania. I do not believe the Senator from Ohio or the Senator from Virginia has ever done any work directly in conjunction with the members of the National Resources Planning Board. I found them very competent, very intelligent, and very constructive in their suggestions, and for that reason I shall vote to support the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, which I hope will prevail. I am sure that if my colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who served with me on the joint committee to which I have referred, were present, he would join in what I have said.

Mr. MCKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Overton
Andrews	Gillette	Pepper
Austin	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hawkes	Robertson
Bone	Hayden	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Smith
Bridges	Holman	Stewart
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Lodge	Tobey
Butler	Lucas	Truman
Byrd	McCarran	Tunnell
Capper	McClellan	Tydings
Caraway	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chandler	McKellar	Van Nuys
Chavez	McNary	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Walsh
Danaher	Mead	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	White
Eastland	Moore	Wiley
Ellender	Nye	Willis
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wilson
George	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators having responded, a quorum is present.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for only a few moments to discuss the paragraph of the bill dealing with the National Resources Planning Board. When that paragraph came before the House it was stricken out entirely. When the bill came to the Senate Committee on Appropriations an amendment was offered to restore the item of $534,000 for the Board for the coming fiscal year. That item was adopted in the subcommittee, but when it came before the full Appropriations Committee it was rejected by a tie vote, 10 to 10. After the rejection of that proposal a Senator suggested that $200,000 be appropriated for collaboration with the States. That was agreed to, and that provision is now in the bill.

Mr. President, on my own responsibility as a Senator, and, of course, without the committee approval, because I did not receive committee approval, and the committee was evenly divided on the question, while insertion of the item would require the approval of the majority of the committee, I have now made a motion to restore the item of $534,000. I wish first to say to my friend, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], with whom I have collaborated on the so-called economy committee for quite a while, and for whose views I have the highest respect, that I feel exceedingly interested in the reduction of Government expenditures. I feel very much the same on that subject as he does.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Tennessee has shown that repeatedly by his work, which has been magnificent.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I thank the Senator. But in this case one of the principal objections which was offered to the proposal to insert the item of $534,000 was that a bill was pending in the Senate which would establish another planning board to take the place of the National Resources Planning Board, which had been set up by Executive order, and that we ought to wait until action on that measure was taken.

Mr. President, if we are to wait until the Senate acts on legislation proposing to establish another planning board—and the proposed legislation may or may not be passed—I think we shall not be doing a very practical thing.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What was the prospective Senate body which was referred to in the argument just made by the Senator?

Mr. MCKELLAR. My recollection is that it was the Finance Committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was wondering if the so-called George committee was referred to, which has been created to deal with post-war problems.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Perhaps it was. I believe it was the George committee rather than the Finance Committee. I probably was led into making that mistake because of the fact that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is chairman of both committees.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That committee is in existence and is organized and has gone to work.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That may be true, but I am sure that, so far as the next year is concerned, the proposed legislation will not be passed in time for the contemplated committee to begin operations on the 1st of July, and I do not know what line it may take. It may conclude to follow along the lines now followed by the National Resources Planning Board.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to call the Senator's attention to a parallel in relative economic point of view. The George committee is undertaking its work on post-war planning with $50,000, and the National Resources Planning Board asks to have several million dollars.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Not several million dollars. I will tell the Senator exactly what amount is asked by the Board. I think the Budget estimate this year for the National Resources Planning Board was $1,400,000. Mr. President, we should be perfectly frank and fair about this matter. We should be economical in dealing with the situation. I wish to call the Senate's attention to what has been expended by the National Resources Planning Board. I think the Senate should have those figures.

Before doing so I wish to say that the Board was set up by law. It will be found on page 230 of the hearings on the

independent offices appropriation bill for 1944 that the Board was set up under a law passed in the administration of President Hoover. In the spring of 1939 a point of order was made against this very kind of appropriation, an appropriation in that year for the National Resources Planning Board, and the Senate actually voted on that question. I do not know how the Vice President or Presiding Officer decided the question, but the question was submitted to the Senate, and the Senate held that the point of order was not well taken. The legislative authority for the Board is contained in the Federal Employment Stabilization Act of 1931, and is a joint resolution of June 7, 1939—Public Resolution 20, Seventy-sixth Congress.

A summary of the Board's legal history shows that that joint resolution approved and put into effect Reorganization Plan No. I, combining in the National Resources Planning Board the functions of the Employment Stabilization Office and those of the National Resources Committee.

So that there is legislative authority for the Planning Board. Under that legislative authority the following appropriations have been made for it: In 1934, $102,036; in 1935, $1,011,145; in 1936 and 1937, $1,823,258 for the 2 years; in 1938, $793,884.33; in 1939, $775,400; in 1940, $841,146; in 1941, $955,018; in 1942, $1,251,932; in 1943, $1,017,618.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from Tennessee contend that the National Resources Planning Board was established by Congress?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, indeed. It was established by the law of 1931, and the law of 1939 amending the previous law. That situation was brought out in the hearings.

Mr. BYRD. Established by that name? In 1931 the Federal Employment Stabilization Office was established.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true, and under that law a national planning board was established, and it operated until 1939, when, by joint resolution of June 7, 1939, several planning functions were combined. That joint resolution combined in the National Resources Planning Board the functions of the Employment Stabilization Office and those of the National Resources Committee.

Mr. BYRD. But the Congress has never established a National Resources Planning Board by that name.

Mr. McKELLAR. Probably not by that name. I cannot say.

Mr. BYRD. That is the way we establish an agency—by name, is it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. Ordinarily we do so, but Congress did not do it in this case. Congress established first the planning board of the Employment Stabilization Office, and then afterward the joint resolution combined that agency with the National Resources Committee, and gave it the sanction of law, and the Senate itself overruled a point of order raised on that question.

Mr. BYRD. I understand that, but the fact remains that the National Resources Planning Board, as such by that name, has never been authorized by Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. The National Resources Planning Board by that name has not been established by Congress, but two acts of Congress established the two organizations which in 1939 took the name of the National Resources Planning Board.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator read a list of appropriations made commencing some years back.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I tried to keep a reasonable count of them. They seemed to approximate more than $5,000,000.

Mr. McKELLER. I can tell the Senator the total in a moment.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that the total for the 9 years is $8,571,437.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to state what I am interested in. I listened to the remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I do not know what else there may be in the report in addition to the comments and the excerpts he read, but it seemed to be merely a lot of rhetoric. I should like to know what the Board has done with the $8,000,000 already appropriated which would justify a further appropriation in the expectation that the money will be so spent as to justify its expenditure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the National Resources Board is a fact-finding commission. It has no authority except to find the facts and to suggest planning for future years.

Mr. TYDINGS. What planning has it suggested for future years, other than large appropriations, no taxes, and the American flag? [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, I am not dealing in rhetoric or in language, but I am trying to deal with facts in submitting this matter.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In reference to the very appropriate query of the Senator from Maryland, let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that the National Resources Planning Board has rendered and is rendering a very material service to many of our war agencies, as has been testified to in the hearings. In the hearings letters were presented from Donald Nelson and from the War Department. I think perhaps the Senator from Tennessee will refer to those letters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have a memorandum of them, and am going to refer to it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am keeping an open mind on the proposition.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the Senator is doing so; I want to convince him if I can.

Mr. TYDINGS. But up to the present time I have not heard any detailed information which in my judgment would warrant the continuance of the National Resources Planning Board. Assuming that the outline for the future is to be in line with the remarks we heard on the floor today, I should like to know how the objectives are to be accomplished, how they are to be paid; whether involving the building of bridges and roads and hospitals and what might be called postponed or delayed services, which it seems to me would be a worthy matter for our consideration, or whether it is proposed merely to run off at a tangent and promise everyone good wages and full employment, without any program to show how that is to be achieved. I should also like to know how it is to be paid for.

It seems to me there is room for a program in that field; but up to the present time I have not heard anyone detail it, and certainly no one has offered any method by which it can be financed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the actual building of roads, waterway improvements, highway improvements, and any other public improvements, of course, is not in the hands of the National Resources Planning Board. What the Board does is to furnish the information and make recommendations.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask the Senator to permit me to continue.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall listen to the Senator, of course.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will do so, I shall be greatly obliged to him.

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. What the National Resources Planning Board does is to furnish information to make recommendations, and to furnish plans and aids in helping the administrators of the Government properly to conduct such matters after the war is over, and even at the present time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me there?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Up to the present time, what plan has the Board offered for the post-war period that is tangible and real and detailed?

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say to the Senator that I have not read the last report. The report is very voluminous. I have been ill and recently have been exceedingly busy in connection with the matter of appropriations; and it has been impossible for me to read the report. So I cannot give the Senator the information, but I refer him to the report.

In the meantime I desire to give the Senator an illustration of the work of the Board. My distinguished friend the Senator from Louisiana, whom I love very dearly, asked a question awhile ago of the Senator from Ohio as to what the National Resources Planning Board had ever done for the War Department. I desire to read to the Senate a letter which will answer the question of the Senator from Maryland at the same time:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
HEADQUARTERS, SERVICES OF SUPPLY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D. C., February 22, 1943.

MR. FREDERIC A. DELANO,
Chairman, National Resources Planning Board, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DELANO: In view of the wartime shortages of transportation equipment, and

particularly of rubber, the Transportation Corps of the War Department continues to be very seriously concerned over the problems of maintaining essential truck transportation service and war worker transportation, especially by private automobile and bus. It is my desire to express the appreciation I feel for the help which the National Resources Planning Board has been able to give the Highway Division during the past year in pointing out the nature of these difficult problems with which we were to be faced as the war progressed, and in helping me and my staff to formulate the ways and means by which the War Department could mitigate the seriousness of these problems.

Mr. President, I digress long enough in the reading of the letter to state that we all know that one of the most trying and one of the most difficult problems we have in our country today is that in connection with the transportation of our citizens and of war materials and of civilian supply materials.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator think that the National Resources Board's report on transportation by automobile and bus has produced the present situation or has done anything to alleviate it?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it has done a great deal to alleviate it, but I do not think it has had a particle to do with producing it. I think that situation has been brought about by the immense congregation of citizens in various parts of our country for war service and by the immense concentration of materials, both war materials and materials needed for the civilian population; and I think the work of the National Resources Planning Board has been greatly remunerative, as the author of the letter, the Army officer in charge of transportation, has to say.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that if the only thing to which the National Resources Planning Board can point is the maintaining of essential truck transportation service and war worker transportation by private automobile and bus, certainly that condemns it finally as any successful planning agency that can formulate plans.

Mr. McKELLAR. That might be so if there were only one thing to which it could point; but I have just started. The Senator took about an hour and a half to point out some difficulties in connection with the Board. I am just starting to show what the Board has done; and the letter I was reading is the first letter I have read. I shall give the Senator the facts about it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Before the Senator reads the letter, will he yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask the Senator to excuse me for a moment, because the Senator from Ohio has asked me a very straightforward question, and I want to answer it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not want the Senator to leave the letter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I had not intended to do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. Because what he has read thus far from the letter does not tell me anything that the National Resources Planning Board has actually done.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not understand language if the language does not indicate what has been done; I may not understand language. For instance, I shall read the letter again to the Senator:

It is my desire to express the appreciation I feel for the help which the National Resources Planning Board has been able to give the Highway Division during the past year in pointing out the nature of these difficult problems with which we were to be faced as the war progressed, and in helping me and my staff in formulating the ways and means by which the War Department could mitigate the seriousness of these problems.

Mr. President, I may not understand language; I may be so dense as to be unable to understand language; but the language I have just read has a very definite meaning to my mind.

I continue to read the letter:

It is probably fair to state that your analysis of the rubber situation and its effect on transportation, and your recommendations as to the action which should be taken, represented the most forward-looking thought on the subject which we are able to discover anywhere in Washington.

I may not understand language; but that statement makes a very direct impression on my mind.

Furthermore, I feel that with respect to transportation, the suggestions which you gave us as early as last winter were largely corroborated by the report of the Baruch committee.

If that is not aid, it is planning. The men who use that planning say that it has been very helpful in the war effort. Does that make no impression? If it does not, I am incapable of understanding language.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The impression it makes on me is that it is simply a letter of general recommendation, couched in the most general terms, such as we sometimes address to appointive power to get a person a job, or to a pardoning board to secure the release of some one from the penitentiary.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it has as little effect as that, I do not think it is worth anything.

Mr. OVERTON. There is nothing specific about it. It is stated that the Board has aided in the rubber program. What it has done, I do not know. The writer of the letter does not undertake to say what was done.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me answer one question at a time.

Mr. OVERTON. The question which I asked the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], to which question the Senator from Tennessee alluded, was asked with the purpose of determining something specific which the National Resources Planning Board had done for the War Department or for the Congress in enabling it to enact legislation. I wished to determine whether any of the members of the Board had appeared before a committee, or what the Board had done for any department or agency of the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator from Louisiana a question. Does he understand that the National Resources Planning Board is a planning board, or a work agency, to accomplish something specific? If he understands it to be a work agency of the Government, he may be correct. However, as I understand, the National Resources Planning Board does not do work on roads. It does not supervise highways. It does not build levees in the Senator's State or in my State. It does not build improvements on the Santee and Peedee Rivers in South Carolina. It does not build bridges in the State of Virginia. It does not build great Federal works, such as reclamation works, in the States of the West. It does planning, so that other organizations may do the work.

Mr. OVERTON. If I may answer the Senator's question, the Board is not a planning board. It is a receiving board. That is all it has done.

Mr. McKELLAR. I differ entirely with the Senator on that point. I think it has done very fine work. As I shall show, the work has been accepted by a number of departments. For example, the Board has the strongest support from the W. P. B., the War Manpower Commission, the State Department, the War Department, the O. P. A., the Interior Department, and agencies dealing with strategic services and public works.

The Board deals with public works. It not only undertakes to inform the people of the Nation with regard to public works, but it cooperates with the States, counties, and cities, including the cities and counties of Maryland and Louisiana. Boards in those States are in favor of cooperating with the National Resources Planning Board. If my dear friend from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] will consult the proper authorities in the State of Maryland he will find that the State authorities welcome the collaboration of the National Resources Planning Board. The same statement applies to Louisiana, Virginia, and my own State. I have received letters from officials of a great many States showing that the States are vitally interested in this matter. We have 3,000 counties. The cities and counties are vitally interested in the matter, and have received great help.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Up to the present time it seems to me that my good friend from Tennessee is supporting his argument with a letter of recommendation rather than with concrete, specific evidence.

Mr. McKELLAR. I can understand how a Senator who is opposed to the National Resources Planning Board under any conditions or circumstances can look upon these letters as recommendations.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not opposed to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. The fact is that these letters represent the views of departments and agencies of government. I think they should be given proper consideration. I do not think we should close our minds to them.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I had assumed the Board would do, and what I assumed, after listening to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], it was thinking of doing, was primarily to envision the conditions which will exist after the close of the war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. The Senator is misinformed.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will bear with me. I had assumed that the function of the National Resources Planning Board was to develop a program which would give, in broad outline at least, a suggestion of what we might do to meet that situation. I listened to the Senator from Ohio reading excerpts from the report. It promised every man a job at good wages when the war is over. It promised him a degree of contentment and said that the Bill of Rights had been outmoded and that the time had come to reestablish it on economic grounds.

After all those words were read I failed to find what the plan was to implement the program and achieve the great new world which we are entering.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator's mind is so closed to the argument on this side that he will not listen to what is being said. He quotes the Senator from Ohio as saying that the National Resources Planning Board promised certain things to the people. I sat here listening during most of the time the Senator from Ohio was speaking, and I do not recall that he quoted any language which promised such things. If the Board is promising Tom, Dick, and Harry all over the country to do certain things for them, that is one thing. I do not believe that to be true.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is the way I understood it.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was the Senator's interpretation of what the Senator from Ohio said.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The language on page 5 of the bill is:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used except for correlation and coordination of planning with State governments and with political subdivisions of such States.

My own State of South Dakota and quite a number of other States have abolished planning boards. Will the Senator explain how the National Resources Planning Board can be of any benefit to us?

Mr. McKELLAR. The counties and cities have a right to deal with the National Resources Planning Board, even though the State government does not want this service.

Mr. President, I am glad to have these interruptions, but I wish to finish reading the letter from the War Department. There are one or two other letters which I wish to read:

Although we have progressed a long way toward recognizing the essential nature of motor-vehicle transportation in the war effort, you know, as well as I do, that the problems involved in maintaining even the most essential truck and bus operations and in getting people to and from their work in private passenger cars will call for all the ingenuity which we transportation men can summon. I hope, therefore, that we can continue to count on your cooperation.

The letter is signed by Col. Frederick C. Horning, of the War Transportation Division.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I usually say what I wish to say and then quit. It is not my fault that I have occupied the floor for so long. It has been because of interruptions. I yield again to my good friend and neighbor from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is always very generous in yielding.

I was confused in finding my way through this labyrinth of words. I hold in my hand a pamphlet of the National Resources Planning Board entitled "After the War, Full Employment." There are some things in it which are more or less concrete. I wish to read from it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to know whether it bears the name of the National Resources Planning Board.

Mr. TYDINGS. On the cover appear the words "National Resources Planning Board. After the War—Full Employment."

If the Senator will bear with me for a moment——

Mr. McKELLAR. I have borne with the Senator not only once but many times, and I will bear with him again.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to show the Senator how his statement that they do analyze is substantiated by the facts, but what they do further after they analyze is a little hazy. Allow me to read to the Senate from this report. It deals with the public debt.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to have a copy of the report?

Mr. TYDINGS. This will be interesting to Senators, because it will relieve us of a very heavy load of trouble, worry, and responsibility. I am sorry that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is not in his seat at the moment, because he would not need to worry about a new tax bill. It would not be necessary after he heard what I am about to read.

The public debt is something very different from the private debt of an individual.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from what page is the Senator now reading?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am reading from near the bottom of page 7. The Senator has before him the lease-lend report. He does not have a copy of the document from which I am reading.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have asked for it a number of times. If the Secretary of the Senate is about, I wonder if he will procure for me a copy of the report from which the Senator from Maryland is reading.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will give the report to the Senator, but I should like first to have the Senator's attention while I read two paragraphs.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. TYDINGS. The part which I am about to read deals with the public debt. It states as follows:

The public debt is something very different from the private debt of an individual.

Of course, no one will question that.

An individual will always improve his asset position if he is able to pay off a part of his debt. But a nation may make itself poor by repayment of public debt.

Mr. President, we ought to call the conferees back and discharge them and have no tax bill at all, because what I have just read points the way to riches.

Let me continue.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say right there that I do not agree with the statement at all. [Laughter.] I do not know what the Senator was reading from, and I should like to verify it. If any officer of the Senate or the Presiding Officer will direct someone to get a copy of what the Senator was reading, I should appreciate it.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is a pamphlet entitled "National Resources Planning Board."

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, I know what is printed on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be provided with a copy of the document.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is in the same position I occupy. Frankly, we do not read all these reports. I have read a few of them. I wish to read this to the Senator, beginning with where I left off.

That is true because such repayment tends to cause deflation, depression, and unemployment. It is a good thing to pay off a part of the public debt if you want to check an excessive boom. It would be ruinous to pay off the public debt in post-defense period when unemployment was spreading.

A public debt internally held has none of the essential earmarks of the private debt of an individual. A public debt is an instrument of public policy. It is a means to control the magnitude of the national income and, in conjunction with the tax structure, to affect income distribution.

Mr. President, let us boil that down. I do not see a job in this for anybody, although the title is——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Maryland where he got the document from which he has read?

Mr. TYDINGS. It came from the Library of Congress, Government publications reading room. It is entitled, "After the War—Full Employment. Post-War Planning. January 1942. National Resources Planning Board." The membership of the Board is set forth. There is also a statement concerning the pamphlet.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Librarian tells me he does not have a copy of it. I wonder where it came from.

Mr. BYRD. The copy came to me as chairman of the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is a valuable member.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator did not show it to me. I am sorry. He usually shows me important documents which come before the committee.

Mr. BYRD. It was in the possession of the committee and I turned it over to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I will be brief, because I do not want to transgress on the time of the Senator any further.

It is high time that such nonsense as that putting this Government overwhelmingly and almost irreparably in debt is a good thing for the Nation be ended once and for all. That debt is no better if the people do not intend to pay it off, than is any other debt which is not to be paid off. If it is to be paid off after the conclusion of the war the interest on it alone, will consume an amount equal to the total amount of taxes which this Government levied on its people from 1930 to 1940. At the rate of 2 percent the interest will consume $6,000,000,000 a year. That is more money than the Government raised on an average annually from 1930 to 1940. The interest on this debt must be paid, or it will not be worth 5 cents. To do that will require a revenue equivalent to all we raised from 1930 to 1940 on a yearly basis. In addition to that, we shall have to provide for all the consequences of the World War. This continual reiteration of the fallacy, of the sophistry, that a national debt is a blessing to the people, is an outrage foisted on their common sense, and an abuse of all the teachings of every sound and worth-while economist from Maine to California, and the teaching of every high school and college in America.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator has done what the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] did today. He has taken some kind of a document and referred to certain isolated items in it with which he does not agree. I am quite sure, from a hasty glance at it, that the most of it is entirely a proper comment to be made upon the situation as we find it at this time.

I am sure that the Senate will agree with me on that during the time I have been here no Member of the Senate has tried in a more practical, and in a more straightforward, way to reduce the expenses of Government than have I.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Quite a number of Senators have done as well, perhaps some have done better, but I do not believe any Member has more consistently and courageously tried to reduce all expenditures of Government than have I.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I sit on the Committee on Appropriations with the Senator from Tennessee. He is chairman of many of the subcommittees of the committee, and I am glad to testify that no member of that committee is more judicious in his appraisal of estimates, and more desirous of saving money and not wasting it, than is the Senator who now has the floor. I am glad to pay him this deserved tribute.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR I will yield to the Senator in a moment. I thank the Senator from Maryland. I am trying to make an argument on the amendment which I have offered, and due to interruptions I am afraid my train of thought has not registered as it should.

Speaking of expenditures, I will give the Senate an illustration which all will understand. Last year I introduced two bills. One was to cut off the C. C. C., and the other was to repeal the provision or directive—whichever it was, I have forgotten now—creating the N. Y. A. I also considered cutting out the W. P. A., which I thought had served a good purpose, but had outlived its usefulness. All these matters came before the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member. I soon found that all three of the proposals could not be carried. I found that we could repeal the provision for the C. C. C. I pointed out on the floor of the Senate the reasons for so doing, and we repealed it at a saving to the Government of not quite a million dollars. I found that we would lose them all if we undertook to put them all through, and, therefore, I accepted a compromise on the N. Y. A., reducing the appropriation from $151,000,000 to $46,000,000, if I am correct in my recollection of the figures. That was done. Incidentally, I may say that the administration has transferred what was left of the N. Y. A. to the War Manpower Commission. It is my intention to vote against any appropriation for the N. Y. A. at the present session of Congress so as to carry out the purpose we then had in mind.

It was simply impossible last year, in the situation prevailing in the Senate, for us to repeal outright the W. P. A., but we did reduce the appropriation for it by about one-half, and it was entirely discontinued after the 1st of July by Presidential order. In that way we have gotten rid of the W. P. A., which had outlived its usefulness, the C. C. C., which had outlived its usefulness, and we have gotten rid of two-thirds of the N. Y. A., which has outlived its usefulness.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to say as chairman of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures I have served with the Senator from Tennessee, and there is no Member of the Senate who has rendered more valuable service for economy than he has. He occupied the position of acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and has done an astounding work. I have spent hours with him, and I have been simply amazed at times at his grasp of public affairs and the smallest details of appropriations. I desire to pay my tribute to him as having done as much as has any other Member of the Senate to reduce unnecessary expenditures. I am only regretful that I cannot agree with him in this instance.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator, and I am sorry I cannot agree with him about the matter in controversy. Regarding that matter, let me say that the House struck the provision out entirely, and that almost immediately brought about an effort to establish another planning commission to do the same work that this Commission has done and is doing. I wish to say that if that is done, it makes no difference how carefully it may be done, the work has got to be administered by substantially the same people. We know that that will be done, but at a greater cost than $534,000.

Last year the appropriation was approximately $1,100,000. The amendment I have offered would cut it in half. In my judgment, it would be good sense and good economy to retain the present commission to do this collective work, which it is doing well and to the satisfaction of almost all the State organizations that have to join in doing it. As I recall, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] a little while ago made a speech in which he stated that he was Governor of Vermont when a part of this work was going on, and that it was exceedingly helpful and beneficial. I was glad to hear him say that, and I have no doubt that other Senators who were at that time governors of their States—I do not now remember the exact number—will say the same thing. I make that assertion because many State officials are now advising me that it will be very troublesome and hurtful to their States, to their communities throughout the country, unless this organization is retained.

I am not in favor of high salaries for this Commission; I am not in favor of the large organization they have; but it is proposed to cut it in two by this amendment. The subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I think almost unanimously, agreed to the amendment, and then in the full committee it subsequently was rejected by only a tie vote.

Senators, I never was more convinced in my life that it would be an economy measure to continue this Commission with an appropriation of $534,000 a year; it would be the greatest kind of economy; it would be very unwise and uneconomical to do away with it and set up some other board or commission to take its place. The present Commission has had experience; it has brought together an enormous amount of facts on which various counties and cities and States have acted with success and satisfaction. It has been represented to us by many Government agencies that they could hardly get along without it. I think it would be very unwise for the Senate to strike it down in an angry moment. If I may so express it. I do not mean anything offensive by the remark, for we all have moments when we want to hit something, to knock something out, and teach a lesson, but it is not always economy to do it. I am sure upon reflection it will be found that it would not be economical or to the best interests of the country to break this Commission entirely and set up another one in its place.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In reference to the pamphlet to which the Senator from Maryland referred and from which he read, I want to call attention to the fact that the pamphlet does not constitute a report or a recommendation of the National Resources Planning Board. On the back of the flyleaf this statement appears:

> This statement on full employment was prepared for the Board by Dr. Alvin H. Hansen, Littauer professor of economics, Harvard University, and special economic adviser to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
>
> Prior to final printing, a pre-print edition was circulated to members of the Federal Reserve banks and to a group of businessmen, economists, and labor leaders for criticism and suggestions. Dr. Hansen has made numerous revisions in the text as the result of the many helpful comments which were received.

As the Senator says, it is possible to pick up what purports to be a profound treatise on an economic question and select one sentence or perhaps one paragraph which taken by itself may sound ludicrous; but this man evidently—I do not have the honor to be a Harvard graduate—must be a very distinguished economist. He is professor of economics at Harvard; he holds a particular professorship there, and is also special economic adviser to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Before the pamphlet was ever printed it says on its face it was submitted to the different Federal Reserve banks, to leading businessmen, economists, and labor leaders, and their views and suggestions in large measure were incorporated in the pamphlet.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, as I said a little while ago, I have never read the pamphlet, indeed I never heard of it, it is something new to me. It is marked "Library of Congress Government Publications," but I am unable to find another copy of it. I have no doubt it is authentic, but I, myself, do not agree with the particular paragraph to which a while ago my distinguished friend from Maryland referred and read, causing laughter among Senators, which was proper. I do not suppose any of us could write a treatise on any subject of such magnitude and have all his fellows agree with him. It would be remarkable if they should. We would state something with which they did not agree. As kindly and as gentle a man as I am, I have not been able to get all Senators to agree with me, much as I do desire to have them agree, because I really think it is good sense, it is good economy, it is good legislation, it is good judgment, to continue this Board in part, as is suggested in the amendment reported first by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, rather than to destroy the whole thing, and then have it set up under another name and have the same administration appoint the officers for it. That probably will be what will happen. I yield now to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Who proposes such a thing? No one in the Senate that I know of is proposing it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; a committee has been appointed, of which I think the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has been made chairman, to formulate something of a planning nature for the period after the war.

Mr. BYRD. That has already been done.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not think they have ever had hearings.

Mr. BYRD. But the committee has already been appointed.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee has been appointed, but there have been no hearings up to date, as I understand, and of course, as Senators, we all know that it would be utterly impossible to make a report and pass a bill for such a purpose through the Senate, even more difficult to pass it through the House, between now and the first of July.

I yield now to the Senator from Georgia, as I ask him just what the name of the committee is to which we have been referring.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wish to say to my distinguished friend from Tennessee that the committee which has been appointed is a Senate committee; it is not a joint congressional committee, merely a Senate committee. That committee will of course do all the work it possibly can with respect to all the economic planning that falls within its jurisdiction.

The difficulty about the National Resources Planning Board is that it is not a congressional board at all; it is purely executive. Congress has no real control over it; there is no regional representation on it, and if it had been created by act of Congress I should be here moving to amend the act so that there might be regional representation.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will allow me to suggest it, the Board was created by congregational act in 1931.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator is altogether wrong.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was during Mr. Hoover's administration, as was testified before our committee. A point of order was overruled in the Senate against an appropriation for it, on the ground that the legislation did provide for it, and that legislation was amended by the act of 1939.

Mr. GEORGE. That may be so, in a way, certain functions which have been taken over by the Board may have had their origin in legislative acts, but the National Resources Planning Board is purely an executive agency, and Congress has no control of it, and no direction over it. It is not even regional, and to my mind it is indefensible to think of a planning board which is not at least regional, reflecting the interests of every area in the United States.

I wish to say about the Planning Board that it has made an effort, and I think a very praiseworthy effort, to overcome this situation; it has cooperated with the States, and with the State planning boards. I have no doubt it has furnished a great deal of assistance to the planning boards of the several States. I was, therefore, hopeful that the acting chairman of the committee might accept the action of the committee and provide an appropriation of $200,000, which, as I understand, would be limited to the cooperation of the Planning Board with the State agencies, so as to permit that function to continue.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say to the Senator and to the Senate that that could not be done, for the reason that the $200,000 which was requested would not be sufficient for cooperation with the various States. There are 48 States, and one District, and, in addition to that, there are a little more than 3,000 counties, and I cannot tell how many cities would use it. Besides that, there must be some provision made for the salaries of the officers. It would not be proper to establish a commission and require them to work for nothing, and spend the whole $200,000 with State officials. That would not be the kind of legislation this body should pass, or which any other legislative body should pass.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will permit me to conclude, I shall be glad to yield to him.

In the next place, I have tried to take care of the situation mentioned in the amendment I have offered, through a proviso that $300,000 of the money shall be expended in collaboration with the States.

I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I was about to make the statement that if the appropriations were confined to such sums as the Board spent in collaboration with the State planning boards, it seems to me that when they had exhausted the $200,000, they could very well say, as any other Federal agency should say, "That is all the money we have to devote to that purpose."

I have been very closely associated with, and I have very greatly admired, for instance, the head of the planning board in my State, Hon. Henry G. McIntosh, a delightful, charming gentleman of exceptionally high character and purpose. I know he and his board have been doing a good job for the State, and that they have depended for assistance, perhaps financial assistance, and suggestion, upon the National Resources Planning Board. But when it comes to the National Resources Planning Board serving the country as a Federal agency, it has no congressional responsibility, except that it gets its money from the Congress, and the Congress has no control over it. It is in the unfortunate situation of existing under an Executive order, and the only chance we have to deal with it is through an appropriation bill. We cannot successfully offer amendments here; we cannot call for regional representation here; we cannot call for specific reports to the Congress here, because we are hampered by the fact that the whole thing is rooted in an Executive order, and general legislation on an appropriation bill is not in order, and it would be necessary to have a two-thirds vote in order to overcome that obstacle. It seems to me Congress should

consider that condition, and concede, if you please, whatever virtue there is in the National Resources Planning Board. It simply should be organized on another basis.

It seems to me also that we should give some consideration to the fact that the House entirely eliminated the appropriation for the Board, and if $200,000 merely for the purpose of enabling it to continue operation with the States were appropriated, we should be satisfied with that.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I am bothered by one question which the Senator from Tennessee may be able to answer. If we were to eliminate the entire committee amendment dealing with the National Resources Planning Board, would not the President have the power, at least under the second War Powers Act, to set up another board under a new name to perform exactly the same functions?

Mr. McKELLAR. Undoubtedly he would have such power.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe that technically the Senator from Tennessee is correct, but actually we put an amendment in an appropriation bill a few days ago providing that the President should not use his emergency fund for any purpose for which Congress had appropriated, or for which the Budget had estimated and for which Congress had failed to appropriate. Therefore, if provision for this Board shall be eliminated from the pending bill, and the amendment to which I have referred is kept in the other bill, it is questionable whether the President legally could set up such a board.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the President, by congressional legislation, is prohibited from setting up the Board, then such action might take precedence over the power the President now has. The question which the Senator from Connecticut asked me was: Would the President now have the right to set up such a board? I answered in the affirmative and I am sure I am correct in my answer.

Mr. DANAHER. I also am sure the Senator is correct. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Having in mind the answer which has already been made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] as a partial corrollary to what the Senator from Tennessee says; if we keep this board alive with any appropriation at all, then the President, under the War Powers Act, may assign to it whatever functions he chooses and expand or contract it as by Executive order he decrees; is that not so?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; not if the amendment is agreed to, because of the language on page 6 of the bill:

> The appropriation herein made for the National Resources Planning Board shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation by such agency during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

That is exactly what I wanted to call attention to. The Committee on Appropriations has not run wild about this matter. I cannot say that it ran wild when it voted 10 to 10 on a question. I cannot do so, and would not think of making such a suggestion. But we anticipated exactly the question which the Senator from Connecticut raises, and we provided against it by saying—as we ought to say in all cases—that the transfer of money from a separate fund to another activity, which, to my mind, is improper procedure, shall not be allowed. The Senator from Connecticut is exactly correct in his contention, but we have provided against such a thing by the very amendment proposed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, the restriction on the War Powers Act which was put in the recent bill by the Senate Appropriations Committee provides that the President may not use the funds at his disposal for the purpose of making money available to agencies for which the Congress has failed to make an appropriation. That restriction would apply in connection with this very appropriation. So, therefore, if we withhold the $200,000, in my humble judgment, the only way the President could get around that restriction would be to pare down or dissolve this Board, and set up another one with a new name. Perhaps he would do it that way. But if we fail to make the appropriation, if we turn it down, we shall have provided that the President shall not use the funds at his disposal to revitalize the Board.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply wish to say to the Senator from Maryland and to other Senators, that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations went into this matter as carefully as it ever went into any matter that came before it. It went into the question in the minutest detail. We endeavored to report a saving of more than half a million dollars in this one item of $1,110,000, which was the amount originally asked for. In the judgment of the members of the subcommittee, and in my judgment, it is infinitely better and more economical to give this reasonable amount to the National Resources Planning Board, and especially when $300,000 of it is to be used for the purpose of collaboration with State authorities, than to run the risk of having set up another agency, with its manifold costs and expenditures. We know that Congress has already given the Executive the power to do that very thing, and we cannot complain if he does it, after we have given him the authority to do it. I am quite confident that the plan which the committee has worked out to save over one-half million dollars in this item is the best plan.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Tennessee, but I wish to ask one more question on this point: If the President had the power to set up such an organization by Executive order in the first place he certainly has the power to set up a similar organization tomorrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. Absolutely.

Mr. DANAHER. He can call it, if you choose, the Committee to Supersede the George Committee on Post-War Planning. He can call it anything he pleases to call it, and under the War Powers Act he can assign to it any functions he may desire.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me one moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield to the Senator in a moment. I think the Senator from Connecticut is entirely correct. I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I question the basis of the Senator's statement. I do not believe the President had any right to assign to the National Resources Planning Board the power to do the things it has done. Not only that, but under the Overman Act he has no right to create a new function which has not been created by Congress. He cannot authorize a body to perform a function not authorized by Congress, nor can he transfer to some other body a function authorized by Congress to be performed by a particular body. So I should say that no authority existed, except as Congress, through appropriating money in the last 3 years, has by implication recognized the right of this Board to go on with its work. The only way this Board would have any authority to continue its work would be by Congress appropriating money for it.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut, because he wishes to continue along the line of a question he asked, but later I wish to add a little bit to what the Senator has said.

Mr. DANAHER. What I was about to say bears on the contribution made by the Senator from Ohio, because I am filled with consternation if his statement is accurate. I am wondering, for instance, what is the status of such an organization as the Board of Economic Warfare? Certainly Congress never created that Board. Not even the Treasury in its depleted state can appreciate the fact that the R. F. C. has drawn on it for the B. E. W. and its operations. There are additional instances which will occur to the nimble mind of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator could name not only a dozen but probably a score, or several score, of other organizations which have been set up under an act of Congress either shortly before or shortly after the war. Most of us were here then and many of us voted for legislation providing for such action. I do not remember whether the Senator from Ohio voted for it or not.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment. The fact remains, however,

that we passed a law giving the Executive that authority, and he has used that authority, and up to date he is still using that authority.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is a perfectly extraordinary doctrine, to my mind, that the President of the United States, without legislative authority, can set up a new bureau to do anything he chooses to have it do. There is no such doctrine in constitutional law or statutory law. Take the Board of Economic Warfare. The President can issue export and import licenses. He is authorized to delegate that power to some assistant, and he has delegated it to the Board of Economic Warfare. But if there is no legislation authorizing post-war economic plans to be made, the President cannot authorize any board to do such planning which is not authorized by Congress, or to spend any Government money for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. The trouble with the Senator from Ohio is that he is discussing post-war operations of the National Resources Planning Board. Its work is not confined to post-war operations. It is doing its work now, and all its operations are proceeding during the war, and we do not know how long the war will continue. We are certain it will continue more than another year.

I think the Senator from Ohio voted for the War Powers Act. Under the War Powers Act which we passed almost unanimously about the time the war broke out, we gave the Executive the power to set up all kinds of organizations, and he has set them up. He has carried out the will of Congress.

I think the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] is absolutely right in his contention that if we should eliminate the provision for the National Resources Planning Board, as the House did, the next day the President could set up an organization to take its place and appoint on it whomever he pleased. He could appoint everyone who is now a member of the National Resources Planning Board, and call it by a new name, and such action would go through without the slightest difficulty and probably without comment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. If that be true, the restriction we wrote on the Executive's powers in the extraneous fields which we were discussing the other day in the Committee on Appropriations does not amount to a thing.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has not yet become law, and probably will not become law until the 1st of July.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the point is that in that amendment we provided that in cases in which Congress denies an appropriation of money to keep alive an executive function, the Executive shall not use the funds in his hands to revitalize or continue the function. In my opinion, the mere change of labels would not defeat the provision we wrote into the bill. I care not what in the world it may be called; it would still be a planning function.

The point here is whether or not, if we take away the appropriation, the Board will continue to function. If the bill, when passed, incorporates the committee's thought about the appropriation—that is, if the legislative bodies deny the appropriation for the organization—the organization is just as dead as Hector's goat. [Laughter.]

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding to me. Also I want the RECORD to show that nothing is to be construed as expressing opposition by me to the committee amendment. I simply wish to have it made clear that I do not share the confusion of those who say the President cannot do something, when we all know he is doing it. I merely want that to be perfectly apparent.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In connection with the authority which is alleged to exist—and I think that claim is the most extraordinary legal claim I have heard advanced in the Senate since I have been Member of it—it is said that it is based on the First War Powers Act. That act is express in saying that the President is authorized to make such redistribution of functions among the other executive agencies as he shall deem necessary. It says nothing about creating any new duties. It says the money shall be expended only for the purpose for which it was appropriated, under the direction of such other agencies as may be directed by the President to perform and execute the functions authorized to be performed.

Under that authority the President has no power to do anything he pleases. Unless the Congress has authorized the work and has conferred upon some department of the Government the power to perform it, the President can not legally exercise such power. It seems to me a fair inference that unless the President has been authorized to spend money in order to have some agency do the things the Board is doing, there is no authority for the Board to do the things it is doing today.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Congress has passed that law. The law is interpreted as giving the President that power. In probably between 50 and 100 acts, at least, passed since that time, Congress has ratified the President's conception of his powers under that act, by appropriating money with which to carry out what the President has done.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is referring to what?

Mr. McKELLAR. To the War Powers Act.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the President has ever interpreted the War Powers Act as giving him any power not expressly conferred by some other act, insofar as the redistribution of functions is concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. How did he happen to appoint the Board of Economic Warfare?

Mr. TAFT. The Board of Economic Warfare is exercising powers as his agent, in connection with the powers we conferred to control exports and imports into the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. To my mind, the distinction the Senator has made is without legal justification.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment. I do not know how long the Senator from Maryland will be here. He kept me from reading a portion of the celebrated boomerang from which he read awhile ago. With the language he read, I do not agree, as I said then, any more than he does. But what he read is not all the language. On page 2 I happened to run across a brief statement with which I do agree. It is as follows:

Everywhere one hears it said—

Says the pamphlet by Mr. Hansen—

that, when this war is over, all countries, including our own, will be impoverished.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, what difference would that make if the national debt does not make any difference?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator so that he might read the language he wished to read; and I should like him to permit me to read more of the language now, so that other Members of the Senate may hear it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall read the language again:

Everywhere one hears it said that, when this war is over, all countries, including our own, will be impoverished. This view is, however, not sustained by past experience.

These people have been investigating.

No country need be impoverished if its productive resources (both capital and human) are intact. The productive resources of this country will be on a considerably higher plane when the war is over than ever before. A larger proportion of our population will be trained to perform skilled and semiskilled jobs.

We all know that to be true.

We shall have enormous productive capacities in all the machine industries.

We all know that to be true.

And in special consumers' durable industries, where plant and equipment may have become deficient by reason of the war, we shall be able very quickly, with our large basic machine-producing industries, to expand to meet the peacetime requirements.

We all know that to be true, if the program is properly handled.

We shall have, when the war is over, the technical equipment, the trained and efficient labor, and the natural resources required to produce a substantially higher real income for civilian needs than any ever achieved before in our history.

That is a subject on which it is possible to have a difference of opinion; but I have in mind that that statement is true.

I read further from the pamphlet:

Whether or not we shall, in fact, achieve that level of income will depend upon our intelligence and capacity for cooperative action.

We have to make up our minds as a Nation that we will not permit a post-war depression to overwhelm us.

That is good sense; it is as good sense as the isolated item the Senator from Maryland read awhile ago is bad sense. So we cannot pick out a few words in a program of this sort and judge the whole thing by it.

I read further from the pamphlet:

We do not have to take economic defeat after the military victory is won.

We all agree to that; we all agree that that can be done if the program is properly managed.

We can, if we will, maintain business prosperity. We can sustain a continuing demand for goods. We can keep industry going at high levels. We can maintain substantially full employment. We can achieve a society in which everyone capable of and willing to work can find an opportunity to earn a living, to make his contribution, to play his part as a citizen of a progressive, democratic country.

An important gain will, we may hope, be won from the defense program in the struggle to achieve and to maintain full employment.

Mr. President, none of that is communistic. It is not even socialistic. It is common, practical business sense, and I endorse every word I have read.

I have not read more than two or three pages of the pamphlet; there may be other items just as strong as the one I have just now read. Obviously, the item the Senator from Maryland read cannot be taken as indicating the nature of the entire pamphlet. I hope the Senate will not be misled into voting to reject this appropriation simply because of a misstatement of opinion which was indulged in at some time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has proved my point by what he has read.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I proved the point of the Senator from Maryland by what I just read, I am the worst ignoramus I ever heard of. [Laughter.]

In my younger days I have looked into the mirror to see what sort of looking man I was. I have not done so very much recently because I am getting along in years, and I am too old to look into the mirror. However, if that language sustains the first proposition announced by the Senator, then I am wholly ignorant of what language means.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not believe that the privilege of committing senatorial hara-kiri has ever been extended promiscuously. At any rate, I should not want to put the Senator in that position. However, he proves my original statement that there is nothing but New Year's resolutions in what he has read, without anything to show how they are to be attained. That is a Fourth of July oration which I have been delivering for the past 25 years, and which the Senator has been delivering.

Mr. McKELLAR. So the Senator has delivered this as an oration heretofore?

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly. It is propaganda. It is a speech. There is no plan in it. It is a program of large appropriations, no taxes, and the American flag.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not see the Senator's name on this pamphlet. I did not know that this was the speech which he has been delivering for the past 25 years. I am astonished to learn that. However, it has good sense in it, notwithstanding the particular provision which he has read.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to page 5, line 24, of the bill, where the word "correlation" occurs. The language is:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used except for correlation and coordination of planning with State governments and with political subdivisions of such States.

Two questions suggest themselves to me in that connection. In the first place, what is the difference between correlation and coordination? We hear a great deal about coordination these days. Usually it means that if I coordinate you, you do what I say. I do not know what the difference is between correlation and coordination. I do not know why it is necessary to have a provision of this kind when it comes to planning, because we may plan for a State government to have $1,000,000,000 of Federal funds spent in the State, but if nothing is done about it, it still remains planning.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the reason why I obtained unanimous consent of the Senate, about 4 hours ago, to strike out that part, and offered an amendment to strike it out.

Mr. LODGE. Was that amendment agreed to?

Mr. McKELLAR. It has not yet been agreed to. The Senator can vote to strike it out and insert other language. If by accident I have left the word "correlation" in it, I shall be very happy to strike it out, at the Senator's request.

Mr. President, this document intrigues me. Every time I am interrupted I cast my eye on the celebrated document entitled "After the War, Full Employment." The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] says that he has been making this speech for many years. I wish to read again from page 4:

When the war is over the Government cannot just disband the Army, close down munitions factories, stop building ships, and remove all economic controls. We want an orderly program of demobilization and reconstruction.

Does any one doubt that?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Just a moment. Every one of us endorses with all his heart the language of the distinguished Senator from Maryland when he penned those lines. I endorse it entirely, and I think everyone else endorses it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Board ought to be called The Board of Political Textbooks of a Certain Strain rather than the National Resources Planning Board.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is now talking about the Board. I am talking about the speech which the Senator has been making for years before the people of Maryland and elsewhere.

Mr. TYDINGS. It has also been made in Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. And in Tennessee. Listen to this:

We want an orderly program of demobilization and reconstruction. The Government cannot escape responsibility.

We all know that to be true. We could not escape it if we were to try. I doubt if anyone would try very hard to escape this responsibility.

To fulfill its responsibility it needs the hearty cooperation—

Of what? Listen to this. I am speaking to men who are interested in business. We are all interested in business.

To fulfill its responsibility it—

The Government—

needs the hearty cooperation of business, labor, farmers, and the professions in the great task of developing a vigorous, expanding, and prosperous society.

Can anyone object to that?

Mr. LODGE rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator from Massachusetts object to it?

Mr. LODGE. I do not object to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure that the Senator from Massachusetts will uphold the Senator from Maryland in his speech on that subject.

To fulfill its responsibility it needs the hearty cooperation of business, labor, farmers, and the professions in the great task of developing a vigorous, expanding, and prosperous society.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Those are worthy sentiments. If all we needed to solve our problems were sentiments as well expressed as these, all our problems would have been solved long ago. Unfortunately, some of us believe that there is a great deal more expression of worthy sentiments than there is of ability to carry them into effect.

I ask the Senator from Tennessee to go back to the amendment relating to correlation and coordination. I have found his proposed amendment, which, except for the fact that the $300,000 provision is in it, retains the same language. It says:

Provided further, that of this appropriation not less than $300,000 shall be used for correlation and coordination of planning with State governments and with political subdivisions of such States.

I believe the definitions of those words ought to be made clear, because frankly, they do not convey a clear meaning to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps the Senator is correct; but I do not believe that Congress ever undertakes, in legislation, to make clear or define the terms it uses. I do not recall ever having seen that kind of legislation.

Let me say that in order to meet the objection of the Senator from Massachusetts I shall strike out the words "correlation and." I will perfect my amendment by striking out the words "correlation and" so as to read "coordination of planning" and so forth.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator says that in Congress it is not customary to make one's meaning clear. I appreciate his having made that contribution.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Supplementing what the Senator has just finished reading, let me say that usually in such addresses we add "And in order to eliminate war, nations must live peaceably together."

That ought to go in somewhere.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sorry it is not there. However, that is outside the functions of the Appropriations Committee, and we cannot very well put it in.

Mr. TYDINGS. I mean it should be in what the Senator was reading from the pamphlet.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know that the Senator is very proud of the speech which he has been making for such a long time; but I am not willing to have it enacted into law.

Mr. TYDINGS. War can be eliminated only by nations living peaceably together. I think the Board should have discovered that fact. It is an outrage that the Board permits war to continue without commenting on it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know that the Senator feels outraged at the Board, and I regret it. I tbink he is mistaken.

Mr. President, I believe that the amendment which I have offered ought to be adopted and taken to conference, and that it should be discussed in conference.

That is about all I wish to say at this time. I hope we may have a vote as soon as possible.

I am reminded of something said by one of the greatest Senators ever to sit in this body. Away back yonder, many years ago, when I was a youngster here, Hon. James A. Reed, the distinguished Senator from Missouri, one of the brainiest men I ever knew, and one of the grandest characters I ever knew, one of the most eloquent men, and one of the greatest debaters I ever knew, occupied the seat I am now occupying, while I occupied the seat now occupied by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Senator Reed once made a speech lasting 3 hours. When he had concluded, he turned to me and said, "McKELLAR, everything has been said on this subject that can be said. Circulate among the boys, and let us have a vote now." [Laughter.] I am somewhat in that attitude, I know, but I am sure the Senate will acquit me of having used too much time because I have been interrupted so often. I apologize to the Senate for taking so much time. I should like to have a vote upon the amendment as soon as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], as modified, to the committee amendment, beginning on page 4, line 23.

Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. McNARY, and Mr. TAFT asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McNARY obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McNARY. I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Chair state the parliamentary situation?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not yield for that purpose. I wish to occupy the floor for only 45 seconds.

During the discussion of the pending amendment reference has been made to the state of mind of the members of the National Resources Planning Board. Today I received a letter from the distinguished chairman of the Board, Mr. Delano, who sets forth his views and historical references to a pamphlet which has been read here. I ask unanimous consent, in all fairness, that the letter be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD,
Washington, D. C., May 26, 1943.

Hon. CHARLES L. McNARY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR McNARY: Two or three days ago I had occasion to read a speech made by Senator TAFT in which he made some pretty devastating statements in regard to the report of the National Resources Planning Board. I wrote him on May 20 pointing out that the statements he made were inaccurate and that he was doubtless misled by a recent little booklet published by Dr. H. G. Moulton entitled "The New Philosophy of Public Debt."

Since then I have read Dr. Moulton's book with care and compared it with various statements in our report. It is true that as a Board we have studied various economic theories held by various students in Sweden, Great Britain, Germany, and in our own country. We have published a number of pamphlets prepared by Dr. Alvin H. Hansen, who has explored these questions quite fully, but we have been very careful not to commit ourselves to any extreme statements. What we are interested in is to try to explain the views of men who have studied the problem. It seems to me that Dr. Moulton has been unfair to us in blaming us for opinions expressed, for example, by Dr. Hansen sometimes in pamphlets addressed to us and sometimes in articles which he has written for distribution.

Mr. Beardsley Ruml, one of the Board's consultants, recently said in New York, "Dr. Moulton's reference to the Board is an uninformed misstatement of the Board's recommendations."

It is the policy of the Board, and in that the Board merely accepts the policy which this country has adhered to from the beginning, that there are conditions in which public expenditures must exceed the revenues, and deficit financing must be resorted to. The present war provides one of those conditions, and no one would deny the appropriateness of deficit financing at this time. This is far from saying that continuous deficit financing is either necessary or proper, for the Board neither advocates nor believes in such a policy. Quite the contrary, there are times when the revenues of government should exceed expenditures—sometimes by wide margins. It is possible that shortly after the end of this war conditions will develop wherein the tendency to inflation will have to be controlled by collections in excess of expenditures and sharp reduction in debt.

One of the statements quoted by Dr. Moulton in itself states this position. It is as follows: "* * * Whether taxes should equal, fall short of, or exceed expenditures must be decided according to economic conditions" (p. 17 National Resources Development—1942 Report NRPB).

You may be interested to know that I served for upwards of a year as president of the Stable Money Association. I was asked to serve by such men as Senator Root and Mr. Dwight Morrow, and they each contributed considerable funds to the investigation. Altogether, I think there was $70,000 contributed for the conduct of the investigation by men who were not convinced of the solution of the problem but who believed that it was one worth studying. One of the things we did was to invite Dr. Schacht of Berlin to come to New York and address the association. We held a meeting at which he was the principal speaker, and there were, as I recall, 125 to 150 prominent men present. This, you may truly say, is ancient history, but it is perhaps worthy of consideration.

Speaking for myself (and I think also for my colleagues), I do not believe in continuing an uncontrolled deficit spending, and I do not think that deficit spending is the cure-all. Sometimes I believe it to be absolutely essential, but I do not for a moment believe that we are ever justified in spending money wastefully or unwisely. As you very well know, banks are very proud of boasting about their gross deposits, although they must also realize that deposits are debts or liabilities. However, that does not mean that a bank can spend its deposits recklessly. The success of a bank depends upon its reputation for intelligent use of its funds and its reputation over a period of years will depend upon the wisdom of its investments; and this, it seems to me is equally true of the Federal Government.

I feel that Dr. Moulton's book is false in detail and deliberately misleading in purpose.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERIC A. DELANO,
Chairman.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, since Mr. Delano has referred to my statement as an excuse for the letter which has just been read, I think that I should point out that, in the first place, I received a similar letter from him which I put in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and which was almost word for word the same as the letter which has been read. In the second place, inasmuch as he has made an attack upon Dr. Moulton, I think something should be said about Dr. Moulton.

Dr. Moulton is a leading economist of the Brookings Institution, which is probably the soundest and most reliable research economic organization in the United States today. Dr. Moulton's statements are not misleading. He has stated absolutely the exact facts. He has quoted from the Board itself. Incidentally, the suggestion by Mr. Delano that he is not responsible for Mr. Hansen's theories is wholly met by statements in the report. After all, the plans which the Board has in mind for having the Government guarantee and underwrite certain rights, which I estimate will cost about $50,000,000,000 a year, are supported and explained in the report.

The previous publications of the Board include "After Defense—What?" That is the one from which I read. Another is, "After the War—Full Employment." That is the Hansen document which was referred to by the Senator from Tennessee, dealing with post-war planning, and so forth. It also provides background for this proposal. In other words, the Board published Mr. Hansen's document and adopted it. They cannot say they are not responsible for propagandizing Mr. Hansen's views. Furthermore, their own report goes just exactly as far. The quotation from the pamphlet, which is clearly theirs, and written by no one else, is as follows:

When we organize for maximum production on the basis of full employment, without being stopped by the costs we have discovered, as have other nations, that increased production pays the real costs involved. Doing the job pays the bill.

In other words, it does not make any difference how much you spend, because doing the job pays the bill. The Government debt amounts to nothing.

Mr. Delano is an estimable gentleman. I can only conclude that he simply has not read the reports written by subordinates. He does not understand the necessary implication of the things which are set forth in those reports.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks a release by the National Resources Planning Board. It pays a compliment to the statement made by Dr. Moulton.

In addition to the release, I ask permission to have inserted a very short statement from a publication entitled "National Resources Development Report for 1943." The statement referred to is on page 13 and is under the title "Plans for Finances and Fiscal Policies."

Third, I will ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a very brief statement from a publication entitled "Post-War Planning" and published by Steel, which is a magazine current throughout the country. The statement I have in mind is found on page 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Without objection, the excerpts will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Beardsley Ruml, treasurer of R. H. Macy & Co. and adviser of the National Resources Planning Board, in the course of remarks on Business Organizations Look Ahead, made today before the American Association of Planning Officials, stated, "Dr. Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution, writes in his book, New Philosophy of Public Debt, that the National Resources Planning Board advocates a new conception that continuous deficit spending is essential to the economic prosperity of the Nation.

"Dr. Moulton's reference to the Board is an uninformed misstatement of the Board's recommendations on fiscal policies. These are clearly set forth on page 13 of part 1 of its recent report for 1943, in part, as follows:

"'It is our national policy (as it has been since the beginning of our history) to accept as a suitable role of government, positive effort to foster and encourage the free activities of private individuals and agencies in advancing their well-being through productive enterprise.

"'Accordingly the fiscal and monetary policies of the Federal Government should be conceived and administered to complement and supplement these activities of private enterprise in the maintenance of adequate effective demand.'"

[From National Resources Development Report for 1943]

B. Plans for finance and fiscal policies. It is our national policy (as it has been since the beginning of our history) to accept as a suitable role of government positive effort to foster and encourage the free activities of private individuals and agencies in advancing their well-being through productive enterprise.

Accordingly, the fiscal and monetary policies of the Federal Government should be conceived and administered to complement and supplement these activities of private enterprise in the maintenance of adequate effective demand.

[From Steel]

The National Resources Planning Board may be mentioned first, for the reason that it is a part of the White House staff. It dates back before the Roosevelt administration, its original ancestor having been President Hoover's Social Trend Committee. Since then its name and status have been changed a number of times. In 1939 it was set up as now organized, the former Employment Stabilization Office being merged with it.

As now constituted, it is a long-range planning body that makes studies and reports directly to President Roosevelt. It has three divisions, one responsible for economic studies and reporting on trends of income, employment, and business activity; another responsible for physical resources such as land, water, energy, and special studies in the field of transportation and industrial problems; the third is responsible for public works plans and programs. The term "energy" as used above, covers coal, waterpower, and electric current.

The Board has issued more than 100 reports which deal not only with post-war planning but which are used currently in studies intended to stimulate war production. The Board also is studying actively the post-war utilization of the new war plants, also the future of the aviation industry. It is studying health and education plans. The board is planning soon to launch studies on various other significant subjects, such as peacetime products, technological improvements in products, and post-war distribution of civilian goods.

The studies of the National Resources Planning Board definitely are not—as so many have feared—aimed at regimenting the American economy. Originally, its aim was to find the causes of sore spots in our economy. Then, in November of 1940, when we had started on all-out conversion to war production, the Board was instructed to look into post-war problems. As will be shown later, it has covered a lot of ground in establishing a proposed framework for the post-war economy.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise to seek information as the result of the letter which was submitted by the able minority leader and just read by the clerk. As I recall, there was a man by the name of Ruml mentioned in that letter, and I am wondering who he is, if the Senator will tell me, and what part he played in connection with this report. I am honestly seeking information. As I recall, the name "Ruml" appears in the letter and I am wondering who he is.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I always admire the facetiousness of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. The letter was sent to me today by Mr. Delano. It does refer to Mr. Ruml, who is famous for the Ruml plan.

Treating the matter seriously, I ask that the clerk read the paragraph referring to what Mr. Ruml says.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire whether or not Mr. Ruml is a member of the board at the present time, or has any connection with it?

Mr. McNARY. I do not know about the history of the transaction. I only know that his name is used in the letter.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator from Alabama tell me?

Mr. HILL. Yes, I will say that Dr. Beardsley Ruml, whose name we have heard so much and whose name has attained so much prominence in this country in recent months, is one of the chief advisers of the National Resources Planning Board. The fact is there are two chief advisers but the No. 1 of the two is Dr. Beardsley Ruml, the author of the Ruml tax plan. I may say about the advisers to the Board that, according to the testimony, Dr. Ruml sits in with the Board at its different meetings. He is an adviser to the extent that he is even paid a certain per diem and an amount for his services, and, according to the testimony before the committee, of all the advisers Dr. Ruml evidently rendered more advice last year than any other adviser, because he received the largest sum of money.

Mr. LUCAS. Is he the same Dr. Ruml whose tax plan in modified form a group of Democrats joined with Republicans in attempting to work out a few days ago?

Mr. HILL. Exactly.

Mr. LUCAS. Now, I understand that the same Ruml is chief adviser to the Board?

Mr. HILL The Senator is exactly right; and just as certain Democrats joined with a number of Republicans to put through the Ruml tax plan, certain of us Democrats are hoping that certain Republicans will join with us to carry out Dr. Ruml's views, which views, of course, strongly recommend the continuance of the National Resources Planning Board and its work.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that one time Dr. Ruml was an actual member of the Board?

Mr. HILL. No, he was never an actual member of the Board. What happened was that one member of the Board, Mr. Yantis, as I recall his name, left the Board, and at that time they brought Dr. Ruml in, not as a member of the Board but as chief adviser of the Board, and he has been chief adviser for some years, and is still chief adviser.

Mr. LUCAS. That is very illuminating to me. May I ask one other question?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. Who is the other member who is adviser to the Board? I should like to know who he is.

Mr. HILL. I will give the name to the Senator in a moment.

Mr. TAFT. His name is Henry S. Dennison.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask what his background is? I know something about Mr. Ruml, but I am very anxious to know about Mr. Dennison, to learn whether he is a long-haired professor or a businessman.

Mr. HILL. I cannot tell the Senator as to that. The record shows that Mr. Henry S. Dennison is from the great State of Massachusetts.

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps the Senator from Massachusetts can tell me something about Mr. Dennison.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Dennison is a distinguished manufacturer and citizen of Massachusetts.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. That he has had much to do with the formulation of this report, I very much question.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very happy to know that there are two businessmen connected with this Board, Mr. Ruml and Mr. Dennison, because the general impression throughout the country is that there is a group of socialistic, communistic professors on the Board who are attempting to reshape the world through this particular Board, and it is very encouraging, and I am very happy to learn, that two men who are the chief advisers to the Board are big businessmen who have plenty of money on tap.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that he will find further that the evidence before the committee showed that not only does the Board have these two big businessmen, Dr. Ruml and Mr. Dennison, as its chief advisers, but that at its meetings the Board calls in businessmen of all kinds, big businessmen and businessmen who are perhaps not so big, to confer with the Board, to counsel with the Board, and to advise the Board. The Board has drawn very heavily upon the wisdom, the experience, and the advice of the business leadership of this country.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. In view of what the Senator has just stated, I should think that our troubles are pretty well behind us. It is certainly reassuring to me to know that with Mr. Ruml and Mr. Dennison and Mr. Delano and the others, the difficulties are to be brushed aside and the passageway is to be illuminated and down at the end are health, wealth, and prosperity for all of us. What a picture!

Mr. HILL. I wish I could share the Senator's ludicrous optimism, but that does not happen to be the way of this world. It might be the way of the world of Alice in Wonderland but not the way of the world in which we live today. There never was a time, I will say, when the services of this Board were needed so badly as they are at this particular juncture. Many problems will arise from the war situation. When the war closes some 18,000,000 people will be out of jobs. They will need employment and work will have to be found for them. Eight million of them will come out of the armed forces, 10,000,000 of them will come out of war industries.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I wish to say one other thing, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Washington.

Forty percent of the capital invested in the war industries is capital invested by the Government; 40 percent of our war industries, the plants, the facilities, the physical properties are owned by the Government of the United States. One of the greatest problems we shall have to face when the war is over will be the problem of making wise disposition of this property so as not to interfere with or harm our American private enterprise system. Many cities and communities in this country will be sorely disrupted. As we all know, because of the war program many of them have had a mushroom growth during the war, due to the installation of manufacturing plants or military camps or some other war activity within the confines of the communities. Such communities will need plans, help, and guidance. We shall confront the problem of the release of economic control. We shall have to know something about the employment situation, about income, about the standards of living, about the many factors which will have to be considered and weighed in determining how rapidly we can release economic controls.

Mr. President, I have before me a number of excerpts from letters which have come from State planning commissions, from county planning boards, and from municipal and city planning boards. It had been my intention to read from some of these excerpts in order that the Senate might know what work this National Board has done, and that it might know how the different planning boards in our States, counties, and cities are looking toward the National Resources Planning Board for help, service, and guidance in the postwar problems.

The distinguished acting chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee, the author of the amendment, is very anxious to have a vote on the amendment, and we are anxious to finish the consideration of the bill this afternoon. We have been considering the bill now for nearly 5 hours, and I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the excerpts, but I say to my colleagues that a majority of the States, through some kind of a planning board, some sort of State representation, have spoken on the question of the continuance of the National Resources Planning Board, and they all have expressed themselves as being in favor of its continuance. Many of these statements are most laudatory; they praise in the highest terms the help they have received from the Board and state the needs with which they are confronted, which make it so essential that the Board be continued in operation.

The Senator from Tennessee earlier in the day quoted from different Government agencies in Washington, those mainly responsible for the carrying on of the war effort, testifying to the splendid work and the valuable services the Planning Board has rendered those agencies.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the excerpts from these State, city, and county planning boards as to the work of the National Resources Planning Board, and the need for the continuance of the Board and its work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Telegram from Gov. C. A. Bottolfsen, of Idaho, February 24, 1943:

"The Idaho Legislature has reestablished State planning board with appropriation to study war emergency problems to be met in shift from wartime to peacetime. During past years cooperation and assistance given by National Resources Board to Idaho has been of great value and in carrying forward new program we would appreciate your cooperation and technical assistance."

Letter from Gov. Chase A. Clark, of Idaho, September 21, 1942, requesting National Resources Planning Board assistance for planning project:

"I am writing you about ways and means of advancing the efforts of the communities in northern Idaho, particularly in the Coeur d'Alene-Sandpoint-Spokane triangle area, to meet the problem of providing additional housing, transportation, health protection, schools, and other accommodations made necessary on account of the heavy inmigration of war industry workers and military personnel in that area. Also the need to prepare now for the war impacts yet to come and the post-war adjustments to follow.

"You are, I know, well aware of the serious situation prevailing in that region and of the lack of coordinated effort among the local, State, and Federal agencies in meeting it. I believe the problem is regional in character, consequently I should greatly appreciate it if you, as chairman of the Pacific Northwest Planning Commission, would consider providing through the National Resources Planning Board the advisory and coordinating direction so greatly needed now in making a quick appraisal of the problems involved and in outlining a program of action. * * *"

Resolution of Southeastern Regional Planning Commission (two members each from North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee, appointed by Governors), February 22, 1943:

Expressing "The appreciation of this commission for the splendid cooperation it has received from the National Resources Planning Board, without which we could never have made our comprehensive studies and gathered the valuable data which will be shown in the Commission's forthcoming report. We, therefore, urge upon our representatives in Congress the continuation of the National Resources Planning Board as an agency of Government, and that it receive a congressional appropriation adequate for its reasonable use."

Excerpt from letter from L. F. Eppich, president, the Denver (Colo.) Planning Commission, February 9, 1943:

"The National Resources Planning Board has been of great assistance to Denver through its stimulus of a coordinated planning operation here. Last August it organized a meeting of various planning groups in the Denver region, including Federal, State, and local organizations. As a result of this meeting there was created what is known as the Denver Metropolitan Planning Project to which the Planning Board through its regional office here in Denver assigned a num-

ber of consulting experts. These men have worked closely with all agencies in the preparation of important analytical investigations. In addition, the Planning Board is assisting the city of Denver by providing the much needed services of a public works program analyst in the preparation of a fiscal plan correlated with a public works plan.

"We are highly satisfied with the progress that is being made and feel impelled to express the appreciation of the Denver Planning Commission for the splendid work which the Planning Board is doing. This opinion is shared by Mayor Stapleton and the city council who are equally interested in these post-war plans."

Action of the Corpus Christi Planning Commission as reported in the Corpus Christi Caller, February 13, 1943:

"* * * The (Corpus Christi Planning) commission also went on record favoring a continuation of the work of the National Resources Planning Board. A subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee earlier in the week had omitted funds for the National Resources Planning Board for the next fiscal year.

"The board is the only Government agency which is planning for the post-war period and Corpus Christi is one of the six cities in the Nation which is receiving assistance from the board, it was pointed out by members of the planning commission."

Excerpt from letter from M. W. Torkelson, director of regional planning, Wisconsin State Planning Board, February 25, 1943:

"I feel strongly that the National Resources Planning Board is an absolute necessity for the proper functioning of the State planning organizations. Our State Planning Board organization here in Wisconsin is a good one. It has a good staff and an adequate appropriation for normal working. With regard to doing the work that is necessary to be done in connection with the matters in the State, we are entirely independent of the National Resources Planning Board, that is, we do not expect them to furnish us with personnel nor with financial help. We are, however, dependent on them entirely for information regarding what is being done in other States and receive great help from them in the way of advice and assistance. Some day, some time, it is going to be realized that planning organizations—local, State and national—are absolutely essential for the proper functioning of government, not to lay down a course for the legislative body but to assemble and correlate, for the use of the legislative body, the factual information that is necessary for them to act with a full and complete knowledge of the facts."

Excerpts from letter from the director of the Northwest Regional Council, Portland, Oreg., Feb. 23, 1943:

"Never was there a time in the history of our country, or our region, when sound planning was more needed, when the people as a whole were more concerned with the future. The central library in Portland reports that the demand for books and pamphlets dealing with post-war planning is second only to those concerned with international relations. My contacts with education at all levels reflects a growing interest in planning, an ever-increasing appreciation of the work of the National Resources Planning Board in the Pacific Northwest. The war is creating problems which will demand heroic action—action which should be guided by facts rather than by guess. An organization which can view these problems broadly on both a regional and national basis is an urgent necessity. With 8 years of experience, with an over-all viewpoint, with an organization of enthusiastic citizen leaders built around its regional counsellors, the National Resources Planning Board can do an immensely valuable job, can serve as the leader in the coordination of the work of these democratically organized regional units.

"Rather than the abolition of the National Resources Planning Board, conditions call for the expansion of its services so that it can put some of the best minds in the country to work on post-war problems; to determine now the course of action most likely to promote regional and national well-being; to implement a sound action program; to create an informed public opinion through a well-planned educational program; to interest citizens taking an active part in solving local and regional problems; to encourage cooperative action for meeting the situations which are bound to arise."

Excerpts from a letter from director of Michigan State Planning Commission, February 25, 1943:

"A motion was passed at the last meeting of the State Planning Commission requesting the services of the National Resources Planning Board on the important phases of Michigan State programming.

"It is apparent at this time that the State legislature may set aside twenty to fifty million dollars for post-war allocation. Governor Kelly has recently requested that the authorization act of the State Planning Commission be amended to cover further post-war planning procedure. The Planning Commission has requested an increase to $67,000 annually in order to conduct this state program.

"The Planning Commission further moved to extend its sincere thanks to the National Resources Planning Board for the highly valued assistance it has given to the State through the staff and consultation during the past 2 years.

"It is not the desire of the State Planning Commission to realize an improper proportion of services from the National Resources Planning Board relative to other States in the region; however, it will conscientiously apply for and appreciate all possible service which may be rendered by the National Resources Planning Board in this effort to prepare for peace."

Telegram from Michigan State Planning Commission, February 19, 1943:

"Michigan State Planning Commission at February 11 meeting requested continued services of the National Resources Planning Board and expressed gratitude for the extensive and valuable staff and consultant services rendered during the past years. Stop. Services especially desirable on State post-war program under way. Stop. Assistance in this behalf welcome."

Excerpt from letter from William A. Bowes, commissioner of public works of city of Portland, Oreg., February 11, 1943:

"It is my opinion that every effort should be made to retain the services of the National Resources Planning Board. This organization has done a great deal for the State of Oregon in mapping plans and organizing a program for the development of our resources. In the post-war world, this information will be invaluable. If we are not going back to a leaf-raking program, then let's plan the work to be done so that it will be a lasting benefit to the State, counties, and communities where relief work will be needed. Without adequate planning, such as the National Resources Planning Board is doing, there is little left but a hodge-podge program, developed on the spur of a moment under the pressure of much-needed relief for those who are hungry."

Excerpts from letter from chairman, Washington State Planning Council, February 23, 1943:

"It has been our experience that the National Resources Planning Board has been one of the groups in Washington that has been most successful in decentralizing their activities and in causing their work of research to reach out into the various areas.

"The State of Washington, specifically, has gained greatly by the enlightened activities of the Board. Without your assistance we could not have set up the Puget Sound Planning Commission, which has been so successful in aiding in the work of organizing housing and living facilities for war industry in the Puget Sound area.

"The splendid financial study which has just been completed for our Governor would not have been initiated and could not have been carried on except for the expert leadership and assistance given by your Mr. Otto Croy.

"Your work in the public works programming has been most useful to us. The State of Washington has accumulated an excellent financial surplus, and it hopes, in post-war, to be able to make an important contribution through public works expenditures through the assistance, in part, that you have given us."

Excerpt from Montana State Water Conservation Board November 9, 1942, to Consultant Otto Croy of the National Resources Planning Board, region IX field office:

"Since you had a very substantial part in preparing Montana's 6-year program, you will perhaps be gratified to know that the program was very well received and formed the basis for a good many of their deliberations. Governor Ford is very well pleased with the program and has referred to it on many occasions. It is only in justice to you that you should be advised of this fact, and I am glad to pass the news on to you."

Excerpt from letter from the engineer-director, Arkansas State Planning Board, Little Rock, Ark., February 25, 1943:

"The consultants who have served this Board from time to time have undoubtedly helped greatly in making the work of this board the success it has had and the prestige it is now enjoying throughout the State.

"We are greatly concerned with the disposition of Congress toward financial support for continuing the work of your agency. We have written all of our Senators and Congressmen and have had several replies indicating that they are interesting themselves in behalf of the National Resources Planning Board appropriation. We shall continue to give them every assurance that the State departments are receiving valuable help because of our collaboration."

Letter from Gov. Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, February 3, 1943:

"I certainly appreciate your splendid courtesy and help. It is my firm purpose to practice the most friendly cooperation, and I will be more than glad for this to be my policy with reference to your position, since I am aware of the great help you and your department can be to our State."

Excerpts from letter from Director El Roy Nelson, Colorado Planning Commission, February 13, 1943:

"We are indebted to a great extent for this research work to the National Resources Planning Board, which has been willing to lend us the aid of engineers and research men, particularly from the University of Denver and the University of Colorado. These men have been chosen by us, but have been and are being paid by the National Resources Planning Board.

"Our opinion is that the National Resources Planning Board is, by odds, the best agency to carry on planning. We can work well with them in developing the resources of this State. Our objection is largely to the other 156 agencies, which go on their way and develop their plans.

"Because of this we would hope that the National Resources Planning Board could continue its research work and assist us in research of economic development of this State."

Excerpt from letter from the Utah Commission on Industrial Development, February 10, 1943.

"The National Resources Planning Board is one Federal agency that has been a real help to Utah and to our Commission on Industrial Development. It has helped you and us in furthering, the establishment of the new iron and steel plant at Provo, the Kalunite plant at Salt Lake, and in developing our water and mineral resources. The Board is now furnishing the valuable services of a group of technicians who are working with us in preparing plans and programs to meet the problems arising from the huge war-time expansion in Utah, Weber, Davis, Salt Lake, and Tooele Counties. With their aid we are working out a sound and useful plan for the post-war development of our State. We feel that because of this technical service, Utah will be one of the first States to have ready, specific programs and projects for the post-war period."

Excerpts from letter from L. H. Andrews, Plan Engineer, City Planning Commission, Shreveport, La., August 11, 1942.

"Some time ago, you were kind enough to send Mr. L. P. Cockrill to Shreveport to assist us in our planning program. Mr. Cockrill was invaluable in the service that he rendered at that time.

"We are at the cross roads on several of our planning programs, and feel the need of experienced help."

Excerpt from Chairman of Commission on City Plan, Baltimore, Md., October 2, 1942.

"It is our purpose to deal with this problem ourselves. We know our city, but we may need to call on Washington for expert advice, in certain fields and we may need to do certain types of research which will require staff work and we wonder how much assistance we can hope for from Washington."

Resolution of Washington State Planning Council, Olympia, March 1, 1943:

"The council, having carefully examined the 6-year public-improvement program submitted to it, prepared in substantial part as a result of the assignment to the State planning council of Mr. Otto Croy, program consultant from the National Resources Planning Board, acknowledges itself greatly indebted to the National Resources Planning Board for the admirable analysis of the State's past, present, and future in the field of public works programming and believes the work to be so valuable that it should be carried down through the counties and cities.

"Therefore, in expressing its gratitude to the National Resources Planning Board for the excellent assistance and leadership thus given it respectfully asks consideration of further assistance in the enlarged program for cities and counties for which at the present time we have no trained staff available."

Excerpt from letter from Oakland (Calif.) City Planning Commission, February 24, 1943:

"Before us is one of the largest problems, that is, post-war activity. The time for planning for this post-war activity is now, and not when the problems are face to face with us. The National Resources Planning Board was undertaking such a job. Many of the State and local planning commissions are also undertaking the same type of work. The National Resources Board has done much to stimulate interest at the local level for the solving of the post-war problems which will inevitably arise.

"The Oakland Planning Commission respectfully petitions that you do everything possible to assist in having this function of the Federal Government continued. This request is made because of the value of the work already completed and the recognized need for a continuation of this type of activity, particularly to the local planning units."

Excerpts from letter from Gov. Dwight Griswold, of Nebraska, August 6, 1942:

"This is to express, on behalf of myself and the State zoning agency, our appreciation for the cooperation and services of the National Resources Planning Board in assisting us in our State zoning activities.

"We hope that the services of the National Resources Planning Board will continue to be available for this State program, which is of considerable value to facilitate and protect our war industries."

Letter from Detroit City Plan Commission and the Michigan State Planning Commission, January 4, 1942:

"The importance and magnitude of the post-war problems of the Detroit-Southeastern Michigan industrial region call for an immediate appraisal of its post-war prospects. In recognition of the interest in this objective expressed throughout the region and as a result of a conference held in Detroit between representatives of the National Resources Planning Board, the Michigan State Planning Commission, and the Detroit City Plan Commission, we propose that the following steps be taken:

"1. That the Detroit-Southeastern Michigan Post-War Joint Committee be established.

"2. That the committee consist of an executive committee and advisory council as hereinafter outlined.

"3. That the National Resources Planning Board jointly, with the Michigan State Planning Commission and the Detroit City Plan Commission, take the initiative in the task of making this appraisal and that each of these agencies contribute its utmost to the undertaking.

"4. We propose that an executive committee be set up comprised of one representative each from the National Resources Planning Board, the Michigan State Planning Commission, and the Detroit City Plan Commission, to which may be added a fourth member who would represent the region outside the city of Detroit. This executive committee would be responsible for the conduct of the undertaking, including the selection and direction of the staff.

"5. In addition to the executive committee, we propose that an advisory council be formed which would be representative of the various governmental and private interests in the region. The advisory council will provide technical advice on matters of policy and procedure and will serve as a two-way channel between the enterprise and the region. It will be expected to assume responsibility for securing such additional material support as may be required.

"6. The State Planning Commission and the Detroit City Plan Commission will each contribute such staff services and facilities as are at their disposal. In addition, they will secure the assistance of other local and State departments and agencies. They will further present to their respective appropriating bodies a request for such additional financial aid as would be justified as a contribution by each of them.

"We respectfully request, therefore, that the National Resources Planning Board enlist the aid of all appropriate Federal agencies and make available to the joint undertaking such of its own personnel and other resources as may be required to carry the job to a successful conclusion."

Excerpt from letter from R. C. Martin of Bureau of Public Administration of the University of Alabama, November 16, 1942, concerning Southeastern Regional Plan:

"I want to say that I think you have done one of the most significant things I have seen in the South in a long, long time. It is highly important that the problems you raise be considered, and considered now before they have become serious, as they undoubtedly will in the near post-war period."

Letter from engineer and executive secretary of the City Plan Commission of Spokane, Wash., February 25, 1943:

"I wish to express, on behalf of the Spokane City Plan Commission, our appreciation for assistance we have received from the National Resources Planning Board through the bulletins and statistics compiled by the Board for the benefit of local planning commissions such as ours. The city of Spokane has availed itself of the services of the National Resources Planning Board in the preparation of an advance program and budgeting of capital improvements, and has received considerable benefit from the services of the Washington State Planning Council in its connections with the National Board.

"We propose to submit in the near future an application to your Board for assistance in coordinating our urban planning studies. This application will be made on the basis of the city contributing a portion of the expense of obtaining the services of a National Resources Planning Board technician."

Excerpts from letter from chairman of the Northern Lakes States Regional Planning Commission, Madison, Wis., February 26, 1943:

"After our meeting in Chicago last Wednesday, I think that it is necessary that I should call your attention at this time to the need for greater assistance from the National Resources Planning Board in connection with the work of the Northern Lakes States Regional Committee than has been provided in the past. * * * We in Wisconsin are better situated as regards staff than either one of the other two States and yet it becomes increasingly evident that we, too, require the assistance of the National Resources Planning Board in the carrying out of this program. The reason for that is the great and increasing demand on our services in other fields, and while I am talking about them, we shall be very glad to get any assistance in this particular, also."

"The services of your office, especially those rendered through Mr. Cross, have been helpful, and we will expect to call on you to a much greater degree than heretofore. For this reason the pending shift of your office from Indianapolis to Chicago is especially fortunate from our standpoint."

Joint letter from the Governors of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado, April 29, 1941:

"Request is hereby made by the Governors of the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado for assignment of the staff now engaged in the Pecos River investigation to undertake a compilation and appraisal of the factual information now available concerning the water resources of the North Platte River and its tributaries in the three States, and an inventory of the basic information needed as a basis for a complete study of the water resources of said river and use for irrigation or other beneficial purposes.

"It is understood that this preliminary study shall not include any independent field investigations by the National Resources Planning Board, that it shall not interfere with the progress of pending litigation, and that it shall be made without cost to the States.

"When completed the findings of the investigators, which may become very important in possible assignments of the existing and impending controversies, shall be submitted, through the appropriate officers of the National Resources Planning Board, to the Governors of the three States."

Letter from Governor Ralph L. Carr of Colorado, May 17, 1941:

"As Governor of Colorado, may I extend to you and the National Resources Planning Board my thanks for your agreement to make

a compilation and appraisal of the factual information now available concerning the water resources of the North Platte River and its tributaries.

"From our happy experience on the Rio Grande, I know that this information will enable the States of Wyoming, Nebraska, and Colorado to settle their differences, to allocate the river flow and to do an intelligent job while they're at it. We are very grateful."

Excerpts from letter from chairman of the Illinois State Planning Commission, February 27, 1943:

"At the meeting of the Illinois State Planning Commission yesterday, the members voted unanimously to accept the very gracious tender of the National Resources Planning Board of such assistance as may be available in the promotion of certain planning work in southern Illinois.

"May I repeat in behalf of the Commission a word of appreciation of the interest and the offer of assistance of your field office and the Washington staff."

Excerpts from the director of the Virginia State Planning Board, Richmond, March 7, 1942, concerning Hampton Roads defense area:

"I wish to take this opportunity to express the warm appreciation of the Virginia State Planning Board for the exceedingly valuable assistance in this critical matter which has been provided through the region 2 office."

Excerpts from letter from Brig. Gen. Rollin L. Tilton, Commanding Headquarters, Chesapeake Bay section, Fort Monroe, Va., March 25, 1942:

"This will acknowledge and thank you for the copy of the Hampton Roads Regional Water Supply Study.

"The information contained in this study is of inestimable value and reflects within itself the diligent investigation for which you and your office are highly recommended."

Excerpt from letter from Mrs. Wardlow Steele, secretary, Tennessee State Planning Commission, February 20, 1943:

"At the present time we are engaged in planning work that will be of great importance to our people in the post-war period. Much of this work deals with planning for industrial growth, and the National Resources Planning Board is able to give the State technical help in this planning that cannot be obtained elsewhere. The aid we have received has already been exceedingly helpful, and the working relationships with this agency are so good that we urge that its fine work be continued. Now, more than ever before, we need intelligent planning not only on a State level but for the Nation as well."

Excerpt from letter from Chairman P. D. Houston confirms above, Tennessee State Planning Commission, February 2, 1943:

"* * * I feel the planning commissions, both State and Federal, will be of more value during the coming years to our entire population than they have for many years past as when this war is over we will in a measure be in a new world.

"The research that is being carried on by the National Resources Planning Board will provide information that will enable our leaders of business to know what resource is available without their having to make independent research or inquiry, and the work of the Planning Board will facilitate the progress which I feel sure our people will make when we are permitted to go again in a normal way."

Excerpt from letter from J. J. Harrison, chairman, Arkansas State Planning Board, February 17, 1943:

"As one of the directors of the American Society of Planning Officials I attended meetings of the board of directors and the national conference held by this society and, therefore, am acquainted with the progress of planning work throughout the Nation. There is no doubt that the National Resources Planning Board has and is now making a very fine contribution to the Nation in its encouragement of State and local planning, and is also contributing materially to the State and local boards in their efforts to do their own planning within their own region."

Excerpt from letter from Don McBride, director, divisions of planning and water resources, Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, February 12, 1943:

"Especially at this time is the function of that agency important. If ever we needed a guiding hand in the coordination of our planning, it is now, and certainly we must plan. It is vital to our post-war existence and I am confident that we will find ourselves like a ship without a rudder if we abandon planning at the Federal level of the Government."

Resolution of Washington State Planning Council, March 1, 1943:

"The council, having carefully examined the 6-year public improvement program submitted to it, prepared in substantial part as a result of the assignment to the State planning council of Mr. Otto Croy, program consultant from the National Resources Planning Board, acknowledges itself greatly indebted to the National Resources Planning Board for the admirable analysis of the State's past, present, and future in the field of public-works programming and believes the work to be so valuable that it should be carried down through the counties and cities.

"Therefore, in expressing its gratitude to the National Resources Planning Board for the excellent assistance and leadership thus given, it respectfully asks consideration of further assistance in the enlarged program for cities and counties for which at the present time we have no trained staff available."

Letter from Acting Director Larrabee of Tennessee State Planning Commission, Nashville, Tenn., November 2, 1942:

"We are currently conducting an industrial survey of Tennessee. In view of the fact that we hope the study will lead to a plan for a post-war industrial development of the State, it has occurred to us that your organization could be of great help to us in this work.

"If you have an economist whom you could assign to us for a period of several weeks we would appreciate it. It seems to me to be ridiculous to attempt a project of the magnitude of this one without the assistance of the National Resources Planning Board. A great deal of work has already been done by you and we hope to avoid the waste of repetition. At a time like the present this waste is inexcusable."

Excerpt from letter from T. V. Kalijarvi, executive director, New Hampshire State Planning and Development Commission, January 6, 1943:

"The Governor has assigned the planning and development commission the very pleasant task of studying the possibility of a conservation department in our State set-up. In the course of that study it becomes necessary to determine if any other States have such a department in existence. I have already written to the Council of State Governments and received some literature on the matter, particularly a report by Clifford J. Hynning and a report from Arkansas. However, I wonder if there are any studies available in any of the other States of which you know or any studies which your organization has made which would be helpful.

Call on them

"Still another question in my mind is the availability of consultants on this particular type of study and if they are available who they might be. Any advice which you can send me on this matter will be very much appreciated."

Excerpt from letter from Dudley Harmon, executive vice president, New England council, September 12, 1943, to Chairman Cutter, region I, National Resources Planning Board:

"Your latest publication, Another Tale of Two Cities, provides the most substantial evidence yet made available in support of the policy of industrial diversification within the community which this council has advocated since its earliest days. For this reason, we are requesting 125 copies to be sent to our directors, selected chambers of commerce, and others interested in the economic health and welfare of our New England communities."

Excerpt from letter from L. F. Hubbard, planning assistant, New Hampshire State Planning and Development Commission, February 8, 1943:

"* * * This material (of N. R. P. B.) is of the greatest value in the coordination of policies and techniques of our respective offices. Very frequently methods of approaching a new study or of portraying information are suggested, which materially contribute to our knowledge and efficiency."

Excerpt from letter from Ernest J. Bohn, director, Regional Association of Cleveland, February 9, 1943:

"* * * We are concerned with the preparation of comprehensive plans for this region, and therefore your reports are of inestimable value. (Our library is open to the public, and therefore we should receive these reports without cost.)"

Excerpt from letter from F. A. Pitkin, executive director, Pennsylvania State Planning Board, February 8, 1943:

"* * * The material which we receive from the National Resources Planning Board field offices is very valuable to us in connection with our State planning work."

Excerpt from letter from Mayor Harry P. Cain, city of Tacoma, Wash., November 25, 1942:

"I just want you to know that in my considered opinion your contributions have been fundamentally important to Tacoma's future. Should we fail to take advantage of the work of your agents the fault will lie directly with us."

Excerpts from letter from Puget Sound Regional Planning Commission, Seattle, Wash., February 23, 1943:

"The Puget Sound Regional Planning Commission, representing this—a critical defense area, an area in which war production must continue at a maximum for many months—respectfully requests that planning consultant services of your Board be continued to be given this commission for the year 1943–44.

"The local people, therefore, ask for your consultant services to help effectuate programs of development for war and long-range conditions. By local people we mean local business and industrial leaders, local public service groups, and local governmental agencies.

"We, therefore, ask for continued leadership in the form of consultants assigned to this area. If these consultants are furnished they can also, as they have done during the past year, give assistance in solving some of the still existing bottlenecks in this defense area. Your Board must keep aware of the fact that the Puget Sound region will become increasingly more important as the military activities are stepped up to win the war in the Pacific Ocean, with the Puget Sound ports and industries becoming of greater importance."

Excerpts from letter from city manager of Borger, Tex., February 28, 1943:

"The attitude taken toward the National Resources Planning Board recently by some

of the Members of Congress is quite disturbing. Not that we are capable of criticizing Members of Congress on their attitude toward issues that come up for their consideration from time to time when we don't have all the facts. That would not be fair to them, but we all remember the old saying: 'For the lack of a nail the shoe was lost, for the lack of a shoe the horse was lost, etc.'

"Some of us who were directly involved in the difficulties that prevailed remember too well what happened to us from 1929 through 1936, when the country lost all that millions of Americans had to offer society—their labor—for the reason the country was without adequate plans and we were not in position to work them."

Excerpts from letter from Charles Diebold, Jr., president of the Buffalo City Planning Association (N. Y.), February 3, 1943:

"At the invitation of this group the National Resources Planning Board has provided full-time services of a planning technician and from time to time the expert consulting services of various members of its technical staff. The work of the planning technician, who acts as technical adviser to our council, has included the preparation of preliminary estimates of post-war employment goals for each major industry in the area. These goals are being used by the post-war planning committee of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce in stimulating and coordinating the post-war planning of leading industrial firms. Work has already gone forward in the field of labor, housing, urban redevelopment, public works, and public finance, either by groups already organized to do this work or by special committees appointed by the council.

"Appreciating the help we have already received from the National Resources Planning Board in this, one of the greatest industrial centers of the United States, and of the help we will continue to receive and which is being extended to other similar areas, I sincerely hope you will help the Board obtain an adequate appropriation to carry on for the next fiscal year."

Excerpts from letter from Gov. John E. Miles, of New Mexico, and Governor Stevenson, of Texas, October 31, 1942:

"The States of Texas and New Mexico desire to negotiate a compact respecting the use, storage, and distribution of the waters of the Pecos River, and the rights of the States thereto, said Pecos River being an interstate stream.

"It is the view of both of us that someone should be appointed to represent the United States who has some connection with the National Resources Planning Board, as that Board has caused to be made the Pecos River joint investigation which will be used as the basis for an effort to arrive at an agreement."

Resolution of Los Angeles County, Calif., Board of Supervisors, March 2, 1943.

The board met in regular session March 2, 1943. Present: Supervisors Gordon L. McDonough (chairman), presiding, William A. Smith, John Anson Ford, Oscar Hauge, and Roger W. Jessup, and J. F. Moroney, clerk, by Alice Burks, deputy clerk.

"In re National Resources Planning Board: Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to restore budget for next fiscal year.

"On motion of Supervisor Ford, unanimously carried, it is ordered that the following resolution be, and the same is hereby, adopted, to wit:

"Whereas President Roosevelt in a letter to Congress dated January 14, 1942, stated: 'The National Resources Planning Board, as the planning arm of my Executive office, is charged with the preparation of long-range plans for the development of our national resources and stabilization of employment. At my direction, it is correlating plans and programs under consideration in many Federal, State, and private organizations for post-war full employment, security, and building America; and

"Whereas this board feels that said Planning Board in functioning as above outlined is doing a very necessary piece of work and that the various reports issued by said Planning Board in recent months have been very helpful to the regional planning commission of the county of Los Angeles: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of supervisors of the county of Los Angeles hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to restore the Budget of the National Resources Planning Board for the next fiscal year."

The foregoing resolution was adopted by the board of supervisors of the county of Los Angeles, State of California, on March 2, 1943, and is entered in the minutes of said board.

J. F. MORONEY,
County Clerk of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and Ex Officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Said County.

ALICE BURKS, *Deputy.*

Excerpt from letter from Puerto Rico Regional Planning Commission, September 16, 1943:

"I take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks for all the help that the National Resources Planning Board has already extended to the Puerto Rico Planning Board. The regional office in San Juan, under the able direction of Mr. Bartlett, has been giving splendid cooperation since the drafting of our planning law and all throughout the initial stages of the organization of this Board. I am also grateful for the introduction to planning that I received in the States in your central office, and for all the courtesies that you and your associates extended to me."

Excerpt from letter from the Director of Public Works of Santa Barbara County, Calif., W. C. Penfield, March 4, 1943:

"In this particular county, we are perhaps more in a position to appreciate the benefits of your work than many communities of like economy and population. Our greatest planning effort is that of creating a multiple purpose water program which will serve every area of this county. We have found that some Federal help will be necessary to carry it out. The National Resources Planning Board has done a fine job in coordinating the activities of several Federal agencies to prevent duplication, waste of funds, disagreement between bureaus, etc. In fact, the effects of your work here are only beginning and we are anticipating a remarkable dividend from work already performed as well as that which we expect to follow."

Excerpt from letter from Frank F. Stearns, executive secretary, the City Planning Board, Miami, Fla., March 5, 1943:

Urging "restoration of sufficient appropriation to properly provide for the functioning of the National Resources Planning Board, city, State, and national planning should be closely coordinated for comprehensive results. It would appear that post-war plans should be in the making, right now so that communities and the Nation as a whole could be in a position to convert to peacetime projects with the least possible loss of time and money.

"We therefore urge that every possible effort be made to provide for the best planning of localities on a national scale."

Excerpt from letter from Raymond V. Long, director, Virginia State Planning Board, March 18, 1943:

"The Virginia State Planning Board is concerned seriously with the possibility of securing consultant assistance from the National Resources Planning Board in our post-war planning. Already representatives of the National Resources Planning Board have met with the Virginia State Planning Board as invited guests and we have on various occasions visited their offices asking advice on our post-war planning program. These conferences have been very helpful and we have assurance that greatly increased consultation services will be available if invited."

Excerpt from letter from Henry Cook, engineer, Tarrant County, Fort Worth, Tex., March 4, 1943:

"The Tarrant County plan was completed recently and printing of 100 copies will be finished within 2 or 3 weeks. The National Resources Planning Survey representatives acted as consultants to our office in the preparation of this plan, and we are grateful for the splendid contribution they have made and for cooperative spirit that existed while we were engaged in this work."

Excerpt from letter from Gerald V. Balthaser, executive director, the Housing Authority of King County, Seattle, Wash., March 16, 1943:

"* * * Our Authority feels that the National Resources Planning Board, through its Washington Office and local staff, has been of immense help to us all in this area—assisting in planning of site locations, furnishing in advance vital data for planning public facilities, assisting in the coordination of various agency activities responsible for approvals, and to us, expediting our projects in general."

Resolution No. 2727 adopted by San Francisco City Planning Commission, March 11, 1943:

"Whereas it has been called to the attention of the city planning commission that the entire proposed appropriation of $1,400,000 for the National Resources Planning Board for the fiscal year of 1943–44 was eliminated from the independent offices bill by the House of Representatives on February 17, 1943; and

"Whereas through this deletion or elimination the Nation will lose the services of an organization which has had 10 years of successful experience in preparing comprehensive plans for the development of our national resources and the stabilization of employment; and

"Whereas California will be vitally affected most directly by the loss of the field offices for this region, located in Berkeley; and

"Whereas this branch has aided both private enterprise and governmental agencies through its analysis of population, employment, economic and industrial development, war-time changes, and prospective post-war conditions in California and neighboring States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the City Planning Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, respectfully requests that the Senate Appropriations Committee restore the sum necessary for the continuation of the National Resources Planning Board before sending the bill to the Senate.

"I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was approved by the city planning commission at its special meeting March 11, 1943."

Mr. HILL. I now yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. I was about to ask the Senator from Alabama whether Mr. George F. Yantis, of my State, is now a member of the Board.

Mr. HILL. He was at one time on the Board.

Mr. BONE. I think he still is.

Mr. TAFT. He is still a member of the Board.

Mr. HILL. He is a member of the Board. It was Dr. Mitchell who re-

signed, but Mr. Yantis is still on the Board.

Mr. BONE. I should like to say to my colleagues in the Senate that if the most irrepressible critic of this Board and its activities, and its alleged or assumed views, were to assert that Mr. George F. Yantis was an irresponsible radical, it would probably create a riot in the State of Washington. Mr. Yantis is a very able, brilliant, and outstanding member of the bar, and is regarded as a very high class man. He is level-headed, with an understanding mind, and I think is realistic in his approach to problems. I have a great personal admiration for Mr. Yantis. I do not always see eye to eye with him, but it certainly is amusing to hear anyone suggest that a man such as Mr. Yantis would be an irresponsible disturber or radical because he is anything but irresponsible.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. All I know about his views comes from what I read in the testimony before the House committee, where Mr. Yantis said that even leaf raking creates wealth. Any man who holds such a view certainly is open to the charge made against the Board that they have adopted a new financial philosophy.

Mr. BONE. I have heard some of the Senator's brethren on the other side of the aisle assert that a mere proposal of public ownership of power was bolshevistic and calculated to overthrow the Government. I am not quite prepared to accept such an asinine statement as a realistic statement of fact. I do not know anything about what Mr. Yantis may have said concerning something that is probably historical, and may have referred back to the old organization of relief that was set up in the earlier days. I would not share that view; I think nothing is worth while unless it is productive of some real wealth; but this I do want to say, that if men were hungry I would get them jobs somehow, even though for the moment, and if by virtue of the frightful economic pressure on them it was necessary to give them the work in order that their families might eat. I shall not be mean enough in my own soul to deny a man access to some sort of a job, temporary though it might be, if it feeds hungry kids, though I certainly would agree with my able friend from Ohio in wanting them to get away from that sort of operation as speedily as possible, though economic necessity knows no law. It is possible Mr. Yantis may have referred to something in the past, and that his reference was historical rather than an expression of his present-day contemplation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not at all intend to say that we should not have had leaf raking, but I refer to the philosophy which runs through the whole report, that the spending of Government money alone creates wealth and produces prosperity, entirely apart from the other purposes to which it may be devoted. That is all I intended to imply, not that we may not have to have leaf raking, but as a relief, not as a financial measure.

Mr. BONE. When one contemplates the astronomical expenditures in this present war, he finds himself drifting from any moorings which educationally are provided for him. If anyone in this hour can contemplate the rising debt without wondering where it is going to lead, he is an unusual human being. There is no reason to these debts as they accumulate, and I do not know that any board ever set up by the Government could provide in this hour a sensible, sound answer to what we must face in the way of a problem if the debt reaches such a sum as 4 or 5 or 6 hundred billion dollars.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I had not intended to say anything in connection with the proposal now before the Senate because of the lateness of the hour, but if the Senator from Alabama will yield I should like to add one thought for the RECORD.

It seems to me that in view of the cataclysmic character of the problems with which it is obvious this Nation will be confronted at the conclusion of the war, the surest way by which to destroy the private enterprise system would be to enter that period with no plans to meet the problem of the transition of our wartime industry and the demobilization of our armed forces and their adjustment to peacetime conditions.

Likewise, it seems to me that it would be a great mistake for the Congress to deny the Executive funds requested for planning for this purpose. The granting of such funds, let me say, does not imply that the Congress will accept any of the programs when they are formulated; but to deny the Executive such a request is for Congress to assume a responsibility which it seems to me it cannot well afford to assume.

I am happy that the Senate has created a committee to study post-war problems, but it seems to me that should not mean the exclusion of either the House of Representatives or the executive branch of the Government. I venture the prediction that when the end of the war comes—and God grant it may come soon, with victory—we shall be grateful for each and every step, each and every plan that has been made, for the problems confronting the Nation will test the combined intelligence, judgment, character, and stamina of the men who may then be in positions of responsibility and power in this Republic.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin, and I wish to say that I am glad the Senator from Ohio raised the question of leaf raking, because I do not hesitate to say here this afternoon that if we make no plans, if we refuse to appropriate the money so that plans and studies may be made to meet the post-war situation, and to meet the transition from war economy back to civilian-goods economy, we will find that we will again be at a leaf-raking stage.

We will again be confronted with such a situation that in order to keep men's souls and bodies together, to keep them and their loved ones from going hungry we will have to let them rake leaves and pay them for the raking of leaves.

It is perhaps impossible for any Member of the Senate to realize what may be the effect if Congress refuses to continue this Board in existence or refuses to allow it adequate funds. Cities, counties, States, subdivisions of the local governments, have been looking to the Federal Government for leadership in the matter of plans and studies. They are looking now, according to all the testimony we have received, for leadership from the Federal Government. This afternoon some Senators, at least are thinking of destroying that leadership, and of saying to the States and the cities and the counties, that, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, we will destroy that leadership, we will deny them any guidance or service or help or leadership in the matter of studies for the post-war period.

Mr. President, I can think of no better illustration of being penny-wise and pound-foolish than to deny the Board this comparatively small amount, approximately $500,000. When we think of the millions of dollars which we have expended due to the compulsion and the needs of the depression, of the billions of dollars we are expending today on the war effort, the $500,000 in question is a mere bagatelle, which will be spent solely so that we may be prepared and ready, so that we may not have to spend other millions, and hundreds of millions, and perhaps billions of dollars because we had not been made ready and had not been prepared.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I wish to suggest to my friend the Senator from Alabama that there is no more grim implication in this leaf-raking program, with all the lost motion and lost efforts wrapped up in it, than there was in the fact that it was made necessary by the break-down of the so-called economic system then dominated by the most conservative forces in American life.

Mr. HILL. The forces which today constitute the main opposition to this Board and its work are the very forces which broke down and stood in default in the days of depression. They had nothing to offer, and now they do not want the Government to prepare in the event they have nothing more to offer and the Government shall have to step into the breach.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Historically, there never has been presented to the American people a picture of more complete domination of the processes of industry and politics in this country by business, big private business, than the domination of the congressional processes of thinking and the political activities in our States by private business enterprises in the roaring twenties. I do not think any

man who is intellectually honest will take issue with that statement. Now, if with that supreme and complete control of our political and economic life we faced that break-down, it does not lie readily in the mouth of an exponent of that viewpoint, expressed by big business in the twenties, now to be too critical of leaf raking because big business domination brought about the necessity for leaf raking.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is very anxious to have a vote on his amendment, and I shall conclude simply by expressing the fervent hope that his amendment will meet with the Senate's approval.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator from Tennessee that I shall not take much time, but I wish to say a word—and I shall not occupy more than 3 or 4 minutes—with respect to my own sentiments, for whatever they may be worth.

We have a National Resources Planning Board now in existence. The Board has a personnel already established and experienced. Perhaps in the first instance, and I think we all agree to that, it would have been better to have set the Board up as a legislative agency. If there were a proposal before the Senate this afternoon to substitute a legislative agency for this executive agency I would vote for it. But, as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee pointed out in his able discussion, whether we will have any statutory planning board for the Nation is problematical. We may or we may not have it. If we do have one it may be some time hence before it is established, and the time between this day, or when this appropriation might be available for that body, and when the agency subsequently to be created under that hypothesis might go into operation, may be a considerable period.

All of us have fears and at the same time hopes with respect to the conclusion of this war. We are afraid it is going to be a long war. We may have much time for planning. That is more probable than a realization of the hope we cherish in our hearts that it will be a short war, and that we may not have much time for planning. At least our leaders have been talking in terms of the possibility of concluding the war in 1943 or 1944, but I think Mr. Churchill's most pessimistic estimate was possibly the year thereafter.

So, Mr. President, I say we have a National Resources Planning Board. It has been in existence for several years. I think the consensus is that it has done creditable work. It is certainly working in the right direction at least. If its personnel should be improved, that is a matter which Congress perhaps by its debate may indicate to the President. If there is not adequate regional representation on the Board perhaps the policy of the Board will be influenced by what has been said in this debate and in other discussions before the Appropriations Committee.

But the point of it is, Mr. President, that the important thing is to obtain the best results we can in the direction of competent planning, and to obtain them as soon as possible. There is but one real danger to the institutions of America, and that is the kind of dictatorship that will come out of economic chaos. The only danger that such would-be dictators as John L. Lewis and Gerald K. Smith and many others constitute to American institutions is to be able to rise to power upon the heartaches, upon the economic chaos, and upon the suffering of the masses of the American people.

When our soldiers and sailors come back from war they are not going to expect jobs 6 months thereafter. They are going to expect jobs within a few days after they return home. In my own little State of Florida, with 1,800,000 population, there are from 300,000 to 400,000 war workers. They too are going to expect jobs when the war comes to an end. We cannot plan too much. I doubt if we can plan too much in trying to prepare against the day before which all of us stand in awe, the day after the war, when we shall have perhaps as great a fight as we are now having to save the true and typical American way of life.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with what the Senator from Florida has to say. My criticism of this Board is not that it cannot do a good job of planning, not that it should not do a good job of planning, and not that a good job of planning is not needed, but up to now from reading its reports it has struck me that it is dealing with the abstract rather than the concrete; with philosophy rather than with facts. My disappointment comes from the fact that it has evolved no real program. If this Board were to sit down and make a survey of the country, and find out or suggest plans whereby the returning soldiers and those who are now working in the war plants, and so on, could be integrated under some plan, that would be one thing; but up to now, as I have read the reports—and I have not read them all—it seems to me that the Board has simply dealt with abstract philosophies.

If it had dealt with what the Senator is addressing himself to, my disposition would be to approve its continuance. But in the absence of that I hate to tell them to go on in so abstract a fashion.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for a moment at that point, let me say that the Senate is familiar with the fact that in the last session of Congress there was pending a bill providing for the making of blueprints, the very thing the Senator is talking about. Hearings were held on the bill. The bill was on the calendar but was not allowed to be considered. However, if there is any criticism of the National Resources Planning Board for not having detailed information, for not having a program worked out, it is not its fault; because we attempted to prescribe just such blueprinting arrangements.

Incidentally, let me say that the bill had the support of practically every mayor in the United States, but still we could not pass it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I cannot quite accept the Senator's premise, as I see it, as being in line with the facts of the matter. Regardless of whether that bill was passed, the National Resources Planning Board has not been shown as devoting its attention to the blueprinting of the details to which the Senator has referred. As I understand the situation, the Board could have done so if it had wanted to.

What we are doing is wading through ream after ream of rhetoric. Rhetoric is all right to a certain degree, but I want to be more practical about the post-war period. I want to see something I can understand and can get my hands on, something which deals with the matter in a forthright way.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, of course the Senator knows that one or two philosophers can sit down and write reams of rhetoric, as the Senator says, but it takes money to enable engineers to make plans and to design bridges and housing facilities and factories. The mere fact that we turned our backs upon what the Board tried to do makes it necessary for someone who knows about the matter to point out that the Board was trying to do the very thing the Senator from Maryland wants it to do.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will permit me to say a further word, I should like to point out that the Board has had $8,000,000 appropriated for its activities. So far as I know, there is nothing other than the intangible as a result of the expenditure of the $8,000,000. I feel that a committee of the Senate or of the House, or a joint committee of the Senate and the House, if given $5,000, could assemble some engineers and could take testimony and could evolve something tangible relative to the needs in the post-war period. But as we have already spent $8,000,000, and have little to show for it, other than rhetoric, I am disillusioned as to the will or wish or aim of the Board to do what I originally thought it had been instructed to achieve.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator will permit me to cite two instances which came to my personal attention and knowledge not long ago. If I may be permitted to mention the fact, inasmuch as our able colleague was the toastmaster on the occasion, I was invited to make a talk on the subject of post-war planning, before the Baltimore Real Estate Board—a very fine organization. I called the National Resources Planning Board and asked if it had any material it could place in my hands. To my great satisfaction—whether the audience felt that way I cannot say—I found that the National Resources Planning Board had already worked out a plan and scheme for the Baltimore-Washington area, and had accumulated a great deal of data with respect to what should be done about housing facilities, for example, around the great Martin Aircraft plant, and about the buildings and terminal facilities and about preserving the dock facilities there for future operations, and about how the economy of the whole

Baltimore-Washington area was tied together, and the necessity for regional planning, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. Elliott came to me and talked to me at great length about what the Board had been doing in working out the principles of regional planning.

As another illustration, let me say that I happened to meet Mr. Chauncey Hamlin, a very distinguished gentleman of the opposite political party from that to which I belong. I met him at Buffalo, N. Y. I found out that he is the chairman of the planning board having to do with all the Niagara Falls area, the area involving Buffalo and other cities in that section of the country, and the area around the Great Lakes and Niagara Falls region. What I learned led me to believe, in fact, he stated as much to me, that they had taken typical cases around the country and had tried to work out a pattern from the areas they had chosen, in an effort to work out recommendations which could be made effective.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. What the Senator stated to be a fact is at variance with the observation of the Senator from Utah that—inferentially, at least—the Board was not dealing with blueprints and details.

However, from the testimony and the evidence presented to Congress, I have the feeling that the Board is dealing with the question in an abstract way.

In reference to the Baltimore-Washington situation, let me say that it is only natural that the Board would have some information about it, because Mr. Delano, who is a member of the particular institution we are discussing, has for a number of years taken a very leading and constructive and fine part in developing the Greater National Capital and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and, I believe, also has been on the Art Commission. Things of that sort are in his ken, and he knows them well. But they are only small grains of sand on the beach of unemployment.

My criticism of the Board is that after the expenditure of $8,000,000, there is nothing that Congress can find which has anything realistic or concrete or definite in its as to a plan.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in respect to the suggestion my able friend has made, let me say that the information about Baltimore, of whose planning board and art commission Mr. Delano was not a member, was, it seemed to me, quite as adequate as was the information the Board has relative to Washington. As a matter of fact, I think I received the impression somewhere that the Board had chosen at least five strategic areas—I do not know whether the Senator will recall this—and that one is the Niagara Falls area, that another, as I recall, is the Washington-Baltimore area, that another is in the West, and that another is farther south. I received the impression that the Board tried to make out of those areas a certain pattern which might be of interest in connection with the stabilization of the economy of the country.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator may be correctly advised about that; I do not speak with full knowledge of the fact. However, I do say that in Baltimore and in the State of Maryland, planning boards were set up a good while ago.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator's State has a good State planning board.

Mr. TYDINGS. And we have one in Baltimore City. I have an idea that what the Senator said in reference to Baltimore City more or less related to the plan which the local authorities prepared and sent to Mr. Delano, rather than to any plans which the National Resources Planning Board prepared and sent to Baltimore.

The reason why I say that is because I think we both know that up to the present time the Board has not been actively engaged in explorations in communities, except perhaps on a very limited scale. The experts coming in from the outside are not familiar with the local problems. They would have to consult with local people.

Therefore, I believe we have not gotten for the $8,000,000 which has been expended, the kind of results to which we are entitled.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say that the able Senator will perhaps be interested to know that each of the agencies complimented the others on what had been done—a situation which indicated to me a fine spirit of cooperation existing between the agencies.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am very glad to support the statement the Senator from Florida made with regard to activities in Maryland. I have had many conferences with Colonel Delano, not merely on matters of philosophy but with regard to specific problems concerned with Maryland. On numerous occasions I have taken to meet him the chairman of our State's roads commission, members of other Maryland commissions, and many other prominent citizens. In each instance we have gone over many specific problems at considerable length. I certainly formed the impression that not only do Colonel Delano and his associates have a large fund of specific information, but that such information was not merely information handed to them by some State board, but was information which had been obtained by them as the result of his board's conducting independent studies in cooperation with State authorities. The conferences which I have had with Colonel Delano and his associates—and they cover quite a number of years, beginning even before I became a Member of the Senate—justify me in believing that the board has been doing very constructive work along specific lines.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, the Board has not been in existence during all the period of time to which my colleague refers. In the second place, Mr. Delano was on a commission which was developing a parkway and road system to link Baltimore with Washington. That program is 10 or 15 years old, and has been revised and modified. I am not saying that Mr. Delano has not great knowledge of many of the conditions between Washington and Baltimore, and in both cities. What I am saying—and no one has disputed it with any evidence—is that after $8,000,000 has been spent, no plan has been evolved to show where we are to employ people when the war is over. The only thing we have is a treatise on the welfare of mankind.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, does not the Senator remember the good work which the National Resources Planning Board did in reporting on the unemployment situation in the anthracite coal region and the future marketing of anthracite coal? I have sent for a copy of the report, and will give it to the Senator in a few moments.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, in 1933 I was in charge of public works in this area, including a large number of States. I do not recall what Colonel Delano's title was at that time, but certainly he was in charge of planning operations, working under or in close cooperation with the P. W. A. It was a part of my duty and pleasure to be in contact with him almost daily. Though this particular Board was not in operation at that time, certainly Colonel Delano was devoting his time to studies regarding planning. I know that, because of the fact that during that period I discussed many concrete planning propositions with him.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to conclude. I thank the able Senators very much.

All that is involved in the amendment offered by the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is something over $300,000. While that is a great deal of money for an individual, when we are talking about planning the economy of a nation with a population of 130,000,000 people, and prospective unemployment of ten or fifteen million people, the amount of money is a relative bagatelle. In view of the fact that this is the only commission we now have and that there is no immediate proposal before the Senate to substitute another one, it certainly seems to me that the risk of doing nothing is greater than the detriment to the country of expending the $300,000 and continuing the experienced organization which the country already has.

I hope the amendment will prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to the committee amendment commencing on page 4, line 23.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Overton
Austin	Gillette	Pepper
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Ball	Guffey	Reed
Bankhead	Gurney	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hatch	Robertson
Bone	Hawkes	Russell
Bridges	Hayden	Smith
Buck	Hill	Stewart
Burton	Holman	Taft
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Langer	Tobey
Capper	Lodge	Truman
Caraway	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wagner
Danaher	Maloney	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Wheeler
Eastland	Millikin	White
Ellender	Moore	Wiley
Ferguson	Nye	Willis
George	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I know that the Senate is anxious to vote on this question. I shall not consume more than 5 minutes. I know that the subject has been covered, but I think there ought to be presented in this discussion a greater picture of what is needed in the future than has been developed, to my way of thinking, up to the present time.

Some eight or nine million soldiers will be coming home and hunting jobs. There are 20,000,000 men working in the war plants of this Nation, which will be closed down overnight with the cessation of hostilities. That will make a potential army of from eighteen to twenty-eight million men.

There will be $60,000,000,000 worth of war materials accumulated by the Government, which must be sold in competition with private business, which will then have the difficult task of reviving on a peacetime economy. The national debt will probably be from two hundred and fifty to three hundred billion dollars; and in spite of the talk-down statements about the national debt, that is $7,500 for every family in America, rich and poor, high and low. The annual interest on that debt alone will take as much money as the yearly revenues of the Government during the period from 1930 to 1940. Furthermore, there will be about $75,000,000,000 worth of war contracts outstanding after the war is over, which must be renegotiated and settled before private business can go ahead.

In addition, by the time the war is over the banks of the country will have invested 70 percent of their total resources in Government bonds. The American Bankers' Association estimates that by June 30, 1944, the banks of the country will hold about $100,000,000,000 of Government securities, and that the resources of the banks then will be about $160,000,000,000. The capital assets of the banks are only $8,000,00,000; and a decline of only eight points would wipe out all the capital structure of all the banks in America unless plans are evolved to deal with this situation.

These are some of the highlights in the post-war picture; and when we pick up these great volumes of sheer rhetoric, without the semblance of a plan, without even assembling the facts with which the Board must deal, other than to treat them in terms of generalities, I realize that somewhere along the line there is a theorist who is dictating the policies of this Board, without any concrete plan to meet the impact of the situations which are sure to be on the Nation's doorstep shortly after the last shot is fired.

Therefore I say it is folly, after we have spent $8,000,000 on this Board, and it has not produced a single plan worthy of the name except pamphlets in the abstract, to go on appropriating more money. What we ought to do is to eliminate this Board, and by congressional action set up one equipped with money enough to obtain the proper staff to deal with each of these tremendous problems separately, and integrate it into a national policy, for two purposes:

First, to reestablish private business in this country as we know it ought to be reestablished, with the minimum amount of Government ownership and the minimum amount of regulation.

We ought to do it because there are only two places a man can get a job—either in private industry or in government. Government has not a thing in the world with which to pay his wages unless it first takes it out of the work of those employed on the farms or in private concerns. We are fooling with dynamite; we are piddling with one of the greatest problems that will come before us in the post-war period, as if it were nothing but a spring zephyr. We cannot treat it in that way and solve it. To do so would be only to waste money and get nowhere.

What we want is a practical, visible, realistic solution of this problem. For that reason I shall vote against this appropriation in the hope that we can eliminate this Board and in due time set up something worthy of the name which will tackle these problems head-on and give us the solution which will perpetuate our American way of life, our private enterprise, our system of private initiative, our constitutional form of government, with justice and opportunity, created not from the top, but from the sweat and toil of all of us in private enterprise, the only place where real wealth can be accumulated for the benefit of all our citizens.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] as modified, to the committee amendment beginning on page 4, line 23.

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be stated because I have not been able to be present during the early part of the debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 18, in the committee amendment after the word "laws" it is proposed to strike out "$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$534,422"; and on the same page, line 22, after the word "Board" it is proposed to strike out "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used except for correlation and coordination of planning with State governments and with political subdivisions of such States," and insert in lieu thereof "Provided further, That of this appropriation, not less than $300,000 shall be used for coordination of planning with State governments and with political subdivisions of such States."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand the reading of the amendment, it would provide that no less than $300,000 shall be spent. Did the Senator from Tennessee mean that no more than $300,000 shall be spent?

Mr. McKELLAR. It means that no less than that amount shall be spent. I believe that $300,000 should be spent in cooperation with the States.

Mr. WHITE. The amendment means that no less than the amount stated shall be spent. In other words, that amount must be spent.

Mr. McKELLAR. That amount must be spent.

Mr. WHITE. At least $300,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. If he were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on official business.

The Senators from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BROOKS], who are paired on this question, are absent attending a meeting of the Illinois Congressional Delegation, together with State officials of Illinois and representatives of Government departments, in connection with the flood problem in Illinois. I am advised that if present and voting, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] would vote "yea," and the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from West Virginia would vote

"yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD]. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is absent because of illness. I am informed that if present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of the death of his wife.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—31

Aiken	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Hatch	Russell
Bankhead	Hayden	Stewart
Bilbo	Hill	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Langer	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tunnell
Eastland	McKellar	Wagner
Ellender	Mead	Wallgren
Gillette	Pepper	
Green	Radcliffe	

NAYS—43

Austin	George	Revercomb
Bailey	Gerry	Robertson
Bridges	Gurney	Smith
Buck	Hawkes	Taft
Burton	Holman	Tobey
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Tydings
Butler	Lodge	Vandenberg
Byrd	McCarran	Van Nuys
Capper	McClellan	Wheeler
Chandler	Maloney	White
Chavez	Millikin	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Willis
Danaher	Nye	Wilson
Davis	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	Overton	

NOT VOTING—22

Andrews	Johnson, Calif.	Reynolds
Barbour	Kilgore	Scrugham
Barkley	Lucas	Shipstead
Brewster	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Maybank	Walsh
Connally	Murdock	Wherry
Downey	Murray	
Glass	O'Mahoney	

So Mr. McKELLAR's amendment as modified to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the committee amendment as previously amended.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for a yea and nay vote on the committee amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to say that every argument made against the Board heretofore is just as good against the amendment now pending. It is not that anyone wishes to prevent planning; I think we should undertake planning, and in my opinion the George committee will undertake planning. The way to begin any thorough planning, any planning not based on a wholly false foundation, is to begin over again, and the only way he can begin again is by abolishing the Board.

Five hundred and thirty-four thousand dollars is just a drop in the bucket. The question is not the amount of money, it is not whether we want to go ahead with planning, but whether we want to be led in that planning to a complete collapse in the United States, whether we are going on with that false premise, with a program which, in my opinion, will cost a huge amount every year if we ever start on it, to the complete destruction of this Republic. We must decide whether we want to get back to reasonable, constitutional planning.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I recall, with one exception the entire membership of the Committee on Appropriations agreed to this provision. There may have been two against it, but after a vote, like that taken here a while ago, this proposal was voted in, and I hope the $200,000 to provide for cooperation with the States will be agreed to.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, others may do as they like, of course, but from my own standpoint I am not willing to take the responsibility of voting against intelligent planning for after-the-war America, either because of any hatred of the administration, or from any question of relationship which some of the Board might have to some of the administration. In my opinion there will come a time when people will inquire as to the motives of those who see fit to vote against planning for such tremendous matters as will face the American people, not alone in the immediate future, but for some time to come.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to take only about 2 minutes. In the committee I worked with those who sought to preserve the National Resources Planning Board. I offered an amendment, which was adopted by the subcommittee, to grant $534,000 for that purpose. In the full committee there was a tie vote, and the amendment was lost. It is my opinion that the best thing to do, in view of the circumstances, in view of the strong prejudice existing against the National Resources Planning Board, is to wipe the slate clean and drop out the amendment reported by the committee.

In view of the circumstances, in view of the vote taken this afternoon, in view of the feeling that the board has boondoggled along through the years, spending a lot of money and getting nowhere, I can see no advantage in continuing the present set-up. I am not trying to pass upon the justice or injustice of the feeling held; I am trying to deal realistically with a hard established fact. My opinion is that we had better wipe the slate clean and begin again, and the $200,000 left to the Board for a limited 2 years would amount to nothing. I think the proper and wise thing to do is to reject the amendment.

Mr. NYE rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I see that the Senator from North Dakota has risen, and I hope he will say what he has in his mind. He has called my attention to a statement I just made which I wish to correct. I stated that I thought there was only one vote in the committee against the amendment. The Senator calls my attention to the fact that there was a roll call on the amendment, and that it was agreed to by 11 to 9. I have examined the roll call, and I find the Senator from North Dakota is exactly correct, and I desired to make this statement to the Senate. I am very sorry I fell into an inadvertent error.

Mr. NYE. I was sure the Senator from Tennessee would not want to leave the wrong impression, and that if the matter were called to his attention he would correct the statement, as he has done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). Again referring to my pair, I am advised that if present the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] would vote as I am about to vote. I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. PEPPER. I announce that my colleague [Mr. ANDREWS] is absent because of illness. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on official business.

The Senators from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BROOKS] are absent attending a meeting of the Illinois congressional delegation, together with State officials of Illinois and representatives of Government departments, in connection with the flood problem in Illinois. I am advised that if present and voting, they would vote "yea."

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is absent because of illness. I am informed that if present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of the death of his wife.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Ellender	Mead
Bailey	George	Pepper
Ball	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Green	Russell
Bilbo	Guffey	Stewart
Bone	Hatch	Thomas, Okla.
Brewster	Hayden	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Hill	Truman
Capper	La Follette	Tunnell
Caraway	Langer	Vandenberg
Chavez	Lodge	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Wagner
Danaher	McKellar	Wallgren
Davis	McNary	Wiley
Eastland	Maloney	

NAYS—31

Austin	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bridges	Holman	Robertson
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	McCarran	Taft
Butler	McClellan	Tobey
Byrd	Millikin	Tydings
Chandler	Moore	White
Clark, Mo.	Nye	Willis
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wilson
Gerry	Overton	
Gurney	Reed	

NOT VOTING—21

Andrews	Johnson, Calif.	Reynolds
Barbour	Kilgore	Scrugham
Barkley	Lucas	Shipstead
Brooks	Maybank	Thomas, Idaho
Connally	Murdock	Walsh
Downey	Murray	Wheeler
Glass	O'Mahoney	Wherry

So the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to as follows:

NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary for the work of the National Resources Planning Board, to perform the functions transferred to said Board on July 1, 1939, and for all expenses necessary for the planning activities of said Board in the interest of national defense, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; contract stenographic reporting services; printing and binding (not to exceed $8,000); purchase of books of reference and periodicals; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with development, conservation, and use of the resources of the Nation; not to exceed $20,000 for traveling expenses, $200,000: *Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated under this item shall be used for the performance of any functions or duties other than the functions heretofore authorized by law to be performed by the Federal Employment Stabilization Board: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used except for correlation and coordination of planning with State governments and with political subdivisions of such States.

The appropriation herein made for the National Resources Planning Board shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation by such agency during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendm nt submitted by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, in line 25, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That the Administrator may, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transfer to this authorization or to an authorization of a constituent unit from funds available for administrative expenses of the constituent units or the Office of the Administrator of the National Housing Agency such additional sums as represent a consolidation in the Office of the Administrator or in a constituent unit of any of the administrative functions of the National Housing Agency; but no such transfer of funds shall be made unless the consolidation will result in a reduction in manpower and a savings in administrative expenses, which savings shall not be used for administrative expenses but instead shall be returned to or remain in the funds from which administrative expenses are drawn under this authorization."

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I wish to appeal to the able acting leader, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. MCKELLAR], if we might at this time recess until tomorrow at 11 a. m.?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that such an order will not be made. The joint resolution providing for extension of the Trade Agreements Act is before the Senate, and has been under debate for 1 day. The act expires on June 12. Because of the fact that so many Senators were absent on Tuesday and Wednesday we had to forego the session of the Senate on those days, and I hope consideration of the appropriation bill may be concluded this afternoon so that we may resume consideration of the joint resolution extending the Trade Agreements Act the first thing tomorrow morning. I do not wish to proceed with it this afternoon.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I am sure that the amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] requires some discussion, and, in my judgment, it will require considerable discussion. I think that, inasmuch as the Senate met at 11 o'clock today, we might as well recess now and meet again tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I spoke to the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. MCKELLAR] and he said he thought there might not be much debate concerning an amendment which the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] intends to propose, dealing with the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has an amendment to which I see no particular objection. I see no objection to the amendment being adopted and going to conference. I hope the Senate may agree to that amendment and get it out of the way. If the Senator will have his amendment read I am sure it will take but a minute to consider.

Mr. MCNARY. Is the proposed amendment a modification of the amendment offered yesterday?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, my amendment has not as yet been offered.

Mr. MCKELLAR. No; that amendment has not as yet been offered.

Mr. MCNARY. I am directing my remarks to the amendment offered yesterday by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. There is strong opposition to that amendment throughout the country.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Let us see if we cannot get down to that in a moment, and I will speak to the Senator from Oregon about it. Let us see now if we cannot agree to the H. O. L. C. amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 46, beginning in line 15 and ending in line 21, was agreed to may be reconsidered, and when that is done I shall offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, to the committee amendment on page 46 I offer an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 46, line 21, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That the Home Owners' Loan Corporation shall prepare a plan for its liquidation by July 1, 1945, and shall submit a report of such plan to the Congress, setting forth the terms of liquidation and such other information as may be necessary to inform the Congress of the disposition of the property of such corporation while in the process of liquidation: *Provided further*, That the Federal Home Owners' Loan Bank Commissioner, on behalf of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, shall transmit to the Congress semiannually during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, a progress report with respect to liquidation, showing all dispositions of the property of such Corporation by States during the period of liquidation, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds during each quarterly period of the fiscal year 1944."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. BYRD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. What is the period of final liquidation proposed?

Mr. BYRD. The amendment does not fix a definite period. It simply provides that the Home Owners' Loan Corporation shall present a plan for liquidation.

Mr. OVERTON. Within what time?

Mr. BYRD. Up to July 1, 1945, and then, of course, Congress can either accept or reject that plan as it sees fit. It further requires that semi-annual statements be made as to the liquidation now going forward, so the Congress may keep in touch with it.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. The amendment does not propose that liquidation shall be made.

Mr. BYRD. No; that a plan of liquidation shall be prepared.

Mr. MCKELLAR. No; I could not consent to anything like that. It merely directs that a plan be submitted by the

Home Owners' Loan Corporation itself. I see no objection to that. The Congress should call on it for information at any time it desires.

Mr. BYRD. It requires semiannual reports as to the progress now being made in liquidation.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I understand that the amendment of the Senator from Virginia makes no very material change in the present situation. Reports are now prepared from time to time, formally and informally, by the H. O. L. C. and they are submitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency, through which such matters clear in the Senate. I do not understand that the proposed amendment makes any material change in general procedure in that respect.

Mr. BYRD. It makes this change, that it asks for a report as to a plan for liquidation as of July 1, 1945, and then requires semiannual reports to the Congress, and it would then be a matter of public record as to the liquidation which is already going forward.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am not raising any objection to the amendment at all. I am simply calling attention to the fact that reports practically similar to what this amendment calls for are now being submitted from time to time. It is true there is no existing specific provision that they should be submitted to the Congress, but as they do come to the Banking and Currency Committee I presume they are a part of the records available to the Congress. I do not object to the amendment at all, but I do not think it makes any substantial change in what is being done now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to the committee amendment on page 46, after line 21.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Have all the committee amendments been disposed of?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that consideration of the amendment which I offered on behalf of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] may go over until tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, consideration of the amendment will be passed over until tomorrow.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The next amendment which had been passed over was, under the heading "National Housing Agency—Federal Home Loan Bank Administration", on page 43, line 2, after the words "total of," to strike out "$8,310,734, and such corporation shall be liquidated as provided by section 4 (k) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to the extent necessitated by the reduction of administrative personnel herein required, and the expenses incident to such liquidation shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof. The Home Owners' Loan Corporation shall not incur for administrative expenses in excess of $833,333.33 for any month from July to December 1943, inclusive, nor in excess of $208,333.33 for any month from January to June 1944, inclusive" and insert "$12,142,200."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is the amendment the modification as expressed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] in his amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; it has nothing to do with that. The Glass amendment has not been submitted.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. It is not the present purpose of the Senator to submit it, I take it.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. McNARY. Very well; I have no objection whatsoever. I objected to that amendment because it attempted to exclude the private housing agencies of the country from operation, and was rejected by the House. That is the reason for my opposition. Now that that amendment is not to be offered, I am content to go forward.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 43, lines 2 to 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment which had been passed over was, under the heading "Title II—General Provisions," on page 70, after line 24, to strike out:

SEC. 205. Unless otherwise specified and until July 1, 1944, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States, or of any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States, whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person is a citizen of the United States or a person in the service of the United States on the date of this enactment who, being eligible for citizenship, had theretofore filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen or who owes allegiance to the United States.

And insert:

SEC. 205. Unless otherwise specified and until July 1, 1944, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this act who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, or (3), is a person who owes allegiance to the United States.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LODGE. Has the committee amendment been acted upon?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not as yet. The amendment went over on the request of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment submitted by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 71, in line 23, after the word "States", it is proposed to insert "*Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with: *Provided further*, That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to explain the amendment. I understand that the amendment will be accepted by the Senator from Tennessee who is in charge of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I do not have the right to accept the amendment on behalf of the committee. So far as I am concerned, I do not express any opposition to the amendment at this time.

Mr. OVERTON. But in the committee meeting I think it was understood that the amendment would be accepted.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senate has to pass on it.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the amendment relates to the citizenship clause. That clause provides in effect, that no compensation shall be paid under this appropriation Act or under any other Act to anyone who is not a citizen of the United States, or who has not filed a declaration of citizenship, or who is not a person who owes allegiance to the United States.

There is no objection at all to the House provision as clarified by the Senate committee amendment. The purpose of my amendment is to make the administration of the provision a practical one. As the provision now stands, disbursing officers of any department or agency of the Government will have to conduct an inquiry in order to determine whether any particular person is a citizen of the United States or has filed a declaration of citizenship or owes allegiance to the United States, and he will have to determine that question at his peril. If the disbursing officer should make a payment to any officer or employee who happened not to qualify under the restrictions and limitations of the provision, he would make the payment at his risk.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator may have provided in the amendment for the point I am about to raise; when I heard the amendment read I did not notice whether that had been done, because I heard

it then for the first time: Suppose that, subsequent to the disbursement, the proof is developed contrary to the statement in the affidavit. Does the Senator's amendment provide for recoupment?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator's amendment does not provide for recoupment. However, of course as a legal proposition I suggest that the Government would be entitled to recover any amount which had been paid to one who was not entitled to it. I do not think there is any question about that. The affidavit will constitute only prima facie evidence.

However, my amendment does provide that anyone who makes a false affidavit shall be penalized by being imprisoned for not more than 1 year or by paying a fine of not more than $1,000.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should suggest, Mr. President, that if the Senator also provided in his amendment that, in case of false statement, the person making such statement shall be liable in a civil action for recovery of moneys obtained, the matter would then be without question.

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection to that, but I think it would follow as a matter of law.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am not so certain, in view of the language of the proposal, that it would follow. The Government here is becoming a volunteer in making the payment. The Government says, "Now we shall make the payment on a mere affidavit." Then, as a matter of law, has not the Government estopped itself from any civil recovery, if it says only that, "We shall prosecute this man for making a false statement, if it is false"?

That is a question which could be entirely avoided by inserting merely two or three words in the Senator's amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. I shall be very glad to undertake to dictate such a provision now if the clerk will take it down, or I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont, in order that he may do so.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am sure the Senator can do so better than I could.

Mr. OVERTON. I am not so sure about that.

Mr. President, I will modify the amendment. After the words "existing law", I insert the following: *"Provided further,* That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government."

Is that language satisfactory?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. Now, Mr. President, let me make the further statement that when the subversive-activities clause was before the Senate several years ago, I was either appointed as a committee of one to draft an appropriate provision respecting the subversive-activities clause, or else I appointed myself as a committee of one; I have forgotten which was the case.

At any rate, I devoted a great deal of thought to that matter. I consulted those in the administration who had to do with the disbursements and who made the payments; and I came to the conclusion that, among other things, it would be wrong to constitute each disbursing officer a tribunal to determine whether one was guilty of subversive activities or was a member of an organization the purpose of which was the overthrow of the Government of the United States. Therefore, I provided in the clause that for the purposes of that clause, an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate and is not a member of an organization, that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence.

After considerable discussion, that clause was adopted as a protection to the disbursing officers. It was agreed to by the Senate and by the House, and has been incorporated in innumerable provisions of appropriation acts since then.

The purpose of the pending amendment is similar to the purpose of the amendment about the overthrow-of-the-Government clause. That purpose is that an affidavit shall constitute merely prima facie evidence, so as to protect the disbursing officer, that one qualifies for the reception of payment under the provisions of this section. Then there follows a provision imposing a severe penalty upon one who makes a false affidavit; and that penalty is in addition to other penalties prescribed by law—as, for example, the penalty on one who commits perjury.

Mr. President, I think the amendment should be agreed to, and not only should be taken to conference, but should be agreed to in conference between the House and the Senate.

In the last deficiency bill the House inserted a similar provision incorporating what I have in the pending amendment, omitting, however, the penalty clause, but making the affidavit prima facie evidence, so as to protect the disbursing officers. That was approved by the Appropriations Committee of the House. I think, therefore, that the House conferees will approve this amendment if it is adopted by the Senate. I understand that the amendment is agreeable to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. I therefore ask that it be agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I know that the Senator from Louisiana is an expert on this particular subject. I distinctly recall when this subject first arose, about 3 years ago. It is my recollection that we dealt with it in a satisfactory manner at that time. I would appreciate being informed why it is necessary to deal with it further at the present time.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the provision to which the Senator from Massachusetts refers applied to those who belong to an organization which advocates the overthrow of the Government, or who themselves advocate the overthrow of the Government. They are not entitled to employment or compensation. This is a new clause in reference to citizenship; and I should like to throw the same safeguards around the citizenship clause that were thrown around what might be called the Communist clause.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] to the committee amendment, on page 71, line 23.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not believe there are any further committee amendments except the one referred to by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] a while ago, which the committee has directed me to offer. I stated that under those circumstances it would be necessary for me to offer it. I hope, with the consent of the Senator from Oregon, we may take it to conference. If there is any trouble about the amendment we can thrash it out in conference and see what can be done with it.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I always try to be considerate. I very strenuously object to the amendment. The Senator now advises me that he is bound by a committee commitment.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Committee action.

Mr. MCNARY. I like the other word just as well.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Or commitment.

Mr. MCNARY. I do not wish to embarrass the Senator from Tennessee. I wish to help him out. He is in a hole. If he merely wishes to take the amendment to conference, read it over, and discharge his duty in that fashion, I will go along.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42, line 25, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That the Administrator may, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transfer to this authorization or to an authorization of a constituent unit from funds available for administrative expenses of the constituent units or the office of the Administrator of the National Housing Agency such additional sums as represent a consolidation in the office of the Administrator or in a constituent unit of any of the administrative functions of the National Housing Agency; but no such transfer of funds shall be made unless the consolidation will result in a reduction in manpower and a savings in administrative expenses, which savings shall not be used for administrative expenses but instead shall be returned to or remain in the funds from which administrative expenses are drawn under this authorization."

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, let me explain the amendment. There has been a consolidation of a number of departments, and the head of the National Housing Agency came before our committee and said that it was possible for them to make a further consolidation of

agencies and save the Government money. This amendment was drawn for that express purpose; and it is provided in the amendment itself that such consolidations may be made only in the event they save the Government money and also save manpower. I invite the attention of the Senator from Ohio and other Senators who may be interested to the language on page 2 of the amendment:

> But no such transfer of funds shall be made unless the consolidation will result in a reduction in manpower and a savings in administrative expenses, which savings shall not be used for administrative expenses but instead shall be returned to or remain in the funds from which administrative expenses are drawn under this authorization.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I think I was on my feet before the announcement of the Chair that the amendment was agreed to. I wish to ask the Senator from Tennessee a question regarding the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was agreed to?

Mr. TAFT. I understood the Senator from Oregon to object to the amendment. Perhaps I did not speak up as quickly as I should have.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope that will be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, under the Overman Act the President may consolidate bureaus.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Would this amendment confer upon the Federal Housing Administrator the power to consolidate bureaus without referring the question to the President? If so, it seems to me it is clearly additional legislation, and not proper in an appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely true. The amendment is hedged about in this way:

> The Administrator may, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget—

That is a part of the Presidential office—

> transfer to this authorization or to an authorization of a constituent unit from funds available for administrative expenses of the constituent units.

And so forth. The consolidation must meet two requirements. It must save both manpower and money to the Government. I can see no possible objection to the amendment. The transfer may not be made unless the consolidation saves both manpower and money.

Mr. TAFT. My difficulty is that in the National Housing Agency there are consolidated three completely separate organizations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. One is the F. H. A.; another is the Home Loan Bank System; and the third is the F. P. H. A. Those agencies are very jealous of one another and of other bureaus. It seems to me somewhat doubtful whether we should confer upon the Federal Housing Administrator the right to take a bureau away from one of those agencies and give it to another, or take it into his own office, even if such a transfer would save money.

Mr. McKELLAR. It may not be done unless it saves both money and manpower.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me to be a matter of such importance that it ought to go to the President himself. He made the consolidation under certain conditions. It seems to me that if there are to be further consolidations they ought to be made under the Overman Act and not under an appropriation bill authorizing the Administrator to make these rearrangements.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would the Senator prefer to have the amendment read:

> That the Administrator may, with the approval of the President—

And so forth?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I think that would entirely remove my objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I modify the amendment by striking out, on page 1, line 2, the words "Director of the Bureau of the Budget" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "President of the United States."

Mr. TAFT. I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be modified accordingly.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] on behalf of the committee.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, have the committee amendments been concluded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendments have been concluded. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 66, line 7, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes, except for cooking purposes, but if the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs finds at any time that the procurement of an adequate butter supply is not feasible, this appropriation shall be available for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes to the extent that such administrator finds to be necessary to meet the requirements of the Veterans' Administration facilities for other than cooking purposes."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief explanation of the proposed amendment. For a number of years similar appropriation bills have carried the following limitation:

> Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes except for cooking purposes.

It was originally placed in the law because it was found that in some of the Government institutions oleomargarine, or butter substitutes, were being served to the inmates thereof in lieu of butter. It is now, of course, a well-known fact that there is a shortage of butter in the United States, and the limitation referred to was omitted from this bill when it passed the House of Representatives. Language similar to the amendment which I have just offered was incorporated in the first deficiency bill.

The language, as Senators well know from a study of it, does not bar the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from utilizing oleomargarine or other butter substitutes for veterans in veterans' hospitals, except where he is in a position to obtain butter. In other words, he may buy it when butter is not available. The desire is to maintain this principle in the statute, but to recognize the emergency which now exists.

I feel certain that the Congress will wish to continue the policy which it has followed for a number of years of providing butter for the inmates of and persons assigned to veterans' hospitals wherever it is available to be furnished as a part of the regular diet.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I think it may require some time for the proper consideration of the amendment. It may be advisable to allow the matter to go over until tomorrow. If it is not put over, of course we shall have to proceed now. It is the same old fight being made against the South on the oleomargarine question. I do not see any necessity of going into it on this occasion. The other House declined to go into it. It is an attempt against the use of products of cottonseed oil in the interest of butter.

I had always understood that when people knew what they wanted to buy and what they wanted to use, they ought to be permitted to exercise their free choice. I feel the same principle of free choice should apply to veterans in hospitals.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if I may be pardoned for intruding, it is now nearly 6 o'clock, and if we get into this subject discussion is likely to develop similar to that which I have seen develop in the past. I think we had better adjourn until tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We may as well.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not want to take an improper attitude. I realize that the hour is late. House Joint Resolution 111 was reported last week. To accommodate some Senators, I put it over until Monday. Then, to

accommodate still other Senators, I stated that I would not ask for a Senate session on Tuesday and on Wednesday of this week. In the meantime I consented that the pending bill might be considered. I had no idea there would be a prolongation of the discussion on the bill. I shall ask the leadership if this matter is to go over until tomorrow.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will permit me, this matter may be disposed of on a point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to ask if the amendment would not be considered in the nature of legislation and subject to a point of order. Our committee considered it, and we had a hearing upon it. The Senator from Wisconsin appeared, and the committee was of the impression that during the war we needed all the butterfats and substitutes we could get, and that the provision should not be inserted. I understand that the other House feels the same way about it. I am inclined to think that this may be treated in the nature of legislation, and I make a point of order on that ground.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that all after line 4 is subject to the point of order. Does the Senator from Wisconsin wish to reoffer the amendment in a modified form?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in view of the situation which exists so far as the purchase of butter is concerned, I would not wish to absolutely tie the hands of the Veterans' Administrator and prevent him from utilizing butter substitutes if butter is not available, even though the Senate might agree to the amendment. The Senate and the House have both incorporated this language, or similar language, in similar appropriation bills, as well as other bills, for over 10 years, to my certain knowledge. However, in view of the butter shortage, and the difficulty of obtaining it, I should not wish to offer the amendment in its original form, as it exists in the present statutes, because I believe that some latitude must be allowed the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in instances—rare though they may be—when he may be unable to purchase butter for the hospitals distributed over the United States.

Therefore, if the point of order against the amendment in its present form shall be sustained by the Chair, the Senator from Wisconsin will be forced to accept the ruling.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by me with respect to estimates submitted by the Budget Bureau.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Under the provisions of the pending bill, the appropriations of the Budget Bureau have been reduced from the amount requested by this Bureau.

At this time I will not discuss the details of this reduction, but I do want to take this opportunity to say that I have come in close contact with the Budget Bureau and its director, Mr. Smith, during my service as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and I think it is only fair to say that the Budget Bureau is perhaps the only agency of the Government that is showing any concern with respect to holding down governmental expenses.

I have not always agreed with the Budget Bureau. I, of course, know it is under the control of the Executive and must carry out the Executive's policies, but I think the Budget Bureau has made earnest efforts to hold down needless Government expenditures and to bring about orderly and consistent methods of budget procedure, which I believe to be very vital in view of the vast magnitude of our expenditures.

New activities are constantly being placed upon the Budget Bureau. For example, it now has, by congressional enactment, the control of all reports and questionnaires, and has already effected a reduction of 14 percent in these questionnaires as instituted by the different agencies of the Government.

I am making this statement so that as one Member of the Senate it may be understood that while not agreeing in all the actions of the Budget Bureau, I do know that insofar as the Budget Director himself is concerned, he and his organization are doing all they can to eliminate useless and unnecessary expenditures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 1762) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GLASS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. NYE, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate.

PHOSPHATIC FERTILIZER

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by me on the subject of the use of phosphatic fertilizer manufactured by the T. V. A.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY BEGINS TO SHIP AMMONIUM NITRATE TO BE USED AS FERTILIZER ON DEMONSTRATION FARMS IN 14 STATES

This week the Tennessee Valley Authority is shipping ammonium nitrate from Muscle Shoals in Alabama to 14 different States. Because requirements of the War Department for explosives have been reduced this new product can be made available for fertilizer use on the same test demonstration farms which have been participating in the program through which Tennessee Valley Authority's highly concentrated phosphatic fertilizer has been distributed during the past 8 years.

The results obtained by the use of this new product on these demonstration farms will furnish practical and scientific information which will be exceedingly valuable if, because of further reduction in the need for explosives the capacity of other plants, those under private operation, becomes available for use as a fertilizer on the land. Six thousand tons of ammonium nitrate, high in nitrogen content, containing over 34 percent of the vital mineral and conditioned with lime, will be distributed from Muscle Shoals to demonstration farms in May and June. This week's shipments will go to Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Missouri, Wisconsin, and New York, and there is a possibility that some of the product may also be provided for demonstration farms in Oregon, Vermont, Ohio, and New Mexico.

An additional quantity above that allocated for use on demonstration farms will be produced by Tennessee Valley Authority, but according to regulations of the War Production Board it must be made available for distribution by the industry under allocations by the War Production Board. These allocations, I am informed, adhere to the formula of historical fertilizer use. I do not pretend to know the best way to distribute a material of which we have a critical shortage, but I want to go on record now as questioning the desirability of freezing any longer in any way the "historical" method of handling fertilizer in the United States. Historically the marketing policies of the fertilizer industry have made impossible the full replenishment of the mineral content taken from the soil by cropping. The worn-out lands of the South, the dust bowls of the West are footnote comments to the "historical use" of plant food from commercial sources.

I should prefer to see more recent history honored. I should like to remind the antiquarians in the fertilizer industry, the War Production Board and the Agriculture Department that history has been made since 1933. I should like to be assured that in decisions affecting fertilizer and war food production the history of Tennesseee Valley Authority's demonstration program in the past 8 years had not been excluded from consideration. I reviewed that program on this floor recently, and summarized the results obtained since this one agency of government had the courage and the vision to turn its back on the tradition of the past and provide a new plant food to make a better history for the future.

In my judgment it was an important moment in our agricultural history when the Board of Tennessee Valley Authority decided in 1933 to use the facilities of Muscle Shoals to produce phosphatic plant food. When they entered into cooperative agreements with the extension services of the land-grant colleges in the several States to inaugurate a demonstration program to try out the new fertilizer developed another paragraph in history was recorded, and when more than 40,000 farmers agreed to change their farming practices to use the new materials, the writing of a whole new chapter was begun. Those farmers paid the freight, they bought the lime that most soils needed in addition. They took a chance in order to participate in a great new program to relieve a basic mineral deficit in their soil. The results achieved have been magnificent. Those demonstration farmers made agricultural history. They proved what soil scientists had long contended—that by the abundant use of phosphate combined with the planting of legumes, nitrogen would be drawn from the air and fertility restored to the soil with profit to the farmers. They demonstrated a plan which will insure the efficient use of manpower and machines and guarantee full production from every acre, every crop, and every animal.

Since 1935, 42,000 farmers in 29 States have participated in the demonstration program. On their farms the Tennessee Valley Authority has shown what happens when P_2O_5 is made available to the soil in highly concentrated phosphatic plant food. Those farmers have used an average of 17 pounds of P_2O_5 on every acre of crop and meadow and

pasture every year. And as a consequence, on their farms they have increased production of meat and eggs and dairy products, the foods we need today, by an average of over 30 percent.

That was the average use of P_2O_5 and the average increase in production. It includes the results obtained on the poorest land, by the least industrious farmer, and reflects the experience of those beset by special tribulations of inclement weather or by personal misfortunes. On the most successful farms the increase in production of war-scarce foods has gone up over 60 percent. To make that startling record, 30 pounds of P_2O_5 has been applied to every cleared acre. On the same land, the same men, with the addition only of this new plant food have increased their food production without more manpower or more machinery. This is history, too. But it is not the history honored by the fertilizer industry or the experts who advise the War Production Board. Theirs is the history which tolerates a use of 2 pounds of P_2O_5 per acre. That was the average use of phosphate on the farms of the rest of the country, while the demonstration farms stepped up their use as high as 30 pounds.

Devotion to the policies sanctified as history by the industry and the so-called experts who parrot their contentions, limits phosphate use and prompts the specious claim that we have a surplus capacity for production of P_2O_5 in this country. Of course we have a surplus if the farms of the country continue to be limited to 2 pounds per acre by the marketing policies of the industry. If those policies are permitted forever to restrict our food production, then we will always have a capacity for production of the precious mineral of about 600,000 tons beyond anticipated demands. Preoccupied with preserving the habits of the past, no effort has yet been made by the industry, or our agricultural agencies to get that surplus used on the land.

Yet if that much P_2O_5 were applied to the soil and if the results were similar to those experienced on demonstration farms we would have 24,000,000,000 additional pounds of milk this year. That is more than we need. As a matter of fact, the use of only one-tenth of the idle commercial capacity for production of P_2O_5 would mean that our goal of milk production could be reached without more manpower or more machinery. But the capacity is not being used. The land is not getting the mineral. New acres are opened instead. Men and machines are wastefully employed. Formulas of historical use are cited as sacred standards, and the experience of more than 40,000 farmers over 8 years is ignored.

Tennessee Valley Authority does not agree with the optimistic statements which picture this country with a surplus capacity for P_2O_5 production. It reports that we have a critical shortage, if the need of the land for vitality to produce the food we need is taken as the measure of demand. I think the Authority's judgment is likely to be correct on this subject. I like the kind of history it has written in the past few years. I know what this program has accomplished in the South. And I know how disastrous it will be if the supply of P_2O_5 for fertilizer is restricted. Such a restriction threatens.

Part of Tennessee Valley Authority capacity devoted to phosphatic fertilizer production has had to be turned over to make elemental phosphorus for combat uses, and substantial demands for shipment of this highly concentrated fertilizer to Great Britain have to be met. To meet this situation, Tennessee Valley Authority recommended almost 2 years ago that additional capacity be provided in order that the supply of phosphate for demonstration farms should not be reduced because of these additional demands. Congress agreed with Tennessee Valley Authority's position and authorized construction of a plant at Mobile in my own State. Funds were appropriated, designs were completed, a site was purchased, but priorities for the use of material have been denied. Of course, such a plant requires substantial amounts of steel. But every ship load of this concentrated phosphatic fertilizer applied to British soil means that seven shiploads of food are spared a crossing.

Every pound of P_2O_5 used on our land relieves the shortage of nitrogen, releases men and machines. I wonder if those relationships have been balanced. I am afraid the decision has been reached by the very men whose selective sense of history does not include the experience of the past 10 years, who do not know the story of a fertilizer program based on the need of the land, rather than the settled habits of men.

Again it is another page in history as Tennessee Valley Authority begins to send out this new plant food, as the capacity of the plants at Muscle Shoals make one more contribution toward breaking down the mineral limitations of our soil. The same farmers will cooperate and the same demonstration methods will be used as 6,000 tons of this new product are used on the soil. I know it will be effectively applied but I am concerned about the use of the amount to be made available for distribution by the industry according to the formula of "historical use." Upon inquiry I am advised by the office of Tennessee Valley Authority that the Authority proposed a different method for distribution of the balance. It wanted farmer cooperatives to have its product, believing that a better educational program would be provided. That recommendation was rejected by the War Production Board. I have asked for a report. I want to know the details. For we ought to know, if additional quantities of ammonium nitrate become available for fertilizer as military demands decline, how it is likely to be used. The War Production Board, the War Food Administration, all agricultural agencies will have a basis for decision when this two months' test is over. On July 1, this brief demonstration will be history, too.

I do not want its results ignored as the implications of the program with respect to phosphate use have been evaded. Problems of storage and shipping, problems of application will have been encountered. If every difficulty is resolved and if more material is available, we can have high hopes for our next planting season—provided only that fertilizer history is brought up to date. Unless it is, the benefits of this program will be restricted to participating farmers. We will know when the experience of this decade has been added to the knowledge of the past in the circles where fertilizer experts move. It will be the day that private industry produces P_2O_5 to the full capacity of its existing plants. It will be the day priorities are granted for the Mobile plant. It will be the day when our agricultural experts face the basic problem of increased food production, when recommendations for fertilizer production and plans for distribution are based on the need of the land, not the habits of farmers or the interest of a private industry in the historical method of treating soil exhaustion.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of House Joint Resolution 111, to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is on page 1, beginning on line 8.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it is too late to proceed with the consideration of the joint resolution at this time, and I am willing that a recess may be taken.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing two nominations under the War Manpower Commission), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nominations withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Wirt G. Bowman, of Nogales, Ariz., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 26, with headquarters at Nogales, Ariz.

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Basil Manly, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1948 (reappointment).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Admiral William A. Glassford, Jr., United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 19th of May 1943;

Rear Admiral Raymond A. Spruance to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of May 1943; and

Capt. Wilder DuP. Baker to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 13th day of July 1942.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as in executive session I ask that the Senate confirm certain nominations on the executive calendar, which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the nominations.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed this day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 28, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 27 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

James H. Flanagan, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the term of 3 years from July 1, 1943 (reappointment).

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Wirt G. Bowman, of Nogales, Ariz., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 26, with headquarters at Nogales, Ariz., to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following surgeons to be temporary senior surgeons in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective from June 1, 1943:

Oswald F. Hedley
Thomas H. Tomlinson, Jr.

The following passed assistant surgeon to be temporary senior surgeon in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective from June 1, 1943:

William E. Graham

The following passed assistant surgeons to be temporary surgeons in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective from June 1, 1943:

Daniel J. Daley
Eugene W. Green
Jack L. James
Edgar B. Johnwick
Leo D. O'Kane

The following passed assistant sanitary engineer to be temporary sanitary engineer in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective from June 1, 1943:

Walter N. Dashiell

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Archibald Andrew Fall, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from August 18, 1940.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

First Lt. George Brendan O'Connor, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 12, 1938.

Second Lt. Joel John Dilworth, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

TO INFANTRY

Second Lt. Thomas Martin Ward, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 11, 1941.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) have been examined and found qualified for promotion. All others are subject to the examination required by law.)

To be major with rank from June 12, 1943

×Capt. William Clyde Baker, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
×Capt. William Livingston Bayer, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Herbert William Ehgott, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Capt. Turner Ashby Sims, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Francis LeRoy Ankenbrandt, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. William Hunt Mills, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Capt. Keith Richard Barney, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Capt. Elvin Ragnvald Heiberg, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Capt. Francis Xavier Purcell, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Harold Anthony Brusher, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Raymond Coleman Maude, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Samuel Wallace Van Meter, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Richard Wyman Pearson, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Irving Arthur Duffy, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary colonel).
Capt. William Preston Corderman, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Clerin Rodney Smith, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Capt. Fiorre John Stagliano, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Parker Montrose Reeve, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Capt. Harry Warren Johnson, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Rufus Leonidas Land, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. James Norvell Krueger, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Robert Kinzie McDonough, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Donald Prentice Booth, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Capt. Arthur August Gerhart Kirchhoff, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Capt. William Murlin Creasy, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel).
Capt. Alfred Henry Johnson, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Ralph Morris Osborne, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Capt. Norman Arthur Matthias, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Capt. Malcolm Raymond Kammerer, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Robert Eugene Mousseau Des Islets, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Capt. William Edward House, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. James Roy Andersen, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Benjamin Easton Thurston, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Harold McClure Forde, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. William Alexander Walker, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John Colt Beaumont Elliott, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Capt. Samuel Russ Harris, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Lewis Sherrill Griffing, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Waldo Eugene Laidlaw, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
Capt. Hamer Pace Ford, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John Ensor Perman, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. George William Hickman, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Earl Jerome Murphy, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Holger Nelson Toftoy, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Harold Doud, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Capt. David Louis Van Syckle, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Wallace Hayden Barnes, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Shelton Ezra Prudhomme, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. John Paul Doyle, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Leon William Johnson, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Richard Walden Mayo, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Earl Lewis Ringler, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Walter Clement Stanton, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Capt. Frank Sayles Bowen, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Malcolm Dudley Jones, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Capt. William Peirce Ennis, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Clair McKinley Conzelman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Samuel Pickens Collins, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. John Cline Strickler, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Theodore Charles Wenzlaff, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
×Capt. William Jesse Deyo, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Benjamin Peter Heiser, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John Lawrence Ryan, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Capt. Egon Rowland Tausch, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Alexander Randolph Sewall, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Prentice Edward Yeomans, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Paul Hamilton, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Charles Clifford Sloane, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Charles Winchell McGeehan, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Capt. James Russell Wheaton, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Capt. Basil Littleton Riggs, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Malcolm Hobson Harwell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Henry Raymond Baxter, Air Corps, (temporary colonel).
Capt. Roy Silverman, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Tyler Calhoun, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Capt. Richard Hanson Grinder, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Edwin James Van Horne, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Robert Charles Ross, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Harry Purnell Storke, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Thomas Edward Pickett Barbour, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Joseph Halversen, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Capt. Marvin Westlake Peck, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Capt. George Albert Smith, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. James Robert Davidson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Frank Freeman Miter, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John Prichard Woodbridge, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Thomas Edward de Shazo, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Capt. Kenneth Frease March, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Robert Sylvester Nourse, Adjutant General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Richard Edward O'Connor, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John Sieba Roosma, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John Anthony McFarland, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Capt. Morris Robert Nelson, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Kenneth Perry McNaughton, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. John Harvey Kane, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Russell Potter Reeder, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
Capt. Charles Draper William Canham, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Edward Harold McDaniel, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Capt. Willet John Baird, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Paul John Black, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Capt. Clifton Coleman Carter, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Paul Leroy Carroll, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Edward Lyman Munson, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Capt. James Bell Burwell, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Frederick Prall Munson, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Thomas Howard James, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Wilson Turner Douglas, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Capt. John Robert Burns, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Marvin John McKinney, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Thomas Benjamin White, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. William Benjamin Hawthorne, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Thomas Randall Horton, Infantry (temporary major).
Capt. Roy Jacob Herte, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. James Oka Wade, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Brookner West Brady, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Harry McNeill Grizzard, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

To be major with rank from June 13, 1943

×Capt. Charles Herman Deerwester, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Charles Winslow O'Connor, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Bernard Alexander Bridget, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Charles Arthur Bassett, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Grant Albert Williams, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Norman Mahlon Winn, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Capt. Narcisse Lionel Cote, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. George Hall Sparhawk, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. John Felix Guillett, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Dixon McCarty Allison, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Joel G. O'Neal, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Alva Lee Harvey, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

To be major with rank from June 30, 1943

×Capt. Robert Lee Miller, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. John Osman Taylor, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Frank Neuman Leakey, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. George Olaf Norman Lodoen, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Lindsey Roscoe Wingfield, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Philip James Henderson, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Edgar Richard Curtis Ward, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Oliver Wolcott van den Berg, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
Capt. Ralph Eugene Rumbold, Infantry (temporary major).
Capt. Noble Theodore Haakensen, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Paul Arthur Ridge, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. James William Andrew, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. George J. Eppright, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. William Vance Davis, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. William Crawford D. Bridges, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Capt. Harry Joseph Wheaton, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Capt. George John Zimmerman, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Capt. John Albert Dabney, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Capt. John Emmett Walker, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Rothwell Hutton Brown, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Irvin Schindler, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary colonel).
Capt. Charles Owen Wiselogel, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Albert Jerome Thackston, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Joseph Roy Dougherty, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Arthur Hodgkins Bender, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Clarence Daniel Wheeler, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Walter Sylvester Lee, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Manning Eugene Tillery, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Cleo Zachariah Shugart, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Capt. William Preston Grace, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Claude Augustus Billingsley, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Gerald Geoffrey Johnston, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Elmer Joseph Rogers, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. John Francis Fiske, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Ross Drum Lustenberger, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John Caswell Crosthwaite, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Jonathan Dean Hawkins, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Clarence Shortridge Irvine, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Mason Harley Lucas, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Ralph Emerson Holmes, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Darr Hayes Alkire, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Francis Albert Rudolph, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Thurston H. Baxter, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Albert Gallatin Franklin, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Chester Erwin Margrave, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John Albert Tarro, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. John Titcomb Sprague, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Frederick August Bacher, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Walter Byron Larew, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Frank Coffin Holbrook, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Yantis Halbert Taylor, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Newell Edward Watts, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Claire Stroh, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Charles William Stratton, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Charles Albert Sheldon, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
Capt. Francis Edgar Cheatle, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Stewart Yeo, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Robert Jones Moulton, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. James Trimble Brown, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Charles Weller McCarthy, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Capt. Benjamin Branche Talley, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Capt. John Gibson Van Houten, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Capt. Kenneth Holmes Kinsler, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Edgar Albert Gans, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Howard Ravenscroft Johnson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Albert Samuel Baron, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. George Edwin Steinmeyer, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Arthur Joseph Lehman, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Oscar Frederick Carlson, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. George Edley Henry, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Henry Louis Luongo, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Herbert Butler Powell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
Capt. Signa Allen Gilkey, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Edward Francis Merchant, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
×Capt. Layton Allen Zimmer, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Jay B. Lovless, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Clinton William Davies, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. James Byron Colson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. William Hans Brunke, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Thomas Beverley Harper, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Paul August Jaccard, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. James David O'Brien, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Reuben Kyle, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Paul Burnham Nelson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×Capt. Harvey Flynn Dyer, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×Capt. Robert Bartlett McCleave, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

To be captain with rank from June 13, 1943

×First Lt. Kenneth E. Fields, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. George Wood Beeler, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. John Joseph Danis, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. Duncan Hallock, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Alfred Dodd Starbird, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. John Douglas Matheson, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Richard Davis Meyer, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Alden Kingsland Sibley, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Marshall Bonner, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×First Lt. Lawrence Joseph Lincoln, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Clayton Samuel Gates, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. James Vance Hagan, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Robert Campbell Tripp, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Edward George Herb, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William Jonas Ely, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. John Thomas Honeycutt, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. William Allen Harris, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Charles Russell Broshous, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
First Lt. Percival Ernest Gabel, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
First Lt. John Gardner Shinkle, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Bernard Card, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. Hoy D. Davis, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Alvin Charles Welling, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William Harris Ball, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×First Lt. Douglas Charles Davis, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Elisworth Barricklow Downing, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Robert Amrine Turner, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. David Warren Gray, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Frank Sherman Henry, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William Orin Blandford, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Walter Adonis Downing, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Guy Cecil Lothrop, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Robert Crain Leslie, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. John Edward Watters, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Francis Joseph McMorrow, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Charles Golding Dunn, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Thomas Allen Glass, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
×First Lt. Thomas Samuel Moorman, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Harry Julian, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×First Lt. Dabney Ray Corum, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Lauren Whitford Merriam, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Herbert George Sparrow, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Howard Elwyn Webster, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
×First Lt. Robert Wolcott Meals, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Walter August Jensen, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Edward Bodeau, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William Livingston Travis, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Thomas Burns Hall, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Chalmer Kirk McClelland, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Ferdinand Marion Humphries, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. John Denton Armitage, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Theodore John Conway, Infantry (temporary major).
×First Lt. Clayton Earl Mullins, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Paul Elton LaDue, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Edward Joseph Hale, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. William Joseph Daniel, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Chester Arthur Dahlen, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. John Joseph Lane, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Travis Monroe Hetherington, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Edgar Ozzo Taylor, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×First Lt. Ira Whitehead Cory, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William York Frentzel, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Thomas Kocher MacNair, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. James Hilliard Polk, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. John Glenn Armstrong, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Samuel Edward Otto, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Harry Winfield Schenck, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
First Lt. Lamar Cecil Ratcliffe, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Gerald Chapman, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Robert John Lawlor, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
First Lt. Arthur Alfred McCrary, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Daniel Parker, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Edgar Haskell Kibler, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Harold Cooper Donnelly, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Morris Oswald Edwards, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. William Oscar Senter, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Frank Joseph Zeller, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Sidney Francis Giffin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Robert Beall Franklin, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William Gordon Bartlett, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Paul Nelson Gillon, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Paul Rudolf Walters, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Vernon Cleveland Smith, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
First Lt. Edward Thorndike Ashworth, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William Bruce Logan, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Lafar Lipscomb, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Harry Stephen Bishop, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×First Lt. Harry Sheldon Tubbs, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel)
×First Lt. Herman Henry Kaesser, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Francis Hill, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Herbert Charles Plapp, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Lassiter Albert Mason, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×First Lt. Joseph Henry O'Malley, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Frederic Henry Fairchild, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Emory Edwin Hackman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. George Hobart Chapman, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Patrick William Guiney, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. John Frederick Thorlin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Frank Harris Shepardson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William George Fritz, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Robert Worman Hain, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Charles Goyer Patterson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Clyde Lucken Jones, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Victor Edward Maston, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Ethan Allen Chapman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Oren Eugene Hurlbut, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Harrison King, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. George Warren White, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Richard Park, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Beverly DeWitt Jones, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William Hadley Richardson, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Frank Patterson Hunter, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. George Harold Crawford, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×First Lt. Harold Roth Maddux, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. John Roosevelt Brindley, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Dwight Divine 2d, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
First Lt. Samuel McFarland McReynolds, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
First Lt. Marcus Tague, Field Artilery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Joseph Leonard Cowhey, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Edward Deane Marshall, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. George Leon Van Way, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Charles Henry Chase, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. David Virgil Adamson, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. John William Ferris, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Robert Penn Thompson, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Russell Roland Klanderman, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. James Leo Dalton 2d, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×First Lt. Neil Merton Wallace, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. William Paul Whelihan, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Marshall Woodruff Frame, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel)
×First Lt. Robin George Speiser, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William James Given, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Harry Nelson Burkhalter, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Avery John Cooper, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Laurence Browning Kelley, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Stephen Ogden Fuqua, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

First Lt. Hardin Leonard Olson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Cam Longley, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Robert Benton Neely, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Phillip Henshaw Pope, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William John Ledward, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Joseph Warren Stilwell, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Peter Paul Bernd, Infantry (temporary captain).
×First Lt. Arthur Robert Cyr, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
First Lt. Arthur Wilson Tyson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Joseph Menzie Pittman, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. George Allen Carver, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Gordon Pendleton Larson, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Thomas Joseph O'Connor, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. George Rushmore Gretser, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Robert Totten, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Douglas Moore Cairns, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Sherburne Whipple, Jr., Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Edgar Collins Doleman, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Cyril Joseph Letzelter, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William Orlando Darby, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Daniel Light Hine, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Jack Wallace Rudolph, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. John Abell Cleveland, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. George Thomas Powers 3d, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Joshua Robert Messersmith, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Roy Tripp Evans, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Edwin Martin Cahill, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William Francis Ryan, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Raymond Emerson Kendall, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. James Henry Skinner, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Anthony Frank Kleitz, Jr., Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Paul Thomas Carroll, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Richard John Meyer, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Randolph Whiting Fletter, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Charles Harlow Miles, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Humbert Joseph Versace, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Milton Fredrick Summerfelt, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Franklin Guest Smith, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. William Henry Baumer, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Gabriel Poillon Disosway, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. James Pugh Pearson, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
×First Lt. Earl Jacob Macherey, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Ralph Alspaugh, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Gerald Lorenzo Roberson, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Joseph Edward Bastion, Jr., Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Thomas Herbert Beck, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Maurice Evans Kaiser, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Benjamin Thomas Harris, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Gardner Wellington Porter, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Harry William Sweeting, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Franklin Stone Henley, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Cyrus Abda Dolph 3d, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. John Martin Breit, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Harold Lindsay Richey, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Charles Fauntleroy Harrison, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary major).
First Lt. Thomas Bowes Evans, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Walter Andrew Fleckenstein, Infantry (temporary major).
×First Lt. Franklin Gibney Rothwell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Leo Harold Heintz, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William Fant Damon, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major).
First Lt Robert Evans Arnette, Jr., Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Francis Clay Bridgewater, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Ernest Mikell Clarke, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Victor Haller King, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Daniel W. Smith, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Harold Keith Johnson, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. James Orr Boswell, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. David Parker Gibbs, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Gordon Milo Eyler, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Cordes Fredrich Tiemann, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×First Lt. Maddrey Allen Solomon, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt Lyle William Bernard, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Shelby Francis Williams, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Jean Evans Engler, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Corwin Paul Vansant, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Walter Abner Huntsberry, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Andrew Donald Stephenson, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Douglas Graver Gilbert, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Frank Laurence Elder, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Donald Cameron Cubbison, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Amaury Manuel Gandia, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Samuel Abner Mundell, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
×First Lt. Robert Harold Bayne, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Bruce von Gerichten Scott, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Felix Louis Vidal, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Gwinn Ulm Porter, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×First Lt. Frederick Robert Zierath, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Robert Hulburt Douglas, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Carl Darnell, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Joseph Brice Crawford, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Frederick William Coleman 3d, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Raymond Wiltse Sellers, Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. Matthew William Kane, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Alton Alexander Denton, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Frederick William Gibb, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Norman Kemp Markle, Jr., Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Jesse Martin Hawkins, Jr., Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Ralph Talbot 3d, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Charles Ellsworth Leydecker, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Austin Andrew Miller, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Morris King Henderson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Earl Francis Signer, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Richard Thomas King, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. John Daniel O'Reilly, Infantry (temporary major).
×First Lt. Roland Arthur Elliott, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Lloyd Ralston Fredendall, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Edson Schull, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Joel Lyen Mathews, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Royal Reynolds, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. George Hollie Bishop, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Stephen B. Mack, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Lawrence Kermit White, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Graydon Casper Essman, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Russell Franklin Akers, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Claude Leslie Bowen, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Duff Walker Sudduth, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. David Wagstaff, Jr., Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. James Rhoden Pritchard, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Robert Emmett Gallagher, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Samuel Edward Gee, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Alston Grimes, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Nelson Parkyn Jackson, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Frederick Otto Hartel, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Ivan Walter Parr, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William Roberts Calhoun, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Roy Dunscomb Gregory, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Karl Truesdell, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).
First Lt. Glenn Howbert Garrison, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Edson Duncan Raff, Infantry (temporary colonel).
×First Lt. Chester Braddock Degavre, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William Agin Bailey, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Seymour Eldred Madison, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Robin Bruce Epler, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×First Lt. John Neuman Scoville, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. William Field Due, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Peter Demosthenes Claines, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. John Frederick Schmelzer, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Sydney Dwight Grubbs, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. David Thomas Jellett, Infantry (temporary major).
×First Lt. Millard Loren Haskin, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Joseph Anthony Remus, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Ben Harrell, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Richard Churchfield Blatt, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Richard Allen Risden, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Joseph Ermine Williams, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Miller Payne Warren, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Stanley Nelson Lonning, Infantry (temporary major).
×First Lt. Robert Moore Blanchard, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William Wilson Quinn, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Charner Weaver Powell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Charles Pearce Bellican, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Edward Spalding Ehlen, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Thomas Tallant Kilday, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
×First Lt. Richard Mattern Montgomery, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Charles Hoffman Pottenger, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. John Roberts Kimmell, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William Vernard Thompson, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Robert Wilkinson Rayburn, Cavalry (temporary major)
First Lt. John Baird Shinberger, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Emmanuel Salvador Cepeda, Philippine Scouts (temporary captain).

To be first lieutenant with rank from June 11, 1943

Second Lt. Harold Clifton Brown, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Alan Edward Gee, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Finzer Presnell, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John William Burfening, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Anthony Graf, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Winston Cureton Fowler, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Gibson Cooper, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Lawrence Cutright Sheetz, Signal Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Charles Bellows Hazeltine, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Leo Erway Dunham, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Alton Parker Donnell, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. George Francis Dixon, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Ashod Michael Ahmajan, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Lawrence Joseph Fuller, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Paul Francis O'Neil, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Lawrence Gordon Forbes, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Samuel Richard Peterson, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Eugene Joseph Carr, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Austin James Russell, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. David Stuart Parker, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Harry Albright French, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Earl McFarland, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Joseph Vincent Iacobucci, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Raymond Harold Goodrich, Signal Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Edward Aiken Flanders, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Edward Thomas Podufaly, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Marvin Leroy Jacobs, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Clayton Allen Rust, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Howard Wilson Penney, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Ila Wheat, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Thomas Duvall Quaid, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Raymond Maurice Clock, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Carter Pfeil, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Louis Aloysius Thommen, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Francis Richard Sullivan, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Leonard Landon Hazeman, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Richard Henry Free, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Edward Gaylord Cook, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Walter Eugene Gunster, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Milford Franklin Stablein, Cavalry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Montgomery Cunningham Meigs, Cavalry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Nathan Louis Krisberg, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Paul Hobart Krauss, Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Robert Edward Applegate, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Thaddeus Michael Nosek, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Ivan Sattem, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Carey Law O'Bryan, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Lawrence Joseph Legere, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Oval Hale Robinson, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Paul David Phillips, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Charles Harvey Banks, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. William Harvey Roedy, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Carmin Noble, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Ralph Morris Rogers, Cavalry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. John Bunyan Corbly, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Philip Lovell Elliott, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Luther Dixon Arnold, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Cuyler Llewellyn Clark, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Gerhard Evans Brown, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Edward Minahan, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. William Regis Shanahan, Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. James Pershing Strauss, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Irving Dice, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
Second Lt. Charles Edmund Harrison, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Urey Woodson Alexander, Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. William Payne Francisco, Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Jack Stewart DeWitt, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Alan Greene Rorick, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant).
×Second Lt. Woodrow Maurice Smith, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. David Roger Guy, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Robert Ray Williams, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Montgomery Moore, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Wendell John Coats, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Edward Patrick Wynne, Signal Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Walter Ferrell Winton, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Bernard Ambrose Ferry, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Lawrence Ronald Klar, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Frederick Jacob Yeager, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Mayo, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Raymond Renola, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Clarence William Clapsaddle, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Morris Loeb Shoss, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Edward Verner, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Moore Brewer, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Kenneth McRae Lemley, Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. John Thomas Harvey Spengler, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Raymond Leroy Shoemaker, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Nils Martin Bengtson, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edward Hamilton Kyle, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Homer Barron Chandler, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Charles Richard Fairlamb, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Dean Titus Vanderhoef, Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Stephen Silvasy, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Charles Webster Bagstad, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Donald Haldeman Baumer, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Joseph Murphy, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Robert Hamilton Warren, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Manford Jay Wetzel, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Dean Marti Benson, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Henry Augustine Miley, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Zachariah Endress, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Robert Wendt, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Clarence Talmage Marsh, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Rolland Woodrow Hamelin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Clarence Edward Gushurst, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Raymond Weir Millican, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Donald Vivian Bennett, Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. William Clark Craig, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Henry Allen Cunningham, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Woodrow Wilson Vaughan, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Richard Josiah Kent, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Willard Walters, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. George Daniel Carnahan, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Samuel Merrick Patten, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. John Paul Gerald, Cavalry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Robert John Fate, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Kirkbride Taylor, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Edwin Fahey Black, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Willis Franklin Lewis, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Robinson Riley Norris, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Henry Harrison Mullin, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Burdett Eugene Haessly, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Thomas Huntington Monroe, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. William Elliott Heinemann, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Hobart Burnside Pillsbury, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Wilbur Wilcox, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Virgil Alvin Schwab, Air Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Richard Sargent Abbey, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Theodore Louis Hoffmann, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Manley Calbraith Perry, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. John Jacob Beiser, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Bradley Foote Prann, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Donald Boyle Stewart, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Charles Simonton Brice, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Thomas Henderson Scott, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Francis Joseph Crown, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Walter Wellman Lavell, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Everett DeWitt Light, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Francis Clare Gideon, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. William Everett Marling, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Charles Alexander Shaunesey, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Andrew O'Brien, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Victor Woodfin Hobson, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Joseph Richard Couch, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Second Lt. Joseph Michael Cole, Jr., Air Corps (temporay major).
×Second Lt. Jerry Spears Addington, Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. James Garland Dubuisson, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Sydney Gilbert Fisher, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Solomon Theodore Willis, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Joseph Patrick Donohue, Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Leonard Milton Orman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Otis Maxwell Uim, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Edward Henry Hendrickson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Dennis Ladislaus Barton, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Philip Courtney Loofbourrow, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Alan Griffith Baker, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Orloff Lake Bowen, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Richard Levin Belt, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Harry Thompson Simpson, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Walter Joseph Fellenz, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Paul Schroeder Deems, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. John MacNair Wright, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Robert Campbell Cassibry, Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. William Loring Clay, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Michael Paulick, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Lavern Smiley, Cavalry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Arthur Austin McCartan, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Charles Gillies Esau, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Harry Lee Wilson, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Jerry Geza Toth, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Victor Stanislaw Zienowicz, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Jerome Delaney, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Roscoe Kintner, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Wendell Burley Sell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Lamar Williams, Air Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Davison Dalziel, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. William Edward Buck, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel)
Second Lt. Frank Armand de Latour Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major)
Second Lt. George Joseph LaBreche, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Thomas Bowman Hargis, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Charles Langworthy Beaudry, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Chester Kieser Britt, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
×Second Lt. James Elroy Tyler, Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Richard Hobbs Fraser, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Edwin Carroll Haggard, Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Melvin Herbert Rosen, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Donovan Paul Yeuell, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Stewart Lawrence McKenney, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edison Albert Lynn, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Bertil Andrew Johnson, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Alan Phillip Thayer, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Raymond Starrat Sleeper, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Joseph Pidgeon, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Frederic Watson Oseth, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Robert Wilbraham, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Jordan Joseph Wilderman, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Arthur Harold Nelson, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. John Stevens Harnett, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Leonard Colligan, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. James Frederick Kreitzer, Cavalry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. John Edward Aber, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Lawson Orr, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Alan Martin Strock, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Harold Pitman, Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. William Beverly Campbell, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Gilbert Hume Woodward, Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. George Columbus Hines, Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Thorne Tuck, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Harry Frank Bunze, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Osmund Alfred Leahy, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Butler Bonham, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Howard Thomas Wright, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Anthony Lotozo, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. George Alexander Aubrey, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Paul S. Cullen, Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Thomas Frederick Gordon, Coast Artillery Corps (temeporary captain).
×Second Lt. Joe Wilbur Leedom, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Joseph Kenney, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Joseph Smith, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. John Edmund Collins, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Michael Francis Bavaro, Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. William Frederick Horton, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Olin Lee Bell, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. Herbert Mead Bowlby, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Scott Montgomery Case, Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Francis Edward Kramer, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Rowland Herman Renwanz, Cavalry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. James Wilbourne Milner, Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. James Fant Berry, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Joseph Schuyler Hardin, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Jules David Yates, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Sanford Patrick England, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. William Goodnow Stoddard, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Jack Pershing Thompson, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. James Richard Maedler, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Dill Baynard Ellis, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Everett Houston Ware, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Philip John Moore 3d, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ronald Maurice Kolda, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. James Scott Greene, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Hugh Jefferson Turner, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Salvo Rizza, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. John Robert McLean, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Deber Townsend, Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. John Herold Wohner, Infantry (temporary major)
Second Lt. Charles Henry Colwell, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Wing Fook Jung, Infantry (temporary captain)
Second Lt. Thomas Corwin Chamberlain, Cavalry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Cornelius Arthur Murphy, Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Francis Michael Rooney, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Thomas Hennessy, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ralph Edward Zchrobsky, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Walter Israel Wald, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Anthony O'Brien, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. John Christie Emery, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Joseph William Ruebel, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Reginald James Clizbe, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Delbert Earle Munson, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Holland Stephen Rasmussen, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Roderick Wetherill, Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Arthur Robert Barry, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Bryce Frederic Denno, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Augustus John Cullen, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ernest Bryant Jones, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Russell Dodderidge, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Thomas Franklin Mansfield, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Maurice Earle Parker, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Wallace Leo Clement, Cavalry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. William Benjamin Wright 3d, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Dan Porter Briggs, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ford Prioleau Fuller, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Phineas Knapp, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. James Francis Downing, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Arthur Dudley Maxwell, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Frank Colacicco, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Donald Lionel Bierman, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. John Thomas O'Keefe, Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Samuel McClure Goodwin, Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Carroll Cameron, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Wallace James Hackett, Field Artillery (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Ralph Anderson Osborn, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major)
Second Lt. David Barbour Byrne, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Lester Frank Schockner, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. John Dibble, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Raymond Henry Bates, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Harry Ami Stella, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Joseph Lee McCroskey, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Harry Bert Lane, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Second Lt. William Eugene Farthing, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Martin Bell Chandler, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Henry Patrick Heid, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Rush Spencer Wells, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. George John Bayerle, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Fred Hughes Coleman, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Albert Park Richards, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Kerr Roberts, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Hans Mueller, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James McLaurin Ridgell, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Neri Philip Cangelosi, Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Charles Edward Balthis, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Leland George Cagwin, Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Thomas Henry Muller, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Parham Kevan, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Silvie Emil Gasperini, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Harmon Porter Rimmer, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. James David Loewus, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Fielding Lewis, Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. David Rockwell Crocker, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt Leonard Edward Symroski, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Andre Ringgold Brousseau, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. William Myers Kasper, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Frank Messar, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Ross East, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Richard Thomas Cassidy, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Lester Cicil Hess, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert William Strong, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Henry Hudson Norman, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Lee Watson Fritter, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Eugene Orville McDonald, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Franklin Stapf Shawn, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Morrill Elwood Marston, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Milton Carlton Barnard 2d, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Sanford Harvey Webster, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. John William Norvell, Air Corps (temporary major)
×Second Lt. James Frederick Williams, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edward Deming Lucas, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. George Washington England, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Allan Ashley Crockett, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Francis O'Donnell, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Frederick Anthony Schmaltz, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Warren Curtis Stirling, Air Corps (temporary captain)
×Second Lt. Gilford Dalton Green, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Mercer Patton Davis, Air Corps (temporary captain)
Second Lt. Raymond John Downey, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Frank Chittenden Mandell, Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Emory Sherwood Adams, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Archie Joyce Knight, Air Corps (temporary major)
Second Lt. Arthur Gordon Malone, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Roy Willard Nelson, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Richard Ware Mabee, Infantry (temporary major)
×Second Lt. Florian John Erspamer, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
×Second Lt. Andrew D'Elia, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
×Second Lt. Charles Eugene Oglesby, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Charles Theodore Biswanger, Jr. Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Arthur Theodore Frontozak, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Ralph Adair Colby, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Bidwell Moore, Infantry (temporary captain)
×Second Lt. Thaddeus Philip Floryan, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Albert Dale Epley, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Lloyd Webster Hough, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Anthony Lewis Paul Wermuth, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Andrew Donald Budz, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Frank Talman Watrous, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Durward Henry Galbreath, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
×Second Lt. Jodie Gibson Stewart, Jr., Infantry (temporary major)
Second Lt. James Edward McGinity, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Eben French Swift, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Theodore Weisman Davis, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Neville Mackin 3d, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Richard Alexander Shagrin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Louis Gonzaga Mendez, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Byington McAfee, Air Corps (temporary major)
Second Lt. William Joseph Gildart, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Joseph Jackson Eaton, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Stanton Thomas Smith, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Mark Ransom Hudson, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Sidney Vincent Bingham, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Stephen Bernard Morrissey, Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Julius Boswell Summers, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Karl Tweeten Rauk, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Mark Clair Baugher Klunk, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Edward Franklin Hoover, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Patrick Dwyer, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

×Second Lt. Victor George Conley, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Leon Luther Clarke, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Roland Merrill Gleszer, Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Joseph Lee Mastran, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. William Francis Coleman, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Walter Drummond Swank, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Norman Holm, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Franklin Wolfram Horton, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Paul Sorg Reinecke, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Ralph Edward Miner, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Edward Aloysius Murphy, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Charles Raleigh, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Edward Dunphy Fitzpatrick, Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Burton Elmo McKenzie, Air Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Julian Aaron Cook, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. James Mason Smelley, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Irvine Harrison Shearer, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. George Thomas Larkin, Infantry (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Page Egerton Smith, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Henry Force Daniels, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William White Saunders, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Aquilla Ballard Hughes, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Frank Benjamin Wagner, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Henry Harley Arnold, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. William Powell Litton, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Marvin Hatfield Merchant, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Alvan Cullom Gillem 2d, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Chester Moffet Freudendorf, Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Russell Joseph Manzolillo, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Benjamin Franklin Delamater 3d, Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Jack Borden, Infantry (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Theodore Ross Milton, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Raymond John LaRose, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Philip Robert Cibotti, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Marshall Cloke, Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Henry Randolph Brewerton, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Harlan Benton Ferrill, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Francis Thomas Devlin, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Ralph Newlin Ross, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Frederick Leif Andrews, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Landon Albert Witt, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Kermit Robert Dyke, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Bertram Coontz, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Milton David Lederman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. John Richard Knight, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. William Lyon Porte, Infantry (temporary major).
Second Lt. Graham Charles Sanford, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Albert Henry Bethune, Coast Artillery corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Percy Charles Stoddart, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. Frederick Grinnell White, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
×Second Lt. Thomas Klauder Spencer, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Alfred Jennings Floyd, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Lyman Oscar Heidtke, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Michael Kuziv, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. William John Bennett, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

To be first lieutenant with rank from June 12, 1943

Second Lt. William Frederick Stewart, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

To be first lieutenant with rank from June 25, 1943

×Second Lt. Joseph Paul D'Arezzo, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
×Second Lt. John Frederick Freund, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

×Lt. Col. Andrew William Smith, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 1, 1943.
Lt. Col. James Wesley Duckworth, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 1, 1943.
×Lt. Col. James Brent Anderson, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 2, 1943.
Lt. Col. Walter Franz von Zelinski, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 2, 1943.
Lt. Col. Jarrett Matthew Huddleston, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 2, 1943.
×Lt. Col. John Pierce Beeson, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 2, 1943.
×Lt. Col. Albert Bowen, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 3, 1943.
×Lt. Col. James Monroe Troutt, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 4, 1943.
×Lt. Col. Howard Tilghman Wickert, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 7, 1943.
×Lt. Col. James Vincent Falisi, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 10, 1943.
×Lt. Col. Nelson Allen Myll, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 10, 1943.
Lt. Col. Harold Paine Sawyer, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1943.
Lt. Col. Frank Ernest Winter, Medical Corps, with rank from June 14, 1943.
Lt. Col. William George McKay, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 14, 1943.
Lt. Col. Frederic Hamilton Thorne, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 14, 1943.
Lt. Col. James Roy Hudnall, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 14, 1943.
Lt. Col. Elton Lacroix Titus, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 16, 1943.
×Lt. Col. Guy Blair Denit, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 18, 1943.
Lt. Col. John Andrews Rogers, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 18, 1943.
×Lt. Col. Charles Rice Lanahan, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 20, 1943.
Lt. Col. Read Benedict Harding, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 21, 1943.
×Lt. Col. Lowyd Whitcombe Ballantyne, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 26, 1943.
Lt. Col. Seymour Crandall Schwartz, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 30, 1943.

To be major

Capt. Albert Russel Dreisbach, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 17, 1943.

To be captain

×First Lt. James Edmund Vickers, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 1, 1943.
First Lt. George Arack, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 17, 1943.
First Lt. Robert Goodwin Rate, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 18, 1943.
First Lt. Ivan Charles Dimmick, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 23, 1943.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Beverley Morrison Epes, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 5, 1943.

To be major

×Capt. William Thomas Williams, Dental Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1943.

To be captain

×First Lt. Raymond Eugene Boudreaux, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 14, 1943.
First Lt. Chester Kenneth Ramage, Dental Corps (temporary major) with rank from June 14, 1943.
First Lt. Charles Rupert Thompson, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 14, 1943.
×First Lt. Pearson White Brown, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 17, 1943.
First Lt. John William Helton, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 28, 1943.
First Lt. Joe Hammon Allen, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 28, 1943.
First Lt. Kenneth Ray Elwell, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 28, 1943.
×First Lt. Alexander Colin MacDonald, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 28, 1943.
×First Lt. Harold Wilenzick, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 28, 1943.
Fist Lt. William Orville Orsinger, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 28, 1943.
×First Lt. John Robert Law, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 28, 1943.
First Lt. George Andrew Long, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 28, 1943.
×First Lt. Harold Preston Haskins, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 28, 1943.
×First Lt. Pierre Oscar Evans, Dental Corps (temporary captain, with rank from June 28, 1943.
First Lt. Thomas Roosevelt Haddock, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 28, 1943.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonel

×Lt. Col. Kenneth Earl Buffin, Veterinary Corps, with rank from June 11, 1943.

×Lt. Col. William Roy Wolfe, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 23, 1943.

To be captain

First Lt. William Edward Bills, Veterinary Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 1, 1943.

First Lt. Harry John Robertson, Veterinary Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 1, 1943.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonel

×Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Henry Nathan Blanchard, United States Army, with rank from June 13, 1943.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Henry C. Bridgers, Jr., October 1, 1939.
Donald C. Higgins, September 1, 1940.
Frank R. More, September 1, 1940.
John A. Porter, October 1, 1940.
John M. Kipp, November 1, 1940.
Jack A. Eady, November 1, 1940.
James V. Barry, December 1, 1940.
Theodore H. Davie, December 1, 1940.
Lloyd W. Van Antwerp, December 1, 1940.
Frederick T. Moore, Jr., August 1, 1941.
Thomas D. Harris, August 1, 1941.
Ward D. Hall, August 1, 1941.
John H. Sandor, September 1, 1941.
Alexander C. Holt, Jr., October 1, 1941.
Robert K. Etnire, October 1, 1941.
Murlin W. Alley, November 1, 1941.
James D. Nelson, November 1, 1941.
John F. Bundy, November 1, 1941.
Gordon R. Egbert, November 1, 1941.
Gordon P. Chase, November 1, 1941.
Elwyn L. Christman, December 1, 1941.
Onia B. Stanley, Jr., December 1, 1941.
William E. Hardy, December 20, 1941.
Charles E. Healy, January 1, 1942.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Grayston H. Weber, August 1, 1939.
Charles A. Shipman, September 1, 1939.
Herbert E. Hanset, October 15, 1939.
Robert J. Sutherlin, October 20, 1939.
Willard D. King, October 20, 1939.
William N. Thies, November 1, 1939.
Theodore W. Marshall, November 20, 1939.
Henry M. McDowell, November 20, 1939.
William B. Paulin, March 25, 1940.
John S. Kilner, March 25, 1940.
Richard D. Gruber, March 25, 1940.
Robert E. Helme, April 15, 1940.
Robert Wagner, April 15, 1940.
Wilson F. Lord, April 15, 1940.
Marion F. Barfield, April 15, 1940.
William J. Bowers, June 7, 1940.
Carl D. Bauer, June 7, 1940.
Clem B. Connally, June 7, 1940.
Donald H. Shiley, July 15, 1940.
Norman D. Johnson, July 15, 1940.
Leif O. Johnson, July 15, 1940.
John S. Hill, August 1, 1940.
Albert L. Dodson, August 1, 1940.
Ralph E. Cheney, August 20, 1940.
Frederick C. Wiseman, November 1, 1940.
Gaylord D. Propst, November 25, 1940.
Francis V. Kenney, January 20, 1941.
Guy M. Thompson, Jr., February 14, 1941.
Robert E. Sorensen, March 16, 1941.
Sylvan Greene, April 3, 1941.
Eric W. Pollard, April 3, 1941.
John W. Sparkman, Jr., April 3, 1941.
Herman P. Kooy, May 24, 1941.
Robert E. Pearce, May 31, 1941.
Roger M. Wolfe, May 31, 1941.
Hubert K. Reese, May 31, 1941.
William J. Lahodney, Jr., May 31, 1941.
Thomas J. Wood, May 31, 1941.
Thomas Seabrook, June 3, 1941.
Charles J. Alley, June 3, 1941.
Arthur J. Cassidy, June 3, 1941.
William E. Cardinal, June 3, 1941.
John M. Clarke, June 3, 1941.
Charles F. Willis, June 3, 1941.
Howard L. Grimmell, Jr., June 3, 1941.
Paul F. Stevens, Jr., June 6, 1941.
Narvin O. Wittman, June 6, 1941.
Forrester C. Auman, June 6, 1941.
Ried W. Stone, June 21, 1941.
Joseph A. Tvedt, June 21, 1941.
Stanley V. Brown, June 21, 1941.
Norman D. Hodson, June 21, 1941.
Kenneth M. Erskine, June 21, 1941.
Robert H. Higley, June 21, 1941.
Charles P. Muckenthaler, Jr., June 21, 1941.
John P. Adams, June 21, 1941.
Edward K. Halsey, June 21, 1941.
Troy T. Guillory, June 21, 1941.
Frank A. Yourek, June 21, 1941.
Albert H. Wood, June 21, 1941.
Frank Osegueda, July 16, 1941.
Everett L. Hawkins, July 16, 1941.
Forrest H. Norvell, Jr., July 16, 1941.
George S. Clute, July 16, 1941.
Ben T. Brown, July 16, 1941.
Thomas H. Stetson, July 16, 1941.
Edmund J. Kelly, July 16, 1941.
Raymond F. Compton, July 16, 1941.
Milford A. Merrill, July 16, 1941.
Harry A. Frederickson, July 16, 1941.
Woodie L. McVay, Jr., July 16, 1941.
John L. Genta, July 16, 1941.
Thomas J. Gallagher, Jr., July 16, 1941.
Charles O. Peters, July 16, 1941.
Joseph A. Riley, July 16, 1941.
Roy P. Gee, July 16, 1941.
Gerald R. Stablein, August 3, 1941.
Champ Thompson, August 4, 1941.
Walter G. Hartley, Jr., August 4, 1941.
James J. Davidson, August 4, 1941.
John H. Muller, Jr., August 4, 1941.
Jacques E. Vroom, August 4, 1941.
Julius M. Larsen, August 18, 1941.
William E. Thomas, August 18, 1941.
Robert E. Seamans, August 18, 1941.
William R. Pittman, August 18, 1941.
Phillip W. Cobb, August 18, 1941.
Frank H. Savio, August 18, 1941.
Howard J. Silberstein, August 30, 1941.
Orlan A. Soli, August 30, 1941.
Henry J. Nickerson, August 30, 1941.
Joe W. King, August 30, 1941.
William A. Williams, August 30, 1941.
Joseph B. Deodati, August 30, 1941.
Daniel C. Sheedy, August 30, 1941.
Rahe E. Hargrave, August 30, 1941.
Angy M. James, September 1, 1941.
Lawrence G. Traynor, September 6, 1941.
William D. Carter, September 6, 1941.
Raymond S. Osterhoudt, September 6, 1941.
Clyde C. Andrews, September 6, 1941.
Levern C. T. Niehaus, September 6, 1941.
John B. Bain, September 6, 1941.
Harry B. Gibbs, September 6, 1941.
Jack D. Cruze, September 6, 1941.
Joseph H. Heatwole, September 6, 1941.
Bronislaw P. Antonik, September 6, 1941.
Vance W. Adler, September 6, 1941.
Robert S. Merritt, September 6, 1941.
William J. Pendola, September 6, 1941.
Fred W. Frank, Jr., September 9, 1941.
Edward G. Bull, September 10, 1941.
Jack H. Sands, September 10, 1941.
Hugh S. Wagner, September 10, 1941.
Don D. Adams, September 10, 1941.
Clarence A. Twiddy, September 10, 1941.
Robert A. M. Dibb, September 10, 1941.
Gustave W. Binnebose, September 10, 1941.
John H. Jorgenson, September 10, 1941.
Byron W. Strong, September 10, 1941.
Dee Jones, September 10, 1941.
William S. Jamieson, September 10, 1941.
Thomas D. Martin, September 10, 1941.
Robert L. Engeman, September 10, 1941.
John C. Allman, September 10, 1941.
Henry A. Fairbanks, September 10, 1941.
Joseph E. Raible, September 10, 1941.
Robert M. Disque, September 10, 1941.
Lawrence R. Naegely, October 8, 1941.
Edward V. D. Davidson, October 8, 1941.
Robert C. Shaw, October 8, 1941.
Carl D. Krantz, October 8, 1941.
Robert P. Friesz, October 8, 1941.
Arthur C. Cason, October 8, 1941.
Albert D. Jillson, October 8, 1941.
Henry P. Morelli, October 8, 1941.
Hollier G. Tomlin, October 8, 1941.
Robert H. Jennings, October 10, 1941.
Clarence B. Gregg, October 10, 1941.
Bennie W. Jones, Jr., October 10, 1941.
Edmund W. Creekmore, October 10, 1941.
Samuel W. Forrer, October 10, 1941.
William T. Sorensen, October 10, 1941.
William J. Foley, October 10, 1941.
Chester F. Rief, October 14, 1941.
Wayne R. Waters, October 14, 1941.
Walter L. Hahn, Jr., October 14, 1941.
Richard M. McLemore, October 16, 1941.
Howard C. Flatau, October 16, 1941.
George D. Worthington, October 16, 1941.
James D. Billo, October 16, 1941.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

James C. Luce, February 17, 1941.
Charles G. Robinson, Jr., February 17, 1941.
Harvey E. Reitz, May 26, 1941.
Harry R. Walker, March 12, 1942.
Gerald E. Cummings, March 12, 1942.
Robert N. Trapp, May 6, 1942.
Matthew S. Mickiewicz, May 19, 1943.
Stanley L. Drennan, May 19, 1943.
Harry B. Trachtenberg, May 19, 1943.
Edward E. Cale, Jr., May 19, 1943.
Robert W. Simpson, May 19, 1943.
Jack E. Schiffmacher, May 19, 1943.
Joseph E. Acker, Jr., May 19, 1943.
Warner D. Bundens, Jr., May 19, 1943.
Jacob J. Robbins, May 19, 1943.
George S. Sayre, May 19, 1943.
Fred H. Hanold, May 19, 1943.
William J. Wagner, May 19, 1943.
Domenic J. Pontarelli, May 19, 1943.
Joseph Vogel, May 19, 1943.
Charles R. Goodwin, May 19, 1943.
Myron A. Shilling, May 19, 1943.
Stanley J. Okulicz, May 19, 1943.
Robert C. Miller, May 19, 1943.
John C. Taylor, May 19, 1943.
James E. Conley, May 19, 1943.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Herschel E. Woltzen, November 19, 1941.
Neil W. McDaniel, November 19, 1941.
Robert L. Ellis, November 19, 1941.
Gaylord W. Glarner, November 19, 1941.
Douglas B. Smith, November 19, 1941.
Robert S. Jennings, November 19, 1941.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenants (junior grade) to rank from the date stated opposite their names, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

John E. Carey, February 17, 1941.
George O. de Tarnowsky, May 26, 1941.
James A. Brantley, October 2, 1941.

Comdr. Edward H. Jones to be a captain in the Navy, to rank from June 30, 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Richard C. Latham, July 1, 1941.
Marion J. Reed, June 30, 1942.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942:

Edgar H. Forrest	Joseph F. Harmon
Earl W. Miller	Chester F. Pinkerton
John R. Dinsmore	Charles W. Jenkins

The following officers of the Naval Reserve to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Walter C. Avery, April 1, 1941.
Robert O'Toole, Jr., May 18, 1941.

Lt. James T. Riordan, CEC–V(S), U. S. Naval Reserve to be an assistant civil engineer in

the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 16th day of December 1940.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate May 27 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

APPOINTMENTS

John Bradley Haight to be area director in the Indianapolis area office.

Agnes S. Cronin to be area director in the western Long Island area office.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 27 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Thomas Matkins Johnston, to be second lieutenant, Corps of Engineers, with rank from June 1, 1943.

William David Lutz, to be second lieutenant, Field Artillery, with rank from June 1, 1943.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS

To be second lieutenants

Arthur F. Torgler, Jr.	John I. Warner, Jr.
Edwin B. Glass	Arthur L. Adams
Everett P Pope	Webster R. Hood
Geary R. Bundschu	William J. McLeod
Fenwicke W. Holmes	John Mesko
Donald C. Baker	James R. Johnson
Richard A. Munger	Theodore H. Robbins
Conrad M. Fowler	Rogers Blood
Charles D. McPherson	Walter G. Bender
Maurice C. Goodpasture	Dwain L. Lengel
	James L. Sizemore
Adrian F. Pilliod, Jr.	Rolfe Jenkins
Raymond V. Fridrich	Robert M. Butler
Edward E. Hammerbeck	Herbert R. Merrick, Jr.
Roland H. Makowski	Charles P. Lewis, Jr.
George W. Holmes 3d	Robert U. Skibinski
Peter J. Mulroney	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we praise Thee that in every disappointment Thou still dost love us and in every darkness Thou dost enlighten us. O wondrous story of deathless love: It comforts in the gloom of night, it lifts in the hour of burden, and stills the sighing heart. We would chant the psalm of thanksgiving and pray that our faith may not become blind, nor our devotion frozen, nor the anchor of our hope locked in the chilly embrace of doubt and skepticism.

We pray that down through the aisles of the past to the vaulted roof of the future, the angels' song may be heard in all the temples of our Republic. O let the incense of their holy altars envelop our country, blessing all hearthstones and circling forth over land and sea. Inspire us to dedicate our talents and gifts and withhold not. Lest we be judged unfaithful to our sacred vows, may we deny ourselves, take up our cross, and follow Thee. He who knocks at the door of every heart and stretches forth His arms in every hour of need, will teach us the fortitude of unrequited labor and the joy of humble tasks done in love. Almighty God, with great soul might lead us to have faith that we are a mighty part of a world plan that shall carry with it the rapture of moral victory and the aspirations of a free people. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE PRESIDENT OF LIBERIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House that His Excellency, Edwin Barclay, the President of the Republic of Liberia, will be received by the House today at 12:30 o'clock, and will address the House at that time. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time this afternoon, such recess to be subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 24, 1943.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have been asked to use your good offices to extend to the Members of the House of Representatives an invitation to attend a memorial service for those employees of the Federal Government who have lost their lives in the service of their country during the present war. The memorial service as planned has the enthusiastic approval of the President. It will be held at 4 o'clock on the afternoon of Sunday, May 30, in the Sylvan Theater on the grounds of the Washington Monument. In the event of rain the service will be held in the Government Auditorium.

A limited number of chairs will be available for Members of Congress, Supreme Court Justices, and head of departments and agencies. Admission cards for these may be obtained from Mr. Robert Bailey, Civil Service Commission contact representative, in room 248, House Office Building.

Very truly yours,

WM. H. MCREYNOLDS,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

EDSEL B. FORD

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to place forever in the permanent RECORD of this body the distressing news of the death of a great American, Mr. Edsel B. Ford, president of the Ford Motor Co. He was the only son of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Ford, the worthy son of a famed and distinguished father. He died at his estate at Gaughler Point, on beautiful Lake St. Clair in the village of Grosse Pointe Shores, Mich. His death came as a shock to dynamic Detroit, and to friends of the motor industry throughout the world. The great industry over which he presided strained every facility within its domination to serve the war effort. The slogan was "Full production for victory."

The Ford Motor Co.'s production lines deliver the following fleets of weapons: M–4 tanks, Pratt & Whitney aircraft engines, jeeps, M–10 tank destroyers, amphibian jeeps, universal carriers, Consolidated Liberator bombers, truck and jeep engines, transport gliders, Army trucks, rate-of-climb indicators, tank engines, gun mounts, magnesium castings, aircraft generators, armor plate, turbosuperchargers.

His father, Mr. Henry Ford, now in his eightieth year, with his faithful wife ever at his side, has done many notable things in a long life. And tribute should be paid today to this distinguished couple for the ability and foresight they displayed in the rearing of an only child, to become the man that the world learned to know as Edsel B. Ford. Devoted, retiring, able, quiet, respected; a family man, with three sons in the armed service. He always stood aside that his father might have his day. His own responsibilities came at an early age, and they were indeed great. The war brought him extra burdens. His load was heavy. He laid it down at the early age of 49. The sympathy of an appreciative Nation goes to his distinguished family.

WORK RELIEF IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 128) to authorize an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object and withhold the reservation until the gentleman can make his statement.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the resolution?

Mr. BELL. House Joint Resolution 128, I might say, grows out of the fact that not long ago the House passed a resolution authorizing an investigation of the economic, social, and political conditions in the island of Puerto Rico. Shortly after that the Senate passed a resolution which came over to the House, providing for a relief bill in Puerto Rico in the amount of $25,000,000 this year and $25,000,000 next year. That bill was referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and after holding several hearings and giving the bill full consideration, that committee felt that it did not want to approve a 2-year relief program until the House-approved subcommittee could go to Puerto Rico and make a complete investigation of conditions there. Such an investigation would include a study of the necessity to pass such a relief bill and would enable us to be better advised as to the actual needs there.

We were told that at the present time there were almost a quarter million of people on relief and out of employment. While in continental United States unemployment has been taken up by the

war effort, the effect in Puerto Rico has been just the reverse.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has any effort been made to give the people of Puerto Rico relief by way of war work?

Mr. BELL. There have been some military installations put in down there. Those, of course, have given some employment, but the purpose of House Joint Resolution 128 is merely to act as a stop-gap. In substance the resolution provides that an appropriation of not to exceed $8,000,000 is authorized to be made by the Appropriations Committee and to authorize the extension of the present relief program there for not to exceed 5 months.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As I understand, this would be a temporary appropriation until the committee has had opportunity to make an investigation to see why Mr. Tugwell has not planned some work for the people of Puerto Rico.

Mr. BELL. That is it exactly. The committee did not want to enter into the proposed 2-year program which was passed by the Senate until it could find out more about what is going on in Puerto Rico. While no members of the committee want to see people starve to death during the interim, and on the contrary want them to be taken care of, we felt that the mere call of humanity demands that we do something at this time to take care of the temporary situation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How was the vote in your committee?

Mr. BELL. There were no votes cast against the resolution, although the entire membership of the committee was not present at the time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. As the gentleman knows, I supported the resolution and I think the investigation in Puerto Rico should be made. I should like to suggest that at the moment a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is inquiring into certain orders that might result in the elimination of brand names and trademarks. I have observed in the press of the Nation and have been reliably informed that under Mr. Tugwell's guidance and leadership a system has been put into effect in Puerto Rico which has resulted in the elimination of brand names and trade-marks on goods and on commodities imported into that territory from this country.

It strikes me that a real service could be performed by the committee to which the gentleman refers, in its investigation if it would, in connection with its inquiries into the general economic situation in Puerto Rico, inquire into that regulation and into the orders and operations which have resulted in the elimination of brand names and trademarks in this island. It is claimed on the part of the administrator, or of the government there, that a saving has been effected. The chamber of commerce says that no saving has been effected, but on the contrary a great deal of waste and loss will result.

Mr. BELL. I think that the resolution authorizing the investigation into the economic, political, and social conditions in the island is amply broad enough to cover an investigation into just what the gentleman from Indiana has called attention to, and I will be glad to pass that on to the committee making the investigation.

Mr. HALLECK. There are many who believe that Puerto Rico has been made something of a guinea pig in that sort of an experiment. How soon does the gentleman expect to get under way with the investigation and make some report?

Mr. BELL. The subcommittee of the Committee on Insular Affairs expects to leave Washington tomorrow or the next day.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Tugwell advocated the philosophy for this Government here in the United States that all private industry would have to disappear. Has he been carrying that out to the detriment of the people there?

Mr. BELL. That is one of the things the committee wants to find out when it goes down there.

Mr. REED of New York. I hope you will.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOSSETT. I believe the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs neglected to point out that under the present law this whole program expires on June 30. Unless we take some action, the whole works program of Puerto Rico will be stopped automatically on June 30.

Mr. BELL. That is correct. I may add that at the present time certain projects which are said to be of use to the military installations are under process of being completed, but they cannot be completed by June 30. At that time, as the gentleman has said, all authority to proceed and money to proceed with will expire, so that unless this House Joint Resolution 128 is adopted, all of that work will immediately stop on June 30 and a great number of people unquestionably will suffer as a result of it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say, in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], that while I have no brief for Rex Tugwell and do not believe in public ownership of private land, unless this Government takes some steps to cut up the lands in Puerto Rico in some way and enable those people to grow something out of that ground on which they can live—something to eat, if you please—we shall have to feed them for all time to come. Starvation is not only going on there now, I may say to the gentleman from New York, but it was going on there under the Harding and Coolidge administrations and has grown gradually worse. Unless some provision is made to permit the people of Puerto Rico to grow something out of that ground to live on, we are going to have to feed them probably for all time to come.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Before the subcommittee on Interior Department appropriations, which appropriates money for Puerto Rico, it developed that if they were permitted to refine raw sugar in Puerto Rico it would put thousands of people to work, and they could ship that sugar here in less bulk than they are shipping the raw sugar now. The people there and the people in the United States would be benefited if they could build those refineries and refine the raw sugar there and ship it here. I think it would be well for the gentleman's committee to make an investigation of that point.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. In supporting the resolution in the committee I had in mind the observation made by the gentleman from Indiana. He is entirely correct. While Mr. Tugwell may be responsible for a lot of it, I am also aware of the fact that if the large sugar industries there had not been interfered with many of those people would have work. The observations the gentleman made a moment ago are entirely correct. The individual is helpless, but if he has a job with the sugar industry he is better off than if he is on relief.

I favor this resolution because it is a stop-gap. I personally am familiar with the conditions there, having been down there. Those people are in very great need, which has been made more acute by the Tugwell administration and by the war.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Will the gentleman tell us what program is in force now to bring Puerto Ricans into this country to help the war effort here?

Mr. BELL. I am not familiar with what has been done in that respect. The purpose of House Joint Resolution 128 is merely to bring about a stop-gap to take care of a desperate situation until the committee can go down there and inquire into just such questions as the gentleman raises.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I hope the gentleman will keep in mind that at the present time we are releasing 1,000 Japanese a week from the relocation centers. If we can afford to release 1,000 Japanese a week we can certainly afford

to bring Puerto Ricans up here to do the kind of work we are now calling on the Japs to do in this country.

Mr. BELL. I assure the gentleman the committee would be happy to inquire into that point.

Mr. REED of New York. If the gentleman will yield further, there is one reason why this matter should be investigated, and that is that you can find quite a lot of trained labor there. Vocational education has been carried on in Puerto Rico for quite a number of years. There ought to be a large mass of well-trained young people, who are now mature, to take over some of the work that is needed to be done for the war effort.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. May I point out that we do appropriate money and we are bringing a great many laborers in from the Bahamas to give employment to the needy people of the Bahamas. I know the gentleman's committee will inquire whether it would not be better to bring them in from Puerto Rico and take care of our own, rather than bring in people from some other country.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. May I ask the gentleman if it is not true that in our committee it was very clearly established by the testimony that private industry was discouraged in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands rather than encouraged?

Mr. BELL. I may say to the gentleman that there was considerable testimony indicating that.

Mr. CHURCH. The testimony was to the effect that the long-run program for the betterment of those people should be to encourage industry and encourage the development of more jobs rather than to discourage it.

Mr. BELL. There was some testimony along that line, too.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman will recall that I brought out in the testimony the philosophy of Dr. Tugwell himself that discouraged a great deal of business from going there; further, that little has been done toward bringing those people into the United States, where employment can be had.

The chairman also knows that I voted against the resolution.

Mr. BELL. I was not aware of the fact that the gentleman voted against the resolution, although I knew that he was against it.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman is aware of the fact that I object to this measure. I know that it is merely a stopgap. I cannot approve it, because I cannot bring myself to believe that we should continue outside of the United States in the Virgin Island and Puerto Rico that W. P. A. activity which we stopped in the United States over a year ago by failure to appropriate for the W. P. A., and the fact that this W. P. A. work has been turned over to the Federal Works Administration does not help the program much.

Mr. BELL. The gentleman will recall that the testimony is undisputed that at the present time there are from a quarter of a million to a half a million people unemployed in Puerto Rico, and unless this stopgap legislation is passed and the W. P. A., the Federal Works Agency, continued temporarily, there will be great suffering among the people.

Mr. CHURCH. And the gentleman is aware of the fact that I fear that continuing this activity may do more harm than good in the long run and may be tossing away another $8,000,000 the next 5 months without solving the problem in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Of course, this is only an authorization and not yet an actual appropriation. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of the right to object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri for the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is authorized to provide work for employable needy persons on useful public projects in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands for the period July 1, 1943, to November 30, 1943, in accordance with the appropriate provisions and for the purposes prescribed in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1943, which provisions are hereby extended and made applicable to the appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $8,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, including administrative expenses in connection therewith.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIS EXCELLENCY EDWIN BARCLAY, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as a committee to wait upon and escort the President of Liberia the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Under previous order of the House, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

RECESS

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m., the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Speaker.

During the recess the following occurred:

The President of Liberia and his party entered the Chamber at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m., and the President of Liberia was escorted to the Speaker's rostrum by the committee of Representatives appointed for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. Members of the House of Representatives, there are few republics outside of the Western Hemisphere. Today we have as our guest the President of a republic in Africa. It is my pleasure to present to you Edwin Barclay, President of the Republic of Liberia. [Applause.]

The PRESIDENT OF LIBERIA. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives, I consider it a great honor to appear before your honorable body, and I am fully appreciative of the courtesy done me and my country by your permitting me to be present at your session and to convey to you greetings from the only democracy in west Africa to the great democracy of this hemisphere. It is fitting that I should convey this greeting, because it is to American democracy that the people of Liberia owe the foundation of their state and the character of their political institutions.

With the world now fighting to maintain for all peoples the democratic ideals upon which the American Republic was founded, Liberia, as a matter of choice, is dedicated to cooperate with and to render all assistance within her power to those states that are now engaged in a terrific struggle to banish terrorism and authoritarianism from the world.

Up to the present we have made considerable contribution to attainment of this objective. Although we have neither large armies, air forces, nor navies to contribute, we have what is important in the prosecution of the war—natural resources and a strategic position which we have freely placed at the disposal of the United Nations as our contribution to the cause of liberty and human dignity. I thank you.

At 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m., the President of Liberia and his party departed.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the Speaker called the House to order at 12 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings had during the recess of the House will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the New York Times in regard to the production of sulfur on the island of Sicily.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my

remarks in the RECORD and include certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter written to the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the proposal to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, and include therein a short editorial from the New York Times on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

WILLKIE THE LEADER WHO DID NOT LEAD

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SHAFER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein two letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two press releases from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MORTALITY AMONG MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we held memorial services for our deceased Members. It must have been very gratifying to the House to realize that during the past year, while it is to be regretted that we lost any Members, our number was reduced by only 3—the smallest number by far during the years since we started our memorial exercises. I remember that our first group included 28. Since that time the roll call of deceased Members has steadily decreased, in spite of the fact that we have been under very great strain during the past several years, until yesterday there were but three.

Mr. Speaker, may I at this time pay tribute to Dr. George Calver, who I believe, to a very great extent, is responsible for this reduction in the mortality of our Members. I think Dr. Calver has done a great deal for all of us because of his personal interest in our welfare and his unquestioned ability. He has taught us how to maintain our health and he has cooperated with us in trying to do so. I am sure I voice the sentiments of our Members when I say that Dr. Calver has proven himself indispensable.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a sermon by the Most Reverend William T. McCarty, military delegate of the Army and Navy diocese, delivered at the fifth annual solemn memorial Mass at Arlington National Cemetery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on the subject of merchant marine awards of distinguished service medals and to include therein the citations from March 15 to May 15.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the 6 months' anniversary of the Coast Guard SPARS and include therein certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "All-American Centennial," by Howard R. Driggs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the service and activities of Disabled American Veterans and to include therewith certain statements of commendations made by various persons of this organization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from a soldier in the Pacific area.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper article about a mother and father in my district with six children in the service of their country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: First, that my colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article; and, second, that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio broadcast.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by the United Farmers of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper release of mine on the Kerr amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FARM MACHINERY

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I read from the Sol H. Lewis column of the Seattle Times of April 18 the following article:

OUR PEEVISH PLOWMEN

I know the commandment about not coveting thy neighbor's possessions, but I really don't blame our Lynden farmers for casting an envious eye across the international border 3 miles northward, where they see their Canadian neighbors using brightly painted new agricultural machinery and implements.

None of these farm essentials can be obtained from their home Lynden dealers. Priorities and freezing and red tape have our United States implement factories all bound up, although top officials at Washington continue to appeal for bigger crops.

I'll let you in on the secret, folks, why we are forgetting the commandment and are waxing so covetous up in this sector. All the bounteous stocks of tractors, plows, harrows, drills, and tedders which can be bought up in British Columbia have marked on them, "Made in the U. S. A."

What are we going to do about this? Are we going to stand by supinely and allow this absurd, intolerable situation to continue without change? Let us do something about this maddening condition. What kind of enthusiasm for the war program can we engender in farmers when such developments as these occur. It is despairing, provoking, and echoes to high heaven for quick and decisive action.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, there is no effort to disband or do away with the Dies committee. The Dies committee has been continued for the present year. The members of the Dies committee have not had a meeting since the Comintern is supposed to have been abandoned, but I am sure the majority of the members of the Dies committee feel they have a real job of house cleaning to do here in America as a result of the work of the Comintern in the last twenty-some-odd years. We have that job of house cleaning to do yet if it can be done.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a lucid and a very powerful article written by the distinguished columnist, William Philip Sims, under the caption "Russia versus Poland." I invite the attention of the membership of the House to this article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an existing order of the O. P. A. which discriminates against the local merchants who support every public enterprise, contribute to the chamber of commerce and who develop their towns, counties, States, and country. This order is very much in favor of the chain stores so far as the selling of merchandise is concerned. It permits the chain stores to undersell the independent merchant, which undermines the independent merchant business of America. We all know and appreciate that our local independent merchants give as much of their time, money, and energy to the development of home enterprise as any other class of people on earth.

These independent merchants invest their earnings in a home, in a business house, and the general improvement of their home town in the building of churches, public parks, and always deposit their money in their home town. Now what is the picture with respect to the chain-store operators—most generally rent their business house and deposit their money in out-of-town banks, and upon the first slackness of business the chain store moves to towns where business is better and the independent merchant which this O. P. A. order affects will have to assume the load of carrying on local society and government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a few excerpts and quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON TAX BILL

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on the tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a newspaper article and in the other to include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next. I may say that on Tuesday the conference report on the tax bill will be brought up for consideration and on Wednesday there will be consideration of a labor bill. Beyond that I have no information to convey to the House at this moment as to the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 38, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a study and investigation of the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products from rural areas through the various marketing agencies to the ultimate consumer, as it affects farmers, the various types of middlemen, wholesalers, retailers, and consumers, with a view to ascertaining, among other things:

(a) The effectiveness of the present system of marketing, and the adequacy of present marketing facilities, with particular regard to the protection of farmers and consumers.

(b) The effect of transactions on the futures grain and cotton exchanges upon such system and upon farmers and consumers.

(c) The existence of any practices in connection with the grading, storing, processing, transporting, distributing, or marketing of farm products, which adversely affect farmers and consumers.

(d) The present and prospective development of the types and methods of transportation for farm products, and the existence, if any, of discrimination in railway freight or in motor carrier rates on farm products in the various areas.

(e) The feasibility of establishing an up-to-date marketing and distributing system from the rural areas through local, State, and National marketing agencies under a farm cooperative program that would provide facilities for proper grading and distribution, necessary storage, and for other essential activities of an orderly marketing program.

The committee shall make a report to the House as soon as practicable after its study and investigation has been concluded, and in its report the committee shall make such recommendations as it may deem proper, including recommendations with respect to any legislative action necessary to effectuate its recommendations.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the

committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman. Oaths or affirmations may be administered by the chairman or any member of the committee designated by him.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, this bill has the hearty approval of every member of the Agriculture Committee and a unanimous report by the Rules Committee.

May I state that many State legislatures including my own State legislature have passed resolutions endorsing the passage of this bill. I have received many letters from labor organizations and consumer organizations giving their hearty approval to the passage of the bill.

I want to state to you frankly out of my long experience as a general merchant and banker dealing with farmers, as well as in connection with my own personal operation of my farm, that the major problem during all these years which has been increasing as the years go by confronting farmers as well as consumers is the manner in which farm products are marketed and distributed.

Farmers are engaged in the most technical and hazardous business of any group in this country.

They are supposed to know all about the various types of soils, fertilizers, and the proper grading of their various crops, of which, for instance, cotton, has more than 30 different grades and lengths of staple. He plants his crops but in that he has to contend with all types of weather, floods, droughts, and insect infestation, he is unable to even guess the amount of crops that he will be able to harvest.

Farmers operate as individuals, therefore they are unable to fix or demand, a fair price for that which they produce. In other words, he is forced to accept that which he is offered in his local market. If he ships to some distant market he has to accept in the way of a price that which is left after everyone else handling these products gets theirs. Very often these products reach a glutted market and in a great many instances farmers not only do not receive any returns, but are called upon to pay the freight. Millions of consumers not connected with any type of consumer organization are called upon in making their purchases to pay extremely high fixed prices, including many additions commonly called spreads between the farmers and the consumer.

We have been in recent years, appropriating money to pay farmers benefit payments commonly called a subsidy with the hope that farmers may be able to receive the so-called parity price for their products.

Mr. Prentiss Brown at the head of the O. P. A. is now proposing to roll back the consumer price and pay a subsidy to certain handlers of farm products with the hope of cutting down on the high and unreasonable prices to consumers. I want to state emphatically that you had just as well put this money in a rat hole as far as being able to settle the farmer and the consumer problem in this manner.

How long would General Motors, the International Harvester Co., or any other well organized industry or business last if they had to market their products in line with the manner in which farm products are marketed and distributed—they would not last 6 months.

These groups under rules and regulations formulated by their various associations of which they are members not only definitely control their production in line with the purchasing power of the country but they control the marketing and distribution of their products as well as fix the price—you can take it or leave it.

Out of all my past experience and even at this time as a Member of Congress I am just as helpless in marketing my farm products as any other farmer. Let me give you one experience: I shipped to this city, Washington, a beautiful lot of lima beans. Practically everyone interested in buying beans stated that there were plenty of lima beans on the market. I sold a portion of these beans to a certain chain store. I divided the balance between two commission merchants. I received from the chain store $1.10 per basket of 30 pounds, and 65 cents and 45 cents from the two commission merchants. At the same time these beans were being sold to the consumers here in the city at 10 cents per pound, amounting to $3 per basket.

I have been interested in doing something about this serious problem confronting farmers as well as consumers ever since I have been a Member of Congress, but because of the attitude of those who are responsible for the various spreads between the farmer and the consumer and because of the attitude of millions of consumers backed by the large metropolitan press contending that the farmers of the country were responsible for the high consumer prices we have not been able to do anything about it.

During the past few months, on account of the operation of the O. P. A. in trying to fix price ceilings for farmers and every other group handling farm products operating between farmers and consumers, not only have the eyes of the consumers of this country been opened but you Members of Congress have been made to realize the serious problem confronting helpless farmers as well as innocent consumers because of the manner in which farm products are being marketed and distributed. I fully realize that in the passage of this bill you are giving to me and the members of my committee a tremendous job. I want to assure you, however, because of my deep interest in millions of innocent farmers, many of whom, although responsible for feeding 130,000,000 of people in this country are living in poverty with their children denied the privilege of proper education and proper opportunities, that I expect with the assistance of the distinguished members of my committee to give to you as well as the people of this country, including the millions of innocent farmers and consumers, the very best service that we are capable of rendering.

Let us get the facts and let the chips fall where they may. In making this investigation we want it definitely understood that we do not want to harm any necessary legitimate business connected with the marketing and distributing of farm products, and there is no thought in the mind of any member of my committee in making our final report of advocating the putting of the Government into the marketing and distributing of farm products. There is too much of that going on at this time.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The price of food in the big cities is getting worse every day to the people, and especially the poorer people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina 1 additional minute.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Assuming that this resolution is adopted, can the gentleman tell us what consideration will be given to that matter, from the standpoint of going into the cost to the public and how that will be corrected?

Mr. FULMER. I will be glad to answer the gentleman from New York.

At the present time the farmers in my State are getting two and a half cents a pound for potatoes. The people in your city, New York, are paying twelve and a half to fifteen cents a pound. Who is getting the difference between the two and one-half and the 15 cents? It goes to numerous middlemen, many of whom are perfectly useless, who do not produce a living thing, simply operate more or less as real parasites, absolutely sapping the very life blood out of the farmer or the consumer, or both of them. While this has been a major problem all these years, this is the first time the people have ever awakened to the fact that this is true and are demanding that something should be done about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the N. Y. A. has found a place in the educational life of the Nation—a place heretofore neglected, and I shall advocate the continuance of N. Y. A. until it becomes an integral part of our public-school system. The continuation of this activity cannot be immediately transferred without great cost

and the readjustment of our public-school system. Its value is so great in my opinion that we would make a great mistake not to continue this inestimable opportunity now given the youth of the country and provide funds for this purpose.

I have an intimate knowledge of what the N. Y. A. has done and is doing in my State, North Carolina, and I think I have a correct picture of what it has done in other States of the Union. In peacetime it gave boys and girls in my State an opportunity to develop latent talents and become not only useful, but happy citizens.

The National Youth Administration has geared its program of activity into a vital and fundamental part of the Nation's war effort. Through simultaneous training of workers for war industries, and production of critical materials for the United States Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission, and other war agencies, the N. Y. A. is playing an increasingly important role in the Nation's all-out effort to protect and preserve the American way of life.

As an illustration of the fundamental changes which have taken place in the N. Y. A. since the establishment of the N. Y. A. war production training program in July 1941, it may be pointed out that in North Carolina alone, in the period from July 1, 1941, to March 31, 1943, there were 11,162 trained young people between the ages of 16 and 24, inclusive, who went from their N. Y. A. training centers into industry. These jobs were principally in critical war and war-related industries, many of them with companies or agencies such as the Glenn L. Martin Co., the Norfolk Navy Yard, the North Carolina Shipbuilding Co., the Fairchild Corporation, the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. These and many other firms served by N. Y. A.-trained youth hold key and essential contracts for the production of guns, ships, planes, tanks, and the hundreds of other materials and supplies necessary on the battle fronts scattered throughout the world where the heroic young men of the United States and of the United Nations are fighting and dying in order that the Jap-Nazi-Fascist tyranny may be wiped from the face of the earth forever.

The N. Y. A. training program is based upon production. This makes it possible to train youth under the same conditions which they will experience when they enter employment in private industry. Each youth learns his job by doing actual production work under the supervision of a trained and skilled technical supervisor. By beginning with simple production jobs, the youth progresses to more complicated types of production as he gains familiarity with the tools and procedures of the training shop to which he is assigned. In addition, during the period of from 10 weeks to 3 months that a youth undergoes training, he learns good work habits and workshop techniques, as well as the safety practices upon which progressive concerns place great and proper emphasis.

Since the establishment of the war production training program of the N. Y. A., the North Carolina centers of N. Y. A. have produced many thousands of articles for the war effort. These include ships' ladders for the United States Maritime Commission, which are being used in the construction of Liberty freighters, Diesel engine flanges for the United States Navy, cartridge containers for the United States Army, desks and tables for military posts, cooks' uniforms for the United States Army, sighting bars, identification tags, targets, gun racks, and many other types of essential equipment which were not available through normal industrial channels due to the heavy demands made upon industry for the mass production of war equipment. The shop facilities of N. Y. A. training centers have also provided maintenance and repair services for the mechanized equipment of the armed services stationed in the State.

Through this two-fold program of training and production, the N. Y. A. war production training centers provide young men and women throughout North Carolina, and the United States, with practical work experience and thorough training in those occupations which are essential to war production, and in which there is at the present, and prospectively, a great shortage. These occupations include machine shop work, aircraft sheet metal work, blueprint reading, industrial sewing, aircraft woodworking, radio, welding, foundry practice, and other occupations of equal wartime importance.

At the present, more than 2,200 young people in North Carolina are daily receiving training in vital work-training activities in N. Y. A. local and resident projects located in Elizabeth City, Scotland Neck, Rocky Mount, Greenville, Washington, Kinston, Wilmington, Raleigh, Durham, Burlington, Greensboro, Lexington, Winston-Salem, Lenoir, Ellerbe, Hickory Grove, Sardis, Asheville, and Charlotte.

There are those who attempt to minimize the great contribution N. Y. A. has made and is making to the prosecution of the war effort. In the light of the splendid record of N. Y. A., it is difficult to understand why this should be so, for since that tragic day at Pearl Harbor over 500,000 American youth have received N. Y. A. war production training. To be exact, 591,000 boys and girls have received training in mechanical skills which have been of inestimable value to industry in meeting the enormous production schedules which it has had to meet.

Can anyone honestly say that this contribution to industry has been of no importance? Certainly the thousands of factories scattered throughout the land which have been saved the time and trouble of breaking in unskilled workers would never say so, for these companies, hundreds of them, have formally expressed their approval of N. Y. A. training. With the ranks of their skilled workmen long since depleted, manufacturers have had to make the best possible use of those remaining, even as they have had to make the best possible use of their machinery, and neither of these two factors can be fully utilized for the prime purpose of production if the training of inexperienced persons for semi-skilled tasks must be undertaken at the same time.

Only 2 percent of the total youth population of the United States ever graduate from college, and only 10 percent of our high school graduates ever have an opportunity to attend college. There are thousands of boys and girls in our Nation who have God-given talents to do well the things taught by N. Y. A. provided they are given an opportunity to develop these talents. They feel secure in knowing that they can earn a livelihood, and this security enables them to enter the threshold of life with confidence and soon find a place of usefulness which makes them fine citizens. The N. Y. A. offers a wonderful opportunity to thousands of young people who would otherwise be untrained for suitable employment and who heretofore have been denied an opportunity to make a great contribution to the country.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution that has been recommended by a unanimous vote of the Committee on Agriculture and also by the Rules Committee. It provides for a study and investigation of the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of food products from rural areas through the various marketing agencies to the ultimate consumer. I think it is a good resolution and that the report of this committee would be of real benefit to this body in considering the most important problem of food distribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

S O S FOR EUROPE'S CHILDREN

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this resolution. I want, however, to discuss another important food problem in the short time assigned to me. Mr. Speaker, will America permit the children of Europe in the subjugated countries under Axis domination to die for the want of food? Yesterday I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 244, urging that the United States inaugurate a program at once to save the children of Europe's subjugated countries from starvation and to give food relief to the adult civilians as well. America, through all her history, has been known for her humanitarian activities. Our lend-lease program, which to date involves the expenditure of the

colossal sum of $70,000,000,000, is the greatest contribution ever made by a nation in the world's history for the preservation of civilization and for the assistance of distressed nations overrun by invading conquerors. One of the greatest tragedies growing out of World War No. 2 is the fact that hundreds of thousands of the children of the overrun countries of Europe are being gradually starved to death for the want of food and care. The president of the Greek Red Cross, in London, stated that 110,000 children in Greece and Piraeus alone—one-third of the children—have perished of hunger and the epidemics coming from hunger. It is reported that in Athens in 2 months in 1941, 9 out of 10 babies died at birth. Tuberculosis in many of the stricken countries has risen above 60 percent. This blight will be visited upon the oncoming generations for decades to come. The starved children of Europe who survive this holocaust will be crippled in body and mind, and the vitality and the well-being of the nations of which they are a part will suffer the blight for many generations.

Mr. Speaker, there is ample food in many of the nations of the world not directly involved in the conflict as active participants to save these children, particularly in many South American countries, and much food even in our own country that could be allocated to save the lives of these little folks who are crying for bread, and also to help save the adult civilians as well. Furthermore, there are adequate shipping facilities in neutral countries, such as Sweden, which are available for this humanitarian purpose of carrying food necessary to sustain life to the subjugated countries of Europe. In the interests of humanity the blockade against such mercy ships should be lifted and the essential foods necessary to sustain life be permitted to pass to these children. Can we in America not stop this harvest of death and bring relief to them who are without relief from any other source?

Pursuant to permission heretofore granted, I include as a part of my remarks a most interesting discussion of this problem by Tracy D. Mygatt:

S O S FOR EUROPE'S CHILDREN

(By Tracy D. Mygatt)

THE WORLD'S MOST TERRIBLE STORY

The world has no story more terrible than the slow starvation of Europe's children in this war. Exact figures are not available. But we know that the child life in six countries is involved, countries most of which have been democracies, countries which would be allies of the United States were they not Nazi-conquered. Children of France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Poland, and Greece, are in peril.

Journalists, Red Cross workers, American friends—persons who have witnessed the children's sufferings with their own eyes in southern France before that, too, was occupied—tell us that no words can picture the hourly agency of these beggared children whose food ration (even when obtainable) does not suffice to sustain life and to whom, save in the case of Greece only, the Allied blockade permits no outside food to be brought in. For it is the supreme irony that this cruel wrong is being done these children not by their masters and enemies but by their so-called friends.

FOR MANY IT IS TOO LATE

One knows something of the story of Greece. Before the blockade was partially lifted some 9 months ago, we have it on the authority of the President of the Greek Red Cross in London that 110,000 children in Greece and the Piraeus—one-third of the child population—perished of hunger and the epidemics fatal because of hunger. In Athens alone in a period of 2 months in 1941, nine out of every ten babies died at birth.

In Belgium, where the child population of 2,000,000 is the most sorely menaced of all the occupied countries, the average daily calory ration dropped in July of 1942 to the appalling level of 886. Even in the First World War it never fell below 2,280. Tuberculosis among children has risen in many sections as high as 60 percent, in some to 100 percent. In starving France the rate of the great white plague mounts daily.

BUT FOR OTHERS THERE IS STILL TIME

The relief that has been sent to Greece under Swedish and Swiss supervision in this past year, though still grossly inadequate, has saved thousands of little lives. Working under these neutral governments, the International Red Cross has performed a vast humanitarian work. For the children of this one country at least there has been raised what ex-President Hoover strikingly calls the front of human decency.

THE "GREEK EXPERIMENT" MUST BE REPEATED

Child salvage in Greece was made possible because, after long agitation, chiefly in Great Britain (where public opinion is far ahead of our own), the Allies agreed to let food for children pass through the blockade to Greek ports, and because on their side the Axis Powers promised not to divert the food to their own uses. This promise the Axis has strictly kept. And our own United States Government, in a letter from Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles to the President of the Greek War Relief, written as long ago as last August, certified that the operation in Greece has been successful and that the Nazis have derived no benefit from it. What has been done for the children of Greece can be—must be—done for the children of France, of Belgium, of Holland, of Norway, of Poland. For these, too, we must raise "the front of human decency."

MONEY IS WAITING

Money—the occupied nations' own money—is available to buy the medicines, milk, and vitamins their children need. For, loose reports to the contrary, the governments-in-exile desperately want to see the children, upon whom the future of their countries depends, rescued from the worst death known to man, slow starvation—provided always it will not benefit the enemy.

FOOD IS WAITING

South America has lost many food markets through the war. The Latin American countries have food which they are only too eager to sell—grains, meats, fats, milk. Thus, with both money and food at hand Europe's children can be saved without depriving rationed Americans of 1 ounce of food or taking from their pockets 1 penny of cash.

SHIPS ARE WAITING

Sweden has ships at this moment which she is unwilling to risk in belligerent shipping. She is ready to charter these idle vessels to feed the starving children. War supporters should take note that Allied shipping will be in no way affected because little children of the occupied countries continue to live. But as Rufus Jones of the American Friends Service Committee said in the Carnegie Hall meeting on February 20, 1943:

"The blockade which is an instrument of starvation will not be open for mercy ships until America sends out a loud and unmistakable call to open the way for food to go to the children of Europe."

We must use all channels of democratic influence to persuade the American and British Governments, to let the food go through the blockade.

HUNGER LAYS NO SAFE BASIS

Granted that some children in the occupied countries will survive today's misery, is it reasonable to suppose that this rickety, tubercular, thwarted remnant, who have felt in the formative years of childhood every man's hand against them, will in the future have mind or body to help build a free and warless world? Is it not rather ominously certain that, however great the Allied victory, the resentful child-victims of today will grow up to become the storm troopers of tomorrow? Nazi Germany is in large measure the harvest sowed by the Allied blockade of 1919.

GET YOUR FRIENDS TO ACT

Here, in the desperate plight of Europe's children, is a meeting ground for all people of good will, be they pacifists or war supporters. It is our plain duty, then, to bring them the facts and to urge them to act now with all speed. To write urgent letters to the President, to Secretary of State Cordell Hull, to their Representatives in Congress. Also strong letters to the press. To beseech their ministers and rabbis to cooperate. To take the floor on this tragedy at their unions, their clubs. To seize any and every avenue of influence to halt this atrocious cruelty to the children before it is too late.

Not that we would put the job off on others. We ourselves must speak the word, write the letters. But we must gain wider influence. The vital need, as Rufus Jones has well said, is to: "shake America wide awake so that we can deal with this absolute priority for any permanent peace—the saving of the children of the conquered parts of the world."

Let the mercy ships sail!

There are now pending in the Congress a number of resolutions to accomplish this purpose. I introduced the following resolution (H. Res. 244):

Whereas the food supply of all the small nations invaded and occupied by the Axis Powers is exhausted, due to the requisition of native food supplies by them and the dislocation of food production and economic processes and the inability of these invaded countries to secure their usual imports through the blockade; and

Whereas many thousands of citizens of these countries, and particularly the children, are in dire distress and need for essential food to preserve their lives; and

Whereas great numbers of these children, as well as their parents, have already met death through starvation, and the remainder through malnutrition are facing starvation; and

Whereas there are food surpluses available in the American continents and shipping facilities may be secured through neutral countries; and

Whereas the demands of humanity and common decency require that the United States come to the relief of these stricken countries and provide sufficient food to save the lives of the children now facing death from starvation, and perfect arrangements so that food may be provided for the adult civilian populations, without in any way interfering with military operations or making it possible for any of the Axis Powers to profit by reason of this relief to the stricken countries; and

Whereas Belgium, Norway, Poland, Greece, Yugoslavia, and the Netherlands and others of the subjugated countries have lived in friendship with the United States during our entire national existence and have sent

us millions of our most useful and helpful American citizens, and now have no means whatever of securing the necessary agreements by which this disaster can be averted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States respectfully urges that the Government of the United States, through the Secretary of State, perfect at the earliest possible moment, and put into effect a program in cooperation with the British Government and the Governments of Sweden and Switzerland and other Allies participating with us, the setting up of a definite relief program for these stricken nations and particularly for the providing of the necessary food to prevent the starvation of the thousands of innocent children in these various subjugated countries who are now dying from lack of sustenance; and be it further

Resolved, That in the perfecting of plans for the accomplishment of these humane objectives that provision be made, based on agreements with the belligerents, or otherwise, for the use of these food supplies for this specific purpose, with adequate provision for the protection thereof and with full safeguarding of such relief so that the Axis Nations may not obtain any military advantage by reason of this relief being provided to the children and the adult civilian populations of the invaded nations.

Mr. Speaker, I most respectfully urge my colleagues to give early consideration to all of these resolutions which have for their common purpose the giving of relief to the starving children as well as the adult civilians of the overridden nations of Europe, held under the cruel heel of the Nazi invaders and who are being slowly starved to death. If we wait, it will be too late. Many thousands already have gone to their doom. We must act with great speed if these little folks of Europe are to be saved.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, off and on for some period of time we have discussed subsidies on this floor, but I doubt very much whether we have, first, a correct appraisal of the determination of the administration to impose subsidies upon this country, and, second, an adequate concept of what subsidies will mean to our economic structure in the immediate future and in the post-war period. To me, that proposal is so profoundly interesting that I am of the opinion that it is going to be one of the major problems and a major controversy in this country before we get through. A little rational analysis and a little common sense in the approach will, I think, indicate the magnitude of the problem. One can analyze it about in this fashion.

Take a specific item. Here is a can of corn for which the retailer normally would have to get 20 cents a can or maybe more in order to bring about a fair margin of profit. Under the system that prevails now, he cannot buy canned corn and sell it for 20 cents, and translate that same practice to other commodities, without going out of business, so it is proposed now, first, to place a ceiling on canned corn, and secondly, to find out what it costs the packer and processor to produce canned corn, permit him to sell it to the retailer under the price ceiling, and still remain in business, and pay to the processor a subsidy out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me cite another illustration. They propose to roll back the price of butter 5 cents a pound and pay a subsidy of 5 cents a pound to the processor. By so doing the consumer saves 60 cents a year on the 12 pounds of butter he is allowed under the rationing system, and the Federal Treasury pays out $90,000,000 in order to finance the butter subsidy. This 60 cents that you may save as a consumer is not enough to buy you a haircut the next time you go downtown.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is rather singular now that notwithstanding the many expressions on the floor of this House concerning subsidies and the action of this House on the agriculture appropriation bill and other proposals with respect to subsidies, the determination is still there to adopt the subsidy philosophy.

Let us look for a moment at the mechanics of the subsidy application. If you are going to pay the processor the difference between what it costs plus a margin of profit to put up a case of canned corn or tomatoes or a side of beef, and what it will take the retailer to sell that same commodity under a ceiling price, you have to audit everything the processor pays, and you may have to go back and examine the costs of the feed that goes into the livestock. You will have to examine the cost of the raw material, you will have to examine the costs of the commodities. You must have people in the processing plant checking every item of cost, for obviously you are not going to disburse the money out of the Federal Treasury unless a fair and careful audit and check has been made. There will be auditors and accountants in the plants. There will be regional set-ups, there will be district set-ups. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation will have to make its own check-up before it places its seal of approval upon the payment of a subsidy. Finally, before the Federal Treasury disburses any money, it will want to be satisfied that the amount to be paid to a processor has been carefully ascertained and represents the difference between his cost and the amount he will get under a price ceiling.

Spin that out in terms of personnel. I will venture the opinion here and now that Prentiss Brown will need at least 20,000 more people on the pay roll to make audits, to make accountings, to have watchmen to watch the watchmen to watch the watchmen to see that the Federal Treasury is safeguarded. So there will be superimposed upon the economic structure of the country a tremendous personnel structure that will ultimately break down, because, in my humble judgment, it cannot be efficaciously and efficiently done.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I wonder if my distinguished colleague from Illinois has considered this subsidy proposition in connection with the price of coal. We have that facing us right now. Is it contemplated to increase the price of coal to the consumer or take that out of a subsidy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It may be. We subsidize the transportation of coffee today, we subsidize the transportation cost of gasoline, and now we propose to apply it to meat beginning the 1st of July. We propose to apply it to other commodities that go upon the tables of the people. How far will the program go? It may be that every item that enters into the cost of living in the country will finally become the objective of the subsidy, in view of the fact that all prices are presently subject to inflationary forces.

Mr. CLEVENGER. May I say further that we are already subsidizing out of the Federal Treasury competitive crops in other nations to the extent of millions of dollars?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly.

Mr. CLEVENGER. That is quite in violation of the spirit of this House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now we shall have to go abroad in the country to find accountants. We must find auditors. The renegotiation service in the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission cannot find experienced auditors in sufficient quantity to do that job expeditiously, and yet here is a proposed program which will require a host of persons trained in the field of auditing and accounting.

Out of some 90,000 war contracts, less than 15 percent have been audited, because they do not have the necessary personnel. It is now proposed to subsidize all of the commodities and to find C. P. A.'s and accountants everywhere in competition with other agencies of the Government, and in my considered judgment it cannot be done. You cannot administer that kind of a program successfully.

But the other and the more important implication is this: Do not forget that the inflationary spiral and the inflationary procedures that have been engendered all this time will still keep working their way in the post-war period. You are likely to get more repercussions after the war than now. The demand will then come out to cling to this whole subsidized program, and in a little while it hardens into permanency, and takes on a rigid character, and then all the power in the Government cannot pry it loose. Some years ago a distinguished member of the Cabinet made a statement, with respect to subsidies, and said that first the people will rather demur at the idea of a subsidy, but that after a time, when they get acclimated, they will expect it, and then a little bit later they will demand it. When we embark on this subsidy program I say to you frankly that we cannot see the end, nor can anybody else in government, and we may find ourselves committed for a generation of time for the payment of subsidies out of the Federal Treasury, bringing with it the greater centralization of the bureaucracy of

this country, and finally a complete domination of business. If you take a processor whose volume of business in a year is $20,000,000, and $1,000,000 of that amount comes out of the Federal Treasury, in the way of subsidy, that means that the Federal Government has a 5-percent interest in that business. We are stewards of the public treasury. We could then very well say, "Since 5 percent of that business comes out of the people's fund we ought to have a couple of directors on the board of directors," and when you spin out that implication the ruin may finally be complete, and that may be the avenue by which we socialize the productive industries of the United States. This is an important and a dangerous thing that requires the best thinking of Congress now to match the determination of every agency in the Government that is bound and determined that there shall be a subsidy program for this country.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The gentleman has touched briefly on the point that I had in mind. If we adopt this situation we are admitting that our economic system has broken down. The question in my mind is this: When wages get back to normal, as they will after the war, how are we ever going to get away from a subsidy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman has put his finger upon it. What someone is trying to do is to find a sweet and royal expediency with which to resolve a fundamental maladjustment in our economy. There may be an inclination to take something sugar-coated, because it is disagreeable, but in proportion as we take the sugar-coated route, so the fall will be infinitely greater when we get through.

The full implications of the subsidy philosophy have not yet fully impressed themselves upon this body. It may prove to be a long and tortuous road. It may extend far into the post-war period. It may require billions of dollars. It may develop other maladjustments which in turn will make it increasingly difficult to get back to a free economy in the post-war period. Certainly, it means growing Federal control over every industry, every business, and every commodity which is subsidized, so that finally we will have created a sort of W. P. A. for business and industry.

It is so easy to contend that it works in Great Britain and should therefore work here. Do not forget that Britain has only 7 percent of her people employed in the production of food commodities and hence it could work in a country where a small percentage are subsidized for the other 93 percent. Finally, do not forget that Britain's food needs have been provided by us through lend-lease and that the administration of a subsidy under those circumstances is comparatively easy and simple compared with the problem here. Let me earnestly suggest the need for immediate and careful consideration of this subsidy matter now before we embark upon a fallacious course that is dangerous and from which there may be no returning before it is too late.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, we have before us today in my judgment a most constructive proposal, and I rise at this time in support of Resolution 38 introduced by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee. I think there has been a good deal of misunderstanding abroad in this country, both today and in the past. When we have talked about living costs we have failed to distinguish between the prices received by the farmer at the farm for his crop on the one hand and the price the consumers pay for consumable food commodities when they are finally purchased in the markets of the Nation. There is a tremendous difference between these two things. For example, a loaf of bread costing the consumer 12 cents includes about 1 cent to the wheat farmer. And there are many other examples of the same thing that can be given. Not over one-third of all consumer expenditures for all foods has, through the years, reached the farmer.

In my judgment there are two fundamental things that we have to consider in all these instances. One of them is a constructive solution of these economic problems, and the other is the maintenance of a fundamental freedom among the people of this Nation and avoidance as much as possible of dependence upon Government. I believe and am convinced that out of this study there can come findings as to methods for the solution of this problem of the spread between what the farmer receives and the consumer pays, which method will not involve any dependence upon Government but which will be based on the cooperative action of the farmers themselves in getting together and mutually forming themselves into cooperative marketing and buying organizations for the solution of this problem. Cooperative methods have already proven successful, in many parts of the country and in connection with many problems. Cooperatives of farm producers have made all the difference in giving to those farmers command over their own economic fate.

I come from a section of the country where cooperatives are very widespread among our farmers, growers, and ranchers. I only need point out to you the vast difference between the problem confronted by individual farmers, each operating as an individual producer coming to market with his crops and confronted there with monopolistic control of that bottleneck between the producer and his market, and finding it necessary to sell at whatever price is dictated by that middleman. I ask you to contrast that picture with the other picture of a group of farm producers, wholly independent of any governmental intervention or aid, who have joined together in a cooperative organization, in order that they together may market their commodities in an orderly and fair way and have something to say about the price for which they shall sell.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. FORD. Is not the only thing wrong with this that it comes about 50 years later than it should have?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think this has always been the central problem of agriculture, and I am glad the chairman of our committee has brought this matter to the attention of the House. I have no doubt it will pass this House without dissent. I feel that is altogether worth while. The main thing I wanted to bring to the House in these few remarks is simply the idea that out of earnest and careful consideration of this problem there can come a deeper understanding on the part of all of us, on the part of many people throughout this country of the capacity that exists among groups of the American people to solve their problems in a constructive manner, if they will apply the principle and method of cooperation thereto.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to hear the gentleman say what he has said with regard to the purpose of this resolution, because I value his opinion. I may say for the benefit of my colleagues in the House that the gentleman from California is also the author of a very outstanding book, and I hope to have the pleasure of going through it in the very near future.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I appreciate very much, indeed, what my able and earnest colleague from Minnesota has said. I want to thank him very sincerely, indeed, and to say I will feel very much honored to have him read my book.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial and an essay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution contemplates the most comprehensive investigation that has ever been sought at the hands of Congress. The magnitude of the task should not frighten us. The scope of the resolution is broad enough to actually embrace a thorough investigation of the entire economy of America. Under the authority of this resolution all phases of

the great distribution system of this country will be thoroughly investigated.

The resolution was unanimously reported by the House Committee on Agriculture and met no opposition at the hands of the Rules Committee of the House. I predict that it will pass the House in a few moments without a dissenting vote. This, Mr. Speaker, is clear and convincing evidence of the necessity for the investigation contemplated. It seems to be generally conceded by everyone that the spread between the prices producers receive and the prices consumers must pay is too great. When you visit retail stores it is easy to understand why consumers complain. When you visit the farm it is easy to understand why farmers complain. In seeking the passage of this resolution I do not mean to even suggest that the margin of profit now being realized by the retail merchants of America is in itself the cause or even a contributing cause. Frankly, I do not believe that the retail merchants have realized or are now realizing unholy profits upon retail sales. The fact is, on account of the many difficulties which they are now encountering many small retail merchants have been forced out of business. Thousands of them have been forced to close their doors on account of the fact that they could not operate upon the small margins of profit which they are allowed to make.

In supporting this resolution I assure you that I am not only interested in the welfare of the producer and in the welfare of the consumer, but I am likewise interested in the welfare of those who are now charged with the responsibility of operating this great distribution system of America. Certainly those who are now dependent for a livelihood upon the successful operation of the distribution system of this country should welcome the investigation which is sought by this resolution.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I know many questions will be investigated by this committee relating to the transportation of produce from farm to market and its distribution, but I wonder if this committee or one of its subcommittees will thoroughly investigate the reprehensible practice engaged in by some labor organizations in making truckers pay a fee to their unions before they can enter certain cities, which charge comes out of the pockets of both the farmer and the consumer.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank my friend for having mentioned the very deplorable situation referred to. I have every reason to believe that the committee will thoroughly investigate this particular matter.

The sponsors of this resolution are devoted to the ideals of America and they believe in the American way of life. They believe in the competitive system of free enterprise and they likewise believe that with all of its ills and imperfections the distribution system of America is the best distribution system in the world. There is a general belief, however, that within our present distribution system many evil practices have been permitted and that many parasites and leeches have fastened themselves upon the distribution system of the country which should be and remain in all respects a competitive system.

It will be the purpose of this committee to determine whether or not our system can be made more efficient or more economical. It will be the purpose of the committee to determine whether or not better methods of marketing can be found; methods which will bring about the greatest possible reduction in distribution costs. This, Mr. Speaker, is the imperative challenge to the merchants of America. We must eliminate the evil and preserve the good that is in our present system and we must perfect our system for the future. Only by thinking of the future will we be able to influence the economy in which we shall live.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the resolution also provide for investigating the discrimination going on here in Washington in favor of the chain stores over the individual groceryman?

Mr. COOLEY. I think that the resolution does contemplate that. As I stated in the beginning, I think the investigation will be the most comprehensive ever authorized by this Congress and the committee charged with the responsibility of conducting this investigation will have an opportunity to perform a very worth-while service.

Mr. RANKIN. Will it also investigate the freight-trade discrimination against the agricultural sections of the country?

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly hope so, and if I have anything to do with it I shall insist that that be done.

Mr. PACE. That is particularly named in the resolution.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; that is definitely mentioned in the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, so far as I now recall, I was the first person to lay down upon this table a long line of packages of food which people bought in order that they might eat. I had exhibits like this now in my hand and I called attention to the great spread between the farm prices farmers got for these foods out on the farm and the prices consumers paid for use at the dinner table. The farmer is always blamed for this great spread between farm and dinner table but he gets very little of it.

Here is a corn product. I live in a corn country. The corn in that package of corn flakes cost $134.40 a bushel, and still they damn the farmer, although he got about 80 cents a bushel for it.

I also have in this second package some good old corn meal. Nobody ever had better food than good old corn meal mush on Sunday night, mush and milk, or fried mush the next morning. You cannot have any better stuff to eat than that on the farm. That corn is just simply ground up corn. I suppose the farmer got 80 cents a bushel for it. But the corn in this package cost $3.36 a bushel.

I sold some corn when I was out home during the recess at Easter for 88 cents per bushel. It is always the farmer who is to blame. The farmer is not responsible for the high cost of living.

This is a bill for the consumer. I have seen corn so low that we burned it in our homes in order to keep warm instead of buying coal with the proceeds of that corn. This resolution provides simply for an investigation. When we were before the Rules Committee someone there asked me, "Well, what are you going to do about it?" Candidly, I told them that I did not know exactly what we could do. But there are many things that might be done. The doctor always has to make an examination and a diagnosis of the disease before he can remedy it. If I have fallen arches, the doctor should find out whether the trouble is in my feet or up here in the lumbar vertebrae. That is what we will do in this case. We want to know what is causing this thing that makes living so high and farm products so low. We want to know, for example, how the cooperatives can maintain and save the consumer this money and how the farmers can get some of the things that they really earn. I have never yet read a metropolitan paper that told the truth. They all talk about the higher cost of living as if it were the farmer's fault.

Something was said a moment ago about chain stores. Here is the O. P. A. advertising about rolling back prices and paying subsidies, and telling our small merchants that they cannot sell as cheaply as can the big chain and catalog houses. They are absolutely advertising it to the consumers of the small merchants at the cost of the small merchants and they are advertising to the consumers that the chain stores can sell cheaper than the local merchants. An investigation as called for in this bill is demanded.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as far as this resolution is concerned I am sure that under the leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] it will be handled in a very splendid manner and ultimately some good will result from it. I just wonder if our immediate food problem does not need a little more attention than some may think. I do not think

the Members of this House appreciate the difficulties and the embarrassing situation as far as food is concerned.

I just want to leave one thought with you, if I can, in regard to subsidies, and I know how dangerous this ground is I am going to step out on. I know how thin the ice is, so do not feel sorry for me. The mere fact that you pay a subsidy is not any assurance that we are going to get production. This last year we have had subsidies extended to cheese, for example, but we still have 24 percent less cheese today than a year ago. They have not put any subsidies on hogs, but we have something that takes the place of a subsidy. We had a guaranteed price of $13.25 as a floor price up until September 1944. That inspired the producers to go ahead. The hog farmer knows what the floor is going to be and he knows that as long as the governmental agencies keep corn down below parity that he has a pretty good feeding ratio, so he can go ahead and expand his operations as far as hogs are concerned.

There is something deeper than that in these subsidies, and here is where the ice really gets thin.

That is the difficulty. They say, Are you against a subsidy? I got a letter this morning from the head of a farm organization saying he was against all subsidies. I wanted to be honest with myself and honest with him and I had to ask him if he wants to dispense with subsidies as it affects his own group.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] a question with reference to the farm bill. How in the name of common sense can they bring in a bill like the agricultural appropriation bill was brought in on the floor of the House to provide for the payment of not $5, not a hundred dollars, not a thousand dollars, but as high as a hundred thousand dollars for certain big land operators in this country—to people who happen to be engaged in a system of agriculture from which they are receiving 100 percent, 120 percent, to as high as 145 percent of parity for their product?

I ask you in all fairness the question, Why should the United States Treasury send checks to someone who is engaged in the type of farming from which he is receiving 120 to 140 percent of parity; why should a subsidy be taken out of the Treasury for which the future generations will have to pay? We all know why they want to roll back prices. There is no use deceiving ourselves; it is not only to take care of a group of our citizens who have not had an increase in salary, to take care of the group of citizens that are on relief, individuals who are receiving pensions, railroad retirement payments. As far as I am concerned, individually, I can understand the reason for extending a subsidy as far as paying the grocery bills of some of those groups with a whole lot more complacency than I can to take millions and millions of dollars out of the United States Treasury and send checks to people that are getting 125 to 140 percent of parity, when some of them will receive up to $100,000 a year.

There are those who stand up on the floor of the House, day after day, and seem to feel badly for some particular group of people, like these small business groups, and I have seen enough tears shed here this session to float a battleship, but the question that disturbs me about it is the fact that, with all the lawyers we have in Congress, we do not know where the authority of law is that gives the O. P. A. the right to put these people out of business; I would like to know under what law or authority these men are put out of business.

When Mr. Brown was before our committee he was asked the question as to what authority they are using, what authority does the O. P. A. have, to issue certain orders and regulations which are forcing people out of business. Mr. Brown himself said he was not too sure whether he had the legal right to do what certain groups were trying to get him to do. I think that is one of the troubles of this whole grade-labeling business. First of all, you have got to find some authority in the law authorizing them to do something about grade labeling before we should have grade labeling.

In other words, Congress formerly passed laws and the bureaus carried them out; now Congress has to pass laws to keep the bureaus from doing something they did not have a right to do in the first place. These packers and canners are a part of this food program and we must recognize that fact.

There is no use of our getting excited about it. As to subsidies, I think if we are going to subsidize we should subsidize right straight across the board on the basis of need. If we want to give a subsidy to the groups that are not already getting a subsidy, that is one thing, but why should we pay a subsidy out of the United States Treasury to someone who is now getting 125 to 140 percent of parity for his product, and deny a subsidy to another person whose wages have been frozen at 30 cents per hour? If the subsidy is wrong in principle, we should quit. But there is no justice in extending subsidies to one group and denying them to other groups that have a more economic reason for needing them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, apparently there is no opposition to this resolution. It is a resolution that ought to be adopted. It is a resolution that is of importance and far reaching in its scope. I doubt if there has been a resolution introduced that is more far reaching than this one. I hope that this committee in its investigation will go into the question of discriminatory freight rates.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I would just like to inject into this argument this thought: That I am very much in favor of the resolution, but I wish to express the opinion that it will not have much effect on our present situation. This investigation will involve time. I think that the country is in a critical condition with respect to the production of foodstuffs and that we ought to proceed, long before we can possibly hope to have a report from this committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today, which I would like to change to next Wednesday. I therefore ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, June 2, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SCOTT, from June 1 to June 3, inclusive, on account of official business.

WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 495) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States; and pending that motion, may I say that it is my understanding that the bill is to be considered with 1 hour of general debate, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] and myself.

The SPEAKER. That has already been agreed to.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 495, with Mr. IZAC in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to make a very brief statement on the bill as it is presented to the House.

The Senate passed this bill last February. It came to the House Committee on Military Affairs and was amended in several particulars.

The principal thing the legislation does is to change the status of the present Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, which is treated now as with but not in the Army, the change being that it is no longer to be the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, but the Women's Army Corps.

Under this measure, if enacted in its present form, as reported by the committee, these women will be permitted to volunteer or not volunteer, as they choose, as members of the Army of the

United States; in other words, it remains a voluntary organization. Those who are now in the corps as an auxiliary to the Army may become as a whole members of the Army, but those who do not wish to remain in the Women's Army Corps and become members of the Army are to be discharged.

The number fixed in the original legislation as a maximum was 300,000, I believe, although I may be mistaken. My recollection is not definite on it. We have reduced that to 150,000. I am not sure we acted wisely in that respect, but I find no objection to it and no criticism up to this time.

Another vital change which the House Committee on Military Affairs wrote into the bill as an amendment is a provision stating that the members of the Women's Army Corps shall not be permitted to command combat troops. Their authority is limited to the command, control, and direction of those in the Women's Army Corps and does not apply to the male members of the United States Army.

Another change we made in the Senate bill was to reduce the minimum age limit from 21 to 20. The age limits fixed in the pending bill are 20 to 45.

We do not provide in this measure that the members of the Women's Army Corps may have the benefits of the service men's dependency allowances, but we do provide that they shall be entitled to all other benefits and privileges of other members of the Army of the United States, that is, male members, enlisted men and officers in the same rank that they shall occupy in the armed services. We put the administration of this portion of the act under the Veterans' Administration instead of the Federal Employees' Compensation Commission.

As I stated a moment ago, this remains entirely voluntary. The corps is a volunteer organization. There will be no drafting of members of this corps. The only enlistment will be volunteering by those who desire to become members of the corps.

Mr. Chairman, I think that in substance covers the principal changes in the legislation.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Does this measure allow these girls the privilege of taking out insurance?

Mr. MAY. It applies to them the same as to enlisted men and officers in the Regular Establishment, of the same rank and grade.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the act approved about a year ago which established the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps provided for the creation of a corps of women for service with but not in the Army. This was done designedly, for several reasons, the principal problem being that the creation of the Corps was in the nature of an experiment. The extent to which the Corps would be utilized by the Army was uncertain, and its exact place in the Military Establishment was subject to some doubt. That was somewhat the reverse of the situation insofar as the WAVES of the Navy are concerned. The WAVES became part of the Navy, but the WAAC did not become part of the Army.

I may say that the record of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps since it was established more than justifies the wisdom of the forward action taken at that time. It is a matter of record at the War Department that the Department here has had requisitions from division, corps, army, and general military headquarters throughout the country, and even outside of the country, for approximately 500,000 trained WAAC's, it having been proven conclusively to the military commanders that they might well replace personnel at these headquarters and allow them to shift the duties of male noncommissioned officers and officers from these headquarters to combat and front line duty; so that the value of the WAAC as a military adjunct is now definitely established.

This bill in effect gives them the various benefits which would accrue to them as a result of being a part of the Army. It also lowers the enlistment age to 20 from 21. This puts them on an even basis with the WAVES, with similar provision being made for them.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I think there is no real opposition to the bill. It seems but just to give these women an opportunity to take out national life insurance, and to give them other benefits. The War Department believes they will be more valuable actually taken into the Army than as an auxiliary. In the beginning they felt that an auxiliary was wise, but as time has gone on they have felt it is important to take them into the Army.

I have seen a good many of these WAAC's and I find them extremely dignified and unselfish in their service. They only wish to take the place of the men in order to release them for duty and to fill any position where they are needed, no matter how humble or prosaic. They are doing a very fine, patriotic job, and they have my deepest respect and gratitude, and I know that all the Members of the House hold them in the same respect and the same honor that I do. The Commander in Chief of the Army, President Roosevelt, paid the WAAC's a fine tribute on their first anniversary.

The following information was presented to me by the War Department showing the necessity for a certain number of WAAC's overseas:

The War Department has found by experience that there are certain duties that are most efficiently performed by women. This was true in 1918 when a number of civilian women were sent to France, and it is true today in most of the overseas theaters. These duties relate principally to clerical and communications functions in the higher headquarters.

Conditions in the active and semiactive theaters today are such that it has been found impracticable and inadvisable to send to those areas women in civilian status, and the War Department now restricts the movement of women to those areas to those who are enrolled in some uniformed organized corps (such as the WAAC or the Army Nurse Corps). This is necessary in order that their supply, administration, and security may be properly handled by appropriate military agencies.

It will continue to be necessary to send some women overseas. Certain clerical and technical personnel will be required in addition to nurses, hospital dietitians, and physiotherapists. All should have equal protection of the uniform and a recognized military status. The need for WAAC services overseas is frequently relatively greater from the standpoint of military efficiency and necessity than is the need for them in this country, even though the numbers overseas will never be excessive. To prohibit use of the WAAC's overseas will seriously hamper the War Department in making the most effective use of all Army personnel and will deny to the women who must be sent overseas the protection that status as a member of the Women's Army Corps affords.

Attention should be invited to the fact that we already have WAAC units in overseas theaters, particularly in north Africa. Any restriction now in the use of WAAC's overseas would necessitate the immediate replacement of this personnel, with resulting burden on shipping and administration.

There appears to be little consistency in permitting nurses, hospital dietitians, and physiotherapists to go overseas and at the same time prohibit similar use of Women's Army Corps personnel.

We now have under consideration requests from overseas theater commanders for over 3,000 WAAC personnel. Plans for early shipments against these requisitions are now being formulated.

The following is a letter from the able director, Oveta Culp Hobby, as a result of further quotations from Army officers as to the kind of service the WAAC's are performing:

MAY 26, 1943.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Here are some additional quotations about the corps which ranking officers have made. I am sure you will enjoy reading them as much as I did:

Brig. Gen. J. R. Kilpatrick, commanding general, Hampton Roads, Port of Embarkation, Newport News, Va.:

"I am greatly impressed with their discipline, intelligence, efficiency, and devotion to duty. They have raised the standard of discipline of the command and are doing a splendid job."

Col. George W. Teachout, commanding officer, Camp Crowder, Mo.:

"I believe we have at Camp Crowder one of the largest groups of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps in any post. * * * The morale of the girls is very high. General Milliken, General King, and myself, each of whom has a company in our command, are most delighted and pleased with the work that the girls are doing."

Maj. Gen. Barton K. Yount, commanding general, A. A. F. Flying Training Command, Fort Worth, Tex.:

"Your corps has already proved its value in hundreds of departments which were not anticipated when it was founded.

"The first detachments of WAAC's have begun to arrive at stations of this command, and they are already beginning to take the place of enlisted men who will thereby be made available for service overseas."

Brig. Gen. Herbert C. Holdridge, Post Commandant, Fort Washington, Md.:

"The war has come into the home, so woman's place is now in the war."

Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, A. S. F.:

"Where the WAAC is, there is a job well done. The women of the corps are more than fulfilling the hopes of the Army. Their work is splendid; their service of great value. The Army needs them more and more, and looks on them with pride."

Brig. Gen. T. J. Hanley, A. A. F.:

"The WAAC's are doing a fine job wherever they are and the Army Air Forces are looking forward to receiving many more companies."

Col. E. W. Timberlake, post commander, Bolling Field, D. C.:

"The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps personnel assigned to our command has shown the highest type of intelligence and aptitude in relieving enlisted men for administrative functions. The exchange is made on a one-for-one basis and, frankly, I have found the WAAC's work, quantitatively and qualitatively, to be equal to that of the enlisted men they replaced."

Col. Charles W. Seifert, post executive to Fifth Service Command:

"The WAAC company is fulfilling our expectation of service to the very highest degree. Their demonstration of military courtesy, enthusiasm, and spirit of service is an inspiration to the entire command."

Sincerely,

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Director.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point and include an article from the Yank.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to get permission in the House to include the article referred to.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York to revise and extend his remarks?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be no further desire for time in support of the bill. I understand the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT] has requested time in opposition. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, this bill ought not to be here. In my service, I believe it is the worst bill that has been introduced in this Congress during that time. No one, in my judgment, can justify the provisions of the bill. I am not speaking here today for myself. I am speaking to you today for the women of America. The other day I made some remarks on this floor with regard to a similar bill for the WAVES, and a committee came to see me. That committee was made up of the wives of naval and Army officers. They told me that they had been precluded from going out of the United States with their husbands during the emergency. They said for our sake, they pleaded with me to use every effort I could to prevent the women's auxiliaries, the WAVES, the WAAC, the SPARS, or any other organization to have that privilege which was denied to them. Do you doubt that the wives of Army officers and naval officers are opposed to this measure? Of course you do not. They want to bring in 150,000 WAVES and 150,000 WAAC's. I do not know how many SPARS they want to bring in or how many of these other auxiliaries. I was amazed the other day when I read in a newspaper that some college had organized a group of girls that called themselves the WORMS. Here is what you have to contend with. There are nearly 10,000,000 men in the service and only 1,250,000 men overseas. You cannot open a second front because you do not have sufficient shipping to send the men and equipment over there. And it was testified before our committee that it takes 17 tons of shipping to send 1 person over. Five hundred WAVES would take approximately 10,000 tons of shipping; a pretty good-sized ship to take them over.

And here we have MacArthur praying for dive bombers, praying for planes, praying for bombs, and machine guns, and what do you do? You send them a bunch of WAVES or a bunch of WAAC's, and why? Because they say the women ought to have a part in this war. I take off my hat to the women of this country. They have built our cities, they have built our schools, and our homes, and we owe a great debt of gratitude to them for all the fine things in this country.

God created them a little lower than the angels, and they can have anything in this country that they want. I say to you that if they had the right to sit in these seats this afternoon and vote on this bill it would not pass, because the good women in your district and in my district would not support a measure of this kind. They are not going to fight. One of them came up here the other day to see me. I do not know why. She is not from my district, she is not from my State, but she had seen in the newspapers where I had been opposed to some of these organizations. She said to me: "I want to tell you about this thing. They took me down to Daytona Beach when I was enlisted, or incarcerated or whatever you want to call it, and they took over a big hotel down there and they took every door off the hotel, the first thing. They did not want any privacy in that building. They took all the doors down, even the bathroom doors, and they put all the girls in together. Then they had to have a bed check—I never heard of a bed check before—at 11 o'clock at night." All military training. I then asked her to tell me what they taught them down there, whether they taught her to run a typewriter, or an adding machine. She said: "Here are some of the things I had to learn. The hardest thing I had to learn was to salute an officer. You had to stand with your feet together, stand up straight, get your arm out at a particular angle, but I could not do the job just right." After a while she mastered that in the boot training. She said the hardest thing she had to learn was to say "Good night, ma'am."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want you to tell me in the name of common sense what good it is going to do, to teach a girl that kind of stuff, when you say they are to be brought in here to do book work so as to release some man for overseas duty. The fact is you want to militarize the women of this country, to regulate them, and teach them that men are superior, and that they have to look up to them and salute and that commands must be recognized. Then you have in this bill that a WAAC cannot give a command to anybody except a WAAC. She cannot command a soldier or a sailor even though she outranks him. No, she has to take commands from some officer.

I hope that this Congress will not allow the womanhood of this Nation to be taught that there s class in this country. I have always thought that a good woman was as good as anything in the world; that she was equal to anything. But no, not so. Down in Kentucky, down in my own district a few days ago, at a camp down there, a ridiculous thing happened. A second lieutenant came down the road in a car driven by a WAAC. They drove up to a famous roadside inn, a beautiful little place, to eat. He got out of the car. He left the WAAC at the wheel. He went in and wined and dined himself, and he did not take the girl in, never bought her anything to eat. When he was questioned about his action, do you know what his answer was? He said, "I could not take her in for lunch because I outrank her. I could not eat with her. Because of military regulations it would be a violation for me to do that." If you want to teach our women and our girls to become chauffeurs for second lieutenants in the Army, then I am frank to admit that I do not understand my colleagues.

Oh, look here. We are spending billions of dollars; a bankrupt nation. When the boys come home we will not be able to pay them compensation. Yet you have three or four hundred thousand SPARS and WAVES and WAAC's. Look at what your country is paying your money for. Here is a picture in Sunday's Star. There is a beautiful girl. She said, "I joined to serve my country and I am having the time of my life."

You go down into my district and the high school children are bringing out their pennies to buy bonds in order to send bombs over there, and then they take that money and they spend millions and millions of dollars on this program, buying advertising, building camps, and renting institutions. The other day LaGuardia came down here and he got hold of Admiral Jacobs. He sold him on the idea of training the WAVES up in the Bronx at Hunter College. We spent $1,000,000 to rent the college. We spent $800,000 to rent apartment houses to house the WAVES. I said to Admiral Jacobs, "What did you do that for?" He thought it was very improper for me to ask such a question. You may think it improper now for me to bring this matter to your attention, but he said, "In fact, New York City has been hard hit by the war."

One member of my committee said, "I am surprised at that because the other night I was up there and I thought I was going to have to sleep in the park. I could not get a hotel room anywhere. I thought it was the richest city on the face of the earth. I have bragged about it all over my district," yet we come to find out from this admiral that he let LaGuardia sell him a bill of goods on Hunter College because New York needed something. Bartering away the people's money. Why? Because LaGuardia came down here and sold him on the

idea of taking girls from Washington, from Tennessee, from Kentucky and sending them to Hunter College to be trained.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I just wanted to ask the gentleman from New York a question. It is my understanding that under the law at present deceased WAAC's are not entitled to be buried in national cemeteries as are the WAVES and SPARS and the women marines. Is it the gentleman's understanding that one of the benefits which will accrue as a result of the enactment of this legislation is that that will be equalized?

Mr. ANDREWS. It entitles all members of the WAAC to all benefits of members of the Army.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not have any further requests for time. Therefore the Clerk may read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the Army of the United States, for the period until the cessation of hostilities in the present war and for 6 months thereafter or for such shorter period as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation shall prescribe, or until January 1, 1945, whichever is earlier, a component to be known as the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause down to and including line 9, and insert "That there is hereby established in the Army of the United States, for the period of the present war and for 6 months thereafter or for such shorter period as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation shall prescribe, a component to be known as the Women's Army Corps. The total number of women enlisted or appointed in the Women's Army Corps shall not exceed the number authorized from time to time by the President, and in no event shall exceed 150,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The enlisted personnel of such corps shall consist of women enlisted in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the concluding paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (54 Stat. 213). All laws and regulations now or hereafter applicable to enlisted men or former enlisted men of the Army of the United States and their dependents and beneficiaries shall, in like cases and except where otherwise expressly provided, be applicable respectively to enlisted personnel and former enlisted personnel of such corps and their dependents and beneficiaries.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, in line 9, after "2", strike out the remainder of the line and all down to and including the period in line 13, and insert: "The enlisted personnel of such corps shall consist of women of excellent character in good physical health, who are enlisted in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the last paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (54 Stat. 213), and who are on the date of such enlistment citizens of the United States between the ages of 20 and 45 years."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The commissioned officers of such corps shall consist of women appointed as officers in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the joint resolution of September 22, 1941 (55 Stat. 728), and ordered into the active military service of the United States.

They and their dependents and beneficiaries shall have all of the rights, privileges, and benefits accorded in like cases to other persons under that act, except where otherwise expressly provided.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 5, after the word States, insert "The commanding officer of such corps shall be a colonel and such officers of lower rank shall be appointed as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided*, That physicians and nurses shall not be enlisted in this corps: *And provided further*, That military authority of officers commissioned under the provisions of this act may be exercised over women of the Women's Army Corps only, and is limited to the administration of the corps."

Page 3, line 15, after the word "act", insert "except where otherwise expressly provided."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. The Secretary of War is authorized to prescribe such additional regulations applicable to such corps and to the members thereof as he may deem necessary. The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps and the Army Nurse Corps shall be the only women's organizations in the Army of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of section 4.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no woman appointed as an officer in the Army of the United States under the provisions hereof who has previously held an appointment as an officer of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps established pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 14, 1942 (Public Law 554, 77th Cong.), shall be entitled to any uniform allowance payable to officers of the Army of the United States. Such officers who have not received a complete issue of uniforms, insignia, accessories, and equipment prescribed under the provisions of section 8 of such act of May 14, 1942, may be issued the remainder of such prescribed articles, and all such officers who have heretofore received, or may hereafter receive such complete issue, or any part thereof, may retain such articles as their personal property.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 23, strike out "5" and insert "4."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, in rising at this time I am appreciative of the tolerant attitude of the House which, during this debate, grants me the privilege of speaking out of order so that I may pay my humble tribute to the name and memory of one of Michigan's greatest citizens, and one of the greatest personalities of this generation, the late and beloved Edsel Bryant Ford.

Fate denied me the privilege of knowing, personally, this outstanding and upright fellow citizen, but I feel in my heart that I have known him intimately during most of my life.

Edsel Ford was a man of my own age. I have watched him grow alongside of his illustrious and productive father. I have watched him expand, even ahead of the great Ford enterprises. The only son of his father, he led an exemplary and inspiring life. Unlike the sons of some wealthy families, Edsel Ford grew to manhood modest, unspoiled, and productive. Scandal, not in the slightest degree, ever soiled his name. In following his father's footsteps, he has made a great success of his business but he has never lost touch with the world about him as he patronized the arts and the sciences, and contributed mightily to every worthwhile charity, not confining his gifts to any geographical area, nor to any particular element, or restricting benefits to any creed of our society.

My heart goes out to Henry Ford, a noble father, and to Mrs. Ford, a loving and devoted mother, in this their hour of supreme sacrifice in the loss of their only son.

In the time of the Nation's crisis, why could not this life have been spared to sustain the parents and the family of this outstanding and universally beloved citizen.

I offer my silent prayer for the repose of his kindly and noble soul, and I pray that the God of all, the Master Mechanic of the Universe, shall welcome this genius of production and grant him life everlasting, where his efforts will be even more appreciated than they were upon this earthly sphere. May the good Lord sustain the bereaved widow and the splendid sons and daughter, and the parents of the deceased with true Christian fortitude until they shall all meet again.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. Effective on the last day of the second calendar month following the date of the approval of this act, the act of May 14, 1942, as amended, except section 11 thereof, is hereby repealed. Section 11 of such act of May 14, 1942, shall not be applicable to enlisted personnel or commissioned officers of the corps established by this act except in cases in which its applicability is based upon the status of such enlisted personnel or commissioned officers as former members of the corps established by such act of May 14, 1942. Enlistment or acceptance of appointment under the provisions of this act shall terminate service

under the act of May 14, 1942, and personnel who were enrolled or appointed under the act last mentioned who do not so enlist or accept appointment hereunder will be discharged. The Secretary of War is authorized to provide transportation and sleeping accommodations, or an allowance in lieu thereof, at the rate of 5 cents per mile, for the travel from her last duty post to the place of her acceptance for appointment or enrollment to any member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps established pursuant to the provisions of such act of May 14, 1942, who is not appointed or enlisted in the Army of the United States pursuant to the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 13, strike out "6" and insert "5."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Kentucky to explain why the bill does not give the dependents of the WAAC's an allowance. It is because enlisted members of the WAAC do not have dependents, or is there some other good reason for it?

Mr. MAY. The provision we inserted does not take away from the dependents that may be included under the Servicemen's Benefit Act, but it prohibits those members of this corps who are single from making claims for it, or those who have secondary or collateral dependents, that is, brothers and sisters rather than children.

Mr. KUNKEL. How about parents?

Mr. MAY. They are not included.

Mr. KUNKEL. But the parents of enlisted men are included.

Mr. MAY. They are.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky: On page 5, line 9, after the word "act" change the period to a colon and add the following: "That no member of this corps stationed in the United States shall be ordered to serve outside of the continental United States."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to stop sending these WAAC's outside of the United States. The record will show, I am certain—at least I have seen newspaper statements of the fact—that they have had some trouble in north Africa with the organization they sent over there.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I feel sure the gentleman does not wish to make any statement along that line. I have checked and rechecked with the War Department and they tell me they have not had any difficulty with them over there.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I yielded to the gentlewoman to ask a question, not to make a statement.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman does not wish to do the women any injustice.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I am not saying that the girls were at fault, and no criticism of them should be made. Members of Congress who put through legislation to send them over there are due the criticism, not the girls. Since the gentlewoman has questioned my statement, I may say that I refer to the article in the Times-Herald by Helen Essary, whose daughter is a member of the WAVES. I am sure the gentlewoman from Massachusetts saw that, and I am sure all of you saw the statement in the paper about the trouble that had developed in north Africa, where the girls had to be given protection, probably by the convents or by the Mothers Superior over there. That statement was in the Times-Herald in an article written by Helen Essary a few days ago.

Here the Government goes out and robs the country of school teachers by advertisements such as I showed you awhile ago. Advertisements which appeal to the women of the country. Of course the women are patriotic, but you know what problems it brings when you put them in the service. Here is a battery here, there is a company there; they need a clerk, they need somebody to keep their records. What did we do in the other World War? We took boys out of the Army whose arches were fallen or who had other defects which prevented their serving in the combat troops. In my outfit we had a boy who had worked for the Associated Press. He could operate a typewriter faster than any person I have seen. He kept our records. There are plenty of boys who can do this work. Why have embarrassment? Why have trouble? Because when you send them over there boys are going to give their lives to protect them. When you send girls over there remember that with our soldiers you also have Arabs, you have Senegalese, you have all kinds of people in the service and they are going to be thrown in contact with them. There is bound to be complications. Those problems will come up. The only reason you want this bill is to go out and use it to entice more girls to join the organization. You know, the people of this country have not swallowed this stuff. They say, "We do not want our girls to go." Why, a mother came a thousand miles to my office to see me. Her daughter worked here in Washington and she is 20 years old. The mother was crying and asked me to beg her daughter not to join this organization. I told her to go down to Potomac Park, or to go down to Anacostia and look around and find out what the enlisted personnel in this organization had to do. The officers have good times. The enlisted personnel peel potatoes, they scrub floors, you make servants out of them, and teach them to say, "Good night, M'am," and all those things. Down South we expect our servants to use that language, not the young ladies of the land.

This is a problem and you have a number of them over there now. Certainly you have enough over there. Let us stop, look, and listen. Let us quit sending them over there. Let us send some men over there who can fight. Let us take off our coats and get ready to fight. You are in a war. When America thinks of an invasion, there will be the wounded, the crippled and maimed who will be piled back into this country. Women get sick the same as men do. They will crowd the hospitals, they will use up the doctors. They have no business over there. They are in the way and I beg this House and ask the Congress to rise up against this. I believe if we had a secret vote we would not have many votes for this bill, and you need not be afraid of it. I made the fight last July and I went home. I received the praise and approbation of 95 percent of the good women of my district. They do not want this thing. They do not want this to happen. You have 9,000,000 mothers now who have sent their sons away. They can stand that, but let us not send their daughters. They are in enough sorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, the objection comes too late. I make the point of order that the Chair had already ruled that the unanimous consent request was granted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair put the question, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] objected.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT].

Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that my good friend from Kentucky treats this bill partly as a matter of levity and also subjects 50,000 fine young women in this country, who have volunteered, if you please, to help win this war, to a certain form of criticism and sarcasm, to which I do not think they are entitled, and which I know they do not deserve. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Military Affairs and I have attended the hearings on this bill, and I voice, I believe, the unanimous opinion of the committee charged with the responsibility of looking into the matter. We heard the representatives of General Marshall who stated that these women have done a masterful job wherever they have been sent. Now, we bring in a bill here to clarify and simplify the law that this Congress passed by an overwhelming majority. I say in all fairness to these women that it is neither just nor magnanimous to ridicule them or to encourage vile and untrue propaganda about them. I see

smiles and levity from a few, but I do not think these fine women deserve it. They volunteered their services and I assert they have done a grand job.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Did General Marshall testify on this bill?

Mr. THOMASON. Not personally on this bill, but the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from your own State, will bear me out that General Marshall sent word to the committee by his official representatives and spokesmen that the WAAC's had done a marvelous job and he not only wants them retained but he needs more. In that connection, may I ask my friend to take the time to read the report of General Eisenhower in north Africa in reference to the fine young American women who went to the battle front, who went right into the offices along with the high-ranking Army officers all the way up to the front, and also acted as translators. Many of them are college women with three or four degrees and who are able to speak two or three languages. Ask General Eisenhower how these fine young women performed in the battles of north Africa and there will not be a vote against this bill.

I wish I could relate some experiences that the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, along with a good many other Members of the House, had in New York yesterday. Most of the trip was a military secret but every man on the trip will now testify that the WAAC's are doing a fine patriotic job both at home and abroad. May I add right here that when 50,000 fine young American women in this country, enlisted and volunteered they probably enabled some married men to stay out on the farms of Kentucky and other States. These women who volunter must prove themselves to be women of high character. There has been entirely too much vile and untrue propaganda reflecting upon the character of these young women and I resent it. The records of the War Department show that they come from the best homes of America, and it is our duty in this terrible crisis to defend and encourage them. That is what I propose to do.

Mr. Chairman, I am only relating what the record shows by the testimony submitted before the Committee on Military Affairs.

I want to add this: That if these women have been doing a good job in north Africa, as General Eisenhower says they have, if they have done a splendid job in England, as the War Department says they have, if the War Department now says we need them and more, too, in order to enable more young men to enter the combat service, if they are needed, and you are going to adopt this amendment prohibiting foreign service, why not make it apply to nurses and all women now doing such grand work overseas? Why not be consistent?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the reason back of this amendment is sound, should we not disband the Army Nurse Corps?

Mr. THOMASON. Not only disband the Nurse Corps, but disband every military activity in which women are participating.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KUNKEL. I object.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor only to show this: This is a bill from the Military Affairs Committee, and my good friend from Texas in some of his remarks has created a possible inference in the RECORD that those of us who a little later might have a different mind with respect to bills from the Navy Department might be placed in a wrong position with respect to any action we take on this bill.

I am perhaps willing to accept the advice of the Military Affairs Committee on matters originating in that committee, because I think, and I hope, that they have secured sufficient information from the War Department which they feel justifies them in their recommendation to the House. But I do not want any action of mine or of any other Member on this bill to be construed as binding him to follow any legislation or to support any legislation that might be brought on the floor of the House relating to the Naval Establishment. I say that for this reason: I am a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. We had a bill on the floor about 3 weeks ago to grant permission to use WAVES in overseas duty. I opposed that because I can tell you, as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, that no one from the Navy Department has ever given any information to our committee that would in any way justify Congress allowing WAVES to go overseas.

Mr. THOMASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I will yield in just a moment.

The situation with respect to nurses is entirely different. Nurses are women who, in most cases, have had 3 or 4 years of rigid disciplined service. They are more acquainted with life by nature of their profession.

There are 6,000 enlisted men on duty here in Washington, in the Navy Department, and 7,500 officers, most of them clamoring to get overseas. Women were enlisted and commissioned in the Navy in order to make it possible for these men to be relieved of desk duty and sent overseas, and we cannot justify sending one single woman into danger, even a danger that is occasioned by just a trip across the ocean, when there are over 13,000 men on duty behind desks in the Navy Department in Washington, and thousands and thousands of them are in the Naval Establishment in shore stations throughout the United States.

I am saying that so that when someone later comes out with a bill granting permission to use these WAVES on a service they never enlisted for, that because we might have accepted the recommendation from the Military Affairs Committee in this instance because they do not wish to risk impeding the progress of the war, and because we feel that the Military Affairs Committee should know more about it than the Members who are not on that committee, that any vote on this measure will not be considered as binding on anyone when a similar proposal might come with respect to the naval service.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. As a matter of fact, there is no difference, is there?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. In answer to my friend from Mississippi, I will say this: Maybe the War Department can justify, or the Military Affairs Committee can say that the exigencies of the moment are such, that the shortage of manpower is such that the need for women is great because in that way they can relieve men from desk duty in the War Department and send them overseas.

About that I do not know, because I do not sit in the secret executive sessions of the Committee on Military Affairs, but I hope that when they make a recommendation to this House they have examined the question thoroughly. I am a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, however, and a member of the subcommittee that has been appointed to investigate the personnel problem, enlisted, officer, and civilian, of the Navy Department here in Washington. The statistics we have on that with respect to these officers and enlisted men who want to go abroad, who want to go to sea, and who are not relieved to do so by a WAVE, are astounding. Then they come along and ask to send a woman overseas, when they are taking no steps to send the men who actually want to go.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If this bill is passed, will not that put these women in the same status as all soldiers, so that in the future if we pass any beneficial legislation for the veterans that legislation will apply equally to these women in the Army Corps; in other words, any pension legislation or anything like that will apply equally to these women?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Presumably it would, with one exception, that the provisions of the Service Men's Dependency Allowance Act do not apply to them.

But I did not want to discuss that particular phase of this bill.

The gentleman who just preceded me spent his time in discussing the bill that seeks to permit the WAVES to go on foreign duty. Personally, I am in favor of the WAVES going on foreign duty, but the conditions relating to the WAVES and to the women covered by this bill are not the same. In the first place, the women who are covered by this bill are already permitted to go on foreign duty and we are not authorizing it anew. When the WAVES bill was passed, for some reason the Committee on Naval Affairs saw fit not to recommend to this House that the WAVES be allowed to go on foreign duty. We are not bringing in something new in this bill to allow the WAAC's to have foreign duty. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT] is injecting something new into it in trying to forbid to them that foreign duty. I certainly join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in his desire to get these young men out of Washington and get them out of these desk jobs.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. With respect to the Naval Establishment——

Mr. SPARKMAN. With respect to all of them.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I take it for granted the gentleman knows more about the War Department than I do, because he is on the Committee on Military Affairs, but does the gentleman believe there is any justification in sending a single woman overseas in the Naval Establishment when there are 13,000 men on duty in the city of Washington?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let us argue the naval bill when we get to it.

We have been assured by the War Department that they are moving these young men out just as fast as they can. Every woman in the Auxiliary Corps who has been trained and sent to the field has replaced a man. Under present regulations she must replace a man when she is sent out.

I was in a military establishment yesterday with other Members of Congress. I happened to talk to an officer of the WAAC. I asked her how many WAAC's were used in that particular establishment. She said that at the present time there are about 400, but that the plans call for 2,000. My question was prompted by seeing literally hundreds of young men, apparently able-bodied, well able to go out into field duty. Every one of those 1,600 additional WAAC's that will be sent to that establishment will replace one of those able-bodied young men and release him for foreign service. Remember that in foreign service we have hundreds and thousands of able-bodied young men who are driving jeeps and trucks and doing clerical jobs, doing the kind of work that women are doing in this country. Every woman we send to foreign duty will replace one of those men.

Talk about sending women to danger zones; we are working women right here in this country in places that are just as dangerous as the places they will be sent over there. There is a great arsenal down in my section of the country. I have gone in there and seen women doing dangerous work, working with dangerous chemicals, compounding explosives, and building fuses. I have read in the paper, as you have, of explosions in which women were killed. You do not object to their working in those places of danger. Is it any more dangerous to drive a jeep or an ambulance or a truck or to do some clerical work miles and miles back of the front line, but in a place where they can substitute for some able-bodied young men who can be out digging a trench and carrying a rifle and firing a gun and doing the real front-line work?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of taking any part in this debate, and I certainly want to see the bill passed, but I do not want the RECORD to stand that in the opinion of this House, American women would be in the way if they were permitted to go overseas or to go to any part of the world with our Army.

I want to pay my tribute to the services rendered by American women during World War No. 1 in France and in other places. There is nothing that means so much to an American soldier, if he has the misfortune to find himself in an Army hospital, as to look up and see in that ward a fine American woman. I never saw one in the military service that was in anybody's way. The same thing applies not only to nurses but to recreational aides, physio and occupational aides, whether they are in uniform or whether they are just patriotic American women who have gone abroad to render whatever service in a recreational way they can to the men of the armed services.

So long as our military authorities continue to select the type of women that have been selected in the WAAC, the WAVES, and the other women's organizations, we are not going to have any problem with them, whether they be in Africa, Great Britain, or on the continent of Europe. I respect the women who have volunteered their services, and I know that the American men now serving in our military and naval forces will protect them wherever they may be assigned to carry on their worth-while activity. The man who wrote the words for the popular song The Rose of No Man's Land expressed my attitude to the American women who serve so nobly in time of war. God bless them. Their contribution to the morale and the morals of our Army cannot be overstated.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, a number of us in this House took part in a little trip yesterday, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] came very close to bringing out a thought I have in mind, which I think is very pertinent. Those who were in the party will recall the great office building that our group passed by, where not alone on one floor but on half a dozen or more floors there were several hundred men who had their heads out of the window. I studied carefully the faces of those young men, soldiers, both officers and enlisted men. They were glancing out of the windows of this huge Army base office building and watching the world go by. I believe it was the gentleman from Alabama who said to me at that time, "Why can we not have WAAC's sitting up there doing those office jobs, so that they may release these young men, who certainly should be in more important work in this war of survival we are facing?" I agreed heartily with him. We estimated at that time, less than 24 hours ago, that fully 80 percent of those hundreds of soldiers who were watching us go by were under 30 years of age. Personally, I was disturbed at their lack of application to their jobs.

Permit me to bring one more point to your attention. In various tours of Army camps during the past 2 weeks I do not believe that I ever at any point heard of anything that was not complimentary to the work that the WAAC's are doing today. I made inquiry especially of numerous officers as to how the WAAC's were of assistance and whether such organization proved beneficial. These officers invariably praised the work of the WAAC's. One complained that there were far too few of this group in the service.

I do feel, Mr. Chairman, that the WAAC's perform a great service to our Nation. I do not agree that they should go overseas, however. Let the able-bodied men we saw yesterday in that office building go overseas. These young women can replace them at their office jobs and most likely do a far better job than the young men who I am sure would much rather go into active service.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise merely to make one or two remarks. There is a letter which appears in the record of the hearings from General Marshall, pointing out definitely the need for these women in the Army of the United States. He was frank enough to say to our committee that when he considered the original legislation he thought their proper place was to be with the Army, but not in the Army; but in view of the experience he has had in their training, he has changed his mind and come to feel that their place is in the Army.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. To ask the chairman of the committee if the enlisted personnel and the heads of the personnel, both, likewise will be free to withdraw from service and not be forced to remain in the Regular Army?

Mr. MAY. I made that statement in my original remarks. It is entirely voluntary. If they do not want to remain, they are immediately discharged.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, all of the enlisted personnel, under the changes made, will be free to retire from the service?

Mr. MAY. That is correct. And that relates to officers also.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Did the general make any remarks in regard to the necessity for WAAC's going overseas?

Mr. MAY. I do not remember that there was anything in his letter about that, but he did send a couple of hundred of them to Africa.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement here that I shall ask to have inserted in my remarks, which comes from the War Department, and which was brought to me by a legislative representative, to use regarding the sending of women overseas. I think the House will be favorable to their going overseas, as the War Department has wished.

Mr. MAY. I read the article the gentlewoman refers to, and it may be included in my remarks, when we get into the House, if the lady so desires.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. While General Marshall may not have made any specific statements, it is true that the Secretary of War recommended the passage of this bill, which does provide for that service.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not also true that the defeat of this bill would not abolish the auxiliary corps? This legislation is intended to supplant, replace, and perfect existing legislation.

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Among other things, if it becomes necessary to discipline a member of the corps, this legislation would authorize that, whereas the present provisions are lacking in that respect.

Mr. MAY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, which is in point and greatly clarifies the situation.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I have finally concluded it would be a cowardly thing for me to remain silent, feeling as I do in reference to this legislation and seeing that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT] is bearing the burden of the opposition alone.

I am opposed to the bill, and being opposed to it I did not feel it was allowable that I should remain silent in a cowardly way.

Mr. Chairman, I have not been requested to do so, and I know that no indictment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT] was intended, but I do want to suggest to the House that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT] has not spoken in disrespect or disparagement of the womanhood of the United States of America. If that conclusion was reached, I think it was by misunderstanding and misinterpretation of his words. The man does not live who holds in higher respect the womanhood of the world than I do. I do not claim unusual position in that regard, but I do claim equality of position with anybody who lives. On account of that pedestal upon which I have placed her and which position she has occupied in my life always, I am opposed to this bill. I have hesitated very seriously about making opposition to it because I did not have the advantage and benefit of listening to the testimony before this fine Committee on Military Affairs, which committee I have followed every time since June 1941, when I became a Member of this House. But I suggest to you that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER], who was rolled into this House to testify as to the grandeur of the presence of women in time of war, made most particular reference to that woman who occupies a position as grand as one can—that of a nurse who ministers to one when he is injured or sick or about to die.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I do not want the RECORD to appear that I confined my remarks to nurses.

Mr. FOLGER. I shall be particular about that. The gentleman made further reference, and that is an interpretation of my own. We are having a shortage of nurses throughout this Nation today. There is pending in the House and in the Senate a bill which would limit an appropriation for the purpose of securing nurses against the anticipated time when there will be an alarming dearth of them. The bill provides that those who shall administer it must confine it to hospitals which have an average number of 100 patients per day throughout the year. In my State of North Carolina it has the effect of making provision for 9 hospitals and denying that provision to 34 hospitals, and I apprehend the same ratio will hold largely in every State in the Union. I want some more nurses.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Granting the gentleman's argument is true, and it is true, how would the defeat of this bill affect that proposition one bit?

Mr. FOLGER. I heard a soldier on the train the other night as I came to Washington, talking to two lovely girls. There were two soldiers and two girls. They were all nice. The girls were nice. The boys were fine. Those young men said, with great respect, "We wish you would give us nurses instead of soldiers or WAAC's and WAVES," and they did it very politely.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I would like to make the observation that anybody who knows the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT] knows that he has the highest respect for the womanhood of America and knows that he places them on a high pedestal. For that very reason he is arguing against this bill, in order to preserve the respect that the people of this country have for the women of this country and to keep them on that high pedestal.

Mr. FOLGER. I do not think anything else was intended. I think it was a reference to some organization that was misunderstood.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment reported again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the pending amendment.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky) there were ayes 34 and noes 69.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 5, line 10, insert:

"SEC. 6. The provisions of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942 (Public Law 625, 77th Cong., approved June 23, 1942), shall not be applicable to the dependents of women enlisted under the provisions of this act. Money allowances for subsistence and rental of quarters shall be allowed to women commissioned or enlisted under the provisions of this act only to the extent that they are allowed to male commissioned officers and enlisted men, respectively, without dependents."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky: On page 5, line 18, after the word "dependents", at the end of line 18, strike out the period, add a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That members of this corps shall not be eligible for pension or compensation for disabilities received on account of service in said corps unless such service was rendered outside the continental United States."

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, we are about ready, I hope, to open a second front and when we do our wounded heroes will be coming back to this country in countless numbers. I hope when that time comes they will not be put into competition, these veterans returning from the battle fronts, with girls who have been assigned civil-service jobs in this country.

My amendment provides that if a girl goes overseas she shall be eligible for compensation, but unless she serves overseas she will not be eligible to receive a pension or compensation for physical disability received during the war. I hope you will not put them in competition with these boys who go

over there and risk their lives, for the girls who stay home are not in the danger zone. The Government clothes them, pays them a good salary, and they are not in danger here. The whole theory of pension and compensation is to take care of our veterans who fight our wars, who put themselves in danger, and become thereby disabled.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Gladly.

Mr. COOLEY. If we intend to exact the same responsibility from the WAAC's, does not the gentleman think we ought to make them the same allowances and provide for them the same benefits whether they be pensions or other compensation? If we have the policy of employing them in this country, it seems to me that identically the same provisions should be made for the women as for the men.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. The committee did not do that; they excluded them from making allotments to their dependents. If it is true that their dependents are not entitled to allotments, the WAAC's who serve in this country ought not to be entitled to pensions or compensation for physical disability especially when they stay here in good jobs, in the country at home, not in any more danger than you are in, not in any more danger than I am in right now.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Would the gentleman support an amendment that would deny compensation to a soldier who served in the United States?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I certainly will support an amendment that would preclude any man who stays in the United States and is not put in danger from receiving any compensation. If he is not put in danger, why should he take funds due a wounded soldier?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman know that in some of the maneuvers, some of the practices, men unfortunately are injured and sometimes lose their lives in preparation for war right here at home?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. But that is a minor thing. We know and they know that it is their own men who are flying above them. We have got to start making limitations. The fact of the business is that we are broke, this country is bankrupt, and when these men come back we will not have enough money to support them as we ought to support them. Now, are we going to put in competition with them a class of people who have civil service jobs who will come in and say: "Why, I won the war." It reminds me of a story. A beggar went into a restaurant: He told the manager he was a beggar and had no money. He said: "I am hungry; I want something to eat."

The proprietor said: "I am willing to give you something to eat if you will tell me a good story."

And the beggar told him the story of a woodpecker who in a storm lighted on the end of a branch of a great oak and began pecking on it. While he was pecking a great wind came along and uprooted the tree, and to his dying day the bird believed it was his pecking that caused the tree to fall.

And so many people who will never leave this country will run around after the war is over saying: "I won the war. I won the war." When the war is over the veteran who served in this country behind a desk, who never was in any danger at all but who had a good job at Government expense, the Government furnishing him his clothing, the Government furnishing him his medical attention, certainly he ought not be allowed a pension or compensation.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. With reference to the gentleman's remarks about pensions to people who serve only in this country, did the gentleman vote for the bill that was passed last year providing pensions for widows of war veterans whose husbands died from disabilities not service connected?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I believe I did. I am a veteran of the last war and I vote for all veteran legislation; and that is the reason I am pleading with the House now to protect the veterans of this conflict, because I know and you know there will be literally thousands of them back here crippled and blind and helpless, and with this debt on us we shall not be able to provide for them properly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I did not want to get into this discussion, but I think someone ought to stand up here and say that a great many of the words expressed here in behalf of American womanhood are in actuality an insult to the women of America. I am opposed to this amendment and I do not like section 6 of this bill. I do not believe in the discrimination that is being set up. I am in favor of the bill, and I shall vote for it despite section 6, but I do not like to see these discriminations set out in the law.

Mr. RICHARDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is there any reason in the world why, if the women are going to be placed in the Army on an equal basis that the men are, they should not receive all the benefits that the men receive?

Mr. McMURRAY. I should like to say that I am in entire agreement. We are giving women the responsibility, as an integral part of the Army, to perform military services and no valid reason has been given that should cause us to deny them any benefits or any privileges that we give the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Is it not a fact that under this bill the women do get every benefit that the men get? An allotment is not a benefit to the soldier.

Mr. McMURRAY. An allotment to a dependent of a soldier is a benefit to the soldier.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. If the woman voluntarily enlists and has no dependents, she would not have any allotment to give. She must have no dependents when she enlists. If she acquires dependents after enlisting that should be her responsibility. Therefore she gets every benefit that the soldier gets. If I did not think so, I would not vote for the bill.

Mr. KUNKEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. I am in accord with the opinion the gentleman expressed on section 6, the dependent allowance provisions in this bill.

Mr. McMURRAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. If the gentleman's position is correct and section 6 should be eliminated, it would be possible for a woman to make an allowance to her husband who is in the Army, and he to make an allowance to her, with the Government paying both of them. Does the gentleman think that is proper?

Mr. McMURRAY. I think there has been loose thinking on the question of allowance. I happen to be one of seven Members of this House who, on a standing vote, voted against a bill which wanted to restrict the Selective Service Act on the basis of dependency. I do not think dependency ought to be considered of major importance, and I believe it is the responsibility of the Government to make allowances for dependents when men and women volunteer their services to the armed forces of the United States. Now, I do not want to argue this. I merely state that I am opposed to section 6, if it does in fact discriminate against women. I hope that we will be sensible, that we will really be proud of our women, that we will defeat the pending amendment and pass the bill.

Mr. KUNKEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. It seems to me that the objection urged by the gentleman

from Ohio could certainly be cured by legislative provision.

Mr. McMURRAY. I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. IZAC, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 495, to establish a Woman's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky), there were—ayes 75, noes 13.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 260, nays 39, answered "present" 1, not voting 132, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—260

Allen, Ill.	Bonner	Cooley
Allen, La.	Bradley, Mich.	Cooper
Andersen, H. Carl	Bradley, Pa.	Cravens
Anderson, Calif.	Brehm	Crawford
Anderson, N. Mex.	Brooks	Creal
Andresen, August H.	Brown, Ga.	Cunningham
Andrews	Brown, Ohio	Curley
Angell	Bryson	Curtis
Arends	Buffett	D'Alesandro
Auchincloss	Bulwinkle	Davis
Barrett	Busbey	Dawson
Bates, Ky.	Canfield	Day
Beall	Cannon, Mo.	Delaney
Beckworth	Carlson, Kans.	Dewey
Bennett, Mich.	Carter	Dilweg
Bennett, Mo.	Case	Dingell
Blackney	Chiperfield	Domengeaux
Bland	Church	Doughton
Bloom	Clevenger	Durham
Bolton	Coffee	Eberharter
	Cole, Mo.	Ellis
	Cole, N. Y.	Ellison, Md.
	Colmer	Elston, Ohio
Engel	Kelley	Price
Fellows	Kilday	Priest
Fenton	Kinzer	Rabaut
Fisher	Knutson	Ramey
Fitzpatrick	Kunkel	Ramspeck
Flannagan	LaFollette	Reed, Ill.
Fogarty	Landis	Reed, N. Y.
Forand	Larcade	Rees, Kans.
Ford	LeCompte	Rivers
Fulbright	LeFevre	Rizley
Gale	Lemke	Robertson
Gathings	Lesinski	Robsion, Ky.
Gavagan	Lewis, Ohio	Rockwell
Gavin	Luce	Rodgers, Pa.
Gearhart	Ludlow	Rogers, Calif.
Gilchrist	McCord	Rogers, Mass.
Gillette	McCormack	Rohrbough
Gillie	McCowen	Rowan
Goodwin	McGehee	Sadowski
Gordon	McGregor	Sasscer
Graham	McKenzie	Sauthoff
Grant, Ind.	McMurray	Scanlon
Gross	Madden	Schuetz
Gwynne	Magnuson	Schwabe
Hagen	Mahon	Shafer
Hale	Maloney	Short
Halleck	Mansfield, Mont.	Sikes
Hancock	Mansfield, Tex.	Simpson, Ill.
Harless, Ariz.	Marcantonio	Slaughter
Harness, Ind.	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Va.
Harris, Ark.	Martin, Mass.	Smith, W. Va.
Harris, Va.	Mason	Smith, Wis.
Hartley	May	Sparkman
Hays	Merrow	Spence
Hébert	Michener	Springer
Hendricks	Miller, Conn.	Stefan
Herter	Miller, Mo.	Stewart
Hill	Mills	Stockman
Hinshaw	Monkiewicz	Sullivan
Hoch	Monroney	Sumner, Ill.
Hoeven	Morison, La.	Sumners, Tex.
Holifield	Morrison, N. C.	Sundstrom
Holmes, Mass.	Mott	Talbot
Holmes, Wash.	Murdock	Talle
Hope	Murray, Tenn.	Thomas, N. J.
Horan	Murray, Wis.	Thomas, Tex.
Howell	Myers	Thomason
Hull	Newsome	Tibbott
Izac	Norton	Tolan
Jarman	O'Brien, Ill.	Towe
Jennings	O'Brien, N. Y.	Troutman
Jensen	O'Connor	Van Zandt
Johnson, Ind.	O'Hara	Voorhis, Calif.
Johnson, J. Leroy	O'Konski	Vorys, Ohio
Johnson, Luther A.	O'Neal	Wadsworth
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Outland	Walter
Johnson, Okla.	Patman	Ward
Johnson, Ward	Patton	Wasielewski
Jones	Peterson, Fla.	Wheat
Judd	Phillips	White
Kean	Pittenger	Whittington
Kearney	Ploeser	Wickersham
Keefe	Poage	Winter
	Poulson	Wolcott
	Powers	Wolverton, N. J.
		Wright

NAYS—39

Abernethy	Hare	Peterson, Ga.
Arnold	Hart	Rankin
Bell	Heidinger	Richards
Bishop	Hobbs	Somers, N. Y.
Boren	Johnson	Starnes, Ala.
Burdick	Anton J.	Tarver
Camp	Johnson,	Vincent, Ky.
Chapman	Calvin D.	Vursell
Chenoweth	Kerr	West
Folger	Lambertson	Whelchel, Ga.
Fulmer	Lanham	Whitten
Gore	McMillan	Winstead
Gossett	Manasco	Zimmerman
Gregory	Pace	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Butler

NOT VOTING—132

Baldwin, Md.	Clark	Douglas
Baldwin, N. Y.	Clason	Drewry
Barden	Cochran	Dworshak
Barry	Compton	Eaton
Bates, Mass.	Costello	Elliott
Bender	Courtney	Ellsworth
Boykin	Cox	Elmer
Buckley	Crosser	Fay
Burch, Va.	Culkin	Feighan
Burchill, N. Y.	Cullen	Fernandez
Burgin	Dickstein	Fish
Byrne	Dies	Furlong
Cannon, Fla.	Dirksen	Gallagher
Capozzoli	Disney	Gamble
Carson, Ohio	Ditter	Gerlach
Celler	Dondero	Gibson
Gifford	Lynch	Schiffler
Gorski	McGranery	Scott
Granger	McLean	Sheppard
Grant, Ala.	McWilliams	Sheridan
Green	Maas	Simpson, Pa.
Griffiths	Merritt	Smith, Maine
Guyer	Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Ohio
Hall,	Miller, Pa.	Snyder
Edwin Arthur	Mruk	Stanley
Hall,	Mundt	Steagall
Leonard W.	Murphy	Stearns, N. H.
Heffernan	Nichols	Stevenson
Hess	Norman	Taber
Hoffman	Norrell	Taylor
Jackson	O'Brien, Mich.	Treadway
Jeffrey	O'Leary	Vinson, Ga.
Jenkins	O'Toole	Weaver
Jonkman	Pfeifer	Weichel, Ohio
Kee	Philbin	Weiss
Kefauver	Plumley	Welch
Kennedy	Pracht	Wene
Keogh	Randolph	Wigglesworth
Kilburn	Reece, Tenn.	Willey
King	Robinson, Utah	Wilson
Kirwan	Rolph	Wolfenden, Pa.
Kleberg	Rowe	Woodruff, Mich.
Klein	Russell	Woodrum, Va.
Lane	Sabath	Worley
Lea	Satterfield	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Courtney for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Compton.
Mr. Tarver with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Jonkman.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Cochran with Mrs. Smith of Maine.
Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Schiffler.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Rolph.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Willey.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Pracht.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. King with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. McGranery with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. Furlong with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Green with Mr. Jeffrey.
Mr. Russell with Mr. Welchel of Ohio.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Lea with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Rowe.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to establish a Women's Army

Corps for service in the Army of the United States."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish to announce there will be no legislative business at the session to be held tomorrow.

PRINTING OF ADDRESS OF PRIME MINISTER CHURCHILL BEFORE JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I submit a concurrent resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Con. Res. 21), as follows:

Resolved, by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the address delivered before the joint meeting of the Members of the two Houses of Congress by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Right Honorable Winston Churchill, on Wednesday, May 19, 1943, be printed as a House document and that 30,000 additional copies be printed for the House Document Room.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include therein certain subject matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL FOOD CONFERENCE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have just had a long-distance call from the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. SMITH, in Hot Springs, Va., who has been in constant attendance at the International Food Conference.

When I left Hot Springs on Saturday evening, after consultation with Judge Jones, the permanent chairman of the conference, he assured me that the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. SMITH, and I would both be handed all releases which have been given out as official statements of all delegates at that conference, and I may say that up to that time I had given to me approximately four inches of such documents, mimeographed, that went into the hands of all the delegates, and some of it no doubt, to the press. In other words it was, to say the least, public information.

I have just been informed by the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. SMITH, that for some reason, since my departure, no similar documents have since been handed to him and that he has been unable to obtain any such documents. Therefore, because of the secrecy which seems to have been assumed at this conference, the gentleman from Ohio, Dr. SMITH, and myself are today introducing a concurrent resolution which I will put in the hopper at this time.

THE OPENING OF INDEPENDENT COPPER MINES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a recent release of the Senate Special Committee on Small Business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the commodities of which our country has suffered the greatest shortage has been copper. A statement by Mr. Eberstadt when he was with the War Production Board indicated that we were 50 percent short of copper even for war needs. And we all know how desperately copper is needed for electric power transmission and many other purposes if our domestic economy is to function at full capacity.

Nevertheless, we are at present dependent for 85 percent of all our copper upon the Big Three copper corporations of the country, and so far their influences have been sufficient to prevent the opening of some of the smaller independent and, in some instances, higher-cost mines. I am, therefore, very gratified indeed to be able to report to the House that within the past 10 days authority has at last been granted by the War Production Board for the opening of three important copper mines heretofore idle. It is my belief that a considerable portion of the credit for this is due to the persistent efforts of the Senate Committee on Small Business, to Mr. C. E. Wilson, of the War Production Board, and to some individual Members of Congress who have been fighting as hard as they know how against monopolistic bottlenecks in the production of needed metals. I include with my remarks at this point a recent release of the Senate Special Committee on Small Business dealing with this matter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 17.—Charles E. Wilson, Executive Vice Chairman, War Production Board, has communicated to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman, Senate Committee on Small Business, an interpretation of the Government's labor policy affecting the domestic mining industry, which says that "the scarcity of labor at this time or in any particular mining district will not be an influencing factor in guiding our policy to bring in new mines which produce metals so necessary in our war effort."

This interpretation is regarded as a marked departure from the position which the War Production Board has followed since the injection of the strategic raw-materials question into the war-policy equation. Apparently it also throws down the gantlet to the War Manpower Commission, which has heretofore shown no indication of relenting in its policy of sanctioning no new, domestic, nonferrous mining work in sections where labor shortages exist.

Touching on this point, the interpretation by Executive Vice Chairman Wilson contains this significant reference: "The miners required in producing these metals will be made available from some source."

This new development has arisen rapidly from a situation created a month ago, when, at the request of President Roosevelt, Donald M. Nelson, Chairman, War Production Board, addressed a letter to the Chief Executive, setting forth certain policies to guide all the war agencies concerned in the production of strategic metals and materials.

At this time Mr. Nelson said: "As I size up the risks involved in seeking all we can get versus something short of that, the risks are much less serious under a policy of seeking all we can get."

Mr. Nelson also said: "I believe our policy should be to assign a very high preference so far as manpower goes, to the relatively small needs of domestic mining. We should make even more aggressive efforts to provide labor, by recruiting and training and perhaps military furloughs. * * * We must find ways to provide adequate working forces not only for operating mines but also for new projects."

Mr. Nelson's letter was transmitted by the President to Senator MURRAY with a note containing the words: "I do approve these policies, and am making them public in this letter to you."

Vice Chairman Wilson's communication to Senator MURRAY, released for publication today, carried this statement:

"We recognize the labor condition that will continue to exist and believe, with careful cooperation of all agencies having to do with manpower and labor along with the Army, that the required production of nonferrous metals will be forthcoming.

"As set forth in the policy attached to the letter written to you by the President under date of April 24, 1943, the scarcity of labor at this time or in any particular mining district will not be an influencing factor in guiding our policy to bring in new mines which produce metals so necessary in our war effort. The miners required in producing these metals will be made available from some source.

"We recognize that the heavy drain being made on the mines now operating makes it necessary that we bring in new properties so as to keep the production of critical metals on a basis required by our over-all war program."

Senator MURRAY expressed the conviction that the Wilson letter is the most important statement to the domestic mining industry since the President announced his approval of War Production Board's mining policy. "It makes crystal clear the attitude of War Production Board toward domestic mining and its determination to get all possible production from domestic sources," said the Montana Senator.

Senator JAMES G. SCRUGHAM, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee's Subcommittee on Mining and Minerals Industry, declared: "In spite of the announcement of the President's policy, there appeared to be a tendency in some quarters to avoid its spirit and to interpret it with strong reservations, particularly in connection with the mine-labor shortage. Mr. Wilson's unqualified and definite interpretation removes all doubt regarding War Production Board's intention to carry out the policy so far as is humanly possible. It will be a specific guide for the Facilities Bureau when considering new projects. There need no longer be any reluctance on the part of War Production Board's Labor Division to give approval of applications for additional premiums so necessary to keep many small and marginal mines operating. Under this policy interpretation, which is as clear and specific as anything to come from

War Production Board so far, many mining projects which are needed to increase the production of strategic and critical minerals and for which approval has been withheld, can now be approved. The Mining and Minerals Industry Subcommittee is gratified that Mr. Wilson recognizes the necessity for a forceful, simple statement of War Production Board's aims and that he has the courage to stand behind the mining industry in its all-out war effort."

Mr. Speaker, those who have not followed carefully the trend of events in connection with metals production, will probably not realize the very great significance of the passages in Mr. Wilson's letter to Senator MURRAY wherein he states that from now on alleged labor shortages will not be allowed to be used as excuses or grounds for objection by forces seeking to prevent full, all-out production of these necessary commodities. For this charge of "labor shortage," along with other grounds, has heretofore been repeatedly used in the manner I have just described.

It is earnestly to be hoped that the constructive action which I have here brought to the attention of the House may be followed by similar action to the end that some of the shortages in steel, copper, and other metals may be eliminated.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the fine work he has been doing about the copper program.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman very much. I know he is profoundly and patriotically interested in this whole question.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DOMENGEAUX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 40 minutes.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain statements compiled by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take the time allotted to me this afternoon to discuss the question of what a $300,000,000,000 debt will mean to this country. The President in his message to this Congress submitting his Budget told us that he had a $170,000,000,000 unexpended balance. In the same Budget message he asked us for $109,000,000,000 more, making a total of $279,000,000,000 unspent. On May 24 of this year the national debt had exceeded $139,000,000,000. In view of these facts and in the face of these appropriations and unexpended balances, no one can doubt but that the debt will reach or exceed $300,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, I am charged with the responsibility of assisting in the drafting, holding hearings on, and steering through the House, War Department appropriation bills aggregating billions of dollars. I have tried to discharge that duty to the best of my ability. I have tried to do what little I could to see that the taxpayer gets value received for the money we appropriate.

In 1941 I made a study of cantonment construction. I brought before this House a series of reports. The story can be told in one paragraph.

According to the congressional committee known as the Graham committee, it cost $206,000,000 to build the cantonments where 4,000,000 men were housed and trained in the World War No. 1. It cost $800,000,000 to build the cantonments where the first 1,200,000 men were housed and trained in this war.

Our national debt at the conclusion of World War No. 1 was approximately $27,000,000,000. This included some $11,000,000,000 loaned to foreign countries. We are talking glibly about a national debt which we are told will reach, or may exceed, $300,000,000,000. The war is costing us many times what it is costing England or Russia and when the war is over we will be burdened with the greatest national debt in the history of the world. The tragic part is that the people themselves cannot understand just what a $300,000,000,000 national debt will mean. The figures are so colossal that they are utterly beyond the comprehension of the individual citizen.

If the average individual knew just what that debt meant his demand for economy both in and outside the war effort, his insistence upon obtaining value received for his tax dollar would be irresistible upon the executive and the legislative branches of the Government.

It is with a hope that I can make the average taxpayer and citizen realize just what a $300,000,000,000 national debt will mean that I am speaking to this House today. If I can contribute just a little toward arousing public opinion on this question I shall feel that my efforts have been worth while.

On February 3, 1938, I delivered a speech on the floor of this House on the public and private debt of America. In connection with this speech I inserted tables giving the following information on each of the 48 States in the Union. Table 1, column 1, contained the name of each State; column 2, the population; column 3, the assessed valuation; column 4, the share of the national debt on a per capita basis; and column 5, the percentage that the State's share of the national debt was of its assessed valuation. I also gave other information in these tables. At the same time I inserted a table giving the same information for the State of Michigan by counties.

Again, on May 17, 1939, I inserted into the RECORD an article written by me for the Hearst papers, and which appeared in the Chicago Herald and Examiner.

In both the speech and in the article I pointed out the danger of the policy which was then being followed by the present administration. In the article published on May 17, 1939, I used the following language; I quote:

> This policy will lead us further and further on the road to spending and borrowing, and will inevitably be followed by unlimited inflation.

I then pointed out what the inevitable result of inflation would be. I think my record in trying to economize and obtain more for the taxpayers' dollar is well known in this House. Ever since I have been in Congress, and this is my fifth term, I have tried to awaken public consciousness, and have tried to make the public understand just where we are going and how we are going there.

The spending and talking of spending of billions and hundreds of billions of dollars has so confused the public mind that talking of billions alone will not bring about a consciousness of what is happening.

Every home owner and property owner knows what assessed valuation is because the taxes he has paid are computed upon the assessed valuation placed upon the property which he owns. I had hoped, and still hope, that by making a comparison between the assessed valuation of the property in America with the national debt, on a per capita basis, I can bring home to the people the enormity of the debt we are incurring and the results of such a debt.

Recently I wrote to each State and the District of Columbia and obtained their latest figures on assessed valuation. By assessed valuation I mean the value of every piece of property real and personal, tangible and intangible, that each State is placing upon its assessment rolls or is assessing for taxes.

WHAT WILL YOUR SHARE OF A $300,000,000,000 NATIONAL DEBT BE?

I have again compiled three tables which I am placing in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. Table 1, column 1, gives the name of each State and the District of Columbia. Column 2, the population of each State under the 1940 Census. Column 3, the assessed valuation of each State according to the latest available figures, which are, with the exception of one or two, 1941 or 1942 assessments. Column 4 shows what each State's share on a per capita basis will be of a $300,000,000,000 national debt. Column 5 shows the percentage that that share of the national debt will be of each State's assessed valuation.

I am also enclosing a second table which gives the same information on each county of my home State of Michigan and the third table, which gives the same information on each of the 11 counties which comprise the Ninth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent.

PUBLIC CONSCIOUSNESS MUST BE AROUSED IF WASTE IS TO BE ELIMINATED

After visiting 47 defense plants and traveling approximately 4,500 miles over a period of nearly 2 months and after examining and studying cost sheets, I have come to the conclusion:

First. Our ability as a nation to meet our financial obligations of the future will depend upon the policy we now follow in our expenditures.

Second. That it is absolutely essential that public consciousness of this debt should be awakened in order that we might eliminate some of the excess costs due to various causes in our production program.

Third. That only by eliminating such excess costs can we hope to avoid the ruinous results of inflation, the danger of which I pointed out as far back as 1938.

I am hoping, vainly I am afraid, but hoping nevertheless, that we will never reach the $300,000,000,000 national debt limit. The authorized national debt limit now is $210,000,000,000.

People have a right to rely upon you and upon me and upon every other public official to obtain as nearly a dollar's worth of value as possible for every dollar we spend. They have a right to depend upon us and to expect us to do everything we can to eliminate such excess costs, whether these expenditures are made for war purposes or nonwar purposes.

A $300,000,000,000 NATIONAL DEBT IS TWICE THE ASSESSED VALUATION OF EVERY PIECE OF PROPERTY IN AMERICA

The population of the 48 States and the District of Columbia, under the 1940 Census, is 131,669,275. The assessed valuation of the 48 States and the District of Columbia, according to the latest figures available, is $150,002,511,228. A $300,000,000,000 national debt is exactly twice the assessed valuation of every piece of property in America. Of course, one can argue that assessed valuations differ, and they do differ. Some States may assess on a 40 percent basis and other States may assess on what they call a 100 percent cash value basis.

A few years ago a study was made of the District of Columbia, which is supposed to be on a cash value basis. The study was made in connection with the tax problem and the share that the National Government should bear of the District's expenditures. If I remember correctly, the assessed valuation of the District of Columbia represented about 70 percent of the actua' value of the property within the District which was assessed.

THE ASSESSED VALUATION IS FIXED BY AN OFFICIAL OF THE STATE CHARGED BY LAW WITH FIXING THAT VALUATION

Property value is a relative term. Property value is determined, of course, by both the physical value and the income the property is producing. Apartment houses which cost millions of dollars were torn down in the city of Detroit during the depression to make room for parking lots because the owners could not pay the taxes on these apartment houses as their rentals had dwindled to almost nothing. Assessed valuation is the only valuation which is fixed by an official who is charged by law with the duty of placing an actual value upon each specific piece of property. It is the one type of valuation that we can understand and it is only when we realize that a $300,000,000,000 debt is twice the assessed valuation of every piece of property in the entire nation that we begin to realize just where we are going in our national debt and what the ultimate result may be.

ALABAMA'S SHARE OF A $300,000,000,000 NATIONAL DEBT ON A PER CAPITA BASIS WILL BE 606 PERCENT OF ITS ASSESSED VALUATION

I would like to comment upon some of the States and their share of this liability. The first of the alphabetical list of States is Alabama. Alabama has, according to 1940 census figures, a population of 2,832,961. The assessed valuation of that State, according to the latest figures obtainable is $1,063,905,950. Alabama's share of a $300,000,000,000 national debt on a per capita basis will be $6,453,485,158, or 606 percent of its assessed valuation.

ILLINOIS' SHARE OF A $300,000,000,000 NATIONAL DEBT ON A PER CAPITA BASIS WILL BE 342 PERCENT OF ITS ASSESSED VALUATION

The population of the State of Illinois, according to 1940 census figures, is 7,897,241. Its assessed valuation, according to the latest figures obtainable is $5,246,400,000. Illinois' share of a $300,000,000,000 national debt on a per capita basis will be $17,989,914,998, or 342 percent of its assessed valuation. This amount is $1,000,000,000 greater than the lowest point of the entire World War No. 1 national debt which was reached under the Hoover administration.

If the people of the State of Illinois were compelled to vote upon themselves a bond issue of nearly $18,000,000,000, a debt nearly 3½ times the assesed valuation of every piece of property on the assessment rolls of that State, would the people of that State be apathetic toward waste of Government funds and toward excess costs in the future as they are and have been in the past?

MICHIGAN'S SHARE OF A $300,000,000,000 NATIONAL DEBT ON A PER CAPITA BASIS WILL BE 180 PERCENT OF ITS ASSESSED VALUATION

The population of the State of Michigan, according to 1940 census figures, is 5,256,106. Its assessed valuation, according to the latest figures obtainable, is $6,623,578,978. Michigan's share of a $300,000,000,000 national debt will be $11,973,409,468, or 180 percent of its assessed valuation.

If the people of the State of Michigan were compelled to vote upon themselves a bond issue of nearly $12,000,000,000, which represents nearly twice its assessed valuation, would the people of Michigan be as apathetic, as callous toward the waste and excess cost in the future as they have been in the past? Would not the people of the State of Michigan insist that something be done instead of merely talking, as they are, about such excess cost and waste?

NEW YORK, OHIO, AND PENNSYLVANIA'S SHARE OF A $300,000,000,000 NATIONAL DEBT ON A PER CAPITA BASIS WILL EXCEED THEIR ASSESSED VALUATIONS

New York's share of a $300,000,000,000 national debt will be $30,705,485,476, or 108 percent of its assessed valuation. New York's share will exceed the all-time high of the entire national debt up to 1933.

Ohio's share will be $15,735,540,136, or 165 percent of its assessed valuation, while Pennsylvania's share of a $300,000,000,000 national debt will be $22,552,610,040, or more than twice the assessed valuation of all the property placed on the assessment rolls within that State.

May I ask again, would the people of New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania be as deaf to demands of public economy and excess public expenditures if they had to vote upon themselves a bond issue for these tremendous amounts of money, or would the people of New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and other States insist upon more careful expenditure of both the war and nonwar dollar?

WHAT THE INDIVIDUAL COUNTIES' SHARE OF A $300,000,000,000 NATIONAL DEBT ON A PER CAPITA BASIS WILL BE FOR THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Let us take some of the counties in my own State of Michigan. The first on the alphabetical list is Alcona County which has a population, according to 1940 Census figures, of only 5,463. The assessed valuation of this little county is $4,163,840, while its share of a $300,000,000,000 national debt will be $12,444,714, or nearly three times its assessed valuation.

Lake County, the smallest county in my district, has a population of 4,798. Its assessed valuation is $2,406,787, while its share of a $300,000,000,000 national debt on a per capita basis will be $10,929,844, or 454 percent of its assessed valuation.

Muskegon County, the largest county in my district, which has numerous war industries, has, according to 1940 Census figures, a population of 94,501. Its assessed valuation, according to latest figures obtainable, is $92,880,579, while its share of a $300,000,000,000 national debt will be over $215,000,000, or 231 percent of its assessed valuation.

THE SHARE OF THE NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN OF A $300,000,000,000 NATIONAL DEBT WILL BE 285 PERCENT OF THE ASSESSED VALUATION OF THE ENTIRE DISTRICT

The population of the Ninth Congressional District, according to 1940 census figures, is 230,861. The assessed valuation of the 11 counties representing my district is $189,569,169, while my district's share of a $300,000,000,000 national debt will be $539,569,358, or 285 percent of the assessed valuation of the entire district.

Would the people of these individual counties be apathetic toward pleas for economy if they were compelled to vote upon themselves a bond issue which would, in some instances, be from four to five times the assessed valuation of all the property in their several counties?

I am bringing this matter before the House in the hope that publication of these staggering figures will make the people back home less insistent upon the expenditure of public moneys within their districts and more insistent in their demands for the elimination of waste and extravagance and excess cost, both in war and nonwar expenditures.

REPORTS OF WAR COSTS WILL FOLLOW WITHIN THE NEXT FEW WEEKS

I shall bring before this House within the next few weeks results of studies I have made along this line, including the results of the study I am making of war costs and production costs in defense

plants. I have made this study as a member of the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee in the hope that I may in my own humble way contribute something toward the reduction of this tremendous burden which our people are and will be asked to bear.

In conclusion, may I say that Congress, and every individual in the Government who is charged with the expenditure of the taxpayers' money, must make every effort to reduce to a minimum the cost of civilian activities and to eliminate every dollar of unnecessary expenditures or waste both in nonwar and in war activities. While I realize that war production comes first and economy second, while I realize that war is waste, I also feel that there comes a time when we can, and must stop throwing money out of the window or down a rat hole. There comes a time when waste not only fails to contribute toward the war effort but actually retards the war effort and retards production.

Only an aroused public demanding and insisting upon immediate action by both the legislative and executive branches of the Government can bring about a change in a policy which has been responsible for so much waste and excess cost. This waste and excess cost, upon which I shall comment in a series of reports, must be self-evident and can be seen by every citizen who is concerned about the ability of our taxpayers to meet the ultimate tax obligation imposed upon them by this tremendous debt.

EXHIBIT 1

What a $300,000,000,000 debt will cost each of the 48 States on a per capita basis, not including interest

State	Population, 1940 census	Assessed valuation of each State [1]	Each State's share of a $300,000,000,000 national debt on a per capita basis	Percent of assessed valuation [2]	State	Population, 1940 census	Assessed valuation of each State [1]	Each State's share of a $300,000,000,000 national debt on a per capita basis	Percent of assessed valuation [2]
Alabama	2,832,961	$1,063,905,950	$6,453,485,158	606	Nevada	110,247	$221,232,532	251,142,666	113
Arizona	499,261	416,253,674	1,137,361,558	273	New Hampshire	491,524	571,418,493	1,119,691,672	195
Arkansas	1,949,387	476,837,675	4,440,703,586	931	New Jersey	4,160,165	5,445,446,356	9,486,855,870	174
California	6,907,387	7,679,695,379	15,735,027,586	205	New Mexico	531,818	339,470,980	1,211,481,404	356
Colorado	1,123,296	750,727,610	2,558,868,288	340	New York	13,479,142	28,307,224,061	30,705,485,476	108
Connecticut	1,709,242	3,299,276,597	3,893,653,276	118	North Carolina	3,571,623	2,307,405,031	8,136,157,194	352
Delaware	266,505	353,504,978	607,098,390	171	North Dakota	641,935	867,026,693	1,462,327,930	168
District of Columbia	663,091	1,451,303,009	1,510,521,298	104	Ohio	6,907,612	9,526,377,299	15,735,540,136	165
Florida	1,897,414	2,126,823,548	4,321,309,092	203	Oklahoma	2,336,434	1,248,906,651	5,322,396,652	426
Georgia	3,123,723	1,243,175,256	7,115,840,994	572	Oregon	1,089,684	1,838,812,040	2,482,300,152	134
Idaho	524,873	400,127,156	1,195,660,694	298	Pennsylvania	9,900,180	11,139,696,231	22,552,610,040	202
Illinois	7,897,241	5,246,400,000	17,989,914,998	342	Rhode Island	713,346	1,480,217,639	1,625,002,188	109
Indiana	3,427,796	3,954,977,650	7,808,519,298	179	South Carolina	1,899,804	383,598,807	4,327,763,512	112
Iowa	2,538,268	2,962,561,673	5,782,174,504	194	South Dakota	642,961	944,418,287	1,464,665,158	105
Kansas	1,801,028	2,944,384,776	4,102,741,784	139	Tennessee	2,915,841	1,536,324,625	6,642,285,798	432
Kentucky	2,845,627	2,149,142,610	6,482,339,306	301	Texas	6,414,824	4,602,438,557	14,612,969,072	317
Louisiana	2,363,880	1,423,859,455	5,384,918,640	378	Utah	550,310	603,350,797	1,253,606,180	207
Maine	847,226	704,000,491	1,929,980,828	274	Vermont	359,231	288,655,358	818,328,218	283
Maryland	1,821,244	2,691,069,805	4,148,793,832	154	Virginia	2,677,773	2,290,893,977	6,099,966,894	266
Massachusetts	4,316,721	6,137,691,497	9,833,490,438	160	Washington	1,736,191	2,329,850,887	3,955,043,098	169
Michigan	5,256,106	6,623,578,978	11,973,409,468	180	West Virginia	1,901,974	2,034,065,971	4,332,696,772	213
Minnesota	2,792,300	4,917,804,550	6,360,859,400	127	Wisconsin	3,137,587	4,626,331,361	7,147,423,186	154
Mississippi	2,183,796	592,145,976	4,974,687,288	840	Wyoming	250,742	337,346,300	571,190,276	169
Missouri	3,784,664	3,978,890,388	8,621,464,592	216					
Montana	559,456	1,101,415,478	1,274,440,768	115	Total	131,669,275	150,002,511,228		
Nebraska	1,315,834	2,042,442,436	2,997,469,852	146					

[1] Latest figures available from States either 1941 or 1942 figures. Per capita, $2,278.
[2] These figures represent the percentage that a $300,000,000,000 debt would be of each State's assessed valuation.

EXHIBIT 2

What a $300,000,000,000 debt will cost each of the 83 counties of Michigan on a per capita basis, not including interest

County	Population 1940 census,	Assessed valuation of each county [1]	Each county's share of a $300,000,000,000 national debt on a per capita basis	Percent of assessed valuation [2]	County	Population, 1940 census	Assessed valuation of each county [1]	Each county's share of a $300,000,000,000 national debt on a per capita basis	Percent of assessed valuation [2]
Alcona	5,463	$4,163,840	$12,444,714	298	Lapeer	32,116	$24,701,190	$73,160,248	295
Alger	10,167	6,467,818	23,160,426	358	Leelanau	8,436	5,876,515	19,217,208	326
Allegan	41,839	38,983,772	95,309,242	244	Lenawee	53,110	59,252,997	120,984,580	204
Alpena	20,766	17,225,530	47,304,948	274	Livingston	20,863	24,390,070	47,525,914	194
Antrim	10,964	5,822,247	24,975,992	428	Luce	7,423	4,981,075	16,909,594	339
Arenac	9,233	5,729,866	21,032,774	367	Mackinac	9,438	6,053,003	21,499,764	355
Baraga	9,356	6,507,790	21,312,968	327	Macomb	107,638	94,463,083	245,199,364	259
Barry	22,613	20,186,780	51,512,414	255	Manistee	18,450	12,730,981	42,029,100	330
Bay	74,981	73,428,191	170,806,718	232	Marquette	47,144	51,567,820	107,394,032	209
Benzie	7,800	5,848,456	17,768,400	303	Mason	19,378	15,322,454	44,143,084	288
Berrien	89,117	79,138,240	203,008,526	256	Mecosta	16,902	11,984,282	38,502,756	321
Branch	25,845	22,754,413	58,874,910	258	Menominee	24,883	18,165,970	56,683,474	311
Calhoun	94,206	103,592,595	214,601,268	207	Midland	27,094	30,933,179	61,720,132	199
Cass	21,910	19,109,115	49,910,980	261	Missaukee	8,034	3,405,413	18,301,452	537
Charlevoix	13,031	8,526,025	29,684,618	348	Monroe	58,620	64,650,881	133,536,360	206
Cheboygan	13,644	6,806,560	31,081,032	456	Montcalm	28,581	25,356,046	65,107,518	256
Chippewa	27,807	22,611,915	63,344,346	280	Montmorency	3,840	2,364,425	8,747,520	370
Clare	9,163	6,498,877	20,873,314	321	Muskegon	94,501	92,880,579	215,273,278	231
Clinton	26,671	23,985,967	60,756,538	253	Newaygo	19,286	14,479,204	43,933,508	303
Crawford	3,765	2,706,220	8,576,670	316	Oakland	254,068	252,725,909	578,766,904	228
Delta	34,037	15,880,333	77,536,286	488	Oceana	14,812	10,158,836	33,741,736	332
Dickinson	28,731	15,329,220	65,449,218	426	Ogemaw	8,720	5,820,903	19,864,160	341
Eaton	34,124	29,036,322	77,734,472	267	Ontonagon	11,359	6,992,794	25,875,802	370
Emmet	15,791	12,401,540	35,971,898	290	Osceola	13,309	8,624,203	30,317,902	351
Genesee	227,944	257,749,700	519,256,432	201	Oscoda	2,543	2,287,035	5,792,954	253
Gladwin	9,385	6,011,862	21,379,030	355	Otsego	5,827	3,447,330	13,273,906	386
Gogebic	31,797	33,189,448	72,433,566	218	Ottawa	59,660	47,942,363	135,905,480	283
Grand Traverse	23,390	15,755,215	53,282,420	337	Presque Isle	12,250	9,072,225	27,905,500	307
Gratiot	32,205	31,069,663	73,362,990	236	Roscommon	3,668	3,858,256	8,355,704	216
Hillsdale	29,092	23,985,525	66,271,576	276	Saginaw	130,468	145,350,817	297,206,104	204
Houghton	47,631	15,974,018	108,502,418	679	St. Clair	76,222	95,317,897	173,633,716	182
Huron	32,584	28,423,481	74,226,352	260	St. Joseph	31,749	29,360,040	72,324,222	246
Ingham	130,616	158,813,114	297,543,248	187	Sanilac	30,114	23,676,185	68,599,692	289
Ionia	35,710	27,669,322	81,347,380	293	Schoolcraft	9,524	6,336,775	21,695,672	358
Iosco	8,560	8,893,670	19,499,680	219	Shiawassee	41,207	28,433,127	93,869,546	330
Iron	20,243	21,328,020	46,113,554	216	Tuscola	35,694	25,197,773	81,310,932	322
Isabella	25,982	20,400,737	59,186,996	290	Van Buren	35,111	29,870,818	79,982,858	267
Jackson	93,108	104,006,525	212,100,624	203	Washtenaw	80,810	101,598,334	184,085,180	181
Kalamazoo	100,085	127,210,783	227,993,630	179	Wayne	2,015,623	3,505,731,475	4,591,589,194	130
Kalkaska	5,159	2,209,660	11,752,202	531	Wexford	17,976	10,704,729	40,949,328	382
Kent	246,338	266,204,295	561,157,964	210					
Keweenaw	4,004	3,288,530	9,121,112	277	Total	5,256,106	6,623,578,978		
Lake	4,798	2,406,787	10,929,844	454					

[1] Latest figures available from counties, 1942 figures. Per capita, $2,278.
[2] These figures represent the percentage that a $300,000,000,000 debt would be of each county's assessed valuation.

EXHIBIT 3

What a $300,000,000,000 debt will cost each of the 11 counties in the Ninth Congressional District of Michigan on a per capita basis, not including interest

County	Population, 1940 census	Assessed valuation of each county [1]	Each county's share of a $300,000,000,000 national debt on a per capita basis	Percent of assessed valuation [2]	County	Population, 1940 census	Assessed valuation of each county [1]	Each county's share of a $300,000,000,000 national debt on a per capita basis	Percent of assessed valuation [2]
Benzie	7,800	$5,848,456	$17,768,400	303	Muskegon	94,501	$92,880,579	$215,273,278	231
Grand Traverse	23,390	15,755,215	53,282,420	337	Newaygo	19,286	14,479,204	43,933,508	303
Lake	4,798	2,406,787	10,929,844	454	Oceana	14,812	10,158,836	33,741,736	332
Leelanau	8,436	5,876,515	19,217,208	326	Wexford	17,976	10,704,729	40,949,328	382
Manistee	18,450	12,730,981	42,029,100	330					
Mason	19,378	15,322,454	44,143,084	288	Total	236,861	189,569,169	539,569,358	285
Missaukee	8,034	3,405,413	18,301,452	537					

[1] Latest figures available from counties, 1942 figures. Per capita $2,278.
[2] These figures represent the percentage that a $300,000,000,000 debt would be of each county's assessed valuation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman has made this survey. I congratulate him on the industry he has shown in connection with it. I wonder if in his investigation he came in contact with the contract renegotiation law. Does the gentleman have any views as to whether or not that law should be repealed?

Mr. ENGEL. I expect to discuss that matter when I come before the House later but I may say to the gentleman from Texas that I am opposed to the repeal of the renegotiation law.

Mr. PATMAN. In other words, the gentleman realizes that unless we keep that law as it is there will be at least two or three billion dollars in the hands of a few people that should not be there, because we did not have the experience upon which to let the contract at the time quickly.

Mr. ENGEL. I think the gentleman's figures of two or three billion dollars are conservative; my candid opinion is that we shall get back around five or six billion dollars. I do not agree with the gentleman that they are in the hands of a few people. I think the records show that we are taking away excess profits from a great many contractors.

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad the gentleman corrected that, because I did not know.

Mr. ENGEL. I was one of the men who helped write that clause into the bill. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] offered the amendment on the floor of the House after it had been stricken from the bill which was drafted in my committee.

I do not want to comment now upon the trip I made through the plants. I spent 2 weeks in General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler, and I have some very complete information which I shall bring to the House.

This is what has been happening. A certain company, without giving names, had a contract to manufacture 3-inch armor-piercing shells. The first contract was for $16.80 per shell. Against that first contract were charged the tools and dies and jigs, the change-over in the factory, and educating and training the labor for that particular job. That was the first contract, and that company took successive jobs. It kept reducing the price until it got the price for the same shell down to $6.50 per shell, making renegotiation unnecessary in that particular instance, undoubtedly.

However, we have other companies who say, "We cut the cost of this shell to $8.60, and we think we have done a good job." Perhaps the actual cost was $6.50, which still allows them an excess profit. I believe in giving them adequate profits, but I also believe that no company or no individual has a right to make excessive profits out of this war.

I am not only not against renegotiation, but I expect to oppose any attempt to repeal the renegotiation law.

Mr. PATMAN. I noticed the gentleman's remarks particularly about the evaluation of all property in the United States. Of course, the gentleman does not insist that the assessed value represents the true value. I believe he mentioned that. The latest and the only estimate I have been able to get is that the values of tangible property, real estate, buildings, durable goods, and things like that, will amount to about $300,000,000,000. Even at that the picture is not encouraging. I am not trying to justify any waste or any large expenditure, because I am with the gentleman in the thought that we should reduce expenditures just as much as possible.

Mr. ENGEL. I made the statement in my remarks that the assessed valuation ranged from 40 percent to what some people call 100 percent of actual value, and I commented upon the District of Columbia study which showed that they had a 70 percent valuation on the property values here where they were supposed to assess at 100 percent value. But what I am trying to do is use some method which will make the average citizen understand just what is happening and realize what $300,000,000,000 means. By a comparison with the assessed valuation, he has a yardstick which he can use to measure this debt.

Mr. PATMAN. At the same time, the gentleman realizes that we are spending only about 3 or 4 cents out of every dollar that is spent for any purpose except for the war?

Mr. ENGEL. I agree with the gentleman. I believe in giving the War Department and the Navy Department what they ask for. You cannot do anything else. But I also believe in holding them responsible for any waste that occurs, and I think the time to stop the waste is now.

Mr. PATMAN. I agree with the gentleman that we should stop every bit of waste that we can, but when you cut down nonwar expenditures, if we cut them out entirely, the amount would be insignificant in comparison with the amount spent for war.

Mr. ENGEL. That is why I included war expenditures in my remarks.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman from Michigan is one of the greatest fiscal experts we have and I believe that every thoughtful citizen is indebted to him for the splendid work that he has done along the line of fiscal policies and the investigations and reports that he has made. Here is a matter that has been bothering me for some time. We are appropriating these vast sums of money and we want to appropriate them because we want the Army and the Navy and everyone else to have all the money that they need. Naturally not all of this money will be spent by the time this war ends. There cannot be any other end to the matter than that, because we cannot handle the affair in any other way, for we must have a supply of things and not let it run down. What is being done by the Appropriations Committee, if anything, toward the recapture of appropriated moneys, so that they will not be in the hands of anyone who may divert them to any other purpose or who may spend them for nonwar projects?

Mr. ENGEL. If the gentleman will examine the appropriation bills, billions of dollars have been reappropriated. The appropriations lapse at the end of the fiscal year and revert to the Treasury unless they are reappropriated.

I think the gentleman will find in every contract let by the War Department, and I think the Navy Department has the same provision, a clause which enables the War and Navy Departments under certain conditions to cancel the contract in case an armistice is signed or in case peace comes. The gentleman will find that the Government is protected. While we are getting some of this money back, and some of it will not be expended, yet there is going to be a great deal of money required to readjust conditions.

For instance, when a contract is such that a factory has to be made over, so to speak, to make it possible to perform certain war work, naturally, you cannot chop the contract off and let the factory owner restore his factory to where it was before the war without compensation. You have to allow something to get it back to where it was, to give him a chance to get back to production. The committee has questioned the War Department officials very carefully along the line of having such clauses in these contracts.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not speaking so much of actual contract obligations. I think we all agree that too much of an abrupt stoppage of war contracts not only is injurious to business but prevents us from going to peacetime matters. It may have a bad international effect if we do not retain a strong army until the matter is completely settled; but in the beginning of the gentleman's remarks I understood him to say that the President had on hand a large sum of money which was not spent.

Mr. ENGEL. The President had at the beginning of this year an unexpended balance of $170,000,000,000, and he asked for $109,000,000,000 more to carry him through June 30, 1944.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose at the time the war does end that there would be $100,000,000,000 in the same category as this $170,000,000,000. What would be the status of that; what would happen?

Mr. ENGEL. In the first place, we are just beginning to get the Army up to where it is approaching what we hope will be the limit, which means that your Army pay item is going to be perhaps three or four times as large as it was last year. Again, when peace comes, it will take a certain length of time before the Army can be discharged and get it back into civilian life.

There are certain appropriations which will lapse. When we appropriate an amount for Army pay, that sum can be expended only for Army pay. If there is no Army to pay it cannot be paid out, and it lapses back to the Treasury. There is so much for subsistence, but there are certain other lump sums that we have given to the President, to go out and purchase any equipment he wants to, and certain other funds that he must have in order to carry on the war, for which he does not have to account to Congress. Some of those funds may carry on through after peace is declared.

Mr. CURTIS. How about lease-lend funds? It seems to me that they can expend lease-lend funds for almost anything the human mind can imagine so long as it does not go to a citizen of the United States.

Mr. ENGEL. They can expend lease-lend money as long as the Lease-Lend Act is in force.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, he can go on and spend lease-lend funds for the benefit of foreign nations after this war ends.

Mr. ENGEL. I think he can.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has inspected many of these plants. I wonder if he is satisfied with the progress that is being made toward winning this war. That is, is the gentleman satisfied that everything is being done that can be done by the Army and the Navy and the different armed services?

Mr. ENGEL. Well, again, I do not want to anticipate remarks that I am going to make in the future. In order to dispel any doubt I want to say this, and I want to be fair, I do not think we are doing everything we can do. I do not think we ever reach our objective. But I believe we are doing a splendid job of production.

Mr. PATMAN. In the training of the men, does not the gentleman marvel at the fine coordination and the harmony that exists in getting these men together, training them, getting supplies to them, hundreds of thousands of different articles?

Mr. ENGEL. May I say I have not visited the training camps. I have confined my activities to going through the actual plants. While I think they are doing a good job in training, I believe there is room for improvement in our training program.

Mr. PATMAN. Does not the gentleman believe that even though there should be some waste, as much as we hate waste, that the main object is winning the war, and we have to risk a little?

Mr. ENGEL. I agree with the gentleman absolutely, but there comes a time when waste of public funds actually retards the war effort.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, we do not want to do that.

Mr. ENGEL. On the other hand, there comes a time when it does not help the war effort. War is waste, as I said before. You cannot help but have some waste.

Mr. PATMAN. And haste makes waste, too.

Mr. ENGEL. Haste makes waste, but without anticipating what I am going to say, when I get through with my remarks which are to come, there will not be any doubt whatever and there will not be any difference in the gentleman's opinion and mine as to what is happening in this war program. I do not mean to imply any criticism of the War Department, General Marshall, or the General Staff, but I am talking about conditions which exist, and which I do not want to anticipate now. I can take the gentleman to my office and convince him that some things are happening that should not happen. I think that some costs are highly excessive.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, anything that is against the public interest I think the gentleman is rendering a great service by disclosing it.

Mr. ENGEL. I agree with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE SHIPSHAW ALUMINUM PROJECT

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to pay my compliments also to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. I think he not only represents the people of his district but also one of the almost forgotten virtues of Americanism, that of thrift, of getting the job done with the least waste of time and money.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to bring to the attention of the House and put into the RECORD a matter about which I have had a voluminous correspondence from the people of the Pacific Northwest, and particularly from the people of my district. They want to know why a grant of $68,500,000 of the taxpayers' money was made by the administration, without interest, to the Aluminum Co. of Canada in order that they might develop a property belonging to the Aluminum Trust in Canada. They ask for an investigation.

It is my conviction that matters such as these demand a complete and factual answer. The retention of confidence in Government demands that rumors—if they are rumors—be stilled and the faith of the people in their administration be restored with a candid recitation of sound policy as substantiated by a history of the facts. If there has been a central purpose in the present Congress, it has been to attempt to restore a sort of morality in our domestic dealings within the borders of the United States.

In the matter of farm credit, this Congress has taken action to oppose the making of nonrecourse loans. Yet here, apparently, is a huge, nonrecourse loan to the Aluminum Trust for the purpose of developing not a productiveness of our own country but that of a foreign nation, friendly though it be.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Has the gentleman asked Mr. Jesse Jones about that?

Mr. HORAN. I have asked him about it; yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Has the gentleman received an answer from him?

Mr. HORAN. Yes; and my speech will show that his answer is very lame.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman expect to put his answer in the RECORD?

Mr. HORAN. His answer is already in the RECORD. It is in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations. I might say to the gentleman from Texas that I am not here to indict anybody; I am here to present the side of the case as the people themselves are seeing it. I am supporting a resolution calling for an investigation.

Mr. PATMAN. If there is anything wrong, I hope it is gone into. That, of course, was one of the charges I brought against Mr. Mellon when I impeached him and caused him to be driven from the Treasury, and, naturally, I would not have any love for the Aluminum Co. of America in a case like that, but I do think that Jesse Jones is one of the most honorable and one of the most able men we have in our Government, and I just do not think that he would do anything

wrong about it. I hope the gentleman looks into it thoroughly.

Mr. HORAN. I hope the Congress will pay attention to what the gentleman from Texas has just said, and respect this resolution and pass it, so we can get all the facts.

I have been inclined to agree and go along in this denunciation of what is termed nonrecourse loans Certainly, any honorable man who borrows money wishes to pay it back dollar for dollar with reasonable interest. He wants to do that by being protected in his markets. He wants to receive a reasonable reward over and above the cost of labor, material, and management. He wants to serve his Nation and the world by supplying your spiritual, physical, and material needs. He knows he must do this at the price you can pay.

But here we have the case of nonrecourse loan made, not to our American farmer, not to be used to pay American labor, but to subsidize foreign production and foreign commerce. If moral values are to be defined and imposed at home, it would seem both imperative and expedient that those same moral values attend every instance of our foreign relations. Consequently, I have joined with my colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. COFFEE] in demanding an investigation of the whole Shipshaw affair, and have asked for this time that I might review some of the background, some of the history, and some of the incidents which I feel should be justified or indicted by a full investigation. It should be mentioned here also that there are many legislators in the Canadian Parliament as concerned about this as we are here.

The story of the Shipshaw affair begins with the period immediately following the World War because at that time the Aluminum Trust decided, as a matter of policy, to look in foreign fields for locations for production plants. They wanted to find places where they could develop power sites—so important to the production of aluminum—where they did not have to compete with the high-priced power demands of domestic and small industrial consumers. They were aware, of course, of the tremendous opportunities in the western part of our great United States, but they excluded our own West because of the transportation burdens. I want you to remember that fact when we get to the "escalator clauses" later on.

In 1922, they acquired five power properties in Norway. The Shipshaw location entered the picture when in 1925 Alcoa bought from the James B. Duke interests three power sites on the Saguenay River in the Province of Quebec, purportedly for the purpose of eliminating a possible future competitor. On the Saguenay there were three power sites, the Isle Maligne, the Chute-a-Caron, and the Shipshaw.

In 1925 the Aluminum Trust developed the Isle Maligne power plant. The Chute-a-Caron was finished in 1931. Shipshaw, the third and largest, begins generating this year, and when finally completed will have a rated capacity of 1,200,000 horsepower.

So much for the power projects brought to the attention of this Nation because of the Shipshaw affair. It is sufficient to say that they would be of no concern to us had it not been for our war-born demand for aluminum and the short-sightedness of some of the men in high places in our Government who as late as 1940 insisted that we faced no shortage in aluminum.

Just why these men, who should have known, should have failed to develop every possible source of American production we probably will never know, but the fact remains that in the fall of 1941 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's Metals Reserve Company entered into contacts with the Aluminum Trust looking for increased aluminum productiveness. These negotiations continued through the winter and resulted in two contracts. The first in May of 1941 and the second July 15, 1941. According to these contracts, the Aluminum Co. of Canada was to deliver 340,000 metric tons of aluminum by the end of 1944. In return, they were given without interest a down payment of $25,000,000 and also were extended a loan from the Export-Import Bank at 3 percent. This aluminum was to be delivered at the price of 17 cents a pound. This entire $50,000,000 was made available to the Aluminum Co. of Canada as of August 30, 1941, 1 month before construction began on Shipshaw. So far these contracts appear not to be beyond the scope of the usual procedure. However, it so happens that in this same month of August 1941 Alcoa had reduced the price of virgin aluminum in the United States from 17 to 15 cents per pound, probably due to the activities of Thurman Arnold, and from which grew the case of the United States against the Aluminum Co. of America.

In this case it was pointed out that the cost of producing aluminum in 1926 was 13.8 cents per pound and it was sold for approximately 27 cents a pound. The schedule through the years to 1937 shows corresponding figures. In 1937 the cost of producing aluminum had been reduced to 9.6 cents a pound, while it was being sold on the market at 19½ cents a pound. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD at this time exhibits 718 and 1701 of that case, which give the cost of producing and the selling price of aluminum through those years.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I wish the gentleman would agree to put Mr. Jones' letter in the RECORD in connection with his remarks.

Mr. HORAN. I shall be only too glad to, because it will not make Mr. Jones look very good.

Mr. PATMAN. That is all right; just so his statement goes in the RECORD.

Mr. HORAN. I feel sorry for him, because I shared the respect for Mr. Jones that the gentleman has, and I am very unhappy about all of this.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman knows that the question of critical metal, strategic materials, is a very important one. I ask the gentleman to suppose he were Federal Loan Administrator and needed production; that it was necessary to get production. Would not he seek it from any source he could obtain it, and if necessary, make certain commitments to get aluminum from any place when it is so necessary for this war? I know he would do it. That is what Mr. Jones was doing. He was doing what he considered to be the necessary thing, I am sure.

Mr. HORAN. I hope the gentleman from Texas tomorrow will read my speech in its entirety, for in it I show that we in the West were demanding that it be done not in 1940 but before that.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman from Texas spoke about the urgency of getting strategic materials. In the case of rubber this Congress gave a direct mandate to the R. F. C. to acquire a stock pile of rubber prior to the war with Japan, and it was not done.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield that I may reply to that statement?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The truth is that Mr. Jones piled up the largest stock pile of rubber ever before in history known, 700,000 tons during the 18 months preceding Pearl Harbor; and had it not been for the vision and foresight of Mr. Jones we would have been caught with insufficient rubber to carry on this war.

Mr. HORAN. We were, were we not?

Mr. PATMAN. No. We were not. We had the largest stock pile of rubber we ever had.

Mr. CURTIS. It was less than a year's supply.

Mr. HORAN. In view of the demand for rubber for the war, 700,000 tons was not very much.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; that is the normal supply for a year, and by cutting it down it was sufficient.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington may include the matter referred to.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Alcoa's average cost of producing virgin aluminum ingot, including provision for administrative and selling expenses

Year	Cost per pound	Annual average selling price per pound
	Cents	*Cent*
1926	13.82	26.98
1927	13.66	25.36
1928	11.63	24.09
1929	11.48	23.58
1930	11.24	23.33
1931	11.26	22.78
1932	11.91	21.76
1933	12.24	19.30
1934	13.58	18.95
1935	11.38	18.75
1936	9.65	18.82
1937	9.60	19.56
1938		19.44
1939		19.86

Cost per pound: Exhibit 718. *United States v. Aluminum Co. of America.*
Selling price: Exhibit 1701.

Mr. HORAN. It would seem reasonably apparent that the Aluminum Trust

has never lost any money on the basis of the selling price as against the cost of production. The only sound argument that we, who believe in the capitalistic system, have for the free competitive market is that it enables society thereby to get the raw or semifinished materials with which they, in turn, serve their fellow men at the lowest possible figure consistent with sound business methods and firm credit.

The only excuse for a fixed economy such as now stifles this Nation and the world is that we hope to temporarily achieve by force what may not have been achieved by freedom. Personally, I doubt that we will ever successfully replace a free economy with one that is bureaucratically controlled. Neither do I feel that our hopes for world peace can be sustained in a world-wide foreign commerce that permits, ignores, or even encourages world-wide trusts and the cartel system that goes with it.

In 1937, as the record shows, the Aluminum Trust was selling their aluminum for an average of 19.56 cents a pound. The record also shows that their costs in 1937 were 9.60 cents a pound. This figure includes depreciation and some selling and administrative expense. The figures were rejected by the court, we are informed, because they did not include any return on invested capital. It is worth noting, now, that Shipshaw, according to the records, is not burdened by any capital-investment costs. A year ago last winter a protest over paying 17 cents when the United States price was only 15 cents resulted in the cancelation of contracts Nos. 1 and 2 and the substituting of contracts Nos. 3 and 4. These were entered into between the R. F. C. Metals Reserve Company, the Aluminum Trust, and the Export-Import Bank, and the total aluminum order was boosted from 340,000 metric tons to 685,000 metric tons. Contract No. 3 called for 1,000,000,000 pounds, or one-half million metric tons, of aluminum. It called for delivery by the end of 1944. Of this contract, 800,000,000 pounds, or 400,000 metric tons, were to go to the United States at 15 cents a pound. But note this, 100,000 metric tons was to go into lend-lease at the apparently cartel price of 17 cents per pound, the old figure.

And here is where Santa Claus entered the picture. This contract assimilated the $25,000,000 down payment and the $25,000,000 loan of the earlier deal by providing an advance of $50,000,000 without interest or obligation except as to the delivery of aluminum. This was to "enable the seller to undertake the expansion of the productive capacity of its plant," according to the wording of the contract. That is the same principle that this House has denied in the case of nonrecourse loans to the farmers. In addition to the $50,000,000, a line of credit up to $25,000,000 was allowed at 3 percent. It is eloquent, I think, that the Company has not had to use this line of credit very much. It is worth noting that whenever we get a pound of Canadian aluminum from the Aluminum Trust, we pay them 10 cents in cash and credit 5 cents toward the reduction of the down payment. Against this 5 cents, if they wish, they can borrow an additional 5 cents at 3 percent. In the light of the cost exhibits cited, it is not surprising that they have not had to draw very heavily on the loan fund.

Contract No. 4 was entered into April 1, 1942. It called for an additional 370,000,000 pounds—296,000,000 pounds at 15 cents and 70,000,000 pounds at 17 cents, at lend-lease price. An additional interest-free advance for $18,500,000 was made and an additional line of credit, to the extent of $9,250,000, was opened. Thus, we see that the Aluminum Trust was given a noninterest advance of $68,500,000, $3,500,000 over the estimated cost of Shipshaw. In addition to that, they were given a 3-percent line of credit of $34,250,000 repayable at 10 years' maturity, based on dates when borrowed. And that is not all. Delivery of aluminum is cancelable by the United States on 6 months' notice. In that event, the Aluminum Co. of Canada is permitted to retain without obligation the unaccounted-for balance of the advance payment of $68,500,000. And that is not all. In the event of cancelation, the United States must pay to the Aluminum Trust 1 cent per pound for all metal undelivered under the contract. And even that is not all. We put into these contracts escalator clauses which give the Aluminum Trust the right to raise the price on aluminum. When transportation or labor costs rise, in connection with getting this material from British Guiana, they can add the increase. Consequently, although the contract calls for 15 cents a pound for aluminum delivered in America and 17 cents when delivered in lend-lease, I am very reliably informed that the present invoices will read better than 17 cents per pound delivered in America, and better than 19 cents delivered for lend-lease. Thus is the reduction of 2 cents, pointed to often as a shaky defense of this deal, washed out. I want here to recall the fact that the Aluminum Trust rejected our own West because of the costs of transportation—yet, today, they are making us pay for the hazards of transportation involved with the sites they did select. And that is not all. The Canadian Government has granted more help in the form of tax exemption politely labeled "accelerated depreciation." This is reported to be $37,000,000 in the case of Shipshaw or 56 percent of the estimated cost. According to reports from the Canadian Parliament, the complete depreciation about which our Canadian friends are no more happy than ourselves may amount to $175,000,000 on Alcoa of Canada's entire operation.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Does that not impress the gentleman that there must have been some real necessity for this increased production of aluminum?

Mr. HORAN. May I say to the gentleman from Texas that the people of my State have been insisting that was the case for 4 long years and begged this Government to open their eyes to the need of aluminum, but men in high places of this Government stated we did not need aluminum.

Mr. PATMAN. Is not the gentleman mistaken about that? Was it not the Aluminum Co. of America that was insisting all the time we did not need additional aluminum? The gentleman stated that Thurman Arnold was trying to do something about it.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, thus fully paid for and more than half depreciated in advance, the Shipshaw comes into production this year. It is worth noting that the construction began in secrecy in October 1941, and because of the speed of construction and the severe weather in which the men worked required twice as many men as was estimated to be necessary for construction in normal times. A total of 10,925 men were required, and during the winters of 1941 and 1942 night temperatures sometimes ranged between 20 and 50 degrees below zero, requiring a change of shifts every 2 or 3 hours in order to prevent the men from freezing.

While we conserved our needed power developments here in the United States because of lack of materials what was being done, in secret, for the Aluminum Co. of Canada? Well, this construction required the use of 44 power shovels and cranes, 525 trucks, and 67 tractors. It required 1,400,000 cubic yards of concrete, involving a delivery of 31 carloads of cement a day, 14,000,000 pounds of reinforcing steel, 3,900,000 tons of dynamite, and 30,000,000 board-feet of lumber.

Exclusive of hydraulic and electric machinery in the powerhouse, our Government, while closing the doors to normal development in the West, development capable also of producing aluminum where men can work in milder climates; where transportation deliveries are more accessible and the national security furthered, while they closed the doors to development in our own West, the administration not only agreed, through our lend-lease connections, to the use of the named materials in this Canadian development, but they also granted priority ratings not permitted in our own domestic program. It would appear that the most-favored-nation's clause does not apply at home.

In January 29, 1942, at the request of the Metals Reserve Company of R. F. C., a priority of AA-3—equal to the highest rating at that date granted any power project in the United States—was given to Shipshaw. Within a month, the Power Branch of W. P. B. arranged to have six big steel shafts put upon the production schedule of American shops for Canadian Shipshaw. At almost the same time steel shafts for our own western projects were removed from production schedules. In April 1942 at the request of the Aluminum Trust, the Power Branch of W. P. B. added four additional Shipshaw shafts to the production schedules in the Camden Forge and Midville Cos. in the United States.

In October, the Shipshaw priority was raised to AA-1, higher than any United States power project, and within a few

weeks was raised to AA-2X, the complete green light. In addition to the priority for shafts—called the bottleneck of power development—it is understood that the Canadian contractors secured silicon steel for the steel forging and casting through the assistance of W. P. B. Most other materials are reported to have been secured in Canada, but since in most instances these are merely Canadian branches of American firms, and because of the nature of lend-lease, we can say that this was still a further denial to the development of western power and reclamation. Thus our good old American Santa Claus apparently subsidizes through a nonrecourse loan the aluminum cartel. It seems to me if we would protect the future security and development of our own Nation, this whole proposition demands an investigation. Not only because of the definitely questionable nature of the deal itself, but because we here in this Congress are trying to eliminate such things as a matter of policy from our domestic transactions and also because we should certainly think twice before granting abroad what we are denying to our people at home.

The projects in America which were stopped are widely regarded as our margin of domestic security after the war. They not only give promise of employment when the let-down comes, but because of the reclamation features, they promise far more than the mere aluminum from Saguenay. They promise an industrial development and also homes and farms for the returning soldiers and those cast out from employment when the present "production for destruction" program shall have ended in our land. These western projects now being shut off by W. P. B. even as they favor Shipshaw are as yet but scarcely developed despite publicity to the contrary, but meager though that development is, those projects alone constitute an annual market for some three to four hundred million in nonwestern commodities, and with the completion of those projects better than a half billion dollars annual market. All this, of course, is in addition to the benefits to our transportation system, as it travels in its transcontinental way. The projects affected are the Grand Coulee, Shasta, Keswick, Anderson Range, and Davis Dams, Columbia-Big Thompson project, and several T. V. A. dams aggregating 1,600,000 horsepower, as well as the reclamation development dependent thereon. But that is not all. The Grand Coulee Dam is, indeed, a marvelous structure. It is built to use 18 huge generators. Up to a year or so ago progress of installing those generators was going on in an orderly fashion. Those generators are rated at 108,000 kilowatt-hours each, but so efficient is Grand Coulee that they actually generate 120,000 kilowatt-hours each. But through the exigencies of war and the actions of W. P. B., installations have been stopped even though the demand for power exceeds the program of installation.

To meet this demand generators have been brought to Grand Coulee which were originally planned for Shasta Dam. These generators are only about two-thirds as big and the nature of their design made it necessary to block off an entire penstock and turbine area in Grand Coulee in order to install them. The very bed of the generator compartments had to be mutilated and holes cut through them in order to accommodate these Shasta generators.

Time, manpower, and money have been wasted out there in order that Shipshaw might be favored.

Most tragic of all, that miraculous efficiency contemplated for Grand Coulee, a project many times called the eighth wonder of the world, has been seriously impaired, and at a time when our war industry is crying for power and more power.

Today men say that our old frontiers are gone; that the West of Horace Greeley, where men could go and create their capital out of sweat and sand, no longer exists as a land of opportunity.

I say to you that the real frontiers of the West are yet to be.

Out there are three-quarters of a billion acres waiting to be reclaimed. Out there are turbulent rivers waiting to be harnessed. Out there are enormous deposits of rich and useful minerals waiting to be converted into use. Out there are great forests and fine climate.

Our West is opportunity itself.

But it is a balanced opportunity.

Out West, the hand that turns to bring aluminum in this hour of need, brings also rich lands, improved navigation, flood control, power for our farms at low cost, fresh water for our cities, regulated water flow and delta control; the creation of marvelous wildlife and recreational areas, and most important of all, a greater security to you of the rest of the Nation because they will produce for your needs, and consume in return, your products.

At Shipshaw, there is aluminum, nothing more.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I express the hope that aluminum can be developed in the West and not only aluminum but also the iron ore resources that can be used to make steel and other critical materials. I feel there must be something wrong with the gentleman's statement, because I know Mr. Jones is not going to deliberately and willfully favor some foreign country, even Canada, one of our allies, over our own people in the United States. I am sure that a reasonable and careful investigation will disclose why that has been done.

Mr. HORAN. I was very careful not to mention Mr. Jones' name until the gentleman brought the matter up, because I am not trying to indict any man at this time. I want the gentleman to understand that. The best way he can protect his fine citizen from Texas is to join with me in demanding an investigation of this transaction and make it a matter of record.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will put Mr. Jones' letter in I will be glad to read it over.

Mr. HORAN. I am only too happy to put Mr. Jones' letter in because, in the face of the facts that have been developed up to now, it is a very, very lame excuse for what has been done at Shipshaw.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include Mr. Jones' letter in the RECORD. Also four pages from the Interior Department appropriation hearings on the Shipshaw matter in connection with my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, March 24, 1943.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TRUMAN: In reply to your inquiry about Metals Reserve Company's purchases of aluminum from Canada, beg to advise that May 2, 1941, at the request of the Office of Production Management, Metals Reserve Company contracted with the Aluminum Co. of Canada for the purchase of 170,000 metric tons (374,680,000 pounds) of aluminum at 17 cents per pound, the then-prevailing price of aluminum in this country.

This contract and all subsequent contracts in this program were approved by the President.

In connection with the purchase, the Aluminum Co. required an advance of $25,000,000, which we agreed to make at 2 percent interest. Such advances are authorized in connection with the purchase of critical and strategic materials under section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and do not require interest. The interest was computed to equal 0.295 cent per pound of aluminum, and in drawing the contract this was deducted from the price of 17 cents. The advance was to be amortized at the rate of 6⅔ cents per pound of aluminum delivered.

Substantial advances on purchase contracts of critical and strategic materials have been made to China and Russia and in connection with purchases in some Latin-American countries.

May 13, 1941, the Office of Production Management requested that the initial contract be doubled. This was concluded at the same price. The company asked for an advance of $25,000,000 against this contract, and a loan for this amount was made to it by the Export-Import Bank at 3 percent interest.

In negotiating contracts with the Aluminum Co. of America to build and operate aluminum plants in the United States for our account, we secured a reduction from Alcoa in the price of aluminum in the United States from 17 cents to 15 cents per pound, thereby saving the Government a great many millions of dollars.

After getting the reduced price from Alcoa, we asked the Aluminum Co. of Canada to reduce their price from 17 cents to 15 cents, notwithstanding we had contracted to pay 17 cents. The company was reluctant to reduce the price since they were getting 17 cents from the British and Canadian Governments. However, we finally prevailed upon them to reduce the price to 15 cents on 80 percent of the shipments. To get this reduction in price, we waived the interest on the advances, and made a reduction in the amortization requirements. The reduction from 17 cents to 15 cents saved Metals Reserve Company $16,000,000, while only $2,500,000 was waived in interest. This revision of the previous contracts provided for an in-

crease in our purchases of aluminum from Canada to 1,000,000,000 pounds.

February 23, 1942, we were requested by the War Production Board to increase the purchase of Canadian aluminum by an additional 370,000,000 pounds. These purchases were made at the reduced price schedule. The latter contracts also provided for advances against deliveries.

Total loans and advances to date in connection with all purchase contracts aggregate $69,500,000, and repayments have been $15,919,477. Total amount of aluminum contracted for is 1,370,000,000 pounds, and deliveries to date have been 368,000,000 pounds.

The contracts made provision for a fixed basis of cancelation on any part of the aluminum that we might determine not to buy.

Metals Reserve Company has had no control over the expenditure of the loans and advances; that is, whether they were to be used for working capital, plant expansion, or otherwise.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. MARLETT. The total requisitioned appropriations are $68,717,951, of which the cash on hand amounted to $3,533,341, leaving a net difference of approximately $65,000,000 expended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Now, has your agency connection with the generating of power at Bonneville or Grand Coulee Dam?

Dr. RAVER. No, sir. We sell the power and construct, operate, and maintain the transmission and substation facilities.

LOAN TO THE ALUMINUM CO. OF CANADA

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Did you read the very interesting story in Merry-Go-Round this morning, with reference to the shortage of power in the Northwest and the inability to get priorities from the War Production Board? The article further stated that Jesse Jones had made a secret loan, I believe, of some $65,000,000 without interest to the Aluminum Co. of Canada.

Dr. RAVER. I certainly did read it.

Mr. CARTER. I have not read it, but I have just heard about it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Frankly, I was not only amazed, but shocked at the story. I have known and admired Secretary Jones for many years. I have also admired his businesslike methods, as well as his quick and definite decisions. I shall, of course, not pass final judgment until I hear his side of the controversy, but the story, to say the least, calls for a clear-cut explanation, or else there must be a thorough investigation of the whole transaction. I wonder if you have any definite information to give the committee concerning the matter either on or off the record?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It may be possible, Mr. Chairman, that they do not want any surplus power in the United States, as that might interfere with the Power Trust here, and that is why they are going to go up into Canada; then, after the war is over, they would not have any surplus here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me add here that without doubt this committee as well as the Congress is entitled to know the full facts of the situation. Do you know anything about it, and if so, do you care to make any comment?

Dr. RAVER. Well, my comment goes entirely to the effect of a development of this kind upon this project in the Northwest, for which I am responsible for the administration at the present time. I do not know anything about the contract arrangement between Mr. Jones and the Aluminum Co. of America. But here we have been developing this project in the Northwest and supplying the power capacity for one-third of the aluminum production of this Nation, and we have been doing that conscientiously and for the purpose of winning the war. That is the reason you appropriated the money; that was the fundamental basis of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is it not true that there is a shortage, actual or potential, of aluminum in this country, and is it not also true that some of the plants are not operating to full capacity?

Dr. RAVER. There is supposed to be a shortage of aluminum. Not only that, but it is also true that some of the plants which are established in the Northwest today are not operating full capacity—not because we have not the power and have not provided the power for them, but because they are unable to secure the necessary alumina, which is the basic powder from which aluminum is made. Now we suddenly find out that a great power plant has been constructed in Canada by and for the Aluminum Co. of America, which is operating these Government facilities in the Northwest; that it was constructed secretly and at a time when critical materials—we were told, at least—prevented us from going ahead on much of our program. That is one of the reasons we have balances left in our appropriation from last year, because much of our program was stopped and we have been forced to operate our system on a shoestring, overloaded and without reserves and even without the necessary fire protection, in many cases, because we have not been able to get the fire hydrants and other critical materials that we need to protect this war-production plant; and at the same time we find those critical materials which we could not get, even to provide for a sound, sensible, operation of our own system, have been going to Canada for the Aluminum Co. of America. I do not think it sounds very good and I am glad to have that on the record.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Well, to say the least, it calls for an explanation. To say I have been shocked that $65,000,000 or $68,000,000 have been spent on such project in Canada, under circumstances as related in this news story is putting it mildly. I have no quarrel with our good neighbors on the north, but constantly we are hearing that in Canada they are actually making chairs out of aluminum and that they have an abundance of aluminum there. And I might add that they have an abundance of a lot of other things in Canada that citizens of the United States of America are being rationed on. It isn't a very healthy situation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, it must have been to protect some big interest of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Of course, I assume that an investigation will disclose that the Aluminum Co. of Canada and the Aluminum Co. of America are the one and same company.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Because when they stopped that Central Valley project and the one you are administering, when they needed the power there must have been some great influence to get the War Production Board to stop these projects and then send this material they claim was a shortage of, up to Canada for them to construct a plant there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not know how other members of the committee feel, but this purported transaction does not seem to square with the long honorable record of Jesse Jones, generally recognized as a great farsighted, square-shooting businessman.

Mr. ALVEY. There is an article in this morning's PM that goes into more detail than Drew Pearson's article.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have not read that article. The committee should get the facts. Here they are closing down a lot of power and reclamation projects in the United States, slowing up on others that are not running to full capacity, and at the same time, $68,000,000 of American taxpayers' money being loaned without interest, according to this story, to build an Aluminum Co.'s factory in the wilds of Canada. And the article further states, I believe, that a lot of the principal may never be paid back. Knowing the Honorable Jesse Jones as I do, I must say that part of it sounds fantastic to me.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, where did they get their money?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. According to the article, from the Metals Reserve Company, a part of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. JENSEN. And where is this plant being built—is it completed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It seems to be about completed.

Mr. ALVEY. It will be completed this year, by June.

Mr. JENSEN. Where was it built?

Mr. ALVEY. On the Saguenay River, in the Province of Quebec, a couple of hundred miles north of Montreal.

Dr. RAVER. It is a project which has almost as much firm power in it as the Grand Coulee Dam. That is quite a project to keep under blankets and nobody know about it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. On what theory, or perhaps I should ask if you know what reason or excuse is given why it has been kept a deep, dark secret according to the newspaper report, so that the taxpayers, the American people, and the Congress should know little or nothing about it?

Dr. RAVER. It is a competitive threat to our own power market after the war is over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As a post-war proposition, that Canadian Aluminum Co., which we hear is a subsidy of the Aluminum Co. of America, will have a great factory employing thousands of people in Canada with our gallant fighting men looking for jobs. And even though Canada is our ally and a friendly nation, unless there is some good reason for it, I give notice here that I am going to make a vigorous protest.

Mr. CARTER. Do you think that is a part of the good-neighbor policy, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That story, if correctly reported, is not my idea of a good neighbor or the good-neighbor policy.

Mr. CARTER. Is it not in line with the good-neighbor policy?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I do not think so.

Mr. CARTER. Do you know that we are financing a big steel mill also out of this country?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is in South America, is it not?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The situation is entirely different in South America, where the Nazis have been spreading anti-American propaganda for decades.

Mr. CARTER. Do you know that the taxpayers of this country have furnished money to every South and Central American country, and why discriminate against Canada, if we are going to do that. Canada is always very friendly to us. She even supplied us with liquor during prohibition.

Mr. JONES. If I understand, the full amount of money spent in South America is to be about $2,000,000,000.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The geographical situation is entirely different. This is right in competition with us; in South America we are trying to get them to produce things down there that we need. But this is power. We can furnish plenty of it, right here in this country.

Mr. MARLETT. It is also in competition with California power.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Absolutely.

Mr. JONES. Was this loan made to the Government of Canada, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No; to the Aluminum Co. of Canada, according to the printed story.

Mr. JONES. For a power plant of their own?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, did not they try to prevent the Reynolds Co. from developing their own aluminum plant—the same group. Was not there some opposition by the Aluminum Co. of America against the Reynolds Co. in developing its plant, and that has been a known fact for a couple of years?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] may be permitted to extend her own remarks in the RECORD and to include a communication from the War Department, also one from Colonel Hobby.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. SMITH of Maine, on account of official business.

To Mr. SIKES, for 1 week, on account of important official business.

To Mr. BELL, for 3 weeks after May 28, 1943, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 170. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. T. Travis;

H. R. 328. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, because of military operations, to defer or waive payments under nonmineral leases of public lands in Alaska;

H. R. 535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Donna Pittel;

H. R. 777. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia," approved February 24, 1914;

H. R. 940. An act for the relief of Howard E. Dickison;

H. R. 1153. An act for the relief of Cordie Underwood and Wilbur Kea;

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Alva Burton Rickey;

H. R. 1468. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Azer;

H. R. 1667. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation;

H. R. 2067. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. M. Reid & Co., of Macon, Ga.; and

H. R. 2115. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 170. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. T. Travis;

H. R. 328. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, because of military operations, to defer or waive payments under nonmineral leases of public lands in Alaska;

H. R. 535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Donna Pittel;

H. R. 777. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia," approved February 25, 1914;

H. R. 940. An act for the relief of Howard E. Dickison;

H. R. 1153. An act for the relief of Cordie Underwood and Wilbur Kea;

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Alva Burton Rickey;

H. R. 1468. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Azer;

H. R. 1667. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation;

H. R. 2067. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. M. Reid & Co., of Macon, Ga; and

H. R. 2115. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 28, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

This committee will hold public hearings on investigation of civilian employment in governmental departments, Friday, May 28, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m. in room 246, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Friday, May 28, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearings pursuant to House Resolution 98 by Congressman HALLECK.

COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, June 1, 1943, for consideration of housing bills, in room 1304, New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2731, to facilitate the award and payment of just compensation for property requisitioned under the authority of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

1. Tuesday, June 1: Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, will open the hearings with any statements and recommendations he desires to submit covering national flood control and the projects that should be included in the bill to be reported, especially as they are related to national defense and as they will be important following the existing war to provide sound flood-control projects and desirable public works. General Reybold is now on an airplane tour of inspection of the flood areas and will submit a first-hand report covering recent major floods along the Missouri, Arkansas, White, Mississippi, Illinois, Wabash, Ohio, and other rivers in the recent flood areas. He will be followed by Maj. Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Assistant Chief of Engineers, who has previously advised the Flood Control Committee during hearings and who will also appear before the committee and submit his views and discuss generally the projects that have been favorably reported since the hearings were conducted on H. R. 4911, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, reported on June 9, 1941, which became the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941. Col. George R. Goethals, Chief of the Flood Control Branch Office of Chief of Engineers, will attend the hearings and will furnish to the members of the committee in detail any and all available information respecting the said projects on which favorable reports have been submitted by the Chief of Engineers.

The district engineers and the division engineers have furnished to the Chief of Engineers data and information respecting major floods since August 18, 1941, and particularly with respect to recent major floods in the various drainage basins of the country, which will be submitted to the committee.

2. Wednesday, June 2: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects for the New England region, including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers, and the Middle Atlantic region, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

3. Thursday, June 3: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals,

other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the upper and lower Ohio River and tributaries, and on projects of the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

4. Friday, June 4: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects along the Missouri River and tributaries and the upper Mississippi River and the Great Lakes region.

5. Tuesday, June 8: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, including the Arkansas and White Rivers, and on rivers flowing into the Gulf west of the Mississippi River, and in the western Rocky Mountain region, including Texas and Colorado, and in the Pacific Northwest region, including the Willamette River and the Columbia River and tributaries.

6. Wednesday, June 9: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the Los Angeles area and in the State of California, including the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kern River Valleys, and on projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

7. Thursday, June 10: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

8. Friday, June 11: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

440. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a message from the Republic of Cuba with regard to the independence of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

441. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944, amounting to $2,700,000 (H. Doc. No. 210); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

442. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on lists of papers, recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BELL: Committee on Insular Affairs. House Joint Resolution 128. A joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, without amendment (Rept. No. 506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 2795. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land or buildings and facilities or fixtures appurtenant thereto, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on Roads. H. R. 2798. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes", approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 2808. A bill to amend section 215 of the Judicial Code, relating to the quorum of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2809 (by request). A bill to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2810. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, so as to provide for an increase in the amount of the Government's contribution to the dependents of enlisted men entitled to family allowances under such act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 2811. A bill to extend for 1 year policies of insurance issued by the War Damage Insurance Corporation without further payment of premiums; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2812. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, so as to provide for an increase of 15 percent in the amount of the Government's contribution to the dependents of enlisted men entitled to family allowances under such act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 2813. A bill to amend section 7 of the act approved February 28, 1925, so as to change the method of computing the daily rate of compensation in the case of certain postal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 2814. A bill to adjust the basis of compensation for overtime service of certain employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LAFOLLETTE:

H. R. 2815. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Indian Creek and its tributaries in the county of Harrison, State of Indiana, and in any adjacent counties through which said Indian Creek or its tributaries may flow, for flood control, for run-off and waterflow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2816. A bill to provide for the payment of certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 2817. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2818. A bill to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2819. A bill to provide for the classification of the public lands in Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2820. A bill to provide for the establishment of a permanent medical corps in the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 2821. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense," approved October 14, 1940; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 2822. A bill to provide for the exercise by the United States of certain jurisdiction over persons within areas in the Republic of Panama, the temporary use of which for defense purposes is granted to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2823. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the posthumous appointment to commissioned or noncommissioned grade of certain enlisted men and the posthumous promotion of certain commissioned officers and enlisted men," approved July 28, 1942; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution providing that any commitments by the signatories to the International Food Conference does not bind the United States of America in any way to the decisions arrived at unless first approved by the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution providing that any commitments by the signatories to the International Food Conference does not bind the United States of America in any way to the decisions arrived at unless first approved by the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation with reference to persons entering the armed forces taking their option in national service life insurance or United States Government (converted) life insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 2824. A bill for the relief of Alice Stamps and Henrietta E. Stamps; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:
H. R. 2825. A bill for the relief of Sigfried Olsen doing business as Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co.; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. LAMBERTSON:
H. R. 2826. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:
H. R. 2827. A bill for the relief of Ida M. Rutherford; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:
966. Petition of A. Moulton McNutt, Esq., and 320 citizens of Camden, N. J., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
967. Also, petition of Orpha Turner and 25 citizens of Ithaca, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
968. Also, petition of F. A. Natt and 23 citizens of Savanna, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
969. Also, petition of Clara Lawrence and 40 citizens of Marion, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
970. Also, petition of C. W. Reelhorn and 20 citizens of Pataskala, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
971. Also, petition of Della Stumpf and 55 citizens of Santa Ana, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
972. Also, petition of Ellen E. Trumble and 12 citizens of Moscow, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
973. Also, petition of N. A. DePas and 29 citizens of Wilson, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
974. Also, petition of E. R. Town and 42 citizens of Middleton, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
975. Also, petition of Mrs. M. L. Roberts and 46 citizens of Caldwell, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
976. Also, petition of Mrs. C. G. St. John and 33 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportion of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
977. Also, petition of the Methodist Laurelwood Church of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
978. Also, petition of Florence Blake and 19 citizens of Henriette, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
979. Also, petition of Mrs. A. F. Miller and 25 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Winona, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
980. Also, petition of Effie S. Johnson and 22 citizens of Red Wing, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
981. Also, petition of Mrs. Francis Lee Woodward, Sr., and 22 citizens of Caldwell, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
982. Also, petition of Roy McMillan and 25 citizens of Alma, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
983. Also, petition of W. P. Breneman and 87 citizens of Reading, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
984. Also, petition of Elder Dillard B. Thompson and 40 citizens of Minnesota, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
985. Also, petition of 28 citizens of Waco, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
986. Also, petition of Elizabeth Weinmann and 41 citizens of Canoga Park, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
987. Also, petition of Mrs. A. M. Purdy and 52 citizens of St. Paul, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
988. Also, petition of Elizabeth R. Hackett and 100 citizens of Phoenix, Ariz., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
989. Also, petition of Mrs. N. N. Strangeway and 28 citizens of Rochester, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
990. Also, petition of Celia Hawkins and 25 citizens of Alma, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
991. Also, petition of Rev. F. M. Wannkamp and 14 citizens of Alexandria, Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alco-

holic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

992. Also, petition of Boyd R. Keck and 99 citizens of Berwick, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

993. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 80 citizens of Butler County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

994. By Mr. KEE: Petition of Mrs. C. I. Cheyney and 42 other citizens and residents of Bluefield, W. Va., urging the passage by Congress of House bill 2082 introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

995. By Mr. McCOWEN: Petition of Mrs. Alta M. Walker, Georgetown, Ohio, and 115 other citizens of Georgetown and Hamersville, Brown County, Ohio, and 20 other citizens of Greenfield and other places in Highland County, Ohio, urging Congress to pass House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of the mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

996 By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of sundry citizens of Ohio petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082, introduced by Hon JOSEPH BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

997. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Maude B. Baxter and 100 other citizens of Kansas, urging the passage of House bill 2082, because they are convinced that the liquor business is one of the most serious hindrances to the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

998. Also, petition of Carrie M. Newton, of Topeka, Kans., and 49 other citizens of the State of Kansas, urging the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

999. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of sundry residents of Nitro, W. Va., supporting House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1000. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Rev. F. W. Domina and other citizens of Livermore Falls, Maine, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1001. Also, petition of Minnie E. Yates and other citizens of Camden and Rockland, Maine, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1002. By Mr. HERTER: Petition of several citizens of Massachusetts, urging favorable consideration of House bill 2082, a bill prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1003. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mrs. Z. W. Ankron and a number of other citizens of New Martinsville, W. Va., sponsored by the women of the temperance union, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1004. Also, petition of the National Association of Retail Druggists, Chicago, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 997 or its companion bill, Senate bill 216, providing for the creation of a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1005. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. R. J. Smith and 33 citizens of Millmont, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1006. Also, petition of the Fidelis Class, of the First Baptist Church of Miama, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1007. Also, petition of Mrs. J. A. Rogers and 25 citizens of Ithaca, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1008. Also, petition of the First Christian Church and 118 citizens of Miami, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1009. Also, petition of 17 citizens of Alta, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1010. Also, petition of L. Austin Lippitt and 29 members of the Community Congregational Church of Austinburg, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1011. Also, petition of 79 citizens of Virginia urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary to winning the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1012. Also, petition of Margaret A. Bower and 45 citizens of Berwick, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1013. Also, petition of Mrs. Thomas W. Bittle and 34 citizens of Myerstown, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1014. Also, petition of G. N. St. John and 226 citizens of Virginia, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1015. Also, petition of J. A. Boak and 51 citizens of New Castle, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1016. Also, petition of Rev. Charles A. Brown and 26 citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1017. Also, petition of Clara B. Dawson and 50 members of the Free Methodist Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1018. Also, petition of 40 citizens of Santa Monica, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1019. Also, petition of Grace M. Hamilton and 405 citizens of Wilton and other towns in New Hampshire, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1020. Also, petition of 371 citizens of North Charleston and other towns in New Hampshire, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1021. Also, petition of Luella E. Winter and 33 citizens of Caldwell, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to preserve manpower, reduce absenteeism, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1022. Also, petition of Mrs. L. O. Hunter and 23 citizens of Waldorf, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1023. Also, petition of 17 citizens of Farmington, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1024. Also, petition of Mrs. Carl Samuelson and 17 citizens of Spicer, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1025. Also, petition of Leta Anderson and 66 citizens of Kinder, La., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1026. Also, petition of Katherine Berry and 21 citizens of Spokane, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1027. Also, petition of Glen B. Ogden and 11 citizens of Colusa, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1028. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Clara Alexander, of Topeka, Kans., and more than 100 other citizens of Kansas, urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for winning the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1029. Also, petition of Rev. J. E. Bartholomew, of Topeka, Kans., and 16 other citizens of Kansas, supporting House Joint Resolution 109, introduced by Mr. O'BRIEN, of Michigan, to provide for the recognition by the United States Government of the provisional government of the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1030. By the SPEAKER. Petition of A. H. Landley, of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a recently granted Federal deposit insurance to 130 New York mutual-savings banks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1031. Also, petition of the office of the city clerk, city of Milwaukee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to post-war restoration of Great Lakes shipping and commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 28, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all hope, we bless Thee for the cleansing ministry of memory and for the rich heritage of noble deeds. Look upon us in pity and mercy as our Nation, founded in Thy name, turns to its stirring past and to its warrior dead. In the flowering splendor of Maytime's garden, even as bugles are sounding to new battles for liberty's cause, prepare our hearts and minds for the sacramental journey to quiet cities of the dead where, under their tents of green, sleep those whose lives were offered as freedom's shield. We thank Thee for the thoughts which make tender our hearts as on the yearly day of remembrance hallowing the white stones and grassy mounds which mark their resting place, we come with reverent step as loving arms are filled with bright-hued blooms, emblems of the evergreens of gratitude and the forget-me-nots of love. Save us from decorating tombs and at the same time desecrating the costly heritage which it takes graves to guarantee.

As our day of memorial comes, with misty eyes and with sorrowing pride we see the blue stars in flags of service which day by day are turning to gold. In thought we leap the seas and walk amid new crosses rising from consecrated ground under alien skies. In this desperate struggle against a pagan creed and for a fairer world, steel our wills to endure to the end as the dear sons and daughters of our hearths and hearts ride off as valiant knights with waving plumes white as their steadfast purpose to battle to the death if need be against the powers of darkness.

"O risen Lord, O shepherd of our dead,
Whose cross has bought them and whose star hath led,
In glorious hope their proud and sorrowing land
Commits her children to Thy gracious hand."

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 27, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Gurney	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hatch	Robertson
Bone	Hawkes	Russell
Brewster	Hayden	Scrugham
Bridges	Hill	Shipstead
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lucas	Tobey
Capper	McCarran	Truman
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chandler	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	White
Davis	Moore	Wiley
Downey	Murray	Willis
Eastland	Nye	Wilson
Ellender	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on important public business.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of the death of his wife.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication, which was referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FEDERAL REAL ESTATE BOARD

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report of the Federal Real Estate Board (an interdepartmental agency) relating to Federal contributions to States and local governmental units with respect to federally owned real estate (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the initiation of measures looking toward the post-war restoration of Great Lakes shipping and rehabilitation of Great Lakes commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution of the Flatbush Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the appointment of a permanent commission to study and define the peace aims of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Richmond and Greely, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CONTINUATION OF FARM PROGRAMS—PETITION OF PLEASANT VIEW FARMERS UNION LOCAL, ST. MARYS, KANS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter in the nature of a petition which I have received from the Pleasant View Farmers Union, St. Marys, Kans., expressing their interest in the continuation of the soil-conservation program, the Farm Security Administration, and other measures which would benefit agriculture.

There being no objection, the letter in the nature of a petition was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. MARYS, KANS., *May 24, 1943.*

SENATOR ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We, as a group of 40 Farmers Union members of Pleasant View Local, No. 1843, wish for continuation of soil conservation and Agricultural Adjustment Agency program, run by farmers themselves.

We also vote for continuation of the Farm Security Administration.

We also adopt the crop insurance made available to farmers, same as other laborers.

We ask for a fair price for our wheat and not parity.

Anything that you can do to help adopt these plans will be appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

PLEASANT VIEW FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
St. Marys, Kans.
ALBERT F. GRIESHABER, *President.*
CLARA GRIESHABER, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION—WAR DAMAGE CORPORATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask consent to present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted April 12 by the executive council of the American Bankers Association and request unanimous consent to have it included in the RECORD following my remarks.

This resolution expresses approval of the bill S. 1121, which would provide for the return of certain premiums paid the War Damage Corporation. I invite the attention of the Members of the Senate to this resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the War Damage Corporation was created to provide insurance against losses of property resulting from enemy attack; and

Whereas the sale of such insurance by the War Damage Corporation since July 1, 1942, has already produced a large surplus; and

Whereas protection of property against war damage is a national responsibility; and

Whereas the War Damage Corporation should not be operated as a profit-making enterprise: Therefore be it

Resolved, That, in the opinion of the executive council of the American Bankers Association, the net earnings of the War Damage Corporation should ultimately revert to its policyholders, either by remission of premiums and/or a refund of any surplus remaining at the end of this war.

RESOLUTION OF ILLINOIS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—CARE OF ILL AND WOUNDED SOLDIERS AND SAILORS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I also ask consent to present Resolution No. 59 adopted by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois, and request consent to have it included in the RECORD, under the rule, following my remarks.

This resolution deals with the proper care of the returning sick and wounded soldiers and sailors from the present war zones and following the end of this war. I invite the attention of the Members of the Senate to this resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

House Resolution 59

Whereas during World War No. 1 the returning sick and wounded soldiers and sailors found us totally unprepared to furnish them proper hospitalization and treatment; and

Whereas those sick, helpless, and bewildered men were for a considerable length of time left to shift for themselves or were inadequately cared for; and

Whereas the number who will return from World War No. 2, broken in mind, spirit and body, needing medical service, treatment, and hospitalization will in all probability exceed the number who needed such services during the former World War; and

Whereas we now have an efficient Veterans' Administration which is making efficient use of all the means at its command; and

Whereas it will take time to properly locate, plan, equip, and staff specialized institutions of this nature so as to provide adequate care and treatment for all those in need; and

Whereas we as a Nation are duty bound to do everything in our power to relieve and rehabilitate all those injured while in our service: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That in order to be assured that the close of World War No. 2 will not find our Nation unprepared to properly care for our sick and wounded, as was the case in World War No. 1, we hereby memorialize the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, that immediate steps be taken to prepare to meet our responsibilities in this matter; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the House May 19, 1943.

ELMER J. SCHNACHENBERG,
Speaker of the house of representatives.
R. P. RANDOLPH,
Clerk of the house of representatives.

EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and myself, I ask consent to report with amendments, Senate Joint Resolution 25, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting equal rights to men and women, and I submit a report (No. 267) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MCNARY:

S. 1141. A bill authorizing the appointment and retirement of William G. Everson as a major general, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWKES:

S. 1142. A bill for the relief of Parker McKee, Sr., and Louise McKee; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. BUSHFIELD (for himself, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. AIKEN) introduced Senate bill 1143, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1144. A bill for the relief of D. A. McElduff; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1145. A bill for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 1146. A bill to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1147. A bill authorizing the improvement of the waterway from Punta Rasa to Fort Pierce and Stuart, Fla.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 1148. A bill to amend section 203 (b) (6) of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. HAWKES:

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1944, as Edison Day, in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Elva Edison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PREVENTION OF SUBSIDY PAYMENTS TO PROCESSORS IN PRICE STABILIZATION

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and myself I ask consent to introduce a bill to prevent the payment of subsidies to processors in stabilizing prices, and for other purposes.

I request that the bill be appropriately referred and that an explanatory statement in connection therewith be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement presented by the Senator from South Dakota will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1143) to prevent the payment of subsidies to processors in stabilizing prices, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUSHFIELD (for himself, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. AIKEN) was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. BUSHFIELD relating to the bill, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and himself, is as follows:

The questionable wisdom of the proposal of the Office of Price Administration to roll back prices on butter, coffee, and meats and to pay a subsidy from the United States Treasury to the processors of these products caused the subcommittee on food of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to decide upon a definite attempt to prohibit such payments without specific authorization from Congress; hence this bill.

Testimony taken for several days before our committee from processors from many parts of the country convinces us that the producer might suffer heavy loss as a result of the proposed roll-back, because the subsidy could not or would not be passed on to him. It is an acknowledged fact that consumers as a class are earning more than ever before in our history. When we consider that the roll-back and subsidy on butter would save each individual consumer only about 65 cents a year, the resultant decrease in his cost of living seems inconsequential.

Moreover, we believe that the payment of general subsidies from the United States Treasury for the benefit of any group is wrong in principle and we hope Congress will promptly put a stop to what appears to us to be a step toward the development of such a system.

Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones, appearing before our committee the other day, stated that the total subsidy would be about $450,000,000 a year. When asked by what authority he would pay out this huge sum, he said he would pay it under the order of the President and that no appropriation by Congress was necessary.

Thus the Congress has been told, in effect, that its attitude toward the payment of this money is immaterial; that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, of which Mr. Jones is the head, has the money, and that it would be paid out as indicated.

The committee believes that such payments should not be made without congressional authorization and, through this bill, we are asking the Congress to say so promptly. Failure to insist that subsidies of the type now contemplated by Office of Price Administration be paid only out of funds specifically appropriated for that purpose by Congress will be tantamount to a green light for the administration to go ahead with its attempt to bolster up and preserve inequities in the price structure by paying general subsidies whenever it sees fit.

AMENDMENT OF EMERGENCY FARM MORTGAGE ACT—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, Senate bill 1078 refers to extension of the power of the Land Bank Commissioner, which power expires on the 30th of June. By mistake, the bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Committee on Banking and Currency has jurisdiction of the subject. I have conferred with the chairmen of both committees, and it is agreeable to each of them that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1078) to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, and that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CLARK of Idaho submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the control of predatory animals and injurious rodents, from $740,000 to $1,000,000, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2719, the Interior Department appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESSES AND ARTICLES BY HON. HENRY A. WALLACE (S. DOC. NO. 59)

On motion of Mr. GILLETTE and by unanimous consent, it was,

Ordered, That certain addresses and articles by Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, be printed as a Senate document.

CONTINUATION OF FARM PROGRAMS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD at this point some telegrams I have received dealing with the matter of the F. S. A. and other farm agencies. The first telegram is from Crosby, N. Dak., and reads as follows:

CROSBY, N. DAK., *May 25, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Divide County Farmers Union urges you to do your utmost to restore the agriculture appropriation bill and try to get increase for the Farm Security Administration and incentive payments.

DIVIDE COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
IVAN ERICKSON, *Secretary.*

I read a telegram from Watford City, N. Dak., which reads as follows:

WATFORD CITY, N. DAK., *May 14, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We object strenuously to the divorcement of county and local committees from their duties under present rules for the operation of farm programs. We urge you to use your influence in preventing any change in the present set-up.

That is from the Association of Commerce of Watford City, N. Dak., a commercial club, made up entirely of businessmen. It is signed by Blaine Whipple, secretary.

Another telegram, which is from Beulah, N. Dak., reads as follows:

BEULAH, N. DAK., *May 14, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Please stand firm on the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program as it is today to help increase food production.

KNIFE RIVER FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
EDNA STROM, *Secretary.*

I have a telegram from Dickinson, in the western section of North Dakota, which reads as follows:

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *May 17, 1943.*
Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request your continued support urging maintenance on statute and operations Triple A Farm Security Administration and Soil Conservation Service. Without these farmers measures disaster might befall farmers this year should crop failure become imminent.

ST. PIOUS FARMERS UNION, LOCAL NO. 774.

Here is another telegram from Dickinson, N. Dak., which reads as follows:

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *May 19, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Stark County Farmers' Union, 1,500 members, are requesting you for the fullest support and improvement of the entire farm program.

BOARD OF STARK COUNTY FARMERS' UNION,
SPENCER BOB, *Chairman.*

Here is another telegram from Wheelock, N. Dak., reading as follows:

WHEELOCK, N. DAK., *May 21, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We trust you will now and in the future stand squarely behind the farm people of the State of North Dakota who elected you to your high office, and fight for all the necessary appropriations for a continuation of the Triple A and Farm Security Administration.

BROKLYN FARMERS' UNION, No. 364.
GEORGE MOEN, *President.*
Mrs. A. M. JOHNSON, *Secretary.*

Here is another telegram from the northwestern section of the State, which reads:

WHEELOCK, N. DAK., *May 21, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to back the appropriation for Triple A, Farm Security Administration, and soil-conservation programs, and that the control of Triple A remain in hands of county and community committeemen. We ask that the Bank for Cooperatives remain in control of Farm Credit Administration. We also believe in nonrecourse loans and incentive payments for war crops.

VIEW FARMERS' UNION, LOCAL 371,
HOMER LEEN, *President.*
OSCAR LARSON, *Secretary.*

Here is one from Ohall, N. Dak., which is close to the Canadian border. The telegram reads as follows:

OHALL, N. DAK., *May 25, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We of the Farmers' Union, Renville County, demand control of the Triple A by elected committeemen, with adequate funds,

incentive payments for short crops, and expanded nonrecourse F-2 loans for increase of farm production; also adequate funds for Soil Conservation and Farm Security Administration to operate on, with the farm-labor program and bank of cooperatives handled by the Farm Credit Administration.

RENVILLE COUNTY FARMERS' UNION,
GULLICKSON, *Secretary.*

Here is a telegram from the town of McGregor, N. Dak.

MCGREGOR, N. DAK., *May 24, 1943.*
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We ask your support for adequate funds for Farm Security Administration continuation of Agricultural Adjustment Agency payments for war crops parity payments on wheat.

SAUK VALLEY FARMERS UNION LOCAL.

I may add, Mr. President, that there is not a more patriotic group of farmers anywhere in the United States than those around the little town of McGregor, N. Dak. They had 9 continuous years of drought, but, instead of leaving the area, those farmers stayed there, relying upon the programs which they are begging to have continued. They stayed there during that drought, knowing that the Government, as they thought, was going to help them. It is because of that they are producing large war crops; they are paying their debts, paying what they owe to the Federal land bank and the mortgage company. If we only leave them alone they will work out their own salvation.

Here is a telegram from Ryder, N. Dak.

RYDER, N. DAK., *May 24, 1943.*
WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge your support of the National Farmers Union in the fight on agricultural appropriation bill in asking: First, adequate appropriation for Triple A; second, opposition to putting control of Triple A into Extension Service; third, continuation of Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation nonrecourse loan; fourth, funds for incentive payments so that farmers are paid for risk of shifting to war crop production; fifth, $1,000,000,000 for Farm Security Administration; sixth, $400,000,000 for soil conservation; seventh, continue Bank of Cooperatives in Farm Credit Administration.

MCLEAN COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
WELDON L. HAUGEN, *Secretary.*

Here is a telegram from Petersburg, N. Dak., in the northeastern section of the State, a community that is almost solidly Scandinavian, made up of folk who came from Norway and Sweden 20, 30, 40, or 50 years ago, and who are among the most outstanding farmers of the State:

PETERSBURG, N. DAK., *May 13, 1943.*
Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Farmers Union Local 168 voted unanimously with 74 voting to urge you to oppose with vote and influence any change in the present existing farm program. We want Agricultural Adjustment Agency as is. Federal Security Administration non-recourse loans for war crops. More experienced farm help with plenty farm machinery and repairs. We want to help win this war by producing necessary food and fiber.

LOUIS R. HILLEBRAND, *President.*

Here is a telegram from Havelock, N. Dak., in the southeastern section of the State:

HAVELOCK, N. DAK., *May 25, 1943.*
WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Will appreciate the continuance of your good work on legislation favorable to Triple A, Federal Security Administration, and incentive payments.

HAVELOCK FARMERS UNION LOCAL 858.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I hope every Senator will make a study as to how the F. S. A. and the farm program generally are affecting all the Northwestern States. State after State would almost have gone into bankruptcy if it had not been for the fact that the Federal Government sent hundreds of millions of dollars into the States to help finance the farmers. When a farmer could not keep 20 cows, arrangements were made so that he could keep 10; when he could not keep 10, when the drought continued for 8, 9, or 10 years, arrangements were made so that a foundation herd could be retained. The Federal Government did a tremendous amount of good, and it is continuing to do so. I hope that the farm agencies will all be continued and that appropriations necessary to keep them functioning, as they have been functioning in the past, will be granted.

SOME PHASES OF THE POLITICAL SCENE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DANAHER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator DANAHER before the convention of the Young Republicans of Connecticut, at Hartford, Conn., on May 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEW HORIZONS OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—ARTICLE BY SENATOR BALL

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "New Horizons for the Republican Party," written by him, and published in the Nebraska State Journal of May 24, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FARMERS PAYING DEBTS TO GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Farmers Paying Debts to Government," delivered by Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, on the National Farm and Home Hour, May 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S TOMORROW—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM L. NELSON

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "America's Tomorrow," delivered by William L. Nelson at the annual convention of Missouri postmasters, Kansas City, Mo., May 18, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

BROADEN SOCIAL SECURITY—EDITORIAL FROM COLLIER'S WEEKLY

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Broaden Social Security," from the May 22, 1943, issue of Collier's Weekly, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS OF COLUMBIA RIVER FISH PACKERS

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Point Adams Packing Co., of Hammond, Oreg., relative to the problems of the Columbia River fish packers, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEEDING THE CHILDREN OF EUROPE—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Feed the Children," published in the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch of May 12, 1943, and an editorial entitled "Food for Hungry Children," published in the Ohio State Journal of May 13, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

KING COTTON NEEDS A FRIEND—STATEMENT BY C. M. HARRISON

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "King Cotton Needs a Friend," by Mr. C. M. Harrison, president of the Bank of Amory, Amory, Miss., which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 495) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 128) to authorize an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 21), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the address delivered before the joint meeting of the Members of the two Houses of Congress by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Right Honorable Winston Churchill, on Wednesday, May 19, 1943, be printed as a House document, and that 30,000 additional copies shall be printed for the House document room.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 128) to authorize an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PRINTING OF ADDRESS BEFORE CONGRESS OF PRIME MINISTER WINSTON CHURCHILL, OF GREAT BRITAIN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 21, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the address delivered before the joint meeting of the Members of the two Houses of Congress by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Right Honorable Winston Churchill, on Wednesday, May 19, 1943, be printed as a House document, and that 30,000 additional copies shall be printed for the House document room.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 1, line 8, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 8, after the numerals "1943", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That every foreign-trade agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of said act, as amended, shall be subject to termination 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as fixed by proclamation of the President, pursuant to joint resolution of the Congress or by the President."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah obtained the floor.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have asked the Senator to yield to me for a moment in order to see if we cannot make an arrangement temporarily to lay aside the pending business, and take up House bill 2714, making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes. I will state my reason for making such a request. We all know we have increased the overtime pay of a great many Government employees, and unless the urgent deficiency bill is passed and becomes law before next Tuesday, it will lead to the greatest confusion in the making of the payments; in fact they cannot be made.

It is very urgent that they should be made. There are only two possible controversial items in the bill, and I do not think they will lead to extended discussion. I think we can probably pass the appropriation bill in the course of an hour at the outside. I wonder if the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would be willing to agree to the unanimous-consent request I now submit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 111 be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2714, in an endeavor to pass it this morning. If consideration of the bill should lead to any delay, the Senator from Georgia, or the Senator from Utah, or any other Senator can ask for the regular order, and that, of course, would bring back House Joint Resolution 111 for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the Senator from Tennessee how long it will take to consider the appropriation bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think it will take more than an hour. One can never tell, however. There are two items in it which will probably take several moments to explain, but I do not think they will lead to any extensive discussion. I believe the bill can be passed within an hour.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, with the understanding that Senators can call for the regular order and displace the appropriation bill if it becomes manifest that its consideration will involve long discussion, I would gladly accommodate the Senator from Tennessee, because I know the necessity for passing the appropriation bill. At the same time, the joint resolution to extend the Trade Agreements Act is in very much the same condition, and I will have to give notice that I shall ask for the regular order if discussion of the appropriation bill becomes protracted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will sustain the Senator from Georgia if he calls for the regular order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in view of the statements made on the floor and conversations had about the matter, I have no objection to the proposed action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee that House Joint Resolution 111 be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2714?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—General Appropriations—Legislative," on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SENATE

Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: For the payment of 21 pages for the Senate Chamber, at $4 per day each, for the period July 1, 1943, to December 31, 1943, both dates inclusive, $15,456.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 7, to insert:

Senate restaurants: For payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with the act approved September 9, 1942 (Public Act 709, 77th Cong.), fiscal year 1943, $13,592.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 2, after line 21, to insert:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Capitol Building: For an additional amount for the Capitol Building, fiscal year 1943, including the same objects specified under this head in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1943, $10,600, to remain available until June 30, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive Office of the President—Emergency Fund for the President", on page 3, line 16, after the figures "$25,000,000", to strike out *"Provided,* That no part of the funds continued available by this paragraph shall be allotted to or expended for the National Resources Planning Board or the Farm Security Administration or for any of the functions of either said Board or said Administration" and insert *"Provided,* That no part of the funds continued available by this paragraph shall be allotted to or expended for any of the functions of any agency of Government for which appropriations have been duly made by the Congress, or for the functions of any agency for which estimates have been submitted by the Budget and for which the Congress has failed to make appropriations: *Provided further,* That this limitation shall not apply to allotments or allocations made to the War Department or the Navy Department."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office for Emergency Management", on page 5, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$834,000" and in line 8, after the word "binding" to strike out "$4,363,000" and insert "$4,597,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 8, to insert:

War Shipping Administration: Notwithstanding the provisions of section 203 of the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943 (Public Law 678), the Office for Emergency Management, War Shipping Administration, may expend during the fiscal year 1943 not to exceed $294,430 for travel.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent Executive Agencies", on page 6, after line 1, to insert:

BITUMINOUS COAL CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

Salaries and expenses: For the Office of the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, fiscal year 1943, in carrying out the functions thereof as created by the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended (15 U. S. C. 849 and 852), as further amended by the act of April 24, 1943 (Public Law 40), and as further amended, to be supplemental to and merged with the appropriation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943, and to be available for the same objects of expenditure, $16,000, to continue available during the fiscal year 1944: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall not be available for obligation unless and until there shall have been enacted a further extension of said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 13, to insert:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CONTINGENT AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

Postage: For an additional amount for postage for strictly official mail matter, including the rental of postage-meter equipment, fiscal year 1943, $4,000.

Judicial expenses: For an additional amount for judicial expenses, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, $1,675.

General advertising: For an additional amount for general advertising, authorized and required by law, and for tax and school notices and notices of changes in regulations, fiscal year 1941, $108.40.

Printing and binding: For an additional amount for printing and binding, fiscal year 1943, $8,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 4, to insert:

REFUND OF ERRONEOUS COLLECTIONS

Refund of erroneous collections: For an additional amount for refund of erroneous collections, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, $35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 9, to insert:

PAYMENT TO JOSEPH SHARFSIN

For payment to Joseph Sharfsin, of the Philadelphia (Pa.) bar, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 23, 1942 (Private Law 469), $3,472.39.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 13, to insert:

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Tuberculosis sanatoria, expenses: For an additional amount for provisions, and so forth, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, $28,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 18, to insert:

COURTS

THE MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Salaries: For an additional amount for personal services, including pay of retired judges, fiscal year 1943, $5,464.14.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 10, to insert:

PUBLIC WELFARE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION, WORKHOUSE AND REFORMATORY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Support of convicts: For an additional amount for support, maintenance, and transportation of convicts transferred from District of Columbia, fiscal year 1941, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1941, $6,036.58.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 8, to insert:

NATIONAL TRAINING SCHOOL FOR BOYS

National Training School for Boys: For an additional amount for care and maintenance of boys committed to the National Training School for Boys by the courts of the District of Columbia under a contract made by the Board of Public Welfare with the Attorney General at a rate of not to exceed $2 per day for each boy so committed, fiscal year 1942, $4,562.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 16, to insert:

NONRESIDENT INSANE

Nonresident insane: For an additional amount for deportation of nonresident insane persons, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, $4,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 21, to insert:

MILITIA

For an additional amount for personal services and other expenses, fiscal year 1941, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1941, $453.12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 2, to insert:

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

For the payment of claims in excess of $250, approved by the Commissioners in accordance with the act of February 11, 1929, as amended by the act approved June 5, 1930 (45 Stat. 1160; 46 Stat. 500), $2,152.54.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments dealing with judgments and audited claims be agreed to en bloc. The Government is obligated to pay them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendments dealing with judgments and audited claims were agreed to en bloc, as follows:

On page 11, after line 7, to insert:

JUDGMENTS

For the payment of final judgments, including costs, rendered against the District of Columbia, as set forth in Senate Document No. 44, together with such further sum as may be necessary to pay the interest at not exceeding 4 percent per annum on such judgments, as provided by law, from the date the same became due until the date of payment, $11,418.75.

On page 11, after line 15, to insert:

AUDITED CLAIMS

For the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the accounting officers of the District of Columbia, under appropriations, the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), being for the service of the fiscal year 1940 and prior fiscal years:

Public schools, salaries, District of Columbia, 1940, community centers, $6.08;

General advertising, District of Columbia, 1940, $11.24;

Support of convicts, District of Columbia, 1940, $108.80;

Metropolitan Police expenses, District of Columbia, 1939, motor vehicles, $147.92;

Support of convicts, District of Columbia, 1939, $328.50;

Support of convicts, District of Columbia, 1938, $149.40;

Contingent and miscellaneous expenses, 1937, general advertising, $286;

In all, audited claims, $1,037.94.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Tennessee if there was any division in the committee with respect to any of the amendments to the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not with respect to the amendments which are being considered now. The two controversial amendments are one which has already been agreed to at the bottom of page 3, and one on page 48, section 304, the last section but one of the bill. As I remember, those two amendments were the only really controversial amendments in the whole bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator referred to the amendment on page 3 as being a controversial amendment. My recollection is that the discussion in the committee was largely over the form or the draft rather than the purpose of the proposal. Am I correct in that respect?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct. That led me into making a mistake of fact yesterday in discussing another amendment in another bill. I thought the action on that amendment in our committee was unanimous, but by examination of the record it was discovered that the amendment was agreed to by a vote of 11 to 9. Correction of that statement was made at the time. The amendment now referred to, as I remember, was approved by all members of the committee.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. What specifically is included in the increase made on page 5, line 7, of approximately $134,000 for printing and binding?

Mr. McKELLAR. That refers to an overnight printing service, for which an additional sum of money was found to be necessary.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does House bill 2714 comprehend printing and binding of reports of a historical nature concerning the last World War and the peace?

Mr. McKELLAR. This bill does not. That item will come up in the appropriation bill for the State Department, which is now before the committee. The hearings on the State Department bill have been completed. When that measure comes up the Senator will find contained therein the item to which he refers.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am interested in having that item allowed, if possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 12, to insert:

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1943 for the payment of increases in compensation authorized by the act of April 1, 1943 (Public Law 22, 78th Cong.), as follows:

For poundmaster, salaries, District of Columbia, 1943, $175;

Commission on Mental Health, District of Columbia, 1943, $525;

Public schools, salaries, District of Columbia, 1943: Administrative and supervisory, $11,373; attendance officers, $265; teachers and librarians, $470,700; in all, $482,338;

Recreation Board, salaries and expenses, District of Columbia, 1943, $14,305;

Metropolitan Police, salaries, District of Columbia, 1943: Pay and allowances, officers and members, $48,000;

Fire Department, salaries, District of Columbia, 1943: Pay of officers and members, $7,000;

Gallinger Municipal Hospital, salaries, District of Columbia, 1943, $36,000;

Probation system, courts, District of Columbia, 1943, $750;

In all, $589,093.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 11, to insert:

HIGHWAY FUND, GASOLINE TAX, AND MOTOR VEHICLE FEES

DEPARTMENT OF VEHICLES AND TRAFFIC

Expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1941, for purchase, installation, and modification of electric traffic lights, signals and controls, and so forth, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1941, $468.19.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, one page 13, after line 19, to insert:

REFUND OF PAVING ASSESSMENTS

Refund of paving assessments: For the refund in part of paving assessments paid by abutting property owners in connection with the restoration of abandoned street railway track areas, where portions of such assessments were subsequently paid by the street railway company, $7,426.65, payable from the special fund created by the act of April 23, 1924, as amended by the act of August 17, 1937.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 3, to insert:

WATER SERVICE

Washington aqueduct: For an additional amount for operation, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, $174,763, payable wholly from the revenues of the Water Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 9, to insert:

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The foregoing sums for the District of Columbia, unless otherwise therein specifically provided, shall be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the Treasury of the United States in the manner prescribed by the District of Columbia Appropriation Acts for the respective fiscal years for which such sums are provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior," on page 15, after line 1, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

BITUMINOUS COAL DIVISION

For the Bituminous Coal Division, fiscal year 1943, in carrying out the purposes of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended (15 U. S. C. 828–849), as further amended by the act of April 24, 1943 (Public Law 40), and as further amended, to be supplemental to and merged with the appropriation under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943, and to be available for the same objects of expenditure, $800,000, to continue available during the fiscal year 1944: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for obligation unless and until there shall have been enacted a further extension of said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 15, to insert:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Maintenance, Wapato irrigation and drainage system, etc., Yakima Reservation, Wash. (receipt limitation): For operation and maintenance of the Wapato irrigation and drainage system and auxiliary units thereof, Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., fiscal year 1943, $20,000, to be added to the $165,980 appropriated for this purpose in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943 (56 Stat. 520).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Reclamation," on page 16, after line 15, to insert:

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

To enable the Geological Survey to meet obligations incurred by it arising from cooperative work pending reimbursement from cooperating agencies in accordance with the provisions of the acts of February 27, 1925 (43 U. S. C. 39, 40); May 10, 1926, as amended (43 U. S. C. 48); June 17, 1935 (43 U. S. C. 49); March 4, 1915, as amended (31 U. S. C. 686); and July 2, 1943 (56 Stat. 537–539), fiscal year 1943, $400,000, which amount shall be placed to the credit of the 1943 appropriation account of the Geological Survey: *Provided*, That there shall be returned to the Treasury not later than 6 months after the close of the fiscal year 1943 out of reimbursements received from cooperating agencies an amount equal to the sum herein appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 5, to insert:

GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES

Salaries and expenses, Government of the Virgin Islands: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified for the appropriation for this purpose in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943 (56 Stat. 560), $7,000.

Salaries and expenses, agricultural experiment station and vocational school, Virgin Islands: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, fiscal year 1943, including the objects specified for the appropriation for this purpose in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943 (56 Stat. 560), $2,100.

Defraying deficits in treasuries of municipal governments, Virgin Islands: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1943, for defraying the deficit in the treasury of the municipal government of St. Croix because of the excess of current expenses over current revenues for the fiscal year 1943 (56 Stat. 560), $45,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 18, to insert:

PUERTO RICAN HURRICANE RELIEF

The limitation of $19,950 upon the amount that may be expended for administrative expenses, Puerto Rican Hurricane Relief, contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943, is hereby increased to $22,350.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 19, to insert:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the postal revenues)

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INSPECTOR

Clerks, division headquarters: For an additional amount for compensation of 332 clerks at division headquarters and other posts of duty of post-office inspectors, fiscal year 1943, $8,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 2, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Star Route Service: For an additional amount for inland transportation by star routes (excepting service in Alaska), including temporary service to newly established post offices, fiscal year 1942, $14,000.

Railway Mail Service: For an additional amount for Railway Mail Service, salaries, fiscal year 1943, $5,375,000.

Railway postal clerks, travel allowance: For an additional amount for travel allowance to railway postal clerks and substitute railway postal clerks, fiscal year 1943, $375,000.

Railway Mail Service, traveling expenses: For an additional amount for Railway Mail Service, traveling expenses, fiscal year 1943, $3,000.

Domestic air-mail service: For an additional amount for the inland transportation of mail by aircraft, including the objects specified under this head in the Post Office Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal years which follow, respectively:

For 1941, $192,541;

For 1942, $327,891.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 23, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Indemnities, domestic mail: For an additional amount for payment of indemnities, including the objects specified under this head in the Post Office Department Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years which follow, respectively:

For 1942, $110,000;

For 1943, $660,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 7, to insert:

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

For maintenance and operation of the United States Soldiers' Home, to be paid from the Soldiers' Home permanent fund, $44,800: *Provided*, That no part of the Soldiers' Home permanent fund shall be used for the payment of salaries including overtime in excess of amounts fixed by the Board of Commissioners for the Soldiers' Home.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—War overtime pay and other compensation increase," on page 27, at the end of line 15, to increase the appropriation for "Salaries, Freedmen's Hospital, Federal Security Agency," 1943, from $22,700 to $28,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 6, to insert:

Foreign quarantine service, Public Health Service, 1943, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, at the end of line 25, to increase the total appropriation for the Federal Security Agency, from $2,162,700 to $2,178,700.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "War Department—Civil functions," on page 42, after line 9, to strike out:

Soldiers' Home permanent fund (trust fund), 1943, $44,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, at the end of line 16, to reduce the total appropriation for civil functions of the War Department from $359,400 to $314,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, at the end of line 25, to reduce the total appropriation under section 201, for additional amounts for appropriations for

the fiscal year 1943 for the payment of increases in compensation authorized by law, from $121,899,751 to $121,870,951.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—General provisions," on page 48, line 1, after the words "United States", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 10, to strike out:

SEC. 304. No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett: *Provided,* That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided further,* That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for services performed as a member of a jury or as a member of the armed forces of the United States, nor any benefit, pension, or emolument resulting therefrom.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me ask if there was a division in the committee over the deletion of section 304.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there were a great many expressions of opinion as to section 304; but the committee took the position that either last year or the year before a similar item was carried as to Goodwin V. Watson, and the committee sustained the item at that time, and the bill as reported to the Senate contained the provision. The Senate by a viva voce vote, I believe—I do not think there was a yea-and-nay vote—overruled the committee. Under the circumstances, the Senate having taken that position on a previous occasion, we felt it probably would take the same position in this instance; and so we struck out the item so that it could go to conference and be considered there. I shall ask the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who is a member of both the subcommittee and the full committee, if my statement is not substantially correct?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think the Senator is, as usual, entirely correct. The item, as the Members of the Senate know, deals with a very controversial matter. It was the attitude of the Senate, when the problem was last before us, that we should not in such a way attempt to deal with the status of the three men involved. The Appropriations Committee has conformed its present action to the previously expressed view of the Senate. There has been, and there is, so much division in the other branch of Congress with respect to this matter that it would also seem advisable to the members of the Senate committee that this subject might perhaps well be pursued further and that further study might well be given to it in the conference committee. Whether any solution is possible, I do not know. I simply know that, for myself, I am opposed to the proposed method.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let me ask whether any evidence was presented to the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee in connection with the matter.

Mr. WHITE. I was not a member of the subcommittee which considered the bill. My impression is—although the Senator from Tennessee can answer—that the subcommittee acted upon the past record which had been built up in the case and was very substantially influenced by the past action of the Senate itself with respect to it. I think I am correct, but I am not certain.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that I asked the Senator from Maine whether any evidence had been adduced before the Senate subcommittee in connection with the three men involved in the amendment on page 48.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I recall, the only evidence adduced was in behalf of striking out the provision and none was adduced for retaining it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Can the Senator advise me whether I have been correctly informed? It has been stated to me that the action of the House was predicated on the findings of the so-called Kerr committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have heard that, but there was no evidence of that kind before our committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The further statement has been made that the evidence taken by the Kerr committee was not available to the House. I wondered whether it had been made available to the Senate committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. It had not; and that was an additional reason why the committee, with practical, if not entire, unanimity, concluded to strike out the item and to give them an opportunity to make a showing later.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a moment ago I said to the Senator from Wisconsin that, in my opinion, no new testimony was presented to the subcommittee on this matter, but that the subcommittee and the full committee acted on the past record of the Senate with respect to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. In addition to that, there were a number of witnesses before the subcommittee. Independent witnesses came down from New York and the Secretary of the Interior appeared before the committee and very vigorously opposed it, and probably other officials of the Government appeared. All the witnesses before our committee were in opposition to it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The only reason for my interruption of the Senator from Maine was that if the information which had been given to me was correct, namely, that the action was taken without the testimony or the evidence which had been the basis for the action of the House committee being presented to the House itself, it would seem to me a most unusual procedure. Certainly, a man or a group of men have the right to be confronted with the testimony upon which it is proposed that he or they be denied the right to his or their livelihood. Let me say further that I have grave question as to whether depriving a person of his position in this way does not violate in spirit, if not in letter, the provision in the Constitution which prohibits Congress from enacting a bill of attainder.

However, be that as it may, on the basis of the statements made to me, if the evidence on which the House text is predicated has not been made public, it would be, in addition, a most unfortunate precedent. Surely a man has a right to be confronted with the evidence against him in a court, committee, or forum, where he may refute it if he can.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I take it the Senator does not mean that what he is now saying is addressed to the action of the Senate committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No.

Mr. WHITE. I wanted that to be made clear.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly; but the point is that I wished to ascertain, if I could, whether the information which had been given to me was correct, and whether any evidence had been made available to the Senate Appropriations Committee upon which any such action could be justified, waving aside for the moment the question of whether it is within the power of Congress to enact legislation of this character. I rose to ask the Senator the question because I was most anxious to know what the record showed in that regard. I confess that I have not had an opportunity to read it. I have been busy with other matters.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Without expressing any view as to what the Senate should do, it seems to me that the power of the Senate to do this, if it so desires, is clear. No man has a constitutional title to a job. Since it is within the power of Congress to appropriate for any purpose, or not to appropriate, Congress undoubtedly has the power. It may be a foolish exercise of the power.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, with all due respect to the legal attainments of the Senator from Texas, let me say that there are very able lawyers who take exactly the opposite view, and who hold that such action would be violative of the provisions of the Constitution. However, that is not unusual. I do not know how able lawyers could continue to earn a livelihood unless they were able to disagree on propositions of law.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has anticipated me. I was about to observe

that the fact that able lawyers disagree is what supports the legal profession.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is why they are able to eat. Nevertheless, after reading the arguments on both sides of the constitutional question, the Senator from Wisconsin has grave doubt whether Congress has the right to enact such legislation. In the present state of the record, I certainly hope that the Senate conferees will make an ardent fight for the Senate's amendment. I wished to have the RECORD show that the Senate has an understanding of the question and is aware of the action which it is taking in this regard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 48, after line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 3, to change the section number from 305 to 304.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2714) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to thank the leaders on both sides, as well as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and other Senators who aided in the passage of this bill so that the urgent deficiency appropriations may be made available as soon as possible.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of the able Senator from Tennessee in charge of the bill just passed to the amendment on pages 3 and 4 of the bill. I do so now, because, like the Senator from Tennessee, I desire to see the trade-agreements measure which is before the Senate taken up as soon as possible. Therefore I did not present this matter while the Senate was considering the bill a few moments ago. However, I hope that the Senator from Tennessee and the other members of the conference committee will take to conference and seriously consider what I have to say.

It seems to me that the amendment which has been agreed to may be so restrictive as to contradict the purposes for which the emergency fund was originally established. I seriously question that the language of the amendment as amended does not restrict the use of funds to the purposes for which Congress has heretofore made appropriation or authorization. It provides that such sums may not be spent by any agency for which Congress has made an appropriation, or by any agency for which estimates have been submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, and for which Congress has failed to make appropriations. It seems to me that it would restrict the funds to purposes for which Congress has made authorization, but for which no estimate of appropriation was ever submitted, or for which Congress has made no appropriation.

I honestly believe that the situation is somewhat confused. There may be considerable doubt as to the purposes for which the President's fund may now be used, or whether it may be used at all. The amendment would seem to require that the agency which is to spend the funds must be one for which no appropriation has been made, and thus would seem to include the Executive Office of the President, for which Congress has made appropriations. In other words, if my interpretation is correct, the President is given a fund which he himself may not spend, and which no agency may spend unless it is one for which no appropriation has been made or refused by the Congress.

I wished to put that statement into the RECORD at this time with the sincere hope and expectation that it may be considered in conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am very happy that the Senator has put the statement in the RECORD. It will be considered by the conferees. Of course, this amendment will put the whole question into conference.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. The amendment can be changed, or amended, or even stricken out in conference. The whole subject will be before the conferees. So I am sure that if the amendment would adversely affect anyone in the executive department, or any other department, the conferees will hear about it. The matter will certainly be brought to their attention and considered very carefully.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the last statement made by the Senator. I am satisfied that it is only a question of the rearrangement of the language, and that the committee does not mean to do what I contend it has done. It may be that I am mistaken. However, I believe there is merit in what I have said, and that the question should be carefully considered by the conferees.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, according to the way the amendment reads, if an appropriation has been made by Congress, no money may be expended from the President's emergency fund for that purpose; or if a Budget estimate has been submitted, no money may be expended from the fund unless Congress should allow it. There are instances of Congress having authorized work to be done, for which no estimates have been submitted—as, for example, the Florida ship canal. As the amendment reads, it would be possible to use this fund to build the Florida ship canal. I think the question had better be looked into carefully in conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. That will certainly be done. The Senator from Arizona is one of the conferees, so I am sure no injustice will be done.

POST-WAR PLANNING

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate spent a great deal of time discussing the question of planning for post-war domestic problems. The disposition of the Government to create new agencies for planning for present emergencies or post-war objectives is too often an admission of the unwillingness of the present agencies and institutions to function, whether through lack of vision or of application. Such planning can best be done by those duly charged with the responsibility to do it.

In no field is this more true than with reference to the present war or the mechanics of the peace to follow. In this instance the failure of Congress to plan intelligently for the future is due to the paucity of information which comes to the Congress from those charged with the conduct of the war and with the policies between nations associated in the war. This indicates the desire of the executive department to conduct these tremendous tasks without the counsel of the Congress. It points clearly to the intent of the administration to write its own plan for peace without counseling with the Congress. Twenty-four years ago the Nation had an outstanding example of the dire results of such a policy in the failure to reconcile the unconsulted wish of the Congress in making the terms of peace. We ought to avoid another such experience.

The able junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has offered a plan to bring about closer cooperation among the branches of our Government responsible for determining the peace. The plan is now under consideration in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am taking this brief time from the business of the Senate to urge on the Committee of Foreign Relations the early consideration of the plan proposed by the able Senator from Wisconsin to bring unity of thought between the Executive and the Congress in this highly important task.

In the Washington Post of one day this week there appeared an editorial strongly urging consideration of this proposal. I ask that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, in further support of the request I have made.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELLING CONGRESS

The enthusiasm with which Congress received Prime Minister Churchill last week was not wholly due to warmth of feeling for our British Allies or to admiration for a great statesman. In part, it reflected the hunger of Congressmen for news and background information about the war. This was the first opportunity the great majority of Senators and Representatives have had to get a first-hand report on the Tunisian campaign or the war in general in recent months.

When President Roosevelt returned from Casablanca, there was hope that he would report to Congress on the progress of the war and on such plans for future action as could be revealed without giving valuable information to the enemy. Instead the President's speech on his trip was made at a

dinner given by the White House Correspondents' Association. Even when the great victory in north Africa was won, there was no report on the matter to Congress. Legislators had to await the arrival of Mr. Churchill from London to obtain an authoritative review of this notable achievement. Later Mr. Churchill also met in executive session with the Foreign Relations Committees of both Houses and answered questions about the war in the best House of Commons manner.

The effect of Mr. Churchill's candor and his consideration for the legislative branch is to turn the spotlight once more upon the dangerous lack of cooperation between the White House and Congress. Our legislators are expected to vote staggering sums for the war, to support every proposal advanced by the Commander in Chief, and to prepare for the restoration of peace without being kept informed as to how the battle is going. The liaison between the executive and the legislative branches is so poor that the latter looks hopefully to foreign visitors for information on which intelligent policies can be based.

This sort of separatism could be justified only on the theory that the administration is solely responsible for the conduct of the war and the making of peace when the guns have been silenced. But, of course, that responsibility is not wholly on the executive branch. White House policy must be supported at every turn by legislation which only Congress can enact. And the peace treaty will have to win the support of two-thirds of the Senate. In the circumstances full understanding and cooperation between the two are basic essentials of any sound formula for winning the war and the peace.

Why, then, has the Senate Foreign Relations Committee been so dilatory in reporting out the Wiley resolution calling for a Foreign Relations Advisory Council to act as a liaison between the Executive and legislative officials who share the duty of planning for a lasting peace? The President is unquestionably right in laying great store upon a meeting between himself, Mr. Churchill, and Marshal Stalin. But the only sound basis on which international cooperation in the post-war world can be laid is cooperation within our own Government in working out the objectives for which the United States will be prepared to stand. Negligible progress in that direction has been made, even though the White House and Capitol are but 2 miles apart.

Ten months before Pearl Harbor Senator WILEY introduced another resolution asking the Secretary of State to report in executive session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the threat of war in the Far East and our preparations to meet it. At that time the State Department knew that war in the Pacific was rapidly approaching. But the resolution was pigeonholed. The committee did not get the information sought. No adequate preparations to meet an attack were made. The United States was humiliated at Pearl Harbor and a great sacrifice of human life will be necessary to regain what we have lost in the Far East. No one can say with assurance how the situation would have been changed if the information in the hands of the State Department had been conveyed to key Members of Congress. This much, however, is certain: the withholding of such information makes it impossible for the representatives of the people to act intelligently in the face of a global crisis. The Senate cannot act too quickly to bridge this dangerous gap between executive and legislative action while the problems of the forthcoming peace are still in the discussion stage.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rise to invite attention to a most distressing situation which may have an important influence in slowing up the actual winning of the war.

We have before us the question of extending the reciprocal trade-agreement authority for another period of time. The academic bureaucrats who label themselves as experts, but who are not experts, have raised the false and deceitful hue and cry that the reenactment of these destructive and highly dangerous alleged reciprocal trade treaties is necessary and required as a war emergency, and as a measure to develop unity among ourselves and our allies.

This is a falsehood. The mute evidence of the destructiveness to American farmers and workers is a matter of record which is backed up by a preponderance of sworn testimony.

The American people, particularly our workers who toil in our factories and mines and our farmers who sweat and work long hours on the farms, have been grossly deceived by these alleged experts who have taken upon themselves the rights and prerogatives of the elected Members of Congress. These governmental bureaucrats are determined to make treaties. They have grand ideas of setting up a world to their own liking. They do not seem to care what it costs the workers and farmers of America. Over the years they have set up a secret super-government, within the Government, which has successfully pulled the wool over the eyes of the people, and these bureaucrats now feel that they control all political parties. They have convinced themselves that they can do as they please, because they think they can control or influence the judiciary, the administrative, and the legislative departments of Government.

Thus far, the people have endured this infamy with bovine complacency. The people have been deliberately confused by these wastrels of the people's money who have wormed their way into high places of nonelective Government policy-making positions. These dangerous bureaucrats have almost succeeded in setting class against class. They have deliberately defamed and belittled the legal profession, because it is largely represented in the legislative body, and constitutes the personnel of the courts. They have loaded the various divisions of the Federal Government with their sixth columnists, represented by young, callow college graduate fledglings, most of whom never worked a day with their hands, and who do not know what it means to earn an honest dollar by the sweat of their brows. I call upon every farmer to look over and study his local, State, and Federal tax bills, and see how many tax dollars he has had to pay for being deceived by these sixth columnist internationalists into thinking he is being benefited.

I call on the men and women who toil and labor in the mines, in the factories, in American industry, and on the American farms, to become curious and ask questions. We know that it is impossible to get something for nothing. We know that we must expend an honest effort to receive an honest reward. What has happened is that these bureaucrats have taken away from the people hard-earned wages by means of hidden, indirect, punitive, and direct taxes to a greater extent than they have given back to them alleged benefits from these treaties. They have made it appear that honest farmers are opposed to honest workers and toilers. They have skillfully organized a sentiment among our workers and farmers that because an American business or an American industry, under our American Constitution, expands and develops, and becomes big, it is something evil, which the workers and farmers should abhor and oppose in every manner.

They want to control our banks and financial institutions, and make office boys and girls out of the Members of the Nation's Congress. In a deceptive manner, they have developed a sentiment that politics is something unclean, untouchable, and horrible. Webster's Dictionary defines the word "politics" as the science of civil government. They are opposed to the practical application of the science of civil government by the people of this Republic. They are opposed to the orderly processes of civil government. That is why the Federal bureaucrats defame the word "politics." That is why Federal bureaucrats, who are appointed to their jobs, belittle the orderly operation of the system of checks and balances developed by the various American political parties since the creation of the Republic. That is why Federal bureaucrats want to take over the functions of the Congress and rule the Nation by directives, decrees, regulations, and dictatorial practices. That is why they flout and ignore the Congress. Much of the slander and most of the slurs which have been directed against the Nation's Congress have been promoted in a subversive manner by Federal bureaucrats.

They have bungled the food production system in America. Their false ideologies ordered the little pigs to be slaughtered, and our wheat and cotton to be plowed under, and they have driven farm workers to the crowded cities to compete with factory workers for their daily bread. They have set up and put into operation alleged reciprocal trade treaties which have totally bankrupted and destroyed many vegetable growers who are now urgently needed to provide food for the present war emergency. These Federal bureaucrats have by directives, decrees, regulations, and dictatorial practices curtailed the planting of fields for the production of foodstuff, thereby driving men and women out of the food-production industry, while they have permitted the alleged reciprocal trade treaties to build up vast vegetable growing organizations in Cuba and other foreign countries whose production comes into this country under conditions utterly destructive to our American vegetable grower. The shame of it all is that this vegetable-producing industry in Cuba was made possible by the infamous operation of the Cuban trade agreement which reduced the tariff on tomatoes and other vegetables to less than one-half the difference of the cost of production, and permitted favored American financial speculators to invest their funds in Cuban vegetable growing.

These destructive, alleged reciprocal trade treaties are just one outstanding evidence of what these bureaucrats are doing. They have become convinced that they are so powerful they can push the Nation's Congress around at will. They lied to the people and the Congress when they said they had to have the blank checks on the National Treasury for emergency purposes. They are lying now when they say they need these alleged reciprocal trade treaties for good neighbor purposes and to keep faith with our allies during this war.

This program of the reciprocal trade agreement authority is in complete disrepute with a great majority of the people of the United States. The farmers are practically in unity against its extension. If there is anything in this war emergency ghost, then we should not extend this authority, as the farmer with his program of contributing to the war effort by raising more food will be much perturbed by such action. If it is important that we have increased food production, then it should also be important that we contribute to the upbuilding of morale for those who raise the food. The farmer who produces sugar in the form of cane, corn, and sugar beets has been insulted by the reciprocal trade-agreement program. The result has been a shortage of sugar with the attendant rationing program, while sugar beet factories, cane fields of the South, beet fields in the West lie idle. There is no excuse for this sugar shortage except for crazy bureaucratic bungling. The same criticism may be directed against the treaty program as it relates itself to the flax grower and the wheat grower.

In order to keep our workers employed it is necessary that the farmers have purchasing power with which to buy the products of industry. Shall we reduce the buying power of the American farmer by reciprocal trade treaties which permit foreign, peon, squalid labor to compete with our American farmer on a tariff basis less than half the difference in cost of production?

The post-war program should include rural electrification of the American farms so that power will be available for irrigation of the sub-marginal lands of the Middle West and the burdens for the women folks made lighter in the homes.

These reciprocal trade agreements not only injure the American farmer, but they have been a serious detriment to American industry. One of the industries which has suffered much at the hands of the reciprocal trade agreement bureaucrat is the wool growing and the wool cloth manufacturing industry.

Wool growing and the manufacture of wool clothing is necessary in the national defense as well as in civil life. One lesson the present war is teaching us is that we cannot depend on our allies from overseas for our supplies of wool or wool clothing, but must preserve our own wool growing and wool manufacturers at all costs. This is imperative.

Mr. President, how has the manipulation of the trade agreements authority affected the import sources of domestic supply?

Duties have been reduced, not only on lower grades of wool coming from the Argentine, but duties on wool cloth have also been greatly and dangerously reduced in our agreement with Great Britain. That means also that duties on wool cloth were reduced to Italy and Japan, with whom we have no agreements, through operation of the most-favored-nation clause. In Great Britain, labor costs are approximately one-third of ours in America; in Italy they are one-fifth, and in Japan, less than one-tenth.

Great Britain has increased her exports of wool cloth to the United States in spite of the war. When peace comes, her exports to us will be a serious threat to our wool industry and our national employment. Such imports will force our wool growers to sell their wool in the world market at the world price which will eventually kill the growing of wool in America.

These bureaucrats are trying to force upon the American farmer a program which he utterly despises, and at the same time are asking him to contribute to the war effort by raising more food. While the damage is being done by unknown agents of the Government, yet the Congress of the United States is responsible for this misuse of the treaty-making power by delegating it in the manner provided by the statute which it is sought to extend in the pending joint resolution. We are preaching the "four freedoms" and saying to the world that every country should choose its form of Government and have the kind of laws it desires, and at the same time we are trying to force upon our own people something they condemn.

I do not care how good the administration may say the trade-agreement program is, the fact remains that the farmer and nearly all businessmen are utterly disgusted with it. Are we going, in the name of the war emergency, to force upon the farmer something he despises? Are we going to give the voters of America a demonstration of democratic government by jamming down their throats something they do not want? Are we going to depart from the principles of free government by disregarding the will of the people in order to satisfy a small group of bureaucrats, who have made trade agreements during the last 10 years without any regard to the wishes of the people?

Do these starry-eyed, inexperienced, self-styled experts intend to destroy our American industries in order to accomplish their economically unsound ideologies? I warn the Senate to look carefully into this horrible, behind-the-scenes, international activity, being carried on without permission of the people's elected representatives.

Who wants these trade agreements for use now? Not even the State Department. They desire to have this authority so that when we reach the time of the peace negotiations they will have this power for post-war planning. Are you in accord with the post-war planning program of having America become Santa Claus for the world so that bureaucrats may make the post-war treaties as they desire? Who knows now what contingencies will confront us when the war is won? Do you want to delegate to an unknown bureaucrat unlimited authority to make unlimited contracts after this war is over with nations that do not now exist?

If we extend this authority, and it is in existence when this war is over, I venture to say that we will have the greatest list of secret treaties that was ever known in world history.

Does Congress desire to delegate unlimited authority to crackpot bureaucrats to make treaties after the war? The war could end within 2 years, and then treaties will be made without our consent. Is it the intention of the United Nations to ask us to enter into some kind of agreement that Congress would not approve when this war is over? What other interest could they have in this proposed legislation? If we do not pass this extension of trade-agreement authority, the American Nation has the power to contract and treat with nations as fully as it would have with this extension. The only difference is, that if we do not pass it, the treaty-making power will be where the founding fathers placed it—with the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Why should the United Nations desire us to change our constitutional method of making treaties now? Do they feel that at the peace table they could get some advantage which they would not have without it? Do they have the effrontery to say that they feel that the President would make concessions and give away American resources what the Congress would not dare to do because it is responsible to the American people?

Are we now, in the passage of this joint resolution, trying to thwart the will of the people? Congress has been criticized for delegating its authority to unknown bureaucrats and we received a directive last November to recapture some of that delegated authority. Are we going to respond by spitting in the face of the voters?

Without arguing about the great opposition which exists in the minds of private business in general against the extension of this authority, I will ask you if you intend to insult the most vital industry in the present war effort, the farmer, by extending this authority, without drastic amendment? Will you dispute the fact that the farmers and stockmen are practically 100 percent opposed to this program? If you do, examine all the hearings which have been had before the Committee on Reciprocity Information since 1934, and you will see that practically every farm and stockman's organization in America has opposed every one of them. Members of Congress in great numbers have opposed many of these treaties.

When the Argentine trade agreement was proposed in 1939, many Members of this body and the House also appeared to protest against it. The bureaucrats who conduct the secret negotiations which terminate in these agreements knew that this power was hanging in the balance.

They rejected the Argentine agreement early in 1940. This was done so that the trade-agreement program would be saved for them to cater to foreign interests. They intended to make this Argentine trade agreement, but they knew if they made it in 1939, that would have been the last one they would ever have made. They rejected it early in 1940, and then when the resolution of extension was presented in February of 1940, they went before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and deliberately misstated their intentions as to the Argentine agreement. At the very time that Secretary Cordell Hull denied that there was any intention to renegotiate a trade agreement with Argentina, spokesmen of Argentina were asserting that such was the present intention. Attention of representatives of the State Department were called to the statements, but this simply brought further denials. However, the prophecy of Argentine statesmen came true, and just as soon as the resolution of extension was passed in 1940, the Argentine agreement was negotiated. This is outstanding evidence of bureaucratic chicanery.

At this point I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the testimony of some of our own colleagues. I shall read now from page 2433 of hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, volume III. I quote first from the statement of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]:

Two years ago the power to make reciprocal trade agreements was extended by Congress for an additional period of 3 years.

On the first vote the Senate denied the extension. However, a quick recess was called and enough Senators induced to change their position to grant the extension by the slimmest kind of a margin.

I voted against the extension because the original policy to import only goods which we did not have but needed had been abandoned, and agriculture, in which my State is heavily interested, was being made to bear most of the burden of the program. If the question of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act were before the United States Senate today, it would be defeated unless safeguards for the protection of American agriculture were incorporated or the power to ratify trade agreements was restored to the United States Senate in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution.

I quote now from the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], page 2434:

Now, it seems to me that it must follow inevitably and without argument from that principle that we cannot lay a basis of trade which will develop mutual benefits for both parties to the trade unless we are exchanging what we have for what we have not.

Can it be said that agriculture is one of those industries which is benefited from an excess of protectionism? I do not think that can be contended for a moment. Excess protectionism is imposed upon the country by interests whose efforts to obtain special privileges in their disregard for the general economic well-being threaten the every foundation of our democracy.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, I contend that it is self-evident that agriculture is not one of the special interests which threaten the basis of our democracy. Agriculture has been suffering. Agriculture is not one of the industries that has exploited the people. Agriculture is the industry which has been exploited, and it seems to me that there can be no question whatsoever that all the power and influence of this Government in Congress and in the executive departments, in the State Department, in the Tariff Commission, and in this committee, should be exercised to uphold and to defend agriculture and not to throw the markets of America open to excess surpluses of agricultural products from other countries.

Then the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] testified as follows, as appears on page 2434:

I voted for the trade-agreements law when it was passed, but I have not been happy ever since about that vote. When the date of expiration comes along I hope we will not have cause to repent even more strongly than some of us have already repented at times in the past.

Now, Mr. Chairman, without expiating and extending on these details, I think I voice the expression of a great majority of both Houses of Congress. Oh, but they say Congress hasn't got anything to do with this now. They have put in a bureau to take charge of that. I have high respect for Secretary Hull. I served with him in the House 10 years, and 2 years in the Senate. He has made a great Secretary of State, but at the same time we do not propose to have these trade agreements used as a club to hammer agriculture into insensibility when it is just beginning now to come to life a little bit.

Last year we spent $700,000,000 out of the Treasury to try to do something for agriculture to give it better prices. Now it is proposed to come along and reduce the rates on agriculture so they can bring more products from abroad into the United States, more cattle, more flax, more wool, more other products that are competitive with the products of the American farmer.

Now, let me refer to the testimony of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. Reading from page 2434 again we find the Senator from New Mexico testifying as follows:

Throughout all my support of the trade-agreement theory, I have always argued and contended that agricultural products—that is, competitive products—should not be included. I have said that there would be no occasion for anyone to fear that any trade agreement would be entered into which would bring agricultural products into our own country in competition with our own farmers, cattle raisers, sheepmen, and all engaged in agriculture. I believe that. I said that in some campaigns. I defended some of the things which have already been done in trade agreements and I want to say that I still believe in the trade-agreement policy. I think it is a policy which must be maintained.

Nevertheless, I am confronted with this situation, that if trade agreements are entered into which bring into the country agricultural products in competition with the products of our own country, then my whole philosophy is destroyed. The very thing that I have preached and argued is taking place. The thing which I said would not happen is taking place.

I do not want to reverse my position. I do not want to have to go back to my own State and tell the cattlemen and sheepmen that I have been mistaken all these years, and that we are now bringing into this country products to compete with them, the thing I said would not happen.

The hearings also contain a statement made by the Honorable John J. Dempsey, then a Representative in Congress, and now Governor of the State of New Mexico.

Mr. President, we are promised now that this authority will not be used during the present emergency, and that it is needed only to meet the post-war necessities. Is the promise of the bureaucrat any more to be believed now than in 1940? If it is said that it is, on what premise is the assertion based? Can we predicate that assertion also on the present war emergency? The excuse serves the bureaucrat for every purpose he desires to promote. Do you believe, Mr. President, that those who deceived us once would be any less inclined to deceive us now during war?

If there is no intention to negotiate treaties during the present emergency, then why do we need the authority at all? When the war is over, the people will want their chosen representatives to have something to say about the terms of world peace, and the extent to which the resources of the American Nation are to be distributed to the world free of charge. Why should this be prevented by present post-war arrangements? The American people want their chosen representatives to determine whether to furnish a quart of milk to Hottentots who never drank milk, or give away our agricultural resources to foreign nations who can use their spare time to build armaments while we feed them free of charge.

The American people want their chosen representatives to make the treaties which shall determine how long their boys will remain abroad as a United Nations police force for the rest of the world, at our expense, through the payment of exorbitant taxes. The American voters do not want us to delegate authority now or in the future that will permit service-exempted draft-dodging bureaucrats to determine the policies of this Nation which may cause us to guarantee the "four freedoms" to peoples who may not want them, any more than we choose their form of government. We do not want any other country to guarantee us our form of government. Why should we ask any other country to give up its form of government and take ours? Are we to delegate authority now for smart-alecky bureaucrats to contract to send our boys in the armed forces on such a mission? Or shall we place it in the power of crackpot bureaucrats to contract as a part of a trade agreement, to keep our boys in the Eastern Hemisphere to enforce such trade agreements, in order to guarantee the "four freedoms"?

Three years ago, in 1939, one of the distinguished Members of the Senate, in appearing against the Argentine trade agreement, made the following statement which is to be found at pages 27–28 of the stenographic record of that hearing before the Committee on Reciprocity Information and Independent Interdepartmental Agency:

I voted for the trade-agreement law when it was passed, but I have not been happy ever since about that vote. When the date of expiration comes along, I hope we will not have cause to repent even more strongly

than some of us have already repented at times in the past.

The extension to which the Senator referred was the one just ahead, in 1940. Statements of similar import were made by several other Senators.

The remainder of the story is that these lying, irresponsible, deceiving, characterless bureaucrats listened to these distinguished Senators in December 1939, and then late in 1940, after the trade-agreement authority was extended in April 1940, made the exact agreement with Argentine, which they had rejected at these Senators' request in 1939. Do we want to delegate another 2 years of unlimited power to the same agency?

In view of what I have already said, I say to the Senator now that the past administration of the reciprocal trade agreement authority has not been entirely honest. The tactics used upon former occasions to secure its extension have not been frank. This time the war emergency is used as an excuse, not as a reason; it constitutes no reason. There is not one Member of this body who is willing now to permit the treaty of peace which will follow this war to be made by unknown, crackpot, irresponsible, deceiving bureaucrats. The Ways and Means Committee of the House asked to have the names of the persons who negotiate trade agreements made known to it, but the executive department refused on the ground it would submit them to political pressure. It would have submitted them to congressional annihilation.

If we authorize these alleged reciprocal trade treaties, which definitely tear down the high American standard of living, which will weaken and soften our Nation, we will automatically pave the way for World War No. 3.

There are but few Members of this body who are now willing to delegate to these unknown bureaucrats the power to ship a quart of milk a day to every Hottentot in the world as a part of the postwar world plan. If that is not the use intended to be made of this authority, tell us what it is. It is admitted now that it would be bad policy under existing world conditions to negotiate trade agreements. Then why extend this authority? If we grant a bureaucrat any power he will use it. It is like a boy playing with a firearm; give him a gun and he will play with it under all conditions. The Mexican trade agreement was promulgated in January of 1942, after Pearl Harbor. It reduced tariff rates on tomatoes to 1½ cents per pound, when the statistics furnished by the United States Tariff Commission show that it costs the Mexican grower 3 cents less to produce and place on the Chicago and New York markets, than it costs the American farmer to produce and place fresh tomatoes on the same Chicago and New York market. Is this good for the morale of American vegetable growers? When that is true, it is asinine to compel the American farmer to compete with cheap, peon, squalid, low-standard-of-living labor in his own market, even if the foreign producers do not market a considerable amount. It is a dirty disadvantage that should not be forced upon the American farmer.

If these crack pot bureaucrats would do such a thing in the present emergency, that is, consummate the Mexican agreement 1 month after Pearl Harbor, what guarantee have we that they will not negotiate one with Germany if the opportunity presents itself? If they are willing to force the American farmer to compete with low-standard-of-living peons in Mexico, in order to get cheap vegetables at the expense of the American farmer, who will say that after the war they will not let in cheap clothes from Germany made under squalid labor conditions there, or permit the Japanese rice farmer living on 10 cents a day to annihilate the American rice farmer?

The idea of free trade economy applied through new trade agreement ideology by crackpot, irresponsible bureaucrats has resulted in just as ridiculous things as that during all the last 10 years. The bureaucrats are now planning a postwar Utopia; freedom of access to natural resources, a quart of milk a day, chicken a day, go where you please, without regard to immigration laws, and what have you. Does the Senate want to put into their hands the power to level the tariff protection which has compensated American labor, American farmers' and American businessmen for the difference in cost of production which has resulted from our decent American standard of living? Or does the Senate prefer the new ideology of leveling the standard of living of the world so that all countries can have free access to what we have developed while they fiddled or prepared for war?

These crackpot, social-minded charity workers are now promoting their crackpot ideology through the International Food Conference. Do we know what business is being transacted there, or what recommendations will be made? This secret conference bears many of the attributes of the secret negotiations of trade agreements. Is a secret program now being formulated to be put into practice by unknown crackpot ideologists who are in or hover near this International Food Conference? Do we want to continue a secret treaty organization to give effect to the crackpot ideas that may come out of this conference?

Mr. President, in my judgment, it is time to end these secret international treaties which have always created jealousies among nations.

Treaties should be made in the manner provided by the Constitution, and then we would not have secret triple alliances which developed into the Axis Powers, or its counterpart the Triple Entente, equally as dangerous and disturbing to world peace. We as a nation have always condemned secret national treaties, yet now we are asked through this resolution to turn over to crackpot demogogic bureaucrats the power to involve us in such secret agreements. And this at the most dangerous and critical time in world history, and when it is highly desirable that international treaties be open, honest, and aboveboard.

Our farmers and workers are getting mad. They will not stand for such legislative or administrative chicanery. The handwriting is on the wall. Are we the representatives of the people, or have we turned over the people's birthright to the bureaucrats, crackpots, incompetent administrative draft dodgers, alleged foreign trade experts, and starry-eyed callow dilletantes?

The Senate's vote on these alleged reciprocal-trade treaties will tell the story to those outraged Americans.

The issue before the United States Senate now is well defined. If it is the desire of the Senate to keep faith with the American farmer and laborer, the resolution should be amended so as to provide for Congressional approval of trade agreements before they become effective. If it is not so amended, it should be defeated, as its past history has shown it to be a dangerous delegation of congressional prerogative. The greatest criticism now directed against Congress is that there has been improper delegation of its authority under the Constitution. I ask my colleagues to support such an amendment as a safeguard to the interests of our constituents.

Mr. President, I see sitting before me today some Senators who are engaged in business, some of whom have been at the head of large, fine business institutions. I wish to call to their attention a letter written to every Senator by Walter W. Cenerazzo, president and business agent of the Waltham Watchworkers Union No. 72, of Waltham, Mass. In my judgment, every farmer in the entire Northwest will agree to what that gentleman, representing the workers in that large manufacturing concern, says.

The letter was sent to every Member of the Senate on the 22d day of May 1943. It reads as follows:

WALTHAM WATCH WORKERS UNION NO. 72,
Waltham, Mass., May 22, 1943.

DEAR SENATOR: This brief is being sent to you for your information. It was presented to the Senate Finance Committee but was omitted from the unrevised editions of the printed committee hearings because of objections of officials of the Department of Commerce under Executive Order 9103 issued by the War Department to the figures on imports for the years 1941 and 1942 which were contained in the table on page 8 of this brief. These figures have been censored from the original copy submitted and will not appear in the brief as printed in the revised edition of the Senate Finance Committee hearings.

As it is doubtful whether or not the revised committee hearings will be printed in time for debate, our organization is taking this opportunity of presenting the facts to you as incorporated in the brief.

I ask the Senate to note particularly this statement:

We deem it highly unusual that a Government agency should have the right to censor figures which are in our possession and which are used other places in this brief, and we deem it important that you should know of this action. Whether or not this Department has the right to do this we do not know, but we leave it to your judgment whether or not this type of censorship is to be continued. The officials of the Commerce Department insist that under Executive Order 9103 the War Department has issued an order through the Director of the Budget that detail export and import figures for the last

quarter of 1941 and for the year 1942 are confidential and that these figures may not be published in a Government publication in table form.

I ask the Senate, Why?

The letter concludes, as follows:

We trust you will give this brief your utmost consideration so that you will understand the problem that is facing the 2,300 men and women who are members of our organization.

Respectfully,

WALTER W. CENERAZZO,
President and Business Agent.

Mr. President, because of the very great importance of the question which is before the Senate, I shall read a portion of the brief:

This brief is presented on behalf of 2,300 American workmen who are now working 100 percent on the production of vital time mechanisms for the defense of the United States and our allies. In behalf of 2,300 American workers who have had 293 of their midst, or some 12 percent of our number, left to serve in the armed forces of our country—293 men and women who are serving our country seeking to destroy Hitler and the other Axis enemies of the American people. Two thousand three hundred men and women, members of Watch Workers Union, No. 72, of the International Jewelry Workers Union, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, respectfully protest to the elected representatives of the United States, members of the Senate Finance Committee, the continuation of reciprocal trade agreements which make it possible for the American public to furnish the finance, in part at least, for Hitler to make war on our people.

The Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A2232, reveals that the Director of Economic Warfare, Hon. Milo Perkins, based on what he stated were reliable reports, states "that the brass and steel used in Swiss watches are derived from current imports from Germany" (into Switzerland).

The importation of Swiss watches and watch movements into American markets is made possible only by the Axis permitting Swiss watches and watch movements to pass through its lines, which, since the inception of the present World War, have surrounded Switzerland.

This most unusual condition and sequence of events is known to and made possible through the acquiescence of State Department officials to these startling facts, who, in their mad desire to promote foreign trade, even though such particular foreign trade deprives many thousands of American workers of their job opportunities, entered into an alleged reciprocal-trade treaty with Switzerland.

Fifty million dollars for Hitler.

It is our sincere belief, based on what we consider reliable reports, that certain influential American distributors of Swiss watches and watch movements have transferred to Hitler, since January 1940 some fifty millions of American dollars to help Hitler finance his war against the United States and our allies. This money was sent to pay for products of Swiss watches which could be exported from Switzerland and only through Hitler's military lines.

This outrageous condition, so far as we know, is only justified by our Government officials because of our entry into an alleged reciprocal trade treaty with Switzerland.

No jobs available for our returning heroes.

Our workers, Americans all, are dependent for our livelihood on the employment opportunities which exist through the operation of those few American plants engaged in the manufacture of watches.

Two hundred and ninety-three men, formerly employed in only one of the three existing American watch-manufacturing plants (a comparable number have also left from the other two watch-making plants) now in the armed forces of their country, serving in Africa, in the South Pacific, in Iceland, and elsewhere, were assured when they answered their country's call, that their jobs awaited them on their return after having contributed, if they lived, to our winning of the war.

When, and after, they return, unless the pending reciprocal trade treaty legislation is substantially and properly amended, these soldiers, sailors, and marines—heroes all—will find their former jobs have been transferred to watchworkers in Switzerland.

LEGISLATIVE PROTECTION ASKED FOR

Our workers, realizing fully that not only their wage and working conditions (the most advanced in the world so far as exist in the manufacturing of watches) but also their opportunity for a livelihood is at stake, appeal to the Members of the United States Senate for amendments to the pending legislation which will protect their job opportunities.

We ask that the pending reciprocal trade-treaty legislation be amended as follows:

(a) That no tariff rate reductions be authorized or continued in effect which permits the entry into American markets of competitive products of foreign workers at less than American costs of production;

(b) that in view of the chaotic and unsettled world conditions, which we believe will exist at the cessation of hostilities, all trade treaties should be terminated at least 6 months following the cessation of hostilities;

(c) to eliminate the trend toward totalitarianism in our own country that the elected representative of the people, namely, those constituting the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives, attach to the pending reciprocal trade-treaty legislation language which will permit of the elected representatives of the American people resuming the responsibilities which the Constitution invests in them;

(d) that all trade treaties or the extension of any existing trade treaty be submitted to and voted upon by the Congress of the United States within 90 days following its completion and such trade treaty shall not become effective unless approved by the Congress of the United States.

Congress should not be rubber stamps for bureaucrats.

The American workers are not at all impressed with the false alarms sent forth through the press and the radio by Washington bureaucrats who would have us believe that any change in the present law would be an affront to our allies.

We believe the elected representatives of the American people can and should assume and carry out the responsibilities they were elected to carry out, one of which responsibilities is to live up to the requirements of the Constitution of the United States.

Surely, it is not too much to ask that our means of livelihood be protected.

FORTY-TWO THOUSAND AMERICANS' JOBS TRANSFERRED TO SWITZERLAND

History repeats itself. Within 6 months after the cessation of hostilities, with all Government orders for the making of timing instruments on which we are now employed canceled, with American markets stocked up with products of watch workers of Switzerland, and with many millions of American workers and returned heroes looking for work the idle promises of the Washington bureaucrats will be of but little value.

Prior to the outbreak of the present global war there were only 3 American watch factories in operation of the 60 in operation some years ago. Most of the others had been scrapped simply because the products of these American factories could not compete in the American markets with the products of the low wage paid watch workers of Switzerland.

In wartimes our industry thrives because Uncle Sam needs our products and demands unlimited production for the use of our armed forces. Our workers are continually working in excess of regular hours at the request of the Army and Navy. During these wartimes, World War No. 1 and now World War No. 2, the importers and distributors of Swiss watches make heavy inroads into the business of the American watch companies. The United States Government says to the American watch workers: "You cannot produce for civilian use as we need your output for American defense." We agree the United States Government is correct in so doing, but, on the other hand, the Swiss watch industry is given free reign to ship into the United States an unlimited amount of watches, at total landed costs which are less than our cost of production.

The State Department officials, prior to their entry into the alleged trade treaty with Switzerland, which, in 1942, resulted in the transferring of the job opportunities of some 42,000 American watch workers to workers in Switzerland, were fully aware of the sweatshop, child labor, and other substandard labor conditions which exist among the watch workers of Switzerland.

In addition, these same State Department officials were fully aware of the existence in Switzerland, especially as it pertains to the manufacture and export of watches and watch movements of a watch trust or a watch cartel, which was controlled in turn and subsidized by the state itself.

The following is taken from a publication, Digests of Trade Data—Concessions Granted by the United States in the Trade Agreement With Switzerland, issued by the United States Tariff Commission:

"SWISS PRODUCTION AND TRADE

"Switzerland is the world's largest producer of jeweled watch movements and maintains an extensive world trade. During the past two centuries Switzerland has developed a specialized skill in the manufacture of jeweled watch movements, and for a long time this industry has catered to a world market. Although exports of machinery and of textiles from Switzerland exceed exports of watch movements, the watch industry, including the various supplying trades, employs more people than either the textile or machinery industries.

"In 1929 there were between 1,200 and 1,400 enterprises in the watch industry, employing 63,675 persons. For the season 1932–33 this number was estimated at 53,700. (These figures include those engaged in the manufacture of watch parts in small household enterprises and probably employees engaged in the production of watch cases, watch jewels, etc.). It was estimated that in 1929 the number of persons in Switzerland dependent upon the watch industry for their support was 400,000, or one-tenth of Switzerland's total population. Of the 1,200 to 1,400 enterprises in the watch industry in 1929, it was estimated that some 500 were assembly firms, 70 were manufacturing firms producing complete watches, while some 600 to 800 small enterprises occupied themselves with the production of individual parts.

"Organization of the Swiss watch industry: The Swiss watch industry is very complex, consisting of manufacturers of complete movements, manufacturers of individual parts, assemblers of complete movements from parts made by other manufacturers, manufacturers of watch cases, etc. Before the war these various manufacturers were organized along functional and regional lines, most of these organizations being grouped loosely

under the semiofficial Swiss Watch Chamber of Commerce. During the years immediately following the war currency depreciated in many other countries and the erection of tariff bariers against imports of finished movements in many of Switzerland's best export markets stimulated the migration of the Swiss industry to foreign countries. These barriers were raised chiefly against the completed movements, while efforts were made to stimulate the importation of parts for assembly. At the same time Swiss watch manufacturers were induced to come to these various countries to establish local watch industries.

"These developments proceeded at a rate such as to arouse considerable fear in the minds of many Swiss industrialists as to the future of the Swiss watch industry, and led to greater organization of the Swiss industry to prevent the expansion of this movement and to control various practices which were lowering the prestige of the Swiss watch abroad. As a result, most of the manufacturers in the various lines of the Swiss watch and clock industry now are members of trade associations which are grouped together under three major industrial organizations, and these three groups in turn are united for purposes of common policy by a series of working agreements or conventions. The three organizations comprise the makers of complete watches (both manufacturers and assemblers), the producers of incomplete movements, and the manufacturers of parts and accessories, respectively. Through the organizations, with assistance from interested banks, some measure of success was achieved in controlling the exportation of unfinished movements and parts for assembly abroad and in raising the average quality of the Swiss watches exported. However, their efforts were to a large degree frustrated by the noncooperation of a number of independent firms.

"During 1931 there was considerable agitation in Switzerland for governmental intervention in support of the organized Swiss industry in its efforts to control the independents who persisted in practices which tended to threaten the industry. Although it was not until 1934 that the Government actually accorded the degree of intervention desired, it lent its support and credit in 1931 to the organization of the Société de l'Horlogerie Suisse, S. A., generally known as the superholding company. The object of this company was to acquire majority control of the old organization of the producers of incomplete movements and to buy up control of various independent plants making either essential parts or incomplete movements which in 1931 were not members of the organized Swiss watch industry. This company was capitalized at 50,000,000 francs. Of this amount 20,000,000 were subscribed by the banks in the watchmaking communities and 20,000,000 by the industrialists and the various cooperating organizations. Six millions of francs were subscribed by the Government by the purchase of 6,000 shares in the new organization, while 7,500,000 were lent the company by the Government free of interest, redeemable by annual installments after 1934. This superholding company achieved a greater measure of control over the complex Swiss watch industry than had been attained previously, but it was still unable to control a small number of factories. On March 12, 1934, the Government finally took direct and positive action, issuing a decree (a) prohibiting the opening of new enterprises in the watchmaking industry, or enlargement, transformation, or transfer of existing enterprises without the authorization of the department of public economy, and (b) forbidding the exportation of watch parts without an export permit issued by the Swiss Watch Chamber. In 1933, export duties had been enacted to discourage the exportation of watchmaking machinery.

"In 1934 there was organized an association of watch producers engaged in exporting to the United States. There is little information regarding the organization and functions of this association. Its objects are reported to be the elimination of some of the more undesirable features of competition among Swiss concerns for United States business.

"Further measures of control in Switzerland over the exportation of watches and watch movements are provided in the 'Declaration' of the Government of Switzerland which forms a part of the United States-Switzerland trade agreement. These control measures are being taken 'with a view to cooperating with the Government of the United States of America in its efforts to suppress the smuggling of watches and watch movements.'

"Swiss exports: Switzerland does not publish statistics regarding production of watches and watch movements. However, inasmuch as about 95 percent of Swiss production is exported, Swiss exports of these products give a very good indication of production. It will be noted that total production of cased watches and finished movements ranged from 16,000,000 to 20,000,000 movements in the period 1925–30, but declined to approximately 8,000,000 in 1932 and recovered to more than 12,000,000 in 1934."

Since 1934, according to reliable sources, there have been imported to the United States the following watches and watch movements, and as many as 42,000 Americans' jobs transferred to Switzerland in one year alone.

Year	Number of watches and watch movements imported	American watch workers' man-hours transferred to workers in foreign countries, principally Switzerland	Number of workers' years employment transferred to workers in foreign countries	Foreign declared value of watches imported
1934	920,393	11,044,716	6,903	$2,834,092
1935	1,201,896	14,422,752	9,014	3,668,645
1936	2,228,606	26,743,272	16,715	5,877,676
1937	3,127,274	37,527,288	23,455	8,183,117
1938	2,386,226	28,634,712	17,760	6,562,570
1939	2,919,147	33,029,764	20,643	8,057,789
1940	3,536,982	42,443,784	26,526	10,220,772
1941 [1]				
1942 [1]				

[1] The figures for the years 1941 and 1942 were submitted in the original brief to the Senate Finance Committee, but due to the appearance of this table the printing of this entire brief was delayed by objection of officials of the Department of Commerce under Executive Order 9103 issued by the War Department until such time as the figures were deleted from the table, therefore causing this brief not to appear in the unrevised editions of the Senate Finance Committee hearings on this subject. We have been told that this censored edition of the brief will appear in the revised edition of the printed Senate Finance Committee hearings.

The American watch worker produces 1 watch in approximately 12 hours. From the years 1938 to 1942, inclusive, the combined output of the 3 American watch factories was an average of 1,405,000 watches per year, and they had an average of 6,800 employees per year. Personally, I do not know, but I doubt if our total added exports, secured through our entry into the trade treaty with Switzerland, will equal this demonstrated loss of American man-hours of employment in this 1 industry alone.

HITLER-SWISS WATCHES ALONE AVAILABLE

Just consider this outstanding fact: In 1942 there were imported into the United States 5,691,000 watches and watch movements. If American labor had produced these watches, there would have been 42,000 more persons employed for 1,600 hours per year and we would have had that many more available persons working on war materials for which the United Nations are sorely pressed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad the Senator is reading the brief which, I understand, comes from the Waltham, Mass., Watch Workers Union.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. The agent of the union is Mr. Walter W. Cenerazzo, who is a good friend of mine. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not it is true that this business in Switzerland is conducted, and must be conducted, with at least the tacit approval of the German Government?

Mr. LANGER. It is. There can be no doubt of it.

Mr. LODGE. Consequently, the facts and figures to which the Senator alludes are undoubtedly well known in the countries of our enemies.

Mr. LANGER. That is true. The brief goes into that question. Quoting further from the brief:

Four times more watches were imported than were produced in the United States. The consumption or consumer demand for these watches is not that great. The answer is the Swiss watch importer, knowing that America's factories would be placed on war work, has built up a reserve stock here to sell to the American consumer during and after the present war.

The American jeweler who is trying to stay in business has to buy watches from whom he can, so he stocks up with foreign-made merchandise which costs him just as much as a fine American-made watch.

You can't blame him for trying to stay in business, but after the war we have the post-war problem of what to do with the increased personnel who have been trained for watch making during the war period. There will be no back log of orders; the consumer demand will have been satisfied. During the war when people have an excess purchasing power they will buy the things they need. They can't buy automobiles; they can't buy many items, but they can buy Swiss watches. Those industries are protected for the post-war period, but how about the people that I represent? How about the people who work for the other watch companies? They have done their bit for their country. Waltham employees were one of the first to have attained 100 percent participation in the pay-roll savings plan for the purchase of War bonds. 293 men out of less than 1,000 from the Waltham Watch Workers Union are in the armed forces. They are coming back, after having served their country to—what? To a job, yes, to a laid-off job.

This answers the inquiry of the Senator from Massachusetts:

GULLIBLE AMERICAN PUBLIC

In the meantime, Switzerland, surrounded by Axis, on the one side by Italy, on another side by Vichy France, on the other by Germany, is able to export into the United States, under a trade treaty with our enemy, watches and watch movements. In exchange for these watches and watch movements, Switzerland is given millions of American dollars. Hitler receives his share of these dollars. The consuming American public is thus helping finance Hitler's war against us through the purchase of these 5,691,000 watches which were imported into the United States during 1942. Many of these watches are cased in the United States. They are sold under trade names, nationally advertised names. The American public buys watches called "Miss America," "American Maid," "Miss Liberty," and "Croix de Guerre of American Achievement"—Swiss watches being palmed off as American made.

These watches are assembled of products of Swiss workers. Where does Switzerland get the raw materials for these watches

during wartime? How are they so safely escorted through Axis territory to reach America, we would like to know? This question of Swiss competition has been gone into very thoroughly in the past by far more able men than I, men who made a study of this because their financial interests were at stake.

This committee recommended legislation to prevent the smuggling of watches and watch movements, mainly from Switzerland. The Congress enacted this legislation into law. This is known as the Walsh-McCormack law.

At the hearings in 1934 briefs were filed, attorneys were hired to present to the Committee for Reciprocity Information facts which were vital to our industry. These facts were ignored and treaties negotiated and signed, notwithstanding the warning which was given at that time by Mr. T. Albert Potter, president of the Elgin National Watch Co. I quote Mr. Potter from testimony given by him on December 17, 1934:

"Remember, these fine craftsmen in Europe are not only makers of watches but many of them, even today as adjuncts to watch factories, are actively engaged in the making of parts for foreign munitions factories."

After 4 years of reciprocal trade treaties, and, assumedly after careful consideration, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor adopted the following on reciprocal trade treaties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be incorporated at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the provisions of reciprocal-trade treaties negotiated by the State Department with foreign nations affect very vitally both the economic conditions of American workers and unemployment and there are many organizations, representing thousands of workers, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, which are seriously affected by these trade treaties and for that reason are deeply interested in their provisions, and

Whereas the economic and industrial interests of these workers demand that the American Federation of Labor exercise all efforts possible to prevent the importation of goods from foreign countries, under the provisions of reciprocal-trade treaties, where lower wages, longer hours, and lower standards prevail than exist in competing industries within the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive council of the American Federation of Labor expresses its opposition to reciprocal-trade treaties which discriminate against American workers. We are opposed to reciprocal-trade treaties' provisions which provide for importation of goods and merchandise which because of low labor costs abroad, are sold at a lower price than the same goods and merchandise produced by workers in the United States, where wages and conditions of labor are established on a higher standard than those which prevail abroad; be it further

Resolved, That a committee representing the American Federation of Labor be accorded the privilege of presenting labor's point of view relating to the provisions of reciprocal-trade agreements affecting labor before said agreements are negotiated and ratified.

Mr. LANGER. I continue reading from the brief.

You will note that the executive council expressed opposition to reciprocal trade treaties which discriminate against American workers. Under the terms of opposition cited in the resolution, unanimously adopted by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor on reciprocal trade treaties, such reciprocal trade treaties are seemingly impossible of accomplishment.

Had the appeal of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor been heeded and the jobs of American workers not transferred to workers in foreign countries through our entry into alleged reciprocal trade treaties, there is reason to believe that they would not have considered it necessary to make the following demands on the resolutions committee of the major political parties in 1940:

"PROTECTION OF WAGE AND WORKING STANDARDS

"To protect and safeguard the employment opportunities of America's wage earnings against unfair competition of the products of workers of low wage and depressed standards and conditions of employment of foreign countries, and, with which we are bound to be faced at the end of the present European and Asiatic wars, and, in order to hold secure the advanced industrial relations and employment standards secured by America's workers through legislative enactments and collective agreements against competition from products of workers in countries of lower standards, it is essential that adequate and proper legislation be had to obtain these ends. We urge the adoption of this policy and procedure."

The position of our organization is based upon this platform: That we believe in "live and let live." Any country with which we have a trade treaty should be able to ship their products into this country on equal terms. No more, no less, do we ask. If the cost of a Swiss watch landed in this country is the same as an American-made watch, our problem is solved. We know our product is superior. We know the American public will choose correctly.

This is not a political problem. This is an economic problem which will seriously face three communities after this war—Lancaster, Pa.; Elgin, Ill.; and Waltham, Mass. Hamilton today has 2,100 employees, Elgin over 5,000, Waltham 2,600. Where do they go from here? Only the Congress of the United States can determine that. Trade treaties should have either congressional approval or Senate ratification, then the interests of an industry small in size but vital in nature, such as ours, can be protected.

Labor sought restrictive immigration legislation to protect American jobs and the American way of life. American labor is not antisocial. We sought and we still insist on restrictive immigration laws to protect our jobs. However, what protection do we have when, in 1942 alone, the jobs of 42,064 American workers in this one industry alone were transferred to workers in foreign countries?

The position of the American Federation of Labor on immigration is as follows:

"IMMIGRATION

"In order to protect the welfare and the standards of living of the American workers, organized labor has favored from the beginning a restricted and controlled national immigration policy. Upheavals brought about by war conditions abroad demand the exercise of unremitting vigilance in the enforcement of these controls. We urge the adoption of a declaration in favor of the continuation of the Nation's restricted immigration policy and the progressive application of these principles as dictated by changing conditions."

Our position on the imports of competitive foreign-made products is the same.

We might as well speak for every industry in America whose products are in competition with those imported from foreign lands.

The brief continues as follows:

We see no advantage in barring the entry of the immigrant, and at the same time permitting entry of the product of the immigrant at total landed costs which are less than American costs of production.

We are here today pleading with you not for an advantage, not for profit, but for job security. Today we hear advocated security from the cradle to the grave. We ask only for the opportunity to work under a profit system. We ask only that this Congress, the chosen Representatives of the American people, keep within their hands the power to approve these trade treaties. We ask that this committee, the chosen representatives of the people, insist that no article, whether farm commodity, industrial, or what have you, when competitive with American-made products commercially available, be allowed to land in this country for one cent less than competitive American-made products produced in this country.

Is there any good reason why American lives should be endangered, why American savings be invested in War bonds and savings stamps, and at the same time we permit millions of American dollars, through the sale of Swiss watches be placed where the mad dog Hitler and his group can grasp them? Is there any good reason why products of workers in Switzerland should continue to control 50 to 80 percent of the American watch market?

We hear of post-war plans. Why should we, through trade treaties, insure the transfer of our jobs in the production of watches to workers in foreign countries?

Isn't this fair? Isn't it a fair request for American workmen to make of their Government? The answer is obvious. We appreciate the opportunity of presenting our case, a case for the existence of our job opportunities.

There are some 10,000 American workers now employed in the remaining American watch factories producing very, very essential timing instruments for the use of our armed forces. At the cessation of hostilities we assume we will be producing American-made watches, if there is a sufficient demand or market for the products of our labor.

But, with the importations of Swiss watches and watch movements increasing yearly, some 100 percent from 1939 to 1942 alone, it is probable that the market for American-made watches will no longer exist, as the low-wage paid products of the workers of Switzerland, which have been permitted to be exported to the United States through Hitler's military lines, only because much of the proceeds, in the form of American dollars, would be used by Hitler to finance Hitler's war against the United States and our allies.

Mr. President, that gives a concrete example of what has occurred to 20,000 workers in America. It is a concrete example of what the bureaucrats have done in making a trade treaty with Switzerland. It would be almost criminal to permit these bureaucrats to continue making trade agreements unless the Congress is consulted and has the power to ratify them.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. The Senator's philosophy is that a trade agreement is in truth and fact a trade treaty, and that consideration of and action upon it falls within the duties imposed by the Constitution upon the Congress.

Mr. LANGER. The statement of the Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah obtained the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Gurney	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hatch	Robertson
Bone	Hawkes	Russell
Brewster	Hayden	Scrugham
Bridges	Hill	Shipstead
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lucas	Tobey
Capper	McCarran	Truman
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chandler	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	White
Davis	Moore	Wiley
Downey	Murray	Willis
Eastland	Nye	Wilson
Ellender	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, when one wishes to present a background of history in connection with the discussion of the subject of the tariff, he is practically obliged to discuss the history of his country, because since the adoption of the Constitution in 1787, soon after which, in 1789, the first tariff act was passed, our country has passed through a tariff evolution, and the tariff has been the theme of probably more political discussion and political battles than any other single question in our history.

I think that at this time we should refresh our minds with a bit of tariff history, and that we should be thoughtful about that history, because in the evolution of tariff techniques we have at last come to a time, the first time since the McKinley Tariff Act was passed more than 50 years ago, when the people of the United States have not at the next election repudiated the tariff act passed by the previous Congress. That, Mr. President, should give us food for thought, and should particularly give food for thought to those who want to return to the old tariff-making methods, tariff making handled by Congress as a purely legislative matter.

Mr. President, I ought to point out some exceptions in connection with tariff making to the general statement I have made. The McKinley Tariff Act was passed on October 1, 1890, and at the next election those who supported the McKinley Tariff Act were defeated, and the administration changed. The people made that change, only to be disappointed by the enactment of the Wilson-Gorman Act on August 27, 1894, a tariff act which should have followed the instructions of the people given in the previous election. The Wilson-Gorman Act was also repudiated by the people, and there was a change of administration, and another party came into power.

The Dingley Tariff Act of 1897 was not repudiated at the next election, because a war intervened, and the conditions in the country resulting from the war brought about a situation which caused the tariff to cease to be a paramount issue. But again, as soon as the Congress began reenacting tariff laws in the old way, with the enactment of the Payne-Aldrich Act of 1909, the party in power lost control of the Congress at the next opportunity the voters had to elect Members of the Congress.

The situation with respect to the Underwood Act was the same as that in connection with the Dingley Act. The Underwood Act was not repudiated by the people, to be sure, but a war intervened following the enactment of that act, so a real test was not afforded.

Then came the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act. The sponsors of that act were both defeated at the election following the enactment of the act.

Mr. President, we must never lose sight of the fact that following the enactment of the Hawley-Smoot Act not only were its authors repudiated but the party of which they were members was repudiated in a way in which the American people had never before punished a political party in power.

As we continue examining the record with respect to tariff laws, and when we speak about the history of the tariff, we discover that in its history and development we have at last worked out a technique which has received the support of the American people, and which is today receiving their support, a technique which the American people wish to see continued, and which should be continued without amendment, so that this better method, this better technique of adjustment, may become one of our governmental habits.

Much has been said lately about the reciprocal trade treaties in respect to the peace after the war, and in regard to their effect upon the making and the control of that peace. I do not entertain an exaggerated notion about the importance of reciprocal trade agreements in the making of peace. I do not think such agreements are of paramount importance. I think there are other factors very much greater and very much more important. However, I wish to point out the fact that in international relations when there comes an era of depreciated currencies, chaos in international affairs, subsidies, dumping, and all the other elements which follow in the wake of controlled currency and totalitarian economics—the bartering system, all the types of national competition which we shall have to meet, but which we shall not be in a position to combat if the world organizes against us, except by using the same techniques as used by others, which we will not use and cannot use because we cannot stoop to that level of international trade—I say when we know from the experience after the last war what we shall have to face because of the resurgence again of peaceful trade and ambition and competition, with disorder in practically all countries as the aftermath of a great war and the aftermath of a great defeat, we shall find that the greatest thing the United States can do for the world and for itself will be to be able to put forth a restraining hand, for that which makes for stability in the world will in very fact contribute to a better and a lasting peace.

Mr. President, in regard to post-war planning and what we are doing in relation to it, I can only repeat what I have said before on the floor of the Senate, that the time to settle differences between allies is while we are at war and while we are interested in one another, and that every difference we settle between ourselves while we are in the war makes the peace that much easier. We should never get into our minds the thought that in a state of war we have one world and that the next day, when the peace comes, we have another world. It is the same world. Of course it is true, and everyone who has read the old Greek classics knows it to be true, and it has become proverbial as a part of the literature of mankind that men unite for war and destruction, but divide for peace and construction. That was wailed back in the days of Greek drama, and it has proved to be true.

When we note those things, Mr. President, it seems to me we should take every opportunity we can to make sure that when there is one element of stability it should be developed, not only for our own sake but for the sake of the world, and it should not be destroyed.

Mr. President, much has been said and will be said, and later in my address I expect to refer to it again, to the effect that by the joint resolution we are attempting to put some kind of curb upon the executive department of our Government because we assume that the President has too much power and is gaining too much additional power.

Mr. President, Congress has not given up its power in regard to reciprocal trade agreements. Congress can repeal the original act. Congress never legislated for all time. The present Congress cannot bind the next Congress. No type of amendment will in any way make it more difficult or less certain that if Congress makes up its mind and if the people make up their minds to bring this tariff technique to an end, they can bring it to an end. But in regard to the power of the President, other tariff acts have given the President very much greater power than the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has given him. If we are frightened of our President, we should look back at history. We should remember that the reciprocal trade agreements have never frightened the people of the United States to the extent that one single case has gone to the Supreme Court. Yet the flexible tariff arrangement and need for a Tariff Commission came in the evolution and growth of the tariff, and caused misgivings on the part of the American people.

For 9 years we have had this act before us. Twice before it has been reviewed, in addition to the original action by the Congress of the United States. The American people have had an opportunity to judge of that which has been done. They have judged of it, and they have called it good. Since they

have called it good, the technique should be continued.

Mr. President, as to the concept of recognizing tariff control—for that is what a tariff act is; it is a control of foreign commerce—throughout the history of the United States the fact of the control of commerce has been predominant in the reasoning of the cases about the tariff which have gone to the Supreme Court. Tariff for revenue only has never been anything but a slogan, which sometimes has been effective, but in practice and in the making of law in actuality never was effective. The tariff has its origin and its end in the control of foreign commerce, and that is the only way in which it should be interpreted. Since it is interpreted in that way and since it is a control of trade, to what fairer, better, or more desirable way can we turn than the way of negotiation and the building up of agreements with foreign nations in such a way that the agreements can be mutually helpful to the countries which enter into them, and can be controlled in such a way that neither country will be hurt by them? Incidentally, under the reciprocal trade agreements the whole world receives benefits by the liberal or the unconditional use of the most-favored-nation-clause technique.

If after 9 years, when we have had changing conditions, it develops that we have proved a technique which is advantageous to ourselves and which has brought about good feeling on the part of other nations toward us, it seems to me that it is something to which we ought to say "Amen," and ought to continue.

There is another point which arises constantly, and that is the viewpoint which considers the international trade agreements as treaties. Mr. President, I do not consider such agreements as treaties. I do not think they are treaties. Furthermore, I do not want them to be considered as treaties. I should not like to see the time in the United States when an agreement between the United States and Cuba, for example, in regard to control of trade, would become the supreme law of the land. I think we must not lose sight of the fact that while there is a provision in our Constitution in regard to the ratification of treaties, we have not insisted upon using that provision. We have not decided that that is the only way by which we can bring about the equivalent of treaty understanding with nations. We have used other techniques. For us to turn our backs upon them means that we turn our backs upon history.

It will be remembered that back in Polk's time three great international questions faced the Nation—the Oregon question, the Texas question, and the ambition or desire to annex California. President Polk used the technique of coming to the Senate and asking what Washington asked, which should be asked occasionally. He did not come to the Senate for "advice and consent" in the negotiation of an arrangement with Great Britain in regard to the Oregon Territory. He came to the Senate and asked for advice, and the question of the continuation of negotiations was discussed on the floor of the Senate; and a proper technique, out of the ordinary technique of our constitutional arrangement, was used, to the tremendous advantage of our country.

Mr. President, I do not like to see our Constitution bound in its possibilities. We would never have had peace with Germany after the last war if we had had to go through the ratification of the treaty. The Senate refused to ratify the treaty and peace came by joint resolution. If I remember correctly, the annexation of Texas came not by treaty arrangement but by joint resolution.

For more than 100 years the Supreme Court of the United States has recognized the fact that agreements, treaties, and conventions are different things. From the inception of our present constitutional government the Congress, the courts, and the Executive have recognized that there are several types of international agreements, which are not treaties in the constitutional sense. This, of course, is understood by all Senators. I do not wish to enter into an argument about it, because it would be like arguing a case in court, where neither attorney ever convinces the other, and the decision is left to a third party. These distinctions were well pointed out by Chief Justice Taney in *Holmes* v. *Jennison* (1840) (14 Pet. 540, 571):

> The words "agreement" and "compact" cannot be * * * held to mean the same thing as the word "treaty."

A treaty was defined as—

> A compact made with a view to the public welfare by the superior power, either for perpetuity or for a considerable time.

The Court further said that—

> The compacts which have temporary matters for their object are called agreements, conventions, and pactions.

Everyone knows that there is a 3-year limit upon the trade treaties, and that they are considered as agreements. The technique which we have allowed to develop follows that line.

It seems almost sure that the writers of the act of 1934 actually had before them this decision, because they put in the time limitation to meet the opinion of a great Supreme Court Justice. This decision may aptly be applied to the Trade Agreements Act, which has been enacted as an emergency measure and which requires that agreements be subject to termination not more than 3 years after they take effect.

That there are compacts not possessing the dignity of a treaty in the constitutional sense which may be authorized by Congress and negotiated and proclaimed by the President was recognized by the Supreme Court in the case of *B. Altman & Co.* v. *United States* (224 U. S. 583, 601), involving an agreement made under the authority of section 3 of the Tariff Act of 1897. And in the case of *United States* v. *Curtis-Wright* ((1936) 299 U. S. 304), which was cited by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Supreme Court made it clear that the Federal Government has as an essential part of its sovereignty "the power to make such international agreements as do not constitute treaties in the constitutional sense."

In *Field* v. *Clerk* ((1892) 143 U. S. 649, 694), the contention was made that section 3 of the Tariff Act of 1890 delegated to the President treaty-making power. The Court disposed of this point by holding that the trade agreements authorized by the act were not treaties requiring ratifications.

In that act we have the background for our reciprocal trade technique of today. It was objected to on the ground that the President was given too much power, but the Supreme Court said "No."

The contention of alleged delegation of legislative authority, which has been mentioned several times, may be summed up by citing legal authority.

It has been charged that prior to the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act there were no precedents for changing import duties by Executive action pursuant to international agreement. This position is predicted upon confusion of differences in detail with differences in principle.

The Dingley Tariff Act of 1897, section 3, recognized the appropriateness of changing tariff duties by Executive proclamation pursuant to international agreement entered into under congressional authority. The fact that this law was limited to specified articles, whereas the Trade Agreements Act is not so limited, is a matter of detail rather than of principle. Section 315 of the Tariff Act of 1922 authorized the President to select the articles upon which duties were to be changed. The fact that the initial proceedings under the flexible tariff concerned a cost investigation rather than a trade-agreement negotiation is likewise a difference only in detail and not in principle. Combining the two laws, section 3 of the Dingley Act and the flexible tariff provision, we clearly have precedents for changing duties by Executive agreement and selecting the articles upon which changes are to be made.

The contention has been presented that the case of Field against Clark is no precedent for the Trade Agreements Act. It must be remembered, however, that under the act of 1890 the President did have discretion to find that duties were imposed by foreign countries which were reciprocally unequal and unreasonable, and under the Trade Agreements Act the President is authorized to find that the duties of the United States and of foreign countries are unduly burdening the foreign trade of the United States. Here, again, the difference is one of detail and not of principle.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that in the very terms of the Dingley Tariff Act, passed in 1897, the Congress completely answered the argument which the Senator is now making. The Tariff Act of 1890—the so-called McKinley Act—contained section 3 to which the Senator has correctly alluded, which authorizes the President, upon the finding of

a fact of discrimination against the commerce of the United States by certain countries, to reduce the tariffs upon certain specific articles to certain specific rates fixed by Congress. Seven years later, when the Dingley Act was under consideration, the same power was again renewed in section 3. However, at that time Congress desired to provide for reciprocal trade negotiations between the Government of the United States and all other governments, and it so provided in section 4. But in section 4 it decreed that such compacts, agreements, or arrangements—whatever term we may wish to apply to them—should be regarded as treaties, and should come to the Senate for ratification. So I submit that an examination of the facts reveals that the Congress which enacted the Dingley Act in 1897 saw a distinction between the granting of power to the President, upon the finding of a fact, to put into effect a tariff rate which the Congress itself had named, and the power which is now contained in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to enter into negotiations with all the world to fix tariff rates.

It seems to me that the question which must be answered is, if the Congress felt in 1897 that there was a distinction between these two separate grants of power, what has transpired since then to make a change?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course, the argument made by the Senator from Wyoming was presented to the court, and the court did not consider the point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish the Senator would point out where the argument was made.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The court did not consider that point, but the court did point out the fact, as I have stated, that there is a great difference between a formal treaty and a compact.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, there is a difference between compacts and treaties; no one contends otherwise. The issue here is that an effort is being made to expand the agreement, or the compact, to embrace treaties. There is a distinction, and those who are supporting the technique by which the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been defended and extended are supporting the technique which is making an Executive agreement take the place of a treaty. When the proper time comes, I shall be very glad to read to the Senator the language of Mr. Wallace McClure, of the State Department. He has published a well-thought-out work on Executive agreements, in which he specifically makes the point that the Executive agreement can supplant the treaty-making power. If that can be done by an act of Congress without a constitutional amendment, then there is nothing in the Constitution which cannot be wiped out by act of Congress.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for keeping the discussion on that plane.

The fact that during the past 9 years the Court has not been asked to pass upon this question, the fact that treaties, or agreements, have been negotiated, entered into, and have become a part of our custom, and the fact that in the great general evolution of this idea we have not turned our backs upon it, all seem to me to be an argument—in spite of the argument to the contrary—which can be made in favor of the technique as we have followed it through.

The ruling of the Supreme Court in *Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388) has been presented as authority for requiring a definite standard to be followed by the Executive in carrying out the legislative will. In the *Curtiss-Wright Case* (299 U. S. 304), the Panama Refining Co. case was relied on as support for the contention that the arms embargo law was invalid as a delegation of legislative power; but the Supreme Court rejected the contention, holding that in delegating power to control foreign affairs Congress was not limited to the same degree of exactness as in domestic affairs. On page 320 the following language appears:

> It is quite apparent that if, in the maintenance of our international relations, embarrassment—perhaps serious embarrassment—is to be avoided and success for our aims achieved, congressional legislation which is to be made effective through negotiation and inquiry within the international field must often accord to the President a degree of discretion and freedom from statutory restriction which would not be admissible were domestic affairs alone involved.

That the Tariff Act is primarily a regulation of foreign commerce and only, incidentally, a revenue measure, is a point which I have already made, and a point which I think we should keep constantly in mind. It seems to me we should never forget, Mr. President, that the United States customs tariff has been historically a means of commercial trade rather than primarily a source of revenue. That is the first point I have sought to make so far; and that it has been necessary in its historical development, to place in the Executive increased executive control of the tariff.

Those are the practical aspects of the situation, Mr. President, and I have given the reasons why we have advanced in our tariff history to the place where we find ourselves today.

Mr. President, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be extended. The Congress and the President have already approved the act three times, in the original act of 1934, and the two 3-year extensions, in 1937 and 1940. In my opinion—and it is only my opinion—the Congress should now make this legislation permanent. Of course, that is not what the pending joint resolution provides for, so I am going outside of the sphere of the resolution in saying that, in the history of the evolution of the tariff, we have arrived at the place where we ought to make the legislation permanent.

Mr. President, the record made by the administration during the past 9 years in negotiating reciprocal agreements has proved this method of dealing with the tariff and international trade problems to be fair and practical. It is also, even during the war, a workable method of handling some current foreign trade problems and will be needed to solve the new and complex conditions of industries and international trade that will certainly exist at the end of the war.

This method should in time, and the sooner the better, become a permanent part of United States foreign trade policy. It ought not to be a political question any longer. This way of handling some of our foreign trade problems has come to stay, because it is worth keeping.

The reciprocal trade agreement is a good instrument, and should not be discarded merely because some of us may not agree with every act of the administration under the law. We do not discard hoes for weeding gardens merely because we occasionally hit a tomato or beet plant when we aim at a weed. What we do instead is to be more careful with the hoe—develop more skill in its use as we gain experience. That is what we ought to do with the Trade Agreements Act. We ought to perfect our use of it to the end that it will more effectively promote the general welfare and prosperity, not only of our country but of the world.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ARE NATURAL OUTGROWTH OF UNITED STATES TARIFF EXPERIENCE AND OF WORLD ECONOMIC CONDITIONS PREVAILING IN 1934

Mr. President, the reciprocal trade-agreement method of dealing with the tariff problems is a natural outgrowth of our historical treatment of the tariff and of conditions extant in 1934, when the act was first passed by Congress.

From the first Tariff Act of 1789 our policy has been one of protection of essential domestic industries. True, the Republicans have voted higher rates and greater protection to more industries than the Democrats, but all our tariff acts, from the first to the last, even when we said they were primarily for revenue only, have carried considerable protection to many industries, though it might in some cases, especially under the Democratic administrations, have been more or less incidental. We have come to think of this tariff treatment as the American method, and up to recent years it has not been a bad method for our country to employ to regulate our foreign trade. It has proved on the whole to have been a justifiable and fairly satisfactory method of regulating our foreign trade to meet the needs of our new and growing industries and the competition of our foreign rivals. Here I may say, Mr. President, that the tariff grew up in the United States under rather stable international monetary systems that no longer exist.

The act of 1789 was passed immediately after the close of the war for our freedom from Great Britain. If we had had no such war, we would not have had the same urgent need for our own domestic manufacturing industries. We might not have mistrusted Great Britain and her willingness to supply us continually with our needs for certain manufactures, and because we would have continued to trust her and continued to get our requirements regularly from her, we might have made our first Federal revenue law, not a protective tariff law, but one calculated to bring in just the amount of revenue needed by the United States with the least possible injury to

and interference with business and trade. But the facts are that we had had a great war, we had been compelled to manufacture our own supplies of certain needed commodities or else go without them, and those infant industries were in existence at the close of the Revolutionary War. Immediately after the war, we were not willing to put implicit trust in obtaining our future needs from Great Britain or from any other foreign source. Consequently, we passed a law in 1789 that protected some of these infant industries. That first act started this country out on our American method of regulating our foreign trade by tariffs.

Much the same ground has been fought over at the passage of every tariff act since that time. The same old arguments are made of whether to stimulate and protect domestic industries essential for the defense of the Nation in war, whether to encourage and maintain infant industries; if so, what industries; what, if any, new industries to encourage and foster by the tariff device for regulating foreign competition; how much, if any, foreign competition to permit, and so forth, have been questions before the American voting public in a more or less perennial debate ever since that first tariff act was passed.

Looking back over our history it is plain and the record is clear that each Tariff Act has had some fairly good reasons for its coming into being at the time of its passage by the Congress. Of course, many mistakes were made, when rates were fixed too high and made to protect industries which should never have been protected. Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in the light of history, will now readily admit that to be so. But at the time, by arguing from false premises, by mistaken judgments, by erroneous appraisement of facts, or for other reasons, they justified themselves and did a pretty good job of selling the voters on their protective-tariff policy right up to 1930, when the mistake of mistakes in the tariff law was made.

We had the power then, in 1933, to wipe out in one fell swoop all the "iniquitous" high tariffs of the Smoot-Hawley Act and to put on the statutes a law enacted for the sole purpose of obtaining the revenue needed from customs duties and omitting any and all rates to regulate our foreign commerce. Why did we not do it?

There are many reasons why we did not do it, and they are good and sufficient reasons, too.

The whole world was in a state of depression. All nations were struggling with the problems created by millions of unemployed. Each country was trying to put its men and women back to work. All countries were regulating and restricting imports to maintain high domestic production so as to keep farmers and laborers employed on their own farms and in local factories. At the same time each nation was attempting to maintain or increase exports, some countries even subsidizing them, in order to keep up or to increase opportunities for employment of its own citizens. Their leaders were not in the frame of mind, nor were they in a position at that time, to accept any large increase in imports.

The United States was struggling with the same gigantic displacement problems. Under such conditions as existed in 1933 when the Democratic Party became the majority party and took over the Government, it would have been the sheerest folly to have abolished all our protective tariffs. Imports would have swelled beyond compare, our own unemployment would have increased, and all our problems incident to such unemployment would have been aggravated.

Our exports could not have increased immediately to balance the augmented imports. Foreign countries were regulating trade by all kinds of barriers, if not absolutely preventing imports, and subsidizing exports to help solve their unemployment; and Germany, Italy, and Japan were completely controlling imports and exports in order to prepare for war which they knew would result in a blockade of their foreign trade. They were making themselves as self-sufficient as possible and building stock piles of essentials for the future emergency. Under such conditions it would have been futile to reduce our tariffs unilaterally.

On the other hand, there was presented the possibility of bringing back reasonable soundness to international trade, to win for our reductions in tariff rates reciprocal reductions of foreign tariffs against our exports and thus to reestablish international exchange of goods on a basis of approximately equal advantage to all trade-agreement countries. In this way we would not leave the rest of the world locked up in tight trade compartments while we wandered around the globe begging for markets, but we would unlock some at least of these closely guarded and barricaded foreign markets to the products of the United States, in exchange for opening up our own vast market a little more liberally to the products of other countries.

These are in brief the reason why the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed in 1934 instead of a general downward tariff revision. The act was renewed in 1937 and in 1940 because on its merits as employed by the administration it had won the recognition that it was a sound, constructive, and workable method of handling the very knotty, complex, and continuous economic problem of regulating our foreign trade to the commercial advantage of our great Nation and to the promotion of friendly relations with the other nations of the world. The experience of the past 9 years has proved the usefulness of these trade agreements to the economy of the United States and to the establishment and maintenance of good relationships with our neighbors—the rest of the countries of the earth.

As suggested earlier, this reciprocal trade agreements method of adjusting or regulating our foreign trade naturally grew out of our tariff experience, especially the experience with the so-called flexible tariff provisions of the Tariff Acts of 1922 and 1930. The trade-agreements method simply corrects some of the weaknesses, cumbersomeness, and the unilateral nature of those procedures for adjusting rates of duty; and where reductions are made by this new method, the United States gets something in exchange from other countries, while under the flexible provisions of the earlier acts no such concessions whatever from foreign countries were won or could be won for this country because they were not even provided for in those earlier acts. Certainly when the trade agreements act was passed in 1934 we needed such a tool to pry open some of the almost air-tight foreign markets for our exports; and we will also need it, perhaps even more urgently, after this war is over.

ACT IS CONSTITUTIONAL—THAT QUESTION NEEDS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION

Mr. President, I desire next to discuss a question which has not been considered for some time, the question of the constitutionality of reciprocal trade agreements.

The flexible provisions of the Tariff Act of 1922 were declared constitutional by the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court on April 9, 1928, in *Hampton & Co.* v. *United States* (276 U. S. 394). There is nothing so new or strange in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act as to make it unconstitutional. We may take it for granted that at this late date, if and when the question comes before the Supreme Court, that tribunal will declare the act constitutional.

There is no need here and now of again arguing whether or not the trade agreement act and method of regulating our foreign trade is constitutional. That question is now largely academic. Congress has during our history passed so many acts giving the President the power to regulate our foreign trade and commerce and has specified at different times what should be the basis of his changes in customs duties, if, as, and when he finds such action to be in the best interests of the country, that further to debate the constitutionality of such procedure as used in these trade agreements is to waste time on futile considerations The reciprocal trade agreements are to our advantage and are desirable for the welfare and peaceful well-being of the United States or they are not. On that basis let us decide whether we want to continue them in operation and to negotiate more of them in the future.

I am a strong supporter of our Constitution, but I see no sense in prolonging an attempt to destroy useful legislation, so long in operation to the advantage of our country and of the world, by merely technical, inflexible, and outmoded interpretations of certain phrases of the Constitution, especially when for so many years a majority of our citizens and of our courts, including the Supreme Court, have taken the view that these acts are permissible, when our Constitution is properly and liberally construed, even if they may not be specially provided for in it. Anyway, the arguments on that question have been so thoroughly

gone into before when this matter was under consideration in 1934, 1937, and 1940, and have been so carefully reported in the hearings of the committees and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at those times that I shall not waste the time of the Senate by going into it again. I am convinced beyond a shadow of doubt that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is specifically constitutional under the commerce clause of the Constitution and that the question needs no further discussion in this or any other session of Congress.

EXTENSION IS NEEDED NOW TO REASSURE OUR ALLIES OF UNITED STATES COOPERATION AFTER THE WAR

Mr. President, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be extended now and maintained as the policy of this country to reassure our allies in the war that at the end of the war we will not desert them, withdraw from commercial cooperation behind a high tariff and quotas wall, and leave the other nations of the earth in international selfish individualism and geographical isolation.

This great American Nation must lead the way and use its powerful influence to establish international cooperation, economically as well as politically after the war. This role of leadership in the field of international economic cooperation which rests upon this country because of its size, population, and industrial and military power, no less than upon its spiritual leadership of ideas and ideals of democracy, simply demands that we do our best to reestablish sane, healthful, wholesome, and profitable trade between the many nations of the earth.

These trade agreements are good instruments for the exercise of a great beneficial influence on the trade of the United States with the outside world after the war and for influencing the foreign trade policies of the other countries to promote a prosperous trade among themselves as well as between them and the United States. In this way the standards of living in all countries may be raised and the friction caused by international trade barriers may be removed to a large extent at least. By extending the Trade Agreements Act our present allies will be reassured and encouraged to continue in battle to the victory for which we are all fighting, confident that we shall continue interest in them and them in us, after the war is won, so that the peace also may be won.

UNITED STATES POLICY IS TO TREAT ALL COUNTRIES ALIKE

Mr. President, I desire to consider the question of the most-favored-nation policy in our treaties and to indicate what that technique has done for us and for the world. The adoption of the most-favored-nation policy in our treaties with other countries, now incorporated in all agreements under this Reciprocal Trade Act, was first generally adopted and applied by our Government in the Harding administration when Charles Evans Hughes was Secretary of State.

It is interesting to note that this technique is no longer questioned, a fact which it is rather difficult to realize when we remember how earnestly it was debated when the idea of the most-favored-nation treatment was first presented.

No question about the constitutionality of the most favored nation policy has been raised. Nor can this question be made a political issue because both major political parties have adopted it and applied it in our treaties and trade agreements with other countries. This is the established policy of the United States, and it is a wise policy and greatly to the advantage of this country. It will undoubtedly continue to be our policy, for it has great merit. We shall continue to try to obtain most-favored-nation treatment from all other countries and in exchange we shall grant it to all other countries that do not discriminate against United States trade.

Without such a policy of treating all nations alike, the world would be divided into rival trading groups, friendly and unfriendly. Those being treated as well as any other nation in trade with us would be friendly and those not enjoying such relations would be unfriendly. A similar situation would prevail in the case of every other nation. If each and every country tried to make special and exclusive bilateral trading arrangements, regulating specifically all trade in each item between each such two trading countries, world trade relationships would soon be so complex and so limited and so many irritating elements would be involved that any reasonable degree of freedom of exchange of goods and services to obtain the benefits of natural geographical advantages and specialization would be impossible. The free and equal access of all nations to essential raw materials and foodstuffs would also be a myth and unobtainable.

Mr. President, I am wondering if the Atlantic Charter could have been as bold in its declaration in regard to open and free access to raw materials if it had not been for the experience of our country during the last 9 years with reciprocal trade agreements. I believe that that experience has contributed to a world doctrine to such an extent that our great allies can declare, as, indeed, they have declared, that the doctrine itself is for the benefit of the whole world.

The wide exchange of the world's goods and services which will promote international friendships, high standards of living, and prosperity for all countries can come only when nations stop this selfish, bickering discrimination against each other and refrain from forming rival, competing, unfriendly groups of nations for the exploitation of the trade they control to their own particular advantage and to the detriment of other nations.

It would most certainly be to the decided advantage of the United States, which has the next to the largest, if not the largest, foreign trade of any nation in the world, if we could win by reciprocal trade agreements, or by any other equitable procedure, trade treatment by each and every foreign country, equal to the best treatment that each and every foreign country respectively grants to any third country. We would in consequence enjoy freedom from discriminations against our exports to each and every country of the world and also freedom from discriminations by them against their respective exports to the United States. That is a part of what this country is aiming at in negotiating these reciprocal trade agreements. We not only grant most-favored-nation treatment in our market, but we get most-favored-nation treatment in the countries with which we have made such agreements.

Our total exports are generally greater than our total imports. Consequently in quid pro quo trades we stand to obtain a net gain, value for value. But because the United States has such a paramount interest in world trade and in keeping it on a reasonable, friendly, and fair basis and free from direction by military, naval, cartel, financial, or other pressures, we stand to gain far more from such a most-favored-nation status extant generally throughout the world than can be measured by just the balance of commodity exchanges. Such world trade conditions would help to make the world a better place in which to live and the United States is greatly interested in doing that very thing.

Having said this much about the general background, character, legal status, and purposes of this act, let us examine briefly what has been accomplished under its operation for the past 9 years.

AGREEMENTS MADE AND IN PROCESS

The administration has completed 29 agreements with 25 countries under the act. There have been an original and two supplemental agreements with both Cuba and Canada. The agreement with Nicaragua became effective October 1, 1936, but on March 10, 1938, the duty concessions and certain other provisions of the agreement ceased to be in force. The operation of the agreement with Czechoslovakia, effective April 16, 1936, was suspended as of April 22, 1939, because of German occupation of that country. Consequently, there are reciprocal trade agreements in effect at present with 24 countries, including Nicaragua, which treaty has not been entirely voided. Also announcement has been made of intention to negotiate agreements with three other countries and hearings have been held on the proposed United States concessions and our demands for concessions from the other countries. These three are with Iceland, Bolivia, and Iran.

It is true, of course, that we have not been able to make trade agreements with all countries. But we have explored the whole field. We even sent men to Germany, Italy, and Japan and tried to come to some satisfactory agreements with them. But we were no more successful with them in negotiating reciprocal trade agreements than we were in preventing them from starting this great war. They were not willing to meet us on a fair and just basis. On the other hand many other countries that are in a position to do so have been keenly interested in making quid pro quo trade arrangements with us. The agreements now in effect with 24 countries and the 3 in proc-

ess prove this point beyond a doubt. The complete list is as follows:

Trade agreements calendar—Trade agreements in process of negotiation

Country	Date of issuance of public notice	Latest date for submitting written statements	Opening date of public hearings
Iceland	Nov. 17, 1941	Dec. 8, 1941	Dec. 15, 1941
Bolivia	Apr. 4, 1942	May 4, 1942	May 18, 1942
Iran [1]	July 29, 1942	Aug. 27, 1942	Sept. 9, 1942

[1] Iran signed Apr. 8, 1943.

Trade agreements signed (in chronological order)

Country	Signed	Effective
Cuba	Aug. 24, 1934	Sept. 3, 1934
Brazil	Feb. 2, 1935	Jan. 1, 1936
Belgium (and Luxemburg)	Feb. 27, 1935	May 1, 1935
Haiti	Mar. 28, 1935	June 3, 1935
Sweden	May 25, 1935	Aug. 5, 1935
Colombia	Sept. 13, 1935	May 20, 1936
Canada (superseded)	Nov. 15, 1935	Jan. 1, 1936
Honduras	Dec. 18, 1935	Mar. 2, 1936
The Netherlands	Dec 20, 1935	Feb. 1, 1936
Switzerland	Jan. 9, 1936	Feb. 15, 1936
Nicaragua [1]	Mar. 11, 1936	Oct. 1, 1936
Guatemala	Apr. 24, 1936	June 15, 1936
France	May 6, 1936	Do.
Finland	May 18, 1936	Nov. 2, 1936
Costa Rica	Nov. 28, 1936	Aug. 2, 1937
El Salvador	Feb. 19, 1937	May 31, 1937
Czechoslovakia [2]	Mar. 7, 1938	Apr. 16, 1938
Ecuador	Aug. 6, 1938	Oct. 23, 1938
United Kingdom	Nov. 17, 1938	Jan. 1, 1939
Canada (second agreement)	....do....	Do.
Turkey	Apr. 1, 1939	May 5, 1939
Venezuela	Nov. 6, 1939	Dec. 16, 1939
Cuba (first supplementary agreement)	Dec. 18, 1939	Dec. 23, 1939
Canada (supplementary fox fur agreement) [3]	Dec. 13, 1940	Dec. 20, 1940
Argentina	Oct. 14, 1941	Nov. 15, 1941
Cuba (second supplementary agreement)	Dec. 23, 1941	Jan. 5, 1942
Peru	May 7, 1942	July 29, 1942
Uruguay	July 21, 1942	Jan. 1, 1943
Mexico	Dec. 23, 1942	Jan. 30, 1943

[1] The duty concessions and certain other provisions of this agreement ceased to be in force as of Mar. 10, 1938.
[2] The operation of this agreement was suspended as of Apr. 22, 1939.
[3] This replaced a previous supplementary agreement relating to fox furs, signed on Dec. 30, 1939.

PRESENT POLICY DOES NOT GIVE AWAY CONCESSIONS FOR NOTHING

Some persons, however, argue against generalizing to all countries our concessions granted in a reciprocal-trade agreement with one country, because we thus give away something to these other countries and get nothing in return. It must be remembered that when we grant most-favored-nation treatment we also get it in return from the country with which the treaty is made, and consequently we may actually in any particular case get more from that one country than we give. We may, too, get less, dependent on our actual trade with the particular country involved and also dependent upon her trade with other countries and what her comparative treatment of our trade has been in the past before this reciprocal agreement was consummated.

On this point of giving something for nothing to third, fourth, and fifth countries, let us recall that the general policy and practice of our Government is to grant concessions only on articles of which the country with which we are negotiating is the principal supplier, the principal source of our imports. In that way other countries which supply minor imports may get some benefit, at least temporarily, without at once granting our exports a quid pro quo benefit in their markets. If we do not subsequently make an agreement with such countries and if they do not discriminate against our products sufficiently to warrant denying them this equal treatment, they may continue to enjoy this gratuitous concession. If and when we subsequently negotiate an agreement with such countries, we surely and most certainly remind them of our previous concessions from which they have benefited gratuitously, and we usually, if not always, obtain satisfactory compensating concessions from them.

On the other hand, if we have already a most-favored-nation treaty with such other countries we also obtain gratuitously from them any concessions which they may make to third, fourth, and fifth countries. Because we do actually have such treaties with most countries of the world, dating back even before the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed, we probably as a result of such treaties obtain from those third, fourth, and fifth countries concessions equal in value to, if not greater than, any we give away gratuitously by our policy. This would be true especially of countries which were actively liberalizing their trade agreements as the United States is doing under our present policy and of countries with which we had an export balance.

PRESENT POLICY DOES NOT GIVE AWAY UNITED STATES BARGAINING POWER

The other point of this argument is to the effect that when we so generalize our concessions to all countries by granting to them these concessions gratis and without demanding from each and every one of such countries standing to benefit from such United States concessions an offsetting, equal, or a quid pro quo concession before we let them enjoy the equal treatment of the country with which we have consummated an agreement, we lose our bargaining power with those countries with whom we may not yet have made agreements. The same answer given above applies equally against this contention and for the same reasons there is not much truth in the argument. However, it is a plausible argument that there may be something to it in theory, but there is not much to it in actual practice as shown by the facts. These trade agreements can stand on the accomplishments of the administration as shown by the record. The record of course is not perfect, but it is a good one. Let us examine in summary just a few of the facts.

The Tariff Commission has been one of the principal sources of factual data aiding the State Department in the trade-agreements program and has made available to us some valuable and illuminating information showing what has been accomplished to date. One such study is based on carefully analyzed data about 160 of the most important commodities in our foreign trade on which the United States granted concessions in trade agreements, representing 90 percent, by value, of all imports on which rates have been reduced. For 130 of such commodities, representing 91 percent of the imports of the group, the agreements granting the reduced duties were made with the countries that were the principal suppliers. With regard to 13 commodities, which accounted for 3 percent of the imports of the group, agreements were made with the second largest supplier. With regard to 10 of the 160 commodities, the agreement country ranked third, fourth, or lower as a supplier. And with regard to 7 of the 160 commodities, concessions were granted in agreements with countries from which no imports whatever were received in the United States in 1939, the base year for the study.

The above facts show that in practice the administration has stuck close to its policy of granting concessions to countries that are the principal suppliers, but that there have been some exceptions to the rule in order to meet special conditions and accomplish what seemed to be favorable results warranting departure from the usual practice. For example, in the agreement with Argentina, effective November 15, 1941, a reduction was granted on canned tomatoes and tomato paste. Italy was the principal source of imports in 1939 and none came from Argentina. But during 1942 few, if any, came from Italy or Argentina, and Canada became a principal source of imports and we already had a reciprocal agreement with Canada.

Another illustration is ferromanganese—30 percent or more manganese—containing not less than 4 percent carbon. Canada in 1929-33 was the principal source of imports, in 1934-35, Norway was first and Canada second as suppliers. Canada was also a larger potential source than any other country. A reduced duty was granted in the agreement with Canada, January 1, 1936, but in 1939 Canada was not a supplier of any imports to this country. The Netherlands then ranked first as a source, Norway second, Czechoslovakia third, and Poland and Danzig fourth. During the war we need all the ferromanganese we can get from any and every source. When this duty was reduced in 1936 it was thought that the concession would do no harm and it might get us a little of this much needed ferromanganese. And as a matter of fact in 1942 Canada again and the United Kingdom were our principal, if not our sole sources of imports, although the concession was automatically granted to all countries when it was originally granted to Canada in 1936.

Let us now take a general view of results. On the basis of value in 1939, 79 percent of the imports subject to reduced duties in all trade agreements—not including Peru, Mexico, and Uruguay—came from countries to which the concessions were granted; excluding Cuba the proportion is 74 percent. Imports of dutiable products having rates bound against increase came largely from nonagreement countries, but this was due almost entirely to the binding of the rate on burlaps in the United Kingdom agreement with imports valued at $24,000,000 from British India, a nonagreement country. Sixty-nine percent of the imports bound free of duty were

received from the countries in agreements with which the bindings were made.

These facts show that in few, if any, cases has generalization of concessions granted something for nothing, and in few, if any, has the United States lost bargaining power. Nothing really has been given away or lost. First-rate powers which have honorable and forthright foreign policies do not take advantage of our generosity. We have lost no bargaining power with such countries. On the whole we have gained in good will by our fair, open, and honest dealing much more than we have lost. This, in the long run, will result in much greater trade for the United States than would the stingy, bickering, haggling policy involved in the strictly limited bilateral agreements policy advocated by some opponents of the present program. As a matter of fact, the United States is greatly admired and highly respected by all the other nations of the world because of this administration's policies in negotiating these reciprocal trade agreements.

FARMERS NOT HURT BY TRADE AGREEMENTS

Despite much talk about the administration "having sold the United States farmers down the river" in the trade agreements negotiated, one will search in vain for evidence of such an effect. On the contrary, farmers in general have been benefited by the administration of this act.

While foreign markets for our great surplus crops of cotton, wheat, tobacco, and so on have not been greatly expanded because of peculiar pre-war world conditions and the existing war economies of foreign countries, yet the extension of foreign markets for our manufactured products has extended industrial employment and increased purchasing power in this country and thus expanded our home market for our domestic farm products. This effect of foreign trade is quite apparent now when war conditions have turned our former great surpluses into present deficits.

The American farmers have also gained from the trade agreements the same as all other consumers because the lower tariffs have reduced the prices of imported goods and because the resulting increased competition has also reduced the prices of domestic articles the farmers purchase and forced greater efficiency of domestic manufacture, thus keeping down the farmer's costs of production and his and the city and industrial worker's costs of living.

Some specialized groups of farmers, such as the flaxseed growers of the Northwest and of California, may think they might be injured after the war if the reduced duty on flaxseed in the Argentine agreement were continued when the war is over, but that remains to be seen. Anyway, that agreement terminates November 15, 1944, or before the end of the war, or "until the thirtieth day following a proclamation by the President of the United States of America, after consultation with the Argentine Government, that the existing abnormal situation in respect of the trade in flaxseed has terminated," and no harm will be done under the present rate of duty during the war. The security of our domestic producers, if necessary, may be provided in any new agreement by a quota on imports. In general, our farmers have benefited by the agreements.

UNITED STATES SUGAR-BEET AND SUGARCANE GROWERS NOT INJURED

We now and then hear grumblings from the sugar-beet and sugarcane growers or the sugar manufacturers or refiners about the injury they have sustained or may suffer, but the evidence shows that not only have they not been injured by the reduction in the duty on sugar in the agreement with Cuba but that the sugar industry has prospered greatly during the past 9 years under the sugar program of the administration. It is true that the duty has been reduced, but with the quota system adopted in the Jones-Costigan Sugar Act and as it has been administered by the Government, imports have been kept within such limits as to secure for our farmers a good price for their beets and cane and for the domestic manufacturers and refiners a profitable margin on the average on the sugar they produced. Few, if any, 9-year periods of the industry's history in this country have been more profitable than the period during the existence of the Cuban trade agreement.

Good prices paid farmers for sugar beets

The average returns to United States farmers for growing sugar beets during the 1942 crop season is estimated to be slightly more than $9 per ton, compared with an average of $6.75 per ton for the 1938, 1939, and 1940 crops. These average prices include both payments by beet-sugar processors and conditional benefit payments by the Government.

It is estimated that the comparable price the United States beet growers will get for the 1943 crop will be about $11 per ton. This includes a subsidy of $1.50 per ton which will be paid by the Government for beets grown this year in addition to the conditional benefit payments under the farm program and the amount paid by the processors.

Good profits earned by beet-sugar companies in the United States

In a statement printed by the Securities and Exchange Commission—Advance Release No. 3, December 1942—it is shown that the average net profit as a percent of sales for six of the largest beet-sugar companies was 7.7 percent for the fiscal year ending in 1941, and 9 percent for the fiscal year ending in 1942. The range was from a loss of 2.4 percent to a gain of 11.2 percent in 1941 and from a low of 5.9 percent to 11.6 percent for 1942.

The report of the United States Tariff Commission on the costs of production of beet sugar, table 5–A, page 55, shows that the ratio of profit to investment for 10 of the largest beet-sugar companies was 14.5 percent on the average for 1940 and 13.4 percent on the average for 1941. These profits, however, are calculated without deducting income taxes paid. The net profit after income taxes were deducted would be less.

REDUCTION IN DUTY ON CATTLE HAS INJURED DOMESTIC PRODUCERS VERY LITTLE, IF ANY

There has been considerable unjust criticism among farmers of the trade agreements with Canada and Mexico because of the reductions in the duties on cattle granted by the United States in those agreements. In the first Canadian agreement effective January 1, 1936, the duty was reduced from 3 cents a pound to 2 cents on heavy cattle weighing 700 pounds or more each, and in the second Canadian agreement, effective January 1, 1939, it was further reduced to 1.5 cents per pound. Farmers claim that this resulted in lower prices being paid for domestic heavy stockers and feeders and fat cattle, especially on the St. Paul market where most imported Canadian cattle are marketed and consequently that these concessions injured the United States farmers who market their cattle in St. Paul.

Both the farmers' representatives and the State Department, respectively, quote prices at St. Paul to show that the farmers were injured and to prove that they were not injured. I am willing to believe that prices in that particular market might have been slightly lower because of the imports from Canada. But even so, is it asking too much of our farmers to ask them to meet a little competition from their Canadian neighboring farmers in order to maintain the splendid good neighbor policy between Canada and the United States?

And, in addition, the United States limited the number of such cattle that could be imported in any one year to 155,799 head in the first agreement and to a maximum of 225,000 head per calendar year in the second agreement and to not over 60,000 head per calendar quarter year. These limitations on the number that could be brought in from all sources, principally Canada, at the reduced rates, made it certain that the injury to the Western cattle producers would be limited and within the bounds of a reasonable quid pro quo exchange for the concessions won from Canada in these agreements.

Furthermore, the United States cattle feeders of the Middle West profited by the slightly lower prices and the availability of the Canadian cattle which they purchased for their feed lots on this side of the border.

Now, during the war, we would be glad to get these or any number of cattle from Canada to help piece out our supplies of beef, but Canada no longer permits exports to this country because of her own great need for beef.

The duty on cattle weighing 200 pounds or more each, but less than 700 pounds, was reduced in the Mexican agreement, effective January 30, 1943, from 2.5 cents a pound to 1.5 cents per pound. No tariff quota is now applicable, but the agreement with Mexico provides for a quota to become effective at a future date, at which time the quantity entitled to entry at the reduced rate will be limited to 110,000 head per calendar quarter year and to 400,000 per calendar year.

This concession granted when our beef supplies are short and domestic produc-

tion inadequate and prices of beef very high cannot possibly injure domestic cattle raisers and even if they should claim that they would have received even higher prices if the duty had not been reduced, the great need for beef in this country during the war and our short supply would certainly justify the concession from every point of view.

When all factors are considered, neither these farmers nor other growers of the United States have suffered any substantial injury by the concessions granted in the trade agreements. The same may be said of the mining and manufacturing interests of this country—they have suffered no substantial injury because of the concessions granted on imports of their products. Conversely, all have been benefited by the concessions we have won from other countries. Their exports have been freed from paying excessive taxes. They may have benefited by the cheaper imports or lower prices necessary to obtain essential supplies, or only from the general good will and more friendly relations of our neighboring countries and others enjoying trade with us. All have shared in the more prosperous foreign trade promoted by the trade agreements and in the better relations with other countries established when reciprocal trade agreements are in operation.

AMENDMENTS SHOULD NOT BE ADOPTED

Amendments proposed by opponents of the trade agreements should not be adopted. They would either cripple the program or destroy it. Adoption of amendments such as the one limiting concessions by this country to noncompetitive products, or only to those agricultural products that are sold here for prices above parity, or to those products whose costs of production in the United States are low enough so that the present tariff more than equalizes the difference in their costs and costs in the foreign country with which we are negotiating, would so cripple the trade-agreement program that it would not be of sufficient use to warrant continuing it. And to require the approval of both Houses of Congress before an agreement may become effective would practically preclude the use of the trade agreements as an instrument, if our past history with such procedure can be relied upon. The record shows such agreements never have been approved, and it seems likely they never would be. To require their approval by the Senate, while quite unnecessary from the constitutional point of view, would also stultify the program and void it to the extent of almost, if not entirely, destroying it. It would throw the old tariff fight right back here in the Senate, which, in reality, would destroy the trade-agreement program and return it to the logrolling control of the special interests of the local units rather than the general public interests now dictating the program.

Furthermore, to add such burdensome limitations on any administration trying to deal with foreign countries is to destroy the program as a practical way of adjusting trade, because the representatives of the foreign countries would have no confidence that agreements could be made, and even if they thought they could be made, they would conclude that no concessions could be obtained by them that would be worth while. Consequently they would not be interested in attempting to negotiate agreements with us. Their views must be taken into consideration in these agreements as well as ours. It takes both sides to make an agreement. Unless foreign countries obtain concessions which they think worth while, they will not try to conclude an agreement. Agreements must be reciprocal.

TRADE AGREEMENTS NEEDED DURING WAR

The trade agreements are needed now because of rapidly developing shortages of many commodities essential in our war economy while failure to extend the act might limit the flexibility essential to meet our present needs. For example, the feeds now in great demand for expansion of our beef, dairy, poultry, and other livestock products might be had from Canada, Australia, or Argentina, if shipping were available and duties reduced on the imports and our import quota restrictions removed on good wheat. Of course, one difficulty is shortage of shipping and that is outside of trade agreement influence, and another is the quota fixed by the President on wheat imports under the agricultural program. But if it were made possible to import at lower duties wheat from Canada, Australia, and Argentina, when shipping does become available as it well might, our feed shortage might be greatly alleviated to the benefit of our program for adequate human food products of animal origin for ourselves and our allies. Furthermore, extension of the act may be an aid in keeping prices within the ceilings set and thus keeping down costs of living and thus help in the control of inflation. In other ways also the war program might be helped by adjusting tariffs on our imports in exchange for reciprocal lowering of other countries' duties on our exports.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I have not heard all the discussion, but I understand from the Senator's statement that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been a law for 9 years, having been passed in 1934 and extended in 1937 and 1940. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TUNNELL. I understand from the report of the committee that 27 countries have entered into agreements with the United States under the act.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct, and I have placed in the RECORD a list of the trade agreements, so that it will be available to the Senate.

Mr. TUNNELL. I understood from the Senator's statement that in no case has any question as to the validity of these agreements been taken to the Supreme Court of the United States in all that period.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I know of no case arising under the act which has been carried to the Supreme Court.

Mr. TUNNELL. Does the Senator know of any particular reason why there should now be question raised as to the validity of agreements, or as to the length of time the agreements should stand?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator from Utah does not know of any reason at all. When there is an act which has gained such universal good will among our own people, and which has caused the nations of the earth not only to respond to what we might call a good-neighbor policy, but actually to appreciate what we have done, and when the reciprocal trade agreements have been so much appreciated in the world, it seems to be that to change the policy at this time, when we are fighting to make it possible for all nations to have access to the goods of the world in the most desirable way, would be the most backward step we could take.

Mr. TUNNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I might add a word about other questions—the Danaher amendment, for example, which would make of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act a war act. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is primarily a peace act, and should be construed as a peace act and as an act of good will.

Mr. President, after all is said and done we must adopt broad and enlightened trade policies for this, the greatest trading Nation on earth. We have gained a military leadership; we have gained a political leadership, we have gained a position in international relations the like of which no other nation has ever gained in the history of the world. Everywhere the United States is looked to and thought of as the hope of the whole earth. In the parts of the world which our enemies have overrun and now control we all know that the populations would have given up hope long ago had it not been for the strength and character of the United States, and the reverence they have for our country.

We must deal fairly and even generously with the other nations of the world to win and keep their friendship and good will. We need their support or at least their cooperation now during the war and after the war ends and to establish and maintain the only kind of peace that has any chance of enduring. Renewing this Trade Agreements Act will contribute one mechanism that shows some prospects of helping to shape world trade and to direct it into a constructive element toward friendly, cooperative international relations. It ought to be given new life and the administration encouraged to go forward in its constructive program so that when the war ends we may go right ahead making agreements for constructive direction of our own trade and the trade of the world so that our views and their views may be harmonized on just and fair objectives for world trade and cooperation. These trade agreements cannot do everything necessary to restore world sanity but they may be administered as a program pointing in the

right direction and consequently they should be given our approval and the people of this great country should help to direct us in our foreign policy by adopting a broad and constructive point of view on these great international problems.

Mr. President, I would make a plea to my fellow Senators. We are at war. When I stood on the floor of the Senate years ago, sponsoring the Selective Service Act, I happened to make the statement that our country was actually in peril. I was charged with being a warmonger when I made that statement, and as pointing out a condition which did not exist. I was put in the place of an aggressor because I said that it was time for the United States to prepare, time for the United States to realize the conditions which were prevalent in the world, and the ambition of certain nations to ruin that for which we stand. I did not go so far as to predict an attack upon the United States, because I had too much faith in the world's recognition of the fact that we were strong, and able to take care of ourselves. But I did point out that we were in peril, and I was charged, for so stating, with being one of those who wanted to encourage war and to make war more certain.

Mr. President, in this plea I of course am making an appeal for peace, but the making of peace is very much more difficult than the making of war. War is simple. All a country has to do is to reach its enemy, defeat him and crush him. It is a single objective. But peace is complex in the extreme. There can never be peace by fiat. Peace will never be brought to the world merely by some one declaring "Let us have peace." It has to come step by step, it has to come act by act; and in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act we have one technique, not a major technique, but one wherein we bind close to us certain nations in the world, and it is well to have them bound to us.

Mr. President, there has arisen a certain criticism—and it comes out in this discussion—to the effect that the President has been given too much power. I have already shown that, so far as tariffs are concerned, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act the President is not granted the great powers which have been granted by other tariff acts. But is not this the time when we should uphold the hand of our Commander in Chief, when we should grant him power? We do grant him power. Is it not a time when we should think of the fact that the test of the worth of any constitution is in its ability to protect the people from hazards and from war? I am happy beyond words to point out that America's Constitution is again standing the test of war. America is stronger in war than she is in peace.

Mr. President, I simply wish to add that I no longer have to predict that we are facing peril. Everyone knows we are in peril and that we are going to remain in peril for some time. Everyone who knows the methods of war practiced by our enemies realizes that the advantages are not all on our side to this day. Colonel House, I believe it was, after the last war laid down the doctrine that the nations of the world are divided into two parts, the haves and the have-nots. We must all realize that in the last 2 years America has ceased to be a have nation and has become a have-not nation. That change in our position, Mr. President, means that we must do nothing now to make it harder for us, a have-not nation, to gain access to all the friendly trade we can secure.

My final plea, Mr. President, is a plea far beyond and above all other pleas. Now that we are fighting a war my plea to all is to hold up the arms of our Commander in Chief. Do not legislate in such a way that our Commander in Chief will have to fight at a disadvantage to himself, and to our own disadvantage. I ask everyone when thinking about the powers of the President, the powers of the Congress, and the powers of the judiciary, to remember that after all there is but one Government. We do not have three governments. If the three coordinate branches of the Government cannot unite in sustaining the defense of the American people, our Government will come to naught. This is no time to change by one whit the great power which our President has. Let us uphold his power. Let us give him power so that we shall be assured in every way not only of victory in the war, but of the type of peace which means the perpetuation of American ideals throughout the world and American institutions here at home.

Mr. BUSHFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Gurney	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hatch	Robertson
Bone	Hawkes	Russell
Brewster	Hayden	Scrugham
Bridges	Hill	Shipstead
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lucas	Tobey
Capper	McCarran	Truman
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chandler	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	White
Davis	Moore	Wiley
Downey	Murray	Willis
Eastland	Nye	Wilson
Ellender	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in the year 1934 the Congress passed a Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, whereby it was provided:

SEC. 350. (a) For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production so that foreign markets will be made available to those branches of American production which require and are capable of developing such outlets by affording corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States, the President, whenever he finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purpose above declared will be promoted by the means hereinafter specified, is authorized from time to time—

(1) To enter into foreign-trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof; and

(2) To proclaim such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or excise treatment of any article covered by foreign trade agreement that the President has entered into hereunder. No proclamation shall be made increasing or decreasing by more than 50 percentum any existing rate of duty or transferring any article between the dutiable and the free lists. The proclaimed duties and other import restrictions shall apply to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of all foreign countries whether imported directly or indirectly: *Provided*, That the President may suspend the application to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of any country because of its discriminatory treatment of American commerce or because of other acts or policies which in his opinion tend to defeat the purposes set forth in this section; and the proclaimed duties and other import restrictions shall be in effect from and after such time as is specified on the proclamation. The President may at any time terminate any such proclamation in whole or in part.

This act provided for its own expiration at the end of 3 years. However, without positive action on the part of the President or of the Congress, which would require a two-thirds vote of both Houses, trade agreements authorized under this law may run on forever, irrespective of the termination date in the law itself.

That law was again before the Congress in the summer of 1937, and was renewed for another 3-year period. In 1940 still another renewal was granted for 3 years.

We are now asked to renew it again for 3 years, without restrictions. The House of Representatives reduced the length of life of the act to 2 years, and the Finance Committee of the Senate submits an amendment which now is before us, providing in effect for termination of any trade agreement 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war. In years gone by, the original of this act has been debated fully, intelligently, and ably. I shall not, therefore, take the time of this session for a full and complete discussion of this proposal as though it were new legislation before this body for the first time.

Under the provisions of this law, trade agreements have been entered into with some 30 nations. None of those agreements have been approved or ratified by the Senate or by the Congress. The entire power of fixing, within a range of 100 percent, the duties between the nations signatory to those trade agreements has been delegated by the Congress to the President. Under the pro-

visions of the pending joint resolution, duties may be lowered as much as 50 percent or raised as much as 50 percent. To the President is given the sole power of selecting the articles or goods upon which duties may be raised or lowered. Congress has delegated within that limitation the entire constitutional power of tariff legislation.

I came to the Senate as a representative of a farm State. In South Dakota we have few manufactures and few industries outside of those connected with farming and the processing of farm products. South Dakota is deeply concerned with the condition of the market for its products. We in this Chamber may talk learnedly about the statesmanship of tariff legislation and the good-neighbor policy, but I say categorically to the Members of this body that Mr. John Q. Citizen is interested primarily in how this law or the administration of it will affect him. Is the act beneficial to him or detrimental to him? Is it going to protect his business or damage it? Is it going to penalize him or give him assistance?

I do not mean to say or imply that the people of my State are not interested in world politics. They are intensely so. I do not mean to say that they are not as high-minded and as forward-thinking as are some of the statesmen on Capitol Hill. They are. But the first law of Nature, whether in civilized nations or among savages, is self-preservation, and we in South Dakota want to know what this proposed law is going to do to us and to the other American citizens.

The markets of the world are closed today. No merchandise is shipped out of this country today except that belonging to the Government, so the question of world markets is not presently at issue, but we hope that condition will not continue long. What we in South Dakota and what those in all other agricultural States are deeply concerned about is what is going to happen to the market for our cattle, our sheep, our hogs, wheat, corn, and dairy products. Those are the products of the soil from which we make our living. Those are the products that mean existence or starvation to us. Our first measure of consideration is to see that those products or the markets therefor are protected. If those markets are taken away from us by nations who are able to out-trade us, or through the effects of idealistic dreaming, then we are opposed to this kind of legislation.

The American market is our market; and, insofar as it is necessary to protect our own people, I stand unqualifiedly upon that statement. American markets for American products. Much as the dreamers and planners in this Capital City would have it otherwise, the market price of the products about which I am talking is governed by the law of supply and demand. And while that law may be temporarily upset by attempts of price fixing and rationing, in the end it will prevail, to the complete discredit of those who advocate otherwise.

Let me try to illustrate by a concrete example. I have upon my farm 100 hogs which are ready for market. It would not profit me to put any more corn into them. Every day they remain in the feed lot upon the farm there is a hazard of loss. The market is ready for them. The consumers want fresh pork. I am ready to sell. On the same day on which I deliver my 100 hogs to the market, under the provisions of this trade-agreement law some foreign country or countries are invited to dump upon the market upon which I sell my 100 hogs an equivalent number of hogs. The inevitable effect of that dumping upon my market is that the price which I receive for my hogs goes down; and all the oratory and all the statements of good-neighbor policy to the contrary will not make my loss or my dislike or my anger any less, because some planner tells me I must do my good deed for today and cheerfully accept whatever the market brings. This illustration may be applied to my cattle, sheep, corn, or wheat. It does not make any difference what the product is; the result is the same, and I lose money by this dumping of foreign farm products upon the American market. Nor will it make me any happier as a farm producer to tell me that a trade has been made with Canada whereby Canada will take our automobiles, our stoves, or our refrigerators in return for Canadian cattle, wheat, or whatever the product may be.

Let me illustrate it in another way: The principal livestock markets of the Middle West are Chicago, St. Paul, Sioux City, Omaha, Denver, and Kansas City. Every producer watches the total receipts at those markets. If he is fortunate enough to plan the arrival of his carload or trainload of cattle at the market of his choice on a day of light receipts, he receives a better price and is able to make a better sale than when his cattle arrive on the same day as a large shipment from Canada or any other locality. A glutted market is the name applied to days of heavy shipment, and every time it occurs it means loss to the shippers.

That, Senators, is exactly what the trade agreements do. That is exactly what our agreement with Canada does, and the agreement with Canada gives the same privilege to every other nation in the world to dump its products upon my market. Instead of Canada alone stealing my market, these trade agreements throw the market open to the world. This is not reciprocity. Reciprocity means in anybody's language that the benefits are reciprocal or equal and that I get as much benefit as does the Canadian citizen. This is just downright darn foolishness.

Every head of cattle, every hog, every sheep, every bushel of grain brought into the American market takes just that much away from me and every other producer. Every Canadian steer that is sold upon the Minneapolis or Chicago market takes away from me a market for my steer, and as a result I get less money for it.

The reciprocal trade-agreement-program objective is the recovery of export markets. In many cases foreign markets have been lost by unfair or discriminatory tariff barriers erected against our goods by certain foreign nations. Although we have in the neighborhood of 30 of these agreements in effect today, I have been unable to ascertain a single case in which the President, acting under the authority of this law, has required those foreign countries to abolish their unfair and discriminatory barriers against us.

Assistant Secretary of State Grady says:

> Even more serious than tariffs and trade barriers, and far more threatening with respect to the future of world industrial development, is the virtual destruction during the last 4 years of the structure of international prices because of the gross discriminations, preferential trading agreements, and the arbitrary control of trade through import quotas, exchange allocation, and the like.

That statement was made on May 20, 1935.

According to the United States Tariff Commission Reports, since January 1, 1935, 822 bilateral agreements and 559 supplementary bilateral agreements have been entered into between foreign nations with which we have trade agreements, and many of the bilateral agreements are discriminations against our trade. So far as I have been able to ascertain, the President has refused to use his power to protect American commerce against such discrimination, save in one instance only.

In the 1939 Report of the Secretary of Commerce is this statement:

> Obstacles to foreign intercourse became perhaps even more numerous and complex during the past year than in preceding years. Imports from the United States are frequently on a different footing from shipments originating in other countries, notably in instances in which clearing and compensation agreements are in effect or in which bilateral trade results in an excess of exports from this country.
>
> The situation has been rendered the more confusing during recent times by the formation of trade areas and currency blocs to which access from outside areas is completely or partially closed by the use of extraordinary control devices.

Candidate Roosevelt said in Sioux City, Iowa, on September 29, 1932:

> We may not have the astuteness in some forms of international diplomacy that our more experienced European friends have, but when it comes to good old-fashioned barter and trade—whether it be goods or tariff—my money is on the American. There cannot and shall not be any foreign dictation of our tariff policies.

I am perfectly willing to agree with the President that we are lacking in astuteness in our dealings with certain other Nations; but I think that lack of astuteness continues right on through these trade agreements, because America has been "traded out of her socks."

Every one of the countries with which our presently existing trade agreements are in effect agreed in those contracts not to engage in further discriminatory practices toward the United States; and yet, on March 1, 1939, according to the United States Tariff Commission Report, trade-agreement countries were parties to 98

exclusive agreements with other countries, from which the United States received no benefits. Thus a perfect network of these agreements has been built up by the other nations of the world precluding us from their markets, and with one exception the President has failed to terminate a single one of our trade agreements.

As an illustration of what I mean, let me invite attention to the United Kingdom, or Great Britain. Under a bilateral agreement with Turkey, the British Government agreed to purchase from Turkey in 1940 tobacco valued at 20,000,000 Turkish pounds, or 10 times the greatest amount ever used by the British manufacturers in a single year. At the same time, Great Britain announced that she would discontinue buying American tobacco, which amounted to a conservative estimate of $50,000,000 to American tobacco producers.

Nor is that all. Great Britain refused to allocate exchange for the purchase of American apples, pears, or automobiles. That was before she saw the pearly gates opening upon a lend-lease heaven.

On March 15, 1940, Great Britain announced that she would stop buying canned fruit from the United States, and on the 25th of the same month she announced that she would materially curtail her purchase of American cotton.

On October 18, 1939, she completed an agreement with Argentina for the purchase of 200,000 metric tons of Argentine beef. That is not what I would call a good-neighbor policy.

We have frequently been told by proponents of the trade-agreement program that beneficial results have come to America because of this program.

On March 8, 1940, the President made this statement:

> I can tell you this: Our reciprocal-trade program has brought results—results not only in better markets for our industrial goods, but in better markets for our farm goods—results which are mathematically proved in terms of pounds and bushels and dollars and cents.

Unfortunately for the President's contention the facts do not bear out his statement.

Here is the record—percentage of net exports of domestic production of agricultural products, taking the 5-year average for 1926–30, inclusive, and the year 1938 after the trade agreements had been in force for 4 years:

Commodity	Average 1926–30 percent	1938 [1] percent
Cotton, including linters [2]	54.0	28.1
Wheat, including flour	18.3	11.4
Corn, including meal	.7	2.6
Oats, including meal	.8	.4
Rye, including flour	29.5	1.4
Barley, including flour and malt	11.7	3.3
Rice, in terms of rough	23.5	19.0
Tobacco, unmanufactured	33.8	28.8
Pork, including lard	3.4	.8
Lard, including neutral	31.6	13.7

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Crop years, August to July.

Thus, it appears that instead of benefiting American agriculture, the trade-agreement program has actually damaged it. The market value of agricultural exports from the years 1932–39 declined nearly 10 percent.

In his message to Congress on March 2, 1934, the President said with reference to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act:

> Important branches of our agriculture, such as cotton, tobacco, hog products, rice, cereal, and fruit raising will find expanded opportunities in foreign markets.

Those of our States growing cotton should be interested in the record of cotton under these trade agreements. In the crop years 1932 and 1933, 45.3 percent of all foreign-mill consumption was American cotton. After this marvelous program of the State Department had been in effect 4 years, the foreign mill consumption of American cotton had dropped from 45.3 percent to 21 percent, or less than half of what it was when the program started.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I understood the Senator to state that under the program the foreign-mill consumption of American cotton had declined.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator realize that that was caused by an attempt to place the price of American cotton above the world price, and that because of that attempt foreign industrial nations purchased foreign-grown cotton instead of American-grown cotton, because they could buy the foreign-grown cotton more cheaply? The trade agreements had nothing to do with it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I realize that at that time we had a Secretary of Agriculture who said that we did not want any foreign markets.

Mr. EASTLAND. Nevertheless, it is a fact that the decline was due to an attempt to hold the domestic price of American cotton above the world price level.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Nevertheless, the amount of cotton we were selling abroad declined by more than half, whatever the reason was.

American agriculture has lost every round of the fight for foreign business, largely because of the failure of this country to protect itself. Our ancestors may have been Yankee traders but if they had done no better job than the present crop of Yankee traders, they would have lost their clipper ships to the heathens of China and India.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the Senator repeat for me the amount of cotton consumed in American factories?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not have those figures. My figures are for the amount of cotton consumed in foreign mills. It declined from 45.3 percent to 21 percent.

The Secretary of State is making a fight for the renewal of this authority unhampered by limiting amendments. He has warned Congress that the trade-pact extension bill as amended by the Senate Finance Committee "would serve notice to the world that the United States was headed straight back to the narrowest policy of economic isolation."

The facts in the case do not warrant such a statement, and I object to having the State Department or any other bureau of this Government set up straw men for the purpose of knocking them down. Let us stick to the facts and stop imagining terrible things that are going to happen in the future when there is no foundation for such imaginings. The Secretary—and I have every respect and personal regard for him—has repeatedly stated during the existence of these trade pacts, when a renewal was in process of being put through Congress, that they were necessary to help preserve the peace. Certainly these trade agreements did not prevent the present war, nor will they prevent future wars.

I have talked with the distinguished Secretary of State on two occasions. I have asked him three times to tell me why a requirement that the Congress have the ratification or approval of these trade pacts made any difference. I am still waiting for his answer. He did not answer the question, and has not answered it to this day. He did not answer it during the time I was in his office.

Nearly every one of the 30 nations with whom we have trade agreements requires approval or ratification of the agreements by its legislative bodies before they are binding; and yet, according to the proponents of this extension, for America to require the same thing would be to jeopardize the peace of the world.

Mr. Stalin is quoted as saying to our Government very definitely what it is he wants when this war is over.

Mr. Churchill said very definitely that he was not acting as Premier of Great Britain to liquidate the British Empire.

Who is there among all the bureaucrats and statesmen in Washington to say to the world that the American producer must be protected? The only answer which I have been able to get from the distinguished Secretary of State, either by reading his statements or by personal questioning, is that he says such limitations requiring ratification will not work, but no one has undertaken to explain why they will not work. If they work for Britain, France, Russia, and all the South American countries, certainly they can and will work for the United States of America.

I do not believe the amendment reported by the Senate Finance Committee goes far enough. Either the amendment submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] or the one submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is far preferable to what the committee has reported.

The President stated at Butte, Mont., in 1932 that—

> A man's sincerity is measured by his acts rather than his words.

Let us be sincere and practical in dealing with this subject. We have grown into the habit of giving America away to every Tom, Dick, and Harry in the world who asks for it. Let us think of America for just a little while.

Referring further to America, I call the attention of the Senate to the testimony of Dr. John L. Coulter before the Ways and Means Committee given on April 20, 1943, in which he shows, in a careful and full analysis of this matter, that, excluding the countries whose trade has been interrupted by war and revolution, our exports to trade-agreement countries from 1938–40 were substantially less than they were with countries with which no trade agreements have been concluded.

The argument that failure to extend this act will be interpreted by other nations as evidence of policy of noncooperation is, in my opinion, pure bunk. Congress must decide whether the renewal of trade-agreements authority is essential to retain the good will of other nations, and nothing in the record, nothing in the history of our relations with other nations, indicates the slightest reason for believing that a limitation upon this act will cause friction with any of them.

There are those who say that if we attempt to put limitations upon the act, we will go back to the old way of making tariffs. To me that method is preferable to selling America down the river, which prevails under these trade agreements. But I must disagree with that statement. That, Mr. President, is not the issue at all in this debate. The making of a tariff is not in this picture. The tariff under which we are operating today was passed in 1930, and, although the New Deal Party has been in complete control of the Congress and the national administration for 10 years, no attempt has been made by that party to revise the Tariff Act of 1930, except as it has been revised through the side door of trade agreements.

The word reciprocity was long ago deleted from the law by the State Department. We have had no reciprocity for 10 years, because the advantage has been all on one side—the other fellow's side.

Reciprocity itself and reciprocal trade agreements are nothing new. They have been in effect in various ways in this country ever since the first President. It has been an announced and an established policy of the Republican Party since its birth. I doubt if there is any Senator in this Chamber who does not approve of reciprocity. But the question whether we approve or disapprove of reciprocity and reciprocal trade agreements is not an issue in this debate. The only question is whether or not the Congress shall recapture the power given to it by the Constitution to pass upon such agreements.

Much has been said in previous years to the effect that a reciprocal trade agreement is a treaty. Whether it is or not, I think we should bear in mind that there is a difference between a treaty and a trade agreement.

In the case of a treaty, it is an agreement with a foreign country, negotiated by the President or the State Department. After it is complete, it is submitted for ratification to the Senate.

A trade agreement, on the other hand, is based upon legislation already enacted by the Congress. The presently existing tariff law of this country, which I believe is known as the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, is the law upon which this trade-agreement authority rests. The Congress passed the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act fixing certain duties upon certain articles of goods entering this country. It has been in full force and effect for many years. Neither the Democratic Party nor the Republican Party have seen fit to attempt to change that tariff act. Under the Trade Agreement Act provisions the authority granted to the President is to lower or raise the duties upon certain articles of goods coming into this country from foreign countries by not more than 50 percent in exchange for similar concessions from the particular foreign country.

There is nothing new in this legislation except in the form of this particular bill. From the days of George Washington down to the present, the Congress has repeatedly passed directive acts for the guidance of the executive branch of the Government in tariff legislation. In every one of them, however, we find a distinct difference from that contained in this act. That the act of 1934 is unconstitutional as a delegation of legislative power, is not open to serious debate.

But let us look at the historic record.

Congress passed and President Adams approved the act of 1798 suspending commercial intercourse between the United States and France and its dependencies and providing that if the Government of France before the next session of Congress shall clearly disavow and shall be found to refrain from the aggressions, depredations, and hostilities which have been and are by them encouraged and maintained against the vessels and other property of the United States, and against their national rights and sovereignty, in violation of the faith of treaties and the laws of nations, and shall thereby acknowledge the just claims of the United States, it shall be lawful for the President to limit and discontinue the prohibitions and restraints hereby enacted and declared.

The nonintercourse act of March 1, 1809, forbidding the importation, after May 20, of goods, wares, or merchandise from any port in Great Britain or France, provided that the President be, and he hereby is, authorized, in case either France or Great Britain shall so revoke or modify her edicts that they shall cease to violate the neutral commerce of the United States, to declare the same by proclamation, after which the trade suspended by that act can be renewed by the nation so doing.

An act approved June 4, 1794, while George Washington was President, authorized the President while Congress was not in session, "and whenever in his opinion the public safety shall so require, to lay an embargo on all ships and vessels in the United States or upon the ships and vessels of any foreign nations."

By the act of April 18, 1806, it was made unlawful to import into this country from Great Britain, Ireland, or any of the British colonies, articles such as leather, silk, hemp, flax, tin or brass, woolen clothes whose invoice price exceeded 5 shillings sterling per square yard, woolen hosiery, manufactures of glass, silver, and plated wares, nails, spikes, ready-made clothing, millinery, beer, ale, porter, pictures, and prints. In this act the President was given authority to suspend the operation of the act if in his judgment the public interest should require it.

In March 1815, under President Madison, the Congress passed a law providing that so much of the laws imposing duties upon the tonnage of ships and vessels and upon goods, wares and merchandise imported into the United States might be repealed by Presidential order under certain conditions.

In 1817 Congress prohibited the importation of plaster of paris when any other country prohibited the shipment of this commodity in United States vessels, and gave to the President authority to suspend such act by proclamation when reciprocity was granted to this country.

In 1824, the Congress passed an act wherein it was provided that, upon satisfactory evidence being given to the President by the government of any foreign nation that no discriminating duties of tonnage or impost were imposed or levied within the ports of such nation upon vessels of the United States or upon merchandise shipped therein, the President was authorized to issue a proclamation declaring that the foreign discriminating duties within the United States were suspended.

Similar sections were embodied in the acts of 1828, 1829, 1830, 1836, 1847, 1850, 1858, 1863, 1866, 1867, 1869, 1871, 1872, 1880, and 1884.

It will thus be seen, Mr. President, that the policy of reciprocity has been a long-established policy in this country, recognized by Congress and acted upon by the President.

The Tariff Act of 1922 enacted a similar clause, although at that time it was called the flexible tariff provision, and was known as section 315 of the 1922 Tariff Act. Under that act, the President was given authority to do many of the things provided in the 1934 act. But not until the act of 1934 has the Congress attempted to delegate to the President legislative power. That is the distinction between the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and all the other acts that preceded it.

Under the act of 1934, Senators, the President may either lower or raise the rate of duty by 1 percent, by 10 percent, by 20 percent, by 50 percent. The President may select any figure that his fancy may dictate up to 50 percent, and in that manner, Senators, he is given the power to legislate tariff duties for this country. It is not an administrative duty thus delegated; it is a legislative discretion delegated to him under the act.

In support of that contention I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the case of *Marshall Field Co.* v. *Clark* (143 U. S. 649). This case arose out of an act of Congress in 1890. The provision of the act in question reads as follows:

> That with a view to secure reciprocal trade with countries producing the following articles, and for this purpose, on and after the first day of January 1892, whenever, and

so often as the President shall be satisfied that the government of any country producing and exporting sugars, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, imposes duties upon the agricultural or other products of the United States, which in view of the free introduction of such sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides into the United States, he may deem to be reciprocally unequal and unreasonable, he shall have the power and it shall be his duty to suspend, by proclamation the provision of this act.

Other tariff enactments, from the very beginning of this country, gave the President power to act administratively, either to abrogate or put off the tariffs which the Congress had enacted, but none of them, until 1934, ever gave him the power to decide the amount of the tariff and the articles covered by the tariff.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the Senator agree that in the act of 1934, which was renewed in 1937 and 1940, various specific limitations were laid down for the President of the United States?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Within 100 percent, yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Not within 100 percent, but within 50 percent. He can change the rates only 50 percent. So far as the limitation as to the amount is concerned, it is exactly the same as the provision contained in the Smoot-Hawley law. The act also lays down certain other standards as to what the President must find before he can enter into one of these agreements, very much more specific and very much more limited than was contained in the very act to which the Senator referred, which was upheld in the case of Marshall Field Co. against Clark.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The limitation imposed by the act of 1934 provides that the President may lower the tariff duties by 50 percent or raise them by 50 percent, within his discretion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was the discretion granted in the Smoot-Hawley Act, except in somewhat different terms, was it not?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is very true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Except that in this case the President takes into consideration the benefit of the foreign trade of the United States, whereas in the other case he could only act after a finding by the Tariff Commission, within very narrow limits. The limits were certainly as specific in the act of 1934 as in the Smoot-Hawley Act, and I think the Senator must agree to that if he compares the two acts.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have compared them minutely for several days. The limits are within 50 percent, up or down.

It will be seen that the act we are now considering does not go anywhere near as far as the act of 1934. The majority opinion of the court in the case last cited, written by Justice Harlan, held it was not a delegation of legislative power to the President, but in the majority opinion is this statement:

That Congress cannot delegate legislative power to the President is a principle universally recognized as vital to the integrity and maintenance of the system of government ordained by the Constitution.

The majority held this act of 1890 was not unconstitutional, because no discretion was given to the President, as we find in the act of 1934. He could either suspend the duties or not, but he could not determine what the duties should be.

The court, quoting Judge Ramey, of the Supreme Court of Ohio, says:

"The true distinction is between the delegation of power to make the law, which necessarily involves a discretion as to what it shall be, and conferring authority or discretion as to its execution, to be exercised under and in pursuance of the law. The first cannot be done; to the latter no valid objection can be made" (*Cincinnati, Wilmington, etc. Railroad* v. *Commissioners*, 1 Ohio St. 88). In *Moers* v. *City of Reading* (21 Penn. St. 188, 202) the language of the court was: "Half the statutes on our books are in the alternative, depending on the discretion of some person or persons to whom is confided the duty of determining whether the proper occasion exists for executing them. But it cannot be said that the exercise of such discretion is the making of the law." So, in *Locke's Appeal* (72 Penn. St. 491, 498): "To assert that a law is less than a law, because it is made to depend on a future event or act, is to rob the legislature of the power to act wisely for the public welfare whenever a law is passed relating to a state of affairs not yet developed, or to things future and impossible to fully know." The proper distinction the court said was this: "The legislature cannot delegate its power to make a law; but it can make a law to delegate a power to determine some fact or state of things upon which the law makes, or intends to make, its own action depend. To deny this would be to stop the wheels of government. There are many things upon which wise and useful legislation must depend which cannot be known to the lawmaking power and must, therefore, be a subject of inquiry and determination outside of the halls of legislation.

Chief Justice Fuller and Justice Lamar wrote a strong dissenting opinion to this majority opinion:

But the proposition maintained in the opinion that the third section, known as the reciprocity provision, is valid and constitutional legislation does not command our assent, and we desire to state very briefly the ground of our dissent from it. We think that this particular provision is repugnant to the first section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." That no part of this legislative power can be delegated by Congress to any other department of the Government, executive or judicial, is an axiom in constitutional law, and is universally recognized as a principle essential to the integrity and maintenance of the system of government ordained by the Constitution. The legislative power must remain in the organ where it is lodged by that instrument. We think that the section in question does delegate legislative power to the executive department, and also commits to that department matters belonging to the treaty-making power, in violation of paragraph 2 of the second section of article II of the Constitution.

We do not think that legislation of this character is sustained by any decision of this Court, or by precedents in congressional legislation numerous enough to be properly considered as the practice of the Government.

These enactments, in our opinion, transferred no legislative power to the President. The legislation was purely contingent. It provided for an ascertainment by the President of an event in the future, an event defined in the act and directed to be evidenced by his proclamation. It also prescribed the consequences which were to follow upon that proclamation. Such proclamation was wholly in the nature of an executive act, a prescribed mode of ascertainment, which involved no exercise by the President of what belonged to the lawmaking power. The supreme will of Congress would have been enforced whether the event provided for had or had not happened, either in the continuance of the restrictions, on the one hand, or on the other, in their suspension.

But the purpose and effect of the section now under consideration are radically different. It does not, as was provided in the statutes of 1809 and 1810, entrust the President with the ascertainment of a fact therein defined upon which the law is to go into operation. It goes further than that, and deputes to the President the power to suspend another section in the same act whenever "he may deem" the action of any foreign nation producing and exporting the articles named in that section to be "reciprocally unequal and unreasonable"; and it further deputes to him the power to continue that suspension and to impose revenue duties on the articles named "for such time as he may deem just." This certainly extends to the Executive the exercise of those discretionary powers which the Constitution has vested in the lawmaking department. It unquestionably vests in the President the power to regulate our commerce with all foreign nations which produce sugar, tea, coffee, molasses, hides, or any of such articles; and to impose revenue duties upon them for a length of time limited solely by his discretion, whenever he deems the revenue system or policy of any nation in which those articles are produced reciprocally unequal and unreasonable in its operation upon the products of this country.

These features of this section are, in our opinion, in palpable violation of the Constitution of the United States, and serve to distinguish it from the legislative precedents which are relied upon to sustain it, as the practice of the Government. None of these legislative precedents, save the one above referred to, have, as yet, undergone review by this Court or been sustained by its decision. And if there be any congressional legislation which may be construed as delegating to the President the power to suspend any law exempting any importations from duty, or to reimpose revenue duties on them, upon his own judgment as to what constitutes in the revenue policy of other countries a fair and reasonable reciprocity, such legislative precedents cannot avail as authority against a clear and undoubted principle of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I oppose the extension of this act in its present form for three reasons:

First. It is unconstitutional, and the Supreme Court has never overruled or altered the case of Marshall Field against Clark. It is still the law;

Second. If this act is renewed without limitations it will result in a definite injury to the American farmer; and

Third. The most-favored-nation clause is a vicious provision, which will in time destroy the farm producers of the United States.

We all hope we are approaching a decision in the present war. A peace treaty will follow. I am opposed, as was so ably presented by the Senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] the other

day, to turning over to any individual the full power and authority of this Government, to trade away the rights and privileges and property of American citizens without ratification by the representatives of the people.

The power to make these agreements without the ratification of Congress constitutes the blue chips in the poker game of international power politics.

In the formation of a peace treaty the protection of the civilian population is more important than imposing terms upon the defeated enemy. If our rights as American citizens are given away or traded away by the President for the glamor or the exalted personal glory of world ruler, the American people will have been sadly cheated. Those who deal in world politics become so intoxicated with the glamor and adulation given them that the rights of the people are apt to be forgotten.

Today, we have the amazing spectacle in our supposedly free America of the denial to the press of this country and to the Members of Congress of the privilege and right of attending the International Conference on Food, now being held within 100 miles of this Capitol. Secrecy, manipulation behind the scenes, undisclosed negotiations of which the American people know nothing are the reasons why we demand the right to pass upon this administration's deals made with other nations.

Secretary Hull has demanded that this Trade Agreement Act be renewed without limitations, because he contends that any other action will be notice to the world that the United States will be heading straight back to the policies of economic isolation.

Mr. Hull assured the people on three different occasions that the enactment of his legislation would keep us out of war. His predictions failed so miserably that we are not to be blamed if we are somewhat skeptical today.

The American people are watching this debate today to determine whether or not the Congress has the courage and farsightedness to demand control over this great power. Sooner or later we must serve notice upon the world that foreign commitments made by the President are not binding until and unless they have the approval of the Congress. This is our opportunity to give that notice. Let us notify the world by our action here today that commitments made by this administration are only binding when ratified by Congress.

Mr. President, let us put an end to this one-man government. Let us reassure the American people that Congress is on watch. Let us notify the world that the Congress is the representative of the American people. Let us remember that we were sent here to see that America is preserved for Americans.

In conclusion, what is the picture? Enactment into law of the pending joint resolution will not prevent war. That has been completely demonstrated in our present tragic foreign war.

It will benefit only foreign nations to the positive detriment of American producers.

It will not create a good-neighbor feeling with other nations, as has been proven by the actions of those other nations in negotiating 98 bilateral treaties to our detriment while our own trade agreements were in force.

Our action must be such that it will serve notice on other nations that commitments by the Executive of this country are not binding until ratified by the Congress.

And last of all, but most important of all, the measure is unconstitutional, because it is a plain delegation of legislative power to the President and should be killed.

PERSECUTION OF THE JEWS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, and my colleagues of the Senate, on Sunday, May 23, the people of the United States paid homage to some of our valiant fighting men, the American Jewish heroes. We honored them not because their bravery exceeds that of Americans of other faiths, but because they are an inseparable part of our courageous American forces who are fighting the scourge of totalitarian oppression.

Where else in the world, Mr. President, could such a group be so honored? Not in Nazi Germany and the occupied countries where the pagan philosophy of Adolf Hitler has found evil expression in both Jewish and Christian persecution. Not in the Nazi satellite countries which are doing their best to ape the sadistic Nazi program.

No, Mr. President. Thank God, in these free United States we can hold up our heads and pay honor where honor is due. We can express our gratitude to the men—all the men—who are sharing in the hardships of this war and contributing to the glory of our victory. Freedom of gratitude and freedom to express that gratitude is a part of America's heritage.

Senators will recall the action of Barney Ross, the fighting Jewish Marine who, returning from Guadalcanal, stepped down from the gangplank and kissed the ground. He said:

> This I vowed to do if I ever saw American soil again.

Barney Ross is typical of the thousands of Jews in our armed forces who are fighting for America. So was Sgt. Meyer Levin, who, together with Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., sank the first Japanese battleship in this war and who later gave his life for his country.

We are proud and grateful to have had a team like Kelly and Levin fighting for us.

Indeed, the Kellys and Levins in our history have helped to make America the land that it is. They shed their blood in the Revolutionary War, helped extend our frontiers, built up our trade and commerce, and contributed to our music and literature and art and drama.

Who was it that our country dispatched with secret documents to Benjamin Franklin in Paris during the Revolutionary War? A Jew, Col. David Salisbury Franks. Who was it that repeatedly staved off mutiny in the Colonial Army by turning over his entire fortune to pay the Revolutionary forces? A Polish-born Jew, Haym Salomon.

The Jew has stood by this country in vicissitude and in triumph. When the War of 1812 threatened our sea lanes, a Jewish hero, Commander John Ordroneaux, saved his ship from the British by running to the powder magazine with a lighted match and warning his crew that he would blow up the vessel if they retreated.

Many Jewish volunteers shed their blood in the Civil War. Seven won the highest award for bravery that this country offers—the Congressional Medal. Throughout the South the word "front-hall" became synonymous for valor because of the exploits of a Jewish soldier, Max Frauenthal.

The story is the same for every war in America's history. A Jew, Col. Joseph Heller, was the first volunteer in the Spanish-American War, and a Jew was the first man to fall in the attack at Manila.

The deeds of the Jewish boys in the Seventy-seventh Division and the "lost battalion" of the last war are still fresh in our memories. Gen. John J. Pershing stated that the 250,000 Jews who served in the Army during the last World War had no superiors for bravery in action, devotion to duty, and unhesitating sacrifice.

Mr. President and my colleagues, is it any wonder that this country recognizes its debt of gratitude to its Jewish heroes?

The part that Jewish servicemen are playing in this war is a matter of public record. Let me recall for you a part of that record?

The first boy to lose his life from Newark, N. J., was Private Louis Schleifer; the first from Delaware was Sergeant Harry Fineman; Connecticut's first casualty was Kenneth Harold Messenger; the first body to be returned to the United States for burial from the Pacific battle zone was that of Marine Sergeant Herbert Keilson; the first fatality from Minneapolis was Ensign Ira Weil Jeffrey, who received a posthumous award for valor; the first known fatality among the membership of the American Bar Association was Ensign Robert L. Leopold. The first close personal friend of mine to give his life in this war was Capt. Jacob Joseph of New York City who fell on Guadalcanal.

Lt. Roy Bright piloted the first plane to land on Wake Island just prior to the outbreak of the war, and has since been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Silver Star for gallantry in action. Sgt. Chester Davis was in the first American air raid on Nazi-held Europe. Lt. Col. A. H. Rosenberg led the first American troops into Algiers.

Chaplain Alexander Goode was the first Jewish chaplain to lose his life, when he and three other chaplains aboard a torpedoed ship gave their life preservers to members of the crew.

Wherever the American flag has gone, Jewish soldiers have followed. They are fighting on every battlefield of this war. They were at Pearl Harbor when it was attacked so treacherously by the Japanese. They were fighting in the foxholes of Bataan and Corregidor. A Jew,

David Goodman, was one of the "expendables" who helped bring General MacArthur out of Corregidor. Another Jew, Irving Strobing, stuck to his wireless post, tapping out the last brave words of a hopeless fight, and gave his stirring message to the world.

Jewish servicemen followed the spread of war into the Pacific and on to the far-flung battle fronts of the Aleutian Islands, China, Russia, and the Mediterranean. They are fighting over Europe and in north Africa.

It is not possible now to tell the whole story of Jewish participation in this war. It is still in the making—in the heat and dust of land battle, on the high seas, through the long stretches of the air.

It is no wonder, however, that Rear Admiral John F. Shafroth, commander of the United States naval forces in the southeast Pacific, was recently moved to say to his Jewish fighting men, "Your people, your country, and your Navy are proud of you."

Mr. President, it is no coincidence that a few weeks ago the Christian churches set aside a day of compassion for the Jews in Europe. For every Christian knows that an attack on the Jews is also an attack on Christianity, on religion, and on civilization as a whole.

Both Protestant and Catholic church leaders in this country have raised their voices time and time again in protest against the cruelties inflicted upon Jews in Nazi-occupied Europe.

Let me read you in part the declaration adopted by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America at their last biennial meeting in December. That document stated:

> The reports which are reaching us concerning the incredible cruelties toward the Jews in Nazi-occupied countries, particularly Poland, stir the Christian people of America to the deepest sympathy and indignation.
>
> It is impossible to avoid a conclusion that something like a policy of deliberate extermination of the Jews in Europe is being carried out. The violence and inhumanity which Nazi leaders have publicly avowed toward all Jews are apparently now coming to a climax in virtual massacre. We are resolved to do our full part in establishing conditions in which such treatment of the Jews will end.

Here is another ringing indictment of Hitler's anti-Jewish policy. It was made at the beginning of this year by the Church Peace Union. After expressing its horror and indignation at the cruelties now being visited upon all the people now subject to Nazi tyranny, the Church Peace Union said:

> We join all civilized men in a demand that in the post-war world there be established a political, economic, and social status for Jews and Judaism consistent with the requirements of decency and democracy; that Jews shall be free men; and that the Jewish tradition shall be free to fulfill itself.

To repeat for you the great volume of protest made by the Protestant churches would be impossible. The Methodist bishops have declared that the United States is at war because—and I quote—"there has arisen in the world a pagan philosophy driven by un-Christian motives and bent upon establishing its will upon mankind."

What can be more pagan, Mr. President, than willfully destroying one's fellow men?

Leaders of the Baptist Church have called upon all Christian people to "proclaim the principle of religious liberty" for "all tribes, nations, and races."

Cincinnati's 300 Protestant churches read a pastoral letter not long ago which said:

> The conscience of Christian men cries out in agony and protest when their fellow children of God, the helpless and inoffensive Jews of Poland and Bessarabia, Russian Ukraine, Austria, Belgium, Holland, and France, are tortured and uprooted and put to death by the barbarians of fascism.

Among the many other Protestant bodies which have publicly denounced anti-Semitism are the National Lutheran Council, the Disciples of Christ, the Reformed Church of America, the Northern Baptist Convention, the Quakers, the International Christian Endeavor Society, the Congregational and Christian Churches, and the National Conference of Methodist Youth.

The Roman Catholic Church in this country has likewise made countless utterances against the persecution of Christians and Jews by the Nazis. In doing so it is following the fundamental teachings of the Catholic Church. The late Pope Pius XI stated in 1938:

> Abraham was called our patriarch, our ancestor. Anti-Semitism is not compatible with the sublime reality of this text; it is a movement which we Christians cannot share—no, it is not possible for Christians to take part in anti-Semitism. Spiritually, we are all Semites.

Let me repeat that last sentence of the late Pope. "Spiritually, we are all Semites." To sanction anti-Semitism, my friends, is to destroy our spiritual selves.

The Roman Catholic hierarchy of the United States, in an important pronouncement made last November, stated:

> We feel a deep sense of revulsion against the cruel indignities heaped upon the Jews in conquered countries and upon defenseless peoples not of our faith.
>
> We raise our voices in protest against despotic tyrants who have lost all sense of humanity by condemning thousands of innocent persons to death in subjugated countries as acts of reprisal, by placing other thousands of innocent victims in concentration camps, and by permitting unnumbered persons to die of starvation.

Mr. President, that is the attitude of Christians in the United States. We can have no part in anti-Semitism. We will fight to the end any doctrine, any political movement, any totalitarian leader who espouses this cruel and uncivilized program against human rights.

With your permission, I should like to quote for you excerpts from two additional statements made by Christian groups who also condemn the poison of race hatred.

The Pastors' Association of the National Protestant Church of Geneva defined its spiritual position by declaring:

> In the strength of the conviction of our evangelical faith, we call the members of our churches to resist any attempt to introduce among us the conceptions of a racialistic anti-Semitism which is condemned by the spirit of our Lord and by our whole tradition based upon Holy Scripture.

Mr. President, could anything be clearer than that? The spirit of Christ, the tradition of Christianity, condemn anti-Semitism.

Now let me read in part a manifesto signed by 43 prominent European Catholics who are refugees from Nazi-occupied Europe. Those Catholics, who saw with their own eyes what Hitler was doing to the European Jews, stated:

> By attacking that people from whom Christ came forth, anti-Semitism shows itself as anti-Christian in its very root. Contrary to Christianity is every doctrine which, by error or by hatred, makes naught of men's exercise of their natural rights by reason of their ethnic or religious affiliations.

Then the 43 signers went on to say:

> Every law of "exceptions" or of "discrimination" is unjust. And furthermore we know that Christians must not only take care of themselves and their interests, but of the good of all their brothers and of the fate of justice and of law, and that the hideous racial, religious, and political persecutions which today engulf the world in blood strike at the heart of each one of us insofar as he belongs to Christ.

What the manifesto is saying is that an attack on the Jews is an attack on each one of us. We are together in this fight—Christians and Jews—and we are fighting the same battle.

In Hitler's own country the Christian leaders are lined up against him. The great Archbishop of Munich, Cardinal Faulhaber, not only denounced the treatment of the Jews, but worked with the Chief Rabbi of Bavaria to save valuable objects from the Munich synagogue when the Nazis tore it down in October of 1938. He stored these holy Jewish objects in his own quarters to preserve them from Nazi violence.

When Nazi posters were displayed in Munich, saying "Away with Faulhaber, the friend of the Jews," what was the answer of Cardinal Faulhaber?

He said:

> You can see in this town of Munich the destruction which blind racial hatred has caused. We Christians must love every race, as Christian love and charity are fundamental commandments of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Though his dwelling was attacked by Nazi mobs, the great Cardinal remained firm in his determination to uphold the God-given rights of all persons.

Conrad Count von Preysing, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Berlin, is another German churchman who has dared to tell the Nazis that they commit wrong. In a pastoral letter last December, which I had the privilege of reading before this body not long ago, Bishop von Preysing condemned Nazi theories as being contrary to "the absolute sovereign power of God."

The Bishop of Munster, August Count von Galen, told his congregation in March that the German defeat at Stalingrad was a punishment for the Nazi persecution of peoples in occupied countries and especially of the Jews.

Here is what all the Catholic bishops in Germany told the Nazis in a pastoral letter this spring:

Before the authorities we stand up for religious and clerical rights, but likewise for the human rights bestowed by God on mankind.

Although many of the Protestant Church leaders in Germany have been thrown into concentration camps for their beliefs, the German Evangelical Church also has stood firm. Bishop Wurm, of Wurttemberg, only recently sent an open letter to Minister of Propaganda Joseph Goebbels condemning the anti-Christian philosophy of the Nazis.

Mr. President, what is happening in the brave occupied countries? I will try to give you a brief picture of the courageous action taken in defense of the Jews by Christian leaders in these subjugated lands—action which they have taken at tremendous risk to themselves.

In France, both Protestant and Catholic clergymen not only have spoken against the mass deportation of the Jews but they also have sheltered and fed their persecuted brethren. Many churchmen have been arrested by the Nazis because of their opposition to anti-Semitic decrees.

The National Council of the Reformed Church of France, which represents French Protestants, protested formally in letters to the highest French authorities against the application of measures against the Jews. The Archbishop of Lyons, Pierre Cardinal Gerlier, told the Catholics that it was their duty not to surrender Jewish children whom they were hiding from the Nazis.

Only last February a high-ranking Nazi official summoned Cardinal Gerlier to him and demanded that the French clergy cease their opposition to Nazi anti-Jewish measures. Cardinal Gerlier told the German commandant that the French clergy was responsible not to the Germans but to the commands of the Pope. Then the French cardinal reminded this Nazi official:

Doubtless Your Excellency knows that the Holy Father has condemned the anti-Jewish laws and measures against the Jews.

In Belgium, although church leaders have been arrested and executed for defying the Nazis, Belgian Christians are still being told by their clergy to pray every day for the persecuted and tortured Jewish brethren.

The Catholic and Protestant Churches in Holland have fought against the mistreatment of the Jews by both separate and joint action. The General Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church took its stand against Jewish persecution by saying:

The commandment of the Saviour to love our neighbors applies to them as it does to any other neighbor. When the authorities exceed the limits of their mandate and their demands are contrary to God's commandments, the words of the apostle should be observed: "We must obey God rather than man."

The Roman Catholic hierarchy in Holland issued a pastoral letter condemning the unmerciful and unjust treatment meted out to the Jews by those in power in our country.

So unanimous are both churches in the condemnation of Nazi brute methods that the Protestants and Catholics of Holland sent a joint open letter to the Reich Commissioner of the Netherlands last February protesting the persecution of religious minorities.

The Netherlands Information Bureau in this country has made public an underground letter which all the Christian churches of Holland circulated last summer. Exposing the inhuman measures taken by the Nazis to deport some 120,000 Jewish Netherlanders, the letter added:

This is a cool résumé of the facts which in harshness and businesslike efficiency are only paralleled by the orders of the Egyptian Pharoah who had all Jewish male children killed, and by the action of Herodus, the anti-Semite, who, in order to kill Jesus, murdered all infants in arms of Bethlehem. Now, thousands of years later, Hitler and his henchmen have taken their places in the ranks of those tyrants.

In Denmark, despite the heel of the Nazi oppressor, Danish clergymen have made their protests heard in the official church press. The Church Gazette of Sonderbourg carried an article which said:

Hatred of the Jews is prompted by the demand for a scapegoat. * * * We will not lend our support to the introduction of anti-Jewish laws. Jew hatred is an infectious disease to which the innate sense of justice of the Danish people will not permit them to succumb. It is a disease that we shall cast out from our midst. Shame upon us if we ever allow ourselves to fall victims to it.

The Danish pastors' journal printed an article by Dean Johannes Nordentoft, a well-known church leader, who said:

As the authorities will not act, the Christians must be amongst the first to fight this dirty anti-Semitism. Those who remain silent, or look upon anti-Semitism with only a mild distaste, are accomplices in the campaign of hate.

The Norwegian Church, whose brave leader, Bishop Eivind Berggrav, has entered his second year of imprisonment, and who was not even allowed by the Nazis to see his wife when she was gravely ill, has led the fight in Norway against Jewish persecution.

The Norwegian Church Council, in a protest to the Nazi puppet premier of Norway, Vidkun Quisling, said:

In the name of Jesus Christ we admonish the secular authorities to stop the persecution of Jews and to stop the spread of race hatred which is being disseminated throughout the land.

By keeping silent while this legalized unfairness against the Jews continues, we ourselves become a responsible accessory to its continuance. If we remain true to the Word of God and the confession of our church, we are forced to speak out. It is the God-inspired duty of the church to express disapproval when secular authorities commit wrongs.

Mr. President and my colleagues, every right-thinking country in the world is incensed at the Nazi violation of our Judaio-Christian tradition of tolerance and liberty. We are all together in this fight—not only the United Nations against the Axis but also the united Christians and Jews against Nazi paganism.

For if Adolf Hitler has made the vow that "the present struggle will not end with annihilation of Aryan mankind but with the extermination of the Jews in Europe," he has also said: "One is either a German or a Christian. You cannot be both."

Hitler's henchman, Alfred Rosenberg, made this telling statement:

I am absolutely clear in my own mind, and I think I can speak for the Fuehrer as well, that both the Catholic Church and the Evangelical Confessional Church, as they exist at present, must vanish from the life of our people.

Mr. President, this is a fight to the death between two philosophies. It is one war, and there can be but one outcome. Let us vow that none of our brave American soldiers, Christians and Jews alike, are going to shed their blood in vain. Let us resolve that a free and victorious future will reestablish God's kingdom upon the earth, and that the right to honor all men deserving of honor will be shared by all the nations of the world.

Mr. President, in connection with the celebration of American Jewish Heroes Day, the following letter was addressed to Dr. Stephen S. Wise by Stephen Early, secretary to the President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 17, 1943.

Dr. STEPHEN S. WISE,
Chairman, United Jewish War Effort,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR DR. WISE: This acknowledges your letter of March 14, addressed to the President, requesting a message from him in connection with the observance of American Jewish Heroes Day, particularly in connection with the luncheon to be given on May 23 in honor of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Levin, parents of the late Master Sgt. Meyer Levin, who was Colin Kelly's bombardier and who later lost his life rescuing his comrades in the Pacific war zone.

May I explain to you that this request comes at a time when the President is devoting his time day and night to prolonged conferences with the British Prime Minister and with other high officials. It seems necessary therefore, for the time being, for him to devote all of his energy to his war duties.

In the circumstances, may I ask you to accept this assurance of the President's good wishes. He hopes the observance of American Jewish Heroes Day will inspire all who participate with a renewed appreciation of the sacrifices made by American Jewish heroes and their contributions to the upbuilding of our free institutions.

Very sincerely yours,

STEPHEN EARLY,
Secretary to the President.

The following letter was sent by the Secretary of State to Dr. Wise:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, May 22, 1943.

Rabbi STEPHEN S. WISE,
Chairman, United Jewish War Effort,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR RABBI WISE: I have received your letter of May 14 informing me of the ceremony in observance of American Jewish Heroes Day being arranged for May 23. I should appreciate it if you would extend my cordial greetings to those participating in this tribute to the valor and sacrifice of American Jewish heroes who have lost their lives in defense of our country. There is no more inspiring feature of our national war effort than the wholehearted devotion with which all Americans, irrespective of race or religion, are performing their duty of citizenship in this

grave national crisis. American Jewry has every reason to be proud of the patriotism of Jewish youth in this struggle for the preservation of freedom.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

From the Hon. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, came the following telegram addressed to Dr. Stephen Wise:

MAY 19, 1943.

DR. STEPHEN S. WISE,
Chairman, United Jewish War Effort, New York:

I welcome this opportunity to send my greetings to you on the occasion of American Jewish Heroes Day. Ever since the founding of the Republic American Jews have served heroically in its armed forces. Throughout the years they have proved their unselfish devotion to the Nation and to the ideals which it strives to represent. Once again American Jews are fighting and dying to protect and preserve our precious freedom. The Navy is proud to salute its officers and men of Jewish faith whose courage and patriotism have contributed so much to the struggle against the common enemy of mankind.

FRANK KNOX.

From General MacArthur, on the occasion of the American Jewish National Heroes Day, comes the following message:

Every page of American history belies the enemy claim that one race is superior to another. That doctrine is as wrong morally as it is false scientifically. In peace and in war our country's noblest tradition as well as the best security for our future is the doctrine that each citizen shall be weighed on his merits and not by his inheritance. The searing fires of this war have again and again put to the test the fighting qualities of our men and women. As Colin Kelly and his bombardier, Meyer Levin, so well exemplified, we have met the challenge, whether Catholic or Protestant, Jew or gentile. On May 23, specially set aside in their honor, I am proud to join with you in saluting the memory of fallen American heroes of the Jewish faith.

Admiral Halsey sent an airmailgram containing the following statement:

The Jewish heritage, has been one of suffering and sorrow. Jews have always fought against oppression, seeking freedom for themselves and for all peoples. We are proud to have the Jews in our ranks. Their deeds furnish unshakable proof of their courage and loyalty to our common cause—the worldwide preservation of freedom.

INCREASED ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF MILITARY FORCES

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, all evidence now at the disposal of the Congress points to the early induction of men with families into the armed services of the United States. The induction of men with family responsibilities represents a grave and serious undertaking—an undertaking which poses problems of considerable magnitude for the Government of the United States and for the many millions of American citizens who will be directly and indirectly affected by such a policy.

As for me, personally, Mr. President, I have long hoped—as I still hope—that the needs of our armed forces may be fully and properly met without the induction of the American family man. For, indeed, we all know that the American family is the most fundamental and necessary of all the American institutions. I sincerely question the validity of any policy which seeks to invade the sanctity of the home, to break up the family, to induct the head of that family into the armed forces, and to force the remainder of that family to work out its own destiny in a war-torn world. Mr. President, I sincerely question both the merit and need of such a drastic policy at this time. I sincerely trust that ways and means will be found to meet all essential military requirements without resorting to any such all-emcompassing and dangerous policy as that to which this Government is apparently now committed.

But in the event that such a policy is carried out—and there is every reason to believe that it will be—it is the responsibility of this Government to see to it that the terrific burdens which will fall upon the wives and families of the men who are inducted are eased and cushioned in every way possible. No man should be taken into the armed forces without full and complete assurance that all those dependent upon him for support will be fully and amply provided for during his absence. No family, because of the military induction of its main means of support, should be permitted to disintegrate, to fall into a reduced standard of living, or to become a charitable charge in any way whatever. We owe it to ourselves, we owe it to the men in service, and we owe it to America, to see to it that none of these conditions ever comes to pass in our country.

Mr. President, there is not one among us who is not aware of the fact that the costs of living have been tremendously increased throughout this country during recent years. There is not one among us who is not aware that the proper development and nurturing of the average American family require the expenditure of many more dollars than were formerly required. There is not one among us who cannot comprehend the tremendous problems—both economic and social—which will come to the wives and families of the men who, according to all available data, are soon to be inducted into the armed forces. In view of these conditions, and in view of the further fact that there is no reason to believe that these conditions will be appreciably improved, I submit this Government should take immediate action to see to it that the Servicemen's Dependent Allowance Act of 1942 is amended, and that such allotments are increased to a point which will insure the full and proper maintenance of all individuals and families who are completely or partially dependent upon any man who is called upon to serve in the armed forces.

Mr. President, the distinguished and able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has already foreseen the necessity for taking immediate action in this regard. And he has, therefore, introduced a bill (S. 1131) designed to increase the Government's portion of these allotments by 15 percent. Mr. President, the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is to be commended for the action thus taken. Indeed, Mr. President, in my sincere opinion an increase should be immediately forthcoming, if the wives and families of the men in service are to be assured a freedom from want and a freedom from fear of want. Surely this Government, which is exerting its every power to prevent and curtail suffering throughout the world, should deem it an inescapable duty to make certain that those dependents of our men in service are amply and fully provided for. Surely, Mr. President, the American way of life, the American family and the American home are worthy of our most determined consideration and our most complete protection.

I am asking no gift, I am asking no charity when I call upon the Government to increase these allotments. The services which have been and which shall be rendered on our behalf by brave Americans now under arms lie far beyond any power of compensation we may possess. Indeed the very blows they are striking, the punishment they are taking are keeping this country and its people secure. The very least that we can do is to make a full and proper provision for the dependents of these men who do and will fight the battles of liberty for us.

Mr. President, as an indication of the serious light in which this matter is held, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, a telegram which I recently received from Mr. William M. Leader, a member of Selective Service Appeal Board I–A in the State of Pennsylvania, in which he calls attention to the serious problems which will follow upon the induction of heads of families into the armed service, and properly urges that servicemen's dependency allotments be fully and properly increased.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *May 21, 1943.*

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

With the day fast approaching when millions of fathers will be inducted into the armed forces of our country which will mean, under the present Government allotments to dependents, a drastic lowering of the American standard of living, let us not wait as we did before for a whole year before the Congress acted to give the American soldiers an American wage, but let us recognize at once the hardships that the women and children of this country face with present dependent allotments which, for a woman with three children, amounts to $82 per month.

As a member of Appeal Board I–A of Pennsylvania, under the Selective Service Act, and having acted on approximately 10,000 cases of appeals in the past 3 years, I am surely aware of what this problem will bring and its effect on the morale of the fighting father, who will be a much better soldier if his loved ones at home are adequately cared for. We owe it to our country and we owe it to our men in the armed forces to pay back, in a small way, the security which is possible for us because of our men and women in uniform, to grant these men sufficient income for their families and to assume other responsibilities that most of them have and will be so poorly prepared to abandon when they

will so shortly be called upon to enter our Government's fighting forces, I urge you to introduce, or support, necessary legislation in Congress which will raise the Government allotments for dependent children from $10 and $12 per month to $25 for each child, and for dependent wives and mothers from $15 and $28 per month to $35.- Under this system, a father, with three children, inducted into the armed forces would be entitled to $132 per month for his family against the present $82 which they now receive. A high American standard of living is, after all, our most powerful defense against any enemy. So let's not wait until the actual suffering in this situation begins on a big scale before we act. May I have an early answer as to what reaction this thought brings and if you are sympathetic to this problem, what action you propose?

WILLIAM M. LEADER,
Member, Pennsylvania Appeal Board I-A, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I repeat the hope that the necessary military needs of our Government will be met without the induction of family men, but I submit that mere hope will not forestall what now appears to be an inevitable development. I therefore urge the Congress immediately to take whatever action may be necessary to increase these dependency allotments to a point commensurate with the American standard of living and the American standards of health, safety and human welfare. Let us act now. Let us not wait until want, suffering, and chaos are upon us before we move into action to protect the mothers, wives, and children of those gallant American men who may be called upon at any hour to risk life and limb in the immediate defense of their country.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I supported the Trade Agreements Act in 1934 when it was originally enacted and on the past two occasions in 1937 and 1940, when the act was renewed for 3-year periods. I intend again to support its renewal.

I wish to discuss the broad policy considerations involved in this issue. Our responsibility as a legislative body is to lay down sound and wise policies; and if we are to fulfill that responsibility today as befits the Senate of the United States we must not permit our deliberations and our decisions to be diverted.

There are many important policy aspects of the trade-agreements program. Some of us will be concerned with the relationship of this issue to the question of laying the foundations for a just and durable peace. Others will dwell on the relationship of the trade-agreements program to the great issue of regulating our foreign commerce in such a manner that this Nation's domestic prosperity will be safeguarded and promoted. Both of these broad aspects are germane to our deliberations. I could support continuation of the trade-agreements policy because of either of these considerations. However, in my present remarks I desire to invite the Senate's attention to another aspect of the question which particularly commends the trade-agreements policy and program to the favorable consideration of all men who are genuinely anxious that this Government and this country should champion post-war policies which are directed toward the promotion of our common welfare through the workings of free and private enterprise.

There is no need to recite the fundamental economic policies and objectives which ought to be pursued if the next generation is to have an even chance of working out its problems through the processes of private enterprise. During the post-war period we and the other nations will be engaged in demobilization of our manpower concentrations in the armed forces and in the production of war goods and weapons. During this period we shall also be engaged in a gradual demobilization of the multiple of governmental controls which today touch every phase of our lives. We must never forget that the problems of "total demobilization" are bound to be quite as great as—in fact probably much greater than—were the problems of "total mobilization."

To my mind one of the great dangers is that we and other nations will seek to solve these "total demobilization" problems by more and more governmental regulations. I fully recognize that there must be a transition period during which many of the existing regulations will be gradually relaxed and adjusted to peacetime conditions. How and how fast these regulations are relaxed and eliminated is not, however, the issue before us today. Today the question is whether we are to continue a program which has worked in the past and can only work in the future in one direction, namely, in the direction of freeing private enterprise from the heavy and arbitrary hand of governmental control and direction.

The trade-agreements program, by its very nature, is a program of private enterprise. Its main purpose is to give our private producers and traders an opportunity to deal with other producers and traders on terms to be determined by the private parties in their own self-interest. That is the essence of private enterprise; and any governmental program which works in that direction cannot do other than serve the best interests of this Nation as a whole.

The trade-agreements program is designed to remove excessive and discriminatory governmental trade barriers which put private enterprise at the mercy of political forces, both at home and abroad.

This program is the very opposite of governmental bureaucracy. Not only are its purpose and accomplishments in the interest of freer private enterprise, but its actual administration is carried out in an economical manner, without the creation of some huge new bureau which grows as it goes. The trade-agreements program is administered through efficient utilization of the personnel and resources of established governmental departments and agencies such as the Tariff Commission and the Departments of State, Commerce, and Agriculture. The record of the past 9 years, during which the program has been in operation, is of itself the best possible proof that the program has been and will continue to be administered in the best interests of the Nation as a whole.

When the war is over the productive capacity of our country will be greater and stronger than ever before in our history. Broadly speaking, we shall have two choices before us. Either we can seek to expand our markets or we can seek to curtail our production. The first is the way of private enterprise, and the second is the way of governmental regimentation. The first is the way of the trade-agreements program, and the second is the way of governmental restrictions, or even of direct governmental operation.

Mr. President, the details of the future may be uncertain but the broad courses are not. The action which we take on this measure will in large measure determine whether our Government is to regulate its foreign commerce on a basis which fosters the expansion of private enterprise and trade, or whether it is to turn international commerce over to governmental direction and operation. Let no one make the fatal assumption that we can do the latter and escape the same consequences for our domestic commerce. Our economic life is an inseparable whole and we cannot apply one philosophy to part of it and another to the remainder.

Accepting these fundamentals as I do, I am strongly opposed to the amendment which has been proposed by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] to provide that all trade agreements shall be terminable by joint resolution of the Congress 6 months after the war.

The adoption of the Danaher amendment is equivalent to giving notice to the world that the trade-agreement program may cease 6 months after the war.

Our major objective for the post-war world is the establishment of conditions which will permit our Nation and like-minded nations to build a stable prosperity and a durable peace. Whatever may be the precise nature of the eventual measures which we adopt for the realization of these ends, we know, or ought to know, that neither of these ends can be secured by resorting to nationalistic excesses in any field, least of all in international economic relations. As a Nation possessing the greatest productive capacity and dedicated to progress through private enterprise, our foremost interest is to keep the governments of the world from imposing excessive nationalistic restrictions on the mutually profitable exchange of goods. In short, our vital self-interest demands that our Government should now, and in the future, do everything in its power to assure that post-war commercial relations will not be shackled with excessive and discriminatory trade barriers.

Manifestly, these objectives can only be accomplished through some mechanism which permits our Government to reach and to maintain agreement on these matters between ourselves and the other nations. We simply cannot do this alone, and we cannot do it by sitting back in

fancied exclusiveness and telling the rest of the world that we will make up our mind on this question 6 months or so after the end of the war.

We cannot do it alone. International trade is a two-way operation and likewise so is the regulation of this trade. We can raise or lower our tariffs by unilateral action without getting anywhere in the effective regulation of foreign commerce under modern conditions. That is why the Congress adopted the Trade Agreements Act originally in 1934, and that is why we must keep this mechanism of international economic cooperation in effective operation for the future.

The trade-agreements program is a method, and the only practical one, whereby this Government can secure the cooperation of other governments in creating and maintaining healthy and stable international commercial relations. Let me make very clear that it is my considered judgment that unless we and other like-minded nations shall be able to maintain stable international commercial relations in the post-war period there can be no prospect of achieving any stabilization in currency exchanges.

Mr. President, if we now abandon or hamstring the trade-agreements program, our action will have world-wide consequences simply because we would thereby be knocking the props out from under the entire cooperative structure which has been built up around the trade-agreements program. Anyone is living in a fool's paradise who imagines for one moment that we can scuttle a cooperative program of this nature and not pay dearly for it. I shall not dwell on the adverse effects which such action would have on the present war unity of our allies and friends, particularly in this hemisphere. What I do wish to dwell upon until every open-minded person sees it is the fact that any sign of a lack of confidence on our part in the trade-agreements program is tantamount to hoisting a warning for the future. That, I assure the Senate, is precisely what the adoption of this amendment would mean to the world.

What will be the consequences? Other nations which are now—and after the war certainly will be—in a weaker economic position than the United States cannot afford to take a chance that 6 months or a year after the war we will pull down the warning and say we were only fooling. If this signal is now run up on the mast and left flying until 6 months after the war, any prudent government, any prudent businessman, either at home or abroad, must make plans on the assumption that the hurricane will strike. The tragedy of it is that as soon as other governments begin making such plans the coming of the hurricane is absolutely assured and we shall be powerless to prevent it or do very much about it. Once this type of storm warning is posted and taken seriously by the world—and, I might ask, who in this Chamber who supports or opposes this amendment wants to tell anyone not to take the warning seriously?—once that warning is posted, forces will be set in motion which of themselves will bring on the storm.

Mr. President, if this most powerful trading Nation is preparing to go back to a policy of restricting rather than promoting a full and mutually profitable exchange of goods, other nations must and will make their plans accordingly. They cannot afford to wait and see. Their only alternative will be to barricade themselves up behind every form of trade barrier and discrimination against us.

Once these agreements begin to fall, whether on our initiative or on the initiative of the other parties because of lack of confidence in our intentions, the whole cooperative structure could collapse like a house of cards. If and when such forces are put in motion, we and the other nations will not be starting from scratch in building up barriers to trade. With the fall of these agreements, the highly destructive trade restrictions and discriminations of the early thirties, including our Smoot-Hawley tariff rates, will automatically spring into full force and effect. Then these barriers will only mark the beginning rather than, as before, the culmination of our follies.

The argument has been advanced that because of future uncertainties we should adopt this amendment to make the trade agreements terminable by joint resolution of the Congress 6 months after the termination of the war. For my part, I cannot imagine anything which is more likely to contribute to the most chaotic uncertainties with respect to international economic relations than formal notification to the world by the Congress of the United States that we have not made up our minds about so simple and fundamental a matter as the policy embodied in the trade-agreements program. I will go further and state, in the words of the House Ways and Means Committee report on this measure, that—

> Unless we and other like-minded nations take a position now on certain agreed policies and establish procedures for making these policies effective the uncertainties which we fear will soon become the certainties of past, sad experience.

Mr. President, this measure and particularly the Danaher amendment, present to this body our first opportunity to demonstrate whether we are capable of playing a positive rather than a negative, a constructive rather than a destructive role, in the shaping and reconstruction of a worth-while post-war world. I have every confidence that a majority of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will meet this issue as it ought to be met, with resolution and decisiveness, and thereby give the trade-agreements program the clean-cut renewal which its record and promise fully merit.

I, for one, do not want to return to the horse-trading, Hawley-Smoot days. I know from my own personal experience as an exporter that passage of the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill did more to destroy the foreign trade of this country than any other action ever taken by our Government. Immediately retaliations occurred, and, for the first time, Great Britain imposed a tariff on the importation of foods. It would be a tragedy to change back from the reciprocal trade-agreement method to the logrolling tariff methods of previous day.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat will he yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is a fact, is it not, I will ask the Senator from Virginia, that if under the terms of the Danaher amendment the result should be the abrogation of any of the trade agreements heretofore made or which may hereafter be made, automatically all the terms of the Smoot-Hawley Act would be restored, and it would be necessary to resort to the old logrolling processes in order to change any provision of it whatever?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Missouri is entirely correct, and I stated that during the course of my remarks.

FORREST W. DICKEY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 235) for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

FLORENCE B. HUTCHINSON

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF LEONARD L. GAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1784) for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMPARISON OF INCOME TAXES IN PUERTO RICO AND UNITED STATES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the other day—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield for that purpose?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Gurney	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hatch	Robertson
Bone	Hawkes	Russell
Brewster	Hayden	Scrugham
Bridges	Hill	Shipstead
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lucas	Tobey
Capper	McClellan	Truman
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chandler	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	White
Davis	Moore	Wiley
Downey	Murray	Willis
Eastland	Nye	Wilson
Ellender	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a few days ago a subcommittee of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs returned from Puerto Rico and outlined the difficult living conditions existing in that island. Thereupon a bill was introduced for the relief of Puerto Rico. As I recall, the bill carried an appropriation of $25,000,000. I was interested in knowing what taxes the Puerto Ricans were paying in comparison to those paid by Americans on the same income; and so I have had a chart prepared showing the difference between income taxes in Puerto Rico and income taxes in the United States. I shall take, for example, a $10,000 income. Let us assume that a man in Puerto Rico makes a $10,000-a-year income; he pays a tax of $1,200 on his $10,000-a-year income; but a man living in the United States, and having an income of $10,000, pays a tax of $2,152 on his $10,000 income, or almost twice the amount paid by the Puertc Rican.

Mr. WILEY. I inquire if the tax in Puerto Rico is a Federal tax?

Mr. TYDINGS. Puerto Rico has its own income-tax law and we have our income-tax law. All receipts from income taxes in Puerto Rico are retained by the insular government.

The query naturally presents itself: Why should the American Congress appropriate money for the relief of Puerto Rico when Puerto Rico has an income-tax law which imposes on the same income a tax far less than that which our own citizens have to pay? As a matter of common sense, it seems to me that before we are called upon to appropriate money for the relief of Puerto Rico, the Puerto Rican Legislature ought to tax the people of Puerto Rico as much as we tax our people.

Not only does that general disparity follow all the way through, but the normal tax in Puerto Rico is 5 percent, whereas the normal tax in the United States is 6 percent; and the surtaxes in Puerto Rico are away below the surtaxes imposed in the United States.

The exemptions in Puerto Rico provide $2,000, for a married man whereas in the United States the exemption of a married man is only $1,200. All the way through the disparity is very glaring.

I am sure that none of us realized the other day when, in a spirit of generosity and good will we were appropriating money for the relief of Puerto Rico that there was such a wide gap in the taxes levied on incomes in Puerto Rico as compared with those levied in the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The situation in Puerto Rico is this: If Puerto Rico should levy on wealthy persons the same income taxes levied in the United States such persons would move their residence to the United States. For wealthy people our country is a more desirable place in which to live. So there is no question that Puerto Rico would lose a large amount of revenue. The Government of the United States, of course, might gain it; but it is perfectly easy, I think, to understand the reason why the Puerto Ricans always kept their higher income-tax rates just below those of the United States. As a matter of fact, as we have increased our rates, they have increased their rates, but always maintaining a differential.

It may be that the figures the Senator has show that Puerto Rico did not increase the income-tax rates in the last law enacted by the Puerto Rican Legislature, but I know that the legislature is very anxious to get from the rich all the money it can. The legislature is controlled by the Populares Party, which believes in high taxes on the rich. I feel sure there is involved the practical consideration which I suggest, that if the present advantage were taken away the wealthy would move to Florida, where there are many advantages. I do not believe anyone goes to Puerto Rico for the purpose of being able to pay lower taxes because to live 6 months in Puerto Rico is pretty much of a burden; but I rather think the Senator will find that Puerto Rico has increased its tax rate since the figures he has had compiled but a differential has always been maintained, and I understand why that is.

Of course, so far as revenue is concerned Puerto Rico is allowed to keep its income taxes, anyway, and I think we have to leave to their judgment the question whether by the rates imposed they obtain more money than they would by imposing rates absolutely equal to those imposed by the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that the law from which I am reading is the 1942 Puerto Rican statute, and the Legislature of Puerto Rico of 1942 just adjourned a few days ago; so it is the latest law.

To illustrate further the wide difference, a married man in America making $1,500 pays $48 in taxes, whereas in Puerto Rico a man making $1,500 pays nothing. A married man in Puerto Rico making $2,000 pays nothing, while in the United States he pays $140.

A married man in Puerto Rico making $3,000 pays $100. In the United States he pays $324.

A married man in Puerto Rico making $4,000 pays $200. In the United States, on the continent, he pays $532.

In Puerto Rico a married man making $5,000 pays $330 a year in taxes. On the continent he pays $746.

A married man in Puerto Rico making $6,000 a year pays $460. On the continent he pays $992.

A married man in Puerto Rico making $7,000 pays $630. On the continent he pays $1,246.

A married man in Puerto Rico making $8,000 pays $800. On the continent he pays $1,532.

A married man in Puerto Rico making $9,000 pays $1,000. On the continent he pays $1,826.

A married man in Puerto Rico making $10,000 pays $1,200. In the United States proper he pays $2,152.

Merely considering incomes from $1,500 to $10,000, it is shown, I think, that it is not the desire of the Puerto Ricans to tax the wealthy particularly. They do not even have comparable income taxes on those of low incomes, who are not thinking of leaving Puerto Rico and coming to live in the United States for income-tax purposes.

Even when we come to the higher brackets, we find quite a difference. Let us take a married man in Puerto Rico with an income of $200,000. He pays $127,420, but on the continent such a man would pay $150,012.

A married man in Puerto Rico making $500,000 would pay in taxes $358,380, but in the United States proper he would pay $414,000.

A man in Puerto Rico making a million dollars a year would pay $743,380 into the insular treasury, whereas here he would pay a little over $100,000 more, or $854,000.

These few illustrations show that the disparity between Puerto Rican taxes and United States taxes is larger in the lower brackets than in the higher brackets. They likewise show that there is an enormous field in which Puerto Rico can increase her taxes on those in

the lower brackets if she desires, and collect an enormous amount of money for insular purposes, without having the American Congress appropriate for the relief of Puerto Ricans.

I do not think it is sound, as a general principle, for the United States Congress to pass bills for the relief of Puerto Rico when the people of Puerto Rico, on the same income, enjoy a very, very much lower rate of taxation than is imposed upon our own citizens. I am not saying this to minimize the serious economic effect on Puerto Rico of the war. Relief is proper, but relief should be considered as a burden on our own people, as well as a benefit to Puerto Ricans.

I am hoping that these remarks, which are not made in rancor, which are not made in bitterness, which are not made to asperse Puerto Rico or its people or its legislature, but are made to present the sheer facts of the case, will induce the people of Puerto Rico and the legislature of Puerto Rico at least to close a substantial part of the gap before we are asked in the future to appropriate millions of dollars, which can only be raised by imposing burdens on the American people to a great extent heavier than those borne by our compatriots on the very beautiful island in the Caribbean.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. My recollection is that the income tax of Puerto Rico produces between four and five million dollars. I am very definitely of the impression that if the Puerto Rican tax rates were raised so as to be equal to those of the American law, there would be raised no more than four or five million dollars. Even if no one left Puerto Rico, if everyone remained in Puerto Rico and retained his residence there, I doubt if it would possibly increase the return by $2,000,000. So when we come to talk of the relief necessities of $15,000,000, which is the estimate of the W. P. A. for next year, I doubt very much whether, regardless of the Senator's principles, the alleviation of the need for relief would be very great.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think there is something in what the Senator says, namely, that they could raise the rates so high that the law of diminishing returns might apply, but basically I differ with the distinguished Senator from Ohio in the opinion that there is not room for a very substantial increase in the tax rates of Puerto Rico without diminishing its gross revenue. In my humble judgment, it would be very materially increased.

It is true that the income taxes in Puerto Rico, as compared with those in our own country, are small, but a million dollars or $2,000,000 raised in Puerto Rica is a million or $2,000,000 less to be paid by the people of our own country for the people of Puerto Rico; and as a good, sound American doctrine, I believe that every tub should stand pretty much on its own bottom, and that it is not sound governmental principle for a part of our country which levies a lower burden on its citizens in the form of taxation than that levied on our own citizens in taxation to come and ask for relief, and then ask our citizens to give of their largess to the people of Puerto Rico.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD immediately following, and as a part of my remarks, first, a table showing the rates of income taxation in Puerto Rico and in the United States, as exhibited in the table which I hold in my hand, not only the normal tax rates, which are 5 percent in Puerto Rico as against 6 percent in this country, but the surtax rates, which are materially less in Puerto Rico than in this country. Immediately following that information is a table showing the rates and amounts of income tax on specific incomes.

All this information clearly indicates that, in the future, we should go a little more slowly than we have gone in making relief appropriations to Puerto Rico, until the island demonstrates that it is carrying a comparable load, all things considered, to that which our own people are shouldering during this burdensome and expensive war.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Income taxes in Puerto Rico and United States

	Puerto Rico	United States
Personal exemptions:		
Single persons	$800	$500
Married persons	2,000	1,200
Dependents	400	350

Taxable income after deducting personal exemptions	Normal tax on entire taxable income	Surtax rate graduated with increase in size of taxable income	Normal tax on entire taxable income [1]	Surtax rate graduated with increase in size of surtax net income [1]
	Percent		*Percent*	
Not over $2,000	5	Plus 5 percent	6	Plus 13 percent.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	5	Plus $100 plus 8 percent of income over $2,000	6	Plus $260 plus 16 percent of income over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	5	Plus $260 plus 12 percent of income over $4,000	6	Plus $580 plus 20 percent of income over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	5	Plus $500 plus 15 percent of income over $6,000	6	Plus $980 plus 24 percent of income over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	5	Plus $800 plus 19 percent of income over $8,000	6	Plus $1,460 plus 28 percent of income over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	5	Plus $1,180 plus 23 percent of income over $10,000	6	Plus $2,020 plus 32 percent of income over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	5	Plus $1,640 plus 26 percent of income over $12,000	6	Plus $2,660 plus 36 percent of income over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	5	Plus $2,160 plus 29 percent of income over $14,000	6	Plus $3,380 plus 40 percent of income over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	5	Plus $2,740 plus 32 percent of income over $16,000	6	Plus $4,180 plus 43 percent of income over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	5	Plus $3,380 plus 34 percent of income over $18,000	6	Plus $5,040 plus 46 percent of income over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	5	Plus $4,060 plus 37 percent of income over $20,000	6	Plus $5,960 plus 49 percent of income over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000	5	Plus $4,800 plus 40 percent of income over $22,000	6	Plus $6,940 plus 52 percent of income over $22,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000	5	Plus $6,400 plus 44 percent of income over $26,000	6	Plus $9,020 plus 55 percent of income over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but nor over $38,000	5	Plus $9,040 plus 48 percent of income over $32,000	6	Plus $12,320 plus 58 percent of income over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000	5	Plus $11,920 plus 54 percent of income over $38,000	6	Plus $15,800 plus 61 percent of income over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	5	Plus $15,160 plus 56 percent of income over $44,000	6	Plus $19,460 plus 63 percent of income over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000	5	Plus $18,520 [2] plus 58 percent of income over $50,000	6	Plus $23,240 plus 66 percent of income over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000	5	Plus $24,320 [2] plus 60 percent of income over $60,000	6	Plus $29,840 plus 69 percent of income over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000	5	Plus $30,320 [2] plus 63 percent of income over $70,000	6	Plus $36,740 plus 72 percent of income over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000	5	Plus $36,620 [2] plus 66 percent of income over $80,000	6	Plus $43,940 plus 75 percent of income over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000	5	Plus $43,220 [2] plus 67 percent of income over $90,000	6	Plus $51,440 plus 77 percent of income over $90,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000	5	Plus $49,920 [2] plus 68 percent of income over $100,000	6	Plus $59,140 plus 79 percent of income over $100,000.
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000	5	Plus $83,920 [2] plus 70 percent of income over $150,000	6	Plus $98,640 plus 81 percent of income over $150,000.
Over $200,000	5	Plus $118,920 [2] plus 72 percent of income over $200,000	6	Plus $139,140 plus 82 percent of income over $200,000.

[1] In the United States income for normal taxes differs from income for surtax purposes in that an earned income credit and certain Government bond interest are deducted in computing income for normal tax purposes. An earned income credit formerly allowed in Puerto Rico was repealed in 1941.

[2] The latest available law (act of Dec. 3, 1942, No. 20) reports these figures as $20,760, $26,560, $32,560, $38,860, $45,460, $78,960, $112,960, and $147,960. The figures reported in the law are obviously erroneous in that they contain mathematical miscalculations. The figures reported in the table are believed to be correct, and are the ones contained in a bill "P. de la C. 31" introduced on Feb. 16, 1943, to correct "dos errores de calculo aritmético." The legislature in Puerto Rico has adjourned, but we have been unable to determine the fate of the bill.

Rates and amounts of income tax on married persons in Puerto Rico and in the United States

Net income (before deducting personal exemption)	Puerto Rico			United States			Net income (before deducting personal exemption)	Puerto Rico			United States		
	Rate		Total tax	Rate		Total tax [1]		Rate		Total tax	Rate		Total tax [1]
	Normal	Surtax		Normal	Surtax			Normal	Surtax		Normal	Surtax	
	Percent	*Percent*		*Percent*	*Percent*			*Percent*	*Percent*		*Percent*	*Percent*	
$1,000							$25,000	5	40	$6,350	6	52	$9,220
$1,500				6	13	$48	30,000	5	44	8,680	6	55	12,204
$2,000				6	13	140	35,000	5	48	11,170	6	58	15,308
$3,000	5	5	$100	6	13	324	40,000	5	48	13,820	6	61	18,532
$4,000	5	5	200	6	16	532	45,000	5	54	16,770	6	61	21,882
$5,000	5	8	330	6	16	746	50,000	5	56	19,800	6	63	25,328
$6,000	5	8	460	6	20	992	60,000	5	58	26,060	6	66	32,492
$7,000	5	12	630	6	20	1,246	70,000	5	60	32,520	6	69	39,956
$8,000	5	12	800	6	24	1,532	80,000	5	63	39,260	6	72	47,720
$9,000	5	15	1,000	6	24	1,826	90,000	5	66	46,300	6	75	55,784
$10,000	5	15	1,200	6	28	2,152	100,000	5	67	53,480	6	77	64,060
$11,000	5	19	1,440	6	28	2,486	150,000	5	68	89,960	6	79	106,536
$12,000	5	19	1,680	6	32	2,852	200,000	5	70	127,420	6	81	150,012
$13,000	5	23	1,960	6	32	3,226	250,000	5	72	165,880	6	82	194,000
$14,000	5	23	2,240	6	36	3,632	300,000	5	72	204,380	6	82	238,000
$15,000	5	26	2,550	6	36	4,052	400,000	5	72	281,380	6	82	326,000
$16,000	5	26	2,860	6	40	4,504	500,000	5	72	358,380	6	82	414,000
$17,000	5	29	3,200	6	40	4,964	750,000	5	72	550,880	6	82	634,000
$18,000	5	29	3,540	6	43	5,448	1,000,000	5	72	743,380	6	82	854,000
$19,000	5	32	3,910	6	43	5,938	2,000,000	5	72	1,513,380	6	82	1,734,000
$20,000	5	32	4,280	6	46	6,452	5,000,000	5	72	3,823,380	6	82	4,374,000

VICTORY TAX IN PUERTO RICO AND IN THE UNITED STATES

Puerto Rico: Tax of 5 percent on Victory tax net income in excess of $15.05 a week.
United States: Tax of 5 percent on Victory tax net income in excess of $12 a week.

[1] Computations are based on the maximum earned income of $14,000; incomes of $14,000 or less are treated as all earned.

Sources: The tables of rates in Puerto Rico and the United States are taken from the statutes as follows: Puerto Rico Laws, second and third special sessions, 1942, Act No. 20, 29; United States, Revenue Act of 1942. The amount of tax on married persons was computed by the compiler in the case of Puerto Rico, and taken from the Prentice-Hall Federal Tax Service, 1943, p. 3014.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have a consistent record in opposition to the reciprocal-trade treaties, miscalled "trade agreements."

I voted against the act passed in 1934, when it was proposed as a means of ending the domestic depression by expanding our foreign trade.

I voted against the extension of the act in 1937, when its extension was asked on the ground that it would promote world peace.

I voted against the extension of the act in 1940, when it was recommended on the plea that it would keep us out of war.

I intend to vote against extension of the act again, despite the fact that the administration tells us it is necessary for us to extend the act in order to prove our good faith toward our allies in this global war.

In regard to the 1943 explanation of why we must continue the exclusive power of the Executive to negotiate and effect Executive agreements instead of treaties with foreign nations, I should like to ask an answer to this question:

"What more do we have to do to convince our allies of our good faith in conducting this war?"

There are American men in uniform in action on some 70 military fronts all over the world.

We are raising, equipping, training some 11,000,000 men for service with the United Nations. Millions of them are already abroad.

We are sending food and supplies to help support the people of Britain, north Africa, and other peoples. In order to furnish food for the Russians, by next winter our own people are likely to be as severely rationed as are the people of Germany and of Britain.

We have passed a Lend-Lease Act, and backed it by appropriating billions upon billions of dollars, to donate all kinds of supplies to our allies.

The money expenditures—and remember this means contributions of goods and services, not merely financing—for war purposes this year exceed the expenditures of all the nations engaged on both sides in this war.

Expenditures for the United Nations' cause by the United States Government this year will exceed $100,000,000,000. The national debt is climbing steadily; before the war is won it will pass the $250,000,000,000 mark and may go over $300,000,000,000.

I ask Senators, in the name of common sense, what more do we have to do to convince our allies that we are in this war to the limit?

I say that that particular claim advanced as to why we must enact this extension act, unamended, without Congress holding any powers over agreements made with foreign nations, is so illogical as to be fantastic.

Unless we are required to surrender our national sovereignty, I do not see how much further we have to go to convince our allies of our good faith.

As I have indicated, the case for the trade-agreements extension is not being argued at this time on the merits or demerits of the reciprocal trade agreements policy, nor upon the results to date of that policy as administered by the executive branch of the Government.

I have read innumerable tables and summaries of statistics, tending to show how our export trade has increased since the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed. But it has seemed to me that proponents of the program completely ignore the fact that if we include in the balance sheets the amount of subsidies paid on exports to foreign nations, and include also the billions of dollars of gold the Treasury has purchased from abroad at inflated prices, we will discover that the increased exports about equal the sum of these two items.

So far as the remaining years of the war are concerned, these arguments in favor of trade agreements are largely academic. There is no foreign trade, except such as is Government controlled, nor is there likely to be for some years to come.

The main issue involved today, as I see it, is to what extent Congress is going to surrender to the Executive power to make post-war commitments without reference to the will of the people as expressed through their chosen representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Instead of peace treaties at the close of the war, requiring Senate concurrence to become effective, are we to have Executive agreements, along the line of the reciprocal trade agreements, but covering all fields of foreign relations?

Shall the Congress admit, and submit to, the doctrine of totalitarian governments that only the Executive is competent and empowered to deal with international problems?

Are we fighting this war to preserve the United States of America and its representative form of government, or are we fighting it to make the Executive supreme in foreign affairs? The step from that point to making the Executive the law-making power also in domestic affairs may be a short one, Mr. President, if this doctrine is to be accepted by the Congress at this time, or at any other time.

But before discussing the implications of this complete surrender to Executive dictatorship in the field of foreign relations, I desire to restate briefly my own position in regard to the reciprocal trade agreements program as such.

I am in favor of building up our foreign trade, but not at the expense of our domestic welfare. Foreign trade, to my mind, is the means to an end; not the end itself.

Mr. President, I am not in favor of sacrificing the farmers of the United States, or the workingmen of the United States, or the standard of living of the people of the United States merely to be able to point to immense tonnages of goods shipped to and from our shores.

Any attempt to build up our foreign trade at the expense of our domestic economy is attacking the problem from the wrong angle.

I hold it to be basic—I am not now talking of war conditions but of peacetime conditions—I hold it to be basic that our trade with foreign countries flourishes most in periods of domestic prosperity.

When farmers have adequate purchasing power—and that is multiplied seven or eight times through its extension to national purchasing power—that is when we are able to import and do import the largest quantities of necessities and spend most freely for foreign luxuries.

Anything which will improve the purchasing power of the American people will encourage and expand legitimate foreign trade. Anything which will tend to destroy or to impair the purchasing power of the American people, or of any considerable group of the American people, will defeat the admittedly desirable objective of increasing foreign trade.

Mr. President, I am for increasing our foreign trade through policies which will increase the purchasing power of the American market.

I am opposed to what I consider the fallacy of trying to build up foreign trade through diminishing the purchasing power of the American market.

One other point ought to be mentioned, I think, at this time:

By various pieces of labor legislation, and by the wage policies of the administration, we have been increasing the wage levels steadily. I am far from being opposed to that.

Through the A. A. A. and other farm legislation, we have been trying to build up farm prices toward production costs. I am far from opposed to that.

But the near-free-trade objectives of the trade-agreements program, if carried out, would bring in farm products and industrial products at lower prices based on lower wage levels and living standards of nations from which we import.

The two programs, lower prices for foodstuffs and manufactured products forced by competitive imports from abroad and higher prices and higher wages for goods manufactured in this country—these two programs pull in opposite directions.

They simply do not make sense, and no specious arguments backed by advocates' statistics can cause them to make sense.

Right now the main question involved, as I see the picture, is not whether or not the reciprocal trade agreements program is sound or unsound, whether it has worked successfully or not, whether its operations have justified the claims made for it, or the charges made against it.

Mr. President, I think the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act does invade the field of treaties, which is the domain of the Senate under the Constitution.

I think it invades the field of revenue legislation, which is the original function of the House of Representatives under the Constitution.

I think it can be argued successfully that it invades the field of regulation of commerce, which is a congressional function under the Constitution.

The all-important question presented by this proposed extension of the Trade Agreements Act, without the amendment offered by the Senate Finance Committee is whether Congress intends to divest itself of its powers to have some say in regard to the part the United States shall play in the post-war world.

I find myself in agreement with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that the legislative power never has stood in more jeopardy in this country than at this moment.

Looking ahead to we know not what conditions will prevail in the post-war world, I consider it unwise, almost suicidal folly, for Congress to turn over to the Executive the power to enter into executive agreements without retaining the right of legislative review.

Therefore, I shall support the Finance Committee amendment, which reads as follows:

Provided, That every foreign trade agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of said act, as amended, shall be subject to termination 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as fixed by proclamation of the President, pursuant to joint resolutions of the Congress or by the President.

Mr. President, without that language, or language to that substantial effect, the Congress would have little or nothing to say about the post-war foreign trade policies of the United States. They would be left entirely in the hands of the Executive. I do not believe it can be successfully denied that, possessed of those powers, the Executive could write so-called trade agreements which would extend into the entire field of political as well as economic relations with other nations of the world.

It is entirely within the range of possibility that if the Congress again approves the principle of substituting Executive agreements for treaties, the Executive might decide to negotiate and conclude executive agreements, instead of peace treaties, at the end of the war. At the least, he could conclude trade agreements which would so commit the United States in the field of foreign relations that the Senate's share in concluding treaties would in actuality be just about zero.

I say again, Mr. President, that the issue presented is whether the Congress shall regain and retain, or strip itself for good and all, of what is left of its power in the field of international economic reorganization.

In past years the Executive has been steadily building up his powers at the expense of Congress, which is the people. That is a point which is conveniently overlooked by many zealous men and women with good intentions who are advocating one-man control of foreign relations without realizing it. Overlooked also is the corollary, which must follow as surely as night follows day, that then we should also have a one-man government in the domestic field, so as to meet the one-man decisions in the international field.

It is interesting to note the steady trend in that direction. In the first half century of the existence of the United States 27 agreements and 60 treaties were entered into; in the second half century there were 238 Executive agreements and 215 treaties; in the latest—I hope it is not the last—half century of our existence as an independent nation there have been consummated 917 Executive agreements and 524 treaties.

I am indebted to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for calling my attention to a recently published book on international Executive agreements, by Mr. Wallace McClure, of the State Department. Mr. McClure apparently expresses the bureaucratic view. I quote from his book two sentences which I believe chart plainly the road we are expected to follow in foreign relations in the post-war world:

It is believed that the President has, and was intended to have, under the Constitution all the powers and functions of the head of a fully recognized member of the society of nations; that he has, accordingly, the authority to enter into any manner of national act on any subject that is entered into by any other nation of the world—

Mr. President, let me call attention to the words "that is entered into by any other nation of the world." If that language means anything, it means that if Adolf Hitler, Josef Stalin, or any other dictator has certain powers in the international field, then our Executive is entitled to the same authority for this Nation. I resume the quotation:

and that, while this power must be exercised without violation of the Constitution and in accommodation with other possibly conflicting powers granted by the Constitution, notably the powers of the Legislature, an Executive agreement not in contravention of the Constitution and not in conflict with any act of Congress (best shown by positive congressional confirmation either before or after signature) is binding on all of the executive and all the law-enforcing agencies of the Government and is the equivalent.

What I have just quoted is found on page 252 of Mr. McClure's book. I quote now from page 363:

The President can do by Executive agreement anything that he can do by treaty, providing Congress by law cooperates.

Mr. President, I can see that passage of the pending legislation without the amendment proposed by the Finance Committee could be taken to be full cooperation by Congress—congressional confirmation before signature.

Mr. President, the administration has been telling us, the people of this country, and the world that action on this proposed legislation is the acid test of the United States post-war policy. In other words, the administration has served notice that enactment of the pending joint resolution without amendment retaining the right of congressional review of Executive agreements will be understood at home and abroad to mean that the Executive will have full power to enter into binding agreements as to post-war foreign relations.

To my mind, such suggestions make it imperative upon Congress to adopt some amendment along the lines of the one proposed by the Senate Finance Committee. Otherwise, the other nations of the world will have been led to believe—through statements from our own Department of State—that Congress has abdicated its powers to review, confirm, or reject such agreements or treaties.

I do not believe that Congress, particularly the Senate, or the people of the United States, are going to take that view of the matter when the time comes to determine our post-war policies and programs.

Therefore, I consider it particularly unwise and not altogether honest to lead other nations to believe that the President of the United States at the close of this war will have powers to commit the United States to certain agreements or treaties or perhaps to some form of a League of Nations—a power President Wilson clearly did not have at the close of World War No. 1.

Secretary of State Cordell Hull and other representatives of the State Department, as I read the record of hearings, declared that Congress has and will continue to have power to terminate these trade agreements without the adoption of the amendment. But they maintained it would be bad psychology to tell other nations that, by adopting the amendment.

If Secretary Hull and Dr. Sayre were not such honorable men, I should say that such an attitude might indicate a desire to soften the facts in the case and to lead other nations to a misconstruction of the powers of the Executive and of the lack of power of the Congress in the field of foreign relations.

If this power is retained in the hands of Congress, I think it is only fair to other nations that they so understand. I am not in favor of leading them to believe that what both Secretary Hull and Dr. Sayre said in the committee hearings is not so. Such a belief on their part might lead to the charge that the United States had "run out" on Europe again, when, according to Secretary Hull and Dr. Sayre, such would not be the case at all.

Mr. President, let me say furthermore that when our representatives sit at the peace table—I presume there will be peace conferences of some kind—it will be their responsibility to make settlement in accordance with the conditions prevailing at that time. Our representatives will be expected by our people, and by the representatives of other nations, to fulfill our international obligations fully, and at the same time to protect the interests of the United States and the people of the United States.

I say that the government existing at that time should be free to determine what our post-war course should be, in accordance with then existing realities. It should not be bound by what our State Department now, in ignorance of future realities, decides should be our course—a decision which might commit us to that course in advance.

I say it is not sound policy—in fact, it is the opposite—to send our representatives to the peace conference bound by previous commitments made through these trade agreements or other Executive agreements. Let us not tie their hands or our own hands; let us arrange to have our hands free in meeting the post-war problems in the light of post-war conditions.

Some mention has been made of article VII of agreements entered into under the Lease-Lend Act. I note that last March the Senate Finance Committee, by unanimous vote, adopted the following language in its report to the Senate:

> Article VII indicates the type of economic action which may be contemplated. It is not a commitment which binds either of the legislative bodies of this Government. For example, Article VII does not authorize the reduction of tariffs or commit the United States to other measures which under the Constitution must be adopted by the Congress or by either branch thereof. * * * The committee believes that there is no authority in the Lend-Lease Act to warrant any general post-war commitments or post-war policies.

I heartily approved that statement, Mr. President. I hope the Senate follows the same line in considering the proposed extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, by adopting the Finance Committee amendment.

In charting our post-war course, our hands should not be tied either by the Trade Agreements Act, by the Lend-Lease Act, or by any other commitments not made in accordance with our Constitution and established American traditions.

I shall support the amendment offered by the Senate Finance Committee, and I plead with my colleagues to accept it. I think the Congress owes that much to its own self-respect, and to the protection of the best interests of the United States and the people of the United States in a post-war world of which as yet we know but little, and that little is very conjectural. I am ready to vote on the amendment and on the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter received by me from Mr. Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, taking a strong stand in favor of the amendment suggested by the Senate Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., May 26, 1943.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate:

We trust that before the Senate puts the stamp of approval on House Joint Resolution 111, renewing the Trade Agreements Act for another period of years, this measure may be so amended as to vindicate the ancient and fundamental right of Congress to be something more than a mere spectator in matters relating to the tariff and the formulation of our policies with reference to foreign trade. As we see it, that is the most important issue involved in this whole question.

We hold that any plan which robs the chosen representatives of the people of one of their most important functions, reducing them to impotency, and which wrongfully delegates this power in its entirety to the executive department of the Government cannot successfully be defended as liberal, constitutional, or American.

The Grange opposed the enactment of this law in 1934 on the ground that the sweeping delegation of legislative authority it contains is wholly at variance with the American concept of government, and that it violates both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution.

We have always been in favor of foreign trade under proper conditions. We have never been opposed to true reciprocity, by which we mean an exchange of goods or commodities with other nations on a basis that is mutually beneficial or advantageous.

While one of the declared purposes of the Trade Agreements Act was to develop an outlet for our farm surpluses, as the act has been administered it has had the opposite effect. Under the workings of this act, farm imports have greatly increased, while our exports of agricultural commodities have shown a sharp decline. During the 5-year period from 1936 to 1940, both inclusive, our food imports averaged nearly 250 percent of food exports.

It is true that normal trade has practically been brought to a standstill by the war. However, it must be taken for granted that in asking for the renewal of the act, the administration intends to make use of it in the post-war period, when conditions will naturally be vastly different from those that existed when most of our trade agreements were made.

Under the circumstances, we feel that the amendment adopted by the Finance Committee, which provides that all trade agreements that have been negotiated shall be terminated within 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, is both wise and prudent. We hope that this amendment may be retained.

The National Grange has repeatedly and unanimously gone on record at its annual conventions in favor of Senate ratification of all trade agreements before they become effective, on the ground that these agreements are treaties within the meaning of the Constitution. At the very least, Congress should have the right to reject, by a majority vote of each House, any trade agreement deemed contrary to the best interests of the Nation.

The supporters of the act without change contend that any such amendment might be misunderstood by the other countries of the world. However, it is worthy of note that 25 of the 30 trade agreements we have thus far made were subject to some form of parliamentary ratification in the countries with which we have dealt. The Grange advocates that the same rule be applied here at home. Imaginary fears as to how this might be viewed by other nations should not deter us from taking proper steps to protect the interests of the United States. Nor should we be afraid to let it be known that ours is still a government of laws, and not of men.

Sincerely yours,
THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
FRED BRENCKMAN,
Washington Representative.

Mr. CAPPER. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a

letter received by me from Mr. Charles M. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation. His letter is along the same line as Mr. Brenckman's letter, and indicates that the agricultural interests of the country are opposed to the proposed extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE
MILK PRODUCERS' FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1943.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: With respect to the pending debate on House Joint Resolution 111 to extend the Trade Agreement Act, this organization comprised of 71 dairy cooperative associations with a combined farm family membership of 280,000, desires to record its position with the Members of the Senate.

Having followed closely the workings of this act since its inception, we continue firm in our belief that its extension without incorporation of several safeguards should be opposed. Extensive studies made by us disclose, not only the dubious character of alleged economic benefits resulting from the agreements, but also an administration policy that may well threaten agriculture's and the Nation's welfare in the post-war period.

Consistent with our past policy, we would prefer to see the Senate reclaim its prerogative of ratifying treaty arrangements (and trade agreements in our judgment contain treaty matter). We believe, however, that under existing war conditions, provision for termination of trade agreements 6 months after hostilities cease as provided in the committee amendment to the resolution, offers a safeguard insofar as post-war treatment of imports and tariffs is concerned. This is particularly true when coupled with the action of the House of Representatives limiting the extension of the act to a 2-year period. This organization, accordingly, endorses both the 2-year extension adopted by the House as well as the amendment of the Senate Committee on Finance and urge the members of the Senate to adopt both.

In addition, we request the Senate to give favorable consideration to and adopt an amendment which will restore the cost of production principle to trade agreement negotiations. It is only through such an amendment that American producers may be protected against a flood of competitive foreign commodities entering this country at less than domestic levels of production costs.

Sincerely yours,
THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE
MILK PRODUCERS' FEDERATION,
CHARLES W. HOLMAN,
Secretary.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President. I shall vote for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act without amendment. I do not think the act goes far enough; but it is, in my judgment, a step in the right direction.

Secretary Hull was eminently correct when he said we could build no permanent edifice of peace unless that edifice were built upon the free flow of world trade. A truer statement was never made than the statement, "When trade ceases, armies march."

Before the First World War America was a debtor nation. We had tariffs then, but they were not so high as the tariff level subsequent to each of the two general tariff revisions in 1921 and in 1930. The old tariff before World War No. 1 did not, to such a great extent, hamper the free flow of world trade. We had in that era, as now, a surplus of agricultural products—cotton, wheat, corn, and other basic farm crops. The nations to whom we were indebted, industrial nations, desired and needed those products. They were glad to take them in payment of our debts. We therefore sold them those products and thereby secured the foreign exchange to service and pay our debts. Consequently, even with a protective tariff, we had no farm problem then. To a great extent we had a universally prosperous America.

As the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] pointed out in his speech upon this subject—and let me say that it was an able speech, one which went to the fundamentals of the economy of America and of the other nations of the earth—as a result of the First World War we became a creditor nation. For the United States to do business and for our foreign debts to be paid, it was, therefore, necessary for us to accept goods or gold in payment, since the only way nations, like individuals, can do business is through the sale of goods, personal services, or the transfer of gold. A creditor nation must, to collect its debts, maintain an extensive foreign trade. But in that era we did not accept our responsibilities. We passed a tariff act in the early 1920's which, up until that time, was the highest tariff in history. Because of it foreign countries could not trade with us. If they could not sell us their products, they could not purchase the products of the United States. This is elementary economics.

So, Mr. President, in the fabulous 1920's our country launched upon an unsound program; a program which did not eliminate, but only delayed, the fatal day, the debacle which was sure to follow. In order to keep our economic engine running, in order to maintain that export business which is absolutely and utterly essential to the prosperity of America and to the very existence of our capitalistic system, we loaned the debtor nations vast sums of money. With this money they purchased American products. They took our cotton, our wheat, our meat, our lard, our manufactured goods, and all other products of which we had an exportable surplus. During this era we imagined ourselves rich. But like the castle built upon the sands, our so-called prosperity could not withstand the storm which was to follow. That program contained the seeds of its own undoing. The economic storm which was caused by our own folly and the folly of other nations in erecting barriers and other restraints upon the free flow of trade. Other nations were unable to repay our loans. They could borrow no more money from us; they could not buy our goods. Surpluses piled up. Trade was stagnated. Prices fell. We went into the worst depression in years.

At that time, instead of lowering tariff duties and reopening the channels of foreign trade, which was the proper thing to do and what we most certainly should have done, we made the second tragic blunder. There was enacted in 1930 the highest tariff act in history. Other nations followed suit. They, too, revised their tariffs upward. In addition, they placed other restrictions upon the free flow of trade. Worse still, some discriminated against American goods. Great Britain changed from her age-old free-trade policy to one of protection. The trade of the world was thereby stagnated. The depression was thereby deepened; and out of the unemployment, poverty, and misery which followed, dictators sprang up. Alien creeds rapidly matured into full flower, and some of the peoples of the world surrendered their personal liberties to the new systems, which held forth to them the promise of securing bread. One scavenger nation at this time embarked upon her ruthless course of conquest.

Mr. President, the Congress of the United States, by adopting in 1934 the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the extension of which is now under consideration, took the lead in reopening the channels of world trade and in leading the peoples of the earth back to economic sanity. Our Secretary of State, the official to whom the administration of this program was entrusted, is sincere, extremely able, and to a remarkable degree possesses the confidence of the American people. The Congress, in my judgment, acted wisely in the original enactment and in each subsequent extension of this legislation.

But, Mr. President, world trade could not be reopened in a day, or in a year, for that matter. Furthermore, this program had its advent in a world in which some of the major nations were not interested in trade, but were primarily interested in arming themselves and preparing for war. Our economy throughout the 1930's was unsound, because it was not built upon a great export trade. The employment of the country depends upon the business of the country. When the volume of business increases, the volume of employment increases, and this swings upward the economic cycle. Because of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, because of the tariffs of other nations, and because of quotas and other trade restrictions, our foreign trade fell off. There was not a sufficient volume of business to give employment to our people. In the case of agriculture, surpluses were piled up. Consequently, in a world of plenty, there were stark hunger and destitution. There was a world need for the products of the farms and factories of America; but because we did not have the ability to exchange commodities with the nations across the seas, because we could not trade, we were forced to subsidize agriculture, to reduce the acreage planted in basic crops, to kill pigs, to reduce the output of our great agricultural industry, and to reduce the output of a large portion of the business of America. We were forced to support millions of Americans through a glorified dole. During that period we created artificial employment. America lived to a large extent upon its capital. That era, too, was artificial and unsound.

Of course, Mr. President, this program can be of no benefit during the war. There can be no even flow of trade during this period. In the post-war period all the peoples of the earth of every nation, race, and creed will turn to America for leadership. There will then be erected an edifice which we all hope will make for permanent peace and prosperity for mankind. But if we do not rise to the occasion and deal with the realities of the situation, this edifice will contain the seeds of disaster—poverty, hunger, misery, and another great war.

Mr. President, I reiterate, there can be no permanent peace or prosperity without world trade. There can be no sound prosperity unless artificial restrictions on the flow of commerce are removed.

I know that the interests of America must be protected. The welfare of the Nation as a whole must be paramount. I know that these paramount interests will be protected. They have been protected by the Secretary of State. This program during the 9 years of its life has done good. It has not harmed this country. It has not hurt a single industry in this country. It has been of benefit to America. I think the Secretary should have gone further, but I may be a partisan witness; I may be unable fairly to judge.

In my judgment, the amendment adopted by the committee should be defeated. I full well comprehend the argument of the proponents of this amendment, that we must reserve for the United States complete freedom of action in the post-war world; that our hands must be untied when our representatives sit around the council table; and that they favor reciprocity. But the primary interest of Congress must be to uphold the essential national interests of the United States. And so it must. Our national interests will be best upheld by a workable system of cooperation and collaboration. It is the best system I know of. The primary interest of all of us is to uphold and promote the essential national interest of the United States. This interest can be served in no better way than by lowering tariff barriers without injury to the industry of the country. We have here a workable program of international collaboration and cooperation. It has proved to be so by the 9-year span of its life. All of us agree that it is a step in the right direction. Through this program the essential national interests of the United States will be as well served in the future as they have been in the past.

The adoption of the amendment would be notice to the world that we reserve the right to destroy the program and return to the old rates, and the old system of Hawley-Smoot days, which in this instance would be a greater mistake than was the adoption of the Tariff Act of 1921. Mr. President, no matter whether or not our hands are tied, it is better that they be tied if by remaining united we would drift back into the tidal wave of trade barriers, and the restraints on commerce which marked the tragic days which followed the First World War. Of course, no one knows what the global economic state will be after victory is won. But, Mr. President, we know what it must be based upon. It must be based upon a reduction of trade barriers which will not do injury to the economy of the United States. The only way to create security and prosperity for America is by international cooperation and collaboration, which will seek a reduction in those barriers which restrict the flow of international trade.

Practically no one expects the war to be over within the next year or 18 months. Who is there who believes that the hostilities with Japan will cease within the next year or 18 months? This amendment presents merely a theory. We gain nothing by its adoption. If it were adopted it would shake the confidence of our allies and the nations with which we are dealing.

I have been very much interested in the argument that we want the maximum of exports which we can profitably acquire; but that exports are not profitable if gained at the expense of imports which displace essential domestic production and employment; and further, that a rule of reason must balance these forces on a realistic basis. If that be the rule, if a rule of reason must balance these forces on a realistic basis, we have set up a program which has balanced and will balance these forces. It has increased exports. It has increased the flow of world trade without injury to the essential business of the country.

I do not believe we have gone far enough. But I repeat that this program is a step in the right direction. It is far superior to the old system. Under it we are far better off than if we were under the rates of the Hawley-Smoot Act. I do not think the program should be hamstrung in the least by the adoption of a crippling amendment.

For that reason I prefer to see a system of reciprocity administered by the Department of State. I know that there will be no general scaling down of duties in any other way. I would be careful to whom I would vote to delegate this authority. I have confidence in Secretary Hull. I know he can best protect the interests of the Nation as a whole. I believe he will do this in the negotiations around the counsel table. I know further that with authority in his hands he could make better and more satisfactory trades, because foreign nations, like human beings, will enter into more all-inclusive agreements when they negotiate with one who has the authority to speak and to commit us absolutely. No man will show his full hand when dealing with one who must go to some higher authority. This is especially true when the subject might be the object of further negotiation.

As is well known, Mr. President, I represent a cotton-producing State. A greater percentage of the citizenry of my State depend for their livelihood upon the growth of cotton than is true of the citizenry of any other Southern State. Fourteen million people in America depend for their livelihood upon the production of this great crop. More people in America are engaged in the business of growing cotton than are engaged in any other single business. When they are unable to purchase, when they are unable to consume, factories in the East will shut down, and millions of Americans will be thrown out of work. Our country will then be certain to enter a depression, for after all, agriculture is the great market for industrial goods. In productivity, intelligence, and in business ability, America has the greatest and most prosperous agricultural industry in the history of the world. The great Mississippi Valley, the Southeast, and the Southwest, are the greatest producers of raw materials in the world. This area, with its ability to buy and consume the products of industry, has made America the greatest industrial Nation upon the earth. The business of growing cotton, and the livelihood of those who grow it, depend upon foreign trade, upon the export of cotton. If the export markets were lost permanently, and the cotton growers forced to produce only cotton for the domestic American market—and since 1937 we have been producing cotton practically only for the American market—practically every cotton grower in the South would be bankrupted. This will surely occur unless the portals of world trade are thrown open to us.

American-grown cotton is a superior cotton. Foreign countries desire to use it. To do so they must be able to trade with us, to ship us goods, and to take out our surplus products in return. At the beginning of the present war, and for several years prior thereto, we had practically lost those markets. One of the principal reasons for this was that foreign countries could not acquire the dollar exchange to purchase our farm products, and because of that fact the Government was forced to subsidize this great industry. In my judgment, the same thing is true of the agricultural products of the West.

In order to regain these foreign markets after the war, in order to be able to plant a normal cotton acreage once again, in order to be able to purchase the products of American industry, as well as furnish employment to the workers of the East, it will be absolutely essential that foreign countries shall be allowed to purchase our cotton, and that the purchasing power of the South be increased. To do this it will be utterly essential that they shall be in position to sell their goods to us, as well as to acquire the dollar exchange with which to purchase the cotton of the South, and the exportable surplus of the farm products of the West. There can be no permanently prosperous America until this is done.

Mr. President, permit me to say to Senators who represent the States of the West that we of the South have been their customers. We desire to remain their customers. I am sure they desire us to remain their customers. However, we have been capable, and we are now capable, with minor exceptions, of producing the same farm products which

they produce. Our soil is fertile. Our growing and grazing season is longer than theirs. If world trade is not restored, if it is not possible through the scaling down of tariff barriers for us to recapture foreign cotton markets, then for our existence we shall be forced into competition with them. We do not desire to do this. We do not desire to enter into competition from which they, we, and industry will suffer because the prosperity of industry depends upon the purchasing power of American agriculture. The Nation would suffer from such competition. But when we are prosperous and the West is prosperous the Nation prospers because when the purchasing power of all increases the consumption of commodities increases, the volume of business increases, factory wheels hum, and there is work for all to do.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that these trade agreements are sound in principle. I do not think the program goes far enough. If I had the power within my hands, I would go further. But I have confidence in the Secretary of State. I am willing that he be empowered under this joint resolution to enter the post-war period unhampered and unimpeded, to reopen the avenues of world trade. I sincerely hope and pray that he can do so. There can be no permanent prosperity unless this is done. There cannot be permanent peace unless this is done. Secretary Hull is economically sound. He has envisioned a new world. That vision is practical and safe. The Congress of the United States must rise to the occasion and see that the post-war castle, wherein there will dwell forever a peaceful, contented, happy, and prosperous brotherhood of man is built upon bedrock.

CIVILIAN PILOT TRAINING

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill which is on the calendar. I ask that Calendar No. 264, House bill 1670, be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1670) to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not rise to object. I understand the bill will not provoke controversy. I know nothing of it.

Mr. McCARRAN. If it provokes any controversy, I shall immediately withdraw the request.

Mr. GEORGE. I have no objection.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will not the Senator please explain what the bill seeks to accomplish?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Pilot Training Act of 1939 provided for the training of civilian pilots, The Army and the Navy have now placed the training of all military trainees under the direction and supervision of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The Comptroller General has held that the word "civilian" in the act under which civilian pilot training is now being conducted by the Army requires that when trainees are in the military or naval service the appropriation must come through the Army or the Navy, and not through the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The bill is to correct that situation, so that the appropriation may come through the Commerce Department, thus to be handled by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, so as to enable it to train enlisted enrollees. We seek to have the word "civilian" stricken so that the act may cover not only civilian, but military enrollees as well.

The bill has the approval of the Army, I am certain it has the approval of the Navy, and it has the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. It has the approval of the House of Representatives, having passed the House; it has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, and it is here for the approval of the Senate itself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is it a fact that every person taking this training must agree to serve in the armed forces, either the Army or the Navy?

Mr. McCARRAN. Civilian trainees obligate themselves to take the course which may be assigned to them by the Army or the Navy, but the greater number of the trainees are actually in military service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1670) to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "any amounts heretofore appropriated for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, and unexpended, shall be available for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of such act, as amended by the provisions of this act," and to insert in lieu thereof "Any appropriations heretofore made and available for obligations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for carrying out the provisions of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, shall be available for carrying out the provisions of such act as amended hereby. Any obligations entered into heretofore under such appropriations for purposes which are brought within the scope of such act by this amendatory act shall be deemed to be valid if otherwise properly incurred."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 1670 was read the third time and passed.

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, an event has happened today which deserves the attention of the Senate and of the country. I refer to the issuance of an Executive order by the President which establishes in the Office for Emergency Management, of the Executive Office of the President, an Office of War Mobilization, which shall be under the direction of a Director of War Mobilization to be appointed by the President.

Mr. President, this Executive order provides that there shall be certain well-defined functions of the Office of War Mobilization. Those functions are:

To develop unified programs and to establish policies for the maximum use of the Nation's natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the effective use of the national manpower not in the armed forces, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions.

To unify the activities of Federal agencies and departments engaged in or concerned with production, procurement, distribution, or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products, and to resolve and determine controversies between such agencies or departments, except those to be resolved by the Director of Economic Stabilization under section 3, title 4, of Executive Order 9250.

To issue such directives on policy or operations to the Federal agencies and departments as may be necessary to carry out the programs developed, the policies established, and the decisions made under this order. It shall be the duty of all such agencies and departments to execute these directives, and to make to the Office of War Mobilization such progress reports as may be required.

Under the authority of this order the Office of War Mobilization is allowed to perform its functions through certain other officials and agencies of the Government as the Director shall determine.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate the Executive order in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER PROVIDING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes of the United States, particularly by the First War Powers Act, 1941, as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and in order to provide for the more effective coordination of the mobilization of the Nation for war, it is hereby ordered as follows:

I

There is established in the Office for Emergency Management of the Executive Office of the President an Office of War Mobilization which shall be under the direction of a Director of War Mobilization (hereinafter referred to as Director), to be appointed by the President.

II

There is established in the Office of War Mobilization the War Mobilization Committee (hereinafter referred to as the committee), of which the Director shall be the chairman and with which he shall advise and consult. The committee shall consist, in addition to the Director, of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the Munitions Assignments Board, the Chairman of the War Production Board, and the Director of Economic Stabilization. The chairman shall request the heads of other agencies or departments to participate in the deliberations of the committee whenever matters specially affecting such agencies or departments are under consideration. It shall be the duty of the heads of the agencies and departments to supply necessary data to the Director and the committee.

III

It shall be the function of the Office of War Mobilization, acting in consultation

with the committee and subject to the direction and control of the President,

(a) To develop unified programs and to establish policies for the maximum use of the Nation's natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the effective use of the national manpower not in the armed forces, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions;

(b) To unify the activities of Federal agencies and departments engaged in or concerned with production, procurement, distribution, or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products and to resolve and determine controversies between such agencies or departments, except those to be resolved by the Director of Economic Stabilization under section 3, title IV of Executive Order 9250; and

(c) To issue such directives on policy or operations to the Federal agencies and departments as may be necessary to carry out the programs developed, the policies established, and the decisions made under this order. It shall be the duty of all such agencies and departments to execute these directives, and to make to the Office of War Mobilization such progress reports as may be required.

IV

The Office of War Mobilization may perform the functions, exercise the powers, authority and discretion conferred on it by this order through such officials and such agencies and in such manner as the Director, subject to the provisions of this order, may determine. The Director shall receive such compensation as the President shall provide, and within the limits of funds which may be made available, may employ necessary personnel and make provision for supplies, facilities, and services necessary to discharge his responsibilities.

All prior Executive orders insofar as they are in conflict herewith are amended accordingly.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 27, 1943.*

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I mention this matter because the issuance of this Executive order today is a vindication of the effort of Congress to achieve substantially and fundamentally this objective which the President has today adopted as his own.

I think it would not be amiss to ask unanimous consent to incorporate in my remarks at this point Senate bill 607, a bill introduced on February 1 of this year in the Senate by the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who is detained today from presence in the Senate by illness, to whom we all owe a great debt for what he has done in attempting to bring about such a step as has been taken today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 607

A bill to establish an Office of War Mobilization, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the purpose of this act to (1) inventory and mobilize all the economic resources of the United States, including manpower, facilities, materials, technical and scientific knowledge, and natural resources for maximum use in the provision of military and essential civilian needs; and (2) adjust and stabilize the economy in accordance with the needs of full mobilization and other conditions created by war.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INDEPENDENT OFFICE AND ITS CONSTITUENT OFFICES

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby created as an independent agency an Office of War Mobilization, which shall be under the direction of a Director of War Mobilization (referred to in this act as the "Director"). The Director shall be appointed by the President and shall be compensated at the rate of $20,000 per annum.

(b) The following offices are hereby created within the Office of War Mobilization: (1) Office of Production and Supply, (2) Office of Manpower Supply, (3) Office of Scientific and Technical Mobilization, and (4) Office of Economic Stabilization. Each such office shall be under the direction of an Administrator who, subject to the approval of the President, shall be appointed by the Director. Each Administrator shall be compensated at the rate of $15,000 per annum. The Director, subject to the approval of the President, is authorized to appoint such Deputy Administrators as he deems necessary. Each Deputy Administrator shall be compensated at the rate of $12,000 per annum.

(c) The Director and the several Administrators and their deputies shall be full-time employees and they and all other full-time employees of the Office of War Mobilization shall sever all private business connections and shall receive no salaries or compensations other than those received as employees of the Office of War Mobilization.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMITTEE ON REQUIREMENTS AND PROGRAM

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a Committee on Requirements and Program under the chairmanship of the Director and consisting of the Secretaries of War and the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Administrators of the four constituent offices of the Office of War Mobilization. This Committee shall develop, subject to the approval of the President, a comprehensive national program for maximum use of resources for military and essential civilian needs. This program shall be based on schedules of military requirements furnished by the War and Navy Departments and determinations as to minimum essential civilian needs and available resources by the Office of War Mobilization.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A BOARD OF WAR MOBILIZATION

SEC. 4. There is hereby created a Board of War Mobilization under the chairmanship of the Director and consisting of four representatives of industry, four representatives of labor, four representatives of agriculture, and four public members at large appointed by the Director with the advice and the approval of the President. The Board shall hold regular meetings at least once a month. The Board and each individual member shall have access to all information of the Office bearing on the effectivenss and adequacy of war mobilization. The Board is directed to make to the Office of War Mobilization such recommendations relating to policy and operations as it may deem necessary to improve war mobilization. The Board and each member individually shall endeavor to secure maximum cooperation and participation of the American people in war mobilization. To this end, the Board shall direct, extend, and improve the war-production drive, now being carried out through plant labor-management production committees.

DUTIES AND POWERS OF THE DIRECTOR OF WAR MOBILIZATION

SEC. 5. (a) The Director shall effectuate the program developed in accordance with section 3 and shall effectuate the necessary adjustments and stabilization of economic conditions through (1) the establishment of the policy and the supervision and coordination of the several constituent offices of the Office of War Mobilization, and (2) the issuance of directives on policy or operations to other Federal agencies concerned with the purposes of this act; it shall be the duty of all such agencies to execute such directives.

(b) The powers now possessed by the several Federal agencies and subdivisions of agencies which are transferred to the constituent offices of the Office of War Mobilization by section 7 of this act and all powers provided in section 8 are specifically vested in the Director. Whenever the Director deems it necessary to the furtherance of the purposes of this act that additional powers be vested in him, he shall make appropriate recommendations to Congress or to the President for such additional powers.

(c) The Director shall perform and exercise the powers and authority granted under this act in such manner and through such officials of the Office of War Mobilization and of other Federal agencies as he may determine.

(d) The Director is authorized to redistribute the functions of the constituent offices of the Office of War Mobilization and to make such transfers and other internal reorganization which he deems necessary, including the redistribution and transfer of the functions and personnel of the several Federal agencies and subdivisions of agencies transferred to the constituent offices by section 7 of this act: *Provided, however,* That the powers conferred herein do not supersede the authority vested in the President in the First War Powers Act. Whenever the Director deems the transfer of additional Federal agencies or subdivisions of agencies to the constituent offices to further the purposes of this act, he shall recommend to the President that such transfers be made by virtue of the powers vested in the President under the First War Powers Act.

(e) The Director shall establish within his own office a planning and progress-reporting staff which shall maintain a record of the extent of mobilization of manpower, facilities, materials, technical and scientific knowledge, and natural resources, and shall check progress on the comprehensive program developed in accordance with section 3 of this act and on the programs of the several constituent offices.

(f) The Director shall advise and consult with the Board of War Mobilization on all major policies.

FUNCTIONS OF THE CONSTITUENT OFFICES

SEC. 6. The several constituent offices shall exercise the following general functions, through such powers as are vested in the Director or acquired by him in accordance with section 5 and further delegated by him to the several administrators in accordance with section 10 (a): (a) The Office of Production and Supply shall (1) maintain a current inventory of materials, facilities, and other productive resources, other than manpower, and shall maintain a record of the present and projected use of potential industrial capacity; (2) translate the production program developed in accordance with section 3 into a detailed time schedule of end and intermediate military and civilian products by plants; (3) procure through contracts, or otherwise, the requirements of the Departments of War and Navy, and of the Maritime Commission, and all foreign requirements including lend-lease; (4) review progress on all outstanding contracts and renegotiate such contracts where necessary so as to conform to the schedule under (2) above; (5) allocate critical materials and facilities, in accordance with this same schedule; (6) check on the use of facilities, materials, and other production factors through

plant inspection; (7) determine in collaboration with the Office of Manpower Supply a detailed time schedule of plant-by-plant manpower requirements.

(b) The Office of Manpower Supply shall (1) maintain a current inventory of manpower resources and a record of the present and projected use of manpower resources; (2) allocate manpower as between combat and other essential needs, including production, so as to meet the comprehensive program developed in accordance with section 3 of this act; (3) develop to the maximum extent, through proper training and placement of workers, all potential manpower resources needed to meet the program and schedules determined under sections 3 and 6 (a) above; (4) arrange for the transfer of workers from plant to plant, industry to industry, and area to area in accordance with the needs of war mobilization; (5) insure through plant inspection the use of labor at maximum effectiveness.

(c) The Office of Scientific and Technical Mobilization shall effect the full and immediate mobilization of scientific knowledge, techniques, and personnel, for the prosecution of war and for making adjustments necessitated by war conditions.

(d) The Office of Economic Stabilization shall effect the adjustments of economic structure and conditions of business or employment needed to effectuate the purposes of this act. The Office of Economic Stabilization shall have jurisdiction over Federal regulation of civilian purchasing power, prices, rents, wages, salaries, profits, rationing, subsidies, loans, and all other matters relating to the adjustment of the economy to the needs of full war mobilization and to the conditions created by war.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS AND PERSONNEL OF CERTAIN EXISTING AGENCIES

SEC. 7. (a) There is hereby transferred to the Office of Production and Supply the functions and personnel of (1) the War Production Board and the Smaller War Plants Corporation; (2) those subdivisions of the War, Navy, and Treasury Departments, of the Maritime Commission, and of the Office of Lend-Lease as shall be determined by the Director, subject to the approval of the President, as being related to, engaged in, or concerned with the procurement, manufacture, or other provision of war matériel; (3) the Federal Loan Agency and the Department of Commerce as shall be determined by the Director, subject to the approval of the President, as being related to, engaged in, or concerned with financing plant expansions, materials, purchases, or other operations bearing on the purposes of this act; and (4) the Petroleum Administration for War.

(b) There are hereby transferred to the Office of Manpower Supply the functions and personnel of the Selective Service Administration and the War Manpower Commission, excepting that subdivision transferred under (c) below.

(c) There is hereby transferred to the Office of Scientific and Technical Mobilization the functions and personnel of the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel of the War Manpower Commission.

(d) There is hereby transferred to the Office of Economic Stabilization the functions and personnel of the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Economic Stabilization.

(e) All persons attached to the military services who are transferred to the Office of War Mobilization by this act or who are subsequently so transferred shall be relieved from active service for such length of time as shall be requested by the Director.

AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING STATUTES AND ADDITIONAL POWERS AND DUTIES

SEC. 8. (a) The Selective Service Act is hereby amended as follows: "The Director of War Mobilization through the Office of War Manpower shall establish such organization and procedure for determining occupational deferment as he shall deem proper, and the findings arising through such procedures and organizations shall supplant those heretofore made by the local selective-service boards."

(b) The Director, through the Office of War Manpower, is empowered to make loans or grants to cover costs of subsistence and transportation of workers, including their families, being placed in or transferring to war essential civilian activity whenever he deems such assistance will further the purposes of this act. The maximum grant to any individual family shall not exceed $200 and the maximum loan shall not exceed $300.

(c) The Director is authorized and directed through the Office of Scientific and Technical Mobilization to (1) appraise current use of scientific and technical personnel and facilities and make plans and proposals for maximum mobilization of such personnel and facilities for the war effort; (2) review all proposals for development of improved processes, products, and materials or for other scientific research and development, including development of models and pilot plants, which may be brought to the attention of the Office of War Mobilization or initiated by the staff of the Office, and promote such proposals deemed in aid of war mobilization through loans or grants to public agencies or private persons or through the establishment of research facilities and pilot plants under the direction of the Office; (3) promote the widest and fullest utilization of advanced processes, techniques, and products; and for these purposes he shall have access to all production facilities and all information bearing on processes, products, materials, or other factors of production; (4) arrange and where necessary compel the licensing for the duration of the national emergency of patents, secret processes, and special technical information at reasonable compensation in order to foster their wider utilization where this is deemed necessary in the interest of war mobilization.

FUNDS

SEC. 9. (a) All appropriations for any agency available for use in connection with any function transferred to the Office of War Mobilization are hereby transferred and shall be available to the Office of War Mobilization for the purpose of exercising the function so transferred. For the purposes of this subsection, the Director of War Mobilization shall determine, subject to the approval of the President, which functions have been so transferred. Funds appropriated for the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and lend-lease procurements shall not be limited in their expenditure to the original purposes specified in their appropriation but shall be based on the program determined in accordance with section 3 of this act.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $200,000,000 to the Office of War Mobilization to defray loans or grants made under the authority of section 8 (b). There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $200,000,000 to the Office of War Mobilization to defray costs or loans or grants or other expenditure under the authority conferred in section 8 (c) (2) of this act.

DECENTRALIZATION OF ACTIVITIES

SEC. 10. (a) The Director shall delegate the powers and duties conferred in this act to the administrators of the constituent offices to the maximum extent consistent with proper determination of policy and coordinated operations.

(b) The Director and the several administrators are hereby directed to decentralize operations on an area basis to the maximum extent consistent with efficient operation.

(c) The Director is authorized and directed to employ State and other area representatives, who shall coordinate and integrate the operations of the constituent offices in these States and other areas.

(d) The Director and the several administrators are authorized and directed to establish boards similar in structure and function to the board established under section 5 of this act on a national, area, and industrial basis.

SEC. 11. (a) All laws or parts of laws conflicting with the provisions of this act are to the extent of such conflict suspended while this act is in force.

(b) Upon the termination of this act all executive or administrative agencies, governmental corporations, departments, commissions, bureaus, offices, or officers shall exercise the same functions, duties, and powers as exercised prior to the date of enactment of this act.

(c) This act shall take effect immediately upon its enactment and shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination thereof, or until such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

SEC. 12. (a) All orders, rules, regulations, permits, or other privileges made, issued, or granted by or in respect of any agency or function transferred to any other agency or function under the provisions of this act, and in effect on the date this act takes effect, shall continue in effect to the same extent as if such transfer had not occurred, until modified, superseded, or repealed.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to establish an Office of War Mobilization. The bill, in terms, is the successor of a bill introduced in the Senate last October by the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the junior Senator from Florida, and about the same time in the House of Representatives by a distinguished Representative from California [Mr. TOLAN].

I cannot refrain from paying tribute to what Representative TOLAN has done in this field, for it was first his committee, the Tolan Committee on Migratory Labor, set up in the House of Representatives, which on December 18, 1941, recommended a single civilian agency for the conduct of civilian and war production. On March 9, 1942, and again in October 1942, the Tolan committee described the agency which should perform this function, and, as I have said, it was thereafter that the Kilgore-Pepper and the Tolan bills were introduced, respectively, in the Senate and in the House of Representatives.

The bill to which I refer as introduced in the Senate in October 1942 was heard before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and that subcommittee made a report, and I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in my remarks the report which was made at that time, which is not long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE ON S. 2871, TO ESTABLISH AN OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION

This subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor was directed by the chairman of the committee, Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS of Utah, to hold hearings on S. 2871 and to report to the full committee. The members of the subcommittee, originally established to hold hearings on Senate Resolu-

tion 291, were Senators CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, chairman; LISTER HILL, of Alabama; H. H. SCHWARTZ, of Wyoming; ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., of Wisconsin; and EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, of Colorado. In discharging its duties by this report on S. 2871 your subcommittee recommends that the Committee on Education and Labor give favorable consideration to this legislation.

NATURE OF MODERN WAR

This is a total war. What does that mean? We have heard the phrase so much in recent months it has begun to lose its impact.

During the First World War total expenditures of the Federal Government were $26,000,000,000 through the year 1919. Since June 1940, when the National Defense Advisory Commission was established, Congress has appropriated approximately $225,000,000,000 and approximately $56,000,000,000 have already been expended.

The numbers in our armed forces today already exceed by about 2,000,000 the numbers in the service during the last war and plans are already made for adding approximately 4,000,000.

We fought the last war largely by weapons produced by our allies. Very few of our combat planes saw a fight, and a very small number of our guns fired a shot in battle. Already in this war our weapons are fighting on every front although we are far short of the supplies needed to overwhelm the enemy.

In the First World War we employed only 8,000,000 in all manufacturing. This figure is far short of the 17,000,000 employed today in war industry and much further behind the 25,000,000 we may expect at the peak of war employment. This enormous increase in the numbers on war jobs is taking place simultaneously with the huge drain into the armed forces.

These figures give some idea of the magnitude of the undertaking in which we are now engaged. They help convey the meaning of "total war."

We need to realize that by entering upon this war we have committed America to enormous changes. Defeat, we all know, will destroy the America we are fighting to defend. It may not be so apparent to most of us that the effort to gain victory is also bound to transform America.

How it will be transformed depends upon decisions already made and on others now on hand.

It is well to remember that today America has only one important customer: Uncle Sam. Congress has already appropriated the major part of the funds required to fight this war during 1943 and most of 1944. From here out the ruling question is how that money will be spent, by whom, what production goals will be, and how they can be met. Even of the $56,000,000,000 already spent, a large part has gone as advances for incomplete end-products or for new plants. Many of these end-products will require further expenditures for their completion.

During the first 2½ years of defense production and throughout the first year of the war, Congress has considered that its primary duty was to appropriate. It has been assumed that other branches of the Government were equipped to carry out the mobilization of America's resources, to give meaning to the figures on these Treasury checks. This has proven to be an unjustified assumption.

Our productive effort to date has been great. But compared to our productive capacity it has been unsatisfactory. The margin between what we have done and what we can do will not merely decide the length of the war. Here, now, today, we are deciding the shape of the peace and the structure of post-war America. The nature of the problems at hand rules out military control or even monopolistic civilian control of this war-production effort.

The problem of a war economy is how to maximize production and how simultaneously to maintain balance in motion.

This is a brand-new job, and it requires a new understanding of the problem. Our military men are unprepared to face such a program. Their solution, as they have demonstrated, is to let the contracts to the individual large firms and expect them to deliver on time. Many of these large firms in turn want to be allowed to do the job in their own way without interference, supervision, or any centralized control.

Peacetime production may have been possible by this means. Wartime production is not. Without coordination of all the parts, the war machine won't work. The reason should be apparent. Our peacetime economy has depended upon surpluses of men, materials, and machines. Surpluses gave us leeway. War scarcity allows no room for serious miscalculations or mistakes in judgment.

As surpluses have disappeared our war-production program has begun to run into difficulties. This was understood in advance and forecast by those observers who had studied the war economy of our enemies and of our allies.

It is possible now to predict that we shall run into increasingly serious difficulty from now until the end of the war if we do not meet the problem of scarcity head-on.

If we continue as we have begun, we shall try to overcome scarcity by robbing Peter to pay Paul. Already the armed services have cut back the proposed goals for important military end-products.

To date many of these cuts could be explained away. In another 6 months the discrepancies between our achievements and our goals will be so glaring as to call for sweeping shake-ups. Six months hence we shall be far worse situated than we are today to benefit from thorough reorganization. We shall have lost most of the leeway that remains to us.

And 6 months hence we shall hear as we hear today the warning not to change horses in the middle of the stream. Unfortunately, the "don't rock the boat" boys have won all the arguments and lost all the games to date.

It is easy to understand why this is the case. We are fighting an entirely new kind of war. Our enemies understand this. Our team does not. The stakes in this war are high. They are: The world of the future.

Our enemies are fighting to enslave this world. We say that we are fighting to free it; but how?

Throughout the first 2½ years of our effort 100 of America's largest corporations have received 75 percent of all war contracts by dollar volume. To them has gone the great bulk of new plants built at Government expense, over $14,000,000,000. To them are flowing in increasing numbers the workers seeking jobs in war industry. America, a land of giant corporations before the war, will emerge from this war with a larger share of its vastly expanded economy controlled by a smaller number of firms.

This situation has developed during this war more by accident than by design. It has been accompanied by the destruction of one small community after another through the shutting down of its factories and the migration of its people. The face of America is already greatly changed. But it rests with Congress whether these changes shall continue unnoticed and uncontrolled. The time for decision is now.

The military authorities have protested that there is no fundamental conflict between the civilian and military agencies charged with military production. In a certain sense this is true. Insofar as both groups have to date resisted the need for a fundamental change in our approach to the war production job, there has been too little conflict. Recently, however, certain new elements have been injected into the effort to improve the program. New personnel within the War Production Board has brought forward proposals directly counter to the usual approach found both within the contracting agencies and the Board itself.

This new personnel is production minded. It realizes the importance of clear lines of authority and responsibility. It places a high value upon the establishment and maintenance of flow schedules. It relies upon over-all programs to get its job done and it knows that such programs are unattainable without the constant flow to some central spot of continuous and up-to-date information on progress of that program.

The war production effort to date has been characterized by the absence of such understanding. No centralization of information has been possible because no adequate information about the progress of the program existed anywhere. Forecasts were a substitute for schedules. Frequently the end-products produced fell far short of the forecasts but in a number of instances production far exceeded the forecast. This lack of balance has meant that many end-products remained uncompleted for lack of certain components. Meanwhile some components and even some important end-products were produced out of all proportion to any immediately foreseeable demand. Many new productive facilities were produced without regard to the need for their product.

This lack of balance runs throughout our war production program to date. It cannot be corrected without a basic change in our general understanding of the problem.

The central problem is this: War today involves our entire economy. When we confront this fact squarely, the American people will agree that our war production must have the broadest possible popular base and the most democratic and representative control if we are to wage a successful war and make a lasting peace.

Today the drift is in the opposite direction. This drift arises from fear, the fear of excessive capacity in the post-war world. The forces struggling within our war production program have from the start fought over the question of expansion and of what should be expanded. The battle to expand raw-material facilities is still going on although it has been throughout a losing fight. Much of the reduction in the President's goals for 1942 and 1943 has stemmed from failure to expand this capacity. The resistance to raw-material expansion was followed by reluctance to convert. A competent investigation of conversion would reveal how limited it has been. A large part of our increased production will come from new facilities.

Because of these shortcomings of our production program the President's goals have been revised downward. It is possible to predict moreover that we shall not meet these goals if the present conduct of the program is not changed. It is easy to substantiate this prediction. An inspection of the records of the past 6 months will show how we have fallen behind our projected goals to date. The monthly goals for the coming year call for a rapid rate of increase. If we have been unable to maintain the much slower rates of increase in 1942, it is impossible to imagine that we can achieve the vastly accelerated increases for 1943.

There is a paradox hidden within our present situation. Our current production program aims at a speedy victory. Failure to meet the program's goals will prolong the war. Meanwhile, however short the program falls of early victory, it is piling up vast problems for America when the war is won. The capacity to produce 8,000,000 tons of shipping a year and 14,000 aircraft a month will be available to us at the war's end. Where do we go from there?

The same absence of balance which threatens our war-production program threatens

our post-war economy. If we continue destroying America's small businesses and uprooting our smaller communities, and many of our large ones as well, we shall not recognize post-war America. The clamor to maintain a vast standing Army and Navy and a huge armament industry will be almost irresistible.

The numbers in the armed services and in war industry whom we must demobilize are out of proportion to the numbers involved in the last war. We cannot expect our largest corporation alone to reemploy them. Indeed, the jobs for many of them are already disappearing as new metals, new materials, and new methods simplify the productive process. War, and especially this war, brings in its train a scientific and technical revolution. We cannot expect the borders of our own country, even with the best balanced economy we may achieve, to absorb the production of which we shall be capable.

The productive capacity which astounded the world in 1929 has been far surpassed already by the national output in the year 1942, and that we shall further extend it in 1943. This is the other half of the paradox previously cited. Unbalanced and disorganized as it has been, the productive effort is enormous. It is not self-correcting. We need the balance of a new war-production program to channelize the energies of this economy if we are to win the war, and in learning to maintain this balance throughout the war we shall learn much to ease our transition into the post-war period.

We should count ourselves fortunate that the best approach to our war-production program will also provide the best transition to a post-war economy. We can embrace this solution so much more wholeheartedly because it serves this double purpose.

BRIEF SURVEY OF WAR-PRODUCTION PROGRAM

After a year of war the people have learned that the War Production Board has not been engaged in the business of war production. They are told that the chaos in raw-material distribution, long recognized and admitted, will be remedied by the celebrated Controlled Materials Plan which will come into full operation 6 months from now. They look hopefully for improvement in manpower mobilization and wonder whether the recent changes in the War Manpower Commission will do away with compromise and conflict. They learn that the armed services divide their time on the home front between devising military strategy and attempting to organize war production and manpower. This is the method of partial war, not the method of total war. It harbors grave consequences for the future.

One year after Pearl Harbor, the Nation looks in vain for a unified program of all-out war production. Each new crisis in production evokes a piecemeal attempt at solution. Errors accumulate and crises intensify because these attempts are not part of a comprehensive program. The constant reshufflings in the Washington war agencies reflect our failures and not the progressive results of experience.

Some people would justify a disjointed war effort in terms of speed and urgency; they show a tragic misunderstanding of the requirements of total war. They cannot support their position with evidence that the output of war implements comes up to stated goals. The record is sharply against them.

We are still tinkering with the elements of war production when the entire resources of the Nation should have been fully mobilized.

Military procurement in peacetime presented no great problems. Established relationships of the procurement services with a small number of large corporations were relied upon for small quantities of items delivered in leisurely fashion. But this is war—total war—and the continuation of peacetime methods cannot achieve the transformation of the economy to an all-out war footing and the tremendous, uninterrupted output of weapons to triumph over the enemy.

Procurement means the letting of war contracts. This function is basic to any program of war production. It is idle to talk about raw-material control, production scheduling, and manpower allocation outside the framework of contract award. Today, a few large prime contractors are overloaded with war work, while the resources of many communities and numerous medium-sized and small plants lie idle. It is not too much to say that the procurement officials and through them the largest war contractors hold in their hands the power over the life and death of hundreds upon hundreds of American communities. The evidence does not permit doubt that these officials have failed signally to organize the Nation's resources for all-out war.

MATERIAL DISTRIBUTION

From the confusion of last summer arose widespread clamor for some control over materials allocation which would increase schedule and balance supply with the war demands. At that time production was falling steadily behind the projected goals. New facilities were being built with critical materials needed to make end products. Meanwhile, many component parts were produced in excess of the numbers required for immediate assembly, while other components lagged. As a result, completed end products fell short of the goals forecast. Large inventories of certain critical materials were simultaneously being hoarded.

Many observers disputed the contention that material shortages were primarily responsible for the break-down of the program. They argued that in the absence of any over-all program for increasing supplies and for scheduling the flow of war production from the raw material to the end product, break-down was inevitable. They contended that such scheduling was impossible under the existing methods of procurement and production. They pointed out that the War Production Board, granted sweeping powers by Executive order in January, had transferred its authority to the military and other procurement agencies. They insisted that the War Production Board must resume final authority, and—many added—actual operating control over procurement and production.

Your subcommittee has examined the controlled-materials plan. We find that it is a method of gearing the distribution of materials to the existing system of contract award. It underwrites the present control of the armed services and the other contracting agencies over procurement and production. It reinforces the present practice of distributing the bulk of the contracts to a limited number of large war producers, and places in the hands of the individual prime contractor control of the flow of material to producers of component parts.

The operations of the controlled-materials plan were outlined in part as follows in the general instructions issued on November 14, 1942, to those operating under it:

"The controlled-materials plan provides for the division of available supplies of controlled materials among the various claimant agencies in the interests of the most efficient use of these controlled materials in war production, and for the further division of the supplies of materials by the claimant agencies to their prime and secondary consumers.

"The plan contemplates centralized control by the War Production Board over the division of controlled materials among the claimant agencies and appropriate accounting so that no agency can overdraw its allotment. Detailed responsibility for the distribution of controlled materials through specific allotments to programs and schedules is decentralized—first, in the claimant agency primarily responsible for each program; and secondly, in the consumers responsible for each schedule.

* * * * *

"Responsibility for the preparation of bills of material shall be upon the claimant agency, with reference to the War Production Board, and upon the prime consumers, with reference to the claimant agency. This shall not prevent a claimant agency from working with secondary consumers in cooperation with the prime consumers insofar as is necessary to direct the preparation of accurate bills of material for subcontracted items."

The claimant agencies named above are principally the procurement agencies of the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and Lend-Lease Administration, and the Office of Civilian Supply. The prime consumers named above are chiefly the 100 largest war contractors having approximately 80 percent of all war contracts by dollar volume.

Controlled Materials Plan attempts to limit demand to supply. It resolves the conflict and competition of the several military procurement offices and of their prime contractors through a materials-quota system. Controlled Materials Plan is not a production program. It is not a scheduling plan. Before this subcommittee Mr. Eberstadt, presently responsible for Controlled Materials Plan, stated that Controlled Materials Plan is neutral with respect to programming and scheduling. The testimony submitted before us indicates that in fact Controlled Materials Plan reinforces a system in which both authority and responsibility are dispersed among the independent claimant agencies, who, in turn, have delegated their responsibilities to the prime contractors. It leaves the War Production Board which is nominally responsible for production without substantial check or control over any phase of production.

The quota system, which is the core of Controlled Materials Plan, has already been in operation with respect to the manufacture and distribution of machine tools since last May. Testimony of representatives of the Tools Divisions of both the War Production Board and the Army-Navy Munitions Board and of the individual prime contractors, revealed that under this little Controlled Materials Plan for machine tools there was no systematic procedure for checking requests for new machine tools against already available idle facilities. The various claimant agencies were nominally responsible for such checking, but each individually could not do so, and it was frankly admitted before this committee that the prime contractors' requests for machine tools were not properly checked.

This little Controlled Materials Plan has permitted prime contractors to accumulate large numbers of new machine tools and other facilities without reference to the large amount of capacity already available in the aggregate of small manufacturing plants.

Lack of machine tools in plants of prime contractors, under this system, has bottlenecked and delayed a number of important armament-production programs. Thousands of small plants which could have broken these artificially created bottlenecks have been shut down.

The final and fundamental shortcoming of Controlled Materials Plan is its basic assumption that raw materials are the limiting factor in the war production program. From this assumption the plan proceeds to a division of the assumedly fixed material production flow. Repeatedly since the beginning of America's defense program, assumptions that our flow of material supplies was necessarily limited to a given level of production have been disproved. It has been demonstrated that the chief factor determining the availability of supplies of many materials is the utilization of technology

and manpower and that the supply of these raw materials can be expanded or contracted according to needs of the war effort. The Controlled Materials Plan by its very organization continues that static approach toward raw material production which has thus far delayed the provision of adequate supplies of steel, copper, aluminum, rubber, magnesium, and other critical materials.

If Controlled Materials Plan were properly related to genuine production planning and scheduling it would form an indispensable part of an over-all production program. Doubtless under the able leadership of Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt this will become the eventual function of Controlled Materials Plan, but as first conceived and as presently set up, Controlled Materials Plan will not operate as a part of procurement planning.

In summary, Controlled Materials Plan will act only as a method of preventing the present inadequate military procurement services from paralyzing the war production program by their competition and conflict over facilities and materials. It would appear that Controlled Materials Plan is the capstone to the present inadequate structure. It is, as it were, a guarantee that the present defects will be prevented from blowing the whole system apart.

SCHEDULING

Controlled Materials Plan is no substitute for a production program operated by a centralized civilian agency exercising control over procurement. Until such an agency is in operation the Controlled Materials Plan will interfere with any attempts at scheduling.

To date what passes for scheduling has been done by the armed services and other contracting agencies. This should more accurately be called forecasting, and it has been highly inaccurate even as a forecast. These so-called schedules bear no relation to any over-all program of war production combined by a central agency supervising the separate contracting agencies. Indeed, these forecasts are not even integrated within the contracting agency as between the several end-products required. In fact, there is no adequate scheduling of components for an individual end-product.

The incapacity of the armed services and other contracting agencies individually to carry out scheduling for the war-production program is demonstrated in the current agreement of the armed services to return control over scheduling to the War Production Board. The reported terms of this agreement leave control over production and procurement in the present contracting agencies and hence will not accomplish the objectives embodied in S. 2871.

Temporarily the effect of this agreement will be a truce in which the vice chairman in charge of production will have a chance to demonstrate his proposed plans for scheduling and expediting aircraft production, subject to the limitations inherent in the retention of control over procurement and production in the hands of the armed services. Without a staff on his own, the vice chairman in charge of production must rely on the existing procurement organizations.

Control over materials cannot solve the flow of end products, and without a scheduling plan which works back from production of end products it may actually be disruptive of the productive program. Today the statement of requirements in terms of end products is in the hands of the armed services and the other contracting agencies and is not subject to review by any central agency. There is no balancing of these statements of requirements. Cut-backs of proposed output arising from alleged material shortages are not adjusted on any basis of over-all consideration of the capacity of our war production economy in terms of end products.

To expect that the vice chairman in charge of production can schedule even critical items without a return of procurement and production control to the War Production Board is almost certainly to predetermine the failure of the attempted scheduling. If, however, the present attempt demonstrates the need of such control, it will have served a useful purpose.

Scheduling must, to be an ultimate success, be built into the structure described in S. 2871, where it can be related to the work of other agencies, such as the Office of Manpower Supply. The Committee on Requirements and Program stipulated in S. 2871 will bring together the information needed to relate the flow of materials to the available manpower and facilities.

Startling examples of the failure to properly schedule the component parts of military items were brought to the committee's attention. As is well known, our aircraft program is behind schedule, and it would appear from testimony before the committee that this is primarily due to a failure to schedule the thousands of component parts flowing to the fabricating units.

One plane manufacturer illustrated his difficulties to the committee. A billet of steel to produce an 8-foot steel pipe was, according to schedule, to be in the August "melt" of the steel industry. However, this billet was not included in the August "melt." It was not in the September "melt" and not in the October "melt." At the time of the committee's hearings, the middle of November, this production executive had crossed the continent in search of some person in authority who could guarantee that this billet of steel would be kept in the November "melt." After seeing many officials on the west coast and at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, a friend introduced him to a colonel in the War Department in Washington who said that he could keep the billet in the November "melt." However, the executive preferred to wait until the pipe was delivered before being confident that it would be delivered. It is relevant to state that this billet of steel was ordered in May for delivery in September. It may have been delivered in December.

When similar difficulties in obtaining similar components exist, it is easy to understand why we are behind schedule and it is not difficult to understand that the scheduling of components is the key to maximum war production at the present time.

Hundreds of items similar to this steel billet are involved in the finished aircraft. If any one of these items is held up or is not properly scheduled, the manufacturer can only resort to substitutes and improvisation, but there is a limit to improvisation. This is demonstrated by our present failure to meet our aircraft production program.

MANPOWER MOBILIZATION

The Nation and the Congress are thoroughly familiar with present difficulties in mobilizing manpower. The Tolan and Truman committees have reported to the Congress that centralized civilian control of all manpower agencies is desperately needed to develop an intelligent manpower policy which will meet the needs of industry for skilled labor and the needs of the armed services for manpower.

On December 5, the President issued Executive Order No. 9279 conferring broad powers on the War Manpower Commission. The principal points established by this order appear to be:

1. Transfer to the War Manpower Commission of the Selective Service System.

2. Directing the Secretaries of War and Navy to consult with the chairman before determining the number of men required to be selected each month through the Selective Service System.

3. Restricting voluntary enlistment for the armed services.

4. Authorizing the Chairman to take all lawful and appropriate steps to channel all hiring through the United States Employment Service or to accord with such arrangements as the Chairman may approve.

5. Authorizing the Chairman to designate establishments, occupations, or areas of greater and less essentiality and to supervise transfer of workers in such establishments.

6. Conferring on the Chairman power to prevent or relieve inequities or hardships arising from his operations described in (4) and (5).

7. Making the Chairman a member of the Economic Stabilization Board.

By giving to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission a voice in establishing the rate and magnitude of withdrawals to military service, the new Executive order pointed toward the first requisite of a manpower policy. A definite figure of manpower needed by the armed services must be determined and a time schedule planned for withdrawals from civilian industry. The necessary recruiting and training policies for industrial and agricultural manpower cannot be developed outside this framework.

By placing Selective Service under the War Manpower Commission and restricting voluntary enlistment the new Executive order recognizes that occupation must become the primary basis for future deferments. Industry cannot be stripped of essential manpower by voluntary enlistment and by haphazard action of 6,500 local selective service boards, each subject to community pressures unrelated to occupational needs. These boards have considered the filling of military quotas their first responsibility. They lack information and are not technically qualified to pass upon industrial and agricultural requirements. Considerable testimony was presented to the subcommittee that highly skilled and irreplaceable machinists, for example, were drafted without regard to their key positions in war production. Essential workers in agriculture as well as in industry have been withdrawn in the same unplanned way.

Your subcommittee approves the inclusion of Selective Service within the War Manpower Commission and declares emphatically that the centering of greater responsibility for occupational deferment policy in the State and national offices of Selective Service would constitute a backward step. The Selective Service hierarchy, including occupational advisers, above the local boards, is composed almost entirely of military men whose qualifications do not bear upon the job in hand. Unfortunately, proposals to give greater authority to the Selective Service System in the complex job of mobilizing manpower continue despite the clear mandate in the Executive order that qualified civilian personnel must perform the job. If these ill-considered proposals are acted upon, complete manpower chaos will follow.

Your subcommittee considers that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission can give meaning to his new mandate only by the rapid, vigorous development of national and regional plans for the training and transfer of labor, and for a system of labor-utilization inspection to prevent hoarding of labor and to increase labor productivity. Testimony before the subcommittee indicates that the War Manpower Commission has hardly begun to establish the regional and area machinery necessary to operate an effective program of manpower mobilization. Unless the United States Employment Service is completely revamped and equipped with the necessary funds and personnel, the authority to channel workers through this service will come to naught.

While commending the principles contained in Executive Order 9279, and regarding the order as a forward step, your subcommittee is unanimous that it can be no substitute for the Office of War Mobilization embodied in S. 2871. Your subcommittee concurs with the judgment of the chairmen

of five congressional committees that manpower mobilization must proceed as part of a centrally managed production whole, or else the mobilizing agency will have the strait-jacketed role of a referral agency to the largest war contractors. The Executive order says nothing about the role of the manpower chief in production policy. So long as the relationships and responsibilities between the military and civilian agencies in war production are not clearly defined, the authority of the manpower chief over the demand for manpower is nominal. Techniques for the training, transferring, and inspecting the use of manpower cannot become really effective without a rational program for scheduling the demand for this manpower.

The contribution of S. 2871 in part is to define (1) the relationships between military and civilian agencies for the whole war program and (2) the operating responsibilities within the civilian administration of the war program. The new executive order achieves neither of these fundamental necessities and therefore can be no substitute. To the extent that the new order confers added power as against the old one, it may cut even more across existing lines of responsibility. So while it is a step in the right direction, the goal of unified war production can be achieved only if other steps are taken simultaneously.

INTEGRATED PRODUCTION PLANNING

There are three alternatives before us: (1) Proper mobilization as represented in S. 2871, (2) continuance of the muddling through with the present dispersion of powers and lack of coordination, (3) centralization of control of the civilian economy under the military.

The attitude that we can somehow muddle through this war without proper organization is one which invites defeat. Our offensive warfare in north Africa has decreased the ranks of those who fail to recognize the need for total mobilization. This has, however, been offset by the tendency of some to believe that we can now rest on our oars, and that the battle has been already won.

Your subcommittee believes that the Axis enemy cannot be defeated by haphazard, partial use of our resources. We believe that the American people desire and are prepared for all necessary steps to mobilize our complete resources.

The job of the military is to defeat the enemy on the field of battle. Its experience, personnel, training, and viewpoint do not fit it for centralized production and procurement planning. We agree with the opinion of Mr. Bernard Baruch so ably expressed in a memorandum submitted to a joint congressional and Cabinet commission in 1931:

"It is absolutely impracticable for the War Department to control industrial mobilization because:

"(a) It is an economic problem requiring the ablest leadership in industry and utterly unsuited to military administration.

"(b) The central control agency must act as arbiter of conflicting demands—the greatest of which is that of the civilian population. No single competitor, such as the War Department, should be entrusted with such arbitration.

"(c) The job of the War Department is our armed forces. That is a big job. To pile on top of it the task of economic mobilization would insure the failure of both.

"There is an inevitable tendency in the War Department to forget these principles even in planning. Their function is to say what they want and when and where they want it. The job of industrial control is to see that they get it strictly on their specification. We must neither militarize industry nor industrialize the Army."

Full mobilization of our economy must rest in civilian hands. Manpower, contracts, facilities, scheduling, and raw materials are all related elements in war production. The proper decisions can be made and policies developed only when these elements are integrated into an over-all program. The Office of War Mobilization in the bill now before us would provide the instruments for achieving such a program. This bill, in effect, calls for an economic general staff in relation to the civilian war effort. It establishes a clear line of command from the President on down, just as for our military strategy there is a clear line of command from our Commander in Chief and the joint chiefs of staff to the specific military operations being undertaken in various parts of the world. We can no longer afford the peacetime luxury of overlapping, duplicating, and conflicting Federal agencies. We can no longer tolerate the disturbances to production created by lack of adequate authority and responsibility. It has become necessary to break cleanly with the present situation and to consolidate our war agencies into one smoothly functioning machine. Then only will maximum war production be obtained.

The proposed legislation will, we believe, make a major contribution to America's war effort by (1) locating final responsibility for policy-making decisions in one set of hands; (2) redefining the operating responsibilities of all subordinate agencies so as to minimize or to eliminate all current jurisdictional disputes; (3) decentralizing operating responsibility in regional and district offices; (4) providing the Director of War Mobilization and all his subordinates with a comprehensive information on current progress; (5) establishing for the first time adequate machinery to balance the requirements of the armed forces with the potential capacity of the American economy; (6) creating an advisory group broadly representative of the American productive economy to guide and assist the Director of War Mobilization on policy decisions.

1. The proposed legislation will locate final responsibility for policy-making decisions in one civilian head subject to approval by the President.

Unity of command and full information as to current developments are indispensable in wartime. In modern war it is as true for military production as it is for combat operation. But war production and other organized efforts to back up the fighting front must be directed by civilians.

Unified control over industrial and agricultural production, transportation, and essential civilian needs has been lacking to date.

No single individual and no group of individuals is to blame for this. It is attributable to the difficulties of converting our peacetime economy and governmental apparatus to the demands of modern war. Nevertheless, we cannot afford to continue longer in this fashion.

The people think there are too many agencies with overlapping responsibility. The people think there are too many jurisdictional disputes between these agencies. The people think too many operations are being carried on from Washington. The people persist in the belief that many of the tasks ahead are essentially simple if properly organized.

We believe that the people are right. This legislation, which we support, will stop the piling one agency on another. All future reorganizations will take place from the top down. Final decisions will rest with the Director of War Mobilization, subject, of course, to check by the President.

2. The proposed legislation will redefine the operating responsibilities of all agencies, to minimize or to eliminate all current jurisdictional disputes.

Testimony taken by this subcommittee indicates that unwarranted delays and failure to make decisions are more serious than actual errors in decisions by these agencies.

The resulting confusion has had an adverse effect on both the administrators and the public. At a time when action was of prime importance one operation after another was paralyzed for lack of decision.

Where mistakes have been made, they have frequently sprung from the absence of any over-all program. Lacking such a program and a central authority for integrating the several subordinate agencies, war production has stumbled from one crisis into another.

The continued existence of competing agencies defies the formulation of a program. The absence of a program, in turn, makes effective scheduling impossible. Manpower cannot be related to production or production to transportation.

To date the armed services and other contracting agencies have retained jurisdiction over procurement and production. Control over the flow of materials has been lodged in the hands of the War Production Board, but much of the responsibility for issuing priority orders until recently has been left with the armed services. Meanwhile, manpower functions have been dispersed among the War Department, the War Manpower Commission, the War Production Board in its various divisions, and the Selective Service Administration. Many other agencies and many divisions of the agencies mentioned have been operating in these fields without any clear definition of function and responsibility.

3. The proposed legislation will decentralize operating responsibility in regional and district offices.

Full knowledge of productive capacity currently available is to be had only at the local level. Here also the decisions must be made which achieve day to day balance in the production program. Until authority for contract letting and adjustment of manpower supply to demand is decentralized our war program will continue to lag.

This is well known to men experienced in production. They are optimistic about the achievements possible through genuine decentralization. Their optimism derives from experience.

A decentralized war production program will need to use more production engineers outside the individual plants in order that fewer may be needed inside those plants. Within a given firm every use of a production engineer for trouble shooting removes that man from the maintenance of a steady flow of production. Serious difficulties nowadays are most likely to appear several steps back in the flow of production and tend to involve many other producers. Proper scheduling will quickly show up such developing bottlenecks; the presence of a qualified man who can understand the trouble will release the energies of half a dozen firms.

This legislation establishes regional offices of the Office of War Mobilization, production and supply, manpower supply, economic stabilization, and technical mobilization. It also stipulates the formation of a regional board over which will preside a chairman who is the representative of the Director of War Mobilization. Thus, unified command extends from the national to the regional level and to the district level.

Once the proposed organization has been established the national offices will be concerned primarily with major policy and operating decisions. The existing war agencies have not functioned in this manner. Instead, they have constantly organized "rescue parties" to cope with problems which should have long been anticipated and planned for.

4. The proposed legislation will permit the Director of War Mobilization and his subordinates to obtain comprehensive information on current progress.

A committee on requirements and program is to be established to bring together representatives of the contracting agencies and the several offices attached to the Office of War Mobilization; the Director of War Mobilization is made chairman of the committee. Attached to this committee are to be a division of program planning and a division of progress reporting.

Before we can have effective program planning we need to improve the current system of progress reporting. And improvements in progress reporting depend upon effective scheduling.

To date what passes for scheduling among the armed services and other contracting agencies should properly be called forecasting. These forecasts have left much to be desired. Most of them have overshot the mark, but a few have fallen short by a wide margin. The production program has been bedeviled by overproduction of some items and some components while most items have been falling short of our goals and our needs. Many bottlenecks could have been prevented by a proper scheduling system.

5. The proposed legislation will establish for the first time adequate machinery for balancing the requirements of the armed forces with potential capacity of the American economy.

This is the job assigned to the Committee on Requirements and Program. As chairman of this committee, the Director of War Mobilization will secure from the armed services and other claimant agencies statements of their requirements. By the transfer of responsibility for letting contracts and their fulfillment to the Office of Production and Supply, the new plan leaves to the armed services and other claimant agencies the responsibility for stating their requirements and specifications. Because we are in a shortage situation, both requirements and specifications must be reviewed by the Committee on Requirements and Program and cut back to conform with the over-all program.

This proposal makes the Director of War Mobilization responsible for the establishment of a balanced war production program. Since the end result of this program is an effective American fighting machine, the purpose of creating such a committee is to bring into balance the existing program. It is not enough to allocate among the competing claimant agencies a fractional part of the materials they desire or to require them to adjust their individual programs to conform to the available supply of materials.

6. The proposed legislation will create an advisory group broadly representative of the American production economy through which the Director of War Mobilization can obtain guidance and assistance on policy decisions.

A Board of War Mobilization is to be established consisting of representatives of industry, labor, agriculture, and the general public. This Board is to be consulted on all major policy questions. It is not to be given veto power.

By this means it is hoped to give the Director access to representatives of the leading groups engaged in war production. If the Director knows that his actions will have the support of these leading groups represented on the Board, he can proceed quickly and with reasonable confidence of general support throughout the country.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, subsequently Senate bill 607, to which I have referred, was reintroduced at this session of the Congress, and was referred, by the wisdom of the Senate, to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. A very able subcommittee of that committee was appointed, under the chairmanship of the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

The members of that subcommittee are the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

That subcommittee, Mr. President, went most earnestly and seriously into this baffling question of how to get the best results out of American economy in the prosecution of the war, how to avoid the conflicts which were frustrating the national war effort, and how to resolve the clashes and controversies in furtherance of the war itself. Great credit goes to that subcommittee for its accomplishments.

That subcommittee, Mr. President, made a very able report to the Military Affairs Committee on the 13th of this month, in which a definite and concrete recommendation for setting up a war mobilization committee was made to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks, the report from the Subcommittee on War Mobilization to which I have just adverted.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR MOBILIZATION—REPORT TO THE SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

Mr. Chairman, we have the honor to submit this, the first interim report of this Committee on War Mobilization, in the interest of clarifying certain issues in war production which have become matters of foremost national concern. The committee, through enactment of Senate Resolutions 33 and 107 has been charged with the duty and responsibility of inquiring into the mobilization of the Nation's resources for war.

I

This first interim report is based on hearings held in executive session on April 16, 17, and 19 and on certain independent studies and investigations pursued by the committee. Testimony was given by Justice James F. Byrnes, Mr. Paul V. McNutt, and Mr. Charles E. Wilson with regard to the interrelation of the Office of Economic Stabilization, War Manpower Commission, and War Production Board. Questioning of the witnesses was directed principally toward section 3 of S. 607, a bill to establish an Office of War Mobilization. S. 607 was referred to this committee for study and consideration.

Section 3 reads as follows:

"There is hereby created a Committee on Requirements and Program under the chairmanship of the Director and consisting of the Secretaries of War and the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Administrators of the four constituent offices of the Office of War Mobilization. This Committee shall develop, subject to the approval of the President, a comprehensive national program for maximum use of resources for military and essential civilian needs. This program shall be based on schedules of military requirements furnished by the War and Navy Departments and determinations as to minimum essential civilian needs and available resources by the Office of War Mobilization."

It is evident that this section proposes the establishment of a program committee, in which is vested full authority, subject to the approval of the President, for establishing an over-all war-production program, and the powers to keep all parts of this program in balance.

Evidence studied by the committee shows urgent necessity for such action. The committee feels that these facts are of such compelling importance at this time that they should be released at once rather than at the termination of the committee's deliberations concerning S. 607.

The primary fact which we must record is that in many essential programs we are behind schedule. Several key programs have been materially reduced; among them aircraft, tanks, and ordnance.

In the opinion of this committee the principal cause for our failure to meet the President's production goals has been the lack of proper mobilization policies and the necessary war organization to execute those policies. Alleged material and manpower shortages are a result of these lacks.

In almost every phase of the war effort we have continued to rely upon customary practices and relationships. We have not as yet developed the unified policy and operational structure which is the basis of competent organization in Government as well as in business.

We are confronted by a deep-going crisis. Our various war programs, all essential, are out of balance with one another and in most cases are short of the goals set. We face the crucial months of the war with world-wide offensive action demanded of our armed forces. Yet in Washington there is much talk about cut-backs, of renewed production of civilian goods. Rather than every effort being bent toward perfecting war mobilization organization and policy, we find attention concentrated on how to avoid the inevitable changes in customary government and production practices and relationships which alone will release the mighty productive and manpower resources of the American Nation for an all-out war effort.

We find inadequate steel capacity with the result that one program must be sacrificed for another. We find that facilities have been overexpanded in certain industries, while small plants able to do the job have gone unused.

In brief, no over-all production program has existed or does now exist. Nor does any war agency exist, the responsibility of which is to balance and integrate the various but equally essential programs. While we have achieved much in war production, still for want of policy and organization we find ourselves falling short of all-out mobilization, short of the production needed for our fighting men.

S. 607 assumes particular timeliness in view of the current controversy raging over the needs of the rubber program versus the needs of the 100-octane program. Charges and countercharges by those engaged in this controversy show beyond question that each of the several major production programs was conducted independently of all others, that balance has not been maintained, and that almost every program is behind schedule.

There is nothing new in this, for the conflict between the needs of the rubber program, the 100-octane aviation gasoline program, and the naval escort vessel program has already been conducted in the national press at least three times within the past 6 months and many more times before congressional committees.

Several months ago, at the time of the Casablanca Conference, this particular conflict was reported to have been resolved. Now it flares again. It would seem that lack of balance in the war-production program is clearly exhibited by the recurrence of this old conflict. It is logical to assume that absence of a balanced program will continue

to prevent achievement of our war production goals and will become the occasion for further cut-backs, unless and until some over-all balancing of the various programs is accomplished.

War necessarily dictates that manpower, facilities, materials, and every other resource in every field, all are the components in our war economy and must move together in balance to obtain maximum production. Every resource is essential and upon their proper joint scheduling rests the possibility of the success of our entire production program.

II

Common sense would seem to indicate that, with the life of the Nation and of the free world at stake, keymen who are responsible for the various parts of our war-production program must meet together regularly in order that fundamental production policy decisions may be reached on a joint basis and in an orderly fashion.

Perhaps the three most fundamental divisions of the war mobilization structure, insofar as production is concerned, are the Office of Economic Stabilization, the War Manpower Commission, and the War Production Board. The three witnesses, each representing one of these key agencies, agreed that their three programs are interdependent and interrelated. However, each testified that policy decisions in his particular agency are confined to the limits of authority delegated to that agency, and that such decisions are reached by the individual agencies on a unilateral basis.

Justice Byrnes, Mr. McNutt, and Mr. Wilson agreed that decisions of each have important bearing on the work of the other two. They testified that informal ad hoc interagency committees often meet on special problems, but the committee finds that no permanent over-all program committee exists.

In addition to informal interagency meetings, the witnesses pointed out that regular sessions of the Cabinet afford a formal mechanism whereby basic program and policy conflicts could be resolved.

The committee does not question the good will or competence of the Government officials responsible for various parts of the war-production program. The committee does not question the need for informal interagency committees and relationships, nor does it question the effective operation of the Cabinet system.

But the bald fact is that basic policy and program conflicts continue. Regardless of the particular effectiveness of the individual administrators, informal interagency meetings, and the functioning of the Cabinet, the committee is of the opinion that those officials directly and immediately responsible for the various critical war programs should establish joint policy and be jointly responsible for the smooth functioning of the war-production effort.

III

It would appear that the War Manpower Commission has been reduced virtually to the status of a service station, attempting to supply requirements as stated by a number of claimants. The agency exercises no control over the manpower demands of these claimants. The Chairman of the Commission testified that requirements of manpower for the armed forces are determined unilaterally by the War and Navy Departments. The Food Administrator determines manpower requirements in agriculture, and these are not reviewed by the War Manpower Commission. Demands of war contractors for manpower, according to the Chairman, are merely being checked on a statistical basis to determine whether original statements of needs conform with final hirings. There has been no practical control over the validity of demands by war contractors or to prevent hoarding, inefficient use of labor, unnecessary absenteeism, or labor idleness resulting from poor production methods and organization.

The evidence indicated that no machinery exists for balancing the demands of the various claimants in such a way as to preclude the possibility of any one program obtaining manpower at the expense of others.

Testimony showed that war production was being expanded or cut back in individual plants without consultation with the War Manpower Commission. Further, according to testimony, such expansions and cut-backs do not become known to the War Production Board until after they have taken place, and then in many cases by accident.

The War Manpower Chairman is without power to alter the demands placed upon the Commission. If he wishes to revise any demand placed upon War Manpower Commission, the Chairman must take up each question separately with the President. Such was the procedure in the determination of the size of the Army.

Recognizing that it has been excluded from the field of manpower demand, the War Manpower Commission has come to consider itself as a supply agency. However, the war contractors continue to hire through their own employment offices. Thus the War Manpower Commission has been excluded in most industrial areas from even its declared function as a supply agency.

There is only one activity left which the Manpower Commission can perform. That function is to freeze manpower on the job.

The War Manpower Commission has undertaken steps to freeze the supply of manpower. In the past 6 months it has established stabilization plans in certain areas which prevent a worker from leaving his present job unless the employer agrees to his separation, or unless the worker has obtained a "certificate of separation" from the local office of the United States Employment Service. By this arrangement, the employment service acts primarily as a court of appeals on the decision of the war contractor to hold the worker.

Under the Executive Order of April 8, the chairman of the War Manpower Commission has prohibited separation of an essential worker from his present employment if such separation has as its cause the inducement of higher wages. This action tends to freeze the supply of manpower into the present pattern of inefficiency.

IV

Testimony of the War Production Board vice chairman indicated that that agency also has been reduced virtually to the "service-station" status. Principal demands for facilities and raw materials represent unilateral decisions by claimant agencies and the War Production Board exercises no serious power of review. Unilateral determinations are made by the armed services, maritime and shipping agencies, the Food Administrator, the Rubber Director, and the Petroleum Administrator. Although the War Production Board allocates raw materials in bulk, it does not undertake to balance the fundamental elements of the production program. Likewise, it does not act to assure the most efficient utilization of facilities, raw materials, and other resources. In brief, there is a conspicuous absence of over-all balancing of programs that come within the purview of the War Production Board.

The Executive order establishing the War Production Board clearly intended to set up a central agency fully empowered to mobilize the Nation's resources for war. This was true to an even greater extent of the orders setting up the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board and the Office of Production Management, the latter of which included authority to mobilize manpower resources. It would appear, however, that most of these powers were delegated to the various agencies which now compete with one another in such a way as to engender conflicts inimical to maximum production.

Theoretically the War Production Board has general authority over contracts, use of facilities, materials allocation, and scheduling. In practice, these powers have been and are now exercised by the separate and competing procurement services to which they have been delegated.

Only in two particulars have the old relationships been altered by recent administrative changes. The War Production Board has undertaken to schedule the flow of critical components. Also, Mr. Charles E. Wilson is exerting very real pressure to improve inventory control and to improve scheduling of materials by the services.

In no single phase of the war-production program does centralized control exist at the present time. This is true of materials, distribution, scheduling, use of facilities, and contracting. In summary, the War Production Board is not a war-production board. It does not function as an over-all production organization.

V

There has been considerable discussion of the relationship of stabilization policies to the mobilization of manpower and production. In the Executive order of April 8, the Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization is instructed to 'hold the line." The President's veto of the Bankhead bill, the dismissal of 10,000 wage cases by the War Labor Board, the announcement by Price Administrator Prentiss Brown that no general rent increase would be granted, the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission in rolling back freight rates—these and other steps would seem to indicate that the administration has decided to "hold the line" against inflation.

Within the "hold-the-line" framework, the Executive order of April 8, in sections 1, 2, and 5 authorizes the Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization to alter relative prices and wages in order "to maintain and increase production." However, so far as the committee could discover, there is at the present time no comprehension of the need for a flexible wage and price policy within the general price and wage levels in order to "maintain and increase production."

Indeed, there is little understanding of the complete interdependence of stabilization, manpower, and production policies. Nor does there exist at the present time any mechanism to provide for policy decisions which concern all three aspects of the war-production effort.

Failure to understand the interdependence of wage and price policies with the mobilization of production facilities and manpower is reflected in the changing wage and price policy decisions.

The Shipbuilding Stabilization Agreement endorsed by the War Labor Board created a liberal wage scale in order to flow manpower into this war industry.

In the Non-Ferrous Metal Mining case, wage and price decisions were made a part of a complex manpower and production policy.

But in the Packing case, in the West Coast Air Frame case, and in other cases, wage decisions have attempted to sidestep the manpower problem. And the Executive order of April 8 serves to freeze wage inequalities which hinder manpower mobilization.

Because the War Manpower Commission has failed to fulfill its function as a supply agency, prime contractors have relied upon wage increases to hold or obtain needed manpower. Seventy-five to eighty-five percent of all wage cases before the War Labor Board have represented requests by employers to raise wages for manpower reasons.

Because wages and prices have not been considered as production questions, our price

and wage policies have been piecemeal, depending in many cases upon considerations peculiar to the specific case.

If wages and prices had been administered as production and manpower instruments, stabilization of both the wage and price structure by industry-wide agreements, with incentive payments for increased production, would have become the basis for policy at an early stage.

Only if wages and prices become production instruments will it be possible to achieve overall stabilization of the economy.

In the case of armament production a serious error has been made by not giving enough recognition to the close relation of prices to production. Under the present cost-plus system there are no incentives for efficient use of facilities, labor, and materials. The cost-plus system, combined with the lack of production controls, constitutes the root of a tremendous waste of resources and inflationary tendencies.

Justice Byrnes testified that his function as Director of Economic Stabilization primarily is one of settling disputes. He described his function as that of a "court of appeals." His agency has chosen to limit itself to curative rather than preventive action. No problem is considered by the Office of Economic Stabilization until it has reached an impasse through controversy among subordinate agencies.

It is clear that the Office of Economic Stabilization does not operate as an over-all agency to balance the various war-production and mobilization programs.

VI

The three witnesses described advisory boards which now exist for the purpose of discussing policy on a joint basis. Each of these boards is attached to one or the other of the three major agencies—Office of Economic Stabilization, War Manpower Commission, and War Production Board. Top officials of related agencies are included in the membership. But no one of these existing advisory boards has the authority to function as an over-all mobilization organization. They have never served in such a capacity, with the result that important decisions have always been made on a unilateral basis by the agency having jurisdiction over the program in question.

For example, when questioned on policy determinations in the drafting of fathers for military service, testimony of the three witnesses indicated that no joint decision was reached in the matter. Drafting of fathers, according to the testimony, has been treated purely as a manpower problem within the narrow jurisdiction of the War Manpower Commission. The testimony revealed that the effect of the drafting of fathers on war production was not considered, or at least that the War Production Board was not consulted in this connection. The effect of this action on the national economy in removing principal income sources from large groups of families has not been considered by the economic stabilization agency.

Similarly, the whole question of the size of the Army and the use of manpower in general has been decided on a narrow agency basis after unilateral decisions on requirements by the armed services. In no instance was a joint policy decision reached by representatives of all affected agencies.

The committee also discussed incentive wages with the three witnesses. It appears that decisions are to be made by one agency, this time by the War Production Board, although the problem is common to all agencies.

The poor results in aircraft production by the Ford Willow Run plant were discussed with the three witnesses. It was agreed that this specific problem involved questions of manpower, production, and economic stabilization. Yet it has been treated purely as a War Production Board problem and no attempt has been made to reach a joint agreement on action needed.

In the case of the airplane industry as a whole, it has been estimated that the present program requires 750,000 additional workers by the end of 1943. However, it appears that existing and even higher production commitments could be met with one-half or one-third of the additional workers if steps were taken to obtain the most efficient utilization of manpower already on the job.

But the aircraft agencies of the Federal Government do not appear to be taking the steps necessary for making these substantial reductions in manpower requirements. Undoubtedly this situation is duplicated in the shipbuilding program and other major production programs.

Thus, each particular production program may be using 20 to 100 percent more manpower than it actually needs. Under the present hit-and-miss system not only are excessive requests for manpower being made, and no controls imposed to obtain efficient use of labor, but production goals are being cut back because steps necessary for efficiency have not been introduced. The President's aircraft program of 125,000 planes for 1943 has already been cut below 100,000 planes.

VII

SUMMARY

It is with regret that the committee is compelled to report that war mobilization is in crisis. Either we go forward to undertake the integration of basic mobilization policies in the fields of manpower, production, and stabilization, or we will continue to proceed haltingly from one emergency to another.

The time has come—indeed, it has all but passed—for basic policy integration. We cannot accept the doctrine that we are in the middle of a war and therefore cannot undertake to effect total mobilization. That is a doctrine of despair. It must be discarded if we are to forge ahead to victory.

The committee will continue its hearings on S. 607 in order to study completely the existing war organization and its effect on the mobilization of the Nation's resources in America's battle for survival.

VIII

We recommend that the Senate Military Affairs Committee report a revised version of section 3 of S. 607 to the floor of the Senate as a separate bill. The following is the wording of the recommended bill:

"A bill to create a Board charged with the duty of formulating a war mobilization program, and for other purposes.

"Be it enacted, etc.,

"SECTION 1. Board established: (a) There is hereby created a War Mobilization Board. The Board shall have a membership of 13, being comprised of a Chairman, to be appointed by the President, to be paid a salary of $10,000, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Lend-Lease Administrator, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the War Food Administrator, the Petroleum Administrator for War (serving also for the Solid Fuels Administration), the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration (serving also for the Maritime Commission), the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, and the Director of Economic Stabilization.

"(b) In the event any of the offices named in paragraph (a) of this section shall be combined, abolished, or otherwise reorganized the President shall make such changes in the personnel of the Board as he shall deem appropriate.

"SEC. 2. Duties of the Board: The Board shall:

"(a) Formulate and submit to the President for approval, after consultation with such other Federal officials as it deems necessary, a comprehensive war mobilization program for mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's resources for the supply of military forces and essential civilian need. As part of the war mobilization program, the Board shall provide for stabilization and adjustment of the national economy in accordance with the needs of full mobilization. The war mobilization program shall include a detailed schedule of military and essential civilian production and specific quotas of manpower and allocation of other resources, including facilities and materials, to be made available to the military forces, to particular categories of military and civilian production, and to other productive and economic activity. In preparing the war mobilization program the Board shall take into account schedules of requirements and available resources furnished by the appropriate agencies of the Federal Government.

"(b) In order to effectuate the war mobilization program, the Chairman of the Board, with the approval of a majority of the Board, shall have the power, within the limits and authority vested in the executive departments and agencies concerned with the subject matter under consideration, to issue directives on policies, plans, procedures, and methods to such departments and agencies, and to order any executive department or agency to utilize its facilities, services, and personnel and to take such action under the authority vested in it as the Chairman, with the approval of a majority of the Board, deems necessary.

"It shall be the duty of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government to comply with these directives and orders."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, Senate bill 607, to which I have adverted, and which I have asked to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. President, we recall that as early as May 1940, when it became apparent that the resources at least of this nation had to be mobilized into an arsenal of democracy if democracy were to be saved in the world, the President set up the National Defense Advisory Committee. That committee was succeeded in January 1941 by the Office of Production Management. The process of evolution continued and in September 1941, the Supply, Priorities, and Allocations Board was created by Executive order. The situation demanded further alteration and change, so that at last in January 1942, by Executive order, the War Production Board was created, and there was appointed a chairman of the War Production Board. That board continued to function until the summer of 1942, with a very considerable lack of decisiveness in its policy and a lack of adequacy in the performance of the obligations imposed upon it by the President's Executive order of January 1942.

Finally, Mr. Donald Nelson, the Chairman of the War Production Board, brought to his aid—I believe it is correct to say with the assistance of representatives of the War Department and the Navy Department—one of the able men of this country, Mr. Charles Wilson, the head of General Electric Co., which has a fine production record during the war, and Mr. Wilson has made a signal contribution to the war effort by the way that he, with relatively limited powers, has improved the correlation and coordination and the concert of effort among the various agencies producing, distributing, and transporting for war.

But it was obvious, Mr. President, that there was still no authority in any person other than in the President himself to pull the heads of these various departments together and demand that they pull like a team for the nation, and not for their own departments or agencies. Instance after instance occurred wherein the national effort was either paralyzed, or frustrated, or at least delayed, by lack of cooperation and coordination on the part of the executive agencies who should have been a team, but in many instances were a galaxy of prima donnas.

So at last the President in the spirit of the effort of the Congress and in furtherance thereof, has finally vested in Mr. Justice James F. Byrnes the authority to correlate and coordinate and to put into concert the efforts of the various Federal agencies, so that at last they will be a mighty team pulling a mighty nation to a glorious victory.

Mr. Byrnes' powers, Mr. President, are very great under this Executive order. Most of us would have preferred perhaps that the authority be set up by the Congress, but those of us who have been the sponsors of this legislation are concerned about results and not honors and not even technique. The nation is concerned about getting the job done.

But we do have a right to look with peculiar interest and attention upon the administration of this Executive order by its able director, Mr. Justice James F. Byrnes. Mr. Byrnes has authority, not only to pull into consultation and counsel the various Federal agencies, but it is their duty to obey his directives in furtherance of the national economic effort. Of course, Mr. Byrnes does not have authority over the military or the naval operations of the Nation, but he does have authority, as this Executive order says—

> To unify the activities of Federal agencies and departments engaged in or concerned with production, procurement, distribution, or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products and to resolve and determine controversies between such agencies or departments.

With a single unimportant exception.

I know I express the hope of many Senators, Mr. President, when I say that I am entertaining the belief that Mr. Justice Byrnes will carry this principle of correlation and coordination out of Washington into the field itself, into the various regions of the Nation, even into the several States, and, if need be, even into the vital producing areas of the Nation, for these levels of coordination must occur throughout the whole effort or the effort will be frustrated and impaired.

I rather regret that the President did not see fit to have added into his Executive order the duty of the Director to take into consultation representatives of management, of labor, of agriculture, and of the public, so that there might have been brought to bear upon the Executive director the greatest possible wisdom from the country, but knowing as I do, and as Senators do, Mr. President, the character and the open-mindedness and the anxiety of Mr. Justice Byrnes always to avail himself of the best of counsel and knowledge, I am assured in my own mind that he will always be accessible to these groups and that he will call them into counsel whenever occasion may require.

Mr. President, in Washington is, or has recently been, the Prime Minister of Great Britain. The President and the Prime Minister, with the technical staffs, have been in consultation about making and launching the final offensive upon which we rely to bring the evil Axis to its knees, to bring at last its leaders to the hangman's noose. That cannot be accomplished, Mr. President, within our mighty potential, unless it be totally employed, unless the whole weight of our strength be thrown against the enemy in proper timing and concert with our allies. Now at last there is a member of this War Mobilization Committee, the head of the Munitions Assignment Board, who acts in concert with our allies all over the world. I am led to believe, therefore, that our leaders have been thinking in terms, not only of coordinating our domestic effort, but of bringing into accord our struggles all around the world among the members of the United Nations. That is a good sign. Democracy is at last working effectively.

So I compliment the President, if I am not puny in doing so, upon drawing tighter the lines of control of our effort, and directing it with greater energy and clarity against the enemy. I hope, therefore, that we will hear no more of these clashes and conflicts of Federal agencies and officials; that at last we will recognize that there is someone to whom we may appeal other than the busy President, to bring us out of too frequent chaos, and to expedite the happy day of victory.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I notice that under the President's order a board composed of five men, in addition to the chairman of the board, is set up. Is it the Senator's understanding that votes will be taken by the board on the questions pending before it? In other words, what I fear is that perhaps through the new arrangement the War Production Board and the men responsible for its operation and functioning will completely lose their authority and their power to do their jobs, because they have been placed as a minority in the executive board. What is the Senator's opinion on that point?

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator, who has been most helpful in the whole effort to get something like this into reality, for his question and suggestion. If I thought that the development anticipated or feared by the able Senator would occur I, too, would be alarmed, because I think it would be contrary to the national interest.

However, Mr. President, with the War Production Board being executively administered by an able man like Mr. Charles Wilson, who has already done a marvelous job of administration, who knows production from first-hand and from long experience, and who knows how to get a job done, I am sure that Mr. Justice Byrnes is too wise a man to interfere with the authority of so able a man as Mr. Charles Wilson, in his sphere of operations.

However, Mr. President, I conceive that Mr. Justice Byrnes' function will be more nearly to coordinate the efforts and activities of all Federal agencies, and to stimulate the one and retard the other, when occasion might demand, to initiate suggestions which might improve the whole effort and better the whole pattern, and more or less to be the captain of the team or the director of all the various organizations, so that he might get the best out of them all, and keep them in balance and in equilibrium.

For example, if Mr. Justice Byrnes were to discover that it was essential in the national effort to have better cooperation among the procurement agencies, he would not have the Maritime Commission pulling in one direction with a policy, and the Army and Navy pulling in still another direction, or in two directions—which is more likely to be the case—and other agencies doing something else. I anticipate seeing the day come when such a man as Mr. Justice Byrnes will have the representatives of all the procurement agencies of the Government seated around a table, and then will have there the representatives of the War Manpower Commission, the representatives of the War Production Board, and the representatives of all the other agencies which must act in concert in order to get the job done. Then they will operate in concert and will exchange their views, and Mr. Justice Byrnes will make the decisions and will get the right men in the right places, and eventually will get the whole machine going in the right direction.

Mr. President, I am sure it is in the mind of every member of the Senate that recently we had quite a controversy here about who retarded the octane-gas program, the synthetic-rubber program, and the escort-vessel program. It was generally agreed that the thing which retarded the development of those programs was the shortage of valves. As luck would have it, a few days ago when I was coming from Florida on an airplane I found myself seated beside the head of a valve-manufacturing enterprise in the South. With this controversy fresh in my mind, upon learning that he was a valve manufacturer, we

got talking on the subject of the production of valves, and I led the discussion into an inquiry of him as to how there came to be a shortage of valves for those three programs. He says the reason was that when the valve manufacturers came to Washington to find out how many valves were needed, they could not find anyone who knew. They were told that more valve-producing facilities would be needed. But they could not find anyone who would tell them how many valves would be needed. They could not find anyone who would standardize the valves that the industry was making. On the contrary, some of the agencies wanted them to make literally thousands of modifications in standardized valves which could be produced in large volume.

It was only after all the programs had been laid out—after the decisions had been made as to the number of ships, the quantity of octane gasoline, and the volume of synthetic rubber needed—and after the production on all of them was under way, that it was at last discovered that there was a shortage of valves and a shortage of facilities with which to produce them. That situation came about because there was no coordination of the whole effort. The Nation is not just making synthetic rubber or octane gasoline or escort vessels. The United States of America is at war, and our great task is in getting the United States Government to run the war, and not having a lot of separate, often unrelated, and occasionally antagonistic agencies trying to run the war.

At last, therefore, to aid the overburdened President there is a capable man with knowledge of how to get things done by and through people, a man who has the opportunity to strengthen and to accelerate the tremendous effort which now is being turned in its forward assault upon the cracking Axis.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wanted to say a word in commendation to those in Congress and to the President for this forward step toward winning the war.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1932, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senate has been in session since 11 o'clock, and it is now almost 5:30. It is obvious that we cannot today conclude the debate and reach a vote on the committee amendment—the Danaher amendment. Therefore, I submit the unanimous-consent request which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The request will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, by unanimous consent, that at the conclusion of its proceedings today the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. on Tuesday next; that at not later than 2:30 o'clock p. m. on said day a vote be had without further debate on the committee amendment to the joint resolution under consideration, viz, House Joint Resolution 111, the time between the hours of 11 o'clock a. m. and 2:30 p. m. to be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the amendment, to be controlled respectively by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAVEZ in the chair) laid before the Senate messages fr m the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Several surgeons and passed assistant surgeons for temporary promotion in the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment and/or promotion, and also appointment, by transfer, all in the Regular Army; and

Sundry citizens for appointment under the War Manpower Commission.

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

BRIG. GEN. NORMAN THOMAS KIRK—NOMINATION REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Military Affairs, I report favorably the nomination of Brig. Gen. Norman Thomas Kirk to be Surgeon General in the Army of the United States, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I have consulted with my good friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] and with other Senators; and if there is no objection, I should like to have the nomination considered and confirmed at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I understand that the committee reported the nomination unanimously. I believe that the change must be made by Tuesday.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is correct.

Mr. MCNARY. Under the circumstances, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be read.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Norman Thomas Kirk (colonel, Medical Corps), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as the surgeon general, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, vice Maj. Gen. James C. Magee, the Surgeon General, whose term of office expires May 31, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

APPOINTMENTS AND TRANSFERS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, there are divers other nominations for appointments and promotions, and also appointments, by transfer, all in the Regular Army, including 214 captains to be majors, 295 first lieutenants to be captains, 431 second lieutenants to be first lieutenants, and a few other nominations for appointments or promotions, or appointments by transfer. The printing in the RECORD of all the nominations would require considerable space. The nominations have been unanimously reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. I have consulted with the Senator from Oregon and with other Senators; and, if there is no objection, I should like to have the nominations confirmed en bloc at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, before the confirmation occurs, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the able Senator if he has any knowledge as to how many of the officers whose nominations are now being considered are members of the National Guard or the Officers' Reserve.

Mr. CHANDLER. They are all in the Regular Army.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not true with respect to the nominations for promotion which are submitted to the Senate that they are all nominations of Regular Army men?

Mr. CHANDLER. There are more Regular Army men than others, but there are promotions in the National Guard. However, it so happens that these are all Regular Army men.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is not customary to have the Senate confirm the appointments of any of the officers in the National Guard, the R. O. T. C., or the Army of the United States, below the rank of colonel.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. Or perhaps not even of colonels. I think a man must have arrived at the rank above colonel in order that his nomination may be submitted to the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Vermont is correct. That may account

for the fact that there are fewer nominations for promotion in the National Guard than in the Regular Army.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this is the second time I have made inquiry into this question. I have been somewhat disturbed by what appeared to me to be a policy on the part of the War Department to permit Reserve officers and National Guard officers to reach a certain rank and then stop. Very few of them get beyond the rank of colonel. Very few of them ever become brigadier generals or major generals. I have always thought that such a policy should be very carefully scrutinized, because there are some very able men in the National Guard and in the Officers' Reserve. I believe that sometimes they do not have perhaps as good an opportunity for promotion as do Regular Army officers.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Florida that his interest is shared by members of the Military Affairs Committee, and rather close attention is being given to the question which the Senator raises.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. CHANDLER. It has not been overlooked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

The clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the executive calendar.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Basil Manly to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Wirt G. Bowman to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 26, with headquarters at Nogales, Ariz.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am well acquainted with Mr. Bowman. He is a man of ability, and one of the outstanding businessmen of my State. He is well qualified in every way for this position, and will serve with credit to himself and his Government.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I understand that Mr. Bowman has been endorsed by both the senior and junior Senators from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William A. Glassford, Jr., to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from May 19, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond A. Spruance to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from May 15, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Wilder DuP. Baker to be rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from July 13, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, June 1, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 28 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Everett R. Speer, from the State of Texas, to be assistant regional chief of placement, at $5,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

Walter Orie Ware Lee, from the State of Virginia, to be principal industrial specialist in the Bureau of Manpower Utilization, at $5,600 per annum, in the Washington office.

Frank B. Stilwell, from the State of Ohio, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the Dayton area office.

John F. Conley, from the State of Massachusetts to be senior training specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Boston regional office.

Morris J. Kaplan, from the State of New York, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the New York regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Harold Bates, from the State of Massachusetts, to be principal manpower utilization consultant, at $5,600 per annum, in the Boston regional office.

James T. Black, from the State of Texas, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Dallas area office.

Ervin K. Zingler, from the State of Texas, to be senior labor economist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

Lester G. Graham, from the State of Texas, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the El Paso area office.

Raymond D. Johnsos, from the State of Illinois, to be principal manpower field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Chicago regional office.

William D. Gallier, from the State of Texas, to be principal manpower field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

Arthur A. Smith, from the State of Texas, to be principal manpower field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

Richard L. Shaw, from the State of Ohio, to be senior administrative officer, at $4,600 per annum, in the Cleveland regional office.

Richard B. Johnson, from the State of Texas, to be housing and transportation specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

Wilfred Bradshaw, from the State of Indiana, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Indianapolis area office.

Frederic S. Martin, from the State of Rhode Island, to be regional personnel officer, at $4,600 per annum, in the Boston regional office.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 28 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Basil Manly to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1948.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Wirt G. Bowman to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 26, with headquarters at Nogales, Ariz.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be The Surgeon General

Brig. Gen. Norman Thomas Kirk, to be The Surgeon General, with rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Archibald Andrew Fall et al.

(NOTE.—A full list of all persons whose nominations for promotion or appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, were confirmed, may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 27, 1943, beginning on page 4972 with the name of Archibald Andrew Fall and ending on page 4980 with the name of Henry Nathan Blanchard.)

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

William A. Glassford, Jr., to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from May 19, 1943.

Raymond A. Spruance, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from May 15, 1943.

Wilder DuP. Baker, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from July 13, 1942.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Mark C. Clayton, Cedar Bluff.
Edgar Petree Thompson, Russellville.

CALIFORNIA

Ralston S. Woodruff, Gustine.
George S. Simpson, Van Nuys.

GEORGIA

John A. McLeod, Valdosta.

ILLINOIS

Abraham M. Boyenga, Ashton.
Marguerite F. Senesac, Bourbonnais.
Leslie B. McCaffrey, Fort Sheridan.
Wilbur A. Woods, Pawpaw.
William O. Butler, Saybrook.

INDIANA

Harold E. Thomas, Austin.

KENTUCKY

Ople Ann Akers, Lynch.

LOUISIANA

Ava T. Honeycutt, Dry Prong.
Felix J. Orgeron, Harvey.
Olivier Dufour, Marrero.
Camile F. Hoffmann, Thibodaux.
Arthur Deshotels, Washington.

MAINE

Helen H. Hurd, Lincolnville.

MASSACHUSETTS

Arthur W. Bennett, Island Creek.
Edward J. Redmond, South Deerfield.

MINNESOTA

Svend Petersen, Askov.
Charles J. Larson, Cosmos.
Frances G. Mushel, Foley.
Inga O. Berget, Holt.
Nicholas D. Schons, Nicollet.
Michael E. Gartner, Preston.
Irene T. Cowie, Rothsay.
Ernest F. Schroeder, Wells.

MISSOURI

Ollie Bullock, Catron.
Charles D. Hyde, Niangua.
James H. Anders, Risco.
Frank P. Anthony, Wright City.

MONTANA

J. Francis Murray, Plentywood.
Vivian M. Matthews, Walkerville.

OKLAHOMA

Charles N. Combs, Dawson.
Joseph L. McKinney, Eufaula.
Jesse W. Phillips, McAlester.
Roland F. Butler, Pryor.
Mary H. Dunagan, St. Louis.

OREGON

Charles W. Abbott, Central Point.
Jack R. Strauss, Falls City.

PUERTO RICO

Vincenta Correa Aviles, Vega Baja.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rufus H. Gaines, Anderson.
Edward O. Reynolds, Summerville.

TEXAS

B. Elizabeth Proctor, Grand Saline.
Laura K. Tondre, Marion.
George E. Blair, Mexia.
Sallie Tilton, Point.
William J. Stringer, Teague.
Ollie V. Gregorcyk, Woodsboro.

VIRGINIA

Randolph H. Perry, Charlottesville.
Frank J. Safley, Mineral.

WASHINGTON

Clara May P. St. John, Concrete.
Easton L. Mudgett, Coupeville.
Emma C. Atkinson, Langley.
Kenneth L. Mannen, Port Blakely.
Elizabeth J. Wallace, Roy.

WEST VIRGINIA

Leyman R. Friend, Ameagle.

WISCONSIN

Charles T. O'Brien, Necedah.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 28, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Breathe upon us, O breath of God, as we wait in prayer at Thy holy altar. Like blossoms which open in the springtime revealing hidden beauty and wonder, so doth Thy plans unfold. Put Thy hand, O Lord, upon the life and destiny of our democracy and may the cross of our Master turn the hearts of men, blessing the sentiments and emotions unexpressed and unuttered.

Thou hast been unto us in the past, so wilt Thou be with us in the day that now is and the morrow which is to come. Beset by many problems and difficulties, inspire us with broad vision and sincere purpose; help us to take our part and assume our responsibilities. Almighty God, bless the Congress most abundantly; keep us as true as daylight, as sincere as Nature, and as open as divine mercy. O unify us and put us in league with the giant cause of humanity and idealism; with an uncompromising spirit keep us as constant as the breath of heaven. Lead us in the highest accomplishments of free government; uncoil the very best powers within us that men everywhere may feel their tremendous forces. Subdue extravagance, make the indifferent mind to think soberly; in city, in the quiet paths of the country, and by the high-sounding sea, lift all grateful hearts to Thee. Hold us all to the sublime assurance that the souls of the righteous are in the hands of God. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1762. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GLASS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. NYE, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2346) entitled "An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Commerce.
2. Department of Labor.
3. Post Office Department.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Department of War.
6. Federal Works Agency.
7. The National Archives.
8. National Housing Agency.

PRESIDENT OF BOLIVIA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

HOUSTON, TEX., *May 21, 1943.*

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

I should like to extend to you and to the Honorable Members of the House my sincere gratitude for the attention I received during my visit in your Capital, and upon leaving your glorious country, I wish to express again the loyal adherence of my people to the democratic cause and their friendship for the people of the United States.

GEN. ENRIQUE PENARANDA,
President of Bolivia.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the results of a recent telegraphic poll conducted by Esquire on the proposal that a three-man commission be appointed to represent sports during the war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INFLATIONARY THREAT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the threat of price inflation continues to grow. Through the O. W. I. Discussion Guide No. 4 the Treasury Department has issued an appeal for public support for a spendings tax as a major means of mopping up inflationary income. The Senate Finance Committee turned a cold shoulder to that plan last summer; the House Ways and Means Committee will turn a cold shoulder to it this summer for the simple reason the proposal is grossly discriminatory. Everyone now knows that the bulk of the inflationary

spending is in new war wages, the average of which is about $2,400 per year. But in advocating a spendings tax, the Treasury Department wants the Congress to exempt approximately $1,500 for a single man and $2,200 for a married man without dependents and more if he has dependents.

Recently the President made a fine and inspiring speech on the subject of holding the line against inflationary wage increases. His special committee to consider a demand for railroad workers has breached that line. His War Labor Board in virtually ordering the coal operators to agree to portal-to-portal pay, which for large operations will mean a daily increase of $1.50 in current wages, has breached it in a major way. The 80 cents per day the coal operators have agreed to pay violates the Little Steel formula, but John L. Lewis says: "Not enough."

The War Labor Board, in attempting to force the coal operators to agree to a wage scale, which in normal times would mean bankruptcy for them in the absence of a law enabling them to pass the burden on to the consumer, is evidently acting upon the assumption the Congress will provide such a law. My advice to the coal operators is to stop, look, and listen, else they may wake up one hot summer day in the near future to find they have been left holding the bag. Partial success for the increased wage demands of the coal miners is now assured. Yet the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. are merely waiting to ascertain the definite measure of that success before pressing their new wage demands. After yielding to the coal miners, the War Labor Board will have a fat chance to deny the future demands of the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. Then we will see new life breathed into the Bankhead and Pace farm-price bills still pending in the Senate. It all adds up to price inflation of a very dangerous character.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an excerpt from a leter of a constituent regarding taxation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection—

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement by Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, before the Banking and Currency Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the house of representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Denver Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by C. William Hazelett before a committee of the other body.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Professor Bayes, of New York University.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of any business on the Speaker's desk and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein an address delivered by the Honorable Randolph Paul, chief counsel of the Treasury. This address will require three pages in the RECORD. I am advised by the Public Printer that the cost to the Government of printing the address will be $150.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by the associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] is recognized for 30 minutes.

LABOR

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address my remarks today in the interest of labor, the laboring man and the laboring woman, of the group that is not organized but in numbers is seven to one in the majority. We do not maintain a dues-paying system, nor do we assess any of our members for the right to work, especially for our Government. We are the farmers, the lumberjacks, the cattlemen, the timber workers, the cowboys, the store and bank clerks, the small businessmen that are being discriminated against in favor of the chain stores; men on public works, men who make contribution to the erection of church houses and contribute to the Christian welfare of our respective communities. We are the majority of the people of America but we are not organized nor are we given too much consideration in the management of our Government or in the management of our own affairs.

From our homes and firesides our sons and daughters are now on every battle front in the world fighting for freedom, giving their all. We keenly feel that we should assert ourselves in this great world conflict in opposing a few small minority groups that are detrimental to our all-out efforts toward victory. We do not have a legal right to demand nor do we feel that we would be patriotic citizens were we given the right to strike, slow down, or demand higher wages in winning this World War.

We farmers are having a tough time. Our Government puts a ceiling upon our products, and a small organized group who profess to be very efficient claim our prices must be set back to a lower level. They suggest the Government subsidize us to keep the cost of living down. We know transportation and distribution increase the price of the toll to where it appears to be high, yet when the organized groups and the transportation companies get their demands, which are upheld by law, the consumer is paying the organized groups in many instances many multipled times the cost of production, in some instances more than we pay hijacking union-not-needed truck drivers.

To illustrate, when we reach a certain point going to market we are compelled to pay, regardless of whether any work is done or not, an exorbitant fee, in some instances more than our own cargo will bring on the market, for an organized member of a union to drive our truck to the market place, and, too, our court of last resort says these practices are in keeping with the laws of the land. Notwithstanding the lower House of Congress has passed a measure that is now on the Senate side, no action has been taken to correct this evil.

On last Sunday afternoon, between the hours of 1:15 and 1:30, I was listening to my radio, and I listened with a great deal of attention to the address of William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. In following his speech I made up my mind that somebody should bring it to the the attention of this body when he got to this point:

> The American Federation of Labor calls upon Congress to defeat the Smith-Connally bill. We will demand a record vote on this measure. Regardless of whether it is killed or adopted, we shall endeavor to vote out of office any Member of Congress who supports it. Into this effort the American Federation of Labor will pour every resource at its command.

Is not that cracking the whip? Is not that serving notice on you whether or

not you will serve the people of America another term, particularly for me? I came to this Congress without the consent of organized labor. The American Federation of Labor endorsed my predecessor. Mr. Charles Hathaway, president of the Oklahoma State Federation of Labor, started off in this style:

There is important business at hand—the business of defeating PAUL STEWART, who is running for Congress in the Third District against Wilburn Cartwright, the incumbent.

Down farther in his letter he says:

I am asking you to send me a contribution for this "Beat Stewart" campaign if it is at all possible, and I am sure in most instances it is. It is up to you and me as union members to make believers out of these labor haters.

My labor record has not been bad from the viewpoint of organized labor. It is far above the average for the unorganized groups.

We are not given over to the theory of following the lines of least resistance for self-preservation. This is no time for complacency. To do what is right is our watchword. We shall not be intimidated regardless of the opinion of others. The American people have always on all occasions righted gross wrong, and, believe me you, they will rally to right present-day practices. We shall not withhold any action which enures to the betterment of our armed forces and the great mass of unorganized labor who are giving their all and putting forth their sincere energies and efforts to a supreme sacrifice for freedom and democracy. We know our Oklahoma and we will meet the adversary face to face and test the strength of our now overlords in that fair State. We believe the rank and file of organized labor see with us in our views upon fair play. We know too well many dues-paying members are counted as members that fully appreciate that when their country is at war they should not be compelled to pay a labor racketeer tribute of any amount in the way of a fee to work upon a Government project, and when the smoke clears away he will resume his normal life of continuing to be a red-blooded American citizen, and longs for that day.

I was amused the other day when we were discussing the poll-tax bill. I thought of the four great freedoms, and particularly of the freedom to work. Then I thought of some of my colleagues who were leading the fight and were so interested in their fellowman, and wondered how with a clear conscience they could support an organization that compels a man to pay for the privilege of working and then oppose a law which provides a citizen shall pay $2 fee to vote.

The groups of labor that I represent are not influential enough to have a round robin signed by Cabinet members and Under Secretaries and addressed to a legislative body in filing their protest against certain measures.

I was a little fearful when I first came here. I had always been taught that when you run counter to a statute in the United States Code it is dangerous. But after having been here 5 months, I see in places they do not care to jot their signature down in filing their protests to Congress. We do not have paid attorneys to represent us in the Halls of Congress. Occasionally one of us of the common herd will come up here as a Member and be faithful to a trust. I would be derelict and not keeping faith were I to let pass this challenge to the American people and their representatives in Congress.

I do not believe that Mr. Green's percentage in the Seventy-ninth Congress will be 20 percent of what it is today, and I do not mean by that there is going to be a turn-over; I believe that the people of the country have let and will let their wants be known, and that Congress will carry out their will.

There are some groups that are not too well organized, I mean upon point of strategy and a point of attack. This is another branch of the American Federation of Labor—the American Federation of Government Employees. This letter is out of the regional office over at Kansas City and is from Mr. Zimmerman, national vice president, ninth civil-service district.

He says in his letter to me of April 28, reading from the last paragraph:

There are several local posts of civil-service employees who are members of the American Federation of Government Employees living in your district. We will certainly remember those who prove to be our friends, also those who do not.

I have a like letter, worded a little differently but having the same meaning, from the president and secretary of Local 47, from Muskogee, Okla., and his concluding paragraph is as follows:

You are no doubt aware of the increase in the cost of living and the need for increase in salaries for Federal employees, and you are assured that your support will be appreciated and remembered.

I could well take my text from the 15th verse of the 24th chapter of Joshua: "Choose you this day whom ye will serve," for, after all, the issues uttermost in the minds of men of America is whether John L. Lewis and William Green and Philip Murray shall run this country or shall the great mass, we the people. I wager my possibilities and potentialities in further service of my people in Congress or otherwise that the majority will win and that those self-same organized-labor leaders will at some future date realize their mistake.

I am not a prophet, but these high-dealing organized-labor leaders will realize when Congress is made up of those now on the firing line their mistakes. Let me suggest that you make research, and read the story of the old beggar who could have become very rich had it not been for his greed for more. The story is substantially as follows: A great philanthropist came along with a cornucopia well filled with gold and forewarned an anxious old beggar, who was holding his hat as a container for the flowing gold therefrom—that should his hat—the container, spring a leak that all gold that went to the ground would become as naught, but with avarice the beggar pleaded for just a few more pieces which came forth and the hat burst and the gold became nil. Such will be the greed of the strangle hold of organized labor unless they relent their present hold upon the American public.

We think we know the pulse of Congress, I may be in error, but to my way of thinking, already many of you have voted at least one time against the wishes of the labor dictators and if so, you might as well have voted against every measure in Congress in which they were interested. Insofar as concerns political support, this group during my 20 years as a lawmaker have adhered to the old English proverb that goes back to 1545 that "One had as good eat of the devil as the broth he is boiled in."

I have given you now a rather brief history of the demands of organized labor and the threats of organized labor.

I want now to go into another field of action for a few short minutes, and that is the field of the fellow back home and on the battlefront. I received the other day a letter from an American patriot who is stationed in the southwest Pacific war zone, Island X. His letter is dated May 11, 1943, passed by the naval censor, addressed to the gentleman from Oklahoma, Hon. PAUL STEWART, M. C., House Office Building, Washington, D. C., and it is as follows:

DEAR MR. STEWART: You will be surprised to hear from one of your constituents out in this neck of the world, but using a voter's privilege, I am writing to you so that you may know the reaction of thousands of men out here in the service to the coal strike for higher wages. If you and enough like you were to order a battalion from here to attend to that little matter the strike would end and those un-American ——— would be taught what a sacrifice in the interest of a national effort means. They should be placed on the same pay basis we are and even then they have the comfort and conveniences of home and get to be with their loved ones. They don't fight the heat or cold, disease, and tropical fevers, vermin and ants, lizards, etc., that makes life very unpleasant for us to say the least, and these things are all in addition to our risking all for the privilege of living as we wish to. We are not making these sacrifices in order that such selfish un-American ——— can fatten their pocketbooks at the public expense. It looks from here as though there was a lack of guts in dealing with such scum. Give them ——— for us, Paul. I have told lots of my buddies of your fight for fairness and when I told them I was writing to you they heartily endorsed all I have said. If men of your courage do not fight for us and expose all of the rottenness of that mess that stinks clear out here, we just as well quit and come home. I am in the CB's construction unit of the Navy. Am from Broken Bow and know lots of your friends there and in Idabel. As a veteran of World War No. 1 and being in this one I know I am subject to disciplinary action for writing to an official criticizing the war efforts, but to ——— with consequences. You may keep my identify or use it, I care not, but do wish you to use this letter where it may do some good.

The slacker ——— are not content to stay safely at home but must highjack the war effort of our Nation to further their own selfish aims. John L. Lewis should be shot as a traitor or locked up in solitary from now on.

Hoping to hear from you and to hear of your action which we are sure you will take, I and my buddies are,

Respectfully,

The censor agrees.

I have the original letter in my office; I have sent for it now, and I shall be glad to show it to any Member of Congress here on the floor, and they can see the signature, which I will withhold. I might say that there was added these words on the last page of the letter, "The censor agrees."

I refer now to a like letter which is contained in the RECORD, in the Appendix, introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas, Congressman GATHINGS, and if Members will do so, they may turn to page A2579 of the Appendix and find it. That letter does not withhold the name, as I have in the case of my letter. He sets forth in no uncertain terms the condition as he sees it about these strikes, the sit-downs, and the unreasonable organized labor demands being made upon the American people in this distressful time.

As to the sentiment of the country, I have here a letter from Modern Industry, a magazine of and for all industry, 347 Madison Avenue, New York, and it is dated May 11, 1943, and says:

Should labor unions and trade organizations be required to register and file financial statements? Industry says "Yes." Voting by Modern Industry's readers, representing the 500,000 management men in 31,500 plants responsible for 89 percent of all United States production, was as follows:

"Yes," 96.9 percent.

"No," 3.1 percent.

These votes were cast after reading the arguments on both sides of the question as presented in Modern Industry's regular monthly feature, The Debate in Print.

Favoring the move was HOWARD W. SMITH of Virginia, while Leo Pressman, general counsel of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, argued against it. General feeling seems to be that legitimate organization would have nothing to fear from the searchlight of publicity, while exposing graft or racketeering in lawless labor unions and trade associations would be a service to both members and the public. The break-down of the voting by geographic areas was as follows:

New England, "yes," 100 percent.

Mid-Atlantic, "yes," 96.3 percent; "no," 3.7 percent.

North Central, "yes," 97.6 percent; "no," 2.4 percent.

South, "yes," 90.2 percent; "no," 9.8 percent.

West, "yes," 100 percent.

Pacific coast, "yes," 100 percent.

That is a fair analysis, outside of the unions, of the way industry, which is serving 89 percent of our production today, registered. I feel that you feel as I feel that all-out effort, every sacrifice should be made to the men facing the common enemy and giving their all. Upon every occasion where the armed forces have spoken they have condemned the attitude of organized labor in demanding higher wages and in striking. Right at this very moment there are a number of strikes going on throughout America. If our men in the theaters of war should strike, what would be argued? The least we can do is to give them every cooperation humanly possible without interference. If any of you wish to see this original letter, I have it here now and I will be happy for you to look at it. I have the envelope in which it was enclosed, with the mark of the censor, and the name signed to it. It is not phoney by any means.

Col. Eddie Rickenbacker, a hero of two world wars, on the 12th of March made a few observations regarding conditions in America today. I wish to devote the rest of my time in quoting some scattered excerpts from America—Let's Get Fighting Mad, by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker:

Let me begin by answering the unspoken questions which are probably in the minds of many of this audience. Why am I speaking, and on what basis do I speak?

I come to you as the voice of millions of American boys—your boys who cannot speak for themselves because they are in uniform, on the battle lines, on the high seas or under them, in the air, or in the training camps.

I come to you with a background of personal contact with thousands of those boys in New Guinea, Port Moresby, Buna and Gona, Australia, the Fiji Islands, and in the hell holes of Guadalcanal.

I come to you from dugouts filled with mud and water, from men waist deep in the swamps of the jungle, from the fox holes and the hills, from the hastily dug graves, and from the hospitals where man and boys, crippled and maimed, lie in torment and suffering.

Yes, may I say also, that I come as one who has looked death in the face, a time when one develops, in the twinkling of an eye, an entirely new sense of the material values of life.

True, you can't win a war without fighting, and the strongest must do it. But, short of actual combat, every man, woman, and child in this Nation is in the fighting forces, just as much as they.

I say "is in the fighting forces." Let me correct that and say "should be" or "must be," because there are millions who not only are not in but are actually a drag anchor on those who are trying to fight.

On second thought, "drag anchor" is much too mild to apply to many of them. They are little short of saboteurs and traitors.

They work against our all-out effort to win, cost us defeats, cause the unnecessary death of our American soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen, delay the day of victory for our forces.

After the disaster at Pearl Harbor, Secretary of the Navy Knox is quoted as saying, "A half-hour would have made all the difference in the world."

Perhaps, now, you understand better why I am urging you to eliminate the incompetents in Government, the racketeers in labor, the "patrioteers" in industry, all those whose objective is greedy, grasping, selfish personal gain.

Their measure is the dollar. Mine is the lives of American boys and the preservation of a decent democracy.

I have no objection to men earning money, provided they earn it by industry, honest effort and competent work.

I do object to their getting it simply because some laboring racketeer threatens to tell his men to walk off a job and stop work at a time when production is vital to the safety of our Nation, and means life or death to American boys.

Then further says Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker:

Back in 1917 a Minnesota boy about to go into the Army told his side of the story. This is what he wrote:

"I am a mother's son. I am the pride of a family and part of a home. I love my wife as you love yours. I am a youth in years and experience in life, yet I am a gambler, betting the highest stakes a man can wager, my life. If I win you win; if I lose I have lost all. The loss is mine, not yours; and there is a grieved mother, a saddened family, and a broken home to which I can never return.

"I ask only for Godspeed and support of my Nation in return for laying upon the altar of my country my all. For bravery and blood will you furnish bullets and bread? Will you pawn your shekels if I pawn myself? Will you bet your gold while I bet my blood? Will you hazard your wealth while I risk my life?

"I am the flower of a Nation's manhood, the glory of a noble race. I am the American soldier. I am the boy in the trenches."

Today millions of boys like that are marching in the armed forces of our Nation, a smile on each face and a song on the lips, though each cannot help but realize all that lies ahead.

In their hearts each must be asking the same question which that boy asked in 1917, "What are the folks back home doing to back us up?"

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

FOOD RATIONING

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the rationing and pricing of food is now in the hands of three agencies:

First. The Office of Civilian Supply in the War Production Board, which hopes to have a complete set-up of personnel, including economists. We hope there will also be businessmen to make decisions. Mr. Whiteside, the head of that unit, is an able businessman. He has been head of Dun & Bradstreet for years. We would hope that he would not put an economist in a position of authority, but would only use them for research and advice.

Second. The Food Administration for War, under Chester Davis. This outfit has its units controlled by economists—its price and rationing units by economists who have the say; they have made a terrible mess of things.

Third. The Office of Price Administration has units relating to food under the control of economists; they likewise have made a terrible mess of things.

The administration under Roosevelt has neither the character nor the courage to straighten this thing out and get rid of these incompetents. It is a menace to the war effort, and the action of the administration in continuing is a stab in the back to the boys who are in our armed forces, but it is just another instance of President Roosevelt's failure to cooperate with the war effort. With the food situation, the price and rationing situation in such a muddle; with Harry Hopkins, the Rasputin of the White House, in a key position in connection with the allocation of war materials, America faces a critical situation—perhaps the most critical in her history. It is absolutely necessary that we reduce the number of rationing units to one and get some efficiency in this situation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include certain data.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include certain telegrams from packers showing the hardships which the O. P. A. is placing upon the packing industry of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPUBLICAN FOOD STUDY COMMITTEE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Republican food study committee is composed of 40 Republican Representatives who are interested in obtaining the food facts of production, distribution, and consumption. There is nothing new about such a committee, as there have been similar committees in previous years. Heretofore, I had never taken a part in the work of the committee, but this year I felt that some very constructive work could be accomplished. I feel that it is the duty of the minority party to make constructive suggestions in regard to legislatior and not spend its time indulging in destructive criticism. It is a path I expect to continue to follow. The gentleman from North Dakota, the Honorable WILLIAM LEMKE, made every effort to perfect a bipartisan committee to meet the problems of agricultural production.

When we became engaged in this war we were told that food would win the war and write the peace. We have seen industry and labor practically perform miracles. We have seen the aircraft industry expand beyond all expectations; we have seen tanks, guns, bombs, and all munitions of warfare produced on a scale that was heretofore thought impossible; we have seen transportation agencies accomplish results thought unbelievable; we have seen coal mined in larger and larger quantities and more tons per man; the building of ships is far ahead of schedule. While there may be some individuals who have not made their best contributions, I think that history will record the achievements of labor and industry during the past year not only as a production phenomenon but will show what a free people can accomplish in time of need.

In order for agriculture to carry its share of the responsibility in connection with the war it has, in many cases of necessity been required to produce under severe handicaps. Materials, labor, housing, and transportation were provided for the industrial production and agriculture was asked to produce more with less labor and many times less equipment and transportation than they had previously. Nature made a splendid contribution in providing the best weather conditions we had had for years.

I do not wish to be critical of the manner in which the food problem was approached because the necessity for these instruments of war was so imperative that food production might not have had the consideration which many of us thought it should have been accorded.

I want to digress right there to say that I do not believe a single Member of this House after Pearl Harbor had any question in his mind but what he wanted to see as many planes, as many tanks, as many munitions of war produced as possible. We did not hear anything about any labor bills at that time; we did not hear a criticism as to what agriculture was being accorded because I think 99 people out of 100 realized that the immediate necessity was the production of these munitions and implements of war.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I prefer to wait until I finish the main part of my statement; I shall have plenty of time in which to yield.

Men by the thousands went from the farms to help make these munitions of war. Materials were allocated for the purpose of producing weapons of war and these materials were, of necessity, denied the producers of food. As the industrial machine approximated its maximum production and as the difficulties of food production became more apparent there came to be more of an appreciation of the importance of food in connection with the war. This resulted in the migration of a million and a half people to the farms between March 1 and May 1, 1943. In order to maintain or increase food production, it is necessary to look ahead as we only have one crop a year and there are many factors to be contended with, even during that one year. With its 340,000,000 acres of crop land, there is no reason to believe that the increase in food production could not have been accelerated as rapidly as the industrial production that we have witnessed. This is indicated by the fact that the production of many farm products was increased by 50 percent in a little over a year's time. Believing that, statistically, we are still in a position to furnish the necessary food needed during this emergency, it is fitting that we stop occasionally and take inventory of the situation as it exists.

First. We must consider that there are still two schools of thought. One is that all that is necessary to provide food for our soldiers, our domestic population, and for lease-lend is to have someone put a price ceiling on the product in the market place. Adherents to this philosophy seem to think that if someone writes 10 cents on a can of peas in the grocery store the consumer is being protected.

The second school of thought is that the best production of our Nation and the most desirable insurance for our consumers and, incidentally, the very best method of not only preventing inflation but also avoiding starvation is by providing for an abundant food production.

The people who evidently belong to the first school of thought are the farmer subscribers to the Henderson philosophy and, now, the Brown philosophy, the consumer groups who are not familiar with the problems of food production, and the "me too" group of our society who either have not the energy or the initiative to think for themselves.

The advocates of the second school of thought, which include the national grange and other farm organizations, economists who have had practical backgrounds and all people familiar with the processes of stimulating food production. We also find a difference of attitudes among this second group. The three forces which have hindered the maximum production for which this second school of thought has been working are first the scarcity group which still have the control philosophy in their minds, second the deception of the producer groups by certain bureaus of the Government that have taken place.

I do not say that in any criticism; it is just a statement of fact. It is regrettable that it happened, it is too bad it ever happened but it will have its effect on production as far as 1943 is concerned.

Third. The bottleneck in food production as a result of the machination of the O. P. A. The farmer, by nature, likes to and wants to produce in abundance. It is not necessary to buy his cooperation and he does not want anyone to be paying for his patriotism. People should realize that the producer has done a splendid work and that although the E flags for his meritorious performance have been few, he has also made a startling contribution to the war effort and this is especially appreciated when one realizes the handicaps of the labor, equipment, parts and transportation difficulties that he has of necessity had to contend with The consumer has had food so cheap for so long through a plan that subsidized the domestic producer that it came as a rather severe shock when it was necessary for him to pay somewhere near the cost of production to secure food. There is no doubt but what the subsidy to the producer has been, in many, many cases, reflected in a lowered food cost to the consumer.

That has been one of our difficulties all the way through. They keep referring to 1939 prices but they do not realize that most of the farm products were bringing only 50 to 75 percent of parity at that time. Then they try to show how much more the farmer is getting at this time and what increased quantities he is producing, but the comparison is based at the one year of 1938 of lowest prices that existed during the last 10 years.

Speaking for no one but myself of this Food Study Committee, I feel that the bill, H. R. 2739, as introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS], represents a constructive suggestion. The time has surely come when

we should not have such a divided authority over so many important questions. If the food part of the Office of Price Administration is transferred to the Agricultural Department so that one man has the responsibility for the food from the time the seed goes into the ground until the food is placed on the consumer's table, a very constructive step will be made in behalf of the food program. If this Food Study Committee should never do anything except present this legislation for the consideration of Congress, it will have been well worth the effort.

If this study committee should never do anything more than to submit the legislation it has recommended for the consideration of Congress, it will have been well worth while, in my opinion, for out of its study has come constructive suggestions which can be put into operation.

I have had an opportunity, as I presume all the rest of my colleagues have, of seeing the efficiency of our township, county, and State officials. It is disheartening to me at times to see the happenings that take place as a result of either our legislation or the powers that are assumed by certain individuals without the benefits of legislation. I repeat what I said yesterday—that if we are going to see these small businessmen, one after another, forced to the wall, we can at least insist that it be done in a legal manner and according to the law.

And I think many times as we sit here that we should realize the effect of such legislation on the county officials and people out home who are trying to make these things tick, and make them work. It is not merely a case of getting up here and criticizing the bureaucrats, the thing needed is to get this job done and to do this we must have these agencies out there in the field on which we can depend, if we are going to get these things carried through. They are trying to make these rulings work. I realize that we have the Patman Small Business Committee and the Smith Committee to Investigate the Usurpation of Power by the Bureaucrats, the special Boren committeee in regard to grade labeling and newsprint, as well as the regular committees of the House that have tried to approach these problems. No man can say that the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable HAMPTON P. FULMER, has not exerted every energy as far as he is concerned individually to try and correct the situations that make many of us believe that certain agencies are more interested in putting through their particular schemes than they are in furnishing the food to win the war. We have had hearing after hearing before all these committees but no one has been able to show yet where the following provision of the law gives these bureaucrats any authority to put businessman after businessman out of business:

(h) The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the business practices or methods, or means or aids to distribution, established in any industry, except to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, price schedule, or requirement under this act.

Sometimes, I feel that these committees, which are naturally controlled by the majority, are apt to be rather lukewarm in their approach and whitewashing in their effect. These problems transcend all party or partisanship consideration. How about the small businessman as a part of the food program? What has happened and is happening to him?

Once again, I wish to remind you that the Ways and Means Committee bill to allow the increase in the public debt had a special amendment that prevented the executive department of our Government from placing a $25,000 limit on salaries. Since this amendment had majority sponsorship and both majority and minority support, and was readily passed, I wish that someone would tell me why, by the same token, we do not protect the thousands of businessmen who are suffering from rulings of this same Price Control Act. If this assumption of power received legislative consideration for the few in the higher income brackets, why isn't it as much our duty to give equal consideration and protection to the small business firms of our country? These packers and canners and other groups are a part of our food-production program and we should not allow any agency of the Government, the O. P. A. or any other, to make rulings that are not in strict conformity with the letter of the law and that do not contribute to increased food production. I was pleased to accept this appointment by the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOSEPH MARTIN. I am happy to have the opportunity of working with our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable AUGUST ANDRESEN, a Member of this body who has been an outstanding Member in protecting the rural and business interests of our country.

In conclusion I have here an exhibit A which I want to present. For example, here is a letter I received from one of my constituents. There can be no partisanship about this one because he happens to have formerly been chairman of the county Democratic committee. He is one of my best friends and has been throughout the years. He is an honest man and a good businessman and even though our political beliefs have not always coincided we have always been very close personal friends. He used to be a mail carrier. Then he bought himself a butcher shop and a little grocery store in a town of around three or four hundred people. He has had a son in the service a couple of years. I want you to hear the letter he writes:

DEAR REID: I am writing you concerning the Office of Price Administration No. 27 pertaining to butchering cattle by small butchers. If the thing is allowed to stand as it is (the handwriting is on the wall) it will mean that thousands of small butchers like myself will have to turn the key in my door. This meat must be graded by an official grader of the Government, and the nearest one is at Green Bay, which is some 50 miles away. The cost of these graders is $2.20 per hour from the time they leave Green Bay until they get back again.

If we were in a big supermarket so we could have our meat all killed and on hand at a certain time each week it might be all right. But as it is, being only a small operator, it is going to cause an extreme hardship on us. One week we may have a lot of meat, the next week hardly any, and if we should kill before the graders get around, we can't touch a thing until he gets here—even if it is of 4 or 5 days or a week.

If this is allowed to go on, we might as well fold up.

I would suggest that they make us post a small bond if they are afraid we will run a black market.

If there is anything you can do about this, I know you will.

As ever,

Respectfully yours,

A. B. AVERILL.

Now, just stop and put yourself back in that little town. You are running that little butcher shop. You have been running it for 20 years. The people have confidence in you. They know you would not handle any wares you should not handle. You tell your people you have got to get some one from 50 or 60 miles away to look over the meat before you can offer it to the community.

Mr. GWYNNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. Has the gentleman been able to find any law which authorizes the O. P. A. to do many of the things they are doing?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have tried to have a lot of confidence in the 230 lawyers we have in the House, but I cannot find any lawyer who has found that authority, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The price-control law is quite specific as to congressional intent with reference to what the O. P. A. can do, but I generally find that they interpret the law to suit their own convenience and issue their directives and orders to suit themselves. Their main purpose is to liquidate most of the small business of the country and change our method of distribution of food, and set up a new order which may seem strange to the American people.

With reference to the roll-back on butter, meat, and coffee that is being proposed now, they are going to roll back the price of butter 5 cents a pound and are going to pay a subsidy to the processor to make up that difference, so the farmers will not have to take any loss. I have indicated before that the saving to the average consumer in the United States on butter is 60 cents. The cost of the subsidy from the Treasury will be $90,000,000 to finance that saving of 60 cents a year to the individual.

On meat they propose to roll back the price 2 cents a pound. We are allowed 2 pounds a week under the rationing system. We save 4 cents a week. That is to lower the cost of living. That is

4 cents a week or $2.08 a year. That is what you are saving with that roll back; still it will cost over $300,000,000 out of the Treasury to finance that subsidy.

On coffee they propose to roll back the price 2 cents a pound. We will save 20 cents a year on that and it will cost about $100,000,000 to finance the subsidy on coffee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman have any figures as to how much extra it will cost us because of the roll back and the additional employees that will be necessary to put that into effect, to collect this subsidy in the form of taxation and redistribute it to the people? The gentleman did not mention that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The O. P. A. is asking for an appropriation of $175,000,000.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. To pay a $90,000,000 subsidy?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No. That is to police it. They will have to go into every business establishment, they will have to have so many auditors that every other man, woman, and child in the United States will have to be an auditor to check the books to find how much they made on the over-all picture and to determine whether or not the concern is entitled to a subsidy.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand that the representatives of the dairy industry are in Washington today protesting against some of the proposed rules and regulations which are going to be put into effect on June 1, under the general roll-back order. I have letters from many creameries in my State. One small creamery tells me that if this rule goes into effect they will lose approximately $40,000 to $60,000 a year. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he has any information as to whether this rule and regulation is going into effect on June 1?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If I could read the minds of the superintellectuals down in the O. P. A. I probably could answer the question. I am doubtful if they can work out the mechanics to put it into operation on June 1. What the gentleman has said with reference to representatives of the dairy industry being here today conferring with the O. P. A. and the R. F. C., and also Mr. Chester Davis, is correct. They are trying to work out the mechanics. The administration is taking it for granted that the subsidy will be paid and that the roll-back will go into operation, but when it will go into operation it is impossible for me to state at this time.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] was discussing the matter of supply and food. You have a food investigation committee in the minority of which you are a member. You have discussed a very, very important subject which should be given unusual attention by the consumers of the country, and especially the members of that committee. The gentleman indicated he has an A example on food production. Would the gentleman permit me to give him an A and B example of an occurrence that is happening immediately, at the present time which is affecting the food situation throughout our Nation. Would the gentleman permit me to give that? It will take just a few minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If it does not take too long.

Mr. STEFAN. I have lived in my district for over 34 years and in my State for over 57 years. I know nearly every feeder in my district. Some of my feeders have been feeding cattle for a quarter of a century, having approximately a thousand to three thousand head of whitefaces which they buy from all over. They buy the feeders in your State, they buy them west of us, and bring them into my district to feed. A great deal has been said about proteins, and the need for them. We cannot get proteins now. Some of the feeders who have been feeding cattle in my district for a quarter of a century, having over a thousand head, and up to 3,000 head, in their lots in the past have none in their lots today.

They held a discussion in my district recently, may I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, and one gentleman whom I know intimately, Lewis Smithberger, a great feeder, declared at that conference that while he usually feeds a thousand head of livestock at this time of the year, this year he has no cattle on feed.

This is the first time in 25 years or longer that such a condition has existed on this particular farm. This feeder is afraid to buy feeder cattle at the present time without some assurance against loss. He fed 24 head recently on corn and hay for 108 days and made 30 cents a head, not counting anything for labor, taxes, depreciation on buildings, or machinery. The margin between cost and selling price was $2.56. The gain was 2½ pounds per day, and the gentleman from Wisconsin understands what that means.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Oh, yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Another friend of mine named Armbruster, with whom I am very well acquainted, is feeding 340 head, but is selling them off because he does not see anything ahead but a loss, and is afraid to put more feed into them. This same man, Mr. Armbruster, recently held a sale of hogs and after the sale was announced, the Government decided to force the price of hogs down to $14.50. His breeder sows which the previous year were worth $90 to $100 each, brought $60 to $65.

That is an A and B example, and I want to say to my colleague from Wisconsin, I wish they could solve the problem of foodstuffs, but what is being done about a solution of that problem which has a direct bearing on the production of food which we need to feed the armed forces as well as the civilian population. Our farmers are anxious and worried.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. How could I be expected to give a solution to the problem in a 5- or 10-minute discussion that Fulton Lewis has spent about 3 months on? But, we have got to get the facts; the main trouble is we are without any definite information and we have to get the facts first in order to try to solve the problem.

Getting back now to the question of cattle: We have in the United States around 75,000,000 head of cattle; in North America we have approximately 100,000,000 head, including Mexico and Canada. South America has about 100,000,000 head, an equal number, 44,000,000 head of which are in Brazil and 33,000,000 head in Argentina. In other words, we have something like 200,000,000 head of cattle here in the Western Hemisphere. If we had had a program and the man who is producing this beef had confidence that those who are undertaking to control the program had some knowledge about beef production, I do not think we would have ever been in the mess we are in insofar as beef is concerned.

We are eating around 55 pounds of beef per capita. We have been importing ever since around 1913, except for a short period during World War No. 1. So naturally it has had an impact on the beef situation. The amount imported of two or three pounds per capita in the United States is not much, but it had its effect in the coastal cities.

I do not believe there is anyone who can stand up and contend that with 200,000,000 head of cattle in the Western Hemisphere we cannot furnish the American people all the beef that is necessary, not only for the men in the armed forces, but for civilians. What is needed is some assurance, as the gentleman from Nebraska has just indicated, that the feeders and producers be given some confidence.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is not putting his finger on the question I have in mind. These people want to raise beef; they are in the cattle business and want to raise beef if they can get feed.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will come to that in a moment. First, let me tell you about the hog business. With hogs at 13¼ a lot of them are selling at 115 to 120 percent of parity, under an authorization that will continue to September, 1944, and the farmers producing hogs in the largest numbers in our history. If the beef farmer had a floor we would see a stimulation in beef production as a result.

One of the principal methods to get the producers to increase production is by giving them some assurance as to what they will get for their product.

If the producers had some assurance and had more confidence in Washington, they would not have to spend half their time listening to the radio to find out about the latest ruling of the O. P. A.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to my colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I think my colleague from Wisconsin has hit the nail squarely

on the head. As the gentleman and I well know, because people from our State have consulted us again and again, none of these people have been able to find out what price they were going to be able to get for their product. My colleague will remember that that was true of the canners way back last December, and we were trying to get something done about it and could not. This is not political, because all parties were represented. We went over to see Secretary Wickard as long ago as January or February of 1941, I believe, and showed them there the mistakes they were making on cheese. We got the fruit of those mistakes, and now they have gone right into another one. We have pointed that out, and there is no correction for it. It goes from one product to another, until there is no assurance that we shall produce as much on our farms as we did last year.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to my colleague that I presume that the reason for the 24-percent reduction in cheese today is pretty much right here in Washington, and would not exist today if the cheese industry of Wisconsin had had the proper consideration.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. That is right.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. My colleague agrees with that.

The point that we were able to jump that production of cheese up 50 percent in a little over a year to me was an indication of what can be accomplished if you will just get these forces working together, but you cannot do it by having the O. P. A., for example—I do not want to get into the butter-oleomargarine argument, but they have the O. P. A. sending out men around the country telling the people not to eat butter, that oleomargarine is better for them, while at the same time the Department of Agriculture is asking us for money and we are appropriating money for them to produce more butter. It just does not make sense.

As far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, my personal experience with them is that they are always willing to listen to your troubles and they give you sympathy and consideration. I feel that one of the greatest troubles we are in now is the fact of these two schools, that the O. P. A. has been a little closer to the throne or something, because their decisions have overshadowed the decisions of the people in the Department of Agriculture that undoubtedly are much more familiar with the problems of production.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. HULL. I should like to call attention to a statement appearing in today's News, on page 3, as to the testimony of Mr. Stettinius before the Senate Committee on Appropriations relating to lend-lease expenditures for next year. Just now they are having their troubles about the proposal to roll back the price of butter 5 cents a pound and pay out of the Treasury $100,000,000 to the processors in the roll-back program. Mr. Stettinius said that our benefits to Great Britan next year would be $4,213,000,000. He said that food comprises 60 percent of all lend-lease shipments to Great Britain, with munitions and other industrial materials amounting to 40 percent. This is the statement he made:

> The food is distributed through retail markets with receipts ultimately reaching the British exchequer to help finance the war.

Approximately $2,600,000,000 of that lend-lease appropriation is going indirectly into the British Treasury at a time when Congress is having such an intense discussion over the matter of subsidies to American farmers.

I just want to call attention to the relative amount involved in the so-called cutting down of the price of butter, rolling back the price of butter, and the amount we are expending which will flow into the British Treasury out of the supplies we are sending abroad.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank my colleague for his timely observation. He has been very close to this food situation, not only as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee but through actual experience.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I first wish to compliment the gentleman on his splendid contribution to the House today on this subject. I was very much interested in what he had to say about the work that was done by our industry and labor in the getting of mechanized equipment necessary for the armed forces, how they all fell to after Pearl Harbor and accomplished a marvelous piece of work.

In connection with that, I think we should also pay tribute to those branches of our Government that aided labor and industry to get this all-out production for the armed forces. They are entitled to some consideration. However, in doing that, I wonder if they did not overlook another major portion of mechanized equipment that is necessary in order to win any total war. I refer now to farm machinery.

As to the Food Study Committee to which the gentleman referred in the beginning of his remarks, I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee dealing with farm labor and farm machinery. Our committee is anxious to get the benefit of the gentleman's views on that question. Therefore, I wonder, when the Department down here made the ruling a year or two ago that farm machinery could be manufactured only to 13 percent of 1941 production for the farmers, if they did not create a bottleneck there at the same time that this marvelous production was stepping up the other way, so that we shall not have the heart and the men to man the war equipment that is necessary because of the lack of food that will come about through the failure to get this farm machinery. I wonder if the gentleman does not agree with me that in order to have this total production we should have for this all-out war, practically equal priority in consideration should be given by those who are managing this war to the production of essential farm machinery, so that we may get to the farmer what he needs to plant and harvest his crops.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not think there is any doubt about that at this time, but I still stand where I did before and where I stood in my office during those months. For all that I would surely like to be good to my constituents, as any Representative would, I surely was not going to take the position the first 6 or 8 months, or the first year of the war, for that matter, knowing that we had 700,000,000 or 800,000,000 bushels of wheat in storage, knowing the stock piles of corn we had in storage, and knowing that the immediate problem was this matter of producing tanks and airplanes and other war materials. I did not want to put my judgment up against that of the people who should know and say that they should divert any particular amount of steel to agriculture, because I was not in a position to be able to judge and I had to take their judgment that they were doing the right thing by diverting it all into the production of the munitions of war.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I did, too, and all the rest of us did, but does not the gentleman believe today that some of this should be diverted?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; the food problem is much more serious today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In conclusion let me ask this further question. I hold in my hand H. R. 2226, introduced March 13, 1943, a bill to prohibit the Federal Government from aiding in the production of rice outside of the United States, its Territories or possessions. Reading into the bill I find that the purpose of it is to prohibit the Government or those branches of the Government from furnishing tractors and other agricultural implements outside of the United States for the growing and harvesting of rice. Do I understand, or can the gentleman tell me whether or not we have been furnishing farm machinery and equipment for agricultural products outside of the United States, at a time when machinery is sorely needed by our farmers within our own borders?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Material was furnished in the lend-lease bill a year ago. The argument at that time was that we had better send the machinery to England rather than food, and, as I remember it now, there were some 10,000 tractors included in that bill at that time, in regard to rice—and that applies to peanuts also—I know that one of our colleagues, Mr. STEPHEN PACE, of Georgia, who had been following that for a month or more so expressed his position, and I feel as if I am free to repeat it, if I can judge from conversing with him, and it is that at this particular time with the world food conference and with everything involved in the war, he believed he would like to feel that any steps that he would take would not interfere with the war effort. I do not know whether they can even grow rice in Cuba. I would not be able to answer such a question. There are some 20,000 rice farmers in this country, and any one of them can say: "We have the land, and if

we only had the machinery we can produce more rice now than they ever will produce in Cuba," and as an individual I cannot tell you whether Cuba is in a position to produce more rice than they can here.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. We are all agreed with the gentleman. We do not want to do anything to interfere with what is necessary for the war effort, but at the same time we cannot overlook the fact that food is very essential to the war effort.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Along the machinery line in fairness to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] and also the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] you indicate that hac the Department of Agriculture had the full responsibility and the authority to go ahead and produce this food, we would do a better job than under the dual or triple system. Now, in the case of machinery I say to you that as a member of a committee with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], we went deeply into the question of farm machinery, and we were told that if the Department of Agriculture recommendations had been followed out, we would have had some new machinery for the farmers, but they were overruled by another authority, the War Production Board, or some other authority. I would like to state also that we were informed that we would get no new machinery for our farms until 1944, and we are having trouble getting machinery and getting repairs. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin has hit the nail on the head when he said if the Department of Agriculture be given the authority we would get somewhere—without interference on the part of the other agencies.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank my colleague for his contribution. That situation has been ironed out as well as possible. There will be machinery made for use this fall. If it had not been for the fact that the War Production Board had diverted the farm-machinery problem over to the Agriculture Department, I doubt if the machinery would be on its way to production today. We have to have this whole food program in one man's hand from the time the seed goes into the ground until the finished product is on the table. We will then get rid of all of the buck passing, and most all of the criticism, and I may say that if we can accomplish that we will go a long way toward ironing out all of these difficulties.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And is it not a fact that one of the things done by the Food Study Committee was to bring forth the bill introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] that will consolidate these activities in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; if we do not do anything more, that is something constructive, and that at least would have been worth while.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. LARCADE. In reference to the bill that was referred to by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], H. R. 2226, with respect to rice, I introduced an identical bill, 2470, on the same subject, and I would like to answer the question with respect to the rice industry. What brought about the introduction of this bill, my bill and a similar bill by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] was the fact that we found out that this Government had made a secret arrangement with Cuba, as far back as April 1942 to subsidize the planting of rice in Cuba, to the extent of advancing $25,000,000 in funds and in addition to furnish all of the farm machinery required for that purpose. Our farmers in Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, and California were unable to get one tractor, to say nothing of parts to repair their machinery for the purpose of cultivating and harvesting the coming crop. I have protested to all of the departments of Government, but without avail, and for that reason we introduced this bill to try to stop that for the reason that Cuba is not able to produce rice properly. It is unsuited for that purpose. If they would give the farmers of Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, and California the machinery it would be unnecessary to expand the rice industry anywhere else. We would be able to grow all the rice necessary. Food is just as essential as any other thing for the winning of the war.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. At this time.

Mr. LARCADE. At this time. They could furnish the farmers of the rice area and all other food production centers the necessary machinery in order that rice and other food products might be grown, to contribute to the winning of the war. It is necessary because we find it is a graver problem every day on account of the shortage of food.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield to me to ask a question of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am surprised to hear about the secret arrangement that took place in 1942, to provide $25,000,000 of subsidies to grow rice in Cuba, because I know that the rice problem, during ordinary times, has been a problem in the gentleman's section. We can produce enough rice to take care of the needs of our country and also have some to export. But what I was wondering about is this: We know that certain big interests in this country own the sugar plantations of Cuba and the refineries. I assume it is the same interests who are getting the advantage of this rice subsidy program. Does the gentleman know whether or not the people who are the beneficiaries of our $25,000,000 bounty are in fact American citizens who are interested in the sugar business down there or whether it is the rank and file of the poor peons of Cuba?

Mr. LARCADE. The arrangement was allegedly made with the Cuban Government.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think it should be in the RECORD at this point that at least this is a loan, and it is not any direct subsidy.

Mr. LARCADE. It is a loan from the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. As I understand it. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. I notice that lately they have had a change of heart in the farm machinery allotment. Perhaps the gentleman could give some reason why they have decided to allot more farm machinery next year.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. There are two reasons. I tried to cover that before. One is they feel they can spare the steel for that purpose at this time. Secondly, they have begun to see the importance of food production. It has been brought home to the people a little more in the last 90 days than it was before that. People close to it might see that this was happening ever since we got into the war, but were not in a position to do much about it. Now they realize that we must keep up this agricultural production. As the gentleman knows, if they will do what they say they are going to do in 1944 we will not be in such bad shape as far as machinery is concerned.

Mr. LANDIS. The gentleman knows that the bipartisan committee worked on this since the first of the year.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes: and they did good work. It was an absolutely nonpartisan approach, and I am sure they should be complimented on the way that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] and his committee presented that farm machinery problem at that time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I recently surveyed a section of my district and in the part of the State from which I come, with reference to farm machinery. There is no doubt there is a very serious shortage of farm machinery. That shortage is crippling the farmers a great deal. But I want to add to what the gentleman has said with reference to the shortage of machinery, that if the War Production Board would exercise some reasonable foresight in providing materials to even repair machinery which is presently available, so that the machinery that is broken down could be mended and put back into service, it would help to relieve the critical shortage of farm machinery.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think we can look forward to that taking place. I think that is the approach that the leaders of this agricultural program are trying to accomplish, and that they are making steps toward that.

Mr. BROOKS. I have been in some little shops that need just a little bit of steel here and there to place upon farm machinery to make it workable, and because of the lack of priorities they cannot get iron to repair the machinery, and the machinery lies idle in the field.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But I want to repeat, beginning on December 7, 1941, we must remember that the psychology of every one was to do nothing that would keep from producing all

the munitions of war that we could produce. It takes time to work it out. Unfortunately we might have had a New York City man here who did not really understand the problem, and it takes a little time to iron it out. But I believe that at the present time, whether it was by the bi-partisan committee or any other committee that was responsible for ironing it out, it is being ironed out, until today we should be fairly well satisfied with the picture as far as parts for machinery is concerned. Is that not right?

Mr. BROOKS. No. I am sure the gentleman has made a careful study of it, but I have recently talked to a distributor of farm machinery, and he impressed upon me the fact that if these little repair shops could get parts or the steel necessary to repair the machinery, it would help a great deal.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But has that not been provided now?

Mr. BROOKS. No, it has not.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But is it not being provided for by the allocations of steel from now on?

Mr. BROOKS. I hope it will be in the future, but to date it is not yet provided for. Little blacksmith shops out in the country areas trying to repair machinery are unable to get even steel out of which to make repairs, nor the parts really needed to repair the machinery.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have not had so much difficulty myself so far as machinery was concerned, repair parts, and so forth, needed for increased production. If other Members have, I feel sorry for them. I have been quite fortunate in being able to iron out dozens of these cases, and we have to have a great deal of machinery in Wisconsin with all our dairy cattle. It takes many different repair parts for machinery, milking machines, and everything else. I have personally felt as though they were kind of trying to get the job done better every day. I may be just taking a Pollyanna attitude; maybe I am wrong, but I had a feeling we were kind of in the process of getting the thing ironed out.

Mr. LANDIS. Let me clear up one more point. The gentleman left the impression that agricultural production is still being controlled by the well known advocates of scarcity. Would the gentleman care to elaborate on that any further?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not think there is any doubt that we have had 10 years of varying surpluses of certain crops. I said that did not apply to all of them or to all products. Human beings being what they are they cannot in one day jump from a controlled program to a full production program, and unfortunately that is tied up with politics a little bit, because possibly if they do not do it just right you lose control and you might also lose control even at election time. That kind of ties into it. But I think the men down at the Department of Agriculture have tried to get rid of that control approach.

We hear a lot about labor unions and men having to join a union before they could do any work to help win this war. I have lots of things to do besides thinking up unpleasant things, but I have often thought to myself that if I lived out on a farm and I had to have someone tell me that I could not raise corn unless I raised 90 percent of this or 42 percent of something else, that it would not work very satisfactorily. Such a program does not make sense in a food production program. I saw from an article the other day by Mr. Davis that by 1944 they are going to have the controlled food program well out of the picture. They have got to get back to a production program.

Mr. LANDIS. How about our farmers in the flooded areas of the Midwest? Will it be necessary for us to introduce legislation to prevent penalties being assessed against those people if they have to go to other crops?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I believe our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], has a bill to take care of certain phases so far as his State is concerned. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] is familiar with that program. I will ask him to explain it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There are probably ways to get at that. I traveled through the State of Indiana on Monday afternoon of this week and I could see literally tens of thousands of acres there covered with water and the crops that had been planted just rotting away. At the present time, as the gentleman knows, the Department of Agriculture, or the triple A have a regulation that a farmer can plant only 5 percent more corn than he did last year unless he plants these extra war crops. If he plants more than 5 percent additional corn acreage he is denied the benefit checks unless he also plants these other crops that are specified. I think it would be a good idea for the Department of Agriculture to lift that restriction on production and tell those farmers in Indiana and Illinois to take every possible acre they can and plant it into corn and soybeans so they will have some crop to feed their livestock. If they do not do that we are going to have a decided shortage in corn this coming year.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. Does not the gentleman believe some of our trouble is due to the fact that we have some people in the Government who in spite of their oaths of office are more interested in trying to make the country over than they are in winning the war? Does it not get down to that finally?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yesterday in my few remarks I said that Congress used to pass laws and bureaus followed them but that today it seems we have to pass laws to keep the bureaus from doing things they were not authorized to do in the first place.

Mr. GWYNNE. That is correct.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is about the situation in many cases, I may say to my colleague.

Mr. GWYNNE. Does not the gentleman believe a few good impeachment cases might serve notice on these people that we are still operating under a constitutional type of government?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Iowa enjoys the reputation of being a very learned judge. I do not believe I should enter into the legal implications of his question.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman, by reason of his very keen mind and former association with some of the men who are probably handling these affairs down here could prevail upon these bureaucrats to come back and live according to the Constitution.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. My friends in the Federal service follow the spirit as well as the word of the law. They are mostly old civil service employees and not politically appointed.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] whom I see on his feet.

Mr. CHURCH. Awhile ago the gentleman said that most of this difficulty was due to man-made troubles. Does not the gentleman believe he should have said due to the troubles these long-haired men have made?

If we could get rid of those long-haired men, we might avoid such critical situations as we find the O. P. A., W. P. B., and other agencies in this week due to their theories.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois, that as the gentleman from Minnesota just inferred, I try to be a little bit sparing in my criticism of the long-haired boys and the bureaucrats.

Mr. CHURCH. I am more interested in what is going to happen the next few days. These men as advisers to O. P. A., to W. P. B., to Justice Byrnes, and others have brought about chaos and uncertainty. What are the industries with inventories of meat, coffee, dairy products and such going to do with their losses if the O. P. A. carries out plans we are hearing of this week?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is largely in the hands of the Appropriation Committee. The appropriation for the O. P. A. will determine what is going to be the attitude of the Congress and the people. What disturbs me more all the time is the query, Where is the law that gives anybody down at the O. P. A. the authority to do all these things? That is enough to disturb anybody.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not want the gentleman to put himself in the same class with some of the long-haired gentlemen to which the gentleman from Illinois referred just now, because I know, as a matter of fact, the gentleman from Wisconsin had to come up the hard way and did have some practical experience and had to work his way through, whereas the men who make up these regulations, these super-intellectuals, as I call them, have never had a day's practical experience and are trying to work from a blueprint to change and remake our economy.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I always appreciate the kind words of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JENNINGS. I have listened with great interest to the informative remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I want to interpose at this time a suggestion, or rather a communication, that I received this morning from a hard-headed east Tennesseean who in the First World War fought to preserve this country and to save our way of life. He is very much exercised and concerned because of a long news article that appeared this week in a Washington paper listing about a dozen or fifteen aliens who had high salaries and who are in high places of power in this administration and undertaking to make this country over according to the pattern that they brought with them from the countries of their origin. He was very much concerned about that. He was wondering if what he did with his gun and with the sacrifice he made to preserve this country was to go by the board.

Recently I came in contact personally with men who have not been over in this country long enough to get dry behind the ears but within a short period of a year have been jacked up from a salary of $3,800 a year to $6,500 a year, when it is my candid opinion from what I have seen of them, heard of them, and observed, any job that any of them is competent to fill ought to be abolished.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will answer the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee by saying that he has talked with people of his district, he has read the newspapers, and he has conversed with his colleagues, and I believe he will agree with me when I say that that feeling of apprehension is not only from our side of the aisle. I would call your attention to a news article in the paper within the last couple of days in which our present Acting Speaker in a very constructive manner presented some of the things that had to be ironed out as far as Government employees are concerned. I do not think the apprehension is all on our side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to answer the gentleman who just spoke, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 minutes at the conclusion of the other special orders for the day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy listening to our colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] speaking on these problems of food production, but I could not help but wonder as he was discussing the problem of production whether or not we would have any workable system of distribution by the time the problems of production were solved. I have been disturbed by the mail I have received in the past several weeks from successful merchants, from men who have been in the grocery and meat business, retail merchants, for anywhere from 15 to 30 years. They are writing me, telling me, and showing me conclusively that it is practically an impossibility for them to stay in business and carry out the regulations and the instructions of O. P. A. Almost every day the Washington papers carry stories of the testimony of witnesses before various committees of this House and the other body.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Committee on Small Business, is here in the Chamber and is going to address the House for 30 minutes this afternoon. I know that his committee members are disturbed at the reports that are coming to Washington from these small businessmen. It seems to me that the committee of the House more than any other committee responsible for this situation and the committee that should assume the responsibility is the committee that wrote the Price Control Act of 1942—the Banking and Currency Committee. I grant you it seems apparent, at least to a layman, that the language included in that bill was clearly enough written so that any reasonable person would believe that we were going to make use of the methods and systems of distribution that we have developed and operated successfully in this country.

I think the major difference between rationing in this country and rationing in Great Britain is the fact that in Great Britain they have very definitely made use of an approved system of distribution of wholesalers, jobbers, and retailers, and have put into effect a plan under which they receive a fair and reasonable profit for their efforts to get food from the producers, and in that country very often from importers to the table of the consumer.

I make these remarks in view of the interesting remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I really asked for this 10 minutes for another purpose, perhaps not as important as this discussion with respect to raising and distributing food.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 25, I introduced a resolution requesting that June 26 be designated as National Baseball Day to perpetuate and honor the memory of Maj. Gen. Abner Doubleday, founder of America's national game of baseball.

This resolution was introduced at the request of Hartford Chapter No. 1, Veteran Baseball Players of America, Inc.

General Doubleday is generally recognized as the founder of the game of baseball as we know it today. It is true that various kinds of ball was played prior to the introduction of our present game. We knew of games such as barn ball, two old cat, three old cat.

While I think it is very proper that we honor the anniversary of the birth of General Doubleday, it occurred to me that this observation might well be tied in with our efforts to promote the sale of war bonds and stamps. The latter is now under consideration by the Treasury Department, and over this week end I hope to have the opportunity to talk with a representative of the office of the high commissioner of baseball, as well as the managers of some of the big-league groups in New York City.

Baseball is our national game, and the baseball fans of America are certainly an enthusiastic group of citizens. I believe if the major and minor leagues will cooperate and agree to play one game during the week ending June 26, charging as admission to the game a receipt showing the purchase of a War bond or a reasonable number of stamps within that week, more than a billion dollars would be subscribed to that week.

I believe this idea could be carried on into the smaller communities, through the large number of semipro and amateur ball clubs who, I am certain, would be glad to cooperate in such a plan.

There is no doubt in my mind but what the sporting editors of newspapers from one end of the country to the other would assist materially in the promotion of this program.

May I urge my colleagues to give some thought to this proposal and, if possible, confer with some of the sports editors in their own districts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], who had been given permission to address the House on Monday, may have the same time allotted to him on Tuesday of next week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ANSWERING MR. MURRAY OF WISCONSIN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] has had much experience in the production of food. He was for a time, as I understand, a county agent. I do not know of any person who is better qualified all the way around on the farm and food production than county agents. They not only must have knowledge of the subject, but they must be practical, they must be diplomatic, they must know how to deal with people, to use tact in dealing with them, but naturally people with whom they deal have a great deal of confidence in them, so I appreciate very much the gentleman's remarks.

NOT JUST GRUMBLING, GRIPING, AND GOSSIPING

I know the gentleman has tried to be constructive, and very much different from the type of argument we usually hear, that is just grumbling, griping, and gossiping just complaining about everything that is done without considering the fact that we are at war. The gentleman has tried to offer something that was really constructive.

LOT OF THINGS WRONG

I know that there are a lot of things wrong with our country. We expect a lot of things to be wrong. We cannot disrupt our economy, disrupt the way of living of 135,000,000 people, deprive them of doing the things they are used to, without causing a great deal of trouble and many inconveniences. If the people had never gotten used to all these things they would not miss them, because people do not miss what they have never gotten used to. But since we have gotten used to so many modern conveniences and geared the business of our country to produce things needed in the war, and then we have gotten into a global war, the largest war in the history of the world, and are compelled to resort to rationing and to regimentation, necessarily we will be irritated, we will be confused and the regulations that are made, even though necessary, in many instances will be irritating to us. We just naturally do not like them. But at the same time I realize that in a large program, in a huge program such as this one, there will be a lot of mistakes made; we in Congress can expect a lot of mistakes; the country can expect a lot of mistakes, but what I expect is that these mistakes may be quickly corrected. And, I join our friends of this House who have criticisms to offer for the failure of people in certain Federal positions for not correcting errors where obvious mistakes are made; I am irritated by them.

MEN AND WOMEN IN UNIFORM MAKING THE REAL SACRIFICE

But often upon examination and investigation we find it is not as simple as at first we might think. There are so many factors involved that when we understand we agree maybe we have been too hasty in our conclusions. So let us keep in mind that we are engaged in the biggest war this world has ever known. Let us not overlook the fact that there are some seven to nine million men in this country who are in uniform and who are really the ones who are making the sacrifices. We are not making a sacrifice. What are we giving up? We are giving up very little.

WHAT ARE WE SACRIFICING?

I heard the Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, not so long ago, speaking at a Texas breakfast, in which he emphasized the fact that he was not giving up much if anything; that he was getting plenty to eat, plenty to wear, and enjoying modern comforts and conveniences; that the people who are making the sacrifices in this war primarily are the men who are serving in uniform, and their loved ones, fathers and mothers, wives and children; they are the ones who are making the sacrifices.

REPUBLICAN FOOD STUDY GROUP

With that understanding let us look at some of these problems that have been brought to our attention. This food conference committee of the Republican Party is one: I regret that in this great body of 435 Members it is necessary for a political party to organize any group since they are members of the committees of the House, recognized minority Members, entitled to rights guaranteed by the rules, to bring up the subject and to insist upon hearings about any subject they desire.

Then they can have the hearings printed; they are official, they are public records, they are distributed to all Members of the House and the Senate, and they are available for public distribution. By having both Democrats and Republicans on the committee, I believe you must agree there is just a little bit better balance there than if they were all Democrats or if they were all Republicans.

WHY REPUBLICAN COMMITTEES?

Since we have a recognized set-up here in the House of Representatives, one that has been proven over a period of more than 150 years as the best system in the world, I see no reason why we should organize any political party into committees to study the very problems the recognized congressional committees are studying; that might be construed as just a little bit in opposition to the existing order. But if they have anything good to offer, I am willing to receive it and glad to have any constructive idea they have.

In order to more thoroughly and more fully carry forth the point I am hoping to make, may I suggest to you that the committee the gentleman mentioned awhile ago, the Committee on Small Business of the House, of which I happen to be the chairman, has been working for months and months on this food problem that he discussed. In the month of December 1942 we filed a report in which we insisted that there should be one agency to handle food. That was months ago, and we have been insisting on it ever since. Practically every thought that the gentleman brought out that was wrong has been advanced by our committee in written reports either to this House or to the Speaker of the House. So I join him in the hope that there will be one agency that will have to do with food.

NEW SET-UP

This afternoon's papers carry the story that there is an entirely new set-up, there is a War Mobilization Director, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, former Justice of the United States Supreme Court, and he will be succeeded as Economic Stabilization Director by the Honorable Fred Vinson, one of our former colleagues in the House. All of you, practically, know these two gentlemen. Every one of you will agree that they are men of the very highest type, the kind like Marvin Jones, the kind with good common sense and reason, men who know what should be done and how it can be done, who know how to execute laws and rules and regulations and at the same time do it all in the public interest. I do not know that the President could have selected two better men than those two. I congratulate the President on his fine selections of able men to fill these two important places. I am inserting herewith the order of the President and his statement concerning this new organization:

MAY 28, 1943.

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

To unify more closely the work of the war agencies concerned with the production, procurement, transportation, and distribution of military and civilian supplies, materials and products, I am creating the Office of War Mobilization, which will be under the direction of Justice James F. Byrnes.

Justice Byrnes will be assisted by a War Mobilization Committee composed of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the Munitions Assignment Board, the Chairman of the War Production Board, and the Economic Stabilization Director. The committee has been purposely kept small so that it can function most effectively. But the heads of the various departments and agencies will be asked to sit with the committee whenever matters of special concern to their departments or agencies are under consideration.

The committee will lay down unified policies and develop integrated programs and will see that the policies established and programs developed are expedited. In addition to its regular meetings, the committee will meet from time to time with me in the Cabinet Room.

We are entering a phase of the war effort when we must streamline our activities, avoid duplication and overlapping, eliminate interdepartmental friction, make decisions with dispatch, and keep both our military machine and our essential civilian economy running in team and at high speed.

Justice Byrnes is resigning as Economic Stabilization Director to become Director of the Office of War Mobilization. Judge Fred M. Vinson, of Kentucky, now a member of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, will succeed Justice Byrnes as Economic Stabilization Director. Judge Vinson was a Member of Congress for 14 years and for 8 years of that period a member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

EXECUTIVE ORDER PROVIDING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes of the United States, particularly by the First War Powers Act, 1941, as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and in order to provide for the more effective coordination of the mobilization of the Nation for war, it is hereby ordered as follows:

I

There is established in the Office for Emergency Management of the Executive Office of the President an Office of War Mobilization which shall be under the direction of a Director of War Mobilization (hereinafter referred to as Director), to be appointed by the President.

II

There is established in the Office of War Mobilization the War Mobilization Committee (hereinafter referred to as the Committee), of which the Director shall be the Chairman and with which he shall advise and consult. The Committee shall consist, in addition to the Director, of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the Munitions Assignments Board, the Chairman of the War Production Board, and

the Director of Economic Stabilization. The Chairman shall request the heads of other agencies or departments to participate in the deliberations of the Committee whenever matters specially affecting such agencies or departments are under consideration. It shall be the duty of the heads of the agencies and departments to supply necessary data to the Director and the Committee.

III

It shall be the function of the Office of War Mobilization, acting in consultation with the committee and subject to the direction and control of the President—

(a) To develop unified programs and to establish policies for the maximum use of the Nation's natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the effective use of the national manpower not in the armed forces, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions;

(b) To unify the activities of Federal agencies and departments engaged in or concerned with production, procurement, distribution, or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products and to resolve and determine controversies between such agencies or departments, except those to be resolved by the Director of Economic Stabilization under section 3, title IV of Executive Order 9250; and

(c) To issue such directives on policy or operations to the Federal agencies and departments as may be necessary to carry out the programs developed, the policies established, and the decisions made under this order. It shall be the duty of all such agencies and departments to execute these directives and to make to the Office of War Mobilization such progress reports as may be required.

IV

The Office of War Mobilization may perform the functions, exercise the powers, authority, and discretion conferred on it by this order through such officials and such agencies and in such manner as the Director, subject to the provisions of this order, may determine. The Director shall receive such compensation as the President shall provide, and within the limits of funds which may be made available, may employ necessary personnel and make provision for supplies, facilities, and services necessary to discharge his responsibilities.

All prior Executive orders insofar as they are in conflict herewith are amended accordingly.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 27, 1943.*

ONE AGENCY HERETOFORE RECOMMENDED

With all due respect to the recommendation made by the gentleman's food conference, composed of 40 members of the Republican Party, with no Democrats on that committee, may I suggest that the bill that finally is the result of their labor is nothing more than just a recommendation that all food be under a food administrator. That is all there is to it. That is in the bill introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], who I presume is the chairman of this Republican food conference committee.

Whom do they want to make Food Administrator? I thought Chester Davis was one of the best administrators in the country. I applauded the appointment by President Roosevelt of Mr. Davis as Food Administrator. But under this bill Chester Davis would not be Food Administrator. The Secretary of Agriculture, the gentleman who has been criticized here so much, is designated as the Food Administrator.

One gentleman referred to the fact that he pointed out serious mistakes to the Secretary of Agriculture months ago, and that no effort has been made to correct those mistakes, yet this group is proposing to place food under that very man, who they claim has not corrected mistakes when shown them. I am not saying the criticism is justified. It is pointed out to show inconsistency. That just anything is wanted for a change.

Our committee has not been idle on this recommendation after we made it in December. We have sought every opportunity and advantage to properly present it to this House. You gentlemen know that, after all, consideration is the main thing, getting the right kind of consideration. You can iron out many problems and many difficulties if you can get the right kind of consideration by the right people. We have pending before our Committee on Banking and Currency now, of which I am a member, the committee that handles the price administration legislation, a bill known as a bill to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation and to increase the authorized funds. To that bill I proposed days ago to introduce an amendment—the amendment has already been prepared and it was read into the RECORD—proposing one Food Administrator.

O. P. A. NOT TO BLAME FOR EVERYTHING—WHAT ABOUT CONGRESS?

Who is to blame for this confusion? I will tell you who is to blame. Congress is to blame, that is who is to blame. It is easy to kick the Price Administrator around, it is easy to blame everything on O. P. A. O. P. A. has been guilty of lots of things that were wrong, of too many things that were indefensible, but where they are not altogether to blame, why place all the blame there? I know the blame today was placed on the Price Administration, but when the price-administration law came before Congress, Congress at that time did not trust the then Price Administrator, Mr. Leon Henderson on farm prices, and Congress put into that law a provision that the Price Administrator could not fix any price on any agricultural commodity without the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. Therefore, Congress divided the authority. We had a dual responsibility there. That has caused an endless amount of confusion and trouble. Who is to blame? Congress is to blame. Congress should have corrected it a long time ago, but Congress did not do it.

LITTLE PACKERS

The gentleman says that the little packers have been greatly pressed and crushed. I thoroughly agree with him. I think that the ones administering that law were absolutely wrong. It has been injurious to a larger proportion of that industry than any other industry in the country, as vital and essential as it happens to be in this war effort, in particular. They were wrong, but who caused it? Divided authority caused it. We had O. P. A. before our committee, we had Secretary of Agriculture Wickard and Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Grover B. Hill before our committee face to face. We said, "We want to know who is responsible for this thing." You know what happened. O. P. A. said, "We knew something had to be done. There was a price squeeze. We could not afford to let meat go out of sight in price to the consumer. We had to fix it, but then we had to fix the price on the live animal to keep from squeezing out the little packers, and we, O. P. A., went to the Agriculture Department and we insisted on fixing the price of live animals, but Agriculture said no." They could not move, because Congress said the Department of Agriculture must approve these prices.

DIVIDED RESPONSIBILITY

So we have a responsibility there, and we might as well assume it, and they wrangled for months and months, and during this time there have been dozens and dozens of little packers forced out of business—absolutely wrong, almost criminal. Yet it was because of the divided responsibility placed in these two agencies by the Congress, and in that condition Congress must accept just a little bit of the blame. But now, since we have found out we have this confused situation over which we have control and caused, I think we should correct it. But should we do it by making the Secretary of Agriculture the Food Administrator? I think Chester Davis is as good as you can get.

LET DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ENFORCE

I am for one Food Administrator, and I am going to insist upon it in this bill; and, furthermore, I am going to insist that the Department of Justice enforce these rules and regulations—the Department of Justice, a regularly established and organized department of our Government, consisting of able men of both parties, on the bench, and as prosecuting attorneys and enforcement officers. I think that will go a long way toward solving these difficulties, and what you gentlemen have proposed has been proposed before. We all know it now, and what we need is its being put into effect.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will permit me to go ahead for the present and later I will yield.

MORE THINGS RIGHT THAN WRONG ABOUT GOVERNMENT

There are lots of things wrong, but when people are suffering so much, especially the men who are meeting our enemies on the field of battle, and their loved ones, and since we know that there are so many things wrong about our Government, yet there are more things that are right about our Government than are wrong about it.

PROPOSE ONE THING GOOD EVERY TIME A CRITICISM MADE

I think in wartime it would be a pretty good policy if every time we criticize the Government for something, we should mention something good that the Government has done, and I feel sure that out of the millions of things that are done every week, every month of the year, when we have to grumble and gripe, we can at least think of something constructive, something good that our country has done.

TWO MAIN OBJECTIVES

Two main objectives we have in our country today. The first one is winning the war. That is No. 1. No. 2 is preventing inflation. We have not won the war, but I believe everyone who is informed is willing to admit that he is satisfied with the progress that has been made in winning the war. Therefore our No. 1 objective is well on the way, and can we not afford to stand some of these little irritating and confusing things as long as we are succeeding in our main objective of winning this war.

RUINOUS INFLATION WITHOUT PRICE CONTROL

Our No. 2 objective is preventing inflation. We have not stopped all inflation and probably will not entirely stop it, but we have made an effort to stop it. Inflation would be almost as serious to our country here at home as the loss of the war would be in a foreign country. We do not like price control, it is said, we do not like the way prices are fixed. Yet we realize it is an immense program. Does anyone know how many commodities are involved in prices? There are 8,000,000 commodities in this country. It is an amazing figure. That includes the grades, and classes, and styles, and fashions, and designs. All of them do not have prices fixed on them, but most of them do, and whenever you come to dealing with seven or eight million different commodities you must expect some confusion, and you certainly will have it; but let us hope that just as much of it as possible may be ironed out. It takes time to do that. I think I have been too impatient probably, at least I have been impatient. I think many problems should have been ironed out before, but maybe I was expecting too much. Let us hope they will be ironed out as rapidly as possible, and these confusing and irritating things stopped. But let it be said in favor of the Price Administration, whoever administers the law, that if it had not been for some price control, we would be facing ruinous inflation today. Our dollars would not be worth 15 cents had it not been for price control, as ineffective as many people think it has been. Our dollars would not have been worthless, but almost so. So, if price control has broken down, we will have inflation. Every informed person knows that there are several dollars in the pocket of millions of people today to buy every dollar's worth of goods that can be offered for sale. So when you have that much money in the pockets of the people all over the country, and they are in competition, wanting to buy these different goods that are for sale, do not you know that the price would go to the sky, and do not you know that your dollars would decrease in value in proportion as the price went upward? Every informed person knows that. So in our talks about the Price Administration and price control, let us not overlook one thing, and that is that we do not want it to fail, and let us not abuse it, and let us not object to the extent that there would be a likelihood of its failure, because its failure would destroy the present generation in this country. Inflation will destroy it. So, price control has done a lot of good, and we cannot win this war successfully unless we prevent inflation, and to do that we must prevent runaway prices which cause inflation.

CHESTER DAVIS GOOD FOOD ADMINISTRATOR

The bill as presented by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] in effect does exactly what we have been advocating for months—not everything, but just the one agency part. I have not read the bill carefully, but one agency that is advocated is what our committee has advocated for months. We have often pointed out the confusion that was existing by this divided responsibility. However, I do not agree that Secretary Wickard should necessarily be made Food Administrator. I think Secretary Wickard is a good man. I think he is a good, honest, reliable, upright, and sincere person, but personally I am very much impressed with Chester Davis. Why should we just slap down Chester Davis and establish someone else up there, when Chester Davis is just getting started in the job? He is doing an excellent job. Why not give him this power?

FARM PROBLEMS AND STEEL SUPPLY

I know that not only a fair farm price is essential, but the question of machinery comes in. Particularly I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for being so fair about the farm machinery question. When this war came on we only had a limited amount of steel. We did not have steel for all purposes. First, we needed steel for planes, tanks, and guns. That came first. Next we had to have ships to transport the men and materials to foreign lands. Ships were absolutely vital and necessary. Along with ships we needed escort vessels, naval vessels, battleships, and everything that went with them. Everyone of us will agree that steel for those purposes should have come first. Someone had to know how much steel we had. It was and is a military secret. We should not discuss it and disclose this information to everybody. Our enemies would like to know. They would like to have known all the time, but we did not want them to know. The President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, placed Mr. Donald Nelson in charge of war production. Mr. Donald Nelson is a good man for that job. He has done an excellent job. He knew how much steel we had. He knew the purposes for which it should be used. If we wanted to use steel for another purpose that should be subordinate or inferior to the purposes I have mentioned, Mr. Nelson would say, "No," and it was his duty to say "No," because the winning of the war came first, and we simply did not have enough steel to go around. I believe that Donald Nelson honestly administered the regulation or directive that was given to him. Donald Nelson knew the facts. He exercised his best judgment. I believe he did.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] a while ago made the observation that if they could only get parts for machinery, the farmers would be much better off. May I suggest to you that the first thing that Donald Nelson did on that was to order the making of parts—not 100 percent of 1941, but 165 percent of 1941, on the same theory that the gentleman advanced, that if they could just get parts they could carry on with those old machines. Not only that, but he ordered 20 percent of new machines compared with the 1941 production. We talked to him about it. We said, "Can't you raise your figures?" He said, "Later on, but right now we need steel for more important purposes." And he would point out to you and show you why. Later on he did raise it to 40 percent.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] thinks that the farm machinery problem, although not entirely solved, is a long way on the road to solution, because in addition to the machines, I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana, we must have manpower to operate those machines. There are fewer men on the farms today than there have been for a long, long time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I know my good friend from Texas has made a long, difficult, and patient study of small business. I know he is interested in the welfare of the small businessman, but I know that above that he is interested in the winning of this war. It seems to me that at the present time we can place the production of food alongside of the production of battleships. When you can produce food by simply repairing farm machinery with the very minimum use of steel, it does occur to me, whether it takes 100 percent or 200 percent or 300 percent or 400 percent, that it is conservation for the War Production Board to allot the necessary amount of steel to repair the machinery which lies broken out in the fields, in order to produce food to win this war.

Mr. PATMAN. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. I want to produce food. I want the farmers to have all the machinery and all the manpower they can get. Everyone does. But when this war is over and history is being written, I imagine the gentleman will be satisfied with what has been done. You do not know, I do not know, we should not know about the problem, the scarcity of critical materials. It is not our province or duty, but we have entrusted to others, gentlemen in whom we have the highest confidence, and let us presume that they are honest people; that they are not trying to ruin or wreck this country. They are trying to save it. They are considering food. They are considering oil. They are considering battleships and they are considering everything. For one to say that we must just take the steel stock pile and each one take a grab at it and take his part, little as it may be, that is not sensible. We have to leave it to somebody to allocate, and we have done that.

Mr. BROOKS. I am not placing the responsibility directly at the door of Donald Nelson.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, it is his duty. That is his responsibility.

Mr. BROOKS. But I am saying that if his orders have been sufficient, then

there has been unequal distribution of the steel necessary for the farms.

Mr. PATMAN. With all due respect to my good friend, how can the gentleman say it has been unequal and unfair, when he does not know? The gentleman does not know how much steel has been available for allotment.

Mr. BROOKS. I will say to my good friend, and I have confidence in his fairness and in his integrity, that I have seen machinery lying out in the field unable to be used. I have had appeals from little blacksmith shops which repair those machines for metal to do the repairing, and I have seen the War Production Board sit inert and do nothing in the face of those appeals.

Mr. PATMAN. I have seen that too, but they were the exceptions, not the general rule, and the reason for that was that they never delegated power to the local offices. I am glad the gentleman brought that up; that is one of the criticisms I have had of O. P. A. and W. P. B. They say they are trying to correct that. I hope they do. They should delegate more power to these regional, State, and district officers so they can adjust these things locally, but those little things which stick out like a sore thumb are the exceptions and not the general rule. I remember one instance that was brought to the attention of our committee, the case of a small concern that could have done a lot with certain materials that were being burned in an Army camp. Why, they just piled up a lot of fine lumber and burned it! It sounded horrible, and I do not condone any such waste; it is wrong; but you know there are always rules and regulations that have been built up over a period of time which in unusual times will not work and are not practicable and should not be used, but it takes a little time to readjust them. Railroad companies right down there in our country, in east Texas, instruct their section foremen that when they pull ties out from under tracks and replace them, the old ties which could be used for many purposes by nearby farmers who would like to buy them, that those ties must be piled up and burned. They adopted this rule to keep down the possibility or opportunity for graft or unusual waste. Corporations have had such rules as long as we have had corporations, and they were the right kind of rules in normal times, but often rules good in normal times are not good in time of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DILWEG, of Wisconsin, for 1 week, on account of death in the family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from California, Mr. CECIL R. KING, be permitted to revise and extend his own remarks by inserting an address he made over the radio on Friday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPORT ON TAX BILL

Mr. DOUGHTON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Tuesday, June 1, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, June 1, 1943, for consideration of housing bills, in room 1304, New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

There will be a hearing of the Committee on Roads on Tuesday, June 1, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 2241.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 2, and Thursday, June 3, 1943, on bills dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act—H. R. 1882 and H. R. 2309.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

1. Tuesday, June 1, Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, will open the hearings with any statements and recommendations he desires to submit covering national flood control and the projects that should be included in the bill to be reported, especially as they are related to national defense and as they will be important following the existing war to provide sound flood-control projects and desirable public works. General Reybold is now on an airplane tour of inspection of the flood areas and will submit a first-hand report covering recent major floods along the Missouri, Arkansas, White, Mississippi, Illinois, Wabash, Ohio, and other rivers in the recent flood areas. He will be followed by Gen. Thomas M. Robins, Assistant Chief of Engineers, who has previously advised the Flood Control Committee during hearings and who will also appear before the committee and submit his views and discuss generally the projects that have been favorably reported since the hearings were conducted on H. R. 4911, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, reported on June 9, 1941, which became the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941. Col. George R. Goethals, Chief of the Flood Control Branch, Office of Chief of Engineers, will attend the hearings and will furnish to the members of the committee in detail any and all available information respecting the said projects on which favorable reports have been submitted by the Chief of Engineers.

The district engineers and the division engineers have furnished to the Chief of Engineers data and information respecting major floods since August 18, 1941, and particularly with respect to recent major floods in the various drainage basins of the country, which will be submitted to the committee.

2. Wednesday, June 2: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects for the New England region, including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers, and the Middle Atlantic region, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

3. Thursday, June 3: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects on the upper and lower Ohio River and tributaries, and on projects of the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

4. Friday, June 4: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects along the Missouri River and tributaries and the upper Mississippi River and the Great Lakes region.

5. Tuesday, June 8: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects on the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, including the Arkansas and White Rivers, and on rivers flowing into the Gulf west of the Mississippi River, and in the western Rocky Mountain region, including Texas and Colorado, and in the Pacific Northwest region, including the Willamette River and the Columbia River and tributaries.

6. Wednesday, June 9: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the Los Angeles area and in the State of California, including the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kern River Valleys, and on projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

7. Thursday, June 10: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

8. Friday, June 11: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2731, to facilitate the award and payment of just compensation for property requisitioned under the authority of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2620, a bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives of the United States, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 16, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2750. A bill to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 2828. A bill to permit certain burials in the Scottish Rite Temple in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2829. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the following streams, which are tributaries to the Red River of the North: Buffalo River, Wild Rice River, Marsh River, Sand Hill River, Red Lake River, Roseau River, Snake River, Middle River (tributary to Snake River), Tamarac River, and Two Rivers in the State of Minnesota, for flood control, for run-off and waterflow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. Res. 245. Resolution to authorize the Territories Committee to investigate the Hawaiian Islands' political, economic, and social conditions; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2830. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lim Shee Chang; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 2831. A bill for the relief of Canal Dredging Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1032. By Mr. HOPE: Petition favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1033. Also, petition concerning House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1034. Also, petition favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1035. Also, petition concerning House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1036. Also, petition concerning House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1037. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Fowler, Kans., favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1038. By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland: Petition of various citizens of Maryland, supporting House bill 2082, a bill to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1039. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution adopted by the members of Local Union No. 116, Progressive Miners of America, Harrisburg, Ill., signed by Clarence Osborn, president, and William Pearron, secretary, urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1040. Also, communication from the Home Loan & Finance Co., of Flora, Ill., signed by L. L. Bottorff, manager, and Elahoon Harshbarger, secretary; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1041. By Mr. ANDREWS: Petition of Dr. Harold F. Hewitt, pastor, Ripley Memorial Church, Buffalo, N. Y., and others, containing 18 names, favoring passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1042. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of H. D. Lamb and 146 other citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1043. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of Mrs. T. E. Kidd and 44 other citizens of the city of Buckhannon, W. Va., advocating passage of House bill 2082, introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH H. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1044. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of H. O. Nippert and 59 others, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1045. By Mr. JEFFREY: Petition of 65 citizens of Preble and Butler Counties, Ohio, urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1046. By Mr. McCOWEN: Petition of Rev. Newton Crider, of Milford, Ohio, Clermont County, and 19 other citizens from Milford and other surrounding places in the vicinity of the Sixth Ohio District, urging Congress to pass House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of the mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, all the ways of our need lead to Thee; our deepest cravings but drive us to Thy everlasting arms; Thou alone art our refuge and our strength. For this quiet moment may we rise above our baser selves and, instead of our cramped and cabined conceptions, may there come the lure of far horizons, the light of lifted skies. We confess with shame and sorrow that often on life's lower levels we find ourselves surprised and trapped by unworthy compromises, by cowardly concessions, by weak acquiescence, by betrayals of integrity, and disobedience to the heavenly vision. When we would do good, evil is ever present with us. But we are grateful for those better moods when even in the pressure of daily duty there comes to us the hush of solemn thoughts, vistas of splendor, windows of insight, when the darkening veil on the face of all things falls away and the inner eyes of the soul see through the sham and show of the common days. May we find Thy highway through the fields of time and sense.

Breathe through the things that are seen the peace of the unseen and eternal. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, May 28, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Reynolds
Bankhead	Gurney	Russell
Barbour	Hatch	Scrugham
Bilbo	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bone	Hayden	Smith
Brewster	Hill	Stewart
Brooks	Holman	Taft
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lodge	Tobey
Byrd	Lucas	Truman
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wallgren
Connally	Mead	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	White
Davis	Moore	Wiley
Downey	Murray	Willis
Eastland	Nye	Wilson
Ellender	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on important public business.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letter, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, LEGISLATIVE ESTABLISHMENT (S. DOC. NO. 60)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment, fiscal year 1943, amounting to $24,192 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 61)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $1,500,000 in the form of an amendment to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

WAIVER OF PROSECUTION OR CIVIL ACTION UNDER ANTITRUST LAWS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmeeting, pursuant to section 12 of Public Law No. 603, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 11, 1942, his third report covering the period from February 1, 1943, through May 26, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the City Council of Springfield, Ill., favoring the adoption as a national policy of the so-called "American All—Immigrants All Program"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois relating to the care of ill and wounded soldiers and sailors returning from the wars; to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolution printed in full when presented to Mr. BROOKS on the 28th ultimo, p. 5017, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Illinois; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"House Joint Resolution 47

"Whereas the growth of this country from a small republic of 3,000,000 people to a mighty Nation of 135,000,000 may be attributed largely to the fact that our high ideals of government contain a universal appeal to the freedom-loving people of the entire world; and

"Whereas the cosmopolitan composite thus formed has its roots in divers origins, the cooperation of each one of which is essential to the harmonious functioning of the whole; and

"Whereas a national program designed to blend these various elements into a homogeneous pattern and still preserve their native cultural standards is a desirable method of combating enemy propaganda directed at fostering national jealousies and prejudices which should have no place in our American way of life; and

"Whereas the basis of such a program was perfected by Mr. Avinere Toigo during his term of office as executive secretary of the State of Illinois committee on citizenship and found expression in the beautifully executed "Americans All—Immigrants All" pageant held in Springfield, Ill., in 1940 and 1941, which was the culmination of an intensive educational campaign; and

"Whereas it is appropriate that this movement should receive impetus from the city which aided in the development of Abraham Lincoln, who so ably personified tolerance in its every aspect; and

"Whereas it is of the utmost importance that the unification of divergent national concepts be intelligently and sympathetically directed toward the formation of a truly indivisible union: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That we respectfully urge the institution of a national program consonant with the principles stated in the preamble, and that a suitably engrossed copy of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to President Roosevelt and to the presiding officer of each House of Congress for such action as may be necessary."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Alabama; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution endorsing United States Resolution 114, which provides for the forming of an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority, and urging passage of said resolution by the United States Senate

"Whereas the people of Alabama are desirous that the war be brought to a successful termination as rapidly as possible and that guaranties of enduring peace and security be provided; and

"Whereas the formation of an organization of the United Nations as provided in United States Senate Resolution 114 is a proper step toward attaining these ends, in that said organization—

"(1) Will assist in the coordination and complete utilization of the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis;

"(2) Will better enable the establishment of satisfactory temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces until such time as permanent governments can be established;

"(3) Will further the administration of relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nation forces;

"(4) Will enable the development of procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of dissensions and disagreements between nations; and

"(5) Will provide for the assemblance and maintenance of a military force and the suppression by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Legislature of Alabama does hereby approve United States Senate Resolution 114, and does urge its speedy adoption by the Senate of the United States; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Senators from Alabama, and to each of the four Senators who joined in presenting this resolution."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 33

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Alabama, in session assembled, That the War Production Board and such other authorities as may have concurred in the announced proposal to take over the car-manufacturing plant of the Pullman Standard Car Manufacturing Co. at Bessemer for the purpose of housing machinery for the extrusion of aluminum be requested to give full consideration to the fact that the existing plant is engaged to full capacity in war production, is organized and equipped to continue the operation of its car-manufacturing business upon the cessation of the war effort, is one of the principal industries in the Birmingham area processing into finished product the raw materials of that region, and that the taking over of the plant for the purposes proposed would sacrifice and destroy a permanent business for no other purpose than to provide a roof and walls for the processing of aluminum.

Resolved, further, That the Federal authorities are assured of the full cooperation of public agencies and citizens within the State of Alabama in the matter of the establishment of the proposed aluminum-processing unit, but are desirous of avoiding what is obviously an unnecessary sacrifice of one of the most important industrial units in the State fully equipped to assist in the post-war economy and assured of a market for its production if it is not dismantled as threatened by the public announcement; Be it further

"Resolved, That the Senate of Alabama does protest the action of the War Production Board in this regard and calls upon it to reconsider and rescind its action and asks that this plant for processing of aluminum be located elsewhere within the State than in the plant of the Pullman Car Manufacturing Co. at Bessemer and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the National Congress, the two Senators and the Congressmen from Alabama, and the Chairman of the War Production Board."

A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Memorial 3

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States of America urging that all departments and functions of the Federal Government relating to commercial fishing and fisheries be transferred from the United States Department of the Interior and placed under the United States Department of Agriculture

"Whereas by reason of the present war in which the United States of America is engaged there exists a meat shortage in this country; and

"Whereas a considerable amount of the food produced and consumed by the people of this country consists of fish and seafoods, which is helping to alleviate the existing meat shortage; and

"Whereas all departments and functions of the Federal Government relating to commercial fishing and fisheries are now administered by the United States Department of the Interior; and

"Whereas such departments and functions more properly belong under the United States Department of Agriculture and if transferred from the United States Department of the Interior to the United States Department of Agriculture, such change would be conducive to greater production of fish and seafoods and would aid and assist our country in combating the existing meat shortage and facilitate the prosecution and successful early termination of the present war: Be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

"SECTION 1. That we do hereby respectfully memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States of America to take such action as is necessary to immediately effect the transfer of all departments and functions of commercial fishing and fisheries under the Federal Government from the United States Department of the Interior and place the same under the United States Department of Agriculture.

"SEC. 2. That a copy of this memorial under the great seal of the State of Florida be immediately forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and to each member of the delegation representing the State of Florida in both the House of Representatives and Senate of the Congress of the United States of America.

"SEC. 3. That a copy of this memorial be spread upon the journal of both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Florida and that sufficient copies thereof be furnished to the press.

"Approved by the Governor May 27, 1943."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Baxter Springs, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens, members of the Salem United Brethren Church, of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 332. A bill to revise the Alaska game law; with amendments (Rept. No. 268);

H. R. 338. A bill to authorize the incorporated city of Anchorage, Alaska, to purchase and improve the electric light and power system of the Anchorage Light & Power Co., Inc., an Alaska corporation, and for such purpose to issue bonds in the sum of not to exceed $1,250,000 in excess of present statutory debt limits; without amendment (Rept. No 269); and

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 270).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1149. A bill for the relief of Vodie Jackson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1150. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joe J. Svejkovsky; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1151. A bill to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1152. A bill to provide for the conservation of wildlife on public lands and reservations of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 1153. A bill for the relief of Anders Hjalmar Evert Johnson; and

S. 1154. A bill for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis, Aquilino Echevarria, Mario Rosario Arriaga, Aboitis Luis Maria Astuy, Jose Diaz Villar, Benedicto Jeraro Diaz Fernandez, Leon Monasterio Sagasti, Pedro Onarteechevarria, Mario Canuto Goicoechea, Manuel Zulueta, and Arturo Calvo Berriochoa; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1155. A bill for the relief of Peter L. Richter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1156. A bill to authorize the disposition of certain property under the jurisdiction of the War Department; and

S. 1157. A bill to amend section 61 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, for the purpose of providing such training of State and Territorial military forces as is deemed necessary to enable them to execute their internal security responsibilities within their respective States and Territories; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

COMPENSATION FOR UNUSED LEAVE OF MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF CAPITOL POLICE FORCE ENTERING THE ARMED SERVICES—AMENDMENT

Mr. MEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13), to compensate members or former members of the Capitol Police force entering the armed forces for unused leave, which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate and ordered to be printed.

STUDY FOR PURPOSE OF REVISION OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 154), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and comprehensive study of the Standing Rules of the Senate with a view to determining what amendments, modifications, or other revision is necessary and desirable for the purpose of bringing such rules up to date. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

WAGES AND COST OF LIVING—RESOLUTION OF SEATTLE LABOR CONSUMERS' LEAGUE

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, a short time ago I received a communication from the Labor Consumers' League operating in the city of Seattle, Wash. Its vice president is Mr. L. H. Paqué; its executive secretary is Mr. Charles Mentrin; its president is Mr. Peter E. Terzick, secretary of the Puget Sound District Council, Lumber and Saw Mill Workers; its recording secretary is Mr. Roy W. Atkinson, field representative of the C. I. O.

To this communication is attached a resolution praising the President of the United States for his recent directive freezing wages. It is a resolution of commendation of the President sent by this organization, which in its letter to me uses this language:

In consideration of the Presidential directive, which pertains to wages and cost of living, you will find the attached resolution a true criterion of the temper and attitude of the American people who are partially represented by the Labor Consumers' League; and that when the public realizes the seriousness of this last Presidential directive, and the importance of it to the war effort, you will find that all of the working people are in accord with proper stabilization of wages in relation to the cost of living.

The Labor Consumers' League present endorsing body consists of over 200,000 members of organized labor in Seattle and vicinity, both American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The letter is signed by Mr. Paqué and Mr. Mentrin. I ask that the resolution attached to the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the President of the United States has issued a directive order wherein he freezes wages at the January 1941 level plus 15 percent thereby strengthening and adding to the formula already adopted by the National War Labor Board; and

Whereas the President in issuing this drastic order is convinced that such a course is necessary to prevent national currency inflation; and

Whereas all labor is now, and has always been unalterably opposed to inflationary methods both in finance and normal living expenses, the present trend of which is continually upwards with the wage levels remaining fixed, thereby causing those engaged both in peace and wartime industries to make more and more sacrifices in order to do their part in financing and carrying forward the war effort; and

Whereas the President with the full knowledge of these conditions, has caused the drastic directive to be issued, thereby placing the welfare of the country first and foremost: Therefore be it

Resolved by Labor Consumers' League, That we commend the President of the United States for his courageous action; and be it further

Resolved, That we petition and urge our Commander in Chief to go further in a similar directive order and freeze all items of ordinary living at the level of January 1941, with such proportionate increases to producers and wholesalers, including all transportation costs of not more than 15 percent by the retailer of all such goods; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be petitioned to create a special war fund that would provide for the payment of the differential to those wholesalers and retailers who have stocks on hand that they have been forced to acquire at prices in excess of the ceiling to be set, as previously stated in the foregoing resolve.

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION.

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director, Office of War Mobilization, at Spartanburg, S. C., on May 31, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

IN TIME OF WAR WE MUST PREPARE FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HILL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "In Time of War We Must Prepare for Peace," delivered by him at the University of Alabama at the alumni banquet, May 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Memorial Day address delivered by him at Calvary Cemetery, Pittsburgh, Pa., on May 31, 1943, at exercises held under the auspices of Martin-O'Donnell Post No. 274, Veterans of Foreign Wars, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHEELER BEFORE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN CLUB OF CHICAGO

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator WHEELER on the occasion of the annual spring banquet of the University of Michigan Club of Chicago, at Chicago, Ill., on May 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR MOBILIZATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of war mobilization, delivered by Senator Pepper on Friday, May 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GREEK NAVY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of the Greek Navy, delivered by him on May 31, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Memorial Day address delivered by him at the Battle Ground National Cemetery, Brightwood, District of Columbia, on May 30, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY HON. SUMNER WELLES AT NORTH CAROLINA COLLEGE FOR NEGROES.

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, at the commencement exercises of the North Carolina College for Negroes, at Durham, N. C., on May 31, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY J. EDWIN MATTOX BEFORE YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF CALIFORNIA

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Youth of America and Civilian Defense," delivered by J. Edwin Mattox, before the Sectional State Executive Committee, Young Democratic Clubs of California, at San Francisco, Calif., on May 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISSION TO MOSCOW—ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mission to Moscow," published in the Washington Times-Herald of May 31, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S VIEWS ON RECIPROCAL TRADE—ARTICLE BY CARL SANDBURG.

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Washington's Words Point a Path Now," written by Carl Sandburg and published in the Washington Post of Sunday, May 30, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, beginning on page 1, line 8, which has heretofore been stated.

The Chair calls attention to the order made on Friday last, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered (*by unanimous consent*), That at not later than 2:30 o'clock p. m. on Tuesday, June 1, 1943, a vote be had without further debate on the committee amendment to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the time between 11 o'clock a. m. and 2:30 o'clock p. m. to be divided equally between the proponents and opponents of the amendment, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Under the unanimous-consent agreement the 188 minutes now remaining will be divided equally between the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], 94 minutes to be controlled by each Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, did the Chair say 94 minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-four minutes to be controlled by each Senator. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized and the time under his control is now in effect.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Does that take into account the 21 minutes which have expired, which were necessary to be used in order to produce a quorum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes. The remaining time has been divided equally.

Mr. McNARY. Ninety-four minutes for each side?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes. That is the amount of time now remaining. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I am sorry, Mr. President, but as the time is limited, I think it is not fair to other Senators who will follow me to yield during my talk on the question before the Senate.

Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of the committee amendment to the pending measure. I certainly have no desire whatever to interfere with the continued operation of the Trade Agreements Act, and it seems to me the amendment will not do so in any way, but will merely leave us free after the war to determine the policy which should then be adopted.

People do not seem to understand that if we pass the pending measure we not only give power to the President for 2 years to enter into trade agreements but he may then, at the end of 2 years, or just before the end, enter into trade agreements which are binding on the United States for 3 years from that time. The extension of the power during the war does not concern me, for I think tariffs are relatively unimportant during the war; but what does concern me is that if we pass this measure and extend the act for 2 years, then, at the end of, say, 1944, the President may enter into a series of trade agreements fixing the tariff policy of this country for 3 years from that time, or until December 1947. I believe that we are asked, therefore, to tie our hands at a time when it will become peculiarly necessary to readjust our policy to whatever conditions may then prevail, conditions which we are absolutely unable to foresee at the present time.

It is said that we will not be hampered because most of the agreements have already run 3 years and are now terminable on 6 months' notice. Therefore, it is said, any additional treaties which may be made for 3 years are of no importance.

There are two answers to that suggestion. The first is that we may enter into a new treaty with a country with which we have no treaty, providing for a particular reduction in rates covered, perhaps, in some of the existing treaties, and by doing so we extend the reduction for 3 years, during which time we cannot change it in any way as to any country.

For instance, in the case of the agreement binding the duty on crude rubber, that agreement is now contained in the Peruvian Treaty and it is contained in the British Treaty. The British Treaty may now be terminated in 6 months. The Peruvian Treaty may be terminated in about 1 year from this time. But the President may enter into a treaty, we

will say, with the Dutch Government, also binding rubber on the free list. We may enter into that treaty in December 1944 and, regardless of the fact that the British and Peruvian treaties are terminable, we will absolutely bind ourselves to keep rubber on the free list until 3 years from the time the Dutch Treaty is made.

There is another answer to the argument that all important treaties have already been made, and that is, that although they have been made, they may be made over again. In December, 1944, just before a new Congress begins, just before a new President enters upon his office, the Secretary of State may make a whole series of new treaties, revising the British Treaty, the Brazilian Treaty, every other treaty, and he may lay out the whole pattern of what our trade relations are to be during the 3 years following, during the next administration. He may bind rubber on the free list. He may bind chrome on the free list. He may reduce the tariffs on agricultural products, including flax. He may lay out the entire program.

It is said now that he does not intend to do so; but we cannot be sure that he does not intend to take such action. Certainly the State Department up to this time has shown an intention by executive agreement, without consulting Congress, of doing everything it can to write the provisions of the peace as it thinks they should be formulated. That is shown in the lease-lend agreement in which the State Department has, I think, and the Foreign Relations Committee thinks, gone outside its legal authority, and provided that in settling the lend-lease obligations finally we shall enter into an agreement, and that agreement shall include provision for agreed action by the United States of America and the United Kingdom directed to the expansion of production, employment, and so forth, and to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and "to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers."

It says:

> At an early convenient date, conversations shall be begun between the two governments with a view to determining * * * by their own agreed action—

The above stated objectives.

The State Department, in other words, has told us in so many words than it intends to renegotiate with the British and every other nation the terms of the reduction of our tariffs, and that it intends to do that, not at the end of the war, but before the end of the war, whenever the time is convenient.

So it seems to me perfectly clear that what we are doing in passing this measure without amendment is to authorize the State Department to write the trade provisions of the peace treaty, if the war is over by the end of 1944, and to lay down the entire basis of the economic relations between the countries of the world.

After the war we shall find an entirely different condition. The Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act under which we are now acting will be entirely out of date. In some respects we may want a much higher tariff, and in the case of other items we may want a much lower tariff than 50 percent of the Smooth-Hawley rates to carry out the general purposes of the peace treaty. Certainly currencies are going to be very different from what they were at the time the rates of the Smoot-Hawley tariff were made. Exchange rates with some countries are going to be such that the goods which come from some countries must bear a very high tariff rate if we are going to have any continuation of certain industries in the United States at all.

In respect to other countries it may well be that we can afford to lower the rates to much less than 50 percent of the existing tariffs.

But it seems perfectly clear to me that in the period after the war the Congress should retain in its hands the right to make the kind of treaties which should be made and the right to determine what should be done. It is said that if we agree to the amendment we shall discourage all the other nations of the world, and shall make them think there will be no cooperative action after the war, that we are repudiating any friendly approach to the tariff problem. Certainly no such result could follow from the adoption of the amendment which is proposed; and certainly I do not believe in repudiating the present tariff policy, in repudiating the desirability of reasonable rates, or in repudiating cooperation with all other nations.

Mr. President, at this point I want to read what I said in a recent speech which I shall hereafter ask to have printed in the RECORD.

> Of course, there are many conditions which can be established now to make nations less likely to undertake aggression in the future. First, there must be a sound economic basis for peace, one which will assure to every nation a fair distribution of the world's goods and the ability to develop its resources and capacities. In the Versailles Treaty economic conditions where completely disrupted and disregarded in the interest of the self-determination of peoples. States were set up which were wholly unable to support themselves. Europe was broken up into a large number of unstable units. In the post-war settlement we must try to establish customs unions between nations whose economies are complementary so that they can be reasonably self-sufficient. We must assure to each one of these nations and groups of nations the raw materials which they require to feed their people and develop their industrial life. We must assure to each an outlet for sufficient products at least to pay for these raw materials. If we interpret freedom from want to mean only this fair and equitable economic treatment for nations, then I think it is a reasonable goal and one which must underlie any practical plan for peace.

Mr. President, when we come to try to work out a world in which every nation will have a chance, we shall have to revise completely all existing tariffs, we shall have to approach the problem from an entirely new standpoint, we shall have to study the entire question; and we shall have to find that we cannot do it within the limits of the Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. President, I desire to cite a few examples of the difficulties we shall be in if we tie our hands so that after the war, for 3 years, perhaps, we shall not be able to change many of our tariffs.

In the first place, let us consider the question of rubber. We have set up a synthetic rubber industry for which we have appropriated $650,000,000. Even the State Department takes the position that the rubber case should not be prejudged at the present time.

The report of the House Ways and Means Committee, reflecting the views of the State Department, says, regarding rubber:

> In short, the post-war situation cannot and should not be prejudged at this time. * * * The need for assisting the synthetic rubber industry after the war and the nature and extent of such assistance, if any is needed, should be determined only after the close of the war, when the question may possibly become pertinent in the light of the facts at that time.

Yet, Mr. President, if we do not adopt the committee amendment we do prejudge the case. For 3 years after the war we shall prevent the Government from imposing any tariff on crude rubber. During those 3 years we may well destroy the synthetic rubber industry. Not only that, but we would put ourselves in the hands of the Dutch and the British, who practically control the rubber supply of the world. The additions of rubber from Brazil will be very minor. It is perfectly clear that before the war the Dutch and the British held down production. The Senate will remember, from the report of the Truman committee, that even after the war began the rubber cartel, if we may call it that, held down production to 60 percent of capacity. It was only after the most strenuous pressure from Mr. Jones that they gradually increased the capacity to 87 percent, and finally to 100 percent. Throughout the history of the rubber industry our producers have been in the hands of a monopoly of the British and the Dutch, who control the rubber supply; and yet it is proposed that we give authority to the State Department to bind rubber on the free list from now until 1947, and absolutely to tie our hands against the protection of the synthetic rubber industry. I do not know whether the protection will be necessary; I do not know whether it will be advisable; but I certainly say that we should not tie our hands so that we could not protect that industry if we wished to do so.

The second item to which I should like to call attention is that of tin. Tin, like rubber, has been controlled by a cartel of the British and the Dutch, and we have had to pay through the nose in order to get tin. They have so handled tin by building smelters in Malaya and prohibiting the export of tin ore that it never paid anyone to build a tin smelter in the United States. Now, we have built a tin smelter in the United States. In Texas we built a smelter to which Bolivian ore is brought, and we produce our own tin. But if tin is bound on the free list, obviously, the tin from Malaya

will come in very much more cheaply than the tin which can be produced in Bolivia and then smelted in Texas, and, after the war is over, we are going to find our Texas smelter shutdown, without any possibility of continuing, because we shall have tied our hands by a 3-year agreement. I do not think any intelligent administration would wish to have the power to tie up this country for 3 years. I do not understand why there is any opposition to the provision that when trade treaties are made they shall be terminable 6 months after the war.

The third item to which I should like to call attention is that of chrome. Chromite or chrome ore was also bound duty-free in the trade agreement with the United Kingdom. In the book on World Minerals and World Peace, by Leith, Furness, and Lewis, the following observation is made with respect to chromite:

> The United States: Because of wartime reduction in imports, the United States has started a large-scale development of low-grade chromite ores in Montana. Production is expected to be at the rate of over 500,000 tons per year—more chromite than has ever been mined in a year by any country.

Again it should be noted that in the past the world production of chromite has been dominated by a practical monopoly exercised by the Chrome Trust of London. The discovery in recent years of deposits in Asiatic Turkey has tended to break the control of this monopoly, but not completely. The continued development in the United States of chromite production would make the United States independent of this monopoly situation.

Yet, Mr. President, if we pass the joint resolution without the limitation proposed by the amendment we shall give the State Department the power to tie our hands so that the chrome industry will come to an end when the war comes to an end, although we have chrome deposits available.

Take the question of flaxseed—an agricultural product. There are many other agricultural products, but let us take the question of flaxseed. Prior to 1938 from 60 percent to 80 percent of the flaxseed consumed by the United States was imported, principally from Argentina; but as a result of the wartime demand the sown acreage of flaxseed in the United States has increased from 1,000,000 acres in 1938 to more than 6,000,000 acres in 1943. The United States production of flaxseed has increased from 8,000,000 bushels in 1938 to 50,000,000 bushels in 1942. In the Argentine agreement the duty on flaxseed was reduced from 65 cents a bushel to 32½ cents, for the period of the emergency, and to 50 cents thereafter. We are asked to give the State Department authority to reduce the duty on flaxseed to 32½ cents, and to bind it for 3 years, so that we would provide a sufficient time during which the farmers of the United States would have to abandon the production of flaxseed; and it would be almost impossible again to establish a very desirable industry, and one which is giving work to many American farmers.

The wartime development of certain industries in the United States as a means of providing essential and critical materials which have heretofore largely been imported from abroad creates a serious problem in many respects. The problem is summarized as follows by Mr. Alonzo E. Taylor, in an article which appeared in the Harvard Business Review during the past winter:

> On the one side, it is necessary to visualize the position of the United States and of other manufacturing countries. Before the war, total manufacture in the United States was nearly half of total manufacture in the world; is this proportion to be maintained, lowered, or raised? Is technical progress to be reversed? Having proved utility and cheapness of substitute materials, are we to discard patents and processes, demolish plants, and disrupt enterprise in order to return to import of Asiatic fibers, etc., i. e., revert to where we stood before the war? Having learned synthetically to provide replacements for rubber and tin, are these achievements to be submerged in a political policy for the support of Asiatic exports?

I do not purport to give an answer to that question. I only say that we cannot decide it now. We should not give the State Department the power to make treaties during and just before the end of the war, which will bind us for 3 years from that time to a tariff policy and tariff rates, and bindings on the free list which will prevent our taking the steps which may be necessary to continue to build up these industries to the point where they may become completely self-supporting.

One provision of the Danaher amendment is that when we make a treaty, instead of making it for a period which binds us for 3 years, we should make it for a period which would bind us only until 6 months after the war, by which time we must reconsider the entire tariff policy of the United States and our trade relations with all the other nations. It means that we should have a free hand to deal with those trade relations.

The only other thing in the Danaher amendment is that the termination may be by act of Congress. I am inclined to agree that Congress could probably terminate these agreements, anyway, after 3 years, or, thereafter, after 6 months' notice is given. After the expiration of 3 years Congress could raise the tariff rate; if the new rate were made effective after 6 months, so that the State Department might give notice under the treaty. I am inclined to think, therefore, that that feature does no more than to state exactly what the present law is; but since some doubt is raised, I see no reason why we should not call the attention of the other nations to the fact that these treaties may be ended by act of Congress, as clearly they may be.

Mr. President, a comparison is made between this policy and that of flexible tariffs. I am entirely in favor of flexible tariffs. Personally, I am in favor of delegating to a commission the making of tariffs; but if we are to make that delegation it must be made with certain definite standards. The flexible tariffs have been made on the standard of making a tariff rate equal to the difference in cost of production here and abroad so as to enable the American producer to meet the competition of foreign production. However, under this act there is no such standard. That is why I do not believe we can properly delegate the power, whether it is constitutional to do so or not. It seems to me that we should prescribe a standard if we are to delegate that power. We are putting in the hands of the Secretary of State—in some cases, at least—the power absolutely to destroy an American industry. I do not believe that Congress desires to grant such power, and I do not believe it should grant such power. Obviously, there is no review of the action of the Secretary of State, because there is no standard upon which his action may be reviewed.

In the reciprocity treaty with Canada, which I very strongly favored, in the first place, there was no general reduction of rates. The treaty related to Canada only. In the second place, the reciprocity treaty was with a country which has practically the same standard of living as we have, and a country in which the greater problems of tariff do not arise. I would be prepared again to vote for such a treaty. Furthermore, it was submitted to the Senate, and was approved by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

The authority which we are considering is simply an authority to the Secretary of State to reduce all tariffs 50 percent, and in the course of doing so, to get anything he can from other countries. The rates which he has attacked, which are about 60 percent of all the rates, have been reduced to 57 percent, so he has gone a long way toward the full authority contained in the act.

Of course, if one is for free trade, he is in favor of the Secretary going all the way to the 50 percent. Anyone who believes that every rate on the books is 100 percent too high, naturally would be for this trade-agreement policy, because it would reduce all rates to 50 percent of what they were. However, if one desires a scientific method of deciding what the tariff ought to be, I do not see how he can be for the trade agreements, unless some kind of standard is imposed, which will have to be complied with by those who are administering the treaties, some standard which will actually prevent the destruction of any American industry.

Mr. President, it is not as if this policy had tremendously increased our trade. It has not increased our trade. It may have done so in the case of trade with some countries; but if we look at the figures on international trade, we find that the greatest trade we ever had in the history of the United States was under very high Republican tariffs, in the period from 1925 to 1929. For 5 years our exports averaged $5,000,000,000 a year. For 5 years our imports averaged $4,200,000,000 a year; and yet when we come to the 5 years from 1936 to

1940, after the trade-agreement policy had been well started, anyone would think, from reading the newspapers, that there had been a tremendous increase in trade. As a matter of fact the average exports for those 5 years were only $3,400,000,000; 70 percent of what they were back under the high tariffs of the 1920's. Imports were only $2,600,000,000, or 65 percent of what they were under the high tariffs of the 1920's.

There is no evidence that this policy has increased foreign trade. Taking the total foreign trade as a percentage of total goods produced, and considering first exportable goods, from 1923 to 1927, under high Republican tariffs, the percentage of foreign trade exports was 10 percent of the total goods produced. From 1937 to 1940 it was only 7.7 percent of all the goods produced, or approximately a 25 percent reduction from the figure back in the 1920's.

Again, in percentage of national income, from 1925 to 1929 the percentage of national income represented by exports was about 4 percent. In 1940 it was 3.2 percent. In other words, a much smaller amount of trade has resulted from the trade treaties than existed under the high tariffs of the 1920's.

In spite of this, Mr. President, I should vote for the continuation of the trade agreements, for one reason, because during the war tariffs are not of great importance. I certainly do not wish to disrupt a policy which, in general, has been wisely administered, but it seems impossible to me to vote for an authority to the President under which he may absolutely tie the hands of this country immediately after the war, at a time probably more important to our future economy than any other time in the history of the United States, and at a time when our hands should be free. We should be able to impose lower tariffs than 50 percent, or to impose higher tariffs if we wish to do so to protect new industry, to protect ourselves against depreciated currencies in particular countries, and to meet the conditions which will confront us at the end of this war as they confronted us at the end of the last war.

At the end of the last war it was insisted that we pass an emergency tariff act, and Congress did pass an emergency tariff act, to protect the wool and other industries, in which competition from foreign sources immediately after the war was so severe as to threaten the complete destruction of a number of industries. Mr. President, I should like to vote for these treaties. It seems to me that the amendment for which we are asking is very simple. If that amendment is not adopted, then I see no recourse except to ask that Congress be given the power to pass on the treaties in the beginning, and asked to approve each treaty as it comes, in order that Congress may have some voice on a fundamental issue.

What possible reason can there be for our not insisting that treaties which are made now shall expire 6 months after the war, in order that we may meet the tremendous and difficult problems which this country will face at that time?

Mr. President, as an evidence of my general views on cooperation with foreign nations after the war, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the address which I delivered at Grove City, from which I have quoted.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Ketler, young ladies and gentlemen of the graduating class, and your friends, it is a great pleasure for me to come to Grove City at the invitation of my old friend and classmate, Dr. Ketler, and get away for a day from the pressure and confusion of Washington. Ohio, like Pennsylvania, is the home of small colleges, and those colleges determine the character of the people as much as any influence in the State. Ordinarily, you would go out to reform your State. Now you graduate into a world at war, and it is your task to set it right. You have spent many years in preparing yourselves to meet the problems of a world at peace. Now, you must turn aside from every plan that you have made for life, and participate in the greatest war effort which this country has ever made. I sympathize with you because one of my own boys is graduating this year from another college, and going into a service for which he has had little preparation. But there is no alternative. We have no choice except to carry this war through to overwhelming victory over Germany, Italy, and Japen. Otherwise, the world won't be worth living in.

With a victory in Africa, I think we can feel that it is only a question of time—though perhaps a long time—before our armies march to Berlin and to Tokyo. Up to this time we have been exclusively concerned with winning the war, but I believe the time has come when we should sit down and determine just why we are fighting the war and what we are going to do with victory when we obtain it.

My own belief is that the United States went to war in order that his counry and its people might enjoy peace now and in the days to come; in order that they might be left free to work out the destiny of the American Republic. We went to war to make clear that national aggression cannot succeed in this world; to punish the aggression which has occurred and discourage aggression in the future. We went to war to prove that so far as the American Republic is affected, might in this world will not make right.

I do not believe that we went to war to establish the "four freedoms" or any other freedoms throughout the world, and I do not believe we went to war for all the purposes stated in the Atlantic Charter. We did not go to war even to establish liberty throughout the world, except as such a world condition might result from the insurance of our own liberty. Look only at the history of the last 10 years. We did not go to war against Japan when it attacked China. We did not go to war with Germany when it attacked Czechoslovakia or Poland. War occurred only when our people came to believe that aggression was so dangerous and so likely to be successful in the world that our own safety was threatened. That led, first, to aid to Britain, and, finally, it led to war itself. I was opposed to entering the war because I did not believe that aggression in Europe was so dangerous as to threaten our own safety even if it attempted an attack upon us across the oceans. As I analyze the public opinion which led us gradually to war, it was an opinion which disagreed with this view. Perhaps it was correct. Now that war has been undertaken, our people are determined to carry it through to complete victory and a severe punishment of the aggressor, not only for our present safety, but to discourage aggression for all time to come.

I don't believe, therefore, that we are engaged in any crusade of the "four freedoms." The first two, freedom of expression and freedom of religion, have to do with the individual citizens of each country and their relations with their own government. Certainly we are not going to undertake to interefere with the internal government of every country in the world because they may fail to grant freedom of expression or freedom of religion. We would not only have to defeat our enemies and establish governments in the Axis countries with American constitutions, but we would have to interfere with the governments of our allies. This is not a war of democracies against dictatorships. There is no freedom of religion or freedom of speech in Russia. There are benevolent dictators in Brazil, in Cuba, and in China. There was a dictator in Poland. In Greece, which made one of the most magnificent defenses against aggression that has been seen in this war, the people were governed by a dictator, Metaxas, who was so benighted as to prohibit in Greece the reading of the Republic of Plato. Surely we are not going to interfere with the internal governments of Russia and China and other nations in order to insist that all of their citizens enjoy freedom of expression and freedom of religion. If we are, we will have to have a permanent army a good deal larger than 11,000,000 men, and we will have to suspend for a long time any renewal of freedom in the United States.

As a matter of fact, the Atlantic Charter itself contradicts the idea of any crusade for these freedoms. The third paragraph of that document states that the parties "respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live." That means that the Russians can have a dictatorship of the proletariat if they wish to. It means that China can be run by a generalissimo and avoid elections of every kind. It means that other governments with a democratic form may permit the subjection of the rights of freedom of expression and freedom of religion to the will of the man whom they choose to elect.

The other two freedoms are freedom from fear and freedom from want. It is just as impractical to insure these freedoms as the other two, if they are construed as individual rights of men against their own governments. If they are intended to relate to the country itself rather than its citizens, a victory in the war can certainly be used to advance national freedom from fear and want. Freedom from fear, after all, means no more than the discouragement of aggression by other nations. Freedom from want as applied to nations means that every nation shall be given access to the raw materials which it needs and to the markets required in order that it may have the exchange with which to purchase these raw materials. While I don't believe that we went to war in order to assure these freedoms to every nation in the world, certainly if they can be established as a result of the war, we wish to establish them. We should certainly use the opportunity offered by victory to obtain many important improvements for which we would not have gone to war.

I feel very strongly, however, that no war can be justified as a crusade—even for world freedoms. If we prevail in the war, it is undoubtedly true that the principles for which we stand will be stronger throughout the world. The world will have to be made over in any event, and we can certainly establish a system of which liberty is the cornerstone in every country where we have the power to do so and the people appear to want it.

If we admit that the United States can properly go to war to impose our ideas of

freedom on the rest of the world, then it seems we must admit that the Soviets have a right to crusade to impose communism on the rest of the world because they believe communism to be the final solution of the world's problems. We would even have to admit that Hitler, however deluded he might be, had a right to crusade to impose his ideas of national socialism on the world. A crusade is by its very nature an aggressive and emotional act. Our purpose in this war is to punish and abolish aggression. If war can be justified as a crusade, the world will face perpetual war.

Finally, I believe every American will agree that we did not go to war in order to acquire more territory for the United States, or to rule the world, either by ourselves or in combination with our allies.

If our prime purpose in fighting this war is to insure peace and independence for the American people now and hereafter, what does that mean in terms of present policy and post-war planning? In the first place, it emphasizes again the preponderant importance of winning the war. I am not one of those who feel that the winning of the war is secondary compared to the winning of the peace. The very winning of the war accomplishes half or more than half of our principal purpose. It punishes the aggressor. It crushes him for years to come. It seems almost inconceivable that another madman like Hitler can arise for generations, convinced that he can conquer the world.

So our first job is to win the war. In fact, if we don't win the war, there isn't much use discussing our second job. I am unable to understand the mentality of those who criticize the deal with Darlan, or the arrangements with Spain, or any other step which will save American lives and bring the war to a speedier conclusion. I regret the attitude of those who insist on interfering with the British handling of the situation in India. That handling may be right or it may be wrong, but the British are in control of India, and we cannot interfere with that control without dissension and disunity, which would hamper victory. Furthermore, they have been in control of India for several hundred years, and they probably know a good deal more about the proper way to handle the situation in the present emergency than any American novelist or parlor pink. If our policy discourages a few enthusiasts in Europe and among our Communist fringe, that can certainly be corrected after the war. It is certainly much easier to cure than Mr. Stalin's statement of his intention to take over the Baltic states and eastern Poland.

But, of course, there is another job to be done when the war is won, and a job of almost equal importance to the winning of the war. That is the assurance of future peace and the prevention of future aggression, by the best machinery conceivable. It is not an easy task. For centuries men have yearned for such a result. One council of nations after another has been set up, and after every war the treaty makers have stated their purpose of assuring perpetual peace. No matter what organization of the world we set up in our generation, it is only likely to be successful 30 years from now if the next generation is determined then to make it successful.

In considering the post-war problems, I believe we should distinguish clearly between the transition period after the war and the permanent organization of the world. Many steps may be taken in the transition period which are unthinkable as permanent policy. During the transtition period the world will be dominated by the United Nations. The Axis Nations will be completely disarmed and subjected to every penalty which seems wise and effective. While this temporary power continues it should be possible to solve many problems and establish conditions and relations between nations which will give every nation a fair start in life. Undoubtedly the Axis nations must be policed, and they must be policed either by the national armies or perhaps by a special police force representing all the United Nations. It may be possible to set up economic treaties and relationships which will be fair to every country and give each access to raw materials. It may be possible to establish customs unions, establishing free trade among certain groups of nations. Certainly during the transition period we should be liberal in the provision of relief and other assistance necessary for reconstruction.

During that period also we can take our time in working out the permanent organization of the world to secure peace. The purpose of that organization must be to make as easy as possible the continuance of peace. It seems to me largely a practical question, and I should certainly be glad to support any plan if success is probable. I supported the League of Nations in 1920. I do not think we are yet in a position to determine exactly what our program should be, but certainly there should be a thorough discussion at this time of the different plans proposed. We don't know how the war will end. We don't know what the attitude of England and the British Empire and Russia will then be. Nevertheless there are certain principles which ought to underlie our thinking on the subject and certain principles which ought to be discouraged from the start.

I am going briefly to discuss three or four of these permanent post-war plans which we are asked to approve. The first is to continue more or less indefinitely the post-war control of the world by the United Nations. The philosophy of the plan is expressed in Henry Luce's American Century. We are to dominate the world, as England is said to have dominated it during the nineteenth century, but since the world is much smaller the domination will be much more effective. We are to be the senior partner in the control. Russia and China will be left to their continental interests, while, with the British as our helpers, we will look after the oceans and the rest of the world, insure peace, happiness, and liberty to all peoples.

There are several difficulties with this plan. First of all, it is completely contrary to the ideals of the American people and the theory that we are fighting for liberty as well as for security. It is based on the theory that we know better what is good for the world than the world itself. It assumes that we are always right and anyone who disagrees with us is wrong. It reminds me of the idealism of the bureaucrats in Washington who want to regulate the lives of every American along the lines that the bureaucrats think are best for them. I doubt very much if our control would be successful. Certainly however benevolent we might be, other people simply do not like to be dominated, and we would be in the same position of suppressing rebellions by force in which the British found themselves during the nineteenth century. There isn't the slightest evidence that we would make a success of our American raj. I visited Puerto Rico last winter, where we have been for 45 years without relieving poverty or improving anyone's condition. If we can't make a success of ruling a small island of 2,000,000 people, how are we going to manage several billion people in the rest of the world? The American people love liberty for other people as for themselves, and there would be a constant protest in this country against any act which smacked of imperialism. We would allow domestic politics to dominate our solution of problems our domestic politicians do not understand. We would have none of the ruthless efficiency in our colonial system which the British developed in their dealings with other peoples. In short, this plan, besides violating every principle of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, would probably be a failure both for ourselves and the rest of the world.

The second plan, vaguely outlined in some of Henry Wallace's speeches, has some relation to the first. We are still to dominate the world, even to the extent of running the schools and universities of Germany during the transition period. But instead of emphasizing force, our control is to be through the dispensation of money and goods to carry out the ideal of freedom from want. We are to establish more or less free trade throughout the world, and distribute American goods in all directions, largely on credit. Since this school of thought believes that the Government debt should be constantly increased, and that Government deficits create prosperity in this country, we will be killing two birds with one stone by increasing rapidly our own production and giving away the products to other people. In other words, we are to maintain our control through economic generosity.

This plan seems almost too visionary to make any real headway. In the cold, gray dawn of peace, the American people are not likely to continue the lavish give-away policy of lend-lease which is necessary in war. Furthermore, I believe that with the utmost direct generosity we cannot improve materially the conditions of other countries or put them under any real obligation to us. A country, like an individual, can only become prosperous through its own efforts. We can help a people to help itself, and we ought to do so by reasonable trade arrangements and by assisting countries which wish to improve their industry, commerce, and agriculture, but we certainly are not going to do the world any good by setting up an international work projects administration.

The third type of plan which is now being strenuously urged is that of the superstate, proposed by Clarence Streit, author of Union Now. Its present form is described by Governor Stassen in the current Saturday Evening Post. According to this plan, there is to be a world government growing out of the United Nations control. This is to be a complete national government operating directly on every individual throughout the world; as our Federal Government operates on the citizens of our States. The control is to be by a legislative body like the House of Commons, which will select the executive and his cabinet. As the temporary post-war problems are disposed of, a world code of justice will be adopted by legislation, and that code of justice will be enforced by an international police force. The code of justice is to emphasize human rights rather than national rights, but obviously it will have to concern itself also with the question of boundaries. It will contain provisions protecting minorities and prohibiting religious persecution. It will have a department dealing with education and medical care throughout the world. It is not entirely clear whether it is actually to operate schools and hospitals, but certainly it is to make available propaganda in the form of books, radio programs, and movies for educational purposes. It is to administer all seaports and all airports; and while it is said that "the proposal contemplates no sudden attempt to make trade universally free," yet apparently the world state is to have power to prohibit the raising of tariffs, or other trade practices, of which it disapproves. The world state is to have power to raise its own taxes by levying an excise on international trade.

I believe the idea of a superstate with full sovereignty in certain fields is unsound and impractical. Most people think of an international police force or government as being directed at Germany, Italy, and Japan to keep them in order after the war. But remember that this is a permanent arrangement for ourselves as well as for the Axis.

The proposal is to set up a government which can do to the American people everything that it can do to other nations. If it can bomb Tokyo into submission, it can bomb New York into submission. If its police force is to be effective, it must be bigger and more powerful than the American Army, as well as all other armies. This implies an almost complete disarmament. The plan is compared to the uniting of the Thirteen Colonies into one nation in 1788, but the comparison is false. The people who were there combined had substantially the same form of government, and the same standard of living, and the same language and ideals, whereas here we are trying to combine republics and democracies and kingdoms and dictatorships under a federal state. We are trying to combine men who earn $10 a day with men who earn 10 cents a day. We are trying to combine the East and the West, the Brahmin and the Rotarian. Such a state would fall apart in a few years and leave more chaos than if it had never begun.

The attempt to regulate the treatment of minorities, of Jews in central Europe, of Negroes in the United States, and of many other equally difficult minority problems would be far more likely to produce war than to abolish it. The United States is probably the most dangerous Nation, but obviously in any question regarding our standard of wages we would be outvoted 10 to 1 under any conceivable plan of representation. Our tariffs would be reduced, or bound, and our markets raided.

My own opinion is that no such tremendous government could be truly democratic. We have about reached the practical limit of size without totalitarianism in the United States. We are being forced into more and more centralization of government, and once that centralization becomes complete, it will be difficult indeed to maintain anything like a truly democratic government in which the individual has a voice.

Furthermore, I believe the establishment of any such superstate is wholly impractical today. Our people will not agree to disband their Army and Navy or reduce them to impotency. I feel equally confident that England has no such intention and that Stalin has no such intention. In fact, if I read correctly the recent statements of the leaders of those countries, they intend as far as they can see ahead to control the Continent of Europe by a superior military force. That is the meaning of the 20-year Anglo-Soviet treaty. That is the direct statement of English policy which appeared recently in the London Times. That, it seems to me, is the practical implication of Mr. Churchill's council of Europe. If these large nations are going to rebel against international control of their seaports, airports, tariff policy, and minority treatment—and they certainly are—they cannot with good face impose these restrictions permanently on the small nations. I don't believe a superstate is practical even to enforce boundary questions. Certainly as applied to matters of internal control, as suggested in the Stassen article, it will be a nightmare.

In my opinion, international cooperation must be worked out along the same general lines suggested in the League of Nations. Any plan must be based on the retention of sovereignty by every nation, with agreements between those nations worked out as specifically as possible through general covenants and bilateral treaties. The main purpose of such covenants must be to prevent any international aggression likely to lead to a war in which all of us may be again involved. It is said that nations will not keep their promises, and of course without an international police force cannot be made to do so. The answer is that the maintenance of peace, in any event, depends upon the continued cooperation of the great powers. Not even a superstate can find a way to enforce its sovereignty over the unlimited steppes of Russia or the teeming millions of Asia or the seven seas of Britain. We must under any plan rely on the continued desire of these nations to maintain peace by carrying out the covenants into which they have solemnly entered.

Of course, there are many conditions which can be established now to make nations less likely to undertake aggression in the future. First, there must be a sound economic basis for peace, one which will assure to every nation a fair distribution of the world's goods and the ability to develop its resources and capacities. In the Versailles Treaty economic conditions were completely disrupted and disregarded in the interest of the self-determination of peoples. States were set up which were wholly unable to support themselves. Europe was broken up into a large number of unstable units. In the post-war settlement we must try to establish customs unions between nations whose economies are complementary so that they can be reasonably self-sufficient. We must assure to each one of these nations and groups of nations the raw materials which they require to feed their people and develop their industrial life. We must assure to each an outlet for sufficient products at least to pay for these raw materials. If we interpret freedom from want to mean only this fair and equitable economic treatment for nations, then I think it is a reasonable goal and one which must underlie any practical plan for peace. I do not believe that subsequently we can control the tariff policies of individual nations by force or decree, but a continued interest on the part of all in making international trade an aid to peace should be sufficient to prevent any great discrimination developing in any particular country.

Obviously, the territorial settlements must be such that they do not create constant and intolerable friction. On the basis of self-determination and a reasonable tolerance, we should be able to do a better job than was done at Versailles.

The principal question in working out a new League of Nations is to determine how far we will agree to use our armed forces to prevent aggression in other parts of the world. Many will object to any such undertaking, but I believe that within carefully-defined limits we should be willing to take an active part in maintaining peace. Insofar as Europe is concerned, I believe that obligation should be a secondary obligation after the council of Europe has made every possible effort and failed. In America and in the Far East we might assume a much more direct interest, and prompt American action in those areas, when the proposed League of Nations has found some nation to be an aggressor, may well prevent the development of a world war.

I question, however, whether our armed forces should ever be used except to punish or prevent the physical aggression of one nation against another, and to enforce any disarmament agreement which may be entered into. Apart from that, I believe that interference in the internal affairs of other nations, to protect their minorities, to change their system of education, or to reduce their tariffs, would be more likely to foment war than to prevent it Surely it is perfectly possible to work out the problems of air transportation as the problems of sea transportation have been worked out in the past, by international treaty and agreement. We don't need any international officers running our airports and seaports. We want the ability to protect our industries against the competition of starvation wages, and develop here the materials which might be essential to our survival as a nation. Our Negro problem is difficult enough without the issuance of directives from the council of a league. On the other hand, I see no loss of sovereignty in a treaty binding us to send our armed forces abroad on the finding of an international body. Being sovereign, we could refuse to keep our promises. Being Americans, we would not refuse.

The question whether we shall actually enter a league of nations must await the termination of the war. We certainly do not wish to assume any obligations unless the plan is one which gives some reasonable chance of practical success in assuring world peace. We do not wish to assume any obligation unless the territorial settlement and the other terms of the peace treaty are fair to all nations so that we can agree wholeheartedly to stand behind them. The economic arrangement must be such as to assure every country a fair deal and a chance to improve the condition of its people. But if these conditions are complied with, I have no doubt that the American people would approve a treaty obligation binding us to cooperate with other nations to keep the peace of the world.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio, who has just finished making an address in behalf of the Danaher amendment, candidly admits that the trade treaties have been administered in a way which has been a credit to the State Department and he gives every indication that eventually he will probably vote for these trade treaties, regardless of what may happen to the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I did not indicate anything of the sort, unless some amendment were adopted. Furthermore, I said they had in general been well administered. That was the extent of my commendation.

Mr. LUCAS. Others who were listening to the Senator's speech may have obtained a different impression than that which was obtained by the Senator from Illinois. But from the remarks which were made by the Senator from Ohio I was rather persuaded that he did not have any really serious objection to these trade treaties. I may have been mistaken. Be that as it may, Mr. President, I do not rise at this time to discuss at length either the merits or demerits of the trade treaties. I shall discuss the treaties in the light of this cataclysmic storm in which the world is moving.

We are witnessing in the Senate of the United States the same type, kind, and character of debate which we have always witnessed on the subject of trade treaties. There is nothing new in any of the arguments. We seem to forget that America stands at the crossroads in the greatest crisis of her history in 150 years. These debates upon the trade treaties move along just as though we were in the throes of eternal peace. Amendments have been offered—not one but several—as I understand, of the same type which had heretofore been debated and discussed every time the question of trade treaties arose.

Mr. President, my record from the time I have been in the Senate has been one of consistency in supporting trade treaties. Regardless of what position I have taken in the past upon the trade pacts or any amendment concerning them which has been heretofore debated, I say that at this hour of the history of the world I would not hesitate for one moment to change my position in order

that we might present some sort of a solid front in connection with a matter which is international in its character.

We are dealing with the hour and all its implications. Past arguments, old predilections, special interests and blocs are mere bagatelle compared with the great issue before us. Selfish people or groups cannot prevail, if it interferes with the winning of the war and the winning of the peace.

Mr. President, I wish to read some remarks made by General Eisenhower, which deeply impressed me and gave me some thoughts in connection with the subject of trade treaties. On Saturday last, this heroic and gallant general of the American and Allied forces, after the greatest victory of the war, on the north African front, made a speech, and and he is quoted in the New York Herald Tribune as follows:

"This team is bound together by indestructible devotion to a common cause. * * * We have wilted the enemy's morale, for in this theater one of the best and proudest of his armies has been utterly destroyed."

He described this as one of the intangible but "transcendently important" results of the African triumph. The most important intangible, he said, was the high degree of proficiency gained in Allied teamwork.

"This demonstration of unity on the battlefield, of unity in adversity as well as in victory, is sorely puzzling the Axis today," General Eisenhower said. "Our solidarity terrified them because they had complacently counted on divided counsels and interfamily quarrels that have been characteristic of Allied campaigns of former wars."

Mr. President, that is the nub of the situation confronting us today. The real reason for the great victory of the American and Allied forces in Tunisia was our solidarity in presenting a united front in that great battle. It seems to me that if the Senate of the United States could present some kind of a united front in connection with trade treaties involving international relationships with other nations, we would once more give to Herr Goebbels and his group of propagandists something to think about, something which might terrify them.

But apparently, Mr. President, we cannot do that in the United States Senate; we continue to have our family quarrels. Yet I undertake to say that if bombs were falling in Washington every other day, as they have been in England in the past, we would see that much-needed solidarity in the United States Congress upon legislation involving world problems.

The article continues to quote General Eisenhower:

I speak not merely of senior commanders and their readiness to meet each problem on its merits and without division along nationalistic lines but of the rank and file as well. Each man here has come to realize that the greatest patriot, the greatest lover of his country, is the one quickest to promote Allied team play and to demand its perfection. This spirit has inspired also the French troops that fought alongside us during the Tunisian campaign. For them and for their sacrificial devotion to duty, every British and American soldier has only words of praise. They were magnificent.

* * * * *

We are ready to undertake any further task our countries may choose to assign us. We stand as a single body—determined that there will be no cessation of effort until, working in concert with all other forces of the United Nations, we shall have brought the last army of Germany, Italy, and Japan to its inevitable "Tunisia."

Mr. President, there in that last utterance can be found the key to success. Standing as a single body these soldiers move forward to victory. We can lighten their load, remove some of their burdens, if we here in the Senate stand united on these trade pacts. I appeal to Senators to promote team work and team play on the home front. It is the greatest weapon that can be used to bring this cruel war to an early and victorious close.

Mr. President, one large concession has been made with respect to the termination of these trade treaties. Two years from July 1, 1945, the trade treaties will terminate, under the terms of the pending measure. Surely that date is far enough in the future to satisfy many who expect at that time to rewrite the trade treaties and tariff policy of this country, although I confess that I think such is only a bit of wishful thinking. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut is meaningless and would nullify, in my humble opinion, what the trade-treaty program is attempting to do.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Illinois please explain how the amendment could be meaningless and at the same time nullify?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct in that regard; the word "meaningless" was unfortunate and unnecessary. But I submit the amendment itself would lead only to confusion and chaos so far as it concerns those who are in concert with us in connection with these trade treaties. It would nullify a record of 8 years of constructive international good. It would give Mr. Hitler and his gang the opportunity to distort and misrepresent. They would use the radio to tell people who are affiliated with us in these trade treaties that the proposed amendment means the end of kindly and friendly relationships with the countries which have been our good neighbors for a long period of years. They would advise the world that we were leaving all our friends in an economic vacuum 6 months after the shooting stops.

Let me go back to the war of 1917. It is said that trade treaties are futile. Mr. President, trade treaties fit hand in glove with the good-neighbor policy of the countries to the south. It will be recalled that back in 1916 we had troops on the Mexican border, and it will be recalled that the Panamanian Government was unfriendly to us, thereby involving the Panama Canal; indeed, as a result of the dollar exploitation diplomacy which had been carried on by this country for decades there was not a country south of the border that was overly friendly to the United States of America. Today there is not a nation in South America, with the exception, perhaps, of one, that is not our friend as a result of the trade treaties and the good-neighbor policy. Any American soldiers now found in any of these countries are there as friends and allies.

Mr. President, regardless of the merits of the pending joint resolution, in my opinion the Members of the Senate who have boys in the service, those who have brothers or nephews or close friends in the service, will be doing their country a real service if they defeat every amendment that comes to the floor of the Senate, irrespective of its merits. I say that with the utmost kindness toward every Member who will present amendments. In my humble judgment, the United States Senate should have accepted in 30 minutes the joint resolution just as it came over from the House of Representatives, in order that we might present the same solidarity of thought and purpose and action to which General Eisenhower referred in his speech in Africa. That was one thing, as he said, that frightened the Axis Powers.

Mr. President, adopt any amendment at this time, regardless of its merits, and fuel will be furnished to the lying propaganda machine of the German Government. Furthermore, regardless of what may be said, regardless of how individuals in high places of Government may understand the trade treaties, the rank and file of the people of various other countries, in my humble opinion, will misunderstand the action of the Senate should crippling amendments be adopted.

Mr. President, that is about all I care to say upon this important matter. I hope the Senate will reject every amendment which comes to the floor. The trade treaties should continue for another 2 years in the form in which they are now written. There is no reason to cause misapprehension, there is no reason, as I see it, to cause confusion or chaos to exist in other countries which are parties to these trade pacts at the present time. Certainly it seems to me that in all good conscience every individual who is interested in an international program based upon trade so far as the future of America is concerned should support these trade treaties. In my judgment, they are the basis for international peace and good will and amity in the post-war period.

Much has been said about the delegation of power to the President. I have heard it ever since I have been a Member of the Congress of the United States. Every time a delegation of power is made by the legislative to the executive long speeches are delivered upon the floor of the Senate about the destruction of the American way of life. Let me say that such power was delegated back in the War of 1812; its power was delegated in the Civil War; in fact, greater power was delegated to the Executive in the Civil War than has ever been delegated in this war. Power was delegated back in World War No. 1; and, Mr. President, the American people, after each and every war, recaptured that power which, in a crisis, had been delegated to the Executive. They will do it this time. The people are supreme in

this country, and will continue to be supreme when this great emergency shall have passed.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, perhaps never within the lifetime of any living man has representative government been so greatly threatened or faced so gruelling a test for endurance, as today. Representative government has disappeared in many respects throughout great portions of the earth, and it is threatened everywhere. For that reason I wish to speak briefly in favor of the pending amendment proposed to the measure extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States provides:

> The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes.

This paragraph gives Congress the power to pass all tariff laws, and clearly indicates that it is the duty of Congress to fix the policy of our Government concerning international trade.

The pending amendment merely reaffirms our determination and devotion to that fundamental principle of our representative, constitutional form of government.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was first passed by a subservient Congress in 1934, and it gave the executive branch extraordinary, discretionary, legislative authority over tariffs and foreign trade as an emergency measure to aid in bringing about economic recovery by expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States. It is doubtful that it accomplished this result.

In 1937 the act was extended for the express purpose of contributing to world peace, more than because of any economic objective.

In 1940, when it was apparent that it had not resulted in maintaining world peace, it was extended again on the theory that it would contribute as a part of the foundation of any stable and durable peace.

Now, in 1943, the House has voted to extend it for 2 years without amendment. We are told that if we amend it in any particular it is an indication that we are preparing to withdraw from active participation in world affairs. I do not so interpret it, and I deny that my vote for the pending amendment carries with it any such implication. I believe that the future peace of the world depends, as largely as upon any other factor, upon the maintenance and continuance of a truly representative, constitutional form of government in the United States of America.

The pending amendment provides as follows:

> *Provided*, That every foreign-trade agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of said act, as amended, shall be subject to termination 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as fixed by proclamation of the President, pursuant to joint resolutions of the Congress or by the President.

This amendment, if it serves notice of any purpose, should serve notice on the countries with whom we deal, and to the executive branch of our own Government, that the Congress intends to retain its constitutional, supervisory control over trade agreements which affect the lives of the free people of America. No fair-minded person could interpret such action by Congress as being unfriendly to the most wholehearted cooperation with other nations now and in the future.

The Congress has voted for the most extraordinary lease-lend program ever enacted by any country in the history of the world. We have appropriated over $13,000,000,000—we have already expended over $11,000,000,000 of America's substance to that end. More nations than are now enjoying reciprocal trade agreements are already the beneficiaries and participants in the lease-lend program. The latest appropriation bill provides for more than $6,000,000,000 additional to be expended for that purpose. This has the overwhelming approval of Congress, notwithstanding the fact that our own Government has not to this day set up a master bookkeeping system whereby the Congress can know in detail every phase of the lease-lend activity, to say nothing about having no definite agreements as to how or when any part of these funds are to be repaid, if ever. Certainly that is no indication of a lack of desire on the part of Congress to cooperate in the future peace of the world.

Neither are we relinquishing our war effort in any other particular, for we are spending more effort and money in the production of the necessary weapons and material of war than ever was expended in the history of man. In addition, we are making every sacrifice, including the raising of an Army, preparing to send more than 4,000,000 men—the flower of our country—to foreign battlefields, to assure the victory of ourselves and our allies.

This amendment under consideration provides only that 6 months after the close of the war, when victory has been won, the Congress may have a voice, representing the people of America who have made these extraordinary sacrifices, in determining the future course of foreign trade as it relates to our people. The fact that the present administration wants the power, without any interference on the part of the Congress, to negotiate these binding, all important trade agreements is reminiscent of the fact that President Wilson failed to take the Congress in as a partner in his determination of the future course of the world at the conclusion of the last World War. Certainly it can be said aptly now that the only lesson we learn from history is that we learn no lesson from history.

Included in our lease-lend expenditures, I am sure you will find that upward of $2,000,000,000 of America's money has been spent in the development, erection, and construction of the greatest communication system ever known in the world. Literally, hundreds of installations have been made of radio towers and equipment and air fields. Transoceanic and transcontinental air routes have established, built, and paid for by America, constituting a web that will undoubtedly be the communication and the air commerce routes of tomorrow. In addition to that, we have built and paid for many other bases and harbors in countless places.

We were a Nation that built practically no ships before the war, but through the sacrifice, the inventive and constructive genius of our American people, with their money, their sweat and their toil, we are building more ships than any country in the history of civilized men.

One of the greatest contributions we are to make in the liberation and the protection of liberty-loving people all over the world, is our construction of airplanes, great cargo ships that will carry material, weapons and men across oceans and over mountains, to aid embattled China and to liberate other freedom loving people. We will produce more planes before this war is over than all the other countries of the world. We are undertaking now to develop an air force that will be equal to one-third of the air power of the entire universe. We will have literally thousands upon thousands of young men, the finest aviators in the world, familiar with these communication systems, airports and transport routes throughout the universe before this war comes to an end. The future commerce of the world will be carried in part by these ships on the sea and in the sky.

What is to become of these ships and the trade that they will carry? Shall the Congress have nothing to say about this when this war is concluded?

The people of America are devoting their lives and their fortunes to the development of substitute strategic materials cut off from us by the treacherous acts of the little yellow fiends of the Pacific. The liberty of the world depends upon our success in this field. Are these heroic efforts and outstanding accomplishments to be scrapped by the arbitrary decision at the conclusion of the war, of one man or a few who feel that they know what is best for 135,000,000 free Americans?

Will the men who sacrificed and served in the foxholes and the hellholes of the battle fronts of the world return to find that we whom they dared to die to defend have foreclosed them from having an immediate voice through their Representatives in Congress concerning the future trade relations with the world?

Shall we further scrap or abandon our constitutional responsibilities here in these halls while the flower of American youth is fighting to defend us on the battlefield of the universe?

In part, that is the question we decide today.

I yield to no man in my desire for peace. And the hundreds of thousands, yes, the millions, of veterans who will return to the shores of America with their battle scars and experience, in my judgment, will be outstanding advocates of peace in the future. My experience has taught me that authentic veterans are exceedingly practical and peaceful men. I predict that they will join in the demand that we become and remain

one of the strongest nations of the entire earth not only for the protection of ourselves but for the guarantee of the peace of the future.

They will not, nor will I, join with those in America who believe that it is wrong to be strong, or a sin to be self-sufficient. I disagree with those who constantly condemn and blame America, saying we lost the last peace, or those who would indicate that we were responsible for this war, or that we will do other than contribute our full share and more to the future peace of the world. We are contributing our full share and more to the war effort in the cause of freedom everywhere today and we will continue to play our full part in the peace to follow.

When I vote for this amendment I wish to place my own interpretation upon my own act. I do it with the one thought in mind that we are serving notice to the world that we intend to be a free people, preserving a strong nation devoted and dedicated to truly representative, constitutional government.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the reciprocal trade joint resolution because we are at war, because I want to do everything possible to keep the Allies together during the war, and because I want to do everything possible for sound international collaboration after the war. On these great objectives the joint resolution has a limited impact, to be sure, but in small things, as well as large, I shall do what I can for victory in war and sound collaboration in peace.

As this states my entire reason for supporting the joint resolution, it comes as somewhat of a shock to hear it asserted that all those who favor mild safeguarding amendments to the Trade Agreements Act are opposed to international collaboration. This is simply not so, Mr. President.

I have often wondered what it is about this question which makes so many men lose their sense of proportion. Otherwise, how can one explain the fact that so much—too much—is continually being claimed for the program? When I first came to the Senate the claim was constantly made that the trade-agreements program would preserve peace, end unemployment, and that it was the only device which could prevent us from going back to the worst days of congressional tariff making. Actually, of course, it did not preserve peace, it did not end unemployment, and it is not the only device which prevents us from going back to the evils of congressional tariff making.

Just as too much has been said for the joint resolution, so it is that too much has been said against this very modest little amendment. When we boil it all down what does the amendment amount to? It simply means that Congress and the President under its terms can properly revoke an agreement without being charged with any breach of international good faith. The actual power to cancel an agreement or indeed to revoke the entire act resides in the Congress at all times, but if we exercise the right without some language of this kind we might be chargeable with an act of international bad faith, and this is something which we would not and should not do.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. In view of the statement just made, is it the Senator's understanding that the Congress, as well as the President, always has the power to repeal an existing trade agreement?

Mr. LODGE. I think that, as a matter of brute power, the Congress probably has that power.

Mr. TOBEY. What would be the modus operandi by which Congress could proceed to repeal an existing trade agreement?

Mr. LODGE. The Congress could repeal——

Mr. TOBEY. The act itself?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; the act itself.

Mr. TOBEY. In the opinion of the Senator from Massachusetts, could the Congress by itself repeal a specific agreement that was made under the act?

Mr. LODGE. I think it could as a matter of theory. I do not know what the practical modus operandi would be.

The amendment simply recognizes the status of the Congress in a frank and honorable way. To refuse to accept such an amendment as this, in my opinion, suggests a rather arbitrary and intolerant viewpoint. Have we not learned from past experience that we cannot always have everything our own way without the dotting of an "i" and the crossing of a "t", and that it is good statesmanship and good democracy to compromise our differences?

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], in his speech, to which I listened with careful attention, as I do to all his speeches, gave as a principal argument against the amendment the fact that it will leave us—

> With our hands completely untied at the time of the greatest chaos perhaps that ever settled upon the world, 6 months after the termination of the war.

Mr. President, I have pondered that statement, and the more I think about it, the more I think that it is actually an argument for the amendment. I believe, as a general proposition, that the United States should be free, and should not have its hands tied in a period of great emergency—in a crisis. I was one of the five or six on this floor, as I recall, to vote against the Neutrality Act in 1937 because I believed that it would tie our hands at a time when we should need full freedom of action. It so happened that events caused Congress to repeal the Neutrality Act for the very simple reason that we did not want our hands tied in the manner prescribed by the act. With the hindsight which we now have, I think we can see that it would have been much better if we had never had the act and therefore never had to repeal the act at all under the circumstances which then existed.

Mr. President, I am in favor of America making promises which she can keep, and which she therefore will keep. I have great hope that by making only such promises as are within the range of our capabilities we can prevent periods of chaos and crisis and emergency from arising. But, Mr. President, when such periods of chaos and crisis and emergency are upon us, I want to see an America which is free to deal with the situation—an America whose word counts heavily because its word is not taken for granted.

For these reasons I shall vote for the committee amendment, as well as for the joint resolution.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, in spite of my high regard for the sponsor of the committee amendment and for its advocates, I feel obliged to present four reasons why I believe it is in the best interest of the Nation as a whole that the amendment be defeated.

These reasons are as follows:

First. The adoption of the committee amendment would tend to weaken rather than strengthen the unity of the United Nations at this time when the strengthening of our unity is of critical importance in winning the war. It certainly would not strengthen our unity with our allies thus to emphasize our option to cancel, 6 months after the war, and without the consent of our allies, all of the agreements covering their reciprocal trade relations with us. To justify the adoption of any measure at this time that would in any degree weaken our unity with our allies would call for a showing of far greater benefits to be derived from it than those which can be derived from this amendment.

Second. The adoption of the committee amendment would weaken rather than strengthen the force of our trade agreements as present and future influences against the other participants in those agreements entering into or preparing to enter into any agreements with other nations detrimental to our interests. The committee amendment would amount to a special warning to the world to place little reliance after the war upon the continuance by us of our reciprocal trade obligations. Whether or not we propose actually to terminate our reciprocal trade agreements after the war, the effect of this special emphasis upon our right to terminate them will be to instigate the other parties to them to consider entering into agreements with other nations without regard to us. The committee amendment would encourage our allies, therefore, to look everywhere except to us for post-war economic alliances. This amendment might even instigate other nations to give us notice of their determination to cancel their reciprocal trade agreements with us so as to leave them free to discriminate against us. I believe that the adoption of this amendment would weaken both our wartime and post-war position without a sufficiently offsetting advantage to justify that effect.

Third. The benefits to be gained by the adoption of the committee amendment are of little if any value to our

Nation. Three questions are sufficient to analyze them.

Does the committee amendment add a new right of termination of the trade agreements to those now held by the United States as a party to them? The answer is "No." The right of the United States to terminate these agreements is fixed by the terms of the agreements themselves and naturally cannot in good conscience be altered without the consent of the other contracting party. Furthermore, the United States already has ample right under the terms of these agreements to terminate any or all of them on not more than 6 months' notice after the expiration of the first 3 years. All the agreements now in effect have either passed this 3-year mark or in all probability will have passed that mark long before the end of the war. The committee amendment, accordingly, does not attempt to increase the right of the United States in existing agreements as such. It deals merely with what agency, as between the Congress and the President, shall speak for the United States.

As to the possibility that new reciprocal trade agreements with new lives of 3 years, or new lives based upon the pending amendment, will be made in the midst of the war, I believe it is highly unlikely, either on our part or on the part of other nations, that any such agreements can be secured.

In view of the close relationship that must exist between the administration and Congress with respect to wartime policies, the way to approach any such possibility, I believe, is by direct and frank understanding on that specific point.

The administration and the Congress have a joint constitutional responsibility for our foreign-trade policies, and if there is any doubt about action that is likely to be taken during the war which might substantially change our trade relations and war policies, it should be met by direct action preventing those steps being taken, or being taken without advice by and concurrence of the Congress. The doubt is certainly not resolved by the cumbersome and extremely tardy control presented by the committee amendment. The committee amendment merely provides a way, a means, to cut down agreements at that highly uncertain and remote period when the President shall have proclaimed that hostilities have ceased in the great war which we are fighting all around the world, and which may continue for years to come.

My second question as to the effect of the committee amendment is this: Does the committee amendment add any new power to the President's right to terminate the reciprocal trade agreements on behalf of the United States? The answer is, "No." The President already has the recognized right to terminate the agreements on behalf of the United States on not more than 6 months' notice after the expiration of the first 3 years of the respective agreements. In fact, it has been suggested that the committee amendment, instead of expanding the President's authority, might by implication repeal his general right to terminate the agreements, and might limit that right of termination to the one occasion with which the committee amendment especially deals, namely, that which will arise 6 months after the cessation of hostilities—a period which is decidedly more distant.

My third question as to the effect of the amendment is this: Does the committee amendment add any new power to the Congress, on behalf of the United States, to terminate the reciprocal trade agreements? The answer is that perhaps it does, but probably it does not. In view of the fact that Congress has not heretofore taken any action depriving itself of its right to terminate such agreements by joint resolution, it presumably retains that right. If the Congress can now, by the committee amendment, give itself the right to terminate all reciprocal trade agreements six months after the war, then no doubt Congress could by direct action terminate the same agreements at any time now, on not more than six months' notice, provided only that, in accordance with the terms of the agreements, the first three years of their respective lives should have expired. Here, also, it may be suggested that the adoption of the commitee amendment might by implication limit the right of Congress to terminate trade agreements so that hereafter such right could be exercised only six months after the cessation of hostilities. It may be argued that the specification by Congress of its right so to proceed at that time indicates recognition by Congress that it would not so proceed at any other time; otherwise there would be no reason for Congress to specify the procedure stated in the committee amendment.

In any event, the added right of Congress to terminate trade agreements in the manner specified in the committee amendment is of such extremely limited value that it can hardly justify the sacrifice of any strength of our position in the war to acquire those rights.

Let us further examine the effect of the committee amendment. First of all, if the action is to be taken under the committee amendment by joint resolution, the joint resolution which would result would require the signature of the President to make it effective, or the resolution would require a two-thirds vote of both Houses to override his veto of it. The likelihood of having the Congress vote to override his veto in such a case is sufficiently remote as to indicate small likelihood of action by Congress under such circumstances. Therefore the matter remains largely a subject of Presidential action.

Second, under the committee amendment the right of Congress to terminate reciprocal trade agreements could be exercised only if the President in his discretion had proclaimed the cessation of hostilities in the present war. This leaves the time of action to a substantial degree at the discretion of the President.

Third, the opportunity for Congress to tereminate the reciprocal trade agreements under the committee amendment could occur only after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as fixed by the proclamation of the President. This presumably means, therefore, the present war with Germany, Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Japan. It is hardly likely that the much-hoped-for cessation of hostilities against all those enemies will occur before June 12, 1945. Yet, on June 12, 1945, the right of the President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements under this general law will again expire, as it is now about to expire on June 12, 1943. Accordingly, the committee amendment could better be presented 2 years from now, than now. In so doing, the amendment would avoid the exceptional difficulties which are presented by its consideration at this particular moment, and many things bearing on the need for it may well have been determined before June 12, 1945.

Under these circumstances, the benefits, if any, which would flow from the committee amendment are so slight that they are readily outweighed by the detriment arising from it.

Finally, my fourth reason for opposing the committee amendment is that it offers no constructive alternative for what it would destroy. The amendment unnecessarily expresses a threat of possible and remote action to terminate all reciprocal trade agreement 6 months after the hostilities in the present war have ceased, and to do so by joint action of the Congress, even over Presidential veto. The amendment unnecessarily emphasizes an unlikely and unfortunate possibility of disagreement within our Government. It voices a congressional threat, and accompanies it by no declaration of congressional policy either for or against the principle of economic international collaboration as opposed to economic international warfare. It overemphasizes the possibility of a difference of policy between the Congress and the President. It emphasizes the ultimate responsibility of Congress in case of such a disagreement. If Congress proposes to emphasize and exercise its inherent powers and to act in opposition to the executive branch of the Government, it certainly should do so only under unusual circumstances; and, when doing so, it owes it to the country and to the world to express on its own account that quality of leadership which is essential to the discharge of so great a responsibility. A threat without the accompaniment of a clear, constructive alternative course of action does much harm, and leads nowhere.

I believe that the committee amendment, if accepted, would thus turn out to be an expensive one-way ticket to nowhere, and would fall far short of justifying the price paid for it.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it is my intention to support the joint resolution as passed by the House, but with the Senate committee amendment definitely providing that any agreements made automatically becomes revocable 6 months after the close of hostilities. This does not mean that a single agreement will be revoked, but it makes it possible to do so if conditions following the war should so require. The governments with whom we contract have the same option, and it may be to their interest to want to

change certain trade provisions. The suggested arrangement is not a one-sided one.

With the adoption of the committee amendment, I think it is unnecessary to decide on the constitutionality of the original act. Nearly everyone is in agreement that the act itself is of little effect during the war, for practically all available shipping is used to move material purchased by Government agencies and therefore the movement of materials is not affected by tariff or other restrictions which affect normal commercial trade. During the war there can be little if any commercial trading. Without the committee amendment attached, I shall vote against the extension of the original act.

Following the war, conditions may make it desirable for either or both contracting governments to want some change. We have certainly been friendly enough in our trade relations with all other nations during the past, and I see no cause for uneasiness on the part of our good neighbors, if the committee amendment becomes a part of the Reciprocal Trade Act. We ask for ourselves no right which does not automatically become their right, and, frankly, it may be our neighbors who will want to renegotiate the trade agreements that are now or may hereafter become operative.

It is easily possible, in fact, almost certain, that a fundamental overhauling of our whole foreign trade policy may be necessary to meet post-war conditions. The war has hastened the development of the small, backward nations, especially those of South America. They may receive a tremendous influx of people from the European war-torn countries—people of talent, skilled in the sciences, leaders in the professions and in business, including international trade. The United States and other nations have developed substitutes for rubber, silk, tin, and many other things, directly affecting the methods and problems of trade between countries. I doubt if we as a Nation will want to scrap our synthetic rubber plants when war ceases. Likewise, I doubt if other nations who have developed synthetic products, essential to their safety, will want to scrap their plants and again depend on natural materials available only by ocean delivery from points thousands of miles distant. The passage of House Joint Resolution No. 111, including the committee amendment, will harm no one, and will give protection to each contracting party alike. Existing agreements may continue for years; and, again, if either party discovers that post-war conditions have changed to the extent that new agreements should be executed, the change becomes possible within a reasonable time, 6 months following the close of hostilities.

Proponents of the joint resolution have stated that "the renewal of the trade agreements program is essential for the maintenance of employment and business activity after the war." To this I cannot agree, for certainly a given amount of energy advantageously employed at home supplying our own needs is just as useful economically as the same amount of energy applied in the making of goods to be shipped abroad, particularly when there is a question as to whether we can receive payment therefor without the extension of credit in the form of direct loans or through some lend-lease gymnastics. There is no use going into detail in proof of this statement. I will, however, quote from a reliable authority.

An examination of the record will show that despite all our attempts to increase imports through the reciprocal trade agreements, yet in the period of 1936–1940 our merchandise imports averaged about 3.5 percent of our national income produced, as compared with about 5.5 percent in earlier years when we were supposed to be laboring under unconscionably high tariffs.

From this it is easily seen that any benefit obtained from the operation of this act has been largely psychological, rather than material.

However, none of us can tell what the future trend may be; hence I wish to protect the interests of the United States, the Constitution of which I have sworn to protect and preserve.

I do not like the trend of affairs during the past 10 years as it affects the economy of our own people, and I hesitate further to place in jeopardy any of the rights and liberties of the people of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial appearing a few days ago in a Nebraska newspaper published at Fremont, Nebr. The editorial is entitled "Lord Help Us." While some of the remarks contained therein are not entirely apropos of the subject under discussion, I think many of the thoughts presented are directly applicable.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fremont (Nebr.) Guide and Tribune]

LORD HELP US

This is a bold and broad statement, but a considered one:

Lord help the United States if the New Deal is allowed to remain in power through the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt for a fourth term or the election of one of his ardent followers.

By that statement no criticism is implied of President Roosevelt's conduct of the war on the actual fighting fronts. We are doing splendidly considering the slow start we had.

But his command of the war does not make Roosevelt indispensable. It is highly probable that there are many men in the United States who could have done as well, or better.

We reiterate our original statement: Lord help the United States if the New Deal is allowed to remain in power.

For there is every indication that the New Deal plans to extend itself—even going further with some of its theories than it has at home—all over the world, and at the expense of the people of the United States.

There is every indication that the New Deal is casting Uncle Sam in the role of the great sucker. He's played that role before, but never before on the scale which the New Deal contemplates.

There is every indication that the New Deal is setting up Uncle Sam to feed the world, to clothe the world, to give social security to all the world—and at no cost to the rest of the world, but at the sole expense of the people of the United States.

Temporary relief to starving countries must, of course, be given as rapidly as we free them from the Nazis, but indications say that that isn't all the New Dealers have in mind. They are planning to set up the United States as a permanent relief agency.

Now, all this would be enough if it was only going to cost some of our hard-earned dollars. But it will cost much more. It will cost us much of the good that will be needed at home, much of our industry, much of our agriculture, and much of our natural resources.

The New Deal planners practically admit they have something like this in mind. Paul Appleby, chief of the United States delegation to the "give-it-away" food conference at Hot Springs, says rationing must continue for years after the war ends.

What it all boils down to is this: The New Deal plans to raise the living standard of the rest of the world a few degrees while cutting the standard of the United States at least, and probably more than, half.

Why is the New Deal planning all this? Well, it's possible that our New Deal do-gooders are just so full of the milk of human kindness that they can't help themselves. But it is also possible that they can see Roosevelt not only as President of the United States but as president of the world.

Whatever the reasoning—or lack of it—behind the New Deal's grandiose schemes, the outcome isn't hard to see.

The other countries of the world naturally will accept all that we given them. Why not? It won't cost them anything because we here in the United States will be footing the bills, just as we've been footing the bills for idealistic but foolish experiments ever since 1933.

And when those countries have taken all they want, they'll tell poor old open-handed, but ragged, flat-broke, and flat-bellied Uncle Sam to go fly his kite.

And the better world for which we are allegedly fighting may have become a reality, but our own home will have become a hellhole.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in conclusion, based on the latest estimates, the United States has about 6 percent of the world's population and possesses about 30 percent of the world's wealth. Around 1930 we had about 35 percent of the total wealth. We earned about 36 percent of the total income in 1940, against about 42 percent in 1930. It is estimated that Lend-Lease will total about $100,000,000,000 by the time the war ends. That is nearly one-third our total wealth as a nation. I think it is about time carefully to consider legislation in the light of how it may ultimately affect this Nation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, this debate on a third extension of the act authorizing reciprocal trade agreements has been remarkable in that it has been a classic illustration of the Shakespearean expression about those who "keep the promise to our ear and break it to our hopes."

This is the fourth time that this proposition has been before the Congress, essentially in identical form.

It is said that on the eve of ordering the memorable and heroic charge by General Pickett's division at the battle of Gettysburg, General Lee said, "We have tried their right; we have tried their left; and now I am going to break their center."

In this case the opponents of the principle of reciprocal trade agreements tried the center in 1934. They tried the right in 1937. They tried the left in

1940; and they are now unwilling to make an outright attack at all. They are trying to win this battle by subterfuge.

As I have listened to the various proposals for crippling and emasculating amendments, by those who profess unwillingness to oppose the principle of the reciprocal trade agreements, I am reminded of nothing so much as the old Biblical story of Joab and Abner, in II Samuel, chapter 3. We all remember the war that existed between the House of David and the House of Saul. Joab was the general of the House of David. Abner was the general of the House of Saul. Abner went down and made peace with King David, but Joab, David's own general, was not satisfied with that peace, and he sent word to Abner that he would like to have him come up to Hebron and have a peaceful meeting with him. When Abner got there Joab told him to step into the gateway for a quiet talk, and when he got in he took him by the coat lapel and said, "How is it with thee, my brother?" And, as the Bible states, he smote him under the fifth rib, laid his innards open, and Abner fell down and died.

So we find the situation today, Mr. President, among those who are absolutely unwilling to make an open attack upon the principle of the reciprocal trade agreements. We find the statement that they are willing to reenact that act with just one little amendment, or another little amendment, or a third little amendment—either the Danaher amendment, the O'Mahoney amendment, or the Maloney amendment. Some have said, "We believe that the act is unconstitutional." The other day my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] said, "I have grave constitutional doubts." But those doubts could be resolved by "this little inconsequential amendment," or by the other little inconsequential amendment, or some third little inconsequental amendment, any one of which would completely destroy the force and effect of the whole reciprocal trade agreements program.

When I have listened to such arguments, Mr. President, I have been reminded of nothing so much as the very vivid story I heard told on the floor of the Senate the other day by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. He said that one of his old constituents went fishing and caught a fine big succulent catfish and was about to prepare the catfish for cooking. A catfish is rather slippery on the under side, and the old man had some trouble getting his knife into the catfish. The catfish was flipping around on this side and flopping around on the other side. The old fellow said, "Mr. Catfish, what is the matter with you. Why don't you lie still? Don't you realize that nothing ain't going to happen to you? Don't you know that you is in the hands of a friend? You are perfectly safe, Mr. Catfish? I ain't gwine to do nothing offensive to you. All I am gwine to do is gut you." [Laughter.] That is the purpose of the amendments which have been offered to the reciprocal trade agreements joint resolution.

Mr. President, it is very seldom indeed that I take the trouble to read or refer to a newspaper editorial on a question under consideration in this body. However, there was an editorial in the Baltimore Sun of Thursday, May 27, which seemed to me to be so succinct, so logical, and so unanswerable that I wish to read it. It contains a discussion of the speech of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] on the day before. I believe that it deserves to be read into the RECORD, and I desire to read it at this time. The editorial is headed "Hiding in the wood pile."

Let me say, Mr. President, that I am certain that I do not need to say to my distinguished friend from Michigan that there is no Member of this body with whom I have ever come in contact for whose talents and character I have a higher admiration than I have for his, and there is no one for whom I have a warmer personal affection and respect.

The editorial reads as follows:

Senator VANDENBERG, who opened the Senate debate for the opposition to the trade-agreements bill, was too clever to attack the bill directly. Again and again he professed his devotion to the principle of reciprocity.

I may say in passing, Mr. President, that some of the most eloquent speeches which have ever been made in this body in favor of executive discretion in the matter of tariff regulation were made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] when a comparatively new Member of this body in connection with the flexible provisions of the Smoot-Hawley bill and the so-called Collier-Harrison Act, which was designed to restrict and repeal that discretion or to subject it to congressional approval.

I continue to read from the editorial in the Baltimore Sun.

He argued, however, that the agreements already in existence might interfere with our freedom of negotiation at the peace table, and he insisted that to keep our policy flexible we must leave the way open for Congress to reconsider the trade-agreements program when the war ends.

With this in mind, he supported the Danaher amendment, which provides that Congress by joint resolution may denounce all trade agreements within 6 months from the end of the war. By this means, Mr. VANDENBERG contended, we shall avoid sending "our negotiators to the peace table—there to meet free agents of every other power on earth—with their hands tied behind their backs by presently negotiated and permanently frozen trade agreements, no matter how nobly meditated."

This argument is vitiated by two obvious misstatements of fact. It is not true, as Mr. VANDENBERG implies, that a renewal of the Trade Agreements Act will freeze all existing trade agreements. The fact is, and Mr. VANDENBERG ought to know this if he does not, that the renewal of the act is necessary to keep the trade agreements fluid. Many of the agreements have already been amended at least once, and those with Cuba and Canada have been amended several times. While the Trade Agreements Act remains in force such amendments are always possible. In implying that the pacts would be frozen if the act were renewed without the passage of the Danaher amendment, therefore, Mr. VANDENBERG is giving a false impression.

A second misstatement of fact is to be found in Mr. VANDENBERG's charge that our agents at the peace table will have their hands tied while the agents of other powers will be free. The Senator from Michigan must think his hearers are very stupid indeed if he really wants them to believe that we would be bound by the trade agreements while the other signatories would not be. The truth is that to the extent that the trade agreements bind one, they bind all.

The principal sophistry in Mr. VANDENBERG's argument, however, does not appear on the face of his speech. He says the Danaher amendment will free our hands to follow a sound commercial policy at the end of the war. What he fails to say, however, is that if the existing trade agreements are denounced the Hawley-Smoot tariff comes back into full force and effect.

Mr. President, I cannot too strongly emphasize the last statement in the editorial which I have read. I will read the statement again.

He says the Danaher amendment will free our hands to follow a sound commercial policy at the end of the war. What he fails to say, however, is that if the existing trade agreements are denounced the Hawley-Smoot tariff—

Of infamous memory—

comes back into full force and effect.

I continue reading from the editorial:

This is the concealed Abyssinian in the wood pile which the supporters of the Danaher amendment have carefully built up. Should this amendment be passed, and should the trade agreements be denounced under its terms, the Smoot-Hawley tariff, many of the excesses of which have been pared down by the Hull program, would be automatically restored. Worse still, the high tariffs which foreign countries erected in retaliation for our passage of the Smoot-Hawley tariff would be automatically restored at the same time.

I should add to the statement which I have read from the editorial in the Baltimore Sun, Mr. President, that not only would the iniquitous tariffs in foreign countries barring the products of our farmers and factories from the markets of the world be automatically restored, but the infamous and iniquitous system of restrictions and discriminations in matters of exchange, and other commercial restrictions of every sort, largely brought into being by retaliation against our short-sighted and benighted tariff policy, would also be brought automatically back into effect. I conclude reading the editorial in the Baltimore Sun, as follows:

To do that would deal foreign trade a paralyzing blow at the very outset of the post-war period. Such a procedure would not free our hands, as Mr. VANDENBERG naively asks us to believe. On the contrary, it would tie our hands to a far greater degree than now, and it would put international trade the world over into the same strait jacket which caused it to wither away in the early thirties. This would not only tie our hands, but it would tie our trade and invite an economic calamity.

We hope that the Senate will think this issue through and see that a vote for the Danaher amendment is a vote looking to restoration of the Hawley-Smoot tariff. It is not a vote to free our commercial policy but to shackle it.

Mr. President, with all the respect which I have expressed, and now feel for

the distinguished Senator from Michigan, I thought as I listened to his eloquent—and he is always eloquent—remarks the other day, and as I have read them over in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that in his statements of the issues involved in the pending joint resolution, the distinguished Senator has been uncommonly contradictory for him, and unusually careless for a man of his meticulous care in stating issues. In particular has it seemed to me to be true in his championing of the amendment which would permit Congress, by joint resolution, to terminate any or all trade agreements 6 months after the ending of hostilities.

At one place the distinguished Senator from Michigan argued that the Danaher amendment is absolutely inconsequential because it amounts to nothing more than a restatement of the constitutional power of Congress which exists at this time. I think that is true; I think it is unquestionable. But a few minutes later the distinguished Senator from Michigan attributed such tremendous and outstanding importance to the Danaher amendment that he stated that the adoption of the amendment would resolve very serious constitutional doubts which the Senator from Michigan professes to entertain as to the constitutionality of this proposed law.

Mr. President, if there is any doubt as to the constitutionality of the trade agreements act—which I do not believe, and do not think is even debatable—it seems inconceivable to me that such doubt could be resolved by a restatement of existing law which the Senator from Michigan insists the Danaher amendment practically amounts to. So the only conclusion that could be drawn from the argument of the able Senator from Michigan is that either the proposed amendment has some sinister hidden power—which has not yet been openly claimed for it, even by its authors—or that the constitutional objections of which the Senator from Michigan has spoken so appealingly are singularly weak and unconvincing. It matters very little to me upon which horn of this dilemma the distinguished Senator from Michigan and other supporters of the act may choose to hang this strange doctrine, but certainly they cannot have it both ways.

The Senator from Michigan, as well as other supporters of the proposed amendment, cannot eat their cake and keep it too. If the amendment does not mean anything, if it is merely a restatement of existing law, if its only purpose can be offensive to the nations with whom we might like to enter into trade agreements, and create in their minds an impression of our insincerity, then it should not be agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield very gladly to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I dislike to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am happy to be interrupted at any time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think it is fair to interrupt the Senator while he is speaking under limited time. Possibly later in the afternoon I may wish more extensively to comment on the amazing perversion which my able friend is presenting to the Senate. But in this instance I think he should be a little more scrupulous in stating the position I undertook to present regarding the constitutional question.

I am sure I never said that the Danaher amendment would meet my constitutional objection. I think the Senator will find that what I said was that, so far as I was concerned, during the pendency of the war crisis I was willing to suspend all my previously expressed doubts regarding the subject if we could simply be sure that the entire program could optionally pass in review after the termination of the war. Is not that what I said?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to read exactly what the Senator said.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly do not wish to misquote the Senator from Michigan. Without quoting him directly, I was giving the impression his remarks made on me when I heard them, and when I read them again in the RECORD no later than this morning. The Senator from Michigan began his remarks with these words:

> Mr. President, I regret that the measure providing for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act could not have been presented in a form which could have produced substantial agreement at this particular time for the sake of its impact upon the general war situation. Some of us earnestly sought to create this result in spite of our predilections. I think the extension of the act with the one single amendment asserting the constitutional rights of Congress in a modest way, avoiding all reasonable offense, would have achieved this desirable conclusion. I think it should have achieved this conclusion if we could have been dealing with reasonable men. I think it has been a mistake on the part of the present administration to resist this useful and constructive achievement, and I think that when the Senate has approved the pending amendment the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will still stand in a position of effective and formidable endorsement.

I shall not undertake to read his whole speech, but the Senator went on to express very grave constitutional doubt about this matter, and stated that, while he had entertained very great constitutional doubts, nevertheless, the adoption of a simple amendment would enable him to vote for the joint resolution. The point I am making, I will say to the Senator from Michigan, is that if the amendment, as was asserted and as has been claimed repeatedly both in the committee and on this floor is nothing on earth except a restatement of existing law—and that has not been seriously questioned, for I take it the Congress does have the right at the present time under this act, by joint resolution, to repeal all the trade agreements law or to abrogate any particular trade agreement, and that under existing law the President has the same power—then I say that if the Danaher amendment means nothing except a brief restatement of existing law, then there is certainly nothing in the amendment to resolve any constitutional doubt as to the constitutionality of the whole act and the whole system.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield further to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I submit that the Senator has read nothing to justify his repetition of the position which he previously erroneously attributed to me. I did not undertake, for a moment, to say that the Danaher amendment was an answer to the fundamental constitutional challenge which many persons, including the Senator from Michigan, feel in respect to this legislation, but what I did say was, and what I now repeat is, that I recognize that we are in a state of war; I recognize that during a state of war we have to deal with public questions often on a different basis than in normal times; and I said, and I repeat, that, so far as I was concerned, if the Danaher amendment, which in my view simply notifies the world that there is an ultimate congressional authority, were adopted, then, as a matter of good faith, I would suspend all other doubts, and I would not myself renew any of my previous constitutional objections, although I added that I certainly would have to vote for any such amendments if they were offered provided the Danaher amendment was not adopted. That is a totally different thing, I submit to the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator can put any construction he pleases on his remarks, and I am entitled to make any comment on his position, and that is what I am doing.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not complain of that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am simply pointing out that if the act is unconstitutional, it ought not to be passed, and if it is not unconstitutional nothing in it whatever would be changed by the adoption of the Danaher amendment except our situation with regard to other countries of the world. In other words, if the only purpose of the Danaher amendment is to put every other nation in the world on notice, possibly unfairly, possibly without justification, that we are not entirely sincere in this matter, that we intend to abrogate these treaties 6 months after the war is over, then they will never then be willing to deal with us on any such basis.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Illinois permit me to conclude inasmuch as the Senator from Missouri referred to me?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I totally disagree with what the Senator has just said regarding the matter of notice we are giving to the world. I do not want to argue

with him unless he is connecting his statement in some way with my position. What he has suggested certainly is diametrically opposite to the purpose I find in the Danaher amendment, and I simply say in one or two sentences to the Senator that I think the notice we would give the world through the Danaher amendment is that there is a constitutional authority already resident in the Congress to revoke trade agreements, but, so far as the text of the existing trade agreements is concerned, the only reference is to notice by the President; and I am saying that if the world thinks the trade agreements made under this act are subject only to revocation upon notice by the President the world is totally mistaken, and I am therefore believing very sincerely that the best possible way to insure post-war good-faith relationships is to anticipate post-war candor now by asserting textually through the Danaher amendment what I believe and what the Senator from Missouri believes to be the proper authority of Congress.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, the reason for the provision in existing law is very simple. The power of the Congress of the United States to repeal an act or to modify an act or to change or to abrogate one of these agreements by a joint resolution either signed by the President or by a joint resolution passed by a two-thirds majority of both Houses over the President's veto is inherent, and did not require any statement in a statute passed by Congress. The authority of the President to terminate one of these agreements after 3 years on 6 months' notice or, in fact, to abrogate it at any time, is not inherent in the power of the President himself; it is one of the powers specifically delegated by law, and, therefore, was properly included in the limitation of the law.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator agree with me that if it were desired to attempt to nullify the Trade Agreement Act as would be done by the Danaher amendment, it would have been much better to offer a straight-out repeal of the act and then the country would know what we are voting on?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think so, and I will say to the Senator from Illinois, as one who has very ardently and very conscientiously supported this act both in its inception in 1934, and its continuation in 1937 and in 1940, that if any such crippling amendment as the Danaher amendment, the O'Mahoney amendment, or the Maloney amendment comes out of the conference report on this matter, assuming it reaches that stage, then I, as a supporter of the principle of reciprocal trade agreements, believe it would be very much better to let the thing die and I intend to vote against any such conference report.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to conclude as briefly as possible. I merely desire to suggest to the Senator from Michigan and those who are supporting the Danaher amendment that, in view of the infinitesimal advantages even planned for the Danaher amendment in the way of a restatement of an undoubted congressional power and privilege, as against the great advantages that inhere in cooperation in international affairs, the Senator from Michigan might very well have pondered the remarks of one of his favorite prophets whom he quoted so eloquently in his speech the other day when he said:

> The imprudence of posing the biggest issues on a test of this small issue is evident.

Mr. President, I merely wish to say in closing that the Reciprocal Trade Act was originally passed as the only possible, practicable means of providing the machinery for the whole world, not only the United States, but for the whole world, to work out of the morass of despair into which we had been plunged largely through our own initiative, in passing the Fordney-McCumber bill and the Smoot-Hawley bill, followed by retaliation on the part of every other nation in the world, not only in tariff rates, not only in prohibitive barriers, but through vicious quota systems, and exchange regulations, which paralyzed the international trade of the world.

Congress could not pass an act to correct that situation. Congress had been largely responsible for creating the condition, and it had passed out of the power of Congress to correct it. Therefore Congress started in on the program of laying down the broad principles upon which its agents should act—and in this case the Executive is nothing but an agent of the Congress—and then permitting the Executive to proceed, within the limits prescribed by law, for certain specified purposes, for benefiting our foreign trade, and making the best trades possible with other countries, not only as to tariff barriers, but economic restrictions of other sorts.

I feel that the results of that policy have not been as immediate and as great as I had hoped. That was possible because the situation was extremely complex, and only 5 short years intervened between the time when Congress acted to set up this authority and the outbreak of the war in Europe, which almost completely hamstrung economic relations over the world. But it is the only effective machinery existing in the world today for economic cooperation rather than economic warfare.

I urge every Senator to consider the alternative to the renewal of this program without crippling amendments. The alternative is to revert immediately to the prohibitive provisions of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, which is so infamous that no Senator will stand on this floor to defend it, and not only to revert to that but to revert to the barriers to American trade which were set up by other nations in retaliation for our short-sighted tariff policy. So I urge, with every fiber of my being, that the Congress pass the pending measure for extension of the Trade Agreements Act without crippling amendments, and so maintain machinery which is the only hope of economic trade relations by cooperation instead of by retaliation and warfare throughout the world.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I shall vote for the reciprocal trade program and its continuance for the reasons I shall state. I wish to express my confidence in Secretary Hull, who was responsible for the inauguration of the program, which has been so helpful and so effective on behalf of the people of the United States.

I think it is desirable to continue in existence this sound principle of international cooperation, in the interest of unity in our war effort, and in the interest of a secure peace when the war shall have ended, and continued prosperity to the American people. I think it would be very desirable to have the affirmative vote on the pending measure sufficiently large to indicate to everyone on earth that it was a bipartisan vote; that it was not a matter of politics, because these agreements have had the merit of being workable, and they have been helpful to the people of the United States.

I think it would be a mistake to adopt crippling amendments, and I agree with the Senator from Missouri that Congress has not given up its authority to do away with the trade agreements by congressional resolution. Amendments such as that offered by the Senator from Connecticut in my opinion do not offer anything, and certainly Congress has not given up its authority, except in those instances where it delegates to the President certain power to act as the agent of the Congress.

I intend to support the present program because, as I have said, I am confident that Mr. Hull, our Secretary of State, has done a magnificent piece of work; that his work is entitled to a vote of confidence on the part of the Senate of the United States, and that our approval would give to the American people, and to the people in the countries with whom we deal, a feeling that we mean to follow this course not merely during the war but in the interest of peace and security after the war has ended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I reserve the right to conclude, of course, and I defer to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

Mr. DANAHER. I did not understand the Senator from Georgia; I do not know what he said.

Mr. GEORGE. I said I reserved the right to conclude, briefly, and I defer to the Senator for the present.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like very much to have the Senator from Georgia proceed. It is true that as chairman of the committee he reported the pending amendment on behalf of the committee, pursuant to a vote which the committee itself took directing that he take that step, but the fact remains that the majority of the committee have proposed the committee amendment which comprises the pending question, and certainly under all our normal intercourse and dealings in the handling of matters before the Senate, the proponents of a proposition have been given

the prerogative of closing the debate. I know of no reason why that usual and customary procedure should be dispensed with.

Mr. GEORGE. I am ready to vote, Mr. President. If the Senator does not care to argue the matter, I am perfectly willing to have the vote.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator from Georgia if I am not entirely correct in my understanding that in a situation such as that which now prevails the proponents of an amendment normally would conclude the debate?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think so. I am certainly not conscious of doing anything unethical. As chairman of the committee I reported the joint resolution. I asked the majority, who voted in the amendment, to report the joint resolution and take the burden, and that they declined to do so, and I think I have a right to conclude the debate. But I am perfectly willing to vote at this time, if the Senator does not desire to speak.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator from Georgia how long he intends to speak, if he does conclude the debate?

Mr. GEORGE. I have but 34 minutes, and I do not think I shall take more than 15 or 20 minutes. I merely wish to state my position very briefly. I shall not delay the vote very much by a speech.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I do not see a sufficient number of Senators on the floor at the moment to carry the committee amendment, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Reynolds
Bankhead	Gurney	Russell
Barbour	Hatch	Scrugham
Bilbo	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bone	Hayden	Smith
Brewster	Hill	Stewart
Brooks	Holman	Taft
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lodge	Tobey
Byrd	Lucas	Truman
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wallgren
Connally	Mead	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	White
Davis	Moore	Wiley
Downey	Murray	Willis
Eastland	Nye	Wilson
Ellender	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And the Senator from Georgia has 33 minutes.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there certainly has been much misapprehension as to both the purpose and the intendment of the committee amendment, if one is to place reliance on the sort of utterance which the last few hours have given. We have pending before us a proposal which has already passed the House to extend the act of June 12, 1934, as amended, for an additional 2 years. If we were not to extend the act at all, every trade agreement which today is outstanding would continue in full force and effect. Those which had originally been written for 3 years would continue automatically under the 1934 act, which provides that they shall continue, subject only to 6 months' notice of their discontinuance to be given by either country. Those which have been agreed upon in 1941 or 1942 would continue, not only throughout their specified lives, but thereafter indefinitely, subject to termination upon 6 months' notice. At this point in our thinking, Mr. President, we should look at the original 1934 act to ascertain just exactly what the statute authorized as to the life of a trade agreement and we find in section 2 (b) the following language:

> Every foreign trade agreement concluded pursuant to this act shall be subject to termination, upon due notice to the foreign government concerned, at the end of not more than 3 years from the date on which the agreement comes into force, and, if not then terminated, shall be subject to termination thereafter upon not more than 6 months' notice.

Mr. President, interestingly enough, the act is completely silent as to who is to give the notice of termination in the event that the United States chooses to terminate. So the Committee on Finance, before reporting the joint resolution coming to us from the House, first proposed to amend the pending measure—the proposal could be said to be an amendment to existing law—by providing that the notice of termination is to be given either by the President of the United States acting by himself, whenever he decides to give notice to terminate, or by the President acting pursuant to a joint resolution which the Congress may pass.

In other words, Mr. President, with respect to the pending amendment, in no way whatever would the President's power, if he has any, be interfered with. Quite the contrary, the Committee on Finance in its majority amendment says that whatever the President's power might have been, it would still continue; whatever the President's power in the future may be, we would still accord it to him. But we would also say that at a date not earlier than 6 months following the cessation of hostilities in the present war, the Congress of the United States might pass a joint resolution calling upon the President to terminate an improvident trade agreement.

At that moment, of course, the President of the United States would have the power to veto the joint resolution passed by the Congress, if he disagreed with the action of the Congress. Thereupon, it would become incumbent upon the Congress, if it were to succeed in its endeavor, to override the veto by a two-thirds vote of both Houses. That is the situation which as a matter of law is said by opponents of the committee amendment to spell disaster for the United States. That contention is perfectly absurd, it seems to me.

Mr. President, while the amendment has been referred to as the Danaher amendment, there is no reason in the world why it should be dignified, especially by the allocation of my name to it. Seriously, let it be known that the majority group in the Finance Committee caused draft after draft of the proposed language to be written by various members.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield for a question, not for a statement.

Mr. TOBEY. I think the Senator will accept the statement—30 seconds long, only—which I propose to make.

Mr. DANAHER. Very well.

Mr. TOBEY. If what my friend the Senator from Connecticut has said is correct, the allocation of his name to the amendment not only would dignify it, but certainly would vitalize it.

Mr. DANAHER. I appreciate even the 20 seconds to which the Senator limited himself, and I thank him.

Mr. President, the intention of the drafters of the amendment was to make as little change as possible in existing law. Even the very phraseology, the very nouns, the very prepositions and clauses of the proposed committee amendment follow exactly the language of the original act, with a slight interpolation. It should be recalled that since the original act had provided that every foreign trade agreement concluded pursuant to the act shall be subject to termination as therein stated, it follows, as a matter of statutory construction and as a matter of treaty interpretation, Mr. President, that that provision was automatically and necessarily written into every such trade agreement.

Mr. President, the committee amendment would say that every trade agreement concluded hereafter, over the life of the act, as extended, shall automatically include as a statutory clause not only section 2 (b) of the 1934 act, but also the statement of a power in Congress to call for a termination; and with design, Mr. President, we said, "Every foreign trade agreement"—not all foreign trade agreements—"shall be subject to termination."

In other words, "every" is used in the sense of "each"; and it would require 31 separate joint resolutions to terminate the 31 trade agreemens at any future date, were Congress to attempt to exercise the power, so reserved.

Moreover, the language in line 9 designedly says——

Every foreign-trade agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of said act as amended—

The use of the words "in accordance with" was designed to incorporate by reference all of the existing statute, with its limitations, its authority, its powers, and its rights—whatever the statutory language affords.

So, Mr. President, stripped of all its technicalities, it could have read that—

Every foreign-trade agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of said act as amended shall, 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as fixed by proclamation of the President, be subject to termination pursuant to joint resolution of the Congress or by the President.

We did not adopt that form, simply that the committee language might conform as closely as possible to, and be entirely consonant with, existing law.

Mr. President, if we ask, Why is it of importance or interest that we bring back some possible measure of control to the Congress with reference to these trade agreements, we are faced with this situation: If we should extend the life of the authority over the next 2 years for the President to conclude new agreements, he would, under the original act, be in a position to bind the United States for 3 years. We would stand committed. If the war should end within that 3-year period, even though Congress may technically have the right to repudiate an agreement which we have authorized our President to make, we most assuredly would not wish to stand at the bar of international good morals and leave our country and our President open to condemnation for having repudiated an agreement, even though we should find it to our national interest to do so.

Consequently, Mr. President, if we at this time add to the series of escape clauses provided in the 1934 act which operate for the benefit of the United States, and now give notice to every country which concludes an agreement over the period of the extended life of the act that the President himself may terminate an improvident agreement, or may be called upon by Congress to do so, every nation will be put on notice at the outset. That course would preserve, rather than destroy, the good faith and morals of the position of the United States at the bar of world appraisal.

There are other phases, economic and legal, which justify this step. One of them is to be found in the statement of Mr. Elmer Davis, which was made in Chicago on April 27. I quote from the Associated Press account of the utterance of the head of the Office of War Information.

If it comes to the unconditional surrender of our enemies, there may simply be occupation of the defeated countries. There are a lot of policies which may be worked out in practice instead of conference. Nobody can see what the peace negotiations will be.

He pointed out that the Allies may dispense with a peace parley entirely. That utterance from the head of the Office of War Information is in line with other utterances which have hitherto emanated from the State Department, that the so-called peace negotiations may be deferred for a period of years. Over that entire period the United States would be helpless during the stated life of each agreement in the face of the position which we would otherwise have authorized our President to take if we do not now give to the Congress an opportunity, definitely reserved, to bring back for review and examination whatever trade agreements he might conclude under the act if extended.

It is because of that situation, Mr. President, that the people of the United States are entitled to the reasonable protection which the committee amendment would give.

At Hot Springs at this very moment there is in conference a group which is discussing the world movement of foods in the post-war period. We were told at the very outset that American interests would not be committed, and that the interests of no other nation would be committed at that conference. We were told that it is purely exploratory. If it be so for what reason is it that the delegates are not committing either their nations or our own at the food conference at Hot Springs? Clearly because they cannot possibly foresee what conditions in the future are to be, and they so stated. Why should we pass this joint resolution without amendment, and authorize trade agreements which may bind our Nation over the post-war period?

Mr. President, on or about the 4th of March Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, proposed to 34 nations a form of international currency stabilization. After that proposal had been considered for about a month by representatives of foreign nations, it was submitted informally to a group of Senators, who were asked to meet with Mr. Morgenthau in conference. It became perfectly apparent, not only from his explanation to us, but from the press releases which were issued by the Treasury with reference to the program, that the post-war financial situation may be one of utter chaos. In that situation, in the absence of an international monetary stabilization program, the reciprocal trade agreements program of the United States could in fact spell disaster for our people. No special argument from the Senator from Connecticut is needed in support of that statement. We need only recount some of the developments over the past several years in our own country, and the definite objectives of those in the executive branch at the present moment.

I hold in my hand a copy of the remarks of the Attorney General delivered on the 25th of April 1942, in Washington. I wish to read what he said to the group to whom he delivered those remarks:

You have complete control over production. Obviously you can't suddenly release that control over production simply because tomorrow morning peace is here. You have complete control over the processes of distribution. That can't be thrown over when peace comes. The gap would be too great. You have the problem of the exchange of raw materials. You have the economic problems of the tendency toward inflation on the one side, coming from the fact that most of the goods that people want in times of peace no longer exist, so that the tremendous desire to make and acquire those goods will tend toward an inflationary direction; and on the other hand you have the seeds of deflation coming from the fact that suddenly you are going to retool your plants and throw men out of employment because they can't be used, for a while at least, in production.

* * * * *

To what extent have we used international corporations? We have used domestic Government corporations tentatively, but still with a great deal of skill, and there is enough already in our experience with such organizations as, let's say, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries or the Tennessee Valley Authority, to see to what extent flexible and effective and prompt use can be exercised by the Government, through the corporation, and to what extent some control is needed over them.

In the same way I can think of the possibility of an international corporation, with its stock owned by various nations, having flexible powers, and built on the experience of the war. After all, that is what we are doing today. We are buying and selling and distributing enormously through these Government corporations all over the world. To what extent can we use that kind of technique in the peace?

Mr. President, through the Export-Import Bank the Congress has already created, until January 2, 1947, a lending authority of more than $700,000,000. That fund, or $500,000,000 of it, comprises a revolving fund from which exports from the United States have been financed through the Export-Import Bank.

Moreover, every import for many months has been received under directives through the R. F. C., the B. E. W., the Commodity Credit Corporation, and other governmental agencies, exactly in line with what the Attorney General told the group to which I have referred.

More than 66 percent of all the goods which have been imported are duty-free anyway, such as rubber, tin, and other items not indigenous to our productivity, and yet, Mr. President, it is said that the reciprocal trade-agreements program has stimulated all this trade.

I have here in my hand the figures on the imports of gold into this country during the past 8 years, which time coincides roughly with the period for which the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been on the books. The aggregate runs into billions of dollars of gold every year. In 1940 it was four billion one hundred and fifteen millions of gold. In 1939 it was three billion four hundred and seventy-six millions of gold. In 1938 one billion eight hundred and eighty-six millions of gold was brought into this country, and at $35 an ounce, of course, there were credited balances in favor of countries which took our exports. But it is said that the reciprocal trade-agreements program was producing that situation. Yet other claims have been advanced for the reciprocal trade program.

We have been told in the report which the Senator from Georgia filed in behalf of the committee—and he took the

House committee report and attached it to one of his own—that the reciprocal trade-agreements program increased both our imports and exports in 1938 and 1939 as compared with earlier years. But the fact of the matter is that for the 6 years from 1924 to 1929, inclusive, our exports amounted to $28,975,000,000, while during the 6 years from 1934 to 1939, inclusive, the exports were only $16,241,000,000.

Mr. President, if we were to take the period of 1938 and 1939 and compare it with 1936 and 1937, we would discover that the average rate of increase in exports of the United States was precisely the same before the trade-agreements program became effective as it was afterward. The trade-agreements program did not increase the rate of exports of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table which clearly demonstrates the facts, and which was prepared for me last week by the United States Tariff Commission, may be included in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Foreign trade of the United States, 1924–39

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Exports						Imports					
	Agricultural	Percent of increase or decrease over previous year	Nonagricultural	Percent of increase or decrease over previous year	Total	Percent of increase or decrease over previous year	Agricultural	Percent of increase or decrease over previous year	Nonagricultural	Percent of increase or decrease over previous year	Total	Percent of increase or decrease over previous year
1924	2,110		2,388		4,498		1,911		1,699		3,610	
1925	2,136		2,683		4,819		2,340		1,887		4,227	
1926	1,817		2,895		4,712		2,416		2,015		4,431	
1927	1,885		2,874		4,759		2,221		1,964		4,185	
1928	1,863		3,167		5,030		2,100		1,991		4,091	
1929	1,693		3,454		5,157		2,218		2,181		4,399	
Total	11,504		17,461		28,975		13,206		11,737		24,943	
1930	1,201		2,580		3,781		1,469		1,592		3,061	
1931	821		1,557		2,378		1,008		1,083		2,091	
1932	662		914		1,576		668		655		1,323	
1933	694	+4.8	953	+4.3	1,647	+4.5	732	+9.6	717	+9.5	1,449	+9.5
Total	3,378		6,004		9,382		3,877		4,047		7,924	
1934	733	+5.6	1,367	+43.4	2,100	+27.5	821	+12.1	815	+13.7	1,636	+12.9
1935	747	+1.9	1,496	+9.4	2,243	+6.8	1,072	+30.6	967	+18.6	2,039	+24.6
1936	709	−5.1	1,710	+14.3	2,419	+7.8	1,242	+15.8	1,182	+22.2	2,424	+18.9
1937	797	+12.4	2,502	+46.3	3,299	+36.4	1,579	+12.7	1,431	+21.1	3,010	+24.2
1938	828	+3.9	2,229	−10.1	3,057	−7.3	956	−39.5	994	−20.5	1,950	−35.2
1939	656	−20.8	2,467	+10.7	3,123	+2.2	1,118	+16.9	1,158	+16.5	2,276	+16.7
Total	4,470		11,771		16,241		6,788		6,547		13,335	
Grand total	19,352		35,236		54,598		23,871		22,331		46,202	
Percent of increase or decrease:												
1934 over 1932		+10.7		+49.6		+33.2		+22.9		+24.4		+23.7
1938 over 1934		+13.0		+63.1		+46.6		+16.4		+22.0		+19.2
1939 over 1934		−10.5		+80.5		+48.7		+36.2		+42.1		+39.1

Source: Compiled from official statistics of Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, and statistics furnished by the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in the discussion of the validity of the trade-agreements program, we have completely overlooked the fact that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, since the war broke out, through October 31, 1942, had financed foreign purchases—all reflected in imports, understand—in the amount of $3,188,591,000. We have no possible comprehension even at this minute of the extent of operations of the Board of Economic Warfare, but I know that during the period from April 13 or 14, 1942, through December 31, 1942, it drew on the R. F. C. for more than a billion dollars. When governmental agencies and operating corporations have handled both the exports and imports of the United States, what sophistry it is to say to us, "Do not protect the people of the United States; do not look forward to a post-war period with its disorganized finances, with international currencies gone awry, with war-torn nations having needs which we cannot possibly predict. You must authorize us in the State Department"—someone back of a desk down there—"to pass upon what our destiny and American rights are to be." Yet, Mr. President, that is what it amounts to.

We have been told, "If you do not give these fellows back of a desk down there complete power, the whole program of collaboration and cooperation of the United States with the entire world is doomed to failure."

I have heard it argued on the floor this morning that if we fail to pass the pending joint resolution without amendment, the Smoot-Hawley tariff will be revived. Mr. President, the Smoot-Hawley tariff is now the law of the United States. It has been the law since 1930. It has not been amended in any particular. No one has even suggested that it be repealed, although this administration has had complete control of the Congress since 1934, and, if you please, during the life of the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Mr. President, there are only 1,180 items affected by the reciprocal trade-agreement program now outstanding. There are thousands not touched at all, and, of course, at this minute they are governed by the Smoot-Hawley tariff.

So, Mr. President, it is like drawing a red herring across the trail to say that the adoption of the committee amendment would mean a return to congressional logrolling and legislative tariff making, and all the other types of utterance with which we have been belabored during the past several days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. DANAHER. Did the Chair say my time had "practically" expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has expired, leaving out the word "practically."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Chair for his courtesy in advising me in the premises, and I now yield the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not wish to make an extended argument on this question, but I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the real situation that exists with regard to the Trade Agreements Act.

The Trade Agreements Act was passed in 1934. Every objection which was then raised is again being raised to the pending renewal measure, and by the same Senators. There is not a thing new in the argument. Not a thing new has transpired in connection with the Trade Agreements Act.

I have not thought it proper, and none of us who are supporting the pending joint resolution have deemed it proper, to submit arguments with reference to the constitutionality of the act, either upon the proposition that a trade agreement is a treaty and must therefore be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, or upon the ground that the Trade Agreements Act constitutes an unlawful delegation of legislative power. Those points

have been discussed in this body time after time.

There is in the RECORD of March 29, 1940, the brief of the Attorney General, Mr. Jackson, at that time. It is a long and exhaustive brief, carefully prepared and carefully thought out holding the Trade Agreements Act to be constitutional upon all points of the attack, as I now recall.

Arguments may be found in the RECORD which have been repeated on the pending renewal joint resolution, and which will be repeated on the two constitutional questions which have been injected into the discussion.

Mr. President, the amendment which is now before the Senate admits on its face that it is wholly unnecessary. It is referred to as the committee amendment, and it was adopted by a majority of the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think, in passing, attention should be called to the fact that while it is referred to as the committee amendment, and while it is technically a committee amendment, it was adopted in the committee by a majority of only one vote.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true, but, on the face of it, Mr. President, the amendment which is now before the Senate admits that the action which the Senate is asked to take is wholly unnecessary. The amendment reads:

Provided, That every foreign-trade agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of said act, as amended, shall be subject to termination 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as fixed by proclamation of the President, pursuant to joint resolution of the Congress or by the President.

It will be noted that the amendment proposes to declare all trade agreements terminable and, therefore, they are all terminable, and that is written in the very language of the amendment itself. It is not confined to trade agreements hereafter made; it is as applicable to all trade agreements made in the past as those made in the future. The very amendment itself carries on its face the positive, the straight declaration that it is a wholly unnecessary legislative pronouncement. Every Senator who has spoken on this floor has said that, of course, the Congress had the right to abrogate the Trade Agreements Act if it wished to do so and, by a separate act, to abrogate any specific agreement which is outstanding, if it wished to do so; and it would not have to do more than pass an act which changed the rates of the tariff that covered any particular agreement. But the amendment itself, in its own teeth, says that this action is unnecessary, and, therefore, the question arises why is it pressed with so much vigor?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I have only a few moments, but I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand the Senator's argument at all. Why is it not necessary, when, if it is not adopted, we authorize a tying up for 3 years?

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to make it plain that the amendment itself says with reference to every single trade agreement heretofore made or hereafter made, whether it has run 6 months or 1 year, that it shall be terminable within 6 months after the termination of hostilities.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield a moment, it is because there are only five trade treaties which have not run for 3 years and they will all expire, in all probability, before the end of the war.

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly; I know that; but on the very face of the text is the flat declaration that notice is being served that every one of them can be terminated. I ask the reason why? Why is it desired to put that kind of an amendment in the act?

It is true that of the existing treaties all but five of them have already run for 3 years, and they can be terminated by the President himself or by the Congress as matters now stand. The five remaining can be terminated probably within less time than 6 months after the conclusion of the war, even if initially they run the period fixed in the Trade Agreements Act. But, Mr. President, the point I am making is that the very amendment is a flat admission that it is proposed to do an unnecessary thing. What is the reason for proposing to do it?

Mr. President, in the Finance Committee it was vigorously insisted that, although trade agreements were concluded for a fixed period of not exceeding 3 years—some of them had been negotiated for 2 years—nevertheless, the President was the only organ of the Government which could terminate the agreements even after 3 years or could give notice to terminate them. I wish to read a brief excerpt from a comparatively recent Supreme Court decision, reported in Two Hundred and Ninety-seven United States Reports, at page 114, the opinion being rendered by Mr. Justice Hughes:

As to the third point, we think that the question as to the authority of the Executive in the absence of congressional action, or of action by the treaty-making power, to denounce a treaty of the United States is not here involved. In this instance, the Congress requested and directed the President to give notice of the termination of the treaty provisions in conflict with the act. From every point of view, it was incumbent upon the President, charged with the conduct of negotiations with foreign governments and also with the duty to take care that the laws of the United States are faithfully executed, to reach a conclusion as to the inconsistency between the provisions of the treaty and the provisions of the new law. It is not possible to say that his conclusion as to articles 13 and 14 was arbitrary or inadmissible. Having determined that their termination was necessary, the President, through the Secretary of State, took appropriate steps to effect it—

As directed and required by the Congress.

Here we have the Trade Agreements Act which authorizes the executive branch of the Government to make trade agreements with foreign countries respecting trade, respecting impediments to trade, and restrictions on trade. The Congress may abrogate that act whenever it pleases. Congress may by a direct act change every single duty that is fixed in a trade agreement whenever it pleases to do so. I do not assume that Congress would please to do so. Here is the express declaration of our own Supreme Court that when the authority is given to the President to terminate a trade agreement such authority is also the authority of the Congress because the Congress may direct him and require him to give notice of termination, and he is bound to comply with the law of the land. Indeed, the resolution of Congress itself is, to all intents and purposes, a termination of any particular trade agreement.

Mr. President, I should like to ask Senators to consider the provisions which have been incorporated in the later trade agreements and to see if there is any need to have our hands untied in the post-war period. I should like to quote article 11 of the agreement with Mexico which is one of the recent trade agreements.

1. If, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the concession granted on any article enumerated and described in the schedules annexed to this agreement, such article is being imported in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles, the Government—

That includes the Congress, Senators—

the Government of either country shall be free to withdraw the concession, in whole or in part, or to modify it to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent such injury.

Note the language:

If, as the result of unforeseen developments and of the concession granted on any article enumerated and described * * *.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Is the flexibility which the Senator enunciates a feature of most of the trade agreements, according to his understanding?

Mr. GEORGE. It is a feature of all the trade agreements. I had not read the entire provision of the Mexican agreement, and I should like to read a little more of it:

Accordingly, if the President of the United States of America finds as a fact that imports of any article enumerated and described in schedule II or schedule III are entering the United States of America under the circumstances specified in the preceding sentence, he shall determine whether the withdrawal, in whole or in part, of the concession with regard to the article, or any modification of the concession, by the imposition of quantitative regulations or otherwise, is necessary to prevent such injury.

And so forth. The second provision in that particular section gives to the opposite government identically the same right and the same power. It is as follows:

Before the government of either country shall withdraw or modify a concession pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 1 of this article, it shall give notice in writing to the government of the other country as far in advance as may be practicable and shall af-

ford such other government an opportunity to consult with it in respect of the proposed action; and if agreement with respect thereto is not reached the Government which proposes to take such action shall, nevertheless, be free to do so and the other Government shall be free within thirty days after such action is taken to terminate this agreement in whole or in part on 30 days' written notice.

The general escape clause is also in each agreement we have made, and in the very latest agreement, that with Iran, which, by the way, deals with only a few enumerated articles, there is substantially the same broad clause corresponding to the clause in the Mexican treaty which I have read. But I should like to read that clause, because it happens to be in the latest agreement:

1. If the government of either country should consider that any circumstance, or any measure adopted by the other Government, even though it does not conflict with the terms of this agreement, has the effect of nullifying or impairing any object of the agreement or of prejudicing an industry or the commerce of that country, such other government shall give sympathetic consideration to such written representations or proposals as may be made with a view to effecting a mutually satisfactory adjustment of the matter. If agreement is not reached with respect to the matter within 30 days after such representations or proposals are received, the government which made them shall be free, within 15 days after the expiration of the aforesaid period of 30 days, to terminate this agreement in whole or in part on 30 days' written notice.

2. The governments of the two countries agree to consult together to the fullest possible extent in regard to all matters affecting the operation of the present agreement.

Could anything be broader than that? "If the Government"—of the United States—"should consider that any circumstance has the effect of prejudicing an industry or the commerce of that country," and if the situation is not cured, we can cancel the agreement on short notice. If what we are talking about is practical protection against unforeseen events, it is already provided as fully as it could be, and it is provided in a form which was agreed to and which works both ways, and which, therefore, neither gives offense nor prevents friendly negotiation to work out particular adjustments without wrecking entire agreements. If what we want is practical protection, we would be wise to take it in that form. The amendment is not practical protection; it is notice to the world that we propose to abandon the whole policy 6 months after the war.

The supporters of the amendment insist that they are talking about something which may happen in the future, but has not happened in the past, and they ask, "How do we know that those who are charged with the administration of the act will put this clause in each and every trade agreement made?"

Mr. President, that attitude is on all fours, it seems to me, with the statements of most of the witnesses who have testified on the Trade Agreements Act from the beginning down to this time, and who always admitted that their interests had been very well safeguarded in the past, but that they were worried about what might happen in the future. After 9 years of experience, it is time for us to realize that this program is carefully conducted. There is adequate protection against contingencies in every one of the agreements now existing. The responsible negotiators know as well as we do that the future is uncertain. They have proved that they know how to write adequate protective clauses, and to get them in agreements. I for one am fully confident that they will not forget their wits tomorrow, or next year, or the year after that. The point is that they can provide protection by negotiation and agreement, in a clause which works both ways, and which, therefore, does not drive away the customers or unnecessarily jeopardize the bulk of the provisions in the agreements about which no one has ever complained, either before or after the agreements have entered into force. This is a commercial program, and we should all remember that every bargain has two sides.

The supporters of the amendment are correct as to one point: The period just after the war ends is certain to be, for everyone engaged in foreign trade, the most confused and difficult time they have ever known. Old trade connections everywhere are broken, old lines cut asunder. It is not possible to fight a total war, on every ocean in the world, and start off the next day with trade as usual.

In such a time as that what does private enterprise require in the way of governmental policy and action? I think that what it chiefly needs is continuity—some reasonable prospect that the policy which Government pursues will not be changed too often or too fast. Private enterprise has shown a hundred times that it can operate under very adverse circumstances if the circumstances are stable enough so that they can be provided for. But it cannot deal with constant changes in the main outline and direction of the laws to which it must conform. If we want private foreign trade to revive after the war, and to be prosperous and grow, we must endeavor, so far as in our power lies, to attain stability in the main outline and direction of the regulations we impose on foreign commerce. We shall need flexibility in detail, to deal with unforseen contingencies, but we must do our best to achieve stability in principle and general direction. Certainly we must not formally announce that we intend or contemplate an abrupt and fundamental change, unless we really mean it.

The continuation of the trade-agreements program, and of the agreements negotiated under it, and confidence that they will in general remain in force according to their terms, will provide the necessary element of continuity, and the continuing power to negotiate new individual agreements, and to change old agreements in detail by renewed negotiation, plus the various escape clauses, plus the ultimate power to terminate any particular agreement entirely pursuant to its terms, if the interests of the United States so require—these elements make the program flexible in detail. On that basis, firmly held to through the years, private enterprise can plan and act, and the thriving commerce which we all desire can be developed. But if we say, as the pending amendment proposes, that we are seriously thinking of scrapping, 6 months after the war, everything that has been done since 1934, how can any trader, any export farmer, any export manufacturer, plan, or act, or know what to expect?

If the Senate wants to scrap the program, and the hope for fruitful private foreign trade after the war, then let it vote for this amendment.

I wish to add one further thought and I am done.

What the United States needs most in its foreign policy in general and its international commercial policy in particular is a consistent appreciation of its own real national interest and the continued will to act upon it. It is time that we forgot the local rivalries and fears and prejudices which forever hamstring us when we attempt to state and follow a single foreign policy. The United States is a great and powerful country, and it has many good and powerful friends throughout the world. If we can demonstrate our resolution to work in real collaboration with those friends, not only today in war, but afterward in peace, in the practical affairs which affect our national security and prosperity and theirs, then there is real ground to hope that we may have a peaceful world when this war is over, and great prosperity at home. But if the Senate says—and it will say it if it adopts the pending amendment—that we are getting ready now to cancel all our trade arrangements with them, and theirs with us, 6 months after the war is over, and are getting ready to retire into our economic shell from that time on, then collaboration is impossible, and we are headed straight for economic confusion and chaos.

Mr. President, what is proposed to be done by the amendment would create a situation much like that faced by a man who rents a house, the lease for which contains a stipulation that it may be terminated or canceled on 30 days' notice. The tenant goes into the house and there on the wall of the house he sees the motto, God Bless Our Home, and right under that motto finds the reminding note of his landlord:

DEAR TENANT: Take notice that I have the right on 30 days' notice to terminate your lease.

Affectionately yours,
YOUR CONSIDERATE LANDLORD.

Mr. President, how long will a tenant remain in a house under such circumstances? How long can he remain in it? If the Senate acts as it is now proposed it shall act, how long will it be before all our trade arrangements with other countries will be broken up and disturbed? How long can we continue to do business on such a basis?

Mr. President, I do not speak as a free trader. I wish to make my position clear. I believe in reasonable protection for

American industry. I do not believe in monopolistic tariffs, and I am willing to say that whatever administration comes or goes I would rather risk turning such matters over to a body which would apply scientific principles in the writing of a tariff than to go through what I went through in 19 long months in 1929 and 1930 when we produced the Smoot-Hawley tariff measure, an act with which no one was satisfied. Some of the leading Republicans and protectionists on the Senate floor actually voted against it. The only hope of the future for those who want reasonable and fair protection for American industry and the American standard of labor, is to commit our country to some scientific means of tariff formulation and not return to the old and evil practices which brought none of us anything but headaches.

Mr. President, I am quite well aware that much of the real opposition to the Trade Agreements Act arose from a fear that the Congress is parting with too much of its power. The Congress does have the power to regulate foreign trade and commerce, but the Congress is powerless to do it unless it can secure the cooperation of the executive arm of the Government. Congress cannot deal with a foreign country. Congress cannot deal with the commerce which leaves our shores and enters the ports of foreign nations. Congress, the legislative body, can deal with it only if the President, who in external affairs is the only spokesman of the Nation, can be induced to cooperate in our joint effort and our joint enterprise to regulate foreign trade and foreign commerce.

I do not want to do anything now which is equivalent to saying that even at this moment our great Nation is not willing to carry on fair trade negotiations in the narrow field of international commerce. I do not want to see our country take such a position, because of its enormous effect upon everything we shall hereafter do. Senators, we should know that while our country does not propose to commit itself to impossible tasks, and does not propose to go beyond the power which it ought rightfully to exert in the postwar period, nevertheless America today carries the hope of the vast majority of the freemen of all this earth. Why disappoint them by writing into this simple law which has been in effect for 9 years, a notification that we reserve the right when the war is over, to terminate and end all that we have done to promote a helpful and beneficial trade and commercial intercourse between our Nation and the other nations of the world?

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read the preamble and resolutions adopted by the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, the largest chamber of commerce organization in the State of Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

At a meeting of the board of directors of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, St. Louis, Mo., held may 19, 1943, the following resolutions and report submitted by its foreign trade bureau were adopted:

"To the chamber of commerce:

"The foreign trade bureau offers the following preamble and resolution: Our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been tested in peace and in war. It has survived those tests, supported and enlarged our foreign trade, and helped to foster our good neighbor policy. Therefore, we feel that the wrecking of such a comprehensive program at this time should be opposed.

"The renewal of the act is of paramount importance in prosecuting the war, and would likewise serve notice on the world that the United States has a definite foreign trade policy, and that our Nation will help in the construction of a durable peace.

"As early as 1932, the chamber of commerce voiced its approval of liberal trade and urged favorable congressional action until the first act became law, June 12, 1934. In 1937, and again in 1940, we reaffirmed our previously declared principle.

"The foreign trade bureau therefore recommmends to the board of directors of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce again endorses the principle of reciprocal trade agreements and urges the Congress to promptly extend the period for the negotiation and renewal which expires on June 12, 1943; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chamber urges its members who are interested in foreign trade to express their views to their representatives in Washington."

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in connection with the joint resolution to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The amendment to this act, which is commonly known as the Trade Agreements Act, and which is just completing its ninth year of existence, has been well explained in the Senate, so I shall not go into details regarding it.

I believe in fair, sound trade agreements between all friendly nations interested in world peace.

Such agreements are most important, and should go to the point where they stimulate us to efficiency in the production of things required by our own people and the people of the world, but never should go to the point where they jeopardize the use of plant capacity in our country, and thus, through causes beyond our control, create substantial unemployment among us.

Emotionalism and sentimentalism should not be the basis for trade agreements. Practical results which satisfy wants, create employment, stimulate competition, and lead to improved production at reduced cost will lead to the cultivation of friendly relationship on a basis of fair mutuality. This should be our aim and hope.

I am in favor of the extension of the act as it is before the Senate, and the cultivation of every sound economic relationship with other responsible nations of the world. I am in favor of the committee amendment, which provides that each agreement made under the amended act shall be subject to termination 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as fixed by proclamation of the President pursuant to joint resolution of Congress, or by the President.

I am in favor of the amendment because unknown and uncertain factors will exist after the cessation of hostilities, and at this time no man can foresee them with certainty. This amendment gives only the right to terminate, but does not in itself terminate any agreement. When a majority of the Congress and the Chief Executive agree that such termination should be made, or when two-thirds of the people's representatives in Congress agree that termination and review are necessary in the interest of our people, then I feel we should be in a position to take such action without question.

The amendment is nothing more or less than notice to the world that we wish to review and continue our trade relations on a mutually fair basis. It is doing in international trade relations exactly what we often do in domestic trade contracts.

Even in domestic contracts, where we know considerably more about the existing conditions and situation among ourselves, we use protection clauses, termination options, and review clauses. Why should any ally or foreign nation misconstrue our actions in reserving this right, and interpret it as a decision to cease cooperating when the war is ended? Certainly, no serious-minded ally would place such an interpretation upon this amendment, particularly in view of the contribution being made to the free people of the world by this Nation, without any selfish motives or desires.

Our allies and friends should—and, I believe, will—have respect for us when we provide for review in an unknown situation such as that which will face all peoples and nations when this horrible, devastating war shall have ended.

By extending the act, with the amendment providing for review and termination, if deemed necessary, of all agreements made thereunder 6 months after the end of hostilities, we are placing ourselves and those with whom we deal in a position to proceed in the making of new agreements properly balanced in mutual benefits and obligations, without having any charges of bad faith hurled by one at the other. Such action on our part will simply be a notice to the world that ours is a three-branch system of government, and that the Representatives of the people assembled in Congress are responsible to the people for what happens in their international relationships as well as in their domestic affairs.

The passage of the joint resolution as amended by the committee amendment will mean, to me, that we want to do as much business as possible with other nations. We recognize that the only way to do so is by keeping the agreements fair and properly balanced, after recognizing the conditions of production and the living standards existing in each and every country. In going into the unknown we wish to provide opportunity for a fair and intelligent review, if deemed necessary, at a given time. We want to do so without any danger of being misjudged, misunderstood, or being accused of bad faith. Understanding and the keeping of faith are vital and essential to the continuance of trade relations and to peace itself.

As one of the leaders of the world, we owe a great duty to the world, but likewise we owe a duty to our own people. In properly and fairly serving our own people, and in thus maintaining for mankind the beacon of liberty with the accomplishments and principles of a free people, we shall be serving mankind throughout the world. While attempting to create peace abroad, let us avoid doing the things which will create strife, conflict, and devastation at home. While promoting and developing a strong and sound international viewpoint and relationship, let us not lose our perspective and our loyal cooperation in guarding our home affairs and relations. In guarding them, we shall be preserving the greatest accomplishment of mankind since time immemorial.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2:30 o'clock has arrived.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Andrews	George	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gerry	Overton
Bailey	Gillette	Pepper
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barbour	Gurney	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hatch	Russell
Bone	Hawkes	Scrugham
Brewster	Hayden	Smith
Brooks	Hill	Stewart
Buck	Holman	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lodge	Tobey
Capper	Lucas	Truman
Caraway	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	White
Downey	Moore	Wiley
Eastland	Murray	Willis
Ellender	Nye	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment of the committee is as follows:

On page 1, at the end of line 8, insert the following proviso: "*Provided*, That every foreign-trade agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of said act, as amended, shall be subject to termination 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as fixed by proclamation of the President, pursuant to joint resolution of the Congress or by the President."

Mr. GEORGE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceed to call the roll.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. If the Senator from Virginia were present, he would vote "nay." If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am not advised how the Senator from New Hampshire would vote. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who, I am informed, if present, would vote "nay," and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on important public business. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] would vote 'nay."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]; the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]; and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from California, the Senator from Wyoming, and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and that the Senator from Kentucky, the Senator from Arkansas, and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], who would vote "yea" on this question, is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who is absent because of illness, is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] on this question. If present, the Senator from California would vote "yea", and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], who is necessarily absent, is paired on this question with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. If present, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—33

Aiken	Davis	Moore
Austin	Gerry	Nye
Barbour	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Brewster	Holman	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Overton
Buck	La Follette	Reed
Bushfield	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wiley
Danaher	Millikin	Willis

NAYS—51

Andrews	Ball	Bilbo
Bailey	Bankhead	Bone
Burton	Gurney	Scrugham
Byrd	Hatch	Smith
Caraway	Hayden	Stewart
Chandler	Hill	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	McCarran	Tobey
Connally	McFarland	Truman
Downey	McKellar	Tunnell
Eastland	Maybank	Tydings
Ellender	Mead	Van Nuys
Ferguson	Murray	Wagner
George	Pepper	Wallgren
Gillette	Radcliffe	Walsh
Green	Reynolds	White
Guffey	Russell	Wilson

NOT VOTING—12

Barkley	Kilgore	Robertson
Bridges	McClellan	Shipstead
Glass	Murdock	Wheeler
Johnson, Calif.	Revercomb	Wherry

So the amendment of the committee was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DREWRY, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. MAAS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2584) to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON of Georgia, Mr. DREWRY, and Mr. MAAS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2346) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for

other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 495) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in reference to Senate bill 495, a bill to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, which was passed by the Senate on the 7th of February and considered by the House and passed with amendments on May 27, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the joint resolution, it is proposed to insert the following:

> No foreign trade agreement hereafter entered into under the authority delegated to the President by such section 350, as amended, no amendatory or supplementary agreement hereafter entered into under such section, and no duties and other import restrictions specified in a proclamation issued by the President to carry out any such foreign trade agreement or any such amendatory or supplementary agreement, shall take effect until the Congress by law has specifically approved such agreement and the duties and other import restrictions so specified to carry out such agreement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, only a profound conviction that the Congress of the United States stands today face to face with the greatest crisis since its establishment moves me to take the time of the Senate this afternoon.

Legislative power has been disappearing all over the world; that is to say, the power of the people to govern themselves through their elected representatives has been written off the statute books of nations occupying one-half of the world. Here in the United States, over a period of from 25 to 50 years, we have been observing legislative power become weaker, and now we see it about to vanish. The right of the people, through their elected representatives, to write the laws by which they shall be governed is dissolving before our very eyes, and we seem not to understand what is being done.

Senators who have been in this Chamber today during the debate will recall that on one or two occasions 15 to 20 minutes were required to summon a quorum of the Senate, because the Members of this body were either in their offices telephoning to executive agencies or were walking into the office of executive leaders with their hats in their hands, asking them to exercise the power which the Constitution gave to the Congress of the United States.

I wish to take advantage of the opportunity when at this moment on the Democratic side there is a large representation of members of the party of Jefferson, to say to them that the principle which I am urging upon them today is the historic principle of the Democratic Party, the party which they represent, the party which sent them here to legislate for their constituents. I am taking advantage of their presence to prove to them that what I say is democratic doctrine; and I am asking the Democratic Members of the Senate to stand by the traditional principles of their party.

During the administration of Woodrow Wilson there was enacted a Democratic tariff bill. It carries the name of one of the great leaders of the Democratic Party, whc honored the House of Representatives when he was a Member there, and honored the Senate when he was a Member here. I refer to Oscar W. Underwood, of Alabama. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] while I read from the Underwood Tariff Act a provision which was written into that law by the distinguished Senator from Alabama who was the predecessor of the very able statesman who now occupies the seat of the majority leader.

The Underwood tariff law contained a provision for reciprocal tariff agreements. Some Democratic Members prefer to forget it now. Let me read the provision. It is subsection (a) of section 4:

> That for the purpose of readjusting the present duties on importations into the United States and at the same time to encourage the export trade of this country, the President of the United States is authorized and empowered to negotiate trade agreements with foreign nations wherein mutual concessions are made looking toward freer trade relations and further reciprocal expansion of trade and commerce: *Provided, however,* That said trade agreements before becoming operative shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States for ratification or rejection.

Mr. President, the last time a Democratic Congress wrote a tariff bill, it took the same position as that which I am taking here today, and which I have taken on every occasion when the subject of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was before this body for consideration.

In 1934 I urged that no agreement should become effective until presented to this body. In 1937 I made the same suggestion. In 1940 I offered the same amendment which I am now offering. Again I say to the Senate, do not throw away the right of legislative review, because the surrender of congressional power has gone to such an extent in this great crisis that the Congress may never again be able to recapture it.

Mr. President, the evil of our time is arbitrary central power. We are fighting this war because executive power in other lands has taken away from the legislative representatives of the people the power to pass upon the law, and to say what shall or shall not be the law.

The appalling fact we now face is that this Congress, with an overwhelming majority of Democratic Members, is again being asked to surrender to the Executive the power to perform the responsibility which is ours. We have no means of knowing what exercise will be made of the power which we are asked to give away. We are not permitted to look behind the curtain of Executive power. The work is done in secret, by agents whom we do not know, certainly by agents who were never elected by the people. Is that an exaggerated statement?

Mr. President, I ask Members of the Senate to look at the United States Government Manual, published by the Office of War Information. I ask them to turn to page 158 of that document, and there learn who performs the congressional function with respect to tariff rates, with respect to the regulation of international commerce, and with respect to international agreements. All three of these are parts of the congressional power.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Am I to understand the able Senator to say, or to leave the inference, that these agreements are executed in secret?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They are certainly negotiated in secret, and executed in secret, because no Member of Congress knows what any single item in a reciprocal trade agreement is until it has been promulgated and has become effective so far as the United States is concerned.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Am I in error in surmising that hearings are held, and that notice is given that the Government intends to negotiate with respect to a certain country, and with respect to a certain commodity?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. PEPPER. And that those interested have an opportunity to express their views on the subject before the agreements are executed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct; but I say to the Senator that that is merely a form, meaning nothing.

The Committee for Reciprocity Information which receives the evidence to be presented by interested persons does not execute or negotiate the treaties, and there have been numerous instances of the tentative form of the reciprocal trade agreement having already been drafted before the hearings of the Committee for Reciprocity Information had been concluded.

Mr. President, as I have had occasion heretofore to say, I shall never forget the humiliation which I felt when, several years ago, I attended a hearing held by the Committee for Reciprocity Information, and there saw a dozen Senators and Members of the House of Representatives standing before the committee meekly arguing on behalf of the produce or manufactures of their respective States, asking this appointive board of the Executive to exercise a power which those gentlemen had seen the Congress of the United States delegate away.

When the Senator from Florida asked me to yield I was asking Members of the Senate to turn to page 158 of the United States Government Manual. There are two pages describing the Committee for Reciprocity Information. Bearing in mind that the theory of the legislative branch of the Government is that the people elect responsible officials who perform their duty and then report to the electorate on what they have done, how do the members of the Committe for Reciprocity Information make response to the people of Florida, the people of Wyoming, the people of Georgia, or the people of Utah, with respect to what they are doing in secret?

I read from page 158 of the Government Manual:

> Committee for Reciprocity Information, Tariff Commission Building, E Street between Seventh and Eighth Streets NW. National 3947.
>
> Members: Chairman: Oscar B. Ryder (Chairman, United States Tariff Commission).
>
> Representatives of:
> Department of State.
> Department of the Treasury.
> Department of Agriculture.
> Department of Commerce.
>
> Special assistant and executive secretary, Edward Yardley.

That is all the information we have with respect to the personnel of this body, which, allegedly, gathers information upon which the action of the Executive is based.

When we, the elected Members of the Senate, when the elected Members of the House of Representatives, charged by the Constitution of the United States with the responsibility of doing the things which the Executive is doing, pick up the Manual we are unable to find who exercises the power which we have delegated away.

Then, Mr. President, turn to page 605 of this Manual, where will be found this very interesting notation:

> Committee for Reciprocity Information. Transferred by Executive Order 8190 of July 5, 1939, to the Department of State, to be administered under direction of the Secretary of State. Executive committee on commercial policy continues to exercise its function of selecting certain members of Committee for Reciprocity Information, effective July 1, 1939.

So it appears that the executive committee on commercial policy exercises the function of making the appointments to the committee which was intended to carry out the provisions of the Reciprocity Trade Agreements Act as enacted in 1934, which reads as follows:

> SEC. 4. Before any foreign trade agreement is concluded with any foreign government or instrumentality thereof under the provisions of this act, reasonable public notice of the intention to negotiate an agreement with such government or instrumentality shall be given in order that any interested person may have an opportunity to present his views to the President, or to such agency as the President may designate, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe.

Shakespeare speaks of keeping the "word of promise to our ear" and breaking "it to our hope."

When Congress drew the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in the first place it undertook to provide a system by which the persons affected could be heard, but, in practice, that system has been washed out. When Dr. Sayre appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives at the present session of Congress and testified with respect to the pending extension joint resolution, when he was asked to give the name of the individuals who exercised the power we are about to vote away, his answer to the committee was that nothing would be gained by giving the names.

Ah, Mr. President, I would not be concerned to take the time of the Senate this afternoon if I did not realize what every other Member of the Senate must realize in his daily experience, that the doctrine of the separation of the powers upon which this Government is founded is being wiped away, sometimes, I think, in apparent ignorance of what is being done on the part of those who do it.

It is said if the Congress of the United States reserves to itself the power of legislative review, a power which is reserved by the governments of 22 of the 26 nations with whom we have made reciprocal trade agreements, that, somehow or other the very foundations of international accord will tremble. How can it be said that the foundations of international relations will be shaken if the Congress of the United States reserves the power that the Parliament of Britain has? How can it be said that if the Congress of the United States reserves, as my amendment would reserve, the power to say "yes" or "no" to an agreement after it has been negotiated, as the Government of Canada does, that Canada will take offense?

How can it be said that Mexico will take offense if we in the Congress place the Congress of the United States on the same level with the legislature of Mexico, for the Mexican Congress reserves this power which I ask the Congress of the United States to reserve. It is a false argument, conjured up by the power-hungry bureaus in order to retain the powers we have given them.

It is said that if Congress retains the power to say "yes" or "no," to approve or reject, we shall go back to the old system of logrolling tariffs. How does that follow? This amendment does not provide that the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives shall write a tariff bill. The amendment offered by the distinguished and able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] does not ask for a resumption of logrolling. Again it is a false argument, intended to cover up the appalling contempt which Congress is building up for itself. I say to the Members of the Senate that, if we do not choose to exercise the power which belongs to us, the time is not far distant when people will say, "Well, stay at home if you are not going to do the work the Constitution says you ought to do." That is the way the legislative power has been frittered away.

Let me say a word to some of my friends from the Southern States. When I stood on this floor during the last session and, though I do not believe in poll taxes, spoke against the attempt to regulate the States by an act of Congress, since the Constitution provides the way it should be done, namely, by amendment, they came to me and expressed gratification for the position I had taken in defense of the right of the States to govern themselves. I say to them now, I am defending a far more sacred right, for I am defending the right of the people of the United States to be represented in Congress by responsible Senators and responsible Members of the House of Representatives, who, if they do wrong, can go home to the electorate and be punished, and who, if they do right, can return to their homes and to their constituents and receive the applause which is their due. But, instead of that, we grant the power away, to have it exercised behind a black curtain, in a manner with which no one is familiar, and then some of us seem to think we are acting in defense of the "four freedoms." How can we defend the "four freedoms," Mr. President, if we destroy the primary freedom of the right of the people to write the laws?

Can it be doubted that the power of Congress is involved here? Reciprocal trade agreements take on certain aspects of international treaties. Even the agreements already made do so. The agreement with Colombia modified a treaty. The agreement with Belgium and Luxemburg modified a treaty. If an Executive agreement is of sufficient dignity to modify a treaty, ratified by two-third of the votes of the Senate, who is there to say it does not take on some aspects of a treaty? Treaties are within the jurisdiction of the United States Senate, but we toss that jurisdiction away. Reciprocal trade agreements involve the levying of tariff duties. The power of taxation is a power which was explicitly granted to the Congress; indeed, it was the traditional point of view of all our people, and of our people's ancestors, that the fundamental safeguard of democracy was the power of the purse.

I remember so well when the distinguished former Senator from Tennessee, the distinguished former Representative from Tennessee, the distinguished former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the Honorable Cordell Hull,

now the Secretary of State, speaking upon the floor of the Congress referred with pride to the fact that the taxing power had been taken away from the Executive, denouncing the flexible tariff provisions of the Smoot-Hawley law and the Fordney-McCumber law on the ground that they constituted a surrender of the taxing power. He called it a major surrender of the power of the people.

Secretary Hull was right when he made that charge. I am right when I repeat it. We cannot, under any idea of emergency legislation, surrender, as is proposed in the pending measure, a fundamental duty of ours, and defend our action as in any sense a democratic act.

Let me call to the attention of the Senate the point of view, the curiously distorted point of view, under which the State Department is acting. When Dr. Sayre was before the House Ways and Means Committee defending the proposed extension, he was asked in how many countries it was possible to have reciprocal trade agreements go into effect as they go into effect here—by the unsupervised, unregulated, unreviewed discretion of the Executive. He had to say 4, 4 out of all the 26. That, of course, was an unanswerable argument in support of the position I take.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Can the Senator give us any light as to how many foreign countries with which we have made agreements have reciprocal trade agreement acts such as the one on our statute books?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. GEORGE. Is the Senator not talking about the other countries simply entering into agreements, having no previous legislative approval thereof, and then taking them back to their parliaments for action?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I disagree with the Senator. In our case there is not a prior approval, because we do not know what is going to be done.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes, there is. I should not care to argue that with the Senator, but certaintly the law is a prior approval.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is another blank check. That is all it is.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; the Senator is wrong. But that was not the point I desired to bring to his attention. Does the Senator know how many other countries have similar acts of their legislatures which authorize the negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements? If so, then there may be some comparative worth in the argument the Senator is making, that in a great many instances trade agreements have to go back to the legislative branches of the governments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my judgment that the Government of the United States is the only one in which the legislative body has made a complete surrender, except in the case of the four Dr. Sayre mentioned.

Mr. GEORGE. I asked the Senator if he was prepared to give us the information. I think it is easily ascertainable. I think he will find that in most instances our Government merely enters into an agreement through the officials of the country who have the authority, without any prior act similar to ours.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with the Senator; in other words, what the Senator is saying is precisely what I am saying, namely, that the countries with which we are making trade agreements have not seen fit to do what the legislative body of the United States has done, that is to say, give away their power, except in four instances.

Mr. GEORGE. They may not have seen fit to do so, but I cannot see any force in the argument that other countries take trade agreements, for instance, back to their parliament, unless other countries have failed and neglected to take any preliminary steps such as we have taken. In that event, there would be force in the argument.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I confess I do not follow the argument of the Senator from Georgia. He is merely saying that, unless it can be demonstrably proven that other countries have surrendered legislative power to the Executive, then there is no use in bringing up this question. I say that, regardless of what other countries have or have not done, the Congress of the United States should not continue to surrender its power. Already we have given away too much of its power.

Mr. GEORGE. Perhaps I misunderstood the Senator. Is the Senator merely speaking of the question of policy, or is he saying that fundamentally we have no right to put these treaties into effect until they are approved by the Congress? Those are quite different propositions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is a technical difference which I think means nothing. I take the position, though I do not want to be drawn into a constitutional argument——

Mr. GEORGE. I am not trying to get into a constitutional argument.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wanted to avoid that.

Mr. GEORGE. If it is a question of policy about which the Senator is talking, I can understand his argument.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I am talking about policy as well as about the primary responsibility of the Congress of the United States.

Returning to Dr. Sayre's testimony:

The agreements not requiring subsequent foreign legislative action are those made with Belgium and Luxemburg—

That is one agreement—

with Cuba, with Ecuador, and with Peru.

Those agreements put into effect provisionally, subject to eventual foreign legislative action, are Argentina, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Netherlands, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, and Venezuela.

Those agreements which did not become effective until after foreign legislative action are Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Sweden, and Uruguay.

Mr. Sayre proceeds:

I would like to add that with respect to many of these, they are agreements with countries under the parliamentary system of government. By that, of course, as you realize—

Here is the teacher talking to the members of the Ways and Means Committee—

By that, of course, as you realize, the executive is in control of legislative action. So long as the executive, the prime minister, remains in power, he can command the action of the legislature.

Mr. President, it needs only to be read to be revealed as a completely perverted interpretation of the manner in which a parliamentary government acts. The prime minister is at all times under the command of the parliament, and the moment he acts in a manner which is not in agreement with the parliament he loses his political head. He does not command the parliament. So long as he has the confidence of the parliament he may lead the parliament. A parliamentary form of government is a form under which the legislative and the executive proceed together. But, Mr. President, we have seen develop forms of government in which the executive has complete control, in which the executive can in fact command, and when the command is uttered, then the members of the legislature say "ja" because they dare not say "nay," whatever their judgment may be.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to an inquiry as to the effect of his proposal?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The effect of the proposal?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes. May I make the specific inquiry as to the method by which it would be implemented? Is it the thought of the Senator that the various agreements or proclamations shall be treated as treaties?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. GILLETTE. Or should they be approved by a simple act of the Congress?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They should be approved by an act passed by the Congress, by a majority vote of both Houses. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] will, I understand, later on offer an amendment, the effect of which will be to regard these agreements as treaties, and therefore require a ratification by two-thirds of the Senate. I have not offered such an amendment, because I have felt that since reciprocal trade agreements deal with tariff rates, with the taxing power which under the Constitution must originate in the House of Representatives, it was more in accord with the actualities to regard the agreements as in fact regulations of commerce, or tariff bills amending existing tariff laws, and therefore subject to approval by a majority vote of both Houses.

Mr. GILLETTE. Will the Senator yield to a further query?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. GILLETTE. That being the purpose of the Senator's proposal—and I had reached the conclusion that that

was the purpose—then under his proposal, should it be adopted, as a matter of application, not only would it be necessary to refer a reciprocal trade agreement to the Congress, to be approved by the Congress by the passage of a joint resolution, but every change in proclamation, every suspension of a rate, every change of a rate, every elimination of a rate, temporary or permanent, would not take effect until it had been presented to the Congress in a joint resolution, and the measure passed by the Congress?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. The reason is that under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act the State Department has undertaken to do precisely that thing. Having made an agreement with Cuba, then, there was a supplemental agreement dealing with only one particular commodity, and so forth. My thought is that a reciprocal trade agreement should be presented to the Senate and the House for approval, in the form of a joint resolution, and I venture to say that there would be no more difficulty in securing approval of proper agreements than there was in securing the approval of the lend-lease law.

Mr. President, the Members of the Senate and of the House are not stupid. They are not cheap politicians, as many commentators would like to make the country believe. I have found many men in the House and in the Senate who are quite as honest, quite as able, quite as well educated, and quite as competent to handle the affairs of the Government as the anonymous clerks who in effect write the trade agreements.

I am looking at the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and I cannot help but remember that it was he who 4 or 5 years before the outbreak of the war, long before anyone in the executive arm of the Government had the slightest dream of what was coming, introduced in the Senate a bill to provide for the accumulation of strategic minerals and metals. If the policy which was embodied in the bill introduced by the Senator from Utah, and passed by the Congress, had been carried out by the Executive, we would not during the past year and a half have had the troubles with respect to strategic minerals and metals which we encountered, and we would not have them now. I could cite a dozen instances of Members of the Senate and the House having demonstrated their capacity.

What I complain about, Mr. President, is that under a false argument that this sort of government must be carried on by experts in the bureaus we turn our powers over to them, and then fail to supervise the execution of those powers, and by and by we see them absorbed by the Executive.

That was the point which was brought so clearly to my mind when I read the testimony of Dr. Sayre. Following that which I have just read, in which Dr. Sayre was talking about parliamentary government, he further said:

> That is, in those countries one does not have the distinction, the separation, I mean, between legislative and executive functions.

And so saying that the heart of the American system is the separation of the powers, Dr. Sayre asks us to destroy the separation and to clothe the Executive with the legislative power.

It is to that, Mr. President, that I object; and I say to the Members of the Senate there is a definite and clear purpose to by-pass the Congress. I charge that in the executive branch of this Government there are those who deliberately intend to strip the Congress of the power it has, and ought to exercise; and I say to you, Mr. President, that if the Congress does not exercise its power, the time will come when the people will punish the Congress for not exercising it. Do we not recall the returns of the last election, when Members of the House and Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle were defeated because the people felt they had turned their power over to the bureaus, and in resentment of what the bureaus were doing the people retired the Members of Congress who had given away their power?

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. I take it the Senator has in mind that the history of the growth of democratic government is always based on the growth of parliamentary government; it is always backed, is it not, and always grows by the increase of power of the legislative body and of the authority of the legislature over the power of the purse?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is exactly the rule.

Mr. GERRY. That is a matter of history; is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There can be no question about it.

Mr. GERRY. In democratic governments the fight has always been to take power from the executive and add to the legislative power, if democracy is to work effectively.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Democracy is measured by the degree in which the elected representatives of the people exercise their power. By the degree in which the elected representatives of the people abdicate their power, arbitrary central government grows.

Mr. President, perhaps I should not be taking the time of Senators who are now present if this were the only example of the evil which I am pointing out. The evil is growing also in the field of appropriations, for we pass appropriation bills conveying to the Executive the power to spend billions of dollars in whatever manner the Executive may please, according to his discretion in the exercise of his power. Mr. President, if that were done by the President of the United States himself, that would be one thing; but the powers which we delegate away, although we delegate them in the name of the President, go to subordinates whom nobody knows—nobody, I say, in the sense of the people of the United States, the electorate.

Dr. Alvin Hansen, one of the advisers of the Federal Reserve Board, and an adviser of the National Resources Planning Board, was quoted on June 27, 1942, almost a year ago, in the Chicago Journal of Commerce, as saying:

> Congress will surrender to the administration the power to tax, keeping to itself the right only to establish broad limits within which the administration may move. Congress will appropriate huge sums of money, and surrender its power of directing when and how the money shall be spent. Other extraordinary powers, such as, for instance, to effect wholesale social reforms, will be delegated to the administration, which will retain most, if not all, of the extraordinary wartime powers.

Dr. Hansen was talking about the reorganization which is to follow the war. The point of view expressed by the experts who now man all the bureaus is not a point of view which has ever been passed upon by the people of the States or of the United States, but is a point of view which is built upon the progressive deterioration of the legislative power. We give up a little, and then a little more, and then a little more; and each surrender is used as a precedent for the next surrender we are asked to make.

Take, for example, the story with respect to this very question. It was in 1890 that the McKinley Act was passed. In that act Congress said to the President, "You may, if you find discrimination practiced by certain countries, reduce the tariff on five commodities to this particular level." Congress named the commodities and named the level. That was attacked in the courts; and the famous case of Field versus Clark was argued in the Supreme Court. In that case the Supreme Court said that was not a delegation of legislative power, because no discretion was delegated. It said that the legislative power is the power to exercise discretion. All that the Congress delegated in that law, the Supreme Court held, was the right to the President to find the fact of discrimination; and, upon the finding of the fact of discrimination, certain specific rates went into effect.

Then, in 1897, the Dingley Act was passed. A similar provision with respect to a few commodities was inserted; but the fact that the Congress of 1897 did not believe that the first action was a delegation of legislative power or senatorial power was demonstrated in the very next section of the act, section 4, because there it was provided that the President could make reciprocity treaties with other countries, but then it was also provided that such treaties would have to be ratified by the Senate of the United States. Yet, in the face of that clear declaration of legislative construction, the act of 1890 is now cited as a precedent for this extraordinary grant of power.

The fact that the Democrats in Congress did not believe that it was a precedent for reciprocal trade agreements was demonstrated by the Underwood Act, of which I have spoken, the act of 1916, because there, when giving the power to make reciprocal trade agreements, Congress provided just as I now ask it to provide, that the agreements should be approved by the Congress.

In 1934 we enacted the present reciprocal trade agreements law, on the ground that an emergency existed and that it was necessary to build up our

trade; but it was limited to 3 years, because at that time it was not thought possible to induce Congress to surrender power for more than 3 years. Now it is argued that this is not a delegation, but that it is based upon the precedent of the McKinley Act. However, a reading of the law makes it clear that the present law conveys away the discretion which belongs to Congress. It has been given to the Executive; and we have destroyed, so far as this law is concerned, the separation of executive and legislative powers, upon which our Government was founded.

I say that there is a deliberate, clear intention to bypass the Congress of the United States and the Senate. I now undertake to demonstrate it. I have before me a very able and well-written book entitled "International Executive Agreements," written by Mr. Wallace McClure, of the Department of State, and published by the Columbia University Press in 1941. This book was printed after the Senate, in 1940, had failed by four votes to adopt the Pittman amendment, which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] will offer to the pending joint resolution, and after the Senate, by 6 votes, had failed to adopt the amendment which I have now again offered.

The date of publication of this book is very significant. I hope that every Member of the Senate who cherishes the belief that the popularly elected Members of this body and the popularly elected Members of the other House will have something to say about the reorganization of the grand, new, free world we are to have after the victory, will read this declaration of policy. Mr. McClure has made it a very simple matter to analyze, because at the end of each part he summarizes his argument.

Let me submit this argument from page 32 of "International Executive Agreements" by Wallace McClure, of the State Department:

The introductory portions of this monograph are believed to show:

(a) That the two-thirds rule governing the Senate's approval of treaties is not only undemocratic but also, because of its capacity to produce stalemate in time of crisis, a peril to the national welfare.

That is the first statement. The purpose of the joint resolution is to show that the constitutional procedure is undemocratic. Instead of changing such procedure in the constitutional manner by a constitutional amendment—and such amendments have been offered—the purpose is to avoid the Constitution by indirection, and to make the Executive agreement take the place of the treaty-making power. If the authors of the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution have wondered why their resolution has been so magnificently neglected, they will probably find the answer in Mr. McClure's book.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from New Mexico seems to be the only member of that group present. We will not look for the answer in any book by Mr. McClure. We are perfectly willing to trust the Senate Committtee on Foreign Relations and the Senate of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So long as the Congress of the United States continues to grant away its constitutional powers, I am afraid the Senator and his associates will be in danger of looking in vain.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. HATCH. I think I can say for the four of us that we are not willing to grant away the constitutional power of the Senate or of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was sure that would be the answer of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I still say that I will do as I did in 1934, and again in 1937, and 1940. I will vote against the Senator's amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Returning to the argument of Mr. McClure, I had read paragraph (a). I now read paragraph (b):

(b) That, in the light of historical cases in which Executive agreements and treaties have been used interchangeably to accomplish seemingly identical purposes and which involve authoritative interpretation of the Constitution by legislative, executive, and judicial officers sworn to uphold it, there would seem to be no more doubt of the constitutional validity of one method than of the other. Accordingly, since no division or limitation of the subject matter of international acts is laid down, there is, prima facie, no reason to deny the existence of constitutional authorization for the use of executive agreements relating to whatever subjects may be dealt with by the treaty-making power.

Part 1 comprises a detailed factual account. Its purpose is to set forth the increasing utilization of the democratic method, traced through early, middle, and recent periods, and to demonstrate the extent of actual use of Executive agreements by causing to pass in review as many of them as possible within necessary limits of time and space. The procession is impressive in both amount and variety and is believed to argue powerfully in favor of constitutional warrant for even more extensive employment of these instruments. The primary purpose of Part 1, however, is neither to affirm nor to deny the constitutional validity of what has taken place, but to set forth facts and to let these facts speak for themselves.

On page 190, after a discussion of the world today, the author of "International Executive Agreements" describes the purpose of Part 2:

Part 2 has the purpose of pointing out that the Constitution, today, quite aside from formal amendments, has grown into a complex of customs, procedure, and fixed ways of accomplishing the requirements of government which must be regarded as superadded to the stated articles of the great charter framed at Philadelphia. The interacting influence of convenience and compulsion have created a habit of international dealing with both legislative and contractual character through means other than treaties in the sense of article II, section 2 of the Constitution. This habit has become so confirmed that, whether or not it was intended or foreseen by the people of the United States or their public servants when the Constitution was adopted, it has become a constitutional usage—one of many such usages—to all intents and purposes part of the Constitution and the constitutional system of the country.

Thus, Mr. President, the author makes it clear that the continued delegation of legislative power creates the basis for the argument that a usage has grown up whereby the separation of powers has been erased and the Executive takes over those responsibilities which were intended to be exercised by the elected representatives of the people.

On page 252, at the conclusion of the chapter on usage and external relations, I find this language:

It is believed that the President has, and was intended to have, under the Constitution, all the powers and the functions of the head of a fully recognized member of the society of nations—

Among the fully recognized members of the society of nations today, Mr. President, are the totalitarian powers, in which executive and legislative powers have been combined.

I continue reading:

That he has, accordingly, the authority to enter into any manner of international act, on any subject, that is entered into by other states of the world; and that, while this power must be exercised without violation of the Constitution and in accommodation with other possibly conflicting powers granted by the Constitution, notably, the powers of the legislature, an Executive agreement not in contravention of the Constitution and not in conflict with any act of Congress (best shown by positive congressional confirmation, either before or after signature) is binding on all the executive and all the law-enforcing agencies of the Government and is the equivalent of law.

The Constitution of the United States says that the Constitution itself and the laws enacted thereunder, as well as treaties made under the authority of the United States, are the supreme law of the land. We are now told that Executive agreements likewise can become the supreme law of the land, though Congress has not participated in writing them.

I shall now read from page 363 of the book entitled "International Executive Agreements," from which I have been reading, a statement which is one of the most revealing of all.

The President can do by Executive agreement anything that he can do by treaty, provided that Congress by law cooperates. And there is a very wide field of action in which the cooperation of Congress is not necessary; indeed, where Congress possesses no constitutional authority to dissent.

These two sentences—

Says Mr. McClure—

offer the nutshell statement of the theme and thesis of this book and what is believed to be the result of a correct presentation of law and fact. It is true that, in strict logic, a case can be made for the President's constitutional authority to enter into and enforce any bona fide international agreement that is not in conflict with the Constitution, regardless of congressional approval or at least if Congress does not by law dissent.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Is it the view of the able Senator from Wyoming that Congress would lack the power to void one of these agreements if it so desired?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say that if the Congress wanted to void a treaty it would have to pass a joint resolution which would then have to receive the approval of the President. If it did not receive such approval it would have to be passed over his veto by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. BONE. That is correct; it takes a two-thirds vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Whereas the subjects with which we are dealing are within the initial jurisdiction of Congress, and if we now say that a reciprocal trade agreement, in order to be effective, must have the approval of the majority of the Congress, then it will not be necessary to pass a joint resolution with respect to this matter over a Presidential veto.

Mr. BONE. The point I seek to make is that the Congress has the power, should enough votes be registered, to void one of these agreements. The exercise of the two-thirds rule would not be unusual. The rule requires a two-thirds vote to ratify treaties.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, but what I am attempting to point out is that what the Congress can do now by a majority vote, should the pending joint resolution be passed, it can do only by a two-thirds vote if there should be a veto.

Mr. BONE. Perhaps I misunderstood the Senator's view. It has always been my view that Congress has the power to void this kind of an arrangement, or even a treaty. If we want to place ourselves in the position of violating an agreement we can do so. Congress has the power to abrogate a treaty if it so desires.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. BONE. There is nothing I know of in the way of a law which Congress cannot get rid of, except overriding the Constitution. That can be done only by amendment, which must be ratified by the States. Congress has the power to upset treaties, and trade agreements are certainly no more sacred than are treaties.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. However, as I have pointed out, in the case of the veto Congress can act only by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. President, I shall not prolong the discussion. Allow me to assert now what I said in the beginning, that I have risen only because of a profound conviction that the Congress of the United States cannot, with safety, surrender its legislative power in this great crisis in international affairs. We are living in one of the greatest of all those transformation periods of civilization. No man living knows what will come out of this war. No man living can predict the course the reorganization will follow. But we do know that the regulation of international trade will have a vital effect upon that course. We know that already by the use of the Executive agreements international commerce is being regulated. We know that commitments have been made under the Lease-Lend Act. If we now grant the authority which we are being asked to grant, before the peace has been won, we must know that the legislative power which we have with respect to the regulation of foreign commerce will be exercised by the Executive. That, Mr. President, would be a surrender of the power of the Congress to which I cannot give my adherence.

I still believe in the fundamental philosophy of Jefferson. I still believe in the fundamental philosophy of Lincoln. I believe in what the Democratic Party has stood for throughout its life. I believe that the sacred foundation stone of free government is a free legislative assembly exercising the legislative power. If ever there was a time when that freedom should not be surrendered, Mr. President, this is the time. Let the Congress preserve at least the right to ratify these agreements.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, does the amendment which the Senator has offered begin with the words "No foreign trade agreements heretofore entered into" and end with the words "restrictions so specified to carry out such agreement"?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. That is the amendment which is printed in my name, and the only amendment printed in my name.

Mr. President, I have said that in presenting this amendment I am acting in accordance with the traditional policy of the Democratic Party. I have quoted from the Underwood Tariff Act to show that it was the Democratic policy in the administration of Woodrow Wilson. I should like also to quote from a speech by the Honorable Cordell Hull, now Secretary of State, delivered in the House of Representatives in 1929, and from a speech made by the late Senator Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana, one of the great progressives of our time, who also expressed the point of view which I have expressed here today. I ask that these quotations may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the speech of Hon. Cordell Hull, House of Representatives, May 13, 1929 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 71st Cong., 1st sess., vol. 71, pt. 2, p. 1212) commenting on the Hawley-Smoot bill]

The proposed enlargement and broad expansion of the provisions and functions of the flexible tariff clause is astonishing, is undoubtedly unconstitutional, and is violative of the functions of the American Congress. Not since the Commons wrenched from an English King the power and authority to control taxation has there been a transfer of the taxing power back to the head of a government on a basis so broad and unlimited as is proposed in the pending bill. As has been said on a former occasion, "This is too much power for a bad man to have, or for a good man to want." * * * "This proposal embraces another revolutionary policy, which is, to abandon the law and the Republican doctrine to the effect that all tariffs should be measured by the difference between production costs here and abroad, by adding a number of alternative so-called methods to ascertain what is termed conditions of competition between this and other countries. It is proposed thus to give the President and his Tariff Commission, which, by the way, is virtually taken away from Congress, authority to use what in practical effect will be any sort of basis on which to fix tariff rates."

* * * * *

That we are unalterably opposed to section 315 of the Tariff Act, the flexible provision, and demand its speedy repeal. That we strongly condemn the proposed course of the Republican Party which contemplates the enlargement and retention of this provision, with such additional authority to the President as would practically vest in him the supreme taxing power of the Nation, contrary to the plainest and most fundamental provisions of the Constitution—a vast and uncontrolled power, larger than had been surrendered by one great coordinate department of Government to another since the British House of Commons wrenched the taxing power from an autocratic King.

QUOTATION OF SENATOR THOMAS J. WALSH OF MONTANA ON THE FLOOR OF THE SENATE AUGUST 10, 1922

Whatever doubt may be entertained by anyone concerning the constitutionality of the amendments under consideration, no doubts ought to exist in the mind of anyone, in my judgment, as to their unwisdom. Their stoutest defenders will probably disclaim any attachment whatever to the principle they represent as a feature of a permanent tariff policy; indeed, they hasten to convey the assurance that, were it not for the chaotic business conditions which prevail throughout the world and the instability of foreign exchange, they could not be induced to embrace it or even to tolerate it. Some apology, Mr. President, is certainly in order for such an astounding delegation of the functions of Congress to the Executive, vesting him with an authority no constitutional monarch may exercise, in character quite like that for the assumption of which kings have been brought to the block.

No emergency, however grave, can justify the surrender into the hands of the President of the taxing power entrusted by the people to their representatives in Congress, no matter how profound may be his statesmanship or how exalted may be the character of the man who for a brief period may be elevated to that high office. If this encroachment upon the liberties of the people is either sanctioned or condoned there is no man wise enough nor prescient enough to foresee the ultimate consequences.

It is said that an exigency exists demanding this departure from the settled policy of our Government. Our skies are never wholly clear; emergencies continually confront us, and when they are wanting an ambitious President or an indolent or subservient Congress will have no difficulty whatever in conjuring up such.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I shall take only a brief portion of the Senate's time to discuss the most important phase of the proposal to extend the authority of the Executive to negotiate trade treaties with other nations. We should make it clear—and I think we have made it clear—that whatever action we take on the pending measure in its practical application will not affect the operation of the present treaties nor of those which will be made before the present authority expires, and that will include agreements with almost all the principal nations of the world. They can be honorably terminated under present provisions only by order of the President.

The direct question posed today is not upon the issue of the policy of protection

for American markets versus the free-trade policy, adroitly concealed in the Hull trade treaties. I should welcome the opportunity to try that issue before the bar of public opinion. The doctrine of the protection of markets for the products of American labor and American farmers has been the traditional policy of the Republican Party. In the days of the party's infancy Abraham Lincoln, brushing aside all the mists of theory and the confusion of words, expressed the fundamental principle of protection when he said, in substance, "I do not know a great deal about the tariff, but I do know that when you exchange American dollars for foreign-made goods, we have the goods and the other nation has the dollars, but when we exchange American dollars for American-made goods, we have both the dollars and the goods."

This philosophy was tersely and plainly restated the other day by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] when he said, in substance, "The farmers of my State are not concerned about the fulsome theories of foreign trade, but they do know that when they drive a hundred head of hogs to a market that is glutted by a shipment of hogs from a foreign market they find that the price has been depressed by the surplus of hogs and they feel that they have been sold down the river and no political arguments of theorists or Utopian ideas of idealists are going to alleviate their anger."

During my campaign for the United States Senate I took throughout the State of Indiana exhibits of commodities imported into this country by permission of these trade treaties—commodities which were in direct competition with goods which had been produced in this country.

Into a city where a shoe factory was closed down I took shoes made in Czechoslovakia.

Into a town whose textile mills were closed down I took fabrics made in Japan.

Into cities whose steel hearths were cold I took metal products from Belgium.

In communities whose prosperity depended on the economic level of agriculture I found frying chickens, canned meat, and grain from Argentina, with which country our trade agreements have been most generous, but which has not associated herself in the war effort, nor is she represented in the international food conference now being held at Hot Springs.

In all these communities I found impressive contributions to our huge roll of the unemployed. I found many on W. P. A. who had formerly earned good wages on the farm or in the factories.

I was convinced by the election returns in those communities that the people were opposed to these trade agreements.

Somehow, in every generation we need to re-learn the lesson that the superior standard of living which our American workmen and American farmers enjoy cannot be supported if the essentials of that standard of living have to come in competition with products made by the low-paid labor of other lands. I am sure the American people, from the experience gained in recent years, are eager to pass judgment on that question again.

Neither shall the extent of our willingness to cooperate with other nations in sound post-war collaboration be judged by the question before us. Again I am willing to try that issue before the bar of American public opinion. The American people are sick and tired of the fantastic theories of the New Deal—that we can spend ourselves rich, and that deficit financing is a sure way to universal happiness and prosperity. These policies are advocated because the New Deal never has and does not know how to operate in a period of solvency.

Furthermore, the American people are fed up with the doctrine that we can buy good will by giving away our markets and our resources in the vain hope that we can make everybody happy by sharing everybody's misery.

Of course, every sensible American believes in real reciprocity, and real reciprocity is based upon an understanding that works a profitable advantage to both parties to a transaction. There is no good will gained by surfeiting our markets with importations from other lands of commodities of which we already have a surplus. There is no sound advantage in merely swapping jackknives except, of course, to international bankers who profit in handling the exchange of money and who are the most zealous advocates of these trade agreements.

There is a sound basis for good will between nations in the exchange of the surplus goods we have for surplus goods which other nations have and which we need. There is a sound basis for good will in helping other nations to develop their own resources and to stand upon their own feet. You gain the good will of your distressed fellow man only when you aid him to become self-supporting. You do not gain his good will when you maintain him as an object of patronizing benevolence. World-wide W. P. A. will fail to establish world-wide security, just as our national W. P. A. failed to establish national security, because the process sabotages the ability of the Nation, as it does the ability of the individual, to attain self-sufficiency which is necessary to self pride.

America, of course, will collaborate with other nations in a sound post-war economic pattern. But in order to do that, it is not necessary to accept the present policy of international trade relationships as a sine qua non of world cooperation.

Indeed, no one will now claim in face of the present world upheaval that these trade agreements have prevented war. Nor am I so partisan-minded as to say that they have caused war. At the peace table will be found the keenest minds of the world. Great Britain and Russia, through their leaders, have declared their determination to maintain the interests of their respective nations. We should be equally frank with respect to our own intentions. Our leaders at the peace table must be prepared to meet the skillful and adroit diplomats of other nations. They must be equipped with every reserve force we can give them. How tragic it would be if again at the peace table we should have nothing with which to bargain except a group of glittering ideals because America's rich economic advantages had all been committed through trade agreements, and our representatives found themselves destitute of bargaining power.

But the real issue before the Senate today, and it is a tremendous issue, is whether we shall continue to delegate to the President functions which belong to the Congress. I would be glad also to try this cause before the bar of public opinion. The shrillest note in the rising chorus against the New Deal is that which calls to the Congress to recapture the unnecessary powers granted to the President and to reassume its fundamental responsibility to be the spokesman of the people in establishing the policies which most vitally affect them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator said he would be willing to try the question of reciprocal trade agreements at the bar of public opinion. I understand these agreements were in effect in 1936 and in 1940.

Mr. WILLIS. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. So far as the Senator's party is concerned, the bar of public opinion is closed on the trade agreements, both as to 1936 and 1940.

Mr. WILLIS. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. So I think the Senator had a pretty fair trial at the bar of public opinion.

Mr. WILLIS. Yes; I think the increasing membership of Republicans in the Congress is the answer to that thought.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Reference has been made several times to the bureaus here in Washington being responsible for the defeat of many Democrats in 1942. This may not be worth anything, so far as opinion is concerned, but had the leader of the Senator's party, Mr. Willkie, been elected in 1940—the candidate the Senator supported so nobly—there is no question in my mind that we would have had a World War just the same. Does the Senator agree with me in that?

Mr. WILLIS. I believe Mr. Willkie and Mr. Roosevelt both promised we would be kept out of war, but——

Mr. LUCAS. That is not at all the question I am asking the Senator. If he desires to debate with me the question which he has raised, I am asking whether or not he agrees with me that Japan would have stabbed us in the back some time in 1941 whether Roosevelt had been President or Willkie had been President.

Mr. WILLIS. I agree that is probably true.

Mr. LUCAS. And when Japan stabbed us in the back, that started a world war, and placed the United States in the middle of the conflict. Senators on the other side of the aisle are constantly denouncing the New Deal, they are con-

stantly talking about the bureaucrats in Government. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] in making his trade-agreements speech, mentioned 17 different types of bureaucrats, and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] also had much to say about so-called, self-styled experts, dreamers, and planners.

I undertake to say you are on the wrong road. The New Deal did not bring your people to power in 1942; the war brought the Republicans to Congress. As a result of the war, there were all these little annoyances, such as rationing of gasoline, fuel oil, sugar, and coffee. A free people were irritated. They were not ready for these necessary acts of partial regimentation. In my opinion, that was what brought the Republicans to Congress, and nothing else, and had Mr. Willkie, the leader of the Senator's party now, although you do not recognize him, been elected President in 1940, the Democrats would have had a landslide in 1942, because war would have occurred just the same. Thank God for the good of the United States and the world Roosevelt was elected. I think the Senator will agree with that, too.

Mr. WILLIS. I cannot agree with the philosophy of the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I just asked the Senator whether or not he agreed with me that Roosevelt was the man who should have been elected from the standpoint of the United States and the world, in view of what happened.

Mr. WILLIS. No, I will not agree to that.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator thinks Willkie should have been elected?

Mr WILLIS. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I think Mr. Willkie will be glad to hear that. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIS. One of the greatest tragedies that has come to America in my lifetime was when we deserted the principle of two terms only for any President of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. The people spoke on that in 1940, did they not?

Mr. WILLIS. I believe they did; but they were mistaken.

Mr. LUCAS. The question went before the bar of public opinion, where the Senator is now requesting the American people to decide again with respect to trade agreements. They spoke definitely in 1940, regardless of what the Senator may think.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois believes the people are right only when they decide in his favor. Were they wrong in 1942, when, the Senator said the question was rationing, but everyone else in America knows very well the question was the bureaucrats who were administering the rationing in a way that has never been able to justify itself, not only on this side of the aisle, but on the other side of the aisle, from which we have heard the most vehement criticism.

Mr. LUCAS. That may be correct. It is hardly in point.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator from Maine. Those were the thoughts which were in my mind.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine can take any view he desires to take with respect to what happened in 1942. I have my opinion, and the Senator has his. I merely spoke with respect to what happened in 1940 before the bar of public opinion. The Senator from Indiana said that was the greatest tragedy that happened; but the people spoke. The people spoke in 1942; that is correct; and to whatever the people say the Senator from Illinois is willing to agree, and the Senator will stand in 1944 with what the majority agrees to, as will the Senator from Maine, and the Senator from Indiana. There is no disagreement on that.

I am talking about what has occurred. I am talking about the third term, talking about taking trade treaties before the bar of public opinion. Those things have been before the bar of public opinion, and the American people have answered twice on the trade treaties. The Republican Party had the opportunity to take that question before the people in 1936 and 1940, and it did so, and notwithstanding that fact, Roosevelt carried Illinois in 1936 and 1940. They had an opportunity to take the third term question to the people in 1940, and they did. I traveled over 13 States, I saw Uncle Sam with his thumb down upon every billboard in every county, with the inscription, "No third term." I do not know how much it cost to place that one poster throughout America. It was an effective one, too, and they did not wait until the last week in the campaign to emphasize the third term. There was not a Republican spokesman in America who was not out on the stump discussing the third term. The people spoke, and they said, "We will have Roosevelt again for a third term." That is how they stood.

I thank the Senator for permitting this interruption, I am very happy to know that the Senator has gone back with Mr. Willkie. That is the finest thing that has happened to Mr. Willkie lately, and I know he will want to know about it. I am told that in Indiana he is not in quite so good favor as he was in 1940, and with the Senator supporting him, I know Indiana will go along all right.

Mr. WILLIS. I have no desire to argue with the Senator from Illinois about the merits of Mr. Willkie, or the voice of the people, but I suggest that he call the roll of Representatives and Senators of 1940 and of 1943, and he will see the answer of the American people at the bar of public opinion.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Commenting on the position of Mr. Willkie in Indiana, about which I have heard something similar to that the Senator has mentioned, I have also heard reports as to whether the Senator from Illinois commanded the same confidence in Illinois that he did 3 or 4 years ago.

Mr. LUCAS. I have heard that about the Senator from Maine, too, and it was not so good. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I should like to proceed with my presentation.

Time and again we hear the charge that Congress has lost face with the people, and why should not that impression be growing in the country if we lend basis to the charge by failure to perform our constitutional duties? Why should not the people look to the Executive to direct all the policies of the country if we fail to do our part? Why should not dictatorial procedures gain favor if Congress supinely abdicates its responsibilities?

I am sure that every Member of the Congress is deeply concerned that such an impression should exist in the country, yet every time an opportunity arises to regain the powers which have been delegated to the Executive, some group will clamor that this is not the time and that the specific issue then being discussed is not the one on which we should begin this reform. We have too long delayed in responding to the demand of a citizenry grown impatient with the failure of Congress to function. If repeatedly we neglect to lay hold on the opportunity to recover our powers, is it not to be expected that there will be an increasing lack of confidence in the Congress? Does not our delay create a threat against the very form of our government?

Mr. President, the people of America today stand in grave danger of losing their constitutionally granted rights that the provisions of no treaty negotiated on their behalf shall be effective until approved by two-thirds of their voting representatives in the United States Senate.

Just as the people were rudely awakened from their naive thought that the congressional prerogative for declaring war would always be a deliberative safeguard rather than a mere post facto formality, so much the people now take care lest the same Executive habit of keeping the conduct of foreign relations exclusively in its own hands leave the people with even less to say about the peace than they had to say about the war.

There exists today two distinct and practical threats to our constitutionally defined procedure for making international commitments.

First. The Congress might, by resolution, enact an expression of sentiment which might be seized upon by the Executive as constituting advance advice and consent to whatever international commitment he might choose to make; or

Second. The Executive, by so-called Executive agreement, might make an international commitment without the consent of the Senate, which, while being in reality a treaty, could be interpreted as being an Executive agreement merely by virtue of the fact that it had not been submitted to the Senate for two-thirds concurrence.

Congress on the one hand, acting by resolution and without participation of the President, annexed Texas in 1845; annexed Hawaii; ended war with the Central Powers on July 2, 1921; and made the United States party to the International Labor Convention on July 19, 1934.

The President, on the other hand, acting by so-called Executive agreement, and without participation of the Congress, concluded a treaty with Great Britain in 1817 limiting naval forces on the Great Lakes, which agreement was not submitted to the Senate until a year later.

Notes on the open door in China were handled exclusively by the Executive, without congressional participation, in 1889 and 1890. The immigration agreement with Japan in 1907; the grant of special Japanese rights in China in 1917; the armistice of November 11, 1918; and in the same category the so-called trade agreements embodying Secretary Hull's philosophy of world trade—all were in fact treaties, but were not submitted to the Senate for its concurrence merely because the Executive, for convenience' sake, chose to call them agreements.

In 1907 President Theodore Roosevelt made an agreement with bankrupt Santo Domingo whereby the United States controlled that country's customhouses to prevent similar action on the part of European creditors.

President Roosevelt wrote in his autobiography:

I put the agreement into effect and I continued its execution for 2 years before the Senate acted. * * * But it is far preferable that there should be action by Congress—

He added—

so that we might be proceeding under a treaty which was the law of the land and not merely by a directive of the Chief Executive which would lapse when the particular Executive left office.

Nevertheless, even when the Senate refused to ratify it finally, Roosevelt kept it in effect.

Considering it—

He wrote—

as a simple (Executive) agreement which would be converted into a treaty whenever the Senate acted.

Parenthetically, I would state that there is not even a legal precedent for Theodore Roosevelt's belief that an Executive agreement loses its effect upon the passing of a specific Chief Executive from the scene.

Executive agreements formerly concerned themselves merely with postal, copyright, and trade-mark conventions, claims, and real reciprocity agreements to implement an established congressional policy. Real reciprocity agreements, of course, were in the same class with trade-marks and copyrights, in that they were only a matter of common sense and convenience. The trade agreements which we are considering today cannot rightfully fall into that class because they are controversial questions of fundamental foreign policy.

This view was upheld in the Supreme Court decision in the case of Field against Clark, which ruled that "Executive agreements" were necessary and proper agreements, but only to carry out the already-expressed will of the Congress.

The decision in the case of Field against Clark would be an excellent precedent for citation by those who, today, wish to preserve the spirit and intent of the Constitution in matters of international commitments, were it not for the more recent decision, during the New Deal administration, wherein the Supreme Court, in the case of United States against Belmont, decided on May 3, 1937, that the President is—in the words of the decision—"the sole organ" of international relations for the United States; and that the "Executive agreement" is just as much "the supreme law of the land" as a treaty is declared to be in article 6, clause 2, of the Constitution.

In fact, the United States against Belmont decision went so far as to reverse a lower court decision which had protected the integrity of a law and policy of one of our 48 States. This decision ruled, in effect, that an "international Executive agreement" made by the President without congressional participation or Senatorial concurrence is the "supreme law of the land" even to the extent of over-ruling any laws or policies of a State if inconsistent with the "Executive agreement."

In the case of the Executive agreement made with Santo Domingo by President Theodore Roosevelt, in which instance he chose to keep it in effect even after the Senate had refused to concur, Edwin S. Corwin, distinguished authority on constitutional law, says:

The only substantial difference between the President's agreement and the treaty which superseded it is to be found in the mere fact that the latter was ratified by the Senate.

Many legal scholars, of course, are of the opinion that an Executive agreement should be made to become a treaty by concurrence in it by two-thirds of the Senators present, if it is not to have the effect of a domestic law. That is the opinion of thousands of persons jealous of their rights and of their very form of government. It is no doubt the implied will of the Constitution. Certainly it is the spirit of the Constitution.

But, as Corwin points out, it is for the most part "a problem of practical statesmanship rather than of constitutional law."

It is what Woodrow Wilson had in mind when he wrote, in 1908, that—

If the President have character, modesty, devotion, and insight as well as force, he can bring himself and the Senate into a great and efficient body of common counsel.

On many fronts today there are indications of intent to sidestep the spirit of the Constitution, the express right of the people to choose their own representatives empowered with the duty of passing upon international commitments.

Nowhere is there indication of what Woodrow Wilson spoke of as the "character, modesty, devotion, and insight" of responsible officials intent upon consulting the people and making international commitments afterward, but rather are we disturbed by the growing habit of officials to effect commitments by devious means before informing the people.

We can only work and pray to the end that the Executive not choose to substitute personal agreement with other nations for agreement by treaty, subject to approval by the representative agents of the people.

But where foreign commerce is concerned, the authority and duty of the Congress is made clear and inalienable by article I, section 8, of the Constitution. Surely, where our prerogative is clear, we should not give it up. Surely we must respect our oath to preserve and defend our sacred Constitution. Preserving to ourselves the right to pass upon these treaties of foreign commerce may strengthen us in what I hope will be future determination to insist upon the right to approve or disapprove the Executive's terms of peace.

Mr. President, it is late, of course. But surely it is not too late to do away with blind vanity.

It is vain of any administration to think it can make agreements with all the world without the approval of its own people.

It is still more vain to think that any temporary administration of the Government of this Nation, by agreements either illegitimate or legitimate, can enforce its will not only upon its own people but upon all the peoples of the earth.

Mr. GEORGE obtained the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I had hoped that we might be able to reach a vote this afternoon on the pending amendment. Let me ask whether the Senator from Connecticut wishes to discuss it?

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to proceed for approximately 2 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE. I will yield to the Senator to get a vote; but I wish to discuss the matter for about 5 minutes.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to discuss the amendment for about 2 minutes, Mr. President.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well; I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, interestingly enough, earlier in the afternoon, shortly after the Senator from Georgia took the floor, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] addressed the Senate as follows:

I think, in passing, attention should be called to the fact that while it is referred to as the committee amendment, and while it is technically a committee amendment, it was adopted in the committee by a majority of only one vote.

The Senator from Georgia replied:

That is true, but, on the face of it—

And then he went on to discuss other phases of the subject, as they addressed themselves to him.

The point I wish to emphasize is that, while the Senator from Missouri apparently would seem to disparage the status of the amendment by describing

it in the language he used, the fact of the matter is that indeed it was a committee amendment. There was nothing "technically," if I may use the word used by the Senator from Missouri, to be ascribed to its status at all. It had the majority vote of the committee itself.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of the total committee.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; of the total committee, as the Senator from Michigan reminds me.

Mr. President, furthermore, I was prompted by the remark of the Senator from Missouri to consider the personnel, the 10 committee members, who had constituted the minority when the vote was taken in the Finance Committee. Of course, there was the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is chairman of the committee; and, in addition, there were the Senator fron Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who is chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs; the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who is the majority leader of the Senate; the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who is chairman of the Committee on Interoceanic Canals; the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is chairman of the Committee on Rules; the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who is chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate; the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], who not only is chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining, but, I think it might quite pointedly be observed, is chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], who is chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. President, that was the lineup of committee chairmen, the organized—consistently, thoroughly, completely organized—majority membership in that committee, voting as I have indicated. There may or may not be the slightest connection between the fact that the vote in the committee was 11 to 10, and that the vote on the floor was 51 to 33, adverse to the committee amendment, and the fact that the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Jones, sat right here on the floor of the Senate during the course of the debate this very day, and that he interviewed Senators in the lobby, right behind the rostrum now ococupied by the distinguished Senator from Delaware. There may be no connection whatever between all those events; but I have at hand the results of the findings of Dr. Alvin Hansen, who is economic adviser to the Federal Reserve Board, who points out that in the postwar period, at the very minimum, 15,000,000 persons now employed will be unemployed. He estimates that a figure approximating 18,000,000 might, indeed, be a proper estimate; but, to be conservative, he takes the figure 15,000,000.

Mr. President, when we in this country surround our laboring people with unemployment compensation protections, social security benefits, the benefits of organization under the so-called Wagner Act, and all the other advantages which have come with legislation, and which I most assuredly support, I can say that the post-war world, with millions of persons unemployed, will find our people in competition with the citizens of other countries who have no such protections, countries where exploitation of the laboring man will be enforced, where there will be thrown into competition with the products of our workers the products of foreign countries where the labor costs are one-tenth or one-twelfth of what they are in this country.

Mr. President, as of that date, when I look forward to that period of post-war unemployment, when I realize what it will mean to the economy of the people of the United States, and when I realize the dangers which confront us and the chaos which will ensue, I think perhaps I might like to cast my eye back over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 1, 1943, and I might conceivably like to see a few of the little items to which I have just adverted, which, were they not now to appear in the cold black-and-white of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, might otherwise be lost.

So, Mr. President, perhaps when we total the votes here the score has been made. The consequences lie ahead of us. I can see them, Mr. President; I can realize they are coming. I can assure the Senate that June 1, 1943, will have a relationship, in the events which transpired here today, to the trade-agreements program and the opportunity the Congress might otherwise have had to reappraise the American status in the world economy.

Mr. President, I am glad it was a part of my opportunity here to have supported the committee amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if it is consistent with the full development of this particular subject, I hope we may obtain a vote on it this evening.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming reads as follows:

> No foreign trade agreement hereafter entered into under the authority delegated to the President by such section 350, as amended, no amendatory or supplementary agreement hereafter entered into under such section, and no duties and other important restrictions specified in a proclamation issued by the President to carry out any such foreign trade agreement or any such amendatory or supplementary agreement, shall take effect until the Congress by law has specifically approved such agreement and the duties and other import restrictions so specified to carry out such agreement.

Not only are the department and the President to negotiate trade agreements, but the agreements must be enacted as law before they become effective; and with respect to all agreements which are now outstanding, before any modifications or changes can be made in them, or any amendatory or supplementary agreements can be made effective, the question must be submitted to the Congress and the proposed modifications must be ratified by an act of Congress.

To me it is a very strange amendment, and I am quite sure that it would prove to be harmful in the extreme in its administration. Senators who think that we can bring trade agreements to the floor of the Senate or the floor of the House without opening up the whole tariff act to debate are simply mistaken. Anyone who has gone through any of the tariff debates as a participant and has observed how all of us are importuned to take care of special narrow and local interests, as against the national general welfare, can well understand why we do not want to lose all we have gained and return to the old method of trying to negotiate, or at least to debate, tariff agreements on the floor, when they would necessarily be open to all kinds of amendments, and there would be a general tariff in each one of them before we got through with it.

I am as strongly opposed as is the Senator who has offered the amendment, for whom I have very great respect and love, to the improper delegation of legislative power to the Executive; but I believe that we must take a factual view of the question. How could the Congress make freight rates, for example? How could the Congress regulate passenger fares? Undoubtedly the power is in the Congress. It does not reside anywhere else. How could the Congress ever devise freight and passenger tariffs which would be equitable and fair and in the national interest? It would be impossible. Therefore we have the Interstate Commerce Commission.

How could the Congress regulate many of the things which are now submitted to commissions—The Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Communications Commission, for example? The Communications Commission regulates transmission by radio of messages in the United States, and outside, to the extent that we have treaties which permit such regulation. Those are all Congressional powers, but they must be exercised through some agency if the job is to be done fairly, equitably, and with any degree of efficiency.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator has referred to the Interstate Commerce Commission. I am glad he did so, because in one of his speeches before the Finance Committee the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] referred to the delegation of power to the Interstate Commerce Commission as being the taking-off point in the abrogation by Congress of its functions and duties. We all know that during the time of its existence the Interstate Commerce Commission has made several thousand rates and orders. Does the Senator believe that if Congress, functioning as a congressional body, had undertaken to pass on each of the questions which it delegated to the Interstate Commerce Commission for determination and decision, the Congress would have been able to do anything else during that time?

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly not; and it could not have done that job very well, because while it is a matter within the

jurisdiction and power of the Congress, it is simply not a matter which can be done without careful and systematic study.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the pending amendment were adopted, and each trade agreement with a foreign power were to open up the subject of the tariff, as the Senator has so well explained, to the extent of a general tariff revision—which it might well do under our rules—would Congress be able to do anything else whatever, or be able to do a good job of tariff revision?

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly not.

Mr. President, I wish to make one further observation, and then, so far as I am concerned, when the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] shall have finished, I hope we may have a vote.

When I came to the Congress I had very strong notions that the flexible tariff provision of the act of 1922—the Fordney-McCumber Act—was perhaps an unlawful delegation of legislative powers. I was quite honest in that view. I had the same view as to the provisions in the Smoot-Hawley Act. That is to say, I questioned whether or not there was a proper delegation of power. I concede that Congress may not delegate legislative power. I have never asserted that it could; but Congress can lay down an intelligible principle and delegate the authority to act through the application of that principle to the finding of basic facts.

When I read the cases on this question very carefully, and particularly when I read the opinion of Chief Justice Taft in the celebrated case in which he sustained the validity and constitutionality of the flexible provisions of the tariff act, I was convinced that the delegation of power in both the tariff acts referred to, and again in the trade agreements act, was entirely constitutional and valid.

That is particularly true with respect to the Trade Agreements Act, because while the power to control and regulate interstate and foreign commerce is definitely in the Congress, and is a congressional function, as I stated a while ago in my brief remarks, the Congress cannot exercise the power to regulate foreign commerce without the assistance of the Chief Executive. There must be cooperation and collaboration if there is to be regulation of interstate and foreign commerce. Congress, of course, has the power to do it. Congress may fix tariff rates. Congress may prevent imports from coming in; but if Congress is looking into the larger field with a view of eliminating unnecessary trade restrictions and hindrances, whether in the form of duty or not, if Congress is looking to the broader aspect of the question of regulating interstate and foreign commerce, then Congress must necessarily call upon the President.

The flexible tariff is not a Democratic doctrine. It is a Republican doctrine. Reciprocal trade agreements in their essence are Republican doctrine. The distinguished father of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], when he was President of the United States, was himself an advocate of reciprocity in trade. So was McKinley. So were many leading outstanding Republican leaders of former days. The reciprocal approach to tariff making, if one is to trace its origin and accredit it to either party, is largely the doctrine of our Republican friends. In my judgment the flexible tariff is definitely a Republican doctrine.

There has been a gradual evolution. Of course, the McKinley tariff law was not like the present trade agreements act. The Dingley tariff was different. There has been a gradual evolution.

However, step by step, an effort has been made to find some way of dealing with the complicated and intricate problem of the tariff; and anyone who has lived through it, anyone who went through the experience of framing the Smoot-Hawley Act, must be conscious of the fact that when it is finished it is almost impossible for any man to say that it deserves his support, because it is made up of compromises. It is made up of one compromise after another. I early learned when I entered this body that if I were to get any suitable protection for an industry in my section which I really believed was entitled to some protection, I must go along with someone who wanted protection somewhere else. I early learned that there was not very much to the belief of our farmer friends that they would receive great benefits through the tariff, because by the time they had obtained their duties, through the trades and log-rolling methods to which their representatives had to subject themselves, other industries obtained so much higher duties that all the profits of the farmer were swallowed up, as it were, before he got them.

Irrespective of that and repeating what I said, I think there is a sound basis for protection of American industry and American standards of living, and I am anxious to see that we lose nothing we have gained in our effort to evolve a better method of regulating and fixing our tariffs.

I appreciate that fundamentally the fixing of tariffs comes back to the Congress. I know where the power originates. I know the President has not the power to fix a single tariff rate. He has not the power to fix an embargo. He cannot do it; it is not within his power; but the Congress can delegate to him, as the Chief Executive, the power to negotiate, the power to pare down and to remove unreasonable restrictions if it can be done.

All on earth that is done in the Trade Agreements Act is the acceptance basically of the flexible provisions and principles of both the Fordney-McCumber and the Smoot-Hawley Acts, and saying to the President, "Now, we ask you to negotiate for us, but you must negotiate within the limits of the flexible provisions of those two tariff acts; that is to say, you cannot raise or lower a duty by more than 50 percent. If you can expand our trade and commerce, and relieve it of unnecessary restrictions which hamper and impede commerce, if you can do that, operating up or down within the limits of 50 percent of the basic rates as Congress has fixed those rates, then we empower you to do it."

So, Mr. President, aside from all other considerations, and on the merits, in my opinion, Congress should be willing to continue this power under the Trade Agreements Act for the period of 2 years, the short period to which the House has reduced it. That is aside from the other and more impelling thought at this time, that we certainly ought not to be willing to take any chance on reversing our whole position, thereby disappointing, perhaps even though unjustly, the hopes of so many of the men and women of the world who think we are going at least to undertake to cooperate in the field of commerce and trade, which will be so vital and so necessary for the prosperity of not only our country but of the world after the war ends.

I hope, Mr. President, that we may have a vote.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to make one or two comments on the pending amendment, because I am one of the Senators—I hope there are more—who have changed their policy on the subject of trade agreements hitherto followed.

The State which I represent happens to be in keen competition with Cuba in the production of fresh vegetables. Those who are engaged in that great agricultural industry in my State have been bitterly opposed to trade agreements in the past, due to their belief that under the trade agreements there were certain arrangements made for the importation of fresh vegetables into this country which mitigated against their best interests.

Both my colleague and I in the past have voted, at their instance, and at the instance of the cattle industry and sugar industry, against these trade agreements acts.

However, Mr. President, those votes were cast in peacetime. This is wartime. I know of no way in which we can refrain from placing trust in our own Government to deal fairly with our own citizens. If I am not willing to trust my Government to deal fairly with the people of my State, then I am not a loyal citizen of my country. I am sure that I express the sentiment of every other Senator when I say that I shall always, in every way by which I can do so, try to influence the agencies of the Government executing agreements under such statutory authority as is proposed so as to prevent any action which would mitigate against the substantial and sound interests of my State.

We cannot go back to the old days of isolation or tariff logrolling, yet the Government must have power to try to save from economic chaos the broken world the war will leave us.

Mr. President, it is a good lesson for us to begin to learn that all of us cannot have everything we want and at the same time have the kind of world all of us wish for more than anything else. Every State and every section and every interest, to a degree, is going to have to make some sacrifice if we all are to have the kind of world in which we may prosper, or perhaps survive.

I have thought, therefore, that it might be appropriate to give this word of explanation, because of the changed attitude on the part of my colleague and myself on this subject.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has based the power for the proposed delegation of authority on the flexible tariff provisions of various tariff laws. I wish to point out that those tariff laws prescribe a very definite standard, the standard being the difference between the costs of production in this country and other countries where similar articles are produced. That is a definite standard, a standard which the Tariff Commission could follow. I would approve such a system today. I think that is the kind of system we ought to have today. I think the Tariff Commission itself ought to have authority to make changes in the tariff, or I would even be willing to give them complete authority to write the tariff, referring to the difficulty of Congress writing a tariff.

However, no standard is fixed in this instance. The decision is absolutely in the discretion of the Secretary of State. By reading section 1 of the act it will be seen that it states a great many purposes to be accomplished, but as for prescribing a standard, there is no standard, and that is the difference between the reciprocal trade agreement and the flexible tariff provisions of past acts. After all, it is a distinction as to all delegation of legislative authority.

Of course, we have to delegate much legislative authority, but we prescribe, and should prescribe, a definite standard when we turn over any such authority to administrative boards, and the act prescribes no such standard. It seems to me the flexible tariffs are no precedent whatever for the passage of this kind of measure.

If we were to write in such a provision as one requiring consideration of the cost of production I would vote for the measure immediately, because it seems to me that is what the American people want. However, far from that, this particularly provides that sections 1336 and 1516 shall not apply to the articles covered.

That means that we are delegating to the President of the United States the authority to reduce a tariff to a point at which the foreign cost of production, plus the tariff, is very much less than the American cost of production. That is what it means, without any question, and without any standard except the President's arbitrary discretion. It means that we are delegating to him the power to destroy an American industry if he thinks the industry should be destroyed in the interest of promoting our exports, perhaps, of other products.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did I correctly understand the Senator to refer to the fact that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act contains a repealer of section 516 (b) of the act of 1930?

Mr. TAFT. No, the repealer of section 516, as I understand, practically removes any possibility of court appeal.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. I referred to the provision of section 1336 of this title, which is the one prescribing the difference in cost of production, which is repealed. So there is no standard in the act. The flexible tariff provision is no authority for the proposed action. As a matter of fact, I would vote for a flexible tariff provision. I think that is the way in which tariffs should be made. I do not think they should be made by such complete, wide-open delegation of authority to the President. It is said he is limited to 50 percent of the Smoot-Hawley tariff rates, but if a tariff be reduced by 50 percent it may be just as destructive of industry as if the tariff were abolished altogether. What is provided is only a limit. It is no standard by which the President can be guided.

Of course, if we refer back to the reciprocity treaties made during the time of McKinley, or to the Canadian reciprocity treaty, we find that those treaties were submitted to the Senate. In the case of the Canadian reciprocity treaty, it was approved by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate. Certainly no one should object to reciprocity under such circumstances. Those were direct reciprocity treaties. They were direct deals with another nation by which we reduced certain duties in return for reductions on the part of the other nation. There was no application of the most-favored nation clause, and therefore it did not amount to a general reduction of tariff rates such as is provided for in the Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. President, I, too, disapprove of making tariffs by congressional action. I should like to vote for a method of making tariffs which would not be by congressional action, but I cannot see how I can vote for the pending measure, with its complete delegation of arbitrary authority to the President of the United States. While I would not propose the kind of amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, since the leaders in charge of the joint resolution have refused to accept any amendment, have refused to impose any standard, have refused even to impose a limit until 6 months after the war, I have no choice except to vote for the amendment, and against the joint resolution, if the amendment shall not be agreed to. If the amendment shall be agreed to I shall be willing to vote for the joint resolution, although I think it does not provide a scientific method of making tariffs.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Ohio, in his reference to the remarks of the Senator from Georgia, completely overlooks one fact. In the first place, the Senator from Ohio, in my opinion, is entirely in error as to the question of the delegation of power when he says no standard is set up. Very definite standards are set up in the act. It states the purposes as follows:

> The President, whenever he finds as a fact—

That requires a definite finding of fact—

> that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purpose above declared will be promoted by the means hereinafter specified, is authorized from time to time—

To do the things set out thereafter.

Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio denies the proposition enunciated by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that the principle of this act is entirely in consonance and in accordance with the principles of the flexible tariff provisions of the various tariff acts we have had. He undertakes to make a distinction because the other acts set up one narrow, definite standard having to do with the cost of production at home and abroad. The Senator from Ohio completely overlooks the fact that any such standard as was set up in the original flexible provisions had already proved itself completely inadequate and inefficient to get out of the tariff situation in which we not only found ourselves, but in which the whole world had been plunged by the prohibitive tariff provisions of the Smoot-Hawley Act, the Fordney-McCumber Act, and other Republican tariff acts.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to ask if the Senator can think of any single reduction of more than 50 percent of the rate specified in the Smoot-Hawley Act, which the President would be forbidden to make under the general provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act? In other words, how can there be a standard when there is not a single reduction the President is able to make within the terms of the broad purposes stated in section 1 of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The act set up the authority of the President to adjust these matters between limits, and the limits are set forth in the act. The limits set up in the so-called flexible tariff provisions of the Smoot-Hawley Act and the Fordney-McCumber Act were not applicable, because, through our stupid, short-sighted course, we had forced the other nations of the world, to use a common expression, not only to "see" us but to "raise" us. They had not only adopted prohibitive tariffs, following our bad example, but they had gone on and set up other devices which could not possibly have been reached by the so-called flexible tariff provisions of the tariff acts. They had gone on, from setting up prohibitive tariffs to making discriminatory quotas, which absolutely shut our products, both of the factory and of the field, out of any markets of the world. They had not only done that, they had made arbitrary arrangements as to rates of exchange, which had exactly the same effect on our entrance into other markets as prohibitory tariff acts, and we could not possibly reach them by such strict limitations, such narrow limitations, as were set up in the flexible tariff provisions. So when the present administration came into power, and it was desired really to undertake to cooperate in commercial matters, in international trade, and to undo the bad effects of these prohibitive tariffs, it was decided that it was necessary to give the President authority not only to deal with tariff rates but to undertake to give him authority to remove these discriminations against American trade in the

shape of exchange discriminations, quota discriminations, and the like.

I desire to add merely one other thought, to emphasize a point which has been touched on by the Senator from Georgia, because it deals with a matter which has run throughout the debate. For the last 9 years we have heard Senators and Representatives refer to the fact that tariff rates are being changed by action of the officials of the State Department, but of course anyone who will read the act must know that no such statement is true to any degree whatever. Reciprocal trade agreements do not change any tariff rates. The only way tariff rates can be changed is by the President's proclamation, pursuant to a reciprocal trade agreement, and when the President issues his proclamation, he issues it, not in his capacity as Executive, but he issues it as an agent of the Congress, under powers defined and given to him by act of Congress; and that is not such a delegation of authority as the Senators have been discussing to any greater degree than the exercise of the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission is a delegation of authority by Congress.

Mr. President, everyone agrees that we should have reciprocity in international trade. The only difference between the kind of reciprocity now sought and the old, bad system of reciprocity in general tariff revision, is that the system under the reciprocal trade agreements contemplates that nations may be able to trade with each other to their mutual advantage, one nation giving up certain things which it can give up without hurting it, in consideration of certain advantages which may help it, and the other countries doing the same thing. That is one kind of reciprocity. The other kind of reciprocity, to which we would return, if the joint resolution were defeated, or crippling amendments to it were adopted, is the old, bad system of reciprocity, "You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours," when one Senator would say to another, "I am interested in a tariff on coal. I will vote for your tariff on oil if you will vote for my tariff on coal."

Another Senator would say, "I am interested in a tariff on steel. You vote for my tariff on steel and I will vote for your tariff on lumber." That is the sort of reciprocity which brought this country into the depression, from which ever since we have been slowly and toilsomely emerging.

Mr. President, in congressional legislation I will set this sort of reciprocity, a reciprocity of mutual advantage between nations, against the bad, nefarious system of reciprocity of "You scratch my back and I will scratch yours."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. GEORGE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I find I can transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who, if present, would vote as I intend to vote. I am therefore free to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BROOKS. On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If present, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] would vote "yea."

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is paired on this question with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. If present the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is paired on this question with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. If present, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—31

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Brewster	La Follette	Overton
Bushfield	Langer	Reed
Butler	McCarran	Scrugham
Capper	McNary	Shipstead
Chavez	Maloney	Taft
Clark, Idaho	Millikin	Thomas, Idaho
Danaher	Moore	Walsh
Davis	Murray	Willis
Gerry	Nye	
Holman	O'Daniel	

NAYS—50

Andrews	Clark, Mo.	Hawkes
Austin	Connally	Hayden
Bailey	Downey	Hill
Ball	Eastland	Lodge
Bankhead	Ellender	Lucas
Barbour	Ferguson	McFarland
Bilbo	George	McKellar
Bone	Gillette	Maybank
Burton	Green	Mead
Byrd	Guffey	Pepper
Caraway	Gurney	Radcliffe
Chandler	Hatch	Russell
Smith	Truman	Wallgren
Stewart	Tunnell	White
Thomas, Okla.	Vandenberg	Wiley
Thomas, Utah	Van Nuys	Wilson
Tobey	Wagner	

NOT VOTING—15

Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Reynolds
Bridges	Kilgore	Robertson
Brooks	McClellan	Tydings
Buck	Murdock	Wheeler
Glass	Revercomb	Wherry

So Mr. O'MAHONEY's amendment was rejected.

SIMPLIFICATION OF NAVAL ACCOUNTING PROCEDURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2584) to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. DAVIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Mr. GEORGE obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Connecticut wish to offer his amendment this afternoon?

Mr. MALONEY. I had intended to ask that it be considered now.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I had in mind submitting a request for a unanimous-consent agreement. However, I yield to the Senator from Connecticut so that he may have his amendment read.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, through the graciousness of the senior Senator from Georgia, I call up the amendment which lies on the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution, it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. —. Effective on the date of enactment of this act, section 2 of such act of June 12, 1934, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) No foreign trade agreement hereafter entered into under the first section of this act shall take effect until the Senate of the United States shall have advised and consented to its ratification, two-thirds of the Senators present concurring.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to submit a unanimous-consent request that all debate on further amendments to the joint resolution be limited, tomorrow, to let us say, 20 minutes on each amendment, and that no

Senator shall speak more than once on any amendment.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and hoping that I shall not have to object, I am wondering whether it will be possible, under the circumstances, that when the Senate convenes tomorrow I shall have the floor, in view of the fact that my amendment is now pending.

Mr. GEORGE. I intended that that be the case. The reason why I yielded to the Senator, so that he might offer his amendment, was in order that he would have the floor when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Mr. MALONEY. I thought that was the case. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I shall have no objection to the request.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think the unanimous-consent request should carry with it a limitation to 15 minutes debate on the joint resolution. The limitation should apply to the joint resolution as well as to the amendments, in order to hasten the conclusion of the debate.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, Mr. President, I should have said that.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request, as amended?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to know what the request is?

Mr. GEORGE. I submitted a unanimous-consent request that when the Senate meets tomorrow, each Senator shall be limited to 20 minutes debate on each amendment and on the joint resolution.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not care to object, and I do not care to impede the progress of the measure; but I suggest that there be a limit of 30 minutes on debate on the joint resolution and a limit of 15 minutes on debate on each amendment. I hope the Senator will accept my suggestion, because some of us may want to address the Senate briefly on the pending amendment and on one other amendment which I know will be offered.

Mr. GEORGE. I am very glad to modify the request as the Senator from Nevada has requested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia, as amended?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I assume that the unanimous-consent agreement is that debate shall be limited to 30 minutes on the joint resolution and to 15 minutes on any amendment thereto or motion thereon which may be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request, as amended, submitted by the Senator from Georgia? None is heard, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to give notice also that the conference report on the tax bill, which lies on the desk, will be called up at the earliest possible moment tomorrow, after completion of debate on the pending joint resolution.

Mr. President, I do not think it would require unanimous consent, but I do ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], who has just offered his amendment, be entitled to the floor as soon as the Senate meets tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? None is heard; and it is so ordered.

ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 153, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 153), submitted by Mr. ELLENDER on May 24, 1943, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, until otherwise provided, the Committee on Claims is authorized to employ an assistant clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $3,600 per annum, and Senate Resolution No. 18, agreed to January 23, 1939, is hereby repealed.

INVESTIGATION RELATING TO FOOD PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 124, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I will say to the Senate that this is an additional appropriation to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to carry on certain phases of the investigation which it has been making for some time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 124) reported by Mr. SMITH from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on April 2, 1943, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized (a) to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to any matters relating to the production, transportation, distribution, exportation, utilization, and consumption of food and allied products produced within or imported into the United States and its Territories and possessions, and of all products, commodities, and factors involved therein, including farm prices and shortages of farm labor, machinery, fertilizer, and feed or other commodities necessary to crop and livestock production; and (b) to make inquiries into any policies and practices of the Government which appear to imperil the production and distribution of adequate supplies of food for our armed forces, our civilian population, or our allies. The committee or subcommittee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the result of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the remainder of the Seventy-eighth Congress; to employ such clerical and other assistants; to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF DISTRIBUTION AND UTILIZATION OF MEDICAL PERSONNEL, FACILITIES, AND RELATED HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with an additional amendment, Senate Resolution 74, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may we have the resolution read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 74) heretofore reported from the Committee on Education and Labor with amendments, and from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate with an additional amendment, as proposed to be amended, was read, as follows:

Whereas the needs of the armed services for medical personnel has brought about acute shortages of doctors, nurses, dentists, and allied personnel in many areas; and

Whereas many centers of war production lack adequate facilities for the maintenance of health; and

Whereas a large number of men have been rejected for military service because of physical or educational deficiencies; and

Whereas the physical and mental fitness of the Nation has a direct bearing upon the efficiency of both the armed forces and civilian efforts in the effective prosecution of the war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor or a subcommittee thereof to be appointed by the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee be authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation, in cooperation with such public and private agencies and such persons as it might see fit to consult regarding the distribution and utilization of medical personnel, facilities, and related health services: Be it further

Resolved, That the subcommittee be authorized and directed to study and investigate the deficiencies in health and education among persons otherwise fit for service with the armed forces and persons otherwise fit to be employed to the best advantage in agriculture, industry, and other activities so as consistently with the spirit of our institutions, and the national emergency best to promote the war and victory for our cause. The committee shall report to the Senate, as

soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the session, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistance, to require by subpena, or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to make such investigations, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to incur such expenditures as it deems advisable.

That the heads of the executive departments and other executive agencies detail and/or engage personnel temporarily to assist the committee upon the request of the chairman. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it may deem necessary. The committee may utilize the services of facilities of the various departments and agencies of the Government.

The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the subcommittee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I thought that this proposal involved the subject of manpower. I ask whether it does or not?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], who is the proponent of the resolution.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think the caption which attracted the Senator's attention had not been properly amended, as the resolution itself had been amended, so as to be limited, not to the general subject of manpower, but to an investigation which comes peculiarly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor, namely, questions pertaining to education and public health, and the distribution of doctors among the civilian population of the country. The resolution has nothing to do with the general subject of manpower.

Mr. AUSTIN. I accept the statement of the Senator from Florida. Therefore I shall not object. However, I serve notice that I think that jurisdiction of the subject of manpower belongs in the Committee on Military Affairs. The committee is attending to its business in that respect and is holding hearings. It held one today on that subject. The hearings cover the whole field. Not only is it a waste of the energy of committees to refer a similar subject to another committee, but it would not serve the cause of total mobilization.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am in hearty agreement with what the Senator from Vermont says so far as the duplication of authority is concerned in connection with these investigations. Heretofore on the floor of the Senate I have made myself rather clear as to how I feel about such procedure. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that if there is any question in his mind I shall be glad to delay consideration of the resolution until tomorrow, so as to give him an opportunity to examine the resolution and confer with the Senator from Florida, to see if he has any objection to it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I accept the statement of the Senator from Florida without qualification.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a few questions about this resolution, which I have heard read hastily once. I am not entirely familiar with its provisions. Has the resolution been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. PEPPER. It has.

Mr. LODGE. As I understand, it relates to the question of manpower, and to the question of the health of inductees under selective service. While I am confident that the purpose of the resolution is a worthy one, I wonder if the Senator would mind having the resolution go over for a day, so as to give us an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall be glad to have the resolution go over. Let me say to the Senator that it does not relate to anyone who is already in the service. What came to the attention of the Committee on Education and Labor was the fact that at Camp Lee, Va., when 600 white boys were inducted into the service, 193 of them were rejected because they were illiterate. In the country as a whole 2,997,000 men between the ages of 18 and 44 were rejected from selective service because they were either physically, mentally, educationally, or morally deficient. The committee had previously dealt with the subject of the distribution of doctors among the civilian population of the country, and we had rather extended hearings on that subject. It was desired to continue that subject for consideration; but in no sense of the word was there intended to be any encroachment whatever on the military jurisdiction. It was not intended to deal generally with the subject of manpower, but to deal only with questions peculiarly within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, including matters of education and public health affecting only the civilian population.

Mr. LODGE. Those are very worthy aims, but I should like to have a day to examine the resolution. I am sure that I approve the aims of the Senator from Florida, but I should like to have a day to examine the resolution. I ask that it go over.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be glad to have it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

DEPENDENTS OF FRANK EDWARD DACE

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 159, Senate bill 367.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 367) for the relief of dependents of Frank Edward Dace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on the last call of the calendar the bill was objected to by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. I am advised that he has withdrawn his objection. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 367) for the relief of dependents of Frank Edward Dace was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lynn Jeanett Dace, the sum of $11,800, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for the death of her husband, Frank Edward Dace, who died as a result of an accident which occurred on February 20, 1942, while he was voluntarily and gratuitously making acceptance flights for the United States Army Air Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

FOOD PRODUCTION AND FOOD PRICES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a letter addressed by me to Hon. Prentiss M. Brown, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration; three telegrams received by me protesting against the combination "roll-back and subsidy" program to lower food prices, also a radio talk delivered by myself on May 16, 1943, over Broadcasting Station WIBW, dealing with the subject of food production and food prices.

There being no objection, the letter, telegrams, and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 1, 1943.

Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I enclose you a telegram I have just received from George W. Catts, executive manager, Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City, Mo., and a telegram from Harlen McLeod, of Gilcrest, Colo., protesting against the proposed roll-back and subsidy for meat effective June 1.

These are typical of numerous similar complaints I have received from others. I am sure there will be a flood of objections from producers, processors, and others interested in the livestock industry in Kansas and other Middle West States.

I also enclose a telegram from the Washington County Cooperative Creamery Co. of Linn, Kans., urging the rescinding of the 10-percent roll-back on butter. I am in hearty sympathy with the appeal made by the butter producers.

I hope you can postpone action on the program mentioned in these telegrams until you have had time to look into the whole matter carefully and thoroughly. I believe

thorough study of the situation will convince you the program ought to be abandoned. It will not work. I will appreciate your early consideration of this very important matter.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR CAPPER.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 31, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER:

Proposed plan of the Office of Price Administration roll-back and subsidy for meat effective June 1 will probably lower livestock prices and curtail production. Loss on meat inventories slaughtered prior to June 1 will be reflected in lower prices paid by packers after June 1. Production cannot be maintained in face of questionable feed supply and price uncertainties. Please urge postponement of effective date until all interested groups can be heard and a more equitable and practicable plan developed.

GEORGE W. CATTS,
Executive Manager, Chamber of Commerce.

GILCREST, COLO., *May 31, 1943.*

Hon. Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

You are asking the feeder to produce more pounds of meat. Do you think it is fair to us to put the price back so that we will lose money, or shall we leave our feed lots empty? All feeders are trying to help win this war, but we cannot stand this price fluctuation. I feed 200 head of cattle and 1,600 sheep; also run 650 cattle on range. Quit meddling with prices and we will produce our share.

HARLEN MCLEOD.

LINN, KANS., *May 31, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER:

We urge that you put all your influence and power in the rescinding of the 10 percent roll-back on butter.

WASHINGTON COUNTY CO-OP CREAMERY CO.

MORE FOOD OR SHORTER RATIONS

Months ago I called attention to what I felt sure was the fact—that the farm problem had become a food problem.

There are indications that Washington at last has come to realize this fact.

I understand plans are under way to shift the emphasis from prices to production in the field of food.

It is high time that shift was made.

If it becomes necessary to discard the Office of Price Administration, or to change its name and its objectives, the quicker the change is made the better.

The Office of Price Administration program, so far as the public is concerned, has been to tell the consumers they are entitled to cheap foods. The Office of Price Administration's purpose is to get lower food prices.

FOOD PRODUCTION IS MOST VITAL

What the Government should be explaining to the consumers today is that unless food production in the United States this year is greater than now appears probable, the people of the United States are going to go on short rations before the end of this year; certainly in 1944. And I really mean short rations.

In the Department of Agriculture this fact has been known for months. But the Department apparently has been unable to convince the other agencies that getting food is more important than fixing prices on food—prices based on much lower costs of production than prevail today; prices based on food surpluses instead of food scarcity.

But the Administration has insisted upon following a Pollyanna policy in regard to food production and farm help, farm machinery, farm prices. Consumers have been given to understand the problem of food was virtually only a matter of prices. The main idea was to keep the so-called "greedy farmers" from getting too much for what they produced.

LAST 3 YEARS ABOVE NORMAL

Those acquainted with the situation have been aware all the time that the last 3 years have been unusual years, years of abundant production. The weather was right all the way through, taking the country as a whole. Yields were bountiful. Feed grains and forage were produced in abundance for feeding dairy cattle, beef cattle, hogs, sheep, chickens. There were marked shortages of protein feeds for chickens and livestock. But the average consumer did not associate that with the food he took from the grocery.

We are told—and took pride in the fact we were able to do that much for our Allies—that this year one-fourth of the beef produced would go abroad. But it was rather slurred over that mathematically this meant only three-fourths the beef would be available in the United States.

We were told that one-third of the eggs laid would be needed abroad. But as consumers few persons tumbled to the fact that meant only two-thirds of the eggs would be available for home consumption. And so on down the line—one-half the cheese and one-half the evaporated milk; more than one-third the dried fruits; one-fourth of edible fats and oils, one-third of the lard; and so on.

But amounts to be shipped abroad did not, and do not now, tell the whole story. The Government is trying to lay up reserve stocks of food to feed reconquered lands in north Africa and later in Europe. These plans made during the fall and winter were based upon the supposition that 1943 farm production would exceed, or at least be as large as that of 1942.

ADVERSE CONDITIONS THIS SPRING

That part of picture already has changed, and changed for the worse.

In the Northwest and Midwest, late spring has delayed plantings dangerously, especially considering shortages of manpower and machinery.

In Florida and Georgia frosts this spring have delayed and seriously damaged the potato crop and many vegetables. Fruit crops over much of the South will be below normal, in some places much below normal.

The pig crop in the Corn Belt, through a combination of protein feed shortages, late winter, and inexperienced and inadequate help, has taken severe losses.

It is a little early to say for sure about wheat, but all reports I get indicate the probability that it will not be a bumper crop; that it may even be a short crop.

SURPLUS WHEAT IS VANISHING

From the fact that the Department of Agriculture is advising against the policy of feeding wheat to animals, except where storage space is inadequate, I take it the experts can see that 2-year supply of surplus wheat vanishing weekly. I think it was last fall when I told you the way things were going then, wheat and more wheat would be needed by 1944.

I do not like to keep crying "wolf," but as I see the picture the time has come—actually the best time has passed—for the administration to revise sharply and almost completely its food, price, and farm policies.

I say we are going to need every ounce of food that can be produced and made available for consumption.

It is all right, and very proper, for speakers to go on the air and call for more food production. That is an essential part of the program of education. But food is not produced, any more than wars are finally won, by radio broadcasts.

EXCESS PRODUCTION MORE EXPENSIVE

It takes men, and machinery, and fertilizer, and prices to cover production costs, to produce food. To produce food in excess of ordinary production, it takes more of all these; the administration should remember that excess production generally is higher cost production.

Now all the factors are not on the down side in this food situation.

The manpower situation is somewhat improved over what it was last fall, and considerably improved over what was then indicated.

The farm machinery situation remains bad, but the War Production Board is indicating more allowance will be made for farm machinery production for 1944. Last summer the allocations were for only 23 percent of 1940 production to be made in 1943. That has been raised to 40 percent; may be 80 percent for 1944. It ought to be 100 percent.

It has been my opinion for some time that the farm price policies attempted to be effectuated by the Office of Price Administration, and by the Office of Economic Stabilization, have been decidedly inflationary instead of what they were intended to be—anti-inflationary.

Any policy or program that discourages and decreases production, that complicates and breaks down the machinery of distribution, is inflationary in character, and in an emergency like this, also very dangerous.

CHESTER DAVIS IS SAWING WOOD

I think there is going to be a decided change in the manner of handling food production and control within a comparatively short time.

Chester Davis, the new food administrator, has noticeably not been on the air; he has not been doing much talking. My information from the Department of Agriculture is that he has been—to use an old phrase—just sawing wood.

Members of Congress from the farm States at present are watching this situation closely. We are interested in winning the war. We know that maximum food production is necessary to win the war. The troubles we have been having off and on for months past here in Washington have been largely efforts to get the administration to see the real need is maximum production.

It would be too bad, just when our military forces are going so good, to have the war machinery at home slowed down by monkey wrenches thrown into it by the mistaken farm, food, and price policies.

FOOD AS NECESSARY AS ARMS

I hope Chester Davis succeeds in getting the food-production program straightened out. But along with that someone is going to have to make it plain to consumers that food production is just as much a war necessity as arms production—and now that the arms-production program is working at top speed, it is more than ever necessary that food production be stepped up, not allowed to lag when the need for food is so great.

To farmers, I urge that you plant and harvest and produce every ounce of food you possibly can, including meat and dairy products. Your country needs it.

To consumers, conserve every ounce of food. Don't waste it. And do everything you can to make it possible for farmers to produce more.

To producers and consumers alike—if there is a way for you to produce some of your own food in a Victory garden—or any kind of a garden—do just that thing.

Your country needs food—and so do you.

Mr. CAPPER. In my letter to Administrator Brown, Mr. President, I have suggested that he abandon the program of using subsidies to hold down food prices. The plan, I am certain, will not work, and I have so told Mr. Brown.

For the purpose of encouraging the production of certain risk crops in unusual quantities, there may be some justification for making so-called incentive payments or bonuses. This would be for the purpose of securing needed increased production.

However, to borrow billions of dollars to subsidize food prices so that consumers, with more spending power than ever before, may get their food at less than cost would simply add fuel to the inflation conflagration well under way. I am convinced that this subsidy and rollback program will not work; it is merely adding to the confusion and discouraging production.

NOMINATION OF GUY DOANE McKINNEY

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the acting majority leader. I notice under the heading of "War Manpower Commission" on the Executive Calendar the nomination of Guy Doane McKinney from the District of Columbia, to be principal information specialist, at $5,600 per annum, in the Washington regional office. May I inquire if that is the State of Washington?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should say it is in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BONE. I should like to have the nomination passed over until I can ascertain whether it is for the city of Washington, D. C., or the State of Washington.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I will move an executive session, and will then ask that that nomination be passed over until we can check it.

Mr. BONE. I want the nomination to go over until I can ascertain who is being appointed in my State.

Mr. HILL. On the face of it, I think this appointment is in the District of Columbia. I will say to the Senator that we will agree that the nomination may go over until the Senator has had an opportunity to investigate it.

Mr. BONE. I should like to have the RECORD show that I want the nomination go over in the event it comes up again when I am not present.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will yield, I will move that the Senate go into executive session at once.

Mr. BONE. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination in the Coast Guard, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Abe D. Waldauer, of Memphis, Tenn., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 43, with headquarters at Memphis, Tenn. (reappointment).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers of the Naval Reserve for appointment and/or promotion, and sundry officers for promotion in the Navy.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that all nominations in the War Manpower Commission be confirmed en bloc with the exception of the nomination of Guy Doane McKinney. As to that nomination I request that it go over at the suggestion and request of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE].

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, for the purpose of the RECORD let me say that I will rise on this floor and object to every appointment in my State unless the bureaus at least do me the honor of calling me up and asking me if I know the nominees. I hope I shall have some help from my brethren, who certainly should be fed up with this kind of business at this time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am quite sure, from an examination of the calendar, that this appointment in the Washington regional office is in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia. If the Senator will examine the calendar, he will note that in the column in which the name "Washington" appears all the names there are names of cities, including Atlanta, Canton, Lincoln, Kansas City, Boston, and so on down the list. They are all names of cities, so I am confident that the appointment referred to by the Senator from Washington is not in the State of Washington, but in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia.

However, I am willing that the nomination of Guy Doane McKinney be passed over temporarily.

Mr. BONE. If it be true that his appointment applies to the city of Washington, I would have no objection.

Mr. HILL. I am confident that that is the case. The calendar strongly indicates it.

Mr. BONE. I am serving notice now, however, that I will not agree to the confirmation of the nomination of any person appointed in my State until the departments let me know in advance who the person is. I want that statement to appear in the RECORD.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator from Washington that the calendar not only strongly indicates, but practically shows, that this man is an appointee in the city of Washington, and not in the State of Washington.

These nominations come under the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. They were reported by that committee. That committee has a rule—and I think that rule is strictly adhered to—that it will not report any nomination in any State without first consulting the Senator or Senators from that State and obtaining their approval of the nomination.

Mr. BONE. The language used in the calendar is "Washington regional office." I have no means of knowing whether that refers to the State of Washington, or the city of Washington in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HILL. I invite the attention of the Senator to the language in the nomination above that of Mr. McKinney—"in the Kansas City regional office." I am sure that his nomination is in the District of Columbia, and not the State of Washington.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs which handles these nominations. I yield to him.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I am positive that the name referred to would not be on the calendar if the person came from the State of Washington, unless the Senator from Washington had first approved the nomination. We have an understanding that no appointment will come from that committee to the Senate for confirmation unless the appointment has been approved by the Senator in whose State the appointment is to be made. Some Senators have declined to show any interest in such nominations if they have no voice in the appointments. We have an understanding in the committee that no nomination will be reported to the Senate unless the Senator in whose State the appointment is to be made approves the nomination. I will not guarantee it, but I am reasonably certain that if the name had been from the State of the Senator from Washington it would not be on the calendar without his approval.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, let me say to my good friend from Kentucky that appointment after appointment has been made of men in my State to positions calling upon the appointees to lay down rules of human conduct and establish policies. I have never before heard of some of these men. So far as it lies in my power I will not stand for this practice any longer. I think it is time for Senators who are interested—and most of them are—to put an end to this kind of business. I am tired of being blamed for the acts of men over whose conduct I have no control. If I am to accept any fragment of responsibility for their existence in those jobs, I want to know who they are before they are appointed. I think it is time for Senators to determine in their own minds to follow that course.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the War Manpower Commission be confirmed en bloc, with the exception of the nomination of Guy Doane McKinney to

be principal information specialist in the Washington regional office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed with the exception stated.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the Public Health Service nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc. That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be forthwith notified.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 2, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate June 1 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

THE COAST GUARD

Capt. Charles A. Park to be a rear admiral, for temporary service, in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of May 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 1 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEON IN THE REGULAR CORPS, EFFECTIVE FROM JUNE 1, 1943

William E. Graham

TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEON IN THE REGULAR CORPS EFFECTIVE FROM JUNE 1, 1943

Daniel J. Daley
Eugene W. Green
Jack L. James
Edgar B. Johnwick
Leo D. O'Kane

TO BE TEMPORARY SANITARY ENGINEER IN THE REGULAR CORPS, EFFECTIVE FROM JUNE 1, 1943

Walter N. Dashiell

TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEON IN THE REGULAR CORPS, EFFECTIVE FROM JUNE 1, 1943

Oswald F. Hedley
Thomas H. Tomlinson, Jr.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

APPOINTMENTS

William F. Gow, of Alabama, to be field supervisor, at $5,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office.

James W. Reinhardt, of Ohio, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Canton area office.

John M. Baker, of Ohio, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Cincinnati area office.

Clinton A. Johnson, of Nebraska, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum in the Lincoln area office.

Will S. Denham, of Missouri, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Kansas City area office.

Alfred Mack, of Massachusetts, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the Boston regional office.

Francis Xavier Powers, of Massachusetts, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Worcester area office.

Harold Field Kellogg, of Massachusetts, to be housing and transportation specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Boston regional office.

Arthur M. Cochran, of Massachusetts, to be senior training supervisor, at $4,600 per annum, in the Boston area office.

George Melvin Dunlap, Jr., of Kansas, to be assistant regional chief of labor utilization, at $4,600 per annum, in the Kansas City regional office.

Gerald L. Arnett, of Illinois, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Moline area office.

George D. Haskell, of Iowa, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the Des Moines area office.

Harold Ladd Pierce, of California, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the Los Angeles area office.

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

German L. Warren, Waycross.

PENNSYLVANIA

LeRoy A. Starr, Adamsdale.
Claude H. Strickland, Hop Bottom.
Alfred R. Warner, Waynesboro.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 1, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we rejoice that divine love which blooms fadelessly in Gethsemane, shines in the crown of thorns. In the presence of Calvary, we pray that selfishness and strife may die and that we shall neither guess nor fear, nor be found unworthy to stand and serve our country. Storms bursting on the battle lines, whatever they may engulf, they cannot swallow the might of the human spirit—praises be unto Thy holy name.

Blessed Lord and Master, Thou hast vehemently affirmed the glory of self-sacrifice and rebuked selfishness, teaching us hopefully to identify ourselves with a sinning, suffering world; no heart is pure that is not passionate and no virtue is safe in indifference. In the name of Him by whose stripes we are healed, we beseech Thee that this indulgent generation may know of the grace of our Lord, who, though He was rich for our sakes He became poor and gave us the sublime manifestation of humble service. As a great Nation, we have not been made for the ends of wealth, luxury, and pleasure, but to help Lazarus at the gates of all peoples. O summon us to trial and endurance for the sake of those who are in the mad delirium of famine, persecution, inquisition, murder, and death. Lord God of hosts, lead us on in the power of magnitude, energy, and in the splendour of a mighty Union, and thus we shall fulfill our high destiny. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 28, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution authorizing that the address delivered before the joint meeting of the Members of the two Houses of Congress by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Right Honorable Winston Churchill, be printed as a House document.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1670. An act to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2714. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1784) entitled "An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 1463) entitled "An act for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 235) entitled "An act for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference

asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF BILLS ON PRIVATE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar for today be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM of Virginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

CURRENT TAX PAYMENT ACT OF 1943

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That (a) this Act may be cited as the 'Current Tax Payment Act of 1943.'

"(b) Meaning of terms used: Except as otherwise expressly provided, terms used in this Act shall have the same meaning as when used in the Internal Revenue Code.

"SEC. 2. Collection of tax at source on wages.

"(a) In general: Chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to employment taxes) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subchapters:

"'SUBCHAPTER D—COLLECTION OF INCOME TAX AT SOURCE ON WAGES

"'SEC. 1621. Definitions.

"'As used in this subchapter—

"'(a) Wages: The term "wages" means all remuneration (other than fees paid to a public official) for services performed by an employee for his employer, including the cash value of all remuneration paid in any medium other than cash; except that such term shall not include remuneration paid—

"'(1) for services performed as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, other than pensions and retired pay includible in gross income under chapter 1, or

"'(2) for agricultural labor (as defined in section 1426 (h)), or

"'(3) for domestic service in a private home, local college club, or local chapter of a college fraternity or sorority, or

"'(4) for casual labor not in the course of the employer's trade or business, or

"'(5) for services by a citizen or resident of the United States for a foreign government or for the government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, or

"'(6) for services performed by a nonresident alien individual, other than a resident of a contiguous country who enters and leaves the United States at frequent intervals, or

"'(7) for such services, performed by a nonresident alien individual who is a resident of a contiguous country and who enters and leaves the United States at frequent intervals, as may be designated by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, or

"'(8) for services for an employer performed by a citizen or resident of the United States while outside the United States (as defined in section 3797 (a) (9)) if the major part of the services for such employer during the calendar year is to be performed outside the United States, or

"'(9) for services performed as a minister of the gospel.

For the purpose of paragraph (8) services performed on or in connection with an American vessel (as defined in section 1426 (g)) under a contract of service which is entered into within the United States or during the performance of which the vessel touches at a port in the United States, or on or in connection with any vessel as an employee of the United States employed through the War Shipping Administration, shall not constitute services performed outside the United States.

"'(b) Payroll period: The term "payroll period" means a period for which a payment of wages is ordinarily made to the employee by his employer, and the term "miscellaneous payroll period" means a payroll period other than a daily, weekly, biweekly, semimonthly, monthly, quarterly, semiannual, or annual payroll period.

"'(c) Employee: The term "employee" includes an officer, employee, or elected official of the United States, a State, Territory, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing. The term "employee" also includes an officer of a corporation.

"'(d) Employer: The term "employer" means the person for whom an individual performs or performed any service, of whatever nature, as the employee of such person, except that—

"'(1) if the person for whom the individual performs or performed the services does not have control of the payment of the wages for such services, the term "employer" (except for the purposes of subsection (a)) means the person having control of the payment of such wages; and

"'(2) in the case of a person paying wages on behalf of a nonresident alien individual, foreign partnership, or foreign corporation, not engaged in trade or business within the United States, the term "employer" (except for the purposes of subsection (a)) means such person.

"'(e) Single person: The term "single person" means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that such person is single, or is married and not living with husband or wife, and is not the head of a family.

"'(f) Married person: The term "married person" means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that he is married and living with husband or wife.

"'(g) Married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding: The term "married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding" means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that for the purposes of this subchapter such person claims all of the personal exemption and that for the purposes of this subchapter his spouse is claiming none of the personal exemption.

"'(h) Married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding: The term "married person claiming half of the personal exemption for withholding" means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that for the purposes of this subchapter such person claims half of the personal exemption and that for the purposes of this subchapter his spouse is claiming not more than half of such exemption.

"'((i) Married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding: The term "married person claiming none of the personal exemption for withholding" means a married person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) making no claim with respect to the personal exemption for the purposes of this subchapter.

"'(j) Head of family: The term "head of a family" means a person with respect to whom a withholding exemption certificate is in effect under section 1622 (h) stating that he is the head of a family.

"'(k) Dependent: The term "dependent" means a person included in a withholding exemption certificate in effect under section 1622 (h) as a person dependent upon and receiving his chief support from the employee and either under eighteen years of age or incapable of self-support because mentally or physically defective.

"'SEC. 1622. Income Tax Collected at Source.

"'(a) Requirement of withholding. Every employer making payment of wages shall deduct and withhold upon such wages a tax equal to the greater of the following:

"'(1) 20 per centum of the excess of each payment of such wages over the family status withholding exemption allowable under subsection (b) (1) (A), or

"'(2) 3 per centum of the excess of each payment of such wages over the Victory tax withholding exemption allowable under subsection (b) (1) (B).

"'(b) Withholding exemption.

"'(1) In computing the tax required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a), there shall be allowed as a withholding exemp-

tion with respect to the wages paid for each payroll period—

"'(A) in computing the tax required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a) (1), a family status withholding exemption determined in accordance with the following schedule:

"Family status withholding exemption

"Payroll period	Single person	Married person claiming whole of personal exemption for withholding or head of family	Married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding	Married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding	Each dependent, other than the first dependent in the case of the head of a family
Weekly	$12	$24	$12	0	$6
Biweekly	24	48	24	0	12
Semimonthly	26	52	26	0	13
Monthly	52	104	52	0	26
Quarterly	156	312	156	0	78
Semiannual	312	624	312	0	156
Annual	624	1,248	624	0	312
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.70	3.40	1.70	0	.85

"'(B) in computing the tax required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a) (2), a Victory tax withholding exemption determined in accordance with the following schedule:

"'Payroll period	*Victory tax withholding exemption*
Weekly	$12.00
Biweekly	24.00
Semimonthly	26.00
Monthly	52.00
Quarterly	156.00
Semiannual	312.00
Annual	624.00
Daily or Miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.70

"'(2) If wages are paid with respect to a period which is not a payroll period, the withholding exemption allowable with respect to each payment of such wages shall be the exemption allowed for a miscellaneous payroll period containing a number of days (including Sundays and holidays) equal to the number of days in the period with respect to which such wages are paid.

"'(3) In any case in which wages are paid by an employer without regard to any payroll period or other period, the withholding exemption allowable with respect to each payment of such wages shall be the exemption allowed for a miscellaneous payroll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days (including Sundays and holidays) which have elapsed since the date of the last payment of such wages by such employer during the calendar year, or the date of commencement of employment with such employer during such year, or January 1 of such year, whichever is the later.

"'(4) In any case in which the period, or the time described in paragraph (3), in respect of any wages is less than one week, the Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, may authorize an employer, in computing the tax required to be deducted and withheld, to use the excess of the aggregate of the wages paid to the employee during the calendar week over the withholding exemption allowed by this subsection for a weekly payroll period.

"'(5) In determining the amount to be deducted and withheld under this subsection, the wages may, at the election of the employer, be computed to the nearest dollar.

"'(c) Wage Bracket Withholding:

"'(1) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employer shall deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee a tax determined in accordance with the following tables, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a).

If the payroll period with respect to an employee is weekly

And the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
		Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents		
		Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents		
		Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents				
		Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—									
		No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents				
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$10	$1.00									
10	15	2.50	$1.30	$0.10							
15	20	3.50	2.30	1.10	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20	$0.20
20	25	4.50	3.30	2.10	.90	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30	.30
25	30	5.50	4.30	3.10	1.90	.70	.50	.50	.50	.50	.50
30	40	7.00	5.80	4.60	3.40	2.20	1.00	.70	.70	.70	.70
40	50	9.00	7.80	6.60	5.40	4.20	3.00	1.80	1.00	1.00	1.00
50	60	11.00	9.80	8.60	7.40	6.20	5.00	3.80	2.60	1.40	1.30
60	70	13.00	11.80	10.60	9.40	8.20	7.00	5.80	4.60	3.40	2.20
70	80	15.00	13.80	12.60	11.40	10.20	9.00	7.80	6.60	5.40	4.20
80	90	17.00	15.80	14.60	13.40	12.20	11.00	9.80	8.60	7.40	6.20
90	100	19.00	17.80	16.60	15.40	14.20	13.00	11.80	10.60	9.40	8.20
100	110	21.00	19.80	18.60	17.40	16.20	15.00	13.80	12.60	11.40	10.20
110	120	23.00	21.80	20.60	19.40	18.20	17.00	15.80	14.60	13.40	12.20
120	130	25.00	23.80	22.60	21.40	20.20	19.00	17.80	16.60	15.40	14.20
130	140	27.00	25.80	24.60	23.40	22.20	21.00	19.80	18.60	17.40	16.20
140	150	29.00	27.80	26.60	25.40	24.20	23.00	21.80	20.60	19.40	18.20
150	160	31.00	29.80	28.60	27.40	26.20	25.00	23.80	22.60	21.40	20.20
160	170	33.00	31.80	30.60	29.40	28.20	27.00	25.80	24.60	23.40	22.20
170	180	35.00	33.80	32.60	31.40	30.20	29.00	27.80	26.60	25.40	24.20
180	190	37.00	35.80	34.60	33.40	32.20	31.00	29.80	28.60	27.40	26.20
190	200	39.00	37.80	36.60	35.40	34.20	33.00	31.80	30.60	29.40	28.20
$200 or over		20% of the excess over $200 plus									
		$40.00	$38.80	$37.60	$36.40	$35.20	$34.00	$32.80	$31.60	$30.40	$29.20

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $1.20 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall (or if the wages paid are $200 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $12, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

If the payroll period with respect to an employee is biweekly

And the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
				Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
				Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
						Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—					
						No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
						Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—					
						No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
At least	But less than	The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$20	$2.00									
20	30	5.00	$2.60	$0.20							
30	40	7.00	4.60	2.20	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	9.00	6.60	4.20	1.80	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	11.00	8.60	6.20	3.80	1.40	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	14.00	11.60	9.20	6.80	4.40	2.00	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40
80	100	18.00	15.60	13.20	10.80	8.40	6.00	3.60	2.00	2.00	2.00
100	120	22.00	19.60	17.20	14.80	12.40	10.00	7.60	5.20	2.80	2.60
120	140	26.00	23.60	21.20	18.80	16.40	14.00	11.60	9.20	6.80	4.40
140	160	30.00	27.60	25.20	22.80	20.40	18.00	15.60	13.20	10.80	8.40
160	180	34.00	31.60	29.20	26.80	24.40	22.00	19.60	17.20	14.80	12.40
180	200	38.00	35.60	33.20	30.80	28.40	26.00	23.60	21.20	18.80	16.40
200	220	42.00	39.60	37.20	34.80	32.40	30.00	27.60	25.20	22.80	20.40
220	240	46.00	43.60	41.20	38.80	36.40	34.00	31.60	29.20	26.80	24.40
240	260	50.00	47.60	45.20	42.80	40.40	38.00	35.60	33.20	30.80	28.40
260	280	54.00	51.60	49.20	46.80	44.40	42.00	39.60	37.20	34.80	32.40
280	300	58.00	55.60	53.20	50.80	48.40	46.00	43.60	41.20	38.80	36.40
300	320	62.00	59.60	57.20	54.80	52.40	50.00	47.60	45.20	42.80	40.40
320	340	66.00	63.60	61.20	58.80	56.40	54.00	51.60	49.20	46.80	44.40
340	360	70.00	67.60	65.20	62.80	60.40	58.00	55.60	53.20	50.80	48.40
360	380	74.00	71.60	69.20	66.80	64.40	62.00	59.60	57.20	54.80	52.40
380	400	78.00	75.60	73.20	70.80	68.40	66.00	63.60	61.20	58.80	56.40
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus									
		$80.00	$77.60	$75.20	$72.80	$70.40	$68.00	$65.60	$63.20	$60.80	$58.40

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $2.40 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $24, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

If the payroll period with respect to an employee is semimonthly

And the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
				Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
				Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—							
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
At least	But less than					Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of persona exemption for withholding and has—					
						No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
						Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—					
						No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$20	$2.60	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
20	30	5.00	$2.40	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
30	40	7.00	4.40	$1.80	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30	$0.30
40	50	9.00	6.40	3.80	1.20	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60	.60
50	60	11.00	8.40	5.80	3.20	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90	.90
60	80	14.00	11.40	8.80	6.20	3.60	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
80	100	18.00	15.40	12.80	10.20	7.60	5.00	2.40	1.90	1.90	1.90
100	120	22.00	19.40	16.80	14.20	11.60	9.00	6.40	3.80	2.50	2.50
120	140	26.00	23.40	20.80	18.20	15.60	13.00	10.40	7.80	5.20	3.10
140	160	30.00	27.40	24.80	22.20	19.60	17.00	14.40	11.80	9.20	6.60
160	180	34.00	31.40	28.80	26.20	23.60	21.00	18.40	15.80	13.20	10.60
180	200	38.00	35.40	32.80	30.20	27.60	25.00	22.40	19.80	17.20	14.60
200	220	42.00	39.40	36.80	34.20	31.60	29.00	26.40	23.80	21.20	18.60
220	240	46.00	43.40	40.80	38.20	35.60	33.00	30.40	27.80	25.20	22.60
240	260	50.00	47.40	44.80	42.20	39.60	37.00	34.40	31.80	29.20	26.60
260	280	54.00	51.40	48.80	46.20	43.60	41.00	38.40	35.80	33.20	30.60
280	300	58.00	55.40	52.80	50.20	47.60	45.00	42.40	39.80	37.20	34.60
300	320	62.00	59.40	56.80	54.20	51.60	49.00	46.40	43.80	41.20	38.60
320	340	66.00	63.40	60.80	58.20	55.60	53.00	50.40	47.80	45.20	42.60
340	360	70.00	67.40	64.80	62.20	59.60	57.00	54.40	51.80	49.20	46.60
360	380	74.00	71.40	68.80	66.20	63.60	61.00	58.40	55.80	53.20	50.60
380	400	78.00	75.40	72.80	70.20	67.60	65.00	62.40	59.80	57.20	54.60
$400 or over		20% of the excess over $400 plus									
		$80.00	$77.40	$74.80	$72.20	$69.60	$67.00	$64.40	$61.80	$59.20	$56.60

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $2.60 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall (or if the wages paid are $400 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $26, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

If the payroll period with respect to an employee is monthly

And the wages are		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
		Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents		
		Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents		
		Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
At least	But less than	No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents				
		Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—									
		No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents				
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be—									
$0	$40	$4.00									
40	50	9.00	$3.80								
50	60	11.00	5.80	$0.60	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10	$0.10
60	70	13.00	7.80	2.60	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40	.40
70	80	15.00	9.80	4.60	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70	.70
80	100	18.00	12.80	7.60	2.40	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10
100	120	22.00	16.80	11.60	6.40	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
120	140	26.00	20.80	15.60	10.40	5.20	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30
140	160	30.00	24.80	19.60	14.40	9.20	4.00	2.90	2.90	2.90	2.90
160	200	36.00	30.80	25.60	20.40	15.20	10.00	4.80	3.80	3.80	3.80
200	240	44.00	38.80	33.60	28.40	23.20	18.00	12.80	7.60	5.00	5.00
240	280	52.00	46.80	41.60	36.40	31.20	26.00	20.80	15.60	10.40	6.20
280	320	60.00	54.80	49.60	44.40	39.20	34.00	28.80	23.60	18.40	13.20
320	360	68.00	62.80	57.60	52.40	47.20	42.00	36.80	31.60	26.40	21.20
360	400	76.00	70.80	65.60	60.40	55.20	50.00	44.80	39.60	34.40	29.20
400	440	84.00	78.80	73.60	68.40	63.20	58.00	52.80	47.60	42.40	37.20
440	480	92.00	86.80	81.60	76.40	71.20	66.00	60.80	55.60	50.40	45.20
480	520	100.00	94.80	89.60	84.40	79.20	74.00	68.80	63.60	58.40	53.20
520	560	108.00	102.80	97.60	92.40	87.20	82.00	76.80	71.60	66.40	61.20
560	600	116.00	110.80	105.60	100.40	95.20	90.00	84.80	79.60	74.40	69.20
600	640	124.00	118.80	113.60	108.40	103.20	98.00	92.80	87.60	82.40	77.20
640	680	132.00	126.80	121.60	116.40	111.20	106.00	100.80	95.60	90.40	85.20
680	720	140.00	134.80	129.60	124.40	119.20	114.00	108.80	103.60	98.40	93.20
720	760	148.00	142.80	137.60	132.40	127.20	122.00	116.80	111.60	106.40	101.20
760	800	156.00	150.80	145.60	140.40	135.20	130.00	124.80	119.60	114.40	109.20
$800 or over		20% of the excess over $800 plus									
		$160.00	$154.80	$149.60	$144.40	$139.20	$134.00	$128.80	$123.60	$118.40	$113.20

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $5.20 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages paid fall (or if the wages paid are $800 or over, of the excess of the wages) over $52, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.10, to the nearest multiple of $0.10.

If the payroll period with respect to an employee is a daily payroll period or a miscellaneous payroll period

And the wages divided by the number of days in such period are—		And, (1) such person is a married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
		No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents	Eight dependents	Nine dependents
		Or, (2) such person is a married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding and has—									
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
		Or, (3) such person is a single person and has—									
				No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents	Seven dependents
						Or, (4) such person is a married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding and has—					
						No dependents	One dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents
						Or, (5) such person is head of a family and has—					
At least	But less than					No dependents or one dependent	Two dependents	Three dependents	Four dependents	Five dependents	Six dependents
		The amount of tax to be withheld shall be the following amount multiplied by the number of days in such period									
$0	$1	$0.10									
1	2	.30	$0.15								
2	3	.50	.35	$0.15							
3	4	.70	.55	.35	$0.20	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05	$0.05
4	5	.90	.75	.55	.40	.20	.10	.10	.10	.10	.10
5	6	1.10	.95	.75	.60	.40	.25	.10	.10	.10	.10
6	7	1.30	1.15	.95	.80	.60	.45	.30	.15	.15	.15
7	8	1.50	1.35	1.15	1.00	.80	.65	.50	.30	.15	.15
8	9	1.70	1.55	1.35	1.20	1.00	.85	.70	.50	.35	.20
9	10	1.90	1.75	1.55	1.40	1.20	1.05	.90	.70	.55	.35
10	12	2.20	2.05	1.85	1.70	1.50	1.35	1.20	1.00	.85	.65
12	14	2.60	2.45	2.25	2.10	1.90	1.75	1.60	1.40	1.25	1.05
14	16	3.00	2.85	2.65	2.50	2.30	2.15	2.00	1.80	1.65	1.45
16	18	3.40	3.25	3.05	2.90	2.70	2.55	2.40	2.20	2.05	1.85
18	20	3.80	3.65	3.45	3.30	3.10	2.95	2.80	2.60	2.45	2.25
20	22	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.70	3.50	3.35	3.20	3.00	2.85	2.65
22	24	4.60	4.45	4.25	4.10	3.90	3.75	3.60	3.40	3.25	3.05
24	26	5.00	4.85	4.65	4.50	4.30	4.15	4.00	3.80	3.65	3.45
26	28	5.40	5.25	5.05	4.90	4.70	4.55	4.40	4.20	4.05	3.85
28	30	5.80	5.65	5.45	5.30	5.10	4.95	4.80	4.60	4.45	4.25
$30 or over		20% of the excess over $30 plus									
		$6.00	$5.85	$5.65	$5.50	$5.30	$5.15	$5.00	$4.80	$4.65	$4.45

If the number of dependents is in excess of the largest number of dependents shown, the amount of tax to be withheld shall be that applicable in the case of the largest number of dependents shown reduced by $0.15 for each dependent over the largest number shown, except that in no event shall the amount to be withheld be less than 3 per centum of the excess of the product of the median wage in the bracket in which the wages fall and the number of days in the period (or if the wages paid are $30 or over, of the excess of the wages) over the product of $1.70 and the number of days in the period, computed, in case such amount is not a multiple of $0.05, to the nearest multiple of $0.05.

"'(2) If wages are paid with respect to a period which is not a payroll period, the amount to be deducted and withheld shall be that applicable in the case of a miscellaneous payroll period containing a number of days (including Sundays and holidays) equal to the number of days in the period with respect to which such wages are paid.

"'(3) In any case in which wages are paid by an employer without regard to any payroll period or other period, the amount to be deducted and withheld shall be that applicable in the case of a miscellaneous payroll period containing a number of days equal to the number of days (including Sundays and holidays) which have elapsed since the date of the last payment of such wages by such employer during the calendar year, or the date of commencement of employment with such employer during such year, or January 1 of such year, whichever is the later.

"'(4) In any case in which the period, or the time described in paragraph (3), in respect of any wages is less than one week, the Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, may authorize an employer to determine the amount to be deducted and withheld under the tables applicable in the case of a weekly payroll period, in which case the aggregate of the wages paid to the employee during the calendar week shall be considered the weekly wages.

"'(5) If the wages exceed the highest wage bracket, in determining the amount to be deducted and withheld under this subsection, the wages may, at the election of the employer, be computed to the nearest dollar.

"'(d) Tax paid by recipient: If the employer, in violation of the provisions of this subchapter, fails to deduct and withhold the tax under this subchapter, and thereafter the tax against which such tax may be credited is paid, the tax so required to be deducted and withheld shall not be collected from the employer; but this subsection shall in no case relieve the employer from liability for any penalties or additions to the tax otherwise applicable in respect of such failure to deduct and withhold.

"'(e) Nondeductibility of tax in computing net income: The tax deducted and withheld under this subchapter shall not be allowed as a deduction either to the employer or to the recipient of the income in computing net income for the purpose of any tax on income imposed by Act of Congress.

"'(f) Refunds or credits:

"'(1) Employers. Where there has been an overpayment of tax under this subchapter, refund or credit shall be made to the employer only to the extent that the amount of such overpayment was not deducted and withheld under this subchapter by the employer.

"'(2) Employees. For refund or credit in cases of excessive withholding, see section 322 (a).

"'(g) Included and excluded wages: If the remuneration paid by an employer to an employee for services performed during one-half or more of any payroll period of not more than thirty-one consecutive days constitutes wages, all the remuneration paid by such employer to such employee for such period shall be deemed to be wages; but if the remuneration paid by an employer to an employee for services performed during more than one-half of any such payroll period does not constitute wages, then none of the remuneration paid by such employer to such employee for such period shall be deemed to be wages.

"'(h) Withholding Exemption Certificates. Every employee receiving wages shall furnish his employer a signed withholding exemption certificate relating to his status for the purpose of computing the withholding exemption, or if the employer exercises his election under section 1622 (c) (relating to wage bracket withholding), for the purpose of computing the amount to be deducted and withheld under such subsection. In case of a change of status, a new certificate shall be furnished not later than 10 days after such change occurs. The certificate shall be in such form and contain such information as the Commissioner may, with the approval of the Secretary, by regulations prescribe. Such certificate—

"'(1) If furnished after the date of commencement of employment with the employer by reason of a change of status, shall take effect with respect to the first payment of wages made on or after the first status determination date which occurs at least thirty days from the date on which such certificate is furnished to the employer, except that at the election of the employer such certificate may be made effective with respect to any previous payment of wages made on or after the date of the furnishing of such certificate. For the purposes of this paragraph the term "status determination date" means January 1 and July 1 of each year.

"'(2) If furnished otherwise than by reason of a change of status, shall take effect as of the beginning of the first payroll period ending, or the first payment of wages made without regard to a payroll period, on or after the date on which such certificate is furnished to the employer.

"A certificate which takes effect under this subsection shall continue in effect with respect to the employer until another such certificate furnished by the employee takes effect under this subsection. If no certificate is in effect under this subsection with respect to an employee, such employee shall be treated, for the purposes of the withholding exemption, or in case the employer exercises his election under section 1622 (c) (relating to wage bracket withholding), for the purpose of computing the amount to be deducted and withheld under such subsection, as a married person claiming none of the personal exemption for withholding and having no dependents.

"'(i) Overlapping pay periods, and so forth: If a payment of wages is made to an employee by an employer—

"'(1) with respect to a payroll period or other period, any part of which is included in a payroll period or other period with respect to which wages are also paid to such employee by such employer, or

"'(2) without regard to any payroll period or other period, but on or prior to the expiration of a payroll period or other period with respect to which wages are also paid to such employee by such employer, or

"'(3) with respect to a period beginning in one and ending in another calendar year, or

"'(4) through an agent, fiduciary, or other person who also has the control, receipt, custody, or disposal of, or pays, the wages payable by another employer to such employee,

the manner of withholding and the amount to be deducted and withheld under this subchapter shall be determined in accordance with regulation prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary under which the withholding exemption allowed to the employee in any calendar year shall approximate the withholding exemption allowable with respect to an annual pay-roll period.

"'(j) Withholding on basis of average wages: The Commissioner may, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, authorize employers (1) to estimate the wages which will be paid to any employee in any quarter of the calendar year, (2) to determine the amount to be deducted and withheld upon each payment of wages to such employee during such quarter as if the appropriate average of the wages so estimated constituted the actual wages paid, and (3) to deduct and withhold upon any payment of wages to such employee during such quarter such amount as may be necessary to adjust the amount actually deducted and withheld upon the wages of such employee during such quarter to the amount required to be deducted and withheld during such quarter without regard to this subsection.

"'SEC. 1623. Liability for tax.

"'The employer shall be liable for the payment of the tax required to be deducted and withheld under this subchapter, and shall not be liable to any person for the amount of any such payment.

"'SEC. 1624. Return and payment by governmental employer.

"'If the employer is the United States, or a State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing, the return of the amount deducted and withheld upon any wages may be made by any officer or employee of the United States, or of such State, Territory, or political subdivision, or of the District of Columbia, or of such agency or instrumentality, as the case may be, having control of the payment of such wages, or appropriately designated for that purpose.

"'SEC. 1625. Receipts.

"'(a) Requirement: Every employer required to deduct and withhold a tax in respect of the wages of an employee shall furnish to each such employee in respect of his employment during the calendar year, on or before January 31 of the succeeding year, or, if his employment is terminated before the close of such calendar year, on the day on which the last payment of wages is made, a written statement showing the wages paid by the employer to such employee during such calendar year, and the amount of the tax deducted and withheld under this subchapter in respect of such wages.

"'(b) Statements to constitute information returns: The statements required to be furnished by this section in respect of any wages shall be furnished at such other times, shall contain such other information, and shall be in such form as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe. A duplicate of such statement if made and filed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary shall constitute the return required to be made in respect of such wages under section 147.

"'(c) Extension of time: The Commissioner, under such regulations as he may prescribe with the approval of the Secretary, may grant to any employer a reasonable extension of time (not in excess of 30 days) with respect to the statements required to be furnished under this section.

"'SEC. 1626. Penalties.

"'(a) Penalties for fraudulent receipt or failure to furnish receipt: In lieu of any other penalty provided by law (except the penalty provided by subsection (b) of this section), any person required under the provisions of section 1625 to furnish a receipt in respect of tax withheld pursuant to this subchapter who willfully furnishes a false or fraudulent receipt, or who willfully fails to furnish a receipt in the manner, at the time, and showing the information required under section 1625, or regulations prescribed thereunder, shall for each such failure, upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

"'(b) Additional penalty: In addition to the penalty provided by subsection (a) of this section, any person required under the provisions of section 1625 to furnish a receipt in respect of tax withheld pursuant to this subchapter who willfully furnishes a false or fraudulent receipt, or who willfully fails to

furnish a receipt in the manner, at the time, and showing the information required under section 1625, or regulations prescribed thereunder, shall for each such failure be subject to a civil penalty of not more than $50.

"'(c) Failure of employer to file return or pay tax: In case of any failure to make and file return or pay the tax required by this subchapter, within the time prescribed by law or prescribed by the Commissioner in pursuance of law, unless it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect, the addition to the tax shall not be less than $10.

"'(d) Penalties in respect of withholding exemption certificates: Any individual required to supply information to his employer under section 1622 (h) who willfully supplies false or fraudulent information, or who willfully fails to supply information thereunder which would require an increase in the tax to be withheld under section 1622, shall, in lieu of any penalty otherwise provided, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

"'SEC. 1627. Other laws applicable.

"'All provisions of law, including penalties, applicable with respect to the tax imposed by section 1400 shall, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this subchapter, be applicable with respect to the tax under this subchapter.

"'SUBCHAPTER E—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"'SEC. 1630. Verification of returns, etc.

"'(a) Power of Commissioner to require: The Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, may require that any return, statement, or other document required to be filed under this chapter shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, and such declaration shall be in lieu of any oath otherwise required.

"'(b) Penalties: Every person who willfully makes and subscribes any return, statement, or other document, which contains or is verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, and which he does not believe to be true and correct as to every material matter, shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be subject to the penalties prescribed for perjury in section 125 of the Criminal Code.

"'SEC. 1631. Use of Government depositaries in connection with payment of Taxes.

"'The Secretary may authorize incorporated banks or trust companies which are depositaries or financial agents of the United States to receive any taxes under this chapter in such manner, at such times, and under such conditions as he may prescribe; and he shall prescribe the manner, times, and conditions under which the receipt of such taxes by such depositaries and financial agents is to be treated as payment of such taxes to the collectors.

"'SEC. 1632. Acts to be performed by agents.

"'In case a fiduciary, agent or other person has the control, receipt, custody, or disposal of, or pays the wages of an employee or group of employees, employed by one or more employers, the Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, is authorized to designate such fiduciary, agent or other person to perform such acts as are required of employers under this chapter and as the Commissioner may specify. Except as may be otherwise prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, all provisions of law (including penalties) applicable in respect of any employer shall be applicable to a fiduciary, agent or other person so designated but, except as so provided, the employer for whom such fiduciary, agent or other person acts shall remain subject to the provisions of law (including penalties) applicable in respect of employers.'

"(b) Technical Amendments.—

"(1) Amendment to Section 34.—Section 34 of the Internal Revenue Code (cross reference) is amended by striking out '453, 454, and 466 (e)' and inserting in lieu thereof '453 and 454'.

"(2) Amendment to Section 322: Section 322 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code (cross reference) is amended to read as follows:

"'(f) Tax Withheld at Source: For refund or credit in case of withholding agent, see section 143 (f). For refund or credit in case of employer required to deduct and withhold tax on wages, see section 1622 (f).'

"(c) Expiration Date for Withholding at Source on Wages Under Subchapter D of Chapter 1: Section 476 of the Internal Revenue Code (prescribing the expiration date for the taxes imposed by subchapter D) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 476. Expiration date.

"'The tax imposed by Part I of this subchapter shall not apply with respect to any taxable year commencing after the date of cessation of hostilities in the present war. The tax imposed by Part II of such subchapter shall not apply with respect to any wages paid after June 30, 1943, unless paid during the calendar year 1943 with respect to a payroll period beginning on or before such date.'

"(d) Effective Date: The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect July 1, 1943, and shall be applicable to all wages paid on or after such date, except that such amendments shall not be applicable to wages paid during the calendar year 1943 with respect to a payroll period beginning before such date.

"SEC. 3. Credit for tax withheld at source.

"Section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the credit for tax withheld on wages) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 35. Credit for tax withheld on wages.

"'The amount deducted and withheld as tax under Subchapter D of Chapter 9 during any calendar year upon the wages of any individual shall be allowed as a credit to the recipient of the income against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year beginning in such calendar year. If more than one taxable year begins in any such calendar year such amount shall be allowed as a credit against the tax for the last taxable year so beginning.'

"SEC. 4. Refunds.

"(a) Excessive withholding, etc.: Section 322 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to excessive withholding) is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) Excessive withholding: Where the amount of the tax withheld at the source under Part II of Subchapter D or Subchapter D of Chapter 9 exceeds the taxes imposed by this chapter against which the tax so withheld may be credited under section 35 or 466 (e), the amount of such excess shall be considered an overpayment.

"'(3) Credits against estimated tax: The Commissioner is authorized to prescribe, with the approval of the Secretary, regulations providing for the crediting against the estimated tax for any taxable year of the amount determined by the taxpayer or the Commissioner to be an overpayment of the tax for a preceding taxable year.'

"(b) Presumptions as to date of payment: Section 322 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to presumption as to date of payment) is amended to read as follows:

"'(e) Presumption as to date of payment: For the purposes of this section, any tax actually deducted and withheld at the source during any calendar year under Part II of Subchapter D or under Subchapter D of Chapter 9 shall, in respect of the recipient of the income, be deemed to have been paid by him not earlier than the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of his taxable year with respect to which such tax is allowable as a credit under section 35 or section 466 (e). For the purposes of this section, any amount paid as estimated tax for any taxable year shall be deemed to have been paid not earlier than the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of such taxable year.'

"(c) Delegation of authority to collectors to make refunds: Section 3770 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to authority to make refunds) is amended (1) by striking out '(4)' at the beginning of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof '(5)'; and (2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

"'(4) Delegation of authority to collectors to make refunds: The Commissioner is authorized to delegate, with the approval of the Secretary, to collectors any authority, duty, or function which the Commissioner is authorized or required to exercise or perform under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection, or under section 322 or 1027, where the amount involved (exclusive of interest, penalties, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) does not exceed $1,000.'

"(d) Overpayments: Section 3770 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to authority to make credits and refunds) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"'(c) Rule where no tax liability: An amount paid as tax shall not be considered not to constitute an overpayment solely by reason of the fact that there was no tax liability in respect of which such amount was paid.'

"(e) Cross-reference: The last subsection of section 3771 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to interest on overpayments) is amended to read as follows:

"'(f) Estimated tax and tax withheld at source: For date of payment in respect of estimated tax and of tax withheld at source on wages, see section 322 (e).'

"(f) Review of allowance of interest: Section 3790 of the Internal Revenue Code (prohibiting administrative review of Commissioner's decisions) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: 'In the absence of fraud or mistake in mathematical calculation, the allowance or nonallowance by the Commissioner, of interest on any credit or refund under the internal revenue laws shall not, except as provided in Chapter 5, be subject to review by any other administrative or accounting officer, employee, or agent of the United States.'

"SEC. 5. Current payment of tax not withheld at source.

"(a) In general: The Internal Revenue Code is amended by striking out sections 58, 59, and 60 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'SEC. 58. Declaration of estimated tax by individuals.

"'(a) Requirement of declaration: Every individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien with respect to whose wages, as defined in section 1621 (a), withholding under subchapter D of chapter 9, is not made applicable) shall, at the time during the taxable year prescribed in subsection (d), make a declaration of his estimated tax for the taxable year if—

"'(1) his gross income from wages (as defined in section 1621)

"'(A) in case such individual is single or married but not living with husband or wife: can reasonably be expected to exceed $2,700 for the taxable year; or did exceed $2,700 for the preceding taxable year; or

"'(B) in case such individual is married and living with husband or wife: can, when added to the gross income which can reasonably be expected to be received by such husband or wife from wages (as so defined),

reasonably be expected to exceed $3,500 for the taxable year; or did when added to the gross income of such husband or wife from wages (as so defined) for the preceding taxable year, exceed $3,500 for such preceding taxable year; or

"'(2) his gross income from sources other than wages (as defined in section 1621)

"'(A) in case such individual is single or married but not living with husband or wife: can reasonably be expected to exceed $100 for the taxable year and his gross income to be such as will require the making of a return for the taxable year under section 51; or did exceed $100 for the preceding taxable year and such individual either was required to make a return under section 51 or 455 for such preceding taxable year or would have been so required if he had been single during the whole of such preceding taxable year; or

"'(B) in case such individual is married and living with husband or wife: can, when added to the gross income which can reasonably be expected to be received by husband or wife from such sources, reasonably be expected to exceed $100 for the taxable year and the aggregate gross income of such husband and wife can reasonably be expected to be such as will require the making of a return under section 51 or 455; or did, when added to the gross income of such husband or wife from such sources for the preceding taxable year, exceed $100 for such preceding taxable year and such individual would have been required to make a return under section 51 or 455 for such preceding taxable year if he had been married and living with husband or wife during the whole of such preceding taxable year; or

"'(3) in case such taxable year is the taxable year beginning in 1943, such individual was required to make a return under section 51 for the taxable year beginning in 1942, and his gross income from wages (as defined in section 1621) for such taxable year is greater than the gross income which can reasonably be expected to be received from wages for the taxable year beginning in 1943.

"'(b) Contents of declaration: In the declaration required under subsection (a) the individual shall state—

"'(1) the amount which he estimates as the amount of tax under this chapter for the taxable year, without regard to any credits under sections 32, 35, and 466 (e);

"'(2) the amount which he estimates as the credits for the taxable year under sections 32, 35, and 466 (e); and

"'(3) the excess of the amount estimated under paragraph (1) over the amount estimated under paragraph (2), which excess for the purposes of this chapter shall be held and considered the estimated tax for the taxable year.

"The declaration shall also contain such other information for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this chapter as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe, and shall contain or be verified by a written statement that it is made under the penalties of perjury.

"'(c) Joint declaration by husband and wife: In the case of a husband and wife living together, a single declaration under this section may be made by them jointly, in which case the liability with respect to the estimated tax shall be joint and several. No joint declaration may be made if either the husband or wife is a nonresident alien. If a joint declaration is made but a joint return is not made for the taxable year, the estimated tax for such year may be treated as the estimated tax of either the husband or the wife, or may be divided between them.

"'(d) Time and place for filing: The declaration required under subsection (a) shall be filed on or before the fifteenth day of the third month of the taxable year, except that if the requirements of subsection (a) are first met after such date, the declaration shall be filed on or before the fifteenth day of the last month of the quarter of the taxable year in which such requirements are first met. An individual may make amendments or revisions of a declaration filed under this subsection, under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. If so made, such amendments or revisions shall be filed on or before the fifteenth day of the last month of any quarter of the taxable year subsequent to that in which the declaration was filed and in which no previous amendments or revisions have been made or filed. Declarations and amendments and revisions thereof shall be filed with the Collector specified in section 53 (b) (1).

"'(e) Extension of time: The Commissioner may grant a reasonable extension of time for filing declarations and paying the estimated tax, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe with the approval of the Secretary. Except in the case of taxpayers who are abroad, no such extension shall be for more than six months.

"'(f) Persons under disability: If the taxpayer is unable to make his own declaration, the declaration shall be made by a duly authorized agent or by the guardian or other person charged with the care of the person or property of such a taxpayer.

"'(g) Signature presumed correct: The fact that an individual's name is signed to a filed declaration shall be prima facie evidence for all purposes that the declaration was actually signed by him.

"'(h) Publicity of declaration: For the purposes of section 55 (relating to publicity of returns), a declaration of estimated tax shall be held and considered a return under this chapter.

"'SEC. 59. Payment of estimated tax.

"'(a) In general: The estimated tax shall be paid in four equal installments except that—

"'(1) if the declaration is filed (otherwise than pursuant to an extension of time) after the fifteenth day of the third month of the taxable year, the estimated tax shall be paid in equal installments the number of which is equal to the number of quarters remaining in the taxable year (including the quarter in which the declaration is filed); and

"'(2) if any amendment or revision of a declaration is filed, the remaining installments shall be ratably increased or decreased, as the case may be, to reflect the increase or decrease, as the case may be, in the estimated tax by reason of such amendment or revision; and

"'(3) at the election of the individual, any installment of the estimated tax may be paid prior to the date prescribed for its payment. One installment of the estimated tax shall be paid at the time of making the declaration, and an installment thereof shall be paid on the fifteenth day of the last month of each succeeding quarter of the taxable year. Payment of any installment of the estimated tax shall be considered payment on account of the tax for the taxable year.

"'(b) Assessment: The estimated tax shall be assessed only to the extent paid.

"'SEC. 60. Special rules for application of sections 58 and 59.

"'(a) Farmers: In the case of an individual whose estimated gross income from farming for the taxable year is at least 80 per centum of the total estimated gross income from all sources for the taxable year, in lieu of the time prescribed in section 58 (d), the declaration for the taxable year may be made at any time on or before the fifteenth day of the last month of the taxable year.

"'(b) Application to short taxable years: The application of sections 58, 59, and 294 (a) (3), (4), and (5) to taxable years of less than twleve months shall be as prescribed in regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"'(c) Application to taxable years beginning in 1943: If the taxable year is the calendar year 1943, the fifteenth day of September 1943, shall be substituted for the fifteenth day of March for the purposes of section 58 (d). If the taxable year begins in 1943 after January 1, the date which shall be substituted for the fifteenth day of the third month of the taxable year for the purposes of section 58 (d) shall be prescribed by regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. In either case installments of the estimated tax for such taxable year payable after September 1, 1943, shall be ratably decreased to reflect the payments on account of a taxable year beginning in 1942 which are treated as payments on account of the estimated tax for a taxable year beginning in 1943.'

"(b) Additions to tax: Section 294 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to additions to tax in case of nonpayment) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"'(3) Failure to file declaration of estimated tax: In the case of a failure to make and file a declaration of estimated tax within the time prescribed, there shall be added to the tax an amount equal to 10 per centum of the tax.

"'(4) Failure to pay installment of estimated tax: In the case of the failure to pay an installment of the estimated tax within the time prescribed, there shall be added to the tax $2.50 or 2½ per centum of the tax, whichever is the greater, for each installment with respect to which such failure occurs.

"'(5) Substantial underestimate of estimated tax: If 80 per centum of the tax (determined without regard to the credits under sections 32, 35, and 466 (e)), in the case of individuals other than farmers exercising an election under section 60 (a), or 66⅔ per centum of such tax so determined in the case of such farmers, exceeds the estimated tax (increased by such credits), there shall be added to the tax an amount equal to such excess, or equal to 6 per centum of the amount by which such tax so determined exceeds the estimated tax so increased, whichever is the lesser. This paragraph shall not apply to the taxable year in which falls the death of the taxpayer.'

"(c) Penalties: Section 145 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to criminal penalties) is amended (1) by inserting after 'return' wherever appearing therein the words 'or declaration', and (2) by inserting before 'tax' wherever appearing therein the words 'estimated tax or'.

"(d) Payment by installments: Section 56 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to installment payments) is amended by striking out 'The' at the beginning thereof and inserting in lieu thereof 'Except in the case of an individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien with respect to whose wages, as defined in section 1621 (a), withholding under Subchapter D of Chapter 9 is not made applicable), the'.

"(e) Date for making return by certain nonresident aliens.

"(1) Section 217 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to returns by nonresident aliens) is amended by inserting after 'In the case of a nonresident alien individual' the following: 'with respect to whose wages, as defined in section 1621 (a), withholding under Subchapter D of Chapter 9 is not made applicable,'.

"(2) Section 218 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to payment of tax by nonresident aliens) is amended by inserting after 'In the case of a nonresident alien individual' the following: 'with respect to whose

wages, as defined in section 1621 (a), withholding under Subchapter D of Chapter 9 is not made applicable,'.

"(f) Taxable years to which applicable: The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942, except that section 294 (a) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code shall not be applicable to a taxable year beginning in 1943 in the case of an individual not required to make a declaration under section 58 of the Internal Revenue Code for such year.

"SEC. 6. Relief from double payments in 1943.

"(a) Tax for 1942 not greater than tax for 1943: In case the tax imposed by Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code upon any individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien not subject to the provisions of sections 58, 59, and 60 of such chapter) for the taxable year 1942 (determined without regard to this section, without regard to interest or additions to the tax, and without regard to credits against the tax for amounts withheld at source) is not greater than the tax for the taxable year 1943 (similarly determined), the liability of such individual for the tax imposed by such chapter for the taxable year 1942 shall be discharged as of September 1, 1943, except that interest and additions to such tax shall be collected at the same time and in the same manner as, and as a part of, the tax under such chapter for the taxable year 1943. In such case if the tax for the taxable year 1942 (determined without regard to this section and without regard to interest or additions to the tax) is more than $50, the tax under such chapter for the taxable year 1943 shall be increased by an amount equal to 25 per centum of the tax for the taxable year 1942 (so determined) or the excess of such tax (so determined) over $50, whichever is the lesser. This subsection shall not apply in any case in which the taxpayer is convicted of any criminal offense with respect to the tax for the taxable year 1942 or in which additions to the tax for such taxable year are applicable by reason of fraud."

"(b) Tax for 1942 greater than tax for 1943: In case the tax imposed by Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code upon any individual (other than an estate or trust and other than a nonresident alien not subject to the provisions of sections 58, 59, and 60 of such chapter) for the taxable year 1942 (determined without regard to this section, without regard to interest or additions to the tax, and without regard to credits against the tax for amounts withheld at source) is greater than the tax for the taxable year 1943 (similarly determined), the liability of such individual for the tax imposed by such chapter for the taxable year 1942 shall be discharged as of September 1, 1943, except that interest and additions to such tax shall be collected at the same time and in the same manner as, and as a part of, the tax under such chapter for the taxable year 1943. In such case the tax under such chapter for the taxable year 1943 shall be increased by—

"(1) the amount by which the tax imposed by such chapter for the taxable year 1942 (determined without regard to this section and without regard to interest and additions to such tax) exceeds the tax imposed by such chapter for the taxable year 1943 (determined without regard to this section, without regard to interest and additions to such tax, and without regard to credits against such tax under section 466 (e) or under section 35 of such chapter), plus

"(2) if the tax for the taxable year 1943 (determined without regard to this section, without regard to interest or additions to the tax, and without regard to credits against such tax under section 466 (e) or under section 35 of such chapter) is more than $50, an amount equal to 25 per centum of the tax for the taxable year 1943 (so determined) or the excess of such tax (so determined) over $50, whichever is the lesser. Such amount shall in no case exceed 25 per centum of the tax for the taxable year 1942 (determined without regard to this section and without regard to interest and additions to such tax) or the excess of such tax (so determined) over $50, whichever is the lesser.

"This subsection shall not apply in any case in which the taxpayer is convicted of any criminal offense with respect to the tax for the taxable year 1942 or in which additions to the tax for such taxable year are applicable by reason of fraud. An individual who becomes subject to tax for the taxable year 1943 under this subsection shall be an individual required to make a return for the taxable year 1943 under section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(c) Additional increase in 1943 tax where increased income:

"(1) Tax for 1942 not greater than that for 1943: In the case of a taxpayer whose liability for the tax for the taxable year 1942 is discharged under subsection (a), and whose surtax net income for the base year plus $20,000 is less than that for the taxable year 1942, the tax imposed by Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code for the taxable year 1943 shall be increased by the excess of 75 per centum of the tax imposed by such chapter for the taxable year 1942 (determined without regard to this section and without regard to interest and additions to the tax) over a tentative tax computed as if the portion of the surtax net income for the taxable year 1942 which is not greater than the sum of the surtax net income for the base year plus $20,000 constituted both the surtax net income for the taxable year 1942, and the net income for such taxable year after allowance of all credits against net income:

"(2) Tax for 1942 greater than that for 1943: In the case of a taxpayer whose liability for the tax for the taxable year 1942 is discharged under subsection (b) and whose surtax net income for the base year plus $20,000 is less than that for the taxable year 1943, the tax imposed by Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code for the taxable year 1943 shall be increased by the excess of 75 per centum of the tax imposed by such chapter for the taxable year 1943 (determined without regard to this section and without regard to interest and additions to the tax) over a tentative tax for the taxable year 1943 computed as if the portion of the surtax net income for such taxable year which is not greater than the sum of the surtax net income for the base year plus $20,000 constituted both the surtax net income for the taxable year 1943, and the net income for such taxable year after allowance of all credits against net income.

"For the purposes of this subsection 'base year' means any one of the taxable years 1937, 1938, 1939, or 1940, to be selected by the taxpayer.

"(d) Rules for application of subsections (a), (b), and (c).—

"(1) Application of subsection (b) to members of armed forces: If the taxpayer is in active service in the military or naval forces of the United States or any of the other United Nations at any time during the taxable year 1942 or 1943, the increase in the tax for the taxable year 1943 under subsection (b) (1) shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount by which the tax for the taxable year 1942 (determined without regard to this section) is increased by reason of the inclusion in the net income for the taxable year 1942 of the amount of the earned net income (as defined in section 25 (a) (4)).

"(2) Joint returns: If the taxpayer either for the taxable year 1942 or for the taxable year 1943 makes a joint return with his spouse, the taxes of the spouses for the taxable year for which a joint return is not made shall be aggregated for the purposes of subsections (a), (b), and (c), and in case the taxable year for which a joint return is not made is the taxable year 1943, the liability for the increase in the tax for the taxable year 1943 under subsections (b) and (c) shall be joint and several.

"(3) Foreign tax credit and applications of sections 105, 106, and 107: The credit against the tax imposed by Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code for the taxable year 1943 allowed by section 31 of such chapter (relating to taxes of foreign countries and of possessions of the United States), shall be determined without regard to subsections (a), (b), and (c). Sections 105, 106, and 107 of such chapter (relating to limitations on tax) shall be applied without regard to subsections (a), (b), and (c).

"(4) Section 107 income attributed to base year: That portion of the compensation which is received or accrued in the taxable year 1942 (if the tax for such year is not greater than that for the taxable year 1943), or in the taxable year 1943 (if the tax for such year is less than that for the taxable year 1942), and which under section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code is attributed to the base year, shall for the purposes of subsection (c) be excluded in computing the surtax net income for the taxable year 1942 or 1943, as the case may be, and be included in computing the surtax net income for the base year.

"(5) Partnership business formerly operated as corporation: If, during the base year of any individual, such individual was a shareholder in a corporation and if substantially all of the assets of such corporation were at any time prior to May 1, 1943, acquired by such individual or a partnership of which he is a partner pursuant to the complete liquidation of such corporation, and if at all times after such liquidation up to and including the taxable year 1942 (if subsection (a) is applicable) or the taxable year 1943 (if subsection (b) is applicable) the trade or business of such corporation was carried on by such individual or partnership, for the purposes of subsection (c) such individual may compute his surtax net income for the base year as if the earnings and profits of the corporation for the taxable year ending with or within the base year had all been distributed as dividends at the end of such taxable year. If the interest of such individual in the partnership is proportionately less than his interest in the corporation, his distributive share of such dividends shall for the purposes of this paragraph be adjusted to reflect such difference.

"(6) Certain portions of increase in 1943 tax not part of estimated tax: The amount by which the tax for the taxable year 1943 is increased under subsection (a), (b) (2), or (c) shall not be considered to be a part of the tax for such taxable year for the purposes of sections 58, 59, 60, and 294 (a) (3), (4) and (5) of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(7) Taxpayer dying in taxable year 1942: If the individual dies during the taxable year 1942, subsections (a) (b), and (c) shall not apply.

"(e) Extension of time for payment of portions of increase in 1943 tax:

"(1) Twenty-five per centum increase under subsection (a) or (b): At the election of the taxpayer, made under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, the Commissioner shall, except as hereinafter provided, extend the time for the payment of the portion of the tax for the taxable year 1943 equal to one-half of the amount of the 25 per centum increase therein under subsection (a) or (b) (2) for the taxable year 1943, in which case

such portion shall be paid on or before the fifteenth day of the fifteenth month following the close of the taxable year. The Commissioner may condition the extension upon the furnishing by the taxpayer of a bond in such amount, not exceeding the amount with respect to which the extension applies, with such surety or sureties, as the Commissioner deems necessary, conditioned upon the payment of such amount in accordance with the terms of the extension. If such amount is not paid on or before the date on which it is payable, it shall be paid upon notice and demand from the Collector. If such amount is not paid on or before the date on which it is payable, there shall be collected, as a part of the tax, interest on such amount at the rate of 6 per centum per annum for the period beginning with the date on which such amount is payable and ending with the date on which it is paid.

"(2) Increase under subsection (c): At the election of the taxpayer, made under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, the Commissioner shall, except as hereinafter provided, extend the time for the payment of the portion of the tax for the taxable year 1943 equal to the increase therein under subsection (c), in which case such portion shall be paid in four equal annual installments, the first of which shall be paid on the fifteenth day of the fifteenth month following the close of the taxable year, and of the remaining installments one of which shall be paid on the last day of each succeeding twelve-month period, except that any installment may be paid prior to the date prescribed for its payment. The Commissioner may condition the extension upon the furnishing by the taxpayer of a bond in such amount not exceeding the amount of such increase, with such surety or sureties, as the Commissioner deems necessary, conditioned upon the payment of such amount in accordance with the terms of the extension. If the time for the payment of such portion is extended, there shall be collected, as a part of the tax, interest on each installment at the rate of 4 per centum per annum for the period beginning with the date prescribed for the payment of the tax for such taxable year and ending with the date on which such installment is paid or the date on which it is payable, whichever is the earlier. If any installment is not paid on or before the date on which it is payable, it and the remaining installments shall be paid upon notice and demand from the Collector. If any installment is not paid on or before the date on which it is payable, there shall be collected, as part of the tax, interest on such installment at the rate of 6 per centum per annum for the period beginning with the date on which such installment is payable and ending with the date on which it is paid.

"(f) Treatment of payments on account of 1942 tax. Any payment (other than interest and additions to the tax) made on account of the tax imposed by Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code for the taxable year 1942 upon a taxpayer whose liability for such tax is discharged under subsection (a) or (b) shall be considered as payment on account of the estimated tax for the taxable year 1943. In the case of any extension of time for the payment of such tax granted by the Commissioner prior to September 1, 1943, payment of the portion thereof which if such extension had not been granted would have been payable under section 56 (b) prior to such date shall be made notwithstanding subsection (a) or (b), but the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall apply to any such payment. In case the taxpayer becomes delinquent, prior to September 1, 1943, in the payment of such tax or any installment thereof, subsection (a) or (b) shall not relieve the taxpayer of his liability for the tax, but the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall be applicable to payment of such liability. If any payment on account of the tax imposed by such chapter for the taxable year 1942 is made pursuant to a joint return made by husband and wife for such taxable year, and such payment is considered as a payment on account of the estimated tax for the taxable year 1943, such payment may be treated as a payment on account of the estimated tax of either the husband or the wife for such taxable year or may be divided between them.

"(g) Use of term "Taxable Year". For the purposes of this section the terms "taxable year 1937", "taxable year 1938", "taxable year 1939", "taxable year 1940", "taxable year 1942", and "taxable year 1943" mean, respectively, the taxable year beginning in 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1942, and 1943, respectively; and "taxable year" as applied to the taxable year 1942 or 1943 shall not include any period of less than twelve months unless occasioned by the death of the taxpayer or unless there is no taxable year of twelve months beginning in such calendar year.

"(h) Regulations. This section shall be applied in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"SEC. 7. Additional allowance for members of armed forces.

"(a) In general. Section 22 (b) (13) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to additional allowance for military and naval personnel in computing net income) is amended to read as follows:

"'(13) Additional allowance for military and naval personnel. In the case of compensation received during any taxable year and before the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, by a member of the military or naval forces of the United States for active service in such forces during such war, or by a citizen or resident of the United States who is a member of the military or naval forces of any of the other United Nations for active service in such forces during such war, so much of such compensation as does not exceed $1,500,'

"(b) Effective date. The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942.

"SEC. 8. Abatement of tax for members of armed forces upon death.

"Chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting after section 404 the following new supplement:

"'*Supplement U—Abatement of tax for members of armed forces upon death.*

"'SEC. 421. Abatement of tax for members of armed forces upon death.

"In the case of any individual who dies on or after December 7, 1941, while in active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or of any of the other United Nations and prior to the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, the tax imposed by this chapter shall not apply with respect to the taxable year in which falls the date of his death, and the tax under this chapter and under the corresponding title of each prior revenue law for preceding taxable years which is unpaid at the date of his death (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) shall not be assessed, and if assessed the assessment shall be abated, and if collected shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment."

"SEC. 9. Assistant commissioners.

"Subchapter B of Chapter 39 of the Internal Revenue Code as amended to read as follows:

"'SUBCHAPTER B—ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS

"'SEC. 3905. Appointment.

"'There shall be in the Bureau of Internal Revenue two Assistant Commissioners, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"'SEC. 3906. Duties.

"'The Assistant Commissioners shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Commissioner or required by law.'

"SEC. 10. Extension of time in connection with release of powers of appointment.

"Section 403 (d) (3) of the Revenue Act of 1942 is amended by striking out 'July 1, 1943' wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 1, 1944'; and section 452 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1942 is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Release before March 1, 1944:

"'(1) A release of a power to appoint before March 1, 1944, shall not be deemed a transfer of property by the individual possessing such power.

"'(2) This subsection shall apply to all calendar years prior to 1944 and to that part of the calendar year 1944 prior to March 1, 1944.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
DAVID I. WALSH,
BENNETT CHAMP CLARK,
HARRY F. BYRD,
A. H. VANDENBERG,
JAMES J. DAVIS,
JOHN A. DANAHER (with reservations),
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

COLLECTION OF INCOME TAX AT SOURCE ON WAGES

Description of House and Senate bills

Part II of subchapter D of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code provides for collection at the source of a tax of 5 percent on the excess of all wages paid on or after January 1, 1943, over a specific exemption of $624. The amount of tax collected at source under this provision is allowed as a credit against Victory tax and any excess thereof over the Victory tax imposed under part I of subchapter D is allowed as a credit against other income taxes imposed under chapter 1. Section 2 of the House bill would amend part II of subchapter D to provide for collection of a tax at source on wages paid on or after July 1, 1943, at a rate of 3 percent upon the excess of the wages paid over a specific exemption of $624 and a rate of 17 percent (which was designed to approximate the yield of the normal tax and the first-bracket surtax on such wages) upon the excess over a withholding exemption, the amount of which depended on the employee's family status. Thus, the combined rates approximated the net Victory tax, the normal tax, and the first-bracket surtax on such wages. In lieu of withholding at the flat percentage rates on the excess of the wages over the exemptions, employers were granted an option to withhold a tax determined under tables provided in the bill under which the two portions of the tax were combined into a single amount to be withheld from each wage payment.

The Senate bill adopts the basic system of collection at source as provided in the House bill but makes a number of technical

changes which are explained below. Under the bill as passed by the Senate, the methods of collection, payment, and administration of the withholding tax were coordinated generally with those applicable to the social security tax imposed on employees under section 1400 of the code. This proposal was made in order to facilitate the work of both the Government and the employer in administering the withholding system. Accordingly, section 2 of the Senate bill places the 20 percent withholding provisions in a new subchapter D of chapter 9 of the code. The new subchapter is entitled "Collection of Income Tax at Source on Wages." This amendment requires a change in the numbering of the various sections discussed below. This system of collection of income tax at source, like other income-tax laws, will apply in the Virgin Islands.

Definitions

Subchapter D under the bill as passed by the Senate consists of sections 1621 to 1627, inclusive. Section 1621 provides definitions of the more important terms used in subchapter D. The general definition of the term "wages" contained in section 1621 (a) is the same as that contained in the House bill and in section 465 (a) of the code. The term is generally defined to include all remuneration whether designated as salary, wages, fees, commissions, etc., and whether paid in cash or property, if paid for services performed by an employee for his employer. Certain of the exceptions provided in existing law with respect to remuneration paid for given types of services are continued in identical language. These exceptions, numbered to conform to the bill, include remuneration paid (2) for agricultural labor as defined in section 1426 (h); (3) for domestic service in a private home, local college club, or local chapter of a college fraternity or sorority; and (4) for casual labor not in the course of the employer's trade or business.

Exception (1) relates to remuneration paid for services performed as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, other than pensions and retired pay includible in gross income. The addition of the expression "includible in gross income under Chapter 1," is a clerical change required by a further clerical change in section 1622 (a) from the provisions of the corresponding section 466 (a) of the code.

The exception provided with respect to remuneration for services performed for a foreign government or instrumentality thereof was amended in the Senate bill (exception (5)) to make clear that the exception extends to remuneration paid to employees by the Commonwealth of the Philippines. The exception was also amended to make certain that the services must be performed for the particular government, or branch of such government.

The exception provided in existing law for services as an employee of a nonresident alien individual, foreign partnership, or foreign corporation, if such alien or foreign entity is not engaged in trade or business within the United States, was eliminated. In many cases, although not engaged in trade or business in the United States, such employers do have an office or place of business therein or agents by whom wages are paid to citizen or resident employees in the United States. The amendment requires the tax to be withheld in such cases.

Section 1621 (a) (6) provides an exception for remuneration paid for services performed by a nonresident alien individual other than a resident of a contiguous country who enters and leaves the United States at frequent intervals. This is the same clerical change as that made in the House bill from a similar exception relating to the requirement of withholding contained in section 466 (a) of the code. The effect of this exception is generally to exclude from withholding all nonresident alien individuals who are subject to withholding under the provisions of section 143 of the code. By express provision, the exception does not extend to residents of a contiguous country who enter and leave the United States at frequent intervals. Thus residents of Canada and Mexico falling in such category who are employed within and receive remuneration for services performed within the United States will be subject to withholding under the provisions of the bill. Such persons are subject to the tax imposed by sections 11, 12, and 450 of the code, the same as in the case of citizens of the United States, upon the wages received for services performed within the United States and are not presently subject to withholding with respect to compensation for personal services under section 143.

Many persons falling within the category of residents of a contiguous country who enter and leave the United States at frequent intervals are employed by American railroads and steamship companies in transportation service which involves crossing and recrossing the border at frequent intervals. These and similar cases have many complicating factors and are not susceptible of appropriate treatment by rigid statutory rules. In addition, the exception of this general category of nonresident aliens from withholding under section 143 with respect to compensation rests within the discretion of the Commissioner. Accordingly, exception (7) authorizes the Commissioner to provide exceptions from withholding for such individuals under regulations prescribed with the approval of the Secretary.

Exception (8), relating to services performed while outside the United States, is a clarification of existing law designed to facilitate the use of certain presumptions in determining whether the major part of the services for an employer during the calendar year is to be performed outside the United States.

Exception (9) is a new provision excepting from the definition of "wages" remuneration paid for services performed as a minister of the gospel.

Section 1621 (a), relating to the definition of "wages," makes clear that the exception provided in paragraph (8) thereof with respect to services performed outside the United States does not extend to wages paid for services performed on an American vessel or upon any vessel as an employee of the United States employed through the War Shipping Administration. Hence, withholding is required upon the wages paid to (1) employees performing services on or in connection with an American vessel (as defined in section 1426 (g) of the code) under a contract of service which is entered into within the United States or during the performance of which the vessel touches at a port in the United States and (2) employees serving on or in connection with any vessel as an employee of the United States employed through the War Shipping Administration. This is in accordance with present administrative practice under existing law.

The term "pay-roll period" is defined in section 1621 (b) and is identical with that contained in the House bill and in section 465 (a) of the code. The Senate bill, however, added a definition of the term "miscellaneous pay-roll period." This term embraces any period for which a payment of wages is ordinarily made to the employee by his employer other than a weekly, biweekly, semimonthly, monthly, quarterly, semiannual, or annual payroll period. Thus, if an employer's ordinary practice is to pay his employees for periods of 10 days, such 10-day periods are miscellaneous pay-roll periods.

Section 1621 (c) defines the term "employee" in the same terms as the House bill and section 465 (d) of the code.

Sections 465 (c) and (e) of the code contains definitions of the terms "withholding agent" and "employer," respectively. Under the House bill and under the bill as passed by the Senate, the definition of withholding agent has been eliminated. Both bills generally define the term "employer" to mean the person for whom an individual performs or performed any service, of whatever nature, as the employee of such person. This general definition is not adequate, however, to cover certain special cases, such as the case where the local agent of a nonresident alien individual, foreign partnership, or foreign corporation pays wages to a citizen or resident of the United States, and the case of the person making payment of wages in situations where the wage payments are not under the control of the person for whom the services are or were performed, as, for instance, in the case of certain types of pension payments. The House bill provided for these cases by an exception to the general definition of the term "employer" which provided that if the wages are paid by a person other than the person for whom the services are or were performed, the term "employer" means the person paying such wages. The Senate bill has restated the exception in order to make clear that it is designed solely to meet unusual situations and not intended as a departure from the basic purpose to centralize responsibility for withholding, returning, and paying the tax and furnishing receipts.

Accordingly, the Senate bill provides in section 1621 (d) (1) that if the person for whom the services are or were performed does not have control of the payment of the wages for such services the term "employer" means the person having control of the payment of such wages. Section 1621 (d) (2) provides that in the case of a person who pays wages on behalf of a nonresident alien individual, foreign partnership, or foreign corporation, which is not engaged in trade or business within the United States the term "employer" means the person who pays the wages.

As stated, section 1621 (d) makes it clear that the responsibility for withholding, paying, and returning the tax and furnishing receipts rests with the employer, except as otherwise specifically provided in section 1624. In the case of a corporate employer having branch offices, the branch manager or other representative may actually, as a matter of internal administration, withhold the tax or prepare the receipts required under section 1625, but the responsibility and legal duty for withholding, paying, and returning the tax and furnishing the receipts rests with the corporate employer.

Under the bill as passed by the Senate, the tax required to be collected at the source is based upon the excess of the wage payment over the amount of the withholding exemption provided in section 1622 (b). The amount of the withholding exemption in a specific case is in general dependent upon the status of the individual employee as single, married, etc.; upon the number of his dependents; and, in the case of an employed married person whose spouse is also employed, the amount of the withholding exemption claimed by each spouse. In all cases the withholding exemption will be determined by the employer upon the basis of the information relative to status set forth in a withholding exemption certificate required to be furnished by the employees. Accordingly, definitions have been provided in sections 1621 (e) to (k), inclusive, for the purpose of enabling the employer to determine the status of wage earners with respect to the withholding exemption. Under these definitions, which are identical in all but one respect with those contained in the House bill, the terms "single person," "married person," "head of a family," and "dependent," have the meanings assigned to such terms for the purpose

of the personal exemption and credit for dependents in section 25 and the regulations prescribed thereunder, but the application of the appropriate amount of withholding exemption in each case depends upon the furnishing of a withholding exemption certificate stating that the individual occupies the described status or is entitled to the withholding exemption with respect to dependents. If no certificate setting forth the status of the employee is furnished, no withholding exemption is allowed; and tax will be withheld upon the gross amount of the wage payment. If husband and wife are both employed, each may claim one-half of the withholding exemption allowed a married person or they may agree to allow one spouse to claim all of the withholding exemption, and the other spouse to claim none of the withholding exemption. The option in such case extends only to the withholding exemption allowed a married person which under the definition is termed the "personal exemption for withholding."

The withholding exemption provided with respect to dependents must be claimed by the spouse who furnishes the chief support for such dependent whether or not such spouse claims any part of the personal exemption for withholding. In the case of the head of a family having one or more dependents, one of such dependents is to be omitted in determining the number of dependents for the purpose of the withholding exemption with respect to dependents. The only respect in which the Senate bill differs from these provisions in the House bill is that the former proposes to qualify the definition of the term "married person claiming half of the personal exemption for withholding" contained in subsection (h) so that such amount of the personal exemption for withholding shall apply only where the withholding exemption certificate expressly states that for the purposes of the tax collected at the source on wages the employee's spouse is claiming not more than one-half of the personal exemption for withholding. This change is designed to bring this definition in line with the definition of "married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding"

Requirement of Withholding

The House bill expressed the withholding requirement in terms of two portions of the tax required to be collected at source. The portion required to be withheld at the rate of 17 percent was based upon the excess of the wage payment over the amount of a withholding exemption which approximated the personal exemption of the wage earner under the regular income tax plus credit for dependents plus 10 percent of such exemption and credit, the combined amounts being prorated in accordance with the length of the particular pay-roll period. The portion required to be withheld at the rate of 8 percent was based upon the excess of each wage payment over the prorated withholding exemption of $624 provided for Victory tax purposes. Thus, the employer would first apply one withholding exemption and rate to each payment of wages, then he would apply another withholding exemption and rate to such payment, and by adding the two results would arrive at the total amount of tax to be withheld. This amount would approximate the net Victory tax, the normal tax, and the first-bracket surtax on such wages.

The Senate bill is designed to achieve this same objective of withholding on wages an amount approximating the net Victory tax, the normal tax, and the first-bracket surtax on such wages, but it is so framed that the employer will not be required to make two separate computations and add the result of each in order to arrive at the amount of tax required to be withheld from any one employee.

To accomplish this objective of simplifying the work of employers, section 1622 under the Senate bill changes the aggregate withholding exemption of $552 for single persons provided in the House bill to $624; the withholding exemption of $1,320 for married persons to $1,248; and the withholding exemption of $408 for each dependent to $312. These amounts are termed the family status withholding exemptions. Withholding would then be applied at the single rate of 20 percent on all amounts paid in excess of these exemptions, prorated in accordance with the length of the pay-roll period. The Senate bill provides, however, that in no case may the tax to be withheld be less than 3 percent of the amount of the wages for each pay-roll period in excess of the prorated $624 Victory tax exemption.

The reason for the provision in section 1622 (a) that the amount to be withheld shall in no event be less than 3 percent of the amount in excess of the Victory tax withholding exemption is that the family status withholding exemption of a wage earner might equal or exceed the amount of his wages so that no withholding for normal tax and first-bracket surtax should take place, while at the same time his Victory tax withholding exemption might be less than the amount of his wages so that withholding for Victory tax purposes should take place. In other words, the provision is necessary to insure withholding for Victory tax purposes in the case of single persons with dependents having incomes between $624 and the applicable exemption under the 20-percent withholding, which ranges upward from $624 depending on the number of dependents, and in the case of married persons or heads of family with incomes between $624 and the applicable exemption under the 20-percent withholding, which ranges upward from $1,248 depending on the number of dependents. To illustrate: John Smith is a married person claiming the whole of the personal exemption for withholding and has one dependent. His weekly wage is $30. His weekly family status withholding exemption is $30 ($24 because he is a married person claiming the whole of the personal exemption for withholding, plus $6 because of his one dependent). Since his weekly family status withholding exemption equals the amount of his weekly wage, there will be no withholding for normal tax and first-bracket surtax purposes. However, John Smith's weekly Victory tax withholding exemption is $12, and since his weekly wage is $30, he has a Victory tax liability, and his employer will withhold $0.54 (3 percent of $18).

The specific wage levels at which only the 3-percent rate is applicable are readily ascertainable, and the Commissioner's regulations can furnish a list of those levels so that employers will not need to make computations in order to determine whether the 3-percent or full 20-percent rate is applicable. For example, a married person with one dependent who claims all of the personal exemption for withholding and who receives less than $33.18 a week will be subject only to a withholding tax of 3 percent on the amount received in excess of the prorated $624 Victory tax exemption. For all such persons receiving a weekly wage of $33.18 or over the rate of withholding will be 20 percent on the amount in excess of the applicable family status withholding exemption.

Under the Victory tax withholding provisions the liability for withholding is placed upon the person having control of the payment of wages. Section 1622, under the Senate bill, like the House bill, specifically designates the "employer" as the person required to withhold and collect the tax. This is a clarifying change. A clerical amendment in the House bill eliminated the provision in section 466 (a) which restricts the withholding to wages includible in gross income. The same change is made in the Senate bill. This limitation, which was designed to exclude from withholding the amount of any wage payment exempted under the law from the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the code, is rendered unnecessary by the changes made in the definition of the term "wages." The phrase "to any individual" was stricken from the requirement of withholding in order to avoid any implication that withholding should not apply merely because wages are received by a corporation, such as a corporate executor of a deceased employee.

Withholding Exemption

The amount of the withholding exemption applicable with respect to any payment of wages is determined under the provisions of section 1622 (b) under the Senate bill. The House bill changed the term "withholding deduction" contained in the Victory tax provisions to "withholding exemption" in order to avoid confusion. The latter designation is also used in the Senate bill. For convenience of reference, the withholding exemption allowable in computing tax at the 20-percent rate has, in the Senate bill, been designated the "family status withholding exemption" and that allowable in computing tax at the 3-percent rate the "Victory tax withholding exemption." The amount of the withholding exemption applicable to all wage payments is determined under the schedules provided in section 1622 (b) and the rules relative to the application of such schedules in certain types of cases are provided in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (b). The schedule of family status withholding exemptions applicable for the purpose of the 20-percent rate provided in subsection (a) (1) is as follows:

Family status withholding exemption

Payroll period	Single person	Married person claiming whole of personal exemption for withholding or head of family	Married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding	Married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding	Each dependent, other than the first dependent in the case of the head of a family
Weekly	$12.00	$24.00	$12.00	0	$6.00
Biweekly	24.00	48.00	24.00	0	12.00
Semimonthly	26.00	52.00	26.00	0	13.00
Monthly	52.00	104.00	52.00	0	26.00
Quarterly	156.00	312.00	156.00	0	78.00
Semiannual	312.00	624.00	312.00	0	156.00
Annual	624.00	1,248.00	624.00	0	312.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.70	3.40	1.70	0	.85

The schedule of Victory tax withholding exemptions for the withholding rate of 3 percent is as follows:

Pay-roll period:	*Victory tax withholding exemption*
Weekly	$12.00
Biweekly	24.00
Semimonthly	26.00
Monthly	52.00
Quarterly	156.00
Semiannual	312.00
Annual	624.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.70

The first schedule was changed in the Senate bill from that contained in the House bill, for the reasons stated above. The latter schedule is the same as that provided in section 466 (b) of the code with the exception of an additional line setting forth the amount of the withholding exemption applicable with respect to wages paid for a single day's service in the case of a daily or miscellaneous pay-roll period, and the designation, "Victory tax withholding exemption."

Except for the designation, the schedule is the same as that in the House bill. Under the rules prescribed in paragraphs (2) and (3) of the subsection, the daily or miscellaneous payroll period exemption will be used for computing the amount of the withholding exemption in the case of wages paid on a daily basis, for any period not otherwise provided for in the schedules, or for wages paid without regard to any period. For instance, in the case of wages paid for a 10-day payroll period, the amount of the withholding exemption applicable is $1.70 per day multiplied by the number of days in such period, or $17. The same rules apply to the withholding exemption schedule applicable for the purpose of computing the tax at the 20-percent rate.

The rules prescribed in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of section 1622 (b) are the same in substance as those provided in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of section 466 (b) of the code, and the same as those in the House bill. The Senate bill inserts "withholding" before "exemption." This is a clarifying change.

Paragraph (4) of section 1622 (b) is substantially the same as paragraph (2) of section 466 (b) of the code except that it is made clear that the rule there prescribed is applicable only if authorized by the Commissioner under appropriate regulations. Under this provision, if wages are paid for a period of less than a week or, in the case of wages paid without regard to any period, if the time described in paragraph (3) is less than 1 week, the employer may, if so authorized by the Commissioner, compute the amount of the tax on the basis of the excess of the wages paid during the calendar week over the withholding exemption allowable for a weekly pay-roll period. If the employer is not authorized to use such method, the tax will be based upon the excess of the wages paid, prorated on a daily basis, over the amount of the daily withholding exemption of $1.70. The application of this provision is illustrated by the following example:

If a married person (having no dependents) claiming all of the personal exemption for withholding receives in a calendar week $8 per day for 4 days, his employer may be authorized to withhold upon the amount in excess of $24 (or $8) at 20 percent, so that the total amount withheld would be $1.60. Hence, under such method withholding would apply beginning with the payment made for the fourth day, since the employee would have received $24 for the first 3 days. On the other hand, if not so authorized, the employer must use the amounts specified in the schedules for a daily or miscellaneous pay-roll period, in which case the amount withheld for each day would be 20 percent of the excess of $8 over $3.40 ($4.60), or $0.92, and the total amount withheld would be four times the latter amount, or $3.68.

Paragraph 5 of section 1622 (b) under the Senate bill is a new provision which, in order to simplify the work of the employer who withholds under the schedule method, permits him to round out the wages to the nearest dollar in computing the amount of tax to be withheld.

Paragraph (5) of section 466 (b) of the code provides that the total withholding exemption allowed an employee with respect to wages received from any one employer during the calendar year shall not exceed the amount of the withholding exemption allowable for an annual pay-roll period. This limitation operates to prevent an excessive withholding exemption and consequent underwithholding of the tax in those cases in which the employee receives regular wages plus additional wages in the form of bonuses, commissions, etc. The Senate bill, like the House bill, eliminates this paragraph as unnecessary. Under section 1622 (i) in the Senate bill, the Commissioner is vested with authority to provide appropriate rules for the determination of the withholding exemption applicable in such cases under which the withholding exemption allowed to an employee in any calendar year shall approximate the withholding exemption allowable with respect to an annual pay-roll period.

Wage Bracket Withholding

Under the provisions of section 1622 (c) under the Senate bill, employers may at their option withhold a tax determined under tables provided in such section to be deducted from each wage payment. Such tax shall be in lieu of the tax computed under the percentage rates and required to be withheld under the provisions of subsection (a). The change made in subsection (b) under the Senate bill with respect to the withholding exemption made it possible to provide one table applicable to each pay-roll period for all employees, regardless of their marital and dependency status. The resulting redesigning and reduction in the number of tables should substantially simplify the employer's task and the amounts withheld will very closely approximate the amounts which would be withheld under the more numerous tables of the House bill. Under this section, tables are provided for weekly, biweekly, semimonthly, and monthly pay-roll periods. For the convenience of employers making payment of wages for pay-roll periods other than those comprehended by the above-mentioned tables, or for periods which do not constitute a pay-roll period, or making payment of wages without regard to any particular period of time, a further table described as the table applicable to a daily pay-roll period or a miscellaneous pay-roll period is provided. Under this table the amount of the tax required to be withheld is determined by multiplying the amount of tax shown opposite the particular daily wage bracket by the number of days in the period for which wages are paid or, in the case of wages paid without regard to a period of time, by the number of days which have elapsed between such wage payments, since the date of commencement of employment during the calendar year, or January 1, of the calendar year, whichever is the later.

The rules relating to the application of the above-mentioned tables to specific types of cases are prescribed in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of section 1622 (c) under the Senate bill. These rules are in substance the same as those prescribed in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of section 466 (b) of the code, and are identical, apart from minor changes, with those prescribed in the House bill, for the purpose of determining the amount of the withholding exemption in cases where the tax is determined by application of the percentage rate to the wages paid. For example, if wages are paid for a period which does not constitute a pay-roll period, paragraph (2) of section 1622 (c) provides that the amount of tax to be withheld shall be computed by multiplying the tax shown opposite the appropriate wage bracket in the miscellaneous table by the number of days contained in the period for which such wages were paid. Paragraph (4) of that section provides that if wages are paid for a period of less than 1 week the employer may be authorized by the Commissioner to compute the tax under the table applicable in the case of a weekly pay-roll period. If the employer is authorized to use the table applicable to the weekly pay-roll period, the aggregate of the wages paid to the employee during the calendar week shall be considered as the weekly wage.

Paragraph 5 of section 1622 (c) under the Senate bill is a new provision which, in order to simplify the work of the employer who withholds under the table method with respect to employees whose wages exceed the highest wage bracket in any table, permits him to round out the wages to the nearest dollar in computing the amount of tax to be withheld.

Tax Paid by Recipient

Section 1622 (d) under the Senate bill is substantially the same as section 466 (d) of the code and the corresponding provision of the House bill. However, the language has been changed in order to make clear that nothing contained in the subsection should be construed to relieve the employer of the duty imposed by law to withhold and pay the tax. Under this provision, payment by the recipient of the income of the tax required to be withheld by the employer relieves the employer from payment of the tax but does not relieve him from liability for additions to the tax or penalties for failure to withhold, collect, and pay the tax in accordance with the provisions of the subchapter.

Nondeductibility of Tax

Section 1622 (e) under the Senate bill provides that the tax withheld and collected at the source on wages shall not be allowed as a deduction either to the employer or the recipient of the income in computing net income. However, provision is made by an amendment to section 35 of the code for credit for tax withheld at source in the case of the recipient of the income. This represents a clerical change from the House bill.

Refunds or Credits

Subsection (f) provides that the refund or credit of any overpayment of the tax required to be withheld and collected shall be made to the employer only to the extent that the amount of the overpayment was actually withheld and collected from the employee. The provision differs from the House bill by reason of the fact that the provisions of law applying to the social-security tax on employees under section 1400 have been made applicable. The subsection contains a cross-reference to the provision for credit or refund to recipients of income in the case of excessive withholding.

Included and Excluded Wages

Subsection (g) under the Senate bill is identical with the corresponding provision of the House bill. This subsection provides that if the remuneration paid for services performed during one-half or more of any pay-roll period constitutes wages, all the remuneration paid for such period shall be deemed to be wages; but if the remuneration paid for services performed during more than one-half of such pay-roll period does not constitute wages, then none of the remuneration paid for such period shall be deemed to be wages. The subsection has application only to remuneration paid for a period of not more than 31 consecutive days which constitutes an established pay-roll period within the meaning of the definition contained in section 1621 (b). It has no application to remuneration paid at irregular intervals or to remuneration paid without regard to any period. The 31-day limitation is intended to minimize changes in pay periods in order to avoid withholding.

Withholding Exemption Certificates

Subsection (h) of section 1622 under the Senate bill requires every employee receiving wages to furnish his employer a signed withholding exemption certificate in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may, with the approval of the Secretary, by regulations prescribe. The purpose of the certificate is to enable the employer to determine the amount of the withholding exemption applicable to the wages of each employee or, if the employer elects under section 1622 (c) to adopt wage-bracket withholding, the amount to be withheld under that subsection. The status of the employee

as single person, married person claiming all of personal exemption for withholding, married person claiming half of personal exemption for withholding, married person claiming none of personal exemption for withholding, head of family, and the dependents to be taken into account by the employer for withholding purposes, are to be determined in accordance with the certificate furnished by the employee. Once in effect a certificate is to continue in effect until another certificate furnished by the employee takes effect. If no certificate is in effect with respect to an employee, the employer is to treat such employee as a married person claiming none of the personal exemption for withholding so that with respect to such employee there will be no withholding exemption in effect. Similarly, if the employer uses the wage-bracket tables, the amounts to be withheld from the wages of an employee with respect to whom there is no withholding certificate in effect are to be determined in accordance with the tables provided in the case of a married person claiming none of the personal exemption for withholding. In case of a change of status, the employee is required to furnish a new certificate not later than 10 days after such change occurs. This is a change from the House bill, designed to make clear that in the case of a change of status the employee must furnish a new certificate showing that change.

Under the House bill, changes in the employee's withholding exemption status are permitted at any time, but it is provided that the employer shall have at least 30 days from the date of notification of a change in status before being required to give effect to such change. Under subsection (h) of the Senate bill the employer is not required to give effect to a change in status more than twice during each calendar year. The modified rule is as follows:

(1) If the employee furnishes a withholding exemption certificate after the date of commencement of employment, the certificate is to take effect with respect to the first payment of wages made on or after the first status determination date which occurs at least 30 days from the date on which such certificate is furnished. For the purposes of this provision, the status determination dates are fixed as January 1 and July 1 of each year. These provisions are a modification of those under the House bill, designed to allow employers ample time in which to adjust payroll and other accounting records to conform to the withholding exemption certificates furnished by employees after the date of commencement of employment. Wherever feasible, however, employers may give earlier effect to such certificates. (2) If the employee furnishes a withholding exemption certificate on or before the date of commencement of employment, the certificate is to take effect as of the beginning of the first payroll period ending on or after the date on which the certificate is furnished or with respect to the first payment of wages made without regard to a payroll period on or after such date.

The rules set forth under (1) above are applicable to all wage earners who are employed on July 1, 1943, when the new withholding provisions take effect. The rules under (2) above apply in the case of new employment or reemployment, after an interruption in employment with the same employer, occurring after July 1, 1943. In applying these rules in the case of an employee intermittently hired and rehired by the same employer at frequent intervals, such employee shall be deemed to have commenced his employment at the time of the first hiring.

Overlapping Pay Periods, Etc.

Section 1622 (i), under the Senate bill, authorizes the Commissioner, under regulations prescribed with the approval of the Secretary, to provide suitable rules for the determination of the withholding exemption and the application of the wage-bracket tables with respect to various types of wage payments which do not fall readily within the statutory pattern which is necessarily designed to fit the customary type of periodic wage payments. The problems intended to be covered by these regulations are those arising generally in case of supplementary payments in the form of bonuses, commissions, dismissal wages, and the like, made in addition to periodic wage payments, and payments made with respect to periods beginning in one calendar year and ending in a different calendar year. The Senate bill changed the language of the corresponding provision of the House bill in order to make clear that the purpose of this provision is to limit the withholding exemption allowed to an employee in any calendar year to an amount approximating the withholding exemption allowable with respect to an annual pay-roll period.

Payments supplementary to periodic wage payments are made in various ways. Such payments may consist of commissions or bonuses paid each pay-roll period and covering the same or different periods as the regular wage payment or they may be made without regard to any particular period. The actual payment of the supplementary remuneration may or may not coincide with an actual payment of periodic wages. Such payments of supplementary remuneration raise the problem as to the proper handling of the withholding exemption and the wage-bracket tables in order to provide for the allowance of the appropriate withholding exemption and the deduction of the appropriate amount of tax.

For example, an employee's remuneration may consist of wages paid at periodic intervals plus additional wages in the form of a bonus paid at the end of each 6-month period. If the tax required to be withheld and collected at the source is computed independently with respect to each such payment of wages, after giving effect to the withholding exemption applicable to each such payment, it is apparent that such employee will have been allowed the entire amount of the withholding exemption to which he is entitled for a full calendar year. Hence, he should not be entitled to any withholding exemption with respect to wage payments made by the same employer during the balance of the calendar year. The same result would obtain if the tax on the periodic wage payments was withheld under the table applicable to such periods and the tax on the bonus was withheld on the percentage basis after allowance of the amount of the withholding exemption applicable to a 6-month period. It is obviously more desirable to have the withholding exemption to which the employee is entitled spread over the wage payments for the entire calendar year. Moreover, it is considered undesirable to burden the employer with the necessity of keeping records in order to determine at a given time the aggregate amount of the withholding exemption previously allowed to the employee.

Under the Senate bill, as in the House bill, the maximum amount allowable as a withholding exemption to an employee with respect to the wages paid by any one employer during the calendar year should approximate the amount of the withholding exemption allowed for an annual payroll period, whether such exemption is based on the schedules provided in subsection (b) of section 1622 or is reflected in the tables contained in subsection (c). For these reasons, it is expected that the Commissioner will provide reasonable regulations for the appropriate treatment of all such supplementary or overlapping wage payments. Such regulations should insure, on the one hand, that the amount of tax withheld by the employer will approximate the amount that would be withheld and collected if all wages paid to the employee by such employer were paid at periodic intervals throughout the calendar year and, on the other hand, that the employee will receive the benefit of withholding exemptions approximating in the aggregate the amounts specified under the schedules for an annual pay-roll period.

Withholding on Basis of Average Wages

The Senate bill added a new provision, which is contained in subsection (j), to permit withholding to be based on average wages. Under this provision, the Commissioner may, under regulations, authorize employers to estimate the wages which will be paid to any employee in any quarter of a calendar year; determine the amount to be withheld and collected upon each payment of wages to such employee during such quarter as if the appropriate average of the wages so estimated constituted the actual wages paid; and to withhold and collect upon any payment of wages to such employee during such quarter such amount as may be necessary to adjust the amount actually withheld and collected upon the wages of such employee during such quarter to the amount otherwise required to be withheld during such quarter. This provision is designed to promote the efficient functioning of the withholding system in cases where there is steady employment and little fluctuation in wages between pay periods, so that a reasonably accurate average can be estimated, and it is expected that the Commissioner's regulations will prescribe rules appropriate to that end.

Liability for Tax

Section 467 of the code consists of subsections (a), (b), and (c). The House bill changed the headings and combined subsections (a) and (b) into new subsection (a). These were clerical amendments made because of the new definition of the term "employer" contained in section 465 (d) under the House bill and effected no substantive change in the law Subsection 465 (b) under the House bill, relating to adjustments, was identical with section 467 (c) of the code. Under the Senate bill the corresponding section (sec. 1623) omits the provision for adjustments, since the adjustment authorization provision of section 1401 (c) of the code is made applicable.

Returns

The House bill provides for quarterly returns by the employer of tax withheld at source. The Senate bill omits the House provisions with respect to return and payment of the tax by employers. These requirements, under the Senate bill, are governed by the applicable provisions which apply to the tax imposed by section 1400. The provisions of the House bill relating to the determination of deficiencies have also been omitted in the Senate bill.

The change in the Senate bill from a system of collection, payment, and administration based upon the principles applicable to the income tax to a system of collection, payment, and administration based upon the principles underlying the collection of the social-security tax on wages has been made in order to promote efficiency and flexibility in the administration of the tax by the Government and the operations of the employer thereunder. This change, however, does not contemplate any departure from the basic principle that the responsibility and legal duty for withholding and paying the tax, etc., rests with the employer. In view of this basic principle, the Senate bill, in section 1624, retains the provision of the House bill that if the United States, a State, Territory, or political subdivision, or the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing is the employer, the return of the tax may be made by the officer or employee having control of the payment of wages or other officer or employee appropriately designated for that purpose.

Receipts

Section 469 of the code, relating to receipts, was amended by the House bill in two respects. Subsection (a) of section 469 was amended to eliminate the language which requires the employer to show on the receipt the period of employment covered by such receipt. As so amended, the section would specifically require only that the receipts show the amount of wages paid and the amount of tax withheld with respect thereto. The Commissioner is granted authority to prescribe by regulations the form and content of such receipts and, if he finds it necessary, he may require that the periods of employment be shown. Subsection (b) of section 469 of the House bill provided that the receipts should be in lieu of the information returns with respect to wages, but information returns would still be required with respect to remuneration not subject to withholding. Under the Senate bill, these House provisions are retained as section 1625 (a) and (b), and a clerical amendment is made in the heading and in the reference to "subchapter" rather than "part." The Senate bill contemplates that a duplicate of each receipt shall be furnished to the Government and provides that the furnishing of such duplicates shall be in lieu of the filing of Form 1099 information returns.

Subsection (c) of section 1625 under the Senate bill alters the provisions relating to extension of time for the furnishing of receipts to employees. By the terms of the amendment the Commissioner under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary is empowered to grant to any employer a reasonable extension of time (not in excess of 30 days) with respect to the receipts required to be furnished to employees. Thus, the extension privilege will no longer be limited to the receipt to be furnished on the day on which the last payment of wages is made but may be applied in the case of receipts to be furnished at the close of the calendar year.

Penalties

Under the House bill subsections (a) and (b) of section 470, relating to penalties for fraudulent receipts or failure to furnish receipts, are identical with existing law. Under the Senate bill these penalty provisions remain substantially the same. The section has been renumbered as section 1626 and certain other clerical amendments have been made to adjust the provisions to the section of chapter 9 of the code.

Under the House bill subsection (c) of section 470 was amended to increase from $5 to $10 the minimum addition to the tax for failure by the employer to make and file a return required by this subchapter within the time prescribed by law or prescribed by the Commissioner in pursuance of law. The Senate bill retains this provision as section 1626 (c) with clerical changes required by the shift to chapter 9 of the code.

Section 470 (d) was a new provision added to the code by the House bill. This section provides appropriate penalties applicable to employees who willfully supply false or fraudulent withholding exemption certificates or who willfully fail to supply information which would decrease the withholding exemption. The penalty in each instance is a fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment of not more than 1 year, or both, and such penalties are in lieu of those provided in section 145 (a) of the code. This provision with minor modifications is retained in the Senate bill as section 1626 (d). As amended the statutory language makes clear that the penalties are applicable in the case of an employee who willfully supplies false and fraudulent information, or who willfully fails to supply information, which would require an increase in the tax to be withheld at source on his wages. Reference to section 145 (a) was eliminated because of the change from chapter 1 to chapter 9 of the code.

Under the bill as passed by the Senate, as has been previously noted, the withholding provisions have been shifted to chapter 9 of the code. To reflect this technical alteration an additional section has been added to the withholding provisions, namely, section 1627, and a subchapter E, to follow subchapter D of chapter 9, has been added. These new provisions are discussed below.

Other Laws Applicable

Section 1627 under the Senate bill provides that all provisions of law, including penalties, applicable with respect to the social-security tax on employees imposed by section 1400 shall, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of new subchapter D of chapter 9, be applicable with respect to the tax imposed under that subchapter.

Verification of Returns

Subchapter E of chapter 9 under the Senate bill contains certain provisions which will apply to chapter 9 generally. Under that bill there are two sections in subchapter E, namely, section 1630 and section 1631.

General provisions with respect to verification of returns, and related matters, are contained in section 1630. The Commissioner is empowered under subsection (a) to require that any return, statement, or other document required to be filed under chapter 9 shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that such return, statement, or other document is made under the penalties of perjury. To exercise this power the Commissioner is to prescribe appropriate regulations with the approval of the Secretary. The subsection makes clear that the declaration made under the penalties of perjury shall be in lieu of any oath otherwise required. Thus, the regulations may provide that the oath may be dispensed with in the case of employers making returns under chapter 9.

Subsection (b) of section 1630 provides for penalties in the case of a person who willfully makes and subscribes any return, statement, or other document, which contains or is verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, and which he does not believe to be true and correct as to every material matter. The subsection states that such person shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be subject to the penalties prescribed for perjury in section 125 of the Criminal Code.

Special Provision for Payment of Withheld Taxes

Section 1631 relates to the use of incorporated banks or trust companies (which are depositaries or financial agents of the United States) in connection with the payment of taxes under chapter 9. Under this section the Secretary may authorize such incorporated banks and trust companies to receive any taxes under chapter 9 in such manner, at such times, and under such conditions as he may prescribe. If the Secretary should make such authorization, he shall prescribe the manner, times, and conditions under which the receipt of chapter 9 taxes by authorized incorporated banks and trust companies is to be treated as payment of such taxes by the collectors. Withholding under the new system will involve very considerable amounts of tax moneys which will be withheld from the wages of employees. These funds will not belong to the employers. It may well prove desirable to provide a method by which these funds will be turned over by employers, and reach their way into the Treasury, more rapidly and more currently than, for example, on a quarterly basis. The purpose of section 1631 is to provide a flexible method by which this objective may be accomplished without placing an undue strain on the administrative tax collection machinery.

Technical Amendments

Section 2 (b) of the House bill was a technical amendment changing the heading of subchapter D of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code. This amendment is unnecessary under the new structure provided in the Senate bill; accordingly, section 2 (b) of the Senate bill contains other technical amendments in keeping with the rearrangement effected thereunder. Paragraph (1) amends section 34 of the code by omitting reference to section 466 (e), relating to credit for Victory tax withheld at source under the system in effect prior to July 1, 1943. Paragraph (2) amends section 322 (f) of the code, which is likewise a cross-reference provision, to provide a cross-reference to section 1622 (f), relating to refunds or credits to employers and to recipients of income, instead of to section 466 (f), the present credit provision relating to the Victory tax.

Section 476 of the code provides that the taxes imposed by subchapter D of chapter 1 shall not apply to any taxable year commencing after the date of cessation of hostilities in the present war. Section 2 (c) of the House bill amends section 476 to limit the application of this provision to the Victory tax imposed by part I of subchapter D of chapter 1. Section 2 (c) of the Senate bill amends section 476 so that the tax imposed by part II of subchapter D of chapter 1 shall not apply with respect to any wages paid after June 30, 1943. Wages (as defined in sec. 1621 (a)) paid after that date will be subject to the provisions of subchapter D of chapter 9.

Effective Date

Section 2 (d) of the Senate bill, relating to the effective date, provides that the amendments made by section 2 (a) and (b) shall take effect on July 1, 1943, and shall be applicable to all wages paid on or after such date.

Conference Amendment

The conference amendment retains with the following changes the provisions of the Senate bill with respect to collection of income tax at source on wages:

In section 1621 (b) the word "daily" has been inserted in the definition of a miscellaneous pay-roll period. This is a clerical change.

In section 1622 (b) (2) and section 1622 (c) (2) the parenthetical expression "(including Sundays and holidays)" has been inserted in the interest of clarity.

Paragraph (5) of section 1621 (c) provides that in determining the amount to be deducted and withheld under the table method the wages may, at the election of the employer, be computed to the nearest dollar. This provision has been changed to qualify the rule so as to make it clear that it is applicable only if the wages exceed the highest wage bracket in the applicable table. Thus the rule is applicable in the case of a weekly pay-roll period where the weekly wage exceeds $200.

The provisions of section 1622 (h) have been amended in order to provide more logical rules for the effective date of withholding exemption certificates. The first rule, contained in paragraph (1), has been limited to certificates furnished after the date of commencement of employment with the employer by reason of a change of status. The second rule, contained in paragraph (2), has been extended to include the case of any certificate furnished otherwise than by reason of a change of status.

Section 1622 (h) has also been amended by adding the expression "and having no dependents." The purpose of this change is to avoid any misapprehension as to the consequences in a case where no withholding certificate is in effect.

A new paragraph (4) has been added to section 1621 (i). This paragraph authorizes

the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, to prescribe regulations for determining the manner of withholding and the amount to be deducted and withheld, in the case of a payment of wages by an employer to an employee through an agent, fiduciary, or other person who also has the control, receipt, custody, or disposal of, or pays, the wages payable by another employer to such employee. In such a case the withholding exemption of the employee for any 1 year is to approximate the withholding exemption allowable with respect to an annual pay roll period. To illustrate the application of this provision: Five companies maintain a central agency which carries on the administrative work of the companies. This central agency or organization consists of a staff of stenographers, clerks, bookkeepers, and so forth. The expenses of the central agency, including wages paid to the foregoing employees, are borne by the companies in certain agreed proportions. Under the arrangement, each company is the employer of each employee on the staff of the central agency. Under the provisions of new paragraph (4), the Commissioner is authorized to provide that each such employee will be entitled in any one year only to an aggregate withholding exemption which shall approximate the withholding exemption allowable with respect to an annual pay roll period, rather than to five such withholding exemptions.

A complementary provision has been inserted as new section 1632. This section is made a part of subchapter E of chapter 9 of the code. Consequently its provisions are applicable with respect to all of the taxes imposed under chapter 9. This section provides that in case a fiduciary, agent, or other person has the control, receipt, custody, or disposal of, or pays, the wages of an employee or group of employees, employed by one or more employers, the Commissioner, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, is authorized to designate such fiduciary, agent, or other person, to perform such acts as are required of employers under chapter 9 and as the Commissioner may specify. If such designation is made, all provisions of law (including penalties) applicable in respect of an employer shall be applicable to such fiduciary, agent, or other person so designated, except as may be otherwise prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. However, except as so provided, the employer for whom such fiduciary, agent, or other person acts shall remain subject to the provisions of law (including penalties) applicable in respect of employers.

Thus, in the illustration given above of the five companies maintaining a central agency to carry on their administrative work, the Commissioner may designate such central agency or organization to perform such of the acts with respect to withholding, return and payment of the tax, the furnishing of receipts, and so forth, as the Commissioner may specify. However, such a designation relieves the employer of responsibility only to the extent that the Commissioner prescribes.

The expression "an employee" contained in section 1622 (i), following paragraph (4) of that subsection has been changed to "the employee." This is a clarifying change.

Section 1625 (c), relating to extensions of time for the furnishing of receipts, has been changed by striking out the words "to employees." This is a clarifying change designed to make certain that the Commissioner's authority to grant extensions of time for the furnishing of receipts extends to the receipts required to be furnished by the employer with his return of withheld taxes.

Sections 2 (c) and (d), relating respectively to the expiration date of the withholding provisions of the Victory tax (part II, subchapter D of chapter 1 of the code) and the effective date of the withholding provisions under subchapter D, chapter 9 of the code, have been changed. The change with respect to the expiration date of withholding under the Victory tax provides that such withholding shall not apply with respect to any wages paid after June 30, 1943, unless such wages are paid during the calendar year 1943 with respect to a pay-roll period beginning on or before June 30, 1943. The change with respect to the effective date of withholding under the bill provides that such withholding shall take effect July 1, 1943, and shall be applicable to all wages paid on or after such date, except that it shall not be applicable to wages paid during 1943 with respect to a pay-roll period beginning before July 1, 1943.

DESCRIPTION OF HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS

Miscellaneous amendments

Credit for Tax Withheld at Source on Wages

Section 3 of the Senate bill amends section 35 of the code to provide that the amount of the tax withheld and collected under subchapter D of chapter 9 shall be allowed as a credit to the recipient of the income against the income (including Victory) tax imposed by chapter 1. The credit for the amount withheld during any calendar year upon the wages is to be allowed as a credit to the recipient of the income against the tax for the last taxable year beginning in such calendar year. Apart from a clarifying change this provision is substantially the same as the corresponding provision in the House bill.

Excessive Withholding

Section 4 (a) of the Senate bill, which amends section 322 (a) (2) of the code, relating to excessive withholding, is the same in substance as section 3 (a) of the House bill, which made a clarifying amendment to section 322 (a) (2).

Authority to Make Credits Against Estimated Tax

Section 4 (a) also adds a new paragraph (3) to section 322 (a). This provision authorizes the Commissioner to prescribe with the approval of the Secretary regulations providing for a credit against estimated tax for any taxable year of the amount determined by the taxpayer or the Commissioner to be an overpayment of the tax for a preceding taxable year.

Under the new procedure in the declaration and payment of the estimated tax (the first installment of which will generally be payable at the same time as the making of the return and final payment of the tax for the preceding taxable year) a class of cases will arise in which it is apparent that the tax for the preceding taxable year has been overpaid. The Commissioner should have the same authority to credit an overpayment of the tax for a preceding taxable year against the estimated tax for the current taxable year as he has under existing law with respect to the tax for the current taxable year. Permitting the taxpayer on his return or on his declaration to compute the overpayment and credit it against his estimated tax in his declaration would obviate unnecessary remittances by the taxpayer of the estimated tax and unnecessary refunds by the Commissioner. The administration of the provisions of the bill may, therefore, require some crediting procedure as to the estimated tax in addition to that now provided in section 322 (a) (1).

In the absence of administrative experience in the field, it seemed wiser, in providing such additional credit, not to require the credit to be made or permitted, but to grant authority to the Commissioner to make or permit this type of credit, together with authority by regulation to specify the terms, conditions, extent, and effect of the credit to be made or permitted to be made. Among the matters to be covered by the regulations if the authority is exercised are—

(1) Whether and to what extent and under what conditions the taxpayer shall be allowed to take the credit on his declaration; and (2) whether the effect of the credit (whether taken by the taxpayer or made by the Commissioner) is to be like the credit allowed under section 35 of the code or like the credit specified by section 322 (a) (1). If, under this provision, the Commissioner authorizes a credit against the estimated tax of the character of that prescribed in section 322 (a) (1), such credit will constitute a payment of the estimated tax both generally and for the purposes of section 59 (b); and if the determination of the overpayment proves to have been erroneous, the year for which the overpayment was determined is adjusted.

Presumption as to Date of Payment

Section 4 (b) of the Senate bill amends section 322 (e) of the code, relating to presumption as to date of payment, to include tax actually withheld and collected at the source under subchapter D of chapter 9; to insure the application of the rule to the proper taxable year; and to provide for the application of the same rule with respect to payments of estimated tax.

Delegation of Authority to Collectors to Make Refunds

Subsection (c) of section 4 of the Senate bill amends section 3770 (a) of the code, relating to authority to make refunds New paragraph (4) has been added which authorizes the Commissioner to delegate, with the approval of the Secretary, to the various collectors any authority, duty, or function which the Commissioner is required to exercise or perform with respect to the making of refunds, and the like, in respect of any individual, estate, or trust, where the amount involved does not exceed $1,000. This provision makes it possible for the Commissioner to delegate to the collectors the function of making refunds of such amounts, not in excess of $1,000, as the Commissioner may prescribe. This provision will permit the administrative authorities to handle refunds more expeditiously.

Rule Where No Tax Liability

Section 4 (d) of the Senate bill adds new subsection (c) to section 3770 of the code. Under this provision an amount paid as tax shall not be considered not to constitute an overpayment solely because there was no tax liability in respect of which that amount was paid.

The income-tax law requires the taxpayer to make a return of his tax and to pay the tax so returned. These requirements contemplate that in the discharge of these duties at the time, place, and manner prescribed, honest mistakes will occur—mistakes both as to the amount of the tax and as to the existence of any tax liability; and that such honest mistakes made incident to the bona fide orderly compliance with the actual or reasonably apparent duties of the taxpayer are to be corrected under the provisions of law governing overpayments. It is believed that existing law so provides. The language of certain court decisions (holding that certain payments, not made incident to a bona fide and orderly discharge of actual or reasonably apparent duties imposed by law, are not overpayments and accordingly that interest is not payable) has been read by some as meaning that no payment can result in an overpayment if no tax liability actually existed. It is not believed that such reading is in any way a statement of existing law. The provisions of the bill, however, emphasize the need for clarity in this regard.

Under the bill as passed by the Senate, two requirements become basic features of the income tax: (1) The declaration and payment of the estimated tax; and (2) the with-

holding and collection by the employer of tax from the wages of employees, and the return and payment as such of the amount by the employer to the Government. Honest mistakes incident to faithful and orderly compliance will, of course, occur, just as they have in the older procedures of the tax. The doubts expressed as to the existence of an overpayment in case it ultimately turns out that there is no tax, it is believed should be put to rest, and to this end the amendment to section 3770 of the code was inserted in the Senate bill. It is thought that the code does not contemplate that liability for inerest can be cast on the Government by merely dumping money as taxes on the collector, by disorderly remittances to him of amounts not computed in pursuance of the actual or reasonably apparent requirements of the code, or not transmitted in accordance with the procedures set up by the code, or by other abuses of tax administration. As to these, a proper application of existing law will enable the courts, in the future as generally in the past, to deny treatment as overpayments to these improper payments.

Cross Reference

Section 4 (e) of the Senate bill changes the designation of the last subsection of section 3771 to subsection "(f)." This is a cross-reference provision.

Review of Allowance of Interest

Section 4 (f) of the Senate bill corresponds to section 3 (b) of the House bill and amends section 3790 of the code relating to prohibition of administrative review of the Commissioner's decision on the merits of claims presented under the internal-revenue laws. Because of the difficulty of applying the rules provided in the House bill, the Senate bill has extended the scope of section 3790 to include interest on any credit or refund under the internal-revenue laws.

Conference Amendment

The conference amendment retains with the following changes the provisions of the Senate bill covering miscellaneous amendments:

Section 4 (a) of the Senate bill, amending section 322 (a) (2) of the code (relating to excessive withholding), has been amended to make clear that where the amount of the tax withheld at source on wages is in excess of the income (including Victory) tax imposed by chapter 1, the amount of such excess shall be considered an overpayment. This amendment does not effect any change in substance.

Section 4 (b) of the Senate bill, which amends section 322 (e) of the code (relating to presumption as to date of payment) has been amended in two respects: First, it has been changed to provide that the tax actually deducted and withheld at the source on wages shall be deemed to have been paid by the recipient of the income not earlier than the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of his applicable taxable year; second, a clerical change is made, which omits the reference to the case of a nonresident alien individual. This second change is required by reason of the conference change which makes the return date of certain nonresident alien individuals the same as the return date for citizens and residents of the United States.

Section 4 (c) of the Senate bill, which amends section 3770 (a) of the code by authorizing delegation of authority to collectors to make refunds, has been changed to make clear that the amount involved, i. e., $1,000, is to be determined without regard to interest, penalties, additions to the tax, and additional amounts. Such items are, however, within the scope of the authorized delegation.

The references throughout the foregoing portion of the bill to withholding at the source have been made uniform, so that the reference now is to "deduction and withholding." These are clerical changes, and do not effect any change in substance.

CURRENT PAYMENT OF TAX NOT WITHHELD AT SOURCE

Description of House and Senate Bills

The House bill provided for a system of current payment of individual income tax only to the extent of a so-called estimated basic tax (net Victory tax plus normal tax plus first-bracket surtax) on income not constituting wages subject to withholding at source. The system proposed under the Senate bill provides for the current collection of all individual income (including Victory) tax on income to the extent that such taxes are not paid through withholding at source.

Section (5) of the Senate bill strikes sections 58, 59, and 60 of the code, which are cross-reference provisions, and inserts in lieu thereof new sections 58, 59, and 60 to provide for the current payment of that portion of the individual's tax liability not required to be withheld at source. Withholding at source is at a rate designed to approximate the net Victory tax, the normal tax, and first-bracket surtax and applies only with respect to wages (as defined in sec. 1621). The current payment system is designed to provide for collection during the taxable year of the remaining tax liability for such year. Accordingly, it provides for the current collection of the net Victory tax on income not subject to withholding at source, for the current collection of the surtax above the first bracket on wages, and for the current collection of the normal tax and surtax on income not subject to withholding at source. The amount of the current payment is to be determined upon the basis of a declaration by the taxpayer of his estimated tax liability for the current taxable year.

Requirement of Declaration

Subsection (a) of section 58, under the Senate bill, prescribes the rules for determining what persons are required to make a declaration of estimated tax. Nonresident aliens and estates and trusts are specifically excepted from the requirement to make such declaration and from the current payment system. Under the House bill, nonresident alien individuals who are residents of a contiguous country and who enter and leave the United States at frequent intervals were not excepted from the requirement for a declaration. The Senate bill excepted all nonresident aliens from the operation of the current payment system.

The requirements as to who shall make and file a declaration are based generally upon the amount and kind of the estimated gross income for the current taxable year or the amount and kind of the actual gross income for the preceding taxable year, and the personal status of the individual as single or married at the time prescribed for the making of the declaration. Under the House bill, the amounts of gross income which determined the necessity for a declaration of estimated tax were based upon the amounts which determined the necessity for a return under section 51. Under the Senate bill, provision is made for declarations of estimated tax in certain cases by persons required to make returns of Victory tax under the provisions of section 455, even though such persons would not be required to make returns under the provisions of section 51. These amendments are designed to collect the Victory tax currently in the case of individuals who are not subject to withholding at the source and to equalize the system of current collection as between such persons and persons subject both to the Victory tax and the regular income tax.

Under the conditions set forth in section 58 (a) in the Senate bill, every individual who, at the time prescribed for the making of the declaration, is single or is married but not living with husband or wife shall make and file a declaration of his estimated tax for the taxable year if—

(1) His gross income from wages (as defined in sec. 1621) can reasonably be expected to exceed $2,700 for the taxable year; or

(2) His gross income from wages (as defined in sec. 1621) did exceed $2,700 for the preceding taxable year; or

(3) It can reasonably be expected that for the taxable year his gross income from sources other than wages (as defined in sec. 1621) will exceed $100 and his gross income from all sources will amount to $500 or more; or

(4) His gross income for the preceding taxable year from sources other than wages (as defined in sec. 1621) did exceed $100 and his gross income from all sources for the preceding taxable year was $500 or more.

Every individual who, at the time prescribed for the making of the declaration, is married and living with husband or wife shall make a declaration of his estimated tax for the taxable year if—

(1) It can reasonably be expected that for the taxable year, such individual will receive gross income from wages (as defined in sec. 1621) and the aggregate gross income of such individual and such spouse from wages will exceed $3,500; or

(2) In the preceding taxable year, such individual received gross income from wages (as defined in sec. 1621) and the aggregate gross income of such individual and such spouse from wages exceeding $3,500; or

(3) It can reasonably be expected that for the taxable year such individual will receive gross income from sources other than wages (as defined in sec. 1621), the aggregate gross income of such individual and such spouse from the sources other than wages will exceed $100, and (a) the gross income from all sources of such individual will exceed $624 or (b) the aggregate gross income of such individual and such spouse from all sources will amount to $1,200; or

(4) In the preceding taxable year such individual received gross income from sources other than wages (as defined in sec. 1621), the aggregate gross income of such individual and such spouse from sources other than wages exceeded $100, and (a) the gross income from such sources of such individual for the preceding taxable year exceeded $624, or (b) the aggregate gross income from all sources of such individual and such spouse for the preceding taxable year was $1,200 or more.

For the purposes of section 58, the amount of the gross income which the taxpayer can reasonably be expected to receive or, in the case of a taxpayer upon the accrual basis, the amount which can reasonably be expected to accrue, shall be determined upon the basis of the facts and circumstances existing as of the time prescribed for the making of the declaration.

Contents of Declaration

Subsection (b) of section 58 in the Senate bill prescribes the rules relative to the form and content of the taxpayer's declaration of estimated tax. Is is required generally that the declaration shall be in such form and contain such information as may be prescribed by the Commissioner under regulations approved by the Secretary. Subsection (b) specifically requires that the declaration shall state (1) the amount which the taxpayer estimates as the amount of his tax under sections 11 and 12, or section 400, as the case may be, and the Victory tax imposed by section 450 (adjusted for the credit provided in sec. 453), without regard to any credits for tax withheld at source; (2) the amount which he estimates as the amount of the credits allowable for the taxable year under sections 32, 35, and 466 (e) on account of tax withheld at source on

tax-free covenant bonds and wages; and (3) the excess of the amount estimated under (1) over the amount estimated under (2). Under subsection (b) the "estimated tax for the taxable year" is the excess of the amount estimated by the taxpayer as the tax imposed by chapter 1 (without regard to the credit for taxes withheld at source) over the amount which the taxpayer estimates as the amount allowable as a credit for the taxable year for taxes withheld at the source. The subsection further provides that every declaration of estimated tax for the taxable year shall contain or be verified by a written statement that it is made under the penalties of perjury.

Joint Declaration by Husband and Wife

Under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 58 in the Senate bill, a husband and wife living together at the time prescribed for making a declaration may elect to make a joint declaration in which case the liability with respect to the estimated tax shall be joint and several. A joint declaration by husband and wife shall be signed and verified by both spouses. If the declaration is signed by one spouse as agent for the other, authorization for such action must accompany the declaration. No joint declaration is permitted if either husband or wife is a nonresident alien. If the husband and wife make a joint declaration but do not make a joint return for the taxable year the amounts paid on account of the estimated tax for such year may be treated as payments on account of the tax liability of either the husband or wife for the taxable year or may be divided between them in any manner they see fit.

Time and Place for Filing Declarations

The time and place for filing declarations of estimated tax required under section 58 under the Senate bill are prescribed in subsection (d) of such section. Such declarations must be filed on or before the 15th day of the third month of the taxable year by every person whose then anticipated income for the current taxable year or whose actual income for the preceding taxable year meets the requirements of subsection (a). In the more usual case of taxpayers on the calendar year basis, such declarations are to be filed on or before the 15th day of March. In the case of taxpayers on a fiscal year basis, such date will be the 15th day of the third month of the particular fiscal year. If, under the provisions of subsection (a) a declaration is not required on or before the 15th day of the third month of the taxable year but subsequent thereto the facts and circumstances are such that the gross income for the taxable year can reasonably be expected to meet the requirements of such subsection, a declaration of the estimated tax liability is required to be filed. In such event, the declaration must be filed on or before the 15th day of the last month of the quarter of the taxable year in which the requirements of subsection (a) are first met. For instance, a single person was hired on January 2, 1944, at a salary of $2,400 per annum. He had no other source of income, could not reasonably expect to receive any other income, and did not receive any income during the preceding taxable year. In the absence of any change of circumstances before March 15, 1944, such person is not required to make a declaration as of that date. On July 1 such person was advised that he was promoted to a higher position and that thereafter his salary would be increased to $3,200 per year. Hence, on that date the gross income of such person for the taxable year could reasonably be expected to exceed $2,700. Therefore, assuming that such taxpayer makes his income tax return on a calendar year basis, a declaration of his estimated tax liability for the taxable year should be filed on or before the 15th day of September of such year.

Under the provisions of subsection (d), an amended or revised declaration is permitted, subject to such regulations as may be prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. Such amended or revised declaration may be filed in any quarter of the taxable year subsequent to the quarter in which the declaration or the last amended declaration was filed. The revised estimate shown in such amended declaration shall not take effect with respect to any quarter unless filed on or before the 15th day of the third month of such quarter. Declarations of estimated tax liability and all amended or revised declarations shall be filed with the collector of internal revenue for the district in which is located the legal residence or principal place of business of the person making such declaration or if the declarant has no legal residence or principal place of business in the United States, such declarations and amendments and revisions shall be filed with the collector of internal revenue at Baltimore, Md. Any such amended declaration shall be filed with the collector for the district in which the original declaration was filed.

Subsection (e) of section 58 authorizes the Commissioner to grant a reasonable extension of time for filing the declaration of the estimated tax under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe with the approval of the Secretary. Except in the case of taxpayers who are abroad, no extension shall be granted for a period of more than 6 months. This provision is the same in substance as the comparable provision of the House bill, except that the Senate bill applies the same rules relative to extension to payment of the estimated tax.

Rules Applicable to Declarations

Subsection (f) relating to persons under disability, provides that if the taxpayer is unable to make his own declaration a declaration shall be made by a duly authorized agent or by the guardian or other person charged with the care of the person or property of such taxpayer. In such case, the taxpayer and his agent shall be responsible for the declaration as made and incur liability for any penalties provided for erroneous, false, or fraudulent declaration.

Under subsection (g) it is provided that the fact that an individual's name is signed to a filed declaration shall be prima facie evidence for all purposes that the declaration was actually signed by him.

Subsection (h) makes applicable to declarations of estimated tax the provisions of section 55, relating to publicity of returns.

With the exception of the foregoing section 58 (h) and the differences due to the basic difference in the systems of current payment of tax in the House bill and in the Senate bill, section 58 of the Senate bill is substantially the same as the corresponding section 58 of the House bill.

Payment of Estimated Tax

Section 59 of the Senate bill is substantially the same as section 59 of the House bill except for technical amendments necessitated by the requirement for current payment of the entire tax instead of only the basic tax as under the House bill, and a clarifying amendment relating to installment payments of the estimated tax.

Under the provisions of new section 59, if the declaration of the estimated tax is made on or before the fifteenth day of the third month of the taxable year, such tax shall be paid in four equal installments. In such case the first installment shall be paid at the time of filing the declaration, the second installment on the fifteenth day of the sixth month, the third installment on the fifteenth day of the ninth month, and the fourth installment on the fifteenth day of the twelfth month of the taxable year.

If the declaration of estimated tax is filed after the fifteenth day of the third month of the taxable year, the estimated tax shall be paid in equal installments the number of which is equal to the number of quarters remaining in the taxable year. For example, if the declaration is filed on the fifteenth day of the sixth month of the taxable year, the estimated tax shall be paid in three equal installments.

If, pursuant to section 58 (e), the Commissioner grants an extension of time within which to make a declaration of estimated tax, installments of such tax shall be paid at such time and under such conditions as the Commissioner may prescribe.

If a taxpayer files an amended or revised declaration of estimated tax, the remaining installments of estimated tax shall be ratably increased or decreased, as the case may be, to reflect any change made in the previously estimated tax by such amendment or revision. For example, on March 15, 1944, the taxpayer filed a declaration of estimated tax for the calendar year 1944 in the amount of $600. An installment of $150 was paid at the time of making such declaration. However, on June 15, 1944, the taxpayer filed an amended declaration, disclosing an estimated tax for the taxable year of $300 instead of the $600 originally estimated. As a result of such amended declaration, the installments of estimated tax required to be paid on June 15, September 15, and December 15 will each be $50.

At the election of the taxpayer, any installment of estimated tax may be paid prior to the date prescribed for its payment.

As stated above, section 58 (e) authorizes the Commissioner, under certain conditions, to grant an extension of time for payment of the estimated tax.

The section further provides that payment of the estimated tax shall be considered payment on account of the income (including Victory) tax imposed by chapter 1 for the taxable year. The taxpayer will, of course, have to file his regular income-tax return as usual, and on such return the estimated tax paid will be taken into account. All such payments of estimated tax are for the purpose of the provisions of law relating to refund or credit of the tax imposed by chapter 1, including the provisions relating to interest on overpayments of such tax, deemed to have been paid on the fifteenth day of the third month following the close of the taxable year.

Subsection (b) of section 59 provides that the estimated tax shall be assessed only to the extent paid. Thus, the collector may not distrain for any unpaid installment of estimated tax. Such provision, however, shall not be construed to prevent the application of section 146 relating to the closing by the Commissioner of the taxable year.

Special Rules for the Application of Sections 58 and 59

New section 60 under the Senate bill provides special rules for the application of sections 58 and 59 relating to the declaration and payment of the estimated tax. Subsection (a) allows the individual whose estimated gross income from farming for the taxable year is at least 80 percent of his total estimated gross income from all sources for the taxable year the option of filing his declaration on or before the fifteenth day of the last month of the taxable year, in lieu of the time prescribed for other individuals under section 58 (d). This provision recognizes the difficulty of estimating in the early part of the taxable year the amount of income which will be derived from ordinary farm operations. Weather conditions, plant and animal diseases, ravages of insects and other pests, are among the factors which contribute to the uncertainty of such income. The estimated gross income from farming is the estimated income of the farm entrepreneur from the cultivation of the soil and the raising or harvesting of any agricultural or horticultural commodities, and the raising of live-

stock, bees, or poultry. In other words, the requisite gross income must be derived from the operations of a stock, dairy, poultry, fruit, or truck farm, or plantation, ranch, nursery, range, or orchard.

Subsection (b) of new section 60 authorizes the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, to prescribe suitable regulations for the application with respect to short taxable years of section 58, 59, and 294 (a) (3), (4), (5), added to the Internal Revenue Code by the bill. Thus, the rules applicable to short taxable years with respect to the declaration and payment of the estimated tax, and additions to the tax for failure to make a timely declaration of estimated tax, timely payment of installments of estimated tax, or for substantial underestimates of tax, are to be established by regulations.

Subsection (c) prescribes the special rule governing the transition to the system of current payment of the income tax on income not subject to withholding at source. The subsection provides the rule applicable with respect to the filing of the first declaration required under the bill. In the case of a taxable year which is the calendar year 1943, the declaration is to be filed on or before September 15, 1943. In the case of a taxable year which is a fiscal year beginning after January 1, 1943, the declaration shall be filed on such date as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe. Apart from the date for filing the first declaration, all of the other rules prescribed in the bill with respect to declarations generally shall be applicable to such first declaration. The subsection makes it clear that the payments which taxpayers are required to make with respect to their 1942 tax shall be applied to decrease ratably the installments of estimated tax for taxable years beginning in 1943.

Additions to Tax

Section (5) (b) of the Senate bill adds to section 294 (a) of the code three new paragraphs numbered (3), (4), and (5). These paragraphs contain sanctions relating to the filing of declarations and payment of installments of estimated tax and to the proper estimate of tax.

Paragraph (3) provides for an addition to the tax in the case of failure to make and file a declaration of estimated tax within the time specifically prescribed by this bill or within the time prescribed by the Commissioner under the authority granted by the bill. Such addition to the tax shall be in an amount equal to 10 percent of the tax. The term "the tax" for the purpose of this provision means the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the code. The Senate bill eliminates from the comparable provision of the House bill the minimum penalty of $10.

Paragraph (4) provides for an addition to the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the code in the case of the failure to pay an installment of the estimated tax within the time specifically prescribed in the bill or within the time prescribed by the Commissioner pursuant to authority granted by the bill. Such addition to the tax shall be in the amount of 2½ percent of the tax imposed by chapter 1, but in no event shall such addition be less than $2.50. In the case of husband and wife who file a joint declaration of estimated tax for the taxable year, and subsequently file separate returns for such year, the addition to the tax in the case of a failure to pay an installment of the estimated tax within the time prescribed shall be 2½ percent of the tax imposed on each spouse under chapter 1, but not less than $2.50 in the case of each spouse.

Paragraph (5) provides for an addition to the tax in the case of a substantial underestimate of tax. In view of the fact that the taxpayer may revise his estimate of tax quarterly throughout the taxable year, and as late as the 15th day of the last month of the taxable year, the provision for an addition to the tax is a reasonable sanction to insure the payment during the taxable year of a total amount of estimated tax closely approximating the actual liability for the year. In the case of individuals other than farmers exercising the election under section 60 (a), an addition to the tax imposed by chapter 1 is provided in the event that the amount of the estimated tax (increased by the amounts of the credits for taxes withheld at source) is less than 80 percent of the amount of the tax imposed by that chapter (determined without regard to the credits for taxes withheld at source). The parenthetical expressions represent a change from the comparable provision of the House bill, designed to obviate hardship in certain cases. In the event of a failure to file any declaration where one is due, the amount of the estimated tax for the purposes of this provision will be zero. In the case of farmers exercising the election under section 60 (a), the addition to the tax is applicable if the amount of the estimated tax, increased as stated above, is less than 66⅔ percent of the amount of the tax imposed by chapter 1, determined as stated above. The addition to the tax shall be an amount equal to 6 percent of the difference between the amount of the estimated tax so increased, and the tax imposed by chapter 1 so determined; or the difference in dollars, whichever is the lesser. To illustrate: (1) Taxpayer A files a declaration showing an estimated tax of $200, based upon the excess of an amount estimated as the amount of tax without regard to withholding credit, $800, over the amount which he estimates as the withholding credit for tax withheld at source on wages, $600. His tax for the year, determined without regard to the withholding credits, is $1,200. The actual amount of tax withheld on his wages is $700. Eighty percent of his tax for the year determined without regard to the withholding credits is $960. The amount of the estimated tax, which is $200 ($800 minus $600), increased by the amount of the credit for tax withheld at source ($700), is $900. Accordingly, taxpayer A is subject to the penalty. Applying the 6-percent rate, the amount of the penalty is $18 (6 percent of $1,200 minus $900). The penalty of the dollar amount of the excess is not applicable because that excess is $300 ($1,200 minus $900). The 6-percent penalty is the lesser, and therefore applicable.

(2) Taxpayer B files a declaration showing an estimated tax of $200, based upon the excess of an amount estimated as the amount of tax without regard to withholding credit, $800, over the amount which he estimates as the withholding credit for tax withheld at source of wages, $600. His tax for the year, determined without regard to the withholding credits, is $950. The actual amount of tax withheld on his wages is $550. The amount of the estimated tax, which is $200 ($800 minus $600), increased by the amount of the credit for tax withheld at source ($550) is $750. Accordingly, since 80 percent of $950 is $760, taxpayer B is subject to the penalty. Applying the 6-percent rate, the amount of the penalty is $12 (6 percent of $950 minus $750). The penalty of the dollar amount of the excess is $10 ($760 minus $750). Since the dollar amount penalty is less than the penalty at the 6-percent rate, the former is applicable.

Penalties

Subsection (c) of section (5) of the Senate bill amends section 145 (a) of the code. Section 145 (a) prescribes criminal penalties for the willful failure to make and file returns, keep records, supply information, or pay tax. By the amendment contained in section 5 (c) the same penalties are made applicable to the failure to make and file declarations and pay the estimated tax.

Installments

Section (5) (d) of the Senate bill terminates the privilege of installment payments of tax in the case of all individuals subject to the system of current collection of income taxes provided in the bill. The bill contemplates that since the payments made during the taxable year will be based upon the reasonably anticipated tax liability for that year (which should closely approximate the actual tax liability in view of the privilege granted to the taxpayer to revise his estimate), there is no occasion for retaining the installment privilege. The requirement, pursuant to section 56 (a), for payment on the 15th day of the third month following the close of the taxable year of any excess of the actual liability over the amount of estimated tax paid during the taxable year should not create a hardship in any case where a reasonable and proper estimate is made during the taxable year. Despite the amendment made by subsection (d), any payment of tax or any payment of an installment of tax due and payable before September 1, 1943, shall be made in accordance with the requirements of the present law. In other words, a taxpayer on the calendar year basis, who pays his 1942 tax liability in installments, must pay his March 15 and June 15, 1943, installments of 1942 tax.

Effective Date

Subsection (e) of section 5 of the Senate bill provides that the amendments made by section 5 of the bill shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942. Thus the recommended system for current payment of individual income tax not withheld at source applies only to taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1943.

Conference Amendment

The conference amendment extended the system of current payment of tax not withheld at source to those nonresident aliens with respect to whose wages withholding at source is made applicable. Thus, generally speaking, the current tax payment system will apply to certain nonresident alien individuals who are residents of a contiguous country and who enter and leave the United States at frequent intervals. Such aliens, with respect to wages received for services performed in this country, are subject to tax in the same manner and to the same extent as citizens of the United States. Since they will be subject to withholding on such wages, failure to include them within the current tax payment system would cause a considerable doubling-up in the payment of their taxes. The necessary change to effect the inclusion of these aliens is contained in the opening sentence of section 58 (a). For the purposes of the contents of the declaration, such aliens shall estimate the amounts of all of the credits allowable with respect to taxes withheld under section 143 and withheld on wages.

Paragraph (3) of section 58 (a) under the conference amendment is a new provision which extends the scope of the declaration requirement in order to cover a situation arising from the operation of section 6 (b). Under this provision a declaration of estimated tax for the taxable year beginning in 1943 is required from an individual who was required to make a return for the taxable year beginning in 1942, and whose gross income from wages for such 1942 taxable year exceeds the gross income which can reasonably be expected to be received from wages for the 1943 taxable year. This provision is designed to require an individual to file a declaration and pay as a part of estimated tax the amount of the excess of his 1942 tax liability over his 1943 tax liability (by reason of section 6 (b) (1)), in the case where such individual would otherwise not be required to file a declaration for the taxable year 1943.

Section 58 (b) (1) has been changed by striking the reference in the Senate bill to "the amount of tax under sections 11 and 12, or 400, as the case may be, and section 450,"

and inserting in lieu thereof: "The amount of tax under this chapter." This is a clarifying amendment.

Section 5 (d), which amends section 56 (b) of the code, has been changed to remove the installment privilege in the case of the nonresident alien individuals to whom withholding under subchapter D of chapter 9 is made applicable. This provision is required by reason of the inclusion of such individuals in the current tax-payment system.

A new subsection (e) has been added to section 5 of the bill. This subsection amends sections 217 (a) and 218 (a) of the code to provide, in effect, that nonresident alien individuals to whom withholding under subchapter D of chapter 9 is made applicable shall file returns and pay tax at the time provided in the case of citizens and residents of the United States. The purpose of this provision is to coordinate the return and payment date of such individuals with the date applicable to others to whom the current tax payment system applies.

Subsection (f) of the conference amendment (corresponding to subsection (e) of the Senate bill) contains a change which precludes the application of section 294 (a) (5) in the case of taxpayers who are not required to make a declaration of estimated tax for a taxable year beginning in 1943.

Relief from double payments in 1943

Description of House and Senate Bills

Section 6 of the Senate bill contains provisions relating to the problem of transition to the system of current collection of tax liabilities. This section differs materially from the corresponding section of the House bill. This difference is occasioned by the fact that under the House bill the system of current collection of tax liabilities is applied only to normal tax, surtax at the first bracket rate and the net Victory tax, the balance of tax liability for any taxable year being collected in the year following the receipt of the income as under existing law. Under the House bill the transition problem was met by the discharge of the liability for tax for the taxable year beginning in 1942 only to the extent of the normal tax plus a percentage of the surtax net income at the first bracket rate. Thus, the amount discharged corresponded approximately to the amount to be collected currently in cases in which the income for the 2 years is approximately the same.

The Senate bill calls for the collection currently of the entire tax liability. Section 6 of the Senate bill meets the problem of transition by discharging the entire liability for the taxable year commencing in 1942. Under subsection (a) of section 6 this discharge is made applicable as of September 1, 1943, to all persons to whom the system of current collection of tax liabilities applies, with the exception of any case in which the taxpayer is convicted of any criminal offense with respect to the tax for the taxable year 1942 or in which additions to the tax for such taxable year are applicable by reasons of fraud. It is also provided that interest and additions to the tax for the taxable year 1942 shall be collected as a part of the tax for the taxable year 1943.

In order, however, to prevent certain windfalls as a result of the discharge, subsections (b) and (c) of section 6 of the Senate bill provide for an increase of the 1943 tax liability in certain situations. The net effect of these increases, which is more fully explained below, is to reduce the amount of the relief from 1942 tax liability, but for administrative reasons the entire 1942 tax liability is discharged and the reduction is couched in terms of an increase in the 1943 liability which would otherwise be due. There are no comparable provisions in the House bill.

Subsection (b) of section 6 of the Senate bill provides a special rule applicable in cases in which the 1942 tax would have been greater than the 1943 tax. In such a case an amount equal to the excess of the 1942 tax over the 1943 tax (in both instances determined without regard to interest, additions to the tax, and credits for amounts withheld at source) is added to the 1943 tax liability. For example, a taxpayer who is married but has no dependents and who had a net income for the taxable year 1942 of $10,000 and would, therefore, be liable for a tax in the amount of $2,152 for the year 1942 but for the provisions of subsection (a) of section 6, is nevertheless liable for that minimum amount of tax for the year 1943, even though his net income for 1943 were to drop to a figure which would produce a tax liability less than $2,152. If, for example, his net income for the year 1943 were only $2,000, producing a tax liability of approximately $180, he would have added to his liability for 1943 the difference between $2,152 and $180, or $1,972. A special exception to this rule makes such an increase of the 1943 tax liability inapplicable with respect to persons entering upon active service with the armed forces in 1942 or 1943, to the extent that the excess of the 1942 tax over the 1943 tax is attributable to earned net income as defined in section 25 (a) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code. The determination of the portion of the excess of 1942 tax over 1943 tax which is attributable to earned net income is to be determined under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

The increase in the tax liability for 1943 which is effected by subsection (b) of section 6 of the Senate bill is considered to be a part of the 1943 tax which is to be paid currently during the taxable year. Therefore, on the occasion of the taxpayer's filing his declaration of estimated tax for 1943 on September 15, in the case of a taxpayer on a calendar year, the tax liability for the taxable year 1943 as estimated by the taxpayer will include any increase resulting from the operation of subsection (b) of this section. Thus, in the case of a calendar year taxpayer (other than a taxpayer who entered the armed forces in 1942 or 1943) who elected to pay his 1942 tax in installments, the September and December installments of estimated tax can never be less than one-fourth of the 1942 tax less whatever amount is estimated to be withheld at source.

Subsection (c) of section 6 of the Senate bill contains two additional situations in which the 1943 tax liability is increased as a result of, in effect, reducing the amount of the 1942 tax liability discharged. In both of the situations covered under subsection (c) however, the resulting increase in the 1943 tax is considered not to be a part of the 1943 estimated tax which is to be paid currently during the taxable year. Such increase, therefore, is required to be paid at the time prescribed for the payment of the tax for the 1943 year. Subsection (d) of this section, which will be subsequently discussed, provides for a manner in which this increase may be paid over a period of 4 years. In effect, in each of the situations covered under subsection (c) the principle involved is the same, namely the reduction in the amount of relief from tax liability for 1942 or 1943, whichever year is the measure of relief, from a full year's relief to a lower amount in cases where the taxpayer's income has risen substantially when compared with the income of a previous period. This lower amount of tax relief is obtained by computing a tentative tax for the year otherwise serving as the measure for relief, based on the amount of the surtax net income of the base year plus $10,000. As in subsection (b) the tax for the year 1942 is technically discharged and the excess of tax liability over the relief so computed is added as an increase of 1943 tax. The subsection provides that the increase in tax will be determined under regulations of the Commissioner. It is contemplated that such regulations will prescribe the details relating to the comparisons of the years involved, the computations of the tentative tax on which such increase is based, the method of determining the composition of the income on which the tentative tax is computed, and other matters involved.

The first situation covered by the Senate bill in subsection (c) of section 6 is one in which the tax for the taxable year 1942 (determined without regard to interest and additions to the tax and credits for amounts withheld at source); is less than that for the taxable year 1943 (similarly determined), and where the surtax net income of the taxpayer for any one of the taxable years 1938, 1939, or 1940, whichever may be selected by him (hereafter referred to as the base year), plus $10,000 is less than the surtax net income of the taxpayer for the taxable year 1942. In such a case relief from the liability for the taxable year 1942 is limited to an amount equal to a tentative tax computed as if the portion of the surtax net income for the taxable year, which is not greater than the sum of the surtax net income for the base year plus $10,000, constituted both the surtax net income for the taxable year 1942 and the net income for such taxable year after allowance of all credits against net income. The effect of this provision is to limit the discharge of the 1942 liability to an amount of tax computed on an amount of surtax net income and net income equivalent to that of the base year plus $10,000 computed at the 1942 rate rather than on the income for 1942. The amount of income on which the tentative tax is computed is composed of the same type of income as the income of the 1942 taxable year. Thus if the 1942 income consisted entirely of capital gains the tentative tax would be computed as a tax on capital gains. The excess of the 1942 tax over the tentative tax computed in this manner is discharged and the amount of such excess is added as part of the 1943 tax liability.

An example will illustrate the application of this provision. Taxpayer A had a surtax net income of $5,000 for his base year. In 1942 he had a tax liability of $13,002. For 1943 his tax, without regard to this section, amounted to $14,000. His surtax net income for 1942 was $30,000 and was composed entirely of dividends and interest. By taking the amount of his surtax net income for his base year of $5,000 and adding to it the sum of $10,000, a tentative tax for 1942 for income thus constituted would be $4,680. Thus, the amount by which the tax for 1943 is increased is the difference between $13,002 and $4,680 or $8,322.

The second situation covered in subsection (c) is one in which the tax for the taxable year 1942 (determined without regard to interest, additions to the tax and credits for amounts withheld at source), is equal to or greater than the tax for 1943 (similarly determined) and the surtax net income of the taxpayer for the base year plus $10,000 is less than the surtax net income for the taxable year 1943. Where the tax for 1942 exceeds the tax for 1943, subsection (b) initially operates to increase the 1943 tax by the amount of the excess. In such a case the relief from liability for the taxable year 1942 is further limited by subsection (c) to an amount equal to a tentative tax computed as if the portion of the surtax net income for the 1943 taxable year which is not greater than the sum of the surtax net income for the base year plus $10,000, constituted both the surtax net income for the taxable year 1943 and the net income for such taxable year after allowance of all credits against net income. An additional factor is present when reference is had to 1943 as the year for measuring the relief owing to the fact that Victory tax is applicable to this year. It is necessary, therefore, in arriving at the tentative tax to compute a tentative Victory tax based on an amount determined by a ratio based upon relationships with respect to the

types of 1943 incomes. Thus, the computation in this situation is similar to the computation made in the first situation covered, but the comparison between the surtax net income of the taxable years and the excess amount of tax over the tentative tax is based on the surtax net income of the 1943 year and the computation takes its particular form from the manner in which the income for 1943 is constituted, in this subsection it is also provided that in the event that there is included in the taxable year used as the measure of relief, income which, under section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code, is attributed to the base year selected by the taxpayer, such income shall be excluded in computing the surtax net income of the relief year and shall be included in computing the surtax net income for the base year.

Subsection (d) of section 6 of the Senate bill provides that at the election of the taxpayer made under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, the time for the payment of the portion of the tax for 1943 equal to the increase occasioned by the application of subsection (c) shall be extended. If so extended such portion of the tax shall be paid in four equal installments, the first of which shall be paid on the fifteenth day of the fifteenth month following the close of the taxable year and one of the remaining three installments shall be paid on the last day of each succeeding 12-month period. It is provided that the Commissioner may condition this extension upon the furnishing of a bond not exceeding the amount of such increase with such surety or sureties as he may deem necessary. If the time is extended for payment of this portion of the tax, it is provided further in this subsection that there shall be collected as a part of the tax, interest in the amount of 4 percent per annum on each such installment from the date prescribed for the payment of the tax for the taxable year until the date on which such installment is paid or payable, whichever is the earlier. If any installment is not paid on or before the date on which it is payable, it and the remaining installments shall be paid upon notice and demand from the collector and interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum is to be collected from the payable date until the date of payment.

Subsection (e) of the Senate bill provides special rules for the application of subsections (b) and (c) and requires that in computing the tax for the taxable year 1943, the credit for foreign tax shall be determined without regard to any increase in the 1943 tax by reason of subsections (b) and (c). It further provides that in applying sections 105, 106, and 107 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to limitations on tax) any increase in the tax occasioned by subsections (b) and (c) shall likewise be disregarded. This subsection also contains a provision for the computation of the increase in tax under either subsection (b) or (c) where a joint return is made by a taxpayer to whom either one of the subsections apply. The rule is stated that the taxes of the spouses of the taxable year for which a joint return is not made shall be aggregated for the purposes of subsections (b) and (c), and, in addition, provides that if the taxable year for which a joint return is not made is the taxable year 1943, the liability for the increase in the tax under subsections (b) and (c) shall be joint and several.

In the Senate bill subsection (f) of section 6 provides that subsection (a) shall not apply to an individual who died during the taxable year 1942. Thus, no amount of the tax liability of such a person is discharged.

Subsection (g) of section 6 of the Senate bill provides for the treatment of payments made on account of the 1942 tax. Any payment (other than interest and additions to the tax) made on account of the tax imposed by chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code for the taxable year 1942 upon a taxpayer whose liability is discharged under subsection (a) is considered as payment on account of the estimated tax for 1943. Where any payment of such tax is made pursuant to an extension of time granted by the Commissioner prior to September 1, 1943, such payment is likewise treated as a payment of estimated tax for 1943 and is required to be paid despite the fact that the provisions discharging the tax liability are effective as of September 1, 1943. If the taxpayer should become delinquent prior to September 1 in the payment of his tax or any installment, the fact that the liability for 1942 tax is discharged as of that date is specifically provided as not relieving the taxpayer of his liability for the tax. Such payment, however, is to be treated as a timely payment would be, namely, as a payment on account of estimated tax liability for 1943. The effect of this subsection is to require taxpayers who have elected to pay in installments to continue undiminished their payments on account of 1942 tax liability for all installments which would be due before September 1, 1943. In the event of an extension of time or of delinquency occurring before September, the legal consequences resulting are no different from what they would be under existing law and only after the payments for which time has been extended or which have become delinquent have been paid, do such payments take the character of payments on account of estimated tax for 1943. This subsection further contains the rule that if any payment on account of the tax for 1942 is made pursuant to a joint return, the payment may be treated as a payment on account of the estimated tax of either the husband or the wife or may be divided between them.

Subsection (h) of section 6 of the Senate bill contains the definition of the term "taxable year" when used in reference to the years 1938, 1939, 1940, 1942, or 1943 in the section. It provides that the term means the taxable year beginning in such enumerated year. When used in conjunction with 1942 or 1943 it does not mean any taxable year of less than 12 months, unless such short year is occasioned by the death of the taxpayer or unless there is no taxable year of 12 months beginning in the calendar year. Thus there will be no relief from the tax liability with respect to the short taxable year 1942 where a taxpayer effects a change from a calendar- to a fiscal-year basis but the 12-month fiscal year beginning in 1942 will be the year for which tax is discharged.

Conference Amendment

The conference amendment retains with the following changes the provisions of the Senate bill with respect to relief from double payments in 1943:

In place of the 100 percent discharge of tax liability for most taxpayers, the committee of conference adopted the policy of 75 percent discharge of such liabilities where the total liability is in excess of $50. As in the Senate bill, even though the effect be to discharge only 75 percent of the tax liability of the lower of 1942 or 1943, for administrative reasons the entire 1942 tax liability is discharged and the 1943 tax liability is increased by the 25 percent of tax with respect to which no relief is granted. Thus, in the case of taxpayers whose tax for 1942 is not greater than that for 1943, section 6 (a) of the bill, as agreed to in conference, provides that the 1942 tax shall be completely discharged but that the 1943 tax shall be increased by an amount equal to 25 percent of such tax for 1942. Where, however, the tax liability of the individual for 1942 is $50 or less, the entire amount of the tax is discharged and the 1943 liability is not increased. In order to prevent inequity to persons whose tax liability only slightly exceeds $50, it is further provided that the tax for 1943 shall be increased by 25 percent of the amount of the tax or the excess of the tax liability over $50, whichever is the lesser.

The conference amendment brings into the system of current collection of income tax, by imposing the requirement for filing declarations, etc., those nonresident aliens who are residents of contiguous countries and who enter and leave this country at frequent intervals by reason of being employed in this country. Such individuals are subject to withholding provisions applicable to citizens on their wages earned in this country (except where the withholding is specifically made inapplicable by regulations), and such individuals file returns under existing law in the same manner as citizens. In order, therefore, that these individuals should not be required to double up in their payments of tax to this country, they are included in the provisions of section 6 of the bill, discharging tax liability for the taxable year 1942. Since the fixed income from investments of such persons is withheld on at the source currently under existing law, the discharge of tax liability applicable to such persons as in the case of all other persons is measured in the terms of tax imposed under chapter 1, which means, as it does throughout the law (unless specifically stated otherwise), the net tax liability after credits against the tax.

As in the Senate bill, subsection (b) of section 6 provides that the amount of tax liability in effect discharged shall be measured by the 1943 tax liability in cases in which that liability is less than the 1942 tax liability. As in the Senate bill, in this case the 1942 tax liability is technically discharged and any excess of the 1942 over the 1943 tax liability is added to the 1943 tax liability. In such a case the additional 25 percent of tax, or excess of tax liability over $50, whichever is the lesser, which is added to the 1943 tax, is computed on the lesser amount of tax liability, namely, that for 1943. For example, under the conference amendment a person whose tax for 1942 was $1,000, and for 1943 was $800, would be liable for a 1943 tax in the amount of $1,200 ($800 plus $200 plus 25 percent of $800), and his 1942 tax would be discharged.

The comparison to determine whether the 1942 or the 1943 tax liability is the greater is made on the basis of tax liability before the application of credits against the tax for amounts withheld at source. Where the 1942 tax liability is not greater than that for 1943, the 25-percent increase is determined on the basis of the tax imposed (i. e., net tax liability after credits) for 1942. For the purposes of determining the amount of the increase in the 1943 tax liability where the 1942 tax liability is greater, the tax imposed (i. e., net tax liability after credits) for 1942 is used with respect to the year 1942 and the tax imposed plus the credits for tax withheld at source under sections 466 (e) and 35 of the code is used with respect to the year 1943. The difference in the two taxes so determined is the increase to be added. For the purpose of determining the amount of the 25-percent increase in the 1943 tax in such a case, the tax imposed for 1943 plus the credits for tax withheld at source under sections 466 (e) and 35 are used.

The conference amendment recognizes that, in the case of a nonresident alien or a person holding substantial amounts of tax free covenant bonds, there might be a situation where an individual's tax before credits for tax withheld at source for 1942 would exceed his tax for 1943 similarly determined, but the tax imposed for 1942 would be less than his tax imposed for 1943 plus credits for withheld tax on wages under sections 35 and 466 (e), so that there would be no excess of 1942 tax liability over 1943 tax liability.

In such a case the conference amendment limits the 25-percent increase in the 1943 tax to 25 percent of the net tax for 1942, or the excess of such tax over $50, whichever is the lesser. This limitation is necessary to achieve the result that the measure of discharge of tax liability shall be the tax liability of the year in which the lesser tax is imposed.

The conference amendment makes some changes in the treatment of cases of increased incomes found in subsection (c) of section 6 of both the Senate bill and the bill as agreed to in conference. The taxable year 1937 is added to the years from which the taxpayer may select his base year. In addition, it is provided that $20,000, instead of $10,000, is to be added to the surtax net income of the base year in computing the tentative tax which is the limit of discharge of tax liability. If the tentative tax so computed is less than 75 percent of the tax liability for the year which is the measure of relief, the excess of such 75 percent of tax liability over the amount of tentative tax is made an additional increase in the 1943 tax.

By reason of a technical rearrangement, special rules for the application of the provisions relating to discharge of tax liability are to be found in subsection (d) of section 6 of the bill as agreed to in conference rather than in subsection (e) of that section as in the Senate bill. These rules in addition to the points discussed hereafter relate to: (1) The application to the taxable year 1943 of the foreign tax credit (paragraph (3)); (2) the application to the taxable year 1943 of the limitations on tax rate effected by sections 105, 106, and 107 of the code (paragraph (3)); and (3) the rule to be followed in the case where joint and separate returns are made by a husband and wife for the taxable years 1942 and 1943 respectively, or vice versa (paragraph (2)).

In addition, as a further technical rearrangement, there is included in paragraph (1) of subsection (d) the rule found in subsection (b) of section 6 of the Senate bill excepting from the increase in the 1943 tax the excess of the 1942 tax over the 1943 tax to the extent attributable to earned net income in the case of persons who were members of the armed forces during 1942 or 1943. In the Senate bill this exception was applicable to a member of the military or naval forces of the United States. The conference amendment makes this exception applicable also to a member of the armed forces of any of the United Nations. Instead of the use of the phrase "attributable to earned net income" in the Senate bill, the conference amendment excepts from the increase "an amount equal to the amount by which the tax for taxable year is increased by reason of the inclusion in the net income for the taxable year 1942 of the amount of the earned net income." This change is designed to make certain that the earned net income in this respect is to be taken out of the upper tax brackets.

The conference amendment likewise incorporates, as paragraph (7) of subsection (d) of section 6, subsection (f) of section (6) of the Senate bill providing no discharge of tax liability in case of persons who died in 1942. There is also incorporated, as paragraph (4), the provision in subsection (e) of section (6) of the Senate bill relating to the treatment of section 107 income in cases to which subsection (c) is applicable.

The conference amendment adds to subsection (d) of section (6), as paragraph (5), an additional rule for the application of subsection (c). This rule provides that if during the base year of an individual, such individual was a shareholder in a corporation and if substantially all of the assets of the corporation were acquired by such individual or a partnership of which he is a member pursuant to complete liquidation of the corporation at any time prior to May 1, 1943, and if at all times after the liquidation up to and including whichever of the 2 taxable years, 1942 or 1943, is the measure of discharge of the taxpayer's liability, the trade or business of the corporation was carried on by the individual or partnership, the individual may compute his surtax net income of the base year as if the earnings and profits of the corporation for taxable year ending with or within the base year had all been distributed as dividends at the end of such taxable year. The individual's distributive share of these hypothetical dividends is limited to his proportionate share in the partnership during the taxable year used as the measure of his discharge of tax liability if such interest is proportionately less than his interest in the corporation.

Subsection (d) of section 6, in paragraph (6), provides that the 25 percent increase in 1943 tax required under subsections (a) or (b) (2), or the additional increase under subsection (c), shall not be considered to be a part of the tax for the taxable year 1943 for the purposes of the estimated tax provisions. Thus these increases would for the first time be reflected in the annual returns filed in 1944. A similar provision was incorporated in subsection (c) of section 6 of the Senate bill with respect to the subsection (c) increase.

The conference amendment incorporates in paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of section 6, the rule with respect to granting extension of time for the payment of any increase in 1943 tax resulting from the application of subsection (c). The substance of this provision is the same as that found in the Senate bill in subsection (d) of this section. Paragraph (1) of subsection (e) under the conference amendment contains provisions for the extension of time for payment of the 25 percent increase resulting from the application of subsections (a) and (b) (2). This paragraph provides that at the election of the taxpayer, the Commissioner shall extend the time for payment of the portion of the tax for the taxable year 1943 equal to one-half of the amount of the 25 percent increase under subsection (a) or (b) (2). The time for payment of this one-half is extended to the fifteenth day of the fifteenth month following the close of the taxable year. As in the case of the increase under subsection (c), the Commissioner may condition the extension upon the furnishing by the taxpayer of a bond not exceeding the amount with respect to which the extension applies, with such surety or sureties as he may deem necessary, conditioned upon the payment of the amount in accordance with the terms of the extension. If the amount is not paid on or before the date on which it is payable as a result of the extension, it is to be paid on notice and demand from the collector; and if not paid on the payable date, interest at the rate of 6 percent per annum is to be collected as a part of the tax on the amount for which the extension was granted for the period beginning with the date on which this amount is payable and ending on the date on which it is paid.

By reason of the technical rearrangement, the conference amendment includes, with minor technical changes, in subsection (f) of section 6 the substance of the provisions found in subsection (g) of section 6 of the Senate bill. This subsection relates to the treatment of payments on account of the 1942 tax.

Under the conference amendment subsection (g) incorporates the provisions of subsection (h) of section 6 of the Senate bill.

The conference amendment adds a new subsection (h) providing that the entire section 6 shall be applied in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCE FOR MILITARY AND NAVAL PERSONNEL

Description of the House and Senate Bills

Section 22 (b) (13) of the code makes provision for an exclusion from gross income in the case of personnel below the grade of commissioned officer in the military and naval forces of the United States. The amount to be excluded under this provision is not to exceed $250 in the case of a single person and $300 in the case of a married person or head of a family and applies only to salary or compensation received for active service in the armed forces during the present war.

The House bill would amend section 22 (b) (13) of the code to effect an exclusion from gross income in the case of military and naval personnel, without distinction as to rank, with respect to the compensation received during any taxable year and before the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President for active service during such war. The amount to be so excluded would not exceed the excess of $3,500 over the personal exemption claimed under section 25 (b) of the code.

The Senate bill amends section 22 (b) (13) to provide for a flat exclusion of $1,500 from gross income in the case of all military and naval personnel, without distinction as to rank, with respect to such compensation. The amount of such exclusion is not to be reduced by the personal exemption claimed under section 25 (b) of the code.

The amendment would apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1942, and not, as under the House bill, with respect to all compensation received after December 31, 1941, by a member of the military or naval forces of the United States for active service in such forces.

Conference Amendment

The conference amendment adopts the provisions of the Senate bill, but extends the application of those provisions to a member of the military or naval forces of any of the other United Nations. The provision will therefore cover such individuals as well as members of the military or naval forces of the United States.

ABATEMENT OF TAX FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES UPON DEATH

Description of the House and Senate Bills

Under the House bill supplement U is added to chapter 1 of the code to relieve a member of the military or naval forces of the United States who dies on or after December 7, 1941, in active service from the liability for the tax imposed by chapter 1 for the taxable year in which falls the date of his death. In addition thereto, the supplement provides that any tax imposed under chapter 1 or under the corresponding title of any prior revenue act (including interest and additions to the tax) which is unpaid as of the date of death shall not be assessed. If any such tax, interest, or additions to the tax have been assessed and are unpaid at the date of death, such assessment or assessments shall be abated. If the amount of any such liability which was unpaid as of the date of death is collected subsequent to such date, the amount so collected shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment.

The Senate bill revised the House version of this new supplement to limit the relief granted therein to that portion of the income taxes which is attributable to earned net income as defined in section 25 (a) (4) of the code. In addition, the taxes in respect to which such relief is granted are limited, in general, to those which would have become due and payable after the date when such individual entered upon active service in such forces or the effective date of the Selective Service Act (September 16, 1940) whichever date is the later, assuming that such member paid, or would have paid, his

taxes in quarterly installments to the extent provided for in the code. If the liability for the portion of such taxes which is attributable to earned net income is outstanding at the date of death, the liability shall be abated. If such portion of the taxes has been paid at any time, the amount paid shall be credited or refunded as an overpayment.

To effectuate this policy, the Senate bill classifies such deceased members of the armed forces into three groups according to the year in which they entered upon active duty in such forces, and states with respect to each group those taxes (or the portions thereof) of which the members of the group are to be relieved. This classification was made necessary by reason of the transition in the year 1943 to a current tax basis.

The first category applies to those who entered upon such service before the commencement of the taxable year beginning in 1943. The taxes to be abated, credited, or refunded to members in this group are (1) the tax attributable to earned net income for the taxable year in which falls the date on which he entered upon such service or September 16, 1940, whichever date is the later; (2) the tax attributable to earned net income for all subsequent taxable years while he was in such service; and (3) for the taxable year last preceding the date on which he entered upon such service or September 16, 1940, whichever date is the later, that portion of the tax for such preceding year attributable to earned net income which bears the same ratio to the entire tax so attributable as the number of quarters in the taxable year referred to in (1) subsequent to the date on which he entered upon such service or September 16, 1940, whichever date is the later, bears to 4. Thus, for example, if the individual (on a calendar-year basis) enters the service on July 1, 1942, he would be exempt from the tax attributable to his earned net income for the year 1942, for all subsequent years in the service and for one-half of the tax so attributable for the calendar year 1941. If he entered the service on July 1, 1940, he would be exempt from such tax for 1940 and subsequent years in service and for one-fourth of such tax for 1939.

The second category consists of those members of the armed forces who entered upon such service in the taxable year beginning in 1943. The taxes to be abated, credited, or refunded in respect of this class are: (1) that portion of the tax for the taxable year beginning in 1943 (not including the increase in such tax prescribed by the "windfall" provision contained in section 6 (c) of the Senate bill), which bears the same ratio to the total tax (not including such increase) as the number of quarters in such taxable year subsequent to the date on which he entered upon such service bears to four, to the extent such portion is attributable to earned net income; and (2) the tax attributable to earned net income for all subsequent taxable years during which he was in such service.

The third category is made up of those members who entered upon such service after the end of the taxable year beginning in 1943. The taxes to be abated, credited, or refunded in respect of this group are all the taxes which are attributable to earned net income for the taxable years during which they were in such service but not including the taxable year during which they entered upon such service.

In computing the tax to be abated, credited, or refunded under (3) of the first category and (1) of the second category, a fractional part of a quarter subsequent to the date on which he entered upon such service or September 16, 1940, whichever date is the later, shall be disregarded unless it exceeds 15 days, in which case it shall be considered a quarter.

CONFERENCE AMENDMENT

The conference amendment adopts the provisions of the House bill, but extends the application of those provisions to a member of the military or naval forces of any of the other United Nations. The provisions will therefore cover such individuals as well as members of the military or naval forces of the United States.

Assistant Commissioners

Section 9 of the Senate bill amends the Internal Revenue Code to authorize the appointment of two Assistant Commissioners, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The amendment provides that the Assistant Commissioners shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Commissioner or required by law. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The conference amendment retains this provision.

Powers of Appointment

Section 10 of the Senate bill extends the time in connection with the release of powers of appointment for estate and gift tax purposes from July 1, 1943, to March 1, 1944. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The conference amendment retains this provision.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
HAROLD KNUTSON,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS A. JENKINS.
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and I yield myself 10 minutes at this time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 86]

Allen, Ill.	Gifford	Merrow
Baldwin, Md.	Granger	Miller, Conn.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Grant, Ala.	Myers
Barry	Guyer	Nichols
Bell	Hagen	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bonner	Hancock	O'Leary
Bradley, Pa.	Harris, Va.	O'Toole
Buckley	Hart	Ramey
Burchill, N. Y.	Hartley	Randolph
Byrne	Heffernan	Reed, Ill.
Cannon, Fla.	Hendricks	Rockwell
Capozzoli	Herter	Russell
Chapman	Hoffman	Sadowski
Cochran	Hope	Scott
Compton	Judd	Sheridan
Costello	Kennedy	Sikes
Courtney	Keogh	Somers, N. Y.
Crawford	Kerr	Sumners, Tex.
Culkin	Kilburn	Tolan
Delaney	King	Treadway
Dies	Klein	Van Zandt
Dilweg	Lambertson	Welchel, Ohio
Dirksen	Landis	Welch
Domengeaux	LeCompte	White
Ellsworth	Lemke	Wilson
Fay	Lynch	Winter
Flannagan	McCowen	Woodrum, Va.
Gale	Magnuson	Worley
Gavagan	Mansfield, Tex.	Zimmerman
Gibson	Marcantonio	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 342 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Without objection, further proceedings, under the roll call, will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative business and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CURRENT TAX PAYMENT ACT OF 1943

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, after 4 months of arduous and strenuous work by the Committee on Ways and Means, we are today, as far as our committee and the House of Representatives are concerned, to write the last chapter in a bill providing for the current collection of individual income taxes. This has been one of the most difficult, as well as one of the most controversial and troublesome, bills with which our committee has ever had to deal. The House can realize, I am sure, some of the difficulties which faced the conference committee. You all remember the fierce battle in the House on the first and second bills which we reported, neither of which was adopted, and also the fight over instructing the conferees to agree to the Senate amendment.

For 8 days the conferees labored, either in joint conference or in individual meetings, in an effort to reach a compromise or an agreement which we hoped would be acceptable to both the House and the Senate. It will be recalled that the bill which the House sent to the Senate had the effect of canceling 100 percent of the 1942 tax liability of 90 percent of all taxpayers, or approximately the tax liability of 35,000,000 taxpayers out of a total of 39,000,000. Since 100 percent of the tax liability of these taxpayers would have been canceled, there was no doubling up of their 1942 and 1943 liability in the bill passed by the House and sent to the Senate. In order to prevent doubling up of the remaining 4,000,000 taxpayers, the House bill did not place them on a current basis with respect to that part of their liability above the first-bracket rate. This bill canceled, in the aggregate, approximately 77 percent of the total 1942 liability, or a total of $7,600,000,000.

The Senate struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and passed a bill with the following features:

First. It provided for a withholding system as did the House bill.

Second. It provided for a special treatment for the armed forces, as did the House bill, but changed the House provisions.

Third. The Senate bill, with the exception of the windfall provision, canceled 100 percent of the 1942 tax liability. With the windfall provisions, the Senate bill canceled about 87 percent of the 1942 tax liability.

Thus, the bills of the House and of the Senate were in direct conflict on the all-important matters of the amount of

cancelation and the method of cancelation necessary to make a transition to a current system of payments.

One of the most difficult problems with which our conferees were faced was the insistence of the Senate conferees that the total abatement or forgiveness be at least equal to the aggregate cancelation provided in the House bill. The Senate conferees were adamant also at the outset in their position as to an equal percentage of cancelation of the tax "straight across the board" for all taxpayers.

The conferees discussed various plans for compromise for a period of at least 5 days, and remained in seemingly hopeless deadlock. The House conferees would not accept the Senate bill; neither would the Senate conferees accept the House bill; and as a result we discussed and voted on various other proposals, one bill, the last bill reported by the committee to the House, another a flat 50 percent abatement of the 1942 tax or the lower of the 1942 or 1943 tax, another a 60 percent "straight down the line" abatement, but none of these proposals made by the House conferees, while having a majority vote of the House conferees, could secure a majority vote of both the House and Senate conferees. Finally, a proposal was made which 10 of the conferees were seemingly willing to accept. This provided for a 100-percent abatement of the lower of the 1942 or 1943 tax liability, where the tax was $50 or less, with a notch provision to take care of persons whose tax liability slightly exceeded $50. The notch provision allowed a flat $50 abatement to those taxpayers whose tax was between $50 and $66.67. Other taxpayers would have 75 percent of their tax for the lower of the 2 years, 1942 or 1943, abated. Special relief provisions were added to take care of the taxpayers in the armed forces together with antiwindfall provisions to prevent abatement of that part of the tax on war profits.

During the long consideration and discussion of this controversial subject, may I call the attention of the House to the fact, in showing how difficult the problem has been, that at no time was there ever a unanimous vote on any proposal relating to this subject either in the executive sessions of our committee, on the floor of the House on three separate occasions, or in the conference committee. The first and only time when there was a majority of both House and Senate conferees was on the final vote which stood 11 to 3. On this vote, the Senate conferees were unanimous and the House group stood 4 to 3. May I add further that this was the only vote ever taken in the conference, in which the majority members of the House conferees did not vote together. Having been unable to get the Senate conferees to agree on a graduated abatement of the 1942 liability, except to the extent of a $50 tax, the majority of the House conferees yielded on this point, in order to get a bill, and voted on two different motions for a "straight across the board" abatement. One motion was for a flat abatement of 50 percent, and the other for a 60-percent abatement. Accordingly, the only difference in the last analysis was the extent to which the House conferees would go in total abatement, the principle of straight across the board having been yielded in two votes. But the Senate conferees would not go below a 75-percent abatement, pointing out that the House bill provided for an abatement of 77 percent of the 1942 liability. Our House conferees having already yielded on the differential in the motions for a straight 50 and then a 60-percent abatement, I did not feel justified in being responsible for the failure to reach an agreement because of a mere difference of 15 percent, especially as such a failure would end any hope of getting a current collection system in operation this year. The following examples will show the tax effect of the differences between a 60 percent and a 75-percent abatement:

Married persons, no dependents

Net income before personal exemption	1942 tax	60 percent forgiven	75 percent forgiven	Difference
$10,000	$2,152	$1,291.20	$1,614	$322.80
$100,000	64,000	38,436.00	48,045	9,609.00
$1,000,000	854,000	512,400.00	640,500	128,100.00
$5,000,000	4,374,000	2,624,400.00	3,280,500	656,100.00

Moreover, in terms of total revenue, a 60-percent abatement would abate only 15 percent, or one and one-half billions less than a 75-percent abatement. One very important point to be considered was whether it would not be better to collect less with less postponement or the possibility of more with longer postponement. Under a 60-percent forgiveness, the amount not canceled would have to be spread over a period of at least 4 years in order to prevent undue hardship in the upper brackets. With a 75-percent abatement, the entire amount of the forgiven 1942 liability could be collected in 2 years, and taxpayers will have this back liability out of the way by March 15, 1945. Under a 60-percent abatement, this back liability will not be liquidated until March 15, 1947. It is better to secure this revenue now when incomes are rising than to postpone its collection to some future date when incomes are falling. Furthermore, under a 75-percent abatement, we will collect 25 percent of the 1942 liability by March 15, 1945, whereas under a 60-percent abatement we would collect only 20 percent of the 1942 liability by March 15, 1945.

I will now briefly discuss other important features of the conference agreement:

There are two antiwindfall provisions in the bill. One of these provisions limits the tax to be abated to the lower year, 1942 or 1943. It was recognized that this provision would work an undue hardship on persons who were in the service in 1942 or 1943. Since their tax in 1943 will in most cases be lower than their 1942 tax, to prevent such a hardship a special rule is provided with respect to the 1942 tax of persons in the service in 1942 or 1943. Instead of collecting the full 1942 tax, that part of the 1942 tax liability relating to earned income, which a civilian would have to add to his 1943 tax, is forgiven in the case of the serviceman. This will afford relief to persons in the armed forces whose earned net income in 1942 was considerably higher than their service pay for 1943. The following example will make this clear:

Assume a soldier who is married with no dependents had a net income of $3,200 in 1942. His tax for 1942 amounted to $360.80. He entered the Army in 1943 and had no tax to pay. His 1942 liability will be canceled. Not only does the conference agreement afford relief to servicemen as to their 1942 liability, but also as to their liability for 1943 and subsequent years. Under the conference agreement, a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, during the present war, is allowed, in arriving at his income subject to tax for 1943 and subsequent years, to exclude $1,500 of his military pay. This allowance is in addition to his personal exemption and credit-for-dependents allowance. The conference agreement also allows this $1,500 exclusion to American citizens or residents of the United States serving with our allies. The Senate had a rather involved provision relating to the income tax of a man dying in the service. We were able to get the Senate conferees to accept the House provision in preference to their own, with the qualification that this relief should also be extended to persons serving in the armies of the other Allied Nations. I will not take the time of the House to discuss further changes, as they are fully set forth in the conference report.

I will now discuss the second windfall provision.

It was thought necessary to guard against windfalls during the war period, to limit the amount of the abatement to the equivalent of a tax on a normal year plus $20,000. For his normal year the taxpayer may choose any one of the years 1937, 1938, 1939, or 1940.

The conference agreement will put into operation a withholding system as of July 1 of this year. It will also meet the public demand for a current pay-as-you-go system, and will bring into the Treasury more revenue than either the House bill or the Senate bill. For the fiscal year 1944 the conference committee report will add approximately three billions more than the existing law or the House bill, and almost two billions more than the Senate bill. It puts all the taxpayers upon a current basis. A differential is provided in the case of the smaller taxpayers by allowing an abatement of 100 percent of the tax liability of the lesser year, 1942 or 1943, which does not exceed $50. While the compromise was not a perfect solution of the problem, it did, in my opinion, meet many of the defects contained in the Senate bill. I therefore did not feel justified in standing in the way of getting a bill, which the country was demanding, and which was so important from the standpoint of the immediate revenue needs of the Treasury. Accordingly, I felt it to be my duty to cast my vote with the 10 other members of the conference

who were willing to support the compromise proposal.

Considering both the House and Senate bills which were before the conference, I do not believe anyone can say that the House conferees got the worst of the bargain, or that anything better was possible under the circumstances, if a current tax system was to be enacted at this session or during this Congress. It was either this compromise or no bill, as I am sure everyone familiar with the subject must realize.

In closing, I wish to present the following table, which shows how much revenue is collected under the conference agreement as compared with the House and Senate bills:

Treasury estimates

[In millions of dollars]

(1942 liability existing law, 9,815)

	House bill	Senate bill	Conference report
Amount of 1942 liability canceled	7,602	8,515	6,533
Percent of cancelation	77.5	86.8	66.6
Amount of 1942 liability uncanceled	2,213	1,300	3,282
Percent uncanceled	22.5	13.2	33.4

REVENUE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1944

Existing law	12,999.5
House bill	13,022.8
Senate bill	14,912.2
Conference report	16,005.9

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I find myself in disagreement with the distinguished and beloved chairman of my committee. We have worked shoulder to shoulder in many legislative battles during recent years and have tried to be mutually helpful to each other. We have seldom disagreed, but on this occasion we are conscientiously and honestly unable to agree on this conference report. I am sure he accords to me the same sincerity of purpose that I very cheerfully accord to him. Three of the four Democratic House conferees did not sign the conference report, and I am one of those.

It is my conviction that the effect of this bill is to transfer an unfair and unjust part of the financial burden of this war from the wealthy to the lower income group of the people, and I am unable to support it.

You have been urging pay-as-you-go legislation. You started out to get taxpayers current and wind up here with a bill that gets less of them current than almost any plan that has been proposed. The result of your effort is to pass a bill that does not get taxpayers current, but only accomplishes the real purpose of forgiving taxes already due the Government and in many instances already paid.

The House, by a vote of 313 to 95, sent to the Senate a pay-as-you-go tax bill which forgave a total of about seven and one-half billion dollars. The conferees have brought back to the House a bill effectively forgiving about eight and one-half billion dollars of tax, after allowing for windfall provisions. A special tax of 25 percent on the lower of the liabilities of 1942 or 1943 further reduces the effective forgiveness under the conference bill to about six and one-half billion dollars. Because the amounts forgiven under the House bill and under the bill brought back in the conference report do not differ widely, you have been told, and you no doubt will be told again, that this conference bill closely resembles the House bill and represents a substantial acceptance of the House bill. Quite the contrary is the truth.

The bill which the House sent to the Senate made 40,000,000 taxpayers completely and immediately current. The bill returned by the Senate to the House also made these 40,000,000 taxpayers completely and immediately current. This bill makes only 5,000,000 taxpayers current. The bill reported by the conferees, however, retains one-fourth of a year's tax liability on about 33,000,000 of these 40,000,000 taxpayers.

Who, then, gets from this bill the benefit of the amount improperly reimposed on these 33,000,000 taxpayers? The answer is that the tax which has been reimposed on these 33,000,000 taxpayers has been removed from the shoulders of about 380,000 taxpayers with incomes above $10,000. The $10,000 mark is about the breaking point in comparing the difference between the House bill and the conference report. Taxpayers with incomes of less than $10,000 realize much less forgiveness under the conference bill than under the House bill and taxpayers with incomes above $10,000 realize much greater forgiveness under the conference bill than under the House bill. That is what this conference bill does. It completely redistributes the burden of tax for the year 1942, and departs violently from the distribution of that tax under the House bill.

Let me give you some examples to illustrate the difference between the House bill and the conference bill.

A married couple with an income of $3,000 is forgiven $324 under the House bill, and only $243 under this bill.

A married couple with an income of $5,000 is forgiven $691 under the House bill and only $560 under this bill.

A taxpayer with an income of $25,000 is forgiven $4,437 under the House bill and $6,915 under this bill.

A taxpayer with an income of $50,000 is forgiven $9,185 under the House bill and $18,996 under the bill before you.

A taxpayer with an income of $100,000 is forgiven $18,690 under the House bill and $48,045 under the bill before you.

Under the House bill a married taxpayer with an income of $1,000,000 is forgiven $189,750, while under the bill before you he is forgiven $640,500.

Under the House bill the amount forgiven for those with net incomes over $10,000 amounts to $1,512,000,000 out of a total liability for these incomes of $3,555,000,000, or 42.5 percent. Under the conference bill the corresponding amounts of the effective forgiveness, after allowing for the windfall provisions and the special 25-percent tax, are $2,213,000,000 out of $3,555,000,000, or 62.3 percent. The amount forgiven under the House bill is about seven and one-half billions and under the conference bill about six and one-half billions. The amounts forgiven for incomes over $10,000 are 20 percent of the total forgiveness under the House bill as against 34 percent under the conference bill.

Thus, it is seen clearly that the effect of the bill which has been brought back to us by a majority of the conferees lifts the burden from the shoulders of a few large taxpayers and places it on the shoulders of millions of small taxpayers.

This bill retains in its essential characteristics the same basic inequities present in the Ruml-Carlson bill, which this House on three separate and distinct occasions rejected. In this bill the taxpayer with a $3,000 income is forgiven an amount equal to nearly 5 weeks of income after taxes; the taxpayer with the $100,000 income is forgiven an amount equal to 15 months of income after taxes. This is the same Ruml-Carlson bill that we turned down before it was reduced to three-quarter size.

The reduction of the Ruml-Carlson bill to three-quarter size not only does not remove its basic inequities; in many ways it makes the bill even worse than the full Ruml-Carlson bill which we found so objectionable. This bill makes only 5,000,000 taxpayers current. The House bill makes 40,000,000 taxpayers current. The 4,000,000 which the House bill did not make current are those for whom current payment is not necessary and in many cases is not convenient or feasible. The 33,000,000 additional taxpayers, which the bill before you does not make current for 2 years, are the ones most in need of being made current. They are the ones for whom the hearts of the Ruml-Carlson proponents bled when the Ways and Means Committee bill was before the House.

More serious is the fact that this bill will interfere with the adoption of the kind of tax bill we must have if this war is to be properly financed and economic disruption in this country is to be prevented or kept to a minimum. By providing for a 12½ percent collection of the 1942 tax in the coming year and another 12½ percent in the year following, this bill will almost certainly interfere seriously with the imposition of the additional taxes which are so badly required. Statements were made on the floor of the Senate that a 75 percent forgiveness would give increases in collection over the next 2 years which would take the place of tax increase on incomes. At a time when the President of the United States has asked for an additional $16,000,000,000 in taxes or savings, or both, and when every indication points to the need of at least that amount for financing the war and blocking the development of serious inflation, we are placing ourselves in the position of making the necessary increases very difficult to get.

There is not only the fact that a small increase in receipts into the Treasury for the next 2 years under this bill stands in

the way of increased taxes on individual incomes. There is also the fact that the cancelation of taxes under this bill is, as I have pointed out, grossly inequitable. When a new tax measure comes up it will be necessary to go to the small and middle incomes in order to get the great bulk of the revenue under that measure. This is for the simple reason that large incomes are already paying rates which cannot be increased in any great degree. It will be a serious matter to impose on the lower income group tax increases which will more than take away from them the amounts forgiven under this bill, while at the same time the higher income groups are not subjected to increases which offset or even greatly reduce the benefits they would receive under this bill. The net benefits accruing to the large income groups will present an enormous obstacle in placing heavy tax increases on low income groups.

Accordingly, I say that although the Ruml-Carlson bill would interfere seriously with a new tax bill because of its inequity, this bill will interfere even more with a proper tax bill because it confuses the issue through the 12½ percent collection of 1942 tax liability this year and next year. The President has asked us for $16,000,000,000. This bill forgives about $6,500,000,000 and places a heavy obstacle on the increase of tax rates necessary to even distantly approach the $16,000,000,000 request of the President.

The proponents of this measure point to some increase in revenue not only from the payment over 2 years of 25 percent of the 1942 tax, but to the operation of two so-called windfall provisions. These windfall provisions are a clear admission that the principle of the Ruml-Carlson bill, followed in the bill which the conferees have returned to the House, is inequitable and must be made to appear more presentable than it really is. The first of these provisions is to forgive the lower of the 1942 or 1943 tax. That is supposed to catch a person with an abnormally high income in 1942. No doubt it does so. But it also catches, and I suggest catches a great many more people whose 1943 incomes are abnormally low because of shortages, priorities, and other inevitable results from the war. We know that hundreds of thousands of small businessmen, for example, are suffering heavily in 1943. This windfall provision will catch them and label them as having abnormally high incomes in 1942. Millions of people for whom the relief of pay-as-you-go was intended will receive relatively little of its benefit under this windfall provision.

The second windfall provision is intended to catch people whose incomes in 1942 or 1943 were higher than in 1940, 1939, 1938, or 1937. It is intended to catch the war profiteers. No doubt it does catch some of them. But it also catches many innocent businessmen whose earnings were abnormally low in those pre-war years and who now must pay 1942 taxes on the excess just as though they were war profiteers. Moreover, I would point out that the conferees found it desirable to insert a provision that if a partnership has absorbed a corporation, then the partner's income shall be computed on the basis of the corporate income for 1940, 1939 1938, and 1937, in order that a proper base-period income may be reconstructed. This is no doubt an equitable provision, but there are literally dozens, perhaps hundreds of other types of cases much more important than this very rare situation which will call out for similar relief. We are going to be faced in the application of this windfall provision with all the difficulty and problems we have gone through in trying to give general relief for persons with abnormally low base-period earnings under the excess-profits tax. This second windfall provision fires a shotgun into a crowd. It catches many innocent people and opens the door to, in fact demands, a multiplicity of further amendments to prevent the harsh operation of the provision.

The House bill did not need windfall provisions of this kind because its distribution of cancelation was equitable. It avoided the basic windfall which the large income receiver gets out of the bill before you and which no windfall provision touches.

Sincerely believing that this bill does not include the essential elements of fairness and equity to the taxpayers of the country, and that the price paid in forgiveness is too great to pay for the desirable results of accomplishing a pay-as-you-go system, I am not in a position to give it my support.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of the conference report it might be well to bear in mind that the House on two different occasions came within four votes of adopting the Carlson bill, which involved substantially 100-percent abatement. We present you the best compromise that we were able to work out after 5 days of hard and grueling work in conference. The Senate conferees voted as a unit on every proposition that came up, until one of the majority Senators announced that he would thenceforth vote for every compromise because he did not want it to go to the country that Congress is unable to function and that his party is unequal to the occasion.

The responsibility for enacting a tax bill and for getting the people of the country on a current basis does not rest with the minority, it rests with the party in power, but we have cooperated 100 percent. There was no politics in the conference; none whatever. This is shown by the fact that Senator GEORGE, Senator WALSH, Senator CLARK, and Senator BYRD voted with three Republican Senate conferees, or should I say the three Senate Republican conferees voted with the four Democratic Senators whom I have named.

Those who are opposed to the report we have brought before you would have you believe that the Federal Treasury is going to lose enormous sums of money if it is adopted. The contrary is the case. Under the existing law, the Treasury will take in $12,999,000,000 in the next fiscal year. Under the House bill the Treasury would take in $13,022,000,000. Under the Senate bill, the Treasury would take in $14,912,000,000. Under the conference report, the Treasury will take in $16,005,000,000. These figures are not mine; they are from the Treasury Department.

Speaking now to those on this side of the House who wanted complete abatement, may I say that it was out of the question to attain that end. I am not entirely satisfied with the report we are presenting to you. It is a compromise. That is the reason the bill was sent to conference, to iron out the differences between the two Houses and try to work out a reasonable compromise. I think we have done so, notwithstanding the statements of the preceding speaker.

The American people want to be put on a current, pay-as-they-earn basis. Under the conference compromise, practically all of them, over 40,000,000, will be made current within 2 years. We could not do any better.

I ask you, as one American to another, can we afford to say to the country that we are not capable of rising to the occasion when an emergency exists? This country is at war. The cry is for revenue to wage that war. Let me ask you on the majority side, you whose primary responsibility it is to place people on a current pay-as-they-earn basis, What will the reaction of the country be to you if you fail them in this momentous hour? Ponder on that. That point was brought out by two distinguished Senators who belong to the majority party. Both of them said it would be one of the most unfortunate things that has happened in a long time if the conference report should perchance fail of adoption. Failure would be a serious indictment of representative government.

At this time I wish to pay tribute to one of the noblest Romans I have ever served with, the chairman of this committee, the beloved gentleman from North Carolina, "Marse" BOB DOUGHTON. He recognized the emergency, he recognized the need for action, as did all of those who signed the conference report, and he was big enough to sweep partisan considerations and personal views aside and rise to the occasion. God bless him. I hope he stays in this House another 100 years.

At this point I shall offer for the RECORD a brief explanation of how the bill will operate.

Let us take the situation with which we are all familiar—our own income. In the case of a Member of Congress, with a $10,000 salary, his tax liability for 1942 was approximately $2,000 if he is a married man with no dependents. He filed a return last March 15 and presumably paid his first installment of $500 on his 1942 liability.

Under the proposed new law, the second installment on the the 1942 liability must also be paid. It is due June 15. Thus by July 1, when the withholding tax begins, he will have paid one-half his 1942 liability.

Under the conference report, all amounts paid on the 1942 liability will be applied against the current 1943 liability.

Beginning July 1, the Sergeant at Arms of the House, who is the official paymaster, will begin deducting the new withholding tax from each Member's salary. This is not an additional tax, but is for the purpose of collecting the income tax at the source. In the lowest surtax bracket, it will result in collecting the full liability at the source, but as the tax liability of Members of Congress extends beyond the first bracket only part of their liability will be collected through the withholding tax. The balance will be paid in installments. The withholding tax is 20 percent of the wage or salary in excess of the withholding exemption, which is $52 a month for single persons and $104 a month for married persons. Thus the withholding on a Congressman who is a married man with no dependents would be 20 percent of the excess of the monthly salary, $833.33, over the monthly exemption, $104. This would be 20 percent of $729.33, or $145.87. This amount will be deducted monthly, and may be credited toward the 1943 liability.

On September 15, Members of Congress, like everyone else subject to income tax, will file a tentative return of estimated tax on their 1943 income. Assuming the Member's income for 1943 is the same as for 1942, the 1943 tax will nevertheless be greater because of the Victory tax, which became effective January 1, 1943. In the case of a married man with no dependents, the total tax on an income of $10,000, including net Victory tax, would be $2,467. By June 15 the Member would have paid half his 1942 assessment, or $1,000, which would be credited on the 1943 liability. Also he would have had deducted from his salary up to July 1, on account of the present Victory tax withholding, approximately $234.40, which would make a total of $1,234.40 standing to his account as of July 1. Thus for the remainder of the year he would owe the difference between this amount, $1,234.40, and $2,467, or $1,232.60. During the remainder of the year, however, there will be withheld from his salary $145.87 per month under the withholding tax, which in the last 6 months of the year would total $875.22. Thus, of the $1,232.60 still owed on his 1943 liability for the last half of the year, all but $357.38 will be collected at the source. This balance he will pay in two installments, one-half on September 15 and one-half on December 15. On March 15, 1944, he will file his final return for the year and make any necessary adjustments on account of overpayment or underpayment. At that time, on the same form, he will file his return of estimated tax for 1944, and will pay in installments so much of his tax liability for the year as is not being collected at the source.

The next question is, What happens to the 1942 tax liability under the bill? Seventy-five percent of this liability is abated under the bill, and the remaining 25 percent is collected over a period of 2 years in addition to current taxes. In the example cited, the 1942 tax was $2,000. Thus $500 of the 1942 assessment would be collected under the bill, one-half, or $250, being payable March 15, 1944, and the remaining one-half on March 15, 1945.

If a Member had a higher tax liability on his 1942 income than will be due on his 1943 income, then his 1943 tax would be based on the higher income of the 2 years, and the 75-percent abatement would apply to the lower income of the 2 years.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the conference report now before us is the old Ruml plan in a new dress, and I shall vote against it.

The only difference between this report and the original Ruml plan, which would forgive 100 percent of a year's tax, is that the conference report reduces the forgiveness to 75 percent. Both operate on the same principle of percentage forgiveness rather than on a forgiveness based on a number of tax units as was provided in my bill, which passed the House on May 4.

This means that at a later date, through higher rates, the Treasury will recover from the lower- and middle-bracket taxpayer every dollar now forgiven him plus that amount forgiven to those in the upper brackets. In other words, it will collect from the lower- and middle-income groups to compensate for the bonus now being declared for the wealthy, the upper income group. The poor will pay for the benefit given to the rich.

Why do I say that? Because the incontrovertible proof stands out before our eyes.

It is generally agreed that the rate of 85.4 percent on incomes of $1,000,000 is so high that it cannot be raised. To go any higher would amount to confiscation. It would be practically a capital levy. So when you forgive 75 percent of a year's tax to an individual with an income of $1,000,000, which, under the provisions of this legislation amounts to $640,000, you make an outright gift, you give him a bonus, and you cannot get any of it back when you increase the tax rate.

This is not true in the middle and lower brackets. On those taxpayers you will raise the rates, and you are going to do it sooner or later. Any statement to the contrary is questionable as to its veracity. It is an attempt to fool the taxpayer.

Our national debt, we are told, will run up to $300,000,000,000 before this war is over. That debt must be paid. You cannot raise the rates for the large income so, after forgiving huge sums to the rich, you will raise the rates for the low- and middle-income groups to collect the money necessary to pay that debt. Such procedure, Mr. Speaker, is unfair and unjust to the small taxpayers. It is unfair and unjust to the white-collar class, and I shall not be a party to it. I shall vote against the report.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before us is supposed to be a compromise of the House and Senate pay-as-you-go bills. It is not my idea of a compromise. It uproots the principle we endorsed in the House bill by a vote of 3 to 1 and transplants in its place the principle adopted by the Senate. It grafts onto the transplanted Senate principle a few miscellaneous provisions to make a prettier display. But basically what we have before us is simply the Ruml plan set to three-quarter time. It is off key, it grates on my ears, it is all disharmony.

When the pay-as-you-go bill was sent to the Senate by this House it did what we needed to do, in a fair and reasonably simple way. It put the bulk of income tax on a current basis and abated enough of the tax to avoid hardship in the process of transition. In that bill, tax cancelation did what it was supposed to do. It was a means to the end of getting on a pay-as-you-go basis. But since it left this House, the end has been sacrificed to the means, and cancelation has become the basis for the biggest tax grab in history.

The bill presented to us by the conference committee is the product of a dog fight on the size and distribution of the tax grab and not on the principles of pay-as-you-go. There is nothing sound, nothing sensible, about the tax-forgiveness features of this bill. All they do is to specify how far each taxpayer can dip into the grab bag. The rule of thumb applied in forgiving taxes is simply this—the bigger your income, the deeper you reach into the grab bag of tax forgiveness.

By all odds, the prime beneficiaries of tax forgiveness under the conference committee bill are the taxpayers with incomes about $10,000. There are $380,000 taxpayers with incomes above $10,000. They represent less than 1 percent of the total of 44,000,000 taxpayers. Yet, their cut of forgiveness is not 1 percent, or 5 percent, or even 10 percent. Oh, no; their cut is 34 percent of the entire amount of taxes forgiven under the Ruml-ized bill now before us. More than one-third of the total forgiveness goes to 1 percent of the taxpayers. Their cut is large and juicy indeed. Some people call that the principle of equality of treatment. I do not care much for a "principle of equality" which produces such gross inequality in practice and revitalizes the danger of inflation—or is the danger of inflation confined to the little fellow?

There has been some attempt to justify this wicked tax grab on the ground that the tax gift is not realized until death or until income slacks off. The Ruml-ites do not deny that tax forgiveness is a gift. They simply try to cloud the issue and say it is not realized right away. I think we can decide for ourselves whether or not it is realized right away. Find me a $10,000 income man, for example, who does not salt away some funds to pay his taxes. You simply will not find him. If this bill becomes law, the funds the taxpayers have been salting away for payment of 1942

taxes will not have to be used for taxes. Taxpayers will be paying as they go and will be using current funds, not accumulated funds, to pay off their taxes. The money they set aside to pay 1942 taxes will be cash on hand. It will be money that can be added to the taxpayer's wealth or spent in inflationary buying. It will be an immediate tangible gift to the taxpayer to do with what he may. That is why forgiveness has become so popular. It is not just forgiveness to get pay-as-you-go. It is forgiveness for the sake of forgiving.

Who is going to pay for this forgiveness? After all, you cannot subsidize the rich without having someone paying for it. And that someone is bound to be the millions of Toms, Dicks, and Harrys in our taxpaying population, the millions of taxpayers in the lower and middle brackets. After all, it is their rates which are mathematically capable of expansion. You cannot boost a 90-percent rate very far, but a 20, 30, or 40 percent rate lends itself to expansion. To get back the taxes canceled by this bill, you would have to raise the tax on a man with a $2,000 net income from $220 to $350. Or if his income were only $1,500 his tax would have to go up from $78 to $170. If his income were $3,000, his tax would have to be raised from $504 to $702.

In other words to offset the tax forgiveness to the wealthy, you would have to double the tax rates of the great majority of average citizens. Apparently, doubling up of taxes is good enough for the little fellow, but the big fellow under this bill slices up the biggest pork pie in history.

I have but a very short time to deal with the facts as they pertain to the conference report but I can best illustrate my views in the matter by comparing the report and its effect upon the Congress and people of the United States by saying that it is a legislative toadstool. To some it may look like the real thing but it is dangerous in that it is political poison. After this warning each and every Member of this House is on his or her own. If you suffer the ill effects of partaking of this dish, it is your own funeral, not mine.

Up to this point I have been talking about the fabric of the bill. Now, I want to take a look at the embroidery which has been attached to the bill to sell it to this Congress and to the people of this country. When I look at this frill of antiwindfall provisions and a 25-percent carry-over of the 1942 tax, I can only conclude that we are being lured to walk into an elaborately baited trap. Some of that bait looks pretty attractive and on the surface appears to improve the bill. Actually, the special provisions of this bill are merely an attempt to hoodwink and befuddle us and to camouflage the tax grab, which is the real core of the bill.

Limitation of forgiveness to 75 percent of the 1942 tax is supposed to be a major improvement. But it is still the Ruml principle, pure and simple. It still confers a permanent and irretrievable gift on the wealthy which is all out of proportion to the "Indian gift" that it confers on the average citizen. Let us not delude ourselves. This is simply the Ruml plan set to different music. It simply sings the Ruml lullaby in three-four time, instead of four-four time. And it reserves a special time for the little taxpayer—he gets the two time. He gets the least of tax forgiveness, but he will get most of the tax increases when the next tax bill comes up. Look out for the sales tax and the increased income tax rates which are to follow.

Now, how about this one-quarter of the tax that is not abated but spread over a 2-year period? A lot of loose talk would have us believe that this carry-over of 25 percent is a substitute for tax increases. That kind of talk is sheer bunk and nonsense. First of all, under the conference committee bill, we will be paying only 2¼ years' taxes on 3 years' income. I do not know how you can call that quarter a tax increase when it is really a reduction of a tax liability already incurred. Second, it is ridiculous to speak of substituting the 25-percent carry-over for the tax increases we have to have to finance this war. What do the war profiteers expect? An enormous tax subsidy plus insurance against tax increases? That is asking too much, and we will be failing our duty on the home front if we adopt such an unrealistic program. The boys now in uniform will be asking questions when you begin to lay this load on their shoulders. It will prove embarrassing if you vote for this bill.

The so-called antiwindfall provisions of the bill before us also call for close scrutiny. As I understand it, antiwindfall provisions are supposed to be studded with teeth that bite into objectionable windfalls. Gentlemen, the provisions before us are toothless. They fail to strike at the basic inequity of the bill. They do not even touch the distorted structure of tax forgiveness under the Ruml principle on which it is based.

It is true that these so-called antiwindfall provisions will reduce the amount of forgiveness by about one and one-fourth billion dollars. But that reduction is made not at the expense of those who are unjustifiably enriched by war profiteering or those who are unjustifiably enriched by tax forgiveness—no, those reductions are made primarily at the expense of persons whose income happens to fall off in 1943. This bill makes a decline in income from 1942 to 1943 prima facie evidence of war profiteering. You and I know that such declines have occurred in millions of cases because war has offset peacetime activities and not necessarily because war inflated 1942 incomes. Basing tax forgiveness on the smaller of 1942 and 1943 taxes tars the innocent victim of war's dislocations with the same brush as the guilty war profiteer.

The bill also contains a provision for a special tax on excess income in wartime. This bill was so liberalized and watered down by the conference committee that it catches only a few fish in its net. Among those fish are not merely war profiteers but people who are just coming into their own as a result of long and diligent effort. Gentlemen, this bill simply does not recognize the difference between right and wrong. In this bill black and white have become fused into a dirty gray.

No amount of camouflage can hide the ugly fact that this bill hands out an unjust and discriminatory enrichment in the midst of a cruel and costly war. While American boys are dying on battlefields all over the world we have the spectacle on the home front of taxpayers feasting on the carcass of 1942 taxes. This is not a pretty picture, yet it is precisely what we are doing if we pass the conference committee bill. I want no part of a bill which matches the sacrifices being made on the battle fronts with unjust enrichment on the home front.

I want to point out that the percentage differential in the forgiveness was definitely and hopelessly rejected but when in the final analysis I sought a differential on the basis of earned and unearned income, in other words, on a basis of such income as a man works and sweats for and such income as is gathered from coupon clipping, a principle which is well established in tax law allowing exemptions and variations, this, too, was turned down by the conferees and is not in the bill.

To show you how solicitous the conferees must have been about the greatest possible remission of taxes which are due the Federal Government from the upper-bracket taxpayers, they would not allow any kind of differential either in percentages or on a basis of earned and unearned income, but when it came to the consideration of the amendment which was offered by me in the Committee on Ways and Means and approved by the House, having to do with abatement of such taxes as might be due and payable from a soldier, sailor, or marine who forfeits his life and his all for his Government, the conferees, with the assistance of the minority Members on the House side, retained until the last day the Senate provision which made of my original proposal a sham, a joke, and an insult to our heroic warrior dead because in their case it made a distinction between earned and unearned income. When on the last day of the conference I threatened to disembowel the report, the conferees, led by the minority of the House, backed off and the curse was erased.

Just imagine the courage of conferees who excluded from consideration the earned- and unearned-income distinctions because it would affect adversely the amount of irretrievable forgiveness granted to the upper-bracket taxpayers while at the same time insisting on making this distinction and applying it to a soldier hero who gave his life for his country and the conferees insisted that tax forgiveness would be allowed only on the earned income but if the soldier had sold his home and showed a profit of $500 to $1,000 or clipped a small amount of dividend coupons, he would have to pay unto the last cent and upon death it would be taken out of the amount collected from his estate, but the taxpayer with a million-dollar income from coupon clipping would receive without dif-

ferentiation, the full 75 percent of remission provided for in the conference report. The conferees were frightened into the path of political righteousness by my warning. My original amendment, contained in the House bill, is now in the conference bill.

These are important reasons why I cannot vote for the conference report, and I urge that it be voted down for we would be far better off to remain on the tried and true basis than to create further and sinful inequalities. Remember when you vote for this bill you vote for eventual reimposition of all of the forgiveness and the great bulk of the recapture of the taxes so ruthlessly thrown away at this time will have to come from the lowermost brackets, from the millions of men and women who are least able to bear the load and who already are overburdened.

Let me warn you that there will be no hesitation, in fact there will be an outright demand later to impose a Federal sales tax, not of 2 or 3 percent but possibly 10, 15, or maybe 20 percent. Imagine a man with a wife and four, five, or six little children paying through the nose to make up for the remission, for the congressional gift to those in the highest brackets, who cannot be made to pay under any system of reassessment. To that class of big taxpayers it will be an outright and irretrievable bonus, the equivalent of all the tax increases which we have imposed upon them in the past 5 years. In this class you will find many of the type of Heintz and Jacks, wartime profiteers. Some people will be permitted to retain millions in war profits and will keep them with congressional approval while the small taxpayer will be scalped. Those who will vote to approve this conference report will either do it blindly or feign to believe that there is no threat to inflation while they contend that a few extra dollars in the pocket of the little fellow threatens our very existence. A surplus dollar with no place to go, whether in the pocket of a rich man or a poor man, unless invested in a War bond, is a threat to inflation.

I am going to be free to follow the proper course when the next tax bill comes up. My position will not only be defensible but absolutely impregnable, but some of you Members here who are going to impress your imprimatur upon this conference report are going to have the time of your lives making explanations to your constituents when the next campaign rolls around. Any candidate passing an I. Q. test of a 14-year-old boy who will make an issue of your vote in support of this iniquitous proposal will drive you out of Congress.

Should the conference report prevail, I am of the impression that the President should and will veto the bill because there is nothing wrong with our present tax system, and while it may be desirable to establish the system of paying as you go and collecting at the source, it is not worth the price we are called upon to pay for its establishment and the inequalities cannot be justified by any argument.

As time goes on you will find that the attitude of my friend from Tennessee, and my equally distinguished and sincere friend from Oklahoma, with whom I join, will be recognized because it is honest and just, and constitutes a force that is irrepressible.

The principle embodied in the conference report is a typical and time-honored Republican principle of what is fair and equitable. It does not square with the ideals of Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, or Roosevelt; therefore, let the Republicans pass it if they can, and let there be no defections on our side. Let there be no support of this heretical doctrine that remits $75 in the case of one taxpayer, which will later be reassessed three times over, and permits the remission of $750,000 to another taxpayer which cannot be recaptured. This is not equality in treatment, it is inequitable and unjust.

If the House will vote down the conference report, we can bring back a report that will differentiate in a fair way between small and large taxpayers and allow abatement on a percentage basis, and my idea is that it ought to be abated in the same way that it was put on in the 1942 tax bill. There can be no argument about the fairness of taking it off as you put it on, but there is a lot of argument against forgiving 75 percent of all of the tax increases which you, by previous action, applied in the last 5 years.

THE DINGELL PLAN

It will be interesting for the Members of the House to know that I suggested a plan to the House and Senate conferees which, for the want of a better designation, would be known as the Dingell proposal or plan, which would bring about absolute currency in tax collection and would embody the feature of collection at the source without any forgiveness or abatement whatsoever. Currency in payment would be brought about by the simple and gradual change in the practice of collecting income taxes due by setting back the first collection due date and the final date for payment 3 months in each of the coming years except the first year, when the initial set-back would be only 2 months, until full currency was attained. This plan, for a certainty, would work out as regards the individual income taxpayer. There is no challenging that statement. It might even be extended eventually to include corporation income taxes.

To illustrate my plan, an income taxpayer under existing law pays his 1942 tax by making his first or part payment, or even all of it, on or before March 15 of 1943. He must pay the balance of his obligation, if any, under pain of penalty, by December 15, 1943. My plan, aiming at eventual currency, would obligate the taxpayer to pay his 1943 tax by partial or full payment beginning January 15, 1944, with a final payment, if any, payable by October 15, 1944, instead of the customary December 15, as provided under present law. The tax for the following year would be due and payable beginning October of the same year and the final payment would have to be paid on or before July 15 of 1945. Thus each year the grace period would be reduced or revised toward currency until all taxpayers simultaneously became current, and this would be without any remission or forgiveness whatsoever. But this plan was not very attractive because it was not sweetened with full or partial abatement.

Under the plan which the conference submits to the House, such tax payers as are to become current will not attain such classification or status until the end of 1945. I believe, under my plan without any abatement and beginning in the shift of initial payment date in the year 1944, we would be fully current in 1947. I will include in the RECORD a rough sketch or a table which I prepared and believe is readily understandable which will serve as a guide for the membership.

The table follows:

	Last payment due
If 1943 tax due date is moved from Mar. 15 to Jan. 15, 1944	Oct. 15, 1944
If 1944 tax due date is moved from Jan. 15, 1945, to Oct. 15, 1944	July 15, 1945
If 1945 tax due date is moved from Oct. 15 to July 15, 1945	Apr. 15, 1946
If 1946 tax due date is moved from July 15 to Apr. 15, 1946	Jan. 15, 1947
If 1947 tax due date is moved from Apr. 15 to Jan. 15, 1947	[1] Oct. 15, 1947

[1] If desired, when year of currency is attained, final date of payment of taxes could be extended to Dec. 15, 1947.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, an ancient law that I ran onto said that a well-made law should be formulated on the basis of caution, perspicacity, precision, sagacity, and conciseness. I can hardly claim that this particular conference report brings in a bill here which fulfills those requirements. I think this has been one of the hardest tasks I ever faced in this legislative chamber. We are in the midst of war, and it would seem as though we might have gotten together without such a waste of time.

I am not particularly enamored of this conference report, but I feel that I would not be discharging my duty unless I were to vote for it. The people of this country are entitled to know just where they stand so far as this bill is concerned. We started out as a committee in good faith to hold hearings for one specific purpose, and that was to make the people current in the payment of their taxes. The reason for that was known to every person practically in this country. That was that the rates had become so high, and the tax load had increased so rapidly, that to go on under the old system of collecting the taxes a year behind was a dangerous thing, and it would become more dangerous as we proceeded to put on an ever-increasing tax load. Once before I called attention to the fact as to just how rapidly this load has been put on the backs of the people In 1940 the tax load was about $5,387,000,000. In 1941 it was stepped up to $7,607,000,000; in 1942, $12,700,000,000; in 1943, $22,976,000,000; and in 1944, $33,081,000,000. Then you add onto that $10,000,000,000

of local and State taxes, and we are now looking forward to the $16,000,000,000 in addition which the President still insists upon.

Word has gone out to the country that if this bill is passed it will not be necessary to raise the $16,000,000,000. I fail to see where that can possibly be true, because we are going to spend in 1943, $80,000,000,000; in 1944, $104,000,000,000, and we are going to have a debt in 1944 of $210,000,000,000. I fail to see how you can go along here for 2 years, or for 1 year, without another tax bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman will recall that in the conference committee it was told us that the adoption of this report would probably obviate the necessity for another personal income tax bill for this year.

Mr. REED of New York. Oh, I have listened to promises from this administration since 1933, and I know of only one that was kept, and that was to make the country wet. That was in 1933. I have a list, comprising almost a volume, of New Deal broken promises, so that I do not attach very much importance to what was said by administration leaders in conference, in regard to additional taxes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. REED of New York. I would like to, but I cannot at this time as I have only a few minutes left.

In order to meet at least a large part of the tremendous outlays now being made for war purposes, totaling over one hundred billions annually, and at the same time aid in the check against ruinous inflation, burdensome taxes must of course be levied. In the past few years the tax load has been increased by leaps and bounds, without giving taxpayers a chance to adjust themselves to each new increase. All the increases have been retroactive in effect, and it is this feature of the recent tax bills which has worked a tremendous hardship on all taxpayers, since they have had no opportunity to prepare for the increased burden, or adjust themselves to it.

The 1942 tax bill, for example, was not enacted until October 21, 1942, after nearly 10 months of the year had gone by, yet it was made applicable to all income earned from January 1, 1942. Most of the responsibility for the delay in the enactment of the 1942 measure was due to the administration's procrastination in formulating its program and its subsequent reversal of position on several major policies. On two occasions the President intervened at the last minute by suggesting changes which were in contravention of the administration's previous position—once in connection with the lowering of personal exemptions, and the other time in connection with the taxation of excess corporate profits.

The high level of present taxes, coupled with the fact that the income tax now reaches the great mass of the people, has aggravated and made more obvious certain fundamental defects in the present tax-collection machinery. One of these defects is that the personal income tax is not collected until the year after the income on which it is based is earned. This works a great hardship on the taxpayer when his income ceases, as at death, retirement, or loss of his job, as well as when his income sharply declines. Under the present collection method the income tax is not actually based on ability to pay, as it is supposed to be, since it is levied on the income of the past year, and not on the income of the current year, out of which it must be paid.

On February 2 of this year, in response to widespread popular demand, the Ways and Means Committee began public hearings on various proposals to place the personal income tax on a current, pay-as-we-go basis. To correct the defects in the present system, it was determined that the income tax should be assessed against current income instead of the past year's income, and be collected out of current income as the income is earned. It was made clear that this change would be of benefit to the Treasury, as well as to taxpayers, since it would tap the higher level of national income 1 year sooner than under existing law and at the same time reduce tax delinquencies.

Among the plans considered by the Ways and Means Committee were the following:

First. Doughton plan No. 1, which, in addition to collecting taxes currently, would have involved substantial doubling up by requiring taxpayers to carry forward their 1942 liability, recomputed at 1941 rates and exemptions, and discharge it over a period of 3 to 5 years.

Second, Doughton plan No. 2, which would have carried forward half the 1942 assessment in the case of all taxpayers and collected this amount in addition to current taxes over a period of 5 years.

Third. The Robertson-Forand plan, which would have made taxpayers current to the extent that their liability did not exceed the amount proposed to be withheld at the source under a 20-percent withholding tax.

Fourth. The Carlson plan, which is a modified Ruml plan, and which would have made all taxpayers immediately current with no doubling up in their payments. This would have been accomplished simply by changing the basis of assessment of 1943 taxes from 1942 income to 1943 income, and by abating the previously assessed 1942 liability.

Of the various plans considered, the Carlson plan was the one plan and the only plan which would make all taxpayers current with no doubling up. The other plans either did not make all taxpayers current, or else delayed the objective for a period of years and in the meantime required substantial doubling up in payments.

In March, the majority of the Ways and Means Committee voted down all pay-as-you-go proposals, and reported to the House a measure which failed to make any taxpayers current, and which would not have permitted any taxpayers to become current except by paying 2 years' taxes in 1 year. Nine Republican members of the committee, who had supported the Carlson plan in committee, offered the proposal as a substitute for the committee bill. It failed of adoption by a vote of 193 to 215. The House then recommitted the wholly unsatisfactory committee bill to the Ways and Means Committee by a vote of 248 to 168.

After reconsideration of the matter the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, on April 30, reported to the House the so-called Doughton No. 1 plan, which, as previously pointed out, involved substantial doubling up as the price for getting taxpayers current after 3 years. Again the Republican members of the committee proposed the Carlson plan as a substitute, and this time it failed of adoption by a margin of only 4 votes, 202 members having voted for the substitute and 206 against. The Republican minority then moved to recommit the committee bill, with instructions to report back the Robertson-Forand bill forthwith, as a substitute. This measure, while it did not make all taxpayers current, did make 90 percent current with no doubling up. It was felt that if this measure were sent to the Senate, the other body would amend it by substituting the Carlson plan. The House adopted the motion to recommit by a vote of 230 to 180. On final passage, the amended bill embracing the Robertson-Forand plan was adopted by a vote of 313 to 95.

When the bill reached the Senate, it was referred to the Finance Committee. That committee, after considering the same plans which had been studied by the Ways and Means Committee, adopted a modified Ruml-Carlson plan as a substitute for the House bill. When the measure reached the Senate floor, various alternative plans were again considered, but the Carlson plan, as modified, was the only one which commanded a majority vote in the Senate. Following is a list of the various plans considered by the Senate and the vote thereon:

Ellender amendment—no abatement of 1942 liability—defeated 21 to 57.

Connally amendment—Doughton No. 1 plan—defeated 29 to 50.

George amendment—75 percent Carlson plan—defeated 32 to 50.

O'Daniel amendment—withholding tax only—defeated 29 to 48.

Bankhead amendment — Robertson-Forand plan—defeated 27 to 52.

Finance committee amendment—Carlson-Ruml plan—carried 48 to 31.

On final passage, the Senate bill was agreed to by a vote of 49 to 30.

Upon the passage of the bill by the Senate, the Senate insisted upon its amendment and asked for a conference with the House. After the conference was agreed to, the Republican minority on the Ways and Means Committee sponsored a motion to instruct the conferees to agree to the Senate bill. Had not the President intervened by sending a letter to Chairman GEORGE and Chairman DOUGHTON urging the defeat of the Senate bill, there is no question but what our motion would have carried, and the people would have been given the Carlson-Ruml plan, which they overwhelm-

ingly desire. The President's letter, however, had the effect of swaying enough votes to prevent our motion to instruct the conferees from being carried, and it was defeated 194 to 202.

The conference committee met for a week trying to arrive at an agreement. Although a majority of the Senate conferees favored the Carlson plan, it has not been possible to secure its adoption in conference since the majority members of the House conference group are definitely and unalterably opposed to it. The three Republican members of the conference consistently supported the Senate bill, embracing the Carlson plan, but without at least one vote from the Democratic side we were unable to command a majority vote. While our votes, coupled with those of the Senate members favoring the Carlson plan, represented a majority of the conference committee, the rules require the conferees on the part of each House to vote as a unit in accordance with the will of a majority.

With the threat of a Presidential veto being bandied around, the Senate Democratic conferees were anxious to compromise on something short of the Carlson plan. The House Democratic conferees had little to offer except the discredited Doughton No. 1 plan and the Robertson-Forand plan, neither of which were acceptable to the Republican minority members of the conference or to the Senate conferees. Finally, the Democratic House conferees proposed a 60-percent Carlson plan, but this, too, failed to receive our support or that of the Senate conferees.

The Senate conferees proposed as a compromise the so-called George plan, which had been offered in the Senate by Senator GEORGE. This, in effect, was a three-quarters Ruml-Carlson plan, since it abated 75 percent of the liability of the lower-income year, 1942 or 1943, in the case of all taxpayers. The House Democratic conferees were unyielding on this compromise proposal because of the amount of abatement involved, and the House Republican conferees were opposed to it in principle because of the fact that it involved some doubling up, which was the basis of our opposition to all substitute proposals for the Carlson plan.

The conference committee, as I have indicated, sat for a week without being able to arrive at any agreement. A deadlock was in prospect, with the result that there would be no legislation on the subject enacted into law. As a final compromise proposal, the Senate conferees offered a plan based on the George 75-percent proposal, but with 100-percent abatement of 1 year's liability where the tax was $50 or less. The plan also included the principle of the two antiwindfall provisions of the Carlson plan, limiting the abatement to the lower income of the 2 years, 1942–43, and excluding from the abatement smaller war profits.

It became evident that if any agreement was to be reached with the Senate, it would have to be on this proposal. I personally did not favor it because of the doubling-up feature, resulting from the carry-over of 25 percent of the past year's liability. I have felt all along that the Carlson plan was the only fair and practicable measure for accomplishing the transition to a current, pay-as-we-go basis of income-tax collection. But here we were, faced with the dilemma of either accepting the Senate compromise proposal or being responsible for the complete break-down of the conference and the collapse of the effort to at least substantially achieve the desirable and necessary tax reform which we had set out to accomplish. I felt that under the circumstances I must subordinate my own views on the subject and vote to accept the compromise proposal so that the pay-as-you-go system could be put into immediate effect and the transition to a fully current basis be accomplished within a reasonable time.

The 25 percent carry-over, which will be spread over a period of 2 years, will in effect amount to a 12½-percent increase in tax payments in 1944 and 1945. However, it is to be hoped that such increase will be in lieu of any increase in rates in connection with the President's request for $16,000,000,000 of additional revenue, since there is a limit to what the taxpayers can stand.

If the Carlson plan had been adopted, there would be no such doubling up. Except for the opposition of the administration, and the President's interference, the Carlson plan would undoubtedly have been adopted by the House after it had been passed by the Senate. The full responsibility for the increased liability under the conference agreement must therefore rest squarely on the shoulders of the administration. We of the Republican minority, both in the House and Senate, certainly did all we could to give the people the Carlson plan, and we regret that our efforts were not successful. So far as I am personally concerned, I want to say that while I signed the conference report, I did so only in order to get any legislation at all and not because I favor the compromise over the Carlson plan. I am still for the Carlson plan, but I realize that under the present circumstances there is no possibility of securing its enactment.

Following is a brief summary of the principal provisions of the conference agreement, and an outline of how it will apply in the case of the average taxpayer.

The bill as agreed to in conference provides for withholding at the source, commencing July 1. The withholding rate will be 20 percent, and will apply to wages and salaries in excess of the withholding exemptions, which are $624 annually for single persons, $1,248 annually for married persons, and $312 annually for each dependent. On a weekly basis the withholding-tax exemptions are $12 for single persons, $24 for married persons, and $6 for each dependent. On a monthly basis they are $52, $104, and $26, respectively.

If, for example, a married man earns $50 a week, his employer will withhold out of each pay envelope, commencing July 1, 20 percent of the excess of the weekly pay over the weekly exemption of $24 which is applicable in his case. Thus the withholding tax would be 20 percent of $26, or $5.20. This withholding tax will be credited against the current income-tax liability of the taxpayer. It is not an additional tax, but simply a means of collecting the personal income tax at the source as the income is earned. The withholding will only apply to wages and salaries, and in general will cover only those types of employment as are now affected by the Victory tax withholding. Thus it will not apply to agricultural labor, domestic servants or self-employed persons. The present Victory tax withholding will be absorbed in the 20 percent rate, which is intended to cover both the Victory tax liability and the first bracket liability under the regular income tax. Those whose tax for the year does not exceed the amount withheld at the source will have nothing more to pay. Those whose liability does exceed the amount withheld, and those who are not affected by the withholding, will pay their remaining or entire tax, as the case may be, in quarterly installments.

The tax paid March 15 of this year on account of the past year's liability will be credited against the current year's liability. The June 15 installment on last year's income must be paid in full, and it will also be credited to the current year's tax. Those who paid their tax in full on March 15 will not have to pay any September 15 or December 15 installment unless their income for 1943 is higher than for 1942. The withholding tax will be collected, however, and any overpayment will be refundable March 15, 1944.

On September 15, taxpayers will be required to file a return covering their estimated income for the year. At that time, they will take credit for the amounts paid on March 15 and June 15, and adjust their September 15 and December 15 installments accordingly. They will also take credit for the amount withheld out of their pay envelopes after July 1. On December 15 they may, if they desire, file an amended return showing an increased or decreased income over that previously estimated. The final return for the year will be filed March 15, 1944, at which time any necessary adjustments can be made, based on the actual income for the year, and the actual outlays for contributions, interest payments, and other deductions. On the same final return, taxpayers will show their estimated income for the ensuing year. Amended returns may be filed on any of the subsequent quarterly installment dates, if necessary.

In order to assure the filing of substantially correct estimates of income during the year, either on the original return or the amended returns, the bill provides that taxpayers must pay during the year at least 80 percent of the amount finally ascertained to be due for the year, or face an interest penalty of 6 percent of the amount by which the

payments during the year fall short of 80 percent of the actual liability shown on the final return. In the case of farmers, only two-thirds of the final liability must be paid within the year to avoid the interest penalty, and they also are not required to file a return of estimated income until the last installment date, December 15.

The 1943 tax liability will be based on the higher income of the two years, 1942 or 1943, in the case of all taxpayers—except members of the armed forces, as hereafter explained. In order to prevent any undue doubling up of taxes as a result of the shift to a current collection basis, the conference report provides for the abatement of three-fourths of the liability for either the year 1942 or 1943, whichever is the lower. Where the amount of tax due in the lower year is $50 or less, the liability is completely forgiven, and there is no carry-over. On liabilities of between $50 and $66.67, there is a flat $50 abatement, and on liabilities over $66.67, the 75 percent abatement applies.

The unabated one-quarter of the tax for the lower of the two years will be collected in two installments, one of which is payable March 15, 1944, and the other on March 15, 1945. No interest will be charged. In effect, this carry-over amounts to a 12½ percent increase in tax payments during these two years, since it is added to the payments on account of the current liability for such years.

Those whose income in the abated year—1942 or 1943, whichever is lower—exceeds the highest income for 1937, 1938, 1939, or 1940 by more than $20,000 will be subject to a special antiwindfall provision, the effect of which is to limit the abatement to so-called normal income and to prevent its application to swollen war profits. This would be accomplished by collecting as a windfall tax the difference between the 75-percent abatement of the tax for the lower of the 2 years, 1942 or 1943, and a tentative tax, computed at 1942 rates, on the total of the base year's income plus $20,000. For example, if the tax in the lower of the 2 years, 1942 or 1943, were $400,000—the approximate tax on an income of $500,000—there would be a provisional abatement of 75 percent, or $300,000, and the balance, or $100,000, would be carried forward and collected over the next 2 years in addition to current taxes. The $300,000 provisional abatement would then be compared with a hypothetical tax on the highest income for 1937, 1938, 1939, or 1940, increased by $20,000. If the resulting hypothetical tax were equal to or greater than the amount provisionally abated—75 percent of the tax for the lower year, 1942 or 1943—no windfall tax would be assessed since no abnormal profits would be indicated. However, if this hypothetical tax on so-called normal income had amounted to only $100,000, then the abatement would be limited to this sum, and the difference between it and the $300,000 provisional abatement would be collected as a windfall tax. This windfall tax may be paid in four installments, at the option of the taxpayer, with interest at 4 percent, the first installment being due March 15, 1945.

In the above example, the taxpayer would owe the full tax for the highest income year, 1942 or 1943, plus one-quarter of the liability for the lower of the 2 years, plus the windfall tax.

The conference report includes three special provisions for members of the armed forces. First, there will be no increase in their 1943 tax on account of having had a higher income in 1942, insofar as such 1942 income was earned income, as distinguished from unearned or investment income. The first $3,000 of the 1942 income would be presumed to be earned in all cases, but no amount over $14,000 would be recognized as earned income. Thus if a soldier had a civilian salary of $10,000 in 1942 and a service income of $600 in 1943, his tax for 1943 would be based solely on his 1943 income and not his 1942 income, and there would be no carry-over of any part of the 1942 liability. In such case the 1943 tax would cover the full liability for the 2 years, except as the abatement provisions might be applicable. They require that the 1943 tax be increased by 25 percent of the tax for the lower year—1943—if it is in excess of $50, but since in the above example the soldier did not have sufficient income in 1943 to make him subject to tax he would have no liability either on account of 1942 or 1943.

The second provision in the interest of members of the armed forces is that which increased their exemption for income-tax purposes. They are permitted under the conference report to exclude from gross income the first $1,500 of their service pay, regardless of rank, and in addition will be entitled to the regular exemption of $500 for single persons, $1,200 for married persons, and $350 for each dependent.

The third provision relating to members of the armed forces would cancel any outstanding income-tax liability of such a person who dies while in active service.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may care to consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, this is sorry business, and every Member knows it.

This Ruml plan, from a practical standpoint, trades a big year of taxes for a bad year. It gives away the taxes for the most prosperous year of our history, and the Government takes the loss in the first bad year we come to. It is argued ingeniously we must "take the taxes out of the salary check." But this monstrosity forgives 75 percent, not only of the tax on salaries of workers, but it forgives 75 percent of taxes on capital gains, bond interest, dividends, real-estate profits, commissions, and like income. Besides being so flagrantly dishonest, it is cumbersome, a nuisance, and a constant annoyance.

I believe in the collection of taxes at the source, but not in the tossing away of revenue. A Congressman takes an oath to support the Constitution. He also has a duty to protect the revenues of his Government against private deceit and public clamor.

For these reasons and many others advanced in the RECORD I shall vote against the conference report.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am sorry, but I do not have the time.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. How are we going to get any information from the committee if they will not yield to anybody except to listen to them speak.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If the distinguished gentleman had asked me to yield, I would have been glad to. He did not do me that honor.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I was afraid to ask the chief himself when I could not get anybody else to answer. I want some questions answered.

Mr. DOUGHTON. If the gentleman has read the report, which has been available for several days, it gives all the information at my disposal. I am sorry I do not have time to yield at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

TAXES AGAIN

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, this Ruml plan has about as many lives as an alley tomcat, and about as many morals. No matter how many times it is defeated it always bobs up again in a new guise. So here she is again, 25-percent reformed, and the Congress will take her to its manly bosom at a shotgun wedding and all will be forgiven—at least 75 percent of all will be forgiven, which is a pretty good average on sin in Washington.

This bill is not a tax bill at all, but merely a method of collecting taxes, or, rather, not collecting taxes. The President advises us and the country that we need $16,000,000,000 of additional revenue, so we spend 5 months in devising a plan to avoid additional revenue. Under this bill we forgive:

Three weeks pay to the average wage earner.

Two and one-half months pay to Members of Congress.

Four years' income after taxes to wealthy persons in the upper bracket income class.

Evidently tax forgiveness is being rationed and big business has the proper priorities with a 28-percent cut to Members of Congress.

Naturally, the question arises, How will we raise the extra $16,000,000,000? The answer is, by a Federal sales tax. For more than 30 years I have opposed the principle of the sales tax. I have felt, and still do, that it violates the fundamental principle of taxation—let the burden rest on those best able to pay. The sales tax reverses this principle and places the tax burden upon the food, clothing, and other necessities of those least able to carry the load. And yet the pious proponents of this new tax will say, "It is the only way to prevent inflation." My answer to that is this: No $50-

a-week wage earner is buying $3.50 steaks in the swanky hotels and restaurants of Washington. Only those who have the money can afford the outrageous prices for food in our Capital City. It is not the Government employees, clerks, stenographers, mail carriers, and so on, who run up the price of food.

Speaking of food calls to mind the roll-back. One thing brings on another in this upside-down program. In order that we may keep down food prices to the consumer, and at the same time keep up production, we are going to pay subsidies. On June 1 there was a roll-back of 10 percent on the price of butter. Let us say that this roll-back will amount to 5 cents per pound. Under present restrictions that means 60 cents per year per person. The subsidy will be paid to the creameries and will cost the Government $90,000,000 annually. There will also be a roll-back of about 2 cents per pound on meat, and 2 cents per pound on coffee, and that will run about $350,000,000 per year. All of which will amount to less than $1 per month to the average American family on butter, meat, and coffee. To affect this saving, which means less than 1 cent a day to the consumer, it will cost the Government $450,000,000 annually. This means more taxes, and more taxes means more wages, and more wages means higher cost of living, and so the merry dance goes on, and no relief in sight.

The Congress vetoed the President's $25,000 ceiling on wages, which I felt was a mistake. The Congress again made a mistake on this tax bill. Both of these congressional acts aided big money. And the third mistake will be made when we pass a sales tax. All of these measures will work to the detriment of the average wage earner. The President made a mistake in not taking Mr. Bernard Baruch's advice on the first price-fixing bill, which Mr. Baruch said was no good and would not work. The results speak for themselves. It seems strange that we should not be realistic enough to face the facts and remedy them.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may care to consume to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the passage of this bill. I have voted against every one of these bills which have for their major purpose giving millions to those who already own millions at the expense of the smaller income taxpayers and the Treasury of the United States.

The bill is even worse than the bill which was passed by the House some days ago, known as the Robertson-Foran bill.

For instance, a married couple with an income of $3,000 is forgiven $324 under the House bill and only $243 under this bill.

A taxpayer with an income of $25,000 is forgiven $4,437 under the House bill and $6,915 under this bill.

Under the House bill a married taxpayer with an income of $1,000,000 is forgiven $189,750, while under this bill he is forgiven $640,500, and the larger the taxpayer the larger the increased amount of forgiveness on up to those in the millionaire class.

I paid my 1942 income tax on the 15th of last March. Now, why the Government should give me back 75 percent of my income tax for 1942, permitting me to use same as payment on my 1943 taxes, is beyond my comprehension, especially at this time, when we are called upon to vote billions almost weekly in connection with our war efforts, the greatest struggle ever in the history of the world.

In the first place, the Ruml proposal is, more or less, a real joke, as far as accomplishing what has been carried in the tremendous amount of propaganda in the press, through the mails, and over the radio, that is, "we are going to make taxpayers current, pay as you go."

The only class of taxpayers that could become current and pay as they go, based on what they actually know as to the amount they would have to pay, would be those taxpayers who do not have any income except a definite salary or wage income.

Where a taxpayer is engaged in other lines of business, for instance, farming, merchandising, banking, in fact, as stated, any line of business other than simply receiving a salary, the only thing that such a taxpayer could do under this bill would be to guess as to what amount such a taxpayer would have to pay, in that, certainly, this type of taxpayer would not, as stated, be in a position to know what amount of income tax he would have to pay until the end of the taxable year, at which time he would know the definite amount for which he would be liable.

For instance, take my farming operations. There is not a possible chance for me to know just what I am going to produce on my farm this year, and, certainly, I do not know what I am going to receive for the products I sell until after I have finished gathering and disposed of my farm products.

In the next place, there is no way of actually knowing about any losses which I may have on the farm which would be deductible until, as stated, at the end of the year, when I am in a position to get out a balance sheet, which would definitely indicate the amount of taxes that I am due.

This Ruml-tumble proposal originated in Wall Street, and I am sure when the people of the country wake up to just how Mr. Ruml is giving the humble a real tumble those who vote for this bill will have to do a considerable amount of explaining.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a very interesting statement, which I am sure will be read with a great deal of interest by the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, giving information concerning the Ruml-tumble tax proposal:

BARELY ONE-HALF OF ALL INCOME TAXES AND INCOME TAXPAYERS ARE BROUGHT UNDER THE PAY-AS-YOU-GO-BEFORE-YOU-KNOW PLAN—ITS MECHANICS AND HOW IT WILL WORK

For the doctor, the lawyer, the statesman, with other occupation besides his statesmanship; for the 2,250,000 business units in the United States and for the tens of thousands of small manufacturers there will be more bookkeeping, more bother, more guesswork, uncertainty, and confusion than they have ever known before, if we adopt the pay-as-you-go bookkeeping and tax-paying plan. Even then we shall cover only about one-half of the taxes and one-half of the taxpayers.

When the plan is in full operation on March 15 of the pay-as-you-go-year, the guessing year, all taxpayers, except farmers and corporations, would file an estimated tax return, if it can reasonably be expected that their income will exceed $1,000. The pay-as-you-guess plan comes in here. Some of the taxpayers, about one-half, would have to guess for the remaining 8½ months of the year as to expenses, possible profits, interest, or dividends, raises or reductions in wages or salaries, contributions, depreciation allowances, the various reserves that might be deductible, in fact you would have to make a guess on all the multitude of factors that go into fixing your taxable income. Then you would have to keep guessing all through the balance of the year, because if your taxable income rises or falls below the estimate, then you might need to file amended returns on June 15, September 15, and December 15, (why not monthly if you are to have a true pay-as-you-go?) and increase or decrease your installments accordingly.

To keep you out of the pay-when-you-know class, back into which all people normally endeavor to go, you had better not make any mistakes in your guesses.

One bill before Congress provides that if you do not guess right as to at least 80 percent of the total actual liability shown on the final return, then there would be assessed a penalty amounting to 6 percent of the amount by which the actual tax exceeds the estimate.

This threat has to be applied to keep people from falling back into the normal post-your-books-when - you - know - the - entries, pay-what-you-owe-when-you-know methods.

One can see what a blur of confusions, explanations, apologies, noncompliances and dissatisfaction will arise from these pay-by-guess-bookkeeping, taxpaying methods. The final and probably chief amount of these taxes will be paid on the pay-when-you-know method anyway.

After the March 15 report of the pay-when-you-know year, there comes the reviewing agent in the following year. This reviewing agent (or now agents) would check the final pay-when-you-know report. He would also have to go over the guesses of the pay-as-you-go year. There lies a possible appeal to the conference committee, when all reports and penalties may again be reviewed and assessed.

Assume that a pay-as-you-guess bill is enacted, will all taxes and all taxpayers come under it?

Decidedly no!

A. The farmer would get away with December 15 figures. In other words, he remains on a shortened, confused pay-when-you-know basis. There are between 50 and 60 million of them. They will neglect these rules. Will it make sense to file a report on December 15, and then file another one 3 months later?

B. Corporations are left on the pay-when-you-know basis. There are about 4,000 of them.

But the A and B groups—farmers and corporations—number nearly one-half of the taxpayers and pay nearly one-half of the Federal income taxes.

We are asked to stand for all this capricious system of exemptions, guesses, penalties, and "checkoffs", adding thus to the general odiousness of such income-tax imposts.

For what reason or reasons? Unquestionably the most potent one back of this movement is to get 2 years' taxes into 1, so that

the rather sordid argument may have force that the burden is too great. Hence the taxes for one of these years must be forgiven, and that in the midst of this exacting, exhausting life and death struggle, this war.

"The forego and forget." The taxes which are proposed to be rebated are now an actual asset exactly as much in existence and belonging to the Government and the people as if they were cash in the Treasury. If the Government wanted to cash in on these taxes, and the people were not being misled by promises of forgetting and foregoing for a small discount the Government could in a month or two at the outside put these $10,000,000,000 in the Treasury of the United States. Why, then, should this asset be wiped out in these days of dire National need?

Should the pay-as-you-guess or pay-before-you-know bookkeeping and taxpaying plan be adopted, the following forecast will probably prove correct.

After the sinister rebate is consummated we would in practice and soon no doubt by law slide back into the only sensible way of keeping our books and paying our taxes, the pay-when-you-know-what-you-owe way and (it is to be hoped) in four installments again.

Congress will lift the 6 percent penalty or other penalties. In the first stage it may even put taxpayers all on the former basis December 15. The individual taxpayer will farcically guess low on the pay-before-you-know March 15 year. He will make his books up and pay the bulk of his taxes when he knows what he owes.

"Check-offs" by the busy taxpayers for the Government will be dropped too.

A famous author says:

"Man stumbles and falls backward by imposing upon himself the intolerable burden of governmental paper work."

Do not substitute pay as you go by guess, leaving out half of the taxpayers and half of the taxes (corporations and farmers) nor introduce the governmental "check-off" with all its evils and, for such a bad bargain, throw in $10,000,000,000 of sound national assets to boot.

But rather pay when you know what you owe.

Be thankful for four installments.

In this time of national dire need pay all you owe.

As to the Government "check-off," trust more to the sporting spirit as well as the business honesty and sense of American taxpayers that in these days they will keep their books and pay their taxes as they should.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I realize the situation in which the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is placed. I would go with him anywhere, but I am not in the same embarrassing situation he is. I regard this bill as it comes back by way of a conference report to the House as economically unsound and morally wrong, and I cannot support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, one of my fellow members of the Ways and Means Committee said it would be a sorry spectacle if this bill should pass. I think it would be a sorry spectacle if this Congress did not answer the demand of the American people to get on a pay-as-you-go tax basis. They are asking for that.

As we all know, there are two means of accomplishment. You can pay 2 years' taxes in 1 year. That is almost impossible. You can pay parts of 2 years in 1 year, and that is somewhat possible. It will be a great burden, no matter how it is levied, owing to the high rates of taxes that are now necessary to support our war effort.

This conference report does a good job in making the transition to a pay-as-you-go system as easy as possible. It does another thing. It also makes it possible not to have to write new rates for personal income taxes in 1943. Of course, there is no guaranty that they will not be raised, but by spreading the unforgiven 25 percent of the lower year, at least $1,225,000,000 will be raised. If that sum is added to the admitted revenue increase of $3,000,000,000, due to the increase of national income, the revenue will be $4,225,000,000 more in fiscal year 1944 than it would be if we did not pass the bill.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I will yield in just 1 minute, if you please.

What the people want is to get on a pay-as-you-go basis. In addition, the people want to know what will be the tax rates during the ensuing year, and not fear that new rates written in the fall of 1943, will be made retroactive to January 1, 1943. This bill will make everyone current by March 15, 1945, and it will place the least burden on all. It is not giving away the Treasury. It is acting fairly with all taxpayers in proportion to the amount they have been paying in taxes.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina for a question.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Can the gentleman tell us how, if we adopt this pay-as-you-go plan and then should not be satisfied with it and want to go back to paying our taxes as we always have done for the preceding year, how can we do it with no year to substitute?

Mr. DEWEY. In 1945 Congress could change to the old system if it wished to.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. How?

Mr. DEWEY. I only have 5 minutes and I cannot enter into a long argument on writing a new tax bill for the gentleman. I am discussing the bill that is before us and I cannot yield any further.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I cannot yield further. I would like to say in closing, the Ways and Means Committee has struggled for 4 months.

The accusation that there has been any favoritism shown either to large or small taxpayers is unfair and unjust. The compromise bill before us is the only means of getting on a pay-as-you-go basis and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the people demand that of us and demand a current tax bill at the same time.

I hope that the House will vote for the bill brought to them by the committee of conference.

Mr. Speaker, I yeld back the balance of my time.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MCLEAN].

Mr. MCLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the conference report. It does not accomplish all that we started out to do in making necessary improvements in our income-tax collection system, but it is a step in the right direction. It will make possible in not more than 2 years the collection of all income taxes out of current income. Meanwhile at least 75 percent of the income taxes will be collected on a pay-as-you-earn basis. The flow of income to the Treasury will not be diminished but will be greater than under present law.

The consideration of this matter has taken an unnecessarily long time. The delay has been due to the effort of the Treasury Department to obtain larger amounts of tax from persons whose taxes are already so high that, measured by the ability to pay, additional taxes could not be collected by increased rates. Had it not been for this effort, there would have been slight resistance to the suggestion for the abatement of the tax on 1 year's income. Every suggestion made for the solution of the problem recognized the necessity for some element of abatement. The difference in the several plans was only as to the amount and the classes of persons who would be affected thereby.

Because of the need to gain additional revenue and the virtual impossibility of increasing the income taxes, except from new taxpayers, the Treasury Department sought by overlapping to use what should have been an administrative measure as a revenue bill. The effort has succeeded in its purpose to the extent of the revenue which the bill will produce. The bill provides that the base for the 1943 taxes shall be the amount due for 1942 or 1943—whichever is the greater. The tax on the lesser of the two will be abated to the extent of 75 percent, and the balance will be payable over a period of 2 years. It is estimated that by these processes the flow of income to the Treasury will be increased in 1943, and will increase the amount which the taxpayers will be required to pay in 1944 and 1945. This is tantamount to an increase in income-tax rates. Such rates are approaching—if they have not already reached—all that the traffic will bear, and, therefore, there should be no consideration given in the immediate future to the increase in the rates of taxes on incomes.

I favored a simpler process. The difficulty presenting itself came as the result of an error that was made in the tax law of 1913 when the income tax was first adopted. The tax covering incomes earned in the year 1913 was made payable during the year 1914. At that time and until recently the taxpayers were few, the rates were low, and the persons liable for the tax were of a class who always had the ability to pay. With the increase in expenditures of the Federal Government, it became necessary to provide additional revenue. The number of taxpayers and the rates of tax were considerably increased. Many liable for the

tax will not have the ability to pay unless the tax can be collected out of current income. The error of 1913 has become a serious matter. The income tax of today is entirely different from that of 1913 both in the quantum of the tax and the number and type of people who have been brought into the taxpayers' fold. Old methods of collection have become obsolete. A new and modern method of collection must be applied so that payment can be made out of current income.

The case of the new taxpayer creates no difficulty, but taxpayers already on the rolls are making the payment of the tax on their previous year's income out of the income of the subsequent year and at the same time accumulating a tax liability payable in the following year. To require them to make payment of their tax on their current income out of current earnings results in the payment of 2 years' taxes in 1.

I favored the simple method of abatement of the tax on the income of 1 year and a fresh start on a modern method of collecting income taxes on a pay-as-you-earn basis. Experience has demonstrated that the date of payment of income taxes may be so far removed from the earning period that the taxpayer may have dissipated his income and be without the ability to pay on the date when the payment becomes due. The application of this principle requires that income taxes be paid out of current income.

The plan for the 100-percent application of this principle received a substantial vote in the House of Representatives on two occasions. It was recognized to some extent by the bill which passed the House. The compromise which comes from the conference committee and is now before us recognizes the principle and makes it possible to bring about the payment of income taxes on a pay-as-you-earn basis in a comparatively short time.

I am still of the opinion that the 100-percent application of the principle would have been better. It would have simplified matters for the Treasury Department, with resulting economy in administration. Much of the amount anticipated will not be collected due to the vicissitudes of life and business, and the anticipated revenue will be reduced by these losses and the cost of collection of the amount realized. There is bound to be a considerable amount of uncertainty and confusion added to the unpopularity of the tax, which always results in greater difficulty in collection.

However, I believe that the step we are about to take is in the right direction. It will ultimately correct a serious flaw in our income-tax system. It will protect the revenue for all time, and it will provide additional revenue which would otherwise have to be found by increasing taxes on personal incomes.

There will be some complaint as to the complete abatement of the taxes amounting to $50 or less. That provision merely recognizes the fact that the costs of collection would exceed the amount realized. That is merely good business, eliminating what amounts to nuisance taxes so far as the Government is concerned. The American people will applaud the provisions which will prevent any advantage to those who are making large profits out of war contracts, and the generous treatment of the tax liability of those who have left everything behind them and are now in the service of their country in the four corners of the earth.

I am satisfied that the plans outlined in the conference report afford the best solution of the difficult problem that it is possible to agree upon.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, at the outset of the debate on the so-called Ruml-Carlson plan I announced that I was opposed to any forgiveness or any compulsory doubling up.

As the conference committee bill contains both of these vices I must oppose and will, at the proper time, vote against the adoption of the conference committee's report.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that today—after 5 months of deliberation—the House will approve the conference report on pay-as-you-go tax legislation.

Generally speaking, no compromise can be wholly satisfactory to everyone. This conference agreement is no exception. I think it is time that we resolve some of our personal views into legislative language and give our Nation current income-tax collections. The House of Representatives and Congress must demonstrate to the people of our Nation that we can legislate.

The conference agreement that we are considering today is the final result of very divergent views on changing our method of income-tax collections. We have been traveling in the same rut for so long that it is very difficult to open up a new trail. Those of us who have been working hard to secure early approval of this legislation fully realize its problems and complexities.

There is no doubt in my mind but what the pending conference agreement will call for future revision. It is on that basis that I am giving my consent and approval to it today.

I realize the great burden that is being placed on employers for the collection of this tax. If it were not for the fact that our Nation is at war and that our personal income taxpayers have increased in number from 3,900,000 in 1940 to 44,000,000 in 1943 I would not have encouraged the enactment of this type of legislation. I do feel, however, that it is just as essential to make improvements in the collection of our income tax as it is to change rates and exemptions according to the national income and need for revenue.

When the present bill becomes a law it will completely change the method of income tax collections that has been largely in effect since 1914. It is a forward step and one that I believe must be taken. It had been my hope that Congress would approve legislation that would place personal income taxpayers on a fully current basis as of January 1, 1943, with no doubling up. Unfortunately the House did not accept my views and as a result most of our personal income taxpayers will be saddled with a 25 percent increase in their tax. They will not become current until they have paid the 25 percent increase which will be due at the rate of 12½ percent on March 15, 1944, and 12½ percent on March 15, 1945. It had been my hope we could make this transition from the present year-behind collection system to a current collection system without using the bill as a means to increase taxes. While the conference committee did not accept my proposal in whole, they did accept it in principle by the abatement of at least 75 percent of 1 year's liability for all taxpayers.

There has been much contention about the abatement or forgiveness of taxes. The word forgiveness was a cleverly coined word used to defeat pay-as-you-go tax legislation. Everyone who is familiar with taxes and studies this proposal knows there is no forgiveness of individual income taxes until the taxpayer's income declines or ceases. It is my contention that an individual's income tax should be reduced when his income declines. It is more evident that we should not collect income taxes for the preceding year from an individual after his death. The purpose of the legislation under discussion is to remove the income tax debt liability and place our income taxpayers on a current basis.

It is with some regret that I find the provision of the conference report requiring the 1943 tax to be based on the higher income of the 2 years 1942 or 1943 is not limited to those with incomes over $5,000, as provided in my bill. It is my thought that all taxpayers whose income is less than $5,000 should not have to pay on the higher income of the 2 years, but on their current 1943 liability. This was one provision of my bill that would have been of great benefit to men in the service, farmers, small businessmen, and laboring people.

The present bill by requiring the taxpayer to pay his income on the higher of 1942 or 1943 income will work a real hardship on a large number of our citizens whose income will be greatly reduced in 1943 through no fault of their own. It will be a real hardship on those farmers who reside in the flood-stricken areas of the central United States. This situation will be equally true for farmers living in areas where last year they produced the first paying crop in years and this year, because of the elements, may produce a very small crop. It will also mean a real problem for the thousands of small businessmen who had a small income in 1942 but are gradually being forced out of business in 1943. Not only will these taxpayers whose income was greatly reduced have to pay the tax on the higher year, they will in addition thereto have to pay an increase of 25 percent of the tax for the lower year spread over the 2-year period.

When this bill becomes a law the day of levying personal income taxes retroactively will be passed. No more will Congress be criticized for approving income-tax legislation retroactively to January 1 after 9 or 10 months of the year have gone by. This was the situation we found ourselves in following enactment of the 1942 Revenue Act. It was not only unfair to the individual taxpayers, but it is an out-dated manner of levying taxes.

When our individual taxpayers are on a current basis Congress can enact tax legislation changing the exemptions or rates and place them in effect with a minimum of disturbance to the taxpayer. His taxes will be paid out of current income on the basis of the income he receives, not out of current income on the basis of last year's tax liability. This feature alone is highly desirable in our income-tax law and should meet the approval of Congress and the taxpayer. As I stated earlier in my remarks, I am confident there will be many inequalities and many hardship cases develop under existing legislation.

As one Member of this Congress I want to assure the American people that when these inequities arise that it will be my desire to assist in correcting them as far as practicable and necessary in future tax legislation.

ANTIWINDFALL PROVISIONS

The conference agreement adopts the principle of the two antiwindfall provisions which were contained in my bill, but with certain modifications.

The first antiwindfall provision of my bill would have required taxpayers with over $5,000 taxable income in 1942 to pay a 1943 tax based on the higher income of the 2 years, and the tax for the lower of the 2 years would have been abated. Under the conference agreement, this provision is made applicable to all taxpayers, regardless of the size of the income, except that there are special provisions in the case of servicemen, which I will explain later. In other words, if the conference report is adopted, all taxpayers will pay a 1943 tax based on the higher of the 2 years, 1942 or 1943, and the 75 percent abatement will apply to the lower of the 2 years.

For example, if a man's tax for 1942 was $100, and his tax for 1943 was $200, this provision would not apply. He would simply be forgiven $75 of his 1942 tax, and the remaining $25 would be carried forward and paid in addition to current taxes, one-half being due and payable March 15, 1944, and one-half March 15, 1945.

On the other hand, if his tax liability for 1942 was $200, and his tax on 1943 income was $100, the final 1943 tax would be based on the higher 1942 liability. What actually happens is that the 1943 tax of $100 is increased by the difference between it and the higher 1942 tax, which means that there would be an additional liability of $100, making a total tax for 1943 of $200 instead of $100. The result is substantially the same as taxing 1942 income instead of 1943 income.

The 75 percent abatement then applies to the lower tax year, 1943, and the 25 percent carry-over is based on the 1943 tax before being increased because of the higher 1942 liability. In other words, the carry-over is 25 percent of $100, not of $200. The unabated $25 would be payable one-half on March 15, 1944, and one-half March 15, 1945.

An exception to this rule requiring the 1943 tax to be based on the higher income of the 2 years, 1942 and 1943, is made in the case of persons in the armed service. There will be no addition to their 1943 tax because of having a higher income in 1942, insofar as the 1942 income was earned income not in excess of $14,000. In other words, if a soldier had a $3,000 civilian salary in 1942, and $600 Army pay in 1943, his 1943 tax liability would be based solely on his service income, and on that amount there would of course be no tax in view of the liberal exemption for members of the armed forces. In effect, the 1942 tax liability would be completely wiped out in his case. The 75-percent abatement provision would apply to the lower income of the 2 years, which means that the 25-percent carry-over would be based on the 1943 tax, which would be zero, since in the case cited there would be no 1943 liability. As a practical matter, this relief provision for members of the armed forces will result in the abatement of 100 percent of their 1942 liability in all cases where the income was earned income not in excess of $14,000.

The second antiwindfall provision of the conference agreement is also based in principle upon the similar provision of my bill, but again substantial modifications have been made. This second antiwindfall provision is designed to prevent the 75 percent abatement provision from applying to that portion of the income of the abated year which represents swollen war profits. In other words, the intention is to limit the abatement to normal income.

Under my substitute proposal as amended on the House floor, the income of the abated year was compared with the base year 1940, and if it exceeded the base year's income by more than $5,000 the excess was subjected to the regular normal and surtax rates. In other words, the 1940 income, plus $5,000, was used as a yardstick in measuring the extent of the swollen war income in the year which would otherwise be abated. Such war profits were taxed in full, and the abatement thus limited to the normal portion of the income.

Under the conference agreement, a somewhat different method of taxing the war profit windfall is used. In the first place, instead of using the year 1940 as the base year, the conference report permits taxpayers to use the highest year of the years 1937, 1938, 1939, or 1940. Secondly, the conference agreement allows an increase of up to $20,000, instead of $5,000, before the windfall tax applies. In the third place, the conference agreement, instead of setting off the income in the base year against the income in the abated year to measure the windfall, sets off a hypothetical tax on the total of the base year's income plus $20,000 against 75 percent of the tax of the abated year. In other words, it compares tax with tax, instead of income with income. In some cases this method may have the effect of subjecting the so-called windfall to a higher rate of tax than under the method provided in my bill, but this is somewhat offset by adding $20,000 to the base year's income instead of only $5,000.

The second antiwindfall provision of the conference agreement would work out in this fashion: Assume that the taxpayer had an income of $1,000,000 in 1943, $500,000 in 1942, and $80,000 in the highest base year. On his 1943 income he would pay a tax, including net Victory tax, of approximately $900,000. His 1942 liability, based on the $500,000 income, was approximately $400,000, and being the lower of the 2 years, the 75-percent abatement would apply to this amount. Twenty-five percent of the $400,000 tax, or $100,000, would be carried forward and collected, in addition to current taxes. One half, or $50,000, would be payable March 15, 1944, and the remainder March 15, 1945. The 75-percent abatement, amounting to $300,000, is then compared with a hypothetical tax, computed at 1942 rates, on the base year's income of $80,000, plus $20,000, making a total of $100,000. The hypothetical tax on this amount would be approximately $64,000. This is the norm, or yardstick, to be used in measuring the amount of so-called windfall in the 75-percent abatement, and represents the tax on normal profits. The excess of the 75-percent abatement of $300,000 over this $64,000 is the amount of the windfall tax. Thus, the abatement would be limited to $64,000 instead of $300,000, and the $236,000 difference would be regarded as a windfall, and would be collected as a windfall tax. It may be paid in four installments, commencing March 15, 1945, with interest at 4 percent.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means or to any member of that committee who may be able to answer it: Under this conference report what happens to a man who has gone into the service? Let us assume his income in 1942 was $20,000 but that he is now in the service at $50 a month: Is he forgiven the tax on the lesser of the 2 years or just what happens to him and how are you providing for a solution of his tax problem?

Mr. DOUGHTON. He is forgiven the tax on the greater of the 2 years to the extent that the tax on that year's income is attributable to earned income.

Mr. POWERS. In other words, if he is making $50 a month, does he have to pay a tax on what he earned in 1942?

Mr. DOUGHTON. He is forgiven all of that part of his tax for 1942 attributable to earned income.

Mr. POWERS. Are we to understand that if he in 1942 had a tax of $1,000 to pay, but that in 1943 he made only $50 a month, he would be paying out more than he made?

Mr. DOUGHTON. He would not have to pay the $1,000 if the income on which the tax was levied was earned income.

Mr. POWERS. In other words, under this bill he would be paying more tax in 1943 than his total earnings.

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; nothing like that.

Mr. POWERS. If a man made $20,000 in 1942 and made $600 in 1943 he would be paying more tax in 1943 than the money he made.

Mr. DOUGHTON. His 1942 tax would be forgiven to the extent it resulted from earned income. If his income for 1943 was only $600, he would probably have no tax to pay.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not suit me. It contains too much forgiveness and abatement in the higher incomes to suit me. I do feel the taxpayers of this country should be permitted to go on a current basis if they want to do so.

I am supporting the conference report because of the assurance of the committee that this legislation will provide additional revenue for the year to the extent of between three and four billion dollars and the further assurance that large profits created by reason of war contracts will not escape taxation and that such profits are protected by the windfall provisions of the bill.

I have always held to the opinion, as I do now, that this is not a time when taxes, especially on larger incomes, should be forgiven, reduced, or abated. It ought to be clearly understood that this is not a tax bill and that the primary reason for such legislation is to permit taxpayers to go on a current or pay-as-you-go plan or basis. In fact, that is the only real excuse for its consideration. I think it is extremely unfortunate that the great Ways and Means Committee of the House should have been required to spend so much of its time and energy in giving consideration to the matter of pay-as-you-go legislation instead of giving consideration to the question of meeting the ever-increasing obligations of our Government created by the war effort.

According to figures that have been submitted, we are going to spend about $80,000,000,000 this year and $144,000,000,000 next year. Under present circumstances our legislation will provide for raising about one-third of the amount we are spending. Somehow, somewhere, consideration is going to have to be given pretty soon to the problem of meeting the payment of at least a greater portion of this mounting debt. So I say the question of more importance in my judgment is the problem of raising further revenue to meet the obligations that are being created every day. The average American citizen has just about as much tax burden as he can carry, and the question of finding a new source of taxation is going to be a more difficult problem for this Congress than any Congress has had to meet in our history. Nevertheless, the Ways and Means Committee has the responsibility of presenting a plan as to how this dilemma is to be solved. This is a responsibility the Ways and Means Committee and this Congress must assume in the very near future.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is a very unfortunate situation that confronts us today. We do not have enough time to give this important matter proper consideration. The rules controlling conferences and the reports of conferees do not admit of proper consideration and I am in favor of amending them. I think they should be amended, and I have openly favored this for years. Here we come in today about to finish up an important matter that we have worked on for months and a matter that the country has been thinking about for months. Groups in the country have been tremendously interested in it for months; yet we are called upon to dispose of it finally in 1 short hour—30 minutes on each side. In the case before us no speaker has an adequate chance to explain the differences that the conference committee has made in these bills. As you probably realize, a conference committee has wide latitude. The fact of the matter is, as I have already stated, the conference committee has too much latitude, I think. As you know, the House passed a new bill, the Senate passed a different bill; the conference committee considers both bills and it brings out a bill that is different from either. It is a situation that ought to be remedied, but I do not know how we can do it. There is not much we can do about it today. We must act on what is before us.

Let us consider for a minute the parliamentary situation that we are going to find facing us in a few minutes. We are going to be called upon to vote. On what? We are going to vote on whether or not you shall accept this conference report. Suppose you do not accept it? What will be the result? Or, let me put it the other way: Suppose you do accept it. If you accept it by a majority vote, then we are through with this troublesome question. We shall have passed it, and it then goes to the Senate and, when it is considered and if they pass it, will then be up to the White House. What the President may do with it I cannot say and have not the temerity or, some might think, the audacity to even prophesy. But something is going to be done. If we do not vote for it, if we vote it down, we shall find ourselves exactly where we started with this difference: Somebody can make a motion to recede and concur or somebody can make a motion to instruct the conferees and send this conference report back with instructions.

What good will that do? The country is demanding action. In fact, the country is tired of our failure to function. Mr. Speaker, it would appear to me that the only thing that we can do, the only sensible thing we can do, is to adopt this conference report.

What is the matter with the conference report? One of the Members, speaking briefly this afternoon, said, "It is the Ruml plan over and over," and he is against the conference report, because he thinks it is the Ruml plan. Another favors it because he thinks it is not the Ruml plan. It is not the Ruml plan at all, and it cannot be truthfully said that it is the Ruml plan. The only feature of it that is a part of the original Ruml plan is the withholding at the source feature. Let us see what kind of a plan it is. What does it do? Let us just consider it fairly and lay aside any political considerations. Let us see what it does and determine whether or not it is a rich man's bill, as has been suggested.

Here is the first important feature: It provides that the taxpayer must pay on whichever is the larger, the 1942 or 1943 income. He has got to pay on the larger one of those 2 years, and that will be, in most cases, 1943, but if 1942 is larger he will be compelled to take 1942. Everybody gets the same consideration. There is no preference to the rich man as against the poor man there.

Let us take the next step. The next step is absolutely a step for the poor man. Let me figure with you for just a minute. Every man whose tax is less than $50 is forgiven his 1942 tax. Of course he pays his 1943 tax. We are all going to pay our 1943 tax if our 1943 income is higher than our 1942 income. If 1943 is lower, then the contrary, if we elect to do so. But assuming we are going to pay 1943, let us then consider how much of the 1942 tax will be forgiven.

When a taxpayer's tax is found to be $50 or lower, it is forgiven him entirely. He, therefore, gets a 100-percent reduction. That is fair to everybody in that group. There is no grab about that. Everybody gets the same treatment.

Now, suppose his tax is more than $50. Then he gets a reduction of 75 percent, and that applies to everybody from the $50 man up to the million-dollar man. They all get a 75-percent reduction. How did that come into this conference report? It came into it because the Democratic Senators in conference from the beginning steadfastly maintained that they must have a law that will play straight across the board, a 75-percent reduction to everybody straight across the board. And I want to appeal to you on the Democratic side as to whether that has not an appeal as being fair. It is a total 100-percent reduction to the man with a tax under $50 and a 75-percent reduction to everybody above that.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another provision in this bill that stops the rich man. What is it? It is the windfall provision. Nobody has discussed that with you yet this afternoon.

What is the windfall provision? Let us suppose a man makes a million dollars in 1943 and makes a half-million dollars in 1942. He must pay 1943 in full. He is entitled to a 75 percent forgiveness across the board as all other taxpayers but he does not actually get all that 75-percent reduction. He is subjected to a windfall tax if in fact he has had a windfall. This is determined by searching his income for the years 1937, 1938, 1939, and 1940. If it appears that his income in the highest of these 4 years, plus $20,000, is

less than the forgiven portion of his 1942 income, he must pay a windfall tax. For instance, suppose in the above case that man who had an income of $1,000,000 in 1943 and $500,000 in 1942, only had an income of $50,000 in 1937, 1938, and 1939 and an income of $75,000 in 1940 there would be a wide margin of many thousands of dollars between his 1940 income and his 1942 income which would be subject to the regular income tax. I cannot here give you the details of this setup, but it is sufficient to say that the windfall taxes will bring many millions of additional taxes into the Treasury and that these millions will all come from the rich or heavy incomes.

Now, here we are. We take the little man and we give him a $50 credit and we take the big man and every other man and we give him 75 percent but if he made a large amount of profit in 1942 he has to pay on that inordinate income.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman cannot dispute that. No; I cannot yield, as my time is very limited.

Mr. DINGELL. No, he pays it over 2 years.

Mr. FORAND. Will the gentleman yield? I dispute what the gentleman says.

Mr. JENKINS. I did not yield to the gentleman. The gentleman from Massachusetts a few moments ago said this bill was the same as the Ruml plan. Why should I yield to the gentleman to make a statement such as that when the gentleman knows that is not true.

Mr. FORAND. If the gentleman will give me a chance I will prove it.

Mr. JENKINS. No; the gentleman cannot prove it, and why persist in making such an unfounded claim? If he can prove it, he should do so in his own remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I am not entirely pleased with this report. I never was very much for the original Ruml plan. In fact the original Ruml plan was never considered on the floor of the House for his plan was not in legislative form. I favored the Carlson plan, which took some of the basic Ruml ideas and built up a very complete plan; the people were for the Carlson plan and I favored it. I have never been very much for a withholding tax that only withholds from certain groups. I am not in favor of a withholding tax that withholds from the working man unless we make it current and forgive him a portion if not all of the 1942 tax. To withhold and double up taxes at the same time is too much of a burden to the working man and to almost all of our other classes of citizens.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on which we will vote today fully meets every dictionary definition of the term "compromise." According to the dictionary, a compromise is "a settlement by which each party concedes or gives up something"; or it is "a combination of two opposite systems, made by sacrifice on the part of each." It necessarily follows that no compromise is ever fully satisfactory to any of the conflicting parties. The most that can usually be said of a compromise is that the compromise settlement is better than no settlement at all. And that is the most I can say in favor of this conference report.

When the tax bill was sent to conference and the Speaker had named the managers on the part of the House, and the President of the Senate those on the part of the Senate, I fully realized that in that entire body of 14 legislators there was not a single one who had previously said the bill passed by the House was his first choice. On the part of the Senate conferees there was only one who was even willing to accept the House bill. However, every Democrat of the House conferees loyally voted for the House bill on the three or four occasions it was offered in conference.

With a full realization of the problem confronting the House conferees and feeling that a compromise would be better than no bill at all, I addressed the following letter to the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman DOUGHTON, on the day before the conferees met:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I send this letter to confirm what I have personally told you, namely, that I intend to support the conference report you bring back to the House on the pending tax bill. I am far more interested in seeing collection at the source of at least the basic tax liability commenced by July 1 than I am in seeing the forgiveness plan suggested by me written into law.

The withholding plan in the Senate bill is an improvement over that in the House plan and, therefore, I hope that will be adopted. In the House on yesterday I gave some of the reasons why I did not think the forgiveness plan of the Senate bill should be adopted. However, I am convinced that no conference report that does not provide some method of making a substantial number of taxpayers current within a reasonable time will be adopted by either the House or Senate. A program to make taxpayers current will not reach the desired goal if postponed until after the war. We naturally hope the war will not last more than 2 years longer.

On numerous occasions, in the committee and elsewhere, I have expressed the view that while increases in income taxes were unavoidable I did not think those increases should be made retroactive. That was my principal objection to all plans requiring a doubling up since one-half of the current calendar year will be gone before the new bill can become effective. One virtue of the bill passed by the House was that it required no doubling up, leaving open the question of increased rates for a subsequent bill to be applied to 1944 income. The House bill automatically makes 90 percent of the taxpayers current in 1943 and to all intent and purposes 96 percent, as the maximum increase on the net income of $5,000 of a married man with no dependents would be only 1.1 percent. Three hundred and thirteen Members of the House have voted for that plan and 27 Members of the Senate. There were 4 Members of the Senate paired for it.

There are two valid objections to the House bill. First, it forgives, after making allowance for the abatement of taxes to those in military service, something over $7,000,000,000 of 1942 liability, but the alternative to that, if we are to make taxpayers current, is a doubling up that amounts to a retroactive increase in rates. The second objection is that from a dollar standpoint it confers a greater benefit upon 90 percent of the taxpayers than upon the remaining 10 percent. The alternative to that is to confer a greater benefit in dollars upon the 10 percent than upon the remaining 90 percent. The alleged inequalities of treatment in the House bill is the lesser of the two inequalities. The President will accept the House bill and he may not accept the Senate bill. The House bill will be acceptable to 96 percent of the taxpayers. The percentage of opposition in the Senate to the Senate bill was greater than the percentage of opposition in the House to the House bill.

A conference report differing from any plan heretofore proposed is apt to engender considerable debate in both House and Senate. But, as I first indicated, you can count on my support of the conference action.

I quote this letter at this time for two reasons: In the first place, I wish the official record to show I have never wavered in the personal belief that the plan I first proposed to the Ways and Means Committee and which was finally adopted by the House was the best solution of a difficult problem. Secondly, I quote it to indicate my previous promise to accept the conference report made at a time when I did not know what the report would be. When I make a promise I carry it out when it is in my power to do so.

No one realized better than the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee that in breaking the deadlock and making a tax bill possible he was agreeing to a compromise of "two opposite systems, made by sacrifice on the part of each." He sacrifices his opposition to the windfalls inherent in the Ruml plan because this conference report retains about 75 percent of them, in return for the inauguration by July 1 of collection of the basic tax liability against wages and salaries at the source, and for the advantages to accrue from speeding up for the fiscal year of 1944 the collection of income-tax liability by the sum of between two and three billion dollars. It was not an easy decision for him to make, but in making it he was 100 percent sincere in the belief that the action then taken was for the best interests of the country. I predict that when the roll is called on this conference report a majority on both sides of the aisle will not only pay tribute to that sincerity, but likewise to the wisdom of the decision made.

In voting for the conference report I will at least have the personal satisfaction that the 20-percent-withholding plan I proposed to the Ways and Means Committee will be written into law, and likewise that the supporters of the Ruml plan in both House and Senate were forced to make major concessions on the subject of windfalls by reason of the fight made in the House to limit the waiver of 1942 tax liability to the corresponding number of tax units to be collected at the source.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker being in doubt, the House proceeded to divide.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman permitted to ask for the yeas and nays during the time the vote is in progress?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 159, noes 68.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 257, nays 114, answered "present" 1, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

YEAS—257

Allen, La.	Fellows	Lewis, Ohio
Anderson, Calif.	Fenton	Luce
Anderson, N. Mex.	Fish	Ludlow
	Fisher	McCormack
Andresen, August H.	Fogarty	McGregor
	Gallagher	McKenzie
Andrews	Gamble	McLean
Angell	Gathings	McWilliams
Arends	Gavagan	Maas
Arnold	Gavin	Madden
Auchincloss	Gerlach	Magnuson
Baldwin, Md.	Gilchrist	Maloney
Barrett	Gillette	Martin, Iowa
Barry	Gillie	Martin, Mass.
Bates, Ky.	Goodwin	Mason
Bates, Mass.	Gordon	May
Beall	Graham	Merritt
Bender	Grant, Ind.	Michener
Bennett, Mich.	Green	Miller, Mo.
Bennett, Mo.	Griffiths	Miller, Nebr.
Bishop	Gross	Miller, Pa.
Blackney	Gwynne	Mills
Bland	Hale	Monkiewicz
Bloom	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Morrison, La.
Bolton		Mott
Boykin	Hall, Leonard W.	Mruk
Bradley, Mich.		Mundt
Brehm	Halleck	Murray, Wis.
Brooks	Hancock	Newsome
Brown, Ohio	Harness, Ind.	Nichols
Buffett	Harris, Ark.	Norman
Bulwinkle	Hays	Norton
Burch, Va.	Hébert	O'Brien, Ill.
Burchill, N. Y.	Heffernan	O'Hara
Busbey	Hendricks	O'Neal
Butler	Hess	O'Toole
Byrne	Hill	Peterson, Fla.
Canfield	Hinshaw	Pfeifer
Carlson, Kans.	Hoch	Philbin
Carson, Ohio	Hoeven	Phillips
Carter	Holmes, Mass.	Ploeser
Case	Holmes, Wash.	Plumley
Celler	Horan	Poulson
Chenoweth	Howell	Powers
Chiperfield	Jarman	Pracht
Church	Jeffrey	Price
Clason	Jenkins	Priest
Clevenger	Jennings	Rabaut
Cole, Mo.	Jensen	Ramspeck
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Anton J.	Reece, Tenn.
Cravens		Reed, Ill.
Cullen	Johnson, Calvin D.	Reed, N. Y.
Cunningham		Rees, Kans.
Curley	Johnson, Ward	Rizley
Curtis	Jones	Robertson
Davis	Jonkman	Robsion, Ky.
Day	Judd	Rockwell
Dewey	Kean	Rodgers, Pa.
Dirksen	Kearney	Rogers, Calif.
Ditter	Keefe	Rogers, Mass.
Dondero	Kennedy	Rohrbough
Doughton	Keogh	Rolph
Douglas	Kilday	Rowan
Drewry	Kinzer	Rowe
Eaton	Kleberg	Satterfield
Elliott	Knutson	Schiffler
Ellis	LaFollette	Schuetz
Ellison, Md.	Lane	Schwabe
Elmer	Lanham	Shafer
Elston, Ohio	Larcade	Sheppard
Engel	Lea	Short
Fay	LeFevre	Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.	Sundstrom	Ward
Slaughter	Taber	Weaver
Smith, Maine	Talbot	Wene
Smith, Ohio	Talle	Wheat
Smith, Va.	Taylor	Whelchel, Ga.
Smith, W. Va.	Thomas, N. J.	White
Smith, Wis.	Thomason	Wigglesworth
Somers, N. Y.	Tibbott	Willey
Springer	Towe	Winter
Stanley	Troutman	Wolcott
Starnes, Ala.	Vinson, Ga.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Stearns, N. H.	Voorhis, Calif.	Wolverton, N. J.
Stefan	Vorys, Ohio	Woodruff, Mich.
Stevenson	Vursell	Wright
Stockman	Wadsworth	Zimmerman
Sullivan	Walter	

NAYS—114

Abernethy	Gore	Morrison, N. C.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gorski	Murdock
	Gossett	Murphy
Barden	Gregory	Murray, Tenn.
Beckworth	Hare	Myers
Boren	Harless, Ariz.	Norrell
Bradley, Pa.	Hart	O'Brien, Mich.
Brown, Ga.	Heidinger	O'Connor
Bryson	Holifield	O'Konski
Buckley	Hull	Outland
Burdick	Izac	Pace
Burgin	Jackson	Patman
Camp	Johnson, Ind.	Patton
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, J. Leroy	Peterson, Ga.
Clark		Pittenger
Coffee	Johnson, Luther A.	Poage
Colmer		Rankin
Cooley	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Richards
Cooper		Rivers
Cox	Johnson, Okla.	Robinson, Utah
Creal	Kee	Sabath
Crosser	Kefauver	Sasscer
D'Alesandro	Kelley	Sauthoff
Dawson	Kirwan	Scanlon
Delaney	Klein	Snyder
Dickstein	Kunkel	Sparkman
Dingell	Lemke	Spence
Disney	Lesinski	Steagall
Durham	Lynch	Stewart
Dworshak	McCord	Sumner, Ill.
Eberharter	McGehee	Tarver
Feighan	McGranery	Vincent, Ky.
Fitzpatrick	McMurray	Wasielewski
Forand	Mahon	Weiss
Ford	Manasco	West
Fulbright	Mansfield, Mont.	Whitten
Fulmer		Whittington
Furlong	Mansfield, Tex.	Wickersham
Gearhart	Marcantonio	Winstead
Gibson	Monroney	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Folger

NOT VOTING—60

Allen, Ill.	Gifford	Miller, Conn.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Granger	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bell	Grant, Ala.	O'Leary
Bonner	Guyer	Ramey
Cannon, Fla.	Hagen	Randolph
Capozzoli	Harris, Va.	Russell
Chapman	Hartley	Sadowski
Cochran	Herter	Scott
Compton	Hobbs	Sheridan
Costello	Hoffman	Sikes
Courtney	Hope	Sumners, Tex.
Crawford	Kerr	Thomas, Tex.
Culkin	Kilburn	Tolan
Dies	King	Treadway
Dilweg	Lambertson	Van Zandt
Domengeaux	Landis	Weichel, Ohio
Ellsworth	LeCompte	Welch
Fernandez	McCowen	Wilson
Flannagan	McMillan	Woodrum, Va.
Gale	Merrow	Worley

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Miller of Connecticut against.

Mr. Chapman for, with Mr. Sadowski against.

Mr. Harris of Virginia for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Mr. Baldwin of New York for, with Mr. Dilweg against.

Mr. Kerr for, with Mr. Folger against.

Mr. Compton for, with Mr. Flannagan against.

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Ramey.
Mr. King with Mr. McCowen.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Russell with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Courtney with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Landis.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Weichel of Ohio.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Van Zandt.
Mr. Hagen with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. KERR, who, if present, would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "nay."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the hall and listening, but failed to hear his name called?

Mr. HOBBS. No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the roll call just completed I was called from the floor for only a few minutes by two of my constituents. When I returned I was unable to qualify. Had I been able to qualify I would have voted "aye."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF WOMANHOOD

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, in this time of stress, when manpower is needed and every nerve and resource of the Nation is being put to the test, it is indeed gratifying to realize the wonderful contributions that the womanhood of the country is making toward our war effort.

Today in the city of Washington there is being entertained a young lady, Miss Vera Anderson, of Pascagoula, Miss., who is the champion woman welder of the world. As an employee of the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation of my home

town of Pascagoula, Miss., Miss Anderson in competition with a representative of the Kaiser Shipbuilding Corporation of the west coast won this coveted honor. She is a splendid type of young American womanhood. In addition to her skill and patriotism, she is charming, graceful, and attractive.

I am sure that I speak the sentiment of this body when I say that the Congress of the United States joins with me in justifiable pride in the opportunity to welcome this fine young woman to the Capital City of the Nation. She is emblematical of the thousands of other splendid women who are contributing so much toward the ultimate goal with which we are all concerned—namely, an early and victorious conclusion of this war. Moreover, I am confident that the whole Congress joins with me when I say to you, Miss Anderson: We felicitate you, we salute you on behalf of a grateful American people for your efforts to that end.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ACQUISITION AND CONVERSION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL AUXILIARY VESSELS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to all Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DREWRY, MAGNUSON, and MAAS.

NAVAL TRUST FUNDS AND ACCOUNTING PROCEDURE

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2584) to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON of Georgia, DREWRY, and MAAS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the other day I was granted permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I have been informed by the Government Printing Office that the extension exceeds the usual limit and will cost 112.50. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks may be printed in the RECORD under those circumstances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by me on May 30.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BELL (at the request of Mr. SLAUGHTER), for 3 weeks, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Boston Post of May 26.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS FOOD CONFERENCE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, no doubt the American farmers will be intensely interested to learn that they are to be the first group to be liquidated under the grandiose scheme that is being concocted by the so-called food conference at Hot Springs to make our Nation over into a totalitarian state and to put it under the heel of a world dictatorship.

According to newspaper reports, the blueprint-drawing section of the new world order, which is headed by Alexey D. Krutikov, chairman of the Soviet delegation to the conference, has advanced what amounts to a proposal to abolish individual ownership of farms and to set up collectivization of farming as it now exists in Russia.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SAUTHOFF asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

WE PROTEST

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an alleged procedure or practice in the War Department in the issuance of certificates of disability for discharge, where pressure has been brought upon servicemen to sign affidavits or make admissions, without full knowledge or information, that they are suffering from disabilities alleged to exist prior to their induction into the Army, as an inducement to secure certain benefits. Such allegations or admissions may be without any foundation of truth based on the facts. If this practice has been indulged in, it is reprehensible and should be stamped out at once.

In accordance with consent heretofore given, I include as a part of my remarks an editorial appearing in the Disabled American Veterans' Semi-Monthly of its issue of April 29, entitled "We Protest," in which this practice is discussed and which is worthy of consideration by the Members of the Congress:

WE PROTEST

Through actual contact with soldiers or their parents, and through correspondence received from wide sections of the country, our attention has been called to a situation existing in the Army which we hope will be immediately corrected. We cannot believe that the condition is the result of general orders or that the commanding general knows anything about it.

We are referring to the policy of certain Army officials seeking to obtain false statements and affidavits from soldiers or the parents of soldiers who are about to be discharged because of mental or physical conditions which in the opinion of the medical officers, render them unfit for military service. The requests are unlawful in themselves. The methods used in obtaining these false statements are reprehensible and can serve no good purpose.

For example, we have in our possession a communication sent to the mother of a soldier advising her that her son was hospitalized and suffering from a severe mental disability. It further requested that she sign the enclosed affidavit to the effect that she knew of his mental condition prior to his entrance into the service and that she would assume complete responsibility over him if he were released and sent home to her. The mother had not seen the son in 11 months and was unaware that he ever suffered from any nervous or mental disability. He had not been ill at any time prior to his entrance into the service, except for childhood maladies. Yet, almost hysterical upon learning that her son was seriously ill, she was ready to sign anything in order to protect and aid him. She was counseled to make no false affidavit regarding her knowledge of her son's condition, to advise the Army officials of the facts and to insist that they properly care for him. As a result, the Army reconsidered and recorded the condition as "incurred in line of duty." The man was discharged and transferred to a mental institution of the Veterans' Administration as should have been done at the first.

Another instance called to our attention involved a soldier who was threatened with dishonorable discharge unless he signed a statement to the effect that he knew the heart condition (for which he was to be discharged) existed prior to his enlistment several months before. The fact in this case disclosed that the man had never sought or received medical attention for any disability

prior to his enlistment, and nobody was more surprised than he to discover that his heart was bad. He was greatly upset that his Army career was to end so abruptly as he was slated for officers' training and had every hope of "making good." He has refused to sign the false statement but what we want to know is why he was threatened and bulldozed in an effort to make him sign it. Space prevents us from relating similar incidents. We do not object to the Army discharging a man who is found to be unfit for the duties of a soldier. What we do object to is the crude method whereby certain Army officials attempt to falsify a man's service record in an effort, apparently, to protect the Government from future claims for benefits.

We know, and the public knows, that many men are going to break under the stress and strain of intensive training—necessary intensive training. There is nothing for the Army to apologize about and there is no need for them to maintain a policy whereby they endeavor to charge the breakdown of these men to inadequate personalities or to conditions which existed prior to enlistment. The responsibility is not the Army's; the responsibility is the Government's. The Veterans' Administration is authorized and qualified to subsequently determine whether or not the conditions which rendered the man unfit for the duties of a soldier were incurred in line of duty or existed prior to enlistment.

It is no more disgraceful for a man to break in training or in combat than it is for a student flyer to crash before he has earned his wings. Frankly, we do not like the methods being used by some military units which have been endeavoring to secure affidavits from ignorant and frightened parents to the effect that they know of and are aware of their son's condition and are willing to accept the responsibility of his care even though they have not seen him in months and where the facts indicate that the man has never been seriously ill prior to his entrance into military service.

Why should the military assume the right to break the law of the land in an effort to secure false affidavits through duress or fear when such methods have not only been frowned upon but have resulted in severe punishment when indulged in by citizens who make up this Government? We only hope and pray that the situation or the method used is not general and that the general staff of the Army is unaware of the situation and will act immediately to correct it in all phases. As servicemen, with some knowledge of the military forces of the United States, we accept the right of the military to discharge a man with the comment that in the opinion of the authorities who ordered the discharge the condition existed prior to enlistment, but we emphatically protest the actions of a few individuals who, in their enthusiasm, feel that they are entitled to use despicable methods in an effort to falsify official records to justify their actions. If this policy continues and becomes general, the service records and their contents will become valueless because of the opinion that will be formed that where the record is adverse to the soldier, it was obtained through fraud or duress.

This protest must not be taken as an effort to retard the war effort. Rather we feel that the bitterness engendered by the methods the Army is now using is doing real injury to the service and breaking down that confidence in the military which is absolutely necessary if we are to continue as a united people, bent upon our main objective—the winning of the war.

The entire problem will be solved when the Army and the Government adopt the policy that when a man has been examined and accepted into the military service he is considered to be in sound mental and physical condition except for those conditions noted by the medical examiners and made of record at the time of his acceptance. It is the only equitable solution. It is the American way.

Mr. Speaker, being deeply concerned over this alleged practice of the War Department in prejudging the cases of such discharged servicemen, I wrote to the Secretary of War asking to be advised as to the facts with reference to this alleged practice. Following is a copy of my letter to the Secretary, and his reply:

MAY 21, 1943.

Hon. HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Herman E. Lafky, commander, Department of Oregon, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, has called to my attention a practice which he states exists in the War Department, of discharging disabled servicemen with foreign combat service, on the basis of alleged preexisting disabilities, and requiring them to prejudge and prejudice their case by signing releases of all disabilities before receiving consideration for present disabilities.

I will appreciate it if you will advise me if such a policy does exist, and the reason therefor.

Yours truly,

HOMER D. ANGELL,
Member of Congress.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., May 26, 1943.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ANGELL: This acknowledges receipt of your letter of May 21, 1943, addressed to the Secretary of War, concerning disability discharges from the Army, which question was brought to your attention by Mr. Herman E. Lafky, commander, Department of Oregon, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Army regulations provide that a certificate of disability for discharge will state whether such disability was incurred in line of duty or not in line of duty, together with the facts upon which a decision is based; whether the enlisted man declined treatment for the relief of the disability when the same was directed; whether disability was due to his own misconduct or whether a preexisting disability, injury, or disease was or was not aggravated in line of duty by active military service, together with the nature of duty causing aggravation.

All individuals subject to disability discharge are examined by a board of officers who give consideration to the interests of the Government and of the enlisted man equally and impartially. Questions of doubt which cannot be decided factually are resolved in favor of the enlisted man. Whether the disability becomes apparent inside or outside the continental United States has no bearing on the decision as to the preexistence of the disability.

Pensions are paid by the United States where it is determined that disability resulted from personal injury or disease contracted in line of duty or for aggravation of a preexisting injury or disease contracted or suffered in line of duty when such disability was incurred in or aggravated by active military service, unless the result of the individual's own misconduct.

On March 17, 1943, Public Law 10 (78th Cong.) was enacted, amending Veterans Regulations No. 10, granting hospitalization, domiciliary care, and burial benefits to individuals honorably discharged for non-service-connected disability.

I trust the above information is sufficient to clarify this subject for your constituent.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MARTYN,
Administrative Assistant.

Mr. Speaker, I am not fully convinced that the practice as outlined by the Secretary of War is such as to preserve the rights of servicemen who are not only endangering their lives and subjecting themselves to critical disabilities but in many cases are making the supreme sacrifice in defense of our country. I agree with the editorial above quoted that when our Government accepts these men for service they subject them to critical and exhaustive examinations to determine their physical and mental condition, and such examinations should be binding upon the Government. Certainly in the stress and strain of this all-out war these men when becoming disabled in line of duty should not be required to prejudge and prejudice their cases by admissions or affidavits or examinations made by Government officers under war conditions where it is difficult to ascertain the truth as to whether existing disabilities arising during service were due in any part to preexisting conditions. Many of these men who are subjected to the great strain of mental and physical endurance in the icy barren waste lands of Attu or the swamps of Guadalcanal are unable to withstand the enormous demands upon them and as a result become hospital cases. Is it fair to these disabled servicemen for our Government under these conditions to require them to certify to a record which may be entirely false and which ultimately will deprive them of just benefits to which they are entitled from our Government?

Mr. Speaker, when the war ends, and God grant it may be soon, upward of 10,000,000 of the young manhood of our Nation will be returning to their homes. The first question that will present itself to them is, What will be their opportunity in their homeland to which they offered their lives to defend? Will they find remunerative employments open to them where they may again enter into the responsibilities of citizenship in a free world? These post-war problems require the consideration of every one of us, particularly Members of the Congress, who are charged with the responsibility of enacting the necessary legislation to make possible the reabsorption of these servicemen from a war economy into civilian pursuits in a world at peace. We must not only be certain that the men who return disabled and broken in body and spirit will be cared for with every consideration possible, but we also must make certain that the able-bodied will not be turned loose in a world which offers them no hope for continued self-respecting employment. It may well be that for a year or a year and a half after peace comes that our Government will find it necessary to continue the servicemen on the Government pay roll pending the time that avenues of employment open to them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a letter written by Mr. Raymond B. Howard, of the National Editorial Association, to Elmer Davis, of the Office of War Information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a magazine article on the subject of inflation, written by my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a table on seigniorage as it appears on page 78 of the Bulletin of the United States Treasury. I should like to have it printed in the form in which it appears in the Treasury Bulletin, if that is possible under the rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, today Columbia University is honoring herself, this House, the Volunteer and Lone Star States, and the distinguished chairman of our Committee on the Judiciary by conferring on the gentleman from Texas, HATTON WILLIAM SUMNERS, the honorary degree of doctor of laws. He is certainly one of the most beloved and esteemed Members that has ever graced this floor. He is friend of all—the foe, the friendless. We, his friends, rejoice that new honor has come to him. He deserves such high recognition. May Columbia University and the other great universities of the land continue to live upon the plane which this action evidences. Here honorary degrees are conferred based on a predicate of scholarship whether proven in academic institutions or in the school of life—with or without supporting diplomas, save the degree of real achievement. To the gentleman from Texas, HATTON W. SUMNERS, no honor could come which would be more deserved or more welcome. His colleagues in Congress are more than delighted by this recognition of his signal service to the cause of letters and law.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to address the House today for 25 minutes. I ask unanimous consent to transfer this time to tomorrow, to follow any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address I delivered over the radio on May 30, and also to extend my own remarks and include therein an article relating to veterans' legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I have written.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of a new Federal elections law which I am introducing today, and also a statement by the Honorable Arthur J. Freund, chairman of the criminal law council of the American Bar Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects—in one, to include an article by George Dixon; in the other an editorial from the New York Journal-American.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the conclusion of business and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ROLL-BACK PRICES

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Nebraska addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter written this day to Mr. James F. Byrnes, and Mr. Prentiss Brown, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LAUNCHING OF THE STEAMSHIP "WILLIAM TYLER PAGE"

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceeed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to report to the Membership of the House that it was my privilege to be a member of the official party at the launching of the liberty ship which was named in honor of our late friend, the Honorable William Tyler Page. The launching took place at noon, May 31, at the Bethlehem Fairfield Shipyards near Baltimore, Md. It was one of the most impressive sights that I have ever witnessed, and I have returned inspired by the first-hand knowledge of the tremendously important and effective part that private enterprise and labor are playing in the winning of this global war. It was my privilege to talk to Vice President Willis of the great Bethlehem organization whose genius and initiative are making it possible for us to build 10,000-ton ships in less than a month's time. The *William Tyler Page* is the one hundred and forty-fourth Liberty ship completed in these yards. I also talked to many of the workmen who

indicated to me and other members of our party their determination that ships will be delivered to our Government on time.

It was a great inspiration, Mr. Speaker, to see great shipbuilding officials such as Mr. Willis and others working in close harmony with thousands and thousands of skilled workmen who are building ships with incredible speed.

The inspiration to name this ship for the late William Tyler Page came from our former House employee, John O. Snyder, who was a friend of William Tyler Page for 42 years. The resolution suggested by Mr. Snyder was introduced by our colleague the gentleman from New York, the Honorable JOSEPH L. PFEIFER. With the assistance of the gentleman from Virginia, Hon. OTIS BLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine, and with the assistance of the Maritime Commission, the name for this ship was sent to the Bethlehem-Fairfield organization at Baltimore.

Miss Joanne Cronin, granddaughter of William Tyler Page, sponsored the ship. She is the daughter of Capt. and Mrs. Joseph C. Cronin, of Memphis, Tenn., where Captain Cronin is the commandant of the naval air station. Among those who were in the official party were relatives and very close friends of the late William Tyler Page. They included the Honorable Chauncey Reed, of Illinois; John C. Page, John Andrews, James P. Griffin, employees of the House of Representatives; Will P. Kennedy, of the Washington Evening Star; Mr. and Mrs. Harry Pierce and daughter Patricia, of Collingswood, N. J. Mrs. Pierce is a daughter of William Tyler Page. John Page is the son of William Tyler Page. Also in the party were Mrs. Bertha Taylor Voorhorst, of the American's Creed Association, and Miss Antoinette Hart, secretary to Congressman PFEIFER. We are deeply indebted to Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Willis for their unusual hospitality and assistance in giving the official party full information regarding the building of the *William Tyler Page*. Mr. Willis is the vice president and general manager of the Bethlehem-Fairfield shipyards where these great Liberty ships are being constructed.

The official party was escorted to the shipyards by officials and employees of the company and there found a gallant ship of over 10,000 tons ready to be launched. We were thrilled, Mr. Speaker, as we faced that ship with the full name *William Tyler Page* painted on its prow. As the noon-day whistle blew, thousands of workmen joined us in singing the Star-Spangled Banner and in reciting the American's Creed, and as the beautiful little granddaughter of the great patriot for whom the ship was named, burst the bottle of champagne against the prow of the ship, it slid down the ways majestically amidst the cheers of thousands of American men and women, amidst the screaming of whistles and the waving of innumerable flags.

The launching of the *William Tyler Page* was one of the most inspiring sights I have ever witnessed, and as I stood there watching this beautiful ship touch the water for the first time, I felt that on board would remain the spirit of William Tyler Page, the author of the American's Creed, a gentleman who was born in the shadows of the home of Barbara Fritchie "in the land made rich with corn" and in whose veins ran the blood of the cavaliers of Virginia, a man who has been the adviser of hundreds of Representatives of the people and a man who served the greatest deliberative body in the world—the House of Representatives—for 60 years.

Mr. Speaker, we had the privilege of talking with the gentleman who will be captain of the *William Tyler Page*, with the chief engineer, and with some of the members who will compose the crew which, in a few days, will sail the sea on the new Liberty ship *William Tyler Page*. From the lips of the builders, from the lips of the crew, and from the lips of many workmen, we learned that in these great shipyards the service of William Tyler Page was well known and that his spirit not only will remain alive as long as the *William Tyler Page* sails the seas for victory, but forever will be part of the spirit behind the men who build ships that go down to the sea and the essence of the spirit of the real heart of America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article entitled "New Approach to Lasting Peace," written by Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson, appearing in the current number of Collier's Weekly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION—KEY TO VICTORY

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, my attention has frequently been called to a potential weakness in our transportation system. It is well known that the link of transportation from farm and factory to firing line is essential to the winning of the war. That transportation system consists of railroads, ships, airplanes, and trucks and trailers on the highways. It is this latter that has the earmarks of potential weakness.

Close to 5,000,000 trucks and trailers normally operate over the highways in the United States. Our usual, pre-war, annual additions of new truck and trailer equipment have been roughly 10 percent on the average—more in the case of common carriers and less for those privately operated.

With the enlarged use of all forms of transportation, due to the war effort, the trucks and trailers have and are being operated longer hours and with greater loads. Quite naturally these trucks and trailers are wearing out far faster than ever before.

What is being done to replace this equipment as it wears out? Virtually nothing. And therein you have the makings of a break-down in highway transportation—a break-down that in turn will affect adversely all other forms of transportation as well as the war effort and the civilian population.

Over a year ago the War Production Board practically halted the manufacture of trucks and trailers. Some few units have been permitted but all told it would not account for but a small percent of normal needs. There were a number of trucks and trailers on hand at the time manufacture was stopped. But taking all these in the so-called pool plus those manufactured we have put into service in the last 16 months less than one-half a normal year's addition to our highway transport system. By July 1 there will be no more light trucks left in the pool, and by August 1 there will be none of any type left.

No contribution to the war and civilian effort can be more important than a healthy transportation system. And we face a break-down in an important link unless action is taken promptly.

It is quite likely that the manufacturers of trucks and trailers are so busy with other war orders that they, like the manufacturers of agricultural implements, do not care whether they manufacture their regular line or not.

Potential post-war backlog of sales is not half as important as a continuous, smooth, functioning highway transportation system throughout the war. The so-called backlog of sales that is growing for post-war rehabilitation is but an indication of how far highway transportation has already broken down. From the April 2 issue of the Wall Street Journal I quote the following:

> During the past 15 months a total of 630,000 potential civilian truck sales have accumulated for peacetime business, according to F. F. Staniford, sales manager of Mack Trucks, Inc. Basing his figures on an average of 44,500 truck sales per month during the years 1937 to 1941, inclusive, Mr. Staniford subtracted the civilian truck sales made during 1942 to arrive at his total. Roughly, 6 out of every 100 normal truck requests have been met in the past year, and this ratio is expected to hold for the duration of the war.
>
> This means, according to the Mack sales manager's figures, that at the end of 1943 a backlog of well over a million potential truck sales will have accumulated. Every additional month of war adds 42,000 to this figure.

If the above figures are correct then our efficient highway transportation system of trucks and trailers, that existed prior to the war, is disintegrating or going out of business at the rate of about 1 percent a month. Think of it—our vital highway transportation system going out of business at the rate of 1 percent a month. Yet despite this curtailment in operating units, the trucks and trailers are expected to carry more and

more goods. There are more products of the factory, mine, forest, and farm to be transported. A diminishing transportation system cannot transport an increased quantity over the highways. Either the products will not be hauled or other transport mediums, already overburdened, will suffer.

New trucks and trailers do not come from a spigot. You cannot draw off at will the quantity you desire. America found this out with reference to agricultural implements. It takes time to convert plants back to the manufacture of trucks and trailers—time to get the maerial allocated and time to physically manufacture them. Even if it were decided this very day to provide for an enlarged program of truck and trailer manufacture, it would perhaps be late this fall before any came off the assembly line.

One can easily understand the action of the War Production Board on the outbreak of the war in cutting out the manufacture of trucks and trailers. At that time the rubber situation looked pretty bleak. But so far as essential transport is concerned, the rubber problem has been solved. Rubber can no longer be a reason for allowing our highway transportation system to go to pieces.

The thing that is difficult to understand is why the War Production Board and the Office of Defense Transportation now sit idly by and permit our highway transport system to disintegrate. These bodies are equally responsible for the forthcoming break-down in highway transportation—a break-down that is certain to come if action is delayed longer. Do we have material for Shipshaw and similar projects outside the country when our domestic highway transportation system is going to ruin? If we do it is time the American people were given all the facts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include three articles appearing in the Cleveland Press on the dates May 19, 20, and 21.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] be permitted to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Englewood Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has asked me to announce that he was delayed in reaching the House today because of bad weather, which grounded the plane in which he was traveling. Had he been present he would have voted for the tax conference report.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a recent article appearing in the New York Journal of Commerce by Mr. Basil Harris, a former official of the Treasury Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BURDICK was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

OUTLAWING STRIKES

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House preserves its good judgment on labor legislation. Any bill making strikes unlawful, instead of strengthening our war effort, will throw this country into such a turmoil that we shall have little time to give to the war effort.

If we have no precedents in this country, surely we will not shut our eyes to history—especially recent history. England has been wise enough to make no law outlawing strikes. She has had more damaging strikes than we have, but still she refused to pass an anti-strike law. Why? First, England is convinced that saying a thing is wrong by law doesn't carry any power unless such a law is supported by public opinion. We have tried that with prohibition. We declared by law that it was unlawful to sell intoxicating liquors. Instead of stopping drinking it only made the matter worse. When such a law was passed many people who never drank before started in for the first time. The law was not respected. Finally, convictions could not be obtained, and the experiment had the tendency to weaken respect for all laws.

Then, too, England had spread before her view the events in France when the French Government repealed all labor laws. The resentment in France was so intense that she fell an easy victim to a military machine that could not have prevailed if the French people had been united in spirit and in purpose.

In the United States events have proven that those who belong to organized labor unions are just the same kind of people as the rest of us are. They have their sons in the armed forces; their boys are being shot up on many battlefields. Is there anyone in this House who contends that these people are not as patriotic as the best of any other class of citizen?

We have had no perceptible stoppage of production on account of labor troubles. Ninety-eight percent of those employed in our war effort have done nothing but work in our common defense. This, in spite of the fact that every year accidents claim thousands of lives and result in 2,000,000 injuries. And in spite of the fact that no matter what their wages have been, the cost of food, clothing, and housing has gone up faster than the rise in wages. Untold thousands of families engaged in war production have barely been able to keep driving ahead. Their struggles have not been told by this Congress nor have we investigated the conditions in which they live. No, thousands have made no complaint, but have done their best.

Shall we now, because there has been trouble in some quarters, say that the whole of organized labor shall be condemned? We already have laws on the statute books to meet extreme emergencies. The power to execute the laws has been lodged with the President. He has exercised the power wisely and is not seeking any more laws on the subject. Recent events show that the President has been patient but firm.

Organized labor has had a struggle—covering long weary years—to arrive at a measure of protection. The Congress, since 1934, has not failed to give to labor the protection it deserved. Now, at one fell swoop, shall we repeal all we have done and force labor back to the dark days of industrial slavery in the name of the war effort? We are playing with dynamite when we attempt such a move. Suppose we pass this law and 10,000 men strike because the wages they receive will not supply themselves, their wives, and children with sufficient food, clothing, and shelter? All will be criminals. All will be tried, and under the Constitution, each one has the right to be confronted with the witness against him. We shall have 10,000 trials. If found guilty, 10,000 will be sent to jail and the breadwinners who dig in the darkness of the underground will be taken away from families which will overnight become destitute. Ten thousand strikers is a small body. Suppose we have a strike of 50,000. We shall have 50,000 trials and, if convicted, 50,000 of the same breadwinners will be sent to jail. Suppose we have a strike involving 200,000 workers. Do we want 200,000 trials and do we want to lock up 200,000 workers and leave their families objects of charity?

To simply state this situation is to prove how utterly inane such a move would be.

What else will this bill do? It slaps 14,000,000 loyal citizens in the face. It says to them, "Watch your step or to jail you go." Ninety-eight percent of these people have done nothing but work just like the rest of us in our common effort to give our boys all the protection

possible. Can anyone on this floor say a miner is not willing to protect his son? The passage of this bill, instead of harmonizing and increasing our common purpose to drive out the enemy, will cause disunion and destruction and will build in this country such a dissatisfaction with our Government that there will be no united and determined purpose which we must have to win this war. We may have the best guns and the best war equipment in the world, but that is not enough in this struggle. We must have the heart to fight, the purpose to defend a great country that guarantees to all the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Love of our country is the strongest bulwark of its defense.

Many people in this country have always been against organized labor and war offers them the opportunity they have waited for—to crush labor and set it back half a century. Those who would do this do not think—those who want to do this have not stopped to consider that if labor can be crushed, it is only one more easy step to crush all individual effort in this great land. Capital and labor must work together if we are to maintain our system of government, and those of us who still believe in individual effort have done our best to maintain friendly relations between capital and labor. With the passage of this bill, I predict the nationalization of all enterprises in the United States. Those who desire to perpetuate individual effort are doing the most to destroy it. Those who take advantage of every opportunity to pounce upon labor are doing more to sovietize this Nation than all the Communist speakers in the world.

My admonition to this House is to keep its head. Say to the world that in the United States a democracy can remain united, a democracy can protect both capital and labor, and that a democracy united and aroused cannot be defeated by any power or combination of powers on earth.

Strikes are caused by several influences, among the more important of which are:

The increased cost of living that has mounted faster than the increase in wages.

Increased profits of employers which are out of proportion to the total wage cost brought about by wartime production.

We are engaged in a great experiment in the United States today. Many people in the world today do not believe that a democracy like ours which supports private capital can function at full capacity in time of stress. This is no time to change systems. We have the capitalistic system now and we have a war now and our duty to our country is to make the present system work. So far as legislation can go to bring about a mutual and cooperative relation between capital and labor, that legislation should be forthcoming. But when labor has only one right—the right to strike in order to bring about justice to labor, we should decline to take away that right.

I am firm in the belief that if wages were based on the amount of production that labor was capable of turning out, there would be very little trouble between capital and labor. The more production, the more profits to the employer, and if we add another factor—more wages in that event—we shall have solved much of the difficulty.

If the laborer knew that all of the profits were going to his Government, there would be no incentive to strike, but since we have the individual profit system in this country and must make it work now, we could contribute to a better understanding between capital and labor if both were to receive equal benefits from the highest production possible. I believe contracts with labor should be drawn on that principle.

We should be in closer touch with the food, housing, and clothing problems of labor. Men who work with their hands need substantial food—need meat and lots of it. We should see that no O. P. A. order and coupon points prescribed by that agency should interfere with the flow of meat products to the men who labor. We should remember that from January 1941 to March 1943 food prices increased 40.5 percent and during the same period the cost of clothing increased 26.7 percent. We should know more about the housing conditions of labor, and when it is obvious that the wage received cannot possibly cover the necessary expense of labor, we should not hesitate to satisfy the demands of labor on that score.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to confirm what the gentleman has said about the miners not having sufficient meat. That is the report I get from the mining camps in my State. I noticed a headline today which reads: 530,000 miners on strike. Does the gentleman know whether the bill we will have before us in a few days applies only to those who have contracts?

Mr. BURDICK. I could not answer the gentleman because I have not seen the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. If that is the case, the passage of such a law would not apply to the soft-coal miners at all.

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman is right.

Mr. Speaker, when we have determined the cause of strikes, we will be able to settle the warfare between capital and labor. No one can make me believe, from all the evidence available now, that the United Mine Workers desire to interrupt our war effort. There is some cause back of these strikes that has not been presented to us. No one can make me believe that John L. Lewis wants to stifle our war effort and that he is not a patriotic citizen. He, like other leaders, cannot always control his membership—but at the same time he is fully aware of the cause lying back of strikes, and will not desert his members—if convinced they are right in their demands. Congress is not informed on these matters—at least there is insufficient information to warrant this Congress going in roughshod and making it a criminal offense for any laborer to strike.

If this Congress can keep its head as well as the President has in this labor trouble, our production will go forward and we can convince the world that capital and labor can work together—that the result of our common efforts will demonstrate the solidarity of the people of the United States.

Our war production thus far has not only astonished the world but ourselves as well. Manufacturers, laborers, and those directing our war effort are to be enthusiastically thanked by the American people. We are doing the job—our planes and ships are coming off the production line in never-ending streams. Our men are being trained to man these engines of war in a remarkably short period of time—yet they have demonstrated on the battle front that they have the highest ability and the best machines in the world today.

There is also in the United States today a unanimity in the war effort that has taken the heart out of our enemies. We have made mistakes and will make some more, but on the whole our war effort has already made itself felt in every corner of the earth. Less incrimination, less inclination to class every one who disagrees with us, as foreign snipers and traitors, less inclination to find fault with those directing our war effort, will do more to bring forth the utmost war effort than anything else this Congress can do. Politics should be entirely out of our discussions. It is not important that we win the next election but it is important that we win the war.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House should congratulate Mr. Prentiss Brown for accepting the resignation of Dr. James K. Galbraith, Chief Price Specialist, and his deputy, which was submitted to him and accepted yesterday. Dr. Galbraith has been one of the stumbling blocks to the successful administration of the price-control law. I do not know if Dr. Galbraith is more than a puppet in his position in the O. P. A., but I am inclined to believe that he has been used as a tool by someone higher up. I have been trying to figure out who the superman could be in the administration, to give all of the directions in this new scheme of remaking our American economy and our way of life. I know the President is busy in the war effort. I know he has certain associates like Harry Hopkins, who resides in the White House, but the thought occurs to me that it might be a man by the name of Benjamin Cohen, formerly of the team of Corcoran and Cohen, that dictated most of the policies during the early days of the New Deal. I think we ought to investigate Benjamin Cohen and see what he is doing to change our system of free

enterprise and way of life. For the time being I am grateful that Dr. Galbraith is no longer in the Government service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday May 17 last, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] made a speech on the floor of the House in which he attacked my remarks in which he attacked my remarks in support of H. R. 2698 to repeal the Renegotiation Act.

The gentleman began by ascribing to me a lack of perspective when he said:

First the gentleman from Michigan evidently overlooked the fact that any company doing less than $100,000 worth of business each year is exempt from renegotiation, and the suggestion has been made to Congress that this be increased to $500,000.

And then the gentleman from Texas claimed that this exemption removes almost all small business from the scope of the law. Now if the gentleman will consult my remarks, he will find on page 4322 of the RECORD that I did not overlook this provision, but did refer to it and said—

But this affects—exempts—only a little outer fringe.

Then in the next breath the gentleman confirms the truth and soundness of my statement aforesaid when he goes on to say:

Moreover if he had looked closely—

I wonder if the gentleman thought he saw a mote in my eye—

at the figures on the companies which have been cleared by the Price Adjustment Boards, he would have seen that many small businesses have not been required by the Boards to renegotiate their contracts because their profits were not excessive. The Navy Department for example has cleared without renegotiation 240 companies holding a total of $500,000,000 of contracts, that is, small companies.

May I assure him that it is not the gentleman from Michigan who failed to look closely, but instead the gentleman from Texas. If he will refer to my speech, page 4319 of the RECORD, he will find that I devote considerable attention to this exemption of a half a billion from renegotiation. And if the gentleman had looked closely and had done a little thinking, he would have noticed that $500,000,000 for 240 companies averages more than two million each. And the gentleman says, "That is, small companies." So according to the gentleman's own argument, exemption of five hundred thousand will not exempt any contractor, and my claim that it would affect only the outer fringe was conservative and sound, and it still stands. And I repeat, if it is a question of perspective, it shows that it is the perspective of the gentleman from Texas that is faulty, not mine. I prefer to think that the gentleman, who is an experienced, able and very active Member of this House, has so many matters on his mind, that like some others, he has not given this matter of renegotiation of contracts sufficient thought. But at all events, in his thoughtlessness in this phase of the argument, he has fallen on his own sword.

This should also dispose of his next argument that repeal is the masquerade of big business behind the name of small business. Such an attempt to confuse the issue and avoid the merits of the discussion by injecting a prejudice against big business, is an admission of lack of valid and meritorious arguments against the repeal. No one, and I least of all, wants to see any business, big or little, make excessive profits out of the war. I made this statement clearly in my remarks and insisted that there must be machinery to prevent undue Government loss. I expressly affirmed that the renegotiation law, at its inception and in the absence of maladministration, fulfilled a drastic need; but with the enactment of the 90-percent-excess-profits-tax law, it has become unnecessary. But I make bold to say that even if there were a few scoundrels who would make inordinate profits out of war and misery, they should be reached by other measures than one which hamstrings our war production and war effort, casts an intolerable and un-American burden on all industry, and threatens to destroy our economy, and with it jobs for our 10,000,000 soldiers and the other millions of war workers when we turn from war to peace. The burdens of this Renegotiation Act far, far outweigh the benefits.

The gentleman denies my statement that administration of the renegotiation law would require a great bureaucracy, and states that at the present it is composed of a little less than one thousand persons in the Army and Navy boards alone. However, according to the Truman committee, as of March 20 last, only one-half of 1 percent of the war contracts had been renegotiated. Estimates have been made that at that rate it will take 330 years with the present staff, to renegotiate the contracts as of that time, not to mention contracts subsequent to that date. I think we can agree that renegotiation of contracts should be completed in 5 years, and would therefore take 66 times the present staff, running into a personnel of over 60,000 in the various boards. We might, therefore, paraphrase the words of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], "Hush, hush, price adjustment boards, hush your lonesome cry. Your number will be legion bye and bye."

To my claim that renegotiation is a serious and vital interference with war production and takes up too much of the time of the contractor's organization, the gentleman responds with only one case which he says took 50 days and during this time "some of the company's officials had to spend about 3 days on the matter." He does not say what officials spent about 3 days, nor does he state how much time other officials of that corporation had to lose from war production on renegotiation. I have received or read hundreds of letters and excerpts from letters stating that it is not only a tremendous interference with the war production of the contractors, but many of them emphasize not only the actual loss of production of weapons, but probable consequential losses. For instance, one writes that renegotiation prevented the production of 100 gun mounts for ships, and while it is speculative, asks how many ships and cargoes were lost for want of the guns which could not be placed on the ships without these gun mounts. Furthermore, it is well known that business counsel agencies advise war contractors as follows:

The contractor who knows his business, fares best before renegotiation boards. Production managers who can explain the history and operations of the company, make the best advocates. (See Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. A2288.)

These facts, together with the most favorable though lone example that the gentleman could find, shows that for almost one-sixth of the year, the heart and brains of war production industry is pulled off its job, not to mention the claimed upheaval in all operations in the industry.

Next the gentleman attacks my statement that the law is administered without a legislative standard or formula. He admits that the only standard in its application is what seems reasonable to a bureaucratic board, regardless of whether behind that board is the complex of Hitler, Hirohito, or Harry Hopkins. It has already been admitted that the four boards have widely varying standards. This is no reflection on the boards, for they get their orders from headquarters. He suggests that I could not suggest to Congress any better formula or standard which would work. Precisely, and as I said in my remarks, because it is government by bureaucracy and not by laws; because no standard or formula can be evolved it is unworkable, and because it is unworkable and destroys private enterprise, we should junk it instead of junking private enterprise.

Following this, the gentleman attacks my claim that the renegotiation law enables the departments to by-pass Congress and secure money in the nature of appropriations, over which Congress has no control. He states that if the Congress appropriated for four bombers, and the department has asked for enough money to get six, it is not circumventing the will of Congress to get two extra bombers in this manner. This answers itself. The gentleman is careful to use bombers for his example. He knows the American people feel such a need for bombers in this emergency that they would with difficulty hesitate to beg, borrow, or steal them. I share this emotion. But supposing it is tanks which may be outmoded by antitank guns, or any other weapons which the gentleman, in a subsequent part of his address admits are being supplanted by others. Anyway, I still claim it is for Congress to authorize the two additional bombers, and to say that the money for two additional bombers should be appropriated. Instead of that the gentleman from Texas says, "The Army, by increasing the purchasing power of its appropriation,

has reduced the need for further appropriations in the future." What is this other than an admission that the departments are by-passing Congress and will spend what they wish from a tremendous fund of their own. And I still maintain that Congress should retain this prerogative instead of delegating the power of appropriations for further needs to the departments by continuing the Renegotiation Act.

The gentleman's next attack is on my argument that renegotiation settlements are not voluntary on the part of the war contractor. His answer, it seems to me, is without merit. He attacks none of the reasons which I gave as eliminating the contractor's freedom to fight, through fear of retaliatory action by the departments. He is right when he states that an appeal lies to the Secretaries of the War and Navy Departments, which I have shown in the above-named reasons, is of no practical value. But the gentleman is wrong when he states, "There is no doubt about the legal ability of the contractor to appeal to the courts." The standard contract; yes, all contracts provide that on questions of fact the contractor may appeal to the Secretary of the Department, whose decision shall be final. Inasmuch as there are practically no questions of law, but all disagreements would present questions of fact, this precludes the contractor's appeal to the courts.

In the next observation, the gentleman for once agrees with me in part that contracting officers of the Departments should seek closer prices and that pricing should improve. However, it should be obvious that the very nature of the Price Renegotiation Act precludes this. The act inherently makes close pricing not only absolutely unnecessary, but positively discourages it. Loose pricing is the surest method of insuring the greater recoveries of the Price Adjustment Bureau and of warranting its perpetuation. In fact and effect the Price Renegotiation Act is a totalitarian measure enabling the Departments to order the production of matériel at whatever prices they wish to allow at a future date. Its principle is ruinous not only to the war effort but to our whole economic system, yes, even to our political concept of constitutional government. It is no wonder that under such a concept the gentleman thinks that, having bought 2,000,000 antiaircraft shells a month last year, it would be impossible for a procurement official to fix a fair price on 40,000,000 per month in this year. I do not think that this would offer any difficulty. It might have been difficult to arrive at a fair figure on 40,000,000 for the first order, but with previous experience I see no difficulty whatsoever. This same reasoning applies to allowances for contingencies such as labor stoppages, changes in specifications, and similar elements in contracts which the gentleman thinks cannot be reasonably arrived at in making a contract. However, I do not wonder that the reasonableness of totalitarianism cannot see this. It does not have to.

The gentleman's main and final argument is that I am all wrong not only in saying that the 90 percent excess-profits tax will accomplish all that is sought to be accomplished by the Renegotiation Act, but he boldly claims that we have no 90 percent excess-profits tax. It is his further claim that we have an 80-percent tax and not a 90-percent tax. But here again it seems to me that the gentleman, by seeking to distinguish between a percentage tax and a tax rate, is muddling the situation instead of clarifying it. While he pretends it, he is adding nothing new in calling attention to the 10 percent refund to corporations when peace is declared. I had, as I said, in fairness mentioned it, but with the observation that after hostilities cease we do not know when peace will be declared, nor is there certainty that corporations can use it at will. This refund is therefore of very doubtful value.

Let me make my position clear. It is my understanding that the tax rate on corporations consists of a 40 percent normal tax on their base or normal earnings, and a 90 percent excess-profits tax on their annual earnings in excess of their basic annual earnings. It is true the law also provides that the total tax on any company shall not exceed 80 percent of its taxable income.

It must be obvious that this 80-percent clause is a protection; that refuge can be sought in it only by corporations which had a low normal, average, or basic income. According to the Bureau of Internal Revenue it is true that this is the exception and not the rule, and on last year's corporation tax, only twenty and three-tenths millions of taxes were saved by those who sought refuge in the 80-percent clause, compared to over two billions of taxes collected from corporations. In other words a corporation earning $4,000,000 last year, whose base earnings were $2,000,000, would pay 40 percent on $2,000,000 and 90 percent on the two millions of excess profits regardless of whether it is for war contracts or civilian supplies; regardless of whether it is excessive profits or merely excess profits. This corporation would pay two million six hundred thousand in taxes.

Inasmuch as under the 80-percent provision it is protected from paying more than three million two hundred thousand on the four million, it finds no relief in the 80-percent clause, and it must pay the 90 percent excess-profits tax. However, if this same company had basic earnings of $1,000,000 a year, it would pay 40 percent on this million, and 90 percent on the excess of three millions, or a total tax of three million one hundred thousand, and still it would have no occasion to avail itself of the 80-percent clause. The fact, however, that it came dangerously near to the line, makes further illustration unnecessary. It is only corporations which had an exceedingly and unusually low base earning power in peacetime, and comparatively great profits when the excess-profits tax began to operate, which can avail themselves of this protective provision. And as I said before, it is the exception rather than the rule to so great an extent that apparently corporations could save only one-tenth of 1 percent of the corporation tax by its provisions.

It seems to me that these figures make it clear that the excess-profits tax will accomplish all that we seek to accomplish by the Renegotiation Act without the vices of the latter, and that, not to mention two and a half billions, there is no such savings under the Renegotiation Act as $250,000,000, or $500,000,000. The observation of the gentleman from Texas that perhaps I consider those as small sums is refreshing coming from the other side of the aisle.

The gentleman concludes his remarks by half a dozen instances in which he claims that contractors made many times more earnings in wartime than they did in peacetime. I, of course, cannot dispute these conclusions. However, these examples mean nothing for his argument. He does not speak in terms of dollars. A corporation which operated at a loss or at a very small profit, say a dime for a 5-year average, making 15 times as much, would only make $1.50, even though it was 15 times as much as in peacetime. Furthermore, it is apparent, inasmuch as the gentleman states that these figures are based upon taxes paid in 1942, that they must apply to the year 1941 before we had the 90-percent excess-profits tax. Lastly, none of these examples contain any evidence that the excess-profits tax would not have been an ample measure to recover for the Government all excess and excessive profits that can in justice be expected from the Renegotiation Act.

I believe I have now met, analyzed, and I hope answered every objection to repeal that has been advanced by the gentleman from Texas.

Before I close it is perhaps appropriate to make the observation that the gentleman did not answer, or even discuss, my ruling reason for repeal. That was that the bureaucrats, as they will almost generally do, instead of carrying out the will of Congress in a wholesome, beneficial, and remedial purpose for the benefit of the country, proceeded at once to usurp powers not in the act which wrecked its purpose and impaired the war effort and the general welfare of the Nation.

In my remarks I quoted from the act:

> The secretary of each department is authorized and directed—

What?—

> whenever in his opinion excessive profits have been realized, or are likely to be realized, from any contract with such department * * * to require renegotiation of the contract price.

Had the bureaucrats carried out the will of Congress and confined themselves to excessive profits and contractors realizing excessive profits, many of the present vices would have been eliminated, and in the main it would have proved a wholesome measure. Such excessive profit contracts could have been detected from general sources, but specifically from the income-tax returns. In this way even the evil of the absence of a yardstick for determining what are excessive profits would have fallen on a small fragment of our war production.

But instead of confining themselves to such they immediately proceed to renegotiate all contracts, and not for excessive profits alone, but excess profits as

well. Even the 240 companies which the gentleman from Texas said did not require renegotiation I claim were renegotiated. While the term may be of somewhat ambiguous connotation, to hold the contrary would be just as inconsistent as to say that a person had not been in a holdup, because, while the robber had put him in fear at the point of a pistol he had nothing on his person of which he could be robbed.

And when I speak of bureaucrats in this discussion, I do not mean the boards and investigators. I heave heard time and again that they are fine persons, and in the main I believe them to be. But these compliments are usually accompanied by the alleged statements of such officials, "We can only do what Washington orders us to do." Nor do I mean the Army and Navy. I have been told from various independent sources that the Army and Navy are not in favor of the Renegotiation Act. Whether this be true or not, from the multiplicity of these reports, I am inclined to believe it. But the question immediately presents itself; if this is true, and they are free to carry out their convictions, why don't they confine themselves to the plain intent of the law and decimate their burden? The answer is obvious. The real bureaucrats are those who constitute the invisible forces constantly at work to wreck the social, political and economic framework of our Nation, and establish a new order. Their destructive influence on our national policy, and especially our domestic economy, is giving cause for grave concern which is becoming more and more general. It is these bureaucrats, responsible for the rubber famine, the food production failure, the O. P. A. fiasco, who are also reaching for and retaining more power over our economy and our war production through the Renegotiation Act.

It is high time that the American people as a whole become realistic in this matter. The red herring which is drawn across the trail by the argument that the act prevents war millionaires is in the face of the 90 percent excess profits tax pure propaganda.

I repeat, we must have the courage to be realistic. It is true that in the early part of our defense and war production, lack of information on the tremendous reduction of costs through mass production resulted in some instances in enormous profits. But by this time this lack of knowledge has been overcome and these excessive profits have been recaptured.

We are now in grave danger through the renegotiation act and even the 90-percent excess-profits tax, of destroying the capital necessary for reconversion and tiding over when we change to peacetime production. The former allows corporations no margin, and the latter only a margin of doubtful value for this purpose.

It has long been accepted that it takes an average of $4,000 of capital to provide machinery and other essentials for each and every job. Lately, with the advance of technology, it is said this has been stepped up to $6,000 for each job. The bulk of the billions of this capital consists of savings, or stored labor from millions of small investors. Not only are they entitled to wages—dividends—on their stored labor, but also sufficient wages—profits—to replace their worn-out machinery and property. Millions of these small investors—many of them absolutely dependent on them for the necessaries of life—are deprived of these wages for their stored labor, and to many their capacity to produce—by their stored labor—is destroyed without social security, such as unemployment compensation to tide them over.

Even though our long-haired professors and star gazers may be indifferent to this fact, and show only contempt for industry, frugality, and thrift, we have the further consideration that unless this capital to provide jobs is conserved, unless this seed-money for jobs for reconversion is allowed to these corporations, there will not be the $6,000 nor any capital in thousands of industries to provide jobs for our 10,000,000 soldiers and millions of war workers when we convert to a peace economy.

And yet this is the very calamity we are running into with reckless abandon. Instead of excessive profits, thousands of corporations are unable to pay dividends because they are feverishly conserving profits to survive the conversion period and keep their workers on the pay roll in the meantime. I have heard of even large industries who, if the war should stop and their war orders be canceled, have not sufficient reserves to pay their employees for 1 week.

It is up to the American people to preserve this country from these crackpots and bureaucrats. It took the Truman committee, in January 1942, to blow the lid off the O. P. M., with its billions of waste without results in our war production. The administration, in sheer desperation, changed its attitude, came back to capital and labor—private enterprise, if you wish—and said, "Here, you take over the job," with the result that in a year we set a world record, notwithstanding the monkey wrenches thrown into the machinery by the long-haired professors and star-gazers.

We must do the same in the rest of our domestic problems. Not go back to the weaknesses and evils in the old system, but to its virility and driving power, minus those weaknesses which after all reside in the American people themselves. We have a terrific job on our hands, not only in winning this war but in overcoming the post-war problems in our economy as well. This is the problem of the American people. We do well to heed Jefferson's inhibition, "Were we to be directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread." We are on the threshold of the fulfillment of that prophecy now. Likewise if we continue to be directed from Washington in our economy by such bureaucrats and measures as direct the Renegotiation Act, we will soon want jobs. We owe to our fighting men on the far-flung battle lines and the seven seas the duty upon their return to provide them with jobs. Repeal of the act and abolishment of the bureaus created under it, will be a long step in that direction.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Philadelphia Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann entitled "Last Days of White Elephant."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VISITING PRESS CORRESPONDENTS FROM SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Capital of our Nation is honored today by being host to a group of representatives of the press who are on a good-will tour from our neighbors to the south—Cuba, Paraguay, and Chile. It has just been the privilege of some of us to enjoy a very delightful luncheon with these gentlemen. We found them to be as charming a group of gentlemen as it has been our pleasure to meet in a long while, and are delighted that they are here. As I said to them, we hope they will thoroughly enjoy their visit, remain long, and soon come again.

During that luncheon the suggestion was made, attributed to me but it did not originate with me, that it would be a good idea for all children in America to be required to study Spanish in grammar school and high school, and that the children of the South American countries be required to study English. While, as I say, the idea did not originate with me I consider it an excellent one and sincerely hope it may materialize.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. I know of no way in which peoples of different nations can come to know each other as well and be as close to each other, as comradely, as brotherly, as neighborly, as for the peoples of the different nations to speak well, even though not fluently, the language of their neighbor; so it affords me pleasure to indulge in that suggestion

and to express the hope that it may bear fruit in the years to come contributing toward a closer relationship between all 21 countries of this hemisphere, because it is in this hemisphere as we all know that the future not only of America but of the entire world lies. On the conduct of these 21 nations depends the future of the world.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the charming gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman from Alabama believe that one way to achieve solidarity in the Western Hemisphere is through the good offices of our own very fine press at home and the press of the countries represented today by these extremely cultivated, gracious, and able gentlemen?

Mr. JARMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is undoubtedly correct; there is no group of people in those countries or our own country who are in position to accomplish more toward that end than the representatives of the press.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say that the press of these countries is doing exceptionally fine work in bringing about understanding and appreciation of our common hopes and problems.

Mr. JARMAN. That is certainly true. All of us appreciate their fine contribution toward the war effort and American solidarity. When these able gentlemen return to their homelands their knowledge of America will enable them to accomplish even more along that line.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to my friend the distinguished gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. In furthering that great plan of solidifying our relations with the other American countries does not the gentleman believe it will be a good thing if we could have a convention, an agreement with them to standardize the moneys of the respective countries so that their gold peso and our gold dollar, their silver dollar and our silver dollar, would be standardized to a certain value which would make them pass current in both countries?

Mr. JARMAN. I regret to say I am not sufficiently familiar with money matters to know much about that but I unhesitatingly express the belief that the gentleman's thought is worthy of mature consideration. In other words, in the vernacular of the street, I am impressed with the probability that "he has something."

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations subcommittee on subversive activities of Federal employees and also to extend my own remarks in that connection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include the text of a resolution I have introduced and a number of letters I have received.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LUDLOW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Leave of absence was granted by unanimous consent, as follows:

To Mr. TALBOT, for 1 week, on account of important business.

To Mr. VAN ZANDT, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. ELLSWORTH (at the request of Mr. HOLMES of Washington), for June 1 and June 2, on account of official business.

To Mr. HENDRICKS, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARTLEY (at the request of Mr. EATON), for 2 days, on account of important business.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2346. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 2, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 2, 1943, for consideration of housing bills, in room 1304, New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 2, and Thursday, June 3, 1943, on bills dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act—H. R. 1882 and H. R. 2309.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Investigation of Restriction on Brand Names and Newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m. o'clock, Wednesday, June 2, 1943.

Business to be considered: Resuming public hearings pursuant to House Resolution 98 by Congressman HALLECK. Food and canners' industry will be heard.

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 3, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments. Room 246, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2617, a bill to provide for speedy and summary notice in proceedings to condemn property for war purposes, and to accelerate the distribution of deposits and awards to the persons entitled thereto in such cases, at 10:30 a. m. on Friday, June 4, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

1. Wednesday, June 2: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects for the New England region, including the Connecticut and Merrimac Rivers, and the Middle Atlantic region, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

2. Thursday, June 3: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the upper and lower Ohio River and tributaries, and on projects of the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and

Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

3. Friday, June 4: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects along the Missouri River and tributaries and the upper Mississippi River and the Great Lakes region.

4. Tuesday, June 8: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, including the Arkansas and White Rivers, and on rivers flowing into the Gulf west of the Mississippi River, and in the western Rocky Mountain region, including Texas and Colorado, and in the Pacific Northwest region, including the Willamette River and the Columbia River and tributaries.

5. Wednesday, June 9: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the Los Angeles area and in the State of California, including the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kern River Valleys, and on projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

6. Thursday, June 10: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

7. Friday, June 11: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2731, to facilitate the award and payment of just compensation for property requisitioned under the authority of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2620, a bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives of the United States, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 16, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

443. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Smaller War Plants Corporation for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $12,006,000 (H. Doc. No. 215); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

444. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on Federal contributions to States and local governmental units with respect to federally owned real estate (H. Doc. No. 216); to the Committee on the Public Lands and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

445. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the disposition of certain property under the jurisdiction of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

446. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

447. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to make it a criminal offense for certain escaped convicts to travel from one State to another; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

448. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the third report of the Attorney General covering the period from February 1, 1943, through May 26, 1943, pursuant to section 12 of Public Law 603, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 11, 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

449. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Third Quarterly Report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the Education and Training of Defense Workers, covering the period beginning January 1, 1943, and ending March 31, 1943; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 511. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 512. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 163. An act to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship construction reserve funds, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 513). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 2832. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to permit naturalization proceedings to be had at places other than in the office of the clerk or in open court in the case of sick or physically disabled individuals; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 2833. A bill to amend section 11 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. R. 2834. A bill to amend the laws of the District of Columbia relating to the recorder of deeds; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 2835. A bill to incorporate the General Conference of the Mountain Assembly of the Churches of God; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHELCHEL of Georgia:

H. R. 2836. A bill to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 2837. A bill to provide for central responsibility for the production and distribution of the Nation's food by establishing a War Food Administration in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2838. A bill to suspend during the national emergency the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended in cases of certain vessels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 2839 (by request). A bill to suspend during the present war the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, in cases of certain vessels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 2840. A bill to provide that service subsequent to July 29, 1921, in respect of the management, operation, and maintenance of the Cape Cod Canal shall be included in computing length of service for purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 2841. A bill to subject Indians of the State of California to the laws of that State; to the Commitee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Missouri:

H. R. 2842. A bill to enforce the rights of citizens of the United States in the nomination and election of Senators, Representatives, electors, the President, and Vice President of the United States, and in any election to amend the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2843. A bill to provide during the present war for certain additional compensation for star-route contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 2844. A bill regulating the control over voting securities of certain financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for feed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes; to the committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. Res. 246. Resolution providing funds for the investigation authorized by House Resolution 38; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to prepare for the proper hospitalization and treatment for veterans for World War No. 2; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States protesting the action of the War Production Board relative to the Pullman Standard Car Manufacturing Co. at Bessemer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the fundamentals of the Americans

all-immigrants all programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that the functions of the Federal Government relating to commercial fishing and fisheries be transferred from the United States Department of the Interior and placed under the United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 2845. A bill for the relief of John J. Beaton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 2846. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Ring; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2847. A bill for the relief of the estate of Romano Emiliani; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1047. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution adopted by the Community Service Council on the 19th of May 1943, at a meeting at Niagara Falls, N. Y., favoring enactment of House bill 1290, which would be beneficial to aliens over 50 years of age who are unable to meet the educational requirements for citizenship; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1048. Also, resolution adopted by the Buffalo New York Baptist Association, Inc., at the one hundred and thirty-third annual session, favoring the passage of legislation which would forbid the manufacture and sale of all alcoholic liquors except for medicinal and scientific purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1049. Also, petition sent in by residents of Buffalo, N. Y., urging the same treatment for the rationing of gasoline throughout the entire United States with no discrimination against the Eastern States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1050. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of the Springfield Union, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, recommending the passage of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States, for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1051. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 501 citizens of Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1052. By Mr. GAMBLE (by request): Petition signed by the Reverend C. A. Teates and other residents in White Plains, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1053. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of the Junior and Senior Chambers of Commerce of Morrilton, Ark., and of the Conway County Flood Control Association, urging consideration of flood-control legislation; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1054. Also, petition of the Arkansas Bankers Association, urging abolition of certain credit agencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1055. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Letter from Allen Murphy, of Eldorado, Ill., one of the leading businessmen of southern Illinois, protesting against the Office of Price Administration order fixing retail prices which gives advantage to chain stores, mail-order houses, and large retail stores over the small merchant; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1056. Also, communication from C. F. Naugle, general merchant, Harco, Ill., protesting against certain retail prices fixed by the Office of Price Administration for the small merchants; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1057. By Mr. JONKMAN: Petition of Rev. Ralph M. Compson and 100 other citizens of Rockford, Sparta, and Grand Rapids, Mich., recommending the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1058. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition submitted by Minnie M. Snidecor, of Ypsilanti, Mich., and signed by 30 other residents of the community, urging enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1059. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of Hannah R. Patterson and 19 other residents of Columbus, Ohio, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1060. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. J. L. Mims and 41 citizens of South Carolina, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1061. Also, petition of W. J. Woodring and 82 citizens of Port Matilda, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1062. Also, petition of 60 citizens of Hood River, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1063. Also, petition of the Riverside Baptist Church, of Miami, Fla., signed by 116 members, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1064. Also, petition of Mrs. R. K. Triplett and 48 citizens of Chattanooga, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1065. Also, petition of C. A. Patterson and 40 citizens of Berwick, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1066. Also, petition of L. A. Swan and the I. O. G. T. Grand Lodge of California, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1067. Also, petition of 43 members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Centenary Methodist Church of McComb, Miss., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1068. Also, petition of 19 citizens of South Carolina sent in by the Federated Forces for Temperance and Law Enforcement, of Orangeburg, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1069. Also, petition of Emily McCutchen and 40 citizens of Bakersfield, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1070. Also, petition of Leon Fields and 162 citizens of Montana, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1071. Also, petition of Emma King and 48 citizens of Caldwell, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1072. Also, petition of Etta Pomroy and 31 citizens of Rochester, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1073. Also, petition of Jeannette Wickersham and 51 citizens of Edison, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1074. Also, petition of 87 citizens of Bremerton, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1075. Also, petition of Mrs. L. B. Offutt and 88 citizens of Pennsylvania, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1076. Also, petition of Ella K. Whitmore and 51 citizens of Monrovia, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1077. Also, petition of Mrs. Allie Lung and seven members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Holtville, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1078. Also, petition of Mrs. C. W. Clift and 20 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Harlingen, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1079. Also, petition of Mrs. E. B. Pease and 66 citizens of Glasgow, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1080. Also, petition of M. W. Thompson and 62 citizens of Wellsboro, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1081. Also, petition of Pauline Grinnell and six citizens of Harlingen, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1082. Also, petition of Lillian Wenner and 20 citizens of Berwick, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1083. Also, petition of Mrs. Thomas Arnold and 42 citizens of New York City, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1084. Also, petition of Mrs. A. W. Barker and 40 citizens of Alhambra, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1085. Also, petition of G. M. Bruce and 11 citizens of St. Paul, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1086. Also, petition of F. E. Watson and 62 citizens of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1087. Also, petition of Sallie M. Heffner and 140 citizens of Palmyra, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1088. Also, petition of Rev. S. S. Mumey and 70 citizens of Lewisburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1089. Also, petition of Mrs. W. W. Jones and 61 citizens of Havre, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1090. Also, petition of Mabel Babb and eight citizens of Napa, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1091. Also, petition of Mrs. Frank L. Rohrer and 21 citizens of Hagerstown, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1092. Also, petition of Laura C. Miller and 90 citizens of Winfield, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1093. Also, petition of Martha Farley and 80 citizens of New Columbia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1094. Also, petition of Charlotte Smith and 40 citizens of Winfield, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1095. Also, petition of Caroline Flagg Young and 20 citizens of Rockford, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1096. Also, petition of Mrs. R. R. Grant and 21 citizens of River Forest, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1097. Also, petition of Eva L. Barnes and 32 citizens of Wheeler, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1098. Also, petition of Nellie Emerson and 24 citizens of Staples and Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1099. Also, petition of R. J. Van Beck and 125 citizens of Kalamazoo, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1100. Also, petition of Mildred N. Bowser and 217 citizens of Mechanicsburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1101. Also, petition of Mrs. J. G. Charles and 18 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the

manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1102. Also, petition of Roy R. Gowan and 21 citizens of Woodruff, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1103. Also, petition of Mrs. James Davies and 300 citizens of Madelia, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the maufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1104. Also, petition of Mrs. E. E. Norris and 20 citizens of Houston, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1105. Also, petition of Lillie C. Oberlin and 41 citizens of Santa Ana, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1106. Also petition of Amy E. Keiser and 69 citizens of Ono, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1107. Also, petition of Meda Harvey and 40 citizens of Pasadena, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1108. Also, petition of Mrs. E. K. Crowell and 14 citizens of St. Paul, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1109. Also, petition of Mrs. G. F. Halnerson and 122 citizens of Madison, Wis., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1110. Also, petition of Edith C. Cozad and 47 citizens of Hemet, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1111. Also, petition of Anna Pettit and 26 citizens of Ithaca, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1112. Also, petition of Emma Landstrom and 62 citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war: to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1113. Also, petition of Mary F. Byington and 40 citizens of Winter Haven, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the committee on the Judiciary.

1114. Also, petition of Esther Born and 50 citizens of Waseca, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the committee on the Judiciary.

1115. Also, petition of Edith Campbell and 77 citizens of State College, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1116. Also, petition of Jennie Ray Thompson and 22 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1117. Also, petition of Louise Alger and 62 citizens of Apalachin, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1118. Also, petition of Mrs. Wilma and 19 citizens of Waseca, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1119. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles H. White and 92 citizens of Williamsport, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1120. Also, petition of Harvey N. Hamble and 33 citizens of El Paso, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1121. Also, petition of Cora Lanning and 21 citizens of Rutland, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1122. Also, petition of Rev. Hiram O. Weaver and 15 citizens of Newmanstown, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1123. Also, petition of Claude A. Kinney and 40 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1124. Also, petition of Edna Thompson and 43 citizens of Dawson, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1125. Also, petition of Hall Adams and 38 members of the Northside Baptist Church of Rock Hill, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1126. Also, petition of Mrs. Frank Armstrong and 11 citizens of Champlin, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1127. Also, petition of Mrs. S. L. Hurley and 19 citizens of Silver Spring, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1128. Also, petition of Edith Forrest and 26 citizens of Moberly, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the

winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1129. Also, petition of Mrs. H. J. Riordan and 251 citizens of Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1130. Also, petition of Mrs. F. C. Helble and 111 citizens of Warren, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1131. Also, petition of Mary M. Wolfe and 37 citizens of Lewisburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1132. Also, petition of Vertie Vible and 21 citizens of Leesburg, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1133. Also, petition of Mabel Bennett and 38 citizens of Hillsdale, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1134. Also, petition of Mary Shawbaker and 46 citizens of Monrovia, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1135. Also, petition of G. F. Smith and 46 citizens of Woodsboro, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1136. Also, petition of 92 citizens of Montrose, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1137. Also, petition of Mrs. Ambrose C. Brown and 68 citizens of Tionesta, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1138. Also, petition of Rev. Edward A. Durham and eight citizens of Goffstown, N. H., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1139. Also, petition of Tennie Crain and 20 citizens of Gorham, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1140. Also, petition of Jennie Friend and 20 citizens of Meridian, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1141. Also, petition of Mrs. Oscar Hall and 19 citizens of Rockford, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1142. Also, petition of Stella M. Douglas and 20 citizens of Brunswick, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1143. Also, petition of Mrs. S. R. E. Addy and 40 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the counties of Aiken, Saluda, Edgefield, McCormick, and Lexington, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1144. Also, petition of Minnie V. Pursell and 31 citizens of Bremerton, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1145. Also, petition of E. F. Pursell and 44 citizens of Bremerton, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1146. Also, petition of Mrs. E. P. Roberts and 61 citizens of Albuquerque, N. Mex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1147. Also, petition of Mrs. A. D. Haight and 13 citizens of Robbinsdale, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1148. Also, petition of Clara Ross and 8 citizens of Columbiaville, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1149. Also, petition of Rev. Charles G. Cole and 61 members of the Methodist Church of Havre, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1150. Also, petition of Hollis C. Stevenson and 35 citizens of Plattsburg, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1151. Also, petition of Mrs. Festus Curry and 12 citizens of Gray Court, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1152. Also, petition of Catherine C. Robinson and 50 citizens of New York City, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacturing, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1153. Also, petition of Rev. Paul Williscraft and 19 citizens of Glasgow, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1154. Also, petition of the Baldwin Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of H. R. 2032, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1155. Also, petition of Harmon W. Jones and 22 citizens of Centralia, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for

the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1156. Also, petition of Mrs. James Peterson and the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Kansas City, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1157. Also, petition of Susan B. Simpson and 20 citizens of Torrance, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1158. Also, petition of Rev. S. H. Jones and 20 citizen of Seward, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1159. Also, petition of Ammy Pancvast and 55 citizens of Ashland, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1160. Also, petition of Mrs. T. D. Van Arnam and 20 citizens of Milaca, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1161. Also, petition of Mrs. T. W. Baker and 31 citizens of Lupelo, Miss., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1162. Also, petition of Mattie Miller and 57 citizens of Hartsville, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1163. Also, petition of Mrs. R. B. Gillaim and 12 members of the Ladies' Bible Class of the First Baptist Church of Union, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1164. Also, petition of Paul W. Moss and 22 citizens of Rockfield, Ky., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1165. Also, petition of the Men's Brotherhood Class of the Tionesta Methodist Church of Tionesta, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1166. Also, petition of Frank D. Thomson and 26 citizens of Claremont, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1167. Also, petition of Mrs. C. C. Chamness, Sr., and 10 citizens of Blenheim, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1168. Also, petition of the Youth Temperance Council of Bowman, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1169. Also, petition of Bessie A. Buckley and 83 citizens of Vandergrift, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1170. Also, petition of Mrs. E. W. Gibbs and 19 citizens of Hood River, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1171. Also, petition of M. L. Calvert and 20 citizens of Lenore, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1172. Also, petition of Mrs. R. C. Gore and 12 citizens of Paducah, Ky., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1173. Also, petition of Opal Hurt and 62 citizens of Lindsay, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1174. Also, petition of Mrs. F. R. Coburn and 21 citizens of Edmondston, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1175. Also, petition of Mrs. W. E. Leaver and 21 citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1176. Also, petition of Miss Birdie Richter and 55 citizens of Piedmont, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1177. Also, petition of R. D. Hoy and 36 citizens of El Centro, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1178. Also, petition of Mrs. F. E. Hubbard and 22 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1179. Also, petition of Mrs. E. B. Smith and 133 citizens of Fort Pierce, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1180. Also, petition of Blanche Lockwood and 16 citizens of Santa Monica, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1181. Also, petition of Mrs. E. C. Rowe and 40 citizens of North Platte, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1182. Also, petition of Rev. M. A. Simmons and 51 members of the Southside Church of the Nazarene of Miami, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for

the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1183. Also, petition of Mrs. Clinton Weber and 29 citizens of Hutchinson, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1184. Also, petition of Rebecca S. Cowgill and 50 citizens of Pasadena, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1185. Also, petition of Fannie E. Northfield and 15 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1186. Also, petition of Margaret Utt and 20 citizens of Tustin, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1187. Also, petition of T. E. Blair and C. R. Hollis and 51 citizens of Gattman, Miss., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1188. Also, petition of Rev. J. N. Tinsley and 60 citizens of Miami, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1189. Also, petition of Sarah Engle and 40 citizens of New Berlin, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1190. Also, petition of Harry F. Watson and 110 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1191. Also, petition of Marie Harris and 20 citizens of Mansfield, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1192. Also, petition of 55 citizens of Bow, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1193. Also, petition of Bertha M. Swank and 36 citizens of Melba, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1194. Also, petition of W. J. Hughes and 60 citizens of Alliance, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1195. Also, petition of Elizabeth R. Hackett and 112 citizens of Phoeniz, Ariz., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1196. Also, petition of Myrta S. Hopkins and 50 citizens of East Aurora, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1197. Also, petition of James M. Wise and 167 citizens of Rockford, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1198. Also, petition of Sadie C. Reynolds and 39 citizens of Hughson, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1199 Also, petition of Emma L. Stevenson and 111 citizens of Bremerton, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1200. Also, petition of Anna G. Pride and 69 citizens of Madison, Wis., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1201. Also, petition of Ruth Hawk and 51 citizens of New Plymouth, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1202. Also, petition of A. F. Miller and 21 citizens of Winona, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1203. Also, petition of 39 citizens of Middletown, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1204. Also, petition of Mrs. R. R. Haight and 471 citizens of Corunna, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1205. Also, petition of Mrs. L. S. Henderson and 20 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Clinton, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1206. Also, petition of 144 members of the First Baptist Church of Miami, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1207. Also, petition of 50 citizens of Victoria, Ark., sent to Congressman BROOKS HAYS, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials, necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1208. Also, petition of Mrs. Emmert and 72 citizens of Danville, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1209. Also, petition of the Richland Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Richland, Mo., signed by 75 citizens, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic

liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1210. Also, petition signed by 91 members of the Central Baptist Church, of Miami, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1211. Also, petition of Mrs. Frank Henschel and 17 citizens of Princeton, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1212. Also, petition of Anna Manly Wray and 34 citizens of Union Star, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1213. Also, petition of Ruth Stahr and 49 citizens of Ketchikan, Alaska, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1214. Also, petition of the Grace Methodist Church of Miami, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1215. Also, petition of Mrs. J. A. LeMay and 62 citizens of Prescott, Ariz., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1216. Also, petition of Rev. C. E. Wonderley and 188 citizens of Pen Argyl, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1217. Also, petition of Margaret P. McClure and 97 citizens of New Wilmington, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1218. Also, petition of Mrs. Homer R. Blanch and eight citizens of Annville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1219. By Mr. GREEN: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Reese and others of Tampa, Fla., favoring passage of the Bryson bill, House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1220. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, League for the Development of California's Mineral Springs, San Francisco, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Mineral Springs areas as desirable sites for military hospitals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1221. Also, petition of the Commission of the City of Ironwood, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the continuation of the National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, under the canopy of Thy grace and goodness we bow in adoration and thanksgiving, for hitherto Thou hast blessed us and we have found Thee faithful unto all Thy promises.

We pray that our President and Vice President and all Thy servants whom Thou hast called to positions of leadership in the life of our Republic may be graciously equipped for every task.

Grant that in these days, which are so significant in judgment and responsibility for all of us, we may find our refuge and strength in the reality of Thy wisdom and power.

May the blessings, which Thou dost bestow upon us, become contributions with which we shall seek to minister unto needy humanity and be dedicated to the dawning of that day when righteousness shall be triumphant and peace shall be enthroned in the hearts of men and of nations.

To Thy name, through Christ, our Lord, we ascribe the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, June 1, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A confidential letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, in relation to the personnel of the land forces in active training and service under the provisions of law on April 30, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF THE DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS

A letter from the Attorney General, reporting, pursuant to law, all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 867 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Immigration.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF DEFENSE WORKERS

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third quarterly report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the education and training of defense workers, covering the period January 1 to March 31, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF WAR LABOR BOARD ON WAGE STABILIZATION

A letter from the Chairman of the National War Labor Board, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 130 (submitted by Mr. BYRD and agreed to April 9, 1943), the second monthly report on wage stabilization covering the month of April 1943 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A resolution of the Huron County (Mich.) Farm Bureau, favoring a study of conditions surrounding the production of beans with a view to increasing the supporting price guaranteed thereon; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Dickinson County, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation authorizing Federal aid for snow removal programs of the various counties in Michigan in what is commonly known as the Snow Belt; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution of the Midwest Humane Conference favoring amendment of the 28-hour law regulating the interstate transportation of livestock so as to apply the law to truck as well as rail shipments; the enactment of legislation and adoption of regulations pertaining to the proper handling, loading, and unloading of livestock whether shipped by rail or truck, and also the adjustment of priority regulations so as to make available calf-feeding equipment such as pails and nipples, etc., for the feeding of baby calves; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the Michigan Home Economic Association assembled at Lansing, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide day care of children in wartime, school lunches, grade labeling of the 1943 pack of canned fruit and vegetables, and nutrition research, and also the enforcement of pure food and drug laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Resolutions by Local Unions No. 182, of Lansing; No. 564, of Vassar; and No. 644, of Muskegon, all of the United Automobile Workers—American Federation of Labor—in the State of Michigan, favoring the adoption of measures to compensate war workers who have 100-percent attendance records by paying a premium of 5 percent of their total month's earnings in defense bonds and stamps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Dickinson County, Mich., favoring payment by the Government of a service charge equivalent to the amount of tax that would be paid to the respective governmental units in whose jurisdiction a plant is located as if such plant and machinery were the property of a private enterprise and subject to taxation; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Dickinson County, Mich., favoring the enactment of pending legislation providing for the elimination of the poll tax in the election of Federal officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of sundry citizens of Belding, Mich., praying for the enactment of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war (providing for control and regulation of the liquor traffic); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions of sundry citizens of Belding, Mich., praying for the prompt enactment of legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in publications, or billboards and over the radio, and also to suspend the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and the demobilization period; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution of the Michigan Legislature; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Resolution 32

"Resolution memorializing Congress to use their good influences to the end that sufficient metals be allocated to build and equip enough factories to produce at least 1,000,000 annual tons of synthetic rubber

"Whereas with 92 percent of our normal supply of rubber in control of the Japs, the Baruch Rubber Study Committee recommended that America should manufacture 1,106,000 tons annually of synthetic rubber in order to supply our necessary military and civilian vehicles with tires during this motorized war; and

"Whereas Rubber Director William M. Jeffers, has made every effort to follow the instructions of the Baruch report and get synthetic tires into production, but factory capacity has been cut to 43 percent of what the Baruch investigation said was necessary to keep America's essential motor vehicles rolling; and

"Whereas the transportation of freight and employees to and from Michigan war factories would be tragically crippled if more tires are not made available; and

"Whereas the farms of America and the petroleum industry can produce abundant supplies of grain alcohol and petroleum products, and our chemical, rubber, and other industries are well able to transform these basic ingredients into synthetic rubber: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Michigan Sixty-second Legislature of 1943 hereby expresses its full approval of Mr. Jeffers' efforts to keep the American military machine and civilian economy on wheels; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Michigan Legislature memorializes the Members of the United States Congress to use their good influences to the end that sufficient metals be allocated to build and equip enough factories to produce at least 1,000,000 tons annually of synthetic rubber; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, majority and minority leaders of both the Senate and the House, all Michigan Congressmen and United States Senators, Rubber Director Jeffers, War Production Board Chairman Nelson, Economic Stabilization Director James C. Byrnes, Office of Defense Transportation Director Joseph Eastman, and Office of Price Administration Director Prentiss Brown.

"Adopted by the senate, March 25, 1943."

A resolution of the Michigan State Senate; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Resolution 40

"Resolution requesting Federal authorities to take immediate steps to make it possible for farmers to obtain necessary farm machinery for the production of crops

"Whereas many farmers in Michigan have applied to the various Federal authorities through State and county agencies for priorities on farm machinery, tools, etc., which are absolutely needed to assist in the fitting of the land, and the planting and production of farm crops; and

"Whereas it appears that all county rationing boards have allocated all the priorities that are allowable, and in some counties at least (and in Saginaw County as an example) three times as many applications have been filed as are allowable; and

"Whereas a great number of farmers are not able and under the present set-up at Washington will not be able to get the priorities on grain drills, tractors, etc., that are so much needed, and Michigan boards find their hands tied in making possible the assistance they realize should be offered: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved That the proper authorities at Washington be asked to remedy this situation at the earliest possible time; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Office of Price Administration, to the United States Department of Agriculture, and to the Michigan Members of Congress.

"Adopted by the Senate, April 30, 1943."

A resolution of the Michigan State Senate; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 34

"Concurrent resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact Senate bill 450 regarding compensation to civilians

"Whereas the United States is engaged in a total war and many civilians are patriotically contributing their services in such necessary activities as civilian defense work; and

"Whereas many of these civilians, including the civilian defense workers may be injured and become burdens on their families or society unless provision is made to protect them from financial loss caused by such injuries; and

"Whereas the members of the Senate of the State of Michigan believe that the Federal Government should make provision to protect these citizens rendering invaluable service to our country: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact Senate bill 450 introduced by Senator Pepper which provides for compensation to civilians, including civilian defense workers; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and the Representatives from Michigan.

"Adopted by the Senate, March 26."

A resolution of the Michigan State Senate; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Resolution 39

"Resolution requesting the United States Coast Guard to relax the ruling prohibiting fishing from boats in the St. Clair River, the Detroit River, and in the connecting channels through Lake St. Clair

"Whereas the United States Coast Guard has adopted and promulgated a ruling prohibiting fishing from boats in the St. Clair River, the Detroit River, and in the connecting channels through Lake St. Clair; and

"Whereas annually, between May 15 and July 1, there takes place a pickerel run in the St. Clair and Detroit Rivers affording recreation to thousands of defense workers and furnishing some 300,000 pounds of pickerel to noncommercial fishermen, thus affording a substantial source of food in cooperation with the rationing program; and

"Whereas the members of the senate are of the opinion that the permitting of noncommercial fishing from small boats could not in any way impede navigation or interfere with the war effort; and

"Whereas the members of the senate feel that recreational opportunities consistent with the war effort should be encouraged, in order that the people may attain a proper balance in living: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate, That the members of the senate request the United States Coast Guard to relax the ruling prohibiting fishing from boats in the St. Clair River, the Detroit River, and in the connecting channels through Lake St. Clair, so that fishing from small boats may be permitted under such restrictions and conditions as may be considered necessary to avoid conflict with commercial navigation in said waters; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the United States Coast Guard and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress.

"Adopted by the senate, April 30, 1943."

RESOLUTION OF INDIANA REPUBLICAN STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OPPOSING POST-WAR COMMITMENTS

Mr. WILLIS presented a resolution adopted by the Indiana Republican State Central Committee at its meeting held on Tuesday, May 4, 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is continuing discussion among the members of the Republican Party within the State of Indiana of the position that the party should take with respect to the Nation's post-war policies; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the Republican State Central Committee that it should at this time make some expression on this subject for the consideration of the members of the party in this State: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, That it is the opinion of the Republican State Central Committee of the State of Indiana that the United States Government should take its proper place with other nations in such international conferences as may follow this war and should recognize such relationships and obligations to its allies, and with its allies to the other nations of the world, as may be in keeping with the conditions and circumstances as then exist and as are compatible with the common interests of the American people; be it further

Resolved, That it is the opinion of the Republican State Central Committee that our country should win the war and then stand firm and enforce our announced policy of unconditional surrender; that the Axis Powers should then be disarmed and there should and must be no armistice; that when the war is won, our 11,000,000 fighting men and women will again become integral parts of our civil government, that they will return to us fortified by first-hand information of conditions in foreign countries and will therefore be thoroughly qualified to participate in the formulation of a post-war program to preserve the peace and well-being of the world, and that no such post-war program

should be determined without the benefit of the knowledge and judgment of our armed forces; and accordingly we believe that no political party can or should at this time feasibly engage in the making of detailed permanent commitments on post-war arrangements, but should confine itself to the general principles enunciated in the foregoing paragraph of this resolution.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. EASTLAND presented a resolution adopted by the National Congress of the Sons of the American Revolution of New York City on May 19, 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there are now pending before the Congress of the United States numerous bills having for their purpose the modification or repeal of existing laws dealing with the subjects of immigration and naturalization: Be it

Resolved by the Congress of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, That in the judgment of the society, any material modification or repeal of our basic laws dealing with the subjects of immigration and naturalization may result in great and irreparable injury to the United States and to the Nation's future destiny; and that, to say the least, any proposals for such modification or repeal may well await the final outcome of the fearful global struggle in which we are now engaged.

UNIFORM MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE LAWS—RESOLUTION OF CONVENTION OF EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the eighty-fourth convention of the executive council of the Episcopal Diocese of Kansas, expressing their approval of the uniform marriage and divorce joint resolution introduced by me, and now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Reverend McPhetres as chairman of the department of Christian social relations presented the following resolution as having been approved by the executive council:

"Whereas we recognize the family to be the foundation of present-day civilization; and

"Whereas the marriage and divorce laws of the States vary from complete laxness to rigid requirements, producing many serious complications; threatening the stability of, and creating a major problem in our social order; and

"Whereas the need for uniform marriage and divorce laws is evident to all Christian people: Be it

"*Resolved*, That this eighty-fourth convention go on record commending the Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER, United States Senator from Kansas, for his efforts to bring about uniform marriage and divorce laws through the 48 States and the District of Columbia, and pray that these efforts may be continued until achieved."

Upon motion duly seconded the resolution was passed and a copy ordered sent to Senator CAPPER.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 27. A bill to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war; with amendments (Rept. No. 271).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BREWSTER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Mr. MOORE introduced a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 64) to permit additional sales of wheat for feed, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SHIPSTEAD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2719, the Interior Department appropriation bill (in the item relating to special educational benefit extended to Indian children attending the public schools in Minnesota) which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 34, line 25, strike out "$5,864,665" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,886,855".

PROVISION FOR TRAINING NURSES FOR THE ARMED FORCES, HOSPITALS, ETC.—AMENDMENT

Mr. BARBOUR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2664) to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: At the proper place in the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. That notwithstanding the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or any other provision of law, any owner, lessee, tenant or operator of any farm land on which a substantial part of any crop was destroyed or damaged by flood or by insect infestation in 1943 so that abandonment or replanting of such crop is necessary, may market without penalty the actual production of cotton from any acreage planted on such farm land and the planting in 1943 of any acreage in excess of the farm cotton acreage allotment on such farm land shall not cause the producer to suffer any deduction or loss of eligibility for payment, commodity loans, or price support: *Provided*, That the acreage in excess of the farm acreage allotment in 1943 shall not constitute past acreage or past production of cotton in determining the farm, county, or State acreage allotment for any subsequent year."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2481, the agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committtee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON AT DEDICATION CEREMONIES OF FLETCHER GENERAL HOSPITAL, CAMBRIDGE, OHIO

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on the occasion of the dedication ceremonies of the Fletcher General Hospital, at Cambridge, Ohio, on May 31, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD AT "FOUR FREEDOMS" REDEDICATION SERVICES AND UNVEILING OF PLAQUE IN MEMORY OF CAPT. JACOB JOSEPH

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by him at the "four freedoms" rededication services and the unveiling of a plaque in memory of Captain Joseph, and the introductory remarks made by Mr. Morris W. Haft at the meeting held by the Jacob Joseph School and Mesfita, in New York City, on May 23, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

WAR MOBILIZATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "War Mobilization," delivered by Senator MURRAY on May 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOVIET RUSSIA AFTER 15 YEARS—ADDRESS BY COL. RAYMOND ROBINS

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Soviet Russia After 15 Years," delivered by Col. Raymond Robins on July 26, 1933, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S AID IN POLICING THE WORLD—STATEMENT BY CHIEF JUSTICE GEORGE W. MAXEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "United States Must Help to Police World, Maxey Declares," from the Philadelphia Record, which appears in the Appendix.]

FUTURE COURSE OF THE WAR—EDITORIAL FROM THE ALABAMA BAPTIST

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Bold Guess at a Huge Problem," written by L. L. Gwaltney, editor of the Alabama Baptist, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO COL. A. ROBERT GINSBURGH

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Louisville Courier-Journal paying tribute to Col. A. Robert Ginsburgh, which appears in the Appendix.]

EFFECT ON AMERICAN WORKERS OF IMPORTATIONS OF SWISS WATCH MOVEMENTS AND WATCHES—LETTER FROM AMERICAN WATCH ASSEMBLERS ASSOCIATION

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated May 24, 1943, from the American Watch Assemblers Association, addressed to him, and relating to the effect on American workers of importations of Swiss watch movements and watches under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which appears in the Appendix.]

DRIFT POLICY RISKS LOSS OF PEACE—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Drift Policy Risks Loss of Peace," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of June 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

BARGE RATES ON INLAND WATERWAYS—STATEMENT BY C. E. HOLLOMAN

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by C. E. Holloman, traffic manager, Houston Chamber of Commerce, on the subject of barge rates on inland waterways, which appears in the Appendix.]

QUESTION FOR AMERICANS—POEM BY R. L. NICHOLSON

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Question for Americans," by R. L. Nicholson, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] proposing to add at the end of the pending joint resolution a new section. The Chair calls attention to the unanimous consent agreement limiting debate on the part of each Senator to 30 minutes on the joint resolution and 15 minutes on any amendment or motion relating thereto, no Senator to speak more than once on any amendment and on the joint resolution. Under the order of yesterday the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is entitled to the floor on his amendment.

The amendment of Mr. MALONEY is as follows:

At the end of the joint resolution add the following new section:

"SEC. —. Effective on the date of enactment of this act, section 2 of such act of June 12, 1934, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) No foreign trade agreement hereafter entered into under the first section of this act shall take effect until the Senate of the United States shall have advised and consented to its ratification, two-thirds of the Senators present concurring.'"

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	O'Mahoney
Andrews	George	Overton
Austin	Gerry	Pepper
Bailey	Gillette	Radcliffe
Ball	Guffey	Reed
Bankhead	Gurney	Revercomb
Barbour	Hatch	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hawkes	Russell
Bone	Hayden	Scrugham
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Brooks	Holman	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Tobey
Capper	McCarran	Truman
Caraway	McFarland	Tunnell
Chandler	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Moore	White
Downey	Murray	Wiley
Eastland	Nye	Willis
Ellender	O'Daniel	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Utah, [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on important public business.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Chair repeats the announcement that, under the unanimous-consent order, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 30 minutes on the pending joint resolution, or more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on any amendment thereto or motion thereon.

The senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] has the floor. The time of the Senator from Connecticut to speak on the amendment has expired. He has thirty minutes on the joint resolution.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. MCNARY. I remind the distinguished occupant of the Chair that all the unanimous-consent agreements ever entered into heretofore became effective after a quorum had been announced, if the absence of a quorum had been suggested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut was recognized before the quorum call, and yielded for the quorum call.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I assure the distinguished and thoughtful and very gracious minority leader that I shall have all the time I desire within the 30 minutes allowed me on the joint resolution.

Mr. MCNARY. At some future time I shall argue this question out with the parliamentarian. I have a very positive opinion on the subject.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will yield, I shall be glad to ask unanimous consent that he be granted an additional 15 minutes.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I am inclined toward the view expressed by the Senator from Oregon, and I do not want such a unanimous-consent request made. I think it would jeopardize the position taken by the Senator from Oregon, which I think is important. I prefer that the unanimous-consent request be not made, and I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to all the debate on this proposal up to now, as I did in 1940 and in 1937, and when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was first submitted to the Senate in 1934. On every occasion I voted against the measure then pending, and I shall vote against the joint resolution on this occasion, unless the amendment now under discussion shall be adopted. I voted for the amendment proposed by my distinguished colleague the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], but not because it was satisfactory to me. Even had that amendment been accepted by the Senate, I should oppose the joint resolution unless it contained the amendment which I now discuss.

Mr. President, I was particularly interested in the very able address made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and I supported his amendment, but I wish to say for the record that I should not support the joint resolution even if it contained the amendment proposed by the able Senator from Wyoming, unless the amendment which I propose should also be adopted.

The question I raise is not a new one. It is more than 150 years old. It is a constitutional question. It originated in the minds of 55 men meeting at Philadelphia a long time ago. While I, for myself, have no doubt on this question, I urge other Senators, if there be any who have a doubt, that they resolve it in favor of the language of the Constitution, and I respectfully remind them that we cannot go wrong if we follow the direction signs and the guideposts of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, all the pending joint resolution does is to ask that the Congress surrender its constitutional and traditional prerogatives to make tariffs and approve treaties. It does not do anything more than that. These trade treaties, or so-called trade agreements, I should like to point out, might be used as instruments of economic aggression, and I borrow those words from those persons in the Department of State who have with complete abandon made an appraisal of the purposes of Members of Congress who offer opposition to the

joint resolution. I do not believe that the administration, as I said the other day, would make any such use of the powers it now seeks. I merely point out, Mr. President, and I reiterate and should like to emphasize, that we are being asked to pass judgment on a method by which a policy—any sort of policy, let me point out—may be put into effect.

Mr. President, I said a long time ago in the Senate that the rights of States were being edged toward the grave. That is almost as serious a situation as any with which our Government could be confronted. But it is a little more serious to me when the Congress of the United States begins to surrender its powers, when the powers of the Congress are marching toward the grave.

In his eloquent discussion yesterday, the able and distinguished Senator from Wyoming, who, during all the years he has been a Member of the Senate, has been a protector of State rights and a defender of the Constitution, discussed this particular question at some length, and, because I do not intend to take a great deal of time of the Senate, partially for the obvious reason that I do not have the time, I am not permitted the time, I should like to associate myself with the constitutional aspects of the speech made yesterday by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. President, year after year since I came to Congress there has been a gradual surrender of power. The country, suffering from the cruel blows of the depression and more recently from the shock of war, has been bewildered, saddened, and angered, and, under pressure from here and pressure from there the Congress sometimes, I fear, not knowing just what to do and staggering under a burden the like of which the Congress had not earlier known, yielded its power, gave it up, sometimes with a show of resistance, sometimes with little resistance, always supposing, I assume, that one day when the clouds had passed, when a better time had come, Congress might recapture the power.

Mr. President, I do not believe that there are many men in high places who would take the powers of Congress for evil purposes, but I likewise know that there are few enough men in high places who are anxious to give back powers which they once obtain. Unless we do it now, I do not believe that we are going to recapture such of the constitutional powers of the Congress in respect to the making of treaties which we gave away in 1934.

A Senator said yesterday on the floor that he was an early adherent to the view I take, to the view of other Senators who have spoken in opposition to the joint resolution, but because we had come to the serious period of war he had changed his mind, and he thought that in wartime we should give up this power and place this treaty- and tariff-making authority in the executive department downtown.

Mr. President, I am going back a little bit in the record. I discussed this proposal at great length and with great seriousness in 1940. I discussed it at some length here in the Senate the other day. There were not many Senators then present. There are not many Senators now present, because Members of the Senate, suffering a pressure which Members of Congress have not heretofore known, are at this hour attending important committee meetings all over this building and in the Senate Office Building. I was compelled to abandon a committee meeting over which I presided in order to be here at 11 o'clock this morning. If I were meeting every obligation that is mine, I would at this moment be attending an Appropriations Committee meeting.

Mr. President, Senators cannot make a complete contribution to the responsibilities they have under the terrible pressure of war and depression, but this should be one time, as we deal with a great constitutional question, when we ought to have complete attention. Little by little, day by day, and month by month, we have surrendered our powers. How much, if any, we shall recapture I hesitate to predict; but I should like to point out, Mr. President, that we have given up more power than we realize.

Once it was the satisfactory feeling of the Members of Congress that they held, among other things, the power over the purse. That is no longer literally true. Within the past few days it has been brought boldly to our attention that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, of which Mr. Jesse Jones is Chairman, has appropriated more than $30,000,000,000 and has created dozens of corporations, without the specific approval of the Congress—an agency of government, a new agency of government, which, in my judgment, was set up to be a temporary agency, has appropriated more than $30,000,000,000. And the Congress has the power over the purse.

Where is the stopping place, Mr. President? Where is the danger sign? How far are we to go? I know, as does the distinguished Presiding Officer and as do all other Members of the Senate, there are other agencies of government which, without the direction or approval of Congress, make large appropriations and spend considerable sums of money. That was not the intention of the founding fathers, nor was the step the Senate now seems about to take at all close to the views of those men. I find no place in the records of the Constitutional Convention much debate on the subject of the ratification of treaties. There must have been a rather complete meeting of the minds of those men who, under divine direction, at Philadelphia a long time ago wrote into the Constitution the language which I now desire to use as an amendment to this all-important joint resolution.

In the debate yesterday a Senator to whom I have earlier referred, expressing a change of mind on this question, made a plea that we trust our Government, that we trust our Government in connection with this important joint resolution. That is all I ask. Who and what is the Government? Are we the representatives of the people? Are not we the Government, or a part thereof? Are we being trusted? Is not the entire question with which we are confronted one of a lack of trust in the Senate of the United States? Is it not a fact that we are asked to accept blindly, without even so much as having a chance to read them, trade treaties with nations all over the world? Who will deny that the man who has control over the economic life of this Government, or any other government, will long be without, if he desires it, political control over the life of the Government? Who will deny his influence on the political affairs of governments abroad, if he is able to wield great influence on the economic life of the nations abroad?

Mr. President, that is the question with which we are confronted. The fact is that there is not, on the part of some in the executive branch of Government, a trust in the Congress of the United States: that there is a lack of faith in the representatives of all the people of this country.

O, Mr. President, officials of the State Department, well informed as they are on international affairs and on what goes on in other lands, might better be informed, in my judgment, on what goes on here at home. I speak to them a word of warning. When they charge those of us opposed to the joint resolution with being economic aggressors, I say they take a dangerous step. Have we heard from any nation or statesman or diplomat abroad an expression of a feeling of fear, the like of which we hear from our own diplomatic officials? Has any Member of the Senate heard one word from any other nation expressing fear of us or of what our attitude might be after this war is over? Oh, no. I have heard no such fear expressed. I think all our allies and all the nations with whom we have entered into commercial treaties have faith in us. Excepting our enemies, the nations with whom we are now engaged in war, it seems to me that there has been a constant belief and faith in our generosity and in our anxiety and desire to help our neighbors everywhere on the globe.

Only in our own Government do we hear it said that unless the Members of Congress yield their views and their convictions, unless they march down the line for the pending joint resolution, they further threaten the economic tranquillity and the peace of the world. Should there come a darker day, should there later be an economic distress or misunderstanding, let it be said now that those who have expressed these fears and have made these predictions must assume the responsibility therefor.

Mr. President, I nearly forgot that I want to read a statement issued by the members of the Finance Committee of the Senate in the year 1929, when Mr. Hoover was President of the United States. The statement was offered in the Senate on October 3, 1929, by the able and distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. It reads as follows:

The joint statement by the minority members of the Senate Finance Committee reads as follows:

"A question of far-reaching consequence—

Let me say parenthetically that at that time the subject of treaties in reciprocity was under discussion in the Senate—

transcending considerations of party prompts us to issue a public statement in relation to the socalled flexible provisions of the tariff bill now pending before the Senate.

"The question involved is one that in our opinion strikes at the very roots of constitutional government. It concerns the preservation unimpaired or the abandonment of the power of levying taxes by that branch of the Government which the forefathers agreed should alone be charged with that duty and responsibility.

"Whatever argument could be advanced during the war and immediately following for delegation to a degree of the taxing power to the Executive unquestionably no longer exists. To incorporate now in the law any recognition of a right of the Executive to impose taxes without the concurrence of the legislative branch is without justification.

"Authority in the Executive to make the laws that govern the course of commerce through taxation is especially objectionable. It is an entering wedge toward the destruction of a basic principle of representative government, for which the independence of the country was attained and which was secured permanently in the Constitution.

"There is no issue here as to the integrity of any Executive who has had or may have extended to him the exercise of this power. The issue is one of taxation by one official, be he president or monarch, in contrast to taxation by the representatives of the people elected, entrusted exclusively with the power to seize the property of the citizen through taxation. If proof be needed that the danger which the forefathers foresaw is inherent in this issue, a mere casual inquiry into the methods employed, selfish influences used, sinister schemes and contrivances brought to bear, one need but examine the record.

"PROCESS HELD VIRTUALLY SECRET

"The principle is: Are taxation laws and their application to be made virtually in secret, whatever may be said about a limiting rule, or are they to be enacted by the responsible representatives of the people in the Congress, where public debate is held and a public record made of each official's conduct?

"The arbitrary exercise of the taxing power, all the more dangerous if disguised and not obvious, in its basic character is tyranny. Resistance to the impairment of this popular right has largely occasioned many of the wars and revolutions of the past.

"An issue of this importance should not be associated with the opinions or necessities of those interests, States, or sections that directly profit by some rate schedule in the body of the tariff act. With respect to the principle here at stake any trading or logrolling is especially unjustifiable and indefensible. Neither should we be unduly influenced by the attempt to divert attention from this momentous issue by condemnation of and emphasis upon the dilatory and unsatisfactory results of congressional procedure.

"POINT TO AMENDMENTS

"No one seeks to prevent or in any way to interfere with the investigations and reports of the Tariff Commission in connection with emergency tariff legislation. The point is, we emphatically insist that final action and responsibility based on Tariff Commission reports shall be taken by the Congress.

"For the purpose of preventing apprehended congressional delay an amendment has been made providing for the submission of the reports to the Congress by the President, and furthermore, an amendment will be presented strictly limiting action by the Congress to matters germane to the particular subject matter or rates recommended by the President after investigation by the Tariff Commission.

"We do not hesitate to say that if this extraordinary and what we believe to be unconstitutional authority passes now from the Congress, it is questionable if there will ever again be a tariff bill originated and enacted by the Congress.

"It is our solemn judgment that hereafter all taxation through the tariff and regulation of commerce thereby will be made by the Executive. It is the inherent tendency of this tariff-changing device and the apparently conscious purpose of its proponents to use it to keep the tariff out of Congress, where it is such an embarrassing business, as everybody knows, to the party that profits politically by it. So also it will be of distinct advantage to the interests that are the direct beneficiaries of the tariff.

"In an age where there has been a steady tendency to rob the individual citizen of his power and influence in his Government through bureaucracy, we deem it our duty to vigorously protest any further encroachments in this direction, and especially with respect to taxation.

"In the hope of arousing the people, regardless of party, to take a broad and public view of this important public question, we make this appeal.

"Furnifold M. Simmons, of North Carolina; Pat Harrison, of Mississippi; William H. King, of Utah; Walter F. George, of Georgia; David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts; Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky; Elmer Thomas, of Oklahoma; Tom Connally, of Texas."

Mr. President, that statement does not deal with exactly the same situation as confronts us now, but it deals with the same subject, and with the Constitution. I hope Senators will give it close attention. It was signed by eight distinguished Members of the United States Senate in 1929. Among them was the able and distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate [Mr. GEORGE]. There is no Member of the Senate for whom I have a higher regard or a more sincere and deep feeling of affection than I have for the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia. He was joined in signing that statement by other Senators who are here at this time, not the least of whom was the able and distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] who is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

What has happened since that time, Mr. President? Congress has been in session for a long time, and Members of Congress are tired. There is an inclination, after one has been rowing upstream for a long time, subconsciously to yield to pressure—to yield to the temporary pressure of public opinion, not numerically great, but articulately expressed. But, Mr. President, I fear that if we surrender these powers now it will be a difficult task to regain them.

I hope—and I regret to say that it is no more than a hope—that Congress will take hold in connection with this all-important joint resolution. The language of the amendment is not my language. It is the language of the founding fathers, the language of men who had been close to the problems of the Old World, and who had taken plenty of time, after their rich experience, in the preparation of a document which is immortal, immortal unless we in a moment of carelessness or temporary weakness give up that for which men have died, and for which men are dying right now.

As I see it, this is the time of test. In a little while we shall come to the end of another terrible war. Following this war there ought to be a peace table. There should be a peace conference. It is all important that there be a treaty of peace. It is of paramount importance to me that the Senate of the United States, in keeping with its traditions and practices, and under the Constitution of the United States, be permitted to ratify that peace treaty.

Shall we continue a dangerous precedent? Shall we, to use a colloquialism, now count ourselves out, and thereby deny the more than 130,000,000 people of this country, who fight this war and who make the sacrifices, a voice in what transpires after the war? Cannot they be trusted in the making of treaties with other governments? Is it to be supposed that a treaty in which they have no voice can long be successful? Do Senators believe that a policy adopted without the approval and sanction of the American people can successfully endure? Mr. President, I am among those who doubt it.

I believe that the Constitution directs us in our responsibility. I think that judgment and common sense point out the path. I am as certain in my own mind as a man can be that we shall do ourselves and our country a disservice if we turn our backs on those who sent us here, if we close our eyes to the Constitution, and unless we now insist that these so-called reciprocal trade agreements are treaties and require ratification by a two-thirds vote of the United States Senate.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, as has every other Member of the Senate privileged to be present, I have listened with profit, enlightenment, and edification to the very earnest statement made by the Senator from Connecticut. I am in entire agreement with every statement he has made relative to the use or abuse, the utilization or destruction, of the treaty-making power. However, I cannot support the amendment which the Senator has offered to the pending measure.

While, of course, an international agreement, of necessity, has as its parties different nations, yet the pending proposal, in my humble judgment, is based upon a delegation of power which the Constitution has definitely placed in the Congress, the power to levy imposts, the power to levy duties, the power to regulate international commerce. That power can be delegated for administrative purposes, with certain standards, as our judiciary has repeatedly held. In this particular case I think the learned Senator is in error in attempting to consider the pending measure in the light of a treaty.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. With respect to the last expression by the able Senator from Iowa, we can do no less than consider these agreements in the light in which they are considered by the agency mak-

ing them. The agency making these agreements regards them as treaties, by their very expression, because the most-favored-nation clause is inferentially, although not by act of Congress, written into every one of them. If we make a treaty with Brazil, Russia comes in and takes the benefits under the most-favored-nation clause.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the statement made by the Senator is absolutely true; but I wish to supplement his statement by referring to the fact that the treaty agreements, or agreements negotiated under this delegated power, have as their basis the purposes delineated and set out definitely in section 360 of the original act, which specifically covers the field of congressional authority to which I have referred.

Mr. President, yesterday I listened, as did many other Senators, to the superb address delivered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. Still I was unable to support his amendment, because I believed it administratively impossible. In the first sentence he uttered the Senator from Wyoming put his finger upon the sore spot in our international life at the present time. He stated that we were going through one of the severest crises this country has ever faced; and while he did not state it, his position could be expressed in three words—Government by usurpation. It is upon that subject, Mr. President, that I wish to address the Senate for a very few minutes. Because what I have to say is important to me, and should be said, and because it will probably subject me to criticism, I have had written down exactly what I have to say so that it cannot be used as an excuse by me that I spoke hastily and without mature consideration. I dictated what I have to say. I have reread it. The language was chosen carefully, and I mean every word of it as I shall now state it.

Anyone must be unusually dull and slow of perception who does not note throughout the Nation a mounting concern among our citizens relative to the almost daily evidence of contention among the coordinate branches of our Government on matters pertaining to fields of jurisdiction and authority. Our citizens would be fatuous indeed if they failed to read in these signs a possibility of serious threat to our future governmental tranquillity, both in the war and in the post-war periods. Scarcely a week passes that some Member of this body does not comment on this floor relative to the effect of some action taken by an executive agency, or some action proposed by way of legislation, and refer to these actions or proposals as unwarranted invasions of the rights of one of the three main branches of our Government by agencies of some other branch.

Let me be specific as to some of the more recent instances to which I refer. The Senate is now completing action on a bill designed to extend for 2 additional years the authority of the executive department to negotiate trade-agreement compacts with other nations. Some very learned and masterly addresses have been made in the debate on this measure and on certain amendments proposed to the joint resolution. The theme of every address which has been made in opposition to the measure was the suggested wisdom of keeping in the Congress a restrictive control or a veto power over the exercise by the executive department of powers delegated by the Congress in that proposed legislation.

A few weeks ago this Congress acted on legislation which made concessions to the Republic of Panama of certain property rights held by the United States of America. Numerous expressions of concern were heard on this floor during the consideration of that measure relative to the unwisdom of taking the action proposed other than by formal treaty negotiation and Senate ratification.

Within the past few months there has been a rapid increase in the tempo and volume of expressed concern over the general exercise of the treaty-making power, its incidence in the negotiation of treaties of peace at the conclusion of present hostilities, and the formulation of agreements looking to political, economic, and peace security in the post-war world. As Senators know, that concern was again expressed today. Again and again in these discussions there occurred expressions of great concern on the part of Senators lest in the establishment of these pacts one of the coordinate branches of our Government should proceed without the constitutional cooperation of the other branch concerned.

Allow me, in order to be even more specific in referring to incidents wholly of domestic concern, to invite attention to what I have in mind. Last fall this body was debating legislation of great economic importance to huge segments of our national industry. Senators had strongly held convictions on the proposals then pending and expressed those convictions in debate on this floor. I am referring to a particular proposal dealing with consumer price levels, as well as price levels for the production of raw materials. As the Senate was about to vote on the measure, the Vice President of the United States, sitting in his constitutional capacity as Presiding Officer of the Senate, presented and asked the clerk to read a letter from the President of the United States addressed to him, the Vice President, commenting and suggesting certain Senate action on the then-pending measure and, in effect, threatening to veto the proposal, if passed.

More recently, the Senate, after months of executive interposition, passed the Connally antistrike bill by a large majority vote. This bill was messaged to the House, and the House, through its appropriate committee, gave it full consideration and unanimously reported it favorably to the House for passage after adding some amendatory matter. The Rules Committee of the House granted a rule for its consideration by that body, and a time was set for its hearing on the floor of the House. But at this juncture, the heads of several executive agencies, having no more legislative authority in the matter than the Sultan of Sulu, joined in a letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in an obvious attempt to influence or block House action. So far as I am informed, these executive agents had neither asked nor been asked to appear before the appropriate committee and give their views on the legislation proposed, but had gratuitously and with consummate presumption injected themselves into the legislative picture through the letter to which I have just referred.

On the 24th day of May, during the week before last, the eminent Vice President of the United States, while presiding in his capacity as President of this body, laid before the Senate a letter from the President of the United States addressed to Mr. WALLACE as President of the Senate, and asked the clerk to read the letter to this body. The request was complied with, and the letter was read and appears in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 24, 1943, on page 4765. The letter referred to certain post-war plans and attached a draft of proposed legislation to accomplish certain things in relation to post-war planning.

Mr. President, I do not take exception to the proposal itself or its purpose. On the contrary, I believe that I find myself in agreement with most of the statements in that letter. But I strongly take exception to the manner, means, and method of its presentation.

The President of the United States has full constitutional right and full constitutional duty to communicate with the Congress on matters of public concern. But the method is particularly prescribed in the Constitution itself, and that method is not by letter addressed to the Presiding Officer of this body or the presiding officer of either branch of the Congress. The Vice President is not a Member of the Senate. He has no right of voice in its debates. He has no vote in this body, except in one carefully described situation. He cannot take the floor to demand recognition, the right of voice, or participation in the discussions of this body. He has no right to present for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any documents excepting such as are proper, such as official messages, reports, and communications received and presented through the regular channels. I did not raise objection when the letter was presented on May 24, because I realized that the Presiding Officer was acting in the best of faith and intention. But I give notice here and now that if ever again there is an attempted repetition of action to lay before the Senate letters addressed to other than the Members of the Senate and presented by other than the Senators themselves, I shall make a point of order against such effort and attempt.

Mr. President, during the few years I have served in the Senate, I have been assiduous in trying as best I could to protect the jurisdiction and authority of each of the associated branches of our Government from encroachment on or invasion by the activities of another branch. In the remaining months that

I shall be permitted to serve, I shall, as best I can, be as meticulous in opposition to any similar attempts in the future. The founding fathers brought out of the chaos of political opinion and contention a document which proposed to keep the lines of demarcation of the fields of executive, legislative, and judicial governmental authority well established, well marked, and well delineated.

They planned with superlative wisdom to keep these respective jurisdictional authorities so balanced one against the other that they could and would serve as a check on usurpation or assumption of authority by any one branch whereby and wherefrom could come any abuse of power which had been delegated to that particular branch from the great repository of power, the American people.

When, a few years ago, it seemed that there was a threat against the supreme judiciary power from the executive branch of the Government, I, as well as many other Members of this body, strenuously opposed such action. When, a few years ago, there appeared what to me was an attempt by the legislative branch to encroach on the clear prerogatives of the Executive in certain appointments of influential officials, I opposed this encroachment by the legislative, even though it involved an opportunity for me to pay a personal debt of resentment. Never will I wittingly be a party either by acquiescence or by concrete approval to attempted expansion of power either in the legislative, the executive, or the judicial branches of our Government by usurpation, encroachment, invasion, or assumption of authority not clearly granted by the Constitution or conferred by proper delegation of power from the chosen constitutional repository.

Mr. President, the first section of the first article of the Constitution and the very first sentence of that Federal document secured legislative authority before another word was added. The importance of legislative control was explicitly asserted. I quote the first sentence:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.

No other agency has initial legislative power or authority of any kind, unless such authority has come by the proper delegation of such power from the body where the Constitution has so clearly placed it—the Congress of the United States.

But there are two outstanding functions to be performed by the Executive in legislative matters. One of these functions antedates and one of them postdates the enactment of a law by the American Congress. Section 3 of article II provides—and again I quote from this well-known provision—

He—

The President—

shall from time to time—

Now listen—

He—

The President—

shall from time to time give to the Congress—

What is the Congress? The Senate and the House of Representatives—

give to Congress information on the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration—

Again I ask the Senate to listen—

recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Iowa on the amendment has expired. He has 30 minutes on the joint resolution.

Mr. GILLETTE. I shall take about 5 minutes on the joint resolution.

Please note, Mr. President, that these messages on the state of the Union and recommendations of measures for passage are to be made to the Congress in a formal message addressed to both branches, not to one branch of the Congress, and certainly not by letters mailed to the Presiding Officers or party leaders in either branch. Furthermore these messages are to be addressed to the Congress with all the dignity and purpose of a message from the Chief Executive, outlining and delineating the Nation's situation and needs from the Executive viewpoint.

Not by the remotest stretch of imagination could or should this provision be used to bring the Executive or his agents into participation in legislative debate or to attempt to influence the course of pending legislation by unsought advice, by threat of disapproval, or by any other type of pressure during the course of legislative consideration. It is interesting to note also that even a recommendation as to legislation is limited by this constitutional provision to affirmative action, to Executive suggestions for consideration by the Congress of such measures "as he shall judge necessary and expedient," and not by way of opposition to proposals pending before the Congress and against their enactment. If the Executive opposes a legislative proposal, his constitutional interposition comes only after the Congress has passed a bill, when if he approves the measure he affixes his signature and it becomes law; if he does not approve, the alternative courses of action for him are definite and specific—to allow the bill to become law without his signature or to return the bill, together with his objections, to the Congress for further action.

Mr. President, I have often thought of this tremendous power of veto which under our organic document is vested in and wielded by a President of the United States, in a democracy where the people are exercising their will to legislate on matters of public weal through representatives of their own choosing, where, under equality of representation and under full and open debate, discussion, and opportunity of amendment, a measure has merited and received the approval of a majority of the people's delegates, not in one branch alone, Mr. President, but after committee and floor consideration by both the Senate and the House and the recording of their approval by a formal vote.

What a tremendous responsibility is this, Mr. President, when one man's judgment is to be registered against this volume of considered opinion and majority approval. But, far more than this, such judgment by veto not only negates and displaces the weight of majority opinion referred to, but, in effect, becomes paramount and controlling and equal in efficacy and potency to one less than two-thirds of the membership of both the Senate and the House.

It is wholly reasonable to suppose, then, that a Chief Executive would, and I am sure that he does, take such veto action only after the most careful and prayerful searching for guidance of his judgment. But the power is his, Mr. President, and the duty is his, and whenever a President, in the performance of that duty, has reached a conclusion which places his individual judgment in the scales to outweigh the deliberate judgment of a majority of the people's legal representatives in the legislative branch, I for one have always been ready and willing to reexamine with extreme care the law proposed and to scrutinize most carefully and reconsider my own judgment and conclusion, in the light of the findings of the Chief Executive. I have on occasion, after such reexamination, reversed my position on a bill, in the light furnished by the Chief Executives' findings. But, Mr. President, with the constitutional right and the constitutional duty to exercise this stupendous power of veto after the legislative body has acted, would it not seem that this overwhelming, overriding power should suffice a Chief Executive, without attempting to exercise power that does not exist by attempting to interpose, influence, and participate in the legislative debates themselves by invading the field of clear constitutional definition vested wholly in the legislative branch?

I do not assume, Mr. President, that the fathers of our Constitution reached the zenith of human wisdom when they framed that document, but until the people of this great Nation, through the methods devised and provided, change the provisions of our basic and organic law, I shall oppose, with all the vigor I possess, every action in any department which, in my honest judgment, attempts to invade, encroach upon, seize, usurp, or dominate by any branch of our Government a field of authority which has been constitutionally vested in another.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY].

Mr. GEORGE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capper	Guffey
Andrews	Caraway	Gurney
Austin	Chandler	Hatch
Bailey	Chavez	Hawkes
Ball	Clark, Idaho	Hayden
Bankhead	Clark, Mo.	Hill
Barbour	Connally	Holman
Bilbo	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.
Bone	Downey	La Follette
Brewster	Eastland	Langer
Brooks	Ellender	Lodge
Burton	Ferguson	Lucas
Bushfield	George	McCarran
Butler	Gerry	McFarland
Byrd	Gillette	McKellar

McNary	Reed	Tydings
Maloney	Revercomb	Vandenberg
Maybank	Russell	Van Nuys
Mead	Scrugham	Wagner
Millikin	Shipstead	Wallgren
Moore	Smith	Walsh
Murray	Stewart	White
Nye	Taft	Wiley
O'Daniel	Thomas, Okla.	Willis
O'Mahoney	Tobey	Wilson
Overton	Truman	
Radcliffe	Tunnell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Seventy-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY].

Mr. GEORGE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REVERCOMB (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. If the Senator from Kentucky were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. On this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I understand that if present, he would vote "nay." If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], who, if present, would vote "yea" on the pending question, has a pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained in important committee meetings.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent on public business, is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

Mr. CHANDLER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who, I am advised, if present would vote "yea." I transfer that pair to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who, if present, would vote "nay." I am therefore free to vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—33

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Brewster	La Follette	Overton
Brooks	Langer	Reed
Bushfield	McCarran	Scrugham
Butler	McNary	Taft
Capper	Maloney	Tobey
Chavez	Millikin	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Moore	Walsh
Danaher	Murray	White
Hawkes	Nye	Wiley
Holman	O'Daniel	Willis

NAYS—44

Andrews	Eastland	Maybank
Austin	Ellender	Mead
Bailey	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Ball	George	Russell
Bankhead	Gerry	Smith
Barbour	Gillette	Stewart
Bilbo	Guffey	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Gurney	Truman
Burton	Hatch	Tunnell
Byrd	Hayden	Tydings
Caraway	Hill	Van Nuys
Chandler	Lodge	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Lucas	Wallgren
Connally	McFarland	Wilson
Downey	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—19

Barkley	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bridges	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Murdock	Thomas, Utah
Davis	Pepper	Wheeler
Glass	Revercomb	Wherry
Green	Reynolds	
Johnson, Calif.	Robertson	

So Mr. MALONEY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, on the desks of Senators will be found an amendment which I now offer to the pending joint resolution.

At the proper place in the joint resolution I propose to insert the following:

No foreign trade agreement hereafter entered into under the authority delegated to the President by such section 350, as amended, no amendatory or supplementary agreement hereafter entered into under such section, and no duties and other import restrictions specified in a proclamation issued by the President to carry out any such foreign trade agreement or any such amendatory or supplementary agreement, shall take effect if the Congress by concurrent resolution has specifically disapproved such agreement and the duties and other import restrictions so specified to carry out such agreement, within 60 days after such agreement has been laid before the Congress.

Mr. President, I shall not take a great deal of time in discussing the amendment because not much time is necessary. In the beginning I wish to make a correction of a typographical error in the amendment. On page 1, line 5 of the amendment I ask that the word "important" be stricken out, and that the word "import" be inserted in its place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be made.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] yesterday, would require affirmative approval by the Congress before a reciprocal trade agreement or treaty, whatever one may wish to call it, could become effective. I agree with the proponents of the measure that that method would slow up the process of making treaties. I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] which the Senate has just rejected, could be open to the same objection. My amendment, Mr. President, is not open to that objection. All the amendment does is to provide that no foreign trade agreement, and no amendatory or supplemental agreement, and no duties and other import restrictions, shall become effective if the Congress, by concurrent resolution, shall specifically disapprove them within 60 days after they have been laid before the Congress. That is the very minimum of control the Congress should exert and retain. That would not cause any delay or any confusion in the making of the agreements. No agreement would need to wait for affirmative action before it became effective.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The thing which bothers me concerning the Senator's amendment is precisely the same thing which bothers me concerning the so-called O'Mahoney amendment. Let me ask the Senator a question: If we should agree to his amendment providing for the process of House and Senate action on these agreements, would we not confess in the statute that these agreements are not treaties?

Mr. REED. I have no such intention.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is that not what we would do?

Mr. REED. I think not. In answer to the Senator from Michigan I will say that at least I am seeking to retain in the Congress of the United States some vestige of authority to reject or approve trade agreements. All of us who live between the Missouri River and the Sierra Nevada Mountains or the Coast Range near the Pacific, know how uneasy a great segment of our people are as to the possibility of treaties or agreements being made which might do our people great damage, and cause great injury without an opportunity being afforded the Congress of the United States to reject such agreements if it desired to do so. All my amendment seeks to do is to provide 60 days in which the Congress may by a concurrent resolution disapprove such agreements.

On my amendment, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not care to argue the pending amendment. It represents the fight against the effort to make a tariff by any method other than the old log-rolling method. The same objections have been urged, and the same position has been taken by all those who have opposed every effort to make progress in the difficult matter of tariff making. If the proposed amendment were adopted, it would, of course, mean that any agreement which was negotiated, or even any modification of an agreement which had already been negotiated, would come to the Senate and lie here for 60 days, and become immediately the subject matter of debate, indeed, of constant debate, and all the

progress which has been made would be lost.

I do not care to argue the question. I do care to state that, of all times on earth, those who are opposing the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act have chosen the time that cannot be defended before the bar of public opinion in this country. The proposal is to renew the act for but 2 years. In the meantime an election will intervene, and if then it is desired to go back to the old methods that invite corruption in tariff making, Senators will be privileged to do so. However, I desire to say to those Members of the Senate who now urge one after another, amendments intended to defeat and to end the operation of the act that they have chosen most unwisely the time in which to make their case, because the American people know and understand perfectly well that if the American Congress now is to take a backward step in this single field of international trade and commerce, it is intended thereby to serve notice upon the world that we are prepared to scuttle and run.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. REED. Does not the Senator from Georgia think that this question arises by the inexorable march of time and because the current authority extended by the act of Congress expires on the 30th day of this month? At what other time, in heaven's name, would those of us who have views upon the subject, those of us who desire to express opinions, those of us who think some modification might be wise, bring it up, except now?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I let my former statement stand, in answer to the Senator's inquiry. I am confident that the American people know that this is not the proper time to raise this issue. With all but five of the trade agreements already having run for 3 years, and with little possibility that any general trade agreements can be concluded with any country during the last days of this war or in the period in which the world now finds itself, why bring up the issue? I think the record is made; all those who want to oppose the act, all those who do oppose it—and I can understand why Senators may oppose the act—have made their record. Why persist in the effort to kill the act? Why continue to present amendments designed and intended to kill an act which can do this country no real harm, and at the same time take a step which at this time may do this country immeasurable damage in the eyes of the world?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, there is just one thing the able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] said upon which I wish to comment because it has been stated repeatedly throughout this debate that to the extension of the Trade Agreements Act there is no alternative in tariff making except a return to the old log-rolling methods of general congressional revision. I say that is just not so. There is no such limitation upon the alternatives. The fact of the matter is that the existing tariff law provides a so-called elastic tariff which is administered in the first instance by experts of the United States Tariff Commission, and is administered in the last recourse by the President of the United States, acting under the recommendations of the Tariff Commission. It has not any relationship to the old-fashioned log-rolling methods.

A decade ago I myself, sat through one general congressional revision of the tariff, and I hope to heaven I shall never have to sit through another. I can think of no Senator on this floor who would be more bitterly opposed to the old, so-called log-rolling congressional methods of tariff revision than I would be. I believe completely in the theory of the elastic tariff. I believe completely in permitting the Executive to act under the elastic tariff, because the elastic tariff prescribes a definite cost-of-production rule to guide the Tariff Commission and the President in the administration of the act.

I simply want to protest against the wholly empty pretense that any man who is opposed to any phase of the Trade Agreements Act necessarily, ipso facto, thereby becomes a partisan and a defender of the old congressional log-rolling methods.

I happen to be opposed to the amendment submitted by the Senator the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REED], because I think it is a statutory confession that we have ceased to look upon trade agreements as treaties. So far as I am concerned, I have a deep constitutional conviction that they are treaties. Therefore, I shall vote against the amendment submitted by the Senator from Kansas.

However, in view of the fact that the statement to which I have referred has again been renewed, I take advantage of this opportunity to insist that we do not face the alternatives that have been held up to us. One can disagree to the delegation to the State Department of almost the total tariff power, and can still believe in a scientific tariff, scientifically made by a scientific United States Tariff Commission administered by the President of the United States, all acting under specific rules and yardsticks created by the Congress under the Constitution.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have not thus far taken part in the debate. I do not desire to return to the old method of enacting tariff legislation. I believe in trade agreements. I voted for two of the amendments submitted to this body by Members of the Senate. I voted for the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and for the amendment submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]. I did so because I feel that the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives, constituting the Congress, are just as desirous of having good will, in bringing about good understanding, as any other branch of the Federal Government possibly can be. I am not one of those who believe that honesty of purpose and sincerity of purpose prevail only in the executive branch of the Government. I, for one, have a great deal in common with the people outside the United States who will be affected by this legislation, and I will not defer to any member of the State Department or of any other agency of the executive branch of the Government in the desire to have good understandings and trade agreements which will be beneficial to the people of both countries.

However, it is my fundamental conviction that, after all, the Congress of the United States has a constitutional duty to perform; and I believe that it should perform that duty. We should not act under the assumption that, in order to perform that duty, in order to show that we are seeking good will, in order to show that we are in favor of reciprocal trade agreements, we must have someone in the State Department perform our duty.

I believe that we are a part of the Government. I am in favor of reciprocal trade agreements. I shall vote for the joint resolution; but I still insist that when an amendment is offered in this body in good faith by any Senator, the Senators who vote for such an amendment should not be accused of being against the objective which is sought to be obtained by the joint resolution. I am for the joint resolution.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I have reached the conclusion to vote in favor of extension of the Trade Agreements Act for the duration of the war, but with the expectation that after the war there will be a strong movement for the restoration of the democratic rather than the autocratic method of regulating tariff rates. My reason for this course of action is that I am opposed to any interruptions in our relations with foreign countries while we are still engaged in the war.

I think the claim made that failure to extend these trade agreements without amendments would be injurious or harmful to the war effort or the writing of peace terms thereafter, is exaggerated. However, in view of the fact that very few, if any, such trade agreements can be made while the war is in progress, I have decided to support the pending measure. As was suggested by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the subject of our international trade is largely an academic one for the duration.

I wish to have it clearly understood, however, that in voting for the extension of the Trade Agreements Act at this time, I do not intend to be understood as committing myself to a continuation of this law after the war is ended. I also intend to vote against amendments that will tend to embarass the negotiators during the next 2 years, but I shall vote for amendments that represent a principle I have voted for in the past.

I assume that the wisdom, or unwisdom of continuing this policy will depend upon conditions which confront our country and the world when hostilities cease. Indeed, I anticipate that after the war is ended there will be a strong move in this country in favor of recording congressional sanction to these treaties. I anticipate a growing opposition—it is here now, as this debate shows—to permitting any bureau or department of the Government to exercise

absolute authority to negotiate trade treaties which may spell life or death for various domestic industries and in time lower the wages of labor and reduce our present standards of living.

Under the Constitution, these trade agreements are, in fact, treaties requiring Senate ratification; and in my opinion, a large element of our people will urge that this policy be restored after the war.

It is impossible to make these national trade agreements by the State Department or by the Congress without some injustices being done and without some industries in this country being more or less seriously affected. The difference, however, between the two methods is this: The injustice in one instance is done by a bureau removed from the control of the people, and the aggrieved party has little opportunity to be heard, and if heard, it is largely behind closed doors. If, through congressional action, an injury is inflicted upon a particular industry or section of the country, the people have an opportunity to have their case presented to their chosen representatives, to have hearings held and the whole question pro and con thrashed out in the open by the Representatives of the people in their Congress.

In other words, they have an opportunity to employ democratic process to obtain relief in one case, and in the other, they are at the mercy of bureaucrats who are not elected by the people, and not directly responsible to the people or the chosen representatives of the people in their Congress. An appeal for relief under the present system practically makes Members of Congress unable to redress wrongs inflicted on their constituents; and every Member of this body knows it.

Because I look for the rebirth of constitutional government and the restoration of congressional powers in the United States following the war, I feel certain that there will be a strong movement to restore to the Congress, with all its shortcomings in dealing with tariffs—and they are many—all the powers of government which have been bestowed upon it by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it had not been my intention to make any remarks upon the issues involved in the pending joint resolution and the amendments which have been offered or may be offered thereto before it comes to a final vote.

I was a Member of the United States Senate at the time the Smoot-Hawley bill was under consideration. I think it is no exaggeration to say that I had an active part in organizing the so-called coalition in the Senate which for 8 months attempted to prevent the excessive rates adopted by the House from being enacted into law. I think I learned something from that experience.

Mr. President, it is my considered judgment that those who support and advocate the joint resolution and the policy it is intended to continue are not serving the cause of democracy when they attempt to smear those who disagree with them.

There will be reactions in this country as a result of this war. I fear that they may be violent reactions; I trust that they may not be blind reactions. If democracy is to survive, those who wield power must exercise tolerance. They must accord to those who disagree with them the honesty and sincerity of purpose which they claim for themselves.

I have seen Congress strip itself of power until today it is largely a rubber stamp. It has even lost control of the purse strings, as was stated by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]. I do not think it lies in the mouth of any Senator to charge other Senators who disagree with him, and who desire to see some check placed upon the executive power, with a desire to return to an era of corruption. So far as I am concerned, I shall let my record in the fight which I made with Senators who are members of the Democratic Party against the excesses of the Smoot-Hawley tariff stand as an answer to any such charge.

I firmly believe that the statements made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in his speech of yesterday will grow in import as the history of the near future unrolls and reveals itself. Unless Congress has the courage to stand up and fight for its own power and its own prerogatives, how can it expect either the country or the executive branch of the Government to respect it?

Mr. President, so long as we had the power over the purse strings we had power to require an accounting as to the conduct of executive policy; but by the appropriations of the huge sums of money which have been made by this Congress, and with the power of Federal corporations to draw upon the credit of the United States, the Congress has no longer control over the purse strings. Every student of history knows that the relinquishment of power over the purse strings will bring about the death of representative government.

Mr. President, I have cast my votes upon the amendments which have been offered, and I shall cast my vote upon the pending joint resolution, in the firm conviction that the preservation of democracy at this time demands that Congress should guard its power and not relinquish it further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PEPPER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS]. If he were present he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

Mr. REVERCOMB (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. If he were present he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "yea."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote "nay." As I intend to vote the same way, I am free to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on imcause of illness. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] are detained in important committee meetings.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent on public business, is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], who would, if present, vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—28

Aiken	Davis	Moore
Ball	Gerry	Nye
Brewster	Gurney	O'Daniel
Brooks	Holman	O'Mahoney
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Overton
Butler	La Follette	Reed
Capper	Langer	Scrugham
Chavez	McCarran	Taft
Clark, Idaho	McNary	
Danaher	Millikin	

NAYS—49

Andrews	George	Stewart
Austin	Gillette	Thomas, Okla.
Bailey	Guffey	Tobey
Bankhead	Hatch	Truman
Barbour	Hawkes	Tunnell
Bilbo	Hayden	Tydings
Bone	Hill	Vandenberg
Burton	Lodge	Van Nuys
Byrd	Lucas	Wagner
Caraway	McFarland	Wallgren
Chandler	McKellar	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	White
Connally	Mead	Wiley
Downey	Radcliffe	Willis
Eastland	Russell	Wilson
Ellender	Shipstead	
Ferguson	Smith	

NOT VOTING—19

Barkley	Buck	Green
Bridges	Glass	Johnson, Calif.

Kilgore	Pepper	Thomas, Utah
McClellan	Revercomb	Wheeler
Maloney	Reynolds	Wherry
Murdock	Robertson	
Murray	Thomas, Idaho	

So Mr. REED'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I have heretofore had printed and which is on the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 8, after the numerals "1943", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no commodity or article shall be included in any foreign trade agreement entered into which permits the entry into American markets of products of workers, farmers, or miners of foreign countries at total landed costs, all tariff duties paid, which total costs are less than the cost of production or wholesale selling price of competitive products of American workers, miners, or farmers where such American products are commercially available."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate for any great length of time. It is quite apparent that, notwithstanding the merit of any amendment it has been decreed that it shall not go into the pending joint resolution. I believe the day will come when the Congress of the United States will come to the realization that, after all, we do represent a democratic constitutional form of government. I think the sooner that day arrives the sooner we will assure the perpetuity of the Government that was instituted 160 years ago. The more we delay that hour, the more we invite the tearing down of that fine form of government that has carried us through troubled waters for more than a century and a half.

If there is anything we are fighting for in this war today, it is the American way of living; if there is anything that spells the American way of living it is the American standard of living for those who toil in America. If, in passing the pending joint resolution, we delegate to executive agencies the power to forget and to ignore everything that pertains to the differential between the standard of the living of American toilers and the standard of living of those who serve in peonage in other countries—if, I say, by the passage of this joint resolution we hand over to others authority to forget and ignore that differential, then, indeed, it seems to me that the Senate of the United States has been recreant to its greatest obligation.

I hope, Mr. President, this war is not being fought to gain great fortunes for certain groups and certain men. I rather hope that it is being waged so that men who toil, men who work, men who belong to the toiling masses of this country, and women also, shall know that when the war is over they will not be placed in such a position that they will be forced to compete with peon and slave labor and discouraged humanity in every corner of the globe.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Would it be fair to say that all the Senator's amendment proposes to do is to require that trade-agreement tariffs shall be measured by the same statutory yardstick—namely, the cost of production—which already is required by law to be applied under the elastic section of the tariff law?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the Senator, by and large, states the thought expressed in the amendment. I wish to call to the attention of those Members of the Senate who do us the honor to listen that at the close of the last World War there were turned onto the markets of America nearly a hundred million dollars worth of commodities which were either fabricated or in course of fabrication; nearly $100,000,000 worth of commodities manufactured at the expense of this Government were turned loose upon the markets of this country. The quantity of goods thus thrown on the market following World War No. 1 cannot be compared to the quantity which will face American markets at the close of World War No. 2, because what we expended in the war effort in World War No. 1 was a mere fraction of what we will expend in the war in which we are now engaged. So the commodities which, after this war, will be thrown loose on American markets, without cost figured into them, will naturally tear down our own labor standards, because they will tear down our own facilities for manufacturing even at the cost of production.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to finish this sentence, if I may, and then I shall yield to the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I realize the Senator's time is limited and I do not care to interrupt him unduly.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let us go a little further and bring into the picture the other countries and the other peoples that will be producing and seeking to find a market here for commodities produced by peon labor. Take the two and combine them and what is the result?

We speak of our boys struggling for a continuation of the American way of life. If our boys are not struggling for a continuation of an uprise, and a continual uprise, in the way of life of the toilers, then they are not struggling for anything, because the toilers constitute the red blood not only of America but of every other country in the world. It is the workers who constitute the vitality of a nation; and when we say that we will not recognize the cost of production here, with labor at American standards figured in, then, indeed, we have forgotten the very thing for which in the first place our Government was instituted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Missouri asked me to yield, and I yield first to him.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to inquire of the Senator from Nevada about the thought he was expressing as to the necessity for writing specific tariff regulations into a formula of the sort we are now considering. In other words, when the Senator undertakes to write in a specific tariff stipulation, he is going back to the Smoot-Hawley law in its entirety, so far as the flexible provisions are concerned, is he not?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to take the Senator's time for any debate with him, because I realize he is under a time limit.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps the Senator from Nevada can answer the question I desire to propound at the same time he answers the other question.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope I can.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am wondering how this amendment could be made into a workable provision. It seems to me there would be a great deal of difficulty in working out such a proposal. I can see merit in what the Senator says, but I do not see how it could be very well worked out.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Tariff Commission cannot work it out, then indeed I am wondering how our armed forces will work it out; I am wondering how America will work it out. It seems to me that the Congress of the United States—and I say this without at all attempting to be captious—can well afford to write a prescriptive value of American labor into a measure so vital as the one now before the Senate.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I do not wish to take the Senator's time, which is limited, but I desire to call his attention to the fact that after the First World War ended we had 20,000,000 pounds of sugar in France, as I recall. It was dumped over there at 2 cents a pound, while we were paying 20 cents a pound in this country. So we have not been very kind to our own people in some of our war operations.

I should like to ask the Senator whether the language I am about to suggest might not be important in his amendment. I should not want to keep out of the country commodities of which, by reason of restricted output by some of the monopoly operations, there was not an adequate supply here. Suppose the Senator should add to his amendment a sentence at the end, because of his use of the term "commercially available," which is rather vague, in these words, "in quantities reasonably adequate to normal needs and requirements." I do not want to pay 50 cents for something which could be reasonably produced for 10 cents, merely because some outfit has a monopoly. I will ask the Senator to look at the language. I think the American public has a right to protection against monopoly prices and restricted output, and the language suggested would not harm the Senator's amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the able Senator from Washington that I think his suggestion would void the whole amendment. The purpose and object of the amendment is to hold the life of American toilers and American laborers

at such a level that it can sustain itself under American standards. What we are going to be confronted with, if my analysis of the situation is at all correct, is twofold. First of all, a great mass of American-produced commodities will be thrown onto the American market, then a great mass of people in foreign countries will be engaged in production at what I call peonage wages; in other words, under conditions which are substandard.

Mr. BONE. We would have adequate supplies, then, if our own people could produce the goods. My suggestion is to apply only in a case where there is no adequate or reasonable supply of a commodity in the United States. If there is such a supply, Americans should produce the commodity. We will have the labor to produce it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator from Nevada will yield to me under his time limit I shall be glad to let the Senator occupy a portion of my time.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, the Senator knows that all the provisions of the hitherto existing law, all the provisions which have been in effect as to dumping, still remain in effect under the trade agreements. All the antidumping provisions of any of our laws are still in effect under the reciprocal trade agreements. It seems to me that what the Senator is driving at is the question of dumping.

Mr. McCARRAN. Not necessarily. Dumping is only one phase of the question. The question is larger than dumping. We have always tried to keep American labor on an American standard. We cannot keep American labor on an American standard if we put American labor in competition with peonage labor abroad. Today we have that in a limited form in other countries which are now dealing with us, because they are not affected by the war. In other words, South American countries are sending here their commodities. Would we allow them to come in and tear down American standards of living? If we lower the bars entirely, so that there is no protection whatever to American labor, then I can only see that American labor by millions upon millions will again face the unfortunate condition which prevailed in 1932, when a large segment of American labor was on the dole. I do not believe in the dole. I do not believe that American labor wants the dole. I do not believe the toilers of America want anything more or less than an opportunity to work. If given an opportunity to work and to sustain those who are dependent upon them, American labor will carry American life forward, even through the crises which will confront us after the war. But what will result if, on the other hand, we say to American toilers, "Yes, you may send your sons to fight and die abroad; yes, you may go yourselves into war activities; yes, you may do everything you think is essential for this war, but when the war is over millions upon millions of people in foreign countries for which you are now fighting, and for which your sons are now dying, will be put into a condition enabling them to produce commodities by the thousands of tons and dump them onto American markets, to tear down American standards of living, and the American wage earner's right to an American standard of living."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Idaho in the chair). The time of the Senator from Nevada on the amendment has expired.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall occupy the time of the Senate for only a moment longer, because I know what the fate of the amendment will be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 30 minutes on the joint resolution.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, we are today dealing with a measure which will have a place in history, in my judgment. A similar joint resolution has been passed on two previous occasions, and the one now pending will be passed today. I shall vote against the joint resolution, as I have heretofore voted against similar measures. I shall vote against it for at least two reasons. One is that in my judgment we would be setting aside the specific mandate of the organic law of this country. The Congress of the United States can never again ask this country to sustain it when the Congress itself refuses to sustain the law which gave the Congress its place in this Government. We cannot complain, if we pass the pending joint resolution, that agencies in the executive branch of the Government, or other branches of the Government, are usurping Congressional functions, when we ourselves let down the bars, refuse to accept the responsibility and the toil involved and say to the world, "Yes, we know that every treaty must be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, but, knowing that, we set it aside."

The able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] says that the hour, the time, the day in which we live, afford the greatest argument for setting aside this constitutional mandate. If the Constitution of the United States is so weak that the existence of any emergency can be made the basis for setting aside one of its specific mandates, then the day may only be tomorrow when we shall set aside all constitutional provisions, simply because someone may announce that it is the day, it is the hour, it is the time when we must forget the mandate of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I know there is a difference of opinion with respect to what the mandate of the Constitution is, but under my oath of office, and under my duty in observing my oath, I shall vote for the pending amendment, first of all, because its adoption will mean the uplift of my people, it will mean the continuation of the toiling masses of our country in a safe and secure American way of life. I shall vote against the joint resolution because the Constitution of the United States provides that every treaty must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. That being a provision of the Constitution, I have never been able to make myself believe that the Senate can grant a delegation of that power.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barbour	Hawkes	Russell
Bilbo	Hayden	Scrugham
Bone	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Lodge	Tobey
Byrd	Lucas	Truman
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wallgren
Connally	Mead	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	White
Davis	Moore	Wiley
Downey	Murray	Willis
Eastland	Nye	Wilson
Ellender	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, the Senator from Missouri desires to say a few words on the amendment. I think I should do so, also, because of the unusual character of the amendment.

The amendment provides—

> That no commodity or article shall be included in any foreign trade agreement entered into which permits the entry into American markets of products of workers, farmers, or miners of foreign countries at total landed costs, all tariff duties paid, which total costs are less than the cost of production or wholesale selling price of competitive products of American workers, miners, or farmers where such American products are commercially available.

Mr. President, the amendment would go far beyond any theory which is actually involved in the present tariff act. I call attention to the fact that the amendment would prohibit a trade agreement which permitted the entry into the United States of any article at a landed cost lower than the cost of production or wholesale selling price of competitive domestic products where such American products were commercially available. It is plain that the amendment would remove every possible element of price competition in the United States, so far as imported products are concerned. If Senators will examine the amendment, they will see that it would require that the landed cost of all competitive imports be not less than the selling price of domestic goods. The Senate should note well that the comparison would be between the landed cost and the domestic

price. No margin would be permitted with which a dealer in imported goods could pay the expenses of the business of selling such goods at wholesale.

Where would the comparison be made? It necessarily would be made in the highest-priced market, not in the principal market. Why? Because under the Constitution the duties must be uniform throughout the United States. If the amendment were written into the law, we should have to make the comparison with the wholesale selling price in the very highest-priced market in the United States in order to comply with the provision of the Constitution relating to the fixing of uniform duties.

Now, let us see what would happen. In simple terms, the amendment would require that duties be adjusted on a basis to prevent any price competition, even in the highest-priced market in the United States. Could any tariff be more destructive of the consumer and more satisfying to those who wish a complete monopoly of the American market? Of course, it would be impossible to negotiate any foreign trade agreement with this provision written into the law because the United States would have nothing whatever to offer for the paring down of any unreasonable trade, monetary, or quota restrictions.

What would this amendment do if it were adopted? I wish to make it plain. It would put into the hands of the American producer the power to raise his tariffs as he might see fit. If he were in the highest market, all he would have to do would be to raise his prices, and that would call for a rise in the tariff, because under this amendment, as I have said, the highest market in the United States must be taken as a basis. What would that do in a case in which one concern might control production and distribution, or a case in which a group of closely affiliated concerns might control all production and distribution in certain lines? It would mean absolute monopoly because the producers themselves would have the power to continue to raise their wholesale selling prices and demand that the tariff rates go up. There could be no importations into the United States.

So, Mr. President, with all due respect to my friend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], I hope that this amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, this debate has taken a very remarkable course from beginning to end. We have had no attack from any quarter fundamentally on the principle of the reciprocal trade agreements, but we have had amendments offered, any one of which would have been calculated to destroy the whole principle of reciprocal trade agreements; and, strangely enough, some of them were absolutely antagonistic to each other. However, we have had essentially the same vote in behalf of all these amendments, antagonistic as they may be. From the very same group of Senators we have had the same vote for each one of these amendments, any one of which would destroy the effect of the whole Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

We had the amendment of my very able and distinguished friend, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], which was in absolute antagonism to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]; yet the same group of Senators voted for both amendments.

Mr. President, if the agreements authorized to be continued by the joint resolution are treaties, as was suggested by the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, then they should become the supreme law of the land, as is provided by the Constitution for treaties. They do not need the action of the House of Representatives. They do require a vote of two-thirds of the Senate. They become the supreme law of the land, which, in good faith, cannot be changed by statute.

So Senators might conceive of these agreements as treaties, and logically vote for a provision for ratification by the Senate. On the other hand, they might be considered as legislation, as provided in the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming. In that case, of course, it would be a duplication for Congress to make the authorization under strict limits, but that would be a perfectly logical position.

Mr. President, I assert that no Senator could have logically voted on one constitutional theory for the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming and also for the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to my friend from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Since the Senator from Missouri has made that statement, I rise to call attention to the fact that a very distinguished American statesman, who by many of us is now called the founder of the Democratic Party—I refer to Thomas Jefferson—found no such logical contradiction as the Senator from Missouri now finds in a similar situation. I have no hesitation in saying that the Senator from Missouri is one of the greatest students of history in America.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I appreciate that compliment from my distinguished friend from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He knows, probably in much greater detail than I the story of the Louisiana Purchase. I am merely reminding him that Thomas Jefferson, as President of the United States, consummated the Louisiana Purchase; and when that had been completed, he sent a letter to some of his congressional leaders. In his letter he pointed out that two powers of Congress were involved. He said that not only would there have to be Senate ratification of the treaty by which the purchase was made, but that there would also have to be action by Congress as a whole in support of it. What finally evolved was that the treaty was ratified by the Senate; and the House and Senate combined in making the appropriation which was necessary to complete the purchase. When President Jeffereson wrote to his Minister abroad, he had authority from Congress only to purchase New Orleans, and, as I understand, the sum involved was only about $2,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me to answer what the Senator from Wyoming has said, I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, I have spent most of my life reading the writings, speeches, and messages of Thomas Jefferson. I have three different sets, each purporting to be the complete writings of Thomas Jefferson. As I say, I have spent most of my life reading those documents. I am bound to say that from Jefferson's standpoint, great logician and facile writer that he was, the most difficult operation he ever had in his life was in reconciling his powers to execute the treaty involving the purchase of Louisiana with his subsequent submission of the issue to Congress. I say that very frankly; but I think that President Jefferson made a very excellent adjustment of that problem, at least in his own mind—and, it seems to me, to the mind of posterity. But that does not seem to me to have anything to do with the pending question.

Yesterday the Senator from Wyoming asserted that this was a matter for legislation by Congress.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator in a moment.

Yesterday the Senator from Wyoming asserted that this was a matter for legislation by Congress, and he very properly voted for his own amendment. Today the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] asserted that it was not a matter of statute—which, of course, congressional legislation is—but that it was a matter of treaty, requiring a vote of two-thirds of the Senate.

If it is a question of regulation by statute, as asserted by the Senator from Wyoming, the Senator certainly cannot agree that the Senator from Connecticut was correct today when he said it was a treaty requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senate, because, Mr. President, the treaty process and the statutory process are mutually antagonistic to each other.

The President does not require any authority from the Congress to negotiate a treaty. Under the Constitution he has authority to negotiate a treaty at any time he pleases, and when the treaty comes from the Executive it does not require joint action of the House and the Senate. It requires a two-thirds majority of the Senate in order to be ratified, and if ratified it thereupon becomes the supreme law of the land.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to yield if the Senator from Nevada will wait until I finish the comparison which I am trying to make.

As I said, it becomes the supreme law of the land. Under the Constitution it is coordinate with the Constitution itself. A Federal statute, of course, can be changed by this or any future Congress.

Therefore, I say that anyone who asserts that this matter is to be regulated by statute is in inevitable antagonism with one who asserts it is a treaty which becomes a part of the supreme law of the land and requires ratification by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am under obligation to yield first to the Senator from Nevada.

I have no quarrel with any Senator who adheres to the view of the Senator from Wyoming that this is a statutory matter. I certainly have no quarrel with any Senator who adheres to the view of the Senator from Connecticut who asserts that a trade agreement is a treaty, and, therefore, requires a different procedure. But I cannot understand the mental process of anyone who can possibly vote for both the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming and the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, and, still less, how he can then vote for the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

I now yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. In regard to the action of President Jefferson, to which the Senator has made reference, the Senator will recall that President Jefferson did submit the matter to the Congress, and that he had the Congress thereafter. The Senator will further recall the language of President Jefferson, when he said that the emergency of the hour demanded that the Executive act, and that if thereafter the Congress to which he submitted the question did not approve his action, that was a matter for Congress. In other words, he never lost sight of his Congress.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How did he submit it? Did he submit it as a treaty, or in the form of legislation making effective certain regulations which the President saw fit to make in pursuance of the treaty with France?

Mr. McCARRAN. He submitted it in the form of an Executive act for the approval of Congress.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. What I wish to emphasize to the Senator—and he will immediately recognize it—is that Jefferson did not lose sight of his Congress. He recognized Congress to be the representative of the people of the United States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I entirely agree with the Senator from Nevada that President Jefferson never lost sight of his Congress, and never at any time impinged upon the authority of the Congress.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. Now, will the Senator agree with me that this proposed amendment is a regulatory feature to be written into a delegation of power? The Senator at least agrees that the Congress may delegate the power to fix tariffs. I do not agree with him, but he has taken that position.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Supreme Court of the United States has also taken that position.

Mr. McCARRAN. In other words, we have a right to regulate the delegation, and the action taken pursuant to such delegation.

I have just one more question which I should like to propound to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to answer any question of my distinguished friend from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. With reference to the subject of treaty-making power, I understood the Senator from Missiuri to say that the President of the United States can make a treaty. I cannot go along with my good friend from Missouri in that statement. The President of the United States does not make a treaty. A treaty is formulated by the President, but before it becomes effective it must be submitted to the Senate of the United States and be ratified by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have never asserted the doctrine that the President of the United States could himself make a treaty. I should be the last to adhere to any such doctrine as that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The time of the Senator from Missouri on the amendment has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will take time on the joint resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri has criticized those who voted for the amendments, but I believe he has misstated the position in which one opposed to the pending joint resolution is placed. I voted for the first amendment. My objection to the joint resolution is that it would give wholly discretionary power to the President, which I think should not be delegated to the President, for a period of 5 years before it can be changed.

I voted for the first amendment, which I thought was a very mild one. I said that I did not care if the President had that discretion during the war, but that it must be limited after the war. The majority of the Senate refused to agree to the amendment. We were then in the position of completely delegating authority to the President under the Reciprocal Trade Treaties Act, or voting for an amendment which in some way would restrict his power. It might not restrict it in the way I wish to see it restricted, but any of the amendments would remove the basic objection which I have to the joint resolution without any amendment, namely, the unlimited discretion given the President.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator adheres to that view, he could undoubtedly accomplish the same result by an amendment to strike out the enacting clause of the joint resolution.

Mr. TAFT. I intend to vote against the joint resolution unless an amendment shall be agreed to which would accomplish the result which I have indicated.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I appreciate the frankness of the Senator in that statement.

Mr. TAFT. I would rather have the joint resolution with the restriction provided in either the Maloney amendment or the O'Mahoney amendment, than to vote against it altogether. I am in favor of either amendment, but in some way there must be a restriction placed upon the unlimited discretion of the President.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me the Senator would be glad to vote for the joint resolution with the enacting clause stricken out.

Mr. TAFT. As I have said, if no amendment is adopted I shall vote against the joint resolution, but if the first amendment had been adopted, restricting the President's power only as it relates to post-war settlements, I would have voted against the other amendment. It is not a question of asserting that this is a treaty, or an act or anything else. It is a practical question of being presented with a choice of giving unlimited discretion, or adopting an amendment which will more or less limit the President's discretion. Personally, if I had the writing of an amendment, I would not write either the Maloney amendment or the O'Mahoney amendment, and I would not support either of them, but the joint resolution with either of those amendments in it would, in my opinion, remove the basic objection which I have to it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, of course, any of those amendments would be exactly equivalent to selling an automobile with the engine removed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the first proposal to which I referred would not have such effect.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I am glad to yield further to the Senator from Ohio, but I am under a time limit, and the Senator can take the floor in his own right.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] was very frank today. He said he had voted against the act in 1934 and had voted against an extension joint resolution in 1937, and against another one again in 1940, and that he was not in favor of the pending joint resolution. That was an extremely frank statement, and it simply meant that the Senator from Connecticut was franker than some of those who have offered amendments intended to cut the heart out of this whole proposition and at the same time to be able to say that they did not vote against the continuance of the reciprocal trade agreements.

Now, Mr. President, let us see what the amendment of my distinguished friend from Nevada proposes. It proposes, on page 1, line 8, after the numerals "1943", to insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That no commodity or article shall be included in any foreign trade agreement entered into which permits the entry into American markets of products of workers, farmers, or miners of foreign countries at total landed costs, all tariff duties paid—

I am sorry the Senator from Nevada has left the floor, because I should like to have him explain exactly what that means—

which total costs are less than the cost of production or wholesale selling price of competitive products of American workers, miners, or farmers where such American products are commercially available.

I undertake to say, Mr. President, that there is no American citizen, no British citizen, no citizen of any of our allies, no man on earth who would be able, under the McCarran amendment, to tell whether the negotiators had any authority to make an agreement or not. Without any standard, it sets up so many different bases, and, certainly, there is so much confusion in the amendment itself that no intelligent administrator could possibly be able to tell what his authority was. This is simply another of those amendments designed not to accomplish any essential end, but to cut the heart out of the whole principle of international cooperation in trade matters.

When I look at the record of the Senate, Mr. President, as to those who voted first for the Danaher amendment, then for the O'Mahoney amendment, then for the Maloney amendment, and who now intend to vote for the McCarran amendment, I am reminded of an incident that happened when I was a small boy hanging around the House of Representatives. One of the leading Members of the House at that time and one of the ablest debaters of that body, Jerry Simpson of Kansas—unfortunately and unjustly known to some as "Sockless Jerry"—happened to be berating the McKinley administration on one occasion. He was doing it in very unmeasured terms and was called to order. The Speaker directed that his words be taken down, and he was ordered to take his seat under the Rules of the House. The Speaker decided that he had been transgressing the Rules of the House in his references to the Executive, and on appeal on a yea-and-nay vote the decision of the Speaker was sustained. Whereupon the Democratic leader, who, as I recall, was James D. Richardson, of Tennessee, rose and made the customary motion that the gentleman be allowed to proceed in order. The House happened to be in a bad humor on that occasion and, on a yea-and-nay vote Jerry Simpson, one of the leading Members of the House, was actually denied the right to proceed in order. So at the conclusion of the roll call Mr. Simpson rose, addressed the Chair, and said, "Mr. Speaker, the House has decided by yea-and-nay vote that I cannot speak out of order; you had decided that first; now the House has decided by yea-and-nay vote that I cannot proceed in order." He said, "Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this: 'Where am I at?'" [Laughter.] As quick as a flash, the great Speaker of the House of Representatives, Thomas B. Reed, of Maine, who had as keen a wit as anybody I have ever known serving in the Congress, shook his head and said, "That is one thing that no mortal man has been able to find out."

So I say that those who voted for the Danaher amendment, those who voted for the O'Mahoney amendment, those who voted for the Maloney amendment, and those who are about to vote for the McCarran amendment will never be able to find out exactly "where they are at," because all the amendments embrace contradictory theories.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I understood that while I was conversing with the acting majority leader, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and my attention was therefore diverted from the course of the remarks of the Senator from Missouri, he said that I had left the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was mistaken. At the time the Senator from Nevada did not happen to be in his usual place. I saw him a moment after I made that remark, and I am glad to correct the RECORD and say that the Senator from Nevada has always been on the floor since I have taken the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wonder if the Senator now has any question to propound.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I made some reference to the Senator from Nevada, and I merely mentioned the fact that he did not happen to be on the floor. I have no questions whatever, but I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada for any question he may desire to ask me.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is it not true that those who voted for any of the other amendments, the Maloney amendment, the O'Mahoney amendment, and other amendments, and who intend to vote for the amendment now before the Senate, are voting in the spirit of returning the power of the people to the place where the people intended that power to repose?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I by no means agree with the statement of the Senator from Nevada. I do agree that those who voted first for the Danaher amendment and then for the O'Mahoney amendment and for the Maloney amendment, and who intend to vote for the McCarran amendment, are all united by one common purpose of trying to defeat the ultimate aim of international cooperation in trade affairs as represented by reciprocal trade agreements.

I do not agree, Mr. President, that there has been any essential loss of power by the legislative branch in connection with trade agreements. I say that we are doing the same thing that Congress did when it constituted the Interstate Commerce Commission. I say that we are going not nearly so far as Congress went in enacting the flexible provisions of several different tariff acts. I say that the only question here is as to whether we shall absolutely destroy all possible chance for reciprocal trade agreements to succeed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to yield again to my friend.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is it not true that the difference between the power that was delegated by the Congress to the Interstate Commerce Commisison and the power under the reciprocal trade agreements act is that the Interstate Commerce Commisison, if I may use a phrase perhaps out of turn, is an intranational organization; an organization that exercises its powers with respect to domestic questions affecting the Nation; whereas this is a delegation of power affecting international affairs to perform functons which under the form of our Government belong to the representatives of the people.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to my friend from Nevada, that if I believed as he believes, I would think that the rejection of the Maloney amendment, which treated this whole matter as a treaty, absolutely answered his question. I should not think, if I held the views just expressed by the Senator from Nevada, that the adoption of his amendment would cure a constitutional situation. I should think that matter was determined by the rejection of the Maloney amendment.

Mr. President, this is either a matter of negotiation of trade agreements in which the Congress recognizes that the negotiation of such agreements—and in order to be successful they must be a subject of negotiation—is a matter too cumbersome for the Congress and for which the Congress has no constitutional process, or else the agreements must be regarded as treaties.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. If it is impossible for a parliamentary body such as ours to participate in any way in the negotiation or the adoption of trade agreements, why is it possible for the parliamentary systems of most of the other great nations to do exactly that?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Because they have no such constitution as the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. How does the Constitution of the United States handicap the functions of this body?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will ask the Senator from Maine whether he knows of any way by which the Congress of the United States can negotiate with foreign nations.

Mr. BREWSTER. I know that the Constitution prohibits it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then, why does the Senator ask the question he has propounded? If we were to assume that the Congress of the United States was desirous of making a 5-percent, or a 10-percent, or a 20-percent horizontal reduction, or any other reduction in the Smoot-Hawley rates—that is the simplest question to put—does the Senator know any way by which Congress could propose such a reduction to other nations?

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not think it would be necessary for us to propose it; we could simply adopt it. In view of the terrific criticism of the Hawley-Smoot tariff, it is very interesting to note the extraordinarily few changes which the Senator's administration has made in it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator had given attention to those matters, I am sure he would understand that very thoroughly. Of course, Congress could not by legislative enactment correct the vicious, bad situation in trade throughout the world which had been created by the enactment of the Smoot-Hawley law, because we had forced other nations not only to put up prohibitive

tariff rates in retaliation, but to establish quotas, and to establish exchange regulations, which acted tremendously against the United States, and we could not correct that by an act of Congress.

Mr. BREWSTER. We were not told that in 1932 and 1936, when the Senator's party said that reciprocal trade agreements would afford a cure for this whole matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly told everyone who would listen to me in the State of Missouri in 1932 what the situation was.

Mr. BREWSTER. Did the Senator say it was impossible to remedy it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I certainly did.

Mr. BREWSTER. Did he say it was going to be hopeless to vote for the Democratic Party because they could not possibly cure it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not say anything of the kind. I said that I hoped the Democratic administration would be able to work out some new machinery.

Mr. BREWSTER. And it has had 10 years.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think we have accomplished a great deal in that regard.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thought the Senator then said it was impossible to remedy the condition.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The reason for the adoption of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in the first place was that we had made it impossible, by our own stupid and vicious legislation, the Fordney-McCumber Act and the Smoot-Hawley Act, to correct the situation by ourselves, so that it was necessary to provide some new machinery, which we did.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to adhere to my first question, that is, Why it is impossible for the Congress of the United States to adopt agreements which have been negotiated by an agency of this Government, although it is possible for every other parliamentary system in the world to do it; and they actually do it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That has been debated at length in this body, and the Senator from Maine is entirely familiar with the arguments. Other nations have different systems. In some nations the responsible heads of the Government are members of the parliament, and they speak, not as representatives of the king, but as the representatives of the parliamentary majority; and that is not true in this country.

Mr. BREWSTER. But they must still account to their parliamentary body for their acts, exactly as I ask that our Executive account to this body for his acts. The analogy is complete.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The analogy is not complete. The Senator from Maine is a Member of this body, and he is perfectly familiar with the fact that under the rules of the Senate any 15 aggressive Senators can defeat any proposal in this body, if they so desire.

Mr. BREWSTER. If the Senator desires to proceed on that theory, then we might as well abolish this body as a functioning part of our Government.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. Then why, in the most important matter affecting the economy of our country, does the Senator desire that this body be impotent?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not desire that this body be impotent. I think this body yesterday and today, in taking a position by a very substantial majority already on three votes—and I am satisfied we will get the same number on the next vote—is exercising its legislative authority.

The Senator from Maine may not like the three votes which were taken yesterday and today, but under the Constitution he certainly has no complaint about it. Of course, the Senator from Maine is riding several horses going in several different directions at the same time. The Senator from Maine voted for the Danaher amendment, he voted for the O'Mahoney amendment on one theory, and he voted for the Maloney amendment on an absolutely conflicting theory. They cannot possibly be reconciled. Now he is going to vote for the McCarran amendment, I apprehend, which is absolutely in opposition to the theory of both the other amendments.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator is in error. My mind is not yet clear on the McCarran amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator is going to see the light, I should like to withdraw any attempt to commit him to that proposition, because I should like to have him with us, of course. We all have great respect for the ability and logic of the Senator from Maine, and if the Senator is going to see the light, and wants to come over, and is not convinced by the logic of the Senator from Nevada, we should be very glad to have him with us.

Mr. BREWSTER. What is the saying, "While the lamp holds out to burn"——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. "The vilest sinner may return." [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. I was very much interested in the suggestion of inconsistency in our position, which troubled me a little coming from so logical and distinguished a Member of this body as the Senator from Missouri, and I was happy to hear him subsequently say to the Senator from Nevada that he did recognize the unifying element in our attitude in this amendment we were seeking to adopt.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That you were trying to emasculate the joint resolution.

Mr. BREWSTER. That we were seeking in some measure to circumscribe the unlimited power of the Executive. I have on other occasions heard the Senator from Missouri pursue that subject very eloquently, when he was not in agreement with the course of the Chief Executive, and some Members of this body feel that possibly some limitations of some character, the constitutionality of which I do not think the Senator would question, may be desirable, and I anticipate that within 2 years, when our economy collapses, and the American people are looking for a scapegoat——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I did not yield for a speech.

Mr. BREWSTER. They may desire to have the Senator then account for his position.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator from Maine that I am perfectly willing to put my record, as one jealous of congressional responsibility, during my 10 years in the Senate of the United States, against that of anyone else who has been a Member of this body during that time. I have never regarded reciprocal trade agreements as being a matter which involved any delegation of power which the Congress should not make, because the history of international cooperation in the form of trade agreements has been such that anyone who has studied the subject to any extent whatever knows that the ratification by the Senate, or congressional enactment, after such an agreement was made, would open up the way to the logrolling practices of general tariff legislation, which not a single Member of the Senate, so far as I know, would be able to stand up and urge now.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator agree that in the parliamentary body of everyone of the larger countries exactly that situation prevails?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I would not agree to that at all.

Mr. BREWSTER. Why is it that the parliamentary bodies of Great Britain, of Canada, and of Brazil are not fully as subject to the unfortunate logrolling proclivities of which the Senator speaks, when they have to adopt a measure which has been negotiated?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Maine must certainly be familiar with the fact that certain nations are under a parliamentary system.

Mr. BREWSTER. We are supposed to be.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We are not; the Senator from Maine must certainly know that we have not what is technically known as a parliamentary system.

Mr. BREWSTER. What are we? I thought until recently, that we had a parliamentary system, and that Congress had certain responsibilities.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator from Maine does not know the difference between a parliamentary system in which the leader of the majority, supported by a parliamentary majority, is the executive, and a government in which there is a distinct constitutional executive dissociated from the legislative body, then I shall not take the time of the Senate to undertake to explain it to him now. I should be glad if the Senator would read any standard work on the subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I appreciate the dissertation upon government, but it seems to me perfectly evident that when the members of any parliament in the world in considering a trade agreement which has been negotiated with our country, must act formally on its adoption, they must act in exactly the same way that we do. If it happens that they have more confidence in their executive than we have in ours, it is simply a happy and a fortuitous circumstance. But I should assume

that, so far as the individual members of the other parliamentary bodies are concerned—and I use the word "parliamentary" in the commonly accepted sense of functioning as we are as the duly elected representatives of the people—exactly the same difficulties which the Senator from Missouri raises against the possibility of our functioning, that we would have logrolling, local considerations, and sectional factors entering into the question, would prevail in Canada, in Great Britain, in Brazil, in all the other countries which have found it perfectly feasible, throughout the 10 years this system has been functioning, to make it operate successfully.

Mr. President, I do not care to labor the point, but I desire that the RECORD should make it clear that there are those in this body who feel that some limitations upon the Executive may be in this instance desirable.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield if I have the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. It seems to me the Senator's argument has even more force with respect to a country which has technically a parliamentary system than with respect to a country such as our own which has technically a constitutional system, because in a technically parliamentary country, the prime minister, or what would correspond to him, is the executive, but he is always subject to removal by the body itself.

Mr. BREWSTER. On a day's notice.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. On a day's notice, on any vote. Whereas in our country under our constitutional system we elect the President for 4 years, and barring very remote conditions, he cannot be removed. So when the Senator from Maine makes the argument that in every country in the world, with the exception of three or four—I believe Cuba, Ecuador, and some others——

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. The parliamentary bodies of those countries have to ratify, either before or after the making of the trade agreements, it occurs to me that his argument applies with more force to such a parliamentary body, which can get rid of its prime minister or chief executive on a moment's notice, whereas we in this country cannot under our system do so.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Idaho. I do not think I could state the situation more beautifully, and I leave it to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to answer the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PEPPER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], who, if present, would vote "yea." I transfer my pair to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who, if present, would vote "nay." I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. REVERCOMB. (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. If he were present he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "yea."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who, if present, would vote "nay." I find I can transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Virginia to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I do so, and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained in committee meetings.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay." I am not advised how the Senator from New Hampshire would vote.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—32

Aiken	Holman	Nye
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel
Brooks	La Follette	O'Mahoney
Bushfield	Langer	Overton
Butler	Lodge	Reed
Capper	McCarran	Scrugham
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Shipstead
Danaher	Maloney	Taft
Davis	Millikin	Tobey
Gillette	Moore	Willis
Gurney	Murray	

NAYS—47

Andrews	Brewster	Downey
Austin	Burton	Eastland
Bailey	Byrd	Ellender
Ball	Caraway	Ferguson
Bankhead	Chandler	George
Barbour	Clark, Mo.	Gerry
Bilbo	Connally	Guffey
Hatch	Pepper	Vandenberg
Hawkes	Radcliffe	Van Nuys
Hayden	Russell	Wagner
Hill	Smith	Wallgren
Lucas	Stewart	Walsh
McFarland	Thomas, Okla.	White
McKellar	Truman	Wiley
Maybank	Tunnell	Wilson
Mead	Tydings	

NOT VOTING—17

Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Bridges	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Murdock	Wheeler
Glass	Revercomb	Wherry
Green	Reynolds	

So Mr. MCCARRAN's amendment was rejected.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I know of no other amendment to be offered to the joint resolution. Of course, I should like to reach a final vote on it as soon as possible, in order that the Senate may take up the conference report on the tax bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PEPPER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] who would vote "nay." I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. REVERCOMB (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I am advised that if the Senator from Kentucky were present he would vote "yea," and that if the junior Senator from Nebraska were present he would vote "nay." Having transferred my pair, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as that which I made before, I transfer my pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who would vote "yea," to the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who is absent because of illness, and who, I am informed, if present would vote "nay." Having transferred my pair, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senators from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK and Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEEL-

ER] are detained on important public business.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senators whose absences I have announced would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I am advised that the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," if present.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has a general paid with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. I am advised that if present the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] would vote "nay," if present. The Senator from California is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—59

Aiken	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Andrews	George	Reed
Austin	Gillette	Reynolds
Bailey	Guffey	Russell
Ball	Gurney	Smith
Bankhead	Hatch	Stewart
Barbour	Hawkes	Thomas, Okla.
Bilbo	Hayden	Tobey
Bone	Hill	Truman
Burton	Holman	Tunnell
Byrd	Lodge	Tydings
Capper	Lucas	Vandenberg
Caraway	McFarland	Van Nuys
Chandler	McKellar	Wagner
Chavez	McNary	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Walsh
Connally	Mead	White
Downey	Murray	Wiley
Eastland	Overton	Wilson
Ellender	Pepper	

NAYS—23

Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel
Brooks	La Follette	O'Mahoney
Bushfield	Langer	Revercomb
Butler	McCarran	Scrugham
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Shipstead
Danaher	Millikin	Taft
Davis	Moore	Willis
Gerry	Nye	

NOT VOTING—14

Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Buck	McClellan	Wheeler
Glass	Murdock	Wherry
Green	Robertson	

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) was passed.

CURRENT PAYMENT OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2570) to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The report was read.

(See page 5192 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, May 28, 1943, for conference report.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I take it we are to have an explanation of the conference report.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. I will offer some explanatory statements.

Mr. President, I shall discuss very briefly the results of the work of the conference committee on the tax bill, and will ask to have inserted at appropriate places certain examples and tables which I think may be helpful to Senators in answering inquiries with respect to the tax bill, and in advising themselves about the details of the conference report.

The main question of difference between the conferees was the treatment of the 1942 liability. We were unable to persuade the House conferees to agree to the Senate bill. Neither could the House conferees persuade us to agree to the House bill. Finally we were able to work out the following compromise, which was agreed to by all the Senate conferees and a majority of the House conferees:

First. If the tax for the lower year 1942 or 1943 was $50 or less, 100 percent of the tax liability for the lower year is abated.

Second. If the tax for the lower year 1942 or 1943 was between $50 and $66.67, a flat $50 of the tax for the lower year is abated.

Third. If the tax for the lower year 1942 or 1943 was over $66.67, 75 percent of the tax for the lower year is abated.

The following example will show how the plan is applied:

Tax for 1942	$100
Tax for 1943	50

The taxpayer will be compelled to pay an amount equal to his tax for 1942, which is $100. An amount equal to $50, which is his 1943 tax, will be canceled.

Another example is as follows:

Tax for 1942	$60
Tax for 1943	100

The taxpayer will have $50 canceled, and will have to pay in addition to his 1943 liability an additional amount of $10, making a total payment for 1943 of $110.

Another example is as follows:

Tax for 1942	$100
Tax for 1943	300

In this case, an amount equal to 75 percent of $100 will be canceled, requiring the taxpayer to pay an additional $25 in addition to his 1943 liability of $300, making a total payment for 1943 of $325.

At least one-half of the part of this tax which is not forgiven is payable on March 15, 1944. At the request of the taxpayer, the Commissioner is required to extend the time for the payment of the other half to March 15, 1945. No interest is chargeable during the period of such extension.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a burden table showing, for various net incomes from $1,200 to $5,000,000, the tax liability under existing law, the amounts forgiven and not forgiven under the conference agreement, and the total current burden in 1944 and 1945, assuming that the income remains unchanged.

In connection with the table, I also ask to have inserted an explanatory statement.

There being no objection, the table and explanatory statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tax liability under existing law, amounts forgiven, not forgiven, and total current burden in 1944 and 1945, under bill agreed to by conferees on May 27, 1943; for a married civilian with no dependents [1]

Net income before personal exemption	Existing law tax liability [2]		Amount forgiven	Amount not forgiven	Total current burden 1944 and 1945 [4]
	Calendar year 1942	Calendar year 1943 [3]			
$1,200		$35.47			$35.47
$1,500	$48.00	100.13	$48.00		100.13
$1,510.87	50.00	102.74	50.00		102.74
$1,550	57.20	112.11	50.00	$7.20	115.71
$1,600	66.40	124.09	50.00	16.40	132.29
$1,601.47	66.67	124.44	50.00	16.67	132.78
$1,800	103.20	172.00	77.40	25.80	184.90
$2,000	140.00	219.91	105.00	35.00	237.41
$2,500	232.00	339.69	174.00	58.00	368.69
$3,200	360.80	507.38	270.60	90.20	552.48
$3,300	382.20	534.33	286.65	95.55	582.11
$5,000	746.00	992.58	559.50	186.50	1,085.83
$10,000	2,152.00	2,676.36	1,614.00	538.00	2,945.36
$15,000	4,052.00	4,854.13	3,039.00	1,013.00	5,360.63
$20,000	6,452.00	7,531.91	4,839.00	1,613.00	8,338.41
$25,000	9,220.00	10,577.69	6,915.00	2,305.00	11,730.19
$50,000	25,328.00	28,074.58	18,996.00	6,332.00	31,240.58
$100,000	64,060.00	69,584.36	48,045.00	16,015.00	77,591.86
$250,000	194,000.00	207,857.69	145,500.00	48,500.00	232,107.69
$500,000	414,000.00	441,746.58	310,500.00	103,500.00	493,496.58
$1,000,000	854,000.00	900,000.00	640,500.00	213,500.00	1,006,750.00
$2,000,000	1,734,000.00	1,800,000.00	1,300,500.00	433,500.00	2,016,750.00
$5,000,000	4,374,000.00	4,500,000.00	3,280,500.00	1,093,500.00	5,046,750.00

[1] Assumes the taxpayer is not subject to the second antiwindfall provisions (sec. 6 (c)).
[2] Maximum earned net income assumed.
[3] Includes gross Victory tax, computed by assuming that Victory tax net income is 1% of net income shown in stub.
[4] Assumes income level remains unchanged.

Staff of Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, May 28, 1943.

Explanation of table: It may be noted in this table that in the case of a constant net income of $1,500, the entire 1942 liability of $48 would be forgiven, since it is less than $50, and the 1944 and 1945 burden would amount to $100.13, an amount equivalent to the 1943 tax, including gross Victory. At a net income of $1,510.87, a taxpayer who was married and had no dependents would have a 1942 liability of exactly $50. This entire $50 would be forgiven and his 1944 and 1945 burden would be equal to his 1943 tax of $102.74. The table shows that a person with a net income of $1,600 would be benefited by the so-called notch provision, which adds to the 1943 tax 25 percent of the lower year tax liability, or the excess of such tax liability over $50, whichever is lesser. This individual would have a 1942 calendar year tax liability of $66.40; without the notch provision he would be required to add 25 percent of this amount, or $16.60 to his 1943 tax. However, the notch provision in effect reduces this additional tax by 20 cents to $16.40, the excess over $50. This notch provision ceases to benefit a married person with no dependents when the net income rises above $1,601.47, where the tax is $66.67.

At a net income of $10,000, $1,614 would be forgiven and the total current burden in 1944 and 1945 would amount to $2,945.36, compared with a 1943 tax liability under present law of $2,676.36.

Mr. GEORGE. The conferees retained the second antiwindfall provision of the Senate bill, but made three important changes, which will alleviate some of the harsh effects of the provision. These are as follows:

First. Under the Senate bill the taxpayer could select either the year 1938, 1939, or 1940 as his base or normal year. The conferees agreed to allow him to select also the year 1937.

Second. Under the Senate bill the tentative tax which could be abated was computed on an amount equal to the surtax net income for the normal year, plus $10,000. The conferees raised the $10,000 figure to $20,000.

Third. The conferees provided a special relief provision for partnerships which were operated as corporations during the base year. In such cases the partner could use as his surtax net income for the base year the earnings of the corporation for the base year to which he would have been entitled had the corporation distributed such earnings as dividends.

The whole purpose of this antiwindfall provision was to limit the amount of tax to be abated to the equivalent of the tax computed on an amount equal to the tax on a normal-year income increased by $20,000. An example will show how the second windfall provision will apply in the following case:

	Surtax net income	Tax
1942	$100,000	$64,000
1943	250,000	194,000
Base year	30,000	
Base year plus $20,000	50,000	26,240

Since 1942 is less than 1943, the second windfall provision will apply to the year 1942. Under the general rule, we would abate 75 percent of the tax for 1942, or $48,000. However, under the second windfall provision, the amount to be abated cannot exceed a tentative tax on an amount equivalent to the income of the base year plus $20,000, computed at 1942 rates. The tentative tax in such a case will be $26,240. Therefore, the effect of this provision is to abate $26,240 instead of $48,000, leaving uncanceled $37,760 of his 1942 liability.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, would the Senator care to yield at this point, or does he wish to finish his explanation?

Mr. GEORGE. I think I had better finish the explanation, and then I shall be glad to return to any point.

Certain technical or administrative changes were made by the conferees. The most important of these are as follows:

First. In the case of a payment of wages by an employer to an employee through an agent, fiduciary, or other person who has also the control, receipt, custody, or disposal of, or pays the wages payable by another employer to such employee, the Commissioner is authorized to require withholding of the tax by such agent.

Second. In order to avoid administrative difficulties and in order to lessen the burden upon the taxpayer, the withholding provisions will not be applicable to wages paid during 1943 with respect to a pay-roll period beginning before July 1, 1943.

Third. The conference agreement extended the system of current payment of tax not withheld at the source to those nonresident aliens with respect to whose wages withholding at the source is made applicable. Thus, generally speaking, the current tax-payment system will apply to certain nonresident alien individuals, who are residents of a contiguous country and who enter and leave the United States at frequent intervals. Such aliens, with respect to wages received for services performed in this country, are subject to tax in the same manner and to the same extent as citizens of the United States. Since they will be subject to withholding on such wages, failure to include them within the current tax-payment system would cause a considerable doubling up in the payment of their taxes.

Fourth. A provision was added by the conference agreement to require an individual to file a declaration and pay as a part of his estimated tax the amount of his excess 1942 tax liability over his 1943 tax liability, in the case where such individual would otherwise not be required to file a declaration for the taxable year 1943.

With the exceptions noted, the general withholding-at-the-source provisions of the conference report are identical with the provisions which were included in the Senate version and also included in the House language.

TAX RELIEF FOR SERVICEMEN

In opening this discussion of tax relief for servicemen, it should be stated that a serviceman is subject to income tax only upon his base pay, and any additional compensation paid for foreign or special service. Allowances furnished to a serviceman for quarters, subsistence, dependents, and uniforms are not included in gross income for the purpose of individual income tax.

It will be noted that only his base pay and any additional compensation paid for foreign or special service are required to be returned by him for the purpose of his individual income tax.

Both in the Senate bill and in the conference agreement substantial tax relief is extended to servicemen. This relief may be summed up under the following headings:

1. One thousand five hundred dollars exclusion of service pay—

Such exclusion, of course, is available to both married and unmarried servicemen—

2. Special relief from abating the tax for the lesser of the years 1942 or 1943.

3. Special relief for servicemen dying in the service.

Each of these headings will be discussed separately.

1. $1,500 EXCLUSION OF SERVICE PAY

Under existing law, so much of the base pay as is received while in the armed forces from the United States before the termination of the present war by personnel below the grade of commissioned officer in the military or naval forces of the United States, for active service in such forces during such war as does not exceed $250 in the case of a single person, or $300 in the case of a married person, is excluded from gross income. This amounts, in effect, to an exemption of $1,500 in the case of a married person and to $750 in the case of a single person. Both the Senate bill and the conference agreement extended this relief as follows: So much of the compensation as is received by a member of the military or naval forces of the United States for active service in such forces during the present war as does not exceed $1,500 is excluded from gross income. The conference agreement also extends this provision to citizens or residents of the United States serving in the military or naval forces of any other of the United Nations. Unlike the exclusion of $300 for married and $250 for single persons under existing law, this $1,500 exclusion is allowed to all military personnel, and is not restricted to those below the grade of a commissioned officer. This relief provision is made applicable for taxable year beginning in 1943 and will continue for each subsequent year until the present war is terminated.

The following will show the differences between the exclusion under this bill and the exclusion under existing law:

(a) Married man with no dependents

Present law:	
Personal exemption	$1,200
Exclusion from income (to those under grade of commissioned officer)	300
Total relief	1,500
Conference agreement:	
Personal exemption	1,200
Exclusion from income (to all military personnel)	1,500
Total	2,700

(b) Married man with 2 dependents

Present law:	
Personal exemption	$1,200
Exclusion from income (to those under grade of commissioned officer)	300
Credit for 2 dependents	700
Total relief	2,200
Conference agreement:	
Personal exemption	1,200
Exclusion from income (to all military personnel)	1,500
Credit for 2 dependents	700
Total relief	3,400

(c) Single man

Present law:	
Personal exemption	$500
Exclusion from income (to those under grade of commissioned officer)	250
Total relief	750
Conference agreement:	
Personal exemption	500
Exclusion from income (to all military personnel)	1,500
Total relief	2,000

2. SPECIAL RELIEF FROM ABATING THE TAX FOR THE LESSER OF THE YEARS 1942 OR 1943

The effect of the conference agreement in abating the tax for the lesser of the year 1942 or 1943 in the case of a civilian is as follows:

First. If the tax for the lower of 1942 or 1943 is $50 or less, 100 percent of the tax for the lower year is abated.

Second. If the tax for the lower of 1942 or 1943 is between $50 and $66.67, a flat $50 is abated.

Third. If the tax for the lower of 1942 or 1943 is over $66.67, 75 percent of the tax for the lower year is abated.

It was recognized that this would result in hardship upon a person in the armed services in 1942 or 1943, since the tax for 1943, will, in most cases, be considerably lower than the tax for 1942. In 1943, the income of a great many men in the service is limited to their service pay. Therefore, a special relief provision was adopted to prevent the full tax from being collected for 1942 in the case of such persons.

The effect of the provision is to abate all the 1942 tax which was due to the inclusion of the earned net income in the taxpayer's net income for 1942, if the taxpayer had no 1943 tax to pay. If the taxpayer had a 1943 tax to pay, a part of the 1942 tax would, in effect, be collected by the addition of 25 percent of the tax for 1943, the lesser year, and abating the entire 1942 tax. Earned income is limited to so much of the income from wages, salaries, and other amounts received as compensation for personal services as does not exceed $14,000. If the taxpayer's net income is not more than $3,000, his entire net income is considered earned net income and if his net income is more than $3,000, his earned income is considered to be not less than $3,000. Earned net income is earned income less deductions properly chargeable against earned income.

The following examples will illustrate the effect of this provision:

In the case of civilians, the amount by which the 1942 tax would exceed the 1943 tax is in effect brought over to 1943 and added to the 1943 tax. For example, if a civilian's tax would be $200 in 1942 and $100 in 1943, there would be added to the tax of 1943 of $100, another $100 from 1942, making the 1943 tax $200. In the case of servicemen, the part of 1942 tax which was attributable to earned income would not be brought over and added to the 1943 tax. In the above example, if all of the $200 1942 tax was on account of earned income, none of it would be brought over and added to 1943, so that the 1943 tax would be $100. However, since only 75 percent of the 1942 tax is forgiven there would be added to the 1943 tax an additional 25 percent of the lesser of 1942 or 1943. So that in the example for the civilian there is added to 1943, 25 percent of 1943, which is the lesser year, or $25, making the total 1943 civilian tax $225, while for servicemen there will be added 25 percent of 1943, or $25, to his 1943 tax of $100, making his total 1943 tax $125.

Mr. President, I now set out examples, with explanatory notes showing just how the tax will apply to servicemen:

EXAMPLE I. ALL EARNED INCOME IN 1942 AND NO TAX PAYABLE FOR 1943

Assume a married man with a net income of $10,000, derived entirely from salary, who was liable for 1942 tax of $2,152, and that he entered the service in 1943. Assume he owes no tax for the year 1943. The effect of this relief provision is to cancel his entire 1942 tax of $2,152.

EXAMPLE II. ALL EARNED INCOME IN 1942 AND TAX PAYABLE FOR 1943

Assume the same situation as to 1942 and a tax of $600 for 1943. All of the 1942 tax of $2,152 will be canceled. To the 1943 tax of $600 will be added 25 percent of the lesser year, which is 1943, or $150, making the total 1943 tax $750. However, this additional 25 percent is payable $75 on March 15, 1944, and $75, March 15, 1945. Moreover, under a provision of existing law the payment of this additional amount, as well as the 1943 tax, can be postponed by the Commissioner until 90 days after the termination of the present war.

EXAMPLE III. PARTLY EARNED AND PARTLY UNEARNED INCOME

Assume that a married man entered the service in 1943 and that his tax situation for 1942 and 1943, under existing law, is as follows:

Year	Net income	Earned net income	Tax
1942	$20,000	$10,000	$6,452
1943	0	0	0

Under the conference agreement, because he was in the armed service the amount of tax for 1942 to be added to his tax for 1943 is $2,152, as shown by the following computation:

(1) Excess of 1942 tax over 1943 tax	$6,452
(2) Increase in 1942 tax due to earned income	4,300
(3) Amount of 1942 tax to be added to 1943 tax	2,152
(4) 1943 tax	2,152

Since the serviceman owes no tax for 1943, the only amount payable as his 1943 tax is the carry-over of $2,152. The amount of $2,152 would, therefore, become the estimated tax for 1943, and when declaring this amount in the return to be filed September 15, 1943, the serviceman would take credit for whatever amount he had paid on his 1942 taxes in March and June 1943. His payments through June 30 would amount to at least $3,226. This taxpayer would, therefore, have no additional payments to make in September and December 1943, and would later receive either a credit or a refund amounting to at least $1,074. It will be seen that this relief provision has reduced this taxpayer's 1942 tax liability from $6,452 to $2,152, a reduction of $4,300.

If this serviceman had a tax for 1943 of $746, his tax for 1943 would be less than the tax for the year 1942. Accordingly, the 1942 tax will be abated and the 1943 tax will be increased by the sum of (1) the 1942 carry-over tax of $1,406, and (2) 25 percent of the 1943 tax, or $186.50. His total 1943 tax will, therefore, amount to $2,338.50 as shown by the following computation:

(1) 1942 tax	$6,452.00
(2) 1943 tax	746.00
(3) Excess of 1942 tax over 1943 tax	5,706.00
(4) Increase in 1942 tax due to earned income	4,300.00
(5) Amount of 1942 tax to be added to 1943 tax (3) minus (4)	1,406.00
(6) 25 percent of 1943 tax	186.50
(7) Total 1943 tax (2) plus (5) plus (6)	2,338.50

Mr. President, a table, which I asked to have inserted in the RECORD at this point illustrates, for specific cases, the special tax relief accorded members of the armed forces as the result of the exclusion of $1,500 from gross income, and the relief from the antiwindfall provision which requires payment of tax on the higher year, 1942 or 1943. I also ask that the explanatory statement attached to the table be printed.

There being no objection the table and explanatory statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Examples illustrating special treatment accorded members of armed forces (special exclusion and relief from antiwindfall provision) under bill agreed to by conferees on May 27, 1943

[MARRIED PERSON—NO DEPENDENTS]

Type of taxpayer	Gross income [1]		Tax liability under existing law		Amount forgiven	Amount not forgiven	Total current burden [2]	
	1942	1943	1942	1943 [2]			1943	1944 or 1945 [3]
Civilian	$2,500	$600	$186.00			$186.00	$186.00	
Soldier [4]	2,500	600	186.00		$186.00			
Do.[5]	2,500	600	186.00		186.00			
Civilian	5,000	600	639.00			639.00	639.00	
Soldier [4]	5,000	600	639.00		639.00			
Do.[5]	5,000	600	639.00		639.00			
Civilian	5,000	3,200	639.00	$430.72	323.04	746.68	639.00	$692.84
Soldier [4]	5,000	3,200	639.00	107.32	612.17	134.15	107.32	120.74
Do [5]	5,000	3,200	639.00	430.72	531.32	538.40	430.72	161.16
Civilian	10,000	3,200	1,826.00	430.72	323.04	1,933.68	1,826.00	484.56
Soldier [4]	10,000	3,200	1,826.00	107.32	1,799.17	134.15	107.32	120.74
Do [5]	10,000	3,200	1,826.00	430.72	1,718.32	538.40	430.72	161.16
Civilian	20,000	4,000	5,448.00	615.20	461.40	5,601.80	5,448.00	692.10
Soldier [4]	20,000	4,000	5,448.00	279.80	5,378.05	349.75	279.80	314.78
Do.[5]	20,000	4,000	5,448.00	615.20	5,294.20	769.00	615.20	356.70
Civilian	1,800	3,200	70.08	430.72	52.56	448.24	430.72	439.48
Soldier [4]	1,800	3,200	70.08	107.32	52.56	124.84	107.32	116.08
Do.[5]	1,800	3,200	70.08	430.72	52.56	448.24	430.72	116.08

[1] In the case of soldiers, the 1943 gross income shown is before special exclusion; maximum earned income assumed
[2] Includes gross Victory tax.
[3] Assumes income remains unchanged and payment for second half of additional 25 percent is extended.
[4] Assumes soldier entered armed forces Jan. 1, 1943 ($1,500 exclusion applies to 1943 income).
[5] Assumes soldier entered armed forces Dec. 31, 1943 ($1,500 exclusion does not apply to 1943 income).

NOTE.—In computing tax liability deductions are assumed to be 10 percent of gross income.

Staff of Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, May 31, 1943.

Explanation of table: The tax liability under existing law, the amount forgiven, the amount not forgiven, and the total current burden is shown in this table for civilians, for soldiers who entered the armed forces on January 1, 1943, and therefore, would receive the benefit of the $1,500 exclusion with respect to 1943 income, and for soldiers who entered the armed forces on December 31, 1943, and therefore would not receive the benefit of the $1,500 exclusion with respect to 1943 income. It is assumed the person is married and has no dependents.

It will be noted that where the gross income is $50 a month in 1943, or $600 for the year, resulting in no 1943 tax liability for either civilian or soldier, and the 1942 income was high enough to result in some tax liability, the civilian in effect is forgiven nothing, and must pay his 1942 tax in full in 1943, while the soldier is forgiven his entire 1942 tax and is required to pay nothing in 1943, or in subsequent years so long as he is in active service in the war and his income remains unchanged.

In the case of gross incomes of $5,000 in 1942 and $3,200 in 1943, a civilian would be forgiven $323.04, would be required to pay $639 in 1943, and $692.84 in 1944 and 1945, if his income remained unchanged. A soldier who entered the armed forces January 1, 1943, and who had the same gross incomes as the civilian would be forgiven $612.17, would be required to pay only $107.32 in 1943 and $120.74 in 1944 and 1945. A soldier who entered the armed services on December 31, 1943, and who had the same gross incomes would be forgiven $531.32, would be required to pay $430.72 in 1943 and $161.16 in 1944 and 1945.

In the case of gross incomes of $10,000 in 1942, and $3,200 in 1943, the soldier who entered the armed forces on January 1, 1943, would be forgiven $1,476.13 more than the civilian, and the soldier who entered the armed forces on December 31, 1943, would be forgiven $1,395.28 more than the civilian.

3. SPECIAL RELIEF FOR SERVICEMEN DYING IN THE SERVICE

Mr. GEORGE. Finally, Mr. President, under the conference bill certain special relief for servicemen dying in the service is provided and the provisions of the conference bill should be here noted.

Under the conference agreement, any individual who dies on or after December 7, 1941, while in the active service as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, or of the United Nations, and prior to the termination of the present war, is relieved of any income tax (including interest, additions to the tax, and additional amounts) which were unpaid at the date of his death. If such unpaid amounts are collected after the date of his death, they will be refunded. This provision is designed to protect the widow and other survivors of a deceased serviceman from being forced to deplete the estate of the deceased serviceman by income taxes which he owed at the time of his death. It was thought that since the serviceman had given his life for his country, his widow or other survivors should not be subjected to the payment of income tax which the serviceman owed at the time of his death. This provision is less complicated than the Senate provision under which the relief was limited to earned income of not more than $14,000 and to taxes which in general were due after the person entered the service. We were forced to yield in favor of the House provision, but the conference extended this relief to a person dying in the active armed service of any other of the United Nations.

REVENUE EFFECTS

Mr. President, the immediate effect of the conference bill will be to increase the Federal individual income-tax revenue in the fiscal year 1944 by about $3,014,000,000, or to $16,014,000,000. It makes the transition tc a system of current payment by discharging approximately $6,511,000,000, which is equivalent to about 66 percent of the 1942 income-tax liability of individuals. It reduces taxes about $759,000,000 through the special treatment accorded the armed forces. The net effect, therefore, is to carry over to be collected in 1943 and subsequent years about $2,545,000,000, as compared with the 1942 liability of $9,815,000,000. The bill agreed to in conference will bring in during the fiscal year 1944 about $2,991,000,000 more revenue than the House bill and about $1,102,000,000 more than the Senate bill. In addition, the new system of collection will increase the revenues by reaching more completely the income subject to tax not reached under the existing method of collection. There are many other benefits, both to the Government and the taxpayers, which cannot be evaluated in terms of dollars and cents. The effect on the revenues is shown by the table which I ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative amounts of tax liability canceled, not canceled, and due in the fiscal year 1944, under the conference agreement, the Senate bill, the House bill, and present law

[In millions of dollars]

Item	Conference agreement	Senate bill	House bill	Present law	Increase (+) or decrease (−) conference agreement over—		
					Senate bill	House bill	Present law
Tax liability canceled:							
Amount	6,511	8,515	7,602		−2,004	−1,091	+6,511
Percentage of 1942 liability	66.3	86.8	77.5		−20.5	−11.2	+66.3
Tax liability not canceled:							
Amount	3,204	1,300	2,213	9,815	+2,004	+1,091	−6,511
Percentage of 1942 liability	33.7	13.2	22.5	100.0	+20.5	+11.2	−66.3
Tax liability due in fiscal year 1944	16,014	14,912	13,023	13,000	+1,102	+2,991	+3,014

Source: Staff of Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, June 1, 1943.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, that is all I have to say with reference to the conference report, and when the examples and tables inserted in the RECORD are examined, I think most practical questions arising can be very readily answered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator has made a very excellent analysis of the bill, and I think most of us who have been following the legislation have

a pretty clear understanding of what the conference report proposes to do. I have one question, however, on which I am not entirely clear. Under the second windfall provision a recovery is to be made of taxes paid by persons receiving very large incomes due to the war, but in the provision was any leeway given, or any relief afforded, to persons who happened to have very large incomes in 1942 not due to the war or to war profits?

I am inquiring because I have just received two telegrams, and one of them, from a trust officer of one of the large Denver banks, presents this question:

DENVER, COLO., *June 2, 1943.*
Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Have been attempting to apply proposed Current Tax Payment Act of 1943 to specific case of the beneficiary of a large trust created by will in 1942. The beneficiary will receive an estimated one-hundred-and-sixty-odd-thousand dollars of fully taxable income during 1943, and it appears that her total Federal taxes payable from that income, including normal tax, surtax, unforgiven portion of 1942 tax, windfall tax, and Victory tax, will aggregate slightly more than her total income from the trust during 1943. The inequity seems to lie in the large windfall tax inasmuch as the trust beneficiary had only nominal income during the base years. The income involved is not in any way connected with war profits, and the beneficiary is without sufficient capital funds with which to pay deficiency and pay expenses until income for future years is received.

Was any provision made for such a condition?

Mr. GEORGE. If the income was received in 1943, I assume the tax for that year was higher than the tax for 1942. In that case the second windfall tax will only apply to the year 1942, and only to that year if in excess of the income for the normal year plus $20,000. So far as the second windfall is concerned the conference agreement permits the taxpayer to take the highest income he received in 1937, 1938, 1939, or 1940, and increase that income by $20,000. Then the unabated 1942 tax which results under the second windfall is payable in four annual installments, beginning in March 1945. It is payable in four installments—that is, on March 15, 1945, March 15, 1946, March 15, 1947, and March 15, 1948. I do not, therefore, believe that this windfall provision is as harsh on the taxpayer described in the telegram as might appear at first blush.

Under the pay-as-you-go system, the taxpayer will estimate his 1943 tax and pay the estimated tax in 1943. Therefore, any part of his 1942 tax which he is required to carry over into subsequent years will not be required to be paid until after 1943.

It was recognized that in most cases the $20,000 income, plus the highest earnings of the taxpayer in either one of his 4 base years, would fairly well protect him against the windfall provision where his income had not gone up on account of war conditions or war profits. It was not the desire of the conferees fully to abate the tax liability of those who had profited as a result of war contracts. I know that is not the case mentioned in the telegram, and that case may be one of hardship, but ordinary taxpayers who find themselves in such a position, by and large nearly all of them, with a few exceptions, will be fairly well protected by taking the highest earnings in any one of the 4 base period years and adding $20,000, calculating the liability on that total income, and comparing it with the tax for 1942 or 1943, whichever is the lesser year.

I think, however, I may say that, in my judgment, the greatest benefit we have given in hardship cases such as that the Senator has presented results from the spread of the windfall recoupment over 4 years.

I may say now to the Senator and to the Senate that, in my judgment, in the case of individuals who have not profited from the war there may be undue hardship for which we will have to provide some form of relief. We were faced with a similar situation under the excess-profits tax as applied to corporations, and after the enactment of the law it had to be amended to provide for hardship cases. I think it very safe to say that in genuine hardship cases, such as that referred to, the Congress would have ample opportunity to work out relief provisions. But there is no special relief provision in the conference report to fit a case such as that presented by the Senator from Colorado if real hardship results.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator from Colorado permit me to ask a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to say a word further, and then I shall be glad to take my seat.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Georgia for his explanation of the relief provisions which are offered by the conference report and for the hope he has so well expressed that relief may be given in the future in such a hardship case as I have just described.

In the telegram it was suggested that an amendment be offered to the conference report, which, of course, is not parliamentarily possible. We have to accept the report as it is or reject it as it is, and there is no chance to make any corrections in the provisions of the conference report at this time. So the hope for relief in the future that is expressed by the able Senator from Georgia is very much appreciated.

Mr. GEORGE. I am reasonably sure that Congress itself would desire to take care of proper cases. That is the only consolation I can offer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree entirely with what the Senator from Georgia has said, but I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether it is not true that the provisions as to the second windfall, as contained in the conference report, are very much more liberal as to individual taxpayers than the provisions of the bill as reported from the Senate Finance Committee to the Senate——

Mr. GEORGE. And as it passed the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And specifically those written by the Senator from Colorado himself. The Senator from Georgia will recall that the original provision was defeated by a tie vote, and then the Senator from Colorado had the opportunity to put in a couple of amendments, which he did, which marshaled enough votes to put over the second windfall tax in the Senate Finance Committee. Does the Senator from Georgia have the slightest doubt that the provisions of the conference report are very much more liberal as to individual taxpayers than the provisions of the bill as reported by the Senate Finance Committee to the Senate, which were written essentially by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] himself?

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to say, Mr. President, that the second windfall provision in the conference report is more liberal to the individual income taxpayer who is affected by it than the bill which was approved by the Senate Finance Committee and passed by the Senate. Under the windfall provision of the Senate bill approximately $400,000,000 would have been recouped from individual income taxpayers, whereas under the conference report $200,000,000 will be recouped. But I think I should say in justice to the Senator from Colorado, and I am sure the Senator from Missouri will approve what I am about to say, that the proposals made by the Senator from Colorado in the Senate Finance Committee greatly helped the windfall provisions in the bill, as we had it under consideration at the time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield I will say that I am very happy to agree to that statement. I think the Senator from Colorado contributed greatly to agreement in the Finance Committee; as a matter of fact I know he did, because the Finance Committee reversed itself——

Mr. GEORGE. That is true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On the basis of two of his suggestions. This is a very late day for the Senator from Colorado to be coming forward and objecting to the second windfall provision, because it was really much more greatly modified than the provision which he himself originally presented.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not understand the Senator from Colorado to be objecting. He was simply bringing to our attention a proposition which was not presented before we had concluded the conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think it is only fair to say, and I hope the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] will agree with my statement, that I was not the author of the second windfall provision, to the contrary I was bitterly opposed to it, but when I could not defeat

it I did offer two amendments which greatly modified it, and afforded some relief under it. I was not entirely satisfied with the relief afforded by my amendments; I should have liked to go much further, but in legislation we have to do the very best we can. The senior Senator from Colorado did the best he could to eliminate the second windfall provision. Had I thought at the time of the special hardship situation which is disclosed by the telegram which I have just read certainly I would have offered some amendments dealing with that particular point. But what we were trying to do in the committee was to correct excessive war profits which might escape under the abatement of 1 year's taxes. The Senator from Missouri will recall that I voted against the Carlson-Ruml bill for the reason it contained this very second windfall provision.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am very glad to approve all that the Senator from Colorado has said, because he has given a faithful and detailed statement of his activities, as I recall them, in regard to the second windfall provision of the measure.

Mr. President, I believe I have nothing further to submit.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, on the vote on the conference report I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, from the minority side of the conference I wish to make a brief statement regarding the general situation, inasmuch as the minority conferees have joined in the report, having done so chiefly for the sake of unity in the war effort, a unity which the administration always demands, but too frequently neglects to encourage or does not deserve.

The conference was the most difficult in which I have ever participated in all my 15 years in the Senate. Seemingly insurmountable barriers confronted us for many days, and only a dogged determination to serve the public interest by preventing a collapse of the conference kept it alive. The public interest required an agreement. Our ultimate choice—as it is the Senate's—was this agreement or nothing.

In this connection I give my full measure of praise to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and to the genuinely brave statesmanship, in the last analysis, of the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. But I should also like to have the record show—particularly to those voluble critics who automatically charge a political taint against Republican attitude—that an agreement would have been impossible without Republican cooperation.

From start to finish, except upon an inconsequentially few occasions, the seven Senate conferees almost invariably voted as a unit, without regard to partisan lines, seeking only the best national welfare under these difficult circumstances. I hope this may be some evidence of good faith to the country behind the compromise which is now presented.

It is needless to say that the result is far from satisfactory to any of us—least of all to the minority, which has faithfully supported the Carlson-Ruml plan ever since the proposed legislation was initiated. We wanted to make all possible American taxpayers current in their tax liabilities with least possible delay, treating all alike without discrimination. We confronted majority conferees from the House who really wanted no abatement at all. We also confronted an adverse situation which was seriously and almost fatally complicated by the attitude of an obdurate Treasury and by the recent inflammatory letter from the President. Such a situation manifestly was not one of easy composition.

In this situation, fraught with great danger to the war effort, if the Congress should fail to function in this critical, fiscal need, I wish to say to my minority colleagues that their spokesmen in the conference joined with their majority Senate conferees, and with the House minority conferees and one House majority conferee, in making the pending recommendation—believing it to be the best available answer to the current problem.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very much interested in the very dispassionate statement being made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. Does not the Senator think it ought to be stated at this point that there was not one single member of the conference, from either the House or the Senate, as between the Houses, or as between the Democratic and Republican Parties, who was in favor of the bill as it passed the House of Representatives, or who was willing to take the responsibility for it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Missouri is entirely correct. He is historically accurate as to that particular issue.

I wish further to say to my minority colleagues to whom I as one of the conferees am really reporting, that we joined in holding the line for 5 torrid days against a drive which would have entirely emasculated the Senate bill and, in my view, would have cheated the legitimate hopes of a great majority of the American people. The final compromise, now here pending, is a combination of the 75-percent abatement plan originally presented by the able Senator from Georgia, plus refinements proposed by our minority, namely, the total elimination from the remaining 25 percent of pyramiding taxes in 1944 and 1945 for some 4,000,000 taxpayers in the lowest brackets.

The conference report will put probably 90 percent of all taxpayers on a current basis at once, and 100 percent within 2 years. It will make tax collection at the source immediately possible—a device, whether we like it or not, which is indispensable to the war effort. It will substantially increase the Federal tax revenue for 1943, 1944, and 1945. It probably will stabilize individual income taxes for the next 2 years. It will strongly help in the vital battle against inflation. Meanwhile, it will save Congress and the country from the spectacle of democracy's impotence in a crisis.

Mr. President, with great respect for the good conscience of many Members of Congress who oppose this report, nevertheless I observe that it is always pleasant and comfortable to vote against a tax bill—and particularly a war bill such as this. But duty is frequently unpleasant and uncomfortable. This bill will further burden the purse and the patience of our people. It will further load down American employers with tax-collection tasks for their Government, which ought to reciprocate by lightening the load in other directions. But it is all still a relatively small war price which we thus pay on the home front. I respectfully recommend this conference report to my minority colleagues, regardless of its unsatisfactory features. And to the President and the Treasury I respectfully recommend a greater willingness in the future to play team ball with the Congress in meeting our further fiscal emergencies.

In his first public utterance after becoming virtually Assistant President, the estimable Mr. Byrnes said on Monday night that he would do all in his power to bring about the same coordination of efforts among the civilians in governmental agencies that exists on the military fronts. I respectfully suggest to him that there is tremendous opportunity for him to exercise this saving grace when he speaks to the White House and the Treasury regarding their future congressional relationships in respect to further fiscal crises.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have no desire whatever in the brief time I shall occupy the floor this afternoon to speak for the majority or for the minority in connection with the presentation of the conference report.

I joined with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] in being the first congressional sponsors of the principle of pay-as-you-earn taxation. As a subcommittee, we offered that report to the Finance Committee nearly a year ago; and in the full Finance Committee we obtained for the report only our own votes.

Since that time much water has passed over the dam, much expression of public opinion has been had, much changement of alignment has been made. Unfortunately, as I have said before on this floor, in the House of Representatives the matter had become one of partisan debate and partisan consideration. I think that is one of the most unfortunate things which ever has happened in the tax history of the United States.

In this body, fortunately, Mr. President, there never has been any partisan alinement on the question of pay-as-you-go, pay-as-you-earn, collection at the source. When the matter was considered in the Finance Committee a few weeks ago, as many Democrats voted for the motion which I made to report the so-called Ruml plan, the modified Ruml plan, as Democrats voted against it.

That matter was considered in this body, Mr. President, and was fully con-

sidered; and the plan was adopted in the Senate bill by a vote of 49 to 30, as I now recall.

A conference committee was appointed at the instance of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. That committee certainly adequately represented the view of the Senate as to devotion to the Senate bill. The committee represented two Members of the Senate who had voted against the Senate bill, the Senator from Georgia, himself, and the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. It included five other Senators who not only had voted for the Senate bill, but who were devoted in principle to it.

Between the time when the bill was passed by the Senate and the time when the motion to concur in the Senate amendment was voted on in the House, the President of the United States saw fit to express his views on that question and, in effect, to announce his intention to veto that bill. I think the letter of the President undoubtedly was decisive in the vote of the House of Representatives as to concurrence in the Senate amendment.

Mr. President, I am not one of those who have criticized the President or who now want to criticize him for his timely expression of his position on a measure which might be presented to him for signature. I cannot imagine anything which would be less conducive to national unity and to common purpose than for the Congress of the United States solemnly to pass a bill which the President already knew in advance he would be forced to veto.

Therefore, Mr. President, when we started the conference the Senate conferees commenced it with the proposition in mind that it would be necessary for us to compromise; because there was not a single member of the conference committee, either on the part of the House or on the part of the Senate, who would seriously assert that it would be conducive to national unity for the Congress to pass a bill which the President would be forced to veto.

The Senate conferees, on the first day of the conference, in view of the President's letter, very frankly came down to essentially the position which is involved in the final conference report; and I am certain that I speak for the Senator from Massachusetts as well as for myself and for the Senator from Michigan and for the other minority Members when I say that when we stated that proposition we were stating the irreducible minimum to which we would be willing to go.

We had several days of the most tortuous conferences, which wore on all of us, starting early in the morning and lasting until late in the afternoon. There were many times when it was apparent to most of us on the conference committee that there was no possibility of agreement, and the suggestion repeatedly was made that the conference be broken up in disagreement. But always the suggestion was made, Mr. President, that there were two great hazards that we had to avoid. One was adopting a conference report which we knew the President would feel compelled to veto. The other was breaking up the conference and conveying to the people of the United States the impression that the Congress was unable to legislate.

There were honest convictions on both sides of the conference, both with regard to the Senate position and the House position, and with regard to the Republican position and the Democratic position. I say, Mr. President, as my deliberate opinion as one of the first sponsors of the 100-percent cancelation of taxes, the skip-a-year plan, the Ruml plan of taxation, or whatever one may choose to call it, that I believe that the compromise conference report brought in by the Senate and House conferees is the very best proposition that could possibly have been agreed upon in order to bring about legislation, and that that is very much better than would be a complete failure of legislation.

No one questioned at any turn of the road the desirability and necessity of having collection at the source and making the Nation current with its taxes. The only dispute between us at any stage was as to how much additional taxes, in the way of double taxation, the individual taxpayer could possibly stand in order to achieve a result favorable to himself and favorable to the Treasury, making him current with his taxes. The conference report represents the ultimate maximum on the one side and the ultimate minimum on the other side. I believe that the Senate should follow the example of the House and adopt the conference report by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as one of the Senate conferees on the tax bill, I wish to say that I have never known a group of men who labored more diligently and cooperatively to reach a conclusion on one of the most difficult and controversial subjects that has ever been presented to a congressional conference.

I especially wish to pay tribute to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and to Mr. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, for their patience and leadership in the final report, which was adopted by the conferees by a vote of 11 to 3.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to add a word to what the Senator has said. I intended to say it, but I was speaking extemporaneously, and did not mention the services of the chairman of the Finance Comittee and the chairman of the House Ways and Means Commiteee. They are certainly entitled to all credit for this agreement.

Mr. BYRD. I wish to say, too, that the Republican members of the conference showed a most cooperative spirit in the effort to reach an agreement.

If the conference had been unable to reach an agreement, I believe that the average citizen of this country would have reached the conclusion that Congress was unable to function and to make a final decision on a question which has created perhaps as much interest on the part of the average citizen as any domestic question that has been presented to the Congress in many years.

It is true, I think, that the agreement reached did not fully meet the views of any single conferee; but I am of the firm conviction that it was much wiser to reach an agreement, even though some concessions had to be made by every conferee in the effort to harmonize the differences that existed.

In view of the mutual advantages of a pay-as-you-earn system of taxation, both to the Government and to the individual taxpayer, it was my opinion the taxpayer and the Government should each make a suitable contribution to attain a tax policy which would be beneficial to both.

I was hopeful that some agreement could be reached with an abatement of between 50 and 60 percent, with collection of the balance in a 2-year period, and provision for a longer period in special hardship cases, but this could not be agreed upon.

What is definitely accomplished by the conference report is, first, the collection of a withholding tax effective July 1 next, of not exceeding 20 percent on wages and salaries, with certain exemptions; and, second, it has accomplished the objective of placing the entire income tax system as affecting individuals on a pay-as-you-go basis on March 15, 1945.

It is essential, in my opinion, that a withholding tax at the source be instituted at the earliest possible time, and that very great advantages will accrue from a complete pay-as-you-go tax system such as is made effective on March 15, 1945, by the conference report.

We may as well face frankly the fact that for years, and perhaps for generations to come, this country must pay exceedingly heavy and burdensome taxes. Before our Budget is balanced, we shall have a colossal debt, which may exceed $300,000,000,000, and is not likely to be less. The servicing and gradual payment of this debt, combined with the essential expenditures of Government, will tax to the utmost the resources of all our citizens. Under these conditions, it is obviously very beneficial to bring tax collections as close as possible to the period during which the money was earned on which income taxes must be paid. Under the present system, the taxpayer begins to earn an income on January 1 of one year, but he does not pay his final tax on such earnings until December 15 of the following year. In other words, he does not pay finally until 23½ months later. To shorten this period undoubtedly will make more flexible the tax collection system with mutual benefits both to the Government and to the taxpayer.

For this reason, Mr. President, and because I thought that it was important to reach an agreement, after advocating as strongly as I could the principles I supported in the Senate debate on the tax measure reported by the Senate Finance Committee, I signed the conference report, and believe it would be for the best interests of the country that the report be adopted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement of the

reasons why I shall vote against the conference report.

I do not in anywise wish anything I may say or may not say to be taken as a criticism of the Senate conferees. Obviously, the report upon which they agreed was well within their power, and I have no doubt that they labored arduously and long in order to arrive at any agreement whatever.

I have already set forth rather fully my reasons for being unalterably opposed to the bill as it passed the Senate on May 14. I shall not now repeat the statement of those reasons; but, in my opinion, the basic arguments against the bill as it passed the Senate lie against the conference report.

As I see it, we cannot escape the fact that more than $6,000,000,000 of taxes are being abated, forgiven, or canceled. We cannot escape the further fact, in my opinion, that the adoption of this report, with the 25-percent carry-over for the next 2 years, will in all probability create such a situation that the additional taxes, which every person recognizes must be levied if we are to avoid uncontrolled inflation, will have to be fried out of the hides of the people of this country who are in the lower income group. To my mind that will be a tragic consequence of the adoption of this report.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, as has been indicated by previous speakers, the task assigned to the conferees was most troublesome and confusing. We were confronted in the conference room with the atmosphere which had been developed in the House by reason of 3 long months of agitation and discussion of various ways and methods to establish the pay-as-you-go tax system. That atmosphere entered into the conference room, and we were confronted with two elements. The Republican conferees on the part of the House were apparently willing to go before the country in the next election—assuming, of course, a disagreement in the conference—on the issue of the pay-as-you-go tax plan. The Democratic conferees on the part of the House were disposed to preserve the law as it was, maintain the present statutes, and fight out the issue of forgiveness, as well as the extent of forgiveness, in connection with the adoption of a pay-as-you-go tax plan.

Fortunately the Republican members of the conference on the part of the Senate brought into the deliberations a spirit of cooperation, compromise, and an earnest and sincere desire to reach an agreement.

I do not wish to diminish the credit which should be accorded to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] or the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], but perhaps more than any other man the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] led the way toward reaching an agreement. He abandoned all thought of keeping alive a political issue upon this question, and I think it was his unselfish leadership which led his party colleagues on the part of the House to change their attitude and join in an earnest and sincere desire to reach a united conference report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, the Senator knows—and it will bear out what he has just said—that it was a noteworthy fact that in nearly all the votes which were taken in the conference the House conferees voted 4 to 3 one way or the other, while almost without exception the Senate conferees voted unanimously 7 to 0.

Mr. WALSH. That is true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I entirely agree with the Senator from Massachusetts in what he has said relative to the influence of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to emphasize that. If no other record is made of this controversy, I wish to pay special tribute to the spirit of tolerance, and the abandonment of any partisan consideration upon the part of the Senator from Michigan. His attitude was really inspiring.

I shall not take time to indicate how much we all are indebted to the gallant and able chairman of the Finance Committee for his leadership. That has already been referred to. As usual, he was patient, considerate, tolerant, and able in the presentation of his views.

However, there was one other member of the Committee of Conference to whom great credit is due, and that is the noble and able Representative from North Carolina, Mr. DOUGHTON, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. When the crisis came over whether we should disagree and have no report, or bring a report back to Congress, he stood alone among his conferees of his own political faith and decided that it would be unfortunate for the Congress to confess to the country its inability to pass a tax bill at this time. His attitude was most commendable, and was taken under circumstances which impressed every member of the conference. The depth of feeling and sincere racking of his conscience to reach a decision deeply impressed every one of us.

I do not wish to take up the time of the Senate, but there are some facts which I should like to have made a matter of record in connection with the closing of this discussion, and I shall briefly present some views which I think should be made a matter of record in connection with this controversy.

Mr. President, acceptance by the House and Senate of the conferees' report may be taken for granted, and if the President interposes no veto and the bill becomes law, it will constitute a big forward step in dealing with the immensely complex tax problem which confronts our country, or any country, in time of war. The change over to the pay-as-you-go basis of tax collections will yield larger revenues to the Treasury this year than would otherwise have been the case, and the pay-roll withholding tax, starting July 1, will supply a partial check on the inflationary spiral arising from an increasing supply of money and a diminishing supply of goods. The settlement of the present tax controversy and the enactment of the present bill will clear the path for early consideration by Congress of the bill to raise additional revenues, and to impose additional taxes in various categories to help meet the prodigious needs of the Treasury for funds.

Unfortunately, in dealing with this question of putting the taxpayers of the country on a current basis, there has been a great deal of misrepresentation, appeals to great prejudices, and much sparring for political advantage. It has not been confined to one party, either. The issue has been distorted and the advantages to the Government, as well as to the country, of modernizing our tax system and putting it on a sound, business basis, have been obscured. The method of paying income taxes 1 year after the income was received was not particularly burdensome to the taxpayers, nor prejudicial to the Treasury, so long as the number of income taxpayers was comparatively small, their incomes constant, and the rates relatively moderate. The big increase in the number of income taxpayers arising both by reason of the broadening of the tax base effectuated in the 1943 tax bill, as well as by increased earnings, the higher income-tax rates now imposed, and the wide fluctuations in tax liability from year to year resulting from war conditions, all combined to create the need and Nation-wide demand for revision in the methods of tax assessment and tax collection.

The adoption of the plan to pay taxes at the time and in the year when incomes are earned is of decided benefit to the Treasury.

In my opinion, it is of more benefit to the Treasurer than to anyone else. It means that the Treasury will be able to collect future taxes more easily and in larger volume. It is also a convenience to all taxpayers, large and small. The contention that this change over to a pay-as-you-earn plan is of particular benefit to taxpayers in the high income brackets is not true. It is no hardship on wealthy taxpayers to pay their taxes a year or 2 years after receipt of income on which they are levied. The wealthy, unlike the ordinary wage earner and white collar worker, have accumulated funds out of which to pay their income taxes as well as enjoy the opportunity to borrow on their capital, if that be necessary.

Another misrepresentation indulged in by the opponents of the pay-as-you-earn tax plan is that taxpayers are forgiven all or a part of the taxes of 1 year by the proposed change. This in theory may be urged, but as a reality every taxpayer will pay taxes—increased taxes—this year and every year that he lives in the same way that he has paid taxes in the past. Furthermore, the compromise pay-as-you-go tax plan that the conferees have agreed upon will place in the Public Treasury this year and in every year in which incomes continues to increase, more money than any other plan proposed. This would be true even if the present tax system were continued. There is no current financial loss to the Government by the new plan.

I have favored from the very outset the placing of all taxpayers on a current tax-paying basis without discrimination.

This would compel all taxpayers to pay the taxes levied under the tax law of last year in full, and leave the way open and free to increase future taxes on a graduated scale, which has become the fixed policy on the ability-to-pay theory.

Those who preferred to continue the present obsolete tax system were unwilling to change to the new system without imposing what I call penalties for this privilege. The result was that various proposals were made arranging for a 50-percent carry-over to be added to the 1943 taxes. The imposing of as high a carry-over tax as 50 percent would bankrupt many taxpayers, and would amount, in many instances, to what has never yet been imposed in any tax law, namely, a tax on taxpayers' capital.

It became apparent that there was a real contest between those who believed in adopting the new system without any carry-over tax and the extremists, who wanted to levy excessive carry-over taxes. Therefore, a compromise had to be reached or the establishment of a pay-as-you-go plan abandoned.

The Senate conferees brought to the conference a bill which had passed the Senate almost 2 to 1, with no carry-over taxes. The Senate conferees, as a compromise, suggested a carry-over tax of 25 percent of the 1942 tax liabilities, computed at the 1942 rates, to be paid in 1944 and 1945 in 2 installments of 12½ percent each year, but with a provision that all taxpayers whose taxes were less than $50 would be excepted from this carry-over tax. This compromise, after a deadlock of several days, was finally accepted by 11 of the 14 conferees.

The conference report, Mr. President, should be adopted, and the controversy over this question ended.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion for a few moments?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Very well, I withhold the point of no quorum.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I should like to emphasize what has been said by members of the conference committee on the part of the Senate who have spoken on the conference report, and particularly to stress the earnest, devoted and patriotic service rendered by every member of the conference committee.

I may say, Mr. President, that the minority conferees of the conference committee on the part of the Senate were most helpful in working out the very best possible bill, as has been said, that could be written under all the circumstances.

I wish to pay my especial respects to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], as well as all the Democratic members of the conference committee representing the Senate.

I particularly wish to endorse all that has been said with reference to the highly courageous act of the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable R. L. DOUGHTON, in making possible this bill, for finally he himself went all the way in order to make possible an agreement. Even that act would have been unavailing however, had it not been for the cooperative spirit of the minority members of the House conference committee, acting in conjunction with the Senate conferees, and especially the minority members of the Senate conference committee.

I wish, Mr. President, in this connection also to say that I appreciate the differences of point of view which have arisen over this important question and over the other important question which has today been disposed of by a vote of this body, to wit, the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I fully understand that there are deep convictions held by Senators on both sides of the aisle. I am very happy to think that in the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act there has not been a solid line-up along political lines, but many Senators on both sides have entertained the view that, for one reason or another, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act seemed to them to be essential as a legislative measure.

I wish specifically to acknowledge my debt of gratitude to the distinguished leader of the minority, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], who has cooperated at all times, although opposed to the Trade Agreements Act, in securing final votes upon all issues that arose during the consideration of the joint resolution.

I wish also to express my appreciation, Mr. President, to all members of the Senate who have likewise cooperated in an effort to bring to a speedy conclusion all the issues which honestly arose and existed upon the particular joint resolution.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I renew my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Pepper
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barbour	Hawkes	Russell
Bilbo	Hayden	Scrugham
Bone	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Lodge	Tobey
Byrd	Lucas	Truman
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wallgren
Connally	Mead	Walsh
Danaher	Millikin	White
Davis	Moore	Wiley
Downey	Murray	Willis
Eastland	Nye	Wilson
Ellender	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PEPPER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote "yea." Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] are necessarily absent. All these Senators would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. CHANDLER. My colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], is temporarily absent from the Senate because of illness. I am informed that if he were present he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—62

Aiken	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Andrews	George	Reed
Austin	Gerry	Revercomb
Bailey	Gillette	Reynolds
Ball	Guffey	Scrugham
Bankhead	Gurney	Shipstead
Barbour	Hatch	Smith
Brewster	Hawkes	Stewart
Brooks	Holman	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Tobey
Bushfield	Lodge	Truman
Butler	Lucas	Tunnell
Byrd	McCarran	Tydings
Capper	McNary	Vandenberg
Caraway	Maloney	Van Nuys
Chandler	Millikin	Walsh
Chavez	Moore	White
Clark, Idaho	Nye	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	O'Mahoney	Willis
Danaher	Overton	Wilson
Davis	Pepper	

NAYS—19

Bilbo	Hill	O'Daniel
Bone	La Follette	Russell
Connally	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Wagner
Eastland	McKellar	Wallgren
Ellender	Maybank	
Hayden	Mead	

NOT VOTING—15

Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Bridges	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Glass	Murdock	Wheeler
Green	Murray	Wherry

So the conference report was agreed to.

PERMISSION TO INTRODUCE AND DISCUSS A BILL

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I shall have to be away for several days after tomorrow. I request unanimous consent that at the beginning of the session tomorrow I may introduce a bill and discuss it or make an explanatory statement, which will take not more than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? None is heard, and it is so ordered.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by me with respect to the pending coal strike, and I request that following my statement there be printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Who's Boss?" appearing in the Washington Post of June 2, 1943.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in order that there shall not be any misunderstanding with respect to the Senator's request, and before unanimous consent is given, I desire to make it clear that I have no objection to having the Senator's statement printed in the body of the RECORD, provided it does not appear in RECORD type, but is printed in such a way as to show that it is a statement.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, that was my understanding. I used the word "statement"—a statement coming from the Senator from Virginia, to be inserted in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thought the Senator meant that; but yesterday there was a slight misunderstanding with respect to a request by another Senator, and I do not want the previous situation to recur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD, OF VIRGINIA

Who is the boss of the United States of America? Is it John Lewis or President Roosevelt? Millions of Americans are asking this question.

On May 2 President Roosevelt delivered a solemn warning to the Nation calling for the resumption of coal mining and the stoppage of all strikes in defense industries. His words were brave and the principles he enunciated were of the highest patriotism. Using his powers as Commander in Chief, he took over the mines. The American flag was hoisted. He appointed Secretary Ickes to take charge. The American people then believed that at last the administration intended to come to grips with John L. Lewis. Twice before John L. Lewis had won victories over the administration. The average citizen said that Harold L. Ickes was a "tough guy" and he would tell John Lewis where to get off, but so far Mr. Ickes has spoken very softly and made rather humble requests of Mr. Lewis to resume the mining of coal.

The strongest condemnation Mr. Ickes has as yet made of Mr. Lewis was last night when he said, "The President of the United Mine Workers cannot escape the responsibility for the cessation of work today." Mr. Lewis was not even mentioned by name.

What hidden power has John L. Lewis so that he, and he alone, can defy the Government of the United States in an hour of the greatest peril this Nation has ever faced? Can anything be more destructive of the morale of those American boys who are fighting and dying on many foreign battlefields? Has the American flag which now flies over the coal mines of America lost its power and prestige?

We were told that no strike could occur against the United States Government. Mr. Ickes is operating the coal mines acting for the Government. The United States is the employer. Yet, today, in the third day of the strike, the Associated Press reports that 500,000 miners remain idle. Mr. Lewis has defied the War Labor Board. He has refused to appear before them or to negotiate directly with them. Piece by piece he is obtaining all that he has asked for. The actual awards have not been made—but concessions have been tendered him which indicate he will finally gain all that he has requested.

If Mr. Lewis can defy his Government and the American flag now and get by with it, what may happen when peace comes? Then America will go through the most difficult period of reconstruction of its American economy that has ever faced us. Then the seeds that are being sown today by the lack of courage and firmness on the part of the high Government officials may sprout to domestic chaos and strife. If Mr. Lewis can defy his Government in time of war, how can he be controlled in time of peace in the volcanic readjustment period following the war?

Congress has endeavored to pass antistrike legislation affecting those engaged in war industries. Just before Pearl Harbor the Smith bills were passed by the House of Representatives. Had these bills been enacted by the Senate and signed by the President, it is not likely the strikes would have occurred. This legislation was smothered in the Committee on Education and Labor on the direct request of the President and of Madam Perkins.

The Connally bill, on the point of passage in the Senate more than a year ago, was removed from the Senate calendar at the direct request of the President who said that the passage of the bill would be harmful to the war effort. It was passed a year later and is now before the House of Representatives.

I introduced legislation 60 days ago providing for "work or fight" of those striking in defense industries. Immediately the various departments of the Government opposed this legislation, saying that it would be harmful to national morale to require those to fight who have refused to work and produce materials for those who are fighting.

The winning of the war abroad will be delayed, with much greater loss of life unless we can control our domestic affairs at home. We cannot temporize any longer with this situation.

We must preserve at all costs constitutional government at home. We owe this to our sons who are fighting and dying on many foreign battlefields so that we may have this constitutional government.

[From the Washington Post of June 2, 1943]

WHO'S BOSS?

On May 2 the President in the most solemn address he has ever delivered to the Nation called for the resumption of coal mining. It had been stopped. The next day the miners trooped back to work. But they did not go back to work at the President's behest. They went back to work at the command of John L. Lewis. Twenty minutes before the President appeared in front of the microphone Lewis had waived the strike for 15 days. It was this order that the miners obeyed. They kept on mining coal when Mr. Lewis decreed a renewal of the truce, and they left the mines on Monday night in their entire strength when Mr. Lewis failed to renew the truce. There has thus been demonstrated what was unclear on May 3—that the miners look for guidance to Mr. Lewis and not to their President and Commander in Chief.

Why do the miners put the leader of their union ahead of their President? Why this extraordinary fealty to a man as if he is a god—to a man obsessed with a lust for personal power and a passion for vengeance against their President? Why should they seem so indifferent to the dire consequences of their action to their own kinsmen in uniform? Why should they endanger their own hearth and home in their country's struggle for survival? Why should honest and worthy Americans knowingly give aid and comfort to their enemies?

Surely it is not because of the force of their grievances. Those grievances are in a fair way to satisfaction. The President promised to improve the living conditions of the miners, and he has more than carried out his promise. Not only has food been made available up to the limit of the existing rations; supplementary rations have been authorized on the justifiable grounds that in virtue of their arduous occupation the miners need more than normal rations. Prices have been reduced where they have been above ceiling level. And the administration is asking Congress for authority to subsidize the reduction of ceiling prices on miners' necessities. Equal consideration has been given to the miners' wage demands. The War Labor Board's award, which was offered as the base for fresh bargaining between operators and miners, was extremely liberal, and met all legitimate grievances. Secretary Ickes ordered a 6-day week to come into operation immediately with time and a half for the sixth day. The miners even have the assurance that compensation for the sixth day will be paid when mechanical difficulties prevent work on the sixth day. Why, in view of this catalog, do the miners ignore the President and stop the production of coal?

The answer is that the miners are not free agents. In no organization on earth is there a more docile following than in that of the miners of America. It is not a question of gratitude only, though John L. Lewis has lifted the living standards of the miners as a result of the concessions he has won from the coal operators. The fact is that Lewis has the power of life and death over his miners. They are his creatures just as if they were the lieges of a feudal lord. The tragedy is that it was the President himself who delivered the miners into bondage to Mr. Lewis. This he did by setting up a special arbitration board 18 months ago to compel the nonunion miners to join Mr. Lewis' union. Now the livelihood of the miners is in the keeping of a man who owes no responsibility to anybody for his satrapy. There is no choice for the miners. He is their boss. The tolls of his tyranny over the miners are shown by the fact that the miners left their work not at his behest but because he had not given them permission to work beyond the truce. He can exert his will merely by failing to nod, equally by nodding. It is useless to rail at the miners till the Government saves them from this thralldom. The time has come to recommend legislation which will insure the democratic process in union management. The emendation of our labor laws providing for such changes as accountability for funds will be far more assurance to the miners of protection than a Presidential appeal to desert the leadership of this vengeful Pied Piper who now holds their lives and suffrages in the hollow of his hands.

At the same time the miners must be shown who is the real boss in this critical

situation. They have never properly understood. The spectacle of the repeated obeisances to Mr. Lewis has reinforced their fear of Boss Lewis. They have seen him flout Government tribunals. They have seen him walk like Agag as a law unto himself. They have seen him take even the President's measure. How can we expect the miners to stand up to him when the Government itself has been afraid? Accordingly the President must accompany his order to the miners to go back to work not only with an explanation of the true facts of the situation but also with a demonstration of the supremacy of Government. Less than that would make the Government contemptible in the eyes of the citizenry. Less than that would mean the degeneration of our democracy into a mobocracy. It must be made clear, specifically, that any aid to the strikers in a strike against the Government at war is enjoinable. If this is not possible under existing law, it can be done by passing the Connally bill, and the administration should at once declare that it is back of that measure. A holdup of coal is a terrible threat to the lives of our soldiers and to our survival as a Nation which must be countered by the full strength and majesty of this Government.

CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 575, to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate in the manner provided by the Constitution. I wish to say that in the event the bill shall be taken up I shall not press it until tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the motion now made is to proceed to the consideration of the confirmation bill, introduced by the Senator from Tennessee. I thought we were to proceed to the consideration of the lend-lease appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am moving to take the bill up, but shall not press it this afternoon, and tomorrow morning I shall ask permission temporarily to lay the bill aside and proceed with the lend-lease bill, which I hope may be passed in a few moments.

Mr. McNARY. If that procedure is followed, the able Senator from Tennessee then will have to obtain unanimous consent temporarily to lay aside the confirmation bill. Suppose consent were not granted.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it will be granted. That has been done in a hundred different cases in the last year or two. I anticipate no trouble about temporarily laying the bill aside, and I shall ask that that be done. I thought that while Senators were present this afternoon would be a good time to take the bill up. What I suggest is in accord with the usual practice.

Mr. McNARY. I am not disturbed by the situation, but it is customary to dispose of the appropriation bills before we undertake to legislate on bills on the calendar. I do not know why the procedure is somewhat reversed. Why does not the Senator move to take up the appropriation bill and dispose of that, and then take up the other bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. I wanted to have the confirmation bill taken up while the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] the acting majority leader, was present. I knew that he was thinking of leaving the city, and I did not want the bill taken up in his absence.

Mr. McNARY. If the Senator from Tennessee will lay aside his bill and take up the appropriation bill, as I am very anxious to get through with the appropriation bills, I shall have no objection to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. Is that understood?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee. If he is to bring up the lend-lease bill tomorrow, I wish, if he can, through the Committee on Appropriations, he would get an answer to a question I have so that it will be available tomorrow when we take up the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall undertake to do so as best I can.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The question is, Have any lend-lease agreements been made since the recent extension of the act; and if so, may they be produced for our consideration?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall certainly try to produce them.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I think there is about to be a misunderstanding concerning the question of taking up the bill for consideration. I am quite interested in the bill which the Senator from Tennessee has moved to take up. So far as I am personally concerned I am perfectly willing to have it taken up in the morning and go on with it to a conclusion. I am not willing to agree that I shall not object to unanimous consent.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, are we about to act on a unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). No. The question is on the motion made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to take up Senate bill 575.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me to make a very brief statement for the RECORD?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, for many days past I have been attempting to get the Senate to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 35, which was introduced by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the purpose of which is to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States. This measure received the unanimous approval of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, and I, as the Senator in charge of the bill, have been besieged by certain silver manufacturing interests of the country, by the Treasury Department, and more particularly, by the War Production Board, to bring about at the earliest possible moment the consideration of this bill. I have been offered the generous cooperation of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and similar cooperation on the part of the acting majority leader, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. But deferring to the wishes of the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] I have not heretofore asked that the bill be considered because he is attempting to work out in a conference now in session a difficult problem—difficult from his viewpoint—in connection with silver.

I make this statement for the RECORD in order that those who are so much concerned and who insist that the need for silver for war purposes is very serious will know that the Senator from Connecticut has not been unmindful of their wishes and is giving constant attention, as best he can, to the situation.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Supplementing the request made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] of the Senator from Tennessee for information as to lend-lease matters, I also ask the Senator from Tennessee to be prepared to advise the Senate tomorrow, if he will kindly do so, as to what amounts of money have been transferred from the Army and Navy to lend-lease operations.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to give that information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 575.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I should like to take a few moments to make a statement. The motion of the Senator from Tennessee relates to the bill which would require Senate confirmation of appointees in the executive branch of the Government receiving more than $4,500 a year. That is, briefly and in substance, what the bill provides. I do not quite understand why the bill is so important that it must have the right-of-way over an appropriation bill which the Senator from Tennessee himself says will come up for consideration tomorrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply wish to say to the Senator from New Mexico that the bill in question was reported to the Senate on April 14. I tried to get it up a number of times. I recall distinctly that one time the Senator from New Mexico would be unable to be present, and I let the bill go over on the request of the Senator in order that he could go to his home State. Since the bill has been before the Senate for nearly 2 months without action, and in view of the fact that action on it was voluntarily postponed by me at the request of the Senator from New Mexico, I am a little confused about the situation. I thought

when the bill went over at the request of the Senator from New Mexico, so as to let the Senator visit his home without having the measure considered while he was away, that I had not pressed it unduly, in fact, I thought I had been exceedingly generous and kind to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee is always generous and kind, but if the Senator from Tennessee thinks he has been more generous and kind to me than I have been to him——

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President, I do not.

Mr. HATCH. Let him consult the members of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, I am not making any such claim.

Mr. HATCH. I do not know then what the Senator means by his statement concerning the previous postponement of consideration of the measure at my request. I desire postponement now. Do Senators know how long I want it postponed? Some Senator behind me says, "Forever." I do not know who it was, but so far as I am concerned he told the exact truth. I would postpone it forever. But I am not going to ask that of the Senate this afternoon. I do not have such a great personal interest in the bill. I have a fairly good idea as to what the Senator is going to do with it. But I dislike very much, Mr. President, that an appropriation bill must be made the second order of business in order that this measure may have the first place for our consideration, and that we shall be obliged to give unanimous consent to lay aside the bill in order to take up an appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I said that I might not give unanimous consent. I have only one voice in the Senate, and I am very much inclined to say right now that if the Senate adopts this procedure then I shall say that the Senate ought to finish the business which it thinks is so important. I am very much inclined to say that I would object to any unanimous-consent agreement to lay aside the bill for any purpose, although the bill is not very important.

Reverting again to the remark made by a Senator sitting behind me, I think the bill ought to be laid aside forever. But I suggest to the Senator from Tennessee, that we go ahead in an orderly manner, that we take up the appropriation bill tomorrow, which should be taken up then, and if the Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent now to take up his bill on Monday I shall not object to it now.

He can make the request at this time. Let the important business come first. Let first things be first things. If the Senator from Tennessee objects to that procedure, then I shall be inclined to object to a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator understand that the Senator from Tennessee has requested unanimous consent for anything to which the Senator from New Mexico has a right to object?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee has moved that the Senate take up Senate bill 575, with the understanding that if his motion is agreed to and if the bill is made the pending business, he then will request unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside, and that more important business be taken up.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, Mr. President, the Senator can object at any time he desires to do so, but I do not understand that he has a right to object to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to take up his bill.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from New Mexico is not objecting.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator would not have a right to object, even if he wanted to.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator understands the parliamentary situation very well. He knows that the Senator from Tennessee has made his motion, and has made it on a condition.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that the Senator from New Mexico is opposing the motion of the Senator from Tennessee; but it seems to me that some confusion has been injected into this matter by the repeated threats of the Senator from New Mexico to object to something.

I understood that the Senator from Tennessee has made a motion upon which the Senate is entitled to act, and to which the Senator from New Mexico has no right to object.

Mr. HATCH. Has the Senator from Missouri finished his lecture? [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was not delivering a lecture; I was asking the Senator from New Mexico a question. I understood that the Senator from New Mexico had the floor. I shall repeat the question if the Senator desires to have me do so.

Mr. HATCH. Yes, if the Senator will ask a question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Very well. The question is, Does the Senator from New Mexico maintain that he has a right to object to consideration of the motion of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has proceeded far enough with the question. Let me say that the Senator from New Mexico stated he was not objecting, from the standpoint of objecting to the granting of unanimous consent, to the motion of the Senator from Tennesee. Of course, the Senator from Tennessee has a right to make his motion. I also have a right to speak on the motion; and if I care to threaten a little bit I have a right to do so, because I have learned it from the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield to me for a moment, let me say that there can be retaliatory threats fully as efficient as those of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator from Missouri has any in mind, I suggest that he make them now. I am not threatening the Senate of the United States, Mr. President; but I have a very definite reason for objecting to the particular procedure proposed, and simply as a matter of reason I ask whether there is not some point in the suggestion I make.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator is addressing his question to me, let me say that he stated a few moments ago that I had made a motion on condition. I had not made a motion on condition, Mr. President; I merely suggested that tomorrow, because of the importance of appropriation bills, and simply in following the usual custom, which I am sure has been observed hundred of times since I have been in the Senate, for a bill to be taken up and then be temporarily laid aside so that an appropriation bill or a conference report might be considered. I want to follow that course—the usual, ordinary, every-day course in the Senate in such matters.

But I make the motion, without any condition whatsoever that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 575. I think every Senator present knows what it would do; I think every Senator present is familiar with its provisions. I very sincerely hope that the Senators present will vote with me that the Senate proceed to consider the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say that I am unalterably opposed to the bill which has been introduced by the Senator from Tennessee, and at the proper time I propose to have some things to say on the bill. Probably my remarks will not change any votes; I learned that a long time ago.

However, let me say that the consideration of the bill will not be any 10-minute affair. What I am objecting to, and what it seems to me we should take into consideration, is the matter of putting aside the lend-lease measure, which is a war measure, for a bill which has been pending for a long time. I should like to have the Senate proceed to consider the lend-lease bill. It is a bill which is in the interest of the war effort. I do not think we should delay its consideration, if it is ready to be taken up. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not press his motion; and I hope we shall proceed in the ordinary fashion, and shall take up the war measures which are ready to be considered, and afterward proceed to consider the bill of the Senator from Tennessee. It seems to me that is the proper course to follow. I merely make that suggestion.

Mr. McNARY. Question.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is willing to vote; and, therefore, I am prompted to say that the reason why I said there was a condition attached to the motion was the statement made by the Senator from Oregon. I understood the Senator from Oregon to say that if the Senator from Tennessee would request unanimous consent that his bill be laid aside, so that the lend-lease appropriation bill could be taken up tomorrow, he would have no

objection to agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee. I take it, in view of the threats I have made, according to my friend the Senator from Missouri, that the Senator from Oregon may not be of that mind at this particular moment, in view of the fact that it is now my definite intention to object to any unanimous-consent agreement which may be requested.

I should like to interrogate the Senator from Oregon as to whether he is still of the same mind he was before.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am still of the same opinion.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am not unkind enough to say what came into my mind. [Laughter.]

I do not want to weary the Members of the Senate. If they think the bill of the Senator from Tennessee is of such importance that the Senate should vote now to make it the unfinished business, with the understanding that it be laid aside, and that then the Senate proceed to take up a bill which even the Senator from Tennessee says is more important business, I shall not try to inflict my views on the Senate. Certainly, if anything I have said could be construed as a threat to any Member of the Senate, I want to withdraw it. But, as a Senator—merely as one Senator—I shall have the right to take whatever course may seem best to me when any unanimous-consent agreement is proposed. I say to the Senate in all sincerity that I shall follow that course at the time. I do not desire to delay a vote. I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution.

INVESTIGATION OF DISTRIBUTION AND UTILIZATION OF MEDICAL PERSONNEL, FACILITIES, AND RELATED HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 74. This is the resolution which was considered yesterday. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] asked that it go over for 1 day. It is my understanding that he has made an investigation and has no objection to its immediate consideration and adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 74) authorizing an investigation of the manpower resources of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor, with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with an additional amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Edueation and Labor was, on page 1, line 1, to strike out—

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation in cooperation with the Manpower Commission and any other agency, or agencies, public or private, it might see fit to consult, of the manpower resources of the United States with particular reference to housing, health, education, technical training, civilian mobilization and morale, and how such manpower resources should—

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor or a subcommittee thereof to be appointed by the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee be authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation, in cooperation with such public and private agencies and such persons as it might see fit to consult regarding the distribution and utilization of medical personnel, facilities, and related health services: Be it further

Resolved, That the subcommittee be authorized and directed to study and investigate the deficiencies in health and education among persons otherwise fit for service with the armed forces and persons otherwise fit to—

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, on page 2, line 9, after the words "That the", to insert "said committee or."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Education and Labor was, on page 2, line 13, after the word "industry", to strike out "the armed services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was, on page 4, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the proposal. I remember that yesterday the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] objected to it.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, that objection has been cleared.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor or a subcommittee thereof to be appointed by the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee be authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation, in cooperation with such public and private agencies and such persons as it might see fit to consult regarding the distribution and utilization of medical personnel, facilities, and related health services; be it further

Resolved, That the said committee or subcommittee be authorized and directed to study and investigate the deficiencies in health and education among persons otherwise fit for service with the armed forces and persons otherwise fit to be employed to the best advantage in agriculture, industry, and other activities so as consistently with the spirit of our institutions, and the national emergency best to promote the war and victory for our cause. The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistance, to require by subpena, or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to make such investigations, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to incur such expenditures as it deems advisable.

That the heads of the executive departments and other executive agencies detail and/or engage personnel temporarily to assist the committee upon the request of the chairman. The committee may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it may deem necessary. The committee may utilize the services of facilities of the various departments and agencies of the Government.

The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the subcommittee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent funds of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the subcommittee.

The preamble, reported as an amendment by the Committee on Education and Labor, was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the needs of the armed services for medical personnel has brought about acute shortages of doctors, nurses, dentists, and allied personnel in many areas; and

Whereas many centers of war production lack adequate facilities for the maintenance of health; and

Whereas a large number of men have been rejected for military service because of physical or educational deficiencies; and

Whereas the physical and mental fitness of the Nation has a direct bearing upon the efficiency of both the armed forces and civilian efforts in the effective prosecution of the war: Therefore be it

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I move that the title be amended so as to read, "A resolution (S. Res. 74) authorizing an investigation of the educational and physical fitness of the civilian population as related to national defense."

The amendment of the title was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2848) amending the "joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943," approved April 29, 1943, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2848) amending the joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, approved April 29, 1943, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Burton Y. Berry, of Indiana, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general;

William R. Langdon, of Massachusetts, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general;

Rollin R. Winslow, of Michigan, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general;

Daniel V. Anderson, of Delaware, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

Maxwell M. Hamilton, of Iowa, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul general;

James S. Moose, Jr., of Arkansas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5, to act as minister resident and consul to Saudi Arabia;

Alexander C. Kirk, of Illinois, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Egypt, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary near the Government of Greece now established in Egypt; and

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of Czechoslovakia, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary near the Government of Czechoslovakia now established in London.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the executive calendar.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION—GUY DOANE McKINNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Guy Doane McKinney to be principal information specialist in the War Manpower Commission, at $5,600 per annum, in the Washington regional office, which nomination had heretofore been passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Abe D. Waldauer, of Memphis, Tenn., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 43, with headquarters at Memphis, Tenn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the Navy nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not move an adjournment, but will move a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator particularly wishes a recess, I have no objection to a recess. I thought perhaps Senators might wish to introduce bills, but they can do so anyway. I withdraw the motion and move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 3, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 2 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Abe L. Savage, from the State of New York, to be principal information specialist, at $5,600 per annum, in the New York regional office.

Gerald B. Leighbody, from the State of New York, to be area chief of training, at $4,600 per annum, in the Buffalo area office.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Jack V. Stockburger, Winslow, Ark., in place of Joe Davidson, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Euva M. Greenwood, Farmersville, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Mary D. Briggs, Los Angeles, Calif., in place of M. D. Briggs. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1942.

Frank J. Schultz, Muroc, Calif. Office became Presidential April 1, 1942.

Victor L. Roberts, Weimar, Calif., in place of E. M. Kennedy, retired.

COLORADO

Frank W. Salfisberg, Silverton, Colo., in place of F. E. Cooper, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Peter M. Davey, Bridgeport, Conn., in place of P. M. Davey. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1942.

FLORIDA

William T. Stephens, De Land, Fla., in place of E. L. Powe, retired.

GEORGIA

W. Riley Allen, Blackshear, Ga., in place of L. P. Grainger, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Merr L. Abbott, Sheridan, Ill., in place of M. L. Abbott. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

INDIANA

George B. Casaday, New Carlisle, Ind., in place of D. I. Lauver, transferred.

Melborn Grigsby, Poseyville, Ind., in place of Guy Dunlap, resigned.

IOWA

Lewis M. Adams, Buffalo, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Bess B. Gorham, Pisgah, Iowa, in place of O. C. Watts, removed.

KANSAS

Hazel R. Craft, Lewis, Kans., in place of H. R. Craft. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ben J. Funk, Sedan, Kans., in place of W. R. Whitworth, resigned.

J. Glenn Logan, Topeka, Kans., in place of J. E. Barrett, retired.

KENTUCKY

Howard K. Veach, Carlisle, Ky., in place of V. C. Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Ethel Hibbard, Loyall Ky., in place of L. M. Proffit, resigned.

Edward Schindler, Middletown, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Dorothy M. Kent, Morgantown, Ky., in place of D. M. Kent. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1942.

Frank W. Mimms, Trenton, Ky., in place of F. W. Mimms. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lovella L. Campbell, Vicco, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

LOUISIANA

Clarence H. Bonin, Gueydan, La., in place of C. H. Bonin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ernest T. Cutrer, Robeline, La., in place of F. M. Caldwell, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Mertis L. Foster, East Brewster, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

MICHIGAN

Harold L. Muchler, Bad Axe, Mich., in place of H. L. Muchler. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Guy E. Pitkin, Brighton, Mich., in place of G. R. Pitkin, resigned.

Donald R. Ellwanger, Caro, Mich., in place of R. C. Jacoby, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Louis F. Masonick, Browerville, Minn., in place of G. H. Malven. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

Russell A. Quist, Fairfax, Minn., in place of J. O. Ellevold, transferred.

Sam Doherty, Le Sueur, Minn., in place of W. W. O'Malley, deceased.

George V. Anderson, New York Mills, Minn., in place of M. A. Sondergaard, removed.

MISSISSIPPI

Wallie E. Beasley, Biloxi, Miss., in place of J. R. Meunier, retired.

Riley L. Sheley, Charleston, Miss., in place of C. E. C. Fedric. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

Ida E. Ormond, Forest, Miss., in place of I. E. Ormond. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

George C. Poole, Gulfport, Miss., in place of F. B. Hewes, deceased.

Chester E. Bolen, Parchman, Miss., in place of M. J. Sandlin, resigned.

MISSOURI

Kenneth C. Patton, Clarksville, Mo., in place of K. C. Patton. Incumbent's commission expired May 3, 1942.

Alfred M. Pondrom, Florissant, Mo., in place of A. M. Pondrom. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEBRASKA

Charles O. Kocina, Verdigre, Nebr., in place of C. O. Kocina. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Dorothy M. Hayes, North Rochester, N. H., in place of L. B. Farnsworth. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1942.

NEW JERSEY

Ethel H. McDonald, Englishtown, N. J., in place of E. H. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Henry N. McKay, Haddon Heights, N. J., in place of H. N. McKay. Incumbent's commission expired August 2, 1941.

C. Melvin Johnson, Jr., Highlands, N. J., in place of C. M. Johnson, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1942.

Thomas Whittington, Sea Isle City, N. J., in place of Thomas Whittington. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Thomas H. Hall, Vineland, N. J., in place of T. H. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Clara Katz, Woodbine, N. J., in place of Clara Katz. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEW MEXICO

Jose Z. Sanchez, Santa Rosa, N. Mex., in place of J. Z. Sanchez. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEW YORK

Joseph W. Cain, Adams, N. Y., in place of J. W. Cain. Incumbent's commission expired May 14, 1942.

W. Edward Sweetman, Ardsley on Hudson, N. Y., in place of W. E. Sweetman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John J. Navins, Barrytown, N. Y., in place of J. J. Navins. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lillian O'Connor, Briarcliff, Manor, N. Y., in place of Lillian O'Connor. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Horace G. Shepard, Chaumont, N. Y., in place of H. G. Shepard. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary B. Dietrich, Chauncey, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Gerald S. Sweet, Chazy, N. Y., in place of G. S. Sweet. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Wentworth S. Colwell, Cold Spring, N. Y., in place of W. S. Colwell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Corliss R. Pitkin, Corinth, N. Y., in place of C. R. Pitkin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Joseph C. Miller, Croton Falls, N. Y., in place of J. C. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Austin W. Stitt, Frewsburg, N. Y., in place of A. W. Stitt. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Flora A. M. Humes, Great Bend, N. Y., in place of F. A. M. Humes. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William L. McGranaghan, Hancock, N. Y., in place of W. L. McGranaghan. Incumbent's commission expired May 14, 1942.

Donald W. Murphy, Holland Patent, N. Y., in place of G. E. Blust, removed.

Lillian F. McNeil, Inlet, N. Y., in place of L. J. McNeil, deceased.

John V. Kellogg, Interlaken, N. Y., in place of J. V. Kellogg. Incumbent's commission expired June 9, 1942.

Raymond F. McIntyre, Lake Placid Club, N. Y., in place of Edward Hart, deceased.

Benjamin R. Gerow, Liberty, N. Y., in place of B. R. Gerow. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary G. McCarthy, Limestone, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John W. Clark, Mahopac, N. Y., in place of J. W. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William F. Agnew, Mayfield, N. Y., in place of W. F. Agnew. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Elizabeth M. Trainor, Monsey, N. Y., in place of E. M. Trainor. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Isidore Smith, Mountain Dale, N. Y., in place of Isidore Smith. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Robert E. Purcell, Philadelphia, N. Y., in place of R. E. Purcell. Incumbent's commission expired May 14, 1942.

Howard M. Curtis, Richfield Springs, N. Y., in place of H. M. Curtis. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Harold D. Ashline, Rouses Point, N. Y., in place of H. D. Ashline. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Morgan A. Lynk, Sharon Springs, N. Y., in place of M. A. Lynk. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Joseph J. Finan, Staatsburg, N. Y., in place of L. S. Filkins, retired.

Frank M. Campbell, Wilson, N. Y., in place of F. M. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NORTH CAROLINA

Ethel G. Womble, Goldston, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Shepperd Strudwick, Hillsboro, N. C., in place of Shepperd Strudwick. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

Horace C. Johnson, Wrightsville Beach, N. C. Office became Presidential October 1, 1942.

NORTH DAKOTA

Nicholas J. Krebsbach, Velva, N. Dak., in place of N. J. Krebsbach. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

OHIO

Lorand T. Lewis, Apco, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Durbin W. Gerber, Dover, Ohio, in place of D. W. Gerber. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles A. Hart, Minerva, Ohio, in place of C. A. Hart. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

Harry E. Croner, Piqua, Ohio, in place of C. J. Bartel, deceased.

Thomas G. Williams, Vermillion, Ohio, in place of C. A. Trinter. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

OKLAHOMA

Brooke L. Wallace, Wayne, Okla., in place of B. L. Wallace. Incumbent's commission expired May 3, 1942.

OREGON

Bessie B. Nunn, Wheeler, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

PENNSYLVANIA

G. Wilda Schang, Broughton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Melvin C. Bender, Friedens, Pa., in place of H. D. Brown, transferred.

John A. Frazier, Liberty, Pa., in place of J. A. Frazier. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Oliver S. Rosenberger, Penllyn, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

James F. Gibbons, Pittston, Pa., in place of J. F. Gibbons. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

PUERTO RICO

Mary Peet de Velazquez, Humacao, P. R., in place of Rafael Castaneda. Incumbent's commission expired December 1, 1941.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Patrick B. Holtzclaw, Arcadia, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

TENNESSEE

Albin M. Fulton, Cumberland Gap, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Maude M. Day, Pressmen's Home, Tenn., in place of B. L. Day, resigned.

TEXAS

Wilhelm A. Richter, Abernathy, Tex., in place of G. W. Ragland, transferred.

Gussie T. Edens, Big Lake, Tex., in place of H. B. Edens, retired.

Ephraim B. Hyer, Buckholts, Tex., in place of E. B. Hyer, resigned.

John F. Griffin, Devine, Tex., in place of H. D. Thompson, transferred.

Titus J. Shillingburg, Dublin, Tex., in place of G. L. Keller, removed without prejudice.

Jack V. Gray, Rotan, Tex., in place of J. V. Gray. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Susie A. Cannon, Shelbyville, Tex., in place of S. A. Cannon. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

VERMONT

Alson Leon Esty, Richford, Vt., in place of A. L. Esty. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

VIRGINIA

Bernice B. Turley, Bishop, Va., in place of M. C. Crockett, resigned.

T. Pryor Jones, Blackstone, Va., in place of T. E. Chambers, removed without prejudice.

WASHINGTON

David E. Burklund, Mukilteo, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Emerson G. Lawrence, Port Angeles, Wash., in place of A. J. Cosser, retired.

Leo B. Reed, Redmond, Wash., in place of L. B. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hanna A. Hanson, Riverton Heights, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

John Maloney, Jr., Skykomish, Wash., in place of John Maloney, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

Otto F. Reinig, Snoqualmie, Wash., in place of O. F. Reinig. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Helen G. Anderson, Union, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

WISCONSIN

Elmer G. Zellmer, Fair Water, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 2 (legislative day of May 24) 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Guy Doane McKinney to be principal information specialist, at $5,600 per annum, in the Washington regional office.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Abe D. Waldauer to be collector for customs collection district No. 43, with headquarters at Memphis, Tenn.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Henry C. Bridgers, Jr., et al.

(NOTE.—A full list of the names of the persons whose nominations for appointment in the Navy were confirmed today, may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 27, 1943, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Henry C. Bridgers, Jr., and

ending with the name of James T. Riordan on p. 4980.)

POSTMASTERS

HAWAII

Jack Y. Ouye, Hakalau.
Kaku Sakai, Hawi.
John A. Robello, Kalaheo.
Kwai Chew Lung, Kilauea.
Alexander Cameron, Papaaloa.
James Takeo Yabusaki, Papaikou.
Ethel Koi Leong Lau, Pearl City.
Timothy Wong, Waipahu.

NORTH CAROLINA

Sam H. Lee, Monroe.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and most merciful Father, in the solemnity of these moments we wait in the name of Him who was bruised for our iniquities; harken unto the voice of our petition and consider our meditation. As we tarry in this silence, we feel the sense of a world gone wrong, which has failed because of hopes wasted and truth outraged. Whatever this tragedy has taken from us, may we never lose faith in the Lord Jesus as our Saviour; grieved by ruinous events, O increase our power to trust, to wait and hope for vision and victory.

Let us not presume that wickedness wins any immunity from punishment. Pride and power, glee and glory of successful iniquity, all shall reap the vintage and stubble of the wicked. We would not be blinded by sinister splendor, nor misinterpret divine patience or ripening judgment. Listen, O man, unto the word of the Lord: "I have seen the wicked in great power and spreading himself like a green bay tree. Yet he passed away and lo, he was not, he was sought and could not be found." Heavenly Father, brighten our pathway and allow not material glory to betray us, nor the intoxication of ambition to lure us to take any fatal step. Speak condemnation upon any who imperil the cornerstone of our Republic, or retard or threaten the heralds of freedom. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 367. An act for the relief of dependents of Frank Edward Dace.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2584) entitled "An act to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. DAVIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 495) entitled "An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

RECRUITMENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2848) amending the joint resolution making an appropriatior to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, approved April 29, 1943.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to explain what this resolution is about and the reason for its coming here at this time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the House joint resolution, as enacted, provided authorization for recruitment and distribution of farm labor. It was also provided in the resolution that all receiving old-age assistance be allowed to draw both assistance and any wages that they might be entitled to receive under the resolution at the rate in effect in the various States in the month of April 1942.

By a singular coincidence, almost on the day the Congress passed this law, the State Legislature of the State of California passed a law increasing the rate of old-age assistance in that State. As a result this law applies to all the States of the Union with the single exception of the State of California. This joint resolution merely amends the original joint resolution by moving the date from April to July and, without prejudicing in any particular. The sole effect of this joint resolution is to make applicable to the State of California as well as to the other 47 States.

Mr. TABER. This is simply for the purpose of permitting the persons who draw old-age assistance and who desire to go to work on the farm to still draw their old-age assistance, and the reason for substituting the month of July for April is so they can still do it without a change in the amount of old-age assistance that has taken place since the original bill was drawn.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct. The only change in the law proposed by the pending joint resolution is to make the law applicable to the State of California as it is to all other States of the Union.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to say to the able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], that I introduced a few minutes ago this bill (H. R. 2848) amending the joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, approved April 29, 1943, reading as follows:

That section 5 (f) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943," approved April 29, 1943 (Public Law No. 45, 77th Cong.), is amended by striking out "April" and inserting in lieu thereof "July."

I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for his cooperation and help in calling this bill up at once. This is an emergency matter. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has stated the case very accurately. Under the provisions of Public Law No. 45, Seventy-eighth Congress, no individual receiving old-age assistance would be permitted to accept any income arising from agricultural labor if the old-age assistance was paid at a rate in excess of the rate received during the month of April 1943. The State legislature of the State of California increased the amount of old-age assistance during the month of April last, therefore under the provisions of this act the individuals would not be eligible to receive income from agricultural labor. My bill simply strikes out the word "April" and substitutes the word "July," because by that time an individual receiving old-age assistance in the State of California will be receiving the increased amount and will therefore be permitted to work in agricultural labor without any penalty levied against his old-age assistance.

The State of California considers this matter of such vital importance that it has sent a delegation here to Washington consisting of State Senator Jerrold Seawell, Senator Jesse Mayo, Senator Jack Shelley, and Assemblyman Walter Fourt. Yesterday with this delegation I conferred at length with Mr. Oscar Powell of the Social Security Board. The situation was thoroughly discussed, and the amendment that I have offered was recommended. I understand that my amendment will make it possible for the agriculture interests to employ some 25,000 or 30,000 individuals in California this season that would be barred from accepting this employment unless my amendment is adopted. The individuals affected cannot draw the old-age assistance and the additional compensation obtained from work in agriculture unless this amendment goes through.

The special delegation consisting of three State senators and the assemblyman has been most helpful in working out the solution of this matter.

I want to express my thanks and appreciation not alone to the Speaker, the majority and minority floor leaders, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for the helpful cooperation, but also to the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

This is a fair and just amendment, and I am sure that it will be unanimously adopted.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], the dean of the California delegation.

Mr. LEA. The California delegation has taken a great deal of interest in this problem. The matter happened as the chairman has stated. The California delegation was not familiar with what had been done at the time the matter was up, but so far as I know, every member of our delegation is in favor of this amendment. The main feature is that it permits these aged people to engage in agricultural work without having reductions made from their pensions during the war period.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Is the amendment limited to people in the State of California?

Mr. TABER. No; it is not.

Mr. CASE. The reason I ask that question is that it has been brought to my attention that a great many Indians who are past 60 or 65 years of age and who are drawing old-age assistance would be available for farm labor in my State were it not for the fact reductions will be made, they will be taken from the rolls and reinvestigated.

Mr. TABER. It makes no exception.

Mr. CASE. Does it permit a recipient of old-age assistance who earns up to $40, which would be the maximum allowable under the social-security law, to continue to draw that without any reductions?

Mr. TABER. It does not make any difference how much they are receiving, they are entitled to still draw old-age assistance and work on a farm, and it does not make any difference what State they are in.

Mr. CASE. Suppose they are Indians, would they be entitled to the same rights?

Mr. TABER. It does not make any difference who they are.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to ask this question: Is the change as proposed in the resolution the only change; there is no other change in the phraseology of the resolution?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct. The only change is to substitute the month of July for the month of April in order to put the rates of old-age assistance into effect subsequent to the enactment of the California legislature.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The reason for making that change and for setting the State back, is to permit the State of California to participate under the law on the same basis that is extended to all other States?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct. Without this amendment the State of California is not admitted to the full benefits of the law. With this amendment the law applies alike to every State, including California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If this is done it will relieve between 18,000 and 20,000 Californians who are receiving pensions at present under social security for agricultural activities, and that is the purpose.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is the sole purpose. It will increase the amount of labor available, and also provide for equal benefits to those drawing old-age assistance in California along with those on the rolls in the rest of the country.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think it is a splendid amendment and should be adopted.

Mr. TABER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do so only for the purpose of securing information that I find very desirable at this time, may I ask the chairman of the committee this. I know that special treatment is given the State of California.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No special treatment is given the State of California or any other State. The bill merely provides that the State of California, which without the passage of this law would be excepted, shall receive the same consideration received by every other State in the Union.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I realize fully that the conditions in California are somewhat different than they are in the other States.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit, the only difference is that California happened, by coincidence, just at the time this law was enacted, to pass a law increasing its rate of old-age assistance. In view of the fact that the Federal law provided that the rates in effect in April should prevail, this took California out of the purview of the Federal enactment. California did not know what we were doing and we did not know what California was doing.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I understand that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This resolution merely remedies that discrepancy.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the bill now pending extends the same benefits to those drawing old-age pensions in the several States everywhere throughout the country?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Exactly.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. It does not play favorites anywhere?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If this bill is not passed, California becomes an exception, but if this bill is passed, the same law obtains uniformly throughout the country.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. May I say that California is discriminated against if this bill does not pass, because none of the other States happens to have increased its pensions at that particular time. We do not believe we ought to be penalized for increasing our pensions.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I may say to the gentleman from California that I am clearly in harmony with the purpose of the bill.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 (f) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution Making an Appropriation to Assist in Providing a Supply and Distribution of Farm Labor for the Calendar Year 1943," approved April 29, 1943 (Public Law No. 45, 78th Cong.), is amended by striking out "April" and inserting in lieu thereof "July."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF CIVILIAN PILOT TRAINING ACT OF 1939

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1670) to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 6 to 10 inclusive and insert:

"SEC. 2. Any appropriations heretofore made and available for obligation during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for carrying out the provisions of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, shall be available for carrying out the provisions of such act as amended hereby. Any obligations entered into heretofore under such appropriations for purposes which are brought within the scope of such act by this amendatory act shall be deemed to be valid if otherwise properly incurred."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the magazine America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this morning on the bill H. R. 2848 and include therein a copy of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

WISE LEADERSHIP OR INFLATION—AND DICTATORSHIP

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short article from Business Week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by Col. Lewis Pick, division engineer of the Missouri district, at Omaha, to the Eight-State Committee on Flood Control.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by former Justice Byrnes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brief address by Raymond Gram Swing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the life, character, and public services of the late Frank Buck.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Mr. Charles J. Zinn, of New York, at the Tomb of General Grant, on Sunday last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FREE MAIL TO SERVICEMEN

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that the war is presently entering a phase where morale will play a most important part. I believe that we should do everything we can to assist and improve the morale both of those in the fighting forces and those on the home front.

I have today introduced a bill to provide for free postage for mail and mail matter addressed by any person to a member of the armed forces, and it is my opinion that this bill will do much to aid in the successful prosecution of the war. I sincerely hope that the committee to which the bill will be referred will give to it early and favorable consideration.

FEDERAL TAXES PAID BY HAWAII

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend and revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FARRINGTON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ROLL-BACK ON MEAT PRICES

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include therewith certain telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HILL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and the conclusion of other legislative business, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received from Mr. Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

O. P. A. PRICE CEILINGS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEWART addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by Lt. Comdr. William A. Porteous, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Col. J. P. Bush at Skagway, Alaska, May 31, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RENT REGULATION IN INDIANA

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of an opinion by the United States Supreme Court.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GRANT of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a Memorial Day address delivered by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a lodge in Kimball, Nebr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech which I delivered over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in today's Times-Herald by John O'Donnell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TAXES PAID BY HAWAII

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article from the Reader's Digest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain other material.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

USE AND OPERATION BY THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN PLANTS IN THE INTEREST OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 234, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that

the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-one Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 88]

Bell	Grant, Ala.	Peterson, Fla.
Bonner	Guyer	Pfeifer
Cannon, Fla.	Harris, Va.	Ramey
Capozzoli	Hartley	Russell
Chapman	Hendricks	Scott
Cochran	Herter	Sikes
Compton	Hoffman	Steagall
Costello	Hope	Talbot
Courtney	Johnson, Ind.	Thomas, Tex.
Crawford	Keefe	Tolan
Culkin	Kerr	Treadway
Curley	King	Van Zandt
Dies	Landis	Voorhis, Calif.
Domengeaux	LeCompte	Weichel, Ohio
Ellsworth	McCowen	Welch
Fernandez	Merrow	White
Gale	Nichols	Wilson
Gifford	O'Brien, N. Y.	Woodrum, Va.
Granger	O'Leary	Worley

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings, under the call, be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF PERSONS DISABLED IN INDUSTRY

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report on the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes, H. Res. 247 (Rept. No. 515), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report on the bill (H. R. 2795) to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land or buildings and facilities or fixtures appurtenant thereto, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 516), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2795) to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land or buildings and facilities or fixtures appurtenant thereto, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

USE AND OPERATION OF WAR PLANTS IN PROSECUTION OF WAR

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]; and pending that, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr Speaker, I have been requested to make a statement with respect to the procedure of your committee more than to the provisions of this bill.

The House Committee on Military Affairs reported the bill several days ago. Subsequent to the reporting of the bill, which was approved by a vote of 21 to 0, there were certain officials in the Government in some of the bureaus downtown who addressed a letter to the Speaker of the House and likewise a letter to me as chairman of the committee expressing opposition to some features of the legislation, and suggestions as to other features of it. Let me state now that when I opened hearings on the subject of available manpower for war needs and on what was known as the Smith bill, the Colmer bill, the Austin-Wadsworth bill, and the Connally bill I wrote letters to all of the labor leaders whom I knew, or the principle ones at least, inviting them to express their views and to come before the committee to be heard. I received courteous letters of acknowledgment from Mr. William Green, from John L. Lewis, and from Phillip Murray, stating that they would send representatives; and they did, and at least two-thirds of the 1,068 pages of testimony which are now available was devoted to the study of the antistrike legislation and related questions.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Not now; I will yield later if I have time.

Then we received this letter protesting against the legislation after a request from one of the ranking members of the House Military Affairs Committee. I might just as well make it personal and say the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] requested that I open hearings on the question of whether or not the committee would submit amendments. I then conferred with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], ranking majority Member. At the suggestion of these two gentlemen, or rather on my own judgment, after conference with them, in an effort to be fair to the Bureaus and to the Bureau chiefs, I opened hearings yesterday and today, as a result of which we will present several amendments which largely meet their views.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule. This is the first rule that has been reported out of the Committee on Rules that I have opposed on the floor of the House during this session of the Congress and therefore I propose to explain in detail my reasons for opposing this specific rule. When we had a meeting of the Committee on Rules to consider granting a rule to make in order this legislation I asked the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], who just addressed the House, whether the heads of the great labor organizations had been invited to appear before his committee on the Smith-Connally bill, and if they had appeared. His answer was that he had invited them but had not heard from them.

I hold in my hand a telegram from the president of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. William Green, addressed to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], and sent from Washington on May 8 in reply to the invitation. In this telegram Mr. Green says:

> I earnestly request that your committee accord representatives of the American Federation of Labor an opportunity to be heard in opposition to Senate bill 796. This measure is highly objectionable to labor. Please advise when an opportunity to be heard in opposition to this bill will be accorded representatives of the American Federation of Labor.

I am opposing the rule and the consideration of the Smith-Connally bill at this time because the representatives of 12,000,000 wage earners, loyal American wage earners, were refused an opportunity to be heard on this bill affecting collective bargaining and the fundamental legislative rights of labor obtained step by step during the past 50 years.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. When I have completed my statement, I will yield. This is the first time such a thing has happened in the history of this Congress. Naturally, when the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], came before our committee and made no mention of this telegram I withdrew my opposition as a member of the Committee on Rules and took no part in the proceedings because I saw no reason why I should fight the battles of labor if they did not care enough to participate in them themselves.

That was not the fact, according to the telegram from Mr. Green, and I have checked it up since in all details or I would not mention it here today. The fact is that no representatives of labor were heard on the Smith-Connally bill at any time and that in itself should be sufficient reason to vote against the rule. The members of the Military Affairs Committee are here and they know the facts and I venture to say that none of them will sustain the statement of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman, of course, heard me tell Mr. Hines in the Rules Committee at the time that I had not received that telegram and if the gentleman will read the testimony he will find that Mr. Hines testified for at least 20 pages as the representative of the American Federation of Labor. It is all in the RECORD. There were five other witnesses of the American Federation of Labor included in the hearing who testified at length and I asked them if they wanted to add anything further to their testimony.

Mr. FISH. I cannot yield further. Mr. Hines told me that the gentleman admitted he was confused when he made that statement in the Rules Commiteee and that he had received this telegram. I asked him that question and he said he had not and furthermore Mr. Hines told me personally that he never was afforded an opportunity to testify on the Smith-Connally bill.

Mr. Speaker, the first reason I am opposed to adopting the rule is that no representatives of labor were heard against the bill reported by the Military Affairs Committee, and I hope I have made that clear. Maybe they were heard on other bills introduced 6 months or a year ago or perhaps by the author of this bill, but not on the provisions of the pending measure. If the time has come that a committee of the House of Representatives refuses to hear representatives of patriotic American labor organizations of the American Federation of Labor, the Railroad Brotherhoods, and all of them, then I think it is about time that we hold up this legislation until they are heard. That is my first plea.

My second reason is that those in authority, those public officials who have the main responsibility for the conduct of the war, for winning the war, which is the greatest objective now before the American people, all of them are united in saying that this bill in its present form will impair the war effort, that it may provoke strikes, that it may cause dissension and disunity in labor and seriously impede or lessen the production of weapons necessary in winning the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I hope in the consideration of this bill no one will impugn the patriotism of the American wage earners and of organized labor. One million sons of the American Federation of Labor members and their relatives are in the armed forces of the United States. Ninety thousand members or sons of members of the United Mine Workers are in war service, and so on down the line. They have loyally contributed in blood, bonds, and tears to help win the war.

Everybody in authority in this country from the President down, every single high official has testified, the War Department, the Navy Department, the War Production Board, and James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, that labor not only has been loyal but has made a tremendous and unprecedented record for production of war weapons and war supplies for our own armed forces and those of our allies. There is not a Member of Congress who does not know that we have in every case increased production beyond the dreams of the most optimistic in airplanes, in tanks, in guns, equipment, and ships to win the war. The record of labor for war production excels all the rest because they are primarily responsible for it and a right to be proud of it. We are winning this war on production.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the rule will be voted down so that free American labor can have a fair hearing on legislation affecting their rights, interests, and welfare, and at least be afforded an opportunity to express their views on such legislation. I believe that with open hearings a bill can be written that will be workable and will not create disunity and dissension in the ranks of labor, be harmful to production, and imperil our war effort but rather promote the war effort and help win the war. The following are a half dozen specific reasons why I am opposing the pending rule and urging its defeat.

I am opposed to the consideration of the Connally-Smith bill, S. 796, under the rule, as the departments and agencies of the Government that have a direct responsibility in the conduct of the war and the settlement of labor disputes are opposed to it in its present form.

I am opposed to its consideration in view of the fact that the labor organizations, such as the American Federation of Labor, which is opposed to this bill, did not have an opportunity to present their views before the Committee on Military Affairs.

I am opposed to it because it will legalize strikes and may provoke labor disputes or strikes and impair our war efforts by lessening production. No single official of the administration who has to do with the Army or the Navy, winning the war, increasing production, or settling labor disputes has shown the necessity for such legislation nor advocated its passage.

I am opposed to it because it is very similar to the Smith bill, in principle, which passed the House of Representatives 18 months ago, and upon which the Senate took no action, which measure I voted for at the time, as it was aimed to stop Communist-inspired strikes which had been prevalent throughout the Nation.

I am opposed to the consideration of the bill under the rule as I believe that the whole subject matter should go back to the committee from which it originated, open hearings should be held, and labor given an opportunity to suggest amendments to protect their rights to collective bargaining, as well as those who have charge of the conduct of the war, in order to work out a feasible and practical bill that would have practically the united support of all fair-minded Americans.

I am opposed to the consideration of the bill under the rule, as it would be an antilabor measure in its present form, and would undoubtedly meet the same treatment in the Senate as its predecessor, the Smith bill, which passed the House in December 1941.

This proposed legislation is of such vital importance that it should be more carefully considered, free from war hysteria and personal rancor, for the best interests of the country, increased production, and winning the war.

I resent any attempts to harrass or impugn the motives of loyal American wage earners whose sons are fighting in our armed forces over all the world, and who have very generally adhered to the no-strike pledge of their various organizations. It may well be, however, if this pledge is repudiated and Nation-wide strikes affecting war industries become prevalent, and the necessity of such legislation is shown at the hearings before the committee, that I would join with others who are proposing consideration of this legislation under the rule now; I might support any antistrike legislation that may then be necessary to help win the war.

In view of these facts, and since none of the high officials of the departments and agencies of the Government that have the responsibility for the conduct of the war and the production of war weapons have supported this bill or advocated its passage in its present form, I feel that Members of Congress of both parties should vote the rule down, and thereby open the way for the consideration of any remedial legislation that would eliminate strikes during the war and promote better harmony between labor and management in the interest of the American people, and to insure victory at the earliest possible moment with the least possible casualties.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule. I believe I am justified in so doing because of the manner in which the House version of S. 796 was conceived. Because of the limited time on the rule I cannot go into detail. However, if the rule should prevail I will go into the bill's history thoroughly, so as to acquaint you with all the facts as I know them.

While I voted in committee to report this bill out I did so because I am one of those who do not believe in "pickling" any major bill—or a bill of this kind which affects so many people—because I or anyone else disagrees with its provisions.

I want to say to the House, however, that the subject matter of the House substitute for S. 796 contains nothing whatsoever of the subject matter of the four bills which we had under consideration for so many weeks. No testimony, therefore, came before us which could guide us in the formation of the current House bill.

As a matter of fact, the testimony given us by Under Secretary of War Patterson and Admiral Land on the Wadsworth-Austin bill had nothing whatever to do with this bill as is evidenced by both of these very well thought of officials signing a letter on May 15 to Speaker RAYBURN protesting against the passage of this bill we are now about to consider.

My colleagues, when those charged with the procurement of our war supplies say that the passage of this bill will hinder rather than help the war effort; when they say that the morale of the American workers will be lowered by the enactment of this proposition—we better go slow.

The Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson, for the War Department, Secretary Knox of the Navy Department, Admiral Land of the Maritime Commission, and Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, have all denounced this proposed legislation and they are the backbone of our production and procurement.

Likewise those whose duty it is to deal with the problems of Labor are advising us of the mistake we will make if this bill is passed. I refer to the Secretary of Labor, the War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board. All of them have said that it will hinder their work rather than help them.

All of the great American labor organizations are protesting against the passage of this bill. Their morale has been superb, as can be seen by the results of our production. We will, by the passage of this bill, put their morale and production efforts in reverse and by so doing will give aid and comfort to our enemies.

An analysis of S. 796 by the American Federation of Labor, as of yesterday, June 1, very clearly demonstrates this. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place in the RECORD at this point the full text of this analysis. In view of all the evidence from authorities such as I have mentioned, I trust the rule will be defeated:

ANALYSIS OF AND COMMENTS ON SMITH-CONNALLY BILL, S. 796, BY THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

The bill is a hodgepodge of antilabor measures, many of which have no relationship whatsoever to the war effort. The bill tramples upon and violates almost every right which labor has gained after years of struggle. It is a bitter reward for the contributions that labor has made to the present war effort whereunder seemingly impossible production records have been achieved. No greater or more unmerited blow to the morale of millions of patriotic American workers can be conceived than that inflicted by the present bill. The bill will inevitably interfere with war production and stimulate industrial unrest, and the effectiveness of existing machinery for the orderly settlement of labor disputes will be impaired if not destroyed.

The report accompanying the bill states that the legislation is necessary because of the crisis in the coal mines. Aside from the fact that the Government has taken appropriate action and now operates the mines, the provisions of the bill are not limited to the coal industry but apply to every plant producing materials needed in or helpful to the war effort, and apply to millions of American workers in addition to the comparatively few working in the coal mines. Compulsory legislation prohibiting strikes is not necessary to achieve maximum production. Existing voluntary procedures have not only proved sufficient but have operated to make possible the greatest production record in the history of this or any other country. Organized labor has lived up to its no-strike pledge to the fullest possible extent, and even those few unauthorized stoppages which have occurred have caused a total man-days' loss of only a fraction of that occurring in time of peace and is less than half of that occurring in Great Britain. Time and again our war leaders and production heads, in praising the production achievements of organized labor, have declared that the time which has been lost was unavoidable and that labor has fulfilled its no-strike obligation to the fullest extent humanly possible. The production records speak for themselves in this respect. The passage of this bill would constitute an absolutely unwarranted reflection upon millions of American workers and would impugn the patriotism of millions of union members whose brothers, sons, and fathers are on our fighting fronts.

Let us analyze some of the provisions of the bill.

Section 2 prohibits strikes for a 30-day cooling-off period. Organized labor has already voluntarily given up the right to strike and has lived up to its pledge in this respect, which in itself makes such a provision unnecessary. Compulsory abandonment of the right to strike amounts to involuntary servitude—a condition that has not and will not be tolerated by organized labor and prohibited by the United States Constitution.

Section 3 of the bill requires a majority vote to engage in a strike after the 30-day "cooling off" period. Such a provision reflects directly and unwarrantedly on the integrity and responsibility of the many thousands of union leaders throughout the country. Unions, by their own elections, themselves repose responsibility in their officers to determine the policy and conduct the affairs of the membership. However, the most important objection to this provision is the fact that it denies to minorities their moral and legal rights to quit in concert and declare their grievances to the world. The mere fact that only 450 of a thousand employees are agreed upon a strike and agreed upon the grievances that give rise to the strike is no reason to deny them their rights because 550 think otherwise. The right of a minority to strike is not dependent upon the will of a majority; it is not equivalent to elections to office. The right to strike, like all basic constitutional rights, is an individual and collective right not subject to dictates by any group, majority, or otherwise. It is protected by the Constitution in the same manner as religious worship, freedom of speech, peaceable assembly, and similar rights.

Section 4 (a) forbids force or violence in connection with a labor dispute in a war plant. This, of course, is entirely unnecessary since force or violence is nowhere lawful in the United States. Its necessary result is for antilabor employers to encourage violence on the picket line through the use of professional provocateurs and thus deprive workers of their rights under the Wagner Act.

Section 4 (b) prohibits peaceful picketing before a "house or place where a person resides." This is clearly in violation of the first amendment which prevents Congress from the passing of law abridging freedom of speech and of assembly.

Section 4 (c) prohibits any but so-called bona fide employees from engaging in peaceful picketing. This is a direct throw-back to the reactionary days where labor disputes were in effect limited to disputes between an employer and his immediate employees. In other words, this section prohibits so-called stranger picketing and is in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States for the same reasons as noted above. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the recent case of *American Federation of Labor* v. *Swing*, said that "A State cannot exclude workingmen from peacefully exercising the rights of free communication by drawing the circle of economic competition between employers and workers so small as to contain only an employer and those directly employed by him. The interdependence of economic interest of all engaged in the same industry has become a commonplace."

Section 5 (a) outlaws the boycott. Unions may not strike any person—regardless of whether or not he be a defense contractor—or refuse to work on or handle the products of such person in an effort to induce a defense contractor to deal with the union. Thus, if a defense contractor be on the unfair list and has among his customers employers who are in no way involved in the defense program, the union, nevertheless, may not strike or picket such customer. There is no conceivable connection between this provision and the defense program. The purpose of this provision, too, is primarily to reduce labor's basic constitutional rights.

Section 5 (b) prohibits strikes and other concerted activities on the part of unions against a defense contractor calculated to displace another union that has a collective bargaining agreement. While this provision is undoubtedly aimed at jurisdictional and interunion disputes, it would also by its terms tend to freeze collective bargaining relationships between the employers and

company unions and to restrict freedom of choice of employees under existing contracts.

Section 6 deals with enforcement. 6 (a) amends the Norris-LaGuardia Act so as to permit ex parte injunctions for violation of any of the preceding sections. Thus, the dictatorial rule of government by injunction is revived in a purported national effort to fight dictatorships. Section 6 (b) adds to the penalties by permitting civil actions for damages by employers for violation of the preceding sections. Here is revealed the true spirit and purpose of this bill, namely, to weaken and destroy labor unions. It can superficially be argued that the prevention of strikes is necessary as an emergency measure in order to avoid interruptions in defense production. But surely, there is no connection between the continuous flow of defense production and enriching employers by giving them private suits wherewith they will seek to deplete union treasuries.

But that is not all. Section 6 (c) imposes additional penalties on individuals who are found to have violated the preceding sections. First, an employee loses his status as an employee or as a representative under the Wagner Act. Second, employees lose all benefits under "any act making appropriations for relief purposes"; and third, section 6 (d) completes the picture by providing that, if any individual violating the preceding sections is an officer or representative of a labor organization, then the organization itself loses its status under the Wagner Act and under the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Section 7 deals with compulsory registration of all labor organizations with the National Labor Relations Board. It requires filing information on almost every detail of internal union affairs. Failure to comply disqualifies the labor organization to act as collective bargaining agent.

It should be noted that in England registration of labor organizations is entirely voluntary and carries with it certain stated benefits. This provision, which can only remotely be connected with the national defense program, does not, of course, extend any benefits to labor organizations and makes it compulsory for them to register. From the tenor of the entire bill, as well as the spirit of those who sponsor and favor it, it is fair to say that the direct aim of these provisions is to accumulate sufficient data about labor organizations so as to facilitate procedures for destroying these labor organizations.

No other voluntary trade association, such as the National Association of Manufacturers, chambers of commerce, or employer associations are required to register and disclose their internal affairs. If such legislation is proper, then it is likewise proper to require the disclosure of the internal affairs of all clubs, societies, mutual benefit associations or any other type of voluntary association.

Sections 8 and 9 give the War Labor Board authority to hear and determine labor disputes affecting the war effort, but it is provided that the Board cannot direct that a closed or union shop clause be incorporated in any labor agreement directed by it. Labor has not asked the Government to compel the union or closed shop; the Government should not seek to compel a compulsory open shop. The matter is one which should be left to the discretion of the War Labor Board, dependent upon the facts of each particular case. Under this provision, upon the expiration of existing union shop agreements employers may refuse to renew them, and labor, under its no-strike pledge, would have no way of maintaining the security which perhaps had been won only after long struggles. Is it equitable to permit any company to take advantage of the no-strike agreement to throw out a union shop previously established by agreements between the parties? In the Harvill Aircraft Die Casting Corporation case the War Labor Board determined that "Likewise, to push union shops back into open shops would unstabilize, for war production, the unions of the millions of American workers who have pledged themselves not to strike but to leave to peaceful arbitrament the security of the unions which they have won after long and arduous struggles."

Section 10 empowers the War Labor Board to prohibit strikes in any plant in which a dispute has arisen, and the prohibition on striking can last as long as 60 days. The order is enforceable by injunctive decree obtained by the Attorney General in the Federal courts, and the Norris-LaGuardia Act is amended to permit courts to issue labor injunctions. This section is objectionable for the same reason that section 2, providing for a "cooling off" period, is objectionable; it constitutes involuntary servitude and is entirely unnecessary in view of the no-strike pledge.

Under section 13 of the bill it is made a crime punishable by heavy fine or a year's imprisonment, or both, for any person "to instigate or induce any interference or other interruption" with a plant taken over by the Government. Any just protest against intolerable conditions voiced by one worker to another, let alone to an assemblage of his fellow workers, could be classified as an "inducement" or an "instigation" or an "interference" with the operation of a business. It matters not whether such worker be union official, union member, or neither; indeed, if a protest is made by a union representative upon request of workers whom he was chosen to represent, the crime presumably would be conclusive. Under this section not only is a condition of involuntary servitude imposed but, even worse, persons who already have had their right to a strike outlawed would be hazarding their liberties by making any protests or by taking any concerted action against any grievance, no matter how great the provocation. Surely, personal liberty and liberty of speech is what we are fighting to preserve, not destroy.

Subsection a (2) of section 13 makes it a crime for any person to aid an interruption by giving direction or guidance or providing funds. Under this section an international union could maintain ordinary correspondence or intercourse with an affiliated local that might be involved in a work interruption at a Government-operated plant only at its peril, and the payment of ordinary salaries as required by constitutional provisions in such cases might well constitute a crime.

It is no comfort to provide in section 13 that any individual shall have the right to cease work when that individual is forbidden to discuss lawful grievances with a fellow worker or workers and quit employment in concert with him or them. This proviso merely restores the ancient doctrine of conspiracy under which organized labor, early in its history, suffered so much abuse at the hands of the courts.

The Smith-Connally bill is wrong in principle, is entirely lacking in necessity, is unjust in application, and constitutes a gratuitous insult to millions of American workers who are expending every effort on the production fronts. At very best, as stated by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, the provisions of the bill "constitute a club—a vengeful weapon aimed at all American workers in retaliation for the acts of a few. American workers will not and cannot subject themselves to such tyranny. This measure, if enacted into law, will wreck the war production program. It will wipe out the vast benefits that have been derived from the operation of labor's voluntary no-strike pledge. It will be as unenforceable as prohibition. How can American workers join whole-heartedly in a war for the preservation of freedom when their own freedoms are being cut out from under them? How can American workers believe in the sincerity of America's war against Fascism, when Fascist legislation is being imposed against them?"

If any person believes that war production would be increased by passage of the bill, or that the morale of the American worker would thereby be raised, he is seriously mistaken. Not only is the voice of 12,000,000 organized workers raised against passage of this bill, but the leaders of our war program both on the military and production front and the heads of all governmental agencies and tribunals dealing with labor relations have unanimously condemned the bill as constituting an interference with the war effort and have requested and urged the Members of Congress to vote against its passage. In a letter addressed to the Speaker of the House, the chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs and the majority leader of the House, and signed by the War, Navy, and Labor Departments, the Maritime Commission, the War Production Board, the National Labor Relations Board, and the National War Labor Board, it was stated that "the committee bill proposes drastic and far-reaching changes in the overall machinery and principles established by statute, Executive order, and mutual agreement, for dealing with labor relations in the war period. According to the committee report, these changes are imperative because of the emergency which may arise from the current dispute in the coal industry. But the bill in its terms is not limited to that industry and therefore must be appraised with respect to its impact upon the whole field of industrial production. While recognizing the gravity of the coal mining situation, and without attempting to suggest here what specific steps should be taken in dealing with that situation, we note that since the Government has taken possession of the coal mines, only a few sections of the bill have any bearing upon that particular dispute. The bill relates to American industry generally and to the whole problem of maintaining industrial peace in time of war. It is accordingly felt that in evaluating the bill our judgment should not be obscured by the exception presented by the coal mining situation to an otherwise unprecedented record of industrial peace since Pearl Harbor. Although a number of strikes have occurred since the declaration of war, they have, with very few exceptions, been unauthorized stoppages of short duration opposed by the responsible leadership of organized labor, and the total man-days lost have been less than at any other time in our industrial history.

The bill contains numerous coercive provisions, including injunctions and criminal penalties. At the same time it impliedly recognizes the propriety of strikes after a 30-day notice and a secret ballot. In both these respects the bill runs squarely counter to the national policy embodied in the voluntary and unconditional no-strike agreement entered into by industry and labor with the President immediately after Pearl Harbor. This agreement, which represents the cornerstone of our wartime industrial relations structure, has been supplemented in a number of industries by written agreements outlawing strikes and lock-outs for the period of the war. This nationally accepted arrangement, whereby strikes and lock-outs have been outlawed by voluntary action, has proven by experience so satisfactory that a change in the arrangement should be approached with greatest caution. It would seem unwise in time of war to experiment with an untried substitute for a policy whose worth is already demonstrated.

"The absence of any comment in this letter on other features of the bill does not necessarily imply approval of those features. The shortage of time has prevented the

preparation and submission of any joint detailed analysis. Some of the undersigned agencies will, however, submit comment on certain sections of the bill bearing on problems respecting which they have special knowledge and experience."

Such an expression of disapproval by governmental war and labor agencies should be conclusive.

On May 18 the American Federation of Labor formally reaffirmed its no-strike pledge "as a valid and compelling obligation, come what may." It was stated, "No strike will be authorized or approved by the American Federation of Labor and its affiliated unions until the enemies of America have been crushed into final defeat."

This week President Roosevelt reports that America is producing more fighting planes than all of the enemy nations combined; Secretary of the Navy Knox announces that virtually an entire new navy was launched in the first few months of this year; merchant ships are sliding down the ways at a rate never before approached in shipbuilding history; a virtual avalanche of guns, tanks, and ammunition, unsurpassed in quality, is pouring forth from American factories. Production has reached such staggering quantities that Donald Nelson acknowledges there is no further need of expanding plant capacity.

Organized labor takes pride in this accomplishment. The American worker neither expects nor merits restrictive, stultifying legislation such as the Smith-Connally bill as its reward. Such legislation not only constitutes a completely unwarranted reflection upon the patriotism of the American worker and would result in an incalculable blow to morale, inevitably and seriously impairing production, but constitutes a restriction of the very liberties to preserve which we are fighting this war and would be a definite step in the direction of that form of government imposed upon the people of the enemy countries by their dictators.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a statement of the American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House votes down this rule and it will be justified in so doing because, despite what might be said, for all practical purposes there were no hearings on this particular piece of legislation. Most of the Members of the House, in my opinion, were startled when they learned a few days after the passage of this bill in the Senate that it had suddenly been reported by the Military Affairs Committee of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this bill are similar to the provisions of a bill that we had before the Naval Affairs Committee last year. We had hearings for 3 months or more on that particular bill. The Secretary of the Navy, Donald Nelson, Admiral Land, and various Cabinet officers appeared before our committee and not one of them advocated the passage of that particular bill. After extensive and impartial hearings the Naval Affairs Committee refused to approve the bill. That legislation is now incorporated in the measure which would be considered if this rule is adopted.

Mr. Speaker, those who advocate this do not need a war to induce them to come before you as proponents of this legislation. They are the same ones who for the last 5 or 6 years have consistently advocated all the repressive measures that this House has been asked to consider. If you pass this rule and adopt this legislation the Bill of Rights is going right out of the window. If you do not believe me, read section 4 of the bill which if written into law abridges freedom of speech and freedom of assembly. Such action would be emphatically contrary to the purposes for which we are fighting in this war.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will vote down the rule so the consideration of this bill will not be necessary, and so that there will be no danger that industry will be demoralized by ill-considered action on the part of this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to this rule and to the bill it makes in order.

It seems to me that our most important responsibility at this time is to win this tragic war and to bring peace to a war-torn world. You cannot do it if, in this chamber today, we adopt this rule and pass a bill to shackle labor when the responsibility of winning the war is largely in the hands of labor.

Labor has responded wholeheartedly to its responsibility, and what we are trying to do today is punish 11,500,000 patriotic, faithful, loyal union workers in order to punish a relatively small group and Mr. John L. Lewis. What kind of justice is this? How can it help win the war? What excuse can we offer to the millions of union workers who are responsible for the greatest production the world has ever known?

I have been advised by Mr. James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, that there has been produced 100,000 planes, and in the first month of this year 100 fighting ships, and in May alone 3 times as many pieces of artillery were produced for ground troops as in the 19 months of the preceding World War; 44,830,000 bombs have been manufactured. Air production in the year just ended are 60,000 planes as against 10,143 in the 12 months ending June 1, 1941. These figures represent but a fraction of the great production record.

Mr. Speaker, this is a magnificent record and we should be as proud of our soldiers on the assembly lines as we are of our soldiers in the field. Are we doing justice to them, or to the soldiers who are representing us all over this world, millions of whom have come from the ranks of labor, if we pass this bill today? We certainly are not. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely pray and hope that the House by its action today will not destroy the courage, the heart, and the soul of the working men and women of America. Let us vote down this iniquitous rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me pretty obvious that the same old labor-leader goon squads that have appeared here so frequently in the past have invaded the Capitol again. I want you to know that the main features of this bill are the same as the bill that passed this House in December 1941 by a vote of nearly two to one. There were only 136 votes against that bill, and of that 136 an even 50 were not reelected to this Seventy-eighth Congress. That is quite a heavy political casualty list.

We are told that labor has not been heard. The people of this Nation have been heard from; they have been heard from in a number of polls, two of them published in the last week. On the Connally bill, with respect to certain features of it which prohibited strikes, 78 percent of the public were in favor and 67 percent of labor were in favor of it. Why is the public so agitated; why does the public want to do something about this thing, notwithstanding the threats of William Green, which have been published in every paper of the United States, and which I will read to you in a moment? Why does the public want it? The reason why the public wants it is that, in spite of the no-strike pledges that were so much talked about, the public knows that strikes have been occurring. Have you any idea how many strikes and how much labor disturbance has been going on in this country? I might tell you. Do you know that with the exception of 2 years there were more strikes in 1942 than there had been in any year in the past 20 years? Do you know that there were more strikes in 1941 than there were in any other year, except the year that the National Labor Relations Act went into effect; more strikes in the middle of this war, in the face of a no-strike agreement, than in the last 20 years, with the exception of 2 years, and one of those was a war year? Do you know that the people of this Nation are getting impatient? Do you know how many strikes occurred in this Nation in the month of April? Three hundred and ninety-five! If that average is maintained throughout the year—and it looks like it will—there will be more strikes in this year, according to labor statistics, than have occurred since the beginning of the keeping of labor statistics by the Department of Labor, as shown by their own records in a statement just issued yesterday, which came to your desk.

Do you wonder that the people of this Nation want relief? Do you wonder they are impatient? Do you wonder that they do not want to accept any longer the full leadership of William Green?

Those are facts that have to be taken into consideration.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sorry. I do not have time to yield.

In General Motors alone, our greatest single producer of war materials, there have been 20 strikes in the last 4 months, an average of 1 strike every week. Do you know that the Timken Bearing Co. entered into a contract with a labor union on February 19 of this year, and since that time they have had 19 strikes in direct violation of their written contract?

Mr. Speaker, there is but one question to be decided in this, and that is whether under all those circumstances we are going to yield to the will of the American people merely the consideration of this legislation. You are not bound to vote for it or against it. All you are going to do today on this vote is say, "I will consider it," or "I refuse to consider it."

I have read you polls of what the American people say and what they want you to do. This is what Mr. William Green says:

> We will demand a record vote on this measure. Regardless of whether it is killed or adopted, we shall endeavor to vote out of office any Member of Congress who supports it. Into this effort the American Federation of Labor will pour every resource at its command.

That is the threat of William Green. Are you going to vote for William Green or are you going to vote for the American people this morning?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE], a member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule for the same reasons given by the two gentlemen from Pennsylvania. It is perfectly true, as our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs says, that we have had many hearings, a thousand pages of them, on labor and manpower legislation, but it is equally true that none, or very little, of this testimony was pertinent to the bill under consideration today, S. 796, the Connally-Smith bill.

I voted to report out that bill. I made a mistake. I shall not hesitate ever, I hope, to say when I have made a mistake. And I do not feel that two wrong votes are ever going to make one right vote. For that reason, I am today opposed to the rule.

At the time the bill was reported out, as our distinguished chairman said, there had been no great pressure from the War Labor Board, the National Labor Relations Board, the Army or the Navy, or other interested departments to be heard before our committee on these two bills, the Smith-Connally bills, which they knew were pending. Had there been such pressure from them, I am sure we would have held off reporting the legislation to hear them. But the minute the bill was reported out, they did protest. And we did hear them. And I confess to having been greatly shaken by the unanimity of their disapproval of certain sections of this bill.

May I say in answer to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] that there is no way I know of, none at all, of being for the public and against the people at the same time. If, as I believe, this bill is, as it now stands, against the interests of millions of loyal working people, it will also in the end be against the public interest. I wish that our committee, which is very able to do so, had a little more time to bring out a piece of legislation which will not only satisfy the honest public desire to deal with the strike situation, but will protect the hard-won liberties and freedoms of patriotic working people everywhere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NORMAN].

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe it is wise for the interests of the country or the Republican Party to vote for this rule under the present circumstances.

The Connally bill as passed by the Senate might possibly have been open to some debate, as to the advisability of its passage by the House, but after it has been amended in the House Committee by "hooking on" a lot of matters not in the least related to any so-called anti-strike legislation, I am going to vote against the rule. I do this because I do not believe that such legislation should be presented to the House without full and complete hearings in committee, which I understand was not done on some of the committee amendments to this bill.

For many years the Republican Party enjoyed the general support of labor, due to its policy of protection of the interests of labor. Of late years the trend of thought of labor has been persuaded to follow the New Deal rather than sound Republican principles. In my own district the Republicans put up most excellent candidates for the past 10 years without avail because labor generally supported the Democratic candidate. Last fall the Republican nominee had the confidence of labor, so there is now another Republican vote on our side of the House supporting JOE MARTIN and the Republican position on the tax bill and many other matters along that line. I sincerely hope that the Republican Party may not be maneuvered into a false position which may be interpreted as being unfriendly to labor in general.

Let us defeat this rule and at least give labor a fair hearing.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I can say in a very few words the reasons for my opposition to this rule. In the first place, it is my deep conviction that you cannot legislate cooperation. In the second place, I believe labor has cooperated largely in the war effort, and I think the record proves it. The best proof is the testimony of people from the Navy Department, the War Department, and the War Production Board.

In the third place, some of you may know that we, of the Committee on Labor, a few weeks ago held hearings for some time on absenteeism and other causes of labor unrest, if any. I can say categorically that, without exception, management, in their testimony, asked us not to pass legislation, because things were functioning all right.

Finally, this measure is not going to settle the coal strike for us, and you know it. I feel that if, in a moment of hysteria, in order to get one man who has proved to be, as far as I am concerned, both unpatriotic and unfriendly to labor, to wit, Mr. Lewis, we pass legislation of this type, we are doing a great injustice to the mass of labor, with whom I know most of us sympathize.

Certainly it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that our production is, if anything, ahead of schedule. It is not a question of strikes. They have had strikes in England constantly, in fact more than we have, yet they are producing all right. It is not a question of this or that union. It is a question of whether we are delivering the goods and whether labor is helping to deliver the goods, and I maintain that it is.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this rule is defeated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this rule. Now let us see what has happened. The Committee on Military Affairs reported the bill unanimously. It came before the Committee on Rules for a rule. I heard no extensive congressional opposition to the granting of the rule.

After that time, it is true, the letter from the Department heads was addressed to the committee. That letter was a little unusual, to say the least. I think the Committee on Military Affairs acted with complete propriety in sending for those people and saying to them, "We would like to hear what you have to say about this proposal." Personally, I have always thought that any witnesses desiring to testify before a congressional committee should be heard if possible.

In view of the fact that these additional hearings have been held just yesterday and this morning, it did seem to me that those in charge of determining when this matter might be called before the House might well have postponed its consideration for a few days. I personally urged such action, but that was not done.

And so, what is the situation here today? The issue is solely whether or not we are going to adopt this rule and say that we shall proceed with the consideration of the bill. Personally there are a few things in this bill that I do not think at the moment are desirable or necessary. There are some others that I think are desirable, and I think they should be enacted into law. They will be in the best interest of the country and in the best interest of the patriotic men and women in the ranks of labor. Be that as it may, if the rule is adopted, the bill will go on for consideration by the Committee of

the Whole and amendments will be in order, and any needed corrections can be made.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. No; I do not have time. Then every Member has the right to vote either for or against the bill. If the Military Affairs Committee and the House leadership so determine, I take it that we might postpone further consideration of the matter for a few days. Of course, the Military Affairs Committee is primarily responsible for handling this legislation. They know what the situation is, and I think they ought to be the ones primarily to determine what might be done in that regard.

As for myself, I am unwilling to have it go to the country, the situation in the country being such as it is today, that the House of Representatives has refused to consider a matter that a great many people believe it necessary for us to consider, in view of those conditions prevailing in the country. That our people are disturbed about strikes which have occurred and are now occurring cannot be denied. They are demanding that we take some cognizance of them.

Some may suggest that the rule can be voted down, and perhaps a new bill subsequently brought in. I do not know whether that might happen or not. I do not know what the attitude of the committee might be. But if this rule is defeated today, I am convinced that it would go to the country that the House of Representatives had refused to consider this matter and to pass upon the merits or demerits of the legislation now before us. And there would be serious question whether subsequent action could be had.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] a member of the committee.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, and members of the committee, I take this means to protest the fact that we had no adequate hearings on this bill. I do not think just because there is excitement running through the country, because of the unwarranted conduct of John L. Lewis, that we should pass unbalanced legislation. This bill affects 40,000,000 workers, and it has provisions in it that wipe out the policy of this Government as to labor for the past 10 years. There is a provision in the bill that wipes out the provisions of the LaGuardia Act, and things like that. There was not one single word of testimony on those vital provisions of this bill. When we got this bill from the Senate, it was completely amended by the House committee, and made entirely different from the Senate bill. We only had hearings after every single administrative officer in the Government protested certain provisions of the bill. I think it is better for us to take a few days in a matter like this that affects war development and war production and try to pass a piece of legislation that is well digested.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. No.

Mr. SHAFER. The gentleman voted to report out the bill, did he not?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes, I admit I made a mistake and I am honest enough to say so. You cannot disregard the fact that the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Maritime Commission, every single agency of the Government that has to do with production, states that this bill would retard instead of increase production. I want some legislation. I want to pass some legislation to satisfy my constituents who believe some reasonable legislation of this kind should be adopted, but I want that legislation well considered, and I want it constructive, something that I can go home and stand on. Up to the present time we have not had enough hearings on the bill, and that is why I shall vote against the rule.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the situation before us is not a happy one. Twenty days ago the Military Affairs Committee reports out this bill with a unanimous vote, and three Members of my own party come into the Well of the House today and disown that action and tell us that it was a mistake and that the rule should therefore be defeated. There ought to be a little more introspection and self-examination.

They have a perfect right to change their views. But they could clearly do so and still support this rule. Their views on the bill are probably not unlike my own. But the rule should be adopted and the bill modified to meet their views. That is the logical approach and does not put the Congress in the position of refusing to consider the matter at a time when the public mind is disturbed. Seventeen days ago the Rules Committee reported the rule. I do not know how the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] voted on this rule, but in the 17 intervening days there has been no effort made to indicate to myself, who is not a member of the Rules Committee and who is not a member of the Military Affairs Committee, that they were in error. The Rules Committee has a perfect right, individually and collectively, to change its views, but in the face of the differences of opinion manifest here it should have reconsidered before now. Today they come and ask us to vote down the rule. It is indeed an unhappy situation from the standpoint of the country as a whole. I am not for this bill unless it is substantially modified. I so stated publicly many days ago. I have a substitute resting in my brief case that I propose to offer, and it can be offered under the rule.

But what an absurdity it is to say to all of the people of the United States today that we refuse to even consider the bill, when it has had a unanimous report from the committee, and has been reported out for consideration by the Rules Committee, by a nearly unanimous vote. It is far more logical to vote up the rule to consider the bill, and then to either strike the enacting clause or substantialy modify the bill in the Committee of the Whole. Read the language of the rule. It provides that when it is adopted it shall be in order to consider S. 796. That is the language. You do not commit yourselves. You do not bind yourselves to vote one way or the other. You simply vote to consider, and it would be anomalous, indeed, to say to the country today that we refuse even to consider, after a unanimous vote by one committee and the report by the Rules Committee, which is the steering committee of this House. Let us vote up the rule and modify the bill or vote it down. A vote for the rule is not a vote for the bill. The rule is wholly and strictly a matter of procedure. The merits of the bill are not at issue.

There are many objectionable provisions in this bill. Unless modified, I shall not support the bill. But how can one vote against the rule and thereby say that he refuses to so much as consider the matter.

If and when the rule is adopted, the House resolves itself in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for broad debate. Thereafter the bill is read for amendment.

The rule is wide open. Any germane amendment can be offered. A motion can be made to strike the enacting clause. Amendments can be offered to delete any section of the bill. Substitute measures can be offered. Thereafter, the bill in such form as determined by the Committee of the Whole comes on for final action. Nobody is bound. Every Member is a free agent to vote as he pleases. But at a time like this, when the public mind is agitated, the elected Representatives should not refuse to consider this matter in an orderly and regular way. If the bill is ultimately defeated, we shall have the satisfaction, the people will have the satisfaction, and labor will have the satisfaction of knowing that the proposal was properly considered and that every affected interest has had its day in court on this floor.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I certainly was edified by hearing the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] when he took to task three members of his own party for their action in regard to this matter. I wonder if the gentleman from Illinois has forgotten the right-about turn that he made on the war measures when they were under discussion in 1941. As one Member of this House who took part in those debates and opposed every single measure that I thought was going to get us into this war, I stood on exactly the same platform that the gentleman from Illinois did, but I had the courage of my convictions and went back home and said so. The gentleman from Illinois took a right-about face and promptly marched down the hill again, in fear of what was going to happen the next election.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. His speech does not for 1 minute affect my vote either now or any other time. I believe in standing by my convictions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I deplore the existing conditions as much as any man, but I hope that within a few days or perhaps hours matters will be adjusted fairly and equitably.

My colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] criticizes his colleagues because they were courageous enough to admit that they have made a mistake when they voted to report the bill out of committee. I will say to him that instead of being criticized they should be commended on their admission that they have been imposed upon in voting for this bill which is a vicious substitute for the Connally bill. For the information of my colleague there were many other Members who had no opportunity to explain that they were misled in voting for this monstrosity of a bill which embodies all the vicious Smith provisions that certain antilabor gentlemen have tried to force through this House in the last 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, right here I wish to say that the Committee on Military Affairs, which emasculated the Connally bill, and that without a hearing, has usurped the legislative jurisdiction of other committees. Its membership has yielded to my friend, the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, who, like the gentleman from Virginia and others, are unfortunately extremely prejudiced against organized labor. I regret that these antilabor groups and members have been able to force a rule out of the Committee on Rules over my protest, notwithstanding the fact, as has been stated here and before the Committee on Rules, that hearings had not been held by the Committee on Military Affairs despite the urgent appeals of the heads of all the labor organizations that they be given an opportunity to be heard. They were denied a hearing on the theory or the lame assumption that previous hearings had been held, but the antilabor members failed to state that hearings were held, not during the present Congress, but in the last Congress.

Mr. Speaker, if this legislation was not so far-reaching, I could overlook the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that he gave these labor leaders a hearing yesterday. It is strange, indeed, that this hearing was accorded weeks after the bill was reported by his committee, and after the rule for its consideration had been forced out of the Committee on Rules. Does he not think that it was rather late to grant such a hearing? Oh, yes; he states that they will amend the bill after hearing from these labor leaders. I say to him that no number of amendments that might be adopted on the floor will eliminate the unfair restrictions against labor. They will deprive a man of his right to voice his opinion and will violate his privileges under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Speaker, personally I concede that the labor leaders of this country are against this legislation. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and, I presume, the gentleman from Mississippi, will likewise stress that labor is opposed to the legislation, but I wish to point out that leaders in industry as well as high officials of the Government, including Secretary of War Stimson, Secretary of the Navy Knox, Admiral Land of the Maritime Commission, and many others are also opposed to this legislation. The proponents of this bill and the enemies of labor seek at all times to place the blame for strikes and stoppages of work at the doorstep of labor, but it happens at the moment in the serious mine labor situation that the miners have agreed to compromise while the mine owners, for whom we have done so much and aided to a greater extent than ever before, refuse to accede to the offer of compromise. They apparently fail to recognize that the tremendous increase in the cost of living justifies a reasonable increase in the wages of men engaged in the most hazardous of all occupations. Favorable action on the resolution for a rule or on the bill will be a feather in the hat of John L. Lewis, who selfishly, it appears to me, would weaken the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and other labor organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the Committee on Labor and the Committee on the Judiciary having jurisdiction, and unlike the Committee on Military Affairs, are holding hearings on needed labor legislation. The proposed legislation, instead of being destructive or oppressive to labor or industry, will be helpful and beneficial to them as well as to the Government, and I can assure the House that when the bills are reported out the Committee on Rules will grant a rule for their consideration without delay.

The gentleman from Virginia gave some figures relating to the number of strikes. He did not say that some of the strikes were of only a half hour or an hour or a day or 2 in duration.

I most respectfully ask him to take notice of the fact that all these strikes amounted to a net loss in man-hours of only three-tenths of 1 percent monthly. I repeat, the loss amounted to only that much—only three-tenths of 1 percent in man-hours per month, and notwithstanding this, he continues to stress the undue number of strikes and to magnify the number of hours lost by reason of strikes and stoppages of work—anything to create prejudice against labor that has kept its word and its pledge to eliminate strikes and to cooperate 100 percent with the Government; and this labor has done, despite the statement of the gentleman from Virginia.

In this connection, I also wish to insert, for the information of the House, a telegram which I received only this morning from Mr. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, which also really expresses the sentiments of all organized labor in the United States, which have a right to petition, and rights to appeal, to speak in behalf of 10 or 11 million wage workers, unlike some unfair, avaricious and unwise industrialists and publicists who keep the Washington hotels and the Capitol overcrowded with their lobbyists and agents. Mr. Green's telegram reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 1, 1943.*

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It seems inconceivable that Congress would consider and act upon vicious antilabor legislation such as the Connally-May bill, S. 796, without giving labor a chance to be heard in opposition to said measure. My appeal to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to grant labor a hearing in opposition to the bill was denied. I appeal to the Members of the House to defeat the rule providing for consideration of the Connally-May antilabor bill in order that it may be returned to the Committee on Military Affairs for further consideration and to accord the representatives of the American Federation of Labor an opportunity to present facts and arguments in opposition to said antilabor legislation.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the three ladies, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE], and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], who so splendidly appealed to the Members to vote against this atrocious Smith destructive conglomeration of antilabor provisions as contained in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I feel that this is not the time to pass this legislation, because it would do a great deal more harm than the advocates think it may do good.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, rarely has Congress selected a more propitious time to consider a particular matter of legislation than is the case of our consideration of the antistrike bill today. True, some of us may act hot-headedly under the existing circumstances, but, on the other hand, perchance there may be some who need the stimulus of such a national threat to realize the danger and to stir sufficient courage to do that which must be done if democracy is to survive.

Government by law in this great Nation is challenged and is dangerously near a break-down. Within the body politic, under governmental sanction and without Government control, we have permitted political organizations, under the name of organized labor, to grow to such proportions that they now threaten the sovereignty of the Government itself. The dramatic example of the moment is that of John L. Lewis, dictator of the Mine Workers' Union, who has placed his imperious will above the law and above the interest of his country at war.

The President of the United States has solemnly appealed to the mine workers to go back to the mines and mine coal as their patriotic duty under the stars and stripes. John L. Lewis tells them not to work. The mine workers have chosen to

follow, not the President, not the Commander in Chief in time of war, but instead the dictator of the miners' union. Why do you suppose they chose to follow Lewis' leadership rather than to follow the President of the United States and the undoubted promptings of their own patriotic impulses? The answer is not far to find. John L. Lewis holds the power of economic life or death over them. Many of these people know no trade but mining. Upon that they must depend for their livelihood. If John L. Lewis blackballs a miner there is no appeal from his decision. No miner can work in a union mine without Lewis' permission. This is the reason that the miners are creatures subject to the nod and whim of Lewis' wishes as if they were lieges of a feudal lord. And the Government itself, shame upon all who are responsible for it, delivered the miners into this economic bondage by forcing all nonunion miners to join Lewis' union. Now, the livelihood of all the United Mine Workers is in the hand of Lewis, who owes no responsibility to anyone for his satrapy, and, indeed, contemptuously defies the Government of the United States. The Government must not only break this strike, but it must break the toils of Lewis' tyranny over 500,000 of our fellow Americans.

For 2 years now I have waged a fight against inflation, which is a hazard to the Nation second only to the threat of Hitler and Japan. I have done my utmost to fight this internal foe. We know that more great nations have fallen from within than from the force of external military foes.

Belatedly though it was, the President has ordered that the line be held against wage and salary increases and against run-away prices.

The farmers of the United States have patriotically accepted restraints feeling that in doing so they were making a proper sacrifice and contribution to the stability of our economy which must endure if we are to win the war and the peace.

John L. Lewis, and others, too, are attempting to break the line against wage increases. Lewis is disregarding all orders, all measures, and all procedures set up for the purpose of handling disputes. He is contemptuous of the Nation's leadership. Indeed, he is attempting to take the measure of the President of this great Republic. By our action on this bill, Lewis and every other home-grown dictator must be made amenable to the law. And the law must be enforced. Otherwise he will continue to regard himself above the law, thus degenerating democracy to mobocracy.

I want to warn the President that if he succumbs to the threat of this unpatriotic onslaught against his leadership and against the sovereignty of the people's government; that if John L. Lewis' demands are granted, he can count me out on restrictions on farm commodities, or on the little businessmen of the country. Of course, I well know that if all restraints are removed the devil will be to pay, but he'll be to pay anyway if the Government isn't big enough to handle a mad egotist like Lewis; so, if that be the case, we'll all just take the ride together, as far as I am concerned. A partial holding of the line is not only unworkable but unfair. It should be held everywhere, and cannot be held anywhere unless it is held everywhere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule for two reasons. The first is that full and sufficient hearings were not given on this particular measure. The second is that the Committee on Military Affairs should not have jurisdiction over this kind of legislation. If the Committee on Military Affairs had conducted proper hearings, with industry and labor invited to testify, and if they had considered the facts, this sort of legislation would never have been brought out. I approach this problem as a practical businessman and I know how industry feels about this sort of legislation. I know how labor feels about it.

Mr. SABATH. How does industry feel?

Mr. KELLEY. It is against it.

The laboring people of this Nation are making inestimable sacrifices. Their wages have been frozen, and in many instances they have been frozen on the job, thus preventing any opportunity to better their conditions.

Besides this, the rationing in many areas has prevented families from getting sufficient food, and the workers of the families in heavy industries, such as steel workers and miners, have been denied sufficient food to sustain their strength for their arduous work.

In addition, they have suffered with the rest of the people the taxes and rising cost of living.

To top this off, almost every laboring family has sons in the services. Further, it is estimated that among certain union groups the percentage of members in the armed forces is as high as 18 percent. Several are as high as 16 percent. This is far above the national average.

It is regrettable that Members of Congress and many newspapers overlook this fact and do not pay enough tribute to those who have out-produced any nation in the world in war materials.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, strikes in defense industries in time of war are strikes against the Government, and should not be permitted.

The truth of this statement was recognized by the labor leaders when they agreed with the President of the United States that there should be no strikes during the war, and the War Labor Board was set up so that all parties aggrieved could submit their differences to this Board for arbitration, and the understanding was that work should continue while the differences were being arbitrated by this Board.

Unfortunately, we have had many strikes since the war began in many different industries, and today the coal mines of the United States are closed, notwithstanding the fact that coal is an essential commodity upon which all of our war industries depend, and John L. Lewis, the head of the union miners, refuses to appear before the Board to consider or discuss the question of the demands of the miners, which has now caused a strike and the closing of the mines.

This is defiance of law and a contempt for the constituted authorities of the Government.

Appeals have been made by the President of the United States, but such appeals have gone unheeded, and all of the coal mines are closed today, due to a strike of the miners, which is crippling to the war effort and which, if continued, will paralyze the industries that are producing the guns, munitions, tanks, and planes which our boys must have with which to whip the enemy.

With such a situation as this confronting us, Congress cannot refuse to consider legislation to prevent such stoppages, and I am glad that this bill has been brought before the House, so that we can now consider legislation designed to prevent strikes in defense industries in time of war.

It has been definitely determined that the President is powerless to prevent strikes in war industries, and it is now up to Congress to do so. The American people are looking to Congress, as they have a right to do, to pass proper legislation dealing with such a situation, and if Congress fails to consider such legislation, it would be a neglect of duty in time of war, the consequences of which may be disastrous in the winning of the war.

It is unthinkable that the House of Representatives will fail to meet the responsibility which devolves upon it today, and the defeat of the rule to consider this bill, in my judgment, would cause Congress to sink to a new low in the eyes of the American people.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule and also the so-called Connally-Smith bill which it makes in order because I believe it proposes a remedy that is more dangerous than the disease it is intended to cure.

When I think of the comparatively small group involved, in comparison with all labor employed on war work, it seems about as logical for Congress to pass this bill as for a surgeon to cut off a man's head to save his finger.

I know that a great many people are fighting mad at labor unions, some for personal reasons, others whose emotions have been whipped up by the press and the radio.

I think myself that if labor is to preserve the right to strike in peacetime, which is its only effective weapon against organized employers, it might be wise for all labor to adopt, as almost all labor has adopted, the policy of no strikes in wartime.

The fact that a small group headed by a hate-poisoned, power-drunk leader

have struck and are temporarily paralizing a vital war industry does not warrant Congress in penalizing all labor.

Now, of course, with a coal strike on today, it is both easy and popular to pillory labor. In fact, we have a situation just made to order for labor baiters and labor haters. The coal strike makes it tough for men who support labor on principle and who are convinced that while the present situation is bad it still does not warrant penalizing all labor. In fact, to do so would be the equivalent of hanging all men named Jones because a man named Jones committed murder.

It certainly was not striking labor that produced 100,000 airplanes; it certainly is not striking labor that produced such a volume of machine guns that one-sixth of our armed forces could be armed with them; it certainly was not striking labor that produced the tanks in 5 weeks that licked Rommel at El Alamein; it certainly is not striking labor that is building more ships than the Axis Powers can sink, though they started the war with more subs, guns, tanks, planes, and ships than we had.

It is easy to smear labor. Being a human institution, it has faults, yes, grievous faults, but still very human faults. It is easy to stand up here on the floor and charge everything; but labor, with all its faults, has performed a miracle on the production line.

It is the over-all results that count, and labor has done a magnificent, aye, a marvelous, over-all job of production.

I might offer an invidious comparison, but since comparisons are odious I will not.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I favor the defeat of the Connally-Smith bill, and will take advantage of the first opportunity to kill it by voting against the rule now under consideration. I favor cutting it off sharply, right behind the ears, without wasting any time. There are no arguments in favor that are valid or appealing to me. There are many arguments against the rule and the bill. The Norris-LaGuardia law and the National Labor Relations Act and all of the labor gains of the past 10 years, and even more would be jeopardized if not nullified should the bill pass. I take no chances upon the rule and shall vote against it at this, the first opportunity. There can be no doubt as to my sentiments. I refuse to be swayed by the wave of hysteria which has been heightened by the coal strike which is now in progress and is so disappointing to all of us. This bill will harm, not help the situation. The opponents of labor, not its friends, are taking advantage of a psychological time to force through a bill which would place all of labor in a strait jacket.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this resolution simply provides that the House shall give consideration to a bill that has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Military Affairs, as well as the Committee on Rules. I am not satisfied with all of the provisions of the bill to be considered under this rule but I do think the House should show courage and willingness in permitting the legislation to come to the floor and be subjected to debate and amendments. If it were a closed rule that did not permit sufficient time for debate and did not allow the offering of amendments, I would not support it but I do think the legislation is of sufficient importance to the House and to the country that it should be given full and complete discussion. Mr. Speaker, I am not in favor of any law or any measure that, in my judgment, will in any way injure organized labor or its right to organize and bargain. Labor, generally speaking, has done a magnificent job in the war effort. It has made a record that is not excelled anywhere in the world. The rank and file of labor are among our most patriotic citizens. They want to do the right thing, and they want to do their part to see that this war is brought to a successful conclusion just as soon as it can possibly be done. It is almost impossible to appreciate the responsibility labor has assumed in the war effort. I do think that, if it is found necessary by this Congress to do so, legislation should be passed to see that the fair and reasonable rights of labor, generally, are properly guarded and protected. I hope and believe this House will give fair consideration to all sides of the problem involved when the pending measure comes up for debate and final decision.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCANLON.]

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a minute if the gentleman from New York will permit me, to say as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor, that during the last 3 weeks we have been conducting hearing on H. R. 1483, introduced by the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman LANDIS, a bill to require the furnishing of certain information by labor organizations and to prohibit political contributions by labor organizations, and on H. R. 804, introduced by the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman WOODRUFF, a bill prohibiting aliens from holding office in labor organizations or voting at the elections of labor organizations, we have never been able to get one person from management to appear before our subcommittee and tell us why such legislation as this is needed at this time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule. I regret that we suffer from such an exiguity of time in which to advance arguments against the pending drastic antilabor bill, S. 796.

In this connection, I quote William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor:

> The victims of this legislation, if it is finally passed, will be the membership of the American Federation of Labor, who in response to a request made by the President of the United States relinquished the exercise of the right to strike for the duration of the war. The record shows that the 6,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor have made a 98 percent record in keeping this no-strike pledge. These are the workers who, immediately after Pearl Harbor, erected barracks for our soldiers, manufacturing plants, buildings at our flying fields, all in record-breaking time. They are the workers who produced 6,200 planes last month, and are turning out ships, tanks, guns, and ammunition in an amazing way. They have reached new heights and established new records in production. They are the best, most skilled and efficient workers in the world.
>
> The Connally antistrike bill strikes at a very fundamental right of working men and women. When through the enactment of legislation you deprive workers of the right to strike, you impose upon them a condition of involuntary servitude which is contrary to our American way of life, and to our democratic principles and processes. There is a vast difference between the voluntary relinquishment of the right to strike and the substitution of force and compulsion against workers, robbing them of the right to strike and reducing them to a condition of involuntary servitude. The 6,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor voluntarily laid aside the strike weapon for the duration of the war, but they will oppose with all the power at their command any attempt to compel them to do so. It is no answer to say that the right to strike is taken away only in industries which have been taken over by the Government. This amounts to a difference in degree only, and not in substance.

Recently a newspaper editorial trenchantly summed up the situation which I think worthy of reading to you at this point:

[From the Washington Post of May 13, 1943]

CURBING STRIKES

> The House Military Affairs Committee has warped the Senate's Connally bill into a pair of handcuffs for labor. What was intended originally as legislation to strengthen the President's powers in dealing with strike problems has now become a purely punitive and repressive measure. This is the reaction of angry men to the situation created by John L. Lewis in the coal industry. But ire is scarcely a sound stimulus to lawmaking. When the House comes to consider this proposal, it will do well to bear in mind the admonition which Senator BARKLEY delivered to his colleagues during discussion of the Connally bill last week: "Do not legislate in anger because you are mad at somebody."
>
> The provisions of the old Smith antistrike bill which the House Military Affairs Committee grafted onto the Connally measure and which we criticized 12 months ago can serve only as an irritant to the already difficult labor problems with which the country is beset. They will be regarded by organized labor, and rightly, as class legislation, designed to impose upon them special restrictions. Such legislation can be nothing but a provocation to unrest and disunity. Men won't work when they are shackled.

All organized labor groups in America fulminate at this measure. Our Commander in Chief, the War Department, the Maritime Commission, the Navy Department, the War Production Board, the War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board join in vigorously denouncing the instant bill.

We cannot legislate morale. We cannot insure production at the point of a bayonet in a free democracy. We are asked here and now to turn back the clock of progress. I will not be a party to retrogression. I urge my colleagues to vote "No" on the rule.

Because so much has been said in condemnation of coal miners, I ask your indulgence while I briefly discuss some little-comprehended facts anent that great assemblage of war workers.

A PLEA FOR JUSTICE FOR COAL MINERS

Mr. Speaker, the most maligned and misunderstood group of skilled trade unionists in the United States is that comprising the coal miners. Today these miners are asking for belated justice, for overdue recognition of the need for wage adjustments in the coal industry.

The coal miner is perhaps the most skilled artisan in America. He must be a chemist, a powder man, a carpenter, a civil engineer, a structural engineer, possess a superb physique, all in one. It is the industry which has the highest mortality rate of any in this country. Coal miners are more exploited, in many of the coal-mining towns, than are any other comparable group. They are ill-fed and undernourished, below the standard of their neighbors. In many eastern coal-mining communities they are compelled to live in virtual hovels and are denied the atmosphere of cleanliness which is their God-given right.

Last year they produced 640,000,000 tons of anthracite and bituminous coal. This year they will produce in excess of 700,000,000 tons of these combined products. Yet, there are 160,000 fewer men employed in the coal mines now than when the previous coal production record was established.

In 1941, 64,764 mine workers were killed and injured, a casualty record of 1 out of 10. When the 1942 casualty roll has been completed statistically it will be found that 75,000 men have been killed and injured. The coal miner's job is laborious and extremely hazardous.

Mine workers live remote from the cities. They work all day in the dark, breathing impure air flushed into them by power fans. They must strip down to a pair of shorts and shoes and socks. Their bodies are saturated with perspiration. They are subject to constant abrasions from falling rock and pieces of coal. Their skin is often a mass of painful cuts and bruises into which coal dust filters, adding to their agony. Few of the mine properties possess washrooms where the men may scour and clean their bodies following their daily shift. Frequently it requires as much as 45 minutes of vigorous scrubbing to get the body reasonably clean. Often the men are required to ride from 10 to 20 miles to their homes before they can wash, while overheated from perspiration and while filthy with coal dust.

There is no Member here who would be ambitious to train his son to become a coal miner. Yet the coal miner performs a special service to the community and to the Nation. Without his activity, industry would falter.

In the metals mines of the United States, the miners are given compensation on the basis of portal to portal. In the coal mines of Canada and Great Britain the miners are likewise paid on the same basis. The British miners' workday starts when they enter the mine and ceases when they emerge.

The mine worker must eat and he must eat strong meat. Strong food is essential to his efficient functioning. Without ample proteins, the miner's bodily strength disappears, his resistance is lowered, and he becomes a victim of the ills that are the sequels of malnutrition.

The coal miner is subject to the attack of some six or seven different kinds of poisonous gas, only one of which is detectable by the sense of smell. Often he works in muck and water up to his knees, sometimes up to his waistline. He works under the strain of knowing that at any moment his way out may be cut off, that the roof may cave in, that he may be asphyxiated.

Yet the coal miners have purchased more War bonds in proportion to their number and have furnished more members and sons of members to the armed services on a per capita percentage than any other labor group in our country.

The Little Steel formula has denied justice to the workers of the country. It has failed to retard the upward spiral of wholesale or retail prices. The cost of living to the coal miner has pyramided astronomically.

The following table shows the comparison of average increase for the high and low averages in prices of foodstuffs as between August 1939 and February 1943. These figures speak for themselves. It must be remembered that a coal miner's expenditures are almost entirely consumed in outlays for food and plain and common consumer necessities:

Medium average

Beef	100.8
Pork cuts	132.2
Butter and eggs	147.8
Fish	119.5
Canned goods	104.2
Irish potatoes	159.2
Dry peas and beans	124.4
Fresh fruit and vegetables	110.6
Dried fruit	113.8
Lard and shortening	144.9
Chicken	119.0
Lamb	119.4

The figure for fresh fruits and vegetables, 110.6, is for January 1941–February 1943.

The Congress has denied to the President the legal power to limit net annual incomes to a maximum of $25,000 per year. The Congress has voted into law a quasi-Ruml plan, favorable to the rich. Congress has shown solicitude repeatedly for those of heavy incomes. Let us give some regard to the requirements of coal miners.

The labor members of the War Labor Board unanimously supported the stand of the coal miners in their wage-adjustment request. Remember that the coal miner, after years of devoted work, receives less pay than shipyard and aircraft workers. In my State the coal operators are willing to recognize the coal miners' wage request as reasonable, but are denied the opportunity to grant the request unless and until the eastern coal operators grant such increases.

No one has yet suggested freezing of profits in industry, nor has any statutory limit been placed thereon. The agitation of the mine workers has gotten results from the O. P. A. to the extent that it has embarked on a roll-back in prices which will help to stabilize and slow up increases in the price of living.

Recently two colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE], paid eloquent tribute in this House to the patriotic services being rendered to the country by the coal miners. The miner is asking for simple and elementary justice, and his prayer should be heeded.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT].

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule and to this Connally antistrike bill which will come before the House if the rule is adopted.

When this bill was before our committee we did not have the testimony of the War and Navy Departments, the Maritime Commission, or the War Labor Board. Since that time the representatives of these various branches of our Government, branches which are charged particularly with the all-important task of winning the war, have given us their opinions, belatedly, it is true, but nonetheless weighty and compelling insofar as they affect my present decision to vote.

The representatives of each of these departments have now unalterably expressed their opposition to this bill as an actual deterrent to the war effort. Surely they who are charged, as I said before, with the task of seeing this war to a successful conclusion should know what is best for the war effort. In addition, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, has given to the public the staggering accomplishments that have been achieved by the cooperation and patriotic effort of labor. Production records are exceeding the greatest hopes of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the assembly line is as important in this war as the far-flung battle line, and the soldiers of production who are supplying the soldiers on the front with the materials of war should not be harassed by antilabor legislation. There is no evidence that has been submitted to this House which shows that the stream of supplies to our troops has not been flowing in adequate amount.

This is no time to arouse disunity and discontent among the millions of patriotic workers of our country.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, before a physician can successfully prescribe, he must first diagnose, if he is to cure the ills of his patient. Before Congress can successfully legislate, it should first diagnose, if it is to materially aid in curing some of the Nation's ills.

If it is unethical for a physician to prescribe the identical medicine for each patient who has a headache without first ascertaining the cause of the pain, then it seems to me that it is just a little unethical for Congress to enact drastic legislation which will brand all labor with the same iron.

The physician encounters radicals, hypochondriacs, and insane among his patients. He treats them in accordance

with prescribed methods for their various ills. Just because one of them happens to be mentally ill, he does not consign all of his patients to a psychopathic ward.

Neither do I feel that Congress should consign all members of labor to condemnation just because some radical leader, suffering from delusions of grandeur, should fly off on a tangent. I believe that the guilty should be punished, but I am not in favor of mass execution just to reach the few.

If the Army discovers that it has an inefficient general, it replaces him with a competent commander and does not purge the entire regiment for following the leader into defeat. I honestly believe that if labor had the same laws governing it as industry has, there would be no trouble.

A fellow named Adam once had a beautiful estate, but he also had an ambition to see beyond the boundaries of his estate, so he ate an apple and took a look for himself. Adam's ambition put the entire human race behind the eight ball for the time being, but you all know the verdict which was finally rendered. An all-wise judge cast Adam out of his estate and eventually sacrificed His only Son to help us out of the situation in which Adam had placed us.

It seems to me that there is more than one Adam responsible in this case, who, while not trying to corner the apple market, have certainly been trying to corner the market of power.

I am heartily in favor of casting these Adams out of the estate and honestly believe that just as the workers in a colony of bees drive out the drones, so will these Adams be driven out by the colony, providing that we do not destroy the workers in the colony.

Ambition unrestrained is sometimes a dangerous attribute. Each and every Member of Congress is ambitious to do something concerning an unjustifiable situation. The question is not so much that we do something, but that we do the right something.

I remember reading in high school the admonition given to Cromwell by Cardinal Wolsey in Shakespeare's Henry VIII. He said to him:

> Cromwell, I charge thee, fling away ambition: by that sin fell the angels; how can man, then, the image of his Maker, hope to win by it?

History is filled with men, from the time of Adam down to the present, whose ambitions have been their downfall. No doubt many of you feel that history should now repeat itself and cause the downfall of an ambitious individual.

Perhaps you are right, but I trust that your ambition to overthrow an ambitious individual will not be the means of overthrowing thousands of individuals whose sole ambition is to produce the munitions for winning the war, while at the same time to enjoy the necessities of life with very few of its luxuries.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SULLIVAN].

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, no matter what any man may say, it is apparent to me that this legislation now pending before the House is antilabor legislation. It is so understood by labor as a whole—by the public stung into resentment by an incident of recalcitrance carried beyond all bounds of reason—and I make bold to say it is so understood by a great many Members of the Congress who are now giving it their support. It seems to me, aside and apart from all consideration of the numerical strength of those who eat their bread in the sweat of their brows, that the rights of labor as an essential and inseparable part of this country, its prosperity, and its happiness, are such that this great factor in our common life should not be hastily indicted before the bar of a legislative body well described as "the greatest deliberative body in the world."

I believe it was Pitt who declared that you cannot indict a whole nation, and it remains true today that he who rouses up the machinery of government to degrade and outlaw any class of the citizenry, whether on the score of intolerance in matters of race or creed, or economic or political distinction—tosses a firebrand of bigotry into our national affairs that may well prove the forerunner of destruction of our American institutions with consequent disaster to us all.

Mr. Speaker, rather than being forced into the position of a culprit and public enemy at this time, labor is richly entitled to the praise and confidence of the Nation at large. It required no compulsory or other legislation to call forth from the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. in the shattering dawn after Pearl Harbor the pledge that there would be no strike called by labor during the present war.

These bodies knew that the right to strike was as inherent as the right to defend against involuntary servitude. But they also knew that under stress of common peril all rights might and should be waived. No one in this House, I take it, will rise up to say that this pledge has not been substantially and faithfully kept. Not only has labor kept on the job but by constant and Herculean effort it has increased its efficiency and the output to figures hitherto undreamed of.

The labor movement in this country, uniting its membership in a common cause seeking higher standards of living and a collective activity productive of fair, stable, and dependable bases of working, living, and conditions of work, is perhaps the largest aspect of social progress under a democracy to be found anywhere on earth. It was this movement that cut down working hours from those of the serf chained to his toil, to those of a free man having not alone a daily pittance but a place in the very sun of existence. It was organized labor that finally demonstrated that human labor is not a commodity to be bought, sold, and cast off in the open market at whatever terms that might be dictated by competition and managerial inefficiency, or by the greed of employers fattening in times of depression on the necessities of the poor.

Mr. Speaker, practically all the advances in the condition of labor, bringing a larger economic output, an increased standard of public health, education, and usefulness, bringing to the worker a larger purchasing power immediately reflected in a greater demand for consumable goods, have been accomplished by the labor movement, without the help of legislation, and often in the face of a public opinion poisoned at the wellsprings by clever and unscrupulous demagogs who found it to their advantage to ally themselves with those who had money for such purposes.

It is only in recent years that legislation has gradually passed through the Congress giving effect to the rule that employments of all sorts are affected by a public interest and should be supervised in the light of the public conscience. This legislation enunciating newly the old functions of Government to enact legislation to promote the general welfare has been of great service to labor and the people at large. But at most it merely recognized rights that had always existed and it provided administrative agencies for the purpose of arriving at terms that should be recognized as fair, just, legal, voluntary, and capable of enforcement above and beyond the power of the unions that had so far maintained them. Great advances had been made through collective bargaining. Contracts had become firm contracts binding both parties alike and not merely truces to be violated when the convenient opportunity arose.

Mr. Speaker, the compact between labor and the Government was not one founded on any legislation. It was the spontaneous, patriotic expression of the attachment of a large fraction of our people for our liberties. Likewise in the administration of the pledge by the aid of the War Labor Board there was no binding legislation. The President preferred to keep the relation one that was voluntary in its inception and one that was voluntary in its approach to the means that were expected to remove even the occasion for strikes. The voluntary, extralegislative character of the compact between labor and the Government must not be overlooked. When labor pledged cooperation, the Government pledged that it would refrain from compulsion by law. To pass a compulsory law now in a fit of anger and to cover up its own failure to do its part by controlling the cost of living would now be a glaring example of want of good faith on the part of the Government.

It may be conceded that the task of the War Labor Board and of the unions was not a simple one. Other agencies of Government, some armed by legislation with more potent capacities, bent their influences on the problems of the workers. The military demands and the manpower demands were calculated to disrupt the permanency and continuity of labor. Food and fuel shortages with accompanying rises in prices, pressed heavily on labor.

Mr. Speaker, the thing that has brought down condemnation on the head of labor and that has provoked the hasty drafting of this pending legislation as a punitive measure has been the ambitious, domineering, and rule-or-ruin policy of John L. Lewis. Under the no-strike pledge and the waiver of legislation, the highest degree of good faith required him as a deposed leader of the C. I. O. and as an active head of the mine workers, whom he has for long swayed as a feudal baron would sway his feudal retainers,

to give full effect to those pledges and to submit his grievances to that tribunal set up not by law but as an evidence of good faith. Mr. Lewis has balked and the mine properties are now in the physical custody of the United States Government. Mr. Lewis refused to continue collective negotiations through the War Labor Board on a pretext too transparent to be seriously argued. It is this situation that has brought about a demand to substitute the existing gentleman's agreements by the passage of general legislation indicting and regimenting all war labor as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I do not say that the miners have no just complaint. The $1 raise they received in 1941 was shortly more than offset by an increase in living costs of about 22 percent, and the cost of food is 40 percent of the living costs of miners.

They have long and laborious work, calling for all their strength, and yet they do not get enough to eat. A man who formerly had and needed three pork chops with his lunch every day now has none. He goes home and finds no meat in the house. At the company store, where formerly 1,200 pounds of meat were available for purchase weekly, now no more than 70 to 80 pounds are to be had. These are serious conditions, and they cry out for a remedy, but I am convinced the remedy is to be found through the War Labor Board and the Office of Price Administration. We cannot at this time desert the orderly avenues of presentation and appeal. Mr. Lewis stated he would not bargain further because his case was prejudged.

Mr. Speaker, I hold no brief for the War Labor Board or the Office of Economic Stabilization. These agencies, operating under Executive directives, have been attempting to reduce to a formula the limitations of relief they will administer generally under all conditions that may arise. While adhering strictly in most cases to the formula for increases in wages, they and other agencies of Government have proved woefully ineffective and inept in the domain of prices of those commodities that make up the cost of living. They are even faced with a shortage of food in the open market. It is a matter of elementary mathematics that when a ratio is ordained between two factors, one at least of the factors must remain constant or the ratio will become meaningless.

If we determine that a man is entitled to three meals a day, we cannot stultify ourselves by later requiring that one of the meals shall consist of bread and water.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the War Labor Board, even in the case of the mine workers, is gradually evolving an application of its formulas and its relief powers that will solve the conflict while at the same time preserving the "face" of both sides.

It is a terrible thing, Mr. Speaker, for any country to be ridden by a formula. We have fought wars for formulas.

Mr. Speaker, there are many who will say this is not a punitive measure but the orderly genesis of pertinent legislation. I cannot agree with them. At another time and after a cooling time some of the present legislation may be worthy of reexamination, but today with its slant in the direction of removing some established rights, such as given by the Norris-LaGuardia act and others, the legislation has capacities for mischief and injustice far beyond any remedial merits it may contain.

Mr. Speaker, the tendency manifested by the pending legislation is to make labor in general the scapegoat for certain ills and maladjustments in the economics of a nation at war. Certain effects are considered by the authors of this legislation and immediately it occurs to them to associate these effects with the first causes that come to their mind. It seems to me that this legislation is as far from the point as is the alleged Chinese custom of burning down a house to roast a pig merely because the art of pig-roasting originally was discovered after a conflagration.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the purpose to injure labor in its good name and in the enjoyment of hard-won rights is too evident in this legislation to be set down as inadvertent.

When the criminal procedure is resorted to with fines and imprisonments, supplemented by provision for the issuance of Federal injunctions under odious conditions that we had thought were forever abolished, it seems to me that this legislation is neither just nor wise. It appeals not to our sober sense but to strife and passion, denunciation, and recrimination. It is well calculated to alienate labor and to set one class at the throat of another to the great detriment of our war effort.

That I am not alone in these views is apparent from the protests that have already been made against this legislation. The War Department, the Navy Department, the Labor Department, the War Production Board, the Maritime Commission, the War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board, are among the agencies that have protested against the enactment of this type of legislation at this time. These are agencies that must meet and work with and look to labor in their daily tasks. Their burdens are great enough without adding those that will result from the enactment of legislation deliberately planned to provoke a disturbance of the economic and public peace.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, you cannot indict the whole body of labor in this way. If this business of indicting and pillorying diverse classes of the population is to begin in this instance, I ask you solemnly when and where it will end.

Let us fight the enemy but not among ourselves.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¾ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I think the time has arrived when we should calm ourselves and not accept everything as being 100 percent accurate that is said here in this Well.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] finds fault with those who have changed their opinion and who were intellectually honest enough with the Members of this House to admit that they made a mistake when they voted to report this bill out. These Members admit that no opportunity was given to the laboring people to express their opinion on this legislation. I want to congratulate those Members for having had the courage to change their opinion.

The time has arrived when we should stop insulting 80 percent of the people of this Nation by accusing them of being unpatriotic. Such action itself is un-American. This bill itself is un-American. If it had not been for the laboring people who still have the courage to protest, we would have but very little liberty left.

I only wish that the small businessmen and the farmer would have as much courage to protect their liberty as the labor organizations have. I repeat that the time has come when we should have sufficient intelligence, sufficient honesty and integrity to know that all our people are patriotic, that they are all doing their share to win this war.

On a number of occasions this House has invited foreign representatives to address us, but so far has not invited the small businessmen, the farmers, or the laborers to address it. We know that these have a real grievance. We know that the bureaucrats have crushed 500,000 small enterprises. We know that the farmer has not only been robbed of his help by the draft and cost-plus contracts, but that he has also been deprived of farm implements and repairs.

We know that the laboring people have a grievance. We know that the average income of industrial workers is still around $40 per week. We know that the coal miners have a real grievance. But so far I have heard no one who favors this bill of having suggested that these grievances be settled on a fair and just basis.

So far I have heard no Member who wants to make it a crime for others to demand justice while at work to offer to go and mine coal. If those who are so much opposed to strikes mean what they say, it might be well for them to offer their services as coal miners or as farm help or to perform other physical labor. They might profit by taking the strikers' place for a while.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] threatens us that we may stay at home if we do not accept his labor-baiting bill. My answer to the gentleman is, We are willing to take our chances.

I hope that we will vote this rule down, because it is unfair and it is unjust to the people who are now supplying and producing the war materials for half the world.

It is unfair not only to those people but it does violence to our integrity and wisdom. We have passed a lot of foolish bills in this House and sent them to the Senate. Our only justification is that the Senate, generally, does not pass them. That saves us from explaining our actions when we get back home.

Permit me to inform the Members of this House that 40,000,000 of our people are laboring people, that these 40,000,000

have just as many sons, brothers, and fathers on the battlefields in Europe, Africa, and Asia as the rest of us.

I would like to inform them that not only have they the sons on the foreign battlefields but they are doing the real work that is winning the war. They are the ones who are supplying half the world with arms, munitions, airplanes, and ships. It comes with poor grace for Congress to question their patriotism and pass a law that we will be ashamed of in the years yet to come.

There is no demand nor any reason for this bill. There is more than enough law now passed to handle every situation as it arises.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of time on this side to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 1¼ minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot do otherwise than to repeat here the protest I made before the Committee on Rules against bringing to the floor a bill which very evidently has had all too limited hearings. I would call to your attention the fact that the Government departments which have appeared before the committee were opposed to various and sundry sections of the bill. They contended that strikes would be legalized rather than outlawed and that the net result would be to stir up bitterness and make unity in the war effort almost impossible. I want to make it clear at this point that I reserve my right of decision on the bill itself until I know what amendments are to be made part of it, but I do protest the rule.

It is difficult to keep a balanced judgment over this whole strike situation. I confess that it is incredible to me that the men on any of the war-production lines who have sons at the front can consider anything in their own lives of greater moment than unqualified support of the war effort. Marvelous as is the result of labor's effort, miraculous as the production is reported to be, every strike endangers the lives of our fighting men, and every man involved, whether of labor or of management, will eventually have to take his personal responsibility for lengthening the war and so increasing devastation and chaos.

I have no brief for any or all of us who have failed in our responsibility to the widespread need of bettering labor conditions and the consequent living conditions, but I cannot condone any action that increases the war hazard.

I consider the method by which this bill comes to the floor short-sighted in the extreme as it gives justification to labor in its contention that Congress has seen fit to ignore its point of view, which will of necessity create serious disunity in the war effort. I say again, however, that the lives of our fighting men are in the balance. Let us all remember this at all points of our deliberations. If this House takes affirmative action on this bill it will be in an effort to control through the courts a situation which otherwise might even precipitate martial law. Were martial law invoked, by its very nature it would undo all the benefits labor has won for itself. This would be tragic indeed.

I must therefore, Mr. Speaker, protest the rule and hope that the bill may be returned to the committee for adequate hearings.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this is a rule voted out of the Rules Committee with one dissenting vote for the consideration of the so-called Smith-Connally bill, which was reported out of the Military Affairs Committee of the House with one dissenting vote—and that vote, I am advised, was because the bill was not drastic enough. This House is called upon today to adopt or reject this rule authorizing the consideration of this legislation. I did not seek the responsibility of reporting this rule to the House; I was designated to do so. But I have assumed my responsibility as a member of the Rules Committee, as a Member of the House, and as a Representative of the people of a sovereign State of the Union of the United States.

This bill has been termed an "anti-strike bill," and therefore an insult to labor. As a matter of fact, it is neither. What it is is a bill authorizing strikes under certain conditions and prescribing the conditions under which strikes can be held. I am one of those who believes that no one has a right to strike against his government, and at the appropriate time I shall offer an amendment to make it a felony to incite strikes in plants taken over by the Government. And certainly everyone who agrees with my position that no one has a right to strike against the Government will vote for that amendment.

Another tact is being resorted to here today to again prevent consideration of this type of legislation. You and I know that that is subterfuge. The gentleman from New York and others argue that no hearings were held on this bill, and that, therefore, it should be sent back to the committee for further hearings. Hearings? Mr. Speaker, I hold here a volume of printed hearings of a thousand pages that were had—I grant you not on the Connally bill but on the general subject of strike legislation, including the Wadsworth-Austin bill, the Smith bill, the Colmer bill, and others. Labor was heard on all of that proposed legislation, and, of course, was against it. The Committee on Military Affairs, some of whom would turn about face here today, knew when they voted this bill out what the attitude of labor was. This is but another instance of the machinations and political maneuvering of those who would defeat the bill. The people are sick and tired of this subterfuge and they are not as easily fooled as some of the politicians think they are.

Today several million young Americans, some still in their teens have been drafted into the service of this country to offer themselves as living sacrifices on the battlefields of Africa and Europe and upon the seven seas from Alaska to Tokyo and from Washington to Berlin. These men were drafted into the service of their country by you—the Members of this Congress. Today some of them are shivering and bleeding upon the desolate rock-strewn coasts of Attu Island, others are sweating and dying upon the parched beaches of tropical islands infested with vermin and snakes, while millions of others are being concentrated in Africa and in England for the great invasion push of Europe in an effort to save to posterity and perpetuate the ideals and institutions of our American way of life. You and I have some conception of the impending casualties which such an invasion attempt will bring about. We realize fully that the blue waters of the Mediterranean and the green waters of the Atlantic will run red with precious American blood when that effort starts. Moreover, we realize that the more guns, the more tanks, the more ammunition, and the more planes that these men have to back them up the fewer lives will be lost. You and I and the American people know that our success in Africa was due to the fact that we had more of these guns and tanks and planes than the enemy had.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, today we have the sad spectacle of a half million men engaged in the production of these necessary implements of war out on strike—some of them are striking for one cause and some for another. We have what these boys did not have, an organized minority that threatens to engulf the whole country, bringing pressure to bear on the sovereign representatives of the American people to not even consider a piece of legislation that would insure a continued production of war materials. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for those who would sabotage our war production to call strikes in the gun and plane and tank factories. All that is necessary is to strike at the source of production, which was done in the current coal strike. For we all know that it takes so many tons of coke to make so many tons of coal, and it takes so many tons of coal to make so many tons of steel, and so many tons of steel to make the ships and the planes and the guns and the tanks. By one fell swoop a man by the name of John L. Lewis has paralyzed the whole production program.

And yet we are now urged not to even consider this bill. We are asked to reverse ourselves. Having marched up the hill we are now asked to march back down.

I fully realize, my friends, the political pressure that is being applied to you today. I, too, have received the warnings of the heads of organized labor and their threats. But you and I are not alarmed about this, for you and I know full well that the rank and file of labor—the men who toil before the furnace and on the ships and in the factory—is just as patriotic as the man who wears the uniform and bares his breast to the enemy. Most of these laboring men, too, have sons, brothers, and other kinsmen in the front lines of this war. They as patriotic Americans are not going to hold against you your determination to do your courageous duty by your country and yourselves. Moreover, most of them realize what their leaders fail to see, and that is

that labor is as dependent upon public opinion as any other group of people. They realize that after all labor has as much, if not more, at stake than any other class of our people in this war effort. For if we should lose this war labor could easily become a commodity upon the slave markets of Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo.

Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the people of this Nation, from Maine to Mississippi and from New York to California, are upon this House today. For we have been telling them for nearly 2 years now that we in the House have passed legislation to curb this sabotage of our war program but that the other body has pigeon-holed it. The Senate has passed a bill which your Military Affairs Committee of the House has amended. We cannot evade the issue longer. The responsibility is ours. The die is cast. The orders of the President of the United States, the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, are today being flaunted. The Government of the United States is today being ignored. And for the first time in the history of this glorious young Republic, men have seen fit to strike against and in defiance of their Government. The Congress is challenged. The people are expecting us to meet our responsibilities. The question to be decided is whether a small organized minority can flaunt the will of the great unorganized masses. The issue is: Will the President and the Congress run the country or will it be dominated by John L. Lewis? A great patriotic American people are outraged today. Constitutional government is threatened. If we cannot adopt this rule and pass this bill then once and for all we should declare ourselves impotent to deal with any question involving labor. The American people expect an affirmative answer. Will they be denied again? Is political preference so much desired that we as members of the greatest deliberative body in the world are willing to be driven like miserable cowards to cover by threats of political retaliation at the hands of a few men who have arrogated unto themselves the right to defy the President and the Congress of the United States and the will of 130,000,000 American people?

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Congress will accept the challenge. I believe that it will meet the issue and that the prayers of patriotic Americans everywhere will be answered.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 211, nays 163, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—211

Abernethy	Andersen, H. Carl	Anderson, N. Mex.
Allen, Ill.	Anderson, Calif.	Andrews
Allen, La.		
Arends	Gregory	Pace
Auchincloss	Gwynne	Patman
Baldwin, Md.	Hale	Patton
Barden	Hall, Leonard W.	Peterson, Ga.
Bates, Mass.	Halleck	Poage
Beckworth	Hancock	Price
Bennett, Mo.	Hare	Priest
Bland	Harness, Ind.	Ramspeck
Bonner	Harris, Ark.	Randolph
Boren	Hays	Rankin
Boykin	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Bradley, Mich.	Hess	Reed, N. Y.
Brooks	Hill	Rees, Kans.
Brown, Ga.	Hinshaw	Richards
Brown, Ohio	Hobbs	Rivers
Bryson	Hoeven	Rizley
Buffett	Holmes, Mass.	Robertson
Bulwinkle	Holmes, Wash.	Rockwell
Burch, Va.	Jarman	Rodgers, Pa.
Burgin	Jeffrey	Rogers, Mass.
Camp	Jennings	Rohrbough
Cannon, Mo.	Jensen	Satterfield
Carlson, Kans.	Johnson, Anton J.	Schwabe
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, Luther A.	Shafer
Case	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sheppard
Church	Johnson, Okla.	Short
Clark	Johnson, Ward	Simpson, Pa.
Clason	Jones	Slaughter
Clevenger	Jonkman	Smith, Maine
Cole, N. Y.	Keefe	Smith, Ohio
Colmer	Kefauver	Smith, Va.
Cooley	Kilburn	Smith, Wis.
Cooper	Kilday	Sparkman
Cox	Kinzer	Springer
Cravens	Kleberg	Stanley
Creal	Knutson	Starnes, Ala.
Cunningham	Kunkel	Stearns, N. H.
Curtis	Lambertson	Stefan
Davis	Lanham	Stewart
Dirksen	Lea	Stockman
Disney	LeFevre	Sumner, Ill.
Ditter	McCord	Sumners, Tex.
Doughton	McCormack	Sundstrom
Drewry	McGehee	Taber
Durham	McKenzie	Talle
Dworshak	McLean	Tarver
Eaton	McMillan	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	McWilliams	Thomason
Ellis	Mahon	Towe
Elston, Ohio	Maloney	Vincent, Ky.
Fellows	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson, Ga.
Fernandez	Martin, Iowa	Vorys, Ohio
Fisher	Martin, Mass.	Wadsworth
Folger	Mason	Ward
Fulbright	May	Wasielewski
Fulmer	Miller, Conn.	Weaver
Gamble	Miller, Nebr.	West
Gathings	Mills	Whelchel, Ga.
Gavin	Monkiewicz	White
Gearhart	Monroney	Whitten
Gibson	Mott	Whittington
Gilchrist	Mundt	Wickersham
Gillette	Murray, Tenn.	Wigglesworth
Gillie	Newsome	Winstead
Goodwin	Norrell	Winter
Gore	O'Hara	Wolcott
Gossett		Woodruff, Mich.
Graham		Zimmerman
Grant, Ind.		
Green		

NAYS—163

Andresen, August H.	Curley	Gross
Angell	D'Alesandro	Hagen
Baldwin, N. Y.	Dawson	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Barrett	Day	Harless, Ariz.
Barry	Delaney	Hart
Bates, Ky.	Dewey	Heffernan
Beall	Dickstein	Heidinger
Bender	Dilweg	Hoch
Bennett, Mich.	Dingell	Holifield
Bishop	Dondero	Horan
Blackney	Douglas	Howell
Bloom	Eberharter	Hull
Bolton	Ellison, Md.	Izac
Bradley, Pa.	Elmer	Jackson
Brehm	Engel	Jenkins
Buckley	Fay	Johnson, Calvin D.
Burchill, N. Y.	Feighan	Johnson, J. Leroy
Burdick	Fenton	Judd
Busbey	Fish	Kean
Butler	Fitzpatrick	Kearney
Byrne	Flannagan	Kee
Canfield	Fogarty	Kelley
Carter	Forand	Kennedy
Celler	Ford	Keogh
Chenoweth	Furlong	Kirwan
Chiperfield	Gallagher	Klein
Coffee	Gavagan	LaFollette
Cole, Mo.	Gerlach	Lane
Crosser	Gordon	Larcade
Cullen	Gorski	Lemke
	Griffiths	Lesinski
		Lewis, Ohio
		Luce
		Ludlow
		Lynch
		McGranery
		McGregor
		McMurray
		Maas
		Madden
		Magnuson
		Manasco
		Mansfield, Mont.
		Marcantonio
		Merritt
		Miller, Mo.
		Miller, Pa.
		Morrison, La.
		Morrison, N. C.
		Mruk
		Murdock
		Murphy
		Murray, Wis.
		Myers
		Norman
		Norton
		O'Brien, Ill.
		O'Brien, Mich.
		O'Connor
		O'Konski
		O'Neal
		O'Toole
		Outland
		Philbin
		Pittenger
		Ploeser
		Pracht
		Rabaut
		Reed, Ill.
		Robinson, Utah
		Robsion, Ky.
		Rogers, Calif.
		Rolph
		Rowan
		Rowe
		Sabath
		Sadowski
		Sasscer
		Sauthoff
		Scanlon
		Schiffler
		Schuetz
		Simpson, Ill.
		Smith, W. Va.
		Snyder
		Somers, N. Y.
		Spence
		Stevenson
		Sullivan
		Taylor
		Tibbott
		Troutman
		Voorhis, Calif.
		Vursell
		Walter
		Weiss
		Wene
		Wheat
		Willey
		Wolfenden, Pa.
		Wolverton, N. J.
		Wright

NOT VOTING—58

Arnold	Hartley	Poulson
Bell	Hendricks	Powers
Cannon, Fla.	Herter	Ramey
Capozzoli	Hoffman	Russell
Chapman	Hope	Scott
Cochran	Johnson, Ind.	Sheridan
Compton	Kerr	Sikes
Costello	King	Steagall
Courtney	Landis	Talbot
Crawford	LeCompte	Thomas, Tex.
Culkin	McCowen	Tolan
Dies	Merrow	Treadway
Domengeaux	Michener	Van Zandt
Ellsworth	Nichols	Weichel, Ohio
Gale	O'Brien, N. Y.	Welch
Gifford	O'Leary	Wilson
Granger	Peterson, Fla.	Woodrum, Va.
Grant, Ala.	Pfeifer	Worley
Guyer	Phillips	
Harris, Va.	Plumley	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Harris of Virginia for, with Mr. O'Brien of New York against.

Mr. Talbot for, with Mr. Ramey against.

Mr. Courtney for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.

Mr. Hoffman for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. Costello for, with Mr. Gale against.

Mr. Grant of Alabama for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Chapman for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Powers against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Steagall with Mr. Arnold.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. McCowen.

Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Weichel of Ohio.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Hope.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Michener.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Herter.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. Granger with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Compton.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. GROSS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I was in the cloakroom when the roll was being called the second time and did not hear my name called. I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of the national defense.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 796, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I wish to make this statement and challenge contradiction of it. This bill, as reported by the House Military Affairs Committee, and as further amended by amendments agreed upon which will be inserted in the RECORD at a later time in the day does no harm to organized labor. You will note that I did not even say harm to legitimate organized labor.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman said he challenged contradiction of his statement and I just wanted to challenge it.

Mr. MAY. I do not yield to the gentleman to answer the challenge. He can do it in his own time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to answer some of the criticisms that have been directed at me here even by some of the members of my own committee. To begin with, there were 23 long, hard days of hearings on the subject of manpower and labor with respect to strikes. There were 72 witnesses introduced. I am going to take the time to refer to the record and read the names of those who appeared as representatives of the labor group. Let me add here that I invited, as I have already said today, the leadership of organized labor, to come before the committee to be heard. Some of them came, some sent representatives and some of them ignored the committee. Out of 72 witnesses introduced before the committee, the first man that appeared who represented organized labor was Mr. Lee Pressman, general counsel of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Messrs. Philip Murray, William Green, and John L. Lewis were all advised by me by letter that the hearings were under way. They were each sent a copy of the Smith bill, a copy of the Wadsworth bill, a copy of the Fulmer bill, and a copy of the Connally bill. Beside that, I mailed them a copy of the hearings in the Senate on the Connally bill.

Now, besides that I laid on the desk of every member of the House Military Affairs Committee a copy of the Senate hearings on the Connally bill and asked them if they wanted anything more and they said "No."

In addition to that, Mr. William Green, the gentleman who sent a challenge to the House of Representatives that they "either do my bidding or suffer defeat at the polls" called me up and indulged in a lot of denunciations about the legislation, about its being undemocratic and despotic, and various other vile names that he applied to it. I then asked him if he would respectfully desist for a moment until a humble Member of Congress, bearing a commission from the voters of his district, could be heard, and he said, "What have you got to say?" I said, "I have got this to say, that I wrote you a letter on a certain date in which I said thus and so, and if you wish I will read it to you." He said, "I got it."

I said, "Did you send Mr. Lee Pressman here to represent your organization, and did you send Walter M. Nelson, attorney, and did you read the hearings wherein I said if he had anything else to offer I would like to know what it was?" and he said, "No."

And then it was that I said to him that if labor leadership in this country would adopt the rule of coming to the Congress with something constructive that they would have no trouble in agreeing with Congress on remedial legislation that would take out the objections that they wanted out if they ought to come out. He said he was busy.

Of course, I assume that he knew that I was busy too.

The hearings in this matter started on the 25th day of March. They continued through March 25, 26, 30, and 31; April 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, and May 6 and 7. During most of that time some of the critics of the chairman of the House committee were out campaigning or making political speeches.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Is it not an indisputable fact that this general subject and all the chief provisions of the bill now under consideration have been under discussion and consideration for the past 6 to 8 years?

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. By a half dozen committees in both the House and Senate.

Mr. MAY. And that is not all. This House has voted on express provisions of the Smith bill that are involved in this bill on two different occasions in the last 2 years. It was debated at length. I reopened the hearings three times after they were closed. In addition, after they had a meeting in the office of the Secretary of Labor and "cooked up" a round robin and sent a letter to the Speaker condemning the legislation in part and agreeing to it in part, I was generous enough to allow them to have a hearing on the question of whether or not the committee would bring in committee amendments. We have a list of several committee amendments that resulted from those hearings. There is one substantial change they wanted that they did not get. For instance, one or two of them would have liked to reach in and take out the very heart of the bill. The committee did not think we ought to do that, but we adopted clarifying and remedial amendments, which we will print in the RECORD, as I have stated, and which the Members will have an opportunity to consider before the time comes for reading the bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

This bill came from the Senate, as everybody knows. The first section relates only to the definition of the terms as used in subsequent sections.

Section 2 of the bill, to which there was some objection, provides that neither the owner or operator of a plant nor a contractor shall conduct a lockout to stop production. The bill requires that in the event one who has a war contract and is operating a plant engaged in war production determines to lock out and quit or shut down, he shall give 30 days' notice of his intention to do so. That was the provision that was originally written in the bill. Even today the committee has authorized the modification of that provision, to the extent that we provide that when notice is given the notice shall specify the reasons and the grounds for such a lockout. That is section 2 of the bill.

Section 3 of the bill provides that if the workers at a plant engaged in the production of war material shall decide that they want to suspend operations, that they want to quit work, they shall give a 30-day notice of their intention to quit work and specify in that notice their reasons therefor. That is what is known as a cooling-off period.

I submit very humbly to the Members of this House that if there is a time in the history of any man when he is likely to make a mistake, it is when he acts under the influence of passion or prejudice, and he should never do that. But if he has an opportunity after he has made up his mind and thinks he is right, or has a doubt about whether or not he is right, to have a period of, say, 30 days to cool off and reconsider and determine and arrive at a proper judgment, is there anything wrong about that? Is there anything wrong about those workers who want to stop production and shut down a plant telling the employer or the contractor why it is they want to do it? That would give him a chance, as I understand it, to meet their objections before the plant is shut down.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am in favor of the so-called cooling-off provision. My question is, Why should not that cooling-off provision be carried further and require the maintenance of the status quo for that 30-day period, and prevent the Government from stepping in and taking over the plant; in other words, give the owner of a private industry the same protection that the Government will later give itself, and have a period of cooling off on both sides?

Mr. MAY. We have provided for the maintenance of the status quo in this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The Government steps in, though; am I right in that?

Mr. MAY. Yes; if the Government steps in, of course the Government is in control.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Should not the Government wait 30 days and cool off, too, and protect industry?

Mr. MAY. Of course, the Government could wait 30 days, but the Government of the United States is not going to take over a plant or an industry until every other means has been resorted to, as the gentleman well knows.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am sure the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs will agree, as to the aircraft factories in the West that were taken over by the Government, that if the Government had sent the same number of troops in there to protect the owners of the industry that the Government protected itself with, industry would have produced.

Mr. MAY. Yes, I quite agree, but the Government cannot interfere until there is an interruption of production, and, of course, the interruption of production has to be a major one before the Government will interfere. We undertake to protect the property owner and the contractor by providing in this measure that within 60 days after the causes that brought about the disruption have been removed the property shall be returned to the owner, instead of allowing it to go into Government hands and Government ownership and control and stay there.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Has the constitutionality of the cooling time been passed upon by the Supreme Court of the United States yet?

Mr. MAY. I do not think it has been passed upon because there has been no occasion to pass upon it, because the Congress up to now, at least that branch at the other end of the Capitol, has refused to pass any legislation providing for a cooling-off period.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. We cannot pass a law against a strike, under the Constitution of the United States, and I believe all the courts agree to that. Now, we seek to postpone by cooling provisions in these boards when they will recognize that undisputed right of freedom. Has any of that circumlocution legislation been passed on by a high court yet?

Mr. MAY. I will say to the gentleman that the courts of this country have already settled finally and unquestionably the right of men to strike, and this committee bill does not interfere with that right, except where war production is involved, but we do say that when a man is mad or angry, or acting in passion, it would be a good idea if he would sit down and scratch his head a few times and think the thing over before he picks up his gun to go out and do violence to his neighbor, and the gentleman from North Carolina no doubt has defended or prosecuted one or the other of such cases—many men charged with murder, and always the indicament charged that it was done in heat of passion. Passion is what leads men to do violent acts.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. If the Chairman will excuse me, I really want information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I shall take time later, because I want to get on with the disposition of this debate.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Perhaps I could contribute something to the matter under discussion if the gentleman will yield to me.

Mr. MAY. I yield myself 2 minutes and yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. The right to strike cannot be destroyed until we take out of the Constitution the provision against involuntary servitude. These boards and so on seek to make a man wait to exercise that undoubted right of freedom. I agree with the gentleman that it probably would be a good thing, but what I would like to know is whether or not the Supreme Court of the United States has ever adjudicated the validity of that sort of postponing legislation. I understand that it has not, but if I am wrong, and am so informed, it would greatly influence my vote.

Mr. MAY. That is my understanding, and also let me give the gentleman the value of my judgment. This is a war. We are in the midst of the most desperate war the world has ever seen, and we have drafted men's bodies and souls and sent them to the battle front, and I am satisfied that when the question arises of some man's desire to shut down a plant and stop production, to stop an automobile plant or a tank plant or a gun plant or an airplane plant, and it is under consideration, the Supreme Court of the United States would probably lean backward in order to uphold our contention. I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. But I want to ask the gentleman whether under those war powers—and there I have not any mental trouble, because they are lodged supremely in the Chief Executive, the Commander in Chief. He has the very power that Abraham Lincoln had when he issued the proclamation to free the black people of the South, and he has the power under the Constitution——

Mr. MAY. Oh, I do not yield any further. If the gentleman wants to ask me a question, all right.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I am going to. Has he not the same power that Mr. Wilson had when he seized the railroads of the United States, and what further power can this Congress give Mr. Roosevelt that he does not already possess? And the country anxiously awaits his exercise of that power.

Mr. MAY. I yield myself 2 minutes more time to answer the gentleman, and then I shall yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I really want information.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman voted, I suppose, for the War Powers Act.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I was not here, but I would have voted for it if I had been here.

Mr. MAY. And I take it for granted that he knew what he was voting for.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I say I was not present, but I would have voted for it with pleasure if I had been here.

Mr. MAY. The thing we are trying to do now is to enlarge the powers of some of the President's instrumentalities that he has set up down town, to aid him in enforcing the law, and prohibit the destruction of war production in this country.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina rose.

Mr. MAY. Oh, just a minute.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Oh, let me question the gentleman. I love the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. And I love the gentleman also, but I want to get through. The President has set up under his war powers, the same as those Mr. Lincoln possessed as Commander in Chief, a Board known as the War Labor Board. The President has directed that Board to settle labor disputes, and one individual in this country, the leader of 600,000 workers, has ignored that Board, has defied that Board, has repudiated and denounced it and still repudiates it and denounces it, and what this legislation does is to enable that Board to issue a subpena for that gentleman and bring him in and let him say what he wants to do or at least submit himself to the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States, and if he does not do it, then they will have the power under this legislation to apply to a United States district court for an order compelling his attendance, and if he does not come then, he will be in contempt of court and can be dealt with accordingly.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. And will the gentleman not let me ask him the final question?

Mr. MAY. Oh, no. I am sorry I must now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I thought at first that I might have contributed something to the question under discussion. Many Members of the House know that for many years there has been a provision for a cooling-off period in the Railroad Labor Act, and if that has not been tested by the courts, it is because it has worked so satisfactorily that there has been no occasion to test it.

Mr. MAY. Let me say to the gentleman that we were so careful to preserve that right for the railroaders of this country that we excluded all men engaged in working for the railroads from the previsions of this act and left them under the Railway Labor Board Act. The gentleman from Michigan has contributed a fine thought to the debate.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him the one final question?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Has the President of the United States asked for any additional power? Has the War Department asked for any additional power? Has the Navy Department asked for any additional power?

Mr. MAY. I would not say they have asked my committee for any additional power, but, as representatives of a great people, when we discovered that they did not have the power and that production was being obstructed and interfered with in our war effort, we decided to give them the power, and that is what this bill does.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. You could not take it away from them if you tried. Congress could not do it.

Mr. MAY. We are not taking anything from them or him. We are giving them additional powers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I require at this time.

I wash to state briefly that aside from some new refinements there is nothing in this legislation insofar as it affects labor which has not been either in the Smith bill, which passed this House a year and a half ago, or in the present bill, known as the Connally provisions, which came from the Senate about a month ago.

I want to recall to your minds that the provisions of the Smith bill were adopted by this House by a 2 to 1 vote a year ago last fall, shortly before Pearl Harbor, in peacetime. The provisions of the Connally bill passed the Senate by a vote of almost 4 to 1. It is rather interesting to note, and I say this particularly to my Republican colleagues, I recall how many of them have pointed out, when they have been criticized for the nonpassage of the antistrike legislation, that the Smith bill passed the House and died in the Senate. Eleven of the 252 Members who voted for the Smith labor bill were defeated in the following election of 1942. Thirty-five of the 136 Representatives who voted against the Smith bill were defeated in the following election. I say there is nothing unfair to labor in the provisions of this measure today.

A great deal of criticism is made on the subject of no hearings. There have been more hearings on the provisions of these bills, I dare say, than on almost any other bill that has ever come before the Congress in the last 10 years.

The reason Members say there have been no hearings is that they are looking for an excuse to vote against this measure, and that is the only reason. To be sure, the leaders of the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. have not been heard in public hearings within the last month before this committee. Is there any Member of the House of Representatives who does not know their viewpoint?

So far as the letter of May 15, sent to the committee over a number of signatures, is concerned, the fact has been established that representatives of the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and other agencies, met in session at the office of the Secretary of Labor at her request. Had she not made that request I have no doubt that no expression from any of those departments would have been forthcoming.

In view of the fact that numerous Republicans have opposed the passage of the rule, I want to say that a large majority of the Republican Members of the Committee on Military Affairs have worked busily for the passage of this legislation. Those in the service are for it. The people of the country by an overwhelming majority favor it. The time has come to fish or cut bait on this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am very much concerned as to whether or not the opponents of this bill are going to have an opportunity to discuss the bill. Has any provision been made by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee to afford time to the opposition?

The CHAIRMAN. The time is within the control of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and the ranking minority member of that committee.

Mr. SHORT. Those who oppose the passage of the bill will be afforded an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. No; I want to make a speech here. You will learn something.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, today the Congress of the United States will make history! We are going to decide whether the people in this country shall rule or whether a minority group, most of whom are patriotic, but who are misguided by a few professional racketeers who fatten off the lean earnings of those whom they allegedly support, shall let down their countrymen fighting and dying in foreign lands.

I want it thoroughly understood now that I believe in the right of labor to organize. I believe in unions. I believe in collective bargaining. I believe in the right of labor to strike in times of peace and under normal conditions. But, there comes a time, sir, when all the American people, including labor, which is not apart, but an integral part of our body politic, should deny itself, sacrifice, and suffer with the rest of our entire population. The general welfare of all the people must be placed above that of any particular group.

In support of this bill, sir, I wish to say that it has been most thoroughly considered in both branches of the Congress. Long and exhaustive hearings have been held on the main features of this bill, not only in our own Committees on Military Affairs in the House and the Senate, but also in the Naval Affairs Committees of the House and of the Senate, in the Labor Committees of the House and of the Senate, and all the dilatory, delaying tactics known have been employed to postpone and obstruct the consideration and vote on this legislation. The American people demand action now. Time after time, we have been stalled, deferred, sidetracked, postponed, and put off—and always for an insignificant reason. The Smith bill passed the House in December 1941, immediately before Pearl Harbor by a vote of 252 to 136. When it reached the Senate, certain executive agencies appeared before that body, registered their protest, and it was pigeonholed and forgotten. Only recently when the coal strike threatened a complete break-down of our war-production industry did the Connally bill, which had been postponed from time to time, pass by a vote of 63 to 16, in the Senate.

The present bill under consideration is a combination of the Connally and Smith bills already passed by both Houses of Congress by an overwhelming majority to insure maximum production; to guarantee the men and women of their fathers and mothers back home, the equipment with which to carry on an aggressive and a successful war. The bill was reported unanimously by the House Committee on Military Affairs and a rule was granted several days ago. Since then the executive branch of our Government has again interfered, and certain administrative agencies have done their best—no doubt some of them against their own will—to block the passage of this measure. Of course, in a sense this legislation is unnecessary for the President now has the wartime power to stop these strikes, if only he would exercise it. Why does he fail to act? Could the half-million dollars raised by John L. Lewis for his 1936 campaign have any influence upon him? If some people were as interested in winning this war quickly as they are in a fourth term, the country would not be in its present tragic plight, and we would not be debating this bill today. The chickens are now coming home to roost.

Who, I ask you, are to write the laws of the land—the executive and administrative agencies of our Government or the duly elected Representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States? Is it not our sole prerogative, authority, duty, and responsibility to determine what the laws of this country shall be, without the interference of any other branch or department of Government? How long shall we continue to act as a rubber stamp of the Executive? When will we develop a bone instead of a rubber for a spine? Stand up, speak out, and be counted! Unworthy of being a Member of Congress are you who refuse to do it! Do not duck the issue! Mr.

Chairman, when our house is on fire and the walls are tumbling down around us, I cannot understand why anyone would want to think of his own personal profit or individual gain before putting forth every effort to extinguish the fire that threatens to consume us all. I know that the American Federation of Labor has brashly and rashly threatened to defeat any Member of Congress who votes for this bill. Let us not be scared by such bluff. We will not be intimidated, and we cannot be bribed. This Nation and this Government are still bigger than the American Federation of Labor or any other organized minority pressure group.

While I have very few coal miners in my district, I personally feel that they are at the present time underpaid. Due to the increase in the cost of living, and compared with the wages paid other workers in war industries, these miners who for many weeks in the year never see the light of day, who engage in the most dangerous and arduous kind of labor, should have an increase. The present bill does not deny them an increase, and there is no reason why they, or the workers in the rubber plants at Akron, or the employees of Chrysler, or any other group engaged in the war effort, should go on strike in this crucial hour when we are fighting for our very survival.

Is it possible, Sir, that men drawing the highest wages and living under the best conditions of any people on all the earth, should go on strike, refuse to produce the weapons of war for the men fighting in the front line to defend themselves and preserve the lives and liberties of their loved ones back home? Is it fair for Uncle Sam to draft young men in the flower of manhood, who have spent years in colleges and universities, and thousands of dollars to prepare themselves for professions in which they have earned lucrative remunerations; who drop everything, who forget work, family, home, and loved ones, to fight and die on distant fields and in remote waters for $50 a month, while many of their fellowmen back home, less educated and living in peaceful conditions, distant from the hazards of conflict, drawing higher wages in war industries, go on strike?

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be cynical; I do not want to be unfair, but please tell me, Sir, in the name of God, what are we fighting for? If Uncle Sam can take your boy and your neighbor's son, husband, brother, or father out of his chosen profession—be it law, medicine, dentistry, agriculture, business, or anything else—is it fair for you then to let a fellow back home go on strike in war industries and refuse to produce the weapons by which the soldier, sailor, marine, or pilot is defending himself and protecting his loved ones back home?

Mr. Chairman, this bill does not deny organized labor any of its rights. It does not deny men the right to organize into unions. It does not prevent collective bargaining. It does not deny peaceful picketing. It does not deny the right of labor to appeal to Government for redress of any wrongs. It simply imposes upon labor many of the duties and responsibilities that are already imposed by law upon practically all other groups of our citizenry. As a friend of labor who believes in unions; in its right to organize; in its right to bargain collectively; in its right to strike under normal conditions and in time of peace; I wish to urge that the rank and file of labor, the overwhelming majority of whom are as patriotic as any man on this floor, will put their own house in order, else they will lose all the benefits they have gained in the past quarter of a century.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, is not at all extreme, it is a compromise measure. We have had to give and take. It is temporary legislation only for the duration of this war, and I do hope that all Members, regardless of the stigma that may be stamped upon them, will, in conscience clear and duty free vote unanimously for the passage of this much-needed legislation. Labor, as well as the Army and the Navy must be disciplined. This is total war by total populations. We all swim or sink together. God save this Republic.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, we face a very grave responsibility. We are the representatives of 130,000,000 American people. Our country, too, faces a very serious situation. It is engaged in desperate warfare with three dictatorial powers of the earth. How unfortunate it will be under these circumstances if we cannot avert a further serious situation at home.

It has been said that the great need of the hour is unity. I fear this sentiment has not been properly impressed upon the minds and hearts of some of the American people. It was in a time of war that a great Briton said: "This day England expects every man to do his duty"—every man. It was in a time of war that a distinguished American naval leaders said: "Don't give up the ship." It was in contemplation of conflict that an eminent American statesman said: "United, we stand; divided, we fall." I think it behooves us to profit by the wise counsel of those sage utterances. The great rank and file of the American people, including the American workers, are desperately and vitally interested in preserving and promoting that spirit of unity. The sons of these American workers are fighting on many fronts, on the land, on the sea, and in the air, and these sires, as loyal American citizens, want to see those boys get and get promptly, not too little and too late, the necessary production to carry on their struggle to preserve for you and for me and for posterity the blessings of liberty which have been vouchsafed unto us by a beneficent God.

We all believe in organization; we believe in it for the professions, we believe in it for the trades; but organizations in all times and more especially in times of war have the obligation and responsibility resting upon them to see America first before they see the prosecution of any selfish interest. The labor troubles are not with the fact that labor is organized—it should be organized—but with subversive racketeers many of whom are hostile to the genius of our political philosophy and system and who are seeking to lead astray the patriotic band of Americans who work at every kind of machine and toil at every kind of trade; and it is in order to protect the American worker, loyal and patriotic as he is, that we must do something to show that as the Representatives of the American people, we are trying to inspire and to promote that essential spirit of unity.

It has been said that no further legislation is necessary to stop the strikes which interrupt and delay our effective war effort; nevertheless strikes in this critical period continue. Is there not an obligation resting upon you and me under such circumstances at least to give legislative expression to the unanimous sentiment of the 130,000,000 people whom we represent? This bill may not be perfect; we can amend it and modify it as may be necessary when we come to its consideration under the 5-minute rule.

With reference to this matter of organization, with reference to this matter of strikes by any body of our citizens in any necessary line of endeavor in this trying time, let us suppose that with an epidemic raging, all the doctors, who also are organized, should strike and fail to go to the relief of the stricken people. They would be condemned by popular judgment and by popular utterances. We have today an epidemic facing this country of ours, the epidemic of war and the threatened epidemic of totalitarianism that would make of these very workers serfs and slaves and deprive them of all the benefits that they can enjoy in times of peace or war under our American system. This is an epidemic in which each and every American citizen is a doctor and he must give it the best treatment he can in the field in which he labors. This applies to all workers at their respective tasks, whatever their toil and whatever the nature of their contributions to our triumph.

I am thinking today, not merely of the people at home—loyal and patriotic people will support proper legislation—I am thinking of those boys on many foreign fronts whom we sent to the war and who there are carrying on valiantly to save for us and for posterity the things dear to the American heart and to all free and liberty-living people. They, too, are organized. Suppose they should strike.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of patriotic American labor, I do not want to see it cut its own throat. I want to see it prosper in accordance with American ideals, but I firmly believe that when these boys come back from the hardships and the privations that they are enduring in so many places, facing the foes who would wipe out all in which we believe, they are going to be the most rugged group of individualists that this country has ever had. Every report we get from them, every conversation we have with those who have returned for a brief furlough, is in absolute and utter condemnation of any man in any walk of life who would strike at his trade today and not make his full contribution to the cause for which they are fighting. Oh, let us be true to these lads. We sent them to preserve this American system

of government and to enable us at home to cooperate in assuring its preservation and by the genial influence of example in extending it to all peoples that all the world may be free. Whether a vote to express as their faithful representatives the sentiments of 130,000,000 people means that we shall stay in this Chamber or at the expiration of this Congress depart to private life, it is a vote in accordance with the views and the sentiments of those boys who are fighting your battles and mine, and I am seeking in these troublous times to keep myself true to them. If I do, I shall keep myself true to this land of the free and home of the brave.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, first of all I wish to present some of the facts which I believe represent the background of this bill now before us. First of all, the Military Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, did report this bill unanimously. It did so, as I believe, largely because of the influence upon their minds of the fact that more than 8,000,000 young men and women are now serving in our armed forces and they are entitled to have all of the goods necessary for the proper conduct of the war whenever they need them, wherever they need them, and in sufficient quantities. However, quite a few misleading statements have been made.

If you will turn to page 1018 of the hearings you will realize that there were up to that time only four bills before the Committee on Military Affairs for consideration, and this bill, S. 796, was not one of them. As a matter of fact, S. 796 was not referred to the Committee on Military Affairs of the House until May 6, 1943, and up until page 1018 all of the hearings had been held prior to that time. Obviously no questions were asked bearing upon S. 796, and, as a matter of fact, not a word of the testimony which has been printed in this volume has anything to do with that bill.

This bill was reported unanimously, but it does not represent in every respect and in every section the feeling of the members of that committee, and I think that will be shown tomorrow when amendment after amendment adopted by the committee itself will be offered to cure what the committee now believes to be improprieties, inconsistencies, and perhaps inequities in the bill as it is printed.

With reference to the bill itself, the evidence has been given wholly, as I see it, by witnesses from the Government yesterday and today. If we have in mind particularly the proper settlement of strikes against the Government, in plants taken over and in possession of the Government, plants, industries, or factories, then I think we should give heed to the testimony of Chairman William H. Davis, of the National War Labor Board, who testified this morning. He said that as far as this bill is concerned the only sections in the bill which would be of any advantage to the Government and to his board in the settlement of strikes and in bringing them to speedy and successful conclusions would be sections 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 14. In other words, so much of this bill as represents sections taken from the Connally bill of the Senate which are in this bill which would be of advantage of the board would be those that I have mentioned and he believed that we should leave out section 12. As a matter of fact, the committee has adopted an amendment that I presume will be offered by the chairman tomorrow in which part of that section 12 will be stricken.

Obviously, this legislation is before us from the committee for the purpose of helping the Government operate every business in this country for the benefit of the armed services and the civilian population. There is no intention to hurt any single person or any organization, so far as the committee is concerned, and I think it is obvious that the miners have had a real grievance. That is shown by the decisions of the War Labor Board after hearings, which indicated that these men ought to have more money and that a part of these abuses should be corrected, and I believe they will be. Of course, we cannot permit the absolute shutting down of a factory or a mine which is producing something necessary for the winning of this war, and that is the purpose of the bill. I believe that will be the purpose of the committee as it considers this bill tomorrow for amendment. It will accept such amendments as will accomplish that purpose and finally draft in committee a bill which will accomplish what the membership actually desires.

To me, as we voted on this rule today, I would say that those who voted for the rule did so realizing that there are 8,000,000 young men and women in the service; that there appears to be a possibility that through lack of legislation it is going to be possible for certain factories, certain mines, certain other efforts on the part of the United States and of the people to fail to function. It is possible that some of this failure can be eradicated by the adoption of proper legislation. Certainly Chairman Davis, of the War Labor Board, feels that is true.

With reference to the first seven sections of the bill, they do not have to do with that particular issue and will have to be considered on their merit otherwise. I bring these thoughts to your attention in order that as you consider the bill tonight and as you read the testimony, if you do so, you will do it with that in mind. So far as the first seven sections are concerned, they do not have anything to do with the settlement of strikes which have to do with the proper conduct of the war, other than in the general legislation which you may have that will be beneficial to industry and labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, when I was a young boy I heard one of the great orators of that time make a speech on a trying occasion to the people of my State. It made an impression upon me that has lasted through my life. I only remember one of the sentences he used when he said that as a child his mother taught him when he was a boy to do his duty of the hour and throw defiance to the future.

This is one of the most delicate questions which has ever commanded the attention of this country. One of the troubles now is that we have too much legislation of doubtful constitutionality on the statute books of this country about labor, and the peace officers and the executive officers seem to be afraid to enforce it.

There are two aspects of the labor question, rules and regulations, to be enforced by the courts, the marshals and the officers, and the other war powers which all deal with this thing. There is not a provision in this bill which has been adjudicated by the Supreme Court of our country. Every one of them are of doubtful validity except as they may relate to the war powers. Under the war powers of our Government, as a lawyer, ripe with age, I think the power is absolutely supreme in the executive branch of this Government.

The gentleman from Missouri referred, oh, cruelly, to our President, that the people are demanding action and he would not act; they were angry, they were demanding action. I remember that same thought a while back about military action when he was cruelly abused; he was vilified, and yet in an hour that we did not know approached, he directed the most brilliant strategy ever displayed in warfare on this earth when he quietly, unbeknown to anybody almost, took Africa and enhanced the outlook for a military drive to the satisfaction of everybody. I want to say to my friends, compose yourselves in patience. This great patient President of ours, with a mind as brilliant as has ever adorned the statesmanship of this or any other country, is thinking; he is praying, he is working, and before John Lewis and his followers know what has happened, Franklin D. Roosevelt, our commander in chief and our President, will show him the power and the majesty of this great Government. He is not asking for this law; the War Department is not asking for it; the Navy Department is not asking for it.

Some gentlemen undertake to speak for the boys under the flag and say they want it. They want to preserve the basic rights of freedom as well as anybody else, and I want to say to them that that great army of heroes who are struggling for the perpetuation of liberty on earth is not a class army. In its ranks will be found probably a greater number, numerically speaking, of sons of laboring people than any other class, struggling and dying everywhere, men in mortal combat; and, the sons and the members of families of wealthy people of the country are there. It is no class army; the sons of the wealthy, when they are called, are under the flag and all our available young men are showing the

very highest fortitude and courage ever displayed on this earth.

The wealthiest young man in my State, Dick Reynolds, who, by the way, is treasurer of the great political party to which I belong, is somewhere on a dangerous mission, in the dangers of the Pacific area on a carrier where he sought and worked to be placed, ready to die, with a smile upon his face for his country, although he is the wealthiest man south of here before you come to New Orleans, if not in the entire South. And every one of them are appealing to every group, to all of us to do our duty. Our farming people are doing their duty. There is a little selfishness in every group. Small minorities everywhere want something they ought not to have, but the great majority have exhibited a fortitude and courage and nobility for which our ministers have prayed these long years, and to raise which our statesmen have toiled. Let us unite; let us unite under the leadership of a party President. I am an old man, older than I look, but I have been a citizen under several wars, and under at least one Republican President. But I make an appeal to all who hear me that you realize we cannot overthrow our Government as you can a parliamentary Government. It is in for the duration and the only thing to do is to unite under the leadership of our great Commander-in-Chief of the Army and of the Navy and of the combat forces everywhere; forget a little politics.

When I came to Congress I took one pledge, that I would uphold and support the Constitution of the United States as I would have to do when I took my oath, and so help me God, I would keep that oath, and I would make no other pledge. I am as free a man as ever represented a congressional district here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. May I have a minute and a half more?

Mr. MAY. I am sorry; I am pressed for time.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. You are missing a mighty good peroration.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I have been sorely troubled by the situation that has brought about the need for the legislation we are considering today. I voted for the rule making the consideration of this bill in order, but I voted for the rule because I felt there is a definite problem relating to labor relations that this Congress must deal with at once.

This bill should certainly be considered by the House as only through such debate can the country really understand its provisions. Many people assume that this legislation will prevent strikes in essential defense industries. The truth of the matter is that it does nothing of the sort.

I have previously stated on the floor of the House that so far as I am concerned by no vote of mine will I permit any man or group of men to retard the production of war material. The Connally-Smith bill as we have it before us now—and not knowing what amendments will be offered during its consideration—will not prevent strikes in essential defense industries.

I have many frends working in defense industries and I certainly do not want to stigmatize my friends and neighbors who are now working harder and longer hours than they have ever worked before in their lives, by voting for a piece of legislation which in their minds, and the minds of a great many people is going to put a rope around their necks. Not only will it put a rope around their necks but will make them appear to be part of a group that must be forced by the Federal Government to produce war material that their own sons and brothers are using on every front in every part of the world.

I read every word of the hearings held on the Connally bill in the Senate and closely followed the debate in that body. It appears to me that the Connally bill, in substance, legalizes the activities of the War Labor Board; gives that Board power to subpena witnesses and records, as well as legalizing the taking over of defense industries by the President, in which there are labor disputes.

When the Burke-Wadsworth Selective Service Act was enacted into law, I was in Congress, and I clearly recall the debate on section 9 of that bill. Section 9 is the section under which the President has taken over various defense industries in which there were labor disputes. It was never the intent of Congress that this section should ever be used for any such purpose. The language of that section clearly provides that, in case any manufacturer refuses to produce war material needed by the Government, the Government under those conditions could take over the factory and operate it. No one ever contended that this section gave the President power to take over an industry simply because it was involved in a labor dispute.

Under the Connally bill, any six men in any given defense industry could create a situation which would force the President to take over that industry.

After the Connally bill was passed by the Senate and came over to the House Military Affairs Committee, that committee added the provisions of the so-called Smith bill to the Connally bill. The first seven sections of the Connally-Smith bill has no bearing whatever on the prevention of strikes in essential defense industries. How many of those sections will still be in the bill when this debate is finally concluded no one can say, but as it stands now you will find just about every labor-baiting proposal we have heard discussed in the cloak rooms of Congress for the past 4 years.

I am fearful that organized labor in this country will rue the day it decided to openly accept the benevolence of the Federal Government. In the long run labor would have been better off to have gone along as it had for so many years, building up its own strength as a result of what it accomplished for labor. Organized labor cannot continue to accept the favors, if you will, of the Federal Government and remain a free democratic organization.

What has the filing of financial statements by labor organization to do with antistrike legislation? What has the section forbidding the making of contributions to political parties to do with antistrike legislation? Why is it proposed to go back to the evils created by the use of injunctions in labor disputes? Why not consider these proposals under a separate bill and not becloud the issues involved in this legislation?

This bill, as reported by the Military Affairs Committee practically repeals the Norris-LaGuardia Act. This is simply a case of trying to solve too much in one piece of legislation and, as so often is the case, end by solving nothing.

At the outset I said there was a problem that this Congress must solve and that problem is enacting a law that will adequately punish any individual or group of individuals who attempt to sabotage our war effort. This could be done by writing a comparatively simple bill. A bill which first of all provides, as does one section of the Connally bill, the legalizing of the creation of the War Labor Board and furnishing that board with power to subpena witnesses and records. Also include a section providing that after a labor dispute has been referred to the War Labor Board and a decision rendered by the board, labor and management would be compelled to accept the ruling of the board.

Certainly no fair-minded person could hanestly contend that the War Labor Board, appointed by the President, was antilabor. I would gladly support legislation providing a substantial jail sentence for anyone who refused to abide by the decision of a legally constituted War Labor Board. It is impossible to legislate cooperation. It is impossible to legislate morale in our defense plants. On the whole, the morale in the various defense industries is very good. The 12,000,000 men and women who make up organized labor in the United States are just as loyal as any other group of citizens. They have just as many—and possibly more—sons and daughters, fathers and husbands in our armed services than any other group of a like size. In our disgust at the acts of certain selfish labor leaders we are in danger of approving legislation that will prove definitely harmful to the war effort. We certainly are not justified in approving the Connally-Smith bill because of the acts of this small group of so-called labor leaders.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to discuss in the short time I have the amendments the committee acted on favorably this morning and that it proposes to offer when the bill is taken up for amendment under the 5-minute rule. If those of you who have copies of the bill will get them out, I shall try to take up the amendments one at a time in order that you may be made familiar with them.

In that connection, let me say that in the hearings we held yesterday and today some very helpful suggestions were made to our committee. I believe I am safe in saying that we acted favorably upon every single recommendation made to us by the agencies who signed that letter in opposition to this legislation, with the exception of one, and that one was a proposal to eliminate sections 2 and 3 of the bill. I feel certain that an amendment will be offered on the floor of the House for the purpose of eliminating those sections. Our committee was pretty evenly divided on the question of eliminating the sections, and my guess is that our vote in the Committee of the Whole when that amendment is offered will follow pretty much the same line as it did in the committee meeting this morning.

If you will follow your bill, I shall call your attention to the proposed amendments.

The first one, on page 8, is a very minor amendment. It is in line 22, and the same amendment is to be offered in line 23, where the two words "may be" occur. Those words are to be changed and the word "are" is to be substituted so as to make it read "are required" and "are useful in connection therewith."

The next amendment is to be found on page 9, line 13. After the word "lock-out" insert the words "and the issues involved in the dispute giving rise thereto." Then, at the end of that same sentence, in line 18, insert the words "and the issues involved in the dispute giving rise to such intended strike."

On page 10, in line 13, is to be found the next proposed amendment. After the word "and", the very last word in the sentence, insert the following: "to include on such ballot a concise statement of the major issues involved in the dispute together with a statement of the position of each party with respect thereto; and."

All three of these last amendments, as you can see, are related to the same matter. They simply provide that on the ballot and in the notices the issues involved must be set forth.

On page 10, line 16, which is the very end of the section, add the following: "No ballot shall be conducted under this section when any issue involved in the intended strike has been determined by statute or by any rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant thereto."

Of course, should the amendment which I anticipate, to strike sections 2 and 3 from this bill, be adopted, then the proposed amendments I have just suggested in those two sections would have no place in the bill.

On page 11, line 12, after the word "contractor" insert the following words: "or officers of a local labor organization of which said bona fide employees are members."

That section makes it unlawful for picket lines to be maintained by persons who were not just prior to the strike bona fide employees of that particular plant, but this provision is added in order that officers of that particular local who might be in some neighboring plant but not in that particular plant could have access to the plant and to the plant property.

On page 13, line 12, will be found the next proposed amendment. At the end of line 12 as it stands now, insert the following language:

Provided, That the penalties provided in this subsection shall extend to the local union or unions or other portion of the labor organization concerned in, connected with or participating in such violation and to no other portion thereof.

This subsection provides briefly that if any union violates the provisions of this previous section, it shall lose its status as a representative or labor organization under the National Labor Relations Act, and so forth. Some unions may be organized in such a way that without this amendment it would mean the whole national or the whole international organization would be penalized. This amendment will place the penalty only upon the particular local, or the particular part of the union that may be participating in the strike.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAY. In other words, it means that if there is an individual coal mine somewhere and there is dispute there, then it will be confined to that, and not involve the whole international union.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. On page 15, line 23, after the word "regulation" insert the one word "heretofore." That section defines the provisions of the War Labor Board, and may I say in that connection that in setting up this section defining the duties of the National War Labor Board, that we tried as well as we could to set it up in keeping with the Executive orders that have been issued to this date, and the regulations thereunder, and Mr. William A. Davis, chairman of the War Labor Board testified before us this morning that he thought sections 8, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 14, were pretty good sections.

On page 18, line 10, after the word "strike", insert the two words "or lockout," in order to make it applicable to both classes of work stoppages. In keeping with the recommendations that were made by the various agencies, we struck out section 12, or at least so much of it as they objected to, and we proposed to save that very last clause in section 12, and do that by inserting a new section 12, to read as follows, and it is the substance of the last sentence in the present section 12:

Sec. 12. When possession of any plant, mine, or other property has been, or is hereafter taken by the Government under authority of section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or otherwise, by reason of a strike, lock-out, threatened strike, threatened lock-out, work stoppage, or other cause, such plant, mine, or other property shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as practicable, but in no event more than 60 days after the termination of the conditions which caused possession of such plant, mine, or other property to be so taken.

There are two other amendments that I failed to call attention to as we went through the bill. On page 17, lines 6 through 9, it is proposed to strike out the language reading as follows:

In no event shall the Board have power under this act or otherwise to require as a condition of employment that any individual become or remain a members of a labor organization.

Also to strike out subsection (c), which immediately follows that. The reason for doing that is that it is carried in section 9 of this bill, and that is the power of subpena to the National War Labor Board.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I was one of those who opposed the rule on this legislation, not because I am opposed to it, but because I felt we had not had sufficient hearings or time on some of the important matters in this bill. How does this legislation happen to be before us? It comes before us because a labor leader, leading half a million men, has defied the President of the United States. How did he do that? What brought this situation about? You will remember that several years ago this labor leader submitted a matter to one of the labor boards of the United States. A decision was handed down against his contention. The average person would submit to such a decision like any American would, but he said "No, I do not want to submit to this decision." What happened? The President of the United States suggested an arbitration, and the controversy was as to whether there should be a closed shop in the mine-workers union, and the President had previously publicly declared he was against the closed shop principle. What happened? The very arbitrator, the third man on this board of arbitration, that the President of the United States appointed, decided the case in favor of Mr. Lewis and contrary to the expressed opinion of the President. So, in a way, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] pointed out, the man that now is causing trouble, slowing down production in the United States is the one who was built up by the President of the United States, who was coddled by him and from whom he took campaign funds.

I say that it is a bad situation when we get excited and then try to legislate, and that is the reason I wanted more time to consider some features of this bill. We all admit that labor, like every other group, must make some concessions during the war. We hear men get up here and talk in the Well of the House about the men overseas, in all parts of the world. They get excited about these things, and some of us who want more time and hearings, so we may write sound legislation, know what the soldiers have to contend with. Some of us who

talk, and who you may think delay this legislation, have heard the whistle of machine guns, the crack of the antiaircraft guns, and we have heard the explosion of whizbangs, and we are just as anxious to help our boys as those who never served in a war.

One of the reasons we wanted time on this is because this law restores the right of injunctions in labor disputes. After many, many years of experiment, it is found that that was the wrong way to handle labor disputes, and now for 10 years we have gone along and refused to handle them in that way.

This bill restores that right. I am afraid, and some of the other committee members are afraid, that it is going to make every labor dispute that arises tried in the Federal courts instead of the various administrative agencies that have for 10 years handled labor disputes.

We are going to offer amendments to sections 2 and 3: I want to read to you what the agencies of our Government have said regarding those provisions. I want to make this point quite clear again, that there never was one single hearing, there is not a single line of testimony in the transcript of the hearings on the identical bill that is presented to Congress here. It was not until after these administrative agencies had written letters to the Speaker, and some of us asked that they be called and heard that the people who are responsible for production for war were invited to come before our committee and advise us. Here is what those people said:

The War Department, the Navy Department, the United States Maritime Commission, and the War Production Board, being the agencies primarily responsible for the production and procurement of war materials, are unanimous in their judgment that some sections in the bill as presently drawn would tend to interfere with such production and procurement by stimulating industrial unrest.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I have only 8 minutes. If I have time remaining, I will yield.

The Department of Labor, the National Labor Relations Board, and the four public members of the National War Labor Board, these being the Federal agencies primarily concerned with the maintenance of orderly industrial relations, concur in this view and believe that the bill, as it stands, would impair the effectiveness of the existing machinery for the orderly settlement of labor disputes.

They were referring to sections 2 and 3 of the bill.

Now, we have this situation: The President sat down with the labor unions of the United States and with the producers of the United States, and they voluntarily agreed to a no-strike arrangement during the duration of the war. I believe that on the whole, with only this one bad exception of the mine workers, the labor unions have adhered to this policy. The trouble with section 2 is that instead of allaying strikes and reducing industrial unrest, it will stimulate strikes. I think that during this 30-day waiting period men will be thinking of their coming strike and trying to work up their organizations instead of putting their minds to production and things they should do to make the winning of the war and production a success. As I say, we are not hostile to any legislation of this kind. We think that legislation of this kind for the duration of the war is necessary, but we want it to be reasonable. We want it to be fair. We want to recognize that on the production lines of America are 30 or 40 million men and women. Those men and women have children in the armed forces of the United States. The great mass of them are patriotic. We do not want to punish that great mass because of the sins of a few who get out of line.

So when we come to sections 2 and 3, it is my conviction that the law will be better without those two sections. There are other things that curtail the rights of labor. Labor and the farmers and everybody else have to give up some of their rights during the war. We have a great mass of workmen in the labor unions who are perfectly willing to have those rights curtailed. They are willing to have reports made. They are willing that their union should not give money to political organizations. It was merely to get more evidence on those matters that some of us asked for more time.

It is too bad that this debate has taken on so much heat. People get excited over these matters, and their emotions get aroused. We should approach it from a more calm and deliberate attitude and not be swayed because there is a lot of excitement in the air at the present time.

Unfortunately during the past few weeks we have had an epidemic of strikes. We have had them in Baltimore, Milwaukee, Akron, Sacramento, and the great coal strike which covers over a dozen States. The pledge made by labor is, to that extent, not being kept. The leaders have not been able to hold their men in line. Strikes in war industries are not proper, when the men who are fighting our battles need the tools of war so badly. It is bad for the morale of these soldiers and sailors; it is bad for the morale of our people, many of whom are making terrific sacrifices to help the progress of the war.

That is why I am willing to enact some reasonable and fair legislation for the duration of the war, the purpose of which is to help labor keep its ranks in line. I am positive the laboring men will understand that those of us who are sympathetic to labor's cause will understand that we are passing this legislation with the sole thought of helping develop a winning war program.

For this reason I urge my colleagues of the House to support the amendments suggested in this short talk and others that will be offered to make the bill as reasonable as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] 5 minutes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, out of the hinterlands, on the high seas, the battlefronts, above the clouds, the people of America are watching us today—watching to see what we are going to do about the most burning issue in America.

Mr. William L. Green has said the American Federation of Labor will endeavor to vote out of office any of us who support this Smith-Connally bill. I am wondering just how many members of his own ranks Mr. Green speaks for. Not all the men who carry his union cards believe in the hijacking and racketeering practices of the organization to which they belong. Many of them are honorable citizens who are in there because the Government has supported such setups and they were compelled to join before they could work for their Government. I do not believe Mr. Green speaks for them. In fact, I believe he speaks only for himself and a few others of his ilk who have become so entrenched that they can play tiddly-winks with the sacred precepts we have cherished and fought for through the centuries, and are fighting for today. I do not believe he could vote any of us out of office; I wager my seat in this body that he cannot, for I intend to support this measure for all that is in me.

I know of 72,000,000 other representatives of labor who do not share Mr. Green's sentiments—the 72,000,000 American laborers who do not belong to any kind of labor union. Many of them have expressed themselves to me. They want action against these laborites who are fattening their pocketbooks at the public's expense. In fact, they cannot understand why action has not already been taken. In their eyes anyone who would highjack the war effort of his own country to further his own selfish aims is a traitor. They have told us, their Representatives, how they feel, and to my ears Mr. Green's threat is drowned out by their voices. I am going to do everything I am big enough to do in trying to carry out their wishes. I believe we should set up labor regulations by law rather than by elastic edicts that can be issued today, modified tomorrow, and repealed next week.

The testimony on this bill dealt with the Smith feature of it; that is the only controversy; that is what all the testimony was about. This Connally bill was not even a balloon of appeasement. It merely gives the Federal Government the right to take over private property for organized labor to operate as it pleases. Right now in my district the Labor Department is trying to compel a war contractor to enter into a closed-shop contract and cause many a citizen in my district to pay further tribute to organized labor in the way of union fees, all of which will have to be met by the sale of War bonds.

The day will come—I wish it were this day—when American patriots will receive their own. The American War Dads are organizing in America to the tune of 25,000 a day. They are the men who have sons, sons-in-law, nephews, or wards in the armed services and they are cooperating with the American Legion. Had it not been for the American Legion fronting against these un-American organizations, God knows what would have become of us today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to relate to the membership of the House the manner in which this legislation was drafted, its history, and the amount of time given, specifically, to the provisions of S. 796.

This is done not only to inform you of my feelings in the matter, but also to let you know that notwithstanding the publicity that went out all over the country that the Committee on Military Affairs was unanimous in reporting out this bill to the House, that it was anything but unanimous in considering the bill in committee, section by section.

From March 25 to May 6 or 7 the House Military Affairs Committee has had under consideration four separate bills, namely, the Smith bill, H. R. 2239, the Wadsworth-Austin bill, H. R. 1742, the Colmer bill, H R. 992, and the Fulmer bill, H. R. 1728.

Both the Smith bill—and this was not the same Smith bill passed by the House in December 1941—and the Wadsworth-Austin bill were given rather extensive hearings. Many witnesses for and against these two bills testified before our committee. In fact most of the 70 or 75 witnesses testified on these two bills. There were only 2 or 3 witnesses that testified for H. R. 1728, including the author, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER]. The Colmer bill, H. R. 992, had no witnesses if I recall correctly, although it was on our desks and up for consideration. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] filed a statement with the committee. These 4 bills were classified as manpower bills and my understanding was that after due consideration had been given them that a subcommittee would draft a bill—a manpower bill—embracing the acceptable features from the 4 bills under consideration.

The hearings were concluded with the testimony of the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, Thursday, May 6, and the subcommittee drafted the bill now under consideration by the House. The first time the full committee saw the bill was Tuesday, May 11, and we were informed by our chairman that action, definite action, had to be taken and the bill reported immediately. The bill was read as writte by the subcommittee, and not any of the subject matter of the four considered bills was included, as far as I can determine. The bill as given us was a substitute for the Connally bill, S. 796, which passed the Senate May 5, 1943. This bill, presented us by our subcommittee, was a mixture of the Smith bill of 1941 and the Connally bill, S. 796. I might say that the only portion of the current Smith bill, H. R. 2239, that we had an opportunity to act on was that section relating to prohibiting supervisory employees to join a union or organization for the purpose of collective bargaining. This amendment was defeated.

The full committee had no opportunity to study the Connally bill as passed by the Senate because it was only brought to our attention on May 11, and we did not have much time to give it consideration or thought. Our committee did not hear any testimony whatsoever on the Connally bill.

That portion of the current bill which extends from page 7 to page 15, line 16, is taken from the Smith bill of December 1941. No hearings or testimony was heard. The rest of the bill with the exception of section 11—which was also from the Smith bill of 1941—was taken from the Connally bill. Section 14 is a combination of both the Smith and Connally bills.

There is the history of the present bill. We certainly had no opportunity to study the various sections of the bill or their ramifications as thoroughly as we should.

The reason I voted to report this bill out from the committee is because I do not favor "pickling" any bill in a committee simply because I or anyone else disagrees with it or some of its provisions.

But getting back to this bill and the House Military Affairs Committee: Like one of our distinguished colleagues in the House, I believe that our committee should get back to and consider military and War Department business, and not usurp the legislative functions of another committee of this body.

I recall distinctly, at the beginning of this session of Congress, the great howl that was set up when the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee claimed the right to legislate for all kinds of transportation, including aeronautics. There was a lot of indignation over this in the Military and Naval Affairs Committees. And, in this instance, I believe that questions relating to labor should be considered by the Labor Committee.

This bill, as I see it, is purely a labor bill—especially the Smith portion of it. It is aimed primarily at labor leaders. The question in my mind is, Was this bill dumped into our laps because there is a dispute between the United Mine Workers and the coal operators? Or is this bill before us because the leader of the United Mine Workers of America is a man by the name of John L. Lewis?

The bill is certainly not before us because anyone in the entire coal fields believes that the miner is getting too much money. It most assuredly is not before us because of any question of the miner's patriotism or loyalty to his country. You cannot accuse the miner of a desire to see his son who is in the armed forces of the United States handicapped because of a desire to get a decent living wage for the rest of his family; especially, after he has lived up to his contract and long after many other industries have given their employees increases in wages, including the Government of the United States.

I wonder whether the public, and especially those who love to kick the miner around, realize what a hazardous occupation mining really is? I am afraid some of you do not. I would like to take some of these labor baiters with me into the bowels of the earth to show them what a real he-American goes through day after day, down in the depths of the earth where the miner knows not whether he will ever see the light of day again; down a thousand feet or more where the miner loses the sunshine and fresh air which we know are so necessary to maintain health. Yes; down in the mines where the miner breathes the dust which causes anthracosis or what is commonly called miner's consumption. I am sure if those who do not believe that the miner has a just grievance could see for themselves these conditions, they would change their opinions.

My colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY], who represents the northern anthracite section of Lackawanna County, Pa., gave the House last Friday facts and figures concerning the present controversy. I will not take time to discuss it here, but I do recommend that you read his remarks in the RECORD.

Certainly not any of us want a strike or a lock-out, especially in these trying days. But all you hear is that the miner should not do this or do that. To say that anyone, especially the miner, who dares to ask for an increase in wages, is unpatriotic, is trying to scuttle our war effort, and is aiding our enemies, is as far from being a fact as anything can be. As I said before, the United Mine Workers of America have had a contract and have lived up to it until its expiration. All they want is a new contract with an increase in wages. Certainly they have a right to that, especially when they are considered so indispensable to the war effort and when other industries—so dependent on coal—are spending money right and left—yes, perhaps even the Government's money. Yes, men in some industries are making $10, $15, and even $20 per day. Everybody knows that, and yet you do not hear a "peep" out of anyone on that score or we do not pass any legislation of any consequence to prohibit that sort of thing. Yet even the War Labor Board denies the miner a raise in wages.

It is admitted in the report of the committee that this proposed legislation is necessary because of the coal situation. It, however, does more than that—it strikes at American labor generally.

My fellow colleagues, I plead with you not to act in haste and destroy in a few hours the united efforts and sacrifices which have been made in the common cause of defeating an enemy who would destroy our liberty and freedom. We are on the threshold of victory on the far-flung battle fronts; let us not destroy the home front which is making that victory possible for our fighting men and the fighting men of our allies. Passage of this bill could only mean another Pearl Harbor of our own making. If any new legislation is needed for regulatory purposes over labor and industry, let us legislate in a sound and sane manner that will help to preserve the liberty-, freedom-loving America for which our boys are fighting and giving their lives. We cannot and must not be responsible for

destroying America from within by passing ruthless, dictatorial legislation of which only a Tojo, Mussolini, or Hitler could be guilty.

I beg you to defeat this legislation unless it is amended to eliminate the evil proposals that have and will contribute to the downfall of those who have adopted such Hitler-like policies and laws. Let us not destroy the liberty and freedom for which our boys at this very moment are giving their lives to preserve for us and future generations.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has 37 minutes remaining; the gentleman from New York has 42.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be misunderstood. I believe in the rights of labor; I believe in labor's right to organize for collective bargaining and even to strike in ordinary times. I think the people who toil with their hands are some of the finest people in the world. They have justly earned the rights that should be maintained at all times. In December 1941, when we voted for the declaration of war we did certain things from which we cannot run away; we did certain things that had to apply to every individual in this country, to each one of the 132,000,000 people. It has meant that we have given up many of these so-called social gains, and luxuries of life. Many ideas that we thought we could even hang onto for the duration of the war have had to go out the window. Out in my district you can find farm women driving tractors and holding little babies—tiny babies less than 6 months old—on their laps as they go down through a dusty field.

It is not a pleasant thing for the United States to tear a man away from his family and perhaps from his tiny children and send him to a distant land to fight and perhaps die for his country. Yet, we do it. It is not a pleasant thing to vote for laws restricting the rights of labor, but it must be done.

We do not like that sort of thing, but we all have to work together to win this war. I wonder if there is one here who contends that strikes of any kind will help us win this war. After all, a strike is nothing more nor less than mass idleness. With the greatest job ahead that this country has ever had to do, can we afford to have idleness even on an individual scale, to say nothing of an organized scale of mass idleness? There is no place for it in wartime economy. I maintain that no one has the right to strike against the public safety.

This Government under the Constitution has whatever power is necessary to win this war. Alexander Hamilton said:

> Every Government ought to contain in itself the means of its own preservation.

If the boys carrying guns, when they are given a certain order to execute in this war effort struck and said to their military superiors they would not do this, everyone agrees that would be wrong. I ask now, What is the difference between a strike on the part of an individual carrying a gun and a strike on the part of an individual making that gun? If it is wrong for the man carrying the gun to strike, if it is wrong for the man making the gun to strike; if it is wrong for the man making the steel to make the gun to strike, it is wrong for the man who is mining the coal to make the steel to make the gun to strike. We are all together in this war. We will win it together or we will lose it together.

I realize that much has been said about what our soldiers might think of certain legislation; nevertheless, I feel that the soldier morale is something we must maintain at all costs. I want to read to you a little bit from two letters from soldiers in my district. The first one is from Corp. James Nelson, son of Ida Nelson, of Holdrege, Nebr. Among other things this article goes on to say:

> Corporal Nelson has been brought back to the States as a trainig officer in jungle fighting. About his actual experiences he has very little to say, but when it comes to expressing his impressions of everyday experience in the Army he can be exceptionally fluent.
>
> The favorite gripe, says Nelson, of the boys in combat in the South Pacific is to get papers from the States telling about strikes in war plants and absenteeism.

I want to read from another letter coming from the South Pacific. This boy's name is James E. Chadderdon. He returned to Lincoln, Nebr., after 3 months. It says:

> James E. Chadderdon, former Holdrege resident, returned to Lincoln Monday after 3 months on Guadalcanal after having been honorably discharged from the Army with the assertion that if he was able to find a job in a war plant "I will work 12 hours a day."
>
> James, son of Mr. and Mrs. L. E. Chadderdon, called at American Legion headquarters with his father, a Legion member, and paid his dues. He gave R. C. Patterson, State adjutant, $5 and told him to keep the change and buy playing cards for the boys in the South Pacific.
>
> Chadderdon said that the men on Guadalcanal were not very friendly toward the labor unions in this country. "After you have been in the front lines for 4 days without much food or rest you don't have much respect for fellows that complain about working 40 hours unless they get overtime," he remarked. "I'm going to try to find a job where I can work 12 hours a day."

If this legislation means something to the boys who are far away from home; who are hungry, weak and tired; who are discouraged and blue; who may have the feeling at times that they are deserted, and they have the hardest job in this whole war effort; we ought to pass the legislation. We ought to say to those boys that the great Congress of the United States believes that this is everybody's war and that every individual should serve and should sacrifice. We ought to say that if it is wrong for a man carrying a gun to strike, it is wrong for a man making guns to strike; and if that is wrong, then it is wrong for men mining coal to make the steel for these guns to strike.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I agree with the gentleman that even one strike in these days is bad, but I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not after reading the bill he believes the passage of this bill is going to stop the strikes of men who feel that they ought to strike?

Mr. CURTIS. I think it will. I think the labor people of the United States are patriotic and they are not going to violate the law. If the Congress of the United States speaks out against their leaders and makes such an action unlawful, the rank and file of labor of America are law-abiding, they are patriotic, and they are not going to violate the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for trespassing further on the time of the House today, but I asked for the time merely to call attention to the fact that at the appropriate time I propose to offer a simple amendment to this bill which would do just one thing and one thing only. That is, it would make it a felony to conspire to strike against the Government. That is to say, to strike in any plant that this Government has already taken over. That is all in the world it would do.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Does the gentleman mean to strike under any circumstances?

Mr. COLMER. I mean to say it would be a felony to strike against the Federal Government. I mean to say that a man working in a war plant taken over by the Government has no more right to strike against the Government than those boys sitting in uniform in the gallery have to desert the colors in time of battle. That is what I mean to say and I propose to offer such an amendment. If there were nothing else in this bill except that one thing it would do the job.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. When the gentleman says "strike against the Government," he means a strike in a plant that the Government has taken over and is now operating?

Mr. COLMER. That is exactly what my amendment proposes to do. A question has been asked, Will legislation against strikes be effective? I say yes, legislation can be effective and I say further if this amendment had been written into the law prior to this you would not have the coal strike today because my amendment would strike

at the very foundation of strikes. The average laboring man is just as patriotic as the average man who wears the uniform. The trouble is the laboring man is suffering from bad leadership.

If you strike at the source of this thing and make it a felony for the leaders to call these strikes, especially where the Government has taken over the plant, and that is as far as this amendment goes, you would not have any trouble.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Is it not well to make a distinction between the man who works in a factory and the man who serves in the Army? You cannot coerce one like the other.

Mr. COLMER. I agree with the gentleman that no legislation affecting labor could be written that would suit the gentleman. I realize that. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. COLMER to S. 796:

Page 22, after line 23, insert:

"CONSPIRACY TO INTERFERE WITH GOVERNMENT OPERATION

"SEC. 14. Any person who shall willfully, during the present war or during the period of national emergency as proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, conspire with one or more persons for the purpose of bringing about (a) a cessation of production at any plant, mine, or other property in the possession of the United States, (b) a slowing down of production at any such plant, mine, or property, or (c) any other interference with production at any such plant, mine, or property, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both."

Page 23, line 2, strike out "14" and insert "15."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, with upward of 500,000 coal miners on strike, and with frequent strikes occurring in important war industries, it is imperative that Congress do something about it. Certainly the country expects Congress to take action.

I voted for the rule which made consideration of the Connally bill, as amended by the Military Affairs Committee of the House, in order. That vote has no significance, so far as the merits of the question are concerned; rather it was a vote to bring the whole problem out in the open so that the Congress of the United States might consider it and take suitable action.

We are at war—a war that is taxing our strength and resources to the maximum. We must win that war if we are to continue a free people.

Many of the strikes that have been called have been over the question of jurisdiction. Should a certain job be done by members of the steam fitters' or plumbers' union? Too many times such a controversy has resulted in strikes that have seriously impeded the prosecution of the war by delaying production of most needed war material. We have had strikes in nearly every war activity and the loss in production runs into millions of man-hours.

In the islands of the South Pacific our boys are fighting and many of them are dying needlessly for the lack of war material.

I ask you if this condition should be permitted to continue? Will not Congress, along with certain unscrupulous labor leaders, be charged with sabotaging our war effort if we fail to act to correct now this maladjustment in production?

Some labor leaders shriek to high heaven against Congress taking any action on this most important subject. There is little question but that the Connally bill was unnecessarily severe in some respects, but the House Military Affairs Committee has already eliminated several objectionable features. On the other hand, as amended, the measure contains provisions that every laboring man should approve.

Some of the more important provisions of the measure before us are that workers must give 30 days' notice of intention to strike and the reasons for such intended strike. No strike shall be called until decreed by a majority vote of the union, cast by secret ballot of the workers. Under the operation of the measure jurisdictional disputes, boycotts and sympathy strikes are outlawed and acts of violence and threats will be suitably dealt with.

As I understand this measure it provides that labor organizations must register with the National Labor Relations Board and give detailed information with respect to initiation fees, dues, assessments, number of members, last election of officers, financial transactions, and so forth. It will also make it unlawful for unions to contribute to political campaign funds. Any union violating the provisions of the bill would be denied all the benefits conferred by the Wagner Labor Act.

I have been a paying member of the typographical union for nearly 30 years. That union is distinctive because it rarely has a strike and always lives up to its contractual obligations. It is the one union in America that is truly democratic and representative because it is ruled by its membership rather than by a few insiders who operate for their own personal gains.

I firmly believe that the history of the typographical union furnishes a foundation upon which we may build labor legislation that will protect the interests of the worker, the employer, and the public.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I desire to incorporate in my remarks a very timely article on the typographical union by William Hard which appeared in the June issue of Reader's Digest. The article follows:

THE TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION—MODEL FOR ALL

(By William Hard)

In previous articles I have urged that all unions be required by law to hold regular elections, to make regular financial reports, to get a majority vote of rank-and-file members before striking or picketing, and—in short—to operate democratically.

It has been alleged that such laws would cripple the unions. So now I write about the typographical union, the printers' union.

The typographical union is the oldest union in America. Its local branch in Washington, D. C., was founded in 1815. Its local in New York City was founded in 1850 by Horace Greeley. In 1852 these and other locals merged to make the national union, which now has its headquarters in Indianapolis. Today this union has almost 900 locals and more than 80,000 members. In towns of 7,000 and above, it sets the type for over 85 percent of all newspapers and printing establishments.

Clearly it has been successful for itself. It also has been successful for its members.

Print shops used to be dark and dirty; the air in them was foul; the workday was 12 hours; tuberculosis was an accepted printer's ailment; the average age of printers at death was 28.

The union made up its mind to lift that age. All locals of the union formed committees on sanitation, which pleaded with employers and health authorities, and pushed print shops into the forefront of early industrial sanitary progress. Then, in 1892, the union established the Union Printers' Home at Colorado Springs—a sanatorium for tuberculous members and a place of retirement for aged ones. The union has spent more than $9,000,000 on it.

Above all, the union has reduced the workday. Work in a modern composing room is fast, intense, exhausting. The union has gradually brought the worktime of its members down from 12 hours a day to a maximum of 40 hours a week—except for war needs and other emergencies.

The consequence to the lives of its members cannot be a mere coincidence. Their average age at death has been lifted from 28 to the following levels:

By 1900, to 41; by 1910, to 46; by 1920, to 53; by 1930, to 59; by 1942, to 64.

This union has served life. Its success is unquestionable. So, next: Has it won this success by dictatorship over its members and class war against its employers?

It has not. Among its 900 locals there have been plenty of instances of hotheadedness and unreasonableness. The main point nevertheless remains that the typographical union, so old, so successful, is utterly antidictatorship and utterly anticlass war. Let us look at its methods from the bottom up.

You start toward being a member of the typographical union by becoming an apprentice. You can become an apprentice at 16. Then for six years you study your trade by practice in the shop and by taking 149 printed lessons sent to you by the union's bureau of education. These lessons are so complete that they have been adopted by many school systems as official textbooks.

A special set of lessons tells you about unionism. You are taught to remember the 19 London Times printers who in the early nineteenth century were sent to jail for trying to have a union. You are taught that union men must sacrifice for each other in order to continue to have a union. You are taught that it will be your duty to attend union meetings and to vote on all union problems.

But you are also taught about employers. You are taught that labor should not be unfriendly to capital; that capital and labor both are essential to efficient and economical production; that the union should insure high-class workmanship; that it should strive to reduce unit costs; that the employers of the typographical union have virtually never broken a contract with the union, and that no local should ever break a contract with any employer; that every local should regard itself as a partner with the employer in the production process;

that every preacher of class war, every Communist, every Fascist, every Nazi, is an enemy to the union and should be eliminated from the whole American labor movement.

On all these lessons the apprentice must pass examinations. Then he is a journeyman and a full member of the union and starts voting. He spends lots of his time voting.

The typographical union insists that its locals shall manage their own local affairs. Some unions get themselves centralized into their national headquarters. Their national officers become national despots. They found dynasties. The typographical union nourishes democracy's taproot—local self-government.

Every typographical union local must hold a regular monthly meeting on a regular stated day. It must elect an auditing committee or employ a certified public accountant to examine the books of its officers every 3 months. It must vote on every contract with an employer; and the contract binds every member. It must conduct a referendum of all its members and get a majority before it can raise its dues. It must vote on any proposed strike and get a three-quarters majority before striking.

In these circumstances no one-man rule is possible. And if this union can prevent the birth of labor bosses, all unions can.

Unions normally choose their national officers in a convention of elected delegates. That's democratic enough for most of us. But the members of the typographical union nominate and elect their national officers themselves in a Nation-wide referendum. It happens every 2 years. It is one of the most instructive events under the American democratic sky.

Members who aspire to be candidates must announce themselves in four lines of 6-point type, one column wide, in the December and January issues of the Typographical Journal, the union's paper mailed to every member. The Journal has to print the announcements of all aspirants to national offices whether the existing officers like them or not. They often do not.

The union, being American and democratic, just naturally has the two-party system. One party is called the Independents, the other the Progressives. Each gets its issues by watching the other and pouncing upon it for the general welfare, just like Republicans and Democrats. And, just as where are men known as national Democratic or Republican leaders, so there are union-wide Progressive and Independent leaders.

In February the locals nominate. Each may name one man for each national office. A local with a majority of Independents will vote for a nationally known Independent. Another local will vote for a Progressive leader. In the case of each national office, the five men nominated by the largest number of locals become the Nation-wide candidates. Often, however, it turns out that all the Progressive locals have voted for one man, and all the Independent locals for another, so that only two men run in the final election.

The names of the nominees are printed in the Journal in April. Each nominee may state his qualifications in the Journal—up to 200 words' worth of them.

On the third Wednesday in May the locals vote by secret ballot. The sealed ballots are forwarded to Indianapolis, where, on May 31, while watchers from both parties watch, they are opened and totaled; and the victors are proclaimed. The process has taken 6 months; but it is absolutely stealproof.

And if this union can operate stealproof elections, all unions can. The coercion and fraud that so often occur in union elections are not necessary to a strong and energetic labor movement.

Now, let us look at some more referendum democracy in the typographical union. In 1937 Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, sent the union a letter. It said that an American Federation of Labor convention had ordered the union to pay to the American Federation of Labor a new assessment of 1 cent per member per month. The typographical union was shocked to its foundations.

The union has an annual convention of its own. This convention does a lot of important enacting of general laws and bylaws for the whole union. But there are two things it cannot do. It cannot by itself amend the union's constitution. And it cannot by itself levy a new tax upon the members. Both those things have to go to a referendum vote of the entire membership.

When the members of the typographical union thought of an American Federation of Labor convention trying to do to them in taxation what not even their own convention could do, they went "white hot." They yelled "Dictatorship!" and they rushed to a referendum. They voted 4 to 1 to decline to pay the new American Federation of Labor assessment.

The typographical union in the early 1880's was the main force in the founding of the American Federation of Labor. Now it is independent, belonging neither to the American Federation of Labor nor to the Congress of Industrial Organizations. At its 1942 convention it adopted a resolution saying that it would like to unite itself with a reunited American labor movement—but only on one condition, namely: "The establishment of democratic procedures in all affiliated unions."

And it came near adding another condition, namely: "The elimination of gangsterism and the barring from office of all associates of underworld characters in all affiliated unions."

I ask, Is the typographical union anti-union because it charges that undemocratic procedures exist in unions?

I suggest that this country is equally tired of business leaders who cry "antibusiness" to stop business reforms and of union leaders who cry "antiunion" to stop union reforms.

Now, let us look at the typographical union's funds. On this point our unions are often unfairly attacked. People say:

"Look at all their money, taken off poor working people!"

It is a foolish remark till we know what the money was spent for.

The national organization of the Typographical Union, in its last fiscal year, collected more than $4,000,000 from its members, which is about $1 a week per member. It's a lot. But the union spent more than $400,000 on the Union Printers' Home, and almost $3,000,000 on pensions for old members. It spent $500,000 on funeral benefits and continued to be able to say, "No union printer ever filled a pauper's grave." It spent $100,000 on the Typographical Journal. Its expenses for all its elected officers and employed organizers, for all their traveling expenses and for all other services, and they were many, amounted to less than $200,000. It works out to less than 5 cents per member per week. No corporation does a tighter job of economy.

Claude Baker, president, and Woodruff Randolph, secretary-treasurer, get $7,500 a year. How many businesses with an annual turn-over of more than $4,000,000 pay less to their top men?

But how do I know that the union accounts are straight? Because they are checked twice a year by a committee of three auditors elected by the total membership of the union; and because they are additionally checked twice a year by certified public accountants; and because they are printed every month in page after page of the Typographical Journal.

Many other unions come equally clean. Therefore all can and should and must.

A democratic union has two advantages for the country. The first is that it tends toward relations with employers that are more human and intelligent and stable. But the second is even more important.

The whole democratic world, in order to meet the competition of the totalitarian world, has to perfect its own democratic institutions. It has to democratize its daily business life and its daily labor life. You cannot live an undemocratic life 364 days in the year and then achieve democracy by going to a political polling place on the 365th.

If you visit a union composing room, you may see the compositors, in a lull of work, gathered into a quick huddle. They are holding a meeting of their chapel—a subdivision of their local. They are rapidly settling, among themselves, some point of shop technique or shop discipline.

These little cells represent daily, hourly practice in democratic living. They represent participation in economic government. They represent economic government by consent. They train men to detest autocracy and to desire democracy in all things.

Freedom needs such men. Free democratic business must learn that in order to survive against the totalitarian state it has to have such men. The final merit of the typographical union is that its institutions are organized to produce such men.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important bill and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentlewoman will not insist upon the point of order. The Committee is practically ready to rise and I want to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], whose views concur with those held by the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New Jersey withdraws the point of order.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I heard with interest some of the figures and statements given by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] as to the loss of man-hours resulting from strikes, and I would like to counter by calling the attention of the Members to a very brilliant statement made by Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization and former distinguished Member of this body, the other night over the radio on the subject, wherein he said:

> Do not forget during 1942 only one-twentieth of 1 percent of time of workers engaged in war work was lost on strike. A striker in a war industry is almost as rare as a slacker in the Army.

I have read carefully this bill, read it from stem to stern. To my mind it is a very obnoxious measure, in these parlous times particularly. I would call it a "scab's charter," particularly since it has the effect of reviving and re-creating the vile and loathsome "yellow dog" contracts, and it also reinstitutes domination of labor by court injunctions.

Both Democratic and Republican Parties repeatedly in their platforms denounced rule by labor injunctions, and

they illustrated the most intolerable conditions that were brought about by labor injunctions. Now we would revive all that; a section of the bill provides for the revival of that vilest weapon that has ever been used in the past against labor.

We are again to have the "yellow dog" contracts. This bill will strafe labor, to borrow a World War term.

I believe we are revenging in haste by this bill what we are going to repent at our leisure.

Everywhere you hear words denunciatory of John L. Lewis, but why visit the sins of Mr. Lewis upon the rank and file of labor? Why give vent to your spleen with reference to Mr. Lewis and thereby do all in your power to hurt not only him but labor everywhere, and, besides, to foment and encourage unrest among the ranks of labor.

Section 2 of this bill denies the minority the right to strike. For example, 499 men of a plant of 1,000, under repeated Supreme Court decisions, have the individual right to agree one with the other to strike. But this bill, through section 2, denies the right to a minority to strike. That is an inalienable right, because the right to strike has been held to be not only an individual but a collective right. It involves the right of free speech, the right of free press, and the right of peaceful assembly. Nothing should prevent a group of men in a plant, even if they be the minority, to gather together peacefully and freely express their desires and wishes to better their conditions, and, if they are not bettered, they have a right to urge their fellows to strike.

But, under the cloak and cover of war, that right is to be taken away. Labor is to be curbed into submission.

While labor is engaged in turning out a plethora of tanks, planes, guns, and ships, it is to be stabbed in the back. That is ill reward for labor's purpose voluntarily to ban strikes. I have just read to you the statement of Mobilization Director Byrnes, praising labor and its great contribution to our war effort.

I cannot touch upon all the obnoxious provisions of this bill. One of them is involved in section 5–A. This outlaws the boycott and sympathy strikes. It withdraws the right of the workers to refuse to work on "unfair materials." That right should be suspended in war times. It has been suspended by voluntary agreement. There is no need to suspend it by legislative flat. It is an insult to labor to do so. By judicial interpretation, it is no longer a violation of the Sherman law, or any other law, to refuse to work upon unfair goods. In this regard, I quote the late Mr. Justice Brandeis, who, together with the late Mr. Justice Holmes, said:

> If on the undisputed facts of this case refusal to work can be enjoined, Congress created by the Sherman law and the Clayton Act an instrument for imposing restraints upon labor which reminds of involuntary servitude.

The decision referred to has since gone into the limbo of over-ruled cases, and the right to strike for the purpose of defending the integrity of a trade union organization has never since been successfully challenged.

This section 5–A to my mind has no connection whatsoever with the war effort. If a war contractor is on an unfair list and has customers who are employers who are in turn in no way involved in defense, unions cannot, under section 5–A strike, picket, or boycott such customers.

This is so, despite the unfair conditions obtaining in such employer-customers' shops or plants. This is so despite the unfair goods handled by such employer-customers, which goods the man in the shop of the war contractor may have to use or fabricate or handle.

There is no conceivable connection between section 5–A and the defense program. The purpose is simply to strike down labor's basic constitutional right to boycott, to strike and to refuse to use "unfair materials."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do not rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the amendments which were agreed to and adopted by the House Military Affairs Committee on today, which will be offered tomorrow to the pending bill, for the information of the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The amendments referred to follow:

On page 8, line 22, after the word "which", strike the words "may be" and insert the word "are." Line 23, after the word "which", strike the words "may be" and insert the word "are."

On page 9, line 13, after the word "lock-out", insert the following: "and the issues involved in the dispute giving rise thereto." At the end of section 2 strike the period and add the following: "and the issues involved in the dispute giving rise to such intended strike."

On page 10, line 13, after the word "and", insert the following: "to include on such ballot a concise statement of the major issues involved in the dispute together with a statement of the position of each party with respect thereto." On page 10, line 16, add the following: "No ballot shall be conducted under this section when any issue involved in the intended strike has been determined by statute or by any rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant thereto."

On page 11, line 12, after the word "contractor", add "or officers of a local labor organization of which said bona fide employees are members."

On page 13, line 12, strike the period, insert a colon and the following language: "*Provided*, That the penalties provided in this subsection shall extend to the local union or unions or other portion of the labor organization concerned in, connected with, or participating in such violation and to no other portion thereof."

On page 17, line 6, strike all after the period down to and including the word "organization" on line 9.

Section 10, where the word "Chairman" occurs change to "Board."

On page 15, line 23, after the word "regulation", insert the word "heretofore."

On page 18, line 10, after the word "strike", insert the words "or lock-out."

Strike all of section 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"RETURN OF PROPERTY TO OWNERS

"SEC. 12. When possession of any plant, mine, or other property has been, or is hereafter taken by the Government under authority of section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or otherwise, by reason of a strike, lock-out, threatened strike, threatened lock-out, work stoppage, or other cause, such plant, mine, or other property shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as practicable but in no event more than 60 days after the termination of the conditions which caused possession of such plant, mine, or other property to be so taken."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects and to include therein certain statements and excerpts, and a copy of a bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

TREASURY-POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief article from the Nation's Week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was granted a special order to address the House today. I now ask, in lieu thereof, that I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] is recognized for 25 minutes.

THE SMITH-CONNALLY BILL

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, in the following 25 minutes, during which time I have been privileged to address the Members of this distinguished body, I would like to point out why, in my humble opinion, the House should not adopt the provisions of the Smith-Connally bill. The House of Representatives has been referred to repeatedly as the greatest deliberative body in the world. Deliberation as defined by Webster is:

> Done or offered with deliberation * * * formed, arrived at, or determined upon as a

result of careful thought and weighing of considerations; as deliberate judgment or plan; carried on coolly and steadily.

2. Given to weighing facts and arguments with a view to choice or decision; careful in considering the consequences of a step; circumspect * * * characterized by reflection; dispassionate—not rash.

Certainly in a matter of such grave importance, it is not a time to rely upon emotional appeal or an appeal to passion but to consider the question from the standpoint of a cold factual analysis.

On December 1, 1941, there was introduced in the Senate a bill, No. 2054, relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of the national defense. That bill did not pass in the Seventy-seventh Congress. Recently the provisions of that bill were reintroduced in Senate bill 796. Senate bill 796, originally known as the Connally bill, provided in substance for Government seizure of plants in which a strike had developed and criminal penalty for any activity which might provoke or cause a strike after seizure. Without hearings the bill was brought on the floor of the Senate in the heat and hurry of the critical situation which then appeared to be developing with respect to the coal mines. On the floor of the Senate, and during the course of debate, a substantially new bill was written and passed containing provisions which went far beyond the original Connally bill and covered operations of the National War Labor Board generally, including a provision which apparently called for and permitted dilatory court review of Board decisions.

When the bill reached the House, the Military Affairs Committee, still without hearing—and in fact refusing to accede to the pleas of the labor organizations and many others for the opportunity to discuss the bill—simply and literally struck out the entire bill as passed by the Senate, and inserted a complete new bill of its own. This new bill substantially embodied most of the factors of the so-called Smith bill of 1941. It is for this reason that in its present version the measure is generally referred to as the Connally-Smith bill.

The Connally bill considered by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate was in effect an amendment of section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. In the House, because of the military aspects of the bill, it was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and not to the Labor Committee.

It is fair to assume, therefore, that the problem is not primarily one of labor but something connected with the military. That being so, it is necessary first to consider—how will the bill aid in the war effort?—will it provide an improvement over present methods in helping to win the war at the earliest possible date? Military authorities feel and the record discloses facts which justify the assertion that we are making great strides under the present set-up. May I call your attention to the testimony of some distinguished military witnesses?

One of the first acts of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, the American commanding general of all Allied forces in the African theater, following the Tunisian victory, was to dispatch the following message across the Atlantic Ocean:

Our fighting men, standing shoulder to shoulder with our gallant allies, the British and the French, have driven the enemy out of north Africa. In this victory the munitions made by American industry—labor and management—played a very important role. There is glory for us all in this achievement.

Hon. James V. Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, had this to say:

Hitler and Tojo disrupt, convert, and create industries as expediency dictates. They possess complete power over their war production and exercise that power ruthlessly. Such methods are not for America. Such tactics are completely antipathetic to the very principles for which we are fighting. In this country a tremendous reorganization and rededication of industry is taking place, but it is on a basis of voluntary cooperation. Management and labor alike are putting their shoulders to the wheel, freemen banded together in the common cause of human liberty.

Lt. Gen. William S. Knudsen, Director of Production, War Department, said inter alia:

We are all part of this effort to win the war. Our combined efforts will show the enemy that free labor and free enterprise can lick any combination of slavery and fear. We have the resources; we have the men; and we have the will to win. This is your United States and my United States—united as never before.

Rear Admiral C. H. Woodward, United States Navy, retired, Chief of the Incentive Division, Navy Department, in referring to Pearl Harbor said inter alia:

The fact is that many of these civilian workers had themselves been under fire in that treacherous attack and had courageously joined the Navy and Marine Corps in manning guns that defended the harbor. Undismayed and undaunted, they subsequently resumed their duties with even greater zeal and devotion. And despite almost insurmountable difficulties, their production achievements during the next 9 months were so outstanding that they won for themselves the high distinction of the Army-Navy E—symbol of excellence in production.

That indomitable spirit, manifested in a thousand ways by both labor and management in their relations with the Navy since the beginning of the world crisis, is immeasurably speeding the gigantic task we have before us. It is not only bringing ever closer to realization America's multi-ocean Navy of the future, but is laying, securely and inexorably, the foundations for the smashing victory over the forces of aggression which we are consecrated to win.

Today the Navy is the largest single employer in the country, if not in the world.

And again:

In meeting this mighty production problem, rendered doubly grave because in our struggle we are facing enemies who have been frantically arming for years while we were busily beating our swords into ploughshares, the Navy sought to enlist every hand and brain, every ounce of energy, every bit of skill and ingenuity that free American labor and free American enterprise could muster. It has not sought in vain. The response from both management and labor, organized and unorganized, has been little short of magnificent.

But even more inspiring has been the unity, the feeling of comradeship that has animated these soldiers of production and the personnel of the Navy in their common task of transforming our enormous industrial organization and potentials into an arsenal for the tools of victory. Never has practical democracy been more dynamic or efficient. If any more proof were required that for us the American way of life is the only way of life, this most perilous period of our national existence has supplied it beyond quibble or dispute.

The Navy Department itself accurately characterized this prevailing spirit of understanding and cooperation when it declared publicly not long ago: "The aims, ambitions, plans, and hopes of the Navy are identical with those of the vast majority of men and women who work for the Navy, and its employees are engaged and joined in a common cause and a common objective.'

This ccoperation and teamwork is a prerequisite of total war, which is in essence war on two fronts—the fighting line and the production line. The strategy of this type of warfare is simple: Produce—and attack! The side that produces matériel faster, and with this advantage of fire power attacks sooner, wins the day.

While management, in these and other ways, enlisted its resources in the Navy's gigantic program, labor rose to the occasion no less quickly and patriotically and assumed new responsibilities in our victory drive.

Even before Pearl Harbor labor had demonstrated its fighting spirit when it pitched in and repaired in 5 days the damage done by fire to a $2,250,000 defense plant at Cleveland, Ohio. It rushed construction of the immense naval base at Corpus Christi, Tex., to completion far ahead of schedule and smashed building records in putting up defense housing.

Upon our entrance into the war labor voluntarily discarded its time-honored right to strike, and the score since then is 2,000 strikes prevented for each one that has occurred. Labor is trying manfully to eliminate even this small fraction of work stoppages.

Unions affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the American Federation of Labor have of their own initiative waived double-time rates for holidays and Sunday work in all continuously operating war industries. The building trades unions have done this in the stabilization pact with the Government and war contractors. The metal-trades unions have done the same thing in the shipyards.

Despite the overtime provisions of the 40-hour week law, 7 out of 10 workers are now putting in 48 to 60 hours per week. In the machine-tool industry labor is working from 50 to 70 hours a week; in most aircraft factories 44 to 54 hours weekly; and nearly 70 percent of the Nation's shipyard workers are on their jobs from 46 to 52 hours a week.

In the production of ships, steel, machine tools, and other materials labor is setting new records regularly, only to smash these records in short order. In everything, from driving rivets and welding seams to laying wartime oil pipe lines and building naval barracks, labor has exceeded any previous standards of accomplishment.

The battleship *Alabama* was completed 9 months ahead of schedule. The mighty *Iowa* hit the water 7 months in advance of the contract date. The greatest mass launching in history was staged by the shipbuilders of America last Labor Day, when no less than 174 naval and merchant vessels were launched in 60 different yards throughout the United States. The keels for 49 ships were laid the same day in these same yards. The achievement gained additional luster from the fact that many workers donated their Labor Day wages as contributions toward the purchase of bombers, new ships, and more arms for our fighting forces, and toward Navy relief.

In other ways labor has shown itself equally generous with its money as with its skill and sinews, notably when American Federation of Labor building-trades members recently presented to the Navy a new $62,000 archives building for storing microfilms—1 of 10 buildings contributed by the group to the war effort with wages earned on extra days and holidays.

In recognition of the splendid service of both labor and management the Navy instituted the Navy E award for presentation to plants that demonstrated their excellence in producing ships, weapons, and equipment for the Navy. A total of 221 plants were so honored, with the privilege of flying the Navy E burgee at their mastheads. The present Army-Navy production award was inaugurated in order that all our fighting forces could join in paying tribute to exceptional performance on the production line. Thus far, the Army-Navy production award has been made to 200 plants which are producing for the Navy. Over each of these plants flies the red and blue pennant with its wreath of oak and laurel leaves; and each individual employee wears the distinctive silver E pin as a badge of meritorious service to his country.

An honor not lightly bestowed, the E floating above a plant means that the workers in that building have earned their award with the same caliber of efficiency, skill, and loyalty as the sailors of the warships that in times past won the right to display the identical symbol on their turrets or conning towers.

It means: "Well done to all hands."

Hon. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, made a comment, which is pertinent, as follows:

I wish with all my heart that we could likewise increase the quality of criticism. We have had a greater overproduction in fault finding than in any other product of American ingenuity. If all the profligate outpouring of good paper, ink, and breath could be refined to sound, useful, critical analysis, from which the men charged with the management of war effort could profit, Hitler and his stooges in Tokyo and Rome would know their ultimate doom to be closer.

Today, on the floor of the House, we were treated to the very interesting spectacle of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs speaking with great zeal, with great emotion, and with great feeling, about labor taking 30 days to cool off. It seems to me that a poem I learned when I was but a youngster is appropriate at this stage of the proceedings:

In speaking of another's faults
Pray don't forget your own,
Remember those in homes of glass
Should seldom throw a stone.

When we have nothing else to do
But speak of those who sin,
'Tis better we commence at home
And from that point begin.

I'll tell you of a better plan,
I find it works quite well—
To try my own defects to cure
Before of others, tell.

Then let us all, when we commence
To slander friend or foe,
Think of the harm one word may do
To others we little know.

Remember that our troubles
Sometimes like our chickens roost at home;
So do not speak of others' faults
Until you have none of your own.

FROM THE STANDPOINT OF OBJECTIONS TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE CONNALLY-SMITH BILL

I could go on and quote in the RECORD the objections of the Railway Labor Executives' Association, the objections of the Commercial Telegraphers' Union, the objections of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, the objections of the United Rubber Workers of America, the objections of the Congress of Industrial Organizations—which have been prepared and outlined at length—and the objections of the American Federation of Labor.

At this point I should like also, referring to my little bit of poetry, to refer to the statement made on the floor by he distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. He said that in 1942 we had more strikes than at any other time except 2 years in the preceding 20 years. Let me quote the facts from the record. In the Monthly Labor Review of May 1943 will be found the following, and I quote verbatim from page 959:

There was a substantial decline in strike activity in 1942, the first full year of the country's participation in World War No. 2. During the year there were 2,968 strikes, involving approximately 840,000 workers, and 4,183,000 man-days of idleness. About 28 workers out of 1,000 employed were involved in a strike at some time during the year; idleness during strikes is estimated to be a twentieth of 1 percent of the time worked.

And again:

Viewed against the strike record of the last decade, 1942 stands as a year of slightly more than the average number of strikes but less than the average number of workers involved, and substantially less idleness than in any other year. Except for 1930, there was less strike idleness in 1942 than any year for which information is available.

I say that is exactly contrary to what the distinguished citizen of Virginia said on the floor of this House.

Again, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia talked about having the polls to tell what public opinion in America was. I should like to call his attention and the attention of the House to another poll, not that I care too much about polls, but this is one in a recent issue of Fortune Magazine, that for June 1943, appearing at page 224:

A few weeks before John L. Lewis called labor to arms against the President's domestic war program, 56 percent of the American people marked Roosevelt's job on home problems "good." Their judgment on Congress, elected by the same people less than a year ago, was considerably harsher, 26 percent good, 17 percent poor. Worse, if faced with a choice between a peace plan of Roosevelt's making and one planned by the present Congress, 58 percent would take the President's advice, only 28 percent would endorse Congress.

It seems to me, in view of the attitude of the heads of the departments who are running the war, that this bill should be defeated. As a Member of this distinguished body, I resented a Member of this Congress referring on this floor to the department heads, the people responsible for the conduct of the war, and saying that something was "cooked up"—to use the distinguished Member's expression—in the Department of Labor, when the representatives of the Navy and Army and the W. P. B., the War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board prepared a statement to say to this Congress that they felt that this particular bill was not wise in its provisions.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. I may add to what the gentleman has said that those very same department people, the representatives of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War and the Maritime Commission, distinctly said yesterday, just yesterday, that they would adhere strictly to the letter that they wrote on May 15 against this bill, and that they believed as of yesterday it is still a mistake to have this bill passed.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

At this point in the RECORD I call the attention of the Members of this distinguished body to this so-called reference to the voice of the people and what the country has to say about it. If 56 percent, at least, of the American people marked Roosevelt's job on the home problems "good," and I say that is a small percentage, that the percentage of public approval is larger, why should not we in preparing legislation follow the leadership and advice of those responsible for the war effort?

Once again, I should like to call the attention of the Members to the address of the Honorable James Byrnes on America's entrance into the critical phase of the war, in which he outlines, step after step, the great contribution made by American labor in this war effort.

Now, to refer particularly to the sections of the bill, I should like to place in the RECORD the following:

ANALYSIS OF AND COMMENTS ON SMITH-CONNALLY BILL, S. 796, BY THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

The bill is a hodgepodge of antilabor measures, many of which have no relationship whatsoever to the war effort. The bill tramples upon and violates almost every right which labor has gained after years of struggle. It is a bitter reward for the contributions that labor has made to the present war effort whereunder seemingly impossible production records have been achieved. No greater or more unmerited blow to the morale of millions of patriotic American workers can be conceived than that inflicted by the present bill. The bill will inevitably interfere with war production and stimulate industrial unrest, and the effectiveness of existing machinery for the orderly settlement of labor disputes will be impaired if not destroyed.

The report accompanying the bill states that the legislation is necessary because of the crisis in the coal mines. Aside from the fact that the Government has taken appropriate action and now operates the mines, the provisions of the bill are not limited to the coal industry but apply to every plant producing materials needed in or helpful to the war effort, and apply to millions of American workers in addition to the comparatively few working in the coal mines. Compulsory legislation prohibiting strikes is not necessary to achieve maximum production. Existing voluntary procedures have not only proved sufficient but have operated to make possible the greatest production record in the history of this or any other country. Organized labor has lived up to its "no-strike" pledge to the fullest possible extent, and even those few unauthorized stoppages which have occurred have caused a total man-days loss of only a fraction of that occurring in time of peace, and is less than half of that occurring in Great Britain. Time and again our war leaders and production heads, in praising the production achievements of organized labor,

have declared that the time which has been lost was unavoidable, and that labor has fulfilled its no-strike obligation to the fullest extent humanly possible. The production records speak for themselves in this respect. The passage of this bill would constitute an absolutely unwarranted reflection upon millions of American workers and would impugn the patriotism of millions of union members whose brothers, sons, and fathers are on our fighting fronts.

Let us analyze some of the provisions of the bill.

In that connection I direct the attention of the members to the recent publication of the War Production Board, page 10, in which it shows the part of labor in this war, and I challenge anyone to show that that has not been to say the least, excellent.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think it is very significant that the people who are propelling this legislation through this House at this time are identically the same individuals speaking for and representing the same anti-labor interests who have always been opposed to labor, and who have always sought to undermine the American foundation of freedom upon which American labor unions rest.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the gentleman.

Section 2 prohibits strikes for a 30-day cooling-off period. Organized labor has already voluntarily given up the right to strike and has lived up to its pledge in this respect, which in itself makes such a provision unnecessary.

Section 3 of the bill requires a majority vote to engage in a strike after the 30-day cooling-off period. Such a provision reflects directly and unwarrantedly on the integrity and responsibility of the many thousands of union leaders throughout the country. Unions, by their own elections, themselves repose responsibility in their officers to determine the policy and conduct the affairs of the membership. However, the most important objection to this provision is the fact that it denies to minorities their moral and legal rights to quit in concert and declare their grievances to the world. The mere fact that only 450 of a thousand employees are agreed upon a strike and agreed upon the grievances that give rise to the strike is no reason to deny them their rights because 550 think otherwise. The right of a minority to strike is not dependent upon the will of a majority; it is not equivalent to elections to office. The right to strike, like all basic constitutional rights, is an individual and collective right not subject to dictates by any group, majority or otherwise. It is protected by the Constitution in the same manner as religious worship, freedom of speech, peaceable assembly, and similar rights.

Section 4 (a) forbids force or violence in connection with a labor dispute in a war plant. This, of course, is entirely unnecessary since force or violence is nowhere lawful in the United States. Its necessary result is for antilabor employers to encourage violence on the picket line through the use of professional provocateurs and thus deprive workers of their rights under the Wagner Act.

Section 4 (b) prohibits peaceful picketing before a "house or place where a person resides." This is clearly in violation of the first amendment which prevents Congress from the passing of law abridging freedom of speech and of assembly.

Section 4 (c) prohibits any but so-called bona fide employees from engaging in peaceful picketing. This is a direct throwback to the reactionary days where labor disputes were in effect limited to disputes between an employer and his immediate employees. In other words this section prohibits so-called "stranger picketing" and is in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States for the same reasons as noted above. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the recent case of *American Federation of Labor* v. *Swing*, said that "A State cannot exclude workingmen from peacefully exercising the rights of free communication by drawing the circle of economic competition between employers and workers so small as to contain only an employer and those directly employed by him. The interdependence of economic interest of all engaged in the same industry has become a commonplace."

Section 5 (a) outlaws the boycott. Unions may not strike any person—regardless of whether or not he be a defense contractor—or refuse to work on or handle the products of such person in an effort to induce a defense contractor to deal with the union. Thus, if a defense contractor be on the unfair list and has among his customers employers who are in no way involved in the defense program, the union, nevertheless, may not strike or picket such customer. There is no conceivable connection between this provision and the defense program. The purpose of this provision, too, is primarily to reduce labor's basic constitutional rights.

Section 5 (b) prohibits strikes and other concerted activities on the part of unions against a defense contractor calculated to displace another union that has a collective bargaining agreement. While this provision is undoubtedly aimed at jurisdictional and inter-union disputes, it would also by its terms tend to freeze collective bargaining relationships between the employers and company unions and to restrict freedom of choice of employees under existing contracts.

Section 6 deals with enforcement. 6 (a) amends the Norris-LaGuardia Act so as to permit ex parte injunctions for violation of any of the preceding sections. Thus, the dictatorial rule of government by injunction is revived in a purported national effort to fight dictatorships. Section 6 (b) adds to the penalties by permitting civil actions for damages by employers for violation of the preceding sections. Here is revealed the true spirit and purpose of this bill, namely, to weaken and destroy labor unions. It can superficially be argued that the prevention of strikes is necessary as an emergency measure in order to avoid interruptions in defense production. But surely, there is no connection between the continuous flow of defense production and enriching employers by giving them private suits wherewith they will seek to delete union treasuries.

But that is not all. Section 6 (c) imposes additional penalties on individuals who are found to have violated the preceding sections. First, an employee loses his status as an employee or as a representative under the Wagner Act. Second, employees lose all benefits under "any act making appropriations for relief purposes;" and third, section 6 (d) completes the picture by providing that, if any individual violating the preceding sections is an officer or representative of a labor organization, then the organization itself loses its status under the Wagner Act and under the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Section 7 deals with compulsory registration of all labor organizations with the National Labor Relations Board. It requires filing information on almost every detail of internal union affairs. Failure to comply disqualifies the labor organization to act as collective bargaining agent.

It should be noted that in England registration of labor organizations is entirely voluntary and carries with it certain stated benefits. This provision, which can only remotely be connected with the national defense program, does not, of course, extend any benefits to labor organizations and makes it compulsory for them to register. From the tenor of the entire bill, as well as the spirit of those who sponsor and favor it, it is fair to say that the direct aim of these provisions is to accumulate sufficient data about labor organizations so as to facilitate procedures for destroying these labor organizations.

No other voluntary trade association, such as the National Association of Manufacturers, chambers of commerce, or employer associations are required to register and disclose their internal affairs. If such legislation is proper, then it is likewise proper to require the disclosure of the internal affairs of all clubs, societies, mutual-benefit associations, or any other type of voluntary association.

Sections 8 and 9 give the War Labor Board authority to hear and determine labor disputes affecting the war effort, but it is provided that the Board cannot direct that a closed- or union-shop clause be incorporated in any labor agreement directed by it. Labor has not asked the Government to compel the union or closed shop; the Government should not seek to compel a compulsory open shop. The matter is one which should be left to the discretion of the War Labor Board, dependent upon the facts of each particular case. Under this provision, upon the expiration of existing union-shop agreements, employers may refuse to renew them, and labor, under its no-strike pledge, would have no way of maintaining the security which perhaps had been won only after long struggles. Is it equitable to permit any company to take advantage of the no-strike agreement to throw out a union shop previously established by agreements between the parties? In the Harvill Aircraft Die Casting Corporation case the War Labor Board determined that "likewise, to push union shops back into open shops would unstabilize, for war production, the unions of the millions of American workers who have pledged themselves not to strike but to leave to peaceful arbitrament the security of the unions which they have won after long and arduous struggles."

Section 10 empowers the War Labor Board to prohibit strikes in any plant in which a dispute has arisen, and the prohibition on striking can last as long as 60 days. The order is enforceable by injunctive decree obtained by the Attorney General in the Federal courts, and the Norris-LaGuardia Act is amended to permit courts to issue labor injunctions. This section is objectionable for the same reason that section 2, providing for a "cooling off" period, is objectionable; it constitutes involuntary servitude and is entirely unnecessary in view of the no-strike pledge.

Under section 13 of the bill, it is made a crime punishable by heavy fine or a year's imprisonment, or both, for any person "to instigate or induce any interference or other interruption" with a plant taken over by the Government. Any just protest against intolerable conditions voiced by one worker to another, let alone to an assemblage of his fellow workers, could be classified as an "inducement" or an "instigation" or an "interference" with the operation of a business. It matters not whether such worker be union official, union member, or neither; indeed, if a protest is made by a union representative upon request of workers whom he was chosen to represent, the crime presumably would be conclusive. Under this section not only is a condition of involuntary servitude imposed but, even worse, persons who already have had their right to a strike outlawed would be

hazarding their liberties by making any protests or by taking any concerted action against any grievance, no matter how great the provocation. Surely, personal liberty and liberty of speech is what we are fighting to preserve, not destroy.

Subsection a (2) of section 13 makes it a crime for any person to aid an interruption by giving direction or guidance or providing funds. Under this section an international union could maintain ordinary correspondence or intercourse with an affiliated local that might be involved in a work interruption at a Government-operated plant only at its peril, and the payment of ordinary salaries as required by constitutional provisions in such cases might well constitute a crime.

It is no comfort to provide in section 13 that an individual shall have the right to cease work when that individual is forbidden to discuss lawful grievances with a fellow worker or workers and quit employment in concert with him or them. This proviso merely restores the ancient doctrine of conspiracy under which organized labor, early in its history, suffered so much abuse at the hands of the courts.

The Smith-Connally bill is wrong in principle, is entirely lacking in necessity, is unjust in application, and constitutes a gratuitous insult to millions of American workers who are expending every effort on the production fronts. At very best, as stated by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, the provisions of the bill "constitute a club—a vengeful weapon aimed at all American workers in retaliation for the acts of a few. American workers will not and cannot subject themselves to such tyranny. This measure, if enacted into law, will wreck the war production program. It will wipe out the vast benefits that have been derived from the operation of labor's voluntary no-strike pledge. It will be as unenforceable as prohibition. How can American workers join wholeheartedly in a war for the preservation of freedom when their own freedoms are being cut out from under them? How can American workers believe in the sincerity of America's war against fascism, when Fascist legislation is being imposed against them?"

If any person believes that war production would be increased by passage of the bill, or that the morale of the American worker would thereby be raised, he is seriously mistaken. Not only is the voice of 12,000,000 organized workers raised against passage of this bill, but the leaders of our war program both on the military and production front and the heads of all governmental agencies and tribunals dealing with labor relations have unanimously condemned the bill as constituting an interference with the war effort and have requested and urged the Members of Congress to vote against its passage. In a letter addressed to the Speaker of the House, the chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs and the majority leader of the House, and signed by the War Department, the Navy Department, the Labor Department, the Maritime Commission, the War Production Board, the National Labor Relations Board, and the National War Labor Board, it was stated that "The committee bill proposes drastic and far-reaching changes in the over-all machinery and principles established by statute, Executive order, and mutual agreement for dealing with labor relations in the war period. According to the committee report, these changes are imperative because of the emergency which may arise from the current dispute in the coal industry. But the bill in its terms is not limited to that industry and therefore must be appraised with respect to its impact upon the whole field of industrial production. While recognizing the gravity of the coal-mining situation, and without attempting to suggest here what specific steps should be taken in dealing with that situation, we note that since the Government has taken possession of the coal mines, only a few sections of the bill have any bearing upon that particular dispute. The bill relates to American industry generally and to the whole problem of maintaining industrial peace in time of war. It is accordingly felt that in evaluating the bill our judgment should not be obscured by the exception presented by the coal-mining situation to an otherwise unprecedented record of industrial peace since Pearl Harbor. Although a number of strikes have occurred since the declaration of war, they have, with very few exceptions, been unauthorized stoppages of short duration opposed by the responsible leadership of organized labor, and the total man-days lost have been less than at any other time in our industrial history.

The bill contains numerous coercive provisions, including injunctions and criminal penalties. At the same time it impliedly recognizes the propriety of strikes after a 30-day notice and a secret ballot. In both these respects the bill runs squarely counter to the national policy embodied in the voluntary and unconditional no-strike agreement entered into by industry and labor with the President immediately after Pearl Harbor. This agreement, which represents the cornerstone of our wartime industrial-relations structure, has been supplemented in a number of industries by written agreements outlawing strikes and lock-outs for the period of the war. This nationally accepted arrangement, whereby strikes and lock-outs have been outlawed by voluntary action, has proven by experience so satisfactory that a change in the arrangement should be approached with greatest caution. It would seem unwise in time of war to experiment with an untried substitute for a policy whose worth is already demonstrated.

"The absence of any comment in this letter on other features of the bill does not necessarily imply approval of those features. The shortage of time has prevented the preparation and submission of any joint detailed analysis. Some of the undersigned agencies will, however, submit comment on certain sections of the bill bearing on problems respecting which they have special knowledge and experience."

Such an expression of disapproval by governmental war and labor agencies should be conclusive.

On May 18 the American Federation of Labor formally reaffirmed its no-strike pledge "as a valid and compelling obligation come what may." It was stated, "No strike will be authorized or approved by the American Federation of Labor and its affiliated unions until the enemies of America have been crushed into final defeat."

This week President Roosevelt reports that America is producing more fighting planes than all of the enemy nations combined; Secretary of the Navy Knox announces that virtually an entire new navy was launched in the first few months of this year; merchant ships are sliding down the ways at a rate never before approached in shipbuilding history; a virtual avalanche of guns, tanks, and ammunition, unsurpassed in quality, is pouring forth from American factories. Production has reached such staggering quantities that Donald Nelson acknowledges there is no further need for expanding plant capacity.

Organized labor takes pride in this accomplishment. The American worker neither expects nor merits restrictive, stultifying legislation such as the Smith-Connally bill as its reward. Such legislation not only constitutes a completely unwarranted reflection upon the patriotism of the American worker, and would result in an incalculable blow to morale, inevitably and seriously impairing production, but constitutes a restriction of the very liberties to preserve which we are fighting this war and would be a definite step in the direction of that form of government imposed upon the people of the enemy countries by their dictators.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the excellent record on the whole of American labor, in view of the attitude of the Government departments involved in carrying on the war. I submit this bill should be defeated.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVAL TRUST FUNDS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] may have permission to file a conference report and statement upon the bill (H. R. 2584) abolishing certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement upon the bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain telegrams.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MCCOWEN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for the week of June 1 to 5, on account of official business.

To Mr. PETERSON of Florida (at the request of Mr. GREEN), for 5 days, on account of serious illness of his mother.

To Mr. DOMENGEAUX (at the request of Mr. MCKENZIE), for 3 weeks from June 1, on account of important Government business.

To Mr. PLUMLEY, for 3 days, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 367. An act for the relief of dependents of Frank Edward Dace; to the Committee on Claims.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2346. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 3, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Thursday, June 3, 1943, for consideration of housing bills, in room 217, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Thursday, June 3, 1943, on bills dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act—H. R. 1882 and H. R. 2309.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Investigation of Restriction on Brand Names and Newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m. Thursday, June 3, 1943.

Business to be considered: Resuming public hearings pursuant to House Resolution 98 by Congressman HALLECK. Food and canners' industry will be heard.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2617, a bill to provide for speedy and summary notice in proceedings to condemn property for war purposes, and to accelerate the distribution of deposits and awards to the persons entitled thereto in such cases, at 10:30 a. m. on Friday, June 4, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

1. Thursday, June 3: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the upper and lower Ohio River and tributaries, and on projects of the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

2. Friday, June 4: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects along the Missouri River and tributaries and the upper Mississippi River and the Great Lakes region.

3. Tuesday, June 8: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, including the Arkansas and White Rivers, and on rivers flowing into the Gulf west of the Mississippi River, and in the western Rocky Mountain region, including Texas and Colorado, and in the Pacific Northwest region, including the Willamette River and the Columbia River and tributaries.

4. Wednesday, June 9: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the Los Angeles area and in the State of California, including the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kern River Valleys, and on projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

5. Thursday, June 10: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

6. Friday, June 11: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will hold public hearings on Tuesday, June 8, 1943, beginning at 10 a. m., on bills relating to the classification and compensation of substitute employees in the Postal Service.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2731, to facilitate the award and payment of just compensation for property requisitioned under the authority of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2620, a bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives of the United States, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 16, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

450. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 26, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Quillayute River, Wash., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives adopted on November 5, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 218); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

451. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 26, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Oconto Harbor, Wis., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives adopted on August 26, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

452. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 867 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 247. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 2536, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 515). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 248. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 2795, a bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land and buildings and facilities or fixtures appurtenant thereto, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 516). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WICKERSHAM: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2766. A bill amending the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 517). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RIZLEY: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 133. Joint resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for feed; without amendment (Rept. No. 518). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'TOOLE: Committee on the Library. H. R. 2106. A bill to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a statue of Sir William Blackstone, the work of the late Paul W. Bartlett, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARTER:

H. R. 2848. A bill amending the joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, approved April 29, 1943; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 2849. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their system of public education during emergency and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 2850 (by request). A bill to authorize the rezoning of certain property in the District of Columbia as a residential area; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2851. A bill to provide for free postage on mail to members of the armed forces; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 2852. A bill amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to liability of illiterate individuals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2853. A bill to provide additional compensation for veterans of the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 2854 A bill to provide additional life-insurance protection for members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. Res. 249. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the President investigate the advisability of having Army personnel guard those bridges of the Nation, the protection of which is necessary to the national defense; to the Commitee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 2855. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Buby; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 2856 A bill granting an increase of pension to Ida M. Lent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1222. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of the Arkansas Bankers Association, urging the classification of the banking business as an essential industry vital to the welfare of the Nation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1223. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution in behalf of 300 coal miners, members of Local Union No. 106, of Eldorado, Ill., signed by Ed Dowdy, president, and William Pool, secretary, urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1224. Also, communication from J. F. Karber, principal, Ridgway Community High School, Ridgway, Ill., urging the continuance of the National Youth Administration and that a sufficient appropriation be made therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1225. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Martha P. Tracy and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1226. By Mr. HOPE: Petition with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1227. Also, petition with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1228. Also, petition with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1229. Also, petition with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1230. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Yakima, Palouse, Garfield, Selah, and Zillah, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1231. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the Bronx Borough Taxpayers' League, Inc., of Bronx, New York City, urging that war-damage insurance coverage be extended for an additional period of 1 year without the payment of an added premium; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1232. By Mr. STEFAN: Petition of Lulu Hendrickson and 44 other citizens of Osceola, Nebr., urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1233. Also, petition of Mrs. Harry Adams and 37 other citizens of Wakefield, Nebr., urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1234. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of the Greenville, S. C., County Pomona Grange, A. L. Beam, chairman of the resolutions committee, condemning in no uncertain terms strikes of any kind, for any reason at the present time, or any time during the critical period, also that some definite action be taken to prevent further treason against our Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1235. By Mr. WASIELEWSKI: Petition of the Milwaukee County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of Wisconsin, urging the passage of House bill 2231; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1236. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. E. A. Erickson, of Hawley, and Mr. and Mrs. Nels B. Eide, of Hitterdal, Minn., and 100 other signers from the Hitterdal community, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1237. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of 80 citizens of Franklin County, urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1238. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of sundry citizens of Valparaiso, Ind., and vicinity, favoring the prompt enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1239. By Mr. ROLPH: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 19 of the State of California, relative to memorializing and petitioning Congress to enact legislation giving to draftees and others entering the military and naval service of the United States adequate insurance protection for themselves in the form of permanent total disability insurance as well as life insurance protection; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1240. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 44 of the State of California, relative to the appointment of the Honorable Jesse Tapp as assistant to the Food Administrator of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1241. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 45 of the State of California, relative to facilitating the employment of Mexican citizens in agriculture; to the Committee on Labor.

1242. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 46 of the State of California, relative to repair facilities and materials for agricultural machinery and implements; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1243. Also, House Resolution No. 232 of the State of California, relative to the Post-war International Economic and Food Conference; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1244. Also, House Resolution No. 246 of the State of California relative to memorializing the President and the Secretary of the Navy to name a Navy cruiser of the United States Fleet for the city of San Pedro, Calif.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1245. Also, House Resolution No. 257 of the State of California relating to the return of gold mines to partial production; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

1246. Also, House Resolution No. 284 and Senate Joint Resolution No. 142 of the State of California relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact Senate bill 971 or House bill 2426, Seventy-eighth Congress, providing for Federal participation in financing of a post-war highway-construction program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1247. Also, House Resolution No. 289 of the State of California memorializing Congress to enact necessary legislation to permit the reuse of bottles used as containers of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1248. Also, House Resolution No. 296 of the State of California relative to memorializing the Office of Price Administration in relation to gasoline allowances for the purposes of taking deer; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of life and of light, we approach Thy throne with gratitude and gladness, for Thou hast placed at our disposal the inexhaustible resources of Thine infinite being. Thy fatherly heart always opens with love in response to our many needs.

We thank Thee for our noble heritage and pray that we may possess it more worthily by seeking to be partners with all who are safeguarding it so courageously for our own and succeeding generations.

Bless these Thy servants, granting unto them grace to perform their duties

with pure and steadfast devotion; and may they be abundantly enriched with the tokens of Thine everlasting favor. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord, in whose name we bring our petitions and supplications. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, June 2, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gerry	Overton
Austin	Gillette	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hatch	Revercomb
Barbour	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Scrugham
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lodge	Tobey
Capper	Lucas	Truman
Caraway	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	White
Downey	Moore	Wiley
Eastland	Murray	Willis
Ellender	Nye	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senators from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK and Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on important public business.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication, which was referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 62)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1944, amounting to $385,000, in the form of amendments to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the Delta Council, at Cleveland, Miss., condemning certain alleged experimentation by the Farm Security Administration and favoring execution of the Farm Security Administration program in accordance with the original intent of Congress so as to provide assistance to worthy families in the purchase of family-type farms; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the Delta Council, at Cleveland, Miss., opposing and condemning the employment of Communists by the Government and favoring the prompt separation of such Communists from all branches of the Federal service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the Delta Council, at Cleveland, Miss., favoring the enactment of legislation to protect the laborer, the employer, and the public against unwarranted encroachment upon their rights and personal liberties; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the Delta Council, at Cleveland, Miss., favoring the levy of a Federal sales tax to be designated as a "war tax," so as to help place the Nation on a pay-as-we-go basis to pay expenses incurred in the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Madison, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

INTERFERENCE WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE BY STRIKES—RESOLUTION OF KENT COUNTY (MICH.) BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I present a telegram for the RECORD, and I wish to make a brief observation in connection with it.

I very much doubt whether Washington appreciates the extent of the bitterness with which the country at large is greeting the deadly news of labor strikes. It is a bitterness, unfortunately, which bodes ill even to the legitimate rights of labor. The time is running short for dealing with this problem in a firm but prudent way. Regardless of whatever merits may be involved in these disputes, all interruptions to defense production will not be and cannot be much longer tolerated by a country whose fighting sons are on deadly battle fronts and whose fate is at the bar of destiny. Those who sow the wind will reap the whirlwind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a telegram from the board of supervisors of my home county in Michigan be printed in the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., *June 2, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
Washington, D. C.:

Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Kent County in session June 2, 1943: Mindful of the young men from Kent County in the military service, many of whom have already paid the full price, we are humiliated to note that our Government in Washington temporizes with the challenge to the sovereignty of 130,00,000 citizens of this Nation offered by John L. Lewis. We ask that our Representatives in Congress, regardless of party, demand that those responsible for this sabotage and obstruction of the national defense be dealt with summarily as enemies of the Republic. Yeas, 54; nays, 0.

LEWIS J. DONOVAN, *County Clerk.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1120. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the posthumous appointment to commissioned or noncommissioned grade of certain enlisted men and the posthumous promotion of certain commissioned officers and enlisted men," approved July 28, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 272).

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 883. A bill providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business; with amendments (Rept. No. 273).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 824. A bill for the relief of Dr. J. W. Goin; with an amendment (Rept. No. 274).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 694. A bill for the relief of the W. G. Cornell Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 275); and

S. 1087. A bill for the relief of Burton S. Radford; with an amendment (Rept. No. 276).

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 626. A bill for the relief of Angeline Arbuckle; with an amendment (Rept. No. 277); and

H. R. 1278. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Richard Stever; without amendment (Rept. No. 278).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 653. A bill for the relief of Johnny Newton Strickland; without amendment (Rept. No. 279); and

H. R. 637. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eliza Ward; without amendment (Rept. No. 280).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1158. A bill to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1159. A bill creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges

across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM (for himself and the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises):

S. 1160. A bill to stimulate production of strategic and critical minerals for the present war effort and to assure an adequate supply of such minerals for any future emergency by continuance, intact, in the post-war period of all stockpiles surviving the present war and by necessary augmentation thereof primarily from domestic sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

(Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY) introduced Senate bill 1161, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND (for Mr. MCCLELLAN):

S. 1162. A bill to authorize Federal-aid highway funds previously apportioned to the States to be expended for the repair and reconstruction of highways and bridges damaged or destroyed by floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, or landslides; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT

Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FEDERAL REAL ESTATE BOARD (H. DOC. NO. 216)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, yesterday there was received by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, from the President of the United States, a report from a special committee which he had appointed to study and make recommendations upon the question of communities adversely affected by the Federal purchase of substantial quantities of land and their consequent removal from the tax rolls. In the committee we have had numerous requests from the States for copies of the report. In order that we may comply with the requests, I ask unanimous consent that the report and the President's letter may be printed as a Senate document with an illustration.

There being no objection, the communication from the President of the United States transmitting a report on Federal contributions to States and local governmental units with respect to federally owned real estate was ordered to be printed with an illustration as a Senate document.

PRICE FIXING PROGRAMS AND INFLATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter from the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, from which I read but one sentence:

Economists agree that the disparity between income and living costs is a real problem in the picture of inflation.

I ask that this letter, from Milo K. Swanton, executive secretary, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, together with copies of telegrams which were sent by the Council of Agriculture to Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, and to Hon. James Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization.

There being no objection, the letter and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE (COOPERATIVE),
Madison, Wis., June 1, 1943.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The time has come for Washington officials who are experimenting and tinkering with price programs to face facts in a clear, statesmanlike manner. They say they are determined to prevent inflation. They think only in terms of the kind of inflation that has to do with cost of living, apparently not realizing that inflation began about 2 years ago with high industrial wage rates and high cost of industrial goods and defense materials.

It is humanly impossible as well as inconsistent to accept and to condone inflation on one hand while on the other hand attempting to curb the whole problem of inflation by rolling back and controlling the price of food.

Price roll-back with subsidy is a form of delayed inflation because it increases the amount of surplus funds in the hands of people and because it increases the total national debt. Both of these factors contribute to inflation.

Price roll-back with subsidy is economically unsound because it reduces living costs at a time when the American people are most able to pay. To the extent that living costs are now lowered, the national debt will be increased. In other words, it means postponing the full cost of living for posterity to pay when incomes may be lower and when unemployment may be prevalent. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the cost of living in February 1943 had increased about 20 percent over the average cost of living for the period of 1935 to 1939. However, during the same period, the earnings for employed industrial workers increased nearly 80 percent.

Economists agree that the disparity between income and living costs is a real problem in the picture of inflation. This unspent income has been rising each year. According to Bowman and Hart of Iowa State College, there were $6,000,000,000 of unspent income in 1939. This rose to $27,000,000,000 in 1942. It is estimated this will reach the astounding figure of $55,000,000,000 during the coming fiscal year. In spite of this and to make the situation worse, the Government announces a roll-back of prices with subsidy, demands raising the national debt to make such a system possible while simultaneously financing a gigantic war, all of which must be paid by future generations. All of this the administration insisted upon in the name of helping the consumers who now have the greatest income in the history of our country. This is cowardly statesmanship.

Wisconsin farmers insist only on a fair price for their products in the markets of the Nation. They strenuously oppose price roll-backs with subsidy. Such a program will lead to confusion, uncertainty, and lack of confidence. It will tend to curtail production and increase consumption. The administration's low-food price complex on one hand with high-price war and industrial goods on the other hand is inconsistent and dangerous to the war effort.

The administration's program of food price roll-back with subsidy is a program of postponed inflation. It is a program of responsibility dodging, a program of politics, and a policy of economic insanity. It is high time to consider the general welfare in a true statesmanlike manner, rather than appease certain segments in our national society. The farmers of Wisconsin ask the National Congress to assert its rights as elective representatives of the people to end this proposed system of price roll-back with subsidy, which in the long run will threaten our national stability.

Sincerely yours,

MILO K. SWANTON,
Executive Secretary.

JUNE 1, 1943.

Hon. CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.:

Wisconsin dairymen and livestock farmers insist that fair prices in market place are more conducive to all-out production than any system of price roll-backs with subsidy. Forty Wisconsin farm organizations, members of Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, protest butter price roll-back subsidy program as leading to confusion, uncertainty, and discouragement. We firmly believe similar program applied to livestock will discourage production, at the same time encourage consumption. As you know, such program involving livestock price ceilings means tinkering with America's most sensitive, complicated phase of marketing. Price roll-back with subsidy is a form of delayed inflation—a refusal to pay our current bills with high incomes and when surplus cash is piling up, leaving same to be paid by posterity with low incomes and possible unemployment. Urge understanding dairymen's and livestock producers' problems. Need action based on sound economic policy to prevent otherwise inevitable food disaster.

MILO K. SWANTON,
Executive Secretary, Wisconsin Council of Agriculture (Cooperative).

JUNE 1, 1943.

Hon. JAMES BYRNES,
Director War Mobilization, Washington, D. C.:

Wisconsin farmers insist that fair prices in market place more encouraging to all-out production and less conducive to uncertainty and confusion than system of price roll-backs with subsidy. No economic justification since consumer income is above average and since roll-back subsidy program increases national debt for future generations to pay with inevitably lower incomes. Roll-back subsidy program positively inflationary because will pile up more unspent millions at present and more staggering debt for future.

MILO K. SWANTON,
Executive Secretary, Wisconsin Council of Agriculture (Cooperative).

COMMENCEMENT-DAY ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH P. KENNEDY AT OGLETHORPE UNIVERSITY

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a commencement-day address by Hon. Joseph P. Kennedy, former United States Ambassador to Great Britain, at the Oglethorpe University commencement exercises at Atlanta, Ga., on May 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOCRACY ON TRIAL—BACCALAUREATE ADDRESS BY DR. FRED T. WILSON

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the baccalaureate address, entitled "Democracy on

Trial," delivered by Dr. Fred Taylor Wilson at Salem College, Salem, W. Va., on May 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE POLL TAX

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Poll Tax Really Is School Levy," from the Charleston News and Courier of May 31, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

JEFFERSON DAVIS—ARTICLE BY MRS. CHARLES H. FRED

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Jefferson Davis" written by Mrs. Charles H. Fred, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 4, after the word "Departments", and the quotation marks, it is proposed to strike out:

It is hereby declared that any person holding an office or position in or under the executive branch of the Government of the United States (including Government-owned corporations) and receiving compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year for his services in such office or position shall be deemed to be an officer of the United States, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall not be deemed to be an inferior officer who may be appointed by the President alone or by the head of a department.

SEC. 2. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b)—

(1) the term of office of any person heretofore appointed or promoted to any office or position in or under the executive branch of the Government of the United States (including Government-owned corporations), if the compensation attached to such position is at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year, shall expire on June 30, 1943, unless such term is terminated at an earlier date; and

(2) any person hereafter appointed or promoted to any such office or position to which compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year is attached shall be appointed to such office or position by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term which shall expire four years from the time of his appointment.

(b) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable with respect to any person heretofore or hereafter appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to any office for which a definite term is specifically prescribed by any act of the Congress; and nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the President from filling temporarily, in the manner prescribed by law, any vacancy that may happen during the recess of the Senate.

And to insert:

(1) any person hereafter appointed or promoted to any office or position to which this section applies shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and (2) no person shall hold any such office or position after June 30, 1943, unless he shall have been so appointed: *Provided*, That any person now holding any such office or position, who was not so appointed, may continue to hold such office or position until his successor is appointed and qualified or until September 30, 1943, whichever is earlier, if a nomination for an appointment to such office or position has been submitted to the Senate prior to June 30, 1943.

SEC. 2. Except as provided in section 3, the provisions of the first section of this act shall apply to each of the following civilian offices or positions in or under the executive branch of the Government of the United States (including Government-owned corporations):

(a) The heads, assistant heads, and head attorneys of the several departments and agencies of the Government (including members of the boards of directors and officers of Government-owned corporations).

(b) The heads of the bureaus, divisions, sections, and other subdivisions of such departments and agencies.

(c) The heads and assistant heads of regional, area, or State offices of such departments or agencies.

(d) All persons whose duties include the preparation or issuance of rules, regulations, or orders made or issued under authority of any act of Congress or any Executive order.

(e) All persons whose duties include participation in conferences or discussions with persons from other departments or agencies, or with persons from other bureaus, divisions, sections, or other subdivisions of their own departments or agencies (other than with their own superiors), held for the purpose of determining the policies or methods to be followed in administering any of the functions of any department or agency or any bureau, division, section, or other subdivision thereof.

(f) Any person, except artisans and craftsmen, holding an office or position in or under the executive branch of the Government of the United States (including Government-owned corporations) who receives compensation amounting to $4,500 or more per year for his services in such office or position.

SEC. 3. The provisions of the first section of this act shall not be applicable, except in cases where confirmation by the Senate is otherwise required by law—

(a) In the case of any person appointed or promoted in accordance with provisions of the civil-service laws and rules providing, at the time of his appointment or promotion for his acquiring a classified (competitive) civil-service status by reason of such appointment or promotion and satisfactory service during a probationary period; or

(b) In the case of any civilian office or position held by any person on leave of absence or furlough from such office or position and in active service in the military or naval forces of the United State; or

(c) In any case in which a person is restored to or reinstated in an office or position in accordance with the provisions of any act of Congress providing that he shall be restored to or reinstated in such office or position upon completion of active service in the military or naval forces of the United States; or

(d) In the case of any office or position in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice; or

(e) In the case of any person whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the White House office in the Executive Office of the President.

THE COAL CONTROVERSY

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, yesterday I asked and received unanimous consent to introduce and discuss today what I regard as an important and constructive measure, to meet pressing war and post-war problems of internal security, touching the welfare and happiness of almost every American family. I was especially impelled to do so because the bill in question has the strong endorsement of the responsible leadership of American labor, organized in the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. This leadership, and the millions of working people for whom they speak, have made the most valiant and patriotic contribution to the war effort, and have built up a splendid record of cooperation with Government authority and with industrial management to reduce strikes in war time to such a point that they are insignificant by comparison with the tremendous labor conflicts which raged in this country during the last war.

Late yesterday another labor leader invoked a law which bears my name, the National Labor Relations Act, to justify the most irresponsible and disastrous stoppage of work in a key war industry since the war began. I am using this first opportunity to repudiate and denounce the assertion that the Magna Carta of American labor, the law which guarantees the most sacred freedom of the American worker to associate with his fellows under our democracy, justifies or approves an action undermining the war effort.

Men and women in our armed forces are scattered over the earth, risking at this very moment everything they have and hold dear, in defense of our democratic way of life—yes; in defense of the right of workers to organize as free men and take their rightful place, in cooperation with management and government, in our democratic society. The cruel enemies we face across the seas made labor unions the first object of their violent attack in their own countries, because these leaders knew that the free association of working people under democratic trade unions was the greatest obstacle to their dictatorship, and the greatest threat to their continued reign of error and oppression. I say the statement of this labor leader is a cruel blasphemy of the most sacred rights of free labor guaranteed under the Labor Relations Act.

The right to strike is a part of the liberty we are fighting for. The Labor Act preserves that liberty. But there is nothing in that act which says that labor cannot agree not to strike, during a war, or voluntarily put restraints on its customary privileges, so as to lend its full strength in a democratic war. The very object of the Labor Act is to promote voluntary, peaceful relations by agreements of free labor and free management. The test of democracy is whether every group that shares in the fruits of democratic progress will also share the privilege of sacrifice, and submerge its own interest to the strong United Nation we must have in order to win victory, and to win it with the smallest cost in the lives of our boys. The great mass of American labor and labor leadership have met that test, by entering into and

carrying out their no-strike pledge. The freedom assured by the Labor Act is responsible in great degree for this voluntary and convincing demonstration of labor's patriotism and responsibility.

The no-strike pledge was agreed to by the president of the United Mine Workers. The area of negotiation and award under the War Labor Board's jurisdiction in this controversy covers all the justified demands of the coal miners. This agreement with all the American people is certainly no less sacred—indeed it is far more serious—than any other agreement not to strike negotiated between the coal miners and coal operators in the past.

I am sure that the great mass of organized labor, and the responsibile leaders of organized labor, will join me in resenting this suggestion of one man that their rights as free workers can and should be used to undermine war production, and defy the Government authority which they themselves participated in establishing immediately after Pearl Harbor.

I have spoken out in defense of labor and the miners, many times in the past, when popular feeling ran high against them. I will do so again when their cause is just. I am not responsible for the mental processes of any man who would use what may be a thoroughly justifiable grievance to cloak irresponsible action giving aid and comfort to our enemies abroad and to the enemies of labor at home. I do not think Congress or the country should hold responsible for this action the great mass of labor and their cooperative, patriotic leadership. It would be a tragic mistake, indeed it would play directly into the hands of extremists in the ranks of both management and labor, to pass hasty legislation as an expression of justified resentment over the irresponsible course of one leader in one controversy. That too, would undermine our unity and impair our war effort.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. President I now ask unanimous consent to introduce, for myself and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], a bill to amend and improve the Social Security Act to meet the post-war needs of the American people. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance, and also to the Committee on Post-War Problems.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator made the request yesterday to introduce the bill, and the request was unanimously granted.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1161) to provide for the general welfare; to alleviate the economic hazards of old age, premature death, disability, sickness, unemployment, and dependency; to amend and extend the provisions of the Social Security Act; to establish a Unified National Social Insurance System; to extend the coverage, and to protect and extend the social-security rights of individuals in the military service; to provide insurance benefits for workers permanently disabled; to establish a Federal system of unemployment compensation, temporary disability, and maternity benefits; to establish a national system of public employment offices; to establish a Federal system of medical and hospitalization benefits; to encourage and aid the advancement of knowledge and skill in the provision of health services and in the prevention of sickness, disability, and premature death; to enable the several States to make more adequate provision for the needy aged, the blind, dependent children, and other needy persons; to enable the States to establish and maintain a comprehensive public assistance program; and to amend the Internal Revenue Code, introduced by Mr. WAGNER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, because I am being called out of Washington for a few days, I wish to offer now a few comments on the bill I have just introduced, especially as it bears on the immediate wartime issues of taxation and inflation.

POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

I approach the post-war problem on the basis of hard facts. As a nation, we are just beginning to realize the enormity of the economic issues which will confront us when 35,000,000 war workers and servicemen go forth in search of peacetime jobs. The National Industrial Conference Board, a very conservative board primarily representing industry, has just reported that "demobilization will create an employment problem greater in magnitude than the task of finding jobs for all the men employed in manufacturing in 1939," the year the war began. Every one of us is answerable, for the helpful solution of that problem, to the employers, farmers, and investors of the country, to the millions we have moved into war work, and to the millions whom we sent into the front line of battle.

Mr. President, I do not believe in "selling short" the American system of free enterprise. I am confident that if we do our part it will come through this crisis stronger, with greater opportunities for investment and greater vistas of new markets and new products than ever before

THE ROLE OF SOCIAL INSURANCE

The help and cooperation of the Federal Government—Congress and the Executive together—will be most needed and most effective in the first stages of post-war adjustment—in the care we exercise in demobilizing the armed forces, tapering off war orders, readjusting the tax laws, disposing of war plants, providing public works, and maintaining price control and safeguards against inflation. But with the best of cooperation and intentions and the fullest play to private initiative, the largest burden on record will be placed upon unemployment insurance and our public employment offices. And along with that will come our greatest need, in the interest of business as well as human welfare, to maintain steady family and consumer income when wages are cut off, in periods of illness and disability, and in time of old age. In this field of social insurance we have already seen how it is possible and practical to insure people against the major causes of want, so that our system of free enterprise can go on in periods of crisis as well as prosperity.

The bill deals with that limited but essential phase of post-war adjustment. Many of its separate provisions have been advocated by numerous groups and public-spirited citizens, by small businessmen, by State public-welfare administrators, and, on one point, by several State legislatures. I am authorized to say that the bill has the strong endorsement of the responsible and patriotic American labor leadership, organized in the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill establishes a Nation-wide system of public employment offices, to help war workers and war veterans to avail themselves of job opportunities, in private industry and on farms, throughout the country. It covers broadly the major economic hazards of average American families—the cost of medical and hospital care, and loss of income in time of unemployment, temporary sickness, permanent disability, and old age. It improves the present old-age insurance system, and extends coverage to 15,000,000 persons now excluded, such as farm workers and domestic servants, employees of nonprofit institutions, and the independent farmer, professional and small businessman. All these changes are established under a unified national system of social insurance, with 1 set of contributions, 1 set of records and reports, and 1 set of local offices. Reinforcing the job guaranty in the Selective Service Act, the bill gives the returning veteran and his family, paid-up benefit rights in every phase of this insurance protection. And finally, the bill sets up an improved, unified system for grants-in-aid to the States for public assistance, on a variable matching basis, in place of the rigid categories under present law.

SOCIAL-INSURANCE COLLECTIONS HELP FIGHT INFLATION

In my judgment the bill, while addressed to post-war problems, is a vital factor in the battle against inflation, which commands our attention at this very hour. The danger of inflation today springs from two separate but related sources. The first is an inflationary gap of at least $25,000,000,000 this fiscal year—a gap between the money available for civilian purchases and the supply of goods available for sale. This gap creates a pressure on price ceilings which cannot be eliminated by price control or rationing alone. The second phase of the danger is the tremendous reserve of liquid savings during the war years, which will go into the market for consumer goods immediately upon the close of hostilities.

We know that tax collections are meeting only about one-third of the current cost of the war. We know that almost seven-eighths of current income is earned by the great mass of workers, white-collar people, and minor executives earning less than $5,000 a year after taxes. Obviously this group must be our chief reliance in obtaining any substantial increase in either taxes or savings, requested by the President for the coming fiscal year.

The social-insurance plan under this bill is to be financed, at the outset, by equal pay roll contributions of employers and employees—6 percent each—except for payments by the Treasury to cover the insurance rights of war veterans. Government contributions to the fund are contemplated, but would begin some years after the war. By increasing social-insurance collections now, we would reach the very incomes with the greatest wartime purchasing power. By the same means, we would avoid the post-war inflationary danger of ordinary savings, War bond purchases, or even "forced" savings, because social-insurance contributions are to be paid into a trust fund, and cannot be sold, redeemed, or converted by the contributor or beneficiary. The funds would be invested in Government bonds which would be held solely for the purposes provided by law.

This bill would increase contributions about $5,000,000,000 above present levels, and the bulk of the increase would come out of the wages of the workers themselves. The new benefits, which would cause the greatest current drain upon current collections, would not be payable immediately. A reserve would have to be built up to meet post-war needs. Therefore, the new benefits would be scheduled to begin no sooner than 1 year after collections were first levied and no later than 6 months after the close of the war, as the President might decide upon the basis of conditions at the time.

Our economy can readily afford the proposed increase in pay-roll collections. Employers already pay 4 percent of their pay rolls toward unemployment and old-age insurance. Under present law, beginning in 1944, employers will be paying 5 percent. This bill provides for only a 1-percent increase, an increase which would more than pay for itself to the employer, and to industry at large, by increased efficiency and morale, and by reduced absenteeism on account of illness. As for employees, their pay-roll contribution, under existing law, will be 2 percent in 1944. This bill would make a 4-percent increase, but they would get their full money's worth in increased security. The workers of the country, speaking through their great national organizations, are willing to pay increased contributions for increased insurance protection. This bill proposes a real pay-as-you-go insurance plan—a workable, conservative means for the individual to help build reserves for his future security, just as we permit corporations to build reserves for their post-war needs.

I shall not take time now to discuss other phases of the bill, how it compares with, and differs from, the Beveridge plan in Great Britain; how the health-insurance program would guarantee free choice of patient and doctor; and why a national system of unemployment insurance is so vital for the practical needs of war veterans and war workers returning to peacetime occupations. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks, a statement I have released covering these phases in some detail, including data showing the great variations and the inadequate benefit levels of most State unemployment insurance laws.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I only ask that Senators give the bill their careful study, and await full committee hearings before reaching final decisions on some points which admittedly are controversial.

The plan is an American plan, geared to the wage scales and standards of living of the individual families in various sections of the country. It would protect our wartime economy and would reduce the need of post-war spending for relief. The plan provides for a practical program within our ability to pay. The program is a practical one in a much higher sense. Our democracy could provide no better bulwark against communism, no better safeguard against fascism and rabble-rousers in the troubled times ahead, than to develop this dignified, all-embracing plan for social security upon which the individual family could build its own future by its own efforts.

EXHIBIT A

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

This bill establishes a Nation-wide system of public employment offices to help war workers and war veterans to avail themselves of job opportunities in private industry and on farms throughout the country. It covers broadly the major economic hazards of average people throughout their lifetime—loss of income in time of unemployment, sickness, permanent disability, and old age. It assures medical care and hospital service for the American people, while protecting the free choice by the patient of doctor and hospital and the free choice of patient by the doctor and the hospital. It increases the old-age benefit allowances for workers and their families and extends coverage to 15,000,000 now excluded, such as farm workers and domestic servants, employees of nonprofit instituitions, and the independent farmer, professional, and small businessman.

Along with these improvements the bill creates a unified system of social insurance, with one set of contributions, one set of records and reports, and one set of local offices. This makes possible a more efficient administration, reduces the number of reports and the cost to employers, and simplifies the entire program for workers, employers, and the public.

The bill extends all these phases of insurance protection to the members of our armed forces upon their return to civilian life, whether or not they were covered or had accumulated benefit rights in previous years. This includes a special unemployment allowance for 26 or possibly 52 weeks, up to a maximum of $30 per week, depending on the size of his family.

To supplement this broad plan of social insurance, the bill also sets up an improved, unified system for grants-in-aid to the States for public assistance, on a variable matching basis, in place of the rigid categories under present law.

This is an American plan, geared to our own experience, form of government, and standard of living. Put into operation, this bill would greatly reduce the cost of post-war spending for relief purposes.

I do not claim this bill is in any sense a perfect instrument; it is offered simply as a basis for legislative study and consideration. The important thing is that we develop a social-insurance system secure enough and courageous enough to meet the actual needs of servicemen and war workers returning to peacetime life. Many of the separate provisions of the bill have been advocated by numerous groups, public-spirited citizens, small businessmen, State public-welfare administrators, and on one point, by several State legislatures. I am also authorized to say that this bill has the strong endorsement of both the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Responsible American labor leadership advocates this constructive plan for meeting a foremost national problem.

THE POST-WAR ROLE OF SOCIAL INSURANCE

I do not believe in selling short the American system of free enterprise. I am confident that if we do our part, it will come through this crisis stronger, with greater opportunities for investment, and greater vistas of new markets and new products, than ever before.

In the first stages of post-war adjustment, the Federal Government—Congress and the Executive—can be most helpful, by the care we exercise in demobilizing the armed forces, tapering off war orders, disposing of war plants, providing public works, and maintaining price control and safeguards against inflation. I know that these and other problems will have the careful attention of the Senate's post-war committee. But with the best of cooperation between Government and industry, and with the fullest freedom for the creative genius of free enterprise, the largest burden on record will be placed upon unemployment insurance and our public employment offices. And along with that will come our greatest need—in the interest of business as well as human welfare—to maintain steady family and consumer income when wages are cut off, in periods of illness and disability and in time of old age.

This bill is directed to those limited but essential phases of post-war adjustment. In this field of social security we already have an extensive record of actual experience. We have seen how it is possible and practical to insure people against the major causes of want, so that our system of free enterprise can go on in periods of depression as well as prosperity.

Even if the war ends in 1945, we have little time left for the careful study and preparation such an important program requires.

CONTRAST WITH BEVERIDGE PLAN

First, the Beveridge plan puts more than half the cost upon the General Treasury in the very first year of operation. The social insurance plan under this bill is financed at the outset by equal pay-roll contribution of employers and employees, except for the payments into the fund by the Treasury to cover the insurance rights of war veterans. (There would be some additional increases out of general revenue to cover grants to the States for public assistance.) I personally favor a substantial Government contribution into the social insurance trust fund, but appreciate that the Treasury cannot carry this burden now on top of its war and immediate post-war needs. This bill therefore contemplates Government contribution into the fund beginning after a period of perhaps 10 or 15 years, and increasing gradually until it represents about one-third of the total when old-age benefits paid out reach their maximum under present population trends. To maintain flexibility, however, the bill directs the advisory council to study the entire problem of financing in the post-war years.

Second, the Beveridge plan provides the same contribution and the same benefit for all classes and groups, with variation only as to sex and number of dependents. This bill follows the traditional American system of

gearing both contributions and benefits to past wages, as well as dependents. The bill thus automatically adjusts to different standards of living, wage scales and family needs of workers in different sections, States, and industries throughout the country.

Third, the Beveridge plan provides a guaranteed minimum income for life. This bill puts definite limits on the duration of insurance benefits for unemployment, temporary disability, and hospital care.

Fourth, this bill does not cover many matters embraced in the Beveridge plan, such as provision for workmen's compensation, grants on marriage and birth of children, children's allowances, dental care, nursing or medicines in the home.

FREEDOM OF MEDICAL PRACTICE

There is no plan here, such as that lately considered in Britain, for a system of socialized medicine, with all doctors required to be salaried employees of the Government. Unlike this British proposal, my bill assures complete freedom of choice of doctor and hospital by the patient, and freedom of medical practice and types of remuneration for the doctor and the hospital. No doctor is forced into the insurance system or forced on a salary status. Arrangements for obtaining medical, laboratory, or hospital care would be essentially as they are now in this country, except that payment for the care and services would be out of the insurance fund, built up through the insurance premiums paid by the individual and his employer. Voluntary hospitals would, of course, be eligible to participate in the plan if they choose to do so, and thus be enabled to expand their splendid community services. Nonprofit group medical or hospitalization plans may also be utilized in carrying out the program, and they would be in a position to offer supplementary health protection for families desiring more than the basic social-insurance benefits guaranteed under the bill. In all its provisions, this bill would promote the personal relations between doctor and patient, and be adapted to the needs and practices of the individual community, and the wishes of the doctors in that community, in both rural and urban areas. Similar basic principles as to medical and hospital benefits and freedom of medical practice, are embodied in a program recently put forward by the government of Canada, with the full accord of the Canadian Medical Association and the Canadian Hospital Council.

SOCIAL-INSURANCE CONTRIBUTIONS HELP FIGHT INFLATION

The bill would also help meet our immediate wartime-inflation problem. The danger of inflation today springs from two separate but related sources. The first is an inflationary gap of about $25,000,000,000 this fiscal year—a gap between the money available for civilian purchases and the supply of goods available for sale. This gap creates a pressure on price ceilings which cannot be eliminated by price control or rationing alone. The second phase of the danger is the tremendous accumulation of savings during the war years, which will be available for the purchase of consumer goods immediately upon the close of war.

The Secretary of the Treasury has recently told the American people that tax collections are meeting only about 30 percent of the current cost of the war. He declared that almost seven-eights of current income is earned by the great mass of workers, white-collar people, and minor executives earning less than $5,000 a year after taxes. Obviously this group must be our chief reliance in obtaining the large increase, in either taxes or savings, requested by the President for the coming fiscal year.

By increasing social-insurance collections now, under the broadened benefit structure of this bill, we would reach the very incomes referred to by the Treasury. At the same time, we avoid the post-war inflationary danger of ordinary savings, War bond purchases, or even forced savings, because social-insurance contributions cannot be redeemed, canceled out, or converted into a loan or a cash surrender.

Under this bill contributions into a social-insurance trust fund would be about $5,000,000,000 more than present collections, and most of the increase will come out of the wages of the workers themselves.

We can readily afford this increase in pay-roll collections. Employers already pay 3 percent of pay roll toward unemployment insurance and 1 percent toward old-age benefits; by operation of the law, the old-age levy will go to 2 percent next year, making a total of 5 percent on employers in 1944. This bill provides only a 1-percent increase—an increase which would more than pay for itself to employers in increased efficiency and morale, and reduced absenteeism on account of illness, not to speak of the benefits to our economy as a whole.

As for employees, under the present law, beginning January 1944 their pay-roll contribution will amount to 2 percent. This bill makes a 4-percent increase, but for that increase they obtain their full money's worth in increased security. The workers of the country, speaking through their great national organizations, have expressed willingness to pay increased contributions for increased insurance protection.

This bill proposes a real pay-as-you-go plan—a workable, established, conservative mechanism whereby the individual may help build reserves for his future security just as we permit corporations to build reserves for their post-war needs.

NEED FOR NATIONAL SYSTEM OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

No one can question that unemployment insurance, no less than old-age insurance, presents a national problem within the proper concern of the Federal Government. There is no real issue of State or Federal "rights." Our concern is with the practical needs, reemployment rights and job security of millions of war workers and returning soldiers from every State in the Union.

About half the working population in peacetime was not covered by State unemployment insurance laws. Therefore about half the returning soldiers will have no benefit rights at all. As for those who are eligible, it should be realized that benefits are utterly inadequate, do not grant dependents benefits and do not cover wages lost by illness. In 1940 and in 1941—fairly good years—half the beneficiaries of State unemployment insurance laws were still without a job when their limited benefit rights were exhausted.

Servicemen from different States share the same hardships and face the same dangers in defense of freedom. Why should they be subject to 48 widely different and largely inadaquate benefit systems when they return to civilian life and find themselves out of a job? Under this bill, the returning soldier would have the benefit of uniform minimum standards, with extra allowances for dependents, with a maximum of $30 a week for a possible duration of 52 weeks. These benefits would be payable whether the returning soldier lost his income because he was sick or disabled, or because his job had run out. While he himself is entitled, without cost, to medical and hospital care in a veterans' hospital, under present veterans' legislation, that does not cover his wife and dependents. This bill covers these dependents.

The same injustice under 48 different State laws would befall the millions of war workers, many of whom have shifted from one State to another under the prompting of patriotism and the urging of our war administrators.

The plan for a Federal system is in keeping with the insurance principle that you increase the safety and diminish the cost of an insurance risk by covering the largest possible numbers of people in the same insurance pool.

Nothing in this bill contemplates taking away from the States the $4,000,000,000 in trust funds now held in 51 separate accounts. If a State insists on going its own way, it would have full sovereignty over this fund and continue to pay benefits thereunder.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR CHANGES IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT PROVIDED BY THE BILL

Section 1. Unified national social insurance system (new title I-A): This section outlines the scope of the unified national social insurance system created by the bill. The system would consist of a national system of public employment offices; old-age and survivors' insurance; permanent disability insurance and lump-sum death benefits; protection of the social-security rights of men and women in military service; unemployment insurance; temporary disability insurance and maternity benefits; unemployment allowances upon termination of military service; and medical and hospitalization insurance.

Section 2. National system of employment offices (new title I-B): The bill provides for a new national system of public employment offices established in the Social Security Board, to assist war workers and war veterans to avail themselves of civilian employment opportunities throughout the Nation, to promote employment in private industry and on farms, and, generally, to bring together available workers and available jobs in the maximum use of the Nation's productive facilities and manpower. Among other duties, the new employment service is directed to provide facilities in cooperation with the administration of unemployment insurance and to aid in minimizing the necessity for the payment of unemployment insurance, relief, and assistance. The Wagner-Peyser Act, under which the Federal-State Employment Service has functioned, is repealed. Six months after the termination of hostilities in the present war, the present employment service and all related activities of the War Manpower Commission are transferred to the new United States Employment Service created by the bill.

Section 3. Permanent disability insurance; lump-sum death benefits: Effective January 1, 1944, the present Federal old-age and survivors' insurance system is amended to include monthly cash benefits where the insured worker is permanently disabled before he reaches the retirement age. These benefits would be equal to those paid under old-age insurance, and in the same way would be increased for the worker who has a dependent wife, dependent children, or dependent parents. Where the disabled worker can be rehabilitated so that he may return to work, the bill authorizes the Social Security Board to arrange, through the United States Public Health Service, for proper medical, surgical, hospitalization, or other helpful services to be furnished by practitioners, hospitals, or other agencies (sec. 13).

The bill also amends the present old-age insurance provisions by reducing from 65 to 60 years the age when the woman worker becomes eligible for old-age benefits.

Upon the death of any insured worker, the bill provides for a lump-sum death payment to the surviving spouse equal to six times the primary old-age or survivors benefit of that worker. If there is no surviving spouse, this lump-sum benefit will be paid to any other person equitably entitled, to the extent that he has paid the burial expenses of the deceased worker.

Section 4. Old-age maximum benefits increased to $120 per month; minimum increased to $30 for aged couple: Effective January 1, 1944, the maximum old-age and survivors insurance benefit is increased from

$85 under present law, to $120. The minimum benefit is increased from $10 under present law to $20 for a single worker and $30 for a worker with a dependent wife age 60 or over. Thus the bill provides an assured minimum of $30 a month for an insured aged couple, and higher payments up to a maximum of $120, depending on prior wages and years of employment. The same minimum and maximum provisions would apply in the case of permanent disability.

Section 5. Increased coverage under old-age insurance: This section extends coverage under the Federal old-age, survivors, and permanent disability insurance to agricultural and domestic workers, employees of nonprofit institutions (except ministers and members of religious orders), and hourly employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Present or future employees of State or local governments who are covered by existing pension systems continue to be exempt, as under the present law. Employees of State or local governments who are not under existing pension systems may be covered (under old-age, survivors, permanent disability, medical care, and hospital insurance) by a voluntary compact between the Social Security Board and the appropriate State or local governmental unit.

Section 6. Increased old-age insurance benefits: Effective January 1, 1944, the bill increases old-age, survivors, and permanent disability benefits by $5 to $20 per month depending upon the amount of an individual's wages; and also increases benefits by changing the method for calculating the average wage. The bill also changes the provisions for determining the insured status of an individual so that all persons engaged in Government arsenals, or any other type of war work not covered by the social insurance system, will not have this period prior to 1944 count against them in determining their eligibility for old-age, survivors, and permanent disability insurance benefits.

Section 7. Old-age insurance coverage of self-employed farmers, professional and small businessmen: Effective January 1, 1944, the bill extends the benefits of the entire old age, survivors, and permanent disability insurance system to all self-employed persons; that is, independent farmers, professional people and small businessmen.

Section 8. Social security protection to men and women now in military service (new title II–A): The bill gives "wage credits" to men and women in the armed forces for the entire period of their military service. The individual war veteran and his family would thus be insured for all social insurance benefits provided in the bill, without deductions from their pay during military service. The cost of this protection is borne by the Federal Government out of general revenue.

Section 9. Federal unemployment insurance system; temporary disability insurance; maternity benefits. The bill establishes a new Federal unemployment insurance system administered by the Social Security Board. Unemployment benefits are payable for 26 weeks. If the funds available are deemed adequate, the duration of benefits may be extended to a maximum total of 52 weeks, but the Board may require attendance at a training course as a condition for receiving such extended benefits. Coverage includes agriculture as well as industrial workers, American seamen, domestic servants, and employees of nonprofit institutions (except ministers and members of religious orders). Weekly benefits are payable at 50 percent of the first $12 of average weekly wage, plus 25 percent of the wage between $12 and $56. As in the case of old-age insurance, benefits are increased for workers with dependent wives, dependent children, or dependent parents. The maximum benefit payable is $30 per week. The waiting period is 1 week. Eligibility depends, among other factors, upon registration and continued reporting for work at the public employment office or at training courses approved by the Board. Failure to report or to accept suitable work when offered is a ground for disqualification.

Insured workers who are certified as temporarily disabled, through illness or injury, are likewise eligible for the same benefits, after 1 week's waiting period, for a maximum duration of 26 weeks. In addition to the maximum duration for disability benefits, married women workers are entitled to weekly benefits, in the above amounts, for 12 weeks of maternity leave.

Section 10. Unemployment allowance on termination of military service: Men and women discharged from military service are granted unemployment compensation allowances varying from $12 to $30 per week of unemployment, depending on the number of their dependents. Benefits are payable for 26 weeks of unemployment, and for a possible maximum of 52 weeks if that maximum is established for other insured workers under the unemployment insurance system. Conditions of continued eligibility and disqualification are similar to those applicable to other insured workers.

The cost of these allowances to veterans of the present war is to be borne by the Federal Government out of general revenues.

Section 11. Medical care and hospital benefits: This section sets up a Federal system of medical and hospital insurance for all persons covered under old-age and survivors' insurance and for their dependents. Each insured worker and his dependent wife and children would be entitled to the services of a physician who is a general practitioner, and, on the doctor's advice, to specialists, consultant, and laboratory services (including X-ray, appliances, eyeglasses, etc.) and necessary hospital care. Freedom of medical practice is carefully safeguarded. Each insured person is entitled to choose his own doctor from among all physicians in the community who have voluntarily agreed to go into the insurance system. Each doctor is free to go in or stay out of the insurance system. Those doctors who participate are free to accept or reject patients who may wish to select them as their family doctor, and the participating doctors are likewise free to choose the method of payment from the insurance fund. Doctors practicing as specialists would be entitled to special rates of payment if they meet professional standards for specialists. Thus, existing arrangements for choosing a doctor and obtaining medical, laboratory, or hospital care would not be disturbed except that payment would be out of the insurance system. Three percent of wages and salaries, collected through the unified contributions under the entire social insurance system, are set aside in a special account to meet these insurance costs. The bill contains various provisions to assure that medical benefits will be the highest quality that can be made generally available, will promote personal relations between doctor and patient, will emphasize prevention of disease, and will be adapted to the needs and practices of the community, in both rural and urban areas.

The Surgeon General of the United States Public Health would administer the technical and professional aspects of the program, while financial matters and social-insurance relationships would be administered by the Social Security Board. The Surgeon General would also be authorized to work out the closest possible coordination between medical care and the public health services of the Federal, State, and local governments.

Hospital care is limited to 30 days per year, with a possible maximum of 90 days if experience proves that the insurance fund can afford it. All qualified hospitals are eligible to participate, and all illnesses are covered for hospital care except tuberculosis or mental disease. The insurance system would assure all essential hospital services and at least ward services. The cash benefit or the rate of payment to hospitals would be not less than $3 nor more than $6 per day up to 30 days in a benefit year.

The insured medical care covers all necessary service; limitations may be fixed later by the Surgeon General and the Social Security Board if it should prove necessary. The medical and hospital care program would not include medicines outside the hospital, dental care, home nursing, private hospital rooms, and certain other services. This leaves a wide field for continued operation and development of voluntary hospital and medical service plans to supplement the minimum insurance benefits. No medical or hospital services are made available with respect to any injury, disease, or disability for which these services can be obtained under a workmen's compensation plan of the United States or any State.

The Surgeon General is directed to establish a Medical and Hospital Advisory Council. Members of this council would be appointed from panels of names submitted by professional and other organizations concerned with medical services, education, hospitals, etc. The council would also include representatives of the public who are informed on medical and hospital care and related needs. The Surgeon General is authorized to negotiate cooperative working arrangements with appropriate agencies of the United States or any State or political subdivision, and with private agencies, institutions, groups, or individuals, to utilize their services and facilities on payment of fair and reasonable compensation. Insured persons, or the Social Security Board, or the Surgeon General may transfer or assign to a participating hospital or any other agency or institution utilized in the program any monies paid or payable as benefits under the program. The medical, hospital, and related benefits may be furnished to noninsured persons if appropriate arrangements are made to pay the cost on their behalf.

Section 12. Social insurance contributions; trust fund: The bill establishes a 6 percent employee and a 6 percent employer contribution on all wages and salaries (up to the first $3,000 a year), paid or received (after December 31, 1943) for all social insurance benefits. The employer contribution is payable by employers of one or more employees. Self-employed persons contribute 7 percent of the market value of their services (up to the first $3,000), after December 31, 1943, to cover old-age and survivors, permanent disability, and medical and hospital insurance. In the case of public employees of States and localities (not covered by their own pension systems), contribution of 3½ percent from the employer and 3½ percent from the employee is required to cover the same benefits where voluntary compacts are made under the terms of the bill.

The bill creates a "Federal social-insurance trust fund," to which is transferred existing funds credited to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system. A board of trustees, composed of the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the Social Security Board, is established to hold the trust fund and make annual reports to Congress on the benefit payments and the expected status of the fund during the next ensuing 5-year periods. The Secretary of the Treasury, as managing trustee, is authorized to invest such portion of the trust fund as is not required to meet current withdrawals. As under present law, such investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States.

Section 13. Advisory council; grants for medical education, research and prevention; reduction of benefits: The bill would establish a Federal Social Security Advisory Council, representing employers, employees, and the

general public, to formulate policies on legislation and administration, and to investigate and make recommendations concerning coverage of various groups; the adequacy of benefits in relation to wage levels, cost of living, employment practices, and other factors, especially in the post-war period; and the financing of the insurance system.

The Surgeon General is authorized and directed, with the advice of the Medical and Hospital Advisory Council, to administer grants-in-aid to nonprofit institutions and agencies, engaging in research or in undergraduate or post-graduate professional education. Such grants would be made for projects showing promise of making valuable contributions to the education and training of persons in furnishing medical and hospital, disability, and related benefits, or of making valuable contribution to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of disease or disability. The maximum sum available each year for such grants-in-aid would be 1 percent of the total expended for all benefits from the social-insurance trust funds exclusive of unemployment insurance benefits, or 2 percent of the amount expended for medical care and hospitalization benefit, whichever is less.

Benefits payable under old-age, survivors, and permanent-disability insurance, temporary disability or unemployment insurance are reduced by the amount of any noncontributory Government benefit, allowance annuity, or compensation paid under any similar law or plan of the United States or any State or political subdivision—for example, workmen's compensation benefits. Benefits under the foregoing systems would also be reduced by one-half the amount of any contributory benefits payable under a similar plan or system of the United States or any State supported substantially by direct contributions of wage earners. Both of these provisions for reduction of benefits allow war veterans or their families, however, to receive any additional benefits payable under war-risk insurance, United States life insurance, or national service life insurance.

Section 14. Unified public assistance program: This section places Federal grants to States for assistance to needy persons under a unified public assistance program, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944. It provides variable Federal grants-in-aid to the States, ranging from 50 percent to 75 percent of the total expended, depending upon the State's per capita income. The higher rates apply to the States with the lower per capita incomes. The program authorizes Federal matching, on this variable grant basis, of money payments to any aged person, dependent child, blind person, or other needy individual (without the rigid maxima provided by existing law); and where so provided in an approved State plan, medical services, goods, or facilities to needy individuals, and such services or facilities as may assist in making needy individuals self-supportng.

These Federal grants-in-aid, like the similar provisions of the present law, are made out of general revenues. As under present law, State plans must meet various requirements, including maintenance of civil-service merit standards for administrative personnel. In determining need, the State must take into consideration any other means and resources of any individual claiming assistance except that the State may, in its discretion, not take into consideration any amounts of current income received by an individual up to $20 per month, in such manner and to such extent as the State may determine.

This unified public-assistance program is designed to replace the categorical assistance programs, under present law, for old-age pensions, aid to the blind, and for dependent children. After December 31, 1945, no further Federal grants-in-aid would be made under those old provisions.

Section 15: This section repeals parts of the present system of social-security taxes replaced by other provisions in the bill.

Section 16. Effective dates: The effective date for the unemployment insurance, unemployment-compensation allowance, temporary disability insurance, and medical and hospital insurance provisions shall be determined by Executive order of the President. Such date shall not be prior to 1 year after the effective date of the contributions levied under the bill, and not later than 6 months after the termination of hostilities in the present war.

Section 17: The short title of the bill is "The Social Security Act amendments of 1943."

SIGNIFICANT DATA ON PROVISIONS AND OPERATION OF STATE UNEMPLOYMENT-COMPENSATION LAWS

Table 1 shows the wide variations in amounts of unemployment-insurance benefits which would be received by four different unemployed individuals under existing State unemployment-insurance laws.

Table 2 shows the wide variations in the relative size of the reserve funds of the various States.

Table 3 is a brief summary of the most important provisions of the State unemployment-insurance laws.

The tables follow:

TABLE 1.—*Weekly benefit amount for total unemployment and maximum potential benefits in a benefit year for 4 claimants with specified high-quarter and base-period wages, by State* [1]

State	Claimant A: High-quarter wages of $100 and base-period wages of $200			Claimant B: High-quarter wages of $250 and base-period wages of $500			Claimant C: High-quarter wages of $400 and base-period wages of $1,000			Claimant D: High-quarter wages of $500 and base-period wages of $1,500		
	Weekly benefit amount	Maximum potential benefits		Weekly benefit amount	Maximum potential benefits		Weekly benefit amount	Maximum potential benefits		Weekly benefit amount	Maximum potential benefits	
		Amount	Duration (weeks)		Amount	Duration (weeks)		Amount	Duration (weeks)		Amount	Duration (weeks)
Alabama	$4.00	$67.00	16+	$10.00	$167.00	16+	†$15.00	†$300.00	†20	†$15.00	†$300.00	†20
Alaska	*5.00	67.00	13+	13.00	167.00	12+	†16.00	†256.00	†16	†16.00	†256.00	†16
Arizona	*5.00	[3] 34.00	[2] 6+	10.00	[2] 84.00	[2] 8+	†15.00	[2] 167.00	[2] 11+	†15.00	†210.00	†14
Arkansas	4.00	[3] 64.00	[3] †16	10.00	[3] 160.00	[3] †16	†15.00	[3] †240.00	[3] †16	†15.00	[3] †240.00	[3] †16
California	Ineligible	Ineligible	Ineligible	13.00	208.00	16	†18.00	324.00	18	†18.00	414.00	23
Colorado	*5.00	66.67	13+	10.00	160.00	†16	†15.00	†240.00	†16	†15.00	†240.00	†16
Connecticut [4]	*6.00	50.00	8+	10.00	110.00	11	15.50	210.00	13+	19.50	310.00	15+
Delaware	*5.00	65.00	†13	10.00	130.00	†13	†15.00	†195.00	†13	†15.00	†195.00	†13
District of Columbia [5]	*6.00	100.00	16+	11.00	209.00	†19	†18.00	†342.00	†19	†18.00	†342.00	†19
Florida	*5.00	[2] *33.50	[2] *6+	11.00	[2] 83.50	[2] 7+	†15.00	[2] 167.00	[2] 11+	†15.00	†240.00	†16
Georgia	5.00	80.00	†16	10.00	160.00	†16	15.00	240.00	†16	†18.00	†288.00	†16
Hawaii	*5.00	100.00	†20	10.00	200.00	†20	16.00	320.00	†20	†20.00	†400.00	†20
Idaho	*5.00	50.00	10	11.00	125.00	11+	15.00	250.00	16+	16.00	272.00	†17
Illinois	Ineligible	Ineligible	Ineligible	12.50	180.00	14+	†18.00	280.00	15+	†18.00	†360.00	†20
Indiana [6]	[7] 4.00	[7] 32.00	[7] 8	10.00	80.00	8	†16.00	160.00	10	†16.00	240.00	15
Iowa	*5.00	[2] 33.33	[2] 6+	9.61	[2] 83.33	[2] 8+	†15.00	[2] [8] 165.00	[2] [8] 11	†15.00	†225.00	†15
Kansas	*5.00	67.00	13+	10.00	160.00	†16	†15.00	†240.00	†16	†15.00	†240.00	†16
Kentucky	[8] *5.00	*80.00	†16	[9] 7.00	112.00	†16	[9] 12.00	192.00	†16	[9] 15.00	240.00	†16
Louisiana	5.00	50.00	10	13.00	125.00	9+	†18.00	250.00	13+	†18.00	†360.00	†20
Maine	[1] *5.00	56.00	11+	[9] 6.50	104.00	†16	[9] 11.00	176.00	†16	[9] 14.50	232.00	†16
Maryland	*7.00	50.00	7+	13.00	125.00	9+	†17.00	250.00	14+	†17.00	†340.00	†20
Massachusetts	*6.00	60.00	10	11.00	150.00	13+	†15.00	†300.00	†20	†15.00	†300.00	†20
Michigan	Ineligible	Ineligible	Ineligible	12.50	150.00	12	†20.00	250.00	12+	†20.00	375.00	18+
Minnesota	[9] *7.00	*70.00	*10	[9] 12.00	168.00	14	[9] 15.00	240.00	†16	†16.00	†256.00	†16
Mississippi	4.00	56.00	†14	10.00	140.00	†14	†15.00	†210.00	†14	†15.00	†210.00	†14
Missouri	4.00	[2] 40.00	[2] 10	10.00	[2] 100.00	[2] 10	16.00	[2] 200.00	[2] 12+	†18.00	†288.00	†16
Montana	*5.00	80.00	†16	10.00	160.00	†16	†15.00	†240.00	†16	†15.00	†240.00	†16
Nebraska	*5.00	*67.00	*13+	10.00	160.00	†16	†15.00	†240.00	†16	†15.00	†240.00	†16
Nevada	*5.00	*67.00	*13+	13.00	167.00	12+	†15.00	†270.00	†18	†15.00	†270.00	†18
New Hampshire	[9] *6.00	*84.00	*14	[9] 8.00	112.00	*14	[9] 13.00	208.00	†16	[9] †15.00	†240.00	†16
New Jersey	*7.00	*42.00	*6	12.00	100.00	8+	†18.00	200.00	11+	†18.00	300.00	16+
New Mexico	4.00	64.00	†16	10.00	160.00	†16	†15.00	†240.00	†16	†15.00	†240.00	†16
New York	*7.00	140.00	†20	11.00	220.00	†20	17.00	340.00	†20	†18.00	†360.00	†20
North Carolina	[9] 4.50	72.00	†16	[9] 7.00	112.00	†16	[9] 12.00	192.00	†16	[9] †15.00	†240.00	†16
North Dakota	*5.00	80.00	†16	10.00	160.00	†16	†15.00	†240.00	†16	†15.00	†240.00	†16
Ohio	*5.00	90.00	†18	11.00	198.00	†18	†16.00	†288.00	†18	†16.00	†288.00	†18
Oklahoma	*6.00	67.00	11+	13.00	167.00	12+	†16.00	†256.00	†16	†16.00	†256.00	†16
Oregon	*10.00	*33.33	*3+	†15.00	83.33	5+	†15.00	166.67	11+	†15.00	†240.00	†16
Pennsylvania [10]	*8.00	[2] 32.00	[2] 4	10.00	[2] 70.00	[2] 7	15.00	[2] 150.00	[2] 10	†18.00	210.00	12
Rhode Island	*7.25	48.75	6+	13.00	109.75	8+	†18.00	205.00	11+	†18.00	306.25	17+
South Carolina	*4.00	64.00	†16	10.00	160.00	†16	†15.00	†240.00	†16	†15.00	†240.00	†16
South Dakota	[9] *7.00	56.00	8	[9] *7.00	98.00	†14	[9] 12.00	168.00	†14	[9] †15.00	†210.00	†14

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Weekly benefit amount for total unemployment and maximum potential benefits in a benefit year for 4 claimants with specified high-quarter and base-period wages, by State*—Continued

State	Claimant A: High-quarter wages of $100 and base-period wages of $200			Claimant B: High-quarter wages of $250 and base-period wages of $500			Claimant C: High-quarter wages of $400 and base-period wages of $1,000			Claimant D: High-quarter wages of $500 and base-period wages of $1,500		
	Weekly benefit amount	Maximum potential benefits		Weekly benefit amount	Maximum potential benefits		Weekly benefit amount	Maximum potential benefits		Weekly benefit amount	Maximum potential benefits	
		Amount	Duration (weeks)		Amount	Duration (weeks)		Amount	Duration (weeks)		Amount	Duration (weeks)
Tennessee	*$5.00	$80.00	‡$16	$10.00	$160.00	‡$16	†$15.00	†$240.00	‡$16	†$15.00	†$240.00	‡$16
Texas	[11] *5.00	40.00	8	[11] 9.50	100.00	10+	[11] †15.00	200.00	13+	[11] †15.00	†240.00	†16
Utah	*5.00	100.00	†20	13.00	260.00	†20	†20.00	†400.00	†20	†20.00	†400.00	†20
Vermont	*5.00	66.67	13+	9.61	144.15	†15	†15.00	†225.00	†15	†15.00	†225.00	†15
Virginia	4.00	48.00	12	10.00	120.00	12	†15.00	†240.00	†16	†15.00	†240.00	†16
Washington	* *7.00	*67.00	*9+	12.50	167.00	13+	†15.00	†240.00	†16	†15.00	†240.00	†16
West Virginia	[9] *6.00	96.00	‡16	[9] 8.00	128.00	‡16	[9] 12.50	200.00	‡16	[9] †15.00	†240.00	‡16
Wisconsin	[12]	[12]	[12]	[12]	[12]	[12]	[12]	[12]	[12]	[12]	[12]	[12]
Wyoming	*5.00	49.00	9+	12.50	126.00	10+	†18.00	[8] 238.00	[6] 13	†18.00	†252.00	†14

*Indicates minimum weekly benefit amount, minimum amount of potential benefits, or minimum duration.

†Indicates maximum weekly benefit amount, maximum amount of potential benefits, or maximum duration other than uniform duration.

‡Indicates uniform duration.

[1] Based on laws in effect June 1, 1942, except for Kentucky and Pennsylvania, where amendments enacted prior to June 1 were not effective until July 1.

[2] Base period, 8 quarters. If, in preceding 4 quarters, wages (in Florida and Pennsylvania, uncharged wage credits in other States) were equal to wages in 4 quarters specified, maximum potential benefits in a benefit year would be doubled, to maximum specified in State law.

[3] Assumes most favorable distribution of base-period wages in all 4 quarters; concentration in 1 quarter would limit benefits to 4 weeks.

[4] Based on unemployment fund of $40,000,000 or more. The maximum potential benefits, duration, and, in some instances, the weekly benefit amount would be reduced if the balance fell below $40,000,000, with further reductions if the fund fell to $25,000,000 or less.

[5] Weekly benefit amount may be increased by $1 for each dependent up to 3, and weeks of duration reduced accordingly. Weekly benefit amount including dependent's allowance not to exceed $18.

[6] Duration is based on uncharged wage credits in base period of 5 completed calendar quarters and the quarter in which waiting period was served; therefore duration based on 4 quarters may be understated. See footnote 2.

[7] Assuming $50 in each of 2 quarters other than high quarter; otherwise base-period wages of $250 are required and claimant would be ineligible.

[8] Maximum potential benefits and duration reduced by limitation on wage credits to $390 in Iowa and $360 in Wyoming.

[9] Annual-wage formula; high-quarter wages not used in computing weekly benefit amount.

[10] Based on unemployment fund greater than 1¼ times the highest amount of benefits paid during any 12 consecutive months. When the fund drops below this amount the maximum potential benefits, duration, and maximum weekly benefit amount will be lowered.

[11] Actual benefits are paid for 2-week periods at twice the amounts specified.

[12] Impossible to estimate benefits on the basis of the assumed data, because formula does not utilize either high-quarter or base-year wages for weekly benefit amount or duration.

TABLE 2.—*Selected data pertaining to the financial aspects of unemployment compensation, by State, through December 1942*

[Based on data reported by State agencies,[1] corrected to Feb. 5, 1943]

Social Security Board region and State	Month and year benefits first payable	Cumulative amounts, as of Dec. 31, 1942		Funds available for benefits as of Dec. 31, 1942 (in thousands) [4]	Amount of benefits paid for each $1 collected							Funds available at end of year as percent of wages during year under $3,000 [6]				Ratio of funds available as of Dec. 31, 1942 to high year of benefits	Percent of covered employment who could be paid benefits for maximum duration out of funds available on Dec. 31, 1942		Date first reduced rates under experience rating became effective
		Collections and interest (in thousands) [2]	Benefits paid (in thousands) [3]		Calendar year					Since benefits first payable	Since initiation of program [5]	1939	1940	1941	1942		Under present State formula [7]	Under uniform benefit formula [8]	
					1938	1939	1940	1941	1942										
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
Total		$5,420,222	$2,032,335	$3,387,887	[9] $0.74	[10] $0.55	$0.61	$0.34	$0.30	[11] $0.48	$0.37	5.7	6.1	6.5	6.7	5.6	45.9	26.5	
Region I:																			
Connecticut	Jan. 1938	118,441	28,352	90,090	.95	.31	.27	.11	.12	.29	.24	4.8	6.1	6.4	6.6	7.4	50.0	28.1	Apr. 1941
Maine	Jan. 1938	27,887	13,755	14,132	1.43	.74	.85	.31	.16	.58	.49	2.6	2.7	3.7	5.0	3.1	46.8	18.5	
Massachusetts	Jan. 1938	244,512	106,963	137,550	.75	.52	.81	.38	.31	.55	.43	5.6	5.6	6.1	6.0	4.4	39.9	25.0	Jan. 1942
New Hampshire	Jan. 1938	20,642	8,455	12,187	.99	.54	.87	.35	.17	.53	.40	5.5	5.4	5.7	6.6	4.5	61.8	26.7	Jan. 1941
Rhode Island	Jan. 1938	65,049	31,192	33,856	1.14	.70	.80	.27	.29	.56	.48	4.4	4.9	6.4	7.7	3.6	54.2	31.2	
Vermont	Jan. 1938	9,391	3,083	6,308	.58	.38	.68	.27	.17	.39	.32	6.0	5.6	6.3	6.6	6.9	66.6	31.1	Jan. 1941
Region II:																			
New York	Jan. 1938	807,471	398,851	408,620	.70	.69	.78	.46	.37	.58	.49	4.0	4.3	5.2	5.7	4.1	34.5	23.2	

[1] Except interest, which is credited and reported by the U. S. Treasury; data in columns 12–15, partially estimated as indicated in footnote 6; and data in column 18 which was estimated as indicated in footnote 8.

[2] Represents contributions plus penalties and interest from employers; interest earned by State accounts in unemployment trust fund; and contributions from employees. Also includes the excess of contributions on wages earned by railroad workers through June 30, 1939, over the amounts transferred to the railroad unemployment insurance account, and refund of $41,000,000 by Federal Government to 13 States, Alaska, and Hawaii, collected on pay rolls for 1936 under title IX of the Social Security Act.

[3] Adjusted for voided benefit checks. Includes benefits paid to railroad workers through June 30, 1939.

[4] Represents sum of balances at end of month in State clearing account, benefit-payment account, and unemployment-trust-fund account maintained in the U. S. Treasury (column 2 minus column 3).

[5] Comparisons are valid only among States which initiated benefit payments at same time.

[6] Wages under $3,000 for 1939, 1940, and 1941 were assumed to be equal to taxable wages in those States and years where the $3,000 limitation on taxable wages was in effect; for Nevada and Idaho the 1941 United States ratio between taxable and total wages (excluding 4 States) was applied to each annual wage total reported by the two States; in all other instances the ratio between taxable and total wages reported by a State for the first year throughout which the $3,000 limitation was in effect was applied to the annual wage totals reported by that State for all previous years. 1942 wages under $3,000 were estimated from United States income predictions for 1942 prepared by the Department of Commerce, taken in conjunction with data reported on Forms ES–202 for the first 2 quarters of 1942 and on Forms ES–203 for 1941.

[7] Data in column 17 indicate what percentage of the covered workers employed in the State at the end of September could, from present funds, be paid all the benefits due them in the event of an immediate wholesale layoff of long duration, under the following assumptions: (1) the weekly benefit amount of each claimant would be 10% higher than the average prevailing in the State during the fourth quarter of 1942 (as determined by dividing the amount of benefits paid out for total unemployment during that quarter by the number of weeks of total unemployment compensated) and (2) all claimants would be eligible for the maximum number of weeks of benefits payable under the State law, during a single spell of unemployment, to a claimant receiving the assumed weekly benefit amount. (For Wisconsin, claimants were assumed to have only one base period employer.)

[8] Data in column 18 indicate what percentage of the covered workers employed in the State at the end of September could, from present funds, be paid all the benefits due them in the event of an immediate wholesale lay-off of at least 6 months' duration, if the State's present benefit formula were replaced by a formula providing for a uniform duration of 26 weeks of benefits and a weekly benefit amount equal to 1/26 of high quarter earnings, with a $5 minimum and a $20 maximum. The average weekly benefit amount used for each State in these calculations is equal to the assumed weekly benefit amount used for the purposes of column 17 (see assumption (1) in footnote 7), multiplied by a factor, separately estimated for each State, to take account of the difference between the State's present formula for determining weekly benefit amount and the uniform formula described above. For Utah this factor is equal to 1.00, since the uniform weekly benefit amount formula is identical with Utah's. For other States it varied from 0.99 (Michigan) to 1.56 (Maine). For States with a "high quarter" formula, this factor was obtained by estimating a distribution of high quarter earnings (weighted by number of checks) from data reported in column II of the 1941 Form ES–215, and determining from this distribution the ratio of the average check (for total unemployment during 1941) under the uniform formula to the actual average check. For States where the weekly benefit amount is based on annual wages, it was necessary to use, in addition, available information on the relationship between annual wages and high quarter wages.

[9] Based on 23 States paying benefits Jan. 1, 1938.

[10] Based on 49 States paying benefits Jan. 1, 1939.

[11] Ratio for Wisconsin based on benefits and collections since Jan. 1, 1938.

TABLE 2.—*Selected data pertaining to the financial aspects of unemployment compensation, by State, through December 1942*—Continued

[Based on data reported by State agencies, corrected to Feb. 5, 1943]

Social Security Board region and State	Month and year benefits first payable	Cumulative amounts, as of Dec. 31, 1942: Collections and interest (in thousands)	Cumulative amounts, as of Dec. 31, 1942: Benefits paid (in thousands)	Funds available for benefits as of Dec. 31, 1942 (in thousands)	Amount of benefits paid for each $1 collected: Calendar year 1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	Since benefits first payable	Since initiation of program	Funds available at end of year as percent of wages during year under $3,000: 1939	1940	1941	1942	Ratio of funds available as of Dec. 31, 1942, to high year of benefits	Percent of covered employment who could be paid benefits for maximum duration out of funds available on Dec. 31, 1942: Under present State formula	Under uniform benefit formula	Date first reduced rates under experience rating became effective
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
Region III:																			
Delaware	Jan. 1939	$13,502	$2,584	$10,918	------	$0.30	$0.35	$0.19	$0.29	$0.28	$0.19	8.2	8.1	8.7	8.0	13.0	89.4	35.2	Jan. 1942
New Jersey	Jan. 1939	296,088	63,854	232,235	------	.32	.33	.25	.28	.29	.21	8.6	9.6	10.1	9.7	13.0	69.4	42.7	Jan. 1942
Pennsylvania	Jan. 1938	532,928	208,773	324,156	$1.02	.69	.53	.24	.12	.46	.39	3.6	4.4	5.5	6.5	4.5	50.7	26.1	------
Region IV:																			
District of Columbia	Jan. 1938	40,869	8,474	32,395	.26	.21	.37	.33	.14	.25	.20	8.2	8.7	9.5	9.4	15.3	50.7	35.1	(July 1944)
Maryland	Jan. 1938	85,531	31,258	54,273	1.00	.47	.53	.29	.16	.42	.36	3.9	4.5	5.0	6.0	5.4	31.1	23.2	------
North Carolina	Jan. 1938	73,375	23,664	49,711	.84	.39	.40	.29	.17	.38	.32	4.9	5.9	6.2	7.1	6.1	62.6	25.8	(Jan. 1943)
Virginia	Jan. 1938	58,182	21,683	36,500	.68	.44	.59	.30	.24	.43	.36	5.3	5.2	4.9	5.0	6.2	41.3	20.4	Jan. 1941
West Virginia	Jan. 1938	63,197	25,507	37,690	1.35	.42	.38	.26	.21	.49	.40	3.9	5.2	5.8	5.7	3.1	55.2	23.6	Jan. 1941
Region V:																			
Kentucky	Jan. 1939	67,811	14,783	53,028	------	.44	.44	.20	.19	.31	.21	10.0	11.3	11.4	11.5	10.9	104.5	41.8	Jan. 1941
Michigan	July 1938	304,424	160,477	143,948	------	.82	.53	.23	.72	.68	.52	3.2	3.9	5.3	4.7	3.5	25.5	19.8	Jan. 1942
Ohio	Jan. 1939	346,823	74,780	272,042	------	.43	.42	.17	.27	.31	.21	7.1	7.6	8.0	7.4	11.1	56.8	32.9	Jan. 1942
Region VI:																			
Illinois	July 1939	439,575	126,819	312,755	------	------	.62	.35	.39	.45	.28	7.8	7.6	7.9	7.8	7.2	45.6	32.1	(Jan. 1943)
Indiana	Apr. 1938	138,678	51,424	87,255	------	.49	.44	.22	.33	.47	.36	4.8	5.4	5.7	5.8	5.4	45.6	22.5	Jan. 1940
Wisconsin	July 1936	109,951	26,652	83,298	.58	.24	.37	.22	.25	[1] .34	.24	8.5	8.8	8.4	7.9	8.9	46.3	28.0	Jan. 1938
Region VII:																			
Alabama	Jan. 1938	59,972	23,620	36,352	1.25	.50	.49	.29	.25	.48	.39	5.2	6.3	6.2	5.9	4.5	37.1	20.6	Apr. 1941
Florida	Jan. 1939	40,059	20,071	19,989	------	.54	.98	.68	.51	.66	.48	6.2	4.9	4.8	5.1	3.1	32.5	16.9	Jan. 1942
Georgia	Jan. 1939	54,367	15,161	39,206	------	.40	.51	.29	.39	.39	.27	7.1	7.9	7.1	7.0	8.8	49.3	24.4	Jan. 1942
Mississippi	Apr. 1938	17,685	8,346	9,338	------	.65	.86	.49	.33	.56	.46	5.0	4.0	4.3	5.1	4.2	33.3	13.3	------
South Carolina	July 1938	30,065	8,725	21,340	------	.56	.54	.27	.29	.38	.28	6.2	6.4	6.5	6.5	8.6	44.6	21.3	Jan. 1942
Tennessee	Jan. 1938	57,628	27,198	30,430	.91	.53	.73	.43	.38	.55	.46	4.6	4.9	4.7	5.4	4.9	43.2	21.2	------
Region VIII:																			
Iowa	July 1938	46,688	16,407	30,281	------	.64	.52	.29	.24	.44	.34	5.7	6.0	6.7	6.3	5.8	60.4	28.6	Jan. 1942
Minnesota	Jan. 1938	74,844	38,202	36,642	.68	.53	.79	.64	.43	.61	.49	5.1	5.2	5.3	5.2	3.8	35.3	20.5	Jan. 1941
Nebraska	Jan. 1939	17,852	5,413	12,440	------	.33	.68	.64	.34	.47	.28	8.7	7.8	7.6	7.0	6.8	46.2	22.5	Jan. 1940
North Dakota	Jan. 1939	4,931	2,040	2,890	------	.55	.72	.66	.48	.60	.37	8.2	6.8	7.0	7.0	4.7	56.1	26.9	Jan. 1942
South Dakota	Jan. 1939	5,708	1,321	4,387	------	.35	.35	.43	.26	.35	.22	7.6	8.1	8.6	8.3	11.1	63.4	25.5	Jan. 1940
Region IX:																			
Arkansas	Jan. 1939	21,842	7,999	13,843	------	.53	.88	.57	.16	.47	.35	6.4	5.5	5.3	5.9	4.7	39.2	17.4	Apr. 1942
Kansas	Jan. 1939	30,887	7,991	22,896	------	.42	.44	.39	.26	.36	.24	8.4	8.1	7.5	6.8	10.0	44.9	22.1	Jan. 1941
Missouri	Jan. 1939	117,026	26,238	90,787	------	.28	.37	.23	.42	.32	.22	7.7	8.5	8.6	7.7	11.2	56.7	28.2	Jan. 1942
Oklahoma	Dec. 1938	39,048	13,425	25,623	------	.76	.60	.39	.43	.52	.34	6.9	7.5	8.1	7.0	6.0	48.5	27.0	Jan. 1942
Region X:																			
Louisiana	Jan. 1938	57,963	28,967	28,996	.45	.60	.84	.72	.40	.59	.49	6.3	5.9	5.4	6.0	4.1	31.3	23.1	------
New Mexico	Dec. 1938	8,355	3,732	4,624	------	.86	.87	.49	.30	.61	.42	5.9	4.8	5.4	6.0	3.8	48.1	21.7	Jan. 1942
Texas	Jan. 1938	123,612	39,696	83,916	.43	.47	.45	.36	.20	.39	.31	6.3	7.2	6.7	6.2	7.8	56.1	25.9	Jan. 1941
Region XI:																			
Colorado	Jan. 1939	29,223	10,680	18,543	------	.69	.89	.43	.14	.52	.35	6.9	6.0	6.5	6.8	4.4	45.7	23.7	Jan. 1942
Idaho	Sept. 1938	12,885	6,865	6,020	------	1.10	1.03	.66	.26	.69	.52	5.0	4.1	4.2	5.0	2.7	32.2	17.1	------
Montana	July 1939	15,903	7,686	8,216	------	------	1.15	.86	.37	.74	.45	8.0	5.6	5.7	6.2	2.6	56.7	27.6	------
Utah	Jan. 1938	17,741	8,277	9,464	1.18	.63	.61	.47	.22	.54	.45	3.8	4.1	4.8	5.8	3.8	22.6	17.4	------
Wyoming	Jan. 1939	7,381	3,378	4,002	------	.83	1.05	.50	.24	.63	.42	6.7	5.1	5.7	6.7	3.3	51.4	25.8	Jan. 1942
Region XII:																			
Arizona	Jan. 1938	14,031	6,071	7,960	1.07	.70	.63	.35	.14	.51	.42	3.7	4.1	4.9	6.2	4.2	47.4	19.8	Jan. 1942
California	Jan. 1938	504,532	216,336	288,196	.38	.50	.85	.57	.31	.51	.42	8.3	7.7	7.5	7.8	4.4	39.6	30.6	Jan. 1941
Nevada	Jan 1939	6,664	3,028	3,636	------	.86	1.19	.75	.12	.57	.43	6.0	3.7	3.8	5.1	3.3	32.8	17.1	(Jan. 1944)
Oregon	Jan. 1938	45,350	18,303	27,046	.98	.71	.61	.29	.15	.47	.40	3.5	4.1	4.9	5.5	4.6	55.6	21.5	July 1941
Washington	Jan. 1939	76,831	23,578	53,253	------	.69	.87	.39	.11	.41	.30	6.2	5.6	5.4	6.0	5.6	42.5	22.6	------
Territories:																			
Alaska	Jan. 1939	4,396	1,317	3,079	------	.64	.90	.32	.11	.39	.30	6.2	5.4	4.9	5.5	5.8	50.0	26.1	------
Hawaii	Jan. 1939	12,426	881	11,545	------	.15	.14	.07	.06	.10	.07	7.5	9.5	7.9	6.9	40.3	34.7	23.4	Apr. 1941

[1] Ratio for Wisconsin based on benefits and collections since Jan. 1, 1938.

TABLE 3.—*Significant provisions of State unemployment compensation laws, June 1, 1943*

State and type of fund [1]	Size of firms covered (number of employees)	Eligibility	Weeks of initial waiting period	Weekly benefit rate total unemployment	Maximum payment per week	Minimum payment per week	Weekly benefit rate partial unemployment	Duration in 52-week period (lesser amount below applies): Total amount of benefits (proportion of wages)	Duration in 52-week period (lesser amount below applies): Maximum number of weeks payable
Alabama: Pooled; experience rating effective April 1941; employee contributions determined by experience rating.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal tax.	30 times w. b. a. including $39.01 in 1 quarter.[2]	3	1/26 of high quarter's wages, established by table in law.	$15	$2	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $2.[2]	1/4 in 4 quarters	20.
Alaska: Pooled	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks.	25 times w. b. a.	2	1/20 of high quarter's wages.	16	5	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $5.	do	16.
Arizona: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1942.	Employer of 3 or more in 20 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal tax.	14 times w. b. a.	1	50 percent of full-time weekly wage.	15	5	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $3.	1/6 in 8 to 12 quarters.	14.
Arkansas: Pooled; experience rating effective April 1942.	Employer of 1 or more in 10 days.	22 times w. b. a.	1	1/20 of high quarter's wages.	15	3	do	1/4 in 4 quarters	16.

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 3.—*Significant provisions of State unemployment compensation laws, June 1, 1943*—Continued

State and type of fund	Size of firms covered (number of employees)	Eligibility	Weeks of initial waiting period	Weekly benefit rate total unemployment	Maximum payment per week	Minimum payment per week	Weekly benefit rate partial unemployment	Duration in 52-week period (lesser amount below applies)	
								Total amount of benefits (proportion of wages)	Maximum number of weeks payable
California: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1941; employee contributions percent of wages up to $3,000 not to exceed 50 percent of employer's general rate.	Employer of 4 or more in 20 weeks.	$300	2	1/26 of high quarter's wages, established by table in law.	$18	$10	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $3.	23 to 54 percent in 4 quarters, according to schedule of wage classes.	
Colorado: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1942.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks.	30 times w. b. a.	2	1/25 of high quarter's wages.	15	5	do	1/2 in 4 quarters	16.
Connecticut: Pooled; experience rating effective April 1941.	Employer of 4 or more in 13 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal tax.	$144	1	Established by weighted table in law.	[14] 22	6	W. b. a. less wages, plus $2.	20 percent in 4 quarters, according to schedule of wage classes.[3]	18.[3]
Delaware: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1942.	Employer of 1 or more in 20 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal tax.	$200	1	1/25 of high quarter's wages.	18	5	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $2.	10 x w. b. a. plus one w. b. a. for each $200 in wages.	20.
District of Columbia: Pooled; experience rating.	Employer of 1 or more at any time.	Lesser o. 25 times w. b. a. or $250.	2	1/23 of high quarter's wages, established by table in law plus allowance for dependents up to maximum of $18.	20	6	W. b. a. less wages in excess of 40 percent of w. b. a.	1/2 in 4 quarters	20.[4]
Florida: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1942.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks also all employers liable to Federal tax.	$200 including wages in 3 separate quarters.	1	Established by weighted table in law.	15	5	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $2.	1/6 in 8 quarters	16.
Georgia: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1942.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal tax.	Schedule requiring 25, 30, and 40 times w. b. a.	2	Established by weighted table in law.	18	4	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $3.	Uniform duration.	16 (uniform duration).
Hawaii: Pooled; experience rating effective April 1941.	Employer of 1 or more in 20 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal.	30 times w. b. a.	1	1/25 of high quarter's wages, established by table in law.	20	5	W. b. a. less wages.	do	20 (uniform duration).
Idaho: Pooled; experience rating effective July 1943.	Employer with $78 or more wages payable in 1 quarter.	Schedule requiring 28 to 52 times w. b. a. including $78 earned in 1 quarter.	2	Established by weighted table in law.	18	5	W. b. a. less wages in excess of lesser of 1/2 w. b. a. or $5.00.	1/4 in 4 quarters	17.
Illinois: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1943.	Employer of 6 or more in 20 weeks.	$225	1	1/26 of high quarter's wages.	$18	7	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $2.[5]	do	16.
Indiana: Contributions of 0.135 percent of employer's pay roll pooled; remainder in employer reserves; experience rating effective January 1940.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks.	$250 and $150 in last 2 quarters of base period.[4]	1	1/25 of high quarter's wages.	[4] 18	5	W. b. a. less wages.	do	18.[4]
Iowa: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1942.	Employer of 8 or more in 15 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal tax.	15 times w. b. a.	2	50 percent of full-time weekly wage.	15	$5 or full time weekly wage.	W. b. a. less wages, plus $2.	1/6 in 8 quarters	15.
Kansas: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1941.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks.	$200, or $100 in 2 quarters.	1	1/25 of high quarter's wages.	15	5	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $2.	1/3 in 4 quarters	15.
Kentucky: Employer reserve; earnings from investment pooled; experience rating effective January 1941.	Employer of 4 or more in 3 quarters of preceding year, to each of whom $50 payable in each such quarter, or of 8 or more in 20 weeks.	$200	1	Based on schedule of annual wages.	16	5	1-week benefit rate for unemployment less 80 percent of earnings in a 1-week period.	Uniform duration.	16.
Louisiana: Pooled	Employer of 4 or more in 20 weeks.	20 times w. b. a.	2	50 percent of full-time weekly wage.	18	3	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $2.	1/4 in 4 quarters	20.
Maine: Pooled; experience rating effective July 1943.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal tax.	$144	1	Based on schedule of annual wages.	18	6	W. b. a. less wages in excess of from $2.50 to $2.99 (in accordance with table).	Uniform duration.[6]	16 (uniform duration).[6]
Maryland: Pooled; experience rating effective July 1943.	Employer of 4 or more in 20 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal tax.	30 times, w. b. a.	1	1/26 of high quarter's wages, established by table in law.	20	7	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $2.	1/4 in 4 quarters	23.
Massachusetts: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1942.	Employer of 1 or more in 20 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal tax.	$150	1	Established by weighted table in law.	15	6	W. b. a. less wages.	30 percent in 4 quarters.	20.
Michigan: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1942.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal tax.	$250, including wages in 2 different quarters.	1	1/26 of high quarter's wages.	20	10	W. b. a. minus lesser of 75 percent of wages earned or wages in excess of $3.	1/4 in 4 quarters[7]	20.

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 3.—*Significant provisions of State unemployment compensation laws, June 1, 1943*—Continued

State and type of fund	Size of firms covered (number of employees)	Eligibility	Weeks of initial waiting period	Weekly benefit rate total unemployment	Maximum payment per week	Minimum payment per week	Weekly benefit rate partial unemployment	Duration in 52-week period (lesser amount below applies)	
								Total amount of benefits (proportion of wages)	Maximum number of weeks payable
Minnesota: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1941.	Employer of 1 or more in 20 weeks (of 8 or more outside cities with population of 10,000 or more); also all employers liable to Federal tax.	$200	2	Based on schedule of annual wages.	$20	$7	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $3.	16 to 37 percent in 4 quarters, according to schedule of wage classes.	16.
Mississippi: Pooled	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal tax.	20 times w. b. a.	2	1/26 of high quarter's wages.	15	3	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $2.	Uniform duration.	14 (uniform duration).
Missouri: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1942.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks.	40 times w. b. a.	2	1/25 of high quarter's wages.	18	3	W. b. a. less 5/6 of wages.	20 percent in 8 quarters.	16.
Montana: Pooled	Employer of 1 or more in 20 weeks, or with year's pay roll over $500.	$150	2	do	15	5	No provision [8]	Uniform duration.	16 (uniform duration).
Nebraska: Employer reserve; earnings in pooled account; experience rating effective January 1940.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal tax.	$200	2	do	15	5	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $3.	1/3 in 4 quarters	16.
Nevada: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1945.	Employer with $225 or more wages payable in 1 quarter.	Greater of $200 or twice w. b. a. multiplied by itself including wages of 5 times w. b. a. in some quarter other than highest.	2	1/20 of high quarter's wages.	15	5	do	do	
New Hampshire: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1941.	Employer of 4 or more in 20 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal tax.	$200	1	Based on schedule of annual wages.	18	6	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $2.	Uniform duration. [9]	18.
New Jersey: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1942; employee contribution 1 percent of wages up to $3,000.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks.	$150	1	1/22 of high quarter's wages.	18	7	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $3.	1/3 in 4 quarters	18.
New Mexico: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1942.	Employer with $450 or more wages paid in 1 quarter, or employer of 2 or more in 13 weeks.	30 times w. b. a. including $37.50 in 1 calendar quarter.	1	1/26 of high quarter's wages, established by table in law.	15	[10] 5	do	1/3 in 4 quarters	16.
New York: Pooled	Employer of 4 or more in 15 days.	25 times w. b. a.	2	1/23 of high quarter's wages, established by table in law.	18	10	No provision [11]	Uniform duration.	20 (uniform duration).
North Carolina: 2/10 contributions to employer reserve; remainder pooled; experience rating effective January 1942.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal tax.	$130	1	Based on schedule of annual wages.	15	3	W. b. a. less 5/6 of wages	do	16 (uniform duration).
North Dakota: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1942.	do	30 times w. b. a.	1	1/26 of high quarter's wages, established by table in law.	15	5	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $3.	do	Do.
Ohio: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1942.	Employer of 3 or more at any one time	20 weeks' employment and $160.		Established by weighted table in law.	16	5	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $2.	do	18 (uniform duration).
Oklahoma: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1942.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks.	22 times w. b. a.	1	1/20 of high quarter's wages.	16	6	do	1/3 in 4 quarters	16.
Oregon: Pooled; experience rating effective July 1941.	Employer of 4 or more in any 1 day in any calendar quarter with pay roll of $500.	$200	2	6 percent of high quarter's wages.	15	10	do	1/6 in 4 quarters	16.
Pennsylvania: Pooled	Employer of 1 or more in 26 weeks.	$50 in each of 2 quarters in base year.	2	50 percent of full-time weekly wage.	[12] 18	8	No provision	1/3 in 8 quarters [13]	16.
Rhode Island: Pooled; employee contributions 0.5 percent of wages up to $3,000. [14]	Employer of 4 or more in 20 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal tax.	$100	1	Established by weighted table in law.	16	6	W. b. a. less wages.	18 to 30 percent in 4 quarters, according to schedule of wage classes.	
South Carolina: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1942.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks.	40 times w. b. a. (30 times if w. b. a. is $4).	1	1/26 of high quarter's wages, established by table in law.	15	4	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $1.	Uniform duration.	16 (uniform duration).
South Dakota: Employer reserve; earnings pooled; experience rating effective January 1940.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal tax.	$126	1	Based on schedule of annual wages.	15	7	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $2.	do. [6]	Do. [6]

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 3.—*Significant provisions of State unemployment compensation laws, June 1, 1943*—Continued

State and type of fund	Size of firms covered (number of employees)	Eligibility	Weeks of initial waiting period	Weekly benefit rate total unemployment	Maximum payment per week	Minimum payment per week	Weekly benefit rate partial unemployment	Duration in 52-week period (lesser amount below applies): Total amount of benefits (proportion of wages)	Duration in 52-week period (lesser amount below applies): Maximum number of weeks payable
Tennessee: Pooled; experience rating effective July 1944	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks.	30 times w. b. a. (25 times if w. b. a. is $5).	1	1/26 of high quarter's wages, established by table in law.[15]	$15	$5	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $3.	1/4 in 4 quarters	16.
Texas: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1941.	do	8 times benefit rate for 2-week period.	1	1/13 of high quarter's wages (for 2-week period).	[14] 20	[16] 10	2-week benefit rate less wages, plus $4.	1/5 in 4 quarters	8 times benefit for 2-week period.
Utah: Pooled	Employer with $140 or more wages payable in 1 quarter.	30 times w. b. a.	1	1/20 of high quarter's wages.	20	5	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $3.	Uniform duration.	20 (uniform duration).
Vermont: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1941.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks; also all employers liable to Federal tax.	do	2	Established by weighted table in law.	15	6	do	do	18 (uniform duration).
Virginia: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1941.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks.	25 times w. b. a.	1	1/25 of high quarter's wages, established by table in law.	15	4	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $2.	1/4 in 4 quarters	16.
Washington: Pooled	Employer of 1 or more at any time.	$200	1	1/20 of high quarter's wages.	15	7	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $5.	1/5 in 4 quarters	16.
West Virginia: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1941.	Employer of 8 or more in 20 weeks.	$250	1	Based on schedule of annual wages.	18	7	According to time lost on basis of schedule.	Uniform duration.	16 (uniform duration).
Wisconsin: Employer reserve; earnings pooled; experience rating effective January 1938.	Employer of 6 or more in 18 weeks or annual pay roll of $6,000.	14 weeks' employment.	2	Schedule of average weekly wage.	17	6	W. b. a. less wages.	From any one employer's account, 1 week's benefit to each 2 weeks of employment not exceeding 40 weeks within 52 weeks preceding close of employment.	
Wyoming: Pooled; experience rating effective January 1942	Employer of 1 or more in 20 weeks, and with $150 or more wages payable in 1 quarter.	25 times w. b. a. including $70 in 1 quarter.	2	1/20 of high quarter's wages.	$20	$7	W. b. a. less wages in excess of $3.	1/4 in 4 quarters	16.

[1] Annual wages in excess of $3,000 per worker excluded from employer contributions, except in Nevada.
[2] W. b. a.—Abbreviation for "weekly benefit amount."
[3] Lower maximum rates and duration are provided when balance in the fund is less than 2 percent of the pay roll for 3 years ending with the base period for the benefit year.
[4] Effective July 1, 1943.
[5] Partial benefits are reduced by 1/5 of w. b. a. for each normal work day during which the individual is unable to, or unavailable for, work. An eligible individual unemployed for 6 or less consecutive days, shall be paid benefits equal to 1/5 of the w. b. a. for each such day, less any wages payable during such period.
[6] Benefit duration for lower wage classes is less.
[7] Lesser of $200 or 30 percent of base period wages if such wages are less than $800.
[8] No partial benefits paid, but earnings not exceeding $5.00 are disregarded.
[9] Lower maximum rates and duration are provided whenever fund falls to equal $8,000,000 for 2 successive months.
[10] Effective July 10, 1943.
[11] No partial benefits paid, but wages not exceeding $3. for 7 consecutive days are disregarded.
[12] $15 if fund equals less than 1½ times highest amount of benefits paid in any 12 consecutive months.
[13] ¼ in 8 quarters if fund equals less than 1½ times highest amount of benefits paid in any 12 consecutive months.
[14] Employees pay in addition 1 percent into cash sickness compensation fund.
[15] Rate is 1/20 and 1/25 of high quarter's wages for 2 lowest weekly benefit amounts ($5 and $6).
[16] For 2-week period.

CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I stated yesterday, and in accordance with many precedents, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business (Senate bill 575) be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2753, a bill making appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, commonly known as the lend-lease bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the requested action rather conforms to my views as expressed yesterday. I suggested to the able Senator in charge of the bill that he proceed first with the appropriation bill. I am anxious to get through with the appropriation bills. All of us are. They are important; I think they are much more important than the bill which the distinguished Senator has asked permission to lay aside temporarily. I shall make no objection, because I am anxious to get through with the appropriation bill. Then it can be followed by the bill which is on the calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from Tennessee has just requested unanimous consent to have the pending business laid aside and to have the Senate consider the appropriation bill. Yesterday that question arose. I did not state positively that I would object to such a request, although I did so infer.

Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Oregon. The appropriation bill which is now sought to be made the pending business is of far greater importance than the unfinished business, which is the bill of the Senator from Tennessee. I was of that opinion yesterday. I saw no reason why an important appropriation bill should not be made the pending business at that time. That was my purpose, Mr. President, and I told the distinguished and able senior Senator from Tennessee that I would object to a unanimous-consent request to make the so-called McKellar bill the pending business, in preference to the appropriation bill.

Accordingly, the Senator from Tennessee moved to take up the so-called

McKellar bill and to make it the unfinished business. That was his choice, not mine. The Senate agreed with the Senator from Tennessee, and by inference, at least, said that his bill was of more importance than the appropriation bill. I disagree with that sentiment, but evidently that is what the Senate desired. I indicated yesterday that I would object to the pending unanimous-consent request, and I shall object. I desire, however, to state the parliamentary situation: The Senate has in its own hands the power to take up any bill it wants to consider. If the Senator from Tennessee or any other Senator wants to make a motion to lay aside the unfinished business and to take up the appropriation bill, I shall be most glad to support such a motion. I think the appropriation bill should be made the pending business by appropriate action, just such action as was taken yesterday afternoon. For that reason, and that reason alone, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and as a member of the subcommittee to which was referred Senate bill 575, the unfinished business, and on behalf of the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and a majority of the Judiciary Committee, it seems quite appropriate that a statement be made on the bill which is now pending so that the Senate may know the views of the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary. I shall attempt, briefly as possible, to make such an explanation. I shall not take up the time of the Senate to too great an extent, but I shall ask the courtesy of the Senate that I may conclude the explanation without interruption. At the conclusion I shall have no objection to trying to answer questions.

At the outset, Mr. President, let me say that this bill was introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. It was the subject of long, and I think careful, study, as a result of which a majority of the committee reported to the Senate the bill which is now the unfinished business.

Before we reported the bill to the Senate we amended it in a number of particulars. The amendments will be found in the bill. The amendments, taken with the bill as a whole, are exceedingly important. By every fair amendment to which we could resort we brought forward for the consideration of the Senate the vital question which we think is involved in the bill introduced by the able Senator from Tennessee.

The bill as reported provides for appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of civilian officers in the executive branch of the Government who are appointed without regard to civil-service laws, and whose duties involve policy-making functions or the exercise of executive discretion, or whose rate of compensation is in excess of $4,500 per annum, excepting from the provisions artisans and craftsmen.

Perhaps it might be well at this point, in fairness to my friends on the Judiciary Committee, and to the able members of that committee who will present their views on this bill, to say that the bill does not come before the Senate by a unanimous vote of the Committee on the Judiciary. I am presenting now the views of the majority of the committee. I say that so that the Senate may give proper consideration and heed not only to the explanation which I, representing the Judiciary Committee on this occasion, shall make, but also to the explanations of my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee who may follow me.

Persons appointed or promoted under the classified civil service; persons whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the White House office in the Executive Office of the President; persons employed in the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and persons who have left the Government service to serve in the armed forces are exempt from the provisions of the bill. I think it is worth while, even at the risk of repetition, to cause the Senate to dwell upon those exceptions as set out in the bill. Persons appointed or promoted under the classified civil service; persons whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the White House office in the Executive Office of the President; persons employed in the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and persons who have left the Government service to serve in the armed forces are exempt from the provisions of the bill.

Section 1 requires Presidential appointment, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, of all persons defined in section 2, and not exempt in section 3. Section 1 further provides that no such person subject thereto shall hold office after June 30, 1943, unless he shall have been so appointed, with the exception that if a nomination to such office or position has been submitted to the Senate prior to June 30, 1943, such person may continue in office until September 30, 1943.

Section 2 of the bill defines the persons who must be appointed pursuant to section 1, while section 3 defines the persons who are not affected by section 1.

The Senate, in reading the bill with the amendments, will note the care which the Committee on the Judiciary sought to apply so as to define the groups which would be subject to the provisions of the bill and those which might be exempted. It impresses the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and a majority of the Committee on the Judiciary, that a general statement as to the policy of this legislation might be proper to be presented to the Senate.

Let it be remembered that article II, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution of the United States provides that the President—

> shall nominate, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they think proper in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

This provision of the Constitution, for the purpose of appointment, divides all officers into two classes—those which are specifically enumerated therein as requiring Presidential appointment, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—including those whose appointment is not otherwise provided for—and those appointments which Congress may deem it wise to invest in the President alone, or in the courts, or in the heads of departments, or in all three if desirable.

From time to time Congress has exercised its discretion with respect to vesting appointments in the second category. When constitutionally done, these delegations have been upheld without exception. When such delegations have been made to persons or agencies not included within the second category, such acts have been declared unconstitutional by the courts.

There was a period in our early history when the question of whether Congress could attach qualifications to offices for which the power of appointment had been delegated was much labored. It was argued with many refinements and niceties. Fortunately, this question has long been settled law and it would not now be seriously contended that Congress has not the legislative power to prescribe qualifications for office, or for appointment.

In this connection I refer to volume 13 of the Opinions of the Attorney General, page 520, and a number of cases cited therein.

Under the Constitution, Congress has at all times retained the right to pass upon the qualifications and ability of those who perform executive functions for the Government, either through confirmation by the Senate of Presidential appointments, or by virtue of its unquestioned right to prescribe qualifications for office in the Federal Government, together with its unquestioned right to repeal, at any time, any act which may have authorized appointments by the President, the courts of law, or the heads of departments.

There was a very good reason for including in the Constitution a method by which appointments in the Federal Government could be controlled. That reason was well known to those who drafted the Constitution with the taste of despotic tyranny still on their lips. That reason has not changed. It is still with us today. In fact, it is of even greater importance now than in all the history of our Government. Specifically, it has been ably summed up in the words of Abraham Lincoln:

> Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Under the Constitution the several States of the United States are sovereign. I repeat that expression because in recent times it would appear as though many were of a different turn of mind. Under the Constitution the several States

of the United States are sovereign. This is no idle conjecture. The tenth amendment to the Constitution expressly provides:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

Every precaution and safeguard was taken in the Constitution to preserve the sovereignty of the States and to protect the rights of the people of the States. Those who framed the Constitution realized that everyone who administers the laws of the United States, regardless of salary or title or office, directly affects the States, and the people of the States. To this end, the Supreme Court has repeatedly refused to pass upon the qualifications of persons for office, realizing the effect of such office upon the people and the States, and realizing the power of Congress to compel suitable appointments in behalf of the people.

In the outstanding case of *Keim* v. *United States* (177 U. S. 293) we find the expression of the Court exceedingly emphatic in the following words:

> The appointment to an official position in the Government, even if it be simply a clerical position, is not a mere ministerial act, but one involving the exercise of judgment. The appointing power must determine the fitness of the applicant; whether or not he is the proper one to discharge the duties of the position.

It is essential that the fitness of Federal employees be properly ascertained if a proper administration of the laws of the United States, in relation to the several sovereign States, is to obtain.

In keeping with the letter and spirit of the Constitution that the power of appointment be not lightly regarded, the Supreme Court has decided in a long line of cases that the term "Heads of departments," in whom Congress may lawfully vest the appointment of inferior officers, means one of the members of the President's Cabinet. It does not mean, nor include, a mere bureau head or division head, or section chief.

The Committee on the Judiciary respectfully refers the Senate to the outstanding cases of *United States* v. *Germaine* (99 U. S., p. 508); *Burnap* v. *United States* (252 U. S., p. 512); *Steele* v. *United States* (267 U. S., p. 505). Moreover, it has likewise been determined that while Congress may distribute the appointment of inferior officers at its pleasure among the President alone, the courts of law, and heads of departments, it has no power to vest appointments elsewhere, either directly or indirectly. Attempted delegations to inferior officers, or elsewhere, have been held unconstitutional. I respectfully refer to volume 4 of Opinions of the Attorney General, and also volume 13 of Opinions of the Attorney General, at page 515, and the cases therein cited. Yet today, appointments to responsible executive offices of the Government are being indiscriminately exercised by inferior officers in the executive agencies. The Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate views with alarm the astonishing growth of responsible Government positions which are today being filled without regard to these clear constitutional principles. High-salaried positions in the executive agencies have mushroomed almost overnight. I have before me a table which lists for a majority of the agencies the number of executive officers receiving $4,500 or more as of November 1, 1942. It is not conclusive, but more recent figures are presently unobtainable.

Listen to this list and to the number on the list who are drawing down $4,500 or more. The agencies I shall mention were in existence on November 1, 1942; most of them are now in existence, and there are even more of them.

Bureau of the Budget: Total number of employees, 511; number of employees receiving over $4,500 per annum, 178.

National Resources Planning Board: Total number of employees, 292; number of employees receiving over $4,500, 85.

Office for Emergency Management, liaison office: Total number of employees, 7; number of employees receiving over $4,500, 5.

Division of Central Administrative Service: Total number of employees, 5,375; number of employees receiving over $4,500, 85.

Office of Alien Property Custodian: Number of employees, 971; number of employees receiving over $4,500, 213.

Office of Civilian Defense: Total number of employees, 1,334; number of employees receiving over $4,500, 178.

Office of Coordinator, Inter-American Affairs——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me call attention to the Office of Civilian Defense, where, as the Senator says, 178 employees are receiving salaries in excess of $4,500. Those officials are not employed by the President; they are not employed by the head of any department; they are not employed by the courts; they are not employed by the President and the Senate together. They are employed by somebody we do not know; they are employed by somebody in the particular set-up. Who knows by whom the 178 employees of the O. C. D. receiving in excess of $4,500 are appointed? I doubt if there is a Senator who can tell by whom any of them are appointed.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is the spirit and intendment of the pending legislation to take care of that situation, because, under our oath as Members of Congress, we are charged with the responsibility of conserving the money of the taxpayers of America and, being so charged, we should know who draws these salaries, who makes the appointments, what are the qualifications of the appointees, and whether or not they are qualified to fill the positions.

Mr. President, it is unnecessary to take the time of the Senate to read the entire list, but I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this place in my remarks, by way of explanation, the list of offices, the total number of employees, and the total number of employees receiving over $4,500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The list is as follows:

Agency (as of Nov. 1, 1942)	Total number of employees	Number of employees receiving over $4,500
Bureau of the Budget	511	178
National Resources Planning Board	292	85
Office for Emergency Management, Liaison office	7	5
Division of Central Administrative Services	5,375	85
National War Labor Board	282	37
Office of Alien Property Custodian	971	213
Office of Civilian Defense	1,334	178
Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	1,044	276
Office of Defense Transportation	2,831	253
Office of Economic Stabilization	6	4
Office of Lend-Lease Administration	469	97
Office of Scientific Research and Development	420	66
Office of War Information	3,164	388
War Manpower Commission	916	117
Selective Service System	3,909	19
War Production Board	20,080	3,406
War Relocation Authority	776	100
War Shipping Administration	1,274	103
Board of Economic Warfare	2,716	480
Office of Censorship	1,910	61
Office of Price Administration	35,720	2,010
Office of Strategic Services	1,040	79
Alley Dwelling Authority	242	8
American Battle Monuments Commission	6	
Bituminous Coal Consumers Counsel	56	12
Board of Investigation and Research—Transportation	155	32
Civil Service Commission	7,617	232
Federal Communications Commission	2,174	115
Employees Compensation Commission	530	25
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,305	76
Federal Power Commission	655	116
Federal Security Agency	31,204	969
Federal Trade Commission	593	143
Federal Works Agency	18,070	679
General Accounting Office	8,022	140
Government Printing Office	312	1
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,750	333
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2,844	71
National Archives	445	33
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	18	2
National Housing Agency	13,990	1,058
National Labor Relations Board	887	119
National Mediation Board	27	13
Panama Canal	279	8
Railroad Retirement Board	1,871	61
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7,396	1,448
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,390	262
Smithsonian Institution	823	39
Tariff Commission	351	67
Tax Court of the United States	132	35
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,341	424
U. S. Maritime Commission	6,598	297
Veterans' Administration	43,578	1,092
Department of Commerce	19,282	884
Department of the Interior	27,582	1,098
Department of Justice	29,564	1,606
Department of Labor	5,806	304
Department of State	5,200	668
Treasury Department	59,344	2,428
War Department	579,446	3,385
Navy Department	124,181	856
Post Office Department	266,281	296
Total executive branch	1,381,394	27,684
Library of Congress	1,376	27
Administrative Office, United States courts	98	4
Grand total	1,382,868	27,715

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will permit me, I desire to call his attention to the Office of Price Administration. The employees of that office are not appointed

by the President nor by the head of any department nor by the courts nor by the President of the Senate together.

Mr. McCARRAN. In that office the total number of employees is 35,720, of whom 2,010 receive in excess of $4,500 a year.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; 2,010 employees in the O. P. A. receive in excess of $4,500, and yet nobody under heaven, except Mr. Brown, can tell how any of them was appointed. I believe that Mr. Brown, the director, was appointed by the President, but not by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. I am not saying he is not a fine man, but there are 2,009 others whom Mr. Brown has not appointed, or, if so, he has appointed very few, and whom nobody else that we know anything about has appointed. I doubt if it could be ascertained who appointed them.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, nothing can illustrate better the propriety of this proposed legislation than what has just been called to the attention of the Senate, when we also know from the current press that within the last month or so, and especially since Mr. Prentiss Brown, our former worthy colleague, took over the administration of the O. P. A., there has been exodus after exodus of groups, weeded out, I think it is fair to say, because the new Administrator found them without the necessary qualifications.

Now, Mr. President, reviewing the list I have presented for the RECORD, let it be admitted as true that the Congress has delegated vast powers in order to prosecute the war successfully. We have gone nearly all-out along that line. Speaking personally, I think we have gone entirely too far, that is, we have gone too far without applying more care, more scrutiny, more study to those who administer public offices during this great crisis.

It is likewise true that Congress has delegated vast powers to cope with emergency conditions confronting the country. It is true that many of the executive agencies have been created under such delegated powers and are staffed with personnel pursuant to Executive orders. It does not follow, however, Mr. President, nor is it true, that the staffing of these executive agencies has been consummated pursuant to the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

The argument has been made that while the power of appointment may not have been vested by Congress in the particular appointing agency, nevertheless such offices are not within the constitutional provision that the President shall appoint and the Senate confirm all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not otherwise provided for, and whose offices are established by law. This argument has been supported on the theory that such offices have been "established" by Congress, or on the theory that those who occupy such offices are not "officers" of the United States, but merely employees. Your committee and the senior Senator from Nevada now presenting the views of the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary are not impressed by this argument.

Many so-called employees in the executive agencies, by virtue of authority which has been either assumed, or subsequently delegated to them, are in effect enacting legislation by means of rules and regulations which drastically affect the entire Nation. In addition, many of these servants of the Government are wielding tremendous authority with relatively little compensation commensurate to the effect which their activities have upon the Nation. The Committee on the Judiciary has therefore included such officers within section 2 of the bill, as reported. It should be noted that artisans and craftsmen, who are not engaged in policy-making functions as defined, are not included within the $4,500 bracket applicable to all other civilian officers.

An alarming number of so-called employees in the emergency executive agencies are appointed by heads of bureaus, division heads, and section chiefs, without regard to civil-service qualifications, and without confirmation by the Senate, notwithstanding that they are officers of the United States in every sense of the word. There is no question that if Congress attempted to vest the power of appointment in these heads of bureaus, or elsewhere, such acts would be held unconstitutional. The committee believes it is equally unconstitutional to accomplish a prohibited result by means of executive orders and assumption of authority. Such employees are therefore brought within the provisions of the bill.

Those who drafted the Constitution had no conception of the extent to which the Federal Government would expand. They could not have anticipated the extent to which the Nation would be governed by administrative law, issued through executive orders. They could not have known that the number of civilian employees in the Federal Government would increase from 1,185,558 on December 31, 1940, to 2,810,871 on December 31, 1942; an expansion of nearly 2,000,000 persons in the Government service within the short space of 2 years. Nevertheless, they wisely provided in the Constitution a means by which this tremendous expansion could be accomplished, and if the letter and spirit of the Constitution were followed, as it must be followed, the citizens of the several States would be afforded the protection which they are guaranteed by its provisions, and the rights of the several sovereign States would be preserved. It is essential that the Government of the United States be kept at all times in the people, and be made to remain as close to the people as possible. We must not lose sight of the fact that the first three words of the Constitution are, "We the people," for when we have lost sight of this fact, we have lost the true meaning of constitutional democracy.

The Committee on the Judiciary, in reporting the bill to the Senate, believes that the method provided in the bill for revesting control in the people, through their legally elected representatives, is unobjectionable because it in no way interferes with the war effort; it disrupts no agency of Government; it lays no withering touch upon the merit system established by act of Congress under the classified civil service, but rather strengthens and upholds that system; it implements and assures the selection of competent persons of unquestioned ability to administer the laws of the United States; and at the same time, it assures that appointments shall hereafter be made in the manner prescribed by the Constitution. In addition to this, it insures reasonable control and supervision by the people, through their representatives, of the Government itself and of its operations.

Mr. President, in presenting the views of the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary, as I have attempted to present them in a brief form, I wish to say that I present my own views most emphatically in favor of the pending bill as it is now drawn.

Some objection will be raised to the inclusion of certain agencies. During the course of the discussion it will be said that there should be an elimination from the bill of certain agencies. Every agency included is an agency of the Government, and every agency is paid out of the taxpayers' pockets, and the Congress of the United States is charged with a responsibility to the people. If Congress fails in fulfilling the responsibility, then I am concerned, indeed, as to the future of this Government.

The more we bring the Government close to the people, the more we hold the Congress of the United States responsible to the people, the safer will be the Government in the hands of the people and in the consideration of the people.

In the opening we submit the explanation which I have attempted to make.

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gerry	Overton
Austin	Gillette	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hatch	Revercomb
Barbour	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Scrugham
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lodge	Tobey
Capper	Lucas	Truman
Caraway	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	White
Downey	Moore	Wiley
Eastland	Murray	Willis
Ellender	Nye	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

SIMPLIFICATION OF NAVAL ACCOUNTING PROCEDURE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on House bill 2584, relating to abolishing naval trust funds

and deposits in connection with naval hospitalization, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2584) abolishing certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

DAVID I. WALSH,
M. E. TYDINGS,
JAMES J. DAVIS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CARL VINSON,
PATRICK H. DREWRY,
MELVIN J. MAAS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, as the bill was passed by the House, it would abolish the practice of taxing all persons in the naval service 20 cents a month for the maintenance and operation of naval hospitals. It is interesting to note that since 1790 this tax has been levied and collected each year from all persons in the naval service. The Senate amendment provided that commencing June 30, 1944, there should be deducted from the pay of each person in the naval service on the last day of the fiscal year the sum of $2.40 to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The Senate amendment proposed to continue the old practice. The fact that the funds are not now to be held as a trust fund to help maintain the naval hospitals has led the House Committee on Naval Affairs and the Senate committee to agree to abolish this deduction from the salaries and pay of enlisted men in the Navy.

Therefore, when the conference report is agreed to, there will be cessation hereafter of any tax upon naval personnel for the maintenance of hospitals in which they are treated.

The Army has no such tax at the present time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration and approval of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the report is agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO DR. NEEDHAM Y. GULLEY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in this day of crashing worlds and clashing ideologies I would commend to you a man of peace; for it has been well said that peace hath its victories no less than war, and it follows—to continue the martial theme—that peace hath its heroes—its soldiers, if you please—whose service to their fellows is far beyond the line of duty. It is of such a hero of peace that I would speak to you. Today, Needham Y. Gulley, LL. D., founder and dean emeritus of the Wake Forest College Law School, at Wake Forest, N. C., is 88 years of age.

Wake Forest College has long been known as one of the powerhouses of education in North Carolina. For more than 100 years the power of learning and culture generated there has found its way to the uttermost parts of the world to bless and elevate the race of men. It is a small college measured in terms of wealth and equipment or as compared to the great universities of the world, but it is a great institution of learning measured by the contribution its graduates have made in the life of North Carolina, the United States, and, I may say with pardonable pride, the whole world.

Even as great events may be said to be the lengthening shadow of a man, so the service of this grand old school may be said to be the lengthening shadows of the men who conceived it and who, through more than a hundred years of its existence, through poverty and untoward events, have toiled, sacrificed, and given of themselves that learning and culture—that freedom and our sacred American way of life as conceived by the founding fathers of this Republic, should live on. Standing out sharply against this background of service and sacrifice, looming large in the life of his State, is the life and character of this teacher of men, Needham Y. Gulley.

Dr. Gulley was born on a North Carolina farm. In his home, in the schools he attended, in the church of his choice, Needham Gulley learned the lessons of patience, charity, the love of his fellow men and the eternal soundness and verity of our American way. During his life his was not a large forum, but in that forum he taught no isms to the men who sat in his classes. There were no endorsements of fuzzy foreign-born ideas, no mockings of American customs or concepts of government; nor did he believe or teach that John Marshall was an old fuddy-duddy and that all of Marshall's decisions should be reversed, or that Jefferson, Madison, Franklin, and the other great Americans who conceived and founded this Government were dolts and fools. Instead, he taught, as he firmly believed, that this land of ours and this American way of life was a great rock in a weary world—a Government conceived as a real democracy which should continue on the principles of freedom and justice in accordance with the original plan.

From the classrooms of Needham Y. Gulley have gone men who have become judges, teachers, Governors, Senators, Congressmen, and just plain lawyers and businessmen, and these men have become the leaders in the legal, social, political, and economic life of the State and the Nation. The contribution that each of these men has made has been in a large measure a contribution of Dr. Gulley.

Among the immortals of my State, the men who have labored and served to great purpose—Vance, McIver, Alderman, Porter, Aycock, Alfonso Smith, Poteat, Joyner, Chatham, Wolfe, and Clark, to name just a few—Needham Y. Gulley has a secure and honored place. The people of North Carolina love and revere this wonderful old man who has lived his life so quietly, so peacefully, and yet with such great effectiveness and fruitfulness in the cloistered beauty that surrounds Wake Forest.

Now full of years, honors, and wisdom, Dr. Needham Y. Gulley, on his eighty-eighth birthday, is receiving the affectionate congratulations of his fellow citizens in North Carolina.

As a representative of the folks of North Carolina, I, too, wish to honor today the service of this great North Carolinian, and to tender to him sincere good wishes on this his eighty-eighth birthday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks certain data pertaining to the life and career of Dr. Gulley.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Born on farm in Johnston County, N. C., June 3, 1855.
2. Practiced law in Johnston, Granville, and Wake Counties.
3. Licensed to practice law, age 26, in 1881.
4. Graduated Wake Forest College 1879.
5. Studied law under Edward W. Pou, Sr., Congressman Pou's father; and Mr. Fab. Busbee.
6. Taught in schools of Raleigh, N. C., and Macon County, N. C.
7. Married daughter (Miss Alice Wingate) of Rev. W. M. Wingate, president of Wake Forest College.
8. Founded first law school in North Carolina, attached to a major college or university, 1894.
9. Resigned deanship 1935, then dean emeritus.
10. Made doctor of laws, Wake Forest College.
11. First class at law school, 12, of which 4 are living; one of whom is Congressman JOHN KERR, another Judge Meekins.
12. Retired as teacher 1938. Had class of 67. Returned to teaching 1942 on account of shortage of teachers in armed services.
13. Practices his profession at this time.
14. Number of students in 49 years, about 2,000.
15. Some of his students, Judges Meekins, Varser, W. J. Bone, H. E. Olive, Z. V. Nettles, R. Hunt Parker, J. J. Burney, Q. K. Nimocks, Hoyle Sink, Thomas L. Johnson, and Albion Dunn.

Solicitors, T. W. Bickett, H. L. Koontz, W. S. Spurling, Chester Morris, D. M. Clark, J. Abner Barker, R. S. Pruette, C. O. Ridings, A. E. Hall.

Governor J. M. Broughton.

Senator J. W. BAILEY.

Stephen McIntyre.

16. Editor of Cyc. Member of North Carolina Code Commission in 1907. Member North Carolina General Assembly 1885. Mayor of Wake Forest. Chairman of Wake County Board of Education, still serving.
17. Number students licensed to practice law, 1,640.
18. One hundred percent Wake Forest students pass bar examinations on 25 examinations.
19. Baptist, devout.
20. Has been a great help to young lawyers, formerly his students, as they began practice of law.
21. Great equity and common-law lawyer.

CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me preface the few remarks which I intend to make upon the pending business, Senate bill 575, to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution, with a statement of appreciation of the work which has been done upon this bill by the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee to which it was originally referred, and by the committee itself. I am very glad to say—I think I may speak also for the members who joined in the minority views—that we have a great deal in common with the statements which have been made by the author of the bill and by the eloquent and able Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] who explained its provisions a few moments ago.

This measure is a part of the controversy which has developed over the disappearance of the dividing line between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. The subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was, I think, actuated solely by the purpose of restoring that division.

When the subcommittee made its report to the full committee, several sessions were devoted to the most careful and meticulous examination of the bill in all its terms. At one time it seemed that there was substantial and complete agreement among the members of the full committee with respect to the terms of the bill; but at the last moment a provision which had been eliminated was restored by the committee. That provision is subsection (f) of section 2, appearing on page 5 of the printed copy of the bill before the Senate.

When that section was adopted by the committee it destroyed the difference between the confirmation of officers of the United States and the confirmation of employees. The substance of the disagreement in the Committee on the Judiciary is simply this: In attempting to cure what the members of the committee deemed to be an abuse, if not an evil, the report of the majority goes two or three steps too far, and brings within the contemplation of confirmation employees who were never intended by the Constitution to be subject to confirmation, and who, if they should be brought in, would entail upon the Senate such difficult and detailed work that it would be impossible of performance, and as a result the salutary effects of the bill would be lost.

As pointed out in the minority views, the report of the committee is entitled "Senate Confirmation of Officers and Employees of the United States." There was never any intention in the minds of the framers of the Constitution that mere employees should be subject to confirmation. The significant portion of the Constitution appears in section 2 of Article II, which, as Members of the Senate know, deals with the Executive powers. Omitting portions of the section which have no immediate relevance, let me read this language:

He—

Meaning the President—

shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

The last phrase "but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments" was a recognition upon the part of the framers of the Constitution that the time would doubtless come when the number of officers of the United States would be so great that the Senate would not have the time to pass upon their qualifications. And so Congress was specifically authorized to vest the appointment of these inferior officers in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

Mr. President, it seems perfectly clear to me that when the framers of the Constitution took pains to grant an authorization to appoint inferior officers without the advice and consent of the Senate, there was certainly no thought in their minds that all the employees of the Government should have to be strained through the various committees of the Senate before they assume their functions as employees.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire what caused the committee to adopt an arbitrary figure of $4,500?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the able Senator from Illinois that the salary provision was contained in the original bill. Some of the members of the Judiciary Committee felt that it was not a proper measure of the difference between officers and employees, that it was not a definition of the difference between the two, and it was stricken out.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If the position taken by the majority of the committee is correct, that the appointment of any officer or employee receiving more than $4,500 should be confirmed by the Senate, is there any reason why we should not require all officers and employees, regardless of salary, to be confirmed by the Senate of the United States?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course not. If we can arbitrarily set the figure at $4,500, we can also lower it to $1,200, and we can require confirmation of custodial employees, for example, in all the Federal buildings.

Mr. LUCAS. That is my understanding; and I cannot yet understand why the salary limit for confirmations has been set at $4,500. If it is worth while to start confirming officers, other than policy-making officers, receiving salaries of $4,500 and over, it seems to me that we perhaps should seriously consider confirming the appointments of all employees of the Government.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. In answer to the question of the Senator from Illinois, I should like to say that any figure in regard to salaries would necessarily be a more or less arbitrary figure. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has suggested that the figure be lowered to $3,800. However, it was the opinion of the majority of the subcommittee, and of the Judiciary Committee, that the figure $4,500 was a reasonable one to select.

The question has been asked, "Why was $4,500 selected"? The answer is that an employee who is paid $4,500 or more is supposed to have some responsibility to go along with that salary. An employee who receives $1,200 is not supposed to have the same responsibility as the employee who receives $4,500. The figure $4,500 is at least to some extent a measuring stick, or should be, of the responsibility of the employee or of the officer.

Mr. DOWNEY rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think the able Senator from Arizona, who was one of the most diligent members of the Judiciary Committee and of the subcommittee, has in his statement laid bare the defect of adopting a salary as a measuring stick, because he says, "to some extent it is a measuring stick." Our position——

Mr. McFARLAND. Right there——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will bear with me for a moment, I shall continue with my statement.

Mr. McFARLAND. Pardon me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The point of it all is that the power of confirmation should be exercised only as to those officers who exercise policy-making functions. That is the distinction between the executive and the legislative power. It is a part of the great discussion which has taken place on the floor of the Senate during the course of many weeks, of the invasion of the legislative power by the executive.

O, Mr. President, I am as jealous of the legislative power as some members of the executive seem to be of the executive power. I will not consciously invade the executive function. If I may do so I will exert every power that I have to prevent the executive from invading the legislative power.

What is the distinction between the two? The words themselves tell the difference. The legislative power—and the courts have consistently so held—is the power of discretion. The legislative power is the power of weighing and judging what the law should be. The execu-

tive power is the power to carry out the law. The executive power does not extend to the making of law.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to invite attention to the fact that, while in a general way the statement of the Senator from Wyoming is correct, the Constitution specifically gives to the Senate of the United States, with the President, the power of appointing officers of Government, and it states that all officers of the Government shall be appointed. That is an executive function, but the Senate itself is given a part of the executive function in making the appointments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right. The position which I have taken is simply that officers and employees are separate and distinct functionaries of Government, and should not be confused one with the other. Let the executive branch execute the law, and then in the interest of merit and of efficiency, let the Executive, under the civil-service laws, select the employees who are to help execute the law, and make effective the policies determined by the legislative power. But, let us not go a step beyond that and say to the Executive, in effect, "We shall not only exercise our power to pass upon the policy-making officials, but we shall thrust ourselves into the selection of the employees whom the various bureaus and departments must select." That is a distinction which the courts have recognized.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from California will pardon me so that I may put this point into the RECORD all at one place, I desire to quote from a volume which every Member has in his library, the annotated edition of the Constitution of the United States. Under the section of the Constitution under which this bill comes we find several quotations with respect to the definitions of officers of the United States and inferior officers. I shall not weary the Senate by reading long excerpts from court opinions, so I shall merely read this brief synopsis and cite the cases mentioned.

It has been held that the term "officer" did not include persons of the following classes: Surgeons appointed by the Commissioner of Pensions; merchant appraisers selected by the collector of customs on demand for a reappraisal, and clerks appointed by the collector of customs (*United States* v. *Germaine*, 99 U. S. 508–512; *Auffmordt* v. *Hedden*, 137 U. S. 310–326; *United States* v. *Smith*, 124 U. S. 525–532).

That is the universal ruling of the courts. There is a distinction between officers and employees. Observe that in one of these cases the Supreme Court said surgeons appointed by the Commissioner of Pensions are not officers of the United States, but under this bill surgeons not in the armed forces receiving more than $4,500 a year, though they exercise no policy-making power whatsoever, would be subject to confirmation. The same thing is true with respect to engineers.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. May I say to the Senator from Wyoming, in line with what he was just saying, that all professional and technical employees receiving more than $4,500 a year, except artisans and craftsmen, which are rather broad and general terms, would be required to be confirmed by the Senate. Whether or not they have any policy-making function—and, of course, that class of employees does not have such a function—their appointments would, under the bill as reported by the majority of the committee, be brought before the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me take an example with which the Senator from New Mexico is very familiar, and of which he spoke to me only today. The Bureau of Reclamation carries out vast construction projects throughout the West. The Bureau of Reclamation is manned by engineers and draftsmen, technical professional men, as are surgeons who were in the employ of the Commissioner of Pensions. Such men exercise no policy-making power at all. Many of them, because of the difficulties of the work in which they are engaged, receive salaries in excess of $4,500 a year, and yet under this bill it would be necessary that their appointments be confirmed by the Senate.

The point of the minority, Mr. President, is simply that it is not necessary to go that far. We shall save every single portion of the discretionary power the Senate ought to have under the provisions for advice and consent if we will be content to exercise that power with respect to policy-making officers.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator there to disagree to the words he used when he said, "if we will be content"? I think there is a high and solemn obligation on the Senate of the United States to see to it that it does not invade the province of the Executive, and that its power of confirmation is rightfully and constitutionally exercised.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not think the Senator is disagreeing with what I said.

Mr. HATCH. I am agreeing with the Senator, except that I did not like the word "content." I think it is a more solemn obligation than that.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. At this stage of the discussion will the distinguished Senator state to us exactly what is the rule now governing the confirmation by the Senate of appointees of the Federal Government?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The rule now is that under various laws certain officers are, by the law itself, to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Such an officer, for example, would be the head of a bureau. I think at the moment of some officers whom we recently confirmed, for instance, the head of the Bureau of the Mint, who under the law, must be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Exercising the authority which was given to the Congress in the section of the Constitution I read a moment ago, Congress has passed innumerable bills in which it has provided that the heads of departments may appoint certain individuals. Sometimes the distinction between policy-making powers and non-policy-making powers has not been drawn.

Now let me return to the Bureau of Reclamation. As it happens, I find that the head of the Bureau of Reclamation may be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. The law does not require confirmation by the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Director of the Bureau of Reclamation is appointed without confirmation by the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Exactly; he is appointed without confirmation by the Senate. That is in accordance with the provision of the law. The pending bill, as it was originally perfected by the Judiciary Committee before the salary limitation was restored, would have required the appointment by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of all policy-making officials. The purpose of those of us who advocated this point of view in the committee was to confine the confirmatory power of the Senate to officers exercising a policy-making function.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the Senator if that is the extent of the definition proposed—simply a policy-making officer?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to know how the Senator proposes to identify a policy-making officer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was coming to that.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may I suggest to the senior Senator from Michigan, while the Senator from Wyoming is conferring with the junior Senator from Michigan, that the only difference among those of us who believe that a policy-making official should be confirmed by the Senate, has been as to the definition of policy-making officials; but I think it is probably the unanimous opinion of the Judiciary Committee that all policy-making officials should be confirmed.

I know the junior Senator from Michigan and I, and others who join in the minority views, have all agreed on that point, but in trying to reach policy-making officials we do not want to include literally thousands of minor employees, as the bill does. We do not think that $4,500 a year is a criterion at all.

My own view, if the Senator from Wyoming will yield further, is that the bill should go to the Committee on Civil Service, and that that committee should obtain the most expert advice it can get, and work out, if necessary, even the

names of the officers of the Government who should be confirmed, confining it purely to policy-making officials. I think that can be done. It would be a difficult task, but I do not think the Senate of the United States should in a haphazard manner legislate, and, as I have said, include literally thousands of employees who have not heretofore been confirmed. We should proceed as intelligently as we can to reach a definition and an inclusion of policy-making officials. I think it can be done. I do not think the bill had that kind of consideration, and if the Senator from Michigan will read the hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary, I believe he will be bound to reach that conclusion.

Mr. ELLENDER rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will wait for a moment, let me say, in response to the question of the senior Senator from Michigan, that the junior Senator from Michigan, the junior Senator from North Dakota, and the Senator from Wyoming, now speaking, made a conscious and industrious effort—if I may use that expression in connection with ourselves—to define "policy-making position" so that we would secure the result which the senior Senator from Michigan has in mind, and which the Senator from New Mexico has just indicated.

Now let me read the definitions. I shall not attempt to read all the technical language, because sometimes that tends to obscure rather than to illuminate.

1. The heads, assistant heads, and head attorneys of the several departments and agencies of the Government.

That includes members of the boards of directors and officers of Government-owned corporations.

2. The heads of bureaus, divisions, or other units representing the first subdivision of any such department or agency.

It was not deemed necessary to go down into the subdivisions, but it was felt that those who are the heads of bureaus or divisions which in effect are self-operating should be brought under the confirmatory power of the Senate.

3. The heads and assistant heads of regional area, or State offices of such departments or agencies.

That was included because it was the feeling of the authors of the amendment, and the feeling of the committee itself, that in the vast new agencies, which are exercising such broad powers in the war effort, powers which affect the intimate daily lives of all the people of America, those who have that responsibility in regions and in areas should be regarded as policy making, and their names should come before the Senate for review, so that the Senate may know, and, through the Senate, the people may know, that those who are exercising these broad powers are exercising them in accordance with the spirit and the letter of American institutions.

4. All persons whose duties include the responsibility for final action in connection with the preparation of rules and regulations or orders.

The theory in framing that was that if in this vast bureaucracy there are, as we all know there are, great numbers of persons who are making rules and regulations which have the force and effect of law, the names of such persons should come before the bar of the Senate to be passed upon, and they should not be lightly appointed by executives in agencies which in many instances have been created not by law, but by Executive order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me see if I understand the application of the latter classification. Here is a man, let us say for the sake of the argument, at the head of the Sugar Section in the Department of Agriculture. Would he be subject to confirmation under the policy-making definition?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That would be a source of great consolation to me. Is there any way I could get at Harry Hopkins under any of these definitions? [Laughter.]

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am somewhat confused when I read section 2 of the bill, and then section 3. It is my understanding that any of the officials who are designated under section 2 must pass some kind of civil-service examination. For instance, I know that before a person can be selected to head an O. P. A. division he must qualify under the civil-service rules.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is not strictly correct, let me say to the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know of many instances of that having been done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me answer the Senator, because that is one of the matters which the committee considered.

It is true that by Executive order the President required the appointing agencies to check with the civil service. It was merely a check. The directive did not require that the applicant should take an examination. It merely required that there should be a sort of a summary looking-over of his background.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but is it not true that the applicants were classified?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. There are a great many of them who are holding office who were not classified at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are there not many who were classified?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, there have been great numbers who have been classified.

Mr. ELLENDER. How would we differentiate them? I know of many, for instance, who started at $3,200 and received a certain classification, and were then promoted, so that their salaries today may be considerably in excess of $4,500. As I understand section 3 of the bill they would be excluded from it, would they not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is the Senator discussing the bill as reported by the committee, or is he discussing the amendment which is offered on behalf of the minority?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am discussing the bill as it appears on our desks, with the committee amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator was not in the Chamber when I rose to speak. I am speaking, not for the bill, but for a substitute for the bill which I was about to offer, and the substitute which I shall offer in behalf of the minority excludes the $4,500 limit. But the provision in section 3 to which the Senator is referring was intended to eliminate from consideration persons who had in the past conformed to the existing rule of the civil service, for example postmasters, who are appointed and confirmed, and those who in the past have been properly covered in, who, at the time when they took the examinations, were complying with the civil-service law.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then section 3 would not apply to persons who were simply taken in without examination, but who were O. K.'d by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was the intention. The intention was to exclude from the exemptions of the bill those who, without taking competitive examinations, had been covered into the civil service. As the committee bill covers this provision, only those persons are excluded from confirmation, so far as section 3 (a) is concerned who are appointed or promoted in accordance with the civil-service laws in effect at the time of the appointment or promotion. In other words, those who were blanketed in by Executive order are not granted exemption under the confirmation provision of the bill as reported. This would require, for example, the confirmation of all persons covered into the civil-service system by the so-called Ramspeck bill, with which the Senator from Louisiana had so much to do. The Civil Service Commission has pointed out to me that, beginning with the administration of President Arthur and continuing during all succeeding administrations, more than 200,000 persons have been given a civil-service status by this method. It would seem unnecessary, therefore, to be quite so rigid as is the case with subsection (a) of section 3 of the committee bill.

In the substitute amendment modifications have been made so that exception from Senate confirmation is extended to all persons who in good faith and under act of Congress have been covered into the civil service.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator said a while ago that a surgeon was not an officer of the Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was quoting the Supreme Court.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; the Senator was quoting the Supreme Court. The Senator is familiar, as we all are, with the admirable organization known as the Public Health Service. It is one of the best agencies of the Government. I happen to have in my hand a list of

those appointees who are confirmed by the Senate, and I find in it the names of more than 150 surgeons, senior surgeons, temporary medical directors, temporary surgeons, temporary pharmacists, passed assistant surgeons, who have been appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate since March 30, 1943. I believe that either the Senator from Wyoming has misunderstood what the Supreme Court held with respect to the question or the Senate has misunderstood it heretofore, because under the public health law the nominations of surgeons, assistant surgeons, pharmacists, and so forth, are all sent to the Senate for confirmation. A more salutary provision could hardly have been made. Apparently it has helped to build up that agency into one of the best organizations of the Government. I think we all realize, and especially have we realized in the last few years, what a wonderful amount of good has been done by that agency of Government. In view of the way that organization has functioned, I cannot see how any hurt was done to that service simply because those appointed to it were confirmed by the Senate.

In my judgment those who wrote the Constitution felt that the appointments of all important officers of the Government, at any rate, should be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has exactly stated it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, but the Congress has provided for the unimportant persons in government by turning them over to the Civil Service Commission. That has been done by an act of Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Which is precisely what we are trying to do here.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; quite the contrary. Take an organization such as the Board of Economic Warfare, which I shall use purely as an illustration, without complaining about it. I read today the most remarkable description of that particular activity of Government I ever read or heard. I am sorry the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is not present at the moment. He examined Mr. Jesse Jones before the Banking and Currency Committee in December——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator, I should like to make a comment upon his first remark before the attention of the Senate is diverted to a second.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not want to take the Senator's time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is welcome to all my time, as he well knows, but I like to have the argument presented in a logical way.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is absolutely no conflict between the quotation I made from the Supreme Court and the recitation which the Senator from Tennessee has just made with respect to the fact that the appointments of certain surgeons in the Public Health Service are confirmed by the Senate. Congress by law may so provide, and did so provide in such case. When that law was passed Congress was of the opinion that the importance of these particular positions was such that those officers, inferior officers though they were, should be confirmed by the Senate. But if the Congress had authorized the head of the Public Health Service to make the appointments without confirmation it also would have been perfectly legal.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure the Senator from Wyoming does not want to make that statement, because the Constitution of the United States specifically provides that only the heads of departments or the courts can make appointments of that particular class. It does not provide that the head of an activity for instance such as the B. E. W. or the W. P. B.——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Tennessee is quite right. I meant the head of a department.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator did not want to let that statement stand.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly not, and I am glad the Senator interrupted me at that point.

Mr. President, the whole issue here is whether or not the Senate should undertake the vast detailed work which would be involved in passing upon the qualifications of a great horde of employees who exercise no policy-making powers. In response to the question of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] I was endeavoring to point out how the minority has endeavored to cover that point. We have written into section 2 definitions of policy-making power, and then we have written into section 3 provisions which are intended not to extend this confirmatory power unduly to those who have been in the merit system for a long period of years.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I ask the Senator to permit me to interrupt his very valuable contribution for a moment in order that I may propound a question. I agree heartily that it is the duty of the Senate to confirm policy-making officials, and it seems to me from a hasty reading of the substitute bill presented on the part of the minority members of the committee, that it achieves that end. If we are all agreed that that should be our task why was not that bill adopted? Why was it rejected by the committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator has asked that question. What happened was simply this: In going over the original bill as introduced by the Senator from Tennessee, and as amended by the subcommittee which had given such diligent attention to it, the full committee decided upon the principle which I am now advocating, namely, that the amount of salary a person derives from the Federal Treasury is not the proper measuring stick of policy-making power. So we wrote into the bill a policy-making definition, and after that had been agreed to in principle, at the very last moment, another amendment was offered restoring the salary division contained in the original bill, and that amendment, as it happened, was adopted by the Judiciary Committee. Thereupon those of us who were trying to exclude the salary division from consideration filed the minority report.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. As a matter of interest to the Senator from Massachusetts, I may say that the Committee on the Judiciary did adopt the substitute measure prepared by the Senator from Wyoming, and when the vote was had one Senator asked if he might submit an amendment. Permission to do so was granted, and the Senator offered his amendment putting back into the bill the $4,500 provision, merely adding it to the substitute measure which the Senator had proposed. That amendment was adopted. When that was done those of us who had supported the substitute measure, including the author himself, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], were compelled to vote against the measure which he had offered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, both the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Wyoming have given very enlightening replies to my question, but not complete replies. They have set forth the story of what happened in the committee; but I am still in the dark as to the reasons why, when the object is to reach policy-making officials, and when the bill of the Senator from Wyoming reaches policy-making officials, it was suddenly decided not to adopt that bill but to revert to the salary-scale provision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Well, Mr. President, of course——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I, too, should like very much to know the reason why that was done. I do not know what the reason was. The Senator from Massachusetts will have to ask those who sponsored the amendment what it was.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I assume that the reason for it was that the sponsors of the salary amendment felt that it was the most effective way of reaching all the persons who in the opinion of the sponsors of that provision should be brought to the bar of the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Wyoming took exception to the use of the words "to some extent," in referring to the so-called salary measuring stick. I wish to say that it was my opinion, and the opinion, I think, of the majority of those in the Committee on the Judiciary, that a man who receives a salary of $4,500 or more should have some responsibility if he is to receive that much money.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator to say that the difference between responsibility and

policy making is very great and constitutes the difference between the majority report and the position of the minority. That is all there is to it. Of course, a person has responsibility——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that of course anyone has responsibilities; but anyone who receives a salary of $4,500 usually has some policy-making duties.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the point is that we could recite the names of hundreds of persons receiving more than $4,500 who do not have any policy-making powers. As I said a moment ago, in response to the Senator's remarks, the engineers of the Reclamation Service have no policy-making powers at all.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let us talk about those engineers. Will not the Senator from Wyoming agree with me that some of the engineers in the Reclamation Service have very important policy-making duties?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, they do; and they are covered by the substitute amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator have any fear that if there should happen to be engineers who do not have any policy-making duties, the Senate of the United States would not confirm them just as it confirms members of the armed forces when their appointments are brought before us?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator has raised that point; because if there is anything that is a matter of form, not a matter of substance, it is the confirmation of nominations of officers of the Army and the Navy. Their nominations are brought here in an absolutely routine manner, without any examination at all, even by the committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is mistaken about that. We have a subcommittee appointed from the full Committee on Military Affairs, and the subcommittee goes very carefully over the nominations, investigates them, and holds hearings; and whenever question is raised about them, they are carefully looked into.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; whenever question is raised, they are.

Mr. CHANDLER. They are not reported as a matter of routine. They are reported after an investigation by a subcommittee, and then are reported from the subcommittee to the full committee, and then are reported to the Senate. The Senator is mistaken in what he has said in that connection. We have been unusually careful during the last 2 years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I may say with respect to the activities of the junior Senator from Kentucky, who is the chairman of the subcommittee on the nominees, that that subcommittee has been much more active than was previously the case. But the fact of the matter remains that, of course, the rank and file of the officers who are selected, and whose nominations are sent here by the General Staff and by the Secretary of War, are men of capacity and ability, and are persons against whom no one would make a complaint. In the great majority of cases the nominations come up, the form is gone through, and confirmation is granted.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I desire to ask the Senator a question in regard to the test which the minority members placed in their proposed amendment. Particularly as to subsections (d) and (e), let me ask who is to determine whether the employee comes under either of those subsections?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is not a law passed by Congress which does not have to be considered by the department or agency which has the responsibility for executing it, as well as by the Congress. If the construction of the law adopted by a department or an agency is not in harmony with the law, it will not take the Senate long to find that out. Most of the heads of the bureaus and most of the departments and agencies try to carry out the law as it is drawn.

The issue here is very simple, and I do not want to be drawn into any debate with the Senator from Arizona or with any other Senator with respect to nonessentials and technicalities. The issue is small, clear-cut, Shall we adopt a salary as the measuring stick, or shall we adopt a definition of policy-making power?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I simply desire to say in respect to the salary proposition that I have more trouble with the $2,500 clerks than I do with the $4,500 ones.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No doubt the Senator is quite correct; probably his experience is not unusual.

Mr. LUCAS. I say that with all sincerity.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator from Illinois suggest that the figure be reduced to $2,500?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; if we are going into this matter, I should like to have all employees of the Government confirmed by the Senate. If we are to start in on the salary basis, and are to take an arbitrary figure of $4,500, then we should eliminate all reference to salaries, and should require that all Government employees be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator intend to offer such an amendment?

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President; I do not intend to offer such an amendment. But if we are to have any arbitrary figure from the standpoint of a salary basis, then, as I see it, we might just as well require that all Government employees be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, where would the Senator draw the line?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, at this point I must interrupt, and must retain the floor for if I am going to permit Senators to indulge in cross-fire over my head, I shall never be able to conclude and to sit down. I do not desire to hold the floor. Let me say in extenuation of my position that one Member of the Senate came to me earlier in the day and said, "If you do not talk too long, you will have my vote." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I do not want to lose his vote by talking too long.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator replied to a question by the Senator from Arizona as to who would determine who are policy-making officials of the Government. Is it not true, Mr. President, that the bureaucracies on which we are trying to place a slight check will determine who is a policy-making official and who is not, and therefore the law will be nugatory, unless we have some provision of the statute to do it? Is not that so?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the answer to the question of the Senator from Tennessee is that the particular provision to which the Senator from Arizona referred, and concerning which he now has made a statement, is contained in the bill which the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Arizona are supporting.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; but we have in it a provision that if the official receives a salary of as much as $4,500, he is ipso facto a policy-making official of the Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator brought up that point, because again it clearly indicates what is the issue before the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee, with a definite purpose in mind—and very effectively, so far as legislative language is concerned—introduced a bill designed to bring before the bar of the Senate for confirmation all persons receiving more than a certain salary. The members of the committee felt that that was too broad. They felt that the power should be confined to policy-making officials, and so provided by writing in definitions. Then, after the definitions were written in and the salary provision had been stricken out, at the very last moment the salary provision was restored, and so the bill in its last form is worse than it was in its first form. Therefore, those of us who had attempted to draw the policy-making definitions filed our minority report.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. My question is apropos of the question propounded by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. Has the Government suffered any great distress or wrong through the fact that we confirm little postmasters all over the United States, some of whom make only a few hundred dollars a year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the Senator is aware that the great majority of postmasters, who occupy the fourth-class offices, are not confirmed by the Senate at all. Only the so-called Presidential postmasters, namely, the first-, second-, and third-class postmasters are confirmed by the Senate. The Senator has pointed directly to an illustration of

exactly the point I have in mind. Inferior officers should not be confirmed; and the Congress of the United States, by legislation, took away the confirmatory power so far as fourth-class postmasters are concerned.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is it not true, however, that everyone who receives more than $1,000 is confirmed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is a lesser figure than the one contained in the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator was very kind in response to my previous inquiry. Let me ask him for one further yardstick.

I have complete sympathy with the underlying purpose of the able Senator from Tennessee with respect to the proposed legislation, because it seems to me that this is one of the few ways in which Congress can reach back into the implementing of its delegated power, and have something to say and do by way of limitation of the sprawling bureaucracy which is the curse of our present-day democracy.

In further contemplating the problem, I have been appalled at the physical problem of attempting intelligently in the Senate to pass upon the confirmation of thirty or thirty-five thousand nominations, because I know perfectly well that it would become a matter of form in most instances.

I have that yardstick in respect to the bill. Can the Senator from Wyoming make any sort of estimate as to how many names would be subject to confirmation under his substitute?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That would depend largely upon the war agencies—the War Production Board, the O. P. A., and all the others. Every policy-making official in those bureaus would have to be confirmed, and under the present situation, therefore, there probably would be 10,000 to 15,000, even as we have tried to narrow the field. Unless we do narrow the field, it will be, as the Senator from Michigan has said, a perfectly appalling and impossible task, which, by reason of its very size, will cause the defeat of the very salutary object which we ought to have in mind, of having the policy-making officials come before the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senate devotes an exceedingly small portion of its time to confirmations. Its committees look up the names of those whose nominations are sent to the Senate. As I recall the number, there are now approximately 23,000 being confirmed by the Senate. The number varies from 23,000 to 30,000. I do not suppose we spend one two-hundredth part of the time of the Senate in confirming nominations. The Senator can see that so far as taking up the time of the Senate is concerned, it is a matter of the very least consequence. We could confirm double the number we now confirm just as easily as we confirm the present number. The important point is that when the Senate has the right to confirm, better officials will be appointed, because they know they will have to undergo scrutiny.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think the discussion thus far has covered all phases of this matter, at least in sufficient degree to make the issue clear. I now submit the substitute which has been recommended by the minority. Let me say that as the result of a conference between the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], myself, and other Senators, the substitute has been somewhat altered since the minority views were filed with the Senate.

On behalf of the minority, I submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I ask that the amendment lie on the table and be printed, and also printed in the RECORD, to be offered at the proper time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming will lie on the table and be printed. Without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. LANGER) to the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution, viz: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That (1) any person hereafter appointed or promoted to any civilian office to which this section applies shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and (2) no person shall hold any such office after June 30, 1943, unless he shall have been so appointed: *Provided*, That any person now holding any such office, who was not so appointed, may continue to hold such office until his successor is appointed and qualified or until September 30, 1943, whichever is earlier, if a nomination for an appointment to such office has been submitted to the Senate prior to June 30, 1943.

"SEC. 2. Except as provided in section 3 the following persons in or under the executive branch of the Government of the United States (including Government-owned corporations) shall be deemed to be officers of the United States and the provisions of the first section of this act shall apply to the office held by each of them:

"(a) The heads, assistant heads, and head attorneys of the several departments and agencies of the Government (including members of the boards of directors and officers of Government-owned corporations).

"(b) The heads of bureaus, divisions, or other units representing the first subdivision of any such department or agency.

"(c) The heads and assistant heads of regional, area, or State offices of such departments or agencies.

"(d) All persons whose duties include responsibility for final action in connection with the preparation and promulgation of rules, regulations, or orders made or issued under authority of any Act of Congress or any Executive order.

"(e) All persons whose duties include responsibility for determining the policies to be followed in administering the functions of any department, agency, or subdivision thereof as defined in paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of this section.

"SEC. 3. The provisions of the first section of this act shall not be applicable, except in cases where confirmation by the Senate is otherwise required by law—

"(a) In the case of (1) any person appointed or promoted in accordance with provisions of the civil-service laws and rules, as a result of which appointment or promotion and satisfactory service during a probationary period he acquired a classified (competitive) civil-service status; (2) any person who acquired a classified (competitive) civil-service status as in clause (1) and who, having left the service, has been or may be reinstated with restoration of such status; and (3) any person who, subsequent to appointment, acquired a classified status by action of the President or the Civil Service Commission, pursuant to act of Congress or Executive order; or

"(b) In the case of any civilian office or position held by any person on leave of absence or furlough from such office or position and in active service in the military or naval forces of the United States; or

"(c) In any case in which a person is restored to or reinstated in an office or position in accordance with the provisions of any act of Congress providing that he shall be restored to or reinstated in such office or position upon completion of active service in the military or naval forces of the United States; or

"(d) In the case of any office or position in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice; or

"(e) In the case of any person whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the White House office in the Executive Office of the President."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide that certain civilian officers in the executive branch of the Government who are appointed without regard to the civil-service laws shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. DOWNEY obtained the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gerry	Overton
Austin	Gillette	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hatch	Revercomb
Barbour	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Scrugham
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lodge	Tobey
Capper	Lucas	Truman
Caraway	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	White
Downey	Moore	Wiley
Eastland	Murray	Willis
Ellender	Nye	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2848, which yesterday passed the House of Representatives by unanimous consent. The bill involves a matter of not very great importance except to the State of California and possibly one or two other States.

Last April Congress passed a joint resolution which was approved on April 29 providing that persons receiving old-age assistance from the Federal Government might earn additional money from work upon farms without forfeiting their right to the pensions. A provision was written into the law to the effect that no pensioner could take advantage of it whose rate of payment was increased beyond the amount paid to him in the month of April. Prior to the time of the passage of the joint resolution the State of California—and I believe also the State of Utah—had made slight increases in their pension payments to become effective in the month of July. Consequently, under laws which were in existence at the time Congress passed the law to which I have referred, California and any other State which will grant increased pensions in the month of July would be barred.

Because of the peculiar nature of the law, it is very important for the State of California that some action be taken immediately upon this subject, as it involves the State's fiscal operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to the bill to which the Senator refers; and if it will not take very much time, if there will be no extended discussion of it, and it will not displace the pending bill, I shall have no objection to its consideration. However, I should not want it to displace the pending bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I introduced the original amendment to which the Senator from California has referred, to permit elderly people to accept farm employment. The Senate adopted the amendment. It went to conference, and the date was changed in such a manner as to interfere with the citizens of California and of Utah taking advantage of the law. The amendment now sought is to permit elderly people of California and Utah to be on the same basis with those of other States. In my opinion, the amendment should be agreed to, because there was no intent on the part of Congress, I am sure, to penalize the old people of California and Utah.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In Colorado we have a fixed objective which we try to reach, but the payments vary from month to month according to our revenues. Therefore, at the moment I am not prepared to say whether one month has been higher than another in point of actual payments. Can the Senator make any observations on the effect of the bill to which he has referred on that kind of a situation?

Mr. DOWNEY. What I am asking for would place Colorado in a better position than it now is, but if after July 1 Colorado should increase its old-age payments, it would be in difficulty under this law. What I am asking for would assist the State of Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As I remember, the law mentions the rate of payment. Would the Senator from California interpret "rate" to be synonymous with "amount"?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I would so interpret it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the bill will not displace the pending measure, and will take no extended time, I shall have no objection to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Appropriations will be discharged from further consideration of the bill. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2848) amending the joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, approved April 29, 1943, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REQUISITION OF PROPERTY ACT EXTENSION

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 217, to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect.

It will take but a few minutes to dispose of the bill. It is a bill which the War Department desires to have passed, and the present act will expire within 30 days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. McKELLAR. Can the bill be disposed of within 5 minutes?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Oh, yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will agree that the pending business be temporarily laid aside with the right to insist upon the regular order if consideration of the bill shall take more than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the bill (S. 217) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941 (55 Stat. 742), is amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1943", and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1944", so that it will read as follows: "That whenever the President, during the national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, but not later than June 30, 1944, determines that (1) the use of any military or naval equipment, supplies, or munitions, or component parts thereof, or machinery, tools, or materials necessary for the manufacture, servicing, or operation of such equipment, supplies, or munitions is needed for the defense of the United States; (2) such need is immediate and impending and such as will not admit of delay or resort to any other source of supply; and (3) all other means of obtaining the use of such property for the defense of the United States upon fair and reasonable terms have been exhausted, he is authorized to requisition such property for the defense of the United States upon the payment of fair and just compensation for such property to be determined as hereinafter provided, and to dispose of such property in such manner as he may determine is necessary for the defense of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of October 16, 1941 (55 Stat. 742), is amended by striking out the date "December 31, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "December 31, 1944", so that it will read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Whenever the President determines that property acquired under this act and retained is no longer needed for the defense of the United States, he shall, if the original owner desires the property and pays the fair value thereof, return such property to the owner; but, in any event, property so acquired and retained shall, if the owner desires the property and pays the fair value thereof, be returned to the owner not later than December 31, 1944."

SERVICES OF AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS IN AID OF LAND AND NAVAL FORCES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, on April 6, a House bill (H. R. 2292) to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces, was received in the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The companion Senate bill (S. 676) was considered by the Military Affairs Committee on May 4, amended by substituting the text of the House bill 2292, and approved. This action was taken by the Military Affairs Committee after consultation between the Military Affairs Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee and it was found agreeable to that committee, through its chairman, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], that the Military Affairs Committee take jurisdiction. The Senate bill, as amended, was accordingly reported to the Senate and placed on the calendar. When the calendar was called, an explanation should have been made, the Foreign Relations Committee should have been discharged from further consideration of the House bill, and that bill should then have been passed by the Senate in place of Senate bill 676. Inasmuch as Senate bill 676 was passed, however, on May 20, I now ask that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of House bill 2292 and that the House bill be now passed by the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not make that request.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Very well; I will renew it tomorrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to help the Senator tomorrow.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I knew the Senator would, because I expect to vote for his bill. So I thought if I brought this measure up now I might secure consideration of it.

CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, are we ready to vote?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, since coming to the floor of the Senate today I have carefully read the majority report on the bill proposing to confirm the appointment of officers and employees of the United States, and I confess that while much skill has been used in making a fine constitutional argument, yet I fail to understand why this bill is before the United States Senate, and I have not as yet heard a word spoken in the debate to justify its being here.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. That question has been asked several times. I requested the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] to give me the vote by which the bill was reported. I find that it was reported by a vote of 10 to 4. Ordinarily when a committee votes by a majority to report a bill to the Senate it is reported and comes before the Senate. When it is in the keeping of the committee it is not reported to the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thoroughly understand that the bill was reported favorably by a majority of the committee; but I have as yet failed to hear any argument made on the floor of the Senate as to the real reason why this kind of legislation should be proposed at this particular time.

Mr. President, it is always with the utmost regret when I find myself disagreeing with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, who is the author of this measure. The long and honorable record the Senator from Tennessee has made in this legislative Hall stands forth as a living tribute to his sagacity, his courage, and his statesmanship. His long record here also reflects great credit upon the wisdom and intelligence of the people of Tennessee who have, with conspicuous consistency, sent him here to represent them over this long period of time. But, Mr. President, I am unalterably opposed to this bill for two fundamental reasons. It is difficult for me to understand how the Senate of the United States can take an arbitrary figure of $4,500, use that as a yardstick, and ask the Senate and the other House of Congress to pass a bill which will require the Senate to confirm the appointment of all employees of the Government who receive a salary in excess of $4,500.

I know that, in this great emergency, there are thousands upon thousands of employees in the executive branch who otherwise would not be there. The Senator from Michigan spoke a moment ago about the sprawling bureaucracy which exists in Washington at this time; we hear it denounced almost daily upon the floor of the Senate; and, of course, from the standpoint of efficiency, it is not perhaps what it should be; but that is not strange in a democratic form of government. However, the bureaucracy about which so much is said, and the bureaucrats who are so constantly condemned, are men of all parties and of all faiths. Take, for example, the War Production Board, an agency, we will say, which is bureaucratic in form, or the Office of Defense Transportation, which is another bureaucratic agency of the Government, or at any rate, it has been so termed here; if we had any way of scanning the employees and those who hold official positions in those agencies, and who really do things, we would find that probably there are more Republicans on the pay roll than there are Democrats. I am not objecting to that, for we are in war, and I want my Government to have the best men it can find to conduct its various agencies, regardless of their political affiliations.

Mr. President, with respect to many of these agencies I have not paid very much attention to what goes on so far as appointments affect my particular State. I know that some appointments have been made which have been bad from the standpoint of having the kind of cooperation there should be with Members of the United States Senate, and some of the appointments have been wrong. Senators should have been consulted before the appointments were made. The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] rose yesterday and said that he was giving notice that no appointment should come here for confirmation until the agency in which the appointment was made had conferred in advance with him, and that is, of course, in my opinion, right. I will tell the Senate why. A Senator who is representing his State in the Senate, at least, gets the credit of being responsible for an appointee serving in his State or district of a governmental agency which is operating in behalf of the war effort.

That is one of the reasons why I shall not vote for a bill which, if passed, would reuire the Senate to confirm 38,000 more appointees. I do not want to accept that responsibility insofar as the people of my State are concerned. Furthermore, it is impossible to escape the conclusion that the public think this is a patronage grab upon the part of the Congress, and that, if this bill passes, the Senate will have under its domination 38,000 more employees.

Mr. President, I said a moment ago I do not care so much about the $4,500 employee; in trying to get information from governmental bureaus I have more trouble with the $2,500 clerk or the $2,000 clerk. I can talk to Mr. Patterson or Mr. Stimson or Mr. Knox or Mr. Forrestal, Mr. Nelson, or Mr. Eastman, or Mr. Brown and get information immediately but it is very difficult for me to talk to many of the subordinates who are getting in the neighborhood of $2,500 and obtain any real information.

It reminds me of something that happened during the last war. About the third day I was in the Army I was walking along thinking about home, when I met a general. I passed him by without saluting. He called me back and said, "Young man, how long have you been in the Army?" I said, "Three days, sir." He said, "You must understand the rule of the Army is that when you pass an officer you are compelled to salute." I said, "I understand that perfectly well, sir, but I have just been here about 3 days, and I was thinking about the folks back home, and I apologize." He said, "Now, young man, that is all right with me, but don't you ever pass a second lieutenant and fail to salute him, or you may be court-martialed as a result." [Laughter.] If there are any second lieutenants sitting in the gallery, I apologize to them, because once I was one myself. That illustrates the situation, so far as subordinates are concerned.

Another basic reason why I am against the bill is that an examination of it, with all its ramifications, convinces me beyond the peradventure of a doubt that if this proposal became the law of the land, it would retard, hinder, and delay the war effort.

On page 6 the majority report says, among other things:

> Your committee believes that the method provided in the bill for revesting control in the people, through their legally elected representatives, is unobjectionable because it in no way interferes with the war effort.

Mr. President, I challenge that premise, and that is one of the reasons, and one of the fundamental reasons, why I am opposed to the proposed legislation. There is a perfect example with respect to the appointment of men in the War Manpower Commission at the present time. The names of individuals who are appointed in Indiana, Wisconsin, Illinois, and I think Michigan, in that particular region, are all coming to my office at the present time, my approval being sought before the committee that is handling the appointments will report them favorably to the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I stated on the floor of the Senate a day or so ago that the Committee on Military Affairs would not report any nomination until the Senators from the State concerned had approved the selection, which makes it necesary that the names of the appointees be referred to the Senators.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know what the colloquy was with respect to the question raised by the Senator from New Mexico. What I am saying is that the nominations of persons from the States of Indiana and Wisconsin, and I think from Michigan, that particular area, have been coming to my desk for approval before they finally reach the Committee on Military Affairs, or whatever committee

is handling the nominations for particular positions.

It so happens that I may be away a week or that I may not be able to approve the manpower nominations for 2 weeks. Some of them I have let lie on my desk as long as 3 weeks, because why should I be interested in an individual in Indiana who receives an appointment under the War Manpower Commission?

Mr. President, if such procedure does not hinder and delay and frustrate the war effort on the home front, I do not know what would. If an individual who is appointed to handle an important job does not know for a period of 6 weeks or 2 months whether or not his nomination is going to be confirmed by the United States Senate, that individual is not doing the kind of a job he should do in some temporary appointment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I know the Senator does not wish to leave the impression that any Member of the Senate would desire to delay a nomination which by law it is a part of his obligation to see is confirmed. Submission of nominations to Senators is the law now, and that is the reason why those nominations are sent to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that.

Mr. CHANDLER. They go to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. There they are referred to a subcommittee, of which I happen to be chairman. We have made it a rule to send those nominations to the Senators in whose States the persons are supposed to serve, or the area where they are supposed to serve, unless a Senator expressly says he is not interested; some have done. Of course, we cannot make them interested if they are not. We give the Senator an opportunity and a reasonable time, and I think Senators are not disinterested in those who serve, when they have an obligation by law to scrutinize the man and his talents, and either to approve or disapprove him. I have not had any serious delays in the subcommittee reporting the nominations promptly to the Committee on Military Affairs, and the Military Affairs reports them promptly to the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not complaining about the promptness or the lack of promptness on the part of the Committee on Military Affairs. I did not even mention that committee from that angle. I am talking about my own negligence, in connection with the matter. And a negligence that can be defended.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall yield in a moment. Mr. President, I have more than I can do at the present time in connection with the office of United States Senator. The State of Illinois has a population of seven and a half million and, so far as I can prevent it, I do not want any more nominations coming to my office and coming over my desk. I do not want the responsibility of having to write to my friends in Illinois asking them to look up John Jones, who has been chosen for some particular position, and give me his background and his history in order that I may intelligently pass upon him.

We are at war, Mr. President, and if we are to do what is proposed, and if we are to do it honestly and carefully, and conscientiously, we cannot merely lay these matters aside and say, "They are all right, so far as I am concerned. Push them through." If we assume the responsibility the bill says we should, we will do with these men the same as we should do with every other individual, so far as patronage is concerned—and that is how this bill will be looked upon by the public; make no mistake about it. Make no mistake about the bill, this is a bill which will tell the War Production Board, which will tell the Office of Defense Transportation, and all the other agencies of the Government, just whom they can and cannot appoint to important positions in the great war effort, and I am against the bill on that ground, if on no other.

No one can ever convince me that the bill will not delay and frustate the war effort, and I am more interested in that than I am in trying to keep some individual from being appointed at the head of the War Production Board in my State, or the head of the O. P. A. in my State, or to any other particular agency operating in my State.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield now?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. My reason for asking the Senator to yield a moment ago was to suggest something along the line he was discussing, that if the Senate takes the responsibility, it also assumes the obligation of discharging the responsibility. How many confirmations does the Senate now have; twenty-odd thousand?

Mr. McKELLAR. Forty-odd thousand.

Mr. HATCH. There are 40,000 or 50,000 nominations to be confirmed. There are only so many days in the year, and only so many hours in a day, and if a Senator rightfully discharged his obligation regarding nominations, he would do nothing else but investigate and report as to the qualifications of employees, not officers, in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to cast the slightest reflection on the integrity or the conclusion of any Senator who may disagree with the premise I have stated, that so long as we are in war against an enemy whose leaders have said that "Today there are two worlds, one the totalitarian and the other democratic, and one of them must break asunder," I am constrained to oppose every proposal suggested which in my opinion would frustrate or delay for one moment the hour of victory of the United Nations.

I am convinced that this type of legislation is one of the many legislative illusions which minimize our war efforts. If we do not give to the home front everything we can give in the way of legislative support, and if we hinder and delay and frustrate action on the home front, through adoption of such a legislative policy as is proposed by the pending bill, then ultimately such delay will find its way to the military front, and in my opinion will postpone the successful conclusion of the war. I am sure that if the war were not so far away from the Atlantic and the Pacific shores, we would not be considering a measure of this kind at this crucial hour.

I am not one of those who think, because of our great victory in Africa, because of the effective bombing which is going on in Germany at the present time, and because of our victories in the Pacific, that the war is going to be over in a short period of time, although I pray to God I am wrong. I am legislating today on the theory that the Germans hold Bermuda and that the Japs hold Hawaii, and I cannot legislate in any other way, as I see the awful catastrophe which confronts this great country of ours.

Mr. President, much has been said about the confirmation of the appointment of postmasters, rural-mail carriers, and others who are not policy-making officers of the Government. Such employees are used as an example of confirmation by the Senate, and that is, of course, exactly what we do here. I think I am fairly well acquainted with that situation also. Much as I regret to say so, every congressional district in my State outside Cook County, and some on the inside, are now represented by Republicans. Consequently, under the rules of the game established long ago most of the responsibility for the selection of postmasters and rural-mail carriers falls primarily upon the shoulders of the Senator from Illinois. I should like to have Senators see the long row of files in my office dealing with these two subjects alone, containing the voluminous amount of correspondence which has accumulated with respect to practically every postmaster, and a similar amount of correspondence with respect to practically every rural-mail carrier. These two outstanding examples of patronage alone demand more of a Senator's time than he should give to such a matter, and that is especially true when Senators have so many weighty problems upon their minds dealing with their Government as it affects the entire world.

Let it be said that I have made many valuable friends through appointments. I have also lost a great many friends through them. In appointing one postmaster one makes him his friend but loses the other eight who take the examination, because each and every one of them thinks he was entitled to the post office. Many applicants start a flood of letters to my office with every conceivable kind of argument. Obviously, to answer them requires much of a Senator's time. The point I make is that if we assume the task of confirming 38,000 more appointments and we give to those appointments the same amount of time we are compelled now to give to the appointment of postmasters

and rural mail carriers, Senators will be doing nothing but handling patronage jobs. I do not want to have to do anything like that.

Mr. President, if there ever was a time in the history of this Nation when United States Senators should avail themselves of every opportunity to study government and world affairs, it certainly is at this hour.

Not long ago the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was responsible for the appointment of a commitee to study post-war economic conditions. I am a member of that committee. I undertake to say that if I have to handle the thousands of additional appointments which may be involved in Illinois, if I should be obliged to continue to make investigations, and constantly to write to people about this individual and that individual in order intelligently to pass upon his qualifications, I shall not have any time to study post-war economic conditions. It is all I can do now to keep up the correspondence dealing with postmasters and rural mail carriers and other vital problems that affect the home front.

The military and civilian problems which have arisen throughout the Nation as a result of the present global conflict are of such enormity and perplexity that none of us can find the time to keep ourselves sufficiently informed as to all developments.

Many of these problems particularly affect one's own State and the people one represents. We have a duty, obligation, and responsibility to the States and their people, and of course we are glad to do what we can to aid them in their quest for information concerning important matters which affect their families, or their businesses, or their community.

Mr. President, I wish I might be able to divorce myself completely from all patronage matters in this great crisis. I say that with all the sincerity I possess. Then I would have some time, perhaps, to study such a bill as the one now before the Senate, rather than coming in here and listening to arguments concerning it, and then make the argument I am now making. Certainly I shall not vote for a measure which will place more patronage responsibility upon my shoulders, and that is all the pending measure would do. It makes no difference how much one clothes the discussion with constitutional arguments, when we get right down to brass tacks it is simply a question of wanting to control the appointments which are being made by the various bureaus.

Mr. President, when I make this statement, I do not mean to say that the heads of the various departments of government should not confer with United States Senators with respect to policy-making officials in their respective States. But certainly this measure goes far beyond anything of that kind, and if we are to set the limit at $4,500, as is done by the bill, then it seems to me we should include all appointments, and let the Senate do nothing but sit here day after day, week after week and investigate every $1,200 employee in the Government, and on up to those receiving $10,000 a year. In my humble judgment, that certainly will finally happen if once we move in this direction.

Mr. President, I think the bill should be defeated. I do not speak for any one else than myself, but I am confident that when the time comes that the President of the United States carefully analyzes the bill, or has some one analyze it for him to see what it will accomplish in the way of hindering and frustrating and delaying the war effort, it will meet with a prompt and vigorous veto.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gerry	Overton
Austin	Gillette	Pepper
Bailey	Guffey	Radcliffe
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hatch	Revercomb
Barbour	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Scrugham
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lodge	Tobey
Capper	Lucas	Truman
Caraway	McCarran	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Mead	Walsh
Davis	Millikin	White
Downey	Moore	Wiley
Eastland	Murray	Willis
Ellender	Nye	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SUPPLEMENTAL LEND-LEASE APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE AID

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, there is on the calendar an appropriation bill, House bill 2753, Calendar No. 270, making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, known as the Lend-Lease Act. Mr. Stettinius, the Director of the lend-lease, advises me that it is most urgent that the bill be passed today, if possible. Mr. Stettinius states that certain arrangements of the highest importance with Russia cannot be made or concluded until the bill is passed.

In view of the urgent situation, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the supplemental lend-lease appropriations bill be considered. If the Senate agrees to pursue such a course, it will mean, of course, that as soon as the appropriation bill is disposed of, the bill now pending will automatically come before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I take great pleasure in saying that I have no objection.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The bill to which the Senator has just referred is the same bill which was on the calendar yesterday, is it not?

Mr. HILL. It is, indeed; I will say to the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. It was on the calendar when the Senate convened today, was it not?

Mr. HILL. It was.

Mr. HATCH. Every Senator has had the right to move at any time to proceed to the consideration of the bill, has he not?

Mr. HILL. He has.

Mr. HATCH. I am a little confused about the parliamentary situation. Can the Senate act only by unanimous consent?

Mr. HILL. Is the Senator asking me that question?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator knows that a motion to consider any bill on the Calendar would be in order; and if a majority of the Senate were to agree to the motion, the bill would become the pending business of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Has any Senator expressed opposition to such a motion, if it were made?

Mr. HILL. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. HATCH. Does the Senator have any idea that there would be a single dissenting vote if such a motion were made?

Mr. HILL. I know of no such vote.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is almost ridiculous that an important war measure should be held up, and that the Senate should not act, when it had all the power necessary to act, because one Senator believed the proper procedure was to take up the all-important lend-lease bill first.

Mr. President, I will have no part in any procedure which would delay the war effort in the least. If Senators who have forced this action can gather any satisfaction to themselves from their course of action, that is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. President, I agree to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator for his very fine spirit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2753, a bill making supplemental lend-lease appropriations?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an

act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendment of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 4, line 16, after the word "thereby", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for the payment of any subsidy on agricultural products."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say that the measure is exactly as it was when the House passed it, with the exception of the proviso on page 4 which has just been read. The Senate committee struck out that proviso. I think it was put in by the House under a misapprehension as to what kind of a subsidy was proposed. Lend-lease does not pay subsidies and is not interested in subsidies. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

I believe that Senators understand this lend-lease measure. Lend-lease operations have been going on for more than 2 years. Lend-lease is an exceedingly important instrument in behalf of the war. I do not suppose any agency of Government except the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission has been more instrumental in carrying on the war than has the Lend-Lease Administration. Its work has been excellent. It has reported constantly, both to the President and to Congress. It has made a splendid record. All the information which has been asked for by either branch of Congress has been furnished fully, frankly, and carefully.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me suggest to the Senator that one of the reasons why the Lend-Lease Administration is so fortunate in the results it has achieved in obtaining the legislation it desires is the personality, tact, and high character of its administrator, Mr. Stettinius, who has won the confidence of all the committees of Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that is entirely true.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Before I yield let me say a word to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

Yesterday the Senator from Michigan asked the following question:

Have any new lend-lease agreements been made since the recent extension of the act; and, if so, may they be produced for our consideration?

The answer is, "No." There have not been any, and cannot be any until this bill is passed. The authorities are awaiting the passage of this bill, and it is exceedingly important that it be passed at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for his dependable reply to the question. I merely wish to observe, in case anyone connected with the Lend-Lease Administration is listening, that I hope if any new agreements are written those who write them will not ignore the unanimous, bipartisan observations of the Senate Finance Committee with respect to article VII, if they wish to avoid considerable annoyance the next time there is a lend-lease appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Personally, I do not know what article VII is; but I do know that the Lend-Lease Authority will fully and promptly follow the dictates of Congress in every particular.

Let me reply to the question which was asked by the Senator from New Hampshire, which was as follows:

What amount of money has been transferred from the Army and Navy to lend-lease operations?

Here is the answer——

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say to the Senator that I received the information this morning from lend-lease headquarters, but I think it should be stated for the RECORD.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it should be stated for the RECORD. I know that the Senator received the information.

This is the answer:

Of the approximately $11,000,000,000 of lend-lease aid that has been rendered, about 11 percent, or $1,200,000,000, represents finished munitions procured from appropriations to the Army and Navy.

Prior to the entry of the United States into the war, all appropriations for lend-lease purposes were made directly to the President, but since Pearl Harbor, in order to integrate the supply programs of our allies with the supply programs of the American Army and Navy, no lend-lease appropriations have been made to the President for finished munitions. However, there has been included in acts appropriating funds to the Army and Navy, the authority to transfer to lend-lease countries munitions procured from those appropriations up to a total dollar limit of $35,970,000,000. This means that the appropriations are primarily for the United States Army and Navy, but that a part of the munitions procured with the appropriations can, if the President deems wise, be transferred to lend-lease countries. The authority to make such transfers is exercised on behalf of the President by the Munitions Assignment Board, which determines in accordance with the broad strategy outlined by the Combined Chiefs of Staff whether munitions coming off the assembly line shall be retained by the United States Army and Navy or transferred to our allies.

None of the funds requested in the present appropriation bill is for finished munitions. There is, therefore, no duplication between the funds now being requested and the amount of transfer authority provided in the War and Navy Departments appropriations.

I hope that answer is satisfactory to the Senator.

Mr. TOBEY. It is. To recapitulate, the picture now is that about $34,700,000,000 in finished munitions are available for lend-lease to send to our allies overseas when, as, and if they need them.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, on page 3 of the bill there is provision for an appropriation slightly in excess of $6,000,000,000. Subsection (e) of section 1 provides as follows:

(e) Each of the foregoing appropriations shall be additional to, and consolidated with, the appropriations for the same purposes, contained in the same respective categories of appropriation in the Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941, the Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1942, and the Second Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1942,—

That subsection further provides:

and the appropriations contained in the foregoing acts, are hereby continued and shall be available until June 30, 1944.

I should be very glad to have the distinguished Senator from Tennessee advise us how much remains unused of those former appropriations, which may be added to the $6,000,000,000 proposed to be appropriated by this bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will see from the report of the committee that $2,057,496,000 is the amount which will be reappropriated under that provision.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Making a total, I take it, of something in excess of $8,000,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me ask a further question. On page 2, under subsection (b) of section 1, there is provision for an appropriation of some $259,000,000—

For testing, inspecting, proving, repairing, outfitting, reconditioning, or otherwise placing in good working order any defense articles for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, including services and expenses in connection therewith.

Am I to understand that Lend-Lease is attempting to underwrite the repair of machines of war in the hands of our allies?

Mr. McKELLAR. When the President determines that it is for the best interests of the United States, or is vital to the defense of the United States, he then undertakes to furnish the money for repairs to certain vessels and other instrumentalities of war, as may be necessary.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand that we furnish articles of war, such as munitions and other equipment; but are we undertaking to repair them in the hands of our allies? Are we to bear that expense?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. That has been done in a number of cases, I am sure.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And that is the purpose of this provision?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the purpose of that appropriation. Are there any further questions?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Several days ago I received a letter from a constituent in Raleigh, the capital of my State, in which he stated that he had been given to understand by some radio commentators and newspaper columnists, and from what he had read and heard, that under lend-lease Great Britain is giving us more than we are giving her.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; that is not correct.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Is that not correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. However, Great Britain has furnished to the United States quite a large amount of tonnage of various materials, and quite a good deal of help.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Can the Senator tell me, in dollars and cents, how much we have given to Great Britain under lend-lease, and how much she has given us? What is the difference? Have we given her more than she has given us, or has she given us more than we have given her?

Mr. McKELLAR. We have given her more than she has given us. At the moment I cannot furnish the amount in dollars and cents.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Can the Senator give it in pounds?

Mr. McKELLAR. This is a statement of where lend-lease aid is going:

The total lend-lease aid, including both goods and services, has been distributed by areas as follows:

United Kingdom, $4,430,000,000.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, $1,826,000,000.

Africa and the Middle East, $1,573,000,000.

China, India, Australia, and New Zealand, $1,344,000,000.

Other areas, $459,000,000.

That is the way it has been distributed.

Mr. REYNOLDS. What is the total?

Mr. McKELLAR. The total is about $11,000,000,000 to date.

Lease-lend shipments to the United Kingdom totalled $3,116,000,000 from March 11, 1941, to April 1, 1943.

Shipments of essential supplies to the United Kingdom which were purchased for cash totalled $1,400,000,000 in the same period.

In the last 3 months lend-lease shipments to the United Kingdom were 40 percent of lend-lease exports to all areas.

With reference to the amount in ship tons which we received from Great Britain, I quote from the lend-lease report, as follows:

American forces in the British Isles are receiving almost all the supplies and services that can be provided on the spot as reverse lend-lease, without payment by us. Such aid is furnished through local supply offices at hundreds of airfields, camps, and bases throughout the British Isles. The following table shows the estimated quantities, in ship tons provided to the various services of the United States Army in the United Kingdom from June 1, 1942, to April 1, 1943.

Articles and equipment:	*In ship tons*
Engineer Corps	249,471
Quartermaster Corps	731,301
Signal Corps	7,371
Ordnance Department	115,716
Transportation Corps	3,757
Medical Corps	85,983
Air Force	139,541
Miscellaneous Supplies	29,541
Total	1,362,681

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of what do the materials consist?

Mr. McKELLAR. Various kinds of materials for the Engineer Corps, the Quartermaster Corps, the Signal Corps, the Ordnance Department, the Transportation Corps, the Medical Corps, and the Air Force, and miscellaneous supplies.

Of course, it is not anything like the amount we have given to the British. If I remember correctly, it is about 20 percent of the amount we have furnished them. However, it is a considerable item, and I believe Great Britain has done very well to furnish that much. The committee was exceedingly well pleased with the statement furnished us by the Lend-Lease Administration.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In other words, we have given them about five times as much as they have given us.

Mr. McKELLAR. Four or five times as much.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wish to have the matter made clear, because I wish to know how to answer the gentleman who wrote me about it. As I stated a moment ago, he said that he had been told that they had given us much more than we had given them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The truth of the matter is that we have given them about five times as much as we have received from them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. So many rumors fly around that at times one does not know where he really is. I have heard—although I cannot believe it is true—that in the lend-lease business in which we are engaged, when we give them something here on our shores they take it aboard their ships and charge us for carrying it to their shores. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot answer that question. We had no evidence before the committee upon that point. I shall be very glad to look it up.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should like to know the truth about it, because I cannot believe the statement to which I refer.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will give the Senator the information later, but I cannot do so at the present time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think I can assure the Senator that the information which he has received is not correct.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I could not believe the statement when I heard it. I cannot understand why they should charge us for transporting to their shores supplies and materials furnished by us.

Mr. HILL. I think I can assure the Senator that that is not true.

Mr. McKELLAR. There was no evidence on that subject before the committee. Of course, we all realize that the problem of transporting war supplies, food, and goods in general across the ocean is a serious one at this time, and we have to resort to all kinds of arrangements in order to have the goods transported to foreign shores.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In connection with the perilous trips across the ocean, does Great Britain take title to the goods here, or does she wait until she gets them across the ocean? If a ship carrying several hundred tons of goods is sunk is that our loss or Great Britain's loss?

Mr. McKELLAR. There was no testimony furnished the committee on that point. The question was not asked by the committee, and I cannot give the Senator an answer to his question. As in so many other instances, there are a great many rumors which are not true.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I was wondering who would take the loss, and whether Great Britain takes title to the property here or after it has been transported across the ocean.

Mr. CONNALLY. That would depend on whether delivery had been made, would it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. The delivery would be made where they assume charge of the goods.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Is delivery made to them on our shores or after the goods have been transported to their shores?

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot say. That is a very difficult question to answer. I shall have to look into it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Can the Senator tell me with how many countries we now have lend-lease arrangements?

Mr. McKELLAR. My recollection is that we have such arrangements with approximately 44 countries.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have heard that we are sending goods to 70 countries.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have the proof in the lend-lease report.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Does the Senator have the names of those countries?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I have the names. I can give them to the Senator.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The Senator has said that the number is 44. Does that include the Central and South American countries?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to read their names.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not wish to take the time of the Senator to read them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table from the report to Congress on lend-lease operations for the period ended April 30, 1943, showing the status of lend-lease countries and United Nations with respect to lend-lease arrangements.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPENDIX III.—*Status of nations, lend-lease countries and United Nations—Dates of signing of agreements.*

Country	Declared eligible for lend-lease aid	Lend-lease agreement signed	Reciprocal lend-lease agreement signed	United Nations declaration signed
Argentina	May 6, 1941			
Australia	Nov. 11, 1941	Feb. 23, 1942	Sept. 3, 1942	Jan. 1, 1942
Belgium	June 13, 1941	June 16, 1942	Jan. 30, 1943	Do.
Bolivia	May 6, 1941	Dec. 6, 1941		
Brazil	do	Mar. 3, 1942		Feb. 6, 1943
Canada	Nov. 11, 1941			Jan. 1, 1942
Chile	May 6, 1941	Mar. 2, 1943		
China	do	June 2, 1942		Jan. 1, 1942
Colombia	do	Mar. 17, 1942		
Costa Rica	do	Jan. 16, 1942		Jan. 1, 1942
Cuba	do	Nov. 7, 1941		Do.
Czechoslovakia	Jan. 5, 1942	July 11, 1942		Do.
Dominican Republic	May 6, 1941	Aug. 2, 1941		Do.
Ecuador	do	Apr. 6, 1942		
Egypt	Nov. 11, 1941			
El Salvador	May 6, 1941	Feb. 2, 1942		Jan. 1, 1942
Ethiopia	Dec. 7, 1942			Oct. 9, 1942
Fighting France	Nov. 11, 1941		Sept. 3, 1942	
Greece	Mar. 11, 1941	July 10, 1942		Jan. 1, 1942
Guatemala	May 6, 1941	Nov. 16, 1942		Do.
Haiti	do	Sept. 16, 1941		Do.
Honduras	do	Feb. 28, 1942		Do.
Iceland	July 1, 1941	Nov. 21, 1941		
India	Nov. 11, 1941			Jan. 1, 1942
Iran	Mar. 10, 1942			
Iraq	May 1, 1942			Jan. 16, 1943
Liberia	Mar. 10, 1942			
Luxembourg				Jan. 1, 1942
Mexico	May 6, 1941	Mar. 18, 1943		June 5, 1942
Netherlands	Aug. 21, 1941	July 8, 1942		Jan. 1, 1942
New Zealand	Nov. 11, 1941	Feb. 23, 1942	Sept. 3, 1942	Do.
Nicaragua	May 6, 1941	Oct. 16, 1941		Do.
Norway	June 4, 1941	July 11, 1942		Do.
Panama	May 6, 1941			Do.
Paraguay	do	Sept. 20, 1941		
Peru	do	Mar. 11, 1942		
Philippines				June 10, 1942
Poland	Aug. 28, 1941	July 1, 1942		Jan. 1, 1942
Saudi Arabia	Feb. 18, 1943			
South Africa	Nov. 11, 1941			Jan. 1, 1942
Turkey	Nov. 7, 1941			
United Kingdom	Mar. 11, 1941	Feb. 23, 1942	Sept. 3, 1942	Jan. 1, 1942
United States				Do.
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Nov. 7, 1941	June 11, 1942		Do.
Uruguay	May 6, 1941	Jan. 13, 1942		
Venezuela	do	Mar. 18, 1942		
Yugoslavia	Nov. 11, 1941	July 24, 1942		Jan. 1, 1942

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much.

I have one further question. Under the lend-lease arrangements with Great Britain, what is the understanding with respect to return payment? How does Great Britain expect to pay us back for the difference between the balances? Does the Senator know the answer to that question? Has there been any discussion on the subject in the committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it would require omniscience to answer that question; and I am not omniscient.

Mr. REYNOLDS. There is one other question which I wish to ask the Senator. We are providing lend-lease supplies to various countries in Central and South America. Does the Senator know what sort of an arrangement we have with the countries of Central and South America for them to repay us for what we are doing for them under lend-lease?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not. However, I know that we have furnished aid under lend-lease to various South American countries. In my judgment, probably no aid that we have rendered has been of more vital importance, or more in the interest of this country than that which we have furnished our neighbors in South and Central America. I think our leaders have managed that matter exceedingly well, and I believe the American people will approve absolutely what has been done. We had a very difficult situation, as the Senator from North Carolina and every other Senator knows, and I think it has been managed admirably.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The reason I made inquiry about it is that in my State of North Carolina, as in the State of the able Senator from Tennessee, a great deal of cotton is produced, and in my State the chief industry is that of processing cotton textiles. It has been my observation that all the Central and South American republics are rapidly developing a textile industry, and I have understood that some of our lend-lease aid to South American countries has been for the development of their textile plants in competition with our plants in North Carolina. Of course, if that is so, I do not like it at all, because I am primarily interested in the people of North Carolina, and I do not want any other country being developed at the expense of the taxpayers of America and in competition with the producers of North Carolina. If it be true that lend-lease is providing funds for South American countries to develop their textile plants in competition with North Carolina textile plants, I want to protest against it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator should first find out whether it is true. I do not think it is true.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I was asking the Senator for information. I did not have the privilege of going before the committee, or at least, while I had the privilege, I was not there, and I thought perhaps, the matter was discussed in the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure that what the Senator suggests is not true. In the next place, I believe that whatever is done, is done to help the war effort in such a way as not to hurt our own country.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I was wondering in regard to the South American situation to which I referred.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I was going to say that I think I can assure the Senator from North Carolina that the acting chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee is absolutely right and that what the Senator from Tennessee suggests has not taken place.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I take the Senator's word for anything, but I wanted to find out, because I am particularly interested in my constituents since I have a campaign coming on next year. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not a campaign coming on next year, but I am very much interested in the same matter.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I noticed the other day that we had agreed to let Brazil have $50,000,000 for the purpose of developing her iron deposits. I wonder if that went under lend-lease?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, I am sure it did not.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I know it has not been discussed for a number of years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice in the Report to Congress on lease-lend operations, appendix 3, page 42, the countries that are receiving lend-lease aid are listed, and I notice that Canada has no lend-lease agreement with this country. Can the Senator tell us why?

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to be perfectly frank, and I really do not know.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator tell us how much in the way of goods is obtained from Canada and then sent to England under a lend-lease agreement?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will excuse me, may I ask him to repeat his question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator tell us how much in the form of goods is shipped from Canada to this country and then sent to England under lend-lease agreements?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know of any such goods. There was no proof before the committee that any such goods were sent from Canada to this country and then transshipped under lend-lease to the United Kingdom or Great Britain.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice in the table to which I have referred the third column indicates the dates when lend-lease agreements were signed and the next column shows the countries that

have signed reciprocal lend-lease agreements. What is meant by reciprocal lend-lease agreements?

Mr. McKELLAR. It means what it says. Australia and Belgium, that is, that portion of Belgium not controlled by the Germans, have signed such agreements, and also fighting France, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does it not mean that those countries that have signed that have signed lend-lease agreements but have not signed reciprocal lend-lease agreements do not have to give back in proportion to what they receive of anything to offset what they received from the United States? Let us take the Netherlands; it appears that the lend-lease agreement with that country was signed under date of July 8, 1942. There was no reciprocal lend-lease agreement signed. The Netherlands controls large oil interests throughout South America, and I am wondering if the Netherlands furnishes us any oil in order to offset any goods which we in turn supply to her?

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot say because there was no evidence before the committee on that subject.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. So far as Canada is concerned, on page 31 the Senator will find at the bottom of the page the following statement:

> Canada does not receive lend-lease aid from the United States. She buys munitions and other supplies from us and we buy other types of munitions and materials from her for cash. However, some lend-lease supplies are exported to Canada for the use of other United Nations' forces in training there. We have, for example, sent more than 1,000 trainer planes to Canada for British Royal Air Force, Norwegian, Polish, and other student pilot units. Other lend-lease exports to Canada consist of supplies sent for transshipment, principally partially fabricated munitions items on which production is completed in Canadian plants. The finished products are then sent on from Canada to the United Kingdom, Russia, the Middle East or the Far East, and thus do not appear in the records of United States exports to these areas.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was aware of that language, but I understood that we obtained a considerable quantity of goods from Canada and then transshipped them to England under lease-lend. That was what I was attempting to elicit from the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. There was no testimony about that, and I am sure the Senator is mistaken regarding it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am asking for information. I do not know.

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot give the exact information, as there was no proof concerning that before the committee, and I have no document here which gives the information. I am quite sure, I will say to the Senator, that that is not correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that we are purchasing from British Guiana, and, I think, from Dutch Guiana, about 60 percent or more of our bauxite requirements. I am wondering if we pay cash for it or if we get any credit?

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator a question about that. Is it purchased through the B. E. W., the Board of Economic Warfare?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure it is, if it is purchased, and, therefore, it would not come under lend-lease at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am wondering why it should not. Here is an opportunity, it strikes me, where the English could certainly offset to a large extent some of the cost of goods we are sending to them, and the same thing would apply to the Netherlands. It is my information that the Netherlands is in control of or is purchasing much oil in South America and in several islands in that area, and we are paying out good cash for that oil, and at the same time we are sending to the Netherlands much in the way of goods. I am wondering why it is that a reciprocal lease-lend agreement has not been signed by the Netherlands.

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a great many of the materials which come from South and Central America particularly are bought by the R. F. C., or some of its subsidiaries. For example, materials worth about $450,000,000 have been bought by the R. F. C. for our own use and also for our allies, which are not included in the lend-lease account, because they are straight-out purchases by our Government through the medium of the R. F. C.

Mr. President, that brings up the thought that there should be some place in the Government where a master set of books is kept with all countries with which we have lend-lease agreements, either reciprocal, or one way, or whatever they may be, so that when the war is over at least we may have a picture of what has taken place.

Outside Lend-Lease, and the R. F. C. and the Director of Inter-American Affairs, which also spends money in Central and South America, the Army and Navy have lend-lease transactions in munitions, which have amounted to about a billion and a half dollars, according to my figures, and I shall later put the correct figures in the RECORD. Those things do not come through the Lend-Lease Administrator at all, but they are lend-lease in munitions, and air bases, sea bases, docks, and installations. When this matter was brought up in the committee, Mr. Stettinius, the Administrator, said he would get in touch with the Army and the Navy and with the other agencies and attempt to elicit information as to this matter so that in the future the Congress would have an over-all picture of all gifts, or grants, or whatever we may call them, which have been flowing not only from lend-lease, but from other agencies, to foreign countries associated with us in the war.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the purchases in South America and elsewhere spoken of by the Senator are purchases which are made by the Board of Economic Warfare for different purposes, and that Lend-Lease does not take part in those purchases, and they are not on their books.

The Senator from Maryland is correct, Mr. Stettinius was asked those questions by the Senator, and he very cordially joined in the view that there should be books, and that there should be an over-all record kept of everything.

Mr. ELLENDER. The fact remains, however, as I am sure the Senator will admit, that agencies of our Government are buying from England materials which are really located in South America, but are owned and controlled by England. We are giving cash for them, and the materials are brought back to this country and manufactured, and then transported to England, without offsetting any of the purchase price of the raw material.

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot tell the Senator about that, and I do not think any human being on this earth can tell him. I wish to indicate to him why I make that statement. It is because I find that while those of us on the Committee on Appropriations are working night and day to provide appropriations, my good friend Jesse Jones, with the R. F. C., under authority given him by the Congress, is appropriating about one-fourth or one-third as much money as the Congress is appropriating. So heaven knows who is buying. I think there are dozens of organizations under the R. F. C. which are using money as they please in the war effort, without any respect to Congress, without any regard to whether or not it is appropriated by the Congress. What we do is to give the R. F. C. the power to issue bonds, and they spend the money as they please, without reference to any appropriations made by the Congress. I think that is very unfortunate, I think it is very unwise legislation, and I am glad the Senator has brought the matter up so that I could make this statement to the Senate.

I believe that situation should be corrected. I think appropriations should come from the Congress, as required by the Constitution. I do not believe we should have a dozen agencies appropriating money in the war effort or any other effort of the Government.

Lend-lease, however, has nothing to do with that. Lend-lease comes before the Congress in the proper way. It comes before the Committee on Appropriations, asks for what it wants in the war effort, explains why it needs the money, gives all the facts openly and above board, and Congress thereupon appropriates the money, just as we are doing in the pending bill. Every other agency of the

Government, in my humble judgment, should follow the same course. There should not be a score or more of independent offices appropriating money daily for things we know nothing about and making no report to the Congress.

I learned only a few days ago, in an examination before the Economy Committee, of tremendous sums spent which I did not know anything about, and I do not think any other Senator knew anything about them, because it was purely by accident, and not through the regular course of duty, that it was discovered. I think that should be stopped.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when the renewal of the lease-lend came up for consideration before the Senate I asked several questions seeking to elicit from the Senator from Texas whether he could indicate in dollars and cents the amount England has given this country in order to offset what we have let them have under the lease-lend agreement. I never saw the figures, and I doubt if the figures have been presented to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. My recollection of that is that they were presented to us, but I do not think they appear in the record, I think they were given off the record. My recollection is that the amount was $1,200,000,000, but I should have to examine the record again in order to be certain about it, and I will do so, in answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. ELLENDER. It strikes me that since we have a reciprocal lease-lend agreement with Great Britain, Mr. Stettinius, who heads our Lease-Lend, should at once look into this matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me point out to the Senator from Louisiana that our armed services have spent in British territory $833,000,000 in building air fields, installations, houses, and semipermanent arrangements, which are not a part of lend-lease. I do not say this in criticism of our armed services, because in many of the cases perhaps the national safety warranted the expenditure of the money before any agreement could be worked out. I mention it only for the purpose of showing the Senator that, even when the lease-lend picture is before us, there have been almost a billion dollars additional spent in British territory.

Mr. ELLENDER. And that does not come under lend-lease.

Mr. TYDINGS. It does not come under lend-lease, and that is one of the reasons why I think Britain could give us the bases in the West Indies permanently in exchange for those expenditures, because those bases could be used only in an attack on or defense of the United States, as they lie close to our coasts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say, in reply to the Senator from Maryland, that I hope we will not go into the question of bases in connection with the pending appropriation bill. They are handled under a policy of the Government which is legislative and executive entirely, and does not come under the head of appropriations.

Mr. President, I am quite sure that the Office of Lend-Lease Administration is carrying out, in the best way possible, the law as Congress passed it, and I think every member of our committee who was present and heard the testimony given by representatives of the Lend-Lease Administration has come to the same conclusion.

The Senator from Louisiana a few moments ago asked about what we are buying from the Netherlands Government and what we are sending to the Netherlands Government. We are sending nothing to the Netherlands Government under lend-lease which is not being paid for in cash, except finished munitions.

I also wish to say to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] that the Lend-Lease Administration has provided no aid to any South or Central American country except in the way of munitions. What the Lend-Lease Administration is doing is done for the purpose of carrying on the war. We are not interfering with the internal arrangements of other countries. In our lend-lease dealings we are not interfering with the local situation in other countries or with the administrations in other countries. What we are doing is to help the war effort by furnishing munitions and other implements and articles of war which will help us win at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. President, if I may be excused for saying it, after having had representatives of the Lend-Lease Administration before our committee many times, I have become greatly impressed with their desire to carry out the lend-lease law in the best way they can, and while they no doubt are making mistakes—everyone makes mistakes—still they are doing a good job.

Mr. President, if there are no other questions to be asked regarding this measure, I hope we may have a vote on it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to make a few observations. I thought I would not make any, but the turn which the discussion in the Senate takes every time the question of lend-lease is brought up is, as I see it, a bit discouraging.

Early in 1941, almost a year before Pearl Harbor, Congress considered lend-lease. The bill, I believe, was actually passed and approved by the President on March 11, 1941. Everyone who is at all conversant with the facts knows very well that the dollar exchange in this country of those nations which are now fighting the war on our side was practically exhausted. It was rapidly reaching the vanishing point. Everyone who is familiar with what took place after the passage of the lend-lease measure, allowing for a great deal of waste, allowing for a great deal of mismanagement, allowing for a great deal of incompetency, if you please—if there has been waste, mismanagement, and incompetency in the handling of lend-lease funds—must know that through the passage of the lend-lease measure we are at least half a year, if not a full year farther advanced toward the final conclusion of the war, whenever it may be that the war shall end. This Nation is spending today at the rate of approximately $8,000,000,000 a month, and if lend-lease did nothing more than shorten the war by 12 months, or by 6 months, it would pay back in dollars and cents considerably more than the entire appropriation made for lend-lease, to say nothing of the blood of our men which will be saved if the war is brought to an end 6 months or 12 months earlier than it otherwise would come to an end.

Mr. President, when we had the lend-lease measure before us I, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, had the honor to conduct the hearings on it. I had the honor to champion in a small way the passage of the lend-lease measure through the Senate. There was an honest difference of view at that time on the part of many Senators with respect to the advisability of the lend-lease program. Many Senators feared—and I entirely respect the views of those Senators—that the passage of the measure and the operations which would necessarily flow from it, would have a tendency to and would actually take us into the war. That time is past. Who was right or who was wrong upon that important question is not now, it seems to me, a proper subject of discussion. The fact remains that with lend-lease, and perhaps without lend-lease, Pearl Harbor would have come; Japan would have struck us in the back on that fateful December morning, with or without lend-lease, but beyond the peradventure of a doubt we were some 12 months further advanced in our capacity to manufacture the munitions and the engines of war.

So, Mr. President, I should like to say now that I am not concerned with any accounting between us and the nations which are fighting on our side. I do not greatly care, except for the sake of the complete record, whether a balance is ever struck. I am conscious of the fact that there might not have been any other cotton mills in my State or in any other State if we had not met this issue in the way we did. I am convinced that if we had not made the preparations in the expansion of our plants, if we had not made the preparations which we made in those precious months when we were buying time, if you please, against the fateful hour of attack, the war would have to continue a year longer; and it costs us $100,000,000,000 every year to fight this war, and it will cost us an untold number of human lives, the lives of the best men we have in the Nation.

Mr. President, I am not worried about some waste in Lend-Lease Administration. Under its present management, I have the feeling that it has been most efficiently handled, but I am not concerned about some mismanagement and some failure to compel the countries with which we are obliged to deal at this time to pay us back before we allow them to have the things which are necessary.

How can we place a value upon the good will, and cooperation, and the actual willingness to fight by our side of all our South American neighbors? How can we estimate the good will and the willingness to die in our behalf on the part of all those nations that are fighting on our side? Does anyone expect that China will ever be able to pay us back? Yet how can we estimate the value of China, how can we estimate the value of the blood China is spilling in holding back in the Pacific the most treacherous enemy this Nation has ever had?

Here are the facts, if they are wanted: There is not an informed person anywhere who cannot reach the conclusion, and who is not compelled to reach the conclusion, if he deals frankly with the situation, that even if we have shortened this war by only 6 months we have cut down our expenditures, at the present rate, by $48,000,000,000, not by a mere $11,000,000,000; and in the blood of our men, in the tears of their mothers, we have saved more than can ever be estimated.

I do not defend everything which may have been done under lend-lease—far from it, although I know of very little that has not been done properly. However, I am not stopping to analyze and examine with a microscope all the steps which may have been taken by conscientious men when the lend-lease program was first under consideration.

I desire now to pay my respects to one, a member of the Cabinet, a man who is not of my political faith—I refer to the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, the Secretary of War—who had a deeper interest, who had a more profound conception of precisely what lend-lease meant, than did almost any other man in our Government. I remember with what devotion he fought, day and night, against what he thought would be crippling provisions in the Lend-Lease Act, because he realized, as all America should realize, that the lend-lease program was the very heart of our contribution in the defense of the free nations of the earth until we reached the hour when we were called upon to spill our blood in behalf of the great cause in which we were compelled to take up arms.

Mr. President, it is natural and commendable to scrutinize the expenditures made by all agencies of government; and it is easy to examine the lend-lease operations and find out that so much money has been given here and so much aid there, and to raise a question about whether the expenditures were necessary or proper. However, before we do that we should realize that, against the $11,000,000,000 we have spent under lend-lease, and against the additional $11,000,000,000 we may spend, or the twice $11,000,000,000 we may spend, we have saved, in mere dollars and cents, more than lend-lease has cost, that probably we have sustained the faltering lines, both on the east and on the west, of our chief Axis enemies, that probably we have supported them, and that, but for lend-lease, they might have had to give up the fight before the hour came for the attack upon us. Let anyone recall the time when the three Axis Powers entered into their compact, and let him know for a certainty that somewhere in the future lay the day and hour of attack upon us by one or more of the members of the Axis group.

So, Mr. President, if ever there was a step taken by the American Congress, if ever there was an appropriation, for which I could vote in all good conscience, it was the step we took in passing the Lend-Lease Act and the appropriation of every sum of money we have appropriated under that act.

I thought I should like to make this statement, Mr. President, because I think the historians of the future will recognize that the date of the signing of the lend-lease bill and the commencement of the course of action which our President then took, and has steadfastly followed, was the day on which the Axis Powers were defeated.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with a great deal of what has been said by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia. I, myself, voted for the lend-lease bill before we got into the war. I voted for it as an insurance policy against our becoming involved in the war, more than for any other purpose. I voted for it, in part, because I felt that the countries attacked by the Axis Powers were less at fault, were the innocents, so to speak, and deserved the support of fair-minded mankind.

As I understand the pending question, the issue whether lend-lease was a good thing or a bad thing is not involved in the present debate. Only a short time ago the lend-lease law was reenacted; and, if my recollection serves me correctly, it passed with no votes against it in this body.

What is now before us is an appropriation bill. It is the duty of Congress to examine that appropriation bill, the activities which have heretofore taken place, the purposes for which the money was appropriated, the ends to which it has been used, and from the whole picture to determine the wisdom of continuing in whole or in part, or even to a greater extent, the lend-lease activities provided by the pending bill.

Therefore, I point out, as an advocate of lend-lease, as one who has never failed to give it his support, that I have no quarrel at all with its philosophy. I agree with the Senator from Georgia that if we can shorten the war by a year or 6 months, or, I shall say even 6 minutes, the wisdom of lend-lease can be defended, because it will mean the saving of a great many American lives.

However, in spite of all the humanities of the equation, it would be unwise for this country or for the Congress not to keep an eye on lend-lease appropriations, just as it keeps an eye on the appropriations for our own Army and Navy, and from time to time to ascertain whether lend-lease and lend-lease in reverse, which is the Siamese twin of our lend-lease policy, are receiving the consideration which the sacrifices of Senators' sons and the sons of their constituents merit in all the circumstances, considering that lend-lease was passed 9 months before this country entered the war, and, in the eloquent language of the distinguished Prime Minister of Great Britain, was the most generous act ever performed by any government in the history of the world.

What is lend-lease? First of all, under lend-lease authorizations some $18,410,000,000 was made available to the Lend-Lease Administrator; but in addition to that authorization the War Department, in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, the Fourth Supplemental Appropriation Act, the Fifth Supplemental Appropriation Act, and the Sixth Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1942, and the Military Appropriation Act of 1943, was given additional billions of dollars for lend-lease purposes. So the total sum given to the Lend-Lease Administrator and to the Army and Navy amounts to $35,907,000,000.

When Mr. Stettinius appeared before the Appropriations Committee and gave us a very detailed, and I thought a very frank account of his stewardship, I asked him if he was conversant with the expenditures of the War and Navy Departments in certain fields of military activity outside the United States. He said he had only a general picture of it, but he went on to say that he thought it wise—as I do—that somewhere in this Government there should be a master set of books which would show all the ramifications of the whole lend-lease program, not only his part of it, but the War Department's part of it, the Navy Department's part of it, and such other parts of it as might be pertinent.

I wish to digress and read some of the expenditures of the War Department. As these bits of information are confidential and secret, I shall substitute letters of the alphabet—not an uncommon practice in Washington—for the names of the countries so that no military information will leak out:

Country A, $24,000,000; a South American country; for airports, sea bases, and appurtenant facilities, built with American funds and with American material and equipment. American administrative employees and natives of A comprised approximately 85 percent of the employees.

Country B, $1,900,000 for airports, sea bases, and appurtenant facilities; built with American funds and American materials and equipment; American administrative employees; native labor in country B furnished approximately 85 percent of the employees.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, the Senator is now reading expenditures made by the War Department and not by the Lend-Lease Administration.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct; and I am bringing it out only to show that this thing called global war, so far as appropriations and expenditures are concerned, ought to receive the constant scrutiny of the Congress of the United

States, not only from the time Lend-Lease was originally enacted, but through all subsequent appropriations. I think it only wise, in view of what I consider the willingness of our country to give—and I believe it is most willing to give everything it humanly can to our allies and to others associated with us—to examine the counter-picture and, where opportunity exists, to see if the willingness is reciprocated to an equal degree. If that be "small" I am sorry; but I do not believe it is.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and in a few minutes I hope he will be made a member of the conference committee which will consider this question in conference.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall support the bill on the floor and in conference. I am thoroughly in favor of it, as the Senator knows.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know the Senator is. What I was about to say is that the Senator realizes that none of the other countries can reciprocate with the same ease and facility with which we have given.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will come to that. I do not agree with that statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will also recall that the testimony before our committee was that Great Britain has been very careful to reciprocate whenever she could, and is doing more as time goes on, and as conditions improve. The same statement applies to other countries.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not yet come to Great Britain.

The first country to which I referred was country A. I note that we spent $24,000,000 on airports there. I also note that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bought $24,858,000 worth of critical materials from that country. As the airports and facilities are either permanent or semipermanent, it occurred to me that there might have been a little lease-lend in reverse in that situation, in which we paid both ways. If lend-lease, as I know it exists in this country, is to be encased and clothed in a cloak of unstinted generosity, when we are viewing this global war, I do not see why that garment cannot be made the international mode of dress to a greater extent than appears to be the case up to the present, from an examination, not of a part of the figures, but of all the figures.

I use that comparison only by way of illustration. I could prove the case in many other instances. In addition to paying all the bills, we have paid in full for all the materials we have purchased from countries which have been the beneficiaries of our foreign construction.

Country C, $840,000 for the same purposes.

Country D, $380,000 for the same purposes.

Country E, $220,000 for the same purposes.

Country F, one of the countries mentioned in the debate, which was paying cash for everything awhile back, but whose name I will not now mention, $5,300,000. Eighty-five percent of the labor in that particular case consisted of nationals of the beneficiary country, and the United States paid the whole bill.

Country G, $17,100,000. The same situation existed.

Country H, $830,000. The same situation existed.

County I, $4,200,000. The same situation existed.

Country J, $780,000. The same situation existed.

Country K, $2,100,00. In all these instances the situation with respect to labor was the same, so from now on I shall simply read the countries and the amounts, in order to save time.

Country K, $8,300,000.

Country L, $16,000,000.

Country M, $330,000.

A group of countries, $21,200,000; another operation in the same group of countries, $16,000,000.

An island not far from continental United States, $24,500,000; another island, $1,900,000; another island, $360,000; another island, $11,300,000; another island, $33,300,000; another island, $15,700,000; another island, $4,900,000; another one, $2,500,000.

Another one, $3,500,000; another one, $19,700,000; another one, $95,000,000; another one, $189,000,000; another one, $168,000,000.

That is not chicken feed, Mr. President.

Another one, $62,000,000; another one, $51,000,000; another one, $23,000,000; another island, $80,000,000; another island, $25,000,000; another island, $3,300,000; another island, $100,000,000.

There are several places with reference to which the amount of money is not stated, but where a description is presented of the work done.

I took the Army and Navy figures—and I have read only the Army figures because those relating to the Navy are comparatively small—and for the most part, the Navy's construction has been in places where there was nothing else to do, as it can well be imagined, and the total is nearly a billion and a half dollars. Of this amount almost $800,000,000 was spent in territory of the British Empire. None of this appears in the lend-lease picture. The labor was all furnished locally by British subjects. Eighty-five percent of the common labor was so furnished in practically every case, and we paid the whole bill. That was all right with me. But if these countries were furnishing 85 percent of the labor, it seems to me that at least they might have made that as a contribution when the work was done on their own soil, and when we were most generous in lives, as well as in money, in protecting many of the countries—the names of which I have disguised by using letters of the alphabet—from the threat of invasion, or of being conquered.

I find that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has spent $432,690,000 in the purchase of materials in Central and South America. In many of the countries where these works were installed, 85 percent of the labor used consisted of nationals of the country in which the installations were made. We paid for all the labor and, at wartime prices, bought these critical materials.

There is another angle to this picture. Who is to pay for this? Senators, our sons who are on the battlefield today are going to pay for it. I agree with my distinguished friend from Georgia. Some of these men will return, and the liquidation of this debt will be an obligation which they will have to carry for the remainder of their lives. It will require as much money merely to pay the interest on our national debt as was raised by this Government for all purposes every year from 1930 to 1940. That is merely for interest alone.

I think we owe those men something. I do not mean that lend-lease should be discontinued. I do not mean that it was wrong then or now. I think it was right then, and I think it is right now. However, I think we owe it to those who are going to the theaters of war as fast as ships can take them, as well as to those who are already there, that we give a good accounting of our stewardship, and while we have been and will be generous, to make sure that we have kept the faith with them in this body in the same way they are keeping the faith with us everywhere in the world.

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought the Senator was through.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I shall not conclude for some time.

Mr. President, our work does not stop there. We have entered into various good-will activities, with which I am in accord, and I find that we have spent $21,000,000 for health and sanitation in countries of the Western Hemisphere. That was a fine good-will gesture, but the boys on the fighting fronts will be required to pay that $21,000,000 when they return home. The extent to which we have placed an unbearable and additional load on their shoulders without good reason constitutes, in my judgment, a betrayal of them.

Mr. President, lend-lease should be, in the very nature of things, not a matter of equality of payments because it cannot be, and no sensible man would demand, that books be kept on that basis. But there should be, insofar as there can be, a willingness to reciprocate for the generosity of this great powerful and rich country which has so willingly and rightfully, in my judgment, poured out its abundance in order to help shorten this bloody struggle, and save first of all the lives of our citizens, although many of them have already made the supreme sacrifice.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is there any part of the $21,000,000, to which the Senator referred, for health and sanitation, which was expended for any purpose except to obtain rubber in South America?

Mr. TYDINGS. Allow me to say "Yes."

Mr. HAYDEN. What part?

Mr. TYDINGS. The health and sanitation program applies to countries which supply only rubber.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator know what portion of the money related to the production of rubber? My understanding is that considerable sums were necessary for expenditure in Brazil in order to obtain rubber from the jungles.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. Let us take that as an illustration. I think the Brazilian Government—a country of which I am very fond, and the leading country in size and population in South America, as well as a country which is actually with us in the war—should have the full benefit of the lend-lease program as it now enjoys it. I am heartily in favor of that. I likewise see that our war trade with Brazil has amounted in some critical materials to only $24,000,000,000.

It has occurred to me that with a little more cooperation we could have persuaded Brazil to have borne some of the expenses incident to the furnishing of these critical materials. That is what we are furnishing Brazil. Munitions are nothing more than critical materials because critical materials put together are munitions, and we are sending munitions to Brazil. It seems to me that Brazil might very properly give us raw materials with which to make those munitions in return.

Mr. HAYDEN. But to return to the question of expenditures for health and sanitation; I have heard the representation made that we were in great need of rubber, that it was obtainable in the Brazilian jungles, but it was absolutely necessary to combat malaria and other tropical diseases.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. And in order to obtain it we made these advances. Is it true that the money was not spent for that purpose, and if not, for what purpose was it spent?

Mr. TYDINGS. I can show the Senator the amount of money that was spent in Brazil for health and sanitation, and it was a large sum. I can also show him that money was spent for health and sanitation in countries very far south of Brazil, where rubber was not a question at all.

Mr. HAYDEN. Were American troops operating in that area?

Mr. TYDINGS. Not in all cases. Of course, it is only a drop in the bucket, anyway, because the whole amount is only $27,000,000. I merely put that in the picture to show, as I have said, that this is an uncoordinated effort. Mr. Stettinius has only the lend-lease part of it, the War Department has another part of it, the Navy has another part of it, the R. F. C. has another part of it, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs has another part of it, and all of them are agencies spending money. In my judgment there should not only be a master set of books provided to determine what have been our contributions and the contributions of other countries to us, but if there were greater coordination, without any hardship on some of the recipient countries, I think we could obtain the things we are buying without in the future actually taxing the boys who will bear the load of extra debt when they return. That is the whole point of my argument.

Mr. HAYDEN. There could be no argument about that at all. It is simply plain common sense.

Mr. TYDINGS. But that is not being done.

Mr. HAYDEN. We should not do these things in an uncoordinated way. I merely wanted to try to advance the idea that when we are making expenditures justified by the acquisition of so scarce an article as rubber, they might be very wise expenditures.

Mr. TYDINGS. They might be, but I still cannot see why we could not induce Brazil to pay the money for the development of her own natural resources, when we are sending munitions to Brazil, and she is a country at war.

Mr. HAYDEN. It depends on how quickly we can get rubber.

Mr. TYDINGS. We cannot get rubber in 24 hours, if I understand the tire situation aright.

I think we have reached the time when, I respectfully might suggest, these agencies have to be coordinated. I should like to see the President issue an Executive order to husband all this outgo and income of materials and money through some central agency, from which we could get a statement of fact from time to time, and the account would be beyond dispute, and it would not be lost in the extraneous records of some department or bureau or agency. I think we owe it to the men who are abroad to do that while they are gone.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, has the Senator included the Board of Economic Warfare?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I have not.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the master mystery of all, is it not?

Mr. TYDINGS. I may say that the account which I am rendering is only of that part of the activities which have come within my knowledge. I do not doubt for a moment that there are other agencies and activities, in fact, I could now name two at least, in addition to those I have enumerated, and in addition to the one the Senator has mentioned, from which money is flowing out, apparently without any thought at this juncture of a reciprocal arrangement. That is no reflection on the Lend-Lease Administrator, because it is not within his jurisdiction. That condition exists because these functions and activities have to do with organizations and agencies which are not in any way tied in with lend-lease, either because of a fault in the law or because of a fault in executive administration in not coordinating them all in one place.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Supplementing the inquiry of the Senator from Michigan with reference to the B. E. W., the distinction between the lend-lease and the B. E. W. is a pronounced one. Lend-lease, when it needs money, comes to us for an appropriation, as in the bill before us, but when the B. E. W. wants money, it does not come to Congress for it, it simply issues a directive to the R. F. C., and the powers of the B. E. W. are so broad that in the last analysis, they can draw on every dollar Jesse Jones has in the R. F. C., and the draft has to be honored. That is of course an extreme illustration.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct. In addition to the agencies I have mentioned by name, the Commodity Credit Corporation makes expenditures in foreign countries, the Export-Import Bank makes expenditures in foreign countries, or loans, in some cases, and in the case of the Export-Import Bank, as of the date I got this information, the loans amounted to $71,000,000.

All these loans, of $71,000,000, $132,000,000, and so on, are cumulative, they run into billions, and therefore I make the statement, after having had access to the adding machine, that these simple matters which I have brought to the attention of the Senate today amount to $2,000,000,000 all one way, and which the Lend-Lease Administrator has not on his books because they are not lend-lease operations as encompassed in the law. We should have at some place, a master set of books, and a clearing house, for these extraneous dealings, so that somewhere along the line we would know what the picture was.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, is the $2,000,000,000 amount contained in the appropriation under consideration?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; it has already been spent.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will this appropriation include a similar item of $2,000,000,000?

Mr. TYDINGS. No, it will not. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that the $2,000,000,000 for the most part has come out of Army and Navy funds which we appropriated, and with a provision in the law that they could be used for the purposes which I have generally outlined in the few illustrations I have given, and which carry all the way down through practically all of them.

Mr. AUSTIN. I would not have my inquiry interpreted as an objection.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understood that. I did not put that construction on it. I wish to make plain to everyone that I am not attacking lend-lease in the slightest. I voted for it when it was first before the Senate, I voted for it for the reasons I have stated, partly out of regard for what I thought was the right and wrong in the matter, or, if one wants to look at it that way, because I was a trifle idealistic, perhaps, and largely as an insurance policy, just in case the little bit we could give in so short a time would mean the difference perhaps between the recipient nation standing up or going down.

I am glad we took the action, and I am not against lend-lease now. Money is of secondary consequence. Lives are important. It is important to end the war. But money is of sufficient consequence that where it is being given for a specific purpose, the recipient, when he is able to do so, should reciprocate. I

cannot see the slightest thing wrong with that, either in idealism, or in self-interest, or in the general interest.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not wish to delay the Senator's speech, but in reference to the observation made by the Senator from New Hampshire, there came to my attention 2 or 3 weeks ago a copy of a statement which Mr. Milo Perkins, the Director of the Board of Economic Warfare, made before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. I take it, therefore, of course, that if Mr. Perkins appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, Mr. Perkins, with his Board of Economic Warfare problem, will come before the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

I am not a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I think the Senator from New Hampshire is a member. I do not know whether the Senator was present 2 or 3 months ago when Mr. Perkins appeared before that committee.

Mr. TOBEY. I examined him.

Mr. HILL. I do not know whether the Senator agrees or not, but it was my information, from Senators who heard his testimony, and other Senators, that Mr. Perkins made a most interesting statement, and made a very strong case for what the Board of Economic Warfare was doing. I did not hear the statement. I read in the hearings of the committee that part of the statement which was printed, but it was my understanding, and the records so indicated, that a good part of what Mr. Perkins testified to was off the record and, therefore, did not appear in the printed hearings.

Mr. TOBEY. That is correct. I think he did give a very interesting account of the operations of the B. E. W. Beyond peradventure, some of us on the committee believe that the way to operate is not by access to funds with no limit whatever, but these boards should come before the Congress, sell their propositions, get their appropriations, and clear through Mr. Lindsay Warren's organization, the General Accounting Office.

Mr. HILL. I merely wish to say, as I previously stated, that Mr. Perkins was before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations some 2 weeks ago, so I am sure he will be coming also before the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I wish to reiterate, at the expense of boredom, perhaps, that I am for lend-lease. I am for the utmost generosity we can extend to our allies to shorten this war, and make victory certain and quick, and save every life possible, not only of the men of our own country, but of those of countries which are fighting on our side, whether it be in the Far East, in Europe, or wherever it may be. I am in no sense trying to set up books on that account.

However, it has occurred to me, and I hope this is not disunity, that one of the great failings of a young country such as ours, which has been engaged in world affairs on a large scale for only a few years, lies in its idea that everyone in the world has a detached view, and thinks beautiful thoughts, and is good, and kind, and so on. I think that estimation of the world is unsound, and I think too many of our population have that view. I do not want to see my country—although it may be overgenerous, as I hope it will be in its contributions—to be so overly overgenerous as to be really foolish.

Therefore, when we were pouring out these things to our allies, particularly before we got into the war, and primarily for their defense—for ours incidentally, but primarily for theirs—and when they were so appreciative, as I knew they were, it did not seem to me to be the part of treason, or disunity, or even un-Americanism, for me to ask, or to look around to see what they could do for us, not in payment, not in complete wiping out of the accounts, but as a reciprocal measure which would put them on the same plane that we were on.

Out of my temerity to enter into this greater field of activity beyond our borders, it occurred to me that we had leased for 99 years some bases in the West Indies, and I was curious to see how much money we had spent there. I shall not state the sum, but it is not small. Then I was curious to see how much we had spent on contiguous or nearby islands or territory, and I found that the sum was not small, and it was spent on or in the very part of the Dominion from which we had leased the bases, that is, the country was the same.

These islands, as everyone knows, and as every military man in Britain, in Russia, in China, or in the United States will tell us, have one value only, for the defense of or attack upon the United States. They are close to our own shores. I do not want the islands. I do not want the populations. I do not want my country to use this war as an imperialistic instrument, but the naked bases themselves, which have been leased for 99 years—why? Because they were important to us, and the lessor country realized it—the naked bases themselves, it seemed to me, could very well be transferred to United States sovereignty, not the whole of the islands, not the population, but merely the bases, by way of reciprocation in small part for what we were trying to do there in addition to furnishing armies and navies.

Now the things we are sending abroad, Mr. President, are much more important than money. Money advanced can be repaid by mere services, but when natural resources are taken out of the ground of any country, even though it has no national debt, there is a resultant impoverishment. What we are taking out of the ground is oil, iron, other minerals, which nature took thousands of years to put into the ground, and which human ingenuity cannot return once it is extracted. Therefore the effort on my part to try to obtain for us a spit of sand only, which might protect our remaining resources, I did not think would be anti-British, or anti-Russian, or pro-Axis, or tend toward disunity. It occurred to me that it might be nothing more than a very, very, very, very, very, very small lend-lease, or reciprocal aid, or whatever one might want to call it. I make no apologies whatever for having made that suggestion, and I am using this occasion now to reiterate it.

Mr. President, I should likewise like to see the title to some islands in the Pacific cleared up, to which a country, the greatest recipient of our lend-lease operations before Pearl Harbor, as well as now, claims dominion along with us. They are only little sand spits. They are the only islands we lay claim to in this whole vast territory, among hundreds of thousands of islands. That nation has disputed as against us the title to those two little islands, and has gone so far as to land civil servants on each of them, so that there will not be any question about relinquishment of those two little islands, out of all the thousands of islands, when the war is over.

Mr. President, that sort of thing makes one a little more realistic about lend-lease than he was when we began it. It is beyond my understanding what in the world two or three little islands close to our shores can mean to that country in comparison to what they would mean to us.

Some persons have gone so far as to say "You ought to let these questions remain until after the war." Well, we did not let our oil, and our iron, and other supplies remain here until after the war, and if the transaction is settled after the war I shall be just as happy as if it is settled now, but I think we ought to make the record as we go along. I remember that after the last World War we did not make the record well enough, and there was a great deal of dispute afterwards. The Senator from Oregon remembers very well that it was the habit of Senators to say, "When such and such was going on you did not say anything," or "When the other thing was going on you arose on the floor and said thus and so," and that was forever conclusive evidence that the door was closed then and there.

Mr. President, I have tried to profit by that experience in my own humble way. I do not live in the intellectual clouds, as do some of the great people of this country who never held any political office, but who can lecture on all subjects, astronomy, war, meteorology, disease, the future of mankind, how the world ought to be set up hereafter, how everyone will be taken care of or be lost in the shuffle. I thought I would get down to this more limited mental operation of simply trying to be generous, but trying to be reasonable at the same time.

Mr. President, I find that just off the shores of the lower part of the United States we have spent $212,000,000 on the territory of one particular country. All the labor furnished was local labor, that is, the ordinary labor. We paid the whole bill. Then I find that we bought hundreds of millions of dollars of material, and I find that we paid for it all. Then

I find that we spent great sums for welfare purposes, and we paid for it all.

Mr. President, I find evidences of this astounding thing, that after this war we will have a repetition of exactly what happened after the last war, namely, that the people who demand that nothing be said on matters of this kind during the conduct of the war will be out in the front ranks criticizing everyone in and out of Congress for not having spoken out. Mark my words, and see if that will not be true. Senators will find such persons writing stories, and making speeches, and taking Congress to task for not doing now what they say should not be done until after the war is over. Human nature and human reactions are strange. The very people who are denouncing the Congress for even uttering a sentence during the conduct of this war will rise after it is over and say, "What kind of a Congress was it that permitted these things to go on?" So we had better make the record now.

My humble effort here this afternoon is only to bring these facts to the attention of the Congress, because I believe we owe it to our own people, to those in the armed services, while we support the lend-lease program, while we give these additional billions of dollars—and I shall give the program my full support—that the facts be brought out. The world knows that lend-lease is a one-way street in many cases, a one-way street which could be made a two-way street by a little bit of reciprocal generosity to offset the generosity so abundantly shown in actions of this country even before Pearl Harbor and so abundant since.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a few moments on a matter not of international import but of very vital import to my colleagues and constituents back in New England and the eastern Atlantic States. It is a tragic situation, and to meet this situation I am taking heroic methods this afternoon by seeking to amend the pending bill in order to give relief to a portion of our citizenship which sorely needs relief. As evidence to buttress my case I read to the Senate a telegram received this morning from the commissioner of agriculture of the State of New Hampshire, as follows:

CONCORD, N. H., *June 3, 1943.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Desperate feeding problem faces New Hampshire dairymen and poultrymen, especially the latter. Reports from millers advise impossible to get corn and wheat. Thousands of our people responded to appeal for poultry meat and eggs as with milk. Feeding situation now so desperate unless relief immediately comes thousands of chicks, broilers, and layers will go hungry, and day-old baby chicks do not live long without feed concentrates. Advice via Boston corn and wheat plentiful supply, but fixed price on corn forces holding from sale. Chance to secure supply through Chicago auction market at price above Office of Price Administration fixed price. Millers do not care to violate Federal prices fixed or take loss in July market, Chicago sold short. Check if possible Federal holding corn and wheat and do at once all possible to relieve desperate situation. Urge quick Senate approval bill passed today by House authorizing sale 50,000,000 bushels Government-owned wheat. Urge favorable influence on quick transportation via Great Lakes grain authorized for entry from Canada. Quick action imperative.

ANDREW L. FELKER,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I read a second telegram from the Merrimack Farmers Exchange, Inc., R. W. Peasley, general manager:

CONCORD, N. H., *June 2, 1943.*

Senator CHARLES TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

New England nearly out of corn, wheat, and barley. None available on market. Birds starving in 10 days.

MERRIMACK FARMERS EXCHANGE, INC.,
R. W. PEASLEY, *General Manager.*

I read another telegram from G. M. Bartemus Co., of Concord, N. H., as follows:

CONCORD, N. H., *June 2, 1943.*

Hon. CHARLES TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Unable to buy corn, wheat, or barley in New England. Mill can run 3 days more on present supply. Can you do anything to relieve the situation?

G. M. BARTEMUS CO.

Mr. President, with that Macedonian cry coming to my desk this morning, and as a citizen of the State of New Hampshire, and a Senator from that State, I make bold to come before the Senate this afternoon to submit an amendment to the pending lease-lend bill, not because it affects lease-lend; it is not even germane to it. The amendment is, I know, subject to a point of order, as Senators all know, but I have received splendid cooperation from my leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, and having gone to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] and obtaining his cooperation in the fine spirit that he would not invoke the rule which provides for a point of order to lie against such a proposal, and would not make the point of order; having discussed the matter with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who has given me helpful cooperation; the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]; the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]; and other Senators, I now come before the Senate and say that this situation is so acute in New England and in my own State of New Hampshire that I ask my colleagues in the Senate to consider this situation in the thesis of the Pauline statement, "We are every one members one of another." This is truly a Macedonian cry.

So, Mr. President, I submit the amendment to provide that out of the Commodity Credit Corporation's supply of wheat on hand, 50,000,000 bushels more shall be released and sold, as 125,000,000 bushels were sold last March or February, and be sold at not less than the parity price of corn, so that thereby we shall relieve this shortage which at the present time is in its acute stage.

I send the amendment to the desk, and ask for its reading and adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 18, it is proposed to insert the following additional section:

SEC. 3. That the act approved March 25, 1943 (Public Law 18, 78th Cong.), be amended by deleting "two hundred and twenty-five million bushels" and inserting in lieu thereof "two hundred and seventy-five million bushels."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 2753) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will be authorized to change the section numbers.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

James H. Flanagan, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the term of 3 years from July 1, 1943. (Reappointment.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

Douglas Maggs, of North Carolina, to be Solicitor for Labor.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., of Pennsylvania, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of Czechoslovakia, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Czechoslovakia now established in London.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alexander C. Kirk, of Illinois, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Egypt, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Greece now established in Egypt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James S. Moose, Jr., of Arkansas, to act as minister resident and consul of the United States of America to Saudi Arabia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of consuls general and of other Foreign Service officers.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations of consuls general and of other Foreign Service officers be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 4, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 3 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE

Leo F. Sanchez, of New Mexico, to be register of the land office at Santa Fe, N. Mex. (reappointment).

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the position indicated:

Don A. Jones to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the 15th day of May 1943.

David M. Whipp to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the 15th day of May 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 3 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Jr., now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Poland, serving concurrently as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary near the Government of Czechoslovakia, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Czechoslovakia now established in London.

Alexander C. Kirk, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Egypt, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Greece now established in Egypt.

MINISTER RESIDENT AND CONSUL

James S. Moose, Jr., to act as minister resident and consul of the United States of America to Saudi Arabia.

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Burton Y. Berry
William R. Langdon
Rollin R. Winslow

TO BE A CONSUL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Daniel V. Anderson

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 1, SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE, AND A CONSUL GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Maxwell M. Hamilton

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful Father of mankind, we pray that in the still voice we may hear the message of a righteous and a redeeming God enshrining in our hearts. We praise Thee that there is faith so deeply rooted in the human soul that it survives all tragedies and binds us to Thy throne forever. To Thee, who art the Captain of our salvation, who dost determine our stature and the bounds of our habitation, we pray that our country may be delivered from the blinding power of selfish men and from the subjection of the works of disloyalty to our Government.

O Spirit of God, be with us and guide our lives that they may be honest in the dark as they are in the light, as good in obscurity as they are in publicity, as faithful when alone as when the world is looking on. O inspire us to set our affections on the dateless and spaceless things of Thy everlasting kingdom. Mold our thoughts with immovable conviction, with fortitude and sacrifice, keeping aloft the threefold torchlights of faith, hope, and love. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2848. An act amending the "Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943," approved April 29, 1943; and

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bill of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2570. An act to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2584. An act to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes.

AMENDING THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2766) amending the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this legislation?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. This is the so-called Monroney bill relating to the matter which I discussed with the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman state for the record the purpose of the bill?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. It is to take care of areas, particularly in six States, where they have had heavy flood damage and insect infestation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Just what does the legislation provide?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. This will allow those in the flooded areas and areas where crops have been damaged by insect infestation to go ahead and plant now and it will allow them to plant cotton on some of this land and corn on other land. If they wait much longer they cannot plant anything. It will also allow those folks to remain on the farms where all of their crops and property have been destroyed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is a necessary and urgent relief proposal and it has been unanimously endorsed by the gentleman's committee?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; it was reported out unanimously.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. BISHOP. Does that take in the flooded portion of southern Illinois?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes, the whole area.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or any other provision of law, on any farm on which the county committee finds that a substantial part of any crop was destroyed or damaged by flood or by insect infestation in 1943 so that abandonment or replanting of such crop is necessary, the actual production of cotton from any acreage on such farm may be marketed without penalty and the planting in 1943 of any acreage in excess of the farm cotton acreage allotment on such farm shall not cause the producer to suffer any deduction or loss of eligibility for payment, commodity loans, or price support: *Provided*, That the acreage in excess of the farm acreage allotment in 1943 shall not constitute past acreage or past production of cotton in determining the farm acreage allotment for any subsequent year.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "cotton", insert "or corn."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "acreage", strike out the word "planted" and insert "so destroyed or damaged and replanted."

Page 1, line 10, after the word "farm", insert "in cotton or corn."

Page 2, line 3, after the word "cotton", insert "or corn."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "cotton", insert "or corn."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF JEFFERSON DAVIS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this is Memorial Day in many of the Southern States.

It is the birthday of Jefferson Davis, the Great White Chieftain of the Confederacy—one of the ablest leaders the world has yet produced.

One of his leading adversaries once declared that he was eloquent among the most eloquent in debate, wise among the wisest in counsel, and brave among the bravest on the battlefield.

Bishop Galloway once said of him:

Marvelous, many-sided, masterful man, his virtues will grow brighter and his name be writ larger with each passing century. Soldier, hero, statesman, gentleman, American—a prince of Christian chivalry, the uncrowned chief of an invisible republic of loving and loyal hearts—when another hundred years have passed, no intelligent voice will fail to praise him, and no patriotic hand will refuse to place a laurel wreath upon his radiant brow.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EVACUATED JAPANESE IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include as a portion of my remarks a communication from the Downtown Association of San Francisco.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ROLPH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein two short editorials on the proposal to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a statement by Admiral H. E. Yarnell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE CHINESE EXCLUSION LAW

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, within a short while the House will have before it a bill to repeal the Chinese exclusion law and to grant to the Chinese an immigration quota. I am sure all of the Members of the House are anxious to know about this bill, its implications and what it means to the war effort.

This morning Admiral H. E. Yarnell appeared before our committee and made a statement. I am placing that statement in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I trust the Members will arrange to read it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech before the New York City Rotary Club by Samuel E. Crowther.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OPINION OF ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ARKANSAS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an opinion from the Assistant Attorney General of Arkansas, and that my remarks may appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEWART addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE SILVER PURCHASE ACTS AND THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the managers on the part of the House on the Treasury Department appropriation bill have filed the conference report and have indicated disagreement again with reference to the amendment which I successfully offered to that bill which would preclude the expenditure of any of the appropriations authorized under that bill for the carrying out of the provisions of the Silver Purchase Acts. Undoubtedly somec .e will offer an amendment to recede and concur in the Senate provision which deleted the Celler amendment from the bill. I do hope that the House will follow the procedure it adopted on two previous occasions when it supported my amendment and precluded the use of any money carried in the Treasury Department appropriation bill for carrying out the purposes of Silver Purchase Acts. The Committee of the Whole originally adopted the Celler amendment, the House concurred and again the House refused to recede from its position and refused to accede to the Senate's wish to allow appropriations to be used by the Treasury to administer the Silver Purchase Act. These acts have outlived their usefulness, if they ever had usefulness. We have 3,000,000,000 ounces of silver stored at West Point. We need no more. The Treasury should not be permitted to administer the purchasing

of any more silver. I have bills pending before the Ways and Means Committee to wipe the slate clean of silver purchasing. I admit passage of my bill is the logical method for dealing with the problem, but heretofore that committee has not accorded me a hearing. I had no other recourse but to attack the silver purchasing from the flank. I prefer a frontal attack. But I had no choice. Keep my amendment intact. A half loaf may be better than no loaf at all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a former Congressman and an address by Robert J. C. Stead, made before an international rotary conference at Flint, Mich., on May 7. I am advised by the Public Printer that it will require 2⅕ pages of the RECORD and will cost $99.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution of the Saratoga County War Council.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CORN SHORTAGE IN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that out of the legislation now before the House will come a genuine solution to this labor problem. I am glad to see the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], whom we missed so much yesterday, on the floor today to make his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to read a telegram I received this morning. It deals with another proposition but is very important:

YORK, PA., *June 2, 1943.*

HON. CHESTER A. GROSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In order to supply minimum requirements of feeders and dealers we serve in eastern Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Jersey, Virginia, and Delaware, it is necessary that we purchase 30,000 bushels No. 2 yellow corn weekly. This based on last year's business. All former sources of supply have informed us that they cannot furnish any corn. Under the circumstances, we feel it is imperative that Commodity Credit Corporation release sufficient quantities of corn to supply our minimum requirement. Please do something for us.

HESPENHEIDE & THOMPSON, INC.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. MAY. I will not move to go into the Committee until after the gentleman from Michigan has submitted his request.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot yield now; and inasmuch as the gentleman from Pennsylvania inquired as to where I was yesterday, permit me to make reply.

My health for the last few days has not been good. Farming operations at home demanded my attention, and last Saturday, Sunday, and Decoration Day, in addition to the speaking at Decoration Day exercises in the district, the farm and the home gardens were given attention.

Under the impression that this bill would not be on until later in the week, my return was delayed until 1:50 a. m. on the morning of Wednesday—yesterday—then a grounded plane delayed my arrival until 4:30 p. m.—too late to vote on the rule. It was my desire to be here when the rule came up, but never did it occur to me that the absence of one Member of the House on the question of having a free discussion of so important an issue could be vital. My attitude on this legislation is well understood, not only by my constituents but by every Member of this House who has cared to be present during the past few years.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman withhold that and will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

The SPEAKER. No business can be transacted unless the gentleman from Mississippi withdraws the point of order and if the gentleman does withdraw the point of order, then there is nothing can be done until the Chair determines whether or not the gentleman from Michigan states a question of personal privilege.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order for the present.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, rise to a question of personal privilege.

On page 4 of volume 1, No. 2, of May 1943 issue of the official publication International Education Department, of the U. A. W., C. I. O., which is in my hand, there appears, among other statements, the following:

Now, with Hitler staggering under the blows of our Soviet ally, invasion of Europe to bring about the unconditional surrender of the Axis is imperative. Defeat for the Axis in 1943 is the battle cry of America's people and those of the United Nations.

But against this program of victory, sinister forces have moved into action. Anti-labor and Quisling groups are carrying forward a feverish campaign to block the decisions of the Casablanca conference—to hamper and hold back invasion of Hitler-dominated Europe—to bring about a peace by negotiation with the mad dogs of fascism.

DIVISION FOSTERED

Division and disunity have been fostered. Congress is being made more and more an instrument for the disruption of the military and economic policies proposed by the President in the interest of victory. Policies of the President for putting the national economy on a war footing have been ridiculed, sabotaged, and partially wrecked.

The reactionary poll-taxers and their Republican friends have already jeopardized the cause of effective wartime rationing, price control, and progressive taxation. By their opposition to full mobilization of manpower they seek to strike at the foundation of our military power. An ex-President of the United States, long known for his adherence to doctrines of appeasement, has been applauded in his proposals that we go slow, that we fight a comfortable war, that we do not attack until 1944 or perhaps 1945.

LABOR THE TARGET

Because labor recognizes this for what it is, the fatal policy of defeat and disaster, labor too has been the target of the slander of those who would divide our Nation in its hour of crisis and peril. The Hoffmans, the Dieses, the Rickenbackers, and the forces of betrayal for whom they speak, have conspired against and viciously attacked the millions of men and women who are today providing the weapons needed by the armed forces of democracy.

* * * * *

The conspirators against the unity and victory of the American people and the United Nations, the small but powerful groups desiring a negotiated peace with Hitler, have again been echoing Herr Goebbels' gospel of the Communist menace.

The foregoing statements reflect upon the integrity and the patriotism in his official, representative capacity of the Member from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, and he raises the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], state just exactly the language to which he takes exception?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the specific language to which I refer, and I ask unanimous consent to put my request in the RECORD at this point, is in the article which I handed to the Speaker from the official publication of the C. I. O., and this is the language, but the other is used to show the purpose and intent:

Because labor recognizes this for what it is, the fatal policy of defeat and disaster, labor too has been the target of the slander of those who would divide our Nation in its hour of crisis and peril. The Hoffmans the Dieses, the Rickenbackers, and the forces of betrayal for whom they speak have conspired against and viciously attacked the millions of men and women who are today providing the weapons needed by the armed forces of democracy.

That is a direct charge we are interfering with the operation of the war and, taken in connection with the other language, that we have conspired so to do. It will not take an hour to answer that charge, which is false.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must assume some latitude. It is only by implication, the Chair may say, that this impugns the honor and integrity of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. It is a very close question. The Chair will recognize the gentleman, but he wants it understood that it is a very close question.

EXTENSION OF LIMITATION OF DEBATE ON S. 796

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the pending bill, S. 796, be extended for an additional 40 minutes, the time to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the ranking Member on the other side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on yesterday when general debate was proceeding, those in opposition to the bill on this side of the aisle were given scant consideration and were unable to get time to voice their sentiments in opposition to the bill. Does the gentleman propose to divide the 40 minutes between those who are in favor of the bill and those who are against the bill?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I was pressed for time yesterday and had requests for time from Members on this side of the aisle. I also had a few complaints and criticisms. I have asked this additional time for the sole purpose of being able to allot some of the time to the opposition.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Kentucky was very unreasonable yesterday, I think, when requests were made to him in a proper manner for time. He was both arbitrary and discourteous in his responses to the requests that were made to him. I do not want to object, but I certainly shall unless the gentleman can assure the House that the opponents of the measure will be given time. I do not want any for myself. I will say what I want to say under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some time and I may say I requested some time yesterday. I do not propose to object to continuing the time for debate, but I do agree with the gentlemen who have previously spoken, the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that there are many points of view that should be given a chance for hearing on the floor today and I think we should have time.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, who has the floor?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky propounded a unanimous-consent request and the gentleman who reserves the right to object then has the floor. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor on a reservation to object.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if he will not increase the request for time in order to satisfy the demand for time?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I have done everything I could to allot the time as fair as I could, and I have disregarded some of the members of my committee. I resent and deny the charge that I was unreasonable to anybody. I simply begged an opportunity to arrange my time so that I could allot it among the several gentlemen who wanted to speak. I make this request for the sole and only purpose of being able to accommodate them. I will modify the request and ask unanimous consent that the time be extended for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Kentucky——

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the words on which the personal privilege is requested are as follows:

> Because labor recognizes this for what it is, the fatal policy of defeat and disaster, labor too has been the target of the slander of those who would divide our nation in its hour of crisis and peril. The Hoffmans, the Dieses, the Rickenbackers—

I do not deserve; I do not claim to deserve the honor of having my name mentioned either with that of the chairman of the Dies committee, nor with the name of the hero of World War No. 1, Rickenbacker, or as one of the liberals of the so-called labor group characterize him, "the rat of World War No. 2."

Let me repeat what was said. It is an honor to have my name mentioned with that of Rickenbacker. When a man has served his country, as has Rickenbacker; when he has faced death, as did Rickenbacker in the air and on the sea; when on a raft on the Pacific he held in his arms a dying comrade and saw that comrade die; then and only then should he assume to question the loyalty of Rickenbacker. The man who called Rickenbacker "the rat of World War No. 2" should be expelled from the union to which he belongs. When a union bars or attempts to bar Rickenbacker, Rickenbacker's picture, when he makes an appeal for aid to the Red Cross, or that workers continue at their task to support the men who are risking their lives, it ill behooves any member of such a union to venture a criticism of the patriotism of anyone.

Permit me to read:

> The Hoffmans, the Dieses, the Rickenbackers and the forces of betrayal for whom they speak have conspired against and viciously attacked the millions of men and women who are today providing the weapons needed by the armed forces of democracy.

So far as I know, neither from the floor of this House nor anywhere else has any Member of the House ever challenged the patriotism of any labor man or any worker in the munition factories or in war industries anywhere. Members high in the administration's confidence have charged that those causing these strikes in munitions factories and in the coal mines were guilty of treason. No such charge has been made by me. The racketeers and labor leaders have been challenged; their patriotism has been challenged by some, and as long as they try to continue to call strikes to bring about slow-downs and stoppages of work, the patriotism of some of them will be questioned, and we will continue to wonder whether or not they realize that a war is on.

We know that the fighting men must have arms; we know they must have munitions; we know that when men do not work the fighting men cannot be supplied with either arms or food. We know that the wheels of the factories in this country cannot turn if they do not have coal; we know that coal is not being produced. We know that if that coal is not produced, if the wheels do not continue to turn, men will die for lack of guns and of ammunition.

The question before us today and which must be answered, Are we with our fighting forces, the Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, or are we with the union racketeers? Do we aline ourselves with the loyal factory workers, who are doing their utmost, or do we bow in allegiance to labor politicians?

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in the history of our country that anyone belonging to a union or any union organization has ever conducted a strike against the Government. We did have the Whisky Rebellion, and there have been other disturbances, but at no time has an organized group, known as a labor organization, at any time at all and especially as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] said, "during a time of war," ever defied the Federal Government.

Never before in the history of our Nation has an organized group in time of war hurled defiance at the Commander in Chief of our Army and our Navy. Do we today, serving our Government, stand by the Commander in Chief or do we yield to these labor leaders who oppose this legislation?

Here you have here in the city an indictment for sedition of some thirty-odd individuals. For what reason? Because they wrote, because they said things which it is claimed would interfere with the spirit of our fighting men. I make no comment upon that indictment. The guilt or innocence of the individuals charged is to be decided by a jury, but what have we here now? We have a situation where while our men need munitions of war of all kinds, yet because of the demand that there be paid an additional $2 per day, which is not granted, we have a half-million men going on strike, depriving the Nation of the coal which is necessary to keep in operation the factories which turn out the fighting tools. Is that sedition? Is it undermining the sprit of our fighting men?

Tell me, if you will—let those who advocate strikes, who carry on strikes, tell me if they will—does it encourage our men on the battle front to know that here at home the supply of weapons is being

diminished because men are on strike? Does it increase the happiness of our fighting men, intensify their loyalty, if that be possible, to know that men here at home refuse to support them by turning out the necessary equipment, just because they do not get additional pay of 8 cents an hour or of $2 a day? When news of these strikes breaks on the fighting front, just what do the fighting men say?

I ask the Members of the House to go down to the Union Station where thousands or more men belonging to the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps are passing through every day, day after day, and talk to those men. Ask them what they think about strikes and slow-downs. You will get an answer. You will get it quickly. It will be brief and to the point. Part of the answer may be profane because men who have faced death, who are on their way to face death, have little patience with idle talk. You will understand what they say and you will know that they are earnest and that, if we fail them here in the Halls of Congress, adequate answer will be made to our failure when they return.

Several of the Members asked me where I was yesterday. They intimated that I was running out on this legislation. I was so unfortunate as to be grounded in Detroit and could not get here in time to vote on the passage of the rule. But, Mr. Speaker, has the Congress arrived at such a state that I must be here for the adoption of a rule? My position on legislation is well known to every Member of the House. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because he did me a favor in asking that question; it gives me an excuse for getting this in the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that the article the gentleman read from attacks the patriotism of a former President of the United States, which means Herbert Hoover.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know that that specific reference was to Herbert Hoover.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say in reply to that that while I never voted for Mr. Hoover in my life, and we never agreed on political philosophies, I do not believe there is a more patriotic man, a more sincere and earnest man, in America than Herbert Hoover.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And that statement applies to every Member of the House; it applies to practically every man who works in factories and mines, and the sad thing about it is that some of the so-called labor leaders, labor politicians, fail to realize it. They have fallen into the evil habit of challenging the patriotism of every individual who opposes any legislation they favor, who supports any legislation they oppose.

In coming down on the midnight train yesterday from Kalamazoo to Detroit there were some 35 or 40 men belonging to the armed service who were forced to stand on the platform of the coaches, and several of them were expressing their views. Oh, that we had a record of the views of those 35 or 40 men. A number of issues came up; one was the coal situation, and the strike at Akron in the rubber factory.

Lewis is not the only one who has defied the Government. Lewis and the coal miners are not the only ones who have refused to perform vital work—work which must be done if the war is to be won. There have been strikes all over this country. Men have been prevented from supplying coal to factories just because they would not join the teamsters' union—Tobin's union, an affiliate of the A. F. of L.

This situation was not created by John L. Lewis acting alone. The President himself, this administration and their activities are among the causes of the condition which now confronts us. Time after time, because of the political alliance which exists between this administration and certain labor politicians, strikes and slow-downs have occurred, and the demands for increased wages have been granted.

It is quite true that the strikes have been less in number and that the man-hours involved have been less than in some other years. And one of the reasons for that is that the workers are as a class patriotic, and another is that almost invariably this administration has yielded to demands for increased pay; hence, there was no reason to strike.

To put it bluntly, this administration has sold out the American people. It has sold out to its political allies. This administration created the situation which gave rise to these strikes. Does anyone believe for one moment that, if the administration had adopted a firm, sound policy, forgotten its political ambition for a fourth term, for a continuation in power, these few labor leaders who engineer these strikes would have dared, in wartime, to knock the foundation out from under the armed forces?

Lewis is but following the plan—the plan that is common to other labor leaders who lack his courage, his straightforward method of dealing. Green and Murray and other union leaders have fallen in behind him, seeking, as he is seeking, to increase their power in their respective unions. They are seeking to demonstrate to all workers that they can defy the Government. Whatever may be their words, whatever their promises, their actions show their purpose.

And the question now before us is, as just stated, will we support the armed forces, or will we increase the cost of the war program by an increase in wages, by pay and a half, by double pay, by shorter hours? Or will we insist that all—yes, every citizen—render a service comparable to that rendered by the drafted men?

Coming down on the train, talking to these men who were in the service, some of whom have been across, others who were about to go, I learned that they had but one thought, and their expression was—you know, after the little Sunday school and the home boy goes into the Army and is in the armed forces awhile, he learns, as some of us who come to Congress learn, a little profane language, and once in a while we use it—the thought of all these boys, as they expressed it, was, "To heck"—I substitute a word for theirs—"with these fellows. Let us at them. They say they won't work and you can't make them work; let us at them. They will work." And those fighting men meant it.

Last week, talking with two lieutenants who were back from Guadalcanal, they had and they expressed the same thought. Those of us who think that the people of this country are not back of legislation to end this situation are just mistaken.

Padway of the A. F. of L. said down here in a public forum the other day, "Oh, well, this bill is discrimination." It is nothing of the kind. It applies to all who are called to serve. We who support legislation of this kind are not unpatriotic; we are doing a service not only to the country but to the working man himself. We are trying our best to let labor clean its own house before the boys come back and clean it for them. Discrimination? Would Mr. Padway have legislation against stealing? The majority of the men, he said, do not strike. Of course, they do not. They do not want strikes—that is the reason for this bill, one provision of which would make it possible by a secret vote to prevent strikes. The majority of our people do not steal, yet we have legislation against stealing, against getting drunk, against all sorts of crimes. Labor legislation is aimed to meet the few, the very few in the ranks of organized labor who will not conform to decency and to good practice as they know it. This is not legislation against labor or labor unions. It is legislation against racketeers hiding within and behind a union label.

I read this morning some of the comments that were made here yesterday. A gentleman on the minority side whom I greatly admire made an extended argument which appears in the RECORD as to why this labor legislation should not be considered at this time. First, he was opposed to it because certain men connected with the agencies of government are opposed to it. The fighting men, the men who suffer and die because of the lack of munitions and equipment, are not opposed to it. I care not if some politician in some department is opposed to it. That to me is no reason. The letters which come through uncensored from the men who are doing the fighting are proof positive that they and their officers at the front are not opposed to it—otherwise the letters would not pass the censor.

Then the gentleman said:

> I am opposed to its consideration in view of the fact that the labor organizations, such as the American Federation of Labor, are opposed to this bill.

Permit me to inquire, since when did they become our masters, since when do we serve them rather than our people, when and where, from what source do they derive the power to tell us how to vote?

If time permits, I will show you where Mr. Green, president of the A. F. of L.,

and Mr. Meany, at that time secretary-treasurer of the A. F. of L., as long ago as 1941 advocated two of the most important provisions of this bill, but they did not want it in legislation, they wanted it a matter of voluntary agreement.

Then said this gentleman:

I am opposed to it because it will legalize strikes and may provoke labor disputes or strikes.

Just why will legislation which gives a vote to union men legalize strikes? Strikes are now legal. Will giving union men a voice in union policy promote a strike—cause a labor dispute? His argument carries the assumption that union men want to strike and that if permitted to vote will vote to strike. I say the opposite result will be reached, that often they will vote not to strike.

But if it is necessary and if we must meet the issue in this country as they failed to do in France as to whether or not we shall have strikes or production in war industries, then we had better meet it before 100,000 or 300,000 or 400,000 more men die in this war, some of them because of want of supplies. Let us know now whether we owe allegiance to labor politicians, whether we will have production or whether we will support the armed forces—whether we will countenance additional strikes.

The gentleman further said:

I am opposed to it (this bill) because it is very similar to the Smith bill, in principle, which passed the House of Representatives 18 months ago, and upon which the Senate took no action, which measure I voted for at the time, as it was aimed to stop Communist-inspired strikes.

Does it make any difference who inspires a strike? The purpose of the strike and its result are the real issues. Is not this the question before us today?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. May I ask the gentleman whether he actually believes he is speaking in accordance with the rules of the House on a question of personal privilege when he goes into what was stated yesterday in general debate on a bill that is about to be called up? I have no objection, of course, to the gentleman or any other Member at any time obtaining the privilege of addressing the House on a question of personal privilege or the privileges of the House, but I think the gentleman should recognize and realize that he is not speaking on a question of personal privilege; he is speaking about the bill that is before the House now, on which the gentleman will have plenty of opportunity later to speak under the 5-minute rule and also, perhaps, in the additional hour of general debate which will be agreed upon and which the chairman asked for a few minutes ago.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And did not get. I thank the gentleman for his observation and for his admonition, and all that, but unfortunately I cannot agree with him for the reason that this article charges that I have conspired to interfere with the operation of the armed forces, because I oppose what they are pleased to term antistrike legislation. I am trying to show that this legislation to which the gentleman refers in no way would interfere with or hinder war production. I am sorry that I do not have the intelligence to make my point clear.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, no; I would not say that. I would not charge the gentleman with not having that intelligence.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Undoubtedly the gentleman's charity and good nature would prevent him from making such a charge.

Mr. SABATH. Personally, I do not believe the gentleman's name has been mentioned in that article. Has it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. I was honored by having my name mentioned with that of Mr. Rickenbacker and that of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman should not assume that it was meant to apply to him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Was the gentleman here when I stated my question of personal privilege?

Mr. SABATH. I am always here when I hear that the gentleman is going to speak.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is a high compliment, too. It certainly is a high compliment. But no notice was given that I was to speak. I did not know it myself until the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] just before I raised the question mentioned my name. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] was on the floor then the gentleman's hearing must be bad or else I did not speak loudly enough, because my name was read when the privilege was requested.

Mr. SABATH. It is getting a little weak.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Going back to the discussion when I yielded to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. At that time, reference had just been made to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], who stated that he was opposed to this bill, because it was very similar to the Smith bill in principle, and for which he voted, as he believed the purpose of the Smith bill was to stop Communist-inspired strikes.

Let me repeat. Does it make any difference who inspires a strike? The purpose of the strike, its effect upon our war effort, are the real issues, and the question here before us today is whether, as has been stated time and again, we propose to see to it that legislation which will demand and secure from everyone the fullest cooperation in the war effort, the most complete support of our fighting forces, is enacted, or whether we will yield to the demands of administration politicians, of labor politicians, and permit them to have, as they have had for months, their way with the production program.

It is true, as has been so many times said, that our production record is a marvelous one; that the majority of the men and the women engaged in war production have worked faithfully and well. But it is equally true that a small minority of workers, drawing—if their wages be compared with those of farm workers, clerks, and others engaged in civilian pursuits—wages which are exorbitant, have hindered production; have used every available excuse to increase their compensation, regardless of the effect upon wartime economy.

The question before us today is this: Are we to have the coal which turns the wheels of the factories which make the guns, the planes, the ships, the tanks—all the munitions of war; which process the food, which fabricate the clothing, that the soldier, the sailor, and the airman must have if we are to win?

We cannot dodge the issue. Nor can we deceive our people at home nor the men in the service.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has two main provisions. One is the provision for a vote before a strike is called. Just last week we had up this so-called poll tax matter, and I recall how my Republican friends, including the gentleman to whom I just made reference, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], and a majority on the other side were insistent that that legislation be passed. If it is necessary that the folks of the South, regardless of their ability to pay a poll tax of $2, as in Mississippi, be able to vote in a general election, how much more important, how much more vital is it that when we come to the question of whether there shall be a strike in a defense industry, whether a man shall quit his job, be forced to quit his job—how much more important is it that he should have the right to vote on that proposition? Should he not have the right to vote? Is not that the American way? What do they say about it?

Let us see what Mr. Green has to say. Then also gentlemen brought up another proposition—that they had not had a hearing. Why, bless my soul, away back in 1941, hearings were held before the Committee on the Judiciary, and before the Committee on Rules, at which Mr. Green and others, including Mr. Meany, then secretary-treasurer of the A. F. of L., had all the time they wanted to state their views. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], a member of the committee asked about this question of whether or not there should be a secret vote before a strike should be called, and what did Mr. Green say?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Green, a moment ago you spoke about when a strike has been officially approved. I am just wondering whether or not in the consideration of legislation you would feel that the Congress ought to enact legislation requiring the taking of a vote, a secret vote, on the question of a strike by the members of a craft?

Mr. GREEN. I do not think you need any legislation. That is the policy of the American Federation of Labor, to take secret strike votes.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, sir. Now, if that is the policy of your organization would you object if we were to write that policy into law?

Mr. GREEN. What for?

Mr. WALTER. Well, perhaps there would be other people affected who have not adopted that fine policy.

Mr. GREEN. That is the principle of compulsion which labor resents.

Mr. WALTER. Is it a principle of compulsion or is it merely an instance of the democratic processes being complied with?

Mr. GREEN. It is a form of Government control, a form of governmental order saying to labor, "You must do thus and so." Labor would probably do it, all right. It is just like the adoption of our no-strike policy. We have done that wholeheartedly and willingly. But the probabilities are if Congress would say, "You must do that," then there would be rebellion.

Do you get the point? Let us state it in this way. Mr. Green said, back in 1941, speaking for the American Federation of Labor before the Committee on the Judiciary, that there should be and that it was the policy of the American Federation of Labor to have a secret vote before a strike, and then he said that, notwithstanding the fact that he believed in that policy, that he thought it was right, and that for years they had followed it, that if we write it into law to compel the few who do not agree with it, to compel Lewis, who apparently does not believe in it, to abide by a policy which is right and fair, there would be a rebellion.

Well, if we are going to have a rebellion in this country, we better have it before we get further involved abroad. We better have it now, we better have the issue settled as to whether men can strike against the Government, against the armed forces, as to whether men for $2 a day or 2 cents a day can shut off production of arms and munitions of war which men across the seas must either have or die. I say we better have that issue decided now before we send another million men across the sea, for they will be defenseless if this policy continues. Why praise our form of government if it cannot protect and supply the men who are fighting its battle. Why fight a war to force our form of government on other nations when it can be defied here at home by John L. Lewis and other labor politicians.

Let us see what Mr. Meany, secretary-treasurer of the A. F. of L. said in 1941, and here is the official transcript. What does he say about it, and I read from page 64. He says:

I want the committee to understand that our policy goes not against the cooling-off period as a matter of agreement between employers and employees; it is against the cooling-off period as a matter of statute law. I have personally signed agreements as long as I have been connected with the trade-union movement, that called for a cooling-off period. We agree with the employer that when the expiration of an agreement is reached, we set a 3-month period aside in which you have to give notice. That is standard practice, and has been for 50 years.

This bill provides for a 30-day cooling period.

That provides for a cooling-off period by agreement between employers and employees so that it cannot be used as a weapon by one side as against the other.

That is an agreed, a standard practice that we have had for 50 years, and we believe in that practice, and we insert it in our agreements at every possible opportunity.

If they agree that it is a good policy why not write it into the law?

And yet there are those here on the floor of this House who say that those two things recognized by the unions themselves as being good and necessary, shall not be incorporated into law. Why? Because it is compulsion. I may agree that I will not steal. I may agree that I will not get drunk and come on the floor of this House intoxicated. Should there not be a rule that would punish both? How quickly would I be expelled if I came down here inebriated, staggering around in a drunken state? How long would I be a Member of this House if I made that a practice? Yet these men say of the two most-important provisions of this bill, "The idea is good. We believe in it. We follow it, but do not try by law to make us abide by a rule that we have made for ourselves."

I will not take any more of your time. This issue is clear. There is no excuse for branding a man who votes for legislation which will enable workers to serve not only their country, but to uphold the hands of those they have sent abroad to fight their battles as either antilabor or disloyal. The administration has ducked and dodged. This Congress either decides that we will go along and support the men who have been forced by a law that we passed to fight our battles, or we decide that we will let them take their chances with what production some few men can bring about. We have had an example, an illustration. We have it today. It is not something to speculate about. It is not something in the dim and distant future. It is here with us now. Five hundred thousand miners holding down the production of the coal which the factories must have if they are to furnish the ships, the planes, the tanks, and the guns which the men who have gone must either have or die without even having a chance. Last week we had the strike of 50,000 men in the rubber industry.

The threat of defeat at election put out by the A. F. of L. a few days ago and the threat made by the C. I. O. to the same effect is an idle threat, for our people are not back of the men who make those statements. To me there seems to be just one issue. Is our Government in America supreme? Can a government which says to the boy on the farm and in the factory and in the schools—six boys graduating from high school in my home town next week are going to be inducted the next day—that they must leave home and friends; and fight, and perhaps die, admit that it lacks either the will or the power to give them fighting tools? They are not listening to any call to strike against going into the Army. They are going wherever they are sent. Are we going to say to them, "Yes, boys, you are just past 18; you are going, but here at home the Congress does not see fit in its wisdom, or lack of it, in its courage or lack of it, to pass legislation which would compel those who remain at home to give you the support that you need, that you must have if you are to win."

The charge made in that article is false, as we all know, and I will take my chance with the folks who remain at home and with the boys who come back from the war, rather than with the fellow who dictates to the politicians in the departments here in Washington, before I will follow the orders of the so-called leaders of these labor organizations. It is a choice easily made, for to me my first thought is of the men who are fighting for me, for my children, for my country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Cleveland Federation of Labor against and condemning unauthorized strikes; and in the other a copy of a telegram sent by Mr. A. F. Whitney.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in this morning's paper written by Mark Sullivan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

USE AND OPERATION OF WAR PLANTS IN PROSECUTION OF THE WAR

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the pending bill, S. 796, be extended for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a list of 22 witnesses who appeared before the House Military Affairs Committee at the hearing on the bill S. 796 in behalf of the different labor groups.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The list referred to is as follows:

LABOR WITNESSES

Congress of Industrial Organizations: Lee Pressman, general counsel; Richard T. Frankensteen, United Auto Workers; T. F. Flynn, international representative, United Steel Workers; Donald Henderson, general president, United Cannery, Agricultural, and so forth; Alice Balmer, Washington representative, Office Workers.

American Federation of Labor: Lewis G. Hines, national legislative representative.

Mine officials union: John McAlpine, president; Samuel Krimsley, general counsel; Charles R. Ferguson, international field representative.

Foremen's association: Walter M. Nelson, Kenneth Diller, William Stafford, William Sanders, W. Allen Nelson, Frank Elliott, Robert Turnbull, Walter McNally, Robert Keys, Theodore Bonaventura.

National Federation of Constitutional Liberties: Milton N. Kemnitz.

Railway labor unions: J. G. Luhrsen, John T. Corbett, Martin H. Miller.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States

of certain plants in the interests of the national defense.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of S. 796, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. At the close of the debate on yesterday the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] had consumed 56 minutes; the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] had consumed 1 hour and 6 minutes.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, during the 13 years that I have been a member of the Committee on Military Affairs I have voted to report out a great many bills with which I was not in entire accord. I have also voted for a great many rules on the floor of this House where I voted against the bill on final passage. I happen to belong to that school of thought which holds that every measure in a democratic body is entitled to fair debate and just consideration.

I oppose some of the provisions of the pending bill and when amendments are offered I expect to support them; but I feel we are confronted with a serious crisis in this country and that this Congress and especially the people of the country are demanding legislation. I know that some of the provisions of this bill are untimely. Some of them are unfair and unjust and I will not support them. Above all, I think they will fail to produce practical results. I am anxious to see some legislation that will meet this terrible crisis that now confronts us in the coal fields of the country. This House more than 18 months ago discussed a general labor bill, which was hardly considered in the other body. They have completely ignored it. I think the time may arrive later when this House ought to consider general legislation covering the entire labor field, but there has always been a kind of peculiar psychology about some of this so-called labor legislation. I recall that back a few years ago when labor wanted many of us, including myself, to support wage and hour legislation and the creation of the National Labor Relations Board prevailing wage law, Davis-Bacon act, and many other things in connection with the welfare of labor, and which many of us actively supported, there was no objection made at that time. I think my labor record both here, and before I came here, will compare favorably with any Member of the House.

Labor is entitled to the same fair treatment as any other group of our citizens, but those who will not obey the law and practice justice should be made amenable to it. We have legislated and regulated the farmers, industrialists, contractors; prosecuted the doctors as well as many good citizens who violate O. P. A. regulations. The innocent have nothing to fear.

I should like briefly to recount the steps that lead up to this present bill. I wish you would take time to read the hearings, especially of those who came before the Committee on Military Affairs. Some of the criticism directed to the chairman has neither been just nor fair. At the request of the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] in which I later joined, the chairman thought it was only fair that the representatives of the various departments charged with production should come before the committee and explain why and give their reasons for the letter they wrote to the Speaker of the House and the chairman of the committee. I may say in all fairness that many of those suggestions were adopted and later will be offered as amendments to the bill. In the committee an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] to sections 2 and 3 of the bill, later actively supported by members of the committee such as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], myself, and others, feeling that in view of the statements made by those charged with production, namely, representatives of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission, that those sections did nothing in the world but legalize strikes. So I anticipate that that amendment will be offered again; but to get right down to the very heart of this bill may I remind my colleagues that the testimony adduced before the committee this week showed conclusively that at a meeting a few months ago the no-strike agreement was had in which Mr. John L. Lewis—Mr. John L. Lewis, I repeat—Mr. Philip Murray, Mr. William Green, and many other representatives of labor agreed absolutely to no strikes during the war; then came along the fateful day of May 1 when the coal miners went out on strike at the behest of Mr. Lewis.

If I may recount a little more history, may I recall to your minds that the day they went out the President of the United States, who is the Commander in Chief of the armed forces, issued an Executive order that the Government should take over the coal mines of the country. What did he do? He appointed Mr. Ickes as director in charge of that matter and they unfurled the American flag over every mine. Uncle Sam then became the boss. On the night of May 2, if I may quote his words, the President and Commander in Chief said this:

> A stopping of the coal supply even for a short time would involve a gamble with the lives of American soldiers and sailors and the future of our whole people. Therefore, I say to all miners and to all Americans everywhere, at home and abroad, the production of coal will not be stopped.

The very day when that flag went up over those mines the Pittsburgh Coal & Coke Co., the Philadelphia Mining Co., and the other great mining companies of the coal regions of the country ceased to be the operators and managers of those mines; the operator was nobody but our own Uncle Sam.

A few days ago those miners went out again at the behest of their leader. Against whom, if you please? Not against the owners and operators of the mines; they went out against the President and the Commander in Chief of the United States. I take the position, and I expect to defend it—I do not care what happens to me personally or politically—that no man in peacetime and more especially in wartime has a right to strike against his Government. That is the issue, and that is what we ought to boil this bill down to and try to be practical. I want to get results. I think we can wait about general labor legislation.

I invite a careful reading of section 13. I cannot read all of the provisions in the brief time allotted to me, but I want to refer to that section of the committee amendment dealing with interference with Government operation of plants. It reads as follows:

> INTERFERENCE WITH GOVERNMENT OPERATION OF PLANTS
>
> SEC. 13. (a) Whenever any plant, mine, or other property is in the possession of the United States, it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, or induce any person to interfere, by lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption, with the operation of such plant, mine, or property, or (2) to aid any such lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such plant, mine, or property by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein. No individual shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this section by reason only of his having ceased work or having refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

Why should any honest and patriotic American citizen object to that?

I challenge any man or woman on the floor of this House to point out in this bill a single word that says a man does not have a right to strike. I challenge him to point out where it destroys or diminishes the right of collective bargaining. I challenge him to point out where there is a single prohibition against the right of free speech. I challenge him to point out where it prevents peaceful picketing. It does none of these things.

The bill as reported does repeal the Norris-LaGuardia law about injunctions. I opposed that in the committee and I expect to offer an amendment here to strike it out. There was a provision in the original bill to outlaw the closed shop. I opposed that in the committee and by a majority vote that has been stricken from the bill. I am opposed to strikes in wartime, and that is all we ought to undertake at this time, because that is all we can hope to pass in the Senate and get approved.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Read the next section. There is a criminal penalty.

Mr. THOMASON. Of course, there is a criminal penalty.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does not the gentleman thing it would be better and more effective to have injunctive relief?

Mr. THOMASON. No; I am opposed to injunctions in labor disputes. I cannot yield any further. For heaven's sake, we are in a war, the Commander in Chief has taken over the coal mines in order to provide coal for the winning of this war. The men are working for the Government of the United States and they have struck against their country in wartime. That cannot be defended. Does the gentleman mean to say there should not be some criminal provision providing either a jail sentence or fine when men violate the law? We are in total war.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman asks me a question.

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not say there should not be a criminal penalty, but I say injunctive relief would be more effective.

Mr. THOMASON. I disagree entirely with you. I oppose injunctions just as I did "yellow dog" contracts. Is there any man or any group of men in the United States bigger than our Government? That is the issue. I am for my country first. That is the reason I am supporting legislation on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as they may desire to the following gentlemen, and I ask unanimous consent that they may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD: The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is a grave responsibility that rests upon the Congress today in its deliberation upon the Smith-Connally bill to place a legislative curb upon strikes and to regulate labor unions during the war. As representatives of all the people of the country, we are to decide whether the great majority of them will be properly represented or whether a minority group of labor leaders who profess to find in this proposal something sinister and hostile to the rights of labor shall be dominant, and work stoppages allowed to continue at a time when the existence of our life as an independent nation is hanging in the balance.

Let it be clearly understood that most of those who are supporting this measure are not unfriendly to labor. I firmly believe in the right of the workingman to organize into labor unions for the purpose of protecting him from exploitation by an unscrupulous employer. A necessary corollary to the right to organize is the right of collective bargaining through which the union officers negotiate with their employers to correct any apparent grievance. Furthermore, a necessary corollary to the right of collective bargaining is the right to strike, for that is the only instrumentality of compulsion which labor has to correct a grievance. These are the three spearheads by which labor has succeeded in obtaining for itself many of the benefits of the past 25 years. These are the "rights" which must and should be protected at all times, both in war and peace.

But, Mr. Chairman, the bill before us does not deny to labor any of these rights in spite of all the protestations of the professional labor leaders to the contrary. In simple terms, it provides that in the event collective bargaining should fail to obtain an adjustment of any particular dispute, then a period of 30 days must elapse before a strike is called. The right to strike still exists under the bill, but that right cannot be exercised within 30 days after other efforts for an amicable settlement have failed. Certainly, this is not an unreasonable provision.

This requirement is what is known as the cooling-off period, in which tempers and emotions and personal animosities are allowed to moderate so that the immediate problem or dispute may be viewed with a calmness, fairness, and lack of passion. Already some States of the Union have enacted statutes similar to this, which were opposed vigorously by the spokesmen for labor at the beginning, but which, in actual operation, have proven to be both effective in curtailing strikes and at the same time in accomplishing the goal which labor has sought. The workingman in those States has found that his right to strike still exists in spite of the law, and he is satisfied. The same result will be obtained when this bill is enacted into law.

There are some persons who claim that this legislation is not necessary for the reason that the spokesmen for labor have solemnly promised that there would be no strikes during the war. This in the face of the fact that the great coal strike is now on and 500,000 miners not on the job. What is the record of the War Labor Board in regard to strikes and labor disputes? Since it was created several months ago the W. L. B. has disposed of only 786 disputes, or an average of 50 cases per month. It now has pending before it some 2,000 unsettled cases, which, based on previous experience, will require 3½ years to settle. It is these disputes, Mr. Chairman, from which strikes result. Furthermore, the records indicate that in 1942 there were a total of 2,968 strikes in this country, the greatest number for any year in our history, except in 1937 and 1941. During the month of April just past there were 395 strikes, establishing a record which, if maintained for a year, would total more strikes in 1 year than have occurred in all the combined years since the Department of Labor was created. Strikes are a serious and menacing problem and require the immediate attention of the Congress.

It has been asserted by those who are opposed to this bill that to enact it would be tantamount to an attack upon labor as a whole and charge them with unfaithfulness and disloyalty in time of war. What a silly and preposterous argument. Because laws are passed providing punishment for murder does not mean that all people are suspected of being guilty of murder. Because it is illegal to steal does not imply that everybody is a thief. Because a law is proposed to reduce strikes in the interest of the successful prosecution of the war does not mean that all workers are guilty of violation of the pledge of labor not to strike. No laws would be necessary if everyone were honest and fair and honorable. It is to punish the few and to suppress the temptation of some that laws are made. Honest labor has no reason for offense at this bill—it is only those whose conscience hurts who complain.

No one questions the loyalty and determination of the great majority of workers in this country. Their sons are in the field of battle and on the high seas the same as the boys of the employer and the office worker. They realize the grave danger in which our country rests; they know the importance to the success of our men at the battle fronts that there be no suspension of war production; they are willing to and have worked long and arduous hours; most of them have refused to strike even though they have felt themselves to be aggrieved. It is not those people whom this bill would affect; rather, it would curb the very, very small minority of laborers and labor leaders who persist in practices which are accepted in peacetimes but which have no place when their nation, their homes, their lives, and their jobs are in peril. Some of them have even gone so far as to defy the power and authority of the Chief Executive and the Commander in Chief. Those men who believe themselves above and beyond the power of Government and who seek to make selfish gains for themselves during the exigencies of war, can and must be checked.

By what right, sir, can this Government arbitrarily take a young man from his school, or his profession, or his business, and his home, compel him to give up substantial earnings, tear him away from his wife or mother or children, clothe him in the uniform of a soldier, put a pack on his back and a gun in his hand, command him to go forth to battle a common foe and expose himself to the shot and shell and hell of war and, at the same time, permit any person or group of persons, for personal and selfish reasons, to refuse to work and make the very things which that young man needs to protect himself from the enemy or to inflict harm to the enemy? By what right, I ask, can that same Government confiscate the excessive earnings of a corporation, which have been occasioned by the war, or commandeer the plant, equipment, or property of any corporation or individual for the purpose

of increasing war production and, at the same time, permit a worker or group of workers to stop production because they are dissatisfied with the wages they receive? There must be a uniformity and fairness of treatment for all the people, else the powers of government are misguided and abused.

Deliberation on this bill has not been hurried or superficial. It has been considered most thoroughly by both branches of the Congress. Many committees of both the House and the Senate have held long and exhaustive hearings on this general subject matter for the past 2 years. A bill similar to the one now before us passed the House in December 1941 by a substantial vote of 252 to 136. When it went to the Senate it was allowed to die at the hands of a committee dominated by administration influence. Just a few weeks ago, when the coal strike threatened to cripple our war production, the Senate passed the Connally bill, which had been pending before that body for some time, by a vote of 63 to 16. The bill now before us is a combination of the bill passed by the House in 1941 and the Connally bill. It was reported unanimously by the House Committee on Military Affairs.

Subsequent to the report of the measure, certain high officials of the Executive Department protested the passage of the bill, at the instance, we are told, of the Secretary of Labor. Once more, the Executive branch of the Government has undertaken to thwart the expressed will of the representatives of the people, and we again see evidences of the lash of the dictator, which has been characteristic of the New Deal over previous and supine rubber-stamp Congresses. It is time for the Congress to face its responsibilities squarely, and honestly, and fearlessly, without danger of intimidation or recrimination. Unity we must have; unity we all seek; but that does not mean that the people's spokesmen must follow blindly the directives and edicts of the Executive, even in time of war.

It is time for the Congress to act. The President, though clothed with ample powers to subdue strikes, has failed to act. Even today, there are over a half million workers refusing to produce the coal which is so essential to our war production. Neither the desire of any person or group of them for a fourth term, nor the obligation which is due to an organization which contributed a half million dollars to the New Deal campaign fund in 1936, can be allowed to interfere with the production of the sinews of war. The day for temporizing and vacillation by the President in dealing with this vital matter is over. It is now time for the people, through Congress, to speak.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, this bill does not deny organized labor any of its rights. It does not deny men the right to organize into unions. It does not prevent collective bargaining. It does not prohibit peaceful picketing. It does not withdraw the right of labor to appeal to Government for redress of any wrongs. It simply imposes upon labor many of the duties and responsibilities that are already imposed by law upon practically all other groups of our citizenry. As a friend of labor who believes in unions; in its right to organize; in its right to bargain collectively; in its right to strike under normal conditions, I wish to urge that the rank and file of labor, the overwhelming majority of whom are as patriotic as any Member who serves in this body, put their own house in order, else they will lose all the benefits they have gained in the past quarter century. It is my firm conviction that once this bill is on the statute books and labor itself understands its purpose, its meaning, and its effect, they, themselves, will admit the wisdom of it and become its strongest advocates.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, this is a war measure. Its purpose is to secure uninterrupted production of ships, guns, tanks, planes, munitions, and other necessary war supplies.

This Nation is engaged in a war on the seven seas and throughout the whole world. The people of this country are fighting for the life of the Nation. They are fighting for the lives, the liberties, and the security of every man, woman, and child in the land. Millions of our boys are under arms. In the Army alone, as of May 23 of this year, 6,759 have been killed in action, 14,865 have been wounded in action, 22,494 are missing in action, 16,301 are prisoners of war. The casualties in our Army total 60,420.

In the Navy, as of June 3, the killed are 584 officers, 5,096 enlisted men, making a total of 5,680; officers wounded, 136; enlisted men, 2,100; making a total of 2,236; officers missing, 850; enlisted men, 9,059; a total of 9,909; officers prisoners, 202; enlisted men, 1,339; a total of 1,541; total officers in all categories 1,772; total enlisted men in all categories 17,594. The casualties in our Navy total 19,736.

Among these dead are the heroes who with General Doolittle bombed Japan, were captured and brutally murdered by the Japs.

We have just begun to fight. The campaigns through which our armed forces have gone are but preliminary skirmishes compared to the tremendous and bloody fighting that lies ahead of our armed forces. Responsible heads of our War and Navy Departments have repeatedly warned that casualties of more than a million may be expected before the war is won.

This is a day of mechanized warfare. We are engaged in total war. The overwhelming majority of the American people are determined that no man nor set of men shall be permitted to slow up, sabotage, or in any other wise interfere with the successful and victorious prosecution of this war. The people of this Nation are determined that no man nor set of men, through individual or concerted action, shall be permitted to send our boys, unarmed and unequipped, to certain slaughter. Such a course would be a reversal of the entire history of this country and would lead to our humiliating defeat and to the enslavement of our people.

"To bring the conflict to a successful termination" this Congress has pledged the wealth and the lives of our people. In fulfillment of that pledge more than $200,000,000,000 have been appropriated, and we have builded 8,300,000 of our young men into a living wall of defense and offense. Into this war to defend our liberty, our lives, and our country, the overwhelming majority of the American people are putting their very soul.

This proposed act is not an indictment of the laboring people of this Nation. The great majority of them are at work. It does not question the patriotism of anybody. It simply provides that the labor of the faithful many shall not be defeated by a few selfish men. It does not suspend a single legal right of organized labor. It does not suspend the laws that guarantee to the working people of this country the right to organize, the right to collectively bargain with respect to wages, hours, and working conditions through representatives of their choice. It does not require involuntary labor on the part of anyone. It simply says to those who might seek to slow down or stop the continuous production of materials necessary to the successful prosecution of the war: "Before you do this, let the men and women who compose your organization vote on the question—and then for 30 days let us see if the differences can be settled by peaceable mediation, conciliation, and voluntary arbitration."

The attitude of those who oppose this measure may be boiled down to this: They say to this Government and to this Congress: "You may take the boys of this Nation, put them into our armed forces at $50 per month to fight, and if needs be, to die, but do not you touch, by law or otherwise, the man, or the men, who undertake, in defiance of the Government and the safety of our people, to slow down or stop our effort to arm, equip, feed, and support our boys in this war."

The act as passed by the House provides:

Section 2 makes it unlawful for a war contractor to conduct a lock-out against his employees until after the expiration of 30 days from the date on which such a contractor gives to his employees, or their representatives, and to the Secretary of Labor, written notice of his intention so to do, together with a statement of his reasons for such an intended lock-out. This section makes it unlawful for employees of a war contractor to strike until after the expiration of 30 days from the date on which they, or their representatives, give to such contractor and to the Secretary of Labor written notice of their intention to strike, together with a statement of their reasons for striking.

Section 3 makes it unlawful for employees of a war contractor to strike until after the Secretary of Labor has certified the result of a secret ballot, taken under the direction of the United States Conciliation Service, of the employees engaged at the plants, mines, or other places of employment in which such strike is threatened.

The act clothes the National War Labor Board with power to hold public hearings on any disputes that may arise

between employers and employees in war industries and to take jurisdiction on its own motion of such disputes. In making its decisions the Board is required to conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the regulations and orders issued under such acts, and, where no law is applicable, to provide terms and conditions to govern relations between any employer and his employees to the end that any dispute shall be settled between the parties on a fair and equitable basis.

In short, the act passed by the House would:

First. Make it unlawful for any persons to "coerce, instigate, or induce any persons to interfere by lock-out, strike, slow-down or other interruption," with the operation of any plant, mine, or other property taken over by the Government.

Second. Provide fines of not more than $5,000 and prison terms of not more than 1 year, or both, for persons found guilty of instigating such delays.

Third. Give the W. L. B. statutory authority with power to subpena witnesses.

Fourth. Require secret ballots on all strike votes in war plants and a 30-day "cooling off" period before a walk-out can be called.

Fifth. Prohibit labor organizations from making political contributions.

Sixth. Require unions to register with the National Labor Relations Board and file periodical financial statements.

By the express terms of the act no individual employee shall be required to render labor or services without his consent; and no individual shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of the act by reason of his having ceased work or by having refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

This act, as passed by the House, sets up machinery for the adjustment of labor disputes and for a continuation of work, rather than destructive industrial warfare, strikes, and paralysis of production. There are no strikes in Germany or in Japan. They mean to defeat and enslave our people. Today there are millions of French, Russian, Dutch, Belgians, Poles, and other conquered races toiling in Germany and in the occupied countries of Europe under the lash and at the point of German bayonets. This would be the fate of the working people of this country should we lose this war. Membership in a union and the rights guaranteed our working people under the laws of this Nation would be of no avail and would be but scraps of paper if the Germans and the Japs ever set foot, as conquerors, on the soil of this country.

We are on trial as a free government of freemen and freewomen. Our enemies have said we cannot wage war successfully because our people are free and will not make the sacrifices necessary to win. So far, we have given this statement the lie. The American people—more than 98 percent of them—have been on the job since Pearl Harbor. Our boys face hardship, heat, cold, suffering, and death. On the sea, in the air, and on the battlefield, they have made sacrifices and won victories that entitle them to the support of this Congress. Nothing short of our united support of these heroes will satisfy the American people and their fighting sons.

On the declaration of war, the American Federation of Labor, the C. I. O., and the United Mine Workers gave their pledge that there would be no strikes during the war. These pledges have been kept for the most part. Counting the time lost by unauthorized strikes and the recent stoppage of work in the coal mines, the loss of time in our war industries has been less than 1½ percent. Ownership, management, and the men, women, boys, and girls working in our war plants have wrought miracles in production of war materials.

The men and women in our armed forces are from the homes of this country, from every walk of life.

During the month of May the Axis scored heavily on our home front—perhaps as heavily as we scored on theirs. American boys lost their lives dropping bombs on German factories and mines in order to slow up German production of arms and coal. Hitler did not need to bomb ours to stop our production of coal and steel. More than 500,000 of our workingmen quit work, and it did not cost Hitler one plane or the life of a single German. Our coke ovens were banked, our factories and steel mills slowed down.

But Hitler's factories were not running short of fuel. He was getting plenty of coal, because French and Belgian miners were digging coal every day while their German slave masters stood over them with guns. These French and Belgian miners work 12 hours per day. They cannot strike. The French did their striking back when the French Army was getting ready to fight the Germans—and when the Germans struck the French did not have enough equipment. Now they are slaves. We are calling up our boys to fight. Laval is calling up the boys of France to work as slaves for their German conquerors.

Here are two of the kind of letters I am receiving from mothers and fathers of boys who have been called to fight and, if needs be, to die for this country:

Representative JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.

DEAR SIR: Like a good many of my fellow citizens, I'm fed up to the teeth with the current spectacle of a lot of the tying up of the war effort. Uncle Sam beckons, and my sons lay down their school books to pick up guns, and exchange the comforts of home for the stern discipline of military life. What use for me to protest even if I felt justified?

While I toss on my bed, my 19-year-old wallows in mud and accepts a monthly pittance less than many at home pull down in 1 week. Come January, the second son will graduate from high school just in time to have the finger put on him. It rather strains my patriotism at the seams to contemplate that while these boys renounce all their individual rights, unprincipled men can, by exercising their right to vote strikes (or declare them willy-nilly) condemn these lads to death, on their slightest whim.

My indignation flames at the thought that these men have more power to wield than is their right, or anybody's, in wartime.

I am supposed to have a few rights myself, including that of Congressmen to act in my behalf.

Signed by the mother of a soldier.

Representative JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.

DEAR SIR: I have talked to many gentlemen and we can't understand why you Representatives and Senators can pass laws to take our boys to the armed forces and make them fight and give their lives for $50 a month, and yet you can't, or won't pass laws to stop the strikers from stopping work which is very necessary to the war effort of our boys who are dying for these same men.

We think there should be some law to force them to work or fight, if they don't want to work, let our boys come home and work and let them fight. We farmers are told how much we can get for our foodstuff we produce and also what we must produce; we have the same right to stop producing and demand more pay for products. If we did this, we would be counted very disloyal. Now the general public would like to see some measure taken to force these strikers to stop and let all fight together or let all go down together.

Please reply to this letter.

Yours very truly.

Signed by the farmer father of a soldier.

That the continuous operation of all our factories for the production of war materials and the continuous operation of our coal mines is necessary to the victorious prosecution of this war and to the safety of the Nation and the liberty of our people is recognized by everyone.

And now, when the life of the Nation is at stake, and when its security is threatened, will this Congress act? Shall we refuse to act? Have we a government of laws? Shall we abandon the fate of the Nation to private individuals?

From our brave sailors, marines, and soldiers who are fighting, bleeding, and dying all over the world there comes a challenge to this Congress.

From every fox hole and battlefield, from the frozen slopes of the Aleutians to the desert sand of North Africa and the muck and pestilential swamps and jungles of the South Pacific there comes to us a cry that will not be denied.

From hospitals where our wounded languish in pain and anguish, from the graves of our dead, whose blood cries out to us from the grounds, from the hearts of the fathers and mothers of these boys there comes an appeal that should turn the "coward's heart to steel, the sluggard's blood to flame."

From Japanese and German prisons, where our boys are crowded behind barbed-wire fences, there comes a summons.

I, for one, am ready to stand up and be counted in favor of the bill. I take my stand with the fathers and mothers of these boys, living and dead, and with the boys who stand between us and slavery and the outrage of our women and girls.

This I know, all over this land fathers and mothers of boys who are under arms and who will be called to arms are anxiously awaiting the result of the vote on this bill. Our soldiers, sailors, and marines everywhere are awaiting the roll call on this bill. Hitler, Mussolini, and

Hirohito await it. Let the answer be emphatic. It should be unanimous.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, in the supreme court room at our beautiful State capitol in Nebraska you find these words engraved: "The eyes and the ears are poor witnesses when the soul is barbarous." We might also say, "A man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still." Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable heat and not too much light in the discussion of this labor legislation.

I question whether anything I might say or anyone else will change many votes in this body. Most of us have made up our minds be it good or bad.

I did not like the bill as originally presented to the Congress. There were features in the bill which I think were bad. Some of the sections have been modified or removed. Amendments have been adopted which have improved the bill. I expect to give it my support.

When any organization or union living and operating in this, a democratic country, fails to adopt democratic plans in the conduct of their business then that union or body becomes a direct threat to the Nation itself. It has been quite evident the last few weeks that some of the union racketeers who direct the activities of the unions feel that they are bigger than our Government. These union racketeers, and I refer to the men of the John L. Lewis stripe, are nothing more than saboteurs to our war effort. They sabotage as much as the worker who might deliberately throw a monkey wrench into moving machinery. They deserve the same treatment as other saboteurs have received in the past.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us merely strikes at the one or two percent who are the racketeers in labor and who enslave the service of millions of loyal American workers. Someone has said that more than a million of the American Federation of Laborers' sons are in this World War. You and I know that these fathers and mothers and their brothers would do nothing which might hinder their boys on the firing line from having every weapon and advantage needed to win this war.

I have thought for some time that Congress ought to have a medal or a badge of honor to give the loyal workers who are on the job day after day working without stint or praise to keep the assembly lines of this country in action. These folks want to work, Mr. Chairman, but because some high-paid racketeers of labor will penalize them if they work when a strike is called, they are forced by existing circumstances not to work. There are only a few of these racketeers but they do control a large body of workers. It is some form of slavery because the laboring man is controlled by the labor boss and he has little to say about his working conditions. It is a peculiar kind of slavery because the worker is earning more than he ever did in his life. It is slavery nevertheless because the man who does the work has no more control over his working conditions than his father had in the days when capital exploited labor. He must follow the rules of the racketeer or be kicked out of the union and thus be denied the right to work. These racketeers are selfishly determined to get theirs while the getting is good even at the cost of too little or too late to the boys on the firing line. The boys in the terrible trenches on many battle fronts of the world want ammunition, guns, airplanes, and tanks and there is little difference between the ammunition and guns made by union or nonunion members. They care not who makes them but they want it and plenty of it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say at this point that I believe in labor unions. Were I a laboring man belonging to many of the crafts or to an unorganized group I would want to be a member of the proper union. I believe that labor should have the right to collective bargaining. I believe in ordinary times they should have the right to strike. However, today, when we are drafting the flower of mankind to fight for our liberties on many battle fronts, placing in their hands the weapons of war that we should expect and demand from all groups at home equal sacrifice and unity in this total war effort. When the miner strikes, or any other organized group who are making the many materials needed by our soldiers, it is against the public interest and the best interest of our Government. The organized minority must be prevented from calling these strikes in wartime.

There is nothing wrong with legislation which will permit its own members to decide if they want to strike. Is there anything wrong with legislation which permits that same member in a democratic fashion to decide who he wants for his leader? Is there anything wrong when that same union member wants to know what is done with the money he pays in to the union? This legislation will help the common laborer, the man in the rank and file to decide his own fate and that of his union. It will prevent the racketeer from exploiting honest patriotic laboring men and women. Is there anything wrong with that?

It is unfortunate, my colleagues, when leaders of labor threaten you with political defeat because you do not dance to the tune that they want to play. These racketeers would make you a slave just as they are enslaving their own members. This legislation will help good labor unions, it will prevent that small percent from running amuck and sabotaging our war effort.

It will take some moral courage, Mr. Chairman, and I want to remind my colleagues that moral courage is far more difficult to have than physical courage. I do not believe that the Members of this House will prove to be a spineless group of cowards who run for cover because Mr. Lewis, Green, and company are cracking the whip over their heads. I am convinced that the majority of honest hard-working union members want this legislation adopted. Not the racketeers, no, it would spoil their little party.

It has been stated that the unions have given a no-strike pledge; that is true, but since that pledge was given the statistics from the Labor Department show that more strikes than ever have been carried on in this country. I predict that when the 20-percent withholding tax goes into effect that the curve in strikes will go up. The Labor Department statistics show that in April of this year there were 395 strikes. The great General Motors Co., engaged in an all-out war effort, have had 20 strikes in the last 4 months. The Timken Roller Bearing Co., engaged in making technical materials for the military, have had 9 strikes since February 19. It was on February 19, 1943, that the union in this company gave their no-strike pledge. Gentlemen, with the exception of 2 years, there have been more strikes in the last year than in any 1 year of the last 20 years, and all of this under a no-strike pledge and during the most critical period in the history of our country.

Whenever a small organized minority of racketeers and saboteurs can call a strike which paralyzes production in this country, particularly during wartime, it is an insult to your boy and mine, who are fighting their hearts out to preserve this democracy. I say to you again it is time that Congress, the President, and those in authority take these racketeers of labor by the scruff of their necks, and give them the treatment which will convince the country and the union members that the United States Government is bigger than a few leaders with reptile stripes. This legislation should pass, and it will be a step to curb the unholy activities now perpetuated upon this Government.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the increasing frequency and the increasing size of strikes in our country today has caused concern among all the people of our Nation. These strikes have had a bad effect upon the efficiency of our great war effort. Public concern has now increased to the point where immediate action is demanded of Congress. Capital and industry and labor and the executive branch of our Government have been held strictly accountable for the avoidance of strikes up to date, but as strikes have increased in size and frequency the people have now turned to Congress for some vigorous and effective legislation to control this menace to our war effort before it is too late.

The people today are still looking hopefully to us as their Representatives in Congress to meet this need for legislation with straightforwardness and determination.

It has been my privilege to serve on the Military Affairs Committee, to which the antistrike bill—that is, the Connally bill, S. 796—was referred for study and report to the House of Representatives. I could criticize some sections of this legislation, and I could criticize the incompleteness of the hearings and even the parliamentary procedure in giving jurisdiction over a labor issue to the Military Affairs Committee of the House. I could also criticize the executive departments of our Government for waiting until long

after this bill was acted on by the Military Affairs Committee to voice their objections to it, as they have done.

Just why the War Department, the Navy Department, the Department of Labor and the Maritime Commission and others of the executive branch of the Government waited so long to voice their protest, has not been made clear by the representatives of those departments and agencies. However, this great strike issue today has progressed beyond the point where the American people are going to excuse Congress from responsibility and for further delay on any such grounds. The strike situation has developed to the point where the American people now demand immediate action and effective legislation by Congress right here on the floor of the House.

Congress is well qualified to pass judgment upon the strike issue now. Public sentiment has crystallized and immediate action is demanded. Congress can and must perfect this legislation here on the floor of the House today if we are to fulfill our obligation to the American public and if we are to serve our Nation effectively in bringing about a timely solution to the interference of strikes with our war effort.

Congress should face this issue fairly and fearlessly and effectively by passing the bill (S. 796) today. Then with the help of this legislation I sincerely hope that organized labor and the President and the departments under him will cooperate to their utmost in putting an end to the strike menace.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the discussion about this bill has been largely directed toward the strike now prevailing in the coal mines. I am anxious for the committee to realize that the coal-mine strike is just one of the symptoms of what is happening to the country, and I want to give you some statistics in reference to what is going on, then I want to explain, if I can, just what is in this bill. There seems to be a great deal of misunderstanding about it.

I inquired of the War Labor Board last week how many cases they had pending and undetermined and how many they had decided in the past 15 months of their existence. I find that as of that time they had decided 786 cases in 15 months, or an average of about 50 cases a month. These are dispute cases, every one of which contains the threat of a strike against a war industry. They have decided in that time an average of 50 cases a month. They have now a backlog of 2,050 cases pending, active, actual labor disputes carrying the threat of a strike. If they never have another case it will take them, according to the average they have made, 3 years and 4 months to dispose of the cases now on the docket. So the coal strike is not the only labor dispute in this Nation by any means.

I want to call your attention to the fact that in the largest industry of war production we have, namely, General Motors, there have been in the past 4 months 20 strikes, an average of more than 1 strike a week in General Motors over the past 4 months. I want to call your attention to the fact that the Timken Roller Bearing Co., a most vital concern to all of your mechanical industries, entered into a collective-bargaining agreement on February 19 of this year in which it was agreed that all disputes should be taken through a certain course before any strikes are called. Since that contract was made in February of this year that company, manufacturing vital articles, has had 9 strikes in violation of that contract.

I read you yesterday some labor statistics and I want to give them to you again so that in the RECORD there may be authority for my statement. In the May issue of the Monthly Labor Review, page 961, issued by the Department of Labor, there were in 1942, 2,968 strikes. That is more strikes than ever occurred in the United States at any time within the past 20 years with the exception of 2 years. One of those years was 1941 when we were preparing for war and the other was in 1937 just after the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act. Those are not my figures. They are the figures of the United States Labor Department.

The Labor Department also issues a monthly digest for the use of Members of Congress. In the digest of May 31, 1943, it appeared that in the month of April there were in the United States 395 strikes. If the strike situation continues on that average for 1943 there will have been more strikes in the United States in 1943 than there have been in all the history of the United States since the Department of Labor began keeping statistics on the subject. Gentlemen, think about that for a moment.

It is said that we have a no-strike agreement. Some say there is not any trouble except this coal strike. I am reading you figures given by the Labor Department on what is going on today, not what went on last year or what somebody may predict will go on. We have a no-strike agreement.

Three months before Pearl Harbor at a convention of the C. I. O., Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., made this statement:

> Nothing must stop the work of organizing the unorganized in America, not even a great national emergency shall stop it.

I submit to the House this question: Has the C. I. O. more faithfully kept its promise to organize the unorganized or its promises that there should be no strikes during this emergency?

I want to get along now to the bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not at this time.

This bill was passed on, except the Connally provisions of it, by a vote of nearly 2 to 1 in December of 1941. It had this unusual thing happen to it, in which hearings were had by the House as a Committee of the Whole for 3 days when it considered every provision in detail, which were voted for 2 to 1.

If you will turn to page 7 of the bill, you will note the first thing is definitions. I call your attention to the fact that in these definitions the railway industry is excluded from the operations of the act, so they will still continue to operate under the Railway Labor Act as this bill does not affect railway labor. Of course, their representatives have been up here; they have been after me, those representing the railway labor group, but this bill does not affect them; it shows that on its face.

Sections 2 and 3 of the bill would provide that there shall be no strike until there has been a 30-day notice. The objections to this section are quite conflicting, because the gentleman who just preceded me said that this section was objectionable because it authorized and legalized strikes. It does not authorize or legalize strikes, because strikes are already legalized. I have never introduced a bill as yet that would prohibit the right to strike, and I never expect to do so. This merely provides that there must be a notice of 30 days given before there shall be a strike.

On the other hand, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] on yesterday made a statement about those sections in which he said they prohibited the right of the minority to strike. The gentleman from New York is a good lawyer. I can reach but one conclusion about his observation, that is, he never read the bill. In accordance with the bill the majority may strike or the minority may strike, after the strike ballot has been taken.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Excuse me for just a moment until I complete the explanation, I will yield to the gentleman first.

We come now to the section which prohibits violence and intimidation. We went over all that in 1941, and the House voted for it 2 to 1.

Then the next section prohibits what is known as professional picketing, that is to say, if a plant is to be picketed it must be picketed by employees. The House also went over all that in the debates on this bill.

Section 5 outlaws jurisdictional disputes, boycotts, and sympathy strikes. I do not think this House wants to countenance a strike by A union in sympathy with B union, when B union is striking about something with which A union does not have anything in the world to do, and which is perfectly silly in time of war. And that has all been hashed over in the debate in the House in 1941 and was approved by the House by a vote of 2 to 1.

A violation under this proposed law would not result in sending anybody to jail; it provides nothing of the sort. The only criminal penalty attached to this bill arises when the Government is operating the property that has been taken over and there is a strike against the Government itself. That is where the criminal provision comes in.

What impelled the adoption of the provisions that I have read to you? The theory is this, that Congress from time to time has enacted legislation which gave advantages to organized labor that

it did not give to the rest of the people of the United States. It gave those rights under the Norris-LaGuardia Act and under the National Labor Relations Act. All this bill does is to say that we do not think you ought to do those things during time of war. We make it unlawful, and if you do it, if you violate the law, then we are going to cut you down a notch and leave you where the rest of the American people are, and withdraw some of the special provisions that have been granted under the National Labor Relations Act and under the Norris-LaGuardia Act. That is all.

Registration of labor unions is required under the bill, and it is quite simple, if you will just read it. I have heard that discussed in this debate, but we debated all that last year.

Now coming over to page 18, to the section "Maintenance of the status quo": that gives to the War Labor Board, when it takes jurisdiction of disputes, the authority to order a stay for the period of 60 days and then prohibits a strike until that 60-day period has been given, so the Government can mediate and settle the controversy.

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that while that is a stay period, that it is virtually the same provision that the House Committee on Labor reported out here last year, and which was under consideration at the same time the so-called Smith bill was being considered. The Committee on Labor, which has never done anything against the legitimate interests of labor reported just such a provision, that there must be a 60-day stay while the Government undertakes to mediate these differences. Now, if you will look back into the RECORD of that day you will find that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] was acting chairman of the Labor Committee, that he was for it, that he said he believed in it. And, if there had been such a provision, if the Senate had listened to the wishes of the American people, in passing the Senate bill and included what the House had had in its bill, we would not have had this coal strike today; we would not be losing many hundreds of thousands of tons of coal that are so vitally necessary in this period of our Nation's life, since the War Labor Board, under its jurisdiction, could have said, "You must cease and desist for a period of 60 days before you can call a strike, Mr. Lewis."

You would not have a strike if the Senate had passed this bill as the House passed it last year.

My time is so limited I shall not discuss the Connally features of the bill, because I want to yield. I yield first to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. First, may I ask the gentleman if he agrees with what Director of War Mobilization James F. Byrnes said the other evening, as follows:

> Do not forget dur g 1942 only one-twentieth of one percent of time of workers engaged in war work was lost on strikes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes, I know all that percentage stuff, but I have read you the report of the Labor Department on the number of strikes that took place in 1942, and I have read you their report on the strikes that took place in April, which, if maintained throughout the year, will break all records for the number of strikes ever had in this country.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have just one question on a point on which I am rather confused. Has the President of the United States asked for this legislation?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No, not that I know of. He never asked me for it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Did he ever ask anybody else for it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In furtherance of the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], I think the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] could well say that any legislation of this type, restrictive in nature, is not aimed at the majority but at the willful minority. The great body of our workers, in factory, field, and mine, are the patriotic Americans who are doing so much to bring a victory over relentless enemies.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Of course, it is like the law against murder, innocent people not only do not object to it but want it for their protection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. In section 13 (a), concerning interference with Government operation of plants, is there anything that forbids an individual workman from striking?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. On the contrary, it is specifically provided that there shall be nothing that shall prevent him from striking.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. He not only can quit work but he can participate in a strike, as I understand it, as long as he does not give direction or guidance to the strike.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is the Connally bill. I am not so sure the gentleman is right on that.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. With reference to the percentage points quoted, is it not true that if only the 500,000 miners remain out of work for 30 days, it would paralyze the whole war effort?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; if they remain out of work for 3 more days, it will practically paralyze it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] be permitted to extend his own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, several times during the last few years, legislation has been presented on the floor of this House which asked for the enactment of measures that would nullify labor's accomplishments and impede its advancement.

Similar speeches were made on December 3, 1941. On that day predictions were made that if antilabor legislation were not passed, production would collapse and the war lost in a very short time.

Three months later, in March 1942, a repetition of this antilabor spectacle was staged in Congress when the so-called Smith bill, of a year ago, was up for consideration.

Again, about 6 weeks ago, the same campaign against organized labor emanated from the floor of this House and a repetition of the same speeches calling for the same shackling of labor in the so-called Hobbs bill.

In spite of the above seasonal assaults against the war workers and the defense producers of this country, American labor has overproduced and far exceeded the most optimistic predictions on the turning out of tanks, bombers, cannons, ammunition, ships, and the other essential needs to win this war.

The latest authentic reports indicate that in February 1943, 3 months ago, less than 2 workdays out of every 10,000 were lost on account of strikes. In March 1943, less than 3 workdays out of 10,000 were lost on account of strikes. On Monday, War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes, in a speech at Spartanburg, S. C., stated that in 1942 only one-twentieth of 1 percent of defense production man-hour days was lost on account of strikes. All available data indicates a net loss of man-hours averaging each month approximately three-tenths of 1 percent. This record does not show the necessity for legislative measures of the character of the so-called Smith-Connally antilabor bill. Defense workers have performed what is universally regarded as a production miracle.

Every Member of this House, the people of the country, and the members of organized labor deplore and repudiate the actions of John L. Lewis in bringing about strikes and stoppages in the coal production of this country during wartimes. I am not personally familiar with the economic conditions and company store set ups in the various mining localities, but I am opposed to penalizing the millions of loyal and patriotic members of American organized labor engaged in other fields of industry. Everybody knows that in recent months the food budgets of the American family have reached critical proportions. In fact, in every avenue of American life great sacrifices have been made on account of this

war. No section of our economic set-up has suffered more than the small businessman. In fact, thousands of grocery men, meat dealers, automobile dealers, gasoline stations, and dozens of other retail establishments have closed their doors and lost everything, but are taking their sacrifices without complaint and in the spirit of patriotism.

Does anybody claim that with almost 50,000,000 engaged in war production in this country, that there would not be some unauthorized tie-ups of production scattered over the thousands of mills and factories throughout America? These interruptions have been condemned by the great leaders of labor organizations which supervise 95 percent of American labor, to wit: the A. F. of L., C. I. O., and the railroad brotherhoods.

A few months ago, absenteeism was the vehicle being used to discredit organized labor throughout America. It has been adequately proven to the American public that absenteeism was greatly exaggerated and not all one-sided—bad housing, inadequate transportation, lack of medical services, lack of day nurseries, inability of foremen and superintendents to handle increasing numbers of women workers, and so forth—all contributed to the absenteeism that existed. In time this is gradually clearing itself up without legislation. Volumes of bitter poison were distributed by a few newspapers and commentators whenever certain misunderstanding by local differences between labor and management took place in factories and industries. This vicious lying propaganda has a far-reaching purpose and effect. Both employers and the leaders of our large labor organizations are entitled to every credit for their cooperation and unified understanding during the last 2 years, without which the great success of our war effort could not have taken place.

We must not overlook that labor is entitled to its real place and credit in this great war effort along with industry, and when the history of labor's accomplishments since December 7, 1941, is told to the people after this victory is won, I feel that American labor will receive its proper credit and honor for the part it has played in preserving American freedom and liberty.

It is significant that one of the first official acts of Adolf Hitler 10 years ago was to destroy organized labor and labor unions in Germany. The free institutions of our American system of government need not fear that our Constitution and our liberty and our privileges will ever be in danger because of the freedom and progress and advancement of organized labor.

Persons advocating this type of legislation should take into serious consideration the results its final passage might have upon the morale and mental attitude of millions of members of labor in this country. Individual members of organized labor, by reason of their inherent American patriotism, are jubilant and proud to be able to take part in this great American war production accomplishment.

Members of Congress should visualize for a moment the feeling in the mind and also in the homes of the average American worker if legislation of this nature becomes effective. Millions of our most patriotic workers might assume an attitude that their Government found it necessary to pass legislation to supervise and compel them to work when the liberties of themselves and their families are at stake.

Since Pearl Harbor, the production of American war workers has astounded the world and it was personally called to our attention by the Prime Minister of England a few days ago on the floor of this House. Let us be careful that by reason of our actions on this legislation that the morale of the American worker is not seriously hampered and our victory endangered, all by reason of unnecessary bitterness engendered at frequent intervals by legislation of this kind.

Hatreds, bitterness, intolerance, and witch burning brought prohibition and its penalties during the last war. We should now reflect to the lesson learned in those days. Government cannot legislate in men's minds that which is not in their hearts. This legislation will lead to confusion, repulsion, and impede America's war effort.

A few quotations from the industrial leaders of America might be important at this time:

William Batt, president of the S. K. F. Industries, said the following at Town Hall on April 17, 1941:

> Where there is delay due to strikes, I doubt if the solution can be found through legislation.

Report of the department of manufacture committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce, January 24, 1941, said the following:

> The national chamber believes that antistrike laws prove ineffective and that they will deny fundamental rights to our citizens. The chamber further believes that public interest will be best served by voluntary cooperation.

John S. Kemper, past president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in an address at the Twenty-ninth annual meeting of the organization April 28, 1941, said:

> While the strike situation is apparently on the mend, it still is the most serious obstacle in our military defense. As a result, there has developed a strong minority calling for the outlawry of strikes and lockouts. As I see it, such a step would be the worst possible way to deal with the problem * * * compulsory arbitration or the attempt to deal with labor and employer disputes by any form of legislative compulsion never has worked out satisfactorily.

William S. Knudson, former president of General Motors, in testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, February 10, 1941, said:

> I don't believe you can make a man a criminal because he is striking.

In his speech before the Veterans of Foreign Wars, April 5, 1941, he said:

> I do not believe that legislation against strikes is necessary or enforceable.

B. C. Forbes, on April 22, 1941, in the Journal and American, New York, wrote:

> This writer has constantly opposed legislation outlawing strikes for the reason that cooperation is infinitely preferable to compulsion.

An article by Stewart Chase condensed from the Factory Management and Maintenance Magazine in this month's Reader's Digest said:

> In a great number of industries over the country, labor-management production committees have been formed for the purpose of mutual cooperation and understanding. Naming a few of the companies where labor-management problems are being ironed out without work stoppage are: Du Pont, Bethlehem Steel, Radio Corporation of America-Victor, United Airlines, Western Electric, General Motors, Caterpillar Tractors, Winchester Arms, General Electric, International Harvester, and hundreds of others.

This presents to the neutral and fair-minded citizen the question, Are these wildcat and scattered work stoppages wholly the fault of the leaders or members of organized labor? Neither labor nor management has any first mortgage on patriotism, but uncalled for greed and avarice on the part of either, may easily bring about local wildcat strikes and work stoppages.

Let us not throw the red herring of communism across the pathway of organized labor in America. The public is fast realizing that this smoke screen has been the rendezvous for enemies of organized labor over the last 30 years. If ever this great free land of ours was on the verge of communism and standing on the brink of national discontent and revolution, it was during 1930, 1931, and 1932, when over 12,000,000 American men were walking the streets and highways looking for work to feed and clothe themselves and their families. The same agitation and prejudices and hatreds are cropping up today that thrived immediately after the last World War. This prejudice and hatred against organized labor in the 1920's gave industry, the employer, and the promoter, a free rein and brought us the stock market, real estate, and the promotional booms which led up to the financial debacle of 1929.

In the Middle West during 1930 and 1931, our farmers, the most conservative class of people, were resisting mortgage foreclosures with pitchforks and ropes, and industry and labor alike were crying for a just solution of their troubles.

Let us not repeat the mistakes of the 1920's and allow hatred, bitterness, and partisan feeling to again run rampant and upset our economic structure and threaten our free governmental institutions.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, just a little less than 2 years ago, in a period of critical labor unrest, the Senate by an overwhelming vote enacted the original Connally bill, a measure designed to crush out strikes and prevent work stoppages in defense industries by granting the President arbitrary authority to seize industrial property.

When that proposal came to my committee as an amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act I vigorously opposed it. When the House adopted substitute legislation, I fought the property-seizure principle in conference; and later led the fight which defeated it in the House.

Now, again, in another crisis, the House is called upon to devise legislation which will eliminate this chronic threat to our security without at the same time destroying the rights of labor and the individual. Once again the Senate has approved the principle of property seizure. Now we here must decide whether we shall seek a solution in sound, long-range legislation written within the pattern of the Constitution, or whether we shall further abdicate our duties and responsibilities as representatives of the people and delegate additional arbitrary authority to be exercised at the personal whim and fancy, and I might add, for the political advantage of an Executive who has demonstrated his inability or unwillingness to deal with labor problems on anything but a personal and political basis.

The forceful seizure of property, as proposed in the Senate measure, is utterly no solution of the problem we are facing. That proposal therefore does nothing more than validate the arbitrary exercise of power to which the President has resorted with increasing frequency. It does not, in the remotest way, deal with the basic problems involved.

Nothing could more plainly prove the inadequacy of the seizure method than the present crisis in the coal mines. By Executive decree the President seized the mines throughout the United States on May 1, but what has been accomplished? Did that act end work stoppages? Obviously not, for within the month coal production came to a complete standstill. At best the President accomplished nothing but a troubled and uncertain truce in which not a single one of the basic points in controversy has been settled. In fact, if anything the seizure has complicated the problems and intensified the bitterness. What is happening in this instance is convincing proof of the very things I said in July of 1941 when I argued that Congress could not contribute to a solution of this problem merely by granting more arbitrary power to the President.

I emphasized then, and I repeat with all possible emphasis now that Congress could scarcely do more in a single act to jeopardize the American system of free enterprise and the constitutional rights of the individual than we may do in the endorsement of this principle of property seizure at the discretion of an all-powerful Executive.

I have repeatedly warned my friends in the ranks of labor that the Government will never stop with the mere seizure of physical property, because mere buildings and machinery are worthless without the manpower which alone can make them productive. In fact, it ought to be perfectly clear to everyone that the Government contemplates such seizure primarily as a means of seizing control of labor itself. After Government commandeers a factory or a mine, it would be childish to argue that it will not recruit, by force if necessary, the workmen to operate it. What other reason have you heard advanced for such seizure?

This would indeed be antistrike legislation with a vengeance. It would give the President power to crush any resistance organized labor might offer to any whim or fancy he might choose to impose. This would be the means by which the President could actually destroy the basic rights and privileges of the individual.

Consider for a moment, also, what might happen to the American system of free enterprise under such power. Is it difficult to imagine this President, or some even more aggressively minded state socialist using this authority to impose absolute Government control upon all important industry? Consider the present plight of the coal mine operators. I know we read a lot about continuing negotiations between the Government boss, Ickes, the miners and the operators, but this is nothing but the flimsiest shadow boxing. The operators long since have been reduced to the role of innocent bystanders. And their position is typical of all ownership and management caught in serious labor controversy.

The simple truth is that the operators have no authority whatsoever to negotiate the demands of the miners. They do not now have, and they have not had such authority since the President started issuing directives in an effort to stabilize wages. They are reduced to the status of messenger boys who can do nothing but carry the demands of their employees to the President or his agents for decision.

I hold no brief for management in this instance. In fact, I imagine the operators would gladly agree to reasonable adjustments if they can just find a way of doing it without courting criminal prosecution at the hands of their boss, the Government. But the quarrel is not between management and labor, or management and Government. It is between Government and labor. More specifically, this is the usual personal, bitter struggle between a willful Executive who considers labor relations, or more accurately, labor politics his own private preserve; and a type of equally willful labor leadership which insists that the President must share this tight monopoly with a chosen few.

I shall be the last to condone a selfish act by an individual or by any group, no matter how large, which threatens our national security. I do not condone the action of the miners, whose work stoppage gravely imperils our war effort, but by all means let us be careful to assess the blame in this situation where it properly belongs. First, let us admit frankly that the miners have just cause for complaint. Obviously, the administration is failing badly in its feeble attempts to stop inflation, and the miners, like many other classes of people, have suffered a steady decline in real wages as the cost of living skyrockets. Obviously, also, the miners have a right to expect that their wage scales will be kept in line with the pay in other industries, and we must admit that many other lines of labor have fared much more favorably than the miners.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that at the base, this is a titanic struggle between two individuals who are first of all political enemies. Politics, rather than the question of economic justice, is the main issue here, and it would be terribly unfair to blame the rank and file of mine labor for a condition which is primarily the fault of a willful President.

In this situation we have a personal and bitter feud, but consider the possibilities in a different situation. Suppose a strong man in the White House should strike a bargain with just a little handful of men who own labor under the tight monopoly which has been built up by this New Deal administration. Suppose a President decides to deal with a like-minded labor leadership to sell American industry into state socialism. Would not a wave of strikes purposely called in our key industries just about accomplish that conversion overnight under the authority which the President has been exercising, and which this property seizure bill would legalize?

I do not intend to dwell on that possibility, but I would like to point out that it is not nearly so fantastic as many a debacle which has actually overwhelmed free people before.

I sincerely wish that this question might have been considered, both in the Senate and the House in a more deliberate manner, when the national temper had not been so aroused.

I frankly consider this House substitute less than perfect in many respects, and say to you that certain features of it can and should be improved. In fact, I shall offer a substitute in full for the bill which has been reported to you. As debate continues here, and as the matter receives further study in conference, however, I know we can produce really effective legislation which will serve to restore the American labor scene to harmony.

Whatever the final action may be, however, I hope we shall once and for all put an end to labor relations by personal whim and fancy. I hope we will firmly establish the principle that labor relations, like every other important national interest, will be based in constitutional law.

We must be careful to insure that strong-arm methods which jeopardize individual rights or which threaten the important and desirable gains of labor are avoided.

I know that this body shares my confidence in the rank and file of American labor. We know that labor is not striking, and will not strike, except where it has been purposely misinformed and misled. We know that the men and women in the ranks of labor will not impede production and thus endanger the lives of their own sons and brothers and husbands on the battle fronts unless they are absolutely convinced that for the moment they must do so in the long-range best interests, not only of those

fighting men, but of the Nation as a whole.

The trouble to date arises from the unfortunate fact that the millions of men and women in labor are confused and uncertain. They have been bombarded from every direction with propaganda and political hokum born of purely personal selfishness in this administration and in a limited group of labor leaders. There has been no source in this emergency to which they could turn for facts and truth, for the sorry truth is that there is simply no clear code of labor law and no consistent course of administration upon which they can depend.

They have known only that a President, with almost unlimited power, writes the administrative law and directs its interpretation to suit his mood of the moment. And because there is no solid basis of law to which they can turn, they are forced to look for opinion and guidance to the only other source they know, a leadership which too often has been more interested in personal power and aggrandizement than in the real promotion of labor's interest.

We are warned by many, including ranking administration officials, that to write regulatory labor legislation now will endanger all labor relations. I vigorously disagree with that viewpoint, for it says in just so many words that American labor will be loyal only for selfish motives and for a definite price. I simply do not believe that. I am, in fact, convinced that the average man and woman who works for a living, either in or out of a union, wants, above everything else, to see labor relations divorced completely and finally from politics, so that all of us at home may work in harmony in the one all-important job still remaining ahead of us.

I can think of no greater service this Congress can render the men who are fighting this war abroad, and the people who are willing to make every necessary sacrifice at home to insure victory and a return to peace in a country that will remain true to our traditions of freedom.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. While I quite agree with the gentleman that there is a good deal of appeasement being carried on by Government agencies and authorities, may I ask the gentleman if he does not believe the provision in the committee bill which authorizes the War Labor Board to issue subpenas to compel the attendance of leaders or workers or operators or anybody else would strengthen the hands of those in authority and put them on a spot, so to speak, where they would have no leeway or reason to evade any longer when they can be given statutory authority?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I do not want to disagree with the gentleman on that, but I am not particularly in favor of that provision in the bill. I believe the War Labor Board has enough authority now under the Executive order to function. I believe the remedial legislation I am proposing is all the Board needs to function effectively.

I am going to offer a substitute to this bill. My substitute will contain sections 2 and 3 of this bill and the report section and a couple of others, which I shall discuss later.

The question is whether you want to entrust to the American laboring people the right to govern themselves, and the right to decide for themselves whether there is going to be a strike. I believe in the patriotism of American labor. You will never convince me that when you say to American labor "You can have a secret ballot to determine whether you are going to strike," they will vote to strike. You will never convince me that a small minority in any plant in any organization or in any industry in this country could force the entire organization to go on strike if they have the protection of a secret ballot.

If you reject this solution of the problem, you say, in effect that labor in this country is dishonest and that labor is unpatriotic. You say, "We are not going to entrust to you the right to decide by secret ballot whether or not there is just cause for a strike."

I do not condone strikes, nor can I understand any problem arising in labor or in industry that would justify labor in exercising its constitutional right to strike during war. But even condemning the strikes that we have had in the country, I say that I do not want to see this Congress write legislation that will deny American labor that basic, fundamental right to strike. I want to trust them. I want this Congress to have faith in labor and say that it may by secret ballot determine what it wants to do.

Mr. ELMER. Has the gentleman thought about the point raised by the gentleman from North Carolina yesterday about the bill being unconstitutional?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I did not hear the gentleman, and I do not know what his point is.

Mr. ELMER. The gentleman says that he is not in favor of labor striking when they want to strike?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I did not say that at all.

Mr. ELMER. That is what I understood the gentleman to say.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Then the gentleman misunderstood me. I said that I was not in favor of strikes, and that I could not understand any condition or circumstances where labor would exercise its right to strike during war.

Mr. ELMER. All right. Under this bill does the gentleman think it provides that I must work for a coal company if I am ordered to do so by the Government, and that I cannot quit working for that coal company if I am ordered to work for it by the Government? Is that in this bill?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. It is not in this bill. There is nothing in this bill that would compel a man to work.

Mr. ELMER. Then if you cannot compel him to work, you give him the right to strike.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. He has that right. There is no law that denies labor the right to strike, and this bill does not take it away from him.

Mr. ELMER. Why does not this bill take away from him the right to strike?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I do not think it would be the right thing to do, and I do not believe it would be constitutional to do so.

Mr. ELMER. Could this House pass a measure that would compel me to work for some other man, if I did not want to work for him?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Why, certainly not. That is slave labor, and I will not even consider that as a possible necessity. American labor is patriotic, and will cooperate with the Government in wartime. We will accomplish much more if we depend upon voluntary cooperation, rather than coercion.

Mr. ELMER. If you take away the right to strike, or if you delay the right to strike, then to that extent you have introduced involuntary servitude, have you not, and that is forbidden by the Constitution.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Of course.

Mr. ELMER. And the gentleman from North Carolina was right when he said this act was unconstitutional?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I do not know what he said about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is a combination of the Connally bill passed by the other body and the Smith bill which passed this House, about 2 to 1, months ago. When the bill is read for consideration, if necessary we can amend it in order to obtain full production without hindrance from anyone.

I think we all realize that something must be done whereby our national defense program will not be jeopardized in any manner. The safety of this country depends upon the speed of production of war materials. It has been demonstrated that the size of an army does not bring victory, but it is the implements of war, destroyers, warships, guns, tanks, airplanes, and war materials of various kinds.

More than 8,000,000 of our young men and women are now in the armed services of this country and they are entitled to all the implements of war as they need them and in sufficient quantity. We should not permit the shutting down of factories or mines producing something necessary for winning the war, and if this bill does not carry out this idea it should be perfected so it will.

Slowing down of production, either by owners of industry or by labor, will retard our defense program and injure the morale of our young patriotic boys and girls who are training and fighting, though receiving only small pay. Many have volunteered, but those who did not volunteer were and are being conscripted. They must train and fight, and something should be done to prevent

continuance of strikes during this emergency.

The subversive element in plants producing implements of war or material necessary to the war effort must not be allowed to destroy the morale of our great fighting forces. We owe an obligation to these young loyal Americans who are fighting for the defense of our country, and that obligation is that we must be loyal, every one of us, and furnish them the material for our national defense. They are not asking for more money in this great struggle to defend our country and save democracy.

The people of this country, especially the young men, accepted selective service as a result of the national emergency. Our people are being called upon now to accept new tax burdens and have the right to expect that the program will not be retarded and that the money will be put to proper use. Many bills have been introduced, and some passed the House, with the purpose of curtailing strikes and speeding up production.

Some time ago the House passed a resolution authorizing the Military and Naval Affairs Committees to investigate the underlying causes of strikes and find out who is responsible and to make such recommendation for legislation as is necessary to prevent any obstacle in the way of production of war implements.

Any reasonable man can understand the viewpoint of young men who are taking military training and fighting and receiving small pay, and of the farmers who are producing agricultural commodities necessary for our armed forces and working from sun-up to sun-down and their pay in many instances is just a small pittance.

I do not understand why the Nation as a whole, including industrial management and organized labor, during this emergency would oppose any legislation which has for its purpose the curbing of strikes in plants producing essential war materials.

I am convinced that the rank and file, and probably more than 95 percent of the workers, desire that further strikes in war plants be prevented during this emergency.

In order to win this war we must cooperate better, make more sacrifices, and bury the differences. Someone has aptly said we cannot fight a war within a war and win either contest.

These are unusual and trying times and all must cooperate in this crisis. I am satisfied practically all wish to be loyal to our country, the greatest democracy in the world. All disputes in industries producing material necessary to the war effort should be settled without resort to strikes so that work will not be slowed down. It is my understanding that in certain sections of this country many of the unions have gone on record endorsing this policy of nonstriking during the emergency, although we have strikes today.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, for many months we have seen this Government coddle and cater to the whims of John L. Lewis until today he considers himself bigger than the Government. He considers a wage increase for his union more important than the lives of the young men of our country now on the battlefields of the world, and more important than the very existence of the Nation itself.

To be sure certain people of this House are wild in their opposition to any legislation which affects or regulates labor in any way. Today we hear about labor's rights. I know that labor has rights; but I do not believe those rights are greater than those of other individual citizens nor greater than the rights of the National Government itself fighting for its very existence.

Rights of labor are no greater than the rights of individual American citizens, and if it is essential to the successful prosecution of this war all rights and liberties of individuals must be curtailed and restricted. Recently, a bill passed the House making it a criminal offense against the Federal Government for any citizen to know of any acts of sabotage against the Government and not report such knowledge to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Does anyone claim that such statute would be constitutional in time of peace? The requirements of war and the safety of the Nation have required that the rights and privileges of the individuals, of organized minorities and organized majorities be restricted during the war, that they may be saved for us in time of peace by the winning of the war. Certainly labor should be no exception.

I know the president of the American Federation of Labor has stated openly in the press that the labor unions and his union in particular will use all the assets it has to defeat every Member of this House who votes for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that if labor unions had to account to its members for the use of membership funds, he might have less assets to use for such purpose. As it is he had best be starting the division of his assets, because if, as a Member of this House, I cannot vote my convictions except with fear and trembling, I would no longer care to remain a Member of it. Life is too short, and a man's personal feeling of integrity is too great.

I make no charge against the great mass of American workers. Practically all of them are just as patriotic as you and I. On the whole, they have done a great job of production. I feel that a few irresponsible leaders of labor should not be permitted to run roughshod over the Government of the United States, and actually over the union members themselves. What chance would a coal miner, untrained for other work, have if he refused to accept the dictation of John L. Lewis. You know he would be out and would feel the effects as long as present conditions obtain. On two occasions heretofore beneficial labor legislation has passed this House only to fail to pass the other body.

In spite of the work of some of us, for 18 months these labor leaders and certain persons high in this Government have used their influence to block the passage of any legislation whatever. They have insisted that as bad as strikes were in defense industries, that organized labor itself would correct the ills, which so sorely beset our Nation. We had the pledge of no strike from labor, yet today we find approximately 500,000 coal miners out on strike, called out by a man who considers himself bigger than Government, who apparently is bigger than many care to realize. In an industry, which is vital to the production of arms, machinery, clothing, and which furnishes fuel to keep the people of our Nation warm while they do their part in our all-out war effort, we find these 500,000 men called out by John L. Lewis, called on to lay down their picks and shovels, to play pinochle, if you please, while our boys are dying on the battle fronts of the world, in many instances, because of too few guns, too little ammunition, not enough planes nor supplies, and mind you, many of those young soldiers are sons of the very strikers who add to the chance of these young men never coming home, dying to be buried in an unknown grave. Can we as a Nation permit these individuals through action of their leaders, to place their claim for additional wages above the safety of the Nation?

While legislation to cut out the cancerous growths which have grown up in labor unions has been blocked by pressure from labor-union leaders and perhaps well-meaning men high in Government position, who were going to prevent strikes in time of war, we have had more than 2,900 strikes in 1942 and, I am advised, more than 1,000 strikes so far this year. We have had more than a strike a week in General Motors. Oh, I know it is said that nearly all strikes now prevalent are said to be unauthorized by the labor union. Can you show me any other place where any organization is not responsible for the acts of its subdivision?

It is argued that there is no necessity for any legislation, that this bill will destroy labor. Yet the labor unions, and the Members of this House who oppose this bill were just as vehement in their opposition to the Hobbs bill which did nothing except make highway robbery in the name of a labor union a Federal criminal offense. Neither then nor now does any labor union offer any substitute measure for the protection of the Nation.

I know it is said, and it is true, that the Federal Government has no right to say that a man must work or cannot quit work in peacetime. Our Government in peacetime cannot require a citizen to bear arms. Yet the young manhood of the Nation has been put under arms, their salaries fixed at $50 per month, and now the Nation requires that they risk their lives and in many instances die that the Nation may live. In time of peace certainly this Government cannot fix ceiling prices on commodities, yet today at war, we find the Government fixing the price of practically everything. Through rationing, we find the Government saying how

much may be manufactured, sold and to whom. Under the War Manpowers Act, we find men frozen to their jobs, unable to change to a better job with better pay. We find that employers cannot increase the pay of employees. This is hard to bear but mind you, none of this could be done by our Government in peacetime. All are being done today because we are at war, because in time of war the very Nation itself being endangered, the President and the Congress by its declaration of war have bound all the manpower, and all the resources of the Nation to the prosecution of the war. You know there rests in government the right to deal with any group which places a claim to an increase in pay above the welfare of the Nation. In peacetime no, in wartime, yes.

Before I came here, labor and labor unions have been the recipients of great favor from this administration: The Wagner Act, the LaGuardia Act, the 40-hour workweek, the National Labor Relations Act. But I tell you that the actions of a few labor leaders and unions are jeopardizing the whole foundations of labor's rights given them by statute.

Certainly it is not right to limit a workweek to 40 hours while we are crying on every hand about the shortage of labor. Certainly no man should be required to belong to a labor union, to pay exorbitant dues in way of tribute before he is permitted to work for his Government in time of war. That is un-American and a violation of every right known to our Nation in peacetime or war.

To call a strike in a war industry is just as detrimental to our Nation's war effort and to the Nation's safety as would be the greatest act of sabotage imaginable. Are we to punish one because it is done in secret and to let the other go because it is in the open and in defiance of government? They should be placed on an equal plane, where the effect on the prosecution of the war is apparent.

I say to you I believe in collective bargaining, in the right of people to organize, but unions so organized should be held accountable in its finances to its members; in its actions, to the general welfare of the Nation at war.

As has been said perhaps we cannot forbid the strike of an individual because of the constitutional guaranties against involuntary servitude. However, in case of a strike at this time certainly the privileges given to such labor unions should be withdrawn if certain things detrimental to the Nation are done by them. We certainly can protect others in taking the places of those striking and in so doing do our part in supporting the young men of the Nation who are giving their all, while people at home, already making more money than ever in history, are placing demands for higher wages above the lives of their sons. The bill before us is not perfect, and I hope it will be amended in several particulars.

Is there any reason why a labor union should not be required to register? If a labor union conducts it financial affairs honestly, should it mind accounting to its own members? If such union conducts its elections fairly, should it object to having its elections placed under the eye of the United States Conciliation Service, where strikes in wartime are at issue? Labor should not have any objections to settling this matter by law since laws have been found necessary to prevent the few labor racketeers from destroying organized labor itself and every worth-while right which it has obtained through legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I choose the welfare of my country, the safety of its young men now fighting on the battle fronts of the world, to the special rights claimed by John L. Lewis or any special group in our Nation.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCANLON].

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the present bill. Yesterday I opposed the rule, and, in brief remarks, pointed out that at hearings before a subcommittee of the Labor Committee on bills introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] no one had appeared in favor of these measures. As chairman of the subcommittee I conferred with a prominent industrialist from my State and suggested that he appear as a representative of management. The discussion I had with this gentleman was entirely informal, so I do not feel free to refer to him by name, but in effect he told me: "I do not think I should appear before your committee in favor of these bills. Who wants these labor-baiting measures? Management does not. We are satisfied with the status quo. Just because John L. Lewis and the President have a feud, why should we upset our entire labor relations by stirring up a lot of trouble?"

That was, in substance, the opinion of an industrialist—a very prominent industrialist who, before the war, had engaged in many disputes with labor. But he is entirely satisfied with existing labor relations. Certainly, labor does not want these measures, and if management does not want them, who does?

If this so-called Smith-Connally bill were a good bill—which it is not—I would be opposed to its consideration at this time. It is before this House only because there is a coal strike. This body is heated with anger at the threat to war production resulting from the stoppage of work in the bituminous-coal mines. I personally deplore that stoppage. But this Congress should approach the issues before it in a cool and deliberative state of mind. We are not in that state of mind here today.

We are fighting a great and terrible war. Our sons are bleeding and dying—not just for the physical boundaries and properties of the United States of America but for the freedom and rights which are guaranteed to each and every one of us and to each and every group. Management or industry has certain inalienable rights; labor has certain inalienable rights, and agriculture has certain inalienable rights. These rights to labor are also threatened by the present measure, and certain rights of management are also threatened by it. How are we going to answer the questions of our fighting men when they come home if, in the heat of passion, we on the home front abrogate rights for which their comrades died?

The struggle for the emancipation of labor—and labor constitutes the greatest single bloc in our population—has been long and arduous. Can we honestly and conscientiously cancel that long struggle by acting here in the heat of passion? We cannot, and should not. I trust that before this day is ended we shall in our calm, mature deliberations, defeat this bill, under which we would adopt the methods of our enemies and again enslave millions of working men and women.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, when reason gives way to passion we seldom see and think correctly, and in such moments should never legislate.

Proposed legislation that springs from passion, if allowed to wait until passion gives way to reason, is rarely ever considered. This, I am persuaded, will be the fate of the Connally and May bills if we defer action until we recover our true perspective.

Back of these two anti-labor, anti-industry bills stands a strong, outstanding personality whose conduct, whether right or wrong, has aroused the passions of our people. In an attempt to strike down that personality these bills miss the mark and strike down two great American principles, free enterprise and free labor. The Connally bill would commandeer industry and enslave labor; and the May edition of that bill would further tighten the shackles around labor.

But suppose the bills would accomplish the purpose that prompted them and strike down the personality at which they are directed, involving as they do free enterprise and free labor, can we afford to pay such a price to accomplish such a revengeful object? No, my friends, we can never afford to sacrifice a principle in order to either save or destroy a personality.

Be not deceived about these bills. Stripped of their legislative verbiage they would in plain understandable English permit the Government to take over factories and run them with forced labor. If this is done, what becomes of our American system of free enterprise and free labor? I answer by pointing to the sad plight of industry and labor in Nazi Germany. Oh, you say, this is America. Yes; that is true, but do not make the mistake of thinking you can adopt Hitler methods without becoming Hitlerized.

It would be a tragedy if, while our boys are on the battle front fighting to preserve, among other freedoms, free enterprise and free labor, we on the home front, in a fit of madness, did that which would destroy them. And so, my friends, while our boys are giving their lives to safeguard and preserve these two great American freedoms, I call upon all true Americans to rally to freedom's banner and preserve them from the well in-

tentioned, though passion-made, usurpers, here at home.

The American way to settle industrial labor disputes is by voluntary agreement, and not by force. In no other way can free enterprise and free labor be preserved. In no other way can we hope to secure the production needed for our war effort.

Soon after Pearl Harbor, the President, industry, and labor, following the American way, entered into a voluntary and unconditional no-strike, no-lock-out agreement. That agreement has worked, and under it the total man-days lost has been less than at any other time in the industrial history of our country. And under that agreement we have put over the greatest production job in the world. Yes, my friends, our war-production effort has far exceeded the expectations of the most sanguine among us and will be recorded by future historians as a miracle in production. Now, when your passions seem to be getting the better of you, just sit down and think how the job has been put over—by the Government, free enterprise, and free labor voluntarily teaming up together and cooperating and working in unison to produce that which is necessary to keep America free. Do this, and I know you will agree with me that it could have been done in no other way.

It was a wholesome sign, an omen that our democracy nere at nome is in safe hands, to see Secretary of the Navy Knox, Assistant Secretary of War McCloy, Secretary of Labor Perkins, Chairman Nelson of the War Production Board, Chairman Land of the Maritime Commission, Chairman Mills of the National Labor Relations Board, and the four public members of the War Labor Board join hands with our great labor leaders in opposing these bills. And it is a warranted assumption that these high-ranking Government officials, who are so effectively directing our war effort, in openly and vigorously opposing the legislation were expressing an opposition shared by our great Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt. If this were not true, I do not think they would have spoken.

In conclusion let me say if our democracy during this war reaches the point where in order to carry on further we will have to take over industry and run it with enslaved labor, why, we will then have lost that which we are fighting to retain, and the blood of our boys will have been shed in vain.

There is only one way to continue our unparalleled war production, and that way is to continue to follow the American way of free enterprise and free labor.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON].

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, our processes of democratic government have again reached the forks in the road on their way to the tomb. Frankly, I state to you that unless lawful authority, by some means, can rise above the powers of John L. Lewis and his labor racketeers and gangsters we cannot maintain our sovereignty as a Nation. This is the third time since hostilities that he has defied the Commander-in-Chief and on the two former occasions was granted everything he asked for. His generosity was so great that a few weeks ago he gave the Government a respite of 15 days, but on yesterday, right in the face of this vote he called out over a half million men, it would seem to show his contempt for this effort to place the sovereignty of this Government above that of his "invisible empire."

In approaching a decision on the issues before this body I will not go into details of the bill since its provisions were so ably discussed and explained by my colleague from Virginia. Its provisions are well known to this House, and its purpose should be.

Throughout the length and breadth of this land, from coast to coast, and from border to border, strikes are continuously in progress. Able-bodied men are tieing down defense factories, walking the streets in idleness, continuously spreading discontent, while women and men are working more than 12 hours per day in the fields of this Nation to feed them and their families, while they eat this food and refuse to make equipment for the defense of this Nation, so sorely needed by the boys who stand guard and bleed and die for them in foreign battlefields.

I have given much thought to this matter over many months. The spectacle the last few weeks has presented has been a pitiful one. Lobbyists have worked these buildings and literature has been freely distributed through the offices actually threatening the Members of this body if they do not yield to their dictation. The power bosses have put us all on notice that they were going after us next year and defeat us if we did not jump through the hoop when we were given a command. This, when we are giving the lives of our boys to protect democracy. I presume it is their idea that a dictatorship is fine if they can do the dictating. I here and now put John L. Lewis, Philip Murray, William Green, and all other would-be dictators on notice that so long as I remain in Congress I will remain here with a free voice and free vote. I further accept their challenge and am ready to meet them before the electorate of my State. I had rather suffer defeat than to be coward enough to be driven around by a despot who places his own greed for power and money above the flag that stands as an emblem of all the glory of all the battles fought by the American heroes through the years, and who now is willing to compromise the very blood of the sons of the fathers and mothers of this Commonwealth to further those two selfish purposes.

I am not concerned so much in how long I remain in Congress but more what I do while I am here. I want to leave a record that my friends who sent me here and my children in years to come will look to with pride. If I did not have courage enough to stand up for our boys who are in the armed services while they are fighting for me I would resign and go home. This same gang vowed to defeat me in my last campaign because I refused to be driven around by them. They spent thousands of dollars against me; they spent so much on one candidate to defeat me until it was equal to an extra tobacco crop; prosperity really reigned in the Eighth District of Georgia for a few weeks. Not only this, but they waged an active and filthy slander campaign against me which they did not drop when my people defeated them but have carried on from day to day while I am here giving my Nation my best, a rotten and filthy slander campaign against me.

In the face of these facts many union men in my district supported me, because they knew that I was a friend to labor but a fighting foe of the racketeer who stood ready to sell his Nation for personal gain. The force trying to destroy me came from the racketeers in the industrial sections of the North, where many of them cannot speak the English language to where real Americans can understand it.

Let us analyze the facts as they exist today and forget for a moment Presidential elections, congressional elections, or any other personal interest and dedicate our time, our energy, and our effort to the service of our Nation, those boys who are fighting in desperation on foreign soil, and the mothers and fathers and wives and children they left behind, until this legislation is disposed of.

It is generally considered and accepted as a fact by all that this war will be won or lost by production. This being true, every man-hour that is lost adds to the casualties the youth of this Nation must suffer. Today there are over half a million men roaming about in blank idleness, which has been a continual thing through the months. To these men thousands of American lives can be directly charged. It is and will remain impossible to determine the number of boys who will die the horrible death of the soldier as a result of these work stoppages that this administration has permitted to exist throughout the breadth of the land.

It is a known fact that through the industrial areas where these strikes are prevalent, wages have been increased many times more than the cost of living has advanced. It is very singular that through my section of the State, with the exception of a few defense industries, mechanics and the other laboring class of people have not received but very little increase in wages. However, there has not been a strike or work stoppage of my knowledge in my State, and I want to congratulate the laboring people of Georgia for their loyalty and patriotism in this regard.

Let us presume, however, that in some instances they have grievances. Then, are they justified in striking?

This administration, that labor is daring and defying at every opportunity, passed the National Labor Relations Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act, in which every privilege and right was bestowed upon labor and protected. Frankly, it is my opinion that it was never intended that man, individually or collectively, should enjoy a privilege without discharging a corresponding duty. However, these acts confer every

privilege on labor without imposing the first duty. Further, for the protection of labor, the War Labor Board has been set up, to which, under the law, it is provided that any grievance should be referred for adjudication and adjustment. No fair-minded person can ever contend that this Board has not gone out of its way to lean in favor of the requests of labor. In fact, it has very nearly surrendered to labor and made itself subordinate to its dictates.

Let us see where the rights of the taxpayer come in on this question. I have made an investigation and have learned that the pay roll of the National Labor Relations Board for the month of April 1943 was $227,380; that the pay roll of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor was $753,563.72; and the War Labor Board estimated as an approximately correct figure its pay roll for the month of April 1943 as $350,000; all of which aggregate $1,330,943.72 the taxpayers of the United States of America expended in the single month of April 1943 to provide a legal means by which any grievance, either real or imaginary, that labor may have could be adjusted. Yet in the face of this, these gangsters rise up as monsters and defy the very law that the sons of the taxpayers of this Nation are fighting to defend. April was not a month of exception by any degree, and by the application of a little mathematics, it can be seen that the taxpayers of America spend in these three divisions in 1 year $15,971,324.64 that there may be no necessity for strikes in America, this huge sum in the face of millions spent to operate the Labor Department.

When you taxpayers of this Nation go to pay your taxes I want you to bear these figures in mind and further remember that these same enemies of democracy following defense industries like vultures and assessed the American workman from $50 to $250 each for the right to make weapons for your boys to defend the shores of this Nation; these sums being collected by the agents of this invisible empire who account to no one. It is impossible to estimate the aggregate so collected, but I say to you that it has run into the billions of dollars, which sums come again directly from the pockets of the taxpayers of this nation. Yet, in the face of these outrages practiced upon the people, they have the audacity to tell you and me they will defeat us if we do not yield to their demands. Before I would sell by people short and be a traitor to the causes of American liberty, I would gladly surrender my right to ever hold another public office.

The most unfortunate feature of this whole set-up is the fact that the source of this entire trouble comes from the strong root of the Communist Party which has become imbedded in the precious soils of American Democracy. There can be no doubt that the outrages committed by labor have been planned, directed and enforced by the Communistic influences in this country. It is unfortunate that the same forces are getting a strong hold in the Government departments right here in Washington and it is most distressing to see that the present administration at least condones their acts and connections with the Government, if not purposely and specifically protects them. It is hoped that the recent announcement coming from Russia of the dissolution of the Third International may retard their activities in this country, but I warn the American people of complacency. Frankly, I do not think it will have any effect whatever on the activities in this country for the reason that they have already gotten too strong a hold.

The nefarious and dastardly attempts of the Communist to fool the lower classes, and especially the American Negro, in to embracing them as a Savior and Liberator, is so cowardly, so full of deceit, when anyone that has studied the history of their activities in the past must know that all labor, including the classes just mentioned, would be subjected to absolute slavery if and when they force their form of government over this country. I warn the American people now that unless those of this nation who yet believe in American democracy become active in thought and concerted in effort, that they will communize this Government within the next 10 years. I want to say to American labor that when this happens you will be subjected to the slavery to which you would have been subjected had capital been permitted to run rampant over you. Those seeking to set up dictatorships are very liberal until they get the people under their might and power, and then none except the Big Chief and the Palace Guards have rights above serfs and slaves. They howl about raising living standards. I will admit that all people will be put on one standard, but instead of improving the living conditions, the great middle class will be entirely done away with, and all except the few whip bosses will live in slavery.

The only hope I see to wrest this government from those seeking to destroy it, like John L. Lewis and his kind, is the return of our boys from the Armed Services who have fought through mud, heat, cold and blood in need of supplies and fighting equipment while these people have struck, played and loafed at their expense.

The American Legion has proved itself to be truly patriotic and loyal to the principles of old-time democracy, and I am sure that when these boys return from the present conflict that they, in a joint and cooperative effort with the Legionnaires throughout this country, will so completely awaken the electorate of this Nation that any rat who dares to foster communism and other activities in opposition to democracy will find themselves in such great minority that they will cease to be a threat to American liberty and freedom.

It has been so disgusting to watch John L. Lewis, Philip Murray, and William Green dramatize their play through this war effort until it brings one near to the point of desperation. They claim to be arrayed against each other, and especially against John L. Lewis, but the minute that one steps up and challenges the right of this Government the other two step up and begin squeaking "Amen." The American public need not be deceived; they are going hand in hand, bound by the same purpose and headed to the same destination, if peace-loving and God-fearing people do not stop them. I have so many times heard expressions from them to the effect that this must not be done or that must not be done because it would hurt the morale of the workers. I want you fathers and mothers who have furnished the sons and you wives and children who have furnished the husbands and fathers to fight this war to remember how sensitive the morale of these fellows is who are making $10 and $15 per day in the peace of their homes and protection of their homeland, while your boy or husband is expected to maintain high morale, a steady nerve, and undaunted courage under fire from the land, from the sea, and from the air for 24 hours per day for the sum of $50 per month. I want the mothers who have furnished these sons and wives who have furnished these husbands who toil in the sun for 12 hours a day to make food for these strikers and earn less than $2 per day while they are doing it to remember the men whose morale was so sensitive.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come in America when men must be men, with the courage of their convictions, who can stand face to face with an enemy abroad, or within their midst, face him as an enemy, and fight him unto death. I have and will through the years protect the rights of organized labor, but I will never let a desire to see labor protected or a desire to hold public office cause me to shut my eyes in the face of an enemy, forfeit principle for personal gain, and cast a vote that I know is against the public interest.

To the boys who are fighting today to sustain our flag, to the mothers and fathers who gave them, I pledge you my best now and in the years to come to preserve for you and your children the democracy that produced for us a nation of liberty, justice, and freedom, and on this premise I cast my vote in favor of the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, some say if this bill is passed it will mean dissension at home. My prediction is it will mean dissension at home if it or one that will meet its objective is not passed. What is the basis of my prediction? It has been stated time and again that we are in an all-out war—a war in which every patriotic American citizen is supposed to contribute his bit, to make his sacrifice. Somewhere between six and eight million men are in the armed forces discharging their patriotic duty with an inadequate supply of fighting equipment; they are obeying orders in obedience to legislative enactments; they are insisting that so long as they are not being furnished with adequate equipment because of delay caused by strikes the legislative enactments under which they are fighting should be made to apply to those who are supposed to be working; that is, if the law requires them to

fight, it should require someone to furnish them with the necessary equipment. This is not an unreasonable contention, and there may be some dissatisfaction and dissension among these men and their families, friends, and relatives running into millions if the proposed legislation or legislation designed to obviate strikes in war production is not enacted. It was no reflection on the patriotism of the young men included and enlisted under the Selective Service Act, and I contend that the proposed legislation is no reflection on the patriotism of our production workers, unless it be those who insist they should not be deprived of all of their peacetime liberties in times of war. What would we think of our soldiers and sailors if they should take this latter attitude?

Some people seem to have the idea that no one is expected to make any sacrifice except those in the armed forces; they seem to think that the display of patriotism should be confined to them alone. Patriotism is a virtue to be demonstrated by patriotic citizens in civilian life as well as those in the armed forces and no valid reason can be given for not doing so.

Some are saying that if this bill is enacted into law it will destroy the morale of people who are being paid for their services in our war production effort. Morale! Morale simply represents the standard of one's patriotism or the extent of one's devotion and loyalty to his country, and when one begins to think more of his personal or selfish interests than he does of his country's interests there is little or no morale left, or it is reduced to the lowest ebb.

Legislation and Executive orders designed to secure the highest degree of efficiency in the use of war equipment does not destroy the morale of trained and patriotic soldiers, and I am unable to see where legislation designed to secure the highest degree of efficiency in the production of equipment should destroy the morale of the trained and patriotic worker, and I cannot believe it will.

There is no necessity to get worked up and excited over this proposal. If it had been included as a part of the Selective Service Act where could there have been any objection? The fighter and the worker would have been placed in the same category. There were many who opposed the Selective Service Act, saying we should have an army of volunteers.

Industry and labor volunteered and said they would see to it that there would be maximum production; they enlisted in the production program as solemnly as our young men enlisted in the Army or Navy; they actually signed up with the Commander in Chief of the armed forces and pledged that they would work to the finish, saying there would be no interruptions, shut-outs, walk-outs, or strikes, and there would be no desertions in the civilian forces. But what has happened? This enlistment agreement with the Commander in Chief has been broken time and time again. Today more than 500,000 have deserted the ranks. In the meantime the Government has spent millions of dollars pleading with these civilian enlistees in industry without avail, and the great mass of the American people are now calling upon the Congress to enact legislation that will apply to equipment makers as well as equipment users; that is, the law should apply equally to the man making the machine gun on the home front as it does to the man using the gun on the battle front. The law will deprive no one in civilian life of greater liberties than those being sacrificed by those in the armed forces, and it will deprive no one of the right to discharge his patriotic responsibilities in civilian life. If I am correct in this interpretation of the proposal, where can there be any reasonable objection on the part of anyone who is ready and willing to discharge his or her unselfish and patriotic responsibilities to his or her country in time of war, because this proposal will not interfere with the rights of any such person in the exercise of such right or in the discharge of such responsibility.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. M Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to this vicious bill, which would castigate and stigmatize millions of laboring people throughout this country for the acts of one person, or one small group of people.

I accuse Mr. John L. Lewis of having brought this situation about. I feel that he should be punished as severely as possible. He is a saboteur just as surely as were those who were recently landed in this country from Germany and who were executed for their acts. He has deliberately brought this situation about, by forcing the coal miners to strike, at a time when he knew it would arouse great public resentment. I believe the gentleman hates President Roosevelt and his administration more than he loves the miners. It is his purpose to embarrass the administration, for his own selfish purposes, and he is using the miners to bring this about.

Undoubtedly, the miners have a legitimate cause for complaint. They are undoubtedly underpaid, and are finding it difficult to maintain themselves and their families in the face of ever-rising prices for the essentials of life. However, the War Labor Board is well equipped to deal with this situation. As a matter of fact, the newspapers indicate that an agreement between Mr. Ickes and the miners, as well as the mine operators, was imminent. There was no need to call the miners out on strike, since they had previously been assured by Mr. Ickes that any agreement reached would be retroactive. If the miners had not been goaded by Mr. Lewis into going out on the strike an agreement would now have been reached, and there would not have been the sentiment for the bill now under consideration.

However, that would have defeated Mr. Lewis' purpose, which was to create great public hysteria, which in turn would have the effect of bringing this bill onto the House floor for a vote.

We who are opposed to this bill have not been able to get any time to argue, on this floor, in favor of our position, yet its proponents have obtained all the time they wished to expound their antilabor sentiments.

In spite of this gag rule, the American people, and particularly the laboring people, may well know that their representatives here in Congress will continue the fight in their behalf, and will, in the long run, win out.

Let us defeat this bill, and thus tell the overwhelming proportion of loyal American laboring folk that they may continue their great work in behalf of our war effort without the back stabbing of vicious and unwarranted attacks by labor baiters.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Smith-Connally antilabor bill, because I believe it to be an unfair, unjust, and unwarranted discrimination against the workers of the United States who are doing such a magnificent job in turning out the production needed for the war. This bill, by implication, brands organized labor as disloyal and not to be trusted; and such a misbranding is done in the face of a record that has never been equaled anywhere in the history of the world. It would destroy the splendid structure of organized labor built up through several hundreds of years of death and torture and misery in order to get rid of a few rats that have managed to creep into the building.

On June 2 the Washington News carried an editorial which quoted the Honorable James Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization. Mr. Byrnes showed the splendid war production which American industry and labor have managed to pile up. It is a wonderful record:

Merchant ships constructed in the last 12 months, more than a thousand, compared with 50 2 years ago; and 100 tankers, compared with 22.

Machine-gun production of 1,500,000, compared with 25,000 2 years ago.

Planes, 60,000, compared with 10,000—with the one hundred thousandth in the war-production program coming off the line yesterday.

Fighting ships, 100 in the past 5 months, which was 3 times as many completed as in the entire year of 1941.

But that is not enough. As he warned us: "We are just entering the critical period of the war." We must produce more, much more.

Who built these merchant ships? Labor.

Who built the tankers? Labor.

Who built the machine guns? Labor.

Who built the planes? Labor.

Who built the fighting ships? Labor.

And who will be depended upon to step up this production and give us the goals asked for by our Government? Labor.

There are more than 1,000,000 young men in the armed services of our country who are the sons and brothers of men and women in organized labor. When one considers these facts, it must be apparent that labor is doing a splendid job in aiding the country both in manpower and in production. Why then has this one group been singled out as disloyal to our country in time of need?

BIG BUSINESS

No such stigma has been placed, or is being placed, on big business, and yet there is much in the record of big business that will not bear analysis. Have we forgotten that the subcommittee on rubber charged that the big four in the rubber industry hamstrung our program for a stockpile in crude rubber; or that it played an important part in holding up the synthetic rubber program, even after the Japs had taken Singapore and the Malay Peninsula? Have we forgotten that the charge was made in the Senate that the aluminum trust of the United States had held up the production in bombers, more than all the strikes in that industry put together? Have we forgotten that the charge was made in the Senate that the steel trust had effectively prevented the making of sponge iron which could take the place of scrap iron, most of which we had shipped to Japan? Have we forgotten that 19 big companies were listed by Senator O'MAHONEY in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 11, 1943, as having violated the antitrust acts, for which offense indictments were voted against them? Nineteen big companies who violated the criminal laws of this country and against whom no prosecutions have been made, but, on the contrary, have been rewarded with Government contracts, the dollar value of which far exceeds the taxable resources of most of the States. As Senator O'MAHONEY pointed out in his speech on that day:

> These corporations, and the others on the list, with the huge facilities provided for them as a result of these contracts (Government) will be in the position after the war of dominating our peace economy as they now dominate our war economy.

Right in my own State of Wisconsin, indictments are pending against monopoly practices in the cheese and milk industry which have been pending for 17 months, and no action is taken. In fact, several of these gentlemen have been rewarded by being placed in key positions in the Office of Price Administration, where they have been writing regulations favoring their own companies to the detriment of the independents.

Why are the laws nullified in the face of these violations in the case of big business, while labor, which has done such an outstanding job, is being crucified for simply trying to hold on to its rights gained after several hundred years of suffering?

RICH MAN'S CONGRESS

This Congress, to date, has a unique record. It passed a law only yesterday forgiving 75 percent of the tax on war profits. As Mr. Murray, president of the C. I. O., pointed out, this tax bill forgives—

First. Three weeks pay of the average wage earner.

Second. Two and one-half months' pay of every Congressman.

Third. Four years net pay of those in the upper brackets.

What else has this Congress done? It has taken off a ceiling of $25,000 fixed by the President, and last but not least, it is now proposed that a sales tax be passed to make up for the taxes lost by reason of the 75 percent forgiveness. No wonder this Congress is characterized as the "Rich Man's Congress." No stigma attaches to big business nor is there any legislation which puts big business in a strait jacket. On the contrary, all the rewards both in position of influence and in money are going to the heads of big business.

WHO OPPOSES THIS BILL?

Every official holding a key position in the Government connected with war production opposes this bill. The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Director of War Mobilization, Chairman of the War Production Board, the Secretary of Labor, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, and several others protested to the committee against passage of this bill. So we find ourselves in a very unique position with the production the highest the world has ever known, with every responsible official who heads our production in charge lauding accomplishments of labor, with the sons and brothers of labor constituting a very substantial part of our armed forces, of passing legislation which doubts the loyalty of organized labor to its own country, and at the same time passing legislation, almost on the same day, which grants large Government subsidies to those who are under indictment for having violated the laws of our country. If this is not class legislation I should like to know what is.

Great Britain has antistrike legislation and yet the figures show that Britain has more strikes than we have. Furthermore, the responsible leaders of organized labor have pledged themselves not to strike. Why not believe in them and their sincerity?

I am opposed to this bill—

First. Because it is class legislation and stigmatizes one group that has done an outstanding job.

Second. Because every Government official who is charged with the responsibility of turning out war production is opposed to the bill.

Third. Because it will create dissatisfaction, disunity, and strife at a time when we should all pull together.

Fourth. And last but not least, the charge has been made on the floor that no representative of organized labor has been given an opportunity to be heard on this bill. Inasmuch as it affects the rights and questions the character of organized labor, full opportunities should have been given to every labor organization to put in an appearance and be heard on this question.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the important thing before us is the winning of the war against the Axis. Every one of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, should be agreed on that point. The next question is, Will the passage of this bill help to win the war? The answer is a definite "No." This bill will injure morale, provoke turmoil, and destroy voluntary machinery for the settlement of strikes. I do not have to tell you this. The War Department and the Navy Department have both said so. Both the Army and the Navy are opposing this bill. The chairman of the Military Affairs Committee has come before this Congress with a bill that was not given proper study in the committee—no hearings were held in committee, all opposition was denied the right to be heard or to offer constructive amendments, and then to bludgeon this bill through Congress has even denied the Members of this House who are opposing this bill the right to speak under general debate.

Since when has the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee become so great and learned that he can ignore the recommendations of the Army and the Navy?

The Army and Navy are charged with the responsibility of winning this war. Are they to be ignored by the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee? Not only the Army and the Navy but likewise the Maritime Commission, War Labor Board, War Production Board, and the Labor Relations Board—all of the agencies charged with the responsibility of winning the war have expressed their opposition to this bill, and their recommendations have been ignored. Now, to top it all off, even the Members of Congress who are opposing this bill have been muzzled and all speaking time under general debate has been consumed by the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee and those Members favoring the passage of this bill.

I have never witnessed a spectacle like this one, the great Military Affairs Committee trying to write a bill on the floor of the House. An important labor bill being muddled, rash and hashed amendments offered by members of the committee, and committee members so confused and bewildered, with no evidence of thought, understanding, or agreement amongst them. Noise, tumult, and confusion. The great Military Affairs Committee has now become the congressional Tower of Babel. This is indeed a sorry spectacle. Yes; it would be more amusing if it were not so confusing, as one of our modern cartoonists puts it. But this is major legislation; this is important and serious legislation.

I am a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. To the credit of my chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], and to the members of our committee, with all of the important legislation that we have handled, I want to say that we have never brought a bill out on the floor of this House in this condition. We would be ashamed and disgraced if we were to do so. It is unfair to the membership of this House, it is unfair to the people of the country, to bring out legislation in this fashion.

What do we hope to achieve by this bill? To whip John Lewis? Sure, we are all agreed that he needs a licking.

But the Military Affairs Committee concedes and admits that this bill will not affect the coal strike. So what? Are you going to increase war production? No. Again you must admit that with the exception of John Lewis, both Phil Murray and Bill Green have kept

their no-strike pledge. Both the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. have delivered the goods and kept their pledge and agreement with the Commander in Chief, the boys in the armed forces, the people of the country, and our allies, the United Nations, to deliver the goods. And how they have delivered the goods. All production records smashed, war armaments, heaps of them, way ahead of schedule. Our production has been the great miracle of this war. It is amazing, it is unbelievable. It has left the Axis dazed and bewildered. Yes; they did not figure that American labor could do it. American labor has a million of its members in the armed forces. Labor is loyal, patriotic, and is winning this war on the production lines.

Now, to reward them would you muzzle them, brow-beat them, chain them, or throw them in jail or concentration camps? Oh, no! Labor is America. Labor is intelligent. Labor is free. Labor has made America great. The boys in the armed forces will be back in the ranks of labor when they return. The social advancement, the social gains that labor has made cannot be taken away this easily.

This bill would destroy practically every right won by labor in a half century.

I made a visit to Detroit and to my district last week end. The Dodge, Chevrolet, Plymouth, Hudson, Chrysler, and all the other plants have been turning out jeeps, trucks, ambulances, guns, and armaments so fast that it would make your head swim. The storage lots and railroad sidings are crammed full of war materials. The great Chrysler tank plant is only operating at 25 percent of capacity. Why? Because they would now be over-producing if they were to work at full capacity. Absenteeism? Manpower? That is not what is worrying us. Our worry is to find steady employment for our labor and to utilize labor's capacity to produce by making it easier for them to transfer from plants that are running low on war orders, to plants that have war orders. There is a real problem. Labor is now frozen to a plant that has caught up with production and is slowing down and labor wants to be transferred to a plant that has production orders but cannot because it is frozen by regulations and restrictions.

Who wants this bill, anyway? Not Detroit industry. At least they have not written to me asking support of this bill. Industry and management in Detroit know that labor has delivered the goods. They know that our U. A. W.-C. I. O. leaders have cooperated in every respect. In fact, this Congress should award gold medals of honor to the Detroit labor leaders for their patriotic and loyal services in keeping down all manner of strikes and disturbances.

We have had no authorized strikes or disturbances sanctioned by our labor leaders. They have kept every pledge and more than fulfilled every promise and agreement, and we in Detroit are proud of them. They are the Nation's officers in our army of production, and they have kept faith with the Commander in Chief. Disagreements? Protests? Walk-outs? Yes; we have had them in Detroit, but they were not authorized by the labor leaders. These walk-outs have been small in number and quickly settled, and always our labor leaders have taken a firm and positive stand that the production must go on, that the pledge must be kept, and our labor record is clean.

Here are some of the things that make labor angry and cause these protests and disturbances. I quote a telegram received June 1, 1943:

Ford Motor Co. has violated agreement with Ford Local 400, United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, relative to continuous 6-day workweek mutually agreed November 11, 1942. Company instructed several departments of Highland Park plant, producing vital war goods under bid contract, not to work Monday—Memorial Day—despite the order issued by Chairman of War Production Board Donald M. Nelson, that all war plants are to operate on Memorial Day. But the departments under cost plus will work Memorial Day. We protest attitude of Ford Motor Co., which places profits above patriotism.

BEN GARRISON,
President, Local 400.
WILLIAM OLIVER,
Recording Secretary.

I have personally known Vince J. Klein, financial secretary of Chrysler Local 7, U. A. W., C. I. O., for the past 20 years, and I know of no man in the city of Detroit who is more honest, loyal, patriotic, and a respected citizen than he is. Here is what he and Ed Carey, the president of Local 7, have to say in answer to my recent query about the Chrysler walk-out:

UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS
OF AMERICA, LOCAL NO. 7,
Detroit, Mich., May 29, 1943.

Hon. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: To give you a clear picture of what happend in the three Chrysler plants that were recently forced into a shut-down on May 20, 1943, I am writing you to acquaint you with the facts of the matter. These troubles date back to January of 1942.

When the Chrysler plants were finished with automobile production in January of 1942, most of the employees were laid off work from 4 to 7 months. The Chrysler Corporation was one of the last ones to convert, with the one exception of the tank arsenal which was built by the United States Government for the Chrysler Corporation to operate. When the corporation was transferring their old employees from automobile to tank jobs, the union had a lot of trouble with the corporation. They cut the men's rates from $1.20, $1.25, and $1.30 per hour to 95 cents and $1.00 or $1.10 per hour, depending on the smallest hourly wage they could get the men to work. For instance, they cut the fellows who were repairing metal on auto production from $1.37 per hour to metal repairing on tanks which is much more difficult than metal repair on automobiles, to $1.17 per hour.

Before the corporation started the tank plant operating, they made an agreement with all Chrysler locals in the Detroit area that they would hire or transfer their own employees who at that time were walking the streets, first. But they never lived up to any of the agreements with the union. They hired 800 new employees for the new tank plant while their old employees walked the streets and when we protested, they told us that agreement or no agreement, they still can hire whom they want. The outcome of the whole situation was that the tank plant was shut down on a couple of occasions and tank production suffered on account of the company's union-breaking tactics.

Later in the year of 1942, they started the gun plant and we went all the way up and through the same trouble. We will give you one example, because if we tried to list them all, you would be reading them long after the 4th of July. Finish grinders on precision machines were paid $1.27 per hour on automobile production. The same operations in the gun plant to the very same men was $1.03 per hour and the clearance limit was 300 percent closer; in other words, the men were expected to do a 300 percent better job and their wages were cut about 17 percent.

When the boys complained, their answer was, "You are unpatriotic." The answer of the average man was, "If I were sure that the Government would benefit by it, I would be willing to do so, but if it is only to enrich the corporation * * * to hell with that noise."

As an answer to this, Mr. Keller made a report to his board of directors that in his opinion the corporation was never in a better condition in all around resources than at the present time, and that in his opinion he expected to bring in a much better report to the next meeting of the board of directors, regardless of the turn of the United States of America war effort. In other words, he thinks that war does not affect the Chrysler Corporation one way or another. As a matter of information, here is the yearly remuneration for the officials of the Chrysler Corporation for the past year of 1942: K. T. Keller, $101,050, B. E. Hutchinson, $91,100, F. M. Zeder, $85,450. The net income for the fiscal year of 1942 for the Chrysler Corporation was $15,529,013.

If anyone can accuse the workers and union members of these three plants as being unpatriotic to the war effort, tell them the following facts: the 7,800 workers in these plants gave 1,949 pints of blood to the Red Cross blood bank. During the last campaign several weeks ago for contributions, the Red Cross collected $22,822.

The bond pay-roll deduction averages 12 percent, the workers bought $91,000 in extra contributions on top of their average of 12 percent.

If the company would match the workers' patriotism only 50 percent, they would invest more money in bonds than they did, and they would not try to keep it a secret. In short, the Chrysler Corporation, despite their publicity that they have done so much for the war effort, could have done much more if they were half as patriotic as their workers. To prove that, I will give you three examples of how they bargain.

1. For 6 weeks the union complained about safety in the dynamometer room where they test motors going at a speed of approximately 4,000 revolutions per minute. We even made a complaint to the State of Michigan Safety Division of the Labor Department. They did not install any screens to protect the workers until one of our boys was chopped into a thousand pieces by one of the cooling fans. We picked up his body and put it in a metal basket which was about the size of a bushel.

2. One of our boys working on war production, after driving 8 miles to work and having had a flat tire on the way, was 11 minutes late. Despite his importance on the job, they gave him a penalty—the rest of the day off—and he drove home 8 miles more and did not even see the inside of the shop, nor did he get a hearing. Yet they talk about absenteeism by the workers.

3. Some of our boys working on tank turrets noticed the roof in the shop started leaking during recent heavy rains. The steward asked the foreman to get someone to fix it. The foreman answered, "Go up and stop the rain and the roof won't leak." The men on

that job handle high-voltage electrical equipment and they were in danger of being electrocuted. The steward, knowing the men's lives were in danger, told them to wait until the line moved up to a spot where the roof was not leaking, and then resume the operation. The company disciplined the steward and told him it was not his job to save men's lives and look out for their welfare.

4. One of our men worked for the Chrysler Corporation 11 years, has an execllent record as an employee. One day by mistake, he lighted a match about 7 to 10 seconds before the shop whistle blew. He was fired, causing disruption in his department, while we, as union leaders, were forced as on many other occasions to enter the shop and patch up the trouble. We were fortunate in getting the man back to work after approximately 10 days' penalty.

The foregoing is just a fraction of some of the things being practiced by the Chrysler Corporation.

If you and the other gentlemen in Congress could only get into these plants, without being recognized and be here for only 1 week, I know you would recommend that the good old United States of America take over these plants and run them, not as a prison, but as free American factories should be run. The only thing that held these men in that long is that we are at war and the workers did not want to endanger the war effort of our beloved country.

All these facts are true and the records in giving blood and money to Red Cross can be secured from the officials of that noble organization. The same goes for bonds. Our local union invested $29,600 of its funds in Government bonds. Every one of our officers is a blood donor and buys bonds and makes a substantial contribution to all of these various agencies, and as I stated before, the Corporation despite its riches did not match our war efforts even one-half.

I hope and we all hope that you will understand our side of this, because it hurts when those who only go through motions of being patriots accuse others who are doing all they can for the war effort. It's a falsehood and no one knows it better than the Chrysler Corporation, namely, Mr. Keller, Mr. Hutchinson, and Mr. Weckler, the men in charge of production for the corporation.

Sincerely yours,

ED CAREY,
President, Local 7, U. A. W.-C. I. O.
VINCE KLEIN,
Financial Secretary.

I have received telegrams and letters from every labor local in the city of Detroit, protesting against this vicious antilabor bill. They are too many and too numerous to mention. I submit here a telegram received from Phil Murray, R. J. Thomas, and others:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 14, 1943.*
Hon. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI,
Washington, D. C.:

The Connally bill, as amended by the House Military Affairs Committee and now pending before the House of Representatives, constitutes one of the most dangerous threats to the Nation's war program.

This proposed measure, conceived by a few irresponsible Congressmen who are hell-bent on destroying labor unions, would be a stab in the back at labor, which is sparing no effort and which is making heroic sacrifices at home in the interest of winning the war.

As such, the measure would destroy the morale of our soldiers on the battle fronts who, either as members of organized labor or whose fathers and brothers are in the ranks of labor, must resent this fascist strike at home.

The bill does not even purport to make any constructive contribution to winning the war. In its diabolical intent to destroy labor unions, it must be interpreted as an initial step toward weakening the forces which are united behind our Commander in Chief in his demand for unconditional surrender of the Axis.

The C. I. O. calls for the absolute defeat of the measure and also calls on Congress to direct its attention to making a constructive contribution in fulfilling its outstanding commitments to the Nation by adopting concrete and immediate measures toward stabilizing our domestic economy by effective control of prices which must also be rolled back to September 15, 1942, levels, in accordance with the outstanding law enacted by Congress and by adoption of a truly equitable tax program.

Philip Murray, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations; R. J. Thomas, president, United Automobile Workers; Albert J. Fitzgerald, president, United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America; Frank Rosenblum, vice president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; John Green, president, Industrial Union Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America; Reid Robinson, president, International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers; Emil Rieve, president, Textile Workers Union of America; Joseph Curran, president, National Maritime Union of America; Allan Haywood, director of organization, Congress of Industrial Organizations; James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

I likewise submit a telegram received from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 1, 1943.*
Hon. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It seems inconceivable that Congress would consider and act upon vicious antilabor legislation such as the Connally-May bill, S. 796, without giving labor a chance to be heard in opposition to said measure. My appeal to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to grant labor a hearing in opposition to the bill was denied. I appeal to the Members of the House to defeat the rule providing for consideration of the Connally-May antilabor bill in order that it may be returned to the Committee on Military Affairs for further consideration and to accord the representatives of the American Federation of Labor an opportunity to present facts and arguments in opposition to said antilabor legislation.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

I quote from a telegram received June 2, 1943, from Richard T. Frankensteen:

Strongly urge your voting against Smith-Connally bill. Great majority American labor is against strike in coal industry, as shown by denunciation of strike voted last night by Detroit Industrial Union Council. The political feuds of John L. Lewis should not be used as pretext for shackling all labor. Suggest you urge Congress to constructively tackle problems which face labor instead of passing provocative legislation.

RICHARD T. FRANKENSTEEN,
Vice President and Director,
National Legislative Department.

This shows how Detroit labor leaders regard John L. Lewis.

Here is a letter that I received from J. G. Luhrsen, executive secretary-treasurer of the Railway Labor Executives Association:

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: If the general public, and labor particularly, were to accept the introduction of various antilabor legislation as emanating from the majority opinion of this Congress it would have to conclude that such action was, apelike, fashioned following the line of inconsistent policies of administration authorities created by Executive orders.

Orders, directives, and instructions go forth daily, only to be changed at the whim and caprice of business interests having powerful influence over these agencies. Whatever sound policies go forth are flagrantly disregarded or violated, with the workers left in the middle, reaping the condemnation of both governmental agencies and big business, without enjoying the benefits of either.

Yet certain dyed-in-the-wool antilabor legislatures introduce legislation striking at the heart of labor, with a view of vitiating even such gains as were enacted by legislative consent.

The Railway Labor Executives' Association is opposed to S. 796, whether it receives either the Connally or Smith provisions consideration, because the necessity for this obnoxious legislation cannot be attributed to labor generally, but, to the contrary, if warranted, should be phrased to correct the evils instilled and brought about by the adoption of inconsistent programs and policies of the several governmental agencies, which have not as yet been able to formulate unified and coordinated action between themselves. The President, alone, cannot carry the load, nor check those in whom he has placed his trust.

Reliance for police power for enforcement is placed in appointments for which huge appropriations are requested, when obviously it is known to all loyal and patriotic Americans that public sentiment is the greatest police power we have, and it will be gratefully volunteered, once logical and sound reasonings reinforce the issues of systematic programming in the total war effort.

Practically every daily issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as well as innumerable transcripts of hearings of investigations, prove that "buck passing" is the adopted slogan among governmental agencies, and final and resolute responsibility and authority is assumed by none. How can labor, or the general public, as a whole, escape criticism and condemnation when the leaders themselves digress in every direction without leading to the definite goal of the first essential—"win the war."

Our association resents the lack of recognition on the part of Congress of the fundamental facts which are working destructively rather than constructively, and then feign a friendship for either labor or the general public so that a return to the Congress may meet with greater assurance.

The application of mere common sense, without deep study, if conscientiously sincere, leads to the logical conclusion that you cannot cure an evil by substituting a greater evil, more destructive of morale and patriotism, and that is what S. 796 does. The root of the evil rests elsewhere than labor and the attack should be made in the direction that these roots are taking in our war program.

First, develop an all-out war economy as a substitute for the failure to plan and coordinate the various phases of our war effort, and estop the policies of today which permit the war to be run primarily on the basis of business control and business-as-usual. Labor will not be found lacking in supporting such legislation as will bring about the necessary change which will expedite the winning of the war.

We urge the defeat of S. 796.

Very sincerely yours,

J. G. LUHRSEN,
Executive Secretary.

From the letter of Nathan E. Cowan, legislative representative of the C. I. O., I quote:

As the Nation prepared for the final attack on the continent of Europe, it faces literally the most crucial period in its entire existence. In this crucial period the enactment of a bill such as S. 796 would be a disastrous error—an error which would play into the hands of our national enemies both at home and abroad. It is particularly tragic that at a time like this groups and individuals who for years have sought this kind of legislation in times of peace should be so reckless of our national welfare as to attempt to take advantage of our present war crisis to achieve their ends.

Mr. Chairman, without hearings, the bill was brought onto the floor of the Senate in the heat and hurry of the critical situation which then appeared to be developing with respect to the coal mines. On the floor of the Senate and during the course of debate, a substantially new bill was written and passed, containing provisions which went far beyond the original Connally bill and covered the operations of the National War Labor Board generally, including a provision which apparently called for and permitted dilatory court review of Board decisions.

When the bill reached the House the Military Affairs Committee, still without hearings—and in fact refusing to accede to the pleas of labor organizations and many others for an opportunity to discuss the bill—simply and literally struck out the entire bill as passed by the Senate and inserted a completely new bill of its own. This new bill substantially embodied most of the features of the Smith bill of 1941. It is for this reason that in its present version the measure has come to be referred to as the Connally-Smith bill.

By way of brief summary, it may be said that the bill comprehends five major subject matters:

First. It prohibits strikes except after 30 days' notice to the employer and the Secretary of Labor, and until the Secretary of Labor has taken a secret ballot of the employees involved.

Second. It contains a number of outright prohibitions on various types of activities in connection with a strike and on various kinds of strikes, including refusals to work on nonunion products.

Third. It provides for the enforcement of the foregoing restrictions and prohibitions by Federal injunctions regardless of the terms of the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act.

Fourth. It requires labor organizations to file statements indicating the companies with which they deal, the initiation fees, dues and assessments, and number of paid-up members, the exact votes in elections, and full financial statements.

Fifth. Provisions governing the operations of the National War Labor Board, including a provision outlawing the granting of union security in any form.

The entire statute as so revised is offered as a wartime measure to be terminated 6 months after the end of hostilities.

Mr. Chairman, the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. within 1 week after Pearl Harbor in 1941 met in voluntary and joint session with the representatives of management and the public and made a pledge to the Nation that every effort of labor would be turned toward the maintenance of continuous and uninterrupted production. That pledge was not taken out of any fear of penalty. There was no penalty to fear. The pledge was made because labor in America has recognized this war as one in which the working men and women in this Nation have the greatest stake, one in which the working men and women of this Nation must seek victory for the preservation of themselves and their labor organizations.

Regardless of the barrage of propaganda to the contrary, the simple fact attested by all of our war production agencies is that the no-strike pledge has been fulfilled not merely to a miraculous extent, but to an extent which no penal sanction could have made possible. All available data has indicated a net loss of man-hours averaging each month in the neighborhood of .03 of 1 percent.

That record was achieved out of the free volition of American workers and because American workers had the fullest faith that their Government could accord to them in this crucial period, full justice and equity in the adjustment of the many grievances which American workers still have in the performance of their jobs.

That record has been achieved in the face of great difficulties—difficulties in the form of reckless provocations and annoyances inflicted by management at all levels—management conscious of the grim determination of American workers not to leave their jobs in protest.

The record has also been achieved in the face of the terrific pinch to which American workers have been subjected with constantly spiraling food costs while wage levels were being substantially frozen by Presidential decree and War Labor Board directive.

It is an unfortunate fact that in recent months the sharp pressure on the food budgets of American workers has approached critical proportions. O. P. A. has virtually admitted, on the one hand, that price ceilings have not been fixed at levels calculated to prevent substantial food-price increases, and, on the other hand, that enforcement has in some areas been so ineffective that prices have actually prevailed at levels as much as 40 and 45 percent above ceiling prices.

In these circumstances nevertheless both the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. held firm to their no-strike pledge. More important, the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. have pointed to their membership the direction of sound solution to these problems—the direction of a national demand and insistence on a real roll-back of prices to levels which will enable war workers to maintain their health and continue to function effectively at their war work.

The fact remains, however, that these conditions have also ripened the possibility for the operations of groups in our country willing to engage in tasks helpful to the Nation's enemies. These conditions have furnished ripe soil for the sowing of enemy propaganda as well as for the growth of influence of persons willing to take advantage of the resulting discontent.

The C. I. O. under these critical circumstances has followed the path of constructive action toward continued and ever more effective contribution to the war effort. The C. I. O. has urged and fought for the expansion and strengthening of our price-control system and for the roll-back of prices to the necessary low levels. The C. I. O. has also fought for a program of action which would render the instruments of government, and particularly the War Labor Board, ever more effective for the prompt removal of the just grievances of American workers.

That kind of a program would constitute an effective demonstration to American workers, organized and unorganized alike, of the fact that democratic processes of our Government today are available and effective for the solution of their problems and of the fact that misleaders are counseling lines of action dangerous to the welfare not merely of labor but of the Nation. That kind of a program would strengthen the fabric of our democratic structure, would solidify the ranks of American workers and of the American people generally, and would permit national concentration on the single task of military victory abroad.

That kind of a program is, of course, not the program followed by Hitler or Mussolini. We have received in this country reports of widespread shootings of striking workers not merely in occupied countries, but in parts of Germany itself. We hail these reports as evidences not of the strength of the Hitler regime but rather as evidences of its weakness. We recognize that a strong nation is strong to the degree that its people are united in support of its war effort and not to the degree that it is forced to resort to shooting to keep its people under control.

That is precisely the issue that the offer of this Connally-Smith bill presents to the Nation today. This Nation has performed miracles of production because its people are working; its people are working not because any bayonet is held at their backs but because they want to work. A statement at the present time by the Federal Government that it is now necessary to resort to criminal statutes and penalties and force would have at least two disastrous effects. First, it would be construed by friend and enemy alike as a confession of weakness, of the inability of the Government of the United States to say to the workers of America, and particularly to the coal miners, that their grievances and problems can and will be adjusted through the machinery of Government. It will be used, secondly, by the very same evil forces which we are now combating abroad, in their attempt to increase their own strength and influence, by citing it as evidence of the fact that the American Government instead of taking the road of alleviation and adjustment of grievances takes the road of Hitler and Mussolini, the road of compulsion and brute force.

It is for this reason that the C. I. O. opposed the Connally bill in its original form. For this and other reasons the C. I. O. opposes the Connally bill in its Smith form.

The real answer of Congress and the Nation to John L. Lewis should be the answer of the roll-back of prices, the more effective enforcement of price control, the adjustment of the miners' real grievances. Unfortunately, some groups in Congress have chosen the kind of tactics and program which are calculated to play right into the hands of John L. Lewis by aiming direct and provocative blows not merely at the millions of organized American workers, but at all American working men and women and at the entire population of the Nation. These are the groups which have chosen to attack and interfere with and impede price control and rent control. These are the groups which have conducted hearings such as those of the Smith Subcommittee on Rent Control, calculated to bring pressure on behalf of landlords and their associations to prevent a real control of rents. By the same token, the groups supporting the Connally-Smith bill are supporting a step which stigmatizes and attacks the more than 11,000,000 C. I. O. and A. F. of L. workers who have given and maintained and will maintain their no-strike pledge.

As a matter of fact, the actual contents of the Smith version of the Connally bill reveal that the bill cannot even really make the pretense of being a war measure. In 1941, while this country was not at war, Mr. SMITH proposed these same provisions. He proposed then, as the bill now proposes, that there be a requirement of certain kinds of notice and certain other requirements before a strike could be called. He proposed these measures then as a permanent and unlimited statute. He proposed it then in a frank attack on basic labor rights. The insertion of a provision limiting the continuance of the bill to the duration of the war cannot camouflage the fact that this is still the original bill.

The C. I. O. in its no-strike pledge has made no qualifications with respect to any question of advance notice, of any question of appropriate procedures for calling a strike. The C. I. O. has declared emphatically that it will countenance no strikes. Under these circumstances the reintroduction of the original Smith bill, with its provisions for advance notice and secret ballots and other technicalities related to strikes, is not merely meaningless but is obviously a barefaced attempt to use present circumstances as a basis for carrying through a private labor policy which its sponsors were unable to carry into law in time of peace—a labor policy which has no relationship to and makes no contribution to the solution of present-day problems, while at the same time initiating a provocative attack on basic rights of millions of organized working men and women who, through their organizations and as individuals, have been contributing so much to the miraculous production record of this Nation.

By recklessly seizing this opportunity to attempt to rush his bill through the House under the provocation of John L. Lewis, Mr. SMITH and those sponsoring his bill could not have more effectively done the work of our enemies than if they had been working hand in hand with Hitler and John L. Lewis.

With respect to the provision requiring registration and filing of detailed information by labor unions, labor has repeatedly stated its position. This is not a new proposal; it is not a wartime proposal. It has nothing to do with any current issue before the Nation. It is a proposal which requires labor unions to reveal to the employers with whom they are negotiating the exact number of members in the union, the exact financial strength of the union. It is a proposal which weakens the union in its collective bargaining negotiations with employers. The C. I. O. now discusses and has discussed in the past the evils of this kind of a proposal. But once more it should be emphasized that the ruthless and invidious attempt to insert this provision into a bill coming before the House under the circumstances of the Connally bill is a provocative and reckless gesture of defiance to the people of the Nation, a gesture of insistence at all costs and under all circumstances on seeking the enactment of measures oft debated and constantly repudiated in times of peace. The House should undertake to rebuke decisively tactics of this kind and to insist that this is not the time for the pressing of divisive tactics or for back-room maneuvers at the expense of the Nation.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESANDRO].

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Chairman, the actions of John L. Lewis have, no doubt, aroused the American people, but we must bear in mind that President Roosevelt has recently reported that America is producing more fighting planes than all of the enemy nations combined. Secretary Knox announces that virtually an entire new Navy was launched in the first few months of this year and that implements of war, unsurpassed in quality, are pouring forth from American factories. Production has reached such staggering quantities that Donald Nelson announced that there is no further need for expanding plant capacity.

The War Department, the Navy Department, the Labor Department, the War Production Board, the Maritime Commission, the War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board are among the agencies that protested against the enactment of this type of legislation at this time.

Democracy may be destroyed by the autocracy of a labor leader who is unwilling to place the safety of our Nation above all else. Why must false leadership destroy the good that has been accomplished and why must all men and women in industry be punished for a few small men in high places who vent their spleen and their personal animosities against the President, above the safety of our Nation? This legislation will not prevent strikes but would retard production.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, the time has long since passed when the National Congress should have, by appropriate legislation, guaranteed the uninterrupted production of essential war materials. That long awaited legislative measure is for our consideration today.

From every section of this Nation, yes, from all parts of the world, the eyes and ears of the masses—of the mothers whose hearts bleed for their sons somewhere on the field of battle, of the fighting son himself, of his wife, of his children or his sweetheart—are turned toward this Capitol City of Washington. They eagerly await the verdict which we personally, as legislative jurors, are privileged to return.

Washington today is the focal point of the Nation's millions who earnestly beg of us to shackle those who would sabotage the war effort with nonessential strikes in war industry.

Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo boast that democratic government is unequal to an all out, all manpower war effort. What shall be your verdict?

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I have no quarrel with organized labor. Quite to the contrary is my attitude. Collective bargaining is right, fair, and just. With labor I stand foursquare in all of its legitimate rights and fair undertakings. I concede to it the right to organize, the right to bargain collectively, the right to picket peacefully, the right to petition its Government for redress, the right of peacetime strike. Yet I have no patience with the labor racketeer, nor the capitalistic racketeer and profiteer. Their unnecessary and unreasonable demands, forced walk-outs, shut-downs, and strikes are retarding our progress in this fight and simultaneously adding unreasonable risks to our fighting forces and the perpetuation of our Republic. Incidentally, I come from a labor town. Those people are my friends. I know and am happy to report to you that they are patriotic. So are the other men of labor in my district. They, I can assure you, are doing their utmost. But they and hundreds of thousands of other patriotic labor affiliates, because of the unconscionable conduct of a few selfish, racketeering, sabotaging leaders, are being humiliated and embarrassed, and their brotherhoods and orders are nearing the chasms of disrepute. This legislation is as essential to vital war industry as Selective Service is to the armed forces. It does not deny to labor the right to strike. It continues for them that privilege under prescribed reasonable conditions even in Government operated war industry.

Many arguments have been currently advanced in defense of John L. Lewis closing down hundreds of coal mines. None of them are reasonable; none are feasible; none will stand the test. They argue that labor is doing a good job. Yes, indeed, a commendable job, I agree. They also argue that because patriotic labor is being embarrassed with isolated strikes, we should not enact this legislation and thus further embarrass the patriotic laborer; that it would be a reflection upon him. Only those who violate the law are embarrassed thereby. No,

no, my dear friends, this would not embarrass the patriotic war worker. On the contrary, he would most assuredly welcome it. Why? Simply because it would put his house in order and eliminate the scurrilous activities of the unpatriotic.

Others say that antistrike legislation would affect labor's morale. Well, goodness me, what about the morale of the people as a whole? What of the morale of the young man in uniform? Does not their morale merit your consideration? Every day they see these strikes headlined in the press. What a terrible tonic for them. It makes good reading for no one. It has positively brought the spirit of our people and fighting forces to the breaking point.

Frequently I receive letters from parents of servicemen, from the servicemen themselves, begging and pleading for legislation to put a stop to the unnecessary strikes in war industry. I know that you have received the same. Only a few days ago a young man from my district, a soldier of Uncle Sam, sat with me in my office and related in no uncertain terms the attitude of the American soldier on this question. He stated that the boys do not understand why it is that they, by a law of Congress, are drafted and forced to fight when at the same time the Congress neglects to enact legislation that would guarantee the utilization of a maximum of manpower in the production of war essentials. I agree with them. As long as blood flows in my veins, I shall stand by and cast my vote for them, the threats of John L. Lewis upon my political future notwithstanding. It is not fair for a man back home to go on strike in war industry when the soldier is looking to him for weapons to defend himself and this Nation. God pity the man of this House today who casts a vote of political expediency in favor of John Lewis.

This historic Capitol Building and the House Office Buildings have, in this solemn hour, been descended upon by scores of Lewis' cohorts. They have shuffled from office to office, from building to building, pouring out their threats of political reprisal against those who would support this bill. But no one is here, except you as their Representatives, to represent the masses, patriotic labor and their soldier sons. They are at home putting in a day's work and the soldier a day of war. He cannot secure, nor does he seek, a furlough from north Africa, the South Pacific, Guadalcanal, or Attu to plead his case with you. Oh, no; duty urges him to remain at his post, and God knows he is glad to do it. He offers a service at the possible cost of his life, while Lewis' emissaries scramble for unprecedented power over the workingman and the almighty dollar. Then, please, my colleagues, while Johnny Doughboy offers his life, will you not forget politics and plead his cause today before this body? He needs your help; he will be so grateful and his morale will be so enhanced.

There are but two choices today—John Lewis or Johnny Doughboy. John Lewis is a man who gets along with no one. Several years ago he, being disgruntled, separated his mine workers and himself from the American Federation of Labor. He organized and affiliated with the C. I. O. and thus became its head. More recently he was ousted as its president, and still more recently, again having been disgruntled, he separated his mine workers and himself from that body. Having drifted along for awhile attached to neither of these large labor organizations, he wants to go back to the A. F. of L. He tied on to our President in 1932. Although Lewis was favored, in every conceivable manner, by President Roosevelt, he turned upon him like a rattlesnake in the election of 1940. He cares only for power and more power. His record certainly teaches you that he cannot get along with anyone. He will love you today and bite your hand tomorrow. And so on. That is John L. Lewis.

On the other hand, you have Johnny Doughboy. He is a fighting Yank. He is driving the Japs slowly but surely from the tropical Pacific isles, from Kiska and Attu, and the Germans from the barren wastes of north Africa. He eagerly awaits his opportunity to hie ole Fritzy back into his fatherland and give him the licking of his life. He is step by step pinning Old Glory to the mountain peaks of every field of battle. He is making the good ole U. S. A. secure for me, for my wife, for my little girl, and infant son. For you he is doing the same. Yes; even for John L. Lewis. He does a job at the risk of his life, often without rest or sleep, food or drink. Wages and hours mean nothing to him and a strike is unthinkable. His commander never thinks of ordering one. Contrary to John L. Lewis, he gets along with every one except, of course, the Japs, Italians, and Germans. And his inability to get along with those rats is certainly not difficult to understand.

Now, my colleagues, with whom are you this day taking your stand—John L. Lewis or Johnny Doughboy? I will take mine with the latter and his home front companion, the patriotic laborer. I shall support this legislation. I hope you will do the same.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, there is only one question before the Congress at this time, and that is, are strikes justified in time of war, and, if not, should the Congress consider appropriate measures to bring them to an end?

In considering this question there are certain things we must keep in mind.

First. That our Nation is now engaged in a great world war; that our national safety, our liberty, and everything we hold dear is imperilled.

Second. That this Congress enacted the Selective Service Act, authorizing and requiring the induction of millions of our young men into the military and naval service of the Nation, without their consent, and at rates of pay much less than that now received by the miners and industrial workers who enjoy the safety and comforts of their own homes.

Third. That thousands of our American boys have already given their lives, and millions of others are offering their lives in defense of our country and in defense of the rights and liberties of the American people, including the organized workers.

Fourth. That the failure to supply our military and naval forces with adequate munitions and implements of war would not only result in the loss of millions of lives, but will seriously endanger the entire war effort.

Fifth. That just last week in a speech in Constitution Hall in Washington, Mr. Green, President of the American Federation of Labor, said:

> Immediately after Pearl Harbor I called together the officers of all our affiliated national and international unions and informed them that the emergency called for drastic action to assure maximum and uninterrupted war production. Without a moment's hesitation they agreed unanimously to support the solemn no-strike pledge which the American Federation of Labor gave to the President of the United States.
>
> Only a few days ago, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor issued an official declaration reaffirming the no-strike policy for the duration. No matter how sharply we may disgree with some of the wartime restrictions imposed upon labor, the council said, the no-strike pledge holds good for us. I say to you here and now, without reservations of any kind, that no strike will be authorized, approved, or condoned by the American Federation of Labor and its affiliated unions until the enemies of America have been crushed into final defeat.

Notwithstanding this statement by Mr. Green, there are today numerous strikes in existence by workers of the American Federation of Labor, and only yesterday the Progressive Miners, an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor, left their work and joined the strike of the United Mine Workers led by John L. Lewis.

Sixth. That on May 2 the President of the United States stated in a public address to the American people as follows:

> A stopping of the coal supply, even for a short time, would involve a gamble with the lives of American soldiers and sailors and the future of our whole people. I say to all miners—and to all Americans everywhere, at home and abroad—the production of coal will not be stopped.

Yet it appears that the President of the United States has had to swallow his words, nearly 600,000 miners are on strike, and the production of coal has stopped.

Seventh. That the National War Labor Board has been set up as an agency of the United States Government to hear and determine all disputes between management and labor where they have not been adjusted through collective bargaining or conciliation. This Board has demonstrated that it is friendly to labor and there is no good reason why labor should not be willing to submit its case to said Board.

Eighth. That John L. Lewis has defied the American flag, the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and we are faced with a serious threat of a break-down in Government.

Under these conditions, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that I would truly represent the people of my State or be entitled to serve as their Representative if

I did not raise my voice against these unjustified interruptions in war production, against these injustices to our boys out on the battlefields of the world, and if I did not do everything in my power to bring these strikes to an end and prevent their occurrence during these critical times.

Some labor leaders have said that Congress should take no action, that anything Congress does will enslave labor. They forget that the great rights which organized labor holds today were granted them by the Congress and that if they fail to do their full part in the prosecution of the war it may result in their enslavement at the hands of some foreign enemy. No one has any desire to enslave labor—certainly I do not—and labor should have no desire to try to take advantage of this emergency and thereby run the chance of the enslavement of all our people.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, if all organized workers of the Nation had shown the same degree of patriotism and loyalty as that demonstrated by those living in the district which I have the honor to represent, no legislation on this question would be necessary or even thought of. Since the national-defense program was first started about 3 years ago, long before Pearl Harbor, up until this good hour, the workers, organized and unorganized, in the Third Congressional District of Georgia have not lost the first hour from their work. There have been no strikes, no stoppages of work, and no slow-downs. I have worked with them and I know there have been times when they had good cause to complain, when they were not treated fairly as to wages or working conditions, but they have taken it on the chin, remained on the job, and have produced results in construction which are used today by the Army and Navy as examples of what can be done. Those workers have done those things because they love their country, they know its safety and their lives and liberty are at stake in this World War. They understand and appreciate the hardships their sons, their brothers, their friends, and their neighbors are having to undergo out on the battlefields of the world and they intend to support and sustain them at any cost or sacrifice. Last year Harry Garrett, president of the Central Labor Union in Columbus, Ga., volunteered and is now serving his country in the far Pacific.

This record of service by the workers of my District is a source of great personal pride to me. It has caused me to be doubly careful in all matters and legislation that affects their welfare. But I have concluded that if my own people can make such a record, if they are willing to do their full part and stay on the job in fair weather and foul, then the workers in other parts of the country should do no less, and if they refuse to work while our Nation is at war it is my duty to consider measures which will restrain their leaders in calling strikes and encouraging slowdowns.

I believe that the workers of the Nation are just as loyal as any other group.

The overwhelming majority of them want to have some real part in winning the war and are making a magnificent contribution to the successful prosecution of the war. The industrial production of America, for which the workers are largely responsible, is turning the tide. This production, along with the matchless courage of our boys at the front and the high character of our military and naval leadership, gives us the assurance of victory.

But here and there in the ranks of labor, as in the ranks of other groups, there are some who would take advantage of this emergency, who withhold their best effort as a means of forcing compliance with their personal demands and for their private gain. This should not be permitted in times like these. I am convinced it is brought about for the most part, if not entirely, by a small and irresponsible group of doubtful patriotism and with selfish aims. If the ranks of labor will not voluntarily rid itself of this element and drive out the racketeers and grafters, then certainly the Congress should try to reduce and restrain the influence of this element.

I firmly believe that 99 percent of the workers want to work, to stay on the job, to give their all for victory, and that there would be no stoppages of work if the agitators would let them alone. That the workers themselves are not pleased with the present situation is clearly indicated by the following report of a survey recently made among their members:

WORKERS ARE POLLED ON UNION PRACTICES

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., May 29.—The practices and policies of labor unions by no means meet with the approval of the majority of American workers, or even of labor-union members themselves.

A survey among workers in war industries shows a clear majority holding the view that unions should change some of their ways of doing things. In fact, the number who favor alterations and house cleaning of unions is twice as large as the number who think no change needs to be made.

Even among labor-union members nearly one-half believe modifications in union practices are in order.

The two things complained of most often by the workers interviewed in the survey are graft and racketeering on the part of union management and the use of the strike weapon in time of war.

SIXTY-FOUR CITIES POLLED

In conducting the survey, the institute, through a Nation-wide field staff, interviewed workers in war industries in 64 cities throughout the country. The cross section included a full complement of labor-union members.

Each worker was asked:

"Would you like to see labor unions change their way of handling things?"

The following table shows, first, the vote of both union and nonunion workers in war plants, and second, the vote of labor-union members alone interviewed in the survey.

Total vote:	Percent
Yes	53
No	23
Undecided	24
Union members:	
Yes	45
No	38
Undecided	17

SPECIFIC COMPLAINTS

The 53 percent of workers who replied in the affirmative were asked to state in what way they thought unions should change.

The results are illuminating as a list of what labor itself thinks is wrong with labor unions.

The items listed below fall under two main categories: (1) complaints dealing with the shortcomings of union leaders, such as graft and racketeering, lack of interest in the men, and the elimination of radical influences in unions; and (2) complaints that unions hold up war production through strikes, through union rules on worker production, and through jurisdictional disputes.

I have said before, Mr. Chairman, and I repeat here again, that I think the most important job on earth for me today is to support and be helpful to those men and women who have entered our military and naval services and who are offering their lives in defense of our country and in order that you and I might live and be free.

My duty to them is not only to see that they are properly cared for in training and in battle; not only to see that the sick and wounded receive the best treatment in the world; not only to see that they are properly fed and housed; not only to see that their loved ones at home are provided for and not neglected; but, above all, to see that they are supplied with ample munitions and with adequate quantities of the best guns, the best tanks, the best planes, and the best ships which American skill and a grateful people can provide.

I cannot sit by or stand silent when these American workmen, enjoying the highest pay, the best food, and the most comfortable homes of any workers on earth, lay down their tools and endanger the chances of our forces being properly supported and supplied out on the far-flung battle lines. I am ready to take any measures which will make sure that never again will there be too little, too late.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] 15 seconds.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ELMER].

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON] attacked this bill as unconstitutional. He is right. If he had not waxed so eloquent about the war, gallantry of American soldiers, and praise of his fourth-term candidate for President, he might have given his reasons. I presume he is in the right in some respects. I can agree with him on two of his paens, that of war and soldiers. I charge this bill, by its terms and in its purpose, conflicts with that amendment to the Constitution relating to involuntary servitude. That amendment says:

Section 1. Slavery prohibited: Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

Section 2. Enforcement of prohibition: Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

It is under this provision the Supreme Court upheld the right to strike, quit work, or refuse to work. So long as the mine owners operate the mines, either for themselves or for the Government,

they are the employers and direct and pay the employees, and just so long do the miners have a right to strike, refuse to work, and the constitutional provision above protects them. Neither the Government, President, nor War Labor Board can force or compel a miner to work for a coal company. Congress cannot pass a valid law compelling such service. If this service could be enforced, just that instant involuntary servitude begins. We are back to slavery, this time whites as well as blacks. Nor can any of the above agencies compel such service for 30 days or 30 minutes. It stands prohibited absolutely, unqualifiedly. The shortest space of time is just as violative of its mandate as a year. The argument we are at war and the soldier who carries the gun cannot strike, therefore the workman who makes the gun cannot strike, is not in point, not parallel, not based on the same premises.

The soldier is sworn in under a general law held to be constitutional; he is in the Army of the United States, under the commander. He is working for his Government that has the inherent right to require him and all others to come into its service, for its protection. That service is not involuntary servitude, because rendered for the Government. But it is altogether a different matter for the President or his agencies to order a man outside the Army to work for a third party. The President has no such authority and his orders are corum non judice. I challenge any lawyer to disprove these conclusions. A lot of things have been done from necessity. We have heard so much of it lately. It is the mother of tyrants. A necessity that compels an involuntary servitude here for a moment wipes out every act, every sacrifice, every life of an American soldier abroad and reduces our country to the level of the worst. No amount of eloquence, sophistry, or sympathy can dress this tyrant up and make it look like a Bill of Rights or the "four freedoms."

The President has not asked this power. Some of his close advisers oppose it. There must be a reason. Why ram it down their throats? He can order every miner who strikes reclassified under the Selective Service Act. They are classified now in lower brackets. Does it lend any credence to the reports circulated over the country that, for years, the labor unions are not subject to the draft, through Presidential agreement and that is why the subject is so touchy.

This law will not touch the present strike. It is on now. Already called. This law can deal only with strikes to come. The situation that calls this bill up now is peculiar. It is announced the Labor Board was flouted—this means the President because the Labor Board is his personal creation—it has no statutory basis. No law has been flouted. If so, why prepare this one? If the operation of the mines is in the hands of the owners, then they and the miners can negotiate before the Labor Board. If the mines are in the hands of the President, the Labor Board cannot act as a mediator because it and the President are the same and the owners are not adverse parties. In such event the President deals direct with the miners or their representatives—representing the Government and workers.

It strikes me there is a bug under the chip in this bill and that is section 1:

(b) War contract means—

(1) A contract with the United States by officer, employee of the Department of War, Department of the Navy, or United States Maritime Commission.

(2) A contract with the United States entered into in pursuance of a law entitled "An act to promote the defense of the United States."

(3) A contract, whether or not with the United States, for the production—

And so forth, of—

(a) Weapons, munitions, aircraft, vessel, boat.

(b) Army building, structure, or facility.

(c) Army machinery, tools, material, supply, article, or commodity.

(d) Any component material of above and the production of which is found by the President as being contracted for in the prosecution of the war.

(e) War contractor means contractor or person producing * * * any articles which are required in the prosecution of the war or which are useful in connection therewith.

Under this act anyone making materials which are contracted for by the Government or an individual making materials for another individual whether the Government is a party to the contract or not, is a war contractor, and the manufactured products are subject to the powers of the President to declare same contracted for in prosecution of the war. This covers all articles required or useful in the war. This covers everything—even lead pencils. The Government does not have to take over any plant to exercise this authority. Just declare it to be necessary. The original bill used the words "may be" in lines 22 and 23. The amendment substitutes the word "are" in both lines. These amendments make no change in the meaning of the section.

The remaining sections prescribe the procedure and prohibits strikes in all plants of contractors within the meaning of the definitions.

This plainly violates the provisions of the Constitution above mentioned because it prohibits a strike in privately owned and operated plants and in plants wherein the Government is not interested even by direct contract. This forces an employe to work for a private employer against his will. It is involuntary servitude. In addition, the bill authorizes the President to take over any plant he may desire if the material it makes is useful in the war. This bill is not what most Members think it is—just to outlaw strikes in Government plants in wartime. If it was I would support it.

If this bill covered only plants taken over and operated by the Government it would be legal to prevent strikes, but it goes far beyond this principle, and covers all plants wherein is manufactured anything that is useful to the war program. It cannot be determined now whether the Government has taken over the mines so the strike is against the Government, or if the mines are still operated by the owners, so the strike is against them—there is confusion on this point and it is the decisive point involved.

It is my opinion that the President can handle the strike situation better under existing laws and policies and that this bill will merely clutter up the program. I think he should be required by the Congress and the people, in view of his past utterances, to handle this situation. There is a lot of hue and cry now for this bill, but it will fade away in due time in face of the facts. This bill must be substantially amended before I can support it.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, what is labor? Who is its friend? These are two questions which all of those who earn a living through their own efforts should consider. Especially should those of us who are Members of Congress consider these questions. Much has been said on these points, but I believe a few generalizations can still be drawn and are appropriate at this time. As background for these observations let me enumerate the major provisions of S. 796, the bill before us, as amended by the House Committee on Military Affairs and by the House of Representatives sitting as a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. These provisions are:

First. To prohibit any strike or lockout called prior to expiration of a 30-day cooling-off period and before the conduct of a secret strike ballot supervised by the Secretary of Labor. Violations of these provisions constitute grounds for a civil suit for damages by the injured parties, and temporarily suspend the advantages of the National Labor Relations Act.

Second. To require registration with the National Labor Relations Board of every labor organization representing employees of any war contractor. The registration data is to include a list of union officers and their income from the union, amount of initiation fees, dues, assessments, intelligible financial statements, date of last such statement given members and method of circulation used, and a copy of the constitution and bylaws of the organization. Any labor organization failing to so register will be disqualified from acting as the representative of employees in collective bargaining for such time as the failure shall continue.

Third. To prohibit unions from making political campaign contributions to influence election of national officers, just as corporations and national banks have been prevented. Violation of this section carries a fine of $5,000 or a year in prison. Union members could still contribute as they saw fit, individually.

Fourth. When a war plant is taken over by the Government it shall be returned to the owners as soon as practicable but in no event more than 60 days after termination of the conditions requiring the seizure.

Fifth. To grant the War Labor Board statutory authority to intervene not only in cases certified to it by the United States Conciliation Service but also to

exercise jurisdiction over any labor dispute that has become so serious that "it may lead to substantial interference with the war effort." Specific provisions are made for hearings for both sides to a dispute and for protection of the rights of labor under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and similar laws. The W. L. B. is prohibited from handing down decisions that "require as a condition of employment that any individual become or remain a member of a labor organization."

Sixth. The W. L. B. is also given power to subpœna witnesess and compel production of records relevant to the inquiry.

Seventh. The W. L. B. is empowered, after it has taken jurisdiction in a case, to prohibit the calling or continuation of a strike or lock-out or of the practices giving rise to dispute. Such orders shall not exist for more than 60 days. The act specifically guarantees the right of individuals as follows:

No order of the Chairman (of the War Labor Board) or process of any court under this act shall require an individual employee to render labor or services without his consent.

Eighth. When a plant producing war materials is taken over by the Government, it is unlawful to lead a strike, slow-down, or a lock-out in it, or to pay strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating in it. Violations are punished by a $5,000 fine or 1 year imprisonment. No individual violates this section by simply quitting work or refusing to accept employment.

Ninth. The law is for the duration of the war only and not to exceed 6 months thereafter.

It should be noted that the bill makes no provision for enforcement or court review of W. L. B. decisions. Presumably compliance with Board decisions would be obtained, as at present, by public opinion or Government seizure and operation of plants.

Mr. Chairman, on several occasions during the past few years Congress has set out, after extensive public hearings, to write into law a definite public policy defining the obligations and responsibilities of organized labor. Each attempt to substitute a rule of law for the vacillating policies of executive agencies of government and political expedience as it affects the President has been successfully thwarted by those same officials whose own failures have been largely responsible for each new crisis. It should be remembered that present Government labor policy consists of two things: First, a political alliance between the party in power and leaders of organized labor, and that this alliance makes necessary the handling of labor difficulties on a personal basis by the President to keep up his labor political fences. This has, in turn, necessitated, second, administration opposition, and opposition of leaders of organized labor, to any move which might take adjustment of labor relations out of the hands of the President and require disputes to be settled and abuses corrected according to law enacted by the representatives of the people in Congress. This simple explanation is back of the consistent refusal of all labor leaders and administration officials to support any labor legislation to cope with war strikes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in organized labor. Had it not been for unions, the rule of Government by big business and Wall Street would have continued. But now we have a labor government, pure and simple. I think the time has come to strike a balance and give the Government back to the people.

PRO AND CON

I have mentioned the real reason why all labor legislation is opposed by the political alliance now running the Federal Government. Now, I want to give the arguments which are used by this political alliance to maintain its power. The arguments are simple and all of the same pattern. Any legislation which seeks to do any of the things covered in the present bill is branded as a move to destroy organized labor and all the social gains labor has made in America. When asked to point out the specific provisions of the bill which would bring this result, the reply is to launch into a loud tirade against big profits, fascism, labor baiters, and reactionaries. It is obvious to anyone who reads this bill that it could do none of these things vocally feared by organized labor leaders and the administration. The penalties assessed against those leading war strikes are mild, indeed, compared to those which would be inflicted upon a soldier if he struck against his Government. But enactment of this legislation would, I think, go a long way in convincing some people that we are all in this war and have just as much to lose as the man in uniform unless we win it. The present labor policy may not cause us to lose the war. But no one can deny that war strikes have greatly delayed our winning of the war, and in so doing have caused the death of thousands of American men. This to me is sufficient justification for enactment of this wartime measure. The administration in opposing the bill thus far is paying too high and bloody a price for a little political fence building.

"Oh," it is said by organized labor leaders, "we have outlawed strikes for the duration. The only strikes in progress are outlaw strikes over which we have no control." All honor to those who have outlawed strikes for the duration. But it is against these unauthorized strikes that action must be taken by legislation. If everybody behaved we would not have to pass laws against murder. Certainly a law against murder does not hurt anyone who does not intend to commit murder. The same principle applies to anti-war-strike legislation.

"Oh," say some of these leaders, "such a law does indeed hurt all of the patriotic workers who do not want to strike. It will hurt their morale. It will create disunity and foster strikes." Poppycock! How will these things happen if there is intent to obey the law? Ah, therein, my colleagues, lies an interesting point. President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, recently sent a communication to all unions affiliated with the Federation and stating as follows:

I specifically direct that the officers and members of State federations of labor and of all unions functioning in the States named (those where labor legislation has been passed by State legislatures) refrain from complying with these laws until a court of last resort has passed on the validity of said statutes.

Here, Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with the leader of millions of organized workers advising them to break the law in a nation at war. I submit it would be better citizenship to urge all Americans to obey the laws of their country unless they are found unconstitutional and that to break a law before it is tested in the orderly way provided by the Constitution is criminal. Yes; there is an element in this country which regards itself as more powerful than the Government of the United States because it regards itself as that Government. Is it? The people alone can answer that question. They will answer it when in possession of the facts.

It is said that this act would deprive workers of the right to strike or quit work and thus bring about a condition of involuntary servitude or slavery. Point out the provision which does it, if you can. No one has yet been able to find it. The act, of course, does no such thing, but specifically prohibits it. If the act does not prohibit war strikes then why have it? The answer to that is it is assumed most war-plant workers are patriotic Americans, and will not strike if given opportunity to vote on the question. They will let their dispute be settled on its merits in the way provided by the law. The minority which still prefers to sabotage the war effort by leading an unauthorized strike in a plant taken over by the Government will be dealt with as the act provides. Victory requires sacrifice by all. To lead a strike in a war plant run by the Government stops production just as effectively as an enemy bomb. It is akin to treason.

It is said that the bill is undemocratic. Is it undemocratic for unions to hold honest elections and to vote as to whether their members shall strike? Is it more democratic that a strike affecting half a million men and the life of a nation can be called by the twitch of the bushy eyebrows of one ambitious man?

It is said, without foundation, that all labor violence is the result of stubbornness of employers. But, even if so, do two wrongs make a right?

Under this bill can collective bargaining be denied a union which obeys the law? Will the bill destroy organized labor? Has any similar law passed by a State legislature destroyed labor in that State?

It is said that unions already give account to their members of what they do with their funds. The record, however, shows otherwise. A few well-run unions do make such accountings. Certainly a provision requiring them to do so will not hurt these unions. Dishonest or improperly run unions ought to be forced to divulge this information. The court records of this country, and of my own State of Missouri, show the convictions of many labor leaders who put the fees and dues in their pockets and tell nobody. Not all of these crooks have been

convicted. But, with the provisions of this law they could not retain a position which permits graft and racketeering because of the glare of publicity, which would make much easier the apprehension of those who seek to prostitute the labor movement for personal gain and to cover up careers of crime. One bad apple will spoil a basketfull. It is peculiar that labor does not make an effort to clean its own house and demand such legislation as this. This measure protects labor. It is a Bill of Rights for industrial peace, progress, and victory.

Mr. Chairman, I am tired of seeing the Government blackjacked and browbeaten by pressure groups. Further, it is time we spoke to the dictators, gangsters, racketeers, and saboteurs at home with the same courage we speak to those 3,000 or more miles away. I repeat, I am for organized labor. I think it serves a useful purpose. I have supported in this session many measures desired by organized labor. I have opposed measures it has opposed. I want to see it preserved. But, the only thing which will preserve it against the wrath of the soldier boys when they return is some such law as we have before us to put the irresponsible minority in the organized labor movement in the war with the rest of us.

WHAT IS LABOR?

Mr. Chairman, there has lately grown up in this land a sentiment that only those who belong to organized labor unions are the laboring people of our country. Nothing could be further from the truth. There are 135,000,000 people in the United States. Only about 12,000,000 of our citizens are members of organized labor.

The farmer is a laboring man and works probably harder for less profit than any other class of our laboring people. School teachers are laboring people. The small businessman is a laboring man. Most of these people are not organized in the sense that union labor is generally understood. So when some labor leaders, professional leaders, say they speak for labor we must understand that they speak only for a minority of the laboring people of the United States, powerful though that minority may be. The dictionary defines "labor" as toil or exertion, physical or mental. Professional people are laborers. Very few of them are organized into labor unions. I am a lawyer. I am a member of my local and State bar associations. In a sense, therefore, I am an organized worker. But there is a wide difference of opinion between the leaders and spokesmen of the bar association on one hand and the American Federation of Labor and the C. I. O. on the other about the kind of legislation we should have for those who labor.

Members of Congress must vote on many measures which affect labor. We are voting on one today. Apparently it is opposed by leaders of the organized laboring groups. It has strong support by many patriotic groups whose sincerity cannot be questioned and who are disinterested parties. Congressmen represent many and divergent groups. The votes we cast cannot possibly reflect the sentiments of all these groups but they do affect all of them in many cases. What kind of a standard must guide us? From a practical standpoint this is very important to a Member of Congress who seeks both to serve his country and to be reelected because he is either listed as a friend or foe of organized labor, and therefore, by inference, of all working people. Many votes are decided thereby. So let us consider for a moment another question.

WHO IS A FRIEND OF LABOR?

Who is a friend of labor? That question is an easy one to answer from the standpoint of the typical labor union leader. His friend and the Congressman he will support is the one who opposes any measure which in any way is designed to restrict the activities, lawful or otherwise, of organized labor. I have discussed the reasons behind this. You cannot just be for organized labor 99 times and against them once and be the friend of the typical professional leader who makes his living by working the worker. No, indeed. These unions, many of them, maintain highly paid lobbyists in Washington, D. C. They do not want to have to explain or justify the vote of some Congressman who goes against them on an issue. It is obviously good business for them personally if they can make the rank and file believe congressional opposition to the views of any labor leader is opposition to the best interests of all labor. Some of these leaders have a racket which cannot be protected in any other way. This attitude, which back in western Missouri we would call "whole hog or none," is running organized labor into public disfavor. It is an attitude which every reliable poll, and the vote in many congressional districts, including my own, shows is not shared by the rank and file of organized labor. By way of example let me call your attention to the Gallup poll of May 27, 1943. This poll asked the question:

> Would you approve or disapprove of making it a crime for anyone to urge workers to strike in companies taken over by the Government?

In answer to that question, which is directly on the provision of the bill now before us, 78 percent of the American people are reported as favoring such a law. Those who disapprove of this idea are 14 percent and those undecided 8 percent. The vote of union members on the same question was: Approve, 67 percent; disapprove, 22 percent; undecided, 11 percent. Does this look as if the professional labor leaders were representing their members? No. It shows them completely out of step with public sentiment. A recent Gallup poll revealed something even more interesting. In answer to the question, "Should strikes be forbidden by law in all war industries for the duration, not just those taken over by the Government?" the results were: Approve, 81 percent; disapprove, 13 percent; and undecided, 13 percent. Gallup polls have shown as high as 85 percent of the American people, including 80 percent of the members of organized labor, favor enactment of a bill requiring public reports of union receipts and expenditures, such as corporations have long been required to submit. Even higher percentages favor prohibiting union officials from contributing huge sums from union treasuries to political campaign funds, without approval of their members. The rank and file of labor thinks for itself. It is not herded along in the European follow-the-leader fashion. It fears that some day a public outraged by labor abuses may burn down the barn to get the rats. It does not want that. I do not want it either.

The organized unions of this country collect approximately $300,000,000 per year for which they need make no accounting even to their own members and on which they pay no taxes. A considerable portion of this money is used to influence the election of yes-men to Congress. The financial troubles of a Member of Congress can be few and far between if he is a political friend of some of the leaders of organized labor. Let me call your attention to a statement of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor appearing in news dispatches of May 18, 1943, in the official Federation clip sheet which is sent to labor papers throughout the country to keep them in step with the labor party line as it is developed by professional labor leaders in Washington, and repeated on the radio May 23 by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. The statement is as follows:

> The American Federation of Labor calls upon Congress to defeat the Connally-Smith bill. We will demand a record vote on this measure. Regardless of whether it is killed or adopted we shall endeavor to vote out of office any Member of Congress who supports it. Into this effort the American Federation of Labor will pour every resource at its command.

Think that over. The statement continues—

> It may be recalled that some years ago the American Federation of Labor undertook a similar campaign against Members of the United States Senate who voted for confirmation to the Supreme Court of a Federal judge who had upheld "yellow dog" contracts. This appointee was not confirmed but the American Federation of Labor did not forget those Senators who voted for him. Within 10 years not a single one of them remained in the United States Senate. We trust that the Members of Congress are cognizant of the fact that the political strength of the American Federation of Labor has increased many times since then.

Is labor willing to be patriotic only for a price? Here, Mr. Chairman, is an arrogant challenge to the people's representatives in Congress to jump through the hoop or be smothered under a union labor slush fund in a future election. Think that over, those of you who want to play politics. This bill will be vetoed by the man in the White House "who has supped at labor's table," to use the words of John L. Lewis, who contributed $500,000 to his campaign fund, and who in spite of personal differences on some matters with the President still gets his demands met in one way or another because of his political power as head of an organized pressure group. John L. Lewis "knows where the body is buried."

I have been talking about the kind of Congressman the typical labor leader will support. There is another kind of a friend to labor, but he does not get a favorable rating on pre-election slates and score cards of many unions because he is not a yes-man for any group. He is the kind of a man who believes in unions, collective bargaining, reasonable hours, good pay, the right to strike except in wartime and against the Government, and approves the working conditions which have steadily improved because of the influence of labor unions. This man does not believe that any citizen should be forced to join a union or forced to pay a fee for working on a tax-supported project. He is opposed to monopoly and special privileges of any kind. He does not believe in war strikes, sit-downs, and slow-downs when Americans in uniform are dying for lack of equipment from the home front. This man does not believe that just because an individual holds a union card he should be exempt from the laws regulating robbery, extortion, and racketeering. This man represents not only the organized worker but the millions of unorganized workers I have referred to. He believes that with the increased power organized workers have achieved for themselves comes increased public responsibility and that it is to the benefit of all workers this be recognized. That is the kind of a friend to labor I seek to be.

THE GREATEST UNION

I have never asked for, and, so far as I know, I have never had the endorsement of many professional labor leaders. I do not spurn their endorsements, but as long as a political alliance between these people and the New Deal exists I am not likely to get it, because I am a Republican. But I do enjoy the personal friendship of a great many of these men in my own congressional district. They are loyal American citizens, Most of the restrictive legislation proposed in Congress would not affect them. However, a Congressman must legislate not only for his district but for the whole country. His votes affect the whole Nation. I enjoy the confidence and the support of most of the rank and file members of organized labor in my district. Their record of war production, purchase of War bonds, and sacrifice of their sons will bear inspection. I hope that I may continue to merit support of these good people. I know them. I live among them. I share their hopes and their sorrows. A union card in the pocket of a laboring man does not set him apart in the great fundamental things which are important to this country. We are all members of the finest and biggest union in the world, the United States of America. We are all willing to contribute, each in his own and most effective way, so that the Stars and Stripes can continue to wave over this land where all who do an honest day's toil can hope for the greatest rewards which can come to a freeman. God, save this Republic.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I imagine that every Member of this House received a telegram from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. I received one under date of June 1. In that telegram to me Mr. Green said:

My appeal to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to grant labor a hearing in opposition to the bill was denied.

I desire at this point to read to the House a letter I addressed to Mr. William Green, president, American Federation of Labor, on March 25, 1943:

DEAR SIR: The House Military Affairs Committee has started hearings on H. R. 2239, commonly referred to as the Smith bill, to amend the Selective Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, and also the Austin-Wadsworth bill relating to mobilization of manpower, and the Fulmer bill, proposing the deferment of agricultural workers under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act; and the Colmer bill, H. R. 992.

As the head of your group, I am writing you this letter to suggest that if you desire to be heard either for or against either of these bills, the committee will be glad to hear you at your convenience either the coming week or the week following.

Yours very truly,

A. J. MAY, *Chairman.*

An identical letter went to Mr. Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., and to John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America.

In the printed hearings on pages 775 to 790 will be found the testimony of Lewis G. Hines, national legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C. He came to the committee and requested to be heard. Likewise Mr. Hushing came. He found it impossible to appear and asked permission that Mr. Hines be permitted to testify. That was permitted, and he was requested to say whether or not he had other witnesses he wanted to present.

Now, here is a part of his testimony:

I desire to be as brief as possible; I appreciate the fact that there is quite a number of people yet to be heard. I should like to talk about three bills that are before the committee, namely, H. R. 1742, H. R. 2239, and H. R. 992.

H. R. 2239 is essentially the principal portions of the Connally bill and the Smith bill.

In addition to that, he placed in the record a written statement in opposition to the legislation by Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor.

I put that in the RECORD to show that the telegram you received from him is not true and that it is not in good faith. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein my letters to William Green and John L. Lewis and their answers thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. As used in this act—

(a) "Person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, or any organized group of persons.

(b) "War contract" means—

(1) a contract with the United States entered into on behalf of the United States by an officer or employee of the Department of War, the Department of the Navy, or the United States Maritime Commission:

(2) a contract with the United States entered into by the United States pursuant to an act entitled "An act to promote the defense of the United States";

(3) a contract, whether or not with the United States, for the production, manufacture, construction, reconstruction, installation, maintenance, storage, repair, mining, or transportation of—

(A) any weapon, munition, aircraft, vessel, or boat;

(B) any building, structure, or facility;

(C) any machinery, tool, material, supply, article, or commodity; or

(D) any component material or part of or equipment for any article described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C);

the production, manufacture, construction, reconstruction, installation, maintenance, storage, repair, mining, or transportation of which by the contractor in question is found by the President as being contracted for in the prosecution of the war.

(c) "War contractor" means the person producing, manufacturing, constructing, reconstructing, installing, maintaining, storing, repairing, mining, or transporting under a war contract or a person whose plant is equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required in the prosecution of the war or which may be useful in connection therewith; but such term shall not include a carrier, as defined in title I of the Railway Labor Act, or a carrier by air subject to title II of such act.

(d) The terms "employer", "employee", "representative", "labor organization", and "labor dispute" shall have the same meaning as in section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, does a motion to offer a substitute take precedence over an amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky?

The CHAIRMAN. No. A perfecting amendment takes precedence over a substitute amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I have sent to the desk a preferential motion to strike out the enacting clause. Does that take precedence over the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky?

The CHAIRMAN. It does.

Mr. CELLER. I offer that preferential motion, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. I make the point of order that I was recognized to offer an amendment and I did offer it before the gentleman offered his motion, and being a committee amendment it should be considered first.

The CHAIRMAN. In reply to the gentleman from Kentucky the Chair will state that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] wa on his feet and he now offers a preferential motion. He is entitled to recognition.

The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preferential motion offered by Mr. CELLER: Mr. CELLER moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Is the gentleman's motion in order, since there has been no debate on the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment stage has been reached and, therefore, the motion offered by the gentleman from New York is in order.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, this bill, beyond peradventure of doubt, should have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, since it primarily involves matters concerning labor injunctions and disputes involving labor, which subject matter heretofore, as far as legislation is concerned, has always been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I am quite convinced that if that committee had some control over this bill we would have avoided the confusion involved in the pending version of the bill. We would not have had inserted in the bill, for example, section 6, entitled "Enforcement." I have studied that section very carefully and I want to warn members of the committee that section 6 gives us back again the obnoxious labor injunctions which were banned after many years of striving and struggle, by the passage of the Clayton Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Remember we had consigned labor injunction to limbo. Now they are to be brought back to plague labor. Concomitantly there is being brought back to life the infamous yellow dog contracts, where an individual employee was coerced by his employer to sign a contract that he would not, during the term of his employment, join a union. The courts throughout the land, with wisdom, or I should say lack of wisdom, went to the greatest extremes to enforce that contract—the yellow dog contract—which coerced and held as a peon or slave or serf the workingman. The "yellow dog" contracts, remember, were implemented and strengthened by the labor injunction. Whenever any attempts were made to have the yellow dog employee join a union, he was enjoined and restrained by ex parte injunction. Unions and union leaders were restrained.

The courts granted the injunction on the ground that there would be irreparable damage to the employer. I said briefly yesterday and I shall elaborate in my extension of remarks some of the abuses concerning the issuance of these dreaded and dreadful labor injunctions in support of these "yellow dog" contracts. Now that is all to be revived because the court under section 6 can enjoin violations, aye, threatened violations, of any of the provisions of sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 which refer to jurisdictional disputes, boycotts, sympathy strikes, violence, intimidation, strikes, and lockouts. After 50 years of striving, of travail, of uttermost difficulty and suffering, labor was enabled to assert its rights and to assume some dignity by being able to strike, and to boycott, and to lock out, and to refrain from dealing in unfair goods. That shall now be wiped out by a mere wave of the hand. I hope, Mr. Chairman, before the Congress does that the Members of the House will pause and tarry long with reference to section 6 on injunctions.

In days gone by, practically everything attempted by unionists to preserve their organizations from wrongful acts of employers seeking to destroy them has been restrained by the courts. Most injunctions are issued on ex parte hearings.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I cannot yield at the moment.

The abuses were so cruel and the criticisms so grave that both the parties in their platforms denounced the evils against which labor struggled and denounced specifically labor injunction. This bill would hunt and hound labor by making possible the return of the "yellow dog" contract and the vicious labor injunction.

THE CASE AGAINST INJUNCTIONS IN INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

It is well to keep in mind that the use of the labor injunction is a legal violation of specific rights to protect individuals who stand accused before the court. Particularly in the granting of temporary restraining orders of the ex parte application, the right to a hearing before execution of the judgment is denied. Thus, judgment may be rendered after taking testimony that may be unwritten and the defendant denied the opportunity of confrontration of witnesses or the opportunity to ask a single question. Ofttimes, the proof offered by the plaintiff is merely by way of affidavit.

Federal Judge Amidon has expressed a very definite opinion on the trustworthiness of affidavits. Categorizing affidavits as "an untrustworthy guide for judicial action," he pointedly states, "This is the case in all legal proceedings, but it is peculiarly true of litigation growing out of a strike, where feelings on both sides are necessarily wrought up, and the desire for victory is likely to obscure the moral questions and poison the minds of men by prejudice."

Certainly, it is true that most of these affidavits are made by detectives and guards, overzealous to impress their employers with efficiency and, perhaps, indispensability. Experiences in litigation have shown time and time again that when both sides have had their say, affidavits have been proven to be packed with falsehoods or, worse, with half-truths that, in the matter of industrial disputes, are more deceptive than deliberate falsehoods. Upon this form of proof, the courts have denied citizens of their inalienable rights to strike, for in most cases the preliminary injunction, the ex parte injunction, without notice or hearing, has decided the fate of the strike.

The use of the labor injunction violates other fundamental rights as well, namely, formal indictment, presumption of innocence, requirement of proof beyond reasonable doubt, right to be confronted by witnesses, and, probably most important of all, jury trial. The individual enjoined can be punished by the judge issuing the injunction. There is no limitation upon the judge or the punishment. The offender is punished without trial by jury. Testimony given by Mr. Gregory, former president of the American Bar Association before the United States Commission on Industrial Relations (1912-1916) was vehement in its denunciation of the evasion of jury trial and other constitutional safeguards. He stated:

The obvious wisdom of permitting 12 men drawn from the body of the people to pass on questions of fact has so far commended itself to the wisdom of our legislators and jurists to such a degree that it has become a permanent feature of our jurisprudence. It cannot be denied that the wielding of the club of ex parte injunctions is contrary to the Bill of Rights.

Moreover, courts of equity in granting injunctions and enforcing their orders can be said to be entering the sphere of activity of the executive branch of the Government. To assure compliance, in the old labor strikes it was necessary in many instances to direct the regular police officers or United States marshals, as the case may be, to swear in a large number of deputies. Often, this amounted to placing an army of men at the disposal of the court. The Debs case, the shopmen's strike of 1922, and the coal miners' strike of 1928 can be cited as instances.

The judiciary should not hold both the sword and the purse.

There is more than an implied assumption of executive powers when the courts in industrial disputes directed orders against "all other persons" and "all other persons whomsoever" by enjoining acts which have not been declared to be unlawful by the legislature or any other authority, and by substituting their judgment for the judgment of the legislators on matters of social policy.

The most significant misconception encouraged by the courts in the granting of the labor injunction was the placing of property rights above personal rights.

There was no balancing of the two, especially so since jury trial, which might give more adequate consideration to personal rights, is denied in the contempt proceedings. As Samuel Gompers has aptly stated:

The injunction, as used in industrial disputes, is a preposterous weapon of oppression, used without authority of the law or the Constitution, and an instrument forged by cunning and usurpation for the benefit of the possessors of property to the detriment of humanity.

It cannot be questioned that injunctions cause industrial unrest. It will have that undesired effect in reference to the bill before us. Organized labor considered the use of the injunction as an unreasonable and unwarranted interference with the right to collective bargaining. It still thinks so. More than one authority has expressed the opinion that much of the bitterness manifested by workingmen in labor disputes arose from this cause. As a source of friction and complaint, the injunction ranked among the most serious of problems in industrial relations. Certainly because of it the courts had suffered a loss of prestige and with it a distrust of law and the courts. That is mischief enough. Shall we renew that mischief with new ex parte labor injunctions?

No less a person than Miss Jane Addams of wide social sympathies had said in 1908:

I should say perhaps that the one symptom among workingmen which most definitely indicates a class feeling is a growing distrust of the integrity of the courts, the belief that the present judge has been a corporation attorney, that his sympathies and experience and his whole view of life is on the corporation side. Either this distrust is growing rapidly or the statement of it is being more distinctly made every day.

Mr. Justice Brandeis had this—and most justifiably—to say of "government by injunction":

Through such proceedings a single judge often usurped the functions not only of the jury but of the police department; that, in prescribing the conditions under which strikes were permissible and how they might be carried out, he usurped also the powers of the legislature; and that incidentally he abridged the constitutional rights of individuals to free speech, to a free press, and to peaceful assembly.

Can it not be said that in the use of the injunction in industrial disputes that the employer under the guise of protecting property rights was seeking sovereign power?

Furthermore, section 4 and section 5, among other things, prevent picketing, boycotting, and sympathy strikes. The right to strike and picket is an inalienable right. It is well to note the case of *American Federation of Labor* v. *Swing* (312 U. S. Repts. 321) held that a State statute could not countervene the right to picket peacefully. That was the case wherein a beauty parlor was picketed by a union of which the employees of the beauty shop were not members and the Court held:

Such a ban of free communication is inconsistent with the guarantee of freedom of speech. That a State has ample power to regulate the local problems thrown up by modern industry and to preserve the peace is axiomatic. But not even these essential powers are unfettered by the requirements of the Bill of Rights.

The framers of the instant bill care little about constitutionality of their brain child.

I could spend hours upon other unfair features of this bill, but time will not permit.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. What is the parliamentary situation at the moment? Does a vote come on this privileged motion before another amendment is in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the motion and the argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] are good samples of the type of opposition to the pending bill. There are those who allegedly opposed it because it was not considered or reported by the Committee on Labor; others asserted they opposed it because of their criticisms of the hearings or lack of hearings on the part of the Committee on Military Affairs. Such opposition is nothing more nor less than an excuse. None opposing either consideration of the bill or opposing the bill has said that no matter by what committee this bill had been reported, he would have supported either the Connally or the Smith bill or any other antistrike bill.

Mr. Chairman, we must be practical. There is one thing the entire membership of this body knows, and that is that the only opportunity the Members of the House have had or will have to express themselves and vote for regulatory or restrictive labor legislation is on voting for or against this bill. Members advocating labor control should vote for consideration and for the best bill that can be obtained in the committee. To vote against the bill is to vote against antistrike legislation. We might as well be frank about it. If we wait until the Committee on Labor reports a bill, we shall wait in vain, just as we have for the past 4 years.

It is not now a question of the rights of labor or of the right to strike or the right of collective bargaining; the issue transcends the rights of labor unions, the issue transcends the rights of organized labor.

The demand of William Green that the Members of this body vote against both the Connally bill and the Smith bill with the threat of defeat to any Member voting for either of said bills is an affront to the red-blooded membership of the Congress and an insult to the red-blooded American constituencies they represent.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Gladly when I complete my statement.

John L. Lewis hates Franklin D. Roosevelt, President and the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy of the United States, with such venom that his judgment has been bitterly warped and his patriotism has been seriously impaired, if not practically destroyed. We might as well face the issue. When the coal miners' strike was called and the President took over the operation of the coal mines, John L. Lewis contemptuously and insultingly said to the American people: "Now we will bargain with our new employer, the United States of America."

What is the issue? The issue is striking against the United States when the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, has taken over the operation of the coal mines or other war industry. The issue is the right to strike against the flag. If it comes to the issue that I must either vote for the labor unions or for the Government, with me the Government comes first and I vote for the Government. The issue is whether Congress will support John L. Lewis, who has defied the Government, or the President of the United States, who has taken over the operation of the coal mines. We are either for our Government or against it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Just as soon as I finish my statement. The issue here, we might as well understand, stripped of all camouflage, stripped of all excuses and pretenses, is that this is the only opportunity at least for some time the Members of the House will have to express themselves or vote with respect to labor legislation. We have passed the buck to the Senate, the Senate has passed the buck to the House. There has been enough shadow boxing. We are either for antistrike legislation or we are against it. The issue is: When the production of steel is being impaired or stopped by the strike of 500,000 miners at the instigation and upon the demand of John L. Lewis, whether this Congress will take its stand for labor unions and John L. Lewis or for the Government. For my part, Mr. Chairman, I am for the Government of the United States of America.

It is time for dictatorial labor leaders, who demand that Members of Congress vote as they are ordered "or else," to be emphatically rebuked. It is time for John L. Lewis, who has openly and contemptuously defied the National War Labor Board and the President of the United States in the operation of the coal mines, to be put once and for all in his place. It is time for Congress, which can pass legislation to promote organized labor, to pass legislation that will prevent dictatorial labor leaders from strikes in war plants and from strikes in any plant under the operation of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I extend my remarks to say the Connally bill was passed by

the Senate on May 5, 1943. It was an amendment to section 9 of the Selective Service Act and authorized the President to take over war plants where there are strikes or labor disturbances, and to operate said plants. The Connally bill made it unlawful for any person to coerce or instigate strikes in such plants and provided for the punishment of violations of the provisions of the act. The bill also approved by statute the National War Labor Board, established by Executive order, and put teeth into the operations of the National War Labor Board.

The House in the Seventy-seventh Congress in December 1941 passed the so-called Smith bill. It died in the Senate. When the Connally bill came to the House it was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and this committee amended the bill by striking out the Connally bill and inserting in lieu thereof the principal provisions of the Smith bill, passed by the House by a vote of 2 to 1, as stated, in December 1941.

The purpose of the Smith bill is to prevent strikes or lock-outs in war plants during the war.

Section 1 of the bill provides for definitions.

Section 2 requires a 30-day notice or cooling-off period before there can be any strike or lock-out. A similar provision obtains in the legislation for the railway brotherhoods. No strikes can be called by the brotherhood until there is a cooling-off period. The section does not authorize a strike but it provides that strikes cannot be called until there is the cooling-off period.

Section 3 provides for a secret ballot. A strike cannot be called without such a ballot.

Section 4 is to protect employees from violence and intimidation. Professional strikers are prohibited.

Section 5 makes unlawful jurisdictional disputes and sympathetic strikes.

Section 6 provides for enforcement and penalties for violations.

Section 7 provides for the registration of labor organizations. It requires publication of the annual dues, the method of election, financial statements, with copies of constitution and bylaws. Congress requires financial statements from political parties. Such statements should be required of labor unions.

Section 8 legalizes the National War Labor Board, established by Executive order.

Section 9 puts teeth into the powers of the National War Labor Board.

Section 10 authorizes the maintenance of the status quo, and

Section 11 provides for regulations of the Board.

Section 12 deals with the power of the Board with respect to wages, in Government-operated plants, and I think might well be eliminated.

Section 13 prevents the interference with Government operation of plants.

Under section 14 the act is to be enforced during the war and for six months following the war.

THE PURPOSE

The labor unions announced, following Pearl Harbor, there would be no more strikes. The people praised both organizations. Sometime after Pearl Harbor, however, jurisdictional strikes arose in the Kaiser shipyards involving 100,000 men and nearly $3,000,000 in dues. As I recall, the A. F. of L. had the contracts and the C. I. O. was trying to get them. All efforts to stop the contest failed. The Wagner Act was invoked, but under the Wagner Act the question of jurisdiction can be raised. Strikes resulted. There was delay in production. Strikes have multiplied. There were 395 strikes in April 1943. There were 2,968 strikes in 1942. The purpose of the bill is to prevent strikes in war plants. John L. Lewis has defied the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He has defied the National War Labor Board. He has constituted himself as judge and jury in disputes between miners and operators. He has defied the Department of Labor. He has defied his Government. It is time for a show-down. It is time to put John L. Lewis in his place. No man should be permitted to impede the war effort.

THE RULE

A desperate effort was made to defeat the rule. The bill was favorably reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. While no specific hearings had been conducted on the pending bill, the Committee on Military Affairs had conducted exhaustive hearings on strikes in connection with the utilization of manpower. More than 1,000 pages of testimony had been taken. The representatives of labor had been heard. The views of the labor leaders were known. Congress had already passed the Smith bill 18 months ago. I asked those who opposed the rule, because they alleged that the labor organizations were not heard by the Military Affairs Committee, just one question. I asked, "Would the opponents of the rule vote for the rule if hearings were conducted and substantially the same bill were reported?" All responded they would still oppose the bill. The plea that there were no hearings was invalid. It was really an excuse. Those who voted against the rule because there were no hearings, when repeated hearings had already been conducted, are against the bill. The plea of no hearings is a smoke screen and does not rise to the dignity of an excuse for opposing the bill.

VOLUNTARY COOPERATION

It is said that it is constitutional to conscript men to die for their country, but it is unconstitutional to conscript labor. While the conscription of labor is not involved, I believe that both men and labor could be conscripted if necessary for the defense of the United States and for the successful prosecution of the war. Moreover, I think that if men can be conscripted, property can be conscripted. But, I repeat, the bill does not involve the conscription of labor. It involves the protection of honest labor. The bill guarantees the right of collective bargaining. It is intended to prevent dictators in labor just as democracy is intended to prevent dictators in government. The purpose of the bill is to prevent racketeering and subversive leadership. The purpose of the bill is to prevent and eliminate strikes that impede the war industries. It is said that the proper solution of our labor problems is voluntary cooperation. But labor has heretofore admitted that voluntary cooperation was ineffective. The labor organizations appealed to Congress to enact labor legislation. Labor itself abandoned voluntary cooperation to secure protection for labor. It has appealed for statute after statute, and Congress has responded by passing statutes to protect the rights of labor. If statutes are necessary and essential to protect labor in its rights, statutes are essential to restrict labor and to prevent strikes in war plants during the war.

LEADERS

Again it is said that all labor organizations should not be punished because of the arbitrary unpatriotic demands of some labor organizations. John L. Lewis is without a defender. There is general consensus of opinion that he should be put in his place, but it is urged that because a few labor organizations promote strikes there should not be legislation that would affect all labor organizations. There is no occasion for criminal statutes for the great body of people. They are essential for the few criminals. The regulation of utilities and of exchanges was made necessary because of the violations of the few. Subversive and racketeering leaders and wholly unjustifiable strikes by the few make legislation necessary to prevent any strikes or racketeering by all.

CLEAN HOUSE

It is time for labor to clean house. Excessive fees by unions, undue assessments upon members, excessive salaries, demand relief. Laborers themselves are not objecting to legislation to prevent unreasonable fees, unreasonable assessments, or to prevent racketeering.

We have heard a lot about absenteeism, but absenteeism is not the real heart of labor difficulties, nor is it responsible for the slow production of war materials. I oppose absenteeism. It should be penalized, but my point is that penalizing absenteeism is not enough.

For almost 4 years the people of the United States have urged that labor clean house. Voluntary methods and cooperation have failed. If legislation can promote, legislation can restrict labor. I repeat it is time for a show-down. The Congress must provide that John L. Lewis is the servant and not the master of the United States. The time for name calling has passed. It is time for action. I trust that the Smith bill, as a substitute for the Connally bill, may be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CELLER) there were—ayes 37, noes 133.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY:

On page 8, line 22, after the word "which", strike out the words "may be" and insert the word "are."

Line 23, after the word "which", strike out the words "may be" and insert the word "are."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: Page 7, line 12, strike out all of the committee amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SECTION 1. As used in this act—

"(a) 'Person' means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, or any organized group of persons.

"(b) 'War contract' means—

"(1) A contract with the United States entered into on behalf of the United States by an officer or employee of the Department of War, the Department of the Navy, or the United States Maritime Commission;

"(2) A contract with the United States entered into by the United States pursuant to an act entitled 'An act to promote the defense of the United States';

"(3) A contract, whether or not with the United States, for the production, manufacture, construction, reconstruction, installation, maintenance, storage, repair, mining, or transportation of—

"(A) Any weapon, munition, aircraft, vessel, or boat;

"(B) Any building, structure, or facility;

"(C) Any machinery, tool, material, supply article, or commodity; or

"(D) Any component material or part of or equipment for any article described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C);

"the production, manufacture, construction, reconstruction, installation, maintenance, storage, repair, mining, or transportation of which by the contractor in question is found by the President as being contracted for in the prosecution of the war.

"(c) 'War contractor' means the person producing, manufacturing, constructing, reconstructing, installing, maintaining, storing, repairing, mining, or transporting under a war contract, or a person whose plant is equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required in the prosecution of the war or which may be useful in connection therewith; but such term shall not include a carrier, as defined in title I of the Railway Labor Act, or a carrier by air subject to title II of such act.

"(d) The terms 'employer,' 'employee,' 'representative,' 'labor organization,' and 'labor dispute' shall have the same meaning as in section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act.

"NOTICE TO STRIKE OR CONDUCT LOCK-OUT

"SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for a war contractor to conduct a lock-out until after the expiration of 30 days from the date on which such contractor gives to his employees or their representatives and to the Secretary of Labor written notice of his intention so to do, together with a statement of his reasons for such intended lock-out, or for employees of a war contractor to strike until after the expiration of 30 days from the date on which they or their representatives give to such contractor and to the Secretary of Labor written notice of their intention to do so, together with a statement of their reasons for such intended strike.

"Strike ballots

"SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for employees of a war contractor to strike until after the Secretary of Labor has certified the result of a secret ballot taken, under the direction of the United States Conciliation Service, of the employees employed at the plant, plants, mine, mines, or other place, or places of employment, or in the bargaining unit or units, with respect to which the notice under section 2 applies. At any time after the employees of a war contractor, or their representatives, give notice under section 2, such employees or their representative may request the Secretary of Labor to take, through the United States Conciliation Service, a secret ballot of the employees at the plant, plants, mine, mines, or other place or places of employment, or in the bargaining unit or units, with respect to which such notice applies, for the purpose of determining whether such employees favor or oppose such proposed strike. Upon receiving any such request, the Secretary of Labor shall direct the United States Conciliation Service to take forthwith such secret ballot, and after the taking of such ballot the Secretary shall by order forthwith certify the results thereof, which shall be open to public inspection.

"SEC. 4. (a) Any person violating any of the provisions of sections 2 or 3 shall be liable to a civil suit to any person injured thereby for damages resulting from such injury.

"(b) Any person who violates any of the provisions of sections 2 or 3 shall on and after such violation cease to have and cease to be entitled for a period of 1 year to (1) the status of a representative or labor organization under the National Labor Relations Act; (2) the status of a person participating in or interested in any labor dispute for the purposes of section 4 of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes.'

"(c) In case any individual who violates any of the provisions of sections 2 or 3 is an officer or representative of a labor organization, then or and after such violation and so long as such individual is an officer or representative of such labor organization, such labor organization shall cease to have or be entitled to the status of a labor organization under the National Labor Relations Act and cease to have the status of a person participating in or interested in any labor dispute for the purposes of section 4 of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes."

"Registration of labor organizations

"SEC. 5. (a) Within 60 days after the date of enactment of this act and annually thereafter every labor organization in which employees of any war contractor participate, through its president or other authorized officer, shall register its identity with the National Labor Relations Board and shall state under oath the following information: The name of the labor organization; the address at which it has its principal office or does business; the names and titles of the officers; initiation fees; annual dues charged each member; assessments levied during the past 12-month period; limitations on membership; number of paid-up members; date of the last election of officers; the annual salary of each officer, including bonuses, travel, and other expenses; and the date of the last detailed financial statement furnished all members and the method of publication or circulation of such statement. With such information shall be filed under oath detailed and intelligible financial statements and a copy of the constitution and bylaws of the labor organization.

"(b) Every labor organization established after the date of enactment of this act in which employees of any war contractor participate shall, when established and annually thereafter, register with the Board and furnish the information required of existing labor organizations under the provisions of subsection (a).

"(c) Any labor organization which fails to register with the Board and file the information required by this act shall be disqualified to act as the representative of employees in collective bargaining for such time as such failure shall continue: *Provided*, That in the initial registration only if information on a particular point is lacking, the statement 'no information' or 'no record' shall be considered an answer.

"SEC. 6. Section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 2, sec. 251), is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 313. It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution in connection with any election to any political officer, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress are to be voted for, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section. Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. For the purposes of this section "labor organization" shall have the same meaning as under the National Labor Relations Act.'

"SEC. 7. When possession of any plant, mine, or other property has been, or is hereafter taken by the Government under authority of section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or otherwise, by reason of a strike, lockout, threatened strike, threatened lockout, work stoppage, or other cause, such plant, mine, or other property shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as practicable but in no event more than 60 days after the termination of the conditions which caused possession of such plant, mine, or other property to be so taken.

"Termination of act

"SEC. 8. Except as to offenses committed prior to such date, the provisions of this act and the amendments made by this act shall cease to be effective at the end of 6 months following the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or upon the date (prior to the date of such proclamation) of the passage of a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress stating that such provisions and amendments shall cease to be effective."

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, you will have observed, if you listened carefully to the reading of this substitute, that section 1 is identical with the committee bill.

Section 2 is identical with the committee bill and provides for a 30-day cooling-off period or 30 days' notice before strike.

Section 3 is the same as the committee bill and provides for a secret ballot to be conducted by a Government agency in the event notice has been given to strike.

Section 4 is a part of section 6 of the bill. Section 4 of this substitute is the penalty provision. Subsection (a) of section 4 of the substitute provides as follows:

Any person violating any of the provisions of sections 2 and 3—

Sections 2 and 3 are the strike-notice and the secret-ballot provisions—

shall be liable to a civil suit to any person injured thereby for damage resulting from such an injury.

And that would apply to corporations who have a lock-out, and if any workman were locked out of the plant because of the action of the officers of the corporation he would be entitled to damages in a civil suit against the corporation. It also would apply to labor unions or individuals of labor unions. Anyone who was damaged as the result of a strike in violation of this act would be entitled to file a civil suit for damages.

Subsection (b) provides that any person who violates any of the provisions of these two sections shall on and after such violation cease to have and cease to be entitled for a period of 1 year, first, to the status of a representative of a labor organization under the National Labor Relations Act, and, second, the status of a person participating in or interested in any labor dispute for the purpose of section (a) of the act of March 23, 1932, which is the Norris-LaGuardia act.

Subsection (c) is about the same as subsection (b) and applies to an officer or representative of a labor organization who violates any of the provisions of those two sections. Then or after such violation, and so long as such individual is an officer or representative of such labor organization, such organization shall cease to have or be entitled to the status of a labor organization under the National Labor Relations Act, and shall cease to have the status of a person participating in or interested in any labor dispute for the purpose of section 4 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Section 5 of this act is very similar to one of the sections of the House bill which provides for the registration of labor organizations. This provision of my substitute does not go into as much detail as the House bill does, and requires only the necessary information, such as the amount of dues charged the member, the number of paid-up members and the salaries of the officers, including bonuses and traveling expenses, and a detailed financial statement of the organization.

Section 6 of this substitute amends section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act and merely adds the words "Labor organization" to that act. That act, as you know, prevents a corporation or a national bank from making political contributions.

My amendment would broaden that act to cover labor organizations.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. I wonder if the gentleman has overlooked the fact that the Hatch Act, passed in 1940, contained a provision prohibiting political contributions in excess of $5,000 in any one year, and in that act persons are defined as including individuals, unincorporated groups, partnerships, associations. That is not aimed at labor unions, but all unincorporated groups are limited under the present law to a contribution of not to exceed $5,000 per year. I wonder if the gentleman had that in mind in drafting that provision.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No; frankly, I did not have it in mind, but this does prohibit contributions by a corporation, a national bank or a labor organization.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I understand from the statement of the gentleman that his bill only deals with three things: what may be classified as a cooling-off period, contributions to political campaigns, and the disclosure of receipts and assets and their distribution.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. And the secret ballot.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is the cooling-off period.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman's bill deals with those three questions.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. There is one other section that I have not got to yet, section 7.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. All right.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Under section 9 of the Selective Service and Training Act the President has the power to seize certain plants and industries if the management of those plants fails to cooperate with the Government in this war program, but he has gone beyond that authorization and he has seized industries. He has seized the mines, for example, not because management has not failed to cooperate but because the President and labor leadership are waging a bitter personal feud.

Section 7 of my substitute provides as follows:

When possession of any plant, mine, or other property has been or is hereafter taken by the Government under authority of section 9 of the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940, as amended, or otherwise, by reason of a strike, lock-out, threatened strike, threatened lock-out, work stoppage, or other cause, such plant, mine, or other property shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as practicable, but in no event for 60 days after the termination of the conditions which caused possession of such plant, mine, or other property to be so taken.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Your substitute does not deal at all with jurisdictional disputes?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. It does not.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does the gentleman have any opposition to accepting an amendment to the substitute dealing with jurisdictional disputes?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes; because I do not think it is necessary if you have sections 2 and 3 of this bill, and I believe so firmly that if you will give to labor in the plants the determination of whether there is going to be a strike there will be no strike.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In order that the Committee can thoroughly understand the issues before it, the gentleman's substitute then merely deals with the cooling-off period, the secret ballot in relation to the determination of a strike.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is right.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And contributions to political campaigns.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is right.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. And a disclosure of how much they take in, how much is paid out, and where the money goes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. A financial statement.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. A financial statement, plus seizure after the plants have been taken over by the Government.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is as far as the gentleman is willing to deal with the question?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is as far as I think we should go on this question.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I just want the Committee of the House to thoroughly understand the extent of the gentleman's amendment so we will know exactly the difference between what he is proposing and the committee bill.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for bringing that out so clearly.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I suppose the last section of the gentleman's bill, and I have not read the amendment, carries out exactly what the committee adopted in section 12 of its bill.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is correct.

Mr. MAY. It requires that within 60 days after the causes which brought about the seizure of the plant have ceased to exist, it may be returned to its owner.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is section 7 of this proposed substitute.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. I understand that most of the strikes that we have had before were unauthorized strikes or jurisdictional strikes. Does not the gentleman believe that if a secret ballot is provided, which will also give a cooling-off period, it will eliminate all of these unauthorized strikes and the so-called jurisdictional strikes?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is just exactly what I said a few moments ago, regarding sections 2 and 3 in this bill. I agree exactly with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana may proceed for 5 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to express my own personal gratitude and appreciation for the valuable work which the gentleman from Indiana has done in the consideration of this measure, and I think his substitute offers a very clear plan, and while it may not solve all the difficulties, I shall be glad to vote upon it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the substitute prohibit secondary or sympathetic strikes?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think it would eliminate them. If you give the men and women in labor the right to determine whether or not there will be a strike, if they can vote secretly on the question of a strike, there will be no strikes in this country, because American labor are patriotic and want to cooperate. As I said a while ago on this floor, the only reason we have had strikes is that labor has not had a source of reliable, dependable information, and that they have been misled and misinformed by certain labor leaders.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Will the gentleman explain what his substitute would do in the case of an individual's inciting a strike in a plant before the expiration of the 30 days, or after the expiration of the 30 days if the workers in the plant had voted not to strike?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. They just could not do it. It would be unlawful under this bill.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. What would be the penalty?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. There is a penalty for it, which the gentleman will recall that I described just a few minutes ago.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course the gentleman does not attribute any fault at all for these strikes to any of the operators?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I did not say that. I am not defending the coal operators at all.

Let me make this observation: This is no time for this Congress to write on the statute books more drastic legislation than this substitute I have offered. When we try to enact legislation here toda, while the coal strike is on, it is an indication that this House in the past has failed to look the facts in the face and put on the statute books the needed legislation to prevent this situation. If we should pass this section 12, or 13, making it an offense for anybody to instigate a strike in a defense plant taken over by the Government, it would not apply to this mine situation, for it would be ex post facto as far as the mine strike is concerned. I do not believe this is the time to enact any such legislation as that. If you will take this simple substitute—friends of labor should support this substitute—it will stop practically all of the labor disorders in this country in defense plants, in my opinion.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. Under the gentleman's substitute proposal, he would strike out all of the provisions that have to do with the War Labor Board?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes, I would take out all of the provisions about the War Labor Board. I do not want by law to recognize the War Labor Board as such. It has been appointed and is functioning under an Executive order, and I want to let it continue to operate that way.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Did the gentleman submit his substitute to the committee for consideration?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. We discussed every section in this bill, time and time again.

Mr. SADOWSKI. What action did the gentleman's committee take on his substitute when it was presented to the committee?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I did not offer it as a substitute in committee.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Why not, may I ask?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Because I just got it written this morning.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. If this substitute is adopted and then passed by the House, could you under the bill deal with the present coal strike?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No, this would not deal with the present strike. I say we cannot pass any legislation here today that will affect the present strike in the coal fields.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. There is no way you can legislate on it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. There is no way we can legislate on that at all.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. There is only one person who can deal with that, and that is the President of the United States.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is right. The President of the United States has the power under the Constitution to deal with that.

Mr. SHORT. Pour the oil where the squeak is. The squeak is in the White House.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is right. Put the blame where it belongs.

Mr. SADOWSKI. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman feel that the War Department and the Navy Department would support his substitute amendment? Would it meet with their approval?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I do not know. I am satisfied in my mind of this, that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and every general officer under either of them would support every single provision in this bill if they had their own way about it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. It is a fact that the present bill is not supported by the War Department and the Navy Department?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No; that is not true.

Mr. SADOWSKI. The point I wish to make is, Will they support the gentleman's substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a most unusual procedure that the gentleman from Indiana has suggested. He was a member of the subcommittee that recommended the bill to the full committee, and he assisted in the drafting of the very bill that is up for consideration at this moment. He voted for the rule on that bill. Yet now, when we have concluded the reading of the first section of the bill, he submits an entirely new bill of four single-spaced typewritten pages, which has not been submitted to the chairman or a single man on the majority side, and I am not sure that it has been submitted to all the Members on the minority side, a bill the draft of which, he says, was just completed awhile ago, too late to submit to anybody. I claim that is not a very safe way to legislate on a bill which is as important and controversial as this is.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Is there anything in this bill that the gentleman and every other member of our com-

mittee has not discussed by the hour for the past 10 days?

Mr. THOMASON. That is the very reason why I insist that this House proceed along orderly lines and read the bill now under consideration, section by section, so that we will know what this is all about, because I am sure the gentleman appreciates that if this amendment which he offers, which is an entire bill in itself, should be adopted, to use a slang expression, "church is out," because that is the end of the bill. The simple question the House would have before it would then be voting it up or down. There are some things in the original bill which I am not for, and there are things in the bill under discussion that I am for, but I want to know why a matter so controversial as this, when the country is so vitally interested in it, should not be considered in an orderly way, section by section. Let us debate these things, instead of simply saying by a vote "yes" or "no," that we will either accept or reject this substitute.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman knows as well as this House knows, and as well as anyone else knows, that we could take this substitute up, section by section, and debate it.

Mr. THOMASON. If we are going to do that, I cannot understand the procedure, and I am a little bit suspicious about the procedure the gentleman is about to follow. It sounds like politics to me. I prefer an open frank way of meeting every issue in the bill face to face. I am sure I speak for the chairman of this committee when he says that he never heard of this substitute until 20 minutes ago, and that is true of every man on the majority side of the committee. Why not go ahead and face the issues in the committee bill, as presented, because I am going to offer some amendments myself. There are some things that I am opposed to, and some things that I am strongly in favor of, but I repeat what I undertook to say this morning, and that is that the big issue right now before the country is who is running the country, a certain individual and a group of men or the President of the United States. That is the heart of the bill.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. And the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] had a perfect right to offer his substitute in the committee and had plenty of time to do it, had he not?

Mr. THOMASON. I will be frank with the gentleman and say I think that I remember one or two sections that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] referred to, and he asked the gentleman from Indiana if he was going to support them, and he said "Yes." It seems to me that we ought to go ahead in a regular way, and meet the issue in every section.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. And does the gentleman think that the gentleman from Indiana would have had an opportunity yesterday morning, in view of what happened in the commitee?

Mr. THOMASON. I will say to my friend from Ohio, that the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] spent a long time in preparing the original draft, and then it was gone over and debated section by section and never did I hear the gentleman propose this substitute in its entirety.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has referred to this as an unusual procedure. There have been a lot of unusual things in connection with this whole procedure, and is it not true that the bill as originally written and reported out by the committee has since been amended by the committee, or that the committee will seek to amend it?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. And that you add a lot of things to it.

Mr. THOMASON. That is all true; but those amendments were placed in the RECORD yesterday, but now the gentleman from Indiana seeks to bring in an entirely new bill here and offer it as an amendment to the bill which, if adopted, is the end of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Committee to pay particular attention to exactly what is tendered in this so-called substitute. I believe that calmly and dispassionately I can show to the Committee that the adoption of this substitute is in truth and in fact a defeat of the entire proposal. It consists of nothing other than the present section 2 and section 3 of the bill, and then some provisions which do not touch wartime strikes—top, side, nor bottom. These consist of a prohibition of contributions to political campaigns, require registration and reports by unions, and other collateral matters. In Committee on Military Affairs a motion was made to strike sections 2 and 3 from the bill. Their elimination was recommended by the Army, by the Navy, by the Maritime Commission, by the War Labor Board, and by the National Labor Relations Board. All of those agencies expressed no objections to the bill, outside of some perfecting amendments, if sections 2, 3, and 12 were eliminated from the bill.

It is the first time that I know of that the agencies charged with production for the war and the conduct of the war have agreed upon legislation on this subject. Sections 2 and 3 instead of strengthening the committee bill as an antistrike bill, actually weaken that bill, for this reason: It is provided in section 2 that no strike shall be called except after 30 days' notice. Section 3 provides that no strike shall be called in a war plant until after a secret ballot, the result of which shall be declared by the Secretary of Labor. At the present time all of the unions are under a voluntary agreement not to strike. True it has been violated, but in most instances it has been observed. At least you and I and the American people demand that organized labor do observe and respect the voluntary agreement that they made. If you adopt this provision you say by legislation that in a war factory no strike shall be legal except when it is called after 30 days' notice and after a secret ballot. That is the positive effect of sections 2 and 3 of the original bill, and are the only provisions of this so-called substitute which touch strikes in war plants. By express statutory enactment they legalize a strike in a war plant, called after 30 days' notice and after a secret ballot.

The present coal strike did not come off until after about 90 days of so-called cooling off. These provisions should be stricken from the committee bill. May I say to you that in the Committe on Military Affairs a motion was made to strike them, and upon the original roll call the motion carried by one vote. I am sorry to say that thereafter another member was recorded which resulted in a tie vote. That is the margin by which they remain in this bill. Everybody on the committee who gave particular attention to the matter, and who sincerely desires to secure antistrike legislation during times of war, agreed that those provisions should go out. The Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission, the War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board agreed they should go out. Here we come now with a substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana. In the committee I was wondering whether he would support the bill and I asked him. He felt somewhat insulted because I did ask him. But this is not the first labor bill that we have drawn in the committee, and which certain members have served in drafting, which some have failed to identify as their child when it came to the floor. There has been some question of the paternity in the past. For that reason I was anxious to know how my friend would vote.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. You helped draft this child that is now on the floor.

Mr. KILDAY. You and I; yes, sir.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. And you helped me and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. And now you are standing here arguing against the two most important sections of a bill that you helped create.

Mr. KILDAY. I have not yet voted against any bill that I helped to draft and report. I have assisted in perfecting legislation as I am now doing. These two provisions were placed in the bill originally. I do not claim to know it all. I am willing to listen to men who have dealt with this subject. Hindsight is better than foresight. I ask you to

realize that when you come to adopt sections 2 and 3 of the present bill or the provisions of this substitute, you are going backward. You are not outlawing strikes, but you are legalizing those that are called in a certain way. You are placing a club in the hands of every labor leader, to work within his organization during the 30-day period, in order to line up his men to vote for such a strike. Should this provision become law he could truthfully contend for the legality of a strike in a war plant called in accordance with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and for the purpose of propounding a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his request.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. KEEFE and Mr. HARNESS of Indiana objected.

Mr. MAY. I withdraw the request, Mr. Chairman, and I ask for recognition in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], did not advise me earlier with respect to this proposed amendment, and yet I have no criticism for his having offered it. He had a right to offer that amendment or any other amendment he wanted to offer to this bill. That is what the rules of the House provide. I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment for the reason that it strikes out all the provisions of the original committee bill relating to the National War Labor Board. I undertook to have included in this legislation a provision that would strengthen the arm of the War Labor Board so that they could deal with a single individual in this country who is sitting either in New York or the United States Capital City and dictating to 600,000 men as to when they shall quit work and when they shall commence work.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MAY. Yes; I yield briefly.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Surely the gentleman would not argue that the bill before this House would have anything to do with the present dispute in the coal industry?

Mr. MAY. I take the position that in this time, although a strike has heretofore been called in the coal industry and called off, and another has been called and is under way, that it will apply to the strike that is under way now, and commenced before the legislation is enacted, because when it is once a strike it continues to be a strike, and it would continue to apply. The doctrine of ex post facto does not apply. The War Labor Board can, when this bill becomes law, subpena the presence of anyone.

The reason I oppose the gentleman's amendment is that it takes from the War Labor Board power to deal with the situation that now confronts us. The bill as reported by the House committee provides that when somebody is subpenaed or requested to come before the Board, that the Board may issue a subpena, and if it is disobeyed, they can apply to a district court of the United States for the purpose of an order enforcing obedience to it. That would reach Mr. John L. Lewis today if it were the law.

Let me now reply to some of the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, who objects to sections 2 and 3 of the bill. So far as the committee bill is concerned, that is a good provision, because it is the only part of the legislation that actually has any teeth in it, yet there are a few members of the Committee on Military Affairs who, I think, would like to take some of the teeth out of the legislation. I am not one of those in this Congress or on the House Committee on Military Affairs who takes orders from either the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy—neither of whom appeared before the committee, but both of whom were invited—or from any other bureau head in Washington. I think legislators have a few functions of their own to perform, and I am standing here today in opposition to the amendment that will be offered by the gentlemen who passed these sections 2 and 3. If the Labor Relations Board can be restored to the amendment to be offered by the gentleman as a substitute, I will support the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana, and I do not think it will be necessary to go any further than to accept his own statements in order to find a basis for the opposition. He says it will not affect the coal strike.

We are faced today by creeping paralysis with reference to our war effort, due to the inactivity of the coal miners. It is not going to solve the problem to get up here and cuss John Lewis, and it will not solve the problem to pass the Harness substitute. In my judgment, it will not solve the problem to pass the committee amendment. If the Harness substitute is voted down, I expect to offer another substitute which in substance is the Connally bill as it passed the Senate with the deletion of section 3 to which such objection has been raised and with the addition in section 6 (b) of words which will tie up the War Labor Board activities with the stabilization program. I expect to add in section 4 (b) of the Connally bill, after the reference to the statutes ending with "October 2, 1942" the words: "And the regulations and orders issued under such acts." That will give this House the opportunity, in my judgment, to pass legislation which will be accepted by the United States Senate and will become law and will contain language which will deal with the coal strike and will enable this Government to say to the miners' union:

"You cannot pay strike benefits; you cannot pay unemployment compensation to these men as long as they are not working; you cannot aid, counsel, or guide this work stoppage."

Under section 4 (2), on page 4, of the Connally bill that is prohibited, and it is the only chance insofar as I can read these legislative proposals that are before us that offers the United States Government any opportunity to deal with the coal strike which, as I said, threatens paralysis to the war effort and a stoppage of supplies to our men on the battlefields throughout the world.

I am not willing, good friend of labor as I have been, to stand in the Well of this House and defend stoppage for a single minute in the war industries of this country, and I think we ought to pass something here that will reach the immediate problem instead of shadow-boxing about labor problems that have no connection with this vital work stoppage.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am sorry; I have not the time.

We have a last chance, as I see it, to help solve this coal problem. We are not going to solve the coal strike by making labor unions register or hold strike ballots, because these men are not at work now; they have already gone out. The only thing that is offered in either bill, so far as I have been able to find, is on page 4, section 4 (2) of the Connally bill, where provision is made to stop strike benefits, unemployment compensation, and to stop the officers of the United Mine Workers from contributing, aiding, guiding, or counseling these workers who have gone out. That is action; you can get that through the Senate tomorrow; you can get it enacted into law and we can help put these miners back to work.

I hope this House will vote down the Harness amendment and adopt the substitute I am going to offer. Let us take some concrete action here. We have shadow-boxed about labor questions for years. One year we pass one thing and the Senate passes another; the two get tied up in conference or killed in committee; but today we have a chance for the first time to get the United States Senate on the dotted line on something they have already agreed to on a record vote. It will help stop this strike. It will help put these miners back to work. I think that is what we ought to do.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I understand it, the gentleman's proposal would be a remedy in the present crisis. The substitute amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] seeks to modify existing basic labor law. I prefer the course offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PLOESER to the Harness substitute: Page 3, line 15, section 5, strike out the words "each member" and insert after the word "period" a semicolon and the words: *"Provided, however,* That it is not the intention of this section to require any State, sectional, or local reports of individual life-insurance benefit assessments."

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of offering this amendment is to clarify what I think to be a possible chance for misinterpretation of section 5.

I believe most sincerely in the basic principle of registration of labor unions and financial accounting on their part. Members of labor unions are entitled to know where and how their money is spent. It is the finest possible protection that can be afforded members of the labor unions, but it is quite possible that we are letting both the Government and the labor unions in for an enormous amount of bookkeeping which I assume was not intended by either the author of the substitute or the author of the original bill.

I hold in my hand here a monthly dues receipt from possibly one of the greatest labor unions of all times, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, on which there are seven items. One is a tuberculosis fund, another is a fund for the payment of dues of members who have gone away to war and who cannot pay their dues, another is for accident and health payments, and another one for life insurance benefits, and others. With approximately 195,000 members in this one union, they would be required under this bill, if so interpreted by the administrator of the act, to make some one and one-half million monthly items of accounting in their reports on matters which are not of concern or of interest to the purpose of this legislation. Why should these labor unions be burdened with such voluminous extra bookkeeping? Why should the Government require such information? Such action on the part of this House would not only be abusive but would go far to mimic the myriads of foolish bureaucratic regulations today imposed on business. So the sole purpose of my amendment is to eliminate that unnecessary reporting and unnecessary accounting which benefits neither the labor unions, the Government, nor the public.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words, and I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts to proceed for 10 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I realize and appreciate the fact that the Members of the House have different opinions in connection with the pending legislation, the substitutes and the amendments and other substitutes that will be offered. But there is one thing that I consider to be of paramount importance, and that is this is the time when the House should proceed with deliberative care and caution. If we legislate in anger we are going to repent at leisure.

We are legislating to meet the present situation and we should not, in my opinion, legislate to punish 100 percent for what less than one and one-half percent are doing. We must also realize that a great majority of those out on strike are unwilling strikers.

On the other hand a situation exists that is dangerous to the best interests of the country. That means labor as well as industry, agriculture, and every other economic group in America; that means that the present situation is dangerous for our men, young men and ladies of our armed forces. A continuance of this situation is dangerous for the institutions of government we possess and love.

On the other hand it is our duty, without regard to personal results, to meet this present situation so that a future recurrence will not take place. On that we should not forget ourselves or go too far legislating against all of labor when the vast majority are innocent.

In my opinion this is a time for reason and not emotionalism on our part. During the past year America has given to the world a production record that is unequalled. In turning over from peacetime to wartime economy and the vast production of weapons of war, we have accomplished what we first thought was not possible a year ago. I add I was one of those who did not think it was possible.

Let us give credit where credit is due for this great accomplishment. Congress is entitled to its share of the credit. We have promptly appropriated the money necessary and has given to the Commander in Chief and the executive branches, the power necessary to bring this about. But, that is not enough. Men and women in industry have given their ability and experience to the Government in this great accomplishment. Management has played its important part, but without labor playing its very important part in the teamwork necessary, this production record so necessary to win the war would not have been accomplished. In other words, at this time, we should not legislate to penalize 99 innocent to get at 1 guilty person. Once started, and in this case unnecessarily, no one knows where repressive legislation will end. So far as I am concerned I am opposed to repressive legislation against management as well as against labor until all reasonable means and efforts for voluntary cooperation have been exhausted. We are living in a democracy.

So far as the coal-mining situation is concerned, the time has arrived for action. That action should be confined to this situation. There is no justification to legislate against all labor to meet the present situation. We are not justified in permitting a stoppage of productive activities for war purposes.

Our boys on the far-flung fronts and our allies must be kept supplied with those things necessary to win this war. The amazing thing is that men would even think of striking when our manhood are dying that our country and what it stands for might live.

This is the time for Congress to legislate by action, not by reaction. Legislation by action means meeting the present situation itself. Legislation by reaction means condemning all of labor for what the strikers are doing.

Donald Nelson said yesterday:

Steel production will drop sharply late this week unless the flow of coal to steel plants is maintained and practical paralysis of the production program will follow and serious curtailment of coal supplies.

Wayne L. Morse, the public's member of the War Labor Board, said:

This strike has no parallel since Pearl Harbor insofar as a reckless and wanton disregard of the no-strike agreement is concerned.

He further said:

Viewed from the standpoint of its damage to the war effort and its serious threat to the maintenance of Government by law and order, this strike probably has no parallel in American history.

That comes from a man highly respected by all elements of organized labor.

American manhood, wearing the uniform, is performing its duty to our country. A free labor depends upon a free America. These men on strike owe a duty to our country, and that duty is to go back to work at once. Everything America stands for depends upon winning the war. The leaders of these men owe a duty in this crisis to our country. Every right we possess carries with it a responsibility to preserve that right. The right of citizenship carries with it the responsibility of preserving that citizenship.

We, as Americans and as Members of Congress, owe a duty to our country. That duty now is to act courageously, in a deliberative manner, to meet the present situation. It would be improper, unwise, and unstatesmanlike to convict all of honorable labor for the actions of those engaged in the present situation so dangerous to the best interests of our country.

That comes to the point that I am going to suggest. We have got to meet the coal strike. We do not want to inflame the minds of over 40,000,000 men and women who have been a part of this great productive program. Sixty thousand airplanes produced in a year; tanks and weapons of war and supplies that we thought was impossible.

The amendment as presented goes too far. It indicts all and convicts all and fails to consider the present threat, the present danger in the coal strike.

The committee bill goes too far.

The proposal made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], in my opinion, meets the present situation. If we pass that bill we will give to the President of the United States, not a Republican or a Democrat, but the Commander in Chief, the necessary powers implemented by what he has, to meet the

present situation. I hope that this substitute will not be adopted, and the substitute that will be offered if he can do so, by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] will be adopted. That will be the constructive way for us to act in this body today, to meet the present crisis by meeting the situation as it applies to those who are guilty, by doing our duty as Americans and as Members of Congress, and not convict 99 honorable members of organized and unorganized labor in order to get at one member who is failing to do his duty to our country at this particular time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the substitute that has been offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]. This substitute, contrary to some of the suggestions and intimations that have been made, has been given a lot of study and a lot of careful consideration by a number of us. I think it deserves the very careful and sympathetic consideration of the members of the Committee.

The majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] made a splendid speech, as he always does. However, as for myself, I wish to suggest that I am not approaching this matter in any high emotionalism. I am not approaching it, and I do not believe the Members of the House generally are approaching it in any spirit of hysteria but rather in a spirit of cool and calm judgment and determination as to what properly should be done with this bill that is presently under consideration having regard to numerous facts now existing and which have existed for some time.

I spoke for the adoption of the rule yesterday. I said then that I thought that the House of Representatives was under compulsion to take up this bill and to consider and determine it. I said in my remarks that there are certain provisions of the bill that I do not deem necessary or desirable at this time. But I said there are other things in the bill that seemed to me to be desirable and necessary. My view of it is that this substitute just about represents what a majority of the membership would like to do. If the bill should come on for final vote as at present written, I know that many Members will have trouble choosing between the weight pro and con.

Some question has been raised as to certain provisions in the committee bill having to do with the War Labor Board. Personally, I have no objection to those provisions going back in so long particularly as they do not give rise to the abuses of injunctive action about which so much question has been raised and so long as certain other vigorously contested provisions which are not really essential could be left out.

The majority leader argues for another substitute that will be offered later by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. While I am not altogether familiar with what is in that substitute, I do not believe it anywhere near approaches what the Members of the House want to do in connection with this legislation.

We may as well be practical about it. We have passed some bills here in the House before. They have gone to the other body and have not been acted upon. That may well be the cause of some of our present difficulties. I do not know what will finally come out of the conference action on these two disagreeing bills, but I hope that something of benefit to the country, and, yes, of benefit to labor itself will come out of the bill that will be passed here today or tomorrow.

The substitute strikes certain things out of the bill, so there is not much use talking about them, but what does it leave in the bill? It leaves in the bill that provision that has been called a 30-day cooling-off period. But primarily it simply means that before you can have a lock-out or a strike, notice must be given and then, before a strike may be had, a strike ballot of the men who are in the union shall be held to determine how many of them want to strike. What is the matter with that sort of a thing? Is is not true, that under the Railway Labor Act that is on the books today, strike ballots are held before strikes are called? It is a matter of representative, democratic action to give the man who is going to strike the right to say something about it. This provision does not undertake to outlaw the right to strike because after the ballot is had the minority can still strike if they want to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman's statement a while ago to the effect that we ought to pass something that would in effect meet with the approval of the Senate does not mean, of course, that he wants the House of Representatives to delegate its authority to the Senate and pass just whatever they want?

Mr. HALLECK. No, of course, the gentleman knows I do not mean anything of the sort.

Mr. MAY. Certainly.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has been in Congress much longer than I have. He undoubtedly recognizes the practicalities of some of these situations. It certainly is not any abdication, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. In the gentleman's substitute, subsections (b) and (c), as I understand, take away certain rights from the unions or officers of the unions. I do not understand who determines whether a violation has occurred. Can the gentleman advise me about that?

Mr. HALLECK. Part of the penalty for striking before the ballot is held is to withdraw certain of the protection or advantages or what else you might call them that are provided in certain Federal statutes. The National Labor Relations Act is one of those. I take it that if certain rights were sought to be enforced under that act, and the defense was made that a strike had been held in violation of this provision, such defense would be effective. I think it is evident that after a strike ballot is held, if it is disclosed that the strike is not supported by a majority, even though the minority should elect to strike, it probably would not be a very effective strike. And may I suggest that already a great many unions have that sort of procedure; in other words, they have recognized that it is a fair, representative, democratic procedure.

Something was said here by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], I believe, to the effect that some of the department heads opposed this provision. As I got their contention, it is that this will void the no-strike pledge and even, as he suggested, will legalize strikes. It does not do anything of the kind. It does not supplant the no-strike agreement; it simply supplements it. It does not run counter to it in any way. If no strikes are proposed, no votes need be taken. Certainly, I cannot see how the responsible leaders of labor who say that many of these current strikes are unauthorized could object to the enactment of this provision.

As to the matter of the registration and accounting of union affairs and union funds, the substitute took out some of the details contained in the committee bill. I do not believe any of the witnesses who appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs the other day objected to that. I understand Madam Perkins approves it. I do not know why anyone should object. What is wrong in saying to the man whose money is being paid in, "You have a right to know what is happening to your money."

It may be said to their credit that a great many of the unions in the country already have that sort of a provision and enforce it.

Then there is the prohibition against political contributions. That is no more than the prohibition against corporations and banks, and so forth. It is simply an amendment to the corrupt practices act. If a union member wants to contribute, he has the same privilege as any other individual. His money could not be used politically as he would not want it used.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HALLECK. I am sorry, I would like to proceed. There are some who suggest that possibly some of our present difficulties may stem in part at least from some contributions that were made some years ago. I do not know whether anyone could say with any degree of definiteness as to that. In conclusion I

just say this. I hope the substitute offered will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] is merely a clarifying amendment, to which there is absolutely no objection. I hope the committee may vote on that amendment now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri to the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia to the amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

After the title "Registration of Labor Unions" insert the following:

"NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

"SEC. 8. The National War Labor Board (hereinafter called the 'Board'), established by Executive Order No. 9017, dated January 12, 1942, in addition to all powers conferred on it by section 1 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and by any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942, entitled 'An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes,' and by any other statute, shall have the following powers and duties:

"(a) Whenever the United States Conciliation Service certifies that a labor dispute (excluding any matter coming within the purview of the Railway Labor Act) exists which may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, and cannot be settled by collective bargaining or conciliation, to summon both parties to such dispute before it and conduct a public hearing on the merits of the dispute. If in the opinion of the Board such a labor dispute has become so serious that it may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, the Board may take such action on its own motion. At such hearing both parties shall be given full notice and opportunity to be heard, but the failure of either party to appear shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed to a hearing and order.

"(b) To decide the dispute, and provide by order the wages and hours and all other terms and conditions (customarily included in collective-bargaining agreements) governing the relations between the parties, which shall be in effect until further order of the Board. In making any such decision the Board shall conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; the National Labor Relations Board; the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; the act of October 2, 1942, hereinbefore referred to; and the regulations and orders issued under such acts; and where no law is applicable the order of the Board shall provide for terms and conditions to govern relations between the parties which shall be fair and equitable to employer and employee under all the circumstances of the case. In no event shall the Board have power under this act, or otherwise, to require as a condition of employment that any individual become or remain a member of a labor organization.

"(c) To apply to any Federal district court for an order requiring any person within its jurisdiction to obey a subpena issued by the Board; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred on any such court to issue such an order.

"POWER OF BOARD TO COMPEL ATTENDANCE OF WITNESSES

"SEC. 9. The National War Labor Board, by its Chairman, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of any books, papers, records, or other documents, which it deems relevant to any inquiry or hearing before the Board or any designated member or agent thereof. Such subpenas shall be enforceable in the same manner, and subject to the same penalties, as subpenas issued by the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, approved March 27, 1942.

"MAINTENANCE OF THE STATUS QUO

"SEC. 10. (a) After the Board has taken jurisdiction of a dispute as provided in section 8, the Chairman in order to effectuate the purposes of this act shall have power to issue an order (1) requiring any person to refrain or cease and desist from calling, or assisting in any manner, a strike arising out of such dispute; or (2) requiring the employer, who is involved in the dispute to refrain or cease and desist from practices which change the situation existing at the time the dispute arose, or which by changing an existing situation led to the dispute, and which the Chairman shall deem prejudicial to the prompt settlement of the dispute. No order of the Chairman or process of any court under this act shall require an individual employee to render labor or services without his consent, nor shall any provision of any such order or process be construed to make the refusal to work of an individual employee a violation of such order or process or otherwise an illegal act.

"(b) Such order shall be effective for such period as the Chairman shall determine, but shall, in any event, terminate within 5 days after the findings and recommendations of the Board or within 60 days after the date on which the order was issued, whichever first occurs. Any further order issued under subsection (a) in connection with the same dispute shall not extend beyond the termination date of the original order but terminate at the same time as such original order.

"REGULATIONS OF THE BOARD

"SEC. 11. The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind regulations providing appropriate procedures for carrying out the powers vested in it by this act.

"Whenever any such plant, mine, or other property has been or is hereafter so taken by reason of a strike, lock-out, threatened strike, threatened lock-out, work stoppage, or other cause, such plant, mine, or other property shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as practicable, but in no event more than 60 days after the termination of the conditions which caused possession of such plant, mine, or other property to be so taken.

"INTERFERENCE WITH GOVERNMENT OPERATION OF PLANTS

"SEC. 13. (a) Whenever any plant, mine, or other property is in the possession of the United States, it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, or induce any person to interfere, by lock-out, strike, slowdown, or other interruption, with the operation of such plant, mine, or property, or (2) to aid any such lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such plant, mine, or property by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein. No individual shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this section by reason only of his having ceased work or having refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

"(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object, though I shall not object, because I am glad to hear the distinguished gentleman from Virginia. I am reserving the right to object because I do not want the gentleman to have his 10 minutes, and everybody else have 10 minutes, and then perhaps later have the chairman of the committee move to close debate.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If I can get 5 minutes, I shall withdraw the request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Did the gentleman consider section 12 of the bill to be read as a part of his amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Only that part with respect to the property being returned to the owners as soon as practicable.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is the same as the provision in the substitute.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Then I ask unanimous consent to strike that part from my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, legislation, after all, is a matter of give and take, a matter of compromise, particularly legislation of such controversial character as this. We do not all expect to get everything that we ask for, and somebody has to give up something. I think it is a fair consensus of this body to take the Harness bill as proposed and to put back in it the powers of the War Labor Board. The War Labor Board is something created by Executive order. It has no legal status. Personally I never favored it, I thought that Congress ought to exercise the function of setting it up. However, the fact remains that it is already set up, as a Board, and that Congress has appropriated money for it, and I do not think we ought to refuse to recognize it. So I have offered this amendment to put back in the Harness amendment the powers contained in the bill, with this exception, that I have cut out that feature of the Board which authorizes the Attorney General, notwithstanding the Norris-LaGuardia Act, to proceed by injunction to enforce the orders of the Board. In other words, we do not interfere in this section with or attempt to suspend the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not at this point. In this concession you will notice

that the Harness amendment strikes out certain sections of the bill as reported by the committee. It strikes out that section which prohibits violence and intimidation. I think it ought to be in there, but I do not expect to get everything I ask for, and so the violence and intimidation provisions go out; also the provisions against jurisdictional disputes, boycotts, and sympathy strikes. I think they ought to be in the law, but you cannot get everything that you ask for and they go out under this proposed amendment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman just give me a moment or two to sum up for the benefit of those who have not heard the amendment? To sum it all up, you have the bill you are now considering minus section 4 on violation and intimidation, and minus section 5 on jurisdictional disputes and sympathy strikes, and minus the provision over toward the end of the bill which authorizes the Attorney General to proceed by injunction to enforce the orders of the Board, notwithstanding the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act. I think that is about right. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Does not the gentleman's amendment also eliminate section 12, except the last paragraph which provides that the property shall be returned within 60 days?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; it eliminates all of section 12. That part about the return of property is already in the Harness amendment.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MAY. As I understand the gentleman's amendment it restores to the bill those sections of the committee bill that were omitted by the Harness substitute, relating to the War Labor Board, and at the same time giving them to power to subpena and compel the attendance of witnesses and the maintenance of the so-called status quo?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Well, I do not think I have any objection to that.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman, however, reinserts all of the language in the last sentence of the first paragraph of the committee bill on page 17?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The committee has reported an amendment striking out that language. That is the language that deals with the closed shop, collective bargaining, and so forth.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield to me for an explanation?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman give us an answer on my question?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I did not reinsert it. It is already in the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. There is a committee amendment striking out that language.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The committee amendment does not strike out any language until the House acts on it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes, it does.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. You cannot strike it out until the House acts on it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I would like to say to the gentleman from Virginia, while I am not altogether in agreement with the amendment he has offered, I feel just as he does, that we want to get some place, and I would have no objection to the part of the amendment that the gentleman has offered, if it can be acceptable to the House. I think in view of the fact that the committee, by unanimous vote on day before yesterday, moved to strike out the last sentence in that section on page 17, that is, the last part of subsection (b)——

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Wait a minute. We traded horses before I got to the middle of the stream.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I would like to get straightened out in my mind just where the committee is at the present time. I would like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLASON. If the so-called Harness amendment should be adopted as a substitute for the bill, either with or without the Smith amendment which has just been offered, is it still going to be possible for the chairman of the committee to bring up committee amendments which have been arrived at in committee and which have not at the present time been proposed?

The CHAIRMAN. If the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is adopted, then the further committee amendments to which the gentleman from Massachusetts refers would not be considered. The adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana is a substitute for the pending committee bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. Are we still on section 1 of the bill as far as committee amendments are concerned? In other words, was committee amendment No. 1, on page 8, agreed to?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky was agreed to, as a perfecting amendment to section 1 only of the bill.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMASON. Are further amendments to the Harness amendment still in order?

The CHAIRMAN. As soon as the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] to the substitute amendment is disposed of, yes.

Mr. THOMASON. As soon as the Smith amendment is disposed of, amendments will then be in order to the Harness amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, recently the majority leader came into the Well of the House and made a speech relative to the situation as he understands it on this bill. He indicated how he felt personally, and he said he planned to support an amendment which is to be offered as a substitute by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], who is the whip of the majority party. It therefore would appear that the leadership of the majority party in this House has agreed upon the kind of a bill which they would like to see acted upon this afternoon. It seems to me that in all fairness to all of us, as we are considering the Harness amendment, the Smith amendment, the committee amendments, and the bill which has been offered by the committee, that this bill which apparently has the sponsorship of the administration perhaps, but at least of the two leaders whom I have mentioned in the Democratic Party, should be read to the House at this time in order that we may understand where we are. I would propound a further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman, whether or not it would be possible to have that read at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. It may be read for information by unanimous consent.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. No request has been made at this time.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I would make the unanimous-consent request that the gentleman from Georgia at this time read for the benefit of the House the substitute which he intends to offer as an amendment, in order that all of us may have clearly before us the position of the leadership on the majority side of this House on this subject.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] is recognized.

Mr. CLASON. In my own time, then, if I am permitted to do so, I would ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] to be kind enough to read his substitute amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is not necessary for me to read anything in order to explain to the membership of the committee what I expect to do.

I expect to offer the Connally bill with section 3 as it passed the Senate stricken out, and I expect to substitute for sec-

tion 4 (b) of the Connally bill similar language in the House bill which is section 8 (b) of the House bill. That is all there is to it, but if anybody wants to find out what it is, all he has to do is take a copy of the bill and look at it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That is already in the bill before us?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. CLASON I yield.

Mr. DEWEY. Do I understand the gentleman to say that section 3 of the Connally bill was stricken in his amendment?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Harness substitute and the Smith amendment to the substitute and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. BROOKS objected.

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the great confusion that has been created by substitutes, amendments to substitutes, and other amendments that are to be offered as substitutes together with the bill that we have before us it is a very hard matter for a man to clarify in his own mind just what we are driving at; but of all things in the world that we are interested in, the prime purpose of our being here as Representatives of a sovereign people of a great nation, is to offer such protection to those people that we may go along in our effort to win the war, and the winning of the war is retarded by a condition that exists in this Nation at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise here only to emphasize the importance of sane, reasonable legislation in an effort to bring order out of chaos, to put our mines in operation again so that every other element of business necessarily dependent on them may be advanced with the least possible delay.

The Nation today awaits with feverish anxiety the outcome of a strike of a half million men which may determine the destiny of millions of men under arms. In advocating the passage of the bill under consideration, we cast no reflections on honest labor or the rights of men to organize in their trades or vocations, but we do insist that the power which one individual is exerting at this time is more power than a good man would want and a lot more power than a bad man should be privileged to exercise. Under the leadership of one whose selfish desire for power and wanton lack of consideration for the success of our arms, the war effort is being retarded.

We, as a nation, are demanding of the Axis Powers an unconditional surrender. Are we, then, to cringe on our knees in cowardly fashion before an unscrupulous dictator in this country and beg for a negotiated peace? Every day, every hour these mines remain closed means the lack of support those men on the battle fronts have a right to expect from us. Are we to permit the souls of those men in the uniform of the American soldier to be bartered for the selfish advancement of an unscrupulous, selfish leadership in our own country? Let us rededicate ourselves to a program of conduct under a government by law. Let us assert in our own country the ideals we are fighting for in other continents.

There is but one answer to the question that is in the minds of many people today as to whether or not any individual is bigger than the United States—that question must not go unanswered—and the answer to that question is to be made by the Seventy-eighth Congress. Let us measure up to the standards of patriotic Representatives of a people who look to us for an order of leadership that will bring a peace in all disturbed relations of the world.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have endeavored several times to show my liberality by asking to have additional general debate on this bill, but the pending amendment has been under debate now for about an hour and a quarter and I think we should agree to some limitation of time.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Harness substitute and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SADOWSKI) there were—ayes 137, noes 53.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMASON. Assuming that this entire hour shall be consumed in a discussion of the Harness amendment together with the Smith amendment, will there be any time left for discussion of other amendments now at the clerk's desk, because I have an amendment there to strike out sections 2 and 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to understand the gentleman. The gentleman speaks of an amendment to strike out sections 2 and 3 of the committee bill?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment pending that will strike out sections 2 and 3 in the committee bill, and they are also in the Harness amendment; therefore it would constitute an amendment to the Harness amendment, but if the entire time is to be consumed in discussion of the Harness amendment, will I be heard on my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will give the Chair his attention, the Chair will endeavor to analyze it. Is it the gentleman's intention to offer his amendment to strike out those sections of the pending Harness amendment?

Mr. THOMASON. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the limitation applies. The motion was to limit debate on the Harness amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. How much time does that allow each one of us the Chair has listed?

The CHAIRMAN. About 2 minutes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Some Members of the House have spoken five or six times on this amendment and on the bill. There are others of us who have not had 5 minutes. In the distribution of the remaining time, could not the time be given to those who have not spoken?

The CHAIRMAN. A limitation was fixed by the Committee. The Chair did not fix it. The Committee fixed it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. If the Smith amendment is adopted and if the Harness amendment is adopted, could amendments then be offered to the bill as so amended so that these amendments which might be offered to the pending substitute would then be offered to an amendment which has been adopted?

The CHAIRMAN. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is adopted with amendment or without amendment to it, no further amendments to the committee bill will be in order because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana is a substitute for the committee bill.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Could amendments to the substitute which had been adopted then be considered?

The CHAIRMAN. They could not. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting since 1 o'clock yesterday afternoon to speak against this bill. I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs for his generosity in not allowing those who have been opposed to this bill any time. He has refused to give the labor leaders of this country an opportunity to be heard on this measure, then he brings the bill into the House and with steamroller tactics, without allowing anybody in opposition yesterday afternoon or today to have any time, not even the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], chairman of the Labor Committee, he then tries to shove this legislation down our throats. I state to him and his colleagues right now that I do not want the 2 minutes allotted me. I say, let them have it all if that is the way he wants to bring this legislation in here. If that is the way he and his committee want to legislate, if he wants to be all hog, let them take all the time, let all of the proponents have the time and when this amendment is acted on then give us a chance or an opportunity to express our own feelings upon this bill and to express the feelings of the laboring class of people of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the two issues before the House are very plain to me. First, I think it is all wrong to pass general regulatory legislation affecting all those men who have loyally stood by their jobs, even though War Labor Board decisions went against them, such as was the case with the aircraft workers of the west coast, and put them in exactly the same position as those who have violated the no-strike pledge. I think it will be a mistake which the House will regret if we pass such regulatory legislation under the kind of an emotional stress which every Member of the House is under today. The Harness amendment, plus the Smith amendment, is general labor legislation.

For one thing, it requires registration of labor unions, and the furnishing by them not only of financial reports, but of a great mass of additional information as well. For another thing, it has a provision in it that will invalidate 40 percent of all the agreements between management and labor arrived at under the War Labor Board.

There may be virtue in both registration of a reasonable sort and in some of the other provisions, but if they are to be enacted into law it should be done only after the mature and careful consideration, and not under circumstances such as surround this bill today. The second issue is the pressing immediate one. It is the issue between John L. Lewis and this Government. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], when he addressed the House this morning was right when he said that when a plant has the United States flag over it no man has the right to strike in that plant. Congress cannot, with justice, pass a law that would compel one man to work for another's profit, but when the Commander in Chief has been compelled to take over in the name of the Nation a mine or a plant, then any strike becomes a strike against the Government and Congress has the right and, I believe, the duty to declare such a strike unlawful. I say that as one who has supported labor with all his heart since I have been a Member of this body. The way for the House to meet the real issue before us is for the House to adopt the amendment that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is going to propose, and to say that so far as this House is concerned, it takes the position that a strike is unlawful in a plant taken over by the Government, and that it proposes to uphold the hands of the President in this critical time. That amendment will do one other thing; namely, strengthen the hands of the War Labor Board and give it power to require parties to disputes to come before it. If we do that we will take a strong position and we will not be taking advantage of a grave crisis in the course of this war in order to pass general labor legislation in the manner in which this bill has come before us. If there is to be constructive labor legislation in the nature of a labor code, and I believe we ought to consider such legislation, it should be carefully and maturely devised, and it should be of such a character that we know for certain it will not retard the flow of production on which our war effort depends. Remember, too, the production achieved by American labor in the months since Pearl Harbor has been nothing short of a miracle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. The vital issue in the present emergency is whether or not a strike against the Government, against the flag, against the welfare of our soldiers and everybody else in the country is to be legal or illegal.

Section 4 of the Senate bill made such a strike illegal. Section 13 of the House bill makes it illegal. The amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] will make it illegal; that it should be illegal to strike against the Government is the view expressed by the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] inserts that essential provision in the Harness substitute, which does not now carry that provision. With that included in the Harness substitute the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] says that, while it does not go as far as he would like to see it go, legislation is a matter of compromise and he would accept it. I am willing to follow his leadership on that, with assurance we would have a bill that would meet the present emergency. No bill that does not say that those who incite or induce a strike against the Government have committed a crime will meet the present emergency. The Smith amendment does not compel anyone to work and it is not retroactive. It is inconceivable to me that any Member of this House will go on record as saying that it shall be legal for anyone to lead, incite, or induce a strike against our Government that may paralyze our war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I too have been trying since this bill was brought up in the House yesterday to get time to address the House. I went to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, who is now the presiding genius of labor legislation, and asked him if he would give me some time to discuss this bill and he refused to give me any time. I asked him if he thought it was quite fair to refuse the chairman of the Committee on Labor time to discuss a labor bill, which, of course, this is. He replied that he had no time. What he meant was he had no time to give anyone opposed to his authority. When I asked the Speaker of the House why this bill was sent to the Military Affairs Committee he said, "Well, it is amending the Selective Service and Training Act and properly belongs in that committee." I asked the members of this committee today, Do you think there is anything in the Smith bill we are considering that has anything at all to do with the Selective Service Act? This is a Smith perennial. There are just a few people in this House, and I am ashamed to say many are on my side of the House, who are attempting to use pretty dictatorial tactics. I believe the time has come to do something about such procedure. I think we ought to be ashamed of ourselves here today to be discussing a bill of this kind, when the workers throughout the whole country are doubling, more than doubling the war production that was anticipated. Are we helping to win the war by writing legislation that will place them in a strait jacket? What kind of justice is that? I want to say to the Members of this House that if we adopt this bill today we will commit a greater crime than John Lewis has been guilty of, and I hold no brief for what John Lewis has done nor do I contend that what he has done is proper, but is that any reason why we should strike back at labor because John Lewis happens to be doing a thing that we all disapprove of? Is it not true that the very provisions of this bill were before the House long before we got into war, and since that time machinery has been set up on a voluntary basis to handle strikes and, with one notable exception, has proved to be effective? Why confuse the issue? The only difference now is that they wrap the bill with the American flag.

Is there any man here who would dare to vote for such a bill? I say when the men and women of this country are giving everything they have, their heart and their soul, in the war effort, I dare you to pass this bill.

Industrial relations rest essentially upon concepts of equity and their successful application can be on no other basis than that of voluntary cooperation between employers and employees. All of the advancement which our country has made in bringing about understanding and workable relationships between employer and employee has been only through voluntary cooperation in adjusting inequities and wrongs. Nothing in peace or in war can or will be gained in either weakening or abandoning what has become both a formula and a fundamental concept.

While I am in favor of doing everything possible and necessary to speed the war effort, I am opposed to any legislation which would interfere with the program of the President, the Army, Navy, and the War Production Board. They are responsible for the conduct of the war.

I deeply regret that another attempt is being made to create trouble in the ranks of labor, when harmony is so important in the prosecution of the war program. This is not the time to divide our forces. The men on the assembly lines and in the factories and industrial plants of the Nation are just as necessary as are the soldiers defending our country in many parts of the world. It is the whole combination that will win this war and one cannot function without the

other. Continual picking on the workers of the country is not going to increase output nor improve morale. It is human to make mistakes. We make plenty of mistakes. The workers of the country have made some mistakes and, no doubt, will continue to do so. The employers of labor have many mistakes to their credit but you seldom hear much about their mistakes in this Chamber. When we have failed to control the profits in war industries and the salaries of top-ranking officials, is it logical to say to the workers, "Your wages and your actions must be controlled." What does such injustice do to the average worker? It destroys his morale. It breaks his spirit. It takes his heart out of his work and no human being can do effective work when the spirit is weak.

There is nothing new about this bill nor is it before you today because of the war. The fight on labor unions did not start with the war. Oh, no. It is an old battle, and the war is now being used to confuse the issue and destroy hard-won labor legislation.

Section 2 of the bill prohibits strikes for a 30-day cooling-off period. Why is this necessary when organized labor has already and voluntarily given up the right to strike and the records prove that less than one-half of 1 percent of the workers have disregarded that sacred agreement.

Section 3 of the bill requires a majority vote to engage in a strike after the 30-day "cooling off" period. This provision definitely denies to minorities their rights. Because they disagree with the majority is certainly not a good reason to deny them their constitutional right to bargain collectively. I am not a lawyer, but this provision just does not seem to me to make sense.

Section 4 forbids force or violence in connection with a labor dispute in a war plant. This seems a ridiculous provision, since we now have laws controlling force and violence. The whole bill is wrong in principle and unnecessary.

It is unjust in application and is an insult to millions of American workers who are contributing every ounce of energy they possess to help win the war.

It is also an invasion of the rights of the more than a million organized American workers who are now serving in the armed forces. If you put labor in a strait jacket while these men are fighting and dying for the survival of freedom and democracy, what do you think they will do when they return, many with broken bodies? What answer will you give them when they ask why we permitted the favored war contractors to become rich on war contracts but refused to advance the wages of workers employed on these contracts. We might as well face this issue. Peaceful industrial relations cannot be maintained unless and until we play fair with the workers of America who are now supplying the implements to win this global war.

The penalties prescribed in this bill are so drastic they would completely disrupt voluntary collective-bargaining agreements in war plants, and if there happened to be an unauthorized outburst in a plant, they would be penalized by having the protection of the national labor relations law and the Norris-LaGuardia Act withdrawn from all the other members and local unions affiliated with the group guilty of the outburst. Is that what Congress wants to do to men and women responsible for war production that is the envy of the world? Would you pass a law to punish all for the sins of a small minority? All of the information I have been able to get goes to prove that production in practically every industry is far beyond schedule and has exceeded even the most optimistic expectations.

When the President called a conference shortly after Pearl Harbor, labor pledged complete cooperation.

The War Labor Board was set up to deal with industrial relations. While this Board may not have a perfect record, it has a very good record to its credit, particularly when we consider the great problems it must deal with. Then, of course, we have the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission dealing directly with their own labor problems. This method of dealing with labor relations rests upon a voluntary agreement of employers and of labor leaders of organizations and their members. It has proved very effective. The record discloses that from the beginning of 1942 until the present trouble with John Lewis the number of man-days lost in strikes never exceeded six one-hundredths of 1 percent of man-days worked. I believe no other country can compare with this record of voluntary production.

The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Labor, the Maritime Commission, and the War Labor Board and the War Production Board are all opposed to this bill. They are responsible for war production. They are in a position to know the ramifications of this unnecessary bill. They do not want their extremely difficult task to be complicated at a time when good labor relations are the most important consideration in winning the war and bringing peace to the world. All of their administrative functions would be affected and confused if this bill becomes law.

From what I have heard from several industrial leaders who are cooperating wholeheartedly with their employees, they do not want this bill. Generally speaking, they are satisfied with prevailing conditions. They expressed the view that where there were good labor relations between labor and management, there has been very little trouble. They also expressed the fear that under section 12 of the bill, strikes could be engineered in such a way that the plant would be seized and the employees could bargain directly with the Government. They do not want this to happen. I deplore strikes at this time, but I am optimistic of the future. Human nature being what it is, we may expect a strike here and there, but they will not be serious. Blowing off steam once in a while will not hurt production too much, and it probably will relieve the feelings of some. It is an old American custom and will continue as long as America is a free country.

I have no fears about American workers. They always have and they will continue to be the backbone of our great country. Their patriotism is unquestioned. Their contribution to this war is not only one of sweat, labor, and sacrifice, but more than 1,000,000 of their membership is serving in the armed forces. They are asking for simple justice. If we fail them or through punitive restrictive legislation destroy their faith in government, the reaction might well be something far more difficult to deal with than a strike here and there. Remember, there are 12,000,000 organized workers in this country. Including their families, this group would average 36,000,000 people. Remember, we here in Congress represent that great patriotic group. They have voted to send us here to represent them. We cannot betray them in a fit of hysteria over John Lewis and his coal miners. They represent less than half a million men, and this bill affects more than 11,500,000 other loyal, faithful American workers.

Necessarily extreme and aggravated instances arise in which we are urged to throw aside tested and proven rules and revert to punitive legislation or the use of force. It would be one of the great mistakes of our generation to allow the vaunting ambition of one individual, or of a small number of willful individuals, to shake our faith in the structure of industrial equity that has been built over the span of a century.

I prayerfully hope the Committee will vote down this bill and permit the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and War Labor Board to handle the war production. Labor unquestionably has a great responsibility at this critical time. The members of the great labor organizations realize this responsibility. They are doing everything possible to promote the war effort. If once in a while we would praise their courage and devotion instead of constantly criticizing, the country would realize big dividends in improved morale and even a greater flow of everything it takes to win the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, all afternoon I have been seeking to get recognition to speak against these bills of confusion. I don't suppose that I can add anything to what has already been said but it seems clear that this is a private party going on here today between the members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House. No one else need apply. This is happening in presumably the most representative and greatest deliberative body in the world. I doubt if these is a single person, man or woman, who has been permitted to get the floor this afternoon who was opposed to the passage of this mess of bills—first one kind of bill and then another kind and then amendments to each. I am now serving my seventh year. This is the worst I have seen yet. Maybe it is the

weather. Probably we should get out of here. The country would be better off if we are going to pass legislation in this fashion. Who is asking for this bill or any of them. The Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy certainly is not. It is to him that every man, woman, and child looks in this country. The Congress makes the appropriations. He runs the war. Yet we are doing something today, or trying to, that every one of his subordinates has asked us not to do. As the fellow would say "what kind of business is this?" Is it a House of Representatives or is it a bunch of men who are seeking to pinion millions of men who are not only saving their lives but their children's children's lives in their production which is the highest in the history of the world. It is unfortunate that hysteria has taken possession here. I say again that maybe we had better go home.

Let us go further.

Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to this bill. To my mind it is the most unnecessary and most ill-advised piece of legislation to come before this House in the many years I have been a Member. Nor, am I alone in my opinion of this bill. When I say that this bill is unnecessary and ill-advised I am reflecting the sentiments of the heads of those departments most responsible for the successful prosecution of this war. May I mention just a few of them: James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, who, in a speech last Monday, and, no doubt, having this bill in mind, said:

> When you condemn the few who strike, do not forget that the great mass of the workers, and with rare exceptions, the leaders of organized labor, are doing as much as any of us, and more than many of us, to see that there is no interruption of war production.

He went on to say:

> Do not forget that during 1942 only one-twentieth of 1 per cent of the time of workers engaged in war work was lost on strikes. The striker in war industry is almost as rare as the slacker in the Army.

Now, mark you, Bill Green or Philip Murray did not say that—it was said by a one-time respected Senator and member of the highest court of justice in the land and a man who is now—next to the President—the man who is carrying the heaviest burden of this war upon his shoulders and doing a good job of it, too.

Then we have Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board; Navy Secretary Frank Knox; Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor; Emory Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission; the Assistant Secretary of War, John McClay; the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, and the four public members of the War Labor Board—do you know that those public officials just mentioned look upon this bill as so unnecessary and so untimely and as likely, if enacted, to result so unfavorably on the morale of the American worker that they have signed a public document addressed to the Speaker of this House, our majority leader, and Chairman MAY, of the House Military Affairs Committee, in which they earnestly plead with this body not to enact this nefarious legislation.

They point out in this unusual communication that the bill, if enacted, would "interfere with the production and procurement of war materials by inciting industrial unrest" and would "impair existing machinery for orderly settlement of labor disputes." They go on to say that this is a very poor time to experiment with an untried substitute—that the present policy and program is not only working but working better than it was ever thought it would work.

This year we will double the size of our fleet—that accomplishment alone is without parallel in our history. Only a short time ago the one hundred thousandth airplane was manufactured just since the beginning of our war production program. I am sure you remember back just a short time ago when President Roosevelt said we would, in a short time, build 100,000 planes, and with what laughter Hitler, Goebbels, and Goering received that news.

To add to the praises of labor, just a short time ago, Admiral C. H. Woodward, Chief of the Incentive Division of the Navy, stated that American labor made possible the defeat of Rommel. He publicly stated that "but for the superhuman production of our workers, Rommel might, by now, not only be master of Egypt, but might already have effected a meeting with the Japs in India, and the United States might be advancing deeper and deeper into the shadows of defeat." He stated that " 'miracle' is the word for the kind of job that labor is doing in the common cause" and went on to state that it was his conviction that the American workers would see the job through at whatever cost."

James G. Patton, president of the Farmers' Union, has this to say on this question:

> Freemen have made the weapons that have freed North Africa and Tunisia. It is unthinkable that this freedom, our greatest strength in this war, is to be abridged.

The A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. both strongly oppose the bill. In a straight-from-the-shoulder statement they let it be known that the enactment of this bill into law would be "the surest way to hamstring America's war effort and destroy the morale of the Nation's soldiers of production."

Gentlemen, a quarter of a century ago, during the last war, I was back here in Washington and saw the prevailing hysteria of that day put through a bill which was to cost this country millions of dollars in useless enforcement and untold grief and suffering in its consequences before it was removed from the statutes. I refer to the National Prohibition Act. I am sorry to say in passing that there are those among us yet who would visit the same unhappy calamity upon us again. It seems that some never learn from experience.

There is little doubt but what the second coal strike is, as the saying goes, "the straw that broke the camel's back." Nobody deprecates this occurrence more than myself. That it will interfere with our war production no one doubts. My blood is on nearly every front. No one is more interested than I in winning this war as quickly as possible.

As a practicing attorney for many years it has been my experience that there are always three sides to a lawsuit. The jury, or judge, before whom the case is tried, who both parties litigant deeply criticize, always find another side. The three sides to all controversies are your side, my side, and the right side. Each one of these determined representatives of their respective interests have set their stakes. The stakes can only be brought together by some individual or some agency strong enough to do this. Each one has to give and take. Were I to have my say I would say give Ickes the power to bring these stakes together. The hatreds of two men should not be permitted to make goats out of our soldiers, the American people, and the public interest. This thing has gone far enough. The Government, if we are going to function as a Government, should place this matter in the hands of a man who has the intestinal stamina and the brains to do the job. I feel neither side has a monopoly upon the patriotism of this country. If they did have they would either sacrifice or concede. We know the man does not work quite so well with a gun pointed at him as the voluntary man who likes and respects his master. We know we will get more coal in a voluntary manner than we would by force. There is an old saying that we must never forget, "You can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink."

You ask me why not shackle free labor? I'll tell you why. I am against it and therefore against this bill by pointing to another system—that system of forced labor that prevails in Hitler's dominated Europe. Look at that system and compare it with our system of free and unforced labor. Over there we have half a continent striving to compete with us and they have failed miserably and by that failure have caused Hitler's once powerful juggernaut to be slowed down. The American worker has been able to out-produce his Nazi-dominated counterpart because the American worker is a free worker—the Nazi worker is a forced worker. These heads of these departments who have asked that this legislation not be passed—they know the answer to continued successful production, and it isn't by passing this bill.

Gentlemen, I have sat through a good number of votes and discussions on bills of this kind since I've been in Congress. I have sat and held my peace and voted as my conscience dictated, but the time has come when someone in this House has got to get up on the floor and call a spade a spade. This type of legislation is as vindictive as it is unnecessary, it is inspired by an incessant and mad desire on the part of a few who foolishly expect to profit at labor's expense and downfall. Those few are either so devoid of principle or so ignorant of history that they cannot see the natural consequences of the passage of an act of this kind.

Look at history. Who put Hitler in power? The German people? No! Not the German people but a tycoon named

Fritz Thyssen and some more like him. Do you know what Hitler's part of the bargain was in that deal? Well his part of the bargain called for the trade-union movement of Germany to be wrecked. Hitler kept his word, the labor movement in Germany was wrecked. Its leaders were either jailed or shot. These industrialists who had engineered this didn't have long to rejoice however for Hitler soon turned on them and destroyed them. That, my friends, is the lesson we learn from the last attempt to shackle a free labor movement. It resulted in a world war.

In closing I know of no better thought to leave with you as to why this legislation should be defeated than the lesson we should take to heart for the cause of this last World War with the lesson that those who would destroy another are soon the victims of their own act. A little saying by Thomas Paine best brings home that thought. He said:

He who would make his own liberty secure must guard even his enemy from oppression, for if he violates this duty he establishes a precedent that will reach unto himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the confusion that exists among the members of the Committee on Military Affairs right now indicates what happens when a committee acts without knowing what it is doing. At the moment the condition is a bit ridiculous because the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs himself was forced to admit to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole a few minutes ago that he did not know what the parliamentary situation was with respect to the dozen or so amendments which have been proposed.

When we pass finally on this bill today, outside of those who sponsored the amendments which may be in the bill not a man in this House will know what he is voting on. We are going to enslave 13,000,000 American workers and their families, who constitute the greatest group, if not the majority, of the citizens of the United States, and we are going to do it without the voice of those who oppose this bill being heard, because the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has so little confidence in the justice of the cause he is advocating that he did not dare give time to those who oppose this bill.

When we pass on this no one will know what he is voting on, because no one knows what is in these various amendments. I hope the newspapers carry to the country tonight that we are going to pass on legislation of this kind without an opportunity for those who oppose it to be heard. Then they can judge whether those who advocate this really are sincere or whether they are simply and truly "union-busters."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I wonder how many Members of this House know they are outlawing the closed shop by this legislation?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. There is not a Member on the floor right now who has any idea of what the Harness amendment stands for, what the amendment of Mr. Smith is, or any other amendment that has been discussed here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, in these few moments I shall attempt to explain an amendment I have at the Clerk's desk and that I expect to offer later. It would strike out section 6 of the Harness substitute, which is the section having to do with campaign contributions. I shall offer the amendment in the hope of strenghtening the bill, and leaving it less vulnerable to attack. As I heard the reading of the section, it merely includes labor unions with national banks and corporations, which are now prohibited by the Corrupt Practices Act from making contributions in connection with Federal elections.

This identical provision has been before the Committee on the Judiciary and the subcommittee thereof of which I have been a member for some time, as a separate bill. We have rejected it for two reasons.

In the first place, it is discriminatory. It would prohibit labor unions from making any contributions in connection with political campaigns, while leaving other nonincorporated associations free to make unlimited contributions, except for other provisions of law. In other words, this section of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], applies only to labor unions and does not apply to the Townsendites, the Anti-Saloon League, the Manufacturers' Association, veterans' organizations, trade associations, and innumerable unincorporated associations which spend money in an effort to influence voters and control elections. That is reason number one.

Reason number two is that the Hatch Act which was passed in 1940, known as Hatch Act No. 2, has a general provision applying to all unincorporated groups, limiting their annual contributions for political purposes to $5,000. I think that is satisfactory as it stands. Any new legislation is not necessary. The Harness proposal would be discriminatory, it would weaken your bill, and it would leave it open to legitimate attack. The notorious $500,000 campaign gift by John L. Lewis made from funds exacted from the meager wages of hard-working miners in 1936 would be a crime under the present law.

For your information I quote the provision of the Hatch Act to which I have referred. It is in the Criminal Code, title 18, United States Code:

61M. FINANCIAL AID TO CANDIDATES

(A) CONTRIBUTIONS

(a) It is hereby declared to be a pernicious political activity, and it shall hereafter be unlawful, for any person, directly or indirectly, to make contributions in an aggregate amount in excess of $5,000, during any calendar year, or in connection with any campaign for nomination or election to or on behalf of any candidate for an elective Federal office (including the offices of President of the United States and Presidential and Vice Presidential electors), or to or on behalf of any committee or other organization engaged in furthering, advancing, or advocating the nomination or election of any candidate for any such office or the success of any national political party. This subsection shall not apply to contributions made to or by a State or local committee or other State or local organization.

(B) DEFINITIONS

(b) For the purposes of this section—

(1) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons.

(2) The term "contribution" includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution.

Violation of this section is punishable by a fine of $5,000 or by imprisonment for 5 years.

Its difficult to determine the line between free speech and pernicious political activities, but we need not attempt to decide that question now.

This bill is not exactly as I would have it. I am sorry it was not sent to the Judiciary Committee, which has considered other bills of this character and brought them before the House without serious internal dissension and in such form that you could clearly vote on the principal issues involved.

However, present conditions are intolerable. We must pass the best legislation we can agree upon to curb strikes in industries vital to this life or death struggle in which we are engaged. The arrogance and selfishness of one individual, or several, must not be permitted to jeopardize the success of our entire war effort and the lives of our boys.

I am going to vote for this bill. So would a vast majority of those good Americans demagogs would like to place into a distinct class known as labor.

I want to see secret and honest votes on strikes and annual elections of union officers, which should also be secret and honest. In other words, I want the workers to have the same right I have to give free expression to my opinion without intimidation. If this could be made effective, many of the present labor dictators would be looking for jobs. I think I know the American workingman and I have boundless faith in him. Present labor laws work for the protection of the dictators of labor. Democratize labor and there will be a different story.

I realize I have wandered from the point. I believe my proposed amendment will improve the bill and I hope it will be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise merely to quote a telegram I received from my district this morning. It reads:

We will not forget those who opposed the rule on the Smith-Connally bill Wednesday. We have two sons at Guadalcanal.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FURLONG].

Mr. FURLONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this Connally-Smith-May bill, known on the calendar as S. 796, in its entirety.

It appears that for the past several years certain groups and individuals have tried to give labor the knockout blow, but not being able to accomplish this in peacetime, have chosen this critical war period in which they hope to slaughter labor.

Labor, to whom this Nation is so largely indebted for all it has been in the past, for all that it is today, and for all it may hope to be in the future.

Labor created wealth and capital. Capital and wealth could never have existed if labor had not first existed.

I believe this bill is so designed that if enacted it will agitate and demoralize labor and will destroy all the honest gains made by labor in the past 50 years that are beneficial to all. It will hamper the harmonious progress and achievements attained by labor and management. Labor should be rewarded, not punished, for its meritorious contributions to the war effort.

The Connally-Smith-May bill is a mistake. If labor is forced down, remember, industry will also go down.

If such legislation as this is ever enacted, it will create two distinct classes of people in America that was never intended by our ancestors—the slave and aristocracy. No nation can exist very long, one half slave and the other half aristocracy.

I hope the good Lord will show unto every Member of this Congress the way to decide this for the benefit of all humanity in the United States of America.

For—

To every man there openeth a way,
And the high soul takes the high way,
And the low soul climbs the low.
And in between on the misty flats
The rest drift to and fro.
But to every man there openeth a high way and a low,
And every man decideth the way his soul shall go.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that in my judgment, derived from many years of experience in industry, something like 40 years, this legislation will not do what you expect it to do. It will do harm. I am sure of that statement.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WEISS. I can say that I do not believe there is a better authority in this House to speak on the bill before the House, because the gentleman is a mine operator employing several hundred workmen, and he has five sons serving in Uncle Sam's forces, one in the African theater of war at the present time.

Mr. KELLEY. I can say to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania that they also carry union cards, two of them in the United Mine Workers, two in the Steelworkers, and one in the American Federation of Labor.

I object very strongly to the steamroller method used, and especially the method proposed by some of the proponents of this measure. They have even challenged the patriotism of Members of this House who are opposed to this legislation. I for one object to that sort of thing. It is a shame that Members of this House of the Congress of the United States would have to stoop to that sort of thing in order to put over a measure. If they have to do that, certainly the measure is not worth very much.

Fortunately, no particular group has a monopoly upon patriotism.

The charge has been made that those who are opposed to this method are opposing the Government of the United States. The question has even been raised that it must be a choice between the Government and labor. This is not true. It is a question of protecting the rights of the people as provided under the Constitution or invading those rights.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished majority leader urged in his speech just a few moments ago that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], as amended by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], would constitute an indictment against all of labor and all laboring people in this country; but he went a little further and narrowed his argument and put it upon the basis that what we need is a special indictment of the United Mine Workers of the United States, who are now not working.

I take the view that this body is not undertaking to pass a special law applicable to any particular group. The law we propose is general in its terms, and applies to all. And this is as it should be. We are not here to make fish out of one and fowl out of another. The law plays no favorites. It was so thoroughly recognized after we got into this war that it was an all-out war, which was to be fought on the farms and in the mines, and in our transportation systems, and in all industrial plants and on the battlefields, that it was so fateful in its consequences, the leaders of all organized labor pledged there would be no strikes during the war. Well, there are 130,000,000 people in this country, and they are different each and all one from another just as we Members differ. A very distinguished Member of this body this afternoon said that if he were President he would seize the mines and then shoot the miners. That will not solve the matter. Dead miners could not mine coal. The truth is the miners have boys, brothers, and others near and dear to them by the thousands in this conflict. And I believe this difference can and will be settled on a basis that is fair to all concerned. But settled it must be before our war effort collapses.

This Harness amendment provides machinery for a vote by the men themselves on the question of whether there shall be a strike. It outlaws lock-outs in war industry. It provides reasonable penalties against those who violate its terms. Supplemented by the other amendments that will be offered, it sets up machinery for the adjustment of labor disputes and for a continuation of work, rather than destructive industrial warfare, strikes, and paralysis of production.

There are no strikes in Germany or in Japan. They mean to defeat and enslave our people. Today there are millions of French, Russian, Dutch, Belgians, Poles, and other conquered races toiling in Germany and in the occupied countries of Europe under the lash and at the point of German bayonets. This would be the fate of the working people of this country should we lose this war. Membership in a union and the rights guaranteed our working people under the laws of this Nation would be of no avail and would be but scraps of paper if the Germans and the Japs ever set foot, as conquerors, on the soil of this country.

We are on trial as a free government of freemen and freewomen. Our enemies have said we cannot wage war successfully because our people are free and will not make the sacrifices necessary to win. So far, we have given this statement the lie. The American people—more than 98 percent of them—have been on the job since Pearl Harbor. Our boys face hardship, heat, cold, suffering, and death from the icy snow-covered slopes of the Aleutians to the desert sands of North Africa and the pestilential swamps of the south Pacific. On the sea, in the air, and on the battlefield, their courage, the sacrifice they have made, the victories they have won, their challenging heroism, should shame anyone who fails them in this tragic hour.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the Governor of North Carolina said to the Governor of South Carolina, but the Governor of North Carolina, who is a Member of this House, certainly said plenty to us this afternoon. I respect him highly. I think he has gone through a lot of experience. He is one of the oldest Members of the House, and has has had grave responsibility in the past as the Governor of a great State. This bill, this spectacle, this trying to write a bill on the floor of the House as we are trying to do this afternoon is a sorry spectacle, and in the words of the cartoonist, it would be more amusing, if it was not so confusing. I am a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I am proud of our chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], and I am proud of the membership of that committee. I am proud of the way our committee handles legislation, and with all of the legislation that we have brought out on the floor of the House, we have never brought out a piece of legislation in the shape of this and asked the Members of this House to vote upon it. It is not the way to legislate, it is not the way to handle important legislation, and certainly I say to you this afternoon the Military Affairs Committee cannot be proud of its work. Here

we have the Military Affairs Committee which is supposed to cooperate with the War Department and with the Navy Department, and it comes in here this afternoon with legislation that the War and Navy Departments condemn and which they say is not properly drawn, and is not proper legislation at this time.

Certainly every Member of this House is out to win this war, every one, Republican and Democrat, and certainly we are going to take the advice of the War and the Navy Departments.

Oh, I have so many things that I wanted to say to you this afternoon. I have brought a pile of information here to give to you, and I have 2 minutes in which to do it. I represent a district in the great city of Detroit. I have many things to speak about in respect to labor conditions and production in Detroit. Do you know that the tank plant is only working 25 percent of capacity because we have over produced? Don't let them kid you that this bill will bring about production. Detroit is far ahead of production, so far ahead, that if you look into the yards you will see the tanks and the jeeps piled up so high that we cannot get them out to the boys.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, it seems strange that in both the Seventy-seventh and the Seventy-eighth Congress the numerous Members of Congress who charge labor with being unfaithful and lacking in patriotism and loyalty in this national emergency are somehow or other the very same ones. These Members invariably come from poll-tax States and represent districts in which smokestacks are practically unknown, yet they profess to thoroughly understand the problems of labor. These Members condemn all of American labor because of an occasional strike. Would they by the same token condemn generally the law profession because of a shyster or two? Would they by the same token condemn the medical profession because of an occasional quack here and there? No; of course not.

From the very beginning, let us distinctly bear in mind the fact that we cannot legislate cooperation and production records among the workmen of America. Let us remember the old adage, "We can take a horse to water but we can't make him drink." The Connally-Smith bill, S. 796, proposes to do just that. This measure is one of the most repressive and restrictive measures ever introduced in the Seventy-seventh or Seventy-eighth Congress. In this crucial period, the enactment of a bill such as S. 796 would be a disastrous error which would play into the hands of our enemies, both at home and abroad. While we did not win an overwhelming victory in the recent African theater, the Germans and Italians suffered a humiliating defeat. It was the first serious step backward for "Corporal" Hitler. As our Nation prepares for the final attack on the Continent of Europe, it faces, theoretically, the most crucial period in its entire existence. It is particularly tragic that at a time like this groups and individuals—and this particularly includes the gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman MAY, and the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman SMITH—would be so reckless of our national welfare so as to attempt to take advantage of our present war crisis to achieve their ends.

As the former Governor of New York, Al Smith, said, "Let's look at the record." For instance, let us take the Thirtieth Congressional District, which I represent and which is the heart of the arsenal of democracy. The Allegheny Ludlum Steel Co., Firth-Sterling Steel Co., Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Co., Carnegie-Illinois Steel Co., in Homestead, McKeesport National Tube Co., and the Christy Park Works of the National Tube Co., and the Fort Pitt Steel Casting Co., are all located in my district. Each one has been awarded the Army-Navy E, except the Fort Pitt Steel Casting Co., which has been awarded the Maritime M for cooperation between employer and employee, for efficiency in production, for perfection in production, and for speedy contract compliance in production. My district, together with other industrial districts in the Nation, has been responsible for producing the steel which has now made our Navy the greatest two-ocean navy in the world. We have produced the steel and aluminum for over 100,000 airplanes; we have produced the steel and shells which have made our production in America greater than the entire production of the Axis combined; and our production is increasing by leaps and bounds every day. Do not forget that during 1942 only one-twentieth of 1 percent of the time of workers engaged in war work was lost in strikes. The Honorable James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, gave us this information on May 31, 1943, which is verified by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. All this record has been accomplished in view of the barrage of propaganda to the contrary. The simple fact attested by all our war-production agencies is that the no-strike pledge of Philip Murray of the C. I. O., and William Green of the A. F. of L. has been fulfilled not merely to a miraculous extent but to an extent which no penal sanction could have been made possible. Industrial leaders of the Nation all oppose S. 796. Secretary of the Navy Knox, Secretary of War Stimson, Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, and Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, all believe labor—yes, free labor—has done a superhuman task of producing foodstuffs and implements of war which are now being furnished to greater than half the world. Yes, that record of production has been achieved in the face of great difficulties—difficulties in the form of reckless provocations and annoyances inflicted by some management at all levels—management conscious of the grim determination of American workers not to leave their jobs in protest. That record has also been achieved in the face of the terrific pinch to which American workers have been subjected with constantly spiraling food costs while wage levels were being substantially frozen by Presidential decree and War Labor Board directive.

It is an unfortunate fact that in recent months the sharp pressure on the food budgets of American workers has approached critical proportions. O. P. A. has virtually admitted, on the one hand, that price ceilings have not been fixed at levels calculated to prevent substantial food price increases, and on the other hand, that enforcement has in some areas been so ineffective that prices have actually prevailed at levels as much as 40 and 45 percent above ceiling prices.

In these circumstances, nevertheless, both the C. I. O. and the A. F. L. held firm to their no-strike pledge. More important, the C. I. O. and the A. F. L. have pointed to their membership the direction of sound solution to these problems—the direction of a national demand and insistence on a real rollback of prices to levels which will enable war workers to maintain their health and continue to function effectively at their war work.

To this Congress and the administration must fall the full responsibility for failure to enact a program to stabilize the cost of living. If this Congress which is so critical of labor had enacted legislation to have frozen prices just as wages were frozen under the Little Steel formula, today there would be no complaint and no strikes for higher wages by the miners.

This country has been going through certain definite stages of education about economic matters. It has learned by now that it does not want inflation. It has learned that if food prices rise, wages are bound to rise. It has learned that if food prices and wages both rise, they start in pursuit of each other and that this chase goes up the spiral of inflation. Inflation defeats both the rise in food prices and the rise in wages, and the struggle at this time between one section of the community to benefit at the expense of another section threatens to bring down the community and all its section. This country knows this. It is against inflation, but if prices and wages are to be held in leash and under control, and to avoid strikes in the future, they must both be controlled. Had this Congress enacted legislation to control prices there would be no necessity for the consideration of the Connally-Smith bill, S. 796.

The real answer of Congress and of the Nation to John L. Lewis should be the answer of the roll-back of prices, the more effective enforcement of price control, the adjustment of the miners' real grievances. Unfortunately, some groups in Congress have chosen the kind of tactics and program which are calculated to play right into the hands of John L. Lewis by aiming direct and provocative blows, not merely at the millions of organized American workers, but at all American working men and women and at the entire population of the Nation. These are the groups which have chosen to attack and interfere with and impede price control and rent control. These

are the groups which have conducted hearings such as those of the Smith Subcommittee on Rent Control, calculated to bring pressure on behalf of landlords and their associations to prevent a real control of rents. By the same token, the groups supporting the Connally-Smith bill are supporting a step which stigmatizes and attacks the more than 11,000,000 C. I. O. and A. F. L. workers who have given and maintained and will maintain their no-strike pledge.

As a matter of fact the actual contents of the Smith version of the Connally bill reveal that the bill cannot even really make the pretense of being a war measure. In 1941, while this country was not at war, Mr. Smith proposed these same provisions. He proposed then, as the bill now proposes, that there be a requirement of certain kinds of notice and certain other requirements before a strike could be called. He proposed these measures then as a permanent and unlimited statute. He proposed it then in a frank attack on basic labor rights. The insertion of a provision limiting the continuance of the bill to the duration of the war cannot camouflage the fact that this is still the original bill.

The C. I. O. and A. F. L. in their no-strike pledge have made no qualifications with respect to any question of advance notice, of any question of appropriate procedures for calling a strike. The C. I. O. and the A. F. L. have declared emphatically that they will countenance no strikes. Under these circumstances the reintroduction of the original Smith bill with its provisions for advance notice and secret ballots and other technicalities related to strikes is not merely meaningless but is obviously a barefaced attempt to use present circumstances as a basis for carrying through a private labor policy which its sponsors were unable to carry into law in time of peace—a labor policy which has no relationship to and makes no contribution to the solution of present-day problems, while at the same time initiating a provocative attack on basic rights of millions of organized working men and women who, through their organizations and as individuals, have been contributing so much to the miraculous production record of this Nation.

We have a long, hard road ahead in this war. The hardest fight is yet to come. We have not as yet a firm foothold anywhere on the continent of Europe, and we know that we cannot live in a world half free and have enslaved. There must be unconditional surrender by the enemy. Let us quit fighting each other at a time when we are doing the greatest job of production in the history of mankind. Let us mobilize all our resources and conserve the energy we waste on the floor of this House and instead of fighting each other, let us combine our efforts and fight the one common enemy who would take away all our basic rights and freedoms, yes from the Congress as well as labor. Let us take the first step in that direction by sending S. 796, the so-called Connally-Smith bill, back to Committee where it may repose in peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] is recognized.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I wish that either the advocates or the opponents of this legislation would quit adopting threatening postures either here or in the papers. My Hugenot ancestors came to this country because they were not afraid to declare their right to worship God. My Bavarian German ancestors came here because they were not going to let Bismarck run them. Nobody is going to run me one way or the other. It does not do any good to come here and threaten me. I want to say this, that the Smith amendments put back in a provision which outlaws the closed shop, outlaws the maintenance of union provisions which I think are necessary for labor's protection during this war. They also put back section 13, under which I am convinced that a banker cannot lend money to a coal miner on strike, or anybody else, in order to feed his family, notwithstanding the fact that he has had substantial credit all his life. I, as a lawyer, could not advise a man as to whether the action of the War Labor Board was constitutional or within its powers. Such provisions as are found in this Smith legislation are utterly ridiculous, utterly unwarranted and will absolutely not contribute a thing to the progress of this war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I regret the necessity of opposing the amendatory language suggested by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. Let us be a little realistic now. The Smith amendment includes language to outlaw the maintenance of membership in a union. The War Labor Board was created in January 1941. It has been in operation for nearly 15 months. It has closed a great many disputes by providing for maintenance of membership, which means only that those who are employed in a plant must join a bargaining unit within 15 days after that order, or they must find employment elsewhere. I do not now pass on the merits of membership maintenance. What I am trying to represent to you is that if you have from 700 to 1,000 different organizations where industrial peace has been restored by maintenance of the membership clause, and now you come and outlaw the whole business, you may be dealing with one strike, but you are probably going to inherit several hundred others. Let us make no mistake by cluttering up the Harness amendment with this sort of thing. In the main, the Smith proposal confers statutory power upon the Labor Board. The Board has power now under an Executive order that is provided by the Smith amendment. One of the real difficulties in the present controversy is that perhaps Mr. Lewis would not go before the Board because notice was served that there should be no departure from the Little Steel formula, as a result of which the Board could no longer operate as a genuinely judicial agency. Now, are you going to aggravate this whole matter by saying that all these membership-maintenance agreements that have been made by the Labor Board, or with Board sanction, now go out the window, and we go from the frying pan into the fire?

I propose to oppose the inclusion of all War Labor Board provisions in this bill, because they are not necessary and because they will aggravate the situation with which we are dealing at the present time.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Could the gentleman offer an amendment to that particular language in the Smith amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. You could strike out that portion of section 9 or 10 on page 17, and cure it. But why was it offered in the first place? To confuse the issue and raise another difficulty?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. It was in the original May bill, the bill that the Military Affairs Committee brought out, and then when I opposed it before the Rules Committee the committee met and has offered an amendment to strike out that language, and then the gentleman from Virginia returned it in his amendment. I wonder where it stands in the Harness amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not in the Harness amendment. I can assure the House on that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLMER. If you will turn to page 5246 of yesterday's RECORD you will see an amendment which I propose to offer, which I think you will agree with me should be written into this bill. This is a very practical matter. I do not think it should be a controversial matter. This amendment simply provides that it shall be a felony to conspire to bring about a strike in a war plant that has been taken over by the Government. In other words, it makes it a felony to conspire to strike against the Government.

Now, if there is any Member of Congress who thinks that a man has a right to strike against his Government or to conspire to strike against his Government when the Government is operating that plant, then of course he should vote against this amendment which will be offered at the appropriate time and which I will not have another opportunity to discuss. I cannot see for the life of me how there could be any difference of opinion about that. Is there anybody who has been elected to this Congress who thinks that a man ought to have the right to conspire to strike against a Government-operated plant? If you do, then vote against the amendment; but those of you who think to the contrary I hope you will vote for the amendment.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Does the gentleman remember a Government Stamp Act in the Boston Tea Party?

Mr. COLMER. I did not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Does the gentleman remember a Government Stamp Act in the Boston Tea Party which was one of the causes of the Revolution?

Mr. COLMER. Do I understand from that that the gentleman thinks that a man has got a right, as John Lewis is doing today, to strike against his Government? Does the gentleman approve of John Lewis' stand today?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Will the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. COLMER. I am asking the gentleman a question.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I do not approve of it, but I think that legislation such as the gentleman proposes can go a great deal further than he himself dreams of.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, that is a matter of opinion. I think the gentleman will agree with me that no legislation could be written to which labor was opposed that the gentleman would agree to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] is recognized.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I venture the assertion that there are not three people on the floor of the House who know all the things that are in these various amendments. It has just developed here in the last few minutes that in the so-called Smith amendment to the Harness amendment is the outlawing of the closed shop which several of us, including myself, voted in the committee to strike out and that was done. Now that is back in. The same is true of other features of the Harness amendment. I have an amendment pending to strike out sections 2 and 3; so the confusion here this afternoon and also the temper that has been shown by some makes it seem to me that the most reasonable and sensible thing this committee could do would be to vote down the Smith amendment; then vote down the Harness amendment and give serious consideration to the Ramspeck amendment. The reason I say that is because the Smith and Harness amendments do injustice to the honest, patriotic, law-abiding working people of America by the passage of such legislation as that contained in either the Harness or the Smith amendment; but I go back to my proposition that the main, the important thing we need to legislate about now is the fact that a man, the leader of a group of men, has struck against his Government and struck against our flag which flies over those mines. The President will treat those men fairly if they will be loyal to their Government. The thing we need to do is to pass legislation that outlaws conduct such as that and then leave these other matters for calmer days. That is the only safe way in my judgment we can proceed at this time. So I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT] to strike out that part of the Smith amendment to which the gentleman from Illinois has referred, and likewise my amendment to strike out sections 2 and 3 which the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and every other war agency says is impractical, that these amendments will be agreed to and these sections stricken from the bill. Then we should adopt something like the Ramspeck amendment, for that will take care of this situation of a group of people striking against their Government. Such conduct is indefensible in wartime.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. In view of the confusion that exists, does not the gentleman believe it would be wise for the Committee to rise at the present time to give the Members an opportunity to consider the proposed amendments?

Mr. THOMASON. That is a matter for the Committee to determine for itself; but I do hope and plead and beg that you give serious study before you vote for either the Smith or Harness amendments in their present form and that this legislation be confined to the serious question that now confronts the people of America—that men are striking in Government-controlled and operated plants.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is recognized.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think we were given great food for thought in the remarks of the gentleman from Texas who has just spoken and likewise the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], a few moments ago. They have told us the great trouble with the particular substitute that is brought before us. We do not have the opportunity of knowing all of the implications. I think the issue was being pretty fairly presented to the House prior to the introduction of the proposed substitute. As I stated to you yesterday, the Committee on Military Affairs was proposing amendments to the bill it had reported out to take care of every single objection made by the various war agencies which appeared before us with the exception of the striking out of sections 2 and 3, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] has at the desk an amendment seeking to strike those two sections out of the bill.

It seems to me that the proper procedure for us here is to vote down the Harness substitute. Then we shall have an opportunity to perfect the committee version of the bill with the amendments that will be offered. I feel confident that the Committee of the Whole will strike out sections 2 and 3 and then we shall have met every single objection that the Government agencies made. Then also those who prefer the Ramspeck substitute will have an opportunity to vote for it. The issue will be clearly drawn between the Connally bill as it came from the Senate with such amendments as the gentlemen from Georgia proposes to offer, and the committee bill as perfected in this Committee of the Whole. It will be something that every Member on this floor will understand, whereas the present hodgepodge measure we have before us is something that is almost impossible to understand unless one has availed himself of the opportunity of studying the single copy of the amendment that is available at the Clerk's desk.

In this connection may I say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT] has an amendment pending at the desk to strike from the Smith amendment the language to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] objected. The objection that the gentleman from Illinois stated here was made to us by the various war agencies when they appeared before the committee yesterday and the day before, and it was upon the recommendation of those agencies that the committee voted to strike out that particular sentence, yet now it is sought to be restored to the Harness substitute by the Smith amendment. The Merritt amendment seeks to strike it out of the Smith amendment. I think it would be well for all of us to remember that particular situation.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mrs. NORTON. May I ask whether or not it is the intention of the committee to strike out section 12?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; the committee amendment proposes to strike out section 12.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does not the gentleman believe this whole thing should be recommitted to the committee?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I do not. I think the situation is such that we have got to have legislation to correct it but at the same time it must not be in such form that will justify anyone in saying that we are seeking to enslave labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I join in the suggestion of the gentleman from Alabama that the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] should be voted down in order that we may get back to a consideration of the bill.

The bill reported by the committee and the Connally bill, as it passed the Senate, are the only two proposals which have had committee consideration. We are all in a position to discuss them intelligently. However, my purpose in taking this time is to discuss very briefly an amendment which I have at the Clerk's desk to the Harness substitute in case that substitute should be adopted.

My amendment would strike from the Harness bill the provisions which require the registration of labor unions and the making of financial reports by them. I will support the committee bill. The provisions for registration and reports do

not touch war strikes, top, side, nor bottom. There is no reason why a bill which seeks to control strikes in war plants should go into collateral issues. I find my language is inadequate to express my feelings against those who insist on strikes in war plants, but I say to you my condemnation is slightly less bitter against those who would seek to take advantage of war hysteria and wartime to repeal any established law affecting organized labor, or to take advantage of it in order to put over a controversial issue. I hope all of those matters will go out of any legislation we adopt here and that it will be solely and exclusively a bill to prevent war strikes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is a type of intellect which thinks it can correct all abuses in the country by passing laws and the more serious and the more critical the situation which confronts us, the more drastic and restrictive the legislation which it proposes. If it were not for this coal strike which we face today I would take the position, I believe, that we do not need any labor legislation at all.

In my opinion, labor has cooperated remarkably well. The figures are somewhere around 98 or 99 percent efficiency in man-hours worked in producing war material in this country, and I a mquite sure if it had not been for this cooperation of labor and labor leaders we would not have the splendid production record that we have had. I am also quite sure that the same number of men who were working as free laborers in American plants produced more than a comparable number of men in Nazi Germany, Italy, or Japan. But we have this coal strike confronting us. We are confronted with a paralysis of government.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to pass legislation which will be designed to apply to a strike only when it constitutes a crisis to the country, when it paralyzes an entire industry, and not try to go after these little flash strikes or these spontaneous walkouts which last possibly for an hour or for a day and which responsible labor leaders try their best to avert in the first instance, and if they do occur, try to get the men to go back to work.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. Is it not a fact that less than one-half of 1 percent of the workers in the country have been on strike since the beginning of the war?

Mr. WRIGHT. I believe those figures are correct. I also believe it is true that a smaller percentage than that of man-hours have been lost in this country since Pearl Harbor by means of strikes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I would not again discuss this question except I desire to emphasize that under the parliamentary situation if the Harness substitute, whether amended by the Smith amendment or not, should be adopted, then the consideration of this bill in the Committee of the Whole will be over. It will not be possible for me to offer the substitute which I discussed earlier in the day.

I want to emphasize once more, and I do not believe anybody here will dispute this assertion, that if this House wants to get legislation promptly, there is only one way I think we can get it and that is to pass the Connally bill. Without entering into a discussion of what is in the committee bill or the Harness substitute, and without discussing the merits of the contents of those two bills, may I say there is not much difference between them now. I believe that the United States Senate would not act promptly on that bill. We have every reason to think they would not because a year and a half ago a similar bill was sent there and it has never been considered. Therefore, I urge upon the House to meet the issue of the coal mine strike in the only way we can do it and that is by passing the Connally bill implementing the power of the administration to deal with it.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Can the gentleman inform the House, Does the President of the United States want enactment of the Connally bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman knows I cannot speak for the President of the United States. I have not seen him since the night the sophomores were entertained down there.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. The gentleman is the Democratic whip.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes, but I am not speaking for the President of the United States. I am speaking for myself and giving the Members of this committee the benefit of my 14 years' experience here for whatever it may be worth. I am not quarreling with anybody, I am not mad with anybody, but I think the way to help put the miners back to work is to adopt the Connally bill. If we want prompt legislative action, it is my opinion that passage of the Connally bill offers our best hope.

It does not meet the wishes of everyone, but it will help settle the coal strike. That is what we should try to do without delay.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I heard a story in a recent campaign in Oklahoma, something like this:

> Shame on you, you fooled me once. Shame on me, you fooled me twice.

I want to ask you how many times you have been fooled by the labor leaders? How many times have they brought out the bull whip and cracked it over your heals and told you to take what they wanted to give you or they were going to elect someone else to Congress if you failed to do their bidding?

I elect to accept the challenge wholeheartedly against William Green when he made his threat to go all-out to defeat any Member of Congress that would vote for this bill in its present form. I know many members of labor unions who do not concur with the high-handed methods of their leaders, and were it not for the coercive powers used in kicking them out of the union in connection with the carrying out of these forced strikes, my opinion is that the situation would be much different and in many cases to the contrary.

We have got a war to win; we have about a week's supply of coal.

The day of reckoning is here. Shall we fail our soldiers and sailors and marines and air corps in the midst of the greatest battles in the history of the world? A decision is to be made whether union labor shall administer this government or whether the great mass, the great majority shall rule. We see a combination well organized upon their strategy in opposition to this measure. We see admitted reversal of action with some of you that are swinging to the left when once you were all out for the provisions of this bill.

I recall what my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma, LYLE BOREN, sitting here, said 2 years ago when a like measure was before Congress. He said:

> The worst enemy the workingman had was the man who ordered strikes in a defense industry.

And he was right.

This bill is a little stronger than a gesture, the Harness substitute weakens the act better than half and the proposed Ramspeck substitute in my opinion means almost, if not completely nil.

We read in the press that in all probability another invasion is in the offing with more than 500,000 miners and a number of other essential war industries striking when we are all agreed that coal is most vital to our war effort as well as rubber and other critical materials.

We wonder what action will be taken by our draft boards where these men are striking. Will they continue to be deferred when they are not now working at essential war work? What action is going to be taken to overcome these many strikes now in essential war work plants?

All of organized labor's powers were derived from and through a friendly Congress and today we have power to modify, limit, or to the extreme, a right to repeal every consideration given them. This matter is in our hands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman is there any time remaining that could be allotted?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regrets that all time is allotted, unless some Member who had been listed does not claim his time.

Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN] desire recognition? Apparently the gentleman does not claim recognition, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the rule to consider this proposed legislation, but I would like to have an opportunity to know what I am voting

on, and I think every other Member of the House is entitled to that consideration.

The Harness amendment comprises six or seven pages of closely typewritten matter. It has not been printed.

In my conference on the floor with other Members of the House I find very few, if any, Members who profess to know what is contains. Certainly, nobody knows what it means as amended by the Smith amendment.

It is now 5 o'clock in the evening. Why not have the Committee rise and give us an opportunity to read the proposed legislation in the RECORD tomorrow morning and vote on it at 12 o'clock or soon thereafter tomorrow?

I want to support proper legislation on this subject matter, but I do not want to vote for a bill of six or seven pages which has never been printed and which is beyond the power of any Member to adequately understand merely by having heard it read by the reading clerk. Mr. Chairman, I want to urge, as one of those who has consistently supported the enactment of legislation of this kind, that the committee in charge of the bill give consideration to offering a motion at this time that the Committee rise, so that the Members of the House may have an opportunity at least to know what the legislation is upon which they are expected to cast their votes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PACE) there were—ayes 173, noes 38.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of the national defense, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House meets tomorrow morning it meet at 11 o'clock.

Mrs. NORTON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am not any too anxious to rush the execution of this bill, Mr. Speaker, and I object.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, if it has not already been done, that the substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] be printed in the RECORD for the consideration of the Members of the House, together with the Ramspeck and Smith amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would think that the amendment already offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] and other amendments that have been offered would be printed at the place in the proceedings where they were offered. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] has not offered an amendment.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment which I expect to offer and which is at the Clerk's desk may be printed in the RECORD at this point for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The amendment referred to follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAMSPECK: On page 7, line 12, strike out the committee amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following substitute:

"That section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" 'The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a failure to comply with any such provisions, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States or in its interests of any plant of which possession is so taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided to any plant equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the national defense or which may be useful in connection therewith. Such power and authority may be exercised by the President through such department or agency of the Government as he may designate, and may be exercised with respect to any such plant, whenever the President finds, after investigation, and proclaims that there is an interruption of the operation of such plant as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance, that the national defense program will be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to insure the operation of such plant in the interest of the national defense: *Provided*, That with respect to any plant of which possession shall have been taken under the provisions of this paragraph, such plant shall be returned to its owners whenever the President determines that such plant will be privately operated in a manner consistent with the needs of the national defense: *Provided further*, That possession of any plant shall not be taken under authority of this section after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, and the authority to operate any such plant under the provisions of this section shall terminate at the end of 6 months after the termination of such hostilities as so proclaimed.'

"SEC. 2. In any case in which possession of any plant has been or is hereafter taken under the authority granted by section 9 of such act of 1940, as amended, such plant, while so possessed, (a) shall be operated under the same terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at the time possession of such plant was so taken, or (b) in the event operation of such plant is interrupted or stopped at such time, shall be operated under the same terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at such plant immediately preceding such interruption or stoppage.

"SEC. 3. (a) Whenever any business establishment, plant, mine, or facility is in the possession of the United States, it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, or induce any person to interfere, by lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption, with the operation of such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility, or (2) to aid any such lock-out, strike, slowdown, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such business establishment, plant, mine, or facility by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein. No individual shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this section by reason only of his having ceased work or having refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

"(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 4. The provisions of this act and the amendments made by this act shall cease to be effective at the end of 6 months following the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, except as to offenses committed prior to such date.

"SEC. 5. The National War Labor Board (hereinafter called the 'Board'), established by Executive Order No. 9017, dated January 12, 1942, in addition to all powers conferred on it by section 1 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and by any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942, entitled 'An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes,' and by any other statute, shall have the following powers and duties:

"Whenever the United States Conciliation Service (hereinafter called the 'Conciliation Service') certifies that a labor dispute exists which may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, and cannot be settled by collective bargaining or conciliation, to summon both parties to such dispute before it and conduct a public hearing on the merits of the dispute. If in the opinion of the Board a labor dispute has become so serious that it may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, the Board may take such action on its own motion. At such hearing both parties shall be given full notice and opportunity to be heard, but the failure of either party to appear shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed to a hearing and order.

"(b) To decide the dispute, and provide by order the wages and hours and all other terms and conditions (customarily included in collective-bargaining agreements) governing the relations between the parties, which shall be in effect until further order of the Board. In making any such decision the Board shall conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; the act of October 2, 1942, hereinbefore referred to; and the regulations and orders issued under such acts; and where no law is applicable the order of the Board shall provide for terms and conditions to govern relations between the parties which shall be fair and equitable to employer and employee under all the circumstances of the case.

"(c) To require the attendance of witnesses and the production of such papers, documents, and records as may be deemed by the Board material to its investigation of facts in any labor dispute, and to issue subpenas requiring such attendance or production.

"(d) To apply to any Federal district court for an order requiring any person within its jurisdiction to obey a subpena issued by the Board; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred on any such court to issue such an order.

"SEC. 6. The National War Labor Board, by its Chairman, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of any books, papers, records, or other documents, which it deems relevant to any inquiry or hearing before the Board or any designated member or agent thereof. Such subpenas shall be enforceable in the same manner, and subject to the same penalties, as subpenas issued by the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, approved March 27, 1942.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would the request just submitted by the gentleman from Georgia include amendments that have been sent to the Clerk's desk but have not actually been reported to the House?

The SPEAKER. It would not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that such amendments as have been placed on the Clerk's desk, even though not reported, may likewise be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, in order to be specific, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment striking out sections 2 and 3 be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The amendment referred to follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMASON: On page 9, strike out all of sections 2 and 3.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the committee amendments authorized by the House Committee on Military Affairs, that have been sent to the Clerk's desk, be printed in the RECORD, or were they printed yesterday?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that they were printed in the RECORD this morning.

Mr. MAY. I did not find them in the RECORD this morning.

The SPEAKER. If they were not printed in the RECORD, does the gentleman desire to ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. MAY. I am advised that they were in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to submit a unanimous-consent request, and I should like to address myself to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. Insofar as I can judge the temper of the House and the business before the House, if there ever was a time when this House ought to adjourn over the week end it is now. I know gentlemen say no, but I have been here a good while. If this House is in shape to legislate, I cannot figure it out. Will not the gentleman ask unanimous consent to adjourn over to Monday?

Mr. MAY. I do not think so, because, believing as I do in a cooling-off period, I think that by morning everybody will be cooled off and we will be all right.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DUNKERQUE ANNIVERSARY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, on this day, at this very hour, the heroic evacuation of the British Expeditionary Forces, trapped on the blood-stained beaches of Dunkerque, was being successfully concluded.

This was a miracle of deliverance at which the whole world gasped in amazement. It lifted the heart and strengthened the soul with tremendous emotional and spiritual exaltation.

We must not forget, however, that it was a miracle achieved, with God's help, by the naked courage and valor and tenacity and discipline, not only of the soldiers and sailors and airmen involved, but to an unprecedented degree, by the plain people of England. It was a miracle in which the average citizen, the ordinary man and woman, participated with uncomparable bravery, and skill, and calm devotion; a miracle which would have been impossible without them, the Mr. and Mrs. Miniver's of our time. Never before in history had such an army been rescued, on such a scale, by the civilian volunteers.

It is to this nameless army of the people, these unsung heroes and their quiet heroism, that Joseph Auslander has dedicated his poem, Dunkerque Anniversary, which I am privileged to present before this House. The poem follows:

DUNKERQUE ANNIVERSARY

When the beast from the dark primordial slime
Bellowed his hunger for blood and bone;
When the Czech stood stalwart and sublime
Against the tusks of the mastodon;
When the Pole was bored for the hundredth time;
When the Fleming's furious fate was known;
When the Dutch and the French blazed blood and grime—
England elected to fight alone.

For nine incredible nights and days,
Beneath the pounding of bomb and gun,
Beneath the infernal heat and haze,
Beneath the pitiless blood-drenched sun,
On the Norman beach's glare and glaze,
The weaponless Tommy faced the Hun:
And while we could only gasp and gaze,
England elected to fight alone.

When the Stukas droned their savagery,
And it seemed no strength could stop that drone,
A small and a gallant company
Hurled that hellish armada down,
Wrought an eagle-defended Thermopylae,
Laughing at death from a treacherous throne:
Pillared in flame between sky and sea,
England elected to fight alone.

From Beowulf, Alfred and Harold on,
From Arthur and Armstrong and Robin Hood,
This is the bread of Bellerophon,
This is the Lion's fearless brood,
This is the Balaclava blood,
This is the creed of the Camperdown:
When all but the soul is quite subdued,
England elects to fight alone.

Now that we face the foe as one,
The foul implacable fiend, none other,
Eternally cunning, the ruthless Hun,
Now that we stand as brother with brother,
Now that the enemy is known,
Now that we rally round our Mother—
Until the beast in his own blood smother,
England no longer fights alone.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the publication, the Manresan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. ROWE asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter to Donald Nelson from Chester C. Davis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask uninamous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a petition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two letters regarding the civilian pilot-training course.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

FOOD AND FOOD PRICES

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is safe to say that everybody in the country today is talking about food. Certainly if they are not talking about food, they are thinking about it, because the shortage of food has already made itself felt in our daily lives. This is a startling fact to Americans who up to a year ago had never given a thought to a shortage in their food supply. Our United States was considered a land of plenty, food was easy to obtain, and frequently it was said from public platforms and in daily conversation that no one need ever starve in America. But today that is all changed and it is a shocking change.

Because of this shortage, people first became critical of the management of the production, processing, and distribution of food, the criticism being directed at producers, at distributing merchants, and more recently it has been concentrated on the Government control which has been exercised over the business of bringing food supplies to the householders of the Nation. Opinions have been expressed as to how food should be packaged, how it should be labeled and handled. Some of the suggestions have merit; many of them are the product of theorists who know nothing about the subject but consider themselves economists and experts, though whatever experience and knowledge they may have has been gathered from what they have read in books. Similar suggestions have been made about price control, including mark-ups for the middleman and what price the producer should receive for the efforts of his toil.

In the development of all of this system, little if any thought has been given to the policy adopted by the British, who in turn capitalized on their experience of the past. But, our administration leaders have failed to profit by the successful operations of the most thorough and comprehensive world-wide administration of food control and distribution inaugurated and practiced in our own country during the last World War. This failure to profit by experience is unfortunate, and the confusion which has resulted in the present policies has brought about such a messed-up situation that probably even King Solomon himself could not correct it.

Of course, some of the criticism of the present situation may emanate from people who have an ax to grind or whose toes have been stepped on. Nevertheless, it is a fact that in promulgating the present policies little consideration was given to the advice of people in the different branches of the industry who are experienced and have been successful in their business. Indeed, there are in this House of Representatives men who know from intimate contact and experience the details of food production in the great farms and ranges of our country, and these patriotic Americans have made suggestions in an effort to be helpful in this situation, but their suggestions have met with short shrift and little consideration.

Largely due to this state of affairs, the leader of the minority party in the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., decided to appoint a food study committee made up of Republican Members of the House, to go into these matters and I was honored by being appointed a member of that committee. The policy promptly adopted by this committee, under the able leadership of its chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, Hon. THOMAS A. JENKINS, was to consult with producers, distributors, and consumers in different parts of the country to learn the facts, seeking to clarify the situation and to bring some kind of order out of the chaotic conditions which exist. This committee, made up of about 40 members, divided itself into 10 different subcommittees and they have gone to work with enthusiasm on their own time, and largely at their own expense, making an intensive study, developing their own facts, and listening to the testimony in different parts of the country of all and any one interested in this great subject of food.

It is amazing that attempts have been made in some places to hamper the work of this volunteer committee by the partisan activity of some members of the Democratic Party. In the city of Philadelphia, due to the attacks of local Democratic politicians, the committee was denied the use of a public building for a meeting and recently an attack was made on the floor of the House against this honest effort to aid in the solution of this serious problem. It seems to run true to the pattern of the New Deal psychology that because their own master minds did not think of it first they are not going to let anybody else do anything constructive, no matter how desirable it may be.

Nevertheless, much constructive good is bound to come out of the studies of this Republican food committee. The very fact that its existence has been attacked by the majority party is in itself productive of good because such attacks have aided in bringing the work of the committee to the attention of the people, and judging from the public reactions received in the mail and the statements made at the hearings already held, the people are definitely aroused and welcome an opportunity to be heard on a matter which affects them so closely. Therefore, perhaps we should not be too critical of our friends, the Democrats, in helping us Republicans to get an audience.

As a result of the research of the Republican food study committee, a firm foundation has already been laid for a real reorganization of the food administration in this country. In the introduction by the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman JENKINS, of H. R. 2739, which provides for centralized food control focused in the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, the fundamental step has been taken to correct a most confusing situation. Anyone who has studied this muddled state of affairs with any degree of sincerity is forced to the inevitable conclusion that the greater part of the misunderstandings, bickerings, and confused thinking exists because of the hydra-headed control of the entire food question. Agency has been piled upon agency; administrator has been heaped on top of administrator; responsibility has been delegated, divided, and destroyed. The credit for the existing chaos and confusion rests in no other hands, and at no other place, than the Chief Executive of the Nation. It is he who demanded the legislation; it is he who made the appointments; it is he who built up this monstrous organization; and like the little red hen, it is he who must take credit for the results.

In all the discussion of this perplexing situation, little has been said about the opening up of new channels for food or stimulating its production along lines which would tend to arouse the public's mind and secure its enthusiastic cooperation. Without the help and trust of the people in solving a problem of this kind the difficulties of the task are multiplied a thousandfold. Perhaps the one exception is the Victory garden movement, which has certainly made the public conscious of the need for more food and has secured its support in no uncertain way. Front lawns have been plowed under, back yards have been cleaned up and fertilized, and many vegetables have been planted to eke out the family supply. Indeed, the housewife has learned a great deal about the canning of food, its preservation by processing and dehydration, and this whole movement has made the families of the Nation more thrifty and less wasteful in the handling of this precious commodity. Whoever thought of the Victory garden did a great thing for America.

But the Victory garden idea has benefited the family and the Nation in other ways besides increasing the production of food. It has made the consumer food conscious and has caused him to study and learn about the system of food production and its distribution. That in itself will bring about suggestions for improved and possibly more economical methods than have hitherto been practiced. The Victory garden has improved the health of the Nation. It has brought people out into the open with the hoe and rake and the wheelbarrow and has raised many a healthy sweat on the brow of the corpulent householder who has benefited by being in the open air and sunshine and in doing some work that in time brings him an everlasting reward. Being an enthusiastic gardener myself, I venture to predict that the man or woman who has toiled in his garden and watched the seeds which he planted grow and has enjoyed the thrill of picking his own fruit from his own vine, will never again be without a garden.

Another great reservoir for food which is underdeveloped is the ocean, the lakes, and the rivers of this country. When one realizes that the total estimated need of fish for military, lend-lease, and domestic consumption for 1943 is 7,000,000,000 pounds of fish, of which it is estimated that there will be a shortage of about 50 percent, it is high time something was done about it. The great fishing industry has been treated like an unwanted stepchild in the whole food

program. Fishermen's boats have been confiscated by the Navy and allowed to lie idle while the activities of their owners have been unreasonably restricted. Commercial fishermen are fine, patriotic American citizens and have cooperated in the war effort in every way possible, but the present policy which curtails the production of fish food is short-sighted and unsound.

One of the large fishing grounds of the country is the Atlantic Ocean off the New Jersey coast and the demands of war have made their inroads among the commercial fishermen who have extensive fish pounds off that shore. Many of these fishermen and their crews have gone to war and are serving in the Navy or the Coast Guard, while others have surrendered their boats to the Navy for the defense of the coast and therefore their usual catch of fish is seriously curtailed. Incidentally, there are other factors at work which are beyond comprehension that add to the scarcity of fish food in the market. I refer to the ceiling placed by the Office of Price Administration on the wholesale price for frozen whiting, a food fish of considerable importance. The run of whiting takes place in the spring of the year and lasts about a month or 5 weeks. The ceiling price of 4 cents a pound for frozen whiting in the New York market is totally inadequate since it costs the fishermen about 5½ cents to deliver each pound of whiting to the market. As a result, the New Jersey commercial fishermen during the past 5 weeks have dumped into the sea each day an estimated 25,000 pounds of whiting. Such an attitude on the part of the O. P. A. is indefensible when considered in the light of the present food shortage.

Acting on the protests made by the fishermen in my district, I called this matter to the attention of the O. P. A. and was told that they knew all about the situation and were going to have a conference about it. When advised that the run of whiting would probably last for only another week I was told that that was unfortunate but they were doing their best. Their best by no means reaches the minimum demands of the people of this country. Perfection would be too good to be true; reasonable intelligence, however, is demanded.

Fish is good food, and food is more necessary today than ever before for our own people as well as our allies, and to issue regulations which make it impossible for the producer of food to bring it to market without financial loss is an act detrimental to the best interests of this country and indeed directly hampers the successful waging of the war.

The commercial fishermen of New Jersey are doing all they can to produce as much fish food as possible and this is true of the commercial fishermen in other parts of the country. But even their best will not begin to make up the estimated deficit of three and a half billion pounds in the amount of necessary fish food. However, there is a solution to this in the great army of amateur fishermen who are ready to step in and help. The amateur fisherman is the man or woman who is taken out to fish by men who make a living by taking parties out in the boats they own and who provide the necessary fishing tackle, bait, and so forth. There is also the individual who owns his own boat and fishes for sport.

In normal times these boat captains and powerboat owners in New Jersey are very active during the summer months, taking out these fishing parties and fishing on their own, and they have kept records of the catches which they have made during the past few years. These records show that covering the years 1941 and 1942 the average aggregate catch for each season of some 460 boats along the New Jersey coast was about 10,000,000 pounds of fish. That is a lot of fish, but these men cannot function today because they are denied gasoline for their boats. The O. P. A. regulations permit the commercial fishermen to have what gasoline is necessary for their needs, and that is entirely right, but based on the reasoning that no one is allowed to have a good time and any recreation in these war days, gasoline is denied private fishing parties. The reasons for such a ruling are dissipated by the offer made by the captains of these boats and the private boat owners that in return for the necessary gasoline their catch be sold to the wholesale market with the exception of a small amount, about 20 pounds per person, which might be retained for their own consumption. In this way the deficit in the fish-food supply would be made up, for it is easy to see that if this fish-for-food movement is encouraged and made applicable along all the coastline of the country, in the bays and in the rivers, there would be more than enough fish food available for ourselves and our allies. Extra gasoline is permitted Victory gardeners for food production, why not also to fishermen for the same reason?

The New Jersey boat captain and the private boat owner ask that they be permitted 100 gallons of gasoline per boat per month during the 3 months' fishing season, to carry out this fish-for-food program. This seems reasonable because some of these men think that even less gasoline will suffice, which is undoubtedly true in inland and more sheltered areas where outboard motors are used. But the great and immediate increase in the food supply of the country would justify the allotment of this gasoline and the encouragement of this program.

The Bureau of Fisheries of the Department of the Interior is most interested in this matter and I have written to Secretary Ickes asking him, as Petroleum Administrator for War, to give his sympathetic attention and approval. I urge every Congressman to study this plan and cooperate in every way he can to encourage this sensible method of increasing the food supply of the country. Fishing for food brings immediate results. There is no delay waiting for things to grow as in the case of gardening. The immediate production of some 10,000,000 pounds of fish food is an opportunity that cannot be passed by. Fish for food certainly does parallel the Victory-garden movement which has met with such universal approval. It will produce a great deal more food and it will stimulate interest in a very much neglected industry which plays an important part in our American life.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Price Administration has announced its plan to roll-back retail prices of certain articles of food including coffee, butter, and beef. The reason given for the so-called roll-back is to comply with the President's policy of "holding the line" against inflation.

No one of ordinary judgment wants a spiral of inflation or favors "run-away" prices. A situation of that kind would, of course, lead to disaster. I wish, particularly, to direct the attention of the House today to the policy of the administration of using Federal funds in the form of subsidies to prevent inflation and higher prices.

I wish to discuss particularly the manner in which such a policy affects the beef situation. As I understand the plan now contemplated, the administration expects to reduce, or roll-back, retail prices of beef 10 percent, and permit processors and wholesalers to continue to receive their present margin of profit by paying subsidies to make up for the roll-back. There is also to be a subsidy of 5 cents a pound on butter, and 3 cents a pound on coffee.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; unless it is something entirely outside of the matter I am addressing myself to.

Mr. PATMAN. It is something about that very matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; I will not yield until I get through.

It is now known how much these subsidies will cost the taxpayers of this country. Estimates are between $400,000,000 and $500,000,000. These subsidies are, of course, going to be paid on commodities that are rationed. And they are rationed because there is not now a sufficient supply to meet the demand. If the payment of subsidies would greatly increase production of these important food products, there might be some excuse for such a plan. Or, if it could be established the prices of these foods are far out of line with the cost of other essential commodities, and out of line with the purchasing power of the people, there might be some ground for giving consideration to a plan of this kind. Or, if the Government wanted increased production of a commodity not ordinarily grown in large enough quantities, there might be a reason for paying subsidies to provide more of that commodity. But in my judgment, it does not make good sense to charge the taxpayers of this country hundreds of millions of dollars to pay processors and wholesalers so there may be a small reduction in the retail prices of these particular food products. Neither would it make quite so much difference, if there

were an adequate supply of these products. But the fact remains that it is not going to make much difference whether we cut the prices down if we are not able to buy these particular products. In other words, even if the price of beef is cut at the retail shops as much as 3 cents or 4 cents per pound, it is not going to help very much if the beef is not there to be bought. It might be interesting right here to estimate just how much this so-called "roll-back" is going to mean to the average consumer. It is estimated there will be about 12 pounds of coffee for each consumer during the year. The saving there will be 36 cents. The allocation of butter will be about the same.

The saving there will be about 60 cents. On beef, if one is able to get it, the saving will be about $1.60. These total $2.56. Let us put the total saved at $3, which is really 25 cents per month. In other words, if the program works out according to the schedule, the consumer will save about 25 cents per month on his coffee, butter, and beef—if he is able to get these commodities. So, in order to save about 25 cents a month per consumer, it is proposed that the Government spent $300,000,000 or $400,000,000 in doing it. It might be well to observe that this item of $300,000,000 or $400,000,000—or whatever the cost may be—is to be charged to the taxpayers which the consumer will ultimately pay. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Price Administration and other departments of the Government have just told us that the beef shortage is likely to become more acute in future months than at present. The outlook on beef supply is not encouraging. And beef, after all, is one of the most important food products needed not only for civilian consumption but especially for our armed forces. Some comparisons have been made with regard to the cost of living during World War No. 1 and the present war. According to figures furnished by the Department of Agriculture, during the last 6 months of 1919 when prices were said to have been extremely high, the average price of choice dressed beef on the Chicago market was $24.82 per hundredweight; in 1920, $25.68. On the same market the average price for choice dressed beef for the year 1942 was $21.30 per hundredweight; for the first 5 months of 1943, $22.50. The average price for live beef steers in 1918 on the Chicago market was $14.65; in 1919, $15.50. In 1942 the average price for live beef steers was $13.79; for the first 5 months of 1943, $15.30. Comparative figures on live cattle on the Chicago market will show some increase in price during the latter period, but the difference is slight. I do not desire at this time to go into the matter of comparing the average income or the average earnings of our people, but it is obvious to everyone that earnings and income are much higher than they were during the other World War. I mention these things to show that while we are talking about holding prices down, so far as beef is concerned they are no higher now than at the high point during the other war, and when other costs were relatively lower.

Let us look for a moment at the retail price of beef during a similar period. In 1918 the average price of beef per pound was 31.7 cents; in 1919, 33 cents; in 1920, 33.3 cents; in 1940, 29.5 cents; in 1941, 31.5 cents; and in 1942, 34.9 cents. In other words, the increase in the price of beef to the consumer during the last year was a little more than 1 cent per pound over the price paid at the close of World War No. 1.

Now I want to call your attention to some more figures that, in my judgment, are quite significant. There are approximately 75,000,000 cattle in the United States—not many more than there were in 1918. As a matter of fact, the number of beef cattle on hand in this country has run pretty much the same during the past 30 years. We have had, according to Government figures, an average of from forty-eight to fifty million beef cattle on hand in this country during the past 30 years. We have very few more cattle on hand now than we had 20 years ago even though we have increased in population. So the thing to which I want to direct your attention particularly is the fact that, considering our increased population, the increased demand for meat by our armed forces, and our commitments under lend-lease, we are bound to have a shortage of beef in this country. As a matter of truth, we have it now. I have just said we have about 48,000,000 beef cattle in this country. Not only have our herds failed to increase with our population but there is a tendency at the present time on the part of producers and feeders not to "finish" their cattle and fatten them, so the tonnage of beef is bound to be much lower. Too many cattle are sold before they ought to go to market. The reason is that the feeder, under present conditions, cannot realize a sufficient spread in profit to "finish" his cattle. Furthermore, the question of the sale price at the end of the feeding period is most uncertain because of experimental manipulation of prices on the part of Government officials in an effort to "hold the line."

Let me repeat, neither livestock producers nor farmers are asking for huge profits. They would like to have some assurance that there will not be so much tinkering with livestock prices as to discourage men from increasing their production as well as keep them from delivering a finished product on the market. I would like to suggest again that, with the increased demand for all kinds of food, especially meat, and with our commitments outstanding, the big question after all is going to be one of increasing production rather than reduction of retail prices on such commodities. Somebody is going to have to be a little more realistic and practical with regard to this question. It ought to be examined as a part of the over-all program in the prosecution of this war. Of course, we do not want inflation. We do not want spiraling prices, but we do want production. This country will get along a lot farther and will come nearer reaching its goal of achievement if it will be a little more consistent with regard to the question of adjustment of prices and give more encouragement to bigger and more expansive production of food of all kinds. Only a few years ago, this country tried the experiment of bringing about prosperity on a program of planned curtailed production. Our planners even destroyed crops and livestock to comply with such plan. Billions of dollars in subsidies were appropriated. It did not hold production down. Now our country is in a gigantic and cruel war. Whether we realize it or not, we have an acute shortage of some of the most essential food products. I just seems as if we have not yet realized that an adequate supply of food is one of the most essential war materials. But we are going to find it out in the very near future.

The payment of subsidies from the Federal Treasury in this manner to increase buying power will not help prevent inflation. The consumer will finally pay it back in taxes. To pay subsidies to processors and wholesalers by the millions will not do much toward increasing production. It is more and more production that we need. If there is to be a ceiling, put it on the retail price of meat. But be sure it is uniform and fair to all parties concerned, and do it in the light of increasing rather than decreasing production. Make it simple and plain, and then enforce it.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to emphasize the need of increased production for prevention of inflation as well as for the prosecution of the war and the writing of the peace. Mr. Speaker, we have got to encourage and assist the farmer in the production of more and more food. He should be encouraged to plant every acre of crop he can and to increase his herds of livestock. The farmer is not asking for huge profits. All he asks for is for more nearly the cost of production. The farmers and producers are among our most patriotic citizens. They are willing to work just as many hours of the day as may be necessary to get the job done. Their families will work with them and are willing and glad to do it. All they ask is an even break. They will do their part and then some. But we cannot get more and more production by curbs, regulations, red tape, uncertainties, and gadgets of all kinds that hamper and hamstring the farm people of this Nation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman now yield to me?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. I ask this to state to the gentleman that the Committee on Banking and Currency the day before yesterday reported a bill to further extend the Commodity Credit Corporation, and in that bill there is an amendment that prohibits subsidies. I agree with the gentleman that it will be more inflationary, at least as much inflationary to raise the prices as to grant a subsidy, because if you pay 80 cents for meat that you would normally pay a dollar for, you

have 20 cents extra purchasing power left in your pocket, in competition with everybody else, and that is calculated to cause inflation to that extent.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. To make an observation with reference to this roll-back and subsidy. In my opinion it is a deception intended to fool the people, to make them believe that they are securing a reduction in the cost of living. The gentleman has indicated that an individual may save $3 a year by the roll-back in the price of butter, meat, and coffee. The taxpayer, the consumer, will find that for saving that $3 he has to pay approximately $4 in taxes to save that $3. The taxes will be collected, to pay the subsidy, plus the overhead expense of appointing thousands of auditors and Federal employees to go around the country and figure out whether or not the processor is entitled to the subsidy. I think it is a fraud upon the people.

May I make one other observation with reference to the suggestion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. I am wondering if the amendment that he has referred to is broad enough to cover livestock, and also broad enough to stop the R. F. C. or any other agency from paying a subsidy?

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman turn to the Appendix of the RECORD, page A2762——

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have read the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. I think you will find it is sufficiently broad.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Do you think that in this bill on the Commodity Credit Corporation, we can legislate to stop another corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, from paying the subsidy?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I think so.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think it should be made very definite and certain.

Mr. PATMAN. It says:

> In order to prevent the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other Government agency from being used for the payment of subsidies to maintain maximum prices for agricultural commodities.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would want to make it sure. I think we should also make it clear "agricultural commodities" is broad enough to take in livestock and dairy products.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do want to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] for his statement, and especially for the interest he has taken in an effort to try to work out in a fairly decent way the price of crude oil. I am not discussing that in these particular remarks today, but I know the gentleman from Texas has done everything possible in order to provide a decent price on crude oil without paying subsidies in order to get it, because we do have a critical situation there. The gentleman from Texas has held hearings on the question and has even proposed legislation that might possibly help take care of that situation.

Mr. PATMAN. May I suggest that the gentleman from Kansas has been very helpful. His testimony was good, and we thought it was of sufficient importance to have it reprinted. It has been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Something happened on the floor today that justifies the contention of the gentleman, and that we still have the control complex, possibly more than we should have. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] had to bring in Mr. MONRONEY's bill to the floor of this House today—right in the midst of this war. Think of it. We had to pass legislation here today to allow these poor people in the great State of Oklahoma, 800,000 of them, that will allow them to go ahead and do the best they can to raise food to help win this war. Farmers that want to raise food to win this war surely shouldn't be forced to come here and get a bill passed in order to do it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I may say to the gentleman that that situation in Oklahoma and some parts of my own State and in Illinois and other places, by reason of this flood situation, is a most serious one, and something should be done rather promptly to relieve that situation, not because of the farmers there, but because of the need for the food which they will produce if they are given a chance.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I wish to commend the gentleman for his very timely statement, but I am wondering if irreparable damage is not being done at this very moment by the announcement of this roll-back order on butter and also the threatened subsidy program on meats? Reports are coming to me from the West that livestock feeders are already beginning to empty their feed lots, and that the producers of beef, to whom the gentleman has referred, are already feeling very apprehensive over the situation. I fear that great damage will have been done, regardless of whether or not the legislation suggested by the gentleman from Texas is adopted. I had a letter just yesterday from a cream producer who thought that this roll-back would reduce his price of cream 5 cents, and he called attention to the fact that that is the general impression in the West. I feel we are going to have a very great loss of production, both in cream and in the livestock industry, as a result of these very unfortunate orders.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I will say that I have had a considerable amount of correspondence from livestock operators in my district and in other localities in the mid-west who tell me that they are discouraged about this situation and that they are not going to finish the cattle as they would under ordinary circumstances and conditions, because they not only cannot know, but they are afraid the price will be rolled back after they finish feeding the cattle, and they will have to take less for their cattle after they have been finished.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel it would be much better if Mr. Ickes, for instance, the person in charge of petroleum, also had the price-fixing power on petroleum and petroleum products?

In Canada the administration of petroleum and its products has charge of all those things and they have a much better system. They were warmer last winter than we were; they had more gasoline than we, although we supplied a great deal of it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that I appreciate her expression. My own opinion, I may say to the gentlewoman, is that that is one of the difficulties with reference to the question of price of crude oil: There are too many individuals dealing with the question and it is difficult to place the responsibility in the hands of anyone. I will say, further, however, that I feel that the man at the head of the agency in charge of petroleum, as far as he personally is concerned, without expressing his views, is sympathetic with our views on that question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But he should be given control of prices also, because the two go together.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. May I state that I thoroughly agree that price and everything else relating to the production and distribution of petroleum should be under Secretary Ickes; and all food control should be under Mr. Chester Davis.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. Then in each of these fields we would have one person responsible.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I want to make a prediction regarding the roll-back and subsidies on meat if they put it in operation. I predict to the gentleman that at least 50 percent of the meat will go into the black market and that there will be a famine in meat for the men in the armed forces and for the consuming public who get meat in the legitimate manner. We have it here already. When they roll back the price, which will affect the price of the producer, the black-market operators will go in and take over just the same as they did in

poultry where they are now controlling about 85 percent of the poultry produced in this country.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This roll-back plan will encourage rather than discourage the black market.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by including a statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LARCADE, for June 4, on account of important business.

To Mr. COLE of New York, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. LEFEVRE, indefinitely, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1670. An act to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended;

H. R. 2570. An act to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2848. An act amending the "Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943," approved April 29, 1943; and

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 4, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:15 a. m. on Friday, June 4, 1943, for consideration of housing bills, in room 1304, New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2617, a bill to provide for speedy and summary notice in proceedings to condemn property for war purposes, and to accelerate the distribution of deposits and awards to the persons entitled thereto in such cases, at 10:30 a. m. on Friday, June 4, 1943, in room 346 Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

1. Friday, June 4: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects along the Missouri River and tributaries and the upper Mississippi River and the Great Lakes region.

2. Tuesday, June 8: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, including the Arkansas and White Rivers, and on rivers flowing into the Gulf west of the Mississippi River, and in the western Rocky Mountain region, including Texas and Colorado, and in the Pacific Northwest region, including the Willamette River and the Columbia River and tributaries.

3. Wednesday, June 9: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the Los Angeles area and in the State of California, including the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kern River Valleys, and on projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

4. Thursday, June 10: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

5. Friday, June 11: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold executive hearings at 10 a. m. on Monday, June 7, 1943, on bills dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will hold public hearings on Tuesday, June 8, 1943, beginning at 10 a. m., on bills relating to the classification and compensation of substitute employees in the Postal Service.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold public hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, June 9, 1943, on private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2731, to facilitate the award and payment of just compensation for property requisitioned under the authority of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2620, a bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives of the United States, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 16, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

453. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 24, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the intercoastal waterway from the mouth of the Columbia River to Puget Sound, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives adopted on March 26, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

454. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 in the amount of $1,165,000 for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 219); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

455. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Employees' Compensation Commission for the fiscal year 1943, in the amount of $500,000 (H. Doc. No. 220); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 134. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 523). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 2857. A bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 2858. A bill to amend section 3 (c), Public Law 788, Seventy-seventh Congress, authorizing a uniform allowance for certain officers in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 2859. A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 2860. A bill to provide adequate aeronautical training for the youth of the United

States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2861. A bill to provide for the general welfare; to alleviate the economic hazards of old age, premature death, disability, sickness, unemployment, and dependency; to amend and extend the provisions of the Social Security Act; to establish a Unified National Social Insurance System; to extend the coverage, and to protect and extend the social-security rights of individuals in the military service; to provide insurance benefits for workers permanently disabled; to establish a Federal system of unemployment compensation, temporary disability, and maternity benefits; to establish a national system of public employment offices; to establish a Federal system of medical and hospitalization benefits; to encourage and aid the advancement of knowledge and skill in the provision of health services and in the prevention of sickness, disability, and premature death; to enable the several States to make more adequate provision for the needy aged, the blind, dependent children, and other needy persons; to enable the States to establish and maintain a comprehensive public assistance program; and to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 2862. A bill to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. R. 2863. A bill to authorize the improvement of Lavaca and Navidad Rivers and Channel from Pass Cavallo to Port Lavaca, Tex.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 2864. A bill to authorize the improvement of the Guadalupe River, Tex.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

H. R. 2865. A bill to authorize the construction of a navigable channel from the Houston ship channel to Liberty, on the Trinity River, Tex.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2866. A bill to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to the carrying of concealed weapons; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 2867. A bill to grant naturalization to all foreign seamen who can show employment on American-owned vessels and who continue such employment as long as the United States is at war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. THOMASON:

H. R. 2868. A bill providing for transfer to the Texas State Parks Board unexpended Federal funds allocated to authorities of the State of Texas by the United States Texas Centennial Commission or its successor, the United States Greater Texas and Pan-American Exposition Commission; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 2869. A bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 2870. A bill for the relief of Robert G. Bailey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 2871. A bill for the relief of Ira Knight and his wife, Stella Knight; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2872. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carl Bauer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 2873. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. D. F. Still; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORD:

H. R. 2874. A bill for the relief of Robert Will Starks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2875. A bill for the relief of Adelar Demers; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1249. By Mr. ROLPH: House Resolution No. 226 of the State of California, relative to the Spirit of Freedom Monument as designed by Amos A. Wyckoff; to the Committee on the Library.

1250. By Mr. HOPE: Petition referring to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1251. Also, petition referring to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1252. Also, petition referring to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1253. Also, petition referring to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1254. Also, petition referring to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1255. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 120 citizens of Beaver County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1256. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mrs. H. H. Barnes and 26 other citizens of Clay Center and Broughton, Kans., urging support of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1257. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Resolution of the Union National Farm Loan Association, Ames, Iowa, urging Congress, at the first opportunity, to give due consideration to House bill 2427, extending the lending authority of the Land Bank Commissioner loan funds on and after July 1, 1943; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1258. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Kiwanis Club of Bayside, N. Y., that legislation be promulgated looking to the correction of the deplorable condition existing in the labor field and the evident lack of interest in the war program as shown by the willingness of certain elements in the ranks of labor to cease work on any pretext, and calls upon representatives of labor to support our boys at the front to the fullest degree by eliminating all strikes and utilizing the facilities set up by the Federal Government for settlement of all disputes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1259. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Ann J. Ross, president of the Shawnee County, Kansas, Woman's Christian Temperance Union and 65 other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Topeka, Kans., urging support of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1260. Also, petition of Peggy King and 26 other citizens of Elwood, Kans., urging support of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States, for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1261. Also, petition of Gus Wiese and 26 other citizens of Wakefield, Kans., urging support of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1262. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of Mrs. Tom Caton, of Clarksville, Tex., and 35 other citizens of Texas, favoring the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1263. By Mr. McCOWEN: Petition of 154 citizens of Williamsburg, Clermont County, Ohio, and other surrounding places, urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1264. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Grace M. Crysler and other residents of Onondaga County, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1265. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Cambria County Medical Society, Johnstown, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 997 and Senate bill 216; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 4, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in a world so filled with terror and horror, leaving a ghastly harvest of broken bodies, ravaged lands, ruined temples, devastated towns, we thank Thee for all the gentle and healing ministries which soothe our fear-haunted, troubled souls. We are grateful for the gladness of the morning, the freedom of the wind, the music of the rain, the joy of the sunshine, the deep calm of the night; for trees, flowers, birds, clouds, and sky; for the tender ministries of human love, the unselfishness of parents, the confidence of little

children, the patience of teachers, and the encouragement of friends.

If we have been holding the exploding present so close to our eyes that we have lost the far perspective of Thy favor, grant to us, we pray Thee, as we bow by this wayside shrine, true horizons. Remind us of the better aspects of the civilization out of which we have come, which even now, with new vitality, is beating back the powers of barbarism. Remind us of great books, great art, great music, and of causes, once defeated, now victorious, for which other generations shed their blood. Drawing refreshment from vineyards we did not plant, drinking at cisterns we did not dig, knowing the very freedoms for which we fight have been bought with a price, may we be eager in the supreme test of this glorious day to make our lives part payment on an unpayable debt. So may our imperfect service express something of Thee before life's little day ebbs out and the night comes down and our work is done. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, June 3, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1670) to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1670. An act to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended;

H. R. 2570. An act to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2848. An act amending the joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, approved April 29, 1943; and

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO POSTMASTERS TO ENGAGE IN ESSENTIAL WAR ACTIVITY

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the act of June 25, 1938, entitled "An act extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury (2), War, Navy (2), and Commerce, The National Archives and National Housing Agency which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Overton
Andrews	Gurney	Pepper
Austin	Hatch	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hawkes	Reed
Ball	Hayden	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hill	Reynolds
Barbour	Holman	Russell
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Bone	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brewster	La Follette	Smith
Bushfield	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Walsh
Connally	Mead	Wheeler
Danaher	Millikin	Wherry
Eastland	Moore	White
Ellender	Murray	Wiley
Ferguson	Nye	Willis
George	O'Daniel	Wilson
Gerry	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are detained on important public business.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Seventy-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITION

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Walnut, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1088. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the sale of cotton held by or on behalf of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 281).

By Mr. WILLIS, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky establishing a boundary between said State and said Commonwealth; without amendment (Rept. No. 282).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 37. A bill to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument; with amendments (Rept. No. 283);

S. 321. A bill to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior; with an amendment (Rept. No. 284); and

S. 378. A bill to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument; without amendment (Rept. No. 285).

By Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1108. A bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 286).

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, in connection with the report on Senate bill 1108 which I have just filed, I wish to say that at the meeting of the committee this morning we did not have the advantage of the services of a stenographic reporter. Mr. J. B. Hutson, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, presented a statement regarding the bill which I have just reported, and included in the statement was a summary of the resources, investment, and requirements of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944. The committee directed me to ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF J. B. HUTSON, PRESIDENT, COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION, BEFORE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, JUNE 4, 1943, CONCERNING S. 1108

EXTENSION OF LIFE PROVISION

Mr. Davis in his statement mentioned that legislation is now on the books which requires the Corporation to make loans on the crops, up to the year 1946, on cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts. Other legislation requires that we have price-support programs for the duration of the present emergency and for 2 years thereafter. The proposed legislation would provide for the extension of the life of the Corporation until 1947, or 2 years after hostilities have terminated, whichever is the later. Under past legislation the life of the Corporation has been extended for no more than 2 years at any one time; however, in view of the fact that many of the Corporation's programs, such as the domestic hemp program for instance, are undertaken because of the war and will undoubtedly be carried forward at least for the duration of the present conflict, and further in view of the fact that Congress has within the past year or two enacted legislation assuring farmers that loans will be available through Commodity Credit Corporation until at least the year 1946, it seems appropriate that the proposed legislation should provide for an extension of the life of the Corporation until the year 1947 or 2 years after hostilities have terminated, whichever is later.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

I should like also to point out another item which relates exclusively to the internal workings of the Corporation. At present the administrative expense payments of Commodity Credit Corporation are subject to audit by the General Accounting Office. However, our capital fund operations, those dealing with loans on and purchases of commodities; carrying charges such as warehousing, transportation, and interest payments; and other items directly associated with program operations are not audited by the General Accounting Office, although audited by the Staff of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Treasury appraisal in connection with the annual valuation of assets.

Several months ago a committee was established, made up of representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the General Accounting Office, for the purpose of considering the relationships between the Corporation and the General Accounting Office. This committee has come forth with a recommendation that provides legislation authorizing and directing the audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions. This legislation is mutually acceptable to and supported by both the Commodity Credit Corporation and the General Accounting Office, and, in our judgment, it will provide the means by which our capital fund transactions may receive the review necessary to assure the satisfaction requisite to the expenditures of Federal moneys without requiring detailed audit and examination of each of the millions of documents handled by the Corporation.

Attached is a copy of a letter to Chairman STEAGALL, of the House Banking and Currency Committee, with respect to this provision:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, June 3, 1943.

Hon. HENRY B. STEAGALL,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I learned this morning that the hearings on H. R. 2725, entitled "A bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and to provide for an audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation, and for other purposes," had been concluded and the committee had ordered the bill to be reported with amendments and that the provisions of section 3 of the proposed bill having to do with the audit by the General Accounting Office of the financial transactions of the Corporation had been stricken out.

I have discussed the matter with Mr. J. B. Hutson, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and have been assured by him that both he and the Department of Agriculture are heartily in favor of this audit provision in the bill.

As a matter of fact, the audit provisions of this bill were drafted by representatives of this office, under my personal supervision, in cooperation with representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation. This section of the bill has my full approval and in discussing the matter with Congressman WOLCOTT today I have so advised him.

I am convinced that the audit by this office of the fiscal transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation will be in the best interests of the Government, and in this connection I may advise you that arrangements are already under way with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and Reconstruction Finance Corporation looking to the proposing of legislation for the audit of their accounts and those of other comparable Government corporations which will follow the general plan or pattern of the provisions for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I would have written you sooner, but I had been informed that representatives of the Department of Agriculture would advise the committee that the audit provisions in question had been agreed upon by them and by this office and I understood that we would be given an opportunity to be heard in case the committee was doubtful about any of such audit provisions in the bill.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

STATEMENT RE CHANGE IN BASIS FOR APPRAISAL OF ASSETS OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The annual appraisal of the assets of Commodity Credit Corporation was first provided for in Public Law No. 442, Seventy-fifth Congress, which was approved March 8, 1938. This legislation provided that the "value of the assets shall, insofar as possible be determined on the basis of the market price at the time of the appraisal." It was provided that the annual appraisal should be as of March 31 of each year, with the thought in mind that this would allow sufficient time for the payment to be made by Commodity Credit Corporation or to be received from the Treasury before the close of the current fiscal year.

In Public Law 147, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved July 1, 1941, the language relative to the appraisal was changed to read "on the basis of cost, including not more than 1 year of carrying charges, of such assets to the Corporation or the average market prices of such assets for a period of 12 months ending with March 31 of each year, whichever is less." The appraisal on this basis is rather difficult to make since it involves computation of average price for the preceding year on a large number of commodities and it involves the calculation of the original cost to the Corporation of the commodities plus 1 year's carrying charges. While this information can be obtained from our records, it can be obtained only with a great amount of work.

It disturbed me somewhat that appraisal last year of our assets as of March 31 was not completed by the Treasury Department until some time in late August or early September. Under the proposed method the assets would be appraised at the lower of cost or market value during the preceding month. Under this method the appraisal can be determined much more readily from the books of the Corporation than is the case under the present method of appraisal. I believe that representatives of the Treasury Department informally brought to our attention that a saving in both the time required for and the cost of the appraisal could be made by having the basis of the appraisal changed slightly.

EXPLANATION OF STATEMENTS RELATING TO ADDITIONAL BORROWING POWER REQUIREMENTS OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

This statement is a summary of the estimated position of the Corporation at June 30, 1943, and the estimated requirements for new commitments to be made during the fiscal year 1944. At June 30, 1943, we will have in use all but $465,250,000 of our total resources, without providing for the 1943 wheat program. Loan and purchase operations scheduled for the 1944 fiscal year are estimated at $2,059,165,000, leaving a difference of $1,593,915,000. It is estimated that about $620,000,000 will be available from collections of sales proceeds and repayment of loans before it is necessary to make all commitments for loans and purchases. It will be observed that commitments must be made prior to the harvesting season, during the months of July and August, and collections with respect to these commitments will not, of course, be realized until several months thereafter. Giving effect to the collections which will be made during July and August of this year, our total investment and obligation requirements will reach a peak in August 1943 of $3,722,015,000. To meet these requirements the Corporation will need total resources of $3,750,000,000, which will require an increase of $1,000,000,000 in the authorized borrowing power. The total collections for the 12 months of the fiscal year 1944 are estimated at $1,449,653,000, so that by the close of the fiscal year the total investment and obligations will be $2,894,263,000. It will be noted that this is an increase of only $609,512,000 over the investment and obligations at June 30, 1943. It is necessary, however, to have borrowing authority in excess of this net increase, since funds must be available when commitments are made. Without the increased borrowing authority the Corporation will not be in a financial position to make commitments with respect to crops harvested this season, and the absence of such programs would seriously hamper the food production program.

United States Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation—Summary statement of resources, investment, and requirements for fiscal years 1943 and 1944

RESOURCES

Authorized borrowing power	$2,650,000,000
Paid-in capital	100,000,000
Total resources	2,750,000,000

INVESTMENTS AND OUTSTANDING OBLIGATIONS, JUNE 30, 1943

Commodities owned by Commodity Credit Corporation	$1,145,900,000
Commodity loans held by Commodity Credit Corporation	174,500,000
Loans held by banks	242,800,000
Obligated for current commitments	721,550,000
Total	2,284,750,000
Amount available for new commitments June 30, 1943	465,250,000

REQUIREMENTS FOR LOAN AND PURCHASE PROGRAMS DURING THE FISCAL YEAR 1944 (JULY 1, 1943–JUNE 30, 1944)

Corn	$50,000,000
Cotton	250,000,000
Wheat	400,000,000
Rice	21,000,000
Tobacco	115,000,000
Barley and rye	22,000,000
Flaxseed	34,000,000
Hemp	40,000,000
Naval stores	15,000,000
Miscellaneous agricultural supplies	90,415,000
Oilseeds and products	400,000,000
Foreign commodities	492,500,000
Dry peas and beans	50,000,000
Sugar beets	24,000,000
Pecans	5,000,000
American-Egyptian cotton planting seed	250,000
Loans to Agricultural Adjustment Agency	50,000,000
Total	2,059,165,000
Total additional commitment requirements	1,593,915,000
Amount of requirements to be covered by collections	621,900,000
Net amount of additional borrowing power required	972,015,000

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. WAGNER (by request) introduced Senate bill 1163, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 1164. A bill for the relief of Lucille Sleet; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1165. A bill to increase the period of limitation on actions against railroad carriers for recovery of overcharges from 2 to 4 years; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PREPARATION OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR POST-WAR CONSTRUCTION IN TOWNS AND CITIES

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce—by request—a bill for reference to the Committee on Banking and Currency and also request that an explanatory statement by me in connection therewith be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred as requested and the statement presented by the Senator from New York will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1163) to encourage the development of good neighborhood conditions in towns and cities by private enterprise with the collaboration of public enterprise; to provide credit for the assembly of land in deteriorated urban areas for subsequent reconveyance by sale or by lease for development and redevelopment by private enterprise and by public improvement; to encourage the widest possible extent of home ownership; to provide financial assistance to towns or cities, or appropriate instrumentalities thereof, for the purchase, assembly, and clearance of land in the interest of public safety, health, comfort, and welfare as a necessary preliminary to the development of good neighborhood conditions; to stimulate a great and continuing volume of economic activity and employment in the post-war period; to provide grants for metropolitan development plans, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WAGNER (by request) was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. WAGNER in connection with the bill is as follows:

I am introducing, at the request of the Urban Land Institute, a bill which deals with a vital problem closely related to legislation I have advocated in the past. This bill provides a method whereby the Federal Government can assist States and localities, in assembling large tracts of land as a necessary preparatory step toward the sale or lease of such land for development or redevelopment. This is primarily a private-enterprise bill, in the sense that it recognizes that most of the development and redevelopment will be by private enterprise. It recognizes, however, that some cooperative or supplementary public enterprise will be necessary to make the program comprehensive.

This is not a post-war bill. The problem with which it deals must be met forthrightly before the war is over, in order that industry and finance, as well as State and local governments, may be prepared and ready to act when the war is over.

Certain initial Federal expenditures are required to get this program started. But it is not a public-works bill, it is not a relief bill, and it is not primarily a bill for public spending. It might be called rather an encouragement-to-enterprise bill. It is designed in order that the Federal Government may make those types of expenditures which are an essential part of tremendous programs of private investment and private development. It is not a pump-priming bill, but rather an industry and Government cooperation bill.

This bill deals with problems facing not only those interested from all points of view in the development of real estate in established communities, large and small, but also those interested in large-scale financing and in investments which are going bad because of decay and blight. It is thus a problem close to municipalities and taxing units, large and small.

As I have said, I am introducing this bill by request. I do not believe that it is a perfect measure, but rather one which requires a great deal of additional and intensive study. The bill, I hope, will afford this opportunity for study and discussion throughout the country. It is likely that revisions will be suggested before enactment.

Before enactment also, it will be necessary to get the experience and views of Government agencies which have dealt with similar problems, particularly the National Housing Agency. This bill relates the proposed program to the program of the National Housing Agency because, while land has many uses, the major use of land in established communities is for residential purposes. The problems of the land cannot be separated from the problems of the people living on the land. It is also true that the largest single opportunity for private industry expansion after the war is in the field of residential construction. Furthermore, the agencies of the Government which have the machinery for encouraging private-home financing are located within the National Housing Agency. Fortunately, in my judgment, the bill does not propose to establish still another governmental agency.

I have asked that the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, because that committee has dealt with practically all measures directed toward the encouragement and stimulation of private industry in the field of home building, and also because consideration of the bill will involve problems of finance and credit, and quite likely banking and insurance, intimately related to the general work of the Banking and Currency Committee.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2481), making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Page 18, line 10, after the word "Columbia", insert "including the salary of the Chief of Bureau at $10,000 per annum,".

Amendment No. 2: Page 19, line 21, after the word "Administrator", insert ", including the salary of the Administrator at $9,200 per annum,".

Amendment No. 3: Page 59, line 22, after the figure, insert ", of which not to exceed $30,000 may be expended for the purchase of land adjacent to the present site of the Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, Wis."

Amendment No. 4: Page 61, line 16, under the caption "Forest Fire Cooperation", and following the words "District of Columbia", insert ": *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize expenditures not to exceed $2,300,000 from this appropriation for preventing and suppressing forest fires on critical areas of national importance without requiring an equal expenditure by the State and private owners."

Amendment No. 5: Page 65, after line 8, insert:

"WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the War Food Administration to perform its functions, including those prescribed by Executive Orders 9280, 9322, 9328, and 9334, independently or in cooperation (by transfer of funds or otherwise) with public and private agencies and individuals, including not to exceed $10,000 per annum for an Administrator; other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; printing and binding; the purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; the purchase, operation, and maintenance (including two in the District of Columbia) of passenger-carrying vehicles; $25,000,000: *Provided*, That transfers of funds to other offices or administrative units in the Department with respect to which transfers of funds are otherwise authorized in this act shall be in addition to, and subject to the same restrictions as, the amounts provided therefor in the Budget schedules.

Amendment No. 6: Page 70, line 11, after the words "this item", insert ": *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1943, 1944, and 1945

programs under said act of February 29, 1936, as amended; for the reimbursement of any Federal, State, or local government agency for fertilizers, seeds, lime, trees, or other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, furnished by such agency; and for the payment of all expenses necessary in making such grants, including all or part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof."

Amendment No. 7: Page 70, line 11, after the words "this item", insert ": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1943 carry out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who comply with the terms and conditions of the 1943 agricultural conservation program, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments, or to retain payments heretofore made, for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers."

Amendment No. 8: Page 75, line 23, after the word "Service", insert "and for sale and distribution to other Government activities, the cost of such supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (including the cost of transportation and handling) to be reimbursed to appropriations current at the time additional supplies, materials, or equipment are procured from the appropriations chargeable with the cost or value of such supplies, materials, or equipment."

Amendment No. 9: Page 78, after line 12, insert—

"EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes", approved August 24, 1935, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, funds appropriated by or for the purposes of section 32 of said act shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the maintenance, expansion, and operation of a school milk and lunch program under clause (2) of said section 32: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available for such purposes during the fiscal year 1944 without regard to the requirement therein relating to the encouragement of domestic consumption."

Amendment No. 10: Page 78, after line 12, insert the following:

"CONSUMERS' COUNSEL DIVISION

"ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

"Not to exceed $150,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation made by section 12 (a), title I, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612), shall be available during the fiscal year 1944 to enable the Secretary to further perform the duty imposed upon him under applicable laws to protect the interests of consumers with due regard to the maintenance of a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities adequate to meet consumer demand at prices fair to both producers and consumers, which sum shall be available for administrative expenses (including not to exceed $31,800 for printing and binding) in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of the aforesaid section 392, but without regard to the limitations prescribed in subsection (b) thereof."

Amendment No. 11: Page 83, line 17, after the figure "$378,140", insert ": *Provided*, That the Secretary may require reasonable bonds from every market agency and dealer, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to secure the performance of their obligations, and whenever, after due notice and hearing, the Secretary finds any registrant is insolvent or has violated any provisions of said act he may issue an order suspending such registrant for a reasonable specified period. Such order of suspension shall take effect within not less than 5 days, unless suspended or modified or set aside by the Secretary or a court of competent jurisdiction."

Amendment No. 12: Page 85, after line 5, insert:

"Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5, and for the purchase of property and costs and expenses incurred in connection therewith in accordance with section 7 of the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), $30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said act and shall be considered as made available thereunder, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized under said section 3 (a) and without regard to the limitation in respect of time contained in section 3 (e) of said act; and the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof."

Amendment No. 13: Page 88, line 16, after the words "Farm Credit Administration" and before the semicolon insert ": *Provided*, That the requirement (12 U. S. C. 952) that Federal land banks and joint stock land banks shall be examined at least twice each year is hereby modified so that such examinations need be made only once each year: *Provided further*, That the expenses and salaries of employees engaged in such examinations shall be assessed against the said corporations, banks, or institutions in accordance with the provisions of existing laws except that the amounts collected from the Federal land banks, joint stock land banks, and Federal intermediate credit banks pursuant to the act of July 17, 1916, as amended (12 U. S. C. 657) shall be covered into the Treasury and credited to a special fund, and the Administration shall estimate the cost to the Farm Credit Administration of the administrative supervision of the Federal land banks, the banks for cooperatives, the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the production credit corporations for the fiscal year 1944 and shall apportion the amount so determined among such banks and corporations on such equitable basis as said Administration shall determine, and shall assess and collect such amounts in advance from such banks and corporations and the amount so collected shall be covered into the Treasury and credited to said special fund, which fund is hereby made available to said Administration for expenditure for the purposes set forth in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That as soon as practicable after June 30, 1944, said Administration shall determine, on a fair and reasonable basis, (1) the cost of the examination services rendered during the fiscal year 1944 to each Federal land bank, joint stock land bank, and Federal intermediate credit bank and (2) the amount which fairly and equitably should be allocated to each Federal land bank, bank for cooperatives, Federal intermediate credit bank, and production credit corporation as the cost during the fiscal year 1944 of their administrative supervision, and if the sum of these two items in any case is greater than the total amount collected from the bank or the corporation concerned, the difference shall be collected from such bank or corporation or, if less, shall be refunded from said special fund to the bank or the corporation entitled thereto;".

Mr. RUSSELL also submitted sundry amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2481, the agricultural appropriation bill, 1944, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of the amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 54, line 3, after the words "Chief Forester", insert "at $9,500 per annum."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2481, the agricultural appropriation bill, 1944, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted the following notices in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 2, line 7, after the word "elsewhere", insert "including the salary of the Assistant Secretary which hereafter shall be at the rate of $9,500 per annum."

Mr. BANKHEAD also submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 68, line 14, after the word "inclusive", insert the following: ": *Provided*, That for the purposes of any law, order, or regulation relating to establishing, maintaining, or adjusting maximum prices for agricultural commodities or for commodities processed in whole or substantial part from agricultural commodities, the payments made out of funds appropriated under this item shall not be considered as a part of the prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities or otherwise taken into account."

Mr. BANKHEAD also submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2481, the agricultural appropriation bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of the amendments referred to, see the two foregoing notices.)

INVESTIGATION RELATING TO SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF HYDROELECTRIC POWER

Mr. McFARLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 155), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to (1) the adequacy of the supply of hydroelectric power generated in Government plants, (2) whether such supply is properly allocated and distributed for war purposes and civilian uses (3) whether the distribution of such supply is made under proper conditions and safeguards, (4) the relation between the generation of hydroelectric power at Government plants and irrigation and (5) whether plans for future development of Government hydroelectric plants provide for full utilization of such facilities for both development of electric power and providing water for irrigation. The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation together with its recommendations, if any, for legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INSPECTION OF NAVAL ESTABLISHMENTS IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE BY COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WALSH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 156), which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs or any subcommittee thereof duly appointed by the chairman of the committee, is hereby authorized to visit, for the purposes of inspection, during the present Congress, any part of the Naval Establishment in the Western Hemisphere, the expenses incurred in pursuance thereof, not to exceed $4,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate. The members of such committee or subcommittee shall be paid the actual expenses of transportation incurred by them for travel performed under the provisions of this resolution and a per diem allowance of not more than $8 for such time as they may spend away from their official residences or Washington, D. C., while performing travel authorized by this resolution.

THE NEW PACIFIC—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH BEFORE GEORGIA BAR ASSOCIATION

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah before the annual meeting of the Georgia Bar Association, at Atlanta, Ga., on Wednesday, June 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED ANTI-POLL-TAX LEGISLATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the question of proposed antipoll-tax legislation, delivered by Senator LUCAS on the Radio Forum of the Washington Evening Star on June 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

JEFFERSON DAVIS MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR EASTLAND

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered in Statuary Hall, by Senator EASTLAND on Jefferson Davis Memorial Day, June 3, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREEDOMS OF MEANING—BROADCAST BY FULTON LEWIS, JR.

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio broadcast, entitled "Freedoms of Meaning," made by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on June 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXERCISES AND ADDRESSES AT THE DEDICATION OF RABBI JACOB JOSEPH SCHOOL IN NEW YORK

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from speeches delivered in New York on May 23, 1943, at the dedication of the Rabbi Jacob Joseph School, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE POLL-TAX ISSUE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Poll-Tax Issue," by Senator ELLENDER, on the National Radio Forum, June 2, 1943, broadcast over the Blue Network, the broadcast originating at station WMAL in Washington, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, beginning on page 2, line 4.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, yesterday the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] made an elaborate presentation of the bill and of the report of the committee. I have before me a copy of the minutes of the committee, which show that the committee reported the bill by a vote of 10 to 4. As some question was raised about that yesterday, I asked for a copy of the record, and it is before me.

The Committee on the Judiciary, in reporting the bill, filed a very elaborate report in its favor. The committee calls attention to the fact that the bill sets out the duties of the Senate under the constitutional provision which I shall now read:

> The President * * * shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint * * * all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

The purpose of the proposed law is to carry out the mandate of that constitutional provision. I wish to say at the very outset that I am not complaining about appointments in my own State; I am entirely satisfied with the appointments made in Tennessee. I have found, however, that nearly 30,000 Government officials drawing more than $4,500 a year are appointed in a way which I might describe as being appointed by Tom, Dick, and Harry. They are not appointed by the President; they are not appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; they are not appointed by the head of any department; they are not appointed by the courts of law. I doubt if there is a Senator now present who can say how many of the appointments in his own State are actually made.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I noted with much interest the Senator's comment with respect to appointments made by Tom, Dick, and Harry. I wondered whether the Senator meant to accent the "Harry" by any manner of means?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; when I spoke of Tom, Dick, and Harry, I used a very general term and one commonly used. I did not mean to refer to any particular Harry, or to any particular Tom, or to any particular Dick. I will not do that. I wish to call attention to the fact, however, that there is a provision of our Constitution which requires the Senate to take part in the appointment of officers, either by legislation or by confirmation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to have a statement from the Senator as to who the Tom's, Dick's, and Harry's are who make the appointments? Who have this power at the present time?

Mr. McKELLAR. Heaven only knows! I intended to bring that matter up a little later, but I shall do so now. I will take one independent office as an illustration, the Board of Economic Warfare. Out of a total of 2,620 employees in the Board of Economic Warfare, 480 receive over $4,500 a year, and they are paid a gross amount of $2,689,000 a year. No congressional appropriation has ever been made for the payment of a single person employed in the B. E. W. The Senate Appropriations Committee, of which I happen to be temporarily the head, has never appropriated any money for the B. E. W. The Board of Economic Warfare has spent a great deal of money, and I shall refer to that later. I think what I have said answers the question asked by the junior Senator from Michigan.

The Board of Economic Warfare is composed of the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the

Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce and three or four other Cabinet officers, as I recall, and a Mr. Milo Perkins. Mr. Jesse Jones testified a day or two ago before the so-called Economy Committee, that Mr. Milo Perkins absolutely ran the entire establishment of 2,620 employees; that his word was law, even over him, Mr. Jesse Jones and that he had received a directive from Mr. Perkins to furnish the money to pay all these employees. That is true notwithstanding the provision of the Constitution with which we are all familiar. Of course, the Constitution is out of date. That instrument seems to have been nullified in whole or in part. I wish to read from it so that our memories may be refreshed. There are some inhibitions contained in the Constitution, and this is one of them:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

Yet a day or two ago Mr. Jones, one of my best friends, a man whom I admire, respect, and honor, told me that every few days he received a directive to appropriate money for certain objects, and he appropriated the money for them. I asked him how much he had appropriated, and he told me the amount. It was an immense sum. I asked him why it was necessary for the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses to spend their time appropriating money when all an officer of the Government had to do was to go to him with a directive addressed to him and receive all the money he wanted. He said the Congress had given him that right. I said to him, "All you need is an unlimited right of spending money and it will not be necessary for the Congress to go through the procedure of making appropriations at all." He said that if he were given that unlimited right it would not be necessary for Congress to make appropriations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. How will the bill as reported by the committee change the present situation?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am happy to discuss that point right now. The Senator may be acquainted with the War Manpower Commission. That is an agency with respect to which an amendment was adopted by the Senate last year which was in line with this bill. By that amendment it is provided that the members of the War Manpower Commission and all officials of that Commission receiving more than $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The result is that all the appointments the War Manpower Commission has made in the various States have come before the Senate for confirmation. So far as I know the appointments have been very excellent ones, at least those for my State have been. For the most part I think those for all other States have been satisfactory. Strange as it may seem to some Members of the Senate who have forgotten the Constitution, a Senator represents the State from which he comes; and, as a matter of fact, he has something to say about the character, the kind, the abilities, and the qualifications of appointees who come from his State. When such a provision is in the law we obtain better employees. The agencies of government do not send to the Senate for confirmation the nominations of Tom, Dick, or Harry. They send to the Senate for confirmation the nominations of persons whom they know have the qualifications. That is the constitutional way of making appointments.

I am sure the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], learned and able lawyer as he is, with the fine character and reputation with which he came to the Senate, respects the Constitution of the United States. I need not ask him whether he does; I would not ask him such a question because I know he does. It is utterly astounding to me to find Senators who are great lawyers and who are familiar with the Constitution opposing a bill which simply requires that officials shall be appointed in consonance with the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I simply want to say to the Senator from Tennessee that I think we differ only as to the means of arriving at the answer to the question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the difference is no greater than that.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Tennessee desires to use the figure $4,500 as the test of whether a man is a policy-making official. I think the Senate can place in the bill the definition of a policy-making official and can do a good service, rather than simply to use as the test the amount of salary a man receives. We may say that the Office of Price Administration recently tried to determine the ability of a person by the number of drawers he had in his desk. [Laughter.] The Senator from Tennessee would not want to use such a means of arriving at the answer to the question.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Tennessee not only would not want to do it, but, frankly, he would not do it. There is one thing about the Senator from Tennessee, regardless of whatever else may be said about him: He has views, and he is willing to stand by them; and that is not one of his views.

Mr. President, at this time I call attention to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. As I understand the situation, the principal difference is that the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming would apply only to policy-making officials. It is confined to them. The difference between the O'Mahoney amendment and the bill I have proposed is that the O'Mahoney amendment would apply to policy-making officials, and would leave to the bureaus of the Government the determination of who is a policy-making official and who is not.

In that connection, I desire to read some testimony bearing on the question of who is a policy-making official. However, first I can illustrate the meaning of the O'Mahoney amendment. Let me say that in making the illustration I mean no reflection of any kind; because there is no Member of the Senate whom I admire more than I do the Senator from Wyoming. He serves on my committee, and we are the greatest friends, and I am his admirer in every way. But, Mr. President, if we adopt the amendment which the Senator from Wyoming has offered, we shall be in a situation similar to that of the colored boy and the fish, down on the Mississippi River, not long ago. The colored boy went to the river and caught a fish. He knew beforehand he was going to catch one, because there were plenty of fish there, and he had already built a fire over which to cook it. So he dropped his line in the river and caught a catfish about a foot and a half long—a fine catfish, just large enough for a good meal for one man. He took the fish off the hook, washed it in the water, and then took out his knife to clear out the refuse. As he did, the fish struggled and shook and fought, almost like a tiger. Its tail went first one way and then the other, so fast that the Negro boy could hardly see it. So he said, "Look here, fish, what are you so excited about? I ain't goin' to do nothing but gut you."

I feel much the same way about the O'Mahoney amendment. The O'Mahoney amendment, in the nicest, clearest, smoothest, most adroit way, would simply cut the life out of the bill. Why? Because it would leave with the officials themselves the right of determining who is a policy maker. That is why I object very strenuously to it.

If I can find the testimony showing who is a policy maker I shall do so at once. I shall read from the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am not a member of that committee, but I have the hearings before me. The committee was holding hearings on a proposal to increase the borrowing authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in order to take care of the Board of Economic Warfare. The hearings were held on December 2 and 8, 1942. Mr. Jones testified first, and gave some very interesting testimony relative to the very question about which we are talking. I shall read a little of Mr. Jones' testimony so that we can find out who a policy-making official is. I read first a question by Senator TOBEY, who I am sorry is not in the Chamber at this moment:

> Senator TOBEY. Is any member of your organization on the board of directors of the Board of Economic Warfare?
>
> Mr. JONES. I am on the Board.
>
> Senator TOBEY. Could you give us a brief statement of how the Board of Economic Warfare functions, what is their job?
>
> Mr. JONES. All of the powers of the Board may be exercised by its chairman, Vice President WALLACE, or by the executive director of the Board, Milo Perkins, or such other

officials or employees as the chairman may designate. So, if we in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have a directive, as we do every day or so, to do something, we must either do it or persuade the Board of Economic Warfare representatives that maybe something else would be better.

Senator TOBEY. But Jesse Jones is the head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the lending agency of the Government, and as a director of the Board of Economic Warfare, he knows both sides always, I take it. He is consulted as a member of the Board of Economic Warfare before such a request comes forward.

Mr. JONES. No.

Senator TOBEY. What is the job of that Board?

Mr. JONES. The Board meets occasionally, but few things are submitted for discussion or a vote.

The Board of Economic Warfare was not created by the Congress.

Senator TOBEY. You are told what has been done.

Mr. JONES. We know at Reconstruction Finance Corporation what has been done because we get a directive. Probably the other directors do not all know about it. The Board of Economic Warfare is largely operated, as I say, by Milo Perkins and his assistants.

Senator TOBEY. Then Milo Perkins is what we might call a one-man band. Whatever he sees fit to do he does; he goes ahead and makes requisition on you for the money that may be necessary.

Mr. JONES. That is about correct. We try to cooperate and do the work as smoothly as possible and do it in as businesslike a way as we can.

Senator TOBEY. Who are the other members on the Board?

Mr. JONES. The Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and the Director of Lend-Lease.

Senator TOBEY. They are really a part of the window dressing. These gentlemen do not take an active part in the direction of the Board of Economic Warfare, do they?

Mr. JONES. They do not know much about it, probably.

Senator TOBEY. In other words, the Board of Economic Warfare is Milo Perkins and he might be said to be the Board.

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir; in the daily operations.

Senator TOBEY. And he contacts you, and in the last analysis all that you can do is to furnish the money.

Mr. JONES. Unless we think it is not right. Then we talk about it.

Senator TOBEY. But you cannot stop the giving of the money.

Mr. JONES. No.

Senator TOBEY. Have there been many cases that you thought were not right?

Mr. JONES. A few.

Senator TOBEY. As to such cases did they cooperate with you, or did they have their own way?

Mr. JONES. We managed to reach an agreement. Probably the difficulty is that some member of their organization will be negotiating or considering something for a good many weeks that we do not know anything about, and when presented to us——

Senator TOBEY (interposing). It is fait accompli.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

From that testimony one might suppose that Mr. Milo Perkins is a policy-making official; but he is not. I read from the testimony of Mr. Perkins in the same hearing, on page 75:

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Jones sent to me a copy of his testimony before this committee. I have seen him since then, and talked to him twice on the phone since then. I am sorry, as I told him this morning, that he could not be here today. He has a severe cold.

I want to begin by making clear what Mr. Jones himself has said. On March 21, 1942, in a statement which he made public, he said this:

"When the President, the War Production Board, the Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission, or the Board of Economic Warfare, establishes the need for plant facilities, materials, or supplies, for which no other provision is made, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, when requested to do so, undertakes to provide them. In this way it serves those responsible for war-production policies. It does not make policy."

Then, again on November 30, he said: "Neither the Reconstruction Finance Corporation nor I determine policy."

Jesse Jones is not a policy-making official. Milo Perkins is not a policy-making official, although Mr. Jones testified that he has absolute control of that particular activity.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 2 of the O'Mahoney substitute, in line 12, under subsection (a) of section 2, we find the following language:

(a) The heads, assistant heads, and head attorneys of the several departments and agencies of the Government (including members of the boards of directors and officers of Government-owned corporations).

That certainly would include Mr. Jones and Mr. Perkins, would it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. It probably would. It is possible.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is more than possible, is it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is possible that they might concede that they are policy-making individuals. I assume they would concede it. I think Jesse Jones would admit that he is a policy-making individual, although he says, in the testimony which I have read, that he is not. I think that probably the question would not be raised; but when we leave it to the heads of bureaus——

Mr. FERGUSON. Would not the heads of bureaus be covered by that language?

Mr. McKELLAR. Within the bureaus, they might be considered policy-making officials.

Mr. President, the Senate is abrogating its powers and duties. I do not care so much about the powers, but in my judgment it is abrogating its duties.

In the Office of the Alien Property Custodian, which still has custody of property seized during the First World War, there are a total of 929 employees, and 213 of them receive more than $4,500 a year. We pay them a total of $1,192,800 a year, and no Senator knows who appoints them. They are appointed by some Tom, Dick, or Harry, but no Senator knows who appoints them. Can any Senator tell me who appoints the employees of the Office of Alien Property Custodian?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I have been concerned over reports as to the number of aliens employed by our Government. Does the Senator know whether or not any aliens are employed in this particular department?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know. I could not tell the Senator.

I come next to the War Production Board, which has 20,200 employees. Three thousand four hundred and six of them receive more than $4,500 a year, at a cost of $19,075,000. Can any Senator tell me who appoints the employees of the War Production Board? I am sure I do not know. I could not name a man in the War Production Board.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Does the Senator believe that every person employed in the War Production Board in this emergency ought to come before the Senate for confirmation?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly not. I have never made any such contention. However, I believe that every employee who receives $4,500 a year or more should come before the Senate for confirmation. In this time of war, when we need every dollar we can obtain to win the war, when the employees of that agency are receiving $19,075,000 a year, someone ought to know who the appointees are.

I come next to the Office for Emergency Management, which has 16,000 employees. Sixteen hundred and one of them, or one-tenth of them, receive more than $4,500 a year. The amount paid to the 1,601 employees is $8,905,000. The President does not appoint those employees; the heads of departments do not appoint them; the courts do not appoint them; they are not appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The result is that no Senator knows who appoints them. We are paying out vast sums, and no Senator can say who appoints the employees.

Let me pass to the next one. I am taking only the high lights. The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has had this information compiled from the records. He is chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and these figures are taken from the records.

We come next to the Office of Price Administration. We have heard of that organization. Probably there is not a Senator who has not received letters from his constituents in the past few days about the O. P. A. I have received dozens of such letters. In the O. P. A. there are 34,000 employees, in round numbers. Two thousand and nineteen of them receive more than $4,500 a year, and the Government pays them a total of $11,306,000.

Who appoints those employees? They are not appointed in the constitutional

way; they are not appointed by the President; they are not appointed by the courts; they are not appointed by the heads of departments; they are certainly not appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Yet they receive in salaries $11,306,000 of the people's money. It seems to me that the Senate should exercise the authority given to it in the Constitution. We took an oath to do so.

I come next to the State Department. There are 668 members of that Department who receive yearly salaries of more than $4,500.

There are 2,428 in the Treasury. There are 3,385 in the War Department. There are 1,006 in the Department of Justice. There are only 298 in the Post Office Department. The Post Office Department seems to be complying pretty well with the law and the Constitution.

There are 836 in the Navy Department.

In the Interior Department there are 1,098 employees who are receiving approximately $4,000,000.

The employees to whom I have referred may be appointed by the heads of departments. I do not know. I doubt if they are. I doubt if the heads of the departments ever have anything to do with it. They are appointed by Tom, Dick, and Harry.

I now come to the Alley Dwelling Authority. Some of the members of the Appropriations Committee are present, and they will verify what I am about to say.

Last year Congress appropriated $12,000 for the Alley Dwelling Authority. It had been receiving quite a large sum of money. My recollection is that a Budget estimate of $12,000 was submitted this year, and $12,000 more was allowed for the Alley Dwelling Authority.

There are 8 employees in the Alley Dwelling Authority who are receiving more than $4,500 a year in salary. Think of it! We appropriate $12,000 for the Alley Dwelling Authority, and it has 242 employees. Those 8 receive $44,800 out of an appropriation of $12,000 made by the Congress.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Is there a Senator who approves of that? Here are the figures with reference to the Alley Dwelling Authority.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. Just a moment.

The Alley Dwelling Authority receives an appropriation from the Congress of $12,000 and it has 8 men on its rolls receiving $44,800. I do not know how much the others on the rolls receive. They receive less than $4,500. However, according to that, I am just wondering where in the name of heaven the Alley Dwelling Authority gets $44,800 to pay the 8 men receiving over $4,500 each in salary, when Congress appropriates only $12,000.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Tennessee has practically answered the question I was about to ask. He asked if any Senator approved the situation to which he referred.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. I was unable to decide whether I approved it or not without knowing how it was done. How does an agency for which Congress appropriates only $12,000 pay $44,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot answer the Senator. I do not know.

Mr. DANAHER. Has the Senator inquired into that matter?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a species of financial legerdemain which I cannot understand.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator contend that the pending bill would remedy that situation?

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed it would.

Mr. FERGUSON. In what way?

Mr. McKELLAR. The nominations of the employees would have to come before the Senate for confirmation, and in the light of the statement which I have just read from this record, I do not think any Senator would vote to confirm the appointment of eight men to receive $44,800 from an appropriation of $12,000.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Could not that situation be reached through appropriation bills?

Mr. McKELLAR. It might be. We have tried to reach it. Previously the Alley Dwelling Authority had received a great deal of money. I offered an amendment—for which I believe the Senator from Massachusetts voted—reducing the amount for the entire agency to $12,000.

That agency is engaged in some other kind of war work and receives its appropriations from Mr. Jones or some other source. It receives it in some way.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REED. This is my first year as a member of the Appropriations Committee, but I remember very well the incident to which the Senator from Tennessee has referred. It occurred early in our work this year. May I refresh the recollection of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I should be very glad to have the Senator from Kansas do so.

Mr. REED. As I recall, there was discussion in the committee to the effect that there had been an intention to abolish the Alley Dwelling Authority.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. REED. Last year the Appropriations Committee of the Senate believed it had succeeded in doing so, and wonderment was expressed as to how the Alley Dwelling Authority had managed to survive. Twelve thousand dollars had been appropriated for it, which was an insignificant amount compared with what the Alley Dwelling Authority had previously spent. That was one of the reasons why the Appropriations Committee carefully inquired into the matter in the course of handling the independent offices bill. These additional expenditures, which are not definitely located anywhere, were apparently made from an emergency fund given to the President.

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot enlighten the Senator as to the source from which the money came or how it was paid, but I feel that when the Constitution imposes upon the Senate of the United States the duty of inquiring into the qualifications of officers to ascertain whether they are doing their duty properly and gives to the Senate the right of confirmation we ought to carry out that provision of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I next come to the Civil Service Commission, which has 232 employees drawing more than $4,500. They are not appointed by the President, not confirmed by the Senate, not appointed by the courts, and not appointed by the heads of departments, as the Constitution requires. That is 232 employees out of 7,626.

The next department of importance is the Federal Security Agency, with 969 employees receiving yearly salaries of over $4,500, amounting to a total of $5,436,000 a year. They are appointed by Tom, Dick, and Harry. We do not know who appointed them.

I come next to the Federal Works Agency, with 679 employees receiving yearly salaries of more than $4,500, with a yearly pay roll of $3,802,400. Who in the world knows who appoints the employees of the Federal Works Agency? Does any Senator know? If he does, I should like to have him inform me.

I next come to the Interstate Commerce Commission, an old and fine commission. It has 333 employees receiving more than $4,500 a year, with a pay roll of $1,864,000. They are not appointed by the constitutional agencies. The commissions are not departments, as has been held time and again. The courts have held that commissions and independent agencies are not departments within the terms of the Constitution.

The Maritime Commission has 297 employees each receiving more than $4,500 a year and a pay roll of $1,663,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing employees receiving over $4,500, number of employees, and estimated annual salaries, or both, based on figures for the month of October 1942.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPENDIX III.—*Employees receiving $4,500, number of employees, and estimated annual salaries, or both, based on figures for the month of October 1942*

Agency	Classified employees receiving over $4,500 in executive branch	Total employees in executive branch (Civil Service figures)	Estimated total salaries of employees in executive branch receiving over $4,500	Total salaries of all employees in executive branch for October 1942
Executive Office of the President:				
Executive staff	----------	857	----------	$227,282
Maintenance force	----------	62	----------	7,644
War establishments:				
Office for Emergency Management:				
Alien Property Custodian	213	839	$1,192,800	119,101
War Production Board	3,406	20,200	19,073,600	4,482,697
War Shipping Administration	103	1,117	576,800	205,662
All other Office for Emergency Management	1,601	16,824	8,965,600	3,024,643
Office of Censorship	61	12,058	341,600	1,673,882
Office of Price Administration	2,019	34,197	11,306,400	4,929,846
Office of Strategic Services	79	1,050	442,400	197,907
Board of Economic Warfare	480	2,620	2,689,000	564,850
Selective Service System	19	27,309	106,400	2,789,334
Executive departments:				
State	668	7,725	3,740,800	1,540,341
Treasury	2,428	69,837	13,496,800	12,316,518
War	3,385	1,178,903	18,956,000	166,630,554
Justice	1,606	30,057	8,993,600	5,683,565
Post Office	296	315,627	1,657,600	55,825,423
Navy	836	531,141	4,793,600	115,044,440
Interior	1,098	44,954	6,148,800	7,176,513
Agriculture	----------	76,804	----------	12,632,551
Commerce	884	25,503	4,950,400	4,453,015
Labor	304	5,146	1,702,400	929,451
Independent establishments:				
Alley Dwelling Authority	8	242	44,800	39,179
American Battle Monuments Commission	----------	5	----------	817
Bituminous Coal Consumers Counsel	12	44	67,200	12,059
Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System	----------	448	----------	113,591
Board of Investigation and Research	32	158	179,200	38,976
Civil Service Commission	232	7,626	1,299,200	1,249,582
Electric Home and Farm Authority	----------	87	----------	17,939
Employees' Compensation Commission	25	517	140,000	88,585
Export-Import Bank	----------	49	----------	14,433
Federal Communications Commission	115	2,262	644,000	455,015
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	76	2,727	425,600	386,858
Federal Power Commission	116	827	649,600	166,076
Federal Security Agency	969	66,449	5,436,420	9,371,115
Federal Trade Commission	143	590	800,800	157,317
Federal Works Agency	679	28,455	3,802,400	4,472,639
General Accounting Office	140	7,772	784,000	1,268,021
Government Printing Office	1	7,772	4,600	1,539,944
Interstate Commerce Commission	333	2,522	1,864,800	608,720
Maritime Commission	297	6,508	1,663,200	1,271,103
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	71	2,958	397,500	560,953
National Archives	33	445	184,800	82,015
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	2	22	11,200	5,464
National Housing Agency	1,058	15,626	5,924,800	2,920,804
National Mediation Board	13	77	72,800	20,025
National Labor Relations Board	119	893	665,400	196,864
Panama Canal	8	32,906	44,800	2,606,332
Railroad Retirement Board	61	1,858	341,600	299,892
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,448	6,964	8,108,800	1,562,660
Securities and Exchange Commission	262	1,376	1,467,200	339,441
Smithsonian Institution	39	840	218,400	127,316
Tariff Commission	67	347	375,200	86,582
Tax Court of United States	35	130	196,000	39,011
Tennessee Valley Authority	424	40,065	2,374,400	7,102,106
Veterans' Administration	1,092	44,596	6,115,200	6,379,277
Bureau of the Budget	178	----------	996,800	----------
National Resources Planning Board	85	----------	476,000	----------
Total	27,684	2,687,093	154,900,400	445,135,852
Total estimated annual salaries	----------	----------	----------	5,341,630,224

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Am I correct in interpreting the Senator's statement to mean that he wants to pass on the qualifications through the process of confirmation of all these employees?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; only those whose compensation is more than $4,500.

Mr. McNARY. I am reliably informed that that group exceeds 20,000 in number.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is about 27,000.

Mr. McNARY. Very well; 27,000. Then, the Senator wants to pass on each of those 27,000 cases?

Mr. McKELLAR. I want their appointments sent to the Senate and approved by the Senate. Approximately that many appointments are now sent to the Senate. The passage of this bill would about double the number. I have figured it, and I think the Senate takes about one two-hundredth of its time in acting on Executive appointments. We could well afford to devote one one-hundredth of our time to see that officials are employed in accordance with the terms of the Constitution.

Mr. McNARY. May I make a further inquiry, if it will not disturb the distinguished Senator?

Mr. McKELLAR. It will not disturb me at all.

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator want to pass upon the employees of the Federal Trade Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission and other public agencies in the 48 States of the Union? Has he time for that as acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is not proposed to confirm the commissions in the States, but to confirm certain of their employees getting over $4,500.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator is complaining about——

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not complaining; I am merely stating the facts.

Mr. McNARY. Let me finish, if the Senator please. He is complaining that the Senate ought to have the right to pass upon every individual employee of every agency of the Government who receives a salary in excess of $4,500.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I repeat, there are 27,000 in that group?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator have the time, able, patient, and industrious as he is, and acting chairman of the largest committee having the heaviest responsibility of any in the Senate, to pass upon the appointment of 27,000 employees drawing salaries in excess of $4,500? I myself have not the time; I have not the inclination, and I think something would be wrong with my head if I did have.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, I have.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. It has been stated there are about 27,000 employees in this group. Perhaps if it was required that their names be sent to the Senate for confirmation, the number might be cut 50 percent, which would be a magnificent thing for the taxpayers.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no doubt it would be.

Mr. CHANDLER. The mere fact that confirmation by the Senate was required would keep the heads of boards and bureaus and commissions from employing people and sending them all over the United States without the knowledge of Congress. There is an element involved in this matter of saving money on behalf of the greatly and heavily overburdened taxpayers of the United States, and, in my opinion, that is quite an item.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator and agree with him.

Mr. McNARY. My sympathy has long been aroused by the plight of the taxpayer, but I do not think we could start by this little sand on the beach to balance the budget.

Mr. President, answering the larger problem, I have sat here uncomplaining and heard the clerks of the Senate read the names of appointments under the Manpower Commission. It will be recalled that in the law with reference to that Commission there was a limitation on the right of appointment similar to that sought now to be imposed by the pending bill; but I have not yet heard one complaint of any appointment or heard a request that any appointments go over.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; day before yesterday——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the rule of the Senate requires that a Senator address the Chair before interrupting in debate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Yes; but the Senator yielded to me, and I should like to finish what I had in mind to say. The nominations under the War Manpower Commission have all been confirmed en bloc. That is what we call routine confirmations. No Senator has asked to have one go over; no Senator has inquired into the ability or qualifications of any of the appointees. I want to know what is the purpose of this desire to pass on the appointment of these employees when no one heeds the nominations after they are sent to the Senate. I do not want to assume that responsibility. I shall discuss the matter later, however, and I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. In a moment I shall yield to the Senator from Kentucky, but I desire first to answer a statement by the Senator from Oregon. I think day before yesterday an appointment under the Manpower Commission was before the Senate. It appeared that the appointee had been designated for Washington. The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] did not know him, and, as a matter of fact, as I understood, the appointee was not for the State of Washington but for the city of Washington.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask the Senator to wait for a moment. The Senator from Washington asked that the nomination go over, and it went over. The Senator from Washington looked into the matter, ascertained that it was not an appointment in his State, that the appointee was all right, and, in due course, the nomination was confirmed. The very fact that nominations have to come before the Senate for confirmation makes the appointing power exceedingly careful to select the right kind of men for appointment in the first instance. It makes for good government; it makes for honest government; and, as the Senator from Kentucky said a few moments ago, instead of 27,000 men being appointed I think probably not half that number of names would be submitted to the Senate because it would be found that a greater number was not necessary. As we all know, the departments are growing by leaps and bounds. For instance, I take the B. E. W. which has been mentioned; it has all told today employees to the number of 2,620, although it was never heard of until December 1942, which, as I recall, was the date it was established—2,620 employees in 6 months is going pretty rapidly. When I find that out of that number 480 are drawing over $4,500, it is time that somebody should look into it.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Oregon, and will yield to the Senator from Kentucky in a moment.

Mr. McNARY. I hesitate to disturb the continuity of the Senator's splendid address.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have been disturbed so often that one or two more interruptions will not make any difference.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator is courteous and always pleasant.

Mr. President, with regard to the incident to which the Senator from Tennessee has referred affecting the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], I was present in the Senate on that day; it was my business to be here. Plainly the record on its face indicated the nominee was appointed from the District of Columbia. That was overlooked by the Senator from Washington. He used the occasion as a text for a sermon, namely, that he had not been consulted in the case of appointments made for his State. I think he should have been consulted. The Senator from Washington thought he had been overlooked. That, however, has no relation to the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee of having the Senate pass on the appointments of 27,000 employees.

I might make my case personal. I am probably not entitled to any consideration in my State in connection with appointments, and I do not think there has been an employee under any agencies appointed concerning whom I have been consulted. I have said, "It is your responsibility; I do not care whom you appoint."

Mr. McKELLAR. It is very easy for the "bureaucrats" to consult the Senator under those circumstances.

Mr. McNARY. The point I want to make is that the Senator in his bill has provided a qualification, as was so well stated by my excellent friend, the able Senator from Michigan, based upon a salary limitation. The O'Mahoney amendment tends to make a distinction and base it on the yardstick of policy-making positions.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and the policy makers are those who pass upon the question of who are policy makers and who are not. It is left to the bureau to determine who are policy makers. The result is that, instead of having 27,000 names submitted to the Senate under the $4,500 limitation, there would under the O'Mahoney proposal be only about 13,000, as I recall the statement of the Senator from Wyoming, of policy makers, because policy makers themselves determine who are policy makers and who are not policy makers. We would not get very far by that proposal.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I probably should not intrude so long upon the time of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, but, if he reads and understands section 2 of the O'Mahoney amendment, he will see that it provides for direct action of Congress prescribing who are policy-making officers.

Mr. McKELLAR. The same provision is in the amendment reported by the committee, but the $4,500 provision makes it perfectly clear, so that those who run may read, so that anyone may understand, so that there cannot be any doubt that there cannot be any finagling about who is a policy-making individual and who is not. For instance, a great man like Mr. Jesse Jones stated he was not a policy maker. I should take him to be one.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator permit me to discuss that for a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I am again imposing on the Senator, but I know the Senator's kindly disposition.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Jesse Jones, the Secretary of Commerce, has stated, as the able Senator has said, that he is not a policy-making officer. He comes under the provision we are discussing. He runs a corporation organized by the Government, hence it becomes a Federal agency. Then the Senator reads his testimony quite at length, and discusses the B. E. W., which is not an agency set up under the laws of the Federal Government. I would cure the O'Mahoney amendment by inserting in it the words "all agencies created by law or by Executive order." The point Jones complains about is that he, on a directive, must give money to Mr. Perkins, and he says he has no discretion in the matter. Why? Because Congress has not passed upon the validity of this agency, nor has it authorized it. But the insertion in the O'Mahoney amendment I have suggested would cover the B. E. W.

Mr. McKELLAR. That applies to many others.

Mr. McNARY. The appointments of policy-making officials in that agency would have to come to the Senate for confirmation, just as those in any Federal-controlled agency or Federal-created agency do. I think that, in arguing the matter, the Senator has overlooked that point, and I say that would be covered by such a modification of the language as I have indicated.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that if the Senator looks into it, with his agile mind, he will find that the Committee on the Judiciary, by a vote of 10 to 4, reported the pending bill as it is, and that they have done about the best possible job.

I now come to another reason why the bill should be passed. For years we have been adopting a very crude way of showing our indignation at certain officers of the Government. I say "We." I do not know whether I have taken part in that or not. I believe I did attempt to on one occasion, but upon more mature reflection I am not sure that it is a correct method.

We have a bill before the Committee on Appropriations at this time which directs that no part of the appropriation shall be paid to certain individuals. One of them is a man by the name of Goodwin B. Watson. Another one is a man from Richmond, Va., whose father was once Ambassador to Germany, and I have forgotten his name for the moment.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is Dodd.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; William E. Dodd, Jr. The third one is a man from Chicago, and his name is Robert Morss Lovett.

It seems as if someone has dug up the information that some of these men belonged to a few Communist organizations, and a few other organizations destructive of government. I think the

Department of Justice calls them subversive organizations. I think one man was a member of 140 such subversive organizations, perhaps not all of them subversive, but many of them. He seemed to take a perfect delight in joining organizations.

The Senate and the House have tried to provide many ways of removing these men out of office. A year or 2 ago we went so far as to withdraw an appropriation for this man Goodwin B. Watson. Immediately either Tom, Dick, or Harry appointed Mr. Watson to a position as interpreter of reports from foreign governments, and he is now the interpreter of foreign reports. He gets the reports on the wire or by telephone. He is a linguist, it seems, and confidential reports from foreign governments are submitted to him. I do not know whether he is a Communist or not, but he belongs to a number of Communist organizations. The pending bill would take care of that situation, and such a man would not be appointed, because the Senate would not confirm a man of that stripe for an important place such as he now holds.

Where committees of Congress, or where the Congress itself withdraw money for the payment of the salary of that kind of a man, it looks as if it is singling the man out. I think the correct way to handle such a matter would be for the House, if the Members of the House felt the man was not fit, to impeach him, because he is an officer of the Government and subject to impeachment, and that matter could be tried out. That would be a cumbersome method. The pending bill would take care of such a situation. We would not have such a man in the Government. None of us here are Communists. We do not want our Government run on a Communist basis. That is another reason why I think the bill should be passed.

If the matter were left to the O'Mahoney amendment, in such a case the first report would be that none of the three gentlemen involved was a policy-making individual. One of them happens to be an assistant to the Secretary of the Virgin Islands, or the Vice Governor.

The committee did not report my bill, by the way. They prepared a bill of their own, which I think is better than my bill. I think it would be more effective, and I am supporting the committee bill with all my heart.

There are one or two other matters to which I wish to refer, and then I shall be through. I am sorry I have kept the Senate this long. But I promised to yield to the Senator from Kentucky, who was not in the Chamber when the Senator from Oregon concluded, and I yield now to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I was called to the door of the Senate, and was absent for a moment.

I think that at some time in the not-too-distant future it will not be considered unimportant if Congress shall undertake to save some of the money of the people of the United States. I think the pending bill will have a rather salutary effect on the bureaucrats who appoint without regard to the representatives of the people and without regard to the money involved. All they want to do is to fill jobs and pay out money. They have nothing to do with the collection of taxes; they are not interested in the collection of taxes; but when we have to have tax money, and taxes must be levied on the people of the United States, they always come to Congress.

It is not too much of a task to impose upon a Member of the Senate to ask him to give some information to the Senate about persons living in his own State. As chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, I happen to have referred to me appointments to the Manpower Commission. We will send a letter to a Member of the Senate saying to him, "This appointment has been tendered, and is to be presented to the Senate for its advice and consent." An incident illustrating this matter arose here day before yesterday, to which the Senator from Tennessee referred. The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] did not know whether a certain nominee was from his State or from the District of Columbia, so the nomination was passed over upon his suggestion. But I stated to the Senator from Washington on that occasion that I was virtually certain that the nominee could not have been from his State, because if he had been, unless the Senator approved it, the nomination would not have been presented to the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. President, the bureaucrat is the one who says whether a certain person employed in the Government of the United States is a policy-making official. The Congress of the United States does not make the decision. The bureaucrat decides whether an official is sufficiently important to be a policy-making official. Then such an official makes policies, he makes regulations, he construes regulations, and the people of the United States have to abide by them. No matter how much misery and agony it occasions them, the people have no recourse. I am unwilling to say that a United States Senator does not have sufficient time, or inclination, or disposition, or common sense to determine whether an employee making $4,500 a year shall make policy for the Government. I am also unwilling to say that it is not important that we consider the saving of a little money. Mr. President, even though we save but a little money here and a little money there, the saving of a great many little sums in the aggregate will eventually total a great sum of money. I am willing to join with the Senator from Tennessee in an endeavor to reduce useless and foolish spending, and in that way bring some measure of relief to the too heavily burdened taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield to the Senator from Nebraska in a moment. I wish to ask the Senator from Kentucky, who is the head of the subcommittee having to do with the confirmation of officers in the War Manpower Commission under the provisions of a law enacted some time ago, which is exactly in line with the pending bill, but which applied only to the War Manpower Commission, if he does not believe that we are obtaining a better grade of employees and officers in that Commission by reason of the passage of that law?

Mr. CHANDLER. The fact that the commission knows that appointees to it are to be scrutinized by the United States Senate unquestionably, in my opinion, results in better appointments being made, the appointment of more persons who are capable and better able to perform the tasks to which they are appointed. I think the Senator from Tennessee is entirely correct in that respect.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. As I understand, the only difference between Senators who are discussing this matter is whether the best appointments can be secured by providing for a salary division above which appointees are to be confirmed by the Senate, or through examination by the heads of various agencies of personal qualifications of prospective appointees. The Senator from Kentucky made a statement a moment ago which interested me. He said that the very fact that so great a number of appointments must be submitted to the Senate for confirmation would in itself immediately result in reducing the number of appointments made. I think that statement is very constructive and very convincing, and I wish to thank the Senator from Kentucky for it.

I desire to go a step further and ask the Senator if he would like to make an observation with respect to whether or not under the O'Mahoney amendment the term "policy-making official" can be defined? The question has been asked whether such a definition could be accomplished through providing a salary limitation or division. I wish to ask the Senator whether he believes such a definition can be made in the way here proposed? Further, does the Senator believe officials making appointments can get around a provision with respect to policy-making officials, in such a manner as finally to appoint whomever they wish to have appointed? In the Senator's opinion, is there any difference between the two methods proposed, and does the Senator think the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming would cure the situation?

Mr. CHANDLER. I think the better way to handle the situation is by providing a salary limitation above which appointees shall be confirmed by the Senate. With respect to the question of whether those making appointments can get around a provision with respect to policy-making officials, I should say that if they want to get around it they may try to do so; they may try to find a way to avoid the provision. As I recall, the limitation provided in the original bill was $3,500 or $3,600.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it was $4,500.

Mr. CHANDLER. The $4,500 provision was adopted by the committee. I think that is the better way to handle the situation.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am one of those old-fashioned persons who believe in the Constitution of the United States with all my heart. I believe in all its provisions. The Constitution was not in force 155 years ago. In those 155 years, by reason of standing by its Constitution, our country, from being one of the lowliest on earth, has come to occupy the highest place among the governments of the world. We have accomplished that by standing steadfastly by the Constitution of the United States through all these years.

Why at this hour should we leave the Constitution and throw it on the scrap heap? We have all sworn to uphold it. The Constitution is perfectly plain with respect to the method by which persons should be appointed to office. They should be appointed to office either by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate; or by the President, if the Congress gives him that power, and the Congress has not given him that power; or by the courts, if the Congress has given the courts that power, and it has done so in a very limited way; or by the heads of departments, and the Congress has never given them that power.

Mr. President, we have shown the world that a democracy under the Constitution is the greatest and best form of government. We have shown the world that a government of the people, by the people, and for the people is the best government. We have shown the world, in the words of Lincoln, that such a government shall not perish from the earth.

When this Government was formed the administrative and executive functions were placed in the hands of the President, but in many instances limitations were placed on the President's power. One of the most important of his powers, of course, is the selection of persons who shall aid the President in administering or executing the laws of the United States. The President, under the Constitution, has power to appoint members of his Cabinet, who are heads of departments, but this power is subject to the right of the Senate to approve such appointments.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I have a very high and fond regard for the notable and noble document referred to by the Senator—our Constitution. Where in the Constitution is there any provision which requires confirmation of appointees receiving $4,500? Perhaps I have overlooked it. Perhaps it is in the Constitution.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; not in those words. But here is the language of the Constitution:

> The President * * * shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint * * * all other officers of the United States.

All other officers of the United States. That covers all the $4,500 men just as truly as the pending bill covers them. That provision covers "all officers of the United States."

Mr. McNARY. Pardon me——

Mr. McKELLAR. I will ask the Senator to wait a moment. The language of the Constitution continues—

> whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law.

This is the clause to which the Senator perhaps referred:

> But the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone—

The Congress has not done that. The Congress has never by law vested the appointment of officers in the President alone. There is no such law on the books. In the next place—

> in the courts of law—

The Congress has done that in a few instances—

> or in the heads of departments.

Strange as it may seem, the Congress has never passed a law vesting the right to appoint in the heads of departments.

Under those circumstances my bill is directly in the line of the Constitution, and it simply establishes the dividing line above which are the officers who in the opinion of Congress, come within the provisions of the Constitution.

The Senator from Oregon said that I am a stickler for the Constitution. I admit it; I am proud of it. I do not know how long I shall be here, but so long as I happen to remain a Member of the Senate and so long as I happen to be on the earth I shall be a thousand percent for the Constitution. I think it is the noblest work of man. I do not think another instrument of government was ever penned which is better for the people, which is better for the country, and which makes for better government. If we stand by it we shall continue to grow and prosper. When we throw it aside we are likely to have anarchy and disaster in this country.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield. Indeed, I shall yield the floor if the Senator desires to have me do so.

Mr. McNARY. No; I would not ask that of the Senator. I rise to say that I am inspired by the Senator's energy in his devotion to the Constitution.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad someone is; we hear so little of it in this Chamber, that I am glad to know the Senator from Oregon is inspired by a friendly reference to that now seemingly discarded document.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, since the Senator seemed a moment ago to censure the Congress for not obeying the mandate of the Constitution and requiring confirmation by the Senate of various officials who were appointed long, long ago, I may say I recall that about a year ago I was present at one of the most impressive services I ever heard in this Chamber. At that time high eulogies were paid the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee. I took a part in those eulogies. At that time reference was made to the Senator's long membership in this body—a membership which, on March 4, I think was 26 years. I think he previously served approximately 14½ years in the House of Representatives. The 26 years plus the 14 years make 40 years during which the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee has represented the people of his delightful State. However, not until last month has he tried to enforce this mandate of the Constitution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, I say to my dear friend, not once but a hundred times have I endeavored to place this sort of an amendment in our laws. If any members of the Appropriations Committee are here they will bear witness that, in season and out of season, I have uniformly stood, during my entire service in the Congress, for such an amendment. I must say that the Senator from Oregon was a little generous in describing the length of my service; he described it as being a little longer than it actually has been. I have been in the Senate 26 years, and was a Member of the House of Representatives for 6 years, making a total of 32 years in all. Let me say that during the entire course of my service I have stood for the confirmation by the Senate of the United States of the officers of this Government. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is doing me the honor of listening to me at this moment, is a member of the Appropriations Committee; and he has heard me there, in season and out of season, advocate the confirmation by the Senate of the officers of the Government. I ask the Senator from Wyoming if that is not so?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am glad to say that of course that has been my experience with the Senator in that committee; and, also, I remember very well that when I served with the Senator on the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, of which he is the distinguished chairman, he and I disagreed at that time over the manner in which postmasters should be appointed and confirmed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. At that time I stood for and worked for the extension of the merit system for the appointment of postmasters, while the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee wanted the system to remain upon the old basis.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wanted first-class, second-class, and third-class postmasters to be confirmed by the Senate. I do not think I ever stood for a worthier method of appointment. The Post Office Department has the finest system of any department of the Government. It has been a great success. No department of the Government is more successful than the Post Office Department at this time, as was disclosed in the Appropriations Committee the other day. Notwithstanding the fact that salaries in the Department have been raised probably $100,000,000, that departmental mail amounts to $73,000,000 more; that sol-

diers' free mail—which is perfectly proper—amounts to $50,000,000 more, the Post Office Department has been administered so honestly, efficiently, and fearlessly under the good old constitutional system of having its officers appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, that today it stands out among all other departments and activities of Government, and it has worthy officers. It never was more prosperous than it is today, and it is believed that it will make enough revenue to pay the billion dollars it will cost to operate it.

Mr. President, I desire to say—and again the Senator from Wyoming will verify what I say, because for a long time he was a distinguished member of the Post Office Department; he was appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and made a very efficient and able First Assistant Postmaster General——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Tennessee is very kind in his personal remarks. I venture now simply to add a word to what he has said. Recognizing the force and virtue of the provision of the Constitution which requires the Senate to confirm the nominations of certain officers—ambassadors, judges, and the like—and which also provides that Congress may by law require the confirmation of others, I desire again to emphasize the fact that that provision of the Constitution contains specific language which authorizes the appointment of inferior officers without the advice and consent of the Senate. Therefore, as I said yesterday, the whole argument, beyond any question, is whether Congress shall undertake the perfectly tremendous task of confirming the great army of employees who by no stretch of the imagination exercise any policy-making functions, or whether it is in the interest of good government and the maintenance of the separation of the powers of government to permit the Executive to select employees in accordance with the merit system. My view is that the latter should be done. The Senator from Tennessee disagrees.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator will recall that, so far as the War Manpower Commission is concerned, the law now provides for confirmation. Does he know that the Committee on Military Affairs say they make the recommendations of confirmations without the slightest let or hindrance, that they are not overworked, and that the system has worked admirably? I do not think there is a Senator now present who is not perfectly delighted that the nominations of new officials in the Manpower Commission who are appointed in the various States are first submitted to the Senate, and then, under our rules, to the Senators from the particular States concerned. Why should that course not be followed in all cases? It can be followed in all cases only if we pass a bill similar to the one now pending. The trouble with the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming is that if, under the Senator's amendment, the bureaucrats are given the authority to say who is a policy-making official—I am willing to hazard this prediction—we shall have fewer policy-making officials in this Government than we ever before have had in our Government's history.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator, let me say that the amendment which is offered on behalf of the minority would not leave that decision to the heads of the departments at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. The language of the amendment is the same as that of the original bill. The only substantial difference between the bill with the Senator's amendment and the bill reported by the committee is the provision which makes salaries of $4,500 or more the test. The Senator merely thinks that a man who is receiving $4,500 or more is or should be a policy-making official. That is the only difference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Exactly; that is what I have said from the beginning. Take for example the War Manpower Commission officials. Under the amendment, they would be brought in under subsection (c).

Mr. McKELLAR. Only the heads.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The heads and assistant heads of regional, area, or State offices of such departments or agencies.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming how the dollar-a-year men would be affected by his amendment or by the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Under the amendment proposed by the minority—that is to say, the amendment bearing my name—dollar-a-year men exercising policy-making powers would be affected. However, of course, since part of the policy-making definitions are contained in the bill as reported by the majority, such officials would also be covered by the bill, too.

Mr. LUCAS. In the majority report?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Dollar-a-year men are covered in that; are they?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct—by the policy-making definition.

POST-WAR AIMS OF UNITED NATIONS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, a gentleman by the name of William Philip Simms writes a column for the Washington Daily News. I understand that his column is syndicated through a number of newspapers in this country. Last night I read an article from the pen of Mr. Simms, which interested me greatly, particularly in view of the interest in the subject of his column which is being manifested today throughout our country. That manifestation of interest is so great that I thought perhaps it would be well to bring this particular column to the attention of Members of this body and of the American people, particularly at this time. As I have stated, the people of the world are interested at this hour in the subject matter of Mr. Simms' column of yesterday. I read:

— SAUCE FOR GOEBBELS

(By William Philip Simms)

Signs point to a new effort by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union to redefine their post-war objectives. Unless some of the existing uncertainty is cleared away, the peace plans of the United Nations may as well be written in sand.

Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles, for instance, has just made another of his widely acclaimed speeches on peace aims. He called for international cooperation "to see to it that the world is maintained inviolate." To do this, he said, there would have to be a "combination of armed forces" to maintain order, and a world court to settle disputes between nations.

Complementary plans were proposed by the 44 nations attending the Food Conference at Hot Springs. They drew up resolutions calling for a world free from want. But it was unanimously agreed this would not be possible unless there was also freedom from fear.

Today, however, there is no such thing as freedom from fear, even as between members of the United Nations. Some of our allies are afraid they may be dismembered or wiped out altogether by the action or tacit consent of their own partners.

On the fighting front, the war is going very well indeed for the United Nations. On the diplomatic front it is going less well, and it is betraying no secret to say so. Nor does it serve any useful purpose to soft-pedal this fact. On the contrary, as long as the Allies do nothing to make freedom from fear a reality within the grand alliance itself, it will continue to be the biggest propaganda asset in the hands of the enemy.

In United Nations circles here, therefore, an early meeting between President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Marshal Stalin is regarded as imperative. Or if they can't make it because of the war, they should seek to accomplish the same purpose in some other way.

"We have got to make up our minds very soon," one of the most brilliant diplomats in this country said to the writer, "whether the United Nations are going to observe the letter and the spirit of the Atlantic Charter and the 'four freedoms,' or turn back the clock and follow the old law of the jungle. If the former, a fine new world is possible, with peace and order and work and food for everybody. If the latter, another war will follow this one, and after that another and another, until we either come to our senses or are exterminated."

It is regarded here as a sad commentary that despite pacts, pledges, treaties, and speeches, some of the smaller allies have reason to believe they are in danger of losing territorial or sovereign rights to certain of their larger allies. Soviet spokesmen have openly advanced territorial claims in eastern Europe, and British and American voices have indicated that these claims may not be contested in London or Washington.

Without going into the justice or injustice of these claims, the point is that they are creating doubts in the minds of the peoples of all the little countries of Europe and thereby playing into the hands of Hitler and his propagandists. They point to Poland, to mention another ally, and remark that after helping to defeat the Axis she may be partitioned by her own associates.

It is widely felt here that the United Nations, especially the Big Three in Europe, must put their house in order. They need only to come out boldly, say what they mean by the Atlantic Charter, and pledge themselves irrevocably to its terms. Until they do, the situation will remain duck soup to Dr. Goebbels.

If the Allies cannot do this now, they certainly will not be able to do so after the armistice when they no longer have such vital need for each other. If they can't agree now, there is little hope for a United Nations after the war. And without a United Nations, the post-war plans of Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Welles, and others aren't worth the paper they are written on.

Mr. President, I was vividly impressed by that article, particularly in view of the fact that you and I and every other Member of this body have heard the present chaotic diplomatic situation discussed day after day, particularly since the arrival in the United States of that distinguished and great patriot, Winston Churchill. I recall, Mr. President, with honor to myself, that I was privileged to hear Mr. Churchill. I must admit, in perfect candor and frankness, that to hear him always provides me with unlimited inspiration, because in him and from him flows inspiration for every patriot, for every man who loves his own country better than he loves any other country upon the face of the earth.

I take off my hat to Mr. Churchill. I compliment him by saying that in my opinion he is one of the greatest patriots the world has ever known. The people throughout the world admire a man who has vision and courage. With his patriotic inclinations, because he is ever looking out for the people of his Empire, Mr. Churchill is to be commended and congratulated by the peoples of the whole earth, and loved, admired, and appreciated by the people of the British Empire.

I make mention of that distinguished, world-known patriot, ever interested in the welfare and future of his country. I recall vividly that in his closing remarks in the House of Representatives, where the Members of this body were privileged to attend on the day of his address, he said, according to my recollection, that he hopes for an early meeting between himself, President Roosevelt, and Marshal Stalin, the dictator of the great Soviet Empire of Asia. I was happy indeed that Mr. Churchill advised us then in great candor that he hoped soon for such a meeting. I am inclined personally to believe that the chaotic political situation which exists throughout the world today would be greatly relieved by such a meeting between Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill, and Mr. Stalin. In such a meeting those three world leaders would each be afforded an opportunity to ascertain what is in the minds of the others.

That is just what the American people today are desirous of being told. The statements we read daily in the newspapers and magazines of the country, as well as the statements the American people and others throughout the world hear over the radio from day to day, are in a sense so conflicting that, as Mr. Simms states, some definite decision as to the objectives of the United Nations should be reached.

When Mr. Stalin, Mr. Churchill, and Mr. Roosevelt meet—as I hope they will, and the sooner the better—I have in mind some questions which they might ask one another, and which might well be answered now.

As Mr. Simms has stated, if they are not clarified now, at a time when our brothers united with us in this world conflict need us, certainly we cannot expect a settlement according to our desires after they have reached a time when our services will no longer be so largely needed.

The questions which I have in mind are merely questions of the people of America, as well as those of other nations, and uppermost in the minds of our brethren of the United Nations who today are living in fear that their countries shall not be returned to them, that they shall not be permitted to govern them as they so desire, or that they will be swallowed up and digested by some of the larger of the United Nations. The questions to which I refer are these:

After we have won the war, as we are sure to do, what will become of Poland? What will become of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania? What will become of Finland, Norway, Denmark, and Sweden? What will become of Bessarabia? What will become of a part of Bulgaria?

I make mention of those particular sections of the world over which and around which we are fighting because newspaper writers and commentators over the radio have repeatedly told the American people that the spokesmen for Mr. Stalin, who are looking out after Russia's interests, have said without hesitation that when the war is over they expect to take for the Soviet Union, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Some of those spokesmen have gone so far as to say that they expect to take over Finland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, retake Bessarabia from Rumania, and a bite out of Bulgaria.

The American people, the people of Poland—where the war started and over which it started—the people of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, are all anxious to know whether or not it is actually in the mind of Mr. Stalin to take over their countries by force and bring them by force into the Soviet Union regardless of what the United Nations have to say about it in utter disregard of the Atlantic Charter.

We have all read from day to day throughout the columns of the press that a controversial point exists as to whether or not the United States of America, or whether or not Great Britain itself, will object strenuously now or later to Mr. Stalin, our ally, a brother of the United Nations, to taking over those countries and forcing them into his union. That is one of the questions uppermost in the minds of the American people, and particularly uppermost in the minds of the people of the countries which I have twice enumerated this afternoon.

There are other questions which I wish to ask. These questions have been suggested by constituents in my State of North Carolina, as well as citizens of other States. They are in reference to what will take place in the post-war period, and Mr. Simms has pointed out in his article declaring that no portion of the answer should be secret. We must settle now, while our allies need our help, what is to be done in the post-war period, rather than await the time when they no longer need us as badly as they do at this hour.

Other questions which I wish to have answered are: When we have succeeded in retaking the Dutch East Indies, Java, and Sumatra, from the hands of the slant-eyed Japanese, our deadly vermin-like enemy, after, perhaps, we have lost thousands and thousands of men, are we going to turn the Dutch East Indies back to the Netherlands, or are we going to deliver the Dutch East Indies, Java, and Sumatra, and the islands thereabout, over to the Javanese, the rightful owners, to administer, as we are planning to return the Philippines to the Filipinos to govern.

After we have won the victory, which we are certain to win—it is merely a question of time, and I hope that time is not far off—when we have succeeded in driving the Japanese from Burma, from Rangoon northward all along the Burma Road, are we going to redeliver the country to our British cousins, or will we turn the country over to the owners, the Burmese, to administer themselves, as we are fighting today to turn the Philippines over to the Filipinos to govern in the sort of way they see fit.

Mr. President, another question which has been directed to me on many occasions is—when we have succeeded in driving the Japanese from Hong Kong, are we going to turn that island back to our ally, Great Britain, or will we return that section of China to the Republic of China where it rightfully belongs and where our ally, the courageous Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, is fighting for the liberation of the world? I make mention of the questions I have stated for the reason that the same inquiries, no doubt, have been directed to other Members of this body.

Mr. President, we are fighting for the freedom of the peoples of the world. This war as I recall, began over certain territory in Poland, the Polish corridor, as it was called, and war was declared by Great Britain on September 3 at 11 in the morning and was followed at 5 o'clock that afternoon by France who declared war. They went to war for the purpose of preserving the Poles and Poland, they went to war to see that Poland was provided protection against a greedy and aggressive Germany. Now I ask, Will it come to the point where we shall have to cross arms with one of our allies over the integrity of Poland itself? God forbid. We may have another war among the United Nations over the same territory that brought about the present war.

These questions are being asked throughout the whole world at this hour.

Heretofore, Mr. President, I have always felt that post-war matters should not be discussed until after we win the war. I have felt that we should devote every ounce of energy and strength, first, to the winning of the war, after which we should settle at the peace table with our brothers in arms; but these questions are

constantly popping up in print and over the radio, and I agree with Mr. Simms that when Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Stalin and Mr. Churchill meet they should settle such matters, and let us know exactly what is going to become of this territory and that territory after the war is over.

I have been opposed to every resolution submitted in this body and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations of which I am honored to be a member, because, as I have stated, I felt that all our energy and thought should be devoted, first, to winning the war, after which we who are now on such friendly terms could, without question, settle all the issues between ourselves. But from all we hear and from all we read, if, eventually, we shall need a world police force, we shall, perhaps, have to use it to keep the United Nations from one another's throats, if we are to believe what we hear, rather than to keep peace throughout the world.

I have in mind now a resolution which struck me with great force several weeks ago when it was submitted by a number of our most distinguished colleagues in this body. They are the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. To those Senators I extend my congratulations for their foresight in having offered the resolution, and I have arrived at the point where I favor the resolution. I favor its adoption now because I think the foresight of the able Senators whose names I have mentioned is far better than the foresight of the average member of this body. I make that statement upon the record itself, and the record itself is nothing more nor less than Senate resolution 114 submitted by the distinguished Senators whom I have mentioned. The resolution reads as follows—and I hope the Senate will listen carefully to its reading:

Resolved, That the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority—

I concur most heartily in that suggestion—

1. To assist in coordinating and fully utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis.

We all support that pronouncement for we all want the cooperation of all the allied nations, regardless of their strength or present disadvantageous position, because the thing uppermost in the mind of every Member of this body and every Member of the House of Representatives and of every American is the winning of the war in which we are now participating.

2. To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established.

That is extremely important at this time. Why? Because we are being told that perhaps some of the smaller nations, even some of those among the United Nations, are in fear that their country will not be returned to them to be governed as their people would like to have it governed, but they are in fear at this hour, as mentioned by Mr. Simms, that they will be taken over by some of the other powers. So it is well that we have before us this resolution in reference to this all-important subject.

3. To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces.

We all favor that, because we all favor doing all we possibly can to feed and clothe and house the unfortunates of foreign countres who find themselves in the position they are today and in the situation about which we read through the columns of the daily press.

4. To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations,

That means between the United Nations as well as between the other nations of the world. Let me repeat it:

4. To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations.

In other words, the resolution calls for a meeting of the heads of the United Nations of the world to decide now what we are going to do and how we are going to do it and when we are going to do it and where we are going to do it; and, in view of the chaotic political and diplomatic situation existing throughout the world, I say that this resolution should be adopted now in order that authority may be granted to call together the heads of the United Nations of the world, here or elsewhere, and to ascertain now as to what disposition will be made of territory after the victory shall have been won.

5. To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

That the Senate further advises that any establishment of such United Nations organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to such organization, and for admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement.

There is to be no more territory seized. If the resolution of our distinguished colleagues shall be adopted by this body, and the heads of all the United Nations are brought to this Capital, or to that of the British Empire, or to Moscow, the capital of the country of that great patriot, Joe Stalin, who always is looking after his own people, I say to the Members of the Senate that we will be doing the greatest thing for our country we were ever provided the opportunity of doing, because there would be a written understanding, a written agreement, now, while we are fighting, when we need our allies and they need us, as to what will be the ultimate disposition of all this territory.

I return to paragraph 5 of the resolution, and repeat:

To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

If we can adopt that resolution, if we can get the heads of the nations of the United Nations here, and agree to paragraph 5 of the resolution, if any member of the United Nations should seek or attempt to take any territory belonging to any other nation the military police force could be turned loose against that nation to stop it from doing the very thing which we are fighting against today.

So much for the resolution, Mr. President. I am sorry it has never been voted on in the Committee on Foreign Relations. If it shall ever come before the Senate, I shall vote for it, because I believe, with a great many other people, that we should settle now, before the end of the war, what the territorial boundaries are to be, and who is going to get what, and when, and where.

I admit in perfect candor that I have reversed my position; I have turned right about and taken the other viewpoint. As I stated a moment ago, I have heretofore felt that we should devote all our time and energy to winning the war first, and then settle the other questions, but if we follow that course it may be too late. The Senators are foresighted in offering this resolution, which would perhaps avoid another war and more trouble, such as that in which we find ourselves at the present time.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am interested in the Senator's suggestion as to the police force. I was wondering what sized police force he thinks it would have taken, for instance, to have stopped Germany had such a provision been in effect in 1939?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I really am not prepared to answer the Senator's question, but I am always willing to attempt any sort of an answer. [Laughter.] I make the perfectly candid response that I am ready to answer whether I know much about the subject or not, after which statement I am glad to relate this little joke I once heard about Mr. Al Jolson:

Al Jolson is a blackface comedian. Many of my colleagues have met him personally, many of them have seen him on the screen, and many of them hear him once a week in his program on the radio. Some colored brethren thought he actually was one of their race. They had seen him only on the stage and in the movies, characterized as one of their race, a blackface comedian, and they invited him to deliver a speech at a banquet which was to be held at one of their lodges. He accepted. He knew that he was to talk, but he did not know what subject he was to discuss. So, when he

was introduced and rose, he said, "Brethren, were any of you all born in Africa?"

"No, Brother Jolson."

"Brethren, were any of you all ever in Africa?"

"No, Brother Jolson."

"Brethren, have any of you all ever heard anything about Africa?"

"No, Brother Jolson."

"Brethren, do any of you know anything at all about Africa?"

"No, Brother Jolson."

"Then, brethren, I am going to tell you all about Africa." [Laughter.]

I will say to the Senator from Delaware that the question he propounds is very difficult to answer, for that we knew not, at the time of the event—and the answer would have to be predicated upon the question of time—as to the degree of arming that had been done by any of the nations of Europe. We had reports from time to time to the effect that Germany was rearming, and, of course, we all know that in her rearming program Germany had the assistance of the financiers of other countries of the world, some of whom are participants in the United Nations' movement with us now as allies.

As to the relative strength of Russia, we did not know about that then. Many of us predicted, as the Senator well recalls, that Russia could not last 3 weeks under the onrush and the attacks of Germany, but she has put up the most marvelous fight in all the world, inspired by the patriotism of Russia's leader, Joe Stalin. They are fighting upon Russian soil to save Russian territory for Russia, and I commend them, because nothing in the world could be more laudable than a man standing upon his own soil fighting for the continued freedom of his country and against the enslavement of his people, as Hitler had attempted to enslave the Russians.

However, prior to that, as I believe was stated by one of my colleagues a few days ago during the course of debate here, our ally, Russia, did not participate in the war until after she was attacked by Germany. We knew not the relative strength of any of them, and as to the size of the police force that would be required I really do not know.

The question of a world police force is an important one. We all want peace, we all want to guarantee peace after the war is over, and we are fighting in order that the world may everlastingly participate in and enjoy peace. Otherwise the blood and wealth and lives being poured out would be wasted. It is a question how best we can achieve peace.

I again congratulate the Senators who offered this resolution, because it will bring up the question of an international police force, and we will have an opportunity to debate it. I may be against it and the Senator may be for it, or I may be for it and the Senator may be against it. Anyway we may need a police force to keep peace among the United Nations—our allies—when the time arrives to divide up the territory. I do not challenge anyone's motives. I would not challenge the motive of any Member of this body, because I know all Senators are men of integrity. We differ quite frequently, almost daily, indeed, but no one doubts the integrity or questions the stand of any Senator.

The police force question is one which will arise, and one which probably should be debated now, while the war is progressing. That is one reason, among others, why I have reversed my position. Heretofore I have said we should wait until the end of the war before taking up that subject. I have entirely reversed myself on that question.

Mr. TUNNELL. I did not say that there was anything wrong. I simply wanted to get the Senator's ideas along that line.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say to the Senator from Delaware that I do not know. It might be that we might be able successfully to maintain something of that sort. We are all seeking peace. Our boys are fighting and dying so that we may have peace. We want to make the peace a lasting one. The suggestion was made in the Senate that we should guarantee peace forever. Of course, we would favor such action if we believed it would result in bringing us a lasting peace. I have taken the opportunity to bring before the Senate Mr. Simms' observations as they appear in print in the columns of the Washington Daily News, because many Senators are now thinking about the subject with which Mr. Simms dealt.

I hope sincerely that no one who has heard me or anyone who will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will assume that I had any hidden motive in bringing the matter up. My only purpose is to forward the interest of my country. Sometimes our attitudes differ. There were many of us in this body who before the war were in favor of this or in favor of that; what is the use of a legislative body unless we can disagree? That is real democracy. There are times when the more disagreement we have the better will our Government become, because we as legislators and those whom we represent will know that a question has been debated fully and that we have arrived at the conclusion which we deem to be best for our country.

We can all discuss this subject, whether we are isolationists, nationalists, internationalists or interventionists. Many persons referred to me as an isolationist before we entered the war. Mr. President, I was an isolationist. That not only applies to the past, however. I am now an isolationist, and I am a thousand times more isolationist today than I was before we became engaged in this war.

But that is my privilege. However, I prefer to be referred to as an American Firster or a nationalist. My conception of what that privilege is probably differs with the conception held by others. The only way I can properly explain my position now, without unduly taking of the Senate's time, is simply to read correspondence which I have had with a friend. The other day I wrote to a number of friends in my State in regard to the political situation, in which I am interested. I placed a 3-cent stamp on each letter I sent out. I wrote to a friend of mine, the Honorable Fred S. Hutchins, attorney at law, Winston-Salem, N. C., as follows:

MY DEAR FRED: It is a long time before the Democratic primary of 1944. Nevertheless, I do not think it is too early to make inquiry of my personal friends as to the political situation in your county in reference to the senatorial contest in which I am interested. Therefore this letter to you.

As to the comparative strength of my announced opponent and myself, I would greatly appreciate it if at your convenience you would write me as to your opinion relative thereto.

I have taken care not to mention the name of my announced opponent. It is always my policy in a campaign not to give my opponent any publicity he does not really deserve. [Laughter.]

I would, with appreciation, welcome now any suggestions that you would make relating to the conduct of my oncoming campaign, which comment would include suggestions relative to organizing my friends and supporters in your county.

In addition to the above, if not asking too much, I would be entirely grateful if you would in your reply provide me with the names and addresses of those of your county whom you know to be favorable to my candidacy. In connection with this, of course, I will not reveal to these parties that you provided me with information to the effect that they are for me.

[Laughter.]

With personal regards, thanking you in advance, and assuring you of my deep appreciation of your friendship which I have enjoyed over the years, I am

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator.

Mr. President, it has been and is a sincere friendship, although I do not know whether Fred voted for me. [Laughter.]

As a result of that letter I received a very pertinent response in reference to my position as being an isolationist or a nationalist, and it was a very clear and frank response:

DEAR BOB: I have your letter of the 14th regarding your primary for 1944.

Mr. President, I feel at liberty to read this letter because Fred did not pledge me his support. [Laughter.]

I shall be glad to forward you some names of supporters in the county in the near future. However, I would not be your friend—

And, Mr. President, he is one of my friends. I do not know whether Fred voted for me, but that does not make any difference to me. I do not become angry with a friend simply because he does not vote for me. His opinion of me is as good as my own opinion of myself. That is the way I consider the situation. I never became angry at any Member of this body who took a position in opposition to mine, whether he was a Republican or a Democrat. I can hardly ever tell the difference between my friends, particularly at election time, because the Republicans polled 200,000 votes in my State in the last election, and I had a good many friends among those Republicans.

However, I would not be your friend if I did not tell you that, in my opinion, your stock is not as good here as it has been—

[Laughter.]

Well, I did not turn white or any other color when I read that, because I am so accustomed to disappointments that I have become accustomed to them. [Laughter.] Let me read that paragraph again lest Senators lose the point of it:

However, I would not be your friend if I did not tell you that, in my opinion, your stock is not as good here as it has been due to the most part for your reputation for being an isolationist. Most of the people in this community are with the President on his foreign policy, and particularly for cooperation after the war in maintaining the peace of the world.

Mr. President, I hope Fred is right. I hope I am wrong and that the President is right, because we are all seeking peace.

I explained this situation to Wesley McDonald when I was in your office several months ago. My opinion is that you are going to have hard sledding unless you can conscientiously cooperate in this respect.

In other words, unless I reverse the position I took prior to Pearl Harbor.

With the highest personal regards and best wishes to yourself and Wesley, I am

Sincerely yours,

FRED.

Mr. President, I had to be perfectly honest with Fred, as we all have to be, so I wrote Fred on May 25, as follows:

MY DEAR FRED: Thank you very much for your letter of May 21, contents of which I have noted very carefully, in response to my letter of inquiry regarding the primary of 1944.

I am so happy to have always my friends to speak frankly with me. I have reference to that part of your letter reading as follows:

"However, I would not be your friend if I did not tell you that, in my opinion, your stock is not as good here as it has been, due to the most part for your reputation for being an isolationist. Most of the people in this community are with the President on his foreign policy, and particularly for cooperation after the war in maintaining the peace of the world."

Fred, my position has not changed at all. If an isolationist is an individual who loves his own native country more than he loves any other country of the world, or any other part of the world; if an isolationist is one who thinks first of his own country rather than any other country; if an isolationist is one who is interested, firstly, in the people of his own country rather than those of some other country; if an isolationist is one who believes in free trade and a friendly trade with all the peoples of the world, then I am an isolationist and so are Winston Churchill and Joseph Stalin.

Of course, you know I opposed very vigorously the President's foreign policy, and in reference thereto I am attaching to this letter a short talk I made recently in the United States Senate, along with some other Senators, in regard to the extension of lend-lease, which I hope you may find time to read.

I believe in world peace but from all I can hear and from all I can observe, the very people today who are hollering the loudest for peace and who are yelling the loudest for a force to police the entire world are the very ones who were insisting upon our engaging in the war before ever we declared war.

With warm personal regards always, thanking you for having written me so frankly, and hoping that the next time you are in Washington I will have the pleasure of seeing you, or when next I am in Winston-Salem, which I hope will be at an early date, I am,

Your sincere friend,

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate for having listened to me so intently in my discussion of this subject in which we are all interested.

In closing, I say that any plan to guarantee the peace and the freedom for which we are fighting, under the charter for freedom, I shall be for, and every other Member of the Senate will be for, if we are conscientiously of the conviction that it will guarantee peace to the world; because many of us have sons and other close relatives in the armed services, and we are all interested in bringing them home at the earliest possible time. As the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] said the other day in proposing a plan which would end the war sooner, all of us have such an interest, and we all are entitled to the expression of our views relative to world affairs.

Yes, I am proud to be a nationalist.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO REPORT BILLS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations, which will meet tomorrow, may have authority to report at least two bills which we expect to complete tomorrow, so that they may be printed and placed on the calendar. I make the request subject, of course, to obtaining the consent which the Senator from Oregon usually grants in such cases.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, to what appropriation bills does the Senator refer?

Mr. McKELLAR. One is the agricultural appropriation bill and the other is the naval appropriation bill. I am not sure whether we shall be able to report a third bill. As the Senator knows, the subcommittees are now preparing their reports to the full committee, and the full committee is to take action tomorrow on the bills. I request authority to report the bills so that they may be printed and placed on the calendar, for the information of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, of course, if the requested authority were granted it would be possible for the bills to be placed on the calendar and to be ready for consideration on Monday, and to be considered at that time, upon proper motion made by the Senator from Tennessee or some other Senator.

The objection I have to the requested procedure is that it does not give the Members of the Senate opportunity to consider the bills or to read the reports. When similar requests for such authority have been made in the past, I have stated that I should have no objection provided it could be understood that, after authority was granted, if objection were made when motion was made for consideration, at least 1 day might intervene during which the Members of the Senate would have an opportunity to read and study the bills and reports.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, Mr. President, I merely request the authority because the appropriation bills must be passed by the 1st of July, and for that reason we are anxious to make all possible progress.

Mr. McNARY. I, too, appreciate the necessity for progress. I want the Senate to conclude its work promptly. I want it to be concluded during this month, if possible, so that we may have a summer recess. However, I do not want to rush through with the bills, for they are important. If we are to have a motion, the first thing in the session on Monday, to proceed to the consideration of the bills and then to take up the amendments——

Mr. McKELLAR. That would not be done over the objection of the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, the Senate would not have much time to study them prior to their consideration. If it can be understood that, if objection is made on Monday to the consideration either of any amendment or of the whole bill, consideration would be postponed, I should have no objection to the Senator's request.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if I understood the Senator from Oregon, his suggestion that no controversial questions be considered on Monday relates to amendments, rather than to the bill as a whole. There are approximately 100 amendments to the bill. I do not think there will be any objection whatever to many of them. I should like to have the Senate proceed on Monday to the consideration of the bill; and if there are any controversial items, they may be passed over.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think the Senator will appreciate that I always endeavor to be fair. If any Senator were to desire to have consideration of the bill go over, I should want him to be granted that privilege.

However, as I understand the bill, it is probable that if there are certain noncontroversial amendments they can be disposed of on Monday.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, having had the privilege of many years of experience with the able senior Senator from Oregon, and appreciating his fairness at all times, I have no objection to the suggested procedure.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator. Let me say that, with the understanding that controversial amendments or even the bill as a whole may go over on objection, I am perfectly willing to agree to the request of the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I, too, am perfectly willing.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. That is satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, today America is faced with the greatest threat on her home front since the dastardly attack at Pearl Harbor. There must be no compromise on the issue of whether

John Lewis or the constitutional authorities govern our Republic. Either the United States Government must assert control over its internal affairs or we shall face a dissolution here at home which may cause us to lose the war, and certainly will lengthen it and increase our casualties.

A surrender now to John L. Lewis, or a compromise on any vital principle, would be a declaration to the world that America is unable to prevent sabotaging of the war effort at home at a time of the greatest peril this Nation has ever faced. It would lower the morale of our sons who are fighting and dying on many foreign battlefields. It would encourage Hitler and the Japs, who would believe that, after all, America does not have the intestinal fortitude or the fighting spirit at home to support American boys who are fighting so bravely abroad. It would prove that John L. Lewis is more powerful than the Government of the United States.

It is well for the Nation to realize the extreme gravity of this situation. A Government back-down or compromise now on these issues would result in starting a train of circumstances which could readily bring disaster to the country. Other labor leaders would demand the same consideration that Lewis had been able to force from his Government by threats and coercion. What Lewis is determined to do is to secure a better settlement than any other union has been able to accomplish in time of war.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. As I understand the Senator's position, it is that we should have legislation which would make another strike impossible.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator introduced a bill which would do that by drafting strikers into the Army and reassigning them to do their work. Does not the Senator think that we should go further and fix permanent penalties upon any labor leader who would instigate or cause a strike?

Mr. BYRD. I think we should make it illegal to strike in a defense industry in time of war, during the war emergency, and we should impose penalties sufficient to prevent such strikes. I understand that in the last hour the House has passed a bill which does make it illegal to engage in a strike in a defense industry.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I think John L. Lewis should be in jail. His acts amount to treason. Lewis is as deadly an enemy of America as Hitler and Tojo. He is a more deadly enemy than Mussolini. I do not think, and the Department of Justice does not think, that today there is adequate legislation to imprison him, for the reason that the crime of treason, as defined in our statutes, would not cover his acts, because they are not willful, with criminal intent to injure this country and willfully, designedly, and intentionally to lend aid and comfort to our enemies.

I am drafting proposed legislation which would broaden the definition of the crime of treason so as to cover his situation. I hope the distinguished Senator will join me in this legislation. During the last war we put Eugene Debs in the penitentiary. Debs was given a 10-year sentence because in speeches he urged men within the draft ages not to obey the directions of the Selective Service Boards. He stated that there was no constitutional power to draft men. I think that John L. Lewis' wrong is 100 times worse than the crime for which Debs was convicted and given a sentence in the penitentiary. Debs was a life-long pacifist. In this he was following the path of his conscience. In his case there was not the greed, the insane lust for power, that there is in Lewis'.

I am heartily in favor of the Senator's bill. When it reaches the floor of the Senate, I expect to support it. I have a bill of similar nature, which is now before the Military Affairs Committee. These bills will remedy the situation. They will permanently stop strikes.

Officials of the Department of Justice also state unofficially that legislation along the line of the Senator's bill and my bill is imperative, because, although under the Selective Service Act today, we have authority to draft into the Army and reassign to work men up to 45 years of age, that authority does not extend to men between the ages of 45 and 65.

Such legislation is necessary. It will curb the greedy labor racketeer. Officials of the Department further tell me, unofficially, that it was used during the last war by Woodrow Wilson in the case of a strike at the Bridgeport Machine Tool Works, when he told the strikers that he would draft them into the Army and put them back to work unless they voluntarily returned to work. That weapon then completely solved the situation at that time. I heartily endorse the Senator's bill.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I am told that there are 17,000 applications for wage increases now pending before the War Labor Board. If Lewis wins, either by a compromise or actual surrender, this means the abandonment of the Little Steel formula. It follows, then, that wholesale wage increases must be granted or another epidemic of strikes will result. Another spiral of inflation will then start which may have the consequences of a national disaster. Let us understand that the future control of inflation is inseparably linked with the ultimate decision in the Lewis case.

The coal strike issue is now between the Government and the union, of which Mr. Lewis is the head. Today the American Flag is flying over every bituminous coal mine in America. This means that the United States Government is the employer. A strike or refusal to work is open defiance of the Government of the United States. If Mr. Lewis can defy his Government and the American Flag now and get by with it, what may happen when peace comes? Then America will go through the most difficult period of reconstruction of its domestic economy that has ever faced us. Then the seeds that are being sown today by the lack of courage and firmness on the part of high Government officials may sprout into domestic chaos and strife. If Mr. Lewis succeeds in defying his Government in time of war, how can he be controlled in time of peace in the volcanic readjustment period following the war?

The issue is now squarely up to Congress; and if Congress does not immediately enact adequate antistrike legislation, for the war period, then it will receive and, I think, deserve, the condemnation of the country.

It is true that just before Pearl Harbor the Smith bills were passed by the House of Representatives. Had these bills been enacted by the Senate and signed by the President, it is not likely that strikes could have occurred. This legislation was smothered in the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

More than a year ago the Connally bill, since passed by the Senate, was removed from consideration on the Senate calendar at the direct request of the President, who said the passage of the bill would be harmful to the war effort.

Sixty days ago I introduced proposed legislation providing for a work-or-fight order for those striking in defense industries. Immediately the various departments of the Government opposed this legislation, saying that it would be harmful to national morale to require those to fight who have refused to work and produce materials for those who were fighting.

The Congress of the United States is an independent branch of the Government. It is the duty of Congress to perform its constitutional obligations, regardless of any effort on the part of the executive branch to control its actions. The Congress cannot escape responsibility to meet squarely the great emergency which now confronts us.

This situation has been temporized with long enough. The President has ordered the miners to return to work on Monday. The Congress should immediately enact legislation imposing effective penalties upon those who would sabotage our war effort at home by refusing to back up our boys on the fighting front. Any compromise on this issue is unworthy of American principles and is unjust to those Americans who are fighting and dying on many foreign battlefields.

Unless constitutional government is preserved at home we can neither win the war nor win the peace after the war. This is what we are fighting for abroad. Let us not destroy it at home.

Mr. President, I am informed that the House has passed or is about to pass an adequate antistrike bill, including amendments to the Connally bill.

The Senate should proceed immediately to act upon these amendments and, if possible, agree to them without sending the bill to conference.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I heartily concur in the remarks just made by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and want to

call attention to the fact that from the very first day I became a Member of the Senate I have introduced bills, and fought for their enactment, which would outlaw labor racketeering and bring an end to this era of strikes, work slowdowns, and work stoppages which are so seriously retarding our war effort.

The coal strike is bad, but it is not the only strike now in effect in this Nation. There are many strikes in effect right now, and because of strikes more than 5,000,000 man-days of labor have been lost since Pearl Harbor.

At this time I desire to call attention to some serious consequences which result from labor leader racketeering.

I wish to read a news article which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald yesterday. The article comes by United Press from Pevely, Mo. It is as follows:

AGENT FOR STRIKERS FOUND SHOT TO DEATH

PEVELY, Mo., June 2.—Joseph "Buck" Newell, business agent for the Hoisting Engineers' Union, which halted work for nearly a week on a vital aviation gasoline pipe line to the East, was found shot to death at his home near here tonight. Police said he had been shot in the back. The strike flared into violence on several occasions, with injuries to nonunion men. Work was resumed on the project only after Gov. Forrest C. Donnel, of Missouri, called out State guards.

I read that news item for the reason that it has connection with some other news which I reported to the Senate on May 3, and which is printed on page 3825 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. At that time I read a telegram which I had received that day from Garfield Crawford, of Cape Girardeau, Mo., in which he told of labor difficulties in Missouri, where they were endeavoring to lay the 24-inch pipe line to bring oil from Texas to the eastern seaboard. It seems that some of the labor racketeers endeavored to use force and violence on Mr. O. B. Young, of Odessa, Tex.; Mr. Robert Nickel, of Odessa; and Mr. Samuel Goodrum, of Tyler, Tex.

Those three Texas men, having experience in laying pipe lines, had gone to Missouri for the purpose of aiding in the Government project of laying the line from Texas to the East to bring our oil from Texas and the Southwest, not only for the homes and war factories in the Northeast but for use in our merchant and Navy ships and for our air bombers and tanks overseas.

When they got to the place in Missouri where the pipe line was being laid they were attacked and beaten by the "goon" squad because they would not join a union.

Here is the telegram which Mr. Crawford sent to me on May 3:

Blood will run like water in southeastern Missouri, Scott, and Girardeau Counties unless the Government steps in at once Monday to rid labor racketeers from interference with peaceful construction of 24- and 20-inch oil and gasoline pipe lines from Texas to eastern seaboard. Goon squad of American Federation of Labor gathered at Cape Girardeau and Illmo, beating up peaceful truckers delivering 24-inch pipe line; two serious fights already April 30 in railroad yards at Illmo, and April 28 in dining room of Marquette Hotel, Cape Girardeau. Officers of law, former railroad unioneers at Illmo, evidently in league with goon squad as town marshal unarmed contractor C. H. Dunn's two guards telling guards to quit railroad yards and he would protect workers; as soon as guards left goon squad moved in and almost killed three of Dunn's men. O. B. Young, of Odessa, Tex., Dunn's employee, in St. Francis Hospital, fractured skull, probably die, and no arrest made as yet.

No dispute as to wages, hours, or working conditions; only question of forcing Dunn's men to join against their will. Same situation exists with Oil States Construction Co. pipe-line laying contractors; none of Dunn's men belong to union and refuse to join.

Union racketeers have brought on three strikes in Bolz Dredging Co., laying river loop of big inch line across Mississippi from Grays Point, Mo., to Thebes, Ill. All this work is under War Emergency Pipe Line Corporation, a child of Jesse Jones' Defense Plant Corporation, a branch of Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Here is a statement George C. Bolz, president of Bolz Dredging Co.:

"I have contracts to lay three pipe lines across the Mississippi River as links in the war emergency pipe-line system. I have personally supervised all work to cause a minimum of delay. We have been faced with extreme weather conditions of high water in the river, strong winds, and heavy ice, and yet I pressed on with the work and approximately 60 percent of the work was carried on 24 hours per day. I have been 100 percent American Federation of Labor union contractor for many years. Regardless of my sincerity in performing this much-needed work and faithfully following union principles, union leaders have stopped operations and called their men away from the job at three critical periods of the work—April 2 and 6, April 9 to 11, and the last, which has not been ended, from April 28. Work on the part of our union employees has been considerably below par during this entire period from April 2 to the present time. My job is stopped because other contractors in nearby sectors of the war pipe line operate open shop, not because of any quarrel with my organization. Minutes count much, delays in vital war work as the transportation of oil and gasoline are disastrous and should not be tolerated.

"GEO. C. BOLZ,
"Geo. C. Bolz Dredging Co."

This is the message, too. This is a copy of a wire from C. W. Cromley, assistant traffic manager for War Emergency Pipe Lines, Inc., to C. Hobson Dunn, Cape Girardeau:

"Now, 27 cars pipe at Morely, Mo.; none unloaded since April 27; total of 70 cars there and en route. When will these cars be released? Must have action."

I saw these cars with pipe rusting; demurrage is piling up against contractor, $4 per day per car. Strike delaying construction; responsible for loss of 1,148 feet of extra-heavy 24-inch pipe, causing loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars to Government. Why has not Washington given this important defense work police protection like it has other defense work? This is Ickes' job, and he does not give protection. Dunn's men and Oil State Construction Co. now trying to put through 20-inch line to carry high-octane gasoline from Southwest oil fields to eastern seaboard. Subchasers, airplanes to get this fuel to carry on war in Africa and Europe. All work suspended, but upon request of War Emergency Pipe Line, Inc., Dunn must unload cars. Lives of Dunn and two guards threatened by "goon" leaders. "Goon" leaders have long criminal records; getting this for you. Chief of police of Cape Girardeau supplied me with police record of Joseph Edward Newell, St. Louis labor racketeer and heading "goon" squad. Sending you clippings from papers by mail to hotel. This is serious; help is needed and needed quick. Information given me by district attorney, Cape Girardeau County. Every day's delay means loss of 250,000 barrels high-octane gas per day to fighting forces and more than 300,000 barrels daily of crude for eastern refineries and defense factories. Texas refineries standing idle due to slow-down here.

GARFIELD CRAWFORD,
Cape Girardeau, Mo.

Please note in that telegram the name of Joseph Edward Newell.

The news article which I just read from yesterday's Washington Times-Herald gives the news of the death of this same man, Joseph "Buck" Newell, whose body had been found at his home and who had been shot in the back.

We all regret to know that there is such serious violence in this country. The coal strike is a bad thing, but there are many other strikes in progress right at the present time, and the pipe-line labor disturbance has ended very disastrously.

At the same time, it seems to me that something should be done by the Congress to prevent the use of force and violence while these men are out endeavoring to perform a useful service for their country. Thinking that something might possibly be accomplished, on May 3 I referred the matter to Attorney General Biddle, and I have received from him the following letter, dated May 21, 1943:

I have your letter of May 3, 1943, enclosing a copy of a telegram you received from Garfield Crawford, of Cape Girardeau, Mo., with reference to certain labor difficulties in Scott and Cape Girardeau Counties, Mo.

The facts as outlined in Mr. Crawford's telegram of May 3, 1943, had not been reported to me previous to the receipt of your letter. I have caused a careful examination to be made of Mr. Crawford's complaint and it has been concluded that the matters stated do not involve a violation of any Federal statute.

I bring Attorney General Biddle's letter to the attention of the Senate at this time to show that there are no Federal statutes making unlawful the labor-leader racketeering which took place in southeastern Missouri—Scott and Cape Girardeau Counties.

In this connection I wish to also call attention to Senate bill 189, which I introduced on the first day I became a Member of the United States Senate. It is the same bill which I recommended to the Texas Legislature when I was Governor of that State, and which was enacted by the Legislature of Texas. It has proven to be very beneficial in protecting employees of great industries which are taking part in the war effort. We have not had any strikes of consequence in those war industries in Texas since that bill was enacted. The bill is a simple one. It prevents strikes by outlawing the use of force and violence, without which strikes would be ineffective. Using force and violence by individuals at home to get by force what they desire is the same as individuals in other nations using force and violence to get by force what they want from other nations. We are fighting a world war to outlaw force and violence by nations. Why not practice what we preach and outlaw the use of force and violence here

in our own Nation among our own citizens?

I wish to take time to read this short bill to show how simple and fair it is:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any person by the use of force or violence, or threat of the use of force or violence, to prevent or to attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person acting in concert with one or more other persons to assemble at or near any place where a labor dispute exists and by the use of force or violence, or threat of the use of force or violence, prevent or attempt to prevent any person from engaging in any lawful vocation, or for any person to promote, encourage, or aid any such assemblage at which such force or violence, or threat thereof, is so used. As used in this section, the term "labor dispute" shall have the meaning assigned to it in section 2 (9) of the National Labor Relations Act.

SEC. 3. Any person who violates any provision of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be imprisoned for not less than 1 year nor more than 2 years.

SEC. 4. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remander of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

As I have said, I introduced the bill the first day I was a Member of the United States Senate August 4, 1941. It is still being held in the Judiciary Committee. Since I introduced it I have offered the bill several times as amendments to other bills on the floor of the Senate, where it failed each time to receive sufficient support for enactment. If the bill were enacted into law it would, without doubt, have a tendency to prevent the use of force and violence in labor disputes such as that connected with the building of the pipe line, to which reference has been made. Possibly it will save the lives of many people.

All over the United States strikes are taking place. Unless something is done about the terrible strike in the coal industry, it will without doubt result in force and violence being used, and possibly the shedding of blood, and perhaps many men will lose their lives.

I shall continue to urge that the Judiciary Committee bring out the bill to which I have referred and that it be given consideration on the floor of the Senate.

I also wish to call attention of Senators to a telegram which I have just received on this subject from Mr. and Mrs. W. W. Harris, of El Campo, Tex. The telegram is somewhat similar to many telegrams and letters which I am receiving from day to day. I will place only this telegram in the RECORD. It reads as follows:

JUNE 3, 1943.

Hon. W. LEE O'DANIEL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

As parents of one son who has paid the supreme sacrifice and three others in the armed forces of our country we want to know why Lewis or the coal miners can sabotage the coal industry and remain at liberty while our boys are dying at the front. We demand that the Government, of which you are a part, make the miners work or fight, and that Lewis be tried for treason. This telegram and your reply will be published in the local newspapers.

W. W. and Mrs. HARRIS.

My reply was as follows:

JUNE 4, 1943.

Mr. and Mrs. W. W. HARRIS,
El Campo, Tex.:

Answering your telegram, permit me to extend to you my heartfelt sympathy in the loss of your noble patriotic son who gave his life for his country. I trust your other three sons will return home safely. While your brave, patriotic sons are fighting and dying to save our Nation, it is a most disgraceful thing to see labor leader racketeers calling strikes and work slow-downs in our war industries, and I have been fighting for legislation to outlaw labor-leader racketeering in America ever since the first day I was in Congress when I introduced the same anti-violence strike bill that we passed in Texas while I was Governor. The bill is still being held up in the Judiciary Committee I have also introduced the same bill several times as amendments to other bills, but it always failed to receive enough votes for enactment. I expect to continue to fight for legislation which will outlaw labor-leader racketeering and I sincerely hope that some effective legislation will soon be enacted.

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL.

The telegram from Mr. and Mrs. W. W. Harris, of El Campo, expresses the true sentiment of mothers and fathers of this Nation who are giving their most precious possessions, their own sons, to fight and die for the protection and preservation of our Nation. It also expresses the true sentiment of thousands of other mothers and fathers throughout this Nation and shows the growing indignation of our people against the irresponsible labor-leader racketeering so prevalent in this Nation. These people are looking to Congress and pleading for Congress to enact legislation that will stop this racketeering which is so seriously threatening our war effort and endangering the lives of our boys on the battle fronts.

I am glad to know that the House of Representatives has just passed a measure bearing on the strike situation. I hope its provisions will stop these strikes and abolish labor-leader racketeering, and that it will soon be ratified by both bodies and will become the law of this Nation. In speaking on this subject I want again to make it clear that I am not criticizing the honest laboring men and women of this Nation who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow, and who are making such a worthy contribution to our war effort. I am fighting only those rosy-cheeked labor-leader racketeers who toil not, but who live in luxury from the loot they steal from the pockets of honest working people by charging them for their God-given right to work, and part of which loot they contribute to political campaigns of those who refuse to use their power and influence to outlaw labor-leader racketeering by legislation. I have very patiently and very persistently fought for such legislation since my first day in this Senate, and I intend to keep on fighting for it. I hope we will soon enact some sound, honest, effective legislation along this line.

In this time of great national stress I want to warn my colleagues who come from the cold and frozen northern States that next winter your constituents will perhaps be cold again because they cannot burn in their stoves and furnaces the oil that was not transported through the 24-inch pipeline while construction of the line was stopped by the labor-leader racketeers. They also will be unable to heat their homes and factories with the coal that is today not being mined on account of the coal strike called by labor-leader racketeers. Also I wish to close by saying that while most of the people of this Nation despise these labor racketeers who call strikes during wartime, yet let us not overlook the fact that outside of the moral or unwritten laws of fairness, decency, and loyalty to our Nation, they have violated no Federal laws, except the laws which Congress has failed to pass.

THE LABOR SITUATION AND LABOR'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, we have listened to several discussions, both yesterday and today, with reference to the labor situation in the country generally and with reference to the coal situation in particular.

Mr. President, I am one who believes that we can be proud of the contribution which has been made by labor in this country since the beginning of the emergency. The record is generally excellent. Our production at home has broken every record heretofore established. Our record, compared with the records available in industrial countries abroad, is far better, in every case, than the very best that was ever made by any other nation in the world. The American workman will produce as much in a 36-hour week as the workman in a foreign country will produce in 48 or 50 hours a week.

In addition to that, Mr. President, labor has made a long-range contribution to the Nation's war effort. I can go back to the turn of the century when, as a very young man, it was necessary for me to engage in the most hazardous type of railroad work. I know the conditions which existed in every community of the country in those early days and I know that if those conditions now prevailed, instead of 50 percent of the young men being rejected in the early days of the draft law the rejections would perhaps have been such that an army of the magnitude of our present Army would be impossible of recruitment. To the improvement of the standards which have lifted American manhood in strength, physically, and mentally, and have resulted in a higher degree of safety, greater facilities for adequate education, better health and better housing, organized labor has made a noteworthy contribution. I think now of the long hours, of the little children snatched from school, of the night work forced upon women and young girls, of the scandalous tenement exposures which were revealed in my own State, and I can say that were it not for the power and strength and the leadership of labor many of those barbaric practices would persist today.

Of course, Mr. President, labor is made up of human beings, and human beings, no matter where they may be or what vocation they may follow—and the statement applies to those who are engaged in industry, in finance, and in every other walk of life as well as to labor—are subject to the same errors. Because of that, labor has made mistakes, mistakes which have seriously injured or retarded the progress of the labor movement, and made it more difficult for those who would speak for and espouse and advocate the cause of labor.

In my judgment it would be an indefensible error for labor to engage in any strike which would, in any way, retard the Nation's war effort. While there have been periodic transitory and spasmodic outbreaks, there has yet to be a major strike since the leaders of organized labor signed a nonstrike agreement, and it is my prediction that there will be no major strike. The patriotism, the loyalty and the devotion of the workers of America, and the women as well, whose sons and daughters are in this war effort, are of such high degree that they will not strike while our brave and patriotic troops are scaling the mountain heights in Alaska, are engaged in the jungle warfare of the South Pacific, or are battling the enemy on the sandy deserts of Africa, or while our heroic men in the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard are locked in mortal combat with the enemy on the seven seas. A large proportion of the young men who constitute the Nation's fighting forces come from the homes of labor, and many of them are the sons of fathers who go down into the bowels of the earth to mine the solid fuel for war effort needs. Boys with malaria in their blood streams as a result of military service in far-off lands, boys with inadequate and inferior meals in their mess kits, boys bleeding from a hundred wounds out there on the no man's land of this war come in great part from the homes of the workers of America; and no man with a son engaged in this conflict, no man loyal to the flag of our country, will refuse to honor the instructions of the Commander in Chief, because to do so would be not only detrimental to labor iteself, it would be devastating to all that is holy and noble upon this earth.

Mr. President, the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of our forces, the man who speaks for democracy when he speaks, the very symbol of justice and righteousness in conquered countries, where hunger and squalor, resulting from the mandates of the cruel dictators abide, the very hope of the world calls upon the patriotic miners of the country to return to their mines in these words:

> As President and Commander in Chief, I order and direct the miners who are not now at work in the mines to return to their work on Monday, June 7, 1943. I must remind the miners that they are working for the Government on essential war work.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from New York probably is as well versed in matters relating to labor as is any other Member of the United States Senate. He is making a most important speech on a subject which is of interest to every citizen of this country. There are not now many Senators on the floor, and, because there are not, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield for that purpose?

Mr. MEAD. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Pepper
Andrews	Gurney	Radcliffe
Austin	Hatch	Reed
Bailey	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hayden	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hill	Russell
Barbour	Holman	Scrugham
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bone	La Follette	Smith
Brewster	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McCarran	Tunnell
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Caraway	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chandler	McNary	Van Nuys
Chavez	Maloney	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wheeler
Connally	Millikin	Wherry
Danaher	Moore	White
Eastland	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Nye	Willis
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wilson
George	O'Mahoney	
Gerry	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I was reading to the Senate the order issued by the President and Commander in Chief with reference to the return to work of the miners now on strike. The order issued by the President is as follows:

> As President and Commander in Chief, I order and direct the miners who are not now at work in the mines to return to their work on Monday, June 7, 1943. I must remind the miners that they are working for the Government on essential war work and it is their duty no less than that of their sons and brothers in the armed forces to fulfill their war duties.
>
> Just as soon as the miners return to work, the disposition of the dispute between the miners and the operators will forthwith proceed, under the jurisdiction of the War Labor Board and in accordance with the customary and established procedures governing all cases of this sort.

Mr. President, in my judgment, no man and no organization under present-day circumstances and conditions can afford to defy the President of the United States. It is my opinion, as I was saying to the Senate when the quorum call was had, that up until this late date organized labor has faithfully adhered to its no-strike policy; and that statement applies to the leaders of labor without exception. It is my studied opinion that when the record of this war is history, the same statement can be repeated as a truism. In other words, I believe that when the leaders of labor signed the no-strike pledge they knew what they were signing, they were aware of the conditions under which we are burdened, and they realized that labor would resort to arbitration and mediation and conciliation in the settlement of their disputes.

Mr. President, the Truman committee, of which I am a member, took up the matter of work stoppages as a result of strikes, and they particularly had in mind the possibilities of a coal strike. In making their report to the Senate and to the country they voiced sentiments with which I am in hearty accord and which bear with particular emphasis on the conditions in which the country finds itself today.

In reading that report I find the following:

> This Nation is fighting for its very existence and for the preservation of all our rights, including the right of labor to seek by proper means a fair and just share of the goods produced. In such a situation, our Government has the right and duty to tell, not ask—

And no doubt they had in mind the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, as the spokesman—

> labor and those who represent it and management and its representatives that there shall be no stoppage of work in essential war industry.
>
> At the same time, Government must recognize that when it tells labor not to exercise during wartime its right to strike, it is depriving labor of its chief weapon with which to force management to be fair to labor. Government must, therefore, assume a duty to labor to see that it gets fair and square treatment.

Mr. President, I am familiar to a limited degree with the problems and the difficulties under which the miners are called upon to work, and it has been my thought that until recent years we tolerated a condition which we had no right to permit to exist in this country. The miners of the country were driven as slaves would be driven in other countries. The conditions under which they worked were in some instances cruel, if not brutal. The wages of the miners were inadequate. The homes of the miners were hovels. The diet of the miners was little better than a starvation diet. But, to the lasting credit of the present President of the United States and a friendly majority in the House and the Senate, a majority made up, as it was, by both Republicans and Democrats, the condition of the mine workers of America has been improved so that it is far better than it was prior to 1932. I do not mean to say by that, that justice in the fullest measure or even in a most reasonable measure has been done to the miners of America. I do not mean to say that they have no disputes to arbitrate, no grievances to mediate, for they have; but I do mean to point out the fact that they have a friendly administration and, above all, they have in the President of the United States one of the best friends they ever have had in the White House in the history of the Nation.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. First, I wish to say that I know the Senator from New York is a real friend to labor. His record clearly indicates his belief in labor and his desire to have labor accorded fair treatment and fairer opportunities. Second, let me say that the President of the United States has, with the aid of Congress—both the House and the Senate—given the miners the greatest opportunity to improve themselves that I believe they ever have had under any other administration in the history of the country.

With those two things true, and admitting that the miners have grievances, in my opinion they have no grievances which should not be arbitrated before the War Labor Board or other appropriate agencies. It seems to me to be a great mistake when any labor leader refuses or any group of labor leaders refuse to take their grievances or their disputes before a legally constituted body of the United States.

I do not believe I have ever seen the men and women of the country so deeply stirred over the prospects of any other strike as I have over a coal strike. There are in the country men who realize, as does the Senator from New York, that, from the standpoint of production, labor has made the greatest showing that has ever been made in history; but they view with the greatest alarm, and they are deeply stirred over, the prospects of a strike in the coal industry—a strike which would impede the progress of our people in bringing the war to a successful conclusion.

Yesterday I received a telegram from Sergeant York, one of our greatest heroes, who lives on the borders of my State. I agree with him that the patriotic miners, regardless of their interests, must avoid a strike, and that in the interest of all the people the strike must not come to pass.

I express my appreciation of the fine statement the Senator from New York has been making, and I say that his record entitles him to speak with authority on this subject.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I thank the able junior Senator from Kentucky, and I agree with him when he states that the miners have grievances, and that we have set up agencies to hear those grievances.

I desire to reiterate what I said in the beginning of my remarks—that I believe the leadership of labor in this country is patriotic, that the personnel or membership of labor is patriotic, and that no strike which might impede or retard the war effort will have the sanction of the leadership which signed the no-strike agreement.

Mr. President, I want it to be understood that I am proud of the accomplishments of labor. I think that labor in this country has made a great contribution, first of all, over a long period of years in lifting the standards of the men and women who work for a living; second, it has made a great contribution by its production volume, which has broken every record in this country and in the world.

I have no grievance against any labor leader unless one who would either violate the no-strike agreement or cause work stoppage which would injure or retard the Nation's war production. As I stated in the beginning, in my judgment, that will not happen. The patriotism of the men who work in the mines, the stake they have in the war, and the flesh and blood from their homes in every American unit in our military forces throughout the world will, in my judgment, motivate them along proper channels and right ideals.

Yesterday my able and distinguished colleague [Mr. WAGNER] made this statement to the Senate:

> The right to strike is a part of the liberty we are fighting for. The Labor Act preserves that liberty. But there is nothing in that act which says that labor cannot agree not to strike during a war, or voluntarily put restraints on its customary privileges, so as to lend its full strength in a democratic war.

That is what labor will do. It will not strike against the Nation's war effort.

> The no-strike pledge was agreed to by the president of the United Mine workers. The area of negotiation and award under the War Labor Board's jurisdiction in this controversy covers all the justified demands of the coal miners.
>
> * * * * *
>
> I have spoken out in defense of labor and the miners many times in the past when popular feeling ran high against them. I will do so again when their cause is just.

Those sentiments are my sentiments. That expression of friendship by the senior Senator from my State, whose record in behalf of labor stands out in comparison with that of the very best of friends labor has in this legislative body or any other legislative body in the country, reechoes my sentiments.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. While all of us agree that under certain conditions labor has the right to strike, does my friend from New York agree with the statement that there is no right possessed by labor or anyone else to strike against the Government of the United States?

Mr. MEAD. Labor has agreed, in the no-strike pledge, to forego the right to strike. The Government, compensating labor for giving up that right, has provided machinery which obviates the necessity of strikes. Therefore, there is no reason or cause——

Mr. CHANDLER. There is no right possessed by anybody to strike against the Government of the United States.

Mr. MEAD. That is especially true in time of war.

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] has asked me to have inserted in the RECORD a statement, part of which I shall read, which bears upon the subject which we are now discussing.

> The members of the United Mine Workers of America should immediately return to work with or without the consent of their leaders and produce the coal which is needed so badly to successfully carry on our war effort. If they fail to do so and our war production should be stopped because of the lack of coal and we should then lose this war, the members of the organization will soon learn from our conquerers that they will not be permitted to enjoy the privileges which they have obtained during the past 10 years.

Mr. President, I have before me an address delivered by Lewis Merrill, president of the United Office and Professional Workers of America, in which he says:

> Organized labor will respect its no-strike pledge, and will find other methods which are genuinely in the interest of the workers and of the people to correct its grievances. This is labor's war, and it will not prove treasonable to itself.

Mr. President, the Congress of Industrial Organizations has adopted resolutions which reiterate its pledge that there shall be no strike against the Nation's war effort. Among other things, it says:

> Labor's rights must be protected, vigorously protected, but they must be protected within the framework of rational procedure. Public servants and leaders of labor must follow this tenet.

So, Mr President, as a friend of labor, as a member of organized labor, as one who has held minor but honored positions in labor, and as one who has followed its struggles sympathetically for a long period of years, as one who has taken advantage of every proper opportunity to defend labor, I say that labor must give to this Government, this democracy, this struggle for the emancipation of everything that is decent and just, its fullest contribution. It is my judgment that labor will give no less. It is my studied opinion that the miners of America will continue to mine the coal; and it is my hope that the agencies of Government set up to consider their grievances will accord justice to the miners so far as their demands are justifiable.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very happy indeed to hear the Senator express himself in sympathy with the miners. Of course, we all regret the strike or walkout of miners which has occurred and is now being maintained. But my recollection is that we have had many strikes in this country—on the west coast, on the east coast, and in the Northwest. That is regrettable. However, we have heard more criticism of labor leaders as a result of the action of the miners than we have ever previously heard, which rather leads me to the conclusion that as a result of certain pent-up emotions in the bosoms of the American people relative to the strike situation, they have given vent to their feelings by expressions of enmity toward Mr. Lewis.

I wish to say very frankly that I am in sympathy with the miners. A miner receives approximately only $7 a day. His

time begins only when he puts his pick into the bowels of the earth to dig out the coal. He does not receive pay for the time consumed in getting upon the elevator, descending into the earth, and traveling on a little railway to the place where he is to use his pick and shovel and dynamite. That time is his own.

Seven dollars a day is not enough for a miner in view of the fact that the cost of living has risen so rapidly within the past several months. Today in Washington and elsewhere carpenters are paid $12 a day. A union carpenter worked for me last week. I paid him $1.50 an hour for 8 hours' work, which amounts to $12 a day. He is in no danger whatever while he is using his saw and hammer. The miner is in danger from the time he sets foot on the elevator to descend into the mine, where he takes the little railroad to travel for a mile or two in the bowels of the earth to the place where he starts digging, until he returns to the portal of the mine.

Miners and their families cannot make a living. I sympathize with what the Senator has said. We have no coal mines in the State of North Carolina, but nevertheless I am in sympathy with the coal miners. I hope, as does the Senator, that Government agencies may be able to find some way in which this problem may be adjusted.

I cannot believe all that has been said about Mr. Lewis. I know that he is said to be the character—the person who will stick up for his own people, and that when he believes he is right he will fight to the very end. It seems to me that Lewis has been fighting to help the members of his union, and has done everything he can do to help them. I believe that if he finds he cannot carry out his aims any further he will show the patriotism which we demand today of every man in America. I believe that John Lewis will show the American people that he is in favor of winning the war, that he is an American patriot, and that he will order the miners back to the mines. At least, I hope so. My sympathy is with the miners. We all know that they ought to be paid more money than they are now receiving. Everyone else has been given an increase in compensation, so why not grant it to the miners?

Mr. MEAD. My sympathies are with the miners in their justifiable grievances, and such grievances should be adjusted by the regularly constituted agencies of the Government.

Mr. REYNOLDS. They should be adjusted, and I hope they will be adjusted.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a statement made yesterday by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I heartily endorse the statements made by Senator WAGNER, of New York, today on the floor of the Senate respecting responsible and irresponsible labor leadership.

Senator WAGNER has been an ardent supporter of labor as I have always been. We both want to see labor retain the fair and just gains which it has made during the past 10 years. However, those gains cannot be retained, in my opinion, unless the affairs of the labor organizations of this country are handled by responsible men who look to the welfare of their country as well as the welfare of their membership. I do not believe that the rank and file of the members of labor unions condone now or will ever condone any action of any leader of theirs which would place their country in peril in a time of war, or even in a time of peace. The membership of any labor organization which is led by any man or men who will endanger their country's future must retire them or the laboring men themselves will be the sufferers.

The members of the United Mine Workers of America should immediately return to work with or without the consent of their leaders, and produce the coal which is needed so badly to successfully carry on our war effort. If they fail to do so and our war production should be stopped because of the lack of coal and we should then lose this war, the members of the organization will soon learn from our conquerors that they will not be permitted to enjoy the privileges which they have obtained during the pas 10 years.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I have heard that Mr. Lewis has ordered or invited the miners to return to work on Monday next. Has the Senator heard that?

Mr. MEAD. Yes. I have just been so advised by my distinguished colleague from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not have the floor, but I should like to finish my statement.

There has been much said about submitting the controversy to the War Labor Board. Frankly, I do not think any lawyer would submit a case to a board whose members had made up their minds in advance. It is quite impossible for me to see how the Board could do anything but turn the miners down, when the order to "hold the line" has already been issued. They could not receive more than was allowed under the Presidential order.

I had occasion to talk to the head of the Labor Board when he issued a statement to the effect that the miners should not negotiate further with the operators. I asked him to cite the law permitting or authorizing him to make any statement to the effect that neither the miners nor the company should negotiate. I have examined the law. I can find nothing in any law which would give any official the right or authority under any circumstances or conditions, to say that the miners and the operators should not continue to negotiate if they wish so to do. I think the War Labor Board went far beyond its authority when it issued such a statement.

I am glad, as I know every other Member of the Senate is, that Mr. Lewis has invited or ordered the miners to return to work. I have no doubt that they will return. However, I believe every Member of the Senate realizes that the miners are engaged in one of the most hazardous occupations in the United States. Certainly those who know anything about mining, whether it be hard-rock mining, or coal mining, know that it is a most hazardous occupation.

As I have stated before, in every mining industry in the United States except the coal mining industry, the miners receive pay from collar to collar. The only miners who do not receive pay from collar to collar are the coal miners. I have it on the authority of coal operators themselves that the average time consumed from the time the men leave the collar of the mine until they arrive at the point of actual work, and the time consumed in returning from there to the collar of the mine, is approximately 1½ hours.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I interrupt merely because the information was given to me just a few moments ago by Mr. Bell, of the Associated Press, that Mr. Lewis had signified his willingness to have the policy committee direct the coal miners to return to work. I am not quoting the exact language, but in view of what the Senator said I thought the Senator from New York should read the bulletin which has been issued, and which, of course, is of very great interest to all Senators.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague [Mr. HATCH] handed this bulletin to me a moment ago, from which I shall quote. In a letter to John L. Lewis, Mr. Ickes said:

As operator of the coal mines on behalf of the United States Government I expect that you will direct the members of the United Mine Workers of America to return to work on Monday, June 7.

Mr. Ickes used the words "I expect that you will direct."

In his reply Mr. Lewis made the following statement in acknowledging the letter of Mr. Ickes:

I have no power to direct. I shall, however, recommend to the policy committee of the United Mine Workers of America that it direct the mine workers to return to work on Monday, June 7.

It was my opinion from the very beginning that the elected representatives of the United Mine Workers of America who participated in the conference and signed the no-strike agreement would live up to their agreement.

Mr. President, coal miners are loyal to their country. For months the draft boards in the mining districts were not called upon to draft men for military service because their quotas were filled from among the great number of miners who volunteered.

Knowing the miners as I do, particularly the miners of Pennsylvania, knowing of their patriotism and loyalty, and knowing of the overwhelming numbers of them who volunteered, and having handled, as I did years ago, many trains of coal which came from the mines, it was my overwhelming judgment that when it came to the judgment of their own economic well-being, and the well-being of our fighting men, they would make every sacrifice necessary. So I am very glad to be able to read this statement, and I hope that in

every district in the United States where miners are employed, whether or not the policy committee has opportunity to take affirmative action before Monday—every last miner will return to his work and produce the maximum volume of coal possible of production.

The miners have grievances, as I said a moment ago. Those grievances we were told by the newspapers were at one time close to adjustment; in fact, the miners and the operators were only 50 cents apart. We know that as the result of a court decision portal-to-portal pay can now be placed on a legal basis, and perhaps the miners will be given that compensation. At any rate, the miners should and will have friends in this body and in the other body and throughout the United States as a result of their acquiescence in the order issued by the President of the United States.

After all, the President is our leader; we have no other leader; he is the one man we must follow in this crisis; it is a case of sink or swim with that leadership. That leadership, Mr. President, I embrace and you embrace, and every patriotic man and woman in America, regardless of his station in life or his political affiliation or any other consideration, must follow the leadership of the present President of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 495) to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. MERRITT, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. SHORT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1762) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. STARNES of Alabama, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. CASE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2584) to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2766) amending the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2766) amending the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I should like to make a few observations with reference to the pending legislation, and I wish to do so as a member of the Civil Service Committee of the Senate. Prefacing my remarks so that every Senator may know my attitude, let me say that I have opposed every bill of this character which has been brought before the Senate since I became a Member of this distinguished body. I voted against the proposal calling for the confirmation of regional and field officers of the War Manpower Commission, whose confirmation by the Senate is now required.

I supported the civil-service requirement with reference to appointments by O. P. A. and W. P. B., and other war agencies. I favored civil service insofar as O. P. A. appointees are concerned in the districts, in the States, and in the regions created by that organization. My position, therefore, Mr. President, has been consistent.

I have never sought the appointment of anyone in any of the war agencies as being a matter in which I was personally concerned. I believe, however, Mr. President, that the proposed legislation the Senate is now considering should be studied by the Civil Service Committee of the Senate. In my opinion, there is confusion and misunderstanding in the minds of many as to what are and what are not positions in the Federal service that come under the definition of policy-making positions. A more definite line of demarcation would result if the problem were given careful study by those deeply concerned with civil-service matters.

I believe the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to be helpful and in the right direction.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has just expressed my own thought. I believe the O'Mahoney amendment to be helpful and in the right direction, but even it does not really reach the problem with which we are concerned. The Senator from New York, who is a member of the Committee on Civil Service, and who, as I happen to know, has spent as much time and work in trying to improve the merit system of this Government as has any other man in the Congress—and I want to compliment the Senator for it—understands that that really is our task; that is the thing in which all of us should be interested. Of course, Mr. President, you know and I know, and everyone else who has had any connection with Government departments knows, that the civil service is not perfect by any means; it has plenty of faults; but our job is to correct those faults, rather than to destroy the merit system and return to the spoils system.

Mr. MEAD. My colleague from New Mexico is absolutely correct.

The amendment which I am discussing is an amendment which is pointed in the right direction, and with study by the Civil Service Committee, I am sure that a very definite policy may be formulated and adopted.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield further to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wish to say now, and I should like to have the RECORD show and every Senator to note, that those of us who oppose the pending bill are definitely in favor of the confirmation of every genuine policy-making official; there is no question about that.

Mr. MEAD. I will say to my distinguished colleague that that is my attitude.

Mr. HATCH. I should like to add a thought which comes to my mind on recalling a statement in an editorial, I think, in one of the Washington newspapers, that while we favor, as did the newspaper, the confirmation of those who are really policy-making officials, there is no need for taking a steam shovel to fix a watch. No one would take a steam shovel to fix a watch; but that is exactly what the proponents of the pending bill are doing; they are taking a steam shovel and, with sledge hammer blows, trying to fix a watch.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, to add another illustration to the one just given to the Senate by my distinguished colleague from New Mexico, I need but remind you of the situation that existed in this country before the merit system was adopted, and then to ask for a consideration of the problem of the average Senator, if we were called upon to make appointments which would necessarily have to be made if there were no Civil Service Commission. Think of the conditions which would exist in the postal services of the United States, where at one time it was thought more necessary that a carrier carry his district on election day than to carry his mail bag every day of the workingweek. Think of the burden all of us, especially those from so

large a State as mine, would have to bear when called upon to confirm and consider appointments of thousands of men in the various offices and agencies of the Federal Government. I would have no time to do anything else than to consider the long lines of personnel who would have to be appointed in the various departments and agencies of our Government.

The civil service has made a marked contribution to the efficiency of Government and to the efficiency of the legislative division of the Government.

Therefore, Mr. President, as I stated in the beginning, I hope that the pending bill will be referred by the Senate to the Committee on the Civil Service of the Senate, where it can be studied, where hearings will be held, and where an attempt will be made to define what are and what are not policy-making positions.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator had done me the honor to read the minority views which I filed, he would have found that I recommended that the course which the Senator now proposes should be followed, and at the appropriate time, if some other Senator does not make the motion, I expect to move to refer the bill to the Committee on the Civil Service; and I hope very much that the Senate will adopt the motion.

Mr. MEAD. If the motion shall be made, I shall be very happy to support it, and if the bill shall be referred to the Committee on the Civil Service, I do not believe anyone would find fault with the consideration it would receive at the hands of that committee.

Let me read a list of the personnel of the Senate Committee on the Civil Service, a committee which has been studying civil-service matters since its inception, a committee which is never called upon to consider matters which should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, a committee never called upon to take over the troubles of the Finance Committee, a committee which never delves into problems affecting the Appropriations Committee. Therefore I believe that when a civil-service matter comes up, it should be referred to the Civil Service Committee, which, for a long period of years, has made a specialty of studying civil-service matters.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I say frankly that I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum. I shall not do so unless the Senator agrees, but I should like to have Senators here on the floor listen to what the Senator is now saying. Will he yield for that purpose?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I should like to yield for that purpose, but I have an idea that my speech is about concluded, and that another Senator is very anxious to take the floor, and under the circumstances I shall have to ask that I be permitted to continue my speech.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to say to the Senator that I appreciate very much his yielding as he did a while ago, and it was only because of my desire to have other Senators hear what the Senator is saying that I wanted now to suggest the absence of a quorum. I regret that more Senators are not present.

Mr. MEAD. I thank the able Senator for his compliment and for his deep interest in my remarks and in the proposal which we are now considering. I stated a moment ago that if this proposal, purely a civil-service proposal, were sent to the one committee created by the Senate to consider civil-service matters, no harm would be done. Listen to the roster of the personnel of that committee.

The senior member is the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the author of the pending bill. There are also on the committee Senators GEORGE, of Georgia; BYRD, of Virginia; DOWNEY, of California; MEAD, of New York, and one or two new Senators, including Senator SCRUGHAM on the Democratic side, and on the Republican side there are Senator LANGER, Senator BURTON, Senator AIKEN, and Senator BROOKS.

I believe that the Senate is willing to let those men study this problem, and I know that when the time to vote comes, they will consider the question of being afforded an opportunity to study the pending bill. I hope the time will come when labor matters will be sent to the Committee on Education and Labor, when matters pertaining to finance will always go to the Finance Committee, and civil-service matters will go, not to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but to the Committee on the Civil Service of the Senate. That is the way such matters are handled in another body.

What is the use of training men to become specialists along certain lines, and then, when a very serious problem comes before the Senate, send it for consideration to a committee which seldom considers a question of the character involved?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. There would be great force and merit in the Senator's argument if the members of the Civil Service Committee had been as anxious and as industrious about having possession of the bill when it was first introduced. I should like to know what is the matter with the Committee on the Judiciary. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico is on the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. Not yet. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is on the Judiciary Committee, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is on the Judiciary Committee, and without any objection from anyone, so far as I am informed, this bill was sent to the Judiciary Committee. That committee considered it for a long time, and carefully, and voted 10 to 4 to report the bill to the Senate. What is the reason that at this time the Civil Service Committee comes in and asks for it? Where has the committee been all the time when the bill has been under consideration, from the time it was first introduced? Where were they then?

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator from New York yield to me again?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. One of the great difficulties in the Committee on the Judiciary, in the consideration of this particular bill, was the absence of the Senator from Kentucky, who was not present except on the day we finally voted, as I recall.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is not accurate about that, but I certainly was present the day the vote was taken, and that was the important day. I was one of 10 present who voted for the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I did not wish to get into a discussion with my friend from Kentucky, and if I offended him by making the statement about his absence, it was merely a remark made in good humor, and I withdraw it, and ask that it be stricken from the RECORD. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. CHANDLER. It will not be stricken, because everybody in the United States will know the Senator made the remark, and he might as well leave it in the RECORD.

Mr. HATCH. I was not serious; but the Senator was not present when in the Committee on the Judiciary I raised this exact question, and said the bill should go to the Committee on Civil Service. That is where it should have gone then, and that is where it should go now. If I offended my friend from Kentucky, I apologize deeply, and I am very sorry.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not mind that the Senator calls attention to my absence from the committee meetings, but I will not call attention to the Senator's absence—and all of us are absent at times. I take it that when we are absent there is some reason for it. But I will answer the Senator by saying that the day when the committee voted on the bill I was there, and voted for it.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator voted for the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is on the record, too. I have been present not only in the committee, but in the Senate, on every other important matter that has come up since I have been a Member of the Senate, and all Senators cannot say as much. I do not know whether the Senator from New Mexico can do so or not. If he can, I am very glad; if he cannot, I will not call attention to the fact that he cannot.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. MEAD. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to say in all earnestness that I have observed the conduct of the Senator from Kentucky since he has been a Member of the Senate of the United States. I have observed his votes on all important measures, and I wish to say publicly, as I have said privately, that I think the Senator from

Kentucky has made a most enviable record in the Senate of the United States. I congratulate the Senator on the record he has made.

Have I sufficiently apologized to the Senator?

Mr. CHANDLER. If my friend the Senator from New York will yield——

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. My friend the Senator from New Mexico is using the same salve on me that he used on the Senator from New York awhile ago to obtain a quorum call. I am grateful to the Senator for his statement, but with the permission of the Senator from New York, I wish to call attention to the other members of the Committee on the Judiciary, and say that, so far as I know, no objection was made to the bill going to the Committee on the Judiciary at any time, until the Senator from New Mexico said he made an objection after the bill had already gone to the committee. No effort was made, so far as I know or have been informed, on the part of any Senator to prevent the bill going to that committee. Let me ask the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] when he introduced his bill, if the Senator from New York will indulge me a moment?

Mr. MEAD. I shall be glad to.

Mr. McKELLAR. January 25, 1943.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is the first month of the present session. So far as I am informed no effort was made by any Senator to have the bill go to the Civil Service Committee or to any other committee, and the bill went to the Committee on the Judiciary, and was carefully considered by that committee.

Mr. President, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary is a very good committee. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is a member of that committee. So are the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. I have already referred to the fact that my friend from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is a valuable, hard-working member of that committee. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the committee. So is the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. So are the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS]. We find among Senators on the other side of the aisle that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is on the committee, and so are the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

After nearly 6 months' consideration of the bill the committee voted 10 to 4 to report it to the Senate. Of course, if Senators desire to send the bill to the Civil Service Committee now and have that committee go over the bill again, when I know that the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] wants to kill the bill, that is perhaps a good way to kill it. I prefer, so far as I am concerned, to have the Senate pass upon the bill, because it is now before us by reason of a large majority vote of the membership of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I shall yield the floor in a very few moments. I understand there is a possibility of another bill being brought up for consideration before the Senate adjourns today. I do not want to postpone such action. I wish to say that I agree with everything my distinguished colleague the Senator from Kentucky has said concerning the members of the Committee on the Judiciary. They are all capable, fine, scholarly men. I believe we could call the roll of the Senate, and without hesitation, I would be in unanimous agreement with the Senator from Kentucky if he were to insist that all the Members of the Senate are fine, scholarly persons, because I know they are.

The only point I wanted to make, Mr. President, was that when I became a Member of the Senate, after having served a long time in the House, and found that measures which I introduced were referred to various committees of the Senate, and when I looked around in the Labor Committee for labor bills and found that they were in the Finance Committee, when I looked for civil-service measures and was told that they were in the Committee on Foreign Relations, or in some other committee, I became confused. I was trained in a body where procedure was different than that. As the result of 20 years of experience in the other body I had a different idea with respect to reference of bills. I made inquiry and was told that the rules of the Senate are different from those of the other House. I was told that one time the Vice President made a decision which, liberally interpreted, meant that any Senator could send any bill to almost any committee to which he wanted it referred.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MEAD. I wish to make a statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. The inference is that——

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I do not yield as yet.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. MEAD. I know that if the distinguished author of the bill wanted it sent to the Civil Service Committee, and if he were to ask to have it sent to that committee, I am sure the committee would not object, and I am sure the Senate would not object. On the other side of the picture, if an individual member of the Senate Civil Service Committee were to rise in his wrath and demand that the bill be taken away from the Committee on the Judiciary and referred to the Committee on Civil Service he would be making a futile effort. I wanted to point out that I am of the opinion that proposed legislation should be sent to the committee which is trained to handle the particular type of legislation involved. I have no objection to the consideration given this bill by the Committee on the Judiciary. Its members are all fine men, they are all capable of considering this bill or almost any other bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know the Senator from New York does not want to do me an injustice by inference, but I am afraid his argument is doing me an injustice by inference. I had nothing whatsoever to do with what committee to which the bill was referred. I am not a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. I did not ask that the bill be sent to the Committee on the Judiciary. Therefore in the natural order of business I suppose it was referred by the Vice President to the proper committee. I know nothing about that at all. Of course, feeling the interest I did in the bill, I should have preferred—if I had had any preference about the matter—that it be sent to some committee of which I was a member. I did not take any part in that matter, and am not going to take any part in an attempt now to rerefer the bill to some other committee. The Committee on the Judiciary has to my mind faithfully studied the subject, it has gone over the bill with the greatest care, and it has made a favorable report on it, by vote of 10 to 4. So I want the Senator, the Senate, and the public to know that neither directly nor indirectly have I had anything to do with the reference of the bill.

Mr. MEAD. I know the Senator from Tennessee is correct in his statement, and I know it is in keeping with his record in the past. I know that if the Senator wanted the bill referred to the Civil Service Committee, where he is associated with us as a member, it would be referred to that committee.

However, Mr. President, I do not believe we should waste our time and the country's time by making political appointments. I believe the integrity of the Senate and of Senators is better protected by having Senators give more of their time to the effort to pass upon vital Senate confirmations rather than in making political appointments. Our job is to pass upon vital confirmations. That is our constitutional prerogative. That is the one job we should consider, insofar as personnel matters are concerned.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; but I desire to conclude my remarks.

Mr. CHANDLER. I shall interrupt the Senator only a moment.

Mr. MEAD. Very well; I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. My friend the Senator from New York agrees that the Postal Service is about as efficient as any other Government service we have, does he not?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator think we have had any great trouble in confirming the nominations of post-office appointees?—and we confirm the nominations of all appointees who are to re-

ceive more than $1,000 a year. Does the Senator think that any trouble or any lack of efficiency has occurred because we confirm those appointments?

Mr. MEAD. Is that the Senator's question?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I was one of the sponsors of the bill, now the law, bringing postmasters of the first, second, and third classes under the civil service. I believe that was a step in the right direction and increased the efficiency of an already efficient department. The task involved is not a difficult one. When every citizen of the United States within the district of a post office is publicly invited by the Commission to take an examination, and, when, after every man or woman qualified to take the examination, and desirous of taking it, does take it, the Civil Service Commission—not the Senator, not the Representative, not the Postmaster General, but the Civil Service Commission—gives the Post Office Department the names of three eligibles, that reduces the job, and that assures the Senate and the country that a qualified eligible is available. Then the Post Office Department sends one of the three names to the Senate committee—a very simple task. If that process were followed by the O. P. A., by the W. P. B., and by the War Manpower Commission, if it had the authority to do so—it does not have such authority—a more orderly procedure would result.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If that be the case—and we have to be realistic about these matters—why is it that the average Member of Congress is asked which one of the three he desires to have appointed?

Mr. MEAD. I cannot speak for the average Member of Congress, but I know I am not asked.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The average Member of the House of Representatives is asked in the case of appointments in his district.

Mr. MEAD. Of course, I cannot answer for them, but again I say that the task of selecting from an eligible list is altogether different from the task of picking someone because of some other consideration.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STEWART. The difference there is that we pick from three men, whereas in the instance to which reference has been made, and in the case of the evil which the bill would correct, we would pass upon only one man.

Mr. MEAD. I believe in the system which allows us to pick from three well-qualified persons—persons qualified by the recruiting agencies set up by the Government of the United States and approved by the Congress for the recruitment of Federal personnel.

Mr. President, while on that subject, let me say that I believe that appointees scrutinized by the Senate are in many instances better than those who are selected by an agency of the Government, without reference to the Senate or to the civil service. I maintain that appointees who are scrutinized by the civil service—appointees qualified as a result of an examination conducted by the civil service—are even better than those who are selected only after scrutiny by the Senate.

Mr. President, the only objection I have to the appointments made by the W. P. B., the O. P. A., and other agencies of the Government is that in the past they have not followed the civil-service rules and regulations set down in the legislation giving to them the power to organize their agencies and recruit their personnel. What they did in a great many instances—and perhaps because of the burden of the war—was to select the employee. Then, after the selection, they wrote the qualifications, and then they asked the Civil Service Commission to rubber-stamp him. As a result of that method of selectivity in my State, we found appointees who were seeking deferment from the draft and whose administrative experience was very limited, and in some cases nil.

Mr. President, today the Civil Service Commission is functioning in connection with all the war agencies. An examination is held in the first instance. The people in the community are invited to take the examination, and then the eligible list is sent to the agency which desires to have the appointment made. The trouble in the beginning was, as I have said, that the agency made the appointment, then wrote out the qualifications, and then asked the civil-service agent to rubber stamp the appointee. As a result, nepotism crept into the agencies of government, favoritism and discrimination were found here and there, and politics which would not be countenanced by Members of the Senate was discovered in one instance after another. However, that situation has been corrected as a result of a greater degree of stability in the matter of civil-service examinations.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wonder if the Senator from New York, who is eminently qualified to speak on the civil service, would approve of a system whereby the head of an agency designates the qualifications of the person to whom he wishes to give the appointment, then recommends certain appointees, then has the Civil Service Commission send an emissary into the community and has him proselyte individuals to apply for the position, and then turns down the recommendation of the head of the department?

Mr. MEAD. There are many instances which I could not support or recommend.

Mr. McCARRAN. What I have in mind is this: The Senator speaks about politics. It looks to me as if a new brand of politics is being set up by the Civil Service Commission, judging from some of its actions in recent times with which I have come in contact.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I will say that in the early recruitment of personnel for the O. P. A.—and the same situation probably applies with respect to other agencies of Government, as well—the recruiting activities as a result of the war emergency were taking so much of the time of the Civil Service Commission that it was physically impossible to hold all the examinations which were necessary. So, many of the agencies were given forthright power to make appointments, and then, later on, to have the applicant qualified. Many abuses resulted from the conferring of that authority, and the situation was not good; and I brought those cases to the attention of the Civil Service Commission.

However, today, as a result of the progress made by the Civil Service Commission in keeping approximately even with the demands upon it, the people of a community are now invited by a notice printed in a local newspaper to participate in the examination. That is being done now in my city. As a result of the invitation, an eligible list will be made available to the O. P. A., and the O. P. A. will be able to make an appointment from the list thus established. That is being done in every city in my State. Before the appointment is made, a civil-service examination is conducted, and a civil-service eligible list is given to the appointing power.

Mr. President, I do not want to say anything further except that I hope the bill will be referred to the Committee on Civil Service, for further study. I believe that my position is supported by the contention made during the debate that neither the amendment nor the bill itself clearly defines and clarifies what is or what is not a policy-making position. So, until that is done, I think the bill should be referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Two agencies of the Federal Government which are highly respected by the American people are the F. B. I. and the General Accounting Office. Why is it that, yesterday, the Comptroller General of the United States, the head of the General Accounting Office, in appearing before a committee of the Senate, expressed the opinion that he would rather select his personnel himself, and through his own agency, than through the civil service; and why is it that the F. B. I. selects a personnel which is so highly respected, without going to the civil service?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have concluded my remarks, and I now yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in view of the extreme urgency of the matter, I am wondering if the conferees could meet immediately and bring in a report on Monday or Tuesday. The Senator from Texas knows as well as I do the seriousness of the situation which exists.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the disposition of the Senator from Texas is for the conferees to go to work immediately on the bill and submit a report as soon as practicable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the House has not as yet appointed conferees.

Mr. CONNALLY. The House required a month to pass the bill after it passed the Senate, although it had been working on the subject for about a year. I think we ought to have a brief period——

Mr. BYRD. The emergency is serious.

Mr. CONNALLY. I realize the seriousness of the emergency. The Senator from Texas has realized it all along. It is also desirable to enact the bill in such form that it will be understandable. I have not been able to read in detail all the amendments of the House. I assure the Senator that so far as the Senator from Texas is concerned there will be no delay. I am anxious to get the bill into shape and bring it back to the Senate at the earliest practicable moment. If the House appoints conferees, I am willing to meet with them tomorrow.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I am advised that the House did not appoint conferees. The bill is messaged to us without action of that kind.

Of course, the Senate started the proceedings. The bill was first passed here. We have the papers. The bill will now have to be returned to the House for appointment of conferees; and inasmuch as the House has adjourned until Monday, no action can be taken until that day. If the motion of the able Senator from Texas should be agreed to and conferees on the part of the Senate should be appointed, the bill would have to be remessaged to the House, and the House would then have to appoint conferees. However, that could not be done earlier than Monday of next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. VAN NUYS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. DANAHER conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 796 be printed in the usual bill form with the House amendments thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate, Senate bill 796, the so-called Connally antistrike bill, in the form in which it passed the House of Representatives, with the House amendments thereto.

There being no objection, Senate bill 796, as passed by the House of Representatives today, showing the House amendments thereto, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"DEFINITIONS

"SECTION 1. As used in this act—

"(a) 'Person' means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, or any organized group of persons.

"(b) 'War contract' means—

"(1) a contract with the United States entered into on behalf of the United States by an officer or employee of the Department of War, the Department of the Navy, or the United States Maritime Commission;

"(2) a contract with the United States entered into by the United States pursuant to an act entitled 'An act to promote the defense of the United States';

"(3) a contract, whether or not with the United States, for the production, manufacture, construction, reconstruction, installation, maintenance, storage, repair, mining, or transportation of—

"(A) any weapon, munition, aircraft, vessel, or boat;

"(B) any building, structure or facility;

"(C) any machinery, tool, material, supply article, or commodity; or

"(D) any component material or part of or equipment for any article described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C);

"the production, manufacture, construction, reconstruction, installation, maintenance, storage, repair, mining, or transportation of which by the contractor in question is found by the President as being contracted for in the prosecution of the war.

"(c) 'War contractor' means the person producing, manufacturing, constructing, reconstructing, installing, maintaining, storing, repairing, mining, or transporting under a war contract or a person whose plant is equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required in the prosecution of the war or which may be useful in connection therewith; but such term shall not include a carrier, as defined in title I of the Railway Labor Act, or a carrier by air subject to title II of such act.

"(d) The terms 'employer', 'employee', 'representative', 'labor organization', and 'labor dispute' shall have the same meaning as in section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act.

"NOTICE TO STRIKE OR CONDUCT LOCK-OUT

"SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for a war contractor to conduct a lock-out until after the expiration of 30 days from the date on which such contractor gives to his employees or their representatives and to the Secretary of Labor written notice of his intention so to do together with a statement of his reasons for such intended lock-out, or for employees of a war contractor to strike until after the expiration of 30 days from the date on which they or their representatives give to such contractor and to the Secretary of Labor written notice of their intention to do so together with a statement of their reasons for such intended strike.

"STRIKE BALLOTS

"SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for employees of a war contractor to strike until after the Secretary of Labor has certified the result of a secret ballot taken, under the direction of the United States Conciliation Service, of the employees employed at the plant, plants, mine, mines, or other place or places of employment, or in the bargaining unit or units, with respect to which the notice under section 2 applies. At any time after the employees of a war contractor, or their representatives, give notice under section 2, such employees or their representative may request the Secretary of Labor to take, through the United States Conciliation Service, a secret ballot of the employees at the plant, plants, mine, mines, or other place or places of employment, or in the bargaining unit or units, with respect to which such notice applies, for the purpose of determining whether such employees favor or oppose such proposed strike. Upon receiving any such request, the Secretary of Labor shall direct the United States Conciliation Service to take forthwith such secret ballot, and after the taking of such ballot the Secretary shall by order forthwith certify the results thereof, which shall be open to public inspection.

"SEC. 4. (a) Any person violating any of the provisions of sections 2 or 3 shall be liable to a civil suit to any person injured thereby for damages resulting from such injury.

"(b) Any person who violates any of the provisions of section 2 or 3 shall on and after such violation cease to have and cease to be entitled for a period of 1 year to (1) the status of a representative or labor organization under the National Labor Relations Act; (2) the status of a person participating in or interested in any labor dispute for the purposes of section 4 of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes.'

"(c) In case any individual who violates any of the provisions of section 2 or 3 is an officer or representative of a labor organization, then on and after such violation and so long as such individual is an officer or representative of such labor organization, such labor organization shall cease to have or be entitled to the status of a labor organization under the National Labor Relations Act and cease to have the status of a person participating in or interested in any labor dispute for the purposes of section 4 of the act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes.'

"REGISTRATION OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 5. (a) Within 60 days after the date of enactment of this act and annually thereafter every labor organization in which employees of any war contractor participate, through its president, or other authorized officer shall register its identity with the National Labor Relations Board and shall state under oath the following information: The name of the labor organization; the address at which it has its principal office or does business; the names and titles of the officers; initiation fees; annual dues charged; assessments levied during the past 12-month period: *Provided, however,* That it is not the intention of this section to require any State, sectional, or local reports of individual insurance benefit assessments; limitations on membership; number of paid-up members; date of the last election of officers; the annual salary of each officer, including bonuses, travel and other expenses; and the date of the last detailed financial statement furnished all members, and the method of publication or circulation of such statement.

With such information shall be filed under oath detailed and intelligible financial statements and a copy of the constitution and by-laws of the labor organization.

"(b) Every labor organization established after the date of enactment of this act in which employees of any war contractor participate shall, when established and annually thereafter, register with the Board and furnish the information required of existing labor organizations under the provisions of subsection (a).

"(c) Any labor organization which fails to register with the Board and file the information required by this act shall be disqualified to act as the representative of employees in collective bargaining for such time as such failure shall continue: *Provided*, That in the initial registration only if information on a particular point is lacking, the statement 'no information' or 'no record' shall be considered an answer.

"SEC. 6. Section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 2, sec. 251), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 313. It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution in connection with any election to any political officer, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section. Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. For the purposes of this section 'labor organization' shall have the same meaning as under the National Labor Relations Act."

"SEC. 7. When possession of any plant, mine, or other property has been, or is hereafter taken by the Government under authority of section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or otherwise, by reason of a strike, lock-out, threatened strike, threatened lock-out, work stoppage, or other cause, such plant, mine, or other property shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as practicable but in no event more than 60 days after the termination of the conditions which caused possession of such plant, mine, or other property to be so taken.

"NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

"SEC. 8. The National War Labor Board (hereinafter called the 'Board'), established by Executive Order No. 9017, dated January 12, 1942, in addition to all powers conferred on it by section 1 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and by any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942, entitled 'An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes,' and by any other statute, shall have the following powers and duties:

"(a) Whenever the United States Conciliation Service certifies that a labor dispute (excluding any matter coming within the purview of the Railway Labor Act) exists which may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, and cannot be settled by collective bargaining or conciliation, to summon both parties to such dispute before it and conduct a public hearing on the merits of the dispute. If in the opinion of the Board such a labor dispute has become so serious that it may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, the Board may take such action on its own motion. At such hearing both parties shall be given full notice and opportunity to be heard, but the failure of either party to appear shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed to a hearing and order.

"(b) To decide the dispute, and provide by order the wages and hours and all other terms and conditions (customarily included in collective-bargaining agreements) governing the relations between the parties, which shall be in effect until further order of the Board. In making any such decision the Board shall conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; the National Labor Relations Act; the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; the act of October 2, 1942, hereinbefore referred to; and the regulations and orders issued under such acts; and where no law is applicable the order of the Board shall provide for terms and conditions to govern relations between the parties which shall be fair and equitable to employer and employee under all the circumstances of the case.

"(c) To apply to any Federal district court for an order requiring any person within its jurisdiction to obey a subpena issued by the Board; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred on any such court to issue such an order.

"POWER OF BOARD TO COMPEL ATTENDANCE OF WITNESSES

"SEC. 9. The National War Labor Board, by its Chairman, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of any books, papers, records, or other documents, which it deems relevant to any inquiry or hearing before the Board or any designated member or agent thereof. Such subpenas shall be enforceable in the same manner, and subject to the same penalties, as subpenas issued by the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, approved March 27, 1942.

"MAINTENANCE OF THE STATUS QUO

"SEC. 10. (a) After the Board has taken jurisdiction of a dispute as provided in section 8, the Chairman in order to effectuate the purposes of this act shall have power to issue an order (1) requiring any person to refrain or cease and desist from calling, or assisting in any manner, a strike arising out of such dispute; or (2) requiring the employer, who is involved in the dispute to refrain or cease and desist from practices which change the situation existing at the time the dispute arose, or which by changing an existing situation led to the dispute, and which the Chairman shall deem prejudicial to the prompt settlement of the dispute. No order of the Chairman or process of any court under this act shall require an individual employee to render labor or services without his consent, nor shall any provision of any such order or process be construed to make the refusal to work of an individual employee a violation of such order or process or otherwise an illegal act.

"(b) Such order shall be effective for such period as the Chairman shall determine, but shall, in any event, terminate within 5 days after the findings and recommendations of the Board or within 60 days after the date on which the order was issued, whichever first occurs. Any further order issued under subsection (a) in connection with the same dispute shall not extend beyond the termination date of the original order but terminate at the same time as such original order.

"REGULATIONS OF THE BOARD

"SEC. 11. The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind regulations providing appropriate procedures for carrying out the powers vested in it by this act.

"Whenever any such plant, mine, or other property has been or is hereafter so taken by reason of a strike, lock-out, threatened strike, threatened lock-out, work stoppage, or other cause, such plant, mine, or other property shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as practicable, but in no event more than 60 days after the termination of the conditions which caused possession of such plant, mine, or other property to be so taken.

"INTERFERENCE WITH GOVERNMENT OPERATION OF PLANTS

"SEC. 12. (a) Whenever any plant, mine, or other property is in the possession of the United States, it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, or induce any person to interfere, by lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption, with the operation of such plant, mine, or property, or (2) to aid any such lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such plant, mine, or property by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein. No individual shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this section by reason only of his having ceased work or having refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

"(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"TERMINATION OF ACT

"SEC. 13. Except as to offenses committed prior to such date, the provisions of this act and the amendments made by this act shall cease to be effective at the end of 6 months following the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or upon the date (prior to the date of such proclamation) of the passage of a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress stating that such provisions and amendments shall cease to be effective.

"SEC. 14. No member of the Board shall be permitted to participate in any decision in which such member has a direct pecuniary interest as an officer, employee, or representative of either party to the dispute."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants, mines, and other properties in the prosecution of the war, and preventing strikes, lock-outs, and stoppages of production, and for other purposes."

TRAINING OF NURSES FOR ARMED FORCES AND CIVILIAN NEEDS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2664, a bill to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes. I have obtained the consent of the Senator from Tennessee and of the leaders on both sides. I hope the consideration of the bill will not be prolonged.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator is asking unanimous consent temporarily to lay aside the pending bill.

Mr. BAILEY. That is all I am asking.

Mr. McKELLAR. If consideration of the Senator's bill should consume too much time, I would have the right to ask for the regular order.

Mr. BAILEY. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. With that understanding I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2664) to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor, with an amendment, in section 3, on page 4, line 10, after the word "training", to insert "to the extent that such maintenance is not compensated for by the value of their services during such period;".

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think we should have a brief statement from the able Senator from North Carolina as to the purposes of the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, as I understand, the bill was passed by the House by practically a unanimous vote. A similar bill, introduced by myself, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and it was unanimously approved by that committee. I think I can make a brief statement which will be satisfactory.

The purpose of the bill is to bring to the aid of our Government, in view of the armed conflict in which we are engaged and the great number of soldiers participating, a sufficient number of adequately trained nurses for the hospitals, camps, and field stations.

Our information is that there is a very great shortage of nurses. The number now available is altogether inadequate. It is proposed, therefore, that the Government shall undertake, through the office of the Surgeon General, to provide for the training of nurses and, of course, to pay certain expenses, although the bill carries no appropriation or authorization. It is in contemplation that recommendations will be made to the Committee on Appropriations by the Surgeon General.

The plan set out in the bill is as follows:

(a) That no student or graduate nurse will be included under the plan unless in the judgment of the head of the institution such nurse will be available for military or other Federal governmental or essential civilian services for the duration of the present war, and such nurse so states in her application for inclusion under the plan.

It is further provided that the institution in which the nurse takes the training—

Will pay student nurses under the plan a stipend at not less than the following monthly rates: $15 for the first 9 months of study; $20 for the following 15 to 21 months of combined study and practice, depending upon the curriculum of such institution.

Further, as to the expense to the Government, it is provided as follows:

From the sums appropriated therefor the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay each institution, with a plan approved under section 2—

To which I have just referred—

(1) with respect to items furnished student nurses thereunder, amounts determined by the Surgeon General to compensate such institution for—

(A) reasonable tuition and fees for the courses of study and training;

(B) reasonable maintenance provided pursuant to section 2 for the first 9 months of their course of study and training, to the extent that such maintenance is not compensated for by the value of their services during such period.

The language "to the extent that such maintenance is not compensated for by the value of their services during such period" is the committee amendment.

(C) uniforms and insignia, provided in accordance with section 2; and

(D) the minimum rate of stipend specified in section 2 for periods prior to completion of the course of combined study and training referred to in such section; and

(2) with respect to items furnished graduate nurses thereunder, amounts determined by the Surgeon General to compensate such institution for reasonable tuition and fees for postgraduate and refresher course of study, and reasonable maintenance for graduate nurses undertaking postgraduate courses, or such portion of such amounts as may be determined in accordance with regulations of the Surgeon General.

The matter has been very thoroughly canvassed. The bill comes to us supported by the proper departments of the administration and by the Surgeon General. It is directly associated with the war effort and is indispensable.

With that statement I turn the matter over to the chairman of the committee, Mr. THOMAS of Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, there is not much more to be said about the general scope of the bill. It is a war measure. Like most of the other war legislation, it will come to an end 6 months after the termination of the war.

At the present time the Government is training approximately 49,000 nurses, so this is not a new thing in any sense, but there is a demand for 65,000 nurses in training to take care of the demands which are being made upon the nursing profession.

This bill would, in a sense—but not in exactly the same sense—contribute to the training of nurses exactly what the Auxiliary Corps is contributing to the training of women in so many other lines.

The committee amendment merely provides that whenever any service is rendered by student nurses to the institution, the institution will pay back to the Government the value of such services. Therefore there could be no objection to the amendment. It merely provides for something which has already been done, and I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Following section 7 it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. 8. There shall be no discrimination against any institution on account of the size thereof or the number of nurses employed or student nurses training therein.

Mr. BAILEY. I believe the purpose of the amendment is clear. The purpose is to prevent discrimination against small institutions. As I understand, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor has agreed to accept the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 7, after the word "act", it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a comma, and add the following: *"Provided*, That there shall be no discrimination in the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the respective provisions of this act, on account of race, creed, or color."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, as I realize that the hour is late, I shall say only a brief word, but it is both pertinent and important to point out that only this afternoon I learned of the fact that there had been a typhoid epidemic in southern New Jersey, a mild epidemic, I am glad to say. In several instances the disease appeared among the Bahamians who were recently brought to New Jersey from the Bahamas to help relieve the shortage of farm labor in the southern part of my State. The fact that these cases of typhoid have appeared in this particular group shows the importance and need of the greatest possible medical care, and not only as provided by the bill itself, but as provided in my amendment, just agreed to, which provides that there shall be no discrimination so far as race, creed, or color is concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 2664 was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Clerk is authorized to renumber the sections.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, as an illustration of the temper of the American people with reference to the coal strike, I should like to read into the RECORD a telegram among many which I have received within the last day or two, together with my answer thereto, as well as an editorial which appears in an Oklahoma newspaper of this date.

The telegram is as follows:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *June 3, 1943.*

Hon. ED MOORE,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

It is absolutely disgusting to me and 129,000,000 other Americans to see how strikes are tolerated and labor racketeers appeased at this probably the most crucial time in our history. It creates a great inspiration for the families like me who have men in the armed services to buy bonds and carry on and it must be a wonderful inspiration for the men actually in service. Isn't this a splendid opportunity to force through Congress immediately legislation outlawing strikes in all types of industry working for the war effort for the duration and setting up other labor regulations so badly needed and which have been discussed in Congress many times and on which action was avoided by those in high places by setting up additional boards and committees. If the present Government can't whip John Lewis and the other labor racketeers, how can they whip the Axis forces? Everyone I talk with out here feels the same way and it's too bad this is not election year. What are your thoughts in the matter and what is the Senate planning to do to help solve this terrible mess?

C. L. MAYHALL.

My answer to the telegram is as follows:

JUNE 4, 1943.

C. L. MAYHALL,
Oklahoma City, Okla.:

Re tel. A very pertinent inquiry might be, What secret weapon has been placed by the Government in the hands of labor racketeers you refer to that the Government now does not dare exercise its sufficient power to prevent strikes, thereby endangering the war effort? I favor complete repeal of the Wagner law and enactment of a decent law for the protection of the employer and employee against abuses by either against the other and for the protection of labor against the exploitations of labor tyrants.

E. H. MOORE,
United States Senator.

The title of the editorial which I wish to read into the record is:

Defeat Our Domestic Enemies First.

The editorial is as follows:

People are fed up on strikes in war industries. People are fed up on John L. Lewis and all other domestic enemies who are now attempting to paralyze the fighting strength of our armies and navies. At the war's most critical stage, when our armies in Europe and Africa are poised to strike a vital blow at Hitler's fortress of Europe, a domestic enemy at home is about to shoot them in the back by shutting down all of our war plants.

Immediately after our armies and navies have won the battles of Tunisia and the battle of Attu, a domestic enemy with 500,000 troops at his command attacks America in its very vitals and calls a halt on the production of coal for steel mills, ship yards, railroads, and thousands of munition factories.

The flow of ammunition, guns, and airplanes, without which armies cannot exist, will be stopped for a million soldiers in Africa, a million in England, and a million on Pacific battle fronts. John L. Lewis and his 500,000 followers can accomplish more deadly damage to America and her allies than 5,000,000 Japs or 5,000,000 Germans. Unless they get an increase of $1.50 per day each, they are willing to have a foreign enemy defeat the flower of American manhood on battlefields.

What is the use of defending ourselves on foreign battlefields if we will not defend ourselves at home in our own back yard?

Fifteen months ago this paper started a prairie fire by demanding that Congress pass laws which would absolutely outlaw all strikes in war industries. The American people rose up and demanded that strikes be outlawed. Union leaders became frightened and rushed into print with page advertisements that there would be no more strikes. The promise of labor leaders that there would be no strikes is worth exactly as much as the promises of Hitler and no more.

Congress blustered but did nothing. It will do nothing now unless 80 percent of the American people rise up in their wrath and compel Congress to act.

Congress can stop every strike in the United States within 48 hours by enacting a law with the following provisions:

1. To automatically freeze in every bank or depository the funds of all unions, local or national, which cease work or go on strike.

2. The appointment of a custodian of domestic enemy property to seize and assume custody of the funds of not only the local but of the national union organizations of any union that goes on strike.

3. Provide for the assessment by courts of enormous fines against every striking union and against each member participating in the strike.

4. Provide that the President of the United States shall have the power to set up an industrial army and to draft all the workers of any designated industry into such an industrial army as a body and without going through the red tape of local draft boards. That the President as Commander in Chief shall assign Regular Army officers to take command of the industrial army and to place officers or soldiers on guard over every working unit in mines or factories where strikes have been called to see that each individual produces his normal output.

5. Provide that every worker shall be subject to military discipline and that deserters or mutineers shall be punished by the guardhouse or the firing squad exactly the same as soldiers in the fighting army.

If our cowardly Congress does not pass such laws, it will be abandoning our armies and navies to the sabotage of the most dangerous enemy we have, the enemy in our back yard. If such a law is not passed, America will have a government of the people by the unions and for the unions.

Congress has seen nearly 15 months of union promises not to strike, but so long as the people lie low, Congress will lie low. Seventy-five percent of the Members of Congress are pusillanimous patriots. They want the vote of union strikers; they will pass no law to curb striking unions unless every citizen who feels that strikers should be controlled writes or wires a protest to each of his Congressmen and Senators.

If you want your Congressmen to enact laws that will put all strikers in an industrial army with top sergeants and other military personnel in complete charge of their work and that will freeze every dollar of funds and incoming dues to striking unions then sign and clip out this pledge, and mail a copy to every Member of Congress you know. We demand a law to stop strikes.

To Members of the United States Congress: We are fed up with the way Congress has dodged its duty to outlaw and prevent strikes. We demand a law that will immediately stop all strikes and guarantee full production.

If you, as a Congressman, have not the "guts" to pass such a law, we will vote in 1944 only for candidates who will pledge themselves to pass such laws.

We want action now.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Leo F. Sanchez, of New Mexico, to be register of the land office at Santa Fe, N. Mex. (Reappointment.)

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Douglas Maggs, of North Carolina, to be Solicitor for Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James H. Flanagan to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. It happens there are just two postmaster nominations, and both of them are from Tennessee, and I ask unanimous consent that they be confirmed together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 7, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 4 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Eli H. Brown 3d, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the western district of Kentucky. (Mr. Brown is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 23, 1943.)

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John M. Moore, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky. (Mr. Moore is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 23, 1943.)

Loomis E. Cranor, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky. (Mr. Cranor is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 23, 1943.)

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERAL

Maj. Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. Stafford LeRoy Irwin (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. John Kenneth Cannon (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Lowell Warde Rooks (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. Frank Upton Greer (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Ray Aloysious Dunn (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Maurice Rose (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Reese Maughan Howell (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Edwin Hubert Randle (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Carlyle Howe Ridenour (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Elbert Louis Ford (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Victor Maraist (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Ignatius Stack (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Peck Curtis (major, Air Corps Reserve; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), Army of the United States, Air Corps.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 4 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

SOLICITOR

Douglas Maggs to be Solicitor for Labor.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

James H. Flanagan to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the term of 2 years from July 1, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

TENNESSEE

Albin M. Fulton, Cumberland Gap.
Maude M. Day, Pressmen's Home.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 4, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our heavenly Father, eternal and invisible, whose only begotten Son was proclaimed by the morning stars and whose mercy is free and forever, be gracious to hear our humble prayer. Do Thou enable us to accept the discipline of these days of turmoil and burden. Waiting with cheerful hope and content to suffer, garrison our souls with the benedictions of the spirit of sacrifice and courage; through these virtues we shall help to shape a new world for a new humanity.

Make us to understand that in these hours of peril, murmurings, skepticisms, and despair are offensive to the Lord of righteousness and truth. Thou who art the sum of all wisdom, arm us with that faith which energizes love, ideals, and supplies the motive power which urges on to the golden goal. Enable us to reckon lightly the things of time, the delights of the flesh, and the treasures of earth; when gained unjustly and held in the spirit of ungodliness in the end they tunnel the way of spiritual darkness. Blessed Lord, turn human frailties into strength and disobedience into loyalty that we may hear and heed the pilgrim chant:

"If any man would come after Me, let him deny himself, take up his cross and follow Me."

In the name of our dear Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 217. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States", approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2753. An act making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair trusts that under the circumstances no Member this morning will ask to proceed for a minute. The Chair will recognize Members to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article taken out of yesterday morning's Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the heroic work of the Coast Guard and to include certain Navy releases, citations, and other quotations. The estimate of the Public Printer is that this will take about 2¾ pages and the approximate cost will be $123.75.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by my distinguished colleague from Virginia, the Honorable PATRICK H. DREWRY, at Camp Pickett, Va., on May 30.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two editorials from the Sacramento Bee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a quotation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram protesting the purchase of a million pair of army shoes in Chile.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address recently made by Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 90]

Bell	Hall,	Pittenger
Bradley, Mich.	Edwin Arthur	Plumley
Cannon, Fla.	Hébert	Ramey
Capozzoli	Heidinger	Robinson, Utah
Celler	Hendricks	Russell
Chapman	Johnson,	Sabath
Cochran	Calvin D.	Schwabe
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Ind.	Sikes
Compton	Kean	Smith, W. Va.
Costello	Kerr	Steagall
Crawford	King	Stearns, N. H.
Culkin	Larcade	Talbot
Dies	LeCompte	Thomas, Tex.
Domengeaux	LeFevre	Tolan
Douglas	Lemke	Treadway
Elmer	McCowen	Van Zandt
Gallagher	McGehee	Vincent, Ky.
Gibson	McGranery	Welchel, Ohio
Gifford	Nichols	Welch
Granger	O'Brien, N. Y.	Whelchel, Ga.
Grant, Ala.	O'Leary	Wilson
Guyer	Peterson, Fla.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Without objection, further proceedings, under the roll call, will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

USE AND OPERATION OF WAR PLANTS IN PROSECUTION OF THE WAR

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of S. 796, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday, 8 minutes remained for debate on the pending amendment.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] is entitled to recognition.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY] is entitled to recognition.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the members of this Committee assembled here today are in somewhat better humor than they were when the Committee rose yesterday afternoon.

We are dealing with a very, very critical problem. I do not like to say it, but I must say that I do not think the time has been evenly divided on this issue so that all sides have had an equal chance to be heard. However, the parliamentary situation is such that it seems impossible to get any reasonable legislation at all unless we first defeat the Smith amendment to the Harness substitute and then defeat the Harness substitute. Unless this is done I do not believe any reasonable legislation can ever be voted on.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Having defeated the Smith amendment and the Harness amendment, what would the gentleman then propose in respect to legislation?

Mr. McMURRAY. If the Smith amendment is defeated, and the Harness substitute is defeated, then there will be offered another substitute amendment.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman support that?

Mr. McMURRAY. I shall state my position if and when that is brought before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is entitled to recognition.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I have only 2 minutes and I prefer not to yield.

Mr. HARE. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he would be willing to insert in section 2, following the word "representative," a provision that manufacturers and employees notify the Federal Trade Commission in addition to the Department of Labor, because if this bill goes on for 2 years there may be questions growing out of lock-outs, and labor would want to know the reason why, and my thought was the Federal Trade Commission could make the investigation.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I shall be glad to give that consideration.

Mr. Chairman, since my substitute bill and the amendments proposed have been published in the RECORD, you will find that it is a very simple piece of legislation, which, in my humble opinion, will solve this whole question of strikes. It leaves in the hands of American labor the determination by secret ballot whether the workers shall strike. I have sufficient confidence in the patriotism of the rank and file of labor to say that there will be no strike if we give them an opportunity to vote on the question.

The amendment of the gentleman from Virginia embraces five sections of the Senate bill and pertains to the functions of the War Labor Board. The part of these sections which suspends the Norris-LaGuardia Act, however, has been deleted.

There is one sentence in this amendment which is not satisfactory to any of us, and a motion will be made to strike that from the amendment and I sincerely hope that motion will prevail. I refer to the sentence which appears in the original bill, on page 17, beginning with line 6, which says:

> In no event shall the Board have power under this act, or otherwise, to require as a condition of employment that any individual become or remain a member of a labor organization.

That, I believe, might upset a great deal of work that the War Labor Board has already done, and certainly we do not want to further confuse the already complicated situation. I hope that this sentence will be stricken from the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, somebody said:

> There is so much good in the worst of us and so much bad in the best of us that it hardly behooves any of us to talk about the rest of us.

Another old sage said:

> I wholly disagree with what you say, but I will fight to the death for your right to say it.

I believe that was Voltaire.

Notwithstanding what happened yesterday I am here this morning quite happy, quite cool, and in good humor, and with no hostile feeling toward anyone, and with that in mind I want to take up these amendments and substitutes for the bill we are considering.

First of all, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the vote will first come on the Smith amendment to the Harness substitute. If that is adopted, the vote will then come on the Harness substitute as amended. There will then be an amendment offered, as I understand, to the Harness substitute as amended, first, to strike out sections 2 and 3.

I should like to recount to the House that when this legislation was under consideration by your Military Affairs Committee, I selected three of the majority members, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and three of the minority members, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], and the

gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], to draft for the committee as a result of the long and arduous hearings a bill for the consideration of the whole Committee. They included sections 2 and 3 relating to lock-outs and strikes in that bill, and it was adopted by the Committee unanimously and without question and everything was agreeable until the representatives of the Department of Labor and other departments came up last week for a hearing. As a result of that, some of the members *thought* that they ought to change their minds, and they have a right to do that. I am not finding fault with them. But I do hope and trust, and I earnestly urge, that the House retain those two sections in the legislation, because without them we shall have weakened the legislation materially. In fact we will have carved the very heart out of it. If we are going to pass anything at all, I think we ought to pass something that will make it effective, so that if there is anybody in the Government that wants to stop these strikes and protect the national war effort they will have the power and authority to do it and will not be permitted to resort to an alibi and say, "We tried to persuade somebody but we could not persuade them. We tried to appease somebody and they would not be appeased."

In other words, I think the House of Representatives ought to assume its legislative responsibility and pass what it thinks in its candid judgment ought to be the law, and then deal with the other body when the time comes for doing so. As I understand, the committee bill—and I stand flat-footed for it—it is an amendment to the Connally bill and as such, with whatever amendments are added to it, it will go back to the Senate as an amendment to the Connally bill, S. 796, and probably go immediately to conference. For myself I have only tried to augment and strengthen the power and authority of the President's War Labor Board, and that is one of the principal features of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As I understand, under the rule we are considering the House bill as an original bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. Under the rule, the committee substitute is being considered as an original bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Pending, then, is the Harness substitute in the nature of an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And pending thereafter is the Smith amendment to the Harness amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand, then, Mr. Chairman, that the amendments that are on the desk now which are in the nature of perfecting amendments to the Smith amendment would be out of order because they violate the rule as to amendments in the third degree.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLMER. The amendments that are on the Clerk's desk to perfect the Harness amendment will be in order if the Harness amendment is adopted, but there will be no further time for debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct in that there will be no further time for debate, but any further amendments to the Harness amendment may be considered after the Smith amendment is disposed of.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understood the chairman to state to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] a minute ago that amendments to the Smith amendment are out of order due to the fact that they are amendments in the third degree.

The CHAIRMAN. If a point of order on that ground were made, it would have to be sustained under the rules of the House in that the amendment would be in the third degree.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In the event the Smith amendment is adopted without such amendments having been considered, it then becomes part of the Harness substitute. Then, while the Harness substitute is before the committee for amendment, may amendments be offered to that which might affect some of the language contained in the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It would be difficult to pass on that question until the Chair can at least see the form in which the proposed amendments are presented.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With particular reference to the amendment at the desk to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT], which I understand the gentleman from Virginia has agreed to and which I understood the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] to say he hoped would be adopted, striking certain language from the Smith amendment—it is the last sentence in the first section ending on page 17—if the Smith amendment should be adopted would an amendment later offered to the Harness substitute to strike that particular language be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that it would not be in order, for the reason that an amendment that has previously been agreed to cannot be amended.

Mr. MERRITT. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MERRITT. The gentleman from Alabama submitted the parliamentary inquiry I intended to ask, but do I correctly understand that the amendment I have on the Clerk's desk that will enforce the Smith amendment will not be considered?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot say that to the gentleman. The Chair, in response to the parliamentary inquiry submitted by the gentleman from Alabama, stated that if an amendment is offered and a point of order is made against it, the Chair will then rule on the question.

Mr. MERRITT. Is it in order now for me to offer my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may certainly offer an amendment; and if he does so, the Clerk will report it.

Mr. MERRITT. I offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MERRITT: Strike out of the Smith amendment the language in the committee bill on page 17, beginning with the word "In" in line 6 and ending with the period in line 9.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not in order as it is an amendment in the third degree.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order against the amendment that it is in the third degree. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair rules, may I submit a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the question has been passed on.

The CHAIRMAN. One point of order at a time is all the Chair can entertain. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to make a point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I want to submit a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the point of order comes too late.

Mr. WRIGHT. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules that point of order, because the gentleman from Pennsylvania was on his feet, and the point of order was timely. The amendment had just been reported.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Assuming that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT] is not in order and the Smith amendment as now written should be defeated, will it be in order then for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] to reoffer his amendment with the language referred to withheld from the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It would, because that would be a different amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment to conform, that is, to strike out such language as the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT] attempts to delete by amendment, that would be in order as a unanimous-consent request, would it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia could submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to strike out section 6 of the Harness substitute. When will it be in order to offer that?

The CHAIRMAN. After disposition is made of the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request, and if there is no objection, I desire to make a very brief explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, those of us who want to do something right about this thing, on both sides, realize the difficulty of the situation. We have been trying to reach something that we think is fair, everybody giving and taking a little bit. I am willing to have that portion go out, and I am in hopes, when I submit this unanimous-consent request, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT], who raised the point of order, and who is an advocate of the welfare of organized labor, will not object, because we are just trying to get down to something and make concessions. This is a concession to his wishes, and I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request——

Mr. CELLER. I object.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have not yet stated the request. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the language on page 17 of the committee bill, which appears in the amendment which I offered, reading as follows, may be eliminated, that language being, commencing on line 6, as follows:

In no event shall the Board have power under this act, or otherwise, to require as a condition of employment that any individual become or remain a member of a labor organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia to so modify his amendment?

Mr. CELLER, Mr. LESINSKI, and Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois objected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAY) there were—ayes 73, noes 204.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk; and in view of the fact that this amendment does nothing but eliminate the language to which I have referred, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be placed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in view of the importance of the matter, I think the amendment should be read. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk began the reading of the amendment.

Mr. MERRITT (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia to the Harness amendment: After the title "Registration of Labor Unions", insert the following:

"NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

"SEC. 8. The National War Labor Board (hereinafter called the Board), established by Executive Order No. 9017, dated January 12, 1942, in addition to all powers conferred on it by section 1 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and by any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942, entitled 'An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes,' and by any other statute, shall have the following powers and duties:

"(a) Whenever the United States Conciliation Service certifies that a labor dispute (excluding any matter coming within the purview of the Railway Labor Act) exists which may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, and cannot be settled by collective bargaining or conciliation, to summon both parties to such dispute before it and conduct a public hearing on the merits of the dispute. If in the opinion of the Board such a labor dispute has become so serious that it may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, the Board may take such action on its own motion. At such hearing both parties shall be given full notice and opportunity to be heard, but the failure of either party to appear shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed to a hearing and order.

"(b) To decide the dispute, and provide by order the wages and hours and all other terms and conditions (customarily included in collective-bargaining agreements) governing the relations between the parties, which shall be in effect until further order of the Board. In making any such decision the Board shall conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; the National Labor Relations Board; the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; the act of October 2, 1942, hereinbefore referred to; and the regulations and orders issued under such acts; and where no law is applicable the order of the Board shall provide for terms and conditions to govern relations between the parties which shall be fair and equitable to employer and employee under all the circumstances of the case.

"(c) To apply to any Federal district court for an order requiring any person within its jurisdiction to obey a subpena issued by the Board; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred on any such court to issue such an order.

"POWER OF BOARD TO COMPEL ATTENDANCE OF WITNESSES

"SEC. 9. The National War Labor Board, by its Chairman, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of any books, papers, records, or other documents, which it deems relevant to any inquiry or hearing before the Board or any designated member or agent thereof. Such subpenas shall be enforceable in the same manner, and subject to the same penalties, as subpenas issued by the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, approved March 27, 1942.

"MAINTENANCE OF THE STATUS QUO

"SEC. 10. (a) After the Board has taken jurisdiction of a dispute as provided in section 8, the Chairman in order to effectuate the purposes of this act shall have power to issue an order (1) requiring any person to refrain or cease and desist from calling, or assisting in any manner, a strike arising out of such dispute; or (2) requiring the employer, who is involved in the dispute to refrain or cease and desist from practices which change the situation existing at the time the dispute arose, or which by changing an existing situation led to the dispute, and which the Chairman shall deem prejudicial to the prompt settlement of the dispute. No order of the Chairman or process of any court under this act shall require an individual employee to render labor or services without his consent, nor shall any provision of any such order or process be construed to make the refusal to work of an individual employee a violation of such order or process or otherwise an illegal act.

"(b) Such order shall be effective for such period as the Chairman shall determine, but shall, in any event, terminate within 5 days after the findings and recommendations of the Board or within 60 days after the date on which the order was issued, whichever first occurs. Any further order issued under subsection (a) in connection with the same dispute shall not extend beyond the termination date of the original order but terminate at the same time as such original order.

"REGULATIONS OF THE BOARD

"SEC. 11. The Board shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind regulations providing appropriate procedures for carrying out the powers vested in it by this act.

"Whenever any such plant, mine, or other property has been or is hereafter so taken by reason of a strike, lock-out, threatened strike, threatened lock-out, work stoppage, or other cause, such plant, mine, or other property shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as practicable, but in no event more than 60 days after the termination of the conditions which caused possession of such plant, mine, or other property to be so taken.

"INTERFERENCE WITH GOVERNMENT OPERATION OF PLANTS

"SEC. 13. (a) Whenever any plant, mine, or other property is in the possession of the United States, it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, or induce any person to interfere, by lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption, with the operation of such plant, mine, or property, or (2) to aid any such lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such plant, mine, or property by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein. No individual shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this section by reason only of his having ceased work or having refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

"(b) Any person who willfully violated any provision of this section shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MERRITT) there were—ayes 191, noes 137.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. SMITH of Virginia and Mr. MAY to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were ayes 170 and noes 113.

So the amendment to the substitute was agreed to.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Harness substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HANCOCK: Strike out section 6 of the Harness substitute.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, section 6 does not appear here and nobody can tell what it is. I would like to have the amendment read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HANCOCK: Strike out section 6 of the Harness substitute.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that section 6 of the Harness substitute be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

"SEC. 6. Section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 2, sec. 251), is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 313. It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution in connection with any election to any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress are to be voted for, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section. Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. For the purposes of this section "labor organization" shall have the same meaning as under the National Labor Relations Act.'

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] to the Harness substitute.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HANCOCK) there were ayes 83 and noes 156.

So the amendment to the substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER to the Harness substitute: After section 7 of the Harness amendment insert the following new section:

"CONSPIRACY TO INTERFERE WITH GOVERNMENT OPERATION

"SEC. 8. Any person who shall willfully, during the present war or during the period of national emergency as proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941, conspire with one or more persons for the purpose of bringing about (a) a cessation of production at any plant, mine, or other property in the possession of the United States, (b) a slowing down of production at any such plant, mine, or property, or (c) any other interference with production at any such plant, mine, or property, shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

Page 23, line 2, strike out "14" and insert "15."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] to the Harness substitute.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLMER) there were ayes 63 and noes 181.

So the amendment to the substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KILDAY to the amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: Strike out all of section 5 of said amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that section 5 of the Harness amendment be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

"REGISTRATION OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 5 (a) Within 60 days after the date of enactment of this act and annually thereafter every labor organization in which employees of any war contractor participate, through its president or other authorized officer, shall register its identity with the National Labor Relations Board and shall state under oath the following information: The name of the labor organization; the address at which it has its principal office or does business; the names and titles of the officers; initiation fees; annual dues charged each member; assessments levied during the past 12-month period; limitations on membership; number of paid-up members; date of the last election of officers; the annual salary of each officer, including bonuses, travel, and other expenses; and the date of the last detailed financial statement furnished all members and the method of publication or circulation of such statement. With such information shall be filed under oath detailed and intelligible financial statements and a copy of the constitution and bylaws of the labor organization.

"(b) Every labor organization established after the date of enactment of this act in which employees of any war contractor participate shall, when established and annually thereafter, register with the Board and furnish the information required of existing labor organizations under the provisions of subsection (a).

"(c) Any labor organization which fails to register with the Board and file the information required by this act shall be disqualified to act as the representative of employees in collective bargaining for such time as such failure shall continue: *Provided*, That in the initial registration only if information on a particular point is lacking, the statement 'no information' or 'no record' shall be considered an answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Harness amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMASON to the Harness amendment: On page 9 strike out all of section 2 and section 3 of the Harness amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Harness amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GWYNNE to the substitute offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: After section 8 add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 9. No members of the Board shall be permitted to participate in any decision in which such member has a direct pecuniary interest as an officer, employee, or representative of either party to the dispute."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAMSPECK) there were—ayes 188, noes 87.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee substitute as amended by the Harness amendment as amended.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense, pursuant to House Resolution 234, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. RAMSPECK. On that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 238, nays 136, answered "present" 1, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

YEAS—238

Abernethy	Gossett	Monroney
Allen, Ill.	Graham	Morrison, La.
Allen, La.	Grant, Ind.	Mott
Andersen, H. Carl	Green	Mundt
	Gregory	Murray, Tenn.
Anderson, Calif.	Griffiths	Murray, Wis.
Andresen, August H.	Gross	Newsome
	Gwynne	Norrell
Andrews	Hale	O'Hara
Arends	Hall,	O'Neal
Arnold	Edwin Arthur	Pace
Auchincloss	Hall,	Patman
Baldwin, Md.	Leonard W.	Patton
Barden	Halleck	Phillips
Barrett	Hancock	Ploeser
Bates, Mass.	Hare	Poage
Beckworth	Harness, Ind.	Poulson
Bender	Harris, Ark.	Price
Bennett, Mo.	Harris, Va.	Priest
Bland	Hartley	Randolph
Bolton	Hébert	Rankin
Bonner	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Boren	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Hill	Reed, N. Y.
Brooks	Hinshaw	Rees, Kans.
Brown, Ga.	Hobbs	Richards
Brown, Ohio	Hoeven	Rivers
Bryson	Hoffman	Rizley
Buffett	Holmes, Mass.	Robertson
Bulwinkle	Holmes, Wash.	Robsion, Ky.
Burch, Va.	Hope	Rockwell
Burgin	Horan	Rodgers, Pa.
Camp	Howell	Rogers, Mass.
Cannon, Mo.	Jarman	Rohrbough
Carlson, Kans.	Jeffrey	Rowe
Carson, Ohio	Jenkins	Satterfield
Case	Jennings	Shafer
Chenoweth	Jensen	Short
Chiperfield	Johnson,	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Anton J.	Simpson, Pa.
Clark	Johnson,	Slaughter
Clason	Calvin D.	Smith, Ohio
Clevenger	Johnson,	Smith, Va
Colmer	J. Leroy	Smith, Wis.
Cooley	Johnson,	Sparkman
Cooper	Luther A.	Springer
Courtney	Johnson,	Stanley
Cox	Lyndon B.	Starnes, Ala.
Cravens	Johnson, Okla.	Stefan
Creal	Johnson, Ward	Stewart
Cunningham	Jones	Stockman
Curtis	Jonkman	Sumner, Ill.
Davis	Judd	Sumners, Tex.
Dewey	Kearney	Sundstrom
Dirksen	Keefe	Taber
Disney	Kilburn	Talle
Ditter	Kilday	Tarver
Dondero	Kinzer	Taylor
Doughton	Kleberg	Thomas, N. J.
Drewry	Knutson	Thomason
Durham	LaFollette	Tibbott
Dworshak	Lambertson	Towe
Eaton	Landis	Vincent, Ky.
Elliott	Lanham	Vinson, Ga.
Ellis	Lea	Vorys, Ohio
Ellsworth	McCord	Vursell
Elston, Ohio	McGregor	Wadsworth
Fellows	McKenzie	Ward
Fish	McLean	Weaver
Fisher	McMillan	West
Fulbright	McWilliams	Whitten
Gale	Maas	Whittington
Gamble	Mahon	Wigglesworth
Gathings	Maloney	Willey
Gavin	Manasco	Winstead
Gearhart	Mansfield, Tex.	Winter
Gerlach	Martin, Iowa	Wolcott
Gibson	Martin, Mass.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gilchrist	May	Woodrum, Va.
Gillette	Merrow	Worley
Gillie	Michener	Zimmerman
Goodwin	Miller, Nebr.	
Gore	Mills	

NAYS—136

Anderson, N. Mex.	Beall	Brehm
	Bennett, Mich.	Buckley
Angell	Bishop	Burchill, N. Y.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Blackney	Burdick
Barry	Bloom	Busbey
Bates, Ky.	Bradley, Pa.	Butler
Byrne	Hull	O'Connor
Canfield	Izac	O'Konski
Celler	Jackson	O'Toole
Coffee	Kee	Outland
Cole, Mo.	Kefauver	Pfeifer
Crosser	Kelley	Philbin
Cullen	Kennedy	Powers
Curley	Keogh	Pracht
D'Alesandro	Kirwan	Rabaut
Dawson	Klein	Ramspeck
Day	Kunkel	Rogers, Calif.
Delaney	Lane	Rolph
Dickstein	Lemke	Rowan
Dilweg	Lesinski	Sabath
Dingell	Lewis	Sadowski
Eberharter	Luce	Sauthoff
Ellison, Md.	Ludlow	Scanlon
Elmer	Lynch	Schiffler
Engel	McCormack	Schuetz
Fay	McMurray	Scott
Feighan	Madden	Sheppard
Fenton	Magnuson	Sheridan
Fernandez	Mansfield, Mont.	Smith, Maine
Fitzpatrick		Snyder
Flannagan	Marcantonio	Somers, N. Y.
Fogarty	Mason	Spence
Folger	Merritt	Stearns, N. H.
Forand	Miller, Conn.	Stevenson
Ford	Miller, Mo.	Sullivan
Furlong	Miller, Pa	Troutman
Gavagan	Monkiewicz	Voorhis, Calif.
Gordon	Morrison, N. C.	Walter
Gorski	Mruk	Wasielewski
Hagen	Murdock	Weiss
Harless, Ariz.	Murphy	Wene
Hart	Myers	Wheat
Hays	Norman	White
Heffernan	Norton	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hoch	O'Brien, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
Holifield	O'Brien, Mich.	Wright

NOT VOTING—57

Bell	Grant, Ala.	Pittenger
Bradley, Mich.	Guyer	Plumley
Cannon, Fla.	Heidinger	Ramey
Capozzoli	Hendricks	Robinson, Utah
Carter	Johnson, Ind.	Russell
Chapman	Kean	Sasscer
Cochran	Kerr	Schwabe
Cole, N. Y.	King	Sikes
Compton	Larcade	Smith, W. Va.
Costello	LeCompte	Steagall
Crawford	LeFevre	Talbot
Culkin	McCowen	Thomas, Tex.
Dies	McGehee	Tolan
Domengeaux	McGranery	Treadway
Douglas	Nichols	Van Zandt
Fulmer	O'Brien, N. Y.	Welchel, Ohio
Gallagher	O'Leary	Welch
Gifford	Peterson, Fla.	Whelchel, Ga.
Granger	Peterson, Ga.	Wilson

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Wickersham

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wickersham for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.

Mr. Grant of Alabama for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. Costello for, with Mr. Tolan against.

Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Chapman for, with Mr. Smith of West Virginia against.

Mr. McGehee for, with Mr. Robinson of Utah against.

Mr. Domengeaux for, with Mr. Larcade against.

Mr. Schwabe for, with Mr. Pittenger against.

Mr. Steagall for, with Mr. Ramey against.

General pairs:

Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Russell with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Whelchel of Georgia with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Welchel of Ohio.

Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. Granger with Mr. McCowen.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Kean.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Compton.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. BREHM changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am recorded as voting "yea." I have a pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. CAPOZZOLI, who, had he been present, would have voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote of "yea" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. FENTON. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows.

Mr. FENTON moves that the bill S. 796 be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The question was taken; and on a division (demand by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 103, noes 175.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAY and Mr. MARCANTONIO demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 233, nays 141, answered "present" 1, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

YEAS—233

Abernethy	Case	Gale
Allen, Ill.	Chenoweth	Gamble
Allen, La.	Chiperfield	Gathings
Andersen, H. Carl	Church	Gavin
	Clark	Gearhart
Anderson, Calif.	Clason	Gerlach
Anderson, N. Mex.	Clevenger	Gilchrist
	Colmer	Gillie
Andresen, August H.	Cooley	Goodwin
	Cooper	Gore
Andrews	Courtney	Gossett
Arends	Cox	Graham
Arnold	Cravens	Grant, Ind.
Auchincloss	Creal	Gregory
Baldwin, Md.	Cunningham	Griffiths
Barden	Curtis	Gross
Barrett	Davis	Gwynne
Bates, Mass.	Dewey	Hale
Beckworth	Disney	Hall,
Bennett, Mo.	Ditter	Edwin Arthur
Bland	Dondero	Hall,
Bonner	Doughton	Leonard W.
Boren	Drewry	Halleck
Bradley, Mich.	Durham	Hancock
Brooks	Dworshak	Hare
Brown, Ga.	Eaton	Harless, Ariz.
Brown, Ohio	Elliott	Harness, Ind.
Bryson,	Ellis	Harris, Ark.
Buffett	Ellsworth	Harris, Va.
Bulwinkle	Elston, Ohio	Hartley
Burch, Va.	Fellows	Hébert
Burgin	Fernandez	Herter
Camp	Fish	Hess
Cannon, Mo.	Fisher	Hill
Carlson, Kans.	Folger	Hinshaw
Carson, Ohio	Fulbright	Hobbs

Hoeven	Martin, Iowa	Simpson, Pa.
Hoffman	Martin, Mass.	Slaughter
Holmes, Mass.	May	Smith, Ohio
Holmes, Wash.	Merrow	Smith, Va.
Hope	Michener	Smith, Wis.
Horan	Miller, Nebr.	Sparkman
Jarman	Mills	Springer
Jeffrey	Monroney	Stanley
Jenkins	Morrison, La.	Starnes, Ala.
Jennings	Mott	Stearns, N. H.
Jensen	Mundt	Stefan
Johnson,	Murray, Tenn.	Stewart
Anton J.	Murray, Wis.	Stockman
Johnson,	Newsome	Sumner, Ill.
Luther A.	Norrell	Sumners, Tex.
Johnson,	O'Hara	Sundstrom
Lyndon B.	Pace	Taber
Johnson, Okla.	Patman	Talle
Johnson, Ward	Patton	Tarver
Jones	Peterson, Ga.	Taylor
Jonkman	Phillips	Thomas, N. J.
Judd	Ploeser	Thomason
Kearney	Poage	Tibbott
Keefe	Poulson	Towe
Kefauver	Price	Vincent, Ky.
Kilburn	Priest	Vinson, Ga.
Kilday	Randolph	Vorys, Ohio
Kinzer	Rankin	Vursell
Kleberg	Reece, Tenn.	Wadsworth
Knutson	Reed, N. Y.	Ward
Lambertson	Rees, Kans.	Weaver
Landis	Richards	West
Lanham	Rivers	Whitten
Lea	Rizley	Whittington
McCord	Robertson	Wigglesworth
McGregor	Robsion, Ky.	Willey
McKenzie	Rockwell	Winstead
McLean	Rodgers, Pa.	Winter
McMillan	Rogers, Mass.	Wolcott
McWilliams	Rohrbough	Woodruff, Mich.
Maas	Rowe	Woodrum, Va.
Mahon	Satterfield	Worley
Maloney	Shafer	Zimmerman
Manasco	Short	
Mansfield, Tex.	Simpson, Ill.	

NAYS—141

Angell	Gavagan	Myers
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gordon	Norman
Barry	Gorski	Norton
Bates, Ky.	Green	O'Brien, Ill.
Beall	Hagen	O'Brien, Mich.
Bender	Hart	O'Connor
Bennett, Mich.	Hays	O'Konski
Bishop	Heffernan	O'Neal
Blackney	Hoch	O'Toole
Bloom	Holifield	Outland
Bolton	Howell	Pfeifer
Bradley, Pa.	Hull	Philbin
Brehm	Izac	Powers
Buckley	Jackson	Pracht
Burchill, N. Y.	Johnson,	Rabaut
Burdick	Calvin D.	Ramspeck
Busbey	Kee	Reed, Ill.
Butler	Kelley	Rogers, Calif.
Byrne	Kennedy	Rolph
Canfield	Keogh	Rowan
Carter	Kirwan	Sabath
Celler	Klein	Sadowski
Coffee	Kunkel	Sasscer
Cole, Mo.	LaFollette	Sauthoff
Crosser	Lane	Scanlon
Cullen	Lemke	Schiffler
Curley	Lesinski	Schuetz
D'Alesandro	Lewis, Ohio	Scott
Dawson	Luce	Sheppard
Day	Ludlow	Sheridan
Delaney	Lynch	Smith, Maine
Dickstein	McCormack	Snyder
Dilweg	McGranery	Somers, N. Y.
Dingell	McMurray	Spence
Dirksen	Madden	Stevenson
Eberharter	Magnuson	Sullivan
Ellison, Md.	Mansfield,	Troutman
Elmer	Mont.	Voorhis, Calif.
Engel	Marcantonio	Walter
Fay	Mason	Wasielewski
Feighan	Merritt	Weiss
Fenton	Miller, Conn.	Wene
Fitzpatrick	Miller, Mo.	Wheat
Flannagan	Miller Pa.	White
Fogarty	Monkiewicz	Wolfenden, Pa.
Forand	Morrison, N. C.	Wolverton, N. J.
Ford	Mruk	Wright
Furlong	Murphy	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Wickersham

NOT VOTING—57

Bell	Cochran	Culkin
Boykin	Cole, N. Y.	Dies
Cannon, Fla.	Compton	Domengeaux
Capozzoli	Costello	Douglas
Chapman	Crawford	Fulmer
Gallagher	Larcade	Schwabe
Gibson	LeCompte	Sikes
Gifford	LeFevre	Smith, W. Va.
Gillette	McCowen	Steagall
Granger	McGehee	Talbot
Grant, Ala.	Murdock	Thomas, Tex.
Guyer	Nichols	Tolan
Heidinger	O'Brien, N. Y.	Treadway
Hendricks	O'Leary	Van Zandt
Johnson, Ind.	Peterson, Fla.	Weichel, Ohio
Johnson,	Pittenger	Welch
J. Leroy	Plumley	Whelchel, Ga.
Kean	Ramey	Wilson
Kerr	Robinson, Utah	
King	Russell	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wickersham for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.

Mr. Grant of Alabama for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. Costello for, with Mr. Tolan against.

Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Chapman for, with Mr. Smith of West Virginia against.

Mr. Schwabe for, with Mr. Pittenger against.

Mr. McGehee for, with Mr. Robinson of Utah against.

Mr. Steagall for, with Mr. Ramey against.

Mr. Domengeaux for, with Mr. Larcade against.

General pairs:

Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Russell with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Whelchel of Georgia with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Compton.

Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Weichel of Ohio.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Kean.

Mr. Granger with Mr. McCowen.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. Gibson with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I have a pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. CAPOZZOLI. If present, he would have voted "nay"; therefore I withdraw my vote of "yea" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title of the bill S. 796 will be corrected.

There was no objection.

WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 495, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. MAY, THOMASON, MERRITT, ANDREWS, and SHORT.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill S. 796.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

ACQUISITION AND CONVERSION OF CERTAIN AUXILIARY VESSELS FOR UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2; and agree to the same.

P. H. DREWRY,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
MELVIN J. MAAS,
Managers on the part of the House.

DAVID I. WALSH,
M. E. TYDINGS,
JAMES J. DAVIS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: With this amendment as proposed by the Senate the Navy would not have control over vessels being constructed by the Maritime Commission for the Navy contracted for subsequent to July 25, 1942.

The Senate recedes from its amendment and agrees to the House version.

Amendment No. 2: Without the proviso to section 2 inserted by the Senate this section may, in the future, be construed as giving the Navy Department final jurisdiction in the design and construction of vessels built by the Maritime Commission for other departments of the Government, or of vessels built for our allies.

With the proviso retained in the bill, it will not interfere with the Navy's auxiliary vessels program, but will limit the Navy's authority to vessels built for it by the Maritime Commission.

As this bill is intended to apply only to vessels for the Navy, the managers on the part of the House accept the Senate amendment.

P. H. DREWRY,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
MELVIN J. MAAS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that authorizes 1,000,000 tons of auxiliary ships. The Senate amended the bill by putting a proviso in it to the effect that the Navy could only have jurisdiction as to the design with reference to the auxiliary ships being built by the Maritime Commission for the Navy. We accepted that amendment.

The Senate also amended it by precluding the Navy from having jurisdiction of the designs of ships from July 25, 1942, to date. The Senate receded from that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, if there are no questions, I ask for adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABOLISHING CERTAIN NAVAL TRUST FUNDS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2584) to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2584) to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

CARL VINSON,
PATRICK H. DREWRY,
MELVIN J. MASS,
Managers on the part of the House.

DAVID I. WALSH,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
JAMES J. DAVIS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2584) to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

Amendment No. 1: The amendment made by the Senate provided that all officers and enlisted personnel would have deducted from their pay the sum of $2.40 each year to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Such deductions are not made from like personnel of any other of the services.

The Senate recedes from its amendment and accepts the House version.

CARL VINSON,
P. H. DREWRY,
MELVIN J. MAAS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill and the conference report relate to the abolishment of what is known as the hospital fund. The hospital fund under previous law is created by the fines and forfeitures and a 25-cent deduction from the monthly pay of officers and enlisted men. In view of the fact that the committee has adopted the policy of abolishing the hospital fund and transferring it into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, we do not feel that the enlisted and officer personnel should be required to pay $2.40 to go into the fund. The maintenance of the hospital is to be in the same manner as the Army hospitals; that is, by direct appropriation.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MAAS. This merely puts the Navy on an exact par with the Army?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct. Mr. Speaker, if there are no questions I ask for the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I would like to know if the Speaker will recognize me at this time to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 2589.

The SPEAKER. Is there a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There is a uanimous report from the members who were present this morning. It relates to the WAVES legislation, and we have met the opposition that was pointed out on the floor during the last consideration of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is that the bill the gentleman spoke to me about?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman conferred with the minority leader?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I have conferred with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS]. I did not speak to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], but I did say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] that I would ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the gentleman did not speak to me, as I have informed a good many Members of the House that there would be no other legislation taken up for consideration this afternoon.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, what I am saying now has no application at all to my distinguished friend from Georgia, and this expressly does not apply to his present unanimous-consent request, because there is no more cooperative and able Member of the House than the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. However, for the RECORD I wish to say that I shall insist that all unanimous-consent requests in the future be taken up with the minority leader and the majority leader.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I agree with what the gentleman says.

Mr. McCORMACK. And I shall insist upon that.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I asked the Speaker if he would recognize me to make the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am merely making an observation, and as I indicated, I eliminated the gentleman from Georgia in my statement.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. And in the future I suggest the presiding officer should be consulted.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1762) making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

I have spoken to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and he has no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. WOODRUM of Virginia, FITZPATRICK, STARNES of Alabama, HENDRICKS, WIGGLESWORTH, DIRKSEN, and CASE.

WHEAT FOR FEED

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 133, to permit additional sales of wheat for feed.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act approved March 25, 1943 (Public Law 18, 78th Cong.), be

amended by deleting "two hundred and twenty-five million bushels" and inserting in lieu thereof "two hundred and seventy-five million bushels".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the resolution to give us a brief statement of what is proposed to be done under the resolution.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution simply amends Public Law No. 18, which authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell an additional 100,000,000 bushels of wheat for feed. They have already sold the 100,000,000 and have received many other demands for wheat from feeders throughout the country.

I have received a report from the Commodity Credit Corporation in which they agree that this legislation should be passed, the object of which is simply to amend the present existing law by adding 50,000,000 bushels.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The purpose of this resolution is simply to relieve the shortage and to take the wheat from Government storage?

Mr. RIZLEY. That is right. Demands have been received from all over the country that more of this wheat be released for feed, and this resolution will permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell an additional 50,000,000 bushels.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There is no other change in the existing law proposed by this amendment except to add this 50,000,000 bushels?

Mr. RIZLEY. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No other change is proposed in the law as it now stands?

Mr. RIZLEY. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do so for the purpose of asking the gentleman if he has conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture about the resolution.

Mr. RIZLEY. I have conferred with the chairman of the committee; I also conferred with the Speaker and with the majority and minority leaders of the House.

Mr. PACE. The resolution is acceptable to the chairman of the committee?

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes.

Mr. PACE. He is absent and I make this inquiry for that reason.

Mr. RIZLEY. I have consulted him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell us the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called. Then there are three bills from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to be considered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say that there is the bill on the Consent Calendar on which, if it is not passed on the call of the calendar, the Chair has agreed to recognize the gentleman from Mississippi for a suspension on Monday.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If I may interject, that is a bill from the Committee on Roads.

Mr. McCORMACK. There will be one suspension, as stated by the Speaker.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the roads bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the roads bill. Does the gentleman from Mississippi know the number of the bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do not recall the number of it, but it is the bill that was unanimously reported by the Committee on Roads. It is amendatory of existing legislation to provide for planning for future highway construction. It is the only bill reported by the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are three bills reported out of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to be considered, H. R. 1941, H. R. 1295, and H. R. 1291. I do not know whether or not these three bills will be disposed of on Monday, but the remainder of Monday after the call of the Consent Calendar and the suspension will be devoted to the consideration of such of these bills as may be disposed of. If they are not disposed of on Monday, their consideration will not continue on Tuesday.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Is the gentleman referring to the bills that were reported out of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization having to do with naturalization?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. A rule has been reported on each of these bills. One of them is a bill introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] permitting the naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons and daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Those three bills will be considered on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. They will be in order then. I do not know in what order they will be called up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. These are the same three bills that have been on the program for several weeks?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. If they are not disposed of on Monday, that does not mean they will go over to Tuesday. I am assigning the rest of Monday to them, after the call of the Consent Calendar and the suspension.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In response to the question of the gentleman as to the number of the bill reported by the Committee on Roads, may I say that it is H. R. 2798, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads," and so forth.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

On Tuesday two conference reports will be considered on the deficiency and Treasury-Post Office appropriation bills. If they are not disposed of on that day, they will, of course, continue on Wednesday.

After the disposition of these two conference reports, there will be called up the bill H. R. 2795, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY] and being handled by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. It is in relation to the disposition of surplus material. After that will come the Barden bill, the vocational rehabilitation bill

I have no knowledge now of whether or not the legislative appropriation bill will go to conference, but if it does and the conferees agree, sometime during the week we shall try to bring that conference report up for consideration.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The Women's Army Corps bill has just been sent to conference. I am hopeful that we can have a meeting on it tomorrow morning. When will it be possible to have the conference report on that bill considered?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman from Kentucky made that observation, because, of course, whatever our program is, conference reports will always receive as early consideration as possible.

That is the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the

conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on the procedure on this antilabor legislation this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 6 minutes immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the committee of investigation authorized by House Resolution 38, not exceeding $100,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. MAGNUSON assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Is this the resolution the gentleman talked to me about yesterday as carrying money for the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. PATTON. That is right.

Mr. RAYBURN. This is the point to which I wish to call attention: When we agree to an investigation, we never can agree on the amount for which the committee will ask. I think this is a ridiculous amount this committee has insisted on and the Committee on Accounts has agreed to. I talked to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture on yesterday and he agreed with me that $25,000 was what he would ask the Committee on Accounts for this morning. I said to him that I did not want the committee to report or to talk about anything more than $50,000. I said if they do not have enough they can get more. They could set up their budget for $25,000, and if they spend that this year of course we would give them more. I understand the chairman of the committee was not present this morning but the committee now reports a resolution for $100,000 to begin this one investigation. I just want to say this, that from now on when gentlemen come to me and talk about investigations, I am going to have some arrangement with them about how much money they are going to ask for before I agree to it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Of course, this is a privileged resolution. I just do not like to be treated in this way. Let me say this. The acting chairman of the Committee on Accounts endeavored to carry out the agreement that I had with him yesterday, but he was outvoted.

Mr. PATTON. We did have an agreement, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has just said, between the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], the Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and, I believe, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and myself. I called up the resolution before the Committee on Accounts this morning. Quite a number of the members of the Committee on Agriculture appeared before the committee and made their explanation. They said that this little sum of $25,000—the amount that was agreed to with the Speaker, the chairman of the committee, and myself yesterday afternoon—was too small. They ridiculed the idea and said that $25,000 would just whip them before they got started—it would whip the very purpose for which they were organized.

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTON. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. This is a privileged resolution, and it comes from the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. PATTON. Yes; by a unanimous vote.

Mr. MICHENER. And if enacted into law it is an authorization to expend that amount of money—$100,000?

Mr. PATTON. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. And the Committee on Agriculture would not have to go before the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. PATTON. No.

The SPEAKER. This comes out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Then as a matter of fact, what we would do here today is really to draw a check, if we pass this resolution, for $100,000 upon the contingent fund of the House, to be expended by this particular investigating committee?

Mr. PATTON. That is correct. The members of the Committee on Agriculture who appeared before our committee this morning stated that it was the purpose of the chairman of that committee to divide this investigating committee up into five to seven subcommittees, and that each one of them would go into different phases of agriculture, and of course when they made that statement it means this: When you divide the money among five subcommittees, each one gets only $5,000 apiece, to start with. I tried to carry out the agreement that I had had with the Speaker and the chairman of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Will not the gentleman withdraw his resolution?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement about this.

Mr. PATTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am a member of the Committee on Accounts. Practically the full membership of the Committee on Agriculture was before the Committee on Accounts this morning. We had a discussion lasting for practically an hour, as to what the Committee on Agriculture proposes to do. I do not know how many Members realize it, but if you will notice, we are rolling back prices on butter and meat and other things, and what else is being rolled back on by some of the Federal agencies here on the farmers I do not know. The Agriculture Committee wants to set up a committee of five as the chairman of the Committee on Accounts, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATTON], has said, and provide an appropriation of $50,000. If we are going to do a job, a hard job, a job that requires money, just $50,000 is an insult to the Committee on Agriculture, when it is put on paper. They say it is another boy play, that if you are going to give them a job, then give them enough money to do the job, and I say to you that if we are going to provide food in quantities and provide it for the armed forces, we are certain to have to go back on the farms and we cannot have rolling prices on butter and meat and eggs and what not, with no account investigations, and these members of the Committee on Agriculture which appeared before our committee this morning expressed themselves, and I am the man who made the motion to raise the appropriation from $50,000 to $100,000.

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Let me finish. I have time and again voted for like sums and for other committees, not one-tenth the importance of this investigating committee, and I am happy that I voted for the $100,000 appropriation. If I did not think it was needed, I would not have made the motion, and the vote was unanimous. Even the chairman voted for it. When everybody else had held up their hands, I said to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATTON], "How do you feel about it?" and he also held up his hand, and so it was a unanimous expression from the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. PATTON. In deference to the Speaker and other Members, I think it is quite proper that I should withdraw the resolution at this time, and I will call it up again on Monday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas withdraws the resolution.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO THE COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution (H. Res. 250), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That until otherwise authorized by law there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives the sum of $2,100 per annum, payable monthly, as compensation to an assistant clerk to the Committee on Patents, to be appointed by the chairman thereof.

Mr. PATTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that this resolution creates a new job of assistant clerk to the Committee on Patents. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] has appeared before the committee several times and being a member of the committee he did not press it, but he finally came to the committee and said

that the work was such that his experienced clerk had gone, just like many others have lost their splendid trained people, so he came before the committee with this resolution. It was unanimously agreed to by the committee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the morning Baltimore Sun on taxation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BURDICK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from a local paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a very fine article by Prof. Warren Seavey, of Harvard University, regarding the Chinese Exclusion Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of all other business and any special orders heretofore entered, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE MONETARY SITUATION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there appears the final and concluding installment of the reprint of Senator Cockrell's speech on money. My purpose in having this speech on money reprinted at this time is to provide the Members of Congress with a convenient reference of the history and principles of our monetary system, together with records of the negotiations in the past by the principal nations of the world for the establishment of an international monetary system. Coming at this time when this country and England propose to again undertake to establish a system of international money, I deem the facts and records presented in that speech of interest to every citizen of this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

COMPLETE FLORIDA BARGE CANAL NOW

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I have here a very interesting editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of May 29. It gives further information concerning the imperativeness of completion at this time of the Intracoastal Waterway from Texas to New Jersey, with particular reference to the Florida portion of it.

The oil-scarcity situation in the Eastern States is growing more intense and acute every hour. It will grow more so, particularly with the coming of our offensive in Europe. That offensive may collapse unless we appropriate funds to construct this barge canal within the next 10 months. It is the responsibility of the Congress, and I urge that you assume this as your responsibility and appropriate funds for it.

The need of oil and gasoline of our armed forces in Europe is increasing hourly. This increase and demand will grow as our offensive in Europe expands. Oil sent to Europe must first reach the east coast of the United States. Our chief source of oil supply in this country is Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi. These States border on the existing barge canal. This barge canal is now completed from these fields to Palatka on the St. Johns River, Fla. A stretch of some 30 miles will, with the Withlacoochee River, connect with Palatka on the St. Johns River, which is the east end of this great barge-canal system.

If this Florida link is completed, oil barges can and will operate directly from the oil fields to the east coast of all United States and on up to Trenton, N. J. Absolutely adequate quantities of oil, as well as sulfur and other war materials, can and will move through this system. Existing pipe lines and pipe lines now planned for construction and existing railroad facilities positively cannot bring to the east coast of our country adequate oil and gasoline supplies to be in turn from there transported across the Atlantic Ocean for our armed forces to use successfully and effectively in our pending and future European offensive against the Axis Powers. This offensive will absorb practically every drop of oil which can be and will be transported by existing facilities to the Atlantic seaboard, and then the supply will fall short for our offensive. This will leave absolutely no gasoline and oil on the east coast of our country for factory, home, automobile, and other consumption in the 17 Eastern Seaboard States.

Now, my friends, I am talking frankly with you and telling you what you may expect. I do this to try to encourage you to lay aside your prejudices and take up this matter as an American matter rather than one of protection of vested interests, and for one time, let the interests of all the citizens in these eastern seaboard 17 States prevail. I ask you to support an appropriation to complete this barge canal. It will require probably $30,000,000. The project can and will be completed in 10 months from the time the appropriation is made. If you doubt this statement, I refer you to the unimpeached evidence to this effect submitted to the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mark my word, a year from now when you cannot have even the limited amount of gasoline which you now use in your automobiles and for other home consumption, you will wish that you had heeded the needs of all the people in these 17 States rather than heeded the admonitions of competing carrier interests.

I hope you will read carefully the following editorial to which I referred.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD the editorial referred to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

LESS AND LESS GASOLINE

The eastern gasoline shortage grows more and more serious, especially for the farmers. This, in the country that produces 67 percent of the world's petroleum products. How should we whack around what gasoline we have?

In our opinion, the farmers should have first call on it, for planting, harvesting, and transporting crops. They should come ahead of the armed forces—but wait a moment, now, while we explain.

The explanation is that if we can't feed the armed forces our fighters can't go on fighting, and we shall lose the war.

Next to the farmers should come the armed forces, naturally. After them should come suburbanites, many of whom live far from railroads or bus lines, and most of whom are engaged in the numerous kinds of work necessary to keep the home front on its feet instead of on its ear. Last, though we don't enjoy saying it, should come city dwellers—because cities have subways, trolley cars, and fairly short-haul bus lines which can carry most city dwellers most of the way to and from work. Factory workers generally fall into one of the foregoing classes.

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE BARGE CANAL?

The question that continues to puzzle and irk us is why this gasoline shortage had to become as bad as it is.

Some months ago, Gen. Charles P. Summerall brought forward a plan which he said would guarantee the Eastern States all the gasoline and oil they needed, without rationing.

General Summerall commanded the First Division and the Fifth Corps in France in World War No. 1, and was Chief of Staff of the Army 1926–31. Since 1931 he has been president of the Citadel, noted South Carolina military college, and for several years he has served as chairman of the Florida Ship Canal Authority. In his Army years, General Summerall was particularly well known for his engineering and construction abilities.

To abolish eastern gasoline and oil shortages, Summerall proposed that the Florida ship canal, already well begun in early days of the New Deal, be completed as a barge

canal. This would give oil barges drawn by Diesel-powered tugs a submarine-proof, stormproof, almost all-inland waterway from Gulf oil ports to lower New Jersey.

Summerall was convinced (and convinced many Senators and Congressmen) that the job could be done in 10 months, at a cost of about $44,000,000, and without trenching on any important war material or machine priorities.

In official Washington, however, the plan died the death.

Some railroads and some large oil companies were opposed to it. But spearheading the opposition was Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, who hates oil barges for some reason and loves oil pipe lines. But the plan was not to substitute barges for pipe lines; it was to have them both. And today proves they were both needed. Ickes' pet pipe line, incidentally, was chopped in two the other day when the Arkansas flood waters got really into stride.

Why was the Summerall plan so bitterly and so effectually fought by the New Deal bureaucrats? We don't know, but our guess is that at bottom they were mad because they didn't think of it first.

Whatever the reason, the Eastern gasoline shortage is now menacing our entire war effort.

It shows no signs of easing off. The signs, indeed, point to worse gasoline shortages as the war goes on.

The situation should become especially acute when the cold weather sets in next fall and oil-burning home owners manifest a fairly understandable desire to keep flu and pneumonia away from themselves and their families.

When and if that comes to pass, we can all look back on the almost incomprehensible bureaucratic stupidity and stubbornness and jealousy that caused it.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore granted today I may speak for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to give my opinion on the way this antilabor bill was passed this afternoon, the procedure that was used, and the effect it is going to have on the morale of the American men and women who are working in the factories of this country today.

This bill was brought before the House with no hearings in the committee of any kind, despite what the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has stated. It was brought before this House, and the only Members who had any opportunity to speak on it during the general debate were the proponents of the bill. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] did not have the courtesy to extend to any of the opponents 1 minute of time. I asked on Wednesday and again on Thursday for time, and it was not granted. Finally, almost at the conclusion of yesterday's business, when I finally was recognized, I was given a grand total of 2 minutes to speak against this bill. I thank the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee for his generosity in extending to the opponents of this bill a limit of 2 minutes to all those who wanted to speak against it.

All over this land, people are proud of the fact that the accused is always guaranteed a voice in his own defense. Even the great State of Kentucky subscribes to that reasoning. My State pays the salary of a public defender in order to guarantee that an accused man shall be guaranteed every protection the law affords. This great Nation is engaged in a bloody war to preserve the freedom we love, to crush the dictators that subscribe to the policy that the accused shall not be allowed to speak in his own defense.

Perhaps the gentleman from Kentucky does not subscribe to our reasoning. Perhaps he believes the dictator's way is the best way. Apparently he believes the best way to get his ideas across is to stifle the voice of every man who does not agree with him.

Today American labor is in the position of being damned without a voice having been raised in its defense. The gentleman is to be complimented on his great legislative skill. His methods of procedure will edify those dictators who thought they knew how to silence opposition to their wishes.

I condemn that procedure. It is the rankest procedure ever witnessed in any group or any legislative body in my young years, and I sincerely hope that when this bill reaches the Senate the Senate will look upon it with cool and deliberate consideration and that it will be turned down. I am not one who gets up here every day in the week or every week in the year; this is only the third or fourth time I have taken the floor of the House in the 3 years I have been here, and I do not rise to speak on something I do not know anything about. Oh, I have heard some of those who come from farm States say they get up in the morning at 5:30 and work until dusk. I know what it is to work until dusk on the farm. I was born on a farm and know what it is to get up at 5:30 in the morning and milk six or seven cows, then go to school and come back again and do the same at night. I know what it is to do that every day for 10 years until I graduated from high school; but I also know the other side of the story. I know what it is to go out on the road and earn a living with my hands. I know what it is to join a union; I know what it is to be an official of a union. I know what it is to pay initiation fees to a union. I paid $107.15 to join the union I belong to. I paid $37 a year for yearly dues and still pay them in the bricklayers' union in the city of Providence. I was the president of that union; I am still an official of that union. I know the difficulties they work under. I know what it is to drive 40 miles to work at 5:30 in the morning, put in an 8-hour day and then take 2 hours to go back at night—putting in a 12-hour day to get 8 hours' pay.

Knowing the conditions laboring men work under today I know this bill is not going to have any good effect on the morale of our defense workers in this country. I thought we were supposed to deliberate here in a cool and sensible manner; I thought, when we were considering this bill today, that we were to consider it with a view of increasing our war production, of winning this war. I say to every Member of this House that this bill is not going to increase production. If this bill is enacted into law it is going to lower the morale of every workingman and woman in this country, and I know whereof I speak. I am intimately acquainted with every labor group in Rhode Island. I know personally most of the men and women in industry in the State of Rhode Island. I have lived with them—I have worked with them, and I have walked the streets during the depression with them—without a dime in my pocket. Look at the record they have produced for this Nation at war.

They have worked hard and long—they have not struck—they have not laid down on the job. They have produced and produced in order to arm their sons, their brothers, their husbands. They have gone without oil for heating their homes. They have not had adequate food or clothing. They have done without whatever was not available, but they kept right on working. Is that what the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Virginia have in mind when they refer to the disorganizing influences of labor leaders?

We have in my State the finest group of labor leaders you can find anywhere. They are all men who have worked at their trade. They know the difficulties which attend that trade and they appreciate an employee's problems. We have no union difficulties. We will not have any union difficulties. Yet these men are to be branded as culprits—yes, even as traitors. In spite of the years of devoted service they have given, they are to be told they are interfering with the Nation's war effort; so they are to be branded and, merely because they are labor leaders, they are to be told they are not worthy to be called fellow Americans.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] gets up on this floor and says he wants to be fair. The gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, says he wants to be fair. When he got up this morning he said: "Oh, I have no bad feelings left from yesterday; I am a different man; I am happy."

Mr. Speaker, I am not of that same temperament. I am not happy. I have the same feelings I had yesterday against him and the proponents of this measure, in the way they railroaded this particular measure through this House—without giving the opponents the right to discuss the merits and demerits of the bill.

The gentleman from Virginia on Wednesday, when he first took the floor on the rule making this bill in order, looked up into the gallery and said, "Well, I see the goon squads, for the labor leaders are here again." That, Mr. Speaker, is contemptible. That, Mr. Speaker, is typical of the frame of mind that has been displayed by the proponents of this legislation throughout the so-called debate.

Because men who are elected by members of labor unions to represent them come here to plead the cause of labor, they are called goon squads. Does the gentleman from Virginia feel that way about the young sailor who sat in the gallery a few days ago and decried the fact that the Civil War was being fought all over again here in this House?

Mr. Speaker, I want him to know that the labor leaders who are here have a right to be here, just as any other American has a right to be here. I want the gentleman from Virginia to know those men are just as patriotic as he ever was or ever will be.

So far as threats are concerned, I do not care about any threats from William Green or John L. Lewis or anybody; and I do not care about any threats from the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] when he starts out by saying that 50 of the men who voted against the Smith bill in 1941 were not reelected. I voted against that bill and I came back here with an increased plurality of 50 percent. I only wish to God today that I had been able to vote a sufficient number of times to defeat this bill. As far as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is concerned, if he would only come up in my district next election time and speak against me it would assure me of reelection in the State of Rhode Island. That is what the people of the State of Rhode Island think about these antilabor men we have in Congress today.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I compliment the gentleman on his remarks. I know they come from the heart as well as the mind. As I have listened to the debate in the House the last few days I have wondered a great deal if we have forgotten that the sons of labor are fighting this war just the same as the sons of farmers and businessmen. Can we not appreciate the fact that we should put into practice the tenets of democracy as well as preach them and give credit to these people for doing a remarkably efficient job of production, give them the credit which is justly due?

Mr. FOGARTY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, we have not solved the trouble by any means by the passage of this legislation. It may even cause some strikes. The responsibility for strikes in this country today rests only on the shoulders of this Congress at the present time. The only reason they strike is to get a higher wage. The only reason they want a higher wage is to be able to pay for the stuff they need to eat and the clothes they put on their back. It is the duty of this Congress to stabilize prices, to put a ceiling on prices, and keep its word when it says it is going to.

The Congress told the people of this country a year ago it was going to stabilize prices, it was going to put a ceiling on prices. What do we find at the present time? Foodstuffs have risen on an average 100 percent, yet whenever a labor man or any labor union says they want 10 or 15 percent increase in wages, it is said throughout the country that labor is unjustified, while they are not getting enough money to feed their own children. That is the seat of all the trouble. That is the seat of the trouble we should get at, and it is up to this Congress to do it. Until we roll back the prices that exist today there are going to be strikes and more strikes in this country in order that they may be able to live on the wages they are getting.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The vote taken today in the House will be hailed by the Rome, Tokyo, and Berlin radios within the next 24 hours.

Mr. FOGARTY. I may say to all these anti-Communists we have in Congress, those who have been doing everything they can to fight the Communist Party, that this is going to make more fertile ground to sow the seeds of communism in the case of these disgruntled workers.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Does not the gentleman know that the activities of John L. Lewis are very pleasing to both Tojo and Hitler?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not condone any actions of John L. Lewis. I condemn them. But I do maintain that this is no way to take care of that situation, and you will never take care of it by the passage of bills such as was passed today.

Mr. PATMAN. Does not the gentleman think we should first ask for the unconditional surrender of John L. Lewis before we win the war? In other words, that will be necessary to win the war?

Mr. FOGARTY. The first thing to do is call off the surrender of your job as a Congressman. Stop rising prices—control prices on essentials the way you promised you would do. Then I will guarantee you will have no trouble at all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of other special orders today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the address by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, like others who spoke on the bill which passed the House today, as one of the proponents of legislation, I too express regret in not having appointed time in which to speak before the passage of the bill through the House. I take it, however, that my speaking now is not entirely inappropriate because after all we will have to pass upon the bill again when it comes back from the Senate or from the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, in history I have read where Napoleon's presence in battle was worth a hundred thousand soldiers. John L. Lewis apparently has even greater influence, for he has called a half million men from battle line.

Every worker, whether in farm, mine, or factory, is indeed a soldier. It is true that the battle goes well with us now. The tide has definitely turned our way. There is still, however, much fighting, suffering, and death ahead. Unless each individual does his or her part victory cannot be assured.

Free labor has astounded the world in its accomplishments. War implements of the finest sort in undreamed-of numbers have been manufactured and transported to the most remote parts of the world. Millions of loyal workers have gladly assumed new and additional burdens.

Fair women stand shoulder to shoulder with men in industries. The cry for increased production has been amply met.

Representing, as I do, the largest textile district in the world, I am particularly pleased that our mills have turned out many more products than they did during the last World War with even less spindles in operation. Cotton and its products rank second only to steel, and are as essential to our war effort. More than 5,000 articles containing cotton are used by our armed forces as they fight around the globe.

Peace and harmony between employer and employee have been the rule, but there are exceptions.

Those of us who have labored through the years are proud of our accomplishments. We would jealously safeguard the advances made. No person of reason would advocate or consent to the repeal of laws enacted for the protection of labor. We would not relinquish our social gains except insofar as is necessary to win the war. Let us not, however, sit supinely by and permit unwise leadership to cause the forfeiture of any gains.

A strike has been ordered against our Government in its war industries over which flies our country's flag. More than a year ago in a speech in this House I stated, in part, as follows:

> Consider the horrible spectacle of a man in a defense industry laying down his tools and going on a strike during these dire days of national agony and peril. The man who commits such an unpardonable atrocity against the Nation's war effort is not only depraved with the most violent form of selfishness, he is disgracefully afflicted with a kind of dumbness and stupidity which comes, in large measure, from his neglectfulness in the duty of knowing what we are fighting to save; because, most assuredly, if he knew just what the winning or losing of this war is going to mean to him, to his family and to his fellow workers in terms, possibly of life itself, liberty itself, and the pursuit of happiness itself, he would, instead of making himself almost a traitor to his country, do everything within his power to work for her salvation. Any owner of furnace, farm, or factory

who thinks first of profits at this crucial time is devoid of patriotism.

On Sunday last while in my district I heard a great mass of people make the following pledge:

We, the people of Spartanburg County, S. C.—from the farms and factories, from the towns and cities— assembled here in a solemn ceremony, rededicating ourselves to the true ideals of democracy, do now pledge ourselves, hopefully and prayerfully, to do our utmost in whatever capacity we are able to serve, so that our men and women on the fighting fronts may speedily accomplish victory over our enemies.

Further, we hereby broadcast an invitation and a challenge to every other community in the Nation to join with us in this movement of rededication, so that human freedom, and honor, and decency, and a righteous peace may once again become the guiding principles of mankind.

And may God give us strength and courage, no matter how great shall be our personal sacrifices, to fulfill our responsibilities to those on the fighting fronts.

While there I met a mother with six sons in the service. A father with four sons in uniform writes me as follows:

It has been some time since I wrote you about any public matters, but listening to the news commentators and reading our local papers in reference to the strikes in our war industries and the coal mines, I am wondering what is keeping Congress from making some effort to curb this kind of conduct. The people with whom I come in contact are criticizing Congress for allowing a thing like this to go on when the implements which they are making are so vitally important to our boys who are in the service.

A little mother came in to see me with two babies whose father had been inducted into the Army.

Thus it is that sacrifices and deprivations are gladly being made without complaint.

Shall we as the representatives of the sovereign people allow the cancerous condition developed in this strike against our Government to go without the surgeon's knife?

Unless and until this serious matter is speedily and effectively dealt with by the enactment of proper legislation irreparable losses will result.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to call to the attention of the Members of the House, and particularly to the Members of the Midwest, where floods have recently ravaged farms and towns on the banks of rivers in that section, the way a similar danger has been handled in the Tennessee Valley. I do this for the reason that I know the people who are living in those sections and their Representatives in Congress are very greatly interested in trying to find the most feasible means of preventing a recurrence of these devastating floods.

It is with a peculiar sense of sympathy that I rise to comment on the desolating floods that have ravaged the farms and towns and cities on the banks of rivers in the West and Midwest. For the district I represent has had similar disasters fall upon it in the past. The city of Chattanooga, my home, is located in one of the most vulnerable areas in the valley of the Tennessee. Our history has a good many chapters recording the loss of property, the human suffering that the violence of floods has caused.

In 1867, when Chattanooga was a small city with a population of only about 5,000, the worst flood on record occurred. A newspaper of the day reported that "for miles and miles the land is hidden, only a few of the higher points of hills being above the water. In Chattanooga tonight there are 4 to 8 feet of water in all the streets." No estimate was made of the financial loss due to that flood. But estimates have been made of the loss which would occur if the same flood stage should be reached today, with the city at its present level of development. If the flood of 1867 were to recur today, the damage to property alone would exceed $37,500,000.

To protect our city against a flood of this magnitude by local flood works alone would be impossible. If we tried we would discover what cities located on other rivers have found out—levees would be breached, sea-walls would be overrun when a really high flood occurred. We do not face the prospect of that sad disillusion, for the situation in Chattanooga is different today. We know that complete protection of the city against any disaster from flood will be possible. It will be possible because of the storage reservoirs built by the T. V. A. on the Tennessee River and its tributaries above Chattanooga. In a report submitted in 1938, the T. V. A. outlined a plan by which a local flood protection system, well within the limits of engineering feasibility, could be constructed for approximately $15,500,000. These local works, together with the flood storage provided by T. V. A. reservoirs, will protect Chattanooga against what the engineers call a design flood—a flood of 730,000 cubic feet per second, which would top the 1867 flood by 10 feet. Unregulated, such a flood would cause damage estimated at $70,000,000 at Chattanooga. No sea-wall or levee could hold it. But the upstream storage already provided has reduced our danger to a point where the recommended local works will give us full protection. Since more reservoir dams have been built than was contemplated when the T. V. A. report of 1938 was made, the cost of full protection to the city will probably be less than was originally estimated.

Those local works, which must be built to protect the city fully, must wait until after the war. But the T. V. A. system already is providing substantial protection which minimizes flood damage. We are secure against the annual threat of floods of average crests, although we are not yet protected from the perfect flood, the worst that nature can do. We had a flood early this year. If the Tennessee had been uncontrolled, it would have caused at least a million dollars actual damage, and would have been infinitely costly in slowing war production and transportation. But the T. V. A. reservoirs were operated to reduce the maximum flood height from 39.7 feet to 35.8 feet, or nearly 4 feet, and Chattanooga was safe. In the 1937 flood, when T. V. A. had only a single reservoir above Chattanooga, it was able to reduce flood heights in January and February by amounts varying from 3 to 5 feet and saving an estimated $600,000. In floods in March and April 1936, the estimated saving in Chattanooga was $2,700,000.

In all, since March 1936, when the first T. V. A. reservoir became available for flood control, there have been eight occasions when the river would have exceeded flood stage at Chattanooga if the reservoirs had not held back the waters. Damage totaling some $4,500,000 has been prevented.

We are already experiencing the security that comes when a river is fully controlled. Complete protection is possible for the future. This is the unique experience of cities on the Tennessee, for this is the only example of a genuinely modern approach to the problem of flood control. Incidentally, the T. V A. reservoir dam system gives full protection to all communities on the Tennessee with the exception of Chattanooga.

Prior to the flood of 1927 on the Mississippi River, almost the entire reliance in flood control was placed on the construction of levees, seawalls, and similar engineering works designed to protect limited areas particularly subject to damage. The 1927 flood demonstrated in a devastating way that such works alone were bound to be ineffective. Obviously, they can have no effect on the amount or speed of the water's flow past a given point. They can only attempt to confine the natural flood flows within certain limits. Actually, by narrowing the natural channel which the flood would normally occupy in its sweep downstream, they raise the crest of the flood.

It was realized after the 1927 disaster that storage reservoirs, capable of holding back a part of the flood flows near their scurces at the headwaters, were the logical answer to effective flood control. There are definite limits to the height to which local flood protection works can be built, both because of cost and safety. On rivers which are uncontrolled they cannot give protection, but with reservoirs upstream to store flood flows and lower flood crests at danger points downstream these local flood-protection works can be made effective.

That is the modern theory. It has been carried into practice only on one watershed. The Tennessee is controlled, alone of all of the major rivers in the United States. Great storage dams on tributaries hold back the water near the source. A series of dams on the main river controls the flow, with Kentucky Dam near the mouth providing 4,500,000 acre-feet of flood storage to keep the waters of the Tennessee from rushing into the Ohio and the Mississippi when those rivers are too high for safety.

Each dam built by T. V. A. is a multipurpose structure. They are designed and operated as one system, not only to remove the menace of floods but in order

that the maximum benefit may be obtained from a great natural resource. Those dams not only protect us from high water, they provide a channel for navigation, and make low-cost power available for the area's development.

In the Tennessee Valley, control of floods fits into the general pattern. We are particularly fortunate that the regulation of our river was entrusted to this great new regional agency whose total program is devoted to raising the income level of the area and removing barriers to production. The readjustments necessary to any such development have been accomplished with a minimum of strain and sacrifice upon the individual citizens. Necessarily, farm land has been flooded, but dislocated families have been helped in finding new locations, and the productivity of the acreage remaining has been stepped up by the changes in agricultural practices the new fertilizers produced by T. V. A. made possible. That is a part of flood control too. The cover that protects our once eroded soil holds the water in the land. The rain no longer rushes to join the rising river, black with fertility stolen from the soil. We are experiencing a total conservation program in the valley of the Tennessee. Those storage reservoirs are beautiful lakes, not only a source of delight and refreshment to those of us who have the good fortune to live there, but they will be a source of income to many individuals and small private businesses which serve the needs of recreation.

This is a system of river control which works. It is the only system which will work, which will give permanent protection, vast incremental benefits, and turn the rivers of this country into forces for production, not destruction. It is the only system which will give us freedom from fear of such disasters as have occurred this spring.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I have been greatly interested in the very elucidating and informative address which my colleague from Tennessee has just delivered.

As he knows, we have had some great floods in the Midwest. The State of Missouri has suffered greatly. Millions of dollars' worth of property has been destroyed and thousands of acres have been submerged, which will probably seriously interfere with the food program.

The St. Francis River has been one of the most turbulent streams in northeastern Arkansas and southeastern Missouri. It flows through my home county and through my district.

In 1935, when I came here, I went on the Flood Control Committee. That committee wrote legislation dealing with control of floods, and we adopted the first legislation authorizing the impounding of waters of tributary streams. We constructed the Wappella Dam on the St. Francis River. During this recent flood the reservoir held all of the water that came from the flood, otherwise it would have overflowed one of our richest and most fertile valleys, which was not affected at all by the flood, which goes to show what can be done if we are willing to impound the water on the tributaries and keep it out of the main streams which heretofore have caused serious damage through floods.

I want to congratulate the gentleman on his splendid discussion of the scientific method of controlling floodwaters.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I greatly appreciate the contribution the gentleman has made. My friend makes a persuasive argument for developments such as the T. V. A. on the principal rivers throughout the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that it was necessary to pass any kind of a law, especially in time of war, to prevent strikes, but it was necessary that Congress should act on this question.

SECOND PEARL HARBOR COAL STRIKE

The second Pearl Harbor in this war was the coal miners' strike, which has been just about as damaging to our country's war effort from the standpoint of property loss as the first Pearl Harbor was, and if it is not ended very soon it will be more disastrous to us from that standpoint than the first Pearl Harbor was.

Every law that is passed that has penalty provisions applies necessarily to a minority of the people, because only a minority commit wrongs that laws should be passed to prohibit. If one says that because there are only a few strikes we should pass no law regarding strikes, one could use that same argument just as logically and consistently and say that we should not have any law against desertion from the armed forces because so few men desert the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and our armed forces. Suppose we did not have a law against desertion and a bill should be proposed in this body to make it an offense, with the death penalty, if you please, as it is now, for one to desert the armed forces, and the argument should be made, "We should not pass that kind of a bill, that will affect the morale of our good Army of from 7,000,000 to 9,000,000 men who are doing such an excellent job. We cannot afford to do that. It will injure or impair their morale." That argument would not be persuasive at all.

Would it not be just as persuasive to say that we should not pass any law affecting strikes because there are only a few people striking? It is absolutely the same argument. We should either stop strikes in essential war industries or we should be absolutely fair and consistent and repeal the law against desertions, which none of us would be willing to repeal.

FORCE UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER OF JOHN L. LEWIS

We have called for the unconditional surrender of the Axis Powers. That is the slogan of our allies. It is a good slogan, unconditional surrender. I believe right now we should so direct our efforts in that campaign of a successful war, in our efforts to obtain or secure the unconditional surrender of the Axis Powers, that we should now insist on and force the unconditional surrender of John L. Lewis. I believe that would be a long step in the direction of obtaining or securing the unconditional surrender of the Axis Powers.

Certainly we cannot carry on a war without the things that are made with coal. Steel is vital, other basic materials are vital, materials that can only be made or obtained through the use of coal. There is no bottleneck in our war effort that is more essential than the production of coal, and the stopping of the production of coal is just as helpful to our enemies and more helpful than any other one thing that our enemies could do if they were here in a large force. So it is not a reflection upon the good workers who have done such an excellent job to pass a law that will punish those who are not patriotic in this dark hour of our country's history.

IS CONGRESS PLAYING HORSE WITH THE PEOPLE ON ANTISTRIKE LEGISLATION?

We have passed a bill today. The people are beginning to feel that Congress is doing what is sometimes called in the West, playing horse, acting in just a playful, facetious way, not trying to do anything seriously or honestly. I do not know whether that is true or not. I do not think it is. I think this House means business, and the other body has acted.. Over a year ago the House of Representatives sent to the other body a very fine bill known as the Howard Smith bill, that would have stopped strikes, but the other body did not see fit to take up that bill and even consider it. The other body passed what was known as the Connally bill, dealing with strikes in plants taken over by the Government. They sent that to the House, but our body did not take up that Connally bill and consider it. Then this year we sent to the other body what is known as the Hobbs bill, and that bill was not considered by the other body. On the other hand, the other body took up another Connally bill—I think a very weak bill, but, of course, I am not impugning the motives or good intentions of the author when I say that, for possibly it was as strong a bill as they can pass in the other body, and they passed that bill and sent it over here to the House. Now, then, we are getting down to business. We have taken the Connally bill, and we have amended it, and made a good bill of it, and this afternoon by an overwhelming vote we have sent that bill back to the other body, and the people of this country will now find out whether the House is playing horse with them or whether the Senate is playing horse with them, or whether both the Senate and the House are playing horse. We will find out whether or not there is an honest, sincere effort upon the part of the Congress to pass an effective law that will prevent strikes in wartime, and I hope that such a bill is passed.

How can a man fight unless he has a gun and ammunition? Do you not think we are a bunch of cowards if we sit over here and permit our men all over the world to go along without ammunition and materials of war when we by our votes have sent them there? Would it not be cowardly not to send them guns and ammunition?

It is said it is easier to get cooperation on these measures voluntarily than by law.

If that is true, then, why not repeal the law against desertion and say that you can desert from the Army because we can get better cooperation without any law.

TREASON

It is only in recent years that anyone would have the audacity to strike against his government or to strike at all in an essential war industry in time of war. That is treason, absolutely, and you cannot make me believe that the good workers of this country are going to be offended because we are dealing with a few who are guilty of treason.

In civilian life we make the guns and the ammunition and send them to the men on the front. They are in military service by our votes; we put them there and now we are going to back them up by making it possible for them to get the materials of war unaffected by strikes, stoppages, and walk-outs.

We should subject strikers to this kind of law because they are not willing to go along and cooperate in the war. We cannot send those folks to Japan and Germany. They would be entertained over there.

BANQUET FOR LEWIS IN JAPAN

If you send John L. Lewis to Japan, they would not torture him like they did our flyers. They would give him a big banquet. He is doing an excellent job for our enemies. How much longer will we permit it? I hope the other body now cooperates with this House and passes a law and puts it on the statute books that will stop these strikes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to these speeches that have been made since the final passage of this act. I am sorry the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] have left the floor since making their remarks, but I believe a great many of the remarks which have been made so strongly condemning this legislation come from a failure to know just what this bill really contains.

On yesterday the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] said that he proposed, in the event the Harness amendment was voted down, to offer a substitute. He stated at that time that the heart of this bill was contained in section 13 of the House bill and section 4 of the Connally bill as it came to us from the Senate. He did not say that in so many words, but that is what I understood him to mean. I submit to you, as I suggested to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] a little while ago, that clause 2 of section 13 gives specific authority to deal with the present coal-strike situation, and does the very thing that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] said was the thing that should be done, and that the majority leader of this House said to us was the thing that should be done. That section is in the bill as it passed the House. It was not in the original Harness substitute. The Harness substitute left out all reference to the War Labor Board and the definition of its powers and duties. I may say that Mr. Davis, Chairman of the War Labor Board, testified before our committee that every section relating to the War Labor Board, with the exception of section 12, was good and would be helpful.

In writing those sections we were not trying to do anything to chastise labor. We followed just as closely as we could the Executive order of the President setting up the War Labor Board and defining its duties and powers, and gave to it in addition the power of subpena. We made it a legal entity, whereas today it is a legal nonentity. The War Labor Board today has absolutely no power to enforce any order that it might make. I presume it is not answerable in court for anything it might do because it is a legal nonentity. It does not exist in the eyes of the law. We clothed it with legal authority.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Aside from the right to subpena witnesses, what power does this bill, as it passed the House today, give to the War Labor Board?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me suggest at this time that every Member of this House in order to try to understand what we did pass today, should get the Congressional RECORD of yesterday and turn first to pages 5328 and 5329. On those pages is set out the Harness substitute. The Harness substitute took section 1 of the House bill and section 2 and section 3 of the House bill. Then he put in a section 4 which would have penalized violations under sections 2 and 3. Then he put in section 5 of this bill, which provided for the registration of labor unions. I believe that is section 7 in the House bill. Then he put in a new section 6, which related to the political contributions by labor organizations, banks, and so on.

If I remember correctly, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] offered an amendment today to strike that section from the amendment. If I remember correctly, that amendment was rejected. So section 6 remains in the bill, but it is more or less ineffectual because we have pretty much the same law already in the Hatch Act. I believe this does go a little further. Then section 7 in the Harness substitute is the last sentence of section 12 in the House bill.

Section 8 in the Harness substitute is section 14 of the House bill.

Now, on page 5335 will be found the Smith amendment, which restored to the Harness substitute sections 8, 9, 10, 11, and 13 of the House bill, those sections relating to the War Labor Board, with the exception of section 12, which the Committee on Military Affairs had agreed to strike from the bill. I believe also that the Smith amendment struck out the power to enforce the orders of the War Labor Board by injunction. He omitted that. As finally adopted, he also omitted the last sentence to be found in section 8, subsection (b), on page 17, of the House bill, which said that the Board should not under any conditions require as a condition of employment that any individual become or remain a member of a labor organization. That sentence was objected to by all of the agencies whose representatives testified before us. One sees, therefore, that the Smith amendment put back into the Harness substitute the sections that the War Labor Board wanted, leaving out the only two parts to which they objected, and that action gives the War Labor Board legal standing. That is the measure we have.

I agree with some of the things that have been said here. I stated on the floor of this House twice in the course of the consideration of this bill that I favored the deletion of sections 2 and 3 of the bill because the agencies of this Government charged with war production said they ought to come out and I believed they should come out. We offered an amendment, that amendment was voted down. It was noticeable however that the Members who cried out against the harshness of this bill voted against the amendments to take out those two sections. It was probably strategic, they probably wanted to make this bill just as bad as they could in order that it would be voted down on a roll call; but had they wanted to turn this into a piece of good legislation why did they not help us strike out the parts that the procuring agencies of the Government said ought to be taken out and the parts they say the unions objected to? They voted to leave them in, whereas we who were working hard on this bill trying to make a good bill out of it followed the recommendation of the Government agencies and tried our best to strike those sections from the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. What is the exact language of the Smith amendment that the gentleman says is the same as the amendment that was supposed to have been offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Section 13 of the House bill, which is the identical language lifted word for word from the bill that was sent to us from the Senate as contained in section 4 of that bill. I will read the language, and may I state also that I understand this is what the gentleman from Georgia referred to yesterday and it is a thing I called to the attention of the gentleman from California a few moment ago, or some

other gentleman who made the statement that there was nothing in this bill that affected the present coal strike; as a matter of fact, it is hard to legislate against a condition that has already arisen, because in this country we frown upon making penalty laws retroactive. We can, however, make a law that will apply from this time on. Section 13 of the House bill reads as follows:

SEC. 13. (a) Whenever any plant, mine, or other property is in the possession of the United States, it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, or induce any person to interfere, by lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption, with the operation of such plant, mine, or property.

The time probably is passed when that would be applicable to the present situation, but listen to the language which follows:

Or (2) to aid any such lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such plant, mine, or property by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If I understand correctly, that is the provision to which both the majority whip and the majority leader referred on the floor of this House as taking care of the present situation. When they made their statements the Harness substitute was before us and that language was not in it, but then the Smith amendment was adopted restoring that language; so it seems to me we have complied with the wishes of the majority leader and the majority whip when this was restored to the bill that something be put in the bill to take care of the present situation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Am I to understand from the gentleman, then, that he has very much the same opinion about this legislation that I have: That it should be limited insofar as possible to dealing with the current situation that confronts the Nation? Is that the gentleman's idea?

Mr. SPARKMAN. With this qualification: I believe that the time has come in this country when we are going to have to have some kind of regulatory labor legislation, for the good of labor itself. It has reached that state of bigness where regulation becomes necessary for its own good. I have talked with labor leaders within the last few days who have agreed with me in that statement. I have said repeatedly, and I think it is a fact, that labor leaders themselves should formulate that legislation. I believe they did it some years back when the Railway Labor Act was passed, and there have been other pieces of labor legislation that were formulated more or less by agreement of those who were vitally concerned with it. I believe that the sound, able, patriotic labor leaders of this country—and they are vastly in the majority when it comes to labor leadership—I believe they ought to get together, formulate some plan, and say to some Member of Congress in whom they have confidence: "We believe that the time has come to put on the statute books some kind of regulatory legislation, and we would like for you to sponsor this piece of legislation for us."

In connection with that type of legislation I think it might be well to have sections 2 and 3 in it and probably the registrations of unions, perhaps not as sweeping as provided in this particular section. There are a good many things that might go in there that I believe should have been left out of this bill because we are seeking now to deal with an emergency, not only the emergency that is upon us but a recurrence of strikes that may come while we are in this war. After all this piece of legislation is not permanent law. It is not sought to keep it on the books permanently, but only for the duration and 6 months thereafter, or even earlier if the Congress sees fit to take it off the statute books.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am always interested in any statement the distinguished gentleman from Alabama has to make. He has made a very informative and interesting address. I was especially interested in the statement of the gentleman that he thinks the labor leaders ought to get together on some kind of legislation. Does not the gentleman think that the bill passed by this House today will result in the labor leaders getting together and that it will be an incentive for them to get together?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly hope it does result in that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I understand that since the passage of the bill one John L. Lewis has ordered his men back to the mines on next Monday.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am delighted to have that report. I hope it is true.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I ask the gentleman if he does not have a good deal of misgivings about section 2? I personally think that is a very unfortunate section in that it requires a 30-day cooling-off period. In this present emergency, however, we have a no-strike agreement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Wait just a minute. I have stated that a half dozen times.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not the gentleman think it would be a good idea if this section were left out in conference?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have stated that I opposed this section I voted against it in the Committee of the Whole and I have spoken on the floor. This is the third time I have spoken, and every time I have said both sections 2 and 3 should be left out of the bill, and I earnestly hope that the conferees will leave it out because the agencies of the Government charged with procuring our war supplies say it will be hurtful to their program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman would be rendering a great service if he will take the bill and analyze each section as it passed the House. The gentleman will recall that we not only had the original bill as presented by the gentleman's committee, but then the Harness amendment was offered more or less as a substitute, after which the Smith amendment was offered as a substitute for the Harness amendment. That was on yesterday. Today, when the House met, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] introduced another amendment very similar to the one he introduced yesterday but with certain vital changes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I interrupt to say that the amendment which finally passed was the Smith amendment of yesterday with the exception of one sentence. That is the sentence I pointed out.

Mr. PATMAN. Would the gentleman mind analyzing the bill for us? Would that be asking too much of him? Analyze it in the RECORD tonight so that we will see it tomorrow.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not see how I can very well go any further. I have tried here to go through and show the sections of the bill which has passed and their relation to the bill as reported.

Mr. PATMAN. What I was referring to is the fact the gentleman has expressed a different viewpoint from many that have been expressed during the consideration of this bill. The gentleman is a very able member of that committee and has studied this legislation and kept up with it, and I am anxious to see his viewpoint expressed section by section.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

There is just one other thing I want to say here, and that is this: I think it is deplorable that at any time, and in the heat of debate, these charges of insincerity should be made. I believe that most of the Members of this House are sincere, in fact, I could not pick out a single Member and say that he was insincere in the manner in which he voted for legislation.

I think it is unfortunate also that threats are made her in the Well of the House by any Member, or by a force of organized groups on the outside, and I do not believe that the vast majority of the Members of the House allow themselves to be influenced by those threats.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

Mr. VINSON of Georgia, for an indefinite period, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. DAWSON, for Monday and Tuesday, on account of important business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 217. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1670. An act to amend section 2 of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, as amended;

H. R. 2570. An act to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2848. An act amending the joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, approved April 29, 1943; and

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 7, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold executive hearings at 10 a. m. on Monday, June 7, 1943, on bills dealing with the Chinese Exclusion Act.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will hold public hearings on Tuesday, June 8, 1943, beginning at 10 a. m., on bills relating to the classification and compensation of substitute employees in the Postal Service.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The Committee on the Public Lands will meet at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, June 8, 1943, to consider H. R. 2241, to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument, Wyoming. Anyone wishing to appear before the committee or to file a statement for the record should contact the clerk of the committee.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

1. Tuesday, June 8: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, including the Arkansas and White Rivers, and on rivers flowing into the Gulf west of the Mississippi River, and in the western Rocky Mountain region, including Texas and Colorado, and in the Pacific Northwest region, including the Willamette River and the Columbia River and tributaries.

2. Wednesday, June 9: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the Los Angeles area and in the State of California, including the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kern River Valleys, and on projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

3. Thursday, June 10: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

4. Friday, June 11: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold public hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, June 9, 1943, on private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 9, 1943, in Room 346 Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Investigation of Restrictions on Brand Names and Newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 2 o'clock p. m., Tuesday, June 8, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear additional important witnesses on the hosiery order. At 2 p. m., June 9, the committee will hear some O. P. A. boys.

There will be a meeting of the securities subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Wednesday, June 9, 1943.

Business to be considered: Open hearing to hear Mr. Ganson Purcell, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, on proxy rules.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 2731, to facilitate the award and payment of just compensation for property requisitioned under the authority of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of subcommittee No. 7 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Friday, June 11, 1943, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of bills relating to the carrying of mail on star routes. Public hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2620, a bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives of the United States, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 16, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

456. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to further amend the act of June 25, 1938, entitled "An act extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

457. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on lists of papers, recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 250. Resolution providing for the salary of an assistant clerk to the Committee on Patents; without amendment (Rept. No. 524). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 2869. A bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 525). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 2683. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-seventh anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 19 to 23, inclusive, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 526). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 2859. A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 527). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2876. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, providing for exemption from estate tax of the estates of persons in the military service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 2877. A bill to prevent the payment of subsidies to processors in stabilizing prices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHIFFLER:

H. R. 2878. A bill to amend section 901, Public Law 507, for the purpose of extending the franking privilege to soldiers, sailors, and marines undergoing hospital care in a United States hospital; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 2879. A bill to provide that no member of the armed forces shall be separated from the service under honorable conditions or released from active duty following the present war until he has secured employment in civilian life; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 2884. A bill to permit transfers of farm allotments of tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. R. 2885. A bill to authorize the improvement of Lavaca and Navidad Rivers, Tex.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2880. A bill for the relief of H. G. Tooley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 2881. A bill for the relief of Howard Rasmussen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 2882. A bill for the relief of Bartholomew McGloin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 2883. A bill for the relief of Juan Calcaño; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1266. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of 56 members of the Aledo Gospel Center Tabernacle, Aledo, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1267. Also, petition of Mrs. L. L. Wyatt and 40 citizens of Greensboro, Ga., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1268. Also, petition of T. H. Roach and 14 citizens of North Henderson, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1269. Also, petition of L. A. Engler and 223 citizens of Tacoma, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1270. Also, petition of Hattie FitzHenry and 20 citizens of Lewistown, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1271. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Sackett and 25 citizens of Ithaca, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1272. Also, petition of Mrs. O. McKean and 73 citizens of Wood River, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1273. Also, petition of Inga Moen and 185 citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1274. Also, petition of Edna Allgire and 108 citizens of Longview, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1275. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. C. K. Mahoney and 28 citizens of Seattle, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1276. Also, petition of Mary W. Segers and 29 citizens of Brewton, Ala., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1277. Also, petition of Miss Grace L. Baker and 74 citizens of Lincoln, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1278. Also, petition of R. M. Post and 229 citizens of Mason, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1279. Also, petition of Jessie M. Jewell and 202 citizens of Washington, D. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1280. Also, petition of Myrtie Bonesteel and 98 citizens of Washington, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1281. Also, petition of Cleo Rice and 21 citizens of Leslie, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1282. Also, petition of Jennie E. Hovey and 129 citizens of South Fork, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1283. Also, petition of Mrs. W. A. Horn and 30 citizens of Aledo, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1284. Also, petition of the First Scandinavian Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1285. Also, petition of Mrs. Linnie M. Duck and 90 citizens of Hollidaysburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1286. Also, petition of Mrs. C. C. Ludwig and 75 citizens of Lansing, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and

speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1287. Also, petition of Mrs. G. B. Banernfeind and 19 citizens of Kenyon, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1288. Also, petition of Rose L. Thompson and 132 citizens of Ransomville, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1289. Also, petition of Q. W. Brakebill and 30 citizens of Severance, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1290. Also, petition of the Jersey Shore Ministerial Association of Jersey Shore, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1291. Also, petition of 27 citizens of Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1292. Also, petition of Mrs. G. Olander and 20 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1293. Also, petition of Emma King and 89 citizens of Caldwell, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

1294. Also, petition of the Full Gospel Church, signed by 44 members, of Lindsay, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1295. Also, petition of 61 citizens of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1296. Also, petition of M. A. Macy and 78 citizens of Winchester, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1297. Also, petition of Mary E. Castner and 87 citizens of Williamsport, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1298. Also, petition of Mrs. M. C. Bennett and 58 citizens of the District of Columbia and Maryland, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1299. Also, petition of M. R. Finley and 43 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1300. Also, petition of 13 citizens of Annville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1301. Also, petition of Edythe L. Wengert and 17 citizens of Baldwin Park, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1302. Also, petition of M. G. Halvorson and 37 citizens of Cromwell, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1303. Also, petition of Cora A. West and 22 citizens of Pasadena, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1304. Also, petition of the Salem Evangelical Church of West Sand Lake, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1305. Also, petition of Olive Mather and 32 citizens of Madelia, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1306. Also, petition of 25 citizens of Winnebago, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1307. Also, petition of Otto Pearson and 40 citizens of Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1308. Also, petition of Mrs. J. N. McCall and 25 citizens of Ithaca, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1309. Also, petition of Myrtle D. Purves and 397 citizens of Nampa, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1310. Also, petition of Rev. R. G. Hammond and 16 citizens of Caldwell, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1311. Also, petition of Mrs. H. J. Riordon and 249 citizens of Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1312. Also, petition of Victor W. Hatfield and 29 citizens of Winona Lake, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1313. Also, petition of Mrs. Clarence Johnson and 20 citizens of Rockford, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1314. Also, petition of Mrs. C. S. Harman and 41 citizens of Montgomery, Ala., urging

enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1315. Also, petition of Mrs. J. F. Johnson and 22 citizens of Boone, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1316. Also, petition of Jessie Green and 21 citizens of Farmington, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1317. Also, petition of Mrs. R. M. Clark and 94 citizens of Lexington, Ky., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1318. Also, petition of Mrs. W. E. Hepler and 40 citizens of Beallsville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1319. Also, petition of Mattie Brumfield and 26 citizens of Winchester, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1320. Also, petition of Mary C. Black and 40 citizens of Glen Ellyn, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1321. Also, petition of Mrs. Ira Summer and 100 citizens of Washington, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1322. Also, petition of Catherine L. Hughes and 350 citizens of Lake Crystal, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1323. Also, petition of I. W. Young and 64 citizens of Phoenix, Ariz., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1324. Also, petition of Rev. Harold G. Gardner and 53 citizens of Miami, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1325. Also, petition of Mrs. E. L. Armstrong and 20 citizens of Willoughby, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1326. Also, petition of Doris Lingford and 16 members of the young people's organization of the First Nazarene Church of Washington, D. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1327. Also, petition of Elsie Means and 30 citizens, of Harwood, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1328. Also, petition of Mrs. E. Bergendahl and 23 citizens of Onamia, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1329. Also, petition of Rev. W. A. Juedes and 32 citizens of Rochester, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1330. Also, petition of Mrs. Newton Jones and 20 citizens of Whitefish, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholical liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1331. Also, petition of 122 citizens of Texas sent in to Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1332. Also, petition of Frank M. Coy and 46 citizens of Fredonia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1333. Also, petition of Mary L. Stewart and 40 citizens of Pengilly, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1334. Also, petition of Mrs. R. R. Grant and 20 citizens of River Forest, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1335. Also, petition of 123 citizens of Ebensburg, Pa., sent to Congressman HARVE TIBBOTT, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1336. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Palmer, Mass., sent in by Elsie Marcy, secretary, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1337. Also, petition of Blanche Klinefetter and 30 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1338. Also, petition of Mrs. C. C. Wilcox and 45 citizens of the District of Columbia and nearby Maryland, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1339. Also, petition of Mabel Pope and 23 citizens of Caldwell, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1340. Also, petition of Dr. C. Nora McNeal and 115 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1341. Also, petition of Mrs. Arnold M. Replogle and 55 citizens of Mehoopany, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1342. Also, petition of Verna Brooks and 48 citizens of St. Louis, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1343. Also, petition of Mrs. Ralph L. Haga and 86 citizens of Bassett, Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1344. Also, petition of Mrs. L. E. Crawford and 61 citizens of Emlenton, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1345. Also, petition of Ada Whitmoyer and 40 citizens of Dawson, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1346. Also, petition of Lucile Artman and 31 citizens of Pulaski, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1347. Also, petition of Dora M. Fischer and 60 citizens of Jamestown, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1348. Also, petition of Rev. Adolph P. Weaver and 14 citizens of Greenville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1349. Also, petition of Mrs. W. F. Armstrong and 18 citizens of Greenville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1350. Also, petition of L. H. Benson and 16 citizens of Greenville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1351. Also, petition of Mrs. S. B. Mallory and 15 citizens of Greenville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1352. Also, petition of Robert A. Moore and 14 citizens of Greenville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1353. Also, petition of Mrs. Fred Rose and 20 citizens of Greenville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1354. Also, petition of Neva M. Romich and 20 citizens of Greenville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1355. Also, petition of Mrs. John Mahan and 17 citizens of Greenville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1356. Also, petition of Mrs. Bennie Saylor and 17 citizens of Greenville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1357. Also, petition of Mrs. R. J. McGrath and 19 citizens of Greenville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1358. Also, petition of Winona F. Amon and 48 citizens of Sharon, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1359. Also, petition of Marian C. Kasmere and 37 citizens of Sharon, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1360. Also, petition of Genevieve M. Bartholomew and 54 citizens of Mercer, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1361. Also, petition of Howard J. Kniseley and 90 citizens of Grove City, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1362. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles Lavrr and 35 citizens of Greenville and Fredonia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1363. Also, petition of Mrs. M. A. Glasgow and 56 citizens of Grove City, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1364. Also, petition of Lillian Kennedy and 20 citizens of Sharon, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1365. Also, petition of Rev. J. N. Holder and 26 citizens of Sharpleyville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1366. Also, petition of Mrs. W. J. Hunter and 20 citizens of West Middlesex, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1367. Also, petition of Rev. E. W. Welch and 20 citizens of Middlesex, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1368. Also, petition of Mrs. H. D. Webster and 39 citizens of several States of the United

States, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1369. Also, petition of Rev. Charles G. Mitchell and 20 citizens of Mercer, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1370 Also, petition of Zella Maud Carnahan and 126 citizens of Grove City, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1371. Also, petition of Rev. B. A. Whitten and 70 citizens of Grove City, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1372. Also, petition of 248 citizens of Greenville, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1373. Also, petition of Lillian R. Moon and 40 citizens of Mercer, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1374. Also, petition of Ella N. Broadbent and 20 citizens of Mercer, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1375. Also, petition of Mrs. Luther Watts and 20 citizens of Byron, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1376. Also, petition of Mrs. N. S. Harriss and 20 citizens of San Diego, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1377. Also, petition of J. Daryl Davis and 181 citizens of Sheakleyville and Hadley, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1378. Also, petition of Blanche Spiegelmeyer and 118 citizens of Vicksburg, Pa., uring enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1379. Also, petition of G. R. Briggs and 35 citizens of Caldwell, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1380. Also, petition of Mrs. J. W. DeRees and 266 citizens of Battle Creek, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1381. Also, petition of Hattie M. Coblentz and 141 citizens of Frederick and Middletown, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1382, Also, petition of Mr. Porr and 84 citizens of Highspire, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1383. Also, petition of Mrs. O. C. Plumb and 25 citizens of Hamburg, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1384. Also, petition of Harley Fuller and 20 citizens of Columbia Station, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1385. Also, petition of Benton S. Swartz and 17 citizens of Lancaster, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1386. Also, petition of Mrs. C. F. Higinbotham and 60 citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1387. Also, petition of the First Presbyterian Church of Havre, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1388. Also, petition of Katherine M. Arthur and 20 citizens of Albany, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1389. Also, petition of Rev. Willis A. Stackhouse and 45 members of the North Delaware Methodist Church of Buffalo, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1390. Also, petition of Mrs. Harold Paul and 15 citizens of Dixie, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1391. Also, petition of James Rhinehart and 18 citizens of Midland, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1392. Also, petition of Mrs. J. C. Crawford and 21 citizens of Maryville, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1393. Also, petition of Mrs. R. C. Russell and 17 citizens of Eunice, La., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1394. Also, petition of 60 citizens of Hood River, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1395. Also, petition of Mrs. R. Kilmer and 43 citizens of New York City, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce

absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1396. Also, petition of the Pulaski Heights Presbyterian Church and the Pulaski Heights Nazarene Church of Little Rock, Ark., signed by 194 citizens, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1397. Also, petition of Mrs. George J. Mummaugh and 94 citizens of Reisterstown, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1398. By Mr. KEE: Petition of Hattie Harris and 14 other citizens and residents of Bluefield, W. Va., urging the passage by Congress of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1399. Also petition of Mrs. Ralph E. Shupe and 37 other citizens and residents of Bluefield, W. Va., urging the passage by Congress of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1400. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Annie M. Herring, of Downers Grove, Ill., and 19 citizens of DuPage County, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1401. By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio: Petition of 102 citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against the stand taken by John L. Lewis in the coal-mine controversy, and urging the passage of legislation having for its object the outlawing of strikes for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1402. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of sundry residents of Burlington, Mass., favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1403. By Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Petition of Leiah M. Jones and 61 citizens of Dunkirk, Ohio, and vicinity urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1404. By Mr. POULSON: Petition of certain citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., requesting the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1405. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Methodist Church of Richmond, Va., James Cannon, Jr., bishop, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to passing an all-inclusive Conscription Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we turn to Thee sorely perplexed with our own thoughts, often confused and confounded by the vastness of human problems confronting us. Save us from the despair of a defeated cynicism which denies that there is any road to the fair city of our dreams. Forgive our foolish ways and our faltering faith. Our lives are so cluttered with the trivial and the trifling that mistaken magnitudes keep us from fixing our hearts on the great issues that at last prove to be the factors of our destiny. When common bushes along the way of our daily toil flame with divine fire, forgive us that so often we stand on holy ground with irreverent feet and unseeing eyes, conscious of the bush but not of the flame.

We do not ask to see distant scenes and final goals. We ask but for light enough for the next step ahead and for faith and fortitude to take it boldly. As we go our pilgrim way make us grateful for night skies that bring out the clear stars of faith, for hard tasks that develop the sinews of strength, for sorry failures that bloom into new achievements, and for futile quests which drive us back unfilled to Thee. Along our differing paths, bring us all to the homeland of Thy eternal love. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, June 4, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT — STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Secretary of State commenting upon the final passage of the bill renewing the Trade Agreements Act be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Secretary of State, in commenting upon the final passage of the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, said:

"The further extension of the trade-agreements program by a large nonpartisan majority of both Houses of the Congress is a most welcome and far-reaching decision, coming as it does at a time when the whole future of our Nation depends upon our clarity of vision and resoluteness of action with respect to the momentous questions that are before us.

"The size and character of the affirmative vote in the House and in the Senate reflects the most important thing a democracy can possess—an informed and united public opinion. The clean-cut renewal of the trade-agreements program has had vigorous and almost unanimous support of the press, of responsible spokesmen of American agriculture, business and labor, and of other public-spirited groups which have been steadfast in their endorsement of the program. It is a splendid manifestation of national unity in favor of practical international collaboration now and for the future, an encouragement at home and to our allies and friends abroad, and a blow to our enemies."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONS COMMISSIONED IN THE ARMY WITHOUT PRIOR COMMISSIONED MILITARY SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army without prior commissioned military service, for the period from April 1 to May 31, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CLAIM OF PACIFIC CONSTRUCTION CO., LTD., AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of Pacific Construction Co., Ltd., against the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Claims.

MEMORIAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

House Memorial 9

A memorial to the Congress of the United States of America, petitioning the immediate passage of the Boren bill now pending before Congress, known and designated as House Resolution 1502, amending the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, and introduced by Congressman LYLE H. BOREN, of Oklahoma

Whereas by virtue of ambiguities in the Securities and Exchange Commission Act of 1934, questions have arisen as to the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission to regulate securities issued by States, political subdivisions, and instrumentalities thereof; and

Whereas it is felt that public financing by the States, political subdivisions, and instrumentalities thereof, are matters of local concern and should not be regulated or restricted by bureaus of the Federal Government; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States, a bill (H. R. 1502) introduced by Congressman LYLE H. BOREN, of Oklahoma, amending the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and making it clear that the Securities Exchange Commission has no regulatory jurisdiction over the public financing and bonds of the States and their political subdivisions, municipalities, and instrumentalities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Florida, and the Senate of the State of Florida, do respectfully memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States of America to immediately enact said Boren bill, known as House resolution 1502; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, under the great seal of the State of Florida, be immediately forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and that copies be forwarded to the delegation representing the State of Florida in both the House and Senate of the United States Congress.

Approved by the Governor May 31, 1943.

CONTROL AND REGULATION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference petitions of sundry citizens which I have received in support of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war. I request that a list of the petitions may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petitions presented by the Senator from Texas will be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and the list will be printed in the RECORD.

The list is as follows:

List of petitions in support of House bill 2082:

Florida:	
Eustis	122
Gainesville	87
Orange City	20
	229
Minnesota: St. Paul	17
Texas:	
Beaumont	36
Hallsville	56
	92
Wisconsin: Ripon	18
	356

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I also present for appropriate reference petitions of sundry citizens praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States. I request that a list of the petitions be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petitions presented by the Senator from Texas will be received and referred to the Committee on Miltiary Affairs and the list will be printed in the RECORD.

The list is as follows:

List of petitions in support of Senate bill 360:

California:	
Lincoln	20
Los Angeles	38
Porterville	60
San Francisco	1
	119
Delaware: Felton	125
Florida: Gainesville	1
Illinois:	
Dixon	47
Franklin Grove	81
Macomb	139
Rockford	23
Wheaton	23
	313
Indiana: Indianapolis	1
Iowa: Waterloo (speaking for 250)	1
Louisiana: Ruston	1
Maryland: Baltimore	27
Massachusetts:	
Boston	27
Cambridge	19
Clinton	23
East Lynn	61
Springfield	17
West Springfield	16
	163
Michigan:	
Battle Creek	26
Birmingham	1
	27
Minnesota:	
Braham	47
Champlin	11
Hitterdale	100
Minneapolis	62
Pengilly	42
Rochester	22
Rush City	16
St. Cloud	20
St. Paul	16
South Haven	17
Waseca	43
	396
Missouri:	
Bethany	409
Kansas City	1
Ozark and Douglas Counties	1,002
	1,412
Montana: Billings	1
New York:	
Cherry Creek	42
Ransomville	48
Springfield	37
	127
Ohio: Marion	1
Oklahoma:	
Amorita	18
Hardesty	76
Mill Creek	7
Mustang	68
Perkins	20
Shattuck	59
Thomas	80
	328
Oregon:	
Mapleton	20
Oregon City	1
Turner	1
	22
Pennsylvania:	
Corydon	32
Curwensville	41
Ft. Loudon	34
Lewisburg	80
McConnellsburg	19
Reading	21
Vandergrift	20
West Chester	73
	320
South Carolina:	
Cheraw	23
Clinton	24
Columbia	5
Greenville	48
Rock Hill	37
Woodruff	25
	162
Texas:	
Brownwood	116
Dublin	42
El Paso	510
Falfurrias	1
San Angelo	31
San Antonio	62
	762
Virginia: Richmond	93
District of Columbia: Washington	193
West Virginia:	
Elkins	1
Wheeling	37
	38
Wisconsin: Ripon	43
Grand total	4,676

REPORTS OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 4th instant,

On June 5, 1943, the following reports of the Committee on Appropriations were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 2481. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 287).

By Mr. OVERTON:

H. R. 2713. A bill making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 288).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MALONEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 982. A bill to provide that the unexpended proceeds from the sale of 50-cent pieces coined in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Albany, N. Y., may be paid into the general fund of such city; without amendment (Rept. No. 289).

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1157. A bill to amend section 61 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, for the purpose of providing such training of State and Territorial military forces as is deemed necessary to enable them to execute their internal security responsibilities within their respective States and Territories; with an amendment (Rept. No. 290).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. Res. 155. Resolution authorizing an investigation with respect to the supply and distribution of hydroelectric power (submitted by Mr. MCFARLAND on the 4th instant); without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BONE:

S. 1166. A bill to provide for an additional naval academy to be located on Puget Sound; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 1167. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of forest products pilot plants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1168. A bill to provide compensation for certain persons assisting in the administration of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the ommittee on Military Affairs.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I submit for proper reference an amendment which I intend to propose to H. R. 2397, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and so forth. I ask that the amendment be printed in the body of the RECORD, and that it be followed by a statement which I have prepared.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection it is so ordered.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises) to the bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill, insert the following: *"Provided,* That, after 30 days following the approval of this act and notwithstanding any other provision of law or executive or administrative act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to enforce directly or indirectly in any respect (whether by criminal or civil proceedings in any court or by administrative proceedings or executive acts in any agency or by any officer of the Government of the United States or in any manner whatever concerning) any maximum price, priority, rationing, allocation, distribution, limitation, or similar rules, regulations, directives, or orders relating to goods, supplies, or products for civilian consumption as against any processor, fabricator, wholesaler, or retailer thereof in the usual course or custom of trade, where the facts offered in defense in any such proceeding or before any such court, agency, or officer demonstrate that any such rules, regulations, or orders do not (1) afford, as compared with the prevailing cost of agricultural or other materials or products (including livestock) such persons must buy for processing or resale, the generally fair and necessary operating margins consistent with the third proviso of section 3 of the act of October 2, 1942 (Public, No. 729, 77th Cong., 2d sess.); or (2) make due, adequate, and affirmative provision for the allocation or distribution of such available supplies, goods, or products through the usual and established channels of trade (including processors, fabricators, wholesalers, or retailers) in the proportion so distributed during the calendar year 1941 as contemplated by section 2 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (Public, No. 421, 77th Cong., 2d sess.); or, (3) as to such rules, regulations, or orders issued or amended after 30 days following the approval of this act, have been issued or amended without full consultation orally or in writing with a standing advisory committee composed of representatives and alternates chosen by, and assigned to such committees upon petition of, the several trade associations of the industry dealing in the commodity directly affected (including processors, fabricators, wholesalers, and retailers) and representative of each branch of such industry as required by section 2 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942: *Provided further,* That, in order to prevent evasions of the foregoing, no part of any other appropriation nor any other public funds, personnel, services, or property whatever shall be so used and any court, agency, or officer acting contrary to the foregoing in any case shall be without jurisdiction or authority in such case and any judgments, decrees, orders, rules, regulations, or rulings or other judicial or administrative acts or process issued by any such court, agency, or officer in any such case shall be null and void."

The statement presented by Mr. MURRAY to accompany the amendment is as follows:

Any price control system should be administered in such a manner as to prevent a widespread injury to small, independent business concerns or expansion of monopoly control of our economy. I think this can be accomplished if the intent of Congress is followed.

The Senate Small Business Committee has been called upon time and again to protect small business enterprise from the destructive effect of certain orders and regulations issued by the Office of Price Administration. In a series of conferences and hearings, many of these problems have been ironed out and modifications secured to prevent widespread disaster to small business. I think that the Office of Price Administration is desirous of carrying into effect the intention of Congress. It is a huge task and it is only reasonable to expect that many mistakes will be made. When the effect of the erroneous orders and regulations has been brought to the attention of the Office of Price Administration, we have usually been able to have them corrected.

It cannot be denied that small business has suffered severely under the impact of the war, while big business has expanded and made huge profits. Of course, small business should not be permitted to make unfair profits out of the war, but certainly it should not be unnecessarily hampered or destroyed.

My proposed amendment is intended to protect small business in this regard. It merely permits firms subjected to prosecution for alleged violations of the Price Control Act to set up as their defense that price ceilings established by the Administrator do not afford them generally fair and necessary operating margins as provided in the act.

If the court finds that the facts are as stated, then this proposed amendment becomes operative.

The Senate Small Business Committee (and the same committee in the House of Representatives) has for many months been holding hearings and studying the problems of the smaller businessman under war emergency regulation. It is obvious that there is a great deal of meritorious complaint, not with the laws which Congress has passed, but with the execution of those laws.

Nor do I mean to say that the administrative arm of the Government has acted with complete abandon or in reckless disregard of the laws of Congress or the rights of citizens. Because either the laws are fragmentary or incomplete, or because of the limitations on the right of private parties to defend themselves and have the benefit of those laws, some administrators may have felt that they had reason to assume that some provisions contained in acts of the Congress are merely advisory. I do not think that Congress so intended.

It is obviously unjust, for example, to prosecute a man by injunction proceedings or for contempt or crime, and at the same time forbid him to defend himself and have the benefit of the statutes which Congress has enacted for his benefit. It is not only unjust, but it is not in accord with our way of life or method of government. Anyone accused of violations of regulations should be allowed to show in any court or agency that the regulations do not provide what Congress has said they should provide, before any such court or agency can punish alleged violations or enforce compliance.

Moreover, we, the Congress, cannot examine into individual cases or regulations beyond what is necessary to determine whether parties should have legal protection. Our function, once we are satisfied that the conditions so require, is to pass laws not only so that administrators may have power under them, but also in order that the people may have the protection of those laws.

In three respects I think the work of the various committees of Congress, including particularly the Small Business Committees, have demonstrated a need for some legal recognition of the right of small businessmen to protect themselves in matters which Congress has heretofore recognized by statute. These three matters are:

1. Fair margins;
2. Equitable allocation of goods; and
3. A right to participate, as members of advisory committees, in the drafting of regulations.

These are already the law, expressly or by necessary implication. I should like to discuss each of them briefly:

1. On October 2, 1942, the Anti-Inflation Act became law, providing in section 3 that "In the fixing of maximum prices on products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, a generally fair and equitable margin shall be allowed for such processing."

Nevertheless, this express and necessary limitation on regulations is said (and I think with some merit) to be often ignored by the administrative agencies concerned, as emphasized in numerous hearings before various committees of the Congress. The Committees on Small Business of the Senate and House of Representatives, in joint session on March 10, 1943, adopted a resolution calling upon the Office of Price Administration to establish fair and equitable margins in the meat industry. Moreover, it has become increasingly apparent that the same lack of fair price margins is driving various industries either into bankruptcy or into the so-called black market. Unless corrective measures are promptly taken, therefore, hundreds of thousands of small businessmen may be either ruined or law enforcement may break down. If the law and the regulations are not fair and enforceable, there will result a vicious, secret, and illegal rise in the cost of living, harmful to all. The problem of margins is primarily a small business matter. For big business is largely engaged in production for the Government, upon which production it demands a profit. Any price squeeze upon the production of big business for civilian consumption may be balanced

by profits upon Government contracts. That large business is devoting itself primarily to Government contracts is obvious. That its margins and profits therefrom are at least adequate is evidenced by the laws Congress has passed for the renegotiation of such contracts and recapture of excess profits. Moreover, large business enterprises are directly represented by top personnel in every war agency of the Government. Not only big business, but agriculture and labor have been granted special protections.

2. Similarly, section 2 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 provides that emergency powers "shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in the * * * means or aids to distribution, established in any industry."

But, either through price differentials or through quota and allocation orders, commodities and products customarily handled or sold through small businessmen have been channeled into the hands of big business controlling sources of supply or enabled by the operation of regulations and artificial economic conditions to monopolize the processing and distribution of goods and commodities. The Senate Small Business Committee has, by resolution and at hearings, stressed the necessity of corrective measures. These conditions do not result from a shortage of goods diverted to war purposes, but from maldistribution of products available for civilian consumption.

3. While large businesses, as stated above, are represented in top positions in the several emergency agencies, those agencies have not always been guided by the positive direction of the Congress in section 2 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 that "before issuing any regulation or order," they "shall, so far as practicable, advise and consult with representative members of the industry which will be affected by such regulation or order."

Here again the Senate Small Business Committee, by resolution, in hearings, and correspondence has urged such agencies to afford small businessmen and all segments of a given industry an opportunity to be heard.

These statutory provisions are obviously reasonable and their purposes necessary. Their enforcement need not impede the war effort, but should in fact strengthen it by placing our civilian economy upon a sound basis heretofore recognized by Congress itself. It would seem too clear to admit of dispute that we should make sure that the present law in the three essentials I have discussed should be made operative. If the complaints of small business are meritorious they should be recognized by both administrative agencies and the courts. If they are not well taken, no harm can come, because the agencies and the courts will reject the complaints.

Congress, as I have said, cannot pass upon individual cases. In our system of government that is the function of the courts. We must make these statutes enforceable, or we should repeal them and frankly admit that we are not attempting to protect small businessmen.

I am fully persuaded that no harm can come to any officer or agency by making these laws effective. At the same time I cannot sit by while the rights of hundreds of thousands of businessmen—rights which Congress itself has expressly recognized—fail for lack of any method of enforcement. I wish to strengthen administration by making the laws operative both as to administrators and those who are regulated. Laws without enforceable rights are a mirage. Administration without or beyond the law is doomed to failure. The greatest service we can do for the country and the war effort is to make the system of emergency regulation workable. The way to make it workable is to grant the necessary powers to the administrators and the necessary rights to those who are regulated, including the means of protecting those rights in any type of administrative or judicial proceedings.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ANDREWS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place in the bill insert the following:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for the lease, purchase, or other acquisition of any additional land in Citrus County, Fla., for game preserve, fish and wildlife refuge, or park purposes."

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. OVERTON submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 21, line 10, after the word "stations" insert *"And provided further,* That funds appropriated under the heads 'Pay, subsistence, and transportation,' 'General expenses, Marine Corps,' 'Pay and allowances, Coast Guard' in this act shall be available for the payment of money allowances, in lieu of transportation by the shortest usually traveled route now authorized by law to be furnished in kind, at 3 cents per mile to enlisted men regardless of the mode of travel who, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, travel at their own expense."

Mr. OVERTON also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2713, the naval appropriation bill, fiscal year 1944, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

ORGANIZATION OF PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR AUSTIN

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, on Saturday night, June 5, over N. B. C. and affiliated stations, a joint discussion occurred between the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], Mr. Alan J. Gould, executive assistant to Kent Cooper, general manager of the Associated Press; Mr. Earl J. Johnson, vice president in charge of the News Service of the United Press, and the Senator from Vermont, on a program to study the organization of peace entitled "For This We Fight," and in particular under the title "Underwriting Victory."

In that discussion I undertook to present a certain theory with respect to our present planning for post-war collaboration in which I made the statement, among other things, that—

Victory connotes the establishment of powerful institutions to guard nations from aggression, and to insure their integrity. Therefore, we fight for a more perfect union, though not uniformity, of the United Nations. To make this union real, there must be international organization for strategic security, comprising council, court, and military power.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the statement made by me on the occasion referred to.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To say that we fight for freedom is oversimplification. We did not start shooting just because we loved freedom. We will not begin international peace service just for the sake of our ideals.

We had not achieved the virtue and wisdom which would have moved us to action. It took invasion of our boundaries to break the hard shell of our conceit. The crushing of freedom in neighboring countries did not arouse us. Not until bitter suffering and death came to our own people was our war fervor excited. The folly of our attitude of aloofness and self-sufficiency was revealed by the shock of realization that injury could so easily and quickly be inflicted upon us by sea and air.

American security and peace were suddenly recognized to be dependent upon combined action with other nations which also believe in an orderly world.

Our abandonment of isolationism and assumption of a leading role of responsibility came about the hard way.

But, thank God, we are now uniting upon foundations for a foreign policy.

We fight for victory but the ingredients of victory are not limited to unconditional surrender and the disarming of the evil forces which enslave entire nations. We are suffering the tragic failure of our experiment in "peace without victory," and "international order without military sanctions."

Victory connotes the establishment of powerful institutions to guard nations from aggression, and to insure their integrity. Therefore, we fight for a more perfect union, though not uniformity, of the United Nations.

To make this union real there must be international organization for strategic security comprising council, court, and military power.

Let us start with a council, or similar body (the name does not matter) to perform the political functions of a republican government. Representation in such council should be the right of every nation that is willing and competent to collaborate in the development of a code of world conduct. Such elaboration of the world government as involves regional federations within the over-all organization eventually would be feasible, though I favor starting with a simple implementation of our purpose to work together.

China, Russia, Great Britain, and the United States ought to lead off. They ought to have the will to be and to remain constituents of such council. They flank all of the oceans, and they would furnish the abutments of the great bridges that must cross them. Their combined power and prestige would predominate any other probable combination. The exclusion or omission of any one of these great states would of itself create the possibility of a new world war.

The association of these oriental and occidental states by mere declaration and not because of vital interests would not promise longevity. Now, they are bound together by the common danger of war. Later, for at least two generations, the cement will not be the treaty, or the form of combination. It will be the will of each member to protect and serve its own interest through all-for-one-and-one-for-all action.

And here let me say I believe we have reason for the hope that is in us that beyond this horizon there may extend a broader vision illumined by more ennobling causes for harmonious joint progress with endless possibilities.

However strong may be the aspiration of enthusiasts for self-discipline—and I am one of those enthusiasts—we believe that there must be enacted rules of conduct and that they will have to be enforced. Realism holds us to the cold fact that existing morality of men and governments is impotent to guarantee good behavior of either. Laws with sanctions must be well known and steadfastly adhered to. An administrative body, with power must be ever present and visible.

Such would be the council, or whatever the political body is named. The structure of this rudimentary world government would be defective without a court of justice.

The development of a more perfect edifice could include regional courts adapted to special characteristics and demands of local interest. However, I favor starting with a single court having power to hear and decide cases between nations. Its jurisdiction, as now envisaged, would be open to any nation, and its subpena would run to any nation. Its decree would depend upon the moral powers of the court. But judgments involving peace should be referred to the council, in whom the power is vested to order out the military, to which I refer later.

The peace that prevails within our great country is nourished by the law solely because the law is made a living spirit through courts of justice backed by force.

This is our guide, as Americans, in planning our footsteps for peace on earth. To the same purpose would be the application of law by a court or courts to controversies between nations. Without use of arbitration or civil trial there is no other recourse than force alone.

On the principle demonstrated by this war—that peace is indivisible and that the security of one particular state depends upon the security of the United Nations—it logically follows that provision for military power adequate to overwhelm any violator of the code ought to be made available to the community of nations.

The strength of military forces maintained in the separate states pledged to service in the joint peace effort should be relative to the weakness of offender nations. We intend that the German, Italian, and Japanese military establishments shall be liquidated by disbandment and be prevented from reviving by annihilation of the facilities for the production of weapons for war.

Victory automatically includes disablement of the enemy, but being aware of the professional militarists' tenacity of life, we shall not "conclude peace," we shall "achieve peace," and make it prevail.

Victory must remain guaranty of a nature which the totalitarian can understand—viz, supreme military power in the United Nations—a might that is right. This would not be a collective military police force. It would be such employment of separate forces as the United Nations now use jointly. This would not be an innovation. United action of our armies is a fact accomplished. It has already been characterized in the mutual confidence, respect, and regard among the various nationals in north Africa, and in the Pacific theater of combat. This demonstration of unity inspires our continued collaboration.

Occupation of enemy territory will be necessary. Promises to send troops there will not be adequate. The council would take into consideration geographical, ethnical, and other natural conditions in determining the composition of garrisons, and questions arising between member nations during the occupancy. This is another potent reason for a council, or some similar organization.

The objective of a peace that prevails would depend on the probity of service of such a body.

An urgent public duty confronts Americans. We must have a settled foreign policy when we commence negotiations with our partners; otherwise, they will lead and we will follow. Or, as in World War No. 1, we will fail to do anything except sow the dragon's teeth.

No American foreign policy is valid or has vitality unless it is supported by well-informed public opinion.

Such an opinion cannot be well-informed without concrete proposals for consideration. Deliberation requires time. We should not gamble on when to commence.

Therefore, I say to you, if these few fundamental proposals here discussed appear to you to be necessary to underwrite peace, test them in reason and debate, estimate the near and remote consequences of such a course of action on the welfare and freedom of the United States. If they endure such tests, you may be confident that they are sound. Then let us fight for them.

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES AT CONNECTICUT COLLEGE FOR WOMEN

[Mr. McFARLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Vice President on the occasion of the commencement exercises at the Connecticut College for Women at New London, Conn., on June 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION OF PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator Thomas of Utah in the first of a series of broadcasts sponsored by the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace on June 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. BREHON SOMERVELL

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Memorial Day address delivered by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell at Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Va., May 30, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUBSIDY PAYMENTS—STATEMENT BY ALBERT J. GOSS

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the question of subsidy payments made by Albert J. Goss, master of the National Grange, before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEEDING THE WAR WORKERS—ADDRESS BY EUGENE CASEY

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Feeding the War Workers," delivered by Eugene Casey, Special Executive Assistant to the President, before the Kiwanis Club of New York City, on May 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PETROLEUM SITUATION—STATEMENT BY THOMAS P. HENRY

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Thomas P. Henry, of Detroit, Mich., president of the American Automobile Association, dealing with the proposed appointment of a committee, to be headed by Bernard M. Baruch, to study and report on the petroleum situation, which appears in the Appendix.]

POWERS OF CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY COL. ROBERT R. McCORMICK

[Mr. McNARY (for Mr. BROOKS) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the powers of Congress, delivered by Col. Robert R. McCormick on the Chicago Theater of the Air, which appears in the Appendix.]

AFTERMATH OF THE BERMUDA CONFERENCE—ARTICLE BY BARNET HODES

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "Whose Heads Are We Hitting? The Bermuda Conference Aftermath Provokes a Query," written by Barnet Hodes, and published in the June 3, 1943, issue of The Sentinel, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Nye
Andrews	Green	O'Daniel
Austin	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hayden	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Reynolds
Bone	Holman	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Buck	La Follette	Shipstead
Bushfield	Langer	Smith
Byrd	Lodge	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tunnell
Connally	McNary	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maloney	Van Nuys
Eastland	Maybank	Wheeler
Ellender	Mead	Wherry
Ferguson	Millikin	White
George	Moore	Willis
Gerry	Murray	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative GUYER, and are, therefore, necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the committee amendment on page 2, beginning in line 4.

Mr. McNARY. May the amendment be stated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 4, after the word "Departments" and the quotation mark, it is proposed to strike out:

It is hereby declared that any person holding an office or position in or under the executive branch of the Government of the United States (including Government-owned corporations) and receiving compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year for his services in such office or position shall be deemed to be an officer of the United States, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall not be deemed to be an inferior officer who may be appointed by the President alone or by the head of a department.

SEC. 2. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b)—

(1) the term of office of any person heretofore appointed or promoted to any office or position in or under the executive branch of the Government of the United States (including Government-owned corporations), if the compensation attached to such position is at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year, shall expire on June 30, 1943, unless such term is terminated at an earlier date; and

(2) any person hereafter appointed or promoted to any such office or position to which compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year is attached shall be appointed to such office or position by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term which shall expire 4 years from the time of his appointment.

(b) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable with respect to any person heretofore or hereafter appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to any office for which a definite term is specifically prescribed by any act of the Congress; and nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the President from filling temporarily, in the manner prescribed by law, any vacancy that may happen during the recess of the Senate.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

(1) any person hereafter appointed or promoted to any office or position to which this section applies shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and (2) no person shall hold any such office or position after June 30, 1943, unless he shall have been so appointed: *Provided*, That any person now holding any such office or position, who was not so appointed, may continue to hold such office or position until his successor is appointed and qualified or until September 30, 1943, whichever is earlier, if a nomination for an appointment to such office or position has been submitted to the Senate prior to June 30, 1943.

SEC. 2. Except as provided in section 3, the provisions of the first section of this act shall apply to each of the following civilian offices or positions in or under the executive branch of the Government of the United States (including Government-owned corporations):

(a) The heads, assistant heads, and head attorneys of the several departments and agencies of the Government (including members of the boards of directors and officers of Government-owned corporations).

(b) The heads of the bureaus, divisions, sections, and other subdivisions of such departments and agencies.

(c) The heads and assistant heads of regional, area, or State offices of such departments or agencies.

(d) All persons whose duties include the preparation or issuance of rules, regulations, or orders made or issued under authority of any act of Congress or any Executive order.

(e) All persons whose duties include participation in conferences or discussions with persons from other departments or agencies, or with persons from other bureaus, divisions, sections, or other subdivisions of their own departments or agencies (other than with their own superiors), held for the purpose of determining the policies or methods to be followed in administering any of the functions of any department or agency or any bureau, division, section, or other subdivision thereof.

(f) Any person, except artisans and craftsmen, holding an office or position in or under the executive branch of the Government of the United States (including Government-owned corporations) who receives compensation amounting to $4,500 or more per year for his services in such office or position.

SEC. 3. The provisions of the first section of this act shall not be applicable, except in cases where confirmation by the Senate is otherwise required by law—

(a) In the case of any person appointed or promoted in accordance with provisions of the civil-service laws and rules providing, at the time of his appointment or promotion for his acquiring a classified (competitive) civil-service status by reason of such appointment or promotion and satisfactory service during a probationary period; or

(b) In the case of any civilian office or position held by any person on leave of absence or furlough from such office or position and in active service in the military or naval forces of the United States; or

(c) In any case in which a person is restored to or reinstated in an office or position in accordance with the provisions of any act of Congress providing that he shall be restored to or reinstated in such office or position upon completion of active service in the military or naval forces of the United States; or

(d) In the case of any office or position in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice; or

(e) In the case of any person whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the White House Office in the Executive Office of the President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. McNARY and Mr. McKELLAR asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Nye
Andrews	Green	O'Daniel
Austin	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hayden	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Reynolds
Bone	Holman	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Buck	La Follette	Shipstead
Bushfield	Langer	Smith
Byrd	Lodge	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tunnell
Connally	McNary	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maloney	Van Nuys
Eastland	Maybank	Wheeler
Ellender	Mead	Wherry
Ferguson	Millikin	White
George	Moore	Willis
Gerry	Murray	Wilson

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Several days ago I submitted on behalf of certain minority members of the Committee on the Judiciary an amendment in the nature of a substitute which is now on the desk. Am I correct in understanding that it will be in order to offer that amendment after the committee amendment has been acted upon?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct. It will be in order after the committee amendment has been acted upon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And after the committee amendment has been disposed of it will be in order, no matter which way the vote goes, for the minority members of the committee to offer the amendment in the nature of a substitute?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct in his understanding.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make it clear again to the Senate that the difference between the amendment placed in the bill by the majority of the Committee on the Judiciary and the amendment offered by the minority is primarily that the committee proposal requires the Senate to pass upon all persons who receive salaries above $4,500 a year, whereas the minority were of the opinion that the $4,500 yardstick is not a proper measure, that it should not be used, that the proper distinction is between officers and employees, and that the manner in which

to bring about that distinction is to define what the Congress regards to be policy-making officers of the United States. That the minority amendment undertakes to do, and when the proper parliamentary opportunity is presented it will be my purpose on behalf of the minority to offer the substitute, so that the Senate will have an opportunity to go on record with respect to the distinction between a mere salary standard and a standard based only upon the policy-forming functions of the officer concerned.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It seems to me it would be a much more orderly process if we could vote on the so-called O'Mahoney amendment first. Is that impossible, as a parliamentary proposition?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my understanding that the regular procedure is for the Senate on all bills to go through the committee amendments first and dispose of them.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was merely answering the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HATCH. I was going to ask in that connection if it is not true that if the Senator's amendment, which is proposed as a substitute, were adopted, it would not then be open to amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is true. The substitute after it has been offered, however, will be open to perfecting amendments.

If the Senate disposes of the committee amendment, either by adopting it or rejecting it, it matters not which, there is no binding obligation upon the Senate with respect to the bill itself, and then a subsequent amendment may be presented. It was felt that this was the easier and better way to proceed, inasmuch as a great multitude of amendments would be necessary to bring the committee amendment in accordance with the amendment offered by the minority.

Mr. HILL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. As I understand the rule, Mr. President, the Senate must dispose of committee amendments before a vote on the substitute for the bill as proposed to be amended would be in order. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct, under rule XVIII.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I realize that the Senate is very anxious to proceed with important legislation in the nature of appropriation bills which will soon be before it. I am very anxious to cooperate in order that all necessary appropriation bills and other emergency bills may be disposed of at the earliest possible moment.

I am not taking the floor now in opposition to the committee amendment with any thought of delaying at this time action on the pending bill. I think, however, that before Senators vote on even the committee amendment, some explanation of it and perhaps of the substitute which is later to be offered should be made. For that reason, I am taking the floor now, first of all to say, Mr. President, that the original bill introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] provided, briefly, that all employees of the Federal Government receiving $4,500 or more a year should be confirmed by the Senate. I believe that was the sole standard or yardstick provided in the original bill. Let me ask the Senator from Tennessee whether I am correct in that statement. I am sure I am, because the Senator does not reply.

When the bill was referred to a subcommittee, the subcommittee reported some amendments to it, and submitted the bill to the full committee. Several of us were not satisfied with either the original bill or the bill recommended by the subcommittee. I urged the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to endeavor to prepare an adequate definition of a policy-making official. I think there was no disagreement among any of us, I think there was no disagreement in the Senate, that officials of the Federal Government who are really engaged in policy-making functions certainly should be confirmed by the Senate. We felt, however, and I think rightly so, that the yardstick provided—a salary of $4,500 or more a year—was not adequate for any purpose. It does not define a policy-making official, but does include, as I could show it in detail if I had the time, thousands of employees who have no policy-making functions whatever, but who in reality are employees discharging purely administrative or, in some cases, scientific and technical duties. Under the yardstick of a salary of $4,500 or more a year, all of them would be brought within the requirement of Senate confirmation. Some of us do not believe that would be a wise procedure. On that general subject, I shall have more to say later.

Suffice it now to say that at the insistence of several of us, the Senator from Wyoming did work out and prepare as carefully and as ably as was possible under the circumstances a substitute which made a real attempt to describe policy-making officials, those who should be confirmed by the Senate.

If I may, I shall read the substance of the provisions of the substitute proposal. I read now the one which was offered in the committee. Under its terms those who would be required to be confirmed by the Senate would be—

(a) The heads, assistant heads, and head attorneys of the several departments and agencies—

This is a rather clear-cut expression—"The heads, assistant heads, and head attorneys of the several departments and agencies."

I read further:

(b) The heads of bureaus, divisions, or other units representing the first subdivision of any such department or agency.

(c) The heads and assistant heads of regional, area, or State offices of such departments or agencies.

(d) All persons whose duties include responsibility for final action in connection with the preparation and promulgation of rules, regulations, or orders made or issued under authority of any act of Congress or any Executive order.

(e) All persons whose duties include responsibility for determining the policies to be followed in administering the functions of any department, agency, or subdivision thereof as defined in paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of this section.

Mr. President, as I have said, we were all agreed that some definition or standard should be set up. On the first vote the proposal offered in the committee by the Senator from Wyoming was adopted. I am not quite certain in my recollection, but I believe that on that question at first there was a tie vote, and then one Senator requested permission to change his vote for the purpose of adding an amendment. Permission was granted. Then the amendment was offered to the proposal made by the Senator from Wyoming. The amendment reinserted another clause requiring the confirmation of all persons receiving $4,500 or more a year. Both that amendment and the O'Mahoney amendment were adopted by the Committee on the Judiciary. I am not critical of the committee, but I thought the two amendments were absolutely inconsistent, that one destroyed the other.

In fact, merely in a humorous vein, let me read from an editorial published in one of the local newspapers referring to the action of the committee that morning:

The performance of the Senate Judiciary Committee on the McKellar bill reminds us of the man who agreed to so many reforms in a single day that he finally went out and got drunk to relieve the tension.

That very aptly describes, I think, the situation in our committee that day. We agreed to so many reforms that finally we simply swept all of them in together, until the bill as now reported with the committee amendment is, in my opinion, worse than the original McKellar bill, and much worse than the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming. Under those circumstances I cannot conceive that the committee amendment should be adopted; and I rose to point that out and to make it clear that the Congress, and especially the Senate, should adopt either one policy or the other, but not both. If we want to follow the lead of the Senator from Tennessee, let us revert to the original bill, and provide that all persons receiving salaries of $4,500 or more shall be confirmed by the Senate. However, if we really want to endeavor to adopt a plan which will limit Senate confirmation to genuine policy-making officials, then, certainly, as against the McKellar bill, the O'Mahoney amendment should be adopted. I understand that the Senator from Wyoming is to offer his amendment later in the debate.

Mr. President, on that amendment my position is that while I shall vote against the bill finally, regardless of what amendments may be adopted, I shall certainly support the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming, as

against either the committee amendment or the original bill.

There are many things in connection with the bill which I should like to discuss. I see no particular point at this time in going into a general discussion of the basic, fundamental objections which I have to the entire proposed legislation.

Under those circumstances, so far as I am concerned, if the Senate is ready to vote on the committee amendment, I am ready to vote. I wish to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last week I interrogated the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] with respect to sections 2 and 3 of the bill. Since that time much has been said and much has been written in press reports to the effect that the bill would exempt from its provisions certain classes of persons mentioned under section 3 but that all persons receiving $4,500 or above would have to be confirmed. Suppose the bill were enacted in its present form, would a person who qualifies after taking a regular competitive examination under civil service, and whose salary is above $4,500, be exempted from the provisions of the bill?

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator please restate the question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Before I do, permit me to read section 3 of the bill:

SEC. 3. The provisions of the first section of this act shall not be applicable, except in cases where confirmation by the Senate is otherwise required by law—

(a) In the case of any person appointed or promoted in accordance with provisions of the civil-service laws and rules providing, at the time of his appointment or promotion for his acquiring a classified (competitive) civil-service status by reason of such appointment or promotion and satisfactory service during a probationary period; or

The question is this: Suppose a person takes a regular competitive civil-service examination under the civil-service law and rules and regulations and the salary of the position for which he qualifies is in excess of $4,500, would such a person have to be confirmed by the Senate?

Mr. HATCH. I will answer the Senator from Louisiana in this way: I do not wish to answer his question myself, because one of the chief objections I shall presently raise, when we reach the discussion, is that the amendment is so obscure that one cannot tell; but I do know that the Senator from Wyoming has very definite ideas on the subject, and I will ask him to answer the question of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have that point clarified. That was what I was attempting to clarify last week when I interrogated the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I did my best at that time to make it clear, but I acknowledge that probably my language was a little too vague. The answer to the Senator's question is "No." If a person were appointed as the result of a competitive examination, and the law did not otherwise require his confirmation by the Senate, he would not be subject to confirmation under the committee bill, no matter what his salary might be.

Mr. ELLENDER. So when it is stated on the floor of the Senate and in press reports that all persons whose salaries are $4,500 or above would be subject to confirmation, such statements are not correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is correct with the exception of those who are covered by section 3, of course. I believe that Senators who discussed the question had in mind the fact that certain exceptions are contained in section 3.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The members of the committee naturally discussed the measure in the light of the information which developed in the various committee discussions. That, of course, sometimes results in making it a little obscure to those who have not participated in those discussions.

As I was saying to the Senator 2 or 3 days ago, the result of the committee amendment depends upon the language "at the time of his appointment or promotion for his acquiring a classified (competitive) civil-service status."

Persons who acquired a civil-service status by being covered into the civil service by an Executive order would not be excluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that perfectly. The bill is leveled at those persons receiving over $4,500, who have not taken a regular competitive examination under the civil-service laws, rules, and regulations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Therefore the amendment offered by the minority is so drafted that persons who have been under civil service during a long period of years, or who were brought into the civil service under the Ramspeck act, would be excluded from the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator feel that the language could be improved upon so as to make it certain that those complying with the civil-service laws would not have to be confirmed, although their compensation is $4,500 or over? It strikes me that if the law is intended to include a person who takes the regular competitive civil-service examination, we might as well abolish civil service.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that it is as clear as language can make it now.

Mr. ELLENDER. All I desire is to be certain about it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator that so far as the amendment offered by the minority is concerned, it represents the combined judgment not only of the members of the minority, but of the legislative counsel for the Senate and representatives of the Civil Service Commission with whom I have personally discussed the question. I think the question which the Senator asks is clearly answered, and the language is as clear as we could possibly make it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator. Since the bill exempts civil-service employees already appointed, who receive $4,500 or over, and also those of the future who successfully pass a regular civil-service examination, I can see no objection to the bill. As I view the situation let us either comply with civil-service laws or nullify them. I am for complying with them and for eliminating politics from all appointments.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I tried to make it clear in my remarks that, so far as I am concerned, the basic objections I have to the measure go far deeper than whether or not the committee amendment should be adopted. In the committee I supported the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming; and when the $4,500 clause was added, I voted against it all. I think the Senator from Wyoming followed the same course. Therefore I am merely trying to point out the differences, and what happened in the committee. I shall vote against the committee amendment. I wish clearly to understand the parliamentary situation, and therefore I propound this inquiry: In the event the committee amendment should be adopted, would it then be open to further amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The committee amendment would not then be open to further amendment.

Mr. HATCH. But the substitute could then be offered?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The substitute would then be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute would be in order, and amendments to the substitute or to the bill would be in order.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have nothing further to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Nye
Andrews	Green	O'Daniel
Austin	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hayden	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Reynolds
Bone	Holman	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Buck	La Follette	Shipstead
Bushfield	Langer	Smith
Byrd	Lodge	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tunnell
Connally	McNary	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maloney	Van Nuys
Eastland	Maybank	Wheeler
Ellender	Mead	Wherry
Ferguson	Millikin	White
George	Moore	Willis
Gerry	Murray	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the adoption of the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I merely desire to state the parliamentary situation as I understand it to be. The vote about to be taken is upon the committee amendment. Whether the committee amendment is adopted or rejected, it will then be in order for me to offer the substitute amendment which has been presented to the Senate by the minority of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me add that I do not regard the vote upon the committee amendment as in any way conclusive. The test will be upon the issue which will be presented when I offer the substitute amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that those who favor the bill as reported by the committee will vote "yea" and those who are not in favor of the bill as reported will vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I do not care to have my vote considered in the light of the interpretation just announced by the Senator from Tennessee. I shall vote for the committee amendment because I think the bill is better as thus amended, if it is to be passed, but I shall still vote for the O'Mahoney substitute later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment reported by the committee. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] has a pair on this question with the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. If present the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay" and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] would vote "nay" if present.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] is detained on business in one of the Government departments.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained in important committee meetings.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK]. I am not advised how the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Idaho would vote if present. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—43

Andrews	Gillette	Russell
Bilbo	Green	Scrugham
Bushfield	Hayden	Shipstead
Byrd	Holman	Smith
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Van Nuys
Connally	Maloney	Wherry
Danaher	Maybank	White
Eastland	Millikin	Willis
Ellender	Nye	Wilson
George	O'Daniel	
Gerry	Overton	

NAYS—22

Aiken	Hatch	Moore
Austin	Hill	Murray
Bankhead	La Follette	O'Mahoney
Barbour	Langer	Taft
Bone	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Lucas	Tunnell
Ferguson	McNary	
Gurney	Mead	

NOT VOTING—31

Bailey	Brooks	Downey
Ball	Burton	Glass
Barkley	Butler	Guffey
Brewster	Clark, Idaho	Hawkes
Bridges	Davis	Johnson, Calif.
Kilgore	Reynolds	Wallgren
Murdock	Robertson	Walsh
Pepper	Tobey	Wheeler
Radcliffe	Truman	Wiley
Reed	Tydings	
Revercomb	Wagner	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, in the nature of a substitute for the bill as now amended. The substitute is offered on behalf of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert the following:

That (1) any person hereafter appointed or promoted to any civilian office to which this section applies shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and (2) no person shall hold any such office after June 30, 1943, unless he shall have been so appointed: *Provided*, That any person now holding any such office, who was not so appointed, may continue to hold such office until his successor is appointed and qualified or until September 30, 1943, whichever is earlier, if a nomination for an appointment to such office has been submitted to the Senate prior to June 30, 1943.

SEC. 2. Except as provided in section 3, the following persons in or under the executive branch of the Government of the United States (including Government-owned corporations) shall be deemed to be officers of the United States and the provisions of the first section of this act shall apply to the office held by each of them:

(a) The heads, assistant heads, and head attorneys of the several departments and agencies of the Government (including members of the boards of directors and officers of Government-owned corporations).

(b) The heads of bureaus, divisions, or other units representing the first subdivision of any such department or agency.

(c) The heads and assistant heads of regional, area, or State offices of such departments or agencies.

(d) All persons whose duties include responsibility for final action in connection with the preparation and promulgation of rules, regulations, or orders made or issued under authority of any act of Congress or any Executive order.

(e) All persons whose duties include responsibility for determining the policies to be followed in administering the functions of any department, agency, or subdivision thereof as defined in paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of this section.

SEC. 3. The provisions of the first section of this act shall not be applicable, except in cases where confirmation by the Senate is otherwise required by law—

(a) In the case of (1) any person appointed or promoted in accordance with provisions of the civil-service laws and rules, as a result of which appointment or promotion and satisfactory service during a probationary period he acquired a classified (competitive) civil-service status; (2) any person who acquired a classified (competitive) civil-service status as in clause (1) and who, having left the service, has been or may be reinstated with restoration of such status; and (3) any person who, subsequent to appointment, acquired a classified status by action of the President or the Civil Service Commission, pursuant to act of Congress or Executive order; or

(b) In the case of any civilian office or position held by any person on leave of absence or furlough from such office or position and in active service in the military or naval forces of the United States; or

(c) In any case in which a person is restored to or reinstated in an office or position in accordance with the provisions of any act of Congress providing that he shall be restored to or reinstated in such office or position upon completion of active service in the military or naval forces of the United States; or

(d) In the case of any office or position in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice; or

(e) In the case of any person whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the White House Office in the Executive Office of the President.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am sure it will be sufficient at this time to state that the difference between the substitute now offered and the committee bill is primarily that the committee bill uses a salary received by Government officers or employees as the standard, or measuring stick. The substitute uses definitions of what constitute policy-making officers of the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Policy-making officials under the Senator's substitute are described in exactly the same wording found in the committee bill, are they not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not exactly.

Mr. McKELLAR. But substantially?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is some modification.

Mr. McKELLAR. There are some slight modifications, but all the standards provided in the Senator's substitute, except the one involving the $4,500, are substantially the same as those which are incorporated in the committee bill. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They are very similar; the Senator is quite correct. So, Mr. President, without attempting to take more of the time of the Senate, I merely wish to express the hope that the Senate will see fit to adopt the substitute offered by the minority, and on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. HILL addressed the Chair.

Mr. AIKEN. I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator permit me to make an inquiry?

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. I note that the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has just come into the Chamber. It is my intention to present at this time an amendment providing that employees of the T. V. A. shall be treated exactly as are civil-service employees, employees of the F. B. I., and employees in the executive offices of the President. I say frankly to the Senator from Georgia that I think the amendment will require a little debate. I myself will require a little time to state the reasons why I think the amendment should be agreed to. I do not want to be in the position of holding up the appropriation bill in charge of the Senator from Georgia, and therefore I want him to know that if we take up the amendment, a little time will be required to dispose of it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator from Alabama is aware of the fact that to take up the appropriation bill would, under the rules, involve a motion and some discussion about the displacement of the pending bill, or it would require unanimous consent.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me suggest that apparently we are not very far from a vote on the pending bill, and I believe it would probably save time both on the appropriation bill and the pending bill if the Senator would allow us to proceed a little further. I wish to say that I shall not at all stand in the way of appropriation bills, but it does seem that we are so near to a vote now that it might save the time of the Senate to continue with the pending bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I desire to proceed in an orderly manner, and have both the measures disposed of as expeditiously as possible. I have no information as to how much time the pending bill may take.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps we could ascertain.

Mr. HILL. Of course, I cannot say for certain, because I do not know how many interruptions there will be, but I imagine it would take me 40 or 45 minutes to state the reasons why I think the Senate should adopt the amendment I intend to offer. Then, since the session started today, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] has informed me that he proposes to offer an amendment on the same subject matter, to wit, an amendment to exempt the employees of the Bonneville Power Administration. How much time the Senator from Washington will require I do not know.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I feel very positively that the pending measure should be displaced either permanently or temporarily by the agricultural appropriations bill and by the naval appropriations bill and by other appropriation bills which are now pressing for consideration. The agricultural appropriations bill contains at least 100 amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. It contains 116 amendments, I will say.

Mr. McNARY. The bill must go to conference. Many of the amendments contained in it are highly controversial. Today is the 7th of June. The bill must be passed finally in both Houses by the 30th of June. I think it is imperative that we should consider it at this time. I wanted the Senate to take it up at 12 o'clock noon today, but out of an abundance of good nature I postponed my declaration in that respect until 20 minutes after 1. We have gotten along for a good many years without the legislation proposed by my excellent and very able friend, the Senator from Tennessee. We probably can continue to get along without it for a few days more. I shall not make the motion at this time, but, as minority leader, I shall be as insistent as I can be that the Senate proceed with consideration of the appropriation bills. There are many reasons for proceeding in that manner. I appeal to the able Senator from Tennessee, the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to permit the pending bill to be laid aside in order that we may proceed with the consideration of the agricultural appropriations bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall not object to that procedure.

Mr. McNARY. I am very happy that my appeal has been so convincing.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has been very convincing, so convincing that I shall not object to the procedure the Senator suggests.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 575, the unfinished business, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider the bill (H. R. 2481) making agricultural appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the agricultural appropriations bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to have an understanding with the Senator from Georgia that any controversial amendments shall be passed by for today. I understand that was the understanding had with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that is a very reasonable request, and such understanding was entered into with the able Senator in charge of the bill on Thursday last.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely correct, Mr. President.

Mr. BYRD. I wanted to make it clear that the controversial amendments would be passed over for today.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to the procedure suggested by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the request of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the agricultural appropriations bill is agreed to.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the

heading "Department of Agriculture—Office of the Secretary—Salaries and Expenses", on page 2, line 17, after the word "designate", to strike out "$1,473,184" and insert "$1,528,184."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, at the end of line 7, to increase the total appropriation for the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, from $1,873,184 to $1,928,184.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of the Solicitor", on page 6, line 13, after the word "service", to strike out "$1,679,105" and insert "$1,704,105", and in line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$845,000" and insert "$850,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of Information—Salaries and Expenses", on page 7, line 16, before the word "together", to strike out "$488,000" and insert "$439,257"; in line 25, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$378,556" and insert "$402,860", and on page 9, line 7, after the word "amended", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices or for the compensation of employees in such offices."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. May we have an explanation of the committee amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. Will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. May we have an explanation of the amendments?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to undertake to explain the amendments. There are 116 amendments to the bill. The great majority of them, and all the amendments which have been considered up to the present time, involve the restoration of a part of the Budget estimates. All the amendments which have been considered up to the present time are either below the Budget estimates or not in excess of the Budget estimates.

Mr. President, I should not like to undertake now to explain all these 116 amendments at one time. I shall be glad, however, to make a brief explanation of the bill itself. The bill, as reported by the committee, carries a total of $820,680,709. This amount is under the Budget estimates for this year in the sum of $128,558,490. The total appropriations in the bill are somewhat in excess of the appropriation contained in last year's bill for the reason that last year no appropriations were made for parity payments. Instead of making a direct appropriation, the Congress inserted in the bill a contractual obligation enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with the producers of the basic commodities for the making of parity payments. This year the bill carries an appropriation amounting to $170,281,000 to enable the Secretary to fulfill those contracts.

When we take into consideration the shift in the manner of handling the parity appropriations, the bill this year is $67,730,000 below the appropriations for the current year. The largest single item of increase in the bill made by the committee is in the item for soil conservation payments to farmers. Members of the Senate are familiar with the fact that for a number of years the soil conservation appropriation has amounted to $500,000,000. Last year it was reduced to $450,000,000. This year the Budget estimates were $400,000,000, and this was reduced by the House to $300,000,000. The Secretary of Agriculture and Mr. Chester Davis, who occupies the position of Director of Food Administration and Distribution, both testified before the committee that under the authority of law the Secretary of Agriculture had in December last announced a program to the farmers which would require payments approximating $400,000,000, and that unless the Senate committee restored the Budget estimates, the Government would in fact not be keeping faith with farmers who had prepared their plans this year on the basis of the assurances made last December. The Bureau of the Budget also estimated the sum of $100,000,000 for what was designated as incentive payments. The House disallowed that item. The Senate committee, after going into the matter thoroughly, did not restore that item in the bill. It is not in the bill before the Senate.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Returning for a moment to the item of $400,000,000 provided under the head "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," on page 69, the sum of $32,500,000 is appropriated for administrative expenses. I should like to have a brief explanation of that item, as it seems to me to be a rather exaggerated sum for administration.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say to the Senator that the limitation was offered in the interest of economy. The administrative expenses of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for the current year are approximately $54,000,000, and this language was offered in the bill in an effort to reduce the administrative expenses. The House had inserted in the bill a provision which the Senator will find at the bottom of page 68, which would have reduced the administrative expenses from the $54,000,000 expended this year to half that amount for the coming year. The committee was anxious to make every economy possible; but some of the farm organizations and other groups which were interested testified they did not believe that so drastic a cut could be imposed in 1 year. Therefore, we reduced the amount from $54,000,000 to $32,500,000. I may say to the Senator that under the language of the bill defining the limits of the soil-conservation program for next year, we hope next year to accomplish a reduction of 50 percent to cut this administrative item in half. It has been entirely too large in years past. Efforts have previously been made to limit the amount of this administrative item; and I am glad that now we have the limit in both the House version and the Senate version of the bill, so that some economy may be effected this year. Some economy is bound to result, because those figures are considerably below the amount expended last year.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a moment ago I rose to propound a parliamentary inquiry. I desire now to ask whether there will be an opportunity to object to controversial matters today or tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered, no controversial items are to be considered today. All any Senator would have to do would be to suggest that the item in which he was interested was controversial, and then it would go over, under the agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the next item larger than the Budget estimates is that for forest-fire protection. Last year the matter was dealt with in three bills. Supplemental estimates were made, and the appropriations contained in the agricultural supply bill were also increased.

This year proposals were made to increase this appropriation in varying amounts, some of them greatly in excess of the appropriations contained in the current agricultural appropriation bill. Many witnesses appeared before the committee on this particular item. Senators from the Northwestern States expressed grave apprehension that saboteurs or other persons might cause great losses in our forests, which would impede the war effort. Therefore, the committee felt justified in allowing the amount of appropriation contained in the item for prevention of forest fires appearing in the agricultural appropriation bill for the present year. The committee did not feel justified in accepting the very large amounts which some Members of the Senate suggested, because it would be absolutely impossible to appropriate enough money to guarantee that forest fires would not occur. There is a great shortage of manpower; and if we increase the appropriations we shall have one agency of Government bidding against another agency of Government or against private industry in the effort to secure labor.

Mr. President, the Members of the Senate are familiar with the condition of the bill as it came to the Senate. Due to a controversy between the committees in the other body, for the first time in many years the Committee on Rules did not give the Appropriations Committee a rule. The bill went to the floor of the House without any rule which would have protected legislative provisions inserted by the committee. Some 20 or 30 of those legislative provisions therefore

went out on points of order duly made on the floor of the other body.

Your committee in reporting the bill has endeavored to keep those legislative provisions at a minimum. We are not offering to restore all of them, but merely those that seem to us to be vital and essential to enable the Department of Agriculture to carry on its work in the manner in which it has heretofore been done.

In the bill there were a large number of research items which had been drastically reduced in the other body. In addition to that, the Bureau of the Budget had made an over-all cut of 5 percent in all the research items. Your committee did not feel that this was the proper time for the Government to relax in the unending fight between man and insects and plant disease. With the requirements for food and fiber in this country this year far exceeding those we have ever previously known, the committee felt justified in maintaining all the research items at the present levels. Some 32 of the amendments, involving in the main very small amounts, are for research items carrying on work in combating diseases of plants and animals and the insects which prey upon man, beast, and plant life.

The committee went very fully into the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration. In completely rewriting that item we undertook to place limitations upon the activities of that organization which would bring it back to the original objective of Congress, if I understood it correctly—that of dealing with the individual farmer and the rehabilitation of the individual farmer. The committee undertook to divorce that organization from all of the many rural rehabilitation projects which either have been instituted by the Farm Security Administration or were inherited by it from the Rural Resettlement Administration or from the various resettlement corporations which were established under the W. P. A. in the several States. I shall not now discuss that item any further, because it is one of the items which will go over for a more detailed discussion at a later date.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. On page 89, in an item relative to the Farm Security Administration, the amount is $29,607,573. Does the Senator care to make an observation comparing that amount with the amount of the item for the current year?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to do so. The appropriation for the current year is thirty-eight million and some-odd hundred thousand dollars. The Bureau of the Budget estimate for the item was $36,607,573. The Senator will observe that this is a reduction of several million dollars in the appropriation, which is a rather drastic cut of almost 20 percent; but if the Farm Security Administration carries out the instructions of the committee as to the liquidation of these projects, the amount recommended should be adequate to enable it to carry on its program of dealing with the individual farmer. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I assume that the crop-insurance item will go over until tomorrow, so I shall not undertake to discuss it now.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, from the statement made to me by the very distinguished Senator from South Dakota, I believe he would want it to go over until tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well; I shall reserve my discussion of it.

Mr. President, as I have stated, there are a number of legislative amendments to be offered from the floor. One of them has to do with the so-called school lunch and school-milk program. Senators are familiar with the history of that program. It began in a very small way in some of the States in the disposition of surplus farm commodities which had been acquired by the Surplus Commodities Corporation of the Department of Agriculture. Some of the food commodities which were purchased to absorb surpluses and to maintain price levels were purchased with section 32 funds and were turned over to State welfare agencies, and by them were transferred to schools, where they were prepared by W. P. A. employees and were made available to the students in schools. The program has been exceedingly popular. There has been an increasing demand for this assistance on the part of schools, both public and parochial, throughout the entire country. Under section 32 there was a limitation on the purposes for which the funds could be expended; they could be used only for the purpose of disposing of agricultural surpluses or encouraging the consumption of agricultural products. Today there are no agricultural surpluses. Instead of encouraging the consumption of agricultural products, we are limiting consumption through a process of rationing so as to enable us to have adequate supplies and a fair distribution of the available supplies. The committee did not feel justified in sawing off the school-lunch and school-milk program without any more notice to the trustees and school officials of the various institutions where the program is now in operation. The floor amendment, therefore, clarifies the legal status of this program for next year; and an amount has been estimated, out of the permanent appropriations made by virtue of section 32, which will be considerably larger than the amount which has been available for the school-lunch and school-milk program for the current year.

In the committee report, however, the committee points out that this expenditure should not be deducted, as a permanent policy, from funds which are set aside for the use and benefit of farmers. We hope that before another appropriation bill is considered by the Senate permanent legislation will have been enacted clearly defining the policy of the Government toward the school-lunch and school-milk program. The present program has no general rule to apply throughout the Nation. In one school 30 percent of the cost of the food is contributed; in another 40 percent; and in another 50 percent. The contribution runs from 30 to 100 percent of the cost of the food. The program has assumed such proportions that if it is to be continued at all, the Congress should clearly define and point out the limitations of the program, stipulating the amount which should be contributed by the sponsors or by the school authorities, because we should no longer spend a sum as large as $50,000,000 in any such haphazard fashion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Inasmuch as the Senator has been discussing the most important subject of school lunches, it seems to me that the opportunity should not pass without attention being called to the fact that the reason the request has been made to our committee for the utilization of funds under section 32 for this purpose is fundamentally the breakdown of the local economic structure throughout the States and in the cities. Nothing is of more local character than the education of children in the schools, whatever the type of school may be; but the agencies which are concerned about the lack of nutrition throughout the United States have been compelled to turn to the Federal Government for aid.

This is wholly a matter which ought to be handled by local governing units—by school districts, cities, counties, or States. There can be no more eloquent commentary upon the fundamental failure of our present economic organization than the fact that school agencies, welfare bodies, and groups which are concerned about the proper nutrition of children find themselves compelled to turn to the Federal Government to handle this problem. It emphasizes the need for national thought upon the problem of restoration of local economic activity, because without it we shall continue to go down the road to an increasing degree of national handling of local matters. If we continue to do so we shall eventually destroy local political independence. We shall make it impossible for people in their local communities to avoid control by Federal agencies and Federal law.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I entirely agree with what the Senator from Wyoming says. However, the most effective way to break down the local economic structure is by granting Federal aid, and not standing on the principle of making localities take care of local affairs. The State of Ohio does take care of local affairs. If the fact that one or two States do not is accepted as a reason for extending Federal aid for any deficiency which exists; if because the Commodity Credit Corporation likes to find a way to rid itself of surplus commodities—or did in the past—we undertake a Federal activity, we certainly immediately discourage every effort of the people in the locali-

ties to have their own governments do what ought to be done.

The question of free school lunches is a debatable question. Many States may feel that they ought not to enter upon such a program, and that the parents ought to supply lunches for the pupils just as lunches are supplied for the head of the family who goes to work in a factory. That is a debatable question. However, if we resolve all those questions by simply granting Federal aid, we have just as much to do with breaking down the local economic structure as has the failure of the localities themselves.

I do not wish to be understood as opposing this particular appropriation; but so long as the Senator from Wyoming introduced some political philosophy, I thought I should comment upon it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am glad to have the observations of both able Senators. They express better than I can the thought in my mind when I stated that there should be some specific legislation on this subject if we are to continue to operate in this field. If we are to continue in this field there should at least be some uniformity throughout the United States, and some requirement of local participation on the part of all the schools throughout the United States. However, I did not think, and the committee did not think, that we should saw off this activity at this stage of the proceedings, when the schools have had dumped upon them a greatly increased cost on account of the liquidation of the W. P. A., which has heretofore afforded them the employees to carry out such projects.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have had two or three complaints from Ohio to the effect that after butter was rationed the Commodity Credit Corporation insisted on forcing on school districts in the State of Ohio more butter than they could possibly use for the school lunches, for which it was supposed to have been provided. Those are no doubt exceptional cases; but I believe the whole program could be administered with more economy than it has been conducted.

Mr. RUSSELL. The program "just growed," like Topsy. It started in one school somewhere, where the State welfare agency wished to dispose of some of the surplus. Perhaps the local distribution was not uniform throughout the State, and perhaps the stamp program had not been inaugurated. The State welfare agency turned over some agricultural commodities to a school.

The program is now carried on in every State of the Union, and affects approximately 6,000,000 school children. Certainly the Congress should not longer delay promulgating a specific plan. It is not the function of the Appropriations Committee to legislate on that subject. However, we will offer from the floor the amendment to which I have referred, with the admonition in the report from the committee to those who are interested in this program that this should not be considered as a permanent source of funds, and that if their interest in this program extends beyond the present year, they should see that legislation is enacted by the Congress for the continued operation of the program.

In the first place, it is not fair to charge up to the farmers the expenditure of $40,000,000 and $50,000,000 year after year through the agricultural appropriation bill, for the purpose of school lunches, because school lunches are consumed in the cities as well as in the rural schools—perhaps to a greater extent in the cities than in the rural sections. Yet those who are critical of agricultural appropriations do not take into consideration the fact that a substantial part of the appropriations has been and is being expended today in this program.

I did not understand the Senator from Ohio to say that this program was not in effect in his State. Am I correct?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I did not intend so to state. I simply stated that I think Ohio would handle its own job if no Federal money were handed out. The need for the program did not arise because of any failure in Ohio to provide free nutrition to our school children.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is an agreement that controversial amendments shall go over until tomorrow. I shall be glad to answer any further questions.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator please point out the section which reinstated the appropriations for the regional agricultural corporations?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will refer to page 95 of the bill, section 2, commencing with line 12, he will find a limitation which was imposed by the House and stricken out by the amendment of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to consider that as being controversial, and I make objection to it, and ask that it go over until tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator is not on the floor when that amendment is taken up I shall be glad to see that it is put over until tomorrow.

I wish to say in that connection, Mr. President, that the entire question of Federal credit agencies is one which also demands the attention of the Congress. There should be enacted specific legislation which would coordinate the various Federal lending agencies. It is difficult even for the members of this committee to keep up with the activities of all the many corporations and associations which are in the field of lending funds to farmers. It is very difficult to define the responsibilities of each of these agencies because there is so much confusion and such a shadowland between where one agency is supposed to cease functioning and another is supposed to take up. The committee felt that something should be done about that. It is something about which I had not given much thought until hearings were held by the committee. I now see a very grave necessity for Congress thoroughly to revise and coordinate all the farm lending agencies. The committee, however, did not feel that the Appropriations Committee was the proper place to start. That is one of the reasons why this section was stricken out. The members of the committee felt that it was a matter to which a legislative committee should direct its attention. As a matter of fact, I understand that some such legislation has already been introduced, perhaps by the Senator from Nebraska, as well as by others. Such legislation should be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I can afford to criticize that committee, which is a standing committee, because I am a member of it. Such legislation should be considered, however, at an early date.

The Appropriations Committee did not feel justified, however, in reaching the situation bite by bite, limiting power here and granting power there to these various lending agencies.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the committee amendment to the bill provide for ample funds to continue the Warehousing Act?

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee recommended the full amount of the Budget estimates because it did not feel it was justified in reducing the appropriations for Federal warehousing for this period at a time when we were trying to build up reserves and encourage the storing of farm commodities, and at a time when we have in effect such a far-flung lending program through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. I do not object to that. I wanted to be sure it was in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. We restored it to the amount of the provision for the present year. We restored the amount stricken out by the House.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to have it understood by the Senator from Georgia that the amendment on page 89 will go over until tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have already stated that it is understood that the Farm Security Administration items will go over until tomorow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Printing and binding," on page 10, after line 23, to strike out:

Reproduction of 1942 Yearbook of Agriculture: For printing and binding 231,250 copies of the remainder of the quotas for the Senate and House of Representatives of part 2 of the Annual Report of the Secretary of Agriculture (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture, 1942, entitled "Keeping Livestock Healthy"), as authorized by section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241), $178,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Reprinting of Agriculture Yearbook, 1942: For reprinting with illustrations and binding in cloth of 231,250 copies of part 2 of the Annual Report of the Secretary of Agriculture entitled "Keeping Livestock Healthy," as authorized by section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241), of which 54,450 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 176,800 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, $178,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 16, after the words "Office of Information", to strike out "$1,866,000" and insert "$1,817,257."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Extension Service—Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico", on page 13, after line 18, to strike out:

Extension work, act of April 24, 1939: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work," approved April 24, 1939 (7 U. S. C. 343 c 1), as amended, $300,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Additional cooperative extension work: For additional cooperative agricultural extension work in agriculture and home economics, to be allotted and paid by the Secretary to the several States and the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, in such amounts as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, $555,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 3, after "343g)", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$180,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 5, after the word "work", to strike out "$13,903,950" and insert "$14,238,950."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses", on page 15, line 21, after the word "colleges", to strike out "$638,843" and insert "$688,843."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, at the end of line 24, to increase the total appropriation for the Extension Service from $14,542,793 to $14,927,793.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Agricultural Economics", on page 16, line 15, after the word "trends", to strike out "$2,077,236" and insert "$2,177,236."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 5, after the word "Economics", to strike out "$3,431,502" and insert "$3,531,502"; and in line 9, before the word "may", to strike out "$1,801,649" and insert "$1,851,649."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 16, to increase the grand total appropriation under the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, from $24,282,186 to $24,798,443.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able chairman of the committee how it is possible for these international conferences to cost approximately $25,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the able Senator from Michigan will observe that the total appropriation for international conferences, so far as the agricultural relief is concerned, is only $12,500. The figure to which the Senator refers is the grand total for the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, including the Extension Service and a number of other items carried within this total.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Agricultural Research Administration—Office of Experiment Stations—Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico for agricultural experiment stations", on page 22, line 20, after "427–427g)", to strike out "$2,400,000" and insert "$2,463,708: *Provided*, That in order to prevent reduced allotments because of changes in relative rural population, $63,708 of this appropriation shall be available for allotment during this fiscal year in the same amounts and to the same States and Territory which received allotments from this appropriation in the fiscal year 1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 4, after the word "stations", to strike out "$6,937,500" and insert "$7,001,208."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses", on page 24, line 3, after the word "bulletins", to strike out "$83,292" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 9, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$239,302" and insert "$256,010."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, at the end of line 10, to increase the total appropriation, Office of Experiment Stations, from $7,176,802 to $7,257,218.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Animal Industry—salaries and expenses", on page 26, line 9, after the word "animals", to insert a comma and "including the construction of necessary buildings at Beltsville, Md."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Plant Industry—salaries and expenses", on page 33, line 3, after the word "control", to strike out "$547,070" and insert "$575,860."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 8, after the word "diseases", to strike out "$422,940", and insert "$445,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 13, after the word "byproducts", to strike out "$62,250", and insert "$65,530."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 1, after the word "control", to strike out "$292,000" and insert "$357,370."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if I may revert to page 26 for a moment and refer to the amendment in line 9, let me ask what is the project at Beltsville, Md.? That is not Tugwelltown, is it?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it has no connection whatever with any subsistence homestead. It is the great central laboratory of the Department of Agriculture for dealing with the treatment of diseases of animals and plants.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then I have no further interrogation with reference to that item.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that this language has been in the bill for a number of years. It does not involve any increase in expenditures. When a new disease develops, it is sometimes necessary to build a small temporary building in order that the animal which is being treated may be quarantined and kept away from the animals which are free from disease. Similar language has been contained in agricultural appropriation bills in previous years, and has been stricken out in the House on a point of order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It was the geography that attracted my attention. It sounded a bit like one of those old crystal-gazing, boondoggling projects.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator referred to Greenbelt. There is no connection between Greenbelt and Beltsville.

Mr. TAFT. On page 23 of the bill, in line 3, there is reference to Puerto Rico. Is there to be built a new agricultural experiment station in Puerto Rico?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no. That station has been in existence there for a long period of time.

Mr. TAFT. We visited it. The language on page 23, in line 23, is as follows:

To enable the Secretary to establish and maintain an agriculture experiment station in Puerto Rico, including the erection of buildings—

And so forth.

Mr. RUSSELL. That language has been in similar bills year after year. As is oftentimes true, in preparing agricultural appropriation bills the pertinent part of the legislative provision is inserted year after year. There is no new language in the bill, and no new powers are granted.

Mr. TAFT. It is simply an appropriation for the existing agricultural experiment station, is it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The $16,000 increase grew out of the fact that an increase of 25 percent was allowed all Federal employees stationed in Puerto Rico, the Panama Canal Zone, and Hawaii, except those at this experiment station, when they are assigned to stations in those outlying possessions. I was not aware of the fact that that was the case. I think it is a very erroneous policy to follow. I know of no reason why a Federal employee stationed in Puerto Rico, the Panama Canal Zone, or Hawaii should be allowed a 25-percent increase in his salary by virtue of the fact that he is stationed in one of those places; and then when the Congress votes an increase in his compensation, the increase

is predicated upon the 25-percent increase received because of serving outside continental United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, of course not only is that true as to Americans from continental United States who go to Puerto Rico and who conceivably have some extra expense, but it is true as to all native Puerto Rican employees of the Federal Government who receive more, although the general standard of living is lower than for similar employees doing the same class of work in the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is exactly correct. I have given my views to the Senate as to what I think should be done in the way of legislation. I think the Civil Service Committee or other proper committee should bring before the Senate a bill repealing that increase. I did not know it was in effect until we were studying this bill but I can see no justification for allowing Federal employees in one of our possessions where oftentimes the standard of living and the cost of living are lower than in continental United States, increased compensation in addition to the increase we allowed them the other day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 34, line 1.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 8, after the word "application", to strike out "$239,100" and insert "$256,945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 17, after the word "storage", to strike out "$1,361,828" and insert "$1,428,249."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 21, after the word "soils", to strike out "$134,900" and insert "$142,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 17, after the word "surveys", to strike out "$286,160" and insert "$301,223."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 20, after the name "Maryland", to strike out "$48,550" and insert "$51,109."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 9, after the word "use", to strike out "$320,130" and insert "$336,976."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 13, after the word "surveys", to strike out "$49,595" and insert "$205,430."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 19, after the word "plants", to strike out "$350,340" and insert "$368,780."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 22, after the word "handling", to strike out "$120,520" and insert "$126,860."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 24, to increase the total appropriation for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Plant Industry, from $4,687,376 to $5,113,525.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head "Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine—Salaries and expenses", on page 38, line 8, after the word "nuts", to strike out "$399,130" and insert "$404,130."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 14, after the word "moths", to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$363,060."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 20, after the word "*Provided*", to strike out "That no part of this appropriation shall be expended in any State subsequent to the final adjournment of any session of the legislature thereof which shall have begun subsequent to the enactment of the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, unless the laws of such State contain provisions, deemed adequate by the Secretary, requiring the owners of elm trees suffering from the Dutch elm disease to remove and destroy the same without expense to the Federal Government: *Provided further.*"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 9, after the word "concerned", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further,* That expenditures incurred by landowners for removal of trees from their own lands shall not be considered a part of such appropriations, subscriptions, or contributions."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 16, after the word "shrubs", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$199,680."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 19, after the word "crops", to strike out "$232,340" and insert "$323,520."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 23, after the words "corn borer", to strike out "$330,170" and insert "$380,170."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 4, after the word "purposes", to strike out "$173,250" and insert "$423,250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 13, after the word "cotton", to strike out "$140,730" and insert "$148,139."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 21, after the word "authorities", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$637,460."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 4, after the word "animals", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$174,675."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 11, after the word "control", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$140,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 17, after the word "arthropods", to strike out "$19,740" and insert "$20,775."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 23, after the word "control" to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$66,585."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 4, after the word "fungicides", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$119,815."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 12, after the word "Quarantine" to strike out "$4,612,580" and insert "$5,383,479"; and in line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$615,000" and insert "$630,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering—salaries and expenses", on page 47, line 19, after the word "reports", to strike out "$217,128" and insert "$297,504."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 10, after the word "Engineering", to strike out "$782,829" and insert "$863,205"; and in line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$495,019."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Home Economics", on page 48, line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$156,657" and insert "$193,194"; and on page 49, line 10, after the word "subject", to strike out "$366,131" and insert "$508,781."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "White pine blister rust control", on page 50, line 9, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$1,900,000" and insert "$1,946,342"; in line 10, after the word "amount", to strike out "$170,747" and insert "$174,910"; in line 15, before the words "of said", to strike out "$1,018,160" and insert "$1,042,992"; and in line 18, before the words "of said" to strike out "$711,093" and insert "$728,440."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Forest Service—salaries and expenses", on page 56, line 6, after the word "Act", to strike out "$12,826,826" and insert "$15,393,537."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia explain that amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, Mr. President, I shall be glad to undertake to do so. This is in part a restoration of the Budget estimate for looking after tree plantings in the Great Lakes area. Four hundred and fifteen thousand dollars was stricken from the Budget estimate by the other House. As I stated in my opening remarks the remainder of the increase is a restoration to the present appropriation of the funds which are available for the protection of the national forests against undue and unusual hazards growing out of the war. Two

million one hundred and fifty-one thousand seven hundred and eleven dollars of this appropriation was added by the committee to bring the appropriation up to the current amount. A large number of witnesses appeared before the committee and testified to the fact that greatly increased protection was needed in the national forests as well as on private lands. It involves not only fire protection but protection against other things. There was a fire along the coast of North Carolina last year which silhouetted all coastal shipping at night and a submarine came in there and sank three or four ships which otherwise possibly would not have been located. It is very important that we protect our forests during this period, for in protecting the forests we are protecting the lives of people who are engaged in many lines of activity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee on page 56, line 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 3, to strike out:

FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

To enable the Secretary (1) to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b) (not to exceed $397,368) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,100), of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and acts supplementary thereto; and (2) through the Forest Service to cooperate with and advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained yield management, the conservation of the timber resource, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries, not to exceed $100,000; in all, not to exceed $646,168; including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the purchase of reference books and technical journals; not to exceed $30,000 for the construction or purchase of necessary buildings, and other improvements: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation which is available for carrying out the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act and sections 4 and 5 of the act approved June 7, 1924, shall be expended in any State or Territory unless the State or Territory, or local subdivision thereof, or individuals, or associations contribute a sum equal to that to be allotted therefrom by the Government or make contributions other than money deemed by the Secretary to be the value equivalent thereof: *Provided further*, That any part of this appropriation allocated for the production or procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency for allocation to cooperating States for the production or procurement of nursery stock, shall remain available for expenditure for not more than 3 fiscal years: *Provided further*, That in carrying into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to establish new nurseries or to acquire land for the establishment of such new nurseries.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 15, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$542,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 19, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$267,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 22, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$800,000" and insert "$989,765."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 24, after the numeral "9", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$199,363."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 2, after the numerals "10,", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$118,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 9, after the word "therefor", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$132,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 11, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$15,646,074" and insert "$13,316,045," and in line 18, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$886,034" and insert "$887,074."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest-fire Cooperation", on page 61, line 13, after the word "act", to strike out "$2,492,210" and insert "$6,300,000"; in line 14, before the word "and", to strike out "$72,418" and insert "$87,418", and in the same line, before the word "shall", to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 16, to insert:

FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

To enable the Secretary (1) to carry into effect, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, approved May 18, 1937 (16 U. S. C. 568b), (not to exceed $547,368) and the provisions of sections 4 (not to exceed $83,700) and 5 (not to exceed $65,100), of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor", approved June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 567–568), and acts supplementary thereto; and (2) through the Forest Service to cooperate with and advise timberland owners and associations, wood-using industries or other appropriate agencies in the application of forest management principles to federally owned lands leased to States and to private forest lands, so as to attain sustained-yield management, the conservation of the timber resource, the productivity of forest lands, and the stabilization of employment and economic continuance of forest industries, not to exceed $111,942; in all, not to exceed $808,110, of which not to exceed $44,110 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia; the purchase of reference books and technical journals; not to exceed $30,000 for the construction or purchase of necessary buildings, and other improvements: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation which is available for carrying out the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act and sections 4 and 5 of the act approved June 7, 1924, shall be expended in any State or Territory unless the State or Territory, or local subdivision thereof, or individuals, or associations contribute a sum equal to that to be allotted therefrom by the Government or make contributions other than money deemed by the Secretary to be the value equivalent thereof: *Provided further*, That any part of this appropriation allocated for the production or procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency for allocation to cooperating States for the production or procurement of nursery stock, shall remain available for expenditure for not more than 3 fiscal years: *Provided further*, That in carrying into effect the provisions of the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act, no part of this appropriation shall be used to establish new nurseries or to acquire land for the establishment of such new nurseries.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia explain the difference between this amendment and the one that was stricken out of the House bill on page 57?

Mr. RUSSELL. The House undertook to consolidate farm and other private forestry activities, and they reduced the appropriation—limited the activities. The Senate committee restored $161,000, a restoration that was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senate committee enable the cooperative work that has been going on to be continued?

Mr. RUSSELL. We are endeavoring to make such provision so that the cooperative work that is going on under this head shall not be hampered or crippled. That is the purpose of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 61, line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 63, at the end of line 19, to increase the total appropriation for the Forest Service, from $18,238,284 to $25,524,155.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Commodity Credit Corporation", on page 66, line 11, after the word "amended", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further*, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938" and in lieu thereof to insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or the comparable price as provided by section 4 (a) of the act of July 1, 1941 (Public Law, No. 147, 77th Cong.): *Provided further*, That the

foregoing shall not apply to the sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity for distribution exclusively for relief purposes, nor to commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or are sold for the purpose of feeding or the manufacture of ethyl alcohol, butyl alcohol, acetone, or rubber, or the extraction of oil, or commodities sold to farmers for seed or commodities sold for export or new or byproduct uses: *Provided further*, That no wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at a price less than the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made: *Provided further*, That in making regional adjustments in the sale price of corn or wheat the minimum price need not be higher in any area than the United States average parity price of corn."

Mr. McNARY. I think this amendment should go over.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection whatever to it going over. However, I have heard of no opposition to the provision.

Mr. McNARY. I am not speaking personally at all, and my reason for mentioning it is that a Senator spoke to me about this item a few days ago, and he is not present today.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to the amendment going over.

Mr. McNARY. Inasmuch as the bill is to go over until tomorrow, I should like to have this amendment go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over, and the clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources", on page 68, line 2, after the word "newspapers", to strike out "$300,000,000" and insert "$400,000,000."

Mr. BYRD. I ask that the "Conservation and use" amendments go over until we can have further study of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be passed over.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator mean the entire paragraph, or merely the amount?

Mr. BYRD. I expect it is interlocked, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, it is not. If the Senator will look at the bottom of page 69 he will see that we inserted a limitation on next year's program of $300,000,000, instead of $400,000,000.

Mr. BYRD. There will be no objection to it going over, I think.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be passed over, and the clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Parity payments," on page 70, line 18, after the numerals "1943" to strike out "$193,623,000" and insert "$170,281,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 11, after the word "as" to strike out "follow" and insert "follows."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Have we reached the item at the foot of page 71?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the next amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. When we reach that I shall ask that it go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 71, after line 23, to insert:

To enable the Secretary to make parity payments to producers of wheat, cotton, corn (in the commercial corn-producing area), rice, and tobacco, pursuant to the provisions of section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, he is authorized and directed to make such commitments or incur such obligations as may be necessary in order to provide for full parity payments for each of the crop years 1943 and 1944: *Provided*, That such payments with respect to any such commodity for the crop year 1943 shall be made upon the normal yield of the farm acreage allotment established for such commodity under the 1943 agricultural conservation program and for the crop year 1944 on the normal yield of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the 1944 agricultural conservation program: *Provided further*, That for each of the crop years 1943 and 1944 the Secretary may provide by regulations for reduction in payments for failure to comply with the acreage allotments, limits or goals under the agricultural conservation program for 1943 or 1944, as the case may be.

For payments on the 1943 crop, if the sum of the prevailing basic loan rate (if marketing quotas for the commodity have been disapproved, such basic loan rate shall be the basic loan rate which would have prevailed except for such disapproval) or the average farm price, whichever is the higher, for the crop year 1943 and the applicable rate of the payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the 1943 agricultural conservation program, and the parity payments herein provided, exceed an amount sufficient to increase the farmers' returns to parity prices, parity payments shall be so adjusted as to provide a return to producers which is equal to but not greater than parity price; and for payments on the 1944 crop, if the sum of the prevailing basic loan rate (if marketing quotas for the commodity have been disapproved, such basic loan rate shall be the basic loan rate which would have prevailed except for such disapproval) or the average farm price, whichever is the higher, for the crop year 1944 and the applicable rate of the payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the 1944 agricultural conservation program, and the parity payments herein provided exceed an amount sufficient to increase the farmers' returns to parity prices, parity payments shall be so adjusted as to provide a return to producers which is equal to but not greater than parity price.

Mr. McNARY. I ask that the portion beginning in line 24, page 71, and ending on page 73, line 17, on the subject of parity payments, go over.

Mr. RUSSELL. That all refers to parity payments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be passed over, and the clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Crop Insurance Act," on page 74, line 9, after "55 Stat. 255–256)", to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$7,818,748."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to have this provision for Federal crop insurance go over.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood it was to go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment, together with that on page 74, line 13, will be passed over, and the clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Soil Conservation Service," on page 76, line 2, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$401,315" and insert "$451,315."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 15, after the word "installations", to strike out "$1,071,573" and insert "$1,196,573."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 25, after the word "information", to strike out "$17,130,000" and insert "$20,130,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 17, after the word "Service", to strike out "$18,675,136" and insert "$21,850,136"; and in line 18, after the words "exceed", to strike out "$1,004.691" and insert "$1,231,741."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, after line 19, to insert:

WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, and for other purposes", approved August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), including the purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles, $1,278,649, of which not to exceed $11,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, those funds were transferred from the item for the Farm Security Administration to a separate item. The action of the Senate on this item might in some wise be influenced by what occurs to the suggested appropriation for the Farm Security Administration, and I presume this amendment also should go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over, and the clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Marketing Service", on page 79, line 5, after the word "products", to strike out "$1,084,570" and insert "$1,141,655."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will not the Senator explain the "Land utilization and retirement of submarginal land" provision, on page 78?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that item relates to the liquidation of the so-called rural rehabilitation projects. At one time the Government had about 15 or 16 agencies which were acquiring land. The submarginal lands were acquired in large areas in various sections of the country. Congress has stopped buying the land, and this appropriation is to

provide for looking after those lands which have been acquired. I have forgotten how many million acres the Government owns, but this appropriation is to enable the Government to make use of the seven and a quarter million acres which are administered under this program.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It is just for the administration of the lands we have now?

Mr. RUSSELL. No money can be spent for the purchase of additional lands; it is merely to look after the property in which we have already a very substantial investment.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to have this provision go over, if the Senator has no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no amendment to the provision; it is in the bill as it came from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 79, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 10, after the word "contained", to strike out "$450,430" and insert "$474,137."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 20, after "473d)", to strike out "$363,250" and insert "$388,250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, line 12, after the word "Agency", to insert "and Standard Container"; in line 19, after "491–497)", to insert a comma and "the Standard Baskets Act, approved August 31, 1916, as amended (15 U. S. C. 251–256), and the act to fix standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and splint baskets for fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes, approved May 21, 1928 (15 U. S. C. 257–257i)"; and at the end of line 23, to strike out "$167,520" and insert "$187,520."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Georgia explain whether this increases the authority of the Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not; it combines two items. It provides for the work which has been done heretofore in attempting to police these containers. It is done by having a few field men go around to the plants where the containers are manufactured.

Mr. BYRD. It does not provide for any new authority?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not. However, it does provide for a slight increase in the appropriation. For a number of years $30,000 was provided for this activity. The House has from time to time whittled the appropriation down, and this year they cut it to $10,000. It developed before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate that we might as well abolish the work as reduce the appropriation to $10,000, so we restored it to $30,000.

The purpose of the work is twofold; first, to protect the consumer, and, second, to insure fair competition between producers of various agricultural commodities. The evidence was to the effect that one man could lift the bottom of a basket containing strawberries or blackberries by a very slight degree, and even if it amounted to only 10 or 12 berries to each basket, not only would the consumer lose that much but in competition with his neighbor who is giving the extra 10 or 12 berries he has an undue advantage. This appropriation provides for work which is extremely important to consumers, as well as to all those engaged in producing vegetables, fruits, and the like, which are placed in containers. It would seem to be an overwhelming task to do the work, but it developed that there are only two or three hundred manufacturers of these containers, so instead of going out into the shops and markets and inspecting the containers, the plants are inspected to see that the baskets and other containers are uniform. I think it is a very important work.

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the Senator that it is very important.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 81, line 12 and line 23.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 18, after the word "agreements", to strike out "$992,428" and insert "$1,042,428."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 24, after the word "act", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$464,115."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 17, after "181–229)" to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$378,140."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 7, after "(U. S. C. 2)" to strike out "$225,000" and insert "$325,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 8, after the word "Service", to strike out "$5,866,708" and insert "$6,234,755"; and in line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,298,413" and insert "$1,369,763."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Rural Electrification Administration", on page 84, after line 24, to strike out:

Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5, and for the purchase of property and costs and expenses incurred in connection therewith in accordance with section 7 of the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), $20,000,000.

Total, Rural Electrification Administration, $22,258,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think it is only fair to say that this amendment does not provide for a reduction in or an abolition of the funds available to the Rural Electrification Administration. A floor amendment will be offered later providing that these loans be furnished through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as they have been in years past. The language providing for loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was stricken out on a point of order on the floor of the other body, and an amendment was offered making a direct appropriation instead of the authorization. The Committee on Appropriations felt it was highly desirable to continue the present method of financing, which has been rather successful through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and a floor amendment will be offered later for the full amount.

Mr. WILSON. I ask that that amendment be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understood the Senator, in making his explanation of the appropriation for the Rural Electrification Administration, said that was being handled now as a loan under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it has been so handled for years. The Rural Electrification Administration has borrowed funds from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and has pledged as collateral the notes of the cooperatives. There is no intention on the part of the committee to discontinue the Rural Electrification Administration. We hope to strengthen this amendment if we can when we reach consideration of it, but at the request made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] the amendment goes over until tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. It is taken care of under the loan features rather than by a direct appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; and that is legislation, and amendments dealing with it must be offered from the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it the intention to increase the amount in that item over the appropriation approved by the House?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. We intend to press an amendment which would authorize the Rural Electrification Administration to borrow $30,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for carrying on its work. Of course, that is less than the Rural Electrification Administration has received in years past, but in view of the very tight situation in connection with critical materials, that is as much money as the administration would be able to use advantageously.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Administration believe that would be sufficient money with which to carry on their work?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is all they can use, in view of the tight situation with respect to critical material such as copper and other materials.

Mr. MAYBANK. The R. E. A. is one of the most important departments of the Government.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the establishment of the Rural Electrification has brought about a greater permanent contribution in the way of improving agricultural conditions in this country than

any other single thing the Congress has done in the last 10 years.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Rural Electrification Administration is helping a great deal in the way of increased production and preservation of food.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, it is a very important factor in increasing food production and in improving working conditions on the farm. In view of the scarcity of farm labor it is especially important. Electricity on the farm takes the place of two or three hands, and in the case of dairy production electricity takes the place of more hands than in the case of other farm products.

Mr. MAYBANK. I believe that if the materials had been available the committee would have increased the amount of loan to be authorized.

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee, and the Senate itself for that matter, have always espoused the progress of the Rural Electrification Administration. For years past we have made available as high as $140,000,000 in one year for the Rural Electrification Administration, and this organization has made an amazing showing in their collections. They have collected a great deal more than the maturities from the cooperatives. In addition many of the cooperatives have purchased bonds and placed them in reserve to hold until the maturity of their obligations to the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. WHERRY. The reason I ask the question is that in my State we are very much concerned with respect to the continuation of the Rural Electrification Administration. It appears the item has been taken out of the appropriation in the bill. That is the reason I wanted the explanation made.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the reason I wanted to explain the amendment which has gone over at the request of the Senator from Iowa. The amendment which will be pressed would authorize the Rural Electrification Administration to borrow $30,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for its purposes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to have an explanation from the Senator from Georgia with respect to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the item concerning which appears on pages 87 and 88. It is my understanding that the provision for continuing farm mortgage loans or Commissioner's loans ends July 1. Is that what the paragraph refers to?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, there is nothing in the paragraph which would continue the loans. This is merely making provision for administrative expenses of that organization.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Does the Senator from Georgia know whether or not the provision with respect to Commissioner's loans by the Federal Land Bank Commissioner ends on July 1?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry but I cannot tell the Senator. If it does, I do not know why an appropriation was estimated by the Bureau of the Budget unless it was done on the assumption that the Congress would extend the time.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I think I can explain that point. The other House has already passed a bill extending for a few years the life of Federal farm loans to which my colleague from South Dakota refers. The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has the bill now under consideration and I understand will report it to the Senate floor quite soon.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask that the next amendment, appearing on page 89 down to and including line 3 on page 95, go over.

Mr. RUSSELL. That amendment has been passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Liquidation and management of resettlement projects," on page 95, after line 11, to strike out:

SEC. 2. No part of any appropriation contained in this act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau, office, agency, or service of the Department or any corporation, institution, or association supervised thereby, who engages in, or directs or authorizes any other officer or employee of the Department or any such bureau, office, agency, service, corporation, institution, or association to engage in, the making of loans under the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 (12 U. S. C. 1148), as amended, or the making of loans or advances in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in Food Production Financing Bulletins F-1 or F-2 of the Farm Credit Administration operating under the Food Production Administration, Production Loan Branch.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that that amendment go over until tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. That amendment has already been passed over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the last committee amendment deals with renumbering of sections.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask that the sections be not renumbered at this time because there are some amendments to be offered from the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under instructions of the committee I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 10, after the word "Columbia", it is proposed to insert "including the salary of the chief of bureau at $10,000 per annum."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, is it the purpose by the pending amendment to raise the salary of certain officials from $9,500 to $10,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President, it is not. It is proposed by the amendment to insert in the bill language which has been in similar bills for a number of years. The House committee reported the language but it was subject to a point of order and objection was made to it on the floor of the House. But the Senator will recall that three or four of these items were before the committee. Two of them dealt with the restoration of salaries to the amount the officials affected are already drawing. Two others were to increase salaries. The pending amendment refers to the Director of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. He has been in the Department for a number of years and has always drawn $10,000 a year, but there was no statutory authority for it. The amendment merely proposes that he shall continue to draw the amount he is receiving now and has received for a number of years.

Mr. LODGE. Then the amendment will not result in building up the Bureau and creating a number of more highly paid positions within the Bureau?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not have that effect at all. It merely maintains the salary of this individual at what it is at the present time, and does not affect any other persons whatsoever.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered on behalf of the committee on page 18, line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. On behalf of the committee I offer another legislative amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, line 21, after the word "Administrator", it is proposed to insert "including the salary of the Administrator at $9,200 per annum."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, Mr. President, I shall be glad to explain the amendment. It relates to the salary of the Administrator of Agricultural Research. There has been a reorganization in the Department of Agriculture, and all the research agencies have been consolidated and coordinated. The head of the agency is Dr. E. C. Auchter, who has been with the Department for a number of years. For a long time he was Director of the Bureau of Plant Industry. Unless the amendment is agreed to, he will suffer a reduction in salary.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to say that there is no abler or more expert man connected with the Government, in my judgment, than Dr. Auchter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree entirely with the Senator from Virginia. Dr. Auchter is a very able man. He has been appointed the head of all the research agencies. If the amendment were not agreed to, he would have a number of subordinates who would receive more money than he would receive.

Mr. LODGE. How would his salary be reduced if the amendment were not agreed to?

Mr. RUSSELL. Because he would then receive the same salary he was receiving

under his old classification, which would be below that received by a number of subordinates serving under him.

Mr. LODGE. He has been receiving the salary provided for in the amendment; has he?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; at the present time he receives $8,500. However, he has just been appointed the head of this agency.

Mr. LODGE. He has been promoted; has he?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; this is a promotion, under the reorganization which has just been put into effect; because he has been placed at the head of all the research work in the Department. He has great responsibilities, and at the present time has working under him a number of persons who are receiving $9,000 a year or more. The amendment proposes to pay him $9,200 a year. The proposed action would not result in the increase of any other person's compensation; but it is merely to avoid the very unfortunate situation, I think, of having the man who is the head of a bureau receive less money than is received by three or four of his subordinates.

Mr. LODGE. I am entirely disposed to accept the item, under the statement of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Virginia that this gentleman is an extremely able public servant; but I should like to know whether the item is to be used as a springboard and leader for conducting a program of the magnification of salaries for other persons in the Division in which he is serving.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I can assure the Senator that the item is only for the salary of Dr. Auchter. In fact, his salary should be $10,000, because a number of persons in the Department, doing work less important than his, are receiving $10,000 a year. However, the committee merely offered an amendment so as to have him paid slightly more than some of his subordinates are paid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia, on page 19, line 21.

The amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the committee, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 54, line 3, after the words "Chief Forester", it is proposed to insert "at $9,500 per annum."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment proposes to increase the salary of the Chief Forester so as to make it somewhat commensurate with the salaries of the heads of a number of other bureaus of the Department of Agriculture. The Bureau of Forestry is one of the principal agencies of the Department of Agriculture.

In answer to the inquiry previously made with respect to whether the proposed increase, if granted, would affect other salaries within the Department, let me say that possibly it would, depending upon what ratings the Civil Service Commission might make as to other subordinates; because I believe there is a relationship between the salary received by the head of a bureau and the salaries received by subordinates. However, whatever is done must be done under a recommendation by the Civil Service Commission. I should be glad to have printed in the RECORD a letter—I do not happen to have it with me—to indicate the attitude the Civil Service Commission would take with respect to the matter.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator what salary the Chief Forester now receives.

Mr. HAYDEN. He is paid $9,000.

Mr. LODGE. The amendment would increase his salary by $500; would it?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. So, if we do that, there is reason to believe that our action would be taken as a compelling reason for an increase of salary for others in the Bureau——

Mr. HAYDEN. It would be a justification for a request to the Civil Service Commission for some increases inside the Bureau. Whether the Civil Service Commission would allow such increases, I am not prepared to say, because that would depend upon the justification shown.

However, I did not want the Senate to adopt an amendment of this kind—one which might possibly have that effect, although not certain to do so—without making this statement.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, Mr. President, the thought also occurs to me—I realize it is not a fair question to ask if no Member of the Senate now present can answer it—that if we start piecemeal raising the salary of this official and of that official, our action will be taken as a precedent on the basis of which to raise the salaries of a number of other officials. Of course, everyone has had a cut; everyone in Congress has, in a manner of speaking, had a reduction of salary; and the present time is as good as any to face the question of whether we want to establish such a precedent.

Of course, with the inflationary tendencies which are abroad in the country, probably we are embarked on a program of altering the compensation of persons who are paid by the Government, and probably we shall not be able to alter it as fast as the cost of living increases. But I still have grave doubt about the advisability of taking a step of this kind. While I am sure the official referred to is a splendid man and a good public servant, and is entitled to the proposed increase, considering it on the basis of his individual case, nevertheless there are other factors of which we cannot be oblivious. Consequently, I should like the RECORD to show that, so far as I am concerned, I do not enthuse about this particular item. I do object to it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator desire to have the amendment go over until tomorrow.

Mr. LODGE. I do not want to have the RECORD show that the amendment was agreed to by unanimous consent, because I do not think it is proper.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that the amendment go over, with the other controversial amendments, until tomorrow.

Mr. HAYDEN. Very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk another noncontroversial amendment, which I offer and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 59, line 22, after the figure, it is proposed to insert "of which not to exceed $30,000 may be expended for the purchase of land adjacent to the present site of the Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, Wis."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the evidence disclosed that the land could be purchased for almost as much as is being paid by the Government in annual rental for land and buildings which are necessary for carrying on the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. The amendment would not increase the amount of the appropriation, but merely would enable the laboratory to spend $30,000 for the necessary land.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia. The amendment is agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 61, line 16, under the caption "Forest Fire Cooperation", and following the words "District of Columbia", it is proposed to insert "*Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize expenditures not to exceed $2,300,000 from this appropriation for preventing and suppressing forest fires on critical areas of national importance without requiring an equal expenditure by the State and private owners."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 65, after line 8, it is proposed to insert:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the War Food Administration to perform its functions, including those prescribed by Executive Orders 9280, 9322, 9328, and 9334, independently or in cooperation (by transfer of funds or otherwise) with public and private agencies and individuals, including not to exceed $10,000 per annum for an Administrator; other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; printing and binding; the purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; the purchase, operation, and main-

tenance (including two in the District of Columbia) of passenger-carrying vehicles; $25,000,000: *Provided*, That transfers of funds to other offices or administrative units in the Department with respect to which transfers of funds are otherwise authorized in this act shall be in addition to, and subject to the same restrictions as, the amounts provided therefor in the Budget schedules.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this item provides for the administrative expenses of the Division of Food Administration and Distribution. A Budget estimate came to the committee after the bill had passed the House. Mr. Chester Davis appeared before the committee and outlined the necessity for this administrative expense, and the purpose for which the money would be expended.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on what page is the amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment occurs on page 65, after line 8. A supplemental Budget estimate has been submitted for all the administrative expenses of the new Division of Food Administration and Distribution, to which Mr. Chester Davis was recently appointed.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to have it go over. I should like to see an itemized statement of the expense.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have it before me. Probably it would be easier to let the amendment go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, would the Senator care to make a statement now of the character of the expense? Does it include suboffices throughout the United States? What is the $25,000,000 for primarily?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it includes, not offices throughout the United States, but a committee in every agricultural county in the United States, to see that questions of priority for farmers for gasoline, tires, and farm equipment are promptly handled. I can conceive of no more important expenditure of public funds that could be made today than to do something to clear up the unspeakable confusion which now exists as the farmers of the country are trying to get machinery, gasoline for their tractors, and tires for their trucks and cars, in order to produce the food necessary for the war effort. It has been handled in a very haphazard fashion up to the present time. Mr. Davis is reorganizing that activity, and has already obtained an increase of more than 40 percent in the farm machinery available for the production of crops this year.

Mr. TAFT. I received a call from an officer of one of the leading farm organizations in Ohio, in which he protested against setting up a completely new bureau, and said that obviously, apparently—in Ohio, at least—a new Federal bureau under the Food Administration in every county seat in Ohio was contemplated.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had heard nothing about it.

Mr. TAFT. We already have three or four agricultural agencies. He felt very strongly that they could be combined, and that it would not be necessary to set up a completely new organization for this purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had not heard anything about setting up a completely new organization. This is an effort to consolidate the ones which are now in existence. We now have in each county a U. S. D. A. to deal with war efforts. There must be someone there to represent the Office of Defense Transportation. We also have the local A. A. A. committee. All of them have had some functions in connection with the program of increased food production and distribution.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator assure us that any of them will be abolished; or will they continue, and will we have in addition a new bureau?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot give the Senator any assurance, other than that which Mr. Davis gave the committee. He assured us that he would endeavor to simplify and coordinate the various committees throughout the country in order that confusion might be eliminated.

Mr. TAFT. My information is that in Ohio a new Agricultural Department bureau is being created in each of the Ohio county seats, leaving all the others in existence.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator has been misinformed. I shall be glad to obtain definite information and have it here tomorrow. The amendment has already gone over.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Georgia that he insert in the RECORD today a full explanation of the amendment, so that we may consider it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have before me a table which was submitted to the committee by Mr. Davis. I ask unanimous consent that the table, together with the statement submitted by the Bureau of the Budget requesting this appropriation, appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Rough approximation of supplementary financial requirements for War Food Administration, fiscal year 1944

	Total funds	Washington	Field (State)	County
Determination of total food requirements and assignment of allocations based on Nation's food supply; planning, preparation, administration, securing compliance and legal enforcement of food distribution orders; determining civilian food requirements, and administering nutrition and food conservation activities	$8,800,000			
Determination of requirements and development of programs for obtaining, distributing, and conserving farm and food industry supplies, facilities, and services	2,000,000			
Total	10,800,000	$5,330,000	$5,470,000	
Supervision, operation, and legal enforcement of farm machinery rationing, farm construction and repair permits, farm transportation permits; meat grading arising out of order that all beef, veal, and mutton be federally graded; issuance and enforcement of slaughter permits; and other enforcement work of this character which is almost certain to develop	13,600,000	200,000	1,600,000	$11,800,000
General administration	600,000	600,000		
Total	25,000,000	6,130,000	7,070,000	11,800,000

NOTE.—Division of funds by projects and spread by areas subject to rapidly changing conditions.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FISCAL YEAR 1944, AMOUNTING TO $25,000,000

(May 24, 1943.—Read; referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed)

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 20, 1943.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a supplemental estimate of appropriation, in the amount of $25,000,000, for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1944, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for said fiscal year.

The details of the estimate, the necessity therefor, and the reason for its transmission at this time are set forth in the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitted herewith, in whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF
THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1943.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for your consideration a proposed supplemental estimate of appropriation, in the amount of $25,000,000 for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1944, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for said fiscal year, as follows:

On page 299 of the Budget, in column 2, immediately preceding the head "Commodity Credit Corporation," insert the following new item of appropriation:

"WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES, WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the War Food Administration to perform its functions, including those prescribed by Executive Orders 9280, 9322, 9328, and 9334, independently or in cooperation (by transfer of funds or otherwise) with public and private agencies and

individuals, including not to exceed $10,000 per annum each for an Administrator and a total of 8 deputy, assistant, and associate administrators; other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; printing and binding; the purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; the purchase, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; $25,000,000: *Provided,* That transfers of funds to other offices or administrative units in the Department with respect to which transfers of funds are otherwise authorized in this act shall be in addition to, and subject to the same restrictions as, the amounts provided therefor in the Budget schedule—$25,000,000."

The War Food Administration was created by Executive Order 9334, dated April 19, 1943, for the purpose of administering the Nation's war food program. Included among the responsibilities placed under this agency are: (1) The determination of the total food requirements and assignment of allocations based on available food supplies; (2) planning, preparation, administration, securing compliance and legal enforcement of food distribution orders; (3) providing for adequate food industry facilities and their effective utilization; (4) civilian food requirements, nutrition, and conservation; (5) determination of requirements and development of programs for obtaining, distributing, and conserving farm supplies, facilities and services; (6) supervision, operation, and legal enforcement of farm-machinery rationing, farm construction and repair permits, farm transportation permits, and related war activities; (7) the elimination of black markets, involving issuance of slaughter permits; and (8) meat grading arising out of requirements that all beef, veal, and mutton be federally graded. To meet the expenses of the War Food Administration for the fiscal year 1944, the funds herein recommended will be required.

The foregoing supplemental estimate of appropriation is made necessary by reason of contingencies which have arisen since the transmission of the Budget for the fiscal year 1944. I recommend that it be transmitted to Congress.

Very respectfully,

HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 70, line 11, after the words "this item", it is proposed to insert *"Provided further,* That such amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1943, 1944, and 1945 programs under said act of February 29, 1936, as amended; for the reimbursement of any Federal, State, or local Government agency for fertilizers, seeds, lime, trees, or other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, furnished by such agency; and for the payment of all expenses necessary in making such grants, including all or part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on what page is this amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Page 70, line 11.

Mr. BYRD. That amendment has already been passed over.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President. This amendment has not been passed over. This language has been in the appropriation act for years, and was stricken out on a point of order in the other House.

Mr. BYRD. But that section was passed over.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understood that we passed over the amendments which had been proposed to that section, not that we were prohibited from offering amendments to it. If the Senator wishes to have this amendment go over, I have no objection, but I cannot see why there should be any objection to it. The language has been in the appropriation act for years. As I have said, it went out on a point of order in the House of Representatives. This identical language is in the act under which we are operating at the present time. It was in the act the previous year. It merely provides that the Department may, where the farmers desire it, let the farmer buy seeds, lime, and things of that kind to carry on soil-conservation practices, and deduct the cost thereof from his payments at the end of the year.

Mr. BYRD. That explanation is satisfactory. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia is agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 70, line 11, after the words "the item", it is proposed to insert *"Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1943 carry out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who comply with the terms and conditions of the 1943 agricultural conservation program, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments, or to retain payments heretofore made, for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this language has been in the act for a number of years. It was reported by the House committee this year, and went out on a point of order on the floor of the House. Briefly, this is what it means:

There are a few cases throughout the country of small farms in forest areas and on other federally owned lands. Those isolated farms in the national forests are rented to farmers. Under a peculiar construction of the conservation laws, without this language, a person who is farming on forest land or other land owned by the Government cannot receive any of the soil conservation benefits, even though he complies in full with the program. This language simply puts a man who happens to be on Federal land in the same position as those on private land, and enables him to participate in the program. It has been in the act for years, and I think it has relieved some injustice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia is agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 75, line 23, after the word "Service", it is proposed to insert "and for sale and distribution to other Government activities, the cost of such supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (including the cost of transportation and handling) to be reimbursed to appropriations current at the time additional supplies, materials, or equipment are procured from the appropriations chargeable with the cost or value of such supplies, materials, or equipment."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this is another legislative provision which has been in the act for a number of years. It was stricken out on a point of order. It is under the subhead of the Soil Conservation Service. This is the reason for the language:

At the present time the Soil Conservation Service has some warehouses and storage facilities which are in isolated areas. It permits the Forest Service and other field organizations to use its facilities, and is reimbursed by the Forest Service. If this language is not in the act, it will be necessary for the Forest Service to establish its own storage facilities. This amendment is in the interest of economy and efficiency in Government operation, and I can conceive of no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia is agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 78, after line 12, it is proposed to insert:

EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, funds appropriated by or for the purposes of section 32 of said act shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the maintenance, expansion, and operation of a school milk and lunch program under clause (2) of said section 32: *Provided,* That such funds shall be available for such purposes during the fiscal year 1944 without regard to the requirement therein relating to the encouragement of domestic consumption.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this is a modification of an amendment which was proposed by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] relating to the school-lunch program. I have already undertaken to explain it. The amendment is offered to obviate any question of the legality of carrying on the school-lunch and school-milk program for the year 1944. I wish to point out, however, that it is confined to the year 1944 and does not give the school-lunch program any permanent status under section 32. I ask all Senators who are interested in the continuation of the school-lunch program to take note of that fact in order that they may be encouraged to submit this question as a legislative proposition.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. What would be the cost of carrying out the provisions of the Senator's amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. The approximate cost would be $59,000,000 for the coming year.

Mr. BYRD. Does the amendment provide equal distribution of the fund?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; there is no rule for distribution. That is what I have been inveighing against—the fact that this whole system has just grown up and there is no uniformity about it.

Mr. BYRD. Does the amendment make any provision for contributions from localities?

Mr. RUSSELL. No such provision is made. However, the committee has made a provision in the report that is binding upon the Administrator, and has stated that in no case should the contribution from the Federal Government exceed the cost of food used in preparing the luncheons. In other words, the several schools would have to defray all the expense of the equipment and all the expenses of those who conduct the activity.

Mr. BYRD. Would there be any objection to writing that into the amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be very difficult to do that. It sounds like a simple proposition, and if the Senator from Virginia can prepare language which will not make it too cumbersome, I shall be glad to accept it. We have never had any trouble with this particular Bureau not carrying out the injunctions of the Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Georgia tell us who actually administers the school-lunch program, and decides how much every school is to receive?

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman's name is Roy F. Hendrickson. He is Director, Food Distribution Administration, which has taken the place of the old Surplus Commodities Corporation.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Insofar as the committee has been able to determine from going into the matter, Mr. Hendrickson has done a very fine job, considering that he has had to proceed without the slightest definition of policy from the Congress. I think he has done a magnificent job, when it is considered that he is dealing with thousands of schools scattered throughout the country, and with all kinds of pressure made upon him. He has insisted at all times on the policy of local participation and local contribution. I think he has done a good job, but I do not think it is fair to give any Federal employee this much money and tell him to carry out a program without giving any legislative direction as to how the program should be carried out.

Mr. BYRD. Has the amount been increased?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; there is a substantial increase in the funds available for next year over those available for the present year. As I stated a few moments ago, there is one very sound reason for that. These projects grew up by the use of funds which were turned over by the Surplus Commodities Corporation, and the labor of the W. P. A. The W. P. A. has been liquidated and that expense has been placed in the local subdivisions of government to furnish all the employees who prepare the lunches and handle the lunches, and who collect from the children. It is using a misnomer to call them free lunches, for they are not free.

In practically all the schools a charge is made to all children who are able to pay some nominal amount for the luncheons. There is a great deal of administration, and all expense incident thereto has been placed upon the local school authorities, and I do not think improperly so. I think they should bear it. We took that situation into consideration in increasing the amount of the Federal contribution for food. The price of food has gone up, too, and even with the increase which has been recommended, I doubt that there will be much increase in the amount of food and milk to be made available for the use of the schools in carrying out the program.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to thank the able Senator from Georgia for his excellent explanation of this particular phase of the appropriation bill. I am very much interested in it because the city of Chicago would be vitally affected by the adoption of this amendment. I wish it understood, however, that my amendment does not in any way provide for any increase in the amount. The only purpose of my amendment is definitely to advise the department officials that they will have the right to go ahead and continue to do what they have been doing heretofore.

Mr. RUSSELL. There was involved a very serious legal question as to whether they had the right to do it, because heretofore they had been dealing with surpluses of agricultural commodities. Now there is no surplus. Unless an amendment following the line of that suggested by the Senator from Illinois were adopted, this whole program might be stricken down by a ruling of the Comptroller General of the United States, or by action of a court somewhere. The effect of the Senator's amendment would not be to increase the amount available, because it does not deal with that, but it would clarify the legal status of the program and make sure that there would be ample legal authority to continue the program in 1944. In my opinion, there is a very grave doubt as to the legal authority for continuation of the program under the present circumstances unless the amendment shall be adopted.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator very much. My reason for offering the amendment was that the Senator from Illinois had received information from the Department that unless Congress clarified the situation up by an amendment there would possibly be a ruling which would prohibit it from spending any of the money for school luncheons under the present arrangement.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Georgia know whether it was the intention of the Surplus Commodities Corporation to take over a great number of the W. P. A. staff, which is being legislated out of existence?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; none of these funds can go to the W. P. A. staff that has been preparing food and serving it, because the funds are limited to the purchase and handling of food for the schools.

Mr. TAFT. I understood the Senator to say the purpose of the increase is to pay for the things for which the W. P. A. has paid up to this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; I did not intend to say that. I said there were two reasons why increased funds were recommended by the Budget.

The first reason is that the abolition of the W. P. A. had increased the expenses to the local sponsors so that the sponsors could not buy as much food as in the past. Only about 40 percent of this program is represented in the cost of the food. The remainder is in necessary personal services and equipment. Under the report which we have made, the funds would be limited to the purchase of food. So, under the national average of 40 percent, even with a billion dollars available, if they heeded that national average, they could not spend more than 40 percent in connection with any one project.

The other reason why there has been an increase is because the cost of food has tremendously increased, as the Senator knows. As a matter of fact, we intended to prohibit the taking over of the functions which had heretofore been performed by the W. P. A. employees as they related to the preparation and handling of food in the schools. There has been an entirely new program adopted. Instead of sending out food to the several schools, as used to be done in the past, when surpluses were available now they check on what the school buys and pay for a part of the food thus purchased.

Mr. TAFT. There are, of course, no surplus foods any more.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are no surplus foods that I know anything about.

Mr. TAFT. The former method of disposing of surplus food has now become a Federal program to feed school children.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, for the year 1944. That is what I was pointing out and complaining of when I first discussed the matter.

Mr. TAFT. Was the question dealt with in more detail in the hearings?

Mr. RUSSELL. There were rather extensive hearings in the committee. We did not print all the testimony in our hearings, but in the Senate committee hearings and in the House hearings I think the Senator will find a very thorough statement of the matter.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator be willing to allow this item to go over until tomorrow?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to that being done.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know that I shall discuss it, but I should like to find out more about it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I shall take but a few moments to give my view about the school-lunch program, which, as the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Ohio have said, originated because we had a surplus of foods and also because we had a surplus of labor. The surplus of foods and the people who were on W. P. A. were combined to create the school-lunch program. It has been a marvelous program in a great many ways, and certainly it would be a harsh thing to cut it right off when so many school children have become dependent upon it; but this amendment, as the Senator from Georgia has very frankly said, is a stopgap, and that is all it should be. It is not sound, in my opinion, for the Congress to appropriate $59,000,000 and turn it over to an official in the department to allocate in any way he desires. I believe there is sufficient ingenuity and ability in the Congress to devise a formula or precept and embody it in a legislative bill which will establish the school-lunch program on a proper footing. The minute there are made available foods that can be allocated according to the whim of one official in Washington the tendency is immediately to provide foods for places where he happens to like certain individuals and not to provide them for places where he does not like those in charge, and he becomes more or less a kingmaker.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator find any evidence in the House hearings or in the testimony taken by the Senate committee to indicate that this program has been administered on that basis?

Mr. LODGE. No; none at all, so far as the school-lunch program is concerned. If I gave that impression, I misspoke myself; but I think in the early days of Federal relief there was a great deal of that. I cannot give specific instances now, but it was a matter of common knowledge that a certain mayor who stood in very well with those in control would get a good deal more per capita for the people of his city than the people in another city would get.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator will yield further, I was apprehensive that the inference might be drawn from his statement that there had been some such unjustified practices and policies in connection with the school-lunch program. The Senator from Wisconsin is so anxious to make sure that that program shall not be cut off and that Congress shall have time to pass enabling legislation that I think Senators reading the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts or those who heard them might come to the conclusion that he had found something to criticize in the manner in which Mr. Hendrickson had been endeavoring to carry out the program.

Mr. LODGE. I am delighted to assure the Senator that there is nothing of that kind at all. Everything we found out about Mr. Hendrickson's administration of the school lunch program was entirely favorable; but I think this program is too important, and it is going to mean too much as time goes on for it to rest on a discretionary basis of this kind. I think it is a subject of sufficient importance to be the topic of a legislative bill which will definitely enunciate congressional policy. I favor the amendment, but it is merely a stopgap; that is all it is.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I may say, if the Sentor will yield further, that I think the Senator from Georgia made it very clear that he was serving notice upon those interested in the school lunch program, both in and out of Congress, that this provision is only for 1 year, and that if they desire to see the program continued in the future they should get busy and present and press in the Congress legislation to authorize this type of program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly endeavored to express that view.

I may state further, Mr. President, that I do not think this program ought to be in the Department of Agriculture. It should be administered by the Federal Security Agency. Going further, I think we ought not to take section 32 funds to finance this program. The man who has the type of duties assigned to Mr. Hendrickson—and he is a very efficient public servant—should not be cluttered up with this program. Talk about a man having all this power, Mr. Hendrickson has never sought this power and authority, but it has been thrust on him. If anybody is to blame, it is the Congress. Congress ought to enact legislation on the subject.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator that if there is any one at fault in handling the program over a long period of years it has been the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have so indicated.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask how long this program has been going on?

Mr. RUSSELL. It has been going on for some time. As I recall, since 1933.

Mr. LUCAS. So for 8 years this type of program has been under way. Without the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, it would not have been possible for this type of program to continue without the Congress apparently knowing anything about it, or at least having this discussion; that is to say if the department wanted to pursue this same course in spending funds under section 32 as they did in the past, they could not have spent it for this kind of milk program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that I agree absolutely with the Senator, because, up to now, it has been disposing of agricultural surpluses, and there was ample authority under the law to spend section 32 funds, to dispose of all agricultural surpluses any way they saw fit, but today there are no agricultural surpluses in the United States. Without the amendment of the Senator from Illinois any citizen of the United States might have been able to stop this program if he had desired to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that there was a question of doubt as to whether or not they had authority to continue spending the money.

Mr. RUSSELL. They have changed the whole method of handling from that of furnishing agricultural products, and are now turning over the funds to the local trustees to defray part of the cost of the food. Without the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, I doubt very seriously whether they could have carried on the program.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator that it is very important that it be put on a solid foundation, but I am not condemning anybody in any department for not being able to do that or for not having had it done. That is the responsibility of the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say again that, if anybody is to blame for the present confusion, it is the Congress. We certainly cannot pass it off to anyone else.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I wish to state, after having given some thought to the matter, that I feel, as does the Senator from Georgia, that $59,000,000 is not a sufficient fund to run the program, and that the sooner the Congress of the United States sets up a permanent agency to care for the school-lunch program the better it will be for the children and the better it will be for the health, welfare, and happiness of future generations.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer a legislative amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 78, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

CONSUMERS' COUNSEL DIVISION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $150,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation made by section 12 (a), title I, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612), shall be available during the fiscal year 1944 to enable the Secretary to further perform the duty imposed upon him under applicable laws to protect the interests

of consumers with due regard to the maintenance of a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities adequate to meet consumer demand at prices fair to both producers and consumers, which sum shall be available for administrative expenses (including not to exceed $31,800 for printing and binding) in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of the aforesaid section 392, but without regard to the limitations prescribed in subsection (b) thereof.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I interject an inquiry?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, the amendment proposes legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it proposes legislation.

Mr. McNARY. Did the committee authorize the Senator to offer the amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee authorized and instructed me to offer this language from the floor. It had been in the bill in the House, the House committee having put it in the bill, but it was stricken out on a point of order.

There is rather a peculiar situation, when we get funds for a consumers activity out of section 32 funds, but it has been financed in that method in the past. The amount of the appropriation we are suggesting is $25,000 below the Budget estimate. The Budget estimate was $175,000, and we made the appropriation $150,000. The appropriation was recommended by the Budget, the House committee approved it, but it was stricken out on the floor of the House on a point of order, and I was instructed by the Senate committee to offer it as an amendment from the floor.

Mr. McNARY. I have often stated my objection to legislation so complex as this on an appropriation bill. Why should it not take the ordinary course, and go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and there receive the sanction of the committee, and an authorization, and then come in as a regular bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be delighted to have it take that course. As a matter of fact, I am not particularly interested in this appropriation. I did feel, however, that in this day, when the consumer is complaining somewhat about the prices of agricultural commodities, perhaps this little appropriation of $150,000 out of agricultural funds could properly be made to carry on an activity which had been followed in the past. I do not know whether it has ever been worth 2 cents to the consumer, I may say to the Senator from Oregon. I do not know of anything particularly spectacular that has ever been done by the organization effected to protect the consumer, but inasmuch as the organization was in the department, and was functioning, under a provision which had been placed in the law in the House of Representatives in times past, I offered the amendment as a floor amendment, under the instructions of the committee, in order that the work might not cease on the 1st of July.

Mr. McNARY. I do not think this item has ever had any separate legislative authority from the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course it has not; otherwise it would not be necessary to offer it as a legislative provision from the floor.

Mr. McNARY. I do not like to short circuit provision for anything important. Uniformly the practice is growing of offering legislative amendments to appropriation bills. It is not a good way to legislate, as I have said many times. I do not know anything about this particular item. I recall that one year it was carried in the appropriation bill, but I thought that in the meantime a legislative provision had been brought to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, either in the Senate or the House; but here we are asked to legislate on an appropriation bill for something which should be considered as a matter of policy by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That is my objection, not that I particularly object to this particular item. But every year this comes up in this fashion, and the Committee on Appropriations has not any authority to include such a provision. That committee does not make the proper inquiry, it has not the facilities for doing so. The matter should come before the appropriate legislative committee. I want this amendment to go over for today. I wish to read it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well, that ends the discussion of it. I wish to offer another legislative amendment. Does the Senator wish to insist on his objection to all of these legislative amendments?

Mr. McNARY. Sometimes, when I am in a better humor, I do not insist; but I do not like the practice, and I know the Senator does not.

Mr. RUSSELL. I dislike it very cordially, but I can see no other action to be taken, in view of what has transpired with regard to the bill. For example, here is a little item which legislatively permits the Secretary to require a bond of those under the jurisdiction of the Stockyards and Packers Act. Similar provision has been in the agricultural appropriation bill for some 10 or 12 years. The Department says it is absolutely essential, if we are to protect the producers of the United States. The provision was stricken out on the floor of the House on a point of order, because this year, for the first time in legislative history, the Committee on Rules of the House did not give the Committee on Appropriations a rule on the bill. Just because I object to the general policy of legislating on appropriation bills, I do not think I should stand aside and see as important a matter as this stricken down, so that when the Secretary cannot require bonds of the stockyards and packers to protect the producers of livestock, all these bonds will be invalidated on the 1st day of July, when the pending bill will become law if this amendment be defeated.

Mr. McNARY. The distinguished Senator recalls that in 1921 we passed what was known as the Stockyards and Packers Act. Why has the Secretary waited all these years to get appropriate legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret that I cannot answer the Senator's question.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, the Senator cannot. I want this amendment to go over, and to accompany the other one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

Mr. RUSSELL. All the other amendments I have to offer are legislative, I may say, if the Senator from Oregon objects to legislative amendments.

Mr. McNARY. I stated a moment ago that the Senator is always fair, and I try to be. If he has something in which negligence does not appear so impressive, probably we can work it out. What has he to offer?

Mr. RUSSELL. The language of all these amendments has been in the bill a number of years, and went out this year on a point of order on the floor of the House, and must be restored on the floor of the Senate if the provisions are to get back into the bill. I was not willing to assume responsibility for the Congress enacting legislation on all these questions between now and the 1st of July. These are very important matters. The custom of putting these items in appropriation bills may be a vicious one, but it is a custom which is hallowed by years of practice. They have been reported by the Budget year after year, and they have been approved by the House committee year after year, and year after year the House Committee on Rules has given the Committee on Appropriations a rule which protected it in the matter of these legislative items in the bill. Year after year these provisions come to us, and members of the Senate committee scarcely had realized the importance of some of these items in the bill, until this year, when they were stricken out on points of order on the floor of the House and we held extensive hearings in regard to them.

The amendment I hold in my hand is one with which the Senator is very familiar. It is one which permits the R. E. A. to borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds which are loaned to rural cooperatives throughout the country, rather than have a direct appropriation made by the Congress. Similar provision has been in the bill for a number of years, and this year it was stricken out on the floor of the House on a point of order.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that some of the amendments have the sanctity of age, but only this year the point has been raised that proper authorization has not been given for the appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true. However, the point has not been up in the Senate before.

Mr. McNARY. I am speaking of the other House.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. This year in the other House the standing Committee on Agriculture protested against the Committee on Rules giving the Committee on Appropriations a rule. The Senator may have read some of the rather acrimonious debate between the two committees in the other body, and the House proceeded to strip

the bill of all these items which did not have the sanction of basic legislation.

Some of the provisions are rather important. I have one in my hand, for example, which is legislation, which permits the Federal land bank to assess the various production-credit associations and the banks and cooperatives an amount sufficient to defray the expense of the audit of those enterprises. Such a provision has been in the bill for a number of years. If we do not add it to the bill this year, and the Congress should fail to legislate on the subject by the 1st of July, it would mean that we would have to make a deficiency appropriation of $2,140,000 to carry out the law requiring the audit of the land banks. This has been in the bill for years, providing that the Governor or the land bank should assess these various production-credit associations in an amount sufficient to defray the expense of their annual audits. This year the provision was stricken out. Either we must provide the means by legislation, or there will be a deficiency appropriation of $2,140,000.

I do not like legislation offered from the floor, but it seems to me to be thoroughly justified in a case of this kind. The bill has never been in this shape before. We have never had to offer all these legislative provisions. It is very seldom that I have offered such provisions in the past, because I do not like the practice, but I think most of these amendments are justified, and the greater number of them will save money to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. McNARY. Let me say to the Senator, that so far as I am personally concerned, these amendments may be taken up and the items included in the bill, if the Senator will notify these agencies that they must secure legislation before the provisions are acted on again.

Mr. RUSSELL. The House Committee on Agriculture is now conducting hearings on this matter, and considering the enactment of legislation which would cover the questions which are involved in these various points of order. However, I think it would be rather dangerous for us to act today on the assumption that such provision will be enacted into law by the 1st of July.

It seems to be a safer policy to replace them in the bill than to assume a number of bills carrying this authority in statutes can be enacted.

Mr. McNARY. No, Mr. President, for my part I am willing that these items be written into the bill, which is a procedure conformable to past practices, but I should like to have the Senator to tell me that in the future he will advise these Government agencies that they must obtain the proper authority from Congress before the items can again appear in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to do so, and I will state that I think that they should do so, because I believe they will be in a precarious condition next year if they do not sponsor proper legislation before the standing committees.

Mr. McNARY. I shall feel inclined, in whatever capacity I may serve next year, to make the objection as final if the items appear without authority of statute.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure that they will heed that suggestion from the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interject an observation at this point?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. GEORGE. A great many things have appeared in the appropriation bills of which the Committee on Agriculture had not the slightest jurisdiction. Extraneous matter has been placed in appropriation bills from year to year, and there are some very notable instances of embarrassment that flows from that practice. The only sound program is not to write legislation into an appropriation bill. If everything that is placed in an appropriation bill is matter over which the Committee on Agriculture has jurisdiction the situation might be different. But I can show the Senator where matters which are within the definite jurisdiction of the Finance Committee, and which affect our whole tax program, have been interjected into appropriation measures by amendment. Of course there was a good purpose to be served, and the Senate went along, or perhaps the House was to blame, but whoever was to blame for it, the only sound program is simply to adhere to the rules of the Senate and not place new legislation in appropriation bills.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as I have repeatedly stated, I think it is a very bad practice to legislate on appropriation bills as a general policy. I have seen times however when various minor matters could be cleared up by legislation, and I could see no objection to doing so. For example, a few minutes ago we approved an amendment which carried the provision "including the construction of temporary buildings at Beltsville." I do not know that the standing committees should be required to go into any very great detail concerning matters of that kind. I doubt if the standing committees would consider them if they were presented to them. Some of these amendments are very important, and I think they ought to have a legislative basis, but I do not believe that because in theory the Appropriations Committee should not legislate—and I might say that I do not bring such amendments into the Senate in the bill when I bring a bill to the floor. I offer such amendments from the floor as legislative provisions, and I stated on the floor today when offering each one of them, that each one was a legislative provision. I do not intend to cover up a legislative provision in the bill as I bring the bill to the floor. I offer such amendments from the floor. Legislation on appropriation bills may be a bad practice. But I do not believe that we can justify abandoning programs which are now in operation, some of them vitally affecting all the people of this country, dealing with the purity of the meats, dealing with the purity of the food we buy; I do not believe we can justify omitting provisions which have been contained in agricultural appropriation bills for years because such provisions are legislative.

Of course, the better practice is always to enact such provisions as separate legislation. But we are now in the last days of this fiscal year. The pending bill will be operative on the 1st of July. The Senate has the right if it sees fit to reject the amendments. Any Senator can offer a point of order against them if he wishes to do so, and if we cannot obtain a two-thirds vote in their behalf we cannot get the amendments placed in the bill. But for my part I am not going to assume the responsibility of wasting two or three million dollars out of the National Treasury for the purpose of auditing the cooperatives for example, when we can avoid it by a simple amendment here, merely because it happens to be legislative in character.

I am not going to say that the Secretary of Agriculture shall not be obliged to require a bond under the Packers and Stockyards Act when such bonds have been required under similar bills for a great many years, merely because provision to that end is legislation on an appropriation bill. We know that we are not going to pass legislation dealing with such matters between now and the 1st of July. Such provisions have been in agricultural appropriation bills before. Other Senators have seen them in appropriation bills long before I came to this body. Certainly the present time is as awkward a time as possible to strike such provisions out of a measure or reject them as any we could find, because we are several weeks later than we were last year in our consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I tried to make it plain that I am not going to object to the amendments. In view of the excellent statement made by the Senator from Georgia, I shall in all fairness withdraw the objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad the Senator has done so.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, the fact of the matter is that under the precedents, whenever the House enters into the field of legislation it has always been appropriate for the Senate to go through that open door and itself to legislate. Therefore it is only fair to say that as a matter of actual practice these particular items have to all intents and purposes had legislative sanction as a result of the long practice of incorporating them in the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Any Senator, under all the circumstances, would have been in a position to offer a point of order against these amendments had they been incorporated in the bill in the House. Therefore it seems to me that we are confronted, as a result of what occurred in

the House, with what might be termed "a very exceptional situation," and one of acute emergency. Therefore, while I agree with every word that has been said about the unwisdom of legislating on appropriation bills, in this particular instance it seems to me that the Senator from Georgia, the Appropriations Committee, and the Senate are justified in restoring these items, which really as a matter of fact went out not on their merits, but on the technical point of order raised in the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. And these items have been contained in similar bills for years. No one in the Senate has offered to strike them out of the bill when they came here in years gone by.

Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the Senator from Oregon, I will reoffer the two amendments which I offered on behalf of the committee, and which were just passed over.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator whether the amendments deal with any question of policy, or simply with matters of detail.

Mr. RUSSELL. They deal with matters of detail, but they do touch questions of policy. For example, the amendment to which I referred requires the Production Credit Associations to continue to defray the cost of their audits. If we were to stop that practice now, we would have to make a deficiency appropriation of $2,049,000 to pay for such audits. The credit agencies are amply able to pay for these audits. Most of them have done so for years. All of them have set up reserves to pay for the audits this year. But it is a policy which is contrary to the act creating the credit agencies.

Mr. GEORGE. It seems to me that we ought to go very slowly in adopting in an appropriation bill legislation which really deals with policy, sometimes a policy which is extremely important. Sometimes such items are placed in an appropriation bill, I may say to my colleague, solely because those who are interested in them can work them into the bill, but cannot get the items through the other committees, because when the naked policy is presented, it does not sound so good, but when it is tied in with a great many appropriations, and a great many persons and agencies are interested in them from various angles, those who present them are able to slip them through. I always entertained the view—and, because of my colleague's experience, I want to ask him if I am not correct in my understanding—that the Senate Appropriations Committee has the power and authority to reject anything coming to it from the House which is purely legislation on an appropriation bill. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course it has; the Senate Appropriations Committee can reject anything which comes from the House.

Mr. GEORGE. I mean on the ground that it is new legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; it is not subject to a point of order on that ground. Each House can take action based on a point of order only with respect to legislation originating in that body. Under the circumstances, legislation attached by the House to an appropriation bill is not subject to a point of order in the Senate or in the Senate committee.

Mr. GEORGE. I was asking if it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. No. If the House has attached legislation to an appropriation bill, and if no point of order was made against it in the House, the item is not subject to a point of order in the Senate. If the Senate attaches legislation to an appropriation bill and if the item goes to the House, it is not there subject to a point of order. I think there is a House rule against attaching legislation to an appropriation bill in a conference report.

However, if the House committee proposes legislation to an appropriation bill, and if no point of order is made against the item in the House, the matter is not subject to a point of order when it reaches the Senate.

Let me say that I do not think any of these amendments are tremendously important as representing a change of policy. If they do involve a change of policy, the departure is not made this year, because all the amendments have been contained in previous appropriation bills. Not one of them is new matter. All of them have been in the appropriation bills in years past.

So, instead of changing the policy which has been in effect during the year 1943, they would simply enable the Department to continue on the basis of the policy which has been in effect during the current year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 83, line 17, after the figure "$378,140", it is proposed to insert "*Provided*, That the Secretary may require reasonable bonds from every market agency and dealer, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to secure the performance of their obligations, and whenever, after due notice and hearing, the Secretary finds any registrant is insolvent or has violated any provisions of said act he may issue an order suspending such registrant for a reasonable specified period. Such order of suspension shall take effect within not less than 5 days, unless suspended or modified or set aside by the Secretary or a court of competent jurisdiction."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me ask my colleague to what marketing agencies and dealers the amendment relates?

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment is proposed to the section of the bill which deals with the appropriations for the enforcement of the Packers and Stockyards Act.

The witness before the committee testified as follows:

> That language has been carried in the appropriation act since the fiscal year 1925; and our experience has been, over the 19 years, that the elimination of this bonding provision would remove a great protection now afforded to livestock producers and shippers. Thousands of dollars have been paid out on these bonds, and there are now outstanding bonds totaling about $18,000,000. We increased the bonds a few months ago to take care of the present situation, and to provide some additional protection to livestock shippers.

Let me say to my colleague that the bonds are conditioned on the payment by the packer for the producer's stock when he ships it in on consignment. There have been many cases in which the farmer would ship his livestock to the stockyard, and the man who handled it would fail or would refuse to pay him. The bonds are conditioned on payment being made to the producers of the livestock and other protection to the shipping producer.

I read further from the testimony before the committee:

> The removal of the authority to suspend registrations also will impair the act considerably, because that means that no matter how flagrant the practice may be, or how fraudulent a practice may be, all we can do is to issue a cease-and-desist order. With this language we can do both and we did do both.
>
> We feel that the language which was eliminated on a point of order in the House is very important to the effective administration of this act. It has been in there for years; and time after time, as amendments to the act have been suggested, we have always included it along with other proposed amendments.

Mr. President, it seems that they have suggested this legislation to the standing committees, and some of the standing committees have failed to take cognizance of it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not presently attempting to discuss the merits of the particular amendment, but on the subject of a general appropriation bill—a bill which, until the last very few years, always has been protected from legislation—I have a question to propound relative to the Appropriations Committee, the only committee charged with responsibility for controlling appropriations: Is it entitled to take upon itself the proposing of legislation to an appropriation bill, simply because it says the standing committee having jurisdiction of the subject has not seen fit to deal with it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was instructed by the committee to take up the matter on the floor of the Senate, because of the fact that if the amendment were not agreed to, great losses can be caused among the producers of livestock, who for 19 years have handled the matter in the way in which it would be handled if the amendment were agreed to. No Member of the Senate is subject to taking orders from the Appropriations Committee, of course. Any Senator can make a point of order against the amendment. If the Senator from Missouri desires to make the point

of order, he is at liberty to do so, of course.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I am endeavoring to arrive at some explanation of the remarkable development which, in the last few years, has occurred in both the House and the Senate, with the Appropriations Committees of the two bodies suddenly commencing to take jurisdiction of every possible legislative subject. For many years no rule was more strictly and religiously enforced than the rule against legislation on a general appropriation bill. In the House, in the last 4 or 5 years, there suddenly has developed a practice of having the Appropriations Committee report legislation, if necessary getting a special rule from the Committee on Rules. That procedure keeps the item from being subject to a point of order in the Senate, and makes it subject to any germane amendment which any Member of the Senate may choose to offer to it. I think that practice is a very bad one.

As to this particular amendment, I am inclined to think, as I say, that the legislation should be passed. I do not think it is properly a part of a general appropriation bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I just stated that all the amendments being offered have been carried in the appropriation bills for years, and are offered here only in the effort to prevent a change at this late date in the fiscal year. Personally, I do not like legislation on an appropriation bill; and, as a general proposition, when legislative matters are proposed in the Appropriations Committee, I have voted against them. But as I have stated previously, in this case the committee culled through the provisions which were stricken on a point of order on the floor of the House, and we offered those which we felt were absolutely essential for the carrying on of the program of the Department. The Senator from Missouri states that the policy of offering legislation on an appropriation bill has grown up in the last 4 or 5 years. The provision we are now discussing has been in similar bills for 19 years; and certainly now, when it has been stricken out on the floor of the House on a point of order, I believe the Senate committee was entitled to submit it, and that it was due the producers and consumers of the country to have the item offered on the floor of the Senate, and to let the Members of the Senate vote either for or against it, or let some Senator make a point of order against it.

I am not attempting to take advantage of anyone in respect to these legislative provisions; and, so far as I am concerned, any Senator who wishes to do so is at liberty to make a point of order against it, and to have it stricken from the bill.

These items are now a part of the integral policy relative to dealing with the Stock Yards Act and other acts affected thereby. As I have said, one of them is to permit the R. E. A. to borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The item is legislation which has been in similar bills for years. However, any Member of the Senate can make a point of order when the amendment is offered. I have carried out my responsibilities to the committee by offering the amendment on the floor. I think it would be a very short-sighted policy as to this bill, when we find that this year, for the first time in many years, the Committee on Rules would not give a rule to the House Appropriations Committee, to say that now, on this important amendment, not in the sense of representing any upheaval in the administration in the Department of Agriculture, but in affording the protection the people must have, we should not offer the amendments. I think we are justified in offering the amendments, and I am not willing to assume the responsibility of not doing all within my power to see that the various acts are carried out as effectively as possible. I do not like legislation on an appropriation bill, but I certainly think we had some responsibility when the bill came to us with items which had been in the act for 19 years stricken at the whim of one Member of the House. Those provisions ought to be voted on somewhere, or some Senator ought to make the point of order against them on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not think it is altogether the fault of the Appropriations Committee. The discussion so far has placed the blame on the Appropriations Committee. Most of these provisions have been contained in appropriation bills for years. The appropriate committees dealing with the various subjects must have some knowledge of that fact, and yet they have taken no action whatever, either against such legislation or in favor of it; nor have they taken up the subject matter in order to provide proper legislation. So the Appropriations Committee is in the situation that unless it does something, nothing will be done. Therefore it has had to continue these legislative provisions, because the appropriate committees of the Senate have not taken any action.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I have not the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator from Georgia yield to me for the purpose of replying to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield if the Senator from Louisiana wishes.

Mr. OVERTON. I shall be glad to have the Senator yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator's own statement certainly indicates that in this particular case the Appropriations Committee has usurped the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator says that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry probably ought to have known about this matter, but that it did not legislate on the subject, and therefore the Appropriations Committee had to legislate. Why does the Appropriations Committee have to legislate if the appropriate committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter has not proposed any legislation? Is the Appropriations Committee a catch-all to supervise other standing committees of the Senate, and fill in the gaps?

Mr. OVERTON. No. My objection to the argument of Senators who aline themselves on the opposite side is that they go to the other extreme. The Senator from Missouri now asks, "Is the Appropriations Committee a catch-all to legislate on every subject matter?" It is not. It puts in the appropriation bill only such legislative provisions as are necessary administratively to carry into effect the appropriations contained in the bill. That is the general practice when nothing has been done about it. Of course, in this particular instance, if the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry were to take cognizance of the matter and enact some legislation as a guide to the Appropriations Committee, the Appropriations Committee would follow it; but when it does absolutely nothing, and administratively it is necessary that something be done in order that the appropriation bill may be carried into execution administratively, then it is done. That is the way I view the question.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. I think all this confusion has arisen because of the change from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to the Appropriations Committee of jurisdiction over agricultural appropriation bills. That change was made a comparatively few years ago. Formerly agricultural appropriation bills came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We were supposed to know something about agriculture. They now go before a body of men who know very little about agriculture. There we are. When questions arise, the Appropriations Committee invites, not the farmers, but those interested in the appropriation, to appear before the committee. I believe that the system is working a detriment to the agricultural appropriation bill. It is in the hands of men who know nothing about the real merits of the subjects discussed. So far as I am concerned, with the exception of the few items which I try to save, I have lost interest in the agricultural appropriation bill.

I thought it appropriate to invite the attention of the Senate to the change which has been made in handling the agricultural appropriation bills.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I recall, when I first came to the Senate in 1917, the various legislative committees considered the appropriation bills. Later the Senate, by rule, changed the system. Now certain members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the ranking members of the committee, are asked to sit with the Appropriations Subcommittee and the full committee to pass on items in agricultural appropriation bills.

The Senator from South Carolina may be correct. I do not know who should consider the appropriation bills, but I do not think he is justified in his criticism of the Appropriations Committee as not knowing anything about agriculture.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I placed the members of the Appropriations Committee in the same category as members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate. We are supposed to look after the agricultural interests. That is the reason why our committee is called the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. But when it comes to an appropriation, that is sent to another committee. We are supposed to know the agricultural situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say, on behalf of the chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which handles the agricultural appropriation bill, that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has been chairman of that subcommittee for a number of years. I have never known a man who studied agriculture more faithfully to serve the best interests of the farmers as he sees it, than has the Senator from Georgia. I do not always agree with him; but whether I do or not, he is a remarkable head of a subcommittee, and I wish to bear testimony to that effect.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator; but he is not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; but I do not see that that has anything to do with this question.

Mr. SMITH. I hardly ever see the Senator present at sessions of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am fairly regular in my attendance. I have been a member of the committee for only a short while, but I venture to say that I have attended more meetings of the full committee this year than has the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator must have attended at night; I have been there most of the time. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. I have attended meetings of the full committee with considerable regularity. The committee has some subcommittees functioning. I do not attend the subcommittees of which I am not a member. Neither does any other Senator. I do attend the meetings of the full committee.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have no criticism to make of the Senator from Georgia. He has done splendid work. However, I think it was a mistake to take the agricultural appropriation bill away from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I do not know that we could have done as well with it as has the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the Senator from South Carolina what agency in the Senate took that power away from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. SMITH. I suppose the Senator from Illinois was a party to it. I do not know.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee. I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SMITH. I do not know who took it away.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senate of the United States took it away.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senate of the United States took the power away from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. McKELLAR. As I remember, that is true.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not a member of either of these committees, but I wish to say that the policy of centering the appropriation bills in the Appropriations Committee was adopted in 1921 or 1922.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was adopted in 1919.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I accept the correction. It was adopted in 1919, and has been the policy and the rule of the Senate ever since.

I merely wish to say that I think the Senator from Georgia and the other members of the subcommittee handling the agricultural appropriation bill are not only entirely familiar with the subject matter of that bill but they constitute one of the most diligent and efficient subcommittees before which it has ever been my privilege to appear. I think no one will challenge the statement that the Senator from Georgia shows extraordinary familiarity with all the details, as well as the fundamental policies, which are involved in the agricultural appropriation bill.

I wish to have it appear in the RECORD that it is the opinion of the Senator from Wisconsin that the Senator from Georgia handles the agricultural appropriation bill, which is one of the most important measures with which we have to deal, with as great skill as is displayed by any other Member of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I will not be put in the position of criticizing the Senator from Georgia. I suppose there are many persons who could administer medicine as well as a doctor can; but when we have a doctor we send for him.

I do not care to be put in the position of criticizing the Senator from Georgia. I am criticizing the principle involved.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from South Carolina that I did not take his statement as criticism of me. Of course, I was not a Member of this body when the change in policy was made. Since I became a member of the Appropriations Committee I have discharged the responsibilities placed upon me to the best of my ability.

Mr. SMITH. I understood the change was made in about 1919. That was about 40 years after I became a Member of the Senate. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 78, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

CONSUMERS' COUNCIL DIVISION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $150,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation made by section 12 (a), title I, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612), shall be available during the fiscal year 1944 to enable the Secretary to further perform the duty imposed upon him under applicable laws to protect the interests of consumers with due regard to the maintenance of a continucus and stable supply of agricultural commodities adequate to meet consumer demand at prices fair to both producers and consumers, which sum shall be available for administrative expenses (including not to exceed $31,800 for printing and binding) in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of the aforesaid section 392, but without regard to the limitations prescribed in subsection (b) thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read. It is the last amendment which I wish to have acted upon, with the exception of those which have been passed over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 86, line 16, after the words "Farm Credit Administration" and before the semicolon, it is proposed to insert "*Provided*, That the requirement (12 U. S. C. 952) that Federal land banks and joint stock land banks shall be examined at least twice each year is hereby modified so that such examinations need be made only once each year: *Provided further*, That the expenses and salaries of employees engaged in such examinations shall be assessed against the said corporations, banks, or institutions in accordance with the provisions of existing laws except that the amounts collected from the Federal land banks, joint stock land banks, and Federal intermediate credit banks pursuant to the Act of July 17, 1916, as amended (12 U. S. C. 657), shall be covered into the Treasury and credited to a special fund, and the Administration shall estimate the cost to the Farm Credit Administration of the administrative supervision of the Federal land banks, the banks for cooperatives, the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the production credit corporations for the fiscal year 1944 and shall apportion the amount so determined among such banks and corporations on such equitable basis as said Administration shall

determine, and shall assess and collect such amounts in advance from such banks and corporations and the amount so collected shall be covered into the Treasury and credited to said special fund, which fund is hereby made available to said Administration for expenditure for the purposes set forth in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That as soon as practicable after June 30, 1944, said Administration shall determine, on a fair and reasonable basis, (1) the cost of the examination services rendered during the fiscal year 1944 to each Federal land bank, joint stock land bank, and Federal intermediate credit bank and (2) the amount which fairly and equitably should be allocated to each Federal land bank, bank for cooperatives, Federal intermediate credit bank, and production credit corporation as the cost during the fiscal year 1944 of their administrative supervision, and if the sum of these two items in any case is greater than the total amount collected from the bank or the corporation concerned, the difference shall be collected from such bank or corporation or, if less, shall be refunded from said special fund to the bank or the corporation entitled thereto."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will permit, I believe that this amendment should go over until tomorrow, because it is too complicated to be understood by anyone not familiar with it. I should like to have it go over until tomorrow so that in the meantime I may have an opportunity to examine it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have nothing further in the way of amendments to propose to the pending bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Ulysses S. Guyer, late a Representative from the State of Kansas, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of the foregoing resolutions, the Speaker had appointed Mr. HOPE, Mr. REES of Kansas, Mr. CHENOWETH, and Mr. RIZLEY members of a committee, to join with such members of the Senate as may be appointed, to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

The message announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. MERRITT, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. HARNESS of Indiana were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 133) to permit additional sales of wheat for feed, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I understand that the Senator from Louisiana wishes to bring up the naval appropriation bill. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Nye
Andrews	Green	O'Daniel
Austin	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hayden	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Reynolds
Bone	Holman	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Buck	La Follette	Shipstead
Bushfield	Langer	Smith
Byrd	Lodge	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tunnell
Connally	McNary	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maloney	Van Nuys
Eastland	Maybank	Wheeler
Ellender	Mead	Wherry
Ferguson	Millikin	White
George	Moore	Willis
Gerry	Murray	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT AND THE NAVAL SERVICE

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2713, making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think that the Senate may rapidly complete the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, and, so far as I am concerned, I have no objection.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection. I am anxious to dispose of all the appropriation bills. Will the Senator from Louisiana make a brief statement concerning the bill?

Mr. OVERTON. I expect to occupy about 15 or 20 minutes in doing so.

Mr. McNARY. Very well, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the naval appropriation bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. OVERTON. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, this bill as reported to the Senate carries the sum $24,850,427,198, making it the largest naval appropriation bill which has ever been considered by the Senate. It exceeds the appropriation for 1943, which, up to that time, had been the largest naval appropriation bill considered by the Senate, by $1,215,819,417. Notwithstanding this fact, the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations is $4,808,906,802 under the estimates, and as reported by the committee there is in the bill a reduction of $2,613,260,000 as compared to the amount provided in the bill as it passed the House of Representatives.

This reduction, however, is more apparent than real. The reduction is what may be considered a paper reduction, because the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has transferred from cash appropriations certain items which will net be expended during 1944 and has converted them into the category of contract authority. The contract authority so transferred amounts to the sum of $2,786,800,000.

In addition to that, certain items which appeared in the House bill could be regarded as deficiency items, and, since the Senate committee has placed all deficiency items under a separate title, title II, of the bill, there has been a further reduction in the cash appropriations under title I of the bill.

Mr. President, before presenting the details of the bill, I should like to discuss the current status of the Navy with respect to prior authorizations granted to the Navy Department by Congress. Since June 30, 1940, to date, the total has been $68,800,000,000. If the amount proposed to be appropriated by this bill is approved, eliminating funds in it, approximating $10,000,000,000, to liquidate prior contract authority, we will have $22,800,000,000 more, or a total of $91,700,000,000.

The Senate has heretofore, especially when the last regular naval appropriation bill was before it, been interested in the obligation status of naval appropriations and in the cash balances. By June 30, excluding this bill, there will remain unobligated $1,374,639,450. This total consists of two items of contract authority and two items of cash. The first item is under the appropriation "Armor, Armament, and Ammunition," the shipbuilding appropriation, which material will be contracted for by the Bureau of Ordnance in time to have it delivered to the ships when required.

The other is an item of $65,000,000, which is a part of contract authority for the construction of floating drydocks, which was granted in the amount of $210,000,000. There has not been time to place these orders, as the authority was not received until the last day of March.

The two cash items consist of $10,000,000 under "Pay, Marine Corps," an overestimate for family allowances, which will revert to the Treasury on the last day of this fiscal year, and an item for "Care of lepers, Guam," in the amount of $39,450, which amount will also be returned to the Treasury since Guam is in the possession of the enemy. So much for unobligated balances of authority on June 30, exclusive, of course, of this bill.

As to cash on hand at the present time, which has been obligated to pay the bills, on June 30, the cash credit in the Treasury for the Navy Department, all obligated against old bills, will be $15,245,000,000. All this will be obligated by the end of the fiscal year. Of this sum of $4,300,000,000 is owed on 1942 contracts; $3,900,000,000 is owed on contracts made this year so far, and $2,000,000,000 will be obligated on contracts being effected between May 1 and the 30th of June.

This cash credit is not in the hands of the Navy Department; it is simply to the credit of the Navy Department on the books of the Treasury, and as the Navy requires the money to meet contractual obligations it makes requisitions on the Treasury, usually about twice a month, to obtain the necessary funds. So there is not that much cash, $15,245,000,000, in the hands of the Treasury, but that amount is in the hands of the Treasury with which to meet obligations heretofore contracted or that will be contracted in the future for which appropriations have been made, and, as I have said, at the end of the fiscal year all that $15,245,000,000 will have been obligated.

The cash expenditures of the Navy are running over $2,000,000,000 a month. As a matter of fact, the March figure was $2,292,000,000, and the April figure will be in excess of that. Moreover, the obligations likewise are running over $2,000,000,000 a month. In February they amounted to $2,705,000,000, in March $2,283,000,000. The April figure will be approximately $3,000,000,000.

This means that the expenditure and obligation curves are running somewhat parallel, which I think is a healthy condition, showing that the expenditures are keeping pace with the obligations as they are incurred. Of course, unless they are financed for cash beyond the appropriation year, the Department should in theory each year conclude the year with no cash on hand. However, that is, of course, impracticable, and as a rule they must have some cash on hand carried over.

The House made a departure in this bill in that it included in the aviation program contract authority in the amount of $2,000,000,000 against an aviation program. It was developed at the hearing that it would be practicable to place further contract authority in the bill, which would mean that this authority, which would pay off obligations incurred in the fiscal year 1944, would be liquidated in the fiscal year 1945. I explained that in the opening of my remarks.

Under the caption "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships," we have taken $560,000,000 out of the cash appropriation appearing in the bill as it passed the House and placed that amount under contract authority, because it is not contemplated that that amount will be expended until after the end of the coming fiscal year.

The other item is in "Ordnance and ordnance stores," in which item we have taken out of cash and put under contract authority $2,226,800,000.

The Senate committee thought that was the more logical way of making appropriations. It is going back to the form in which appropriations were made up to a comparatively few years ago, when the House began to make the appropriations in cash, although the expenditures were not to be made during the next fiscal year. The whole matter will come up in conference, I presume, and the better mode of making appropriations will be discussed in conference.

As to title I, the 1944 naval appropriation bill proper, the appropriations as they came from the House carried cash of approximately $27,500,000,000 plus $2,000,000,000 of contract authority. The bill which the Senate is now considering contains in title I cash in the amount of $24,600,000,000, and in direct contract authority $4,800,000,000.

In title II there are supplemental and deficiency items in the amount of $173,539,000, forwarded by the President under date of May 22, and one deficiency item removed from title I in the amount of $28,900,000. These deficiency items of $173,000,000 were sent by the Bureau of the Budget to the Senate committee immediately after we had closed the hearings on the last deficiency bill. They would logically have gone into that deficiency bill, but, since the committee had closed its hearings on the deficiency bill, we took them up, and we have placed them under a separate title—title II—which deals solely with deficiencies in the present fiscal year.

Excluding the deficiencies included in Senate Document No. 55, the net change in authority, as between the House and Senate bills, is only $1,000.

I wish to say that I think the House of Representatives and the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House did splendid work with the bill. They examined very carefully into every item of appropriation, and we did not find it necessary to make any changes in the amounts, with the exception of one trivial sum of $1,000.

The major items in the 1944 Navy bill are, a program of additional aircraft construction for the Navy, which in this bill amounts to $4,943,725,000 and which provides for 27,642 new aircraft. It projects the aircraft procurement program to June 30, 1945.

When this money has been provided, the Congress will have appropriated to the Navy for the fiscal years 1940 to 1944, inclusive, for 82,714 planes. The actual aircraft procured by the Navy, due to adjustments which have occurred since 1941, including lend-lease, will number over 92,000.

Other major items in the bill are increases in vessels and aircraft operating and in the number of craft under construction. As the new Director of War Mobilization has said, the size of the Navy afloat will be doubled during the current calendar year. Aircraft deliveries are stepping up month by month. The deliveries to the Navy in the fiscal year 1944 will be double those for 1943.

A major item of increase in the bill, which of itself is an indication of the increased operations in aviation and ships, is the fact that the enlisted strength of the Navy proper is being increased by provision for 2,250,000 enlisted men, whereas the current year's figure is 1,450,000. The Marine Corps will have 352,500 for 1944, and the Coast Guard 164,560.

On the whole, the fiscal year 1944 sees the Navy passing more from the preparatory and production phase to the maintenance and operation phase. This is indicated by the fact that the naval estimates as they came to Congress prior to the inclusion of the aviation program provided for increases in recurring items of maintenance and operation of $3,500,000,000, and a decrease in the nonrecurring items, which is the procurement of material, of $2,500,000,000, despite the fact that the nonrecurring total included a rise of the shipbuilding expenditure in the amount of $2,200,000,000.

There are various objects which I have classified for which these appropriations are made, and without repeating them, I ask unanimous consent that the breakdown I have, be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Construction of ships	$9,118,120,000
Construction of aircraft	4,983,725,000
Aviation, Navy (all other)	1,600,000,000
Public works (of which $916,074,400 is for new authority)	1,855,317,405
Pay, subsistence, transportation, training, education, and welfare of the Navy	4,271,114,384
Maintenance, Bureau of Ships	1,735,880,000
Ordnance and Ordnance Stores	3,476,800,000
Construction of floating drydocks	160,000,000
Defense installations on merchant vessels	57,000,000
Freight	200,000,000
Other naval appropriations	535,283,165
Marine Corps	973,791,434
Coast Guard	467,756,760
Total	29,434,783,198

Mr. OVERTON. Two shipbuilding authorizations are picked up in the language under the shipbuilding appropriation, the estimated cost of which will total, when completed, $3,389,000,000, and which cover a million additional tons of auxiliary vessels, and a million additional tons of landing, district, and patrol craft.

Some minor language changes were made in the committee, all covered in the report. The Senate hearings cover the reasons for which they were made.

It is our hope that the bill will comprise all naval requirements for 1944, and it should do so, unless some change of personnel strength is made at the

request of the President, or a new shipbuilding program is authorized by the Congress.

In any event, the bill includes the requirements of the Navy Department, as now visualized by it, to carry on the war for the fiscal year 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Naval Establishment, office of the Secretary—Miscellaneous expenses", on page 4, line 2, after the figures "$32,423,605", to strike out the comma and "of which $200,000 shall be immediately available".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Ships—Maintenance, Bureau of Ships", on page 12, line 5, after the word "work" and the semicolon, to strike out "payment on a strictly part-time or intermittent employment basis in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere, solely under the Bureau of Ships, of such scientists and technicists as may be contracted for by the Secretary, in his discretion, at a rate of pay not exceeding $25 per diem for any person so employed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 11, after the word "Bureau" and the semicolon, to strike out "$1,735,880,000", and insert "$1,175,880,000, and in addition to the amount herein appropriated, the Secretary may, prior to July 1, 1944, enter into contracts for 'Maintenance, Bureau of Ships', to an amount not in excess of $560,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Ordnance—Ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy", on page 14, line 5, after the word "purposes", to strike out the comma and "including plant appliances, equipment, machine tools, facilities and services at naval or private establishments", and insert "for essential equipment, facilities, machine tools, including replacements, and services at naval or private establishments to expedite the production of ordnance material."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 16, after the word "practice" and the semicolon, to strike out "payment on a strictly part-time or intermittent employment basis in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere, solely under the Bureau of Ordnance, of such scientists and technicists as may be contracted for by the Secretary in his discretion at a rate of pay not exceeding $25 per diem for any person so employed"; and in line 22, after the word "stations" and the semicolon, to strike out "$3,476,800,000", and insert "$1,250,000,000, and in addition to the amount herein appropriated, the Secretary may, prior to July 1, 1944, enter into contracts for ordnance and ordnance stores to an amount not in excess of $2,226,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts—Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel" on page 18, line 4, after the word "at", to strike out "60", and insert in lieu thereof "65."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," on page 21, line 21, after the word "Accounts" and the semicolon, to strike out "payment on a strictly part-time or intermittent employment basis in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, solely under the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, of such specialists as may be contracted for by the Secretary, at a rate of pay not exceeding $25 per diem for any person so employed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Yards and Docks—Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 24, line 23, after the words "provided for", to strike out the semicolon and "payment on a strictly part-time or intermittent employment basis in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere, solely under the Bureau of Yards and Docks, of such engineers, architects, and technicists as may be contracted for by the Secretary, in his discretion, at a rate of pay not to exceed $25 per diem for any person so employed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public Works, Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 25, line 22, after the word "expenses", to strike out the comma and "and payment on a strictly part-time or intermittent employment basis in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, solely under the Bureau of Yard and Docks, of scientists, technicists, and other personnel, at not to exceed $25 per diem."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "6", and insert "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Aeronautics Aviation, Navy", on page 27, line 21, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "including the payment on a strictly part-time or intermittent employment basis in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, solely under the Bureau of Aeronautics, of such scientists and technicists as may be contracted for by the Secretary, in his discretion, at a rate of pay not exceeding $25 per diem for any person so employed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Pay of civil force, Marine Corps", on page 30, at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "Adjutant Inspector" and insert in lieu thereof "Director of Personnel, Marine Corps."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General expenses, Marine Corps", on page 31, line 11, after the word "maintenance" and the comma, to strike out "$95,157,800, of which $6,800,000 shall be immediately available", and insert in lieu thereof "$88,357,800"; and on the same page, line 13, after the word "personnel" and the comma, to strike out "$77,864,704, of which $13,500,000 shall be immediately available", and insert in lieu thereof "$64,364,704."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 11, after the word "posts", to strike out "$60,376,000, of which $8,600,000 shall be immediately available", and insert in lieu thereof "$51,776,000"; and on the same page, line 13, after the words "In all" and the comma, to strike out "$528,108,004" and insert in lieu thereof "$499,208,004."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Increase and replacement of naval vessels," on page 34, line 5, after the word "war" and the semicolon, to insert "and for the replacement-of combatant vessels as authorized by the act of July 9, 1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 12, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "that would entail expenditures in liquidation thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Coast Guard," on page 39, line 17, after the word "mess", to strike out "and the restriction against the employment of enlisted men in officers' quarters and messes is hereby amended by excepting therefrom such places as may be specifically designated by the Secretary" and insert "*Provided further*, That existing limitations with respect to the detail of personnel to officers' quarters and messes ashore shall not apply to the Coast Guard Academy, the Coast Guard yard, Coast Guard bases, Coast Guard air stations, Coast Guard training stations, and, in addition, not to exceed 200 in number at such stations as shall be designated by the Commandant of the Coast Guard with the approval of the Secretary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 7, after the words "Coast Guard", to strike out "*Provided*, That limitations with respect to the furnishing of equipment for officers' messes ashore shall not apply to such Coast Guard locations as may be specifically designated by the Secretary."

On the same page, line 11, after the figures "$64,500,000", to insert "*Provided*, That existing limitations with respect to the furnishing of equipment for officers' messes ashore shall not apply to the Coast Guard Academy, the Coast Guard yard, Coast Guard bases, Coast Guard air stations, Coast Guard training stations, Coast Guard depots, messes temporarily set up on shore for officers attached to seagoing vessels, and such bachelor officers' quarters and messes as may be specifically designated by the Secretary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department—Salaries", on page 44, line 2, after the word "Navy", to strike out "Director of Personnel, $8,000, Senior Executive Officer, not to exceed $7,000"; and on the same page, at

the beginning of line 4, to strike out "$389,000" and insert "$390,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 3, after the word "Department", to strike out "$5,123,900" and insert "$5,124,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Provisions", on page 47, line 25, after the word "headquarters", to insert a comma, and the words "excepting from such number, as far as practicable, enlisted personnel qualified for combat service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 113, on page 52, line 13, after the word "government", to strike out "as would bring the total number thereof to not more than 20,000, including Marine Corps and Coast Guard headquarters."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 114, on page 53, line 1, after the word "employees", to strike out "not to exceed one hundred and forty-two thousand five hundred and three)"; and on the same page, line 23, after the word "assignment", to insert "or any request therefor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 117, on page 55, line 14, after the word "Department" and the colon, to strike out *"Provided,* That orders placed or expenses incurred by the procuring department or establishment in respect to such allotments shall be considered as obligations against the appropriations involved" and insert *"Provided,* That orders placed with the procuring department or establishment by the allotting department or establishment shall be considered as obligations upon the appropriations involved in the same manner as orders or contracts placed with private contractors."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 118. The appropriations "Construction and machinery", "Emergency construction", and "Maintenance, Bureau of Ships", for the fiscal year 1944 shall be available for the recruitment, transportation, and incidental expenses in connection therewith of civilian employees for the industrial yards of the Navy in areas where in the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy a manpower shortage exists, provided adequate housing is available in the area for housing of the men recruited.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Defense aid," on page 56, line 19, to change the section number from 119 to 118.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 4, to change the section number from 120 to 119; and in the same line, after the word "This" to strike out "Act" and insert in lieu thereof "title."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 5, to insert:

TITLE II—ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEARS 1942 AND 1943

SEC. 201. For additional amounts for appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service, fiscal years 1942 and 1943, to be supplemental and additional to the appropriations in the respective Naval Appropriation Acts for such fiscal years, including the objects and subject to the limitations and conditions specified under the respective headings and subject to the provisions under the heading "General provisions" contained in said acts, except as otherwise provided herein, as follows:

NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT

Bureau of Naval Personnel

Training, education, and welfare, Navy, 1943:

Naval training station, Lake Pend Oreille, Idaho, $254,000;

Instruction, $5,285,000;

In all, training, education, and welfare, Navy, $5,539,000.

Bureau of Supplies and Accounts

Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel:

Fiscal year 1942:

Pay of naval personnel, $22,300,000;

Subsistence of naval personnel, $7,200,000;

Transportation and recruiting of naval personnel, $500,000;

In all, to be accounted for as one fund, $30,000,000.

Fiscal year 1943:

Pay of naval personnel, $35,423,162;

Subsistence of naval personnel, $22,544,015;

Transportation and recruiting of naval personnel, $7,032,823;

In all, to be accounted for as one fund, $65,000,000.

Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1943, $73,000,000.

MARINE CORPS

General expenses, Marine Corps, 1943: Provisions, $6,800,000; clothing, $13,500,000; miscellaneous supplies and expenses, $8,600,000; in all, to be accounted for as one fund, $28,900,000.

SEC. 202. Appropriations in this title for the fiscal year 1943 shall constitute and may be cited as "Title V, Naval Appropriation Act, 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I am authorized by the committee to offer the amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, line 10, after the word "stations", it is proposed to insert *"And provided further,* That funds appropriated under the heads of 'Pay, subsistence, and transportation', 'General expenses, Marine Corps', 'Pay and allowances, Coast Guard' in this act shall be available for the payment of money allowances, in lieu of transportation by the shortest usually traveled route now authorized by law to be furnished in kind, at 3 cents per mile to enlisted men, regardless of the mode of travel, who, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, travel at their own expense."

Mr. OVERTON. The amendment is legislative in character, but no objection has been made to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana on behalf of the committee? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I am authorized by the committee to offer another amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 57, after line 3, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 119. The funds appropriated in the appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1944 of the services mentioned in the title of the act of June 16, 1942 (Public Law 607, 77th Cong.), shall be available for, and the heads of the executive departments concerned are authorized to prescribe, per diem rates of allowance, at rates not to exceed $7 per day, in lieu of subsistence to officers traveling on official business and away from their designated points of duty, and to members of the services concerned (including officers, warrant officers, and surgeons, enlisted personnel, aviation cadets, and members of the Nurse Corps) when traveling by air under competent orders and on duty with troops.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 2713 was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes."

Mr. OVERTON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. OVERTON, Mr. GLASS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. GREEN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Gerald McLaughlin, of New Jersey, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of

Appeals for the Third Circuit, vice William Clark, resigned.

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Eli H. Brown III, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the western district of Kentucky;

John M. Moore, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky; and

Loomis E. Cranor, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leo F. Sanchez, of New Mexico, to be register of the land office, Department of the Interior, at Sante Fe, N. Mex.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations made today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 8, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received June 7 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Harry C. Westover, of Santa Ana, Calif., to be collector of internal revenue for the sixth district of California, in place of Nat Rogan, resigned.

PROMOTIONS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE MARINE CORPS

Col. Thomas E. Bourke to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 16th day of September 1942.

Col. LeRoy P. Hunt to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 16th day of September 1942.

Col. Leo D. Hermle to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 16th day of September 1942.

Col. Claude A. Larkin to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 5th day of October 1942.

Col. Harold D. Campbell to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 5th day of April 1943.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be first lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the dates stated:

Russell A. Bowen, from the 1st day of September 1939.

Edward McC. Hodgson, from the 1st day of October 1939.

William A. Millington, from the 1st day of December 1940.

Burnette A. Kempson, Jr., from the 1st day of December 1940.

The following-named naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the dates stated:

Max R. Read, Jr., from the 25th day of March 1940.

William E. Clasen, from the 1st day of April 1940.

"J" Frank Cole, from the 1st day of April 1940.

George J. Waldie, Jr., from the 1st day of April 1940.

Glenn L. Todd, from the 15th day of April 1940.

George E. Dooley, from the 7th day of June 1940.

Pierre M. Carnagey, from the 20th day of November 1940.

Harry B. Hooper, Jr., from the 20th day of January 1941.

Joseph H. Reinburg, from the 14th day of February 1941.

Quinton R. Johns, from the 24th day of February 1941.

Charlton B. Ivey, from the 16th day of March 1941.

Jack R. Mathis, from the 3d day of April 1941.

Darrell D. Irwin, from the 10th day of April 1941.

James K. Dill, from the 21st day of April 1941.

Stanley R. Bailey, from the 21st day of April 1941.

Joseph E. Leising, from the 5th day of May 1941.

George Moffat, from the 24th day of May 1941.

Jack D. Kane, from the 24th day of May 1941.

Charles Kimak, from the 24th day of May 1941.

Christopher F. Irwin, Jr., from the 24th day of May 1941.

James A. Feeley, Jr., from the 31st day of May 1941.

Thomas O. Bales, from the 31st day of May 1941.

John R. Spooner, from the 31st day of May 1941.

James T. McDaniel, from the 3d day of June 1941.

Robert P. Keller, from the 3d day of June 1941.

Donald H. Sapp, from the 3d day of June 1941.

James G. Obenshain, from the 3d day of June 1941.

Earl P. Paris, Jr., from the 3d day of June 1941.

Richard M. Caldwell, from the 6th day of June 1941.

Arthur L. Turner, from the 6th day of June 1941.

Alan J. Armstrong, from the 6th day of June 1941.

Edwin S. Roberts, Jr., from the 6th day of June 1941.

Fred W. Lake, Jr., from the 6th day of June 1941.

Robert E. Cameron, from the 6th day of June 1941.

Donald S. Bush, from the 6th day of June 1941.

John S. Flickinger, from the 6th day of June 1941.

Robert L. Anderson, from the 6th day of June 1941.

Frank R. Porter, Jr., from the 6th day of June 1941.

Walter E. Gregory, from the 6th day of June 1941.

Walter D. Persons, from the 21st day of June 1941.

James H. Clark, from the 16th day of July 1941.

William W. Dean, from the 16th day of July 1941.

Jack R. Amende, Jr., from the 16th day of July 1941.

Stanley M. Tutton, from the 16th day of July 1941.

Lionel N. Pool, from the 16th day of July 1941.

Philip "L" Crawford, from the 16th day of July 1941.

Harry J. Coleman, from the 16th day of July 1941.

Leslie T. Bryan, Jr., from the 16th day of July 1941.

James W. Poindexter, from the 16th day of July 1941.

Robert B. Porter, from the 16th day of July 1941.

Sumner H. Whitten, from the 16th day of July 1941.

Cecil B. Brewer, from the 4th day of August 1941.

Robert L. Petersen, from the 4th day of August 1941.

James R. Wallace, from the 18th day of August 1941.

Edwin M. Schmitt, from the 18th day of August 1941.

Hoyle R. Barr, from the 18th day of August 1941.

Donald P. Frame, from the 18th day of August 1941.

Douglas A. Bangert, from the 18th day of August 1941.

Thomas G. Bronleewe, Jr., from the 30th day of August 1941.

Richard "J" Ofstad, from the 30th day of August 1941.

Julius W. Ireland, from the 30th day of August 1941.

Paul L. André, Jr., from the 6th day of September 1941.

Joe H. McGlothlin, Jr., from the 6th day of September 1941.

Charles M. Kunz, from the 6th day of September 1941.

Kenneth J. Kirk, Jr., from the 6th day of September 1941.

Warren H. McPherson, from the 6th day of September 1941.

William H. Sublette, from the 6th day of September 1941.

Hugh B. Calahan, from the 6th day of September 1941.

William G. Voss, from the 6th day of September 1941.

David C. Andre, from the 10th day of September 1941.

John E. Reynolds, from the 10th day of September 1941.

Blaine H. Baesler, from the 10th day of September 1941.

Michael R. Yunck, from the 10th day of September 1941.

William M. Ritchey, from the 10th day of September 1941.

Jack Foeller, from the 10th day of September 1941.

Joseph F. Quilty, Jr., from the 10th day of September 1941.

Irwin W. Carter, from the 10th day of September 1941.

Robert L. Hopkins, from the 10th day of September 1941.

William C. Hayter, from the 10th day of September 1941.

Norman L. Mitchell, from the 10th day of October 1941.
William R. Lear, from the 10th day of October 1941.
Frank L. Maerz, from the 10th day of October 1941.
Robert E. Daigh, from the 14th day of October 1941.
Perry L. Shuman, from the 14th day of October 1941.
Herbert H. Long, from the 14th day of October 1941.
Quintus "B" Nelson, from the 16th day of October 1941.
William N. Wilkes, Jr., a citizen of Arkansas, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of August 1942.
Serge R. Ballif, a citizen of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of October 1942.
The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of December 1942:
Horton J. Greene, a citizen of Georgia.
Lewis F. Treleaven, a citizen of Ohio.
Maurice E Roach, a citizen of Tennessee.
Donald B. Thackrey, a citizen of Virginia, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of December 1942.
The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of February 1943:
Richard B. Cavanaugh, a citizen of New Mexico.
Robert E. Judy, Jr., a citizen of California.
Glenn A. Young, a citizen of Oklahoma.
William H. Housman, Jr., a citizen of Kentucky.
George M. Dawes, a citizen of Massachusetts.
William J. Stewart, a citizen of Ohio, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of April 1943.
Corp. Leonard A. Goldberg, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 21st day of April 1943.
The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 21st day of April 1943:
John R. Brett, a citizen of New York.
William O. Franklin, a citizen of California.
Dean N. McDowell, a citizen of the District of Columbia.

PROMOTIONS IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named cadets to be ensigns in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 9th day of June 1943:

Joseph Rogers Steel
Ralph Arnold Peterson
Robert Joseph LoForte
Robert Leslie Ruth
James Paul Van Etten
Norman McLeod Barlow
Alvin Bislinghoff Jordan
Robert Bernard Moore
George Pershing Jacobson
Edward Dabner Hudgens, Jr.
Edward Michael Francis Kirchner
Richard Anthony Pasciuti
Glenn Edgar Murphy
Edward DeKalb Veal, Jr.
Ernest Harold Goldman
Charles Webster Valaer
LeWayne Newcomb Felts
William Ellison Baird
Owen Wesley Siler
William Davis Palmer
William Edward Dennis
Leslie Byron George
William Edward Wallace
William Selby Allan, Jr.
Keith Charles Vrana
Mitchell Arthur Pereira
George MacAulay Lee Costner
John Durward Richardson
Harry Hart Carter
Garth Hines Read
George William Sohm
John Richmond Rogers
Thomas Pope Cheatham
David Richard Domke
Arthur Hancock
Charles Wayne
Warren Edward Rast
Kenneth Raymond Vaughn
Wallace Clarence Dahlgren
Samuel Raymond Woll
Robert Allen Adams
Robert Arthur Schulz
Edward Reuben Tharp
Philip Joseph McFarland
Frederick James Hancox
John Joseph Doherty
Wilfred Ulrich Johnson
James Norton Ashbrook
Paul Morosky
Austin Flint Hubbard
William Michael Benkert
Keith Low
Carl Leonard Parrott
Robert Franklin Lutz
Donald Oscar Ellis
Wilfrid Neville Derby, Jr.
Ward Raymond Emigh
Bernard Edwin Kolkhorst
Robert Ellsworth MacDonald
Donald McIntosh Reed
Daniel John Scalabrini
Rufus Sizer Drury
William Nathan Banks
Robert Jerome Carson
David Lloyd Davies, Jr.
Frank Benjamin Carter
Frank Marshall Fisher, Jr.
Alden Edward Lewis
Robert Tallant Norris
Sereno Sewall Webster, Jr.
Arnold Roy Wadum
William Joseph Zinck
Richard Eugene Hoover
Phillip Hermann
Curtis Johnson Kelly
John Roger George
Donald Arthur Caswell
Vernon Francis Hauschild
Alexander Cameron
Edward Franklin Poole III
Raymond Howard Evans
Charles Edward Johnson

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 7 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE

Leo F. Sanchez to be register of the land office at Sante Fe, N. Mex.

POSTMASTERS

MASSACHUSETTS

Mertis L. Foster, East Brewster.

MICHIGAN

Harold L. Muchler, Bad Axe.
Guy E. Pitkin, Brighton.
Donald R. Ellwanger, Caro.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Dorothy M. Hayes, North Rochester.

NEW JERSEY

Edward C. Bowe, Barrington.
William T. Johnson, Point Pleasant.
Bertha S. Agnew, Titusville.

OKLAHOMA

Brooke L. Wallace, Wayne.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, our natures are teeming with tendencies, desires, and ambitions; we therefore pray Thee to come richly into our hearts that we may be wisely directed. Help us to guard our wandering wills, subdue all threatening passions, and let our minds mingle with quietness, restraint, and courage. May we look with increasing gratitude upon our country, beautifully comforting, nobly sustaining, and dynamically inspiring. We praise Thee that we are American citizens, blessed under our Constitution with political, civil, and religious liberty. Enable us to realize fully that eternal vigilance is the price of everything sacred to our hearts; help us ever to hold aloft freedom's holy light. We pray that an aroused public opinion may put the garment of shame upon anyone who seeks to betray his country under the deceptive guise of patriotic motive. He who refuses to surrender a little temporary liberty for essential safety deserves neither liberty nor safety. Almighty God, we pray for our distinguished Commander in Chief, the coordinate branches of our Government, and for every individual citizen that the sacred rights of a free people may ever be safeguarded.

Thou who hast laid on the altar of the world the divinest love, we wait in appreciative memory of one who has left the folds of the Congress. Modest, yet with patriotic zeal, he served the state with ability and fidelity. Blessings upon her, the devoted companion of his years. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 4, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 25, 1943:

H. R. 2159. An act to provide for special assessments for the laying of curbs and gutters;

H. R. 2486. An act to authorize the appointment as ensigns in the Coast Guard of all graduates of the Coast Guard Academy in 1945 and thereafter, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2583. An act to provide for the reorganization of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2587. An act to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

On May 26, 1943:

H. R. 1896. An act to amend sections 1 and 2 of the act approved June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 262), relating to the establishment of the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park in Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia, and to grant the consent of Congress to such States to enter into a compact providing for the acquisition of property for such park; and

H. R. 2581. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

On May 27, 1943:

H. R. 761. An act for the relief of Charles T. Dulin.

On May 29, 1943:

H. R. 328. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, because of military operations, to defer or waive payments under nonmineral leases of public lands in Alaska; and

H. R. 1468. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Azer.

On June 1, 1943:

H. R. 170. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. T. Travis;

H. R. 777. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia," approved February 24, 1914;

H. R. 940. An act for the relief of Howard E. Dickison;

H. R. 1153. An act for the relief of Cordie Underwod and Wilbur Kea;

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Alva Burton Rickey; and

H. R. 2067. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. M. Reid & Co., of Macon, Ga.

On June 2, 1943:

H. R. 535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Donna Pittel; and

H. R. 2346. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

On June 4, 1943:

H. R. 2115. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2664. An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 796) entitled "An act relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense;" requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. VAN NUYS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. DANAHER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following Departments and Agencies:

1. Department of Commerce.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Department of War.
5. National Housing Agency.
6. National Archives.

USE AND OPERATION OF WAR PLANTS IN PROSECUTION OF THE WAR

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense, with House amendments thereto, agree to the conference requested by the Senate, and appoint conferees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAY, THOMASON, MERRITT, SHORT, and HARNESS of Indiana.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order tomorrow to call the Consent Calendar, and that it also be in order for the Speaker to recognize Members for suspensions.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, does this mean that the Consent Calendar and the suspensions will come ahead of any other business?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, that is the intention.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a joint resolution adopted by the California State Legislature with relation to decentralization of the steel industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include in one an editorial from the Chicago Daily News and in the other a poem by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle, of the Capitol Architect's Office.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Staple Cotton Review for May 1943 by the Honorable A. H. Stone, entitled "Agricultural Credit; the Farm Credit Administration, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations, and the Banks—a Factual Review." I have communicated with the Public Printer, Mr. Speaker, and am advised that it is estimated that this will take five and one-half pages of the RECORD at an estimated cost of $234. I ask that this editorial be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution from the Cambria County Medical Society.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Memphis Commercial Appeal which includes a portion of a letter from a soldier, and further to extend my own remarks and include an editorial on the National Youth Administration appearing in the Arkansas Democrat.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a table from the Labor Department and a table from the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a small businessman in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution and accompanying data.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the bill (H. R. 2553), directing the Secretary of Labor to make an investigation and study of the extent and causes of absenteeism, and to make available the facilities of the Department of Labor to act as a clearing house for information on methods to control absenteeism.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include several statements on the poultry situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask to extend my remarks in regard to the life and character of Dr. L. W. Boe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of the late U. S. Guyer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CLAIM OF MOUNT VERNON, ALEXANDRIA & WASHINGTON RAILWAY CO. (H. DOC. NO. 222)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying bill referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1667, a bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation."

It appears that the Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co. had been granted by an act of Congress the right to use certain streets in the District of Columbia. The act expressly provided, however, that it might "at any time be altered, amended, or repealed by the Congress of the United States." By act of May 25, 1926, the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to provide suitable sites for proposed buildings for the executive departments, such sites to be within the area between Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenues, and between Sixth and Fifteenth Streets NW. The Secretary, among other things, was authorized to close and vacate streets. At that time the railway company maintained tracks within the foregoing area. The Secretary of the Treasury served notice on the railway company requiring it to remove or abandon the tracks. After unsuccessful efforts to obtain an injunction in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, the company complied with this requirement. Thereafter, it abandoned the operation of the street railway.

Subsequently, the railway company brought suit against the United States in the Court of Claims to recover damages for the taking and destruction of its franchise rights. The court held that the plaintiff was not entitled to recover, first, because the action of the Government did not amount to a taking of property, and, second, because the franchise of the company was revocable due to the express reservation on the part of the Congress of the right to repeal the grant, and that consequently no vested property right was taken or destroyed by any action of the United States. The railway company made an application to the Supreme Court of the United States for a writ of certiorari, but the application was denied.

The purpose of the bill under consideration seems to be in effect to reopen an issue that has been duly adjudicated on the merits by a court of competent jurisdiction. The claimant has had his day in court and no reason appears discernible for reopening the matter by legislative action.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 7, 1943.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Thomas E. Lyons, secretary of the Foreign Trade Zones Board of the Department of Commerce. I have checked this matter with the Government Printing Office and am informed that it will cost $54.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of an article from the Baltimore Evening Sun of June 5, 1943, on the gas situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MUNDT, for 2 weeks (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of official business.

To Mr. BULWINKLE, for 4 days, on account of death in his family.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2584. An act to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE ULYSSES SAMUEL GUYER

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my very sad duty to announce officially to the House the passing at about 5 o'clock on Saturday morning of our colleague ULYSSES S. GUYER, of the Second District of Kansas. According to our rank in service, this would have been the duty of my colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], but he has accompanied the funeral train.

Mr. GUYER was the dean of the Kansas delegation. He served an unexpired term in the Sixty-eighth Congress, was not a candidate in the Sixty-ninth, but came here with the Seventieth, and has been a continuous Member since. The last few years he has served exclusively on the Judiciary Committee, of which at his passing he was the ranking minority member.

Mr. GUYER was born in Illinois, educated in the three States of Illinois, Iowa, and Kansas, attended the old historic Lane University at Lecompton, was principal and superintendent of the schools at St. John, Kans., in the late nineties, studied law following that and located in Kansas City, Kans., where over 30 years ago he was elected mayor. He failed to receive the congressional nomination in 1916 by 1 vote, and later succeeded Colonel Little, who defeated him at that time.

Mr. GUYER was a lover and a devout student of American history. He belonged to the old school, which we regret is not more prevalent today, in his emphasis on the historical and his eloquence in expressing it on many occasions.

One of the little sidelights of his versatile character was his great interest in the Christy picture of the signing of the Constitution. He went frequently where Mr. Christy was painting to watch the progress of the picture and always showed it to his visiting friends.

One of the most outstanding and enviable characteristics of our friend was his friendliness itself. He possessed a culture of friendliness that was beyond the average. His morning visits of a minute to his colleagues' offices were always welcome. He brought cheer, pleasantry and never stayed to interfere with one's work.

It is especially interesting that his written request is being carried out that he should be buried at St. John, Kans., the place which he left over 40 years ago. He had taken a wonderfully personal interest in every pupil who had been under his supervision in 5 years. He corresponded with many of them, and sent them little interesting things through all the years. He will be buried out there tomorrow among the boys and girls who were closest to his heart.

In the House Memorial Service April 21, in 1936, he spoke for the minority. These were his opening words:

> Veneration for the sepulcher and reverence for the dead belong to the most ancient instincts of the human race. To respect and to honor the memory and dust of our ancestors is common alike to the savage and the civilized. This inclination to consecrate the grave and to enshrine the memory of our departed ancestors may have been and doubtless was the beginning of the worship of Diety, for in that black night of prehistoric darkness the human soul reached out toward the only symbol of Diety it possessed—its earthly parental
>
> Thus today, both in harmony with the precedents of the House and the customs of mankind, we meet to honor those who have gone to that "undiscovered country" and who for a brief time were associated with us in this forum fashioned by our fathers in the Constitution. This day the discord of party passion divides us not. Individual interests and personal ambitions are forgotten. The battle for supremacy and the struggle for precedence sleep for the moment like those we mourn. All that is sordid, all that

is ignoble in this game of politics retreats in silence from the presence of death.

There are no minority views in this committee's report. It is accepted by unanimous consent without debate. That report constitutes the epitaph of the seven strong men who are the objects of this memorial. Their work in this forum is finished. Their record is completed. Their roll calls have all been answered. Their speeches have all been uttered. Their offices have been vacated by the decree of fate. Soon others will occupy their places and the current of life will resume its accustomed course.

It is one of the inexplicable mysteries of life in which one surrenders his peace of mind, his tranquillity of soul and life under his own vine and fig tree for a disappointing, disillusioning ignis fatuus in the morass of public life. Yet, arduous as the duties are, we are loath to leave its unrivaled associations.

I think the expressions of my friend and yours are more interesting to recall now than anything that I might say myself. Mr. GUYER seemed to be at his best not only on that memorial occasion but also that same summer when they dedicated the beautiful new courthouse in Kansas City, Kans. I close, quoting him further on that occasion:

Who built this symbol? The pioneer who came in the yesterdays of turmoil and danger. The pioneer here on the edge of the Santa Fe and the Oregon Trails, the two most romantic trails that ever blazed the path of empire. They built it in the campfires where danger haunted their bivouac. They built it in the fields where disappointment mocked and gaunt famine stalked. They built it in the little red schoolhouse where the children loved their books.

Thousands who sleep beneath the sod of the soil they loved so well built it in the sweat of their brows and in the fiber of their brain. They and more built it. The workman in the factory on the river brink built it and made it sacred with his sweat and possible with his labor. They and more built it. The mothers at the hearthstone and at the cradle built it; built it in the fathomless blue of their babies' eyes. They and more built it. Generations yet unborn built it in the hopes of their fathers and mothers that are to be, for they, too, by and by, will help to pay for it. The past with its struggles built it. The present with its problems built it. The future with its hopes and fears built it, built it in love of country and mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the death of our beloved colleague, Judge ULYSSES S. GUYER, brings universal regret and sorrow. For 20 years, he was a conspicuous and valued Member of this House, and during this long period of service, he commanded our respect and admiration.

He was a scholar, jurist, statesman, and public benefactor. He was an ardent advocate of many causes, like women's rights and prohibition, which stirred deep controversies and emotions. But he was ever the perfect, courteous gentleman, who recognized the sincerity of those who found themselves in opposition to his views.

Judge GUYER had a vast fund of knowledge of the history of our country. He was a close student of the great men and women, whose genius and sacrifice made possible this great Republic of ours.

He knew intimately the story of the building of the great West; the pushing back of the frontiers of our country. His story of Lincoln's trip through Kansas, a year before he made his Cooper Union speech in New York, was a fascinating revelation of a part of the life of Lincoln not generally known. He was an outstanding authority on the life of the Great Emancipator, as he was on many of our other great American men and women. It was always an intellectual treat to listen to his stories and recitals of the early days of our national life. He was an outstanding member of the legal profession and a sturdy supporter of the Constitution and the American way of life.

We suspend today our legislative battles, we lay aside our struggles that we may unite in doing honor to a great statesman and an outstanding public servant.

We join with his good wife in mourning the loss of this fine American statesman. With sadness we bid U. S. GUYER farewell. But our sorrow is somewhat eased by the knowledge that the worthy life he led will bring him happiness and contentment in the other world to which all of us must go eventually.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of our late friend and colleague, ULYSSES SAMUEL GUYER, leaves another gap in our ranks, taking from our midst one of our ablest, most experienced, and beloved Members. A man of character, of sincerity of thought and purpose, of devotion to duty, a gentleman at all times, his sweet, charming personality will be missed by all who knew him. During his years of service in this body he made many contributions to the progress of our country. He has left his favorable imprint upon the pages of time.

One of his greatest contributions as a legislator in this body was his service as the ranking minority member of the special committee of 1934 that investigated subversive activities, of which committee I was chairman. His contribution to the work of that committee and its legislative recommendations was an important factor in the success of the committee. Out of that committee's investigations came a bill compelling propagandists of a foreign government or foreign principals in this country to register. That bill has been termed the most important legislation of its type in the past 50 years. The country is indebted to Judge GUYER for the effective contributions he made in the drafting and passage of this important legislation.

This illustrates the constructive mind he possessed, and further that he exercised his mind in a constructive manner. It will take a long time for those who knew him to adjust themselves to his permanent journey into the Great Beyond. His death is a great loss to the Nation and to his State, both of which he loved intensely.

His passing is also a great loss to the people of his district that he represented so ably, as well as to those who served with him in this body.

In the irreparable loss that Mrs. Guyer has sustained, I know that all of the Members of the House join with me in expressing and extending to her our profound sympathy in her bereavement.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in the death of ULYSSES SAMUEL GUYER we have lost a true and real friend. He will be missed greatly in the House of Representatives, of which body he was a valued member for 16 years. I will especially miss the Judge, as he was commonly called by his friends. My office is located only a few doors from his and seldom did a day pass that he failed to stop in for a few minutes' visit. He was a good visitor and always did I find his conversations interesting and instructive. Although Illinois was his native State, most of his life had been spent in his adopted state of Kansas, which he loved with the utmost devotion, and which he watched and helped develop into the great State that it is today. He knew Kansas history as few men know it, and when my memory needed brushing up on early-day history of our State it was Judge GUYER with whom I consulted.

While he was a friend to all, he was especially kind and considerate of the new Members. Well I remember when I first came to Congress. I was acquainted with the functions of the State legislature but knew little of the procedure of Federal legislation. He seemed to take a great deal of satisfaction from taking me under his wing and helping to analyze the situation, and for his suggested courses of action and rounded advice I am deeply grateful. Through his many act of kindness he endeared himself to all.

A few days previous to his death I chanced to meet the young lady who has been in his employ for several years. In discussing the condition of his health, which we knew was precarious, she remarked, "The country cannot afford to lose men like Mr. GUYER." She knew him for his sterling qualities; how he had always been found fighting for the things that mean so much for the betterment of humanity. The morning following his death an employee of the House Office Building, not a secretary or a clerk in a congressional office, but an employee of the building, stopped me and said: "How I regretted to learn of the death of Mr. GUYER. I come to work at 7:30, and nearly every morning I would meet Mr. GUYER on the way to his office. He was never in too great a hurry to stop and exchange greetings with me. He was always the same friendly, lovable man, and I deeply regret his death." Everyone who met him felt the influence of his good will, of his great desire to render to each one the courtesy and recognition of his right as a member of society to which he was entitled.

In his early years Mr. GUYER was an educator, and in this field he was most successful. While following the teach-

ing profession he took up the study of law and was admitted to the bar in Kansas City, Kans., in 1902. His sterling character and his firm stand on the right side of all moral issues won him the respect and confidence of his fellow citizens. This respect and confidence was displayed by the people of his home town in 1909 and again in 1910, when he was elected mayor of Kansas City, the largest city in Kansas.

Today I am glad I was privileged to enjoy his close friendship and confidence. This I cherish as a bright spot during my years of service in the House.

In his passing, not only the Second Congressional District of the State of Kansas, but the Congress and the country suffered a real loss.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER].

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult indeed for me to express my feelings here today and pay adequate tribute to the dearest friend that I had in the Congress of the United States, SAM GUYER. In 1938, when I was elected to Congress, in November, I did not know much about what I had been elected to. I had never had any legislative experience. A few mornings after the election was over I received a telephone call. On the other end of the line the voice said, "This is U. S. GUYER speaking from Kansas City. I am going down into the south part of my district tomorrow, and I would like to have you come and meet me. I have never had the privilege of meeting you." I knew Judge GUYER only by reputation as one of the leading citizens of Kansas and of the Nation. So I drove to his little town and listened to Judge GUYER make the first speech I ever heard him make. After he had finished he took me in his automobile and we drove out to the edge of the town. He parked the car and there explained to me some of the things that I would be faced with when I came to Washington, and offered me his help. He told me about the necessity of filing on an office, which I knew nothing about, and he told me about how to get supplies, and said that I should arrange for a place to live in Washington—that I probably would have trouble getting a good place to live. He told me that he was returning to Washington within a few days and would be glad to look after those details for me. When I arrived in Washington Judge GUYER had filed on an office for me and arranged for living quarters for me at the same hotel where he and Mrs. Guyer resided.

My acquaintance with Judge GUYER grew into a beautiful friendship, and his death to me is a great loss and the House of Representatives, no matter how long I serve, will never be the same. There never was an evening that I did not see Judge GUYER at the hotel. We sat and discussed many problems of interest to both of us and he gave me much timely advice. On several occasions when I was ill it was Judge GUYER who would come to my room and bring me the little things that make a person feel that someone cares about how you are progressing. Today words fail me to say anything about Judge GUYER, except that to me he was just like a father. He was a Christian gentleman—a truly Christian gentleman. He exemplified in his daily life those Christian virtues. We all know that. The lovable character that he possessed and his way of meeting his friends has endeared him to the hearts of every Member of this House.

I can say to Mrs. Guyer that she need have no fear about the voyage upon which her beloved husband has embarked. As I sat with him less than 3 weeks ago he told me that he knew the end might be near, but that he was prepared to meet it. He said to me then, "Young man, get yourself prepared to enter that which we call eternity and you will not worry about what the future will bring for you."

To my good friend, Judge GUYER, I can only say bon voyage.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the House knows, Mr. GUYER was for a long time the ranking Republican on the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives. The relationship among the members of that committee is very close. We are friends; we develop a spirit of mutual respect for each other's views. There is practically no partisanship in that committee. I feel as close to the members on the Republican side as I do the members on the Democratic side. As chairman I discuss matters of public interest with them just as freely and receive the same sort of cooperation. This has been possible in no small degree because of the fine Americanism of our distinguished Member, whose recent going away has brought sadness to us all; a deep sense of individual, personal loss. Judge GUYER was a modest man. He had a correct conception of the size of man, the relative littleness of man in the great economy. Mr. GUYER had great respect for public opinion, but he was not one of those people in political life who was dependent for happiness upon popular applause and upon place and position for himself, but he measured succcess by the standard of usefulness in his day and generation. He never posed or pretended. He realized that we all are creatures here on this earth but for a moment; not so long as a second, measured by the sweep of the ages. Our comrade walked into the deepening shadows unashamed and unafraid. He could look into the eyes of his constituents and know that he had never betrayed them for their votes; never betrayed his country for his job. He seemed to realize that if when he walked in the silent places, he could have the companionship of a clear conscience, a realization that he had been true to his people, to his duty, to his country, that whether people stuck out their tongue at him or clapped little hands in applause made very little difference after all. He had a correct notion of the relative value of things.

We are going to miss Judge GUYER very much in our committee. Most of us are well acquainted with his wife; have great respect for her. Our deepest sympathy goes out to her. Judge GUYER delivered here a few years ago on Memorial Day an address which is one of the masterpieces of the English language. Permission having been granted, I present it to be printed as something which in substance I would say on this occasion if I could say it as well:

[Memorial exercises in the House of Representatives—Speech of Hon. U. S. GUYER in the House of Representatives, delivered April 21, 1936]

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker:

"Leaves have their time to fall,
And flowers to wither at the north wind's breath
And stars to set, but all
Thou hast all seasons for thine own, O Death."

Veneration for the sepulcher and reverence for the dead belong to the most ancient instincts of the human race. To respect and to honor the memory and dust of our ancestors is common alike to the savage and the civilized. This inclination to consecrate the grave and to enshrine the memory of our departed ancestors may have been and doubtless was the beginning of the worship of Deity, for in that black night of prehistoric darkness the human soul reached out toward the only symbol of Deity it possessed—its earthly parentage.

Thus today, both in harmony with the precedents of the House and the customs of mankind, we meet to honor those who have gone to that "undiscovered country" and who for a brief time were associated with us in this forum fashioned by our fathers in the Constitution. This day the discord of party passion divides us not. Individual interests and personal ambitions are forgotten. The battle for supremacy and the struggle for precedence sleep for the moment like those we mourn. All that is sordid, all that is ignoble in this game of politics retreats in silence from the presence of death.

There are no minority views in this committee's report. It is accepted by unanimous consent without debate. That report constitutes the epitaph of the seven strong men who are the objects of this memorial. Their work in this forum is finished. Their record is completed. Their roll calls have all been answered. Their speeches have all been uttered. Their offices have been vacated by the decree of fate. Soon others will occupy their places and the current of life will resume its accustomed course.

It is one of the inexplicable mysteries of life in which one surrenders his peace of mind, his transquility of soul and life under his own vine and fig tree for a disappointing, disillusioning ignis fatuus in the morass of public life. Yet, arduous as the duties are, we are loathe to leave its unrivaled associations, and every Member may refer with pride to his membership in this forum of the people. The duties and growing exactions upon its Members increasingly draw upon their powers of endurance and resistance which constantly increases their mortality. I have been a Member of this House for 10 years under five Speakers, three of whom have gone to that undiscovered land where there is always a quorum present.

In my humble opinion, the presiding officer of this House holds in his credentials of election as Speaker the supreme testimonial of exalted character, unimpeachable integrity, and superlative ability. He is no accident. He must prove his fitness for this great office through a long series of years in the fierce furnace of political debate, the

fisticuff of parliamentary strategy and maneuver, and by his ability to manage strong and intelligent men under the most trying and difficult circumstances. That, in my opinion, was what led the late Nicholas Longworth to twice declare upon this floor, "I would rather occupy that chair than any other office in the world."

While in the roster of public offices a Member of this House is not the most exalted, membership in the House holds the opportunity for the highest type of public service. The principal difference between the higher and lower offices is that the higher the more exacting and the more disappointing and disillusioning. Men speak of the Presidency as the greatest office in the world, and we do not dispute that estimate. But what a tragic and disappointing illusion.

With more or less familiarity I have known the last seven Presidents; knew each before his elevation to the high office, met each while serving his term, saw all of them after the expiration of their terms, except one, who escaped in the embrace of death, and every one of them withered under the devastating experience like the grass withered under the furnace breath of the drought of 1934. The Presidency saps the life like a vampire and like a vampire mocks.

I saw Woodrow Wilson stumble down into the valley and the shadow amid the wreck of his shattered dream of peace, disappointed, disillusioned and heartbroken beyond the dream of despair. I saw that world-famous smile of William Howard Taft, which they said would never wear off, fade forever among the things that were. Warren G. Harding, as Senator, might still be in the land of the living. We were all so sure that the cold, calculating, imperturbable equanimity, the impenetrable stoicism, of Calvin Coolidge would be proof against the lethal draught, but now we know that a happy decade or mayhap a tranquil score of years were shorn from his span of life. One of the seven by reason of his superlative strength and his indomitable will survived a decade in the generous hope of again sacrificing himself upon that alluring altar, but before his dream came true he expired like a steed plunging back into his burning barn. I saw Herbert Hoover, too sensitive for such an office, grow old while I looked at him.

There are living six widows of former Presidents and the wife of the only ex-President, eloquent tribute to the eternal feminine and tragic evidence of Presidential mortality. Let no one deceive himself into believing that the present incumbent, in spite of all his playful laughter and gallant front, is not corroding under the acid of this enervating ordeal. We sigh, "Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown," but no more uneasy than the head that is pillowed in that snowy palace at the other end of the Avenue. We speak of "the white light that beats upon a throne," but it is no whiter and not nearly so hot as that which flames about the Presidential chair. But this office confers immortality upon one's name, so scores of patriots surge to immolate themselves upon this alluring but fatal altar.

During the last holiday season I drove past that gleaming palace, with its noble portico aflame with a rainbow of Christmas lights, and I thought as I mused upon the somber shadows that lurked among its stately columns and hid in its classic corridors that we should write above those iron gates what is etched on the lintels of Dante's Inferno:

"Lasciate ogni speranza voi ch'entrate."

Shakespeare, in his tragedy of greatness, puts upon the lips of Marc Antony the naked truth concerning human greatness. Antonius was standing above the body of his assassinated friend and comrade, that "piece of bleeding earth," that pathetic clay that but yesterday was Julius Caesar, "whose word might have stood against the world." As he gazed upon this prostrate form he exclaimed:

"O mighty Caesar, dost thou lie so low?
Are all thy conquests, glories, triumphs, spoils,
Shrunk to this little measure?"

Massillon, delivering the funeral oration of Louis XIV in the Cathedral of Notre Dame, exclaimed, "Dieu, seul, est grand"—God, alone, is great. Such is the tragedy of human grandeur. The old Romans had a lucid saying: "Sic transit gloria mundi"—so passes the glory of the world.

This service reminds us of the swift mutations of life. Nothing in life is permanent or static. Nature abhors both a vacuum and dull monotony. Life is a stream on whose bosom is etched everlasting change. The earth is full of life, music, beauty, and loveliness. But its beauty and loveliness do not last. It changes as swift as the wings of light:

"Beauty comes and beauty goes,
Like the petals of a rose.

Song is but a moment's bliss,
Fleeting as a lover's kiss.

Dawn's bright promise of a day,
Quickly crumbles in decay.

Spring is but an eerie, banshee light,
Vanishing in a burst of flight.

And in all this transiency,
Only God and hope remain to me."

The passing of these colleagues of ours brings into sharp relief not only the eternal change of all things but the mystery of death. Life, too, is quite as much a mystery. What is life with all its wondrous, mighty energies? Its definition and its source have escaped all our sages and philosophers. What is death? Only the poet can approach a definition. Nancy Byrd Turner has recently given her version and vision of death under the title, "Death Is a Door":

"Death is only an old door
Set in a garden wall.
On gentle hinges it gives, at dusk,
When the thrushes call.

"Along the lintel are green leaves,
Beyond, the light lies still;
Very weary and willing feet
Go over that sill.

"There is nothing to trouble any heart,
Nothing to hurt at all.
Death is only a quiet door
In an old wall."

But what a pitiable little span is human life. When viewed only from its troubled surface, what a strange and pathetic tragedy. Yesterday the warm, sweet current of life; today still in the chill of death. Yesterday the thrill and exhilaration of superiority and preeminence; today the democratic equality of the dust. Death, like love, "levels all rank." There is no caste in the dominion of the sepulcher. Death is the universal decree. The earth itself is but one vast mausoleum. We touch it not without desecrating a myriad sepulcher. The very rocks that wall us in are but the dusty archives of life that throbbed in dead and forgotten ages. All that lives must die.

"The hand of the king that the scepter hath borne,
The brow of the priest that the mitre hath worn,
The eye of the sage and the heart of the brave,
Are hidden and lost in the depth of the grave."

But it has been said that there is no life without death. That death is the prophecy of life.

"Plato, thou reasonest well!
Else whence this pleasing hope, this fond desire,
The longing after immortality."

Bryant teaches us a beautiful lesson relative to the migratory bird:

"There is a Power whose care
Teaches thy way along that pathless coast—
The desert and illimitable air—
Lone wandering, but not lost.

* * * * *

"He who from zone to zone,
Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
In the long way that I shall tread alone,
Will guide my feet aright."

The bird that sunward guides its flight does not know that eternal summer laughs beneath the tropic sun. He has never seen the leaves that never fade nor felt the heat that never cools. His native home was where Arctic ice drove summer from the earth he knew. But in his little fluttering heart the Almighty had planted this cosmic urge to seek a land of everlasting summer; and when the bird arrives, there the summer is. Neither Nature nor Nature's God ever deceived their children.

I used to have a friend who was a great lawyer and a greater poet and philosopher, though he wrote all of his poetry in the form of prose. In an essay discussing the conservation of energy and the well-known fact that always and everywhere in Nature nonextinction is her most imperious command; that matter and energy were indestructible and eternal. He tells it so much better than anyone else ever did, so I will quote briefly:

"Each meanest mote of matters' dust doth hide a king, divinity doth hedge. He may his venture's fashion change, or may put on the Gyges ring: he ne'er shall abdicate.

"Though worlds may crash and matter wreck, or seethe in flame with fervent heat, and seeming chaos come again, without a tremor, still enthroned, his royal plumage all unscathed, his power nor jot nor tittle 'bates.

"When comes the time, and come it shall, when seemingly this solid earth, yon flaming sun, and all that his wide eye beholds, in sheer vacuity dissolves * * * his crown serene he still shall wear, shall still his royal scepter wield."

If this mote of matter, Judge Keplinger's humble but regal grain of dust, shall survive the wreck of worlds, what shall we say of mind and soul and energy? Mind and energy are eternal. I am mind, I am energy! I am immortal!

I know of no better manner of concluding this faltering memorial to those of our number who have gone to the land of their dreams than by quoting a little poem by the great dramatic critic, William Winter. About a quarter of a century ago Mr. Winter was very ill and close to the gates of eternity. He recovered, however, and afterward wrote this poem, and, in my humble opinion, no sweeter honey of its kind has dripped from the hive of genius since Tennyson wrote The Crossing of the Bar. In the gentle faith of Him who walked by the tideless sea and in the calm philosophy of William Winter, as expressed in this poem, we can look toward the sunset trail with confidence and hope:

"One other bitter drop to drink,
And then—no more!
One little pause upon the brink,
And then—go o'er!
One sigh—and then the lib'rant morn
Of perfect day.
When my free spirit, newly born,
Shall soar away.

"One pang—and I shall rend the thrall
Where grief abides,
And generous Death shall show me all
That now he hides;
And, lucid in that second birth,
I shall discern,
What all the sages of the earth
Have died to learn.

"One motion and the stream is crost,
So dark, so deep!
And I shall triumph, or be lost,
In endless sleep.
Then onward whatsoe'er my fate,
I shall not care!
Nor sin nor sorrow, love nor hate
Can touch me there."

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, the sad news of the death of our beloved colleague, U. S. GUYER, brings to me a deep sense of personal loss as it does to all of you who were closely associated with him.

Judge GUYER first came to Congress to fill an unexpired term in the Sixty-eighth Congress. He returned in the Seventieth Congress to serve his district and his country for the rest of his life. I was also a Member of the Seventieth Congress. We were sworn in together in December 1927. For the past 10 or 12 years I have sat beside him on the Committee on the Judiciary. I feel that I knew him well, and I was proud to call him my friend.

He was deeply religious, intensely patriotic, a close student of history, a gifted speaker, an able and conscientious legislator and lawyer, a cultured Christian gentleman. He set high standards of rectitude for himself from which he never deviated, and yet he gazed upon his fellow men with kindly, tolerant, and friendly eyes. He was a delightful and stimulating companion. I shall miss him. It saddens me today to realize that we shall never see him again.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of intense sorrow that I speak, yet I had the high privilege of serving in this Chamber with U. S. GUYER for many years, and during that period I learned to respect and honor him. We worked together for long duration on the Committee on the Judiciary. His wise counsels, his opinions, ever the result of careful thought and impartial research, are indeed written indelibly in the archives of that committee. I was always impressed with his quiet demeanor, his whole-hearted sympathy with those oppressed and underprivileged souls. His kindliness, his broad-gaged charity, his untiring devotion, his courage made him one of our most beloved Members. He was an indefatigable worker, an ardent defender of any cause he espoused; indeed, the Nation and the State of Kansas loses a humble scholar and an effective servant. We in this Chamber lose an honorable and kindly colleague. Our words and resolution of sorrow and condolence go forth to his loving wife and loved ones. With Alfred Tennyson we may well say: "God's finger touched him and he sleeps."

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the tributes already paid have pretty accurately portrayed the life, the character, and the standing of Judge GUYER here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, when the Death Angel rapped at our door on Saturday last it summoned one of our older and most distinguished colleagues, the late Representative ULYSSES SAMUEL GUYER, of Kansas.

Judge GUYER came to Congress in 1924. It was then that I became acquainted with him. He was an exceptional man in many particulars. As a school teacher, a businessman, a lawyer, a mayor, and a judge, he came to Congress with a wealth of experience in dealing with the public. He was an idealist. A man of strong convictions, he never temporized with that which he thought was not morally and fundamentally right.

For many years before the advent of national prohibition he was an indefatigable worker for the dry cause. His work in this field was of national scope, and few were more jubilant than was Judge GUYER when the eighteenth amendment became a part of the Constitution.

On the occasion of the memorial services held for the late Senator Sheppard, of Texas, the author of the eighteenth amendment, Mr. GUYER said:

It was not difficult for one to go along with the crowd when I first came to the House in 1924, when the so-called wets could not muster enough votes to successfully demand a roll call. Then it was easy to ride along with the tide of public opinion, which favored the eighteenth amendment by a great majority. But the time came when it was the reverse, when it was impossible for the drys to muster enough votes to order a roll call. But this only aroused Senator Sheppard to renewed faith and activity, which he directed toward convincing the people that a repeal was a tragic mistake.

In this reference to Senator Sheppard Mr. GUYER was speaking his own mind, and he never changed his views or lessened his endeavors in behalf of a cause in which he so thoroughly believed. There was no camouflage or equivocation on his part. He kept the faith that was in him. He died working for the same objective.

For many years preceding its acceptance, he was an advocate of the woman's suffrage amendment to the Constitution, and in late years he has enthusiastically supported the so-called equal-rights amendment for women.

While he was adamant in these matters, yet he was always considerate and tolerant. He respected the conscientious views of others at all times, and only asked like consideration for himself.

Judge GUYER was an orator of no mean ability. He possessed a splendid vocabulary and a clear, analytical mind. His manner of public address was not spoiled by the modern microphone. He was always enlightening, entertaining, and pleasing. A reader of good literature, a student of history and biography, he was a ready conversationalist. He possessed so many of the attributes most valuable in public life and, consequently, was effective. In the passing of this conscientious, courteous, and cultured gentleman, the State of Kansas and the Nation has lost one of its worth while public servants. This is a better world because Judge GUYER lived in it.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, with bowed heads, moist eyes, and throats constricted, your Committee on the Judiciary comes before you today unanimously but sadly to participate in this tribute to our beloved late colleague. The gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, has already spoken of the affectionate regard we have in that committee, and have always had, toward each other on both sides of the political fence. That was particularly true, it seemed to me, with respect to this great man. We all knew his name, but to many of us, particularly in the younger ranges, it seemed that his initials were typical of the man and that here, indeed, was a real American in whom there was no guile, a cause partisan in whom there was no bitterness, and a political foeman worthy anyone's steel, who never sought an unfair advantage, whose kindliness did not forsake him when he went out of the committee room, where politics is barred, and into the forum where political fights were raging.

"U. S." were his initials, U. S. was the man. He was a citizen and Representative of the United States. Although no Representative could have represented his district and his State more loyally, he was too big to be claimed exclusively by any district, State, or section.

As we look at his figure going into the shadows there is one outstanding contribution of this great and beloved man to our faith: that men like Judge GUYER never die; that as he goes on and up to the high calling, which he recognized, we can be assured that the accumulated knowledge his studies and rich experiences brought him through the years is not lost, but will prove a basis for the life and the activities to which he has gone; and the truth we heard so beautifully sung here the other day by the Metropolitan Opera star, Miss Doris Doe, There Is No Death.

We saw him live it, we heard her sing it; we knew it to be true.

And so today, without cant or preachment, this memorial service means that to me, as he looks back over his shoulder and says to us his friends—and there was no enemy here—"Come on, boys, get ready for the better life." We note the ring of truth in the conviction which sounds through his voice in that message to us. There is a chance for us so to live here that the open grave will be stood on end and become but a door to a life of greater usefulness and joyful activity. There should be great incentive in that challenge. It seems to me a grand heritage he has left us. We mourn his passing, but it is not goodby, merely au revoir.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with other Members of the House in paying a last tribute of respect to our departed friend and colleague, Hon. ULYSSES S. GUYER. While the death of Judge GUYER had been expected for some time, yet the

announcement of his passing came as a heavy shock to all of us.

It seems but yesterday we paused in our busy deliberations to mourn the death of another outstanding Member of our body and a distinguished Republican leader, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT].

The constant passing of our friends impresses upon us the fact that each and every one of us must meet this greatest adventure of all—the passing from this earthly sphere to the great unknown—Eternity. Longfellow expresses the thought most beautifully in the words

There is a Reaper whose name is Death,
And with his sickle keen,
He reaps the bearded grain at a breath,
And the flowers that grow between.

Neither youth nor age, poverty nor riches, the humble nor the great, the weak nor the strong, the wicked nor the good, can escape this reaper with his sickle. Yet, with this certainty, death of each one of our loved ones and friends brings shock and grief to us.

It has been said that our friend and colleague, Judge GUYER, met death without fear and as a man who was about to receive his greatest reward for a beautiful, splendid, and useful life. His was a full life as an educator, jurist, lawyer, and for nearly 20 years as a Member of Congress.

As an educator he shaped the lives of thousands of young people; as a jurist he was able and honest, and as a Member of Congress he served his constituency, his State, and his country and our institutions with fidelity and patriotic zeal.

The House of Representatives today honors itself in laying aside its official activities and in paying honor to one of God's noblemen. He was the ranking Republican on our Judiciary Committee and I sat near him. I have been closely associated with him for many years in the House and there is no Member of the House for whom I felt a greater affection or whom I held in higher esteem.

Death is one sorrow from which we refuse to be divorced. While mere words are almost futile on occasions like this, however, I find much consolation, as do, I am sure, the members of his family and his friends that Judge GUYER lived a long and honorable life. He won and held the respect and esteem of all those who had the good fortune to know him. He was one of those men who knew himself. He controlled himself and best of all he denied himself and took up his cross and followed in the footsteps of the Man of Galilee. His was a life of service to his family, his constituency, his State, and his country. I have greatly admired him through the years for his high and noble purposes and his lofty patriotism. He loved his country passionately, and he was ever ready to defend our institutions and American ideals. The Congress and the Nation have lost a great American and we this day mingle our tears with his family and his other friends.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT—

Break, break, break,
On thy cold gray stones, O sea!
And I would that my tongue could utter
The thoughts that arise in me.
O, well for the fisherman's boy,
That he shouts with his sister at play!
O, well for the sailor lad,
That sings in his boat on the bay!
And the stately ships go on,
To their haven under the hill;
But O for the touch of a vanished hand,
And the sound of a voice that is still!

Mr. Speaker, while we all daily expected the death of our late and lamented colleague the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. U. S. GUYER, we were naturally grieved to hear of his passing. It only goes to show that after all there is nothing in life which men will cling to, and fight so tenaciously for, as life itself. However aged or infirm, and regardless of how much they may be suffering, we are never quite ready to give up those who are near and dear to us.

One of the first men I met and became personally and intimately acquainted with after my election to the Seventy-first Congress nearly 15 years ago was ULYSSES SAMUEL GUYER from the State of Kansas. I suppose it was only natural that I should meet him because several years previous to that my father who was postmaster of my little home town had attended a postmasters' meeting in Kansas City. He returned and told me in glowing terms of the beautiful, masterly address he had heard by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER] and having graduated myself from Baker University, which is located in his congressional district, it was natural that I knew many of his constituents. Often when I have spoken in Kansas City those constituents have done me the honor and extended the courtesy of attending those meetings. So, because of mutual friends we had on both sides of the line in Kansas and Missouri, there grew up between us a warm and abiding friendship. Time was, Mr. Speaker, when the boys in Missouri and Kansas did not get along quite so well together. Well did Mr. GUYER recall when Quantrell and his gang from my State raided Lawrence and burned the hotel. But all of that bitterness and discord back in the time of the War between the States and immediately following, has vanished. Behold how sweet it is for brethren to dwell in brotherly love.

U. S. GUYER, Mr. Speaker, was a sort of grand, picturesque figure. He belonged to the old school. While he was not blind to the march of progress and not unwilling to keep step with the times, he was fundamentally conservative. He was grounded in the history and past traditions of our American Republic. He believed in the Declaration of Independence and revered the Constitution almost as much as he did his Bible. He read the Farewell Address of George Washington, the Father of our Country, almost as assiduously as he read the Holy Writ. He stood for the Bill of Rights, and I know that the anxiety and the worry that he has entertained in recent years at the trend away from representative, constitutional democracy toward centralized powerful bureaucracy did not prolong his life.

Mr. GUYER was a great orator. I think it is unfortunate that the new Members of this Congress, even those who served in the last Congress, never knew him. Oh, you have seen him often, but you did not know him as did the older Members of this House. I wish that you might have seen him in his heyday along with the elderly Members of this body, when torrential eloquence poured from his stentorian throat with Niagara force, sentences that sparkled with the brilliance of diamonds, phrases that rolled like peals of thunder, charming and convincing his auditors whether they be in this House or on the public platform.

U. S. GUYER was a man of a deeply religious nature, entertaining strong moral convictions to which he adamantly adhered; yet he was full of the milk of human kindness and had enough hard common sense to know that no pancake is ever so flat but that it does not have two sides. Always he was willing to look at both sides of any great burning public issue.

We can ill afford to lose men of his character and caliber in such times as these. Oh, how I wish I might say something to assuage the sorrow or lessen the grief of his dearly beloved wife, who was truly a great helpmate, a charming woman who has the same kind of religious convictions and the same burning patriotism in her breast as did her husband. But she will discover, Mr. Speaker, that time perhaps is the only thing that can partially heal such deep and sore wounds as she has at this hour. When my heart is overwhelmed I look up unto the Rock that is higher than I. And it must be a source of great comfort, solace, and strength to Mrs. Guyer in this dark hour of her irreparable loss to look up unto that Rock that is higher than she and who, because she has the same kind of religious convictions her husband had, will find a strength and a support in the everlasting arms of a benign and beneficent Providence, a source of strength that comes from Someone greater than any human mortal.

We all extend to her our deep, heartfelt, and sincere sympathy, and we, along with her, shall cherish until our final summons the precious and tender memories, the glories of combat, triumph, and defeat which we have experienced during the past score of years in this body with one of the finest Christian gentlemen and greatest Americans that it has ever been our privilege to know.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with the Kansas delegation in giving my tribute to the late and lamented ULYSSES S. GUYER, now deceased. On Saturday morning, when I learned of the death of our distinguished friend and colleague, I was both shocked and grieved, because I had been associated closely with him since I came as a Member of this body at the commencement

of the Seventy-sixth Congress. Judge GUYER, as we affectionately called him, was one of the men I first met when I came; from the hour of our meeting until he was taken away from us, our friendship had ripened and continued. I came to recognize in him those admirable traits of character which directly appeal to all of us—those of a fine citizen, an outstanding patriot, a great statesman, a devoted and constant American, and a loyal friend.

Many of us in this great lawmaking body are not thrown together in extremely close association, because of our segregated committee work and because of our extremely busy days in intricate legislative problems with which we have to deal. But it was my rare good fortune to have been closely associated with our colleague on the Judiciary Committee, in the House of Representatives. Judge GUYER was the ranking minority member of that great committee, of which I have had the honor to be a member during my service here. Thus, our association became close and constant. His parents when they migrated westward had resided near Sulphur Springs, in Henry County, Ind., for a period of time, which place of their residence is located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. By reason of that fact, Judge GUYER would frequently discuss with me some of the older inhabitants in that vicinity, many of whom he knew by personal contact during visits he had made to the vicinity of the family residence in Indiana.

Judge GUYER loved his home State of Kansas. He was a part of the very fiber and sinew of that great Commonwealth. He held positions of great responsibility and public trust in his home State and as mayor of Kansas City, Kans., he demonstrated outstanding executive ability. His long service in this body stamped him as an outstanding legislator and statesman.

In early life he faced many struggles, but by reason of energy, honesty, loyalty to his people and his country, and unwavering fidelity he ascended the ladder of fame to a fixed place in the hearts of the people of this Nation. His counsel and advice was often sought by the Members of this body and especially by the younger Congressmen, and it was a rare privilege for him to aid and assist those who were less informed. He was truly the friend of man.

When our country became involved in this terrible war, Judge GUYER was greatly distressed. He frequently discussed with others the great hardships and suffering of our soldiers and sailors in this gigantic crisis; he was saddened by it; he expressed the hope that peace would soon come to our Nation. Thus we knew him—our esteemed friend—when he was under the stress of grave responsibilities, when our country was engaged at war, and we knew him when the veil was removed and those finer intimacies which are forever reserved by each one of us for but a few were then exposed; and we knew him when he expressed sound logic and statesmanlike utterances in his constant effort to solve the pending problems of the day. He loved his country. He was both kindly and he was brave.

Our loyal friend, our constant friend, whose memory I will long cherish, lived a good life. He ever struggled onward and forward with the constant weight of the livid problems of the people before him. He continued at his post serving his people as long as health would permit. His last appearance in this Chamber came when he was scarcely able to come; yet, as ever, he responded to his duty as a servant of the people he represented. The summons came for his departure while he was in this city. He was unafraid. While within the shadow of the scene of his constant effort for his country throughout the many years of his service here, he "calmly wrapped the draperies of his couch about him and lay down to pleasant dreams."

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the life work of our friend was ended. The brilliant career of a brilliant man was over.

As we say to him, "Farewell," I wish to pay my humble, yet sincere, tribute to him—my friend—in the unforgotten words which were spoken of a hero in the years gone by—

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the World, "This was a man!"

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, there are none of us who have friends to spare, but when death stalked into this Chamber and took away ULYSSES S. GUYER a loss was inflicted upon me that I can ill afford. Judge GUYER to me was eminent in all things. In his life there were mixed in right proportions all the virtues that go to the making of a man. His high talents were never soiled by ignoble use.

As a Member of this body who knew him long, intimately and well, and as one who loved him devotedly, I join with the thousands who bemoan his passing.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it is true that today the spoken word will show the deep and sincere affection with which Judge GUYER is held in the hearts of his colleagues of the Congress. The written record cannot show the timbre of sincerity and sadness of the voices of those who have spoken of our beloved friend.

It was my privilege to serve during the Seventy-seventh Congress with Judge GUYER upon the House Judiciary Committee. The distinguished chairman of that committee, Judge SUMNERS, has expressed the thought that sometimes our sense of values is disproportionate—that sometimes we have a false sense of values. It is a most affectionate recollection to have known Judge GUYER not only on the committee but on occasions that I met and had early breakfast with him. He had a great fund of anecdotes and history of the Midwest—not only historical as to Iowa and Kansas and Indiana and of other States, but of individual characters of those States—and often my day began with the inspiration of hearing Judge GUYER tell at the breakfast table some of his early personal recollections of people and events that made history in the Midwest. He was in himself a historian and it will be regretted if Judge GUYER did not leave some written memoirs, which would be of great historical value.

Judge GUYER is a lesson in himself to all of us in public life. When we get down to the end of things the personal esteem and affection in which we are held by those with whom we serve is perhaps the finest tribute that can come to men.

ULYSSES SAMUEL GUYER never asked how many were on his side of a cause; if he believed in a cause he was the advocate and champion of that cause. He was a devout Christian. His advocacy and his religion were always tempered with tolerance, and his associates knew his kind and generous nature. It is a tribute to the members of the legal profession and of the Judiciary Committee that while they may be as individuals engaged in the conflict of a cause, whether it be in the courts or in legislation, that they bear no animosity in the conflict and clash of debate, whether it be upon the law or upon proposed legislation.

Norse mythology has given us the Halls of Valhalla; that to these halls were summoned the warriors who had died in battle, and that every morning thereafter poured from its 540 gates these spirit warriors who continued to fight the battles in which they died. And so it is with the causes that Judge GUYER represented, for from Valhalla his warrior spirit will ever continue by the influences which he made in his lifetime.

I join with you who have spoken and who will speak in extending my most heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Guyer in the loss which she has sustained. She will be in some measure comforted in knowing how much we appreciated in his lifetime the distinguished, splendid, Christian gentleman, U. S. GUYER.

The Second District of Kansas and the Congress will share with her the sadness of his passing.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the Old Testament stresses the God of Wrath. The New Testament stresses the God of Love. There was no greater interpreter of the new dispensation than the Apostle Paul. Nothing he has sent down to us through the ages has done me personally more good than the description he gave of the kind of sounding brass and tinkling cymbal an eloquent tongue was which spoke from a heart in which there was no charity.

Mr. GUYER was one of the first of the old Members I met when I came here some 10 years ago. He was friendly with new Members because he was friendly with everyone. In all the time I served here with him, I never heard him say an unkind word against anyone.

After I came to know him better, he often reminded me of an old friend I knew in Richmond, Dr. J. T. Mastin. When I was elected to the State senate

in 1915, State-wide prohibition was the burning political issue in Virginia. Dr. Mastin was chairman of our State board of charities and corrections, doing the work later assumed by what we call the State welfare board. Dr. Mastin was for State-wide prohibition. In February 1916 we had before the State senate a bill to raise Dr. Mastin's salary from the munificent sum of $2,400 a year to $3,000 a year, which was in that day and time a major increase and precipitated a lively debate. Naturally, because feeling over the prohibition issue had run so high, I expected to see considerable criticism on the floor of the State senate over the proposal of our senate finance committee to increase the salary of Dr. Mastin. Much to my surprise, the leader of the wet forces in the senate, possibly the most eloquent man in that body, Col. Tom Downing, of Lancaster, Va., arose in support of the increase in the pay of Dr. Mastin and in the course of his remarks said to us, "Dr. Mastin is so charitable you would not know he is a Christian."

Some who have led reform movements have proceeded, I fear, on the theory of the Old Testament, the God of Wrath, the theory of compulsion, the theory of force; but not our departed friend. He proceeded on the theory of love, on the theory of persuasion.

I will miss Mr. GUYER. The House will miss Mr. GUYER. The House is better by reason of his 18 years' of service here, because, "careless of monument by the grave, he built it in the world; a monument by which men might be taught to remember not where he died but where he lived."

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], in his remarks very properly included a tribute to the beautiful character of the bereaved widow. Within a day or two after I came to join this body, Mr. GUYER came over and sat down beside me, introduced himself, and explained that Mrs. Guyer was a native of South Dakota and he took a great deal of interest in any Member who came from that State.

We visited there a little that day, and I shall never forget a remark he made to me at that time. Someone was speaking from the well of the House and delivering himself at some length and with a great deal of energy. Mr. GUYER said to me, "CASE, when your time comes to speak here, do not take yourself too seriously. Some of the speeches you will think are the best speeches you have made, perhaps those you work the hardest on, will not be appreciated as you think they should. Above all, do not talk too long. You must remember that nearly every person who becomes a Member of this body has to make some speeches to get here, and a lot of the fellows are going to be sitting back thinking how much better a job of making that speech they could do than you."

I have thought of that a great many times, and have profited by the advice. As to Judge GUYER himself, however, I have thought of it somewhat in reverse, because there were few men who spoke to this body who had such oratorical force as ULYSSES S. GUYER when he was in the full strength of his powers.

He was a man who did take an interest in new Members, as so many Members have said. And we have always been appreciative of the special interest which he and Mrs. Guyer took in the Members from South Dakota because of her early residence there.

I think probably one can find in his own remarks the best epitaph of his work. In an address which Mr. GUYER gave on the service of Members of the House at one time, he spoke of the high purposes and the great aims with which most Members come to this body and how they devote themselves to their accomplishment. In that address there ran a passage like this: "We come here with high hopes, we do what we can about these things, and then one day we find we have grown old in the effort."

The phrase "We grow old in the effort" has come to me as I have thought of Mr. GUYER in the last few weeks, because he was a man who came here with high purposes, who fought the good fight for the causes in which he believed, and who grew old in the service of his country. Of no man could it better be said, I think, that he could come to the end of his days, hear the summons to join the innumerable caravan, and, sustained by an unfaltering trust, wrap the draperies of his couch about him, and lie down to pleasant dreams.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am a comparatively new Member of the House, yet I, too, held Congressman GUYER as one of my best friends in this Chamber. I am not a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, so I cannot speak of my association with him from that standpoint.

To indicate my high regard for him I was about to characterize him as a scholar and a gentleman, but that would be inadequate, so I want to revise that and characterize our departed friend as a profound scholar and a Christian gentleman.

I have listened carefully to the eulogies pronounced today by my colleagues. I notice that they paid tributes to him as a jurist, an outstanding lawyer, a statesman with a wonderful background of experience. One Member spoke of his power of oratory by saying he was an orator of no mean ability, which I thought was an understatement, for I always looked upon him as a brilliant orator.

Reference has been made to some of his speeches here in the Chamber, especially on memorial programs. One address of his which is outstanding in my mind is the oration that I heard in the Rotunda at the time of the unveiling of the famous painting by Howard Chandler Christy. It is one of the most scholarly efforts I have ever heard, and one which I have reread with interest and profit.

Congressman GUYER told me that at one time he had been a school teacher, and that was an open door to my heart. I know that he was deeply interested in the right kind of education. Because he was so devoted to basic American life, he attempted, for educational purposes, to get copies made of this famous painting here at the Capitol, the signing of the Constitution of the United States in Old Independence Hall, September 17, 1787, to be widely furnished to schools. He wanted the boys and girls of America to know that famous group of men who established our supreme law, and I have concurred with him and helped a little bit in that effort.

Sometimes I feel that the outside world is prone to think of Members of this Chamber as men who are engrossed wholly in politics, so that they do not think of spiritual things. That is not true, and when I have attempted to refute it in the public mind I have often pointed to Congressman GUYER of Kansas. It has been said here that he was a champion of causes arousing great controversy, and he stood adamant for what he thought was right without fear or favor. Regardless of politics, I say to Christian America that it has never had a finer representation in this Chamber than that of our departed colleague, the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. GUYER.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, a number of reasons prompt me to say a word today in honor of our late colleague. The first one is that some 42 years ago I was born in a small city in the district which Congressman GUYER represented while he was in Congress. I knew many people that he knew. We used to discuss them, some of those people were still in Kansas, and some had gone from Kansas to the district I now represent in California. I remember the last conversation I had with him was about a very fine woman who had recently passed away in Pomona, Calif. She had come there from eastern Kansas. I remember Judge GUYER said on that occasion how little any of us ever know when our time will come and when we, too, will be called.

Another reason I wanted to pay my tribute was because on one occasion I had the honor of speaking from the same platform in one of the churches in Washington, D. C., with Judge GUYER, one of the happiest memories I have of my experience here in Washington. I, too, like Judge GUYER and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], have spent a considerable portion of my life as a school teacher, and we recognize certain things in one another and are able to sympathize and understand each other. Finally, it can be truly said of Judge GUYER that "he has run a good race, he has finished his course, he has kept the faith." It becomes our simple duty not only to pay tribute to his memory in words here today, but to attempt to carry on our work in a manner worthy of the

tradition which he so nobly advanced while he was here.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation, the United States of America, I know we have lost a most valuable Member of this Board, the Congress of the United States, a Member whose wise counsel and devotion to American ideals and the welfare of our country was an inspiration to the membership of this body.

In the passing of Congressman GUYER the people of Kansas have lost a great advocate, and our country has lost a noble citizen, and I have lost a valuable friend.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, the death of Judge ULYSSES S. GUYER has saddened all of us.

For several years it has been my privilege to serve on the Committee on the Judiciary, of which Mr. GUYER was the ranking minority member. He filled that post with dignity and honor. He possessed a great knowledge of the history of our country. He was a deep student of politics in its broad sense and was one of the ablest and most sincere defenders of the philosophy of government set forth in the American Constitution. In all his work in Congress he kept foremost his duty to his Nation, his State, and his district.

Many of us will always remember him as a true and helpful friend. Judge GUYER was one of the first men I met when I came to Congress. As a young man he lived in Toledo, Iowa, and many people in Iowa knew him and are proud of his splendid record. In the troubled times that lie ahead his counsel will be greatly missed.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this solemn occasion to pay my humble tribute to a great American and my warm personal friend, Congressman U. S. GUYER, of Kansas. His passing is a personal loss to me. I am saddened and depressed.

At the beginning of my service in Congress, more than 10 years ago, Congressman GUYER was among the first Members with whom I became acquainted. His office and mine were almost opposite on the same corridor in the Old House Office Building. He called on and conferred with me more than any other Member in Congress. He was not only my colleague and friend but my neighbor in the fullest sense and meaning of that word. I admired and respected him greatly. His courageous convictions and steadfastness on issues for the moment not mandated by popular approval marked him as a man of principle and resolute purpose.

His rectitude in all things, his sterling character, his noble attributes, his generous impulses, his unyielding adherence to what he believed to be right, his sobriety and clean habits of living marked him as an outstanding man.

He was endowed with rare ability. He was truly a great orator. He possessed a remarkable memory and never wearied those who listened to his historic narratives and information. He stood like a giant among men. He was kindly and considerate, hard working, careful and conscientious in his legislative duties. He searched for the truth. He was a fearless defender of the American form of government and our American way of life under it. To him can be ascribed the phrase that "an honest man is the noblest work of God."

Congressman GUYER was such a man. He was a firm believer in and was sustained by an unfaltering faith in God. He was a Christian gentleman.

His State and Nation were made better by his life and deeds. He has answered the last roll call and joined another company where there is no middle aisle. Farewell, faithful and intelligent servant of the Republic.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the first Member of Congress I met on coming to Washington, D. C., was Judge U. S. GUYER, of Kansas. Over a period of 2½ years we became well acquainted. For several months we lived at the same hotel. We discussed many legal questions in which, lawyer-like, we had a common interest. It has been said that Judge GUYER was not only an able jurist but a historian. I know that to be true. Our congressional districts adjoin for more than 100 miles along the Missouri-Kansas border. I have often heard Judge GUYER refer to the bloody but historic warfare which at one time raged along that famous border. That warfare gave rise to bitter feelings which exist to this day, and which influence the political currents of Missouri and Kansas. Congressman GUYER, or Judge as his friends prefer to call him, knew all the details of that tragic era of history.

Judge U. S. GUYER was a kindly man. He was a good, moral man. He was a man of keen mind and stanch faith. His passing is to me a personal loss. It will be difficult for the good people of Kansas to find a man to represent the Second Kansas District with the luster shown by Judge GUYER in his long and useful service to State and Nation. All honor to his memory.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. U. S. GUYER, from the the neighboring State of Kansas, was one of the first men to greet me and try to make me welcome when I came into the House of Representatives, a stranger. He tried to make me feel at home in this great deliberative body. In order to make a personal contact, he recalled that he had a niece living in the little town of Paonia, Colo., in which I reside. I had known her for many years and also her family, including Mr. GUYER's sister. Thereafter, if he passed anywhere near my seat, he would stop and ask if I had had any recent word from his niece or her family back in the western part of Colorado.

I did not know Mr. GUYER during the days of his greatest activity in this body, but I did have the privilege of knowing the sympathetic, thoughtful, kind man who treated me more as a son or nephew than as a new Member coming into a strange surrounding. All my life I shall recall the cordial greeting and the friendly visits and the occasional advice that he gave me on matters that affected the mutual interests of his State and mine.

May there be many more men with that same understanding, the same courteous manner, the same thoughtful and friendly interest in people and in this great country of ours.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the death of our colleague, ULYSSES S. GUYER, was a sad blow to his friends and a great loss to his country. His lingering illness filled us with apprehension and prepared our minds in some measure to expect the announcement of the end, but the tenacity with which he clung to life, the determination with which he fought the ravages of disease, and the cheerfulness with which he faced each new complication gave many of us hope and even belief that he would surmount all obstacles and emerge victorious in his battle for physical existence.

His high sense of duty persuaded him a few weeks ago to arise from his sickbed and attend a session of the House of Representatives in order to cast his vote on the pending tax bill. He had, however, miscalculated his strength and the effort exhausted him. He departed soon after the roll call, never to return.

Congressman GUYER was born in Illinois. His parents shortly thereafter moved to Iowa and thence to Kansas, where he attained his academic, classical, and legal education. His rise was rapid. He became successively an educator, a lawyer, a judge, a mayor, and a Member of Congress. Assigned to the Committee on the Judiciary, he devoted his major energies to the legal problems that that committee considers. He was firm in his convictions, which he reached only after careful investigation. There was nothing hypocritical in his make-up. He did not profess one thing and do another. He detested demagoguery. It was readily discernible that, as a practicing lawyer, he had not been one who would represent a client in the justice of whose cause he had no confidence. His uniform courtesy was notable. Never, in committee, in all the discussions in which he took part, did a word escape his lips that bore the sting of bitterness nor was he ever guilty of insinuations against or aspersions upon the motives of those who opposed him. Thus he was always sure of a respectful hearing, no matter what might be his attitude upon any question at issue. He revered the Constitution and the orderly processes of the law, to which he had dedicated his life. But he never forgot

his earlier struggles in life and the people who were his friends and associates before he had entered upon his chosen profession.

Six years ago he gave me a copy of a letter of greeting that he had just sent to those who had been students in the high school when he was principal—40 years before. To them he expressed his philosophy of life in these beautiful words:

Oh, a wonderful stream is the River Time,
As it runs through the realm of tears,
With a faultless rhythm, a musical rhyme,
And a broader sweep and a surge sublime,
As it blends with the ocean of years.

How the winters are drifting like flakes of snow,
And the summers, like birds between,
And the years in the sheaf—so they come and they go,
On the river's breast, with its ebb and its flow,
As it glides in the shadow and sheen.

There's a magical isle up the River Time,
Where the softest of airs are playing;
There's a cloudless sky and a tropical clime,
And a song as sweet as a vesper chime,
And the Junes with the roses are straying.

And the name of this isle is the Long Ago,
And we bury our treasures there;
There are brows of beauty, and bosoms of snow;
There are heaps of dust—oh, we loved them so!
There are trinkets and tresses of hair.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 251), which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ULYSSES S. GUYER, a Representative from the State of Kansas.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] as a committee to attend the funeral of the late Representative.

ADJOURNMENT

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 8, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, June 8, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments. Room 246, old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:15 a. m. on Tuesday, June 8, 1943, for consideration of housing bills, in room 1304, New House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will hold public hearings on Tuesday, June 8, 1943, beginning at 10 a. m., on bills relating to the classification and compensation of substitute employees in the Postal Service.

There will be a meeting of subcommittee No. 7 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Friday, June 11, 1943, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of bills relating to the carrying of mail on star routes. Public hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Investigation of Restrictions on Brand Names and Newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Tuesday, June 8, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear additional important witnesses on the hosiery order. At 2 p. m., June 9, the committee will hear some O. P. A. boys.

There will be a meeting of the Securities Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Wednesday, June 9, 1943.

Business to be considered: Open hearing to hear Mr. Ganson Purcell, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, on proxy rules.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The Committee on the Public Lands will meet at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, June 8, 1943, to consider H. R. 2241, to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument, Wyoming. Anyone wishing to appear before the committee or to file a statement for the record should contact the clerk of the committee.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

1. Tuesday, June 8: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, including the Arkansas and White Rivers, and on rivers flowing into the Gulf west of the Mississippi River, and in the western Rocky Mountain region, including Texas and Colorado, and in the Pacific Northwest region, including the Willamette River and the Columbia River and tributaries.

2. Wednesday, June 9: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the Los Angeles area and in the State of California, including the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kern River Valleys, and on projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

3. Thursday, June 10: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

4. Friday, June 11: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold public hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, June 9, 1943, on private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 9, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2620, a bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives of the United States, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 16, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2731, to facilitate the award and payment of just compensation for property requisitioned under the authority of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

458. A letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period April 1 to May 31, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

459. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend Public Law 537, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

460. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the conveyance to the State

of Virginia, for highway purposes only, of a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

461. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of March 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

462. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report and recommendation concerning the claim of Pacific Construction Co. Lt., against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

463. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 24, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Occohannock Creek, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives adopted on January 21, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 223); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with three illustrations.

464. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $411,600 (H. Doc. No. 221); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

465. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 972. An act to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417); without amendment (Rept. No. 528). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2886. A bill to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 2887. A bill transferring certain functions of the Price Administrator with respect to petroleum and petroleum products to the Petroleum Administrator for War; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2888. A bill relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 2889. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KLEBERG:

H. R. 2890. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. R. 2891. A bill for the erection of a public building at Freeport, Brazoria County, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 2892. A bill to provide for the appointment of female dentists in the Dental Corps of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 2893. A bill to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws, to place them on a quota basis, and to repeal the laws denying Chinese the right to become citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 2894. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept title to certain tracts of land in Bennett County, S. Dak., as an addition to the La Creek National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2895. A bill to stimulate production of strategic and critical minerals for the present war effort and to assure an adequate supply of such minerals for any future emergency by continuance, intact, in the post-war period of all stock piles surviving the present war and by necessary augmentation thereof primarily from domestic sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. Res. 252. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2859, a bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 253. Resolution authorizing a select committee to study, investigate, and report to the House upon the purposes and effects of the present tax rates and benefits authorized under the Social Security Act, as amended, and all acts relating thereto; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 1502; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIES:

H. R. 2896. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Rhodes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 2897. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to award a Distinguished Service Cross to Joseph F. Conlon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 2898. A bill to extend Reissued Letters Patent No. 19,023; to the Committee on Patents.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1406. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. E. C. Murray and the West Avenue Circle of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Charlotte, N. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1407. Also, petition of Rev. C. C. Matheny and 36 members of the Franklin Baptist Church of Greenville, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1408. Also, petition of Mrs. W. B. Christian and 171 citizens of Scranton and Harrisburg, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1409. Also, petition of Mrs. J. E. Goddard and 11 members of a Sunday-school class of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church of Columbia, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1410. Also, petition of Thomas S. Brock and 36 citizens of Lake Worth, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1411. Also, petition of Rev. Marvin Green and 46 citizens of Barnard, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1412. Also, petition of Marjory Bowden and 146 citizens of Macomb, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1413. Also, petition of the Pennsylvania Conference of the Primitive Methodist Church, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1414. Also, petition of the Interdenominational Prayer League of Sumter, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1415. Also, petition of Mrs. Raymond Eicher and 176 citizens of Fairchance, Pa.,

urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1416. Also, petition of Mrs. Albert Force and 102 citizens of Scranton, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1417. Also, petition of 27 citizens of Washington, D. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1418. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Rush City, Minn., with 15 signatures, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1419. Also, petition of Mrs. W. B. Gibson and 40 citizens of Santa Ana, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1420. Also, petition of Mrs. D. T. Pearce and 38 citizens of State College, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1421. Also, petition of Mrs. J. L. Unruch and 144 citizens of Roselle, Del., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1422. Also, petition of Mrs. J. A. Stafford and 55 citizens of Bozeman, Mont., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1423. Also, petition of Mrs. Thomas S. Anderson and 56 citizens of Frederick, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1424. Also, petition of 600 members of the faculty and student body of Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1425. Also, petition of C. H. Myers and 22 citizens of Cheraw, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1426. Also, petition of Miss M. B. Adams and 72 citizens of the District of Columbia, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1427. Also, petition of the First Presbyterian Church of Salem, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1428. Also, petition of Gertrude B. Ross and 20 citizens of Lake Worth, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1429. Also, petition of Grace M. Hamilton and 43 citizens of Dover, N. H., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1430. Also, petition of Nettie Cramer and 20 citizens of Lake Worth, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1431. Also, petition of B. E. Atkins and 22 citizens of St. Cloud, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1432. Also, petition of C. R. Griffin and 65 citizens of Kershaw and Jefferson, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1433. Also, petition of Mrs. J. W. Lansdowne and 23 citizens of Madison, Wis., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1434. Also, petition of Mrs. Smith Wisegarver and 65 citizens of Champaign, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1435. Also, petition of Sarah C. Waterman and 23 citizens of Washington, D. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1436. Also, petition of Mrs. Verne Bowers and 15 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of De Witt, Ark., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1437. Also, petition of Rev. Paul F. Beacham and 26 members of the Holmes Memorial Church, of Greenville, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1438. Also, petition of Rev. S. T. Clark and 45 citizens of Portsmouth, Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1439. Also, petition of Mrs. Eley Sherwin and 25 citizens of Cedar Springs, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1440. Also, petition of Mrs. Jessie Green and 133 citizens of Farmington, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1441. Also, petition of Mrs. Joe Kainz and 13 citizens of Little Falls, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1442. Also, petition of the Church Federation of Dayton and Montgomery Counties, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a

measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1443. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of various citizens of Woodsfield, Ohio, recommending the passage of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1444. Also, petition of various citizens of Guernsey County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1445. Also, petition of various citizens of Marietta, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, a bill to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1446. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of J. C. Montgomery and 104 other citizens of Franklin County, Tex., urging the enactment of House bill 1649, introduced by the Honorable PAT CANNON of Florida; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1447. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition submitted by May DeGreene, of Addison, Mich., and signed by 23 other residents of the community, urging enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1448. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Mrs. W. C. Almy and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1449. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 68 citizens of Beaver County, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1450. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Anna M. Reist and 14 other members of the Wilbur Samuels Camp and Auxiliary, United Spanish War Veterans of Manhattan, Kans., urging support of House bill 2350, and stating the need of many for the increase of pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

1451. Also, petition of Mrs. C. M. Clements, representing the Hiawatha Woman's Christian Temperance Union and 128 other citizens, urging support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, stating that our country needs our best service at this time and liquor is saboteur No. 1 at the present time; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1452. Also, petition of U. R. Welsh and 52 other citizens of Robinson, Kans., and that community, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1453. Also, petition of Rev. Troy P. Bess, of Holton, Kans., and 43 other citizens of that community, urging the passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1454. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Chandlersville, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, a bill to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1455. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of W. E. Reid, Italy, Tex., favoring House bill 2684; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1456. By Mr. CASE: Petition of Mrs. F. A. Chamberlain, president, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and 157 citizens of Hot Springs, S. Dak., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1457. By Mr. SCHUETZ: Memorial of the Illinois House of Representatives, May 19, 1943, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps in order to assure that the close of World War No. 2 will not find our Nation unprepared to properly care for our sick and wounded, as was the case in World War No. 1; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1458. By the SPEAKER: Petition of sundry citizens of Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 796; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who in the former times didst lead our fathers forth into this land, give Thy grace to us their children in these days of crisis, that we may prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and eager to be the instruments of Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure religion. Save the inner life of the Nation from violence, discord, and confusion, from pride and arrogance, and from every evil way. By the very fiery trial through which we are passing fashion into one people the multitudes brought hither of many kindreds and tongues. As we gird ourselves to do battle with the principalities and powers of evil Thou art the courage that arms us, the strength that sustains us.

Endue with the spirit of wisdom those who have been trusted with responsibility and authority in these troublous times. For the preservation of liberty, for the defeat of all tyranny, for the opportunity still to be free souls, for the redemption of democracy from its failures, for the establishment of a just and lasting peace, we lift our hearts to Thee, O God of our salvation. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, June 7, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2584) to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

NOTICE OF ILLUSTRATED LECTURE ON THE HELICOPTER BY IGOR SIKORSKY

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I announce to Members of Congress that the Senate Naval Affairs Committee cordially invites all Members of Congress and their staffs to attend a motion picture and illustrated lecture setting forth the value of the helicopter by Igor Sikorsky, noted airplane designer and inventor, to be given in the caucus room, 318 Senate Office Building, Wednesday, June 9, 1943, at 10:30 a. m. This program should be of great interest to all Members.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT BEFORE DELEGATES TO UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the address delivered yesterday afternoon, June 7, 1943, by the President of the United States to the delegates to the United Nations Conference on food and agriculture.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It gives me great pleasure to welcome to the White House you who have served so splendidly at the epoch-making United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture.

I use that word "epoch-making" advisedly. The Conference could not have failed to be significant because it was the first United Nations Conference. But it has succeeded even beyond our hopes; it is truly epoch-making because, in reaching unanimity upon complex and difficult problems, you have demonstrated beyond question that the United Nations really are united—not only for the prosecution of the war but for the solution of the many and difficult problems of peace. This conference has been a living demonstration of the methods by which the conversations of nations of like mind contemplated by Article VII of the Mutual Aid Agreement can and will give practical application to the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

You have been dealing with agriculture, the most basic of all human activities, and with food, the most basic of all human needs. Twice as many people are employed in work on food and agriculture as in work in all other fields combined. And all people have, in the literal sense of the word, a vital interest in food.

That a child or adult should get the nourishment necessary for full health is too important a thing to be left to mere chance.

You have recognized that society must accept this responsibility. As you stated in your declaration, "The primary responsibility lies with each nation for seeing that its own people have the food needed for health and life; steps to this end are for national deter-

mination. But each nation can fully achieve its goal only if all work together." On behalf of the United States I accept this declaration.

You have gone beyond the general recognition of principles to deal in specific terms with specific tasks and projects.

You have examined the needs of all countries for food and other agricultural products, both as they will exist in the short-run period of recovery from the devastation of war and as they will exist over the longer run, when our efforts can be fully devoted to expanding the production of food so that it will be adequate for health the world over.

You have surveyed with courage and with realism the magnitude of these problems and have reached unanimous agreement that they can, and must—and will—be solved.

It is true that no nation has ever had enough food to feed all of its people as we now know human beings should be fed. But neither have nations representing over 80 percent of the world's 2,000,000,000 inhabitants ever before been joined together to achieve such an aim. Never before have they set out to bend their united efforts to the development of the world's resources so that all men might seek to attain food they need.

For the short run, you have pointed out steps which have to be taken both in increasing supplies and in maintaining economy of use and coordination of distribution.

In considering our long-range problems, you have surveyed our knowledge of the inadequacy in the quantity and quality of the diet of peoples in all lands. You have pooled our knowledge of the means of expanding our output, of increasing our agricultural efficiency, and of adjusting agricultural production to consumption needs. In the fields of both production and consumption you have recognized the need for the better utilization of the knowledge we now have and for extending still further the boundaries of our knowledge through education and research.

You have called upon your governments individually and collectively to enlarge and improve their activities in these fields.

For the perfection and rapid execution of these plans, you have recommended the creation of a permanent United Nations organization. To facilitate and hasten the creation of that organization, and to carry on the work you have begun until its creation, you have established an interim commission. The Government of the United States is honored that you have asked that the interim commission have its seat in Washington, and will be glad to take the preliminary action for the establishment of that commission which you have entrusted to it.

Finally, you have expressed your deep conviction that our goal in this field cannot be attained without forward action in other fields as well. Increased food production must be accompanied by increased industrial production and by increased purchasing power. There must be measures for dealing with trade barriers, international exchange stability, and international investment. The better use of natural and human resources must be assured to improve the living standard; and, may I add, the better use of these resources without exploitation on the part of any nation. Many of these questions lie outside the scope of the work you have undertaken, but their solution is nonetheless essential to its success. They require, and shall receive, our united attention.

In the political field, these relationships are equally important. And they work both ways. A sound world agricultural program will depend upon world political security, while that security will in turn be greatly strengthened if each country can be assured of the food it needs. Freedom from want and freedom from fear go hand in hand.

Our ultimate objective can be simply stated: It is to build for ourselves, for all men, a world in which each individual human being shall have the opportunity to live out his life in peace; to work productively, earning at least enough for his actual needs and those of his family; to associate with the friends of his choice; to think and worship freely; and to die secure in the knowledge that his children, and their children, shall have the same opportunities.

That objective, as men know from long and bitter experience, will not be easy to achieve. But you and I know also that, throughout history, there has been no more worth-while, no more inspiring challenge.

That challenge will be met.

You have demonstrated beyond question that free peoples all over the world can agree upon a common course of action and upon common machinery for action. You have brought new hope to the world that, through the establishment of orderly international procedures for the solution of international problems there will be attained freedom from want and freedom from fear. The United Nations are united in the war against fear and want as solidly and effectively as they are united on the battle front in this world-wide war against aggression.

And we are winning by action and unity.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Guffey	Overton
Austin	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hatch	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Scrugham
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
George	Murray	White
Gerry	Nye	Willis
Gillette	O'Daniel	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are members of the Truman committee and are attending its meeting in Kansas City.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF LAW FIXING THE HOURS OF DUTY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Act entitled "An Act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes" approved August 14, 1935, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

PAYMENT TO NONCITIZENS EMPLOYED IN GOOD FAITH, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Private Law 537, 77th Congress, approved May 2, 1942 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

RAIL FREIGHT SERVICE COSTS IN THE VARIOUS RATE TERRITORIES (S. DOC. NO. 63)

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution No. 119 (submitted by Mr. STEWART and agreed to March 26, 1943) certain information on rail freight service costs in the various rate territories of the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORT BY THE WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, report No. 4 of action taken under section 217 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman and Secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of the Corporation for the period from its organization on February 2, 1932, to March 31, 1943, inclusive (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Council of the City of Dearborn, Mich., favoring the enactment of pending legislation to provide a permanent means of aiding civilian defense workers who are war casualties; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Piper and vicinity, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS TO MAINTAIN PEACE—RESOLUTION OF ALABAMA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask consent to present for appropriate reference and printing at this point in the RECORD a joint resolution of the Legislature of Alabama endorsing Senate Resolution No. 114.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution presented by the Senator from Alabama will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and also printed in the RECORD, under the rule.

The joint resolution of the Legislature of Alabama is as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 14

Joint resolution endorsing United States Senate Resolution 114, which provides for the forming of an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority, and urging passage of said resolution by the United States Senate

Whereas the people of Alabama are desirous that the war be brought to a successful termination as rapidly as possible and that guaranties of enduring peace and security be provided; and

Whereas the formation of an organization of the United Nations as provided in United States Senate Resolution 114 is a proper step toward attaining these ends, in that said organization—

(1) Will assist in the coordination and complete utilization of the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis;

(2) Will better enable the establishment of satisfactory temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces until such time as permanent governments can be established;

(3) Will further the administration of relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces;

(4) Will enable the development of procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of dissensions and disagreements between nations; and

(5) Will provide for the assemblance and maintenance of a military force and the suppression by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Legislature of Alabama does hereby approve United States Senate Resolution 114, and does urge its speedy adoption by the Senate of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Senators from Alabama, and to each of the four Senators who joined in presenting this resolution.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 1203. A bill to eliminate private suits for penalties and damages arising out of frauds against the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 291).

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 674. A bill authorizing the payment of allowances in lieu of quarters or rations in kind to certain enlisted men; with an amendment (Rept. No. 292).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITE:

S. 1169. A bill for the relief of Samuel Margolin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1170. A bill authorizing the conveyance to the State of Virginia, for highway purposes only, of a portion of the Naval Mine Depot Reservation at Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SALES OF WHEAT FOR FEED

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I wish to have a measure taken up in order to expedite an issue raised last Friday, when the Senate unanimously amended the lend-lease bill by adopting a provision enabling 50,000,000 bushels of wheat to be released for sale. I find, on my return today, that last Friday the House of Representatives passed a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 133, identical with the Senate amendment to the lend-lease bill, and it is now on the desk of the Vice President.

I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 133 be considered and passed at this time, in view of the fact that the Senate unanimously adopted the same provision last Friday, in exactly the same form, as an amendment to the lend-lease bill, as I have already stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 133) to permit additional sales of wheat for feed, which was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES ADOPTED BY AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL INSTITUTE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a declaration of principles recently adopted by the American Agricultural Institute.

There being no objection, the declaration of principles was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. The increase and dissemination of information in the fields of agricultural science and economics.

2. Adequate production on American farms and in American factories.

3. Recognition of the right of American producers to the American markets, and full protection of such rights.

4. Support of sound cooperative associations.

5. Continued study of the problem of securing for agriculture its fair share of the national income in peacetime as well as war, and of efforts to bring about a just and permanent solution.

6. A better understanding between agriculture, industry, and labor, with mutual confidence, respect, and cooperation.

7. Protection of individual rights and liberties. Encouragement of individual initiative. Support of the doctrine of self-help.

8. The right of every man to sell his services or his products without interference, and to increase his earning power by improving his skill or increasing his output.

9. Evaluating every business institution or activity by the service it renders to society.

10. The best possible transportation facilities, at the lowest costs consistent with good service. Impartial encouragement of rail, water, highway, and air transport, and coordination where possible.

11. Restriction of governmental activities to the legitimate and necessary functions of government. Abolition of unnecessary bureaus, boards, commissions, and authorities. A simplified but effective regulatory system, with industry and labor subject to equal controls, and assuming equal responsibility.

12. Rigid control of Federal, State, and local governmental expenditures. An equitable taxation system, with levies held to the lowest possible levels.

13. Preservation of American institutions and the American way of life.

14. Promotion of international commerce and good will.

The board of directors announce that plans are under way for extending and enlarging the research and educational work of this organization. A long-time program for the economic and social welfare of agriculture is being developed. The Institute hopes to make substantial contribution to the national effort to avoid a repetition, in the coming post-war period, of the disastrous experience of agriculture following World War No. 1.

EFFECTS OF ROLL-BACKS AND SUBSIDIES ON FOOD PRODUCTION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPPER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on June 6, 1943, discussing the disastrous effects of roll-backs and subsidies on food production, and two letters on the same subject, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF MOUNT UNION COLLEGE

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a commencement day address entitled "Look Up America, Look Up!" delivered by him at Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio, on June 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR McFARLAND BEFORE JEWISH WAR VETERANS

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator McFARLAND at the Forty-eighth National Memorial Service of Jewish War Veterans of the United States, in New York City, May 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ENLARGEMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY—STATEMENTS BY WILLIAM GREEN AND PHILIP MURRAY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD statements by

William Green and Philip Murray, and an editorial in the Washington Daily News, concerning the Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security bill, which appear in the Appendix.]

UNIFORM OPENING OF POLLS ON ELECTION DAY

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial concerning pending legislation providing for the uniform opening of the polls on election day, published in the Springfield (Mass.) Republican of May 19, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in the nature of a substitute.

AGRICULTURAL APPPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate resume the consideration of House bill 2481, the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that is entirely satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making agricultural appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first committee amendment passed over.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 66, line 11, after the word "amended", it is proposed to strike out "*Provided further*, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938" and in lieu thereof to insert "*Provided further*, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or the comparable price as provided by section 4 (a) of the act of July 1, 1941 (Public Law No. 147, 77th Cong.): *Provided further*, That the foregoing shall not apply to the sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity for distribution exclusively for relief purposes, nor to commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or are sold for the purpose of feeding or the manufacture of ethyl alcohol, butyl alcohol, acetone, or rubber, or the extraction of oil, or commodities sold to farmers for seed or commodities sold for export or new or byproduct uses: *Provided further*, That no wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at a price less than the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made: *Provided further*, That in making regional adjustments in the sale price of corn or wheat the minimum price need not be higher in any area than the United States average parity price of corn."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think this is the amendment which I asked to have go over until today.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McNARY. I did not make the request in my own capacity, but a Senator who was absent yesterday and is absent today asked me to have the amendment go over. I am advised through his office that he has no objection to the amendment. Therefore I am willing that action be taken without further discussion, so far as that Senator is concerned and so far as I am concerned.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Georgia if this is the amendment on page 66 restoring the parity-price provision?

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment is found on page 66 of the bill, and it is practically the same language as that carried in the present appropriation law, under which the Commodity Credit Corporation is now functioning, the difference being that last year the Senate committee placed a limitation of 125,000,000 bushels on the quantity of wheat that could be sold for feed. Early in this year the feed situation became so acute throughout the country that it was necessary to pass an act permitting the sale of another 100,000,000 bushels of wheat for feed. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] a few moments ago presented and the Senate passed a House joint resolution permitting the sale of 50,000,000 more bushels of wheat for feed between now and the beginning of the next fiscal year. The provision of the committee amendment as it applies to next year contains no limitation on the amount of wheat which may be sold for feed. Today a very acute condition prevails throughout the entire country, and there is an unquestioned need for more feed for livestock and poultry, due to the unusual demands of the war for foodstuffs.

Mr. President, I do not think there is any objection to the committee amendment. As yet none has been raised. Even those who opposed a similar provision which was placed in the bill last year have favored legislation subsequently enacted increasing the amount of wheat which would be available for this purpose.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the Senator from Georgia for the information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 68, after the word "newspapers", to strike out "$300,000,000" and insert "$400,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 68, line 3, after "$400,000,000", to strike out the comma and the words "to remain available until June 30, 1945, solely for programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for compliances with soil-building practices and water-conservation practices under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, pursuant to 1943 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1943, inclusive," and in lieu thereof to insert a comma and the words, "to remain available until June 30, 1945, for compliance with programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1943 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1943, inclusive."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, has the amendment at the top of page 68 been acted upon?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes, that amendment was agreed to. Does the Senator wish that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered?

Mr. BYRD. I simply wanted to express my opposition to the increase from $300,000,000 to $400,000,000. I think the time has come when the farmers, instead of being given subsidies, should have an increased price for their products. I do not intend to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Senator will do so, because I think it is important that the question be voted on. I hope that even if it be by voice vote only, a vote will be taken on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia desire that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered?

Mr. BYRD. I ask that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment appearing in line 2 on page 68 was agreed to will be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD. I am opposed to the Senate committee amendment. I am willing to support a $300,000,000 appropriation, as provided by the appropriations bill as passed by the House, but I think that is a sufficient amount, and that we should not increase it to $400,000,000. The time has come when we should give the farmers a reasonable and proper price for their products and eliminate subsidies. If we cannot eliminate them now, I do not think we can ever do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, we naturally feel reluctant during time of war to change the system which has been in effect and which primarily was introduced as a depression aid to agriculture. However, today all the money which is appropriated in this bill for any purpose whatsoever is borrowed money. The

Government is not taking in sufficient money to pay for its war effort, and of course agriculture is a part of its war effort, but not primarily a governmentally operated war effort, because the farmer is an individual businessman. If he needs $300,000,000 for aid in one way or another, it seems to me that in these times the prices he receives should be fair and should furnish the aid, and it should not be sought through an indirect appropriation by the Government, which only adds to the national debt.

Let me briefly illustrate, that if $400,000,000 is appropriated a year for this purpose, and the war lasts 3 years, it means that a sum in excess of $1,000,000,000 will be added to the national debt, which the returning troops, as well as our own generation, and perhaps future generations, will have to pay. I think we have reached the point in these times when a great many of the depression agencies should be eliminated. I do not believe it is sound to carry them through this period. If after the war is over, we fall into a period of business depression, as is not unlikely, pending the readjustment, and have to establish these agencies and functions over again, that is one thing, but I believe we have today reached the point where many of the depression-created agencies and functions should be reduced or eliminated.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to repeat the statement I made yesterday in regard to this item. For a number of years this appropriation for soil conservation payments to farmers has been $500,000,000. Last year it was reduced to $450,000,000. This year the Bureau of the Budget reduced the amount to $400,000,000. To assure a further reduction next year language has been placed in the bill as it appears at the bottom of page 69, which provides that the program for the next fiscal year cannot amount to more than $300,000,000.

There is more involved in this matter, Mr. President, than any mere question of substance, as stated by the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Virginia. These payments are made to farmers for following certain soil-conserving practices on their lands. The program was announced in December 1942, and was carried into every agricultural county in the United States. The farmers were told that if they would follow certain practices with regard to soil conservation and the handling of crops, they would receive certain payments this year. That announcement had been made each year for the 6 previous years. The farmers in many cases, on practically 6,000,000 farms in the country, acting upon the announcement of the Secretary of Agriculture, have expended large sums of money in buying the material which was necessary to be had in order to comply with the program. Of course, the Congress can break that contract with the farmers; it can say it has no sanction of law. That is a debatable question. However, my own construction of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is that the Secretary of Agriculture is required to make the announcement to the farmers, and I think the Congress is morally bound to make the appropriations. Approximately $200,000,000 of this money represents what are in effect out-of-pocket expenditures by the farmers in order to carry on the soil-conservation practices, and in no event can properly be considered a subsidy.

The program has been reduced from year to year, as I have outlined. It may be that these questions pertaining to agriculture are of no importance in time of war; but I think they are of just as vital importance as the production of planes and tanks; because all the equipment obtained with the moneys which are expended for military purposes—and yesterday afternoon we passed an appropriation of more than $20,000,000,000 for the Navy Department, and not a word was said or not an objection was raised as to a single item in the bill—is not worth 2 cents to us without adequate food and clothing to take care of the men who are to operate the machinery.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator said the farmers were promised $200,000,000. Who, except the Congress of the United States, has the authority to promise an appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, evidently the Senator did not follow my remarks. I said the question as to whether the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 permitted the Secretary of Agriculture to promise those payments to farmers was a debatable one.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Constitution authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to obligate the Congress to make an appropriation from year to year?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in the passage of the War Department appropriation bill and the Navy Department appropriation bill we have authorized contractual obligations running into the tens of billions of dollars.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator does not contend that we have authorized a contractual obligation with respect to soil conservation; does he?

Mr. RUSSELL. Most assuredly I do. It is my construction of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 that, within the limit of appropriations authorized by law——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, that is exactly the point. Without authorization by law an appropriation of $400,000,000 could be said to be just as much an obligation as an appropriation of $200,000,000. Does the Senator contend that the Congress is obligated to appropriate $200,000,000 for this activity?

Mr. RUSSELL. I say that so long as we have adopted language, as we have, limiting the amount to $300,000,000 for next year, the Secretary of Agriculture is obligated to make the expenditures in conformity with the authorization and the announcements.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator find that particular point in the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, while the Senator is finding it, will he yield to me so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The money is for payments in the next fiscal year——

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; it is to carry out the program authorized for this year.

Mr. TYDINGS. If that be so, when shall we reach the point of being able to reduce the appropriation, if we can only follow in line with the commitments made?

Mr. RUSSELL. The provision is—

That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1944 program or plans hereafter authorized under section 7 or 8, or both, of said act of February 29, 1936, or under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator, if he will yield to me at that point. Did I understand him to say the 1944 appropriation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is for next year.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. We appropriate in the 1944 appropriation bill to pay for this year's program; and that is why I say it would be a breach of faith to appropriate less than the farmers have been led to believe they will receive. I was showing the Senator how we were undertaking to limit the appropriation for next year without any breach of faith.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me again so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. First, I should like to read the remainder of the paragraph:

the total expenditures of which including administration shall not exceed $300,000,000.

At least by such action, which would be a limitation on an appropriation—a clumsy way to approach the problem, but the only approach we had—we would undertake to assure a reduction of $100,000,000 in the appropriation next year.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I am getting at is whether, if that appropriation is put in the bill, when this time next year comes, we shall have to appropriate more money because the Secretary of Agriculture will have bound us in connection with the program and commitments for the following year. Shall we have to do that?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; because in the bill we limit to not exceeding $300,000,000 the total expenses which are to be made in promulgating the program.

Mr. TYDINGS. So, if the Secretary of Agriculture were to carry the program to a point involving appropriations beyond the amount of the appropriations we authorize, he would do so at his peril, and the Congress would not be bound to appropriate any further money for soil-conservation payments; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Absolutely.

Mr. TYDINGS. Am I to understand that the Senator's statement is that if the Secretary of Agriculture perhaps incurred an obligation to carry out the

program, he will have been circumscribed and curtailed by the limiting language to which the Senator has referred?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly the purpose of the committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. So that, hereafter, Congress could refuse to appropriate any money for this function, if it deemed such a course to be wise; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. It could do that now. As a matter of fact, all the work sheets issued to the 6,000,000 farmers throughout the United States carry a statement that the offer is made subject to appropriations to be made by the Congress. There is no question about that.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree as to that. However, the point is that when those work sheets are issued, the farmer has a right to believe that the Congress will back up what its servant, the Secretary of Agriculture, is attempting to do.

What I should like to know is whether the work sheets will go out again next year. If they do go out, shall we not be in the same position next year we are in now?

Mr. RUSSELL. Within the limitation of this amendment, because we put them on notice, and notify the Secretary of Agriculture that he should not enter into a program next year that will cost more than $300,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why limit it to $300,000,000? What is the magic of that figure?

Mr. RUSSELL. Because we were endeavoring to reduce appropriations, not to strike down all the soil-conservation program.

Mr. President, let me say that if the Congress wants to abolish the program it should do so with a limitation now that will provide that no payments shall be made next year. I am opposed to such a course. I think it would be a mistake, even in time of war, to strike down the program.

However, if the Congress should decide that it desired to strike down the program, it should place a limitation in the bill to the effect that no part of the funds should be available for formulating a program next year that would cost one dime, instead of taking the money out of appropriations made to apply to contracts which already have been entered into in good faith by the farmers.

Mr. TYDINGS. I can appreciate the sense of the Senator's statement, to wit—that after we have made agreements in one form or another with the farmers, the Congress would not be keeping faith if it did not appropriate the money. I can understand that; but I am curious to know how we can get in a position so that, if we desire to change or amend or alter the program, or even eliminate it, that can be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are two ways by which that could be done. One would be by repealing the section of the act of April 27, 1935, which authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to incur obligations not exceeding $500,000,000 for any one fiscal year for this program. The other would be by placing in this appropriation bill a limitation which would prohibit the formulation of any program whatever for next year. Of course, I should be opposed to either of those courses.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, I do not have detailed information on these matters. I think the Senator from Georgia is one of the best-informed Members of Congress on this whole program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish I could deserve the Senator's encomium.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am sure the Senator deserves it, and I commend him for his long and tireless efforts in behalf of agriculture—efforts which I think have been in almost all cases constructive, as I view the picture. But all the money being paid out on the soil-conservation program is not, in my judgment, achieving the results for which it has been paid out. For example, many farmers are doing what they previously were doing, and are collecting the payments for adhering to certain practices which they have been employing for generations.

I understand that there are certain places where these practices have not been put into effect and where this program is being used as an educational program in order to bring the soil to a point of higher fertility. I cannot speak for many States, but I think that generally in the East—in New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and some of the other nearby States—most of the soil-conservation practices have been used by the farmers for many years. In the future, where the fruits of the educational program are being borne, I think we might consider limiting it and applying it only to sections of the country where it is not practiced. What we are doing today in many communities under the guise of soil-conservation payments is simply paying farmers for doing exactly what they have been doing for 15, 20, or 40 years.

That being the case, I would rather see the prices of farm products sufficiently high to compensate the farmer for the expenses to which he is put, rather than to have indirect subsidies paid as a means of lowering the prices. The farmer is entitled to no more than a fair price, and he is entitled to no less than a fair price; but, in the long run, all these indirect payments from the Federal Treasury, added to the national debt, will do the farmer more harm than if we were to proceed, so far as possible, on a pay-as-you-go basis, because the farmer will have to make his contribution to the whole debt structure. Therefore we are not quite candid when we let him believe that he is getting something for nothing, because in the end, like every other workingman, whether he be on the farm or in the factory, he will have to pay his share if our bank deposits and the integrity of our financial structure are to remain unharmed. There is no other way to do it. Therefore I am hopeful that the amount will be reduced in line with what the Senator from Virginia has recommended, because I think the curtailment ought to take place now, while farm prices, on the whole, are good, and when we can reduce this expenditure without hurting the farmer.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We have been discussing the amendment on page 68, line 2, under the heading "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources." The House provided an appropriation of $300,000,000. The Senate committee has raised the amount to $400,000,000.

On page 74 of the bill we find the heading "Soil Conservation Service." The total appropriation recommended for that Service is $21,850,136. What is the difference between the purposes of the two provisions?

Mr. RUSSELL. Both programs have the same objective, but it is approached from different standpoints. The appropriation which the committee is seeking, of $400,000,000, is to pay the individual farmers the amounts which they were assured they would receive when the work sheets were issued to the local A. A. A. committees last December. That is for the work the farmer does on his land.

The whole philosophy of the Soil Conservation Act was that the Nation had a stake in preserving the fertility of the soil, so as to assure that in years to come the soil will not become so depleted that it cannot produce adequate supplies of food to take care of an increasing population.

The Soil Conservation Service item to which the Senator refers is the technical service in the Department of Agriculture. It makes investigations and furnishes information to farmers as to methods of soil conservation to pursue.

Furthermore, I believe 43 of the States have enacted State laws providing for the establishment of soil-conservation districts. Whenever the farmers within a certain area, at an election duly held, vote for the creation of a soil-conservation district, the lands within that area are subject to a certain program. The appropriation of $21,850,136 to which the Senator refers is for the technical force in the field, in the soil-conservation districts, to serve each individual farm and make suggestions to the farmer as to the soil-conservation practices he should pursue. A map is made of each farm. Suppose a farm consists of 60 acres. The map will show the lands which the expert from the Soil Conservation Service regards as suitable to be devoted to crops. Suggestions will be made as to planting wood lots or trees in a certain area which is not susceptible to cultivation. Advice is given and surveys are made for the erection of terraces, to see that the soil of the entire farm is properly drained and not eroded because of improper terracing and drainage.

That is the difference. The Soil Conservation Service deals with the soil-conservation districts and with the technical aspects of the problem, making research into soil-conservation practices. The other item is for payment to the farmers for carrying out those practices.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, both appropriations are, in fact, really under the same head.

Mr. RUSSELL. Both have the same objective, which is conserving and preserving the fertility of the soil on the farms of the United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Why are the items divided in this manner?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a question of opinion. Congress has enacted various laws. All of this program is authorized by acts of Congress. I believe the items were divided in this manner because the Congress would have been hesitant to place a compulsory program upon the several States and incorporate them into soil-conservation districts. Therefore Congress enacted legislation inviting the States to hold elections within the watersheds to determine whether or not the farmers would go into the soil-conservation districts.

The other appropriation applies to the individual farmer. He may carry out the practices suggested, or he may not carry them out. The option is with him, whereas in the soil-conservation districts, when three-fourths of the farmers or landowners in a certain area so vote, all are bound to carry out certain soil-conservation practices.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In the last analysis, however, we appropriate a little more than $420,000,000 for this single purpose, under these two items.

Mr. RUSSELL. For the objective of conserving the soils of the Nation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. How much of the $400,000,000 is used for the type of payment which it is sought to deduct in determining parity prices? What is that program called?

Mr. RUSSELL. Under the present Executive order all these funds may be deducted in price fixing. As a matter of fact, they are not now all deducted. As to these funds that order is an injustice, and I hope they will not be deducted. A large part of these payments are to reimburse the farmer for out-of-pocket expenditures and to deduct them has the effect of fixing his prices below parity and causes him an actual loss.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, when a farmer does certain specific things on his farm, or installs certain kinds of improvements, those are not taken into consideration specifically, but there is a general payment program. Is most of the $400,000,000 used for what, in effect, is a subsidy for particular crops?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no. As I recall, $197,000,000 would go for the general soil-conservation practices, such as liming, planting trees, and building terraces. So much per running foot is allowed for terraces of a certain height. Then there is the administration expense, which next year would be limited to not more than $32,500,000. That would leave approximately $160,000,000 for payments for the other purpose to which the Senator refers, less than half the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Referring to the provision at the top of page 69, it reads:

Provided further, That not to exceed $32,500,000 of said amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs.

Does that mean that a general administrative pay roll of $32,500,000 is required to operate this $400,000,000 program?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has heard previous discussion on that subject. Of course, there is a limitation on the amount which may be expended in the District of Columbia. I was the author of that amendment some years ago. I thought the administrative expenses were too high. In some cases the expenses of the local county committees have been perfectly staggering. For the current year all expenses of administration amount to approximately $54,000,000. We are trying to reduce those expenses. We think they are excessive. In some areas the county committees would meet only a very few days during the year, to formulate the program and see that it was enforced. In other cases they would meet as many as 100 days a year. We are seeking to reduce the administrative expenses from $54,000,000 this year to $32,500,000 next year. That applies to all the locally elected county committeemen in every county of the United States where there is any agricultural interest, as well as the community committees, and all other administrative expenses. As the Senator knows, this program is broken down into the community committeemen, the county committeemen, the county representatives, and the Washington office.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Do not many of these committees do various other things besides attending to soil conservation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Do they not do many things which they are not supposed to do?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that they do. I have not heretofore heard that charge made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is this not the group which has been repeatedly charged with widespread propaganda, to such an extent that recently the Secretary of Agriculture had to chastise them?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; there has been a terrific fight in some States between the Farm Bureau and the Extension Service on the one side, and the triple A committees on the other side. I think that is not true throughout the entire United States, but it has been true in some cases, I will say, in all frankness to the Senator from Michigan. In defending their conduct of the program, the triple A committeemen criticized the Extension Service and the Farm Bureau, and their ideas in taking over the program. There has been quite a political fight between those agencies. I do not think it has been a partisan matter. I do not think there is any line of demarcation between Democrats and Republicans. It has been a fight waged for power between the Farm Bureau and the Extension Service, on the one side, and the triple A committees on the other, as to who should administer and control the farm program.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I understand the Senator from Georgia, the expense of administration for the past year reached $54,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; that is true.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Out of a total expense of how much?

Mr. RUSSELL. Out of $450,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And the committee found that to be indefensible, and tried to reduce it to $32,500,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; we thought it excessive.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Why is $32,500,000 the figure? Is not that still a tremendously extravagant figure for administrative expenses?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I cannot answer the question categorically. The Senator from Michigan knows that in trying to bring about reductions, it is sometimes necessary more or less to use a rule of thumb. I think the committee seized upon that figure because some officials of the farm organizations, when they appeared before the committee, said that they did not believe that in any event the appropriation for administrative expenses should be reduced below that amount.

My judgment is that this program should be administered, and can be administered, with approximately $25,000,000, but I do not think that the committee would be justified in making such a drastic reduction in 1 year. I believe that it would be better to reduce the amount from $54,000,000 to $32,500,000, and next year try to reduce it to approximately $25,000,000. That is my own view. I am not attempting to express the view of others. I do not know what prompted the committee to adopt the figure of $32,500,000 unless someone in the committee—I may have been the culprit—thought that that was the amount suggested by the Farm Bureau as the minimum amount upon which the program could be administered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am glad that the committee is starting to curb this particular item. It seems to me totally indefensible to think of a 10 percent administrative charge against a farm encouragement program. I think if the Senator should suggest $25,000,000 he might find many other Senators agreeing with him right now.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, I should like to propound an inquiry. Assuming the analysis of the matter which the Senator has given to be accurate—I am sure that he believes it to be correct—I should like to have him explain why the House feels that this program could be carried out with an appropriation of only $300,000,000 and why the Senate committee feels that an appropriation of $400,000,000 is

necessary to meet our commitments, in line with the Senator's explanation of those commitments which he gave a few minutes ago.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, I do not know what prompted the House to reduce the amount to $300,000,000. I read the record. No real reason was given, other than that some Member of the House expressed the fear on the floor that some of these funds would be paid out for incentive payments. There was also an impression abroad that if these payments were made to farmers for carrying out this program, it would be like putting money into one pocket, and then, under the price-fixing theory, the farmer would be denied the money by having the payments deducted before his ceiling prices were established, thereby taking it out of the other pocket.

Mr. TYDINGS. It would be treated as a subsidy.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. That is my impression as to what prompted the House in doing what it did. However, Mr. President, I will say that if I should undertake to explain what motivated the House in its action on this bill I would be attempting something which I believe no man could possibly do. In the shape in which the bill came to the Senate, that would be impossible.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Georgia has given a very fair explanation of the situation, but my own opposition springs primarily from the fact that I think it would be a very serious mistake now to embrace a system of what would amount almost to direct subsidy payments. That is one reason why I shall support the $300,000,000 appropriation rather than the $400,000,000, in the belief that in the final result agriculture itself would be better served than by pursuing the opposite course.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope that no Member of the Senate will get the impression from the Senator's remarks that we are embarking on any new program under the proposed $400,000,000 appropriation. The plan is merely to carry out a program announced last December to the farmers of the country, and represents a reduction of $100,000,000 in the funds available year before last.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In line with what the Senator from Michigan has said, I should like to relate two instances which may have some explanatory effect in connection with the size of the administrative expense.

Two years ago the Department of Agriculture brought a party of approximately 600 persons, representing the Department in many sections of the United States to the State of South Dakota, and spent nearly a week there, partly in vacationing and partly in conferences.

From the Senator's explanation, I assume that the expense of that activity was met from the fund for administrative expense.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, all the administrative expenses of this program are paid by the farmer because of the fact the expenses are deducted from the appropriations made for payments to the farmer. Under the policy which the Department was finally prevailed upon to adopt, each farmer was supposed to be shown on his check what proportion had been deducted for administrative expenses of the Triple A.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Then the farmer has not been receiving all the money he should have received?

Mr. RUSSELL. That does not follow at all.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to relate another incident. About the same time as the occurrence to which I have referred, the Secretary of Agriculture who was then in office held a meeting in the city of St. Paul, or Minneapolis, in the State of Minnesota. Representatives of the Department went into my State, as well as adjoining States, and solicited people to go to St. Paul or Minneapolis to hear the Secretary speak.

A special train went from the section of the State in which I live, and all expenses were paid to St. Paul. Was that expense a part of the administrative expense which we are discussing?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have never previously heard of that incident. I think the Senator should have come before the Committee on Appropriations and told us about it so that we could have had an opportunity to investigate. I would have appreciated hearing about it. I certainly do not consider such expenses a proper part of the administrative expense of this program. I do not believe any Member of the Senate would.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to endorse the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan that if the amount were reduced to $25,000,000 we might agree to it more readily.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] made the point that $32,000,000 is the total of the administrative expenses of the Department of Agriculture. It is my understanding that $32,000,000 is for the payment of per diems and expenses of the 90,000 committeemen. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think not. That amount includes all administrative expenses, in Washington and elsewhere.

Mr. BYRD. It could not possibly include all administrative expenses.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does.

Mr. BYRD. The Department of Agriculture has 76,624 regular employees, in addition to the 90,000 committeemen. Last year there was actually expended $42,000,000 for compensation to committeemen, so the amount stated could not possibly include all the administrative expenses.

Mr. RUSSELL. It includes all the expenses of the Triple A. That is what is dealt with in this item.

Mr. BYRD. I was talking about the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, it does not include all the administrative expenses of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BYRD. Under the pending bill what would the 90,000 committeemen be permitted to withdraw from the Treasury?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no idea what they would be permitted to withdraw from the Treasury, because we have reduced the appropriation so that no more than $32,500,000 may be spent. I do not know how much of this would go for the committee's expense.

Mr. BYRD. Does that have reference to the committeemen?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. That is for all the Triple A administrative expenses.

Mr. BYRD. What will the Triple A cost for the present year?

Mr. RUSSELL. Approximately $54,000,000. I do not have all the figures before me now.

Mr. BYRD. Does not that all go to the committeemen?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Department is limited to $32,500,000 for Washington in the field and for the committeemen under the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. How many regular employees have they?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not have the figures, and I cannot tell the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. I do not want to contradict the Senator from Georgia, but the committeemen drew——

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I insist that the administrative expenses for the Triple A program, wherever they are, are contained in this $32,500,000 appropriation.

Mr. BYRD. Ninety thousand committeemen have been drawing per diem for traveling around the country as they please, going here and there, for a great many years, and last year they drew out of the Treasury $42,000,000. That is a matter of record.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not prepared to controvert that, but we are trying to cut it down to such a point that compensation for the committeemen and all other administrative expenses including those in Washington could not exceed $32,500,000.

Mr. BYRD. Is that in the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is in the bill. We have been discussing it on the floor. If the Senator will look at the top of page 69 he will find the limitation. We are trying to limit and reduce the expenses of the Triple A.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to ask the Senator if he made any investigation of communications expenses of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I have the figures here.

Mr. BYRD. For 5 months, from July 1 to December 1, 1942, their expenditures for telephone and telegraph service were $1,153,000. Does that conform with the Senator's record?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not have the figures for 6 months. I find that the communications services for the entire Department for the whole fiscal year 1943

were, approximately, $2,000,000. So the Senator's figure is about correct for 6 months.

Mr. BYRD. For communications by long-distance telephone for 6 months the expenditure was $736,000. That would be a million and a half dollars for the year.

For travel expenses the Department of Agriculture expended $5,175,796 for 6 months, or in excess of $10,000,000 on a yearly basis.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am trying to find the figures as to travel expenses. I think the Senator's figures are about correct.

Mr. BYRD. Then, the paid employees with the Department of Agriculture, exclusive of the committeemen, number 76,624.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator's figures with regard to travel expenses are approximately correct.

Mr. BYRD. Has the committee made any attempt, in this bill, to reduce travel expenses?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; travel expenses are reduced. The Senator will recall that last year we made a reduction in travel expenses in several items spread throughout the bill; we made a small further reduction this year.

Mr. BYRD. Is that contained in the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not as a specific item. It appears in the Budget estimates.

Mr. BYRD. There has been a reduction of travel expenses?

Mr. RUSSELL. There was a substantial reduction in the 1943 bill over the preceding year, and we have reduced it almost half a million dollars more in the current bill.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. TUNNELL. I understand from the Senator's statement that a good deal of the money which has been appropriated has really been expended already on the promise by the Secretary of Agriculture that it would be forthcoming or in the belief that it would be forthcoming.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is undoubtedly true; large sums have been expended by farmers throughout the country on the assurance that they would be reimbursed from the appropriation of these funds.

Mr. TUNNELL. Lime has been bought, I take it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Lime and trees, and terracing practices have been carried out, involving a considerable expense.

Mr. TUNNELL. The farmers of the Nation had reason to believe that the necessary amounts would be appropriated by Congress?

Mr. RUSSELL. They had reason, based upon the construction of the act I read a few moments ago, and on the fact that for 6 years Congress had appropriated funds sufficient to discharge the obligations of the Department of Agriculture to the farmers.

Mr. TUNNELL. And a refusal to appropriate now would fall upon the farmers who have already spent the money and who believed that they would be reimbursed?

Mr. RUSSELL. Undoubtedly, in part, that would be the effect of it, because it would be undertaking to discharge a dollar debt, as I see it, by the payment of 75 cents. It is true that we are at war, but I do not see any reason why, if we can pass a bill appropriating approximately $24,000,000,000 for the Navy in 15 minutes, we should attempt to make a reduction in the payment of funds to the farmers who have already expended in many cases funds out of their own pocket. It is not fair; indeed, it is a breach of faith to the farmers of this country.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, with respect to this issue, I agree in principle with the Senator from Maryland and also the Senator from Virginia. I hope to see the day come when we will abandon this kind of a program, but, in view of the obligation that has either been expressly incurred or exists by strong implication, we would be breaking faith if we did not appropriate sufficient money to carry out the program which has been established and under which the farmers have operated this year. Is it the judgment of the Senator and the judgment of the committee that it will take $400,000,000 to discharge that obligation?

Mr. RUSSELL. The best authority the committee has is the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of Food Distribution and Production, both of whom appeared before the committee and said that the announcement which was made to the farmers last year contemplated the payment of $400,000,000, and that the appropriation of less than that amount would not enable the Department to meet the obligations which were incurred when the program was formulated last December.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, if we reduced it now to $300,000,000, we would be breaking faith to the extent of about 25 percent of our obligations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly so understand the matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. With respect to the amendment the committee has incorporated in the bill dealing with 1944, it is attempted by that method, rather than by repealing the section of the A. A. A. statute, to continue further to reduce the program.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are undertaking to assure that the program next year will be reduced $100,000,000 and will not exceed $300,000,000, under the language the committee has recommended.

Mr. McCLELLAN. With this amendment in the bill the Secretary of Agriculture and no one else would be authorized to obligate the Government beyond $300,000,000 to the farmer, and the Senator now understands that that would be the limit of next year's program?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly what the committee is proposing and trying to do.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I want to commend the committee and the Senator for what I regard as a progressive step to get rid of some of these programs.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. Perhaps the Senator answered the question I am about to ask before I came into the Chamber; but did the Senator state the reason which induced the committee to drop the House proviso that no part of this appropriation should be used for incentive payments?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be happy to refer to that; I have not touched on it, and I shall be glad to tell the Senator the reason. The committee struck that provision because nobody on the committee knew exactly what it meant. I should like to have any Senator define for me exactly what is meant by the words "no part of this appropriation shall be used for the purpose of making incentive payments."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the background of this situation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was going to explain that.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to put in the Senator's mind an idea which he can consider when he explains the matter. I interpret that language to mean that the Secretary could go ahead with soil-building and conservation programs, but he could not use this money as an inducement to farmers to plant a particular crop by promising to give them so much a bushel, for example, or so much a ton; but the money would have to be spent for soil-building and conservation programs. I think that is reasonable. If that is the limitation and that is the interpretation of the provision, I should be inclined to support it. If, however, we are to have a soil-conservation program which will be so hamstrung that it cannot be carried out, then I should not want to support it. I hope the Senator will explain it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be glad to explain it so far as I can, but, frankly, I do not know what the effect of the language will be. I think I know the reasons why the House put the provision in the bill. The Budget submitted estimates to the House of Representatives for $100,000,000, and in endeavoring to describe the payments which are to be made from the $100,000,000, the Department of Agriculture, in making up the Budget, referred to the payments as "incentive payments." That appropriation was rejected by the House, and the Senate committee has not undertaken to insert it in the bill. However, this statement of the reasons for the insertion of the provision is a mere conjecture on my part. The House was opposed to those payments and used the same term to describe them in the limitation.

I can conceive of a situation in which it would be impossible even to make a

soil-conservation payment if this language were contained in the law, because a soil-conservation payment is in the nature of an incentive payment. It is paid as an incentive for the farmer to improve his land. The appropriation which the committee is recommending is for the purpose of meeting obligations entered into last December. I could see no good reason for cluttering up the bill with language which no one could clearly understand or define.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe that if the word "direct" were inserted in the bill before the word "incentive," the Department of Agriculture, with the rulings of its own attorney, who would be favorably inclined toward the provision, would interpret it as Congress means that it should be interpreted—namely, that the money shall not be used directly as a part of the price, per se, for the production of crops, and I think even those who are its greatest friends, or those moderately inclined toward it, are not voting for it as money to be used for incentive payments. I think we are voting it to be used for soil-conservation practices, and I believe we would be wise to reinsert the House provision and, if necessary, make it plainer than it is in the words of the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to point out that we are dealing here with a very complex problem. The soil-conservation payments are not made only to the producers of basic commodities, they are made also to dairy farmers, they are made in small programs affecting only commodities having a limited production area scale. For example, the law applies in some way to the naval stores program in my own State. Some small payments are made there out of this fund. I think we would be doing a very dangerous thing if we put this limitation on an appropriation to pay for a program which has already been promulgated by the Department and carried out by the farmer. If we insert this limitation on this appropriation, we are likely to cause some rulings or interpretations which would prevent the farmer from being paid funds which are due him now. If it is to be inserted in the bill, it should be inserted as applying on the program for next year, not to tie this program down by language which is not applicable to it, which no one clearly understands. I doubt whether any man living could now predict the effect this language might have on these payments.

We are not undertaking a new program, we are complying with the program which was announced to the farmer last December and on which the farmers signed worksheets before they planted their crops this year. Payments have to be made for this purpose, because that is the program which was announced, and if we are undertaking to control the program in the future, the language should be put at the bottom of page 69, in the committee provision affecting the program next year, because I do not know what would be construed to be incentive payments; the Senator from Maryland does not know, and no one else knows. The Senator knows what he has in mind, and I know what I have in mind, but when in an appropriation bill reported to the Senate we are defining something which has not been defined by statute, we are doing a very dangerous thing, because this program has many ramifications, and applies to many commodities throughout the country other than wheat, corn, and cotton.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am very glad the Senator made the explanation as lucidly as he has made it, as he always does explain a matter, because it was evident to me that there was a widespread feeling throughout the country that the purpose of the provision inserted in the bill by the House was to prevent the payment of the so-called subsidy payments. The use of the term "incentive payment" raised the question that is in the Senator's mind, which he has just presented to the Senate, that a soil-conservation payment is an incentive payment. But there is a deep-rooted and bitter antagonism in the Congress toward the payment of subsidies, or to the diversion of funds appropriated for specific purposes to pay subsidy payments, as a policy.

I have in mind that that was the motivating thought in the House when it put this provision into the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for one observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to say that I did make inquiry as to whether there was going to be any undertaking to switch these funds from the purposes announced last December to any new purpose, and I was assured that no such idea was contemplated, that they would be used for the purposes announced when the Secretary announced the program last December.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has answered my question. I could not see where there would be any authority, even if the House amendment were eliminated, to use for the payment of direct subsidies funds appropriated specifically for soil building and conservation purposes, and, in my humble judgment, if that is done, it will be an affront to the intent and will of the Congress, and without any authority of law. In view of the Senator's explanation, and the general understanding that these funds are not to be diverted in whole or in part, having gotten that from the administrative authorities, we might with some reasonable degree of assurance assume that the funds will not be used in the payment of direct subsidies for crops.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would not undertake to say that not one dollar of this fund would be expended for what some might term a subsidy payment, but it will not be expended under the new program; it will be used in the program that was announced last December, before the submission of the extra Budget estimates for the so-called incentive payments, which were regarded as a direct subsidy. This program affects a great many commodities, and I am not advised as to how it all is to be applied, but I do know that it is to be applied only in conformity with the regular soil-conservation and domestic-allotment program that was announced by the Secretary last December, and that none of the money is to be diverted for any new purpose or any new program.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It has been suggested repeatedly this morning by the able Senator from Georgia, and I believe by the able Senator from Arkansas, that there would be some breaking of faith if we should not pass this appropriation bill with the $400,000,000 item in it. I should like to be advised upon what ground that statement is made. What assurance has Congress given that this appropriation would be made at this time?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I read the statute once, but I shall read it again. It appears in the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and is the last section in it. After stating the payments which the Secretary may make, and the obligations he may incur for various purposes, for the planting of pasture land, range land, and for the planting of forests, and general soil-conservation practices, this language occurs:

Mr. REVERCOMB. But was not an appropriation made?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; I am reading the language of the obligations:

> The obligations incurred for the purpose of carrying out, for any calendar year, the provisions of section 590g, 590h, 590i, 590j, 590j–590n, of this title shall not exceed $500,000,000.

That is the language on which the Secretary relied for his authority. It may be a debatable question. I expressed it as my opinion that the Congress authorized the Secretary to promulgate the program. Any other Senator, of course, has a right to a contrary view.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator from Georgia hold that that would be a recurring obligation?

Mr. RUSSELL. For 6 years we have been making appropriations to fulfill the obligation. Congress has followed that policy for 6 years, and appropriated the full amount of payment to farmers that the Secretary has obligated. This is the first year any question has been raised concerning the authority of the Secretary.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator contend that there is a recurring obligation from year to year to appropriate $500,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly do, and I pointed out to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] that it was my opinion that the only way that situation can be relieved is by repealing the statute, or by, as in this bill, limiting the amount to the appropriation for next year. I think this matter is similar to the provision with respect to appropriation of one-third of the customs receipts to the Department of Agriculture. That is done

by permanent statute. There is not even an appropriation item in this bill carrying those funds, because 10 years ago Congress passed an act providing that one-third of the funds collected from customs receipts shall be paid over as a continuing appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for specific purposes. That item is not even in the bill. Yet the Senator says that Congress cannot authorize such matters. We have done it in that particular case. I think we had a right to do it in that case, and we have passed bills year after year which authorized the making of contractual obligations by various departments. It has run into the billions in authorizing contracts for ships as provided in one bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I must say in all candor to the Senator that I cannot follow his reasoning that when a statute is enacted providing that the Secretary of Agriculture may expend $500,000,000 under the law passed in that year——

Mr. RUSSELL. It says "obligate." It does not say "expend."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Obligate?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I cannot follow the Senator's reasoning that that would be a recurring obligation from year to year.

Mr. RUSSELL. That represents a difference of opinion. My viewpoint is that it is a recurring obligation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, on page 68, line 2, to strike out "$300,000,000" and insert "$400,000,000."

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Guffey	Overton
Austin	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hatch	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Scrugham
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
George	Murray	White
Gerry	Nye	Willis
Gillette	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the time available for final passage of the bill is so short, and that its consideration in conference will be so involved, I think the Senate conferees are entitled to know the sentiment on this question. Therefore, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he will inform me regarding one or two points.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, the $400,000,000 appropriation includes almost $200,000,000 which is to be paid to farmers for not producing more than their acreage allotment. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not exactly correct. Some of the money is to be paid to farmers under the program which has been in effect. That provides for the limitation of acreage planted to some commodities.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not talking about the program which has been in effect; but I think I am correct in stating that a large proportion of the money—upward of $200,000,000—is to be paid to farmers for not planting such crops on more than a certain amount of acreage on their farms. That is the rule in my State, and I think it is the rule in the Senator's State. So I understand that the program is to be used in part to restrict the production of certain crops; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the only crops which are under marketing quotas at the present time are cotton and tobacco.

In the program this year, as I understand, there is no limitation on the acreage of wheat or corn which can be planted.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let us take cotton, alone. Is it not a fact that if a farmer plants only so much of his acreage in cotton he gets a part of the money, under the program, whereas, if he plants his acreage as he sees fit, to cotton, without limit to the acreage put in cotton, he does not get a part of the money?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct in part.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point is that those procedures are not soil-conservation processes. They involve nothing more than utilization of the money to restrict the acreage planted to certain crops. As I recall, even in Maryland, a farmer can plant only so much acreage in corn and only so much acreage in wheat, if he desires to receive a soil-conservation check.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is in error about that.

Mr. TYDINGS. I myself received this spring one of the questionnaires which had to be signed.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator got it on last year's payment and last year's crop, too.

Mr. TYDINGS. It showed how much was allowed to be planted in a certain crop; and if more than that acreage was planted in the crop, the payment would not be received. That is my recollection of the questionnaire.

Mr. RUSSELL. That procedure has been used.

Mr. TYDINGS. If that be true, there is no use in calling this program a soil-conservation program. It is a crop-limitation program, insofar as the money can be used for that purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator can call it what he pleases. Of course, heretofore, last year, for example, under the program there were marketing quotas on wheat, cotton, tobacco, and rice.

Mr. TYDINGS. And corn.

Mr. RUSSELL. There were no marketing quotas on corn, and there never have been.

Mr. TYDINGS. I mean production quotas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; production quotas; but they represented goals. There was no restriction on the planting by the individual farmer; he could plant all the corn he wished to plant.

Mr. TYDINGS. But if he did, could he receive the soil-conservation payments?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, if he planted a certain number of acres in cover crops and leguminous crops, and so forth. As to cotton, the quotas on cotton have not been lifted. There has been considerable discussion as to whether they should be lifted. They have been increased by 10 percent.

If a farmer who has a basic allotment of cotton does not plant that acreage to cotton, to enable that farmer to receive one of these payments out of the soil-conservation funds, it is necessary that he either plant the land which is not planted in cotton to the production of a leguminous or cover crop approved by the A. A. A. and plow that crop under, or that he plant the land to one of the essential food crops needed this year.

Mr. TYDINGS. If he plants it to an essential food crop, that is not soil conservation and soil-building practice, because in raising an essential food crop he takes substance out of the soil and does not put it back. I think it is only fair to say that a large part of this program was used to cut down the acreage of cotton as a national policy.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only cotton, but wheat.

Mr. TYDINGS. It was not used primarily as a soil-building and conservation measure. I do not believe it is fair to confuse the two appropriations, one of which attempts to limit production of certain commodities on the farm, and then call that a soil-conservation program, because the land taken out of one crop is often put into another crop which is just as injurious to the soil as was the previous crop.

Mr. RUSSELL. It may not be fair to call it a soil-conservation appropriation, but all these payments have been embraced under this head, which is the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, ever since that statute was enacted by the Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. What does the Senator mean by "domestic allotment"?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the allotment program to which the Senator refers. Payments have been made for those practices for the past 6 years. There is

no difference in the character of the payments which are made to cotton producers this year, as compared with those which have been made for the past 6 years. The difference in the case of the wheat producer is that the restrictions on the marketing of his wheat have been entirely removed this year, whereas he was under restrictions last year.

Mr. TYDINGS. That may be true; but I still maintain that with an appropriation of $300,000,000 there is ample money for the soil-conservation program, and that during the war the Congress ought to discontinue the limitations on production which we used to cut down surpluses. That was the purpose of them. That was why we appropriated the money. There was a tremendous surplus of some commodities on the agricultural market. A great many of those surpluses are being whittled down. Some have disappeared; but under the guise of soil conservation we are continuing a program devised primarily to cut down surpluses, when it is not soil conservation at all. In my humble judgment, if we appropriate $300,000,000 there will be sufficient money available to carry out the soil-conservation program in accordance with the commitments made by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if we are referring to the funds expended by farmers by soil-conservation practices, $197,000,000 would cover that. That has nothing to do with this question. For 6 years we have carried on this program under the same act, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. No question has been raised heretofore about any division of funds. It is all on the same work sheet which the farmer signs, which is similar to those which he has signed in years gone by.

The Senator has referred to cotton. I am always a bit hesitant about discussing cotton on the floor of the Senate, because naturally I have a basic interest in cotton as a commodity produced in my State. However, I wish to say, in all fairness to the cotton producers who receive these almost infinitesimal payments, that if the Senator from Maryland or anyone else had to buy seed out of his own pocket and sow his land with leguminous crops, and then turn those crops under before he could receive the little payment, which in many cases amounts to not more than three or four dollars, he would feel that he had earned it, and that there was no absolute grant or gift for taking the land out of cultivation, because he must devote the land which he takes out of cotton production either to a soil-building crop or, this year, to such crops as peanuts. We have a shortage of approximately 1,000,000,000 pounds of vegetable oils.

It does not make any difference whether the crop be cotton, corn, tobacco, wheat, or rice, or whether the farmer be a grain farmer or a dairy farmer. It is not fair to him to change the rules after the game starts, and after the program was announced in December. It is not fair for us to say, when the time comes to make the appropriation, that we are going to change the rules because Congress has changed its mind as to what is a soil-conserving practice.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator suffer an interruption?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, it seems to me that it would be a great mistake for the Senate to alter this important agricultural program in the midst of war. This Nation has been most profligate in the development of its natural resources. We have sacrificed our timber, until in more recent times when we have made an effort, by the expenditure of huge sums of money, to check the sacrifice of our timber resources by bringing about more scientific methods of cutting the timber. We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in reforestation.

The loss of our timber assets was more spectacular than the loss of our soil resources; but it does not require an expert to travel through the areas of this country which have been longest under cultivation, to see that the apprehensions which Thomas Jefferson felt when he saw how the soil was being wasted and eroded have come to pass.

It is estimated that we are losing annually 3,000,000,000 tons of topsoil in this country through erosion. In short, we have been mining our soil resources; and the older areas of cultivation in this country all bear visible testimony to the fact that we have been mining the soil.

Mr. President, some effort has been made in the past few minutes to indicate that this program is devoted in part to the purpose of curtailing production. That is true only in a limited sense. How could we ever get any soil conservation and rebuilding of the assets which have been mined out of the soil unless we diverted some of the acreage which has been planted for generations in cotton to some type of crop which would restore nitrogen and fertility to the soil?

If Senators have been in certain areas of the South, they have seen entire counties eroded beyond any hope of redemption. If they have traveled through New England, they have seen the result of the resettlement programs of the past. In New England the soil was mined, and today farms are abandoned.

We solved our resettlement problems in the past because we had a vast public domain, and once farms became infertile as a result of erroneous and profligate practices in their cultivation, the oncoming generation of younger men and women could move back, take new soil, and repeat the process. It has been only within recent years that we have come to understand that unless we conserve our soil resources, unless we restore the fertility of the millions of acres from which it has been taken, the ultimate fate of civilization in this country will be the same as that of civilizations of the past which have gone down because they have not conserved their soil. The cradle of civilization is now a virtual desert. Go to China, or read about China; study the history of China, and see what has happened to the millions of Chinese as the result of the wastage of their soil resources.

Mr. President, insofar as the curtailment of the acreage of cotton is concerned, I believe it is a tragedy that it has not been further reduced and some effort made to convert those acres to the production of food which the people of this Nation will need vitally before this war is over. As a matter of fact, I fear that the people will go hungry in this country next winter, not because they do not have money with which to buy food, but because the money which they possess, and the rationing coupons which they have in their books, will not permit them to secure the delivery of the food which they require.

The farmer has been a much-abused member of society ever since this war began. It has been "open season" on the farmer. I think it is high time that we reverse that policy and realize that unless we have adequate food and fiber essential to the war effort, the prodigious strides which we have made in the production of war materials may turn out to have been a futile endeavor; for I say that in total war we not only have to maintain the dietary standards of those in the armed services, but we have to maintain the dietary standards and furnish the food to the people who are supplying the materials for the fighting forces to use against our enemies.

What has been the attitude and policy of the Government, Mr. President? It has been to turn to industry and say, "Produce the goods—we care not what the cost. We will provide you with a contract providing for a return on your managerial contribution, but your costs may be whatever shall be necessary."

The slogan "Produce the goods regardless of cost" has been, figuratively speaking, the policy of Government insofar as industry has been concerned. But, so far as the farmer is concerned, Mr. President, he has been turned upon in this situation if he asked for a price which would represent his cost of production and his labor. He has been denounced as an individual seeking to enrich himself at the expense of the rest of society in this war effort.

I believe a very unfortunate psychological effect was produced in the farming communities of this country as a result of the address made by the President of the United States on last Labor Day. I do not think the farm communities have yet recovered from that psychological situation. However, I know of nothing which would contribute more to the demoralization of the farmers at this time than to have Congress now turn its back upon an obligation which the farmers entered into in good faith and which they now expect the Government to discharge.

Yesterday afternoon the Senate passed a huge appropriation bill providing $24,500,000,000 for the Navy in an hour and 20 minutes. No one strained at that camel. It went through the eye of the Senate without any difficulty. But, what would have been the effect upon the con-

tractors who heretofore had entered into contractural relations with the Government and had not yet been paid if a proviso had been added stating that no contractor was to receive any money out of this appropriation in excess of 75 cents on each dollar the Government owed him? Does any Senator believe that would have had a good effect upon the morale of industry and labor? That, Mr. President, in essence is what is being proposed now. The farmers of this country had every right to assume in good faith that the Government of the United States and the Congress would provide the farmer with the necessary means to carry out the program announced by the Secretary of Agriculture under existing law, and for which the Congress over a period of not less than 6 years had never failed to provide.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator from Wisconsin believe that an appropriation of $300,000,000 will not fully take care of the undertakings made to the farmer?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I certainly do. I am advised that $400,000,000 is the minimum amount which can be appropriated by the Congress to carry out the program which was announced by the Secretary of Agriculture and which the farmers of the country participating in the program have translated into individual work sheets for every acre of the farm they own.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Have those obligations been incurred?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think they have been incurred. I think that when the Secretary of Agriculture, acting under a law which was passed by Congress 6 years ago, stated that he had the power to make obligations and announced a program to the farmers, and the farmers in turn translated that program into work sheets covering the acreage of the farms which they owned, I think a moral obligation was assumed, and I think that the Congress of the United States has a moral obligation to carry it out.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. My question to the Senator is: Has the program gone so far in being carried out that the $300,000,000 will not cover it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In my opinion it has. In practically every section of the country I know anything about, although the season is tragically late, dangerously late, I may say ominously late, most of the farmers have already planted their crops, or are preparing to do so, and have purchased their seed and made all their arrangements for obtaining fertilizer, in those instances where they could obtain it, and they have planned their entire program for this year. If the Senator can show me a farmer in the United States of America who has not made his plans for the 1943 season, I will say that such farmer does not know anything about his business.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What about the item of purchase of law books, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers? Does the Senator believe that obligation is one which has been carried through to the point that we shall have to increase this appropriation by $100,000,000?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There is a provision in this item for administrative expenses. The Senator well knows that no program can be administered unless there is money spent for administering it. The program under the House bill would amount to $300,000,000.

Under the program as laid down by the Secretary of Agriculture it would amount to $400,000,000. Certainly no man can be so naive as to assume that sum of money could be handled and a very substantial portion of it paid out to individual farmers in the United States of America in the form of checks drawn after they had fulfilled obligations worked out on their worksheets, and checked, without the expenditure of some money for the administration of the program.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate very much the remarks concerning soil conservation. The people of Nebraska are interested in that subject just as much as those who live in the Southern and New England States. We want to do all we can to produce and preserve more food. I should like to propound a question. Does the Senator believe that the provision in question which runs through the Triple A has in reality resulted in the increased production of food?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In my opinion, it has accomplished greatly in the increased fertility of the soil and in checking the erosion of the soil. I could take the Senator into my own State, which was one of the 43 States—indeed I think Wisconsin was one of the first States to enact legislation providing for the creation of a soil-conservation system—and travel with him over miles and miles of highway, if I could get the gasoline for the purpose, and show him the most amazing evidences of the value of the soil-conservation program. The State of Wisconsin is usually thought of as a State not subject to much soil erosion, because it is a great dairy State; but even in that great dairy State, Mr. President, the soil-conservation program has accomplished wonders in checking the erosion of soil and in bringing about renewed and increased fertility of soil which had already been eroded.

I have traveled, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska, in the South, where I have seen the marvelous work which has been accomplished there in an area where erosion of the soil was much further advanced because of its long-time devotion to the cultivation of two principal soil-depleting crops, namely, cotton and tobacco.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Aside from conservation and production, which the Senator says have been increased—and I am inclined to agree with him—during the past half dozen years we have had in force a restricted agricultural policy; we have paid millions upon millions of dollars to farmers to take land out of production. Now we are confronted with a food situation referred to by the Senator, which will result, I think, in starvation in many places in this country before another year has passed. Yet during all these years, right up to February, this administration has adopted a policy of economic scarcity, and has paid the farmers millions of dollars to take land out of production, when it should have been paying them to produce the foods which are so badly needed. I should like to know if the $300,000,000 appropriation will increase the food supply. Is the farmer going to be allowed to produce all the food he can produce on his land? That is what I should like to have the Senator answer.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let me respond to the Senator from Nebraska and then I shall yield.

In the first place, I will say to the Senator—and I have previously discussed this matter with him—that I supported the Triple A program in this body because I saw no other alternative to meet the problem confronting the farmer during the years of depression when the buying power of the people of this country was at a low ebb and there were great crop surpluses. I personally was committed originally to the so-called McNary-Haugen program, and it has always been my belief that if the two Republican Presidents who vetoed that measure had seen fit to let it become law we might have avoided much of the difficulty and not have fallen so deep into the depression which we experienced.

I may say further that in the program of growing more food, more agricultural products, the Senator must bear in mind that some of these commodities are not edible—cotton, for example. To my mind, as I stated a moment ago, more cotton acreage should have been curtailed this year than was curtailed. I think that every possible resource of Government should have been properly utilized to produce more foodstuffs upon some of the acreage now devoted to the production of fibers. I know that there are certain vested interests which find it difficult to make such a conversion, but I make the prediction, Mr. President, that by the time the 1st of next January rolls around we will bitterly regret that there was not further curtailment of cotton production and a greater production of foodstuffs which would be available to the people of this country and to the fighting forces.

Therefore, I cannot answer the Senator by saying that it was a mistake to curtail all commodities. In trying to mobilize the Nation for production of food for war, Mr. President, a most careful plan has to be laid down in order to provide the commodities necessary to feed our armed forces, to meet our lend-lease commitments, and to feed the civilian population of the United States.

I think that when next winter rolls around we will be criticized because there was not more and better planning, because there were not more and better devices utilized to stimulate production of the commodities which we so vitally need. I say that we are not moving in the direction of stimulating the farmers who are already laboring under all the handicaps any producer could suffer.

Do you realize, Mr. President, that the farmers are short of labor? Do you realize that they are short of machinery? Do you realize that they are short of the ordinary supplies the farmer must have from day to day, from week to week and from month to month? Do you realize that they have to go through enough red tape and paper forms to discourage a Philadelphia lawyer in order to get the essentials to their production?

Do we want now, Mr. President, on top of all the difficulties and all the trouble the farmer has experienced, and all the abuse he has received, to turn our backs on an obligation entered into so far as the farmer was concerned last December and pay him only 75 cents of what the Congress stated he would be paid? If any Senator wants to take that position, Mr. President, I want it to be taken on the record, so that I can read it next winter when people are hungry.

Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. TAFT, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. REVERCOMB addressed the Chair.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have concluded.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that soil conservation has been a neglected subject in this country, and one that we should pursue both in peace and in war, but I will point out, if the Senator will bear with me, that I think he has been tilting at a windmill when he calls this program a soil-conservation program. As the best evidence is always the law itself, let me read from the law to illustrate my point that a great deal of this program has nothing to do with soil conservation at all. It was a crop limitation program, in part, to get rid of the surpluses which were cluttering up the American agricultural market and had not a single, solitary ounce of soil conservation in it from A to Z. For example, I hold the act in my hand——

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the act to which the Senator refers?

Mr. TYDINGS. A compliation of soil-conservation and domestic allotment acts brought up to January 2, 1942.

The funds available for payment shall be allotted among the commodities produced with respect to which payments or grants are to be computed.

What were they? They were wheat, cotton, corn, and two or three other commodities. They were to be paid upon their acreage production.

I have informed myself as to how much of this appropriation would go for soil conservation and how much would go for acreage curtailment of one kind or another. The over-all figure is only half of it, so $200,000,000 would be utilized in the field of soil conservation, and the remainder would be used under the domestic-allotment plan, which is a plan to cut down surpluses.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does that mean that the remainder of the fund will be used to keep acres idle and not productive?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I would not want to say that, but it means that as to certain crops, taking prior years as a yardstick, if a farmer raised more than a certain amount of the designated crops, he would get no payment from the Federal Government. If he raised so much or less, he would get a payment. Again putting on the stand the best evidence, which is the law itself, let me read that section so that there will be no dispute about it. How are these allotment plans fixed for the designated crops?

1. The average acreage planted to the various commodities for the 10 years, 1928 to 1937, adjusted for abnormal weather and other conditions, including acreage diverted from production under the agricultural adjustment and soil-conservation program.

That is one of the measures.

2. The value of the parity prices of the production for the allotted acres of the various commodities for the year with respect to which the payment is made.

The value of the thing determines it. If wheat is selling at a high price, the farmer gets less. The Government wants him to produce more. If it is selling at a low price, it wants him to raise less of it. So that there is not any conservation in this.

I agree thoroughly with the conservation observations made by the Senator from Wisconsin. I am not taking issue in those matters. I say it is continuing in the bill, the philosophy of scarcity, and no one can successfully deny it, because I have read the yardstick, and that is the law under which the Secretary of Agriculture must administer the program.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. In a moment I shall yield to the Senator from Ohio.

I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that there is a shortage of food; I agree with the Senator that we should produce more food if possible; but this does not assure that more food will be produced, does it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes, I think it does.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Because, in the first place, it would not be at all possible to get farmers to stop producing in part a crop, such as cotton, for example, unless there were some way of offering them an inducement.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the Senator's own argument, if I understood it rightly, was that they would take land out of cotton and put it into soil-building crops, which are not food.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, yes; some of the soil-building crops do produce food. Soybeans, for example, are soil-building food.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And we are greatly in need of edible fats.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The people of this country are going to be very short of edible fats, which are essential for the maintenance of human energy.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with that statement.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. We cannot expect to convert crops which are not useful to the war effort, or crops which are depleting the soil of the country, unless it is made possible to offer some inducement to the farmers to make such conversion.

Mr. TYDINGS. Offering an inducement to switch over from producing one kind of a crop to another and call it soil conservation?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But it is soil conservation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment, if the Senator will allow me to prove that it is not soil conservation.

First of all, outside one or two crops which put nitrogen into the soil—and the accepted mode of soil conservation is for green fertilizer to be applied to crops, clover, and so forth, as well as commercial fertilizer—the farmers of the South are being asked to raise potatoes and other foods which are not soil-conservation crops. Producing potatoes takes substance out of the soil. So that in the main, while there may be a case here and there in which the change does produce the planting of a soil-conservation crop, such as soybeans, or other forms of nitrogen-building legumes, in the main under this program the farmers simply go from one crop to another crop which utilizes the fertility of the soil, which is not soil conservation at all, and the language of the law proves it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. My complaint is that there has not been more acreage diverted from cotton. It is my understanding, and I should like to be corrected if I am wrong, that in the South this year the emphasis has been laid upon the crops which produce things necessary to the war effort, but which at the same time are soil-conservation crops.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is Roman riding, he is on two horses. They are essential to the war effort.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; but they help build the soil.

Mr. TYDINGS. They do not. When a farmer plants corn, when he plants potatoes, when he plants things of that character, they do not help build the soil, they take substance out of the soil.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But the edible fats do help build up the soil. The Senator is not familiar with the facts if he does not know that there is a prodigious program now going on in this country for increased production of edible oils and fats.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course I know that.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me suggest that the greatest of the oil-producing crops is peanuts, and that peanuts exhaust the soil possibly as much as any crop which is raised.

Mr. TYDINGS. Take cotton itself, which produces one of the finest oils and cattle feeds of which one can conceive. Cottonseed meal and oil are not only essential for farmers generally, outside the cotton areas, but they are utilized in the production of any number of munitions which are vital to the war. There are all kinds of what I think are called lintels, which come off the seed which are used in one of the operations in the production of explosives, and are in tremendous demand by the War Department today, far beyond the ability of the farmers of this country to produce.

Returning to the matter which is at issue in connection with the bill, it is a fallacy, it is pure sophistry, to call this a soil-conservation program, when the definition of the law itself, which binds the Secretary of Agriculture, provides for the limitation of certain crops, of which, as every Senator knows, there was a surplus which had so far depressed the market for those crops—cotton and wheat and corn at one time—that the farmer could not sell them and recover the cost of production.

Mr. President, the day of that condition is past; it is fading into twilight and into night. We are in a period now when we need to conserve our soil, it is true, and we shall support appropriations designed for that purpose, but we are also in a period when, as the Senator from Wisconsin has said, we need food, and the program we are discussing is nothing more nor less than an indirect way, if it is properly followed, of producing foods, switching from one crop to another, and it is not a soil-building and conservation program in all its ramifications.

I wish to apologize to the Senator from Ohio, because he rose twice and I promised to yield to him, but in the heat of the debate I forgot to do so. I am willing to yield at any time.

Mr. TAFT. I only desire to call attention to the testimony before the committee, which apparently supports the Senator's viewpoint. I refer to the testimony of Mr. O'Neal, the head of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which appears on page 725 of the hearings. He said:

> It is our conviction that additional Treasury funds are not needed to assume maximum productions in 1943. On the contrary, substantial reductions in last year's figures for some appropriation items can be made, and we believe such reductions will be helpful in the war effort.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In line with these principles, we therefore recommend that this committee—
>
> Approve House provisions continuing Agricultural Adjustment Administration and limiting appropriations to $300,000,000 solely for soil-building and water-conservation practice payments and administrative expenses.

I take it that the head of the American Farm Bureau Federation is making exactly the same distinction the Senator is making.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct, and not only that, but I understand the Grange took the same position.

Mr. TAFT. Soil-building and water-conservation practice payments are those which are made directly for conservation purposes. But apparently it is desired to eliminate entirely the other class of payments, which in fact are restrictive payments.

I wish to make one other observation on that matter. It seems to me that if the American Farm Bureau Federation, probably having more farmers in its membership than any other organization in the country, says the appropriation should be reduced to $300,000, they cannot be thinking we are violating any promise made to any farmer who is a member of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator's logic is unassailable. I cannot speak for the farmers of America, because my acquaintance with them, as every other Senator's must be, is limited, but I have read in numerous newspapers and certain farm magazines, and through their own accredited representatives I have heard, that they think the time has come when this part of the old program should be reviewed and eliminated wherever it can be done without injuring the war effort.

Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia, who rose first, and then I shall be glad to yield to other Senators.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say to the Senator from Maryland and also to the Senator from Wisconsin that I have been very much impressed by the argument with respect to raising more food crops. That is very essential to the United States in time of war. But I may also point out that as recently as November of last year the Secretary of Agriculture in the Wickard case, pressed before the courts, placed a penalty upon an Indiana farmer for raising too much wheat in time of war.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator took the words out of my mouth.

Mr. REVERCOMB. To me it is an abominable circumstance that in this country in time of war, when we need the food, when we acknowledge that we need it, when we know that we need it, the Secretary of Agriculture is vested with the power of placing a penalty upon a farmer for raising a needed crop such as wheat.

Mr. TYDINGS. A farmer living in Carroll County, a neighboring county to mine, a law-abiding man who tries to farm well and does farm well, but who was not conversant with the law, was confronted when he was ready to sell his wheat with a penalty of over $500. He wrote to me about the matter, and I felt somewhat humiliated and ashamed to tell him that I had at least indirectly and somewhat unwittingly been a party to that sort of transaction.

Before I yield to the Senator from Nebraska, let me read four lines at the end—I will not read the intermediate part—of the act to prove what the Senator from Wisconsin has so clearly stated:

> *Provided*, That farm average allotments shall be made for wheat in 1938, but in determining compliance wheat shall be considered in the group with other crops for which special acreage allotments are not made.

Mr. President, why bring wheat in merely for the year 1938? If this is a soil-building and a conservation program, why not leave wheat in for all time? The truth of the matter is, however, as every Senator knows, that in that year it was supposed that there would be a carry-over and a surplus together which would depress the price of wheat; so this program was used to curtail the production of wheat, not for soil-conservation purposes, but so that the price of wheat perhaps would rise to such a point that the farmer could receive a fair price for it. That is all right, but let us call it by its true name. Let us not call it soil conservation, and let us not have it now if we do not need it now. The truth is we now need all the food of every kind we can get.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, the carrying out of the act as originally passed resulted in the benefits with respect to soil conservation which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has mentioned, but if we continue to invoke it for the purpose for which it was created, to place limitations on crops, would not that tend to increase the price all the way along the line?

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the deduction might be drawn in line with the Senator's statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Further, what we want to do is produce all the food we can. Is that not true?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. In my State, we really grow corn. I am not familiar with cotton, but I know something about corn, and I know something about wheat. I know that up to February of this year, if a farmer planted only a wheat crop, and did not in furtherance of the war effort plant some other crops with which we are not familiar in Nebraska, he was penalized on his wheat crop. I went to the office of the Secretary of Agriculture and had a talk with him. I am sure he told me that there were no restrictions now on anything we wanted to grow. If that is true, and I think it ought to be true because the Secretary is well informed, is there any limitation in this act? For what, if anything, are we paying this money aside from soil conservation?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is not compulsory, but there is a limitation, because the Secretary of Agriculture can promulgate regulations providing that if a farmer plants more than a certain portion of his farm to a given crop he shall not receive any benefit.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, that is the interpretation I place on the language, and therefore, there is still a restriction or limitation on planting wheat and corn.

Mr. TYDINGS. At least indirectly it is implied in the law.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. It is implied in the law. I wish to say that I stated in February that what we need is food, and that we should remove the restrictions with respect to these crops, and if we were to pay the farmer anything we should pay him to produce, and not pay him for not producing essentials we shall need.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I had not intended to rise again, but I did so because I felt that the Senator from Wisconsin had misinterpreted my position, which was not in opposition to soil conservation, but to the utilization of so-called soil-conservation funds for the purpose of limiting agricultural production quite apart from soil-conservation practices.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Reference was made a short while ago to the American Farm Bureau Federation. The American Farm Bureau Federation is on record as supporting the House amount of $300,000,000. I simply wish to say a word with respect to the American Farm Bureau Federation. I have not always agreed with it, but it is the greatest farm organization in America. Fortune Magazine recently took a poll to determine which of the farm organizations had the largest membership. Of all organized farmers the American Farm Bureau Federation had 60 percent. Of the high income farmers the Federation had 60 percent. Of all the medium-income farmers who were organized the Federation had 61 percent. Of the low-income farmers the Federation had 48 percent. The next highest organization was the Grange, which agrees with the Federation in this instance.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to know when the Grange agreed to it. I listened very closely to the hearings and no such statement was made.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true. Mr. O'Neal spoke for both the Grange and the Farm Bureau Federation, but the Senator will recall that Mr. Goss was there that day——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Goss of the Grange?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; and some others; I do not know how many, but I think they took the position that Mr. O'Neal had stated the case, and they did not identify themselves.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Goss appeared before the committee in his own right.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I withdraw the statement. The Senator may be correct. I do not wish to take advantage by stating something, no matter how sincerely I am doing it, which may not be accurate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the point I wish to make is that it is inconceivable to me that the American Farm Bureau Federation would advocate something which is charged to be a breach of faith with the farmers of the country. I cannot conceive that to be true, because the American Farm Bureau Federation is directly responsible to the 60 percent of the organized farmers who constitute the membership of that organization. The federation held local meetings. What was decided at these meetings was carried up to State conventions, and the judgment expressed by Mr. O'Neal in Washington is the judgment which comes from the grass roots all over the country. So I must take issue with Senators who contend that we are breaking faith with the farmers, simply because we propose to reduce the appropriation from $400,000,000 to $300,000,000. I think the Senator from Maryland will agree with me when I say that no official of this Government has the right to bind Congress as to any specific appropriation in future years.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator, and I shall conclude with three or four brief observations. The first is that the trouble with the farmer does not lie in whether this measure shall be passed. It lies in the great imponderables which always arise in time of war or when war is imminent—shortage of labor, shortage of fertilizer, shortage of machinery, shortage of transportation, the concomitants of war on a total scale. That is the farmer's trouble, and we cannot legislate for those things back on the farm by the appropriation of money.

The second thing is that prices and wages have been bound up into one general formula by the passage of the O. P. A. Act, the War Stabilization Act, and so forth. It is not good government now indirectly to pay a subsidy to any group working for the war effort any more than it would be fair to pay from the Federal Treasury a subsidy to coal miners or shipyard workers or automobile workers or any other group. If we adopt such a policy, quite apart from the national problem of soil conservation, we might find that it will establish a precedent, and the precedent may be used sooner or later, if the war continues sufficiently long, by the workers to ask for equality of treatment and to request that they also be allowed a subsidy, particularly those groups that perhaps have a better case than some of the more highly paid groups now have.

Finally, I am for the soil-conservation program, as I believe the Congress is as a unit, and as I believe the country is as a unit; but I think we have outlived the policy—certainly during the war—of the philosophy of scarcity. I think we have reached the time when, if we want crops of a certain kind produced, we should adopt some other methods than one which was created to relieve the depression, if we tell the truth, because it is the Siamese twin of the old, original Agricultural Adjustment Act, which was knocked out by the Supreme Court and was revamped to fit the Court's objections insofar as they could be met.

So, Mr. President, in my humble judgment, if the appropriation is reduced to $300,000,000, first, no considerable group of farmers in the country will object; second, an economy, and a deserved economy, of $100,000,000 will be effected; third, the entire soil-conservation program will not be hurt one iota; and, fourth, an inequality created to help a particular group in a period of depression, the depression since having disappeared, will have been eliminated, as it should be eliminated, as we approach more normal times and more normal prices in the field of agriculture, and particularly as to the crops for which the plan was created.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to say a word in conclusion. I cannot agree with the Senator from Maryland or other Senators who take the position that we can obtain soil conservation and a rebuilding of our soil without having a diversion for the one-crop areas. All that the Senator from Maryland or any other Senator has to do is to travel by train—he does not even have to travel by automobile—through the cotton areas of the South, to see the effect on the soil of producing only one crop for generation after generation.

We can obtain a diversion, a change in the practices of the farmers, in only two ways: First, by offering the farmers an inducement, which this program attempts to do; and, second, by compulsion, which, in my opinion, would be unconstitutional. I say that any man is blind, indeed, who cannot now go through the South or through any other agricultural area of the country and see what has been accomplished by the appropriation of this money. We could not have gotten the cotton farmers, the corn farmers, the wheat farmers, or the tobacco farmers—the one-crop producers—to adopt any soil-conservation practices unless we had offered them an inducement to do so. That meant a curtailment of the acreage planted to the soil-depleting crops which they had normally and historically produced. If we had not changed that historical basis, we should not have accomplished anything in the way of bringing about soil conservation in the one-crop producing areas of the United States.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me it is to fail to understand the whole theory upon which the program was based, to think that we can divorce soil conservation from the curtailment of acreage planted to crops which are soil-depleting in character. On each farm, on each plantation, there must be made and carried out year after year a program of changing the historical and past practices of the farm owner or plantation owner, and inducing him to curtail the production of certain soil-depleting crops, and to put the acreage into the production of soil-building and soil-conserving crops.

I say that this program has bearing, both direct and indirect, upon food production. I say furthermore that if we go back on the program which was laid down, the farmers of the country will have a right to believe that we have repudiated a moral obligation which they thought we had authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into on our behalf with them; and they will feel that we have repudiated that moral obligation and have agreed to pay them only 75 cents on the dollar of the obligation which our agent incurred.

CONFIRMATION OF COAST GUARD GRADUATES

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a list of Coast Guard cadets who will graduate tomorrow at 11 o'clock, and it is desired that they shall receive their commissions at the time of the graduation, which is the regular order. Therefore I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that I may report the list sent down by the President of the nomination of cadets to be ensigns in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 9th day of June, and I also ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the nominations at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc, and confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BAILEY. I ask that the President be notified forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmations.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the debate on the pending amendment has probably covered most of the questions which might arise; but I think certain things which have been said should be clarified. References have been made, particularly by the Senator from Maryland, to the Domestic Allotment Act, in his effort to show that not all these payments are strictly soil-conservation payments. I am ready to agree that not all the payments are made directly for what might be termed soil-conserving practices. But the two programs—that under the Domestic Allotment Act by which we sought to provide what was referred to as the "ever-normal granary" and the soil conservation program—have gone hand in hand in this program, and it is impossible to perform a feat of surgery and to separate one from the other. They are both integral and component parts of the same general program.

Much of the debate which has taken place on this problem would seem to me to be rather far from the question. The point was that the Secretary of Agriculture had undertaken to penalize a wheat farmer who had produced more than his allotment under the program last year. Last year was the only year the wheat farmers have been under marketing quotas. I merely desire to point out that in attempting to enforce that law the Secretary of Agriculture was conforming to the dictates of the Congress. On the question of whether the statute is a good one or a bad one, the responsibility rests upon the Congress of the United States, not upon any individual; because the Secretary of Agriculture was directed by law to enforce that act of Congress.

Mr. President, I should like to point out further that none of the marketing quotas is ever placed in effect upon any commodity until it has been approved by the vote of two-thirds of the producers of the commodity, at elections duly held and supervised by farmers. Under the law passed by Congress, no quotas can be imposed, no farmer can be prosecuted, no limitation can be made in the acreage, unless two-thirds of the producers of the commodity so determine at the polls, in an election duly called in each agricultural county for that purpose. As a matter of fact, at the present time there is no limitation whatever upon the production of corn, there is no limitation whatever upon the production of wheat, there is no limitation whatever upon the production of rice—the three products which are regarded as the basic commodities at the present time. On the contrary, the program announced by the Secretary of Agriculture this year, that to which the farmers have responded, and as a result of which I contend that the appropriation should be made in full, was not designed to restrict or curtail production; but, by the express terms of the Secretary's announcement, it was designed to increase the production of the foods of which there is such a shortage in this country today as to cause some persons to be apprehensive lest we shall have a famine.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a press release of the Department of Agriculture, issued on December 5, 1942, promulgating the program of the Department for the current year. It is the program upon which 6,000,000 farmers have already acted, and as to which an appropriation of $400,000,000 will be required in order to fulfill the obligations of the Government. I read the announcement:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ANNOUNCES THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY'S 1943 ADJUSTMENT PAYMENT RATES

Rates of payment to farmers cooperating with the crop-production adjustment phase of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency's 1943 war program were announced today by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Farmers may earn these production adjustment payments in 1943 by complying with their Agricultural Adjustment Agency's acreage allotments for corn, wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts, at the same time meeting individual farm-production goals for special war crops. Following out the Department's policy of full production of all crops needed in the war, severe deductions will be made from each farm's total crop payments in 1943 for failure to plant at least 90 percent of an acreage allotment and 90 percent of a special war-crop goal.

There are no restrictions in this announcement. There is the requirement that the goal for the production of war crops shall be met before the payments shall be made. I continue to read:

This provision is intended to encourage farmers to make full use of their available land. In many instances, farmers will be encouraged to substitute special war crops for allotment crops, especially for wheat and cotton. After farmers first meet their 90 percent special war-crop acreage requirement, they may take any special war-crop acreage above this figure and substitute it acre for acre for allotment crops in meeting the latter's 90-percent planting provision.

In other words, unless 90 percent of the allotment were planted to the crops needed in the war effort, payments to the farmer would be reduced.

In addition to the crop-production adjustment payment described above, farmers also will be able to earn a production practice—or conservation—payment by carrying out specified agricultural practices which improve soil, help prevent erosion, and increase yields of needed war crops. Since these conservation rates vary by regions and States, they are being announced by State Agricultural Adjustment Agency committees.

Mr. President, how in the world is it possible for any Senator to segregate the payments which are made for soil-conservation practices from those which are made for the production of war crops? Today there are no payments conditioned upon the reduction of acreage for any food product. The only payments which are made which are conditioned upon reduction of acreage are those made to producers of cotton and tobacco, and under this program they may plant up to 90 percent of their allotment, either in cotton or tobacco, or in a war food crop; and they must plant the war food crop acreage required of them before they are entitled to payment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In the South, for example, or in the great burley tobacco-producing areas, how in the world could a single acre in those areas ever be utilized for the production of things needed for food in time of war except by getting the farmers not to plant as many acres of cotton or tobacco as they planted last year, and persuading them to plant the crops we need?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would have been impossible to produce such crops without guaranteeing the price from some other source or instituting a program of this kind under the Domestic Allotment and Adjustment Act.

We have for the moment the controversy as to whether or not the Secretary is legally authorized to make these commitments to the farmers. I wish to discuss this question for a moment from the standpoint of good morals and ethics, and what the Congress should do in this situation.

Whether the Secretary has the legal right to make these commitments or not, they have been made year after year for the past 6 years; and the announcement which he has made has been the yardstick followed by Congress in making appropriations to meet these obligations. For 6 years farmers have gone into their county A. A. A. offices, and worked out their program. They have computed the payments which they would receive in December, and the Congress has made the appropriations and the payments have been made.

This year it is proposed to say to the farmer, "You have done your work; Congress has supported the operations of

the Secretary of Agriculture for 6 years; but now we are going to refuse to do so. We are going to pay you with 75-cent dollars."

Whether it is legal, or whether we are quibbling over technicalities or not, I say it would be a breach of good faith and morals for Congress to deny payments to the farmers, who in many instances have gone down into their own pockets and expended their own funds for seed and for conservation practices which were required of them in order to earn these payments.

There is no way on earth to divide this program and say, "This is soil conservation, and that is domestic allotment." If this law is wrong, the Congress ought to change it. If the Secretary has not the right, or should not have the right, to incur obligations for payments under these acts, the Congress should so declare by legislation. However, after the crop has been fixed and the farmer has spent his money in following out the program and checking with his county office as to what he is to receive, after he has already incurred expenditures and put forth his labor and sweat in the fields to conform to the practices, we should not say, "We are not going to make the payments because, forsooth, some of this money has been spent for something that was not a soil-conservation practice."

It would be unfair, unjust, and immoral to take this money away from the farmers, wherever they may be, whether or not the program measures up to what Senators may think is a strictly soil-conservation program. If we wish to adjust this matter we should do it for next year. We should not, after the farmer has acted in good faith, attempt to reduce the appropriation and deny him the payments which he has honestly earned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 68, line 2, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 68, line 2, after the word "newspapers", it is proposed to strike out "$300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$400,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Davis	McClellan
Austin	Eastland	McFarland
Bailey	Ellender	McKellar
Bankhead	George	McNary
Barbour	Gerry	Maloney
Bilbo	Gillette	Maybank
Bone	Green	Mead
Buck	Guffey	Millikin
Burton	Gurney	Moore
Bushfield	Hatch	Murray
Byrd	Hayden	Nye
Capper	Hill	O'Daniel
Caraway	Holman	O'Mahoney
Chandler	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Chavez	La Follette	Revercomb
Clark, Mo.	Langer	Russell
Connally	Lodge	Scrugham
Danaher	McCarran	Shipstead
Smith	Tunnell	Wheeler
Stewart	Tydings	Wherry
Taft	Vandenberg	White
Thomas, Okla.	Van Nuys	Willis
Tobey	Walsh	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 68, line 2.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Am I correct in understanding that to vote "yea" is to vote for an increase to $400,000,000, and that to vote "nay" is to vote in favor of maintaining the amount at $300,000,000?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The yeas and nays having already been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when Mr. REED's name was called). The junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is absent from the Senate. If he were present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in an important committee meeting. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], who, if present would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho, the Senator from Utah, and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained on business in Government departments.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present. I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], who if present would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are members of the Truman committee and are attending its meeting in Kansas City.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—49

Aiken	Guffey	Murray
Austin	Gurney	Nye
Bankhead	Hatch	O'Daniel
Bilbo	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bone	Hill	Russell
Burton	Holman	Scrugham
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Capper	La Follette	Smith
Caraway	Langer	Stewart
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McFarland	Tunnell
Connally	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McNary	Van Nuys
Ellender	Maloney	Wheeler
George	Maybank	Wilson
Gillette	Mead	
Green	Moore	

NAYS—20

Bailey	Gerry	Tobey
Barbour	Lodge	Tydings
Buck	McCarran	Walsh
Byrd	Millikin	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Radcliffe	White
Danaher	Revercomb	Willis
Davis	Taft	

NOT VOTING—27

Andrews	Ferguson	Reed
Ball	Glass	Reynolds
Barkley	Hawkes	Robertson
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	Lucas	Truman
Butler	Murdock	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Overton	Wallgren
Downey	Pepper	Wiley

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I was authorized by the committee to offer an amendment which comes properly at this place, and if in order now, I call it up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 68, line 14, after the word "inclusive", it is proposed to insert "*Provided*, That for the purposes of any law, order, or regulation relating to establishing, maintaining, or adjusting maximum prices for agricultural commodities or for commodities processed in whole or substantial part from agricultural commodities, the payments made out of funds appropriated under this item shall not be considered as a part of the prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities or otherwise taken into account."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, am I to understand that the amendment was approved by the committee?

Mr. BANKHEAD. It was.

Mr. McNARY. And the Senator offers it as a committee amendment?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes, so far as I can. It is legislative in character, but I was authorized by the committee to move to suspend the rule. That, of course, is as far as the committee could go.

Mr. McNARY. At the present time I am not impressed with the amendment. I should like to have a statement by the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall be glad to make one.

Mr. McNARY. I reserve the right to make a point of order, which I probably shall do, but I should like to have some information about the amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall be glad to explain it, and had intended to do so.

Mr. President, a mere reading of this amendment will disclose that it has some of the elements, but not all, of the bill which was passed by the Senate by an almost unanimous vote and was vetoed by the President. The amendment is not intended to raise again, in a direct way, the issues which were presented by the original so-called Bankhead bill and by the President's veto. It is true, however, that the President's Executive order made this amendment necessary, if the order is to be carried out and if a great injustice to the farmer is not thereby committed.

We all recall that the President's Executive order of October 2, which the Senate thought he had no power to make, and so voted, and therefore it did not become a law—and if any Senator cares to see the order I have it here—directed all agencies of the Government in fixing maximum prices to deduct from the parity price, in order to ascertain the maximum price, all parity payments, all soil-conservation payments, and all subsidy payments. Where would that leave the farmers who participated under the soil-conservation program if we completely acquiesced in that doctrine?

There is, of course, as I have indicated, a broad distinction between the original bill which was vetoed and the amendment I have offered, because the bill which was vetoed applied to all kinds of benefit payments; it was not limited to soil conservation, but included parity and all subsidy payments, and was designed to be a permanent statute, to govern until repealed or otherwise disposed of. This amendment limits the consideration of this subject alone to soil-conservation payments which most Members of the Senate, I think, who have given the subject consideration, have believed all the time were not properly denominated benefit subsidy payments because, in the main, a consideration moved from the farmers, under the invitation of their Government, through compliance with regulations announced by the Department and authorized by the statute, and in carrying out the modes of production which the Secretary had a right to prescribe and which he did from time to time prescribe.

The debate today has brought out that this year the farmers have obligated themselves and paid out of their pockets practically half of this entire appropriation. They have bought leguminous seeds; they have planted them; they have hired the labor, when necessary, and in most cases it was necessary; they have bought equipment here and there, when it was necessary; they have engaged in soil practices in other ways, such as terracing ground at an expensive outlay for labor, and on a schedule which the Secretary, acting under the law as he has done from year to year, prescribed, and the Secretary as well prescribed the rates of pay.

On the other part, farmers have diverted their production from soil-depleting crops. Under the rotation system they have abandoned to some extent the production of regular cash crops and changed to other crops in order to meet the war food-production goals which the Secretary laid down. The rates were prescribed, and I have them here. So, under the program, under the announcement of the Government, as the Senator from Georgia has said, the good faith of the Government was involved.

The law has not changed that program, unless the President's Executive order is the law. Certainly the farmers have not understood that a soil program which requires them to engage in expenditures, labor, and effort has been changed by law or even by Executive order, because they have been encouraged to go along, even since the President's Executive order was made. The notice or declaration to the farmers was issued in December, while the President's order was made on October 2. The Department had led them to believe that it was all right, that it was in line with the usual program and practice to spend their money, their time, and their efforts in this particular soil-building program.

This amendment confines the doctrine laid down to this year's appropriation, as to which, as I see it, the good faith of the Government is involved, for the farmers will be money out of pocket if the President's order is carried out. If there is no intention to carry it out, then who can object to this amendment? Even if the amendment is not needed it should be accepted by unanimous vote, because it would give assurance and confidence to the farmers all over the country on 6,000,000 farms who are expecting to receive these payments, which they have worked for and earned.

The President's order to which the amendment is directed provides that these payments must be deducted from the maximum prices, from the market prices, so that if the order is carried out the result will be that the farmer's market price will be reduced below the parity price, if the present market price is at parity, as it is for so many of the more important commodities, but the deduction of these payments in all cases brings down the market price.

I do not believe Congress ever so intended. I do not believe Congress wants to see that result. There is a great commotion all over this country, which is stirring activity in Congress, about a roll-back of the prices of a few commodities, such as meat, and coffee, and butter. Great indignation has been expressed, and protests have been widespread. Although there is not a roll-back of the farmer's price, still there is a fear that that might result.

Here we have a program under the Executive order which constitutes a roll-back of prices, and a roll-back to the farmers, not one affecting processors alone, not one affecting distributors, but a reduction in an amount equivalent to the conservation payments, a reduction in the market price of the farmer, and therefore in the amount of money he gets for his year's work and his crop.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator's last statement was that the amount of the soil conservation payments would be taken into consideration in fixing the farmer's price, and his earlier remarks were directed to parity payments. I was wondering whether the Senator had a division showing the amount of money which goes primarily to soil conservation payments and the amount which goes to the domestic allotment plan, because it might be that some Senators would want to differentiate between the domestic allotment plan and the soil conservation plan, where they were separate, and not integrated in the same program.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I must confess that it is somewhat difficult to argue a question such as that with a Baltimore hotel farmer. He talks about the difference between the conservation plan and the domestic allotment plan. I am surprised that the Senator does not know that they are one and the same, and are contained in the same law.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is a little difficult for me to interpret the Senator's last remark, in view of the fact that he inhabits Mount Everest, and seems to be emulating the Ethiopian in the woodpile. But if I may approach that proposition, of course they are in the same law, but I have not been able yet to find

out where the domestic allotment plan has anything to do directly with soil conservation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is the whole thing; that is what it is.

Mr. TYDINGS. I myself read the law this morning, with those provisions in it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Perhaps it will give the Senator some light for me to say that the domestic allotment plan and the soil conservation plan are the same.

Mr. TYDINGS. While the Senator was absent this morning I read the law to the Senate, so I am conversant with it, and there is a definite distinction between the domestic allotment plan and the soil conservation plan, so recognized in the law itself.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have not time to educate the Senator on that subject.

Mr. TYDINGS. No, and I do not think the Senator would be able to, because one has to start with knowledge before he can impart it to another.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Some people never learn anything and never forget anything.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. Of course, as the Senator from Alabama knows, I am 100 percent with him in his position, and I think there is no logical answer to the argument he is making that there should not be considered the conservation payments, which are paid for a specific purpose in compensation for a specific act, in connection with the computation of price. I call the Senator's attention, however, to the language of his proposed amendment:

> The payment of funds appropriated under this item shall not be considered as a part of the prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities.

In which, of course, we are in full agreement. Then the amendment adds, "or otherwise taken into account."

Mr. BANKHFAD. In fixing maximum prices. It refers back.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am sure the Senator will agree that it leaves that phrase unsupported, where it might be applied to anything else. I suggest, would it not be preferable to add that phrase, if the Senator wants to use it, at the end of line 7, so that it would read that "funds appropriated under this item shall not be considered or otherwise taken into account as a part of the prices," and so forth?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is all right. If the Senator thinks it clarifies the language, I have no objection.

Mr. GILLETTE. It would seem to me that it very definitely clarifies it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I had my amendment prepared by the legal draftsman, and I assumed it was correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. I do not assume, of course, to have a keener knowledge of drafting such a measure than the Senator has.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have great respect for the Senator's judgment and complete confidence in his good purpose, and I am inclined to think he is right. I am glad to accept the suggestion.

I shall not take further time of the Senate, unless the minority leader would like to ask me some questions. I have great respect for his judgment. I crave his cooperation.

Unless there is some question, I shall conclude, because I think the Senate understands the proposal, and I shall not take further time now.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the very distinguished Senator from Alabama contravenes rule XVI of the Senate. Therefore, I shall make the point of order. Before doing so, let me suggest that I supported this proposal when it was before the Senate on a previous occasion. It passed the Senate and the House, and was vetoed by the President. The veto is now before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and hearings have been had upon it.

I think it is most unusual, and that it does not conform to any rule of legislation, not to mention the rules of the Senate, that there should be an attempt to write into an appropriation bill a vetoed measure, when the veto message is now pending before a legislative committee.

I am anxious to have the bill passed. It must become a law by June 30. But to place such an amendment in an appropriation bill, which in effect would be to place a veto message in the bill, would necessarily result in causing opposition in the House, it would delay the passage of the measure, so that it probably could not be written into law by the 30th of June. The consideration of the veto message is a matter which is now before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Secondly, the provision in question does not amount to very much. I remember very well that the able Senator from Alabama, from whose views it grieves me to part, stated in the Senate when he was anxious that his bill, which I supported, be passed, that the benefit it would provide did not at this time amount to very much for the farmers of the country; I think he made an estimate of $75,000,000. I had a very much lower estimate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. An estimate of $75,000,000 for what?

Mr. McNARY. I think the Senator said if his bill were to pass the farmers of the country would benefit to the extent of $75,000,000 over their present prices.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I think the Senator will find it was about $250,000,000.

Mr. McNARY. Someone said about $75,000,000, and I think that estimate was far too high.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I set out the details with respect to it.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator may have, but I probably was not moved favorably by the details.

Mr. President, I make the point of order for the very substantial reason——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order on the ground that the amendment is legislation on a general appropriation bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I could not conceive of any more unfortunate amendment than the one which has been proposed by the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. It is unfortunate because it is utterly untimely. It would tend, in fact, if adopted, it would actually contribute to and probably make necessary the overthrow of the entire national policy addressed to the gravest domestic crisis which this country has faced in the 18 months since our enemies attacked us. I realize that my statement seems to be sweeping; it may appear at first to be extreme; but I believe I can convince the Senator that it is not extreme and is no more sweeping than the facts justify.

Mr. President, we are in the midst of the gravest internal crisis of the last 8 or 10, perhaps 15 years. We are all familiar, certainly, with the superficial aspects of that crisis. There has been a demand, headed up largely by one man, the president of the United Mine Workers, for an overthrow of the national policy on the subject of wages. He has gone to great lengths. He has even put on a strike against the national defense and in the time of war. He has practically said to the American people, to the American Government, and to its President, and to its Congress that "I, the president of the United Mine Workers, must have my way, whether your country is defeated in battle or not. I must have $2 a day for my miners."

It had not seemed to me, Mr. President, that that demand created a situation in which the mere matter of $2 a day was involved. That projected the whole crucial situation of the stabilization of the American economy by means of a firm national policy. It is a test of the power of the Government. It is a test of the stamina and the will of the President. Should Mr. Lewis succeed, we would know then that the Executive order, called the hold-the-line order, had been breached. We would know that the floodgates were open to thousands of demands from all quarters, and we would know that we had let go such power as we now have to maintain the policy of stabilization. We would have an ascending scale of wages. We would have endless demands coming from the wage earners first, and then from the farmers, and coming justly then from the farmers. We have got to hold that line, Mr. President. The terms of this crisis are not the terms merely of meeting Mr. Lewis. The terms of this crisis are the terms of meeting the necessities of national stabilization, and of maintaining the national policy as declared by the President and with the authority of the Congress. We cannot afford to breach it.

Precisely now comes a demand, not unlike the demand from the labor side of the economy, not only that we shall enact legislation which will open the doors, not just to the attainment of parity by the farmers—oh, no—but upon the terms of an endless series of demands, and ever-increasing rivalry between the classes of America, the groups in labor, and the groups in agriculture, each justly saying, "If you increased the

compensation of the other, we must have an increase likewise," thus creating an ascending cycle of inflation, bringing on the destruction of our economy, breaking down the wall and destroying our national policy, and discrediting our Government and its head, the President, and its agency, the War Labor Board.

Mr. President, I know very well that I would go beyond bounds, and that I would probably seem to be unjust if I should say that this amendment is a flank movement coming to the aid of Mr. John Lewis. I do not think that its author had that in mind, but I do not hesitate to say that that would be precisely its consequence. If we enact the amendment into law we would give Mr. John Lewis precisely the club he desires with which to make his case and bring about the consummation represented in his demands.

How quickly would he respond by saying, "All right. You did break down your line; you broke down the line which was established with respect to the farmers. Now you must break down the line for me. You did increase the cost of living; you did enact an amendment which necessarily implied an increase in the cost of living. Now be fair, and give me my demands."

How would we resist that plea? How could we justly pass the legislation which now is in conference, and which shortly will be before the Senate? How would the War Labor Board be able to hold the line? How would the President and his aides be able to maintain the stabilization so essential and so indispensable, not simply to order, but to our security, to the prosecution of the war, and to the maintenance of the economy underlying the war effort? How quickly the whole thing would fall like a house of cards, and the President and the War Labor Board and the Congress and the people be stricken down in perfect helplessness.

Mr. President, I opposed the motion to override the President's veto, made here about 6 weeks ago, as I recall. I thought I knew what I was doing at that time. I opposed it, not precisely on the technical merits of the legislation, but—as other Members of the Senate will recall—in the interest of stablization and by way of fending against the threat of inflation.

Here it comes again—not by way of a report from the committee on the veto message or the motion to override the veto, but by way of legislation in an appropriation bill to obviate a veto message, and that at a time when all the picture of the national crisis is before us.

Six weeks ago when I spoke to the Senate, very probably some Members of the Senate did not realize, as I realized then, that we had to sustain the President, regardless of the technical merits of the matter, because not to do so would have been to paralyze his arm in the hour when he was trying to bring about stabilization. That is why I took that position then, and that is why I am speaking now. If we break down the hold-the-line order, if we contribute to the breaking down of that order, no matter how good the cause, no matter what the merits may be—let it be said that we should like to have the farmers receive increased prices; even let it be conceded that all agricultural prices should be fixed at parity or better; and even let it be said that there is some merit in the demands of the miners, and that it might be well for them to be paid a little more here and a little more there, as Lewis demands—nevertheless, even making those concessions, which I do not make, and to which I would not agree, but even making them for the purposes and the sake of argument, in order to give emphasis to the precise motive which attends me and the necessities of the present hour, I say we can concede anything we please about the merits of the demand, and at the same time say that the hour has come in the United States of America when we must stabilize the national economy, no matter whom we disappoint, no matter what outcries we may hear.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator feel that the War Labor Board and the administration are about to grant John Lewis an increase of a dollar and a half a day through the portal-to-portal pay provision?

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator has asked me how I feel about that. I do not feel that way. If I did, I would not trust my feelings. I am not disposed—I hope I shall not appear to be boastful—to depend upon feelings or intuitions. I could say that there are some evidences; I could say that I have some fears; but what I am saying is that I will not be a party to it; I will not contribute to it; I will not willingly have the Congress open the door to it. I will not yield; I will not make it easy for the President to yield, or for the War Labor Board to yield, or for anyone else to yield. If I had the feelings which the Senator seems to think I have, I would resist them with all the power I could summon.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH. After listening to the Senator's argument on the question of holding the line at the present level of things, I wonder whether he means to say that he abrogates and dismisses all the power of Congress and turns all of it over to one man.

Mr. BAILEY. Is that the Senator's question?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. Of course, I do not, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH. The reason I asked the question is that the Senate, by a vote of 78 to 2, voted for the principle involved in what was a legal question, one which had nothing to do with Mr. Lewis, except inferentially. Then, when the President vetoed the measure, we all submitted. That meant that Congress has nothing to say about it, that the President is to dictate the entire economy, whether just or unjust, and that we have nothing to say.

Mr. BAILEY. I have answered the Senator's question; but he opens up a matter to me. Mr. President, we have the power to open the doors today to all the interminable and unspeakable evils of inflation. The fact that we do not use that power does not indicate that we are supine; it does not indicate that we are giving that power to the President or to anyone else. It simply indicates that we are meeting the demands of the situation by resolving these smaller matters in favor of the larger objective of having a stabilized economy during the war.

Mr. SMITH. It occurs to me that there arose a situation which evidently a majority of the Members of Congress thought was unjust. In stabilizing this matter, the farmers or those who had their benefit payments, so-called, deducted from the parity payments thought that action was unfair. After discussion, the Senate voted 78 to 2 that it was unfair. It was a mere incident, a crook in the line that we were told to hold. The President vetoed the bill. It is now under consideration before a committee of the Senate.

Even though there may be great danger of inflation, I do not think it is likely to come from the great abundance of money which the farmers would have, and which they would spend if they are allowed to enjoy what was promised them, namely, parity.

I could go into some detail, reductio ad absurdum, but I cannot follow the Senator in his argument. The Senator from North Carolina is pleading with his colleagues to obey the behest of one man, against the vote of those whom the people have sent here to represent them.

The situation with respect to John L. Lewis is a thing apart. It is said that if we grant this justice to the farmer, Lewis will say, "All right; you have raised the cost of living. Now raise my wages." The Senate very nobly, and with great backbone, darted under the seats and said, "Yes, Mr. President, since you have vetoed it, we are through."

What did Mr. Lewis do? What is he doing now? Is he holding the line? Five hundred thousand miners went out on strike when the bill was to all intents and purposes killed. I think it is up to us to represent the people who sent us here.

I cannot follow the Senator in his argument. He says, "Hold the line, whether you kill people or not, but hold the line." I am perfectly willing to hold the line if it is held in justice. We may win this war against our enemies and lose America. That is the direction in which we are now headed.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to my distinguished friend. That is just my contention. We can win this war and lose America; and we can lose America before we have an opportunity to win the war.

Mr. SMITH. I think that is the direction in which the Senator is headed.

Mr. BAILEY. We can lose the war on the American front. I hope I am not giving aid and comfort to our enemies. News favorable to our arms comes from

all the winds that blow. Two armies of our enemies have been captured and destroyed. We have control of the air in the Mediterranean and off the coasts of Europe. We are making gains against the Japanese. Our sons, to the number of eight or nine million, true to all the best traditions of their land, have put on the armor of their country and have gone forth to battle. Industry has been converted into an arsenal. The American people have gone into their great period of trial. We can make a mistake right here which would absolutely destroy the American economy. My complaint against Mr. Lewis has been just that. He was not only defying his Government, but he was making a demand the consequences of which would open the door to demands from every quarter of labor—demands which we could not resist if we yielded to him.

In speaking today I am not speaking only to the Senate. I am speaking to the authorities down the street. I would say to the President if I were in his presence, "Mr. President, you must hold this line against John Lewis, no matter what the demands are, no matter what the threats are, no matter what the consequences are. Hold the line."

The national policy must be maintained. Once we yield we can never repair the breach. If we continue to yield, we may be as badly off as the French were about 3 years ago today when the news came that the line had been broken at Sedan on a front of 14 miles, and the German hordes were pouring through.

If we yield to Mr. Lewis' demands, we can do precisely the same thing with respect to the farmers, and we can justify the demands of John Lewis by yielding to the demands—if there be demands—from the farmers. I am taking my position against the farmer demand and against the labor demand, and for a firm and stable national policy, resolving all the minor considerations, however meritorious, in the larger objective of stabilizing the American economy, not for the sake of stability, but in order that we may maintain a country capable of sustaining the men who are fighting our battles.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am listening with the greatest interest to what the Senator is saying, because he is talking about something of the greatest importance to our beloved country. But I am wondering if there is not another part of the line that is being swayed just a little. Apparently the granting of practically unlimited subsidies is in prospect. I say that with some degree of accuracy. I understand that subsidies, not granted by Congress but by one of the borrowing agencies of the Government, have been given to beef and butter to the extent of $450,000,000, and that the plan is already in operation, or will go into operation in a day or two.

If that be true, is it not a fact that we have broken the inflationary line in another place? We must tax the American people to pay these enormous subsidies. I am told that we have already started with subsidies for some articles, not by congressional action, but by departmental action. It seems to me that we may strike a spiral of inflation which will take us so far afield that it will be very difficult ever to get back.

The Senator has discussed two other places where the line might be broken. I should like to hear the Senator discuss the question I have raised.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not pretend to be prepared to discuss the question posed by the Senator. I have thought a great deal about it. I regret the projection of the subsidy theory into the situation; but I take it that the foundation of the proposal of subsidies is a concession with a view to maintaining the line.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. BAILEY. Let me undertake to answer the Senator, and state my thought. It is a price proposed to be paid in order to prevent a rise in the cost of living, and therefore to justify holding the line for wages.

Whether that is sound policy is another question. Other countries have tried it, and they seem to have had a satisfactory experience. I am not commiting myself to that theory, but I would infinitely rather vote for subsidies in order to keep the cost of living down and thereby justify me in voting to hold wages and prices where they are, than not to vote for them and yield to John Lewis on the one hand and the farmers on the other, and every possible demand from every group in America.

That is the theory of the subsidy. I am not commiting myself to it, but there is such a thing as throwing tubs to whales, even by government. As I understand the subsidy, it is in the nature of tubs for whales.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with practically everything the Senator has said as to the other two lines, but I was astounded a few days ago, in questioning Mr. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, who has charge of the paying of this particular subsidy. I asked him to whom he was going to pay the subsidy. It seems that $450,000,000 had been set aside for those two articles of food. I asked him, "To whom are you going to pay these enormous subsidies?" He told me they were going to pay the subsidies to the packers, and not to the producers. That is the kind of subsidy which, I am frank to say, alarms me very much. I feel alarmed about it in the same way that I feel alarmed about other proposed breaks in the line. I agree with the Senator that we should "hold the line."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I am alarmed at these unusual prospects and proposals. We are confronted by a situation which is bound to alarm every one of us. I do not wish to make any extended remarks. I read a part of my mail, as do most Senators. I am alarmed at the revolt in America against rationing. I believe that rationing is necessary. I am alarmed at the complaints against the O. P. A. which have come to my attention. I am alarmed at the general attitude of complaint in America. I am in favor of supporting a necessary national policy designed to meet the situation.

At the time the O. P. A. legislation was before the Senate I had a discussion with the present director of the O. P. A., former Senator Prentiss Brown. I undertook to discuss with him the practical impossibility of price fixing in a democracy. No one who has read history will deny that such an expenditure of money as we are now under the necessity of authorizing, such a limited civilian economy as is now necessary on account of the war, and such a surplus of cash in the pockets of the people which cannot be expended for goods because goods are not being produced, all predicate inflation, and therefore should alarm every thoughtful man and woman in the land.

But it is not sufficient, Mr. President, for us to be alarmed or concerned. We are the responsible body. We must translate our alarm and our concern into a positive policy, no matter what the difficulties may be. We must prevent inflation or pronounce ourselves incompetent to conduct the American Government. We must prevent inflation. By "we" I do not mean only the Congress or the President, but all of us together must prevent inflation, or else the magnificent structure which we have built up for our defense, and all the lofty sacrifices made by mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters, will be shattered and destroyed by an internal difficulty the character of which is such that no nation, since the world began, has ever been able to survive it. We cannot destroy our economy by inflation and have a country left.

Allow me to say another word. I did not mean to speak at such length. Mr. Hitler, in his Mein Kampf, spoke of the United States of America as "the American colossus." Do not think that the German corporal, the German leader, did not have a very respectful conception of the power of this country. It is the Colossus of the West; and he projected his course with the view of avoiding conflict with us. He hoped to keep us asleep until he had all the rest of the world under his heel. He also said that the American colossus, even with all its wealth, its might, and its people, would be no great factor in the war, even if we should get into the war. Why did he say that? He said:

> The American people are a democracy. They are susceptible to all sorts of influences. Every man over there wishes to have his way. We have many groups over there to deal with.

This is his thesis, and this is the explanation of the man so far as we are concerned: He has said that American democracy will never be able to fight a total war. Theoretically he is correct. His calculations may be justified on theory. If America is to behave in that way, we shall not prevail. But America is not going to behave in that way. We will meet total effort by our enemies with total effort over here. We will either do so voluntarily, or we will do so under force of law. If we do so under force of law we shall be acting in response to necessity. Public safety is the highest law. I hope I can avoid—I hope we all can avoid—acting under

the force of necessity. I hope we all can avoid undertaking to bring about in America total effort by force.

Hear me, Senators. The only way to achieve that total effort is by a voluntary spirit in the hearts of the men and women of America. We must have leadership. We must uphold our leadership.

I like the way Senators on the other side of the aisle have conducted themselves throughout this struggle. They have not acted as partisans. I like to think that in the Committee on Commerce I have never seen a partisan vote, and never expect to see one. We cannot have any politics now. We cannot even have Democratic politics. We cannot have any personal politics. We cannot even have anti-New Deal or New Deal politics. We cannot have anti-Roosevelt or pro-Roosevelt politics. We must clench the mailed fist of 135,000,000 Americans and strike the enemy while we can. I think the time to do so is close at hand.

We are about to send abroad great numbers of our men. I have heard men say there was a shipping bottleneck. I announced last night in a little speech in Baltimore that there is not a shipping bottleneck. Everything we make can go across the sea, and every man we can equip can go across the sea, and they are going. When they go, they go in the form of their own dearly loved selves; they go with the heartaches and tears of millions of mothers; they go with the flag of their country over their heads, and, God helping me, they are going with the united strength of a national policy that does not yield and does not fear, but, on the other hand, will throw everything it has with them into this vortex of war.

So, Mr. President, I hope Senators will not think of this strike situation as a mere matter of dealing with Mr. Lewis; that they will not think of it as a matter which we can dismiss by an announcement; that they will not think of the strike situation as a mere clash as to who shall have wages and who shall not have them or whether wages are as high as they should be or otherwise; that they will not think of this proposition before the Senate today as a question of justice or injustice to the farmers, but will think of this crisis as one in which farmer and worker and Senator and mother and father and merchant and housekeeper are vitally concerned and in which they must stand as one; and that we will think of ourselves as being now under obligation to uphold the national policy, whether we like it or not.

I am receiving letters every day from people complaining about this thing and the other thing. I am trying to write them back reasonably, that the time for complaining has gone, that they should come here and state their case, and the Government will treat them as well as it can. But the Government cannot yield at any point when to yield is to open the door and invite the hordes to come in, one for wages and the other for prices, and thus destroy the money of the country, destroy its economy, and destroy our capacity to carry on the war.

So, Mr. President, I am hoping we will come through this crisis, and my faith in my country is such that I believe we will come through it. I am hoping at this moment that the Senate will not take a step now, in the very heart of the crisis, which will enable the chief conspirator of them all, Mr. Lewis, to say, "The Senate broke the line yesterday; let me go through." We are not going to do that; and, whether we like it or not, hear me as I take my seat, we have reached the hour when the national policy is established; we cannot break it down; we must sustain it. That goes for the Senate, it goes for me, it goes for the President, it goes for all the American people. I am for holding the line, whatever the cost; and I think of that line as the line that is right behind the boys who are going across the sea today; I am thinking of that line as the line that is right behind the boys who are fighting in Burma, in the South Seas, and who are soon to fight on the continent of Europe and the continent of Asia. We do not let them break the line; we do not ask them where they shall go, and we do not talk to them about justice or injustice or parity or nonparity, and we do not talk to them about wages, either.

Theirs not to reason why,
Theirs but to do and die.

We can ask no less of ourselves.

Let it be said down in North Carolina, if you please, that I antagonized the workers. Very well; say it as much as you please; I will hold my stand. Let it be said down in North Carolina, if you please, that when the motion offered by the Senator from Alabama came before the Senate, BAILEY went back on the farmer; say it as much as you please; you will have to say, when it is all over, that BAILEY did his part to maintain the national policy and prevent inflation, and that he thought of himself as a man honored in a very great position who was not permitted to forget that the line which he held was a part of the line which is also held by 8,000,000 of our men.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope we may proceed with the other amendments to this section. The Senator from Alabama, I understand, has filed a motion to suspend the rule; that question will be debatable, and I think we can expedite the consideration of this bill if we proceed now with the committee amendments, and let the motion of the Senator from Alabama come up after their conclusion, as is usually the case.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The suggestion of the Senator in charge of the bill is entirely agreeable to me. I merely want to give notice so that every Senator will understand that at the appropriate time, probably tomorrow, I shall make a motion to suspend the rule, and ask for a yea-and-nay vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 68, at the beginning of line 15 it is proposed to strike out "*Provided*, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation carried in this bill shall be used for incentive payments: *Provided further*, That no payment or payments hereunder to any one person or corporation shall be in excess of the total sum of $500: *Provided further*, That this limitation shall not be construed to deprive any share renter or tenant of payments not exceeding that amount to which he would otherwise be entitled: *Provided further*, That the portion of said amount available for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs shall not exceed 50 percent of the amount expended under the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1943, for salaries and administrative expenses for carrying out programs under such acts for the period from July 1, 1941, to December 31, 1942, inclusive," and insert "*Provided further*, That not to exceed $32,500,000 of said amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, at the request of several Senators I am going to move to amend the amendment by striking out "$32,500,000" and inserting "$25,000,000."

I can state the case in a very few sentences. The Senate will recall that we are back now to the section of the bill which deals with conservation and use of agricultural land resources, and the particular pending appropriation deals with salaries and administrative costs of this particular activity.

Mr. President, the committee itself, according to the able Senator who is handling the bill on the floor of the Senate found that the relative percentage for salaries and other administrative expenses in the administration of this $400,000,000 appropriation was absolutely outrageous. As the result the committee has reduced what was an administrative expenditure last year of $54,000,000 to $32,500,000.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the relative administrative expense is still outrageous. If it was outrageous to spend $54,000,000 in salaries and administrative expenses in handling $450,000,000, it is still a diversion of money from the direct conservation purpose, and it is still outrageous, to spend thirty-two and a half million dollars for the administration of a net three hundred and sixty seven and a half million dollars.

I know very little personally about this matter; I merely know that that relative percentage for pay rolls and administrative expense does not make sense. I just know that if there is to be any sort of approach to personnel economy in this Government, we cannot spend thirty-two and a half million dollars to administer $367,000,000.

When the able Senator from Georgia presented the matter, he said that in his own mind he had thought that $25,000,000 at this point was enough, but that he did not feel like putting his own opinion against the united opinion of those who appeared before his committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator

from Michigan yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said that I was of the opinion that these administrative expenses could and should be reduced to $25,000,000 next year, but I did not intend to leave the impression that I thought they could be reduced that much this year without disorganizing the program.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for making definite and clear what I was attempting to refer to. If the Senator comes as close to my $25,000,000 figure as that, it is sufficient support for me to offer the amendment. I remind the Senate that the committee amendment is going to conference anyway. The obvious purpose of the committee itself has been to advertise the fact that the Senate is dissatisfied with the administrative expenses of these committees which administer soil conservation and kindred things. I suggest that we emphasize it to the extent of making a final reduction to $25,000,000 when the bill goes to conference. The item will still be in conference, but the position and purpose of the Senate will be just that much more emphatic.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator is in error in his last statement, as I construe the bill. If it were true that the matter would be in conference, I should not object to the Senator's amendment. I am just as anxious to bring down administrative expenses as is any other Member of the Senate. I am perhaps more anxious than the Senator from Michigan, because while the total appropriation would not be reduced one dime, every dollar we save here is saved to go in payment to the farmers, and I represent an agricultural State, and I am just as anxious as any Member of the Senate can possibly be to reduce these administrative expenses to the fairest level that can be utilized to carry on the program. I want Senators to bear in mind, in voting on the amendment, that we would not be reducing the total appropriation 1 cent. It would be a limitation within the appropriation on the administrative expenses.

The House provision reduces the administrative expenses under this expenditure to $27,000,000. If the Senator will read the language commencing on line 22, he will see that the House has reduced the item to one-half the amount that was expended this year, which would make it $27,000,000. We in the committee undertook to go into the matter fully, but we did not have possession of all the facts. It was impossible to go thoroughly into the matter this year, in connection with the pending bill, if we hoped to have it enacted into law by July 1. We held hearings almost day and night in our efforts to get the bill to the floor, and Senators can observe, from the size of the report of the hearings, that we went as diligently as possible into all the items. If in conference the House conferees have any information which they can present to the conferees on the part of the Senate to the effect that the program can be carried on with $27,000,000, without being severely hampered or disorganized, I shall be glad to withdraw from the limitation of thirty-two and a half million, which was suggested by the Senate committee, but in my judgment it would be a very dangerous thing to say that we were going to cut the administrative expenses in half, and leave the conferees no opportunity whatever to consider the matter.

Even with the higher figure of thirty-two and a half million, we have brought about a most drastic reduction in the administrative expenses. If they can be carried lower than that, no one is more anxious than is the Senator from Georgia to attain that end, because every dime we save in administrative expenses goes to a farmer somewhere.

I ask Senators not to tie our hands, so that we might absolutely wreck the entire program, and even make it impossible to say that the measurements are to be made on the farms to see whether conformity is had with the provisions of the program announced by the Secretary.

I hope that when the Senator from Michigan reads the language here, which makes the limitation of the administrative expenses $27,000,000 on the part of the House, he will not insist on the amount he suggested. I assure him of my good faith in wishing to economize to the fullest extent in the administration of the program, but no man can stand on the floor of the Senate and say what the effect of cutting this appropriation in half at this time would be. I do not know what charges have already been incurred against this appropriation. Such a limitation might bring it down to a point where it would all be consumed by the county committees, which are most numerous, as the Senator from Virginia has pointed out, and no funds would be left to carry on the program for the last 6 months of the year.

I think that in all fairness, as we have made this great stride forward in reducing the administrative expenses, we should not be tied and shackled, and perhaps bring about a condition that would disorganize the whole program.

If the Senator will read the entire section, he will see that under the House language the administrative expenses cannot exceed $27,500,000. Under the Senate committee language they cannot exceed $32,500,000. If it can be developed by those espousing the House position that $27,500,000 is a sufficient amount to discharge the obligations already incurred, and to see that the program is completed, even by economizing to the marrow, below the bone, to the marrow, I assure the Senator that the conferees on the part of the Senate will cut just as low as it is possible to go.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for the attitude of the able Senator from Georgia in this and all other related matters in connection with the bill. He has a very unusual efficiency in handling the entire matter. But in this instance, at least, I wish to register myself as being unwilling not to go at least as far as the House of Representatives itself has gone in this particular item. So I ask the Senator whether I can accomplish the result to which he refers by changing my amendment so that I substitute the figure "$27,500,000" for the figure "$32,500,000." Would that raise the issue in the form in which I now want it raised?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it would, to be candid with the Senator, but I desire to say that I am just as strongly opposed to that amendment as I am to the other suggestion of the Senator, because I think the proposal is to cut the administrative expenses in half without knowing what the effect would be. I do not think that is a proper way to legislate. The Senator from Georgia has offered amendment after amendment, year after year, to the appropriation bills as they have come along in an effort to reduce the administrative expenses. The Senator from Virginia will recall that when the original Triple A Act was pending I was disturbed about the fact that there were no restrictions on administrative expenses, and I offered an amendment on the floor at that time to assure they would not be too large. Due to the fate of that amendment in the House, and the various constructions by the Department, the desired result was not achieved; but as one who is interested in this program, I do not think we could say that the administrative expenses should be cut by one-half at this time, when we do not even know the amount that has already been obligated or expended.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator accept an amendment at $30,000,000? [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the hour grows late, and I think I shall heed the injunction to "agree with thine adversary quickly, whilest thou art in the way with him." [Laughter.]

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest that the amendment be changed to read "$30,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 69, line 12, to strike out "or any State or county information employees: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1944 programs of soil building practices and soil and water conservation practices under the act of February 29, 1936, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the total expenditures of which, including administration, shall not exceed $300,000,000," and in lieu thereof to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1944 programs or plans now or hereafter authorized under

section 7 or 8, or both, of said act of February 29, 1936, or under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, the total expenditures of which including administration, shall not exceed $300,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 71, after line 23, to insert:

To enable the Secretary to make parity payments to producers of wheat, cotton, corn (in the commercial corn-producing area), rice, and tobacco, pursuant to the provisions of section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, he is authorized and directed to make such commitments or incur such obligations as may be necessary in order to provide for full parity payments for each of the crop years 1943 and 1944: *Provided*, That such payments with respect to any such commodity for the crop year 1943 shall be made upon the normal yield of the farm acreage allotment established for such commodity under the 1943 agricultural conservation program and for the crop year 1944 on the normal yield of the farm acreage allotment established for the commodity under the 1944 agricultural conservation program: *Provided further*, That for each of the crop years 1943 and 1944 the Secretary may provide by regulations for reduction in payments for failure to comply with the acreage allotments, limits, or goals under the agricultural conservation program for 1943 or 1944, as the case may be.

For payments on the 1943 crop, if the sum of the prevailing basic loan rate (if marketing quotas for the commodity have been disapproved, such basic loan rate shall be the basic loan rate which would have prevailed except for such disapproval) or the average farm price, whichever is the higher, for the crop year 1943 and the applicable rate of the payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the 1943 agricultural conservation program, and the parity payments herein provided, exceed an amount sufficient to increase the farmers' returns to parity prices, parity payments shall be so adjusted as to provide a return to producers which is equal to but not greater than parity price; and for payments on the 1944 crop, if the sum of the prevailing basic loan rate (if marketing quotas for the commodity have been disapproved, such basic loan rate shall be the basic loan rate which would have prevailed except for such disapproval) or the average farm price, whichever is the higher, for the crop year 1944 and the applicable rate of the payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the 1944 agricultural conservation program, and the parity payments herein provided exceed an amount sufficient to increase the farmers' returns to parity prices, parity payments shall be so adjusted as to provide a return to producers which is equal to but not greater than parity price.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 74, line 9, to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$7,818,748."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, that committee amendment deals with the Federal Crop Insurance Act. The amendment proposes to raise the amount from $3,500,000 to $7,818,748. I wish to call the Senate's attention to the record made under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, which appears in the House hearings on this bill. Wheat insurance has been in force for 4 years. It has operated during those 4 years at a loss to the United States Government of $17,417,000. Insurance on cotton has been in force for 1 year and during those 12 months the Government has sustained a loss of $415,000. The total cost to the Government of the crop-insurance plan to date is $47,000,000. It seems to me—and this is my personal philosophy—that any business venture on the part of the Government is wrong. The Government has no business to compete with private institutions which carry on the same character of business. But granting that it is proper for the Government to engage in the business of crop insurance, it seems to me that any insurance activity which cannot justify itself by paying its way certainly should not have the continued support of the Federal Treasury.

While I am not prepared to destroy this activity entirely—although I think it should be destroyed—I move to restore the item in the section to the House figure of $3,500,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course to achieve the end sought by the Senator from South Dakota the proper method would be to vote down the Senate committee amendment. A motion to restore would not be in order.

Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement about this item. The Senator from South Dakota states that this crop insurance is all in competition with private industry. I challenge the Senator to point to a single insurance company in the United States of America today which would insure the type of risk that is insured by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. The Senator refers to the cost of $47,000,000. That figure applies to the administrative expenses of the organization over the 4 years it has been in operation, as well as the $17,000,000 of losses which have been incurred. It has been the experience of private insurance companies in this country, whether they be the stock fire insurance companies or mutual fire insurance companies, that they have had approximately the same percentage of loss in the first 4 years of their operation that were incurred by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

The effect of the Senator's motion would be to repeal the act which provides for crop insurance. That is what the House had in mind when it reduced the appropriations to $3,500,000, and inserted the proviso that no further contracts could be accepted by the Corporation.

It is true that this Corporation has suffered some losses, but it has been dealing in a new field, and did not have the experience of past operation, such as old-line companies have had, on which to rely in arriving at its rates. In the first years of operations the Corporation was selling a one-year contract. A farmer is a smart individual, and he can generally tell about what he is going to produce on his farm in any given year. If there is general precipitation in the fall, if there is good snow during the winter, and if conditions are right, the farmer knows that he is going to harvest a good crop, and he will not take out any insurance. If the conditions are unfavorable when the time comes to plant the crop the farmer would take out insurance. A remarkable map was displayed before the committee showing how increased insurance policies were taken out in areas which had poor prospects for the year.

Last year the Corporation adopted the policy of selling only a 3-year policy, requiring a farmer to pool his risk over a 3-year period with producers in other sections. I do not believe that this plan has had a fair trial. Certainly Senators who talk about legislating on appropriation bills ought to be opposed to the Senator's motion, because here the House is undertaking to repeal a statute passed by Congress by the simple expedient of denying an appropriation sufficient for the conduct of that agency.

We do not think Federal crop insurance has had a fair trial. I could fill the RECORD with benefits which have flowed from this organization. It so happens that the plan is in operation in the area in Missouri and Oklahoma which is being swept by a flood. I have some statistics which show the number of farmers who are insured.

Do not think that if this agency is abolished the Government is going to be relieved from expenditures of this nature, because if there were no crop insurance, Members from the flooded areas of the country would stand on the floor and request appropriations for $20,000,000, $30,000,000, or $40,000,000 for relief of farmers in their flooded areas, or if insects had destroyed crops Senators would request money for relief of the farmers in the areas affected.

I predict that in the long run the crop-insurance program will prove a real economy to the Federal Treasury because of the fact that it insures the crop up to 75 percent of its value. It should be and it will be self-supporting by pooling the premiums all through an area. That will avoid the necessity for making large appropriations in Congress every time a flood occurs, or a crop failure occurs, or disaster of any kind comes to the farmer. This organization is certainly entitled to a fair trial, and the amount carried in the Senate committee amendment is only the amount asked by the Bureau of the Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 74, line 9.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia can do so, I should like to have him point out a single insurance company which would not take the risk the insurance covers.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to do so. We were advised in testimony given before the committee by a gentleman representing some insurance agency or other insurance organization which was supposed to write insurance on all the risks in the field that at the present time there is no company which will assume all the risks covered by the Government's contract.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In my State and, I assume, in most of the other States there are companies writing insurance to cover losses caused by hail, losses caused by wind, and losses caused by flood. What losses in addition to those are covered by the insurance the Government is writing?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Government's contract covers losses caused by drought, something which affects the Senator's State, and has affected it for years. We appropriated several million dollars

which went for the relief of farmers in the Senator's State in 1 year—an appropriation which would not have been necessary except for the occurrence of droughts. One of the largest appropriations made for such purposes in years was made in order to cover losses occurring in the Senator's State by reason of drought.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In other words, the insurance is simply a guaranty by the Federal Government that the farmer will raise a crop; is that the situation?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President; not at all. The policy provides that the farmer must work the land in a workmanlike manner, and that the work must be approved by the county committee of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, which must look at the farmer's land and must ascertain that he did do the work in a workmanlike manner. Even if the farmer suffers because of the ravages of drought or grasshoppers or other causes in addition to those mentioned by the Senator in his statement, he will receive a benefit of 75 percent of his loss, not 100 percent, based on the historic 5-year production cycle on the farms.

Mr. President, the crop-insurance program is new. The premiums are now being adjusted. Some have been increased and some have been decreased. Considering the full amount of insurance outstanding, the losses over the entire period do not compare with the appropriations we have made in 1 year for an area of the country which has been the victim of flood or of some other disaster.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his explanation; but I am afraid my philosophy of government is in direct contradiction to his.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 74, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment which was passed over will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 74, line 13, after the word "newspapers", it is proposed to strike out the colon and the words "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for or in connection with the insurance of wheat and cotton crops planted subsequent to July 31, 1943, or for any other purpose except in connection with the liquidation of insurance contracts on the wheat and cotton crops planted prior to July 31, 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee which had been passed over was, under the heading "Soil Conservation Service", on page 77, after line 19, to insert:

WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization, and for other purposes," approved August 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590r–590x, 590z–5), including the purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles, $1,278,649, of which not to exceed $11,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I undertook to explain the amendment yesterday. It does not represent an increased appropriation. It represents a transfer of funds from the appropriation suggested for the Farm Security Administration, so as to make the money available for expenditure by either the Soil Conservation Service or such other agency as might be best qualified to carry on the water-conservation program in the Far West. The amendment would restore the language of the appropriation for the present year; and under the amendment, the policy would be the same as heretofore though some funds have been transferred from the Farm Security appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 77, after line 19.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee which had been passed over was, under the heading "Rural Electrification Administration," on page 84, after line 24, to strike out:

Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5, and for the purchase of property and costs and expenses incurred in connection therewith in accordance with section 7 of the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), $20,000,000.

Total, Rural Electrification Administration, $22,258,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to offer as a substitute the legislative amendment, which I was authorized to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 85, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

LOANS: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5, and for the purchase of property and costs and expenses incurred in connection therewith in accordance with section 7 of the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), $30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said act and shall be considered as made available thereunder; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized under said section 3 (a) and without regard to the limitation in respect of time contained in section 3 (e) of said act; and the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Virginia withhold his request for a quorum?

Mr. BYRD. Very well.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I appeal to the Senator that at this time we adjourn until tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no objection to the course proposed by the Senator; but the amendment now pending is the rural electrification amendment. I do not know of any Senator who objects to it. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] asked yesterday that the amendment be passed over. But today he has interposed no objection. I should like to make as much progress as possible.

Mr. McNARY. Of course. I thought the amendment might be subject to long debate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of any Senator who opposes it. There may be some who oppose it; I have not talked to all Members of the Senate.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. I yield the floor.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that I desire to have a discussion of the rural electrification amendment. I do not understand it. As I recall, it calls for an appropriation of $30,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; the smallest appropriation which has been made for the purpose for several years.

Mr. BAILEY. And the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill—a policy which, I believe, should be condemned without fail.

I hope the Senator will agree to the suggestion that the amendment be passed over until tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course I am very amenable to any suggestions by the able acting majority leader or the able minority leader, but I see no reason why we should not proceed with this matter. The Senator from North Carolina may make the point of order against it; of course, the amendment is subject to the point of order.

Mr. BAILEY. I make the point of order right now, with the Senator's permission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well; that is perfectly all right. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then, Mr. President, I move to suspend the rule. Let me say that the only purpose of the amendment is to determine whether these appropriations shall be made directly from the Treasury or whether the work shall be financed through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be rejected, I shall move to increase the appropriation by Finance Corporation be rejected, I shall move to increase the appropriation by $30,000,000, which is the amount of the Budget estimates for loans.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, what is to be done with the money?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is as familiar with the Rural Electrification Act as I am.

Mr. BAILEY. I am sorry for the Senator if that is the case.

Mr. RUSSELL. Perhaps I misunderstood.

Mr. BAILEY. I think that the Senator, as does Mr. Churchill, understates the case. However, we shall let that go.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator knows that funds have been provided in varying amounts over a period of years for the purpose of making loans to farmers' cooperatives for the establishment of electrification facilities for the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. BAILEY. Is any part of the fund now used for the purpose of purchasing existing electrical lines, or are all the funds used simply to extend the lines?

Mr. RUSSELL. No power is granted in the amendment that is in excess of that had under existing law.

Mr. BAILEY. But I think that probably the existing law allows the purchase of existing lines.

Mr. RUSSELL. The existing law does not allow the Rural Electrification Administration, as I understand, to purchase anything. The Rural Electrification Administration makes loans to the local cooperatives, and I understand that the local cooperatives have the power to purchase lines.

Mr. BAILEY. I like the rural electrification program. I think people living in the rural areas should have electricity. I am not objecting to that. However, I desire to know the uses to which the $30,000,000 is to be put.

Mr. RUSSELL. All of it is to be utilized, insofar as possible, for loans to local rural electrification cooperatives.

Mr. BAILEY. Is it to be used for the purpose of buying something already in existence, or for the purpose of adding to the facilities? That is the point on which I seek information.

Mr. RUSSELL. The fund can be used for either purpose, at the option of the local cooperatives, but must be approved in any event by the R. E. A.

Mr. BAILEY. Was there any testimony before the committee or is there anything in the report to indicate that the money is to be used solely for the purpose of taking over existing lines?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; it is not to be used solely for the purpose of taking over existing lines. There may be some existing lines which may be purchased. In the testimony before the committee it was developed that in some instances a rural line ran into a certain area, perhaps into a very thickly populated area right in the heart of the rural electrification cooperative, the farmers' cooperative. In that event, the farmers' cooperative purchased that line, if the owner would sell it. In some cases the owners have sold the lines. I know that in my own State, in the area of one of the strongest cooperatives we have, the Georgia Power Co. had some rural lines, and sold them to the cooperative in order that it might complete the system for the entire area in which the cooperative was operating. But there is no power of eminent domain. The cooperatives cannot take the lines away from the private owners.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand that. I had information—I am not certain that it is accurate—that the whole purpose was to enable them to buy existing lines. I do not see much sense in that. If the people have lines available to them, they have them, and there is no use in buying them. The main object is to have service for the farmers. If the plan is to render service to the farmers by making available to them additional lines in new neighborhoods, I am for it; but if the proposal is one for salvaging, I am not so much interested in that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think the proposition is so much one of salvaging as it is to enable the cooperatives to live. There have been areas in this country where the farmers have met and organized their cooperatives, and when the private power utilities heard that the cooperatives were organized, they would rush in and skim off the cream of the project before the cooperatives could begin to function. That has happened in a number of cases. It was discussed before the committee. In some such cases, if the cooperatives could not function and carry electricity to farmers whom the private power company did not find it profitable to serve, the cooperatives have purchased the lines. It was all a part of the plan to have an area in which a cooperative could function, so as to make it eligible for a loan from the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the Senator has not cleared up the point in my mind, as to what it is proposed to do with the money. He talks about what the cooperatives may do, and what has been done in the past; but I do not believe the Senator is prepared to tell us whether the suggested appropriation is for the purpose of purchasing existing lines or building new lines. I should like to have some idea as to what is to be done with the $30,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, sometimes the farmers' cooperatives are cut off by an intervening line from areas in which they could operate, and it has been necessary to buy lines to reach those areas. They could expend these funds for the purchase of such lines. However, I have no earthly way of knowing what is in the minds of the hundreds of cooperatives in this country, and of all the local boards of directors who might submit applications for loans.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the answer to the Senator's question is that the purposes of the appropriation is to extend rural lines for the benefit of the farmers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly.

Mr. WHEELER. That is the only purpose. The appropriation is not intended for the purchase of electric lines, except in particular instances when they happen to be more profitable to the cooperatives than to the private company. So far as I know—and I have followed the question rather closely—there has been no effort on the part of cooperatives to take over power companies.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I understand, under the basic act they cannot buy any existing facilities unless such facilities are essential to the completion and purposes of a rural electrification project.

Mr. WHEELER. There have been instances in which the power companies have been glad to sell the lines because of the fact that they did not want to extend their lines farther into a particular territory. However, I do not believe that the Rural Electrification Administration has gone into any territory with the idea of buying or taking over the facilities of a power company.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I was not thinking about buying facilities of power companies. I was thinking about buying existing lines. Are we trying to serve the farmers, or to buy some lines which are already serving the farmers? The Senator from Georgia says that if we do not let the appropriation go through in accordance with the amendment, it will have to be made through an independent measure.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some years ago Congress provided that instead of direct appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration, the funds should be borrowed by the Rural Electrification Administration from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and loaned to the farmers.

This amendment is legislation. It would not change the power of the R. E. A. by one jot or tittle, but would simply provide a method of financing. The House committee reported the bill in that shape to the House. Under the peculiar conditions obtaining when the bill was considered, making all these provisions subject to a point of order, the item was stricken out on the floor of the House on a point of order.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Was there not some testimony before the committee to the effect that there was a dearth of copper and other materials?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. That accounts for the reduction of the appropriation. It has been $140,000,000. Now it has been reduced to $30,000,000, because that is the amount of material which was estimated to be available by the War Production Board to carry on these projects.

Mr. SMITH. I was prompted to ask the question by the suggestion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. Being unable to obtain the material, the cooperatives would like to buy other lines.

Mr. BAILEY. The lines are already in existence.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not complete my statement in answer to the Senator from North Carolina.

When the item granting authority to borrow from the R. F. C. was stricken out on the floor of the House on a point of order, an amendment was offered from the floor appropriating $20,000,000 directly from the Treasury to carry out the same purposes for which sums were borrowed from the R. F. C. That amendment was adopted overwhelmingly on the

floor of the House and came to us in the bill. The only proposal is to change the method of financing from a direct appropriation to the method which had been employed for a number of years—that of borrowing from the R. F. C. and allowing the amount of the Budget estimate of $30,000,000 for such borrowing.

Mr. BAILEY. What is the difference?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think there is a great deal of difference. For my part I do not care. If the Senate does not wish to have the money borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, it is just as satisfactory to me to get it from the Treasury. I think, however, as this is a reimbursable item it is preferable to handle it through the R. F. C.

Mr. BAILEY. One day we get it from the Treasury and the next day we borrow it from the R. F. C. If the R. F. C. does not get it from the Treasury, I do not know where it gets it.

Let me ask the Senator one further question, and then I shall not trouble him further.

What is the idea of the Appropriations Committee, against the fixed policy of the Congress, in introducing legislation on appropriation bills? I am not allowed to do it. I am not on the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has as much right to do it as I have.

Mr. BAILEY. If I attempt to do it, the committee says that it is out of order. I am voted down, and I thank the committee for doing so. I say that it is right. But the chairman of the subcommittee brings in a number of items of legislation on an appropriation bill. I think the Senate ought to take a position on the question. If the committee can do it, why can we not do it?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator can.

Mr. BAILEY. No; I cannot. Theoretically I can do it; but I have the whole committee against me, and I yield. I once tried it. I have never tried it since. I think the rule is a very good one. If it is a good rule, we ought to stick to it. I do not mean to read a lecture to my good friends, but I think the Appropriations Committee, above all, ought to adhere to that rule. We cannot afford to confuse legislation with appropriations. When we do so, we put the whole Congress in a bad position, and also make it very difficult for the President to veto legislation.

Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment go over for further consideration and debate. I should like to have a clear statement of policy, and of what it is intended to do. Why is it proposed to get the money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and what is the difference between that method and getting it from the Treasury? Why are we making a shift?

Mr. RUSSELL. We are not making a shift.

Mr. BAILEY. We are violating a rule of the committee and of the Senate. The Appropriations Committee is setting an illustrious example.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are not violating any rule of the Senate or of any committee. In offering amendments from the floor I am offering them under instructions from the committee, pursuant to a policy which has been adhered to for years. We are putting nothing in the bill which has not been in the act in years past. We are merely undertaking to finance these lines by the method which has been employed for the past 4 or 5 years.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator did not say that it was not legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say that. I said that it was.

Mr. BAILEY. The point of order has been sustained.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said that it was legislation.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the Senator think that is a good policy?

Mr. RUSSELL. The rule against legislation on an appropriation bill relates to the power of any individual Senator to make the point of order against the item on the floor. The Senator has a perfect right to make the point of order against this amendment if he chooses to do so. He still has all his rights under the rule.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not believe the Senator sees my point at all. The committee can do that sort of thing; but if an individual Senator should try it, he would be unsuccessful. We all know that to be so.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the committee, in offering an amendment from the floor, does anything violative of the rules in this matter, when the Senate is told that it is legislation, every Senator is equally culpable. Under the rule any Senator has the right to make the point of order against this item.

Mr. BAILEY. It is not a violation of the rule in the sense that it undertakes to set aside the point of order; but it is a violation of the policy of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I insist that it is not a violation of any policy of the Senate. From time to time legislative provisions are offered by Members of the Senate who are not members of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BAILEY. Oh, yes; I realize they are, and even ignorantly; but I never heard of one prevailing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask the Senator to repeat what he said a few minutes ago concerning the uses to which this money is to be put. Did I understand him to say the R. E. A. already had priorities for $30,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not know that they had it down to a question of dollars and cents. The testimony before the committee was that with the 32 projects, the purchase for which of critical materials, such as copper, and so forth, had already been approved by the War Production Board, and the other projects which would be approved under the modification of the ruling of the War Production Board which affects priorities for R. E. A. cooperatives, they could spend $30,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That would then preclude the question of buying other companies?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know, Mr. President. I do not know that they are going to buy any companies. I had not heard of such a thing.

Mr. McKELLAR. I refer to the buying of lines if they have priorities.

Mr. RUSSELL. They have the right to buy lines. They should have that right.

We may as well be frank about this. When the program of rural electrification was started some of the private power companies did everything in their power to create a situation which was destined to cause its failure. There were one or two States in the Union—there was one which I have particularly in mind in which the private power interests ran lines into thickly populated areas and cut off the sparsely populated areas and therefore doomed the people in such areas to live in total darkness so far as rural electric power was concerned. I think if the R. E. A. had been able to buy that line they could have furnished power and light to the people living in the hills and along the creeks. The R. E. A. should have the right to borrow the money and buy that line. Otherwise the rural electrification program can be destroyed. In some States the power interests have cooperated. In my State of Georgia the power company cooperated with some of the companies in purchasing lines, but in other States a pretty bad record has been made in an attempt to take off the cream of the R. E. A. projects and thereby doom the cooperatives to failure from the start.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator from Georgia. The question I wanted answered was, Has the R. E. A. been given priorities which would substantially use up the amount asked? The Senator has answered the question in the affirmative and that ends it so far as I am concerned.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I merely want to make one point. My understanding is that the cooperatives have no right to acquire a private company unless the company is willing to sell.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think it has been discussed here almost on the basis that the cooperatives have power to take over private lines. They do have. The point is that some of the companies are very glad to sell. Some of them are being faced with dissolution orders and are often in the position of having a line which is in the territory of an operating Rural Electrification Administration cooperative, and they are perfectly willing to sell to the cooperative because they must sell to someone. It is logical in most instances that sales should be made to the cooperative which is serving the particular rural area. As I understand, a number of such purchases have been made so that it cannot be said that this is any disadvantage to the private power companies in those instances because they have found it to be the most logical and most economic organization to sell

to, and probably they get the best price they could obtain from them.

Mr. RUSSELL. In some instances it has been of genuine benefit to the private power interests. Under the orders of the Securities and Exchange Commission divorcing holding companies in some cases, some of these companies have had isolated properties which they were ordered to sell, and if they fitted into the rural electrification program I see no reason why the rural cooperative should not be permitted to come in and buy it. They do not have the right of eminent domain. Unless they can agree on terms and conditions of private sale, there cannot be any sale of a foot of line.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to state that I shall offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and shall perhaps wish to be heard on the amendment offered by me. It seems that we shall not be able to finish this subject this afternoon.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BONE. The picture of rural electrification is replete with instances. They come tumbling one on the heels of the other. Where a rural cooperative was prepared to serve territory and upon announcing its purpose to serve a territory which had never previously been served, and which the private company had refused to serve, the private company built a spite line in to take off a certain amount of what is designated as the cream of the business, therefore making it difficult if not impossible for the rural cooperative to come into being and hope to pay its way. I have seen that occur time after time. That sort of thing has been done in my State.

The lines which have been acquired, as has been pointed out in a communication by the Administrator of the R. E. A., are frequently and generally incidental and contributory to the primary purpose of the rural electrification movement then in that community. I happen to know a great deal about those things which I have seen, and I have watched them closely, and I know exactly why objection is raised to this program. I am happy some of my Republican brethren raised it because when they make a point of order after so-called legislative additions have been made to the bill with the consent of the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], it presents a peculiar picture.

Mr. BAILEY. Was the Senator referring to me?

Mr. BONE. The Senator desires to obtain information.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator said he could tell exactly why objection was raised. If he referred to me, I am going to challenge him to show anything other than what I stated. I raised the objection in order to get the information.

Mr. BONE. If the Senator from North Carolina wishes to accept the appellation of a Republican Member, I am quite content to have him do so. I am talking about what has happened.

Mr. BAILEY. I was the Senator who raised the objection.

Mr. BONE. If the Senator's ears are acute enough he heard me refer to our Republican brethren raising the objection.

Mr. BAILEY. My ears are not so long as some others, but not as acute as those of some others.

Mr. BONE. I know that that is a matter of pride with the Senator, and I shall not take issue with him. However, I wish to point out that the so-called legislative additions to this bill have been made with the consent of the able Senator from Oregon and it will present a peculiar picture if we try to crucify the R. E. A. on a point of order, and if it is made someone will discuss it, probably, but it does not look any too good for Senators to make this kind of a point of order when every Member of this body knows how some private combinations in this country feel toward rural electrification, which has been a most valuable service to the farmers. I know of areas which have never been served, and perhaps for years would not have been served, had this form of institution not come into existence. I do not want to take the time of the Senators in debating the merits of a program of this character, but I do want to protest against an attack being made upon the R. E. A.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand it is agreeable now to the Senator from Georgia that consideration of the appropriation be suspended at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I think we may as well suspend now.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further reports of committees?

THE ARMY

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Senate Committee on Military Affairs certain nominations in the Army, and ask that they be confirmed immediately. These are nominations of field officers who served in the north African campaign.

Mr. McNARY. These nominations were ordered reported to the Senate yesterday, I understand.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, it is in order to take them up today.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the Senator very much. I ask that the nominations be confirmed immediately, and that the President be notified forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified forthwith.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gerald McLaughlin to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, there appear on the Executive Calendar the nomination of Eli H. Brown 3d to be United States attorney for the western district of Kentucky, the nomination of John M. Moore to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky, and the nomination of Loomis E. Cranor to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky. These are all reappointments, and the officials are efficient and fine public servants. I ask that their nominations be confirmed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified immediately.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be forthwith notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be immediately notified.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE GUYER, OF KANSAS

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives which will be read.

The resolutions (H. Res. 251) were read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

June 7, 1943.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ULYSSES S. GUYER, a Representative from the State of Kansas.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the

Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the State of Kansas, has lost one of the ablest members of the Kansas delegation in the House of Representatives, I had known ULYSSES S. GUYER for twoscore years, from the time he was a struggling young lawyer in Kansas City, Kans. I had known him as judge of the city court, and as mayor of Kansas City, Kans.; as a civic and political leader; as a public-spirited citizen, and as an equally public-spirited official. And to know SAM GUYER was to like him and respect him. He was one of the ablest members of Congress Kansas has ever had.

Judge GUYER was a believer in our form of government and our way of life. In all the years I knew him, I never knew or heard of him doing a little thing, a mean thing, or a dishonest deed. I sincerely believe he was incapable of littleness, dishonesty, or intolerance, despite the fact that he was uncompromising with himself in his living loyalty to the beliefs he held.

I feel the world is better for his having lived and labored in it. His friends sorrow in his passing, rejoice in having known and enjoyed his comradeship while he was with us.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an editorial from the June 1943 issue of Progress magazine, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD. This editorial is from the pen of Dr. Clinton N. Howard, executive secretary of the International Reform Federation. Representative GUYER was for many years a trustee of this organization. Knowing him as I have, from the time he was a struggling young lawyer in Kansas City, fresh from teaching school at St. John, I think the editorial is most appropriately entitled "An Irreparable Loss."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN IRREPARABLE LOSS

"We sorrow not as those who are without hope." Death has again invaded our official family and taken from our midst one of our long time and highly honored trustees. Congressman U. S. GUYER, of Kansas, a stanch friend of every good cause, and the father of the bill to make the city of Washington dry, is now a citizen of that "city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." The son of Rev. Joseph and Sarah Guyer, he took out his naturalization papers in his boyhood home, and after completing his college education became principal, then superintendent of the public schools of St. John, Kans., named for Governor St. John, the father of the prohibition amendment which remains to this day.

From that date his course was marked by distinguished service as city judge and mayor of Kansas City, Kans., where his administration was marked by a display of courage in the enforcement of the dry law in that wet city, separated by a street from Kansas City, Mo., more wicked and wet—known as "the Bottoms."

Despite political opposition and threats of personal injury, Judge GUYER, as he has since been known, cleaned up the county, the city, and padlocked the Kansas side of "the Bottoms." His record from this point is a confirmation of the divine promise: "When a man's ways please the Lord, He maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him."

A CONGRESSMAN WITHOUT GUILE

In 1902 Judge GUYER was promoted to Congress, representing the nine counties of the second district and was serving his tenth consecutive term, carrying in the late November election all the counties in his district by the largest majority in his nearly 20 years in the House, as a reward for faithful service.

The desperate wets once tried to dislodge him by nominating a voluble wet preacher on a repeal platform, but he was snowed under by an avalanche of votes. Mr. GUYER ran on his dry record in every campaign. He never hid his light under a bushel for political purposes, even threatened by wet reprisals from back home.

One of the first bills put into the hopper of the House on the reassembling of the Seventy-eighth Congress was his bill for prohibition in the District of Columbia which he leaves on the calendar of the House where he was the ranking Republican Member of the Judiciary Committee as his testimony against the liquor traffic in war or in peace.

A COURAGEOUS STATESMAN

He was a man of courage as was shown in many legislative battles. We have room for but one notable example. When the selective-service bill was before the House after its passage by the Senate, the editor prepared an amendment to the bill, providing for the prohibition of the sale, purchase, or possession of alcoholic liquors above one-half of 1 percent content in any military, naval, or aerial training camp, post, barracks, flying field, or canteen, on any premises owned, rented, or operated by the Federal Government, for the protection of the millions of American youth to be enlisted under the operation of the compulsory military law.

S. 860 CAME LATER

Months before Senator Sheppard introduced his S. 860 at the urgent request of several dry organizations both he and Congressman GUYER, at the request of the International Reform Federation sought to tie up the Selective Service Appropriation by making any portion of it available to camps in States where liquors of any alcoholic content were sold. Senator Sheppard was hesitant, as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, to run counter to the known policy of the administration, but promised to present it to the committee, which rejected it. Not wishing the amendment to meet the same fate in the House Military Affairs Committee when the selective-service bill reached that body, we suggested to Congressman GUYER that he propose such an amendment the moment the bill reached the floor. Without hesitation he agreed to introduce the amendment, which he did after strengthening its provisions and extending its application and supported by an eloquent appeal which met with overwhelming defeat, few of the Members of the House voting on either side.

Mr. GUYER believed that defeat was less to be dreaded than silence. It requires courage to defend the right in the face of certain defeat. "If thou faint in the day of adversity thy strength is small."

THE LAST ROLL CALL

Early in April he underwent a major operation at the Doctors' Hospital, and it soon became apparent that his chances for recovery faded with each passing day. "Sunset and Evening Star" was written on his countenance, when we visited the sick room at his Washington Inn home, and later the Navy hospital, from which he passed into immortality during the night of June 5. This morning, Sunday, June 6, we looked upon his strong face in sleep, and bade him a sad farewell.

Tonight a delegation from the House and Senate will accompany his body to the last resting place, St. John, Kansas, where he began his distinguished public career in the Sunflower State. Shortly after my call he dictated his last note concluding, "Thank you, dear friend, for the fruit and flowers and the beautiful prayer you made for me. God will reward you." It was his last signature, as characteristic as was the man who wrote it. We pray God to send us another GUYER from the Second Kansas District, and that the mantle of Judge GUYER may fall upon him as the mantle of Elijah fell upon Elisha. As King David said, "I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me."

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk resolutions, which I ask to have read and considered.

The resolutions (S. Res. 157) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ULYSSES S. GUYER, late a Representative from the State of Kansas.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appoints the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] and the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] as the committee on the part of the Senate provided for in the resolution.

RECESS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 9, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 8 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following to be assistant surgeons in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective date of oath:

Paul C. Campbell, Jr.
Kenneth Grant

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 8 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Gerald McLaughlin to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Eli H. Brown 3d to be United States attorney for the western district of Kentucky.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

John M. Moore to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky.

Loomis E. Cranor to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant general

Omar Nelson Bradley

To be major generals

Stafford LeRoy Irwin
John Kenneth Cannon
Lowell Warde Rooks

To be brigadier generals

Frank Upton Greer
Ray Aloysious Dunn
Maurice Rose
Reese Maughan Howell
Edwin Hubert Randle
Carlyle Howe Ridenour
Elbert Louis Ford
Robert Victor Maraist
Robert Ignatius Stack
Edward Peck Curtis

COAST GUARD

APPOINTMENTS

To be ensigns in the Coast Guard, to rank from June 9, 1943

Joseph Rogers Steele
Ralph Arnold Peterson
Robert Joseph LoForte
Robert Leslie Ruth
James Paul Van Etten
Norman McLeod Barlow
Alvin Bislinghoff Jordan
Robert Bernard Moore
George Pershing Jacobson
Edward Dabner Hudgens, Jr.
Edward Michael Francis Kirchner
Richard Anthony Pasciuti
Glenn Edgar Murphy
Edward DeKalb Veal, Jr.
Ernest Harold Goldman
Charles Webster Valaer
LeWayne Newcomb Felts
William Ellison Baird
Owen Wesley Siler
William Davis Palmer
William Edward Dennis
Leslie Byron George
William Edward Wallace
William Selby Allan, Jr.
Keith Charles Vrana
Mitchell Arthur Pereira
George MacAulay Lee Costner
John Durward Richardson
Harry Hart Carter
Garth Hines Read
George William Sohm
John Richmond Rogers
Thomas Pope Cheatham
David Richard Domke
Arthur Hancock
Charles Wayne
Warren Edward Rast
Kenneth Raymond Vaughn
Wallace Clarence Dahlgren
Samuel Raymond Woll
Robert Allen Adams
Robert Arthur Schulz
Edward Reuben Tharp
Philip Joseph McFarland
Frederick James Hancox
John Joseph Doherty
Wilfred Ulrich Johnson
James Norton Ashbrook
Paul Morosky
Austin Flint Hubbard
William Michael Benkert
Keith Low
Carl Leonard Parrott
Robert Franklin Lutz
Donald Oscar Ellis
Wilfrid Neville Derby, Jr.
Ward Raymond Emigh
Bernard Edwin Kolkhorst
Robert Ellsworth MacDonald
Donald McIntosh Reed
Daniel John Scalabrini
Rufus Sizer Drury
William Nathan Banks
Robert Jerome Carson
David Lloyd Davies, Jr.
Frank Benjamin Carter
Frank Marshall Fisher, Jr.
Alden Edward Lewis
Robert Tallant Norris
Sereno Sewall Webster, Jr.
Arnold Roy Wadum
William Joseph Zinck
Richard Eugene Hoover
Phillip Hermann
Curtis Johnson Kelly
John Roger George
Donald Arthur Caswell
Vernon Francis Hauschild
Alexander Cameron
Edward Franklin Poole 3d
Raymond Howard Evans
Charles Edward Johnson

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Peter M. Davey, Bridgeport.

GEORGIA

W. Riley Allen, Blackshear.

KANSAS

Hazel R. Craft, Lewis.
Ben J. Funk, Sedan.
J. Glenn Logan, Topeka.

MINNESOTA

Joseph R. Dunn, Brainerd.

NEW MEXICO

Jose Z. Sanchez, Santa Rosa.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Patrick B. Holtzclaw, Arcadia.

WASHINGTON

David E. Burklund, Mukilteo.
Emerson G. Lawrence, Port Angeles.
Leo B. Reed, Redmond.
Hanna A. Hanson, Riverton Heights.
John Maloney, Jr., Skykomish.
Otto F. Reinig, Snoqualmie.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal God, our heavenly Father, what wisdom, what power and majesty in all Thy works. Out of the mysterious silences of our breasts, amid the varying currents of this world, do we seek Thee. Thou who art the inspiration of all that is good and the glory of all that is beautiful, send forth Thy light, reminding us of our place and calling. Do Thou open the windows of our minds that we may receive the spirit of love and truth, thus leading humanity away from the wrong, deceptive altars.

Blessed Lord, as daily there are numberless Calvaries in our land, we pray Thee that all sadly stricken hearts may hear the message which has come across the centuries: "Be of good cheer, I will go with thee all the way." Undergird and uphold them with firm belief in the ultimate triumph of the good. Under all circumstances inspire us to think truly, to speak truly, and to live truly; thus our lives will be open books of good and wholesome deeds. In the name of our Saviour, by whom and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honor and glory be unto Thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2713. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. OVERTON, Mr. GLASS, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. GREEN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article that appeared in the Boston Sunday Post of May 30, 1943, entitled "City of Revere."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of the legislative matters on the Speaker's desk, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under a special order for today I was granted 30 minutes to address the House. I yield back that time, and I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter on the Liberty Bell and a poem, The Bishop of Washington.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I obtained unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article which appeared in Collier's magazine. It exceeded the amount permitted. I have an estimate from the Public Printer. It will cost $90. Notwithstanding that, I ask unanimous consent that it may be included as a part of my extension of remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the New York Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by a C. I. O. leader at Pontiac, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE GEORGE P. DARROW

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and sincere grief that I announce the death of my predecessor in Congress, Hon. George P. Darrow, who served as a Member of this House for a period of 24 years.

George Darrow was loved and respected by all who knew him. While an earnest supporter and advocate of the principles and policies of the Republican Party the center aisle did not divide his friends; he was loved and respected by all who knew him. I frequently heard him express his joy and personal pride in the many friendships he made in his long service and he was especially proud of his close association with the former Vice President and Speaker of the House, the Honorable Jack Garner, with our beloved present Speaker, and with Virginia's great elder statesman, Senator CARTER GLASS.

Poor health in his last years prevented the continuance of his activity in public affairs and he retired voluntarily 3 years ago.

We mourn the loss of a good friend, but the memory of his long and faithful service is cherished and may well serve as a guide to all of us.

The entire career of former Congressman Darrow is notable for self-sacrifice and conscientious devotion in the interest of his fellow man. Following his early education in the common schools of New London, Conn., he pursued his studies at Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y., waiting on tables and cleaning classrooms, and so forth, to pay his tuition and board, graduating in 1880, and in later years was honored by having the degree of LL. B. conferred upon him by this university. Following graduation from college he entered upon a business career, which included foreign service as sales representative for an oil byproduct; and, in 1888, he settled in Germantown, Philadelphia, and established and conducted a successful paint business until 10 years ago, when he retired from active business.

Mr. Darrow always took an active interest in civic affairs. During the period of his service as president of the twenty-second sectional school board of Philadelphia he took a leading part in the campaign for the establishment of district high schools and has been known as the father of district high schools in Philadelphia. He served as a member of city council from 1910 to 1915 and was able to secure many improvements for his community and his sound business background enabled him to render outstanding service in the interest of his city and sound government.

In 1914 Mr. Darrow was asked to become a candidate for Congress; he was elected and reelected every 2 years since until 1936, when he suffered unexpected defeat in the landslide of that year; but, in 1938 he was again elected and in 1940 he voluntarily retired from public life by reason of ill-health.

During his service in Congress Mr. Darrow served at various periods on the District of Columbia, Banking and Currency, and Naval Affairs Committees. If any interest was greater than another, there is no doubt it was in our Navy. He was a firm believer in a strong Navy and in his position as ranking Republican member of the Naval Affairs Committee he was enabled to render notable service in its upbuilding. Having served in Congress during the period of World War No. 1 Mr. Darrow was particularly interested in the welfare of war veterans; he successfully sponsored legislation providing increased compensation for disabled veterans while taking vocational training, and in many ways gave aid and assistance to all war veterans and their families. He was co-sponsor with Senator Edge of New Jersey of a bill providing for the construction of the Delaware River bridge in Philadelphia; and, his success in securing the authorization for and funds for the construction of the new naval hospital in Philadelphia was an outstanding feat in that trying period.

Mr. Darrow's position as dean of the Pennsylvania delegation in Congress, his long membership on the Republican steering committee and the Republican committee on committees brought him in contact with practically all of his colleagues.

By his lovable disposition, his courtesy and fairness he won and held their lasting affection and respect.

Friend of three Presidents, elder statesman of Germantown, he will be honored and held in fond recollection by all who knew him for his great services to his city and community, for the example he set of the good citizen, laboring for others during a long and fruitful life.

He giveth his beloved sleep.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have asked the gentleman to yield in order that I may say I have served in this House for a long time. I have served with many good men, many fine gentlemen. I never served with a finer man or a more splendid patriot than George Darrow.

Mr. SCOTT. I may say that I know his family will be deeply grateful for the kind expressions of the Speaker of this House, of whom our late friend was so very fond.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I desire to join in what the Speaker [Mr. RAYBURN] has just said about Mr. Darrow. I regarded him as one of the finest characters I have ever known. His death brings back memories of days gone by. When I came to Congress George Darrow was one of its leading Members. On the other side of the aisle was James Mann, the greatest parliamentarian I have ever seen in action, Frank Mondell, Nicholas Longworth, and many others. On our side, to name only two, was Finis Garrett, one of the keenest blades who ever served in Congress, and Claude Kitchen, one of the ablest debaters of all time.

I have seen those great men leave the Halls of Congress and many of them pass away, but I do not know of anyone who has gone in recent years whose passing I more keenly feel than that of my friend George P. Darrow, of Pennsylvania.

When I remember all
The friends so link'd together,
I've seen around me fall
Like leaves in wintry weather;
I feel like one who treads alone
Some banquet hall deserted,
Whose lights are fled, whose garlands dead,
And all but he departed.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman will doubtless recall that a few months ago I called the attention of this House to the eighty-fourth birthday of Mr. Darrow and at that time, as flowers to the living, the gentleman from Mississippi paid tribute to Congressman Darrow, and at that time I reported his words to Congressman Darrow and to his family, and they were very, very deeply appreciative.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was with keen regret the

older Members of the House learned today of the death of former Representative George Darrow, of Philadelphia. He served many years in the House and was one of its best-informed and most popular Members. He was an outstanding member of the Naval Affairs Committee and a stalwart champion of a strong Navy and of national preparedness.

Men like George Darrow can ill afford to be spared, and to his widow and family will go the deep sympathy of all his former associates and a legion of friends.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, during my period of service here I have enjoyed the friendship of two most estimable gentlemen who were members of the Pennsylvania delegation. One was Hon. George Darrow, the other Hon. Harry Ransley. Both have passed from the scene of worldly endeavors. They won for themselves the gratitude of the people of their State and of the people with whom they served here who had an opportunity to appraise them and evaluate their services and their characters. I am confident they will receive a fine reward in the world to which they have gone.

I learned of the passing of Mr. Darrow with great sorrow, as I did a few years ago on the passing of Harry Ransley. They made records which may well serve as examples to people who are students of public service.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD relative to the Armenians in two world wars and their aspirations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks on two bills on radio operators in the merchant marine, that are pending on the consent calendar today, and to insert certain quotations.

The Speaker. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to embrace therein an editorial from the Galveston Daily News.

The Speaker. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by George Rothwell Brown, appearing in the Times-Herald of June 6, 1943.

The Speaker. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a recent radio speech I made over station WNBF.

The Speaker. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in the Washington Post of today, June 8, on Alaska's future.

The Speaker. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from an American soldier overseas to his mother about strikes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement concerning a bill I introduced on March 12, providing for the payment of $50 per month to members of the armed forces for each month served from the date of the passage of the Selective Service Act to 6 months after the close of the war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CANNING PLANTS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of today's business it is my intention to take up a discussion of the problems of the canning industry, and inasmuch as I shall take only a portion of the time allotted to me, I am going to yield to other Members who have canning plants in their districts and whose operation may be affected.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RUSSIA'S ELECTRIC POWER RESOURCES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

POULTRY FEED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that the electric power proposition may be all right, but at the moment I am more interested in corn and would like to know something about poultry feed. The poultry feeders in my district are asking how they can obtain poultry feed.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Asking for what?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Poultry feed, to feed the hens that lay the eggs that we all like and need or from which come the chicks that grow into broilers and roasters that will help feed the Nation next fall, winter, and spring.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh; poultry feed. I agree thoroughly, but I thought the gentleman said "poker chips."

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know anything about poker chips and do not want to. One constituent uses a thousand bushels of corn a day. He wired me Friday:

> We use 1,000 bushels corn in our two feed plants daily. Have less than 1 week's supply. Unable to purchase any corn. We furnish feed for approximately one-half million laying hens and other livestock. Michigan Elevator Exchange, with many carload orders on hand, are unable to purchase any corn. Situation critical. Must have immediate release. Important you make every effort to have Michigan declared an emergency State to receive corn from Commodity Credit Corporation.

Immediately phoned Commodity Credit Corporation and was told there was plenty of corn in the country, but when I asked where we could get some of it for Michigan, for the processors of poultry and dairy food, was advised there was none available. And when I squawked, the gentleman told me our dairymen and our poultrymen were in no worse situation than automobile dealers and would have to take their loss.

My reply that we could not eat automobiles, hence might be able to get along without them, but that we would need milk, butter, and beef, eggs and poultry before the year was over and that if we did not get the corn, someone would go hungry, brought a laugh, a few harsh words, but no corn.

Next fall, winter, and spring, some of you "city fellers" who have refused to listen to some of us from the sticks, will be hungry and so will your constituents. You will all have my sympathy, but you will not be able to make a meal out of that.

It is all right for the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to be urging the power-development program, but what these poultry raisers and the dairymen want to know is how they are going to get feed for the hens that lay the eggs, for the cows that give the milk and furnish the beef.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by the Honorable Frederick M. Davenport, entitled "Life in the Public Interest."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BISHOP JAMES E. FREEMAN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain statements of appreciation of the life of Bishop Freeman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Nation joins with me today in mourning the passing of Bishop James E. Freeman who was my friend and one of the very great figures of our country. A deeply religious man, a great and inspiring leader and preacher, a great humanitarian. A man, although he loved his own belief, his own creed more dearly than his own life, he believed that all religion was of great value and should be recognized. Believing in a free church and in freedom of religion, he stood in simplicity and in strength like the towers of the cathedral he built for one of the "four freedoms." He welcomed to the National Cathedral the clergy of every denomination. Preachers of many faiths spoke from his pulpit. He wished it to be their cathedral too. He performed a great work in securing money for the building of the National Cathedral. It is a living memorial to his unselfish service. At the same time, with his love of humanity, while he was building the cathedral he was building in the minds of people character and was demonstrating what humanity could do and what religion could do for the world.

He can ill be spared today, Mr. Speaker, and when he is laid to rest tomorrow there will be a feeling of tremendous loss. All that could die of Bishop Freeman has died, but his spirit will live on and on through the ages.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short statement concerning our departed colleague, Harry Englebright.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is consent day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the first bill on the calendar, H. R. 1291, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this seems to be a rather voluminous bill. Will not the chairman of the Committee on Immigration explain it to us?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill contains a number of provisions. Some sections are just for clarification purposes to correct clerical mistakes, and so forth. One section deals with denaturalization. The Attorney General has quite a number of such cases, and it was thought advisable to cut the period of notice from 60 to 30 days.

Mr. BARDEN. May I ask the gentleman whether or not a rule has been granted on this bill?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; there is a rule. Let me say to the gentleman, however, that this bill passed the House in the last session and was reported by the Senate Committee on Immigration in the Senate. Only because of lack of time in which to dispose of it was it not considered in the Senate. I hope the gentleman can see his way clear not to object but to let the bill pass and go over to the Senate.

As I say, the bill corrects a number of technical errors. It gives the Attorney General in the case of denaturalization proceedings the right to cut the time from 60 days on a summons to 30 days. There are pending now several hundred cases for cancelation of citizenship. Under the present law the people involved must be given 60 days' notice. The Attorney General feels that 30 will be more than sufficient. The bill requires them to answer within 30 days. This bill also gives the Government the authority to secure a judicial decree indicating loss of nationality. The other sections provide for——

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as a rule has been granted on this bill, I feel that it ought to be considered in that way. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

REPATRIATING NATIVE-BORN WOMEN RESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1289, to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 317 (b) (1) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 717 (b) (1)) is amended by inserting, after "terminated", the following: "or who has resided continuously in the United States since the date of such marriage,".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING COAST GUARD AND AUXILIARY AND RESERVE ACT OF 1941, RELATING TO WOMEN'S RESERVE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1616, to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

ASSIGNMENT OF DEPARTMENTAL PERSONNEL TO AID INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2468, authorizing the assignment of personnel from departments or agencies in the executive branch of the Government to certain investigating committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ABSENTEEISM

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2553, directing the Secretary of Labor to make an investigation and study of the extent and causes of absenteeism and to make available the facilities of the Department of Labor to act as a clearinghouse for information on methods to control absenteeism.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to have the bill explained.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], when this bill came up last time, asked to have the bill passed over without prejudice. The gentleman from New York is necessarily absent today on official business and I believe that to protect him I should ask to have it go over without prejudice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PROTECTION OF WATER-FRONT FACILITIES AND VESSELS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2663, to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

REDUCTION IN COURSE OF INSTRUCTION AT NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 879, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instructions at the Naval Academy," approved June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 238).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not think we ought to pass measures which are of this apparent importance unless someone explains the meaning of the measure to the House. I hope somebody may be able to do that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs is absent from the Capitol. I do not see the gentleman from Maryland here, who knows about the bill. I sug-

gest that the bill be passed over without prejudice, to be explained later.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

ALLOWANCE FOR QUARTERS AND SUBSISTENCE FOR MIDSHIPMEN OF THE NAVAL RESERVE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2629, to provide an allowance for quarters and subsistence for midshipmen of the Naval Reserve.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is another bill of some importance, and I think that somebody should be in position to explain its provisions before we pass it. Nobody is here representing the committee to explain the bill, therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

CONVEYANCE TO STATE HOSPITAL AT GOLDSBORO, N. C., OF A CERTAIN TRACT OF LAND

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2562, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to the State Hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how much did this land cost the Government? I see they are going to sell it for $4,100.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman that I do not know exactly what it cost the Government, but I am inclined to think that it was less than $4,000. I happen to know exactly where the land is located. This State hospital is a hospital for the insane, and they need this land to protect the watershed that is just adjacent to the property.

Mr. KEAN. Does the gentleman feel there is no loss to the Government for what it paid for the land?

Mr. BARDEN. No; there would not be a loss to the Government if the Government gave it to them. The State hospital man told me that he raised considerable objection to the $4,000 as being too much. He thinks the Federal Government is charging too much, but the State must have it, it is very useful, so he is willing to go along with it.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I think my colleague from North Carolina is somewhat in error regarding the amount the Government has invested. I think the Government actually has invested somewhat in excess of the $4,000. At the request of the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, a special investigator who is now working for the committee investigating the Farm Credit Administration went down to North Carolina and made an examination and appraisal of this property. He recommends the sale of this property as contemplated in this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, upon payment by the State Hospital at Goldsboro of $4,180, to convey to the hospital all right, title, and interest of the United States to that portion of the North Carolina farm tenant security project, located in Wayne County, N. C., known as unit No. 11 of said project, consisting of eighty-seven and ninety-four one-hundredths acres, more or less, described by metes and bounds as follows:

Beginning at a nail on the centerline of a dirt road said corner being a common corner between lands owned by one Charles Davis and the tract hereinafter described, thence along the common line north one degree fifty minutes east one thousand three hundred and forty-five and eight one-hundredths feet; thence north sixty-nine degrees thirty-three minutes east one thousand three hundred and sixty-six and twenty one-hundredths feet; thence south four degrees fifty-three minutes west two hundred and ninety-seven feet to the centerline of a canal; thence along said canal the following courses and distances: South seventy-three degrees one minute east eighty-one and eighty-four one-hundredths feet, south seventy-six degrees fifty-seven minutes east one hundred and two and seventy one-hundredths feet, south forty-seven degrees twenty-four minutes east one hundred and thirty-three and six one-hundredths feet to the west bank of Little River; thence along the west bank of Little River the following courses and distances: South seventy-one degrees forty-nine minutes thirty-eight seconds west fifty-one and ninety-four one-hundredths feet, south seventy degrees ten minutes thirty-two seconds west one hundred and twenty and sixty-five one-hundredths feet, south fifty-five degrees thirty-three minutes forty-nine seconds west one hundred and sixty-four and twenty-one one-hundredths feet, south forty degrees thirty-four minutes thirty-four seconds west two hundred and fifty-three and four one-hundredths feet, south seven degrees twenty-two minutes west one hundred and seventy and twenty-one one-hundredths feet, south forty-six degrees forty-two minutes seventeen seconds east three hundred and ninety-five and eighty one-hundredths feet, south forty-one degrees thirteen minutes thirteen seconds east two hundred and fifty-one and thirty-three one-hundredths feet, south sixty degrees forty-one minutes forty-four seconds east two hundred and thirty-four and thirty-one one-hundredths feet, south seventy-five degrees thirty-seven minutes forty-four seconds east two hundred and fifty-five and fifty-five one-hundredths feet, south sixty-four degrees twenty-six minutes forty-six seconds east eighty-one and forty-four one-hundredths feet, south forty-one degrees twenty minutes nine seconds east two hundred and ninety-five and twenty-eight one-hundredths feet, south seventy-four degrees eight minutes nineteen seconds east one hundred and forty-two and ten one-hundredths feet, south sixty-seven degrees no minutes thirty-eight seconds east three hundred and twenty-three and forty-seven one-hundredths feet, south thirty-one degrees six minutes thirty seconds east eighty-three and eighty-nine one-hundredths feet, south one degree twenty-seven minutes thirteen seconds east eighty-four and fifty-five one-hundredths feet, south forty-nine degrees fourteen minutes west two hundred and twenty-seven and thirty-seven one-hundredths feet, south seventy-four degrees twenty-six minutes seven seconds west three hundred and twenty and fifty-six one-hundredths feet, south forty-eight degrees fifty-six minutes eleven seconds west one hundred and seventy-five and thirty one-hundredths feet; thence leaving the west bank of Little River and running south seventy-seven degrees thirty-nine minutes west seven hundred and fifty-eight and sixty one-hundredths feet; thence north seventy degrees eighteen minutes west nine hundred and four and seventy-nine one-hundredths feet to the centerline of a dirt road; thence along the centerline of said dirt road the following courses and distances: North twenty-six degrees eleven minutes west two hundred and thirty-one and sixty-six one-hundredths feet, north thirty-eight degrees twenty-two minutes west one hundred and thirty-two and no one-hundredths feet, north fifty-two degrees twenty-five minutes west one hundred and thirty-two and no one-hundredths feet, north fifty-eight degrees twenty minutes west two hundred and ninety-one and eighty-five one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISCONDUCT FOR COMPENSATION AND PENSION PURPOSES LIMITED TO FELONIOUS MISCONDUCT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 986, to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph IX of Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"IX. A disability, injury, or disease will be held to have resulted from misconduct when it is due to felonious misconduct."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "misconduct", insert "only."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING MORE ADEQUATE AND UNIFORM PROVISIONS IN VETERANS' LAWS AFFECTING COMPENSATION, PENSION, AND RETIREMENT PAY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2703, to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay, payable by Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill takes jurisdiction away not only from the Pensions Committee, which committee has jurisdiction over Spanish War veterans, but it also takes jurisdiction away from

the Invalid Pensions Committee which has jurisdiction over the Army and Navy and the present global war. I have no objection that bills be handled by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation if the legislation properly belongs to that committee, but the rule is very specific that the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation has no jurisdiction over any other war than the World War. The only committee that has jurisdiction over all wars is the Invalid Pensions Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] has taken the floor several times in his broadcasts attacking the jurisdiction of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. I want to say that this is purely World War veterans' legislation. The bill was drafted at the request of the Veterans' Administration, it was introduced, and the Speaker properly referred it to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] imagines that he is going to block relief for World War veterans, especially these boys who are coming out of the service now and who need this attention, he is very badly mistaken. If we cannot get the legislation passed this way, we will do it under the regular rules of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope that the gentleman from Michigan will not object because of a technical situation that might exist in reference to the question of jurisdiction, because this legislation is important and means much to those who are serving. I am sure my friend from Michigan will look at the broader implications and without in any way changing his views on jurisdiction not object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that this measure has the unqualified support of the American Legion. It has the unqualified support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It has the unqualified support of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, and of the Order of the Purple Heart; it has the unanimous backing of the Committee on World War Legislation, that heard the testimony on it; with one or two minor amendments it has the unqualified support of General Hines, and, with only one question about raising the pay of men in the hospital from $6 to $8 a month, it has the support, of the Bureau of the Budget.

There may be one amendment with which the Bureau of the Budget was not familiar that I am sure the House will approve unanimously, but this matter was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, and the only objection it raised was to that provision in which we provide that instead of receiving $6 a month while in hospitals, a veteran who is totally and permanently disabled from a non-service-connected disability will receive $8 a month.

So this measure has the support of every organization that is interested in World War veterans; it has the support of the Veterans' Administration; and it has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. LESINSKI. I have no objection to the veterans getting a raise in their pay checks, but I do have an objection to a committee getting a preference as to legislation that does not belong to them. Once a precedent is set the equities of it do not mean anything.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say again that the Committee on Invalid Pensions, of which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] is chairman, is the old Civil War Pensions Committee. We have let it go on because we preferred not to disturb that set-up as long as those old veterans or their dependents were living. But hundreds of thousands of the boys in the service now were in the First World War. I have a letter in my pocket now from our former colleague, Colonel Faddis, who has just been wounded in north Africa, and who served throughout the last war. We have hundreds of thousands of these men who were in the last war now in the service. They are so interwoven, so interconnected, that it is absolutely mandatory that the same committee handle the legislation for both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2. This fact is recognized by those on whose shoulders falls the responsibility for legislation of this kind.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This bill also has the endorsement of the Order of the Purple Heart, composed of men wounded in action.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right. The representative of the Order of the Purple Heart, every one of whom was wounded in action, came before this committee and gave this bill his unqualified support.

So if the gentleman from Michigan is quibbling about our turning back the pages of history and throwing these World War veterans back into the old Civil War Pensions Committee, I submit he is going to get cold comfort from the veterans' organizations and from the Members of this House. I am going to object to this bill being carried over without prejudice. I want it considered and passed now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LESINSKI. I object, Mr. Speaker, on grounds that Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation has no jurisdiction over this legislation, that same belongs to the Committee on Invalid Pensions of which I am chairman, and its jurisdiction is all wars, including present global war.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT OF THE REGULAR ARMY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 997, to amend certain provisions of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, relating to the Medical Department of the Regular Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire whether or not the War Department is in favor of this bill?

Mr. BARDEN. Is the gentleman addressing his remark to me?

Mr. KEAN. No, to some member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] introduced this bill, and I think may answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. DURHAM. I shall answer the gentleman's question by stating that I believe the Surgeon General has always been on record as objecting to the creation of additional corps, the Veterinary Corps, the Nurse Corps, and all other corps, and he objects to the creation of this corps.

Mr. KEAN. He objects to this because he does not like to have any more different types of corps in the Army?

Mr. DURHAM. I think that is correct.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SPRINGDALE, UTAH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2527, to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah," and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 28, 1928 (45 Stat. 787, ch. 818), is hereby amended by substituting the following language in lieu of the language in the act following the words "to grant permission to the town of Springdale, Utah," "to convey through such piping facilities as may be necessary, for domestic and other uses within the limits of said town of Springdale, Utah, water from certain springs in the Zion National Park, Utah, located in sections 17, 22, and 27, township 41 south, range 10 west, Salt Lake base and meridian."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CUSTODIAL EMPLOYEES OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2250, to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees into the Postal Service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of February 28, 1925, Postal Salary Classification

Act, is hereby amended to include officers and employees of the custodial service of the Post Office Department: *Provided*, That the salary ranges of the designated classes shall be as allocated by the Post Office Department under the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *And provided further*, That such action shall not result in the reduction of the salary of any employee by reason hereof.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "classes" and insert "grades."

Page 2, line 1, after "of the", insert "grade or."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service."

ADDITIONAL SAFEGUARDS, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2612) to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications of ships of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes," approved December 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 804; 47 U. S. C. 353 note), is hereby amended by striking out in lines 3 to 6, inclusive, the words "national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, to exist but not after July 1, 1943, or the date upon which the President proclaims the existing national defense emergency terminated, whichever occurs first," and substituting therefor the following: "present war and for six months thereafter, or until such earlier time as the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the figures "804" and insert "808"; and in line 8, page 1, strike out the words "in lines 3 to 6, inclusive."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL PAY, RURAL DELIVERY CARRIERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2080) to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is the practice of those in charge of the Consent Calendar to object to bills which carry appropriations or authorizations of several million dollars. This bill will cost $4,318,000 per year. For that reason I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CHANGING NAME "LABORER" TO "MAIL HANDLER," POSTAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2419) to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "assistant clerk."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the classification "laborer" in the Postal Service is hereby abolished, and in lieu thereof there is hereby created the classification of "assistant clerk" to perform the same duties and receive the same compensation as laborers.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, strike out "assistant clerk" and insert "mail handler."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to change the name of 'laborer' in the Postal Service to that of 'mail handler.'"

AID TO STATES—CONSTRUCTION OF RURAL POST ROADS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2798) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RADIO OPERATORS ON CARGO SHIPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2750) to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (50 Stat. 193, 55 Stat. 579; U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 47, sec. 353 (b)), as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) A cargo ship, required by this part to be fitted with a radio installation, which is fitted with an autoalarm in accordance with this title, shall, for safety purposes, carry at least one qualified operator who shall have had at least 6 months' previous service in the aggregate as a qualified operator in a station on board a ship or ships of the United States, but during the emergency proclaimed by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist, but not after the termination of such emergency or such earlier date as Congress by concurrent resolution may designate, the aforesaid requirement of 6 months' previous service may be suspended or modified by regulation or order of the Commission for successive periods of not more than 6 months' duration."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHIP CONSTRUCTION RESERVE FUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 163) to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship construction reserve funds, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) The first sentence of subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows: "For the purposes of promoting the construction of vessels necessary to carrying out the policy set forth in title I of this act, any citizen of the United States who is operating a vessel or vessels in the foreign or domestic commerce of the United States or in the fisheries or owns in whole or in part a vessel or vessels being so operated, or who, at the time of purchase or requisition of the vessel by the Government, was operating a vessel or vessels so engaged or owned in whole or in part a vessel or vessels being so operated or had acquired or was having constructed a vessel or vessels for the purpose of operation in such commerce or in the fisheries, may establish a construction reserve fund, for the construction or acquisition of new vessels, to be composed of deposits of proceeds from sales of vessels, indemnities on account of losses of vessels, earnings from the operation of vessels, and receipts, in the form of interest or otherwise, with respect to amounts previously deposited."

(b) The second sentence of subsection (c) of such section is amended to read as follows: "For the purposes of this subsection no amount shall be considered as deposited in a construction reserve fund unless it is deposited within 60 days after it is received by the taxpayer except that (1) in the case of amounts received before December 10, 1940, the deposit may be made not later than February 7, 1941, and (2) in the case of amounts received at any time between May 27, 1941, and the date of enactment of this amendatory clause, the deposit of which by the taxpayer is authorized by the amendments to subsection (b), the taxpayer may make such deposit at any time within 120 days from such date of enactment, and the Commisison may approve any such deposit previously made if, in other respects, it complies with the provisions of this section, as amended."

(c) Subsection (g) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(g) The provisions of subsections (c) and (f) shall apply to any deposit in the construction reserve fund only to the extent that such deposit is expended or obligated for expenditure, in accordance with rules and regulations to be prescribed jointly by the Commission and the Secretary of the Treasury, under a contract for the construction or acquisition of a new vessel or vessels (or in the discretion of the Commission, for a part interest therein) entered into after October 10, 1940, and on or before December 31, 1943, with respect to deposits made prior to January 1, 1943, or not later than 1 year after the date of such deposit with respect to deposits made on or after January 1, 1943, and in either case only if under such rules and regulations—

"(1) within such period not less than 12½ percent of the construction or contract price of the vessel or vessels is paid or irrevocably committed on account thereof and the plans and specifications therefor are approved by the Commission to the extent by it deemed necessary; and

"(2) in case of a vessel or vessels not constructed under the provisions of this title or not purchased from the Commission, (A) said construction is completed, within 6 months from the date of the construction contract, to the extent of not less than 5 percent thereof (or in case the contract covers more than one vessel, the construction of the first vessel so contracted for is so completed to the extent of not less than 5 percent) as estimated by the Commission and certified by it to the Secretary of the Treasury, and (B) all construction under such contract is completed with reasonable dispatch thereafter."

(d) Subsection (h) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The Commission is authorized under rules and regulations to be prescribed jointly by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commission to grant extensions of the period within which the deposits shall be expended or obligated or within which construction shall have progressed to the extent of 5 percent of completion as provided herein, but such extension shall not be for an aggregate additional period in excess of 2 years with respect to the expenditure or obligation of such deposits or more than 1 year with respect to the progress of such construction: *Provided, however,* That until the termination of the present war or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate, in addition to the extensions hereinbefore permitted, further extensions may be granted ending not later than 6 months after such termination of the present war or such earlier date as may be so designated."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 14, strike out the word "after", strike out all of lines 15, 16, 17, and 18, and in line 19 strike out the words "in either case", and insert in lieu thereof the words "within 2 years from the date of such deposit."

Page 3, line 20, insert after the word "period" the words "of 2 years."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING TIME, SUITS OF UTE INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1947) to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to ask the author of the bill or somebody familiar with the provisions, to explain it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, Congress by an act passed in 1938 authorized suits to be brought before the Court of Claims in behalf of the Ute Indians in Utah. Section 2 of that act limited the time within which the suits could be brought to June 29, 1943. The situation is this at the present time. Two of the attorneys for the Ute Indians have been called to the service in the Army and the Navy. Many of the witnesses who would be used in connection with the trial of the case are likewise in the service—that is, Indian witnesses. The purpose of this act is to extend the time in which these suits may be brought until 1946.

Mr. TARVER. When were these attorneys called into the service?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Within the last year.

Mr. TARVER. Then the Indians had about 4 years since the passage of the bill in 1938 within which they might have brought the suits before the attorneys were called into the service?

Mr. O'CONNOR. These claims require a mighty lot of preparation to bring them into the court through the General Accounting Office and all that sort of thing. In other words, after the Congress authorizes the beginning of suits, it takes time to get the necessary information.

Mr. TARVER. How far back is this cause of action on behalf of the Indians?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It originated a long time ago.

Mr. TARVER. How long?

Mr. O'CONNOR. As far back as 1881. I think the first violation of treaty claimed was in 1881, but at the same time, if the gentleman will recall, we had a mighty hard time to get any sort of a bill through the House owing to certain objectors in the House, authorizing Indians to commence any kind of suits in the Court of Claims or in any other court.

Mr. TARVER. In other words, 57 years after the cause of action originated, the Congress, through a spirit of liberality, gave the Indians 5 additional years within which to bring suit in the Court of Claims. Their attorneys were in position to have brought suit for 4 years of that additional 5-year period, and now you are asking for 3 years more because for the last year two attorneys have been in the armed services.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to suggest this to the gentleman, that the bill has the approval of the Indian Commissioner and the Interior Department, because they are familiar with the facts with relation to the required testimony.

Mr. TARVER. How much money is sought by the Indians?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not know. Perhaps the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], the author of the bill, can explain that.

Mr. GRANGER. I do not know how much is sought. I do not know about the claims.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will say to the gentleman that the amount that can be recovered under the action or actions is not very great, because usually the Government is permitted any offsets that it has against the Indians. The experience has been that in all of the suits against the Government for Indians, tried in the Court of Claims, less than 3 percent of claims recovery is had, because the offsets amount sometime to more than what the claims amount to in the first instance.

Mr. TARVER. Without knowing more about the justice of reviving these old claims and the amount of money involved, I shall be compelled to object unless the gentleman will ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would prefer to have the gentleman make that request if he will do it.

Mr. TARVER. I am putting that up to the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course, I am not the author of the bill. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is the author of the bill. I am very sorry the gentleman takes that attitude, because the bill has the approval of the department and it was unanimously reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs and is a just bill.

Mr. TARVER. I think, according to the statements made here, the Indians have been treated very generously by Congress and have had ample time when their attorneys were available to have instituted the suits. I am not in a position to agree to the passage of the bill this morning.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. The time will have expired by July 1, and if the gentleman objects, of course the bill will be of no effect.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, you could secure reenactment of the provision by Congress if it is justified. I shall be compelled to object unless the gentleman asks that it be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOSPITAL OR DISPENSARY AT ST. LAWRENCE, NEWFOUNDLAND

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 118, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct and the President of the United States to present to the people of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, on behalf of the people of the United States, a hospital, dispensary, or other memorial, for heroic services to men of the United States Navy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some explanation of this bill. From reading the title it seems we are authorizing the Secretary of the Navy and the President of the United States to construct a hospital outside of the United States. I know a great many people in the United States who need hospital facilities. I would like to have some explanation of the bill.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment in the hands of the Clerk which I ask unanimous consent to have read at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment proposed may be read for the information of the House.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "or other memorial."

Page 2, line 2, strike out the words "or other memorial."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution as reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs, is to permit the Secretary of the Navy to construct a hospital or dispensary in the village of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland. The idea of this hospital or dispensary was first conceived by Admiral Bristol, who was in command of the Argentia Naval Station about a year ago. Admiral Bristol has since died.

The purpose of this memorial is in appreciation and gratitude by the United States, particularly the United States Navy, for the very splendid and heroic work that was given to the survivors of the U. S. S. *Truxtun* and U. S. S. *Pollux*, which foundered on the shores of that area in February 1942. If any of us has any idea of the type and kind of weather they have in the Newfoundland area, we will have some conception of the difficulties that faced the men on the *Truxtun* and the *Pollux* when those two ships foundered in that cold, bleak month of the year. It was only the heroic work done by the villagers that resulted in saving many of the lives of the men who were on those two ships. Many lives were lost. Those people out in the wilderness trekked over a space of 4 or 5 miles to the cliffs of St. Lawrence in the Newfoundland area, divested themselves of their own clothes, wrapped them around the men and brought them into their own homes, and only by such constant and heroic measures applied by them over a period of many, many hours, were they able to save that large number of men who finally survived from those two ships.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Is there any limitation on the cost placed in the bill?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the bill provides for an expenditure of not more than $50,000.

In view of the fact that we have one of the largest naval air stations anywhere to be found on the adjacent shores of Newfoundland, it has seemed to me and seemed to the Navy Department that it would be a splendid gesture of gratitude on our part in showing the appreciation for what they have done for our men in one of the most distressing episodes the Navy has ever experienced when these ships foundered if we should authorize this monument to be built.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question about the maintenance of this building after it is constructed.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the bill only provides for and authorizes the building of a hospital unit or dispensary as the Navy Department may determine. I have had stricken from the bill the words "or other memorial."

The maintenance of this hospital or dispensary will come under the Newfoundland Board of Health, which has a series of hospitals in that part of Newfoundland, but none in this particular area; and the cost of maintenance will be carried by the Government of Newfoundland.

Mr. CARTER. What indication has the Newfoundland Government given to this Government that it is able and willing to assume and will maintain and operate this hospital after it is donated?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Navy Department, as represented by the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, has consulted with the representatives of the Newfoundland Public Health Department who naturally would be very happy and pleased to have the Government locate such a hospital there and will be only too happy and pleased to maintain it after it is built.

Mr. CARTER. Of course, I do not blame them for being happy and pleased. I would be very happy and pleased to have the Navy Department establish a hospital out in my district, too, where we have very crowded war conditions. But I think this is a most unusual program.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. One thing about the bill as I read it is that it authorizes the undertaking of the construction of the hospital and leaves no opportunity for a review of the cost of it by the Appropriations Committee. The resolution if passed in its present form would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to engage and enter into an obligation which the Congress would be compelled, practically, to appropriate the money for. It seems to me that if the resolution is to be considered it should be a pure authorization to just authorize an appropriation up to the limit of $50,000 or so much as may be necessary. It should not in itself constitute a joint authorization and appropriation. Consequently I shall ask to have the bill passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the gentleman will permit a perfecting amendment to be offered at this time, because I believe a matter of this kind, where we are trying to build up good relationships with those who are allied with us in this great war, this would be a means of showing a deep appreciation for the splendid service the people of this area have given to the men in the armed service. I think that we can now amend the bill to meet the objections, because I, too, believe that it should be subject to the Appropriation Committee, and I am perfectly willing to have such an amendment offered now to that effect, but I do believe we ought to act on it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts this question: The bill provides that this hospital shall be presented to the people of Newfoundland. Does the Federal Government now have title to the land which they are going to present to this foreign government?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the bill itself authorizes the building of the hospital and acquisition of such land as may be necessary. Whether or not that will be in the nature of a gift or whether or not they will have to buy the land, which after all is very inexpensive land in that land area, does not make much difference.

Mr. MICHENER. In other words, if this bill becomes a law, then the United States invests so much money in this hospital and loses all future control over the land on which it is built and of the hospital?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. This is an outright gift, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MICHENER. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It is to be a gift to the people of this particular area to show our gratitude and appreciation for the splendid service they gave to the men on those two ships.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota and the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania object to the request that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. GERLACH. I object to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The time for reserving objections has passed. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania object to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GERLACH. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

EXTENDING TIME FOR BRINGING SUITS UNDER ACT OF JUNE 28, 1938

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 113, H. R. 1947, to extend the time in which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the bill to which I indicated objection a few moments ago. I am now advised it involves claims aggregating approximately $1,000,000. Part of those claims originated in 1882. The justness of the claims is something about which I have no information, but it does seem that if a real cause of action existed on behalf of these Indians something would have been done about it in less than 61 years. The attorneys who have been employed by the Indians, before they were inducted into service, had 4 years in which to bring suit, and a period of 20 days yet exists within which suit may be brought.

So far as I am concerned, I do not think this is good legislative practice. At

the same time there are Members here from the western part of the country, from the area where these Indians live, who ought to know more about this subject matter than I. I am not in my judgment justified in taking the responsibility because it is within my power under the rules by my individual objection to prevent the passage of this bill if all other Members of the House are of the opinion that it ought to be passed; so, as far as I am concerned, I am not going to object, although I do not believe the bill ought to be enacted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PROTECTION OF WATER-FRONT FACILITIES AND VESSELS

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 97, H. R. 2663, to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever willfully shall violate any regulation or order promulgated or approved by the Secretary of the Navy pursuant to lawful authority for the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities, and relating to fire hazards, fire protection, lighting, machinery, guard service, disrepair, disuse, or other unsatisfactory conditions thereon, or the ingress thereto, or egress, or removal, of persons therefrom, or otherwise providing for safeguarding the same against destruction, loss, or injury by accident, or by enemy action, sabotage, or other subversive acts, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be liable to a fine of not to exceed $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "and."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the comma after "egress" and after "removal."

Page 2, line 6, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall remain in effect only until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting an editorial from Today's News on China.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a sermon delivered at the Baccalaureate Mass at Trinity College graduation exercises on Sunday, May 30, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NAVAL RESERVE ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2859) to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, was this bill on the calendar?

The SPEAKER. It was not.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

Strike out section 502 and substitute therefor the following:

"SEC. 502. Members of the Women's Reserve may be commissioned or enlisted in such appropriate ranks and ratings, not above the rank of captain, corresponding to those of the Regular Navy, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided*, That there shall not be more than 1 officer in the grade of captain nor more than 15 officers in the grade of commander: *Provided further*, That military authority of officers commissioned under the provisions of this title may be exercised over women of the Reserve only and is limited to the administration of the Women's Reserve."

Strike out section 504 and substitute therefor the following:

"SEC. 504. Members of the Women's Reserve shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or in combat aircraft at any time. No such member who is qualified to fill an available billet in the Navy Department proper at Washington shall be assigned to duty outside the continental United States."

Strike out section 506 and substitute therefor the following:

"SEC. 506. Members of the Women's Reserve of the Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or their dependents, shall be entitled to all allowances or benefits provided by law for male officers and enlisted men of such services with dependents: *Provided*, That the husbands of such members shall not be considered dependents. This section shall be effective from July 30, 1942."

SEC. 2. Each member of the Women's Reserve who was enlisted or commissioned therein on or prior to the date this act is approved shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the continental United States, unless and until she shall voluntarily sign a general waiver of said restriction.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "commander", insert "Exclusive of officers appointed in the Medical Department of the Naval Reserve."

Page 2, line 15, after the word "Washington", insert "Except members of the Medical Department of the Naval Reserve."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAAS: Page 2, line 2, after the word "captain", strike out the balance of line 2 and all of line 3 including the word "commander."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday of this week, after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table and other special orders heretofore made, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Harpersburg News on the Post-war Advisory Council, also to extend my own remarks and include a letter I have received from Mr. Chan.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech made before the Arizona State Bar Association on April 30, 1943, by Cleon T. Knapp.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS]?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT OF JULY 11, 1916

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 2798), to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the definition of the term "construction" in section 2 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212), is hereby amended to read as follows: "The term 'construction' means the supervising, inspecting, actual building, and all expenses, including the costs of rights-of-way, incidental to the construction of a highway, except locating, surveying, and mapping."

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. Reapportionment of Federal Highway funds: Federal funds apportioned to the States prior to January 1, 1942, for expenditure on the system of Federal-aid highways, on secondary or feeder roads, and for the elimination of hazards to life at railroad grade crossings in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, which were not on that date obligated by the States and which shall not be so obligated on or before June 30, 1943, shall not be reapportioned among the States in accordance with the provisions of said act, as amended and supplemented, but shall remain available for obligation by the States during continuance of the emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, and for a period of 1 year thereafter."

SEC. 3. The Commissioner of Public Roads is hereby authorized to expend in cooperation with the highway department of any State for engineering and economic investigations of projects for future construction and for surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for post-war highway improvements so much of the unobligated funds for regular Federal aid, for secondary or feeder roads, and for the elimination of hazards at railroad grade crossings, that now remain available to such State, as may be deemed adequate, but not to exceed in any State an amount which would represent such State's share of $50,000,000 apportioned under the formula provided under section 21 of the Federal Highway Act: *Provided*, That agreements may be entered into with any State highway department for such post-war highway projects not exceeding the unobligated Federal funds.

SEC. 4. Section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, approved November 19, 1941 (Public Law No. 295, 77th Cong.), as amended by the act of July 2, 1942 (Public Law No. 646, 77th Cong.), is hereby further amended by striking out the figure "$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "not to exceed $25,000,000."

SEC. 5. The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized and directed to make a survey of the need for a system of express highways throughout the United States, the number of such highways needed, the approximate routes which they should follow, and the approximate cost of construction; and to report to the President and to Congress, within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act, the results of such survey together with such recommendations for legislation as is deemed advisable.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the bill has been reported by the Committee on Roads, which is of course a legislative committee. There are no authorizations contained in the bill and there are no provisions for additional authorizations for appropriations. The pressing need for the passage of the bill arises from the reversion and reapportionment provisions in existing Federal aid highway legislation, where funds are unobligated by the States.

Under section 5 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 the funds apportioned to the States unless they are obligated revert to the Treasury and are reapportioned among the States. It is well known that because of the difficulty in public construction arising from priorities and the war there is practically a cessation in highway construction at the present time.

Section 2 of the pending bill provides for a continuation of the time for the allocation of projects to the States and a matching of those projects by the State without provision for reversion and reapportionment. There is at present allocated to the States on projects unobligated as of April 30, 1943, that would be affected by a lapse on July 1, 1943, the sum of about $68,000,000. These funds are allocated to the States under the formula of the Federal Highway Act. On July 1, 1944, those funds would amount to about $171,000,000. These funds have already been authorized. They are not being obligated because of the difficulties not only in highway construction but in all other construction.

There is a very excellent report on the pending bill here, giving an analysis of it, the amounts that have accrued to each State and the apportionments that are made, which are affected by the provision against reversion and reapportionment, the amendments contained in the bill, and a copy of the bill.

Section 1 of the bill provides for a change in the definition of the term "construction" so as to include rights-of-way. Heretofore, except in strategic highways for national defense, the States have provided the rights-of-way for Federal-aid projects. It is a matter of common knowledge that much of the highway construction that will be required following the present war will involve a change and a relocation of existing highways. So that the first section of the bill is to provide that both the States and the Federal Government shall share in the cost of rights-of-way for the construction of highways.

Section 2 of the bill is to prevent a lapse of highway funds and continues in force until 1 year after the present war.

Section 3 of the bill is an important provision and it looks toward highway construction as public work following the war. I may say in passing that I know generally of no more satisfactory public works to provide work for the unemployed in all of the States of the Union than highway construction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, section 3 provides that there shall be eligible for expenditure with the Federal Government matching in preparing plans for post-war construction not to exceed $50,000,000 of the Federal aid highway funds for all purposes heretofore appropriated. In other words, heretofore the States and the State highway commissions have prepared the plans for construction. This section is merely an enlargement of section 9 of the Defense Highway Act, which provides that there shall be appropriated $10,000,000 to prepare plans and that the local interests and the Federal Government shall share equally in those plans. In the post-war program where the Federal Government must make large appropriations for highway construction, it is preeminently proper that we should provide now for plans so that we will have available to the States and to the Federal Government adequate plans already prepared for the essential highway construction that must follow the war.

Section 4 provides for an additional allotment of $15,000,000 for the construction of roads to strategic materials, primarily minerals, the amount now available having been expended; that amount being $10,000,000.

Section 5 provides for a survey of a system of express highways by the Department of Public Roads and for a report to the Congress within 6 months.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GREEN. I believe the gentleman has answered my question. This extends for 1 year after the duration? It extends for that length of time?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. Does the Federal and State Governments both participate in the expense of surveys up to then?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Both agencies participate, as I stated, in the expense of preparing plans and detailed specifications for highway construction following the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to congratulate the gentleman upon bringing up for consideration this bill and I hope every one votes for it because its passage is very important to every State in the Union and particularly to my own State, as we must prepare to match the sum, and this act will give us time to do this. Take my own State, for instance. This provides that it has the amount of $2,135,692 for highways and $534,708 for secondary roads, and then certain sums for access roads. We must not lose these sums for our State is in dire need of road repairs and construction.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I anticipate the gentleman's question. The purpose of this bill is to prevent the gentleman's State from being deprived of those funds and to extend the time until 1 year after the war for the projects to be constructed and for the gentleman's State to match it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. How much will the State have to contribute in addition to what is provided for by the present law in order to take advantage of this fund?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Nothing whatever, no more than required by existing law. It does not make any other change in existing law.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to commend this legislation for its safeguarding highway funds to the various States. Has any change been made in the allotting of funds for access roads, or is that on the same basis as last year?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No change whatever has been made.

Mr. MURDOCK. But the amount has been increased?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The amount has already been increased to $260,000,000, and there is no amendment for that purpose.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Does this affect the moneys that presently may be due the respective States and which have not heretofore been used?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It does not, except to prevent their lapsing, as I have stated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO THE TAX PAYMENT ACT OF 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD relating to the tax question, including questions and answers and certain tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT OF JULY 11, 1916

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi has covered this bill intelligently and specifically. It seems that he has left very little if anything to be said. I do not believe there should be any opposition to this bill. It is probably one of the most meritorious bills the Committee on Roads has ever reported out.

As the gentleman from Mississippi has said, if we do not act in this matter before July 1 of this year, some $68,000,000 of funds which have already been allocated to the States will be lost to those States for all purposes. Another amount will revert a year following. The total of these amounts, as you will notice by reference to the hearings, is $171,544,373.

There has been very little highway construction under the Federal Highway Act, wherein the States match the moneys allocated to them by the Federal Government, because of the war and because the War Production Board under the circumstances could not give priorities to the States and the contractors for sufficient materials for consruction. So there has been a period now of some months, perhaps over a year, where all the construction that has been done in the several States has been either maintenance, for the purpose of keeping the roads in passable condition, or the construction of roads under the access highway paragraph of the act under which we authorized $260,000,000 to be made available to the War and Navy Departments and other devisions of the Government for the construction of access highways to camps, navy yards, and to forest areas, and the construction of approaches to strategic material deposits.

We anticipate that following the war there will be a boom in roadbuilding. It will be essential that a large portion of the highways in the United States be totally reconstructed. In order to do this job effectively and well, the States must make plans now. They should have what is known as a shelf of projects, so that they will be able to utilize all of their facilities immediately after the war for the rehabilitation of these highways which are being broken up because of the heavy traffic incident to our war effort. So we have not only made these unallocated funds available to them for 6 months following the termination of hostilities but we have provided that $50,000,000 of those funds shall be allocated among the States in accordance with the provisions of section 21 of the Federal Highway Act, which means that this money shall be allotted to the States on the basis of population, area, and road mileage. There will be a fund available to each State for planning purposes.

I can give to the Members of Congress the approximate amount of the $50,000,000 which will be available to their State highway commissioners for planning and survey purposes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I take the liberty of suggesting to the gentleman, inasmuch as we are considering this matter in the House, that he ask unanimous consent to include those figures in his remarks. I believe they will be important.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The figures I have before me are not exact, but I will have the exact figures in a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that as a part of my remarks I may include a break-down of the $50,000,000 that is referred to in section 3 of the bill, in which there will be a designation of the exact amount which each State will have available for planning purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Apportionment of $50,000,000 in accordance with the provisions of sec. 21 of the Federal Highway Act

STATE AND AMOUNT	
Alabama	$1,073,685
Arizona	737,698
Arkansas	879,398
California	2,052,843
Colorado	920,452
Connecticut	318,057
Delaware	250,000
Florida	736,147
Georgia	1,287,986
Idaho	634,020
Illinois	2,020,185
Indiana	1,232,715
Iowa	1,275,186
Kansas	1,293,058
Kentucky	955,360
Louisiana	762,633
Maine	444,348
Maryland	415,242
Massachusetts	670,583
Michigan	1,556,139
Minnesota	1,380,023
Mississippi	919,522
Missouri	1,519,138
Montana	1,037,280
Nebraska	1,020,507
Nevada	654,359
New Hampshire	250,000
New Jersey	651,596
New Mexico	829,669
New York	2,469,884
North Carolina	1,235,019
North Dakota	765,365
Ohio	1,802,996
Oklahoma	1,162,017
Oregon	849,827
Pennsylvania	2,093,567
Rhode Island	250,000
South Carolina	693,473
South Dakota	804,186
Tennessee	1,086,546
Texas	3,252,287
Utah	576,142
Vermont	250,000
Virginia	936,400
Washington	807,890
West Virginia	563,183
Wisconsin	1,231,947
Wyoming	638,436
Hawaii	250,000
District of Columbia	250,000
Puerto Rico	253,006
Total	50,000,000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Will this bill incorporate the highway plan suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]?

Mr. WOLCOTT. This bill does not include the plan advanced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]. The committee has given a great deal of consideration to that, but we think the matter has to be thought out a great deal more thoroughly than it has up to the present time before we want to recommend it to the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is understood that under section 3, in the event any State does not use its part of the $50,000,000 allocated, that part will still be available for construction, so the State does not lose it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. I may say that this $50,000,000 is deducted from the aggregate in the final settlement with the States. None of the States is going to lose any of its money through this allocation process.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Referring to what the gentleman has just said, the bill applies to moneys allocated for secondary road funds as well as for primary Federal aid?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. The total amount available at the present time for Federal aid to highways, secondary roads, the elimination of grade railroad crossings which have been allocated in accordance with the Federal highway acts that have been passed, is the total that I have mentioned, $71,544,373.

Mr. HOBBS. And there is nothing in this bill which relaxes the rule about wartime construction?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. As a matter of fact, we make it easier in this bill for those funds to be used. We increase the amount available for the construction of access roads to sources of raw materials, from $10,000,000 to $25,000,000.

Mr. HOBBS. What I am inquiring about is the relaxation of the rule as to access roads to forts, airports, and similar training grounds, for the preparation of our boys for combat service.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. I think the gentleman refers to the provision of the bill by which we made available $260,000,000 for the construction of what we term "access highways" to camps, navy yards, and so forth.

Mr. HOBBS. And there has been relaxation with regard to roads to sources of raw material but no relaxation as to others?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We increase the amount made available from $10,000,000 to $25,000,000. There has already been expended about $9,000,000 of the original $10,000,000 of the original $260,000,000 made available, and because they have to expand this program we have increased that $10,000,000 to $25,000,000, making available an additional $15,000,000 to construct access highways to sources of raw materials, so that there will be perhaps a lessening by $15,000,000 of the total amount used for other purposes, and it is all the same fund anyway.

Mr. HOBBS. It may be somewhat harder instead of easier to get needed construction to camps, and so forth.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; because there is plenty of money available for all those purposes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the legislation which comes with the unanimous report of the House Roads Committee proposes to take those funds which were provided in our Defense Highway Act of 1941, and use them for a program of planning and the prosecution of road construction immediately after the war. We know that the shortage of manpower and materials made it impossible during the past year to do any appreciable amount of work in any of the States of the Union. Testimony presented to the House Roads Committee disclosed our present improved roads will not remain so without constant maintenance and without replacement when they get beyond the condition of economical maintenance. In many cases they have become a menace to safe highway transport.

Our highway network would decrease rapidly in adequately improved mileage if construction should stop. Under such an assumption by the end of 1960 there would be but 27,000 miles of surfaced roads remaining, from about 209,800 surfaced miles now existing on the Federal-aid highway system.

An adequate reconstruction program is essential in view of an estimated increase in motor-vehicle registration. At the same time there will no doubt be an appreciable increase in annual travel per vehicle, bringing approximately a 50-percent increase in use of the highways.

The Roads Committee learned in February 1938 that the following reconstruction program would be required to meet traffic demands and provide an adequate system by 1960.

On the Federal-aid system the following annual program would be required from 1945 to 1960 if we are to have a 250,000-mile, surfaced, Federal-aid system by that date:

	Miles
Sand-clay, topsoil, etc	2,332
Gravel and stone types	6,943
Bituminous macadam and bituminous mixes	4,739
Concrete, bituminous concrete, brick, etc	4,000
Total annual mileage Federal-aid system	18,014

The average total mileage constructed on the Federal-aid system for the period from 1921–37 was 14,407 miles, although during the years 1935, 1936, and 1937 the average was approximately 13,000 miles on the Federal-aid system.

The House Roads Committee heard in 1938 and again in 1940 that the need for modernizing our road system was increasing at an alarming rate. The total estimated cost of modernizing the roads in 1938 was $3,329,000,000 for 98,181 miles of roads plus $393,428,000 for 19,376 bridges. By 1940 these figures had increased to $3,500,000,000 for 106,560 miles of highways plus $444,476,000 for 21,682 bridges. At that rate the cost of modernization for highways averaged $115,550,000 for 4,189 miles of highways per year plus $25,024,000 for 1,153 bridges per year. This enormous increase was occurring in spite of a normal construction program by the States of approximately $500,000,000 per year.

During the latter part of 1942 practically all road construction was stopped except for that small mileage which was considered of immediate military importance. Therefore, in addition to the rapid need for modernization there must be added the amount of normal construction which has accumulated in the amount of $650,000,000. Taking the figures of 1938 and 1940, with the addition of the average increased need for modernization and the accumulated amount of delayed annual construction, there exists as of 1943 on the Federal-aid and State highway systems a needed construction program of $5,016,000,000.

The explanation made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] as to the general provisions of the bill correctly bring to the membership the necessity for the passage today of this legislation.

I direct attention to section 5 of the proposed measure. This portion of the bill, originally embodied in H. R. 2615, would not only authorize but would direct the Commissioner of Public Roads to make a survey of the needs for express highways in the United States. In that study he would bring back to the President and to the Congress recommendation for the number of such highways needed, the approximate routes which they should follow, and the approximate cost of construction.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Will it be entirely within the discretion of the Commissioner to determine the location of these highways, or will there be any direction from the Congress?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Commissioner of Public Roads is directed by the House Roads Committee, and by the Congress, if this bill is enacted into law, to work with his staff in cooperation with the road officials of the various States, including the gentleman's State, in determining the need, approximate locations, and approximate cost of these highways. He must report within 6 months with a definite limitation on Commissioner McDonald to bring back to Congress and to the President in that period his findings. His report would also recommend to the Congress such legislation as it is deemed advisable to pass in connection with superhighways or express roads.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I take it that this survey you would authorize in section 5 is post-war planning for highway building.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct. I might say also that it is absolutely necessary to plan for the future of America, not only from the standpoint of an integrated highway system but in many other aspects as well, and I believe the able gentleman from Arizona agrees with me on that proposition.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman will permit me, I have always regarded the gentleman as a great advocate of aviation, commercial and otherwise. The gentleman does not feel that aviation will make such strides, that transportation by land or sea will be relatively unimportant.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman raises a pertinent point. I would not assume to say that any one system of transportation would replace any other system.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from West Virginia has also been a stanch advocate of very superior highways ever since I entered Congress in 1937. No doubt, the study provided for in section 5 is planned to coordinate all systems of transportation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. We need an integrated system of transportation and communication in America—highways, skyways, and waterways. All of them need to be well rounded, and this sort of

a survey will be very helpful toward that end.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you think if the O. P. A. continues its present activities there will be anything to haul on these highways?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I should say to the gentleman that I am not in agreement with the policies of the O. P. A. in many particulars. The gentleman may remember that I once said in this body that the American people are eager to comply with restriction, with regulation, and with rationing, but they want common sense used in those programs. On that we are in agreement. I will say in connection with the hauling that across the Pennsylvania turnpike, which is one of the roads which serves as a pattern for what tomorrow will hold from the standpoint of express highways in America, each minute and 17 seconds we have a truckload of munitions moving over that highway between Pittsburgh and Harrisburg, Pa.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Has Mr. McDonald done enough preliminary work to complete this comprehensive survey within 6 months?

Mr. RANDOLPH. In appearing before the House Roads Committee he was questioned on that very point, and he and his associates, in cooperation with the men who are in positions of leadership throughout the States, are working now on such a plan. The report can be ready in the half-year period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. McDonald indicated to the committee that this job could be completed and a report made to the Congress within the prescribed time. He believes such a report will be needed and valuable for post-war work.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. To clarify the situation as to why we need roads for tomorrow, unless we have roads to take care of the airplane traffic that is coming, the airplane traffic will not be successful?

Mr. RANDOLPH. You are correct. The gentleman pictures the future as one in which air travel joins hands with highway development.

May I say for the RECORD, that there is legislation pending in this House, of which I am the author, which would call for a Nation-wide survey of the need for an expanded airport system in this country.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In that connection, it is well to keep in mind in response to the question of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] that Mr. RANDOLPH'S amendment in section 5 provides for approximate routes and approximate costs of these highways, so as to eliminate any anticipated competition as to the location of these lines.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We here lay the ground work for future discussion and planning. Now is the time to proceed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I arise in support of the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 2798) which amends the Federal Highway Act approved on November 9, 1921.

A rather restricted and experimental measure was passed by Congress and approved July 11, 1916, but the great basic Federal Highway Act was passed by Congress and approved November 9, 1921. I regard that as one of the great constructive measures and policies of the Congress and the Nation.

When I first became a Member of Congress in 1919, I requested and was named as a member of the Committee on Roads of the House, and later on introduced the measure before the Roads Committee of the House that was in substance finally adopted and became the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921. I have consistently through the years given my support to amendments that would strengthen this legislation and have supported appropriations to carry out the purpose of that act to provide a unified, coordinated system of highways for the Nation and to aid the States in the building of such a system of highways. Under that act a great unified coordinated system of hard-surfaced roads has been built extending to every county seat and to every industrial and populace center of the Nation, and it has brought good roads to within 2 miles for at least 90 percent of the people of the United States. This system has been of inestimable value to the farmers in providing farm-to-market roads and comfort and pleasure to the farm population. It has contributed more than anything else to the development of our great automobile industry, to convenient truck and bus service. It has served as feeders to our water- and rail-transportation services by bringing the products of the forests, farms, and mines to the rail and water lines. This system of good roads has enabled tens of millions of Americans to see their country and become acquainted with their fellow Americans in all sections of the Nation. I have said many times, if we had had this great system of highways for a reasonable period before the Civil War, there likely would have been no Civil War. The North would have known their neighbors in the South and our citizens of the West would have become acquainted with their fellow Americans in the East. When we get to know each other well, we find that Americans are very much the same whether living in the North, South, East or West. Our system of highways has brought untold blessings to the American people.

I am in favor of the bill H. R. 2798. It modifies the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921. Under the original act no part of the Federal funds could be used in paying for the rights-of-way. This measure amends that act and provides the term "construction" means the supervision, inspection, and actual building and all expenses including the costs of rights-of-way incident to the construction of highways. If this measure becomes a law, the Federal Government may participate with the States in paying for the rights-of-way, the same as it now does in the actual building of the highways. In other words, the costs of rights-of-way become a part of the construction of Federal highways and the Federal Government may contribute for that purpose.

Under appropriations heretofore made by the Congress to aid the States in the construction of Federal-aid highways sums have been allotted to Kentucky and other States of the Union. These allotments or obligations will expire on June 20, 1943. On account of the war and the inability of the States to secure the necessary materials for the construction of highways, Kentucky and other States will not be able to use these Federal funds that have been allotted to them before June 30, 1943, and this money will revert to the Treasury. This measure preserves these funds to Kentucky and the other States until after the war and they can then be used to aid in the road-building program of the several States.

Section 3 of this bill provides that the United States Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to expend in cooperation with the highway departments of the several States for engineering and economic investigations of projects for future construction, surveys, plans, specifications, estimates for post-war highway improvements so much of the unobligated funds, Federal aid for secondary feeder roads and for the elimination of hazards of railroad grade crossings that now remain available to such States as may be adequate but not to exceed in any State an amount which would represent such State's share of $50,000,000 apportioned under the formula provided under section 21 of the Federal Highway Act, and the provision that the Federal Government may enter into agreements with any State highway department for such portion of the State highway department not exceeding the unobligated Federal funds due each of the several States. In other words, this authorizes the States to go ahead and make surveys, plans, specifications, estimates, and agreements for post-war highway projects. We are giving authority here for the highway departments of the several States to make plans for carrying on Federal highway projects after the war.

Section 4 amends section 6 of the Defense Highway Act approved on November 19, 1941, authorizing the expenditure for the purpose set forth in that act not to exceed $25,000,000.

There has been much discussion over a period of several years on the subject of building a system of express highways throughout the United States in Con-

gress and out. It has been urged that these express highways would be self-sustaining and should be built for handling busses and trucks, and especially truck transportation to relieve the congested condition of our highways and add to the safety of our highway travel.

Section 5 authorizes and directs the United States Commissioner of Public Roads to make a survey for the need of a system of express highways throughout the Nation, the number of such highways needed, the appropriate routes which they should follow and the approximate costs of construction and to report to the President and Congress within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act the results of such surveys together with such recommendations for legislation as deemed advisable. I think this is a very wise step and we are very fortunate indeed in having as the Commissioner of Public Roads Hon. Thomas McDonald. As I recall, he was appointed Director or Commissioner of Federal Highways about 1916, and he has continued in office ever since. To him, more than any other one person, is due the credit of laying out and constructing in cooperation with the States our wonderful unified system of highways. He has done a wonderful job, and in all of the years there has not been the slightest intimation that there was any graft or inefficiency in his administration of the Federal highway funds. I am convinced that he will bring to the President and Congress a most illuminating report under the authority granted under section 5 of this bill. He is so very competent from time to time our Government has loaned him to other nations in the Western Hemisphere to help plan and lay out their system of highways.

I am very glad indeed to give this measure my support, and I trust that the motion will prevail and that this measure will be passed without a dissenting vote.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, when this bill, H. R. 2798, was under discussion in the committee, I brought to the attention of the committee at that time a new paragraph which I thought should be placed in the bill. I was assured by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON], that this provision would be placed in the bill, inasmuch as I was compelled to be absent owing to the fact that I was named by the Speaker to accompany the body of our late colleague Mr. Englebright to his home. When I arrived in Washington I found that it had been left out of the bill altogether.

That provision deals with damage done by the Army and Navy to roads in practically every State in the Union at this time. Under section 10 of the by-laws the Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to reimburse the several States for the necessary damage caused by the Army or the Navy, but it does not go far enough to assist the States and cities when a private contractor doing work either for the Army or the Navy causes damage. The States and cities cannot be reimbursed under that provision.

You will find many States, many counties and municipalities in the United States at this time where the damage has run as high as $1,000,000, where large strips of road are a total loss, and which cannot be reimbursed under the provisions of this act. I was in the State of Oregon and I saw some of those instances; also in California and Illinois, where great damage has been done to our State, city, and county roads.

I am hopeful that when this bill reaches the Senate that provision will be placed in the bill by the Senate, and then the matter can be ironed out by the conferees of the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that this legislation will be passed. It is very much needed. But the provision I mentioned is one of the most urgent provisions to be placed in this particular bill at this time, because, as I stated, numerous cities of military importance on our coast, as well as thoroughfares, have been damaged. The damage has not been actually done by the Army or the Navy, but by contractors doing work for the Army and the Navy. Under the language of this bill they cannot be made to reimburse the respective municipalities and States.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. If the gentleman has no objection, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, Mr. WHITTINGTON, a question. What provision is made in this bill for cooperation between the Bureau of Public Roads and the Forest Service in the construction of access roads to open up the metal needed in our war effort?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I can answer that question. That is taken care of in section 4. Twenty-five million dollars is made available for access roads, chiefly access roads to mines, and so forth.

Mr. WHITE. You must remember the Forest Service has the engineering force and equipment to build these roads, but they must have the money, and there is no provision to supply that money.

Mr. ELLIOTT. One of the provisions of the bill, I will say to the gentleman from Idaho, takes care of access roads to mines, no matter whether they are in forest areas or not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is twofold. It has two main objectives, both of them are very simple and both are sound.

The first purpose of the bill is to prevent the reversion to the Federal road fund of Federal-aid money already allocated to the several States but which has not yet been obligated by those States for the reason that during the past year it has been practically impossible to build roads. The W. P. B. will not give priorities for road building because the critical materials which go into road construction, and the manpower required for road building are needed in other phases of the war effort. If this bill is passed the money which has already been allocated to the States under existing law and which under that law belongs to the States, will not revert to the general fund to be reapportioned. If the bill is not passed these funds will revert and the States will lose this money.

A second objective of the bill is the legal recognition of a fundamental fact which should have been recognized long ago—and that is that acquisition of rights-of-way is a proper and necessary part of road construction, and that planning and engineering and surveying are likewise a part of road construction.

In this bill, for the first time, the Congress recognizes the obligation of the Federal Government to participate with the States in this phase of road building, and, therefore, section 1 of the bill redefines the term "construction" to include acquisition of rights-of-way so that Federal-aid highway funds may be used for that purpose. It also recognizes the obligation of the Federal Government to participate with the States in road planning, particularly post-war planning, by making available to the States the sum of $50,000,000 to be used for post-war road planning, which sum will be matched by the States. Heretofore the States have borne the entire expense of both right-of-way purchases and of engineering and planning.

The bill is a very progressive one. It takes a definite step toward full participation by the Federal Government with the States in road building. It recognizes the fact, which many of us on the Roads Committee have so long urged, that the Federal Government should take a much greater part in road construction and should bear a much greater portion of the expense than it ever has before.

The building of an adequate highway system is no longer purely a State matter. It has become a national matter and it is fast becoming an international one.

The Federal Government has never contributed funds to the States for road building which were commensurate with the amount of money which the Federal Government takes each year from the road users of the several States through the imposition of the Federal gasoline tax. On the average we have allocated to the States each year an amount equivalent to less than one-half of the money which the Federal Government has collected each year from the road users of the States, and we have left the other half in the Federal Treasury to be used for purposes other than road building. That has never seemed to me to be fair or just or equitable, and, for my own part, I intend to continue to do everything I can to bring about enactment of legislation under which the Federal Government will contribute its full share of responsibility for the building and maintenance of our Federal highway system.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will pass because it will put Congress on record before the country as taking one very important and far-seeing step in the program of post-war reconstruction. When this war is over two compelling facts will face a nation confronted with meeting and solving vital post-war problems: First, a sadly deteriorated road system, and, second, millions of returned and returning servicemen and defense workers seeking and deserving employment.

Under a wartime economy neglect of our highways has been inevitable, but in the transition to the anticipated peacetime economy there will be few necessities which will deserve priority over the need of a well-integrated system of highways in a state of repair and improvement permitting safe and speedy traffic. To promptly rehabilitate our road system will call for an army of laborers which can be readily recruited from those whose services will be freely and urgently offered to follow war and defense services which will sooner or later become summarily terminated.

This bill insures to the several States the continued right to the use of Federal funds which were made available for Emergency highway transportation needs under the Defense Highway Act of 1941, but which have not been obligated, and, in most cases, could not be obligated because of wartime restrictions. And these funds may now be employed, if the bill is enacted, by the several States for surveys and for construction, including the costs of rights-of-way.

Engineering forces in the State highway departments have been seriously depleted, but such forces as are left intact may be set to work at once in the preparation of plans for post-war construction and for the acquiring of rights-of-way so that instead of a delay of a year or more when the war ends the States will be ready to start work at once.

We can hardly overestimate the value of this saving of a year's time in putting our highway and motor-transportation system in an adequate condition to carry the commerce of the country in a world at peace if the country is to take the place we want it to take in the commerce of the world.

Each of the States now has a system of highways which, taken together, form a national network which has become one of the most important of those facilities making up our boasted national economic system. Improvement of this system, necessarily interrupted by the prosecution of the war, may now be resumed as soon as the war is over when the States take advantage of the provisions of this bill.

There is no public work more useful than highway construction. It stimulates production as well as employment because it not only provides direct labor in many fields near the sources of labor but also provides labor in the production of equipment and machinery. It calls for materials of many sorts from many sources. It does not compete with private industry, but rather stimulates private industry and private enterprise by starting a chain of business activity which reaches into many channels and extends back through the mines and the mills and through an ever widening cycle of business contacts it plays an important part in creating and maintaining what we call good times.

Enactment of this bill will be acclaimed by all who are looking to the Congress to begin now to legislate in anticipation of the day when we shall face the difficult task of setting up the stabilizing constituents of a civilian peacetime economy to displace the total war economy of today.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very timely that road legislation is being brought to us for consideration. The farmers are interested in this legislation, especially where it refers to farm-to-market roads. There are thousands of miles of farm-to-market or feeder roads which have had very little attention and which must be made all-weather roads. Farm-to-market or feeder roads and our post roads must be made all-weather roads in order that we can solve our distribution and transportation problem as it relates to the plan for the future construction of superhighways.

The importance of rural road improvement is shown in the 1940 census figures which indicate that a total of 4,144,136 passenger automobiles and 1,047,084 motortrucks are owned on 4,486,220 farms. The obsolescence of these roads is indicated by the fact that in one prewar year more than 27,000 of the 39,500 traffic-accident deaths occurred on rural highways.

It is absolutely essential that the American farmer be lifted out of the mud, into which many of the country roads are transformed during wet weather. The post-war period must bring to the American farm population a Nation-wide system of modern, all-weather roads.

I favor the passage of H. R. 2798 which is a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes", approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented. The bill is a substitute for H. R. 2113, upon which the members of the House Committee on Roads held extensive hearings on May 14, 15, 17, and 20, 1943. The hearings on this bill are very important and should be read by every Member of the House who realizes that our road-construction program had just begun when war hostilities started and when much of the construction program had to be curtailed in order that we could concentrate our road work on military or defense highways. The report contains some interesting tables, one showing unobligated balances of regular funds, availability of which will expire on June 30, 1943, as of April 30, 1943.

The unobligated balances of regular funds in my State of Nebraska show that in the highway fund we have $1,810,155; for secondary or feeder roads $348,653; for grade crossings $186,780, or a total of $2,345,588 of unobligated balances of regular funds.

The second table in the report which accompanies this bill shows balances of funds apportioned to all States available for programmed projects as of April 30, 1943, and this table indicates that in Nebraska we have for the regular Federal aid $3,029,640; for Federal aid, secondary roads, $691,898; and for Federal aid, grade crossing roads, $515,703; or a total of $4,237,433.

Under the Defense Highway Act of 1941, funds were made available to the various States in accordance with a formula provided by law in order to meet the emergency highway transportation needs. Because of the difficulty in obtaining labor, equipment, and materials, it has been impossible for the States to obligate these funds. Section 5 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 provides that these funds, together with all Federal road funds apportioned to the States prior to December 31, 1941, if not obligated by the States on or before June 30, 1943, shall be reapportioned among the States. The section further provides that no State having an unobligated balance in its road fund shall be entitled to participate in the reapportionment. The most pressing reason for the passage of the legislation now under consideration is the provision found in section 2 of H. R. 2798, which would prevent the reversion and reapportionment of these funds.

The remaining sections of the bill would lay the ground work for a well-planned program of essential road construction and repair to be commenced at the end of the war.

Because of the great interest Nebraska has in this program, I urge the passage of the bill because we in Nebraska are anxious that the Federal- and State-aid program be continued in order that we can complete a well-thought-out and a well-considered road program which includes the completion of thousands of miles of farm-to-market or secondary roads.

We are also interested in the passage of this bill because, under existing law, the cost of rights-of-way in the construction of roads under the Federal-aid program is left to be met by the States without Federal participation. Section 1 of this bill would amend the definition of the word "construction" as found in section 2 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, so that costs of rights-of-way may be included as part of the construction costs and may be shared by the State and Federal Governments on the same basis as other items of construction.

Regarding the reversion and reapportionment of highway funds, one section

of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 provides that any Federal funds apportioned to States prior to December 31, 1941, pursuant to existing Federal-aid road legislation, which shall not be obligated on or before June 30, 1943, shall be reapportioned immediately thereafter among the States in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, except that any State or States which shall not have so obligated said funds on June 30, 1943, shall not be entitled to share in such reapportionment. I am informed that up to this time no State has been able to obligate all the funds allotted to it. This is true, not because the need for road construction, maintenance, and repair is not critical, but because labor, materials, and equipment have been assigned to work which the Government has regarded as even more urgent. Since my State could not qualify, section 5 of the Defense Highway Act, if allowed to operate on these unobligated funds, would place the Federal Government in the position of having reacquired funds for reapportionment among the States and finding no State eligible to participate—and not due to any lack of diligence or good faith on the part of the States.

Therefore, the second section of this bill would correct this situation created by section 5 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 by providing that the unobligated balances shall remain available for obligation by the States during the continuance of the emergency and for 1 year thereafter.

The second section of this bill would also correct another serious situation. Under existing law, unobligated funds apportioned to the States since December 31, 1941, which would not be affected by section 5 of the Defense Highway Act, would revert to the general road fund, according to the terms of their authorization, on July 1, 1944. In other words, all the funds now apportioned to the States under the various Federal highway acts will revert to the Federal road fund either on July 1, 1943, or July 1, 1944, unless the States have obligated these funds before the time has expired, or unless remedial legislation, such as the legislation we have before us, is passed to allow the use of the funds on a broader scale and to prevent the reversion of the unused amounts.

The committee was wise in drawing this bill in that it provides for some post-war planning. You will find that section 3 of the bill, together with section 1, which includes the cost of rights-of-way as part of "construction" as defined in the basic Federal Highway Act, would authorize the expenditure by each State of an amount which would not exceed that State's share of $50,000,000, apportioned among the States, for making surveys, engineering and economic investigations of projects for future construction and for the purchase of rights-of-way. The object of section 3 in this bill is to provide advance planning of highway improvement projects so that they may be placed under construction immediately at the close of the present war to meet the future highway transportation needs, and, if necessary, to provide employment for the men and materials to be released at the end of the war.

Those of you who listened to the speech by the gentleman from Pensylvania, the Honorable J. BUELL SNYDER, on his proposed super-highway program will readily admit that the House Committee on Roads has given much study to post-war planning so far as road construction is concerned. Right along that line, section 5 of the bill authorizes and directs the Commissioner of Public Roads to make a survey of the need for a system of express highways throughout the United States, the approximate number and routes of such highways and the probable cost of such a system. The Commissioner is directed to report the results of the survey to the President and to Congress within 6 months after the date of the enactment of the act.

Due to the fact that the Pennsylvania Turnpike connects with Highway No. 30 near Pittsburgh and due to the fact that the map which was displayed by Mr. SNYDER recently on the floor of this House would indicate that the turnpike would be connected with Highway No. 30 going west, I feel that some consideration should be given to the program of express highways after the war is over. This Highway No. 30 goes through my State and is one of the most heavily traveled highways in the Midwest. It should be considered in post-war highway planning.

I feel that the committee has done valuable work in including feeder roads to sources of raw materials in this proposed legislation. Section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended by the act of July 2, 1942, provides that of the $260,000,000 fund made available for access roads, $10,000,000, now almost exhausted, shall be available for access roads to sources of raw materials. That limitation has operated to prevent construction of many projects which have been certified as important to the national defense. So the purpose of one section in this bill—section 4—is to raise this limitation to $25,000,000 and make it possible to use more of the access-road funds for building these roads to sources of critical raw materials. Such roads are of the low-type construction into mining and timber areas to make it possible to develop mines and produce needed raw materials and make them available for use in the war effort. I feel that the removal of this limitation is of the utmost importance.

Mr. Speaker, this bill reflects very careful study of present and future highway construction. The bill was well considered by the House Committee on Roads which merits much commendation. I see in this legislation much of the work which has been done in research and study for post-war planning by Mr. Thomas McDonald, the director of our road bureau; by Mr. Charles Upham, the great road engineer of the American Road Builders Association; the work of great road machinery construction people; great highway engineers and some of our great American material men. I feel that the combined efforts of these American road builders is reflected in this legislation along with the excellent work of every member of the House Committee on Roads. It has been my experience to learn that this committee gives unusual and serious study to all of the legislation which is proposed to it. I am happy to note that the fundamental principles in the American Road Builders' Association post-war program finds its initial start in this legislation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this bill has the approval of the Association of State Highway Officials. Failure to pass this legislation would place a penalty on those States which have been economical and restricted expansion to aid the war effort and at the same time grant a bonus to the spendthrift States. It enables the State highway engineers of each State as well as the District of Columbia to plan now for the post-war period and thus be ready to furnish immediate employment for the discharged soldiers. These State highway associations have their personnel but not much work for them to do during the emergency. The passage of this bill will enable them to turn their forces loose acquiring or selecting rights-of-way, and drawing plans and specifications for the highways to be repaired and built at the close of the emergency, so that when the boys come back from the service they will have work to put them on at once without having to consume time to acquire rights of way and draw plans and specifications.

Every State in the Union, including the District of Columbia, will benefit by this legislation. Under the Defense Highway Act of 1941 funds were made available to the several States to meet emergency highway needs. This act also provided that unless the funds were obligated by the several States by June 30, 1943, the money would be reapportioned. The States, as explained by the gentleman from Mississippi, the gentleman from Michigan, and others, were unable to obligate these funds because of the emergency. The Emergency Highway Act of 1941 also provided that no State having an unobligated balance to its credit could participate in any of the reapportionment. Since all of the States, including the District of Columbia, have an unobligated amount to their credit, this means that the reapportionment of this fund, if this legislation is not enacted into law, will result in all the States losing the amount that was apportioned to them originally and therefore each State of the Union would suffer by the failure of this act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman yields back 1½ minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the House is considering H. R. 2798, reported by the Committee on Roads, an act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

I am very much interested in this road legislation. Under the existing law the Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to reimburse the several States for the necessary rehabilitation or for the repair of roads and highways of States, of their subdivisions substantially damaged by the Army, or Navy, or both. However, it does not provide reimbursement for the damage that is caused by a person having a contract from the Army or Navy. In my own congressional district, and more particularly in the cities of Oakland, Berkeley, Alameda, Richmond, Hayward, and San Leandro, a great deal of damage has been caused by contractors operating heavy trucks over the streets of these cities. Said contractors were working on Army and Navy contracts.

I regret to say that this present bill does not cover the situation of a contractor working for the Army and Navy Departments, and I had intended to offer an amendment along this line. However, I have the assurance of the various members of the House Committee on Roads that it is proposed to insert such an amendment in the Senate, and I have been requested not to offer the amendment at this time in the House. I will conform to the expressed wishes of the membership of the Roads Committee. I am very glad to support this legislation today, and trust that it will pass the House without serious opposition and I also am hopeful an amendment as above indicated will be placed in the bill in the Senate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to urge upon the Members present the passage of H. R. 2798. This bill is of the utmost importance to the future of the highways of our States and Nation.

Under the Defense Highway Act of 1941, funds were made available to the various States in accordance to a formula provided by law in order to meet the emergency highway transportation needs. Because of the difficulty in obtaining labor, equipment, and material, the States have been unable to use all of these funds, and there still remains unused by the States over $171,000,000. This act will prevent the reversion of these unused funds back into the Federal Treasury and will keep them apportioned among the States to be used at the end of the war emergency.

One provision of the act would amend the present highway law so that costs of right-of-way may be included as part of construction costs and may be shared by the State and Federal Government on the same basis as other items of construction. My State has desired this for many years.

Certain funds are divided and apportioned among the States for the purpose of making engineering surveys and economic investigations of projects with a view of construction after the war. This will make it possible to start work on these State and Federal highways, secondary and feeder roads as soon as hostilities cease. That will result in the immediate employment following the war emergency of hundreds of thousands of men in highway construction over the United States.

Another provision increases the amount of money that may be spent during the war for access roads to sources of raw materials from $10,000,000 to $25,000,000. These roads into mining camps and forests are of low-type construction and will open up many more mines and timber areas for development. There probably is no single piece of legislation that will do more to aid in the present and future use of our highways than H. R. 2798. It will lead to the development of much inaccessible raw material so badly needed in our war effort at this time and will retain for use after the war a substantial sum of money for the development of feeder, secondary, and main highways of our Nation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] spoke of the necessity of repairs on account of damage by war contractors and has brought up a very important question. It is fair to say that this question was not overlooked by the committee. The testimony of the gentleman was really the only direct testimony as to any particular damage brought to the attention of the committee during the progress of these hearings, and it is fair to say that the chairman of the committee has introduced a resolution for the appointment of committees among other things to look into the damage done, it being kept in mind that under the Defense Highway Act while emergency repairs made necessary by the Army and Navy use are provided for, the difficulty is to say where and when and what type of damage is caused by the Army and Navy.

As a matter of fact all our transportation facilities are being used to their uttermost and it is difficult to say what part of the damage occurring on any highway including those to defense plants is attributable to the war. For this reason the reconstruction and rebuilding of highways will involve enormous sums and in certain instances the relocation of the highway. As I say, the committee has in mind reporting at an early date a program to provide large amounts to be expended by the Federal Government in highway construction following the war that will involve the reconstruction and repair of damages to existing highways.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. How will such a bill take care of the cost of those roads that have already been replaced by counties and States?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say that until we have some more experience under the authority of section 10 of the Defense Highway Act it will be rather difficult for the committee to formulate the legislation that is necessary to provide for the rehabilitation that is needed not only in his area but in other areas of the country as well.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired, all time has expired.

The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the bill be passed?

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on this bill may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

DIRECTING SECRETARY OF LABOR TO MAKE AN INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF ABSENTEEISM

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2553) directing the Secretary of Labor to make an investigation and study of the extent and causes of absenteeism and to make available the facilities of the Department of Labor to act as a clearing house for information on methods to control absenteeism.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]?

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

EXTENSION OF TIME IN WHICH SUIT OR SUITS MAY BE BROUGHT UNDER ACT OF JUNE 28, 1938

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 1947) to extend the time within which suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the bill that was called up on the Consent Calendar a short time ago and objected to?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; but I may say to the gentleman from California that the gentleman from Georgia who first objected withdrew his objection. Later on the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr.

KEEFE] objected, but the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], as I understand it, is willing now that the bill be considered without objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, as is well known by the gentleman from Montana, there are certain Members of this House who are designated the official objectors on either side of the aisle. They are not here at this time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. They were all here when the bill was called and considered.

Mr. CARTER. I do not know if the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] had not objected that there would not be an objection from some of them.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say that the matter was presented when the official objectors were here and there was no objection made by the official objectors. The gentleman from Georgia originally objected on the ground he had no knowledge or information sufficient on which to base an opinion. After he ascertained the facts he withdrew his objection and the gentleman from Wisconsin who is now speaking interposed an objection.

I may say to the membership of the House that I have acquainted myself with the facts in reference to this bill and I find that there should be no objection to it, therefore I withdraw any objection that I offered a few moments ago.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Montana very briefly tell us what the bill does?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I will state what the bill does. In 1938 the Congress passed an act giving the Ute Indians of Utah the right to file a claim in the Court of Claims against the Government involving the value of some land that the Indians claimed had been unlawfully taken from them. There was an expiring date on that right to file the suit of June 28, 1943.

The reason why suit has not been filed is because two members of the law firm who represented the Ute Indians are now in the service of the Army or Navy.

Mr. CARTER. How long a time will this be extended?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is extended until 1946. I may say further that this bill has the support of the Interior Department and likewise the Commissioner of Indian Affairs who believe the Indians should have their day in court. That is in substance what the bill is.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. My investigation discloses the facts to be that the attorneys who were handling these claims for the Indians purposely refrained from starting suit on the items that are now open because of the fact that they were in negotiation with the Interior Department and it was expected, and still is expected, that these matters on which suit has not been instituted will be settled by agreement without the necessity of commencing suit; but they are under the necessity of either commencing this suit before the expiration date, which is about 20 days hence, or they will lose their right to commence suit. If they do commence action it is expected that that will set aside all of the efforts toward negotiations that have been had in the past. I believe we will be doing a good thing if we extend the time on the basis of those facts which I have ascertained.

Mr. CARTER. Does not the gentleman think that is an unusually long time to extend that right? That is a period of 3 years, as I understand it.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not think so, under the circumstances, due to the fact I have also ascertained that the two men in Mr. Wilkerson's office who represent these Indian tribes and who had the active handling of these particular claims have entered the armed forces and there is no one in the office who is familiar with these claims, and who can within the time limit properly prepare the petition in order to get the claims in the Court of Claims.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Montana, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment on any and all claims which the Ute Indians or any tribe or band thereof may have against the United States and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209), be, and the same hereby is, extended until 1 year after the termination of hostilities by the United States in the present World War.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out the words "1 year after the termination of hostilities by the United States in the present World War" and substitute therefor "December 31, 1946."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article entitled "Women at Work."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 93]

Barry	Fulmer	O'Toole
Bell	Furlong	Pfeifer
Bradley, Mich.	Gavagan	Philbin
Brehm	Gibson	Pracht
Buckley	Gossett	Rees, Kans.
Bulwinkle	Grant, Ala.	Rivers
Byrne	Gross	Rizley
Cannon, Fla.	Hébert	Robinson, Utah
Capozzoli	Heffernan	Rogers, Calif.
Celler	Hendricks	Russell
Chenoweth	Holifield	Sabath
Cochran	Holmes, Mass.	Sasscer
Cole, N. Y.	Hope	Scanlon
Colmer	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Smith, W. Va.
Costello	Johnson, Okla.	Stanley
Crawford	Kelley	Steagall
Culkin	Kennedy	Stearns, N. H.
Cullen	King	Talbot
Curley	LeCompte	Taylor
Dawson	LeFevre	Thomas, N. J.
Dies	Lynch	Tolan
Dirksen	McGehee	Treadway
Domengeaux	McGranery	Van Zandt
Doughton	McGregor	Vinson, Ga.
Douglas	Marcantonio	Voorhis, Calif.
Drewry	Merrow	Wadsworth
Eaton	Monkiewicz	Weichel, Ohio
Eberharter	Mundt	Wheat
Feighan	Nichols	Whelchel, Ga.
Fitzpatrick	O'Brien, N. Y.	Worley
Flannagan	O'Leary	
Fogarty		

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty-eight Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) "making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 59.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, and 58; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to

the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,497,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lines 11, 12, and 13 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the proviso.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"BITUMINOUS COAL DIVISION

"For the Bituminous Coal Division, fiscal year 1943, in carrying out the purposes of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended (15 U. S. C. 828–849), as further amended by the Act of April 24, 1943 (Public Law 40), and as further amended, to be supplemental to and merged with the appropriation under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943, and to be available for the same objects of expenditure, $700,000, to continue available during the fiscal year 1944."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, 8, 37, 41, 60, and 61.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
R. B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Nos. 1, 2, and 3, relating to the Senate: Provides $15,456 for payment of pages for the Senate Chamber and $13,592 for the Senate restaurants, all as proposed by the Senate.

No. 4: Appropriates $10,600 for Capitol Buildings under the Architect of the Capitol, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 6 and 7, relating to the War Production Board: Appropriates $4,497,000, instead of $4,597,000 as proposed by the Senate and $4,363,000 as proposed by the House and in so doing eliminates $100,000 proposed by the Senate for work during part of the month of June to increase lumber production and fixes the limitation for printing and binding at $834,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House.

No. 9: Appropriates $16,000 as proposed by the Senate for the Office of Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, which office was extended until August 24, 1943, by the act of May 24, 1943, and eliminates the proviso attached to the appropriation making availability of the amount contingent upon the enactment of the new law.

Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33, relating to the District of Columbia: Appropriates $4,000 for postage; $1,675 for judicial expenses; $108.40 for general advertising, fiscal year 1941; $8,200 for printing and binding; $35,000 for refund of erroneous collections; $3,472.39 for payment to Joseph Sharfsin; $28,500 for maintenance expenses of the Tuberculosis Sanatoria; $5,464.14 for salaries for municipal court employees; $6,036.58 for support of convicts; $4,562 for support of boys in the National Training School for Boys; $4,500 for deportation of nonresident insane; $453.12 for the militia, fiscal year 1941; $2,152.54 for settlement of claims and suits; $11,418.75 for judgments against the District; $1,037.94 for audited claims, fiscal year 1940 and prior years; $589,093 for temporary increase in compensation under the act of April 1, 1943, for employees of the District of Columbia; $468.19 for expenses of the Department of Vehicles and Traffic, fiscal year 1941; $7,426.65 for refund of paving assessments under the act of April 23, 1924, as amended; and $174,763 for operation of the Washington Aqueduct; all as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 34 and 35: Appropriates $700,000, instead of $800,000 as proposed by the Senate, for salaries and expenses of the Bituminous Coal Division until August 24, 1943, under the act of May 24, 1943, and eliminates the proviso attached to the appropriation making availability thereof contingent upon the enactment of the new law.

No. 36: Appropriates $20,000 for maintenance of the Wapato irrigation and drainage system, Yakima Reservation, Wash., under the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 38, 39, and 40, relating to the government of the Virgin Islands: Appropriates $7,000 for salaries and expenses, government of the Virgin Islands, and $2,100 for salaries and expenses, agricultural experiment station and vocational school, Virgin Islands, all as proposed by the Senate.

No. 42: Increases the limitation of $19,950 on the amount expendable for the fiscal year 1943 for administrative expenses, Puerto Rican hurricane relief, to $22,350, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, and 51, relating to the Post Office Department: Appropriates $8,800 for clerks, division headquarters, Office of the Chief Inspector; $14,000 for Star Route Service, fiscal year 1942; $5,375,000 for Railway Mail Service; $375,000 for railway postal clerks, travel allowance; $3,000 for Railway Mail Service, traveling expenses; $192,541 for the fiscal year 1941, and $327,891 for the fiscal year 1942, for domestic air-mail service; and $110,000, fiscal year 1942, and $660,000, fiscal year 1943, for indemnities, domestic mail; all as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 52 and 56: Transfers the appropriation of $44,800 out of the Soldiers' Home trust fund for payment of overtime compensation from the applicability of the Overtime War Compensation Act, 1943, and makes payment subject to the regulation of the board of commissioners of the National Soldiers' Home.

Nos. 53, 54, 55, 57, and 58, relating to war overtime pay and other compensation increases: Appropriates $28,700, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $22,700, as proposed by the House, for Freedmen's Hospital; appropriates $10,000 for foreign quarantine service, Public Health Service, as proposed by the Senate, and corrects applicable totals.

No. 59: Restores the language of the House bill, stricken out by the Senate, providing that for the purposes of the general citizenship requirements of section 302 an affidavit signed by any concerned person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of the section with respect to the status of such person have been complied with.

AMENDMENTS REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments of the Senate are reported in disagreement:

No. 5: Relating to the President's emergency fund.

No. 8: Increasing for the fiscal year 1943 to $294,430 the amount that may be used by the War Shipping Administration for traveling expenses. House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 37: Appropriating $400,000 to enable the Geological Survey to meet obligations incurred by it arising from cooperative work pending reimbursement. House managers will move to recede and concur.

No. 41: Appropriating $45,000 for defraying deficits in treasuries of municipal governments, Virgin Islands. House managers will move to recede and concur.

Nos. 60 and 61: Relating to the employment of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett. House managers will move to insist on House amendments.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the amount carried by this bill as it passed the House was $134,096,279.86. When it reached the Senate, the Senate added amendments aggregating $9,534,311.70, so that the bill went to conference providing appropriations totaling $143,430,591.56.

In conference the Senate receded from $200,000 of the $9,534,311.70 and the House agreed to the remaining $9,334,311.70 proposed by the Senate.

Six amendments remain in disagreement, and will be taken up in their order as soon as the conference report is disposed of. The first relates to limitation of the President's emergency fund and will doubtless occasion some discussion. The remaining five are of minor importance—with the possible exception of the last, dealing with the provision relating to Messrs Watson, Dodd, and Lovett, reported by the Kerr committee—and will require little, if any, debate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The conference report is unanimous on the part of the conferees?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The conference report has the unanimous approval of all House conferees on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 5: Page 3, line 16, strike out "*Provided*, That no part of the funds continued available by this paragraph shall be allotted to or expended for the National Resources Planning Board or the Farm Security Administration or for any of the functions of either said Board or said Administration", and

insert "*Provided*, That no part of the funds continued available by this paragraph shall be allotted to or expended for any of the functions of any agency of Government for which appropriations have been duly made by the Congress, or for the functions of any agency for which estimates have been submitted by the Budget and for which the Congress has failed to make appropriations: *Provided further*, That this limitation shall not apply to allottments or allocations made to the War Department or the Navy Department."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 5 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit all of the matter stricken out and all of the matter inserted by such amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a preferential motion. I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of that motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 5?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 128, noes 0.

So the motion to recede was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows: Omit all of the matter stricken out and all of the matter inserted by such amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second on that motion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on my motion.

Mr. TABER. I demand a second on that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. On what does the gentleman demand a second?

Mr. TABER. On the motion for the previous question.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we have 20 minutes on a side. I have moved the previous question. Therefore, when the gentleman demands a second, we have 20 minutes on a side.

The SPEAKER. The previous question must be ordered before any time at all is fixed.

The question is on the motion for the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 43, noes 111.

So the motion for the previous question was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute for the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to substitute for the Cannon amendment an amendment as follows: Add to the language of the Senate amendment No. 5 the following: "or the Department of State or the Office of Strategic Services."

Mr. TABER. On that motion I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire 20 minutes of debate on each side now?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the man who left his impress on human institutions more indelibly than any other man who ever lived, expressed his life policy in a single sentence, "This one thing I do."

Likewise the American people have today one dominant purpose—to win the war; to win it as quickly and win it as cheaply as it can be won—but to win the war. Anything that interferes with that purpose, and anything that does not contribute to that purpose, has no place today in the national program or in this legislation.

Judged by that standard, the proposal presented by the substitute amendment of the gentleman from New York is not in harmony with the war program. It will contribute nothing to the winning of the war. On the contrary, it will seriously interfere with the prompt and successful prosecution of the war.

Let us examine the amendment and its effect if agreed to. What does the amendment involve? When this bill first came to the floor it carried an appropriation for the President's emergency fund. The President's emergency fund is a vital part of the war program. Such funds have been provided in every war fought by the United States. Always in time of war we have made provision for an emergency fund to be handled secretly at the discretion of the Commander in Chief. Obviously we cannot notify Berlin and Tokyo as to our plans, what expenditures we are making, or what we are buying with the money. It is, therefore, indispensable that a secret fund be available under the control of the President which he can use at any time in any emergency and without restrictions. Such a fund was made available to President McKinley in the Spanish-American War. Such a fund was provided for President Wilson in the World War. And on each occasion it was appropriated by Congress without any limitation whatever.

In keeping with that precedent, and in conformity with the needs of modern warfare, the committee in originally reporting this bill to the House, and in response to a recommendation by the Bureau of the Budget, included an amount for the President's emergency fund. It was precisely the same appropriation—although in smaller amount—which had been made for McKinley and Wilson.

But when the bill came to the floor—contrary to the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations; contrary to the recommendation of its subcommittee; contrary to the recommendation of the members in charge of the bill—an amendment was offered to limit the President's control of the fund.

The amendment was adroitly worded. It named two purposes of expenditure against which there was great prejudice and for which appropriations had been previously denied. It denied the President the right to expend any of this fund for the National Planning Board, or for Farm Security, although there was no thought of using it for either purpose and, now, no possibility under the law of expending any of it for either purpose.

Now let it be said again, as it was said before, that the issue before us, neither at the time nor now, is the National Planning Board or Farm Security.

I approve of appropriations for both purposes, as I stated at that time and as I state now. But regardless of how ardently I or anybody else may desire it, not a dollar can be taken from the President's fund for either purpose for the simple reason that in other legislation, diversions from the President's emergency fund for the Planning Board and Farm Security have been expressly prohibited. The House denied funds for the National Resources Planning Board in the independent offices appropriation bill and the Senate restored them and denied supplementary funds from any other source, which, of course, included the President's emergency fund. The House denied funds for farm security in the agricultural appropriation bill and the Senate restored them and denied supplementary funds from any other source, which, of course, included the President's emergency fund. So an amendment to this bill denying funds for either the Planning Board or Farm Security from the President's emergency fund is futile and superfluous on the face of it.

Nor is there occasion for anxiety about any of the other prohibitions set out in the pending substitute amendment. They are offered in the same spirit which prompted the amendment against the Planning Board and Farm Security. That is not the issue raised by this amendment. That is not the purport of this amendment. The purport of this amendment is to register lack of confidence in the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy who has control of this secret fund. The purpose is to suggest that he cannot be trusted to spend it for patriotic purposes; that he will divert money from this fund to purposes not in keeping with the war program.

Now, I ask you if such an amendment, an amendment casting aspersions on the Commander in Chief and notifying the Nation at home, and our allies and enemies abroad, that the Congress has lost confidence in the integrity and patriotism of the President in his prosecution of the war—I ask you if such an amendment will contribute in this national crisis to the winning of the war? Will we be nearer to success in the war if this doubting-Thomas amendment is agreed to than if it is disagreed to? That is the issue on which you are voting in

disposing of this amendment. There can be no other issue.

I have no objection to criticism of the President. That is a God-given right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. That is a right for which we are fighting in this war. But this amendment expressing lack of confidence in the President is more than criticism. It charges design to divert vital war funds from the prosecution of the war. It charges maladministration which would be ground for impeachment. Will an amendment implying such charges help win the war—will such an amendment help America in this hour of need?

But this amendment is more than an expression of lack of confidence. It amounts to a prohibition of the use of the emergency fund. And I quote the highest authority to that effect, a letter just received from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The letter which is directed at the Senate amendment, but which applies even more forcibly to the pending substitute amendment, is as follows:

MAY 31, 1943.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CANNON: I wish to call your attention to the action of the Senate in amending the provision in the urgent deficiency bill relating to the President's fund. This amendment reads:

"*Provided*, That no part of the funds continued available by this paragraph shall be allotted to or expended for any of the functions of any agency of Government for which appropriations have been duly made by the Congress, or for the functions of any agency for which estimates have been submitted by the Bureau of the Budget and for which the Congress has failed to make appropriations: *Provided further*, That this limitation shall not apply to allotments or allocations made to the War Department or the Navy Department."

The effect of this amendment is to so hamper and restrict the President in his use of these funds that they would be of very little value to him and would not at all serve the purpose for which Congress established the funds.

This amendment would forbid the allotment or expenditure of funds for any agency of the Government for which Congress has made appropriations, excepting the War and Navy Departments. It would prevent the allocation of funds for any agency for which estimates had been submitted by the Bureau of the Budget and for which Congress had failed to make appropriations. This would seem to contradict the language of the appropriations for the President's fund which provides:

"To enable the President, through appropriate agencies of the Government, to provide for emergencies affecting the national security and defense and for each and every purpose connected therewith, and to make all necessary expenditures incident thereto for any purpose for which the Congress has previously made appropriation or authorization" (Public, No. 678, 77th Cong.).

It is not quite clear to me for just what functions or purposes this appropriation would be available in 1944. Certainly no agency that has an appropriation or for which an estimate has been submitted and Congress has failed to make an appropriation would be eligible for an allocation of funds. There are, or will be by 1944, practically no agencies of Government not covered by these two categories. The only way in which this allocation can be spent is to create a new agency or to make an allocation to the Army or Navy. Since the Chief of Staff now has a discretionary fund at his disposal which is both larger and less restricted than the authority granted to the President, it hardly seems likely that future allocations of any importance will be made to the War Department.

You may recall our correspondence in connection with the Mexican railroad project in the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs in which you and the committee agreed that the project should continue to be financed by allocation from the President's emergency fund up to the total amount of $7,500,000. It is my understanding that the amendment would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of any part of this allocation after the date of enactment of the bill because this is a function of the Office of the Coordinator, an "agency of Government for which appropriations have been duly made by Congress." Similar situations would arise with most of the allocations now in force because following the language of the appropriation, the funds have been allocated for expenditure "through appropriate agencies of Government."

As was stated in the hearings before your committee, about $12,500,000 were allocated in the first 4 months of this fiscal year, $10,500,000 of which were to the State Department for confidential purposes, and the remainder for purposes and reasons which were set forth in a supplementary memorandum to your committee. This does not seem to me to constitute any abuse of the authority lodged in the President, nor indicate any necessity for the restrictions on the use of the fund involved in the Senate amendment.

I strongly urge that in the conference with the Senate you insist upon the elimination of this item since the restriction is unnecessary and destroys the effectiveness of the fund.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE COY,
Acting Director.

Mr. Speaker, Pizarro with his sword drew a line in the sand and invited all those who would go forward to step across the line. And those who stepped forward won a new world. We draw a line on this amendment and invite all who are solely interested in winning the war to cast a forward looking vote—a vote that will defend and preserve the New World.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will not vote for the substitute without a full understanding of its meaning and implications.

I hope the House in this time of war, when the very life of our Nation is at stake, will not vote to put the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy in a strait jacket, as far as the use of emergency funds is concerned. I believe it is true that Congress has given the President entirely too many blank checks in years past. I am against every form of blank-check appropriation that is not related to the war and I hope Congress will not give any more blank checks. The only kind of blank check for which there is any justification, in my opinion, is the President's emergency fund.

Most of this fund is used through the State Department to finance highly confidential and secret activities which by their nature cannot be divulged but which are very important toward winning victory for us and our allies.

To say that President Roosevelt shall be denied in the greatest of all wars the use of an emergency fund which other war Presidents have had and which they have found very useful, is to my mind unthinkable. In the Spanish-American War Congress gave President McKinley an emergency fund of $50,000,000 and provided that this grant was to be "for national security and defense and for each and every purpose connected therewith, to be expended in the discretion of the President."

When the World War broke out Congress gave President Wilson an emergency fund of $100,000,000 to be expended by him with the same plenary authority that was conveyed in the former statute granting an emergency fund to President McKinley. Later in World War No. 1 President Wilson's emergency fund was increased by $50,000,000. The wars in which Presidents McKinley and Wilson led us were pigmies compared with the titanic struggle in which we are now involved. With free institutions tumbling to destruction all around the world and with the flower of our young manhood engulfed in the bloodiest war of all times, are we going to reverse these historic precedents and deny to President Roosevelt the use of an emergency fund which other Presidents have employed to advantage in the most crucial periods of our Nation's history?

Under the language of the Senate amendment the President's emergency fund would be nullified as far as useful activities connected with winning the war are concerned but it could be used for other purposes for which Congress has not given its approval. For instance, as a possible case, if Congress should decide against appropriating any money to evacuate American nationals from Turkey, on the ground that they were in no danger, and then Turkey should be sucked into the war, the President could not use any part of his emergency fund to evacuate our nationals even though by the new and unexpected turn of affairs they might be brought into the gravest danger.

On the other hand, under the language of the Senate amendment, the President could use his emergency fund to build the Florida ship canal because the Florida ship canal has been authorized but not appropriated for, and no Budget estimate has been submitted to Congress for it.

The Senate amendment, while putting hobbles and handicaps on the President, concludes with an anomalous grant of authority which enables him to make allocations from the fund to the War Department. The irony of this lies in the fact that the Chief of Staff already has an emergency fund to be spent in his discretion amounting to $125,000,000 while the balance in the President's emergency fund amounts to only $89,000,000. It ought to be obvious that there is no need of a transfer of money from the President's emergency fund to the emergency fund of the Chief of Staff.

In former wars there was no report of emergency fund expenditures until after the war was over. After World War No. 1 a Republican Congress made an issue of the delay in reporting and it was long after the war when President Wilson submitted a report. President Roosevelt is taking Congress into his confidence with as complete contemporaneous reports as can be made and these are being printed and made public in our committee hearings.

If the language of the Senate amendment is adopted we might just as well repeal the President's emergency fund. All of the activities for which it was created will be strangled by that amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Would the gentleman be good enough to explain the import of his inclusion of strategic services in this amendment?

Mr. TABER. It is an independent agency set up by an Executive order and is not directly a part of either the War Department or the Navy Department. It is one of the things that might perhaps require funds of an emergency character that might possibly be needed for the carrying on of our war effort.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Then the point of view brought forth by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], in that connection is not correct, and your amendment would be helpful to the Office of Strategic Services?

Mr. TABER. My amendment would permit the emergency fund of the President, which presently consists of about $90,000,000, to be allotted either to the War Department, the Navy Department, the State Department—which has very many unusual functions in these days—or to the Office of Strategic Services. The Senate amendment would not permit of any allotment to any set-up, as I understand it, outside of the War and Navy Departments. The Senate approved that amendment unanimously.

The reason why these restrictions have come up from time to time is this: The President has on occasions allocated large sums of money for things that were not necessary, that did not contribute to the war effort, like the St. Lawrence waterway proposition, which manifestly was not something that was a part of the war effort.

The previous amendments that the House has placed upon the language of the President's fund resulted in this: That allotments might be made for any purpose for which the Congress had previously made appropriations or granted authorizations. Under that no allotments can be made for anything unless previous appropriations or authorizations had been made by the Congress of the United States.

This amendment of the Senate goes further, and it was adopted by the Senate Appropriations Committee, according to my understanding, unanimously, and by the Senate without a dissenting voice, so that restrictions might be placed on that fund, so that it could only be used for effective war purposes. You and I, all of us, want to see this war carried on in the very best possible way and in the most effective way, and we do not want to have a lot of money wasted or spent or allotted for things that the Congress did not appropriate for.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that Congress refused to appropriate money to build this Office of Information building for which $625,000 was requested, and is it not also true it was built and paid for in defiance of the express will of the Congress out of the President's emergency fund?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct, with the exception that he calls it a building. It is a monstrosity.

It is about time that that sort of monstrosity was stopped, and it is about time that we spoke out and that we helped the President to go along with the war effort by giving him the authority that he needs and by giving him no further authority.

I offered the amendment in the House which prevented an allotment to the National Resources Planning Board or to the Farm Security Administration, because I felt that those two agencies did not help the war effort and were not helpful in the war effort, and with that very thing in mind I go along with the Senate to adopt the limitation that they have placed upon this bill. There can be no possible interference with the war effort, no possible failure as a result of the adoption of my substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. He would wipe out the restrictions the House placed in the bill, and he would give to the President the appropriating power and the authorization instead of reserving it to the Congress, as it should be reserved.

I am asking the Congress to do everything it can do for the war effort, and at the same time to reserve to itself the appropriating power. I want to see the war effort carried on effectively and efficiently; we all do. But everytime a move is made where funds of the United States are wasted on something else, or something that does not contribute to the war effort, we are interfering with and blocking the war effort.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would limit the use of this money to four agencies alone, and, of course, we know there are many more agencies. If the amendment prevails there still remains the Maritime Commission, the War Production Board, the Bureau of Ships, the F. B. I., the Selective Service, and the other agencies that would not fall under the amendment.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct. The money for the Maritime Commission has been appropriated and it has on hand upward of $4,000,000,000 of available funds. Every other agency that is really working effectively for the war effort has been given liberal appropriations, and there is no agency where any emergency funds might be required or might be necessary beyond the range of these four that I have named, and where I can conceive that such agencies should not come to the Congress of the United States and ask for the appropriation of funds.

If we do not maintain a decent respect for the proper appropriation of funds, if we do not do the things which prohibit abuse of Executive authority, if we do not stop turning over to the Executive the appropriating powers of the Congress, we are going to contribute to losing the war, and I do not believe that any man of this House or any woman of this House wants to be in that position. I hope that my substitute will be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 145, noes 86.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 205, nays 139, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

YEAS—205

Abernethy	Ellsworth	Johnson,
Allen, Ill.	Elmer	Calvin D.
Andersen,	Elston, Ohio	Johnson, Ind.
H. Carl	Engel	Johnson,
Anderson, Calif.	Fellows	J. Leroy
Andresen,	Fenton	Johnson, Ward
August H.	Fish	Jones
Andrews	Gale	Jonkman
Angell	Gallagher	Judd
Arends	Gamble	Kean
Arnold	Gathings	Kearney
Auchincloss	Gavin	Keefe
Baldwin, Md.	Gearhart	Kilburn
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gerlach	Kilday
Barrett	Gifford	Kinzer
Bates, Mass.	Gilchrist	Kleberg
Beall	Gillette	Knutson
Bender	Gillie	Kunkel
Bennett, Mich.	Goodwin	LaFollette
Bennett, Mo.	Graham	Lambertson
Bishop	Grant, Ind.	Landis
Blackney	Griffiths	Lanham
Bolton	Gwynne	Lea
Brown, Ohio	Hale	Lemke
Buffett	Hall,	Lewis, Ohio
Busbey	Edwin Arthur	Luce
Butler	Hall,	McCowen
Canfield	Leonard W.	McGregor
Carlson, Kans.	Halleck	McKenzie
Carson, Ohio	Hancock	McLean
Carter	Harness, Ind.	McWilliams
Case	Harris, Va.	Maas
Chapman	Hart	Mansfield, Tex.
Chiperfield	Hartley	Martin, Iowa
Church	Hébert	Martin, Mass.
Clason	Heidinger	Mason
Clevenger	Herter	May
Cole, Mo.	Hess	Michener
Compton	Hill	Miller, Conn.
Cunningham	Hinshaw	Miller, Mo.
Curtis	Hoeven	Miller, Nebr.
Day	Hoffman	Miller, Pa.
Dewey	Holmes, Wash.	Morrison, La.
Disney	Horan	Mott
Ditter	Howell	Mruk
Dondero	Hull	Murray, Wis.
Durham	Jeffrey	Norman
Dworshak	Jenkins	O'Hara
Elliott	Jennings	O'Konski
Ellis	Johnson,	Phillips
Ellison, Md.	Anton J.	Pittenger

Ploeser	Schwabe	Talle
Plumley	Scott	Tibbott
Poage	Shafer	Towe
Poulson	Short	Troutman
Powers	Simpson, Ill.	Vorys, Ohio
Ramey	Simpson, Pa.	Vursell
Reece, Tenn.	Smith, Maine	Wadsworth
Reed, Ill.	Smith, Ohio	Walter
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, Va.	Welch
Robertson	Smith, Wis.	West
Robsion, Ky.	Springer	Wheat
Rockwell	Starnes, Ala.	Wigglesworth
Rodgers, Pa.	Stearns, N. H.	Willey
Rogers, Mass.	Stefan	Wilson
Rohrbough	Stevenson	Winter
Rolph	Stockman	Wolcott
Rowe	Sumner, Ill.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Satterfield	Sumners, Tex.	Wolverton, N. J.
Sauthoff	Sundstrom	Woodruff, Mich.
Schiffler	Taber	

NAYS—139

Allen, La.	Gregory	O'Connor
Anderson, N. Mex.	Hagen	O'Neal
Bates, Ky.	Hare	Outland
Beckworth	Harless, Ariz.	Pace
Bland	Harris, Ark.	Patman
Bloom	Hays	Patton
Bonner	Hobbs	Peterson, Fla.
Boren	Hoch	Peterson, Ga.
Boykin	Izac	Price
Brooks	Jackson	Priest
Brown, Ga.	Jarman	Rabaut
Bryson	Johnson, Luther A.	Ramspeck
Burchill, N. Y.	Kee	Randolph
Burdick	Kefauver	Rankin
Burgin	Keogh	Richards
Byrne	Kerr	Rowan
Camp	Kirwan	Sadowski
Cannon, Mo.	Klein	Schuetz
Celler	Lane	Sheppard
Clark	Larcade	Sheridan
Coffee	Lesinski	Sikes
Cooley	Ludlow	Slaughter
Cooper	Lynch	Snyder
Courtney	McCord	Somers, N. Y.
Creal	McCormack	Sparkman
Crosser	McMillan	Spence
Curley	McMurray	Stewart
D'Alesandro	Madden	Sullivan
Davis	Magnuson	Tarver
Delaney	Mahon	Thomas, Tex.
Dickstein	Maloney	Thomason
Dilweg	Manasco	Vincent, Ky.
Dingell	Mansfield, Mont.	Voorhis, Calif.
Fay	Marcantonio	Ward
Fernandez	Merritt	Wasielewski
Fisher	Mills	Weaver
Flannagan	Monroney	Weiss
Folger	Morrison, N. C.	Wene
Forand	Murdock	Whitten
Ford	Murphy	Whittington
Fulbright	Murray, Tenn.	Wickersham
Gordon	Myers	Winstead
Gore	Norrell	Woodrum, Va.
Gorski	Norton	Worley
Gossett	O'Brien, Ill.	Wright
Granger	O'Brien, Mich.	Zimmerman
Green		

NOT VOTING—87

Barden	Feighan	O'Brien, N. Y.
Barry	Fitzpatrick	O'Leary
Bell	Fogarty	O'Toole
Bradley, Mich.	Fulmer	Pfeifer
Bradley, Pa.	Furlong	Philbin
Brehm	Gavagan	Pracht
Buckley	Gibson	Rees, Kans.
Bulwinkle	Grant, Ala.	Rivers
Burch, Va.	Gross	Rizley
Cannon, Fla.	Heffernan	Robinson, Utah
Capozzoli	Hendricks	Rogers, Calif.
Chenoweth	Holifield	Russell
Cochran	Holmes, Mass.	Sabath
Cole, N. Y.	Hope	Sasscer
Colmer	Jensen	Scanlon
Costello	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Smith, W. Va.
Cox	Johnson, Okla.	Stanley
Cravens	Kelley	Steagall
Crawford	Kennedy	Talbot
Culkin	King	Taylor
Cullen	LeCompte	Thomas, N. J.
Dawson	LeFevre	Tolan
Dies	McGehee	Treadway
Dirksen	McGranery	Van Zandt
Domengeaux	Merrow	Vinson, Ga.
Doughton	Monkiewicz	Welchel, Ohio
Douglas	Mundt	Whelchel, Ga.
Drewry	Newsome	White
Eaton	Nichols	
Eberharter		

So the substitute was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dirksen for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Cochran against.

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Robinson of Utah against.

Mr. LeFevre for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

General pairs:

Mr. Steagall with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Heffernan with LeCompte.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Welchel of Ohio.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Monkiewicz.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Pracht.

Mr. Newsome with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Stanley.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Rees of Kansas.

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Hope.

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Van Zandt

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Cox with Mr. Chenoweth.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Rizley.

Mr. Cravens with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Gross.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri as amended by the substitute.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at the conclusion of the speech just made by the gentleman from Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 8: Page 5, line 9:

"War Shipping Administration: Notwithstanding the provisions of section 203 of the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943 (Public Law 678), the Office for Emergency Management, War Shipping Administration, may expend during the fiscal year 1943 not to exceed $294,430 for travel."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 37: Page 16, line 16, insert as follows:

"GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

"To enable the Geological Survey to meet obligations incurred by it arising from cooperative work pending reimbursement from cooperating agencies in accordance with the provisions of the act of February 27, 1925 (43 U. S. C. 39, 40); May 10, 1926, as amended (43 U. S. C. 48); June 17, 1935 (43 U. S. C. 49); March 4, 1915, as amended (31 U. S. C. 686); and July 2, 1943 (56 Stat. 537-539), fiscal year 1943, $400,000, which amount shall be placed to the credit of the 1943 appropriation account of the Geological Survey: *Provided*, That there shall be returned to the Treasury not later than 6 months after the close of the fiscal year 1943 out of reimbursements received from cooperating agencies an amount equal to the sum herein appropriated."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 41: Page 17, line 18:

"Defraying deficits in treasuries of municipal governments, Virgin Islands: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1943, for defraying the deficit in the treasury of the municipal government of St. Croix because of the excess of current expenses over current revenues for the fiscal year 1943 (56 Stat. 560), $45,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments numbered 60 and 61 be considered simultaneously, as they relate to the same matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report Senate amendments numbered 60 and 61.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 60: Page 48, line 19, strike out all of line 19 and the balance of page 48 and strike out lines 1 to 9, inclusive, on page 49.

Amendment No. 61: Page 49, line 10, strike out "305" and insert "304."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60 and 61.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, as a substitute I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment numbered 60 with an amendment, which I sent to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a motion to recede and concur with an amendment is not in order.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state the reason?

Mr. TABER. That has been the ruling right along as I have understood it.

The SPEAKER. The motion has not been reported yet. The Clerk will report the motion.

Mr. TABER. I beg pardon.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOBBS moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment No. 60, with an amendment as follows: Substitute in lieu of the Kerr or committee amendment stricken by the Senate amendment No. 60, the following:

"SECTION 304

"1. It shall be unlawful for any person to be employed in any capacity, in any department or agency of the Government of the United States created by or by virtue of an act of Congress, whose compensation is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by any act of Congress, who has engaged in activity subversive of the Government of the United States.

"2. It shall be unlawful for any person to be employed in any capacity, in any department or agency of the Government of the United States created by or by virtue of an act of Congress, whose compensation is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by any act of Congress who has been a member of or associated with any organization, any part of the aims or purposes of which is or has been subversive of the Government of the United States.

"3. It shall be unlawful for any person employed in any capacity, in any department or agency of the Government of the United States, created by or by virtue of an act of Congress, whose compensation or any part thereof is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by any act of Congress, to have membership in or association with any organization, any part of the aims or purposes of which is or has been subversive of the Government of the United States.

"4. Any person who may have been or may be employed in violation of section 1, 2, or 3 hereof shall be immediately removed from such employment, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any act of Congress shall be used to pay the salary or other compensation of any such person.

"5. Any person who is the head or acting head of personnel procurement for any department or agency of the Government of the United States created by or by virtue of an act of Congress, in which any person may have been employed in violation of section 1 or 2 hereof, or any other officer responsible for employment of any person in violation of section 1 or 2 hereof, or any officer who permits any employee to continue in employment in violation of section 3 hereof, if he knew, or by the exercise of reasonable diligence could have known of such violation of section 3 hereof, shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any act of Congress shall be used to pay the salary or other compensation of such officer.

"6. It shall be unlawful for any person to accept employment in any capacity in any department or agency of the Government of the United States created by or by virtue of an act of Congress, whose compensation or any part thereof is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by any act of Congress, if he be ineligible therefor under sections 1 and 2 hereof.

"7. Any person who may have been employed in violation of sections 1 and 2 hereof and who shall remain in such employment after this act shall have become a law shall be guilty of a high crime and misdemeanor, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any act of Congress shall be used to pay his salary or other compensation.

"8. That the phrase 'subversive of the Government of the United States' as used in this act shall mean any act or conduct, membership, or association, or advocacy of principle or doctrine inimical to the Government of the United States or the tendency or which is to undermine any of the institutions or to distort any of the functions or to impede any of the projects or to lessen any of the efforts of the Government of the United States; whether any such subversive influence exerted or sought to be exerted be open or direct or subtle or indirect, whether such subversive activity may have been by spoken or written words or by acts or conduct, and whether or not such subversive activity produced subversive result.

"9. Any person who violates any of the foregoing provisions of this act, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or be imprisoned for not more than 2 years, or both."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the amendment is not in order; first, because it is legislation on an appropriation bill; and second, because it is not germane.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, this would take the place of and is offered as a substitute for the so-called Kerr or committee amendment. The Kerr or committee amendment, or any other legislation of that character, is made in order by the proviso of House Resolution 105 which was duly and legally adopted by this House. Therefore, if the House should decide to substitute this amendment, which has just been read, for and in lieu of the Kerr amendment it would be perfectly in order.

It is germane because it deals with the same identical subject matter which is covered by the Kerr amendment. The Kerr amendment deals, it is true, with only three named persons, but this sets up the same standard, only more rigorous, which was sought to be set up in the Kerr amendment. It accomplishes the same purpose that the Kerr amendment was designed to cover as to three men, for all in the Government employ in departments or agencies created by or by virtue of an act of Congress whose salaries are paid from funds authorized or appropriated by Congress.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that on neither the ground of lack of germaneness, nor on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, is the point of order well taken. This simply seeks to do in a lawful way, within the province and power of the Congress, what the Kerr amendment seeks to do in an unconstitutional and illegal way. This will really work the will of Congress, and it includes the same identical subject matter which the Kerr amendment seeks to cover. The Kerr amendment differs from this substitute, insofar as germaneness is concerned, only in this: It named three men as the objects of its legislative wrath, whereas my substitute sets up a standard by which the eligibility of all in an indicated class must be judged and requires that anyone whom the cap fits must wear it.

The modus operandi of the Kerr amendment is more direct than would be that under mine. But being direct is not a virtue if so we forget our oaths of office and assault the Constitution. Lynching is more direct than the execution of the death sentence imposed by the court in accordance with the verdict of the jury after a fair trial in a court of law. But none of us advocates lynching.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order against the motion of the gentleman from Alabama, first, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and second, that it is not germane. The Chair in this instance will pass only on the germaneness of the motion of the gentleman from Alabama, because he does not deem it necessary to pass upon the other point.

The provision of the Senate amendment that the gentleman seeks to amend by his motion very definitely applies to three individuals and no more. The motion of the gentleman from Alabama would cover numberless people if numberless people came under the provisions of his motion. The language of the bill is specific. The language of the motion of the gentleman from Alabama is general. The Chair must, therefore, hold that the motion is not germane, and sustain the point of order.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record at this point and include therein quotations from the Supreme Court of the United States and other courts and from the Constitution, and to make certain citations of authority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House agrees 110 percent with all the tributes that have been paid to the Kerr committee. Beginning with the chairman and going through, there is not a single man on that committee who has not the love, respect, and admiration of this House. The same thing goes for the great Appropriations Committee, out of which this subcommittee was created.

No adverse criticism is due the Kerr committee, either because of the method employed in the conduct of the hearings held or of the conclusions reached in the reports they have made. These reports show judicial poise, fairness, and a sense of high responsibility in handling a delicate problem. The members of the Kerr committee heard the evidence, including the testimony of each man under investigation. They had the opportunity of observing the demeanor of each one of the accused. Their report to the House that Messrs. Watson, Dodd, and Lovett are unfit at this time for employment in the Federal Government is entitled to great weight in any balanced thinking on the subject. In my judgment the conclusions reached and reported are right.

THE ISSUE

But was that the issue presented by the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR—with the approval of the full Appropriations Committee—to the urgent deficiencies appropriation bill?

Certainly not.

The issue thus presented is whether or not the amendment offered to the urgent deficiencies appropriation bill should have been adopted. The amendment reads:

No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to deprive any such person of payment for leaves of absence or salary, or of any refund or reimbursement, which have accrued prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

The sole and single question presented by this amendment was, Is such legislation within the power of Congress?

CREATION OF KERR COMMITTEE

House Resolution 105, adopted by the House on February 9, 1943, reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, acting through a special subcommittee thereof appointed by the chairman of such committee for the purposes of this resolution, is authorized and directed to examine into any and all allegations or charges that certain persons in the employ of the several executive departments and other executive agencies are unfit to continue in such employment by reason of their present association or membership or past association or membership in or with organizations whose aims or purposes are or have been subversive to the Government of the United States. Such examination shall be pursued with the view of obtaining all available evidence bearing upon each particular case and reporting to the House the conclusions of the committee with respect to each such case in the light of the factual evidence obtained. Any legislation approved by the committee as a result of this resolution may be incorporated in any general or special appropriation measure emanating from such committee or may be offered as a committee amendment to any such measure notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI.

For the purposes of this resolution, such committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman or the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcomittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

On February 5, 1943, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] offered the following amendment to the Treasury Department appropriation bill:

Page 12, line 22, after the word "Treasury", strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of William Pickens, Frederick L. Schuman, Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., Paul R. Porter, John Herling, Paul F. Brissenden, David J. Saposs, Maurice Parmelee, Harold Loeb, Sam Schmerler, Emil Jack Lever, David Lasser, Tom Tippett, Henry C. Alsberg, David Karr, Guiseppi Facci, David Wahl, Hugh Miller, Walter Gellhorn, Karl Borders, Jack Fahy, Nathaniel Weyl, Robert Morss Lovett, Merle Vincent, Alice Barrows, Arthur F. Goldschmidt, Marcus I. Goldman, Leonard Emil Mins, Henry T. Hunt, Mary McLeod Bethune, Harry C. Lambertson, T. A. Bisson, Katherine Kellock, Jay Deiss, Milton V. Freeman, George Slaff, A. C. Shire, and Edward Scheunemann."

On the same day, after the defeat of the amendment just quoted, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] offered another amendment as follows:

On page 12, line 22, after the word "Treasury", strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of William Pickens."

It will be noted that both the Kerr and the two Hendricks amendments propose to act in exactly the same way to accomplish the removal of those named in them, respectively, from the Government service. Of course, the Hendricks amendments were applicable only to the money appropriated in the Treasury Department bill, while the Kerr amendment was applicable not only to the then pending bill but also to any future appropriation bill. Then, too, there is a proviso in the Kerr amendment which is not in the Hendricks amendments. But the essential procedure of removal is the same in each—named officers or employees in the executive branch of our Government were to be denied payment of their salaries by the legislative branch of our Government.

When, on February 5, 1943, we were considering the first Hendricks amendment, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, called the proposed procedure "legislative lynching." See page 651 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is true that he predicated his characterization upon the qualification:

At the same time I do not want to participate in any legislative lynching of men who have simply been charged with communistic affiliations without the submission of adequate proof to sustain the charges.

But many of us thought then, and think now, that his characterization of the modus operandi of the Hendricks amendment was perfectly apt, no matter how much proof could be made before a legislative committee when the Constitution requires a trial in court before punishment may be inflicted. Many of us also were then and now of opinion that such a procedure was an unconstitutional intrusion into the exclusive province of the executive branch of our Government, and an attempt to usurp its prerogative of removal of its officers and employees.

In somewhat similar vein were the remarks of the distinguished minority leader, Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts, speaking on the resolution to create the Kerr committee:

Let us give Pickens his day in court. That does not mean this House is to be shaken from its determination to eliminate from the Government pay roll all who are joining in attacking the American system of government.

The bureaucrats will never do the job; they dare not; Congress can and will. But let us do it in the orderly way, the just, fair way, and the American way. (See page 736 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 9, 1943.)

On May 18, 1943, as reported on page 4581 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of our great Appropriations Committee, spoke thus of the second Hendricks amendment:

Mr. Chairman, the committee will recall that in February, during consideration of an appropriation bill, a situation arose on the floor in which the House—almost by concert and with practical unanimity—proposed to summarily arraign, try, condemn, and execute, without benefit of clergy or legal process, certain Federal employees charged with subversive activities.

Those charged were to be given no opportunity to be heard. They were to be tried without notice on hearsay and rumor and by what practically amounted to mob action.

In that crisis, by agreement and direction of the leadership on both sides of the aisle and both ranking members of the committee in charge of the bill, I submitted to the House a resolution providing for the appointment of a subcommittee to investigate the charges, hear testimony, give accused opportunity to be heard, and thereupon, in due time, to bring the result of its deliberation before the House.

It was exactly this mode of procedure in the Hendricks amendments that caused many of us to vote against them. We believed that the creation of the Kerr committee for the full investigation of each case and requiring a report to the House with respect to each such case might result in the preparation by the committee of legislation within our power and province, which would accomplish the result desired by an overwhelming majority of the membership of the House, to wit, a separation from the Government service of those found to be unfit to continue in such employment by reason of their present or past association with or membership in organizations whose aims and purposes are or have been subversive of the Government of the United States.

Many of us hoped that the study of this entire problem by the Kerr committee would cause it to sponsor legislation within the power of Congress to enact, which would accomplish the desired end with reference to every Government officer or employee guilty of subversive activity or affiliation.

But the legislation proposed by the Kerr committee with the approval of the full Appropriations Committee is just as subject to constitutional objections as was the legislation proposed in the Hendricks amendments.

Does the fact that in February the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS]

offered the amendments while in May the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, offered one proposing esentially the same action, render the action any the less objectionable?

Does the change of the legislative committee sponsoring the charges change the Constitution?

Many of us thought the big idea was to do the job legally—within our power and province.

EFFECTIVE CONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION POSSIBLE

Let no one say that legislation that would accomplish the desired purpose and within the power of Congress to enact, cannot be drawn. Congress has a perfect right, for instance, to fix by law the standard by which personnel procurement shall be governed and provide that no money appropriated by Congress shall be used to pay the salary of any person who does not square with that standard. Such legislation could also constitutionally provide that the head of every department or agency be held responsible for any employment not in conformity with the congressional standard, and that no money appropriated by Congress should be used to pay the salary of any such head of a department or agency who should fail to discharge his full responsibility in this respect. And in conjunction with such legislation, Congress could have submitted to the head of each department or agency of government the reports of the Kerr committee, as well as the reports of the Dies committee and of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Such legislation would be based upon the fundamental principle that Congress can regulate "the hiring and firing" in whatever agencies or departments of government it has created or may create—*Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52, 161); *United States* v. *Perkins* (116 U. S. 483) excerpts quoted infra.

Such legislation would not be a usurpation of the power of appointment or removal, which are vested by the Constitution in the executive branch of our Government. Neither would it be within the condemnation of the constitutional prohibition against bills of attainder.

My suggestion of such a substitute for the Kerr amendment is as follows:

SECTION 304

1. It shall be unlawful for any person to be employed in any capacity, in any department or agency of the Government of the United States created by or by virtue of an act of Congress, whose compensation is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by any act of Congress, who has engaged in activity subversive of the Government of the United States.

2. It shall be unlawful for any person to be employed in any capacity, in any department or agency of the Government of the United States created by or by virtue of an act of Congress, whose compensation is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by an act of Congress, who has been a member of or associated with any organization, any part of the aims or purposes of which is or has been subversive of the Government of the United States.

3. It shall be unlawful for any person employed in any capacity, in any department or agency of the Government of the United States, created by or by virtue of an act of Congress, whose compensation or any part thereof is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by any act of Congress, to have membership in or association with any organization, any part of the aims or purposes of which is or has been subversive of the Government of the United States.

4. Any person who may have been or may be employed in violation of sections 1, 2, or 3 hereof shall be immediately removed from such employment, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any act of Congress shall be used to pay the salary or other compensation of any such person.

5. Any person who is the head or acting head of personnel procurement for any department or agency of the Government of the United States, created by or by virtue of an act of Congress, in which any person may have been employed in violation of sections 1 or 2 hereof, or any other officer responsible for employment of any person in violation of sections 1 or 2 hereof, or any officer who permits any employee to continue in employment in violation of section 3 hereof, if he knew, or by the exercise of reasonable diligence could have known of such violation of section 3 hereof, shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any act of Congress shall be used to pay the salary or other compensation of such officer.

6. It shall be unlawful for any person to accept employment in any capacity in any department or agency of the Government of the United States created by or by virtue of an act of Congress, whose compensation or any part thereof is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by any act of Congress, if he be ineligible therefor under sections 1 and 2 hereof.

7. Any person who may have been employed in violation of sections 1 and 2 hereof and who shall remain in such employment after this act shall have become a law shall be guilty of a high crime and misdemeanor, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any act of Congress shall be used to pay his salary or other compensation.

8. That the phrase "subversive of the Government of the United States" as used in this act shall mean any act or conduct, membership or association, or advocacy of principle or doctrine inimical to the Government of the United States or the tendency of which is to undermine any of the institutions or to distort any of the functions or to impede any of the projects or to lessen any of the efforts of the Government of the United States; whether any such subversive influence exerted or sought to be exerted be open or direct or subtle or indirect, whether such subversive activity may have been by spoken or written words or by acts or conduct, and whether or not such subversive activity produced subversive result.

9. Any person who violates any of the foregoing provisions of this act, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or be imprisoned for not more than 2 years, or both.

If it be thought that such legislation would not be drastic enough, we could, of course, abolish any department or agency that we created, and, in reconstituting it, we could prescribe the standards for employment and removal of officers and employees.

A BILL OF ATTAINDER

If the Kerr amendment is a bill of "pains and penalties" within the meaning of the Constitution prohibiting bills of attainder, then, under our oaths of office binding us to uphold the Constitution, we must reject it. That the Kerr amendment is a bill of "pains and penalties" within the meaning of the constitutional prohibition "No bill of attainder * * * shall be passed," article I, section 9, is clear.

A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. If the punishment be less than death, it is a bill of pains and penalties. As the term "bill of attainder" is used in the Federal Constitution, it includes both bills of attainder particularly, and bills of pains and penalties (*Cummings* v. *Missouri* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277, 18 L. Ed. 356); *Drehman* v. *Stifle* (75 U. S. (8 Wall.) 595, 601, 19 L. Ed. 508); *Pierce* v. *Carskadon* (83 U. S. (16 Wall.) 234, 239, 21 L. Ed. 276)).

If, then, the Kerr amendment inflicts punishment, it is a bill of pains and penalties, since there has been no judicial trial. This is not to say that the legislative hearings given by the Kerr committee were not judicial in a sense, but this committee was certainly not a court, and nothing short of a trial by a court constitutes a judicial trial.

The only question open for discussion and decision, therefore, is, Would this amendment, if it should become law, inflict punishment?

Throughout this debate it was frankly admitted that this amendment is intended to and will, if enacted, effectively exclude Watson, Dodd, and Lovett from the Government service.

That is punishment.

Take the cases of *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277, 320) and *Ex parte Garland* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 333, 337). These are State cases, not Federal. But the provisions of the Federal Constitution are almost identical as to State and Federal limitation of power. As to congressional power, the Constitution of the United States reads:

No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed (art. I, sec. 9).

As to State power, the Constitution of the United States reads:

No State shall pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts (art. I, sec. 10).

So the Cummings and Garland cases are perfectly in point as authorities in our consideration of the pending amendment, under the above quoted limitation upon congressional power.

In the Cummings case the defendant was a Roman Catholic priest who was indicted and convicted of the crime of teaching and preaching as a priest and minister of that denomination without first having taken the oath prescribed by the Constitution of the State of Missouri, and was sentenced to pay a fine of $500 and to be committed to jail until said fine and costs of suit were paid. This prosecution was under the constitution of Missouri of 1865 which provided that no person shall be permitted to practice as an attorney or counselor at law nor be competent as a bishop, priest, deacon, minister, elder, or other clergyman of any religious persuasion, sect, or denomination, to teach, preach, or solemnize marriages, unless such person shall have first taken, subscribed, and filed said oath—which oath required a statement that the affiant had never been in armed hostility to the United

States or been in sympathy with rebellion or, except under overpowering compulsion, submitted to the authority or been in the service of the so-called Confederate States of America.

The Supreme Court of the United States in its decision in the Cummings case said:

The disabilities created by the Constitution of Missouri must be regarded as penalties—they constitute punishment. We do not agree with the counsel of Missouri that "to punish one is to deprive him of life, liberty, or property, and that to take from him anything less than these is no punishment at all." The learned counsel does not use these terms—life, liberty, and property—as comprehending every right known to the law. He does not include under liberty freedom from outrage on the feelings as well as restraints on the person. He does not include under property those estates which one may acquire in professions, though they are often the source of the highest emoluments and honors. The deprivation of any rights, civil or politieal, previously enjoyed, may be punishment, the circumstances attending and the causes of the deprivation determining this fact. Disqualification from office may be punishment, as in cases of conviction upon impeachment. Disqualification from the pursuits of a lawful avocation, or from positions of trust, or from the privilege of appearing in the courts, or acting as an executor, administrator, or guardian, may also, and often has been, imposed as punishment (*Cummings* v. *Missouri* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277, 18 L. ed. 356)).

In the Garland case the defendant was an attorney and counselor at law and was prosecuted under the same section of the Missouri Constitution of 1865 as was the defendant Cummings in his case.

The Supreme Court of the United States in the Garland case said:

And exclusion from any of the professions or any of the ordinary avocations of life for past conduct can be regarded in no other light than as punishment for such conduct. The exaction of the oath is the mode provided for ascertaining the parties upon whom the act is intended to operate, and instead of lessening, increases its objectionable character. All enactments of this kind partake of the nature of bills of pains and penalties and are subject to the constitutional inhibition against the passage of bills of attainder, under which general designation they are included (*Ex parte Garland* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 333, 337, 18 L. Ed. 366)).

In the Cummings case the exclusion was from the priesthood. In the Garland case the exclusion was from the practice of law. In the cases now before us the exclusion is from the Government service. The decisions from which the above quotations have been taken are directly in point and condemn any such enactment as the Kerr amendment as a bill of pains and penalties subject to the constitutional inhibition against the passage of bills of attainder.

Therefore the Kerr amendment is, in my judgment, plainly violative of the constitutional prohibition "No bill of attainder * * * shall be passed." If this conclusion be sound, and I most respectfully submit and urge that it is, that ends discussion—we need go no further; for if any piece of legislation comes within the prohibition of any one part of the Constitution, it is as void as though it offended each and every provision.

THE KERR AMENDMENT VIOLATES "SEPARATION OF POWERS" PRINCIPLE

But the pending amendment not only violates the constitutional mandate against bills of attainder, but it also violates the principle—implicit throughout the Constitution—of separation of powers, and the explicit creation of a government composed of three separate but coordinate branches—legislative, executive, and judicial.

The doctrine of the "separation of powers" of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government is fundamental in the American theory of constitutional government. One branch is not to encroach upon the other, except insofar as authorized by the Constitution. Essential functions of the legislature are not to be usurped by the executive nor by the judiciary. Similarly, the legislature is not to interfere with the other coordinate departments of the Government except where an intermingling of spheres of action is authorized or contemplated by the Constitution itself. (The Federalist, Nos. 47 to 51.)

The power to "fire" an employee of the executive branch of the Government belongs to the Executive exclusively. *Meyers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52). In the Meyers case the Supreme Court further held:

The power to remove inferior executive officers, like that to remove superior executive officers, is an incident of the power to appoint them, and is in its nature an executive power. The authority of Congress given by the excepting clause to vest the appointment of such inferior officers in the heads of departments carries with it authority incidentally to invest the heads of departments with power to remove.

The Supreme Court recognized in the case of *United States* v. *Perkins* (116 U. S. 483) that Congress, in committing the appointment of such inferior officers to the heads of departments, may prescribe incidental regulations controlling and restricting the latter in the exercise of the power of removal; but the Court never has held, nor reasonably could hold, that the excepting clause enables Congress to draw to itself, or to either branch of it, the power to remove or the right to participate in the exercise of that power. To do this would be to go beyond the words and implications of that clause and to infringe the constitutional principle of the separation of governmental powers.

Further quoting from the decision of the Supreme Court in the Meyers case:

Assuming then, the power of Congress to regulate removals as incidental to the exercise of its constitutional power to vest appointments of inferior officers in the heads of departments, certainly so long as Congress does not exercise that power, the power of removal must remain where the Constitution places it, with the President, as part of the Executive power.

When Congress abolished the Radio Commission and created in its stead the Federal Communications Commission—United States Code Annotated, title 47, section 154—it authorized the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint the seven Commissioners and gave to the Commission the power to appoint the employees of the Commission subordinate to the Commissioners. Congress did not prescribe incidental regulations controlling and restricting the Commissioners in the exercise of the power of appointment or removal.

The exclusive right of the Executive to remove officers within the executive branch of the Government was reiterated in the case of *Morgan* v. *T. V. A.* (115 Fed. (2d) 990, certiorari denied, 61 Sup. Ct. Rep. 806).

The doctrine of separation of powers is reemphasized in the case of *Humphrey's Executor* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 602):

The fundamental necessity of maintaining each of the three general departments of government entirely free from the control or coercive influence, direct or indirect, of either of the others, has often been stressed and is hardly open to serious question. So much is implied in the very fact of the separation of the powers of these departments by the Constitution; and in the rule which recognizes their essential coequality. The sound application of a principle that makes one master in his own house precludes him from imposing his control in the house of another who is master there. James Wilson, one of the framers of the Constitution and a former Justice of this Court, said that the independence of each department required that its proceedings "should be free from the remotest influence, direct or indirect, of either of the other powers" (Andrews, the Works of James Wilson (1896), vol. 1, p. 367). And Mr. Justice Story in the first volume of his work on the Constitution, fourth edition, section 530, citing No. 48 of the Federalist, said that neither of the departments in reference to each other "ought to possess, directly or indirectly, an overruling influence in the administration of their respective powers" (295 U. S. at pp. 629–630).

The argument on the purse strings premise is blasted by an opinion of former Attorney General Mitchell, as follows:

Congress holds the purse strings, and it may grant or withhold appropriations as it chooses, and when making an appropriation may direct the purposes to which the appropriation shall be devoted and impose conditions in respect to its use, provided always that the conditions do not require operation of the Government in a way forbidden by the Constitution. Congress may not, by conditions attached to appropriations, provide for a discharge of the functions of government in a manner not authorized by the Constitution. If such a practice were permissible, Congress could subvert the Constitution. It might make appropriations on condition that the executive department abrogate its functions. It might, for example, appropriate money for the War Department on condition that the direction of military operations should be conducted by some person designated by the Congress, thus requiring the President to abdicate his functions as Commander in Chief (37 Op. Atty. Gen. 56, 61 (1933)).

Supporters say with twinkling eyes and a smile, "Yes, but this is not firing; this is merely denying the money to pay his salary. We do not say he cannot work for the Government; we simply say no Government money can be used to pay him."

Specious. Sophistry. What of the law we passed that no one can work for nothing?

The more serious-minded supporters add: "Seriously, though, Congress has the power to abolish the whole outfit, including Watson, so, if we were to do that, we'd be getting him just the same."

The answer to this is also obvious. Granting that Congress might abolish

the Federal Communications Commission, and that if that were done, that would get Watson, that is not what is being done. Maybe the Federal Communications Commission should be abolished. Congress has the power, undoubtedly, to abolish it; why not act within our power and do so? I challenge any and all of you who think that should be done, because of the employment of Watson and Dodd, or for any other reason, do it. But do not forget your oath of office to uphold the Constitution and trample it under contemptuous feet by passing this bill of attainder which intrudes into the inviolable province of the Executive.

Who made it possible to employ Watson and Dodd? Congress did. We granted the Commissioners the power to appoint whomsoever they might please. The only restriction we have ever placed upon this grant of power is the requirement that no one who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of our Government by force or violence, shall be paid. We so wrote the law. Under that single restriction these men were employed. No contention has been made that they, or either of them, come within that condemnation. After they were employed, we, very wisely, changed the criterion. The special subcommittee constituted to investigate and report to the House how Government employees squared with the new criterion, has made two reports which show judicial poise and careful analysis. The gentlemen who compose this subcommittee are estimable, careful, honorable. Their reports are entitled to the full faith and credit their judgment and honesty of purpose demand. Those who have the power to hire and fire should give the most respectful and serious consideration to these and any further reports, and only the weightiest evidence contra should cause them to fail to follow the report that they are unfit for the present to continue in Government employ, and discharge all that that "cap fits." But ours is not the power to hire or fire, nor have we the right to go out of our own house into theirs and rule.

It is true that the resolution creating the Kerr committee provided:

Any legislation approved by the committee as a result of this resolution may be incorporated in any general or special appropriation measure emanating from such committee or may be offered as a committee amendment to any such measure notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 or rule XXI.

But, of course, this meant any legislation within the power of Congress to enact; that is, not in conflict with the Constitution.

We can abolish the Federal Communications Commission. We can prescribe incidental regulations to control or limit the appointing powers or the powers of removal we grant, but we cannot violate the Constitution by passing a bill of attainder, such as the Kerr amendment, nor usurp the power of either separate and coordinate branch of our Government. The power of removal of officers or of employees in the executive branch of our Government is in the Chief Executive. Congress may remove its own but not those of the Executive.

What has been said as to Watson and Dodd applies for the most part and just as cogently to Lovett.

The fact that Congress adopted the method of removal now proposed in the case of David Lasser, neither changes the Constitution nor justifies the procedure. One wrong never justifies another.

The claim has been made that thousands of Communists were taken off the Government pay roll when the Federal Theater Project of the W. P. A. was abolished. But that was the abolition of a project, not the mere removal of employees. Congress may abolish any organization it creates or authorizes, and such abolition kills the jobs of the employees of the agency abolished. But that is in accord with the Constitution, not in violation of it.

Just as fiercely as we resent attempts to encroach upon our exclusive province, does the executive branch of our Government have the right to resent this encroachment attempted by us. Why cannot we of each separate, coordinate branch of our Government learn and practice the truth that the only road to the sunlit highlands of happiness and success is cooperation?

WHAT POWERS HAS CONGRESS?

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

ART. I, SEC. 1

The provision—

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress—

means that Congress—

within the limits of its powers and observing the restrictions imposed by the Constitution may, in its discretion, enact any statute appropriate to accomplish the objects for which the National Government was established (*Burton* v. *United States*, 202 U. S. 344, 367 (1906)).

The only legislative powers vested in Congress are those "herein granted."

Whenever, therefore, a question arises concerning the constitutionality of a particular power, the first question is whether the power be expressed in the Constitution. If it be, the question is decided. If it be not expressed, the next inquiry must be whether it is properly an incident to an express power and necessary to its execution. If it be, then it may be exercised by Congress. If not, Congress cannot exercise it. (Justice Story, Commentaries on the Constitution, sec. 1243, quoted with approval in *United States* v. *Harris*, 106 U. S. 629, 636 (1883).)

The Government of the United States is one of delegated, limited, and enumerated powers. Therefore, every valid act of Congress must find in the Constitution some warrant for its passage. This is apparent by reference to certain provisions of the Constitution, for example, (a) article I, section 1, that all legislative powers granted by the Constitution shall be vested in the Congress of the United States; (b) article I, section 8, which enumerates the powers granted to Congress, and concludes the enumeration with a grant of power—

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper to carry into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

And (c) the tenth amendment which declares that—

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. (*Martin* v. *Hunter's Lessee*, 1 Wheat. 304 (1816); *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, 4 Wheat. 316 (1819); *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, 9 Wheat. 1 (1824); *United States* v. *Harris*, 106 U. S. 629, 635 (1883)).

In the Constitution are provisions in separate articles for the three great departments of Government—legislative, executive, and judicial. But there is a significant difference in the grants of powers to those departments: The first article, treating of legislative powers, does not make a general grant of legislative power to Congress; it vests in Congress all legislative powers herein granted. The second article, on the other hand, vests the executive power in the President. Similarly, the third article states that the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in a Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as Congress may establish. From the language thus used in these three articles, it has become established that the entire executive and judicial power of the Nation are vested in the President and the Federal judiciary, while only those legislative powers granted by the Constitution may be exercised by Congress. "The proposition that there are legislative powers affecting the Nation as a whole which belong to, although not expressed in the grant of powers, is in direct conflict with the doctrine that this is a Government of enumerated powers." Congress has no inherent sovereign powers in the realm of domestic legislation (*Kansas* v. *Colorado*, 206 U. S. 46, 81 (1907)).

The powers of Congress in respect to investigation and legislation are not absolutely identical, but the power of investigation is the wider and extends to matters on which Congress could not constitutionally legislate directly, if they are reasonably calculated to afford information useful and material in the framing of constitutional legislation.

Interstate Commerce Commission v. *Harriman* (157 Fed. 432 (1908)), order modified in *Harriman* v. *Interstate Commerce Commission* (211 U.S. 407 (1908)); *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* (103 U. S. 168 (1881)).

No power of appointment to office except within itself is granted Congress by the Constitution; nor is there granted, nor implied, any power of removal from office except within the legislative branch of our Government; plus the power of impeachment.

In short, the power of Congress may be summarized thus: To make the law under and in accordance with the Constitution.

WHAT POWERS HAS THE EXECUTIVE?

The Executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America (art. II, sec. 1).

The Executive power—all of it. Not merely those granted in the Constitution, as the Constitution limits the powers of Congress; but all Executive power—the whole of it.

But in addition to this all-inclusive grant of the whole of Executive power, the Constitution expressly grants to the executive department of our Government the exclusive power of appointment of all its officers, superior and inferior.

And, of course, the power of removal is but an incident of the power to appoint, and is a part of it.

In Myers against United States the Court had before it the question of the Executive power of removal, and since the Constitution is silent on the subject—with the exception of removal upon impeachment—it necessarily had to consider the extent of the Executive power in general. It was therefore brought to examine clause 1 of section 1 of article II of the Constitution. The Court stated:

Our conclusion on the merits * * * is that article II grants to the President the executive power of the Government, i. e., the general administrative control of those executing the laws, including the power o appointment and removal of executive officers—a conclusion confirmed by his obligation to take care that the laws be faithfully executed (272 U. S. 52, 163 (1926)).

He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law: But the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments (art. II, sec. 2).

The word "inferior" is not here used in the sense of petty or unimportant, but it means subordinate or inferior to those officers in whom respectively the power of appointment may be vested—the President, the courts of law, and the heads of departments.

Collin's Case (14 Ct. Cl. 568 (1878)); *United States* v. *Germaine* (99 U. S. 508, 510 (1879)).

Further, while the power of appointment to office is essentially an Executive function, Congress has power to prescribe conditions to the complete investiture of an office; and qualifications for office, provided scope is left for the judgment and will of the appointing authority. And it may control appointments through the control of appropriations for salaries. This control may take effect in the refusal of appropriations; or it may create a liability for services antedating issue of commission, and allow back pay for any cause which Congress shall deem sufficient.

United States v. *LeBaron* (19 How. 73, 78 (1856)), filing of bond and taking oaths of office; 13 Opinion Attorney General 516, 524 (1871); In re Miller, 5 Mackey (D. C.) 507 (1887), writ of error dismissed (140 U. S. 690 (1891)), upholding the civil service laws; see *Foote* v. *United States* (23 Ct. Cls. 443 (1888)). 7 Opinion Attorney General 215 (1855); *Bennett* v. *United States* (19 Ct. Cls. 379 (1884)).

When Congress by law vests the appointment of inferior officers in the heads of departments, it may limit and restrict the power of removal as it deems best for the public interest. The head of a department has no constitutional prerogative of appointment to offices independently of the legislation of Congress, and by such legislation he must be governed, not only in making appointments, but in all that is incident thereto—*United States* v. *Perkins* (116 U. S. 483 (1886)), involving a cadet engineer in the Navy, appointed under statute by the Secretary of the Navy. The case specifically left undecided the question whether or not Congress could constitutionally restrict the power of removal of officers appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, page 484.

See also *Eberlein* v. *United States* (257 U. S. 82 (1921)).

In Myers against United States the specific question was raised, whether a postmaster of the first class, appointed with the consent of the Senate under a statute—19 Statutes 80, section 6—which provided that such postmasters "shall be appointed and may be removed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall hold their offices for 4 years unless sooner removed or suspended according to law" could constitutionally be removed before the expiration of 4 years by the President alone. And it was held that he could, that the restrictions and removals in the act of 1876 were unconstitutional, and—

That article II excludes the exercise of legislative power by Congress to provide for appointments and removals, except only as granted therein to Congress in the matter of inferior offices; that Congress is only given power to provide for appointments and removals of inferior officers after it has vested, and on condition that it does vest, their appointment in other authority than the President with the Senate's consent; that the provisions of the second section of article II, which blend action by the legislative branch, or by part of it, in the work of the executive, are limitations to be strictly construed and not to be extended by implication; that the President's power of removal is further established as an incident to his specifically enumerated function of appointment by and with the advice of the Senate, but that such incident does not by implication extend to removals; the Senate's power of checking appointments; and finally, that to hold otherwise would make it impossible for the President, in case of political or other differences with the Senate or Congress, to take care that the laws be faithfully executed (272 U. S. 52, 164 (1926)).

The authority of Congress to condition the President's power of removal by fixing a definite term and restricting removal except for cause depends upon the character of the office. Where an office is predominantly quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative rather than executive, the President has no constitutional power to remove for reasons other than those specified by law. So held, that the President had no power to remove without cause a Federal Trade Commissioner, when the act establishing the Commission (38 Stat. 717) provides for removals for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance only (*Humphrey* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 602 (1935)).

Generally the power of the executive branch is to execute the law.

WHAT POWERS HAS THE JUDICIAL?

The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish—article III, section 1.

It is the duty of the courts only to judge. It is, emphatically, the province and duty of the judicial department, to say what the law is. Those who apply the rule to particular cases must of necessity expound and interpret that rule.

Chisholm v. *Georgia*, 2 Dall. 419, 433 (1793); *Marbury* v. *Madison*, 1 Cr. 137, 177 (1803); *Ex parte McCardle*, 7 Wall. 506, 514 (1869); *Cohen* v. *Virginia*, 6 Wheat. 264, 447 (1821).

Generally: To declare the meaning of the law.

JUDGE KERR'S AUTHORITIES

In spite of the fact that when the Kerr amendment was adopted by the House, the time allowed for debate of that issue—2 hours—was under the exclusive control of proponents, who gave only 10 of the 120 minutes to those of the opposition for actual utterance on the floor, and although among the able supporters of the amendment were some of the best lawyers in the membership of this body, there were only four citations of authority made by the proponents, and not one of these four was in point.

Hart v. *United States* (16 Court of Claims Reports 484; 118 U. S. 62).

The first one of these four citations is the Hart case, cited supra. Judge KERR quotes therefrom as follows:

The absolute control of the moneys of the United States is in Congress and Congress is responsible for its exercise of this great power to indicate a class of persons who shall not be paid out of general appropriations, but shall come to Congress for relief.

It will be noted at a glance that even if this case were an authority on the subject here under consideration—the removal of a Federal employee by denying the use of money carried in an appropriation bill for the payment of his salary, which it is not, it still does not hold that named employees may be denied payment of their salaries by legislative mandate. Of course, the part that the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, quoted is the most favorable part of this decision toward his contention. But even this merely says that the money power of Congress may be used "to indicate a class of persons who shall not be paid out of general appropriations." What we are doing here is not indicating a class of persons, but naming individuals. We have a right to set up a standard for employees of any agency of government we create and to require that no employee ineligible under that standard may be employed or retained in employment; such legislation is entirely proper; it indicates a class of persons who are to be ineligible for employment and anyone whom that cap fits must wear it. But this leaves the power of removal in the executive branch of our Government. It simply requires the Executive power of removal to be exercised upon any member of the class indicated. It does not substitute action by Congress for action by the Executive authority.

But the Hart case was not an employee case. It was a suit filed in the Court of Claims by one who had sold flour, corn, and forage to the Federal Government for the use of its army during the War between the States. Congress had passed a law saying that no one who was a sympathizer with the Confederacy could be paid for any property he might have sold to the Federal Government on credit. This was the class indicated by Congress, no member of which should be paid out of appropriations made by Congress. The Court of Claims held in the Hart case that the seller was a sympathizer with the Confederacy and therefore came within the indicated class of those who could not be paid out of Federal appropriations, and

the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed that decision.

So the Hart case, far from being an authority in point and in favor of Judge KERR's position, is really contra.

OPINIONS OF THE ATTORNEYS GENERAL, VOLUME 7, PAGE 215

No such language as that quoted by the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, appears on that page in that volume. It is, of course, to be assumed that the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, simply made a mistake in his citation and that he was quoting from some other opinion of an attorney general.

The opinion cited by Judge KERR relates to "ambassadors and othe public ministers of the United States." It has nothing to do with inferior officers of the United States, appointed by Department heads under specific authority of Congress. This opinion points out that as the office of public minister is in fact a constitutional, not a statutory one, the President might appoint without the act of Congress and in virtue of the Constitution.

CRENSHAW *v.* UNITED STATES (134 U. S. 99)

Crenshaw was appointed to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis under and by virtue of an act of Congress. Before his graduation, a later Congress changed the law by repealing that part of the law under which Crenshaw was appointed, which provided that every appointee who graduated should be commissioned in the Navy and substituting a provision that only those graduates who attained a certain grade in their studies should be commissioned. Crenshaw did not make the grades entitling him to a commission under the second act of Congress.

The Crenshaw case holds that it is not within the power of one Congress to deprive its successor of the power of repealing an act creating a public office. This is sound, well-recognized law and has nothing whatever to do with cases like those of Watson, Dodd, and Lovett, who were appointed to the inferior offices they hold by the executive branch of the Government under authority granted by Congress and not repealed or changed by subsequent statute. Crenshaw was never inducted into his office by commission. At the time he accepted his appointment as a midshipman he was fully and indisputably chargeable with notice that the law under which he was appointed could be changed by any succeeding Congress. He accepted appointment as a midshipman, received the benefits of a splendid education at Government expense, and was given a certificate of graduation from the Naval Academy. But before being commissioned, the law was changed by a succeeding Congress so that he not having attained the grade which would have put him in the class indicated by the second act, he was not entitled to be commissioned. He brought suit for the salary he would have received had he been commissioned. The Court held that he had no property or contractual right which entitled him to a commission nor to the salary he would have received had he been commissioned.

SPEECH OF HON. JOHN RANDOLPH TUCKER

In 1879 in the debate in this House on the then pending Army appropriation bill, Hon. John Randolph Tucker, of Virginia, made an exceedingly able speech in which he demonstrated beyond question that the money power of the House of Commons in the British Parliament had been used to curb usurpation and oppression by the Crown. No one has ever questioned this historic fact.

But what has this to do with the question whether or not Congress has the power to punish Watson, Dodd, and Lovett without a court trial and if Congress has the constitutional right to usurp the power of removal which our Constitution vested as an incident of the express power of appointment in the executive branch of our Government?

It must be borne in mind that England has no constitution except its statutes. We have a written Constitution which is the supreme law of the land, and in and by which the powers of Congress are strictly limited.

The issue in the debate in which the Honorable John Randolph Tucker participated was whether or not, in an appropriation bill for the maintenance of the Army of the United States, Congress had the power to provide that the Army should not be used to regulate elections. Bear in mind that the Constitution of the United States grants no power to the President to raise or maintain troops. Congress has power "to raise and support armies." (Constitution of the United States, art I, sec. 8, clause 12.)

The President of the United States has no such power, the King of England has.

Furthermore, Congress has power "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces"—Constitution of the United States, article I, section 8, clause 14. The King of England has this power, the President of the United States has not. The King of England is Generalissimo. The President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the land and naval forces—Constitution of the United States, article II, section 2. Mr. Tucker says on this point:

> It thus appears the power of the President is far less than that of the King, and of Congress far greater than that of the Parliament as to the Army. But Congress and Parliament have the power of the purse alike. Now if in England Parliament can limit and has limited the use of troops by the King, and notably in the case of their use and presence at elections, is it revolutionary or against the letter or spirit of the Constitution for us to condemn the supply for support of the Army upon their nonuse at elections? If it be, then is the case of American citizens as to liberal and free elections less favorable than that of the subjects of the British monarchy?

Mr. Tucker further aptly says:

> The President is ex officio no more as Commander in Chief than the General in Chief of the Army, * * * he is the Executive Director of the troops in military operations. But how, where, and when he and they are to be used is within the power of Congress to direct, not in his.

CONCLUSION

So it is perfectly apparent that not one of the four authorities cited by supporters of the Kerr amendment supports their contention.

This leaves the case for the Kerr amendment unsupported by any authority whatsoever save the ipse dixit of its proponents. And this is based, I respectfully submit, upon a mistaken conception that the power of the purse is omnipotent and can override the Constitution of the United States.

For the opposition, however, not only the Constitution speaks clearly and forcibly, but so also does the Supreme Court of the United States. How anyone can read the Constitution and the cases of *Cummings* v. *Missouri* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277), *Ex parte Garland* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 333), *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52), *United States* v. *Perkins* (116 U. S. 483), *Humphrey's Executor* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 602), and *Morgan* v. *T. V. A.* (115 Fed. (2d) 990), in which certiorari was denied in 61 Supreme Court Report 806, and still contend that Congress has the right to pass the Kerr amendment, is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this question has been exhaustively debated in the House on a number of occasions, so thoroughly discussed that nothing further could be added at this time.

In view of the lateness of the hour, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking be permitted to extend their own remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

TRAINING OF NURSES

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2664) to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after "act", insert ": *Provided*, That there shall be no discrimination in the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the respective provisions of this act, on account of race, creed, or color."

Page 4, line 7, after "training", insert ", to the extent that such maintenance is not

compensated for by the value of their services during such period."

Page 6, after line 8, insert:

"SEC. 8. There shall be no discrimination against any institution on account of the size thereof or the number of nurses employed or student nurses training therein."

Page 6, line 9, strike out "8" and insert "9."

Page 6, line 25, strike out "9" and insert "10."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand that these amendments are minor and that they have been agreed to by the gentleman's committee.

Mr. MYERS. Unanimously.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was granted permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the life of our departed colleague, Mr. Guyer. I ask unanimous consent to insert along with those remarks an address delivered by Mr. Guyer on the life and character of the Honorable Edward C. Little.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of the bill H. R. 1289 and correspondence with the Office of the Attorney General and the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a prominent constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

GAS RATIONING IN THE MIDDLE WEST

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 minutes on the subject of the gas situation in the Middle West.

The SPEAKER. Is that agreeable to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF], who has a special order at this time?

Mr. HALLECK. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana to proceed for 4 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the suggestion that middle western gasoline rationing be placed on a par with Eastern States rationing should be approached with the utmost care. Either a great service or a great disservice might be done by such a step.

I think I can speak advisedly on the situation because I am familiar with both sides of the picture. As a part-time resident of the District of Columbia, I know the many inconveniences which arise from being on short gas rations. Again, as a resident of the State of Indiana, I am fully aware of the desire of the residents of the Middle West to maintain their present gasoline allowances. They accepted rationing in the first place not because of gas shortage but because they were told that rationing was necessary to conserve rubber. Clearly they should not be asked to go along with further curtailment just because misery loves company.

The entire crux of the question centers on whether further restriction of the use of gasoline in the Middle West would be of any material advantage to eastern car drivers. Would the cutting of the value of gas coupons in the Middle West or the prohibition of all pleasure driving put any more gas in the tanks of eastern drivers? Or would such further restriction simply mean that the car owners in my part of the country would suffer and the eastern driver would not be benefited in the slightest?

I am frank to say that I think the latter is correct. Some say that the proposed restriction would mean 15,000 more barrels of gas daily to the eastern user. Even if this is true, it seems a relatively small amount to me. I should think that any move for more gas should produce a greater new supply than 15,000 barrels before it would scarcely be worth while. In any event, if transportation facilities in use in the Midwest are needed to move gasoline east, let the O. D. T. take them. But do not put more restrictions on our people unless shortages in supply indicate the necessity therefor.

If it is proved absolutely that the proposed restriction would cure the eastern situation, then a case can be made for it. But certainly there should be no restrictions imposed on Indiana and other States merely to compel motorists in all parts of the Nation to suffer alike. I do not believe that either my colleagues or eastern motorists would approve such a selfish plan.

It is imperative that the entire question be given a thorough hearing before any restrictive step as proposed is taken. Let us get the facts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] for 30 minutes.

THE PLIGHT OF THE CANNERS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin delegation in the House of Representatives met with a group of outstanding canners from the State of Wisconsin in my office Saturday forenoon, June 5, for the purpose of discussing the unfortunate situation in which the canners of Wisconsin now find themselves, through no fault of their own.

As long ago as October 1942, the Wisconsin canners, through individuals and through their association, have been attempting to reach some sensible adjustment of their problems with the Office of Price Administration, and in spite of that early start, they find themselves face to face with the canning season and utterly unable to carry on because of lack of labor with which to take care of the season's pack.

If these canners had been negligent or had attempted through evasive measures to avoid cooperating with the Government agencies, it would be their own fault, but I can truthfully say that the record of the Wisconsin canners is outstanding in that they have faithfully adhered to the regulations of the various departments, no matter how foolish, and up to the present time not a single one of them has been hailed into court because of any violation of Government regulations. This shows that the Wisconsin canners are making a very earnest and honest effort to meet the demands of the Government, both in respect to price regulations and in respect to increased production of food.

In the October meeting these gentlemen were assured of attention to their problems and told that the matter would be taken care of in December. In December of 1942, another meeting was held, and no decisions were made which met the problems of the canners. They were then advised to meet again in February of 1943, at which time there was further delay and procrastination. On several occasions I have personally conferred with the various gentlemen in the agencies, who manifested a sympathetic interest but did nothing. These canners, many of whom are known to me personally, are capable, energetic, honest, and sincere, striving to take care of their growers, their employees, their customers, and the Government's demand for increased production, while at the same time they are badly handicapped by

rules and regulations which are more of a hindrance than a help.

I need not go into the great service rendered by the canning industry to the food problems of the average American home, but I would like to take this occasion to point out that when the Axis forces surrendered at Tunisia they had guns, munitions, equipment, and food, but the food was raw, and the drive against them had been so pressing that they had had no time to process that raw food, with the result, as explained by many prisoners, both German and Italian, that they had not eaten for 2 days and had to quit because of a lack of prepared food. On the other hand, our boys, as well as the French soldiers and the British soldiers, had canned food which could be prepared very quickly, and in that manner our armed forces could be fed and the drive sustained. It was canned food that sustained our boys and the lack of canned food that was one of the leading factors in making the Axis soldiers quit in Tunisia.

If Corporal Hitler had deliberately set out to sabotage our canned-food program, he could not have done a much better job than is now being done by many of the rules and regulations, impossible of fulfillment, that are laid down by the Office of Price Administration.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF CANNERS

In our conference with the canners and their representatives we asked them to point out specific recommendations, and they were all agreed that the chaotic conditions in the food-canning industry, at this critical season, demand that control of the food-canning industry, including wages and prices, be concentrated in a single Government agency with full authority and responsibility for production and distribution, and with such State or regional agencies so that unforeseen problems could be met as they arose, without the long and painful and expensive necessity of spending 4 or 5 days every month in Washington.

Many Members of Congress, both in the House and in the Senate, have been urging for months that the question of food production, through all its various ramifications, be centralized in one specific administrator so that there would not be a half dozen agencies to which each industry would be referred in regard to its problems. Personally, I would prefer that such administrator should be Chester Davis, who understands agriculture and knows what is needed to produce food. And I want to protest with all the earnestness and vehemence at my command against the practice of putting hundreds of half-baked lawyers, who never tried a lawsuit, at desks writing regulations and questionnaires for men who were born and raised in their particular industry and who know more about it in their sleep than these pencil pushers will ever know about it. And I want to add while I am at it that I do not believe because some fellow learned what Karl Marx wrote and received a master's degree or doctor of philosophy degree by writing a thesis on the cranberry and how it cares for its young that he is a competent, experienced official to deal with the problems of growing and processing food.

WISCONSIN'S IMPORTANCE

The State of Wisconsin is the second largest canning State in the Union, being exceeded in its output only by California. However, if you subtract the fruits canned in California from its output, Wisconsin comes first. It is the largest vegetable canning State in the Union. There are 154 active canneries in my State, a number of which operate in my district. Last year, Wisconsin canners produced 20,000,000 cases of canned vegetables. This is a lot of food, and it is badly needed in these trying times. The north African campaign shows what canned food can do for a sustained drive in military operations, and we should take that lesson to heart. If these men cannot get adequate help, then the food will rot on the ground and never be canned. This would be a sin against our armed forces, to say nothing of the starving millions in the unhappy countries of Europe and Asia. But, you cannot get help unless you pay for it. Last year, we were able to get men to work in the plants for 35 and 40 cents an hour. This year canners will be lucky if they can get them for twice that much, but the O. P. A. will not even permit them to pay more than 60 cents an hour.

Take the case of trucks to move this product. You have to have trucks and the trucks have to have drivers. Last year you could hire a truck and a driver at $1.00 per hour, which was the going rate, but this year $1.50 is the going rate, and canners cannot get trucks and drivers at any price less than that.

SPECIFIC PROBLEMS

As to specific problems, the canners submit:

First. The Office of Economic Stabilization must live up to O. P. A.'s promise that wage increases approved by the War Labor Board will be reflected in increased ceiling prices. May I point out in this connection that the 10-cent-per-hour increase recently permitted the canning industry in no case will bring more than 65 cents an hour, while in most cases it will mean a ceiling of 50 and 55 cents an hour for male help in the canneries. It is utterly impossible for canners to secure any male help at these wages, as any male individual less than 70 and more than 12, can get better wages in practically any other industry. To illustrate: A canner at Union Grove, Wis., is restricted to 60 cents per hour for male help, while in the same community, which has only about 1,000 inhabitants, a hemp mill is paying twice that much. There is no chance on earth for the canner to compete successfully in the market against higher wage prices with the ceiling fixed as at present.

Second. The canners believe this is not the time to force Government grades on the industry, but if a single centralized agency in charge of the canning industry determines, after consultation with the industry, that compulsory Government grading is necessary for price-ceiling enforcement, they will cooperate in making such program as practical and workable as possible. This recommendation can only be worked out by a frank, open discussion in an informal manner with those who know what the subject is all about.

Third. The canners are opposed to subsidies in principle but have now made firm commitments to growers, at the Government's direction, and expect the Government to fulfill its part of the obligation either by increased ceiling prices or by subsidies to the canners.

In that connection, I should like to point out that in 1942 there was a 25-percent increase of price over 1941 in canned goods, but that all this increase in price went to the grower. In 1941 the canner paid the farmer $48 a ton for peas, in 1942, $64 a ton, and in 1943 he will pay the farmer $84 per ton. It is apparent from these facts and figures that the canner does not get the increase in price for his product, but that such increase is passed on to the grower. The profits last year to the canner were less than in 1941, and that in the face of the fact that the 1942 pack was the largest in the history of the State. In 1941, 7,500,000 cases of peas were packed in Wisconsin, while in 1942, 13,000,000 cases of peas were packed, but still the canner made less money.

Fourth. In all cases the experience of the industry should be consulted in advance of promulgation of regulations directly affecting the canning industry, as required by law. Time and again canners have been called in to consult with administration officials only to find that the regulations had been already made, and that the summoning of canners for a conference was merely a meaningless gesture.

A study of these specific problems submitted by the canners would lead any fair-minded individual to the conclusion that the suggestions herein contained are fair, just, and equitable and should receive serious and favorable consideration. These canners are in earnest in their desire to produce food, and in order to avoid a serious food shortage they will work night and day to pack every can of food it is possible to pack. In view of that fact they should not be handicapped and hamstrung by regulations which continuously interfere with their production, nor should they be shuttled from pillar to post when they come to Washington to present their difficulties and seek a sympathetic hearing on their problems.

The canner is a patriotic, loyal citizen whose sons are in the service and who is anxious to render every possible aid to his country. Let us give him a chance.

In that connection I just want to point out one thing. I know a case that happened back in my district, where a canner canned peas. He got a carload order for peas, carrots, and beets. He himself did not produce the carrots and beets, so he bought them from another canner. He sold those to his customer. The O. P. A. regulation had stated that when a canner bought in the market.

from another canner he could sell at wholesale prices. That is what this man did. But the O. P. A. reversed itself a short time afterward and said, "No; the wholesale prices under such situation do not prevail." They said he would have to sell at the processor's price. This man was hailed into a State court and the State judge threw the case out. He said it was outrageous. He was then hailed into Federal court and assessed triple damages. All his troubles and the troubles of most of these canners are the result of fantastic regulations that have been written in many cases by law students, hundreds of them down in the departments who never tried a lawsuit, who are not familiar with the industry; and they placed restrictions and regulations upon these men that they cannot understand and cannot interpret. I had a letter only last week from an attorney, an outstanding attorney, who has been a circuit judge, who said that he was utterly unable to advise his client, a canner, in regard to the O. P. A. regulation which the canner had brought to him, and said he could not make head or tail out of it.

I want to add in that respect that these men cannot possibly abide by these regulations that are written by somebody either, as I say, who is just out of law school and knows nothing whatever of the problems, or else had read a book by Karl Marx, or has received a doctor's degree on some thesis that he wrote on the cranberry and how it cares for its young. That is the sort of thing that these men are up against.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I think our primary objective should be to get food for the American people and for our armed forces, and by assisting the canners in their difficulties with the O. P. A. and other agencies we are assisting the American people in getting canned foods. The gentleman has indicated that the canners are paying the producers higher prices for corn, peas, and some other vegetables. That is true, but they are paying the higher price because the Department of Agriculture ordered them to pay such price, and they were to be reimbursed through the payment of a subsidy which they had already passed on to the producer.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The Commodity Credit Corporation claims it has the authority to pay this subsidy. Commitments have been made in contracts with the canners which they have signed with the producers. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] offered an amendment in the Committee on Banking and Currency to the Commodity Credit Corporation bill which would prohibit paying these so-called subsidies to the canners for the canners to turn over to the producers. I hope that when the gentleman from Texas follows you he will explain how they are going to take care of the producers of these vegetables for canning purposes.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. DILWEG. In regard to the question propounded by the gentleman from Minnesota, added to the amendment offered in the Committee on Banking and Currency was an amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] to the effect that any commitment made by the Commodity Credit Corporation would not be affected by its subsidy amendment until 60 days after the enactment of the act, in which event it would not affect the 1943 crop.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I read the amendment carefully, and I have tried to construe it, but the amendment is not very clear. If there is any question about the payment of these obligations that the Department has already made, it should be made clear when the amendment comes up for consideration.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Incidentally, I notice by the paper that Senator MURRAY has offered some amendments which I thought were excellent amendments. I should like to see them adopted. I do not want to go into the details of those amendments here.

Mr. DILWEG. I would suggest that the gentleman include the amendment that was offered by Senator MURRAY in his remarks. I think the House is entitled to look at those amendments as they review your remarks made here today.

There is another question I would like to ask the gentleman, and that is: It appears that the canners are confronted today with two problems. One is the question of getting labor and being permitted to pay them a reasonable amount to induce them to work, and the other is where they stand on the subsidies. Is that correct?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. That is right.

Mr. DILWEG. Can you give us additional information covering the approximate cost per can, that is the increased cost per can, that the reasonable wage paid to this labor that is so necessary would involve?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. About one-fourth of a cent per can.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I would like to add that another trouble is the failure of the O. P. A. to set ceiling prices in many instances. The Michigan canners were here Saturday along with the Wisconsin canners, and in one instance where the O. P. A. had failed to set ceiling prices on food packed in glass bottles, one canner had more than 200 cases on the floor of his warehouse for more than 8 months. Certainly there is no excuse for that.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. That is right.

Mr. SHAFER. Another thing I want to bring out here in support of the gentleman's statement, in which I appreciate very much, his bringing up this subject today, is the fact that the canners are unable to compete with wartime labor in our section, and certainly with most of these canners that is true, particularly if they are located in small towns. One instance, in the little town of Fremont, Mich., a town which I think has a population of 700, in the canning season they employ possibly 600. In their canning factory in the last year, due to the failure of the O. P. A. to set ceiling prices, fix a higher wage for them, they have had more than 1,800 employees in that factory as a result of their turnover.

I could go on here for quite a while, but I just want to point out one more thing, that is, the failure of the O. P. A. to do this job has caused the Michigan farmers to lie back and not produce and the canners cannot make a contract with the farmers.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield to my colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that 75 percent of the Wisconsin pack is going for military purposes?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Another thing in this matter is the delay which is occasioned by the O. P. A. in passing on the request the canners have had pending for a month, for some increase under the wage order that will permit them to pay a fair rate to their help in these packing plants.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. That is correct. Now, let me add that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has a canner down in his district at Union Grove, a place of about 1,000 inhabitants, where he is up against this problem. He can only pay 55 cents, or something like that, as a ceiling when, at the same time, there is nearby a hemp mill that is being built where they are paying about $1.25 an hour.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. One dollar and ten cents, to be exact.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. One dollar and ten cents. That is just double.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. We are indebted to the gentleman, and I appreciate very much his bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

I might point out that it has been called to my attention that the growers of peas in my State are mowing their peas down and are using them for stock feed because they absolutely cannot afford to take the prices the canners can pay. In other instances they are going to turn their hogs in on them because they cannot do anything else.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Do you not think that the agencies that fix the price of wages, as well as the price of food, wholesale, retail, and to the processor, should concern themselves with adequate food production; and is that being done?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I think they should. I think that could have been done if we

had had the same system that Great Britain has, where they centralize control in one man. But, by diversification, they have had to run around to six or seven agencies and never can come to an understanding, and it has left these men in such a plight that they want to get out of the business.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. I want to commend the gentleman for his discussion of this subject, which is vitally important, not only to the districts here in the East and the Middle West, but away out West in my district, in Oregon.

I desire to call attention to two problems, one price ceiling and the other wages. The growers are just about now ready to market a large crop of berries, strawberries. I received a telegram only today saying that the entire crop is going to be destroyed unless they are permitted by the Government authorities, those in charge, to pay wages that will compensate the workers on a parity with the wages paid in the districts.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include at this point in the RECORD an item from the New York Times, and also a telegram I received from the Paulus Brothers Packing Co., of Salem, Oreg.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the New York Times]

PROCESSORS FEAR LOSS OF VEGETABLES PACK—NORTHWEST GROUP LAYS SITUATION TO FEDERAL AGENCIES

PORTLAND, OREG., June 5.—Food processors of the Pacific Northwest today charged that the fumbling of manpower and price problems by Federal agencies had caused the loss of thousands of tons of early vegetables. The processors made their charges at a conference called by the Federal Farm Credit Administration, which makes loans to most of the cooperatives that were represented at the meeting.

J. W. Mayo, executive secretary of North Pacific Canners & Packers, Inc., accusing the Office of Price Administration, the War Labor Board, and other Government agencies of regarding the manpower and price situations as "apparently political rather than economic problems," said:

"It's just fumble, fumble, fumble all the time. Already we have lost thousands of tons of spinach, asparagus, and peas, and the season has only started. If the problem is not solved within 10 days, Gresham (a growing center near Portland), for instance, may not have a strawberry pack this year."

The processors contended that adjustments in wages and price ceilings must be made immediately to insure handling of an estimated $8,000,000 worth of canned, frozen, and dehydrated fruits, vegetables, and milk products in Oregon and southern Washington. The lowest practicable wage scale that could attract adequate manpower was 85 cents an hour for men and 70 cents for women in metropolitan areas, 5 cents less in rural sections, they said; an increase of 2½ to 5 cents over current scales.

SALEM, OREG., *June 14, 1943.*

Hon. HOMER ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Recent press release by Dr. Noble of Seattle War Labor Board, stated that National War Labor Board had approved his recommendation of basic cannery wage scales of 66½ cents for women and 80½ cents for men in metropolitan areas and 3 cents less in outlying districts. Upon contacting him we find, first, these wages affect common labor scale only. In other words we cannot raise wages of workers now being paid more than base scale, result of which puts experienced keymen on pay basis less than common labor which this year is comprised mostly students and old men. Second, that these wage advances can be made only if no increase in our ceiling prices is asked for from office of Price Administration. Our annual pay roll is approximately $500,000, an increase which we are asked to assume would total $125,000 and to assume this as you can readily realize would put us out of business. We have already lost numerous highly trained men to war industries due to their higher wage scales and it is imperative now that we increase wages of balance of our regular employees as well as seasonal employees necessary to process rapidly ripening crops. We have about 100 regular employees and we employ 1,600 people during our peak period of summer. The War Labor Board's job-freezing order instead of being help is detriment insofar as securing necessary help is concerned. We will appreciate any assistance you can give us by forcing immediate action by Office of Price Administration in allowing us to include wage advance in our price ceilings and also relief from War Labor Board in connection with wages of workers affected by basic scale ruling. Above situation is typical of practically every canner in Oregon and entire Northwest and is so serious that unless something is done immediately the processing of crops may be impossible.

PAULUS BROS. PACKING CO.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I wish to say to the gentleman that what he has outlined is not only applicable to his State, but is applicable to every State in the Union, and more or less to thousands of growers and canners in the State of Ohio.

The Food Study Committee that has been studying this problem for the last month or so has a special subcommittee that has given a great deal of attention to this matter. They have had witnesses before them, they have had growers and canners and they have developed this one fact—I think the gentleman knows about it already—there are great quantities, especially of asparagus, in the warehouses in California and some eastern sections of the United States, great quantities of asparagus that is in the way, on which the price has not been fixed, and it is apparently the congestion, or the inability, or the recklessness or whatever the trouble is down below which just paralyzes things, and it is so far-reaching that it is almost going to be a cataclysm.

Furthermore I wish to say that the Ohio delegation representing the canners last week, last Friday or Saturday, went down to see Mr. Vinson. Everybody knows whoever sat in this Congress when Mr. Vinson was a Member of this House that he is one of the most brilliant men who ever served here, capable and brilliant in every way, and I am sure he will make a good administrator if they will let him alone; but these men went down and talked with Mr. Vinson. He, of course, is a new man on the job. He gave us every assurance that he would be glad to do all that he could, but he said this, which has developed in so many instances: "You have got to bring the matter up from below, bring it up from some other source to me and I will pass on it."

I want to see the time come that a bill which has been recommended by our Food Study Committee passes this House establishing all this agricultural activity under one head, and let it be Chester Davis. I think every Republican would be satisfied if it were Chester Davis, but let us get unison, let us get centralized. Then we will go somewhere.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. The other day when there was a discussion here the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] said he favored Chester Davis, and I think most of us who knew Mr. Davis and had contacts with him have a lot of confidence in him, because he has understood agriculture and he would know what to do with its problems.

The gentleman spoke of Mr. Vinson's statement that the matter had to come up from below to Judge Vinson. My only answer is that if you do not do it there will not be anything to bring up from below because you all know that these foodstuffs are highly perishable; you cannot hold them, they spoil overnight. We are going to be in the fix where we have either got to go ahead and can or else let it rot, and it will not take long.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have had a great deal of experience with these supermen down in O. P. A., and I have come to the conclusion that they are more interested in putting over their favorite ideas than they are in securing the production of food for the American people and for the men in our armed forces.

As I size up the situation, these canners need to pay additional wages in order to get the help to can these vegetables. The War Labor Board has granted an increase but the O. P. A. refuses to add a few cents per case to cover this extra overhead.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that already Chester Davis is being bypassed and these complaints and questions taken to Mr. Vinson?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I do not want to pass on the priorities down in the agencies, but I do want to state the difficulty the

canners are in and I want to see the canners get more help.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think I read the gentleman's mind: That we are not particular who does it nor what party nor what faction does it.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. That is right; we want to get it done.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. All we are interested in is getting this done; and if we do not get it done it is not going to be the canners who will suffer, it is going to be the American people.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. And it is not going to do us any good to appropriate money to get labor in here from Jamaica, Bermuda, or anywhere else to raise produce if we do not see that the produce gets into the cans after it is produced.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. HULL. I wish to call attention to one situation which has come up since our meeting with this gentleman in his office yesterday; it came in this morning. We have 25 large pea canneries in my district. The draft boards are taking the boys now who are arriving at the age of 18, I believe it is, boys who were trained in last year's canning operations to manage certain lines in the canneries. The consequence is that this skilled labor which has been obtainable from the high schools in some of these canneries is not going to be available unless we get a reversal of the draft boards' orders on these young men.

Another thing, there is a great shortage of help in our section of Wisconsin. We have had a very cold, backward spring, but things are coming along all right now. We are likely to have at any time very hot weather. That will rush the pea crop and it will take an extra force of men and women to handle the product or else it will spoil before it is ready for canning.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, let me say in conclusion that this is not a matter of political parties or political philosophy. It is merely a matter of getting some food out and getting it out now when the time is ripe for the production of this food. It cannot be delayed. It is one of those things that is seasonal, the crop is highly perishable, and if it is not produced now it never will be for this year and we will have to go into next year. I might add that most of these men, being small independents, cannot stand the loss they would have to take financially and they might be put out of business. We need them badly next year even if they cannot turn out anything this year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today after all previous orders have been completed, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ONE FOOD AGENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in what the gentleman from Wisconsin had to say about one food agency. Much consideration and thought has been given to that question. It is a very serious question. The Congress, as has been discussed here, not wanting to place confidence in the Office of Price Administration, at one time when a price-control bill was before it, inserted an amendment which provided that the Secretary of Agriculture must approve all prices relating to agricultural commodities. That divided responsibility.

Now we go to the O. P. A., we insist on a certain thing, and the O. P. A. will say: "Well, we have submitted to Agriculture our proposition how to cure this. Agriculture does not agree with us." We go to Agriculture and Agriculture says: "O. P. A. is wrong. We want to do it thus and so." Therefore, there is no agreement and there is nothing to go to the economic stabilizer on because nothing has been done to unstable the economic situation. If a price increase is recommended, then it goes to the Director of the Board of Economic Stabilization, but unless there is an increase in price recommended there is nothing to become unstable, and it does not go to the Director of the Board of Economic Stabilization.

So the point is that this divided authority leads to much confusion and often it is against the war effort. It is also against the interest of the people. When we know this we should make an effort to adjust it and I think the best way to adjust it is by having one agency.

ECONOMIC STABILIZER SHOULD HAVE POWER

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] introduced a bill which provides that that one agency shall be the Department of Agriculture. I have an amendment to a bill approved by the Banking and Currency Committee which would provide that the Honorable Chester Davis, who is Food Administrator at this time, should be that one person to have complete and full charge of foods, including production, distribution, price, and everything else. But I have been studying this a great deal and I have come to the conclusion that we are both wrong, and I do not say that I am committed, that I will not change. I think we should have that power in the Director of Economic Stabilization, then we would have that one person to look to. If we have a problem like you have with the canneries, you have one person to go to who can make the decision. If we send it to Agriculture and give them all the power there is another step to be had. After he makes his decision it goes to the Board of Economic Stabilization and we have not finished. We are dealing with someone who does not have the final authority. If we place it in the hands of Chester Davis and he makes his decision, if it is against us it does not go to the Board of Economic Stabilization at all. If it is for an increase in price, we will say, and there is a tendency to unsettle the economic situation, then it goes to the Board of Economic Stabilization and it is passed on by that agency. The point is we are placing it in people, or attempting to, who will not have the final say. So why not now place it in the Director of Economic Stabilization and say to him, "It is your duty, it is your responsibility; we are looking to you and looking to you only." If we do that, I think we will have an opportunity of getting these mistakes and errors that are clear and unmistakable adjusted in much quicker time.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. If the gentleman puts it in the hands of the Economic Stabilizer, that Economic Stabilizer has a thousand things to do. He is going to be stabilizer of everything, not only of foods, but he will have everything else to stabilize.

Mr. PATMAN. That is very true.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. You are doing exactly what you ought not to do if you want to centralize it.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is asking a good, constructive question. At the same time he will have the responsibility. While he has the power, he has the responsibility. Any man will have plenty to do that has this in charge. He can refer part of it to Mr. Davis, he can refer part of it to O. P. A., he can refer part of it to Mr. Wickard, but the point is that he will be charged with the responsibility. He cannot say, "Go and see Mr. Wickard," "Go and see Davis," "Go and see Brown." Mr. Vinson is the man that has it in his own hands, the responsibility is on him, but he may ask other people to make the investigation and report to him. However, he is the man who has the responsibility.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know the gentleman is aware of the fact that one of the main complaints against the O. P. A. is due to the large number of inexperienced men down there who have made certain policies.

They have not had any practical experience either with canning or with agriculture or with the production of food, and they have refused to listen to men who are experienced in these lines. Does not the gentleman believe it would be much better for this agency to go over into the Department of Agriculture, where they have men trained and experienced in food production and food distribution?

Mr. PATMAN. I heard the gentleman last week when I asked him to name

some who were objectionable. I think he named a Mr. Hoffman, did he not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Hoffman resigned this morning.

Mr. PATMAN. I know, but he went back to Agriculture.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I named others. I named Dr. Galbraith, I named Mr. Hamm, I named Mr. Ginsburg, and I named Mr. Baker, and I could give the gentleman the names of scores of others.

Mr. PATMAN. I think the gentleman will be rendering a distinct service if he will give those names for the RECORD at different times and give them to Mr. Brown—I presume he sees the RECORD—and insist that corrections be made. I do not believe we should have inexperienced men at the head of these departments. If they are inexperienced and know nothing about the business, then they do not know how to take competent advice and they are not qualified to pass on it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They are the ones who have been doing it.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not say that all of them are that way, and I do not believe the gentleman says they are all that way. I will say that too many of them have been that way in the past. Even one is too many. When we find one like that, we should try to get rid of him. Some of them have been discharged.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They have had some very fine, practical businessmen in the O. P. A. and they still have some, but I know of several who have gotten out of there and resigned, or were forced to resign, because these superintellectuals, as I call them, would not listen to practical advice and experience.

Mr. PATMAN. We want to get rid of that type of person, but at the same time we must remember that we are in the legislative branch of this Government. The Constitution, when it was made, clearly defined our duties. I sometimes believe that Members of Congress hold out too much hope to their constituents. When they come to us with their problems we are more or less inclined to become optimistic and say, "I am going to help you get that adjusted; we will get it changed." Yet it is something that is in the executive department, it is not in the legislative branch at all. We have no power to hire and fire people in the executive department. We have a duty that is clearly defined. The makers of the Constitution, this great document of ours, said the Executive would have charge of faithfully executing all the laws, and he is responsible to the people, he is elected by the people just as we are. I just wonder sometimes if the legislative branch of the Government does not sometimes try to go too far in running the Executive's part of the Government.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think we are reaping some things that have been sowed during the past 10 or 12 years, when the majority in Congress have built up this tremendous bureaucracy who now fail to recognize the legislative branch of the Government and do just exactly as they please irrespective of the intent of Congress. We are trying to recapture some of that power. A good many men have come into the administration who do not believe in Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. That is very true. The gentleman says, "have come into the administration who do not believe in Congress." I do not know about that. I cannot certify to that. If the gentleman knows, of course I am not questioning his veracity on it at all.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. During my years in Congress—and I have been here a good many years with the gentleman—there has always been at least some cooperation between the majority party and the administration that is in control so that they could adjust some of these things, but now even the best Democrats cannot go down and do anything with these men who have taken over the control of our administrative affairs.

Mr. PATMAN. We have more problems today than we ever had before in history. We had no notice of that Pearl Harbor attack. We did not know it was going to happen. It threw our country into lots of confusion. We were not prepared. We should have been prepared long years ago. We have made lots of mistakes. We made a mistake by not helping China 6 years ago. We made a mistake by not fortifying those bases out in the South Pacific. We made mistakes by not preparing this country, but those mistakes are in the past. When we were attacked by an enemy we had to begin to get ready. In order to get ready we had to change our whole form of government. We had to regiment the people. We had to do lots of things they were not used to. We had to deprive the people of things they had gotten used to and which they do not like to be deprived of. So we have had more problems than we ever had before.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As the gentleman says, we Congressmen have come to be not only Representatives in Congress but representatives in Washington of our constituents, attempting to secure information and advice for them.

To come back to this canning situation, I confess that I have been unable to devote much time to the study of the situation, but may I ask the gentleman this. Is it true that we face the probability that we shall lose a canning crop because of the regulations from Washington?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope not, certainly; if it were all under one person I am sure it would not happen.

We have more problems than one. We have a manpower problem, and we have transportation, and lots of other problems in connection with this matter. They all cannot be ironed out by O. P. A. or by Agriculture, or by Manpower. It takes all of them working together, but if we have them under one person then I do not think that one person would let these mistakes be made, and that is what I would like to see. I would like to see it under one person.

FACING RUN-AWAY INFLATION

Mr. Speaker, this is what I wanted to say when I rose first. Our country is facing ruinous inflation. There are more signs of run-away inflation today than I have ever seen in this country. I could point out to you lots of signs that really represent the handwriting on the wall. This Congress should be doing something about it. It means almost equal to losing the war, if we lose this fight against inflation. There are two major problems facing us. One is winning the war, and the second one is preventing inflation here at home to save our country on the domestic front. Last week the people of this Nation asked for and received $300,000,000 in new money. They put that money in their pockets, or in their socks, or between their mattresses. At least they kept the money out of the banks. They kept it out of a place where a record might be made—$300,000,000. During the past 12 months $5,000,000,000 have been taken out like that in new money, and hoarded. It is $10,000,000,000 more than the normal amount needed in the pockets or in the tills of the people to do business that the people do. There is something wrong about that. Why are they doing it? Is not that a kind of arrow pointing in a certain direction? Two or three things could happen.

Of course, some people say they can handle transactions in cash and maybe avoid income taxes. I do not think many people do that. I think the number that would draw out cash and keep it for that purpose would be insignificant, and would not amount to much, but there are people who say that they are afraid of forced savings. If they have their money in the banks, and a bill should be passed or a regulation enforced that seizes or freezes those savings, they would not have a chance to get the money back, and if they have it in their pockets, or between their mattresses, it cannot be reached through forced savings. I do not know what is happening, but it looks like a flight of money to commodities, when people are willing to pay any price to get certain things.

I hear it said all the time that in England they have only a few hundred people enforcing the price administration, and I heard the statement made the other day that in Canada there are less than 100 people enforcing the price laws of Canada. They have only about 8 lawyers, while down here we have 2,700. Let me tell you something of the difference which you ought not to overlook. In England and Canada the people are taxed very heavily. The money that would normally go into channels of trade, used to purchase goods essential or not essential, is taxed and taken away from the people to pay the war debts of England and Canada. They do not have much money to buy these goods, and price control is a very simple problem.

If we taxed the people of this country today to pay our debts on the same basis

and according to the same ratio as they tax them in England, price control would not be much of a problem in this country, because the people would not have all of these tens of billions of dollars to buy these different commodities with. So, with all of the money that we have and the low taxes, we have got to control prices in some way or face ruinous inflation in this country, and inflation is something that will destroy a nation. One of these days, if something is not done to stop it, the people in the civil service, in your home towns, the postmasters and the rural carriers, and the clerks will write you a letter and say they appreciate the $300 increase which you gave them, but they now find that they can only buy half as much with the money they have with the increase and some say they can only buy one-quarter as much and the first thing you know our dollars will be worth dimes because the value of that money is going down all the time and if we do not realize the importance of ruinous inflation and do more to stop it, our country can lose as much in property values as we could lose if we would lose the war. We must face the issue with taxes.

We must absorb a great deal of this additional purchasing power. That is one way. There are many other ways it can be done, but that is the main way to do it. The President has asked for $16,000,000,000 more to draw that money off, not only to pay debts with it, but to keep it out of competition and keep people from bidding too high on different goods. We have not done much about it. We passed a bill; instead of giving a lot of extra money we are forgiving a lot of money which is in the direction of inflation and not in the direction of deflation.

So I say this Congress must realize that taxes must be levied and assessed until it hurts, because it is necessary to prevent ruinous inflation, and ruinous inflation would destroy the country.

I heard it said the other day that price control is so easy. I do not agree with that. I know many mistakes have been made in price control. I could enumerate many things that I detest and I cannot understand why they have been done. But at the same time we must have price control. There are 8,000,000 commodities in this country that are subject to price control. You cannot control 8,000,000 commodities or half that number without a lot of confusion. There will naturally be a lot of confusion. Some people say we should not have luxuries under price control. They say, Why have furs under price control? Why have diamond rings and pianos? I will tell you why. A fur dealer who makes $100 profit on selling furs has that $100 in his pocket in competition with all of the other money that is seeking the same commodities that he will want. The man who sells a diamond ring or a piano and makes a handsome profit, has that handsome profit in his pocket and it goes into competition with all the other money held by people who are seeking a supply of goods, which causes more run-away inflation. So I say to you that one of the most serious problems facing this country today, one of the major problems, is to stop this trend toward run-away inflation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes after the special order of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes after the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE OIL SITUATION ON THE ATLANTIC COAST

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon my distinguished friend and colleague from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] took occasion to call attention to the fact that those of us on the eastern seaboard are endeavoring to find some of the answers to the very grave gasoline and fuel oil crisis that exists in our territory. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] took occasion to warn us that we should not ask for an extension of rationing unless that extension of rationing into district No. 2, the Midwestern States, would provide some relief for us. I want to assure my colleague that the attitude of those of us on the eastern seaboard is not that we wish to have our headaches and our troubles extended to the Midwest or any other section of the Nation unless by so doing, by extending rationing, it will provide some relief for us.

May I add that I believe we are prepared to prove that an extension of rationing and the release of these supplies from district No. 2 will not, as the gentleman suggested, release more than 15,000 barrels of fuel oil per day, but we will be prepared to show that we can obtain upward of 200,000 barrels of petroleum per day.

Our difficulty is, in large measure, the result of lack of long-range planning. One of the suggestions that our committee or our conference has already adopted is that the Baruch committee, which has the confidence of the American people, be reorganized to investigate the entire gasoline picture and make whatever recommendation it deems advisable. I am satisfied that if that is done, if the Baruch committee is reorganized and tells those of us on the eastern seaboard that we have to give up all but essential driving, our people will be only too willing to comply with that recommendation. But as the matter stands today, there is no really organized planning. There is nothing but confusion. There are a number of people who are under the impression that this entire problem is under P. A. W. That is far from the fact. As a matter of fact, O. P. A., in my opinion, one of the most infamous agencies of this Government, is largely involved. I call the attention of this House to the fact that it does not make any difference whether we have a million or two or three million barrels coming into the eastern seaboard as long as the present coupon system of gasoline rationing is still in effect by the O. P. A.

I hold in my hand a copy of the Newark News of Thursday evening last. The leading headline points out that in one small cleaning and dyeing establishment 35,000 gas coupons were seized, the value of which is a total of 110,000 gallons of gasoline. As I said before, it does not make any difference how much gasoline is transported to the eastern seaboard, as long as this inefficient coupon system is in effect it will do us no good. So it is not only a question of adopting a proper long-range program on the part of P. A. W., but also to bring some sense into the rationing on the part of O. P. A. I am satisfied that if the barge canal system and the Great Lakes system were fully utilized, if additional pipe lines were constructed that should be constructed, and if the tank cars that are now being used in district No. 2, which are still hauling petroleum into district No. 2, were put into service in the East, the situation would be greatly relieved. I want to make it clear that there is no disposition on the part of our committee to attempt to spread our troubles to any other section of the Nation unless by so doing we will find some relief.

This is not just a war for the eastern seaboard. It is a war in which the entire country is involved, and I do not believe that it is proper on the part of any Representative to get up and suggest that if by extending rationing the eastern situation will be relieved, that it should not be done.

Only on Saturday morning the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] pointed out that although his district is an oil-producing district, and although an A coupon in his district is worth 2½ gallons, petroleum is being shipped out of his district across the river into Ohio, where an A coupon is worth 4 gallons and where there is no ban on pleasure driving. To me that does not make good sense. I do not want anyone to get the impression that in the eastern seaboard we are interested only in pleasure driving. But let me call your attention to a recent O. P. A. ruling. That ruling provides that a person may not drive his car to his summer home unless he is going there for the purpose of closing it up and then making the return trip. He cannot drive to his summer home, stay there all summer, and then return at the end of the summer.

I am not attempting to defend the business of making a trip every week end and back, but I would like anyone to show me how any more gasoline is saved by permitting a person to drive to his summer home, close it up, and come back than if he goes and stays all summer and comes back at the end of the summer. And yet that is a sample of some

of the O. P. A. rulings. And, just to make it clear, and I do not want to have any particular argument with my friends from the Middle West, because we have no desire to harm them, but we are merely interested in seeing that we get gasoline on the eastern seaboard, and we are going to take such steps as we can to see that we do get gasoline and fuel oil for our constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

GASOLINE SHORTAGE AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, we in the Middle West, particularly Ohio, have no argument or quarrel with our friends in the East. There is no shortage of gasoline at the source; there is no shortage of supply at the source. This is clearly a problem of transportation. Let me call to the attention of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] and our other colleagues from the East, that the O. P. A. is not the only agency responsible for our dilemma. The Office of Defense Transportation is not efficiently handling the tank cars which are used for transporting gasoline. There are 150,000 tank cars in the United States, of which 55,000 have been allotted to district 1, that is the district on the east coast. These tank cars according to O. D. T. regulations are supposed to make a round trip from source to refinery in 15 days or an average of 10 miles per hour in speed. However, the O. D. T. directives are not being enforced, because the trains carrying the tank cars are permitted to pick up other freight en route from the source to refineries. If the oil trains ran as fast as commercial freight manifests, the oil delivered on the east coast could be tripled or even quadrupled.

Those trips involve some 3,600 miles, and as long as that practice is engaged in, you are going to have a shortage of supply in the East, with the shortage of sufficient pipe lines which are not being constructed as speedily as they should be.

Let me call attention to the number of workmen diverted to the construction of war plants which are not now being used; in my own city, if those men had been used in the construction of pipe lines you would not have as grave a problem in the East as you have, and if the 55,000 cars allotted to district 1 in the East traveled even for the 15-day period allotted by the Office of Defense Transportation, you would not have the shortage that you have experienced in the East.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The O. D. T. told me only Friday that Mr. Eastman had issued a directive to the presidents of the railroads telling them to immediately ship back empties at rapid speed from the destinations from which they came, which would help considerably if that were done.

Mr. BENDER. I will say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that the seat of the trouble is that we have confusion worse confounded right here in Washington. One agency issues orders and another countermands, creating a bedlam as a result of the lack of coordination on the part of the agencies involved not only in the distribution of gasoline but affecting every other problem.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It would be much better, where the Petroleum Administration is concerned, if the one office handled price control and distribution and all matters pertaining to oil and gas.

Mr. BENDER. I think the gentlewoman is absolutely right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And Canada has been warm throughout the whole winter when we have suffered cold throughout the East. Does not the gentleman believe that a revival of the Baruch committee, to give this subject the same impartial study it gave to synthetic rubber, might help a lot in view of the public confidence there would be in the accuracy of its statements?

Mr. BENDER. I will agree with the gentlewoman insofar as the manner of handling this problem as the rubber problem was handled, but the gasoline rationing program in our part of the country was put into effect because of the alleged shortage of rubber.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That was the original reason in the East; a reason that proved to be a fallacy.

Mr. BENDER. Exactly. Under the present policy, however, you have wholesale absenteeism due to this gasoline rationing in your part of the country.

You have curtailment in the production of agricultural products. It does not make sense since there is a shortage of food, and every farm expert tells us that there will be a shortage of food, to have the condition extended to our part of the country and create more absenteeism and a greater shortage of food as a result of invoking of the additional rationing in the Middle West.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind the gentleman that there is another special order pending.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman realize that gasoline stocks in district 2 are some three or four million barrels higher than they were a few months ago, whereas our stocks are very materially lower? It would take only 2 or 3 months, bringing in 200,000 or even 150,000 barrels a day, for us to get our stocks up a little so we could go ahead with some of our business.

Mr. BENDER. I am sure if the gentlewoman heard the statement I made regarding the 55,000 tank cars being used for the East as they should be rather than having them wait at various places to take on additional freight, if those cars were used as they should be exclusively in trains made up of gasoline cars or oil cars rather than running them in with all kinds of mixed freight, I am sure the gentlewoman would have the relief she craves—that together with the extension of pipe lines—with greater dispatch.

In our part of the country we are just as patriotic as folks in any other part of the country, and we are just as anxious as they to win this war as speedily as possible, but it would be a rather short-sighted policy to extend this rationing without first exploring the entire issue and without first coordinating all these agencies so we might have a unified program. I am sure no one in Ohio is happy about the conditions in Massachusetts or New Jersey; I am sure there is a very decided feeling that this matter should be corrected, and that it should be corrected soon.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman go with us and will the people of his district go with us to Secretary Ickes and those in authority and see that something is worked out? I am sure the distinguished gentleman would share with us for 2 or 3 months some of the gasoline they have. We have suffered for a year and a half under rationing.

Mr. BENDER. We would most certainly do everything in our power to see that the gasoline needed in the gentlewoman's section of the country is made available to the greatest extent it can be made available through the proper use of transportation facilities. These facilities are not being used to anything like their maximum capacity.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would you be willing to give up pleasure driving for a time?

Mr. BENDER. I can speak for only myself, but I may say that as far as pleasure driving is concerned in my own State I do not believe there are many people who are using gasoline to any great extent that is not absolutely essential, because the quantity of gasoline allotted to us, the gentlewoman can appreciate from her experience with the gas allotted to her, is not adequate.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. HARTLEY. We are not revealing any military secrets when we state that our difficulties are very largely the result of the great demands for petroleum products on the part of our armed forces.

Mr. BENDER. That is right.

Mr. HARTLEY. That with the prospective events we believe to be in view the situation is not going to get any better but may get considerably worse.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is right.

Mr. HARTLEY. Does not the gentleman believe there is a very great need for a long-term program and a study of such a program, a far more comprehensive program than has been set up to the moment?

Mr BENDER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The main objectives, our chief objective, today, is to supply our armed forces with the gasoline and other oil products they need. We realize that as well as the gentleman does.

If there were a proper coordination of all the interests here, if there were an intelligent handling of this problem in Washington, I am sure we would have relief as you would have relief in your part of the country.

Mr. HARTLEY. Does not the gentleman agree that the coordination of all phases of the petroleum problem, even transportation, rationing, price fixing, and everything else, should be placed under one head and that there would be greater efficiency?

Mr. BENDER. We have been asking for that for the last 6 months, but we have had no results.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As the gentleman knows, 80,000 tons of gasoline have been shipped to Spain. Gasoline and oil are being constantly sent there, and that has to be taken into consideration in connection with our losses.

Mr. BENDER. And I am wondering how friendly that nation is to us.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am wondering, too, if that nation ever received it—if it has not been diverted to the Nazis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial that appeared in the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 28.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain recommendations made by Mr. W. P. Hedden, Director of Port Development, Port of New York Authority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am going to insert in the RECORD in connection with my remarks the complete recommendation of Mr. Hedden, but I would like to read just one paragraph briefly because I want the Members to consider it now.

He states as follows:

In order to deliver to the Northeast the maximum quantities of motor fuel for the next 90 days in available tank cars and inland barges, the Petroleum Administrator should direct the movement of at least 200,000 barrels per day from district 2 to district 1.

As I stated before, district No. 2 has upward of 4,000,000 additional barrels of gasoline than it had some months ago Whereas the east coast has a pitifully small amount. A much smaller supply than it had at the same period.

I want to direct the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that we on the east coast have been rationed for months, not only so far as pleasure driving is concerned, but in the use of gas for the actual conduct of our business. Business has not been allowed to progress because the gasoline was not available. The war effort has been retarded.

Mr. HARTLEY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HARTLEY. Is it not a fact that because of the sufficiency of the stock of petroleum in district 2 that they could send to us 200,000 barrels per day for the next 3 months without having to come to the rationing status that we in district No. 1 on the eastern seaboard are in today?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is absolutely true, and that is what I am going to bring out. It has been interesting to me in that I recently have seen a good many people, businessmen and others, from the second district and they have told me of the quantity of gasoline they have, not only for the operation of their business but for pleasure driving. As the Members know we have not the necessary number of votes on the east coast to pass adequate legislation in order to protect ourselves. If the Members from district 2 would join us I believe we could secure the legislation that would at least give us a fighting chance for our protection. Everybody knows due to the lack of fuel oil the suffering that we endured during the last winter on the east coast, particularly in New England, and so far as kerosene is concerned, most particularly in Massachusetts. The largest percentage of the kerosene used is burned in New England as compared with the rest of the country, and by far the greatest use of it is in my own State. It took us some time to make the Administrator realize how vital an adequate supply of kerosene is.

It has been suggested to me and I have been working on the matter that plenty of trucks are now available to carry gasoline from the barges that can come through the inland waterways and that those trucks could be made available to carry the gasoline down through New York, New Jersey, and to New England. I will ask the Members to join with me in seeing that that be done.

Mr. HARTLEY. Is it not true that the Keystone Pipe Line from Buffalo to Philadelphia, which has a capacity of about 20,000 barrels a day, is not in use simply because the stocks in Buffalo are not available, yet if the barges on the Great Lakes were used the supply would be plentiful in Buffalo?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; that is correct. Those barges should continue now on their way and should be met by trucks. I am told there are plenty of trucks to take the gasoline.

I believe those of us on the east coast must have assistance in making our case strong enough for those in authority to give us results. It is not a matter of mere pleading. We are all in the war together. We all ought to be willing to share any hardship or difficulty, but in this matter it is not hardship we ask of district 2; it would only be asking those of the Midwest to give up temporarily their pleasure driving. The east coast has been grossly discriminated against. Any fair-minded person will agree we are heartily tired of the injustices.

I wish to commend the gentleman from New Jersey. He should be given the greatest praise for his tireless efforts ir working out some sort of a solution in order that we may be given relief on the east coast. It has been a task of love, one might say, but it has been an exhaustive task for us over these long months, and it seems to be an endless one. Immediate relief should be given us.

The statement of Mr. W. P. Hedden, director of port development, the Port of New York Authority, follows:

THE NORTHEASTERN GASOLINE AND OIL CRISIS—A PROGRAM OF RELIEF

THE PRESENT EMERGENCY

Adequate supplies of gasoline are vital to farming, transportation of war workers, maintenance of deliveries of foodstuffs and other essentials in the Northeast. The winter heating emergency is over, but supplies of fuel oil and heavy oil are necessary for current operation of war industries and public utilities, and for the building of stocks in anticipation of next winter.

The damage to pipe lines and delays to rail and inland water transport caused by unprecedented floods, plus increasing demands for overseas shipments to the Army and Navy, have created a grave emergency. The administration officials have properly taken steps to apportion the current supplies to the most essential services. However, the present shortage is curtailing not only pleasure driving but transportation which is essential to the civilian population of the Northeast.

Mr. Chester Dumond, New York State Commissioner of Agriculture, is quoted in the New York Times of June 2 as saying, "The cold fact is that at this moment our current check indicates that many of the farms of New York State are right up against the danger of total absence of gasoline for plowing. * * * Nine of the 21 gasoline distributing bulk plants operated in New York State by the Grange League Federation have had no gasoline for several days. The dry plants are in Steuben, Erie, Allegany, Ontario, Chenango, Wyoming, Monroe, Cattaraugus, and Wayne Counties."

The city situation for war workers is just as critical. Every day 385,000 New York and New Jersey residents must cross the Hudson River between their homes and places of business. The railroad tubes take care of a portion of them but 150,000 travel on rubber and use gasoline, either in busses or private cars. Transportation in private cars has been drastically reduced, despite the fact that clockings in April showed that 70 percent were engaged in essential travel. The load thrown on the interstate bus lines has jumped from 46,000 per day in 1941 to 77,000 in March 1943. In rush hours, the busses are crowded to 45 and 50 passengers, including standees. Now the critical gas shortage has forced a cut of 20 percent in bus service, while at the same time the use of private passenger cars has been cut 30 percent.

It is imperative that these restrictions be eased as soon as practicable. The problem is obviously one of increasing the supply in the

critical Northeast area as quickly as possible, insofar as this can be done by adjustments in consumption and stocks in other sections which will permit a greater daily delivery to the Northeast from points were transportation is available. Prompt steps should be taken in this direction. Our specific suggestions in this regard are elaborated under an immediate program.

In order that the present situation in the Northeast States shall be neither dragged out for an unduly long period, nor suddenly occur a third time, we believe that certain steps should be taken at this time in a longer range program which will effect supplies next winter and next year.

IMMEDIATE PROGRAM

More gasoline by rail from Midwest

In order to deliver to the Northeast the maximum quantities of motor fuel for the next 90 days in available tank cars and inland barges, the Petroleum Administrator should direct the movement of at least 200,000 barrels per day additional from district 2 to district 1.

Mr. Ickes has already hinted that this move may be necessary. He was reported in the New York Herald Tribune of June 2, as warning that the effects of the shortage might soon extend inland to Midwestern and other States, and that if diversion of Midwest oil supplies to the East would help ease the crisis, that course would be followed. It should be started without delay.

By reason of the shorter turn-around from storage tanks and refineries in district 2 (Midwest) as compared to district 3 (Gulf territory), total deliveries by tank car would be increased 50,000 barrels per day by drawing 150,000 barrels more by rail from the Midwest. The same tank cars can deliver 150,000 barrels per day of gasoline from the Midwest on a 12-day turn-around as against 100,000 barrels hauled from the Southwest on an 18- or 20-day turn-around. At present, 80 percent of the total movement is from long-haul points in the Gulf territory.

Gasoline stocks in district 2 are approximately double those of district 1, even under the present rationing. They could be drawn upon at the rate of 200,000 barrels per day above present shipments from district 2 for 2 or 3 months and still not pull these stocks down below those on the east coast.

Furthermore, an additional supply out of current production could be made available to the east coast if the restrictions on driving were equalized to a greater extent. At the present time, the basic allowances in district 2 are three times those in district 1, and there is no pleasure ban on the use of the gasoline in district 2.

More gasoline at Lake ports for water movement to East

In addition to the more effective use of tank cars which could be accomplished by making greater quantities of gasoline available from district 2, inland waterway equipment which may otherwise be wasted, could be utilized in transport from the Great Lakes area to the Atlantic coast, if greater supplies were provided at Lake ports, such as Toledo, Detroit, Cleveland, and even Chicago.

The New York State canal system from Buffalo and Oswego to the Hudson River, which supplies petroleum products direct to points in New England, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, is easily capable of handling 150,000 barrels per day. Governor Dewey and the New York State Legislature have recently authorized improvements which will be completed very shortly in anticipation of a movement of 122,000 barrels a day. Instead, the available supply was first set at 70,000, and more recently at 40,000 barrels per day by the Petroleum Administrator. This limitation in supplies for water movement reflects the absence of any planned program to equalize stocks between the Midwest and the East, and to provide more out of current production by equalizing consumption with the east coast.

The barge, tug, and self-propelled tanker equipment in operation on the New York State canals in 1941 demonstrated ability to move 77,000 barrels per day west-bound. With a late start in reversing this movement in 1942, the east-bound movements were 52,000 barrels per day on the average. With adequate supplies available at points like Toledo, rational allocations of the lake-tanker fleet and the migratory self-propelled barges which operate on both the Lakes and canal, and quick completion of improvements in transhipment facilities at Buffalo and Oswego, there is no doubt that the water movement from now until December 1 could be stepped up to double or triple of what is now in prospect. The whole program, except the contribution of the State of New York, is lagging because of lack of assurance that adequate supplies will be available at Great Lakes ports. This assurance can only be given if a vigorous policy is pressed by the Petroleum Administrator, with whatever help is needed from the Office of Price Administration rationing authorities, and the Office of Defense Transportation officials in charge of allocating water movements on the Lakes, and carried through, if necessary, by definite orders upon the petroleum industry to make these diversions from the Midwest to the East, rather than to content itself with supplying the usual nearby customers.

Use of pipe lines from lake area to east coast

Additional relief in moving supplies to the east coast can be secured by utilizing existing pipe lines and pressing the completion of another pipe line connecting the Midwest with the east coast. The Atlantic Co.'s Keystone line from Buffalo to Philadelphia, with a capacity of about 18,000 barrels per day, is still not reversed, on account of lack of supplies at the western end. Additional supplies at Buffalo would permit the employment of this line. A new pipe line has been authorized from Chicago to Toledo, with an estimated capacity of 30,000 barrels per day, under the sponsorship of the War Emergency Pipelines. If this is completed promptly, additional products can be made available at Toledo as against Chicago, making it possible to bring petroleum by water from Toledo to Buffalo on a 3-day turn-around instead of the longer 9-day turn-around of Chicago to Buffalo by way of Lake Michigan and Lake Huron.

Further economies in transportation mileage and lake tanker equipment might be achieved by an exchange of products whereby Canadian refineries at Sarnia (near Detroit) could make available supplies to move east on a short haul to the Buffalo end of the canals and pipe lines in return for American refined products to be hauled from Chicago to Canadian destinations in Lake Superior.

The efficient utilization of the lake-canal system of the pipe line from Buffalo, and of tank cars in short haul from the Midwest against long haul from the Gulf, depends fundamentally upon adjustment of supply program (and perhaps the rationing program in the Midwest) to provide adequate amounts for movement from district 2 to district 1. Relief to the severely curtailed Northeast to the extent of over 100,000 barrels per day could be obtained from this source.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

In addition to the emergency program already outlined, which, if carried through, would give continuing relief not only for the summer but also for 1944, provision should be made for construction of additional small self-propelled tankers (of the "migratory" type, capable of operation on the Great Lakes, New York State Canal, Hudson River, Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, Long Island Sound), and additional steel barges and tug equipment to distribute the increasing volume of rail and pipe-line deliveries which will terminate at concentrated refining and storage centers in the New York, Philadelphia, and Richmond areas. The Big Inch pipe line, the 20-inch pipe line, and the Plantation pipe line extension, together with older pipe lines reversed from west to east, will deliver by next winter over 600,000 barrels per day of petroleum products to 3 concentrated areas on the east coast. The distribution from that point on to the ultimate consumer will require ample small tanker and barge equipment to place the products at secondary bulk terminals and distribution points, from which truck delivery can be made to the consumer. There are nearly 500 of these secondary bulk terminals in New York Harbor and Long Island Sound alone, with hundreds more in southern and eastern New England, Delaware River, and Chesapeake Bay points. Practically all of these secondary bulk terminals are located on the water. Water equipment should be used in this lateral east coast service to release tank cars, as far as possible, for the shuttle service from the major oil-producing points to the east coast.

It is probable that there will be a shortage of steel tank barge equipment in 1944 to accomplish this necessary transportation between the primary refining and pipe line and rail terminals and the secondary local distribution tanks in New England, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia. Because of the necessity of clearing steel requirements through the War Production Board and arranging for small tanker and tug motive power and barge construction, this program should be pressed immediately.

Provision has been made for conversion of over 100 dry cargo units to petroleum use on the Mississippi-Ohio waterways, and the building of 168 new steel tank barges for use on the same waterways. Also, provision has been made for tugs and wooden barges to handle heavy oils in the Gulf and the South Atlantic intracoastal waterways. However, no program has been planned for the Northeast, largely because of lack of any definite supply program, which will leave idle certain existing barge equipment in the Northeast in the winter of 1933-44. Looking to 1944, however, it is imperative that the steel tank barge equipment in the northeast (including that which operates on the Barge Canal and the Great Lakes during the open season from April to December) be augmented to take care of continued movement east from the Great Lakes; north and northeast from pipeline and rail terminals at New York to the Hudson River territory, and New England, locally in the Delaware River and Chesapeake and Delaware Canal territory from Philadelphia, and locally in the Chesapeake Bay territory from the Richmond terminals of the Plantation Line. This program should be immediately sponsored by the Office of Defense Transportation, with the cooperation of the Petroleum Administrator, who must estimate and plan the supply picture so that the barge equipment can be fully utilized.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. EATON (at the request of Mr. HARTLEY), indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. EBERHARTER (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. WEISS), on account of serious illness in family.

To Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. MERRITT), on account of official business.

To Mr. SASSCER (at the request of Mr. MERRITT), on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 995. An act to provide a penalty for violation of regulations or orders with respect to persons entering, remaining in, leaving, or committing certain acts within or upon vessels, harbors, ports, and waterfront facilities; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2584. An act to abolish certain naval trust funds and deposits thereto, and to simplify naval accounting procedure, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 9, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, June 9, 1943, at 10 a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments. Room 246, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The Committee on the Public Lands will meet at 10:30 a. m., Wednesday, June 9, 1943, to continue hearings on H. R. 2241, to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument, Wyo., and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

1. Wednesday, June 9: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents on projects in the Los Angeles area and in the State of California, including the Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Kern River Valleys, and on projects in other regions and in other parts of the United States.

2. Thursday, June 10: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

3. Friday, June 11: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold public hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, June 9, 1943, on private bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 9, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2620, a bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives of the United States, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 16, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the securities subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Wednesday, June 9, 1943.

Business to be considered: Open hearing to hear Mr. Ganson Purcell, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, on proxy rules.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2731, to facilitate the award and payment of just compensation for property requisitioned under the authority of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Subcommittee on Unemployment Insurance of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearing on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m., committee prints Nos. 1 and 2, dated June 7, 1943, relative to unemployment insurance for merchant seamen.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of Subcommittee No. 7 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Friday, June 11, 1943, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of bills relating to the carrying of mail on star routes. Public hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Investigation of Restrictions on Brand Names and Newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Monday, June 14, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear representatives of Office of Price Administration. (Hearing for June 9 canceled.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule, XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

466. A letter from E. G. Allen, rear admiral, United States Navy, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned from civilian life in the Navy and Marine Corps, from March 30 to May 30, 1943, and in the Coast Guard from April 1 to June 1, 1943; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

467. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report covering its operations for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to March 31, 1943, inclusive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

468. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on a list of papers recommended to him for disposal by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

469. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on lists of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

470. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veteran's laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

471. A letter from the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, transmitting report No. 4 of action taken under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

472. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the law relating to larceny in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPARKMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 219. An act to equalize certain disability benefits for Army officers; with amendment (Rept. No. 529). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 2899. A bill to provide a measure of post-war security for members of the land and naval forces and seamen of the merchant marine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 2900. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2901. A bill to authorize the disposition of certain property under the jurisdiction of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Res. 254. Resolution directing the Library of Congress to deliver to the Attorney General certain papers; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 2902. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William Leo; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2903. A bill for the relief of the Washington Asphalt Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 2904. A bill for the relief of the Reverend R. E. McKinney; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2905. A bill for the relief of Walter R. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2906. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Norma S. McKinney and Mrs. Ella Swenson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1459. By Mr. HALE: Resolution of the New England Traffic League, recommending that the passage of Senate bill 942 as now drawn be opposed; that in lieu thereof the buyers and sellers of all modes of transportation be given the opportunity to confer for the purpose of determining what, if any, illegal or undesirable practices are now being pursued to draft a plan to govern future activities of all rate-making agencies, associations, and bureaus that will be lawful and practicable, such plan to be subject to the approval of Interstate Commerce Commission or such other governmental agency as the Congress may designate, as well as the Department of Justice; and that in order to make effective these recommendations the New England Traffic League urges the Congress and the Department of Justice to defer any action for a reasonable period pending the outcome of these cooperative efforts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1460. By Mr. HOPE: Petition with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1461. Also, petition with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1462. Also, petition with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1463. By Mr. HALE: Petition of 86 members and attendants at the convention of the York County, Maine, Woman's Christian Temperance Union at Berwick, Maine, on May 11, 1943, petitioning Congress to support all legislation which will prohibit the sale of beverage alcohol to the men in or around the camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1464. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Eliza H. Seany and 37 other citizens of Chehalis, Wash., and vicinity, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1465. Also, petition of Mrs. O. L. Soule and 17 other citizens of Elma, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1466. Also, petition of Christ P. Jacobsen and 56 other citizens of Cathlamet, Wash., and vicinity, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1467. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolutions of the Connecticut Valley Pomona Grange, No. 11, Woodstock, Vt., opposing Senate bill 637 as reflecting on the capabilities of the American people to discharge this duty and endangering the freedom of the people; to the Committee on Education.

1468. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Yakima, Grandview, Mabton, Sunnyside, and Pomeroy, Wash., urging favorable action on House bill 2082, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1469. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francis Jean Reuter, T. D. B. S., M. A., Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to petition No. 221; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1470. Also, petition of the National Society of New England Women, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bills 2428 and 2429; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1471. Also, petition of the Consolidated Building Trades, Metal Trades, Central Labor Council of Vallejo, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to old-age assistance; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1472. Also, petition of the Council for Pan American Democracy of New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the colonial system of government be ended in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1473. Also, petition of the United Federal Workers of America, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Kerr committee; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. John R. Edwards, D. D., district superintendent of the Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of all mankind, we acknowledge in reverence our dependence upon Thy daily providence. Thy mercies have proved unfailing. We remember, too, the grace of God, which abundantly pardons. In the light of Thy character and faithfulness our human imperfections are reflected. Our personal and national selfishness is registered in narrow conceptions of life and citizenship which hinder Thy holy purposes for human welfare and world brotherhood. We make our confessions and ask Thy forgiveness. May this our repentance be registered in nobler and fuller living. We recognize Thy chastenings, and accept them as expressions of Thy wisdom. Yet our hearts have not fully turned back, neither have our steps declined from Thy way.

Strengthen today every worthy endeavor. Give us increased nobility of heart.

We pray for Thy servants who gather in our legislative halls, the President of the Senate, and others who have chief responsibility.

We pray for our comrades in the task of world brotherhood, especially for those whose lives are exposed to great danger, for their families and all their interests.

May the blessing of God rest this day upon the bereaved family of Thy servant, who had led a great Christian church in our midst, upon his people, and upon all others who mourn his loss.

We pray for the nations of earth who differ from us in thought and purpose. In the midst of strife may we learn nobility of character which shall be free from unholy prejudice and vindictive passion. In the name of the Great Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, June 8, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 163) to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship construction reserve funds, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2664) to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 37, and 41 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of

the Senate numbered 5 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60 and 61 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 986. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct;

H. R. 1289. A bill to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien;

H. R. 1947. A bill to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209);

H. R. 2250. A bill to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 2419. A bill to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler";

H. R. 2798. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2527. A bill to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah," and for other purposes;

H. R. 2562. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to the State Hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.;

H. R. 2612. A bill to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States;

H. R. 2663. A bill to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities;

H. R. 2750. A bill to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; and

H. R. 2859. A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Murdock
Andrews	Green	Murray
Austin	Guffey	Nye
Bailey	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Barbour	Hawkes	Overton
Bilbo	Hayden	Pepper
Bone	Hill	Revercomb
Buck	Holman	Reynolds
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bushfield	La Follette	Scrugham
Byrd	Langer	Shipstead
Capper	Lodge	Smith
Caraway	Lucas	Stewart
Chandler	McCarran	Taft
Chavez	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McKellar	Tobey
Danaher	McNary	Tunnell
Davis	Maloney	Tydings
Eastland	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ellender	Mead	Van Nuys
George	Millikin	Wallgren
Gerry	Moore	Walsh
Wheeler	White	Willis
Wherry	Wiley	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are members of the Truman committee and are attending its meeting in Kansas City.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably detained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ACQUISITION, CONVERSION, OR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN AUXILIARY VESSELS FOR THE NAVY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WALSH submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2; and agree to the same.

DAVID I. WALSH,
M. E. TYDINGS,
JAMES J. DAVIS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

P. H. DREWRY,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
MELVIN J. MAAS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

PRODUCTION OF FARM MACHINERY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk be permitted to read a letter which I have just received from Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, dealing with farm machinery. It is a very short letter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1943.

Hon. SCOTT LUCAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SCOTT: I am happy to inform you that a substantially increased program for the production of farm machinery will get under way July 1.

A total of 300,000 tons of carbon steel, with other materials in proportion, has been allocated to the farm machinery program for the quarter beginning July 1. To assure continuous and balanced production, advance authorizations totalling an additional 200,000 tons of steel have also been approved for each of the three quarters from October 1, 1943, to July 1, 1944.

During the third quarter of this year, special emphasis will be given to the manufacture of harvesting machinery for this year's crops.

The total authorizations for the quarter and for the year beginning July 1 will make it possible to meet the farm machinery production program requested by the War Food Administration.

Within a few days the War Production Board will issue a new farm machinery order to replace L-170, under which the industry has been operating. Farm equipment manufacturers are being authorized today by telegram to place orders for materials for the new program. The telegrams include allotment numbers under the Controlled Materials Plan which will make it possible for the companies to place authorized orders immediately. Detailed certificates of authorization will be mailed within a few days.

In order to assure adequate production, distribution, maintenance, and repair facilities, the new order will eliminate the concentration features of L-170. It will provide for production of new machinery at approximately 80 percent of the 1940 level.

The whole farm machinery program has been stepped up by advancing the completion dates for the quotas established in L-170 for the year which began October 1, 1942, and placing the farm machinery industry on a new annual basis beginning July 1. Of the 300,000 tons of carbon steel allotted for the third quarter of this year, 83,723 tons will be used for completion of the increased program of harvesting machinery decided upon in March, and the remainder will constitute first quarter authorizations under the new order.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REGISTRANTS DEFERRED FOR OCCUPATIONAL REASONS BY SELECTIVE SERVICE LOCAL BOARDS BECAUSE OF EMPLOYMENT UNDER FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of registrants who have been deferred for occupational reasons because of their employment in or under the Federal Government on May 15, 1943, and stating that "a supplemental report will be submitted as soon as possible for those registrants in the 80 remaining local boards in continental United States and the local boards in the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Two letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Navy (8) and Agriculture (14), and the Executive Office of the President (War Manpower Commission) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest; and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of McLouth, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the so-called Bryson bill, House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

Three memorials of the House of Representatives of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Memorial 8

"A memorial requesting Congress to continue the appropriation for the work of the Farm Security Administration

"Whereas the Farm Security Administration is rendering a much needed service to a great underprivileged class of our citizens; and

"Whereas no other agency, either governmental or private, will properly assume the task of elevating this large group to financial stability and responsible citizenship; and

"Whereas the need for more and more food and related farm produce will be best served by continuing this worthy agency: Now therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States of America in its wisdom continue the appropriations for the activities of the Farm Security Administration; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial under the great seal of the State of Florida be immediately forwarded by the secretary of State to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and copies be forwarded to the delegation representing the State of Florida in both the House and Senate of the United States Congress; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be spread upon the journal in both the house of representatives and the senate of the State of Florida, and that sufficient copies be furnished to the press.

"Approved by the Governor May 20, 1943."

"House Memorial 10

"Memorial endorsing the bill that has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress providing for the relief of Floridians who suffered loss in the campaign to eradicate the Mediterranean fruit fly in 1929

"Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress a bill providing for the relief of Floridians who suffered loss in the campaign to eradicate the Mediterranean fruit fly in 1929; and

"Whereas it is just and equitable that the persons who suffered loss as aforesaid should be compensated for such loss; and

"Whereas such relief should be provided by an act of the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

"SECTION 1. That the Legislature of the State of Florida does hereby unanimously endorse the bill that has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress for the relief of Floridians who suffered loss in the campaign to eradicate the Mediterranean fruit fly in 1929 and requests the Members of Congress to enact the same into law.

"SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Florida Members of Congress.

"Approved by the Governor May 17, 1943."

"House Memorial 14

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States petitioning the Congress to appropriate adequate funds for cooperative forest extension and fire protection and for the continuance of funds for forest research

"Whereas the extension of good forestry practices is essential to the continuing supply of vital forest products; and

"Whereas continuance of cooperative forest fire protection is likewise essential to the future of our forest products; and

"Whereas experimental forest research continues to add to the value of forests and forest products: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Congress be petitioned to appropriate the full amount of $4,000,000 recommended by the House Agricultural Appropriation Subcommittee and an additional $3,000,000 to provide fire protection for interior military establishments; and be it further

"Resolved, That Norris-Doxey funds be appropriated to the amount of at least $500,000 and that the United States Forest Service funds be increased by $500,000 for the continuance of the experimental forest research; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of Florida be, and he is hereby, directed to send a copy of this memorial under the great seal of the State of Florida to each of the Senators and Representatives of Florida in the Congress of the United States of America.

"Approved by the Governor May 17, 1943."

A memorial of the Florida Legislature; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Memorial 2

"Whereas because of unfavorable weather conditions, a late freeze necessitating replanting in many cases and because of increased costs of fertilizer and seed, as well as of labor, and of every other movement incidental to planting, growing, and harvesting this season's crop of Irish potatoes; and

"Whereas the so-called ceiling price of the incoming crop of Florida potatoes, as set by the Office of Price Administration, is not sufficient to meet the added costs, as above enumerated, and is certainly not in line with the prices allowed and named on other essential food products: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the members of the senate and of the house of representatives of the legislature of the State of Florida, do respectfully memorialize and petition the Office of Price Administration in the recommendation that a substantial increase be ordered in the ceiling price of new Florida potatoes comparable with prices fixed on other vegetable food products, and to make possible a reasonable financial return to the growers to compensate them for their work, time, and labor in food production as a valuable contribution to sustain our citizens, our workers, and soldiers in the all-out effort toward winning the war; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Office of Price Administration, the Federal Department of Agriculture, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Florida.

"Approved by the governor May 22, 1943."

A memorial of the Florida Legislature; to the Committee on the Library:

"House Memorial 3

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting that provision be made for the establishment of a national monument at the site of Fort Caroline at St. Johns Bluff, on the south side of the St. Johns River, about 5 miles from the mouth of said river

"Whereas St. Johns Bluff and the area immediately adjacent thereto is of tremendous historical interest, yet has been ignored and neglected by United States Government for some inexplicable reason; and

"Whereas this was the site of Fort Caroline, a colony and fortification established by the French in 1564, was the birthplace of the first Protestant white child on the North American Continent, was the site of the first battle between the armed forces of two European nations in the New World, when the Spaniards, under Pedro Menendez, captured the fort, killing most of the French garrison, and of the battle 2 years later when the French, under DeGourgues, recaptured the fort, killing most of the Spanish garrison, and it is probably the only spot in the United States which was actually fortified by five different nations—France, Spain, England, the Confederate States of America, and the United States of America; and

"Whereas this site is a place of great natural beauty: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to establish the Fort Caroline National Monument at St. Johns Bluff, in Duval County, Fla., as a part of the post-war program for recreational centers; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, and to each of Florida's Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Director of the National Park Service, and to each member of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments; said copies to be under the great seal of the State of Florida.

"Approved by the Governor May 17, 1943."

A memorial of the Florida Legislature; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Memorial 12

"To the Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

"Whereas it is very necessary that war industry not be stopped for any cause for the duration; and

"Whereas the coal industry is important and vital to the welfare of this country, and to the armed forces, and necessary for our victory over the barbarians of the world; and

"Whereas it is important that workers, miners, and employees at similar work stay on the job; and

"Whereas many miners and other workers have sons and daughters in the armed forces; and

"Whereas it is detrimental to the morale of the armed forces to have workers quit their jobs during this time; and

"Whereas our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, has met this emergency with his usual good judgment and appeal to the patriotism of the workingman: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives and senate concurring, That the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, be commended by the Legislature of the State of Florida for his handling of the miner's problem, and for his radio broadcast appeal to the patriotism of the miners, and for his action in the emergency.

"That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this session, and that a copy be forwarded to the President and our Representatives and Senators in Congress.

"Approved by the Governor May 20, 1943."

RESOLUTIONS OF THE FLORIDA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. PEPPER presented resolutions adopted by the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas millions of the flower of American youth are now engaged in a life and death struggle for the very preservation of our system of government; and

Whereas when the complete victory has been accomplished many of these men will return home to begin life anew and will undoubtedly face serious problems of rehabilitation brought on by this global struggle: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce in annual war conference assembled at Miami Beach, Fla., does take cognizance of the foregoing facts and does hereby recommend that the Congress of these United States immediately provide the proper means for the preparation of a competent rehabilitation program to aid and assist these returning civilians of tomorrow to the end that they may once again take their rightful places in our democratic economy.

Whereas the United States of America is now engaged in a total war against the Axis countries; and

Whereas to win this war it is the duty of every person or groups of persons who enjoy the freedom, privileges, and protection of our country to support loyally and patriotically the Government in the all-out effort for victory; and

Whereas a strike during war is a strike against the Government, and regardless of the apparent right to strike such action is dangerous, ill-advised, and unpatriotic, resulting in disunity, crippling of production, and consequent loss of countless lives of our soldiers at the front; and

Whereas John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers of America called a strike of all miners, thus repudiating a solemn no-strike pledge made to the President of the United States in December 1941: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce in annual session assembled at Miami Beach, Fla., deplores and condemns this arbitrary, unpatriotic action of John L. Lewis as an effort to force the Government to accede to his demands without submitting to orderly democratic arbitration through the proper Government channels; be it further

Resolved, That the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce does support and commend the President of the United States as Commander in Chief for reopening production of these vital mines under the flag of the United States of America.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1158. A bill to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 293); and

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution commemorating May 15, 1943, as the anniversary of the inauguration of Air Mail Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 294).

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 369. A bill to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 295).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1046. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906; without amendment (Rept. No. 296).

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 1403. A bill to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 297).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of the United States in the annual expenses of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 298); and

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 299).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1171. A bill granting an increase of pension to Grizelda Hull Hobson; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1172. A bill to authorize a payment to the widow and minor children of the late Commander Howard W. Gilmore, United States Navy, as a token of the appreciation of the people of the United States for his heroic sacrifice of his life; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1173. A bill to suspend, as respects vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, certain provisions of the act approved March 3, 1925, authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damage caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels of the United States, and to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to settle and pay claims for damages caused by vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, or for towage and salvage services to such vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1174. A bill for the relief of William L. O'Brien; and

S. 1175. A bill for the relief of Margaret Barnes Shank; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bills Nos. 1176 to 1216, inclusive, which were referred to the appropriate committees, and appear under separate headings.)

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 986. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 1289. A bill to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 1947. A bill to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 2250. A bill to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 2419. A bill to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler"; and

H. R. 2768. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 2527. A bill to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An Act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 2562. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to the State Hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 2663. A bill to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities; and

H. R. 2859. A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2750. A bill to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; and

H. R. 2612. A bill to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

RESOLUTIONS OF DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, DEPARTMENT OF NORTH DAKOTA—PROPOSED VETERANS' LEGISLATION—BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution from the Disabled American Veterans, Department of North Dakota, requesting "First things first." The resolutions committee is composed of Neal E. Williams, chairman, Norman G. Charboneaulx, Fred Gonglie, Herb Turner, and Fay DeWitt, all of whom have been officers of the Disabled War Veterans, Department of North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution presented by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LANGER. Also, I present a resolution adopted by the same organization to uniformize administrative provisions concerning, and to remove, present inequalities as between various similar groups of disabled veterans and their dependents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LANGER. Also, I present a resolution adopted at the convention of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of North Dakota, setting forth:

That this convention pledge its support to the national organization and go on record before the national organization as recommending that that organization take steps to train and maintain a Veterans' Service representative in each Veterans' Administration facility in the United States, and in States like North Dakota where a Veterans' Service commissioner is maintained by law, said Veterans' Service representative of this organization be instructed to assist such Veterans' Service commissioner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LANGER. Also, I present a resolution adopted by the same organization to provide for a method by which able-bodied persons, now performing jobs which can be satisfactorily performed by handicapped persons, can be replaced in such jobs by handicapped persons, including America's disabled defenders, so as to release them for other essential employment or service—important to the Nation's determination to win World War No. 2.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

By unanimous consent, Mr. LANGER presented the following resolutions adopted by the Disabled American Veterans, Department of North Dakota, the titles of which were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and the resolutions were referred as indicated:

To the Committee on Finance:

Resolution requesting that immediate priorities be granted for the enlargement of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fargo, N. Dak.;

Resolution protesting against the presumption that if a veteran of World War No. 2 does not have more than 6 months' service, that his disability did exist prior to service;

Resolution pledging all members of the Department of North Dakota to purchase War Savings bonds and stamps and other debentures of the Government to promote the war effort;

Resolution authorizing and directing the national service director of the Disabled American Veterans to confer with other national officers and other veteran organizations relative to taking steps looking to the enactment of legislation and provision for such executive orders and other plans as may be designed to provide for the full, suitable, gainful employment of all returning war veterans of World War No. 2;

Resolution to provide for a minimum rating of permanent partial 10 percent for any war veteran who was wounded or gassed in active service;

Resolution to extend eligibility for pension to the dependent widows and children of deceased war veterans who, at time of death, were suffering with a disability traceable to an examination, treatment, or hospitalization of such veteran;

Resolution to provide more effective preferences for veterans suffering from service-connected disabilities and for their wives and widows as to all governmental jobs for which they are qualified;

Resolution to provide an increase in the pension payable to the dependent widows and children of war veterans who at the time of death were suffering from some service-connected disability;

A resolution to provide for continued insurance protection for veterans who have received insurance benefits for 240 months or more, who thereafter have been rated less than permanently and totally disabled;

A resolution to provide that Government insurance policies shall be incontestible, subsequent to one year after date of issuance, reinstatement or conversion and that all premiums paid in on all policies canceled by the Veterans' Administration shall be returned to the veteran or to his next of kin;

Resolution to liberalize the law as to forfeitures;

Resolution to provide that basic ratings of disabilities shall be increased by 20 percent thereof for each additional 5 years of age after the age of 40, in determining the amount of compensation to be granted to service connected disabled veterans;

Resolution requesting legislation, in effect to provide that the amounts of compensation and pension payable to disabled veterans, and the dependents of disabled veterans, shall automatically be increased or decreased by 10 percent for each 10 percent increase or decrease in the cost of living above or below that of the calendar year 1940, to be used as the basic period, provided, however, that such basic compensation and pension payments shall not be reduced below the basic rates provided by law;

Resolution to provide for a minimum rating of 1 percent in all cases where a veteran was noted, at time of discharge, as having some disability;

Resolution to provide that so-called "misconduct" shall be a bar to the receipt of compensation or pension to disabled veterans only where the disability was due to "felonious misconduct";

Resolution to provide full compensation for the so-called "presumptives";

Resolution to provide for adjudication of pending claims after death of veteran;

Resolution to permit suit on any automatic, yearly renewable term or United States Life Insurance policy at any time;

Resolution to increase up to $60 per month the death compensation payable to widows of war veterans who have died by reason of service connected disabilities;

Resolution to provide a pension of $60 per month to any war veteran who is permanently and totally disabled by reason of a disability not established to be service connected;

Resolution to extend the period of time before which to make application for adjusted compensation from January 2, 1940, up to January 2, 1950;

Resolution to provide for retroactive adjudication of equitable claims;

Resolution to provide for a reduction of interest on Government insurance loans, from 5 percent to 3½ percent;

Resolution requiring that permanent total disability shall be determined on the basis of the inability of the individual veteran to follow any substantially gainful occupation;

Resolution requesting removal of all limitation dates before which to make application for various types of benefits for veterans and their dependents;

Resolution to authorize payment of compensation for partial service-connected disability plus the percentage of pension for permanent total disability (nonservice) equal to the difference between 100 percent and his degree of service-connected disability;

Resolution to provide for dependency allowances to be payable to veterans receiving compensation or pension on the basis of permanent ratings;

Resolution to provide full payment of compensation or pension to single veterans while hospitalized;

Resolution to provide eligibility for adjusted compensation to any World War provisional, temporary or probationary commissioned or warrant officer below rank of major;

Resolution to provide that the Veterans' Administration shall not, in the absence of fraud, or clear or unmistakable error, reduce any permanent disability rating;

Resolution to provide for liberalized adjudication of claims of veterans for service connections and compensation;

Resolution to provide prosthetic and orthopedic appliances needed for any war veteran;

Resolution to extend the time within which to make an appeal from decisions of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration;

Resolution to provide that insurance judgments shall be binding upon the Veterans' Administration until modified by court order; and

Resolution requesting amendment to National Service Life Insurance Act to provide insurance benefits for total disability.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolution requesting legislation to provide for the fingerprinting of all persons within the United States;

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolution to remove the Statute of Limitations as to claims for Emergency Officers' Retirement benefits;

Resolution to provide for Army, Navy, and Marine Corps Boards of Appeals and Reviews, with authority to grant honorable discharge certificates to veterans previously discharged dishonorably or without honor;

Resolution to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National Cemetery in every State; and

Resolution to the Congress, urging enactment of legislation requiring the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps officials to furnish each soldier, sailor, or marine upon discharge or immediately thereafter copy of medical record.

To the Committee on Pensions:

Resolution to provide the same amount of pension for the widows and children and dependent parents of war veterans who were permanently and totally disabled in combat, but who have died by reason of some other disability, as if they had died by reason of such combat disability; and

Resolution to extend eligibility for pension to the widow of any veteran, otherwise eligible, if she was married to and living with the veteran for 2 years immediately preceding his death, or if, being married, she gave birth to a child by the veteran.

Ordered to lie on the table:

Resolution expressing appreciation to Past Commanders C. T. Hoverson and Walter Johnson, manager and veterans' contact officer of Veterans' Bureau, Fargo, N. Dak., and also to Dr. P. A. Waters, Veterans' Bureau, Fargo, N. Dak., for their counsel and guidance on the many problems before the Disabled American Veterans convention.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask consent to introduce for proper reference a number of bills prepared by the Disabled War Veterans of North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bills introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and appropriately referred.

(For the bills introduced today by Mr. LANGER, see the end of Mr. LANGER'S remarks.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the first bill is entitled "A bill to provide for liberalized adjudication of claims of veterans for service connection for disabilities with which they may be suffering."

I may add, Mr. President, that the Disabled War Veterans of North Dakota is a very active body, perhaps the most active of any organization in the United States. Realizing that the Disabled War Veterans were not receiving a square deal, and also that some of the other veterans, in their judgment, were not receiving the kind of deal to which they were entitled, they asked that I prepare certain bills for them. Some of these bills they prepared themselves. With respect to others I assisted in the preparation.

The second bill is entitled "A bill to remove limitations on time for making application for veterans' benefits."

The third bill is entitled "A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to include provision for payment of total disability benefits in national service life insurance policies."

The fourth bill is entitled "A bill to amend section 19 of the World War Veterans' Act so as to provide that insurance judgments shall be binding upon the Administrator until modified by court order."

The fifth bill is entitled "A bill to require the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish copies of medical records to persons discharged from the armed forces."

The sixth bill is entitled "A bill to amend paragraph V of Veterans Regulation No. 10."

The seventh bill is entitled "A bill to amend paragraph III of part II of Veterans Regulation 2 (a) so as to extend the time within which appeals may be taken to the Administrator."

The eighth bill is entitled "A bill to amend paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a) so as to provide increased pensions to surviving dependents of deceased veterans who, at the time of their death, were suffering from permanent and total service-connected disabilities but whose death resulted from other causes."

The ninth bill is entitled "A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish orthopedic or prosthetic appliances to any honorably discharged veteran in need thereof."

The tenth bill is entitled "A bill to prohibit the reduction of permanent disability ratings except in case of fraud or clear and unmistakable error."

The eleventh bill is entitled "A bill to extend eligibility for adjusted compensation to certain World War provisional, temporary, or probationary commissioned or warrant officers."

The twelfth bill is entitled "A bill to provide full payment of compensation or pension to hospitalized veterans having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent."

The thirteenth bill is entitled "A bill to increase the amount of the compensation or pension payable to veterans having service-connected disabilities who have dependent spouses or children."

The fourteenth bill is entitled "A bill to authorize payment of pensions at combined rates to veterans entitled to benefits for both partial service-connected disabilities and permanent total non-service-connected disabilities."

The fifteenth bill is entitled "A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of North Dakota."

The sixteenth bill is entitled "A bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identification cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes."

The seventeenth bill is entitled "A bill to change the definition of permanent total disability for pension purposes, as to World War veterans, so as to base it upon an individual, rather than an average, basis."

The eighteenth bill is entitled "A bill to provide that inability of the individual veteran to follow any substantially gainful occupation resulting from service-connected disability shall be deemed to be permanent total disability."

The nineteenth bill is entitled "A bill to change interest rates on loans secured by liens on United States Government life (converted) insurance to 3½ per centum."

The twentieth bill is entitled "A bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to correct erroneous adjudications."

The twenty-first bill is entitled "A bill to extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, may be filed up to January 2, 1950."

The twenty-second bill is entitled "A bill to increase the pension payable to war veterans suffering from permanent total non-service-connected disabilities from $40 to $60 per month."

The twenty-third bill is entitled "A bill to so amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, as to eliminate all statutes of limitations on automatic, yearly renewable term, or United States Government life (converted) insurance policies."

The twenty-fourth bill is entitled "A bill to increase to $60 per month the amount of compensation otherwise payable to widows of deceased World War veterans whose deaths were caused by their service-connected disabilities."

The twenty-fifth bill is entitled "A bill to provide for adjudication of any claim for compensation, pension, or retirement pay upon evidence in file at time of death of the veteran."

The twenty-sixth bill is entitled "A bill to provide that veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 per centum of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 per centum thereof, and for other purposes."

The twenty-seventh bill is entitled "A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct."

The twenty-eighth bill is entitled "A bill providing for the establishment of minimum ratings for disabled World War veterans."

The twenty-ninth bill is entitled "A bill to provide for increasing or decreasing the compensation or pension payments, payable to veterans of all wars, campaigns, and expeditions, or of peacetime service, and to their dependents, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, by 10 per centum for every 10 per centum increase or decrease in the cost of living above the basic cost of living during the first six months of 1940, as computed each six months, provided that such compensation and pension payments shall not be reduced below the basic amounts provided for under such laws, and for other purposes."

The thirtieth bill is entitled "A bill to provide that the compensation or pension of service-connected disabled veterans shall be increased by 20 per centum of the basic amounts, payable for each five years of age beginning with the fortieth birthday, and for other purposes."

The thirty-first bill is entitled "A bill to liberalize existing laws as to forfeitures of rights as to claims for certain benefits by veterans and their dependents."

The thirty-second bill is entitled "A bill to provide that Government life-insurance policies shall be incontestable after one year, and for other purposes."

The thirty-third bill is entitled "A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits (under certain conditions) to persons permanently and totally disabled, and for other purposes."

The thirty-fourth bill is entitled "A bill to provide death compensation for dependent parents of deceased World War veterans under the act of June 28, 1934 (Public Law Numbered 484, Seventy-third Congress), as amended, and for other purposes."

The thirty-fifth bill is entitled "A bill to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed."

The thirty-sixth bill is entitled "A bill to extend eligibility for compensation to the widows and children of deceased World War veterans who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment."

The thirty-seventh bill is entitled "A bill to establish a Board of Appeals and Reviews in the Army for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions."

The thirty-eighth bill is entitled "A bill to establish boards of appeals and reviews in the Navy and Marine Corps for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions."

The thirty-ninth bill is entitled "A bill to provide for a statutory award of $10 per month to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities, and for other purposes."

And the fortieth bill is entitled "A bill to liberalize the bases of eligibility for

receipt of disability retirement benefits as to emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary officers of the World War."

Mr. President, I wish to state that, as I have said before, all the bills were carefully drawn by the disabled war veterans of the State of North Dakota. After having gone over them and examined them with experts who have been in touch with the Veterans' Bureau, there does not seem to be any disputing the fact that the disabled war veterans of the United States have not been receiving the kind of treatment to which they feel they are entitled, and to which I think they are entitled, in view of the fact that they were disabled in World War No. 1.

The bills introduced by Mr. LANGER were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

S. 1176. A bill to provide for liberalized adjudication of claims of veterans for service connection for disabilities with which they may be suffering;

S. 1177. A bill to remove limitations on time for making application for veterans' benefits;

S. 1178. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to include provision for payment of total disability benefits in National Service Life Insurance policies; and

S. 1179. A bill to amend section 19 of the World War Veterans' Act so as to provide that insurance judgments shall be binding upon the Administrator until modified by court order; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1180. A bill to require the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish copies of medical records to persons discharged from the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1181. A bill to amend paragraph V of Veterans Regulation No. 10;

S. 1182. A bill to amend paragraph III of part II of Veterans Regulation 2 (a) so as to extend the time within which appeals may be taken to the Administrator;

S. 1183. A bill to amend paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to provide increased pensions to surviving dependents of deceased veterans who, at the time of their death, were suffering from permanent and total service-connected disabilities, but whose death resulted from other causes;

S. 1184. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish orthopedic or prosthetic appliances to any honorably discharged veteran in need thereof;

S. 1185. A bill to prohibit the reduction of permanent disability ratings except in case of fraud or clear and unmistakable error;

S. 1186. A bill to extend eligibility for adjusted compensation to certain World War provisional, temporary, or probationary commissioned or warrant officers;

S. 1187. A bill to provide full payment of compensation or pension to hospitalized veterans having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent;

S. 1188. A bill to increase the amount of the compensation or pension payable to veterans having service-connected disabilities who have dependent spouses or children; and

S. 1189. A bill to authorize payment of pensions at combined rates to veterans entitled to benefits for both partial service-connected disabilities and permanent total non-service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1190. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1191. A bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identification cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1192. A bill to change the definition of permanent total disability for pension purposes, as to World War veterans, so as to base it upon an individual, rather than an average, basis;

S. 1193. A bill to provide that inability of the individual veteran to follow any substantially gainful occupation resulting from service-connected disability shall be deemed to be permanent total disability;

S. 1194. A bill to change interest rates on loans secured by liens on United States Government life (converted) insurance to 3½ percent;

S. 1195. A bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to correct erroneous adjudications;

S. 1196. A bill to extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, may be filed up to January 2, 1950;

S. 1197. A bill to increase the pension payable to war veterans suffering from permanent total non-service-connected disabilities from $40 to $60 per month;

S. 1198. A bill to so amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, as to eliminate all statutes of limitations on automatic, yearly renewable term, or United States Government life (converted) insurance policies;

S. 1199. A bill to increase to $60 per month the amount of compensation otherwise payable to widows of deceased World War veterans whose deaths were caused by their service-connected disabilities;

S. 1200. A bill to provide for adjudication of any claim for compensation, pension, or retirement pay upon evidence in file at time of death of the veteran;

S. 1201. A bill to provide that veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 1202. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct;

S. 1203. A bill providing for the establishment of minimum ratings for disabled World War veterans;

S. 1204. A bill to provide for increasing or decreasing the compensation or pension payments, payable to veterans of all wars, campaigns, and expeditions, or of peacetime service, and to their dependents, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, by 10 percent for every 10 percent increase or decrease in the cost of living above the basic cost of living during the first 6 months of 1940, as computed each 6 months, provided that such compensation and pension payments shall not be reduced below the basic amounts provided for under such laws, and for other purposes;

S. 1205. A bill to provide that the compensation or pension of service-connected disabled veterans shall be increased by 20 percent of the basic amounts, payable for each 5 years of age beginning with the fortieth birthday, and for other purposes;

S. 1206. A bill to liberalize existing laws as to forfeitures of rights as to claims for certain benefits by veterans and their dependents;

S. 1207. A bill to provide that Government life-insurance policies shall be incontestable after 1 year, and for other purposes;

S. 1208. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits (under certain conditions) to persons permanently and totally disabled and for other purposes; and

S. 1209. A bill to provide death compensation for dependent parents of deceased World War veterans under the Act of June 28, 1934 (Public Law No. 484, 73d Cong.), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1210. A bill to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1211. A bill to extend eligibility for compensation to the widows and children of deceased World War veterans who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1212. A bill to establish a Board of Appeals and Reviews in the Army for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1213. A bill to establish boards of appeals and reviews in the Navy and Marine Corps for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1214. A bill to provide for a statutory award of $10 per month to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1215. A bill to liberalize the bases of eligibility for receipt of disability retirement benefits as to emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary officers of the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also introduce a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service," so as to increase by $300 the amount of additional compensation payable under such act. I introduce the bill for the reason that I find, upon investigation, that the letter carriers and some of the other postal employees are not receiving sufficient pay, in view of the increased cost of living, to enable them to maintain a decent standard of living.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1216) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service," so as to increase by $300 the amount of additional compensation payable under such act, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

VICTORY ON THE HOME FRONT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Victory on the Home Front," delivered by him June 7, 1943, before the Central Retail Feed Association, Inc., at the Schroeder Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

A CHECK-UP OF THE FOOD FRONT—ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Check-Up of the Food Front," delivered by Hon. Herbert Hoover at the American Farm Bureau Federation meeting on June 8, 1943, at the Hotel New Yorker, New York City, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORK OF THE TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RAILROADS

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement of the 1937 accomplishments of the traffic department of the American Association of Railroads, which appears in the Appendix.]

WARTIME SUBSIDIES—ARTICLE FROM BUSINESS WEEK

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Wartime Subsidies," published in the May 22, 1943, issue of Business Week, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CRITICAL CANNED-FOOD SITUATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the Senate for a few moments in order to speak on a subject which I believe merits the attention of this body. I have just returned from my State of Wisconsin. There I found a condition which is truly tragic. The canning factories of the country are having difficult times. My State under normal conditions cans about 36 percent of the peas canned in the Nation. If the pea crop in other States this year does not improve, we in Wisconsin may be called upon to can in the neighborhood of from 40 percent to 45 percent of the total crop. The help problem, of course, arises from the war situation. Help in canning factories, which ordinarily would be paid from 40 to 50 cents an hour during the seasonal period, has all been taken into the war plants. In the war plants the workers are paid from $1.10 an hour up. The result is that we are likely to lose a great deal of very vital food. How important is that food? Mr. President, let me refer to an article I have before me which was published by the Milwaukee Journal, reprinted from the New York Times. The article indicates that the defeat in Tunisia of the Germans and Italians was due in no small measure to the fact that the Germans were undernourished. They had plenty of food, mind you, but they did not have the cooked food. They had plenty of ammunition. What they lacked was the nourishment which comes from cooked food, canned food. Our boys who did such a fine job had canned, cooked food.

I simply want to take a moment to read a paragraph or two from the article. The article was written by Frank L. Kluckhohn:

> But what we are most interested in here is that, far from fighting to the last cartridge, these Germans surrendered with boxes of ammunition in quantity, neatly stacked under trees, at Cap Bon. And that they marched in with enough food to last them a long while—our chief difficulty in feeding them with it has been that their rations are uncooked, whereas most of our front-line rations come prepared in cans. It was not alone that the Germans marched in briskly in military formations to give themselves up rather than face the destruction of their outfits to save time for Adolf Hitler, who sent troops into Africa as late as May 5.

Now let me read another paragraph:

> Most of the Hitlerites were despondent when they came in. After a square meal many of them expressed the view that they were going to beat us in the war. The way they had acted was forgotten. They talked of being "tired" of war when they came in. They talked of victory after being fed.

They did not talk of victory before they were fed. They surrendered. After they had received a square meal of American rations, cooked rations, they talked of victory, the article says.

The paragraph concludes:

> A major, who had entered the German Army when he was 15, said he was glad to have his fighting over.

Mr. President, last week, before I returned to my State, there came to my office representatives of the canneries of the State. They were rather dejected. They want to do all they can do. I put them in contact with Marvin Jones. One of the issues is, Can they raise their wage 10 cents an hour? Since the men in the plants in the neighborhood are receiving $1.10 an hour, where else would anyone want to work? However, this problem involves more than the interests of the canners, more than the interests of the State of Wisconsin. It goes to the very question of whether we shall win the war. Food will win. The lack of food will defeat us.

I read a paragraph from a letter which I received this morning from William Opitz, of the Elkhorn Canning Co., who is a patriotic citizen:

> We must make Washington realize, before it is too late, that canned foods are the No. 1 munition of war. No food and you need no shells, cannon, tanks, airplanes. You can kill more people by starvation than any mechanical device that man can produce.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. In connection with the matter which the Senator is discussing, let me say that I received two letters from the parents of boys in New Guinea. One of them wrote to his folks saying that he could not understand why the people in the United States were being rationed. He said that the boys were not getting any American food. He said that they were getting Australian beef, which was rather poor, but no American canned goods. He said that the Australian canned beans and some other articles were all right, but that most of the canned goods were of very poor grade. This soldier, writing to his parents, said that he had not been paid for 5 months. He said that the boys could buy all the American food they wanted in the canteens, but that they were not being furnished American food.

I took up the question with the War Department and was informed that the Department would immediately take it up by wire with the authorities in New Guinea. The War Department officials said that there was no reason why the boys should not get American food.

As I have said, I received two letters, one from a boy's parents in Billings, Mont., and one from a boy's parents in Helena, Mont. Both of them told exactly the same story.

So far as the farmers in my State are concerned, I have received no complaint from them with reference to the prices of their products; but there is this question: If we are to get plenty of food we must have labor. I read a statement by Mr. Hoover and one by the Governor of New York to the effect that they fear that there will be a food shortage. Other persons have told me that there is bound to be a food shortage. If we are to bring about a greater production of canned goods, we must have labor. We must give the farmer a price such that he can furnish the materials with which to produce the food. It seems to me it is a short-sighted policy to say that we will not give the farmer or the canner a price sufficient to pay his workers so that the workers can be kept on the farm or in the factory.

Complaints in similar vein to the complaint cited by the Senator from Wisconsin have come from the canners of my State.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator. I do not know whether our canned goods are going through to Australia. I do know that under the lend-lease arrangement Australia is giving a great deal of food to our boys there. Lend-lease there is a two-way street, and, so far as I know, there is no complaint as to the quality or quantity of food which the boys are getting.

I am not speaking on that point. I am stressing the point that the Senate of the United States can no longer "pass the buck." For some years we have been talking about the need of a war cabinet. We have sensed that an over-all authority was needed. We need someone at the head who can make the final decision. We hoped that when Jimmie Byrnes was appointed as "assistant President" the war cabinet would go into action. The trouble in the past has been that someone decides what the wages shall be; someone else decides this thing or that thing, but they are in different departments, and there is no person having over-all authority. Here is hoping Byrnes will coordinate this whole matter—wages, prices, priorities, and so forth.

Mr. President, in the next few weeks the question of whether or not certain crops are to be preserved in this country must be decided. It will be decided by the action which is taken in relation to providing labor for the factories.

Three weeks ago when I was in the West there had been heavy rains in Indiana, Ohio, and other States. Much of the land was under water. On my return trip yesterday and this morning I was glad to see that a great deal of that land is coming through in fine shape. Of course, the corn is behind. That means a delay in canning and production in that area.

However, let me stick to the point which I am making. I repeat the language of Mr. Opitz, of the Elkhorn Canning Co.:

> We must make Washington realize, before it is too late, that canned foods are the No. 1 munition of war.

What are we going to do? What is Congress going to do about it? What is

Marvin Jones going to do about it? What are the authorities at the other end of the Avenue going to do? Are they going to neglect the problem? If they do, we may find our boys in the same situation as were the Germans in north Africa. They had plenty of munitions, plenty of food, but not plenty of guts. Why? Because they did not have cooked food.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in its entirety in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMANS WILL QUIT! LESSON OF TUNISIA—THEY WERE NOT OUT OF AMMUNITION OR FOOD, BUT WHEN THEY SAW THEY WERE TO BE DEFEATED THEY CAVED IN QUICKLY

(By Frank L. Kluckhohn)

ALLIED HEADQUARTERS IN NORTH AFRICA.—Why did the German and Italian troops in Africa suddenly collapse after 6 months of sturdy battling against the Allied forces? In the answer to this question one can find many lessons of prime importance for the future. All of us who saw the Germans in action knew that technically they were as expert as any troops could be. They used tanks, artillery and antitank guns, men, and airplanes almost perfectly. They seemed to those opposing them to be as courageous as any soldiers that could be found. Yet suddenly they went to pieces. Why?

The Germans were beaten militarily by superior fire power. They were mauled by Allied planes with complete control of the air, but this does not tell the whole story. This is that they collapsed, that they gave up when they saw the odds were overwhelmingly against them. When it came to the showdown they did not after all have the inspiration of the men of Bataan, the willingness to die for a lost cause and gain vital time, that the Russians showed at Stalingrad. There was something wrong. We know what it was and that is the point of this report.

NOT A MATTER OF NUMBERS

When it is said they bowed to superior fire power, that does not mean they were overwhelmed by numbers. The official count of prisoners shows that 200,000 Axis soldiers, at least two-thirds of them Germans, were captured, in addition to those who died, row on row, as the Americans drove into Bizerte and the British into Tunis. In the actual line, Gen. Sir Harold R. L. G. Alexander probably did not have a number greatly in excess of that.

Thousands of pieces of artillery of all types, hundreds of intact implements of warfare like tanks were taken. The odds were not terribly uneven on paper. When one talks of superior fire power one means that the Allied tanks were better concentrated than the German, that the American artillery and British, too, were far more effective than that of the enemy, that our boys were willing to die—and many of them did—to bring to bear the small-arm fire necessary to get to their objective. These were Allied troops—British, American, French—seasoned by long months of fighting the Germans, to beat them at their own game.

OUTGENERALED ARNIM AND CAPTURED HIM

That only steel thrown faster than the Germans can hurl it would beat the superb masters of warfare most informed Americans have long known, but when the Germans came in as prisoners and asked to see our "automatic" big guns, it showed that the novel American method of employing artillery had them on their heels. When our Infantry charge sheer 2,000-foot cliffs and drove the Germans out it was because they could throw more lead than the enemy in a superior position.

When Col. Gen. Jurgen von Arnim was captured not so far from Enfidaville, it demonstrated that he had been outgeneraled—General Alexander had held important elements of the Axis army there by the mere name of the Eighth Army, while he transferred three of its divisions to the First Army farther north for the knock-out blow.

It is indeed good news that we can outshoot, outfight, and outgeneral the opposition. No one here thinks that the inevitable entry into Europe is going to be anything but hard or that the battle afterward is going to be any easier than the long, difficult struggle in Tunisia. It is dangerous to be overoptimistic because of what has happened.

NAZI INVINCIBILITY?

But in this Tunisian campaign we have shown that the Germans can be beaten in their chosen field—battle—just as they were in 1918. We have proved that Nazi invincibility is a myth.

We have learned, moreover, all the Nazi tricks in using tanks, placing guns, and employing whatever one has most effectively. After we had learned what the Germans knew, we improved our methods and invented tricks of our own.

But what we are most interested in here is that, far from fighting to the last cartridge, these Germans surrendered with boxes of ammunition in quantity, neatly stacked under trees at Cap Bon. And that they marched in with enough food to last them a long while—our chief difficulty in feeding them with it has been that their rations are uncooked, whereas most of our front-line rations come prepared in cans. It was not alone that the Germans marched in briskly in military formations to give themselves up rather than face the destruction of their outfits to save time for Adolf Hitler, who sent troops into Africa as late as May 5.

What is important also is that Prussian generals tried to escape in small boats, or burst into tears after capture; that Germans marched in making the "V" for victory sign, hoping this would please the British and Americans; that others fought over the chance to get away in the limited number of small boats available—most of which subsequently were destroyed; that, in brief, they cracked.

LIKE A FOX ROMMEL RAN

Maybe Field Marshal Gen. Erwin Rommel, who left his men at some time yet to be definitely determined, was ill. That would be a natural thing for the German propaganda machine to say of this national idol. Marshal Rommel was the fox—and like the fox, he ran. Generals have commanded battles from a litter.

No one can minimize the tremendous part the British Navy and Allied air forces played in keeping supplies away from the Axis here, yet the forces of Der Fuehrer and Il Duce had ammunition and food when they gave in. It is on the record that a week was counted on to get from Medjez el Bab to Tunis, yet it took only a day and a half after the planes blasted a way open, smashing gun and infantry positions with concentrated bombing. But the Russians have taken the same sort of bombing, and I saw British and American troops stand up against hourly bombings for days on end in the early stages of this campaign.

Let us boil it down to a fact that the Germans did not fight well with the odds against them. Many of them, moreover, were the Germans who appeared to many invincible when they crushed Poland, France, and Greece with the odds in their favor. That is what it comes down to. When the typical German becomes convinced that he cannot win, he will not fight.

NOT LIKE OUR MEN

Can the reader imagine American troops surrendering by units and when they found that the enemy did not have men available to guard them, marching docilely to the rear? I remember those Hampshire men who died in such numbers near Tebourba that only a few were left. They did not yield a yard. This was against superior numbers with no support in sight. I remember the Americans at Kasserine, out on their feet from weeks of steady and unfavorable fighting, men who thought strongly, perhaps, that they were being misused, who stood their ground though many were killed, and finally turned the tide.

Most of the Hitlerites were despondent when they came in. After a square meal many of them expressed the view that they were going to beat us in the war. The way they had acted was forgotten. They talked of being "tired" of war when they came in. They talked of victory after being fed. A major, who had entered the German Army when he was 15, said he was glad to have his fighting over. Someone asked, "When will the war be over?"

LACKS REAL CONVICTION

"I cannot say," he replied in English. "It may take us 5 or 6 months to recapture Africa."

Summing up, from what I can gather the German has been schooled in war and has fought until his enthusiasm has gone. He is a perfect soldier with regard to technique, both individually and en masse. He is brave enough when he thinks he stands a chance to win, but he lacks the conviction of men with real ideals. He seems to have none of the will to fight when all appears lost that sometimes turns defeat into victory, or at least into glory.

It does not really matter what these men think of Herr Hitler. It is important that the Hitler system has not given them "what it takes."

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower said this week the Allies could find "hope" in what has happened here. We who have seen something of the dirt and blood, who have felt the extreme discomforts of front-line life, who know the nerve-shattering effects of today's high explosives, who have watched the Germans fight, know we have a long, hard row ahead, but we know that if we can pay the price the German military machine will crack. It may be expected to be a high price, but the Nazis will not fight to the bitter end.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 89 it is proposed to strike out lines 4 to 14, inclusive, as follows:

FARM TENANCY

Salaries and expenses: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), $500,000 for necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of said act and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and

means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act.

And to insert in lieu thereof:

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

To enable the Secretary to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws; (2) loans to needy individual farmers; (3) grants; and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, $29,607,573, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts (including the Administrator and not to exceed three Assistant Administrators of the Farm Security Administration) without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

In making my grant payments under this act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $97,500,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500.

The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

FARM TENANCY

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act, $1,326,070.

Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), $30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 percent per annum: *Provided*, That the amount which is available to any State or Territory for making loans under such title I shall be distributed by the Secretary, in accordance with rules prescribed by him, among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory, except that he shall not distribute to any such county or parish in excess of three times the amount which would be distributed to such county or parish were the entire amount available to the State or Territory distributed among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006): *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 percent of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the question of subsidies was discussed yesterday on the floor of the Senate, and is being generally discussed by a great many persons throughout the country, I wish to call attention to an editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily News of June 3, 1943.

It will be recalled that the publisher of the Chicago Daily News is the Secretary of the Navy, a member of the Cabinet.

The editorial states:

IT BUTTERS NO PARSNIPS

The Office of Price Administration's roll-back on retail butter prices is hailed as a blow at the rising cost of living. The housewife who paid 46 cents a pound for butter can now buy the same grade for 41 cents. It's wonderful. It's all done with mirrors.

In order to accomplish this boon to suffering humanity, the butter producer or wholesaler is forced by law to sell the butter to the retailer at 5 cents a pound less than the former price.

I do not know of any law which requires it. I think it is an edict of the department.

The editorial continues:

He, in turn, will be subsidized by the Government at the rate of 5 cents a pound. He will make as much money on the transaction as formerly, the new dealers point out; the retailer will make as much as formerly; the consumer will be benefited by a saving of 5 cents a pound. It is as simple as all that. But is it?

That 5-cents-a-pound subsidy paid to the wholesaler must come from somewhere. Can it be possible that it comes, via the United States Treasury, out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the country—the people who buy butter and those who can't afford butter but have to be content with oleomargarine? Could be.

And what about the elaborate machinery that will have to be set up to enforce and administer this system, police the retailers and the wholesalers, keep the accounts, write out the subsidy checks, deliver them to the wholesalers, compile the reports and statistics inevitable in such a Nation-wide activity? Will this complicated machinery require the employment of many clerks and accountants and stenographers and typists and regional directors and superdirectors? The answer is, "Yes." And will these Government employees be paid salaries and wages for their services? You said it, brother, they will.

The roll-back is, therefore, merely an optical illusion. The consumer, instead of paying 46 cents a pound for butter over the counter, will pay 41 cents over the counter. Then, sooner or later, he will pay out of another pocket the 5-cent subsidy that goes to the wholesaler, plus a few cents additional in taxation to pay for the army of Government employees necessary to administer the device.

Instead of rolling back the price of butter and lowering the cost of living, the subsidy plan, by increasing the administrative load that the consumer must support, will increase the ultimate cost of butter.

The Office of Price Administration may call it a roll-back now; but eventually it will be a kick-back.

I wish to compliment the Secretary of the Navy for this very able editorial

which appears in his newspaper, the Chicago Daily News.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the Senator from Montana that the editorial is an able one; but the Senator does not believe that the Secretary of the Navy really wrote the editorial, or knew it appeared, or had anything to do with it, does he?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether he wrote it or not.

Mr. HILL. My understanding is that since Mr. Knox became Secretary of the Navy he turned the management of his newspaper and its policies, as well as its program, over to certain of his partners and employees. So I really think the Senator, however much he might agree with the editorial, is according the Secretary of the Navy a tribute which I doubt the Secretary of the Navy deserves in this particular instance. I question whether the Secretary of the Navy had anything to do with the editorial.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether he had anything to do with it, and I do not believe that my friend, the acting majority leader, knows whether he had anything to do with it. But, whether he had anything to do with it or not, I agree with the editorial thoroughly, and if the Secretary of the Navy was responsible for it, he should be complimented for it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think in fairness to the Secretary of the Navy it should be said that merely because the editorial is a good one it should not be assumed that the Secretary of the Navy did not write it. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan, being a newspaperman, ought to know that.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in addition to what the Chicago Daily News has said in the editorial which I have just read, I wish to say that I am opposed to the granting of subsidies on another ground. I am not saying this because it is being done by a Democratic administration. I am opposed to it in principle. Sooner or later the people of this country must realize that when prices are rolled back and subsidies are granted the money for such subsidies must come out of the pockets of the people in the way of taxes. I agree with the statement made in the editorial that there will have to be provided another army of Federal employees and bureaucrats to check up on all the various stores. The final result will be that it will cost the American people more money than it would cost to permit the consumers to continue to pay the prices which they are paying at the present time.

Furthermore, subsidies are bad in theory, a bad principle, in a democratic republic, because politicians, whether they be Republicans or Democrats, will say to farmers, merchants, and this group and that group, "If the opposition comes into power, you will not receive this subsidy." If various groups of the people are put under obligation to the Government, sooner or later, if this program continues and this group is to be subsidized and that group is to be subsidized, and some other group is to be subsidized, it will not be long before all the people of the country will be on some kind of a subsidy. When that is done the principles of democracy in a democratic republic will be in danger.

Other forms of government may do it. It has been pointed out that England has done it. But it must be recalled that the British Isles are a much smaller territory than this vast country of ours.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. It also ought to be realized that the British Government is the importer of 90 percent of the food which the people there eat; and, of course, it is easy for that Government, as the importer of 90 or 95 percent of the food products coming into Great Britain, to grant a subsidy by a reduction in the price to the food distributors. But that is no reason why it would work in a country such as ours, under a proposal which seeks to deal with the production and processing of food products. It seems to me that those who have assumed that, because it works in Great Britain to check inflationary price rises, it would work in this country, have wholly left out of consideration the vast difference between what is here proposed and the situation in England.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the observations of the Senator from Georgia. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Montana to this aspect: The sinister part of the subsidy program is that the administration is not coming to the Congress for authority to pay subsidies. It is going to the R. F. C., and the various other corporations which have been created by the Government. A subsidy program has already been instituted in this country when Congress on at least two occasions, has said that no subsidy should be paid.

Furthermore, when Mr. Jesse Jones was before the Joint Committee for the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures he testified that the R. F. C., without any authority of law whatever, had already agreed to pay $450,000,000 in subsidies on meat and butter, to the processors, not to the farmers. The big packers are the ones who are to receive the subsidies.

The Senator is probably aware that some time ago Mr. Henderson testified it would cost $5,000,000,000 to put the subsidy program in operation It will result in complete regimentation of all the farmers and processors of food. As the Senator has said, the $5,000,000,000 must be raised through taxation of future generations at a time when they will be less able to pay than are the people today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Georgia called attention to the fact that the situation in England is different from ours because most of its food is imported. I think it should be stated that a large part of the food imported is obtained through lend-lease from the United States Government, and that the food is then sold to the British people. Pounds sterling are received by the British Government, which, of course, are of no value to us, and are not paid to us. They are available to the British to pay subsidies on foodstuffs acquired elsewhere than in the United States. So not only is the situation different in England, but the subsidy there is paid at our expense instead of that of the British Government.

I wish to call attention to the fact that there is a bill on the calendar, Senate bill 1108, Calendar No. 289, which has been reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, containing an amendment prohibiting the use of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the payment of subsidies. When that bill comes before the Senate I intend to offer, if no other Senator does, an amendment imposing a general prohibition against the use of R. F. C. money, or any other money, for subsidies, except under certain specified conditions, where Congress may have approved the policy, or where it may desire to approve the policy. I hope the Senator from Montana will support such a movement which will bring this question directly to issue in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator need not worry about my supporting it, for I certainly shall do so.

I also call attention to the fact that when subsidies are granted to various industries and various sections people who may never use the particular article are called upon to pay their share of the subsidy so that someone else may obtain the article at a cheaper price. Take, for instance, a subsidy on coal and oil for New England. The question came up in the Senate in connection with a bill proposing to pay subsidies, and it was shown that because we had loaned or given to England a number of our oil tankers it was impossible to ship oil to New England by tankers, but it had to be shipped by rail. Under that bill subsidies are being granted so that the people of New England can get cheaper oil.

I wish also to call attention to the fact——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I shall yield in a moment. I desire to call attention to the fact that the people of Montana who already pay a higher price for their gasoline and oil than the people of New England pay are going to have to pay the subsidy or a part of the subsidy which goes to the people of New England. The same thing is true of coal. I point that out as an illustration of how bad subsidies are and what a sinister influence they are on the people of this country as a whole.

Now I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator realizes, of course, that there have been times when there was no oil or coal at any price in New England.

Mr. WHEELER. I so understand.

Mr. LODGE. I hope the Senator does not really mean that it is a sinister thing for the Government to give a little assistance to a section of the country whose productive facilities, leaving out of consideration for the moment human beings, are entirely necessary to the war effort. I cannot believe that the Senator really thinks that New England has received any special favoritism at the hands of the Government, for if he does think so, I am sure he will find that there is no one in New England who agrees with him.

Mr. WHEELER. I appreciate the fact that New England has been badly hit by reason of the shortage of coal and the shortage of oil, and, coming from New England myself, I sympathize very greatly with the people of New England. But I am pointing out the effect of subsidies generally. When subsidies are given on one article to one section of the country, then the rest of the people have to pay for the cheaper product the subsidized section is getting when they themselves derive no benefit from the subsidy at all.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think one of the cases where a subsidy is justified is on the ground that, because of war conditions, certain transportation costs have greatly increased. That situation affects the people in different sections of the country in different ways. For instance, a plant may be using coal in making war products in Pittsburgh with no increased cost for coal at all, whereas a plant in New England has a very large increase solely due to the war. I think the one exception I would make to the general prohibition against subsidies is a provision that the Government may equalize the cost of transportation where inequality arises because of war emergency conditions. I think in such a case it is not really a subsidy to the particular people involved, but rather an attempt to nullify the inequality caused by war conditions between different people.

Mr. WHEELER. I am perfectly willing to agree that, if there is any instance where a subsidy should be given, it is in the particular instance referred to by the Senator from Ohio. On the other hand, I point out that in my State, for instance, and in some of the other Northwestern States, oil is produced in those States, but notwithstanding the fact that we produce oil and cement and other articles, we have to pay on sugar, for instance, the San Francisco price plus freight to Billings, Mont., right where the sugar factory is located, where the beets are grown. Likewise we pay on oil, which is taken out of the ground in Montana, the Oklahoma price plus the freight to Montana. The same thing is true of various other articles produced in that State. Those States are not only being discriminated against at this time but they are discriminated against at all times. That is why, let me say to Senators from New England, the people of my State are asking, Why should a subsidy be given to New England? Why should a subsidy be given to this section or that section when we are already paying a higher price than they are paying and when of necessity we will have to help pay the taxes in order to provide the subsidies? That is an illustration of the effect of subsidies generally upon various groups of people and upon various sections of the country.

I say that, in principle, a subsidy by the Government of the United States is wrong and is bound, in my judgment, to have a kick-back, as the editorial in the Chicago Daily News points out. Under any theory of government, the principle of subsidies, in my judgment, cannot be defended.

I condemn the action of the R. F. C. in providing funds for subsidies, and of the administration when in order to pay subsidies, money is taken out of the R. F. C. and out of the Treasury of the United States. It amounts to the same thing, for taking it out of the R. F. C. means taking money, the taxpayers' money, out of the Treasury of the United States, without any appropriation by the Congress of the United States and without any law.

As I pointed out, some people say that England is paying subsidies. After all, if England is doing something, that is no reason why the United States should do it. I have heard it repeatedly stated on the floor of the Senate that we ought to do a certain thing because it is what England is doing; we even hear it stated, "This is what Germany is doing, and, consequently, we have got to do the same thing." We are taking a leaf out of the book of Mr. Hitler and out of other books, and saying that the people of the United States have to take certain action because some other country has taken it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. I have noted statements that different committees are against subsidies, and I take it from the sentiments expressed here that the Senate is against them. Then, why is there not presented a bill to notify the administration and our people that, so far as the general principle of subsidy is concerned, we will legislate against it? The question has arisen before different committees. The question of the butter and meat subsidy is before my committee. The testimony which was given against a subsidy on those products was amazing. Here we are talking about subsidies; committees are investigating the subject but nothing is done, and in the meantime subsidies are in operation. Why not stop it now?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill now pending before the Senate and on the calendar which, if enacted, would prevent the use of money by the R. F. C., and, as I understood him a few moments ago, the Senator from Ohio said that if no other Senator does so, he intends to offer an amendment to that bill prohibiting all subsidies of every kind and character.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that, so far as I know, there has been no application to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate for the money with which to pay a subsidy, but a few days ago, as the Senator from Virginia has just explained, the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Jesse Jones, whom we all know and whom we all like and admire, came before the Byrd committee and told us very frankly that $450,000,000 had been set aside to pay subsidies on beef and butter, as I recall, or meat and butter. We asked him to whom he was going to pay the subsidy, whether he was going to pay it to the producers. He was rather vague, as I recall. I have sent for the testimony so as to put his exact words in the RECORD, in order that there may not be any mistake about it, since I would not want to do him an injustice. The answer in substance was, however, that they were going to pay the subsidy to the meat packers.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I asked him what about the producers. He said the producers would get the benefit of it, as I recall the testimony, by the stabilization of prices. In other words, that through the $450,000,000 which the Government would turn over to the packers, in some way, somehow, by some method I could not understand—if it can be done in the way explained I am unable to understand it—the producers would indirectly get the benefit by not having to take a lower price for their products. To my mind the payment of $450,000,000 to the packers of the country, as indicated in the statement given us by Mr. Jones, will be merely a kindly, agreeable, costly gift by the Government to the packers.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. When the question of the roll-back was before a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a point was brought out by the Senator from Oregon to which I should like to call attention. A question was asked as to how much wages had increased in the last 2 years, as I recall the question. The answer was that they had increased 100 percent. Then the question was, "How much have farm prices increased?" The answer was "22 percent." Mr. Jones was asked, "Do you not think that with this tremendous advance in wages a pay-as-you-go plan might be inaugurated, and that those who are getting this tremendous increase in wages should pay the 46 cents which the Department of Agriculture has fixed, rather than reduce the price to 41 cents, and pay the processor?" We said, "Which do you think would be better, to have the one who receives increased wages pay that out of his 100 percent increase, and leave the producers of milk and cream to get 46 percent?" Mr. Jones' answer was, "You have me cornered."

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly; of course he could not say anything else but that he was cornered. I can understand that there may be a few articles which here-

tofore have not been produced in this country and which our people have been denied because of the war, and which it is necessary to produce here, and that it might be necessary to give subsidies in order to encourage the planting of some new crop which the farmers have not heretofore produced, and perhaps they do not know whether they can produce them at the price fixed.

Mr. SMITH. And the Government pay for the experiment.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; in other words, let the Government pay for that particular experiment. But to give a subsidy on butter, to give a subsidy on meat products, to give subsidies on this and on that, in my judgment, is absolutely wrong and should not be permitted by this Government.

Mr. President, I hope that Congress will do something about this matter and that the Congress will pass a law prohibiting the money of the R. F. C. being used for the purpose of paying subsidies unless request is made of Congress and a law is passed by the Congress permitting that sort of thing to be done.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. When Mr. Jones testified before the Joint Economy Committee it appeared that, in addition to the $450,000,000 for subsidy payments on meat and butter, he was already paying the following subsidies annually:

Petroleum and petroleum products	$225,000,000
Sugar	17,805,000
Coal	25,000,000
Chilean nitrate	3,250,000
Fiber	1,100,000
Petroleum coke	250,000
Aluminum rods and bars	250,000

In addition to that he has agreed to pay excess production costs on copper and some other commodities of which he did not have an estimate of the cost. So we have already embarked upon the subsidy policy. He has agreed to pay premiums for the domestic production of copper, lead, and zinc in excess of the 1941 production, at an estimated cost of $30,000,000 each year.

Mr. WHEELER. I find a widespread opinion that because the subsidy is being paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or is being paid by the R. F. C., the people are getting the benefit of it but will not have to pay for it. They think it is possible to take it out of the so-called rich men of the country. They do not realize that, after all, the taxes have to come out of all classes of people, either directly or indirectly, and that if we took all the money of all the so-called ultrarich, there would not be enough money to pay the interest upon our bonded indebtedness at the present time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now have Mr. Jones' testimony before me, and I read from page 1135:

The CHAIRMAN. What I mean is this $450,000,000, how are you going to get it back to Tom Jones who sells the hogs over 3 or 4 months, how does he get his part of it?

Secretary JONES. He will get his part of it, because the packer will continue to pay the prevailing prices.

The CHAIRMAN. It all goes to the packer then?

Secretary JONES. No; it does not go to the packer.

Senator McKELLAR. Who ultimately receives it?

Secretary JONES. It reaches the animal man.

I judge he means the man who produces the animal.

Senator McKELLAR. Who actually receives the money?

Secretary JONES. The packer, the producer.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the packer gets it. He does not give it back to the producer of the animal.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me finish the quotation:

Senator McKELLAR. The packer actually receives it?

Secretary JONES. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. It depends on whether or not anybody else gets it.

Secretary JONES. I would not think so.

There he admits that the producer of the meat gets no part of the money, but that the packer gets the money, and that in some way, by the stabilization of prices, keeping prices where they are now, the producer will get the benefit. There is a ceiling on the price.

Mr. WHEELER. What I assume he means is that the packers were saying that they were being squeezed because they could not afford to pay the prices which had been fixed by the O. P. A. to the stock growers, and then process the product at the price at which they were required to sell it.

So in order to stabilize the price, in order to give the consumer a cheaper price, the packer was given a subsidy. I do not know whether the packer is today receiving a sufficiently high price for his product, but let us assume that he is not receiving the price he ought to receive. Some persons in the United States eat more meat than do others. Some persons do not eat any meat. Some persons require more meat than others. The payment of the subsidy means that the person who does not eat any meat and the person who eats very little meat will be asked to pay taxes in order that the person who eats more meat can have cheap meat. The same thing applies all the way down the line. Some families possibly cannot buy butter because they cannot afford to pay the price for it, and therefore must use oleomargarine. If some families must use oleomargarine because they cannot afford to buy butter, they either directly or indirectly are obliged to pay taxes in order that others may be enabled to buy butter at a lower price.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] a moment ago stated that lead, copper, and zinc receive subsidies. Of course they are in a different category altogether from butter, cream, and beef, for the reason that the Government is the only purchaser of zinc, lead, and copper, and these metals are being used altogether in the war effort. The subsidies which are being paid for the production of these metals go only to new producers. Old producers of copper, lead, and zinc, who were operating prior to the war, receive no subsidies whatever for what they produce. The subsidy, or incentive payment, is given only to the new producers.

Mr. BYRD. That was not the testimony which Mr. Jones gave, although I agree with the Senator from Colorado that the metals present an entirely different question. Mr. Jones testified that premiums are paid for domestic production which is in excess of the 1941 production.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. I asked Mr. Jones the specific question if it would not apply to the Anaconda Copper Co., and he said it would.

Mr. WHEELER. I think Secretary Jones is wrong in that respect. The subsidy would apply to that company only as it developed some new property.

Mr. BYRD. No; the Secretary said that for production which was in excess of 1941 production the company would receive a subsidy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; that statement is wrong for the reason that the Anaconda Copper Co. is not producing as much now as it did in 1941.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Montana spoke of new producers. If the Anaconda Copper Co. were to produce more now than it produced in 1941 it would be eligible to receive a subsidy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. It would not necessarily have to be a new producer. An old producer who increased his production over that of 1941 would receive a subsidy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certain regulations are drawn around that provision, however.

Mr. BYRD. I am not objecting to that particular form of subsidy. I am simply calling attention to what the Secretary said.

Mr. WHEELER. The Government has fixed the price of copper at 14 cents. During the last war the price of copper was 27 cents. Perhaps the price of copper was too high at that time. At this time an increase in price of copper has been sought by producers. Rather than grant a general increase in the price of copper a subsidy has been provided to be paid only for copper produced in mines or portions of mines which were not previously producing to any great extent. With respect to the production of main mines I am quite sure that under the present rules and regulations the producers receive no subsidies.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more so the RECORD may be made absolutely correct?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I find an additional statement in the hearings with reference to the $450,000,000:

The CHAIRMAN. All the farmer gets is the fact that his price is not reduced.

Secretary JONES. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. He gets the same price that he now gets?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I continue to read:

Secretary JONES. That is correct.

Senator McKELLAR. The subsidy goes to the packer, the processor, and the distributor.

The Secretary did not answer my last statement, but it was made in connection with the general discussion. I call attention to that testimony in order to show that so far as this enormous subsidy of $450,000,000 is concerned every dime of it, every cent of it, goes to the packer or to the distributor. Not a single cent of it goes to the farmer who produces the meat or the butter.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say that the $450,000,000 represents simply the beginning of the subsidy program.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, of course; it is simply the beginning of it. Anyone who knows anything about subsidies must be aware that if we begin giving subsidies to one group or to another group, every other group in the country will come to Washington clamoring for subsidies and saying, "We cannot continue to produce and to meet the war requirements without receiving a subsidy."

As the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has pointed out, the Government purchases or takes all the copper which is produced in this country. The Government could have accomplished the same purpose without giving subsidies simply by saying, "We will give you 16 cents or 17 cents for the copper you produce over what you produced last year."

Subsidies are wrong in principle, whether paid to copper companies, or to packers, or to manufacturers, or to any other group in the United States.

Mr. BYRD. Especially is it wrong to take the subsidy money out of the funds of the R. F. C., which is a banking institution and which was not created by Congress for the purpose of making appropriations which are nonrecoverable. The R. F. C. is a banking institution supposed to make loans which will later be repaid, or at least such part of them as it is possible to recover. In this instance the R. F. C. is being used as a means to bypass Congress, so Congress will not have anything to say about the matter at all. Thus the funds which Congress authorized for banking purposes are being given away and will never be recovered.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, we see day by day attempts being made by various bureaus and departments to bypass Congress in every possible way, shape, and form. Yet those who cry the loudest about preserving democracy and parliamentary government in this country constantly shout that it is necessary for these bureaus and departments to bypass Congress because they cannot get everything they want from Congress through the ordinary methods which are established and under the ordinary principles of a democratic republic.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is also true, is it not, that anyone who accepts subsidies from the Federal Treasury accepts at the same time regulation by the different bureaus?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. I repeat what I said at the beginning, that I think subsidies are wrong in principle. I wish to compliment the publisher of the newspaper in which the editorial previously mentioned was published and the Secretary of the Navy for permitting the publication of the editorial, if he did permit it, and I wish to say that I sincerely hope I shall be afforded an opportunity to vote on legislation which will forbid the R. F. C., or any other agency of Government, from granting subsidies unless the subsidies are first approved by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gurney	Overton
Austin	Hatch	Pepper
Bailey	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Scrugham
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
George	Murdock	White
Gerry	Murray	Wiley
Gillette	Nye	Willis
Green	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 89, beginning in line 4.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. What is the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 89, after line 3, it is proposed to strike out:

FARM TENANCY

Salaries and expenses: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), $500,000 for necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of said act and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act.

And to insert:

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

To enable the Secretary to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws; (2) loans to needy individual farmers; (3) grants; and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, $29,607,573, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts (including the Administrator and not to exceed three Assistant Administrators of the Farm Security Administration) without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

In making any grant payments under this act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C., 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $97,500,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under the caption ("Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500.

The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under

the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

FARM TENANCY

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said Act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said Act $1,326,070.

Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), $30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 per centum per annum: *Provided*, That the amount which is available to any State or Territory for making loans under such title I shall be distributed by the Secretary, in accordance with rules prescribed by him, among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory, except that he shall not distribute to any such county or parish in excess of three times the amount which would be distributed to such county or parish were the entire amount available to the State or Territory distributed among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006): *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 per centum of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, under rule XVI, I make the point of order against the committee amendment now under consideration, beginning in line 4 on page 89.

Paragraph 2 of rule XVI provides that:

The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

Paragraph 4 of the same rule provides that:

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

Mr. President, the provisions included under the caption "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," were not in the bill as it came over from the House of Representatives, and there has never been any authority in law for this appropriation. This program was started by Executive order in the Federal Emergency Relief Administration in 1934. On April 30, 1935, the President issued an Executive order creating the Resettlement Administration, which took over that part of the F. E. R. A. program, as well as certain activities of other agencies. On September 1, 1937, the Secretary of Agriculture issued a memorandum creating the Farm Security Administration as successor to the Resettlement Administration, which had been transferred to the Department of Agriculture by Executive order of the President on December 31, 1936.

The Congress has never enacted legislation creating the Farm Security Administration, and has never authorized by law the program known as Loans, Grants, and Rural Rehabilitation.

Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senate to the language on page 90, beginning in line 5 "without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

That is certainly legislation, because it sets aside existing law.

In line 9 we find the language:

Provided, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

The rules have repeatedly been interpreted to mean that any additional duty or responsibility placed upon any agency of the Government, especially when such agency was not authorized by law, is regarded as legislation.

The language of the amendment beginning on line 18 on page 90, and continuing to and including line 5 on page 91, can certainly be regarded as legislation.

I also invite attention to the language beginning in line 6 on page 91, as follows:

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural-rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $97,500,000.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is a change in existing law.

Mr. BYRD. Yes, that is a change in the existing law, and is in the same category as the legislative amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia with respect to the loans of $30,000,000 to be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under the Rural Electrification Act.

Mr. President, it seems very obvious to me that, with the exception of perhaps that part of the amendment on page 92 beginning with line 5 and ending in line 13, which represents restriction, the remainder of the amendment offered by the committee down to and certainly including the first paragraph on page 93 is general legislation upon a general appropriation bill.

In accordance with the rules of the Senate, Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I believe that clearly under the precedents of the Senate the point of order made by the Senator from Virginia in this instance is not well taken and should be overruled. The Senator has stated there is no statutory authority for these rehabilitation loans. I respectfully invite his attention to title II of an act of Congress approved July 22, 1937. It reads as follows:

TITLE II—REHABILITATION LOANS

BORROWERS AND TERMS

SEC. 21 (a). Out of the funds made available under section 23, the Secretary shall have power to make loans to eligible individuals for the purchase of livestock, farm equipment, supplies, and for other farm needs (including minor improvements and minor repairs to real property), and for the refinancing of indebtedness, and for family subsistence.

That is the statutory authority delegated by an act of Congress, which has never been repealed, to the Secretary to make loans for rural rehabilitation.

I ask Senators to refer to line 19 on page 89 beginning with the words "farm debt adjustment service." There is statutory authority found in this act for the carrying out of that service, and I read from section 22 of the same act from which I have already read, which was approved, as I have said, on July 22, 1937:

The Secretary shall have power to assist in the voluntary adjustment of indebtedness between farm debtors and their creditors and may cooperate with and pay the whole or part of the expenses of State, Territorial, and local agencies and committees engaged in such debt adjustment. He is also authorized to continue and carry out undertakings with respect to farm-debt adjustment uncompleted at the time when appropriations for the purpose of this section are first available. Services furnished by the Secretary under this section shall be without charge to the debtor or creditor.

I further invite the attention of the Senate to title I of the same act which provides as follows:

The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make loans in the United States and in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and in Puerto Rico to persons eligible to receive the benefits of this title to enable such persons to acquire farms.

(b) Only farm tenants, farm laborers, sharecroppers, and other individuals who obtain, or who recently obtained, the major portion of their income from farming operations shall be eligible to receive the benefits of this title.

Then follow a great many details with regard to the making of loans to farm tenants, to farm laborers, and to sharecroppers to enable them to purchase farms.

So, Mr. President, so far as concerns the charge which has been made that the Congress has never approved rural rehabilitation loans, I thought it was well for me to read these items in the act—this still live statute—to show that Congress has had ample authority in times past for a comprehensive program of rural rehabilitation. The appropriations which have been made from year to year for the purpose of making these loans have been made to the Secretary of Agriculture and not to the Farm Security Administration. The Farm Security Administration is the agency which has been utilized by the Secretary. But so far as the bill before us is concerned, the appropriation would be made to the Secretary of Agriculture just as has been the case in times past.

There are some portions of this amendment, Mr. President, which are legislative in character. The reference made by the Senator from Virginia to the provision authorizing borrowings from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation does not appear in the basic act to which I have referred. However, Mr. President, I do not depend, in opposing the point of order, solely upon statutory authority for the detailed program set forth for the making of rural-rehabilitation loans. This amendment was reported by the committee in the bill on the strength of one of the most elementary rules of both legislative bodies. It has always been recognized that where one body legislates upon a subject the other body has a right to amend it in any way it sees fit so long as the amendment is germane to the question which is referred to in the bill which comes before it. Every provision of the amendment is germane to a program of rural rehabilitation.

Mr. President, I submit that the House, by inserting by a floor amendment the language found on page 89 of the pending bill appropriating $500,000 for necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I, and by inserting the words—I will read from line 9—"and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act," legislated thereon. It makes no difference how slender the thread of legislation may be which comes to us from the other House. If there is any legislation there at all we are entitled to transform it into a steel cable, or a steel beam, so long as the amendment which we offer is germane to the general subject.

The provision in the House bill is undoubtedly legislation. I wish to submit to the Senate the language of section 6 of the act approved July 22, 1937. A comparison of this language with the House provision clearly demonstrates the fact that the latter is legislation:

SEC. 6. To carry out the provisions of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, not to exceed $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and not to exceed $50,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter.

I hope Senators, without regard to their views on the merits of this issue, will listen to the language which I shall now read:

Not more than 5 percent of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year in pursuance of this section shall be available for administrative expenses in carrying out this title during such fiscal year.

I hope Senators will mark that language well—not more than 5 percent of the amount appropriated in any fiscal year for carrying out this section for the purpose of making loans, shall be available for administrative expenses.

Mr. President, when the House struck out on the floor all the loan money and appropriated $500,000 for the collection of outstanding loans, without making any authorization for loans, it made an appropriation of 100 percent of the sums which were available for loans, and there is no way of escaping the fact that that is legislation. It may be minor, but it has the effect of repealing section 6 of the basic act which was approved in 1937. So long as the House of Representatives legislates in any respect the Senate has a right to go fully into the whole question of rural rehabilitation and tenant purchase loans.

The point made, Mr. President, at the outside, can only present the question as to whether or not the amendment is germane under paragraph 4 of rule XVI. I contend if the House of Representatives undertakes to repeal an act in a general appropriation bill, that the Senate may strike out the language repealing the act and provide for amending the act in the general appropriation bill. To rule otherwise would be absolutely to reverse every precedent the Senate has ever established in dealing with this question. It is undoubtedly in order for this committee amendment to come before the Senate and to be considered on its merits unless it is desired to repeal every precedent the Senate has established concerning the powers of one House to deal with an amendment of the other House which has the effect of changing existing law.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Suppose the Senate amendment had been adopted by the House, all except the provision for $97,500,000 to be loaned by the R. F. C., and the Senate committee had then attempted to insert that amendment in the House amendment, would not that be new and general legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I do not think so. If there was any piece of legislation in the House provision we have a right to amend it in any words which are germane to the subject.

Mr. TAFT. Suppose the House feels that because of the authority of existing law these appropriations are justified, and the Senate comes along and passes an entirely new provision that is not authorized in existing law but brings a new element into the picture and appropriates $97,500,000, would not that be an amendment proposing new legislation? Why is it not the same thing if it is included in the amendment which the Senate committee proposes to the House amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry the Senator from Ohio missed the point I was undertaking to make. I am making the point that the House did legislate on this question. If we go on the supposition that the House did not legislate on the subject, but that it merely conformed to the Rehabilitation Act of 1937, the amendment would have been subject to a point of order, but the House did not content itself with dealing with any provision of existing law; it undertook by this language to repeal and to nullify section 6 of the act to which I have referred, which provided that for administrative expenses the appropriations should never exceed 5 percent of the amount which was made available for loans.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, paragraph 4 of rule XVI provides:

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

Why is not the provision about the R. F. C. general legislation and why is not the amendment itself subject to the rule?

Mr. RUSSELL. Because, Mr. President, the first clause of subdivision 4 of rule XVI relates to amendments which propose legislation de novo. It does not relate to amendments undertaking to amend legislative provisions which come to the Senate from the House of Representatives. The second clause of the paragraph provides—

Nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received.

That is the only language in the entire rule which might be applied to the amendment now under consideration.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that is very much more damning to the proposal, because the amendment is purely general legislation not proposed by the House. I cannot understand the basis of the contention of the Senator from Georgia that it is not general legislation. There is no statutory authority for us to tell the R. F. C. to get into the picture and loan $97,500,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I concede that, but the Senator still misses the point. The first clause of the rule is only to be applied in the event there is no legislation in the bill before the Senate. If there is legislation in the bill before the Senate, the Senate has a right to proceed to change the legislative provision which comes before it from the other House, provided the changes proposed are germane.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is perfectly clear that in this bill there cannot be inserted in the committee amendment a new provision of law, even one relating to such a matter as including employees under the civil service, which is not in the House amendment and not authorized by any existing law and which no one ever

heard of until the Senate committee inserted it as an amendment. I cannot understand the argument of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think that the Senator from Ohio wishes very strongly to understand it. The fact is, nevertheless, that, without regard to the views of the Senator from Ohio, the established precedent of the Senate is that where the House itself has violated the rule against legislation on an appropriation bill the Senate has the right to legislate on the same subject in the Senate. The only rule that pertains to it is as to whether or not the Senate proposal is germane to the House amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is quoting precedents. Does he know of any single precedent in the whole history of the Senate where it has ever been held that because the House chooses to legislate on an appropriation bill with regard to one particular item the Senate, therefore, under its own rules, or the Appropriations Committee, has authority to legislate in any other way it might desire? In other words, assuming the Senator's own argument that the House has legislated with regard to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, the Senator's argument would lead anybody to believe that, therefore, the Appropriations Committee, under the rules of the Senate, has authority and power to legislate on anywith the subject of farm tenancy.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I never made any such contention.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But it is a logical result of the Senator's argument.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what the Senator from Missouri contends. The Senate committee has not undertaken to deal with any new question. The only questions we are dealing with are the ones that have always been contained in this bill, under the act referred to in the House bill, and which the House undertook to repeal when it inserted this provision in the bill. All of them have been carried on under the general act providing for rural rehabilitation loans, for tenant purchases, as well as for rural rehabilitation where purchase loans were not involved. There can be no question that this amendment is germane to the act in question. The rural rehabilitation loans are in the same bill that carries the tenant purchase loans which are referred to in the House provision which is before the Senate. If the House undertakes to legislate and does legislate in any degree upon any question, certainly the Senate has a right to legislate upon the same question. That is absolutely fundamental, and no other ruling has ever been made, Mr. President, in the period I have been in this body; and, I am not familiar with any precedent to the contrary.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator was reading from an act which was approved July 22, 1937.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. To create the Farmers' Home Corporation. I am reliably informed that that corporation has never been created and is in a state of innocuous desuetude. Is the Senator assenting that because of this law, which has never become operative, this particular corporation has never been organized?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the question of the Senator from Virginia demonstrates unfamiliarity with this entire question.

Mr. BYRD. I would thank the Senator very much for an answer.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to point out that there is no mandatory provision here for the establishment of that corporation.

Mr. BYRD. I asked the Senator a question, and I am entitled to an answer from the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret if I seemed to be abrupt with the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator was quite abrupt.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry.

Mr. BYRD. I asked a very courteous question of the Senator. The Senator always tries to make these debates personal, which I do not think is proper. I have my right to my convictions, just as the Senator from Georgia has a right to his.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have absolutely no desire to infringe on any conviction the Senator may have.

Mr. BYRD. I certainly have a right to ask a question, which the Senator should not object to. The Senator was quoting from an act to create the Farmers' Home Corporation, which, he contended, gave legislative authority for the purchase of livestock, farm equipment, and supplies, and I ask this question, Has the Farmers' Home Corporation ever been organized?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not that I know of.

Mr. BYRD. It is a dormant corporation; is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is dormant, because the Secretary, under the specific terms of the law, was given two methods of procedure. One of them was that he could proceed under title I or title II to lend funds through any agency of his own choice, or he could proceed through the Farmers' Home Corporation.

Mr. BYRD. He is not proceeding through the Farmers' Home Corporation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know that, and there is nothing in the act to require him to do it. It is absolutely optional. He may create the Farmers' Home Corporation. He never saw fit to do it, but that does not curtail his power to make loans under title I and title II.

Mr. BYRD. But this is what it says:

Out of the funds made available under section 23, the Secretary shall have power—

And so forth. Section 23 applies to the Farmers' Home Corporation, which has never been organized. The act was passed, and was approved July 22, 1937.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will read section 23 he will see that it does not apply to the Farmers' Home Corporation. It says:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, the balances of funds available to the Secretary—

Not to the Farmers' Home Corporation, but—

available to the Secretary for loans and relief to farmers, pursuant to Executive Order No. 7530—

And so forth. It has no reference to the Farmers' Home Corporation, and there is nothing in the act to make it mandatory on the Secretary to establish that corporation. It was an alternative. For some reason the Secretary saw fit to exercise the powers contained in titles I and II of the act, and he never saw fit to create the Farmers' Home Corporation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the contention of the able Senator from Georgia, it is that the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations stems from the provision written by the House of Representatives, which appears on page 89, entitled "Farm Tenancy."

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator states my position correctly.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the able Senator tell me what part of the amendment applies strictly to the farm-tenancy program, provided for in what is known as the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is my contention that when the House of Representatives proceeds to legislate with respect to one title of this act, the Senate has a right to legislate with respect to all titles of the Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not say that I disagree with the able Senator on that, but I was wondering whether it could be segregated and broken down to the point where we would know definitely which portion of the amendment specifically applied to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; or is the entire amendment a part of the Bankhead-Jones Act?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senate provisions are offered to make appropriations for the Secretary with respect to general powers contained in titles I and II of the Bankhead-Jones Act.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that, and I understand it thoroughly, but I think there is confusion.

Mr. RUSSELL. We go further than the Bankhead-Jones Act, I concede freely, but if the House has the right to deviate from the Bankhead-Jones Act in one respect, to legislate on the question of rehabilitation and tenant loans, we have a right to deviate so long as our deviation is germane.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the Senator's contention is that once the House opens up the field, there is no limit as to how far the Senate may go, so long as it is dealing with loans for rehabilitation in connection with farms.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is exactly correct and the position is sound.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand that if the House had legislated on the Bankhead-Jones Act without violating it in any way or attempting to impose any

additional legislative provisions, then the Senate, under the Senator's amendment, would be barred also from general legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator claims that because the House, dealing with the Bankhead-Jones Act, proposes one kind of general legislation—I do not admit it, except for the purpose of this question—therefore the Senate may impose an entirely different kind of general legislation, in spite of the Senate rule that no general legislation may be proposed to an appropriation bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; so long as it is germane, and I contend that paragraph 4 of rule XVI relates only to new legislation and not to changing legislation which comes before us from the House of Representatives.

Mr. TAFT. But it seems to me clear that the amendment dealing with the R. F. C. is new legislation. It may have reference to a provision that is related to the Bankhead-Jones Act, but it is new legislation, and I cannot see how it can be said it does not come under the rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have undertaken to give my own position on that question. It is my construction that paragraph 4, which the Senator is discussing, relates only to new legislation which might be offered in the bill, but when the House has deviated from the rule which provides there shall be no legislation on an appropriation bill, undoubtedly, under all the precedents, if the House legislates in any respect, then the only qualification on the Senate provisions is that they must be germane to the general subject involved in the legislation, and this amendment is undoubtedly germane to the general purposes of the Bankhead-Jones Act, which is referred to in the House legislative provision which appears on page 89 of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask the Senator one other question. I cannot see why the Senate provision is not one dealing in general legislation. There is merely a failure on the part of the House to appropriate for some of the purposes of the act; but that is not a violation of the act.

Mr. RUSSELL. The language in the House provision which undertakes to liquidate the question by adding the words "and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made" shows that it is legislation, because section 6 of the basic act, which I have once read, says that no money shall be allowed for administrative expenses in excess of 5 percent of the amount that is allowed for loans. The House did not allow a dollar for loans, therefore, if they had appropriated $5 for administration it would have had the effect of anulling section 6 of the basic act, which provides that the administrative expenses shall not exceed 5 percent of the amount made available foi loans.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that can hardly be said to be a violation. Possibly the $500,000 appropriation is void.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not void; it is legislation, because it is made in derogation of the express terms of the statute, and contrary to the express terms of the statute. There can be no question about it being legislation. It might as well be provided in the appropriation bill that the Bankhead-Jones Act is repealed. Then would the Senator contend that we could not strike out that provision and offer an amendment which amended the Bankhead-Jones Act?

It is clear to me that, under the rule, the only question possible in this matter is whether the amendment is germane. Suppose the House tries to repeal some act in an appropriation bill and their action comes to the Senate. The Senate is not compelled to accept this House provision. The Senate has some rights. If the House went to the extent of saying in a general appropriation bill that an act approved on such and such a date "is hereby repealed," undoubtedly and unquestionably, in view of every precedent, the Senate could go into that matter, and amend the act which the House sought to repeal or reject the House amendment. Any other ruling would deny the Senate coordinate powers with the House.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement, because I think this is a very important question. I wish that Senators could disassociate the issue involved in the amendment and consider the matter from the standpoint of the parliamentary situation. I know it is always difficult to do that, but there was very sound ground, Mr. President, for the provision in the rule that an appropriation bill should not carry general legislation. It gave too great opportunity for abuse of the great power of lumping together legislation with appropriations, and making it impossible either to vote against or for the measure without involving the question of appropriations. So I want it generally understood that I am in deep sympathy with that provision of the rule.

But, as I see it, that is not the issue now at stake. The issue at stake is the question of whether or not the Senate shall maintain its unbroken precedents holding that it has the right to explore any field of general legislation which the House of Representatives may have entered. That, Mr. President, is a vital question; it is a question of great extreme importance as affecting the power of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, it is not a question of the power of the Senate. It is the Senate's own rule which is being violated. It is a question of what the Senate wants. The Senate can set aside the rule if it wants to do so. The Senate can change the rule. It is not a question between the Senate and the House of Representatives; it is merely a question whether we shall abide by our own rules.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator will bear with me, perhaps I cannot convince him, but, at least, I will have an opportunity to state why I think it is of great importance. If, for example, the Senate should take the position that the House of Representatives, having legislated upon a subject, the Senate could not pursue that field and alter, amend, enlarge, change, or shrink the action of the House, it would bind itself to a legislative provision in an appropriation bill, which must pass in order that a particular department or agency may continue to function. The Senate would be helpless; it could not change, it could not alter the action taken by the House of Representatives.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senate can strike out the legislative provision which the House has inserted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. That is entirely within its power.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; it is within its power, Mr. President; but if the conferees on the part of the House maintain their position, the Senate is ultimately confronted with either yielding to the ipse dixit and the legislative action of the House without amendment, change, or alteration, or killing the appropriation bill. That is the whole theory behind this general rule. The purpose of the rule is to preserve the power of the Senate to act in any way the majority of the Senate sees fit, whenever the other body may have entered the field of legislation. It could not have been better put than it was put by Vice President Marshall when he said:

> Notwithstanding the rule of the Senate to the effect that general legislation may not be attached to an appropriation bill, still when the House of Representatives opens the door and proceeds to enter upon a field of general legislation, the House having opened the door, the Senate of the United States can walk in through the door and pursue the field.

Mr. President, I contend that it is absolutely necessary that we maintain that precedent. It is clearly a question here of the House having entered the field. The question which is raised in paragraph 4 of rule XVI is certainly one which could be given consideration, namely, whether the legislative action of the Senate committee is germane to the legislative action taken by the House of Representatives. I agree in that respect 100 percent with everything that has been said by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and I think he has proven beyond peradventure of argument that the action of the Senate committee is germane.

But the question at issue is not as yet one of germaneness. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has raised the point of order that the amendment proposes general legislation, and I appeal to the Senate, and I appeal to the Chair, not to sustain such a point of order, not to reverse the unbroken precedents of the Senate, but to maintain the legislative power of the Senate on a parity with the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from Wisconsin has raised the question of relevancy?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I did not raise it. I said that it could be raised.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to follow the invitation extended by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in one of his more courteous moments, and discuss this matter as a matter of parliamentary procedure rather than on the merits of the substantive proposition involved.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that we have listened to a very remarkable demonstration this afternoon. I have often heard it cited as the height of extreme statement that a man could take a match stem and run it into a lumber yard. But the Senator from Georgia has gone even beyond that in tenuous theory. The Senator from Georgia proposes to take a match stem and run it into a vast forest, into great sulphur mines, great factories, great railroad transportation systems, a lease-lend act, into great steamship facilities to transport the products of the match stem overseas.

Mr. President, the argument advanced by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Wisconsin, reduced to its simplest terms, simply means that if the House of Representatives in a general appropriation bill violates its own rule by the inclusion of any item of legislation, by that act it automatically suspends the rule of the Senate as to the inclusion of legislation in general appropriation bills, not only as to the item with which the House has dealt, but as to any other item which in its wisdom the Senate Committee on Appropriations may desire to tack onto it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to correct the Senator's statement that I made any such contention. I said that the amendment had to be germane.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am stating the effects of the argument made by the Senator from Georgia, as I understood it. I was not proposing to quote the Senator from Georgia verbatim. But the argument of the Senator from Georgia is that by reason of the fact that the House of Representatives in a provision beginning in line 5 and extending through line 14 on page 89, according to the contention of the Senator from Georgia, has changed the proportion set up by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, a specific act approved July 22, 1937, as to the proportion of administrative expenses, therefore the Committee on Appropriations is authorized under the Senate's own rules—and that is the only contention here as to the rules of the Senate; the contention is not made with respect to the right of the Senate as a whole to act, but as to the procedure under the rules of the Senate, that, therefore, the Appropriations Committee is authorized under the rules of the Senate to report an amendment dealing with any other legislation connected with agriculture or farm tenancy which the committee may see fit to report. That, as I see it, is the only issue before the Senate.

Mr. President, this is a specific act in connection with which the House is accused of having legislated. I do not desire to waste the time of the Senate in arguing whether the provision which is stricken out in the House bill, to which I referred, is or is not legislation, because that is not necessary for the purpose of my argument. For the purpose of the argument I am perfectly willing to concede the proposition of the Senator from Georgia that the House has legislated by changing the requirement of the original act of July 22, 1937.

But, Mr. President, in the interest of orderly legislation, in the interest of preserving the rules of the Senate, in the interest of preventing appropriation committees constantly proposing substantive legislation on general appropriation bills, I deny the proposition that if the House has legislated with regard to the provisions of a specific bill, namely, the so-called Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937, the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has a right to go afield and take in any other subject which in its wisdom it deems desirable to take in in order to affect the question of farm tenancy or of agriculture in general. That is the question before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand that the contention of the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri is simply that, insofar as the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is concerned, the Committee on Appropriations had the power and authority to explore any field in connection with that one piece of legislation?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes, Mr. President; the Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. And that when the committee goes beyond that, regardless of whether the legislation it recommends affects the farmers, the legislation which the committee then proposes is subject to the point of order?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator has admirably stated the position. In other words, a while ago the Senator from Wisconsin quoted a decision of a distinguished former Vice President in which he said, "the gate was left open and the Senate had a right to go through it." However, the Senate has no right, under its own rules, to do so. I desire to draw a proper distinction relative to the question of the right as between the two bodies. The Senate has a right to do anything it wants to do; but the Senate, under its own rules, as a matter of procedure cannot go through the gate the House has opened, and knock down both sides, and pour through as a general horde.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does not the Senator's whole argument turn on the question of germaneness?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It does not.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It would seem to me that it does.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The point of germaneness would apply, let me say, to the Senator from Michigan, to the question of whether a particular amendment would be germane to the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. No Senator has contended—at least, I have not heard any Senator do so—that there is anything in the amendment which is germane to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I contend that it is germane to it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, with all due respect to my friend, the Senator from Georgia, I must say that I suspect that, in claiming germaneness, the proponents of the committee amendment are endeavoring to escape from the provisions of the rule, and to submit the matter to a majority vote of the Senate on the question of germaneness, because the rule specifically provides for a majority vote on the question of germaneness. It seems to me there can be no question as to germaneness to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act when the committee takes up an entirely different act—in fact two different acts; they were cited by the Senator from Georgia himself—and goes beyond that, and changes that act or those acts by legislation, sets up new machinery under the R. F. C., and goes entirely outside the field of any administration of the Bankhead-Jones Act, which is the legislation claimed by the Senator from Georgia as his original authority for new legislation in the bill. I say there is no justification for going clear outside that act and setting up entirely new authorities—different acts—and setting up entirely new duties and different questions of personnel classification.

Mr. President, as I say, I intend to discuss at this time only the parliamentary situation, because I think a very important parliamentary question is involved. I think the whole practice of the Congress of restricting legislation on appropriation bills is involved in this question. If the practice—a practice more exemplified by this bill than by any other I have ever seen—of having the Appropriations Committee of the Senate absolutely substitute its judgment for that of the legislative committees involved is indulged in and carried out, then I think the other committees of the Senate and of the House might as well be abolished, because there is no use in having any other legislating done if the Committee on Appropriations, in a "must" bill, a bill which is very necessary to be signed, a general supply bill, is to come along and do the legislating.

Mr. President, of course, the reason for the rule which has always existed in the Senate and always existed in the House, at least for many years—certainly for all my lifetime—is very readily evident. Legislation comes before either body of the Congress for consideration upon its merits. It is open to serious discussion, at least in this body, and formerly was in the House; it is open to amendment; and it is open to any legislative action which the body concerned may see fit to take. It may be passed by one body, may fail of passage in the other body, or may pass both bodies and be vetoed by the President, without the sense of compulsion which applies in connection with general appropriation bills.

As to the great supply bills necessary to be passed in order to have the Government continue to operate, they have always been given a high state of precedence, as we say in the Senate, or privilege, as is said in the House; they have been protected against dilatory amendments and various other kinds of amendments, in order to expedite their passage. They are recognized as "must" bills in both the Senate and the House of Representatives; and only under the most extraordinary circumstances has a President of the United States vetoed a general supply bill.

Mr. President, it is for that reason, for that very justifiable reason, that both Houses have from time immemorial adopted rules against having their own Appropriations Committees, in the first instance, or individual Senators or Representatives, in the second instance, offer propositions for legislation on general appropriation bills.

As I said a while ago, this bill is the most remarkable bill I ever saw. I think there are 116 amendments to it. Approximately 100 of them have been subject to points of order. I am not certain as to the exact number; the Senator from Georgia can correct me if I am in error.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I may say that the Senator has slightly exaggerated.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly a great many of them have been subject to points of order; have they not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that 5 or 6 out of the 116 have been. The Senator is slightly mistaken.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A great many of them have been subject to a point of order, and the Senator has recognized that fact by serving notice, under the rules of the Senate—as he has a perfect right to do—to suspend the rule.

However, Mr. President, as to this amendment, involving—as it does—open, flagrant legislation in every line of it—at least, until we reach the second paragraph on page 93, which is the fourth page of the amendment involving legislation—attempt has been made to railroad it through, on the theory that because the House has dealt with one bill, the Senate Appropriations Committee is relieved of its obligation under the rule, and can, as it sees fit, deal with any other measure in any way connected with the whole subject of agriculture.

Mr. President, I do not believe that a more important parliamentary question has been presented to the Senate during my membership in the Senate. I believe that if the Senate should adopt the view of the distinguished Senator from Georgia it might very well proceed to abolish all the standing committees of the Senate except the Committee on Appropriations, because the Committee on Appropriations would then be made the sole judge of what should be in an appropriation bill and what should not be in it. When that is done, the authority of the standing committees of the Senate is completely annihilated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the rule in this case is perfectly clear:

> The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation.

In another place:

> No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

It is admitted that this is general legislation. It is said that because of some precedents or rulings there should be incorporated into these provisions an exception which is not there. It is not in the rule. Not a word is said about it in the rule. The exception is said to be "unless the House, in dealing with the matter, has proposed some general legislation." There may be rulings to the effect that there should be such an exception in the rule, but it is not there. I do not see why we should not abide by the rules of the Senate as they are written. I cannot understand how we can write an exception into a perfectly clear rule of the Senate.

There is no doubt that this is general legislation; but it is claimed that the House has violated the law. I do not even admit that. I do not see how the House has violated the law. The House simply authorized $500,000 for necessary expenses in carrying on this law, because there are some things to carry along. It appropriated no money for the general purposes of the Bankhead-Jones Act. Therefore, it is said that it violated the section of the law which says that—

> To carry out the provisions of sections 1001 to 1006 of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, not to exceed $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and not to exceed $50,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter. Not more than 5 percent of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year in pursuance of this section shall be available for administrative expenses in carrying out sections 1001 to 1006 of this title during such fiscal year.

That is section 6, title I, of the Bankhead-Jones Act.

Frankly, I do not believe that the House violated the law. If the House did not choose to appropriate anything for loans under this act for this year, I see nothing in this provision that is intended to prevent the appropriation of the necessary funds for administrative expenses. In other words, the amendment did nct purport to deal with any such situation. In order to prevent extravagance, the act provided that the general cost of administering loans should not exceed 5 percent of the figure authorized for any particular year. It was not the intention, if Congress should choose not to appropriate anything, to say that it should appropriate nothing for administrative expenses. Certainly, to hang on to that supposed violation of the House rule the power to suspend the entire Senate rule and step out into general legislation to authorize the R. F. C., under no legislative authority whatever, to advance $97,500,000, or twice as much as is authorized under the Bankhead-Jones law, is hanging a tremendous argument on a very small point.

I do not believe that the House violated the law. I do not think that that section of the Bankhead-Jones law would prohibit Congress, if it chose to stop loans, from appropriating a sum to administer the loans which have already been made.

So, Mr. President, it seems perfectly clear to me that under the express terms of the rule this is general legislation; it is admitted to be general legislation, and it should be ruled out of consideration by the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words in support of the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. It seems to me that sometimes a little common sense can solve most of these technical arguments.

I quite agree with what the Senator from Wisconsin has said. The question here is whether or not the Senate will undertake to prevent itself from dealing with matters of legislation which have come to it from the House in an appropriation bill. However we may wish to obscure that question with technical argument, that is the fundamental question which remains. The only question here is whether or not, under paragraph 2 of rule XVI, the Committee on Appropriations is bringing in new or general legislation. The common-sense view is to determine what was meant by the phrase "new or general legislation." It is my understanding that the precedents of this body, without exception, support the contention that the rule was designed to prevent the Appropriations Committee of the Senate from initiating new or general legislation. It was not intended, and has never been enforced, to prevent the Senate Committee on Appropriations from dealing with legislative matters which come to it from the House in an appropriation bill. That is the explanation of the decision so clearly laid down by Vice President Marshall, which was quoted by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Would not the Senate be in a very unique position if it were to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio and discard all the precedents and rulings which have been made by the presiding officers interpreting the rules of the Senate, and start now to interpret them de novo, and in the strictest sense of the word, as he argues the rule must be interpreted? It seems to me that we must take into consideration the precedents and interpretations of the rule if we are not to discard a large body of procedure by which the Senate has been governed for many years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with the Senator from Wisconsin.

The common-sense view of the situation is perfectly clear. The House of Representatives has dealt with this subject matter, which has been in the ap-

propriation act for 5 or 6 years, and which therefore cannot be regarded as new legislation. The proposed appropriation is supported by Budget estimates which have come to the House and to the Senate.

These provisions are now stricken out to a certain degree by the House in a legislative amendment. The House, acting within its rights, wrote this legislative amendment into the bill, in effect repealing a legislative enactment which has been on the statute books for 5 or 6 years. The Bankhead-Jones Act not only deals with tenant purchases, but also with loans and rehabilitation. So the House, having acted and sent the bill to the Senate, we must acknowledge that the House was acting within the scope of its rights.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator does not claim that the House could not refuse to appropriate any money simply because an act was in force; does he?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly not. The House could have refused to appropriate, but it did not do so. The House dealt with a law which has been on the statute books for 5 or 6 years, and which dealt with a subject which has been handled in appropriation bills for 5 or 6 years, and undertook to modify the whole system.

As we all know, the purpose was to destroy the Farm Security Administration. I am ready to acknowledge that there are and have been features about the Farm Security Administration which have not had my support. The Appropriations Committee has attempted to deal with that question, and has provided for the termination of those activities; but the legislative judgment of the Senate and the House has been that the Bankhead-Jones Act ought to be maintained, and that loans for rehabilitation purposes should be made to small farmers. The House, acting within the scope of its legislative power, sent to the Senate this legislative amendment to the bill.

Those who desire to destroy the Farm Security Administration are urging the technicality of the Senate rule against new or general legislation upon an appropriation bill. I submit to the Senate that that rule was directed against the initiation of new legislation in the Senate committee. It was not intended and never has been interpreted as preventing the Senate from dealing with legislative matters which have been sent to this body by the House of Representatives in an appropriation bill.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have been necessarily absent from the Chamber for a time and have not heard all the debate. I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Wyoming. Does the Senator from Wyoming take the position that the House of Representatives may repeal a law by refusing to appropriate money for performing the functions provided for in the law and that, as a result, the Senate does not have any right to disagree with the House?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In effect, that is the position that is taken.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. That is certainly not the position.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said it was, in effect.

Mr. TAFT. The House may pass a bill, and we may vote into it an appropriation of $50,000,000 without the slightest question. There is no question about our right to disagree with the desire of the House to end the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I was merely trying to answer the question of the Senator from Minnesota and stating my opinion. As I understood his question, he has correctly stated the situation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator's understanding is very incorrect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was incorrect in that. There were two questions. The second question concerns relevancy, whether or not the changes which have been made by the Senate Commitee on Appropriations in the legislative amendment which came from the House are relevant. That is a question which must be passed upon by the Senate. But I do contend that the rule does not prohibit the amendment being submitted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no desire to interrupt the Senator from Wyoming in a statement of his position. My reason for asking him to yield was that in answering the question of the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Wyoming apparently undertook to state the position of those of us who believe the point of order is well taken, and he stated it 1,000-percent erroneously, and I desire to challenge the statement of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said, in response to the Senator from Minnesota that, in effect, what he stated was correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. On the question of relevancy I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming—relevant to what? What is the test of relevancy?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The test is the subject matter——

Mr. GEORGE. Of what the House inserted?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of the whole legislative enactment of what the House put in and what it struck out.

Mr. GEORGE. It did not strike out anything, Mr. President. In plain language, it put in a provision which is said to be contrary to an existing provision of the original law. How are we to test the rule of relevancy? What has that to do with the civil service? What has that to do with the R. F. C.? What has that to do with enlarging the powers of the R. F. C.? I am worried about what is the standard of relevancy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Allow me to say to the Senator from Georgia that, as I see it, the standard of relevancy is the act under which and for which this appropriation has been and is here being made. It has been made for 4 or 5 years, and there have been provisions in other appropriation bills authorizing the R. F. C. to advance money to be used for loans and rehabilitation under the Bankhead-Jones Act. My contention is—and I think it is the contention of the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the subcommittee, but I would rather have him speak for himself—that the amendment reported by his committee is altogether relevant to that general subject matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to add only one word further. The Senator from Missouri has stated this is something entirely new and we are trying to railroad it through the Senate. I merely wish to say that this program has been in effect for a number of years. The provisions relating to the borrowing of funds from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have been enacted into law year after year for at least the last 4 years. I have not checked the dates; I think it has been for 5 years, but I know it has been for at least 4 years.

Mr. President, this provision was one of those which came to the floor of the House of Representatives without the benefit of a rule which is usually accorded the Appropriations Committee by the Committee on Rules. Due to the fact that the provision was legislation in the House, the entire matter went out on a point of order on the floor of the House. The chairman of the subcommittee who had charge of the bill in the House then offered the amendment which I contend amply supports any provision which the Senate sees fit to place in this bill which is relevant to the whole question of rehabilitation of farm tenancy in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question by the Chair?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia raise the question of relevancy?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I say the entire amendment is relevant.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Virginia has already made a point of order on the whole amendment on the ground that it involves new legislation in contravention of paragraphs 2 and 4 of rule XVI. The point of order I make is that the Senator from Georgia cannot supersede the point of order of the Senator from Virginia by a different point of order which has to do with the question of germaneness The rule provides for a different treatment as between the point of order on the ground of new legislation, and the point of order on the ground of germaneness. My point of order is that the point of order involving the question of new legislation,

already having been made by the Senator from Virginia, it cannot be superseded and put aside by the Senator from Georgia raising the question of relevancy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Am I correct in understanding that the original point of order which was raised by the Senator from Virginia was based upon the interpretation of paragraphs 2 and 4 of rule XVI? My reason for asking the question is that paragraph 4 of rule XVI is the one which raises the question of relevancy. If the point of order of the Senator from Virginia was based upon paragraph 4 for the purpose of raising the question of relevancy, then the question has already been raised.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, the point of order of the Senator from Virginia refers to paragraph 4 of rule XVI and has to do with the first two lines, which read as follows:

> No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

Now, under that the amendment is certainly subject to a point or order.

Another ground is contained in paragraph 4—an entirely different ground—which relates to the question of germaneness. It reads as follows:

> Nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto, and all questions of relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate.

Mr. President, that provision as to submission to the Senate does not apply to the first ground for the point of order under paragraph 4 of rule XVI, which was the ground relied upon by the Senator from Virginia in his point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on a parliamentary question I am always unhappy to be placed in a contrary position to that assumed by the Senator from Missouri, who is an able parliamentarian, but in this case I must disagree with him most heartily. There is no question that section 4 is complete. The question as to whether or not the amendment is general legislation, as I have insisted, applies only as to whether it is substantially new legislation; and the question of relevancy is one that addresses itself as to whether or not the proposal which is offered is relevant to the legislative proposition which it seeks to amend. I have insisted all the way through that it is entirely relevant because of the fact that the Bankhead-Jones Act, which was approved July 22, 1937, provides for the rehabilitation loans which are carried in this provision as well as for the tenant purchase loans which are carried in it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, does the Senator say that he is relying upon the Bankhead-Jones bill which was approved in 1937?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not rely upon it. I say that we escape the point of order made by the Senator from Virginia that we are proposing new general legislation, because the House has already legislated on this subject, and having opened the door, even by one-half inch, the Senate has a right to march in as a body, if it sees fit, so long as the amendment approved by the Senate is relevant and germane to the House provision.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator relies upon the authorization of loans to provide rural rehabilitation under the act to create the Farmers' Home Corporation; but that corporation has never been created—it is a dormant corporation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The corporation was never created; but I have undertaken to point out—and I will read the entire act if Senators wish—that its creation was wholly discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture. Title I provides for the farm-tenant purchase loans. Title II provides for the rehabilitation loans, just as is suggested in this amendment. Title IV provides for the Farmers' Home Corporation. I want to read from title IV to show that really the question of the Farmers' Home Corporation has nothing to do with this question:

> (b) The Secretary shall have power to delegate to the corporation such powers and duties conferred upon him under title I or title II or both.

It says he shall have the power to do it, but there is nothing in the act which requires him to do it. As a matter of fact, he has never proceeded under the powers which were conferred upon him by the Congress in title I and title II. Mr. President, we have heard argument raised here not only as to the sanctity of the appropriation bill, which has carried this provision for some 4 or 5 years, but as to the time limitation that is involved. I wish to point out that not only has this provision been in the bill for years but it was submitted in the Budget estimates to the Congress for the current year. This question has not been voted on up or down on the floor of either body of the Congress.

I say, Mr. President, not only is the question of relevancy involved but that we ought to face this issue squarely and determine whether or not this program, which has been in effect for some 6 or 8 years, shall be discontinued on a point of order which is raised by one Member of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand the Senator to say that the item was contained in the Budget estimates. The Senator does not mean to state to the Senate, does he, that the legislation contained in this amendment was also submitted by the Budget?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; I do.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator mean to say that all these provisions were in the Budget estimates?

Mr. RUSSELL. They were submitted this year, and last year, and passed both bodies.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Where did the Budget Bureau get the authority in submitting items of appropriation to submit legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will pardon me, I should not like to be diverted to the question of the authority of the Budget Bureau. I was merely answering the Senator's argument that this was an entirely new proposition which we were trying to railroad through.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator said the amendment in its present form was submitted by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am bound by what the Senator says because he has the information and I have not.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not mean to say that it is in the identical form suggested by the Budget.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator admits it is legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Was the legislation, as well as the estimate, submitted by the Budget?

Mr. RUSSELL. The language of the amendment which refers to the authority to borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was contained in the language submitted by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As to the other legislative provisions, such as those requiring reports and as to personnel——

Mr. RUSSELL. No.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And as to loans, and also the provision on page 90 down to line 5 on page 91, were they also submitted by the Budget?

Mr. RUSSELL. The language on page 90 from line 18 to line 12 on page 91 was submitted by the Budget.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So that the Budget is now itself submitting legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I assume that that language was inserted by the Budget because of the fact that the Congress had put that language in the bill for several years. The amendment may be legislation, but it is all relevant to the House provision. The Budget submitted language providing for the prosecution of the 195 rural rehabilitation projects which have, in one manner or another, come under the jurisdiction of the Farm Security Administration. I do not wish to debate the details of those projects because they are not pertinent to this discussion, but I should like to say for the benefit of those who have condemned the Farm Security Administration because of rural rehabilitation projects that only 8 out of 195 were inaugurated by the Farm Security Administration. The remainder have been inherited either from the Resettlement Administration, which was directed one time by Mr. Tugwell, or from the several State corporations which were established for resettlement under the Work Projects Act.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The effect, I understand, if the point of order were sustained, would not be to eliminate the Farm Security Administration but would be to send the bill back to the committee, and I presume the committee could eliminate all legislative matters and report it back with an appropriation of, say, $50,000,000 tomorrow, even though the point of order is sustained. I do not think it is quite fair to say that this is a method simply to eliminate the F. S. A. It seems to me that it is rather a method of holding it within the original legislative authority of $50,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator now is referring to the tenant purchase program and not to the rehabilitation program. There are some $400,000,000 of loans outstanding on that program on which I think the Government has some claim and on which I believe it will make collections.

Mr. TAFT. I was intending to refer to the rural rehabilitation section, section 6, title I.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no earthly way that this bill can be reported back to the Senate with any provision for the liquidation of these projects which is not in some respects legislative, because it would be necessary to provide, if for nothing else, for collecting the loans made by the predecessor of the Farm Security Administration, which would be legislation I insist it makes no difference about it being legislation, for if the House of Representatives puts just one thin string of legislation in the bill, omitting, as it does, section 6 of the act, the Senate has a right to legislate thereon, and the only question that can possibly be raised against the committee amendment is whether or not it is relevant and germane to the House amendment, and, as to that, I think there can be no doubt.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to make clear exactly the point I made. I read paragraph 2 of rule XVI:

> The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

I next read the first two lines of paragraph 4:

> No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I desire to advert to the claim made by the Senator from Georgia that he relies for authorization for rural rehabilitation loans and grants upon the law which is entitled:

> An act to create the Farmers' Home Corporation, to pro vote more secure occupancy of farms and farm homes, to correct the economic instability resulting from some present forms of farm tenancy, and for other purposes.

The Senator from Georgia did not inform the Senate that the Farmers' Home Corporation has never been organized; it is dormant; it has never been put into operation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I made no contention that we were relying upon the Farmers' Home Corporation. I said specifically on the floor that that organization was to be established, under the powers delegated, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. It has never been established, and the powers contained in the Farmers' Home Corporation Act have no connection with the powers contained in titles I and II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act. It is stated in the first paragraph of the act on which I am relying that—

> This act may be cited as the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will permit me to finish, I will make my point.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry.

Mr. BYRD. In response to a question from the Senator from Virginia, the Senator stated a few moments ago that he did rely upon this act for the authorization of the loans and grants for rural rehabilitation. In section 21 of the act it is provided:

> Out of the funds made available under section 23, the Secretary shall have power to make loans to eligible individuals for the purchase of livestock, farm equipment, supplies, and for other farm needs (including minor improvements and minor repairs to real property), and for the refinancing of indebtedness, and for family subsistence.

Let me call the attention of the Senate to section 23, which provides:

> For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938—

Remember, this corporation has not even been organized, and is not operating—

> the balances of funds available to the Secretary for loans and relief to farmers, pursuant to Executive Order No. 7530 of December 31, 1936, as amended by Executive Order No. 7557 of February 19, 1937, which are unexpended on June 30, 1937, are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title.

Of course, there are no such funds available now. That was on June 30, 1937. Those balances have been used for other purposes. Then paragraph (b) provides:

> The President is authorized to allot to the Secretary, out of appropriations made for relief or work relief for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1939, such sums as he determines to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

There will be no funds after July 1 that are going to be appropriated for relief or work relief.

Section 6 of the act provides:

> To carry out the provisions of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, not to exceed $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and not to exceed $50,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter.

No part of that has been appropriated.

Mr. President, I think that during my membership in the Senate I have never known a more strained construction placed upon the rule relating to legislative provisions—for that is what it is in this appropriation bill—than to rely upon an act which creates a corporation which has not even been organized, which is still dormant, still inactive, and then to rely upon appropriations which are not available at this time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it the opinion of the able Senator that if the point of order made by him were sustained it would knock out of this appropriation bill all funds for the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. BYRD. No; the opinion of the Senator from Virginia is that the bill, under paragraph 2 of rule XVI, would go back to the committee and be reported back to the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senate Committee on Appropriations was not able to insert the provision in the appropriation bill when it had the bill before it, how would it be able to insert it on any other occasion?

Mr. BYRD. It could insert it if it did not provide for general legislation, and if it did, then the alternative is to present a motion for a suspension of the rules, as the Senator from Georgia has done in a number of other instances in connection with the same bill.

Mr. PEPPER. If the rule were to be suspended, would that require a two-thirds vote?

Mr. BYRD. It would; the requirement is the same as to all other legislative provisions. If the Senate rule means anything, it means that.

Mr. PEPPER. That would mean that an appropriation for the Farm Security Administration would require a vote of two-thirds of the Senate, whereas if the point of order should not be sustained then the item could be preserved in the bill by only a majority.

Mr. BYRD. It will do one of two things, it will either require the Senate rule to be carried out, namely, to return the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, or require a suspension of the rules by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. PEPPER. In the opinion of the able Senator from Virginia, is it necessary that the provisions accompanying the item here in dispute must be contained in the bill in order to effectuate the continuation of the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator should ask someone who favors the Farm Security Administration. I do not know. I know that in my judgment the provision does contain legislation. It is in defiance of the Senate rules, and should be treated as such. If the Senate wishes to suspend the rule, as the Senator from Georgia has asked in regard to a number of other legislative matters, which will be included in the bill, that is the privilege of the Senate. If the Senate

does not wish to suspend the rule, it should permit the bill to go back to the Committee on Appropriations, in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Has not the Senator already stated that if it went back to the Committee on Appropriations, the committee still could not insert the provision subject to the point of order?

Mr. BYRD. Of course, it could not insert legislative provisions, any more than it can now.

Mr. PEPPER. What the able Senator from Virginia means, then, is that this matter should go back to the Committee on Appropriations and should not come before the Senate under any circumstances except in such form as will require two-thirds of the Senate to pass it?

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator approve of the Senate rule which prohibits——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. BYRD. Let me ask the Senator a question. He asked me several questions, and I should like to ask him one. Does the Senator approve the Senate rule which prohibits general legislation on appropriation bills?

Mr. PEPPER. As a general matter; yes.

Mr. BYRD. Why as a general matter? It has to apply to all matters or none.

Mr. PEPPER. The case now before the Senate I think certainly presents a close question, about which the Senate is entitled to exercise its discretion in passing on the point of order. I am very much persuaded by the reasonableness of the explanation made by the able junior Senator from Georgia that this is not new legislation since similar legislation has been on the statute books for 4 or 5 years.

If the Senator will permit me to ask him one last question, did I understand him to say that he opposed the Farm Security Administration being continued?

Mr. BYRD. I am in favor of transferring the operations of the Farm Security Administration to the Farm Credit Administration. There is no secret about it. I am the chairman of a committee that brought in such a recommendation a year ago. The Senator is well informed about that.

Mr. PEPPER. If I did not misunderstand, I thought I heard the Senator say a moment ago that that could be answered by someone who favored——

Mr. BYRD. The Senator asked me whether the Committee on Appropriations could bring back an amendment containing legislative provisions. I am not on the Committee on Appropriations, and I did not think it was proper for me to answer that question.

Mr. PEPPER. Was it the thought of the able Senator from Virginia that if the transfer of the Farm Security Administration to the Farm Credit Administration were made, the functions which previously had been exercised by the Farm Security Administration would continue to be exercised?

Mr. BYRD. That is my contention.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator did not expect to diminish any of the activities——

Mr. BYRD. I did not say they should not be diminished. I think the appropriations should be cut down, but I say that as to the permanent activities of the Farm Security Administration—and the debate on that will come later—they should be transferred to the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, when the Senate passes upon the point of order it is doing something far more extensive than passing on the rules of the Senate. What it is actually doing is depriving over 450,000 farm families, scattered all over the United States, practically of the means of subsistence above the level of impoverishment and squalor. As a matter of fact, the very condition under which the loans in question have been made to the Farm Security Administration tenants is that they cannot get funds from any other source. This is their alternative, their only hope. Take this privilege away from them, and they are left utterly destitute.

These loan provisions not only make it possible for workers to produce for the war, but involved in the item which is under attack here now by the able Senator from Virginia, who has been frank in his expression of not particularly favoring continuance of the Farm. Security Administration, is opportunity for hospitalization, opportunity for some medical service, opportunity for some dental service, opportunity to obtain seed with which to plant their crops, opportunity to get a new cow if the only cow they possess dies, a new mule if the mule they have passes away, or the very food necessary for the nourishment of their families. All these would be taken away on a point of order by the remote Senate of the United States.

I say remote, Mr. President, because I doubt if we were to walk over the threshold of one of those dependent families and face the issue of depriving them of that succor which is all they have, or sustaining the principle of a point of order relative to parliamentary procedure, I doubt if many of us could make the decision in favor of the parliamentary technicality under the Senate rule against the lives and living conditions of those American families.

Mr. President, remember, if we had before us the statistics of the Selective Service, we would find that many a boy in the front lines comes from one of those homes, and if this point of order is sustained, it means that his mother and father and his brothers and sisters behind will be deprived of means and sustenance, because of a point of parliamentary procedure.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I do not admit that what the Senator from Florida says is correct. The Senator has no right to say that by the transfer of these activities to the Farm Credit Administration this great mass of citizens will be denied any relief or succor of any kind.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Virginia, of course, knows that if this is legislation it is certainly legislation to undertake to transfer these functions to the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. BYRD. Let us have such a provision in a legislative bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is much more violative of the Senate rules than the provision now under consideration, which is predicated on the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. BYRD. The provision can be placed in a legislative bill. I cannot permit to go uncontradicted the broad statement made by the Senator from Georgia. It is not correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. It could not be done in this bill, I said. The Senator knows that if this provision is subject to a point of order, certainly if we were to attempt to transfer all these functions under titles I and II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a motion to suspend the rule and make this subject matter in order would certainly be in order before the Senate, and if the motion to suspend the rule to adopt the committee amendment were adopted, then any other germane amendment would be in order to that, and the whole question would be before the Senate, but that would be in accordance with the rules of the Senate instead of being in derogation of the rules.

Mr. PEPPER. But, Mr. President, the able Senator from Missouri would readily admit that a two-thirds vote of the Senate would be required in order to do that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly. That is what the rules of the Senate provide. The Senator from Florida always comes in and deplores something because it is prohibited by the rules of the Senate, or prohibited by the Constitution of the United States, or by the laws of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. No, I am not deploring something because it is prohibited by the rules of the Senate, or by the Constitution of the United States. I am deploring the poverty in the homes of Farm Security Administration tenants, and I am saying that the Senate does not have to take away from them their sole means of succor upon the parliamentary point which is presented here today, which is a mere technicality about which honest men may have a difference of opinion.

Mr. President, if this were an effort made flagrantly in the face of some direct provision of the rule of the Senate, or of the Constitution, that might present a different case. We lawyers always have heard it said that hard cases make bad law. But there are precedents which justify the item which the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has brought to the Senate today. There is certainly a reasonable difference of opinion as to whether or not this is new legislation. Everyone knows it is not new legislation to keep the Farm Security Administration in existence. It is simply a continuation of that agency, and its functions, which is proposed by this

amendment. That is the substance of it. After all, even a court of law is justified in looking behind the technicality, through the veil of technicality, and looking at the substance which is behind. If this were some irrelevant and extraneous matter which was brought here that would be different, but there is not an item, as I understand, that is involved in the point of order which is not a proposed continuation of what has been going on heretofore. The able Senator from Virginia was correct in saying that this matter should be handled by new legislation. Yet the able Senator from Virginia would not tell his colleagues that he proposes any such legislation now. I am not at all sure——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will be glad to propose legislation to make transfer to the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. PEPPER. But would that not be legislation?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator asked me whether I was willing to propose such legislation, and I said I was.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator contemplate the introduction of any such legislation if the item in question is knocked out?

Mr. BYRD. I have not given consideration to that question.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator propose to destroy this item without introducing legislation to take care of the situation?

Mr. BYRD. Wait a moment. I will agree to introduce legislation tomorrow.

Mr. PEPPER. How long does the able Senator from Virginia think it will take to have such legislation adopted?

Mr. BYRD. The judgment of the Senator from Florida is as good as my judgment with respect to that matter. I think we can succeed in passing such legislation with the assistance of the able Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. But the Senator proposes to diminish the Farm Security Administration as it now exists. It is not the present Farm Security Administration, with its present functions, that the Senator proposes to continue. It is something else.

Mr. BYRD. Of course, I do not propose to continue the present Farm Security Administration. If I did I would vote for this amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well. I think the Senator from Virginia has made clear that he is against the Farm Security Administration. Therefore he proposes to knock it out on a point of order.

Mr. BYRD. I resent that statement. I have a high regard for the rules of the Senate. I regard this proposal as being contrary to the rules of the Senate, and as a Senator I have a right to invoke the rules of the Senate without having my motives impugned.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not think it is news to any Member of the Senate that the Senator from Virginia has not been generally favorable to the Farm Security Administration. I do not deny the Senator's right to feel the way he does.

Mr. BYRD. I have never denied that I am opposed to the waste and extravagance in the Farm Security Administration, which is the greatest in any single bureau of the Government, and I will attempt to discuss that matter when the occasion to do so is presented. But when the Senator from Florida says I am prompted primarily by my opposition to the Farm Security Administration when, as a matter of fact, I am attempting to make certain that the rules of the Senate shall be sustained, he is incorrect in his statement.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to do the Senator from Virginia, for whom I have the highest respect, no disservice. I thought it was a matter of common knowledge that the able Senator from Virginia did not agree with many of us in our esteem for the Farm Security Administration. I believe in it, and want to continue it. If I had the power I would increase its appropriation instead of diminishing it.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Florida would be willing to continue it even in defiance of the rules of the Senate, as I understand. That is the difference between the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say, Mr. President, that if I have on the one hand the proposal to take away from nearly one-half million American farm families the opportunity they have to borrow a single dollar to buy a new mule, or a new cow, or the seed to go in the ground, or the money with which to harvest their crops, or the few dollars with which to pay a doctor or a dentist, or go to the hospital, or with which to buy food or to continue engaging in producing for the war itself, with a good record in producing food for the war—if that proposal were submitted on the one hand, and on the other I have before me a doubtful question of parliamentary technicality to decide, I should certainly resolve that doubt, Mr. President, in favor of the 450,000 farm families, and trust the Senate to preserve the integrity of its own parliamentary rules.

For I know, Mr. President, and every other Senator on the floor knows in his conscience, that if this item is knocked out of the bill today, if the point of order shall be sustained, it will mean that on the 1st of July the functions of the Farm Security Administration will terminate, and there will not be adopted by the Senate or the House any new legislation continuing those functions.

So, Mr. President, we are in substance voting on the square-cut, clear-cut issue of whether we are going to destroy, on the basis of a technicality, the Farm Security Administration, or whether we are going to resolve the doubt in favor of this item, which comes to the Senate not from a single Senator, but from one of the most distinguished committees of the Senate. We are voting on whether we are going to resolve the doubt against the technicality and in favor of the 450,000 needy farm families scattered all over America, with a creditable record of producing for the war and a finer record of sending their sons to fight in the war, or whether we are going to sit here as if we were automatons, as if we had no people's lives on our consciences and say, "Well, at all events, whatever be the consequence, we have got to maintain the technicalities of the Senate rules against one of the Senate's own committees, and against a rational and reasonable difference of opinion between parliamentary experts on the legality of this item."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me preface my remarks by saying that I shall vote for the farm security proposal. I am in favor of it. However, I am wondering whether the statement made by the Senator from Florida is accurate—that if the proposal is voted down, that will be the end of the farm-security activities. I did not so understand the statement made the other day by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I felt that if this item should be voted down, the Senator would offer an amendment increasing the amount of the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration, to be obtained from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or appropriating the money directly from the Treasury. Am I correct or incorrect in that respect?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I think it would be next to impossible to continue the Farm Security Administration without having some of the provisions of the amendment which are in the nature of legislation. There is no question that the provision for borrowing from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is legislation. There is no question that the Senate committee provision requiring the liquidation of the Rural Rehabilitation projects is legislation. My position is that if the House has legislated on these questions, as it unquestionably has done in this bill, the Senate has a right to legislate on them. I shall never admit that when a legislative matter comes from the other body on an appropriation bill, the Senate is tied hand and foot, and is limited to striking out the provision. Legislation coming to us, as a House of equal dignity with the other House, certainly gives us the right to take action similar to that taken by the other body.

Mr. President, I think sustaining the point of order would be very likely to relegate provision for continuing the functions of the Farm Security Administration to legislation; it would have to pursue all the courses of legislation; and, in effect, in view of the fact that the appropriation expires by the 1st of July, it would mean the death of the Farm Security Administration as such.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that the point I have in mind is whether the Senator would be able to submit to the appropriation bill an amendment providing the necessary money.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no trouble about the legislative sanction for the tenant-purchase program.

Mr. WHEELER. I see.

Mr. RUSSELL. But if the rehabilitation program is to be carried on as it is now carried on, legislation would be required in order to grant leave to borrow

from the R. F. C. or to exceed the appropriation which has been allowed.

The Senator from Virginia read the list of allocations which have been made under that act for the maintenance of that work. I freely concede that all the funds for that work have been expended, or practically so; a very small balance remains. But the Appropriations Committee, as I understand, has a right to exceed the authorization under the bill. I do not think that question is now involved.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will yield to me, let me say that a direct appropriation for that purpose, instead of a provision granting authority to borrow from the R. F. C., would not be legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. BYRD. But the Senator from Montana said there was no way around the difficulty, without enacting legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I say that, as a practical matter, with the time now remaining in which it will be possible to provide a direct appropriation for these purposes, and with the opposition which already has been evinced across the Capitol to these matters, it would be impossible to obtain such legislation.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, what I am attempting to find out, and what is confusing to me, is whether we could not appropriate the amount of money required to carry on these necessary operations, without involving the question of legislation. I do not care whether the money is taken from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, provided the Congress directs that that be done or whether it is taken directly from the Treasury of the United States. Either one procedure or the other would have the same result. What I am wondering is whether, by increasing the appropriations and by writing in the bill an amendment to the appropriation items of the bill, we could not accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that I think we undoubtedly would have a right to make direct appropriations for most of those functions. We could not liquidate the resettlement projects, nor could they be carried on, by provisions under the appropriation. We could not either maintain or liquidate them without having direct legislation. But so far as direct loans to the farmers are concerned, I think we could make them under the provisions of this act. We could not, except by legislation, take care of any grants to farmers who have been subjected to losses caused by the ravages of floods in recent months; because an authorization to do that would be in excess of the powers contained in title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank both Senators for what they have said. I shall conclude what I have to say. I am not an expert on these matters, but I have been in the homes of farmers receiving such aid, and I know what will happen if the aid is cut off. I know that the consensus is that sustaining the point of order would jeopardize, if it would not absolutely assure cutting off, the services rendered farmers by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. President, from time to time the Senate has voted on the question of sustaining points of order. If the question is a close one, sometimes the Senate has gone on one side of the line, and sometimes on the other side of the line. There is no flat or fixed rule on the subject. Certainly the House of Representatives has opened the doors to this irregularity, if it is one, by legislating on the subject first. The Senate Appropriations Committee did not inaugurate the delinquency, if it is one. Our committee is simply building on what the House did. I believe there are in this body a sufficient number of able Senators to protect the integrity of our rules. I simply submit that in a case of this sort, one which means so much to so many people, if there is any possible doubt about the decision we should make, it is better to bend a little on the side of humanity and the preservation of lives and the standard of living, meager as it is, of these 450,000 families, than to sit back as if we lived in a vacuum, and wash our hands, like Pilate, of the decision, and say, "I shall have nothing to do with this matter because to give these people help offends my sense of discretion and judgment about what should be done on this technical point under the parliamentary rules of the Senate."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Georgia for a moment so that I may obtain his thought on this matter.

Under title II—Rehabilitation Loans, subtitle "Borrowers and Terms," subsection 21 (a) reads as follows:

Out of the funds made available under section 23 the Secretary shall have power to make loans to eligible individuals for the purchase of livestock, farm equipment, supplies, and for other farm needs—

And so forth.

I repeat the first words:

Out of the funds made available under section 23.

Now, turning to section 23, the title of which is "Appropriation," we find that subsection (a) reads as follows:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, the balances of funds available to the Secretary for loans and relief to farmers, pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 7530 of December 31, 1936, as amended by Executive Order Numbered 7557 of February 19, 1937—

Mark this well, Mr. President—

which are unexpended on June 30, 1937, are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title.

Having quoted those two provisions, let me say that of course the Senator knows, as do all other Members of the Senate, that the funds which were unexpended as of June 30, 1937, have been exhausted. Is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not sure that all of them have been exhausted. They are practically exhausted.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Prior to the creation of the Resettlement Administration under W. P. A., State corporate organizations for rural resettlement and rehabilitation were set up. Some of those funds are still available in the States, but the amount is very small.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have been advised that the funds have been expended.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are practically exhausted.

Mr. TYDINGS. They are the funds which were authorized to carry out the provisions of the act.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. If those are the funds which were authorized to carry out the provisions of the act, and were the funds which were unexpended on June 30, 1937, they are the only funds authorized, because, turning back to rehabilitation loans, the first line reads:

Out of funds made available under section 23—

I have just read section 23. Therefore it seems to me to follow, regardless of the merits of the Farm Security Administration's program, whether we are for it or against it, the language and the import of the language are definitely clear. The only funds authorized by act of Congress to carry out the provisions of this act were those which were unexpended as of June 30, 1937.

I am arguing this question in good faith. I am not trying to take any technical advantage of the law; but I am trying to find out what the law is. Before the Senator comments, I wish to commend him for his candor in answering the inquiries of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Virginia. In my judgment he was completely honest in his answer to those inquiries and did not reserve anything which might have been in his favor when he said that legislation was necessary to do some of the things he enumerated.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about that

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad the Senator is candid, because we can arrive at a decision when men are candid.

Mr. RUSSELL. I always try to be candid in dealing with the Senate not only in connection with this bill but in all other matters. I have not reserved anything, and have no intention of doing so. In the first place, I have no motive for doing so, because I think we can legislate as far as we want to go under the rules.

Mr. TYDINGS. I rose to ask the Senator only this question: As I understand, the Senator does not take issue with what I have presented, but he does say that inasmuch as the House has legislated he feels at liberty to carry out that legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly.

Mr. TYDINGS. But if the House had not legislated, a point of order would lie because, unless the rule were waived, there would be no reason why the Senate Appropriations Committee should put in the bill the provision referred to. The Senator feels that, the House having adopted a provision relating to the subject, the Senate has a right to proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are some legislative provisions in this amendment. I made that statement in the very first

moments of my remarks when I presented my views on the point of order. There are undoubtedly some legislative provisions. The provision which requires the liquidation of farm security projects is legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wished to direct my attention to this one provision.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not impressed with the argument of the Senator from Maryland that because of the limitations in section 23 we cannot make appropriations. Of course, the Senator is familiar with the rule that the Committee on Appropriations may recommend appropriations in excess of the authorization, so long as the purposes of the appropriation are defined by legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct; but let me ask the Senator what is the authorization, if we strike down section 21, entitled "Rehabilitation Loans"?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it is stricken down—not by the point which the Senator raises.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point I am raising, to make it specific, is that when we see what that authorization is we find these words:

> Out of the funds made available under section 23.

Therefore no other funds were made available, and the committee had no right to legislate funds into the bill unless they were in accordance with the authorization.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not understand that to be the determining factor as a limitation on the committee. If, instead, the language read, "Not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be appropriated to the Secretary for these purposes," under rule XVI the Senate committee would have a right to recommend an appropriation of $5,000,000 for that purpose, so long as it was recommended for purposes which were authorized by law.

I do not think that that point is as pertinent as is the objection which has been raised to the legislative provisions of the amendment. But whether it is or not, I take the ground—and I have never been more convinced that I am right from a parliamentary standpoint—that if the House legislates on the subject, even to the slightest degree, the Senate has the right to canvass the whole field and take away from, add to, explain, expand, or contract that which the House has done in dealing with the matter, subject only to the rule as to whether it is relevant or germane to the action the House has taken.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I inquire whether all this debate is not out of order, unless the Chair wishes to be informed. I ask the Chair whether he needs any more information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule whenever the Senate is through undertaking to advise the Chair.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have not the slightest disposition to delay the Senate. However, in reading the law I could not find any authorization for the committee action. The law provides that out of funds made available under section 23 these things may be done.

What is section 23? It provides that only moneys which are unexpended as of June 30, 1937, are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this act.

I believe that if the question were submitted to the parliamentarian he would agree with the point which I have made. The Senator from Georgia does not let that point be the determining factor in arriving at his conclusion. The Senator from Georgia takes a new position, which he has a right to take, namely, that the House has legislated——

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not taken any new position. I have insisted on that position from the beginning.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not saying this in criticism. I believe that the point is material, because the law provides that no funds may be used which were not then expended as of June 30, 1937. The first provision of the law says that only out of funds made available under section 23 may these activities be carried on. Section 23 provides that no funds may be used for these purposes except the unexpended balances which existed on June 30, 1937.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senate has a right to provide that such funds shall be borrowed from the R. F. C., it has a right to change that language.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not know that I would agree to the statement that the Senate has that right, because borrowing is only another way of appropriating.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was predicating my statement on the assumption that the Senate has the right.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point remains that the authority for the purchase of livestock, farm equipment, supplies, and other farm needs relates only to funds made available under section 23; and section 23 very clearly states that no money shall be used for such purposes except funds which were unexpended on June 30, 1937. Such funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the act.

It seems clear to me, therefore, that there is no legislative authority for the provisions written into the bill. As to whether or not the House, by writing in the legislative provision, has given the Senate the right to go ahead, I am not discussing that point at this time. I do not think it has; but aside from that point, there is no clear authority for the appropriation of these funds.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may I ask the very patient and distinguished Senator in charge of the bill another question on the subject of germaneness?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. It occurs to me that the two sections of the Bankhead-Jones Act, one relating to rural rehabilitation and the other to tenant loans, are distinct measures, and that in this case the House, by its alleged violation of the tenant-purchase section, may have opened up the tenant-purchase end of the question; but I do not see how it could have opened up the rural rehabilitation loan question. In other words, I do not see that this is, in fact, germane to the matter which the House has opened up. Will the Senator give us his views on that question?

Mr. RUSSELL. In my opening statement I suggested that that question might arise in the minds of some Members of the Senate. I stated that, in my opinion, so long as we dealt with the general subject of rural rehabilitation loans, we were clearly within the rights and powers of the Senate. That is a question which addresses itself to the discretion of each Senator. In my judgment, the entire committee amendment is absolutely germane to the purposes of rural rehabilitation and farm tenancy.

Mr. TAFT. Are not the two matters distinct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator regard the farm-tenancy program as separate from the rural rehabilitation-loan program?

Mr. RUSSELL. In connection with what I said in my opening remarks, I read both title I and title II as being the legislative background.

Mr. TAFT. But as I understand, the alleged violation of the House relates only to the tenant-purchase program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I freely grant that, but I am happy that the Senator admits that it is a violation, because if the House is guilty of a violation in regard to the tenant-purchase program, the whole question of rural rehabilitation is open to the Senate. There is no way on earth to escape that conclusion.

I invite the Senator's attention to the language which appears in the title of the House provision. What does it say? It says farm tenancy. So long as we are dealing with the question of farm tenancy, and rehabilitation, whether the persons be sharecroppers or laborers, the Senate is not only within its full rights, but also its duty.

Mr. TAFT. I believe very strongly in the farm tenant purchase end of the program, but it is the rural rehabilitation program which I think is doubtful. I think the two are distinct. It seems to me that if the House has opened up only one of them by violating the rule with respect to tenancy, that cannot be said to open up to general legislation the whole subject of rural rehabilitation loans, the law regarding which the House has not violated in any way.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the view of the Senator from Ohio. I entertain a contrary view. I think that when the House opens up this question, as it undoubtedly did, whether it was with respect to title I, title II, or any other part of the law pertaining to rural rehabilitation, the Senate has a right to legislate on that subject so long as the legislation is relevant to the whole question of rural rehabilitation. The Senator from Ohio has a perfect right to regard a part of it as being relevant and a part of it as not being relevant; but it is my firm conviction that if we reverse the precedents and say that we are not able at this hour to legislate, the Senate will surrender substantial rights, and the question will come back to plague and

hamper us. What is the danger in it? Let the Senate say whether or not it is relevant or not relevant, and what parts, if any, of these amendments should be adopted. If we place a limitation on our power by adopting the precedent suggested, in years to come the House will legislate and our hands will be tied by a limitation on our power which will enable us only to accept or reject a House legislative amendment to an appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to paragraph 2 of rule XVI, which reads as follows:

> The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The present occupant of the chair will undertake to state the parliamentary situation as he understands it.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] raised the point of order basing his objection, as he has said, on paragraph 2 of rule XVI, and, as the Chair understood, also on the first two lines of paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have restated the point of order. I rely exclusively on paragraph 2 of rule XVI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was the understanding of the Chair that the Senator relied also on the first two lines of paragraph 4. The Chair now understands that the Senator from Virginia relies only on paragraph 2 of rule XVI.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has raised the question of the relevancy of the committee amendment, based upon a part of the language of paragraph 4. The Chair will read a part of paragraph 4:

> And all questions of relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Chair permit an interruption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He will.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I invite the attention of the Chair to the fact that when the question of relevancy was raised, not by the Senator from Georgia but by the then occupant of the chair, who is not now the occupant of the chair, I then made the point of order that the point of order of the Senator from Virginia, which had to do with new legislation, could not be superseded by a point of order having to do with relevancy under another clause of the rule.

I now call attention of the Chair to the fact that my point of order was the last point of order made, and therefore is the pending point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is mindful of what the Senator from Missouri has said, but feels that it is the duty of the Chair, under paragraph 4 of rule XVI, to submit the question to the Senate. This question, under the rules of the Senate—which, by the way, are whatever a majority of the Senate determines at any particular time—is not debatable. The Chair therefore submits to the Senate this question: Is the committee amendment relevant to the House language?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I renew my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is not debatable. The Chair has submitted the question to the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not desire to debate. I desire to renew my point of order. I make the point of order that the Chair, by his own action, is attempting to supersede the point of order made by the Senator from Virginia with another point of order. I make that point of order and ask for a ruling upon it from the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the Senator from Missouri is out of order. The Chair has submitted the question to the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I insist on a ruling on my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not make a mistake when he submits a question to the Senate for its decision.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I insist on a ruling on my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is the committee amendment relevant to the House language?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum. Under the Constitution the Chair cannot overrule that point, although the present occupant of the Chair is likely to overrule anything.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gurney	Overton
Austin	Hatch	Pepper
Bailey	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Scrugham
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
George	Murdock	White
Gerry	Murray	Wiley
Gillette	Nye	Willis
Green	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The question pending before the Senate submitted by the Chair is as to the germaneness of the committee amendment, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is the committee amendment relevant to the House language?

Mr. RUSSELL. And those who agree with the committee's action should vote "yea"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding, if the yeas and nays are ordered, but the yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. I inquire, Who made the point of order with respect to germaneness?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands it was made by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BYRD. Did the Senator from Georgia make it? The clerk tells me he did not make it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I urged throughout my entire remarks that the only question possible could be that of germaneness.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Georgia did not make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Georgia raised the question of relevancy.

Mr. BYRD. The clerk tells me that the Senator from Georgia did not make the point of order. This is the most remarkable procedure I have ever known.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair ask the Senator from Georgia did he raise the question of relevancy?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. I contended throughout my entire argument that the amendment was relevant. That is my contention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Georgia did raise the question. If he did not raise it, the Chair will not submit it.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator from Georgia did make the point, it should be a matter of record. I ask that the record be read to see whether he made it.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment under consideration is relevant to the provision contained in the House bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I make the point of order that the point of order made by the Senator from Virginia cannot be supplanted by a point of order that the amendment is relevant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will submit the question raised on the point of order by the Senator from Georgia, in view of the record that has been made.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have insisted that the only question to be submitted to the Senate was the question of relevancy.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant was not in the chair all the

time, but the present occupant of the chair was informed that the Senator from Georgia had raised a point of order, and the Chair has a written memorandum on his desk to the effect that the Senator from Georgia had raised the question of relevancy.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not know what the Journal shows, but the RECORD tomorrow will show, and all Senators who are present must know, that I have insisted all along that this amendment was relevant to the House provision. That is the sole ground I took.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will submit to the Senate the point of order made by the Senator from Virginia if the yeas and nays are ordered. Is the Senate ready for a vote?

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the question be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the point of order raised by the Senator from Virginia. The Chair will request that the point made by the Senator from Virginia be put in writing so that the clerk may read it to the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Overton
Austin	Hatch	Pepper
Bailey	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Scrugham
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
George	Murdock	White
Gerry	Murray	Wiley
Gillette	Nye	Willis
Green	O'Daniel	Wilson
Guffey	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that the point of relevancy was raised by me, and I am sure the RECORD and Journal of the Senate will so show.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am preparing the motion and will submit it in a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair say to the Senator from Virginia that the Senator from Georgia has now informed the Chair that the RECORD will show that he raised the point. If he raised the point, the Chair is of opinion that it ought to come in as it was originally presented, and, if he did not raise it, the Chair is of opinion that the point can be decided on the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be glad to let the RECORD be read, but every Senator knows that my argument was that since the House has opened this question, the Senate amendment was relevant and germane.

Mr. BYRD. I ask that the Journal be read to determine whether or not the Senator from Georgia made the motion.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not see how the Senator from Georgia could have made the point of order, because the point of order would have had to be that the amendment was not germane. He certainly did not make such a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. TAFT. He could not make the point of order that it was germane, because that is the question the Senate is required to determine.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not understand that I was required to make a point of order. The only thing that was required of me was to make the contention that this amendment was germane to the House provision. That has been the basis of the argument I have made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the same question can be decided on the point made by the Senator from Virginia. So the Chair wishes to submit it on the point of order of the Senator from Virginia in order that the Senate may have a direct vote on the question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think I have the right to know what the Journal shows, and I should like to know. I have not myself talked with the Journal clerk, but he is a gentleman of very high class who has kept the Journal for a long time, and I should like to know what the Journal shows on this question. As I have said, I have not talked with the Journal clerk. I should like to know what the Journal shows.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I submit the point of order in writing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state the point of order of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as a Member of the Senate, I should like to know what the Journal shows in regard to this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As soon as the clerk reads, the Chair will hear the Senator from Georgia. The clerk will now read the point of order submitted by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

I make the point of order under Section 2, Rule XVI, that the pending amendment contains new legislation and is therefore, under the rules of the Senate, in violation of paragraph 2, rule XVI, which reads as follows:

"The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Now the Chair wishes to hear what the Journal shows with respect to the question of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; and I want to make a point of order against the point of order, on the ground that it involves the relevancy of this entire matter. The whole matter of relevancy is involved, whether it is new legislation or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair hear what the Journal shows.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRD makes point of order that matter inserted by committee was, under Rule XVI of the Standing Rules, general legislation and not authorized by existing law, on a general appropriation bill.

Mr. RUSSELL made point of order that the House of Representatives having inserted legislation in the bill on the floor of the House by making an appropriation in excess of the amount allowed for administrative expenses under the basic act, to provide for the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of July 22, 1937, the committee amendment was germane and the Senate had the right to legislate on the subject matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I say that brings the whole question of relevancy before us, and I see no reason for deviating from the custom of the Senate. The rules have always provided that the question of relevancy in these matters should be submitted to the Senate, and I ask that the question of relevancy now be submitted by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion now that upon the question of the Senator from Virginia the Senator from Georgia expressly stated he did not raise the question of relevancy, and the question of relevancy is not raised on the Journal.

Mr. RUSSELL. I make the point of order against the point of order of the Senator from Virginia that it should be decided on the question of relevancy of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of opinion that it is too late to make the point now, and the Chair is now going to submit the point of order raised by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. TAFT. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Chair asking the opinion of the Senate on the point of order under rule XVI, and will a majority vote prevail no matter which of these questions is submitted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the ruling of the Chair. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Chair state, for the information of the Senate, the effect of the vote, that is, the effect of a vote "yea" and the effect of a vote "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the point of the Senator from Virginia shall be sustained, the bill will be recommitted to the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that; but should a Senator desire to sustain the point of order of the Senator from Virginia, will he vote "yea" or "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question the Chair will submit to the Senate now is, Shall the point of order be sustained? Those who vote "yea" will

vote to sustain the point of order, those who vote "nay" will vote against it.

Mr. HILL. To overrule the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (after voting in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, I am advised, if present would vote "nay," and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. McCLELLAN (after voting in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], who, I am advised, if present would vote "nay," and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is detained in an important committee meeting.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] is detained on important public business. I am advised that, if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], who is detained on important public business is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who if present, would vote "yea," is paired on this question with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are members of the Truman committee and are attending its meeting in Kansas City.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—23

Bailey	Gillette	Taft
Barbour	Hawkes	Tobey
Buck	Lodge	Tydings
Bushfield	McFarland	Walsh
Byrd	Millikin	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Moore	White
Eastland	Revercomb	Willis
Gerry	Smith	

NAYS—54

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Austin	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hill	Overton
Bilbo	Holman	Pepper
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Burton	La Follette	Russell
Capper	Langer	Scrugham
Caraway	Lucas	Shipstead
Chandler	McCarran	Stewart
Chavez	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Danaher	McNary	Tunnell
Davis	Maloney	Vandenberg
Ellender	Maybank	Van Nuys
George	Mead	Wallgren
Green	Murdock	Wheeler
Guffey	Murray	Wiley
Gurney	Nye	Wilson

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews	Clark, Idaho	Reed
Ball	Downey	Robertson
Barkley	Ferguson	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Glass	Truman
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Wagner
Brooks	Kilgore	
Butler	Radcliffe	

So the Senate refused to sustain Mr. BYRD's point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate on the question. I merely wish to remark that the vote just taken is a complete illustration and justification of the statement I have often heard made by a great man in years gone by, that the Senate had very few rules and did not pay the slightest attention to the few it had.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not generally indulge in debating a question when it is once settled, but in view of the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, I wish to state that an examination of the precedents of the Senate will show that the Senate, by an overwhelming vote, has sustained the universal precedents on the issue involved in this parliamentary question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if I may claim the floor again, since the Senator from Wisconsin brought the matter up, I undertake to say that the Senator cannot adduce one single precedent which is applicable to the present case, a case where the House has simply legislated with regard to one law—even if that should be legislation, which I deny, in this case—where it has been held that that action furnishes justification to the Senate, in derogation of the Senate rule, to legislate on an entirely different question. That is the question presented here.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have cited one case, and I could cite many others, and I pointed out that the Senator from Missouri in the discussion of this question has not cited a single precedent to support the position which he has taken.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I cited the Senate rule.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the committee amendment under consideration begins on page 89 and continues to the third line on page 95? Is that all one committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is correct. The committee amendment ends in line 3 on page 95.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for a division of the amendment. Perhaps the division should occur at the end of line 4 on page 93.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator place his suggestion in writing and send it to the desk?

Mr. TAFT. I would suggest that first we consider the part of the amendment striking out the language under the head of "Farm Tenancy", then the part under the head of "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation", and then on page 93 the part of the amendment under the heading "Farm Tenancy". There is a clear distinction between those parts of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the language in question is all one amendment, but I think the Senator from Ohio unquestionably has a right to ask for a division of the amendment, and I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be divided, as requested by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. RUSSELL. I reiterate that I consider it to be all one amendment, but I have no objection to dividing it. In order to bring the matter to a clear parliamentary understanding, I ask that the Senator consider first the item on page 89, after line 3, to strike out the language under the heading "Farm tenancy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? None is heard.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is purely for the purpose of convenience. It is all one amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first part of the committee amendment as it has been divided.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 89, after line 3, it is proposed to strike out:

FARM TENANCY

Salaries and expenses: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), $500,000 for necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of said act and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,

exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 89, beginning in line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next portion of the amendment as it has been divided.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 89, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

To enable the Secretary to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws; (2) loans to needy individual farmers; (3) grants; and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, $29,607,573, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts (including the Administrator and not to exceed three Assistant Administrators of the Farm Security Administration) without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

In making any grant payments under this act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

For additional funds for the purpose of making rura rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $97,500,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500.

The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural-rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The appropriation and authorization herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer as a substitute for the committee amendment, the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 89, lines 16 to 24, and on page 90, lines 1 to 25, and on page 91, lines 1 to 25, and on page 92, lines 1 to 25, and on page 93, lines 1 to 4, inclusive, it is proposed to strike out the language therein appearing, and to insert the following:

LOANS AND RURAL REHABILITATION

Making and servicing loans: To enable the Secretary, through the Farm Credit Administration and through existing agencies under its supervision, including the Crop and Feed Loan Division and Production Credit Association, to administer all activities, projects, facilities, and functions heretofore carried on under the caption. "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," the continuance of which is authorized under the terms of this appropriation, and to provide assistance to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories and possessions, unable to obtain credit elsewhere, through making and servicing of loans under this and prior law, $12,000,000, of which $8,000,000 shall be available to the Extension Service of the land-grant colleges in the States to provide such farm and home management assistance as may be necessary to borrowers: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for these purposes shall be used for the maintenance or establishment of regional offices.

Loan fund: For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy farmers, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary of Agriculture upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed $40,000,000. Such advances shall be made: (1) With interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary of Agriculture shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase program; (2) for carrying on any experiment in collective farming, except for the liquidation of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) for making loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as a whole as a substitute for the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Virginia will be considered as a whole as a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask the acting majority leader if he will not be willing to let the amendment be printed—it will create considerable discussion—and allow its consideration to go over until tomorrow. Obviously, we cannot conclude discussion of it this evening, and probably some other section of the bill could be taken up and disposed of today. I should like the Members of the Senate to have the benefit of having the amendment before them in printed form, and of having it available tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I was interested in the amendment when it was read, but I could not follow it clearly. I should like to have its consideration go over until tomorrow, inasmuch as action on the bill cannot be concluded today.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course, I would not undertake to oppose the wishes of the Senator from Oregon in this matter, because I know his views on the question. However, I understand that the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is practically the same as the House committee amendment, which went out on a point of order in the House. I think it is practically the same as the amendments proposed by the House committee, commonly known as the Farm

Bureau amendments, so far as the accomplishment of functions is concerned. I think most Members of the Senate have some familiarity with it.

Mr. McNARY. I could not tell from the reading; but I thought that probably its consideration could not be completed this afternoon; and probably we could take up some amendment not so controversial, and could consider the amendment of the Senator from Virginia tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that the two remaining amendments—one relating to rural rehabilitation and the other authorizing borrowing from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to finance the Rural Electrification Administration—are controversial, as will be any mendments offered to them. If the Senator from Oregon desires to have the bill go over until tomorrow, I shall not interpose objection, but I should like to point out that whatever remains will be controversial. We shall not relieve ourselves of any controversy.

Mr. McNARY. I am satisfied that we can complete action on the bill tomorrow. It is now almost 5 o'clock, and many Members of the Senate have not had an opportunity to be in their offices today.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not resist the request. I have no objection to having the Senate take a recess at this time.

REPORT FROM THE ALEUTIANS—INVITATION TO WITNESS MOTION PICTURE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the Signal Corps has just completed a motion picture entitled "Report From the Aleutians." It is in technicolor, and runs for 42 minutes.

On the surface, Report from the Aleutians is the intimate, factual story of our men and their fight to establish attack bases along the finger of islands pointing to the heart of our enemy, Japan.

Actually, it is the story of how all services and arms of the American fighting forces—air, sea, and land—have teamed up for victory.

As we well remember, in June of 1942 the Japanese, aiming at our continent, struck at Dutch Harbor and Midway. Reeling back from that attack, the remnants of the foe sought refuge at Kiska and Attu, in the Aleutian chain. Immediately it became necessary for us to establish ourselves within striking distance of that new danger.

The motion picture is the record of how we succeeded, how our fighting forces converted a spongy, barren, storm-ridden island into an attack base, how they built an airfield out of a lagoon, how they transported all their food, munitions, machinery, and men thousands of miles through submarine-infested seas.

Senators will see the actual bombing of Kiska, now a daily mission; they will see a graphic record of the kind of soldier the American man can be.

Tomorrow, Thursday, first at 2 o'clock and again at 3 o'clock, in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building, the Members of Congress are cordially invited to see the motion picture. Of course, members of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate will be expected to attend.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Capt. Charles A. Park to be a rear admiral for temporary service in the Coast Guard, to rank from May 1, 1943; and

Don A. Jones and David M. Whipp, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineers with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from May 15, 1943.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Po t Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters; and

Wallie E. Beasley, to be postmaster at Biloxi, Miss., in place of J. R. Meunier, retired (adverse report).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 9 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Norman Collison, of Bridgeville, Del., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Delaware, in place of James H. Latchum.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

William J. Cronin, Jr., from the State of Connecticut, to be area director, at $5,600 per annum, in the New Haven area office.

John R. Kelly, from the State of Indiana, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Muncie area office.

Joseph H. Braunagel, from the State of Illinois, to be area director, at $4,600 per annum, in the Peoria area office.

Edward D. Connor, from the State of Indiana, to be area chief of training, at $4,600 per annum in the Chicago area office.

Arthur C. Gernes, from the State of Massachusetts, to be deputy regional director, at $6,500 per annum, in the Boston regional office.

George C. Estill, from the State of Florida, to be regional chief of manpower utilization, at $6,500 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office.

Donald H. Roney, from the State of California, to be senior labor market analyst, at $4,600 per annum, in the San Francisco regional office.

Julian Capers, Jr., from the State of Texas, to be senior information specialist, at $4,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office

Edwin E. Knott, from the State of Missouri, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at $4,600 per annum, in the Washington area office.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Maj. George Walter Vaughn, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1941.

Capt. Elmer Matthew Webb, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 14, 1937.

TO CAVALRY

Lt. Col. James Brian Edmunds, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from December 18, 1941.

TO COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

Capt. Jacob George Reynolds, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 13, 1939.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Henry Crandall Newcomer, Corps of Engineers (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1942, effective June 30, 1943.

Second Lt. Arvol Duane Allen, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Harold Reid Armstrong, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1942.

Second Lt. James Moore Boyd, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1941.

Second Lt. Lewellyn Clifford Daigle, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from October 5, 1942.

Second Lt. Robert Usher Gaines, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1941

Second Lt. Ferdinand Frederick Glomb, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 20, 1942.

Second Lt. Jay Jaynes, Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Boylston Brooks Lewis, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 20, 1942.

Second Lt. John Raymond Sands, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt. Samuel Frederick Stebelton, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1942.

Second Lt. Sam Powell Wagner, Cavalry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from June 12, 1943

Lt. Col. Joseph Dogan Arthur, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John Stewart Bragdon, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. George Jacob Richards, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Lehman Wellington Miller, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Douglas Lafayette Weart, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).
Lt. Col. Earl Ewart Gesler, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. John French Conklin, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
×Lt. Col. William Frazer Tompkins, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Douglas Hamilton Gillette, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
Lt. Col. Donald Angus Davison, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).
×Lt. Col. Henry Spiese Aurand, Ordnance Department (temporary major general).

PROMOTIONS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE NAVY

Capt. Gerald F. Bogan, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 7th day of December 1942.

Rear Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 7th day of June 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 9 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

KENTUCKY

Howard K. Veach, Carlisle.
Ethel Hibbard, Loyall.
Edward Schindler, Middletown.
Dorothy M. Kent, Morgantown.
Frank W. Mimms, Trenton.
Lovella L. Campbell, Vicco.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dr. Daniel A. Poling, minister of the Baptist Temple, Philadelphia, and president of the World's Christian Endeavor Society, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee that Thou art God of our fathers, God of our country, and our God. Thou hast companioned us through dark days. Thou art the comrade of our lives. We invoke Thy presence. Pour out the spirit of courage, of fortitude, and of faith upon our country. Be with the President of the United States and all who are associated with him in leadership above us and beneath Thee, that we will remember our sons who are on all fronts of the world—on the land, on the sea, and in the air—offering now the last full measure of devotion that freedom shall not perish from the earth.

We do not seek deliverance from responsibilities. We do not ask exemption from sorrow and from sacrifice. We pray for wisdom and for power. May we for those times be adequate as were those in other times for their occasions. We pray Thy blessing upon this institution, upon these Representatives of the American people. We pray that they shall give now not only for ourselves alone but for all men and all women and all little children everywhere the stored resources of the years. Lead on, O King Eternal. May we find a just and lasting peace as we win this war and may we win the peace not only for ourselves and for our sons and daughters but for the children of men through generations that are to be. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for food.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 157):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ULYSSES S. GUYER, late a Representative from the State of Kansas.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. CAPPER and Mr. REED members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

POSTAL RATES ON FIRST-CLASS MATTER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to an agreement with the Speaker, and the majority and the minority leaders and the ranking Members on both sides of the Ways and Means Committee, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 134, to continue the temporary increase in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 1001 (a), as amended (relating to temporary increase in first-class postage rate), of the Revenue Act of 1932, and section 2, as amended (authorizing the President to modify certain postage rates), of the act entitled "An act to extend the gasoline tax for one year, to modify postage rates on mail matter, and for other purposes," approved June 16, 1933, are further amended by striking out "July 1, 1943" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1945", and by striking out "June 30, 1943," wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1945".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, just long enough for the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] to explain the purpose of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Ohio will recall, this resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. It simply extends for the present the 3-cent postal rate for another 2 years.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. How much money will this bring in?

Mr. COOPER. The report of the Post Office Department is that the estimated revenues yield, due to the additional 1-cent postage on first-class matter, is $130,000,000 per year. The estimated total yield of first-class mail for 1942 is $492,885,000. The estimated total yield of second-class mail for 1942, is $26,793,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to object to the consideration of this proposition, but it seems to me that when several publications in this country that might well be dispensed with at the present time are getting a rake-off of many millions of dollars a year each in their postage reductions, we might at least give some consideration to the individuals in America who have to pay this 3-cent postage—the mothers and fathers who write their sons in the armed services. I understand that the deficit caused by these publications amounts to around $100,000,000 a year, almost as much as they now ask to take from the masses of the American people who write individual letters. If we are going to continue this policy, I submit that both these matters should be brought before the House and be given consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF LIBERTY SHIPS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BLAND addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars, and in one to include a letter written by the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, to a constituent of mine, and my constituent's reply.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an address I made over the Columbia Broadcasting System last night on the subject of rolling back prices.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by William T. Kerr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a speech I delivered last night over WHN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BROOKLYN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in Brooklyn tomorrow, June 10, there will be celebrated the one hundred and fourteenth anniversary day parade of the Brooklyn Sunday School Union. I have on previous occasions called this event to the attention of the House, and I feel justified in doing it again because that celebration does not have a counterpart any place in the world. I wish I could describe it to you. One hundred thousand or more men, women, and children participate, proudly marching under the militant banner of godliness. They are on a holiday of holiness. All the public schools are closed and all business is usually suspended. Today, particularly, I think we should look to events like this for what is needed is such lights to shine not only when the world is bright and at peace, but particularly when the world is dark and dreary and at war. There has been written for me an original poem commemorating the day, and it is as follows:

One hundred and fourteen years record
This Anniversary Day Parade
As proud we march to praise the Lord,
With stirring floats and flags displayed.

We and our children here have trod
In Brooklyn's day of holiness
To honor Brooklyn, Church and God
Whose love and grace our people bless.

This year's parade is doubly dear
For Brooklyn's bravest far away,
Our heroes who cannot march here—.
Remember them this holy day.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from Contemporary China, a reference digest, on the subject of the antiexclusion law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a poem written by a disabled soldier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRESENTATION OF AMBULANCE BY CAPITOL EMPLOYEES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow at 11:45 a. m., on the east plaza of the Capitol, the Capitol employees will present to the Government of the United States an ambulance for use by the United States Army. The Capitol employees raised more than $2,000 from their campaign for funds sponsored by the Congressional Secretaries Club, composed of secretaries to Members of Congress, in order to provide the money to purchase this ambulance. The ambulance completely equipped will cost $1,539. The Capitol Hill employees exhibit an example of loyalty and generosity that might well be emulated by many other groups in this country. It stands as a most commendable and constructive act.

The ambulance will be accepted by Brig. Gen. Wilton B. Persons, Edward W. Smith, and Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, newly appointed Surgeon General of the United States Army, in behalf of the United States. We are all invited to stop by the east steps of the Capitol tomorrow and witness the presentation ceremony.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a Memorial Day address by the Rev. Arnold Brink, of Muskegon, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL FARM PROGRAM

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGIONAL OFFICE OF WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION AND WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COFFEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 248, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2795) to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land or buildings and facilities or fixtures appurtenant thereto, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

This resolution makes in order consideration of a bill dealing with the disposition of surplus property owned by the Government of the United States. It has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The discussion of the bill before the Rules Committee indicated that there is not much opposition. I have no disposition to consume time on the rule, and as soon as the gentleman on the minority side consumes such time as he may desire, I think we can adopt the rule and proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, from which this resolution comes, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, there seem to have been several requests for time, therefore I will proceed under the rule.

You may feel that this is not an important matter. It is of importance to me because of the fact that we are making almost our initial bow before the Congress. The Committee on Expenditures is actually reporting a bill today.

I felt that I ought to revive your memory as to the powers and duties of the Committee on Expenditures. That committee was heralded as one of the most useful in the House. After my many years of service I was made the ranking minority member, or the chairmanship in the event of Republican control. I was made to feel that it would be a very important assignment.

We soon learned that no administration would probably ever allow much of an investigation of its own activities, and I have sometimes feared that if I became chairman of the committee under a Republican regime my own leadership might try to suppress any activity in investigating things happening under the Republican rule.

I have considered that question many times, and wondered what my response might be. However, I read something this morning that interested me much. It seems Wendell Phillips once said that when a statesman, so-called, arrives at 70 and when he no longer has any hope of being President, you can get the truth out of him. I qualify, partially at least.

As to the importance of this committee I will revive your memory regarding

its supposed powers and duties. The examination of accounts and expenditures of the several departments, independent establishments, and commissions of the Government, and the manner of keeping those accounts; the economy, justness, and correction of such expenditures; their conformity with appropriation laws; the proper application of public moneys; the security of the Government against unjust and extravagant demands; retrenchment; the enforcement of the payment of moneys due to the United States; the economy and accountability of public officers; the abolishment of useless offices, shall all be subjects within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

This seems to cover many highly important activities and most-exacting duties.

It has been held that the committee may make investigations without specific direction from the House, unless it decides to compel testimony.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Would you say, after that description of the territory that this committee is supposed to cover, and from action we have had from the committee during at least the last 6 years, that the committee and its functions and its activities should be described as a hoopskirt; one that covers everything and touches nothing?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes. But the point I wanted to make is that sometimes I have felt that new Members may have thought I was shirking my duties, but the older Members will remember that for several years in the critical periods of New Deal excesses, I obtained the floor, demanding many investigations. I introduced many orders to investigate departments. I was always confronted with a sort of whitewash from the department, and the leaders would then lay the order on the table and no discussion was in order, under the rule.

I often suffered the weariness of futility, but kept it up for a long time. I frankly confess that since this war has been upon us, I have somewhat lost my urge for investigation, lest it give the appearance of interfering with the war effort. Today we find a different situation. The administration itself wants something, and this committee seems to be the refuge to which they must repair for favorable action. They now want a transfer of authority from the Congress to the Executive in the matter of disposal of property. This right has been carefully guarded by this body. You gentlemen might well study the bill that was first presented.

In the Congress rests the full authority and the duty of the disposal of property. The Executive can only act under authority specially delegated by the Congress. After the war there will be a stupendous amount of such property. It is estimated at not less than $50,000,000,000. The original bill would have transferred from the Congress to the Bureau of the Budget, which is a bureau controlled by the Executive, the full authority in the disposal of that property.

The Comptroller came before us and I asked him if he still felt that he was an official representative of the Congress rather than the Executive, and he insistently replied, "The Congress. But the Comptroller General was appointed by the present President." We may well feel that he should be fearless, inasmuch as he is appointed to serve for 15 long years and can only be removed by this body.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that the House is not in order.

Mr. GIFFORD. I think the House is in very good order. I can see that my Republican friends are listening carefully. This ought to be a joyful day for the members of this committee. I think it is. It is a most satisfactory day to me, for here I am speaking in behalf of a report from this committee, rather than making a protest. I am approving the action of the committee. How different. I am in accord with this bill. But the entire membership has greatly curtailed its original broad and dangerous provisions. I recall the old adage: "He who gives too soon will be soon called upon to give again." We have given but little and we have taken 4 months doing it. We have been careful. We have had prolonged hearings. We have heeded the fears of the Army, the Navy, the Treasury, the R. F. C., and many others. We have tried to protect those agencies from too much meddling in their affairs. If you read the bill carefully you will find that we have not yielded very much authority, but I for one want to be fair enough to acknowledge that certainly there is real necessity for providing for a great deal of surplus, most especially the quantities left over after liquidation of several activities. One illustration ought to be enough. Much property of the W. P. A., estimated at some $40,000,000, is now deteriorating and should be transferred where needed. Certainly that ought to be disposed of in the proper manner. The Director of the Budget will take control of that surplus property through the Procurement Department of the Treasury, and make proper rules and regulations. The original bill provided for too great a taking from the power of the Congress. We would not delegate the power over $50,000,000,000. This must be considered later. There is a provision in the bill that a joint committee be appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate to consider the proper method for the disposal of that huge amount of surplus material left after the war is over. Industry and the businessmen of the country may well worry over the disposal of that $50,000,000,000.

We must be very cautious in its disposition. We do not want a recurrence of the conditions after the First World War, when vehicles of all sorts were sold across the water, at such low prices that they could be bought and reshipped to the United States and sold to our citizens at a large profit. We thought they would not enter into competition with their own manufacturers, but they did.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the membership of the House is rightly concerned over the proper sale of surplus property and commodities. I wonder if the gentleman would agree with me as being genuinely exercised over the tremendous purchase of lands and property by the Federal Government during the period of the war. Is it not also a very serious problem?

Mr. GIFFORD. I might take the time to enlarge on that and to express my own opinion about it. We know so little about it; that is, we have so little factual knowledge. But we feel certain that the military have taken off the market enormous quantities of goods that the civilian population needs and ought to have, simply because they might need it in the future. We hardly dare criticize the military for doing that, unless we can show they have done so. However, I have no doubts about it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wonder if the committee has gone into the amount of property in the shape of real estate that the United States Government owns? At a recent meeting in Omaha, Nebr., of county officials, the fact was brought out that the United States Government was the owner of about 375,000,000 acres of land. I think they own about 52 percent of the land in Wyoming.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; indeed we have, and we cut all real estate out of this bill.

There is one bone of contention in this bill. I want to say that one of the members of our committee seems very much exercised about it. It is relating to the special joint committee to be appointed. Some of the members do not want to give up the prerogatives of the committee. Many special committees of investigation have been set up, especially by another body. Many members of our committtee feel that they are competent to pass on this whole matter of surplus goods disposal.

I have hopes that this bill will amount to something in that there is not now in the law proper authority to dispose of much property now destroyed or wasted. How many letters I have received—you must also have received many—telling of the waste incident to the building of these cantonments. Hundreds of acres of woodlands cleared for them and for airports. People needed that chopped wood—the Army, of course, could not give it away lest they be accused of favoritism. They had no authority to sell that wood so they simply burned it—at great expense to the Government. That sort of thing must be stopped. The military have a proper system of bookkeeping so that they probably know every day exactly what they have on hand. But that is bookkeeping only and the accountants must

accept reports of much property simply accounted for by being marked "condemned." I understand that is a popular and efficient method used to account for disappearance of property which, if authority had been granted, could have been sold, or at least given away.

We find that officers in the Army have too little authority in the matter of disposal of property. It is claimed under this bill that regulations will be formulated to cure this situation. This bill is full of exceptions. The Army, the Navy, the R. F. C., and others seem to be satisfied with it. We should feel safe in voting for it.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. If authority is extended to the agency to dispose of this material, has there been cautionary moves made so that no particular line of material will be a drug on the market by loading it up?

Mr. GIFFORD. There would not be enough of that under this bill to disturb the market. We have carefully considered that phase and postponed authority to dispose of the great surplus expected later.

As to the details of this bill, if you can read the King's English it would not be difficult except for the many references in it to the many acts heretofore passed. A copy of the hearing will give you the complete Budget and Accounting Act, and title III, which sets up the Comptroller General and General Accounting Office.

I particularly want to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. He is a perfect marvel at detail, and I am delighted to support him in this measure. I congratulate him sincerely on his grasp of detail. I might, also, discuss these details. I might feel competent to do it. But I preferred to give you the over-all picture. It is the intent of the legislation that, from the very beginning, interested me, and if you will read the hearings you will find how carefully we looked into that and questioned as to the broad powers we were asked to grant to the executive department.

Before I get through with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], may I say one thing further. I paid the gentleman a high compliment just now and I meant it. I want to remind you of those former days when I was trying to get investigations, when he was like the Rock of Gibraltar in not allowing anything of that sort to be done by the committee. Today is the first time he has come into his own, though not really the chairman. He is acting chairman, the chairman being away, and in matters of detail he will be able to answer any questions you may possibly think of relating to the bill. You know, Mr. WHITTINGTON, "one rooster does not help another rooster by scratching in the same spot." I intend to let you make full explanation of the provisions in the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I want to join with the gentleman in his praise of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. I do want to reserve one objection, however. I know the gentleman from Mississippi will explain every detail of the bill and I know that every Member of the House will be glad to ask questions. There is one thing in which I disagree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and that is in reference to section 4 of this bill. This committee has been diligently acting for 4 months and the committee should continue the job. Therefore, I point out one disagreement only to my fine friend.

Mr. GIFFORD. I may wish to take some time later. As I stated, this bill may be a little difficult to read because of the references. You may wish to know a little about it, but I assure you that the committee has taken 4 months and we have tried to understand it. Sometimes, the less we know the more we suspect. I imagine some of you may possibly suspect a great deal.

The message of the President amused me when it came in last fall. He said that by Executive order he had done much but preferred affirmative authority from the Congress. I should think he would. As an illustration, he hinted that he might like to take from the Government buildings our air-cooling machinery for nongovernmental industries. Somehow or other that did not come to our committee, although he addressed our committee. It was seen fit to send that matter to the so-called Lanham committee. That was one item on which the President perhaps found he ought to go lightly, because Congress might have awakened if he had taken our air-conditioning from us. So he mentioned that he should have affirmative authority from us. I think he was very wise not to have awakened too much curiosity as to what he was really doing under executive authority, alone. If the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], who is such a splendid cross-examiner, would get busy with the Executive himself I think the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] would find a great many things that the Executive would have to explain.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I may say I have tried to protect the Congress in this bill. Later on when the disposal of $50,000,000,000 of surplus property comes up for consideration, I think we will have much more to say. However, it has been a pleasure to act on the floor as the ranking minority member of the committee, and to prove to the House that the committee is still really in existence and ready to go under another administration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] outlined the history of this committee, its program, and the reason for the committee's organization. Frankly, the committee has been a burial ground for practically every bill that has come before it. It was intended to be a burial ground. It was intended to be the administration's burial ground for measures that were controversial and offensive to it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman will recall that it has been the burial ground for proposals which have been made to reorganize our defense establishments, especially the War and Navy Departments, to create one over-all Secretary, with Under Secretaries for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. Year after year, or a dozen occasions, I have requested but been denied a hearing on creating a Department of Defense. I congratulate the gentleman from Ohio for trying to give a hearing on that important subject.

Mr. BENDER. Frankly, on almost every occasion, whenever a bill was referred to our committee, we had very little time for consideration, and the bill was killed before it had a chance to be discussed.

I join my friend from Massachusetts in saying that I am utterly amazed to think that finally a bill has come out of the committee and has the committee's approval. I am surprised and pleased to find the Committee on Rules ready to act on this bill. I wish the Committee on Rules was as ready to act on the resolution continuing the Tolan committee, the only committee that has not been renewed by this Congress. The Committee on Rules has been sitting on that resolution, why I do not know. But they did not sit on this bill very long, apparently because all the teeth have been pulled from the bill.

This bill is very different from the bill that was originally presented. It has been completely butchered. The Army came in and objected to its coming under the provisions of this bill, so the Army was taken out. The Navy objected to coming under the provisions of the bill, so the Navy was excluded from its provisions. In fact, every objecting agency was taken out of the bill. So you have here a bill that provides for the disposal of surplus commodities exactly as the administration wants it, displeasing no one, and providing for something that of course is at least an approach to the problem.

This bill is necessary. There is a need for some authority to dispose of surplus commodities. The Army, in purchasing lands for army camps, had hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of agricultural implements on hand at a time when farmers were crying for agricultural implements, but the Army had no way of disposing of them. It had no authority to dispose of them and had to use the device that is commonly used and is known as an Executive order, or directive, in order to dispose of the property.

I am sorry the bill does not carry some of the provisions it carried originally, when it was introduced. Even though the Bureau of the Budget is the right arm of the administration, there are

many men in that bureau who are career men and who are trying to do a fine job. I believe they are conscientious and have an earnest desire to see that the taxpayers get as much money as possible back for all these excesse that have been purchased at any time, particularly during this war period. This bill provides for the disposal of surplus commodities, not including real estate, during wartime, and we shall have more legislation to provide for the disposal of properties after the war is over.

Speaking very frankly and very bluntly, there is no need of kidding ourselves about this bill. This bill is exactly what the administrative members of the committee want. That is why it is going to pass through this Congress like a cat goes through a dog show.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has just taken his seat complimented the Committee on Rules to some extent for having reported out the rule on this bill, and took occasion to refer to the fact that the Committee on Rules has not reported a resolution on the Tolan committee.

The pending bill provides for an investigation of this subject further by a special committee. In this session of Congress I have supported resolutions authorizing legislative committees, such as that on naval affairs and military affairs, to make investigations as to how the administration of the legislation coming through those committees is being handled. But I have opposed the appointment in this session of Congress of special investigating committees. I think we shall soon have reached the point where we will be confronted with the necessity of appointing a special committee to investigate the special investigating committees. This Tolan committee, for instance——

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order, first, that the House is not in order; and, second, since we are listening to a very fine speech on the main point of this bill, that a quorum is not present.

Mr. CLARK. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. CHURCH. I am very anxious that the gentleman be heard by the Members of the House.

Mr. CLARK. I would prefer to yield the floor than have the gentleman insist on the point of order.

Mr. CHURCH. I realize that, but in a few minutes we go from the House into the Committee of the Whole, and we have present only a few Members.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to take the gentleman from North Carolina off his feet by a point of no quorum?

Mr. CHURCH. I desire to make the point of order that a quorum is not present in order that the gentleman may be heard by more than just a handful of Members.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has already made the point of order that a quorum is not present, and he cannot make a speech now.

Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 95]

Baldwin, Md.	Gavagan	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gibson	O'Konski
Barry	Gillie	O'Leary
Bell	Grant, Ala.	O'Toole
Boykin	Hart	Pfeifer
Bradley, Mich.	Hartley	Philbin
Buckley	Heffernan	Pracht
Bulwinkle	Hendricks	Rees, Kans.
Burdick	Hinshaw	Rivers
Camp	Holifield	Rizley
Cannon, Fla.	Hope	Robinson, Utah.
Cannon, Mo.	Izac	Russell
Capozzoli	Johnson, Okla.	Sabath
Carter	Kelley	Satterfield
Chenoweth	Kennedy	Schwabe
Cochran	King	Scott
Cole, Mo.	Kirwan	Sheridan
Colmer	Lea	Simpson, Pa.
Costello	LeCompte	Smith, W. Va.
Crawford	LeFevre	Stanley
Culkin	Lemke	Steagall
Cullen	Lynch	Taber
Cunningham	McGehee	Taylor
Dawson	McMurray	Thomas, N. J.
Dies	Magnuson	Tolan
Dirksen	Mansfield, Mont.	Treadway
Domengeaux	Marcantonio	Van Zandt
Doughton	Merrow	Vinson, Ga.
Douglas	Monkiewicz	Voorhis, Calif.
Drewry	Morrison, N. C.	Wadsworth
Eaton	Mundt	Weaver
Eberharter	Murphy	Welchel, Ohio
Fitzpatrick	Myers	Whelchel, Ga.
Fogarty	Newsome	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fulmer	Nichols	Woodrum, Va.
Furlong	Norton	
Gallagher		

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-three Members have answered to their names, a quorum. Without objection further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, at the time the point of no quorum was made, I was on the verge of moving the previous question on the pending resolution. My distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH], said he made the point of order because he thought I was making a good statement, which the membership ought to hear. Of course, I appreciate that compliment, but I think the situation is rather that he was so startled by the fact that I was undertaking to say anything on the floor for more than 1 minute that he was shocked into making the point of order of no quorum. Perhaps it would be right for me to say since more of the membership are on the floor, that the pending resolution would make in order the consideration of a bill for the disposition of surplus personal Government property, and to set up a committee to investigate the perplexing question of just how we shall dispose later on of the vast amount of real estate owned by the Government in this country and abroad. In that connection the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] mentioned the fact that the Rules Committee, while promptly reporting the rule on this bill, had declined so far to report a rule continuing the Tolan special investigating committee, whereupon I was moved to say that, while I approved the practice of having investigating committees of various subjects by the various legislative committees of the House, I did not approve the practice which has become so prolific, of appointing special committees to investigate this, that, and the other subject, and that in my judgment we soon will have reached the point where we will have to set up a special investigating committee to investigate these special investigating committees.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. Not at this moment. We have given the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the Military Affairs Committee authority to investigate subjects in the line of their jurisdiction, and lately we have conferred such authority upon the Agricultural Committee with reference to the Farm Security Administration, which is all right, but it will be rare instances in which a situation will arise where an investigation should not more properly be made by some legislative committee of the House. With all due respect to the Tolan committee, we all know that it was appointed to investigate the subject of migratory labor, resulting after the storm in the Dust Bowl, and all that. If you will read the last report of that committee, you will find that it has completely left that subject, and it files a report in which it almost takes over the whole war effort. We appointed the Dies committee to investigate subversive activities, and un-Americanism, and so forth, and about the only activity I have been able to notice about that committee lately is that a subcommittee of the Dies committee is now in California investigating the internment of Japanese in California, and I am unable to conceive how that special committee could think it has jurisdiction to go out and deal with a question so loaded with dynamite as that question is. I am simply making the suggestion to the House that I think it is about time we put the brakes on the appointment of some of these special committees to investigate these various questions. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the force of the gentleman's remarks but I am inclined to think that this measure may lead to a great deal of confusion if adopted. I notice, for instance, in defining the term "property" it says it does not include any land, building, or their appurtenant facilities or fixtures, or any gold or silver. Then on page 17 it provides under subsection (b) of section 4 for full and complete study and investigation of tangible property, both real and personal. Certainly it seems to me that the committees which have charge of matters of this character ought to be able to determine that, and I am afraid that we will have confusion worse confounded unless this bill can be explained in such a way that it will lay aside the objections that seem apparent on the face of it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to answer the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Just to say to the gentleman from Texas that the committee authorized will not deprive any legislative committee of its jurisdiction. The purpose of this committee is to make recommendations to Congress, and those recommendations would be referred to the proper committees.

Mr. LANHAM. I am not opposing that feature of this bill, because we will have at the close of the war a vast

amount of real estate in this country and in other countries. I happen to be chairman of the committee having to do with war housing, and a great deal of land has been acquired. We make our investigations and are authorized to do so and it seems to me that we are in a better position to know about that situation than any independent committee investigating the matter, or that it could possibly know.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. I respect the gentleman's opinion, and his attitude toward special committees, but the gentleman will agree that many special committees have been created during this Congress, as for example the Dies committee, the Smith committee, the Cox committee, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Wildlife, the Canners committee, the Committee on Newsprint, and the Kerr committee. The Select Committee on Defense Migration has come before the Rules Committee only after receiving the favorable opinion of the Speaker of the House and the majority and minority leaders on the desirability of continuing the work of the committee for a year.

The committee proposes, if continued, to begin at once hearings on farm manpower and migration, so as to report immediately to Congress. This has been the committee's practice throughout its existence: Under House Resolution 113, Seventy-seventh Congress, passed March 1941, reports were issued at least every 3 months. That resolution called on the committee to concentrate its attention on problems arising from the migration of workers to war jobs, and that we have done.

The committee's present proposal is to focus its primary attention on the problems of agricultural labor supply, with which it was concerned under House Resolution 63, Seventy-sixth Congress.

In support of the request for continuation the committee would urge its demonstrated ability to take a comprehensive view of a problem and to make vigorous recommendations for correcting existing confusion. Any reader of the press or Washington reporter knows that the committee's reports on industrial manpower are largely responsible for the proposals now being urged upon the President for a national manpower policy. We believe we can do as much for the farm manpower problem.

In response to the question, "What does the committee propose to do about it?" we refer the Rules Committee to the following excerpt from pages 15 and 16 of our final report under House Resolution 113, Seventy-seventh Congress, where we said:

> In the estimation of the committee the shortcomings of these programs to date closely parallel those of the industrial manpower programs.
>
> There has been the same failure to recognize the need for great expansion of war production and curtailment of nonessential civilian goods. There has been the same easy optimism about the use of customary methods of handling labor supply. And with respect to the draft, the absence of adequate occupational deferment machinery has struck agriculture even more heavily than industry. In agriculture, moreover, the need for a close correlation between the utilization of available manpower and other productive facilities is even greater than in industry. This country should long since have related agricultural manpower and production to the work of individual county war boards and local draft deferment boards.

The above quotation will indicate the line we think any legislation should follow. We cannot afford to have agricultural goals calling for more milk or more peanuts, and no coordination between the manpower program and the agricultural program.

To permit the committee to keep up with the problems of war-induced industrial migration, which is draining agriculture of its labor supply, House Resolution 36—Seventy-eighth Congress—continues in force the authority granted under House Resolution 63—Seventy-sixth Congress—and House Resolution 113—Seventy-seventh Congress. No extension of the mandate previously granted the committee is requested.

Support for the work of the committee from the press and public comes from papers throughout the country, including the Detroit Free Press, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Louisville Courier-Journal, the Catholic journals—America, the Sign, and the Commonweal—the Protestant Home Missions Council, the National Travelers Aid, many columnists and commentators, including Raymond Clapper and Baukhage, organized labor including the A. F. of L., C. I. O., and railway brotherhoods. Libraries of schools and colleges throughout the country have made extensive demands for the committee's hearings and reports. Large numbers of Federal, State, and local officials have written indicating their reliance on the proposals of the committee. Witnesses have universally praised the committee for the courteous way they have been received. In 2½ years of work the committee has never used a subpena.

Mr. CLARK. I appreciate the force of the gentleman's statement. I have no disposition to discriminate, as far as I am concerned, against the Tolan committee. I voted against the appointment of all of these special committees. The complaint I have against them is that if you will compare their final reports with the resolution by which they were authorized you will see that in 9 cases out of 10 they have wholly departed from the jurisdiction that was originally conferred upon them. I have seldom seen any concrete results from the appointment of these special committees, except in very extraordinary cases.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. With reference to the statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina about the subcommittee of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American and Subversive Activities on the West Coast, I wish to state that that subcommittee was sent there by the chairman to investigate charges that had been placed with him by Members of this House and the Senate and by reputable people throughout the country that subversive aliens or people born in America of Japanese descent had been released, who were members of subversive organizations and were dangerous people and should be investigated. That is the sole purpose of the committee in going out there.

Mr. CLARK. My only point about that is that it occurred to me when I read the dispatch in the press that that committee was dealing with a very touchy subject that probably belonged with the military or State departments.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. I think that is part of the reason why this committee undertook that investigation, because it is not within the direct jurisdiction of the War Department but the War Relocation Commission. I will say to the gentleman that in my opinion, having lived on the Pacific coast many years, where the Japanese abound, that if what this subcommittee said about the release of the Japanese in their last report is true, this situation should be investigated by some committee, and that committee should report to Congress so that the Congress could take proper action.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Can the gentleman state what happens to the funds that will be realized from the sale of surplus properties under the bill which this resolution proposes to make in order?

Mr. CLARK. I prefer that that question should be answered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], who will have charge of the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will say that the bill contemplates a vast improvement upon the existing policy, and unless it involves reimbursable funds or special funds, it provides that those funds shall be covered into the general Treasury of the United States.

Mr. CASE. The point that disturbed me, if I may say to the gentleman, is that on page 10 of the bill there is a sentence which indicates that the proceeds could be credited back to the appropriation of the agency or department interested, and thereby augment the funds of that administrative agency or unit, and the funds would not be in the control of the Congress.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. FORD. In view of the statement of the gentleman with reference to a special committee to investigate investigating committees, I wonder if Judge SMITH'S committee, which is supposed to be investigating whether executive departments are going outside of their jurisdiction, would investigate some of these other committees that you and I think are going beyond their jurisdiction?

Mr. CLARK. I do not know that I could add anything to the gentleman's knowledge along that line.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I shall make in Committee of the Whole and include certain computations made by myself and certain records of February 3, 1942, with reference to the soldier's residence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING ACT OF 1921

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2795) to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land or buildings and facilities or fixtures appurtenant thereto, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2795, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the risk of repeating a statement that is often made when legislation is being considered, I venture to say that there are few matters of more importance to the people and to the Congress than those embraced in the bill now under consideration. Under the Constitution the Congress is vested with the control of the purse and property of the people of the United States.

The bill under consideration is an amendment to the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. The passage of that act, under a Republican administration, in June 1921 was a great step forward in executive administration. That act provided for the Bureau of the Budget, the financial management arm of the Chief Executive. It provided for the General Accounting Office, often and properly called the arm of the Congress. The bill under consideration does not change or modify or amend the Budget and Accounting Act with respect to the powers of the Director of the Budget or of the Comptroller General. Their powers remain. The amendments are additions to implement and specify more exactly what the committee conceives to be the purposes that Congress really had in mind in the establishment of the Budget and General Accounting Offices, and to utilize the experience of the Government over the past 20 years in implementing the purposes of that act.

Congress can control the purse strings of the Nation in making appropriations; as long as the appropriation remains in the form of money it is subject to the control of Congress, but when the appropriation is converted into services and the purchase of equipment, materials, and supplies, other problems arise.

To get rid, for instance, of the services of Federal employees no longer needed, recently the Director of the Budget has been directed to canvass the situation and to provide for the elimination of employees wherever possible. But unfortunately the Congress has not provided adequately for the efficient management of property in the hands of executive agencies, or for the disposition of the surplus property belonging to the Government and accruing inevitably from its operations. Those properties are being increased day by day. The surpluses are piling up.

Equipment, materials, and supplies and other property may be considered generally under three heads—to wit, procurement, utilization, and disposal of surplus. First, as to the procurement agency of the Government: The Director of Procurement is nothing more nor less, generally speaking, than the purchasing agent under legislation that the Congress has passed. In the various departments rests the determination of the properties that they need, and he has no veto power; his authority is merely to purchase the property. There is not any over-all requirement or standard of management with respect to the utilization of property once that property has been acquired.

I have referred to the procurement of property and its utilization, I come now to the disposition of the property.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman allow me to complete my explanation, and then I will be glad to yield to any Member?

The first essential requisite of proper management and utilization of property is for the Government to require inventories, provide for standards, to provide for the transfer of that property from one agency to another, to provide for full utilization of property already on hand if a new agency is established, which needs equipment or material, or if material has been acquired by one department of the Government and it has served its purpose, then it should be made available to another department of the Government requiring such property. So the question of utilization is an important one. In the matter of disposition of surplus, after its existence has been ascertained by proper investigation, the law is wholly inadequate.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman allow me to complete my statement? I want to make a connected statement if I can.

Inevitably the surpluses pile up. They piled up during the First World War. With no legislation to provide for their disposition, President Wilson issued an Executive order. The order was amended by the Congress to apply only to the First World War. There were great losses to the Treasury resulting from the utterly inadequate provisions for the disposition of property following the First World War.

Congress undertook to provide, first in 1928 and later in 1933, that property might be transferred between Government agencies at the market value. Appropriations were made upon the request of the Bureau of the Budget to enable departments to acquire property. They acquired property. In many cases hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars' worth of properties were transferred to Government agencies following the First World War, and there was no accounting of the acquisition of the property and no charge against or offsetting reduction of appropriations, since the Congress never had, in the first instance, required such action, and consequently many congressional appropriations were tremendously augmented without the knowledge or consent of Congress. The provisions under existing law are utterly inadequate. There is no legislation requiring the agency that buys new equipment to secure a certificate that some other agency does not have the equipment and belonging to the Government. The present law does not make any provision for determining the surpluses not needed by the purchasing agencies.

There are other defects in the law, and with the discontinuance of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the Work Projects Administration, and numerous other changes in our executive establishment, this problem of surplus property has become acute.

The President of the United States, in November of last year, sent a message to the Congress to advise them that he had established by Executive order for the disposition of surplus property as well as it could be done by Executive order, and recommended the enactment of legislation to provide for the handling of surplus property.

I am very grateful to my colleagues of the committee for their kind personal remarks. May I add that the bill as introduced first in December 1942 and then in the present Congress was H. R. 1610, which was considered by the committee for several months. The bill under consideration, H. R. 2795, is a substitute for the bill H. R. 1610.

This is not a partisan question. As a member of that committee I was assisted by the views and recommendations of all the members of the committee, and they were very diligent in attending the hearings, and particularly the members of the minority. I recall that the ranking member, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], was insistent that there should be no power vested in the Executive or any other agency that would authorize the disposition of property essential to the prosecution of

the war. The committee included that in the pending bill.

I recall again that the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] made a recommendation that there should not be a disposition of the gold and silver located at Fort Knox and West Point. That provision is contained in this bill.

I recall that other members of the committee made recommendations, particularly members from the minority side, that were utilized in the preparation and formulation of this bill. If there ever was, in my experience as a Member of this body, a bill reported that was a committee bill, it is the bill under consideration, because it undertakes to embrace the helpful suggestions which were submitted by all the members of the committee, including the gentleman named, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and numerous other members of the committee.

The Executive orders are set out fully and completely in the report.

There is a very clear analysis of this bill in the report of the committee. There is embraced in the report a copy of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, the existing law; and let me say before I yield for questions that I think a rather hasty but I trust a fairly accurate analysis of the provisions of this bill will be of benefit to the Members.

In the first place, as it is stated, it amends by inserting a new title in the Budget and Accounting Act without changing the subject matter of that act. Section 251 contains definitions. Property, in this bill means supplies, materials, equipment, and any tangible property owned by the United States, but does not include land, buildings, or their appurtenant facilities. The bill H. R. 1610, which was introduced and referred to this committee and providing for the disposition of personal property, did include land, buildings, and appurtenances.

I recall very definitely the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I recall that it was brought to the attention of this committee that the Committee on Buildings and Grounds undertook to handle that problem of the disposition of lands, buildings, and their appurtenant facilities and fixtures, some facilities having been included in the so-called Lanham bill—and I shall have something to say about that bill a bit later. It was passed in this House, but still reposes in the other body. That bill made available essential war materials, as we understood when the bill passed here. The definitions in this bill relate to tangible personal property with the exceptions named. According to the definitions of this bill, "surplus property" means any property which, pursuant to this title, is determined to be surplus to the function, activity, or project in connection with which it was acquired or accrued. I might refer to other definitions, but they are in section 251 of the bill and copies are available.

Section 252 undertakes to implement the purposes of the Budget and Accounting Act. I do not believe I overstate the case when I say that the pending bill is the most progressive advance that has been made in executive administration in the past 20 years; so, section 252, the second numbered section of the bill, provides that the Director of the Budget shall require inventories, estimates, and annual reports as to the transfers, disposition, or disposal of proceeds. The section provides that the Director shall make a periodic survey to ascertain what surpluses exist and to provide for standards of stocking and use, and require the fullest possible utilization of any surplus property by any agency in order to avoid unnecessary commercial purchases. The section requires the Director to submit to Congress at the close of each fiscal year a report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the next section 253 provides that there shall be no disposition of surplus property except as provided. That means that there has got to be, if it is transferred to any agency, an accounting. That means that if Congress appropriates money for a certain purpose and the purpose can be promoted by the transfer of property already acquired, that course shall be pursued and the receiving appropriation will pay the fair value into the Treasury, and thus the intent of Congress shall be carried out.

Section 254 undertakes to maintain this integrity of our appropriations. I have in mind an instance where Congress appropriated $5,000,000 for hurricane relief in New England following the hurricane and flood of 4 or 5 years ago. Two million dollars' worth of property was acquired by the Federal Government, but there was no statute on the books providing for the disposition of that property. There is such a statute in force in the District of Columbia. Section 254 of this bill attempts to do throughout the country what the District of Columbia statute does within the District in the handling of surplus property.

Section 255 provides for disposition of scrap, unusable property.

Section 256 provides a mandate to the head of every agency to determine and make available all surplus property, and directs the President to take such action in the event of inaction by the possessing agency. It further provides for reconditioning of property as found to be necessary and economical.

Section 257 provides that when property has been ascertained to be not needed by any Government department or governmental agency it shall be disposed of by sale or by lease in the domestic market, by sale or by lease to foreign governments, and if it happens to be in a foreign land, if it cannot be sold first to the Government then it may be offered in the commercial market of that country. For instance in Mexico it would first be offered to the Government and if the Government did not want it then it might be offered to the nationals of Mexico. Or, it may be disposed of to tax-supported institutions, per rules and regulations that are authorized, and may be prescribed by the President.

Section 258 relates to accounting with respect to the property, and, as stated in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from South Dakota, the proceeds are to be covered into the Treasury, except in the case of a reimbursable appropriation or corporate fund, so that the Congress can really get its fingers on the fiscal affairs of the agencies of the Government.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment.

There is a provision that was recommended by the Quartermaster General in section 258 relating to cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that he knows his subject thoroughly. Why does he insist on telling all about it before he yields to a question at any particular point? I see men who asked the gentleman to yield leaving the Chamber.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall be glad to answer any and all inquiries.

Mr. GIFFORD. Why does not the gentleman yield to these questions?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall be delighted to, but I shall probably anticipate many questions.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman talks on the subject while Members leave the floor after he declined to yield. I think the gentleman should yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall be delighted to yield. The gentleman has my permission to ask questions, but I will soon have completed my general explanation and feel sure that I am anticipating many of the questions.

With respect to the question asked by the gentleman from South Dakota, there are provisions in the bill that would authorize the rental of property referred to by him. Section 259, on pages 9 and 10, would undertake to extend to the other governmental agencies the privileges now accruing to the forest and road services. That is the matter that the gentleman referred to in his question, as I understand it, appearing on page 10.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. My question was based on the final sentence of that section, which ends on page 10, and provides that the proceeds from rentals shall be made available to the renter agency for the operation, maintenance, repair, or replacement of the equipment, and that in the absence of such an appropriation it will go into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. My question is based on the assumption that in some cases where the Government has a great deal of road-building machinery that will not happen.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, that is the purpose of the bill, to provide for payment into the general funds of the Treasury.

Mr. CASE. This is the point: In some cases the money received from that

rental will conceivably exceed the amount that is ever necessary for repair. There is no provision that that shall go into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts but will pile up; that is, whatever is received from the rental and repair fund.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say that the purpose of the section is to cover into the General Treasury all proceeds from such rentals which are not needed for operation, repair, maintenance, depreciation and management of the equipment rented, as I have already observed.

Mr. CASE. The language does not do that. It is only in the absence of a repair fund, but if there is a repair fund the repair fund will pile up end without end.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, but if it exceeds the needs set forth in lines 7 and 8 and which I have mentioned a moment ago, my thought is that the purpose of the committee was to undertake to require that that money should not remain in the hands of the department but should be covered into the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. CASE. But the language of the bill does not say that.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have tried to assure the gentleman that at least the Bureau of the Budget would know that the money was there when the time came to appropriate more money. I think what the gentleman from South Dakota wants to know is this: Does the gentleman think it advisable to have this bill amended just to add that that money shall be covered in the Treasury when the amount exceeds the amount needed for repair? I think the language here sufficient.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think that to whatever extent it exceeds the amount required for the purposes stated it should be covered into the Treasury and, as the gentleman from Massachusetts stated, this language was submitted to the Director of the Budget, to the Director of Procurement, and to the General Accounting Office with the specific instruction by members of the committee that generally, unless there was a specific fund where this money is required by law to be deposited, the proceeds should be covered into the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to interpose an observation and then ask a pertinent question. I consider this bill one of extreme importance now, during the war and immediately after the war when it will be even more important. Following the last war, is it not true that hundreds of millions of dollars of surplus materials and goods were disposed of recklessly with great loss to this Government, in some instances virtually given away, with scarcely no accounting, to brokers, fly-by-night purchasing corporations, and in some instances to racketeers, who then disposed of it to the public at high prices?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is substantially correct. The subject is covered in the report of the committee on the provisions of the bill. I propose to discuss war materials and war surpluses before I conclude my remarks.

Mr. DINGELL. Does the bill specifically provide against some of the violations of good practices of the Government in the disposition of surplus goods? Is that covered in this bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is as far as property is authorized to be disposed of, and I will come to the war materials in a few minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. I want to be definitely sure of that.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman from Mississippi has stated that this legislation has nothing to do with real property, yet on page 17, subsection (b) of section 4, referring to the committee investigation, states that its investigation shall include both real and personal property. With reference to the act that emanated from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the law itself provides the manner in which that property shall be disposed of. Furthermore, it seems to me with reference to much of this personal property that is in these various military and naval establishments secrecy must be maintained not only with reference to the location of it, but with reference to the purpose of its being there, and that divulging such information by a committee that goes snooping around would likely interfere with our war effort.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will anticipate the gentleman's question. I think that ample provision has been made to safeguard in both respects and I will cover that when I get to section 2 of the bill. I may say in passing that the land and buildings acquired by the Government were for the prosecution of the war and they cannot be disposed of under the terms of this bill, nor can any property in their possession or control be disposed of without the consent of the War Department, Navy Department, and Maritime Commission as the case may be; moreover, if the report of the special committee makes any recommendations, they will be referred to the proper committees of the House and Senate.

Mr. LANHAM. But the War Department, the Navy Department, and Maritime Commission does not have control of the property under the act to which I refer. I can understand with reference to surplus property such as typewriters, desks, and articles of furniture, things of that kind, that surplus property of that kind could be disposed of through administrative channels.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. I am afraid of the appointment of a committee to go all over the country digging into these things which are the responsibility of various legislative committees.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We have your views and we will come to that a little bit later. The special committee would guard all war secrets. It will not travel over the country.

Mr. McGRANERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McGRANERY. On that particular point, as I understood the chairman to explain the bill, he said property as defined on page 2 of the bill means any supplies, materials, or equipment or any tangible property owned by the United States or by any corporation, but not including any land or buildings. Then we go over to page 17, under subsection (b) and you say tangible property, both real and personal, acquired, held, or utilized for military purposes. That is apparently a very glaring contradiction.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is in error. The definition on page 2 describes the property that may be disposed of as surplus property. The language "real and personal property" on page 17 describes investigations that are to be made to develop facts that are not now available to the Members of Congress as to the land and buildings owned by the Government, and I will cover that in a moment. There is no provision in the bill for disposing of lands and buildings acquired for war purposes. The special committee will make recommendations to the Senate and House for the disposal of real property.

Mr. McGRANERY. Are not these legislative committees already set up by the Congress with full authority, capacity, and intelligence to do this?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; when and if they are furnished the facts. They will need all the aid, facts, and recommendations that the special committee could furnish.

Mr. McGRANERY. What is the view of this committee in bringing in a bill asking that a special committee be set up to usurp the very job now being done?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The job is not being done. No committee has recommended the way or manner to do the job of disposing of war materials. I will come to that part of the bill in just a few moments and be glad to cover it then, if I have not answered the gentleman's question already.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I should like to call to the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi, who is making a very interesting and able statement, the fact that he overlooked section 253 in his explanation of the bill by sections, and I call his particular attention to subsection (b) of section 253:

> In the case of any corporation owned or controlled by the United States the provisions of this title shall apply only in respect of materials, supplies, and equipment held or used by such corporation for administrative purposes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I anticipate the gentleman's question. I intend to say before I conclude that this bill does not authorize the disposal as surplus property of any of the substantive properties acquired by the corporations established for the prosecution of the war, or by any corporation owned or controlled by the Government. The only property belonging to those corporations that can be disposed of as surplus is the property known as administrative property, such as desks, typewriters, and things of that sort. That is one of the reasons this committee recommended the appointment of a committee to study that matter, because the disposition of the surplus war materials could wreck the economy of this Nation, I care not whether it be hotels, I care not whether it be minerals or strategic materials. For that reason, I shall undertake to state a few minutes later that the committee has recommended further study before we dispose of any corporation property and war materials, except property used for administrative purposes.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. If the gentleman will let me complete the question, because I want to get the legislative intent of the committee—in view of his explanation, then, the committee does not intend that this bill shall apply to machinery and equipment of the T. V. A. for the construction, maintenance, or operation of the power systems or the fertilizer and chemical operations and similar items of the T. V. A. program authorized by the Congress heretofore?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would say that those properties were evidently acquired for the functioning of that particular agency of the Government and would not be regarded as surplus property. If, however, the T. V. A. has now or at any time equipment, materials, or supplies which are surplus to its needs—by that I mean not essential for the functioning of the T. V. A.—such surplus other than administrative surplus would not be actionable under this bill, inasmuch as Public No. 17, 73d Congress, approved May 18, 1933, creates the T. V. A. as a body corporate and inasmuch as T. V. A. is thus a corporation.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. I am one of those who believe we should have less government in business. Does the gentleman's committee anticipate that when this surplus merchandise is dumped on the market it will come in competition with the regular, established business houses throughout the United States, and tend to break down their markets?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I answered the question, I think, a few moments ago, when I said unless additional provision was made for the surplus war property it could wreck the economic structure of the Nation. The purpose is to prevent dumping.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to section 260, the next section, I merely say that this section is intended to cover the disposition of property similar to that embraced in the Lanham bill (H. R. 1294). We passed a bill here and it was said it was necessary for the prosecution of the war, and it went to the Senate and has not passed the Senate as yet.

Section 261 provides that the powers vested in the President may be exercised by a representative named by him.

Section 262 definitely provides that the bill shall not be construed as a modification of the powers of the Comptroller General.

There are about 100 acts now for the disposition of surplus property by various agencies of the Government. The committee was very careful in reporting this bill not to provide that there should be disposed of any property of any kind essential for the prosecution of the war. So, under section 263, there are listed some 16 acts providing for the disposal of property by the War and Navy departments and the other essential war activities of the Government that are exempt from the provisions of this act.

Section 2, page 15, of the bill provides that during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate, there shall not be disposed of any property acquired by the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, or the War Shipping Administration, without the consent of these agencies, because it is presumed that those properties were acquired for the prosecution of the war.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. As the gentleman knows, there is a lot of equipment, trucks, and road equipment, left over from the C. C. C., stored around in warehouses. This material is needed badly in the farming communities and everywhere. It is just sitting around rusting and rotting down.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is one of the pressing necessities for the passage of this bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Under this bill, when it is passed, will someone have the authority to dispose of this material and get it into use?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Absolutely. That is one of the purposes of the bill and a pressing reason for its immediate passage, I repeat.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Under Executive order, at the present time does not the Procurement Division of the Treasury have authority to dispose of this property?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The representative of that Division says that authority is inadequate, that further legislative authority is needed.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. They have been disposing of property at the present time and have been doing it for some time under that order, have they not?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Because of the neglect of Congress to pass legislation for the proper ascertainment and disposition of the property, it is being handled by Executive order, and the purpose of this bill is to replace and supplant that Executive order.

In section 3 it is provided that after the date on which the President proclaims that the hostilities of the present war have ceased, no war materials, as described, may be disposed of except as may be provided by law enacted after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment. With all due deference, I think if I had made my connected statement, I would have anticipated most of the questions that have been asked. It was the view of this committee, when it rewrote the bill H. R. 1610, after 4 months of study, that the bill should provide for the disposition of surplus properties, and that there should be an inhibition against the disposition of any property, acquired for the prosecution of the war, unless it was done as provided by law, and with the consent of the war agencies, but with the cessation of hostilities there may be $50,000,000,000 in shoes, clothing, airplanes, tanks, trucks, cars, and the disposition of that property should be so handled that it will not wreck the economic structure of the Nation. With the advice that we had, with the lack of information that the committee had as to the amounts and the kinds of war material, with the lack of information our committee had as to the various Government buildings, of various lands that have been acquired, the hotels, and other properties in the prosecution of the war, before the committee was willing to recommend legislation to the Congress for the disposition of war material, of those war properties of every kind and description, involving, as I say, probably billions and tens of billions of dollars, the committee recommended that there should be a further study made of the question of war materials, and that question should cover real and personal property, all of the properties acquired for the prosecution of the war, and that that committee should have substantially the same powers that the so-called Byrd committee has now, to provide an investigator to go into the various departments and agencies of the Government, and ascertain for the committee the surplus properties that might be available after the war. And so, in section 4, the committee recommends that there be appointed a committee of five Members of the House, and five Members of the Senate, to study and accumulate information with respect to the various war properties of this country, and to submit interim reports and a final report to the Congress within 6 months.

It is fair to say that those reports will be referred to the proper committees having jurisdiction—to the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, I think they should go—as to the disposition of public buildings and lands acquired by the Government for war purposes, that are not essential to the continued existence of the Government. The reports would be handled as other reports,

and they would be referred in accordance with the rules of the House. The point is that when the Committee on Expenditures had before it a bill that would have provided for the disposition of real estate, the bill was amended so as to provide for further study before we vested any agency with the disposition of real property. This committee, if appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, would probably be the most important committee to be appointed during this session of Congress. We do not limit its membership to any committee, the Expenditures Committee, the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, or any other. We want the ablest Members, representing a cross section of views of the Congress, to study that question and report to the Congress with respect to the amounts, kinds, and methods of disposition of the property, to prevent just what the gentleman from Michigan, a few moments ago, said occurred after the First World War. The committee, in order to safeguard the contingent fund of the House, is authorized to expend $10,000 in the employment of an investigator, full time, something that would not be available to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds or the Expenditures Committee or the Committee on Military Affairs, one-half to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and one-half out of the contingent fund of the House. The report is to be submitted to Congress, so that, following the cessation of the war, disposition of property described and defined in this bill as war materials may be made by the Congress of the United States, after full investigation by a special committee composed of five of the ablest and best qualified men in the two branches of the Congress, who will formulate and report to the House and the Senate appropriate recommendations for legislation.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that much lumber has been piled up and burned, usable lumber and I am sorry the committee did not see fit to put in a provision making it a penitentiary offense for any officer in charge of any camp or Government property to give orders to pile up lumber or any other equipment and burn it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am very glad that the gentleman brought that to our attention, and it is probably the fault of the Congress that that very thing has happened, and will happen again unless we pass legislation such as this committee has brought to your consideration, which provides for the disposition of just such lumber and materials that now cannot be disposed of under legislation previously passed. I referred to section 260 previously in my remarks.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. POULSON. Is it not true that in the hearings it was shown that that was the reason why there was destruction of property. It was because we did not have a suitable method by which it could be disposed of.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is correct. He was in attendance on all of the hearings, and we profited much by his suggestions.

I would like to say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that I will be glad to answer, during the further consideration of the bill, any questions which the Members would like to ask. I feel a delicacy in consuming more of the time allotted to our side, although I have only one request for time.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has again expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. ROWE. After the committee of five makes the investigation concerning the dumping of materials back on to the market will that be confirmed by act of legislation within the House?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Absolutely. I stated a few moments ago that this committee would make an exhaustive study, as provided in section 4 of this bill, and submit interim reports. There is nothing to prevent the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for instance bringing in a bill in a week or six weeks from now on an interim report or without any report at all but the final report shall be submitted to the Congress within the next 6 months. For my part I am unwilling to leave to any individual, be he President, be he Director of the Budget, or Director of Procurement, or the Comptroller General, or any agency, without any checks or balances, the disposition of property that may aggregate $50,000,000,000. In my judgment, the most constructive feature of this legislation, in addition to providing for permanent better management of equipment and supplies and the disposition of surpluses that have been created, is the provision for a committee to study the question and report to Congress for additional legislation for the disposition of war materials.

I welcome questions but as I have stated, it was my desire to make a connected analysis of the bill before yielding for questions. At the risk of repetition I extend my remarks to analyze and explain the bill by sections and I adopt the language, in analyzing the bill, contained in the report that I submitted in behalf of the committee.

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 2795 BY SECTIONS

The Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, established the Bureau of the Budget and our Federal budgetary system. Since the permanent management controls which H. R. 2795 aims to provide are essentially of budgetary character, the first section of the bill proposes a new title, II–A, amplifying the original legislative charter of the budgetary system.

Section 251 defines the terms used throughout the bill and confines its coverage to the executive branch of the Federal Government exclusive of the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

Section 252 provides for the first time by affirmative legislation applicable throughout the executive branch the operational basis for effective executive management of equipment, materials, and supplies. It requires adequate inventory records as the first essential, periodic surveys of stocks on hand, the development and application of standards to govern both stocking and utilization, and the use of surpluses in the fullest degree possible to avoid unnecessary new purchases in the commercial markets. It centers these controls in the Bureau of the Budget and provides a congressional check of all operations under the title through an annual report from the Director of the Budget.

Section 253 prohibits the disposal of surplus property, as defined in this bill, except as provided in the new legislation and except as to the nonadministrative property of Government corporations. The intent of this exception is to leave these corporations entirely free of any effect by the bill upon their buying, stock-piling, or selling operations, but to apply executive management controls to materials, supplies, and equipment held or used by such corporations for administrative purposes.

Section 254 allows the departments and agencies, and administrative units within such departments and agencies necessary freedom of action in transferring surplus property within their respective jurisdictions. At the same time, and again for the first time in general legislation, the requirement is clearly set forth that the integrity of congressional appropriations must be maintained by payment of the full value of equipment, materials, and supplies transferred to them from surplus stocks.

Section 255 gives the individual agencies necessary operational freedom of action in disposing of equipment, materials, and supplies not necessarily surplus but damaged or worn beyond repair, scrap, salvage, and the incidental products of various field operations carried on by the agency disposing of such property. On the other hand, all such disposal functions are to be subject to Presidential regulations, with a view to uniformity of practice and conformity with sound policy. Property may be disposed of by donation under this section only in the event that it is shown to be unsalable and may be destroyed or otherwise disposed of only if not disposable by sale or donation.

Section 256 (a) provides a mandate to the heads of the executive agencies to release to the Procurement Division all usable or repairable equipment, materials, and supplies in their possession and surplus to the needs of the agency. That such a mandate alone is not enough, however, has been amply demonstrated. Human nature is acquisitive, and Government executives like other men, tend to acquire and hold such property beyond the point of need. Therefore the bill goes further, and directs the President to act in the event of failure to do so at the other levels of executive organization. All such property will be declared to the Procurement Division as

surplus, thus providing a focal point of knowledge as to what is available and where.

Section 256 (b) after providing for repair, rehabilitation, and storage, if and as necessary, prescribes the general plan for the transfer of surpluses within the executive branch. Section 256 (b) thus gives first priority to needs within the Federal Government in the disposal of surplus property.

Section 156 (c) gives second priority in disposal of surpluses, to sale or lease to tax-supported organizations of the States, Territories, and other local political subdivisions of the United States. Both the transfers among the Federal agencies and the sales or leases to non-Federal governmental units would be subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe and would be made at values fixed by the Procurement Division.

Section 57 (a) provides for the disposal by sale or lease in the domestic market, to agencies of foreign governments, or in open foreign markets of surplus property not needed by any Federal agency or other tax-supported organization within the United States. Sales or leases in open foreign markets cannot be made unless the property cannot be practicably disposed of through foreign governments. Donation of surplus property to tax-supported organizations or eleemosynary institutions and finally disposal by destruction or other method is provided for in cases where the property cannot practicably be disposed of by sale or lease through any of the channels previously mentioned.

Section 257 (b) requires that sale, lease, donation, destruction, and any other disposition shall be subject to regulations prescribed by the President. It prescribes further that such regulations as to sale or lease shall include provision for publication of the times, places, quantities, terms, and condition of the proposed dispositions of such property, and require advertising for competitive bids except as the President determines that competitive sales or leases would be contrary to the public interest.

Section 258 provides that all proceeds from the transfer, sale, lease, or other disposition of surplus property acquired by the use of funds appropriated from the general funds of the Treasury, and not by law reimbursable, shall be returned to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The lack of clear legislation requiring that agencies receiving transferred surplus property pay for same from their available appropriations, and that such payments be returned to the Treasury, has unquestionably resulted in expenditure of many millions of dollars which need not have been expended, or at least were not authorized by Congress. The requirements of this section will in no way hamper any authorized Government activity, and will yield very large returns to the Treasury. The section as written carefully protects reimbursable funds and the capital funds of corporations against impairment.

Experience has shown that the over-all attainment of maximum production through the most efficient utilization of a minimum of facilities and material requires frequent and repeated intercompany and intracompany transfers of such facilities and materials from the work under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts to do work under fixed-price contract and subcontract, and that prompt disposition be made of scrap, which is created in the course of such work and directed by the contracting officer. In furtherance of such ends and pursuant to advice of the Judge Advocate General, a contract clause is being inserted in cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts which authorizes such transfers when directed by the contracting officer, and provides that the proceeds thereof shall be applied in reduction of the cost of the work under the contract. The final sentence of section 258 is inserted to preserve the validity of such clauses insofar as they might be affected by the provisions of this section.

Section 259 is designed to promote more efficient use of Government-owned equipment and in the judgment of the committee would quite certainly produce important economies.

The most economical and efficient use of many items of equipment, particularly heavy machinery, tractors, road graders, and so forth, is secured only through fullest possible use of such items during their normal life period. Every general contractor knows this and fights against the waste of idle equipment against which the factors of depreciation and interest on investment are constantly running. Lack of fluidity of use with respect to Government-owned heavy equipment likewise causes duplication of investments and stocking by neighbor agencies, and excessive depreciation costs per unit of work performed. Limitations in existing legislation plainly discourage best utilization. Such limitations have been removed with respect to certain agencies such as the Forest Service and the Public Roads Administration. Section 259 would place all agencies upon an equal footing in this respect.

Section 260 is designed to be operative only in time of war. This section would extend the authority to sell or lease for war purposes any Government-owned equipment, materials, or supplies. As was pointed out in the committee report to H. R. 1294, much of the equipment (such as air-conditioning units and boilers and pumps of various kinds) is attached to and is a part of the buildings belonging to the Government and authority does not exist to permit its release. On numerous field projects of the Government which have been closed down for the duration of the war there are quantities of Government-owned fabricated steel, lumber, and other construction materials which it should be possible to pick up and put to use in the prosecution of the war.

Section 261 permits necessary freedom in delegation of authority by the President and the heads of executive agencies. It also authorizes the President to utilize the services and facilities of any unit of the executive branch in effectuating the purposes of this legislation.

Title III of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, established the office of the Comptroller General and defined his powers, duties, and functions. Nothing in the bill now reported should in any way affect that title, and section 262 removes any question on this point.

Section 263 specifically exempts from any effects of the proposed legislation certain provisions of law which the committee believes should be so exempted. Major exemptions are the authority of the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of vessels stricken from the Navy Register; that of the War and Navy Departments to interchange military stores, supplies, and equipment; the operations of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; the lend-lease programs, and the authorities of all agencies under the First and Second War Powers Acts. Except as specified in this section, the new legislation would modify or supersede all existing laws or parts of laws governing the disposition of surplus equipment, materials, and supplies to the extent of any conflict.

Section 263 concludes the amendment of the Budget and Accounting Act.

Section 2 of the bill defers application to the War and Navy Departments, Maritime Commission, and War Shipping Administration of the program of management and disposal under H. R. 2795 until 6 months after the termination of the war, or such earlier time as the Congress may designate, except to such extent as the heads of those agencies may find desirable.

WAR SURPLUSES

Various estimates have been made of the value of such property likely to be on hand at the termination of hostilities and it appears that such values may aggregate as much as $50,000,000,000.

Recognizing that legislation necessary to deal effectively with these war surpluses should be enacted only after most thorough study and investigation, and recognizing also the urgent necessity of enacting the general program of property management provided by H. R. 2795, the committee has added sections 3 and 4 to permit enactment of the general program and at the same time provide for the necessary study of the war surplus problem, and the development of legislation to deal comprehensively with that problem.

Section 3 would render the general program inoperative with respect to surplus war materials after the date upon which hostilities cease.

Section 4 provides for the creation of a joint congressional committee to make the required investigation of war surpluses and methods of disposition and finally report to the Congress not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the proposed legislation with recommendations as to necessary additional legislation and administrative action. The committee is directed to include within the scope of its studies, real property acquired or held for war purposes as well as personal property. The committee is also directed to submit

interim reports before the final report is made.

Section 5 of the bill is the customary authorization for such appropriations as the Congress may find necessary to effectuate its purposes. New appropriations will be necessary in the Executive Office of the President and the Treasury Department. It has been well demonstrated, however, by the partial controls already applied under Executive Order No. 9235 that such new appropriations will be offset manyfold by savings and direct returns to the Treasury resulting from sound management practices in this field.

Section 6 of the bill provides that this act may be cited as the "Surplus Personal Property Act of 1943."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] 25 minutes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few moments to point out to the Members of this body that the work of our Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is an excellent example of the new vigilance which has been evident in this Congress. Because this body has delegated its powers without realizing the extent of the powers that it was giving up or without realizing what a broad interpretation might be placed upon such delegations of power, our whole system of constitutional government has been threatened.

Our committee has been aware of the far-reaching implications of the bill as originally presented to us and we have made an effort to replace the undefined terminology of the original bill, H. R. 1610, with exact and carefully defined terms.

In a note which accompanied the original draft of the bill submitted to us the President stated its purpose as follows:

> To promote a more effective utilization of Government supplies and equipment both during and after the war.

We agreed with the President that legislation is needed for this purpose, but it would take very little imagination to see how this seemingly innocent legislation could by interpretation have been turned into one of the greatest grabs of power which the administration has ever made.

If the original bill had been enacted into law, it would practically have meant that we would have delegated to the executive branch the constitutional power of Congress to release or otherwise dispose of rights and property of the United States.

To give an example of the extent to which the proposed bill went, I call your attention to the language in section 220 of the original bill. It read:

> When the United States is in a state of war, and upon determination by the President that any land, building, appurtenant facilities, or fixtures, or any supplies, materials, equipment, or instruments owned by the Government and devoted to a particular use are urgently needed in the conduct of the war, are not subject to disposition as surplus property, and cannot otherwise be provided, he may authorize or direct the head of the agency having control thereof, in order to fulfill such need, to sell to nongovernmental agencies such property—

And so forth. Think what this would have meant—the President could have sold to nongovernmental agencies the land and improvements owned by the United States. The latest available report on how much the United States owns in land and improvements is the report of the Public Buildings Administration dated June 30, 1940, and even in this report the latest figures for the cost of improvements for War and Navy Departments are their 1937 figures. According to this report the United States owned 368,816,289 acres or almost one-fifth—19.38 percent—of all the land in the United States. This land and improvements cost us over $5,000,000,000. A few of the items included in this report are as follows:

Sample items taken from record of Federal real estate, by agencies (as of June 30, 1940)—Report made by Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration

Department and agency	Number of projects	Total acreage	Cost of Federal real estate		
			Land	Improvements	Total
Agriculture: Farm Security Administration	353	568, 107	$22, 764, 172	$92, 662, 679	$115, 426, 851
Navy: Yards and Docks	182	499, 961	25, 674, 127	[1] 488, 066, 328	513, 741, 255
War:					
Corps of Engineers	1, 028	1, 730, 142	57, 322, 083	567, 658, 910	624, 980, 993
Quartermaster Corps	549	2, 116, 862	62, 482, 223	[1] 630, 884, 672	693, 366, 895
Independent offices:					
Architect of the Capitol	16	206	17, 269, 166	76, 975, 169	94, 244, 335
Federal Reserve Board	1	5	737, 180	3, 801, 861	4, 539, 041
Federal Works Agency:					
(A) Public Buildings Administration	278	567	60, 100, 412	238, 255, 224	298, 355, 636
(2) Surplus Property	128	1, 369	3, 764, 445	22, 405, 550	26, 169, 995
(B) Public Roads Administration	6	111	159, 041	2, 456, 755	2, 615, 796
(C) U. S. Housing Authority	47	933	19, 087, 870	107, 204, 221	126, 292, 091
Home Owners Loan Corporation	1	1	1, 141, 500	1, 559, 378	2, 700, 878
Smithsonian Institution	14	199	276, 561	8, 767, 180	9, 043, 741
Soldiers' Home	1	500	326, 193	5, 474, 985	5, 801, 178
U. S. Maritime Commission	7	897	2, 302, 703	48, 713, 223	51, 015, 926
Veterans' Administration	96	64, 151	11, 919, 067	195, 564, 691	207, 483, 758
Grand total (includes omitted items)	14, 338	368, 816, 289	691, 524, 231	4, 409, 771, 729	5, 101, 295, 960

[1] 1937 improvement figure (1940 improvement figure not available).

These figures do not, however, present a true and accurate picture since they represent cost and not present-day values. It must be borne in mind that most of this acreage was acquired without cost.

Moreover, we have added a great deal since July 1, 1940, as a result of our war program. For instance, the War Department has acquired approximately 18,800,000 acres, of which 12,000,000 acres were already Government-owned lands transferred from other departments and the balance was purchased from private owners. Between July 1, 1940, and January 15, 1943, the Navy Department has purchased 813,382.59 acres, making an original deposit on them of $82,062,606.78.

In determining what property is owned by the United States it is also necessary to consider such agencies as the Defense Plant Corporation which has built, equipped, and now owns over 1,479 plants and facilities costing approximately $7,000,000,000, the disposition of which in itself will certainly present a complex problem at the close of the war.

Congress made some provision for surplus real property when it passed the act of August 27, 1935—Public, No. 351, Seventy-fourth Congress—which provides that whenever—

> Any real property located outside the District of Columbia, exclusive of military or naval reservations, is declared to be in excess of its needs by the Federal agency having control thereof, or by the President, on recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of Procurement with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is authorized (a) to assign or reassign to any Federal agency or agencies space therein, (b) to lease, or (c) to sell the same.

An example of property that could have been disposed of under the original H. R. 1610 was the Soldiers' Home. In the hearings before our committee—page 159—Mr. W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings, stated, in answer to a question from me, that the Soldiers' Home could have been disposed of had the words "land and buildings" remained in the bill. The Soldiers' Home property is now valued at about $10,000,000 and its 500 acres includes 140 acres in buildings and lawns, 200 acres of woodland, and 160 acres in farm land.

Some of you may recall that last year there was some talk of this land being used as a housing project and the soldiers presented a petition to Congress protesting. This petition, which appears on page 998 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 3, 1942, as part of the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, is in part as follows:

> Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, within the last hour 3 aged veterans from the Soldiers' Home in Washington have furnished me a petition containing three and one-half pages of typewritten matter from occupants of the United States Soldiers' Home, now having some 1,400 members. They furnished me a petition signed by more than 900 of the occupants of the home and asked that I present to the Congress this, their petition.
>
> It is my information that this property was acquired by the United States Government as a soldiers' home about 90 years ago. It is now proposed by some groups of people in Washington that they take over this property for the purpose of converting it into a housing project under the emergency of national defense—another one of the many things that is being cloaked in the robes of national defense interests in order to do something that ought not be done.

It is my information that the title to this property contains a bar against that kind of procedure; that it contains a restrictive clause which provided that this should not be done. I am not asserting this as a fact, but that is my information from these gentlemen. That provision provides that if and when the property is converted to any other use than the use for which it was intended—that is, a home for disabled soldiers—the title shall revert to the heirs or the estate of the donor or grantor, as the case may have been. Of course, that is a complete statutory bar to taking it except with that condition.

This last paragraph of Mr. MAY's statement is in error. Title rests in the United States with no penalty restrictions involved. The Congress can dispose of the property which it now holds as trustee for the soldiers. Mr. MAY continued his statement as follows:

I simply present this petition on behalf of those old soldiers, with the hope that Members of the House will read it, and if and when there is a proposal in the Appropriations Committee or the House Military Affairs Committee, or any other committee of Congress, that due notice will be taken of the right of these dependent defenders of our country.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include this petition therewith.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The petition referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1942.

To the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned, members of the United States Soldiers' Home, respectfully request your interest and protection in behalf of the thousands of veterans throughout the United States who are now entitled to the benefits of this home.

1. This home was established by an act of Congress approved March 3, 1851. By this act the Congress retained under its own jurisdiction the trusteeship for the old, infirm, and disabled soldiers of the Regular Army. The Regular Army veterans, therefore, have no one to look to for protection save the Congress and, in the 91 years of the existence of this home, they have never petitioned in vain. We know that we shall not be denied your protection now. For now we are under attack. Commercial interests are trying, under the guise of national defense, and civilian requirements, to get our property away from us and have proposed to send us "down the river" to land less desirable.

2. At this same time every effort is being made by the Park Commissioners to provide adequate parks and places of amusement for the residents of the District of Columbia. Now, what is this land but a public park? And it was the first such public park in the District of Columbia, maintained without one cent of cost to the taxpayer of either the District or the National Government. The entire cost of maintaining this home is paid by the enlisted men on the active list of the Regular Army. With the exception of the actual living quarters of the members in barracks and hospital, every bit of this land constitutes a public park of which there are all too few in the District. A glance at the record will show the following facilities of the reservation to be available to the public generally:

(a) Over 11 miles of surfaced roads within our gates open for traffic. We pay all costs of maintenance.

(b) Our gates are open 24 hours a day for public traffic, and over 99 percent of the traffic is by the public.

(c) Our grounds are extensively used as playgrounds for children, adults, their families, and friends.

(d) In winter we provide sledding hills for children and adults with protection against harm by our own local police.

(e) At Easter we provide egg-rolling lawns for crowds even greater than can be accommodated at the White House because we have a greater expanse of lawn.

(f) Throughout the entire summer we have evening band concerts attended by a large number of residents of the District of Columbia and visiting tourists.

(g) Sightseeing busses have the home on their itineraries and, recognizing it as one of the beauty spots of the District of Columbia, bring a large number of tourists here. Those who appreciate the beauty of the grand panoramic view of the entire city of Washington and the magnificent forest of trees have no wish to see these destroyed to make room for concrete buildings or commercial activities.

(h) We have built and maintain baseball fields for the children of the surrounding community, who use it freely, never realizing for a moment that this is not a public park. They think it is.

(i) Howard University is authorized to drill and train its Reserve Officers' Training Corps recruits on designated grounds.

(j) During the school year at least three grades, from kindergarten through high school, visit the home dairy and chicken farm weekly—frequently coming in busses accompanied by their teachers. College and university students and constituents of Members of Congress, particularly from rural districts, in the city on sightseeing tours, visit and inspect the modern dairy and thoroughbred Holstein herd of cattle, both from interest and educational purposes.

We are very proud of the historic honor which has been bestowed upon this home in the past when the soldiers of the Regular Army here were given the privilege of entertaining as a summer White House three Presidents of the United States, namely, Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Buchanan, and Mr. Hayes.

3. We not only live in this community and have our large group of friends here among the residential population, but as a group we contribute freely out of the meager compensation we receive to every charitable activity in Washington; in fact, we are among the first to be approached when the Red Cross, Community Chest, the Mile of Dimes, and others need help.

4. It has been estimated that there are now at least 2,000,000 veterans living all over the United States, who by their personal contributions have established their eligibility for membership in this home and who have a paid-up interest in it, even though they do not find it convenient to come here until they get old or need hospitalization. There may be added to this many more veterans of the present terrible combat. For the boys now in service there is nothing too good, and it is our hope that we may keep this home for them also. It may be stated here that of the number of resident members in this home at the present time, over 500 served in the World War; it is our firm belief that the citizens of the United States did not look upon us as parasites 20 years ago, and our brothers in service at this time should not look forward to being called parasites 20 years hence.

5. This home is our pride, the pride of the soldiers of the Regular Army. It has taken the contributions of several millions of them to build and maintain it, and we speak for each and every one of them when we ask you, as our duly constituted trustees, to protect our interests and insure that this institution shall remain forever intact, to be passed on to future old, infirm, and disabled members of the Regular Army in the same splendid condition, or even better, than when we received it from our predecessors.

6. In conclusion, we wish to go on record and assure you that we have the utmost confidence in the officers of this home, and we ask that before Congress ever even considers any proposition to destroy the effectiveness of this home, or its property, that no action be taken until after the officers of this home, its board of commissioners, and, above all, its governor, Maj. Gen. Frederick W. Coleman, have been heard from. General Coleman will speak well for us and for the millions of other veterans who have established an eligibility for this home; we know that he will leave nothing undone in our behalf.

Very respectfully yours,

BENJAMIN I. MOTLEY,
CHARLES M. ARMSTRONG,
HERMAN VEAN,
Committee, Representing Members,
United States Soldiers' Home,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, under the terms of H. R. 1610, Congress would have been helpless in doing anything to prevent the sale, conversion, or other disposition of this property. Our committee wisely decided that Congress should not delegate the power to dispose of such vast amounts of land, buildings, appurtenant facilities, and so forth, and, therefore, the property covered in H. R. 2795 includes only supplies, materials, or equipment—not land, buildings, or their appurtenant facilities, or fixtures, or any gold or silver. I hope that when Congress does consider the question of surplus lands and buildings it will not forget the petition signed by more than 900 occupants of the Soldiers' Home.

The committee then turned its attention to determining how much the bill, H. R. 1610, would cover when limited to supplies, materials, and equipment. As you will note from the committee report, we were amazed to find that no one knows what property the United States Government owns. Although the Government owns billions of dollars worth of property, there are no complete records of such properties. None of the departments have unified inventories.

The only comprehensive list of property that I was able to obtain was the Standard Stock Catalog which lists almost 30,000 different items now handled by the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, which procures or stores them. This alphabetical list ranges from abaci to zirconium-oxide, and includes almost anything you can think of, for example, aircraft, boats, and ships; animals; boilers, engines, tanks; chemicals; food; fuel; furniture; generators and motors; hardware; leather and leather goods; lumber and timber; machinery; metals; metal products; rubber and rubber goods; textile products; tools; vehicles, motortrucks, and so forth. However, this Standard Stock Catalog does not give amounts, so one has no idea of the value of the property now in the possession of the Government which might possibly become surplus. I cannot imagine a successful business of any kind being operated without any record of the properties owned by the business.

Everywhere our investigations showed poor management of properties. To illustrate how confused the records on property are, one agency's report to Congress on expenditures was $2,457,000,000 less than the figures the agency gave me in a confidential report on their purchases. Because of this lack of records,

and also because of the lack of uniformity in the standards for the utilization of property, the committee revised the bill to require inventories and uniform standards in the utilization of equipment, materials, and supplies, and we centered the responsibility for this in the Bureau of the Budget.

We realize, of course, that the real problem of disposing of surpluses will come at the end of this war, when, in all probability, the Federal Government will have surplus stocks of almost unimaginable size. Naturally, the War and Navy Departments cannot—for military reasons—reveal inventories of their present equipment, and if they could it would be impossible to say how much of this equipment will be destroyed or used and how much of it will be surplus at the close of hostilities. This may depend upon how soon and how suddenly the war comes to a conclusion.

We may get some idea of probable surpluses at the end of this war by examining the surpluses at the end of World War No. 1. At that time about 100,000 items became surplus in the War Department alone. New goods which had cost us almost $4,000,000,000 had to be disposed of—to say nothing of old supplies. War Department sales of surpluses included such items as airplanes which had cost almost $70,000,000, wool costing $324,000,000, machinery and engineering equipment costing $29,000,000, and ships, barges, and floating equipment costing $26,000,000. At that time at least 7,000,000 new pairs of shoes were declared surplus. Over 5,500,000 blankets were declared surplus. The War Department offered over 10,000,000 pieces of underwear for sale. Food declared surplus included 25,000,000 cans of beans, 31,000,000 of corn, 24,000,000 cans of peas, 84,000,000 cans of tomatoes, 45,000,000 pounds of bacon, and 38,000,000 pounds of roast beef. Part of our surplus railroad equipment was sold to the French Government for over $77,000,000. On September 30, 1920, the Quartermaster General still had on hand 3,275,584 new woolen service coats, 885,620 new woolen overcoats, 2,028,924 new leather jerkins, 5,802,892 new flannel shirts, 1,671,540 new wool trousers, and so forth, to mention a few items.

The money we spent on materials and equipment in the last war was only a drop in the bucket compared to what we are spending in this war. Consider, for instance, how the number of airplanes in the last war compares with the number in this war. At the end of World War No. 1 we had in commission 16,952 planes of all kinds, including 5,198 produced for us by the Allies. We had manufactured 16,000 Liberty engines. In last Monday's—June 7—papers we read that aircraft production will reach a $20,000,000,000 total this year for transport and combat planes combined and is scheduled to exceed $30,000,000,000 next year. The O. W. I. predicted that we would have 500,000 airplanes in the United States by 1950. Some of these planes are now capable of carrying 60 tons of cargo.

Each day newspaper accounts refer to the equipment now being turned out in huge quantities for our armed forces. We read of jeeps that swim, climb, and fly, of sky trains turned out by a plant in Oklahoma, of a fleet of new destroyer escorts, of aircraft carriers produced on a mass scale by Mr. Kaiser, of a new air-cooled submarine costing over $6,000,000. In March of this year we turned out 146 ships aggregating 1,516,000 dead-weight tons. This would be the equivalent of 18,000,000 tons a year or 5 ships a day. We have shipped almost as many tanks abroad on a single transport as the total number in World War No. 1. Supplying armies overseas has required the shipment from the United States of cargo averaging 82 pounds per day per man. In the first year of this war we shipped overseas 10,474,923 measurement tons of Army freight, not including shipments to the Allies. If you recall some of the items in the Navy budget you will form some idea of the tremendous amount being spent on equipment—for example, over nine billion on shipbuilding.

The Government may have huge quantities of certain commodities on hand at the end of this war. We have already contracted for 1,370,000,000 pounds of aluminum. On April 6, the Office of the Rubber Director stated that the Government owned 720,000 tons of crude and scrap rubber, not including tires. An article in the Washington Post of April 14 says:

> The synthetic rubber program was reported ready for a production of 813,000 tons in 1943, one-third to be produced from alcohol.

We know, also, that the Government has been purchasing huge quantities of foods. The American Institute of Food Distribution reported in March that the canners were holding between 40 and 75 percent of their entire pack of canned fruits and vegetables for the Government. According to the press, the United States has agreed to purchase 2,700,000 tons of sugar from Cuba in 1943.

In short, the War and Navy Departments are buying now enough food, clothing, blankets, tents, cots, mess equipment, medical and dental supplies, and so forth, to equip an army of at least 10,000,000 men. The vast quantities of supplies we will have on hand if the war comes to a sudden conclusion are almost beyond human imagination. It is anticipated that the surpluses will be worth at least $50,000,000,000, as compared to $5,000,000,000 at the end of the last war. In all probability there will be a great deal still in production when hostilities cease.

The problem which will confront this body will be to see that as much of this material as possible is turned into useful material for peacetime purposes. We must get the jeeps, trucks, and tractors onto the farms or use them in road building, and we must get the planes and ships into commerce. We must dispose of these surpluses with the least possible loss as far as the Government is concerned, but in doing so we must not destroy private business. Dumping of such huge amounts of goods on the market might wreck our peacetime economy. In a way the Government will be going into business in competition with private industry and the results may be disastrous for our economic system. There will also be the question of what to do with Government-owned war plants after the war.

The committee realized the complexity of the problems connected with the disposal of war surpluses and felt that further investigation of this whole matter was necessary. For this reason H. R. 2795 does not provide for the sale of surplus war materials after hostilities cease, except that scrap or material worn beyond repair can be sold. War surpluses can be transferred or leased to other agencies.

Section 4 of the bill also provides for a joint congressional committee to make a further study of this whole matter of disposing of surplus war materials after hostilities cease. I want to make it very clear that I am in favor of this entire bill except section 4. I expect to move at the proper time to strike out section 4. That section would mean that the committee of which I am a member and of which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is a distinguished member, will, after working for 5 long months on this important subject of surpluses, pass the responsibility to others. I, for one, believe that it is the function of the regular committees of the House, especially in this case, to study this problem. I believe that we should not pass this responsibility on to others, and that we should not authorize the appropriation of $10,000 for a special committee. I agree with the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] when he stated a few moments ago that we shall soon reach the point where we will be confronted with the necessity of appointing a committee to investigate the special investigating committees. Our committee has spent several months investigating this matter. The printed hearings have just now come in. The corrected and final hearings are the ones which contain on pages 159 and 160 a reference to the Soldiers' Home petition to this Congress asking it not to allow anything to happen that would let someone sell its land or buildings. I hope the Members will examine these final hearings.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Is the gentleman advocating that the surplus property of the War and Navy Departments be brought under the terms of the bill?

Mr. CHURCH. I am advocating the bill with the exception of section 4. Section 263 of the bill specifically exempts 16 different statutes, most of which deal with the War and Navy Departments. I have here a list of statutes which are either repealed or repealed in part—16 statutes are exempted in this bill; 19 statutes, I believe, if I am correct in the number, are not affected; 114 statutes modified or not affected.

Mr. CASE. I assume the gentleman has examined those statutes carefully. I would like to ask him what is the character of those statutes which are repealed; the general character of them.

Mr. CHURCH. They relate generally to the War and Navy Departments. I refer the gentleman to this final report of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I have always contended that the Government should adopt more businesslike methods, particularly in the handling of Government property. Although this supposedly was the aim of the original bill, I could not approve it because it would have meant that Congress would be giving away its power to dispose of properties amounting to staggering figures. Our committee has limited the bill sufficiently to prevent any great loss of congressional control, and I believe the amended bill we reported adequately provides for handling ordinary surpluses so that we may have the most effective use of Government properties possible. Let us make this just the first step in a drive for more efficient, more economical government. It is time for us to apply the common sense rules of good business management for only by so doing can we make our system of government succeed.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I feel that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] should be complimented on the very excellent report he has made on the bill. I, of course, disagree with him as to section 4. The committee and our chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY], should be commended for a fine piece of work, the result of many, many hours of patient study and investigation. Our committee has taken an innocent looking bill, H. R. 1610, entitled "A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921," which was potentially a threat to congressional power, and has completely rewritten it after four committee reprints into a bill worthy of the name that H. R. 2795 carries, the Surplus Personal Property Act of 1943.

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 2795. This bill is of particular interest to the citizens of my Sixth Missouri Congressional District by reason of the burning of Civilian Conservation Corps equipment, to which I will make further reference in a moment. The bill before us proposes to establish a Surplus War Property Committee of five Senators and five Representatives. This committee would be authorized to make a prompt and complete study of the types, qualities, values, location, and custody of war materials and other tangible property, real and personal, which may reasonably be expected to be in possession or control of any agency at the end of the war. The committee would be ordered to report to Congress the results of this investigation within 6 months, together with recommendations for legislation and administrative action to insure orderly disposition of the property. The committee which submits this bill to us for approval now has wisely said:

> Our problem is to see that these enormous supplies will be wisely disposed of. Otherwise they might be used to destroy private enterprise. Our soldiers, when they come back, will want to work in private industry, not at raking leaves for the Government. Unless these materials are wisely handled, there will be more millionaires made after the war than during it.

The report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments also says:

> Efficient executive management of the Government's great and growing investment in equipment, materials, and supplies, and the control of the Congress over the use and disposition of such property are seriously handicapped by the lack of comprehensive legislation. The essential foundation of management standards in determining what quantities should be bought, and similar standards to govern utilization, are conspicuous by their absence. Although the accrual of surpluses is an inevitable feature of the active operations of government, the determination and release of such surpluses is entirely within the discretion of thousands of widely scattered executives. Good housekeeping in government obviously requires that surplus equipment, materials, and supplies be disposed of promptly and efficiently. Yet excepting statutes which deal with specific segments of the Government and with specific categories of property, the executive authority for disposal of surpluses is only implied, and the methods of disposal undefined.

I well remember that after the last war certain individuals with influence in the War Department were able to buy at bargain prices vast quantities of war materials which they sold at retail to the public. Every town had its "army store." Great fortunes were made at public expense. On the other hand, much of this material, clothing, airplanes, tools, and so forth, was simply piled up and burned. That got the Government into a bad habit which it has pursued to the present day. I sincerely hope that enactment of the bill before us will go a long way toward putting an end to such a practice.

C. C. C. FIRES IN MISSOURI

In April 1943 the people of Missouri were shocked by disclosures that abandoned equipment from five Civilian Conservation Corps camps in the Mark Twain National Forest, in Missouri, had been collected and burned under supervision of the local Forest Service director. It was burned, according to the director, because there was no legal way these wheelbarrows, saws, picks, shovels, plows, seed sowers, wheels, axes, and so forth, could be given away or sold to the farmers needing them except by untangling red tape over a period of 2 ensuing years.

When this incredible situation was called to my attention, I at once asked the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Federal Security Administrator for a full report and investigation. After a lot of buck-passing between these officials, I got no information. Then I prevailed upon the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives to conduct an investigation. An able investigator was sent to the scene of the bonfires and there interviewed witnesses and fixed responsibility.

To make a long but interesting story short, it developed that 2,100 items of property, much of it rationed and unobtainable by farmers in the area, had been destroyed. Much of this material was new. The estimated value of the total was between one and two thousand dollars. On May 20, 1943, after the committee had submitted its report, I received a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture admitting that an error had been made in disposition of the property and that action had been taken to prevent any further similar occurrences in his Department. This incident was hard on the morale of the people. They sent their sons to war. They bought Government bonds. They paid increased taxes. And they saw their Government waste their substance.

Today this House is considering legislation which involves not $2,000 worth of Government property but between fifty and one hundred million dollars worth. Certainly there is every reason to believe that the measure before us is an intelligent preliminary approach to a serious problem. Adoption of this measure, I believe, will be good insurance against future fires. We owe it to the people, as Members of Congress, to save their money and by so doing to preserve the soundness of our economic structure. There has been too much of this business of playing fast and loose with the other fellow's pocketbook.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I feel impelled to say a few kind words about the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I had been led to understand that it was a committee which never, by any chance, had any bill referred to it and never had anything to do.

The legislation that has been referred to it is legislation of the utmost importance. The bill which is now being considered deals with only one aspect of a very great situation, namely, the disposition of surplus Government property, whether land or buildings, or personal property, whether during the war or after the war.

This bill is narrow in scope. It deals only with "property" which is defined as supplies and materials, or equipment, or any tangible property owned by the United States or by any Government-controlled corporation and does not include land or buildings or fixtures or appurtenant facilities, or gold or silver. We have in mind, of course, the Government-owned gold in Kentucky or the silver at West Point.

The committee made a very careful study of this whole legislative project and the field with which it attempts to deal. The really amazing thing to me about this bill is that it was not passed at least as early as the year 1812. It certainly ought to have been passed then, and every day of delay in passing a measure of this sort is regrettable, because throughout the history of the United States, even in its most modest beginning, the Government must have had some surplus property. The passage of this bill would eliminate dealing with this property by directives, by Executive orders, and by other pseudo-legislative devices, that were resorted to even in the last war. President Wilson, on Decem-

ber 3, 1918, issued an Executive order, No. 3019. I merely want to call attention to the fact that even in those crude days they could do pretty well piling up Executive orders. That Executive order dealt simply with the disposal of surplus property in the District of Columbia and it was not until 10 years later that Congress passed appropriate legislation dealing with property in the District of Columbia.

Those who have already spoken have emphasized many of the provisions of the bill and I do not desire to cover the same field. I would simply call attention to one or two of the provisions which seem to me important. I think that the inventory provisions, which are found in section 252, are extremely valuable. There was no preexisting legislative requirement for the Government to know anything about what the various bureaus and agencies actually owned.

I would also like to call attention to the provisions of section 263, about which there seems to have been some misunderstanding. In this section you will find enumerated 16 preexisting statutes. Those statutes are not repealed. They are left subsisting, with the exception that "all laws or parts of laws governing the disposition of surplus property or the disposal of proceeds therefrom are modified and superseded to the extent of any conflict with the provisions of this title."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I dislike to interrupt his interesting presentation.

Mr. HALE. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that in including these 16 sections the committee and the gentleman chiefly among the members of the committee interrogated the Army and the Navy and the war-service agencies to be very certain that we had exempted any legislation that might otherwise authorize the disposition of any material essential to the prosecution of the war?

Mr. HALE. The gentleman from Mississippi is entirely correct, and we had the statutes searched very carefully for any legislation that might be affected by this bill or that would be undesirably affected by this bill, and the statutes which are being preserved by that exemption contained in section 263, are statutes which were deemed valuable by the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and so on.

It appeared at the outset that the Secretary of the Navy was a little bit afraid that the Director of the Budget might sell a battleship as surplus material, and we did everything possible to allay any apprehensions that he might have upon that point.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that this bill will obtain unanimous passage, because I think it deserves it.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] stated that he was surprised to have such an important bill referred to this committee. It is my belief that not only the members of the committee but those who sponsored the bill did not realize how important it was; otherwise the bill never would have been referred to this committee. As it is, however, it turns out to be what I think is one of the most important pieces of legislation which will confront this session of Congress; in fact I think this is just the start of legislation along this line; this is really a preliminary step.

We have all heard the old adage that the time to repair the roof is in the summer—not on a day like this—rather than waiting until winter. The time to consider legislation such as contained in this bill is the present, not waiting until the time when it is necessary to dispose of these billions of dollars of surpluses—and I call attention to the fact that it is spelled with a "B" instead of "M"—it is billions we shall have to deal with in the matter of surpluses to be disposed of after the war.

When we opened these hearings we were like people drilling for a water well but discovering oil; in other words we soon began to realize the wide scope this bill covered; we were beginning to realize that this would affect the economy of the country, that it would offer the greatest opportunity for graft since the First World War; in fact I may say that we have already found many people who deal in second-hand commodities making inquiries as to the prospective disposition of this bill. I found it was an important bill and I consider section 4 very important. I take the same stand as does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] that this bill is so important that the best men in Congress should be placed on this committee. I feel we have some of those men in our committee, but if the leaders on both the majority and minority sides consider that other Members should serve on it I feel that the job is big enough that they should approach the problem in that fashion. I will say, however, that this committee has spent 4 months of intensive study on the work and there are many Members on the committee who are qualified; so I do not have the same fears some of the Members do.

The thing that appalled me and something I never realized was that the Government set-up is so inadequate that although we have set up proper procedures for appropriation of money and the spending of money we have no machinery set up to dispose of such things as surpluses; in fact this is one of the reasons why they destroy materials, burn them, give them away, or abandon them, because the "red tape" they have to go through otherwise is so great they cannot dispose of it. Because of my profession I was particularly interested in the subject of inventories. I was absolutely surprised and shocked to find out that the Government had no check, did not have any type of inventory, did not know anything about the quantities of any particular commodities they had in any particular department.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Similar statements have been made before. I was just wondering if the Commodity Credit Corporation does not keep inventory of everything they have. I imagine some of the other departments do also.

Mr. POULSON. That is a separate corporation, I understand. I am speaking now of the general set-up of the principal departments. They have not operated at all on a business basis. I would be surprised if any business would be able to continue very long operating as the Government has in many of its business enterprises.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I did not get the import of the question asked by the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. My remark was that at a recent hearing before the Committee on Banking and Currency it was developed that the Commodity Credit Corporation kept a complete inventory of its assets and liabilities every year, and I wondered if that situation did not exist also in the case of other corporations of the Government.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to answer the gentlewoman's question?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That may be true of corporations; unfortunately it is not true of the Government; and, mind you, this has to do with governmental inventories rather than the inventories of corporations. I believe that answers the gentlewoman's question.

Mr. POULSON. We believe this bill will correct that situation.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction of the record?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman from Mississippi realizes that the effect of this bill is on the administrative properties which is different from the inventories of Government corporations. Is not that right?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Unquestionably, but the gentlewoman from Illinois asked about the inventory of property of the Surplus Commodities Corporation and I specifically stated that insofar as the corporation is concerned they had their inventory, but this provides for an inventory of administrative corporations, and not real-estate corporations.

Mr. POULSON. This bill provides for the handling of surplus Government property. This bill can definitely be stated as being in two parts, one dependent upon the other. The main bill sets up the machinery and procedure by which we may dispose of surpluses, such as we had today in the case of the W. P. A. and the C. C. C., without all the red tape which has heretofore been necessary. This brings a little more efficiency into governmental procedure. This legislation does not purport to establish procedure for post-war disposal of surpluses. We are contemplating future legislation to take care of that problem.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With respect to the investigation of this committee as to real estate, the gentleman was most attentive and most helpful in the hearings. I would like to ask the gentleman if this is not a correct statement with reference to the inquiries of the committee as to Government real estate: If there was one subject that the committee pursued most diligently without ascertaining full information it was as to the various kinds of real estate, including hotels and other institutions, bought by the war agencies since this war began.

Mr. POULSON. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And if we need an investigation of any one thing, that is the one we need it on.

Mr. POULSON. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I consider that section 4 is just as important as the other parts of the bill. I feel that the integrity of the leadership of this House is such that they will appoint the best men and in doing so they will look over the present committee. If they feel that the ability is there, which I know it is, they will be fair in their discretion and I do not feel that we should use our selfish motives in opposing such a wise bill with so much importance attached to it.

Mr. BISHOP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BISHOP. Did the gentleman have it called to his attention about the machinery and equipment that is now stored from the C. C. C. camps, also from the N. Y. A., and also from the W. P. A.?

Mr. POULSON. Yes.

Mr. BISHOP. That stuff at the present time is being burned?

Mr. POULSON. That is right. We do not have any machinery set up to dispose of that in any fashion satisfactory to the department heads. They all have a certain responsibility that makes them hesitant to dispose of it.

Mr. BISHOP. In other words, this committee then would look into that phase of the matter?

Mr. POULSON. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Did I understand the gentleman to agree with the statement that some property is being burned at this time?

Mr. POULSON. The subject was brought up by the gentleman from Iowa that he knew of lumber being burned, and it was brought out in the committee by our very distinguished ranking Member that in his territory they burned wood and many other materials because they did not have any method of disposing of it. That was the answer given to us by some of the department heads.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, the question of inventories on the part of governmental departments is extremely important. Very few of the membership are aware of the fact that there is no inventory kept of Government property. It seems amazing that the biggest business in the world should not know exactly how much property it owns, but that is the condition of the United States Government today. This bill is merely an approach to this great problem of surplus commodities. As has been pointed out, some $50,000,000,000 is involved and this committee is endeavoring to approach the problem through the present bill.

I have been asked by any number of Members, "Are you for this bill"? Of course we are for the bill. We believe it is the first genuine effort that has been made to approach this problem in a sensible, businesslike manner. I am sure I voice the opinion of the minority members of the committee when I say that we are definitely for the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO].

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, today I find that the House is just about as anxious to know something about how this bill got to the floor as we were with reference to how it got to our committee. When the bill was first introduced, it was a very interesting piece of legislation, and I refer to the original H. R. 1610. I think my friend, Mr. Scott, representing the Budget Bureau, who is probably listening now, will tell you that the Committee on Executive Expenditures is probably one of the hardest committees to convince that the Budget Bureau's position is right that they have been before in the House. When you look over on the Democratic side you find the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], who can ask about as many questions as anybody and when you get over to the Republican side you find the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] who can ask many questions and makes a few ironic observations from time to time; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH], do the same.

I do not think that the House need fear this legislation because it certainly has been gone into very capably and very ably by Members on both sides of the House. There has been absolutely no partisanship. At times we were a little bit nasty with the Budget Bureau and sometimes I joined in those bitter attacks.

We were utterly amazed when we started the hearings to find out that there is no agency in the Government that knows how many desks, how many typewriters, how many pencils, how much of any material we have. We were amazed to find that the surpluses that the Government owns are being disposed of under about 134 statutes and the Lord knows how many Executive orders. As a matter of fact the surplus of between $25,000,000 and $40,000,000 of W. P. A. material needs to be disposed of immediately. But it takes legislation to enable the Government through the Procurement Division to dispose of that property.

I have been somewhat interested in the distribution of the war surpluses. Of course, we all recognize the necessity of legislation to place in a central agency the distribution of administrative supplies, but enormous war supplies will be on hand at the end of this war. We hope we may have more than is necessary. Those war supplies will be so enormous that we could absolutely destroy private enterprise if we did not place every safeguard around the distribution of those supplies. It might interest you to know that at the end of the last war we had $7,000,000,000 worth of surplus war material. At the end of this war it is estimated we will have anywhere from fifty to one hundred billion dollars worth of surplus war materials. We will probably have 150,000 airplane engines, we will have anywhere from 90,000 to 160,000 planes, and, of course, if we dump those planes on the market there would be quite a few people who could make millions of dollars out of it. This dumping would retard your aviation industry.

The creation of an organization to dispose of this enormous surplus after the cessation of hostilities will be a stupendous task. We have left room for that to be done, because we think more study should be given. We will have at least 10,000,000 men discharged from the Army. There will be at least 30,000,000 men who will be thrown out of work the day the armistice is declared. Those men will want to go into private industry and make an honest living. They will not want to rake leaves. They will not want to work under W. P. A. or some of these dreamy schemes that some of our planners have now. They want to come back to the American way of life.

I think it is most important that we protect our private enterprise and see that these men are given jobs in private enterprise. Of course, if it is necessary to absorb some of the people on public works, we will be compelled to do it, but the more that can be absorbed by private industry the better it will be for our way of life, for the workers, and for the taxpayers.

After the last war industry was able to speedily convert war-production plants to production for the civilian market, due to the fact that they were able to set aside large capital reserves out of the profits. That is something we should remember. In this war our industry is not going to have much set aside in the way of surplus to reconvert to peacetime production, because we are taking it away from it in taxes. After taxes most corporations will have less than one-tenth of the capital they had to convert to civilian production after the last war. Credits from banks will be hard to obtain due to the heavier investment in Government securities.

On November 11, 1918, war contractors held unfilled contracts in the sum of $7,500,000,000. At the end of this war the unfilled contracts will be between $75,000,000,000 and $100,000,000,000. A much larger proportion of industry is en-

gaged in the production of war materials in this war than during the last war. This will make the problem of reconversion doubly difficult.

In disposing of the enormous surplus of war materials there will be plenty of room for corruption, fraud, and sharp practice. It will be possible, unless we surround the disposition of the surplus war material with every precaution, for the unscrupulous, the unethical, to make enormous profits. We can have more millionaires after the war is over just as easily as we can have them during the war. I am sure that today there are many of these unscrupulous characters in Washington with their eyes on this enormous surplus. We do not want it to fall into those hands, because it will have two bad effects. One of them is, it will be cheating the taxpayers out of a fair return on their investment, and the other is that it will be cheating us all when we destroy the very business that has made America great.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have just inquired of the chairman of the committee whether or not this bill as it is drawn will be broad enough to allow the Commodity Credit Corporation to dump surpluses of cotton and other materials.

Mr. MANASCO. I may say to the gentleman that in the committee I brought up that question because I am interested in cotton, and I found that under the original bill, H. R. 1610, the Government could have sold everything from a battleship to a toothpick, including all the supplies in the different corporations; so we specifically exempted all Government-owned corporations from the sale of any surplus except administrative equipment, such as desks, typewriters, pencils, and so forth.

Mr. WRIGHT. Where do you do this?

Mr. MANASCO. It is on page 4, line 19, subsection (b) of section 253:

> In the case of any corporation owned or controlled by the United States the provisions of this title shall apply only in respect of materials, supplies, and equipment held or used by such corporation for administrative purposes.

This excepts all the property owned by the Metals Reserve Company, the Defense Plant Corporation, and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WRIGHT. That would include surplus crops also, in the opinion of the gentleman?

Mr. MANASCO. We were afraid they might decide to try to sell some cotton and wheat, contrary to the will of Congress, so to keep them from doing this we put in this provision.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I do not see how your bill can prevent a terrific drop in prices. You are going to have all these goods on your hands. How are you going to prevent the purchase of the goods at unconscionable prices?

Mr. MANASCO. That is the reason we want further study. We want the recommendation of everybody.

It may be interesting to know that I introduced a bill, H. R. 2498, that would create a board composed of certain Cabinet officers and members of industry and representatives of the consuming public to protect our economy after this war is over. One of the most important things to keep in mind is that we can destroy the very Government we are fighting today to preserve by dumping these enormous surpluses without proper safeguards.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Is it the gentleman's idea that you are creating here the machinery that will control the drop in prices, so that prices will not go clear down?

Mr. MANASCO. It would be humanly impossible to pass any legislation that would safeguard every situation, but we are trying to have a general control that will protect the consuming public as well as the taxpayers and the Government.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. Is anything done in this bill to extend the purview of the bill to the Alien Property Custodian?

Mr. MANASCO. The Alien Property Custodian, as I understand, will probably not be covered by the provisions of this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This bill covers only the property owned by the United States. The property of the Alien Property Custodian is not owned by the United States but is held in trust by him. It is not embraced in the terms of this bill.

Mr. COFFEE. I did not think that was strictly under the supervision of the committee or came within its jurisdiction.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is not within the terms of this bill.

Mr. COFFEE. I recall that at the end of the last war there was a scandal of about $1,500,000,000 very badly handled by the then Alien Property Custodian. I do not want to see a repetition of it. I am advised there will be seven billions of alien property sequestered by us in this war. We must be vigilant that it be administered with scrupulous honesty and fairness.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. I commend the gentleman for the very fine statement he has made to the House about the bill.

Mr. MANASCO. I thank the gentleman. It may be advisable for the Government to sell some of the surplus property to the manufacturer. This procedure would enable the manufacturer to stay in business after the war, and not be consumed with the fear of having no property to sell or anything of that kind. And when this manufacturer does not have enough cash to acquire the surplus material, it might be to the best interest of our country to extend long-term credit.

Mr. Chairman, I think this question is one of the most serious questions affecting us at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in behalf of the Members upon my side of the aisle that all but one of the Members were practically present at all of the hearings. The one Member to whom I refer was unavoidably absent, being engaged on another important committee. I presume that the other side of the House might have occasion to state the same reason for any of their absentees. But I may say that the Republicans were at practically all of the committee hearings. I say that in justice to these new Members. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE], who was so attentive, has spoken today. Permit me to talk a little about one of the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. GILLETTE], a modest member of that committee, who attended to his duties faithfully. I often find myself that I can entertain best by listening. He listened, and I think it is due him to have that statement made, because he has not, as a new Member, taken any part in the discussion today, which, of course, he could do if he wished.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Speaking for the Pennsylvania delegation, I assure the gentleman from Massachusetts, that we very much appreciate his expression in respect to our colleague [Mr. GILLETTE]. He is all that the gentleman has described, modest, retiring, but we have found him to be one of the solid, substantial Members of our delegation, who always contributes someting worth while.

Mr. GIFFORD. In politics modesty, of course, is always timely. I have not been very modest myself, but still it is a virtue that I greatly admire.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman, in spite of all of his words, is usually modest. In discussing the work of this committee, he has not given to the public the information that I have received in private from his colleagues, and that is respecting the distinguished and painstaking work that the gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking member of the committee, has contributed to this difficult subject.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, I always give painstaking work, and in fact my work often inflicts pain. The gentleman from California said that I am sometimes sarcastic. As an old high-school teacher I might suggest that there is not a word of sarcasm in all of these hearings. There may be some ironical statements, but they are vastly different. I think you should agree with that. Perhaps I may well continue with this explanation. I will do so but agree to delete it from the RECORD. At least it may be entertaining and I may hope profitable.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes. I did not want to consume too much time in my presentation in chief. For that reason I probably did not answer some of the inquiries as fully as I would like. I take this time now to answer some questions that were propounded during the debate, and some questions that have been asked privately during the progress of the debate on the floor. The question was asked whether the Commodity Credit Corporation would come under the terms of this bill. For two reasons it would not. It would not in the first place, under the definition of surplus property. That corporation would be organized for disposing of surplus property, and that is its function. That would be outside of the definition of surplus property. In the next place in all property of any corporation, including the Commodity Credit or any other corporation organized under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, only administrative property, like desks, typewriters, and so forth is within the terms of the bill.

A question was asked by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to which I wanted to respond more at length, whether or not in the event the rental exceeded the cost of repairs, the excess would be covered in the general funds of the Treasury. I might have said to him as I now say that the rental would not only cover the repairs, but would cover maintenance, operation, depreciation and management, but the information of the committee generally was that that would be less than the rental, but remembering that members of the committee want to protect that one thing among others, this committee stood for turning the money back into the Treasury, as miscellaneous receipts. We will offer an amendment to make that provision more definite.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to express my appreciation of what he has said.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman from Iowa has asked about the disposition of lumber not used. Under section 260 of this bill, if there is any property anywhere at any time such as that embraced in the so-called Lanham act, which we passed in the House—it has never passed the other body—any lumber or cement or any material on any project where the construction has been stopped, that can be made available to the Government without purchase or reduplicating. I have already made answer to the inquiry respecting the Alien Property Custodian. That property is in trust and it is not within the terms of this act.

Mr. Chairman, someone rather questioned the wisdom of this committee and the investigation with respect to land. As already has been stated during this debate, the millions and hundreds of millions of dollars invested in lands for war purposes is an important matter.

This special committee which we have recommended the Congress to appoint will not be a roving committee. It will not be a committee to hold hearings or conduct junkets throughout the country. There is only $10,000 available to that proposed committee. That will be a working committee. When we send down to one department after the other in an effort to find out how many acres of land, how many hotels, how many buildings there are and have one department say they do not know and that the other department does, we authorize a subpena here to give the special committee that definite information. In other words, if there is one thing we want to know about and with millions and millions of dollars invested in it, it is real prpperty as well as all other types of property. It is not contemplated that there will be a delay until after the war before legislation is passed for the disposition of surplus war materials or property. That committee may make interim reports. Whenever legislation is needed at any time it should be reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, by the Committee on Expenditures or any other committee having jurisdiction, but the final report of the special committee must be submitted in 6 months. This resolution gives that committee power to subpena and power to appoint an investigator and it protects the Treasury.

May I say in conclusion that I have had some experience with investigating committees. I believe I have a unique record of having been chairman of two successive committees in two Congresses, that did a great deal of work and did not spend a cent of money that was appropriated to them.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. There were two questions I wanted to ask. Does the bill contain anything pertaining to the war minerals and metals deposits which the Government has supplied which may be surplus?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. During the progress of the hearings it developed that any such minerals are owned by corporations. They are not within the terms of this bill. They will have to be disposed of by subsequent legislation or by their charters.

Mr. MURDOCK. Secondly, with regard to land where the Government has used its own public domain for bombing purposes, or war training, and that sort of thing, has there been any arrangement made about the restoration of such land to its original uses and users?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Lands, buildings, or other appurtenant facilities or fixtures are expressly reserved for further legislation and are not included in the terms of this bill. The pressing necessity for this bill is the discontinuance of W. P. A., with about $20,000,000 worth of property; the property of the N. Y. A. now piled up; and the Director of the Budget and the Assistant Secretary of War say they are eliminating 50,000 or 60,000 employees, and that will eliminate administrative property that ought to be disposed of.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The Members will notice that the first section of this bill goes to the middle of page 15. Inasmuch as the bill has been analyzed section by section, I take the liberty, after conferring with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], of asking unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point and that amendments to any section of the bill be in order at this time.

Mr. GIFFORD. As far as that is concerned, I hope there will be no objection to the request.

Mr. LANHAM. Reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry, whether or not any amendment is pending at the Clerk's desk?

Mr. GIFFORD. I understand that any amendment can be offered to any portion of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent request amendments would be in order to any part of the bill.

Is there objection tc the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 20), is amended by inserting at the end of title II thereof (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 31, secs. 11 to 24, inclusive) the following:

"TITLE II-A—UTILIZATION AND DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY

"SEC. 251. As used in this title the term—

"(a) 'Agency' means any executive department, independent commission, board, bureau, office, agency, or other establishment of the Government, including any independent regulatory commission or board and any corporation owned or controlled by the United States, but does not include the legislative branch of the Government, the Supreme Court of the United States, or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

"(b) 'Administrative unit' means any bureau, office, or similar administrative unit within any agency.

"(c) 'Property' means any supplies, materials, or equipment or any tangible property owned by the United States or by any corporation owned or controlled by the United States, but does not include any land, buildings, or their appurtenant facilities or fixtures or any gold or silver.

"(d) 'Surplus property' means any property which, pursuant to this title, is determined to be surplus to the function, activity, or project in connection with which it was acquired or accrued.

"(e) 'Director' means the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

"(f) 'Procurement Division' means the Procurement Division in the Department of the Treasury.

"(g) 'Tax-supported organization' means any unit or instrumentality of government, or any scientific, literary, educational, or public health or welfare organization, which is supported in whole or in part through the use of funds derived from taxation by—

"(1) The United States or the District of Columbia;

"(2) Any Territory or possession of the United States or any subdivision of any such Territory or possession; or

"(3) Any State or any subdivision thereof; but such term does not include any agency (as defined in par. (a)).

"SEC. 252. In order to carry out the purposes of this title—

"(a) The head of each agency shall (1) establish and currently maintain, in such form as the Director may approve, an inventory of such classes or items of property in the possession or under the control of the agency, as the Director may designate; (2) submit to

the Director such estimates of property needed, and such reports in relation thereto, as the Director may deem necessary; and (3) at the close of each fiscal year submit to the Director such report as he may require of all transfers and dispositions of property under this title (excluding sec. 263) during such fiscal year and of the disposal of the proceeds.

"(b) The Director shall (1) periodically survey property in the possession or under the control of each agency and the utilization thereof, (2) establish appropriate standards for the stocking and utilization of property, (3) require the fullest practicable utilization of surplus property by agencies in order to avoid unnecessary commercial purchases, and (4) submit to the Congress as soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year a consolidated report of all operations under this title.

"SEC. 253. (a) No agency or administrative unit shall transfer or sell, donate, destroy, or otherwise dispose of surplus property in the possession or under the control of such agency or administrative unit except as provided in this title or in any provision of law referred to in section 263.

"(b) In the case of any corporation owned or controlled by the United States the provisions of this title shall apply only in respect of materials, supplies, and equipment held or used by such corporation for administrative purposes.

"SEC. 254. (a) Whenever an administrative unit of an agency is responsible for the expenditure of more than one appropriation, allocation, or fund, the head of such agency may transfer any usable or repairable property from the service of one such appropriation, allocation, or fund to the service of another such appropriation, allocation, or fund upon (1) his determination that such property is surplus to the needs of the one and is needed for the purposes of the other, (2) his appraisal of the value of the property to be so transferred, and (3) payment of such appraised value from the receiving appropriation, allocation, or fund and disposal of the proceeds in accordance with the provisions of section 258.

"(b) Whenever an agency has established and is maintaining, at a standard acceptable to the Director, administrative controls over property under an office or employee designated for the purpose, the head of such agency may transfer any usable or repairable property from one administrative unit of the agency to another such unit upon compliance with clauses (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section.

"SEC. 255. Any agency may sell (1) any property which is damaged or worn beyond economical repair; (2) any waste, salvage, scrap, or other comparable items; or (3) any products of industrial, research, agricultural, or livestock operations or of any public works construction or maintenance project carried on by such agency. If any such property is of no commercial value or if the cost of sale thereof would exceed the estimated proceeds, it may be donated to tax-supported organizations or eleemosynary institutions. Any such property which is not practicably saleable and cannot be beneficially utilized by donation to any tax-supported organization or any eleemosynary institution shall be destroyed or otherwise disposed of. The sale, donation, destruction, or other disposition of any property under this section shall be subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe.

"SEC. 256. (a) Whenever the President or the head of any agency determines that any usable or repairable property under the control or in the possession of the agency is surplus to the needs of such agency or any administrative unit thereof in the performance of any functions, activities, or projects in connection with which the property was acquired or accrued, the President or the head of the agency, as the case may be, shall, unless such property is transferred under section 254, or is disposed of under section 255, declare such property to the Procurement Division as surplus.

"(b) Any property declared to the Procurement Division as surplus under subsection (a) which is needed by any of the agencies or administrative units in the prosecution of their functions, activities, or projects shall be repaired or rehabilitated as found necessary and economical and be transferred (or be held in storage pending transfer) by or under the direction of the Procurement Division to such agencies or administrative units as may be designated by the Director at values fixed by the Procurement Division.

"(c) Any property declared to the Procurement Division as surplus under subsection (a) which the Director determines is not needed by any of the agencies or administrative units in the prosecution of their functions, activities, or projects shall be repaired or rehabilitated as found necessary and economical and be sold or leased (or be held in storage pending sale or lease) by or under the direction of the Procurement Division to tax-supported organizations at prices or rates fixed by the Procurement Division.

"(d) Transfers, sales, and leases of property under subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall be pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe.

"SEC. 257. (a) Any property declared to the Procurement Division as surplus under section 256 (a) which cannot practicably be disposed of under section 256 (b) or (c) shall be repaired or rehabilitated as found necessary and economical and be disposed of (or be held in storage pending disposition) by or under the direction of the Procurement Division as follows:

"(1) By sale or lease in the domestic market.

"(2) By sale or lease to agencies of foreign governments.

"(3) By sale or lease in foreign markets, but only if such property cannot practicably be disposed of under paragraph (2).

"(4) By donation to tax-supported organizations or eleemosynary institutions, by destruction, or by such other method as is determined to be feasible; but property shall be disposed of under this paragraph only if it cannot practicably be disposed of by sale or lease under any of the preceding paragraphs.

"(b) The sale, lease, donation, destruction, or other disposition of property under this section shall be in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President. The regulations prescribed under this subsection which relate to the sale or lease of property shall include provisions requiring publication of the times, places, quantities, and terms and conditions of the proposed dispositions of such property, and requiring advertising for competitive bids except in such cases and with respect to such property as the President determines that sales or leases by competitive bids would be contrary to the public interest.

"SEC. 258. Where property transferred or disposed of under any provisions of this title except section 259 has been acquired by the use of funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and such appropriated funds are not by law reimbursable from assessment, tax, or other revenue, all proceeds derived from the transfer or sale, lease, or other disposition thereof shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Where property transferred or disposed of under any provisions of this title except section 259 has been acquired by the use of funds other than those appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury or by the use of funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury which are by law reimbursable from assessment, tax, or other revenue, all expenses incurred in respect of such transfer or disposition shall be deducted from the proceeds (if any), the funds bearing such expenses reimbursed in like amount, and the balance of the proceeds (if any) credited to the reimbursable fund or appropriation or paid to the agency releasing the property. This section shall not apply to the sale with the approval of a duly authorized representative of the agency concerned of any property in the custody of a contractor or subcontractor under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or subcontract which authorizes the crediting of the proceeds of such sale on the cost of the work described in such contract or subcontract.

"SEC. 259. Whenever the Director shall determine it to be efficient or economical, he may designate specific classes of equipment in the possession or control of various agencies and administrative units which may be made available for full use for definite periods of time by other agencies or administrative units or for the prosecution of functions, activities, or projects other than those for which said equipment was acquired within an agency or administrative unit, at a rental rate based on a schedule promulgated by the Director. The rental schedule shall be based on the actual or estimated cost of operation, repair, maintenance, depreciation, and equipment management control. Such use of equipment shall be with the consent of the agency having possession or control thereof and only in connection with a function, activity, or project for which an appropriation, allocation, or fund for the rental, repair, maintenance, and operation of such equipment is available. All proceeds from the rental of equipment under this section shall be credited to the current appropriation, allocation, or fund available to the rentor agency or administrative unit for operation, maintenance, repair, or replacement of the equipment, or in the absence of such an appropriation, allocation, or fund, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"SEC. 260. When the United States is in a state of war, and upon determination by the President that any equipment, materials, or supplies devoted to a particular use are urgently needed by some nongovernmental agency in connection with the prosecution of the war, are not subject to disposition as surplus, and cannot otherwise be obtained by such nongovernmental agency, the President may authorize or direct the head of the agency having control thereof, in order to fulfill such need, to sell to nongovernmental agencies such equipment, materials, or supplies for cash at a price not less than the appraised value thereof, or to lease or rent such property at commercial rates or such other rates as will fully compensate the Government.

"SEC. 261. All powers vested in the President or in the head of an agency by this title may be exercised by a representative or representatives designated for the purpose and the President may utilize the services and facilities of any agency in effectuating the purposes of this title.

"SEC. 262. Nothing in this title shall be construed as modifying any of the provisions of title III of this act.

"SEC. 263. (a) The provisions of this title shall not modify or in any way affect the following provisions of law:

"(1) Section 5 of the act approved March 3, 1883 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 34, sec. 492), authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to sell vessels stricken from the Navy register;

"(2) So much of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes,' approved April 23, 1904 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 50, sec. 65), as reads:

" 'The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to sell to American designers such serviceable ordnance and ordnance stores as may be necessary in the development of designs which may be used in the military service:

Provided, That such ordnance and ordnance stores can be spared for the purpose, and funds arising from such sales shall be available to replace like ordnance and ordnance stores';

"(3) The act entitled 'An act to permit sales by the supply departments of the Army to certain military schools and colleges,' approved July 17, 1914 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 10, sec. 1179);

"(4) So much of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes,' approved August 29, 1916 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 34, sec. 493), as reads:

" 'The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to sell any or all of the auxiliary ships of the Navy classified as colliers, transports, tenders, supply ships, special types, and hospital ships, which are 18 years and over in age, which he deems unsuited to present needs of the Navy and which can be disposed of at an advantageous price, which shall not be less than 50 percent of their original cost, the money obtained from such sale to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts';

"(5) So much of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes,' approved July 11, 1919 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 10, sec. 1274), as reads:

" 'The interchange without compensation therefor, of military stores, supplies, and equipment of every character, including real estate owned by the Government, is hereby authorized between the Army and Navy upon the request of the head of one service and with the approval of the head of the other service.'

"(6) The Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 46, sec. 1101 and following);

"(7) The act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell, loan, or give samples of supplies and equipment to prospective manufacturers,' approved July 27, 1937 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 10, sec. 1192a);

"(8) The joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to authorize the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to assist the governments of American republics to increase their military and naval establishments, and for other purposes,' approved June 15, 1940 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 22, secs. 521 to 527, inclusive);

"(9) The act entitled 'An act authorizing the sale of fuel, electric current, ice, and water at isolated naval stations,' approved June 13, 1940 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 34, sec. 553);

"(10) The act entitled 'An act to expedite the strength of the national defense,' approved July 2, 1940 (Public, No. 703, 76th Cong., U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 41, set forth in note preceding sec. 1);

"(11) The joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution making an appropriation to the United States Maritime Commission for emergency cargo ship construction, and for other purposes,' approved February 6, 1941 (Public Law 5, 77th Cong.);

"(12) Title III (caption "United States Maritime Commission") of the act entitled 'An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes,' approved August 25, 1941 (Public Law 247, 77th Cong.);

"(13) The act entitled 'An act further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved March 11, 1941, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. I, title 22, secs. 411–422, inclusive);

"(14) The First War Powers Act, 1941 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. I, title 50, appendix, secs. 601 to 622, inclusive);

"(15) The Second War Powers Act, 1942 (Public Law 507, 77th Cong.; 56 Stat. 176);

"(16) The act entitled 'An act to authorize the return to private ownership of certain vessels formerly used or suitable for use in the fisheries or industries related thereto,' approved April 29, 1943 (Public Law 44, 78th Cong.).

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (a), all laws or parts of laws governing the disposition of surplus property or the disposal of proceeds therefrom are modified and superseded to the extent of any conflict with the provisions of this title."

SEC. 2. During the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate, sections 252, 253, 254, 256, or 260 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended by this act, shall not apply, except in the discretion of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, or the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, as the case may be, to any property in the possession or under the control of the War Department, the Department of the Navy, the United States Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, or any administrative unit (as defined in sec. 251 of such act, as amended) of either such Department, Commission, or Administration which (1) was acquired from funds made available by appropriation or otherwise for military purposes, or (2) is being held or utilized for military purposes.

SEC. 3. (a) After the date on which the President proclaims that the hostilities of the present war have ceased, no war materials shall be disposed of under section 256 (c) or 257 of title II–A of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, except as may be provided by law enacted after the date of enactment of this act.

(b) As used in this section and in section 4 "war materials" means any tangible property owned by the United States or by any corporation owned or controlled by the United States which was acquired or is held or utilized for military purposes, but does not include any land, buildings, or their appurtenant facilities or fixtures or any gold or silver.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Surplus War Property Committee (hereinafter referred to as the "committee") to be composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker. A vacancy in the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection was made. The committee shall elect a chairman from among its members.

(b) It shall be the duty of the committee to undertake promptly a full and complete study and investigation of the types, quantities, values, location, and custody of war materials and other tangible property, both real and personal, acquired, held, or utilized for military purposes, which may reasonably be expected to be in the possession or under the control of any agency (as defined in sec. 251 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended by this act) at the time of cessation of hostilities in the present war, and no longer needed for such purposes. The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date, but not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, the results of its study, together with its recommendations as to any necessary additional legislation and administrative action to insure the orderly disposition of such property. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be. The committee shall make such interim reports as it deems advisable.

(c) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to employ such experts and such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 2, secs. 192–194, inclusive), shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena, or to testify when summoned under the authority of this section

(d) The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government.

(e) All authority conferred in this section shall terminate upon submission of the committee's final report.

(f) The expenses of the committee, not to exceed $10,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act and the purposes of title II–A of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended by this act.

SEC. 6. This act may be cited as the "Surplus Personal Property Act of 1943."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Insert at the end of line 19, page 10, after striking out the period and inserting a colon, the following: "*Provided*, That all transactions under this section shall be reported at least quarterly to the Director, and whenever the proceeds so reported are found by him to exceed the amounts necessary for the repair, maintenance, and management of the equipment rented, such excess proceeds shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in support of that amendment I will simply say it is offered after conferring with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] and Members on both sides, in response to the suggestion to make certain that the views of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] are embraced in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows.

Amendment offered by Mr. CHURCH: On page 16, line 21, strike out all of section 4.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to take much of the time of the committee on this amendment. In my main statement awhile ago I called attention to the fact that I was very much in favor of this bill. At the same time I am opposed to section 4 remaining in the bill. Section 4 will take from our Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments its duties, the work it has been doing and should do for the next several months.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. In my judgment the creation of this committee would slow up or at least retard a part of the proper investigation of the various matters to which the section pertains.

The Military Affairs Committee would naturally be more familiar with the situation as it affects the War Department; the Naval Affairs Committee with reference to the Navy Department; the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee with reference to the lands for war housing, and so forth. Such investigations as should be carried on could very well be under the jurisdiction and the supervision of the various legislative committees. This section would require the creation of an entirely new committee to embrace the whole field, and to do the particular work that the various legislative committees are supposed to do.

There has been a tendency, I think through the years and perhaps accentuated somewhat in recent years, to emasculate the legislative committees of this House who should have primary consideration of the things that pertain to their respective jurisdictions.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree with the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult for me to support this amendment or to oppose it. I do not care, particularly. There is really nothing in what I read this morning to the House in reciting the duties of this particular committee that would seem to me, after all, to warrant the expectation that this committee would be selected to deal with surplus property after the war is over. I well understand how the committees feel about encroaching on their powers and duties. I had thought perhaps it would be better to have a joint committee created. Sometimes it results in better feeling between the two bodies, and it is more likely to bring results. I served for a year and a half on the joint committee dealing with the reorganization of the Government. Of course, the other body usually tries to show they are more able than the House Members, but usually we manage to get along. But you remember these differences we have had on the floor of the House and sometimes I have thought it might be the better practice if we had a joint committee to go into these things in the first instance.

If we have this joint committee, my committee might be supposed to be recognized and I being the ranking member naturally might expect to be appointed on that committee; or I might step aside in the hope that my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH], who loves the work, might be selected. But because there might be some possible honor attached to it, or because there might be some work involved, I might not feel at liberty to dodge it even for the purpose of having my friend on it.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to talk on both sides of the question. I did that on the Ruml plan, but I think you fully understood my motive and reason. It was the question of taking the lesser of two evils. In this case I do not know about even the lesser of the evils. I frankly say that if the amendment offered in committee by the gentleman from California [Mr. MANASCO] is presented to the House, it seems to me it should receive real attention because it embodies the problem of surplus after the war is over.

What we have done is the usual old method, and I have seen it for the 28 years of my legislative experience, that when a vital matter arises and there is too sudden demand for action a committee is appointed to look into it, largely to delay action.

Mr. Chairman, you have listened to my statement. I absolve every Member on this side, and any member of the committee for voting any way he wishes on the amendment, as I will make no recommendation.

If I find it necessary to vote, I shall vote to create the joint committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have a high regard for the views of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. I understand the attitude of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH], but my thought is they have both misconstrued the amendment and the provisions of section 4. Section 4 is not intended to supplant or to supersede any committee of the House. This section has to do with surplus war materials, and as a member of the committee, I conferred with representatives of industry, agriculture, and manufacturing, who approved the special committee, not for the purpose of passing legislation but for the purpose, as stated in section 4, and at this time it is proper for me to read:

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Surplus War Property Committee (hereinafter referred to as the "committee") to be composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker. A vacancy in the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection was made. The committee shall elect a chairman from among its members.

(b) It shall be the duty of the committee to undertake promptly a full and complete study and investigation of the types, quantities, values, location, and custody of war materials and other tangible property, both real and personal, acquired, held, or utilized for military purposes, which may reasonably be expected to be in the possession or under the control of any agency (as defined in sec. 251 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended by this act) at the time of cessation of hostilities in the present war, and no longer needed for such purposes. The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date, but not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, the results of its study, together with its recommendations as to any necessary additional legislation and administrative action to insure the orderly disposition of such property. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be. The committee shall make such interim reports as it deems advisable.

This committee would have the power, and the only funds provided are $10,000 to employ an investigator, to subpena witnesses, to bring in books and documents; it would have the power and the authority to do substantially what the Byrd committee is now doing, furnish information and submit recommendations and facts that can be utilized by the various committees of the House and Senate.

It is my thought that the information furnished by this committee, composed of able men as the Vice President and the Speaker shall appoint from the two Houses of the Congress, can submit information that should be of benefit to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to the Military Affairs Committee, to the Naval Affairs Committee, to the Committee on Expenditures, and other committees having jurisdiction of the subject matter. I assume that that information transmitted to Congress would be referred by the Speaker to the appropriate committees of Congress; so I insist that the purpose of this section is to ascertain facts and make recommendations. Frankly I do not know how the gentleman from Texas has succeeded but I will say to the gentleman that I know he is doing his best with respect to lands and buildings. At least one member of his committee has come to our committee and asked what information we had been able to obtain as to the lands and buildings that the Government has acquired for war purposes. Thus far we have not been able to get full information; neither has the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, as I am advised, but if this committee were appointed it would have the power to appoint an investigator and to do what the chairman of the other committees cannot do, order those in the various departments to furnish us the factual information, by subpena, to compel production of full information. So it is my thought, Mr. Chairman, that the most constructive feature of this bill is section 4. It is to furnish the Congress for the use of its committees facts with respect to the various kinds of property. We made this recommendation after giving this matter consideration from January until May and after we had had the views of business, agricultural, manufacturing, and mercantile spokesmen of the country.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes to answer the gentleman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. May I ask the gentleman if it is not true that these various departments and agencies of the Government should know what materials they have and what is surplus? And can they not give that information to committees of the House as well as to another specially appointed committee of the House? And may they not also give that information to the Bureau of the Budget as provided in this measure, and

that the Bureau of the Budget knowing the requirements of the various agencies could declare what part of that available material was surplus?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will answer the gentleman's question by saying that they have the right to do that now, but as the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] said, having that right they have not done it; and the gentleman from Maine said, in response to the question of the gentleman from Texas, that as a new Member of this body he was absolutely astounded that the Congress of the United States had not passed this legislation 100 years ago, or to use his language, in 1815; in other words, we have depended upon these agencies to declare whether or not they had any surplus property and if we continue to depend upon these agencies to declare their surplus property we shall continue to be without that information.

Mr. LANHAM. In my judgment, the remainder of the bill makes proper provision to get that information without employing, at great expense, which in my judgment will far exceed the $10,000, an additional committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We went into that very carefully and we limited it very specifically to $10,000, so the Treasury would be protected. We followed the language of the Byrd committee. I do not know, and neither does the gentleman from Texas nor any other Member of Congress, any better source of suggestions than the business, mercantile, and industrial agencies of the country in dealing with a matter involving $50,000,000,000. Chambers of commerce and other business and industrial institutions of the country say: "Give us an opportunity to be heard before passing legislation to dispose of surplus war materials."

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute to answer the gentleman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, directing attention to lines 17 to 19 on page 17 of the bill which provides that this committee shall make its recommendations to insure the orderly disposition of such property, I want to know if this committee has the power to try to work out a way whereby they can get a profitable disposition of this property? This deals only with the mechanics of disposition; I want to know how it will save money for the Government.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Let me say that the purpose of this committee is to make studies and recommendations for legislation to prevent dumping $50,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 or $10,000,000,000 of property at any one time. This committee will give us the benefit of its recommendations as to the orderly disposition of that property, because it would be absolutely ruinous to the economy of the country if we were to dump say 150,000 trucks, or 150,000 airplanes, or 5,000,000 pairs of shoes at one time. To prevent that is the very purpose of this bill.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Is it the gentleman's opinion that this is broad enough to give them that power? Does this go beyond the mere matter of mechanics?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not only will they make recommendations, but various committees of Congress will have those recommendations, have the right to consider them, and we will get the benefit not only of the views of this committee but of the constituted committees of this House who may submit legislation to the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman refer to subsection (b) on page 17 which the gentleman just interrogated him about? I wish to get his opinion. This committee we are going to appoint has to report promptly, proceed promptly. It is going to consider all of this property and insure the orderly disposition of such property. How can that committee do that with any force or effect without taking from the regularly constituted committees of the House and Senate the same problem of considering this matter of surplus or the expenditures in the executive branch of the Government?

Mr. LANHAM. I agree with the gentleman and I called attention to that earlier in the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make reference now to another matter. Allusion has been made to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. May I say with respect to that committee that several years ago with reference to the surplus real estate of the United States Government we did pass a law governing its disposition. This measure comes belatedly in the track of the action of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee with reference to Government-owned real estate. This provides, however, for personal property, though this particular section places the obligation upon the new committee to look also into real estate.

We have some plants of the Army and Navy of this country that are carrying on secret operations. There is a bill pending before the Judiciary Committee with reference to the protection of those secret processes and operations involving personal and real property. I have familiarized myself somewhat with the purpose of that proposed legislation. In order to maintain that secrecy which is necessary for the proper promotion of our war efforts we should not have these over-all committees going around trying to tell the Naval Affairs Committee, the Military Affairs Committee, and the other committees, just how they should conduct their committee operations. I think it ill becomes any of us serving in this House to be criticizing one another in the service that we render through our respective committees. We all take the same obligation; we are all working very diligently in an effort to perform our duties; and I think to have this over-all committee as landlord and overseer for the various legislative committees which know these particular matters, and can best get the information with reference to them, is a mistake.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Am I correct in the assumption, then, that the gentleman thinks the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments does have all the necessary authority now?

Mr. LANHAM. Although I have not looked into the question lately, I understand that in Great Britain that is one of the most important committees in their whole parliamentary system, and it has been my understanding that the purpose of this committee is to follow up these expenditures that are made in the executive departments to know what is done with the money and what is done with what the money buys.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am glad to hear that because I have been on that committee now for 6 or 8 years, along with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]. We have been wanting to do a little something, but that committee has functioned something like the Labor Committee. We have long recesses, and when we do meet we talk a little bit. If the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] could assure us that some time before we are all dead we will have an opportunity to function and look into these things, it would be encouraging. It would induce a man to try to live longer and to try to serve his country a little.

Mr. LANHAM. Let me propound this inquiry: How can a committee of Members of the House, or of the two bodies, take into their hands the respective labors of all these various legislative committees that have to do with these various questions and do the whole job better than these committees can do their respective parts of it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, these various agencies of the Government certainly have the information as to the personal property that they have within their respective organizations and I believe that the committees that have the legislative charge of those various agencies are in a better position from their experience and from their knowledge of the operations of those agencies to get this information from them than one big central, overlord, supervising committee could possibly be.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do not know whether I understood the gentleman correctly, but did I understand him to say that there is now on the statute books legislation authorizing the War Department to dispose of the hotels and land owned by the War Department?

Mr. LANHAM. No. The gentleman is begging the question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am not begging the question.

Mr. LANHAM. I said that insofar as the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was concerned, prior to this war we passed legislation which is now on the statute books and which does give authority to dispose of the surplus real estate of the Government.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In certain instances it does, but in all fairness and in order to keep the record straight, is it not necessary for this Congress to pass a bill to authorize them to dispose of land? You have to pass a special act of Congress in that sort of case and this bill here deals with war materials not embraced in any legislation heretofore passed.

Mr. LANHAM. I understood the gentleman to say earlier in the debate that this bill had nothing to do with real estate and fixtures on real estate. Now he begins to talk about land, dams, and buildings. We are going to get confusion worse confounded by having this kind of committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I am thoroughly familiar wtih the purpose of this proposal. It has been suggested that the committee proposed herein would interfere with the rights of legislative committees in a proper disposition of materials and supplies in the hands of the Government agencies.

I can understand why one of the major committees probably would be better qualified and better fitted by reason of experience to dispose of any surplus property, but we forget that we have a number of agencies in the Government created by Executive orders that do not come under the supervision or direction of any legislative committee. Who is going to take charge of the surplus property there?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a correction, that is exactly the purpose of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That is exactly its jurisdiction.

Mr. HARE. If the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has absolute authority, absolute right, absolute jurisdiction over all of this property, to see where it is, to make inventory of it, and dispose of it, then I think this duty ought to be discharged by that committee, and the proposed committee would then be unnecessary; otherwise there should be some committee charged with such responsibility, and it is my understanding the proposed committee is to be charged with such responsibility. If I am mistaken, I would like to be fully advised.

Mr. CHURCH. I do not want the gentleman to misunderstand me. I thought the gentleman was trying to point out that there is quite a bit of property that would not come under the jurisdiction of other committees. I want the gentleman to understand that this bill has to do with the control of expenditures in the executive departments, and therefore would take care of that property which I thought the gentleman was trying to say could not be taken care of.

Mr. HARE. No; I was referring to the legislative committees only and not to the powers and functions of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

We had an experience this last year in liquidating the Civilian Conservation Corps. That was not under the supervision of any particular legislative committee, yet this agency, created by Executive order, had acquired several million dollars worth of material, supplies, and equipment. Who will dispose of that? The Committee on Appropriations said it should be offered to the War Department, the Navy Department, the Air Corps, and so forth. I think it was referred under the provisions of another statute to the Bureau of the Budget to dispose of it. The Bureau of the Budget kept title to it for a short time, and then said, "We do not know what to do with it, so we will transfer our right back to the War Department." There you are. No one knows exactly what disposition has been made of this material and equipment, although the Director of the C. C. C. has a full, complete, and detailed inventory of all of the surplus materials and equipment of the C. C. C.

The same is true of the National Youth Administration. We have surplus commodities, supplies, and materials there now, stored, on which rent is being paid, yet nobody seems to have the authority, right, or responsibility to dispose of it. There is not an appropriation bill that comes to the House but that has in it an item, year after year, asking for additional equipment. My thought is that if you had a central storehouse or a central inventory of all of this material you would be able to dispose of such equipment by transferring it to whatever agency could use it to the best advantage.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Let me say to the gentleman that there is nothing in this bill that would prevent the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the Committee on Naval Affairs, or the Committee on Military Affairs from bringing in a bill tomorrow morning, if the House would consider it, for the disposal of this property. I submit, as the gentleman says, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Texas says the various committees, including the Committee on the Judiciary, are considering this matter, that all of the information they can get, whether it be furnished by a special committee or a general committee, would be of help.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice in section 4 that the committee is to report within 6 months after this bill becomes effective. Then on page 18, in subsection (e), it is provided that all authority conferred in this section shall terminate upon submission of the committee's final report. Is this permanent legislation on a permanent committee, or will it terminate with the filing of the report by that committee?

Mr. HARE. I judge that the language speaks for itself. I think 6 months would not be sufficient time to make a proper inventory, classify the materials, equipment, and so forth, and suggest the best method for their use or disposal.

Mr. DONDERO. May I ask the chairman that question?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It expires in 6 months.

Mr. DONDERO. It is not a permanent committee?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not at all.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Does not that in effect mean that at the next session of Congress we shall have to appoint another committee? The war will not be over then.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

The question was taken; and, on a division (demanded by Mr. CHURCH), there were—ayes 27, noes 31.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-nine Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CHURCH and Mr. WHITTINGTON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 37, noes 57.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 16, line 8, after "President" insert "or Congress by concurrent resolution."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is, on page 16, line 8, after the word "President", to insert "or Congress by concurrent resolution."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have not had an opportunity to confer with other

members of the committee, but if it would be agreeable to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and unless some of my colleagues object, I see no objection to the gentleman's amendment. Frankly, I think it is in accord with the remainder of the bill. Personally, I am agreeable to it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am surprised but happy.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM: On page 5, line 24, after the word "agency", strike out the period and insert a semicolon and add the following: "*Provided, however,* That any such property which is suitable for agriculture or livestock operations shall be first offered for sale to farmers and livestock operators at the best bid or appraised value."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment so that when this property is sold, it will not be dumped as a lot and sold possibly to industrial groups, but so that the farmers and the livestock raisers will have an opportunity to bid upon it. At this time we need 129 percent of the 1940 implement purchases. The amount we have available now for the farmers is only 23 percent. By the end of this season we will have a total of 40 percent of available implements purchased in 1940, and as a matter of fact we need 129 percent.

Mr. MANASCO. The gentleman would not want to restrict the bill so that the Procurement Division would have to offer surplus tanks, airplanes, and so forth, to the farmers, before it could sell them to anyone else.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I think the farmer should have an opportunity before the four agencies.

Mr. MANASCO. But I think the gentleman should limit his amendment to farm implements and not force the Procurement Division to submit offers to farmers for airplanes, tanks, guns, and things like that.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Airplanes would not be usable for the farm.

Mr. MANASCO. But under the provisions of the amendment, they would have to offer everything

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; I said such articles as are suitable for agriculture.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to give some information to my colleague. Speaking of tanks, these tractors are very valuable on the farms. The tractors are needed all over the country, particularly in the West for land clearing and road grading.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why this amendment should not be adopted and I trust the Members will vote for it. It is an amendment that will be for the best interest of the country, not just for the farmers.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman contemplate that in the sale of the particular goods to which he refers, the bids shall be limited to a group or to a class of farmers?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I say that they shall first offer it to the farmers at the highest bid, or at the appraised value. I say that for this reason. The whole world is going to need food after the war.

Mr. MICHENER. I agree with the gentleman as to that, but who is going to determine whether the bidders qualify? If we are going to adopt an amendment like that, we should provide some method of determining the qualifications of the farmers. Who is going to say whether this man or that man is a bona fide bidder?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The rules and regulations in the bill will do that, because it allows the President to do that through the Procurement Division. I trust this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman is interested in agriculture and in the farmers. All of us are interested in agricultural legislation, providing for the necessities of the farmers, but we just cannot give the farmer special consideration in every bill that comes along. In all kindness I can understand that in a bill 18 pages long it may be difficult. This is an amendment to section 255, and this section deals with waste property, damaged beyond repair, salvage and scrap, and any products that might arise from any of the agencies of the Government. We want to give the farmers help to raise food and we should give them something besides scrap. I can understand that the word "property" would mean plows, tractors, and hoes, but "products" means things that incidentally follow, that are in that category of waste, and this section provides that the President of the United States may establish regulations for the disposal of such waste products, and in order to protect them under section 257, if there is any property that is not waste that was not injured beyond repair and it has been rehabilitated, it must be sold in the domestic market, and the farmers will have an opportunity to acquire all the property that the farmers can use. Such an amendment as the gentleman has offered would not effectuate the gentleman's desire. The bill provides that if there are any surplus materials available to the farmer, he would have an opportunity to purchase them.

Mr. WHITE. What provision is there for disposing of surplus explosives?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. They are war materials generally to be disposed of after the war. We do not undertake to dispose of explosives in this bill unless they are surplus and then only with the consent of the Army and Navy. I ask that the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] be rejected.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Is not the answer to the gentleman's amendment found in section (b), page 8, the first sentence?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, and, as I have stated, the amendment is wholly unnecessary and may hurt rather than help farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am directing my remarks particularly to the gentleman from Mississippi, the gentleman in charge of this bill. I want to say that if there was ever a scandalous condition that existed in this country it was in the disposition of surplus materials after the last war. I point out one instance of the disposal of our surplus explosives. This Congress passed a bill to make those explosives available free to the Bureau of Public Roads and to the farmers for clearing land and building roads. What happened? The du Ponts stepped in and got a $7,000,000 contract at 7 cents a pound, if you please, for cartridging and boxing that material, when they used to sell Red Cross dynamite wholesale for less than 9 cents a pound. When I bought three different consignments of 1,000 pounds each of these surplus Government explosives to clear some stumps off of land in the State of Idaho I had to pay 7 cents a pound to the du Ponts and then pay the freight besides a handling charge of 2 cents before I could get these free explosives. This free powder cost me as much as if I had gone into the open market and bought it. I hope there will not be such a scandal in the disposition of surplus war materials after this war. We are still paying interest on the Liberty bonds sold 20 years ago in the last war to buy that powder, and it was a scandal.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As was stated in the beginning of the consideration of this bill, that material now, instead of being handled in a scandalous fashion, has to be disposed of to the several governmental agencies. If there is no governmental agency that can use it, then it is to be sold, but they get the first chance at it.

Mr. WHITE. I want to put this House and the country on notice of the scandals in the disposition of surplus materials after the last war. I think this bill is an attempt to prevent such scandals. I want the people to know what was done. Any man who bought surplus war material in these so-called Army stores has good reason to know what was done in the disposition of surplus material after the last war. I hope this Congress will have the good sense to pass legislation which will prevent such scandalous conditions occurring again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Help me to understand the amendment. If we have any surplus left over of agricultural or livestock products, corn, oats,

or wheat owned by the Government, must we sell it back to the farmer who may have originally sold it, at a good price, at whatever he may be bid, so he can sell it to the consumer again? Or shall we let the consumer of the products have some advantage; let the poultryman have a chance? Shall not the dealer who might want to buy it to sell to the consumer have an equal opportunity? Under this amendment it seems that it must be first offered to the agricultural people before it can be offered to the dealer or the consumer. They may finally get the best bid possible and then say to the consumer, "You cannot purchase it." We could hardly expect bids other than from agricultural interests. I am a little confused about the procedure. How about these matters that are the products of research? Should they not also be offered back to the people who made the research in the first instance? I do not quite approve of this at the moment. You are trying to favor the farmer and, of course, I do not blame you. At the end of the section you have a provision that these products shall be sold according to the rules and regulations made by your President. I think your President would treat agricultural interests very fairly. But I am wondering if you are not trying to show favoritism to the agricultural and livestock people. Must the calves that the Government bought and has on hand be offered back to the farmer at his own price? Should not the consumer through his dealer have a chance to buy those calves?

I am a farmer and I can sympathize with the gentleman. I do not imagine I would profit under this, because I am but a small farmer. However, I have always found there are so-called gentlemen farmers who have the cash to take advantage of such offers. I doubt if a poor farmer would have much of a chance to bid on necessarily large amounts that would have to be offered. I am trying to say that I think we are in a little danger when trying to particularize and help some particular classes of people in the method of disposal of property.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is the gentleman familiar with the provision in the agricultural bill, where loans have been made on wheat, that under the present law he is permitted to buy back the wheat or cotton that he has obtained a loan on?

Mr. GIFFORD. Two wrongs do not make another right with me. That precedent may be quoted, but this is a little different. You are trying to give a certain class a right over the consumer's equal demands. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I would like to make this observation: That if the O. P. A. continues its regulations and price ceilings on agricultural products as they are doing at the present time, there will not be any surplus to dispose of in the near future.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, I think there will be a few extra cans of agricultural products on hand. Vast amounts are now in storage, pending possible military needs, and the military will probably not let these reserves dwindle much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, my fisherman friend from Cape Cod does not seem today to have the same viewpoint as some of us on this proposition.

Many Members of this House from the agricultural States were visited last week by the canners of fruit and vegetables, who were down here in force, and there were very good reasons for their visit. Unless the canners are given relief, some of the citizens, like my good friend from Massachusetts, the majority leader, others in the cities, will be hungry next fall, next winter, and next spring, because, as one of the representatives in this group said, if they cannot get the cost of packing, if they cannot get the workers, the fruit and vegetables will not be put in cans. They are asking that they be permitted to raise wages 15 cents an hour in order to keep some of the men and women who are working in the canneries and who can and who will go into the defense industries in surrounding towns at higher wages.

A further request they are making is for a ceiling price. The O. P. A. induced the canners in California who are putting up asparagus to pay 15 cents an hour additional wage, with the assurance that the canners could add that extra cost to their price, which, added to the finished product, would raise the price to the consumer less than half a cent a can, but when the time came to fix a ceiling they did not get it.

Our canners are not going to be fooled; they are going to know whether or not when they pay that 15 cents an hour they will be allowed to include that additional cost in the finished-product price, and they want to know it before they get their products canned.

Our canners make contracts with the bean growers, the growers of strawberries, raspberries, cherries, in fact, with the growers of practically everything that goes into cans, for their season's crop. The farmers depend upon those contracts being made before they go into production, and the canners must know, before they make contracts with the growers, whether or not this Government intends to permit the charging of a ceiling price which will cover at least the cost of producing and putting the fruit and vegetables into the cans.

Our canners are not asking for a profit, but they do insist that, when they make every sacrifice demanded, they should be permitted to charge a price which will at least insure their continued existence, their continued operation.

Just had a call from Michigan and was advised that the Associated Press and the United Press carried a statement that the Government had given permission to the canners to raise wages 15 cents per hour. Naturally, the employees wanted to know why the canners were not paying the 15 cents additional. The canners want to know why they are not permitted to pay the 15 cents per hour additional wage.

Last Saturday, at a meeting with Mr. Fred Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, we were advised by Mr. Vinson that the question of the increase in wages which the canners wanted to pay and the question of the determination of the ceiling price would be decided without further delay.

It is evident that the regional board in Michigan recommended the increase in wages, but that recommendation, as I was advised at 4 o'clock this afternoon, had not cleared the office of Chairman Vinson.

The canners, if they pay the additional 15 cents per hour, will be subject to prosecution by the Government.

It is conflicting situations like this which create confusion among those upon whose efforts our food supply for the next 2 years depends.

The difficulty now grows out of the fact that wages in war industries, which in the end, are paid by the Government from the Public Treasury, are far greater than the canners are permitted to pay. Public funds are being used to entice workers in essential food-processing industries away from their jobs.

Unless we can get relief—and that without delay—the fruit and the vegetables necessary to feed the armed forces, for the sustenance of the civilian population, will not go into cans this summer and fall.

These growers and these canners are not going to put their products into cans unless the confusion is ended, and this next winter there will be a shortage, and the folks in the city will be hungry. It will not bother those of us who are living in little towns because our wives and daughters and our relatives are growing and will can fruit and vegetables, and next fall we will have enough to eat, but the folks in the city will be hungry unless the administration quits its destructive interference with the canning industry.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I understand, Mr. Chairman, the vote now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM]?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

The question was taken, and the amendment was not agreed to.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM: On page 8, line 9, strike out the period, insert a semicolon and the following: "*Provided, however,* That any such property which is suitable for agriculture or livestock operations shall be first offered for sale to farmers and livestock operators at the best bid or the appraised value."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I understand no further amendments are to be offered to the bill. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and to the entire bill be limited to 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am sincere in this amendment. The chairman of this committee pointed to the fact that the previous amendment applied to products raised by industrial research, agriculture, livestock operations, which would mean the milk, cream, eggs, and animals, and so forth, but there is no doubt in your mind or in my mind that this present amendment applies to every type of property, because it relates to section 256 which provides that whenever the President or the head of any agency determines that any usable or referrable property under the control or in the possession of the agency is surplus to the needs of such agency or any administrative unit thereof it may be sold. On page 7, beginning at line 23, are set out four different methods of disposition. It may be disposed of by sale or lease in the domestic market, by sale or lease to agencies of foreign governments, by sale or lease in foreign markets, but only if such property cannot practicably be disposed of under paragraph (2), and by donation to tax-supported organizations.

I merely want to protect the farmer or livestock man, to give him a chance to bid on this at the highest bid or at the appraised value in competition at any sale on the domestic market, in competition at any sale to any foreign country or giving it to anyone. This is good property that is going to be sold. Just the other day in one of our counties a considerable amount of equipment was sold, property of the C. C. C., particularly tractors, on which just a week before $250 each had been spent. These tractors were lumped in a group and sold to an eastern firm for $200 apiece, to my personal knowledge. I just want these farmers to have a chance. They do not have even 40 percent of the 1940 purchases, yet they need 129 percent now. I want them to have a chance to secure these plows, hoes, rakes, tractors, go-devils, or what-not, tires, or anything else.

I am not a farmer and I am not a politician although I have served 18½ years at both. I am not going to tell you that I would rather farm than be in politics; I would not. These farmers are having a hard time. I am asking you to do only what is right. At least give them a chance to get this equipment they so badly need either by competitive bids or at the appraised value.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman's amendment provide for this property to be sold at public or private sale?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The amendment allows that question to be determined by the President or by the procuring agency. Certainly we ought to give the farmers an opportunity to get this equipment they so badly need.

Mr. DONDERO. Certainly it seems but fair that the farmer should have that opportunity.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. And even if some of the equipment is classed as junk, there are many parts of it that could be used for repairs which are very necessary. I certainly hope the gentleman's amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the further provisions of the bill which provide for the repair and rehabilitation of this machinery. More of these tractors may be repaired; they may spend $200 on them and then sell them for $200. We should extend this help to the farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I was going to move to strike out the last word, to get the floor on a pro forma amendment rather than on a real amendment. However, I do have a great deal of interest in the case as presented by my friend from Oklahoma in the amendment of his now pending. I happen to know how farmers and livestock men are in great need of certain iron and steel equipment and I hope any surplus will be made available to them on proper terms. I sought this time, however, for another reason. I am not seeking to amend this bill as it now stands because this, in general, is good legislation; I favor it. We are now trying by it to prevent what occurred following the last World War. We want this vast accumulation of surplus material handled to the best advantage and with the least loss to the Government and to the greatest saving for the taxpayers.

I asked the chairman of the committee a question or two before the bill was read for amendments. There are some other fields of war properties, in my opinion, which should also be safeguarded. Neither of them I find is now covered in the bill, therefore each will have to be the subject of special legislation. In addition to all this machinery and equipment we have produced for war which it is hoped will soon be surplus, we are accumulating large stock piles of war materials in minerals and metals. We must do this. We have not done enough of it to date as a matter of fact and it is vital to the prosecution of the war. But it stands to reason that at the close of the war there will be some surplus on hand. In order that the mining industry may be safeguarded when peace comes, and our country's welfare also; the Congress ought to give thought now to safeguarding the mining industry, large and small, against the dumping of surplus war minerals and metals at the conclusion of hostilities. Prices of such must not be permitted to be unduly depressed.

There is another matter I wish to mention, not quite in the same category but equally important. Of course, as the chairman said, this bill does not say anything about land belonging to Uncle Sam, formerly used by private individuals but now taken over for war purposes. The value of much of that land has been reduced or changed because of its war use. I hope that the Congress will give adequate thought to the restoration of the value of that part of the public domain now used for war purposes so that at the conclusion of hostilities it may be returned to its former peacetime uses.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. What does the gentleman advocate doing with all of the surplus Government-owned stock piles of copper and lead after the war?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes, I want a great reservoir established and held of all strategic and critical minerals so we shall never again be caught lacking. I have just introduced a bill which will take care of that. I was anxious to learn from the chairman of the committee whether this legislation before us brought that subject within the purview of the study of the committee which is being set up. In view of the fact that this bill does not touch that subject, I hope that the Members will give due consideration to the bill which I introduced June 7, H. R. 2895, which does go to that proposition.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman appreciates there is a deluge of copper, lead, and zinc being poured into this country from foreign countries all over the earth at the present time for war uses?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes, I understand that fact and I regret that the war made it necessary, but for the protection of our home producers, both large and small, we must look into that matter, too, so that that which has been brought in of necessity during the war from foreign lands will not be the cause of breaking the price of our domestic products.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take time on this bill, and I do not expect to discuss the particular amendment that is now before the House, therefore my statement may be subject to a point of order. But I wanted to get into the discussion on the previous amendment which had to do with food surpluses. Seriously, I think that this Congress had better take some immediate action on certain of the regu-

lations of the O. P. A. or we are going to have a food famine in this Nation. I am amazed at the new regulations being issued by the O. P. A.

I have a wire that came in this morning which amazed me. I did not realize how far this agency is going. I am going to read this wire. It is from Girard, Kans., and is dated June 8, reading as follows:

GIRARD, KANS., *June 8, 1943.*
Representative FRANK CARLSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Office of Price Administration order MPR 401, effective June 10, limiting feed grinders to 50 cents per ton for grinding corn, is absolutely prohibitive and ridiculous. Poultry, hog, and dairy production is heavy here, and if this order stands we will be compelled to shut down our grinders, which will be disastrous to a large number of farmers who depend on our grinding service to keep up their production. Your cooperation needed immediately to get this order rescinded at once in the interest of the war effort.

S. O. FREY,
Manager, Farmers Union Elevator

This town is not in my congressional district, but, Mr. Chairman, I was amazed to learn that we are controlling out in the farm section the cost per ton for grinding feed. Think of it!

It is about time this Congress does something about the matter or we are going to have a food shortage in this Nation. I am fearful that we will be criticized. We can do something about it and we must do something about it.

I would like to talk about cattle feeding for a moment. If you take a 735-pound steer, put him on feed June 1 for 100 days, selling November 1 to 8, that steer has got to sell for $16.68 to break even, yet the O. P. A. is trying to maintain a selling price of $14.50 It is foolish to talk about taxation and enforced savings to drain off this surplus money in the country if we follow that sort of a program. Let us increase our production, let us get some things to sell in this country, let us get rid of all these regulations that are stymying the production of food in this Nation which in my opinion is going to lead to starvation in this Nation and in our allies.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman stated that we can do something and we should do something. I do not see what this Congress can do so far as the regulations that are issued by the O. P. A. are concerned. We have no power to reverse those regulations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, perhaps what I am about to say may be subject to a point of order, but I do not intend to take the full time allotted me. I take the floor in order to complete the record made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

I was one of the Members who met with the Michigan canners last Saturday. That meeting had to do with the processing of food. The amendment now pending before the House is also indirectly connected with the subject of food.

The people who work in the canning industry have been classified as farm labor. The average pay of farm labor is about 45 cents an hour. All the canner is asking is that that price be increased to 60 cents an hour; in other words, that they might be permitted to pay 60 cents an hour, which is about one-half what industry is paying people in defense plants. In the face of that situation a good many of these people as a matter of patriotism are willing to stay in the canning factories and do the work at 60 cents an hour.

Do you know that the canners are faced with the proposition that if they are permitted to increase wages 15 cents an hour, they are asked to absorb that and not add it to the price of the product? The result is going to be that unless the canners are allowed to add the additional cost to the selling price there are going to be a great many empty shelves in the grocery stores next fall and a good many people may go hungry. Let the O. P. A. use a little horse sense in the making of its rules, regulations, and price ceilings, and we will have no difficulty. The canning of fruits and vegetables is of vital importance to this country. It is the storage of food for next year.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Has anyone been able to figure out how the O. P. A. arrives at the rules and the prices they set?

Mr. DONDERO. It is very difficult for me to understand it. It would seem to me that they should acquire in their employment some people who know this subject and know something about it from actual experience rather than those who depend on theory and philosophy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] for the balance of the time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to detain the Committee. Like all members from agricultural districts, I am in sympathy with any legitimate aid that can be rendered the farmers, but I am doubtful about the amendment's giving them the priorities they have under this section without the amendment.

This amendment is to line 9 on page 8. Section 257 states that the property shall, first, be disposed of in the domestic market—the farmers have a right there—and then in the fourth paragraph states that the property may be disposed of by donation to tax-supported institutions, but the property shall be disposed of under this paragraph only if it cannot practicably be disposed of by sale or lease under any of the preceding paragraphs.

My friend from Oklahoma modifies this paragraph. My thought is, with all due deference, that he may really lose more than is gained, because he can acquire property only under this paragraph, whereas he has a prior right to it under paragraph 1.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WICKERSHAM) there were—ayes 35, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2795) to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land or buildings and facilities or fixtures appurtenant thereto, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 248, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CHURCH. I am opposed to the bill in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CHURCH moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with instructions to that committee to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all of section 4.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 legislative days in which to file a minority report on the bill regulating the Commodity Credit Corporation and extending its life.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an article by Warwick M. Downing. I am advised by the Government Printing Office that the cost is $126. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD, notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Oil City Derrick on grade labeling.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I received from the Commissioner of State Aid and Pensions in Massachusetts, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include some tables which I have secured from the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein extracts from a speech by Mr. Beardsley Ruml at Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include therein editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow and also on the succeeding day, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

GEN. HIDINIO MORINGIO, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF PARAGUAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I do this to announce to the House that His Excellency, Gen. Hidinio Moringio, President of the Republic of Paraguay, will be received by the House of Representatives tomorrow at 12:30 p. m. and will address the House of Representatives at that time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time tomorrow, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL LEND-LEASE APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE AID

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF DISABLED PEOPLE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 247, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it proposed to take this bill up and dispose of it this afternoon?

Mr. CLARK. No; the purpose is just to adopt the rule, on which I understand there will be very little debate.

Mr. RANKIN. It is now almost 5 o'clock.

Mr. CLARK. I do not think this will take more than a few minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can assure the gentleman that there is no intention to go into the general debate today. We will adopt the rule, and the bill will then come up for general debate tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this rule will make in order a bill from the Committee on Education dealing with vocational rehabilitation. Before the Committee on Rules the request was unanimous from the Committee on Education and it appears that the bill received a very fine consideration at the hands of the Committee on Education. It was the consensus of opinion in the Committee on Rules that it properly safeguards State rights in the particulars in which the bill operates and I have no objection to the resolution. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is on the agenda for today. Everyone knew that the rule was coming up and possibly the bill. No requests for time have been made on the rule. I quite agree with the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina that inasmuch as the committee has asked unanimously for the rule, the matter should be brought up for discussion and I desire to take no more time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement by Luther Harr, Consumers' Counsel of the United States Coal Commission, before a conference in Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MANASCO). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. J. F. O'Connor, of the United States District Court, delivered on Memorial Day at Los Angeles, Calif.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that when we entered this war, one of the major rights for which we were fighting was freedom of speech. Can it be that we are winning the war on foreign fronts but losing it right here at home? On May 10, 1942, the United States Supreme Court handed down a decision which seriously threatens the constitutional rights of freedom of speech in the United States. That decision, with the majority opinion written by Justice Frankfurter, gave the Federal Communications Commission absolute authority to tell any radio station in the United States what it may and may not put on the air. From now on, the Federal Communications Commission holds a power over the broadcasting stations of the United States equal to that of any totalitarian government. No bureau in Washington has even been given such unlimited powers as prescribed in this decision. From now on, the licensee of any broadcasting station, whether he operates a 100-watter or a 50,000-watter, had better make sure that the Commission can find nothing about his operation, his personal life, or, possibly, even his wife's hats, that they might criticize.

In 1934 Congress enacted laws which provided for the Federal licensing of radio stations. The purpose of the law, according to those who were instrumental in writing it, was to provide traffic regulations in the field of radio, and nothing else. In order that a standard of regulation might be established, Congress provided that licenses should be issued on the basis of public interest, convenience, and necessity. In 1941 the Federal Communications Commission issued a set of rules generally known as chain broadcasting regulations. These rules went far beyond the regulation of frequencies and very definitely inserted the Government as a third party in the financial and program arrangements between stations and networks. Two of the networks asked for injunctions and the matter was argued in the lower courts and then taken to the Supreme Court. On May 10 the Supreme Court, by a 5-to-2 decision, with Justice Frankfurter writing the majority decision, not only upheld the right of the Commission to put these rules into effect, but went so much further in outlining the Commission's power that the question of the rules themselves has become a very minor matter and instead today the entire right of freedom of speech is threatened on every radio station in this country, whether or not it is affiliated with any network. In the decision Justice Frankfurter said:

> But the act does not restrict the Commission merely to supervision of the traffic. It puts upon the Commission the burden of determining the composition of that traffic.

In other words, the administration, through the Commission, can tell any radio station what its programs shall or shall not be. Further, in his opinion, Justice Frankfurter stated, in discussing the argument that the Commission is empowered to deal only with the technical and engineering impediments of radio:

> We cannot find in the act any such restriction of the Commission's authority.

And he added further:

> In the control of the developing problems to which it was directed, the act gave the Commission not niggardly but expansive powers.

One editorial states that the Supreme Court accepts Webster's Unabridged Dictionary as an authority on the definition of words, and in Webster the word "expansive" is defined as "unrestrained." I leave it to you, gentlemen, if this is not the most startling, shocking definition of the rights of our Government to dictate to private industry and private life that has ever been granted in the history of this Nation. Leading members of the bar who have studied the decision of the Supreme Court declare it one of the most dangerous precedents ever established in this country.

As I said before, the great controversy for the past 2 years has been whether or not the so-called chain broadcasting regulations were wise. But today as broadcasters throughout the country study the decision of the Supreme Court, they are horror stricken. The chain rules are forgotten. Today it is a question as to whether or not the Government shall dictate what kind of program we shall have, who shall speak, and on what subjects he shall speak over the broadcasting stations of the United States.

Chairman Fly, of the F. C. C., in a recent press conference, reacted to the anxiety of the radio broadcasting industry much as any other totalitarian leader would. He says that their fears are groundless, and brings up the customary cry of the monopolies. He says that any suggestion that the Government now controls radio is "hooey." He asserts that he aims to free radio stations to conduct their business in a manner in which he, Mr. Fly, thinks best for them. If the stations accept Mr. Fly's protection—if, in other words, they are good children—he assures them that stations certainly have nothing to be afraid of. Is there not a very broad hint there that if they do not play his game there may be something to fear? It is strange that station owners have never sought this freedom that Mr. Fly insists on their accepting, and that they have in the past thrived and improved on their own simple brand of free enterprise.

Broadcasters' fear of imminent Government ownership, control, or domination is the fear of a reality and not the "hooey" Mr. Fly so lightly calls it. What Hitler did to German radio is a cause for fear in any language, and, according to the Supreme Court, Mr. Fly now has the power to do it even here. Mussolini took the same parental attitude toward his children of the broadcasting industry in Italy. He gave them their instructions just the same as he gave castor oil to some of his less tractable party members. Chairman Fly now has the power to measure out to stations the exact amount of freedom he or the administration wants them to have, either with an eye dropper or a tankard, depending on how he feels at the moment. Perhaps he will choose a carefully measured bottle with a rubber nipple feeding 912 radio stations in the United States the way the Dionne quintuplets were fed, while the stations remain in an infantile relationship to Father Fly.

I hope that every Member of this body will study this decision of the Supreme Court and reflect seriously upon its possibilities. I think that you will agree with me that there is only one way to prevent this serious threat to the freedom of speech and our way of living—that is for Congress to rewrite the Radio Act in such definite terms that it cannot be seized upon by the party in power, no matter what it may be, for the chief purpose of directing its propaganda and maintaining itself in office.

A year ago the Interstate Commerce Committee of this body studied a new radio act known as the Sanders bill. No action was taken but when the new Congress assembled last January, the bill was resubmitted in practically the same form by Representative HOLMES. To date, further hearings have not been held. In the Senate, the White-Wheeler bill, a revision of the 1934 Radio Act, has been introduced by Senator WALLACE WHITE of Maine and Senator BURTON WHEELER of Montana. Hearings on this bill are scheduled to start in the very near future. The bill is of such a nature that it would definitely prescribe the powers of the F. C. C. and free the industry of this life and death threat from the Government which now hangs over it. I feel that this is a matter in which Congress should act at once. We will be derelict in our duty if we continue to let any bureau of the Government assume the powers of Congress—in fact, not only the powers of Congress, but a supreme dictatorship in a matter which so closely affects the lives of every man, woman, and child in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

BOOMERANG DOLLARS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, every day the war becomes more a struggle not simply of armies and navies but the home front as well.

In enemy countries, where people and resources are strained to the limit, the question is: How long can the home front stand up?

In America, it is a question of how long will it take to make our full strength effective.

This battle of home fronts, which steadily becomes more crucial, is chiefly a struggle to control living cost and prevent inflation.

What is inflation? I have heard quite a number of definitions. Mine is: Inflation is nothing more or less than a sharp rise in prices generated by the pressure of many dollars competing for an inadequate supply of goods. It is a threat today because people have more money at a time when there are less goods for them to buy.

Inflation is not to be taken lightly. Rapidly rising prices could enormously complicate the task of winning the war. They could cause such havoc with our social structure as to cheat us out of the fruits of victory.

It is absolutely necessary, therefore, for the welfare of the people and for the national well-being as a whole, that we hold the line on prices.

We must avoid boomerang dollars.

History shows that large-scale and long-continued military expenditures, financed in ways that give people more, rather than less, money to spend, without a corresponding increase in things to buy, has been the common underlying cause of every serious uncontrolled rise in prices in wartime.

ITALIAN INFLATION NOW

From Italy today come reports indicating history is repeating itself. The Italian people are not only faced with invasion but with a very serious rise in prices. For most things, Italians pay three times as much as before the war. Even rationed foods have gone up 50 percent. Eggs cost 18 cents each. Chicken is around $1 a pound. A worker pays out $150 for a suit of clothes.

Skyrocketing prices are a sure sign that the burden of war is falling unevenly and unfairly. This is causing a considerable drain on morale. And a combination of the two has divided the Italian people.

MOBILIZATION OF HOME FRONT

We may well ask ourselves how long will it take to complete the mobilization of our home front to stop scrambling for goods that we do not need; to stop clinging to what we know must be given up?

On that answer, too, depends how long and costly the war will be. It may decide whether the peace is won or lost. Rising prices and wages add needless billions to the cost of war. When peace comes, the bubble of the inflated prices and wages can burst with terrible dislocation to workers, farmers, businessmen—to everyone.

WHAT TOTAL WAR MEANS

Total war demands such a huge amount of goods and services that a major part of our productive capacity must be converted from the production of peacetime goods to producing the materials of war.

In 1940 we spent only $1 out of $33 of our national income for war purposes; $1 out of $10 in 1941; $1 out of $3 in 1942; and according to present estimates we will spend a little over $1 out of every $2 of our national income for our war against the Axis in 1943.

Obviously such a huge diversion of our productive capacity to the war effort requires the conversion of most of our industry to war production. Such a conversion also reduces the amount of available consumer goods. How this works is indicated by the production of various kinds of goods.

In 1939 consumers' goods were valued at $6,400,000,000. In 1941, based on 1939 prices, they were up two billion over 1939, and during 1942, our first full year of warfare, they tumbled by more than $3,000,000,000 to $5,200,000,000.

But as consumer goods values fell, more people began to punch factory time clocks than ever before. They are now working harder and working longer. Moreover, like the supply of goods, the supply of labor also is scarce, so that there is a pressure for the "upping" of salaries, wages, net income for farmers and business.

RESULTS OF UPWARD PRESSURE

Let me attempt to illustrate the results of this upward pressure:

In 1939 the average hourly earnings in durable manufacturing industries were 69.8 cents. In 1942, 94.7 cents.

In 1939 the average hourly earnings in nondurable manufacturing were 58.2 cents. In 1942, 72.3 cents.

Farm wage rates were 104 percent of the 1935–39 average in 1939. They were 158 percent of that average in 1942.

Net corporate profits (before taxes) amounted to five and five-tenths billion dollars in 1939, nineteen and seven-tenths billion dollars in 1942. But net corporate profits after taxes rose from four and two-tenths billion dollars in 1939 to seven and seven-tenths billion dollars in 1941, and then remained comparatively stationary. Thus in 1939 income payment to individuals in this country amounted to $71,000,000,000; in 1941 to 92 billions; and in 1942 to 116 billions. The estimated income payments in individuals for 1943 is about $140,000,000,000.

HIGHER TAXES ONLY TAKES PART

Part of the additional income is saved and part is paid in higher taxes; but some is directed to the purchase of goods and services. The expenditures of these additional sums in turn causes a further expansion of income and demands and further pressure on the prices of all products. One reason for the pressure on food prices, for example, is that war workers and others are using their expanded income to bring up their diet to a more adequate level. "They are meat hungry," says Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, "and they have the money to buy the meat."

The increased demand for goods, furthermore, makes necessary additional expenditures by business to replace, repair, and augment productive facilities. These expenditures lead to further pressure on the price structure. Thus the original increase in Government expenditures results in a widespread expansion of demand throughout the economy.

In itself the expansion of demand would not be dangerous. Under ordinary conditions it would be met by increased production of goods. But at the same time that war increases demand for goods, it contracts the supply available to civilians. The reason is apparent: America, for all her vast resources, has not a limitless supply of materials, manpower and machinery. At some point in the development of a war economy more guns mean less butter. The same steel plate cannot be used for both an automobile and a tank; the same sheet of rubber cannot make a tire for both pleasure car and a jeep; the same tanker cannot carry gasoline both to New England and to the global battle fronts.

Civilian production is believed to have reached its peak in August 1941. Since then, although total output has continued to rise, the production of civilian goods has declined at a rate of 1 percent a month, as more productive capacity, labor, plants, and material were diverted to war production.

The effect of war in contracting the supply of things available to civilians is perhaps most clearly seen in connection with production. People realize that there is some limit to the amount of steel or aluminum the Nation can produce. Though it is less evident, war also reduced the supply of available consumer services. In this area manpower is the great bottleneck.

DANGER OF EXPLOSIVE RISE IN PRICES

It is the simultaneous expansion of demand and contraction of supply which creates the danger of an explosive rise in prices. A gap arises between the amount of money people have at their disposal to spend and the amount of goods and services available for them to buy. There is natural tendency for people to compete among themselves to satisfy their individual wants. In effect, they bid against one another competitively for the things which are available.

Of course, not all of the money received by individuals as income is available for spending. Deductions must be made for tax payments and for savings. The size of the gap between supply and demand can obviously be narrowed by raising taxes and encouraging people to save more. The magnitude of the existing gap, however, must not be forgotten. Taxes will absorb only $15,000,000,000 of an estimated income of $140,000,000,000. This will leave $125,000,000,000 at the public's disposal. Another $25,000,000,000, it is estimated, will be invested in War bonds in 1943. But the people will still have approximately $100,000,000,000 in their pockets to buy an estimated $80,000,000,000 worth of goods and services. This is the crux of the economic danger confronting the country.

Unless diverted, the force of these dollars may break through the dam of price control and boil over in widespread bootlegging in violation of both price and rationing control. To draw off these excess dollars will require still higher taxes and some form of compulsory savings. These savings would be drawn out of people's current incomes and returned to them after the war over a

period of years. Realistically, there is no other choice. If excess spending power is not siphoned off, we will destroy not only this spending power but past savings as well, trying vainly to outbid one another for goods and services.

Clearly, the more far reaching are the financial controls to absorb this excess spending, and the more our civilian economy is contracted in favor of war production, the greater becomes the need for assuring people at least their minimum essentials of foods, clothing, shelter, and transportation.

ALL MUST COOPERATE

Price ceilings, of course, contribute to this aim in that they keep prices from skyrocketing beyond the reach of lower-income families.

In his April 1942 speech, President Roosevelt drew a distinction between equality of sacrifice and what he said he preferred to term equality of privilege. This distinction ought to be fixed firmly in all our minds. Too many persons have distorted equality of sacrifice to mean minimum of sacrifice, the attitude of "let the other fellow give up something first." We know what would happen to an army in which every soldier held back until the other man advanced.

To avert that tragedy all of the people must cooperate—every worker, every housewife, every farmer, every manufacturer, every merchant, every minister, every schoolboy. All must fight.

There simply is no such thing as a noncombatant in the battle against rising prices. What each of us buys—what each of us does not buy—affects prices, affects the supplies left for other civilians, affects how much strength is mobilized for war.

Every day, in dozens of actions, in how we shop and what we waste, we either help or hurt the enemy.

Self-restraint must be practiced to keep prices down.

Self-restraint means we must make what we have last longer.

It means foregoing the temporary advantage of higher prices for the things we have to sell.

It means foregoing high wages.

It means that the burden of sacrifice may fall unevenly and that some of us will have to give up more than others. But this is true on the fighting front as well as the home front. All soldiers and sailors are not asked to make the same sacrifices. Some are more fortunate. But all are ready to make any sacrifice which is asked of them.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. PACE, for 10 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. MCCORD, for 3 days, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2664. An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for feed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 10 a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments. Room 246, old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Thursday, June 10, 1943, for consideration of housing bills.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

1. Thursday, June 10: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

2. Friday, June 11: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2731, to facilitate the award and payment of just compensation for property requisitioned under the authority of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Subcommittee on Unemployment Insurance of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m., committee prints Nos. 1 and 2, dated June 7, 1943, relative to unemployment insurance for merchant seamen.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Securities Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Thursday, June 10, 1943.

Business to be considered: Open hearing to hear Mr. Ganson Purcell, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, on proxy rules.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of Subcommittee No. 7 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Friday, June 11, 1943, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of bills relating to the carrying of mail on star routes. Public hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Investigation of Restrictions on Brand Names and Newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Monday, June 14, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear representatives of Office of Price Administration. (Hearing for June 9 canceled.)

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2620, a bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives of the United States, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m., on Wednesday, June 16, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Investigation of Restrictions on Brand Names and Newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 2 p. m., Thursday, June 17, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear drug witnesses. On Friday, June 18, at 2 p. m. to hear newsprint and paper witnesses.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

473. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting in accordance with the provisions contained in the Deficiency Act of April 27, 1904 (31 U. S. C. 583, par. 2), a record of judgments rendered against the Government by the United States district courts as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of $11,325.26, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 225); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

474. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of a vessel of the United States Coast Guard, in the sum of $882.88, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of June 15, 1936 (14 U. S. C. 71), and which require an appropriation for payment (H. Doc. No. 226); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

475. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting in compliance with section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (5 U. S. C. 266), an estimate of appropriation for payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to $5,857.99, as covered by certificates of settlement the numbers of which are shown in

the first column of the attached schedule (H. Doc. No. 227); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

476. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision relating to a judgment rendered by the Court of Claims, as follows: "For the payment of judgment No. 45047 rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of Herman E. Osann covering a claim under the Exchange Relief Act of March 26, 1934, $3,784.64, to be paid from the administrative expense fund, Office of Alien Property Custodian" (H. Doc. No. 223); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

477. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting in compliance with the provisions of the act of September 30, 1890 (31 U. S. C. 226), and the act of April 27, 1904 (31 U. S. C. 583, par. 2), a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which have been submitted by the Treasury Department and require an appropriation for their payment, amounting to $232,578.66 (H. Doc. No. 229); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

478. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of vessels of the Navy, in the sum of $10,628.05, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1922 (34 U. S. C. 599), and which require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 230); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

479. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $4,500,000 (H. Doc. No. 231); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

480. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting in compliance with section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (5 U. S. C. 266), a schedule of claims amounting to $738,176.55, allowed by the General Accounting Office, as covered by certificates of settlement the numbers of which are shown in the first column of said schedule under appropriations, the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), and for the services of the several departments and independent offices (H. Doc. No. 232); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

481. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, in the sum of $71,116.21, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), and which require appropriations for their payment (H. Doc. No. 233); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

482. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 13, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of San Lorenzo Creek and its tributaries, California, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Flood Control.

483. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Patents.

484. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to suspend, as respects vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, certain provisions of the act approved March 3, 1925, authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damage caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels of the United States, and to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to settle and pay claims for damages caused by vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, or for towage and salvage services to such vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

485. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a list of registrants who have been deferred for occupational reasons because of their employment in or under the Federal Government on May 15, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2456. A bill for the relief of Moses Tennenbaum; without amendment (Rept. No. 530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 2907. A bill to provide for flood-control work on the Wabash River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2908. A bill to amend Public Law 537, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2909. A bill to provide for the acquisition and maintenance of suitable accommodations for Capitol pages; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2910. A bill to establish community and county committees of farmers to administer those phases of all Federal programs involving farm contact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLEY:

H. R. 2911. A bill to extend the time during which the 90-percent credit against Federal unemployment taxes for contributions paid into State unemployment funds may be claimed and allowed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 2912. A bill to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 2913. A bill providing emergency credit for farmers whose crops were damaged or destroyed by floods in 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McKENZIE:

H. R. 2922. A bill to further amend the act of June 25, 1938, entitled "An act extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution directing the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration to institute a system of grade labeling of all canned food products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States in prevention of future aggression and the maintenance of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 255. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 2703; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2914. A bill for the promotion of Capt. Richard S. Field, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2915. A bill for the relief of the Pacific Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 2916. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Winnie O'Dell Singleton and Jimmie Dale Singleton, minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of California:

H. R. 2917. A bill for the relief of Sallie Grossenbancher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 2918. A bill for the relief of the city of Battle Creek, Mich.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 2919. A bill for the relief of Michael Eatman, Jr., and Mrs. Michael Eatman, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2920. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Earl B. Burkes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 2921. A bill for the relief of Eddie Bessire; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1474. By Mr. ANGELL: Petitions of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1475. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of 99 members of the First Baptist Church of Big Spring, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1476. Also, petition of Rev. Lawrence White and 62 citizens of Defiance, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1477. Also, petition of Ida Lewis and 20 citizens of Costa Mesa, Calif., uring enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1478. Also, petition of Estelle Harper and 182 citizens of Garden Grove, Calif., urging

enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1479. Also, petition of E. R. Hackett, and 60 citizens of Phoenix, Ariz., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1480. Also, petition of Eleanor M. Clark and 80 citizens of Ontario, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1481. Also, petition of the Amy Baptist Church of Amy, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1482. Also, petition of 44 members of the First Baptist Church of Berkeley, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1483. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Tom Tabor and 112 citizens of Oden, Ark., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1484. Also, petition of Alma E. Kilius and 40 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1485. Also, petition of Mrs. J. H. Flewell and 60 citizens of Long Beach, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1486. Also, petition of George H. Bauerle and 23 citizens of Nampa, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1487. Also, petition of J. B. Abbott and 37 citizens of Garden Grove, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1488. Also, petition of Rev. A. H. Bauknight and 27 members of the Victor Methodist Church of Greer, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1489. Also, petition of Georgia G. Richmond and 28 citizens of Coquille, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1490. Also, petition of Lillian Nelson and 23 citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1491. Also, petition of 64 citizens of the District of Columbia, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1492. Also, petition of Mrs. L. M. Van Nest and 34 citizens of Vallejo, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1493. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles Brooks and 36 citizens of Roosevelt, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1494. Also, petition of Ray F. Brown and eight citizens of Mill Creek, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1495. Also, petition of George L. Beardsley and 40 citizens of Garden Grove, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1496. Also, petition of J. R. West and 38 citizens of Miami, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1497. Also, petition of Mrs. S. Fred Christman and 100 citizens of Cumberland, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1498. Also, petition of Elma Wood and 104 citizens of Wilmington, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1499. Also, petition of Lottie E. Bartshe and 26 citizens of Ithaca, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1500. Also, petition of the Joseph K. Alston Camp No. 7, United Spanish War Veterans, signed by F. N. Wakefield, committeeman, and Rev. J. A. Anderson, commander, of Greenville, S. C., voicing disapproval and expressing condemnation of the attitude of John L. Lewis and urging Congress to enact necessary laws to handle Lewis and his kind; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1501. Also, petition of Mrs. Forrest Lominack and members of the Central Methodist Church, of Newberry, S. C., urging that the Farm Security Administration under its present leadership be continued and that funds for its operation be appropriated by Congress in an amount sufficient to extend its activities to all farm families needing the kind of help which it provides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1502. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of Dorris W. Stiles and 33 other residents of Hayward, Calif., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill, prohibiting the manufacture or sale of alcoholic liquors during the war period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1503. Also, petition of Mrs. John R. George, and 20 other residents of Martinez, Calif., prohibiting the manufacture or sale of alcoholic liquors during the war period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1504. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of the Arkansas State Highway Commission, endorsing the executive committee formula for the apportionment of funds for highway construction; to the Committee on the Public Roads.

1505. Also, petition of the Arkansas-Missouri Ginners' Association, urging speedy passage of House bill 2400; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1506. By Mr. JONKMAN: Petition of Mrs. William A. Rogers and 50 other residents of Sparta, Mich., recommending passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1507. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Luther Pearson, county superintendent, Brazos County, Bryan, Tex., and Mrs. J. L. Brock, Bryan, Tex., favoring appropriation for National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1508. Also, petition of G. C. Boswell, of Ranger, Tex., and Ralph Campbell, president of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, of

Austin, Tex., favoring appropriation for National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1509. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Reclamation Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to appointing J. LEROY JOHNSON to the House Committee on Flood Control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1510. Also, petition of the Ironwood Chamber of Commerce, Ironwood, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1511. Also petition of sundry citizens of the State of Nebraska, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1512. Also, petition of the Pan American Union, of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Pan American Day; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. Horace E. Cromer, district superintendent of the Methodist Church, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Spiritual Father to all men, Arbiter of the destiny of the nations of the whole earth, it is just and needful that we renew with each new dawn our allegiance to Thee and to Thy will. This we pause to do. We seek Thy guidance, Thy way, and Thy purposes for this day. Make us to know that which is right in Thy sight.

Let the blessing of our Father God rest on each of us here assembled, all those whom we represent, the men of our far-flung national forces, the leaders of the nations, and all men. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, June 9, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Caraway	Hatch
Andrews	Chandler	Hawkes
Austin	Chavez	Hayden
Bailey	Clark, Mo.	Hill
Ball	Connally	Holman
Bankhead	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.
Barbour	Davis	La Follette
Bilbo	Eastland	Langer
Bone	Ellender	Lodge
Brewster	Ferguson	Lucas
Bridges	George	McCarran
Buck	Gerry	McClellan
Burton	Gillette	McFarland
Bushfield	Green	McKellar
Byrd	Guffey	McNary
Capper	Gurney	Maloney
Maybank	Revercomb	Vandenberg
Mead	Reynolds	Van Nuys
Millikin	Russell	Wallgren
Moore	Scrugham	Walsh
Murdock	Shipstead	Wheeler
Murray	Smith	Wherry
Nye	Stewart	White
O'Daniel	Taft	Wiley
O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.	Willis
Overton	Thomas, Utah	Wilson
Pepper	Tobey	
Radcliffe	Tunnell	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 64)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $17,285,000, in the form of amendments to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

COMPENSATION FOR USEFUL SUGGESTIONS OR INVENTIONS BY PERSONNEL OF THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

MORE ADEQUATE AND UNIFORM ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS IN VETERANS' LAWS PERTAINING TO COMPENSATION, AND SO FORTH

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

MARCH 1943 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Corporation for the month of March 1943, relating to loan and other authorizations (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

TRANSFERS AND REDUCTIONS OF PERSONNEL IN THE CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 84 (78th Congress), a summary table of reports for the month of April 1943 (including all replies received in the Commission through May 29, 1943) submitted by the various executive departments and agencies; also a separate list of those agencies from which no reports, or from which only partial or incomplete reports were received (with accompanying papers); ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BILBO:

A petition of sundry citizens of Jackson and vicinity, in the State of Mississippi, praying for the enactment of the so-called Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of sundry citizens of Jackson and vicinity, in the State of Mississippi, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens, members of St. Peter's Evangelical and Reformed Church, of Inman, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 159. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the United States Parcel Post Building Company, of Cleveland, Ohio; with amendments (Rept. No. 301), and

S. 346. A bill for the relief of Harriet B. Rickords; without amendment (Rept. No. 302).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 254. A bill for the relief of Edward Gillam; with an amendment (Rept. No. 303).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 462. A bill for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo; with an amendment (Rept. No. 304); and

S. 1090. A bill for the relief of John Henry Miller, Junior; without amendment (Rept. No. 307).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1038. A bill for the relief of Verna Mae Rossell and Winifred Rossell; with amendments (Rept. No. 305).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 575. A bill for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Violet Cuccio; without amendment (Rept. No. 306).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

H. R. 1947. A bill to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209); without amendment (Rept. No. 308).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion for temporary service, sundry naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve for appointment in the Regular Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of law, and sundry citizens and a meritorious noncommissioned officer to be second lieutenants, all in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1217. A bill to equalize the pay and allowances of retired naval officers employed on active duty in the rank of rear admiral with those of rear admirals on the active list, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. MOORE, Mr BUSHFIELD, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. GURNEY):

S. 1218. A bill to repeal the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. L. 984), and the act of June 15, 1935, supplementary thereto (49 Stat. L. 378), and for other purposes: to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 1219. A bill to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 95, line 11, after the figures "$421,039", to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That no part of the appropriation authorized under this item shall be used except for the complete liquidation of the resettlement projects which shall be accomplished by December 31, 1943.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE SOLID FUEL INSTITUTE OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Great Need of Mankind—Cooperation," delivered by him before the Solid Fuel Institute of Milwaukee on June 7, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY BERLE TO GRADUATING CLASS OF UTAH STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Assistant Secretary of State Hon. Adolf A. Berle, Jr., to the graduating class of Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah, May 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

STRATEGY OF THE UNITED NATIONS—ARTICLE BY CLIFFORD B. WARD

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the strategy of the United Nations written by Clifford B. Ward and published in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL TRIBUTE TO JOSEPHUS DANIELS FROM TACOMA (WASH.) NEWS-TRIBUNE

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Newspaper Sage" from the Tacoma News-Tribune of June 4, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BATTLE OF WASHINGTON—ARTICLE BY JAY FRANKLIN

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Battle of Washington," by Jay Franklin, printed in the June 1943 issue of the Railroad Trainman, which appears in the Appendix.]

RAILROAD FREIGHT RATES—ADDRESS BY GEORGE M. CROWSON

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address on railroad freight rates delivered by George M. Crowson, assistant to the president, Illinois Central System, before the Traffic Club of New Orleans, on May 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

BITUMINOUS-COAL PRODUCTION IN WEST VIRGINIA

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "West Virginia May Set Record in Coal Output," from the Washington Evening Star of June 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

INCREASED ALLOTMENTS TO DEPENDENTS OF ENLISTED MEN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on June 6, 1943, on the subject of increased allotments to dependents of enlisted men in the armed services, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OF GASOLINE

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I wish to voice the protest of the people of Indiana and of adjoining States against the enforcement of additional restrictions in that area on the use of gasoline for essential purposes. I am prompted to do this by the great volume of protests which have come to me, and I desire to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the names of some of those who have sent the protests, to indicate the character of the men and the businesses they represent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Frederick M. Sutter, Columbus, Ind.
Powell Chevrolet, Inc., Columbus, Ind.
McKibben & Merrill, Terre Haute, Ind.
Dr. D. G. Walesby, Indianapolis, Ind.
W. A. Oeffler, president, Jasonville Industrial Bureau, Jasonville, Ind.
Bruce C. Kixmiller, Inc., Vincennes, Ind.
Harry R. Baldwin, Anderson, Ind.
Clapp Motor Sales, Jeffersonville, Ind.
Hermann C. Wolff, Indianapolis, Ind.
Webster Cafe, Monticello, Ind.
Lowell L. Martin and Will Thomas, La Fayette, Ind.

William J. Duncan, Samuel C. Ennis, Harry B. Sanger, Harry Folk, Thor Kolle, William N. Lave, Harold G. Muenich, and Gertrude Labahn, Hammond, Ind.

Harold E. Laufer, president, St. Joseph Valley Bank, Elkhart, Ind.

James H. Bryant, Vincennes, Ind.

Paul Steem, Nathan Reiff, William Welch, Ivan F. Goodrich, Otis B. Fields, Ted L. Forney, Simon Koontz, Jr., Theodore A. Reitz, Clarence F. Leist, and Clifford P. Martin, Elkhart, Ind

Wilcox Motor Sales, Jeffersonville, Ind.
Vorgang Motor Sales Co., Jeffersonville, Ind.
Jeffersonville Board of Trade, Jeffersonville, Ind.
Evansville Automobile Dealers Association, J. E. O'Daniel, president, Evansville, Ind.
Osborn Bros. Garage, Jeffersonville, Ind.

William May, S. N. A. & Gravel Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.

Indiana Independent Petroleum Association, Indianapolis, Ind.

Bill Nichold, president, South Bend and Mishawaka Auto Trade Association, South Bend, Ind.

Automobile Club Service Bureau, Joseph L. Asay, American Assurance Corporation, Clyde Baugh & Co., P. W. Burns, Citizens Trust & Savings Bank, Commercial Agency, Inc., John W. Cook, Arthur Deitsch, E. J. Eisterhold, Fred Englehart, Franklin Bank & Trust Co., Greene & Green, Harris & Wade, Heyns Insurance Agency, Eli G. Huber, J. C. Hutchinson, Interstate Finance Corporation, Kattman Insurance Agency, Kinkle Realty & Insurance Co., Sylvester Krock, Levi Bros., Percy C. Logsdon, Fritz Long, Lukens & Sons, McCoy Realty & Insurance Co., McReynolds & Dreier, Harry R. Miles Insurance Agency, Arthur C. Miller, George O. Miller, W. J. Muenstermann, North Side Insurance Agency, Ole H. Olson, Richard J. Peters, Richardt Agency, Inc., Bernard Schenk, Bayard V. Somes, Southern Commercial Agency, George H. Stockwell Agency., Strassweg Insurance Agency, Torian Insurance Agency, Walker Insurance Agency, A. M. Weil & Bros. Co., Werner Realty & Insurance Co., D. Ed Williams, William R. Woods, West Side Insurance Agency, West Side Investment Co., Evansville, Ind.

Loraine Boerger, Kenneth Beard, Walter Binder, Richard Blitz, Herman Bohnke, Henry Branning, Florence Brower, John Wolfrum, Henry Curdes, Vilas Feasel, George Fishering, Leo Weber, Irma Hartman, John Hartwig, Raymond Hawver, Paul Hess, Al Hoffman, David Hostetter, Hamilton Hunter, Walter Keeberg, Frank Lahmeyer, Effie Lucas, Walter Lupke, Clem Mettler, Miller & Lawry, Vern Mitchell, William Moellering, Fred Niemeyer, Harry Geoglein, Eugene Pequignot, Alfred Randall, Walter Rosenwinkel, Schaaf & Auer, William Scheiman, Henry Schoppman, Earl Seibold, Frieda Colditz, Paul Spear, Ralph Stogdill, Ray Kuhn, Willard Thomas, Joseph Till, William VonDreau, Fred Wiedemann, Fort Wayne, Ind.

Southeastern Indiana Division of Cincinnati Automobile Club, Cincinnati, Ohio.

S. T. Berner, W. H. Bruner, Clifford Pletcher, Alexis Coquillard, J. W. Montgomery, Carl W. Ginz, Eugene Happ, Stanley J. Muszynski, Joseph Neff, Clarence Haas, C. E. Perins, Russel E. Smith, F. L. Nelson, Arthur P. Perley, W. S. Phillips, Paul Shanahan, C. Mont Smith, J. Harold Keracofe, Walter Stoner, George E. Keller, Dean Swadner, Fred J. Huns, Marvin Mogle, A. J. Schindler, Regis Richard, Roy E. Rohleder, South Bend, Ind.

A. L. Anchors, Guy S. Ayers, Leslie Bain, David Furse, A. N. Blank, Emma Claus, M. A.

Braman, J. S. Brown, Forest S. Briggs, Thomas J. Welch, Theodore H. Dauer, Caroline Durfos, Edward Flannery, William F. Funke, Mary Kent, T. M. Kitchen, Annabelle H. Huffin, Kenneth McLennan, Harry Hall, Paul Christy, Edward Jakoby, Fred Jannasch, Tyrie Robbins, Wm. Glover, Milo Vale, Gus Kravis, Al Krueger, Alex. Lyris, Julius Mathhies, Ralph Patchter, J. A. Oberdorfer, Walter Pickart, Ralph Rhoades, George Rogge, Wm. Schmidt, John Schneider, E. C. Simpson, F. M. Sopcak, Margaret Graham, J. A. Vitkus, Matthew Vlasic, C. A. Wachowiak, Margaret Walsh, Warren Wise, Fred Wildermuth, Gary, Ind.

Peter Belzeski, John J. Bochnowski, Albert Lesniak, Leo Bonaventura, Jos. W. Dunsing, D. W. Dupes, Max M. Friedman, Margaret R. Hannusin, Alan E. Lewis, John Manta, Lloyd Hurst, Mike Marcovich, D. L. Mitchell, George Mosny, John Packer, R. H. Smith, John J. Block, Jos. Wleklinski, East Chicago, Ind.

The Brazil Trust Co., Burns Agency, Lester Cagle Insurance Agency, Ray L. Coughanowr, May Garrison, Oscar Houk, Indiana Agency, Kidd Insurance Agencies, McQueen & Morgan, J. O. Mullinix Insurance Agency, A. B. Nees & Sons, C. Herman Pell & Son, John Randolph, W. E. Schultz, Rousch & Long, Don Staley, Worth Stigler, Bruan Meyer, Brazil, Ind.

The Geo. H. Knollenberg Co., F. H. Haner, president, Richmond, Ind.

Davis Auto Co., Fort Wayne, Ind.

La Fayette Board of Fire & Casualty Underwriters, N. O. Neiburger, W. G. Thomas, J. C. Goris, F. A. Tedford, Ralph Mayerstein, E. E. Hollenbeck, George W. Burnell, Floys Brunton, Ray Adams, Richard Underwood, C. H. Hockema, Walter Graham, Charles Nicher, Willia Teal, Charles Stallard, Clifford Bowerman, James Erickson, George Balf, William Ball, Millard Overton, Harold Brelsford, B. K. Dicks, George Price, James Price, Ernest Collins, La Fayette, Ind.

J. Rolland Stinson, Leslie N. Carter, Victor A. White, Geraldine Maynard, John F. Wilhelm, Norman Tapper, Paul Segrist, Charles J. Kaufman, Ruth Horan, Henry C. Reissig, Edward L. Phair, Pauline Kleinschmidt, Leo Pottlitzer, John F. Pers, Allan F. Orourke, Julius H. Meyn, Warner F. Blackmun, Alfred A. Sherbb, Carl Kummer, Sylvia Otto, Francis Barney, C. B. Knapp, Vane R. Howard, Mae Heinley, J. E. Hathaway, Walter Thornton, D. Wasserman, Howard J. Gescheidler, Walter A. McNary, Mable Knipple, P. Boersma, P. Amaphony, Fred J. Gescheidler, Howard Gescheidler, Jr., Forrest R. Hobbs, C. Fry, M. Klein, S. C. Gettler, Leslie Meyers, Edmund H. Klein, Lawrence S. Ervin, Jean Koenes, William Lavin, M. Wilson, F. P. Dall, Gibson A. Meyer, J. Clinn Ellyson, Arthur E. Ebert, George W. Clark, Theodore Moor, Anthony D. Baker, Hammond, Ind.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, the people of Indiana have made a splendid and impressive contribution to the war effort. They will continue to do so; but they feel that they should be permitted to continue to use gasoline for essential purposes, and for the purposes of their businesses, because there is an abundant supply of gasoline in that area, and it is transported into and within the area only by means of trucks.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder if the Senator would feel that those for whom he speaks should continue to use their gasoline for nonessential purposes, if the supply on hand in that area could augment the gasoline needed for military requirements, of which there is a shortage.

Mr. WILLIS. I know the people of Indiana do not care to use a single gallon of gasoline which would contribute to the war effort, or which would relieve the shortage on the east coast; but, in view of the inadequacy of other means of transportation, they feel perfectly justified in asking that they may use the gasoline already in the vicinity, and already available. They feel it is not necessary to impose restrictions merely for the sake of regimentation or in order to indicate their sympathy with those suffering for lack of gasoline.

Mr. BREWSTER. I felt sure the Senator would be willing to cooperate.

Mr. WILLIS. I am, indeed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to know whether the situation in Indiana is like that in North Dakota, which is about a thousand miles farther west.

Mr. WILLIS. I am not informed as to the situation in North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I shall tell the Senator what it is. I had a telephone call this morning from Mr. John R. Fleck, the State representative of the National Automobile Dealers Association, stating they have all the gasoline they need, hauling it from about 190 or 200 miles west of the State. They have the trucks available. There are high-school students who desire to work on the farms. There are men living in small towns who farm out in the country, 2 miles, 4 miles, 6 miles, 8 miles, who need gasoline to go to and fro. Is the situation in Indiana like that in North Dakota?

Mr. WILLIS. It is very similar to it.

DEDICATION OF TWO LOCKS ON ST. MARYS RIVER

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce I report favorably House bill 1258, and I submit a report (No. 300) thereon.

If I may have the attention of the acting majority leader and the minority leader, the sole purpose of the bill is to officially name the two new locks which have been built at Sault Ste. Marie. There is no controversy about it. It is desired that the matter should be officially concluded at once, because the dedication is to occur on July 4, and I am asking whether there is any objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Did the bill have a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It did, of the Committee on Commerce and of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McNARY. I join in the request.

Mr. HILL. Under the circumstances, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H R. 1258) to name certain locks in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator in charge of the pending bill, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I should like to state to him that I think he would be justified in giving notice that the Senate will remain in session today until it passes the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be very happy to have the matter take that direction, if it appeals to the leaders of the majority and the minority.

Mr. McNARY. I think the notice should be given. The bill will have a long and rough road after it passes, and it is as important a bill as any that has been before the Senate. It is as important as the Navy appropriation bill or the Army appropriation bill. We must have food first. We have been considering the bill for several days, and it must go to conference, the conference report must be agreed to, and the bill must be signed by the President by the 30th of June. I think we should remain in session today until we finish the consideration of the bill, and if I were in charge of the bill, I would give notice to that effect, because it is proper to give such notice either the day before or early on the day when such an order is desired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that, so far as I am concerned, I will cooperate with him to the fullest. If he wishes to give the notice now, and have the Senate remain in session until the consideration of the bill is completed, I will do everything I can to cooperate with him and uphold his hands in the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question that it is of the utmost importance to have the bill pass the Senate at the earliest possible date. We are several weeks later with the bill this year than we have been in times past. Last year the bill was not presented to the President until after the 1st of July, and that situation caused a great deal of confusion. The previous year the bill reached the President, due to the length of time we spent on it in conference between the House and the Senate, on the last day of the fiscal year. There will probably be more difficulties in the conference this year than there ever have been before, and we will require all the time possible in an effort to iron out the differences between the two bodies.

In view of the great importance of taking action on the bill at the earliest possible time I shall accept the suggestion of the two leaders, and I serve notice that I shall insist that the Senate remain in session today until action on the bill can be concluded.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF HIS EXCELLENCY, GEN. HIGINIO MORÍNIGO M., PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF PARAGUAY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the President of Paraguay will shortly visit the Senate. I ask that the Chair appoint a committee to escort him to the floor of the Senate, and that then the Senate

stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] as the committee to meet the President of Paraguay and escort him into the Chamber.

Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess, at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.,

His Excellency, Gen. Higinio Morínigo M., President of Paraguay, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. HILL, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. CAPPER, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Edwin A. Halsey, and the Sergeant at Arms, Wall Doxey, entered the Chamber and took the place assigned him on the rostrum in front of the Vice President's desk.

The members of the party accompanying the President of Paraguay, including His Excellency Señor Dr. Don Luis Argaña, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Paraguay; His Excellency Señor Dr. Don Rogelio Espinoza, Minister of Finance of Paraguay; Lt. Col. Victoriano Benitez Vera; Lt. Col. Manuel Rodriguez; Maj. Eugenio Reichert, aide-de-camp to the President of Paraguay; the Honorable Dr. Jorge Escobar, Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs of Paraguay; Lt. Comdr. Pedro Meyer, naval aide to the President of Paraguay; the Honorable Wesley Frost, American Ambassador to Paraguay; Brig. Gen. Charles L. Mullins, Jr., United States Army, military aide; Capt. Frank Loftin, United States Navy, naval aide; and R. D. Muir, Division of Protocol, Department of State, entered the Chamber and were escorted to the seats assigned them to the left of the Vice President's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Members of the Senate, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I introduce to you the President of Paraguay.

[Applause, Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF PARAGUAY

His Excellency Gen. Higinio Morínigo M., President of Paraguay, addressed the Senate as follows:

Señor Presidente, Señores Senadores, bien está la suntuosidad del Capitolio para albergar entre sus muros gigantescos las figuras próceres de las ilustres personalidades cuyas estatuas enfilan en la Rotonda como mudos guardianes de la impercedera tradición de esta Casa, de donde ha salido la sabia legislación democrática que tan marcada influencia ha ejercido en el progreso material y espiritual de esta gran Nación.

Elevado es el honor que significa para mí el ocupar esta tribuna, no precisamente como Presidente de una nación hermana de la vuestra, sino, sobre todo, como ciudadano de América, como miembro de la gran familia constituída en torno a una causa común.

Los Estados Unidos de América se incorporaron a la vida independiente sobre la base de un programa bien definido, que aparece en el Acta de la Declaración de Independencia, de 1776, y es completado después por la Constitución Nacional, la Carta de Garantías Individuales y la oración de Gettysburg.

Dicha Declaración de Independencia es, a mi juicio, el documento más trascendental de su género. Empieza con la enunciación del hermoso principio jurídico internacional según el cual "la independencia e igualdad de las naciones de la tierra es un derecho que emana de las leyes de la naturaleza y del Dios de esa naturaleza"; proclama, en el orden público, "que todos los hombres nacen libres; que a todos les confiere su Creador ciertos derechos inalienables entre los cuales están la vida, la libertad y la busca de la felicidad"; y sienta, en materia política, uno de los principios cardinales en los regímenes democráticos: "Que para garantizar estos derechos, los hombres instituyen gobiernos que derivan sus justos poderes del consentimiento de los gobernados."

Desde la fecha memorable de aquella declaración de Jefferson han pasado más de 166 años; y, sin embargo, aquellos principios siguen siendo piedras angulares de la construcción jurídica de los pueblos libres.

Los Estados Unidos de América se han anticipado en trece años a la Revolución Francesa, en la "Declaración de los derechos del hombre y del ciudadano," trasegada después a los demás países del Continente para estructurar las constituciones que modelaron las nuevas nacionalidades que forman la gran familia americana.

Mi patria, al igual que los otros países de América y siguiendo el ejemplo de la hermana mayor del Norte, adoptó la forma democrática de gobierno. Ha sido y es un país democrático desde las más remotas épocas de su historia. Fué paraguaya la revolución llamada de los Comuneros, quienes en 1727, mucho antes de promediar el siglo XVIII, ya habían proclamado, ante la faz del mundo, que la voluntad del común o pueblo debe estar por encima de todas las voluntades, como principio y emanación que es de las autoridades públicas.

Ha venido rigiéndose hasta 1939 por una de las constituciones más liberales del mundo.

Las nuevas cuestiones planteadas en el terreno del derecho puro inspiraron la reforma de 1939, para tratar de poner aquella ley fundamental en consonancia y asegurar un mayor bienestar general. con las modernas conquistas del derecho El problema no fué planteado como un abandono de la ruta seguida hasta entonces para campear por sendas distintas, sino como una rectificación de la marcha para procurar acelerarla convenientemente y alejar obstáculos y espejismos, de acuerdo con las modernas corrientes ideológicas y por el mismo procedimiento que habían puesto en práctica otros países americanos. No na respondido a ninguna tendencia absolutista sino al sano propósito de satisfacer una necesidad, sin desmedrar, como se expresa en la exposición de motivos, los principios cardinales de la democracia americana, consignados en la Constitución de Filadelfia.

Es indudable que el sistema democrático, como organización política y social, es el único que se conforma con la naturaleza del hombre; pero es también indudable que todo sistema o cuerpo de doctrina puede y debe ser modificado a la luz de la verdad, sin remover, claro está, la base de la construcción jurídica para no caer en el absurdo de pretender sostener la fábrica en el aire. "El conocimiento de la verdad," lo dice una inscripción burilada en el frontispicio de la galería central de la Biblioteca de este Congreso, "es el bien soberano de la naturaleza humana."

Con lo dicho, no he querido significar que se trate de una obra acabada. Antes, por el contrario, creo que la reforma no carece de errores y omisiones. Tal es la razón por la cual he propiciado últimamente una revisión de la misma, en consulta hecha al pueblo de mi país con resultado favorable, y siempre en vista de los principios básicos de una verdadera democracia.

La edad contemporánea en la división cronológica de la historia universal, arranca de la Revolución Francesa. Lo justo, en mi sentir, hubiera sido tomar como punto de partida la fecha de la Independencia de los Estados Unidos de América, de la aprobación, por el Segundo Congreso Continental, de las hermosas declaraciones a que he aludido hace un momento, por lo menos en América, donde aquella simiente de libertad ha germinado en instituciones que honran a los pueblos que forman la cumunidad americana, al amparo de idénticas inquietudes cívicas y de comunes aspiraciones.

A la vista de los acontecimientos producidos en los últimos diez años, acaso no sea aventurado afirmar que una nueva era histórica se ha iniciado en el Nuevo Mundo. Recordaré solamente dos de dichos acontecimientos:

Primero.—El advenimiento de la política de la "Buena Vecindad" que nació con la asunción del mando por el Presidente Roosevelt cuando desde los umbrales de este Capitolio dijo que, en el campo de las relaciones internacionales dedicaría esta Nación a la política "de un buen vecino que se respete a sí mismo y que, por hacerlo así, respete los derechos de los otros; de un vecino que en un mundo de vecinos, haga honor a sus obligaciones y a la santidad de sus convenios."

Y segundo. La consolidación del Panamericanismo, desde la Primera Reunión de Ministros de Relaciones Exteriores, en Panamá en 1939, hasta la Tercera de Río de Janeiro, de 1942, y cuyo resultado inmediato ha sido la más grandiosa cooperación de los países americanos que registra la historia, para defenderse del peligro común que golpeó sus puertas con al ataque alevoso de Pearl Harbor, luchar por el mantenimiento de los eternos principios de la libertad y de la justicia, que gobiernan la convivencia social,

y propender a la formación de un mundo mejor que el presente, sobre la base del respeto de la moral y el derecho y la observancia de una real confraternidad, como principios esenciales de la democracia.

El Paraguay ha cumplido y cumplirá fiel y honradamente todos sus compromisos internacionales. Ha roto sus relaciones diplomáticas, económicas y financieras con las naciones del Eje, antes que la Tercera Reunión de Cancilleres de Río de Janeiro clausurara sus sesiones.

Respetuoso de su tradición y fervoroso partidario de los principios enunciados, no ha titubeado ni un solo instante para ponerse del lado de los Estados Unidos de América y de las otras naciones hermanas en la más espantosa tragedia que haya concebido la imaginación y recuerda la historia de todos los tiempos.

El pueblo paraguayo reafirma, por mi intermedio, en esta ocasión solemne, su adhesión a la causa de este glorioso país, que es causa de América, y rinde su homenaje al heroismo de sus esforzados combatientes por la libertad y la justicia.

[Prolonged applause, Senators, distinguished visitors, and occupants of the galleries rising.]

The English translation of the address by the President of the Republic of Paraguay is as follows:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate of the United States, the magnificence of the Capitol is fitting to shelter within its gigantic walls the outstanding figures of the illustrious persons whose statues stand in the rotunda as mute guardians of the imperishable traditions of this House from which has emanated the wise democratic legislation that has exercised such marked influence on the material and spiritual progress of this great Nation.

It signifies a high honor for me to occupy this rostrum, not only as President of your sister nation, but above all as a citizen of the Americas, as a member of the great family of nations united around a common cause.

The United States of America entered into an independent life on the basis of a well-defined program that appears in the Declaration of Independence of 1776, completed later by the Constitution and by the Bill of Rights and the Gettysburg Address.

The Declaration of Independence is, in my opinion, the most transcendental document of its kind. It begins with the enunciation of the fine international juridical principle according to which "the separate and equal station of the nations of the world is a right to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitled them"; it proclaims in the public order "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and it establishes in political matters one of the cardinal principles of democratic regimes, "that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Since the memorable date of that Jeffersonian declaration more than 166 years have passed, and still those principles continue to be the foundation stones of the juridical structure of the free people.

Thirteen years before the French Revolution, the United States of America had set forth the principles of the Bill of Rights, which later served as a model to the new nations of the great American family in the framing of their constitutions.

My country, together with the other countries of America, and following the example of the older sister from the north, adopted a democratic form of government. It has been and is a democratic country since the early days of its history. Paraguayan in origin was the revolution of the Comuneros which in 1727, long before the middle of the eighteenth century, proclaimed to the whole world that the will of the common people must be above all other wills, as a principle which belongs to public authority.

Up until 1939 Paraguay had governed itself by one of the most liberal constitutions in the world.

The new questions which arose in the field of pure law inspired the reform of 1939, in order to place that fundamental law in harmony with the modern conquest of law; and assure a greater well-being. The problem was not stated with a view to abandoning the road followed up to then and traveling by a different one, but with a view to modifying the direction and trying to expedite it in a convenient way, leaving out obstacles and illusions, in accordance with the modern ideologies, and in line with the processes that other American countries had established. It has not followed any absolutist tendency, but the sound purpose of satisfying a need without impairing, as stated in the declaration of purposes, the cardinal principles of American democracy contained in the Philadelphia Constitution.

There is no doubt that the democratic system, as a political and social organization, is the only one which conforms with man's nature; but it is also true that any system or body or doctrine can and must be modified in the light of truth without removing, of course, the bases of the juridical structure so that it may not err by trying to operate in a vacuum. "The inquiry, knowledge, and belief of truth," as stated in an inscription in the facade of the central gallery of the Library of this Congress, "is the sovereign good of human nature."

I do not need to state that we are not dealing with a finished work. Rather, I believe in the reform of its flaws and omissions. That is why I have advocated recently its revision, after consulting my people with favorable results, and always considering the basic principles of a true democracy.

In the chronological division of universal history, the contemporary age starts with the French Revolution. The fair thing in my opinion would have been to take as the starting point the date of the independence of the United States of America, of the approval, by the Second Continental Congress, of the outstanding statements to which I have just referred, at least in America, where the seed of liberty has sprouted into institutions which honor the peoples that are a part of the American community and that live under the same civic preoccupation and the same common aspirations.

In the light of events in the United States during the past 10 years, it may not be unreasonable to state that a new era in history has begun in the New World. Let me review but two of these events:

First. The inception of the good-neighbor policy, coincidental with the inauguration of President Roosevelt, who, from the rostrum of this Capitol said that in the field of international relations he dedicated this Nation to the "good neighbor who respects himself and who, therefore, respects the rights of others; the neighbor who, in a world of neighbors, honors his obligations and the sanctity of his word."

And, second, the consolidation of pan-Americanism, from the first meeting of foreign ministers in Panama in 1939, to the third such meeting, in Rio de Janeiro in 1942, the immediate result of which was the most magnificent cooperation of the American countries ever recorded in history, for the purpose of defending themselves against the common danger which struck against them with the treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor, of struggling for the maintenance of the undying principles of liberty and justice which govern their living together, and of aiming at the formation of a world better than the present one on the basis of respect for the principles of ethics and law and of the practice of a true fraternity, as principles essential to a democracy.

Paraguay has kept and will continue to keep faithfully and honorably all her international pledges. Even before the third meeting of foreign ministers in Rio had come to a close, she had broken all diplomatic, economic, and financial ties with the Axis.

Respectful of her tradition and an active advocate of the principles expressed, she has not hesitated a single moment to put herself on the side of the United States and the other United Nations in the greatest tragedy which the imagination has conceived and which history has recorded in all time.

The Paraguayan people reaffirm, through me, in this solemn occasion, their adherence to the cause of this glorious country, which is also the cause of all America, and pay homage to the heroism of its brave fighting men in the fight for liberty and justice.

Following his address, the President of Paraguay and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were escorted from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled, when it was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair).

LIDICE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, 1 year ago this afternoon a group of individuals from the Nazi Army entered the little town of Lidice, in Czechoslovakia, and exterminated hundreds of innocent people living in that simple village. When

those human beasts had finished their dastardly deed they proclaimed that Lidice had been wiped off the face of the earth. But, Mr. President, the effect of those cruel acts has been just the opposite of what the leader of that murderous gang said it would be. Lidice lives in the hearts of all the civilized world. In Illinois, for instance, my home State, a little village has been named Lidice out of sympathy for the people who died at the hands of those vicious monsters.

Today there appears in the New York Times an editorial entitled "Not Extinguished." The editorial is highly illuminating and interesting, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT EXTINGUISHED

A year ago this afternoon German troops began to gather along the roads leading into a little Bohemian village not far from Prague. Few persons outside of Bohemia had ever heard the name of this village, but it was dear to those who lived in it. On the previous day Reinhard Heydrich, who had earned the love and admiration of many Germans by killing a great multitude of helpless and innocent people, had been buried in the Invaliden Cemetery in Berlin. He had lingered a week in agony after two men, who were never captured and whose names were never known, had jumped on the running board of his car on the road from Berlin to Prague and fired two bullets into his spine—or perhaps threw a grenade which had the same effect. By the afternoon of June 10 the Nazis, by their own story, had killed 261 Czechs in revenge for Heydrich. They killed women. They killed authors and professors. But they were not satisfied. Shortly before 8 o'clock, a year ago tonight, armed men—it would be an insult to a stern but honorable profession to call them soldiers—began to move into the little Bohemian village.

That same evening (the exact sequence of events is not quite clear, but apparently the troops were at their work in the village at that time) the Berlin radio announced that arms, an illegal radio station, subversive printed material, and hoards of rationed commodities had been discovered. It then stated:

"After these facts had been ascertained all male adults of the town were shot, while the women were placed in a concentration camp, and the children were entrusted to appropriate educational institutions. The township was leveled to the ground and the name of the community extinguished. The inhabitants of Lidice near Kladno, No. 483."

A year has gone by. There is no spot on earth where a free press exists that the name of this obscure little village is not known. It has become a part of every language. The poor, humble folk who died there are immortal. They are in every town in occupied Europe. They march with every army. They will gather on every road and behind every hedge, rock, and tree when the great Nazi retreat begins. If there is any wavering on any front, any faint cry of appeasement, it is they who will go silently forward with their bayonets, making sure of no compromise, no mercy for butchers. The armed men who were at Lidice, in Bohemia, on the evening of June 10, 1942, those who sent them there, those who committed similar crimes in other places, and those who ordered such crimes, will then know that the Berlin broadcast erred in one particular. The community of Lidice was not extinguished.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say in conclusion just one further word: Out of the ashes of the holocaust we are now fighting throughout the world it is my prayer and my hope that villages like Lidice that have been overrun, whose people have been murdered and property completely destroyed, may be reconstructed and firmly and impregnably established in the future, for all time to come. It is my hope that valiant nations such as Czechoslovakia and other small nations that have been conquered by ruthless, totalitarian despots may once again take their rightful place in a civilized world where peace, amity, and good will shall reign forever.

THE CRITICAL CANNED-FOOD SITUATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the beginning of the session today we heard the statement that the passage of the pending bill was the most important matter before the Senate, and that the Senate should promptly complete the consideration of the bill. I hesitate to trespass on the time of the Senate, but I desire to bring again to its attention the same subject on which I spoke yesterday. That is the importance of getting food into cans for our own people and for our armed forces. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a statement which came to my desk, and in which a gentleman from my State sums up his experience during the past week, after visiting various agencies and divisions in Washington. He says:

I give you a digest of the conversation. It is as follows:

"Question. Can you supply male help for our canning plant to preserve food?

"Answer. No, no help for canning plants, only for the farmers.

"Question. Then, will you allow me to pay enough wages to get the help?

"Answer. No, not for the canning plants. You can increase wages on the farms and in defense plants, but not in the canning plants."

Mr. President, I repeat what I said yesterday, that this Government must take action within the next few weeks, or else a great portion of the pea crop of the country will not be canned, and then will come the other crops—corn, cabbage, and so forth.

Let me read into the RECORD a letter which very graphically depicts a critical situation. It comes from Martin Meeter, of Union Grove, Wis.

JUNE 7, 1943.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Our canning plant is located at Union Grove, Wis., a village of less than 1,000 inhabitants.

We receive between six and seven thousand tons of vegetables for canning.

Since last winter we have tried desperately to obtain relief on the matter of wages and manpower as we realize that this rural district will not furnish enough help to preserve the crops in the canning plant this year.

Now it appears that the situation is so serious we will have to close up the plant.

The War Labor Board has refused our repeated requests for wage increases to meet current wage levels in that area. Defense plants in Racine are paying 90 cents per hour for common labor. This canning plant must pick up 40 or 50 men and 150 to 200 women during the canning season beginning the first of August on tomatoes.

We have been packing several hundred thousands cases of canned vegetables for the military and lend-lease and have commitments for this year.

A recent Government ruling permits an increase of 10 cents per hour above the wage being paid in the canning plant at the close of last year's packing season. This for common labor would equal 60 cents per hour in our plant. We know, of course, that no one in that area would work for 60 cents an hour in a canning plant, a temporary job, when he can obtain 90 cents per hour in a defense plant nearby.

Now on top of all this, Government is building a $250,000 hemp plant in the same village. The construction company is about to begin this work and must complete this construction before October 1. They will use all the available common labor in the country and are offering to pay $1.10 per hour.

Mr. Senator, this is about the last straw. We have tried to organize and are organizing a food army in this village, including some businessmen and many valiant patriotic women who will do all they can. But you can't run a canning plant such as this with all inexperienced help.

We have lost quite a few men who have gone into the service, others to farms as farmers have been permitted to pay higher wages, and to defense plants. Even at this time we have not enough help left to finish packing some canned sauerkraut on last year's Government orders. Then what will the situation be when perishable tomatoes arrive in August? I have contracted for a good many thousand tons of tomatoes and cabbage for kraut which is now being planted. What am I going to do with it?

We have worked on this matter for several months, hopefully thinking that the proper agencies in Washington would permit us to pay comparative wages or assist in some manner to get the necessary manpower. We have worked diligently with the United States Employment Service at Racine, who admitted to me a few days ago that they were all through—they can't do anything for us at such wage levels.

Through our canners' associations and in person we have appealed again and again for relief—the matter of adequate wages and manpower—but now all doors seem to be closed.

It seems we have to choose between two things: Either we pack the food and violate the law, or we obey the law and lose the food.

This is no idle threat. I cannot ask even those few men I have left to work for us at such inadequate wages when they can walk right out of the plant and get 30 to 40 cents per hour more. Everyone of them has a family to support.

If it was an ordinary business venture we would close up the plant, but this means food for our boys out there and for the Nation, and this must not be. But I see no alternative. What am I to do?

Yours very truly,

MARTIN MEETER,
MEETER'S, INC.,
Union Grove, Wis.

One man says:

I called my men together in the factory a few days ago. They are men with families, who have worked in the factory from 5 to 12 years, just like a family group. We call each other by our first names. Can you imagine what a pleasant task it was for me to explain I could do nothing more for them, that I knew every man in the group could walk out and get 30 cents per hour more across the street in a war plant, and 40 to 50 to 60 cents more by going into the hemp plant that the Government is putting up, putting $250,000 of its own money into it.

The Government is stealing men away from food production, and is granting no relief. We must get help to the canners. Let me repeat what one man says:

If it were an ordinary business venture, we would close up the plant, but this means food for our boys out there and for the Nation.

Recently former President Hoover spoke on the subject of food. An editorial entitled "Program for Food," was published in last evening's Washington Star. The editorial comments on former President Hoover's statement. I ask that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM FOR FOOD

Herbert Hoover, addressing the American Farm Bureau Federation in New York, issued a solemn warning that our food supply is decreasing while the demand for food, at the same time, is rising rapidly. The former President, who was Food Administrator for the United States during the last war and today is a keen student of the food problem, made a series of recommendations which deserve serious consideration.

The program suggested by Mr. Hoover is designed to give this country its maximum production of food. This must be assured, not only to maintain the American people and to win the war, but to make it possible to provide food for millions of persons in the United Nations and other millions in countries that have been overrun by the Axis Powers. There can be no lasting peace without food.

Chief among the recommendations is that forty or fifty million more acres be planted in 1944 than in this year. Only by greatly increased planting will it be possible to produce more and more foodstuffs. During the period from 1932 to 1939 the administration, by its restrictive policies toward agriculture, reduced the acreage of 17 leading crops planted in this country by 47,000,000 acres. Farmers were paid not to produce. It is idle now to comment on the folly of the economy of scarcity. The thing to do is to get away from it—and never to return. These 17 crops constitute about 95 percent of the whole harvested area.

It seems incredible but it is nevertheless true, as Mr. Hoover pointed out, that after the passage of the Lease-Lend Act the Government undertook to increase food production but at the same time continued payments to farmers to restrict production. These restrictive payments were not removed until this spring. In some cases they still persist.

Mr. Hoover also includes in his recommendations a proposal that one agency, headed by one man, take over the whole administration of the food problem. At present nine agencies of the Government are telling the farmers, the food distributors, and wholesalers and retailers what to do about production, distribution, and prices. The result, in Mr. Hoover's opinion, is chaos.

In order to increase the farm-planting acreage, it will be necessary to have increased farm labor and more farm machinery. Declaring that the present price system is stifling farm production, Mr. Hoover proposed that the retail and wholesale price ceilings be done away with. Price fixing must begin as near the source of production as possible, and from there on regulations against profiteering must be placed upon the trades. Prices to the farmers must include floors as well as ceilings, and the prices must take into account labor and other costs. Such a plan would be calculated really to stimulate production.

In 1942 we had bumper crops. This year the harvest is likely to be normal—which means that the actual production of food will be considerably below the crop we have just about eaten up. There is nothing that can be done to meet this situation immediately. The plantings for the following crop, however, will be of vast importance.

If the statistics for the crops of the last year are correct, then in the opinion of Mr. Hoover, some bureaucracy has strangled the flow of food from the farm to the housewife. This is the only explanation of reports that have come from all sections of the country showing scarcity of foods. And if this be true, the sooner the hand of bureaucracy is lifted the better.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate, and the majority and minority leaders give consideration to the matter of getting labor into the canning plants. I ask it not for the canners, but for my country. I ask it because if we do not, as was stated yesterday, the most valuable munition of the country, namely, food, will not be there when the armed forces need it and when the country needs it. The situation is so critical that I trust some action will be taken by the appropriate arm of Government to the end that these factories may get the necessary labor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. GORE, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSON, and Mr. PLOESER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2795. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land or buildings and facilities or fixtures appurtenant thereto, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2664. An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for feed.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2795. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land or buildings and facilities or fixtures appurtenant thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 59.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, and 58; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,497,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lines 11, 12, and 13 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the proviso.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"BITUMINOUS COAL DIVISION

"For the Bituminous Coal Division, fiscal year 1943, in carrying out the purposes of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937, as amended (15 U. S. C. 828–849), as further amended by the Act of April 24, 1943 (Public Law 40), and as further amended, to be supplemental to and merged with the appropriation under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943, and to be available for the

same objects of expenditure, $700,000, to continue available during the fiscal year 1944."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, 8, 37, 41, 60, and 61.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
R. B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 8, 1943.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 37, and 41 to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In the last line of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "Department" insert "or the Department of State or the Office of Strategic Services"; and

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60 and 61 to said bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it will be noted that the House amended Senate amendment No. 5 by adding to the exceptions the State Department and the Office of Strategic Services. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment with an amendment, as follows:

At the end of the matter inserted by the House amendment, and before the period, insert "or the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Undoubtedly that Bureau should be included as an exception.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist on Senate amendment No. 5, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 60, which is the only amendment of substance now in disagreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to explain to the Senate that Senate amendment No. 60, as to which there is disagreement, relates to the action of the House in providing that no part of the appropriation should be used to pay the salaries of Mr. Watson, Mr. Dodd, and Dr. Lovett. The Senate is familiar with this matter. The Senate struck out this provision in the House bill after the House had adopted it by an enormous majority, as I recall by a vote of 3 to 1, or 2 to 1, and since that time the House, by voice vote, has practically unanimously insisted upon retaining the provision. It is necessary for the Senate conferees to have a yea-and-nay vote so as to know what the will of the Senate is before we go into the conference. Therefore, in order to bring the question before the Senate, I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion. So far as I am concerned, I am not taking any position one way or the other, but I wish to have the judgment of the Senate. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 60, and I ask for the years and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not certain that I thoroughly understand the explanation with respect to the last amendment to which the Senator from Tennessee referred. Will the Senator be so kind as to repeat his explanation of the amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to do so.

The House adopted an amendment which became a part of the House bill providing that no part of the appropriation carried in this bill shall be used to pay the salaries of Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, Jr., and Robert Morss Lovett. That amendment was agreed to in the House by an overwhelming majority—about three to one. It came over to the Senate and the Senate committee struck it out. Following the recommendation of its committee, the Senate struck out the House provision, and the amendment went to conference. Since then the House has voted to insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment. As I recall, the vote was almost unanimous. Therefore I wish to get the sense of the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote so that the Senate conferees may know exactly how the Senate feels about it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Did the Senate committee before striking out the House provision, investigate the facts as did the House?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it investigated the facts. The conferees had additional facts which were not before the Senate committee. They were brought before the conference so that both sides were fully advised, and I believe every Senator is fully advised about the question. I wish to have the sense of the Senate on the question before the amendment again goes to conference.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. OVERTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. It is my understanding that when the Senate Appropriations Committee reported the bill there were no facts on this matter before the Appropriations Committee, but they were to ascertain what the facts really were when they got into conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. We had a great deal of testimony brought before the committee when the matter was before it. We had all the facts except some on which the House acted, which were regarded as being secret. But afterward, in the conference, those secret facts were brought before the conference committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Were those secret facts, which apparently no one can find out about, developed by the Kerr committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Why is it that the Senate, as a whole, may not know what those facts are?

Mr. McKELLAR. The evidence is very voluminous, and it would take quite a while to state it. I see no reason in the world why it should be secret.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that, and I am not blaming the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand.

Mr. LUCAS. It is a very peculiar and unusual case. Evidence was taken by the Kerr committee of the House of Representatives, against three individuals, and no one, with the exception of those who were members of the Kerr committee, and those who were members of the conference committee, can find out what the facts are with respect to these three men. To me, this is most significant.

Mr. McKELLAR. The evidence was very voluminous. It was undertaken to show before the committee that these three men were members of the Communist Party, and that one man was a member of several score organizations which were more or less subversive—I believe that is the word that is used—and there was much ado about it. Much of the testimony was from the three witnesses themselves. They were brought before that committee. We read their explanations. I think the Senator can easily understand what the nature of the testimony was. There was plenty of testimony adduced on all sides in order that the committee could make up its mind.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to make a brief statement in conclusion. No Member of the Senate is more opposed to the subversive elements in this country than is the Senator from Illinois. However, I will not vote blindly to discharge three individuals from Government employment upon secret testimony which was developed by the Kerr committee of the House of Representatives, and about which the Senate knows nothing.

Apparently these men are being discharged from appointive positions because of what was developed before the Kerr committee, the Senate being denied the opportunity to peruse that evidence. To discharge the men under such circumstances is tantamount to convicting them as being Communists without a hearing or trial.

Mr. President, I say that this is a dangerous precedent for the Senate to establish, or even consider, and I shall not be a party to it. It does violence to fundamental principles of free government. If I had all the facts which were disclosed to the Kerr committee, and had an opportunity to analyze them, I might reach a different conclusion; but I do not intend blindly to vote to condemn individuals who are on the public pay roll at the present time, brand and classify them among those who seek by subversive measures to overthrow the Government, without clear and convincing evidence. That is what it means. I simply cannot do that.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I understand the Senator from Illinois, he will vote for the motion which I am now making to insist further on amendment No. 60?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Such action will be in accord with the desire of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I wish to make a statement as to my understanding of the case involving these three men. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, and was a member of the subcommittee which considered this bill. When the bill came to the Senate from the House of Representatives it contained this provision barring the further employment of these three men. There was not a scintilla of evidence in the House hearings taken by the subcommittee in charge of this bill with reference to any one of the three men.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely correct.

Mr. OVERTON. I took the position in the committee hearing, and I still take the position that we ought not to condemn any citizen of the United States without charges being preferred against him, giving him opportunity to appear and to be heard, and certainly without any evidence in support of the condemnation pronounced against him by the bill passed by the other House. My recollection is that not one of these three men appeared before our subcommittee, but there were those who appeared in their defense.

Mr. McKELLAR. Notably, Secretary Ickes and a number of other gentlemen.

Mr. OVERTON. The only evidence we had was in exculpation of these individuals, and no one appeared before the subcommittee of the Senate making any charges of subversive influences against these men or charges of any character. Therefore the record is bare of any charges and bare of any evidence against any of them.

If they are, as has been suggested, Communists, if they belong to an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government, we have in every legislation appropriation bill a provision under which each one of them can be brought to the bar of justice. I shall quote from the provision which appears in every appropriation act as the Senator from Tennessee well knows:

> No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence—

That, let me say by way of inference, is merely prima facie evidence, and is put in there in order to protect the disbursing officer who pays those who are employed by the Government out of the appropriations contained in the appropriation acts.

> *Provided further*, That such administrative or supervisory employees of the Department as may be designated for the purpose by the Secretary are hereby authorized to administer the oaths to persons making affidavits required by this section, and they shall charge no fee for so doing: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Those are the pertinent parts of the provision which I wish to read to the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. One of these men, Mr. Dodd, comes from Virginia. He is the son of a former Ambassador to Germany. Am I to understand that these three men were called before the committee to make statements?

Mr. OVERTON. None of them appeared before the House committee considering the appropriation bill in which they have been condemned, and none appeared before the Senate committee.

Mr. BYRD. Is there any evidence before the committee that they are members of communistic organizations?

Mr. OVERTON. There was none before the Senate committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, just a moment. I think Secretary Ickes testified that, so far as one of them was concerned—Dr. Lovett—that Dr. Lovett's principal difficulty in his mind was that he belonged to too many organizations, or something of that kind. That was the extent to which he admitted that he belonged to a number of these organizations.

Mr. BYRD. He said he belonged to communistic organizations?

Mr. McKELLAR. Organizations which were communistically inclined. It depends upon who has the say-so as to whether an organization is communistic.

Mr. BYRD. Did he say that Mr. Lovett belonged to organizations which were inclined to overthrow democracy in this country?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I listened to the testimony of Secretary Ickes, and he did make the statement that the trouble with the man was that he was a joiner; he would join anything that came along; but I do not think he pointed out any communistic organization with which he had been affiliated.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Tennessee, in whom I have the most supreme confidence, can say that any of these men are actual members of a Communist organization, I intend to support the movement to dismiss them from the Government service, if that is the only way to bring about their dismissal. Of course, I think the Department should dismiss them, but if the Department refuses to dismiss them, knowing them to be members of communistic organizations, while I disapprove of this method, I must say that I should vote to let the Congress dismiss them by means of the cancelation of the appropriation. What I want to know is, Is there any evidence which has been brought to the attention of the committee which is conclusive to the Senator from Louisiana that any of these men are members of communistic organizations?

Mr. OVERTON. It is my recollection that the testimony failed to show that any one of them was affiliated with any communistic organization. I may be in error.

Mr. BYRD. That was the charge made in the House of Representatives, was it not, when the matter was considered there?

Mr. OVERTON. It was not made before the Appropriations Committee handling this bill. I understand that there was an investigation made by the Kerr committee, and the Kerr committee made a report, but the evidence in support of the report has never been laid before either the House or the Senate. What are the facts according to the report, I do not know, and I doubt if any other Senator knows. I have never read it. According to my recollection, there was no evidence at all presented against any one of these three men that they were

affiliated with any communistic organization.

Mr. BYRD. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Louisiana that none of these men are affiliated with or are members of any communistic organization?

Mr. OVERTON. If I may answer, I will say that it is my opinion that there is no evidence whatsoever to show that any of them was connected with any communistic organization. That is my recollection; I may be in error.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Louisiana has already partly answered the question which I desired to ask him. It is a fact, is it not, that these men have been condemned so far as the action of one body is concerned, without any hearing whatever, except in star-chamber proceedings, the records of which are not available to the membership even of the Committee on Appropriations of the House or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or to the ordinary mine-run Members of the Senate or House? In other words, we do not know on what basis the so-called Kerr committee arrived at its conclusion that these men were disqualified to hold office.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct, according to all the information I have.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not hold a brief for any of these men. It may be that they are not fit to hold office, but, so far as I am concerned, I would not convict at all in the absence of evidence which was conclusive to my mind that the men concerned were guilty. This is essentially a penal proceeding, a most extraordinary penal proceeding, whereby it is asked that the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, composing the Congress of the United States, pass judgment upon men, as I have said, in an essentially penal proceeding, certainly imposing moral obloquy upon them, without knowing what we are doing.

I do not know any of these men. I may say that some of the public activities of some of them are activities of which I have not approved, some of their expressed opinions are opinions of which I do not approve, but as to Dr. Lovett, I do know that his son was a gallant soldier in the Second Division in the World War, and was killed at the Battle of Belleau Wood. It is going to be very hard to make me believe that a man whose son gave his life for his country in the last war in a very gallant fighting division, is guilty of undertaking to tear down the Government of the United States. I certainly am not willing to reach any such opinion in the absence of specific evidence conclusive to my own mind.

It seems to me that it is a most extraordinary and reprehensible practice to condemn men who have never had a hearing in the open, on evidence about which we know nothing, or undertake to shift the burden of proof to the shoulders of the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from Tennessee, or any other respected Senator, trying to make them give a guaranty that these men have not been guilty. It seems to me the burden of proof is on someone to prove that they are not qualified, and if they are connected with any organization interested in tearing down the Government of the United States, that is adequately already taken care of in the law to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred.

Mr. OVERTON. I thoroughly agree with the observations made by the Senator from Missouri. As I understand the situation, these men are being condemned without any hearing, and without any evidence whatsoever, insofar as the committee is concerned.

There is no one who abhors communism more than I do.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to associate myself with the Senator from Louisiana in that expression.

Mr. OVERTON. I abhor any organization which advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force of arms, so much so, as the Senator from Missouri may recall, that I busied myself in preparing the very clause which I read, and, without much difficulty, got the committee of the Senate to adopt it in the first act in which it was adopted, and agreed to in conference, and it has been incorporated in every similar act since. If these men are Communists, under this clause they cannot be employed, they cannot be paid, and they are subject to trial and sentence before the courts of justice of the land.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But they are entitled to a day in court, which they are not being accorded under this procedure.

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly they are entitled to a day in court.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Washington asked me to yield, and I am glad to yield.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, it seems to me that this sort of procedure should be challenging to every lawyer in this body, and there are some very able lawyers in the Senate, and men who have served on the bench. I think every one of them must shrink at the contemplation of a proceeding which amounts to a bill of attainder, in the absence of any formal hearing, or the production of any proof which would be convincing and persuasive.

Like my colleague the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], I have not heard any of the testimony or evidence, and in the light of what the able Senator from Louisiana has said, it puts us in a peculiar light to sit here as a jury and approve what has been done. Gentlemen of the Senate, we constitute ourselves a jury, and in the absence of any facts at all being presented to us, we lawyers in this body would be placing ourselves in the position of doing a thing we would indict vigorously if a court in our own community should attempt to do it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, the Senator should certainly vote for the motion I have made, which is to insist upon the Senate amendment striking out the House action.

Mr. BONE. In the light of what has been said within the past 10 minutes, I should be constrained to follow that course.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I wish to make a brief observation as a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. McNARY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNARY. However important the consideration of this matter, the appropriation bill is more important. The matter now being considered relates to a bill which is in conference, and we are delaying consideration of a most important bill before the Senate, and if it is to take long, I shall ask that the Senate resume the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope we can have a vote. I wish to answer a question asked by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. Secretary Ickes testified before the committee and said it was claimed there were a number of subversive organizations to which one of these men belonged, but that he did not think they were subversive. That was the testimony about the matter.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. We heard one of these witnesses a year ago—Dr. Watson, I believe. He testified that he was thoroughly American; that he belonged to no communistic organization; that some of the liberal groups he joined may have afterward been influenced by certain communistic members, but that he and his father were lifelong workers in the church, that they both were ministers of religion, that his mother was engaged in religious work throughout her life, that he was an ex-service man himself; and furthermore that he was recommended very highly by the chief of the governmental agency with which he is connected. I do not believe any of these three men has been given the opportunity he deserves, and I do not believe the Senate should take action in a high-handed affair such as this presents itself to be.

Mr. President, I am against anyone working for the Government who is in favor of overthrowing the Government, but I think the integrity of the Senate is such that we should do as the Senator from Missouri has said—give these men a chance before we take summary action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Oregon thinks we should not take any

more time on this matter. I know the Senator from Massachusetts is in favor of the motion, which is to insist on the Senate amendment and thereby instruct the conferees. So may we not have a vote now?

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Tennessee does not want to be the only Senator to talk; does he?

Mr. McKELLAR. I want the bill to go back to conference after the vote is taken, if the Senator understands what I mean.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this is one of the most unusual requests I have heard since I have been a Member of the Senate. I have been in the Senate only 7 years, but I have never heard made a request quite like that of the Senator from Tennessee. So far as I recall, no one on the minority side has expressed himself on this matter, though a number of very able speeches, to be sure, have been made by Senators on the majority side. I do not believe the Senator from Tennessee wants to deprive the members of the minority of the opportunity to make their views plain on this question. In State legislatures there is the right to move the previous question, thereby shutting off all debate. That privilege does not exist in the Senate, and if it should ever be put into effect, I think it should apply to both sides.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say to the Senator that there is no objection to a continuance of the debate. If I made such a suggestion, I withdraw it.

Mr. LODGE. As a conferee, and as a member of the subcommittee, I thought it was incumbent upon me to say one or two words about this matter. I try not to burden the Senate with long speeches. In fact, I do not think I have ever made a lengthy speech in the Senate.

In my study and scrutiny of this matter I did not find justification for the procedure followed by the House. No evidence was submitted to us that these men were particularly dangerous. I may add that no evidence was submitted to show that these men were particularly well qualified for the positions which they hold, and I certainly cannot share in some of the crocodile tears which are being shed in support of these men. But obviously it is an unsound procedure for Congress to attempt to discipline officials in the executive department of the Government who have been legally and properly appointed. That the Congress has the right, under the Constitution, to refuse to vote anyone's salary of course is not open to question, but I think it is unsound policy for Congress to follow such a procedure as that proposed by the other body. For that reason I shall vote "yea," to insist on the Senate's position.

Mr. BONE. Will the Chair state the motion so we may understand the effect of our votes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 60.

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was detained from the Senate floor when the question before the Senate was explained. I should like to ask what evidence was presented to the House with respect to the individuals who are concerned?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it would take a long time to make an explanation of that matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was there evidence presented to the House Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know whether or not evidence was presented before the House committee. We had the so-called Kerr evidence before the conferees. This motion is merely to uphold the position the Senate has taken, and to send the matter back to conference, and that the Senate insist on its amendment No. 60 striking out the provision in question. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk has begun calling the roll, and I believe one Senator has voted. I hope we can continue with the vote, and that the bill be not retarded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no desire to retard the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know the Senator has not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But I did want to know the issue upon which I am asked to vote. I understand the Senator from Tennessee, as the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has moved that the Senate stand by the action it has previously taken, and that the bill be sent back to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly correct.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, these Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained in committee meetings. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained on business in one of the Government departments. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho, the Senator from South Carolina, and the Senators from Maryland would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are detained on public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is detained on official business at one of the executive departments.

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—69

Aiken	Gerry	Murdock
Andrews	Gillette	Murray
Austin	Green	Nye
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hatch	Pepper
Barbour	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Scrugham
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	La Follette	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Tobey
Byrd	Lucas	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Vandenberg
Caraway	McClellan	Van Nuys
Chandler	McFarland	Wallgren
Chavez	McKellar	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wherry
Danaher	Maloney	White
Ellender	Mead	Wiley
Ferguson	Millikin	Willis

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—27

Barkley	Glass	Robertson
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Connally	Moore	Truman
Davis	O'Daniel	Tydings
Downey	Radcliffe	Wagner
Eastland	Reed	Walsh
George	Revercomb	Wilson

So Mr. McKELLAR's motion that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 60 was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist on its amendment No. 61, which simply refers to the numbering.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Now, Mr. President, I move that the Senate request a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments still in disagreement,

and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE conferees on the part of the Senate.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. Is the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CORPORATION—PROPOSED RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, out of order, I move that the Senate recommit Senate bill 1108, a bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation and to increase its borrowing power, to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I make the motion as the result of an agreement reached this morning in the committee, among the members of the committee, that I should move to have the bill recommitted for further consideration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am inclined to favor the motion, if the Senator will specify why he desires to have the bill recommitted.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I made the motion, as I stated, at the request of the members of the committee. No hearings were held by the committee on the principal controversial feature of the bill. After the committee held hearings on the question of continuance of the corporation, the committee went into executive session to act on the bill. An amendment then was proposed on the subject of subsidies and roll-back payments; and, without dealing with the question of holding any further hearings, the committee proceeded by the very small vote of three to two to adopt an amendment to the bill.

After that action was taken, considerable desire was expressed to know more about the bill and to have some hearings held for the information of the members of the committee, at least about the controversial item in the bill. So we have held hearings for 2 days for that purpose; and this morning the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] thought—and other members of the committee including myself agreed with him, all the members of the committee being present—that probably the most helpful procedure would be to have the bill recommitted to the committee for further consideration and further hearings.

That is the reason why the motion is made. That is the only explanation I can make to the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As a matter of fact, the purport of the bill, as reported from the committee, is to legalize certain practices as to subsidies which now are being put into effect without any authority of law whatever; are they not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should not say that; no. I do not think that statement is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the correct statement?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think there is authority of law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator think there is any authority of law for the subsidies now being paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I rather think there is.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I disagree with the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is one of the subjects which has been discussed in the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator that, either on this bill or on any other bill, when it is reported again, if there is any effort to legalize the practices now being put into effect by Mr. Jones and the R. F. C., there will be a very prolonged and bitter fight on this floor before the bill is ever passed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think that is the purpose of the program at all. No one suggested it. The only question which really stands under serious criticism is that of whether the amendment limiting the appropriation goes far enough or whether it should be enlarged. That is the point.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me one further interruption, and then I shall not bother him any further——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say that it seems to me there is no question whatever that the matter of subsidies is being proceeded with now in a way entirely unauthorized by law, certainly not contemplated by the act authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and, in my opinion, in plain violation of law. Any proposition to legalize what is now being done, even by way of limitation, might be construed as a legalization of it. I simply desire to say that I am in favor of the motion of the Senator from Alabama to recommit, but that any renewal of the proposition to legalize the practice now being followed by the R. F. C. will be met with bitter and prolonged opposition on this floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, we need not deal with that subject until we reach it. I do not even know that it will be necessary for the Senate to take such action.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the request is made somewhat untimely. I share the view of the Senator from Missouri. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not in order at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, the motion is not in order until unanimous consent is obtained, and I object.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia is a substitute for the committee amendment beginning on page 89, line 15, and going down to page 93, line 4. It does not apply to the Jones-Bankhead farm tenancy program.

Mr. President, I am in hearty accord withe the opinions expressed by the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Georgia, that the consideration of the bill should be concluded today. I intend to make my remarks in support of the amendment I have offered as brief and concise as possible, and I shall ask that if there are any questions which any Senator desires to ask me, they be deferred until the conclusion of my initial statement.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to inquire simply about the scope of his substitute?

Mr. BYRD. Very well.

Mr. BONE. Does it cover everything from page 89 to the end of the committee amendment? I simply inquire in order to obtain the correct information.

Mr. BYRD. Down to line 4 on page 93.

Mr. BONE. It does not touch the text of the bill on page 93, under the term "farm tenancy"; does it?

Mr. BYRD. No; it does not. As the Senator will recall, the committee amendment, upon motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], was divided yesterday.

Mr. President, the Farm Security Administration, with which the pending amendment deals, has never been authorized by Congress. It may be called a $1,000,000,000 bureau of the Government because this is approximately the amount of its expenditures, loans, and grants since its creation.

This is exclusive of the farm tenant program.

Mr. President, I would not deny a single dollar to the small-income farmers, provided that the loans are based upon proper and sound considerations. The amendment proposed by me would utilize other agencies of the Government that are already organized and that are operating successfully to aid the farmers of small incomes at a great saving of administrative cost.

This amendment I will discuss in detail later.

My attention was first attracted to the Farm Security Administration in the investigation of nonessential Federal expenditures by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of which I have the honor to be chairman. This committee was directed by legislative enactment to make

a full and complete study and investigation of all the expenditures of the Federal Government, with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all such expenditures deemed by the committee to be nonessential, and to report at the earliest practicable date to the President and to the Congress the results of its study, together with its recommendations. Last year an exhaustive investigation was made by the joint committee of the exact activities of the Farm Security Administration. I believe the hearings lasted for more than 10 days.

That report was signed without reservation by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Virginia; the vice chairman, Mr. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, who is chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means; the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations; the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Committee on Finance; the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the ranking Democratic member of the Senate Appropriations Committee; Representative WOODRUM of Virginia, ranking Democratic member of the House Appropriations Committee; THOMAS H. CULLEN, ranking Democratic member of the House Ways and Means Committee; ALLEN T. TREADWAY, ranking Republican member of the House Ways and Means Committee; and JOHN TABER, ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the fact that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures approves of any sound and proper plan to improve the condition of the low-income farmers; but for reasons which are given, this committee believed—and made a report accordingly—that such activities could be much better administered by the other established bureaus of the Department of Agriculture.

During the period from April 8, 1935, to December 31, 1941, the administrative cost of the Farm Security Administration was $275,861,889, in order to spend or give away $714,092,031. In other words, it cost $1 to loan or give away $3.

I wish to read to the Senate the breakdown of that administrative cost.

The Farm Security Administration personnel in that period cost the Government, in round figures, $198,000,000; supplies and materials cost $30,000,000; rental for equipment, buildings, and land cost $9,000,000; communications cost $2,356,000; traveling expenses, including subsistence during that period, cost $28,769,000; printing and binding cost $1,844,000; advertising, $30,000; heat, light, power, water, and electricity, $759,000; miscellaneous costs were $2,447,000, making a total of $275,000,000 in round figures. During that period loans and grants were made to the extent of $714,000,000.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The figure $28,000,000 for traveling expenses, which was cited by the Senator from Virginia, amazes the hearer. Has the Senator any breakdown of that figure?

Mr. BYRD. There is no break-down, except that it was for traveling expenses.

Mr. TOBEY. Was it for travel by motorcar or train, or both? How could it be possible for the agency to spend $28,000,000 for traveling expenses in one fiscal year?

Mr. BYRD. It is not for one fiscal year. It is for the period April 8, 1935, to December 31, 1941. The traveling expenses for a single year, last year, were $5,079,804.

Mr. TOBEY. Even that figure hits us in the face. It seems incongruous and an abnormality.

Mr. BYRD. The committee thought it was extremely excessive.

Of course, that includes what is called subsistence, which is part of the traveling expenses—in other words, hotel expenses and meals during the time the employees were traveling.

As of December 31, the Farm Security Administration had 15,960 employees, with an annual pay roll of about $30,000,000. The traveling expenses for this fiscal year will be $5,079,804. In addition, $230,650 was spent for communications—telephone services and telegrams.

This organization maintains 47 State offices, 275 district offices, and 2,315 county offices, making a total of 2,637 offices. It operates these separate and distinct offices side by side with other agencies who are doing more or less similar work.

I now wish to discuss the resettlement projects. I know that they were begun under Mr. Tugwell. They were the Tugwellian experiments, the most costly experiments that have ever been conducted in this country, based upon the Russian form of communism. They were started by Mr. Tugwell, and the same theories which were then advocated by Mr. Tugwell have to a large extent permeated the Farm Security Administration in its other activities.

Those resettlement projects cost originally $137,502,000. In addition, large sums were spent for development. Of course, I understand that those projects have proved to be so impracticable and so impossible of operation that the Resettlement Administration has abandoned them, but on the other hand, the Administration is attempting to operate a system of cooperative farms which is a program somewhat along the same line.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Can the Senator tell me whether or not a single one of those communal farms has ever been liquidated?

Mr. BYRD. I could not say that definitely, Mr. President. I think that practically none of the resettlement projects has been completely liquidated, except to the extent of being transferred, as I shall explain in a few moments, to some other agency of the Government. So far as I know, the cooperative farms have not been liquidated.

Mr. President, I wish to make some reference to the so-called liquidation of these projects. Take the Arthurdale homesteads, a pet project of the wife of the President of the United States. Let us see what has happened in that case. The Arthurdale homesteads cost exactly $2,744,724. They have been partially liquidated, to the extent of $175,000, but my information is that the Government has secured nearly all the cash it will get out of them. So far as the records which I have been able to obtain are concerned, they show that only $175,000 has been collected by the Government from this costly experiment which was proposed and sponsored by the wife of the President of the United States.

Let us take some of the other projects to show the method of liquidation which we are told is now going forward. As of June 30, 1942—and that is the latest figure I have been able to obtain—projects with a total capital investment, in round figures—and I shall use round figures to save time—of $42,000,000 have been sold for $11,000,000. Some of them have not been wholly sold. Practically none of these projects has been completely liquidated.

Sixty projects of a value of $65,860,000 have been transferred to the Federal Public Housing Authority. What they call liquidation is actually the transferring of these projects to some other agency of the Government where they will be administered at great cost, and will still add to the deficit which has occurred with respect to these projects.

Let us consider a few of the projects listed here:

In Alabama there are the Gees Bend farms. They cost $408,264. So far they have been practically liquidated. They have been sold with receipts of about $128,000.

Take the Skyline farms, in Alabama, on which an investment was made of $1,260,000——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. To what year is the Senator referring?

Mr. BYRD. This is a report up to——

Mr. LUCAS. When was the Skyline farms project initiated?

Mr. BYRD. I do not have that date. I imagine that most of these projects were initiated in 1934, 1935, and 1936—at about that period.

Mr. LUCAS. This is the thing we have been hearing about for the last 4 or 5 or 6 years.

Mr. BYRD. The same thing.

Mr. LUCAS. In connection with the early experiments which the Government conducted along that line.

Mr. BYRD. Yes, and they are continuing somewhat the same experiments under a different name, called cooperative farms, which are practically the same as the original resettlement projects. I wish to point out how costly and impractical the experiments have been, and what little value there is left in these projects by reason of the inefficient management which was given to the projects by the Resettlement Administration which was the predecessor of the Farm Security Administration.

In Arkansas—to read just a few of these—consider the Plum Bayou project in which $1,625,000 was invested. That project has been partially liquidated, only partially, it is true, but the F. S. A. has received $72,000 for that liquidation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Can the Senator from Virginia tell us what percent of that project has been liquidated?

Mr. BYRD. As to that particular one in Arkansas, only a small percentage of it has been liquidated. They have 180 units, and 17 were liquidated.

I will take another one in the Senator's State, the Lake Dick project. That project cost $667,599. There has been practically no liquidation as yet. We have the report from the Farm Security Administration that only 26 families are now being housed on that project which cost approximately $667,000. The Senator is no doubt familiar with that project.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, I am. In that connection I wish to say that I want to see these projects to which the Senator is directing his remarks absolutely liquidated, and abolished. I think they have been costly and impracticable in my State, and I do not want to support any measure that will continue them.

Mr. BYRD. I imagine the Senator prefers cash liquidation rather than the transfer of these projects to some other agency of the Government, as is being done by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will say to the Senator that I do. I think they ought to be completely abolished.

Mr. BYRD. Up to June 30, 1942, $65,000,000 out of $135,000,000 of the original cost of these projects was transferred to the Federal Public Housing Authority where the cost will of course continue as far as the Government is concerned. The operating costs of maintenance of these projects as of the date of these figures which I am reading is $1,877,000 a year, in addition to their original cost.

Take the Roanoke farms. I can furnish any Senator who wants it information concerning the projects of any State. I have an itemized statement which I will ask to have printed in the RECORD. The Roanoke farms, in North Carolina, regarding which there was a publication yesterday in the Washington Post, cost $2,225,000. Mr. James I. Hicks, investigator for the House committee studying the Farm Security Administration, testified before the committee that the Government could give each of these occupants $3,500, or give these projects to the occupants, and save to the Treasury one and a quarter million dollars.

That same thing exists, Mr. President, all through these projects.

Here is Oregon, in which $1,313,000 was expended on a project, which was liquidated to the extent of $163,000.

Indiana: The Wabash farms represent an investment of $1,241,000, with no liquidation as of the date of this report.

South Carolina: The Ashwood plantation, an investment of $1,919,000, with no liquidation.

Mr. President, I do not want to consume the time of the Senate in reading these figures, but I should like to ask that these data, which have been prepared by the Farm Security Administration, be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. BYRD. Now, Mr. President, as far as I can see, there is no provision in this bill providing for a mandatory or immediate liquidation and sale of these projects. It is true that the committee expresses the hope that they will be liquidated, but I think before we pass the pending measure, Mr. President, we should direct the Farm Security Administration not to transfer these projects to other agencies of the Government, but to sell them for what they are worth and take the loss. There is no better time than now and probably there will not be a better time to sell property for many years. Let us get rid of every one of the overhead expenses and administration costs which are constantly piling up the loss which the Government has already suffered in these very costly experiments that were advocated by Mr. Tugwell.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator tell us anything about the farms recently bought as a matter of relocating farmers who have been ousted by defense works? It seems to me that in that case we also have farms which are apparently not being sold or liquidated in any way.

Mr. BYRD. I do not have the exact figures, but the Senator is aware that there is such a program.

Mr. TAFT. In 1941 two assistant regional directors of the F. S. A. from Indianapolis, and the State director of the Farm Security Administration at Columbus, Ohio, formed an Ohio corporation called the Ohio Defense Relocation Corporation. They have gone out in Ohio and spent $1,550,000 to purchase 15,650 acres of land. This is no old proposition. This has been done within 2 years. On that land they have relocated about 156 families, and apparently not one acre of the land has been sold, and no contracts of sale have been made. I may be misinformed, but that is the information that was given me in Columbus. It seems to me an extraordinary project for the Farm Security Administration, in the first place, to form a corporation. I do not know that they have any right to form corporations, although they have done so in all these States, whether to escape audit, or for what purpose, I do not know. Then that corporation goes out and buys 15,000 acres of land, and spends a million dollars and just holds on to it and rents it to people who are relocated from defense areas. Those are all the facts I know about the situation, but it seems to me it is something which requires an explanation.

Mr. BYRD. Undoubtedly, that is going on in many sections of the country; but the Comptroller General not long ago refused to approve some of the appropriations.

Mr. TAFT. I am told that the purchase of this land was finally stopped because the Comptroller General ruled that the use in that way, at least through the Corporation, was not justified under any law of Congress, and, consequently, the further purchase has been stopped; but, so far as I can see, there is no immediate intention to liquidate at a time when presumably liquidation would be fairly easy.

Mr. BYRD. Not only is there no attempt to liquidate, but, as I understand, the program is continuing.

The Comptroller General found the Farm Security Administration guilty in 1942 of using these funds illegally to buy large tracts of land throughout the United States for the purpose of subdividing them into family units and then reselling them to Farm Security Administration clients, to be resettled in a Farm Security Administration colony.

There is another vast resettlement program to which I desire to refer.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I regret that I have not heard the entire discussion of the Senator from Virginia, but I should like to inquire if the Senator has referred to the number of agencies that are now engaged in the loaning of money to the farmers.

Mr. BYRD. I will say that there are 20 agencies engaged directly or indirectly in making loans to farmers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Twenty such agencies?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; 20 such agencies.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia would consolidate, at least to the extent of the particular agency under consideration, two of those agencies for that purpose, would it not?

Mr. BYRD. In answer to the Senator from West Virginia, it would consolidate two agencies that are already doing such work, the Farm Credit Administration and the Emergency Feed and Crop Loan Administration, which are already making practically the same type of loans that the Farm Security Administration is making.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The result would be that overhead expense in operating those agencies would be curtailed, the farmer would get the same benefit or even greater benefit, and certainly there would be greater efficiency of administration by a consolidation of these agencies.

Mr. BYRD. There is no question about that, for the Farm Security Administration has 15,000 employees, and, as I have stated to the Senate, has 2,300

different offices located throughout the country.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Furthermore, it would mean the dismissal or release from the pay roll of numerous employees of the Government, as a natural result, would it not?

Mr. BYRD. It certainly should and unquestionably would.

In regard to cooperative farming which has been undertaken by the Farm Security Administration in practically every instance that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures of which I am chairman has been able to investigate, it has been a colossal failure. It is based on the Russian principle that a group of cooperative farmers should farm a tract of land, each having proportionate ownership. I desire to read to the Senate a statement made by the Appropriations Committee of the House in its report last year:

> The Farm Security Administration is also carrying on experiments in collective farming under a plan which appears to resemble the plan of collective farming in communistic Russia.

This was the official report made by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives—

> The committee believes that this is wholly contrary to the spirit and genius of the American way of life, and ought to be stopped.

Mr. President, at a regional conference of the F. S. A. officials in Columbus, Ohio, in 1941, and again at another conference in 1942, a circular explaining the F. S. A. program was placed before the conference. The circular was printed at the expense of the Farm Security Administration. Before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Mr. Baldwin admitted it was furnished by the F. S. A. officials, and, while he expressed general approval of the objectives, he said he disclaimed any responsibility for the document.

I wish to read to the Senate some of the testimony in respect to that. This document, which has been under consideration by the Farm Security Administration and the ideas of which they have been attempting to sell to the country and to sell to their clients, provides among other things:

> For transferring surplus families from overpopulated areas so that the remaining families may be self-supporting.
>
> Creating economic farm units by combining units that are now too small to maintain a family on an acceptable level of living.
>
> Subdividing large holdings which are capable of supporting a large number of farmers on a satisfactory level of living.
>
> Minimum rural housing standards.
>
> Minimum wages for agricultural workers.
>
> Homestead exemption laws drawn in such a manner as to protect the family type farm.

In other words, make the family type farm the unit to be exempted. That, of course, would necessitate a change in the State laws and, in many instances, a change in State constitutions, because, in Virginia, for example, and in other States, the revenue of the State or locality comes directly from the taxation of land and tangible personal property.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in that part of the document just quoted by the Senator referring to dividing up large holdings of lands, whose holdings are referred to?

Mr. BYRD. I am coming to that later. They propose to acquire the holdings by the use of eminent domain and then distribute them, as I understand.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do they propose to use eminent domain to acquire anybody's property they may select or desire, and then cause it to be divided?

Mr. BYRD. That was the suggestion made in the circular which has been under consideration. I shall come to that in a moment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask whether the Farm Security Administration or any other similar agency of the Government could exercise the right of eminent domain without the consent of the State?

Mr. BYRD. I do not think it could, but I am merely stating what the Farm Security Administration has in mind in this gigantic resettlement project for which it is attempting to create sentiment throughout the country.

Mr. AIKEN. To that extent the States do have control over the situation?

Mr. BYRD. Assuming that the Constitution is as we think it is, and that the Supreme Court will so construe it to be. As I have said, there is to be an exemption from taxation of family-type farms.

The document further proposes—

> To exercise the rights of public (eminent) domain as a means of securing the subdivision of large landholdings into family-type farms. To compensate owners of such large holdings on the basis of earning-capacity values.
>
> To expand cooperating farm leasing and purchasing associations as rapidly as experience justifies.
>
> To acquire Government title to such land as is possible.
>
> To retain land now being held by the Government.

That was presented, Mr. President, to the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. Mr. Baldwin was examined with respect to it. There was no denial of the fact that this document had been printed at Government expense; on the face of it, the document came from the Farm Security Administration, and, while Mr. Baldwin, as I have said—and his testimony is on page 869 and the following pages of the committee report—disclaimed responsibility for it, he did not disclaim his general approval of the objectives of this socialistic and communistic scheme which the Farm Administration has undertaken to sell to the people of this country by reason of meetings and conferences.

I will not take the time of the Senate to discuss it further, but if any Member of the Senate is interested in it, a full examination of Mr. Baldwin appears in the hearings of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

A little later a Land Policy Review was issued by the United States Department of Agriculture over the signature of Mr. Paul V. Maris, Director of the Tenant Purchasing Division of the Farm Security Administration. This is practically along the same line, and was discussed at another meeting held at the Hamilton Hotel in Washington, D. C., in January 1942.

This is an amazing document. It provides an agricultural blueprint of what is evidently intended to carry out the aims of Dr. Tugwell, "to make America over," to socialize American agriculture and industry, to regulate all industry and agriculture by one central authority.

To achieve these farm-tenure objectives, the F. S. A. committee report proposed to develop 10,500,000 acres of irrigable land at a total construction cost, including materials and labor, of approximately $3,000,000,000; 20,000,000 acres of additional drainable land at a total cost, including materials and labor, of approximately $1,000,000,000; an additional 20,000,000 acres of crop land to be cleared at a total cost, including materials and labor, of $900,000,000; the construction of over 500,000 new farm-building units on reclaimed land, at a total cost of $1,500,000; the construction of 1,000,000 new farm-building units in subdivisions and enlarged units at an average cost of $3,000 a unit, or a total cost of $3,000,000,000.

Mr. President, that was the program. The United States Government today owns 20 percent of all the land in this country. When we include the public domain and the land which has been acquired or is pending acquisition by the Federal Government alone, including the recent additions which have been acquired by the War Department, the Government at Washington owns 20 percent of all the land in the United States, and day by day the War Department and the Navy Department are increasing tremendously their holdings, during the emergency, without attempting to utilize to the extent they should, in my opinion, the existing land already owned by the United States Government.

The War Department alone, according to a report which the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures will shortly submit to the Congress, has acquired or has pending acquisition in recent months, since the emergency began, nearly 20,000,000 acres of land, I think it is a very dangerous thing to continue to add to the ownership of land under the management and direction of the Federal Government.

I have discussed the resettlement program, and to some extent cooperative farming, and the objectives of this organization; let us not forget that every day the 15,000 agents and employees of the Farm Security Administration are going throughout this country attempting to sell these ideas to the people of

America, doing so by public meetings, and in many other ways.

I wish to call attention to something which occurred last year, when the document which I hold in my hand was printed by the Farm Security Administration and was circulated under frank by this Administration. That was proven beyond any question. The matter circulated was from the New Republic, and is entitled "Who Speaks for the Farmers?"

I mention this because I want the Senate to know that this organization of the Government is using the Government frank and Government money to denounce Senators because they have had the temerity to question anything the Farm Security Administration has done. These are just a few words I wish to quote:

When Senator BYRD called his fellow Virginian, C. B. Baldwin, Federal Security Administrator, before the committee, Mr. Baldwin testified that the Federal Security Administration was approving loans to clients who needed money to pay present or back poll taxes.

Mr. Baldwin is my constituent; he comes from the State of Virginia. I have no quarrel whatever with him, except I think he is the most inefficient and the most irresponsible head of any division of this Government. I have said that to him, and I will repeat it anywhere in the State of Virginia, although he is my constituent and I have had no quarrel whatever with him of a political character. His family has always supported me in my political career, beginning with the time when I was a candidate for Governor. This is what the document says:

The Byrd committee's all-star cast of Senators from poll-tax States were horrified by such brazen belief in constitutional guaranties, and CARTER GLASS was quick to assert that if the Department of Agriculture Solicitor agreed that such procedure was legal, Mr. Baldwin had better get himself a new solicitor.

As a matter of fact, it is against the constitutions of these Southern States to advance money to anyone to pay his poll tax; it is specifically and definitely prohibited by the constitutions of these States. Then it is said:

Senators MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, and GEORGE, of Georgia, made equally determined noises to indicate that tenants and croppers are not going to be forced to own their own farms, paint their houses, or feed their children balanced diets so long as they are in the Senate to ward off such a fate.

There are two pages of like denunciations of Senators, distributed under the franking privilege of the United States Government, and at the cost of the Government.

Mr. President, that is the type of organization the Farm Security Administration is.

I do not wish to take more of the time of the Senate than necessary. I now come to the rehabilitation program of the Farm Security Administration. Mr. Baldwin testified before the Senate Agricultural Committee that his agency had loaned in rehabilitation loans approximately $560,000,000. No one can foresee or estimate the ultimate loss to the Government by reason of these loans because of the methods by which this organization conducts its affairs.

Mr. Baldwin testified before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures about a year ago that he estimated a loss of 20 percent, which would be $110,000,000 on the total loans of $550,000,000. Yet the assertion has been made that the clients of the Farm Security Administration are current and that they have paid their loans as they become due, in the main.

The fact is, and Mr. Baldwin has admitted it, that he makes additional loans to these clients. He makes loans when the clients are unable, as they are in many instances, to pay the installments which are due. He makes additional loans, and he furthermore has the right to make grants, to which I have not yet referred.

I wish to call attention to pages 1659 and 1660 of the House hearings on the 1944 bill. In response to an inquiry from Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. Baldwin said:

The rule we follow on that is this: If the borrower is going to continue on the program but has not met all of his installments—most of them have met most of their installments throughout the country—we take a new note.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The new note makes him current; does it not?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DIRKSEN, at this meeting of the committee, said:

Every time there is a maturity that has not been paid for a given annual installment, you make a new note?

Mr. BALDWIN. Not in each instance * * *. The rule we follow on that is this: If the borrower is going to continue on the program * * * we take a new note.

Then Mr. DIRKSEN said:

The new note makes him current?

And Mr. Baldwin replied:

Yes, sir; it does.

In addition to taking a new note in order to make them current when they have obligations which have not been paid, he continues to make additional loans, time and time again, to his clients.

I have some data here from Alabama. A man named Sandy Garrett who lives at Childersburg, Ala., received $202.65 in grants. That is one of the ways many of these loans are made current. Mr. Baldwin makes grants, as well as loans. Mr. Garrett repaid only $27.79 of his indebtedness, and was then given a new loan of $274.

Mr. Ed Lewis of Hale County, Alabama, borrowed $2,406 but repaid only $163, and during this period he received grants totaling $380—more than twice the amount of his total payments.

Britt Wages received 18 loans totaling $2,224.

J. M. White received 18 loans totaling $2,628, and then paid back only $511.

I will not read more of these cases, because any amount of such data is available.

Mr. President, one of the objections, as I see it, to the Farm Security Administration, is that it puts farmers into debt to the extent that they cannot pay the debt. I wish to read from the record of the hearings the basis on which many of these loans are made. They are made, Mr. President, for the purpose, and it was so admitted by Mr. Baldwin, of attending moving pictures. The Farm Security Administration regards that as a standard of living. Loans could be made for the purpose of joining the Knights of Pythias or the Masons. What I now say is based on evidence in response to questions which were asked Mr. Baldwin by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. I shall have that part of the record looked up, and shall read it to the Senate later.

Mr. President, the amendment proposed by me provides that these activities shall be transferred to the Farm Credit Administration and the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section.

The Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section is now making loans to more than 1,000,000 low-income farmers. It has done a magnificent work. I think all Senators present will agree with that statement. In fact it has made 1,491,655 loans, including 167,405 drought loans. This organization has personnel in every part of the United States, in every county. My amendment provides that the Extension Service shall be utilized; that the farm agents shall be utilized. We have a farm agent in every county, as Senators know, and if this proposal were adopted it would greatly simplify and coordinate the work which is now being performed by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Has the Senator from Virginia figures to show what percentage of feed loans have been paid back?

Mr. BYRD. The feed loans have been operated extremely efficiently, I will say to the Senator from South Carolina. The cost of servicing each loan of the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section is $2.54, whereas the cost to the Farm Security Administration for servicing each loan is $46.07.

Mr. SMITH. The reason I asked the question is that there has been a difference between the collections made in certain regions. In the South and the Southwest I am informed about 97 percent of the loans have been repaid.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. Under certain weather conditions in the West, by reason of which the farmers do not have the wherewithal to repay the loans, they have not repaid them.

Mr. BYRD. My information is that the average of repayment has been very high. Of course, drought loans are likewise made by the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Has the Senator from Virginia figures showing what percentage of subsistence loans have been repaid by farmers?

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator mean rehabilitation loans?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not think the repayment statistics amount to anything at all because, as I have just explained, Mr. Baldwin testified that when the loans become in arrears they simply gave new notes.

Mr. EASTLAND. I understood from Mr. Baldwin's testimony that only 25 percent of the rehabilitation loans had been repaid in full.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Baldwin admitted to the committee that there was a loss of 20 percent on the original loans.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. Baldwin was before a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a short time ago. The Senator from Virginia stated, I believe, that 80 percent of the Farm Security loans have been repaid. I presume that is 80 percent of the amount due.

Mr. BYRD. No; what I said was that Mr. Baldwin testified that his loss would be 20 percent. I think his loss is going to be very much greater.

Mr. AIKEN. Those figures are over a year old, are they not?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. It is a fact that these small farmers are a little better off during the past year, because they have gotten better prices, and that many of them have gone to work in machine shops and received more money.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Baldwin testified that there would be a loss of 20 percent on the original loan.

Mr. AIKEN. At the present time, between 82 and 85 percent of the loans which have become due have been paid back, and it is estimated that the amount paid back will be nearly 90 percent. So that the loss will not be nearly so great as was anticipated a year ago.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; but I do not agree with the Senator from Vermont with respect to the fact that the loans are current, because Mr. Baldwin testified that when the loans become in default he frequently accepted new notes, and then regarded those loans as being current. That is shown in his testimony.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; but do not some of our big businessmen and big corporations do the same thing? Why should we criticize the little fellow with the $200 loan?

Mr. BYRD. I am not criticizing that. My criticism is based on the fact that Mr. Baldwin said that his loans are current; when a loan becomes in arrears, and a new note is taken for it, it does not thereby become current. That is not the proper way to do it.

Mr. AIKEN. If it is proper for the big businessman or corporation to follow such a practice, is it not proper for the F. S. A. to do so?

Mr. BYRD. What I am speaking of is whether such a loan is current or not. Mr. Baldwin testified that he simply gives a new note when a loan becomes in arrears, and then calls that loan current.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Reconstruction Finance Corporation do that in connection with its operations?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Vermont perhaps knows more about that than I do. I spoke of what Mr. Baldwin said. Let me read to the Senate the testimony of Mr. Baldwin with respect to the basis upon which he makes these loans. It has already been called to the Senate's attention that he makes loans with which to pay poll taxes, but it is further testified that he has made no loans to Negroes to pay poll taxes in the South. Why that was, I do not know. He made them to the white people only.

I now read from the hearings before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

Senator MCKELLAR. Do you include movie tickets, tickets to the movies, for proper recreation?

Mr BALDWIN. No, sir. This is a miscellaneous column there hat might include such an item. I think these people are privileged to go to the movies; yes.

Senator MCKELLAR. So you would include the movies. Would you include the travel expenses to town, for a chance of recreation in the city nearby?

Mr. BALDWIN. Well, I think, sir, the rule of reason would be followed. These families are poor families. They have the same likes and dislikes, I guess, as most of us have.

Senator MCKELLAR. Would you include the Knights of Pythias dues, and Masonic dues, and chamber of commerce dues, and things like that?

Mr. BALDWIN. These items are the normal cost that go toward living in a democracy.

Senator MCKELLAR. That would be normally included under the new democracy?

That is the basis for my statement, Mr. President, that many of these loans have been made on that ground. I am not going to take up more of the time of the Senate. I think we must face fairly and squarely the situation, Senators, that there should be a reduction of these bureaus of the Government which are duplicating work of other bureaus of the Government. We have 20 different agencies making agricultural loans of one kind or another. I know of no better place to start to coordinate and consolidate the activities of the Government than in these agencies which are making loans to the farmers, and I know of no better place to start than to adopt the amendment which has been offered by me, which is the same amendment as was proposed by the House Appropriations Committee, the same amendment which was proposed in the House after very careful consideration and stricken out there on a point of order. I know of no better way to start than for the Senate to adopt the amendment and consolidate the activities of the Farm Security Administration with the Farm Credit Administration and the facilities which are already established in the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section.

Mr. President, I shall conclude with one further statement. In the course of the debate we have heard a great deal of criticism of the American Farm Bureau Federation. I am not one who has by any means blindly agreed with opinions and followed the recommendations of the American Farm Bureau Federation. On the contrary, I think I have voted against their recommendations perhaps more frequently than I have voted for them. However, let me here and now pay my tribute to that great organization of farmers for having performed and for performing now one of the best jobs which has been done or is being done for the farmers of America. When it is said that the American Farm Bureau Federation does not represent the small-income farmers of the country I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the magazine Fortune conducted a survey not long ago, and as a result found that 60 percent of all organized farmers are members of the American Farm Bureau Federation. It is the largest farm organization in America today. The survey showed that 60 percent of the high-income farmers are members of the American Farm Bureau Federation, that 61 percent of the medium-income farmers are members of the Federation, and that 48 percent of the low-income farmers who are organized are members of it. The federation advocates the amendment which was proposed by the House Appropriations Committee and which has been offered by the Senator from Virginia. I offer no apologies whatever for offering to the Senate this amendment, which comes from the greatest farm organization in this country, an organization which represents in its membership more low-income agricultural producers than does any other farm organization in existence. I believe that Mr. O'Neal and the other men who have charge of that great farm organization are now looking at the question from the standpoint of what is best for the farmers and what will be best for them after the conclusion of the war, when, in my judgment, the farmers will be faced with the most serious conditions, after Europe has caught up with its food supplies, ever to be confronted by them. The American Farm Bureau Federation is now attempting to simplify all the various agencies dealing with farmers, so that the farmer will not become a servant of the bureaus in Washington, and so that the farmer's every action will not be controlled by the various Washington bureaus. The American Farm Bureau Federation is rendering the farmers a valuable service, in endeavoring to bring about a coordination and consolidation of the various governmental bureaus in the interests of the farmers of America.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask the Senator if he proposes to change the manner in which the feed loan is to be operated?

Mr. BYRD. I think the bill which has been offered by the Senator from South Carolina, to increase the maximum from $400 to $800, as I understand, should by all means be passed, especially if this amendment is agreed to; and, if necessary, the amount should be increased above $800. I am thoroughly in accord with the Senator's bill, which I understand is now pending in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I hope the Senate will pass it.

Mr. SMITH. I simply want to know if the amendment proposes a change in the method of handling the feed loans.

Mr. BYRD. It was not intended to change it.

Mr. SMITH. The language is:

To enable the Secretary, through the Farm Credit Administration and through existing agencies under its supervision.

The feed loan activities come under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. So there will be no change; is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. No change. There was no intention to make any change, and I am certain the amendment does not do so.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understood the Senator's remarks with reference to the liquidation of the projects which have been discussed, he stated that in the committee amendment to the bill he felt there was not sufficient or adequate direction to compel their liquidation.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I read the committee amendment and also the last paragraph of the amendment which the Senator is now offering, it seems to me they are practically the same. Practically the same language is used.

Mr. BYRD. I am glad the Senator reminded me. I have an amendment as follows:

On page 95, line 11, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation authorized under this item shall be used except for the complete liquidation of the Resettlement projects which shall be accomplished by December 31, 1943."

That amendment would go in on page 95, where appropriation of $421,039 is made to carry out the liquidation and management of resettlement projects. I offer that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will lie on the table, and be printed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is offering an amendment which will place a limit on the time during which the projects must be liquidated; is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator is correct in his statement. Certainly, the pending amendment of the Senator from Virginia does not cover that matter, and I do not think the committee amendment adequately covers it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Am I to understand that the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is a substitute for the committee amendment which was agreed to yesterday?

Mr. BYRD. The committee amendment was not agreed to yesterday, let me say to the Senator. My amendment is a substitute for that part of the committee amendment beginning on page 89, line 15, and extending down to and including line 4 on page 93.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Will the Senator advise me whether the sum total of appropriations included in his substitute amendment is less or more than the total included in the amendment for which his is proposed as a substitute?

Mr. BYRD. I will say it is substantially less. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia provides for administrative expenses of $12,000,000, of which $8,000,000 shall be available to the extension services of the land-grant colleges, and so forth. Let me explain to the Senator the reason why the amount is reduced so substantially. Because the committee amendment provides for the same expenses of $29,607,573; the Senator from Virginia feels that if the other organizations are utilized there can be a saving in administrative expenses to that extent; and then the loans are reduced from $97,500,000 to $40,000,000.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The amount which might be available for the farmers has also been reduced by the Senator's amendment; is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. It has been reduced. Let me say to the Senator that there are a number of new agencies making loans to the farmers. One of them is the R. A. C. C., which recently was organized. It makes nonrecourse loans of approximately $300,000,000 or $400,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, next week a bill to abolish that agency will be pending.

Mr. BYRD. It is not abolished in the pending bill.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Then, Mr. President, if the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is agreed to, it will mean that, while the functions are transferred to another division of the Government, yet the amount available to the farmers for the purposes enumerated will be reduced by more than $40,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. The amount for loans is proposed to be reduced from $97,500,000 to $40,000,000. The latter is the amount which the House Appropriations Committee, after long hearings and careful consideration, regarded as adequate. I think everyone will recognize that the administrative expenses can and should be reduced, if the proposed consolidation with existing agencies is made.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator if, in his opinion, the other agencies of government to which his amendment would transfer the present functions of the Farm Security Administration are now sufficiently staffed, organized, and prepared so as to be able to carry on those functions. In other words, I should not want to have the functions of the Farm Security Administration and that part of the program having to do with the making of loans to small-income farmers abolished. I want to have it retained; and at this time I should not want to have made a transfer which might jeopardize that program.

Mr. BYRD. I will say to the Senator that the $12,000,000 appropriation for which provision is made, plus the funds those agencies already have, in my judgment will be adequate; because, as the Senator knows, the extension services and the emergency crop-and-feed loan agency now have organizations existing all over the country, and it is proposed to use them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are they prepared and equipped to give comparatively the same quality of service in the way of guidance and instruction to small farmers?

Mr. BYRD. I think they are. In 1942 the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan organization made loans to more than 1,400,000 farmers which is nearly twice the amount of loans made by the Farm Security Administration. The Senator is familiar with the farm agents' organization. It is being utilized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In this connection, I do not feel that we ought completely to liquidate this program at this time, when food is so vital. I refer to the program for aiding and servicing the small income farmer. With respect to these projects, I think every one ought to be abolished. That is the way I wish to vote on the question, if it is presented in that form.

Mr. BYRD. In response to the Senator's question, let me say that the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan organization is servicing many more loans for the smaller farmer than is this organization. The total number of loans in 1942 was 1,491,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are those the seed and feed loans?

Mr. BYRD. It is the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section. It has an organization which can be expanded by the additional appropriation of $12,000,000, which would be adequate, in my judgment, to take care of the program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under the Senator's amendment would the other agency have the same authority as the F. S. A. has under existing law to carry on the work of the F. S. A. with regard to the servicing of the low-income farmers?

Mr. BYRD. It would have authority to make loans in the rural rehabilitation program.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Referring to grants, if the functions of this agency were transferred, as the Senator's amendment provides, would the new agency with which it would be consolidated have authority to make grants to farmers, we will say, in areas which have suffered tremendous damage from the disastrous floods which have recently occurred?

Mr. BYRD. I do not think it would have authority to make grants. It would have authority to make loans. It now makes drought loans, which are in the same class.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would the Senator's amendment provide for making grants as well as loans?

Mr. BYRD. The language of the amendment is:

Making and servicing loans: To enable the Secretary, through the Farm Credit Administration and through existing agencies under its supervision, including the Crop and Feed Loan Division and Production Credit Associations, to administer all activities, projects, facilities, and functions heretofore carried on under the caption "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," the continuance of which is authorized under the terms of this appropriation, and to provide assistance to

needy farmers in the United States, its Territories and possessions, unable to obtain credit elsewhere.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then, according to the Senator's interpretation of the amendment, it would authorize grants to farmers in flooded areas.

Mr. BYRD. I do not think it would. The limitation is as follows:

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase program; (2) for carrying on any experiment in collective farming, except for the liquidation of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) for making loans to any individual farmer in excess of $2,500.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wished to determine whether or not the other agency could make grants in flooded areas to rehabilitate farmers, as well as making loans to them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I tried to refrain from interrupting the Senator. He asked not to be interrupted; but I must say that when this amendment was proposed in the House, it was not contended that there was any authority for making grants. As a matter of fact, it was insisted that that authority be abolished. If the Senator will read the language, he will find that it refers only to rural rehabilitation loans. There is no authority for making grants, no matter how grave the emergency may be.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is the Senator referring to the committee amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. The committee amendment permits grants.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What I am trying to determine is the difference between the authority under the committee amendment and the authority under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. RUSSELL. There can be no question about it. On page 9, in the committee amendment, there is specific authority, which has always been carried, for making grants in case of disaster. That is found under subdivision (3).

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the way I interpreted the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Those grants are made from the $29,000,000 to which the Senator from Virginia refers as administrative expenses; but under the Senator's amendment there would be available only $4,000,000 for handling the $450,000,000 in loans which are outstanding, as well as for making new loans of $40,000,000. The other $8,000,000 would go to the Extension Service. There is no fund in the amendment of the Senator from Virginia which could possibly be used for grants.

Mr. BYRD. What I tried to make clear to the Senator is that the amendment does not provide for making grants, but it does provide for rural rehabilitation loans to needy farmers. That provision is found on page 2 of my amendment, beginning in line 13.

My amendment would enable the Secretary—

to administer all activities, projects, facilities, and functions heretofore carried on under the caption, "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," the continuance of which is authorized under the terms of this appropriation.

With respect to what the Senator from Georgia has just said as to the administrative cost, it is intended to utilize existing machinery of other agencies, which would not necessitate anything like the administrative cost of the 15,000 employees now carried by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely wished to get the matter clear in my own mind. Ordinarily I would not favor the grant provision in the law as it has existed in the past; but in my State and in many others an emergency exists, which has been brought about by the recent floods. I think it is necessary that some provision be made for grants to farmers in order to rehabilitate them and put them back on a self-sustaining basis.

Mr. BYRD. That could be easily done by emergency legislation. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia is permanent legislation.

EXHIBIT I

United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, status of projects as of June 30, 1942

RECAPITULATION BY TYPE

Description	Total capital investment	Developed units			Units sold			Income, fiscal year 1942	Operating obligations, fiscal year 1942				Management obligations, fiscal year 1942
		Number of units	Total cost	Average cost	Number of units	Total sales price	Average sales price		Operations and maintenance	Taxes	Insurance	Total	
Projects sold or partially sold	$42,927,423.35	5,982	$34,482,431.58	$5,764.36	3,099	$11,904,862.76	$4,389.70	$670,312.67	$255,579.79	$185,129.07	$79,278.71	$19,987.57	$354,271.75
Projects on which no units have been sold	27,618,406.57	3,154	21,096,146.43	6,688.69				392,857.28	173,665.61	84,065.08	37,644.18	295,374.87	203,966.44
Projects undeveloped	1,148,611.64	74				47,100.00		32,413.85	10,132.33	5,222.52	533.83	15,888.68	6,445.91
Projects transferred to Federal Public Housing Authority	65,808,271.69	5,483	41,940,861.09	7,649.25	1,427	3,332,240.94	2,335.13	1,552,664.74	707,897.09	309,914.36	28,193.90	1,046,005.35	205,077.09
Total	137,502,713.25	14,693	97,519,439.10	6,637.14	4,526	15,284,203.70	3,692.72	2,648,248.54	1,147,274.82	584,331.03	145,650.62	1,877,256.47	769,761.19

PROJECTS SOLD OR PARTIALLY SOLD

State and project name	Total capital investment	Developed units			Units sold			Income, fiscal year 1942	Operating obligations, fiscal year 1942				Management obligations, fiscal year 1942
		Number of units	Total cost	Average cost	Number of units	Total sales price	Average sales price		Operations and maintenance	Taxes	Insurance	Total	
Alabama:													
Gee's Bend farms	$408,264.50	101	$303,578.87	$3,005.73	95	$128,250.00	$1,350.00	$6,001.39	$444.10			$444.10	$7,517.83
Prairie farms	200,935.89	36	140,315.15	3,897.64	34	115,532.00	3,398.00	2,379.44	1,062.73		$46.00	1,108.73	6,247.97
Skyline farms	1,260,030.87	156	863,597.05	5,535.88	32	96,000.00	3,000.00	4,854.36	10,859.01			10,859.01	8,465.02
Arkansas:													
Arkansas Farm Tenant Security	513,297.56	66	393,289.43	5,958.93	16	78,564.00	4,910.25	10,985.49	2,966.15	$317.62		3,283.77	4,304.48
Biscoe farms	371,935.47	74	334,409.51	4,519.03	69	296,382.00	4,295.39	8,345.06	835.67	33.77		869.44	6,783.25
Central and western Arkansas Valley farms	359,390.35	82	359,390.35	4,382.81	69	248,306.21	3,598.64	6,805.78	2,646.45	74.86	3,146.72	5,868.03	6,875.67
Chicot farms	1,050,864.80	89	514,130.29	5,776.74	30	92,722.07	3,090.74	1,272.30	215.11	5,884.42	62.89	6,162.42	10,820.98
Clover Bend farms	478,670.86	86	374,978.42	4,360.21	76	320,415.00	4,215.99	10,458.07	2,496.35	88.27	247.55	2,832.17	7,827.71
Desha	499,489.59	88	466,807.97	5,304.64	60	275,278.10	4,587.97	10,985.72	1,343.01	845.66		2,188.67	7,576.64
Lake Dick	667,599.36	89	297,566.47	3,343.44	8	36,550.00	4,568.75	19,632.92	3,499.82	420.04	4,178.00	8,097.86	7,056.40
Lakeview	902,742.57	140	679,287.49	4,852.05	52	212,770.00	4,091.73	24,257.84	7,049.87	471.87		7,521.74	9,334.38
Lonoke farms	249,873.37	41	191,856.68	4,679.43	39	184,474.64	4,730.12	5,455.21	775.16	60.79	1,969.44	2,805.39	5,230.99
Northwest Arkansas farms	214,320.60	44	214,320.60	4,877.88	30	124,550.40	4,151.68	3,620.44	2,923.18	77.17	1,717.96	4,718.31	6,765.61
Plum Bayou	1,629,716.77	180	1,172,266.60	6,512.59	17	72,255.00	4,250.29	26,270.46	8,191.68	1,251.01		9,442.69	14,560.37

United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, status of projects as of June 30, 1942—Continued

PROJECTS SOLD OR PARTIALLY SOLD—continued

State and project name	Total capital investment	Developed units			Units sold			Income, fiscal year 1942	Operating obligations, fiscal year 1942			Management obligations, fiscal year 1942
		Number of units	Total cost	Average cost	Number of units	Total sales price	Average sales price		Operations and maintenance	Taxes	Insurance	Total	
California: Mendocino resettlement project	$25,175.00	4	$11,750.00	$2,937.50	4	$11,599.60	$2,899.90						$21.56
Colorado:													
San Luis Valley farms	1,075,723.39	86	633,149.09	7,362.20	50	348,572.00	6,971.44	$4,611.03	$15,913.00	$2,225.00	$50.36	$18,188.36	7,995.94
Western slope farms	1,146,877.01	103	982,153.19	9,535.47	31	220,585.66	7,115.67	17,349.07	3,849.33	15,894.00	4,014.37	23,757.70	8,251.82
Florida: Escambia	563,253.75	81	369,882.72	4,566.45	21	73,500.00	3,500.00	2,303.65	4,688.75			4,688.75	7,806.02
Georgia:													
Flint River farms	731,736.68	146	519,928.60	3,561.15	63	225,057.00	3,572.33	6,586.00	66.00			66.00	8,412.32
Georgia Farm Tenant Security	674,610.87	106	648,912.78	6,121.82	27	117,324.60	4,345.33	7,286.92	1,977.36		4,373.20	6,350.56	200.00
Idaho													
Boundary farms	788,440.97	37	469,005.19	12,675.82	37	332,304.60	8,981.19	9,219.18			11.74	11.74	4,609.57
Idaho scattered farms	195,924.49	87	149,537.55	1,718.82	62	96,829.27	1,561.76	5,557.95		1,108.35	285.56	1,393.91	76.27
Kansas: Northeastern Kansas farms	243,382.55	26	224,728.24	8,643.39	8	81,576.00	10,197.00	1,145.96	2,976.54	2,387.42	1,653.04	7,017.00	3,342.70
Kentucky:													
Sublimity farms	441,386.14	66	350,928.66	5,317.10	(1)	(1)	(1)	4,608.82	2,824.00			2,824.00	
Christian-Trigg farms	971,429.33	103	877,098.17	8,515.52	41	306,492.79	7,475.43	22,803.88	4,897.39	4,000.32	6,660.38	15,558.09	8,717.94
Louisiana:													
Louisiana Farm Tenant Security	622,284.51	110	555,903.95	5,053.67	39	177,319.00	4,546.64	13,094.03	6,345.40	2,807.87	3,842.32	12,995.59	5,593.40
Mounds farms	867,723.12	145	525,090.46	3,621.31	2	12,181.00	6,090.50	10,354.30	365.17	6,035.99		6,401.16	
Transylvania farms	873,404.11	160	699,801.07	4,373.76	16	78,870.00	4,929.38	1,358.43	121.60	5,368.98	1,631.00	7,121.58	9,793.16
Maine: State of Maine farms	380,664.46	66	380,664.46	5,767.64	38	133,179.18	3,504.71	6,910.29	7,583.00		1,636.34	9,219.34	3,885.11
Michigan:													
Corporation farms and real estate	46,595.12	18	46,595.12	2,588.62	13	16,343.83	1,257.22	5,051.01					
Johnnesburg farms	84,743.21	15	84,743.21	5,649.55	15	74,011.75	4,934.12						
Southern Michigan farms	554,593.31	72	554,593.31	7,702.68	27	169,662.00	6,283.78	10,462.72	5,251.28			5,251.28	
Minnesota:													
Albert Lea homesteads	46,315.25	14	46,315.25	3,308.23	14	30,257.71	2,161.27	2,452.09			665.20	665.20	
Central Minnesota farms	1,033,846.66	105	1,033,846.66	9,846.16	99	921,045.28	9,303.49	29,148.47	3,938.70		31.96	3,970.66	5,271.24
Ethan Allen	13,700.00	4	8,025.00	2,006.25	3	9,581.00	3,193.66						
Beltrami Island farms	493,654.41	214	493,654.41	2,306.80	214	480,278.84	2,244.29						
Minnesota scattered farms	3,978.00	3	3,978.00	1,326.00	3	3,603.68	1,201.23						
Mississippi:													
Hinds farms	271,239.91	73	249,151.42	3,413.03	59	199,693.00	3,384.63	5,900.45	1,141.76	985.00	2,405.92	4,532.68	7,845.66
Lucedale farms	460,740.04	93	407,525.25	4,381.99	64	162,000.00	2,531.25	7,204.72	683.62	1,450.00	3,463.52	5,597.14	6,382.54
Mississippi Farm Tenant Security	1,822,040.57	294	1,340,203.80	4,558.52	135	685,640.00	5,078.81	43,486.02	4,071.88	15,717.00	121.14	19,910.02	9,919.42
Northeast Mississippi farms	552,363.34	112	545,484.00	4,870.39	45	144,327.19	3,207.27	10,263.92	2,766.47	2,160.00	25.00	4,951.47	8,450.24
Missouri: Rehabilitation demonstration farms	149,163.72	51	149,163.72	2,924.78	4	3,589.00	897.25	12,559.73	648.99		57.62	706.61	
Montana:													
Fairfield Bench farms	1,159,571.51	129	1,096,191.88	8,497.61	89	348,572.00	3,916.54	13,160.21	10,472.00	15,750.00	8,781.57	35,003.57	7,854.62
Milk River farms	2,034,071.38	163	1,341,217.41	8,228.33	64	220,585.66	3,446.63	30,578.72	12,250.27	33,307.46	2.68	45,560.41	7,503.54
New York:													
Finger Lakes farms	433,515.32	55	433,515.32	7,882.10	35	189,335.14	5,409.58	10,782.01	8,263.00	1,473.00	5,185.25	14,921.25	4,342.18
New York Valley farms	273,012.30	34	273,012.30	8,029.77	22	121,812.57	5,536.94	7,696.40	2,233.83	1,137.68	3,551.75	6,923.26	2,076.36
North Carolina:													
North Carolina Farm Tenant Security	553,933.71	95	539,891.27	5,683.07	40	184,362.90	4,690.07	8,865.65	1,474.85	3,808.69	108.44	5,391.98	4,960.11
Pembroke farms	623,473.60	65	417,851.77	6,428.49	58	290,059.00	5,001.02	7,208.91	1,586.26	3,780.61	78.09	5,444.96	6,544.01
Roanoke farms	2,225,364.77	294	1,743,104.62	5,928.93	44	188,922.32	4,293.69	28,293.89	6,948.68	4,320.48	136.15	11,405.31	9,460.34
Scuppernong farms	796,019.04	49	392,966.64	8,019.72	20	118,190.00	5,909.50	5,614.96	8,940.59	4,739.73		13,680.32	9,020.75
Wolf Pit farms	274,493.51	37	202,738.41	5,479.42	29	131,280.00	4,526.90	1,685.27	152.75	1,240.66	4.77	1,398.18	2,913.29
North Dakota:													
Burlington project	212,867.31	35	143,361.27	4,096.04	1	5,050.00	5,050.00	859.29	2,653.80	308.31		2,962.11	3,797.58
Red River Valley farms	1,408,709.89	140	1,086,923.88	7,763.87	8	69,840.00	8,730.00	2,939.73	6,629.56	11,195.77	1.60	17,826.93	6,349.86
Oklahoma:													
Eastern Oklahoma farms	653,218.92	71	523,409.62	7,371.79	59	378,574.20	6,416.51	27,415.60	6,214.86	3,297.04	54.24	9,566.14	6,102.47
Oklahoma Farm Tenant Security	558,942.48	55	482,311.08	10,162.59	9	65,554.59	7,283.84	16,409.46	4,767.04	2,043.33	229.90	7,040.27	562.46
Oregon: Yamhill farms	1,313,533.81	104	1,256,692.72	12,083.58	22	163,218.00	7,419.00	21,964.03	12,347.94	3,033.05	6,568.19	21,949.18	6,919.95
Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania farms	261,391.06	37	244,032.04	6,596.00	20	105,439.28	5,271.96	7,064.12	10,546.00	1,375.98	347.84	12,269.82	4,514.04
South Carolina:													
Allendale farms	600,253.20	117	554,929.51	4,742.99	1	12,000.00	12,000.00	12,449.71	4,510.45	2,344.00	2,248.00	9,102.45	7,961.98
Orangeburg farms	534,047.76	80	458,493.29	5,731.17	37	158,881.00	4,294.08	4,903.39	497.27	2,222.00	873.73	3,593.00	8,645.34
South Dakota: Eastern South Dakota farms	420,132.59	39	420,132.59	10,772.63	4	41,350.00	10,337.50	3,871.84	4,435.00	4,091.91		8,526.91	3,281.50
Tennessee: Tennessee Farm Tenant Security	903,982.93	137	739,646.74	5,398.88	52	230,198.15	4,426.89	14,837.38	4,107.89	5,014.00	7,065.80	16,187.69	7,627.70
Texas:													
Sabine farms	419,361.61	80	349,542.67	4,369.28	61	218,293.83	3,578.58	2,914.15	3,346.52			3,346.52	6,120.90
Sam Houston farms	614,661.83	86	504,406.17	5,865.19	17	94,755.47	5,573.83	6,625.34	7,185.01	2,859.27		10,044.28	6,753.73
Texas Farm Tenant Security	989,825.36	111	972,349.51	8,759.00	34	197,924.00	5,821.29	24,328.69	5,654.81	2,527.53	639.17	8,821.51	3,964.60
Utah:													
Sevier Valley farms	161,007.18	18	160,113.48	8,893.19	18	125,375.84	6,965.32	662.26		221.00		221.00	30.00
Widtsoe resettlement project	87,894.00	15	69,000.41	4,600.03	11	57,458.99	5,223.54	1,045.37			70.16	70.16	
Virgin Islands:													
St. Croix homesteads [2]					337								
St. Thomas homesteads [2]					50								
Washington:													
Snohomish farms	497,070.08	44	497,070.08	11,297.03	41	368,048.00	8,976.78	8,503.68	4,608.86		582.34	191.20	5,450.37
Washington scattered farms	285,405.88	129	234,979.16	1,821.54	97	139,919.23	1,442.47	1,326.90	222.99	351.67	438.38	1,013.04	76.14
Wisconsin:													
Central Wisconsin farms	544,899.34	73	532,299.68	7,291.77	34	187,351.50	5,510.34	22,232.53	10,111.03	5,020.49	13.43	15,144.95	5,495.72
Lakewood-Crandon farms	144,640.50	24	144,640.50	6,026.69	24	95,038.89	3,959.95						
	42,927,423.35	5,982	34,482,431.58	5,764.36	3,099	11,904,862.76	4,389.70	670,312.61	255,579.79	185,129.07	79,278.71	519,987.57	354,271.75

[1] Operated by Forest Service.

[2] These projects recently transferred to Farm Security Administration from Department of the Interior by act of Congress. Amounts of capital investment, sales prices, income, and operating obligations not yet available.

United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, status of projects as of June 30, 1942—Continued

PROJECTS ON WHICH NO UNITS HAVE BEEN SOLD

State and project name	Total capital investment	Developed units			Units sold			Income, fiscal year 1942	Operating obligations, fiscal year 1942				Management obligations, fiscal year 1942
		Number of units	Total cost	Average cost	Number of units	Total sales price	Average sales price		Operations and maintenance	Taxes	Insurance	Total	
Alabama:													
Alabama Farm Tenant Security	$587,617.43	96	$560,770.44	$5,841.36				$10,160.51	$4,608.43		$129.60	$4,738.03	$295.00
Alabama scattered farms	168,646.14	28	123,761.80	4,420.06				2,326.77	2,628.29		38.08	2,666.37	50.00
Coffee farms	1,893,593.66	299	1,372,851.47	4,591.48				25,886.83	20,330.33		2,062.21	22,392.54	15,250.03
Arizona: Casa Grande Valley farms	810,859.80	60	259,402.05	4,323.37				23,953.32	933.73	$4,283.91	1,846.02	7,063.66	7,712.90
Arkansas:													
St. Francis River farms	501,606.53	86	337,854.75	3,928.54				27,948.03	3,848.68	5,663.07	1,646.00	11,157.75	4,404.82
Townes farms	172,477.50	31	127,574.44	4,124.98				6,296.32	195.50	710.51		906.01	4,404.64
Trumann farms	263,718.98	56	239,243.72	4,272.21				26,510.05	4,232.94	3,586.00	1,999.71	9,818.65	4,455.96
Florida: Florida scattered farms	394,159.47	69	394,159.47	5,712.46				4,660.45	671.79		470.00	1,141.79	6,767.20
Georgia:													
Briar patch farms	296,888.44	22	181,704.87	8,259.31				1,151.00	1,641.83		237.73	1,879.56	2,951.59
Georgia scattered farms	24,460.23	7	15,959.96	2,279.99				50.00			29.52	29.52	20.00
Greene County project	341,428.82	125	291,807.29	2,334.46				5,073.92			232.00	232.00	375.00
Irwinville	910,894.47	105	744,666.57	7,092.06				14,882.59	6,711.59	640.00	1,674.31	9,025.90	7,462.60
Piedmont homesteads	651,360.11	50	521,219.67	10,424.39				2,239.26	2,422.01			2,422.01	5,765.34
Wolf Creek	237,817.11	24	183,320.66	7,638.36				1,852.37	429.78		923.23	1,353.01	4,327.93
Indiana: Wabash farms	1,241,431.86	122	1,231,645.25	10,095.45				16,672.07	11,135.21		1,563.43	12,698.64	6,170.37
Kansas: Kansas scattered farms	67,005.44	7	67,005.44	9,572.21				1,230.02	642.00	629.03	721.87	1,992.90	5.00
Louisiana: Terrebonne	527,966.52	71	327,058.07	4,606.45					320.74	2,893.21		3,213.95	
Michigan: Cheboygan farms	15,858.41	3	15,858.41	5,286.14				90.00					
Minnesota: Thief River Falls farms	949,241.67	111	916,425.39	8,256.08				11,343.31	5,457.08		2.76	5,459.84	5,614.36
Mississippi:													
Mileston	831,403.28	106	666,001.18	6,283.03					85.60	9,244.39		9,329.99	7,417.62
Richton homesteads	215,599.95	26	183,490.31	7,057.32				768.34	770.98	970.67		1,741.65	1,517.48
Missouri:													
LaForge farms	779,406.94	101	666,550.51	6,599.51				22,103.16	11,933.77	38.87		11,972.64	5,607.11
Osage farms	965,226.37	86	519,682.43	6,042.82				14,732.28	4,589.87		7,948.23	12,538.10	6,040.78
Montana: Kinsey flats	737,652.46	80	622,814.13	7,785.18									7,554.15
Nebraska:													
Fairbury farmsteads	76,879.32	11	51,535.69	4,685.06				457.60	3,599.43	136.74	597.12	4,333.29	25.00
Falls City homesteads	102,572.20	10	41,544.20	4,154.42					82.00	252.83	693.68	1,028.51	25.00
Grand Island farmsteads	66,490.03	10	46,040.37	4,604.04				759.75	480.00	214.73	540.80	1,235.53	25.00
Kearney farmsteads	97,072.63	10	42,234.31	4,223.43				2,296.78	1,955.70	675.45	544.96	3,176.11	
Loup City farmsteads	102,625.54	11	49,758.27	4,523.48				96.78	1,133.39	1,608.82	800.94	3,543.15	70.00
Scottsbluff farmsteads	231,695.55	23	132,002.58	5,739.24				398.01	1,626.96	2,246.51	1,347.03	5,220.50	4,550.54
South Sioux City farmsteads	111,789.13	22	83,690.77	3,804.13				1,226.35	822.07	719.76	1,142.64	2,684.47	31.00
Two Rivers	544,050.66	40	286,525.14	7,163.13				60.00	2,075.06	831.43		4,906.49	4,792.54
New Mexico:													
Bosque	677,022.82	42	595,469.61	14,177.85				3,885.36	3,460.65	9,289.00		12,749.65	4,776.27
Dona Ana farms	34,467.82	5	34,467.82	6,893.56				2,621.76	55.00	414.07		469.07	
New Mexico farms	189,390.82	22	188,321.59	4,014.62				3,969.33	1,592.79			1,592.79	4,046.71
North Carolina:													
North Carolina scattered farms	174,633.43	25	174,633.43	6,985.37				3,912.58	2,534.03		101.94	2,635.97	3,294.70
Penderlea homesteads	2,277,080.37	186	1,486,149.42	7,990.05				10,857.03	12,359.41	4,162.08	3.55	16,525.04	13,293.94
North Dakota: North Dakota scattered farms	12,041.68	2	9,770.68	4,885.34						86.98		86.98	
Ohio:													
Scioto Farms	1,950,951.15	133	1,432,260.80	10,768.88				36,937.55	10,189.66		1.38	10,191.04	7,399.96
Oklahoma: 101 ranch farms	647,043.47	40	421,139.40	10,528.48				11,536.11	1,664.88	1,801.98	285.42	3,752.28	5,029.52
Pennsylvania: Northampton farms	149,234.86	6	148,395.38	24,732.58				4,962.02	819.00	455.63	449.08	1,723.71	1,086.87
South Carolina:													
Ashwood plantation	1,919,572.70	161	1,362,952.34	8,465.54				10,141.29	10,827.31	10,653.00	2.00	21,482.31	12,887.81
South Carolina Farm Tenant Security	445,943.57	55	420,041.54	7,637.12				3,442.66	2,349.80	2,358.00	1,922.00	6,629.80	125.00
South Carolina scattered farms	68,439.87	22	68,439.87	3,110.00				418.00	1,328.68	263.00	706.74	2,298.42	75.00
Tiverton farms	85,575.81	29	85,575.81	2,950.89				152.00	288.30	328.00	1,090.40	1,706.70	4,355.72
South Dakota: Sioux Falls	218,927.83	14	97,668.76	6,976.34				1,415.35	3,612.90		1,314.64	4,927.54	2,156.66
Texas:													
Fannin farms	269,096.92	38	286,483.19	6,223.24				5,482.58	956.27	945.75		1,902.02	4,970.99
Ropesville farms	668,677.42	76	641,038.19	8,434.71				34,224.10	6,803.70			6,803.70	5,536.45
Wichita Valley farms	928,733.94	91	807,670.07	8,875.50				15,147.89	6,588.82	12,582.30		19,171.12	6,357.22
Woodlake community	651,446.20	101	474,000.32	4,693.07				4,219.88	3,732.59		51.11	3,783.70	5,488.11
Virginia: Shenandoah homesteads	1,043,454.48	151	858,947.69	5,688.40				9,204.73	5,698.06	2,831.00	4,245.65	12,774.71	9,370.95
Wisconsin:													
Drummond Forest community	247,948.61	32	210,623.03	6,581.97	(1)	(1)	(1)	3,092.49	3,439.00			3,439.00	
Monroe County retirement	18,507.78	6	17,519.51	2,919.92				1,145.25					
Northern Pine retirement homesteads	20,118.37	9	20,118.37	2,235.37				863.45		548.36	278.40	826.76	25.60
Total	27,618,406.57	3,154	21,096,146.43	6,688.69				392,857.28	173,665.61	84,065.08	37,644.18	295,374.87	203,966.44

PROJECTS UNDEVELOPED

Alabama: West central Alabama farms	$5,522.00												
Arkansas: Kelso farms	44,712.98									$3,039.00		$3,039.00	$1,704.96
Colorado:													
Colorado scattered farms	2,102.00	1								79.65		79.65	
Las Animas farms	1,758.60												
Florida: Jacksonville homesteads	19,322.87				(2)	(2)	(2)						
Illinois: Southern Illinois homesteads	69,680.03												
Indiana: Rehabilitation demonstration farms	6,807.74	2											
Michigan:													
Au Sable area	21,049.88	1						$171.50					
Potato warehouse	33,568.17							2,584.42	$92.00			92.00	
Saginaw Valley	328,187.51	33						18,572.83	8,727.62	802.00		9,529.62	1,853.55

[1] Operated by Forest Service.

[2] Transferred to the Navy Department.

United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration, status of projects as of June 30, 1942—Continued

PROJECTS UNDEVELOPED—continued

State and project name	Total capital investment	Developed units			Units sold			Income, fiscal year 1942	Operating obligations, fiscal year 1942				Management obligations, fiscal year 1942
		Number of units	Total cost	Average cost	Number of units	Total sales price	Average sales price		Operations and maintenance	Taxes	Insurance	Total	
Mississippi: Mississippi rehabilitation farms	285.19									$16.00		$16.00	
Nebraska: Republican Valley farmsteads	7,154.19	1						$150.00					
New Mexico:													
El Pueblo grazing project	79,268.27							86.42	$1,165.00		$6.88	1,171.88	
New Mexico scattered farms	4,636.60	1						103.00					
Silver City farms	21,548.85	4											
Oklahoma: Tulsa County homesteads	15,023.52	1						320.63					
South Dakota: Spearfish	32,233.51	2				$32,000.00		86.21					
Tennessee: Goodlettsville farms	15,360.00					11,100.00							
Texas:													
Mexia colony	71,033.41							813.63		346.00		346.00	
Nacogdoches farms	80,938.32	1							147.71			147.71	2,845.42
McLennan farms (Waco)	244,845.74	20			(4)	(4)	(4)	5,263.21		939.87	526.95	1,466.82	41.98
Virginia: Colonial acres	4,555.14												
Wisconsin:													
Langlade and Oneida project	21,944.03												
West Bend farms	7,060.11	2				4,000.00		4,262.00					
Wisconsin scattered farms	9,412.98	5											
Vulcan Corporation	600.00												
Total	1,148,611.64	74				47,100.00		32,413.85	10,132.33	5,222.52	533.83	15,888.68	6,445.91

PROJECTS TRANSFERRED TO FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITY

Alabama:													
Bankhead farms	$1,046,420.80	100	$722,052.80	$7,220.53	100	$194,370.00	$1,943.70	$342.02					
Cahaba	2,760,610.47	287	1,807,709.13	6,298.64				68,446.67	$33,453.86		$46.59	$33,500.45	$16,123.83
Greenwood homesteads	827,835.27	83	537,019.12	6,470.11	83	162,291.00	1,955.31	3,493.59					
Mount Olive homesteads	618,162.84	75	504,038.52	6,720.51	75	151,187.00	2,015.83	2,862.77					
Palmerdale homesteads	938,865.08	102	664,988.11	6,519.49	102	190,581.00	1,868.44	3,818.68					
Tuskegee homesteads	18,590.00												
Arizona:													
Arizona part-time farms	564,013.05	91	332,691.38	3,655.95				7,825.09	9,686.87	3,060.98	1,547.10	14,294.95	
Phoenix homesteads	104,859.28	25	92,184.79	3,687.39	25	89,150.00	3,566.00	99.50					
California:													
El Monte homesteads	292,476.81	100	260,868.91	2,608.69	100	299,400.00	299,400.00	3,459.98					
San Fernando Homesteads	102,065.23	40	88,725.13	2,218.13	40	105,960.00	2,649.00	1,232.92					
Colorado: Denver homesteads	120,095.94	3						4,725.11	351.00	700.00		1,051.00	4.00
Illinois: Lake County homesteads	554,745.92	53	545,456.07	10,291.62	47	186,467.00	3,967.38	11,926.77	2,997.86	1,696.38	1,648.27	6,342.51	1,585.46
Indiana: Decatur homesteads	157,279.94	48	146,955.48	3,061.57	48	156,140.00	3,252.91	4,240.99					
Iowa: Granger homesteads	216,189.87	50	206,175.77	4,123.52				9,756.80	1,357.68			1,357.68	4,783.17
Maryland: Greenbelt	13,701,817.17	890	8,819,732.66	9,909.81				550,561.46	204,219.83	98,515.22	9.71	302,744.76	33,256.67
Michigan: Ironwood homesteads	1,373,138.48	132	1,056,762.87	8,005.78				25,810.09	8,603.00		6,673.86	15,276.86	5,018.11
Minnesota:													
Austin acres	213,227.87	44	185,359.33	4,212.71	44	63,796.00	1,449.91	1,686.96					1,112.70
Duluth homesteads	983,984.30	84	865,552.56	10,304.20	84	225,742.00	2,687.40	7,755.84					2,136.92
Mississippi:													
Hattiesburg homesteads	75,648.78	24	60,518.18	2,521.59	24	49,720.00	2,071.67	94.20					1,317.65
Magnolia gardens	73,556.46	25	71,286.85	2,851.47	25	60,000.00	2,400.00						1,400.99
McComb homesteads	91,452.52	20	77,962.27	3,898.11	18	21,910.00	1,217.22	1,592.24	698.00	306.00	773.84	1,777.84	1,394.00
Tupelo homesteads	139,247.12	35	121,446.93	3,469.91	(5)	(5)	(5)						
Tupelo suburban gardens	29,047.32							431.48		341.13		341.13	
New Jersey: Jersey homesteads	3,402,382.27	206	2,165,372.63	10,511.52				39,384.37	10,943.28	12,370.10	661.58	23,974.96	6,674.19
New York: Monroe County homesteads	43,020.53	2						440.00					
Ohio:													
Greenhills	11,860,627.53	737	8,012,917.17	10,872.34				314,553.50	182,799.03	52,461.29		235,260.32	32,630.27
Mahoning Gardens Home	46,277.71												
Pennsylvania: Westmoreland homesteads	2,516,469.81	255	1,117,737.08	4,383.28				31,528.54	20,440.20	8,142.10		28,582.30	10,848.28
South Carolina:													
Greenville homesteads	20,382.76												
La France homesteads	6,509.71												
Saluda garden homesteads	21,351.01												
Tennessee: Cumberland homesteads	3,267,345.10	262	1,989,543.36	7,593.68	209	431,263.72	2,063.46	17,876.90	8,436.23	11,438.30	15.10	19,889.63	12,991.08
Texas:													
Beauxart gardens	143,027.62	50	119,250.96	2,385.02	50	125,000.00	2,500.00	3,450.01					
Dalworthington gardens	325,712.35	79	237,743.90	3,009.42	79	150,000.00	1,898.74	4,171.80					
Houston gardens	283,568.10	100	221,793.65	2,217.94	100	275,586.00	2,755.86	7,549.60					
Three Rivers gardens	162,943.43	50	118,824.32	2,376.49	50	82,650.00	1,653.00						
Wichita gardens	187,527.85	62	170,208.54	2,745.30	62	131,716.00	2,124.45	3,850.38					
Virginia: Aberdeen gardens	1,353,896.29	159	1,008,232.30	6,341.08	2	4,411.22	2,205.61	25,727.81	9,120.29	3,537.00	4,903.90	17,561.19	5,424.24
Washington: Longview homesteads	194,097.58	60	181,533.23	3,025.55	60	174,900.00	2,915.00	4,704.72					
West Virginia:													
Arthurdale	2,744,724.09	165	1,439,459.21	8,724.00				[6] 27,250.00	27,743.89	4,695.54		32,439.43	10,869.14
Red House	1,506,397.82	150	629,996.43	4,199.98				[6] 26,485.00	6,756.13	1,706.09	4.07	8,466.29	9,906.50
Tygart Valley homesteads	2,080,213.99	195	759,385.01	3,894.28				[6] 33,950.00	12,016.13	1,999.23	11,909.88	25,925.24	13,228.62
Wisconsin: Greendale	10,638,465.62	640	6,601,376.44	10,314.65				301,478.95	168,273.81	108,945.00		277,218.81	32,545.60
	65,808,271.69	5,483	41,940,861.09	7,649.25	1,427	3,332,240.94	2,335.13	1,552,664.74	707,897.09	309,914.36	28,193.90	1,046,005.35	205,077.09

[4] National Youth Administration project.
[5] Transferred to Interior Department.
[6] Record of receipts transferred to Federal Public Housing Authority. These amounts are estimates.

FOOD PRODUCTION—THE CANNING INDUSTRY

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement on the subject of the canning industry.

The production of food is one of the most important programs with which this Nation is now concerned. Great projects lie before us, and in all these projects the role which food will play will be of the utmost importance. We must feed and sustain our own armed forces; we must fulfill our lease-lend commitments to our allies; we must provide full and ample food for our civilian population; and, moreover, we must supply needed foodstuffs—when they are liberated—to all those people who now suffer at the brutal hands of their German and Japanese conquerors. These are worthy and prodigious tasks, Mr. President; such tasks as will require the most capable management, the most exhaustive development, and the most effective coordination of all our food-production resources, if the goals which we have set for ourselves are to be attained.

It is an incontrovertible fact that the results which have marked our efforts thus far leave much to be desired. There is scarcely one segment of the food-production industry which is making its most complete and effective contribution to our food-production program. For this condition neither the industries nor the managers and workers in those industries are at fault. The farmer, the producer, the processor, the wholesaler, and the retailer are all doing everything within their power to see to it that each and every one of these food-production goals is met.

But the fact remains that the agencies created by the Government to coordinate, support, and assist in this great food-production program have failed in many ways to perform the tasks which have been entrusted to them. The result has brought confusion, doubt, and delay into every field of food production; and it has, moreover, brought decreased production in many important food lines, decreases which, if continued for any length of time, will certainly pose grave problems for America and her allies.

Mr. President, I have talked with many of those who are directly concerned with our food-production program, and they are one in denouncing the overlapping authority of the various agencies concerned, the multiple jurisdiction of agencies which now seek to operate this program, the lack of cooperation between these various agencies, the impossibility of getting a clear-cut decision on any point of issue, and the wealth of confusion, inefficiency, and red tape which surrounds the efforts of those governmental agencies which are concerned with the food-production program. This is such a condition as will lead inevitably to the collapse of our entire war economy, as well as our traditional system of free enterprise, if it is allowed to persist unremedied.

Mr. President, only this week I had occasion to meet with the Pennsylvania representatives of the American canning industry. For more than 9 months, these representatives and this industry have been contacting the various Federal agencies concerned with the food-production program, hoping to achieve something in the way of a clear statement of the Government's policy, the regulations that would be in force, and other similar statements which every businessman must have if he is to run his organization effectively during wartime. Now I will not recount here all the frustration, confusion, doubt, disagreement, and mismanagement which the operators of this industry found among, and received from, these various agencies here in Washington. Suffice it to say that after the passing of 9 long months, and with the harvesting season right at hand, the canners in America still do not know where they stand, nor do they know what they are to be permitted or expected to do by these various Government agencies.

Mr. President, Mr. Summers and Mr. Warehime, two of the representatives of the canning industry in Pennsylvania, have written me in some detail describing a seven-point program which they and their associates in the canning industry feel should be adopted, if the food-production program is to go forward uninhibited, and if the food-production goals which we have set for ourselves are to be attained. Because I feel that the recommendations outlined in their letter are sound and workable, because I believe that their recommendations might well be applied to every aspect of our food-production effort, and because I feel that they might well be called to the attention of those who are in any way concerned with the all-important food-production program, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW FREEDOM, PA., *June 7, 1943.*

Senator JAMES J. DAVIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DAVIS: The food industry and the canning industry, in particular, are in what we might describe as a rather desperate position due to the confusion, lack of direction, lack of authority, and the impractical methods applied by various war agencies to the industry. While authority is not particularly lacking, yet it overlaps in many agencies so that one agency cannot decide a relatively simple question until they have the assent of possibly two or more other agencies. If only one of the latter happens to disagree, then the entire question is unanswered. Frankly, we are at our wits' end as to how to proceed. We have been contacting, among others, the Office of Price Administration, the War Labor Board, and the Food Distribution Administration (formerly Department of Agriculture) since early last November. We have been annoyed and plagued with innumerable vague promises and cannot brook further delay, as the harvests are now ready. We intend to start harvesting peas this week.

Food processors individually and collectively have attempted to bring some order out of the chaotic conditions in Washington by applying to and recommending to the various agencies in question. Please emember that this is over a 9-month period, and we still have no answers to the major portion of our problems. The National Canners' Association, through its legislative committee, has presented a great bulk of testimony, some of which was solicited by these agencies and some which was volunteered by the association. The legislative committee has appeared before the House Agriculture Committee, the Smith committee of the Senate, as well as numerous agencies, all without results. The industry has, therefore, made out a program of seven points which we believe would be a great help in solving some of these vexing questions.

Point No. 1. Employment of personnel who are practical and not inexperienced theorists.

There are definitely men available in the canning and allied industries and also other walks of life who can definitely do a good job for various Government agencies, mainly for Office of Price Administration, who are willing to come to Washington to do a job for the Government for the canning industry, but at the present time under the set-up would not come due to interference and also other powers who would block their recommendations. This has been the case in the past years as the Office of Price Administration had two experienced and very practical men, namely, Mr. Daniel Gerber and Mr. Norman Sorensen. Conditions were so bad in Office of Price Administration that they were forced to resign as their recommendations were never taken and their policy makers would not take their advice in conferences or in any other phase of the policies of Office of Price Administration.

Point No. 2. Nineteen hundred and forty-two formula prices were enacted for all canned foods, and in most cases did not work a hardship on the canners, and the formula was flexible enough for this type of canner to work without losing money or to change his style of pack; also, it did not interfere with production. Again we wish to refer you to the testimony of Mr. Sorensen before the Smith agricultural committee that not more than 300 hardship cases came before Office of Price Administration, and also if these experienced men's recommendations would have been followed these hardship cases could have been disposed of in very short order.

The Office of Price Administration decided early last fall to compel dollars-and-cents regional ceilings on the canners. Various delegations from the canning industry pleaded with Office of Price Administration not to enforce these regulations, and testified before them the unworkable conditions on their dollars-and-cents ceilings. As an example, with a low-grade packer with no personnel and very little overhead, it would be necessary under the dollars-and-cents ceilings for the packers who are producing the most cases per plant and who have the organization and equipment to do the job which the Government needs, to pack at a loss under the dollars-and-cents ceilings which have been announced for peas, beans, tomatoes, and corn.

The formula prices have worked last year and Dr. Galbraith admitted at a Senate hearing (Dr. Galbraith recently resigned from Office of Price Administration) that to the best of his knowledge no canner profiteered on this basis of the formula system of Office of Price Administration last year.

The fact that dollars and cents ceilings are unworkable for all canners in the area, also that formula price has worked in 1942 and also the fact that other commodities such as lima beans, asparagus, tomato products, and numerous others will have a formula price for 1943, why not have all canned foods under the formula price? It would be well to point out that everything Office of Price Administration has done since last fall has been against production and quoting from Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, Republican from New Jersey, at a hearing last Thursday, he stated "From a business point of view the canners would have been

justified in doing little or nothing to pack this year's crops of vegetables. It is only their patriotism which assures our armed forces and the country of adequate canned foods this year."

Point No. 3. Although grade labeling, that is, the grade being put on the label, has been discarded by Office of Price Administration, the regulation still works such a hardship on the industry that it is still almost impossible to speed production by the mandatory method of putting grades on invoices.

The canning industry has built up goodwill reputation on their use of brands or commercial grades. The most popular items on the grocers' shelves are being bought by consumers by the brand or commercial-grade method. It has proved to be the most practical for consumers' good will, quality, and production. If this is recognized as true in peacetime, then with all the extra work and the problems of distribution which confront us during wartime, it is not necessary to change and establish policies at this time for the most production. In case of any disputes, the industry has always settled arguments by the arbitrary system which included a panel of three men, one representing the buyer, one the seller, and a disinterested party.

Point No. 4. Meetings were held with the Office of Price Administration officials in regard to increased costs for 1943 and the price ceilings as announced for 1943 were in some cases lower than those the canners had for 1942. The canners proved by cost sheets their increased costs for 1943. The Office of Price Administration up to the present writing has not recognized any increased costs which the canners proved to them that they would have; also the Office of Price Administration would not divulge where they got thei costs for 1942. The main increased costs are labor and overhead, as plants which used to pack on a 12-month basis are now cut back to 4 months, due to the shortage of tin. Canners are not objecting to 50 percent of their production being cut, as they realize tin is not available, but organizations have to be kept together and paid which puts a higher overhead cost on the summer months pack of fresh fruits and vegetables. As stated in a preceding paragraph, Dr. Galbraith submitted in testifying to the Senate hearing that in 1942 there were no canners who profiteered through the Office of Price Administration set-up, and since price ceilings in 1943 are less than or not more than 1942, and with the increased costs which canners will have, there will definitely be a loss for some packers on some products and some packing operations for this coming season. In addition, canners in each State were forced to certify and pay growers minimum prices. The Commodity Credit Corporation paid back to each canner so he in turn could distribute to his growers this increased cost and in the case of Pennsylvania, this was not done for beans and tomatoes. The canner will have to lose this increased cost because the Office of Price Administration has not recognized the increase to growers in their price ceilings.

Point No. 4 is that the increased cost of the 1943 packs shall be reflected in the ceiling prices. Early this year after meetings with our local War Board of the Department of Agriculture, we and other canners, following their recommendations contracted fruits and vegetables with our farmer-growers at the prices recommended. We received assurance by the Department of Agriculture that the ceilings as issued by Office of Price Administration would include subsidies by the Commodity Credit Corporation to equal the advances paid to farmers. In this manner inflation would be checked and the ceiling prices would be set at relatively the same levels as March 1942. However, in setting the ceiling prices the Office of Price Administration has used higher produce costs than last year which does not return the processor the recommended advances to the farmer. As an example, in southern Pennsylvania we paid $19 per ton for tomatoes last year. The War Board recommended $27 a ton. Subsequently we contracted at this figure. However, in computing the ceiling price the Office of Price Administration figured the cost at $23 a ton—$4 above the price of last year. The Commodity Credit Corporation took the position that since Office of Price Administration had figured on this basis that the subsidy would only amount to $4 per ton rather than the $8 differential between 1942 and 1943. The Office of Price Administration attempted to justify this with the statement to the effect that regardless of the raw produce price used by them, the difference would be reflected between our cost and their ceiling price. This statement is undoubtedly true provided their ceiling price reflected this difference in cost. However it does not. Our 1942 cost based on $19 gives us a cost which is almost identical with the Office of Price Administration's ceiling price which was figured at $23. In other words, the processor is penalized $4 a ton. This is not an individual case but is the average case. The processor is in no position to absorb this difference. Recent meetings with Office of Price Administration and Food and Drug Administration and Commodity Credit Corporation have resulted in these agencies all admitting that the above is correct. They also advise that they expect to issue an amendment to MPR 306 correcting this situation. However, this amendment will again only include part of this $4 in question. In other words, as a compromise they expect to give us $3 instead of $4. In this particular situation Pennsylvania is harder hit than any other of the 25 or more States packing tomatoes, although the condition is equally true to a great extent on other products in other States.

The above refers only to raw produce. No provision has been made for the increased costs in overhead, labor, or supplies. Due to the restriction on tin, our 1943 production will be cut approximately 40 percent. We have no complaint with this limitation order on tin plate. Due to the shortage of this commodity, it is only right and just that it should be limited. However, a 40-percent cut in production results in a higher overhead cost per unit. The Office of Price Administration will not even consider this question. In regard to wages, the canning industry wants its wages raised. The freeze order of September 1942 froze our wages at a low level and those of war industries at a high level. Subsequently, agricultural labor has been permitted sufficient increases, but this has not been extended to processing labor. As it stands now, we cannot secure the labor at the wages permitted, which leaves us two alternatives: One to proceed with our pack and openly violate the wage freeze; the other is to let the crops rot in the fields. Certainly, very few processors intend to follow the latter course. However, if we take the former course we will be in very serious legal difficulties. Numerous applications for relief by both individuals and communities have been made through the War Labor Board. Only a very few of these have been acted upon. Originally, the Office of Price Administration made public promises that if the War Labor Board authorized wage increases then the Office of Price Administration would permit these wage increases to be added to the ceiling costs. During the last 6 weeks the Office of Price Administration has reversed themselves on this policy. Apparently all of the petitions to the War Labor Board are now tabled due to the so-called policy makers in Office of Price Administration, the "hold the line" order, or the coal strike. In one case it has come to our attention: A Utah canner was authorized to increase wages by the War Labor Board but at the same time was not permitted to include these increases in his ceiling price. He has instructed his growers that he cannot handle the pea crop, and therefore has notified them to harvest the pea crop as hay for cattle. In another case a pay increase was authorized by the War Labor Board and Mr. Byrnes for asparagus cutters in California. Here again the Office of Price Administration has not provided for this increase to be added to the ceiling costs, with the result that the asparagus packers on the west coast have now been packing for 60 days, paying the wages authorized, and yet they cannot sell their pack until the Office of Price Administration provides them with a ceiling price. There is none at present. Valuable time is being lost, and warehouses are being congested, and the food is not available to consumers until the Office of Price Administration makes this decision.

Point No. 5: The industry is opposed to subsidies on principle, but if they are employed with price control, the said subsidies, together with a ceiling price, should cover the cost of processing plus a reasonable profit. In every case it should be made clear that the processor acts only as an agent for the ultimate beneficiary and is never the recipient of any subsidy.

We, as processors, do not approve of subsidies in principle and we wish there was some other method to be found. However, it appears that this is about the only method available. As noted above, these subsidies do not return the differential requested by the war boards of the Department of Agriculture. In the case of these subsidies we are simply the agents of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture and we would like the public to thoroughly understand that the subsidies referred to are turned over in full to the grower. This has not been made clear and in many cases employees have understood that the entire industry was subsidized.

Point No. 6: The transfer of complete control over manpower and wages of processing employees to the War Food Administration where the responsibility for production now rests.

While Mr. Chester Davis has control over production, yet many of his decisions are hindered and delayed due to the fact that he has to refer his decisions to the War Labor Board on labor and Office of Price Administration on price ceilings. More frequently than not, no decision is forthcoming because one of the three agencies disagree on principle. It would be a great deal more satisfactory if one agency could handle all problems in relation to food production. At the same time Mr. Davis would probably be just as helpless as Mr. Prentiss Brown if he were hamstrung and obstructed like Mr. Brown, with orders coming down from above. As we see it, it is not absolutely necessary to transfer all of these functions to one agency provided there could be some relief from the impractical personalities involved and the impractical theories under which Mr. Brown is now forced to work.

Point No. 7: In all cases the experience of the industry should be consulted in advance of promulgation of every regulation as required by law.

The law provides that industries shall be consulted. This has not been the practice in the past. In a number of instances the industry has been called together supposedly for consultation only to be advised that the regulation had already been made and the industry was, at the time, presented with the results of the agency policy makers. The vast experience which the industry could offer was entirely ignored and the industry is required to work under complex regulations evolved by lawyers and professional economists. In a number of instances, practical men who were in the employment of Office of Price Administration or other agencies made certain specific recommendations. In all

cases these recommendations were entirely ignored, with the result that these capable members of the industry resigned, since they felt that agencies had given proof that their experience and counsel were unwelcome. In this particular instance, we direct your attention to the testimony given by Mr. Norman Sorensen before the Smith committee. A copy of this testimony is attached.

We think it is fairly well agreed that the problem of food is probably second only to munitions so far as the war effort is concerned. It is frequently stated that food will win the war and write the peace. Due to floods, adverse weather conditions, and the conditions outlined above, it is undoubtedly true that the food production of the country during 1943 will be some 5 to 10 percent less than in 1942. The large crop in 1942 was primarily due to unusually good and favorable weather throughout the United States. The food industry has had a cycle of about 6 favorable years so far as weather is concerned, and from weather conditions to date it would appear as though the average were about to catch up with the industry. There is nothing much we can do now about 1943's food production as the crops are in the ground, except to alleviate immediately the squeezes created by the above-outlined conditions. Our best efforts should be directed at this time to food production in 1944 and it is none too early to begin this program.

We leave to you the methods of bringing about compliance and cooperation of the various agencies involved. Possibly this can be brought about through parliamentary procedure or possibly through a tightening of the purse strings. Certainly one of these methods is the only method which promises prompt relief. We do not feel that Congress should necessarily concern itself with the thousands of details. We believe the best method will be to put a competent man in charge, but at the same time see that he has complete and full authority. Any attempt at legislation either for 1943 or 1944 would, we are sure, result in months of unprofitable discussion. No fully comprehensive bill could ever be written on such a complex industry. We trust that you will do anything in your power to alleviate this extremely serious situation which threatens not only the domestic economy but to a large extent our military efforts and that of our allies, who have been made grandiose promises through lend-lease.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES G. SUMMERS, JR., INC.,
STRAN SUMMERS.
HANOVER CANNING CO.,
M. WAREHIME.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the conditions outlined and the recommendations made in this letter speak for themselves. The recommendations are worthy of every study and consideration—and something very closely resembling such recommendations must immediately be made effective, if the food production program in America is to go forward successfully. The experience encountered by the canning industry is not unique, it has been repeated many times over—by the meat packing industry, by the farming industry, by the dairy industry, and by almost every other major food-producing industry in the Nation.

Mr. President, we must bring order out of this chaos. The divided, overlapping, and incomplete authority now designed to regulate this particular program is vested in no less than seven distinct Federal agencies. And among these agencies, cooperation and harmony has not been the order of the day. Indeed, a quite converse situation is in existence. In the meantime the food-production capacity and the food-producing industries of America are made to suffer because of this unbearable and inefficient administrative set-up.

Mr. President, I submit that immediate action must be taken to effectively remedy these conditions, unless we are prepared to see America lose the battle of food production, and possibly the battle for self-preservation as well.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do not intend to take up the time of the Senate with a prolonged discussion of the subject which has been under debate during today, but I do not wish to permit this opportunity to pass without expressing my unqualified approval of the Farm Security Administration program in the State of Montana.

I believe all Senators are aware of the conditions which prevailed throughout the West as a result of the depression and the drought which passed over the country during the thirties. As a result of those conditions in my State and other similarly affected areas it was absolutely necessary for some rehabilitation program to be established and carried through to aid the hard-pressed farmers. The program of the Farm Security Administration as carried out in my State has been most effective, and it has accomplished results there which will have a lasting benefit.

I have in my hand a letter written by a former administrator of the Farm Security Administration in Montana, but not now connected with the Administration in any manner, in which he discusses the program in my State and points out the broad benefits which it accomplished. I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in my State the draft has revealed the fact that sons of farmers of Montana were able to meet qualifications for service in a very high percentage. This, in my judgment, was a result of the aid which was given to our farmers during the distressing period of the depression and the drought. It salvaged many a Montana farm family. I myself have passed over those sections of the State which were severely hit during that period when widespread bankruptcy and ruin faced our citizens. I can say here now that the Farm Security Administration in Montana has accomplished results of enduring benefit, and it would be a great misfortune to my State and to the Nation if the Farm Security program were not continued.

EXHIBIT 1

BOZEMAN, MONT.,
May 5, 1943.

MR. JAMES G. PATTON,
National President, Farmers' Union,
Denver, Colo.

DEAR MR. PATTON: Since I have severed my relationship with the Farm Security Administration, I feel at liberty to state my views concerning the work of this organization.

In the first place the philosophy back of the organization is sound and should have the support of all people who are interested in maintaining democracy in this country. Due to the various programs inaugurated by the Farm Security Administration this country was better prepared to meet the situation relative to food production than it would have been otherwise. The fact that farm people have been taught to produce and preserve foods for home use, the work of this organization means much during the crisis through which we are passing.

There has existed for many years a "no-man's land" between the work done by the land-grant colleges and a large segment of our agricultural population. It is true that the Extension Service was founded with the idea of carrying the work of the land-grant colleges and experiment stations into the rural areas but it is also self-evident that the Extension Service has failed miserably in its assignment in that it has only touched a small percent of the people who actually need the assistance it was in a position to render.

The Farm Security Administration, on the other hand, has reached down to this lower level and given help in a financial, social, and technical way. There is proof on every side that these people to whom the Farm Security Administration has extended aid will react as favorably as any other group if they are given an opportunity to do so.

Many of our boys now serving in the armed forces were enabled to do so by reason of the fact that the Farm Security Administration, through its county supervisors and home supervisors, has encouraged and helped people to secure a satisfactory living insofar as necessary foods are concerned.

If you will pardon me I would like to call to your attention a case which I have in mind at this time. There was a large family in the Billings area who, through adverse conditions, came to the Farm Security Administration for aid. It was necessary to give these people assistance for a few years in the way of grants to supplement their loan. The children of this family were undernourished at the time the Farm Security Administration stepped into the picture, but with the assistance the Farm Security Administration gave them they were furnished the means to secure the food necessary to maintain health. As a result of this, one of the boys was enabled to pass a successful physical examination and entered the Air Corps. He was with General Doolittle over Tokyo and lived to come back and do his bit to stimulate the bond drive in Montana.

I recall another situation in Montana in which there were 19 boys called up for induction. Eighteen out of the nineteen passed their physical examination. Eighteen families out of the nineteen had also been assisted by the Farm Security Administration through grants and loans.

While to me as State Director of the program, the loaning part of the program was only one tool with which we had been provided to do a job, people need something besides money. This has been thoroughly demonstrated by the fact that many of them

had had credit before and still had not made a success. With the personnel trained in the philosophy of extending aid in the way of counsel and advice, the majority of these people who are considered poor risks by other lending agencies are demonstrating the fact that loans made on a character basis are just as sound, and oftimes more so, than loans made on ample chattel security.

More important than the repayment of the loans is the fact that these people form a large segment of our social structure and unless given an opportunity to produce and have security they would become a greater threat to our country and its institutions than foes from the outside.

From my experience I doubt if there is any strong justification for any other governmental loaning agency for agriculture.

The Farm Security Administration's program is the most vital factor in the production and preservation of the essential food needed during the wartime. Its organization has long been geared to do the job in agriculture which was created by the attack upon Pearl Harbor. It is the only agricultural set-up that is geared to do the job in the war period provided sufficient funds and authorities were granted to it. Funds and authorities should be provided that would enable it to assist farmers in securing homes of their own or in enlarging uneconomic units, also to purchase, develop, and distribute to tenant farmers large tracts of land now owned by absentee landlords. Funds and authorities should be provided to extend and aid in the development of farmer cooperatives for buying, selling, and processing.

Since the Extension Service has failed in carrying necessary educational work to those who most need it, the Farm Security Administration should be encouraged to enlarge its activities in this field.

It is true that the Farm Security Administration has made what some might be inclined to call mistakes. Whether they were mistakes or not time will tell. Since the Farm Security Administration has been a pioneer in new fields of human endeavor regarding the helping of those in a disadvantaged status economically, socially, and educationally, it might be a better term to call the various attempts at human rehabilitation as experiments. There have been many things that the Farm Security Administration has had to learn by trial and error, having no precedent to follow. Any financial loss that society may have or will incur through the funds spent by the Farm Security Administration is compensated a hundredfold by what has been done in the rebuilding of the morale of a large group of our agricultural population. Further than that, through the encouragement given by the Farm Security Administration many people have been stimulated to endeavor to raise their standard of living and to take an interest in giving to their children, who are the future citizens of this country, an opportunity in life.

We cannot estimate in dollars and cents what this means to society. It means that we have removed many boys and girls from the list of potential criminals or wards upon society.

In closing may I urge you, as representatives of the common man, to use your utmost influence to secure for the Farm Security Administration sufficient funds and authorities to enable it to carry on its proper work and also to enlarge its scope of activities.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS HORSFORD.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I would have spoken upon the subject of Farm Security Administration anyway, but I have upon my desk thousands of letters from farmers, merchants, and businessmen from North Dakota asking me to do so.

I have before me an advertisement in the Columbus Reporter entitled "We the Merchants and Businessmen of Lignite and Columbus Respectfully Urge Congress To Provide for:"

And it mentions the F. S. A. among other things.

I have another advertisement from the Watford Association of Farmers, made up of merchants and businessmen in the city of Watford City, N. Dak.

I have another advertisement which was inserted in the Flaxton Times by the merchants of Flaxton, N. Dak.

I have here a front-page article in the Powers Lake Herald of May 21, 1943.

I have here a petition which appeared as an advertisement in the Bowbells Tribune by the merchants of Bowbells, N. Dak.

I also have a half-page advertisement which appeared in the County Record on May 20, 1943, which was paid for, the advertisement said, by the Hettinger Civic Association, made up of hundreds of businessmen.

I have here a full-page advertisement which appears in the Mott Pioneer Press, stating that the advertisement is sponsored and paid for by the following businessmen of Mott, N. Dak. They are the same 50 businessmen, the names of whom I wish to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wick's Hotel, Mott Drug Store, Log Cabin, Defoe Mortuary, White City Mercantile, Gamble Store, Sax Motor Co., Wolf Den, Mott Pioneer Press, R. A. Grant, S. S. Reishus, O. H. Oplana, Anonymous, Chas. Senn, Wm. Rueter, Standard Oil Co., Mott Shoe Hospital, C. J. Hardmeyer, Ferguson-Olien Shop, O. K. Rubber Welders, Busy Bee Service, Mott Dry Cleaners, N. L. Sauer, Pete Senn, Mrs. N. A. Mosher, J. C. Roster, E. H. Yonaka, Frank Biglor, Alexander Roll, Margules Store, J. C. Penney Co., J. B. Murphy, Fietsam Hardware, Mott Supply Co., Red Owl Store, Occident Elevator, Equity Elevator, Mott Mill & Elevator Co., Kramer's Service Station, Thompson Yards, Inc., Mott Blacksmith Shop, Peter Boehm, Grosz Meat Market, Olien's Repair Shop, Mott Implement, Wangsvicks', Schafer's Market, Johnson Standard Service, Mott Hide & Fur Co., Mees Implement, Weiler Plumbing & Heating, Mott Creamery, Commercial Bank of Mott, Mott Equity Exchange.

Mr. LANGER. I have a full-page advertisement appearing in the Bowman County Pioneer, signed by approximately 50 businessmen, whose names I also wish to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. This advertisement was published on the 27th of May 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

L. L. Molde, Martin Beckwell, Roy J. Messmer, F. U. Co-Op Store, J. C. Stuber, Stone & Puckett, Bowman Co. Pioneer, H. V. Burmeister, James Quinn, C. T. Olson, Bowman Drug Co., Omer Sheets, Andy's Bar, Stanley Benson, H. E. Myer, A. N. Gausemel, H. G. Hinkley, H. F. Olson, Gus Schade, John Schade, H. H. Dahl, J. M. Ryan, C. H. Peterson, H. N. Fisher, Fritz Schade, H. J. Bagley, F. G. Beyer, Bruno Klug, Otto Schade, Joe DeBode, Bennett Drug, Lawrence Septon, Bert Patterson, Lyle Stebbins, Wokal Auto Co.

Mr. LANGER. I have also a full page advertisement which was inserted by the Watford City Association of Commerce, and the McKinzie County Farmers' Union, which was published on May 20.

I have another one which was published in the Bowbells Tribune on May 27, 1943, and signed by the Burke County Farmers' Union, Glendon Bryan, president, and Milford L. Sernsen, secretary-treasurer.

I also have here numerous other advertisements with which I will not clutter the RECORD, inserted by businessmen, professional men, and farmers of the State of North Dakota. So today I speak at their behest.

Mr. President, although I am a North Dakota Republican, ever since I have come to the Senate I have voted with the President of the United States, a Democrat, whenever I felt that the President was right. Whenever I felt he was wrong, I voted against him.

I hold in my hand a letter written by the President of the United States on May 29, 1943, addressed to Mr. James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union. The letter reads as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 29, 1943.

JAMES G. PATTON, Esq.,
President, National Farmers' Union,
Denver, Colo.

MY DEAR MR. PATTON: I have your letter of April 8 urging my continued support of the Farm Security Administration. My position on this matter has not changed since my letter of July 2, 1942, written in response to the joint appeal sent me by yourself and leaders of other prominent organizations interested in this agency's continuance.

The necessity for achieving maximum effort from all our farm producers is even more evident today than it was then. The small farmers of the Nation aided by the Farm Security Administration have given an excellent account of their ability and their patriotic determination during the past year. I am sure that with continued assistance they will equal or surpass that record this year.

I am opposed to any step that might impair the work that the Farm Security Administration has been doing among these small farm families.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. President, it seems to me very odd—and I am not impugning the motives of any Senator in this body—that when big business industrial enterprise is concerned we do not hear any criticism, no matter how much money is squandered, but when the small farmers are concerned, a few defenseless, small farmers, then upon this floor for months past we have heard about the greedy farmers. Only a few months ago we heard how they were impeding the war effort, and upon this floor we heard criticism of Mr. O'Neal, Mr. Goss, Mr. Patton, and of John Brandt, and all the other great

farm leaders of this country; indeed, there were advertisements in some of the newspapers of the East saying that the farmers of the country were so greedy or were so anxious to get rich that they were deliberately impeding the war effort. Upon that occasion I myself rose on the floor to defend the farm leaders.

But, Mr. President, what do we find during the last 2 days? We find the distinguished Senator from the State of North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] delivering a speech impugning the motives of labor. I have that speech before me. The Senator from North Carolina says that he is anxious to assist the President of the United States in holding the line against inflation even though the farmer's price may go up a little bit. He says the workers are going to demand more and there will be a spiral of inflation.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators upon this floor away for a few moments from the farmers and from John L. Lewis and the miners, and I call their attention to what I consider to be one of the dirtiest and most contemptible steals that have ever taken place in the United States of America. I refer to the major oil companies and to the large oil interests. We have not heard one word of criticism of them, although in a speech delivered months ago by Representative COFFEE, of the State of Washington, a record was made that showed that the Attorney General of the United States entered into a consent decree by which the large oil interests took from the people of this country anywhere between $1,500,000,000 and $3,000,000,000. I hold in my hand that speech, and I have verified the letters which appear in it.

I find, for example, a letter to Mr. Thurman Arnold calling his attention to the fact that suits have been brought against three of the major oil companies and asking that it be not settled until Congress could be consulted. Here I have the answer of Mr. Arnold. There is a second letter dated the 22d day of October 1941, signed by the Attorney General, Francis Biddle, from which I will read a few lines:

> It is the intention of Assistant Attorney General Arnold to submit any plan which may be suggested for the settlement of this litigation to the proper congressional committee for its consideration before the Department officially accepts the plan.

Mr. President, what happened? At that time only three major oil companies had been sued, but on the 23d day of December 1941, some 15 or 16 months ago, the Attorney General's office at 10 o'clock in the morning sued 18 more oil companies, and, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, they signed a consent decree. The Government sued on the same day the consent decree was signed; indeed, even the judge—Judge Pine, of the Federal district court—was so shocked that when the consent decree was taken he was heard to remark, "Ah, the Christmas spirit, I perceive."

Mr. President, up to the present time, aside from a speech delivered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], not one voice upon the Senate floor has been raised in protest against this taking of $1,500,000,000 out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this country; but when a small appropriation reaches the Senate, which is designed for the benefit of the small farmers in 47 of the 48 States of the Union, we have long, extended debate.

Mr. President, I wish to go further in connection with the oil situation. I desire to show something that happened last November and was covered up.

Mr. President, back in the Taft administration, those who guided the destinies of our Navy were sufficiently farsighted to realize that the secret of victory on the high seas was oil. I come right back, Mr. President, to oil, and I again remind the Senate that on the 23d day of December 1941, there was signed a consent decree which deprived the people of this country of $1,500,000,000, although the question as to whether the Government had an air-tight case was ably answered by an article in the Cornell Law Quarterly, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of October 8, 1940, and entitled "Oil—Pipeline Divorcement by Litigation and Legislation" written by Dr. Forrest R. Black, professor of law, attached to the Department of Justice, who spent well over a year in studying the law applicable to the case. He revealed in the article that the Department of Justice believed it had a copper-riveted case. Although the Department believed it had a copper-riveted case, it sued 18 major oil companies on the 23d of December at 10 o'clock in the morning and settled all the lawsuits by 2 o'clock in the afternoon. So we come back to oil to find out who is in charge of this Government, whether the Government is being operated in behalf of the poor people, in behalf of the taxpayer, or in behalf of a bunch of scoundrels and crooks who are robbing the people of this country. If so, we come back to oil once more.

I repeat that back in the Taft administration those who guided the destinies of our Navy were sufficiently farsighted to realize that the secret of victory on the high seas was oil. So, Mr. President, they set aside for the United States Navy some of the finest oil reserves in the entire United States. It was provided that those reserves were to be kept in the ground where bombs could not destroy them, where the oil tanks could not be set afire, and the reserves were to be used at a time when the oil of the rest of the world was running low.

The history of those oil reserves since is well known to us. They have been the object of the covetous hands of the big oil companies. There has been wire pulling; there has been lobbying; there have been little black satchels; there has been a total of $330,000 paid in bribes by Harry Sinclair and Edward Doheny to get those priceless oil preserves of Teapot Dome, Wyo., and Elk Hills, Calif., into the hands of private interests. So far, however, our Government has resisted private greed; that is, it resisted it until a few months ago; but now I regret to read that this administration has practically given away to the Standard Oil Co. of California the second richest oil preserve in the world, namely, Elk Hills, known as Naval Oil Reserve No. 1. This reserve has been given to a company which, it is true, has owned a small part of the Elk Hills oil field, a shallow area largely overrun with salt water and containing a very doubtful amount of oil; but because the Standard Oil Co. of California has owned a small corner of the Elk Hills oil field, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, for reasons best known to himself, has permitted 43,000 acres of the richest oil lands in the United States, second in richness only to one field in Arabia, to be taken over in toto and developed during the next 5 years by the Standard Oil Co. of California.

Furthermore, it may be significant that this oil lease—or a better term might be "oil give-away"—has been given to the company which has placed its high officials in key spots inside the Roosevelt administration. They are Ralph Davies, former vice president of Standard Oil of California, who is now Deputy Petroleum Administrator and has charge of most of the Nation's petroleum activities for war under Secretary Ickes. It seems to me significant that Mr. Davies has been drawing a salary of $56,000 from Standard of California and at the same time drawing $8,000 from the Government. He is not a dollar-a-year man; he accepts a Government salary. But also, during all of last year, he continued to draw a salary from the company which has now received this bonanza oil lease from the Roosevelt administration.

Then, working with Mr. Davies, is another important member of Standard Oil of California, Mr. Howard Marshall, its attorney. Mr. Marshall was formerly an attorney for the Office of the Petroleum Administration, in the old N. R. A. days, and prepared an important legal case against Standard Oil of California. Just before that case was to go to trial, he left the Government to join the legal staff of Standard. And now he is back in the Government again, weaving in and out of private industry and Government offices like a shuttlecock, and working with Mr. Davies for the Petroleum Administrator for War.

Another Standard of California official in Washington is Mr. Mark Thornburg, oil adviser to the State Department. Still another interesting figure, who left Washington last week, is Mr. Ed Pauley, who has just resigned as secretary of the Democratic National Committee, but remains its treasurer. Mr. Pauley has been very close to Standard Oil of California in the past. He himself is an oil operator, and some time ago sold out his interest to a subsidiary of Standard of California. He is on intimate terms with Mr. Ralph Davies, and also, of course, he is on intimate terms with the President of the United States.

Now let us examine more carefully what this deal between the Navy and Standard Oil of California involves, by which our priceless oil reserves are given away for a song. This contract between Standard and the Navy was signed on November 18, 1942, by the Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox. It was a very

hush-hush deal. These oil lands had created more comment, more debate, more discussion, than any others in the world. They were responsible for the resignation of two members of the Harding Cabinet, Albert B. Fall and Edwin Denby. Yet the Navy Department, very quietly, without letting anyone know about it, without even discussing the matter with other members of the Roosevelt Cabinet, signed this contract, rushed it to the White House, and somehow or other got it approved by the President in a single day. Why the President acted in 1 day, only he knows. Other officials have known memoranda and contracts to remain on his desk for weeks. But here was a deal in which the entire Nation was interested, and the subject of which had been the source of great controversy in the past, and which many of our distinguished colleagues had spent weeks and months in protecting.

Yet, after the President signed on November 18, and without waiting for any congressional approval or any congressional appropriation, Standard Oil of California rushed its drills and derricks on to Elk Hills and began drilling for oil. They began on November 20, and already have drilled eight excellent wells.

Meanwhile, the Secretary of the Interior, in charge of Public Lands, who is also the Petroleum Administrator, was not informed regarding this vital contract. Nor was the Justice Department, whose Lands Division is supposed to negotiate contracts regarding public lands, informed of this give-away of the Navy's vital oil resources. The only indication which leaked out at the time was a threadbare and very deceptive statement issued by the Navy on December 11, which stated that—

> The Secretary of the Navy has entered into an agreement for acquisition of lands owned by Standard Oil of California in Naval Oil Reserve No. 1 and for operation of the field by Standard.

It will be noted that this Navy announcement states that the Navy has acquired lands owned by Standard Oil of California. Remember that word, in view of the real terms of the contract. The Navy's meager statement goes on to say:

> This oil reserve has been enlarged to include all of Elk Hills. By the terms of the agreement the Standard Oil Co. will convey to the Government its 8,330 acres of land. The Navy will compensate Standard for its interest, for the wells and property on the reservation, in the ratio of their respective interests.

The whole tenor of this brief naval announcement gives the impression that the Navy has acquired something, rather than has given it away. However, the press was given no opportunity to review the terms of the contract, nor was the Congress, nor was the Cabinet. Particularly, it is significant that the man who has fought for conservation of oil in the past, Secretary of the Interior Ickes, was not permitted to know anything about the deal.

But, by accident, the Interior Department and the Justice Department heard about the deal, and secured a copy of the contract. And when they did so they were horrified. For they found, instead of the United States Government acquiring lands, actually the Navy had given away for a period of 5 years all of its carefully preserved oil lands in Elk Hills. And, after the 5 years, two-thirds of the oil goes to Standard Oil of California, while only one-third is returned to the Navy Department. And yet, out of the 43,000 acres, Standard owns only 8,000 acres, or less than one-fourth. In other words, Standard contributes one-fourth of the oil lands—most of them overrun with salt water—and in return for that one-fourth it receives two-thirds of the oil—after the first 5 years. But during that first 5 years, Standard receives all the oil and the Navy receives none.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Who pays the cost of development?

Mr. LANGER. There was supposed to be a $2,000,000 appropriation for that purpose, but the Standard Oil Co. did not wait for that money. The Standard Oil Co. rushed in and drilled wells within 2 days after the contract was signed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Standard Oil Co. of California participate in the cost of that development program?

Mr. LANGER. The Standard Oil Co. pays for it in its entirety, but that land is all proven land. It is not a wildcat proposition at all; it is all proven territory. It is the outstanding oil field in the world, next to one in Arabia.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to bring to the Senator's attention the fact that that field was laid up to serve the Navy in time of war, and, without knowing any of the facts, it may be that the Navy thought this was the time to release the oil for the war effort.

Mr. LANGER. Then why the secrecy?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not know. There may have been a military reason for it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy during the last war, wrote a letter to Senator La Follette, Sr., some years ago, in which he said:

> I remember one night toward the end of a session that Mr. Roosevelt [then Assistant Secretary of the Navy] and I remained at the Capitol all night long, watching the legislation of closing hours fearing that some act might be passed that would turn over these invaluable oil reserves to parties who laid claim to them without even decent shadow of title.

Secretary Daniels was referring to the last war.

But now the shoe is on the other foot and it is the Congress of the United States, not the Navy, which is attempting to preserve the oil reserves of the fleet.

We all remember the day when the Teapot Dome and Elk Hills oil scandals first were brought to light. There was no accusation of graft against the then Secretary of the Navy, Edwin Denby. It was only a charge that he was weak-kneed. He had bowed to Albert B. Fall. He had permitted the transfer of these oil lands to the Interior Department. And, because of that, Denby resigned.

Since then the oil reserves were transferred from the Interior Department back to the Navy for safekeeping. And now the Nation is faced with another weak-kneed Secretary of the Navy, a Secretary who, without informing the public, signed away this coveted wealth of oil.

Let me review briefly some of the actions of this same Secretary of the Navy and some of the men he has placed in positions of trust around him. I think we all agree that a man is known by the company he keeps and that a high official of the Government is known by the men he chooses for positions of trust near him.

One of the most important speeches ever made by the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, was on March 4, 1933, when, with the banks of the Nation closed, he promised to "drive the money changers out of the temple." That speech thrilled the Nation, and Mr. Roosevelt in the immediate months that followed proceeded to carry out his pledge and did drive the money changers out of the temple.

But now I call your attention to the manner in which the money changers have come back into the temple. Furthermore, they have come back into the temple of our fighting forces, the first line of our national defense, the Navy. Examine the men whom Frank Knox has placed in the key positions in the Navy Department. First, there is the Under Secretary of the Navy, Mr. James Forrestal, former president of Dillon, Read, a banker. Next there is Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Artemus L. Gates, of the New York Trust Co., another banker. Next there is Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Ralph Bard, president of the Chicago Investors Corporation, another banker.

Now I would like to ask what a banker knows about fighting. What does he know about running the Navy? A man who directs the Navy must know what it means to take chances. He must have courage, nerve, daring, intestinal fortitude of the highest quality. But what does a banker know about taking chances? What does a banker know about initiative, technical development, farsightedness, planning?

A banker is trained not to take chances. He is trained to hold back, never to push forward. He is trained to avoid taking risks. His job is to protect his investors, protect his stockholders. The last thing in his line is to cruise out and meet the enemy. He hides behind barred windows, shelters; he is trained to squeeze, to scale down interest, to shave every penny.

What, I ask, is there about the banking business which can contribute to the operation of a great Navy? What is there in the record of Mr. Artemus Gates, as a member of the Greenwich Savings Bank, or the American Surety Co., or the Mercantile Insurance Co., or the North British and Mercantile Insurance Co. which would help him to operate the greatest Navy in the world?

And what is there in the record and experience of Mr. James Forrestal, the Under Secretary of the Navy, as a banker which would qualify him to direct our admirals in the greatest war in history? Is it because he negotiated a loan to Bolivia which precipitated the famous Chaco War between Bolivia and Paraguay? Is that what makes him the good executive to direct a naval war and to give away our oil reserves?

Four weeks ago, when President Penaranda of Bolivia was visiting Washington, the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt, actually had to apologize for the loans which the Under Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal, had forced upon Bolivia. Mr. Roosevelt in press conference stated publicly:

I told the President of Bolivia that I wanted to apologize for the loans we had forced his country to take. Those bonds were sold at such high prices, at a time when nobody in Bolivia wanted the loan anyway, that Bolivia was forced to default. If I have anything to do with it—

Continued the President of the United States—

there will be no more bond selling of that kind in Latin America.

The only company which had sold bonds to Bolivia was Dillon Read, of which James Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, was president. Furthermore, the circumstances under which those bonds were sold were extremely unfortunate. The famous Vickers Arms Co., of England, had sold Bolivia a quantity of arms and ammunition with which Bolivia was building up its army to make war against its neighbor Paraguay. Vickers was unable to collect from Bolivia, so what did Dillon Read under Mr. James Forrestal do? It stepped in and put up the money of American widows, American school teachers, and American orphans, and loaned not merely $5,000,000 but $28,000,000 to Bolivia. There were even rumors at the time that the Bolivian Minister of Finance got a cut out of the deal.

Yet, this man, for whom the President of the United States apologized, who forced these war loans on Bolivia, is now sitting at the right hand of Secretary of the Navy Knox, helping to give away our oil lands.

But here is the prize gentleman who directs the destinies of our great Navy, at the right hand of Secretary Knox. He is Joseph W. Powell, who has a very interesting record. In the last war, Mr. Powell was vice president of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co., and, as such, built ships for the United States Government under circumstances which have been the subject of very important litigation by the Justice Department. The Justice Department has sued the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co., and the case went up to the Supreme Court of the United States, which handed down a scathing opinion. Although in that opinion the Court found for the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co., it did so only because the United States Government had delayed 20 years before bringing suit. However, the most interesting part of the opinion is the Supreme Court's remarks about the special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Joseph Powell.

According to Associate Justice Frankfurter and the district court's findings, Mr. Powell was guilty of daylight robbery. The district court, according to Associate Justice Frankfurter, found that Powell "adopted the famous Rob Roy distinction—he admitted he was a robber, but proudly proclaimed that he was no thief."

Associate Justice Frankfurter pointed out that Charles Piez, vice president and general manager of the United States Fleet Corporation, had had no previous shipbuilding experience, and that—

Relations between Powell and Piez were very close. Piez, as Powell knew, had had no shipbuilding experience whatsoever, had implicit confidence in Powell's integrity and shipbuilding ability and experience, and was accustomed to look to him for information and assistance with respect to matters of shipbuilding.

United States shipping authorities attempted to "persuade Powell to undertake the construction upon a lump-sum basis," according to Justice Frankfurter. Powell was adamant, however, and insisted on a contract which cost the Government excess profits of $26,759,479. Or, as Justice Frankfurter summarizes it—

The estimated costs were almost 29 percent greater than the actual costs. Nowhere in the long record, as the master found, is there any explanation or justification for the tremendous disparity between the estimated costs submitted by Bethlehem, those specified in the contracts, and the actual cost. Bethlehem's profits under these contracts amount to approximately $24,000,000. * * * Bethlehem took absolutely no risk of loss. In addition, the Government agreed to advance all sums necessary to finance the construction of the vessels. Even in usurious transactions the lender takes the risk of the borrower's insolvency. Here Bethlehem took no risk at all.

That is the kind of a deal which Joseph Powell, the right-hand man of Secretary Knox, put across on the Government in the last war. Yet, despite that fact, he was given a place of confidence, a place of trust, as the personal adviser to the Secretary of the Navy in this war.

Furthermore, Secretary Knox had had occasion to know something about Joseph Powell much more recently. During a recent congressional investigation it was revealed that Mr. Powell had rented an apartment at the Shoreham Hotel and had paid for the expenses of Mr. Anning Prall, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. At the time, that news caused considerable publicity and much unfavorable criticism. Mr. Powell then was a lobbyist in Washington; and he was charged with using his friend, Mr. Anning Prall, Chairman of the F. C. C., to aid his private business connections.

Yet, despite all those known facts about Mr. Powell, the Secretary of the Navy gave him a position of vital confidence. It is no wonder, when a man has been instrumental in taking $24,000,000 out of the pockets of the Government in 1917 and 1918, and is trusted by the Secretary of the Navy, that the Secretary of the Navy looks with indifference or even approval on the robbing of our national oil reserves by the Standard Oil Co. of California at this time.

Mr. President, I call the attention of Senators who are opposed to the Farm Security Administration to another kind of deal. Only a few days ago the Senate voted in favor of the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Under the reciprocal trade agreement in effect with Mexico at the present time we have made an agreement to import from Mexico 700,000 head of cattle at 3 cents a pound. Not satisfied with the millions we have given her under lend-lease, Mexico put an export duty of 1½ cents a pound on those cattle. By that subterfuge we are financing the Mexican Government to the extent of 1½ cents on each pound of cattle so imported. The Mexican peon gets the other 1½ cents a pound for raising the cattle. Our American farmers are asked to raise cattle in competition with cattle selling for 3 cents a pound.

Again, Mr. President, I listened with interest to what the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia had to say about socialism and communism. It happened that on about the same day when President Roosevelt took office, I took office as Governor of the State of North Dakota. The distinguished junior Senator from Virginia says that what transpired in the establishment of the Farm Security Administration and kindred organizations was socialism or communism; to quote him exactly, he said it was following Russian communism.

Mr. President, I believe that when the history of this war is written, and when the historians come to detail to the people of the future the tragic conditions of the farmers of this country in 1933, 1934, 1935, and 1936, the verdict will be that President Roosevelt avoided a revolution in this country. I remember well when, in October 1933, former Senator Herring called a conference of Governors of 11 farm States. At that time we went to Des Moines, Iowa. Outside the territory of North Dakota, into Minnesota, into Nebraska, into Kansas, and into Iowa, wherever one went, the farmers were on strike. They were tipping over automobiles containing cream cans. In the State of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], we found that the first night we were in Lincoln, a man was killed a few miles south of the town. Governor Bryan, who had a brother-in-law down there, sent for him because, he said, revolution was breaking out in the State of Nebraska.

In the great State of Iowa—I note that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is present, and he will bear me out—in October 1933 the farmers burned or dynamited every bridge leading into Sioux Falls, Iowa. At the Governors' conference, five Governors, of whom I was one, were selected to come to Washington.

I well remember that when we walked into the Office of the President of the United States, there was Leo Crowley. He had in his hand six telegrams from six different cities in the State of Wisconsin. Three of the telegrams told how creameries had been blown up or burned down. In three other cases the farmers had put coal oil into the churns and vats to wreck the creameries. That was all brought to the attention of the

President. It was then, and only then, when the President saw the desperate situation which was facing the farmers of the country, with rye selling at 7 cents a bushel, wheat at 24 cents a bushel, corn at 13 to 15 cents a bushel, and eggs at 3 to 4 cents a dozen, that the President took the action which I shall describe in a few moments.

What was the situation in my own State? I have in my hand a report, not made to me when I was Governor, but made to my successor in office, Governor Moses, after I left the Governor's office, after we had had one good crop.

In Rolette County there were 997 farmers. Fifty-seven were self-supporting; 138 were partly self-supporting; 241 were dependent; 246 were renters; and 315 farmers had no roof over their heads. They were squatting, going from one place to another, trying to find somewhere to live.

It was at that time that the Farm Security Administration came along and gave those poor people $346,000. The administration gave it to them because they needed it.

Take the Indian reservations. It has been stated on this floor that other agencies will lend money to those poor people. I was the Governor of North Dakota. We have Indian reservations in my State. Many of those Indians have farmed for years. They are men of good reputation and character. Does anyone suppose that those Indians could get a single bank to make them a loan? The banks would not make loans at the Standing Rock Reservation near the home of my distinguished friend, the Senator from South Dakota. They would not lend a dollar. They would not lend a dollar to the Indians on the Elbow Woods Reservation. So I telephoned to John Collier and told him the desperate situation, and John Collier sent $12,000 by telegraph. A few days later we needed more money, and again he sent it by telegraph. Time and time again John Collier sent money there to keep those Indians from starving to death.

Finally, after much persuasion, we induced the Farm Security Administration to make 12 loans, 6 to the Indians of the Standing Rock Reservation, and 6 to the Indians at Elbow Woods.

What does the record show? It shows that those Indians paid back their loans better than the average white man did; and yet today if we take away the Farm Security Administration, I do not know of a single place where those thousands of Indians will be able to go to obtain a loan. The same thing is true of the renters in various parts of the State of North Dakota.

I was interested in what the distinguished Senator from North Carolina had to say 2 or 3 days ago. That brings me to the subject of prostitution. I now quote from Federal Probation, a quarterly journal of correctional philosophy and practice, published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in cooperation with the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. I ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia and the distinguished Senator from North Carolina where the prostitutes around camps are coming from. I have before me an article by Helen Hironimus, warden of the Federal Reformatory for Women, at Alderson, W. Va. What does she say? Let me read:

SURVEY OF 100 MAY ACT VIOLATORS COMMITTED TO THE FEDERAL REFORMATORY FOR WOMEN

(By Helen Hironimus, warden, Federal Reformatory for Women, Alderson, W. Va.)

The word "prostitute" brings to mind the picture of a person somewhat different from anyone included in this survey. The popular conception is that of a flashily dressed, gay, and reckless young woman with a certain amount of sophistication.

Recent articles lead one to believe that a prostitute from a camp area might be a homesick, bewildered young girl who left her home in a distant State expecting to marry her soldier sweetheart but found him departed from camp and herself stranded.

We expected to receive both these types of young women as violators of the May Act,[1] but instead there are very few who answer either description. When the United States marshals began depositing the undernourished, dejected, and bedraggled young girls and women on our doorstep we realized that we were in error. With only six exceptions, they have come from submarginal, industrial, and agricultural areas. Under ordinary circumstances most of them would have spent their lives in poverty and obscurity, but the world upheaval has changed their destinies. They were ill-equipped for the rapid whirl of soldiers, easy money, beer taverns, and freedom from drudgery, drabness, and monotony. The six exceptions are young girls who followed sweethearts or husbands to camp and resorted to prostitution when their funds were exhausted.

ANALYSIS OF THE FIRST 100 CASES

The cases included in this survey are those of the first 100 women committed to the Alderson institution for violation of the May Act. To date the statute has been invoked in two military areas surrounding Fort Bragg, N. C., and Camp Forrest, Tenn., and the cases were received from the Federal district courts in the eastern district of Tennessee and the eastern and middle districts of North Carolina.

Race: Included in the group are 68 white offenders, 20 Negroes, and 12 Croatan Indians. The latter are all residents of an Indian settlement in North Carolina.

Period of commitment: Seventy-three of the women were committed for periods of from 10 to 12 months; 21, to 6 months; and 6, to periods of 3 to 4 months.

Age: The women ranged in age from 15 to 65, but, as might be anticipated, younger women constituted the largest portion of the group. Only 10 were above the age of 35.

TABLE I.—*Age distribution of 100 women violators of the May Act*

Age:	
Under 18	12
18 to 20	25
21 to 25	31
26 to 35	22
36 to 45	6
Over 45	4
All cases	100

TABLE II.—*Educational attainment of 100 women violators of the May Act*

Educational attainment:	
No school attendance	15
Less than 6th grade	25
6th grade	27
8th grade	25
Entered high school	7
Completed high school	1
All cases	100

[1] United States Code, title 18, section 518a.

TABLE III.—*Intelligence classification of 100 women violators of the May Act*

Classification:	
Imbecile (I. Q. under 50)	8
Moron (I. Q. 50–69)	57
Borderline (I. Q. 70–79)	11
Dull normal (I. Q. 80–89)	16
Normal (I. Q. 90–110)	8
All cases [1]	100

[1] Average I. Q. for all cases is 67.7 (moron).

Educational achievement and intelligence level: The educational attainment of the 100 May Act violators, as indicated in table II, is quite low. The low level of achievement is explained in part by the restricted educational facilities and the limited opportunities for academic instruction in the areas in which most of the women have lived. Also significant in this connection are the results of standardized intelligence tests administered to the group (see table III). The school achievement claimed was belied by the fact that many of the women who had indicated completion of the fifth grade were found to be completely illiterate. A variety of explanations was given by the women for their limited school achievement; lack of suitable clothing or funds for books, inability to progress, irregularity of attendance, need for assistance in the home were among the most frequent.

Family and environmental background: A review of the family and environmental backgrounds of the group provides conclusive evidence that few of the women are of the sophisticated urban type. Nearly all were reared in rural areas or in small towns, and only nine in cities. Although half of the group came from farm homes, all but six were those of sharecroppers or tenant farmers. The parents of but eight were skilled workers and only one parent had professional status.

While it is difficult to establish with certainty the economic level of the homes, the facts available indicate that 67 came from submarginal homes, 27 from marginal, 2 from fair, and 4 from good homes.

The social histories are replete with recitals of domestic difficulties in the parental background. Forty-three came from broken homes, and in many of these, as well as in the other cases, delinquency, alcoholism, neglect, and cruelty were common. Other homes, while not vicious, were inadequate because of physical disability of the parents, or the absence of constructive discipline. In many instances the mother is reported to have been sexually promiscuous, cohabiting with various men and rearing illegitimate children in the home.

Marital status: The unsettled character of the environment, the limited educational background, and the restricted mental capacities of the group have their reflection in the adjustments made by the women in their various communities.

Of the 53 women who had married, 31 were reported to have been separated or divorced. That several of the group were sexually promiscuous is evidenced by the fact that a total of 31 illegitimate children are listed in the case histories, while 2 other offenders are presently pregnant with paternity unknown.

Employment history: Work histories are extremely limited and of slight consequence. Six women had histories of employment in textile mills or in laundries, 3 had worked on farms, 18 as domestics. An additional 15 claimed experience as waitresses, but for the most part this represented employment in taverns, tourist camps, dance halls, and the like.

Arrest record: That some members of the group already were known to the police and the courts is not altogether surprising. The fingerprint reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other official records revealed that 64 of the offenders had been arrested previously. The majority of the prior

arrests were not for serious law violations, arrests for misdemeanors were predominant. Charges of assault, disorderly conduct, drunkenness, solicitation, prostitution, and vagrancy account for more than two-thirds of the total number of arrests reported for the group. The justifiable inference from these records is that the delinquent activities of the group have been restricted to relatively minor law violations and that the number of habitual or professional offenders was very small.

History of prostitution: While it was clear from the arrest records that several of the women were involved in delinquencies when quite young, it was found quite difficult to establish with any degree of accuracy the length of time that any individual had been involved in prostitution or the age at which prostitution had begun. Sexual promiscuity, in many instances, dated to adolescence apparently as a consequence of the low moral standards of the homes and limited parental discipline. In few cases there is evidence of a history of professional prostitution for a considerable period, but for the most part, participation in sex activities on a commercial basis had its beginnings with the construction of military camps in the areas of residence. From the case histories and from interviews one is convinced, moreover, that there are a large number of the women who cannot be classified as prostitutes, but who are occasionally sexually promiscuous and whose activities would have escaped the attention of law-enforcement agents had their companions not been soldiers.

Use of alcohol and drugs: Almost without exception, the women who became sexually promiscuous when over 30 condone their actions on the grounds that they drank excessively. This reason also is given by a number of younger women. Only 9 of the women claimed abstinence from the use of alcohol, 35 reported themselves moderate or occasional drinkers, and 56 indicated excessive drinking. Of the latter group, 23 reported extended histories of alcoholism. None of the May Act violators committed to date has been found to be addicted to the use of narcotics. The excessive use of alcohol may well be symptomatic of fundamental problems of a psychological nature.

Other factors undoubtedly contributed to these delinquencies. Again the inadequacies of the community environment cannot be overlooked, but the precipitating condition was undoubtedly the introduction to the areas of large numbers of men having limited resources for amusement and relatively large amounts of money to spend. As one young girl expressed it, "There was more money and more men than we had ever seen, and we lost our heads."

Methods of operation: Further evidence of the fact that the activities of the violators were more or less spontaneous results of the impact of the war situation upon their individual lives is gained from the investigation of the character of the relationships. There is little indication that the activities were organized. The usual well-developed pattern of procurers, "madams," and brothels is nowhere in evidence. Only 24 of the women operated in houses. As a rule these women were members of small groups which lived together but solicited independently of each other. Five operated in hotels, two in tourist cabins, and one in a trailer. The remainder resorted to chance acquaintances and pickups and utilized cars, taxis, empty buildings, rented rooms, barns, and fields.

Earnings from prostitution: The earnings of the women varied and fluctuated from time to time. The Indian women denied the acceptance of money in any instance, explaining that this would be a sin. Ordinarily, when the soldiers had considerable money they were generous and a fee as high as $5 might be obtained. Sixty-eight of the women reported accepting whatever could be secured, never more than $5, occasionally nothing; seven reported fees from $3 to $5; four from $1 to $3; four, $1 or less; and five, lodging, food, and drink only.

THE TREATMENT PROGRAM

Further elaboration upon the statistical material would not appear to be indicated. The "typical" picture presented by the violators thus far received is that of a young woman in her early twenties, undernourished, with scanty, cheap, untidy clothing, the product of an insecure and unstable rural existence. Ordinarily, she is rather inarticulate and bewildered at finding herself in unfamiliar surroundings far from home, confined for doing something which she considered her own personal affair. What the picture might be if the provisions of the May Act were extended to other camp areas is, of course, problematical. Undoubtedly, if its provisions were put into effect in urban areas, a more heterogeneous group presenting wider individual differences would be committed. Our present sample, from this point of view, is probably quite typical but its homogeneity unquestionably reduces the number of treatment problems presented.

The relatively short periods of commitment and the fact that the offense constitutes a misdemeanor are the limiting factors in the development of treatment programs at the institution. It is difficult for the staff to formulate plans which will meet all of the needs of the various individuals in view of the short time available for treatment. Moreover, since the women are not legally eligible for parole or conditional release, they are denied the opportunity of receiving constructive supervision upon return to the community.

This is not to say, however, that nothing can be done for this group of offenders during their stay at Alderson. On the contrary, they receive many benefits. When these women were admitted to the institution, medical examinations revealed a wide variety of physical needs. Forty were in need of antiluetic treatment, and 4 required attention for gonorrhea. The relatively low rate of venereal disease may be further indication of the limited sex experience of some of the girls. Generally speaking, all were undernourished, and in only 24 cases had any of the offenders previously received dental attention. Of the remaining group, 37 were urgently in need of extensive dental treatment. Three serious eye conditions were noted, 7 tonsillectomies recommended, and 47 refractions for glasses. Four women suffered from pelvic defects and surgical treatment was indicated.

That other, though somewhat less tangible, benefits were derived, was apparent from the initial period of quarantine to the final process of release. It was a new world of sanitation, clinics, activities, and opportunity for them, and it was interesting to see their development. Marked changes in attitude were evidenced; and the personal appearances of the inmates were greatly improved with the increased knowledge of personal hygiene. So extensive were the changes that in many instances it became difficult to recognize the women. They appeared more youthful and self-assured.

Despite the difficulties in release planning, every effort has been made to prepare the offenders for their return to the community. For the women who will return to textile industrial centers, instruction in the use of power machines in the garment shop has been provided. Others have received training in the institution dining rooms and kitchens so that they will be able to accept positions as domestics, waitresses, and cooks in areas where critical shortages exist. Still others have received instruction in farming.

CONCLUSIONS

After release from the institution some will have other conflicts with the law, but it must be remembered that in addition to their own personal deficiencies some of the women must face almost insurmountable difficulties. There has been an inadequate period of treatment and training and there is no supervision after return to the community. If some fail, others will succeed, and all of them have benefited to some extent by the opportunities offered to them. Although the sentences are of short duration it is better that they were committed here than retained in jails. Sanitation and personal hygiene have been substituted for disease, filth, and vermin; and constructive training has taken the place of idleness.

We know exactly where the prostitutes are coming from. I have before me testimony given before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which subcommittee the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was chairman. This is the statement of Donald E. Montgomery, consumers' counsel of the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers. This is his sworn testimony. He says:

Here they are in a few dashes of brutal statistics just off the Government press:

A. Forty-six million Americans living on cash incomes in 1942 below the $1,500 level.

B. Twenty-seven million of these living below the $1,000 level, and spending, as a whole, more than they took in as cash income during 1942.

C. Over 11,000,000 families whose annual cash expenditure for food was, at best, about $530 a year, or about 50 cents for each family meal, and was on the average only $350 a year, or about 35 cents a meal for the family. Many of these 11,000,000 fared even worse.

The conscience coordinator would program the steps necessary to see that the elemental needs of these people are met. He would recommend, undoubtedly, that the food stamp plan or its equivalent be put back to work, not on a surplus basis but on a need basis. It need not subsidize voluntary idleness, but neither need it tolerate involuntary hunger. In addition to the unemployed and unemployable, it would have to help buy food for many families who are described as fully employed, including some whose breadwinner is on a Federal, State, or local pay roll, especially janitors, charwomen, clerks, and school teachers.

He should develop also plans for preferential rationing of the cheaper types of foods for these low income families. Under a shortage of food, people of means turn to the use of foods which usually are left to the meager tables of low-income families. Rationing gives the well-to-do a claim on their share of cheap foods, but of course takes no steps to bring expensive foods within the reach of low-income families. Preferential rations of the economy types of food for these families would give them some protection.

Mr. President, I shall not make any invidicus comparisons. I have before me the record showing the profits made by the corporations of this country during 1941 and 1942. Take, for example, agricultural machinery, the very machinery which these men and women

must buy. The distinguished Senator from Virginia says that this program is collective farming, communism, and socialism. I have read the record, showing that some of those people have only 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 acres. Would the Senator have a man farming 10 or 20 acres, or even 80 or 160 acres, buy a great quantity of expensive farm machinery?

Is it not good sense on the part of the Government to organize a cooperative of 8, 10, or 15 farmers to enable them to get together and seed and harvest their crops? What do we find? We find that in 1941, and 1942, the profits of agricultural machinery manufacturers rose 211 percent.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a table entitled "Appendix C," showing the percentage change in profits after taxes, 1939–41, arranged by industrial groups, for 1,716 large industrial corporations, and ask that that part of the article appearing on page 5 of the United Dairy Farmer for April 15, 1943, dealing with the Office of Price Administration studies of manufacturers and merchants, showing the profits for the first 3 months of 1942, also be inserted.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every group of manufacturers or merchants whose earnings are reported by the Office of Price Administration studies as increased at all above earnings for 1939, is a group taking undue profit out of the pocket of the middle- and lower-income groups of wage earners. To claim that the corporations' increased profits come from larger volume of business is no justification; because, if true, then logically, so long as the average worker's earnings have not been increased to a living wage, the profiting corporations should reduce their prices on account of their increased volume of business, so that their earnings would remain on the same level as those of the worker; i. e., to the 1939 level, when the war started.

Instead of this, what do we have? We have, by the quotation above and by further reference to volume No. 1, table 1, the news that 156 corporations engaged in trade (wholesale, retail, etc.) increased their earnings from 1939 to 1941 by 72.9 percent. In dollars these 156 corporations took in the sum of $493,730,000 in the single year 1941.

And we have 131 food corporations increasing their earnings in that same period by 62.4 percent, taking in $361,908,000 in 1941. The increase in net profits alone of these two groups who deal with the very essentials of life for American workers was $347,000,000 for 1941 above 1939 net profits.

Added to this are the further increases in rate of profit that these corporations have obtained since 1941. Quoting the Office of Price Administration again.

Volume No. 4, page 1: "Profits before income taxes in 1942 are continuing to rise substantially above the high levels of 1941. * * * It is estimated, therefore, that 1942 profits of all manufacturing industries will show about a 40-percent rise over the 1941 level."

WAGES MUST RISE

Even if excess-profits taxes at last should catch up with this increased rate of earnings, it will be the ultimate consuming public who will be paying the corporation taxes. The corporations are not being asked to reduce their assets in any way to help pay for the war. So again the public, the man who works for a wage, must get a raise in his pay, and quickly.

Percentage change in profits after taxes, 1939–41, arrayed by industrial groups (1,716 large industrial corporations)

Industrial group	Number of companies	Percentage change 1939–41
Total of groups	1,716	55
Durable goods:		
Aircraft and parts	30	338
Lumber products	23	283
Railway equipment	26	255
Agricultural machinery	8	211
Shipbuilding	8	165
Iron and steel	84	146
Industrial machinery, nonelectrical	120	127
Miscellaneous machinery	28	126
Building machinery and equipment	31	97
Nonferrous metal products	27	96
Building construction	11	81
Miscellaneous metal products	49	81
Automobile parts and accessories	74	72
Business machinery	15	63
Copper mining and smelting	17	60
Electrical industrial machinery	31	58
Building materials and supplies	65	49
Household appliances	42	37
Automobiles	20	35
Furnishing, nonbusiness	16	29
Nonferrous mining and smelting, excluding copper	25	9
Nondurable goods:		
Paper and products	72	135
Textile fabrics	62	120
Meat packing	16	88
Rubber products	27	80
Sugar	26	74
Petroleum	79	65
Miscellaneous textiles	9	58
Textile apparel	38	47
Leather and shoes	24	44
Paints and varnishes	13	43
Miscellaneous	36	32
Printing and publishing	41	25
Alcoholic beverages	36	18
Industrial chemicals	35	18
Other chemicals	15	16
Miscellaneous food products	45	14
Nonalcoholic beverages	13	14
Drugs, soaps, and medicines	26	5
Dairy products	16	4
Containers, excluding paper	12	3
Tobacco products	22	7
Baking and grain processing	28	15
Trade:		
Wholesale trade	22	56
Retail foods	23	17
Miscellaneous retail	105	16
Mail order	6	7
Services:		
Transportation services	42	143
Amusements	22	47
Miscellaneous services	45	21

NOTE.—Coal-mining group omitted because of a deficit in 1939. In 1941, profits of this group increases 92.5 percent over 1940.

Compare these percentage changes in profits of corporations after taxes of up to 338 percent with the Little Steel wage formula of 15 percent for labor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this exhibit shows that no matter in what business people have been engaged, whether the manufacture of food, farm machinery, or textile goods, the profits have gone up. However, we still find 11,000,000 families trying to serve themselves a meal at a cost of 35 cents for the entire family.

Reverting again to the speech delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] I invite attention to the enormous profits which were made by the shipbuilders. It will be remembered that by a vote of every Member of the Senate except five, the Senate said that was all right. Only five of us voted against it. Referring to the figures put in the RECORD by the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont, I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 21, 1943, at page 285. In the House of Representatives Representative CULKIN said:

My attention has also been called to the fact that this same company, operating a number of ships through the Red Sea on voyages between October 1941 and June 1942, made profits amounting to some $3,342,000. These were single trips, and the net book value of these boats whose earnings on single trips was in excess of $3,000,000 was $800,000. This procedure, to my mind, smells to heaven, and every phase of it should be ruthlessly investigated and exposed.

Then the distinguished Representative inserted in the RECORD a statement showing the names of the ships and the trips which were taken.

We also have a report from Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General, showing how another corporation organized with a capital of $500 ran it into a profit of nearly $3,000,000.

Mr. President, there has not been any criticism of that on the floor of the Senate. There was not any criticism the other day. When the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] said that we were giving back nearly eight or nine billion dollars under the so-called Ruml plan, there was no objection whatever. Some said it was not forgiveness. I shall not now argue that question. My vote showed what I thought about the entire transaction; but the fact nevertheless remains that this morning's newspaper carried an interview with the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in which he was quoted as saying that he did not know where the $35,000,000,000 which we must raise in taxes by January 1 is to come from.

Mr. President, to return to the Farm Security Administration, to sum up, I said a few moments ago that the merchants in North Dakota in overwhelming numbers, the chambers of commerce in practically every large city in the State, and thousands of the very best farmers in North Dakota say the F. S. A. has been the salvation of the State of North Dakota. I have the petition and the letters with me, and will be glad to have any Senator examine them.

In 1932 in North Dakota we had no crop. In 1933 we had no crop; in 1934 we had no crop; in 1935 we had no crop; in 1936 we had no crop; we had a small crop in 1937, and a poor crop again in 1938. We had fine, honest-to-God farmers out there who seeded 640 acres and never threshed 1 bushel. They depended on the F. S. A. and other Government agencies to help them. They did not leave the farms. They stayed there. As the President said in his letter to Mr. Patton, which I have already placed in the RECORD, they increased the food yield tremendously. They are out there now depending on the Senate to maintain the F. S. A. and other kindred organizations in force.

I wish only that Senators who want to abolish the F. S. A. could see farms such as we have in the great Northwest, where year after year there was no crop, where grasshoppers, rust, drought, and hail took the crop away in its entirety, and yet the farmers with their wives and children stayed there and tried to eke out a living.

They had no one to depend upon but the President of the United States and the Congress to see that they did not starve. I wish Senators had been there at that time. If they had been there they would not now be asking that the F. S. A. be eliminated.

Mr. DANAHER obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, notice has been served that a final vote upon the pending bill must be reached before we adjourn. With the progress we have made, the Senate is likely to be in session until quite late this evening. Would the Senator from Connecticut object to having a quorum call so that I may submit a request for a limitation upon debate in connection with the pending bill?

Mr. DANAHER. I will not object to such a request, Mr. President. I hope that I may obtain recognition for about 5 minutes. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that my purpose in rising is to explain briefly for the RECORD my reasons for being unwilling to sign the conference report on Senate bill 796.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no desire to object to the Senator presenting his statement.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is it necessary to have a quorum call before a request may be made for limitation upon debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only time a quorum is required under the rules is when a request is made to fix the time for a final vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the further consideration of this bill no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on any amendment, and on the bill. I may say that I have discussed the proposal with both the acting majority leader and the minority leader. The agreement, if entered into, will, of course, allow a 30-minute continuous speech to any Senator on any amendment and the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request submitted by the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

PREVENTION OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as one of the Senate conferees on Senate bill 796, commonly known as the Connally bill, I found myself after several days of deadlocked discussion at odds with my colleagues on what seemed to me to be fundamental changes in the bill as it had left the Senate and which at that time had my complete support.

I might modify the word "complete" in the sense that I was by no means in accord with what seemed to me to be the extremity of the criminal penalties which were provided in the section known as section 4 of the bill, and yet I recognized that, in order to achieve the main objective upon which the Senate was in substantial agreement, it was necessary that one yield his own individual views as to a particular section, in this case, section 4. We cannot have everything the way we want it.

However, Mr. President, when the bill reached the House of Representatives marked changes were made, and when the House amendments came before the conferees for consideration, it became perfectly obvious that the philosophy of the Senate bill would be completely thwarted if the House language were to prevail. Although every one of the conferees sought to reconcile his respective differences, and much helpful progress was made over a period of several days, I found myself unable to agree on the bill as finally agreed upon in conference, in that the character of the bill has been fundamentally altered from the form in which it passed the Senate. Under the Senate version the lack of a definition of the term "labor disturbance," for example, which might give rise to authority for the President to seize a plant producing any article which may be useful for the war effort, placed the first section on tenuous ground, at best, but protections were afforded to all parties under the language of section 6.

I might point out that section 6 of the Senate bill provided that the United States Conciliation Service might certify a labor dispute to the War Labor Board, and, moreover, that the War Labor Board, for its own part, might take jurisdiction of a labor dispute whenever the Board found that the labor dispute had become so serious that it might lead to substantial interference with the war effort. Moreover, Mr. President, we had implemented the functions of the Board by permitting it to issue subpenas in order to bring the parties before it and to command the production of documents, and, although we limited the Board somewhat by requiring that its decisions must conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, the decisions, though final, were subject to review by the courts as to questions of law.

Mr. President, a review of such decisions is an inherent right, it has seemed to many of us; it is one which the Senate had interpolated into the bill by way of amendment on the floor. We felt that if the National War Labor Board, which up to this time had been functioning under Executive order, were to be given statutory status, if its decisions were to be final, in the absence of review, we would, indeed, be ascribing to it a most serious grant of authority. So, Mr. President, the Senate was in overwhelming accord, let me say, that the decision of the Board was to be final, except insofar as it was subject to review on questions of law. The conferees have eliminated that provision from the bill. In my judgment, it is a serious error, and since it goes right to the heart of the matter, it is sufficient, indeed, to cause all other points of dispute to take on unusual emphasis.

In the event of a labor dispute and before a strike and before plant seizure, at least, the jurisdiction which we conferred on the Board by section 6 could be invoked, and its decision was "subject to review by the court on questions of law." The action of the conferees in eliminating provision for review not only revives but gives fresh impetus to the natural fears of possible abuse of the authorization. For example, in a plant employing many thousands, a dozen men, in combination, might provoke such a "labor disturbance," a term which as yet lacks definition, as to purport to justify a seizure, and men of design might easily so act in key plants or in key positions in a war industry. When the President seized the North American Aviation plant in June 1941, Attorney General Jackson, now Mr. Justice Jackson of the Supreme Court, handed down an opinion authorizing the President's action. He wrote:

> The distinction between loyal labor leaders and those who are following the Communist Party line is easy to observe. Loyal labor leaders fight for a settlement of labor grievances. Disloyal men who have wormed their way into the labor movement do not want settlements—they want strikes. That is the Communist Party line which those who have defied both the Government and their own leaders to prevent a settlement of the strike have followed.

What Mr. Jackson then said is entirely true now, with this difference, that he was writing of a labor movement in terms of organized labor, whereas there is no such reference in this bill, and the labor disturbance may emanate from groups who hold no membership whatever in organized labor.

Again, Mr. President, under section 4 (a) of the Senate version of the bill, after the Government had taken possession of a plant it became unlawful for any person to coerce, instigate, or induce another to strike. The conferees have amended that language to cause it to reach, in addition, persons who conspire with or encourage any person to strike, under serious criminal penalties. Obviously for citizens generally or third parties, to coerce, instigate, or induce a strike against a Government agency operating a seized plant is one thing; an agreement among men who are actual employees of such a plant is a very different thing, and places this section, it seems to me, on an untenable basis in the light of the general provisions of law contained in the National Labor Relations Act, which recognizes the right of labor to organize and, also, to strike.

Again, Mr. President, it should be emphasized that the conferees, by encompassing the War Labor Board with requirements for conformity to the Nation Labor Relations Act may produce endless confusion, particularly since by depriving parties of an opportunity to seek a review on questions of law, the War Labor Board is given statutory status in making binding official decisions. Hitherto the Board, acting under Executive order, has itself considered its decisions merely advisory. They will now be final, with the result that the War Labor Board is given an over-riding power actually to write every contract of employment from one end of the coun-

try to the other in all instances covered by this particular legislation.

Turning to the conference report, I might point out that the first section gives the act a new title. The second section deals with definitions.

The third deals with the basis upon which the President may seize a plant, and it provides that—

Whenever there be an interruption in the production of an article which may be useful in the war effort if the President finds and proclaims that that interruption is due to a strike or other labor disturbance and that the war effort will be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to insure the operation of the plant in the interest of the war effort—

He may seize it.

Mr. President, assume a state of facts in which terms and conditions of employment have become so obnoxious that men have calculated their situation and have decided to strike. Instead of finding remedy for the grievances which have led to the strike, section 4 of the conference version would freeze those conditions and preserve the status quo. No remedy whatever is provided once the Government seizes the plant other than under section 5 of the proposed act, and under section 5 a majority of the employees will be required to join in application to the National War Labor Board for a change of such conditions.

Curiously any order the Board enters up pursuant to that application shall upon approval by the President be complied with by the Government agency operating the plant, mine, or facility. There is not one word, in terms, about its binding either the employer or the employees; it binds merely the agency of the Government which is operating it.

I particularly stated that there was no obligation "in terms" binding upon the employees; but there are sanctions imposed by operation of the other sections of the act proposed. Under section 6, once the Government has seized a plant, anyone who conspires with one of his fellows to strike, or one who instigates or induces or encourages another to strike, becomes subject to a penalty of not more than $5,000 fine or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Under section 8 of the proposed act there is a provision which has been imported into the measure from the House language of such nature that while under the first subsection of section 8 notice is required to be given to the Secretary of Labor, the War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board that a labor dispute has arisen, under subsection 2 the employees and the employer must continue production for a period of 30 days; and if at the end of that 30 days an election be taken, as the act requires, by the National Labor Relations Board, which results in a strike vote, then there will obviously be an interruption of production in the plant, whereupon the remedy of the Government is to seize the plant.

Therefore, Mr. President, all those employees who felt themselves aggrieved, gave notice of the labor dispute, took their 30 days' waiting period, continued in the plant uninterruptedly, and thereafter voted to strike, find that they have voted themselves into that state and condition whereby the Government seizes the plant and the men become liable to criminal prosecution if thereafter they strike. It is an unusual situation, to say the least.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely desire to be sure I understood the Senator correctly. He did not mean to say that the men would become liable to criminal prosecution except in a case where the plant was actually under the operation and possession of the Government?

Mr. DANAHER. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. HATCH. That is the only case in which the criminal penalties apply.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HATCH. I misunderstood the Senator, and was afraid others would.

Mr. DANAHER. It is possible the Senator from New Mexico did misunderstand, it is possible I misstated the fact, as I am speaking extemporaneously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to the fact that he has exhausted his 15 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. I have 15 minutes on the bill, have I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes on the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. I will take my 15 minutes on the bill.

Let me clarify the point the Senator from New Mexico makes, because I am under no misapprehension about the effect of the provision, and I am sure we are both in accord on the point.

Mr. HATCH. I was sure the Senator was not under a misapprehension, but I was afraid his words would be misunderstood. I hope he will clarify them.

Mr. DANAHER. I will clarify them beyond peradventure, I hope. What I hope I will be understood as saying is that if the men decide and vote that they wish to strike, and actually go out on strike, there is nothing in the proposed act which will compel them to go back to work. But if the Government seizes the plant on the ground that there has been an interruption due to the strike, and under a Government agency, operations are resumed in the plant, then such employees will become liable to the criminal provisions should they later strike. Is not that a completely correct statement?

Mr. HATCH. I wanted to be sure it was understood the criminal provisions did not apply until the Government actually had taken possession of the plant.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct, the Senator from New Mexico and I are in accord.

One other section impels present comment. Section 9, also brought over from the House, is a provision amending the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, to say that no labor organization shall make a contribution in connection with any election in which a Presidential or Vice Presidential elector or a Senator or Representative in Congress, and so on, is involved.

Curiously, no provision is made to operate against management groups; there is no provision which would forbid manufacturers' associations, if you please, from making political contributions. The amendment applies only against a labor organization.

Mr. President, having mentioned some of the collateral points, I wish to revert for a moment to section 7, which after all is one of the most important features of the bill.

I hope I have made it apparent to everyone that the emphasis, as the proposed act stands now, is in the direction of enforcing seizure of these plants by the United States. Every single proposed remedy, every single penalty, is in the direction of driving the Government to seizure of the plants. What we had hoped to accomplish under section 7 of the Senate language was to make available to the employees a mechanism through which they might procure conciliation or adjudication of their dispute, whatever it might be, and rectification of the terms and conditions of employment, if they required modification or amendment. It operated in favor, not of forcing seizure but of amelioration of conditions in a plant, and the Board was given power to act sua sponte, or on the application of the Conciliation Service.

Mr. President, the conference has stricken out those highly remedial, highly effective means of achieving a modification and correction of the difficulties which lead to a strike, and completely eliminated them with reference to any plant where the Government has actually made a seizure. In other words, if the plant is in operation producing war materials and there be a dispute of such nature that the Conciliation Service certifies it to the War Labor Board, jurisdiction may be had under section 7. Also, as an alternative, if the War Labor Board believes that the labor dispute is so serious that it would lead to interruption, the War Labor Board may take jurisdiction. But neither of those sections will apply if the Government actually has seized a plant, under the conference language. The result is that in any case where a Government seizure has been effectuated, the employees who were disgruntled in the first place, who were on strike because, let us assume, of obnoxious terms and conditions, now find themselves frozen in status quo, the cause of the dispute continues with no remedy whatever, unless a majority of the employees in the plant petition the War Labor Board for a rectification of conditions. Even then, whatever the decision of the War Labor Board shall be, it becomes final, because the men cannot strike without leaving themselves possibly answerable to the criminal penalties of section 6.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that under the bill even in the case of plants taken over by the Government whenever a majority of the employees desire to ask for different wages or different working conditions they have the right to apply to the War Labor Board?

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would the Senator advocate that that should be done by a minority? The Senator seemed to make a great point of the fact that it took a majority to do it. I thought this was a majority country, and unless a majority of the employees asked for it, I do not see any reason why they should be given it. The Senator also must remember that under the criminal penalties for striking, under the Government operation, there is a specific clause which provides that no man shall be guilty of any offense under that section for quitting work, and doing no more. He is not guilty of anything then. But if he goes around and encourages or incites or conspires with other men, then he is guilty; is that right?

Mr. DANAHER. That is what it says. I do not say that it is right, but that is what it says.

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg the literary Senator's pardon. I should have said "correct", not "right."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I will simply observe by way of reply to the Senator from Texas that in a war industry there may be 2,000 men employed, and only 24 machine-tool makers. The 24 machine-tool makers may be the very heart of that industry. Their grievance may be a very just one, a very complete one. They may even belong to a craft union which is in no way affiliated with a union which has the bargaining powers in a particular plant. It may in other words result, Mr. President, that a group of employees in a given plant will not be in position to secure redress from their Government of the conditions which were so obnoxious in the first place as to have forced the strike which led to the plant seizure.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the situation is so anomalous and so completely at variance with the genus of the Senate bill, that it is unfortunate, as I see it, that the matter has taken the turn to which I have adverted. I have simply stated my reasons for disagreeing action with reference to the conference report, to the end that my colleagues who are not here, and those others who may be interested may know how and why I feel as I do about the bill.

I may later speak in my own time when the conference report comes up.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is a time limitation now in effect.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me claim my own time.

Mr. RUSSELL. If it can be done in the Senator's own time, very well. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be permitted to proceed but that the time not be charged to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought I had the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that if I surrendered the floor it might have been considered that I had spoken once.

Mr. CONNALLY. No, no; I will make an affidavit on that.

Mr. President, I shall not undertake at this time to reply to the Senator from Connecticut. I wish to say that the Senator from Connecticut was a very useful member of the conference committee and aided the committee very vitally in perfecting the bill. It was with the deepest of gloom that the other conferees, both of the House and the Senate, viewed his failure to sign his name to the report. All five of the House conferees signed, and four of the Senate conferees, including the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and myself. However, all the views which the Senator from Connecticut has expressed here were expressed quite eloquently and quite cogently and quite forcibly to all the conferees. Notwithstanding that, the conferees agreed to the report. When the report formally comes before the Senate I shall then seek the opportunity to make adequate reply to the points which the Senator from Connecticut has urged at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the very distinguished Senator from Texas yield for an inquiry?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will if I have the floor.

Mr. McNARY. When, in the opinion of the able Senator from Texas, will the conference report come before the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope it will come before the Senate tomorrow, because under the House rules the House cannot take it up except by unanimous consent until tomorrow. But I have consulted the parliamentary authority of the Senate, and he advises that if the House should act early in the day at least the Senate may then take the bill up because our rules do not require that the bill lie over.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, consideration of a conference report is always in order in the Senate even when there is a bill of any kind pending.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. But I had hoped that we probably would have until the first of the week further to study the report in the light of the comment made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. We will see how that works out tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say a further word. There are printed copies of the report, with the change of only one or two words, which do not change the meaning but simply change the text, which set forth the provisions of the bill, and I hope all Senators will consult copies of the report and read them before the report comes before the Senate.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am always glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I first wish to thank the Senator for his kind personal observations, and to assure him that I was not arguing this matter at this time, but simply out of candor and out of fairness and equity to my colleagues, I felt impelled to make a statement of the reasons why I found myself in disagreement with the Senator from Texas.

Let me add, Mr. President, that whenever I find myself in disagreement with the Senator from Texas I want to make absolutely certain that I have good reason for my position.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I wish to say that the Senator from Connecticut, with rare zeal and industry, both when he is right and when he is wrong, pursues very forcefully his objective, and I want to thank him for the many contributions he made to the effort to put the bill in proper shape. I only regret that he, like Brutus when he stood near the statue of Pompey, stabbed the report just as we were getting ready to start.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Green	Overton
Austin	Guffey	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hawkes	Reynolds
Barbour	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Scrugham
Bone	Holman	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bridges	La Follette	Stewart
Buck	Langer	Taft
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McCarran	Tobey
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chandler	McKellar	Van Nuys
Chavez	McNary	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Walsh
Connally	Maybank	Wheeler
Danaher	Mead	Wherry
Davis	Millikin	White
Eastland	Moore	Willis
Ellender	Murdock	Wiley
Ferguson	Murray	Wilson
George	Nye	
Gerry	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall endeavor to be as brief as possible in the discussion of this subject. First, I shall undertake to compare briefly the provisions of the substitute offered by the Senator from Virginia with the committee proposal. I must say in all deference that in listening to the remarks of the very able and distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, I was reminded of a current song hit, I've Heard That

Song Before. The Senator made a very able argument, but it was almost identical with the same argument he made on this proposition last year. I have before me the RECORD of May 18, 1942. I find that at that time the Senator inserted the statement which was made by one Paul Morris, as well as an editorial from the New Republic magazine. His recent discussion has been almost identical with the discussion had last year. I even understood the Senator to revert to some person named Sandy Garrett, of Childersburg, Ala. The RECORD of May 18, 1942, covers six pages of matter taken from photostats showing the horrible delinquency of Sandy Garrett, of route 1, Childersburg, Ala. The Senator from Virginia has again embalmed that individual in the records of the Congress and has shown his horrible dereliction. It turns out that it has been established beyond peradventure of doubt that Sandy borrowed $1,107.55 and repaid only $27.79. I did not hear the statement of the figures today. I do not know whether Sandy has done better or worse with his loan this year than he did with his loan last year; but I assume he is still delinquent. Of course, Mr. President, when farm loans are made to the poorest risks this Nation knows—people absolutely without any resources, without any means of establishing credit—we shall find that some individuals will not be able to repay their loans; and I doubt not that poor Sandy Garrett, of route 1, Childersburg, Ala., has a number of companions who have not paid the loans which have been made to them over the period of time during which the program has been in operation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I was simply going to ask the Senator if there was not some evidence that in the flourishing twenties loans were made by the United States Government to a good many foreign nations, and I was going to ask whether in their repayments they did very much better than Sandy has done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, Sandy is in goodly company, the difference being that most of them did not have an opportunity to go down in history by having their cases charted in the Senate 2 years in succession.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. My time is limited, but I shall yield to the Senator.

Mr. BONE. No; under the circumstances I shall not ask the Senator to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The argument that loans were made for the payment of poll taxes was made last year. I am opposed to the bill for abolition of the poll tax; the Senator from Virginia also is opposed to it. Consequently, I do not see why he objects to the payment of poll taxes. Both of us have objected to the bill the purpose of which is to abolish by action of the Federal Government the payment of poll taxes. We have objected to the bill, not because we are opposed to having poll taxes abolished in our respective States, but because we believe that the action to abolish them should be taken by the States themselves.

Reference was made to the fact that some of the persons who had borrowed money used some of the money to go to the motion pictures somewhere: and the witness, when grilled by the committee, broke down and confessed that it was wholly possible that, among the persons to whom millions of dollars had been loaned during the time the program was in operation, some of the borrowers had escaped the supervision of the Farm Security Administration supervisor, and had gone to motion-picture shows. Of course, the witness undertook to point out that any person who had borrowed funds from any other source was likely to have used some of the borrowed money in order to go to a motion-picture show.

So, Mr. President, it seems that the effort is being made to put these borrowers in a class unto themselves, when the entire objective of the whole Farm Security program is to bring them up into the class of all other American citizens, and to remove them from the segregation which they have endured by virtue of their poverty during all the years before this program sprang into being.

I shall not go into the merits of this question, other than to say to Senators from States which are largely populated by urban residents that they had better stop, look, and listen before voting to strike down the Farm Security Administration. That is what this amendment would do. Having failed to kill it outright, this is a proposal to kill it by slow strangulation over a period of 12 months.

Of all the sources of increased food production in the United States, the Farm Security Administration is paramount. The big farmers cannot greatly increase their production. The little farmer has labor available in himself, his wife, and his children. The only hope of increased food production is with the little farmer. I could fill the RECORD with statements from the hearings showing the extent to which this activity has been carried on throughout the Nation. The increase in food production among the 450,000 people dealing with the Farm Security Administration was 3 times greater than the national average. There is a simple reason for that. A man who has 20 acres in a farm-security loan can take care of a thousand chickens, 10 hogs, or 5 milk cows, and carry on all the work he has been doing, and still produce the food which is essential to the war effort, and for which there will be a greater demand as the months go by. The investment in this appropriation is but a small matter to consider when we reflect on the potentialities of the program.

The proposal of the Senator from Virginia, as he says, is made in an effort to consolidate. I would not be unkind enough to mention the fact that some Senators who have been most vociferous in their condemnation of the Appropriations Committee for legislating are now seizing upon this amendment as an opportunity to change the order from what it has been for the past 6 or 8 years, and to set up an entirely new system, dealing with this question legislatively. We have a proposal to create an entirely new system. The amendment provides that the loans shall be made through the Farm Credit Administration, which is a quasi-Federal agency, including the Crop and Feed Loan Division, which is limited by statute as to the amount of loans. I will ask the Senator from South Carolina what the present limitation is. I have forgotten. What is the limitation on the individual borrower?

Mr. SMITH. Four hundred dollars.

Mr. RUSSELL. The loans are to be made through the Farm Credit Administration and the Production Credit Association, which are wholly farmer-owned-and-controlled loaning agencies, and which require collateral of their borrowers. That is where this program is proposed to be placed. The supervision of it is to go to the Extension Service. No one has a higher respect than I have for the Extension Service, and no Senator has supported it more earnestly in the committee down through the years, when we were increasing its appropriations under the increment provided in the fundamental Bankhead-Jones Act. However, the Extension Service cannot and will not ever give the type of supervision which is required if we are to make a genuine effort to rehabilitate farmers.

Speaking of extravagance, it would be the height of extravagance to make an allowance of only $4,000,000 for collecting and servicing nearly 500,000 loans outstanding, as well as lending $40,000,000 additional. The loss to the Government would be far greater than a reasonable appropriation to supervise the rehabilitation of farmers and collect loans. The work is really in the nature of vocational education.

There is another very great difference between the proposal of the Senator from Virginia and the committee proposal. I refer to the question of grants. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia absolutely eliminates any grants to those in distress on the farms. It matters not how great a catastrophe may visit them. If through act of God a crop were absolutely destroyed in any way, under the proposal of the Senator from Virginia, there would be absolutely no agency of Government which could go into the afflicted area and afford any relief by way of grants to farmers who have seen their barns go down the river, or who have seen their crops parched from day to day beneath the blistering sun, or who have seen their fields ravaged by grasshoppers or insects.

The question of rural rehabilitation projects has been brought into this discussion. The Senator from Virginia this year, as last, discussed the horrible failure of the Arthurdale project and some other subsistence homestead projects. I am willing to concede that those projects were failures; but I say that whatever its faults may be, the failure cannot properly be charged to the Farm Security Administration. Every one of the subsistence homestead projects was in being when the Farm Security Administration was established in September 1937. Not

one of them is under the jurisdiction of the Farm Security Administration today. Every one is in the National Housing Agency; and yet when we come to discuss the Farm Security Administration, these failure projects are brought up. I grant that they were failures. The failures are brought in and charged up to the Farm Security Administration, when they were all built by some other agency, and are now under the jurisdiction of a totally different agency.

The committee bill provides for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible, of the Rural Resettlement projects. The amendment of the Senator from Virginia is silent on that question. It makes no provision for them. However, I understand he has an amendment which he said he intended to offer to another provision of the bill at a later date. The one which I understood him to read provided for the elimination within a fixed period. I say, Mr. President, that with the gigantic investment which the Government of the United States has in these projects, whether they are good or bad, it would be the poorest kind of business for us to require their liquidation within a period of from 12 to 18 months. We want them liquidated as rapidly as possible; but when they are forced on the market in a lump, who will buy them? It will be some man who has enough money to buy the whole thing at once, and who will make an inordinate profit out of the disposition of the lands he buys. It is much better to proceed with the liquidation in an orderly way, selling a bit here and a bit there, getting as much as we can, rather than legislating so as to increase the loss of the Government and prove that these projects were a complete failure.

Mr. President, I reiterate what I said last year, in view of the precedent before me. Only 8 out of 195 of these projects throughout the Nation were instituted by the Farm Security Administration. All the others were begun by other agencies of Government, under the subsistence homestead program, under the program of the Resettlement Administration, which was directed by Mr. Tugwell, or under the supervision of the Department of the Interior; and they were all dumped on the Farm Security Administration by Executive order. Only 8 out of 195 were really commenced by the Farm Security Administration; yet all the the sins of all the departments which have had to do with these projects during their long and tenuous lives are being charged up to the Farm Security Administration every time this appropriation item comes to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that when Senators criticize the Farm Security Administration for the omissions or sins of some other agency, they forget the many projects and the many rehabilitations which the Farm Security Administration has successfully conducted throughout its history?

Mr. RUSSELL. They forget them, or they do not care to discuss them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that 92 percent of the indebtedness in connection with loans in the rehabilitation effort has been paid back?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is referring to the rehabilitation loans, is he not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true. I say, Mr. President, without fear of successful contradiction, that in view of the credit risk which is assumed in making such loans, the collection record is nothing short of phenomenal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator to the fact that he has exhausted 15 minutes of his time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will take time on the bill, Mr. President. In the matter of farm tenant loans to farm tenants to enable them to buy farms, the payments last year, including advance payments, represent about 150 percent of the maturities. Bear that in mind. The borrowers in many instances have anticipated the maturities on those loans. Approximately 99 percent of all the borrowers are current, and have met their maturities as they fell due. Where can we find a similar record in any other lending activity of the Government, when we consider the fact that the farmer, above all other people in this country, is subject to distress from the elements and from insects, and is most likely of all to suffer failure of his income in any given year?

We now come down to the rural rehabilitation loans. I should be the last to say that there have not been made many loans which were too large. Undoubtedly, in dealing with this problem involving about a million different farm families in approximately 2,300 counties of the United States, excessive loans have been made in many instances. Let me say, Mr. President, that, in my judgment, if the facts could be thoroughly sifted it would be found that as many loans had failed because they were not quite large enough as had failed because they were too large. Where a man has no energy or ambition, as—I do not wish to be personal—our friend, Sandy Garrett evidently has not, of course, he will not repay his loan. But, Mr. President, I say that we are dealing with people in this loan program who have never had a chance to live, and if 75 percent of them were put on their feet as independent, self-sustaining, valuable members of society, the money lost on the other 25 percent would be the best investment the United States has ever made since the beginning of its history.

The record as to rehabilitation loans shows that for the current year, including prepayments, the collections will amount to 93 percent. I wish to point out that when these farmers have as good a year as they had last year they are just about as good a credit risk as anyone else in this Nation. Last year, there was loaned them ninety-seven and one-half million dollars, and $131,000,000 was collected. Of course, a great deal of it was past due, but it showed that the persons to whom the loans were made appreciated them, and that when they had the money at least a great majority of them would pay it back as willingly, Mr. President, as would you or I.

Mr. President, I believe in this program. It has had faults, weaknesses, and maladministration, but its objectives are too important to the perpetuity of our institutions of government for us to strike this program down by adopting such an amendment as that which is now pending. I ask Senators to go out, if they will, into the areas where the sharecroppers and tenants are found. I have lived amongst them all of my life. I have seen them, Mr. President, move their little chattels and one-horse wagons in the fall to another farm and start making a new crop with a landlord who was not able to finance them and without any means of credit for themselves. I have seen children who could not go to school until the period of what is called the lay-by time in the summer, which is between the time of cultivating the crops and harvesting them. The next year history repeats itself, and when the children have reached 17 or 18 years of age they leave home, marry, and start a new crop of sharecroppers and tenant farmers who live almost without hope in a country which is supposed to be the hope of the world. We cannot afford to strike those people down. They are entitled at least to one chance in life. If there is one Sandy Garrett, there are thousands of others who offset him, who are standing on their feet today, owing no man, or the Government of the United States, making an honest contribution to the war effort through the production of food, and holding their heads high as independent American citizens.

Mr. President, this amendment should be rejected and the Senate should adopt the committee proposal which provides perhaps for an appropriation smaller than it should be.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to propound an inquiry to the Senator from Georgia. As I understand, the amendment provides for liquidation of the cooperatives, or whatever they may be termed, whether poorly or well managed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Whether poorly or well managed, it provides for the liquidation of them all.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if I may, I should like to comment on what the distinguished Senator has said in connection with grants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will then be speaking on his own time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would time be available to me at any later time on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, under the agreement the Senator is entitled to only one speech on the bill, of not exceeding 15 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in 1940, when a hurricane struck, and great tracts of agricultural land in South Carolina and along the coast were destroyed,

as Governor of the State of South Carolina, I made every effort through various agencies in Washington, to obtain funds. Through the Disaster Loan Corporation I obtained some funds, and also through the F. S. A. Had it not been for the grants and loans made by the F. S. A. many hundreds of farmers, who today are producing for the war effort in South Carolina, would not be there.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia well remembers, as do other Senators, that in the summer of 1941 there was no agency of Government connected with agriculture or otherwise that was willing to lend money or to assist the farmers of South Carolina. During that summer and fall more than 30,000 farmers, as shown by the records in the department, received aid and were able to carry on. Today many of them are producing for the war effort. Many of them were more than rehabilitated. Their sons, as well as the sons of others, are in the Army today.

Mr. President, I hope that if the cooperatives shall be liquidated, the Senate will appropriate sufficient money for the only organization of Government I know of, so far as the farmer is concerned, which has always been ready and willing to help the fellow at the bottom of the ladder so that some day he may reach the top.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I helped in the preparation of the appropriation bill in the Committee on Appropriations, and I believe I understand the purposes of the appropriation for Farm Security.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] stated the truth. It is the one agency of the Federal Government which really helps him who needs help. How many millions of dollars have been advanced or loaned to industrialists or to men who actually had credit in the normal places of credit?

The Farm Security Administration has been denounced as communistic. I deny that. I believe that the rehabilitation feature of Farm Security is one which keeps the farmer from being communistic.

Mr. President, there is nothing which the American loves and adores more than a home. Give the average American citizen a piece of land and a roof over the heads of his children, and he will not be a Communist. Unless we continue such an agency as Farm Security and the policy it tries to carry out, communism may rear its head.

I have no fear as to the winning of the war, because we are going to win it; I am not at all concerned with the Nazis or the Japs, because we are going to whip them; but I am concerned with millions of American farmers, and millions of other Americans throughout the entire country, who have not had homes. Do Senators realize that of the 7,000,000 farmers in this country only 50 percent of them can say, "This is my home; this is my property"? And here is the Government, with a sound policy, trying to rehabilitate American citizens, advancing them a little credit which they cannot get elsewhere.

Ask a farmer in Tennessee, or Arkansas, or New Mexico with 2 acres of land and an old mule, to go to a local banker and see how much he can get. He will not get a dime. Is there an obligation on the Government to aid such a citizen? That citizen furnishes soldiers, he furnishes the ones who make the supreme sacrifice. He certainly is entitled to a little help, which is all he wants. He wants a little help in order to enable him to carry on so that he may eventually, through his efforts, be able to say, "This is my place. I am a free citizen of the country. I pay taxes, I send my children to school, I produce for the war effort, I am a member of society." What is the matter with the Farm Security Administration when we consider a situation such as that?

Transfer the functions of the Farm Security to other agencies of the Government, as is contemplated by some of the amendments proposed, and what would happen? I know about the agencies of the Government. Many of them would not look at a farmer, especially if he were poor, and perhaps did not own a piece of land. The Farm Security Administration has a heart, a heart which Americans revere, and the organization is doing a fine job.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Virginia may be rejected.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I listened to an address the other evening over the radio by the Honorable Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, and with many things in his address I agreed. One thing brought out in this radio talk was the fact that the former President, the Food Administrator during the last war, predicted in a most serious tone that there would be a food shortage in this country this year. That opinion is shared by many prominent persons, because of a number of factors which exist at the present time.

I hope these persons are wrong, but I am not going to do anything in the way of legislation which in my opinion will curtail the production of food one iota in connection with the war effort. Whatever prejudice I may have against the Farm Security Administration, whatever prejudice I may have against Mr. Baldwin, a gentleman who I think should be out of office, and I hope that at sometime soon he will be removed from his office; whatever prejudice I may have with respect to the resettlement propositions which have been discussed on the floor of the Senate—and I have heard the same type and kind of argument for the last 3 or 4 years—I shall not permit such feelings to affect my vote in this particular case.

Mr. President, I know that the Farm Bureau Federation in my section of the country is against this proposition. The Farm Bureau Federation has been my friend, and I am a member of the organization at the present time in my own county in Illinois. But here again I must differ with them, because of what I see in connection with the production of food not only for soldiers, but for civilians as well.

It has been repeatedly stated on the floor of the Senate that between 400,000 and 500,000 families are affected through this type of legislation. I undertake to say that if the House provision should become law it would seriously cripple the production of food, which is being carried on by the group of farmers whom the pending legislation seeks to aid.

I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Georgia, to see whether or not the article I am about to read is correct, because to me it says a great deal, and it has helped me make up my mind in connection with my vote on the pending bill. The article says:

> We are making a big thing of importing 5,000 farm workers from the Bahamas. Here are 500,000 farm families, our citizen brothers, who have been helped by farm security loans to a point where they produced last year 36 percent of the national increase in milk, 23 percent of the national increase in dried beans, and 10 percent in eggs and chickens, though they number but 7.6 percent of the Nation's farmers.

I should like to know whether or not there is any Senator who cares to challenge those figures, or agree with them, because they are extremely important. They are taken from an item written by Mr. Samuel Grafton for the Washington Evening Star of April 27, 1943. Does the Senator from Georgia know anything about those figures?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, those figures are in accord with the figures submitted by the witnesses appearing before the committee, and I had adverted to them briefly by saying it was a fine thing having that much of a percentage of increase come from 450,000 farmers out of a total of 6,000,000, and particularly those who were supposed to be less privileged.

I do not think there can be any doubt that the chief field of increased production of commodities of the nature alluded to is among farm security borrowers, because there is no available labor for the farmers elsewhere. There are farmers who do not have the facilities with which to proceed, but who can produce if we give them supervision and credit with which to purchase the chickens and the cows and hogs in order to produce the pork and the milk and the eggs and the poultry which are needed.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator, and I wish to say one word in conclusion.

I know nothing about how the program is administered in other States, but insofar as the State of Illinois is concerned, in my opinion the program has been administered in a very efficient and economical manner, although I have heard many stories to the contrary as affecting other sections of the country.

There is one thing the Committee on Appropriations has done in connection with this matter; it has taken into consideration the very thing I have been discussing, and has dealt with the question accordingly, in my humble opinion.

Mr. President, I heard the Senator from Wisconsin today speak of the lack of help, assistance, and when the farmers are crying for help we find the Bankhead law assisting individuals on the farms in order to increase the production of food.

We hear the suggestion constantly being made by Members of Congress that the Army be allowed to help produce the food for the coming year. So far as I am concerned, when I see this dilemma

in front of me with respect to the food situation I cannot reach the conclusion, merely because of some prejudice, because of some feeling in the past, because of some individual in a bureau who is not administering the law perhaps in the way it should be administered, that I should deny between 400,000 and 500,000 farmers of America the right to continue to obtain rehabilitation loans in order to help them produce the food which this Nation needs, both for the military and for the civilian population next year.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement in behalf of the situation which obtains in my State. The picture is a very sad one. According to the 1940 Census, Mississippi has 335,939 farm families. Of that number, only 97,226 are owners of their farms. Of the total number of farm families in Mississippi, 192,815 are farm tenants. There are 45,594 farm laborers. They are not tenants. They work by the day. In other words, there are 238,413 homeless farm families in Mississippi out of a total of 335,939 farm families. There are over 240,000 farm families who, according to my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] cannot sing Home Sweet Home.

The Farm Security Administration has come to the relief of over 25,000 of these homeless farm families in my State, and of that number, 2,600 are applicants for farm ownership. The only reason there are not more applicants for the ownership of farms is that not sufficient money has been made available by the Congress to make the loans to the 240,000 homeless farm families in Mississippi.

I am glad to report that the 2,600 clients of the Farm Security Administration under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act program have paid 96½ percent of their indebtedness, and during the last year their payments have exceeded their obligations.

Mr. President, while the picture in my State possibly is gloomier than that in any other State in the Union, I wish to plead with my colleagues to reject the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and to stand by the committee provision so as to make available this gracious service to the 240,000 homeless farm families in my State.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have heard all the moving and pathetic pleas which have been made in defense of the committee amendment. They range all the way from Home Sweet Home to Nearer My God to Thee. All those who make the pleas, however, omit one important fact. It costs our Government $1 to loan or give away $3 through the F. S. A. Any agency which spends that much money in overhead is careless and extravagant, and reflects upon the Government and the activity which it represents, and upon the Congress, and it ought to be abolished.

I shall vote for the Byrd amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Virginia a question. Do I correctly understand that under his amendment there will still be available $50,000,000 for the purposes which have been referred to, only that the money will be distributed by the Farm Credit Administration instead of the Farm Security Administration? I do not understand that the Senator, by his amendment, is doing away with rural rehabilitation loans.

Mr. BYRD. The amount is $40,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Forty million dollars, plus twelve million dollars; is that not true?

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. A total of $52,000,000 would still be available for the meritorious purposes which have been referred to?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. TAFT. Is that not more than sufficient to carry any family which is already receiving help, and also aid a large number of new families which are not now receiving help?

Mr. BYRD. I certainly think so.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I feel a measure of guilt, after having served for days on end with the very able Senator from Georgia on the committee which had been giving consideration to this annual agricultural supply bill, because I have not felt equal to pitching in and helping him carry at least a small share of his burden. Perhaps it is as well that I have not been taking any part in it, because, after all is said and done, the Senator from Georgia, it must be admitted, has done an amazing job. No one can better appreciate that than those who serve on a committee dealing with such a bill as this. After the House had virtually rewritten the legislation, and destroyed so many features that we have fought year after year to win, it was not a simple matter to sit down and deal with the hundreds upon hundreds of items in the bill that had to be dealt with separately. The Senator from Georgia has won my utmost appreciation not only by the manner in which he has represented the committee on the floor of the Senate, but by the manner in which he conducted the very difficult hearings and the writing of the bill.

Mr. President, since the life of the so-called Byrd committee, I have served as a member of the committee with the distinguished Senator from Virginia. I know how utter is his sincerity of purpose in the objective of his amendment. I should like to go along with him in support of the larger purpose he and his committee have been serving, but I must depart from him completely as respects his recommendations concerning the future of F. S. A.

A year or so ago, when that committee submitted its recommendations to the Senate, including a recommendation involving the abandonment of the F. S. A., I concurred in the report, except that feature of it dealing with F. S. A., because I had come as closely as anyone could come to intimate acquaintance with the work the F. S. A. was doing.

I cannot now go along with the Senator on his amendment. I cannot do other than insist in my own small way that the Senate stand by the Senate Appropriations Committee in its recommendations with respect to the future of the Farm Security Administration. With all its failures and in spite of all the criticism for which it has given cause, I hope that the purpose served by the Farm Security Administration is here to stay, not only this year, but through the years to come, for it has served in a field which had too long been ignored.

The Farm Security Administration has brought returns which are altogether good for our Nation. So broad a claim as this, of course, is bound to invite a flood of challenges built around faults and failures, most of which I would readily acknowledge. F. S. A. has been guilty of playing favorites. F. S. A. has extended help to some who have been undeserving. F. S. A. has engaged in some foolish experimentation, and has given cause for charges of contributing to collectivism and regimentation. F. S. A. has caused some persons to abandon initiative and resign themselves to a dependence upon government. All this I will admit. But these faults and failures have been so largely remedied and eliminated and have been so insignificant by comparison with the great services rendered deserving individuals that I entertain firm belief that the agency of F. S. A. can be made to win returns which will afford and hold vast advantages to our whole country.

Without the help which F. S. A. made available in my own and other States during recent trying years I know that we should be facing terrible need and failure on every hand. Instead of that, and largely because of F. S. A., I can point to hundreds of successful farm operations today, hundreds of farm families who have been helped to their feet, making tremendous contributions to the food needs of their country in this emergency, and paying not only their real estate and personal taxes but paying income taxes to the Federal Government as well.

In the hearings of the Senate Appropriations Committee will be found merely a very few of the evidences which have come to me of the part which F. S. A. has played in rehabilitating able, deserving farm people who had been all but destroyed by drought and adverse economic conditions. Endless are the personal cases I could recite for the Senate's information demonstrating how people who were hopelessly down and out were saved by F. S. A., given the help in dollars they needed, who have paid back every penny they borrowed and are now most productive parts of our national economy.

There is much room for administrative improvement in the conduct of F. S. A. It is the duty of Congress to force those improvements and hasten elimination of the faults and weaknesses of the administration. But it certainly does not follow that we must abandon an agency which today is playing so vital a part in our economy as F. S. A. has done and is doing. Some persons will insist that there is no such need for F. S. A. today as there once was. Of course, that is the case, but there still is room for it, and who knows when there

might exist as vital a need for it again as there was before.

I hope the Senate will stand with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the committee. In the committee we have gone into the subject with thoroughness. We find such vast advantages growing out of what F. S. A. has done and such large repayment of the loans which are being made that we feel secure in the belief that this agency can carry itself with little or no loss to the Government ultimately.

Let me, while on my feet, give expression of my appreciation to the approval by the Senate of the committee's action on the issue of crop insurance, the removal of the prohibition on sales of wheat below parity, the issue of increased appropriation for soil conservation, the proposal to make R. A. C. C. incentive loans, and other most important matters, including the authorizing of parity payment on crops of next year. Only by these policies are we going to build an agricultural industry sufficiently strong to withstand the tests which are upon the industry now and which are certain to follow this war.

I should be unfair to myself if I did not, here and now, pay my compliments to the chairman of the subcommitee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Never have I known a Senator so thoroughly to acquaint himself with the hundreds of problems presented by an agricultural appropriation bill. The Senate has had occasion to observe during recent days the splendid knowledge and efficiency of the Senator from Georgia. To have worked with him, hour after hour, upon this bill, and to have had a hand in accomplishing the gains won in the bill has been both a great pleasure and an honor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall not long detain the Senate. I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished and able junior Senator from Virginia, and in support of the amendment recommended by the full Appropriations Committee. It should be borne in mind that the service rendered by the Farm Security Administration has been rendered to those at the bottom of the rural economic ladder. They are the group in this country who, prior to the time when the Farm Security Administration's assistance and credit were made available to them, had no hope of improving their economic status insofar as their own existence or the future of their children were concerned. They are the group, Mr. President, who as the Senator from Georgia so well said, probably would have been considered the poorest credit risks to be found in the United States. Yet, while this program has been in operation, more than 1,500,000 families have received help of some type from the Farm Security Administration. Credit has been furnished to approximately 935,000 families so as to enable them to obtain livestock, equipment, and other essentials they need in order to operate their farms. Trained county supervisors have advised them on their farm and home plans. Those plans call for the production of two or more war-essential foods for market, food and feed needed at home, and for cash income needed to furnish their necessities and to pay their debts.

Mr. President, it is a misnomer to call this fund an administrative fund in the sense that an administrative fund is ordinarily considered as an administrative expense. As the junior Senator from Georgia has said, the plan has been as much a farm vocational-educational program as it has been a credit program; and only as adequate supervision and assistance of a technical nature are given to those families who previously have had no opportunity, has it been possible for them to be rehabilitated and to repay their interest and principal. Therefore, to condemn the program on the basis of a statement that it costs $1 in supervision for every $2 loaned, which I do not concede to be true, is to indicate an utter lack of understanding of the entire program.

My fear is that the Committee on Appropriations has cut this fund too deeply, and that as a result the proper supervision and technical assistance may not be sufficiently available. To the extent that such assistance fails, to that extent will the loans fail, and to that extent will the program fail.

The plan of providing credit with personal guidance has worked well. Many farm families were in desperate circumstances, unable to obtain credit from any source, until the Farm Security Administration gave them assistance. With such help and by their own hard work they had repaid, by December 31, 1942, nearly $338,000,000 of the approximately $712,000,000 of loans which have been made.

Mr. President, in the face of that record, I say that the evidence presented to the House committee, the evidence presented to the Byrd committee, and the evidence presented to the Appropriations Committee shrink into insignificance. It consists of a few flyspecks which have been gathered up out of the mistakes which must have been made in a program of such great magnitude, dealing with persons without sufficient farm management experience and, in many cases, without sufficient education.

I say that in relation to the constructive achievements which have been realized in making better American citizens, the evidence presented against the F. S. A. to the House committee, to the Senate committee, and to the Byrd committee should not be dignified by giving it attention. Ninety percent of it would not have been admitted in a police court anywhere in the United States. Ninety percent of it is of the most hearsay character of any alleged evidence I have ever heard or read.

The total repayments, including advance payments, amount to 91 percent of the maturities. Repayments, excluding advance payments, were 85.5 percent of maturities. Approximately 200,000 families have repaid their loans in full. Let that fact soak into the minds of Senators. Two hundred thousand families who, before the Farm Security Administration gave them assistance, were at the bottom of the rural agricultural ladder have repaid in full the loans which have been extended to them by that organization.

Mr. President, I say that such a record compares favorably with the loan record of any private insurance or other agency operating over a similar period of time with similar clients.

These borrowers are not only repaying well, but they are also recovering their position as self-reliant farmers. I say to my conservative friends in this body, on both sides of the aisle, that it is shocking to me to see them band together to tear down an agency which, upon the admitted facts, has been restoring the hope of equality of economic opportunity which made this country great, and which makes men believe in and willing to die for democracy.

If we wish to create in this country such a condition that radicalism will find fertile soil, just allow the tendency adverse to individual ownership of the land by the people, which has been progressing since the turn of the century, to proceed to its logical conclusion. Permit the industrialization and mechanization of agriculture to continue to its logical conclusion, and we shall pave the way for communism or fascism in this Nation. If we want to maintain the moral fiber of democracy while we are fighting abroad on the military fronts and on the seven seas of the world, do not strike down an agency which is enabling so many people to restore their belief that there is a measure of opportunity in this country for men and their families to rise above the level of squalor and poverty.

The Farm Security Administration has not only been doing the job of rehabilitating farmers in America, but it has been doing an amazing and outstanding job in increasing food production. A survey of the 1942 food-production records of 463,941 farmers shows that this group, which made up only 7.6 percent of all the farmers in the United States, supplied 36 percent of all the increased milk production; 27 percent of all the increased production of dried beans; 10 percent of all the additional chickens, eggs, and peanuts produced; 9 percent of the increased pork production; 7 percent of the increase in the production of beef and sugar beets; and 3 percent of the increased production of soybeans.

Shall we strike down an agency which has been enabling a relatively few farmers in the United States to contribute so greatly to the need for increased food for our armed forces, for the lend-lease requirements, and for the civilian population? I say that this great record is indisputable. The survey was made under the supervision of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics; and no Senator in his right mind will question the professional statistical character and standing of that Bureau of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. President, at this point I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table showing the total increases for a number of food products.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Increases in production of essential crop and livestock products between 1941 and 1942, by all farmers and by Farm Security Administration borrowers [1]

Product	All farmers		Farm Security Administration borrowers		Percent of net increase by all farmers contributed by Farm Security Administration borrowers
	Amount increase, 1941 to 1942	Percent increase	Amount increase, 1941 to 1942	Percent increase	
Milk (pounds)	3,914,000,000	3	1,419,000,000	20	36
Pork (pounds liveweight)	[2] 2,252,000,000	13	192,400,000	36	9
Eggs (dozen)	516,000,000	15	49,800,000	31	10
Beef (pounds liveweight)	[2] 1,767,000,000	11	124,300,000	38	7
Chickens (pounds liveweight)	[2] 366,365,000	14	37,100,000	36	10
Peanuts (pounds)	1,028,000,000	70	101,700,000	88	10
Soybeans (bushel)	104,000,000	98	3,360,000	106	3
Dry beans (pounds)	110,500,000	6	30,100,000	34	27
Sugar beets (tons)	1,616,000	16	113,000	24	7

Total number of all farmers	6,097,000
Number of actively supervised Farm Security Administration borrowers producing in 1942	463,941
Proportion of all farmers who were actively supervised Farm Security Administration borrowers (percent)	7.6

[1] Based on a survey, approved by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, of records of Farm Security Administration borrowers at the end of the 1942 crop year.
[2] Preliminary unpublished Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates of commercial slaughter plus home use. Chicken figures include commercial broilers.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the value of the Farm Security Administration has not been limited to the direct contribution which farm families are now making to the war effort. The F. S. A. borrowers not only are growing large quantities of scarce foods for America; they are not only repaying their loans well, but also are recovering their position as self-reliant farmers. They will bulwark the Nation for the years to come. By the end of 1941 the net worth of the average farm security rehabilitation borrower, the value of what he owned over what he owed, had risen 43 percent since the time they came under this program. The actual net worth of the families, which averaged $871 before they received F. S. A. help, had increased by 1941 to $1,242. Does anyone think that families which have gone through that experience are on the road to communism? No, they are on the road to Americanism.

I say that it is a blind and destructive conservatism which would strike down the achievements of an agency which is making a record of this kind—a record which cannot be successfully disputed. All that can be found against the F. S. A., after the expenditure of considerable sums of money, is the kind of tripe appearing in the record of the House committee, the Senate committee, and the Byrd committee. I stated before, and I repeat, that such evidence would not be admitted in a police court in a trial for stealing a chicken.

The net family income had increased an average of 80 percent, or from $480 to $865. The families had learned to grow and conserve more food for the family table. The $327 worth of home-used food produced in 1941 was almost exactly double the $163 worth which the family had been accustomed to using. Does anyone think that children brought up in such an improved dietary situation will make less desirable American citizens? Does anyone think that they will be less willing to die for American democracy on some far-flung battlefield?

I say that this is an activity of the Government of which every true American may well be proud. In my judgment, it is the kind of activity which must be encouraged and developed in this country. We must restore the measure of equality of economic opportunity which existed when we had a great public domain, which could be thrown open to exploitation and use, where individuals and their families could go and take up new land and acquire an economic stake in America. It is the closing of the door of economic opportunity by the exhaustion of the physical frontier and by the development of modern industry that threatens democracy in America. It is not foreign propaganda. Developments of an inexorable economic nature are taking place right here at home.

Of course there have been mistakes in this program. There is not a Senator who, if he had been appointed to administer it, would not have made mistakes. How are we going to help the people at the bottom of the rural economic ladder without sometimes making mistakes? The opponents of the Farm Security Administration ought to develop more than one case to embalm in the records of the Senate for 2 years in succession—the case of some poor fellow in Alabama who missed the boat.

Farm planning and sound credit have been accompanied by other types of aid. More than 117,000 farm families, or 615,000 persons in 1,071 counties of 39 States, through medical plans worked out with physicians, are receiving medical care at a cost which they can afford to pay. Does it make them Communists to give them some medical care, to stop some of the ravages of disease which has taken such a horrible toll in infant and maternal mortality in this group at the bottom of the rural economic ladder in America? I say no. A thousand times no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator on the amendment has expired.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will take time on the bill.

I say that we are helping to build better American citizens, who will have greater love for their country than they would have had if they had grown up suffering from rickets, or with teeth missing, or afflicted with some other disease caused by rural poverty.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield briefly.

Mr. BONE. I wonder what would happen to some of our institutions in America if by congressional action we should blot them out if they should make financial mistakes. I have been watching the newspapers lately, and they are all singing hymns of praise now for the holding companies in the utility field. Their admitted business operations would give a polecat convulsions. They have cost the people of the country billions of dollars. The whole crowd ought to have been in the penitentiary for their maladroit operations.

According to the theory advanced here, because the F. S. A. has made some mistakes, we should incontinently blot it out. On that theory we ought to destroy all the holding companies in the utility field, without a single exception. If we are to enthrone in America the philosophy that an institution which makes some financial blunders is to be blotted out, a novel theory will be established in American political practice. I am glad to see that we are tending in that direction. It will make everyone very careful from now on.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will say to the Senator from Washington that I think the amazement we should express in viewing this great constructive record should be that there have been so little loss and so few mistakes in comparison with the size of the program and the disadvantages of the people involved.

Complaint has been made that some rehabilitation borrowers have been given grants. Grants have been given only on the same basis as grants were given to other farmers. Should an individual who had borrowed a little money and who had a crop failure or sickness be denied relief because of that situation?

Criticism has also been made where borrowers have had hard luck, and were not able to make the grade in a particular year, but there was still hope for their being rehabilitated, and the F. S. A. issued additional notes to take up their delinquency and the interest due. This is a common practice of every commercial loan institution in the United States, and yet because it is done for a poor indigent farmer in America it has been denounced here as an uneconomic practice.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator referred to losses which had been sustained. The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia places the administration under the seed loan and production loan officials.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Well, I was wishing I had those figures, and I hope the Senator will put them in the RECORD, because I myself thought it would be fine to put them in now.

Mr. RUSSELL. This organization has done a good work.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I agree.

Mr. RUSSELL. But these are unsupervised loans. From 1918, when they were made, down to 1940, the repayments amounted to 64 percent as compared with an average of more than 86 percent by the Farm Security Administration.

In the years of 1938, 1939, and 1940, which were reasonably good crop years, the average for those years was 78.92 percent as compared with an average of more than 86 percent over a longer period by the Farm Security Administration, and 93 percent for last year, which shows that not a great deal would be gained by placing this in the seed-loan class. We must also bear in mind that those who borrow from the seed-loan fund have to give a chattel-mortgage on their personal property before they can obtain the money, whereas the other borrowers start from scratch.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly, and it has been suggested that the limit of $800 should be raised for these seed loans. I shall vote for it, but every Senator knows that no small farmer needs to borrow $800 for seed for 1 single year. Let us be frank about it, Mr. President. To adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia would be to kill the service which has been rendered to the farmers at the bottom of the rural economic ladder in America. It would deny them credit; and that is said without any criticism whatsoever of the Farm Credit Administration or the farm-production associations, or any other of the organizations mentioned in the Senator's amendment. They are not equipped, they are not in a position, to render the kind of service which has been rendered by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. President, voluntary debt adjustments have been made with the creditors of more than 107,000 farmers to enable them to carry on. That means that approximately 107,000 farm families have been saved from losing their farms as a result of the voluntary credit work done by this organization.

About 201,000 families are sharing the cost of farm machinery, sires, and other farm-improvement services. More than 17,000 of these services have been successfully undertaken with Farm Security Administration loans.

Mr. President, with all the criticism which can be made of F. S. A., with all the evidence, hearsay or otherwise, which has been dragged in against this organization, this magnificent record of constructive rehabilitation of great numbers of American farm families, and their restoration to self-respecting positions in our society, stand out like a mountain peak against a molehill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have already discussed the amendment offered by me, and I shall take only a few more minutes of the time of the Senate.

I wish to take sharp issue with the Senator from Wisconsin in his statement that the amendment offered by me would deny any aid to the low-income group of farmers. That, Mr. President, is simply not correct, because the emergency Crop and Feed Loan Division of the Farm Credit Administration has now made 1,491,655 loans to low-income-group farmers in this country, limited in this instance to $400. To say that the proposal made by the Senator from Virginia to transfer the Farm Security Administration to the Farm Credit Administration under the administration of the Crop and Feed Loan Division will deny all loans to the low-income group of farmers is simply not correct.

Mr. President, I wish only to refer to another statement which has been made, and that is with respect to the cost of the Farm Security Administration.

The Treasury records show that from April 8, 1935, to December 31, 1941, there had been loaned $576,000,000, in round figures, and grants amounting to $137,000,000 had been made, or a total of $714,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to state to the Senator that my information, which I am sure is correct, is that the Farm Security Administration did not come into being until September 1937; but the Senator is using the figures of 1935.

Mr. BYRD. I am using the figures of the rural rehabilitation program of the F. S. A. and its predecessor agency.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then that is a correct statement.

Mr. BYRD. The cost of their personnel, such as salaries, was $198,000,000, and so forth—an aggregate of $275,000,000.

Now, Mr. President, some reference has been made to the percentage of loans which are current. I merely wish again to invite the attention of the Senate to what I referred to this morning, namely, that Mr. Baldwin testified that when in many instances these borrowers became delinquent in their installments new notes were taken, and the loans would then be declared current. So I submit that the figures which have been given in percentages cannot have any real validity.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia proposes—as has been fully discussed—to transfer the Farm Security Administration to the Farm Credit Administration, and to operate it through the existing Crop and Feed Loan Division and the production credit associations.

It provides for an appropriation of $12,000,000, of which $8,000,000 shall be available to the Extension Service to provide such farm and home management assistance as it may be necessary to borrow. That $8,000,000 compares with $16,000,000 which I understand is available under the Farm Security appropriation proposed.

It is then proposed to make available $40,000,000 of loans. Let us recall that now perhaps there is not as great need for these new loans as there has been in the past and, while this is a reduction in the loans made available, yet under the conditions which now exist, if these loans are soundly administered, $40,000,000 will be sufficient, in my opinion.

I do not desire to take further time, as I know the Senator from Georgia is anxious to dispose of the pending proposal.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to claim the floor for a brief time, largely for the purpose of asking a question or two of the Senator from Georgia which I shall be glad to have him answer in my time, as to the general purport of the committee amendment. It may be that it will be retracing some ground which the Senator from Georgia has covered during my necessary temporary absence from the floor.

I have discussed this matter many times privately with the Senator from Georgia, and I say frankly, in asking the questions, that it has been my observation that the consensus of opinion in my own State, on the part of those who have had opportunity of observing the operations of the Farm Security Administration, is that nearly everyone is in favor of continuing and perpetuating the functions of that Administration, but that nearly everyone complains about the extravagance and waste in the Administration, and certain communistic tendencies in some sections of my State and in other sections of the United States, doubtless inherited from the Tugwellian administration of the predecessor agency.

I can best express the consensus of opinion I have had by reading a letter, very briefly, from the editor of the Missouri Farmer, the organ of the Missouri Farmers Association, the greatest farm agency in the State of Missouri, one of the greatest in the United States, and one of the greatest farm cooperatives in the United States, Mr. H. E. Kleinfelter, who is also the head of the legislative committee of the Missouri Farmers Association. He says:

> We knew that Farm Security Administration was involved in the bill, although we did not understand all the angles at this distance from Washington, nor was there time for us to investigate. We realized Farm Security Administration needed drastic pruning—it, too, is an overgrown bureaucracy—but we were in possession of no facts to pass judgment on it. Common sense tells one that less relief is needed during current times.
>
> Farm Security Administration, with all its faults, has helped many a poor devil who had been turned away by everybody else, and we are wondering if some means has been provided in the bill to continue this aid—aid to those who are now struggling up the economic ladder, and aid to those who will need it badly after the war ends?

Mr. President, in view of the fact that nearly everyone in the country is in favor of continuing the functions, the professed objectives, of the Farm Security Administration, continuing the good work they have done, as Mr. Kleinfelter says, of helping many a poor devil up the hill when he could not get relief anywhere else; also in view of the fact that nearly everyone in the whole United States is opposed to the waste and extravagance which have undoubtedly

been existent in the administration of this office, I should like to have the Senator from Georgia, even if he has already done so, in my time to explain what provisions of the Senate amendment make correction of the existing conditions in this agency, particularly what suggestion there may be for correcting the extravagant tendencies of Mr. Baldwin. The Senator knows I discussed this matter with him several times, and I think the Senator knows my position on it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I understand the Senator's position, and we are not far apart. We are in practical agreement as to our objective.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator that in our private discussions I thought we were in entire agreement, but when I read the amendment the Senator brought in from his committee, unless the Senator can make some further explanation of it, I am not at all certain we agree.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to say that there is no stronger friend of the Farm Security Administration than I have been, but I think there have been some people in the Farm Security Administration who have seized the rehabilitation program as an occasion for presenting their own views as to the organization of farmers and the manner in which farm labor should be handled.

As to migratory labor and the camps, last year the provision for the Farm Security Administration specifically authorized them to administer such camps in certain sections of the country. That is eliminated from the Senate committee amendment this year. There is nothing in the bill, no appropriation, authorizing the Farm Security to deal with the migratory labor problem. It is now being handled by an officer of the Army and Mr. Chester Davis, under the provisions of the special labor act, with which the Senator is familiar. That relates to one question at issue which was raised by the Senator's correspondent. It did not make any difference how earnest many of the Farm Security officials might have been to promulgate ideas out of harmony with those of the Senator or with my ideas, it is another matter when it comes to dealing with the ordinary farmer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not trying to insist on my views being followed by any governmental agency, but I do not wish to appropriate money for a governmental agency with which to propagandize its own views or to compel its own views in violation of the general practice and of existing law.

Mr. RUSSELL. That refers to one question raised by the Senator. The farm migratory labor and the camps and the handling of the labor have been entirely divorced from the Farm Security Administration by the pending bill and the preceding act.

The Senator referred to extravagance. The total funds carried for the current year, 1943, direct appropriations and reappropriations for administration and for grants, was $41,986,743. The Senate committee bill carries $29,607,573. This is a reduction of more than $12,000,000. I say that that is a very drastic reduction in the administrative expenses.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree that is a very substantial and very meritorious reduction. The only question in my mind is that the Senate committee apparently has made no restriction on the use of the money.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We have had many bills presented for this agency in the past, showing they have spent exorbitant sums in telephone charges and telegraph charges, in addition to the enormous use of the franking privilege. It seems to me all those matters are things which are fairly subject to congressional review and reduction.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator's committee has made a very excellent and a very drastic reduction in over-all administrative expenses, but, as I understand, it is still left to the discretion of the administrative agency, which at the time is Mr. Baldwin, as to how the money shall be expended.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of any item in the bill which is broken down into dollars and cents for communications and travel. Such appropriations are always in lump sums.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that, but it seems to me that in the case of this agency the appropriation could be broken down, and some restrictions should be put on the amount which can be squandered for telephone and telegraph bills, which I use only as an example.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator knows that when we cut an appropriation over 25 percent, there must be some reductions in expenses all along the line.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. It might be that in making the adjustment within the total appropriation allowed by Congress there was too much allocated for travel.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that has certainly been true in the past.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to point out that the committee amendment, so far as the activities of the Farm Security Administration are concerned, is much more restrictive than the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator from Georgia thinks he can convince me of that I shall be glad to have him attempt to do so in my time, and if he convinces me I shall vote for the committee amendment rather than for the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not more restrictive as to amount. Of course, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Virginia reduces the amount very drastically. What I am talking about is the operations.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me interrupt the Senator from Georgia to state my position, which is, that so far as I am concerned, I am willing to appropriate every penny that is needed to carry out the proper functions of this agency, but I wish the money to be expended on the performance of the functions, rather than being squandered in administrative expenses. I have been informed that over the period since the creation of this agency, that is the present agency and its predecessor agencies, nearly $1 has been spent for administrative expenses for every $2 either loaned or granted by the agency. Does the Senator know whether that is true?

Mr. RUSSELL. I know it is incorrect as to the F. S. A.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The figures which are furnished me—and I have them from several different sources—show that from April 8, 1935, to December 31, 1941, the Farm Security Administration and its predecessors have cost the Government by way of administrative expenses a total of $275,861,889.27, in order to make loans and grants totaling $714,092,031.52. That is not exactly in proportion of 1 to 2, but it is almost in that proportion. Does the Senator think there is any justification for such a proportion of administrative expense?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not think so at all. The one thing that I have thought to be unfair all the way through in connection with consideration of the Farm Security Administration—and heaven knows the Farm Security Administration has done enough that is subject to criticism, without bringing it in—is the fact that the doings of the predecessor to the Farm Security Administration, under Tugwell and others, have all been bundled up and tied in with the figures of the F. S. A. I do not think that is fair.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I take issue with the Senator from Georgia on that point, because it is the Tugwellian influence, if I may use that expression, in the Farm Security Administration, which is really a subject for debate here. As to many of the activities of the Farm Security Administration no one takes issue. It is the chimerical projects, and excessive use of the telephone and telegraph and other extravagances and waste of money, that are subject to criticism. That is the question which is at issue.

Mr. RUSSELL. There was a substantial reduction in travel expense and in communications expense last year. A very drastic reduction in those expenses for the next year will inevitably ensue because of the reduction of administrative expense of over 25 percent. The administrative expense of the Farm Security Administration will amount to 4.32 percent for the coming year, according to the Budget estimate. When we consider that these loans are made on a 3- to 5-year basis, and that supervision of them is in effect on the farms during the periods for which they are outstanding, I think that the percentage of expense is about as low as it can be, if there is to be assurance of collecting the money. What is lost sight of is that if $40,000,000 is made available this year for loans, and the administrative expenses are $15,000,000, or $12,000,000, as proposed in the Byrd amendment, then the administrative expenses will amount to over 25 percent of the loans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri on the amendment has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will take time on the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Since the loans are made over a 3- or 5-year period, certainly the administrative expense should not all be charged up to any one year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask the Senator from Georgia if it is not a fact that under the contemplated breakdown—I understand it is not in the bill for this year—that the travel expenses are estimated at $5,000,000, or approximately $5,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not have the figures before me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator from Georgia were to go by train to Atlanta—it may be very difficult to get a reservation on the train if he be merely a United States Senator—but if he were to get into a Pullman car, or even break into a dining car, he would find at least five or six Farm Security Agency employees sitting at the tables of the dining car comparing their notes.

It seems to me there has been an entirely exaggerated amount of administrative expense. I am not trying to be cheese-paring or nickel-pinching, or meticulous about the thing, but I still cannot see wherein the Senator from Georgia, with all respect to him and to the Appropriations Committee, has made any particular change in the administrative provisions of this measure, with the single exception of reducing the appropriation for administrative expenses, which I grant he has done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that is done. That is manifest. There is no other way that economy can be effected than by reducing the appropriation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I had hoped was that when the Senator was bringing in the legislative amendment, which this admittedly is, he might have included legislation to restrict some of these obnoxious administrative practices.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not had the experience the Senator from Missouri has had. I do not travel on trains a great deal, but I do not recall meeting Farm Security personnel on trains. They may have been on them, but they were not known as such to me. I do know that approximately 90 percent of the total travel expense allowed this year in the bill will be spent within the counties by the representatives who are servicing and supervising these loans. I do think, Mr. President, when we have an investment of so large an amount in loans we should not be too penurious with travel expenses of the men who are supervising the loans.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not desire to be too penurious, but the Senator from Georgia will be forced to admit that there has been outrageous extravagance in the administration of this agency. What I am troubled about is that there is nothing in the bill to curb the extravagance and the waste except a horizontal reduction in the appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know of any other way to bring about a reduction, and the Senator from Missouri does not know of any other way. If the Senator from Missouri does not regard a 25-per-cent reduction in the total over-all expense a curbing of extravagance, I do not know what it is.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If I were a member of the committee and believed as the Senator from Georgia, that the Appropriations Committee has now become a legislative committee, and had a right to legislate, I think I could frame legislation which would be effective with respect to the use of the appropriation which is now being made.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator can express an opinion as to his belief, but he should not express the opinion that I believe the Senate Appropriations Committee is a legislative committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I was simply basing my judgment on the Senator's conduct in debating the bill yesterday. I have no desire to delay action on the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. It so happens that a substantial majority of the committee agreed with me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They are apparently in favor of the Appropriations Committee being a legislative committee.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, Americans to whom farm problems were never very vital—factory workers, salesgirls, streetcar conductors, truck drivers, and housewives—today have an enormous stake in matters affecting agriculture. Citizens from every walk of life now realize that the future of our common cause—prosecution of the war to victory and an abundant peace—depends largely upon how much food we have for our soldiers, our fighting allies, and our people here at home. Food policy is a part of United Nations strategy; it must, therefore, be patterned to meet the needs of democratic people everywhere.

The farmer, although his living depends on production of food and fiber, cannot today be the special beneficiary of our agricultural policy. He makes no such claim, I am sure; like patriotic citizens everywhere, he has pledged his land, his labor, and, if necessary, his life to victory. He is an American, first; a farmer, second. He knows that his welfare and that of our whole people are identical.

The paid professionals who in the name of the American Farm Bureau Federation claim to speak in Washington for the farmer, too often put the farmer's profits before his patriotism. In doing so they do him insult and injustice, they sabotage his unselfish service, they weaken his country's fighting strength.

In the current attack on the Farm Security Administration—an attack directed chiefly from the offices of the American Farm Bureau Federation—we have an example of the professional Farm Bureau lobby doing business as usual. It is zealous in the interests of the big farm and big plantation operators it represents, the operators who see in the war an opportunity to push the small-scale farmer off the land—to make him a tenant or a day laborer, to absorb his land into their vast holdings. It is reckless of our need for all the food the people of this land can grow.

The Farm Bureau has not demanded dismemberment of the Farm Security Administration as a means of increasing the war food supply. That would be an absurd claim to make; I doubt that even the bitterest critic of the Farm Security Administration has ever suggested that abolition of F. S. A. would give us more to eat. No one, not even the Farm Bureau contends that our war effort would be in the slightest degree furthered by the withdrawal of this assistance to small farmers.

Some do contend, however, that whatever food increase could be secured from the small farmer through F. S. A. assistance would be small and too costly. That, of course, is very different from arguing that there would be greater food production without F. S. A.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, then, has placed itself in a very strange position for a farm lobby. It is telling the public, in effect, "You cannot afford to buy more food through the F. S. A. plan."

This question is exactly the kind, I think, which should be answered by the public at large, rather than by farm interests—particularly by vested farm interests, such as the Farm Bureau in most States represents.

I think the factory worker, the streetcar conductor, the truck driver, and the housewife should be heard on this question of how badly we want more food and how much we are willing to pay for it. They have, perhaps, a greater right to speak on this matter than do farmers themselves. Certainly their interest is more legitimate than that of a paid lobbyist whose job, as he interprets it, is to keep prices up—if necessary by keeping production down.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has reported that in the year ending March 15, the general cost of living rose 7.4 percent, and that in that same period food prices rose 15.9 percent. Those figures have been underlined for our attention by labor unrest. Within the last month there has been one major strike and a rash of lesser ones, all of them largely attributable to rising food costs and increasing food scarcities.

In my own State, potatoes, chickens, and meat have been largely unobtainable for long periods. Due mostly to scarcities of foods, prices have risen alarmingly in the past year in large urban areas like Pittsburgh. In that metropolitan area, for instance, the retail prices of all foods advanced 18.4 percent from April 1942 to April 1943. The average price per pound of butter rose from 43.1 cents to 55.6 cents during that period. In April of last year a Pittsburgh housewife could buy a leg of lamb at 31.2 cents a pound. In April of this year she had to pay an average price of 39.3 cents. Similarly, potatoes went from 42.7 cents for 15 pounds to 77.3 cents; oranges jumped an average of 12.9 cents a dozen; and the price of apples increased by one-half. Those figures are all from the Bureau of Labor Statistics—the most reliable source.

The current O. P. A. plans to reduce the cost of living will probably actually reduce average food costs by only about 3 percent. That will leave the cost of

living still far higher than a year ago; and we are told that, even with higher prices, there still will not be enough to go around, that the shortages are only beginning.

Assuming normal weather conditions—and in view of recent weather, such an assumption is too optimistic—total food production this year will be only about 4 or 5 percent more than last, according to the Department of Agriculture. Under normal conditions crop production will be about 9 percent less than last year, while livestock production will be about 10 percent higher.

From about the same total production as last year, we shall have to send to our Army and, by lend-lease, to our allies twice as much food as we did last year—25 percent of the total food supply, rather than 12 percent. There can be no thought of short measuring those who fight by our side so valiantly.

It is in this background that we must study the questions raised by the Farm Bureau: How much can we afford to pay for more food? How much can we afford to pay for the food increases that will keep our industrial workers hard at their jobs without interruptions? How much can we afford to pay for the food increases we must give our soldiers and fighting allies?

I do not know what the Farm Bureau's answers to those questions might be. I do know that our people in the cities want utmost abundance. I know, too, that the rank and file of farmers want to grow every pound of food they possibly can grow.

The recent figures from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics show that of the country's 6,000,000 farmers, about 2,000,000 are already operating at or near capacity. Their farms, which at present are contributing about 80 percent of our total marketed agricultural production, can make almost no increases in food output unless a shift from nonfood items such as cotton and tobacco to more nutritive crops is encouraged.

At the other end of the scale, about a million and a half of the 6,000,000 farmers can make little or no increases because they farm only seasonally or are handicapped by inadequate land and other resources.

That leaves a middle group of about two and a half million farmers, of whom the Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates that one and a half million can make substantial increases. They have enough labor and land to handle expanded operations, but they lack credit and, to some degree, skill. Apparently, higher farm prices will not solve their problem; at least they have not yet. From 1939 to 1942, prices which farmers received rose 70 percent, but total production rose only 18 percent.

We can easily see, by examining into the distribution of income among farm families, why it is that high prices do not enable the small farmer to expand his production.

Figures provided me by the Department of Agriculture show that if we divide the 6,000,000 farms into three income groupings, each of about 2,000,000 families, the average gross income of the upper group was $7,370 last year—an increase of 94 percent over 1939. This upper income group—about one-third of all farmers—had money left over at the end of the year to invest in expanded capacity. The lower-income third had an average income last year of $800—48 percent more than in 1939, but still far too little to do more than pay family living expenses and current operating costs.

It is the middle-income third with which the Farm Security Administration is largely working and it is in that group that most of the 1,500,000 small farmers whom the Bureau of Agricultural Economics says might greatly expand their output are to be found. The average gross income of those farmers last year was $1,640—53 percent higher than in 1939. If we want to know why that group is unable to buy the livestock, fertilizer, machinery, and other supplies necessary to be had in order to expand production, we must see where that gross income of $1,640 goes. The Department of Agriculture gives this break-down:

Three hundred and seventy-five dollars is not cash income at all; it is the value of products grown on the farm, but used at home.

Six hundred and forty-five dollars is required for current operating expenses. They include largely the cost of the things the farmer buys for business purposes.

Three hundred and ninety dollars goes for family living expenses—a very modest amount, I should say.

One hundred and sixty dollars is needed for payment on outstanding debts.

That leaves only $70 of the family's gross income—only $70 which can be devoted to increasing production next year. Seventy dollars is a good deal less than half enough to buy one first-class cow.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics, through its Chief, has said that nearly 1,500,000 of those small farmers are in about the same situation as were F. S. A. supervised borrowers before obtaining their loans, and that they could be expected to make about the same production increases as have the F. S. A. borrowers.

If that is the case, we might expect a very great benefit to our food situation from mobilizing those small farmers into the food production army. The Farm Security borrowers made increases last year at a much greater rate than did farmers in general. Here is a partial record of their increases, as shown in a recent F. S. A. program report:

> During 1942, Farm Security Administration borrowers, although comprising only 7.6 percent of all the farmers in the United States, accounted for 38 percent of the increase in milk, 17 percent of the increase in dry beans, 9 percent of the increase in eggs and chickens.
>
> In terms of the yearly food requirements of robust American men, the 1942 increased output by Farm Security Administration borrowers would supply eggs to feed nearly 3,000,000 men, milk to feed more than 2,500,000 men, pork to feed more than 1,500,000 men.

It is evident, then, that the one and one-half million under-employed small farmers can be assisted through the Farm Security Administration program to make very important contributions to our war food supply.

How much will it cost to secure those increases? F. S. A. experience with its 450,000 current borrowers provides the answer.

Although none of them were able to get credit from any other source, the F. S. A. borrowers have so far repaid on schedule 91 cents for every dollar loaned them. The F. S. A. has borrowed $326,950,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation since June 1940, and it has repaid to the R. F. C. all but $77,000,000; and that sum is secured by notes in the ratio of 5 to 1.

We must recognize, of course, that credit alone is not sufficient to secure full production from the smaller farms. The F. S. A. has been successful because it has afforded the farmer supervision and training along with loans. Probably the Agency's educational services have been as important as its credit. At any rate, the cost of giving the small farmers guidance and new skills has been somewhat less than $35,000,000 during the year.

I think, therefore, that we should be able to decide for ourselves—without any help from the Farm Bureau—whether the Nation can afford to buy food from small farmers. Indeed, we might ask ourselves this question: Now, in wartime, when our people at home are not getting all the food they want and when a hungry world is watching us, can we afford not to tap the enormous reserve capacity of our smaller farms?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hatch	Revercomb
Barbour	Hawkes	Russell
Bilbo	Hayden	Scrugham
Bone	Hill	Shipstead
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Buck	La Follette	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lucas	Tobey
Capper	McCarran	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Vandenberg
Chandler	McFarland	Van Nuys
Chavez	McKellar	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Walsh
Connally	Maybank	Wheeler
Danaher	Mead	Wherry
Davis	Millikin	Wiley
Eastland	Moore	Willis
Ellender	Murdock	Wilson
Ferguson	Murray	
George	Nye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia to the amendment of the committee. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCLELLAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, I am advised, if present would vote "nay." Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from California and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who would vote "yea," has a pair on this question with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] would vote "nay" if present. He has a pair on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who, I am advised, would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent. The Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "yea" if present. He is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—25

Bailey	Gerry	Taft
Barbour	Hawkes	Tobey
Bridges	Lodge	Vandenberg
Buck	McFarland	Walsh
Bushfield	Millikin	Wherry
Byrd	Moore	Willis
Clark, Mo.	Radcliffe	Wilson
Eastland	Revercomb	
Ferguson	Smith	

NAYS—53

Aiken	Gillette	Murdock
Andrews	Green	Murray
Austin	Guffey	Nye
Bell	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hayden	Overton
Bone	Hill	Pepper
Brewster	Holman	Russell
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Capper	La Follette	Shipstead
Caraway	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McCarran	Tunnell
Connally	McClellan	Van Nuys
Danaher	McKellar	Wallgren
Davis	McNary	Wheeler
Ellender	Maybank	Wiley
George	Mead	

NOT VOTING—18

Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Maloney	Truman
Clark, Idaho	Reed	Tydings
Downey	Reynolds	Wagner
Glass	Robertson	White

So Mr. BYRD's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the first branch of the committee amendment, beginning on page 89, line 15, and continuing to line 5 on page 93.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is a "yea" vote a vote in favor of the adoption of the second part of the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the first branch of the amendment, beginning on page 89, line 15, and continuing to line 5 on page 93.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCLELLAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, I am advised, if present, would vote "yea," and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from California and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who would vote "yea," is paired on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 12, as follows:

YEAS—66

Aiken	George	Nye
Andrews	Green	O'Daniel
Austin	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Gurney	Overton
Ball	Hatch	Pepper
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Bone	Holman	Russell
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Bridges	La Follette	Shipstead
Buck	Langer	Smith
Burton	Lodge	Stewart
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Wheeler
Davis	Murdock	Wiley
Ellender	Murray	Willis

NAYS—12

Barbour	Gerry	Taft
Byrd	Hawkes	Walsh
Eastland	McFarland	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	Wilson

NOT VOTING—18

Barkley	Glass	Robertson
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Kilgore	Truman
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Tydings
Downey	Reed	Wagner
Gillette	Reynolds	White

So the first branch of the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 93, after line 4, to insert:

FARM TENANCY

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act, $1,326,070.

Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006), $30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 percent per annum: *Provided*, That the amount which is available to any State or Territory for making loans under such title I shall be distributed by the Secretary, in accordance with rules prescribed by him, among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory, except that he shall not distribute to any such county or parish in excess of three times the amount which would be distributed to such county or parish were the entire amount available to the State or Territory distributed among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000–1006): *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 percent of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 95, after line 11, to strike out:

SEC. 2. No part of any appropriation contained in this act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau, office, agency, or service of the Department or any corporation, institution or association supervised thereby, who engages in, or directs or authorizes any other officer or employee of the Department or any such bureau, office, agency, service, corporation, institution, or association to engage in, the making of loans under the provisions of section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 (12 U. S. C. 1148), as amended, or the making of loans or advances in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in Food Production Financing Bulletins F–1 or F–2 of the Farm Credit Administration operating under the Food Production Administration, Production Loan Branch.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia to give an explanation as to why this section was stricken?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the pending amendment is found on page 95 of the bill. The section proposed to be stricken was a limitation imposed by the House, which would have the effect of eliminating and prohibiting any loans made by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.

This agency was established by an act of Congress which was passed in 1932. A great many loans were made by the agency in 1933 and 1934, particularly to farmers engaged in the production of cattle. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation then remained more or less dormant for a number of years. Some loans were made, notably in the Wenatchee Valley of Washington, the great apple-producing section, and those loans all turned out very successfully, so far as the evidence submitted to the committee showed. A number of other loans of types F–1 and F–2 were made to encourage the production of farm products.

There was a great deal of testimony before the committee as to the propriety of this organization using F–2 loans as an incentive for food production. They are in the nature of nonrecourse loans. They are made to persons who increase their acreage of certain war crops to a very marked degree, and the sole collateral for the loan is the crop which is produced.

Representations were made in behalf of those who were interested in having the work of the Regional Agricultural Corporation stopped altogether. Other farmers were most anxious that it be continued. Today I received a telegram from a group of farmers in the State of Florida, reading as follows:

Please use your influence to get the Senate to strike out section 2 of H. R. 2481 (agricultural appropriation bill) now before agricultural subcommittee of Senate Committee on Appropriations.

They were in error as to where the bill was, of course.

I continue reading from the telegram:

Said section abolishes the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. The credit available under this program is the only means the undersigned have of producing crops on 3,000 acres this year and 10,000 acres next year. Private capital, Federal Land Bank, Production Credit Association, cannot provide the necessary production funds. Greatly prefer this type of assistance to subsidies. We are all members of the Farm Bureau Federation and disagree with its program in this respect.

That telegram is signed by 20 or 25 men whom I do not have the pleasure of knowing personally, but it shows the type of representations made to the committee in regard to this matter.

Mr. President, the committee was not unanimous in its approval of the type of loans being made under the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation Act. Despite the insinuations, however, that have been made against the committee, and the charges which have openly been made that we were undertaking to legislate all over the face of the earth, we did not feel this was a matter which should be determined on an appropriation bill. It was new matter in the bill, not like the other legislative provisions we have offered, which have been in the act from year to year. It was new matter, and had the effect of repealing, by a limitation on appropriations, the favorable action of the standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House.

So without regard to the views of the committee on this policy, the feeling in the committee was this is a question which should be handled by the standing committee. I believe reference was made to the fact that the Senator from Nebraska had introduced a bill which was pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and on which hearings were about to be had.

The Appropriations Committee clearly showed, in its discussion of this question, that it was almost the unanimous opinion of the committee that all the many ramifications of the various lending agencies of the Federal Government dealing with the farmers should be coordinated and reorganized. We are not a standing committee, and we did not undertake to violate the rules of the Senate by bringing in a legislative proposal which would have reorganized all the credit agencies. To protect the rights of the standing committees of the Senate we struck out the House provision, which we looked upon as an infringement upon the prerogatives of the standing committee which had the bill under consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his explanation.

I should like to see section 2 reinstated in the bill as it came from the House. I think it is a wise provision. All it would do would be to provide a limitation on the use of the funds appropriated in the bill we are now asked to pass.

In effect, it would say to the Department of Agriculture, "You may use these funds only for the specific purposes provided in the bill." Section 2, as it came from the House, provides that the Department may not use those funds through the back door for any other agency for which there is no appropriation in the bill.

There are other limitations in the pending bill with respect to which no question has been raised. Turn to the bottom of page 3. In the provision for salaries and expenses for the Department of Agriculture there is a limitation on the appropriation.

Turn to page 66 of the bill, on which we took so much time day before yesterday. Beginning with line 16 and continuing through to the heading on page 67, "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," a limitation will be found which I think is more far-reaching than the limitation in the particular section now under discussion.

Turn to pages 70, 92, and 93. Further limitations will there be found in this bill by which we are asked to make appropriations of funds which shall be used for the purposes designated in the bill.

When we come to page 95, section 2, we are asked to delete that section because it is desired that the Regional

Agricultural Credit Corporation shall continue to function with the personnel of some of the other organizations for which we are appropriating in this bill.

Mr. President, I say that this is a wise provision. If the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation desires funds to administer the act, it should come to Congress and ask for an appropriation. That is its right and privilege. If it does not have the funds to administer the act, it should not take funds from any other agency. We should protect the Department of Agriculture.

We have been told by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that we are holding this budget down where it belongs. We have argued about expenses. He said the cut was made from $54,000,000 to $32,500,000 in one of the administrative provisions, I believe in connection with soil conservation. Then there was an argument on the floor, and a motion was made by the able Senator from Michigan, and we had a sort of auction, and agreed on $30,000,000, cutting two and a half million from the appropriation for the administration of the act. Yet, we turn around and let the Department of Agriculture finance the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation by taking funds out of that Department and by subterfuge setting up personnel without coming to Congress and asking for an appropriation.

Mr. President, I say that this is a wise provision. It has been said that some point was raised in the House of Representatives as to whether or not it was new legislation. It is not new legislation. There is not an appropriation asked for here.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say it was new legislation.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the distinguished Senator from Georgia to say in the latter part of his remarks that he felt that we should leave this to the legislative committees, that his was an appropriation committee, and that if the legislative committee wanted to take any legislative action, all right.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did make that statement, not on the ground that this is legislation, but that it had the effect of repealing legislation by a limitation on the appropriation.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the same thing indirectly.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not made the point of order against it. I know that a point of order would not lie. Of course, it is a limitation on an appropriation.

Mr. WHERRY. A point of order was raised in the House on the ground that this was new legislation.

Representative HOPE, of Kansas, wanted this section taken out of the bill, and on April 19, 1943, in a discussion of the matter on the floor of the House, he raised the point of order and made the following statement in support thereof. I want the Members of this body to note the ruling made by the Chair on this very point:

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the section just read on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like the gentleman to elaborate on his point of order and point out what part of the section is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HOPE. This section has for its apparent purpose a prohibition of further loans by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. There is no provision in this bill making an appropriation for this Corporation. So the limitation on its face is against officials of the Department of Agriculture who might exercise supervisory functions over it and its activities.

The regional agricultural credit corporations were created in 1932 under the Hoover administration. There were originally 12 corporations, 1 in each Federal land bank district. Later legislation was passed which authorized the consolidation of the regional agricultural credit corporations and the return of capital not needed to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to be held as a revolving fund subject to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

In the meantime, and on March 27, 1933, an Executive order was issued which transferred the jurisdiction and control of the regional agricultural credit corporations from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under whose jurisdiction they had originally been set up, to the Farm Credit Administration, and in that order the functions which were transferred were defined as follows:

"The functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its board of directors relating to the appointment of officers and agents to manage regional agricultural credit corporations formed under section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932; relating to the establishment of rules and regulations for such management and relating to the approval of loans and advances made by such corporations and of the terms and conditions thereof."

Under that Executive order and under the law it is the duty and the function of the Farm Credit Administration to make rules and regulations to supervise the operations of the regional agricultural credit corporations and to approve loans made by them. I think it is generally recognized under the rules of the House that any language purporting to be a limitation which either imposes new duties upon a Government agency or prohibits it from performing the duties which have been assigned to it is not a limitation but is legislation.

In this particular case the Farm Credit Administration is prohibited, or rather its officers are prohibited, under the legislation from directing or authorizing the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation to make loans and perform the other functions that are imposed upon it by law. That being the case, it is apparent that the officials of the Farm Credit Administration will be unable to carry out their duties in supervising the operations of the Corporation, in approving loans, and other duties which have been assigned to them.

It can very readily be determined that this is legislation, I think, by considering the interpretation which officials of the Farm Credit Administration will place upon our action if the section remains in the bill. Certainly they would understand it to mean that Congress no longer expected them to carry on the functions which under the law they are to exercise over the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. In other words, they will conclude that Congress had changed its policy and has forbidden them to do what heretofore under the law they have been authorized and directed to do. That, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, very clearly constitutes legislation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to submit to the Chair the very purpose of the limitation is to prevent the expression of a certain task, function, or duty. It may never achieve that result, as a matter of fact, in substance, but that is its primary purpose. So I submit this is a very good limitation and quite within the rules and does not constitute legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Kansas makes the point of order against section 2 which begins "No part of any appropriation contained in this act or authorized to be expended shall be used," and so forth.

It is the view of the Chair this section is clearly a limitation, and if there are no funds provided in this section the limitation will be ineffective. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. President, this is not new legislation, it does not directly legislate the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation out of the functions for which it was created. This is merely a limitation on the appropriation set up in the act, and if we are the guardians and custodians of public funds, we should see that no money is taken out of an appropriation for any of these departments and then by back-door methods meted out to some organization which does not come in and ask for the appropriation for its functions.

I say it is a wise provision, I say the provision in section 2 should be reinstated. It is the only proper way to legislate. Back-door methods are not in order, and they should not be employed here in the Senate. If the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation want funds, they know how to get them, they know how to administer the act, but for them to come in and take it away from the other departments on the theory we are giving those departments all the money they should have, simply means that they are allowed to borrow funds and personnel from the other departments and paying for the personnel out of these other appropriated funds.

We had Governor Black before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. He said the only reason why he wanted to put this in was the fact that he could go ahead and lend this money through the triple A chairmen and there would be no additional personnel, that it would not cost any money, that they would merely borrow. He was asked, "Then, if that be true, can they do without the personnel in the other departments?" He said they had plenty of time, they could use them in both departments.

What was his testimony as to that? I have here a transcript of the evidence taken before the joint committee, of which the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is the chairman, and the hearing was held on the resolution in which I asked that the R. A. C. C. be liquidated, that there no longer was an emergency, and that there was no need for it to function now. What was the testimony? I read now from the testimony of Governor Black:

Mr. BLACK. I do not know that one could name the most important. Manpower is of prime importance.

Senator WHERRY. Right on that question of manpower, let me ask you this: How could you make a greater saving on manpower than to combine all of your lending agencies into one and loan through that one lending agency, or to continue the production credit associations and the Farm Security Administration that are getting all the credit to the farmers which they need, rather than set up a new agency that will have a personnel that I imagine will be as great as either one of them?

Mr. BLACK. We are not using additional personnel, we are using existing personnel.

Senator WHERRY. What personnel are you using?

Mr. BLACK. We are using the personnel in the production credit associations, the national farm loan associations, certain numbers of Farm Security supervisors, in some cases Agricultural Adjustment Agency men.

* * * * *

Senator WHERRY. You mean that then the Agricultural Adjustment Agency will handle these loans?

Mr. BLACK. In some cases the Agricultural Adjustment Agency men. Ordinarily the man who has been handling the Commodity Credit loans would be the local representative.

Senator WHERRY. You would have to increase the personnel to make these loans, would you not, even in their own organization?

Mr. BLACK. No, sir .

Senator WHERRY. Will it not work out that way?

Mr. BLACK. I should not think so.

Senator WHERRY. If you want to loan $225,000,000, you can still do it on the set-up they have in my county?

Mr. BLACK. It is my understanding the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation is not planning to put on any personnel. They will reimburse the agencies for the service on a time-and-cost basis.

The CHAIRMAN. Reimburse other agencies on what kind of a basis?

Mr. BLACK. A time study and cost basis.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean you will borrow personnel from other agencies?

Mr. BLACK. Yes. They would be reimbursed by Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation for the time spent.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, will not the other agencies have to get new employees to take the place of the ones you borrow?

Mr. BLACK. It is not contemplated that they will.

The CHAIRMAN. They have too many now, then, haven't they?

Mr. BLACK. I do not know that, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If they came to your agency, the number of employees you would require, either they have had too many or they have got to get other employees to replace those that they loan to you.

Mr. BLACK. There is always a certain amount of additional work that can be taken on in any agency.

The CHAIRMAN. How many do you expect to borrow from other agencies?

Mr. BLACK Well, the services necessary for servicing these loans would require the services of one man in each county. * * *

The CHAIRMAN. There are 3,000 counties.

Mr. BLACK. Approximately.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you consider then that there would be 3,000 employees that you would need?

Mr. BLACK. Well, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation will not have any direct employees.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not my question.

You said you are borrowing these men and you are paying the other agencies for them.

Mr. BLACK. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. As far as the Government is concerned, they are just as much employees as if you paid them as your employees directly.

Mr. BLACK. That is correct. * * *

Yes; and there are 3,000 chairmen in the different counties and in addition to the 3,000 chairmen there would be the stenographic help that would necessarily have to be set up under the R. A. C. C.

So there are not only the 3,000 chairmen being paid for out of the funds which are appropriated in this bill, but, in addition, there will be the clerical help they will have to borrow and pay for, getting it from some other department, if they are to maintain and service the loans which they expect to make under the R. A. C. C.

This is a protective measure. If they have more personnel in the department than they need, we should not appropriate for unnecessary employees. If they have too many in the department, this is a good place to begin to cut the appropriations, rather than raise them at every turn of the road.

It is contended that the R. A. C. C. cannot function unless they get the personnel from the Department of Agriculture. I do not think that is true. That is the opinion of Governor Black, but Governor Black contradicted himself so many times when he was put on the stand that it is hard to tell exactly what Governor Black did think back in March, before he had time, apparently, to come before the committee and review and revise his testimony.

If Senators read the original act, in the back of the Byrd report—and it can be secured right here in the Senate Chamber—they will find in the original act provision that the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation be set up under the R. F. C., it is responsible to the R. F. C. and the R. F. C. has granted it, under this act, the authority to appoint its supervisors, and those supervisors can do anything provided in the act. Then the act provides:

All expenses incurred in connection with the operation of the Corporation shall be supervised and paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under such rules and regulations as its Board of Directors may prescribe.

In other words, under the original act the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation can continue to function, under its own provisions, without borrowing personnel from different departments. That takes care of the situation in Washington where the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, which was an emergency organization set-up, can continue to make loans out of the funds it already has, supervised by the Farm Credit under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It does not have to make any accounting to the Secretary of Agriculture. That is provided in the act itself. That was the holding when they said this was not new legislation, that this was simply a limitation on the appropriations in this act.

What is the R. A. C. C.? The original set-up made it a relief organization, the old barnyard-loan organization. I was one who helped to put it over out in Nebraska. Incidentally, I was one of the first directors of the F. S. A. in my county, and I helped to organize the first production-credit corporation in the district. I have had practical experience with these organizations. I did not learn about them from a book. I know what their purposes are. I know what they were created for, and I know what they have been doing in the different communities in my own State.

The R. A. C. C. did a wonderful piece of work. It was organized to help in drought conditions. It was organized to help men get money in an emergency, when they could not get it from private sources, when there were no private banks to which to go; and it did a good job. During all that time it succeeded well. It was managed by credit men of experience, men who knew how to make a loan, and they made the loans, and did a good job.

I should be perfectly willing to keep that organization intact, as it is intact, and make these emergency loans as they are being made in Washington. Whenever there was an emergency, I would be perfectly willing to let them do it. But the R. A. C. C. became dormant in 1934. There came many other credit agencies after 1934, after the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation had served its purpose. Then came the Credit Production Corporation, then came the Federal Farm Security Act, and there are organizations that served their States and took over the functions of the R. A. C. C. The R. A. C. C. is unnecessary except as an emergency organization, and the department should only use it in that way.

What were the conclusions of the Byrd committee as to the R. A. C. C. being revamped to serve the purpose for which Governor Black said it would be used?

What is the first conclusion the Byrd committee reached?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall take 15 minutes on the bill.

1. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program was created during the emergency of 1932 and 1933 in order to extend credit to farmers in the midst of a national drought. This particular credit emergency no longer exists.

That is the first conclusion the committee reached after all the testimony which had been taken, and the transcript of that testimony will fill a volume of tremendous size. The committee heard from farmers all over the United States. It heard from bankers over the United States. It heard from the departmental heads in Washington. Some of the testimony given before the committee I expect to place in the RECORD.

The committee said there is no emergency existing; therefore it is unnecessary to set up another bureau here in Washington. It is unnecessary at this time to bring in another agency and man it with 6,000 persons.

From the testimony let us see how badly we need this organization for food. I am not acquainted with a man named Mr. O'Neal. He did not testify before the Byrd committee, but he did testify before the Senate Appropriations Committee. On page 735, at the top of the page, will be found what Mr. O'Neal said with respect to the R. A. C. C.:

Mr. O'NEAL. In the early days, we thought there might be an occasion, as Senator BANK-

HEAD brought out, where you use that type of loan. But now we feel this way about it: We don't want to reestablish or revive an agency that will jeopardize the sound financing of agriculture. We don't want that. In other words, if that is used rightly, on a sound basis, it can do a lot of good, as it has done in emergencies.

Those are the words of Mr. O'Neal.

What does Mr. Patton say about the matter? On page 888 will be found testimony by Mr. Talbott. He was being examined by members of this committee. Mr. Talbott quoted what Mr. Patton said. I am not acquainted with Mr. Patton, but this is what Mr. Patton said:

As Mr. Patton stated, we urge expansion of the Farm Security Administration, and we should like to have complete war crop insurance. I believe there is already a bill up here on the Hill, before some other committee, to get a type of war crop insurance where the Government takes all of the natural risks. If we could get those two aids, we would not be particularly concerned about nonrecourse loans or Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.

The provision with respect to the Farm Security Administration has been kept in the bill, and appropriation has been made for it. Since that has been done, we do not need R. A. C. C., according to Mr. Patton.

What does Mr. Goss, of the Grange, say? I read from page 899 of the same hearings:

Generally speaking, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation should be continued in liquidation because cooperative credit and private credit are now available to supply most of the needs for which they were originally created. We would favor continuing a regional credit corporation fund for meeting emergencies, but we wish to point out that under the existing acts, the corporations are given the broadest possible powers of lending, the sole restriction being that the loans be made for agricultural purposes. Even the expenses of operation are paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

That, Mr. President, ought to dispel any fear in the mind of the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] that the R. A. C. C. could be maintained regardless of whether section 2 is put back in the act or not. The testimony of Mr. Goss is that the expenses of that Corporation are being paid, when making these emergency loans, by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Mr. Goss continues:

They were set up simply as emergency agencies, and the emergency for which they were created has passed.

Here we have the testimony of the heads of three farm organizations, and they go on record as saying that the emergency has passed, and that we do not need R. A. C. C.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I have only 15 minutes. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator when I am through. I hope the Senator will not consider me to be discourteous, but I wish to finish my statement if I may.

I now read conclusion No. 2 of the Byrd committee:

The revival of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan program duplicates wholly, or partially, the lending activities of 19 other Federal agricultural lending agencies performing identically similar or related functions.

I wish Senators would bear this in mind. When passing appropriation measures for any one of these organizations please bear in mind that many others are duplicating the work of the particular agency for which appropriation is made. I wish to read the list of agricultural lending agencies which are performing identically similar or related functions. How many Senators know how many there are? There are 20 of them. They are as follows: The Central Bank for Cooperatives, Commodity Credit Corporation, Disaster Loan Corporation, District Banks for Cooperatives, Electric Home and Farm Authority, Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Section, Farm Credit Administration, Farm Security Administration, Federal credit unions, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, Federal intermediate credit banks, Federal land banks, Land Bank Commissioner loans; national farm-loan associations, production credit associations, production credit corporations, Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, regional agricultural credit corporations, and Rural Electrification Administration.

So, Mr. President, we have 20 organizations lending money to farmers on short- and long-time credit loans. I say that if nothing more comes out of today's discussion than this, that we enact legislation whereby we can streamline all these agencies into one and cut out the administrative costs of 19 of them and have one Government agency under one administration, with one set of personnel, take care of these loans, then the afternoon will have been well spent. But with the thousands of personnel these 20 organizations already have, to attempt to set up another organization and provide 6,000 persons for it is a waste of money. It is time to consider the matter of waste of money rather than the spending of money like drunken sailors, as has been done in connection with some of the appropriations which have been made.

Mr. President, what does the head of the Federal Reserve System say about this matter? I wish to read a letter from Mr. Eccles. I wish to thank the gracious Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] for sending me a copy of this letter. It is as follows:

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: This is in reply to your letter of March 31 in which you ask for an opinion as to the merits of S. 914, which provides for the dissolution of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.

That is a bill I introduced to terminate the R. A. C. C. Hearings were held on it before the Byrd committee, as I said, in February of this year. The bill provides for the dissolution of the Rural Agricultural Credit Corporation.

I continue to read from the letter:

I favor this bill because I believe that such agricultural production for war as is not now adequately financed through regular banking channels or through the production credit associations can best be provided for by insurance of war crops.

Remember, Senators, this is Mr. Eccles writing to the Senator from New York.

I favor enactment of H. R. 2029, which has the endorsement of the Secretary of Agriculture, or of some similar measure, authorizing the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to insure such war crops as the Secretary may designate. This will enable—

And, Members of the Senate, notice this particularly please—

This will enable private credit to flow directly from the banks to the insured borrowers and will avoid the difficulties, particularly the competition, which result from direct Government lending when there is, as now, an abundance of credit available to the private banking system.

I wish to say to the Senate that this very day there is in the banks of the United States of America $88,000,000,000, nearly four times as much money as was in the banks in 1932, when the R. A. C. C. set-up was initiated.

Private lending agencies are looking for loans. They will take loans wherever they can find them. Mr. Eccles says in his letter that if we can provide for a credit-risk insurance arrangement extending down through the private direct-lending agencies—an arrangement such as those we have provided for under the Home Owners' Loan Corporation or under the insurance risk arrangements, we shall be able to utilize the private lending agencies of the country to do the very thing for which 6,000 persons, I think, will be required in order to finance and administer the R. A. C. C.; and that will eliminate the competition with the private lending agencies.

I read further from Mr. Eccles' letter:

As a matter of general principle, I am for Government measures which have the effect of facilitating the flow of private credit into production, whether in the field of agriculture or other necessary private business activity, and against measures that tend to supplant or compete unnecessarily with private enterprise. To the extent that the need may exist for Government aid to stimulate additional agricultural production, I am satisfied that this general principle and the war effort itself will be best served by reliance either upon insurance of war crops or upon some similar form of guaranteeing the producer against loss rather than upon establishment of competitive Government lending agencies in a field already well served by the numerous banks in the agricultural regions throughout the Nation, as well as by the production credit associations.

The foregoing expresses the opinion of the Board of Governors as well as my own.

Sincerely yours,
M. S. ECCLES, *Chairman.*

What more authority does the Senate want than that word coming directly from the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System? The heads of the Federal Reserve System desire to do the very thing I advocate. Yet, under the provisions of the bill, if we strike out section 2, we let the Secretary of Agriculture bring out a new agency to expand the loans to $250,000,000, and they will be

able to pyramid that amount to $500,000,000. Then the agency will be established, and will come back to Congress and request a larger appropriation; and we shall have a new bureau to finance. In my experience in the 5½ months I have served as a Member of the Senate I have found that it is very difficult to eliminate a bureau once it is established. The time to eliminate the bureau is before it commences operations and we now have a wonderful opportunity to perform that major operation.

Let me tell the Senate that I have received letter after letter from Production Credit Administration members and from F. S. A. members stating that they can lend the money just as profitably or even more profitably than can the R. A. C. C. Yet Mr. Black says they do not have the authority. In 5 minutes he could get all the authority he wanted. I think he has just as much authority to loan through these agencies as he has to take money from the Department of Agriculture and use it for the R. A. C. C. Where does he get his authority to do that? What right does he have to take the money? He has no more right to do that than he has to loan the money through any other agency. If he has a right to loan it through one agency he has an equal right to loan it through another agency.

What was the further finding of the committee? I read conclusion 3 of the Byrd committee's findings:

3. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation's loan program, by soliciting credit where the field is drastically limited, is depriving private lending institutions and country banks of their normal loan business.

That is their finding after considering all the evidence.

Their next finding is as follows:

4. The Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation's loan program may weaken the structure of over 11,000 country banks, which are carrying a great burden of the food-for-freedom program, and the direction of and collections from War bond sales in their respective communities throughout the United States.

That is the impartial opinion of the committee. On the committee sat the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] was the only one who sat through those hearings and who did not join in the report. That is their opinion, that is their finding, that is their judgment. I say such report should be seriously considered and followed by the Senate of the United States.

Oh, yes; I will probably be accused of carrying a portfolio for the private banks of the country; but let me say my word. This country was built upon private enterprise—the corner grocery store, the farmer and the merchant who went out and pioneered this country. They are the ones who built this great Nation. All of them obtained their finances from the country bankers. They are the people who developed this great Republic of ours; they are the people who developed our great enterprises and institutions—the great American way of life for which we are fighting, and which we must continue. However, if we continue to socialize the credit of this country we shall have communism and we shall lose the very things our boys are fighting for. That will certainly come to pass, just as the senior Senator from Wisconsin said a few minutes ago.

I will fight to the last ditch for private enterprise. I will do all I can to eliminate governmental subsidized competition with private enterprise. I will oppose the establishment of unnecessary bureaus every time I get an opportunity to do so. I will do my part to see that the R. A. C. C. is not established. We do not need it. It is just another unnecessary agency with an added 6,000 personnel which could better be used in the war effort.

Some Senators are smiling. They may not smile 2 years from now. I say to the Senate that I have been out in the country, and I know what conditions are and what the people are thinking. I come from the sticks. I come from the country, and I know what the people there are thinking. Some one of these days Senators are going to wake up and find that we are spending $200,000,000 a day. Some of these days they are going to find that they have mortgaged more than the assessed value of the country. Some one of these days they are going to find that they cannot even start to pay the principal of the indebtedness and that they will not be able to pay even the interest on the great debt that has been created. I am fighting to preserve the financial stability of the United States of America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am not speaking on the bill now. I should like to inquire whether it is the purpose to continue longer today. It is already 7 o'clock.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, when the Senate first convened this morning the distinguished minority leader expressed the hope that the Senate might pass the bill today; and the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, the junior Senator from Georgia, stated that he would do everything he could to have the bill passed today, and gave notice to the Senate that he would hope to have the Senate continue in session until consideration of the bill had been concluded.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that. I also understand that there is a limitation on debate; and there is no reason to keep the Senate in session very long tonight. I desire to be heard on this amendment. If the committee insists on keeping the amendment in the bill—an amendment which has absolutely no excuse whatsoever for being in the bill—I am going to be heard as long as I can be; and there will be other motions coming on tonight—for instance, a motion to suspend the rule; and I do not understand that there is any limitation of debate on such a motion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is not.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that two motions to suspend the rule are in prospect. We shall not be able to finish at any early hour tonight. I am at a loss to know why the Committee on Appropriations struck out the amendment if only the R. A. C. C. is involved. I desire to be heard on that matter; because it is one action on the part of the committee for which there cannot possibly be any justification.

I now make an appeal that the Senate recess until tomorrow morning. It will be perfectly agreeable to me to have the Senate recess until 10 o'clock or 11 o'clock tomorrow. Certainly, we can finish consideration of the bill tomorrow if we recess now until the morning.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I join in the request of the Senator from Georgia. Frankly, I would have objected to the unanimous-consent request if I had been in the Chamber at the time when it was submitted. I desire to be heard for at least half an hour on the question of the school-lunch program, and my remarks would naturally require some debate by other Members of the Senate. It seems to me there is no such rush that we should be required to remain in session until midnight tonight.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree entirely with what the Senator from Georgia has said. The Senate has worked very diligently on the bill. If it had been possible to conclude its consideration tonight, it would be perfectly satisfactory to have the Senate do so; but the Senator from Alabama has given notice of a very important motion to suspend the rule. To his motion the agreement for limitation of debate does not apply, in my opinion; and I listened to the agreement very carefully when it was proposed.

I desire to give notice now that if the Senate is to remain in session tonight until the bill is passed, if that motion is made, the bill will be passed, very, very late tonight.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to have expression made on the matter by the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let me say that I am not at all impressed by the threats that we shall have debate; because I should not want to limit the opportunity of any Member of the Senate to debate the provisions of the bill. I have no disposition whatever to keep the Senate in session until an unduly late hour. However, the suggestion that the bill be passed today came from the distinguished leader of the minority, and was heartily concurred in by the acting majority leader, and I wholly approved of it.

The pending bill comes to us very late this year, as I have stated a number of times. We shall have to work day and night in conference in order to canvass all the items with the House. I do not know that at the very best we shall be able to place the bill in the hands of the President by the end of the present fiscal year. I do not want to be put in the position of making any threats or of

attempting to prevent the making of speeches. I enjoy hearing my colleagues speak. However, if the minority leader and the acting majority leader wish to have the Senate recess until tomorrow I have no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, what would the Senator think about a suggestion that the Senate take a recess now until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. RUSSELL. If we are to recess now I think we should meet in the morning. I should like to know the views of the minority leader.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I must defer, out of practice and courtesy, to the attitude of the Senator in charge of the bill. This morning I expressed the very strong hope that we could stay here and finish consideration of the bill tonight. There are 118 amendments involved. The bill must be approved by the 30th of June. I am anxious, as I think we all are, to get through with the appropriation bills, because we may be able to work out a summer recess. I think most of the Members of the Senate are willing to stay in session longer today; I think we should do so. At least I think we should dispose of this amendment. That is my view. However, I shall yield to the view of the Senator in charge of the bill. I have briefly expressed my view. I think the Senator in charge of the bill should decide for himself what he wishes to do.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, of course I will subordinate my judgment in the matter to the views of the Senator in charge of the bill. I think this ought to be said, however: Frankly, from conversations which I have had with certain Members, and an expression of views, I doubt whether we could make any progress tonight, in view of the feeling of a great many Members. It being very doubtful whether we could make any progress tonight, I am inclined to think—although, as I say, I subordinate my views to those of the Senator in charge of the bill—that we might as well take a recess now until 11 o'clock tomorrow. I shall be guided by the views of the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Who has the floor? Has the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] yielded the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Nebraska expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I claim the floor in my own right for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Buck	Danaher
Austin	Burton	Davis
Bailey	Bushfield	Eastland
Ball	Byrd	Ellender
Bankhead	Capper	Ferguson
Barbour	Caraway	George
Bilbo	Chandler	Gerry
Bone	Chavez	Gillette
Brewster	Clark, Mo.	Green
Bridges	Connally	Guffey
Gurney	Mead	Stewart
Hatch	Millikin	Taft
Hawkes	Moore	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Murdock	Thomas, Utah
Hill	Murray	Tobey
Holman	Nye	Tunnell
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
La Follette	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Langer	Overton	Wallgren
Lodge	Pepper	Walsh
Lucas	Radcliffe	Wheeler
McCarran	Revercomb	Wherry
McClellan	Reynolds	Wiley
McFarland	Russell	Willis
McKellar	Scrugham	Wilson
McNary	Shipstead	
Maybank	Smith	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BILBO in the chair). Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. McNARY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 62, as follows:

YEAS—14

Bailey	Connally	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Ellender	Scrugham
Bone	George	Smith
Byrd	Gerry	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	O'Daniel	

NAYS—62

Aiken	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hawkes	Overton
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Barbour	Holman	Reynolds
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bridges	La Follette	Shipstead
Buck	Langer	Stewart
Burton	Lodge	Taft
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tobey
Chandler	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McNary	Vandenberg
Danaher	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Mead	Wallgren
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ferguson	Moore	Wherry
Green	Murdock	Wiley
Guffey	Murray	Wilson
Gurney	Nye	

NOT VOTING—20

Andrews	Butler	Gillette
Barkley	Clark, Idaho	Glass
Brooks	Downey	Johnson, Calif.
Kilgore	Robertson	Wagner
McClellan	Thomas, Idaho	White
Maloney	Truman	Willis
Reed	Tydings	

So the Senate refused to take a recess.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hatch	Revercomb
Barbour	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Scrugham
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Stewart
Burton	Langer	Taft
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Tobey
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wallgren
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Danaher	Mead	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	Wherry
Eastland	Moore	Wiley
Ellender	Murdock	Willis
Ferguson	Murray	Wilson
George	Nye	
Gerry	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. HILL, and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It is my frank opinion that the mood of the Senate at this time is such that it is not best to try to legislate. I think the wisest thing to do would be to recess until tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock. I am confident that we may finish the pending bill if we now recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for the purpose of making a motion?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. BONE addressed the Chair.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington for a question.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I do not know who has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has the

floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MAYBANK. I have yielded to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, allow me to assure the Senator from South Carolina that I want the floor in my own right, and that I wish to say something about the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has yielded. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have yielded to the Senator from Washington for a question.

Mr. BONE. I do not desire to quiz my brother.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator from Washington advise me why he wishes me to yield?

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I wish to obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield the floor to the Senator from Washington. [Laughter.]

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I am happy to observe that all has suddenly become sweetness and light, and I hope I shall pierce the gloom surrounding my colleagues like a gleam of celestial sunshine in what I am about to say.

Mr. President, I was mightily moved by the observations of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I tried in my own way to follow him, because I am an earnest seeker after the truth, and I would not have missed any of the gems of wisdom from the Senator from Nebraska.

I was more than interested in the statement of the Senator about rugged individualism, and I recall—and if I am in error I hope some Senator will correct me—that the R. A. C. C. provision was enacted in 1932, in the era of rugged individualism. It had become so rugged that it was kicking the tail feathers off the very businessmen for whom the Senator from Nebraska now speaks, and they were going broke in my section of the country at a rate which was astounding, to say the least. It was the end of the era of rugged individualism which the Senator so stanchly defends here this afternoon, and if any of the rugged individualism had continued very much longer, there would not have been even a capitalist system left in the United States.

The law was put on the statute books, not by new dealers, but by the Hoover administration, which makes it very interesting to find a good, stanch Republican assailing it today as something which might lead to something very bad, perhaps to communism.

It so happens that the R. A. C. C. today, and for some years past, has only been operating in a couple of sections of the country, around Minneapolis, and in my own State in what is known as the Wenatchee section, which is one of the great apple-growing sections of the United States.

Mr. TOBEY. It is only second to the southern section of New Hampshire, if I am correct.

Mr. BONE. I should be heartbroken if New Hampshire got into the picture as an apple-producing State. I know it has produced many fine things, but I did not know it was much of an apple-producing State.

Mr. President, in the gloomy days of the depression the bankers the Senator from Nebraska talks about let the apple producers in my State down with a dull thud, and in 1938, in one of the greatest crises that has ever stricken any section of the country, those apple growers were going to hell in a hand basket financially, and losing their homes, and when the bankers would not come to their help, I, with my colleague in the Senate and my friends in the House, utilized every agency of this Government to keep them alive, and today they are barely prosperous, but they still need the assistance which the R. A. C. C. has given them.

The Senator from Nebraska has conjured up a Frankenstein monster, some great gargantuan thing to affright us, but he has made a mountain out of a mole hill. Last year R. A. C. C. loaned the apple growers of Washington—and they are the salt of the earth—$8,000,000, and it has all been paid back. What is wrong with that program? In God's name, what is wrong with it?

The Senator says there is no crisis. In the name of all that is reasonable, what are we facing today? No nation in all the endless cycles of time ever faced anything half so grave as this crisis, and all Senators know it.

What do you call this kind of a war, which shakes the very foundations of western civilization? Do you not call it a crisis? Yet the Senator wants to bury or cremate this law, drive it off the statute books, put it out of business, although as I understand from his statement, he implies that it will not put the R. A. C. C. out of business. The provision is:

> That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the compensation of anybody engaged in making loans.

What would be the effect of that provision? I do not think there is a lawyer in this body with nerve enough to rise and say that it would not effect the death of the thing. If the advice of my friend from Nebraska is followed, we decree the death of R. A. C. C., and make no mistake about it. Let us be frank about it. It would simply blot it out. He quoted my friend Bert Goss, of the Grange. I understand the Senator from Nebraska is not a lawyer.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am a lawyer, and I say that the adoption of section 2 would have nothing to do with whether or not R. A. C. C. would continue to function.

Mr. BONE. I listened to the Senator very intently, and tried to follow him, and I do not find myself in agreement with him.

He quoted Mr. Albert Goss, of the Grange. I suggest that he did what lawyers frequently do—that is, quote a part of the testimony. Mr. Goss was asked whether it would not be better to abolish R. A. C. C., and to that question he answered:

> We doubt if this is the most constructive solution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BONE. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator from Washington, because I know his time is limited, but let me state the situation. The R. A. C. C. matter came before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. I looked into it, and I shall take occasion later to say why I looked into it with care. This provision does not abolish the R. A. C. C., it is still in existence, and it can be revived whenever there is any necessity for it.

Mr. BONE. I understand that the provision does not abolish it, just by blotting it out, but it says that no part of the appropriation in this bill can be used to pay anybody connected with making loans under it.

Mr. GEORGE. Why should it be?

Mr. BONE. Somebody has to process these loans.

Mr. GEORGE. Has not the R. A. C. C. money?

Mr. BONE. Yes; but it has to hire someone to do the work in making the loans.

Mr. GEORGE. That is just the point, they have not the gall to hire 3,000 or 5,000 men at a time when there is no emergency and no occasion to use the R. A. C. C. That is all there is to it. They want to borrow the personnel from other agencies of the Government. I am assuring the Senator of that now, because there is no one trying to abolish it. It will not be abolished. It can still be revived whenever there is an occasion for it to make any loans. In my opinion an appropriation of money to pay people to do something cannot be justified where those who have the funds in hand are not willing to face the criticism of the country and pay the money out of their own funds.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, much as I admire my able colleague from Georgia, I cannot bring myself to agree with his conclusion that there is no great emergency, no crisis. I perhaps go as far as any Member of the Senate in believing that this country faces a supreme crisis in the production of food, and anything we can do today to stimulate the production of food—and certainly the R. A. C. C. has achieved it in my State—is something well worth doing.

I wish to go back for an instant, because I mentioned the matter only in passing. In the year 1938 the banking groups in my State were not making loans to the apple farmers—and the apple business is a vitally important business in my State—but were very bitter and very critical of the Federal Government for stepping into the picture and extending credit to the farmers in the apple business. So a warm friend of mine who was present at a certain meeting said, "The bankers do not like this program of Federal credit." Then he said, "I will have my friend HOMER BONE wire the Government in Washington and ask the Federal Government to step out of this credit picture and turn over the whole function of lending to these farmers to private banking interests, and I will send that telegram to-

night, put it right on the wires and send it to Washington." When he put that up, cold turkey, what do you think the bankers out there did? They did precisely as my colleagues suspect; they said, "Oh, no; let the Government continue this loaning activity."

Mr. President, the apple growers are getting into better shape. They are creating a credit of their own which will soon amount to one-half million dollars.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BONE. I do not have very much time.

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall take but a moment.

Mr. BONE. Very well.

Mr. EASTLAND. I wish the RECORD to show that there was no yea-and-nay vote had on the committee amendment providing for the purchase of land for farm tenants, which appears on page 93 of the bill, beginning in line 6. I wish the RECORD to show that I voted for the appropriation for the purchase of farm lands by worthy individual tenants to make them home owners, as provided in the bill, with the safeguards against collectivism as provided therein.

Mr. BONE. Let me say this, Mr. President, and I say it because I am attempting on this floor to defend some very decent people, because I do not want to see them crucified even to satisfy the tempestuous feelings of my friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that a group of farmers who will borrow $8,000,000 and pay it back al ost within a year are a darned good credit risk. That certainly does not represent communism.

When my friend the Senator from Nebraska read off the list of Government agencies I did not know whether he was starting to read a list of the members of the New York Stock Exchange or not. We have 10,000 private enterprises all levying tribute upon agriculture. But the farmers in the Wenatchee Valley are not parasitical fungus growths on the body social. They are raising a fund by taking 2 cents a box on each box of apples sold. They have nearly one-half million dollars in that fund. The businessmen there are putting approximately $35,000 into the fund. In a little while they will have nearly $1,000,000 in cold cash to sweeten the pot, and then the Federal Government can step out of the picture. But is the Senate going to decree the death of this program in the Wenatchee Valley simply because my friend the Senator from Nebraska does not like it?

I will say to the Senate that there is some degree of responsibility here, and I repeat what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] said earlier today, that if Senators wish to create bitterness in the country let them go right ahead with the program of cutting off the little fellows. We might as well be perfectly frank and not kid ourselves, Senators, as we go toddling down this pathway of legislation, for we are headed into some tempests—make no mistake about it.

There is a great deal of misunderstanding about what is going on. There is a great emotional and intellectual ferment in this country, but God help us if we ever pull the props out from under the average little fellow. If he has any guts, he will never take it again. If he is a real American, he will not go through what he went through under the Hoover administration. If he is true to the traditions of his grandsires, he will not go hungry or allow his family to go hungry in a nation whose potentialities for production are what ours happen to be at this time. We must protect the home front here while the war is going on.

Mr. President, this Chamber has resounded day after day with messages about the grim necessity of producing more food for America. We must feed our people here at home or else have a panic. Anything that will stimulate, that will help the producers of food, is much to be desired. We are not giving these people charity.

What do Senators think this is? Does my friend the Senator from Nebraska think this is charity, that he would fling charity to these people like he would fling a bone to a hungry dog? It is a strongly Republican district that my friend the Senator from Nebraska is talking about, and I am glad he raised the issue on this floor. I hate to mention any aspect of partisanship, but the cold record now stands, and if the agency under consideration is destroyed, it will have been destroyed at the insistence of a good conservative Republican, and let that be a matter of record.

I do not like to emphasize these things, Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). The time of the Senator from Washington on the amendment has expired.

Mr. BONE. I will take a little more time on the bill.

Mr. President, there is too much of the record to go through to justify me in attempting to review the whole history of the R. A. C. C. What is there about it that invites all this wrath? The agency existed for only a couple of years, and then in 1934 it subsided. Why was it revived, and how, in the last 2 or 3 years? It was revived when we got into the war. It was revived because there was a fear in the hearts of the men who were motivating this program that we would need to give more assistance to the producers.

When objection is made to the number of lending agencies which exists it reminds me of a person who objects to the number of banks which exist in a town. He might say, "Why in the dickens can we not have simply 1 bank instead of having 4 or 5 in this town?" If any one were to suggest such a thing he would immediately hear a defense of sturdy individualism, rugged individualism, and rugged business in America. Those who would make the defense would say that anyone has a right to go into the lending business, and that we can have 1 bank or 50 banks in a town if we wish. But, Mr. President, if we happen to have more than 1 organization in our governmental set-up which happen to render assistance to agriculture, and the organizations are divided into regional divisions, we find men crying against them and inveighing against them.

Mr. President, I do not like the idea of so many agencies. I should like to see many of them brought together. But this is not the time to destroy an agency which is functioning in only two sections of the country. The record does not show, and my friend, the Senator from Nebraska, did not point out, that the Government was losing any money by reason of these loans.

The banks of the Wenatchee Valley section of my State have telegraphed me and urged me, HOMER BONE, to stand on the floor of the Senate and defend the R. A. C. C. program in my State, and in order that I might accomplish that purpose I have prepared an amendment, in case the Senate, by what I would call improvident action, should reject the amendment prepared by the Appropriations Committee, and refuse to accept its dictum.

Mr. President, that is all I want to say on the subject. Other Senators wish to speak on it. But I say to the Senate that Senators cannot predicate their vote or their attitude of mind on a theory that we do not confront a crisis in food production. Senators on both sides of the aisle have stood up in this Chamber and said we will confront a crisis in food. Men are saying the same thing on the radio all the time. Senators will take upon their souls a considerable responsibility if they vote now to cripple or destroy any agency whose expenditures, contrasted with war expenditures—

Are as moonlight unto sunlight, and as water unto wine.

They amount to nothing then. Literally they are the cube root of nothing.

Mr. President, I looked at one report today with respect to the number of persons employed in the Government. I think it was put out in connection with the McKellar bill. Of the 1,300,000 employees, 703,000 are in the Army and the Navy. That reduces tremendously the total number of employees. Probably 55 percent of all the employees engaged in the service of war and the making of war have nothing to do with normal governmental operations. They have nothing to do with any of our fiscal operations. Fifty-five percent of them are engaged in the grim business of war, which means the shedding of blood for the protection of the country. We have this food job confronting us at home, and if we let the food production of the country break down, if we permit ourselves the luxury of assailing some food-producing instrumentality by weakening its power to preserve itself, we shall have to answer, not only to the country, but to ur own consciences.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall renew my request, since it is manifest that consideration of the bill cannot be concluded at any reasonable hour tonight, that the Senate recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock. I state very frankly that I wish to discuss the pending amendment. It is especially important to the Democratic Party; because if the Democratic Party is going to commit itself to legislation of this kind

at a time when the banks of the country are literally bursting with money, the Democratic Party will have a very poor record with which to go before the country in 1944; and I do not want to see that done.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am asking that the further consideration of the bill go over until tomorrow morning—a request I never would have suggested, and would not urge now, if it were not apparent that we cannot reach an end to the consideration of the bill at an early hour.

I conferred with the Senator from Alabama, and he assured me that he was going to offer his amendment which would involve a motion to suspend the rule. In that event, we would get into the field of unlimited debate again, and I know we would not be able to reach a final vote on the bill until very, very late tonight.

Therefore, desiring to discuss the amendment briefly, I asked that the matter go over until tomorrow morning.

I now renew my request that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. I should be perfectly agreeable to having a recess taken until 10 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me state again that I should yield to the wishes of the able Senator from Georgia, the Senator in charge of the bill. If I felt that by meeting at 10 o'clock in the morning we could have some reasonable assurance that we would conclude consideration of the bill tomorrow, I should not object to the request.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency is holding hearings on the bill providing for extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation's activities, and also is holding hearings on the question of subsidy payments in working out a roll-back arrangement. At the request of Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, we have arranged for a meeting tomorrow, and have agreed to hear him at 10:30 a. m. Of course, the next day is Saturday. If we shall be able to conclude consideration of the bill tomorrow—and I believe we shall be, with the limitation of debate—I should like very much to be able to comply with both obligations: To be in the committee meeting, and also to be present at the session of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to go through with the program. I have always endeavored to be reasonable and to yield to the wishes of the Senator in charge of a bill. If the agreement we made earlier in the day would include limitation of debate on motions, as well as limitation of debate on the bill and on amendments thereto, I think it would be agreeable to have the Senate recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if we can have an understanding as to limitation on motions which might be made on the bill, as well as on amendments and on the bill itself, I think we might make more progress by recessing at this time until tomorrow.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, those of us on this side of the Chamber are very much interested in what is going on. We are not able to hear. Will the Senator please repeat his statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall endeavor to lift my voice; I was not aware that I was talking in a lower tone than usual. I should be glad to stay here tonight if I thought there was any possibility of concluding consideration of the bill tonight. I do not like to tire Senators. If we can obtain an agreement about limitation throughout, I think we might as well recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock. A number of Members of the Senate do not want to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. Unless some unforeseen developments occur, we shall be able to conclude consideration of the bill tomorrow; and if its consideration is concluded tomorrow, the time at which the conclusion of its consideration is reached will not make a great deal of difference.

However, I wish to say that if tomorrow there develops some unforeseen situation which would carry us into the late hours of the afternoon, I shall insist that the Senate remain in session until consideration of the bill is concluded. The time in which the bill must be enacted into law is growing very short. In previous years we have been in conference on agricultural appropriation bills for as long as 2 months without being able to reach an agreement on all the matters at variance between the two Houses.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation to apply to all motions as well as to all amendments and to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I did not understand the request.

Mr. RUSSELL. I asked unanimous consent that the limitation on debate be construed to apply to all motions as well as to the bill and to amendments thereto.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That would mean 15 minutes and 15 minutes, would it?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. In that event, no Senator could speak more than once, or for more than 15 minutes, on the bill or on any amendment or motion, with the understanding that the total time allotted to any one Senator would not be more than 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Chair state what we are now asked to consent to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has requested unanimous consent that the 15-minute limitation be extended to all motions affecting the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, are we asked to act now on the motion of the Senator from Georgia that the Senate recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Senator from Georgia has not made such a motion.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the announcement made at the beginning of the session today by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama included only a limitation of debate to 15 minutes on the amendments. A moment ago I suggested—and request is now being made—that motions be included in that agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has just agreed to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McNARY. I did not so understand. A question was asked. Has the Senate agreed to the unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No objection was made.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I hope that suggestion will be followed. I wonder if we could not include in the agreement with reference to the time of convening tomorrow an agreement as to the time for taking the final vote on the bill—for instance, to have the final vote on the bill taken at 5 o'clock or 5:30. If that were agreed to, we should have arranged for the whole program.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in order to comply with the Senator's suggestion, it would be necessary to have a quorum call tonight. A quorum call would not be required in connection with voting on a motion or on an amendment; but if action is to be taken on final passage of the bill, a quorum call would be required tonight. I, myself, can see no objection to having the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I suggest that the hour of meeting be made 11:30 tomorrow morning.

Mr. McNARY. No; 11 o'clock.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a number of Senators are affected by this matter. Now that we have a limitation as to the length of debate, I think it will be possible to conclude consideration of the bill tomorrow. My suggestion is that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, is it the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. I was expressing the hope that it would be agreeable to the Senate to recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow. That would be agreeable to me. With the limitation on debate, I think it would be possible to have the Senate conclude consideration of the bill if it convened at 12 o'clock tomorrow. A number of Senators who are interested in the pending matter have expressed the hope that the hour of meeting tomorrow would be 12 o'clock.

Mr. McNARY. I shall defer most reluctantly. I do not see why one committee which is to meet in order to hear Mr. Green or anyone else should determine the course of action which the Senate should take.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say that more considerations are involved in my suggestion than the one referred to by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I think the matter should be left as suggested. I shall object to having the Senate meet at 12 o'clock.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me ask what is the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Unless something unforeseen develops, I think it will be possible for the Senate to conclude consideration of the bill by meeting at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I offer a substitute motion that the time of meeting on tomorrow be 11 o'clock a. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute motion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has moved that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow. The Senator from New Hampshire has made a substitute motion that the Senate meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow. The question is on agreeing to the substitute motion.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what is the objection to meeting at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow so that we may have full assurance of being able to complete consideration of the bill? We have been meeting at 11 o'clock.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not on the pending bill.

Mr. McNARY. But we have been meeting at 11 o'clock for the consideration of other bills not as pressing as the pending bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have made some commitments to Senators who are absent from the floor at this time that, insofar as I was concerned, I should be willing to have the Senate meet tomorrow at 12 o'clock. Probably those Senators have relied upon that assurance in making their arrangements to return to the city.

On my part, I prefer to have the Senate meet at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, Mr. President, if the Senator has made commitments, that is a different matter. But, for my part, I should be glad to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock a. m.

Mr. RUSSELL. The suggestion to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. was made only in the last few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the motion is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the substitute motion of the Senator from New Hampshire that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 11, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, the God of our fathers, be near us when we call and answer us when we pray, and when Thou hearest, forgive. There are truths that he who runs may read; there are deeper truths which come only to those who wait and meditate in Thy holy presence. Unfold these, we pray, that we may feel Thy sacred nearness and be led by the fullness of Thy wisdom. In the secret of Thy fellowship, in the depths of soul, preserve us from idle reverie, from the spirit of petulance, from superficial judgment and from the gnawing fragments of self-pity.

We praise Thee for the strength of the life of faith. O may the great crises of today serve to bind us to something beyond the vain, empty repetitions of this world. Dear Lord, give us courage to identify ourselves with every cause of human need, where sorrow cannot wholly rise, whatever the denial or honor it may involve. Fill us with the understanding that the world belongs to him who wills, who knows and prays, trustfully walking with Thee whose ways are paths of peace. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Executive Office of the President (War Manpower Commission).

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1563) entitled "An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following department:

Department of Agriculture.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2409) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. O'NEAL, HENDRICKS, GORE, KIRWAN, JOHNSON of Indiana, H. CARL ANDERSEN, and PLOESER.

WOMEN LAWMAKERS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article by John O'Donnell in the Times-Herald of June 9, under the caption "Capitol Stuff," in which he quotes a "lady lawmaker." An anonymous statement or letter is always the resort of a coward.

As dean of the women in Congress, I resent this filthy article and believe it to be an unwarranted, contemptible, cowardly attack on all women lawmakers and other women as well. My colleagues in the House are representative of the highest type of womanhood. I know none would author the statement quoted in the article referred to. Nor do I believe Mrs. Hobby would be a party to what is described as a "super secret agreement," reached by the high ranking officers of the War Department. The loose talk that has been indulged in recently concerning our women in the armed service can be nothing less than Nazi-inspired propaganda to frighten the mothers and relatives of young women who have volunteered and those who are considering service in the armed forces.

The issue is not, as he describes it, one of "religion, honor, politics, and medicine," but of decency and morality. I know a great many exceptionally fine, highly qualified young girls serving in difficult positions in the Army, Navy, and marines who could be enjoying every comfort at home had they been less patriotic and more selfish. I know the attacks that have been made on them will be resented by every fair-minded person from one end of the country to the other.

Mr. O'Donnell is doing a great disservice to our country by writing such stuff. If he cannot put on a uniform and serve his country, he should not slander those

who are doing so. I am surprised that a reputable newspaper would publish such filth.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I deeply deplore the article referred to by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]. She has checked with the women legislators. I have checked also. No woman legislator made any such statement as is reported in Mr. O'Donnell's column.

It is difficult for me to understand why such things are published today, why there is a whispering and an open campaign of statements against the decency and honor of the women of the United States. It is directed not only against the women in the armed forces really, but against women in industry and in agriculture. There is an underlying attack on all women in this country. There is no doubt in my mind—and I have gone into it quite fully and shall continue to go into it—that there is an effort to discredit the splendid women of our country. Nothing would please Hitler more than to do that.

If we ever allow the people of the other nations of the world, or anyone in our own country, to say or believe things about our women that will ruin the whole structure of our great country.

The men of the United States I have always believed to be the most decent, the most honorable of the men of any nation of the world, and I know that each and every one of you would have the deepest resentment against any person who made slanderous remarks about your wife, or your daughter, or your sister. Also I am sure that you will do everything you can to stop this insidious, more than insidious, this open campaign that tends to destroy the faith in the women of our country.

LIDICE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, this is June 10, which is the first anniversary of the murder of a village by the Nazis—a murder boastfully proclaimed to the world by them—and which is dedicated by the United States and all the United Nations to remembering.

The thing that we should remember and will remember is a little road leading down a gentle slope to a little village in a valley. It was springtime, and the air was fragrant with blossoms. About 90 roofs clustered about the spire of a church. This was Lidice.

For over 600 years these little cottages, these outlying farms had been handed down from father to son; about 400 people lived there; children played there; men worked there at farming, metal work, and mining. It was a small, happy, ordinary village—remote, peaceful.

Then one night the Nazis came. They came in their stamping boots and brown shirts.

Only one man lives today to tell the story of what happened in Lidice on that ghastly night. He hid in a hole outside the village when the Nazis came. He heard the screaming of the women and the children, the rattling of machine guns, after that the terrible sounds—then the rumble of heavily loaded motor trucks, the bleating of a human herd being driven on the highway. Later he heard the roar of explosives, blast after blast. Then, creeping from his shelter, he saw his village ablaze—all of it.

What he heard was the shooting, before the eyes of their wives, mothers, children, sweethearts, and grandchildren of 200 men, including an old man of 82; and the driving off of the women and children into concentration camps and correction schools.

Mr. Speaker, other villages have suffered a fate similar to Lidice—Polish, Yugoslav, Chinese villages. But in no other case has the murderer boasted of his crime. Lidice remains forever the flaming example of Nazi self-confessed atrocity.

Now, a year later, as we of the United Nations unload our bombs on Duesseldorf, Berlin, Essen, Dortmund, on Mannheim, we are remembering Lidice.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] be granted leave of absence for the remainder of the week, because of serious illness in the family.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Christian Century.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the New Republic concerning the Chinese exclusion law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Price Administration has just started its roll-back program with a subsidy. So that they might make it a little more ridiculous than they could otherwise do they have placed a subsidy upon coffee. The wholesale price of coffee a year ago was 13 cents a pound. Today in this morning's paper the wholesale price of coffee is carried at 13 cents a pound. What common sense can there be in this unless it is as indicated in this article from the New York Herald Tribune of June 3:

Frank Russell gets Potter's Office of Price Administration job here. Coffee and sugar exchange official will head New York district office of price agency.

This thing is getting to be an awful mess. The further the Office of Price Administration goes with subsidies and the further they attempt to adopt some system which continues to muddle up the price and rationing situation in this country, just so long as they do that the situation is going to get worse and worse. It is time it stopped.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution by the Arkansas Press Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, June 14, after the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Merlo Pusey appearing in the Washington Post of June 8.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Galveston News on the public debt.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein statements having relevancy to H. R. 2536.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TEMPORARY ADDITIONAL PAY FOR RURAL LETTER CARRIERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH].

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2080) to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that this increases the

pay of mail carriers from 5 to 6 cents a mile?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And is this bill recommended by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and by the Post Office Department?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. It comes to the floor with a unanimous report of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and it is approved by the Post Office Department.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is approved by both and it is unanimous?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. It is unanimous.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service shall be paid for equipment maintenance a sum equal to 1 cent per mile per day for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled in addition to the 5 cents per mile per day for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled as now provided by law. Payments for the additional equipment maintenance as provided herein shall be at the same periods and in the same manner as payments for regular compensation to rural carriers.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect May 1, 1943, and shall remain in effect for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter, or until such earlier date as Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, strike out all of section 3 and insert a new section 3 as follows:

"SEC. 3. This act shall take effect immediately upon its enactment, and shall terminate June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress may by concurrent resolution prescribe."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPITOL NOW OPEN TO SERVICEMEN ON SUNDAYS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMERCIAL FEEDING DIFFICULTIES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include some recommendations from the canning industry.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. GROSS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CANNOT CONTROL PRICES SATISFACTORILY WITHOUT FREEZING EXCESS PURCHASING POWER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] brought up a very interesting point about confusion concerning prices. We will have more problems concerning prices until we do something about the excess purchasing power. I am not attempting to defend any confusion or rules or regulations that are not reasonable or logical. In England, we are told, they have a very small office to control prices. The same is true in Canada. But in England and Canada they siphon off so much of the purchasing power from the people through taxes. The people do not have the money to buy with that we have here, therefore they do not have that pressure and that competition for the purchase of goods that we have here. Unless we place taxes on this excess purchasing power and unless possibly we have forced savings or do something to drain this excess purchasing power off, our problems regarding prices are going to increase.

RESPONSIBILITY HERE IN CONGRESS

The President asked the Congress to put on $16,000,000,000 additional taxes, which would have drained off a lot of this excess purchasing power, but Congress did not do that. Instead, Congress passed a bill which had the effect of forgiving seven or eight billion dollars instead of passing a bill providing for $16,000,000,000 additional taxes. So the responsibility right now for many of these problems, in my opinion, is right here in Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an address which he made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE TO ESCORT PRESIDENT OF PARAGUAY INTO HOUSE CHAMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as a committee to escort the President of Paraguay into the House Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Speaker.

During the recess the following occurred:

The President of Paraguay and his party entered the Chamber at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m., and the President of Paraguay was escorted to the Speaker's rostrum by the committee of Representatives appointed for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. Members of the House of Representatives, it gives me unusual pleasure to have the privilege of presenting our guest on this occasion. He comes from a sister republic in South America, from a people who for more than 100 years have been a liberty-loving, brave, and fighting people. They have maintained their freedom in an atmosphere of hostility many times. They are still a free and a great people.

It gives me great pleasure, therefore, to present to you the head of that great government, the President of the Republic of Paraguay.

The PRESIDENT OF PARAGUAY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, the magnificence of the Capitol is fitting to shelter within its gigantic walls the outstanding figures of the illustrious persons whose statues stand in the rotunda as mute guardians of the imperishable traditions of this House, from which has emanated the wise democratic legislation that has exercised such marked influence on the material and spiritual progress of this great Nation.

It signifies a high honor for me to occupy this rostrum, not only as President of your sister nation but above all as a citizen of the Americas, as a member of the great family of nations united around a common cause.

The United States of America entered into an independent life on the basis of a well defined program that appears in the Declaration of Independence of 1776, completed later by the Constitution and by the Bill of Rights and the Gettysburg Address.

The Declaration of Independence is, in my opinion, the most trancendental document of its kind. It begins with the enunciation of the fine international juridical principle according to which "the separate and equal station of the nations of the world is a right to which the laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them"; it proclaims in the public order "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"; and it establishes in political matters one of the cardinal principles of democratic regimes: "That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Since the memorable date of that Jeffersonian declaration more than 166 years have passed, and still those principles continue to be the foundation stones of the juridical structure of the free people.

Thirteen years before the French Revolution, the United States of America had

set forth the principles of the Bill of Rights, which later served as a model to the new nations of the great American family in the framing of their constitutions.

My country, together with the other countries of America, and following the example of the older sister to the north, adopted a democratic form of government. It has been and is a democratic country since the early days of its history. Paraguayan in origin was the revolution of the Comuneros, which in 1727, long before the middle of the eighteenth century, proclaimed to the whole world that the will of the common people must be above all other wills, as a principle which belongs to public authority.

Up till 1939 Paraguay had governed itself by one of the most liberal constitutions in the world.

The new questions which arose in the field of pure law inspired the reform of 1939, in order to place that fundamental law in harmony with the modern conquest of law; and assure a greater well-being. The problem was not stated with a view to abandoning the road followed up to then and traveling by a different one, but with a view to modifying the direction and trying to expedite it in a convenient way, leaving out obstacles and illusions, in accordance with the modern ideologies, and in line with the processes that other American countries had established. It has not followed any absolutist tendency, but the sound purpose of satisfying a need without impairing, as stated in the declaration of purposes, the cardinal principles of American democracy contained in the Philadelphia Constitution.

There is no doubt that the democratic system, as a political and social organization, is the only one which conforms with man's nature; but it is also true that any system or body or doctrine can and must be modified in the light of truth without removing, of course, the bases of the juridical structure so that it may not err by trying to operate in a vacuum. "The inquiry, knowledge, and belief of truth," as stated in an inscription in the facade of the central gallery of the Library of Congress, "is the sovereign good of human nature."

I do not need to state that we are not dealing with a finished work. Rather, I believe in the reform of its flaws and omissions. That is why I have advocated recently its revision, after consulting my people with favorable results, and always considering the basic principles of a true democracy.

In the chronological division of universal history, the contemporary age starts with the French Revolution. The fair thing in my opinion would have been to take as the starting point the date of the independence of the United States of America, of the approval, by the Second Continental Congress, of the outstanding statements to which I have just referred, at least in America, where the seed of liberty has sprouted into institutions which honor the peoples that are a part of the American community and that live under the same civic preoccupation and the same common aspirations.

In the light of events in the United States during the past 10 years, it may not be unreasonable to state that a new era in history has begun in the New World. Let me review but two of these events:

First, the inception of the good-neighbor policy, coincidental with the inauguration of President Roosevelt, who from the rostrum of this Capitol said that in the field of international relations he dedicated this Nation to the good neighbor who respects himself and who, therefore, respects the rights of others; the neighbor who, in a world of neighbors, honors his obligations and the sanctity of his word.

And, second, the consolidation of pan-Americanism, from the first meeting of foreign ministers in Panama in 1939 to the third such meeting, in Rio de Janeiro in 1942, the immediate result of which was the most magnificent cooperation of the American countries ever recorded in history, for the purpose of defending themselves against the common danger which struck against them with the treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor, of struggling for the maintenance of the undying principles of liberty and justice which govern their living together, and of aiming at the formation of a world better than the present one on the basis of respect for the principles of ethics and law and of the practice of a true fraternity, as principles essential to a democracy.

Paraguay has kept and will continue to keep faithfully and honorably all her international pledges. Even before the third meeting of foreign ministers in Rio had come to a close, she had broken all diplomatic, economic, and financial ties with the Axis.

Respectful of her tradition and an active advocate of the principles expressed, she has not hesitated a single moment to put herself on the side of the United States and the other United Nations in the greatest tragedy which the imagination has conceived and which history has recorded in all time.

The Paraguayan people reaffirm, through me, on this solemn occasion, their adherence to the cause of this glorious country, which is also the cause of all America, and pays homage to the heroism of its brave fighting men in the fight for liberty and justice.

At 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m., the President of Paraguay and his party departed.

AFTER THE RECESS

The recess having expired, at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings occurring in the Chamber during the recess of the House will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1943

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2536, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, as its title states, is a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment."

By reference to the first page of the report you can see something of the history of this bill. The subject has been under consideration for approximately 2 years. The first bill introduced was H. R. 5906. Some study was given that bill. Then H. R. 7484 was introduced and extensive hearings were held on it by a subcommittee. Following that, the committee decided to use the information gained at that hearing and introduced H. R. 699. On that bill we held additional hearings. At the close of the hearings and the consideration of that bill, which covered a period of approximately 3 months of executive sessions and discussions, I introduced the bill H. R. 2536, which is sometimes referred to as the "clean" bill, since it comes to the floor without the necessity of having a great number of clarifying amendments.

May I say this at the outset. During my stay in this House I have never known of a piece of legislation receiving more careful consideration by a committee than this. There was never the slightest tinge of partisanship in the committee room. The bill is truly a committee bill. When reported out, it was reported by a unanimous vote of the committee. One member of the committee suggested that he might want to reserve the right to offer an amendment, but the bill was reported with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Education.

I shall not burden the House by going into a detailed discussion of the various provisions of the bill, but it is decidedly an improvement over the basic act, which has been in operation for approximately 23 years. During that time those in charge of its administration have built up a reputation that I think should be regarded by this House as quite commendable. They have been handling about 50,000 cases a year, and at the present time they are handling 75,000 cases, I think. The cost of rehabilitation is a little under $300 per individual, as compared with the first attempt made in rehabilitation following the World War, when the cost ran up to approximately $5,000 per case.

The administration of this act is in the Office of Education, which by Executive order was placed under the Federal Security Administrator. It may be interesting to you to know that the en-

tire personnel in the Washington headquarters office, to handle this entire program, consists of 22 people. I think Dr. Kratz, the head of this bureau, is entitled to that statement.

In this bill we attempt to provide and do provide for the rehabilitation of the industrial injured, the non-service-connected veterans, the civil air patrol and the merchant marine, and the congenitally disabled, the whole theory of the bill being that if a blind person is rehabilitated to the extent that he can earn a living he not only becomes a better citizen but he goes off the Government pay roll, so to speak, because the United States Government pays blind benefits.

As to those who are injured and crippled in industries, under this program we can make them better citizens, enable them to take care of their families, and eventually create a saving to the Federal Government as well as the State governments and society in general.

The service-connected veterans were taken care of in Public 16, a law passed by this Congress sometime ago. When this bill was originally introduced, it carried a section which provided for a cooperative arrangement for the handling of service-connected veterans. This provision was carried in H. R. 7484 and in H. R. 699. Then the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation considered a bill which was virtually section 1 of H. R. 699 and reported it to the House, and it became a law. We struck that section out of this bill, but in Public 16 was incorporated this provision:

> The Administrator * * * may utilize and extend existing Veterans' Administration facilities and utilize those of any other governmental agency as well as those maintained by joint Federal and State contribution.

This program is maintained by Federal and State joint contributions, and is the set-up referred to.

In this bill, therefore, we make the service available to the Veterans' Administration at his discretion when the agreements are made.

There is another feature to this bill. The service-connected disabled veterans constitute only about 10 percent of the veterans needing rehabilitation. Therefore it becomes highly important and necessary that this act and these facilities be made available. The veterans are already returning, and may I say right here that this department is the only governmental agency that has been or is now taking care of the rehabilitation of the veterans. However, the Veterans' Administration is as rapidly as possible setting up the machinery to take care of the service-connected veterans under Public Act 16, but I might mention in that connection that, as is well known, there will be many veterans who have service connections but who will not be declared service connected for some time to come. As a matter of fact they are still declaring some veterans service connected from the last World War. This bill provides the cooperative machinery to fit with the other bills, making a complete working law, just as we intended in the original H. R. 699 with section 1 deleted. The 50-50 matching is in this bill. The State pays 50 cents of every dollar in the handling of the program, except the administrative cost, which is paid by the Federal Government. The management of the program is with the State vocational board, and in every State of the Union they have these boards set up, and the superintendent of education is usually the man who presides over the board. We have safeguarded every right to the States. We have said what kind of a State plan, and what the plan would really consist of, which shall be submitted to Washington, and when the State plan contains the provisions set up in this act, it is then approved in Washington.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Is there any provision where State institutions are concerned under which the rehabilitation of some of these defectives may be recognized under this act, as well as other institutions? For instance, our institutions for those who cannot see or speak or hear——

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. They can recognize that institution?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; and utilize every facility in the State.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is doing a very fine piece of work, and we are all indebted to him. I wish to ask a question with reference to what schools will be recognized in this rehabilitation program, in all of the categories. It is not confined to any particular branch of schools? Will they include our privately owned commercial schools?

Mr. BARDEN. Absolutely. That is exactly why the administrator has been able to keep this cost down to such a remarkably low figure. It is by utilizing the facilities that have been set up, in making contracts with them.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. The gentleman also will agree that the handling of the program will be for all physically disabled.

Mr. BARDEN. Why, of course.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. And the gentleman further states it does not affect privately owned schools.

Mr. BARDEN. No. I state to the gentleman in all frankness that I have received quite a lot of mail about this bill, and all that I have received from all of the privately owned schools throughout the country have contained praise and a prayer that it would soon become a law.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Do I understand that the soldiers of all wars receive equal treatment under this bill?

Mr. BARDEN. Absolutely. There is no distinction in this bill as to what war one incurred an injury in or whether it was after the war.

Mr. MOTT. Is there any change between this bill and existing law as to the authority and jurisdiction of the Federal Government in regard to this program? Or, let me put the question in this way: Is as much authority left in the States under this bill as under existing law?

Mr. BARDEN. There is considerably more, and we have placed more safeguards around it. The basic act was a rather wide-open proposition. However, I may say that we had a very fine Administrator at the head, Dr. Kratz, who did not use even a small percentage of the power given him, and I say this to his credit, that it was at his suggestion that some of that power was taken out of Washington because he did not like to have power lying around, as somebody would be accusing him of using it.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. HARE. Is there any limitation on the appropriations now applied to all this work?

Mr. BARDEN. I do not understand.

Mr. HARE. In the amount appropriated.

Mr. BARDEN. Certainly not. May I say to the gentleman that in the past years it has been costing around $3,000,000—three to four million dollars. That is, the Federal share of it. I am informed that it will likely run to possibly ten or twelve million dollars in the light of the present industrial activity and of the war.

The gentleman would have to tell me how many people were going to be disabled and how many soldiers were going to need treatment before we could get at the amount of money.

Mr. HARE. I understand that heretofore the act provided for no limitation on the amount that could be appropriated by Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BARDEN. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HARE. As I understand, heretofore there has been no limitation on the amount that could be appropriated by Congress for this purpose?

Mr. BARDEN. I think not.

Mr. HARE. This act does not contemplate any change in the policy?

Mr. BARDEN. No, it does not, if my memory is correct. I think it would be very unwise if we were to try to guess at the cost.

Mr. HARE. I was not expressing an opinion on the matter. I just wanted to be sure that there was no limitation.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Has it been your experience that there has been no discrimination in the case of disabled veterans, where the States have not been able to comply with the requirement of the Federal Government as to furnishing training for them?

Mr. BARDEN. May I have the gentleman's question again? I did not understand it.

Mr. GRANGER. This is a 50–50 proposition between the States and the Government?

Mr. BARDEN. That is correct.

Mr. GRANGER. Has there been a case where a State has failed to take care of its veterans because it has not had the funds with which to do it?

Mr. BARDEN. Well, there have been some cases where the States have exhausted their appropriation and therefore had to cut their activities. But in view of the war and in view of the fact that all State legislatures are closed, we have placed a provision in this bill that where a State exhausts its money and it is necessary for the work to go on until the next session of the State legislature, that can be done.

In working on the physical-restoration feature of this bill we were exceptionally fortunate in having one member of the committee who held a fellowship in surgery at Mayos', and who had had 10 years in China, with a vast amount of experience in this field. That is the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD. His services on the committee, I think, were invaluable, and I am sure all members appreciated it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does not present a new subject to the Congress of the United States. It is one that has been on the statute books and in operation for 20 years.

I want to take this opportunity to pay my respects—and I think I share the sentiments and opinion of all other members of the Committee on Education of the House of Representatives—to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]. He has led that committee in the consideration of this bill for over 5 months of deliberations. In all that time I can say without any fear of contradiction that no man in this House displayed greater patience, tolerance, and uniform courtesy to the members of the committee, no matter on which side of the table they sat, than the distinguished chairman of our committee [Mr. BARDEN].

When this bill first came to the committee for consideration it contained some 26 or 27 pages. The bill which we present to you today contains about 15 pages. The deletion is due largely to the fact that we struck out title I, which had to do with veterans' affairs and which subject was dealt with by another committee. If there was any one thing that challenged the attention of all members, it was to be sure that in the presentation of this legislation the rights of the States were protected.

I join in the opinion expressed by the chairman of the committee that this is a States' rights bill. The statute now on the books, as we all know, provides for a 50–50 matching of State and Federal funds. This bill does the same thing. No State is required to do anything under this bill unless it chooses to do so. The States inaugurate the program. They include in it the plan they desire to carry out and the classes of persons which they desire to rehabilitate. When their plan is approved by the Federal Administrator, then it becomes the program of the State, and the State administers it. There is no change in the substance of the basic law, in my opinion, with one exception; that is, that in the present law the cost of administration is borne equally by the States and the Federal Government. In this bill the Federal Government pays the cost of administration.

It was thought by many members of the committee that that provision was fair to the States; that it did not confer upon the Federal Government any new authority, because the States submit their statements every 90 days to the Federal Government, and the Federal Government sends them a check.

Mr. GWYNNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. Who selects the schools which participate in this program? Is that left to the States?

Mr. DONDERO. That is left entirely to the State boards of vocational rehabilitation, just as it is now. However, this program has very little to do with schools.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I prefer to finish my statement, and then I will yield to the gentleman.

This program of vocational rehabilitation is not a large one. During the last fiscal year the amount of money expended was approximately $6,000,000; $3,000,000 on the part of the Federal Government and $3,000,000 on the part of the States. The question was raised how much larger this program would be under this bill, with limited physical restoration included. The estimate was $12,000,000; $6,000,000 on the part of the Federal Government, and an equal amount on the part of the States. Perhaps the best answer is that if we knew how long the war would last and how many would be injured as a result of the war, and in industry, we might better be able to answer the question with a greater degree of certainty and accuracy. That is not a large program. It is a very modest program, and one that will pay large dividends to the American taxpayer. Under the present law it amounted to about $60,000 annually per State. That is a small amount of money. We have rehabilitated under the present law more than 200,000 cases. These people have become self-sustaining citizens and are taxpayers instead of tax eaters. The average cost per case has been $300, and the Federal cost of administration is about 1½ percent.

I think the fact is worthy of repeating that the entire Federal program, here in the Nation's Capital, has been carried on and administered, including clerical help, by a staff of 22 people under the able, efficient, and economical supervision of Dr. Kratz, administrator of this program.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. My interest in this matter is whether or not there should be a limitation on the authorization. I am interested in that because I sit on the subcommittee which writes the appropriation bill which provides for this agency. I am very much in favor of this bill as a whole, but in all previous legislation as I understand on this subject a limitation has been fixed by the Congress as to the total amount which should be appropriated. In the act of July 2, 1920, there was a limitation of $1,000,000 fixed; and in section 531 of the Social Security Act a limitation of $3,500,000 was fixed.

I can appreciate the difficulty of determining just how much money will be needed to carry out the purposes of the program, but I do not like the idea of just knocking out the limitation entirely and leaving the sky as the limit. It seems to me that we ought to leave some limitation. The gentleman says $6,000,000 is the estimate. Why not name $7,500,000, or some other top figure beyond which the appropriation could not go? Otherwise we might be asked in the course of years anywhere from $15,000,000 to $20,000,000 or whatever the administrative authorities figure it might be possible to expend. Does the gentleman not think it wise to fix a limitation?

Mr. DONDERO. May I answer the gentleman from Georgia in this way: The program under this bill is set up entirely by the 48 States. They must submit their budget estimates and their share of the costs to their legislative bodies. I believe that in itself places a reasonable limitation on the amount to be expended under this program.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman think that it has been unwise heretofore to have a limitation in the law? We have always had one. Why should it be changed? Why should the procedure be changed where we have had a limitation of the authorization heretofore for 23 years, and Congress has always insisted upon having such a limitation?

Mr. DONDERO. I have tried to answer the gentleman by saying that the States under this bill have complete authority over the entire program, and it seems to me a fair limitation is placed on this subject because the States must pay half of the cost.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman feel that it has been an unwise procedure over the past 23 years during which we have had a limitation with respect to the amount to be appropriated?

Mr. DONDERO. No; I do not think so, and I do not wish to be understood as saying so. But it does seem to me that in face of the conditions in which we are now situated and at war there is an effective limitation in the matching of funds and the restrictive powers carried in the pending bill.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. During the 23 years to which the gentleman from Georgia refers there has not been the uncertainty as to needs that there is in this time of war, when both in the military services and in industry men are being disabled who can be rehabilitated and returned to service.

Mr. DONDERO. Exactly.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BLACKNEY. The gentleman is making a very fine statement. I am very much interested in the problem because of its educational scope, but I want to be sure that there is nothing in this bill that continues the apparent policy on the part of the Federal Government to encroach on the educational policies of the States. That is not in the program?

Mr. DONDERO. That is not in this bill. May I say to the gentleman that this bill does not in any way touch the subject of education except to rehabilitate those who have been incapacitated.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I would like to say to the gentleman that for many years I have been consistently in favor of this kind of legislation and I am now, and I am strengthened in my support by a telegram which I received today from the director of education of Ohio, in which he says:

Congressman THOMAS A. JENKINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Just advised that H. R. 2536 is on the calendar for Thursday. This vocational rehabilitation bill has many items of merit which would enable us to provide more benefits to Ohio citizens. We would appreciate the support of the Ohio delegation on this bill.

M. B. PERRIN, *Director.*

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY. I would like to state that for years in Pennsylvania I was in favor of this type of program. And may I suggest it was the opinion of the committee, the reason why it did not wish to fix a limitation in the bill was because of the war and industrial uncertainty in the country, as well as its willingness to be protected under the wise, industrious, and able ability of the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER.

Mr. DONDERO. Let me say that out of the last World War came 330,000 applications for rehabilitation within a 10-year period. One hundred and seventy-nine thousand of these were placed in training. That was based on an Army of 5,000,000 men. If the present program of the War Department is put into effect under which the armed forces are to be raised to 10,000,000 men, then we may expect, proportionately, double the number of cases for rehabilitation, or 600,000.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. First, I want to compliment the gentleman and the committee, particularly its chairman, upon the good job they have done in the consideration of this legislation.

Secondly, I want to state that I have been a schoolman all my life and associated with schoolmen all over the United States. I naturally receive mail from them today as a Member of Congress and every particle of mail from schoolmen that I have received recently concerning this proposed legislation has been favorable to the bill.

Mr. KERR Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. I understand the purpose of this bill to be mainly to assist those who can be taken care of under a rehabilitation program attached to the school system in order to help those men who are untrained, particularly those who need to improve their talents, so that they will be enabled to meet the problems of life and be happier persons.

Mr. DONDERO. The bill provides for vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and limited physical restoration. It enables physically handicapped people to become self-sustaining.

Mr. KERR. It would be just a school feature for that purpose, then, and does not go further?

Mr. DONDERO. It does not.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. TALLE. Will the gentleman explain what was said about the proposed change in administrative costs?

Mr. DONDERO. The administrative costs under this bill, because the people who may be eligible for the services provided herein will be cases growing out of our war effort, is borne entirely by the Federal Government. That is a change from the present law, which provides a 50–50 matching with the States.

Mr. TALLE. And the gentleman does not believe that the proposed change will deprive the States of any power they now have?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not; because the States submit their bills for the cost of administration to the Federal Government, and the Government reimburses the States for the amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to correct a statement I made a few minutes ago in response to a question by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] I believe it was. He asked me if there had been any limitation in the preceding acts on appropriations for this bill. I answered in the negative. I now find I was incorrect; there has been a limitation on the amount to be appropriated, but in this particular act the only limitation which exists is the limitation to be placed by the Committee on Appropriations and by the amounts set up by the States to be matched.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. I am a former member of the Committee on Education and am very much interested in this legislation and the work that has been carried on in the fields of vocational education and rehabilitation, but I do feel that there ought to be some limitation placed in section 9, the section that authorizes the appropriation.

Mr. BARDEN. I must be frank and make this admission to the gentleman: I think that the committee is composed of fairly intelligent men; I believe the program has been handled by fairly intelligent men. After a careful search of our minds and of the statistics we found nothing to guide us in fixing a limitation because we did not know how many hundreds of thousands were going to be injured in industry, we did not know how many soldiers were going to be crippled; there was simply no way to arrive at an estimate or to handle it except to reach out in thin air and just pluck a guess out of the air. The Committee on Appropriations is composed of men who sit down and comb these facts. They are not going to give any more money than can be absolutely justified.

Mr. CARTER. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I want to thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. BARDEN. And may I say to the gentleman that apparently we have much more confidence in you than you have in yourselves.

Mr. CARTER. Notwithstanding the fact I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations and the unbounded confidence the Committee on Education has in the Committee on Appropriations, I still insist there should be a limitation. This is very poor authorization legislation, for you fix absolutely no amount. I would be willing to be generous and have an amount fixed that would probably be in excess of what might be used, but I do feel very strongly that there should be some limitation on this authorization so that we shall know at the end of the year not only how much money is being appropriated but how much money has been authorized.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. In addition to what the gentleman from California has said—and I may say I heartily approve his statement—there has been in the law heretofore a limitation on the administrative expense, but if I understand this bill correctly it just leaves the sky the limit on the matter of administrative expense.

As one member of the subcommittee which handles this particular appropriation I want to say that you put a rather severe burden, a heavy burden, on the subcommittee, because these educational

authorities in their enthusiasm for their work, which is good work of course, will prepare programs which in all probability will far transcend anything which Congress had in mind when passing this legislation, and so far as administrative expense is concerned, the sky will be the limit with them if it is the limit with you; you ought to provide some limitation here.

Mr. BARDEN. The estimate of the present Administrator, as I said a minute ago, was that the first year it would not run much over $12,000,000—it may go a little above that—but he did not see much chance of a peak beyond approximately $25,000,000. He was conservative in his estimates and of course this must be matched by the States, with the exception mentioned by me previously. I might say to the gentleman that under the production training program right now there is being spent $166,000,000 a year.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the bill also provides that the States shall submit an estimate to the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The bill provides that the States shall submit an estimate of their program to the Federal Administrator each year, so that the Federal Government will know in advance substantially what the whole program will be for the coming year.

Mr. BARDEN. It is not a question of our resisting a limitation. We are frank enough to admit that we do not know where to put it, and I do not know of anybody else who knows how to fix such a limitation. Does the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman has stated it accurately.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. Did the gentleman have any testimony before his committee as to the probable cost or estimate?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes. I stated that it is expected that the present program perhaps will be doubled. In other words, it will be $6,000,000 on the part of the Federal Government and $6,000,000 on the part of the States, which would be an average of about $125,000 per State.

Mr. BARDEN. I believe the Director said it would likely go to $22,000,000 or $25,000,000 at the high peak.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is the first Congress in which I have served on the Committee on Education and it has been thus far a strenuous service but a very pleasant one. We all have an affectionate regard for our Chairman. He has been very patient and very considerate in our discussions of this particular measure. I do not think that any committee has been more industrious in trying to solve a problem before it than has the Committee on Education in the consideration of this particular bill.

I call your attention to the fact that under existing circumstances this is peculiarly and necessarily and very largely a Federal bill, one for proper participation of the Federal Government because in its essence it is in the nature of a war measure. This bill, if enacted into law, practically supersedes the former legislation with reference to this subject.

We are having a great many men injured in industry in our war effort. We are having a great many of the soldiers fighting on the foreign fronts returned to us wounded and disabled. Here we have the prime purpose of enabling those people to get back into the war effort, and in these days when we are constantly reminded that there is a shortage of manpower, it becomes doubly our duty to rehabilitate vocationally these disabled people as rapidly as possible and get them into the respective tasks for which they are or can be fitted.

It is a little difficult, of course, to estimate the exact amount of money that is going to be required for this purpose because we cannot know absolutely how many will be injured in industry who can be rehabilitated and how many will be disabled in the conflict of the war. Heretofore this program has been economically administered with a small Federal force of 22 persons, and I doubt if that can be duplicated in any service of the Government taking into consideration the proportionate tasks of those services. We were very much impressed with the representations made to us concerning the administration of this act.

Mr. TALLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. I should like to be fully satisfied that it is wise to make the change involving administrative costs which is proposed in this bill. Here is a force of 22 people which has done a good job under the present plan. Will an equally good job be done under the new plan? During the course of this debate I should like to have the administrative costs broken down so I may know what kind of services will be included under that head.

Mr. LANHAM. I am sure there will be members of the committee who will do that for the gentleman. At present I wish to call attention in the brief time at my disposal to one or two other features of this legislation.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman stated that this is largely a Federal bill. I think he should have said that it is a Federal bill from the standpoint of responsibility but not a Federal bill as it pertains to control.

Mr. LANHAM. Yes; I was just about to make that distinction.

Mr. Chairman, we who serve on this committee have been very much interested in seeing that the provisions of this law would provide for State operation and State control. The Federal angle comes in necessarily by reason of the fact, as I have stated, that this is essentially a war measure to provide manpower for our various lines of activity. The States under the proposal involved in this measure have a great deal more authority than they ever have had under laws of this character and we have been very meticulous in trying to get that kind of legislation. We feel we have done a good job.

One further matter I wish to mention is with reference to the physical rehabilitation of these people who are disabled. We are providing that this physical rehabilitation shall be given to those whose disabilities have become static. In other words, we are not going into the therapeutic treatment of all kinds of people for all kinds of trouble. If a disability has become static, if it is possible for the person to be reabsorbed into industry, it can be done quickly. For instance, suppose that a disabled person has lost some of the fingers of a hand or has lost a foot and the condition has become static. By the use of prosthetic appliances we can very quickly put that person back into industry and make him a useful and component part of our war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], a member of the committee.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I have only 5 minutes. I wish I had 15 minutes, but we are very short of time. I shall make only one or two general observations. It would take me almost 5 minutes to read the passage in the bill here in answer to the question, but if you will turn to the bill it will save me the trouble. It is on page 8, beginning with subparagraph (1).

We worry about whether or not too much money will be spent under this bill. If we believe in the democratic processes of government, I think that will answer the question to begin with, because if Illinois sees fit to appropriate a certain amount of money for physical vocational training, the Government then matches that amount of money. In other words, the cost of this act will depend upon the number of people who are physically rehabilitated and upon the will of the people, expressed through their representatives, in the various States of the Nation.

When this bill came to us it had a good many ideas promulgated there that drifted away from the protection of the States. During some 30 days the 21 members of this committee attempted at all times to curb the power of the Government, not to extend bureaucracy but to retard its onward march in this country. I think I speak the sentiments of every man on the committee when I

say that we labored at all times with that in view, and with the bigger end in view of reconstructing physically people who need it and are not able to give it to themselves, taking them out of the position of being a burden to society and putting them into a position where they can have their own self-respect and not only contribute to maintaining themselves and their families but contribute to society generally. Thousands and thousands of them have been rehabilitated and are now working in the war plants. The records show that there is less absenteeism and that the production if anything is a little greater from these men who have been rehabilitated through the vocational educational systems under this contractual arrangement between the Government and the States.

We quibble about how much it will cost. It will not cost anything. This measure is legislation of economy. It places people in a position to get off the financial back of the National Government and sustain themselves. The more it costs, if it is well and economically run, as it has been, the more good it will do, and in the main, in the larger view, the more it will save the Nation.

I notice that the N. Y. A. has a bill in which it is asking some $400,000,000 to set up some sort of an educational institution within the various States in competition with the public-school system to a certain extent. I assume there will be many people who will pass this large amount as a matter of course, and they will pass judgment favorably.

The National Housing Administration is asking in one bill alone for some $400,000,000, in the face of the fact that Under Secretary of War General Patterson the other day testified that employment in the War Department has reached its peak and that it is going to be reduced by 100,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, this measure is legislation looking to the happiness and the development of the morale of the American people. This is not looking across the seas. We give billions to lend-lease. We spend billions to send the men in the Army to fight and to be maimed and crippled. What does it matter how much it costs when this is for our own people, to rehabilitate them and help out in our own economy, when it is for the happiness and contentment of our own people? This is an introspective view, something for our American people, and it is only a pittance, that we flit away with the wave of a hand in this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this measure and wish to compliment the committee on the careful consideration they have given this program. I do not know anything about what has been accomplished in the other States of the Union but in my own State of Georgia, under the leadership of the State educational department, specifically under the direction of Mr. Paul Barrett, a great piece of work has been done in rehabilitating the physically handicapped persons and furnishing them the opportunity to work in the war program.

As I understand, this bill broadens the act a little bit and makes it possible also to rehabilitate those whose handicap is not entirely physical. It continues a program which has been successful, economical, and humane, and that has contributed in part to solving the shortage of manpower in industry during war time.

I do not believe it is generally known just how serious the problem of the handicapped is. The best information I have been able to get is that there are more than 20,000,000 people in the United States, or 1 out of every 7 of our population, who have some handicap, either major or minor or in between. There is a vast waste of productive capacity, a vast loss of earning power in this country due to our failure to make it possible for these people to earn a livelihood as they would be able to do if they had not become disabled.

A great many of our war industries today are making fine use of people who suffer from physical handicaps, because many of them have been trained outside of this program by industry itself and many others have been trained as a part of this program. Today they have found that these physically handicapped persons can do their part in the war effort. You will find thousands of them working in the war industries of the United States today because they have been given an opportunity to become qualified for that type of work.

I do not know whether or not we ought to put a limitation on this appropriation. We have millions of people working in our war plants today who never worked before. Millions of our war workers are working under stress and strain due to long hours and the desire to produce as much as possible. In all cases proper safety devices have not been provided. In addition, we are going to have many handicapped persons coming back from our armed services. Certainly it makes good sense, in my judgment, to provide sufficient funds to do this job and do it right. We ought not to be too economical about it, although of course we should not waste money.

As far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to abide by the judgment of this splendid committee. I know they have given long and careful consideration to this subject. We know, of course, that we have the check of the Committee on Appropriations as well as the check of the Members of the House and the Senate themselves before any money can be appropriated for this purpose.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. What is the judgment of this committee in regard to the amount of money that should be authorized for this particular purpose?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not undertake to speak for the committee, but I have heard several here say that there is no way to estimate at the present time what the need will be, and I doubt the wisdom of making them come back to Congress and get an amendment increasing the authorization, when we have the splendid gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] and 42 other fine men on the House Appropriations Committee, and if I can judge from what they have been doing recently, they are not wasting any money. I think we may as well leave that up to the gentleman and his colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, checked, as it will be by the Budget, by the Senate, and by ourselves as Members of the House, when the appropriation may be brought here. I am willing to leave it in that state. Let us do this job, let us give these people a chance to play their part in the activities of the United States, and in the war effort. We ought to pass this bill, in my judgment, without a dissenting vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2536, and had come to no resolution thereon.

USE AND OPERATION OF WAR PLANTS IN PROSECUTION OF THE WAR—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I present for printing under the rule a conference report and statement upon the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of national defense.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF DISABLED PEOPLE

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 2536.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2536, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] a member of the committee.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I should like at the beginning to pay my tribute along with the other members of the committee to our chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina, for his patience with the committee, which was composed in large part of new members, and for whom this was the first bill on which we ever worked in Congress. The

bill was considered conscientiously and painstakingly, so that we could learn as much as possible, and we all appreciate the chairman's unfailing helpfulness and wisdom, along with that of the ranking minority member on the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. To work with them was as fine an introduction to the committee workings of this body as a new member could ever hope to receive.

I want to ask some of the questions that may be raised in regard to this bill, and try to give answers to them. First, how big a problem is this? As has been said, there are about 16,000,000 people in this country who are physically handicapped, but only about 3,000,000 need assistance in order to be placed in adequate remunerative occupations. Many of these need some help physically, but they are employed at least part time and managing to get along. However, there are more than 2,000,000 with major disabilities who are not financially able to get adequate training or occupation for themselves.

In addition to that 2,000,000, there are about 100,000 becoming disabled each year. Their number is greatly increased, so says the National Safety Council, because under the present war urgencies a great number of unskilled and partially trained people are entering highly skilled trades in war industries, and there are about 2,000,000 nonfatal accidents a year, and out of that number there are almost 100,000 whose disability is permanent, and require rehabilitation to get them back into useful occupation.

In addition, there are the registrants who are rejected for physical reasons by the draft boards, running as high as 45 percent. In many the disabilities were not known until they had physical examinations under the selective-service boards. Many need training for entering war factories.

Again there are those who are being discharged each month by the Army and the Navy. They passed the physical examination, but under the strenuous military training, some old injury like a football knee "pops up," and they are being discharged. Some of them are worse but their disability is not service connected and they cannot expect to get assistance under the bill for service-connected disabled veterans.

In addition there are a great many people in civilian defense, air wardens, merchant marine, civilian air patrol who are more subject than previously to injury, and also people being compelled to go to farms, where they never worked before and therefore have a high accident rate.

Then there is always the latent possibility of air raids, which would greatly increase the number of disabled. That is one of the reasons why the committee thought it was impossible to make even an approximate estimate of the probable cost of the program.

So the task really is gigantic. Under this program the States were training about 10,000 a year before the war. It has already expanded to 50,000, and it probably will go to at least 100,000 a year.

They may be divided into three main groups. Some of them have an irremediable or unimprovable disability, and nothing that we can do or hope to do will improve them to a point where they can go back to their original occupation. They have to be trained around their disability. A man formerly worked as a policeman. Now both legs are off. He has to be trained at some job where he can sit down and use his hands, some technical skill that does not require the use of legs.

Then there is a second group whose physical disability is permanent, but can be corrected to a degree where they can return to their original jobs. This physical restoration is one of the things which this bill provides for and which was not in the previous legislation. All we could do before was to take a man as he is and try to train him around the disability for a new occupation. If a man had a cataract and there were no funds for having it removed, we had to train him in some skill suitable for the blind; whereas if perhaps $150 could be provided and the cataract removed, he could go back again to the job he had before. Certainly that was a better expenditure of time and money than to have him spend weeks and months trying to be trained in a new skill.

There are people who have crippled legs and hands where, by performing an amputation, you could fit a man with an artificial limb and let him go back to the work he was in before, rather than start him entirely de novo to learn a new trade. Or a plastic or tendon transplant operation to strengthen or stabilize an old infantile paralysis extremity. Better to operate and restore a stiff joint to useful function than to make a man enter an occupation where he would not use the particular extremity.

There are individuals who have facial or other disfigurements that are a little repulsive to the public. They cannot get or hold a job unless they are given plastic operations or prosthetic devices which can correct most of the disfigurement. Often that alone enables them to resume their former occupations and is certainly rehabilitation of the best sort.

So where it is possible by some physical correction or restoration to fit a man to return to his basic work, that is good economy. It was not provided for in the present legislation. It is provided for in this bill.

Third, there are individuals who need both physical restoration of a static disability and also some vocational training. We have tried in this bill to deal with all three types.

The question may come up, Cannot this be done by the States without assistance from the Federal Government? There is one State, New Jersey, which has had a magnificent program of physical restoration due largely to the enthusiasm and generosity of one doctor. In fact, we learned a great deal from the experience of New Jersey, but they admit they have reached the bottom of the barrel. They cannot finance this program any longer without some assistance, especially since the need has grown enormously because of the concentration of many war industries in that State, and the bringing in of workers from other places. It is too big for certain States to finance, because of the sudden increases in those areas.

Secondly, there are so many persons needing this new training who are primarily a Federal responsibility—those injured in war plants, which are the result of a war that the Congress declared. The merchant marine, the air wardens, the Civil Air Patrol—all of those individuals are working at a job which is a Federal job—war. We felt it was not right to saddle all these extra burdens onto the States without more help from the Federal Government than it had given in the past.

That brought up a third question: Could we get a workable relation, a satisfactory partnership between the States and the Federal Government that would meet three criteria—first, that would give Federal funds adequate to do the job to get these men trained, get them back to useful work, particularly during the war effort.

Second, could we have enough Federal control to avoid waste and inefficiency in the State programs; because we cannot turn over Federal money and have it squandered here and there.

Third, could we get proper Federal control and at the same time prevent centralization of power in Washington, prevent further breaking down of State's autonomy, prevent developing another army of workers who would be under Federal oath, responsible primarily to the Federal Government, whereby the Federal Government could try to coerce those States to its will, or use the workers as political agents for whatever administration was in power, or pour extra Government money into doubtful States to swing an election one way or the other, whether it was a Republican or a Democratic administration. We wanted to have safeguards over the use of the money and at the same time make sure we would not be building up another bureau that would be able to exert political or economic pressure in individual States. This has happened in so many other fields, as you are all aware, that it constitutes a danger which the committee could not rightly ignore.

The problem was to withhold funds from improperly administered agencies without starving out agencies that were properly administered, in this case an agency, which, as has been said, has an amazing record of efficiency and economy in administration. We worked harder on this in the committee than on anything else. I believe there have been written into the bill ironclad safeguards which will give the money to do the job, which will prevent any undue Federal interference with or control over the administration within a State under its own plan, and still will provide sufficient Federal control to avoid waste by the States of Federal money.

Now, lastly, what are the values of this program? First, from a humanitarian standpoint I am am particularly interested in that as a physician. I know the most devastating thing that can happen to a human being is a sense of uselessness, to have society bring forth a man and then have no use for him. There is not a man worth his salt who does not protest inwardly and fret about that and begin to deteriorate internally unless he has unusual emotional insight. He loses his self-respect. He is a victim of pauperization and paternalism.

What can restore him so much as being able to make his own way again? Second, from a social standpoint, you cannot build a sound society with men who are primarily objects of charity.

The way to help men is not to give them things, but help them to help themselves, to acquire productive capacity or earning power, so they can be independent and self-sustaining, can hold their heads up in the community in which they live.

Discontent grows among men who are idle, men who are resentful over something that has happened to them, perhaps because of their patriotic and loyal service to their country, where the Nation has received the benefit and they are in effect cast aside except perhaps for a pittance as a pension or handout.

Third, as has been said by several others, from the standpoint of the war effort. When we are scouring the country to get men to work in factories and to work on farms, when we are disrupting millions of homes in order to put wives and mothers in many occupations to free men for heavier work, surely hundreds of thousands of those jobs being taken over by mothers could be done by men with physical handicaps if they had training to enable them to do that work, and thus relieve able-bodied men to switch to more difficult jobs, men who have more physical stamina and skill for very hard work. We cannot afford to have so many men idle because of disabilities which can be corrected or made employable.

But if one does not consider the above three reasons, there is the economic standpoint. I believe this a perfectly sound and necessary piece of legislation, viewed from the hard-headed standpoint of dollars and cents.

I do not regard this program primarily as a charity, I do not regard these men primarily as an obligation of the Federal Government. The primary consideration is that we have a government, which is spending money by the billions of dollars, and we want to get these men where many of them will not be on allowance of say, $30 a month, drawing money from the Treasury; that is not the solution, we want to give them the ability to be putting money back into the Treasury, as has been said, convert them from tax eaters to taxpayers. It is wholly in the interests of the Nation, as well as of the individual to get him transformed from a receiver of assistance to a normally self-respecting, self-supporting citizen. That applies no matter how, or when, or where he received his disability.

When we are spending a hundred billion dollars a year to make cripples, surely it is reasonable to spend six, ten, or even fifteen millions of dollars a year, on a 50–50 basis with the States in order to get these disabled persons back to productive work.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2536 relates to a program in which I have long been interested. The vocational rehabilitation of the physically handicapped citizens of the Nation is a program at once humanitarian in motives, practical in method, and effective in results. Established 22 years ago, this service for physically handicapped workers has proved its worth. I believe in it. And I am one who has followed its development and observed its accomplishments for well over a decade. Even before coming to the Congress I had become familiar in my own community with the advantages of a service to provide vocational guidance, training, and other types of preparation to physically handicapped persons of employable age.

Since coming to the Congress I have watched the expansion of the program on a national basis. In 1935 the Social Security Act included a section on vocational rehabilitation which increased and made permanent the annual authorization for the work. In 1939 the authorization for Federal grants to the States was increased again, this time from $1,938,000 to $3,500,000 a year. With the aid of this modest appropriation by the Federal Government and an equal amount by the States, the service is now provided on a State-wide basis in each of the 48 States as well as in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

The State divisions of rehabilitation provide service currently to about 60,000 handicapped persons. In the fiscal year now coming to a close the States will rehabilitate approximately 50,000 handicapped persons. Three-fourths of these rehabilitated workers will be employed by war production or war-supporting industry. The remainder will be placed in essential civilian employments.

Today industry does not have to be begged or persuaded to employ the handicapped. Industry is well aware that they can meet current manpower shortages only through the utilization of groups who formerly have not formed an important part of our labor supply. Everybody recognizes the necessity for the wartime employment of women. Not so many, however, realize the importance of fully utilizing the services of the three or four million persons of employment age who have serious physical impairments. Industry is anxious to employ them. Especially in the great aircraft factories of the Nation the physically handicapped worker has been hired in tremendous numbers. Here they have been found to be efficient, steady, and reliable. Their contribution has done much to enable the industry to meet the stupendous goals set by the Commander in Chief.

Recently I have seen letters from important producers of war materials saying that their handicapped employees are eminently satisfactory.

These letters are from industries in my own State, and I shall read excerpts. They are very illuminating. This is a letter from the General Electric Co., of Erie, Pa., and it states:

> In general, our experience is that these people are very grateful for an opportunity to be employed, and as a result have an inherent desire to make good.

From another industry in the State of Pennsylvania comes a letter from the Philadelphia Blueprint Co., a very large company in Philadelphia, in which it is stated:

> Our production is far superior in the jobs they are on to that of the more able-bodied. Absenteeism is at an extreme minimum. So far we have had very little turn-over. At the present writing we have had no accidents.

When interviewed by rehabilitation counselors and guided by them into jobs consistent with their abilities and suitable to their physical limitations, their productive output is on a par with that of the able-bodied. These handicapped persons appreciate a job, too. For that reason they stick to it, once they have it. Employers unanimously report that the rate of labor turn-over and the rate of absenteeism is far less among the handicapped than among the able-bodied.

But, mind you, the records already achieved did not just happen. Nor can the complete utilization of handicapped labor be achieved without constructive governmental action. State rehabilitation agencies have arranged the special types of training needed by handicapped persons; they have provided artificial appliances to restore lost function. Above all they have given practical and effective assistance in guiding the handicapped worker into a particular job in which his physical impairment does not detract from this productive efficiency.

H. R. 2536 extends and strengthens the provisions of the basic act under which the program has been operated. But there is no change in the fundamental principle or objective of the program. As I study the bill I find it has three basic objectives. First, it provides some additional financial assistance to the States; second, it corrects the greatest inadequacy of the present program, namely the lack of legal authority for providing physical restoration; and, third, it includes a temporary or emergency provision for additional expenditures during the 2-year period ending June 30, 1945. This last provision is, of course, intended to promote the fullest utilization of handicapped workers in war industries.

The Congress recently has passed legislation looking to the rehabilitation of persons disabled while serving in the

armed forces of the Nation. That problem will be provided for through the facilities of the Veterans' Administration. There is, however, another and closely related problem which the Veterans' Administration does not have and did not ask to have—jurisdiction. I refer to the thousands of young men discharged by the Army and Navy as a result of a so-called non-service-connected disability. Already thousands of such men have been discharged. In writing this bill full provision has been made for assisting these men to prepare for and to find useful wartime employment.

Finally, let me say that this bill makes no change in the administration of the program or in the Federal-State relationship that has existed since 1921. I believe this is very important, for in this program the Federal-State relationship has been especially cordial. Administrative responsibility for the actual operation of the programs has been left with the States, with the Federal Government exercising the leadership and general direction which the State officials have expected from it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, until this afternoon I was unaware of any objections to the bill as reported by the committee. The adoption of suggested amendments may be wise in order to insure the early passage of this important legislation.

Wisconsin was one of the progressive States which pioneered in the movement for rehabilitation of disabled persons. It has developed a remarkably successful program. Our legislature long ago established a State board of vocational and adult education, of which Hon. George P. Hambrecht is director. Its rehabilitation division has been successfully administered by W. F. Faulkes, and continues its great work even though handicapped by lack of funds for the proper expansion of its program.

In the 30 years since the Wisconsin rehabilitation division has been engaged it has handled over 27,000 cases. Of that number, 12,987 succeeded in being registered for service, and 6,580 have been closed and returned to suitable employment, and 3,904 received the special training for particular lines in industry.

Certainly, now of all times, there is need for the legislation this bill provides.

Mr. Faulkes, our State supervisor of vocational rehabilitation, has kindly given this measure his consideration, and I shall ask consent to include in my remarks a statement which he has provided, in which he emphasizes the surpassing importance of the rehabilitation program and dwells upon the features of needed legislation. It is as follows:

REHABILITATION NEEDS FOR THE WAR EMERGENCY

(By W. F. Faulkes, State supervisor vocational rehabilitation)

It is a trite saying that "comparisons are odious." Too often the basis of opposition to a new or different policy or plan is the likening to something within our immediate experience.

I recall an experience I had 30 years ago, when vocational education had its beginning in our State. It was a part-time program—part work and part education. The regular schoolman and "schoolmarm" had difficulty in reconciling actual work in a shop as part of an educational program. Today this reconciliation is generally recognized. The manual or industrial arts program then obtaining in high schools assumed that the ordinary manual arts instructor was qualified to teach any trade. He had to teach something of everything, but not all of anything. In other words, he was "jack of all trades" and master of none. When it was proposed, in the vocational schools, to have an instructor for each trade to be taught, the regular school people raised the cry of per capita costs. However, as the program progressed and commendable results were obtained, opposition gradually ceased.

Twenty-two years ago Congress enacted legislation providing for the vocational rehabilitation of physically handicapped persons. Prior to such legislation the physically handicapped person was largely barred from educational and vocational training activities, and to a larger extent such persons were denied the opportunity to work in accordance with their abilities. The fact that many physically handicapped persons were barred from attendance at public educational institutions was probably the reason for emphasizing education and vocational training as the major function of a rehabilitation program. At least, such was the interpretation placed upon such legislation, not only by the administrators of the Federal act, but by the administrators in many of the States. In Wisconsin the act happened to be drawn by lay persons and, as a consequence, it is one of the most comprehensive acts of its kind among the States of the Union. Notwithstanding the comprehensive features of the Wisconsin act, the emphasis has been placed upon vocational training and education in professional schools.

For a considerable number of years a few of the rehabilitation workers in the country have recognized that much more is involved in the rehabilitation of a physically handicapped person than that of education or vocational training alone. The Federal agency has been gradually brought to recognizing the other necessary features in an adequate rehabilitation program, such as prosthesis, physical restoration, and physical and occupational therapy. The physical correction of a physically handicapped person is not yet recognized by the Federal Government as a legitimate expenditure in the program that may be matched equally by State and Federal funds. The extension of a program of physical restoration involving hospitalization, corrective surgery, physical and occupational therapy will necessitate not only the introduction of specialists in such a program, but will necessitate a considerably increased staff for supervision. Then again, it has been difficult to bring about the recognition on the parts of State boards of education and State boards of vocational education that the rehabilitation of a physically handicapped person is largely one of an individual case-work character. The result has been that there is a greater need for actual case workers in a vocational rehabilitation program than there is in the regular vocational program that is being conducted by the States.

It can be vividly remembered by workers who are still in this field today that when the vocational education program was introduced in the States it was necessary, where an adequate program was promulgated, that a larger staff was necessary than in the regular educational program that preceded vocational education. Likewise, in the rehabilitation program, which necessitated individual case work, a larger staff was predicated than was the case in vocational education. Again comparisons were made, with the result that the work of the vocational rehabilitation program has been impeded quite extensively over the country. We who have been working in the field of vocational rehabilitation have recognized that our first responsibility is to the physically handicapped person. Regardless of prerogatives that may prevail, it is essential that the Nation and the States render such service to the physically handicapped person, whether or not such person's disability has originated directly as a consequence of the war or in one of the many industries that are contributing to the war effort. All of these people must be served and reinstated physically, vocationally, and economically as close to their previous status as it is possible to accomplish.

A brief résumé of what has been accomplished since the initiation of the rehabilitation service may be opportune here, as it will indicate the needs for expansion.

The total number of cases reported to June 30, 1942, was 26,452. Of this number 12,987 had been registered for service and 6,580 have been closed as rehabilitated and returned to some kind of suitable employment. Of this number of rehabilitated cases, 3,904 had received some kind of training in preparation for the particular employment. However, also during this period approximately 4,000 were closed as nonsusceptible, persons so severely physically disabled that placement in regular employment was not possible. Many of these severely disabled could work under sheltered conditions such as the home or a shop especially provided for such purpose. In order to provide such opportunity to this deserving group, the 1940 legislature made available an appropriation of $25,000 for such services. During the fiscal year 1940–41 the United States Office of Education agreed to match the State appropriation. The United States Office of Education has agreed to extend such aid to January 1, 1943, to the amount of $11,000.

In order to carry out the policy of local participation, such homecraft service was worked out in cooperation with local vocational schools. During this initiatory period costs of instruction, travel, and supplies were paid from State and Federal funds. Although the Rehabilitation Division of the State Board of Vocational and Adult Education had accumulated considerable data indicating such need, the approach to the solution of the problem was largely experimental, and because of this it was considered best that during this finding period the costs should be taken care of from available State and Federal funds. The amount of money available, of course, limited the extent of the program. In order to obtain Federal funds for this homecraft program it was necessary to set up definite qualifications for the teachers for such program. Such qualifications were based upon training and experience. During the past fiscal year 24 centers operated under the State-Federal aid program, and 4 counties without such aid. Funds are not available for any expansion of the program at this time. Time will permit only a brief summary of the accomplishments. From July 1, 1941, to March 31, 1942, total sales amounted to $14,173.67; material costs were $4,077.88, yielding a profit of $10,096.61 to the participants in the homecraft program. The continuation and extension of this service depends to a large extent upon future legislation, both Federal and State.

At this time there is pending in Congress a legislative proposal for materially expanding the rehabilitation program. This bill is

being sponsored by the National Rehabilitation Association in accordance with suggestions from the Federal Security Agency and the United States Bureau of the Budget. Congressman BARDEN, of North Carolina, introduced the bill in the House, H. R. 7484, and Senator LA FOLLETTE introduced a companion bill in the Senate, S. 2714.

This bill comprises three titles. Title I relates to the vocational rehabilitation of disabled individuals with war-connected disabilities. Title II relates to persons disabled in industry or otherwise. Title III relates to the vocational rehabilitation of blind persons.

Title I provides for the rehabilitation of the disabled persons who are members of the armed forces. Briefly, this title provides:

1. Sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this title.

2. Administrative expenses of the State boards in carrying out the purposes of this title shall be paid by the Federal Government.

3. The rehabilitation training shall be delegated to the State boards in accordance with a plan set up for such purpose. The Federal Government shall pay all costs of such training.

4. All other services, such as determining eligibility, susceptibility, physical restoration, prosthesis, and placement, shall be the responsibility of the Federal agency unless such services are incorporated in the State plan.

Title II provides:

1. That rehabilitation training shall be the responsibility of the State board in accordance to the provisions included in the State plan.

2. The State boards will be reimbursed 100 percent for all administrative expenses.

3. The State board retains authority to appoint the personnel, which must, however, be in accordance to a merit system approved by the Federal agency.

4. For each dollar of Federal money expended for rehabilitation training there shall be expended by the State at least 50 cents for the same purpose.

There is one major discrepancy in this title. The first three lines of subsection 1 of section 202 read as follows: "In order to provide for the rehabilitation training of individuals certified to the States for such training by the Federal Security Administration," etc. It is proposed to amend this clause by striking out the words "certified to the States for", and inserting the words "entitled to", and striking out the words "by the Federal Security Administrator."

According to conversations with the representatives of the Federal Security Agency and the Bureau of the Budget, more than three-fourths of the States are understaffed for the current program, and no State is adequately staffed to carry on the proposed expanded program.

Under the proposed program as included in the above legislative proposals, there will be added physical and occupational therapy, surgical and medical services, and considerable extension of prosthesis, and an expanded program of placement carried on on a functional basis.

It is my opinion that any State which sets forth an adequate and efficient program will be granted full authority to proceed. On several occasions, Wisconsin was complimented by the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget for continually expending more than the population allotment. I have contended for many years that physical rehabilitation should be included in the State program, but my pleas have always met with a deafened response.

Title III refers to the rehabilitation of blind persons, and proposes that such program be taken over entirely by the Federal agency. This title was added by the National Society for the Blind.

There is urgent need for an impetus and expansion of the rehabilitation program. We must face the fact that the demand for manpower is rapidly increasing; in fact, the surplus is almost exhausted. Recent surveys have indicated that many millions of man-hours of labor can be supplied by disabled, who can be rehabilitated and prepared for many of the tasks in the defense industries and employments. Recently General Hershey stated that it has become mandatory for industry to make place for the one-armed and one-legged applicants in industry. During the past year the Rehabilitation Service placed in permanent suitable employment 731 physically handicapped persons. More than 50 percent were placed in the defense industries. During the current year the objective of accomplishment is a minimum of 1,000. The industries must have these workers in ever-increasing numbers. To win this war adequate production must be had, and production is not possible without adequate supply of manpower. That the disabled can be and have been refitted for employment and satisfactorily employed has been demonstrated a thousand times in our own State.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TROUTMAN].

Mr. TROUTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the pending legislation which should have the unanimous support of the entire House. The Committee on Education has very carefully studied the bill now before you; and after very extensive hearings under the able direction of our distinguished chairman, the bill was unanimously reported out for your consideration.

In these critical times when it becomes necessary to appropriate extraordinary sums for the purpose of waging war, all expenditures which are nonessential for the successful conduct of the war should either be eliminated or drastically curtailed. The present legislation, while causing an increase in expenditure, nevertheless makes a very important contribution to our entire war effort.

The present bill is an amendment to the act approved June 2, 1920, as amended, which provides for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment. The original act, together with the amendments thereto, has apparently been a workable piece of legislation. There has been complete harmony between the Federal director of vocational rehabilitation and the various State vocational rehabilitation boards. The pending measure makes no drastic change in the present arrangement except to clarify and enlarge the present vocational rehabilitation program.

The present bill does make two very important changes to which your attention is called. It provides for a matching of funds by the Federal Government and the States. For each dollar appropriated by the State, the Federal Government will appropriate a dollar. The Federal Government will also pay all administration expenses. The present act places the appropriation of funds on a ratio of population, which system has not been conducive to a maximum appropriation of funds for this important work by the various States. The pending legislation clarifies the existing law by providing for physical restoration where the disabled individual is found to require financial assistance with respect thereto. Provision of physical restoration by the States is not forbidden. It has not been provided in the past because of limitation of funds and the feeling of the administrators that expenditures for such restoration were not authorized. The bill does not set up a State medical program but specifically limits the treatment to such treatment as might be necessary to correct or substantially modify a physical condition which is static and constitutes a substantial handicap to employment and is of such a nature that such correction or modification should eliminate or substantially reduce such handicap within a reasonable length of time. The act further provides for the furnishing of prosthetic devices as are essential to obtaining or retaining employment.

The main object of the legislation is to furnish services necessary to render a disabled person fit to engage in a remunerative occupation, within certain limitations. The purpose of the act is to bring back into gainful occupations those who are physically handicapped, the correction or modification of which handicap would permit them to become gainfully employed. Naturally some handicapped persons cannot be rehabilitated because of the severity of their disability or because of mental or emotional disturbances. It is estimated that within the male population 15 to 65 years of age there are some 7,000,000 persons whose physical condition was such that some vocational rehabilitation might be needed in their occupational guidance and selected placement. Somewhat more than a million others could be equally placed after minor physical repair or training around their handicaps or both. This group together with those suffering from defective vision, and women suffering from disabilities who would be available for industrial employment if rehabilitated, indicates the huge reservoir of manpower much of which could be utilized in a brief time and at a comparatively small cost.

There are very few problems facing our country more important than that of manpower. The needs of our armed forces must be met, and as a result severe shortages of workmen, both in industry and on the farms, are now prevalent. By tapping the huge reservoir of those persons whose physical handicaps can be corrected or modified so as to fit them for gainful employment, much of this acute shortage can be met. In my own State of Pennsylvania there is a potential load of 200,000 disabled persons in need of vocational rehabilitation. Each year approximately 80,000 new cases become permanently disabled through industrial or public accidents and disease. The very rapid expansion of industry, the increased speed of operations and the increased number of inexperienced workers, have caused the rate of disabilities from industrial accidents to increase at an alarming

rate. During the past 3 years there has been an increase of about 30 percent in the employment of workers in industry, but, on the other hand, there has been an increase of 70 percent in the incidence of disability among workers in industry. In addition, there are civilians whose disabilities are more directly connected with the war, particularly those in the protective services. There was a common agreement among all witnesses testifying before the committee as to the need for a greatly expanded vocational rehabilitation program. It was stated that at present more than 2,000,000 cases need the attention of the State rehabilitation services as speedily as it can be given them. Consideration must also be given to the fact that these disabled persons are doubly handicapped, not only by being injured, but also being unemployed without an opportunity for work.

Vocational rehabilitation will not only provide men for essential work but will also better the economic conditions of the handicapped person. Disabled persons are potential charges on the community and the State unless given an opportunity to make the most of what is left to them. They not only do not produce, but they consume a portion of the productive efforts of others. The State suffers economic loss because of the lack of productive power and because of the reduced purchasing power of this group. It is economically unsound to allow them to remain dependent. Unassisted, most handicapped workers are unable to prepare themselves for, secure, or hold employment in competition with normal workers.

Again referring to the State of Pennsylvania, approximately 13,000 disabled persons have been rehabilitated under the present program at an average cost of $300 a person. To maintain a dependent at public expense costs from $300 to $500 a year. The potential income of a disabled person is $1,200 per year and in many instances the average yearly wage of a rehabilitated person is in excess of his wage prior to his injury. The citizens of Pennsylvania are proud of the splendid work that has been done and is now being done by the Vocational Rehabilitation Bureau. Today more than 75 percent of the disabled persons who are prepared for and placed in employment by the Pennsylvania Rehabilitation Service are placed in work essential to war production, such as motor repairing, machine shop practice, bench workers, power machine operating, welding, tinsmiths, sheet metal, and drafting.

The bill now pending also takes into consideration vocational rehabilitation for the blind. There is probably no handicap suffered by man which is less understood than that of blindness. At one time to become blind was to become utterly useless not only to yourself but to the community. When we speak of the blind, we immediately picture a figure in dark glasses standing at a street corner with a tin cup. In the face of the present shortage of manpower for essential war industries, we are just beginning to become aware of a reservoir of competent, dependable labor that has been waiting for an opportunity to become useful—the blind workers of this country. The list of jobs in industry in which blind workers are excelling is surprising and the range of possibilities is even wider. The list includes shell loading, inspection, rivet sorting, drill press operating, lathing, welding, and many other jobs too numerous to mention. His highly developed sense of touch, his greater powers of concentration, his care and precision in his movements, and his great store of physical energy has made the blind worker an extremely valuable addition to our labor army.

The question may be raised as to whether or not industry is willing to employ physically handicapped persons. As a matter of fact, industry is making repeated demands upon the various rehabilitation bureaus to furnish men and women for employment.

In a recent letter from the American Armament Corporation, of Allentown, Pa., to the Pennsylvania Bureau of Rehabilitation, the personnel director writes as follows in relation to a blind girl who had been employed by the company 3 months before the date of the letter:

> In reply to your letter of February 26, I am pleased to advise you that the girl whom you placed with us on December 1, 1942, has proven to be a most satisfactory employee.
>
> In addition to the hand-burring job on which you placed her, she has mastered several go-no-go gage operations in our inspection department. On all jobs her production has definitely been equal to that of any sighted employee doing the same type of work.
>
> She has had one raise since starting and is at present receiving $26 a week.

In another letter from a large manufacturing company located in the city of Erie, Pa., to the Pennsylvania Bureau of Rehabilitation, the personnel manager of that company writes as follows:

> We have yet to find one cause for disappointment in placing physically handicapped people on jobs in our shop. Although in some instances their production is not equal to the top operators, it is within the average and what deficiencies they might have in production they make up in steadiness and dependability. We have not lost, through voluntary separation or discharge, any of our physically handicapped employees. In reference to your question of accident frequency we find them to be as safe workers as any in our plant.

Most of the large manufacturing companies of the country have seen the value of employing physically handicapped people who have received rehabilitation training. In my own State of Pennsylvania, the General Electric Co., the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., the Armstrong Cork Co., the American Car & Foundry Co., and scores of other companies have placed and are placing large numbers of physically handicapped workers into gainful employment. Under present conditions our industries and factories are taking all of the rehabilitated workers that they can secure.

The present bill will afford an opportunity to expand the present program so that many more thousands of disabled persons may be brought back into gainful employment.

The real man is often masked behind his physical handicap. Rehabilitation not only brings to the foreground the capabilities and desires of the individual, but develops in him the feeling of confidence and satisfaction which enables the disabled person to excel in the accomplishments of life.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I think it only fair to offer my congratulations to the chairman and also to our distinguished minority ranking member on the Committee on Education, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. I think they are to be complimented at this time for bringing in legislation of this type. Perhaps my words may sound a little bald when I say that it may have been a good thing that the First World War was fought 25 years ago, before the present dilemma we find ourselves in. I make this statement because I feel it has given us a background for legislation such as is now being considered for the benefit of those disabled. It will take care of persons disabled in connection with industry in wartime, and it is also leading the way for even more complete vocational rehabilitation than we have ever known before. I was looking over a bit of the history of veterans' legislation not long ago and I noted that although peace was declared in November of 1918, scarcely a step was taken before 1920 to rehabilitate soldiers coming home from the battles of 2 years previous. I believe I am correct in stating that the first rehabilitation act was not passed until the middle of 1920. Such a predicament, it seems to me, must have created a lot of confusion and indefinite action on the part of the country. It therefore seems to me that we are moving in the right direction when we take steps to care for the men who will return from the present war. We should take this action before the advent of peace which we hope will come in a comparatively short time. As I have said, early veteran legislation was confused; it was indefinite, and it took a great deal of time, and possibly the benefit of knowledge of all the misfortunes of the First World War has resulted in this step being taken today, the consideration of this bill. I feel sure this is but the beginning of what is going to be done in behalf of the greatest body of American manhood ever to return victorious from a great war. I hope as we consider other measures of this type we will take into consideration all the needs, and anticipate their needs.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As I understand this bill it is on a 50–50 basis of cost between the States and the Federal Government.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Is that the way it was handled in the previous law?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am informed that it is.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I was wondering if the committee had taken into consideration the fact, for example, that New Mexico has more of her men in the armed forces injured and prisoners today than any other State except possibly Texas; that the wounded in battle are not distributed on an equal basis between the States. It seems to me that some consideration ought to be given to that fact so that States like New Mexico, which has had so many of her boys injured, could receive a little more consideration than is proposed in the pending bill as I read it in its present form. I hope the Congress will correct this situation within the next 2 years.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I may say in answer to the gentleman from New Mexico that this bill contains a variable clause to run for 2 years in order to accommodate exactly the situation the gentleman presents to the House. I am sure the State of New Mexico will be taken care of.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I am glad the bill is before the House today and I hope it will be passed unanimously. When the boys come marching home, they will rejoice at their Congress' intelligent action, which will take adequate care of those who are maimed, disabled, wounded in the terrible conflict now raging.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, we have two amendments to offer to this measure.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. For a question.

Mr. FISH. If the gentleman is a student of this bill I should like to ask him whether it covers members of the merchant marine who are suffering the greatest casualties of any group in America today in the World War?

Mr. RANKIN. I am not sure about that, but I want to discuss another phase of it, and I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have an amendment we propose to offer to take the disabled veterans out of this bill. One of them is on page 5 after the word "duty", strike out all of line 5 and the balance down to and including all of line 9; and on page 6 beginning with line 3, to strike out all of line 3 and all of that paragraph down to and including all of line 9.

This measure reaches out and takes in service-connected disabled veterans, and that is unnecessary because they are already being taken care of by a bill reported by the World War Veterans' Committee passed and signed by the President. This amendment is also opposed by the veterans' organizations, and it is not looked on with favor by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. I would like to explain to the gentleman that General Hines was before us on this matter. There are certain facilities to correct a disabled individual which exist in one place and the Veterans' Administration may not have a facility where the disabled person is.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand what the gentleman has in mind. This bill invades the jurisdiction of the World War Veterans' Committee and the Veterans' Administration, and is disturbing the set-up that we now have.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Also the legislation passed for the Veterans' Administration provides that the Veterans' Administration shall use all available facilities?

Mr. RANKIN. Why, certainly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We have that legislation already.

Mr. LANHAM. We want to give that permission also in this measure.

Mr. RANKIN. General Hines says that insofar as the Veterans' Administration is concerned, there is no necessity for the provisions of section 2 (10) and section 3 (a) 1 of H. R. 2536.

Those are the exact provisions I propose to strike out. Not only that, but I have letters from various veterans' organizations, and I have had a conference with the leaders of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Veterans of the World War today, and all three of them ask that those provisions go out of the bill because, if passed, it will begin disturbing our jurisdiction and stir up controversies over these veterans which they do not want, and if we do not win the fight here it will be carried over to the United States Senate.

I hope every Member of the House will vote with me to strike these provisions from the bill, and if that is done we will have no objection to its passage.

Here is a letter from one of the veterans' organizations:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
May 27, 1943.

Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RANKIN: This is in reply to your note of the 25th requesting my reaction to provisions of H. R. 2536 which relate to disabled veterans, and I wish to say that in my opinion the references in this bill to disabled veterans are meaningless.

In the first place, Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, takes care of the rehabilitation of veterans having service-connected disabilities and the Veterans' Administration needs no additional authority insofar as that class of veterans is concerned.

In the second place, H. R. 2536 would cover veterans having non-service-connected disabilities in the same manner that it covers persons without military or naval service, without need of mention of "disabled veterans."

Section 2, clause 10, refers to "any disabled veterans certified pursuant to section 3 (a) (I)," and section 3 (a) (I) relates only to disabled veterans covered by Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, since it refers to an "agreement between the Administrator [of the Federal Security Agency] and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs." Obviously, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs could only agree to something concerning that over which he has authority, and he has nothing whatever to do with the vocational rehabilitation of veterans having non-service-connected disabilities.

Since the Federal Government furnishes all of the funds for the rehabilitation of veterans having service-connected disabilities, there is no need for it to give to the States for a program with which the States have nothing to do.

And, since the States, in their rehabilitation of veterans having non-service-connected disabilities, would not differentiate between such veterans and persons without military or naval service, there is no need for the mention of "disabled veterans."

It is evident that the sponsors of H. R. 2536 have included reference to disabled veterans in this bill for sugar-coating purposes and to gain support of the bill by appearing to favor veterans.

If the sponsors of H. R. 2536 really want the bill to mean anything to veterans, they should eliminate the existing reference to disabled veterans and insert a proviso to the effect that disabled persons having an honorable discharge from the armed forces showing service of 90 days or more during a war, campaign, or expedition, shall be given preference. Otherwise, it is our recommendation that reference to disabled veterans be deleted from the bill.

Respectfully yours,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
National Legislative Representative.

The section 2, clause 10, referred to by General Hines, has reference to any disabled veteran certified pursuant to section 3 (a) 1 and section 3 (a) 1 relates only to disabled veterans covered by Public Law 16, Sixty-eighth Congress. So you merely duplicate the work and stir up trouble for the Veterans' Administration when it comes to handling these men to whom we owe the highest obligation.

I hope my amendments will be agreed to when offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the gentleman from Mississippi saw fit to make certain statements in connection with this bill. The veterans' organizations that he speaks of have not been as cautious and as attentive about these matters as I would like to have seen them. There is not a single organization in the United States of America today rendering rehabilitation service to the veteran except this rehabilitation service here, and the war has been going on for 1½ years.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I do not yield at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I do not run around asking the veterans' organizations what I can do. I have been a member of veterans' organizations ever since they were created. I have served on virtually every committee in the American Legion and some of the other organizations, and I think I know a little about the duties,

the responsibilities, and the wishes of the American Legion and some of the other organizations.

I have here a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars saying that they approve of the bill. I quote from the letter as follows:

> This bill is within the scope of the current program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. We believe it to be a most important one, and urge its favorable consideration.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. GEARHART. I have a letter to the contrary.

Mr. BARDEN. Who are you going to believe? Here is the letter.

Mr. GEARHART. All right. Read this one. Let us put both of them in the RECORD.

Mr. BARDEN. I do not know how we are going to legislate for veterans' organizations if they are going to write the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] one kind of a letter and write me another kind of letter.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Will the gentleman permit me to get to a certain point?

Mr. GEARHART. Have you any doubt about the stand of the American Legion?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declined to yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman. What was the question?

Mr. GEARHART. Have you any doubt as to the stand the American Legion has taken in reference to this bill?

Mr. BARDEN. I do not know anything about what the American Legion's stand is in connection with this. I know they appeared before the committee and they said they wanted section 1 of the bill taken out and if that was taken out they were in favor of the rehabilitation bill.

Mr. GEARHART. Let me ask one more question. Did you not call the American Legion less than a half-hour ago and they told you they were against this bill?

Mr. BARDEN. Now, I called the American Legion headquarters and I called for Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan was not there. I called for Mr. Stubblefield and he was not there. The lady said, "I am interested to know what you are calling about." I stated that I was calling about this bill to see if they had changed their minds. She said, "If the veterans are in they want them removed." Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. GEARHART. That is a very precise answer.

Mr. BARDEN. Where were they? The last time I saw them the bill was O. K. Let me tell you all there is in this.

When we were considering this bill before the committee, the committee struck out section 1 known as the veterans' provision. When Public, 16 was passed, this is what they put in it, and they put it in at the request and after the statement of General Hines, who said that he wanted and expected to use the facilities of this organization because they had done a grand job with it. This is what was written into Public, 16:

> And may utilize and extend existing Veterans' Administration facilities and utilize those of any other governmental agency as well as those maintained by joint Federal and State contribution.

That is a specific and direct reference to this act.

Now let me come to what we put in this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have a message from Mr. Rice, of the Disabled American Veterans, and he is very anxious to have us support the Rankin amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. I yield myself 5 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

This is what we are dealing with. These folks sit downtown and phone up here. I feel that I have some responsibility for these veterans. The men in Africa and in the Pacific do not belong to any veterans' organization. I feel that I have some responsibility for this rehabilitation program. Public, 16 takes care of only 10 percent of those in the armed services who will need rehabilitation. It takes care only of those who are service-connected after the Veterans' Administration declares them to be service-connected, which may be 1 month, 2 months, 5 years, or even 20 years as it is operating now. Somebody must look after the rest of them.

This is what you are attempting to do. We begin on page 2 of this bill, section 2 (a):

> To be approvable under this act, a State plan for vocational rehabilitation shall—

Then you come over here to subparagraph (10):

> Shall also be available to any disabled veteran certified pursuant to section 3 (a) (1).

Now let us take section 3 (a) (1). This refers to the payments to the States:

> From the sums made available pursuant to section 2, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for vocational rehabilitation, for each quarter or other shorter payment period prescribed by the Administrator, the sum of amounts he determines to be—
>
> (1) Necessary expenditures in such period (exclusive of administrative expense) for vocational rehabilitation services provided disabled veterans entitled thereto under laws administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and certified therefor pursuant to agreement between the Administrator and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Is not that what they intended in this law, Public, 16, when they wrote in this language:

> And may utilize * * * other governmental agency as well as those maintained by joint Federal and State contribution.

This is what we are trying to do here. We are trying to make the best possible set-up for General Hines to utilize the only agency in the United States that is equipped to do it. There is no restriction, there is nothing else in there. This will enable the rehabilitation service to carry on a better and a more workable program.

This is the statement of General Hines:

> Insofar, therefore, as concerns the Veterans' Administration, the provisions in question in the present bill are considered unnecessary, but no objection thereto is expressed in view of the complete authority in existing law.

If the rehabilitation services officials say this makes a better and more workable bill for them, when they have been doing the work for 23 years, and General Hines says there is no objection and that it will in no way interfere with him, then why strike it out?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman referred a white ago to the letters. I read from General Hines' letter, where he said that these provisions of the bill are not necessary.

Mr. BARDEN. Why does not the gentleman read the rest of it and say, "But no objection thereto is expressed in view of the complete authority in existing law"? Why does not the gentleman read the rest of it?

Mr. RANKIN. Because it is not in the letter to which I referred, written on June 3. The other letter I read was from the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

I am just as much interested in the veterans of this country as any member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars or the American Legion in the United States of America, and I know about as much about this subject. I have been in the work long enough to know that. God knows I would not put a word in here that would impede or hinder any serviceman from getting the best possible treatment. I was the one who started this. My bill was under consideration before the gentleman from Mississippi or the Legion folks downtown ever thought about it, and the war had been going on a whole year.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand there was an attempt on the part of some people to get jurisdiction of the veterans, and they will not get it.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman from Mississippi knows better than to make a statement like that. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. If this is stricken out, what provision will there be for the rehabilitation of disabled veterans whose disabilities have not been service-connected?

Mr. BARDEN. There will be some question about it.

Mr. LANHAM. And the fact that we struck it out would make a question.

Mr. BARDEN. Who is going to take care of these veterans who come in here and say, "I am a service-connected veteran" and they are told that the Veterans' Administration has not so declared them such, and then they go ahead and rehabilitate that man before the Veterans' Administration ever recognizes him as a service-connected case?

Mr. GEARHART. If he is not officially declared to be a disabled veteran, he is entitled to rehabilitation under the terms of the act that the gentleman is asking us to pass, is he not?

Mr. BARDEN. Certainly.

Mr. GEARHART. Then if he is, he is entitled to rehabilitation under the act that we passed in the last Congress.

Mr. BARDEN. Certainly, but the man will not say that he is not a service-connected veteran. He is going to contend that he belongs in that list.

Mr. GEARHART. It is not for him to say, it is the law.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman knows this, and I will be fair with the gentleman. He knows, and the gentleman has heard me on the subject of the Legion and the veterans enough to know that I would not put a word in here that would invade General Hines' authority, or injure a veteran. If these Legion boys downtown are going to try to look after the boys in the present war they should try to find time to come by and offer their assistance to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes. My record in this House during the last 10 years will speak louder than anything that I can say today. I have always supported legislation which, in my judgment, was reasonable and would bring just benefits to the veterans of this country. I would not today oppose the Veterans' Administration. When they came before our committee and requested that title I of the proposed bill be stricken out it was stricken out. This is all new that an amendment should be brought on the floor of this House today to strike out the language in the bill as suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. It seems to me it would be a mistake, because only those veterans that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs desires to include under the Federal Security Agency will be included. No request was made by the veterans' organizations nor the Veterans' Administration to delete the language in question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Government and the country would not allow for one minute that the veteran should not come under this. The only thing that we are trying to do is to keep out 10 percent and have them under the Veterans' Administration, where they have always been cared for. Under that resolution, you have the right now to Mr. McNutt's assistance, and surely this bill would take care of 90 percent, and they would be classed as people, and not as veterans. When their service connection is established, where a man says I am, and the Administrator says he is not, then that kind of a case should be taken care of under the law.

Mr. RANKIN. Every veterans' organization is opposed to this bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Then why did they not come to the committee and say so?

Mr. RANKIN. They think that you are reaching out and mixing the veterans with all of these other social securities, and the veterans will be made a common carrier to break down the appropriation for all of this vast expenditure that will come in the future. They want to be separate and distinct, to be treated as they have been treated in the past, and every veterans' organization is for this amendment which I propose to offer.

Mr. DONDERO. Why did they not say so to our committee?

Mr. RANKIN. I conferred with them today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I also want to add my humble endorsement to the fine work of this committee.

The reason I am taking these 3 minutes is that I had a little experience in rehabilitation work following the last war. When I came out of the war and tried to rebuild my law practice I worked for about 2 years on a part-time job for the Veterans' Board for Vocational Training. That gave me an insight into the value of this kind of work.

I want to say I think this bill presents every correct principle for handling this problem. First, it teaches a man to stand on his own feet, no matter what his disabilities may be. Second, it utilizes existing facilities. In my State of California we have had 25 years of tremendously successful work in rehabilitating disabled men of all kinds. The work they do is utterly surprising. Third, it decentralizes the administration of this affair.

The results to be attained by this legislation, as I see them, are twofold. One is monetary. In other words, you take men who are drones in society because their disabilities make it impossible for them to work and build them into citizens who can take care of their families, pay their taxes, and carry their own burdens.

But it has another aspect that is far more important than the monetary gain, and that is the social aspect. During my limited experience I got jobs for and supervised the work of about 150 men. When you observe those men, many who are very despondent, who are utterly helpless, who feel the world is entirely hopeless, and that they cannot make their way in life and you get a job for them, and they build themselves up and they learn to surmount their handicaps, you see the brightness come back to their eyes, you see them again become excellent, self-reliant, independent citizens. Their whole attitude and outlook changes. I do not know of any program that can appeal more to human beings than that kind of a program. In my short experience those men had every disability—lost limbs, lost eyes, stomach ulcers, one was partially insane. They were built back into creative citizens. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] said, there is nothing we can think of that is more constructive, that has a more far-reaching influence in the future than this particular kind of work. There is no better Americanism program than this vocational program.

Therefore I want to add my testimony in support of and urge my colleagues to vote for this bill. I hope we will not bog down into a fight over some of the provisions of this bill between the various departments of Government, because it is a fine, constructive piece of legislation. If there is overlapping jurisdiction, let us take out those provisions which some think curtail the authority of the Veterans' Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, in considering this very important legislation, let us keep ourselves on the plane that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has lifted us to. He spoke of his own experience and the great need of men who are injured beyond bearing. I would like to plead with this Committee to consider long before they permit a lowering of the ideals for which this bill stands. If we allow this legislation to slide down the hill into a place where the need of the soldiers will be made the gateway for political abuses it will be the most tragic rather than the most beautiful thing this Congress has ever done. I would like to beg you very earnestly to consider the few parts of this bill that have been suggested as best to be taken out.

There is so much going on today similar to that to which the gentleman from New York referred. Out at Walter Reed Hospital today a young man, an officer terribly burned many years ago, spends 2 days a week going to those burned beyond recognition and saying to them, as the blind man did in England, "Fellows, I, too, have been burned out of all recognition; early plastic surgery was done on me and I am ever grateful. Now they are doing these things better. You'll have to get used to it, of course. I did, and you can. I'm telling you they will give you a face again with which you can go out into the community and hold your heads high and live a full and constructive life."

That is happening twice a week right this moment.

Mr. Chairman, so much of this is needed and will be. Let us rejoice that there are such men as these.

If we are seeking to do this thing well, let us search not only our hearts but the implications and the double meaning of

words in the language of this bill, remembering that members of the committee have told us they would not have been put in had they known the feeling of the veterans' organizations.

I think that we will do ourselves an injustice as an institution, as the finest legislative group there is, if we permit ourselves to do less than our best. I would like to leave with you the hope that you will delete from this bill those few little passages which have in them very real danger to the aim and purpose for which this legislation has really been framed by a loyal, hard-working, and splendid committee.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that there has been a little acrimonious discussion with respect to one part of one section of this bill, acrimony which I am largely responsible for, I am very wholeheartedly for the legislation we have under consideration. I do want to congratulate the Committee on Education for producing it.

But notwithstanding my approval of the bill as a whole, I am very much opposed to part of section 3 because I know it is going to be used to deprive the Veterans' Administration of the right to rehabilitate our disabled veterans who are yet to be returned to us, some of them so broken and crippled as to be just tragic human caricatures of the fine boys who marched so bravely away. I want the great responsibility of caring for the disabled veterans to be left exclusively and completely in the trained, experienced, and sympathetic hands of those in whom the veterans themselves repose confidence. Adopt the Rankin amendments, and the fears so many of us have expressed will be forever laid away.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, this measure is one of great importance. One wonders why such legislation was not proposed long ago. At this time of war with a manpower shortage looming large this legislation becomes necessary. Ten years of social work has brought to me the conviction that some program should be adopted to aid the disabled—to rehabilitate them and thereby place them back to normal lives and lives which offer a productive contribution to the Nation. The splendid feature provides for veterans' border-line cases—those which are not of service-connected disability. I have seen many of these cases—cases which were worthy of attention but under existing law no help could be provided.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have never seen a piece of legislation that was so carefully drawn. The two provisions that have been discussed here are granting provisions; they are not restrictions. I shall hate very much to see this House interfere or upset a bill that has been so carefully worked out as this bill has been. They will save General Hines and possibly the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] much grief. But I say in all frankness and fairness the language in the bill helps Public 16 more than it helps this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., title 29, ch. 4), is amended to read as follows:

"AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

"SECTION 1. Moneys made available for the purpose pursuant to this act shall be used for making payments to States (and Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, herein referred to as 'States') which have submitted, and had approved by the Federal Security Administrator (herein referred to as the 'Administrator'), State plans for vocational rehabilitation of disabled individuals.

"STATE PLANS

"SEC. 2. (a) To be approvable under this act, a State plan for vocational rehabilitation shall—

"(1) designate the State board of vocational education (herein referred to as the 'State board') as the sole agency for the administration, supervision, and control of the State plan; except that where under the State's law, the State blind commission, or other agency which provides assistance or services to the adult blind is authorized to provide them vocational rehabilitation, the plan shall provide for administration by such State blind commission or other State agency of the part of the plan under which vocational rehabilitation is provided the blind: *Provided,* That in any State which by law has established a rehabilitation commission prior to the date of enactment of this act, with authority to provide rehabilitation services to disabled persons, the State board may delegate to such commission all or any part of the operation of the State plan, under a written agreement of cooperation approved by the Administrator;

"(2) provide that the State treasurer (or, if there be no State treasurer, the officer exercising similar functions for the State) be appointed as custodian of funds received under this act from the Federal Government and receive and provide for the proper custody of such funds;

"(3) show the plan, policies, and methods to be followed in carrying out the work under the State plan and in its administration and supervision;

"(4) provide that vocational rehabilitation under the plan shall be made available only to such classes of individuals as shall be approved by the Administrator;

"(5) contain such provisions as to the qualification of personnel for appointment in administering the plan as are necessary to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards; the duty of the Administrator in approving a plan shall be solely the determination of whether the plan contains such provisions, but the Administrator shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, method of selection, tenure of office, or compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such provisions;

"(6) provide such methods of administration, other than establishment and maintenance of personnel standards, as are found by the Administrator to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan;

"(7) provide that the State board will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Administrator may from time to time require, and comply with such provisions as he may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(8) provide that no portion of any money paid to the State under this act shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase, preservation, erection, or repair of any building or buildings, or for the purchase or rental of any land for administrative purposes;

"(9) provide for compliance with such rules, regulations, and standards with respect to expenditures upon which Federal grants are made available under section 3 (a) as the Administrator may establish, including (A) provisions designed to secure good conduct, regular attendance, and cooperation of trainees and reduction of allowance in the case of on-the-job training; (B) maximum fees which may be paid for training and maximum duration of training; (C) maximum schedules of fees for surgery, therapeutic treatment, hospitalization, and medical examination, and for prosthetic devices; and (D) maximum rates of compensation of personnel; and

"(10) provide that vocational rehabilitation provided under the State plan shall be available, under such rules and regulations as the Administrator shall prescribe, to any civil employee of the United States disabled while in the performance of his duty, and shall also be available to any disabled veteran certified pursuant to section 3 (a) (1).

"(b) The Administrator shall approve any plan which he believes to be feasible and which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) of this section, except that he shall not approve any plan which he finds contains such restrictions with respect to the expenditure of funds under such plan as would (1) substantially increase the costs of vocational rehabilitation in the State, or (2) seriously impair the effectiveness of the State plan in carrying out the purposes of this act.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 3. (a) From the sums made available pursuant to section 2, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for vocational rehabilitation, for each quarter or other shorter payment period prescribed by the Administrator, the sum of amounts he determines to be—

"(1) necessary expenditures in such period (exclusive of administrative expense) for vocational rehabilitation services provided disabled veterans entitled thereto under laws administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and certified therefor pursuant to agreement between the Administrator and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; and

"(2) one-half of necessary expenditures under such plan in such period (exclusive of administrative expense) for rehabilitation training of other disabled individuals; and

"(3) one-half of necessary expenditures under such plan in such period (exclusive of administrative expense) for rehabilitation services specified in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E), to disabled individuals (other than those with respect to whom payments are made under par. (1) found to require financial assistance with respect thereto, after full consideration of the eligibility of such individual for any similar benefit by way of pension, compensation, or insurance, such rehabilitation services being—

"(A) corrective surgery or therapeutic treatment necessary to correct or substantially modify a physical condition which is static and constitutes a substantial handicap to employment, but is of such a nature that such correction or modification should eliminate or substantially reduce such handicap within a reasonable length of time;

"(B) necessary hospitalization, in no case to exceed 90 days, in connection with surgery or treatment specified in subparagraph (A);

"(C) medical examination where necessary to determine eligibility for vocational rehabilitation, the nature of rehabilitation services required, or the occupational limitations of the person examined;

"(D) such prosthetic devices as are essential to obtaining or retaining employment;

"(E) maintenance not exceeding the estimated cost of subsistence during training, including the cost of any necessary books and other training material;

"(4) expenditures in such period necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan, including necessary administrative costs in connection with providing the foregoing services to, and guidance and placement of, disabled individuals.

"(b) In the case of any State found by the Administrator to have substantially exhausted its funds available for necessary expenditures specified in subsection (a), he may increase amounts payable to such State under such subsection during periods prior to July 1, 1945, under such conditions as shall be prescribed in regulations promulgated by him.

"(c) The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) shall be as follows:

"(1) The Administrator shall from time to time estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of this act, such estimate to be based on (A) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended for vocational rehabilitation during the period for which such estimate is made, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State and its political subdivisions for such expenditures in such period, (B) a report filed by the State containing its estimate for such period of the administrative expenses to be incurred by the State board in carrying out its functions under such State plan, (C) records showing the number of individuals in the State needing and eligible under the State plan for vocational rehabilitation, and (D) such other investigation as the Administrator may find necessary.

"(2) The Administrator shall then certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated by the Administrator for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which he finds that his estimate for any prior period was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period, except that such increases or reductions shall not be made to the extent that such sums have been applied to make the amount certified for any prior period greater or less than the amount estimated by the Administrator for such prior period.

"(3) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon receiving such certification, pay, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Administrator, the amounts so certified. The money so received by the State shall be paid out in accordance with the provisions of the State plan.

"OPERATION OF STATE PLANS

"SEC. 4. Whenever the Administrator, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board, finds that in the administration of the plan there is—

"(1) A failure to comply substantially with any provision required by section 2 (a) to be included in the plan, or any restriction on expenditures imposed in conflict with section 2 (b); or

"(2) A failure to afford reasonable cooperation with other Federal and State agencies providing vocational rehabilitation or similar services,

the Administrator shall notify such State board that further payments will not be made to the State under this act until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied the Administrator shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such State under this act.

"SERVICES FOR STATE BOARDS

"SEC. 5. To facilitate the operation of State plans under this act, the Administrator is hereby authorized to enter into agreements with State boards needing access to special facilities and services and to furnish to such boards, on a cost basis, services and facilities; and is hereby authorized to establish such needed facilities. Costs of furnishing such facilities and services for any State shall be paid from funds appropriated pursuant to this act, but shall be deemed expenditures under the State plan, and reimbursement with respect to such cost shall be made by deducting an amount equal to such cost from payments made to such State under this act.

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"SEC. 6. Out of funds made available for the purpose, the Administrator is authorized to provide vocational rehabilitation services to disabled persons actually residing in the District of Columbia and to formulate and carry out a plan of cooperation with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission with respect to the vocational rehabilitation of any such disabled residents as are civil employees of the United States disabled while in the performance of duty.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 7. (a) In carrying out his duties under this act, the Administrator is authorized—

"(1) to utilize and enlarge facilities of appropriate units of the Federal Security Agency, and to enter into agreements and cooperative working arrangements with public agencies and private persons, agencies, and institutions, within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, for services and use of facilities of such persons, agencies, and institutions and to compensate them and such units for such services and use;

"(2) to make studies, investigations, and reports with respect to abilities, aptitudes, and capacities of handicapped individuals, development of their potentialities, and their utilization in gainful and suitable employment, or to contract with other agencies, including foreign agencies, for the making of such studies, investigations, or reports by such other agencies;

"(3) to conduct appropriate courses of instruction for any personnel who participate or will participate in carrying out the purposes of this act, and to detail such personnel to attend such courses and appropriate courses of not more than 6 weeks' duration conducted by other public agencies and private agencies and organizations, which detail shall be part of the official duties of such employees;

"(4) to provide personnel so detailed with necessary books and other material and pay their tuition, or reimburse them for expenditures therefor; and, in any case where such detail is away from an employee's official station he may, for purposes of subsistence and traveling expenses, be deemed on travel status.

"(b) Payment for use of facilities, and services obtained pursuant to this act by the Administrator from units of the Federal Security Agency or other Federal agencies, shall be by check either in advance or as reimbursement, for the actual or estimated cost of such facilities and services, and amounts so paid shall be credited, as determined by such Administrator, either to special working funds as provided in existing law or to the appropriation or appropriations against which charges are to be made or have been made in providing the facilities or services, and payment for services and facilities of other agencies shall be made by check to the payee or payees specified by such agencies.

"(c) The Administrator is hereby authorized to promulgate such regulations, and to delegate to any officer or employee of the United States such of his powers and duties, except the promulgation of regulations, as he finds necessary or expedient in carrying out the purposes of this act.

"REPORTS

"SEC. 8. Annual reports shall be made to the Congress by the Administrator as to the administration of this act.

"APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be included for each fiscal year in the appropriations for the Federal Security Agency such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including an equitable share from District of Columbia funds of the sums made available for carrying out the purposes of section 6.

"DEFINITION

"SEC. 10. As used in this act, the terms 'vocational rehabilitation' and 'vocational rehabilitation services' mean any services necessary to render a disabled person fit to engage in a remunerative occupation. Such terms shall not, however, be considered to require any State to provide all such services which may be necessary, but a State plan may be limited to training, or to training and any one or more of the other vocational rehabilitation services.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 11. This act may be cited as the 'Vocational Rehabilitation Act'."

SEC. 2. Effective July 1, 1943, the act entitled "An act to provide for the vocational rehabilitation of disabled residents of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 23, 1929, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. (a) The act of June 2, 1920, as in effect prior to the enactment of this act, and plans and regulations approved and promulgated thereunder prior to the enactment of this act may, notwithstanding the amendment made by section 1 of this act, be considered to remain in effect with respect to the period ending 90 days after the date of the enactment of this act; and the plan formulated with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission pursuant to the act of February 23, 1929, as in effect prior to the enactment of this act, and regulations promulgated under such act of February 23, 1929, prior to the enactment of this act, shall remain in effect except to the extent they may be hereafter modified or superseded.

(b) If any State cannot fully comply with the conditions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended by this act, on the date of the enactment of this act such State may secure the benefits of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act as so amended, until 60 days after the legislature of such State first meets in due course after such date of enactment or until the earliest effective date after such 60 days which could be given in such State to legislation passed within such 60 days to secure the benefits of this act, whichever is the later, if it complies therewith to the extent possible.

SEC. 4. This act may be cited as the "Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1943."

Mr. BARDEN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, to be printed in the RECORD at this point, and to be subject to amendment at any place.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the section to which I have called attention, and which I hope will be stricken out of the bill by the adoption of the Rankin amendment, is totally unnecessary to the complete administration of the measure we have under consideration, if it becomes a law. It is entirely unnecessary to the legislation, put in, I am quite certain, for one purpose and one purpose only: To give to the Federal Security Administrator the power to take over, through the control of the purse strings, the control of the responsibility of rehabilitation of disabled veterans, which we conferred upon the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in the act of March 24, 1943. If that were the purpose, the objectionable section was ingeniously conceived. That it would lend itself to such an unhappy manipulation cannot be denied.

How could that be accomplished? Very, very easily. The section which the Rankin amendment would strike out would, in effect, require the appropriation for the care of disabled veterans and their rehabilitation to be made, not to the Veterans' Administration, but to Administrator McNutt's organization. Then, in order for General Hines to get any part of that money for the purpose of compensating State agencies that he may avail himself of, it would be necessary for him to enter into some sort of an agreement with Administrator McNutt. In the making of that agreement the terms could be so broadly stated that the entire administrative responsibility for the enforcement of the act of March 24, 1943, might be delegated to the Office of Education, the objective so many have been so long seeking, the opposition of the veterans notwithstanding. It is not fear of the words themselves, the words which the Rankin amendment would strike out, that prompts this suggestion; it is fear of the use to which those words could be put by one in official position who might desire to achieve those ends.

Suppose there was somebody in higher authority, higher authority than either Paul McNutt or General Hines possess, and should intimate to the two of them that he would be pleased if they would sign such an agreement. Is there anyone within my hearing so naive as to think that such an agreement would not be forthcoming? The result? The rehabilitation of disabled veterans would be vested in the Office of Education, and the will of the Congress as expressed in the act of March 24 would have been defeated.

General Hines needs none of the authority which this offensive section would enact. Let us not so legislate that he might be compelled to sign an agreement which might render it impossible to do the job we all want him to do—to rehabilitate and retain our heroes, disabled returning veterans—to face successfully what will be, to them, at least, a very different competitive world from the one they went forth to defend with "all they had."

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And is it not true that General Hines has stated that it is not necessary to have this provision? The veterans can have their civilian status if they are not disabled by a service-connected disability. He does not need this language. I was talking with General Hines only a few moments ago on the telephone.

Mr. GEARHART. That is entirely correct.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. In just a moment, after I have commented upon the point raised by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

The act of March 24, the act which provides for the rehabilitation of disabled American veterans is complete in every detail, all comprehensive, so to speak. It confers upon General Hines all the authority he needs, all the jurisdiction he requires, to proceed to rehabilitate those veterans suffering from war-connected disabilities; so it is utterly unnecessary that any additional legislation, in this or any other bill, be enacted. General Hines has so expressed himself. That should be the end of it as far as we are concerned.

I am grateful to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for reporting her conversation with General Hines to us. When he says that this legislation is not necessary, that should settle it.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I am very much afraid the gentleman has overstepped the facts, because half of the money used for this purpose under this bill will be State money, and the very provision the gentleman seeks to strike out provides that if the State takes this money to be approved under this act a State plan for vocational rehabilitation shall make provisions for the facilities to be used by General Hines if he calls for them. We certainly would not have the right to force a State to do something for which there is no provision of law.

Mr. GEARHART. If the gentleman will read section 2 of the act of March 24, 1943, he will find that General Hines has all the authority in himself that Paul McNutt will have, when the instant bill becomes a law, to enter into contracts with the States.

Mr. BARDEN. The law the gentleman refers to states that he may use State and Federal facilities, but when we get to passing a law to make a State spend its own money without its consent it is going too far.

Mr. GEARHART. But where are we going to find constitutional authority to compel a sovereign State to do something its people do not want to do?

Mr. BARDEN. Through the appropriation of money and their acceptance of it.

Mr. GEARHART. That would constitute an agreement, the only way under whichever law we proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: Page 5, line 7, after the word "duty", strike out down to and including all of line 9.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, in reply to my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. REED], let me say that no man in or out of Congress has more sympathy for the disabled than I have, and especially for the blind.

The other day a question was asked, Who was the outstanding woman in America? My answer was, Helen Keller. I think her accomplishments will go down in history as probably the greatest achievements of any human being in America, considering the handicaps under which she labored.

I am not opposed to, and I have never opposed habilitating the disabled, but there is a vast difference between habilitating people who have never been able to do anything and rehabilitating veterans who are injured in war and who are compelled thereby to change occupations.

After the last war, through the Veterans' Administration, we put on one of the greatest rehabilitation programs for disabled veterans the world has ever seen. We propose to do the same thing again. But we do not propose to mix the disabled veterans who are to be rehabilitated with all of the vast multitude of people who have never been able to do anything and who have to be habilitated and make the veteran the common carrier to rake down the millions or billions of appropriations that will be necessary to carry on that vast program.

I know there has been criticism of the veterans' organizations. I have been chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation for 13 years. I sat at the elbow of Royal Johnson, chairman of that committee, from the time it was organized until he went out of office and I want to say to you that if you do not pass this amendment and leave these veterans in the hands of the Veterans' Administration, as we have provided, you will not only stir up a row that will echo in every post of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and D. A. V. in America, but I can tell you this bill will not pass the Senate in its present form.

What we are asking you to do by this amendment is what we have asked from the very beginning, and that is not to interfere with the rehabilitation of the disabled veterans of this war. The man who is not disabled as a result of the war in later years will be a civilian, and this bill here would apply to him with these amendments adopted. This encroachment on the Veterans' Administration is not justified and I say it would be a terrible blunder, in my opinion, at this time.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I wish the gentleman would answer this question. Will the bill that the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] referred to enable the Director of the Veterans' Administration to make these transactions with the various States to rehabilitate the veterans?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and, also, with private institutions. We saw to that, I will say to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. As this language in the present bill is admittedly surplusage, it can do no more than confuse the situation to leave it in.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; it will not hurt the bill a particle to eliminate it.

Mr. BARDEN. It will not injure his bill one particle to adopt these amendments.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. After the other war I was a member of the Committee on Education of the House and so was Mr. REED. Dr. Fess, of Ohio, was chairman of that committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Do not go into ancient history now. I do not want the gentleman to take up my time.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I want to confirm the gentleman's convictions.

Mr. RANKIN. All right. Go ahead.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The question came up just as it has now. There was vocational training or rehabilitation for those injured in civil life and for the veterans. We brought in two bills and we passed two bills.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is what I am in favor of today.

Mr. RANKIN. We separated them and that is what the veterans' organizations are trying to do now.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes if he so desires.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman if he can tell us this: The service organizations, the Legion, and the V. F. W. have examined the bill. What is their opinion?

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that Ted Ray, who now represents the American Legion in Washington, while our friend Mr. Sullivan is in the hospital, came to my office this morning, went over this bill carefully, and said, "By all means these amendments should be adopted and this language should be stricken out." There also came with him the legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Homer Ketchum, with whom we are all acquainted, and Mr. Ketchum said that by all means these provisions should be stricken out. I read his letter into the RECORD a while ago. There came with him Mr. Millard Rice, representing the Disabled Veterans of the World War, who agreed with them thoroughly, and he gave me a copy of his letter to General Hines. I have just read you the reply of General Hines in which he said this language is not necessary.

Of course, General Hines was not going to come in and oppose any provision of the bill. He is a part of the administration. He did not want to get at loggerheads with Mr. McNutt, who is also another member of the administration. But everybody connected with the veterans' organizations who has gone through this fight all these years knows this provision should be taken out of the bill.

Mr. COMPTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COMPTON. I want to know if any of these veterans' organizations appeared before the committee to object to this bill?

Mr. RANKIN. The veterans' organizations, when this matter was first considered, became very much disturbed about it. It was their impression that all these provisions that would include the service-connected disabled veterans of this war would be stricken out. Mr. Sullivan is in the hospital, and until a few days ago I was not aware that these provisions would include the very veterans that we have taken care of heretofore.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to answer the question that the gentleman just asked.

Mr. RANKIN. Please do not take up my time.

Mr. DONDERO. It is a very singular thing that not until this afternoon did any member of the Committee on Education have any intimation whatever that the veterans were opposed to that provision which the gentleman seeks to strike out by amendment.

If they wanted it out, why did they not say so to the committee at the time that title I was stricken out?

Mr. RANKIN. They thought it was out.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Did the Committee on Education make any attempt to determine what the viewpoint of the veterans was on this point?

Mr. DONDERO. In answer to the gentleman from Ohio, may I say that representatives from the veterans' organizations were before our committee and asked that title I be stricken. We did that. Had it been suggested that this language was offensive to them, undoubtedly this would have been stricken out at the same time.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that they went before the committee and asked that that provision be stricken from the bill because it did just exactly what these provisions do. The thing you should have done was to have followed it up and wiped out these provisions. The veterans do not want these two provisions in this bill. If they are out the veterans will have no objection to the passage of the bill. But you are about to stir up a conflict of jurisdiction that is going to stir up a row from one end of the country to the other and, in my opinion, your bill will never become a law unless these two amendments are adopted.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. May I ask the chairman of the committee when this bill was printed and made public?

Mr. BARDEN. It was printed May 7, 1943.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that the legislative representative of the American Legion, who has been looking after this proposition, has been in the hospital for several weeks.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I am very much in favor of all legislation pertaining to veterans being kept separate, but there is one thing in this bill that, listening to the debate, concerns me. Under the present veterans' legislation is it possible for one who is not service-connected to get rehabilitation?

Mr. RANKIN. Adopting these amendments would not affect non-service-connected veterans in the future because they would be civilians. It would not affect them at all.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very strange that this bill has been printed for over a month and those of us on the committee never knew until this afternoon that the veterans' organizations were not in favor of certain provisions of the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. If the gentleman from Minnesota will yield, the bill bears the date of April 19, and then was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on May 7, more than a month ago.

Mr. JUDD. I do not understand how this happened because, of course, we worked very closely with the veterans' organizations, or we thought we did. I do not know what their legislative representatives were doing when we had the bill out all this time.

But the point is, if there is objection to this provision, if there really is a ghost under the bed, which I cannot see but which others apparently fear, then I think it should be stricken out. I think it is rather unfortunate that this fight came here this afternoon. Because that provision was put in there, I know, only because we thought it gave more service to the veterans, not less; better, not worse. We wanted to be sure the States would allow their programs, for which they are contributing half the money, to be used by the disabled veterans if requested by the Veterans' Administrator. They probably would do that anyway, but we are saying here in effect to the States, "Unless you allow your State rehabilitation facilities to be used by these veterans when General Hines asks to use them, we will not give you the Federal money to help with your State programs." That was our way of making dead sure that the States in order to get the money from the Government would allow their facilities to be used by the veterans when General Hines asked them to do so. That was solely what we had in mind.

If the bill does not do that—and as the gentleman from Mississippi and I were discussing the other day, sometimes words do have meanings that were not in the mind of the speaker when he uttered them or in the mind of the writer when he wrote them—if this paragraph has the meaning he finds in it, then, I want it stricken out. But Mr. Chairman, I assure the Committee of the Whole House that there was never a thought of that sort in our minds. We thought we were providing better service for the veterans, not worse.

There is one further point I would make. I feel that in general it is far better for the veterans, once they have been examined and their disabilities determined and the treatment and rehabilitation that is necessary decided upon by the Veterans' Administration, not to set up a whole new set of facilities across the street from the ones the State already has, but to use those facilities and train the men there along with their fellow veterans whose disabilities are not service connected and with their fellow civilians.

For 20 years our doctors' offices have been crowded with men who were too long in veterans' hospitals. They became crippled psychologically worse than they were physically. It is almost impossible to get them to fit back into ordinary civilian life. After all, what we are fighting the war for now, it seems to me, is the privilege of being civilians the rest of our lives.

I assure the gentleman from Mississippi that our sole purpose was to try to guarantee better rehabilitation service, not poorer, for the disabled veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not questioning the good intentions of the gentleman from Minnesota or the gentleman from North Carolina, but we have provided for every service that is necessary in connection with the service-connected disabled veterans through the Veterans' Administration, and we not only provide for using these State institutions, we can use them or we can use private institutions; but what we do not want is the conflict of jurisdiction. For that reason we are asking that it be stricken out.

Mr. JUDD. And may I reply to the gentleman, that even if the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs wanted to use a State's facilities, and the State board of vocational education was busy, or filled up with its own trainees, there is no way under Public Law 16 that I know by which you could compel the State to allow the Administrator to use those facilities. This bill would compel the State to make them available, because, in order to get Government money for its own program, the State would have to agree to that.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has stated definitely the purpose of the committee to be helpful to the veterans, and that General Hines himself has stated that in this way he might be able to avoid duplication of facilities in many cases, and thereby promote economy and assist some rehabilitated disabled veterans.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. COMPTON. Has the gentleman any fear in his heart about any of the States depriving any of the veterans, whether there was authority or not, from having any rehabilitation that they were able to give? Has the gentleman any fear that that would be done because there was some question of jurisdiction?

Mr. JUDD. No. I hope with all my heart that it would not be, but this would seem to be a guaranty.

Mr. GEARHART. I do not want to be understood as questioning the good intention of the gentleman's committee, in fact I want to record myself as believing just the opposite. The point is this: Would you have included this authority to train disabled American veterans with war-service-connected disability in the present bill if you knew that under Public Law 16 exactly the same authority has been conferred upon the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. JUDD. We would not have put it in, if we thought that covered it. We thought then, and I think now, that Public Law 16 might not adequately cover it. This was to make sure that when the Veterans' Administration wants to negotiate for facilities, the State would have to agree.

Mr. GEARHART. General Hines has precisely the same authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield gladly to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me make a personal inquiry. The thought enters my mind to inquire of the gentleman, and we all realize that the committee intended to help the veterans, but there is one basic thought that I am possessed of and I would like to have the gentleman's reaction to it. Why should the States be compelled to take care of disabled veterans? Why is not that the duty and obligation of the Federal Government?

Mr. JUDD. It is not primarily a duty or obligation of the States except as has been said here. We were requiring that the States do it if needed, in order to help out the Veterans' Administration and the veterans. We have been at war a year and a half, and the Veterans' Administration has not yet been able to set up adequate facilities, and these boys are coming back, sometimes several hundred per week, and the idea was to take facilities already established and make them available to the Veterans' Administration now as an emergency—and later whenever the Administrator considered it advantageous. I believe they will generally get better training for return to civilian life and employment if trained along with civilians being trained by the States. When a man's papers are made out in the Veterans' Administration—where all authority would be kept—and the man is assigned for physical therapy or for special training in an occupation, he would get to use the same facilities, already in operation, established, and set up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Coming back to the question of responsibility, and that is what concerns me, our men are serving the United States of America, which, of course, is our Union—the Central Government. If they are disabled, why should not the Central Government assume the responsibility rather than pass it on to the States?

Mr. JUDD. It does under this legislation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Fifty percent under this bill.

Mr. JUDD. Oh, no. Under section 3, under the title "Payments to the States," it reads:

> The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State * * * necessary expenditures the sum of amounts he determines to be—
>
> (1) * * * (exclusive of administrative expense) for vocational rehabilitation services provided disabled veterans.

That covers the total cost for veterans.

Subsections (2) and (3) provide one-half of necessary expenditures for rehabilitation services for other individuals. Under subsection 1, if the States train the war-connected disabled veterans at the request of the Veterans' Administrator, then the Government shall reimburse the States in toto for the cost of such training.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right, but why should not the full responsibility be under the Federal Government?

Mr. JUDD. It is; it merely engages and pays for the use of State facilities.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say to the gentleman from Minnesota that the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts has put his finger on the spot. The Veterans' Administration is authorized to use these State institutions; every State college, and private institution, and these boys are not fighting for the State of Minnesota or for Michigan or for Massachusetts or for Mississippi. They are fighting for the whole United States, and the Veterans' Administration assumes this entire responsibility and, therefore, it is unnecessary to put these service-connected disabled veterans under the provisions here which would involve not only mixing them with the people you are training, and to rehabilitate for the first time, but at the same time unload a part of that responsibility on State facilities. As I have said, this thing is unnecessary; it hampers the bill instead of helping it.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman make the disabled men now coming home wait until whole new facilities can be set up by the Government before they receive training? However, if this language says what the gentleman from Mississippi thinks it says, I am for striking it out. I only wish we had had the information some time ago, for then it would not have been here.

Mr. RANKIN. On that date we were speaking of awhile ago, we were wrong and the gentleman was right about the time it was reported; but, as I said, the head of the American Legion in Washington was in the hospital and it was not called to our attention.

Mr. JUDD. Were the heads of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled Veterans also in the hospital?

Mr. RANKIN. They had written some letters, but in the rush of correspondence mine had been misplaced, but it was called to my attention only yesterday, and for that reason I brought it to the attention of the House.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman from Mississippi will agree, I am sure, that it was, after all, somewhat unfortunate that it came before the committee this afternoon for the first time?

Mr. RANKIN. If I had known that this language had not been stricken out at the time they struck out title I, I certainly would have appealed to the committee.

Mr. JUDD. And it would have been stricken out, without question.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not true that there was testimony before the committee that the veterans themselves or their agencies are now using State facilities, existing facilities, and that this was only to avoid the question of duplicating facilities?

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that this discussion has reached the point it has. There has been considerable fog turned loose in this House. The Rehabilitation Service has enough to do. They have a tremendous job and more than they can attend to now. The Veterans' Administration will have its problems. The Veterans' Administration intends to use every single one of these facilities and have so declared. They have already been over with 400 service-connected veterans to contact the Rehabilitation Service, to do the rehabilitation. Now, there is a reason for that, and I wish the Members would listen to this. Here is the report of the rehabilitation work that was done after the last war which, on account of duplication, lack of facilities, and setting up new facilities cost this Government $5,000 each. That is General Hines' statement. We knew that. Now, they have been rehabilitating, with this organization, for less than $300. Now, just listen to what we are quarreling about. In the act to which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] refers—by the way, I wish we would stop and think, that the service-connected disabled constitute only about 10 percent of the veterans needing rehabilitation. We cannot legislate for 10 percent and walk off and leave 90 percent.

In the act to which the gentleman refers they make this reference:

> Utilize this or any other governmental agency such as those maintained by joint and Federal contribution.

I am not so sure that we have the right to provide for the expenditure of State money in that way. I am not so sure of that. We were not so sure when we wrote this bill. But we were sure of one thing, and that was that we wanted the veterans to have the best possible service. So what did we do? We said they have put language in Public 16 to provide for the use of this Federal and State contribution program—and they were referring to this rehabilitation program—they put this in the bill, and I wish we could separate all other impressions and get this clear—we put into H. R. 2536 a section known as the State plan, section 2, "to be approvable under this act a State plan for vocational rehabilitation shall"—one of the few things we said to the State they shall do. Now, what is it they shall do? They shall provide that vocational rehabilitation provided under the State plan shall be available under such rules and regulations as the administrator shall prescribe, to any civil employee of the United States, and so forth, and shall be available to any disabled veterans certified pursuant to section 3 (a) 1, which says that they shall take care of any veteran which the Veterans' Administration sends down and certifies that he is entitled to it and makes an agreement as provided in this law for him to be taken care of. Now, that is all there is in it. I am so sure that the American Legion would run like shot cats from any audience of soldiers in America if somebody were to get up and clothe them with responsibility for striking out this provision that we put into this bill. What on earth can they be thinking about?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield briefly.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman says that the law which came out of the World War Veterans' Committee only affects 10 percent of the veterans. That means service-connected disabled veterans. The non-service-connected veterans are covered under the rest of this bill as civilians. But this is the provision that we object to, reaching out and seizing control or seizing jurisdiction of the service-connected disabled veterans that are taken care of in that bill.

Mr. BARDEN. I challenge the gentleman's statement. I challenge the statement of any man on this floor who says there is a word that reaches out and takes jurisdiction. The only reaching done was in Public, No. 16, when they reached out and said they were going to spend State and Federal money. The gentleman from Mississippi would be as helpless as a baby to spend a dollar of Mississippi's money under his act, without the consent of the State of Mississippi. Therefore, to correct a very apparent error in the act to which the gentleman refers—Public, No. 16—we put in the State plan, that a State in submitting its plan shall make provision to take care of any service-connected veteran that General Hines sends down and certifies and orders taken care of and makes agreements to pay, and so forth. You cannot make anything else out of this, and I challenge any statement by any Member and I challenge him to prove it, that there is a word in this bill that attempts to take any jurisdiction of any service-connected veteran.

Did they previously make an arrangement that they did not make under that act? I am not a constitutional lawyer. There seems to be about 400 in the House, but I am not one of them. I do say that the State, when it is putting its money in, should have control. I do not think the gentleman could say with one stroke you are going to spend State money.

It is not going to ruin that program. It is not going to hurt the veterans; it is going to put the States in a position where they can say whether or not they want to take care of these men.

I want it distinctly understood where the responsibility for striking out this language is, if it is stricken out; I want it known where the responsibility rests. I want no part of it, and I do not take any other interpretation from any man who may be downtown, and I would suggest to them, the American Legion representatives, and they have been up to my office and talked with me. I never got any impression from them that they were not satisfied with this bill, or with this section. I think there has been some confusion here or there.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. Veterans' organizations have done everything in their power, not in the last few days as some

people have seemed to understand, but for a period of 2 years, and they have been going to the Committee on Education and to the World War Veterans' Committee.

Mr. BARDEN. Will the gentleman stick to the matter under discussion. I know what they have done and what they have not done, and that the Legion representatives, the only two I know, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Stubblefield, have not raised this issue with me—and to do so at this time strikes me as being ill-timed and ill-considered.

Mr. GEARHART. Is it not true that for 2 years the representatives of the veterans' organizations have come to your committee, every one of them, and told you they wanted you to drop all of this education to disabled veterans: that the veterans did not want this?

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say this: Right now this Congress, and you and I have been a part of it, we have had the responsibility for looking after this program for the veterans. This Congress, when the session started this year, did not have before it any such legislation; the Veterans' Committee did not make a move until the latter part of last year. The veterans' bill to take care of the 10 percent disabled has been passed. That was to take care of the disabled, and it is this program, the rehabilitation program, that is saving the veterans today.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. It is the administration of this program.

Mr. GEARHART. How has this legislation saved the disabled, when it has not even been enacted, and when the veterans' bill is already the law and was signed by the President on March 24, 1943?

Mr. BARDEN. This bill amends the basic act. The disabled have been rehabilitated and trained for the last several months under the State-Federal rehabilitation program. Does not the gentleman know that there are a lot of veterans now who are being trained under the State-Federal program, where the States are paying for the training, and where there is no provision for reimbursement?

Mr. RANKIN. Not those with service disabilities.

Mr. BARDEN. Absolutely; and the record will support this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, the House knows that the World War Veterans Committee has been working upon rehabilitation for some months and finally secured the passage of legislation.

I would like to read the testimony of Millard Rice, given in February 1943. This is in response to a question by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], in which he said:

> I believe that the movement was started by those who want to bring about the process of levelization in this country, taking off the hill tops and filling in the valleys; and the first vulnerable point would be the leveling of the benefits allowed to veterans as compared to other needy citizens purely on the basis of need.
>
> One of the processes of levelization is between the handicapped disabled veterans and the handicapped disabled civilians, leveling them off through the Federal Security Administration. The second is the levelization through the entire country.

Then Mr. Rice goes on to say that it has to be separate and apart.

I have just talked to General Hines and he told me that he does not need this legislation for his purpose.

I would like to point out to the committee that if the Veterans' Administration has to go to the Social Security Administration for its appropriation there will be a great deal of delay in the training of veterans. Going back to World War No. 1, at the time the rehabilitation program was established, the rehabilitation of veterans was handled through vocational training. I was visiting with the disabled veterans at that time. In the hospitals it was difficult to help a man to take that training; there was a great deal of delay because you had the Veterans' Administration to deal with, the War Risk Insurance, and you had also a Vocational Training Bureau. There was a great deal of delay in organization and securing appropriations. Only 10 percent of the disabled veterans will come under the social-security program. The other 90 percent of disabled veterans who are serving their country, will go back to their civilian status and will be taken care of in that way. I can see no need for this. I shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

I should like to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina on the fine job he and the members of his committee are doing in this rehabilitation work. It is greatly needed and very necessary, but we do not want this provision for the service-connected veterans in the bill. This is no time to take away from the Veterans' Administration any of its prerogatives. This is the first one. If this succeeds others will follow and you will gradually weaken that Administration so that the World War veterans will be classed with other civilians, and not veterans.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The reference the gentlewoman made a moment ago to the conversation she had with General Hines, as I understood it, was to the effect that General Hines said they did not need the provisions we propose to strike out of the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He said he was not offering objections but he did not need them to carry on his work; he was perfectly satisfied. He was not opposing the committee and I can see why he would not want to, but he does not need that provision in the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. If this amendment is passed is there any question in the gentlewoman's mind but what the Congress will pass all the legislation necessary to take care of veterans?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am positive of that. We have such a law on the statute books at the present time for the service-connected cases.

Mr. JENSEN. And we will give that power to the Veterans' Administration where it justly belongs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And, of course, the veterans know that. It seems to me this is a very important amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I just wanted to read from another part of the bill to confirm a thing which has been said several times, namely, that the Committee on Education inserted these provisions only because it believed it will make sure the facilities of the States would be available for veterans when requested. I refer to section 4, on page 9, which reads:

> Whenever the Administrator, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board, finds that in the administration of the plan there is—
>
> Omitting (1)—
>
> A failure to afford reasonable cooperation with other Federal and State agencies providing vocational rehabilitation or similar services, the Administrator shall notify such State board that further payments will not be made to the State under this act until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure.

I quote that merely as corroboration of the point we are trying to make that these services would have to be rendered to the Veterans' Administration by the States if requested by the former.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He has power to set up the machinery under the bill the Congress has already passed, and that has become law.

Mr. JUDD. He is not actually carrying on this rehabilitation program as yet.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He has administered veterans' rehabilitation in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, one of the previous speakers said it would be wise to let the men speak for themselves. I happen to be a service-connected disabled veteran, and speaking for my post, the World War Amputation Post in New York City, I wish to express these thoughts: That they want to be left alone where they are because they are in very happy surroundings. It is true that after the last war, when the Veterans' Committee was formed to administer to the veterans of the last war, when the Veterans' Administration tried to make pocketbook makers out of motormen and jewelers out of shoemakers, they nade plenty of mistakes because they were new and they were young; but as they went along they saw the plight of the disabled veteran.

They listened to his needs and they served every interest which he desired.

Although these various veterans' organizations have not appeared before the committee in its consideration of this bill, the hour is not too late. This Congress has, since the last war, given ear to all the veterans' organizations in the legislation which they have sought, and surely now, even at this last hour, you must have heard, as I have, that the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the World War Disabled American Veterans, do not want this. I ask you in their name, I ask you as a rehabilitated disabled veteran, to listen to them and to favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to see if we cannot arrive at a limitation of time. I believe we have overemphasized things a little here, that there is not half so much danger as some seem to think.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close within 20 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask that all debate on the pending amendment close in 30 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there are 10 Members standing who want time. The House gladly listened to the chairman of the committee and gave him an additional 5 minutes, and have listened to all others for 5 minutes. We can well afford to spend an hour on this subject because it is an important amendment to the veterans and the men of this war. I object to anything less than 5 minutes to each Member who wishes time on this amendment.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the only reason I come to the rostrum on this occasion is, as I stated previously, that I have heard from Pennsylvania, and on no occasion did I hear any protest against the provisions of this bill.

When the legislative representative of the American Legion was before our committee, and I refer to Mr. Sullivan, I took it upon myself to make sure that Mr. Sullivan had every opportunity so that he could amplify his remarks, and I asked the committee to agree that he might do so in writing at a later date.

The first I heard of any objection to this particular provision covered by the pending amendment was this afternoon. At the present time the Veterans' Administration is using the existing facilities in the several States. General Hines was before our committee and other representatives, and the intent and purport of the testimony of the representatives of the service organizations was to request that we strike out title I. Title I was stricken out. The provision now under discussion was put in the bill merely for the purpose of protecting the veterans so that there would be some compulsion instead of merely a moral responsibility on the States to make existing facilities available for training veterans instead of the necessity of having duplications.

If, however, the veterans feel that they would prefer to have General Hines use moral persuasion rather than the Federal Government use financial persuasion, that is, withholding it in order to get the use of existing facilities, I am perfectly agreeable. If it will help remove any possibility of this bill not becoming law at the earliest possible date, I would agree to the amendments although I do not see how the language in any way can hurt the veterans.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing that every veteran of the World War will agree to and that is that the hospitalization, the treatment, the rehabilitation of men who are disabled during a period of war is absolutely the responsibility of the Federal Government and until they are completely rehabilitated that responsibility should not be spread over the 48 different States. It has been said that under this program the Director of Veterans' Affairs would certify to the State of Connecticut in regard to a Connecticut veteran that John Smith has received the maximum benefit of hospitalization and is now eligible for vocational training. "We turn him over to you in competition with those who have suffered industrial accidents and with others who may need vocational training," and under the direction of the State supervisor he would receive that training. The Federal Government for the time being drops him until such time as his training is completed. If he still has a disability which has not been compensated by his training he may or may not be later picked up by the Veterans' Administration. We do not want that kind of a situation.

It was the understanding of the veterans' organizations, and I talked with their representatives, that when title I was stricken out of the original bill all reference to the service-connected disabled veteran was removed from this bill. I think there is some confusion in our thinking when we use the word "veteran." The man who serves in this war and who will be a veteran at the end of this war, and who later suffers an industrial accident will, of course, be entitled to the benefits of this act and will receive all such benefits. But so far as the man who is suffering from a service-connected disability is concerned the Federal Government must assume that responsibility.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. When General Hines appeared before our committee I asked him this question:

General, why should the Committee on Education be dealing with veterans' affairs?

He answered:

They will not be if this bill passes. The Veterans' Administration will be handling it. We will be using some of their facilities.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes; they will be using some of their facilities. Which is as it should be providing that control is maintained by the Veterans' Administration and not the State.

Mr. DONDERO. I simply quote that to show that in committee we raised the question why we should be dealing with Veterans' Administration affairs.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. If the question could be put to the House now the members of the committee, or many of them, and the majority of the Members of the House would strike this section out so that there would be no question about it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. In view of the fact that everyone agrees that if this is going to in any way conflict with the Veterans' Administration operation of the rehabilitation program, I see no reason why the committee should not accept the amendment without any further argument.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I wish the members of that committee would accept the Rankin amendment. If the committee would accept it, there could be no question about it later.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the point I want to bring out. The adoption of my amendment will not cripple this bill in any way whatsoever. The non-service-connected veteran who will later come in as a civilian may take advantage of it.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Absolutely.

Mr. RANKIN. It will eliminate a conflict that is going to be confusing, dangerous, and damaging to the service-connected disabled veteran.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 3 minutes on another subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that this controversy has come up in connection with this bill because we were all quite happy at having this bill before us, as it deals with an important subject, a subject that is very close to my heart. I refer to the rehabilitation of men who suffer from disability, whether it is from war or from an industrial accident.

Earlier in the day reference was made to the amount of money that might be needed. I hope this program can be permitted to grow just as rapidly as it is possible to obtain trained personnel, and no more rapidly than that, because if we do not get the right kind of personnel to handle and carry into effect this legislation we might do a great deal of harm to

not only the disabled veterans but to disabled civilians. I hope that when this war comes to an end and the Veterans' Administration writes its regulations to carry into effect the acts we pass, there will be one expression stricken from their regulations and that is the expression "permanently and totally disabled." I do not want to see the Veterans' Administration or any other agency of the Government ever to say to a man, even though it might possibly be true, and to have him declared on the records of the Federal Government, that he is permanently and totally disabled, because, unfortunately, there are thousands who are so psychologically constituted that they believe it. They believe that because the Veterans' Administration has formally declared them permanently and totally disabled they are on the shelf for the rest of their life, and it is tragedy when a man does accept that interpretation.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. That provision was never written into any veterans' law until after the First World War, when it was written into the Sweet bill in 1921 before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was created.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I wish that could be dropped from all regulations.

In closing, I want to express this additional thought, and it does not apply to any member of this committee. There are those in Washington who would like to see the care and treatment of the veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 made a part of the social-security program. There are State directors of this rehabilitation program who would like by hook or by crook to bring under their control the training of disabled veterans. Why? Because they know that when they go to their legislatures if they are able to say that part of the money they are asking for is going to be used to train men who were incapacitated in the war, they know that they will get their appropriations much more easily than they would if this language were not in the bill. So I hope that to remove all doubt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi will be adopted.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, the committee has, of course, presented its views. This piece of legislation is entirely too important to be misconstrued. The committee does not now think the bill will be any better if these amendments are adopted. We think the boys now on the battlefields and the veterans' organizations will be injured more than the bill. But in the interest of conserving the time of the House, and in order to get this program going throughout the country, I have conferred with the minority members and many of the other members of the committee and their opinion is that if we are going to be misunderstood and the Washington representatives of the American Legion and the other veterans' organizations want to assume the full responsibility for the removal of this language, I should submit a unanimous-consent request that the provisions referred to be stricken in accordance with the amendments offered. It will not hurt the bill.

I believe the gentleman from Mississippi proposes to offer another amendment. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments may be read in order that we may strike the exact language. I think we can accept them by unanimous consent and avoid a lot of trouble and misunderstanding over what the chairman thinks is a very, very excellent piece of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendments of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 5, line 7, after the word "duty", strike out down to and including all of line 9.

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 6, beginning with the word "for", in line 4, strike out down to and including line 9.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that these two amendments be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the two amendments which have been reported by the Clerk as offered by the gentleman from Mississippi be adopted. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, if these two amendments are adopted then will we have met the objections of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans, and will we also have met the objections of the members of the House Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation?

Mr. RANKIN. That is correct.

Mr. BARDEN. If the gentleman is asking me, I say not as presented to the committee; and I want it distinctly understood, and the Committee on Education wants it distinctly understood, that these organization representatives must assume full responsibility for these amendments. We do not cherish any part of it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I said it would meet the objections raised by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and the members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House. Is not that correct?

Mr. BARDEN. I will let the gentleman assume that.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is to cut out all of paragraph 1 on page 6 except a line and a half. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified to strike out the entire paragraph, and that the numbers of the succeeding paragraph be corrected.

Mr. RANKIN. That will be all right, Mr. Chairman; beginning with line 3, strike out all of lines 3 to 9, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina that the two amendments submitted by the gentleman from Mississippi be adopted?

There was no objection.

So the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 10, line 12, after the words "agreements with", insert the words "two or more."

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, in this paragraph we were dealing with agreements with two or more State boards. The printer simply left out the words "two or more." This amendment is to correct that error.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLEY: On page 10, line 2, strike out the comma and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or."

After line 2 of page 10 insert the following:

"(3) A denial of vocational rehabilitation on account of race, creed, or color."

On page 10, line 5, after "failure", insert "or denial."

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Chairman, this particular amendment is offered for insertion under section 4, after line 2, page 10, of the bill, H. R. 2536, now under consideration by the House. The amendment is to strike out the comma where it appears after the word "services" and at the end of line 2, page 10, of the bill to insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or", and after said line 2, to insert the following:

(3) A denial of vocational rehabilitation on account of race, creed, or color.

Section 2 of the bill provides that there shall be a State plan for vocational rehabilitation approved by the Administrator.

Section 4 of the bill provides that if the Administrator should find that certain requirements of said plan have not been met by the State affected and if he is not satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure that said Administrator shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury and thus the State affected would be denied Federal funds. Part 1 of section 4 mentions a failure to comply substantially with any provision required by section 2 to be included in the State plan for vocational rehabilitation, which must be approved by Federal authority, or any restriction on expenditures imposed in conflict with section 2.

Part 2 of section 4 refers to a failure to afford reasonable cooperation with other Federal and State agencies providing vocational rehabilitation or similar services. The addition of part 3 provided by this amendment simply means that in the operation under State plans as federally approved that it must be shown there has been no denial of vocational rehabilitation on account of race, creed, or color.

The other part of this amendment is to insert in line 5 on page 10 of the bill, after the word "failure", being the last

word in said line, the words "or denial." The present line means that the Administrator will notify a State board that further payments to the State under this act will not be made if there is a failure to comply with the terms of the act. This part of the amendment simply means that there must be no failure to comply with the terms of the act and no denial of the benefits of vocational rehabilitation on account of race, creed, or color.

Reviewing some of the legislation passed in recent years, it is found that provisions having a similar effect to the amendment proposed here have been inserted in a number of measures, of which the following are examples:

Fifty-third Statutes 855, Civil Aeronautics Act, 1938: "*Provided*, That in the administration of this act, none of the benefits of training or programs shall be denied on account of race, creed, or color."

Public Law 163, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved June 28, 1937, Civilian Conservation Corps, section 8: "*Provided*, That the Director may exclude from enrollment such classes of persons as he may consider detrimental to the well-being or welfare of the Corps; except that no person shall be excluded on account of race, color, or creed."

Selective service law, Public Law No. 783, approved December 20, 1941, section 4 (a): "*Provided*, That in the selection and training of men under this act, there shall be no discrimination against any person on account of race or color."

Thus, it appears by various laws enacted by the Congress in recent years that there is ample precedent for the inclusion of the words which are offered to be added to the pending bill by this amendment.

Also, there is no desire or attempt here to offer this amendment from the floor to the exclusion of committee consideration. The simple fact is the matter was not suggested until after the bill had been reported. It would have been more satisfactory for us to bring this question to the attention of the committee for action by its membership and before the bill had been finally reported out.

It is suggested that the reasons which impelled the Congress to insert the quoted language in the various measures which are here cited are just as urgent today as they were when Congress acted upon these other measures.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I regret very much that that amendment has even been offered. This program has been running for 23 years. There has never been the slightest inference of any discrimination. When this man, Ed Brown, who is some kind of a lobbyist around here, and who has been discussed on this floor before, came to me with that suggestion I said to him, "Why raise the issue, why do you want to render that disservice?" I was very anxious because I have a great deal of interest in the subject matter which this attempts to deal with. I led the fight in the State of North Carolina to increase the appropriation for colored schools, and I am not going to permit any discrimination. I went to the trouble of finding out some figures. If there is any discrimination, it is the other way. In the District of Columbia 25 percent of the rehabilitation cases are of colored people. In South Carolina it is 23.8 percent. So, if there is any discrimination, I am sure it is the other way, and I am afraid that this amendment will render a disservice if it is agreed to. There has never been the slightest controversy. The issue has never been raised. I certainly hope in this one grand program, that has been operated so economically and so efficiently, that there will be no interference of that kind. When Brown was discussing this he told me that he had not had one single complaint and had not heard one complaint about this department. Why raise the issue? It does not seem appropriate.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, this amendment would just kill the bill. If the gentleman wants to destroy this legislation, that is the way to do it. Let me say to the gentleman from Delaware—and I am sure if the people of Delaware understood the matter they would see it in this light—in one of the meetings we had a great row over building hospitals for colored veterans, and the two men that led the fighting and held the committee in session until 2 o'clock in the morning were Dick Wilson from South Carolina and your humble servant. The men from the other sections of the country ridiculed us, but we stood with them until we got that settled.

Mr. BARDEN. I just hope that we will not carry this argument along, but let us vote on this and get through with the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, for his success and alertness in looking out after the wishes of the veterans' organizations of the country. As I understand it, the gentleman from Mississippi has contended today that various service organizations have asked that they be excluded altogether from the terms of this bill. I understand that they prefer to be treated separately and to have their own program, and that that is what the committee agreed upon a few moments ago.

Whether this is wise or unwise, it seems to represent the wishes of some veterans in my State.

I do want to say to the chairman of the Committee on Education, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] that I am strongly for his bill, but that I have received communications from ex-service groups in Arizona asking to have their program of rehabilitation kept separate and apart from this general rehabilitation legislation. I will take only a moment of your time here to indicate to the membership, as I have already indicated privately to the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, that such is a request I have received from Arizona.

While I am on my feet I want to say that the rehabilitation program, which has been carried out so effectively throughout the entire country under its present auspices, has been very successfully done in Arizona. Even some in Arizona who are blind in sight have been trained to do war work in airplane factories and in other war plants in a most satisfactory and efficient manner. These blind and formerly helpless citizens are now doing their share and have become a real asset to their community and Nation.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of this bill, H. R. 2536. I am not now a member of the Committee on Education. I have not heard anyone say how many persons will be rehabilitated annually under this bill if adopted.

Mr. BARDEN. I might say to the gentleman, if he is directing the question to me, at the present time I understand there are now about 75,000 cases being handled by the States and the Veterans' Administration. How much more that will be I am unable to say. I ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] how many cases are being handled?

Mr. DONDERO. Three hundred and thirty thousand since this program was inaugurated in 1920.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. As I have understood you gentlemen, there have been handled about 330,000 cases under this program, and there are about 75,000 now being handled by the States and the Veterans' Administration. What has been the average cost per case?

Mr. BARDEN. It has been less than $300, and in handling that number of people it might be interesting to say that in this entire Department in Washington there are only 22 employees.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is a very fine record of economy and efficiency. Have these 330,000 people been rehabilitated under this program?

Mr. DONDERO. As I stated, there have been 330,000. Over 200,000 have been rehabilitated.

Mr. LANHAM. Approximately 175,000 of those have been put back into gainful occupation.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. This bill proposes to amend the act providing for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation for persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment, approved June 2, 1920. At that time, I was a member of the Committee on Education of the House, and so was Mr. REED who has spoken so ably and eloquently in behalf of this program today. Dr. Simeon D. Fess, of Ohio, was chairman of the committee. The Republicans had control of the House and a majority of the Committee on Education.

Our committee, after extensive hearings, reported favorably to the House a bill which became the act of June 2, 1920. This measure met with serious

opposition in the House. Many Members of the House, especially from Virginia and other Southern States, took the position that Congress had no power under the Constitution to pass such an act and this act would invade the rights of the States. This view was ably presented by one of Virginia's great constitutional lawyers and one of the very ablest Members of the House. It was my pleasure and good fortune to urge that it was constitutional and our Federal Government should enter upon this policy to reclaim from the human scrap heap the physically disabled and make them self-supporting citizens. It is very gratifying to me to know that at least 175,000 of the lame, the halt, the blind, and the other physically handicapped have been rehabilitated and put into gainful occupations. It is one of the finest, noblest, best, and most humane policies ever adopted by the Federal Government. I strongly favor this bill in the hope that through the years even a greater number may be rehabilitated and become happy, prosperous, and self-sustaining citizens.

After World War No. 1 the question came up of providing vocational and other training for the rehabilitation of disabled veterans of that war. There were some who at that time, as they have today, insisted that the veterans disabled in service and persons disabled in industry should be trained under the same program; that is, the Federal Government cooperate with the States—contributing for that purpose. Many of us on the Committee on Education in the House took the position that the rehabilitation of veterans was a program solely for the Federal Government. They were injured or lost their health while serving the Nation as a whole, and therefore it was a matter to be handled solely and only by the Nation as a whole, and their rehabilitation should not depend upon the action of any individual State or community. It was the Nation's program, and our Committee on Education in the House brought out a bill for the rehabilitation of disabled veterans of World War No. 1, and another bill which became the act of June 2, 1920, for the rehabilitation of those who received their injuries or disabilities in civilian life and not in the armed service. Both of these measures were adopted by the Congress, and this measure merely amends the act of June 2, 1920.

The act of March 1943 provides rehabilitation for veterans who are disabled in the service of our country in World War No. 2. This bill, H. R. 2536, includes those disabled in the armed service as well as those disabled in civilian life. I did not believe after World War No. 1 that the veterans and those injured in civil life should be rehabilitated under the same program, and I am still of that same opinion, and in this I am in accord with the position of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans' organization, the chairman and other members of the Veterans' Committee of the House, and the various veterans who have expressed similar views here today. I want the veterans rehabilitated under the act we passed in March 1943, and if that requires any amendment to give complete and adequate service to our disabled veterans of World War No. 2, I know the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House will bring out such amendments and Congress will adopt them and I therefore favor the amendments that have been offered by Mr. RANKIN, chairman of the Veterans' Committee of the House, striking certain sections of the bill on pages 5 and 6.

I wish to say, in my opinion, that the members of the Committee on Education that brought this bill out and included the veterans had but one purpose and that is to be helpful to the veterans and, I am sure, that if there had been presented to the Committee on Education of the House the objections of the veterans' organizations, and the facts that have been presented here today, the Committee on Education would have stricken those portions from the bill. Mr. BARDEN, Mr. DONDERO and other members of the committee had agreed to these amendments.

It is quite clear there has been no desire on their part except to do the very best thing to help the veterans in every way possible. I am gratified to see this fine spirit of cooperation. The Vocational Training Act for the veterans of World War No. 1 was likewise a decided success. Under that program thousands and thousands of disabled veterans were rehabilitated. Mr. Fay, a Member of this House, who was disabled in World War No. 1, was trained under that program and made a very eloquent plea here today for the bill. That program developed a great many able lawyers, physicians, surgeons, dentists, machinists, mechanics, farmers, and scores of others in useful professions and occupations.

After the present war there will be hundreds of thousands of disabled men and women who have heroically defended our country. We must improve this training so that we may rehabilitate every one of these disabled veterans whose rehabilitation and vocational training is feasible. The blind can be made to see and the lame and halt can be made to walk again so far as earning power and usefulness are concerned. The scrap heap will be large enough and we can render no greater service than rehabilitate and reclaim each and every one of these whose rehabilitation is feasible.

With the adoption of the Rankin amendments I can and do give to this measure my wholehearted support and, unlike in 1920, I doubt if there will be a vote against it.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 6, line 18, strike out all of line 18, down to and including the figure 1 in line 19.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I find by reading the bill after the adoption of an amendment a few minutes ago, there should have been stricken another line which was referred to in that amendment. It is beginning on line 18, the parenthesis "other than those with respect to whom payments are made under paragraph (1)."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I take this time in order to ask one or two questions with reference to this bill. Do I understand that under the provisions of this bill provision is made for increasing the Federal contribution to the State administrative costs of this rehabilitation program?

Mr. BARDEN. That is the only possible increase covered in this bill which the committee thought was justified by other circumstances.

Mr. KEEFE. My interest in this proposition lies in the fact that I conceive it to be the function of the Federal Government to provide the funds for the administration in the States of this program which is essentially a Federal program, although administered locally in the States. I want to be certain that in this bill, which I have not had time to read carefully, provision is made to take care of the administrative expenses out of Federal grants.

Mr. BARDEN. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. That is correct; is it not?

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. Can the gentleman say how much it is anticipated this program will cost?

Mr. BARDEN. That has been discussed previously, but the history of it has been that it has been costing approximately $6,000,000; $3,000,000 for the States and $3,000,000 for the Federal Government. It is on the increase now, and the Administrator makes a fairly conservative estimate. He thinks that the estimate, under this act, if it is adopted right away, might reach approximately $12,000,000. That is, $6,000,000 for each. But at the peak, when those injured in industry and the soldiers out of the Army begin to come in, he anticipates it might reach as high as $22,000,000 a year.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it anticipated that this legislation will be passed so as to enable the Administrator to put this request before the Appropriations Committee to make it effective in the next fiscal year?

Mr. BARDEN. We are hoping to. You see, the program is operating now.

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, I understand that.

Mr. BARDEN. We are trying to get this done as quickly as possible.

Mr. KEEFE. The reason I am interested is because the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of which I happen to be a member will have charge of this particular appropriation, and I am interested to see to it that proper authority is given so that this expanded program may get into operation at the very earliest date.

I want to say to the gentleman that as far as my State is concerned I think it will be conceded, as indicated in the report, that it has been in the forefront for years in the matter of handling this

particular phase of the rehabilitation of people who have been injured, who have been taken out as the result of industrial or other accidents. I want to say that the State supervisor of vocational rehabilitation representing my State has very unequivocally indicated that it has the complete support of the people of Wisconsin. I am glad to say that I shall vote for this bill in its present form.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, if there are no further amendments, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2536, and, pursuant to House Resolution 247, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1258. An act to name certain locks in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 5 to said bill, with an amendment as follows:

At the end of the matter inserted by the House amendment, after "Services", insert ", or the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 5 as amended, and Senate amendments numbered 60 and 61 to said bill, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. LODGE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1944

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, before presenting my unanimous-consent request, I desire to advise the Members and the Speaker that I have taken this matter up with the majority and minority leaders and with the members of the committee, and with that understanding I am asking unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the Naval Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SHEPPARD, THOMAS of Texas, COFFEE, WHITTEN, DITTER, PLUMLEY, and JOHNSON of Indiana.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the Members who spoke on the bill H. R. 2536 be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] be allowed to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by Paul Mutamen, chairman, Iron County Agricultural Mobilization Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Maj. Willard B. Cole. I have submitted this copy to the Government Printing Office and I am informed that it will take four pages and will cost about $180.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the insertion may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by the President of Pan-American World Airways System, Juan T. Trippe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE WAVES AND THE WAAC'S

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include as part of my remarks a release made to the press this morning by Secretary of War Stimson, and also a letter from Major General Surles regarding the number of WAAC's who have been returned from Africa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to stop some of these fantastic and vicious rumors that have been going about regarding the conduct of the WAAC's—and, of course, about the WAVES, the nurses, and other women in uniform—I heard only yesterday that 21 of the WAAC's had been returned from Africa because of misconduct; in fact, I heard that a whole shipload of WAAC's had been returned—there have only been something like 250 WAAC's in Africa and General Surles writes me that only one was returned because she was having a baby. She was married; it was perfectly legitimate. One was being returned for medical attention, for a recurrent physical disability; and 1 was returned because of unsuitable temperament. Only 3 have been returned, and none for improper conduct or improper reasons.

The Congress of the United States should be the first to stop slander upon our patriotic women.

I know the Members of the House will join me in stopping any misinformation or false rumors that are being spread, because if you destroy even by implication the character of the womanhood of America you not only impair the war effort but you destroy America. If you destroy the character of the future mothers of America, you are destroying our entire country.

I invite your attention to the following press release by the Secretary of War and letter from Major General Surles:

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF WAR AT PRESS CONFERENCE, JUNE 10, 1943

My attention has been attracted to sinister rumors aimed at destroying the reputation of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. I refer to charges of immorality and particularly to the allegation that the War Department has agreed to the issuance of contraceptives and prophylactic equipment to the members of this corps. I wish to state that these rumors are absolutely and completely false.

The record of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps speaks for itself. Since July 1942 approximately 65,000 fine, patriotic women have enrolled themselves in this corps. And every one of these women who has gone to duty in the field has released a soldier for front-line duty. This is the equivalent of 4 combat divisions already. To appraise that, I remind you that our combat ground forces of the Tunisian campaign consisted of just 4 divisions.

The authorized strength of this corps is 150,000 and since the objective behind the enlistment of the corps is to relieve able-bodied soldiers for combat duty, you can well see that we are speaking now of a sizable increase in our fighting forces.

The enemy naturally is interested in our combat strength—the force by which we shall

eventually bring him to unconditional surrender. Anything which would interfere with their recruiting or destroy the reputation of this corps and, by so doing, interfere with increase in the combat strength of our Army would be of value to that enemy. The repetition of any unfounded rumor concerning this corps lessens confidence in it and is actually an aid to the enemy.

Furthermore, any reflection on the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps is in essence a reflection on the whole of American womanhood; for these 65,000 women are a crosssection of the womanhood of our Nation. They are the teachers who taught your children; the wives, sweethearts, sisters, and even mothers of the men who are today fighting to save our freedom. When they are maligned, when vicious rumor destroys their reputations, the effects could reach into our very front lines, injuring the morale of the Army itself. The story of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps is already a fine chapter in the story of American womanhood, and I emphasize the fact that I have made a thorough investigation of these rumors. They are completely false.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 10, 1943.

Hon. EDITH N. ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: In answer to your query as to the number of members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps who have been returned from Africa, I can report as follows as of this date:

Three members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps have been returned from Africa:

One for pregnancy, married, legitimate.

One for medical attention as result of recurrence of gall bladder ailment.

One unsuitable temperament, incapable of adjustment to conditions.

A. D. SURLES,
Major General, United States Army, Director.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, along the lines of the statement made by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, I wish to bring to the attention of the House so that any rumors may be dispelled, that we had occasion a few days ago to have officials of the Navy Department in front of a subcommittee and we inquired into some matters that have been circulating around town.

I want to report to the House, speaking on behalf of the Navy Department, that of the 16,000 enlisted young women of the United States in the United States Navy Auxiliary but 3 have been dismissed from the service because of misconduct. I think this record speaks for itself. As a matter of fact the women in the service are so far below the men insofar as dismissals are concerned that there is no comparison; the rate in our enlisted male personnel is a great deal higher.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and etxend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it would seem unnecessary for any politician, bureaucrat, Army, Navy, or other officer to say anything in defense of the women in or out of our service. All of us had mothers; most of us have wives, daughters or sisters; so what is the sense in giving any publicity to any rumors which question the ability, the loyalty, the virtue of our women? We all know better. Why not let it go at that? Our women are women, American women, regardless of the uniform they wear. They need no defense from anyone.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A LITTLE COMMON SENSE—A LITTLE JUSTICE—LESS USE OF THE WRECKING MACHINERY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, Thursday, June 10, 1943, a group of Senators and Congressmen from the eastern seaboard are questioning Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes. They insist that if the East is to continue to support the war effort they must have more gasoline and, next winter, more fuel oil.

They ask that the Middle West, where at the moment there seems to be an abundance of gasoline, be further rationed. They insist that approximately the same restrictions relating to the consumption of gasoline which are now in force in the East be imposed upon the Middle West.

To the Representatives of the Middle West it seems unfair to require that their constituents be deprived of gasoline or fuel oil merely because transportation or storage difficulties now, for the moment, make it impossible for the East to receive all the gasoline or fuel oil needed.

Let us avoid any discussion which will tend to promote sectional feeling. Let us turn rather to the basic cause of all, or at least the greater part, of our domestic trouble. The reason for much of the burden of the inconvenience, and of the rules, regulations, and directives which are hindering not only industrial production but the production of food is the determination of the New Dealers to remake not only our form of government but our whole economic structure.

Coming from a Republican, that statement might be challenged as the result of political bias, but last week Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL, a blown-in-the-bottle Democrat, exasperated by O. P. A. regulations which threatened the poultry industry in his State, made the statement that responsible officials in the Administration were, and I quote:

> Taking orders from somebody and that what they are doing is only part of a plot to change our Government into communism, socialism, or some other foreign "ism," which means a dictatorship and regimentation of our people and abolishing our private system of enterprise.

The Senator did not understate the case. Not only are responsible Administration officials destroying the poultry industry; they are still limiting the acreage which the farmer may plant to produce necessary food crops.

By arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions, the Administration is strangling the packing and the canning industries. Last week, the packers of the Nation asked Chairman Vinson of the Economic Stabilization Board to secure a ruling which would permit them to pay their employees an additional 15 cents an hour to prevent those employees seeking employment in nearby industries engaged in war production, where the wages are, in effect, paid by the Government and are much higher.

They also ask that the O. P. A., without further delay, fix a ceiling price for the finished product of the canner, which would include all costs of production. The canners were not insisting upon a price which would insure them a profit. They are asking, however, that they be permitted to operate on a basis which would enable them to exist, for, if they were forced out of business, the already apparent shortage of food would be increased.

Not long ago, McNutt's War Manpower Commission issued an order containing an unprecedented provision requiring that labor unions be consulted on the hiring and firing of workers and the obtaining of exemptions.

When a union, which merely represents employees, who are neither stockholders in, nor charged with the responsibility of the management of, a corporation, must be consulted before men can be hired or fired, it is rank hypocrisy to talk about individual enterprise or the preservation of the ability of those on the home front to adequately support the fighting forces.

The confusion and the interference with industries, with business, with farming, has grown so great that no longer can it be charged to incompetency alone. As stated by Senator O'DANIEL, there appears to be a deliberate effort on the part of administrative officials to adopt, follow, and insist upon a course of action which common sense teaches us can only end in disaster.

No fighting force can win a war unless it is adequately supported on the home front. Support on that front means production of food, processing and transporting food, producing and processing and transporting of all the things needed by an armed force must be prompt and adequate. Notwithstanding that acknowledged fact, here at home the Administration continues to interfere with all three. Exasperation exists throughout the country and the conclusion of all too many was concisely expressed on June 7, before the House Small Business Committee when W. H. Albers, president, Supermarket Institute of Cincinnati, testifying, said, "Let the policy of the organization be based on facts and let the O. P. A. stick to that policy. The agency now has become so hopelessly disorganized that the time has arrived for mobs to descend on Washington." Mere words do not bring relief.

On the following day, the President, addressing the delegates to the United States Food Conference, reading from his prepared address, said:

> The better use of natural and human resources must be assured to improve living standards—

And he intimated, as he frequently has, that those improved living standards must exist throughout the world. He then added this extemporaneous statement—

And I want to add that all this will be accomplished without the exploitation of any people by any nation anywhere.

Unfortunately, what the President says is all too often followed by action which contradicts the import of his words. While the President is announcing that no individual anywhere is to be exploited; while the Senators and the Congressmen from the East are insisting upon more gasoline in order that their constituents may continue to contribute to the war effort, labor goons and labor racketeers operating under the protection of this Administration are exploiting people in the city of Port Huron, Mich., and they are defying the right of individuals to aid in the war effort.

From a courageous editor of that city comes a wire, which reads in part as follows:

Attorneys for the retail grocers here have applied to the circuit court for a temporary injunction restraining the teamsters' union, Morris Coleman, and certain other union officers from picketing, boycotting, and interfering with the grocery business by cutting off delivery of food, meat, and other items. The petition for the injunction sets forth that these acts by the teamsters' union are damaging the public health and welfare of the city of Port Huron. The court this morning granted a temporary injunction, following along the line requested, and an order to show cause on a permanent injunction, setting the hearing for next Monday morning.

Again in Port Huron there is a milk strike on. You may recall that some time ago from the well of the House your attention was called to the fact that men convicted of criminal offense, but hiding behind labor unions, were driving automobiles on rationed gasoline and rationed tires from the city of Detroit to the city of Port Huron, where they followed the conveyances driven by nonunion men used to deliver milk to customers about the streets of that city and interfered with their customers in an effort to compel the nonunion drivers to stand and deliver a portion of their wages to the union racketeers. There was an investigation, but the unlawful activities of these so-called union racketeers have been renewed, according to another wire, which reads as follows:

Labor "goons" again at work in Port Huron. No action from War Labor Board. Food shortage threatened here as result of teamsters' boycott on grocery stores handling milk supplies of blacklisted dairies. Situation serious for our community. Can't you help us stop these outlaws?

When there is, throughout the East, a shortage of gasoline; when, under our Constitution, men have the right to join or not to join a union; when, under that same Constitution, protection of property is guaranteed; when we are spending billions upon billions of dollars and sacrificing the lives of thousands of men to carry freedom from want and freedom from fear to all the peoples of the world, why should this administration extend protection or fail to prosecute those who, here in America—to be specific, in Michigan, in Port Huron—are being exploited by the political allies of this administration? What excuse is there for permitting the use of rationed tires and rationed gasoline by those who are insisting that loyalty to the union is more important than loyalty to the Government?

The President of the United States, who is so fond of calling himself Commander in Chief, has ordered our civilians to work and produce. Now comes the union organizers, who add a proviso to that order, which is that citizens shall work and produce when, and only when, they become members of a union.

If the President expects the respect, the wholehearted support of the civilian population, he must play fair; he must treat with justice those who have obeyed his order.

Not long ago the President appealed to the coal miners to return to work. Fifteen Peoria, Ill., coal miners went back to work on May 3, in answer to the President's demand. On June 4, those 15 miners were called upon by their local union to face the union's executive board and to answer for their disobedience to the union's order to strike.

As was asked from the well of the House on March 22, Who is the big boss? In time of war the President called upon those miners to dig coal. They dug coal, and now they are being prosecuted by their union for obeying the President's order, for refusing to obey the strike order of the union.

Are the people of Port Huron to be protected? Are those who in Port Huron and surrounding territory are producing milk to be protected in their efforts to deliver that milk? Are grocery stores engaged in distributing food to have their supplies of food cut off, food which comes in through interstate commerce, by striking teamsters of the A. F. of L.?

As Mr. Albers suggested to the Small Business Committee, if this administration does not straighten out the lawlessness which it is protecting by its refusal to act, there will be the formation and the unlawful activities of mobs.

Am I preaching violence? No, not by any means, for I abhor violence. I am merely anticipating the natural result of exploitation, extortion, racketeering, and violence.

Already in Los Angeles, the zoot-suit-wearing violators of the law, the insulters of soldiers and sailors and of their sweethearts, have learned what the anger of those in the armed forces means. We have had violence. Strange as it may seem, the military authorities have declared Los Angeles closed to the members of the armed forces. The obvious, the just, reaction to the practices of zoot-suiters would have been to punish them for their unlawfulness. Had a firm, just procedure been adopted in the beginning there would have been no need to bar Los Angeles to the armed services. Apparently we, in this country, must make a choice between lawless violence, unjustifiable assaults upon the constitutional rights of our citizens, and orderly constitutional processes.

The racketeers should be barred from Port Huron, Mich., and the zoot-suiters should be kicked into the jails of Los Angeles. Their constitutional rights should be restored to the people of Port Huron, and the soldiers, sailors, and marines—all those in the armed forces of Uncle Sam—should be allowed into the city of Los Angeles. Those who are going to sacrifice their lives in behalf of their country should not be barred from the streets of any American city. When the fighting men come home those who seek to deprive them and their relatives of the American way of life will meet a just, a swift, and effective retribution.

Unless this administration begins to preserve some of the "four freedoms" here in America, some fighting men may think it their right to do something before they go to preserve the American way while they are gone.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table and other special orders I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader, inform us of the program for tomorrow and the early part of next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On tomorrow we plan to take up the conference report on the labor bill, the strike legislation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And that is all that is scheduled for tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

On Monday of next week three bills reported out of the Committee on Immigration will be taken up. If any of those bills do not go through on Monday they will not be carried over to Tuesday. Monday has been set aside for the consideration of those three reports.

On Tuesday of next week individual bills on the Private Calendar will be called. I understand there are between 80 and 90 bills and I think there should be a call of the Private Calendar.

On Tuesday the Labor-Social Security bill will be called up and after disposition of that bill the War Agency appropriation bill will be called and then the War Department appropriation bill.

There is also a lend-lease conference report which I understand will be

brought up in a few minutes. I understand there is a complete agreement on that.

If that is disposed of now there is a conference report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill still pending.

I am unable to give any information as to what day that will come up, but I will advise the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman has given us what we need for the next day or two and I thank him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS TO CARRY OUT PROVISIONS OF AN ACT TO PROMOTE THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CANNON of Missouri submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2753) "making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an Act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: "Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and at the end of the matter so restored insert "produced in the continental United States"; and the Senate agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

No. 1: The House bill contains a provision that none of the funds appropriated therein shall be used for the payment of any subsidy on agricultural products. This matter is stricken out by the Senate. The conference agreement restores the House language and limits the provision to such products produced in the continental United States.

No. 2: Section 3, inserted by the Senate, amends the act of March 25, 1943 (Public Law 18) by increasing from 225,000,000 to 275,000,000 bushels the amount of wheat in governmental control that may be sold for feed purposes. The substance of this section has been incorporated in House Joint Resolution 133 which passed the House of Representatives on June 4 and the Senate on June 8. The conference agreement eliminates the Senate amendment.

No. 3: Corrects a section number in the bill to conform to conference action.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is a unanimous report of the managers on the part of the House. There were only three amendments in disagreement.

The Senate struck out the House provision prohibiting the use of any of the money in the bill for the payment of subsidies on agricultural products. The conferees have restored the House language and modified it so that it applies only to agricultural commodities produced in continental United States.

The Senate also added an amendment increasing from 225,000,000 bushels to 275,000,000 bushels the amount of Government wheat that may be sold for feed purposes and the Senate has receded from that amendment. The Senate receded also on the third amendment which was really a technical amendment affecting a section number.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why the House should not immediately agree to this report and send the bill back to the Senate for final action.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from New York. The amendments involved relate to matters on which the House has repeatedly expressed itself and the agreement with the managers on the part of the Senate is in accord with the House position. I might say by way of explanation that the amendment relating to wheat was eliminated because the House on June 4 and the Senate on June 8 passed House Joint Resolution No. 133, which accomplishes the same purpose as that proposed by the Senate amendment. It has now gone to the President.

It covers the exact proposition and puts into effect all that the Senate amendment would have accomplished. For that reason the Senate receded.

Mr. TABER. Otherwise we would have been willing to yield to the Senate amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We would have yielded but for the fact that the legislation covering the same proposition previously passed obviated any need for further legislation on the subject.

Mr. TABER. Because it is necessary to have this wheat for feed at the present time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under the legislation already enacted 50,000,000 bushels more of Government wheat may be sold for feed purposes. The conferees of both Houses were in complete concurrence on the need for additional feed in order to provide for maximum food production.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have received a petition from various organizations of the city of Washington interested in a proposed constitutional amendment giving to the citizens of the city of Washington the right to participate in the election of Presidential electors and to have such representation in the two Houses of Congress as the Congress may agree to. This petition is made by many organizations in Washington, headed by the Citizens' Joint Committee on National Representation for the District of Columbia, of which the grand old man of Washington and America, Theodore W. Noyes, is chairman.

I see no good objection to this proposed constitutional amendment from any angle. To the people who feel that the Federal Government should never surrender the power to govern the District of Columbia this proposed amendment should not be objectionable, because there is no surrender of that power proposed. If the amendment should be adopted and Congress should act under the grant of power conferred, Congress would retain the power to modify or even repeal the whole thing if the governmental arrangement inaugurated should not work. This proposed amendment will be merely an enabling provision granting power to the Congress to give to the American citizens living in the District of Columbia such rights to participate in the National Government as in the judgment of the Congress would not interfere with the Federal interest.

I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

There was no objection.

The petition referred to follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Your petitioners, the Citizens' Joint Committee on National Representation for the District of Columbia, and the Presidents of its Constituent and Cooperating Organizations, whose names are subscribed below, hereby reaffirm the principles proclaimed by the founders of our Republic that "Taxation without representation is tyranny"; that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed"; and in order that "Government of the people, by the people and for the people" may become an accomplished fact for all the people of the United States, respectfully represent:

That the over one-half million totally disfranchised and unrepresented citizens of the United States resident in the District of Columbia, obey national laws, outnumber the residents of each of 12 States and pay more national taxes than each of 22 of the States.

That over two decades ago, when they outnumbered only six States, they supplied to the Army and Navy of the United States, a larger number of men than any one of seven of the States, and oversubscribed their quotas of all wartime funds.

That again in the present war for the preservation of the principles of democracy and civilization as against despotism and barbarism thousands of these voteless and unrepresented Americans of the District of Columbia are now by voluntary enrollment and by draft serving in the armed forces of our country.

That these, your fellow Americans, now have no voice in their national Government which requires them to fight, to bleed and, perhaps, to die.

That as a fundamental right they are as justly entitled, as are other Americans, to voting representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President.

That the only sound reason which can be offered for any departure, in the case of the District of Columbia, from the fundamental American concepts of representative government is for protection of the national interest in the Nation's seat of government and then only to the extent required for such effective protection.

That this protection of the national interest—coupled with recognition of the interest and rights of the people of the District—is provided in our proposed constitutional amendment which confirms in Congress continuing control of District representation so that both the Nation's and the District's interests may always be equitably protected.

We, therefore, respectfully petition the adoption of House Joint Resolution 81 and the identical Senate Joint Resolution 33, which propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant the above sought relief to the citizens of the United States resident in the District of Columbia.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT

"The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal."

Theodore W. Noyes, Chairman, Citizens' Joint Committee on District of Columbia National Representation; Granville Gude, President, Board of Trade; Harry S. Wender, President, Federation of Citizens' Association (66 member groups); John Locher, President, Central Labor Union (150 local unions); Mrs. Arthur C. Watkins, President, Federation of Women's Clubs (31 Clubs); Mrs. Eugene Callaghan, President, Voteless D. C. League of Women Voters; J. G. Bell, President, Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association; W. H. Blanz, President, District of Columbia Building and Loan League; Paul B. Cromelin, President, Bar Association; Helen Goodner, President, Women's Bar Association; Wm. J. Mileham, President, Federation of Business Men's Associations (21 associations); Robert J. Buxbaum, President, Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor (250 local unions); Dr. Victor Meyers, Chairman, Inter-Federation Conference; Theodore W. Noyes, President, Association of Oldest Inhabitants; Evan H. Tucker, President, Northeast Washington Citizens' Association; Claud Livingston, President, Washington Real Estate Board; Louis D. Krakow, President, Advertising Club of Washington; Dorothy E. Marvin, President Twentieth Century Club; Martha A. Swift, Acting President, Women's City Club; Charles H. Bates, President, Society of Natives of the District of Columbia; Harald H. Lund, President, Monday Evening Club; Lillian Detre, President, Washington Section, National Council of Jewish Women; Julian Brylawski, President, Motion Picture Theater Owners of the District of Columbia; Preston W. Grant, President, Junior Board of Commerce; Samuel E. Collegeman, President, Associated Retail Credit Men of Washington, D. C.; Mrs. J. Dan Blackistone, President, Florists' Club of Washington; L. G. Jackson, President, Hotel Greeters of America, Charter 31; Thomas M. Hysong, President, Newcomers Club; Mildred C. Clum, President, Soroptimist Club; Etta L. Taggart, President, The Washingtonians; Kathryn S. Mitchell, Chairman, Legislative Committee, American Association of University Women; Richard A. Burton, Department Commander, Dept. of D. C. Veterans of Foreign Wars (15 posts); Patrick J. Fitzgibbons, Department Commander, Dept. of D. C. American Legion (40 posts); Joseph M. Cohan, President, D. C. Chapter Rainbow Division of Veterans; Charles A. Murray, President, Young Democratic Clubs of District of Columbia; Malcolm S. McConihe, Democratic National Committeeman for the District of Columbia; E. F. Colladay, Republican National Committeeman for the District of Columbia; Mabel H. Ellett, President, District of Columbia Congress of Parent-Teacher Associations (71 associations); Wilbur S. Finch, President, District of Columbia Suffrage Association.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the gasoline problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

PREVIOUS ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in asking for 30 minutes I did so because I understand that some of my friends in the House, particularly those from California have contrary opinions upon the subject which I shall address myself to, and in order to be fair I thought if I would impose myself upon them for 15 minutes I ought to be willing to have them impose their thoughts and questions upon me for 15 minutes. For that reason I do not propose to yield for the first 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress I am ashamed of the treatment we have accorded China over the years. I am especially ashamed of the fact that, although friendly to China, yet we furnished Japan a large part of the war materials she needed to carry on her aggressive war against China and to build up her war fleet to make war upon us. If we had placed an embargo upon the sale of war materials to Japan, as some of us advocated several years ago, she would have been unable to take over Manchuria, and certainly she would have been unable to prepare to make war upon us.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to bring about a better understanding between the Chinese people and ourselves and to do justice to the Nation that is our most friendly ally in the present war. This opportunity presents itself in the proposal to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, which is now being considered by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

In considering a bill to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, as in the consideration of all other legislation that affects the welfare of this Nation, we should keep before us first, last, and all the time the question, What effect will this legislation have upon the general welfare of our people? On that point there can be no difference of opinion and no argument.

Therefore, keeping the interests of this Nation before me as the primary objective, I want to consider the effect of the passage of this bill from two different angles:

First. What will be the effect of its passage upon the war effort? Will it help or hinder the same?

Second. What will be the effect of its passage upon the post-war period? Will it aid or hinder us in providing jobs for our returning soldiers? Will it help us to preserve our American standard of living after the war is over?

I confess at the outset that in limiting myself to these two points of view, I am

being entirely selfish and practical. I am deliberately ignoring the ethical questions involved and the moral justness of the measure. I am also excluding all sentimental arguments that might be made for lifting a stigma we placed upon a great people 60 years ago, the only people that can preserve peace in Asia in the years to come, and help us keep Japan in her place.

I

Taking up my first question, "Will the passage of this bill aid our war effort, and help bring the war to a speedy and successful end?" Mr. Speaker, I am not a military expert nor a military authority, therefore in finding the answer to this question I must depend upon those who can qualify in those respects. Our military experts tell us that because of transportation difficulties we cannot today send China much material aid in the shape of guns, tanks, planes, food, and so forth; aid that she needs so badly in order to carry on her heroic resistance against the Japanese aggressor. These military experts tell us we must first recapture the port of Rangoon, now in Japanese hands, and reopen the Burma Road before we can send China the aid she needs so badly. Chinese military experts tell us that the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act will do much to stiffen up the morale of the Chinese people and to help offset Japanese propaganda against the United States concerning our treatment of the Chinese people over the years. Our State Department very wisely removed one of the long-standing obstacles to good will between China and the United States when it voluntarily gave up our so-called extraterritorial rights in China. Now Congress has the opportunity to remove the other long-standing obstacle to good will and full friendship between the two nations by repealing the Chinese Exclusion Act, thereby placing China—as far as immigration is concerned—upon the same basis as other nations that have been given a quota.

Mr. Speaker, Admiral Yarnell, an authority on the war situation in the Far East, considers the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act as a very necessary and vital part of our war effort. He testified before our Committee on Immigration and Naturalization as follows:

> Japan has utilized American exclusion laws with much effect in her propaganda campaign in China and other areas of the Far East. By the repeal of these laws this means of stirring up hatred of the western nations will be eliminated. In the consideration of the repeal of these laws, we also should look beyond the war to the peace settlement and the years to follow. * * * In order to insure peace in the Far East, there must be a strong, stable, and democratic government in China. * * * It is my conviction that the repeal of these laws will have far-reaching effects as a war and as a post-war measure. It will also be a partial recognition of the bravery and endurance of a great people who for 6 years have been fighting America's most dangerous enemy. * * * China has a tremendous army available of excellent soldier material and all they need are munitions, leadership, and training. If we can keep China in the war, there is no necessity, as far as I can see, of sending a single American soldier to China outside of technicians and advisers and people who can help them organize and train their Army.

Constantine Brown, one of our best commentators on the war and war strategy, sums up the situation in China as follows:

> The campaign (in Burma) must wait until the monsoon season is over. And the question of whether the Chinese will be able to hold out until next October, when offensive operations in that area can be resumed, becomes increasingly important. China's special Ambassador to Washington, T. V. Soong, has not been pulling his punches recently and his warnings that China might be forced out of the war before the end of the year have not been taken as bluff and empty threats. * * * Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek sought to minimize the importance of the desertion of so many of his generals who went over to the enemy bag and baggage. His pride apparently induced him to suppress or discount the importance of these desertions. * * * The fiasco of the campaign against the Japanese in Burma, coupled with a renewed and powerful offensive of the Japs against Chungking, has brought the situation to a head. We are now being bluntly told that unless something decisive occurs China may be completely in the hands of the Japanese before the end of the year. Dr. Soong is said to believe that Chiang's forces may be able to hold on until the end of the monsoon rains and that if the Allies keep their pledge to start an offensive in Burma when the dry season begins, Chiang may stay in the war. This point of view is not shared by some of our war strategists. * * * According to information reaching Washington from China, the Japanese appear determined to end China's resistance before the Allies have an opportunity to make a serious drive against Burma next fall. And on the basis of what we know of China's war material and modern fighting equipment, some military men express serious doubts whether Chiang will be able to resist a determined Japanese drive this summer.

And so, Mr. Speaker, judging from the testimony of these expert witnesses, the answer to my question, Will the passage of this bill aid our war effort and help bring the war to a speedy and successful conclusion? is an emphatic "Yes."

II

Mr. Speaker, I now come to my second question, What will be the effect of the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act upon the post-war period? Will it aid or hinder us in providing jobs for our returning soldiers? Will it help us preserve our American standard of living after the war is over?

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY], perhaps the best informed man in the House on international finance, international credits, and international trade, testified before our committee on the possibilities for American commerce in the post-war period. His testimony was complete, convincing, and irrefutable. In substance he stated that China, with her 450,000,000 people, now on the verge of a great industrial awakening, offers the only real post-war market for American manufactured goods. He also stated that China will need billions of dollars worth of American products and that she can pay for these goods because she has vast amounts of raw products that we need, and so can establish the international credits that go with a favorable balance of trade. On the other hand, Congressman DEWEY pointed out that while Europe after the war will need vast amounts of American products of all kinds, Europe will have nothing to pay for them, neither raw products, nor cash, which means, of course, a repetition of what happened in our trade relations with Europe after the last war. Congressman DEWEY left no doubt in my mind that the answer to this second question, or series of questions, is as emphatic an affirmative as the answer we gave to the first question.

Mr. Speaker, I want to offer one or two observations of my own at this point in support of the convincing testimony given by my colleague from Illinois. Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, one of the greatest statesmen we have ever produced in America, stated in a speech made decades ago:

> Our trade henceforth must be with Asia. The Pacific is one ocean, and the Pacific is the ocean of the commerce of the future. Most future wars will be conflicts for commerce. The power that rules the Pacific therefore will be the power that rules the world.

My only comment upon this quotation from Beveridge is that with close friendly cooperative ties between Uncle Sam and the awakening giant of the Orient, China, there will arise no question as to what joint powers will rule the Pacific hereafter.

I now want to present another viewpoint on the vital effect the passage of this bill will have on post-war trade, a viewpoint given me at first hand by the leaders of the machine-tools industry of Rockford, Ill., the greatest center of machine-tools production in the United States.

The machine-tools industry of America, in its effort to support and sustain the Nation's war aims, produced during the past 2 years $2,200,000,000 worth of machine tools, the equivalent of its total output for 20 years preceding Pearl Harbor. Even though we assume that the Nation will be on a sustained level of prosperity higher than ever before, these permanent additions to the Nation's production tools are more than adequate to meet the demands of our economy for 20 years to come.

During World War No. 1 we piled up so great a supply of machine tools, compared to normal needs, that one-third of the companies building machine tools for the First World War were forced out of business; some went bankrupt, some sold out their assets, and some merged with other companies in the struggle for survival that was forced upon the industry in the adjustment period of the "difficult twenties."

Taking only machines 13 years old as a basis for determining the supply of efficient machines remaining after the war, the United States will have on hand a volume of modern machine tools at the end of 1943 that cost over $4,000,000,000, of which three-fourths will have been built in the last 3 years. It will require but few new or special machines to supplement this vast amount of potential metal-working capacity to produce all

the goods and services the whole world can consume over many years to come.

In view of these facts, unless we find some way to dispose of the surplus machine tools left on our hands at the close of the war, at a profit, we will either have to dump them in the ocean or the thousands of former workers in the machine-tools industry now in uniform will find themselves out of a job when they come back because the plants in which they formerly worked will be closed. What is true of the machine-tools industry is true of many other manufacturing industries of America. This is a post-war situation that must be faced.

Mr. Speaker, China is awakening from her long sleep. She is on the verge of an industrial revolution. She will need billions of dollars worth of machine tools after this war is over to help in her industrial development. She will need railroads built; railroad engines and railroad equipment for those railroads; farm machinery for modernizing her agricultural methods; road-building machinery to build the vast system of hard roads that will be required; and mining machinery to develop her vast mineral resources. Best of all China will have the raw materials and consequent international credits to pay for these things. And so, Mr. Speaker, our potential trade with China after this war is over should furnish jobs to hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of our boys when they return from the war.

During the hearings on the proposal to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act the testimony showed that the act was passed in 1882 to prevent a flood of cheap labor that threatened at that time. Since then we have passed laws that restrict immigration by placing all European countries on a quota basis. Under a quota only 107 Chinese people could enter this country each year. Therefore, if the Chinese exclusion laws were repealed and China were placed upon a quota basis like other nations, at the rate of 107 Chinese immigrants per year, cheap labor from China, the problem of the 1880's, could never become a problem in the future.

Looking at the question before us, the proposal to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, and keeping in mind the best interests of our people as our primary objective, I say we should repeal the act, and thereby place China, our ally and friend, upon an equal footing with other nations that have been placed upon a quota basis. This, in my judgment, is the least we can do at this time to rectify our past mistakes in dealing with China, and to do justice to our most friendly ally in the present war.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. If China is allowed a quota of 107, and I believe the number is 105—it has been refigured—will those people have to pass the ordinary tests as to health, literacy, and financial responsibility to enter this country?

Mr. MASON. They would all have to pass the same tests that other quota people from all nations have to pass now.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it or is it not true that the Chinese have been coming to the United States every year, lawfully, under various laws relating to wives of certain citizens, students, merchants, and other classifications, in the absence of a quota?

Mr. MASON. That is true.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman referred to the people in the State of California earlier in his address. May I preface my remarks by stating that the people of California—and I believe that can be said also for Oregon and Washington—thoroughly appreciate the magnificent struggle the Chinese have been putting up against our common enemy. I think every Member of this House admires Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, whom, incidentally, I had the honor of meeting when she was known as Miss Soong Mei-Ling, many years ago. We have many friends among the Chinese people.

We recognize the problem, however, as the gentleman has aptly referred to it, as being an economic problem. Of course, the entry of 100 or 105 Chinese people, even if they were coolies, would not amount to a great deal as far as creating an economic problem in our Pacific States is concerned.

It must also be recognized that the problem presented is presented to the three Western States in very large measure, because these people seldom get beyond the Pacific coast. When they arrive there they find a salubrious climate, and they like to stay, just as do others.

The gentleman's committee proposes to admit 105 Chinese per annum. Without taking a position on that particular matter, I am interested to know whether the gentleman and his committee are also interested in admitting other Asiatics after this war is over in some similar volume or greater or less volume.

Mr. MASON. Speaking from the standpoint of the gentleman from Illinois, no. Speaking from the standpoint of the committee, I do not know what the viewpoint of the committee would be until that question was raised.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman recognizes that it is a very large problem?

Mr. MASON. I do.

Mr. HINSHAW. And that it has to deal with world relations as well as our own economic condition?

Mr. MASON. I think I can say, from the standpoint of the committee, that not for 500 years would this committee, as it is now composed, if it lasted that long, be willing to permit one Jap to enter.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman recognizes that there were 16,000 Japanese in the United States at the time of the Oriental Exclusion Act, and that through processes of their own that number has been multiplied to something between 125,000 and 130,000 at this time

Mr. MASON. They were not all legitimate processes, because a great many of them have sneaked in.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman knows that the Immigration Service on our border is engaged very largely in protecting the United States from an influx of a great flood of orientals who would come in here and offer their services far below the prices that our own labor should have.

Mr. MASON. I agree with that, but this bill, restricting the immigration to 105 or 107, absolutely shuts out any danger of that possibility.

Mr. HINSHAW. I should like to ask the gentleman one more question. This is in all sincerity. I have due regard for the industries in the gentleman's district. It has been complained of heretofore that certain countries have been implemented in the production of devices for the destruction of others through our having shipped certain machinery, supplies, scrap iron, and so forth, in times gone by, and that with those materials they have built up a very considerable war industry.

Of course, we do not expect that the Chinese people, if we implement them with the machinery so well made in the gentleman's district and other parts of the United States, would be setting up a similar war machine against us, but the gentleman does recognize that competition from the peacetime products of those machines under the low wage scales existing in Asia might form a very serious menace to our foreign trade.

Mr. MASON. That is true, and that is a problem that will have to be met, whether we sell it to them or somebody else does, some 50 years from now, by perhaps tariff bars.

Mr. HINSHAW. Everyone must recognize that China has sufficient absorbing power for a great deal of goods, so that she could probably produce things for herself, and herself exclusively, for a long time to come, but the gentleman does recognize that the very low wage scales and low living conditions that exist throughout Asia form a serious competitive condition to other countries with high scales of living.

Mr. MASON. I do.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is not under a misapprehension, because I am the author of one of the bills to allow the Chinese to come in.

Mr. HINSHAW. Oh, the gentleman is assured that I have made no comment concerning a bill. I am simply speculating on other matters.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from California, that as for the 16,000 Japs that originally came in and that now through natural processes and smuggling, have grown to 130,000 or 140,000, I wish they might have been 140,000 Chinese that we had let come in in that way. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois this question? The gentleman knows, because he has been on the committee for many years, after all, speaking of the number of Chinese, that there are probably smuggled into this country 10 times the number proposed to allow in every year, but they would not be of as

high class of people as would come in under the quota.

Mr. MASON. That is true.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We had hearings for 3 months, and is it not true that the abundance of evidence from the best brains of the country was that in order to save the killing of thousands of our young men in this war, that could be done by removing this restriction, and the evidence was also that China can handle herself in her own way, if we will only put them on an equal basis, and she even went so far as to say that she does not care whether you allow 107 or 7, as long as you remove the restriction and give her recognition, so that she may stop the propaganda of Japan which is going on every day.

Mr. MASON. Yes, and the summary of testimony would go to show, the testimony of Admiral Yarnell and others, that they need not an American boy, but it will keep her on her feet until she can get herself prepared.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Can the gentleman see any ground for the American Federation of Labor, or even for the American Legion, trying to throw water on this proposition from an economic standpoint?

Mr. MASON. As I brought out as they were testifying, they were testifying from their old historic standpoint, from the standpoint of lowering the price of labor, something that this bill would prevent.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is it not true that in the committee consideration we have closed every loophole, and that only 107 would come in?

Mr. MASON. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. To make this observation with regard to the question raised of potential economic threats by the Chinese as they become industrialized. I think we are together on the diagnosis, but the question is how to treat the matter. The history of mankind is that men who are free try to use their goods for themselves and to raise their standards of living, but that men who are controlled from the outside are kept on low standards, so that those who control them may use them from an economic basis to produce goods more cheaply.

Take Turkey, practically the only nation over there that came out of the war free. Look at Turkey's standard of living and see what it has done. She cannot undercut us now. England keeps India down. The Chinese will be kept down by the Japanese, if they should win, to a position of slave labor. We could not compete with that. The answer to it is to help China hold true and become free, and then by the time the 50 years is up she will more or less have developed her own industry and her standard of living would become sufficiently high that there would not be anywhere near as great a gap.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for another 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Should we fail to keep China in the war against Japan, and China should capitulate and join Japan, then will there be any of the Asiatic people on our side?

Mr. MASON. No. The testimony shows that if that should happen, our war with Japan would be lengthened at least 5 or 10 years, if not longer.

Mr. CURTIS. And it would become a race war. Is that not right?

Mr. MASON. It would.

Mr. CURTIS. What does the gentleman have to say with reference to the outlook not only for the present generation but for our children and our grandchildren should this war become a race war and we not have a stanch ally in Asia, so that men of ideals can stand together rather than men of color?

Mr. MASON. I shudder to think about what could happen under those conditions.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is the ranking member on the Committee on Immigration and he is acquainted with every member of the committee. While we differ as to many bills, what is the gentleman's opinion as to the majority of that committee on the general question of immigration? Does the gentleman feel there is a movement on foot to raise all bars and add to the immigration in this country?

Mr. MASON. I do not think there is any danger of that whatever. I think at least a majority of the committee as it is now constituted would be rather in favor of lowering the quotas than increasing the quotas. I am sure that is true today as the committee is now constituted.

Mr. CURTIS. As the law now stands there is a quota for Hitler but not for Mme. Chiang Kai-shek?

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has aptly stated a truth to which we will all agree, I think, without any question. The gentleman has further stated part of it in his previous remarks. I believe that the Congress, in considering all of this matter, should have a principle before it. That principle should be that while we hope to raise the standards of the rest of the world to equal our own, we will take such a position on all matters that will not allow our own standards to be reduced in the process.

Mr. MASON. I will say "amen" to that.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is one of the vital things that we must consider. That is the reason why the American Federation of Labor and the American Legion and other organizations are very fearful of this act, that there will be something involved here as a precedent or otherwise that would ultimately reduce the standard of living, through such competition.

Mr. MASON. I will say to the gentleman they are not fearful of this act, because they have not studied this act, and they do not know what is in this act.

Mr. HINSHAW. They are fearful of the principle involved in this act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate what the gentleman from California is saying, but is this not true: Does England have any exclusion against the Chinese?

Mr. MASON. They do not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, if we do not sell the Chinese the things that they need to build themselves up, will not England and Russia sell her those things?

Mr. MASON. That is a self-evident fact.

Mr. HINSHAW. I was merely speaking of a general principle as to our own country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, they will sell to China. They are entitled to sell to the Chinese, but after this war, let the group who oppose this question from an economic standpoint understand that if we keep our exclusion acts on the books after the war and China does recover, of course she will buy from England and Russia and the other countries who say to her, "You are equal with us."

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentlemen should all understand that I may vote for this bill. I have not had an opportunity to give it the study that the gentlemen on the committee have given it, but nevertheless there are some principles which we must consider.

Mr. MASON. I want to interject this—that is, that my one regret is that those who were supposed to be contrary-minded to myself on the issue in the bill are not here to enliven the argument. We are too much agreed.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There were hundreds of witnesses and petitions representing over 80,000,000 people who came before the committee; churches of all religious denominations, civic and religious groups, have appealed for the repeal of the Chinese exclusion law, and there was not one answer against that. And those who have been opposing it have been opposing it either from the standpoint of politics or in spite of the fact that a war is on and our boys are going to pay for it unless we do what the committee is trying to do now.

Mr. MASON. I personally invited at least half a dozen of those of contrary mind to stay and take part in this discussion.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is that the reason the gentleman did not personally invite me here?

Mr. MASON. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, June 16, at the conclusion of the legislative program and other previous orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 5 minutes and revise and extend my remarks and include therewith certain excerpts from letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, there has been a growing question among our citizens at home concerning what is going to happen to them in the way of medical care if their doctors, dentists, and so forth are all or most of them removed from our midst. I have had occasion recently to learn what happens to a doctor when he comes under the purview of the Procurement and Assignment Service Office. It seems to me this service acts in a nonofficial status and in an advisory capacity in connection with the Federal Security Agency, and also with the Army and Navy. You will be interested in this letter, I am sure, which comes from the Procurement and Assignment Service in a stamped envelope, unofficial, and which I received from a physician in Los Angeles. It states:

On February —, 1943, you were mailed a blank military classification card with the statement that "The War Manpower Commission in Washington was making a definite request that this card be filled out by every licensed medical physician not in service, regardless of age or physical condition, or other interests."

This is not an attempt to force anyone into the service, but it is important that our records in this respect be completed. We are under obligation to our Washington office to complete this record, and you are under obligation to do your part by filling out and returning this card at once.

That is signed by the chairman of the Los Angeles County committee. The card enclosed has a blank to be filled stating which of several branches of the armed services the doctor prefers to serve in.

You might also be interested to know what happens to people like him, and no doubt there are a great many doctors who find themselves in the position where it would be very difficult to meet the call, in addition to the fact that they have families, probably, and who do not answer that letter.

In the event that letter is not answered, another letter is received. While this is supposed to come from the Procurement and Assignment Service, nevertheless the envelope in which the letter was mailed was a penalty envelope and marked on the penalty envelope it says:

Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board.

On the letterhead of the Procurement and Assignment Service we find this letter:

DEAR DOCTOR: Our records show that you were sent a letter from the central office, Procurement and Assignment Service, Washington, D. C., 2 or more weeks ago, requesting you to send to this office an enclosed card expressing your preference—

Get that—

expressing your preference for military service—Army, Air, or Navy.

You will note they asked him to express his preference for which branch of the service he wants to enter; they are not merely asking him to go into the service; they are asking him the branch of service he prefers to serve in. It further states:

On April —, 1943, we wrote you that we had not received this card and asked you to send it in, or please communicate with this office, indicating your preference for service. We have had no reply.

Paragraph 8 of a directive to this office from the War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C., dated Febuary 15, reads as follows:

"In all cases of available individuals who refused to make application for commission, the names should be referred to the State director of selective service as nonessential unless they are needed for relocation."

It is with reference to that situation the doctors would like to know. First they are asked to express their preference for the branch of service they want to be in, and then when and if a doctor does not state a preference, or does not want any branch, but prefers to stay home and attend to his practice, or if he does not make an application, his name will be turned over to the State director of selective service as nonessential unless he may be needed for relocation.

What kind of business is that? Are those mothers and children who live at home to have no consideration? Are the physicians of this country to have no consideration from their Government, particularly physicians who might be badly needed to take care of the people in their own home communities? Many communities are already dangerously short of medical services.

It seems to me that somebody should take a little look into that situation and see under what authority the War Manpower Commission can state that a doctor is nonessential in the event he has not made an application for a commission in the Army, the Navy, or the air force.

The concluding paragraph of the letter states:

If we do not hear from you within 1 week from this date, this directive will have to be complied with and your name sent to the State director of selective service.

And yet in the first letter it said:

This is not an attempt to force anyone into service.

The best answer is in the vernacular, "Oh, yeah?"

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GILLIE, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. HARTLEY (at the request of Mr. POWERS), for Wednesday, June 9, 1943, on account of business.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1563. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2664. An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for feed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 11, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Friday, June 11, 1943, at 10 a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments. Room 246, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans

an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

Friday, June 11: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of Subcommittee No. 7 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Friday, June 11, 1943, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of bills relating to the carrying of mail on star routes. Public hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the securities subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Friday, June 11, 1943.

Business to be considered: Open hearing to hear Mr. Ganson Purcell, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, on proxy rules.

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Monday, June 14, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear representatives of Office of Price Administration. (Hearing for June 9 canceled.)

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 2 p. m., Thursday, June 17, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear drug witnesses. On Friday, June 18, at 2 p. m., to hear newsprint and paper witnesses.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2620, a bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives of the United States, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m., on Wednesday, June 16, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The subcommittee on unemployment insurance of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m., committee prints Nos. 1 and 2, dated June 7, 1943, relative to unemployment insurance for merchant seamen.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

486. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated October 26, 1942, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on, and a preliminary examination and survey of, the Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

487. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated October 26, 1943, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the waterway from Miami to Key West, Fla.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

488. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate for the Federal Security Agency for "Grants to States for Old-Age Assistance," "Grants to States for Aid to Dependent Children," "Grants to States for Aid to the Blind," and "Grants to States for Unemployment Compensation Administration" (H. Doc. No. 234); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPARKMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 693. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, approved June 16, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPARKMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2349. A bill to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 650. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Missouri River at or near Garrison, N. Dak.," approved February 10, 1932; with amendment (Rept. No. 535). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2649. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Brooklyn Center, Minn." Public Law 525, 77th Cong.); with amendment (Rept. No. 536). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GATHINGS: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 414. An act for the relief of Thaddeus C. Knight; without amendment (Rept. No. 532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2923. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, to provide for an increase of 20 percent in the amount of the Government's contribution to the dependents of enlisted men entitled to family allowances under such act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 2924. A bill to give effect to the provisional fur seal agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. Res. 256. Resolution authorizing an investigation by the Committee on the Public Lands of the administration of public lands; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. Res. 257. Resolution authorizing payment of $250 to settle debts of Special Committee Investigating National Defense Migration; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to abolish discrimination in freight rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. WHITE introduced a bill (H. R. 2925) for the relief of Charles J. Goff, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1513. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1514. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of R. C. Garner and 60 citizens of Maplewood, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1515. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Hazledine and 17 citizens of Alma, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1516. Also, petition of Mrs. M. B. Chase and 20 citizens of Riverside, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1517. Also, petition of W. N. McIntyre and 20 citizens of Butler, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1518. Also, petition of Alma D. Patee and 81 citizens of Ridgefield, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the

manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1519. Also, petition of Catherine Marshburn and 51 citizens of Yorba Linda, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1520. Also, petition of the Men's Bible Class of the First Methodist Church of Fullerton, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1521. Also, petition of Mrs. Thomas E. Hults and 20 citizens of Sterling, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary

1522. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. R. E. McEnony and 22 citizens of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1523. Also, petition of Mrs. Mollie E. Gorman and 1,009 citizens of Canton, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1524. Also, petition of Mrs. H. J. Riordan and 106 citizens of Duluth, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary

1525. Also, petition of Frances Enyart and 20 citizens of Burbank, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1526. Also, petition of Carl E. Carlson and 28 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1527. Also, petition of Viola Perry and 28 citizens of Hannibal, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1528. Also, petition of Mrs. S. A. Chilton and 107 citizens of Chesaning, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1529. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution passed by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Passaic, N. J., endorsing the provisions of Senate bill 1137 and House bill 2783 in aid of post-war planning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1530. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 50 citizens of the State of Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1531. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of sundry citizens of Valparaiso, Ind., and vicinity, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1532. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition of Erskine M. Irvine and 99 other citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., appealing for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1533. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. A. A. Ames and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., and vicinity, urging the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1534. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of Mrs. John Fisher and three other residents of Franklin County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1535. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the mayor and City Council of Brockton, Mass., protesting against the granting of contracts for the manufacture of Army shoes by prison labor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we, the creatures of time and sense, with the fever of mortal days upon our spirits, with wistful longings which haunt the depths of our being, turn to Thee, the King eternal, immortal, invisible. We change with the changing days. We are fretted by every passing wind, tempest-tossed and afraid. But Thou art the same yesterday, today, and forever. Even now, as we face perplexing decisions affecting the lives and fortunes of untold millions who look to us for the wise word and the right action, wilt Thou lift us from the confusions and bafflements of these days into the unhurried calm of Thy presence? Grant us the peace which is the gift of Thy grace and the wisdom which is from above.

In the sacrifices now demanded for the continued boon of freedom may our eyes discern Thy judgments. In the worldwide strivings toward a brotherhood which knows nothing of color, creed, or race, may we see Thy kingdom's coming. In the clanking chains of the enslaved may our ears hear the voice of Thy command, "Let my people go." May the spiritual verities by which we really live assert their sovereignty and ascendancy over our hearts and minds as with unbroken vigil we keep the perpetual light of faith burning over the inner shrine of the soul. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Thursday, June 10, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2713) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. COFFEE, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. DITTER, Mr. PLUMLEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2080. A bill to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service; and

H. R. 2536. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the

enrolled bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gillette	Nye
Austin	Green	O'Daniel
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Pepper
Bankhead	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Scrugham
Bridges	Holman	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McCarran	Tobey
Chavez	McClellan	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Van Nuys
Danaher	McNary	Wallgren
Davis	Maybank	Walsh
Eastland	Mead	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	White
George	Murdock	Wiley
Gerry	Murray	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

REQUISITION AND DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY REQUIRED FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE (H. DOC. NO. 235)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am submitting herewith to the Congress a report of operations for the period October 16, 1942, through April 15, 1943, under the act of October 16, 1941, as amended, which authorized the President to requisition and dispose of property required for national defense.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 11, 1943.*

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO SHIP CONSTRUCTION RESERVE FUNDS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 163) to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship construction reserve funds, and for other purposes, which were, on page 3, line 14, to strike out all after the word "into" down to and including the word "case" in line 19, and insert "within 2 years from the date of such deposit," and on the same page, line 20, after the period to insert "of 2 years."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments, and I think the motion may require a brief explanation.

The amendments relate to subsection (g) of section 511 of the Ship Construction Act of 1936. Subsection (g) provided that contracts falling within the provisions of section 511, especially of subsections (c) and (g) must have been entered into within 2 years from the date of the deposit with which the legislation was concerned.

For the 2-year idea the Senate substituted certain language by way of calendar dates, namely, "entered into after October 10, 1940, and on or before December 31, 1943, with respect to deposits made prior to January 1, 1943, or not later than 1 year after the date of such deposits."

The House did not agree to that, but substituted the language "within 2 years from the date of such deposit", and that is the language in section 511, which has heretofore been approved by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A memorial of the Florida Legislature; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Memorial 15

"Memorial to the President and Congress to call a convention to frame a federal constitution for world government

"Whereas peace under ordered liberty throughout the world is an end devoutly to be desired and worth making sacrifices to attain; and

"Whereas intercommunication has become so rapid and the instruments of destruction so deadly that no nation can now lead a life of isolation in peace and safety; and

"Whereas systems of alliance and balances of power and leagues have failed to accomplish more than a breathing space between wars; and

"Whereas the people of the Thirteen States once faced the urgent need which free men through the world now face—the vital need of uniting their power in the strongest way to secure their common rights; and

"Whereas the people of the Thirteen States then met that need by creating a common government, in the midst of war, and when the war was thus won but the peace was endangered, helped develop that emergency government into the more perfect Union embodied in the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas these principles of federal union have proved for more than 150 years to be the most successful solution known to history of the problem now confronting all free peoples, viz, how to unite, so that all may live together peacefully, with freedom and prosperity; and

"Whereas the American people have never yet explored how far they might apply their federal principles beyond the confines of the 48 States in conjunction with other free peoples so as to secure the lasting world peace that only ordered liberty can provide; and

"Whereas such exploration cannot possibly do any harm and may achieve as great good as our Federal Convention of 1787: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida*, That the President and the Congress be requested to call at the earliest possible moment a convention of representatives of all free peoples, to frame a federal constitution under which they may unite in a democratic world government, subject to ratification by each people concerned; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from Florida in the Congress of the United States.

"Approved by the Governor, June 5, 1943."

By Mr. WHITE:

A petition of sundry citizens of Norway, Maine, praying for the enactment of legislation to control and regulate the liquor traffic in the vicinity of military camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF CONVENTION OF EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF KANSAS—UNIFORM MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE LAWS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred the resolution adopted by the eighty-fourth annual convention of the Episcopal diocese of Kansas, held in Emporia May 3, 1943, expressing their approval of Senate Joint Resolution 24, providing for uniform marriage and divorce legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution presented by the Senator from Kansas will be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EIGHTY-FOURTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE DIOCESE OF KANSAS HELD IN EMPORIA MAY 3, 1943—EXCERPT FROM THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONVENTION

The Reverend Mr. McPhetres, as chairman of the department of Christian social relations, presented the following resolution as having been approved by the executive council:

"Whereas we recognize the family to be the foundation of present-day civilization; and

"Whereas the marriage and divorce laws of the States vary from complete laxness to rigid requirements, producing many serious complications, threatening the stability of and creating a major problem in our social order; and

"Whereas the need for uniform marriage and divorce laws is evident to all Christian people: Be it

"*Resolved*, That this eighty-fourth convention go on record commending the Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER, United States Senator from Kansas, for his efforts to bring about uniform marriage and divorce laws through the 48 States and the District of Columbia and pray that these efforts may be continued until achieved."

Upon motion duly seconded, the resolution was passed and a copy ordered sent to Senator CAPPER.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 2427. A bill to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 309).

SURVEY OF CONDITIONS AMONG THE INDIANS OF THE UNITED STATES (REPT. NO. 310)

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, submitted a partial report (pursuant to S. Res. 17, 78th Cong., extending S. Res. 79, 70th Cong.), being an analysis of the statement of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in justification of appropriations for 1944 and the liquidation of the Indian Bureau, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I file at this time the report of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy for the year 1943. If the report has heretofore been printed or offered from the floor of the House and printed in the RECORD, I shall not ask that it be again printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from North Carolina will be received. The report has heretofore been printed in the House.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 1220. A bill to provide for the reinstatement of persons separated from the postal service under the provisions of section 213 of the Economy Act of June 30, 1932; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1221. A bill to provide that the rates of compensation, pension, or other regular monthly payments payable to veterans and dependents of deceased veterans under laws and Veterans Regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration shall be increased by 20 percent; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1222. A bill for the relief of Oswald L. Sawyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 1223. A bill to fix the compensation of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia and the Superintendent of the National Training School for Girls; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1224. A bill to designate the Public Library of the District of Columbia a public depository for governmental publications; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2080. A bill to provide temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 2536. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PREPARATION OF HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS FOR WARTIME SERVICE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HAYDEN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 875) to provide for the preparation of high-school students for wartime service, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

WAR AND THE CONSTITUTION—ADDRESS BY GILBERT H. MONTAGUE

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "War and the Constitution," delivered by Gilbert H. Montague, of the New York Bar, before the New York State Bar Association annual meeting in New York City on January 22, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SKIPPER GILLAN—ARTICLE BY JAY FRANKLIN

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to Skipper Gillan, by Jay Franklin, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT WE ARE FIGHTING FOR—WAR MESSAGE PUBLISHED BY NASH-KELVINATOR CORPORATION

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a war message entitled "I Am Not Playing for Marble," published by the Nash-Kelvinator Corporation, which appears in the Appendix.]

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of the Senate for a few moments to a bill which is on the calendar. It is Senate bill 883, Calendar No. 279. The bill provides for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business. I desire to speak to that bill for a very few moments. The bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Commerce. It has the approval of Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones, and has the approval of the big businessmen of the country. It calls for no appropriation. It will create no additional bureau. It will not add to the overhead of government.

How, then, Senators may ask, will this Assistant function?

We have often heard it said that behind every great accomplishment is the lengthening shadow of a great man. Behind every great human effort there is the energy, vitality, and vision of a man or a group of men. All history repeatedly illustrates this truth.

Small business does not want a bureau in Washington which would increase bureaucracy. It does not want an organization with tentacles reaching out into its communities and into its businesses. What it wants is an articulate voice here, someone who understands its language and who recognizes the importance of small business in the economical, social, and political life of the Nation.

What, then, it may be asked, could an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business accomplish? He could be the liaison man in government, representing the small businessman. He could preach cooperation between small business and big business. He could reach out into the highways and byways of the Nation and utilize groups of small businessmen to the end that there may be cooperation and building for the Nation. There are innumerable chamber of commerce groups and civic association groups. There is the United States Chamber of Commerce which is now studying this problem. The Assistant Secretary of Commerce would cooperate with the C. E. D., known as the Committee for Economic Development.

When the war is over, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business could have throughout the Nation a working organization of small businessmen who are not on the pay roll of the Government, but who are interested in maintaining the vitality and the character of their own little business concerns.

These men realize the tremendous job that has to be done in getting the millions who are now engaged in the war service or in war production back into industry and the economic life of the Nation on a peacetime basis. All the men and women thus employed and all those in the armed services must be transferred to civilian production work as soon as possible after the war is won. On this front small business and big business will be collaborating with labor. Through collaboration private enterprise will again demonstrate its vitality, as it has in this war enterprise.

The Committee for Economic Development is not a governmental committee. It is a private, nonpolitical, voluntary, nonprofit group made up exclusively of business men and women headed by Paul Hoffman, president of the Studebaker Corporation. Small business may fit into that group without any trouble, or it can have a committee of its own and collaborate with the C. E. D. group.

The point is that we want for small business someone here in Washington who recognizes the importance of small

business to the economic and political life of the Nation. We want someone who will not simply talk but who will see to it that small business obtains recognition.

One of the jobs of C. E. D. is to educate each company, each little business interest in each little community, so that it will start now to do its own post-war planning. The Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business would have no trouble collaborating with this group on that objective.

Small business is concerned with the post-war problem of public works in city, county, State and the Nation and, of course, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business could render assistance in that direction and could assist existing business agencies and individual companies.

The initiative of the individual is what built this country, and it is not the purpose of the bill to interfere with such initiative. Rather, if the Assistant Secretary of Commerce is appointed, and the bill provides that he shall be appointed by the President, one of his objectives would be to add impetus to the growth, the initiative which has made America great. His purpose would be to interest small business in tackling its own post-war problems.

The Assistant Secretary of Commerce would stay out of politics. He would have no part in politics. His heart and soul would be in the high purpose of strengthening the economy of the Nation.

Small business recognizes that the nation will need more homes, food, radios, autos, clothing, air-conditioning, and a thousand other articles when the war is over. Small business recognizes that there is now a terrific deficit in machinery on the farm and that this deficit will grow greater; and this will also be true in the post-war period when there will be a deficit of machinery for manufacturing to supply the nation's needs. The outside world will need our help and this will call for expanded facilities. There will be new methods of production and new products to manufacture. We will have to build new schools and highways, and we will undoubtedly think in terms of great international highways both in the air and on the land. Small and big business is in that picture.

Small business wants to play its part in these great developments and adventures. There will be huge economic savings by individuals in banks and trust companies to aid in the accomplishment of the job which the nation is called upon to do. With its Assistant Secretary of Commerce, small business would have the cooperation of economists and scientists studying the policies of government and fostering maximum productive employment.

Mr. President, small business is a relative term. It includes nearly everyone except the very large business institutions. The perpetuation of small business means, as one great American said to me, the perpetuation of the American way.

The Department of Commerce estimates that in 1939 there were 2,758,272 small business establishments in the United States. These establishments, consisting of manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, servicemen, that is, establishments which sell services rather than commodities, such as laundries, barbers, etc., construction men, hotel operators and owners of amusement places, employed 8,364,971 persons.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a table submitted to the Senate Special Committee to Study Problems of Small Business in December 1941 by the Department of Commerce Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, showing the position of small business in the national economy, embracing the number of establishments and personnel, output, sales or receipts.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Small versus large business, 1939—United States totals for manufacturing, wholesaling, retailing, hotels, amusement, and construction*

Industry or trade	United States totals			Small business [1]			Ratio of small business to United States total		
	Establishments [2]	Personnel	Value of output [4]	Establishments [2]	Personnel [3]	Value of output	Establishments [2]	Personnel [3]	Value of output [4]
Manufacturing	184,230	7,886,567	$56,843,025,000	168,814	2,358,968	$17,366,697,000	91.6	29.9	30.6
Wholesaling	92,794	912,548	19,418,547,000	71,681	355,731	4,100,404,000	77.2	39.0	21.1
Retailing	1,770,355	6,210,788	42,041,790,000	1,614,310	3,487,984	17,836,171,000	91.2	56.2	42.4
Service establishments	646,028	1,754,538	3,420,417,000	637,585	1,294,724	2,241,709,000	98.7	73.8	65.5
Hotels	27,987	362,047	863,155,000	25,224	111,183	229,163,000	90.1	30.7	26.5
Construction	215,056	1,300,448	4,519,638,000	200,307	610,740	1,546,891,000	93.1	47.0	34.2
Places of amusement	44,917	257,200	998,079,000	40,351	145,641	332,837,000	89.8	56.6	33.3
Total	2,981,367	18,684,136	128,104,651,000	2,758,272	8,364,971	43,653,872,000	92.5	44.8	34.1

[1] Small business: Manufacturing plants with 100 employees or less; wholesale establishments with less than $200,000 annual net sales volume; retail stores, service establishments, hotels, places of amusement, and construction establishments with annual net sales or receipts of less than $50,000.
[2] Number of establishments.
[3] Proprietors and employees, except for manufacturing which includes just manufacturing employees.
[4] Value of products for manufacturing; net sales of wholesalers and retailers; net receipts of service establishments, hotels, construction, and places of amusement.

Source: Computed from 1939 Censuses of Manufactures and Business.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, when Secretary of Commerce Jones appeared before the Senate Commerce Committee on May 27, 1943, in connection with my bill, S. 883, he expressed approval of the measure. He said:

> Small business numerically embraces 9 out of every 10 business establishments. It accounts for over one-third of the dollar value of goods and services. It employs approximately 45 percent of all wage earners.

The statement "45 percent of all wage earners" was confined, of course, to personnel of these specific industries—manufacturing, wholesaling, retailing, service establishments, hotels, construction, and places of amusement.

I understand that the Commerce Department's best estimate for the year 1942–43 was that the total business population would be reduced by about 500,000 individual firms, 300,000 of which would be retail. I am told that that is not an alarming figure, since it does not entirely represent failure of businesses especially induced by the war, but, rather, conversion to the war effort and depletion of stocks resulting in curtailment, in addition to the usual amount of failures or discontinued businesses which in normal times was about 1,000 a day.

Small business has always stood on its own feet, and it will continue to stand on its own feet.

Mr. President, we are living in a changing world. It has been contracted. It has grown much smaller. All of this calls for rational planning. It calls for learning to practice cooperation between all segments of our society—labor and management, small business and big business, Government and the citizen. It calls for more cooperation on the home front as well as on the international front. We are all one—we Americans—and in a sense we are each our brother's keeper.

If we pass this bill it will have a great psychological value. Whether its operations will be successful will depend upon the vision of the man who is appointed. Passage of the bill will notify the small businessmen of America that Congress has at last—at long last—taken cognizance of their situation. It will give the small businessman a shot in the arm and will make him feel that he has someone in Washington who is thinking about him, who is concerned about his affairs—someone to whom he can go or to whom he can write and to whom he can submit his individual problems.

When peace comes all business, big and small, must be ready to do the job that will then be necessary, ready to back up its Government in its effort for

international collaboration, ready to take its part in employing those who come back from the service and those who come out of the war plants.

Only by thinking this problem through now can that result be accomplished. What a great job the proposed Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business will have if he will make it great.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill I have introduced printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 883) providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) The Congress hereby finds that (1) the existence of American small business as an integral part of the American economic system is essential for the preservation of the system of free competitive enterprise in the Nation, (2) that the continued existence of American small business as a potent factor in the American economy is now challenged and threatened with extinction, and (3) that destruction of American small business burdens and obstructs the free flow of goods in commerce and interferes with the orderly and fair marketing of goods in commerce.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act, through the exercise by Congress of its power to regulate commerce between the several States and to create executive offices, to preserve American small business as an integral and essential part of the American economic system, and to preserve the system of free private competitive enterprise in the Nation.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

SEC. 2. There shall be in the Department of Commerce an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business. It shall be the province and duty of said Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business to foster, promote, and develop the conduct of commerce, manufacturing, transportation, distribution, and other business facilities and activities in the United States by small business with the end in view of the preservation of small business as an integral component part of the American system of free private competitive enterprise of the Nation. He shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. He shall be charged with the supervision and coordination of governmental activities dealing with the small business and small-business problems, and such other duties as shall be assigned to him by the Secretary of Commerce and as may be required by law. There shall be detailed to his office such number of employees of the Department of Commerce as may be authorized by the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce shall make a report to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each 6 months of the operation of the office of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business, including such other information and such comments and recommendations with respect to American small business and small-business problems as he may deem appropriate.

SUPPLEMENTAL LEND-LEASE APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE AID—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an Act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and at the end of the matter so restored insert: "produced in the continental United States"; and the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
GERALD P. NYE,
H. C. LODGE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMETT O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the report. Its consideration will take only a moment, I am sure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me inquire to what bill the report has reference.

Mr. McKELLAR. The lend-lease appropriation bill.

M. McNARY. Oh, yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement relative to the conference report, if I may be permitted to do so. The House conferees were unwilling to accede to the elimination of the amendment prohibiting the use of lend-lease funds for agricultural subsidies, which was inserted in the appropriation bill on the floor of the House. The Senate conferees have agreed to the restoration of that amendment, although it was their position that subsidy legislation should not be enacted piecemeal.

However, I do not believe that the amendment prohibiting the use of lend-lease funds for the payment of subsidies on agricultural commodities will affect the procurement program of the Lend-Lease Administration. The Senate Appropriations Committee understands that the Lend-Lease Administration does not in fact intend to pay agricultural subsidies, as the committee pointed out in its report. The Lend-Lease Administration does intend to pay the full cost of agricultural products which it purchases, even though under a subsidy program the price to private consumers may be lower as a result of subsidy payments provided by other Government agencies. It is my understanding that that is not precluded by the proposed amendment.

Let me say that the amendment applies only to products produced in the continental United States. The amendment was agreed to, and I hope the Senate will agree to the conference report.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to say a word or two about the conference report. I signed the report on the lend-lease bill because of its very obvious urgency; but in the House there was inserted an amendment about which I have very grave doubts, and I do not want the conference report to be agreed to without having the RECORD show those doubts.

Language was inserted relative to the granting of subsidies. The matter was phrased in such very broad terms, and it was so poorly defined, that it seems to me it is subject to various interpretations. I read the language:

Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for the payment of any subsidy on agricultural products produced in the continental United States.

Mr. President, I am very much in sympathy with the broad purpose of the language as it has been stated to me by those who introduced it in the House; but the language used is so vague, it is subject to so many different definitions, and is attached to a bill as to which it could not possibly have any binding or practical effect, that I regard it as a brutum fulmen—a harmless thunderbolt, something which can only defeat its own purpose. So, while, of course, I heartily approve of the appropriation, and while I signed the conference report for that reason, I desire to have the RECORD show that I have doubts about language of that kind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

THE PETROLEUM SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE WEST—NOTICE OF MEETING

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in view of the current discussion over gasoline rationing and the possibility of imposing further restrictions upon gasoline consumption in the Middle West, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and myself have taken the initiative in asking the Senators from district No. 2, which includes Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and Iowa, to meet on Tuesday, June 15, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m. in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building. The purpose of the meeting is to obtain information regarding the petroleum situation from representatives of the executive agencies concerned. Secretary Ickes will be present, and representatives of the O. P. A. and O. D. T. have been invited to attend.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that we have selected district No. 2 in order to arrive at some logical basis, although it may not be inclusive. I should like to

say that any other Senators from States which they think might be affected, and who might be interested in this situation, will be very welcome if they care to attend the meeting.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I am intensely interested in the remarks made by the able Senator from Wisconsin in announcing a meeting of representatives of Congress from district No. 2 to discuss the situation relating to gasoline and oil and the forthcoming conference with the Honorable Secretary Ickes, that great liberal, who is now the Secretary of the Interior, and the Fuel Administrator. For only yesterday, 24 hours ago, it was my privilege, as one of the Senators from district No. 1, to sit in the Post Office Committee room of the House Building and examine Mr. Ickes and hear from him a report on the situation. I enjoyed his testimony. He was direct and forthright, as he always is. But out of that meeting came almost no satisfaction of aid or comfort for those of us representing the people of New England and the Atlantic States who are now bearing the burdens imposed upon the people of district No. 1, the Eastern Atlantic States, in the shortage of gasoline and fuel oil. So now we have the announcement by the senior Senator from Wisconsin of the meeting of Members of Congress from district No. 2, the Midwestern States. May I say to my good colleague that I hope that out of that meeting will not only come an examination of Mr. Ickes but, after hearing all the evidence, the Members of Congress from district No. 2 will rise to great heights and say to Mr. Ickes, "The whole is greater than any member, and we of the second district in regard to the oil and fuel situation realize the excessive burdens that have been thrust upon the people of the Eastern Atlantic States and New England, and, in a spirit of camaraderie and of common justice, we ask that pleasure driving be prohibited in our district No. 2, that our coupons be cut down, and that we be put on a parity with our brothers and sisters in the New England and Eastern States. We believe in and ask for equality of sacrifice." At least, then, I will give them a degree, magnum cum laude.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the purpose of the meeting is to ascertain what the actual facts are concerning the gasoline situation. I cannot speak for any other Senator, but I can speak for myself by saying that, so far as I am concerned, if the imposition of additional rationing in district No. 2, or any other district, would materially assist the armed forces of the United States or assist in relieving the gasoline and fuel oil shortage in district No. 1, I would be glad to see it undertaken, but I do not wish to see it undertaken simply on the theory that, because of physical difficulties, one district in the United States is compelled to do with less gasoline, all other districts should be compelled to do so just for the fun of it. It is the purpose of this meeting, so far as I am concerned, to ascertain what the facts are, and I can assure the Senator from New Hampshire that the patriotism of the citizens of district No. 2 will not be exceeded by the patriotism of the citizens living in district No. 1.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I am glad to have listened to the Senator from Wisconsin, and I knew that is what he would say. He always measures up along these greater lines, but, while I am not the seventh son of a seventh son, I have the gift of prescience, and I can promise that, after the conference gets through, the pronouncement can be made, and it can be written on the blackboard, that they undertook to solve the gasoline and oil problem by the algebraic formula X, which is an unknown quantity. [Laughter.]

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 95, line 12.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, last night I gave notice that I wished to be heard on the amendment, and that I intended to speak on it. I am not in physical condition this morning to enter into a discussion. I merely wish to make a very brief statement on the amendment. Upon inquiry, I find that this amendment, reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee, if approved, would affect only the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation; that is to say, that no other agency would be affected by the elimination of the committee amendment to section 2. I think, Mr. President, that all of us are familiar with the old R. A. C. C., and with the operations which have been conducted under it. The R. A. C. C. was organized when we were in the very depths of a depression; it was a corporation which came into existence not very long before the Democratic administration came into power, when all the banks of the country were in fact closed. It was intended to provide the means of credit to livestock producers and other types of farmers in the United States, because credit was not then available through the regular credit channels.

Following the R. A. C. C., of course, additional Federal lending agencies were set up. There are some 19 or 20 of them, as we discovered in the investigation which was carried on by the Byrd committee, which are actively engaged in supplying credit to all types of farmers in the United States.

At this time there is no reason for the revival of the R. A. C. C. operations. We have a national income now estimated at from $140,000,000,000 to $142,000,000,000, the highest income in the history of the Nation. There is now on deposit in the banks nearly $90,000,000,000 available for loan. Practically all other Federal lending agencies are in operation, and can meet the needs of those who have not adequate collateral or have not such assets as will justify ordinary commercial loans.

The R. A. C. C. was, in fact, almost a dormant corporation. It was kept alive in order to furnish money to certain particular projects and to certain restricted groups. I have no objection to the R. A. C. C. continuing to function as it has functioned up to this time, so far as all the special projects and special groups are concerned. This amendment would not interfere with that operation. It could not do so, because those groups are very well organized. Loans may be made to them as they have been made in the past, and it would not be necessary to approve the Senate committee amendment in order to permit this Corporation to function as it is now functioning.

It is very well known that the R. A. C. C. has approximately $44,000,000, as I recall. It was partially liquidated. That $44,000,000 is adequate to take care of the special projects and special groups which have been served through this Corporation. In addition, the $44,000,000 may be expanded to the extent of at least $250,000,000 for general loan purposes under the original act creating the Corporation. It is possible that that fund might be expanded beyond $250,000,000, but the Senate can see at a glance that if the R. A. C. C. is to be revived and put back in full operation, it will add at least $250,000,000 to the debt of this Corporation and the R. F. C.

Our debt is high enough; our obligation is already heavy enough; and at this time there is no possible reason for the revival of this Corporation. Bear in mind that the particular projects and special groups such as the apple growers, who were referred to last night by my distinguished friend from Washington [Mr. BONE], can be cared for by the Corporation. I have no doubt that they can be cared for without the language proposed to be stricken out.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BONE. What sort of machinery would be provided for caring for them as the Senator suggests? This provision forbids the use of any money whatever to pay the expenses of anyone in connection with the servicing and processing of loans.

Mr. GEORGE. How have they been cared for?

Mr. BONE. They have made their loans through the R. A. C. C.

Mr. GEORGE. Through what agent?

Mr. BONE. The R. A. C. C. at present has two agencies left which are functioning, one at Minneapolis and one in Wenatchee. The Wenatchee agent, as I understand, is the man who processes the loans. He is the man on the ground. There is not very much of a staff. I think there is only one man there.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me suggest to the Senator that if he would offer a very simple amendment, I think he might meet the situation.

Mr. BONE. In the event that the Senate should not sustain the committee—and I hope it will not do so—I have an amendment which I think would serve to protect Wenatchee, but I was hopeful that I would not have to tender

the amendment. I will read it to the Senator. It is in the form of a proviso:

On page 96, strike out the period at end of line 2 and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following language: "*Provided, however*, That in any region in which commodity loans were being made on December 1, 1942, under the above-mentioned Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, as amended, such credit program then in effect, shall be continued, and the officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau, office, agency, or service of said department, necessary in the administration of such program in such region, shall be retained, and compensation for their services is hereby specifically authorized."

That would narrow the operation, and filter it down to one or two spots.

Mr. GEORGE. It is broad enough to cover any area in which the R. A. C. C. has been functioning.

Mr. BONE. It would apply to any area in which it was functioning and making loans on December 1, 1942. As I recall, the testimony before the committee was that only two sections were receiving aid on December 1, 1942. There was one office at Minneapolis, and one at Wenatchee. On that date no other section of the country was receiving this loan service. I have hesitated to offer the amendment because I do not want to put myself in the position of cutting out other sections. It would save the Wenatchee section, because on that date loans were being processed and serviced in the Wenatchee area, and I understand out of the Minneapolis office, but nowhere else in the country. If I am in error I hope I will be corrected, but that is my understanding. I presented that view to the committee, and it was not challenged there, so I felt that I was fairly accurate in that assumption.

Mr. GEORGE. I would not have the slightest objection to that, or any similar amendment which would accomplish the purpose.

Mr. BONE. I will say further to my friend from Georgia that I showed this amendment to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] yesterday and he told me he would have no objection to it. I have hesitated to offer it, because it would very materially narrow the activity. Nevertheless, I wish to serve the people in Wenatchee. Last year they were loaned $8,000,000, which has all been paid back.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand.

Mr. BONE. They are going ahead with their own program if they can be given this little help in the extension of Government credit.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have said all I desire to say on this amendment. I simply wish to prevent the expansion or revival of the agency as such throughout the country, because it is wholly unnecessary. It cannot be justified. We are wide open to the charge that we are extravagant, that we do not wish to bring about any economies, that we do not wish to rid the country of any overriding bureau. There can be no possible reason for the revival of this corporation in the wide areas of the country in which it has been dormant for several years.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I have only a very short time, but I am glad to yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let me ask the Senator whether he objects to the so-called nonrecourse loans which are being made for the production of needed war crops?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I do. They have occasioned a great deal of difficulty. The bottleneck is not money. The bottleneck is manpower and machinery. The nonrecourse loans, if dropped down into the middle of my home county, for instance, would almost eliminate every bona fide farmer who has put his own money into his farm operation, or made his own arrangements. It is easy to make the arrangement. He cannot compete with it. The nonrecourse borrower can bid for what little labor and machinery is left, but the production of food crops would not be increased. It would be decreased. I am now speaking of the general farming operation. I have no objection to the continuance of this corporation in any area, or with respect to any group which it has continued to serve during the time when it has been dormant in all other parts of the country.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. For example, take the production of flax. I understood that it was intended to finance as much as 650,000 acres of flax in North Dakota. Does the Senator contend that that activity should be financed by the local commercial banks or other institutions if the nonrecourse type of loan should be made under those circumstances?

Mr. GEORGE. I have some slight familiarity with the production of flax. It is backed today by one of the strongest financial corporations in the country, and there is no question of financial aid. There is involved a problem of labor and machinery, with which we are all familiar. But, the mere increase of credit facilities would not, in my opinion, help in the production of any vital war material or any food product.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to ask a further question.

Mr. GEORGE. However, if the corporation is functioning in that area, and with respect to that operation, I am suggesting that that operation be cared for and not be interrupted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I know only what I glean from the testimony. It seemed to me that the testimony indicated that a considerable amount of financing had been done which seemed to be connected directly with increased production of needed war crops.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia on the amendment has expired.

Mr. GEORGE. I will take time on the bill.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I am not very familiar with the operations of this corporation, but I am under the impression that it did a great deal of good at a time when farmers could not obtain credit.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; undoubtedly that is true.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. There has been some objection to it in the past year or two because it had many employees on the pay roll who went out soliciting ordinary loans.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true. There have been some abuses.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. However, with respect to financing the production of flax, I think that if the Government wants flax for war purposes it can afford, through some agency, to place nonrecourse loans to stimulate the production of flax. In the first place, there is a great deal of risk accompanying the production of flax. It is very sensitive to various kinds of diseases. It is very susceptible to frost, and, as a rule, the yield is very small. Ten bushels of flax to the acre is considered a very good crop.

I know that through its various agencies the Federal Government has been importuning the farmers in the areas where flax can be grown greatly to increase the acreage of flax. I also know that farmers hesitate to take the risk. If flax is needed I do not believe that the farmers should be asked to assume a greater risk than they ordinarily would assume by putting in a large crop. One night of frost may kill half a million acres of flax.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. So if a greater production of flax is needed, some inducement should be offered to the farmers so that they would not be required to carry all the risk.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. Let me state to the Senator that this amendment would not directly interfere with the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. It has ample capital to take care of special situations.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It has ample capital now?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; it has ample capital at the present time, without expanding

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to point out that under the terms of this amendment the R. A. C. C. cannot use that capital, because the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation Act provides that the Corporation shall be managed by officers and agents to be appointed by the Farm Credit Administration under such rules and regulations as it may prescribe. Under the House language no regulations could be prescribed relating to the R. A. C. C. because the employees would be stricken from the pay roll. There is a further provision in the act creating the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation that all its loans shall be subject to the approval of the Farm Credit Administration. So none of those loans could be approved by any person who would not have his salary stopped under the House language. That is one of the reasons which prompted the Senate committee to strike out the provision.

The question is much more complicated than appears on the surface. Yesterday, when this amendment first came up, I stated that the members of the committee were divided in their opinion as to the necessity of making these loans. I think the committee was practically unanimous in believing that the R. A. C. C. should not make any F-1 loans in any event, and that F-2 loans should be confined to circumscribed areas and to projects already in operation.

If the House language should be adopted as it now stands, there would be grave question as to whether even the loans outstanding could be collected.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I fully agree with my colleague's statement. I wish an amendment could be drafted and offered in lieu of the committee amendment, or as a further amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the committee has been criticized a great deal for undertaking to legislate on this bill. When this matter was considered I think it was generally recognized that there should be some limiting provision. The question was an involved one. We did not know fully the views of the House. We knew that the House language would have an effect which even some of its authors would not anticipate. I am sure they had not anticipated the question of whether outstanding loans could be collected under that provision. For that reason I hope that the committee amendment will prevail. We shall meet with the House conferees, who will undoubtedly insist upon the House provision. I believe that some reasonable plan can be worked out in conference.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, that attitude on the part of the chairman of the subcommittee, my distinguished colleague, is quite agreeable to me. I think the problem can be met in the way he suggests. However, we ought to understand the situation as it is insofar as the general revival of this corporation as an operating agency throughout the country is concerned.

There is one thought I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate and my colleague, and that is with respect to the revival of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation for the purpose of making of all types of loans. At one time I think that Dr. Black stated distinctly that he did expect to expand it wherever there was a necessity for it or a demand for money. More and more the Treasury is obliged to depend for the enormous financing operations involved in carrying the burdens of this war upon the country banks, upon the small banks, upon the banks which are in agricultural areas, and if those banks are to meet the unfair competition which in certain sections has developed—I do not say it is universal—they will be obliged practically to close up or they will be very seriously crippled. It is a matter which I think I am justified in saying has concerned the Treasury. Up to now financing operations have not had to involve what we speak of as country banks, local banks, in the agricultural areas; but henceforth such banks will have to carry a tremendous burden, and they ought not to be crippled, particularly when there is no need for the operations of this corporation in the general agricultural areas of the country, because credit is available in ample quantities, not only through Federal agencies but through ordinary commercial channels. The difficulty is in a superabundance of cheap credit which creates and aggravates an already desperate labor problem on the farm and even a machinery problem.

I had hoped that the differences on the amendment might be composed, and I should be agreeable to any disposition of it which I believe can be, and I am hopeful certainly will be in any event, worked out along the lines my colleague has indicated. I did not make the motion to disagree with the committee amendment in the first instance, although, if the matter goes to a vote, I shall, of course, vote to eliminate it. I express the hope, however, that some general amendment or proviso may be offered which will make it possible to keep the matter open in conference so far as the operations of this corporation go in those areas and with respect to those special group interests that should be cared for.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I can assure my colleague that there is no disposition on the part of the committee to encourage the operation of the R. A. C. C. in connection with normal agricultural production under normal conditions. Undoubtedly, there is ample credit available for normal operations under normal conditions at the present time, but I think that it would be most unwise to permit the House provision to be agreed to in its present form, because it would even endanger the collection of more than $30,000,000 of loans already outstanding, and it would prevent the fulfillment of commitments which have already been made and which have been partially undertaken, in addition to destroying the special areas referred to by the Senator from Washington. Of course, we can protect them by amendments here on the floor, but the other matters cannot be so protected.

I hope the Senate will vote for the committee amendment, in order that this matter may go to conference, where we will endeavor to work it out on a fair basis. The House is not going to surrender on this question without any struggle; Senators may be assured of that, and the Senate conferees are not encouraging the making of loans by the R. A. C. C. for normal operations under normal conditions. I can assure the Senator that will not be done.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, let me ask him, if this amendment should prevail and the Corporation should be eliminated, what then would be the status of the loans which have been made? Would liquidation or collection of the loans be transferred to some other agency?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is one of the reasons I gave in advocating the committee amendment, which would leave this matter open so that we can endeavor to work out problems of that kind. The committee was advised that, if its amendment were not agreed to, there would be doubt as to the ability of the Farm Credit Administration to pay people, even to undertake to collect loans outstanding, and it would cause confusion on commitments already made. That was one of the reasons which prompted the Senate committee to strike out the provision in the House bill, in order that we might attempt to clarify all those details, and not do an injustice to any citizen or to the Government.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, did the House bill provide for liquidation?

Mr. RUSSELL. The House position was to absolutely close down the operation of the R. A. C. C. at the present time by the simple expedient of denying them any funds for any administrative expenditures whatever.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Did it provide for liquidation?

Mr. RUSSELL. It did not provide for liquidation. It did not even provide for the collection of loans; but merely provided that no person should be paid any compensation carried in the appropriation contained in this bill to perform any function or approve any activity of the R. A. C. C. The Senate committee has recommended that that be stricken in order that there may be some fair adjustment of this matter without leaving it in that very uncertain and nebulous condition.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. May I ask the Senator another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired on the bill and on the amendment.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has not the floor.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I thought I had the floor. I asked for recognition when the Senator from Georgia had finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not recognize the Senator from Minnesota. He merely said that the time of the Senator from Georgia had expired on both the amendment and the bill. The Chair now recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. BONE. The very question the Senator from Minnesota asked the Senator from Georgia and the explanation he has offered about the hopeless involvement in winding up the affairs of this agency in case we should not accept the views of the committee, has made me hesitate to offer the amendment I suggested, because if we accept the House language with this amendment, I have been far from certain whether I would accomplish what I sought to accomplish, and would add anything whatever to a matter that is already hopelessly confused.

The suggestion of the Senator from Georgia is that we accept the views of the committee, our own committee, and let the question go to conference and see what can be worked out. Perhaps that is the best plan; I do not know; but I do not want merely to offer an amendment which would provide no relief for a district which was one of the distressed areas of the United States—I refer to Wenatchee—and so declared by the President of the United States. These loans were a Godsend to the people there; they are now paying their debts a hundred cents on the dollar, and very promptly. I cannot stand on this floor and permit the destruction of this activity without protest, especially when it does not represent anything except the Government extending a little credit to people who need it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Of course, it was an emergency corporation created to meet an emergency. What I am wondering about is what will happen to these loans if this Corporation is now eliminated, and who will liquidate and make collections.

Mr. BONE. If there is no authorization to spend a penny of money for anyone handling the loans, either making the loans or collecting them, I do not know what would happen. We would have to have emergency legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question. Would the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington——

Mr. BONE. I have not offered it as yet.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator has not offered it, but if he should offer it, would it not enable the conference committee to work out a satisfactory solution?

Mr. RUSSELL. I hardly think it would, because we would have in conference only the provisions of the loans which were made prior to 1942.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If we strike out the House provision——

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the Senator proposed to add this in case the committee amendment were rejected and the House provision were left in the bill. The Senator from Washington proposes to offer an amendment to the House language, as a result of which there would be no such language in conference in the way of the House language.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I hope the Senator from Georgia can propose a compromise which will be satisfactory. The provision brought in by the committee is absolutely unsatisfactory to me, and I shall have to vote against it if it comes to a vote, yet I should like to see the matter adjusted and worked out. The R. A. C. C., as it is operating all over the country, opening up new agencies, going into the loan business on a land-office scale, with nonrecourse loans, is an inflationary influence of the most extravagant nature, and it should be stopped and must be stopped. It seems to me we are dealing with a question which is of vital importance.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has been present during the consideration of the bill, and he has heard the criticisms which have already been leveled at the committee for undertaking to iron out certain matters which had been given most careful consideration in the committee. While I should like to settle this matter on the floor by an amendment, I would not undertake to draw an amendment at this late hour and offer it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Colorado has not only heard the discussion and participated in the voting, but he has supported the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the fact that the Senator has, but he can realize that it would be most difficult for me to draft language here and now which would conform with all the divergent views on this subject. It would be impossible for me to do so.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that the seeding season is over. The nonrecourse loans have been made. Provision should be made for their collection, and for carrying out the payments in case of loss, that is, the cancelation of payments on whatever terms the nonrecourse notes are made. Collection must be made of loans outstanding. Unless some provision is made for it, unless someone shall be given authority to make collections, I do not know what will happen to all these loans. I think there is now no necessity for this Corporation going out and soliciting loans among farmers, unless it be for the purpose of inducing farmers to produce risky crops in aid of the war effort. If they are asked to increase acreage and take increased risks, I think the nonrecourse loans are justified, and should be carried out.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am as strongly opposed to the solicitation of loans as described by the Senator from Minnesota as is any other Senator. I say that, as a general matter, the solicitation of loans by any Federal agency, except for especially difficult crops, is now absolutely inexcusable.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Anyone who could not get a loan from private sources should be able to get it somewhere, and at a reasonable rate of interest, if it is a good risk.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree wholly with the Senator as to ordinary risks.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the junior Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired both on the bill and the amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska about the financing of the corporation under discussion, and I invite the attention of the Senator from Georgia. I understand that it gets its funds from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and has funds available to handle the servicing of its outstanding loans.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a comment on that.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation set-up, as it was organized in 1942, is that it is a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and that whatever its province and power, it operates under the Farm Credit Administration. The Farm Credit Administration appoints any supervisor it cares to appoint, and the supervising and all expenses are paid for out of the funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This is provided in section 1148 of the original act, and that is the way it has operated since 1932.

I helped make loans in Omaha. The Corporation had an organization of their own, and they were responsible to the R. F. C. for the set-up. The testimony of Governor Black is that at this time they have $44,500,000 on hand, and they can use that for all expenses incurred in connection with the operation of the Corporation.

This was brought out in the other House; the same matter was argued there that is now being discussed. What the junior Senator from Georgia is suggesting is only his own opinion. There is no authority in the hearings, except that of Governor Black, for saying that if this amendment is deleted they cannot continue to function as they have functioned since 1932. Otherwise, there is no authority in the hearings.

Mr. President, I respect the opinion of the junior Senator from Georgia. He has a right to his opinion, but we all have our own opinions, and I wish to know whether if this provision is reinstated, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation can continue to operate under its set-up as it has since 1932. The only thing we provide is that no appropriations in the pending measure shall be turned over to the R. A. C. C. They can continue to service loans they have already made by the funds they have on hand, under the provisions of the section to which I have referred.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator from Nebraska is entitled to his opinion, but I do not think anyone could be more in error than the Senator has been in the statement he has just made.

Under the language creating the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, the corporation must be managed by officers and agents to be appointed by the Farm Credit Administration, under such rules and regulations as the Farm Credit Administration may prescribe. Under the limitation in section 2, if the Farm Credit Administration undertook to prescribe any rule or regulation relating to the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, the salary of the Governor or officer of the Farm Credit Corporation carried in the pending bill would be immediately extinguished.

There is no question that this House language stops the R. A. A. C.'s dead in its tracks, because in the act it is provided—and I invite the attention of Senators to a reading of the act—"that the corporations are hereby authorized and empowered to make loans and advances to farmers and stockmen the proceeds of which are to be used for an agricultural purpose, including crop production, or for the raising, breeding, fattening, or marketing of livestock, and charge such rates of interest or discount thereon as in their judgment are fair and equitable, subject to the approval of the Farm Credit Administration."

They cannot take a step that does not have to be approved by the Farm Credit Administration, and this amendment would stop them right where they are, because if the officials of the Farm Credit Administration undertake to comply with the duty imposed upon them by statute, of approving any of these acts, or prescribing any rule or regulation for the making of these loans, they will immediately be rendered ineligible to receive the salaries provided for in the appropriation to which this limitation applies.

If the Senate wishes to strike this Corporation dead, and cause the confusion which will result as to whether or not it can be liquidated at all, as to whether or not, where two of four advances on a loan had been made, the others could not be made, or as to whether or not these special projects should be kept alive, it has the right to do so; there cannot be any question about that. Representative HORAN, of Washington, made a very fervent plea on the floor of the House for the project in his State, recognizing, as was appreciated by all Members of the House, that this language would have the effect of closing down the project in the Wenatchee Valley. I understand there is another project, in Minnesota, which is similarly situated, but I do not know the details of it, since no one appeared before the committee in behalf of that project.

The law further provides:

> Each Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation created under the authority of section 1148 of this act, in addition to the powers granted prior to August 11, 1937—

And be it said this is an amendment to the basic act—

> shall have, and, upon order or approval of the Farm Credit Administration, shall exercise, the following rights, powers, and authority.

Nothing could be clearer under the law. It is even so clear that he who runs and who wishes to do so, may read. It is so clear that even a wayfaring man could understand that this Corporation could not move a hand or take a step under the language inserted by the House. I say it is a very grave question whether it would even be authorized to collect an outstanding loan.

Mr. President, I have no great interest in this matter, but I do think that the Senate should consider well before it leaves an agency of Government in such a position as this amendment would leave the R. A. C. C.

I have stated, and I repeat, that the Senate committee did not believe that these F-1 or credit loans be made in competition with existing lending facilities, and undoubtedly there is ample credit available today for most farmers without the R. A. C. C. Everyone on the committee has had it drummed into him ever since we brought the bill onto the floor that when an attempt is made to do what is now proposed to be done on the floor, no one knows what the effect will be. We do not know what the effect of the proposed action will be, and no Senator knows how far-reaching it will be in its effect.

In my judgment the Senate should accept the Senate committee amendment, and let us see what can be worked out on this matter in conference. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] will be a member of the conference. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] will be a member of the conference on this bill. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] will also be members, and so will the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], as well as the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. President, I think we can work this matter out equitably without trying on the floor of the Senate to write in language when no one knows how far-reaching its effect will be.

Mr. BALL. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in support of the position taken by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. At the present time there are 1,100 bankruptcy actions filed by farmers under the Frazier-Lempke Act and pending in North Dakota. I do not know how many bankruptcy actions are pending in Minnesota, but I know some are pending there. Thousands of persons in my State cannot obtain a loan from the banks. I should like to have my distinguished friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] go to North Dakota and investigate conditions there. He and the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] have spoken of the many banks which are bulging with money. There are thousands upon thousands of good, fine, honest farmers in North Dakota who cannot borrow one penny from the banks. There are farmers in North Dakota who, until 2 years ago, have not had any crop in 10 years. As soon as they obtained some money they were compelled to use it to pay their taxes in order to save their farms.

There are thousands of Indians in North Dakota, and the average bank in North Dakota will not lend money to an Indian. When I was Governor of North Dakota I got down on my knees to some of the banks there and tried to persuade them to lend money to Indians, but they arbitrarily refused to do so. It was not until the F. S. A. was established, and the loans we are now discussing were made available, that the Indians were able to obtain sufficient money to buy 8 or 10 or 12 cows and to establish themselves on farms.

Mr. President, I repeat what I said yesterday, that the farmers are now getting along quite well, but they are still in debt. Many of them have boys who are growing to an age when they want to establish themselves on quarter sections of land, but they cannot obtain money for that purpose except by way of these nonrecours loans.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] stated yesterday that the program in question represented a step toward communism. I wish to say to the Senate that this is the first time in my life I have heard a statement to the effect that if a man can obtain a loan with which to buy a piece of land, and own that piece of land, and become a capitalist, that is a trend toward communism. It is just the opposite, because every man who obtains one of those loans becomes a home owner.

I wish to return to the conditions which existed in 1932. I wish to show Senators the effect of these loans in North Dakota alone during the last 4 or 5 years. Six years ago we heard much about the effort which was being made to strike the names of Communist candidates from the ballots. Laws were passed in six States providing that Communists could not have their names placed on the ballots.

Mr. President, what causes a man to become a Communist? If a laboring man cannot pay his rent and is thrown out of his home and has no place to go with his wife and children, he may become a Communist. When President Roosevelt was first elected, in the same election the Communist candidate who ran against me received 5,000 Communist votes. The President after his election gave us the Farm Security Administration and gave us nonrecourse loans, and what happened? Many of those who had previously been Communists became home owners. Each owned a little plot of land of his own, and 2 years later only 1,100 Communist votes were cast in North Dakota. In 1936, as the F. S. A. development continued, only 333 votes were cast for the Communist ticket in the State of North Dakota.

Mr. President, those who borrow money under the F. S. A. are poor people. For the first time in a generation they have had someone in Washington trying to help them. We in North Dakota need the nonrecourse loans if the food so necessary for the war effort is to be produced. As was so eloquently stated by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] yesterday, if we are going to produce the much needed food the men who produce must be encouraged. Unless these nonrecourse loans are afforded them, many small farmers will not be able to continue to produce food.

In conclusion, I call attention to the fact that the payments made by those who have obtained nonrecourse loans represent a remarkable achievement. The borrowers, according to statistics, have paid back more than 50 percent of

the money borrowed, and they have done so at a time when they have been compelled to pay in taxes all they have accumulated, and to repay seed and feed loans.

Mr. President, I hope the committee amendment will be supported by everyone who believes in helping poor folks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BONE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gillette	Nye
Austin	Green	O'Daniel
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Pepper
Bankhead	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Scrugham
Bridges	Holman	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McCarran	Tobey
Chavez	McClellan	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Van Nuys
Danaher	McNary	Wallgren
Davis	Maybank	Walsh
Eastland	Mead	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	White
George	Murdock	Wiley
Gerry	Murray	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 95, line 12.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that the Senator is entitled to a record vote on a matter of this importance. I am sure we shall save time if he is allowed to have one. It hardly seems fair that the Senate should be unwilling to go on record in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair can do nothing about that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me suggest that the Chair recapitulate his count and see.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will be glad to recapitulate.

On a second count, on the persuasion of the Senator from Michigan, a sufficient number have seconded the demand for the yeas and nays.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely desire to point out that I did not make the point of order against the second count.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator had made the point of order, the Chair would have sustained it.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Chair state the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 95, line 12.

Mr. BONE. A "yea" vote would be an agreement with the committee amendment; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, has the roll call been commenced?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll call has not as yet been commenced.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Then I desire to say a word before the vote is taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has already spoken on the amendment. The Senator has a right to speak on the bill if he desires to do so.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes; I simply wish to say that I came today with the intention of voting for the committee amendment. In view of the questions which have arisen in the debate today, I think the matter should go to conference in order to get further information about the nonrecourse loans, and to clear up the points raised in the discussion which has been had on both sides of the question, very logically, by those who are on the two sides. If I correctly understand, the Senator is opposing a controversial amendment of this kind on the floor of the Senate, although he is not a member of the committee. I do not like to vote on such a proposition; but I shall have to do so with the hope that the matter will be cleared up in conference.

Mr. MURRAY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at a point preceding the action of the Senate on the committee amendment on page 95, a statement prepared by the Montana Livestock Association in support of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

CREDIT FOR AGRICULTURE

On August 7, 1919, steers on the Chicago market, weighing 1,050, sold for $12.60 per hundredweight. Cows on the same date sold for $9.25 per hundredweight. Approximately the same date in 1920, steers of the same class, same weight, on the same market, sold for $6.25; cows $4.35. This was the beginning of the depression that was generally considered brought about by World War No. 1.

The winter of 1919 was one of the severest known in this Northwest country. Stockmen, as a whole, had been purchasing land and building up their livestock numbers; many of them rather heavily in debt. On top of that, most of them had to borrow more money to purchase additional feed to get their stock through that severe winter.

In the early twenties, the stockmen found themselves very heavily in debt, and the banks found themselves short of money, and not being able to rediscount livestock paper. Therefore, the situation was so serious that, in order to save the banks and the farmers and ranchmen, something had to be done about the money situation.

Congress came to the rescue by making an appropriation and setting up the War Finance Corporation under the management of Eugene Meyer. The War Finance Corporation loaned money to the ranchmen to pay the banks, providing the bank would guarantee the loan. Later on prices began to improve; ranchmen got in better financial position, and the War Finance Corporation was liquidated.

After 10 years, history repeated itself; the crash of 1929, stockmen again found themselves in a very critical situation, the same as they had in the early twenties. Again the Government came to the rescue of the ranchmen and the banks by creating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and then creating the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation to finance agriculture.

After going through these two strenuous periods, the Department of Agriculture realized that there should be some permanent set-up controlled by the Government to take care of these situations; therefore, in 1933 Congress enacted the Farm Credit Act. The discussions clearly indicated that Congress intended the system to be cooperative, to be permanent, and to be ultimately owned by the farmers and stockmen of the country, and that lastly, it should be free of political interference since it was not intended that the system should lend Government money.

Congress was the first large body to recognize that agricultural credit needs were seasonal, dependent upon types of farming, and that loanable funds must be available when and as needed. With all the years of experience by banking institutions, banks failed to recognize this need; consequently agriculture never received proper consideration until Congress passed the Farm Credit Act of 1933.

You will note that part of the act authorizing the formation of the production credit system was simple and brief and yet one of the most complete pieces of legislation ever enacted.

You will note in the copy of the Summary of Operations for 1942 that the associations throughout the United States served 265,749 farmers. To this number of farmers the associations advanced $477,714,000. All members of the association did not borrow as their financial condition was such that they did not need to use the facilities of the organization. The total membership at the end of 1942 was 317,633 stockholders.

Since stockholders are accorded the privilege of listing their stock for sale when they do not care to use the facilities of the association, many in the past 9 years have taken advantage of this opportunity. In the Spokane district, for example, the 30 associations had 11,660 members, but during the past 9 years more than 18,000 farmers and stockmen have used the production credit associations. The majority of those not members today were able to improve their financial condition to such an extent that it is questionable when it will be necessary for them to borrow again. On the other hand, those retaining membership in the association who do not borrow believe in cooperation and are leaving their stock investment in the organization for two reasons: First, they have a place to borrow when they need to, and second, to help capitalize and strengthen the organization which served them well when credit was not available elsewhere.

I have had occasion at various times to visit with Members of Congress and note that there still exists a general impression that the associations are lending Government money. Of course, you are busy having to keep track of all matters of legislation so you have a good excuse for not being acquainted with all the ins and outs of the operations of production credit associations.

This letter, together with the two pamphlets which I am sending you, are intended to help you get better acquainted with the work being carried on within the State by your farmer friends and mine.

Banks throughout the country are appealing to Congress for help. This is only natural since all banks are flooded with deposits,

and general prosperity of the public leaves them without many loans in their note pouch. Production credit associations do not accept deposits, so are not confronted with this problem. However, our business likewise is down because of the prosperity of the farmers and stockmen. While the banks in this district are appealing to you for aid, it would be interesting to note that if the loans in the production credit system in the four Northwest States were divided amongst the banks making agricultural loans, it would only increase the loans in the note pouch by $40,000 per bank.

One of the great services rendered by Production Credit was the general lowering of all rates of interest to farmers. Banks have lowered their rates but, of course, have not met the Production Credit Association rate, (4½ percent) except to a few preferred clients. Our rate is 4½ to every farmer and stockman. The banks' rates vary from 4½ to 8 percent and the man or farmer who has the least ability to pay interest is generally charged the 8 percent.

Another thing that you will be interested in is the preservation of the original $120,000,000 appropriated by Congress. This money was promptly invested in bonds and used to capitalize the associations. If the system were to be liquidated today the Government would receive not $120,000,000 but $147,000,000. The net worth of the system is $171,685,000. Of this amount the farmer-members have invested $23,034,000 of their own money. Legal reserves and surplus built up by the associations amount to $25,090,000, so it can be said that the system has been successful even beyond the original expectations of Congress when the act was passed.

Another item in which you will be interested is that the system has received no appropriation from Congress since the original appropriation in 1933. It is entirely self-supporting, operates economically, and best of all has decentralized authority. As you know, each district is supervised by a production credit corporation. The corporation does not make loans, it merely organizes, capitalizes, and supervises production credit associations.

It holds stock in the production credit associations, receives dividends when dividends are declared, it operates on a budget and supports the main office in Kansas City.

It is interesting to note that while the bankers throughout the country are attacking production credit associations in this State, the following bankers helped incorporate production credit associations by attending the organization meetings and signing the papers of incorporation.

These bankers knew at the time that the system was to be permanent, yet they recognized its need, wanted it organized, and worked hard to get the associations started.

R. E. Towle, manager, Federal Reserve Bank, Helena branch; A. T. Hibbard, president, Union Bank & Trust Co., Helena; P. B. McClintock, cashier, Farmers National Bank, Chinook; Fred Heinecke, president, First National Bank & Trust Co., Helena; E. F. Galt, vice president, First National Bank, Great Falls; J. G. Reitsch, vice president, Union Bank & Trust Co., Helena; Howard Doggett, banker, Townsend; R. P. Findlater, vice president, Bank of Miles City; George C. Sinton, banker, Manhattan; Axel Nelson, vice president, Richland National Bank, Sidney; L. Pride, president, Baker National Bank, Baker; T. L. Ryerson, vice president, First State Bank, Froid; C. H. Rittenaur, vice president, First National Bank, Helena; J. E. Brown, banker, Havre; H. D. Myrick, director, Federal Reserve Bank, Helena; C. J. Cutz, cashier, Stockmen's Bank, Cascade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCLELLAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, I am advised, would vote "yea." Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] who is detained on important public business, is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is detained at the House of Representatives on important official business. If present he would vote "yea." He is paired on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] would vote "nay," if present.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—41

Andrews	Hatch	Nye
Bankhead	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Hill	Pepper
Bone	Holman	Russell
Capper	La Follette	Scrugham
Caraway	Langer	Shipstead
Chandler	Lucas	Stewart
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McFarland	Tunnell
Ellender	Maybank	Van Nuys
Gillette	Mead	Wallgren
Green	Murdock	Wheeler
Guffey	Murray	

NAYS—31

Austin	George	Reynolds
Bailey	Gerry	Taft
Ball	Gurney	Tobey
Barbour	Hawkes	Vandenberg
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Walsh
Bushfield	Lodge	Wherry
Byrd	McKellar	White
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Wiley
Danaher	Moore	Wilson
Davis	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	Radcliffe	

NOT VOTING—24

Aiken	Downey	Revercomb
Barkley	Glass	Robertson
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brooks	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	McNary	Truman
Burton	Maloney	Tydings
Butler	Overton	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Reed	Willis

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 84, after line 24, it is proposed to strike out:

Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5, and for the purchase of property and costs and expenses incurred in connection therewith in accordance with section 7 of the Rural Electrification Act of May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), $20,000,000.

Total, Rural Electrification Administration, $22,258,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of the objections which have been raised to the legislative provision for handling this item through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as has been done in past years, I have consulted with as many members of the committee as I could reach—and I think I have talked with all of them, with possibly one or two exceptions—and I shall therefore ask that the Senate reject the committee amendment, which struck out the direct appropriation on the part of the House. I shall then offer an amendment from the floor increasing the appropriation to $30,000,000, the amount of the Budget estimate. It will make no difference in the operation of the Rural Electrification Administration. The only difference that will obtain will be in the method of handling the funds. For the past 4 or 5 years the R. E. A. has been financed by Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans. That requires legislation on an appropriation bill. It makes no difference to the R. E. A. or those who are interested in the cooperatives where the funds come from so long as the cooperatives are permitted to operate.

I therefore hope, Mr. President, that the committee amendment will be rejected. I shall then offer an amend-

ment from the floor increasing the appropriation to $30,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 84, after line 24.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I now offer an amendment, on page 85, line 4, to strike out "$20,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,000,000"; and in line 5, to strike out "$22,258,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$32,258,000."

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. What difference would this amendment make in the operation of the R. E. A.?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would not make any difference. The R. E. A. has funds available, and will expend them under the substantive act creating the Rural Electrification Administration. In times past we have provided for borrowing funds from the R. F. C. That requires legislation, because the basic act has no provision for borrowing funds from the R. F. C.

Mr. SMITH. I was a little curious to know why the language involving the $20,000,000 was stricken out.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was done because the Senate committee instructed me to offer a legislative proposal for borrowing $30,000,000 from the R. F. C. That was offered as a substitute, and a point of order was made against the legislative provision, so we handled it by way of a direct appropriation. So far as the operation of rural cooperatives is concerned, it does not make a particle of difference. Under the terms of the amendment which I have offered, they will receive the full amount of $30,000,000 estimated by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. SMITH. As I understand, the language proposed to be stricken out by the committee will remain in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true. The Senate has rejected the committee amendment. The language which appears in the bill as it came from the House will be retained, and my amendment proposes to increase the amount from $20,000,000 to $30,000,000.

Mr. SMITH. What effect would that have on the operation of the R. E. A.?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would have no effect whatever. It would not touch the basic act creating the Rural Electrification Administration. The provision which had been suggested in the nature of legislation to permit borrowing from the R. F. C. had only to do with the source from which the funds were to be derived, and did not in any degree affect the local cooperatives in their operations.

Mr. SMITH. I am merely wondering why the Senator wants to increase the figure to $30,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Because we thought that amount was necessary to enable the cooperatives to continue their development and growth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the committee, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 54, line 3, after the words "Chief Forester", it is proposed to insert "at $9,500 per annum."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the other day the question was raised as to what the effect might be upon other salaries in the Forestry Service. I have a letter from the United States Civil Service Commission, which I should like to have included in the RECORD.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may the letter be read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 2, 1943.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: This is in answer to your request for an explanation of the situation which would be created with respect to the salaries of key positions in the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture in case the salary of the Chief Forester, the head of the bureau, were fixed at $9,500 by specific legislative enactment.

In case this action should be taken by the Congress, there would be under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, no result flowing automatically therefrom which would affect the salaries of other positions. Since the salary ceiling in the bureau would be raised, the Commission would not be surprised to receive from the Department a request for the upward reallocation of key positions in the bureau immediately below the Chief. Action on such a departmental request, however, would be subject to the Commission's determination after careful consideration of the responsibilities of the positions concerned, their relationships with the Chief's position and to each other, and especially the kind and degree of responsibility delegated by the Chief to key positions concerned.

In similar instances which have occurred in the past, action by Congress in raising the salary ceiling within a bureau has permitted the Civil Service Commission to recognize classification levels for certain key positions which it felt it could not previously recognize because the result would be a definite conflict with the salary of the bureau chief. Legislatively raising the salary of the chief in those cases removed the conflict.

It may be that in the case of the Forest Service a similar result will occur, but each individual case will be thoroughly analyzed by the Commission on its merits.

Sincerely yours,

WM. C. HULL,
Executive Assistant.

Mr. HAYDEN. The question was asked the other day, when this proposal was made, whether it would have the effect referred to in the letter, and I stated I did not want the amendment adopted by the Senate under any misapprehension. For that reason I have placed the letter in the RECORD. The changes cannot amount to much. Senators who are familiar with the Forest Service will remember that Mr. Clapp has been the acting head of the Service and therefore has been drawing $9,000. He now goes back to the status of bureau chief and will draw $8,000. The fact that he has those responsibilities might permit of a salary reclassification. My main argument in favor of the amendment is that the Forest Service is one of the chief bureaus of the Department of Agriculture. Practically every other bureau chief is receiving a larger salary. The Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics receives $10,000 a year; the Chief of the Agricultural Research Administration receives $10,000 a year, the Chief of the Commodity Credit Corporation receives $10,000; the Chief of the Agricultural Marketing Administration receives $10,000; the Chief of the Rural Electrification Administration receives $10,000; the Chief of the Farm Credit Administration receives $10,000, and the Chief of the Farm Security Administration receives $10,000.

Certainly a modest increase of $500 in this instance would be fully justified.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not at all propose to dispute the assertions that the Chief Forester is a splendid public servant, and that he is entitled to the amount recommended which is very small. But, I believe it is clear from the letter which has been read by the clerk, that while such an increase would not automatically compel a raise in grade and raise in pay of all subordinates in that bureau, it would, as a practical matter, tend to have that effect. We all know that that is the way in which this agglutinative process of magnification takes place in the Government, that officials get together and promote one man and everybody else is promoted accordingly. If that is what we want to do, we ought to do it consciously and not by indirection.

Mr. President, moreover it seems to me that a case can be made out for other officials which would be just as good and equally as strong as the case made out for this particular official. By taking the action proposed we would set a precedent which would undoubtedly be used in the very near future, because we are acting on the whole question of what to do about adjusting the compensation of Government employees in the light of the inflationary forces which are at work in the country. I believe we should deal with the matter as a major problem, and not in a piecemeal manner. In my opinion this is a legislative question in its essence, and I am growing more and more disturbed at the way in which the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, undertakes constantly to pass upon legislative matters. I know the motive behind it. It is a natural one, namely that an appropriation bill must be passed; it is one bill which will not be pigeonholed. So, if we attach something to it, it has a good chance to be enacted into law. That is certainly a practical consideration, and we want to be practical. We do not want any doctrinaire or theoretical consideration to prevent us from doing what we think is right. But in the Appropriations Committee there is not the background of knowledge concerning such matters that exists in a legislative committee. The

Appropriations Committee does not hear both sides. The testimony it receives is usually of an ex parte nature, and the result is that we take up a lot of odds and ends and our efforts result in a hodgepodge. As I say, I am sure the official in this particular case is entitled to the recommended promotion, but I do not think this is the proper way to proceed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I make the point of order that this is general legislation.

Mr. HAYDEN. The point of order is conceded. There is no question about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 65, after line 8, it is proposed to insert:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the War Food Administration to perform its functions, including those prescribed by Executive Orders 9280, 9322, 9328, and 9334, independently or in cooperation (by transfer of funds or otherwise) with public and private agencies and individuals, including not to exceed $10,000 per annum for an Administrator; other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; printing and binding; the purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; the purchase, operation, and maintenance (including two in the District of Columbia) of passenger-carrying vehicles; $25,000,000: *Provided*, That transfers of funds to other offices or administrative units in the Department with respect to which transfers of funds are otherwise authorized in this act shall be in addition to, and subject to the same restrictions as, the amounts provided therefor in the Budget schedules.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this is the appropriation for the War Food Administration, presided over by Mr. Chester Davis. It went over the other day at the request of some Senator.

I wish to say that, of all the public officials who have ever appeared before the committee, I have never seen one who more convinced the committee that he was trying to provide an economical administration than Mr. Davis, and, in view of the duties which are imposed on him, I think this is a very reasonable request. I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio, who raised the point that they were getting ready to set up entirely new committees throughout the country, that Mr. Davis assured the committee that he had no such intention in mind and that no new committees would be set up anywhere.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have read the testimony since the other day, and I quite agree that if Mr. Davis can carry out the plan he has in mind he will reduce duplication rather than increase it. I certainly shall not oppose the appropriation, but I hope that his assurance and the assurance of the committee will be carried out.

Mr. RUSSELL. I join the Senator in the hope he has expressed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was an amendment offered by Mr. RUSSELL, on page 78, after line 12, to insert:

EXPORTATION AND DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, funds appropriated by or for the purposes of section 32 of said act shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the maintenance, expansion, and operation of a school milk and lunch program under clause (2) of said section 32: *Provided*, That such funds shall be available for such purposes during the fiscal year 1944 without regard to the requirement therein relating to the encouragement of domestic consumption.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that amendment also went over on request of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. What was the amendment? I thought the clerk referred to an amendment on page 78.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment just read, to come in on page 78, was offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] under the heading "Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, is the amendment accompanied by a motion to suspend the rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be again stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will again state the amendment.

The amendment was again stated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 4, after the numerals "32", it is proposed to insert the words "in a sum not exceeding $35,000,000."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not wish to oppose the continuation this year of the school-lunch program. The amendment proposes simply that it be not enlarged beyond its present scope. The expenditures last year amounted to $26,000,000. It is said that the cost of food is now somewhat greater and that certain services heretofore rendered by the W. P. A. can no longer be continued. I, therefore, have made the figure $35,000,000 instead of $26,000,000 which was the amount for the current year, with the idea that such an appropriation will enable the continuation of the school-lunch program in its present form.

Mr. President, I desire to give notice that next year I certainly shall oppose any provision of this kind in the appropriation bill, because it does not belong in an appropriation bill. The only reason I do not like to oppose it now is that this program is in effect; many children are receiving this assistance; many school districts are receiving the assistance, and have budgeted their programs for the next year, so that it would be very difficult for many of them to change their plans. Furthermore, it is almost impossible to get through general legislation before the first of July of this year, and, therefore, I do not want to oppose the continuation of the program. But, Mr. President, every possible objection that can be made to legislation on an appropriation bill can be made to this provision.

There is no law authorizing such a program as is now carried on in behalf of school lunches in this country. All Senators know how the program started. It was started by the Surplus Commodity Credit Corporation. They had certain surplus commodities and desired to find places where they could advantageously use them, where they could give them away, if you please, and they found that the school lunch was a good place, and no doubt it was an excellent place.

Undoubtedly they did have a great many surplus commodities. Now there are no longer any surplus commodities, and I say they have taken this surplus-commodities program and turned it into a subsidy program, and are paying the people providing the lunches direct subsidies, amounting to approximately $10 per child per year, a few cents subsidy every day, subsidies which go to every child, although three-fourths of the children are perfectly able to pay for the lunches.

The act under which it is done, the Surplus Commodities Act, provides that the Corporation may encourage domestic consumption by diverting commodities from the normal channels of trade and commerce. This program is no longer diverting any commodities from the normal channels of trade and commerce. It is entirely apart from the purpose of the act, and a Nation-wide program to feed and subsidize all the school children in the United States was developed wholly without legal authority.

Mr. President, it is a typical example of what has happened repeatedly in the spread of governmental bureaus. It is particularly obnoxious, in my opinion, when it sets up a Nation-wide program in which the Federal Government deals directly with people throughout the entire United States, bypasses the ordinary school system, bypasses all the States themselves, and undertakes to distribute bounty, if you please, to individuals scattered throughout the United States.

To cite merely a few of the similar activities of bureaus showing the usurpations of authority which have occurred, I cite first the Lanham Act. Congress passed the Lanham Act to help schools in the areas around camps and around new industrial plants, which were grow-

ing so rapidly that the local people could not take care of the situation. What happened? The Federal Works Agency took over the old W. P. A. organization, and has proceeded to spread the money to schools, not only for education, but they have set up nurseries to take care of the children of women workers, without the slightest legal authority.

The subsidy program which is now proposed has the merest shadow of legislative authority. The W. P. A. are proposing to spend $500,000 through the R. F. C., without any legal authority whatever, and if their claim that there is some legal authority is valid, it will authorize them to spend five billion or ten billion dollars just as well as the four hundred or four hundred and fifty million dollars they are talking about.

We saw the order which practically abolished all tariffs on goods coming into the United States, under the shadow of a little bill intended to permit naval vessels coming home to bring the stores they acquired in foreign countries.

We saw under the lend-lease program an effort to expand it into a measure to lower our tariffs after the war, and make reciprocal agreements—a usurpation of authority condemned unanimously by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

I hear every day B. E. W. is doing this and that—so far as I am concerned—wholly beyond any legislative authority.

The Federal Government, without any authority, has required the Governors of all the States to turn over the State employment agencies, and has set up a Federal employment system throughout the United States, without any legal authority.

We have today seen how the local rehabilitation loan business has gradually expanded, beyond any authority granted by Congress, requiring us again to legislate on an appropriation bill, if we want to continue it.

Mr. President, it seems to me that Congress must now take a firm stand, and say that we will not authorize or justify or appropriate for activities which are undertaken without any legal authority from Congress.

In the second place, this program violates all the principles of State aid, because it bypasses the States. The lunch money is handed out to the local school districts which happen to have lunch programs. If not, so far as I can ascertain, it is handed out to Rotary Clubs, who may be conducting such lunch programs, or it may be handed out to parent-teachers' associations, wholly irresponsible bodies, scattered all over the United States, none of them, so far as I know, subject to any audit by the Comptroller General of the United States.

If we are to have this kind of program, it should be carried on through the State boards of education, which should supervise the arrangements for the lunches. If we should undertake to legislate on the subject, we would have a different system, a very much better system, than now prevails.

Incidentally, there is no assurance of local contribution; there is no requirement. The officials of the Government bureau may subsidize the whole lunch program, or they may subsidize one-tenth of it. They may discriminate in favor of one district against another, or in favor of one State against another. There is no general legislation providing how the money shall be handed out, and to whom it shall go.

Mr. President, these are merely examples of the unwisdom of attempting to legislate on an appropriation bill, because when we do, we merely hand someone money which he can use practically without restriction. The Committee on Appropriations naturally has not considered the details, cannot consider them, cannot consider how the matter shall be handled, the kind of legislation required. The information at hand is wholly inadequate to enable us to deal with the situation with which we desire to deal.

Of course, there is a serious question as to whether the Federal Government should undertake to subsidize all the school children in the United States, regardless of their financial condition. The testimony shows the activity will cost about $10 per child a year. There are 25,000,000 school children in the United States. If we permit the expansion provided for, we may expand it from twenty-five million to fifty-nine million, but if the expansion continues, it can in the end cost $250,000,000 a year on the part of the Federal Government, if it covers the field undertaken by the Surplus Commodity Corporation in this respect.

Mr. President, it seems to me perfectly clear that while the argument against stopping this movement perhaps is sufficiently strong—and I do not wish to stop what is actually being done—there is no real ground for an expansion of the system.

It was stated a few days ago that the W. P. A. had ceased providing services in some cases, but the testimony of Mr. Hendrickson shows that only about one-third of all the projects received any W. P. A. aid, so that would not be a very material figure. There is no reason I can see why the local districts should not undertake to provide the assistance formerly given by W. P. A.

The Surplus Commodities Corporation are perfectly frank about the matter. They say, "Our present plans for 1944 contemplate a substantial expansion of the school-milk and school-lunch program."

I see no reason for that. It is not a war undertaking. In fact, probably there is less need for it now than there is in time of peace. There is more general prosperity, and the parents of the children are better able to take care of the matter. So it is a question of a permanent provision; it has no relation to the war.

In asking this limitation, I think it is fair to say that, so far as I know, this is the only case in which we are asked to increase a nonwar activity in the appropriation bills of this year. I see no reason why we should do so at this time, and I ask for support for my amendment fixing the figure at $35,000,000, which, according to all my information, will enable the Agency to continue the present program, but not to expand it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on the day the bill came before the Senate I urged the importance of separate legislation clearly defining the responsibility of the Federal Government, the States, and local school districts for this program. The Congress should establish definite and clear standards. We cannot handle that matter in connection with the pending bill.

I hope the Senate will not agree to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, limiting the appropriation to $35,000,000. While some order should be brought out of the present confused situation, that is a matter of legislation, and we have no assurance that legislation will be enacted, or, if legislation shall be enacted, that the sum which would be permitted under the amendment of the Senator from Ohio would be sufficient. There has been a very decided increase, as all Senators know, in the cost of food and of milk. The amount which the Senator from Ohio would allow, $35,000,000, might be enough under the increase at the present time to defray the cost of the food and milk which have been supplied to carry on the program in the same proportions as in effect today. But in the event there should be inadequate supplies of food of the kind which has been used, and it was necessary to purchase slightly more costly foods, it is entirely conceivable that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio could cause the abandonment of the school lunch and the school milk program in some of the schools of the Nation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What figure does the Senator from Georgia think would adequately continue the present program without expansion? I have no special brief for the figure $35,000,000, but it seemed to me that that amount would cover any possible increase in cost in food during the year.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say to the Senator from Ohio that I do not know that we should confine ourselves absolutely to the program which is now in effect. I can conceive of very good reasons why this program should be given to some schools which do not have it at the present time. There are areas in the United States where this program is not today available to the schools, where a great number of the mothers of the children who attend those schools are at work in defense plants, thereby creating a great need for more care on the part of public agencies, such as the schools, to prevent the mounting tide of juvenile delinquency which is shocking the public conscience of the American people today. I do not think that we should so circumscribe this program that it would be likely that any school would be prevented from

receiving the benefit of the milk program, even if the lunch program were not expanded in any of the schools of the country.

I wish to suggest to the Senator from Ohio that the original sum which was contemplated to be expended for this purpose in the Budget estimates which were sent to the House of Representatives was $81,000,000. The House refused to appropriate the unexpended balances of $25,000,000. The Senate committee also did not recommend that appropriation. Therefore, the amount which was available for the school-lunch program was reduced to $59,000,000. Under the Budget estimate as it stands today the $59,000,000 can, I may say, be spent on the school-lunch program. I should like to see some limitation or some restriction placed on the amount, but I could not accept the figure proposed by the Senator from Ohio. If no other committee member should object, I would have no objection to setting a definite figure which would not result in materially restricting the school-lunch program. If the Senator were to propose $50,000,000 I would not oppose it.

Mr. TAFT. $50,000,000—that figure seems large. How about $45,000,000?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I could not accept that figure.

Mr. TAFT. I will modify my proposal by suggesting $50,000,000. I wish to place a limit on the amount. I feel very strongly that the program should be carried forward within that limitation. Mr. President, in the amendment offered on behalf of the committee, on page 2, line 4, after "32", I move to insert "in a sum not exceeding $50,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the amendment offered on behalf of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment offered on behalf of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 86, line 16, after the words "Farm Credit Administration" and before the semicolon it is proposed to insert "*Provided*, That the requirement (12 U. S. C. 952) that Federal land banks and joint stock land banks shall be examined at least twice each year is hereby modified so that such examinations need be made only once each year: *Provided further*, That the expenses and salaries of employees engaged in such examinations shall be assessed against the said corporations, banks, or institutions in accordance with the provisions of existing laws except that the amounts collected from the Federal land banks, joint stock land banks, and Federal intermediate credit banks pursuant to the Act of July 17, 1916, as amended (12 U. S. C. 657), shall be covered into the Treasury and credited to a special fund, and the Administration shall estimate the cost to the Farm Credit Administration of the administrative supervision of the Federal land banks, the banks for cooperatives, the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the production credit corporations for the fiscal year 1944 and shall apportion the amount so determined among such banks and corporations on such equitable basis as said Administration shall determine and shall assess and collect such amounts in advance from such banks and corporations and the amount so collected shall be covered into the Treasury and credited to said special fund, which fund is hereby made available to said Administration for expenditure for the purposes set forth in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That as soon as practicable after June 30, 1944, said Administration shall determine, on a fair and reasonable basis, (1) the cost of the examination services rendered during the fiscal year 1944 to each Federal land bank, joint stock land bank, and Federal intermediate credit bank and (2) the amount which fairly and equitably should be allocated to each Federal land bank, bank for cooperatives, Federal intermediate credit bank, and production credit corporation as the cost during the fiscal year 1944 of their administrative supervision, and if the sum of these two items in any case is greater than the total amount collected from the bank or the corporation concerned, the difference shall be collected from such bank or corporation or, if less, shall be refunded from said special fund to the bank or the corporation entitled thereto."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I undertook to discuss this amendment when the bill first came before the Senate.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I understood the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] made a point of order against this amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. No point of order was made against the amendment. A Senator suggested that it go over in order that he could have an opportunity to study it.

Mr. BAILEY. Is this the Bankhead amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; this is not the Bankhead amendment. The amendment carries language which is in the bill at the present time, providing for payment for supervision of Federal land banks, supervision of Federal intermediate credit banks, supervision of banks for cooperatives, supervision of production credit corporations, examination of Federal land banks, Federal intermediate credit banks, and joint stock land banks by assessment against those institutions rather than by appropriation. It was approved in the Budget estimates this year. It was placed in the bill by the House committee, and went out on a point of order made by one Member on the floor of the House.

This item, Mr. President, is in the interest of economy. It is solely for the purpose of obtaining a reduction in the amount of the appropriation made for the administration of the Federal land banks. The amount asked is $2,049,019. If the Senate sees fit to reject this provision, which has already been in the bill, which is in operation now, with funds having already been set up by the affected units to defray the cost of this auditing, it will be necessary for me to offer an amendment from the floor increasing the appropriation by $2,000,000. The amendment saves the $2,000,000 and does not hurt anyone or anything.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered on behalf of the committee on page 86, line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. That concludes all the amendments within the bill, and all the amendments I was directed by the committee to offer from the floor of the Senate. Having reached this stage, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gillette	Nye
Austin	Green	O'Daniel
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Pepper
Bankhead	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Scrugham
Bridges	Holman	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McCarran	Tobey
Chavez	McClellan	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Van Nuys
Danaher	McNary	Wallgren
Davis	Maybank	Walsh
Eastland	Mead	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	White
George	Murdock	Wiley
Gerry	Murray	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The bill is open to further amendment.

THE CORN SHORTAGE IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the most thought-provoking and direful news which has come to the American people for some months was the announcement in the morning press that the leaders having the matter in charge predict a food shortage in this Nation of ours. This morning in the Committee on Banking and Currency the distinguished president of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Green, in the course of his remarks on the pending bill, said that our greatest duty is to stimulate the increased production of food; and, of course, we concur.

We have set up in this Nation administrations to regulate the prices and supplies of commodities. I now desire to speak to the Senate for approximately 3 minutes on one phase of the subject: the restrictions in the price and supply of a great commodity—corn—and the grain situation in the country.

I come from New England, and I hold a brief for the small farmers of the New England States who raise poultry for a

living. They are a part of the $2,000,000,000 poultry industry. Those men, in a patriotic desire to cooperate with the Government and, at its request, with the county agents, have cooperated and have even doubled, in some cases, the supply of chickens and eggs this year, involving great effort and expense in chicken houses and equipment. They went ahead and made this contribution and effort at the Government's request for cooperation in securing greater food supplies. But now, as a result of this patriotic cooperation, they find themselves unable to buy a pound of corn anywhere in the New England States. We are faced with a shortage. Let me point out that the feeding of poultry is so delicately balanced that when an attempt is made to change the balanced ration used for feeding—a ration of which perhaps from 40 to 50 percent always is corn—the productive capacity of the flock is thrown out of balance and out of gear, and production is seriously impaired. When that is done, the food supply of the Nation is threatened.

The poultry producers acutely need the corn. They must have it. Where is it, Mr. President? Some of it is in the hands of the Government, some is in storage under loans, and some of it is so-called free corn. Where can we get it? We cannot get it, because the Government has put on it a ceiling price of $1.03 at Chicago, and by the time the corn has reached my district the price is approximately $1.20. Even so, it is impossible to obtain the corn, because the farmers will not sell it to the poultry producers. The farmers who have the corn feed it to hogs, and thus are able to obtain a larger income; and no one can blame them for doing that.

When I am asked what the remedy is, I make this suggestion: We have to have the production of our food supplies stimulated. The only solution I can see of this matter, after going through it to the full extent of my mental ability, is to increase the ceiling price of corn, and not only the price of corn, but the price of the things fabricated from corn and sold to the public in one form or another.

Some may say that such a procedure will increase costs. Perhaps in a measure it will. We have already had certain price increases throughout the country, but, above all things, the desideratum is to obtain the production of food necessary to be had in order to feed the Nation, and for lend-lease to our allies, and for our armed forces abroad.

So, Mr. President, without further ado, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD—I shall not take time to read them—a series of letters and telegrams which have been sent by the operators of poultry farms and by grain dealers in my State and in other New England States. I ask that they be printed as a part of my remarks, and that the Senate carefully consider this situation which is so pregnant with direful consequences for the American people as a whole.

There being no objection, the letters and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANCHESTER, N. H., *June 8, 1943.*

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TOBEY: After hearing for a number of years about the tremendous surpluses of grain which the Government has accumulated, it comes as something of a shock to learn that there is only about a week's supply of stock and poultry feed in New Hampshire and that the prospects of its being replenished are not good. If the surpluses of grain do exist, I cannot understand why they should not be made available at this time, for it would be nothing short of a catastrophe if the poultry raisers of New Hampshire, who have increased their facilities at the Government's request, should be forced to liquidate their flocks for lack of an adequate supply of grain. Yet apparently this is the very situation which they are facing. The growers of cattle and hogs are apparently facing the same situation, and already the supply of hog ration is practically exhausted and I understand that none is being mixed.

I suppose that you have received many letters of a similar tenor from your constituents, and I would appreciate it if you would let me know what can be done and what you are doing to remedy the situation.

Yours very truly,

FREDERICK W. BRANCH.

CHRISTIE'S POULTRY FARMS,
Kingston, N. H., June 8, 1943.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHARLES: Referring to my telegram of yesterday, I am writing you at this time in more detail so that you will better understand the feed shortage situation which faces the poultry industry of our region, and the entire country for that matter. I understand that the bill authorizing the Department of Agriculture to release 50,000,000 bushels of feed wheat has been passed by both the Senate and House. This is a relief because it will take care of us so far as wheat is concerned, temporarily at least, but you must bear in mind that additional allotments should be made as soon as possible for future use.

Now about corn—the situation on corn is very critical. Large feed manufacturers and dealers of New England tell me that unless shipments of corn begin to roll East by next week that the corn situation will become even more critical than the wheat one has been. The reason for this is not because there is a shortage of corn, because we understand elevators all over the country are bulging out with corn, but because of Government restrictions on ceilings which makes it impossible for legitimate grain dealers to do a legitimate business. These grain dealers tell me that they can go out and sell an auction short and satisfy the needs of their customers, but if they did that they would lose anywhere from 3 to 6 cents a bushel, which of course they are not willing to do. The Government must release some corn and release it quickly. One method of doing so would be lifting the present price restriction.

* * * * * *

For your information chickens are a peculiar animal. They must be fed certain formulas day in and day out in order that they live, grow, and lay a lot of eggs. To do this they must have a complete balanced ration which cannot be changed from day to day. Corn supplies about from 40 to 50 percent of this ration and wheat or oats or any other grain cannot be substituted for corn, even for a single day, without throwing the birds' digestive system out of balance, and as a result, out of production immediately. If this happens there is nothing for the poultryman to do but to sell his hens because they will not come back in production for several months and no poultryman can afford to keep birds that are not laying for even a day.

Every time 5,000 laying hens are sold, the production of eggs from that flock alone drops 20,000 eggs each week. We need these eggs and chickens to feed our armies, our people at home, and for lend-lease purposes. You may be interested to know that prior to the war we only dried around 10,000,000 pounds of eggs in this country. This year's goal is between three hundred and four hundred million pounds of dried eggs. It will be impossible to achieve the dried-egg goal as well as the egg for home consumption and poultry meat end of it, if the industry is handicapped at every turn. Millions upon millions of hatching eggs and baby chicks are shipped out of New England to all parts of the country as foundation stock for next year's producers of market and hatching eggs, and baby chicks. If this source of supply is stymied in the least, not only our industry will suffer a tremendous economic loss but our war effort will suffer immensely, and we are more concerned about that than we are about our economic loss.

Your efforts to expedite movement of grains for poultry and livestock feeding purposes will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW CHRISTIE.

STRATHAM, N. H., *June 4, 1943.*

SENATOR TOBEY: The poultry industry is faced with a 25-percent immediate reduction in grain supplies. Much of it is due to western stockmen and Corn Belt farmers feeding out corn instead of shipping into the Northeast here to help poultrymen. All other grain stocks are correspondingly short.

The Government has urged the industry to new heights of production. Now a grain shortage. The whole thing is defeating itself. Please, as our Representative, look into this situation at once, or we will be forced to dispose of 25 percent of our laying and growing stock. Grass is a big help in growing pullets, and lawn clippings help layers and breeders, but we must have grain. We can't turn them off to pasture for the summer.

Sincerely,

DUANE YOUNG,
Owner, Pineview Chickery.

MERRIMACK FARMERS' EXCHANGE, INC.,
Concord, N. H., June 9, 1943.

Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are grateful to you for the work you have done in getting the 50,000,000 bushels of wheat released through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The lack of corn has caused a rise in the price of barley of 18 cents per bushel in 12 days. Oats, likewise, are going up. I give these figures merely for your information.

Every day that passes with no corn flowing east brings us nearer to the time when the livestock here will have to be fed a mere sustenance ration containing no corn. Normal delivery time on a car of corn from date of order to date of arrival is about 10 days. This means that if a concern owns a 10-day supply of corn today, they will be out at the end of that period unless orders for corn can be placed today. Yesterday's Chicago Market News says: "There was no trading in corn which was bid at ceilings."

Isn't there anyone in Washington who can do something about this serious situation?

Very truly yours,

MERRIMACK FARMERS' EXCHANGE, INC.,
R. W. PEASLEE, *General Manager.*

CONCORD, N. H., *June 3, 1943.*
Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Desperate feeding problem faces New Hampshire dairymen and poultrymen, especially the latter. Reports from millers advise impossible to get corn and wheat. Thousands of our people responded to appeal for poultry meat and eggs as with milk. Feeding situation now so desperate unless relief immediately comes thousands of chicks, broilers, and layers will go hungry, and day-old baby chicks do not live long without feed concentrates. Advice via Boston corn and wheat plentiful supply, but fixed price on corn forces holding from sale. Chance to secure supply through Chicago auction market at price above Office of Price Administration fixed price. Millers do not care to violate Federal prices fixed or take loss in July market, Chicago sold short. Check if possible Federal holding corn and wheat and do at once all possible to relieve desperate situation. Urge quick Senate approval of bill passed today by House authorizing sale 50,000,000 bushels Government-owned wheat. Urge favorable influence on quick transportation via Great Lakes grain authorized for entry from Canada. Quick action imperative.

ANDREW L. FELKER,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

CONCORD, N. H., *June 2, 1943.*
Senator CHARLES TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

New England nearly out of corn, wheat, and barley. None available on market. Birds starving in 10 days.

MERRIMACK FARMERS EXCHANGE, INC.,
R. W. PEASLEY, *General Manager.*

CONCORD, N. H., *June 2, 1943.*
Hon. CHARLES TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Unable to buy corn, wheat, or barley in New England. Mill can run 3 days more on present supply. Can you do anything to relieve the situation?

G. M. BARTEMUS CO.

KINGSTON, N. H., *June 7, 1943.*
CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The poultry industry of New England in general, and that of New Hampshire in particular, is the seed basket of the poultry industry of America As such it has contributed more to the development and welfare of our $2,000,000,000 industry than any other factor. Our industry is very vital to our war effort. A serious emergency faces the feeders of poultry and other livestock in New England due to the shortage of corn products. There will be no poultry industry left to boast about in New England unless something is done to relieve the situation right away and not 2 weeks from now. Please act immediately.

ANDREW CHRISTIE,
President, Poultry and Egg
National Board, Kingston, N. H.

PITTSFIELD, N. H., *June 5, 1943.*
Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY:

Urge that you do everything possible immediately to make corn and wheat available to New England. Situation very serious and unless relieved at once New England faces a definite feed famine.

RIEL & STAPLETON GRAIN CO.

CONCORD N. H., *June 3, 1943.*
CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate:

We do not believe corn will flow East until Chicago pegged price is raised. When 50,000,000 wheat is released shipments must be greatly speeded to avoid famine. Too much red tape now.

R. W. PEASLEY,
General Manager, Merrimack
Farmers Exchange.

MANCHESTER, N. H., *June 9, 1943.*
Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building:

What are we farmers to do? Have only enough grain for our stock to last 4 days. Can't you do something about the corn situation? Let's not compel our small New England farmers to sell their stock. We all want to help by raising more, even without our usual farm help, and now we cannot feed what we have. Please do what you can.

Mrs. HENRY WHEELER, Jr.,
Bedford, N. H.

BOSTON, MASS., *June 3, 1943.*
Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Owing to a serious emergency that faces the feeders of livestock and poultry throughout New England, due to the inability to purchase corn and wheat through Government or regular channels, we are appealing to you for instant action for relief. Inside of 2 weeks, if unable to get supplies of these two important grains, New England will face a definite feed famine, feeders will be unable to secure feed, and chaotic conditions will result. We believe that there is an adequate supply of corn and wheat in the country to take care of feeding requirements for all sections, but due to governmental restrictions and ceilings, we are unable to buy. The present bill up before the Senate for the allotment of 50,000,000 bushels feed wheat should be passed, also; additional allotments should be made for future use. Once again we emphasize that immediate action is necessary on your part to make supplies of these grains available in order to save the New England farmers, either through changes in corn ceilings or such other methods as can be devised.

BOSTON GRAIN ANL FLOUR
EXCHANGE, INC.,
E. J. SENNOTT, *President.*

CHARLESTOWN, N. H., *June 4, 1943.*
Senator CHARLES TOBEY,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

New Hampshire nearly out of corn and wheat. Poultry raisers face ruin unless these grains obtainable within week. Please act at once.

JOHN L. NELSON,
Manager, Nelson Warner Co.

BERLIN, N. H., *June 4, 1943.*
CHARLES W. TOBEY,
United States Senate:

Serious shortage of corn and wheat facing New England. Strongly urge immediate action.

ROMEO J. BARBIN.

CONCORD, N. H., *June 3, 1943.*
Senator CHARLES TOBEY,
United States Senate Office Building:

Cattle and poultry will suffer unless we can buy grains immediately.

FOWLER BROTHER GRAIN MILLS,
Suncook, N. H.

MANCHESTER, N. H.
United States Senator CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Washington, D. C.:

We are bread bakers employing 75 persons supplying about 25,000 families here in New Hampshire. At present our inventory on corn sugar and corn byproducts will be exhausted in about 2 weeks. We wish you would use your office with Food Administrator Chester Davis, Office of Price Administration Administrator Prentiss Brown, Economic Director Fred Vinson for them to take immediate action to relieve the critical corn situation. Unless this corn situation is straightened out immediately, we will be forced to stop baking bread, which is essential.

ALBERT E. GENEST,
President, Genest Bros., Inc.,
Manchester, N. H.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, poultry and eggs are a part of the common diet of all men. We must have them; and unless the feed necessary for the flocks of hundreds of thousands of poultrymen throughout the United States is obtained by them, I state today—and I say this advisedly—that they will become so discouraged about the situation that they will go out of business.

One man in my State of New Hampshire committed suicide. He had destroyed his flock. He was aided, perhaps, in his efforts to continue operations; but, nevertheless, he became discouraged and lost faith. The Government which had encouraged him went back on him when he came to get the supply of food he needed for his flock.

Mr. President, I have taken these few moments to raise my voice in behalf of the necessities of the poultry producers of the Eastern States.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer. The amendment calls for no appropriation. It is legislation. I desire to make a brief statement concerning it. I ask first that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. That notwithstanding the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or any other provision of law, any owner, lessee, tenant, or operator of any farm land on which a substantial part of any crop was destroyed or damaged by flood or by insect infestation in 1943 so that abandonment or replanting of such crop is necessary, may market without penalty the actual production of cotton from any acreage planted on such farm land and the planting in 1943 of any acreage in excess of the farm cotton acreage allotment on such farm land shall not cause the producer to suffer any deduction or loss of eligibility for payment, commodity loans, or price support: *Provided,* That the acreage in excess of the

farm-acreage allotment in 1943 shall not constitute past acreage or past production of cotton in determining the farm, county, or State acreage allotment for any subsequent year.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, we have had a very disastrous flood in the central-southern portion of the country. This flood has caused great damage in Arkansas and in Oklahoma. Under the present law the farmers in that area have a quota for the production of cotton. They may not exceed that quota unless the restrictions are removed. My amendment proposes to remove the restrictions on the planting of cotton in the green bug infested and flooded areas. The amendment is recommended by Mr. Chester Davis, Food Administrator. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Davis be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, June 1, 1943.

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FULMER: This replies to your letter of May 24, 1943, to the Secretary of Agriculture, requesting a report on H. R. 2766, amending the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY, of Oklahoma.

The bill would provide that, on farms on which the substantial portion of any crop was destroyed or damaged by flood or insect infestation, cotton could be planted, produced, and marketed without regard to present marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and without causing the producer to be subject to deductions or loss of eligibility for payment, commodity loans, or price support.

I favor such legislation with respect to marketing quotas as would enable me to meet emergency situations where it is determined that the lifting of marketing quotas would increase the production of food and feed crops. I understand that this is the purpose of the proposed legislation. The committee may wish to consider whether the same objective could be reached by a more general provision.

In view of your request that this report be submitted immediately, we have not had an opportunity to clear it with the Bureau of the Budget, and, accordingly, we are not advised as to the relationship of this proposed legislation to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER C. DAVIS,
Administrator.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this amendment removes the quota restrictions on the production of cotton in the green bug-infested and the flood-destroyed areas, and only for this year. Farmers in the northern part of the cotton belt can still plant cotton and have an opportunity to raise a crop if the fall is a little late. This is an effort to give the farmers in this distressed area an opportunity to raise a cotton crop this year. The amendment affects only the northern boundary of the cotton district, which is on the Arkansas River in the main, and covers territory in my State and in the Panhandle of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I understand that all other amendments are now disposed of. I wish to make a motion. I offered an amendment with respect to which a point of order was sustained, and I have on file a motion to suspend the rule. At this time I make the motion to suspend the rule so that that amendment may be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, although I have the honor in part to represent a State which is predominantly agricultural, perhaps in a larger degree than any other State in the Union, yet, so far as I recall, I have not participated in any way in the debate on the pending measure. I have not asked for recognition, or occupied any of the time of the Senate. However, I feel that a few words should be said with reference to the motion which has just been made in the effort to bring before the Senate the amendment proposed by the illustrious Senator from Alabama.

I am impelled to make these few remarks, Mr. President, principally because of the superb address which was made the other day by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the further fact that the following morning one of the Washington newspapers carried, in headlines, a statement to the effect that the Senator from Alabama was attempting to revive the efforts of the farm bloc to break through the price ceilings.

That statement is so at variance with the facts that one cannot choose but to make reference to it. I do not blame the young men and women who report the proceedings and debates in the Senate. In most instances I find, on reading the press releases with reference to measures of this kind, that there is nothing in the statements of the news articles themselves, as reported by those young people, to offer any justification for the headlines. They do not write the headlines. Neither do they write the editorials.

Referring again to the statement of the learned Senator from North Carolina, I think I can agree with almost every word he said. He made a superb address. He referred to John L. Lewis.

At this point let me digress to say that the American people are prone to think in terms of symbols. At the present time John L. Lewis is a symbol of the object of the resentment of the American people against certain labor practices, whether John L. Lewis is responsible for them or not. I hold no brief for John L. Lewis, but I simply say that he has become a symbol of the object of all the resentment against improper labor practices, just as a short time ago my good friend Leon Henderson became a symbol for the object of every type of resentment against certain restrictions, rules, and regulations of the O. P. A., and just as another good Iowan, Harry Hopkins, has become in the minds of the people a symbol for the object of their resentment against any governmental administrative agencies which they designate under the heading "New Deal."

The Senator from North Carolina very properly referred to the danger of breaking through the price ceilings, which might, and probably would, result in all the evils of uncontrolled inflation. He very cogently, logically, and earnestly spoke along that line. However, his remarks, erudite as they were, and worth listening to as they were, have no reference whatever to the pending measure.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina spoke of the danger of breaking through the price ceilings. I refer to the Price Control Act which was approved on October 2 last. Let me read from that act:

That in order to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, the President is authorized and directed, on or before November 1, 1942, to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries, affecting the cost of living; and, except as otherwise provided in this act, such stabilization shall so far as practicable be on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942.

I supported that measure, as did other Senators. I am sure the Senator from Alabama supported it. A large majority of the Congress supported it. It is the law, authorizingthe President to fix price levels to "hold the line." The Executive authority has attempted to do so.

However, we placed two limitations in the act:

SEC. 3. No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any agricultural commodity under authority of this act or otherwise below a price which will reflect to producers of agricultural commodities the higher of the following prices, as determined and published by the Secretary of Agriculture:

(1) The parity price for such commodity (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials), or, in case a comparable price has been determined for such commodity under and in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, such comparable price (adjusted in the same manner); or

(2) The highest price received by such producers for such commodity between January 1, and September 15, 1942 (adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture for grade, location, and seasonal differentials), or, if the market for such commodity was inactive during the latter half of such period, a price for the commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in line with the prices, during such period, of other agricultural commodities produced for the same general use;

and no maximum price shall be established or maintained under authority of this act or otherwise for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers of such agricultural commodity a price therefor equal to the higher of the prices specified in clauses (1) and (2) of this section.

Further—

SEC. 4. No action shall be taken under authority of this act with respect to wages or

salaries (1) which is inconsistent with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or the National Labor Relations Act, or (2) for the purpose of reducing the wages or salaries for any particular work below the highest wages or salaries paid therefor between January 1, and September 15, 1942: *Provided*, That the President may, without regard to the limitation contained in clause (2), adjust wages or salaries to the extent that he finds necessary in any case to correct gross inequities and also aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

With those limitations, we authorized the President to hold the lines. One of the lines was based on a parity formula. He could not put a price level on foodstuffs or articles processed in whole or in part from farm products, below a point which would reflect what? First, the parity price. What is the parity price? I shall not again enter upon that old discussion. It is more familiar to other Senators than it is to me.

On the 31st of May there came a statement from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture, fixing a certain parity list of prices based on the formula which we had laid down in the law. The so-called parity prices were computed. Conservation payments are not one of the factors taken into consideration under the law which we enacted.

Let me use this illustration: I use it particularly with reference to the esteemed Senator from North Carolina. I do not know whether the Senator has a farm in North Carolina or not. I hope he has. Let us suppose that he has.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me enlighten the Senator. I have a farm in North Carolina, but I quit operating it, and for 12 years have not allowed anyone else to operate it. I am more prosperous and better off by reason of that policy.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad the Senator has made that statement. Thousands of farmers throughout the United States have found that that situation applies to them, and even more of them will find it applicable, if permission is granted to manipulate and distort the laws which are enacted by the Congress of the United States.

Let us assume that the Senator still has his farm, and that he raises cotton on it.

Mr. BAILEY. That is not correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. On the first day of June the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, under the formula we laid down, said that the parity price of cotton is 20.21 cents.

Now let us assume the Senator, as a United States Senator—and he is one of the best—operates a farm. As a Senator he draws $10,000 a year, and earns five times that much. Let us assume that in the legislative appropriation bill—I ask Senators to listen to this—when a sum of money was appropriated to pay the salaries of the United States Senators, including the Senator from North Carolina, there was added a provision that no portion, not a dollar, of the money appropriated for the salaries thereunder, should be used in computing the parity price for cotton on any farm in North Carolina or elsewhere.

That is not ridiculous. That is comparable. What does the Senator draw his $10,000 a year for? For raising cotton? For raising corn? He draws his salary for his services in the United States Senate. When an appropriation of money is made for the purpose of paying his salary, it should not be necessary to add that the salary cannot be used in determining whether the Senator has a parity price for the cotton produced on his farm in North Carolina. But apparently it is necessary in the case affected by the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, allow me to refer again to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. Listen to what these payments are for. They are not to pay the Senator's salary, nor to compute the price. I read from section 2 of the act:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress—

Under the Soil Conservation Act—

for the purpose of conserving natural resources, preventing the wasteful use of soil fertility, * * * through the encouragement of soil-building and soil-conserving crops and practices—

To do so and so.

Subject to these limitations the Secretary is authorized to pay conservation payments to farmers. For what? I quote from the act:

(1) Their treatment or use of their land, or a part thereof, for soil restoration, soil conservation.

(2) Changes in the use of their lands—

The extent to which the utilization of cropland on the farm conforms to farm practices which the Secretary determines, and measures to prevent run-off by the building of check dams and ponds, and providing for facilities for applying water to the land, and flood control.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I remember distinctly when the Farm Conservation Act was passed. It was based to a large extent upon a survey made by the Department of Agriculture, the Forestry officials, the National Resources Board, and other agencies, indicating the great loss of a national asset, in the matter of soil, due to lack of soil conservation. By erosion, for instance, a hundred million acres of the richest farm land in the United States had been destroyed forever.

The theory of the act, and the expenditure of funds for conservation on the soil, was not based on paying the farmer for raising crops. It was to pay the farmers the cost of maintaining and building up the soil for future generations, as a great national asset. So long as these payments are made for the purpose of preserving and improving a national asset, of course it is ridiculous to add the cost paid for the conservation of this national asset to the parity price of the farmer.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. He is wholly correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. And it was never so intended.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator is entirely correct. The payments were made for a specific purpose. The money is appropriated for the specific purpose of soil building, flood control, and to preserve the fertility of the soil and the money is paid to the farmer for not raising the crop on the land, not for determining the price of what he has to sell.

Why in the world should it be taken into consideration in determining parity price? It is not under the law, and the law provides those factors. Why should the salary of the Senator from North Carolina be applied to the price of cotton, tobacco, corn, or wheat, on his farm in North Carolina?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GILLETTE. I will take 15 minutes on the bill. The Senator's salary should be computed in determining his income, but not the price of the commodity which he has to sell; and there is no reason why conservation payments should be applied in computing parity price.

What was done under the law? Contracts were made with farmers last year. We said to them, "Conform to these soil-building, flood-control, conservation practices. Conform to them by putting in other types of crops, and we will pay you compensation for doing so." Those contracts were entered into, and the payments are due. We are providing in this bill a sum of money to pay them.

Now, the Senator from Alabama offers an amendment providing that these amounts shall not be used in computing the parity price for farm products. Why is it necessary to do that? Why should it be necessary to put into a legislative appropriation bill a prohibition against computing a legislative salary on a price? It is unique. But why is it here? Because of the fact that the executive authority has issued an order that soil-conservation payments shall be taken into consideration in determining the price ceilings.

The esteemed former Justice of the Supreme Court, the able former Member of this body, the highly respected Director of War Mobilization, Mr. Byrnes, whom we all love, appeared before the Agricultural Committee, and was asked categorically, "Do you think this ought to be considered in determining a parity price?" He replied, "Gentlemen, I am acting under that directive," and he read it. It was a directive from the President of the United States, which said that in determining price ceilings soil-conservation or benefit payments should be taken into consideration.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Is it not possible that all soil conservation payments might be made to individuals entirely different from those who raise the commodities on which a price is to be established?

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator. It is not only possible, but true in thousands and thousands of cases. There are areas in the United States—for in-

stance, I come from a corn-producing State—which are outside the commercial corn-producing area. They cannot participate in a dollar of the fund. There are thousands and thousands of farmers in the South and in the East who cannot come in under the restrictions and limitations because they do not raise on their farms in a year more than 400 bushels of corn, which I think is the limitation.

So they cannot be considered, but the price they get for the corn and for the cotton is determined. Why, in the name of all that is sensible and reasonable, should they be compelled to figure in in order to determine the price a payment to someone else for a contract he has made and a consideration that he has paid? It is just as unreasonable as to expect in determining the price of cotton on a Senator's farm that there should be figured in his legislative salary.

Mr. President, I do not desire to occupy any more time.

Mr. WILEY and Mr. RUSSELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield first to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I am sorry I did not hear everything the Senator said. I wonder if he has put into the RECORD in his remarks the articles and commodities which have already reached parity?

Mr. GILLETTE. I have not, I will say to the Senator, but I have in my hand the Statistical Summary issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics as of May 31, 1943, containing a tabulation of parity prices for farm products and actual prices received as of that date. I shall be glad to put it into the RECORD, if the Senator desires.

Mr. WILEY. I should be glad to have the Senator do so. I think it would be very illuminating to anyone reading his remarks.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table referred to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

Parity prices for farm products and actual prices received [1]

Commodity and unit	Actual price		Parity price
	Apr. 15, 1943	May 15, 1943	May 15, 1943
Cotton, pound.....cents..	20.13	20.09	20.21
Wheat, bushel.....do....	122.3	122.8	144.1
Corn, bushel.....do....	100.2	103.4	104.6
Oats, bushel.....do....	61.1	61.2	65.0
Potatoes, bushel.....do....	166.8	190.7	118.4
Cattle, 100 pounds.....dollars..	13.03	12.91	8.83
Calves, 100 pounds.....do....	14.25	14.30	11.00
Hogs, 100 pounds.....do....	14.35	13.90	11.85
Lambs, 100 pounds.....do....	13.88	13.83	9.58
Eggs, dozen.....cents..	33.7	34.2	[2] 28.7
Chickens, live, pound.....do....	24.6	24.7	18.6
Butterfat, pound.....do....	51.3	50.6	[2] 40.6
Milk, wholesale, 100 pounds dollars..	3.04	3.01	[2] 2.35

[1] Prices are shown for only those commodities except cotton for which 5 percent or more of annual sales are made by farmers during May.

[2] Adjusted for seasonal variation.

Mr. GILLETTE. I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the able Senator in his remarks referred to the confusion caused by press reports as to the effect of this amendment. I might say that the confusion is not confined to those who cover the proceedings of the Senate, for a great many Senators seem to be under the impression that this amendment is the same proposal which the Congress passed sometime ago and which was vetoed by the President. I hope before the Senator concludes his remarks he will clarify this situation, because it is certainly not the same measure. It relates only to a small part of the bill which was vetoed by the President; it affects only soil-conservation payments.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like further to have the Senator point out, if he has not already done so, that this amendment, if agreed to, would not have the effect of increasing the market price of commodities, because all of them except wheat are at or above parity at the present time, but it would be an assurance that there could be no roll-back on the farmer of the amount of the soil-conservation payments received by him. It would not necessarily result in increasing the cost of wheat by one dime because of the fact that if these payments were not computed the price ceilings could still be in effect, and the amount of the parity payments made to the wheat farmers would merely be increased by the amount protected by the amendment. So, while it might have a psychological effect, so far as adding to the cost of commodities in the market place is concerned, I am of the opinion it would not add anything to such cost.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Georgia. Of course, he is absolutely correct. He has stated his second proposal in much better terms than I could state it, but I may supplement what he said by stating that it is not the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Alabama to break through the price ceilings at all. It would be absolutely unable to do so if it were so desired. It is simply intended to protect the appropriation made for a specific purpose and to see that it goes to that purpose and is not prostituted and channeled into another purpose.

With reference to the first point raised by the Senator from Georgia, I may say I am glad that he called attention to it. The original proposal which was voted on by the Senate, and which was passed, as I recall, by a vote of 78 to 2, prohibited the computation of any type of benefit payments in determining the price level. I think that was just and proper, but that was the measure the President vetoed and the measure which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture. The amendment now under consideration is limited entirely to soil conservation payments and no other kind of payments, and to no other purpose except to protect the appropriation which is made.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. GILLETTE. If the Senator from South Dakota desires to ask a question I yield to him.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I am very much in accord with the distinguished Senator from Iowa in the presentation of the case in regard to what was known as the original Bankhead bill; but what we are considering today is something else entirely. The Senate passed the Bankhead bill, as the Senator stated, by a vote of 78 to 2, as I remember. I voted with the majority for the bill because I thought the ideas contained in it were substantially correct and should be placed in the law. That bill was passed by both Houses of Congress and went to the President. The President vetoed it and returned it to the Senate, stating in detail his reasons for the veto. The Senate then referred the bill back to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The committee started holding hearings upon the bill and met for several days, but it is my understanding—and if I am mistaken I should like to be corrected—that the distinguished Senator from Alabama requested the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to discontinue its hearings; and I heard nothing further about bringing the bill before the Senate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have no recollection of making a request of anybody. I did think it was unwise at that time to proceed, because, as every Senator knows, we took that bill back to the committee not because of objections to the bill itself, but because of the labor problem which confronted us.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, let me say that I approached the Senator from Alabama and asked him if he wanted the commitee to report the bill back to the Senate, and he said "No."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I did not want it done at that time.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator. It was my understanding that it was not further considered because of the request or desire or the feeling of the Senator from Alabama that the bill should not be brought out.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is what I just stated.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The committee was going into an extended series of hearings for the purpose of proving, as we believed, that the President was mistaken in his reasons for his veto. We believed we could prove that, but when the hearings were discontinued, for whatever reason they were discontinued, so far as I was concerned, that seemed to end the matter.

Now this matter is sought to be brought in through the back door, as it were, instead of marching up the front aisle and entering the Senate there; it is brought in by an amendment to the pending appropriation bill. Personally, while I am very new in this body and not especially familiar with its practices, I do not like this kind of procedure. I hope the Senate will vote down the motion of the Senator from Alabama. Let

us consider this bill, if it has any merit, on its own bottom, and vote upon it simply as a bill which we think will be good for agriculture.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from South Dakota will not make me regret that I yielded to him in my time, because I think he is wholly wrong. There is such a difference between the two proposals that I think they ought not to be connected in any way. This is simply a definite proposal applied to an appropriation that is made in the pending bill specifying that the appropriation and the money under it shall go into channels and for purposes for which it was designed.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa if, in substance, the motion does not include the idea of the original Bankhead bill, at least in part?

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, in part, certainly; I just stated that it did.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is all I want to know, and I will say to the distinguished Senator that I renew my objection to lugging this measure in through the back door instead of fighting it out on its merits.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

Mr. GILLETTE. I will yield to the Senator from Colorado in a moment. I will say that this is not an attempt to lug in by the back door a measure which has been vetoed and is before the committee. It can stand on its own feet and can live or die on that basis. This measure is simply to safeguard an appropriation made in the pending bill for a definite purpose. It is limited to soil-conservation payments.

I now yield to the Senator from Colorado in my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question in my own time and get his answer in my own time, if I may.

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield the floor then.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I want to ask the Senator from Iowa a question. He may yield the floor, and I will ask the question in my own time.

A few days ago in a colloquy between the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] I was intrigued by what they said to one another. The Senator from Oregon stated:

> I think the Senator said—
>
> Referring to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]—
>
> I think the Senator said, if his bill were to pass, the farmers of the country would benefit to the extent of $75,000,000 over their present prices.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] replied:

> No; I think the Senator will find it was about $250,000,000.
>
> Mr. McNARY. Some one said about $75,000,000, and I think that estimate was far too high.

What I am interested to know, and the inquiry I wish to propound to the Senator from Iowa is, Where is the $75,000,000 or $250,000,000 coming from?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the Senator permit me to answer the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am speaking in my own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Iowa was speaking of this very point, and I should like to have him answer, and the Senator from Alabama can answer also.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I can answer it right now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I want the Senator's answer, but I want the answer from the Senator from Iowa first.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have not yielded to the Senator from Alabama. I want to have an answer from the Senator from Iowa. Where is the $75,000,000 or $250,000,000 to come from?

Mr. GILLETTE. I do not know. I took no part in the colloquy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not care whether the Senator did take part in it or not. He made the statement a moment ago that the prices of agricultural commodities would not be increased 1 cent. Is not that what the Senator stated a moment ago?

Mr. GILLETTE. No; I did not say that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What did the Senator say about prices?

Mr. GILLETTE. I do not know whether or not they will be increased. I say the purpose of this measure is not to break through the price ceiling. We have a provision in the law, the Price Control Act, which provided that the price ceiling should not be fixed below a point which does not reflect the parity price of the commodity consumed. The only purpose of the proposal before us is that in computing what the parity price is, whatever it may be, whether it is below the present market price or above it, there shall not be taken into consideration an appropriation made for another and utterly different purpose. That is the only contention the Senator has made.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If we do not break through the ceiling, what benefits in dollars are the farmers going to receive from the pending bill?

Mr. GILLETTE. I do not know that they will receive a nickel, and that is not the purpose. I think behind the administration's action is the thought that we must hold prices at a certain level, that we must not let them break through the parity price. That is the idea, and the officials say, "In order to justify us against claims for increased wages, we shall insist that payments made for an entirely different purpose shall not be computed in determining the parity price on which the ceiling is based."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator very much. I thought that was what he had in his mind, and I will say to him that that is the way I saw the problem, but I was somewhat confused by the colloquy between the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. GILLETTE. If I may interpolate, I have been a Member of the Senate for a number of years with the Senator, and I have never before seen the Senator confused.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This is not the first time, I confess.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I think I can clarify the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to have the Senator do so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. So far as I understand—and I think the Senator from Oregon Mr. [McNARY] will agree—we were talking about the effect of the original bill, not the pending amendment. We had no reference to the effect of the pending amendment. I think the Senator from Colorado will recall that, in connection with the first bill, I presented figures showing the difference between the parity price and the commodity price of corn, as well as of wheat and of sugar, the only three articles affected, and while some claimed it would increase prices about a billion and a half dollars, I was making the argument that it could not do that, because the total difference between the market price and the parity price was only $250,000,000. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] was present at the time, and asked questions, and took part in the debate. I certainly did not have in mind anything in connection with the pending amendment, and I do not believe the Senator from Oregon did.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; the colloquy referred to the original Bankhead bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true. It is my position, which I hope to have the privilege later of elaborating—and I think I can convince the Senator, at least I hope I can, for he is clear-minded and open-minded—that the pending amendment will not break through any line, and will not increase the prices of farm commodities a single cent. The Senator from Wisconsin asked how, then, would it help the farmers? I will say to the Senator that it will help them by preventing a reduction or roll-back in their prices equal to the total amount of the appropriation for soil conservation in the pending bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator very much. He has cleared up the matter in my mind to a considerable degree. I shall listen to his presentation of the matter, however, when he takes the floor in his own behalf.

COMBINATION OF TEMPORARY INCREASES IN FIRST-CLASS POSTAL RATES

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator permit me to make a report? I desire to report favorably House Joint Resolution 134. It is merely to continue the temporary increase in first-class postal rates, which have been in effect for a number of years. I ask unanimous con-

sent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 134) to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe one of the bills making this provision was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and probably that is the committee to which it should have been referred. However, inasmuch as the time when the 3-cent postage rate is to be in effect will expire on June 30, I think we should disregard the question of the particular committee to which the joint resolution should have been referred, and pass the measure. Therefore I have no objection, and I hope there will be no objection to it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have no desire to make objection, but I should like to know whether there was unanimous consent on the part of the committee, or whether any objection or opposition was heard in this matter.

Mr. GEORGE. No; this is merely provision for a renewal of rates which have heretofore been increased. I consulted with a good many members of the committee, desiring to dispose of the matter today, and at the moment the Senator from Massachusetts was out of the Chamber, or I should have conferred with him.

Mr. LODGE. Has the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] been consulted regarding the matter?

Mr. GEORGE. No; the Senator from Oregon has not been consulted.

Mr. LODGE. In view of that fact, I think I had better suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GEORGE. I had rather the Senator would not do that.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to leave the joint resolution temporarily on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The understanding of the Chair was that the Senator from North Carolina yielded for the presentation of a report.

Mr. BAILEY. I did, and I thought I acquiesced in what was going on, but we seem to be going from bad to worse, and I do not know what is up now. There has been a suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] just asked how long I would speak. I told him very briefly. He has a very important matter he wishes to have taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from North Carolina that the Chair recognized the Senator from Georgia. The Chair has not recognized the Senator from North Carolina. The Chair recognized the Senator from Georgia to permit him to make a report.

Mr. BAILEY. I beg the pardon of the Senator from Georgia. I thought the Chair had recognized me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of Joint Resolution 134?

Mr. BAILEY. I do not know in what right I was speaking, if the Chair did not recognize me. But I shall take my seat, in order that the Senator from Georgia may proceed.

Mr. GEORGE. No, Mr. President; I simply reported a bill from the committee and asked unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] suggested the absence of a quorum because the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] was not present. I asked him to withhold the suggestion, and allow the bill to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I may suggest that the bill might be passed with the understanding that if the Senator from Oregon objects the vote by which the bill was adopted can, without objection, be reconsidered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was about to suggest that that be done.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Oregon will be here in a moment. I think the suggestion made by the Senator from Georgia that the measure lie on the table for a few minutes is a very practical one.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I wish to make my bow to the very gracious Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and thank him for his exceedingly kind remarks. I should like to feel at liberty to say as many things concerning him which I have in my own heart. I think I would undertake to speak not simply for myself, but for the entire Senate, in praise and admiration of him. I hope no one will think that in saying that I am indulging in anything like reciprocity. I welcome the opportunity to say that he enjoys the confidence and admiration and the friendship of every one of us. It is very pleasant to discuss this matter with one who is so fair and so intelligent, and it is not pleasant to disagree with him. He takes the view that I have rather misconceived this matter. If I have I am in good company. The President has the same conception of it that I have. I have no words from him other than his veto message, an official document which is on my desk.

In response to an inquiry made by the Senator from Colorado, the Senator from Alabama made the statement that there is nothing in his proposal for the farmer except that it provides against a roll-back with respect to the farmer.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does not the Senator think that it will do considerable good for the farmer if it prevents a roll-back against him?

Mr. BAILEY. It is a beautiful thought, but there is no danger of a roll-back of the farmers' prices, as everyone knows.

Mr. BANKHEAD. They have not had any, have they?

Mr. BAILEY. Not that I know of. The farmers' prices are stabilized, and the whole effort is to keep them from going up. I do not think the farmers are in danger of getting less. That is not the present concern of the Government. The Government's concern is to prevent them from getting so much more that the whole national economy would be upset.

The new argument with respect to the proposed legislation is not the getting of better prices for the farmers but to keep the farmers from getting lower prices. That is the new argument which is being made with respect to the matter. That, however, is negatived by the actual situation which exists.

The demands which I hear from all authorities of the Government are that we do something to freeze prices, not to do something to prevent them from going down. The roll-back of which a Government authority speaks is not a roll-back of farm prices. It is a roll-back of the prices to the consumer, without reducing the prices to the farmer. That is the whole theory. That would be the only justification for the roll-back. So if the Senator bases his amendment, not on improving the prices but preventing the farmers' prices from going down, I suggest that he will receive aid from sources infinitely greater than the Congress in preventing anything like a roll-back or depression of prices. Prices are rising and not falling. The whole effort of the Government is to keep them from going up, and nothing is needed now to be done to keep them from going down. They cannot be gotten down. I believe I have disposed of that feature to my own satisfaction.

With respect to another feature, the Senator first said the proposal was very different from the original Bankhead Act, which was vetoed. It is different in degree. It is not at all different in kind. It is precisely the same legislation, although it is limited to payments made out of funds appropriated under this item; that is the soil-conservation item. What did the original Bankhead Act provide? I have the words of the President for that. He said:

> I am returning S. 660, generally known as the Bankhead bill, unsigned. It is a bill to exclude in the determination of parity price any deduction for any subsidy payment, parity payment, incentive payment, or other payment made with respect to any agricultural commodity.

The difference between the two proposals, Mr. President, is this: The Senator from Alabama has narrowed his

proposition down to the soil-conservation payments, and it is insisted that such payments shall not be calculated or considered in determining whether a farmer has received parity. That is the position of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE].

Again I think the historical record is against the theory of the Senator. I have been in the Senate during all the recent agricultural legislation. This is the eighth or ninth bill on the subject. The first was introduced in 1933. What was it for? Under that bill we levied the processing tax to raise funds with which to bring prices up to parity. Those funds were certainly calculated then and used then to bring about parity. Parity for cotton in those days was, I think, 18 cents. If the farmer received 15 cents a pound for his cotton and 3 cents a pound from the processing-tax fund, we said he was receiving parity.

Now it is said that we should disregard that element of parity because the 1933 act is different from the conservation act. I will agree that the conservation act is different from the first 1933 act. The Supreme Court held that the whole Processing Tax Act of 1933 was unconstitutional. I think that happened in the latter part of 1934, after much good had been done under that unconstitutional act, against which I voted. I voted gladly for the Soil Conservation Act, and I voted for all the agricultural acts which were later passed containing the soil-conservation provision, because I think soil conservation is one of the primary tasks of our country with respect to the lands of the farmers.

The question here is whether in this unusual situation, when we undertake to say whether the farmers are receiving parity or not, we shall go back to the beginning and say "Yes, they receive parity when they get the market price, plus a sum from the Government which, calculated on the basis of the formula then in existence, equals parity price."

That is the historic conception here. Are we adding the conservation payment just as we did the processing payment to the price received on the market by the farmer, and if the market price plus the conservation payment equals parity, do we herald to the world that our farmers are receiving parity prices?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. As I remember, the declaration was made that the processing tax was put into effect for the purpose of increasing the price to the farmer.

Mr. BAILEY. It was for the purpose of raising the price paid to the farmer in the market to what the Department of Agriculture determined to be parity.

Mr. SMITH. Not in the case of the conservation payments; no.

Mr. BAILEY. Conservation payments were treated in the same way. I shall read to the Senator the historic interpretation.

Mr. SMITH. I do not understand that the conservation payments made for work done in preserving the fertility of the soil—payments in return for which the farmer must spend money in buying lime and in hauling dirt to fill up the holes caused by erosion—are to be subtracted from what has been designated in the law as parity.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me say to the Senator, in order to be perfectly plain, Mr. President, that the farmer receives value for the money spent for soil conservation. It is that much profit to him. If it were not, it would be very foolish to spend money for conservation. We do not spend the money for nothing. We put it into the land, and it is income to the farmer.

Mr. SMITH. I want to get a definition of what the Senator is driving at. The Senator wants to determine how much the farmer receives, whether he receives it in the form of parity or in the form of conservation payments—whatever goes into his pockets. The Senator is attempting to limit what the farmer receives, not the prices of his commodities.

Mr. BAILEY. I say to the Senator that it never was in contemplation that we should consider parity a floor. Parity is both a floor and a ceiling; and we cannot have any other conception of it. If we undertake to have any other conception of it, we run right into a hopeless competition of rates in the market. I hope that is plain. As prices of farm products are raised above parity, costs to the workers are raised; and then the workers come forward and justly ask for increased wages. If the workers are granted increased wages, the increased wages run right into competition with the prices received by the farmers. Then parity is raised again, and then we run right into the spiral of inflation.

Any conception of parity that is anything more than parity destroys parity. I should think that would be quite plain. Parity means equality; and the moment it is made inequality, the necessity for a new parity on the labor side of the picture is created. Then that is reflected back into a new demand for parity on the agricultural side. Parity is both a floor and a ceiling.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for a moment, let me say that in theory what the Senator has said is true; but the trouble with the theory, as with all other theories, is that it does not work out that way. For instance, labor costs in the United States have gone up tremendously, but the farm prices of many agricultural products have not gone up in proportion as labor costs have gone up. As a matter of fact, many crops in the United States are not selling at anywhere near parity, as expressed in relation to the things the farmer must buy.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator was not in the Chamber when the Senator in charge of the bill said just a moment ago that there is only one crop which is not receiving parity.

Mr. WHEELER. Only one?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know how many other crops are not on a parity basis, but certainly the wheat producers of my State are not receiving parity for their crop.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator mentioned wheat. He said that one or two other crops had crossed parity. I do not know whether he is correct, but certainly he said that.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly, wheat is one of the great crops produced in this country. Of course, the Senator's argument falls flat when we talk about parity for wheat; because labor costs have gone up, but wheat prices have not gone up.

Furthermore, the prices of farm products do not go up at all in accordance with increases in labor costs. That has been shown to be so time and time again. The labor costs and the prices of farm machinery were maintained all during the panic. Why were they maintained? Because the production of farm machinery was controlled by a monopoly, and it could keep the prices of its products up, and did keep them up, by closing down its factories.

The same thing is true with respect to labor unions and the wages received by labor. The unions can keep the prices up, even though many of the men are out of employment.

However, the farmers cannot do that. Consequently, the spiral about which the Senator has talked—that which is said to occur when prices for agricultural commodities go up as the wages of labor go up—does not apply at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Carolina on the amendment has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand that I have 15 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to be recognized on the bill?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the Senator said the soil-conservation payments would be deducted from the prices received for the commodities.

Mr. BAILEY. I did not say so.

Mr. SMITH. That is the Senator's argument.

Mr. BAILEY. I said the conservation payments should be calculated and included in determining whether the farmer was receiving parity for his products.

Mr. SMITH. Very well. Suppose the farmer sells a lot of hogs and chickens. The Senator would say, "He is receiving that much income; therefore, put parity on the basis of how much is received."

Mr. BAILEY. If he is getting parity, he is getting parity.

Mr. SMITH. On what?

Mr. BAILEY. On his crop or product, whatever it may be. Parity is bound to be a fixed figure.

Let us say that parity for hogs is 10 cents—I do not know what it is. Against that 10 cents, let us say that the farmer is getting 2 cents on the market. If he gets 8 cents for soil conservation, he is getting a total of 10 cents.

Mr. SMITH. But not on the commodity for which he has been promised a certain price.

Mr. BAILEY. He would get it from the Government for his crop, and from the market for his hogs. I do not think that will make any trouble.

It is said that the price will be increased. Senators who said that undoubtedly spoke in good faith, but they overlooked the law. We have a law requiring that money be loaned on the basis of parity prices; and, if I understand the law at all, I do not think anyone will contradict me when I say that, with respect to soil conservation, it has been determined by law that a farmer can borrow up to the parity price on any crop, and then can obtain from the Government the soil-conservation payments as an additional sum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am sure the Senator does not intend to leave an incorrect impression. The Senator stated that the farmer could borrow up to parity.

Mr. BAILEY. No; I did not say that. I said the farmer could borrow a percentage of parity. Is that so, or not?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Oh, yes; that is so.

Mr. BAILEY. What percentage?

Mr. BANKHEAD. On some commodities, 85 percent; on others, 90 percent.

Mr. BAILEY. Exactly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. However, that is a long way from parity.

Mr. BAILEY. If I go into the market and borrow 90 percent, that is nine-tenths of parity. Then if I go to the Government and get my soil-conservation payments, I have gotten my parity; and I can hold my crop, and can put it where I please. I think it is one of the consequences regardless of whether it is one of the intentions in connection with the Act that because we have a new definition of parity, the farmer is enabled to borrow on his crop a larger sum of money than he otherwise would be able to borrow.

Now I go back to the main matter, which is the attitude of the President, as shown in the veto message on the Bankhead Act. I read from the veto message:

To the Senate:

I am returning S. 660, generally known as the Bankhead bill, unsigned. It is a bill to exclude in the determination of parity price any deduction for any subsidy payment, parity payment, incentive payment, or other payments made with respect to any agricultural commodity.

The President said, referring to his message of September 7, 1942:

I further stated: "The purpose should be to hold farm prices at parity, or at levels of a recent date, whichever is higher. * * * And in determining whether a commodity has reached parity, we should include all the benefits received by the farmer from his Government under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program, allocable to the particular commodity. For it is unfair to give the farmer a parity price and in addition give him far more than parity."

To this view I still hold.

* * * * *

In approving that act on May 26, 1941, I stated: "I have taken up the construction of the law with certain legislative leaders chiefly responsible for it and have received from them letters stating that for the 1941 crop the broad intention is that parity payments should, if necessary, be so curtailed as to avoid a price above parity if added to the loan and the soil-conservation payments. I am, therefore, confident that in the pending appropriation bill this clear interpretation and intent will be carried out."

Let us go a little further with the President's message:

Let us consider the merits of the proposal. The act of October 2, 1942, directs the President to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries, which affect the cost of living; and, except as otherwise provided in this act, this stabilization shall be on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942. It is impossible to control the cost of living unless all of its vital elements are stabilized.

* * * * *

But it must be recognized that parity prices are only means to get parity income for the farmers.

If they get parity income, so the President says, they have what the Government justly owes them, and they should get no more.

That income goal has been attained for the cooperating producers of all basic crops. This bill would go beyond the goal of parity income and give to these producers an unwarranted bonus at the expense of the consumer.

Mr. President, those are the facts, stated from the standpoint of the President of the United States, who, as I have previously said, has proved himself to be an extraordinarily strong and true friend of the farmers. He has a national policy on his hands. He is trying to stabilize prices. He is trying to stabilize wages. He is dealing with a very desperate situation, and a very desperate and determined man.

In the midst of that situation the Senate proposes to override its rules and set them aside in order that it may write a definition of parity contrary to the President's conceptions, and contrary to the standards which have heretofore held, a definition which would increase the loan value of any crop with respect to which conservation payments are made, and which would necessarily tend in the direction of increasing prices of food products and farm products, and therefore would upset the situation.

If the Congress wishes to do that, it will take the responsibility. Right now the responsibility for undertaking to break down the national policy is upon one man, and his name is John Lewis. If the Senate adopts this amendment, it will share the responsibility with him, and will give him the best argument he has yet had—and he has not had a very good one. He started out wrong, and he got into the portal-to-portal issue with some administrative authority. He presented his argument in one way or another; but from beginning to end the rights and the facts in the case have been against him. If we now give him what is here proposed, he will go to the War Labor Board tomorrow and say, "Congress is not holding the line. It is not standing by stabilized prices. It is writing a new definition of parity, wholly with a view to increasing the loan value of a crop, and wholly with a view to increasing prices. I do not think all this talk about the roll-back of prices is going to get anywhere, even if it does come from a very respectable source."

Let him say that, and how long does anyone suppose the President could hold the line? How long does anyone think the Government could hold the line? How long does anyone think the War Labor Board could hold the line? How long does anyone think we could hold off inflation in America? It is not a great matter in size, but it is one of the greatest of issues in its implications and consequences.

Before I take my seat let me say that, God knows, I like to see workers have good wages. I like to see farmers have good prices. I like to see families have good incomes. I have never envied the man with a large income, or looked down on the man with a small income. I never saw a man whom I did not wish to have as good an income as I have. But, Mr. President, we cannot undertake to carry out those purposes at the expense of the national policy. We should not take a step here which would impair the strength of that policy. It is being attacked down the street; and when we wake up in the morning we wonder whether the President will be able to hold the line.

The other day a Senator on the other side of the aisle asked me if I did not feel that the line was being broken. I do not want to feel that it is being broken; that if it is broken I do not want anyone to say that the Congress was a party to it. Let the responsibility rest where it belongs, and let us not give anyone an excuse for breaking the line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. WHEELER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gillette	Nye
Austin	Green	O'Daniel
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Pepper
Bankhead	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Scrugham
Bridges	Holman	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McCarran	Tobey
Chavez	McClellan	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Van Nuys
Danaher	McNary	Wallgren
Davis	Maybank	Walsh
Eastland	Mead	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	White
George	Murdock	Wiley
Gerry	Murray	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CONTINUATION OF TEMPORARY INCREASES IN FIRST-CLASS POSTAL RATES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I report favorably, without amendment, House Joint Resolution 134, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 134) to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the joint resolution was called up when I was temporarily absent from the Chamber, and objection was made. I have discussed the matter with the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and I find that the joint resolution received a favorable report from the Finance Committee and the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the pending bill has occupied the time of the Senate for an entire week. It has been rather exhaustively debated in most of its phases. I understand that a very important conference report is likely to displace the pending bill.

In order to bring the discussion on the pending bill to a conclusion, I ask unanimous consent that at not later than 4:30 o'clock the Senate proceed to vote upon the bill, and all motions and amendments relating thereto.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I rise to a question of privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to interrogate the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield for a question. I do not wish to lose my time. What is the question which the Senator from Texas desires to ask me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to say to the Senator from Alabama that I wish to present the conference report on the antistrike bill at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall not occupy more than 30 minutes of the time of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Alabama that it is with the greatest reluctance that I accede to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has the floor. He is proceeding in his own right.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well, Mr. President. I thank the Chair for the information.

Mr. President, the time is drawing short. I recognize the impatience of many Senators. They are anxious to reach the conference report, and they are anxious to proceed to a final disposition of the pending bill.

I regret that a good many Senators have made up their minds about the amendment without knowing the facts. I am at a great disadvantage, especially with such a small attendance.

Mr. President, in the first place, there is nothing in this amendment which would increase the prices of any agricultural commodities. There is not a word in it which would increase the prices of agricultural commodities. The amendment is not intended in any way to increase the prices of agricultural commodities. On the contrary, its chief purpose is to prevent a roll-back of the prices of agricultural commodities with respect to which soil-conservation payments are made.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], who is not so ardent as I am in my friendship for the farmer, and not so anxious to protect the interests of the farmer as I am, has asserted that there is no prospect of a roll-back. Mr. President, a roll-back, certainly on cotton and probably on wheat, was prepared in the O. P. A. just before Easter, and sent over to the Department of Agriculture for the approval of the Food Administrator. Mr. Davis, in his great wisdom, sent it back. It contained a roll-back or reduction of 1.1 cents a pound on cotton, exactly the amount which would go to the cotton farmers under the soil-conservation plan. That is really what has disturbed me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but will he yield to me for one question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield, but the Senator from Missouri knows my situation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand the Senator's situation. If the Senator is trying to prevent a roll-back by subsidies, why does he not include in his motion to suspend the rule a prohibition against roll-backs?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I cannot reach the situation on an appropriation bill in that way.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator can reach it by a motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I cannot reach it on an appropriation bill. Allow me to proceed. Whether the Senator from Missouri is in favor of the amendment or not, I ask my good friend to be patient and listen to me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will listen to the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We are dealing with an appropriation for soil-conservation payments. What are soil-conservation payments? Those who have followed the agricultural program know what they are. They are payments for complying with the agricultural program. There are two aspects. The first relates to actual practices in soil improvement and the prevention of soil depletion, such as the planting of legumes and terracing, for which an actual outlay of money by the farmer is required. The next phase is compliance with the program announced by the Secretary of Agriculture in the matter of production to meet war food goals, the requirement by him of the planting of a certain percentage of the farm to war production goals, which may require rotation and the abandonment of crops which are more profitable to the farmer.

The testimony in the hearing discloses that about $195,000,000, practically half of this entire appropriation, has been obligated by the actual outlay of money by the farmers in pursuance of the soil-conservation program.

Let me read the announcement of the Secretary of Agriculture when this program was announced. I ask Senators who have an open mind upon this subject and who really want to treat the farmers fairly to listen to it. Here is the announcement made on December 5, 1942, by the Department of Agriculture, under the soil-conservation law, and in line with its annual practice for a number of years:

> Rates of payment to farmers cooperating with the crop production adjustment phase of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency's 1943 war program were announced today by the United States Department of Agriculture.
>
> Farmers may earn these production-adjustment payments in 1943 by complying with their Agricultural Adjustment Administration acreage allotments for corn, wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts, at the same time meeting individual farm production goals for special war crops. Following out the Department's policy of full production of all crops needed in the war, severe deductions will be made from each farm's total crop payments in 1943 for failure to plant at least 90 percent of an acreage allotment and 90 percent of a special war crop goal.
>
> This provision is intended to encourage farmers to make full use of their available land. In many instances, farmers will be encouraged to substitute special war crops for allotment crops (especially for wheat and cotton). After farmers first meet their 90 percent special war crop acreage requirement, they may take any special war-crop acreage above this figure and substitute it acre-for-acre for allotment crops in meeting the latter's 90-percent planting provision.
>
> In addition to the crop production adjustment payment described above, farmers also will be able to earn a production practice (or conservation) payment by carrying out specified agricultural practices which improve soil, help prevent erosion, and increase yields of needed war crops. Since these conservation rates vary by regions and States, they are being announced by State Agricultural Adjustment Administration committees.

In the same announcement the rates to be paid are published. I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Crop	Payment rate	
	1942	1943
Cotton, pound.....cents..	1.2	1.1
Corn (commercial area), bushel.....do....	5.5	3.6
Wheat, bushel.....do....	9.9	9.2
Rice, 100 pounds.....do....	2.4	2.0
Peanuts, ton.....dollars..	1.25	1.10
Potatoes (commercial), bushel.....cents..	1.8	-----
Tobacco, pound:		
Flue-cured.....do....	.5	.4
Burley.....do....	.6	.4
Fire-cured.....do....	1.3	1.2
Dark air-cured.....do....	.8	.7
Virginia sun-cured.....do....	.6	.5
Pennsylvania type 41.....do....	.4	.4
Cigar filler and binder (other than types 41 and 45).....cents..	.6	.5
Georgia-Florida type 62.....do....	.8	.7

Mr. BANKHEAD. It will be noted that cotton, corn, wheat, rice, peanuts, potatoes, and tobacco are all listed, and there are shown the rates which the Secretary of Agriculture agreed to pay out of this soil-conservation money if these practices were complied with; if legumes were planted, if such planting was required, the farmers paying for the seed, paying for the cultivation, paying later for plowing under and for terracing when done and for diversions from the old-line crops in order to comply with the war-production goal. Then will any Senator tell me that there is not a real and honest obligation on the part of the Government of the United States?

What is the situation? Here is an appropriation made to meet that obligation of the Government; here is an appropriation to pay the honest debts of the Government of the United States; here is an obligation, not to pay to the farmer a subsidy, not to pay the farmer so as to give him a parity price, but to compensate him for complying with the obligation which he has assumed in response to the invitation of his Government, and in connection with which he has expended money, amounting already this year to nearly $200,000,000 in carrying out the invitation, properly made, in line with the practices in past years of the Department of Agriculture under the Soil Conservation Act.

It disturbs me when I find that my good friend from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], whom I like very much—he and I became Members of the Senate at the same time, and I admire his very great ability—employs his splendid eloquence and his appealing and effective arguments on the other side, especially in a cause by which my heart is so deeply stirred as it is in this instance, involving the preservation of the integrity of the Government of the United States in dealing with 6,000,000 farmers, scattered all over the country, who have no way to protect themselves except through the Congress of the United States.

I insist that the failure to protect those farmers will be considered a repudiation. The Government owes the debt; we are appropriating the money to pay it; but we put it in one pocket, and then by the Executive order of the President take it out of the other pocket by an equivalent reduction in the market price. That is the effect of the order of the President. Whatever soil conservation payments are made, if the Executive order is administered—and, as I have stated a while ago, I have ample evidence to believe it will be administered—under that order we are providing payment for the farmers by an appropriation, and the Executive order is promptly reducing and rolling back the market price in an equal amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time on the motion has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall speak on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized on the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did the Chair rule that the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore made with regard to debate on amendments and debate on the bill applied to a motion to suspend the rules?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; because the unanimous-consent order was modified yesterday to include such a motion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I just asked the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in charge of the bill, for information on that subject, and he advised me that the order had not been changed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said there had been no change in the unanimous-consent agreement that was made yesterday, and there has been no change that I know of, and I have been on the floor most of the day.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, with reference further to the roll-back, if I knew there would not be a roll-back on the farmers of this country, if I knew they would not have a reduction of their market price equivalent to the amount of money they are being paid on the obligations of the Government. I should promptly withdraw the pending motion. My amendment has in it no element under which prices can be increased. It seeks nothing except to prevent a reduction in prices.

I submit to my able friend who thinks that what I fear will not be done, what harm would the adoption of the amendment do? If these payments are not to be deducted from the market price, these soil conservation payments, not parity money, not other subsidies, but the soil conservation money which the farmers have earned, earned honestly and fairly—if they are not to be deducted, which means a roll-back in the price, of course, because that is the only way there is of deducting them, then I ask, in common sense and fairness, how does it help Mr. Lewis? If that is not to be done, nothing will be done, and everything will stand as it is now.

In the Committee on Banking and Currency yesterday, at a meeting attended by the Senator from Ohio, we had an announcement by the O. P. A. that they intended to roll back the prices of fresh vegetables, even without paying any subsidy, right back to the producer. Still, the Senator seems to be under the impression that there is no prospect of a roll-back. They are going to roll back now on butter, meat, and coffee. The effect probably will not go back to the producer, unless the processor gets into such a tight place that he has to reduce his price to the farmer, and that is very much dreaded by many representaitves of the farmers at this time.

As I have said, if they are not going to do it, what harm will there be? If they are going to do it, I cannot imagine a more horrible action by the Government of the United States than by a roll-back to take the money the farmers have earned. I cannot imagine anything worse. It is money of their own, used for subsidizing consumers, and the farmers paying for it, not the Government, but taking it out of the farmers' price. I do not believe there is a Senator on this floor who would be willing to do that if he understood the implications and effects of the program.

Mr. President, I know the fear of taking any action here with Mr. John Lewis still in Washington. I know that the labor situation, and probably the coal mine situation, had more to do with the change in position of many Senators, when the President's veto came before us on the Bankhead bill, than anything else. We could hear all around on this floor, "Send the bill back to the committee until Lewis has been disposed of." That idea has been thrown into this debate twice by the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. What has the prevention of a roll-back in prices got to do with Mr. Lewis, or what he is paid?

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] asked the Senator from North Carolina a question a few days ago which was full of significance, and as the days have passed since that time it has become more apparent that the thought in the mind of the Senator from Ohio seems to be sound. He asked the Senator from North Carolina if he did not feel that Mr. Lewis was going to "get his" anyhow. He did not get a straight answer from the Senator, with the Senator's usual candor and frankness.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not like to interrupt the Senator——

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I told the Senator from Ohio I did not believe that way. I do not know whether that was straight or crooked, but I thought it was plain.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well. Since that time there have been numerous newspaper announcements that Mr. Lewis is "getting his." He is not depending on any subsequent developments here on a soil-conservation program to get what he demands in the way of wage increases.

Oh, there is the "portal-to-portal" about which we have heard so much, on which the operators in Pennsylvania are

yielding here and there, step by step. Mr. Lewis is "getting his," but here we have a situation in which the farmers, who do not go from portal to portal, but who go from dark in the morning to night's darkness, all the long, drawn-out hours, producing food for the American people, do not get any consideration for travel to and from their fields—portal-to-portal. Notwithstanding Congress has decreed it, they have no consideration under the mandate of Congress that the cost of labor on the farms should be adequately weighted. Instead of giving the increase in farm prices—Mr. Lewis may be responsible for it, I rather fear he is—instead of the increase Congress intended for them, here we are confronted with a proposition, under the President's order, and with the intention of the O. P. A. to carry it out—the announced intention, unless they are blocked somewhere—we are confronted with such a situation that, instead of getting some reasonable increase such as labor has been getting, the farmers will get an actual reduction in net income. If the farmers' prices are rolled back, as I have said, it will mean a subsidy to the consumers paid for by the farmers themselves.

There is no real reason for a Lewis complex, for the thought that the prevention of a reduction in prices is going to justify the Labor Board in giving Mr. Lewis increases for his miners. Either they are going to break through the line or they are not. They are not going to break through or fail to break through—and every thoughtful man here knows it—as a result of merely holding the line for the farmer, or because of any subsidy paid for by the farmer. That is not going to have any influence on the action taken by Mr. John L. Lewis. If I thought it would have any influence on his action I would not press for my measure. If I thought it would have any influence at all in the settlement of the wage controversy I would not press it.

Mr. President, I was appealed to—though I did not believe as did those who made the appeal—to let the Bankhead bill go back to the committee and rest there until all the labor controversy was out of the way. On the other hand, I was appealed to by many Members of the Senate to stand pat and demand a vote on the question. I did not want to compromise the labor program, however, or its proper settlement and adjustment.

Today I am trying to make an explanation of my proposition to those Senators on both sides of the Chamber who have previously given very little consideration to it. I ask Senators to confer with corn farmers, wheat farmers, and cotton farmers concerning a reduction in their prices.

Let us take the case of corn. When the price of corn was reduced it resulted almost in a strike on the part of the corn farmers. They would not sell their corn, and they are not selling it yet although the administration promptly restored the amount of the reduction after the Bankhead bill was recommitted. The administration restored the 5-cent reduction it had made in the price of corn, but that action had practically no effect. Today corn is locked up. From all sections of the country there are coming into Washington telegraph messages from persons who are trying to find a place where they can buy corn. A few days ago I received a message from the State director of the extension service in Alabama telling me that there were great quantities of corn in the bins of the farmers, but the feed mixers and producers could get none. He asked me if I could find a carload or more of corn which could be shipped to Birmingham.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. My time has nearly run out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama declines to yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If I can obtain an extension of time I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I shall not trouble the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Corn is locked up. The conservation payment will result in a reduction of nearly 4 cents in the price of corn which will be paid if the President's mandate is observed. Where do the feeders expect to obtain corn for feeding purposes? They cannot obtain any now. Reduce the price of corn 4 cents, and the chicken raisers and dairy men will almost have to go out of business, because they cannot buy corn if such a reduction is made in the price of it.

Mr. President, the same thing holds true with respect to wheat, though not in so great a measure as with respect to corn. Producers will put all the wheat into the loan, and this roll-back, as the Senator from North Carolina says, if made, will reduce the loan price. That is true. The loan price is made based on the market price as of the beginning of the marketing year. So the price to the farmer will be reduced, and his floor price will at the same time be reduced, and his income will be reduced. The farmer will be placed in a position where there is no encouragement for increasing his production.

Production, Mr. President, is the great remedy and answer to inflation. I am one of that school of thought which believes that inflation springs principally from two sources; one is the excess amount of money in the pockets of the people, and the other is the excess amount of consumer goods available. The loan cannot possibly result in inflation. The use of the loan money cannot bring about inflation when an equivalent amount is subtracted from the farmer's pocket. So I will have no part in the fear of inflation being helpful to Mr. Lewis in his labor wage fight. I think our Government is too big, and that our President and Mr. Justice Byrnes and the Labor Relations Board are too big and too broad, and have too much patriotism, and too much courage, to be influenced in the slightest degree by the fears which are expressed that inflation will result from the adoption of a program which is intended solely for the prevention of a roll-back in prices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Alabama on the bill has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Can we not have a vote now on my motion to suspend the rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion made by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BAILEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Gillette	Nye
Austin	Green	O'Daniel
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Pepper
Bankhead	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hawkes	Reynolds
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Scrugham
Bridges	Holman	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McCarran	Tobey
Chavez	McClellan	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Van Nuys
Danaher	McNary	Wallgren
Davis	Maybank	Walsh
Eastland	Mead	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	White
George	Murdock	Wiley
Gerry	Murray	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it is a matter of very great regret to me that I am forced to oppose the motion offered by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], particularly because I have so often agreed with him on matters involving the agricultural interests of the country, and more particularly because I believe that fundamentally the Senator from Alabama is correct in his endeavor to restrict the subtraction of any payments for soil conservation from other payments due the farmers of the country.

Mr. President, I voted very cheerfully and very sincerely for the passage of the original Bankhead bill dealing with this same proposition. I thought then that the proposition of the Senator from Alabama was correct. I still think so. However, that bill which was almost identical with the proposal now before the Senate, except for being a little more inclusive, was vetoed by the President of the United States. At the instance of the Senator from Alabama himself, the Senate avoided the issue of passing that measure over the veto of the President, and, instead, the Senate referred this same proposition, as contained in the President's veto message, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In the debate had at that time it was suggested by the proponents of the measure that the measure be referred to the committee. Both the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], with whom I voted, and whom I was glad to follow, and the leader of the opposi-

tion to the motion, who also happened to be the leader of the majority, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], stated that the proposition was that Congress was putting a club in the closet—a club which might subsequently be used.

Mr. President, that situation has not changed. The club is still in the closet. As I have said, I voted for the motion of the Senator from Alabama on the theory that we were putting in the hands of Congress a club, so that, if the President or any other administrative authority yielded to outside pressure to break the line which has been established, Congress could still take out the club and could pass the Bankhead bill, and possibly all of us would go to hell in the hand basket together, which would be the result of breaking the line established against inflation.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am limited in time. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator when I conclude with my remarks.

Mr. President, the club is still in the closet; but what the Senator from Alabama is seeking to do today, as I see it, is to put upon Congress the responsibility for breaking the line which has been established against inflation. If we were to agree to the motion to suspend the rule, and if we were then to agree to the amendment which the Senator from Alabama proposes to offer, not only Mr. John L. Lewis and his organization but every other labor organization in the United States would have an excuse to say that Congress had breached the line. The President of the United States; my dear friend, Mr. Justice Byrnes, who is in a very responsible administrative position; and my dear friend, Judge Vinson, who is in another very responsible administrative position, would be thoroughly entitled to throw up their hands and to say, "Congress has breached the line."

Mr. President, I undertake to say that if the Bankhead motion is voted down, we shall have laid the proposition of holding the line—a course which nearly everyone in the United States knows is absolutely essential to the welfare of the country—squarely in the lap of the President of the United States and of his great administrative assistants, Mr. Justice Byrnes and Judge Vinson. If they weaken, if they permit either Mr. Lewis and his miners' union or any other group of claimants to breach the line—that is, if they yield to any of them in excess of the Little Steel formula—the responsibility is and will be upon the President and upon Mr. Justice Byrnes and Judge Vinson and the other administrative officials who may be responsible for taking such action. If that should occur, Mr. President, I make bold to predict that within 24 hours the Bankhead bill would be drawn out of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and would be passed in this body by a majority of 4 to 1 or 5 to 1, over the President's veto, and by an overwhelming majority in the House of Representatives, and would become law.

However, Mr. President, the proposition which now is being made, by the motion of the Senator from Alabama, as I see it, is that the Congress, without giving the President and his new organizations headed by Mr. Justice Byrnes and Judge Vinson an opportunity to function, should make a breach which would be a justification to Mr. Lewis and to anyone else who desired to do so, to break down the whole formula for preventing inflation, pure and undefiled.

Therefore, much as I am in sympathy with the general principles enunciated by the Senator from Alabama, it seems to me that Congress ought not at this time to take the responsibility of breaking the whole line against inflation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I desire to take only a few minutes.

First, I wish to say that, while the wheat farmers in my State are not receiving parity for their wheat, I have not heard of a single wheat farmer there complaining about the price of wheat. When we are talking about holding the line, we mean one of two things. When we talk about parity to farmers, we mean one of two things. Either we mean giving them parity, or we do not mean giving them parity. Let us not try to fool anybody. The truth is that some of the farmers are not receiving parity. The Congress and the administration are not giving them what was promised them, and what they were told they would receive under the farm bill.

Every Senator who knows anything about the subject must realize that we are breaking faith with the farmers, who are not receiving parity when we do not give it to them, and that the administration is breaking faith with them when it does not give it to them.

Much is said about holding the line. Because of John L. Lewis, a great sentiment has been whipped up in the Senate against approving a proposal which would give the farmer parity. Is it any wonder that the people criticize the Senate? Is it any wonder that the people lose faith and confidence in a legislative body when Senators say, in effect, that the Senate has not the courage to enact a measure because of a fear that someone else will do something.

Either the farmers are entitled to parity or they are not entitled to it. Either they are entitled to what the Senator from Alabama is asking or they are not entitled to it. Think of it. To say that the Senate is afraid to pass a measure because of John L. Lewis or someone else is the most ridiculous, nonsensical, silly argument which I have heard made in the Congress since I have been a Member of it.

While I have the greatest respect and affection for my friends, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], I must confess that I am shocked and surprised to hear them say that we must not do this because of John L. Lewis. I know that the popular thing to do is to denounce John L. Lewis, and say what a terrible man he is. It is said that he broke the line. Does anyone mean to tell me that the line had not already been broken? If I had the time, I could point out instances of the line being broken in the past few days. It has been broken several times. If it has not been broken, it has been badly bent and warped. It all depends on who is trying to breag the line. If one hires Ed Flynn as his lawyer, he can break the line.

The reason why there is agitation in the country with reference to some of the labor organizations is not John Lewis. I know something about the miners in my State. I say that what is causing the disturbance is the fact that the administration permitted men to receive exorbitant wages in war industries on the coast. Those industries are taking men from the copper mines and coal mines, because they refuse to go down into the bowels of the earth and work in the most hazardous occupation on the face of the globe when they can go to work in the war industries on the coast, where men are falling over each other and receiving $250, $300, and $400 a month.

Did any Senator rise on the floor of the Senate and shout about that? Did any Senator stand on the floor of the Senate and shout about contractors receiving 10 percent-plus, so that they could employ more men than they needed, when the more they had on the pay roll the greater the amount which went into their pockets?

Let us not be hypocritical about this matter. Let us be frank and honest about it. That is what has caused the trouble in the coal mines, and that is what has caused the scarcity of labor in the copper mines. That is what has caused many of our troubles.

I say, without fear of contradiction, that I do not believe there is a Senator who knows anything about the subject who will say that under the conditions existing today the coal miners have not a good case. I do not approve of the methods used by John Lewis, but in my judgment the coal operators, with the exception of those who operate captive mines owned by the steel companies or by the railroads, will say that they feel that the miners have a good case.

Mr. President, I do not care whether Senators vote for the motion or not. In my judgment, it does not mean very much one way or the other. However, I shall vote with the Senator from Alabama on this question. For Senators to stand on the floor of the Senate and use old John Lewis as a whipping boy for the purpose of trying to frighten Members of the United States Senate into not voting for something is a procedure which I cannot follow. I say that we ought to vote for the motion because we believe it is right, or vote against it because we do not so believe.

When the Bankhead bill was under consideration it passed the Senate by an overwhelming majority. Senators thought it was right. They voted for it

honestly, according to their convictions. Then, when the President vetoed it, after having marched up the hill, they turned around and marched down again, and said, "We will send it back to the committee. We will hold it there and see whether John Lewis gets his money. If he does not get it, we do not dare to bring it out, because John Lewis is a bugaboo."

The one thing in which I am more interested than anything else—more than the Bankhead bill, the wage bill, or anything else—is whether or not we are to maintain a democratic republic in the United States. Because I am interested in that, I wish to see the Congress maintain the respect and confidence of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, the great issue which will confront the people of the United States after the war is whether or not we shall be able to maintain a democratic republic. At times I have voted against the administration, and have been criticized because I would not vote to give it certain powers. Let me say to my Democratic friends that the time may come in the not distant future an ultraconservative Republican President of the United States. We may have an ultraconservative Republican President. We may have a man who will be ambitious for power. There will be one crisis after another. There will be labor crises and other crises. That President may come to Congress and say, "I want this power because of this crisis, or that crisis." When Democratic Senators vote against it, our Republican brethren will say, "You voted to give it to a Democratic President, did you not? Why can you not give it to a Republican President?" But, thank God, I shall be in a position where I can say, "I refused to give it to a Democratic President, and I refuse to give it to a Republican President."

As I stated at the outset, I did not intend to speak on the bill. I rose only because of the argument which was presented that John Lewis scares the Senate of the United States into voting first almost unanimously in favor of a piece of legislation, and then almost unanimously against it. Senators were either right when they voted for it, or they did not know what they were voting for, or they were right the second time and wrong the first time, or vice versa.

We had better think about maintaining respect and confidence in parliamentary government in the United States of America. I shall not be intimidated into voting for any piece of legislation merely because I do not like the actions of a single individual in this country—I care not who he may be. I am not going to be afraid to vote for something in which I believe, merely because I think some other man may try to take advantage of me. If Senators should follow such a course they would not only say they are afraid of the man, but likewise afraid that the executive branch of the Government will not have the courage to do what is right if Congress votes contrary to the way it voted on another occasion. So, Mr. President, I repeat what I said a moment ago. First of all, I reject the idea that the Senate of the United States should make a whipping boy out of John L. Lewis for the purpose of scaring us into voting for a piece of legislation.

Secondly, I say that the miners of this country have a case. I know who is holding up settlement of the dispute. I know, as everyone else who is familiar with the situation knows, that there is politics in the matter. I know—because it has been told to me by persons who represent the coal operators—that the ones who are opposed to any settlement of the coal dispute are some of the big steel companies and railroads of the country. They own captive mines. That is what has been back of it all. If it had not been for those companies a settlement would have been reached a long time ago.

No one complained when members of the C. I. O. went out on strike and won large increases in wages. No one complained and shouted about the workers in the rubber industry when they went out on strike in Akron a few days ago. No one complained when the railroad brotherhoods received a raise from the Mediation Board. No one shouted about this, or about that, or about other strikes. But, the coal dispute has been played up.

We have been told we must not vote for the Bankhead measure because John L. Lewis—one man—is going to lick the country. Those who say that give him far more credit than, in my judgment, he deserves.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator believe that the miners would have had difficulty in obtaining a settlement quickly if they had had Mr. Ed Flynn for their attorney?

Mr. WHEELER. I will say to the Senator that if he were the head of the miners' union they would not have had any difficulty.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is prevented from being present by very important public business. Were he present he would vote "nay".

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The result was—yeas 36, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—36

Andrews	La Follette	Pepper
Bankhead	Langer	Reynolds
Bilbo	McCarran	Russell
Capper	McClellan	Scrugham
Caraway	McFarland	Shipstead
Chavez	McKellar	Smith
Connally	Millikin	Stewart
Eastland	Moore	Thomas, Okla.
Gillette	Murdock	Thomas, Utah
Gurney	Murray	Tobey
Hayden	Nye	Van Nuys
Hill	O'Daniel	Wheeler

NAYS—37

Austin	Ferguson	Mead
Bailey	George	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gerry	Radcliffe
Barbour	Green	Taft
Bridges	Guffey	Tunnell
Burton	Hatch	Vandenberg
Bushfield	Hawkes	Walsh
Byrd	Holman	Wherry
Chandler	Johnson, Colo.	White
Clark, Mo.	Lodge	Wiley
Danaher	Lucas	Wilson
Davis	McNary	
Ellender	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—23

Aiken	Downey	Robertson
Barkley	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Brewster	Kilgore	Tydings
Brooks	Maloney	Wagner
Buck	Overton	Wallgren
Butler	Reed	Willis
Clark, Idaho	Revercomb	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Less than two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is not agreed to.

The bill is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2481) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANK-

HEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. MCNARY conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H. R. 1258. An act to name certain locks in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan; and

H. R. 2753. An act making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes.

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CONNALLY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'War Labor Disputes Act.'

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 2. As used in this act—

"(a) The term 'person' means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, or any organized group of persons.

"(b) The term 'war contract' means—

"(1) a contract with the United States entered into on behalf of the United States by an officer or employee of the Department of War, the Department of the Navy, or the United States Maritime Commission;

"(2) a contract with the United States entered into by the United States pursuant to an act entitled 'An act to promote the defense of the United States';

"(3) a contract, whether or not with the United States, for the production, manufacture, construction, reconstruction, installation, maintenance, storage, repair, mining, or transportation of—

"(A) any weapon, munition, aircraft, vessel, or boat;

"(B) any building, structure or facility;

"(C) any machinery, tool, material, supply, article, or commodity; or

"(D) any component material or part of or equipment for any article described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C);

"the production, manufacture, construction, reconstruction, installation, maintenance, storage, repair, mining, or transportation of which by the contractor in question is found by the President as being contracted for in the prosecution of the war.

"(c) The term 'war contractor' means the person producing, manufacturing, constructing, reconstructing, installing, maintaining, storing, repairing, mining, or transporting under a war contract or a person whose plant, mine, or facility is equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required in the prosecution of the war or which may be useful in connection therewith; but such term shall not include a carrier, as defined in title I of the Railway Labor Act, or a carrier by air subject to title II of such Act.

"(d) The terms 'employer', 'employee', 'representative', 'labor organization', and 'labor dispute' shall have the same meaning as in section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act.

"POWER OF PRESIDENT TO TAKE POSSESSION OF PLANTS

"SEC. 3. Section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a failure to comply with any such provisions, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States or in its interests of any plant of which possession is so taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided to any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the war effort or which may be useful in connection therewith. Such power and authority may be exercised by the President through such department or agency of the Government as he may designate, and may be exercised with respect to any such plant, mine, or facility whenever the President finds, after investigation, and proclaims that there is an interruption of the operation of such plant, mine, or facility as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance, that the war effort will be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to insure the operation of such plant, mine, or facility in the interest of the war effort: *Provided*, That whenever any such plant, mine, or facility has been or is hereafter so taken by reason of a strike, lock-out, threatened strike, threatened lock-out, work stoppage, or other cause, such plant, mine, or facility shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as practicable, but in no event more than sixty days after the restoration of the productive efficiency thereof prevailing to the taking of possession thereof: *Provided further*, That possession of any plant, mine, or facility shall not be taken under authority of this section after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or after the termination of the War Labor Disputes Act; and the authority to operate any such plant, mine, or facility under the provisions of this section shall terminate at the end of six months after the termination of such hostilities as so proclaimed.'

"TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT AT GOVERNMENT-OPERATED PLANTS

"SEC. 4. Except as provided in section 5 hereof, in any case in which possession of any plant, mine, or facility has been or shall be hereafter taken under the authority granted by section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, such plant, mine, or facility, while so possessed, shall be operated under the terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at the time possession of such plant, mine, or facility was so taken.

"APPLICATION TO WAR LABOR BOARD FOR CHANGE IN TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT AT GOVERNMENT-OPERATED PLANTS

"SEC. 5. When possession of any plant, mine, or facility has been or shall be hereafter taken under authority of section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, the Government agency operating such plant, mine, or facility, or a majority of the employees of such plant, mine, or facility or their representatives, may apply to the National War Labor Board for a change in wages or other terms or conditions of employment in such plant, mine, or facility. Upon receipt of any such application, and after such hearings and investigations as it deems necessary, such Board may order any changes in such wages, or other terms and conditions, which it deems to be fair and reasonable and not in conflict with any act of Congress or any Executive order issued thereunder. Any such order of the Board shall, upon approval by the President, be complied with by the Government agency operating such plant, mine, or facility.

"INTERFERENCE WITH GOVERNMENT OPERATION OF PLANTS

"SEC. 6. (a) Whenever any plant, mine, or facility is in the possession of the United States, it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, induce, conspire with, or encourage any person, to interfere, by lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption, with the operation of such plant, mine, or facility, or (2) to aid any such lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such plant, mine, or facility by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption, or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein. No individual shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this section by reason only of his having ceased work or having refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

"(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

"FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF THE NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

"SEC. 7. (a) The National War Labor Board (hereinafter in this section called the 'Board'), established by Executive Order Numbered 9017, dated January 12, 1942, in addition to all powers conferred on it by section 1 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and by any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942, entitled 'An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes', and by any other statute, shall have the following powers and duties:

"(1) Whenever the United States Conciliation Service (hereinafter called the 'Conciliation Service') certifies that a labor dispute exists which may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, and cannot be settled by collective bargaining or conciliation, to summon both parties to such dispute before it and conduct a public hearing on the merits of the dispute. If in the opinion of the Board a labor dispute has become so serious that it may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, the Board may take such action on its own motion. At such hearing both parties shall be given full notice and opportunity to be heard, but the failure of either party to appear shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed to a hearing and order.

"(2) To decide the dispute, and provide by order the wages and hours and all other terms and conditions (customarily included in collective-bargaining agreements) governing the relations between the parties, which shall be in effect until further order of the Board. In making any such decision the Board shall conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; the National Labor Relations Act; the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; and the act of October 2, 1942, as amended, and all other applicable provisions of law; and where no other law is applicable the order of the Board shall provide for terms and conditions to govern relations between the parties which shall be fair and equitable to employer and employee under all the circumstances of the case.

"(3) To require the attendance of witnesses and the production of such papers, documents, and records as may be material to its investigation of facts in any labor dispute, and to issue subpenas requiring such attendance or production.

"(4) To apply to any Federal district court for an order requiring any person within its jurisdiction to obey a subpena issued by the Board; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred on any such court to issue such an order.

"(b) The Board, by its Chairman, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of any books, papers, records, or other documents, material to any inquiry or hearing before the Board or any designated member or agent thereof. Such subpenas shall be enforceable in the same manner, and subject to the same penalties, as subpenas issued by the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, approved March 27, 1942.

"(c) No member of the Board shall be permitted to participate in any decision in which such member has a direct interest as an officer, employee, or representative of either party to the dispute.

"(d) Subsections (a) (1) and (2) shall not apply with respect to any plant, mine, or facility of which possession has been taken by the United States.

"(e) The Board shall not have any powers under this section with respect to any matter within the purview of the Railway Labor Act, as amended.

"NOTICE OF THREATENED INTERRUPTIONS IN WAR PRODUCTION, ETC.

"SEC. 8. (a) In order that the President may be apprised of labor disputes which threaten seriously to interrupt war production, and in order that employees may have an opportunity to express themselves, free from restraint or coercion, as to whether they will permit such interruptions in wartime—

"(1) The representative of the employees of a war contractor, shall give to the Secretary of Labor, the National War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board, notice of any such labor dispute involving such contractor and employees, together with a statement of the issues giving rise thereto.

"(2) For not less than thirty days after any notice under paragraph (1) is given, the contractor and his employees shall continue production under all the conditions which prevailed when such dispute arose, except as they may be modified by mutual agreement or by decision of the National War Labor Board.

"(3) On the thirtieth day after notice under paragraph (1) is given by the representative of the employees, unless such dispute has been settled, the National Labor Relations Board shall forthwith take a secret ballot of the employees in the plant, plants, mine, mines, facility, facilities, bargaining unit, or bargaining units, as the case may be, with respect to which the dispute is applicable on the question whether they will permit any such interruption of war production. The National Labor Relations Board shall include on the ballot a concise statement of the major issues involved in the dispute and of the efforts being made and the facilities being utilized for the settlement of such dispute. The National Labor Relations Board shall by order forthwith certify the results of such balloting, and such results shall be open to public inspection. The National Labor Relations Board may provide for preparing such ballot and distributing it to the employees at any time after such notice has been given.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any plant, mine, or facility of which possession has been taken by the United States.

"(c) Any person who is under a duty to perform any act required under subsection (a) and who willfully fails or refuses to perform such act shall be liable for damages resulting from such failure or refusal to any person injured thereby and to the United States if so injured. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine any proceedings instituted pursuant to this subsection in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of proceedings instituted under section 24 (14) of the Judicial Code.

"POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 9. Section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 2, sec. 251), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 313. It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution in connection with any election to any political officer, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section. Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both. For the purposes of this section "labor organization" shall have the same meaning as under the National Labor Relations Act.'

"TERMINATION OF ACT

"SEC. 10. Except as to offenses committed prior to such date, the provisions of this act and the amendments made by this act shall cease to be effective at the end of six months following the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or upon the date (prior to the date of such proclamation) of the passage of a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress stating that such provisions and amendments shall cease to be effective.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 11. If any provision of this act or of any amendment made by this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act and of such amendments, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"Amend the title so as to read: 'An act relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants, mines, and facilities in the prosecution of the war, and preventing strikes, lock-outs, and stoppages of production, and for other purposes.'"

And the House agree to the same.

TOM CONNALLY,
FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
CARL A. HATCH,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

A. J. MAY,
FOREST A. HARNESS,
R. E. THOMASON,
MATTHEW J. MERRITT,
DEWEY SHORT,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to consume much of the time of the Senate in the discussion of the conference report, in view of the fact that the report is included in this morning's RECORD, and I assume that all Senators who are interested have perused the report and know what it contains.

It will be recalled that Senate bill 796 passed the Senate on the 5th of May by a vote of 63 to 16. When the bill went to the House, the House struck out all the Senate bill and inserted what was called the Harness amendment, which included some of the terms and provisions of the so-called Smith bill, which the House had passed a year or more ago.

In short, the conferees agreed on practically every provision of the bill as passed by the Senate. The only important change was a provision with regard to the termination of the act, which automatically will occur 6 months after the war, and there was inserted a clause providing that it could be terminated at an earlier date by the passage of a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In other words, it is perfectly apparent from the text that this is an emergency measure, confined exclusively to the war emergency, for the purpose of protecting production?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that he is eminently correct. It is not only that, it is limited to the war period and 6 months thereafter, and its operation is further restricted by provision that it shall not apply to anything except war plants where work is taking place in the production of munitions or supplies for the armed forces. So it is an emergency measure.

We have not undertaken to regulate labor in time of peace. No doubt there are many who would like to see that done, and the Senator from Texas is perfectly willing, when the occasion arises, to give his best thought and consideration to the issues which may then be presented. But we felt that our function in connection with the pending matter was to make this strictly a war bill, restrict it to the duration of the war, and restrict it to those plants and mines and instrumentalities which were engaged in the production of war supplies.

Let me say, furthermore, that the cardinal objective, the chief principle, back of the bill from the beginning, was not the idea of hunting for some individual in an effort to put him in jail, but the objective was how best we could provide for the continuous operation of plants manufacturing munitions.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. If this is strictly a war measure, supposed to cover the field of stopping strikes which interfere with the war effort, how does the Senator explain the committee going so far afield as to

attempt to regulate contributions by labor organizations to campaign funds?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is a pertinent inquiry.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield for a moment I do not know whether the Senator from Mississippi intended to infer that the conferees went far afield. The provision about which he complains was in the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly.

Mr. BILBO. I did not want the country to be misled into thinking that this has a thing to do with strikes, as a war measure. There is an attempt to hold out to the country that this is strictly a war measure. It has an automatic repeal clause at the conclusion, it is true.

Mr. CONNALLY. This matter was one which came within the jurisdiction of the conference, as suggested by the Senator from New Mexico. This provision was in the bill as it passed the House. The House conferees insisted upon it. The Senate conferees had already secured the agreement of the House conferees to practically every provision of the Senate bill, and the Senator from Mississippi should know that there must be negotiations and conferences and agreements and inducements, and we had to include some of the House text in order to get an agreement. That is why the provision was put into the bill, that we had to agree to something in order to get an agreement.

Mr. BILBO. I am still waiting on the Senator to show the connection, but he has not shown it yet.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have told the Senator the facts. If the Senator cannot deduce the connection from the facts, I cannot help it.

The Senator from New Mexico, the authority on elections and political ethics, assured me that he intended to introduce a bill right away to repeal that section, as soon as the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. I should be very glad, if I could, to present such a measure and have it adopted. I wanted to say to the Senator from Texas that the amendment I am now drafting would equalize and bring into the same class with labor organizations the employer organizations, such as the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. If one is to be denied the privilege of making political contributions, the other should be also.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree thoroughly with the Senator from New Mexico, as I generally do.

Mr. President, I was saying that the cardinal principle of this bill is to keep the plants going, and that is why we have in it the seizure section, which is section 3 of the bill. That is carried forward just as the Senate passed it.

Section 4 provides that in any seized plant, the labor relations and the wages which were in effect when the plant was seized, shall remain in status quo until one or the other of the parties apply to the War Labor Board for readjustment. The reason for the requirement of that status quo is to remove the temptation to strike in order to receive a benefit. If the employees cannot receive any benefit by striking, there will not be the same inducement to strike that previously existed.

Section 5 of the bill provides for resort to the War Labor Board by either party in a dispute as to wages or terms of employment.

Section 6 of the bill is probably the most drastic section of the bill. It is under the heading "Interference with Government operation of plants." In short it provides that when the Government takes over and operates a plant, it shall be an offense punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, for anyone to interfere with the operation of the plant, or to coerce, instigate, induce, conspire with, or encourage any person, to interfere, by lock-out, strike, slowdown, or other interruption, with the operation of such plant.

Mr. President, that language is almost identical with the language as the bill passed the Senate, except that the conferees inserted the words "conspire with, or encourage." In other words, an individual incurs no penalty because he quits his employment or refuses to work. It is specifically provided that—

> No individual shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this section by reason only of his having ceased work or having refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

But under the preceding portion of the section it is made an offense if, in addition to his individual refusal to be employed, he solicits other members not to be employed, if he instigates opposition to the operation of the plant, if he conspires or agrees with other members not to work. That is an offense under section 6.

Section 7 establishes by statute and vests with statutory authority the War Labor Board. Up to now that agency was more or less dependent upon Executive orders not only for its existence but for the powers it possesses. We thought it better to give it a fixed status and by law provide authority for the powers which it is to exercise.

I now come to section 7. Paragraphs (1) and (2) thereof apply only to plants not in Government control, but they must be war plants. In paragraph (1) of section 7, it is provided that the Board shall have the power—

> Whenever the United States Conciliation Service * * * certifies that a labor dispute exists which may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, and cannot be settled by collective bargaining or conciliation, to summon both parties to such dispute before it and conduct a public hearing on the merits of the dispute.

And so on. It is given the authority and power to decide the dispute, and to provide by order the wages and hours and all other terms and conditions. In doing so the conferees inserted language which would require the Board to conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; the National Labor Relations Act; the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; the act of October 2, 1942, as amended; and all other applicable provisions of law.

Mr. President, I wish to say in this connection that it is the conclusion of the conferees that the employment of the language denominating these various acts and the employment of the language "and all other applicable provisions of law" includes Executive orders and regulations issued by authority of and pursuant to the provisions of any of these enactments of the Congress. For instance, it was provided in section 2 of the act amending the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as follows:

> The President may, from time to time, promulgate such regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this act; and may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him by this act through such department, agency, or officer as he shall direct.

So that the Board must be governed by the provisions of these acts, and by Executive orders and regulations issued under the authority of these acts, and pursuant to the policies enunciated in the acts.

At this time I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who rendered very distinguished and useful service as a member of the conference, to state what his view is with respect to that matter.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I think that one more step ought to be recorded in this connection in order to make complete the picture of what would occur under section 7 of the conference report, and that is the Executive order, issued under the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, on the next day after the enactment of that law, and, therefore, related to it in time as well as by direct reference. I quote from the Executive order:

> By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, and particularly by the act of October 2, 1942 (namely, the Anti-Inflation Act) * * * and in order to control so far as possible the inflationary tendencies and the vast dislocations attendant thereon which threaten our military effort and our domestic economic structure, and for the more effective prosecution of the war, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Then I omit some language and read further:

> 1. There is established in the Office for Emergency Management of the Executive Office of the President an Office of Economic Stabilization at the head of which shall be an Economic Stabilization Director.

It is under that Executive order that Mr. Justice Byrnes was appointed Stabilization Director. That position now is held by Justice Vinson. It is, therefore, the correct interpretation, I believe, as stated by the distinguished Senator from Texas, that the jurisdiction of the National War Labor Board covers war activities, and the settlement of disturbances and disagreements relating to wages and other terms of employment in war enterprises and in the performance of war contracts, and that the Board's decision is not unrestricted and unlimited and without review, but also must be passed upon and is passed upon

by the Stabilization Director. In other words, under the statute and under the Executive order made pursuant to the statute, which is a law in effect, the power of deciding the dispute extends to the War Labor Board, plus the Stabilization Director.

Now, if I am not taking too much of the Senator's time——

Mr. CONNALLY. That is quite all right.

Mr. AUSTIN. I desire to distinguish the transactions with respect to the determination of such disputes under section 7 from the transactions with respect to determinations under section 5. There is a difference. Section 7, in paragraphs (1) and (2), of subsection (a) relates to war industries or war plants and war contracts which have not been taken over by the Government where no strike has yet occurred and perhaps no strike is even intended or contemplated, but a disturbance has arisen which gives reasonable ground to believe that the maximum continuous production of the necessary implements of warfare will be interrupted. Then paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) of section 7 come into play and the Board—that is, the National War Labor Board—hears the testimony, in the first instance.

But in the case of section 5 we have a plant in an entirely different situation. The plant has already been seized, and is being operated by the Government; and under this proposed law there can be no strike in that plant; it forbids a strike to exist—it is outlawed—in a plant which is operated by the Government. There can be no strike against the Government.

Nevertheless, if there is a labor dispute relating to wages or terms of the labor contract or conditions of work—any of the questions which may arise in peacetimes, or which may arise during wartimes in respect to any employment other than employment in connection with war contracts—a process is afforded before the same Board for hearing and deciding that issue. But in the latter case, the approval which is necessary is not that of the Stabilization Director. Under the conference report the approval of the President is required. So the two processes of law are distinct and different according to the different cases—in one of them, a plant which is operated by the Government; and in the other, a plant which is operated by private owners.

Now just a word more, if I am not taking too much of the Senator's time.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. The new thing, the big thing, about the pending legislation is that it puts the War Labor Board upon the solid rock of law. Heretofore, the position of the Board has been rather doubtful. It was on the shifting sands of nothing but an order; and we had to hunt through a number of laws in order to find whether there was the sanction of law behind the acts of the Board. I do not care to argue that question; for there will be no room for argument about it if this proposal becomes law.

Under this proposal, whenever the Board acts, whether under section 5 or section 7, it must act according to law; for section 7 says:

SEC. 7. (a) The National War Labor Board (hereinafter in this section called the "Board"), established by Executive Order No. 9017, dated January 12, 1942, in addition to all powers conferred on it by section 1 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and by any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes", and by any other statute, shall have the following powers and duties.

Thereupon, the two paragraphs (1) and (2) occur. In those two paragraphs the emphasis of the policy of the Congress is again laid upon the law; and the obligation is imposed upon the Board, as follows:

In making any such decision the Board shall conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended:

Let me divert from the text long enough to say that one important point in that connection is that under the Fair Labor Standards Act there is a limitation upon the Board that it shall not have the power to impose a closed shop or an open shop or any kind of a shop upon any industry.

I resume the reading:

The National Labor Relations Act; the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; and the Act of October 2, 1942, as amended, and all other applicable provisions of law; and where no other law is applicable the order of the Board shall provide for terms and conditions to govern relations between the parties which shall be fair and equitable to employer and employee under all the circumstances of the case.

Those last commands and limitations upon the judicial power of the administrative board are applicable only in the case of plants which have not been seized by the Government. The other broad powers—those I read in the first paragraph—are applicable to plants which have been seized and plants which have not been seized; so in all cases the law rules this Board as it never did before.

Now I read subsection (d), which appears below. It provides that—

(d) Subsections (a) (1) and (2) shall not apply with respect to any plant, mine, or facility of which possession has been taken by the United States.

It applies to only those two subsections.

The other subsection—subsection (a) of section 7—reads as follows:

SEC. 7. (a) The National War Labor Board (hereinafter in this section called the Board), established by Executive Order No. 9017, dated January 12, 1942, in addition to all powers conferred on it by section 1 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and by any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes," and by any other statute.

They do apply. They apply in respect to a plant which has been seized by the Government and is being operated by the Government. In other words, in the case of both operations the law rules, with respect to the decisions of the Board.

Mr. President, I see the Senator from Connecticut on his feet. I do not know whether he wishes to propound a question to the Senator from Texas or whether he wishes to propound one to me. If the latter is the case, I shall be glad to answer his question at this point, if I may have the permission of the Senator from Texas to do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator from Connecticut has a question, certainly. I thought he wanted to make a speech.

Mr. DANAHER. No, Mr. President. With the permission of the Senator from Texas, I should like to question the Senator from Vermont briefly.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should like to know whether the Senator from Vermont understands that any future Executive orders may have the authority to override in any way whatever limitations imposed upon the War Labor Board by the statutes and regulations to which the Senator from Vermont has referred.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think there is a place where there is reference to orders hereafter made. Has the Senator some particular part of the statute in mind in asking the question?

Mr. DANAHER. I will ask the Senator to pass the question for the moment while I say that I have kept pretty complete notes of our conference, and I have no recollection whatever of our having probed into the regulations and orders, having the force and effect of law, which have been issued or may be issued under section 7 (a) (2). Does the Senator from Vermont have any recollection of our having discussed the effect of any such regulations or orders within the meaning of that section?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know whether we discussed it or not. I know that I considered it. This morning I placed in the RECORD what I regard as a very learned treatise on this subject, which had no application in the mind of its author to this particular bill; but by a strange coincidence it pointed out many laws which are really gathered in by the proposal which is pending. I wish to refer to them only by name. I shall not undertake to read them, because the text of the admirable article by Mr. Montague, of New York, who is a great lawyer, has already been inserted in the RECORD.

When we probe, as the Senator asked me to do, the question whether regulations and orders made by the President have the effect and force of law, so as to come within the clause "and all other applicable provisions of law," my answer is in the affirmative. In illustration of my answer, I point to this short category of laws. From 1933 to 1941 Congress enacted numerous emergency statutes authorizing the President to make rules and regulations which should have the force and effect of law. Some of them apply to such a situation as this. Then there are the powers which were granted by the Council of National Defense Act of 1916;

the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917; the Espionage Act of 1917; and other First World War legislation, which long ago vested in the President the power of making regulations which should have the effect of law.

There are also many unnoticed and forgotten laws which have survived through many years, in ancient statutes which predate the First World War. They are scattered through the statute books.

Finally we have the great reservoir of power which is in the Constitution, and which expressly or by necessary implication gives to the President, the Commander in Chief, the power to do things by regulation or order. In addition, Congress passed the Second War Powers Act of March 27, 1942, title III, of which vested in the President the power, by regulation or order, to bind the property, the persons, the activities, and the lives of our people. I have some extracts from the statutes, but I shall not take the time to read them into the RECORD. As I say, this matter was not overlooked. It is my recollection that regulations and orders were expressly included in the House text. Does the Senator from Connecticut remember that?

Mr. DANAHER. I will answer the Senator from Vermont by saying that section 7 (a) makes reference to "any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the act of October 2, 1942."

Mr. AUSTIN. I rely on that.

Mr. DANAHER. But I was directing my question, as the Senator may recall, to the provisions of section 7 (a) (2).

Mr. AUSTIN. I believe that the House text contained a direct reference to regulations and orders. But whether it did or not—I will not speak for anyone else in the conference—I consider the words "and all other applicable provisions of law" as comprehensive of the powers with which the President was vested, to create an agency or a director and say, "You do so and so."

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Vermont to line 4 on page 4. In addition to the reference to the Price Control Act of 1942, it says, "and by any other statute." So it is all-embracing.

Mr AUSTIN. Such references are very numerous. If a lawyer wanted a good job, he could get a long job compiling and codifying the various statutes which have never been repealed, and which have been forgotten, giving the President, the Commander in Chief, extraordinary powers in time of war or emergency.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Vermont answered the question in the affirmative and supplemented his answer by an explanation which, of course, is in aid of his earlier answer to the Senator from Texas, when he said "That is correct, I believe"—meaning the interpretation which the Senator from Texas had earlier expressed.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is what I thought.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Vermont quite properly points out that section 7 (a), subclauses 1 and 2, would not apply in any case in which the Government had actually seized the plant.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. Having that in mind, I ask the Senator whether or not in his judgment the President, by Executive order, will in the future have the power to override or supersede any order which the War Labor Board may enter pursuant to the conference of power which this proposed statute grants.

Mr. AUSTIN. My answer is "Yes."

Mr. DANAHER. Having established that much in our minds, for the purposes of the present colloquy I ask the Senator to revert to section 5, for he has pointed out that section 5, on page 3, will have application whenever the Government shall have seized a strike-bound plant.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. I read from that section this language:

> Upon receipt of any such application—

That means an application by a majority of the employees of a plant for a rectification of conditions—

> and after such hearings and investigation as it deems necessary, such Board may order any changes in such wages or other terms and conditions which it deems to be fair and reasonable and not in conflict with any act of Congress or any Executive order issued thereunder.

Stopping the quotation at that point, I ask the Senator from Vermont if he also believes that this language imposes a limitation on the War Labor Board or creates a duty on the Board, to have regard to the very same statutes, the very same Executive orders, and the very same regulations which he has spelled out as having application under section 7 (a) (2)?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. I think they should be observed; but this is an attempt to spell out, in the indirect way, after such hearings and investigations, what the order shall conform to. It says that the order shall not conflict with any act of Congress. Instead of saying that the judgment shall conform to certain acts, naming them, it is in reverse:

> Upon the receipt of any such application and after such hearings and investigation as it deems necessary, such board may order any changes in such wages or other terms and conditions which it deems to be fair and reasonable and not in conflict with any act of Congress or any Executive order issued thereunder.

That is one of the transformations which we made, from a prolabor pressure agency, operating with respect to employees alone, without regard to law, into a real judicial body, acting upon evidence and upon the law, and subject to confirmation by the President in one case, and by the Stabilization Director in the other.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas further yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I did not mean to imply, if the Senator gathered such inference from my earlier comment, that the points to which the Senator has allusion with reference to regulations and Executive orders had been promulgated, which, I think, was the Senator's word. I simply pointed out that they had not been discussed.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Senator is correct about that. I do not recall any special discussion about it.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. My own action in the matter of agreeing to the report was that I regarded that entirely adequate for our purposes.

Mr. DANAHER. And it was in our minds, was it not?

Mr. AUSTIN. It was in our minds.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. And all other applicable provisions of the law.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, because of the far-reaching scope and the all-inclusive nature of this particular section we had provided for an appeal which would look to the review of the final decision of the War Labor Board, had we not?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Will the Senator allow me to answer that question?

Mr. DANAHER. No; I should like to have the Senator from Vermont answer the question.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wish to say to the Senator——

Mr. DANAHER. I do not have the floor, and I cannot stop the distinguished Senator from New Mexico from coaching the witness, but he does not need the assistance of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I really wanted to pay a little tribute to the Senator from Vermont. It was his provision which provided for the appeal.

Mr. DANAHER. After that encomium does the Senator from Vermont wish to answer the question?

Mr. AUSTIN. I would do so without it. I believe in the right of review. That is an American principle. I have for many sessions of Congress worked with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and the distinguished Senator from Connecticut on a subcommittee dealing with the review of the decisions of administrative boards. I believe in the principle of review, and, believing in it, I tried to write an amendment which would insure that kind of review. I presented it, but—I do not undertake to violate the confidence of the members of the conference in saying this—for my part I changed my mind about insisting upon it, for two reasons. I will be perfectly candid in stating why. One of my reasons was perhaps all that was necessary, and that was that it could not be

agreed to. But another reason was that the proposed legislation had to do merely with the prosecution of the war and the attempt to assure continuous maximum production of the things necessary to be sent overseas to our armed forces. Therefore, the idea of intruding into the war effort delays which might arise from appeals induced me to change my mind, and I withdrew the amendment which I had proposed. Is that correct as the Senator remembers it?

Mr. DANAHER. If the Senator from Texas will yield further to me, I should like to answer that question by pointing out to the Senator from New Mexico, who, of course, wishes to be accurate, that in lines 11 to 15, on page 6, of the Senate bill, the bill for which the Senate voted, as it left this body, appeared this clause:

> The decision of the Board, including particularly its interpretation of the provisions of the said Price Emergency Control Act of 1942, and said act of 1942, shall be final, except as it may be subject to review by the court on questions of law.

I quote from the bill which the Senate passed, and that is where the power of review was contained in the Senate version of the bill. Is that not correct, as I have just stated?

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, yes. The Senator is speaking from the record.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes. Whereupon, in conference the Senator from Vermont did write out a section which proposed the questions which might be considered by the court on review, and those questions were questions of law, and very valid and very pertinent questions. The Senator from Vermont may recall that I added even to his draft an additional section which would have conferred on the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia jurisdiction to entertain a petition for review. All those things were before the conferees.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Now, of course, it is the fact that there is no longer any petition for review possible under the proposed act, and no appeal is permitted under it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I cannot let that statement go without responding to it. It is my opinion that, if the measure were to become law as it is, and a violation of the rights of either employer or employee should occur which caused damage, there would be a remedy at law for him which would amount to the same thing as a review. In other words, there cannot be an arbitrary exercise of power in our Government.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Vermont yield for a further question?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Because, Mr. President, I should refresh the recollection of the Senator, and I certainly wish to correct the Senator from Texas with reference to his discussion of section 5. There is no provision whatever in section 5 for the employer to seek an appeal or rectification of the conditions which led to the dispute in a case of seizure of a strike-bound plant. Quite the contrary, the Government agency which is operating the plant, or a majority of the employees of the plant, or their representatives, may apply to the National War Labor Board. So the employer, the owner of the plant, has no redress whatever under section 5. I make that specific point, and ask the Senator from Vermont if that is not correct.

Mr. AUSTIN. If I understood what the Senator said—and I apologize for not hearing him distinctly because my attention was diverted to something else—assuming that the Senator said there was no redress for an employer if his rights should be violated, I should have to say "No," that in my opinion there is always redress for an owner of a plant, an employer of labor, if his rights are taken from him without due process of law. Our courts are open to him, I do not have very much doubt about that.

Mr. DANAHER. There is no redress for him under section 5, is there?

Mr. AUSTIN. It is not expressed there.

Mr. DANAHER. No; and the employer most certainly is not, under section 5, authorized to apply to the National War Labor Board for a change in wages and conditions, is he?

Mr. AUSTIN. Not under section 5; that is, when the Government is in control.

Mr. DANAHER. I agree.

Mr. AUSTIN. So the Government would not, probably, be envisaged as having any need to make such an application where it seizes a plant only for the purpose of dealing with a temporary stoppage and with the intention always of returning the plant, as the bill provides, not more than 60 days after the restoration of productive conditions.

Mr. DANAHER. So that when a plant has been seized, the owner or management may not, under section 5, apply to the War Labor Board for a rectification of the conditions which led to the seizure of the plant, may it, under section 5?

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. DANAHER. When we read subclause (d) of section 7, we find that the owner of a plant is debarred from any remedy under subsections (a) (1) and (2) also, is he not, when the Government has seized the plant?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly. It would be a queer situation if the Government of the United States had seized a plant, and was in full operation of it, and then found it necessary to go to some board which had to do with terms and wages and conditions of employment. The Government's power is so supreme that if there were trouble with the toilets, or if there were dangerous machinery, or wages were not right, the Government could act without having to apply to anybody. We have to envisage this practically. Under section 5, if a plant is seized by the Government, there should not be a situation in which the Government would have to apply for anything.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Texas for his courtesy in permitting me to enter into the colloquy with the Senator from Vermont. I will say, merely by way of passing observation in regard to the last answer of the Senator from Vermont, that obviously, as the Senator himself frankly and candidly and quite correctly concedes, the owner may not seek the jurisdiction of the War Labor Board under section 5 if a plant has been seized, and he may not get jurisdiction before the War Labor Board under section 7 (a) (1) and (2) if a plant has been seized, so the only remedy the employer has is to go before the War Labor Board, in the event the Board sends for him by way of subpena, if the Conciliation Service certifies the dispute to the Board, or if the Board takes jurisdiction on its own motion on the ground that there is a serious threat to the continued productivity of the plant. Is that not so?

Mr. AUSTIN. I think that is a fair statement, except, as I have repeatedly said, that if the owner suffers any injury through the act of the Government in taking his property, he has redress, under the Constitution, in the courts of the United States.

The assumption I have in supporting this extraordinary legislation is that the owner will welcome and be very glad to have the interposition of a peacemaker if he is under the threat of a discontinuance of his effort as a war contractor.

Mr. DANAHER. When the Senator uses the word "redress," he does not mean review of the Labor Board's decision?

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. DANAHER. He means only that if the employer can prove damage, he may seek to exhibit it before a court and to obtain a recovery from someone?

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. And from whom?

Mr. AUSTIN. From the Government of the United States.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. The proposed act recognizes that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, just one word, and then I shall yield the floor for the time being.

I wish to call to the attention of Senators, in regard to the court matter, that it appeared in the hearings that about 750 cases had been before the War Labor Board, and in only one case had there been any attempt to resort to the courts, and in that case the petition was dismissed. I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it seems evident that we cannot finish the consideration of the conference report this evening unless the Senate continues in session very late, and then it might be difficult, so I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Paul C. Campbell, Jr., and Kenneth Grant to be assistant surgeons in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective date of oath.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Capt. Charles A. Park to be rear admiral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Don A. Jones to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David M. Whipp to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTER—NOMINATION REPORTED ADVERSELY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Wallie E. Beasley to be postmaster at Biloxi, Miss., which had been reported adversely by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was rejected.

POSTMASTERS—NOMINATIONS CONFIRMED

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations favorably reported be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified immediately.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

GULF COUNTY CANAL, FLA.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 1403, relating to the acquisition of the Gulf County Canal, Fla., which is an emergency matter, and will take but a moment. I shall be glad to explain the bill to the leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1403) to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am advised that the Committee on Commerce reported the bill favorably, and I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1403) to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, June 12, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 11 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

COAST GUARD

Capt. Charles A. Park, to be a rear admiral, for temporary service, in the Coast Guard, to rank from May 1, 1943.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE) FROM MAY 15, 1943

Don A. Jones
David M. Whipp

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be brigadier general

Thomas E. Bourke	Claude A. Larkin
LeRoy P. Hunt	Harold D. Campbell
Leo D. Hermle	

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS

To be first lieutenants

Russell A. Bowen	Burnette A. Kempson,
Edward McC. Hodgson	Jr.
William A. Millington	

To be second lieutenants

Max R. Read, Jr.	Thomas O. Bales
William E. Clasen	John R. Spooner
"J" Frank Cole	James T. McDaniel
George J. Waldie, Jr.	Robert P. Keller
Glenn L. Todd	Donald H. Sapp
George E. Dooley	James G. Obenshain
Pierre M. Carnagey	Earl P. Paris, Jr.
Harry B. Hooper, Jr.	Richard M. Caldwell
Joseph H. Reinburg	Arthur L. Turner
Quinton R. Johns	Alan J. Armstrong
Charlton B. Ivey	Edwin S. Roberts, Jr.
Jack R. Mathis	Fred W. Lake, Jr.
Darrell D. Irwin	Robert E. Cameron
James K. Dill	Donald S. Bush
Stanley R. Bailey	John S. Flickinger
Joseph E. Leising	Robert L. Anderson
George Moffat	Frank R. Porter, Jr.
Jack D. Kane	Walter E. Gregory
Charles Kimak	Walter D. Persons
Christopher F. Irwin, Jr.	James H. Clark
	William W. Dean
James A. Feeley, Jr.	Jack R. Amende, Jr.
Stanley M. Tutton	William M. Ritchey
Lionel N. Pool	Jack Foeller
Philip "L" Crawford	Joseph F. Quilty, Jr.
Harry J. Coleman	Irwin W. Carter
Leslie T. Bryan, Jr.	Robert L. Hopkins
James W. Poindexter	William C. Hayter
Robert B. Porter	Norman L. Mitchell
Sumner H. Whitten	William R. Lear
Cecil B. Brewer	Frank L. Maerz
Robert L. Petersen	Robert E. Daigh
James R. Wallace	Perry L. Shuman
Edwin M. Schmitt	Herbert H. Long
Hoyle R. Barr	Quintus "B" Nelson
Donald P. Frame	William N. Wilkes, Jr.
Douglas A. Bangert	Serge R. Ballif
Thomas G. Bronleewe, Jr.	Horton J. Greene
Richard "J" Ofstad	Lewis F. Treleaven
Julius W. Ireland	Maurice E. Roach
Paul L. André, Jr.	Donald B. Thackrey
Joe H. McGlothlin, Jr.	Richard B. Cavanaugh
Charles M. Kunz	Robert E. Judy, Jr.
Kenneth J. Kirk, Jr.	Glenn A. Young
Warren H. McPherson	William H. Housman, Jr.
William H. Sublette	George M. Dawes
Hugh B. Calahan	William J. Stewart
William G. Voss	Leonard A. Goldberg
David C. Andre	John R. Brett
John E. Reynolds	William O. Franklin
Blaine H. Baesler	Dean N. McDowell
Michael R. Yunck	

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Euva M. Greenwood, Farmersville.
Frank J. Schultz, Muroc.
Victor L. Roberts, Weimar.

MISSISSIPPI

Carrie E. West, Caledonia.
Riley L. Sheley, Charleston.
Ida E. Ormond, Forest.
George C. Poole, Gulfport.
Chester E. Bolen, Parchman.

NEW YORK

Joseph W. Cain, Adams.
W. Edward Sweetman, Ardsley on Hudson.
John J. Navins, Barrytown.
Lillian O'Connor, Briarcliff Manor.
Horace G. Shepard, Chaumont.
Mary B. Dietrich, Chauncey.
Gerald S. Sweet, Chazy.
Wentworth S. Colwell, Cold Spring.
Corliss R. Pitkin, Corinth.
Joseph C. Miller, Croton Falls.
Austin W. Stitt, Frewsburg.
Flora A. M. Humes, Great Bend.
William L. McGranaghan, Hancock.
Donald W. Murphy, Holland Patent.
Lillian F. McNeil, Inlet.
John V. Kellogg, Interlaken.
Raymond F. McIntyre, Lake Placid Club.
Benjamin R. Gerow, Liberty.
Mary G. McCarthy, Limestone.
John W. Clark, Mahopac.
William F. Agnew, Mayfield.
Elizabeth M. Trainor, Monsey.
Isidore Smith, Mountain Dale.
Robert E. Purcell, Philadelphia.
Howard M. Curtis, Richfield Springs.
Harold D. Ashline, Rouses Point.
Morgan A. Lynk, Sharon Springs.
Joseph J. Finan, Staatsburg.
Frank M. Campbell, Wilson.

OHIO

Silvio Zancanella, Adena.
John M. Hudson, Big Prairie.
Homer D. Cole, Marion.

OREGON

Bessie B. Nunn, Wheeler.

TEXAS

Wilhelm A. Richter, Abernathy.
Gussie T. Edens, Big Lake.
Ephraim B. Hyer, Buckholts.
John F. Griffin, Devine.
Titus J. Shillingburg, Dublin.
Jack V. Gray, Rotan.
Susie A. Cannon, Shelbyville.

VERMONT

Alson Leon Esty, Richford.

VIRGINIA

Bernice B. Turley, Bishop.
T. Pryor Jones, Blackstone.

REJECTION

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate June 11 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

POSTMASTER

Wallie E. Beasley to be postmaster at Biloxi, in the State of Mississippi.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 11, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Father Philip Gordon, Chippewa Indian and Catholic priest, pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Centuria, Wis., offered the following prayer:

Father Almighty, we lift our minds and hearts to Thee in sacred communion for these brief moments.

We praise and adore Thee. We thank Thee for the evidences of Thy good will and love toward our people and our Nation.

The black chimneys of industry and the glittering temples of commerce that dot our vast land all too well bespeak Thy favors and the afforded opportunity given to our great Nation to advance the welfare of its peoples.

Let us, O good Lord, not forget that we need a faith in Thee reared like the giant cathedral deep and solid in the bosom of the earth. Grant us, we beseech Thee, a firm belief in Thy power and majesty, Thy justice and charity.

Grant, we pray, that this legislative body be guided by true Christian principles, so that in the twilight of the lives of its individual Members well may it be said of them in the words of the ancient Latin hymn—

"Vexilla Regis prodeunt
"Fulget Crucis mysterium."

Bless, O Great Spirit, the Kitchi Manito of our forefathers, our Great White Father, our President and our Commander in Chief. Bless the Members of this Congress. Bless us all, dear Lord.

We beg these favors of Thee in the name of the Most Holy Trinity—Father, Thee, and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 7, 1943:

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

On June 9, 1943:

H. R. 2848. An act amending the "joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943," approved April 29, 1943; and

H. R. 2570. An act to provide for the current payment of the individual income tax, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize Members to extend their remarks, but prefers not to recognize Members to proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein the roll call of labor's enemies from the American Federation of Labor's weekly news service.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a Senate joint resolution of the Senate of Alabama.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the death of James Wilkinson, of Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. BATES of Kentucky, Mr. GROSS, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. KENNEDY asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short press release.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a table from the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the tax law.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a sermon by the Reverend John Curry Walker, D. D., Second Congregational Church, Waterbury, Conn.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Lincoln and the Kirkham Grammar."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a citation of war service.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter and a resolution from an American Legion Post in Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 163. An act to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship construction reserve funds, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2753) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes."

USE AND OPERATION OF WAR PLANTS IN PROSECUTION OF WAR

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'War Labor Dispute Act'.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'person' means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, or any organized group of persons.

"(b) The term 'war contract' means—

"(1) a contract with the United States entered into on behalf of the United States by an officer or employee of the Department of War, the Department of the Navy, or the United States Maritime Commission;

"(2) a contract with the United States entered into by the United States pursuant to an Act entitled 'An Act to promote the defense of the United States';

"(3) a contract, whether or not with the United States, for the production, manufacture, construction, reconstruction, installation, maintenance, storage, repair, mining, or transportation of—

"(A) any weapon, munition, aircraft, vessel, or boat;

"(B) any building, structure or facility;

"(C) any machinery, tool, material, supply, article, or commodity; or

"(D) any component material or part of or equipment for any article described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C);

"the production, manufacture, construction, reconstruction, installation, maintenance, storage, repair, mining, or transportation of which by the contractor in question is found by the President as being contracted for in the prosecution of the war.

"(c) The term 'war contractor' means the person producing, manufacturing, constructing, reconstructing, installing, maintaining, storing, repairing, mining, or transporting under a war contract or a person whose plant, mine, or facility is equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required in the prosecution of the war or which may be useful in connection therewith; but such term shall not include a carrier, as defined in title I of the Railway Labor Act, or a carrier by air subject to title II of such Act.

"(d) The terms 'employer', 'employee', 'representative', 'labor organization', and 'labor dispute' shall have the same meaning as in section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act.

"POWER OF PRESIDENT TO TAKE POSSESSION OF PLANTS

"SEC. 3. Section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'The power of the President under the foregoing provisions of this section to take immediate possession of any plant upon a failure to comply with any such provisions, and the authority granted by this section for the use and operation by the United States or in its interests of any plant of which possession is so taken, shall also apply as hereinafter provided to any plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the war effort or which may be useful in connection therewith. Such power and authority may be exercised by the President through such department or agency of the Government as he may designate, and may be exercised with respect to any such plant, mine, or facility whenever the President finds, after investigation, and proclaims that there is an interruption of the operation of such plant, mine, or facility as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance, that the war effort will be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to insure the operation of such plant, mine, or facility in the interest of the war effort: *Provided*, That whenever any such plant, mine, or facility has been or is hereafter so taken by reason of a strike, lock-out, threatened strike, threatened lock-out, work stoppage, or other cause, such plant, mine, or facility shall be returned to the owners thereof as soon as practicable, but in no event more than sixty days after the restoration of the productive efficiency thereof prevailing prior to the taking of possession thereof: *Provided further*, That possession of any plant, mine, or facility shall not be taken under authority of this section after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or after the termination of the War Labor Disputes Act; and the authority to operate any such plant, mine, or facility under the provisions of this section shall terminate at the end of six months after the termination of such hostilities as so proclaimed.'"

"TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT AT GOVERNMENT-OPERATED PLANTS

"SEC. 4. Except as provided in section 5 hereof, in any case in which possession of any plant, mine, or facility has been or shall be hereafter taken under the authority granted by section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, such plant, mine, or facility, while so possessed, shall be operated under the terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at the time possession of such plant, mine, or facility was so taken.

"APPLICATION TO WAR LABOR BOARD FOR CHANGE IN TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT AT GOVERNMENT-OPERATED PLANTS

"SEC. 5. When possession of any plant, mine, or facility has been or shall be hereafter taken under authority of section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, the Government agency operating such plant, mine, or facility, or a majority of the employees of such plant, mine, or facility or their representatives, may apply to the National War Labor Board for a change in wages or other terms or conditions of employment in such plant, mine, or facility. Upon receipt of any such application, and after such hearings and investigations as it deems necessary, such Board may order any changes in such wages, or other terms and conditions, which it deems to be fair and reasonable and not in conflict with any Act of Congress or any Executive order issued thereunder. Any such order of the Board shall, upon approval by the President, be complied with by the Government agency operating such plant, mine, or facility.

"INTERFERENCE WITH GOVERNMENT OPERATION OF PLANTS

"SEC. 6. (a) Whenever any plant, mine, or facility is in the possession of the United States, it shall be unlawful for any person (1) to coerce, instigate, induce, conspire with, or encourage any person, to interfere, by lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption, with the operation of such plant, mine, or facility, or (2) to aid any such lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such plant, mine, or facility by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption, or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein. No individual shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this section by reason only of his having ceased work or having refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

"(b) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

"FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF THE NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

"SEC. 7. (a) The National War Labor Board (hereinafter in this section called the 'Board'), established by Executive Order Numbered 9017, dated January 12, 1942, in addition to all powers conferred on it by section 1 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and by any Executive order or regulation issued under the provisions of the Act of October 2, 1942, entitled 'An Act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes', and by any other statute, shall have the following powers and duties:

"(1) Whenever the United States Conciliation Service (hereinafter called the 'Conciliation Service') certifies that a labor dispute exists which may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, and cannot be settled by collective bargaining or conciliation, to summon both parties to such dispute before it and conduct a public hearing on the merits of the dispute. If in the opinion of the Board a labor dispute has become so serious that it may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, the Board may take such action on its own motion. At such hearing both parties shall be given full notice and opportunity to be heard, but the failure of either party to appear shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed to a hearing and order.

"(2) To decide the dispute, and provide by order the wages and hours and all other terms and conditions (customarily included in collective-bargaining agreements) governing the relations between the parties, which shall be in effect until further order of the Board. In making any such decision the Board shall conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; the National Labor Relations Act; the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; and the Act of October 2, 1942, as amended, and all other applicable provisions of law; and where no other law is applicable the order of the Board shall provide for terms and conditions to govern relations between the parties which shall be fair and equitable to employer and employee under all the circumstances of the case.

"(3) To require the attendance of witnesses and the production of such papers, documents, and records as may be material to its investigation of facts in any labor dispute, and to issue subpenas requiring such attendance or production.

"(4) To apply to any Federal district court for an order requiring any person within its jurisdiction to obey a subpena issued by the Board; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred on any such court to issue such an order.

"(b) The Board, by its Chairman, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of any books, papers, records, or other documents, material to any inquiry or hearing before the Board or any designated member or agent thereof. Such subpenas shall be enforceable in the same manner, and subject to the same penalties, as subpenas issued by the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, approved March 27, 1942.

"(c) No member of the Board shall be permitted to participate in any decision in which such member has a direct interest as an officer, employee, or representative of either party to the dispute.

"(d) Subsections (a) (1) and (2) shall not apply with respect to any plant, mine, or facility of which possession has been taken by the United States.

"(e) The Board shall not have any powers under this section with respect to any matter within the purview of the Railway Labor Act, as amended.

"NOTICE OF THREATENED INTERRUPTIONS IN WAR PRODUCTION, ETC.

"SEC. 8. (a) In order that the President may be apprised of labor disputes which threaten seriously to interrupt war production, and in order that employees may have an opportunity to express themselves, free from restraint or coercion, as to whether they will permit such interruptions in wartime—

"(1) The representative of the employees of a war contractor, shall give to the Secretary of Labor, the National War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board, notice of any such labor dispute involving such contractor and employees, together with a statement of the issues giving rise thereto.

"(2) For not less than thirty days after any notice under paragraph (1) is given, the contractor and his employees shall continue production under all the conditions which prevailed when such dispute arose, except as they may be modified by mutual agreement or by decision of the National War Labor Board.

"(3) On the thirtieth day after notice under paragraph (1) is given by the representative of the employees, unless such dispute has been settled, the National Labor Relations Board shall forthwith take a secret ballot of the employees in the plant, plants, mine, mines, facility, facilities, bargaining unit, or bargaining units, as the case may be, with respect to which the dispute is applicable on the question whether they will permit any such interruption of war production. The National Labor Relations Board shall include on the ballot a concise statement of the major issues involved in the dispute and of the efforts being made and the facilities being utilized for the settlement of such dispute. The National Labor Relations Board shall by order forthwith certify the results of such balloting, and such results shall be open to public inspection. The National Labor Relations Board may provide for preparing such ballot and distributing it to the employees at any time after such notice has been given.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any plant, mine, or facility of which possession has been taken by the United States.

"(c) Any person who is under a duty to perform any act required under subsection (a) and who willfully fails or refuses to perform such act shall be liable for damages resulting from such failure or refusal to any person injured thereby and to the United States if so injured. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine any proceedings instituted pursuant to this subsection in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of proceedings instituted under section 24 (14) of the Judicial Code.

"POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 9. Section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 2, sec. 251), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 313. It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution in connection with any election to any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section. Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both. For the purposes of this section "labor organization" shall have the same meaning as under the National Labor Relations Act.'

"TERMINATION OF ACT

"SEC. 10. Except as to offenses committed prior to such date, the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall cease to be effective at the end of six months following the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or upon the date (prior to the date of such proclamation) of the passage of a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress stating that such provisions and amendments shall cease to be effective.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 11. If any provision of this Act or of any amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and of such amendments, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants, mines, and facilities in the prosecution of the war, and preventing strikes, lock-outs, and stoppages of production, and for other purposes."

And the House agree to the same.

A. J. MAY,
FOREST A. HARNESS,
R. E. THOMASON,
MATTHEW J. MERRITT,
DEWEY SHORT,
Managers on the part of the House.

TOM CONNALLY,
FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
CARL A. HATCH,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

SHORT TITLE

The first section of the conference agreement provides that the act may be cited as the "War Labor Disputes Act."

DEFINITIONS

Section 2 of the conference agreement defines terms used and is the same as section 1 of the House amendment.

POWER OF PRESIDENT TO TAKE POSSESSION OF PLANTS

Section 3 of the conference agreement amends section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the powers of the President to take possession and operate certain plants in the interest of the national defense, to plants, mines, and facilities at which there is an interruption of operations as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance. As a condition to the exercise of such authority the President is required to find, after investigation, and proclaim that there is an interruption of the operation of such plant, mine, or facility as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance, that the war effort will be unduly impeded or delayed by such interruption, and that the exercise of such power and authority is necessary to insure the operation of the plant, mine, or facility in the interest of the war effort. The plant, mine, or facility must be returned to the owners as soon as practicable, but in any event no more than 60 days after the restoration of the productive efficiency thereof prevailing prior to the taking of possession by the President. The authority to take possession of any plant, mine, or facility under section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act, as amended, is to terminate upon the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President or upon the passage prior to such date of a concurrent resolution by the two Houses terminating the bill. The authority to operate any plant, mine, or facility under such section 9 is to terminate at the end of 6 months after the termination of such hostilities as so proclaimed.

Section 3 of the conference agreement, above described, is substantially the same as section 1 of the Senate bill with the exception of the requirements of returning the plant to the owners, and in this respect the conference agreement is substantially the same as sections 7 and 11 of the House amendment.

TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT AT GOVERNMENT OPERATED PLANTS

Section 4 of the conference agreement provides that when possession of any plant, mine, or facility is taken under the authority granted by section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, the plant, mine, or facility, while so possessed, shall be operated under the terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at the time possession was taken, except as such terms and conditions may be modified in accordance with the procedure set out in section 5 of the conference agreement.

Section 4 of the conference agreement is substantially the same as section 2 of the Senate bill.

APPLICATION TO WAR LABOR BOARD FOR CHANGE IN TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT AT GOVERNMENT OPERATED PLANTS

Section 5 of the conference agreement provides that when possession of any plant, mine, or facility is taken under section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, the Government agency operating the plant, mine, or facility, or a majority of the employees at the plant, mine, or facility, or their representatives, may apply to the National War Labor Board for a change in wages or other terms of employment. The Board is authorized to order any changes in such wages or other terms which it deems to be fair and equitable and not in conflict with any act of Congress or any Executive order issued thereunder. The order of the Board, upon approval by the President, is to be complied with by the Government agency operating the plant, mine, or facility.

Section 5 of the conference agreement is substantially the same as section 3 of the Senate bill.

INTERFERENCE WITH GOVERNMENT OPERATION OF PLANTS

Section 6 of the conference agreement makes it unlawful to coerce, instigate, induce, conspire with, or encourage any person to interfere by strike, lock-out, or other interruption, with the operation of any plant, mine, or facility in the possession of the United States, or to aid any such interruption by giving direction or guidance in

the conduct thereof or by providing strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein. Violations of this section are punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both. An individual is not to be considered to have violated this section by reason only of his having ceased work or having refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

Section 5 of the conference agreement is substantially the same as section 4 of the Senate bill and section 12 of the House amendment, except that the act of conspiring with or encouraging any person to so interfere has been made subject to the penalties above described.

FUNCTIONS AND DUTIES OF THE NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

Section 7 of the conference agreement describes the powers of the National War Labor Board with respect to labor disputes which may result in a substantial interference with the war effort, and is substantially the same as section 6 of the Senate bill and section 8 of the House amendment, except that there has been included in this section the provisions of section 14 of the House amendment which provide that no member of the Board shall be permitted to participate in any decision in which he has a direct interest as an officer, employee, or representative of either party to the dispute.

NOTICE OF THREATENED INTERRUPTION IN WAR PRODUCTION

Section 8 of the conference agreement provides that in order that the President may be apprised of labor disturbances which threaten seriously to interrupt war production, and in order that employees may have an opportunity to express themselves, free from restraint or coercion, as to whether they will permit such interruption in wartime—

(1) The representative of employees of a war contractor must give to the Secretary of Labor, the National War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board notice of any such labor dispute involving the contractor and such employees. The notice is to include a statement of the issues giving rise to the dispute.

(2) For not less than 30 days after any such notice is given the contractor and his employees must continue production under the terms and conditions which prevailed when the dispute arose, except as they may be modified by mutual agreement or by decision of the War Labor Board.

(3) On the thirtieth day after notice is given by the representative of the employees the National Labor Relations Board is directed, unless the dispute has been settled, to take a secret ballot of the employees on the question whether they will permit an interruption of war production. The National Labor Relations Board is to include on the ballot a concise statement of the major issues involved in the dispute and of the efforts being made and the facilities being utilized for the settlement of the dispute. The Board, upon conclusion of the election, must forthwith certify the results of the balloting, and the results are to be open to public inspection.

A person who willfully fails or refuses to do what this section requires is to be liable for damages resulting from such failure or refusal to any person injured thereby, and also to the United States if so injured. This section is not applicable with respect to any mine, plant, or facility of which possession has been taken by the United States.

Section 8 of the conference agreement embodies substantially the same policy as sections 2 and 3 of the House amendment, and the penalty for violation is substantially the same as that contained in section 4 (a) of the House amendment. The penalties provided in section 4 (b) and (c) of the House amendment are not contained in the conference agreement.

POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Section 9 of the conference agreement prohibits political contributions by labor organizations in connection with any election to which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress are to be voted for. This section is the same as section 6 of the House amendment.

TERMINATION OF ACT

Section 10 of the conference agreement provides that the act is to cease to be effective at the end of 6 months following the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or upon the date, prior to such proclamation, of the passage of a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress stating that the act is to cease to be effective. This section is the same as section 13 of the House amendment.

SEPARABILITY

Section 11 of the conference agreement contains the usual separability clause.

The conference agreement contains a technical amendment to the title of the bill.

A. J. MAY,
FOREST A. HARNESS,
MATTHEW J. MERRITT,
R. E. THOMASON,
DEWEY SHORT,
Managers on the part of the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 96]

Baldwin, Md.	Forand	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Furlong	O'Hara
Barry	Gallagher	O'Leary
Beall	Gavin	Pace
Bell	Gibson	Pfeifer
Bradley, Mich.	Gillie	Philbin
Buckley	Grant, Ala.	Poulson
Bulwinkle	Griffiths	Pracht
Cannon, Fla.	Hendricks	Rees, Kans.
Capozzoli	Holmes, Wash.	Rivers
Carson, Ohio	Hope	Rizley
Chenoweth	Jennings	Robinson, Utah
Cochran	Johnson, Ind.	Russell
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sabath
Colmer	Judd	Scott
Costello	Kilburn	Sheridan
Courtney	King	Slaughter
Crawford	Knutson	Smith, W. Va.
Culkin	LeCompte	Steagall
Curley	LeFevre	Taylor
Dies	Luce	Tolan
Dirksen	McCord	Treadway
Ditter	McGehee	Van Zandt
Domengeaux	Mansfield, Mont.	Vinson, Ga.
Doughton	Miller, Mo.	Voorhis, Cal.
Drewry	Mundt	Weaver
Eaton	Newsome	Welchel, Ohio
Eberharter	Nichols	Whelchel, Ga.
Elliott	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fish	O'Hara	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and forty-four Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. RAMSPECK, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

USE AND OPERATIONS OF WAR PLANTS IN PROSECUTION OF WAR

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to report to the House today that your conferees have brought back a unanimous report on this legislation. I shall not undertake to go into the details of the several sections of the bill to explain the conflicts that were ironed out and reconciled between the conferees of the House and the Senate. I desire to say, however, that the conference was an extremely pleasant one and I can say for the gentlemen of the Senate that they were forgiving, forbearing, and patient, and there was hardly anybody in the conference who was incorrigible except myself.

We finally greatly improved the bill as I believe because we accepted in part the Senate provision and in part the House provision. We put together the important sections of the two bills and arrived at a conclusion that I think will be satisfactory to the membership of the House.

I want to point out that there was one thing in the legislation that was of vital importance to me from the beginning to the end of it, and that was the question of conferring upon the War Labor Board the necessary powers to make effective whatever order it may enter in any labor dispute or in any controversy coming before it. The President's Executive order which set up the War Labor Board is confirmed and approved by the legislation, which means that it now has legislative sanction and legislative power and authority subject, of course, to the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, and the orders and regulations issued pursuant to those acts.

In addition, the committee in compliance with the section of the House amendment to the bill extended the power of the War Labor Board to issue subpenas and other processes to compel the attendance of parties and witnesses. Everybody knows, of course, how obvious the necessity for this is under the circumstances obtaining throughout the country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice in paragraph 3 of section 7, appearing on page 4 of the conference report, that this language is used:

> In making any such decision the Board shall conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; the National Labor Relations Act; the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; and the act of October 2, 1942, as amended.

I call particular attention to this language following immediately thereafter:

> And all other applicable provisions of law.

This language was in the Connally bill as it passed the Senate. The House in paragraph (b) of section 8 on page 15 of the House bill, referring to these same acts, used this language—

> And regulations and orders issued under such acts—

Instead of the language—

> And all other applicable provisions of law.

Was it the intention of the conferees that paragraph 2 of section 7 of the conference report should be construed the same as the language—

> And regulations and orders issued under such acts.

Mr. MAY. It was the intention of the conferees, and it was their purpose to make effective all of the provisions of the acts named and regulations and orders issued pursuant thereto and in no sense to weaken them, but, on the contrary, to strengthen them everywhere we could. The language which the gentleman quoted which appeared in the House bill was unnecessary, since any regulation or order issued pursuant to law is itself part of the law. The language quoted was omitted as unnecessary.

Mr. McCORMACK. Any regulations or orders issued under such acts?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, to submit a specific inquiry, it is not the intention to interfere with the authority and powers of Judge Vinson that he has under the Executive order creating the office of Director of Stabilization?

Mr. MAY. None whatever. On the contrary, we would like to strengthen his hand wherever we can.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is the intention to strengthen rather than weaken.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The conferees undertook, as far as they could, to maintain every provision of the House bill. Of course, there were so many similar provisions in the two bills that when you read the statement of the conferees and the report of the conferees together you will find that we took out of one bill one section and out of the other bill another section, and there were several instances in which the sections were the same. Where we wrote in one section it was probably the Senate bill or possibly the House bill. Under those circumstances, we were able to get together.

I am very glad to bring to you a unanimous report. I hope we can conclude the debate as promptly as possible, and that the report will be approved very promptly by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Being interested in maintaining the high degree of productivity that our workers have rather than venting our spleen on any individual, I wonder whether or not the conferees gave any thought to the possibility of affecting seriously that production record through the adoption of this report.

Mr. MAY. The conferees were of the opinion when we got through with the legislation, and are of the opinion now, as I am, that we have not done anything in this legislation to offend any labor group, but have left in their hands largely the power to control their own activities without dictation from anybody else or anyone, and that we have provided protection for all of their rights under the Wagner Labor Relations Act, under the National Industrial Recovery Act, and under the Wages and Hours Act, without any impairment whatever of any of those rights. We have left it to them that when they want to have an election on the question of whether they will strike or will not strike, they can have that election by secret ballot, the same as you and I have the right to vote on the question of the election of our Representatives and Senators in Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the history of a very vicious provision which the House, in Committee of the Whole, took out of the original May bill, which the gentleman from Virginia took out of his own amendment to the Harness substitute and which has now been put back again in this conference report. By the use of different language the same purpose is being accomplished.

When the original May bill was reported out of committee, it provided that the War Labor Board could not direct any worker to become a member or remain a member of any union. I pointed out that this might mean the end of the closed shop and might mean the end of the union maintenance clauses in the various contracts now in existence. This I did before the Committee on Rules.

Subsequently the Committee on Military Affairs met and recommended a committee amendment striking out that language, so that it would then be possible for the War Labor Board to continue union maintenance, the union shop, and the closed shop wherever they existed, because it was recognized that to do otherwise, to deprive the War Labor Board of the power to direct the union maintenance, the union shop, and the closed shop, would bring about anarchy and chaos in war industries. So the Committee on Military Affairs had an amendment prepared taking out that language.

Then the Harness substitute was offered and the Harness substitute omitted that language. At the time that a deal was entered into—we may as well speak frankly here, because labor is being pilloried and lynched—when a deal was entered into between those who were supporting the Harness substitute and the forces that were supporting the Smith amendment to the Harness substitute, the gentleman from Indiana and others were opposed to having that particular language in the bill. Thus the astute gentleman from Virginia who had put that language again in his amendment to the Harness substitute, because of the insistence of many of you who were ready to vote for the bill without that language, submitted a unanimous-consent request to withdraw that language, to eliminate it, but objection was made. Then the gentleman from Virginia went so far as to offer an amendment to his amendment striking out that language, and this amendment was carried. Therefore, when the bill went to conference, the language prohibiting the War Labor Board to order continuance of the closed union shop and union maintenance did not exist in this bill.

Now, we find this prohibition back again in this conference report, and I shall show you how they do it. I call attention to page 4 of the conference report, subdivision 2, which states as follows:

> In making any such decision the Board shall conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; the National Labor Relations Act; etc.

What do they mean by that? The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] very well knows that in dealing with a situation under the National Labor Relations Act, the National Labor Relations Board is dealing with just two problems: One, the right to organize, and, two, the right of the worker to choose his agent for the purpose of collective bargaining. There we have a situation where we are not dealing with a contract or a relationship between employer and a union in existence. We are dealing with the problem determining who shall be the agent to bargain collectively on behalf of the workers and the right of workers to organize. The National Labor Relations Board cannot direct a closed shop, union shop, or union-maintenance clause. Therefore, by inserting this clause you are now forbidding the War Labor Board to order a closed shop, union shop, or union-maintenance shop. I have explained this involved manipulation so that when you vote for this conference report you will know what you are doing, and I challenge anybody to deny that you are not voting to prohibit the War Labor Board from directing the continuance of a closed shop, union shop, or union-maintenance agreements. Further, I have consistently opposed this legislation because it undermines labor's no-strike pledge, it shackles American labor, it gives undue advantage to employers, it makes for disruption in war industry, it constitutes provocation for industrial disputes, and it is oppressive and coercive. It will injure our war effort.

Fundamentally, it substitutes for our American and democratic system of free American labor the fascistic labor set-up of Government-controlled labor unions. This legislation is incipient fascism. In the interest of democracy and victory, I ask you to vote down this report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman begins will he yield for a question?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Briefly for one question.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am deeply disturbed by the situation disclosed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I shall talk about that in a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, your conferees, seeking to compromise the diversities between the Senate measure, S. 796, and the House substitute, enacted here just a

week ago, have returned a proposal which I believe is the most effective solution which could be reached under the circumstances. It is, in my opinion, a far less satisfactory and effective proposal than the House measure, for it omits a House provision which I still believe to be most helpful and constructive. Worse, it retains the principal Senate provisions validating property seizure in case of strike or work stoppage. I have steadfastly maintained, and I still insist, that the forceful seizure of property is utterly no solution of the basic problems which lead to labor unrest. This is merely more arbitrary power added to authority already vested in the Executive to deal in a purely personal way in labor relations, and the record certainly is sufficiently clear that administrative law written at the whim and fancy of an individual simply will not work.

Even more vigorously, I have insisted that Congress could scarcely do more in a single act to jeopardize the American system of free enterprise and the constitutional rights of the individual than to endorse this principle of property seizure by an all-powerful Executive. I could not in good conscience, therefore, support this measure offered by the conference committee unless I sincerely believed that in endorsing property seizure we have safely limited and restrained the authority of the Executive by several provisions of this proposal.

First, this conference committee bill provides that property taken under this authority shall be returned to its private owners within a period not to exceed 60 days after normal production in the property has been restored. I wish here that the phraseology might have been more specific, for as the provision is now written the determination of the date on which normal production is resumed is left largely with the President. The owner of any property seized may, of course, seek the protection of the courts if the Executive is deemed to be delaying unduly the return of the property. Still, the very vagueness of the language in this instance might conceivably defeat the purpose the conferees had in mind, for a Socialist-minded leadership, or a very small minority of trouble makers, bent on holding a plant or an industry in Federal bondage once it has been seized, might cause petty disturbances, press petty issues, and hamper production almost endlessly. Likewise, those powerful forces within this administration which will never cease their drive to remodel the American economy on the lines of national socialism will find it easy to interpret the language of this provision to suit their own convenience.

Your conferees, however, have added another important safeguard in section 10, which provides that this act shall cease to be effective at the end of 6 months following the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or upon the date—prior to the date of such proclamation—of the passage of a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress stating that such provisions and amendments shall cease to be effective.

Under this provision, of course, it shall remain the prerogative of Congress to withdraw this extraordinary authority from the President any time it may be shown that the authority is being abused. This is a real protection which I confidently believe this or any future Congress will jealously guard and promptly exercise if the occasion should ever demand.

But most important of all the safeguards provided in this measure are those provisions by which we confidently rest the responsibility for labor harmony and the future safety of free enterprise squarely in the hands of the men and women in the ranks of labor. I have every confidence that these provisions will prove effective when the rank and file of American labor come to understand that we are at once placing tremendous responsibility in their hands and giving them the important beginnings of law which will restore to them the control over their own destinies within labor organizations.

I would like to speak again here about the tremendous responsibilities which will rest with the men and women of labor if this conference measure becomes law, for I believe it cannot be stated too often or with too much emphasis that property seizure is a real and immediate danger to labor. American labor has been bombarded by Communist and Socialist propaganda which always argues otherwise, but if there is any doubt in the mind of any workingman on this point, he needs only to look to any totalitarian nation he cares to take as an example to see how labor fares under a dictatorial government. In fact, he can see his own future status clearly defined if he will go no further than the arguments of the proponents of property seizure, who have made it perfectly clear in this instance that they consider this instrument a quick and effective way of crushing out labor troubles.

There is also another small group which contends that this has been, and is, a labor-coddling Government and that in the hands of this President the right to seize property will prove to be no effective means of suppressing labor disturbances. To those it must be pointed out that every concession this administration has made to labor has been in return for political guaranties which labor leadership has so far been willing to offer.

Granted that under these circumstances property seizure will be more nearly a means of destroying private industry than of ending labor troubles under this administration, at least so long as labor leadership is willing to give the blind political obedience expected of it. Let us even assume that there will never be a rift in the relations of labor leadership and this administration; and that labor could be duped into enthusiastic support of a program that would inevitably weaken or destroy private initiative and free enterprise in America. What a mess of pottage indeed would be the temporary privileges and immunities for which labor had traded its previous birthright.

But of more immediate concern to labor is the inescapable fact that it has no guaranty that it can always deal so successfully, even with this Executive. Suppose for any one of many possible reasons the situation changes and the President develops the same personal enmity for other union heads that he now feels for John L. Lewis. If that seems unlikely, do not forget that these two men were the closest business partners in one of the most sensationally successful promotional deals in all history. If these two men can fall into bitter controversy over the division of the profits of their partnership, remember that other lesser partnerships may come to the same end. And remember too that an unrestrained power which can grant special privileges and immunities can just as well impose hardships and injustices.

These inescapable facts are, I believe, clear to the rank and file of American labor. That is why I have such confidence in the effectiveness of the House provisions for a period of calm, judicious study of any points in dispute, followed by an orderly, protected, democratic decision by secret ballot on any threat to interrupt production.

I repeat what I have said hundreds of times before, that the average man and woman in labor is thoroughly loyal, and just as anxious as anyone else to avoid work stoppages which threaten our war effort. Given the opportunity to study the questions involved, and given full protection from violence, intimidation, and compulsion by orderly election procedure and a secret ballot, I am as sure as I can ever be of anything that the American working people will emphatically put an end to strikes and labor troubles.

That is why I am perfectly willing to trust the rank and file of labor with this final responsibility, this most important restraint against property seizure. I am certain of their patriotism, and I feel sure we can trust their good judgment to resist any interference with the war effort and any attempts to destroy the American system of free enterprise.

I presume that all of the Members have seen and studied the measure reported by the conference committee, and that each is conversant with the provisions.

Section 1 cites the short title, which may be termed the "War Labor Disputes Act."

Section 2 merely sets forth definitions, which I believe will be found concise and complete.

Section 3 defines the powers of the President to take possession of property, and this is the heart of the Senate bill, with which I am sure all of you are familiar. This authority to seize extends quite comprehensively to any plant, mine, or facility which may be required for the war effort, or which may be useful in connection therewith; and may be exercised by the President or appropriate Government agency after the Executive finds and proclaims that an interruption of production has occurred or may occur which impedes or may impede the war effort.

This is indeed broad authority, but you will note the limitation in this section that the President must return to its owners any property seized within a period not to exceed 60 days from the date at which normal production is resumed.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Briefly.

Mr. HINSHAW. The language contained in the report is not "normal production." It is further restricted by stating "productive efficiency thereof." If it was "normal operation" it might have been closer to the truth.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Section 4 provides that in the case a property is seized, that plant, mine, or facility shall be operated under the terms and conditions of employment which were in effect at the time possession was taken.

Section 5 provides that in a property operating under Government control, either the Government agency in authority or a majority of all the persons employed in the property or their representatives may apply to the National War Labor Board for a change in wages or other terms or conditions of employment. It should be pointed out to labor that this provision somewhat reduces its bargaining rights, for here only a clear majority of the employees may carry a case to the Board, whereas in an industry in regular private operation, any recognized bargaining unit, even though it may be less than a majority in the plant, may seek relief through appeal to the Board.

Section 6 provides the penalties for striking against the Government after the seizure of a property. Note that it shall be unlawful for any person, first, to coerce, influence, or conspire with another person to interfere with the operation of such property, or, secondly, to aid in any way with an activity interfering with the operation of such property. Any person who willfully violates any of the provisions of this section shall be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

Section 7 outlines the functions and duties of the National War Labor Board. It provides that the Board shall summon for hearing both parties to a dispute where the United States Conciliation Service certifies that a dispute exists which cannot be settled by collective bargaining or conciliation. The Board is empowered also to intervene on its own motion in a case which in its opinion has become so serious that it may lead to substantial interference with the war effort.

The Board is directed to decide the disputes, and provide by order the wages and hours, and all other terms and conditions of employment within the framework of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the National Labor Relations Act, the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and the supplementary act of October 2, 1942.

The Board is empowered to issue subpenas requiring the attendance of witnesses, and the production of papers, documents, and records material to the issue involved.

The Board may apply to any Federal district court for an order requiring any person within its jurisdiction to obey a subpena issued by the Board.

This section confers jurisdiction on any such court to issue such an order.

Section 8 is the provision which I have so vigorously supported through the entire discussion and debate on this legislation. It provides that due notice must be given of any labor dispute involving a war contractor, and that no strike or interruption of production shall be permitted for a period of 30 days thereafter.

This section also provides that in case conciliation fails to resolve the dispute within this 30-day period, the National Labor Relations Board shall forthwith take a secret ballot of the employees in the plant, mine, or facility to determine whether they will permit any such interruption of war production.

This, I repeat, is the heart of the measure I offered as a substitute, and which the House enacted a week ago. It is by this section that we propose to place in the hands of the rank and file of American labor the privilege and the responsibility to decide of their own volition whether there shall be strikes or work stoppages that may threaten our war effort.

Section 9 prohibits political contributions by labor unions by a very simple amendment of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, and assesses the same penalties for violation which presently obtain against any national bank or corporation.

Section 10 provides for the termination of the act at the end of 6 months following the termination of hostilities in the present war; or by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress stating that such provisions and amendments shall cease to have effect.

Section 11 in conclusion is the customary separability provision.

I would like to point out that your conferees bring back to you the basic provisions of my substitute bill, with the exception of registration and reporting of labor organizations. To American labor I want to point out that there is not a single provision in this conference measure which weakens or destroys any basic right of any group or individual. In fact, I believe I can say in all sincerity that this restores certain rights of the individual which have been seriously encroached in recent years, for it assures again to everyone a full voice in the operation of any labor organization of which he may be a member.

I ask labor to note, too, that there is in this measure none of the drastic features of previous proposals in the House to which it raised particular objection, such as prohibitions against picketing, jurisdictional strikes, sympathy strikes, the suspension of the Norris-LaGuardia Act reviewing injunctions, and the penalties for violence and intimidation.

In fact, I believe the conference measure is one which all persons in America who want labor harmony and uninterrupted war production can embrace without misgivings.

The argument has been made throughout the study of this problem that these House provisions, or any provisions for orderly, cooperative procedure in labor disputes specifically recognizes the right of workers to strike in wartime. I fully agree that we do, in these provisions, recognize such a basic personal right. In fact, I will always insist that this is a right of free people which we should and must admit. I know of no way to deny this basic right without descending to slave labor.

It should not be necessary to point out, for I am sure that everyone, including labor, understands that this or any other personal right is always a limited right, in that it may never stand above the national welfare and safety. I shall never condone the exercise of this or any other personal right in a way which might endanger national security and welfare, but I shall never admit that the American people are incapable or unwilling to subordinate their personal privileges and interests to the greater good of their Nation.

If we have any confidence in American labor at all, we certainly do not need fear the consequence of this simple recognition, for American workers with only the rarest exceptions have been and are displaying a spirit of sacrifice of which we can all be proud. The splendid record of production through voluntary cooperation is so clear that the point admits of no argument.

All we need concern ourselves with is to give these loyal Americans the means to protect themselves from the baleful influences which are responsible for labor troubles. Give them a real, tangible, workable code of labor laws which will end administration by personal whim and fancy; enable them to make their own decisions and choose their own leaders on the basis of real labor statesmanship. When we do that we can look confidently for complete harmony and unstinted cooperation.

I want to say again I regret the fact that this legislation has been formulated in an atmosphere of emotional stress. I wish we might have made a beginning toward a real code of labor law in a more calm, deliberate, and unhurried manner. But we were faced with the stark necessities of a war emergency which demanded prompt action to insure uninterrupted production for victory.

I urge you to support this conference measure with confidence.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, unlike my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] who just preceded me I have not a prepared text. I regret that in a matter of this kind, he has seen fit to inject partisan and political questions into this discussion. This is a national issue that affects all of us. It is bigger than politics. It involves more than labor policies. It is an emergency war measure to insure the production of war supplies. I might say that the House conferees are unanimous in this report, likewise the Senate conferees, ex-

cept that one of the Members had some reservations to some of the sections, although he actively participated in making up the conference report. The conferees have been in almost continuous session for 4 days, and, I think, have brought back to you a sound report.

There is one thing about this conference report and this legislation that should not be forgotten, and I think it could be pretty well answered by the title the conferees saw fit to give this act when they called this the War Labor Disputes Act. And as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] has just said, it does not repeal collective bargaining laws and regulations. It specifically provides that a man can strike if he wants to. It is still the right of every man to quit work if he wishes. There is no prohibition against collective bargaining, but if you want to know the heart of this bill, and the heart of this report, it is that in a war like this in which we are engaged, no man or organization is going to interrupt the production of war material.

Boiled down, it is a matter of very simple analysis. There are three things to be considered in this report. As a friend of labor, both here and in the State legislature for a good many years, I cannot understand how anybody can find serious objection to this temporary war emergency legislation. I might say in answer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], that the language to which he refers adopts exactly the same language that the President put in his Executive order establishing the War Labor Board when we said in the middle of subsection 2 of section 7:

> In making any such decision the Board shall conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; the National Labor Relations Act; the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; and the act of October 2, 1942, as amended, and all other applicable provisions of law.

We have not repealed or altered a single word or line in the National Labor Relations Act. Whatever rights the laboring man or the labor unions now have under the National Labor Relations Act, they still have them under this bill.

There are three high points, as I see it, in this bill. The first is that when the President of the United States, who is the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, feels that there is an interruption or about to be an interruption in the production of war supplies, he has a right to go in and take over any plant, mine, or facility. He has done that in about five instances. The most outstanding case, I presume, was the North American Aviation plant in southern California. Just as soon as he took over that plant a bunch of Communists who inspired that strike ran to cover and that plant was returned, I think, within 3 days. It was reported in that case that the majority of the honest and patriotic workers did not want to strike. That is true of every other plant where he has taken over, except in the terrible emergency that now prevails in the coal fields of the country. It must not be forgotten that in this coal situation in which we now find ourselves, when the President took over the first time they ran up the United States flag, and there has been a strike against the Government and not the mine owners since that time. All in the world you can get out of this act is to say that the President not only has the right to take over a plant during this war emergency, but we will put teeth into the law for the War Labor Board, so they will not only have the right of subpena, so that they can compel the attendance of witnesses or of parties to that action, in an effort to try to determine what is the right and fair thing to do. No man is above the law and every man should be made amenable to it. There is no justification for striking against your Government, especially in wartime. Innocent and patriotic men will have nothing to fear from this law.

There are two distinct lines of cleavage in this bill, if you read the conference report carefully. The first one deals exclusively with seized plants.

The Government does not want to take over all the plants and properties in this country. That is the last thing they want to do. The President has proved in the four or five cases where the Government has taken over to restore order and production that he wants to return them to the private owners as soon as possible. It has happened in every case, except in the one that is now confronting the country in the coal fields.

Under another provision of the bill, when the Government takes over, the status quo is established. There is no change in wages, contracts, or conditions unless the majority of the employees say, "We are not satisfied with our wages; we are not satisfied with our working conditions. Therefore we appeal to the War Labor Board for help." Do not forget that is a seized plant. That plant is in the hands of the Government. That plant is making war munitions. When the majority of the employees request it, the War Labor Board gives them a full and fair hearing and decides the issue. That sounds to me both just and democratic.

The other provision in the bill is the case of a plant that is engaged in the making of war munitions and supplies, but has not been taken over by the Government. The Conciliation Service issues its orders for an election by the employees. I might say in passing that if you get the Railway Labor Act that has been in effect a good many years, you will find that this almost exactly copies, if not in words in substance, the language of the Railway Labor Act, where they have had cooling time and a fair, democratic election, and you have not heard of a strike by railroad employees for many years. That is exactly what we have done in this case. I know something about the administration of that act, and we are trying to follow that principle and that system, in order that the men may have the right to express their fair convictions at a secret ballot and have that certified to the Board, and then let us find out the facts and also their wishes. It might be that in some of these cases the men would not want to strike regardless of the wishes of their leaders. It seems to me that that is one of the things we are fighting for in this country—the democratic way of doing things and the will of the majority fairly expressed. This does in principle exactly what the Railway Labor Act has done so successfully for many years.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Is not that the greatest deterrent against the seizure of plants?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; I think it is. I know it has worked with the Railway Labor Act, and that is what we have tried to follow here.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. In regard to the Railway Labor Act, many of the members of the brotherhoods work on rolling stock that is owned by plants. If any labor leader in the brotherhoods calls out one of those men on a strike, is he subject to a fine of $1,000 and the other penalties?

Mr. THOMASON. I do not think so. I think that is getting entirely too technical about a war measure. The truth of the matter is that the railroad brotherhoods have done a wonderful job in this country, not only in the line of their work but in peaceful relations with their employers. I also want to add that railroad employees are specifically exempted by the provisions of this act. Certainly they have no just cause for complaint because they are not covered.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I just want the gentleman's opinion. Would we have this bill before us at all were it not for what is known as the coal strike?

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman's judgment about that is as good as mine, but I want to impress upon every Member of this House this fact, that this act expires 6 months after the war is over. This is a war act. We are in a frightful and dangerous emergency. Let us try to get together and keep war supplies moving and try to see to it that there is peace between the employers and the employees. This bill is not aimed at the great body of honest and patriotic labor who are doing a marvelous job. This is aimed at the willful, selfish, and guilty few who defy the Government and our Commander in Chief. That is all there is to this report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT].

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, as one of the conferees on this important legislation, I am one of those who signed the conference report, even though I am opposed to the legislation. I felt it was my duty, in representing the majority of this House, to see to it that they get their just deserts, regardless of my personal opinions.

The committee was made up of five Senators and five Members of the House,

eight of whom were lawyers, and as if there were not lawyers enough to act, and not being very cagey about it, they found it was necessary to have other lawyers in attendance. The other two were the gentleman from Missouri, who, I believe, trusted in the books written by Matthew, Luke, and John, and myself.

Yes; we did a lot of things to get better legislation, after being fooled by the House. We were successful in striking out the registration amendment from section 5 of the House bill.

During the conference—oh, many times—someone would say, "I offer this proposition," or a section reading such and such, and then they would say that "Even though I propose it, I am not wedded to it." Neither the House nor the Senate was wedded to anything. However, we have delivered a child. That child was referred to by the gentleman from New York who preceded me.

The bill does deal with two seizures, and, in my estimation, it deals with one concerning plants that had been seized by the Government and those privately operated. I am also led to believe that under the emergency, and if it is found to be the fact, I think we should have legislation for those plants which have been seized by the Government, and if the House deems it advisable to have legislation such as is contained in this conference report, I do not believe this is the place to do it at this time, because there should have been some previous legislation even though I may be opposed to it.

There is also a section contained in the bill that has to do with political contributions. I do say that if these people should be prohibited from making contributions in elections, why do we restrict these corporations and these labor organizations? It seems to me there are many unincorporated groups in this country who are doing just that very thing, and if we want to correct that, let us amend the Hatch Act.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Is it not quite true that a man like Eugene Grace or John Pierpont Morgan could give $5,000,000, or more than a dollar for every member of the C. I. O., or similarly any other man, and there is no law to retard them whatsoever?

Mr. MERRITT. That is right.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I would like to make an observation with regard to section 8, particularly subsection 3, that while this entire bill is vicious, this section is particularly vicious, and in my opinion it is an indication of the hysteria which grips the Congress when we are discussing the actual provisions which threaten the basic liberties of every American citizen who will be affected by this legislation. That section alone would be ample justification, in my opinion, for the House to reject the entire bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Let us assume that this bill would not have been before the House at all were it not for the so-called coal strike, as our production now is unparalleled. Now, if we may assume that is the reason for the bill being brought in here, and I think it is a fair assumption, are we not then assuming that the coal operators are free from fault in the whole mess for the coal strike, and that the miners are not entitled to a raise in pay? In other words, by the passage of this bill we are deciding against the miners, which I do not think is fair.

Mr. MERRITT. I will say the original intention of this legislation was to deal with that strike. I do not have any sympathy for Mr. Lewis either.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not like his way either of going at it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this legislation. I was opposed to the bill; I am opposed to the conference report.

I want to have in the RECORD—for everyone to see—just what happened in the handling of this bill by these men who have been steadily crying their love for the American workingman and woman. These proponents of this legislation have constantly claimed they act solely in the best interests of the working people of the land—that they have no interest in antilabor legislation and that, in fact, this type of thing is not antilabor. Their claim is that they are moved solely by their desire to see justice done. They are the self-styled champions of fair play; yet there was never an opportunity for any person representing labor to have a voice in the deliberations on this bill. The hearings—so-called—were secret. They were held in star-chamber fashion and like a council of darkness the committee under the brilliant leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] advised and counseled by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] rushed the bill out here and stuffed it down the throats of the Members of this House who asked only that they be given an opportunity to speak in behalf of the laboring class of the Nation.

They say they are fair—look at the record and see what opportunity was given to the opposition. If they are honest in their purpose—if they seek only honesty and justice—then why do they fear the voice of the opposition? This Nation is founded on the right of freemen to speak freely and voice their opinions on any subject. This bill, which is a veritable dagger in the heart of every man who labors for a week's pay, is a direct contravention of that fundamental right of every American. It is not merely an antilabor bill—it is an anti-American bill. Its handling here in what is supposed to be a House of Representative of all Americans, demonstrates what can be done to all American rights—when those rights run across the lines of the privileged.

Today affords a brilliant example of the fairness which has been shown by the handlers of this alleged legislation—the proponents of the measure needed, they claimed, 48 minutes to promote the hysteria and hypocrisy they felt necessary to get this bill passed. In their bounteous graciousness they gave the opposition—the men who dare speak here for all the factory workers, the shipbuilders, the construction gangs, who make and transport the arms of war to the men at the front—to the men who dare to speak for the laborers of the country, they gave 12 minutes. Think of it, 12 minutes to speak in opposition to the measure that rings the death knell for every labor organization in the country. This action today brands this bill as unfair, unjust, and un-American.

When this House passed the bill I do not believe two-thirds of those in this body knew what they were voting on when they voted for the passage of this bill.

Likewise I say, frankly, when you passed this bill last Friday, you stuck a dagger into the backs of all American men and women who work for a living in this country. Now when the conferees bring back this conference report, all they are doing is to thrust that dagger a little bit deeper into the backs of American labor, and as soon as this bill becomes a law, if it does become the law, those who are going to administer the law, now that they are given the opportunity, now that they have the dagger in the backs of the American people, they are just going to twist and turn and turn it until they crucify every American worker in his country.

Throughout the State I come from I am constantly asked about the antilabor forces in Congress. Since I am a Democrat, I am constantly asked about the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], who has been, up to now, considered the leader of the antilabor forces. I am asked why it is that Democrats are willing to sacrifice the laboring men and women they know. But after today that situation is changed. The mantle of leadership in the antilabor crusade has been passed to the Republican Party. These forces of hate have a new champion. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], a Republican, no doubt under the whip of the associations of manufacturers and industrialists, has swept into the fray and has seized the crown from the tired brow of the ex-champion. And at last there comes into the open this copartnership of all those forces who see in the repression of the working man the opportunity to advance their political fortunes among the ranks of the privileged few.

I am going to tell them now that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is a copartner with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] in attempting to do everything he can to break down the

advance that labor has made during the past 10, 15, or 20 years.

This is not done to create unity. This is not going to build up the morale of the men and women who are working; this is going to do just the opposite. Every man and woman in industry, and every labor organization, knows what this bill means. It is going to throw a wedge between them and industry that can never be closed.

In the interest of fairness and honesty—not only to labor but to all Americans—I implore you—do not be stampeded into doing this thing which is all wrong. I beg of you, vote against this piece of un-American legislation.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor the adoption of this report. The ruthless and unpatriotic machinations of John L. Lewis and of other unprincipled labor leaders have done more to damage morale in this country than all the Axis efforts combined. And this destruction of morale does not stop at the borders of the United States. It is spreading to the men in the armed forces and to the people of our fellow democracies. And it is steadily sapping the good name of organized labor.

I find it incredible that a union made up of good Americans can be induced to strike against its own government in wartime. Yet John L. Lewis has called strikes against his Government, and he dares to give his Government a dead line in which to come to terms with him.

This man, and those who are blind enough to follow his example, says in effect: "You need not worry about the safety of your soldiers and sailors until June 20, but then look out for trouble if you haven't met my terms."

Lewis has been able to do what no labor leader in any other democracy on earth would dream of daring to do in wartime—put a gun at the head of his Government by abetting a strike in a vital industry. The immediate disruption of the domestic economy of our Nation and the imminent danger that our troops in the field will lack weapons and munitions are in prospect, and if there is an ounce of courage in the Congress and the administration, such a condition will not be tolerated.

We shall shortly know whether Mr. Lewis will rule the United States or whether we shall continue to have democratic government. Congress must make the choice, and it must be made now. The passage of this bill will stop Lewis and his kind, and they must be stopped.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, in November 1941 your House Committee on Labor attempted to write reasonable and workable legislation, to assist on the home front, as an effective and all-out aid to the war effort.

I remember that the representatives of many of the branches of organized labor said in effect to the acting chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], and myself and other members, that they would not aid in drafting corrective labor legislation but would oppose each and every proposal, no matter by whom it was made.

Such an attitude is a sad commentary on the leaders who should have generously given cooperation, rather than the dogmatic denial to those of us who sincerely desired their help.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the ill-advised resentment expressed today will turn to approving reflection on the measure that we soon will pass. I feel that rather than placing in the hands of Congress or the administration any lighted torch to burn out the rights of labor during the prosecution of this war, that we by passage of this conference report give an instrument to labor and management and government which will contribute to the winning of this conflict.

I feel firmly that the patriotic and productive working men and women of Amercia—and there is but a small percentage who do not fall in that category—will soberly realize in the future that Congress Members, with streams of strength and currents of courage in their legislative veins, put aside fear and foreboding and did that which was right in a period of our Nation's peril.

It was Oliver Wendell Holmes who said: "New occasions create new duties." Conscious as I am of the sincerity of my congressional colleagues in their opposition to this measure, we have, nevertheless, an occasion which demands a duty. The Congress of the United States regardless of intimidation, threat, or pressure, must exercise its obligation to the Nation at war.

Not only will the rank and file of our people approve this action, but you may be certain the armed forces on the agonizing fog-bound island of Attu; amidst the cruel and drifting mists of Kiska; in perilous Pacific waters; on the searing sands of Africa—all of them at a hundred military, naval, and air bases will commend us for a faithful discharge of congressional responsibility.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I believe the conferees on the part of the House should be complimented for having adopted a statesmanlike attitude in the consideration of this matter. I realize, as one who supported the House bill, that the conference report has taken some good features out of that bill; it has put into the bill some features that perhaps some of us did not agree with that came from the Senate bill; but the conferees on the whole have undertaken to maintain the position of the House and I think they have done as good a job as possible under the circumstances. Personally, I expect to support the conference report.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sorry; I cannot yield at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the interrogation of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] by the majority leader as to whether this bill, by reason of the changes in the language in the conference report, might in any way affect Executive orders. It seems to me quite clear that an Executive order issued under authority of law is itself a law, and therefore when this bill states that they shall comply with all laws, it seems to me quite clear that they must also comply with legally constituted Executive orders.

I want to say a word about the statement made by the gentleman from New York, who speaks the voice of the American Labor Party, as to the insertion in this bill of the language that this agency, the War Labor Board, must conform to the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. The fact is that when I offered my amendment in the first instance that language was in the amendment; it was read in full to the House because someone objected to the unanimous-consent request that the reading be dispensed with. When I changed the amendment and offered it again, that language was still in there, and it was again read in full in the House and it was printed in the RECORD that night. Everybody had an opportunity to read it the next morning, and if they did not know it was in there it was their own fault. The Executive order did not change the National Labor Relations Act. Does the gentleman from New York intend to quarrel with me because I refer to the National Labor Relations Act? Does he contend that the War Labor Board should not be required to comply with that act, as well as every other act of Congress?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not at this time. Why is that clause in there? It is in there because the very Executive order which created the War Labor Board contained the same language. You will find in Executive Order No. 9017, in the concluding paragraph of the order which was issued by the President on January 12, 1942, the following language:

> That nothing herein shall be construed as superseding or in conflict with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, the National Labor Relations Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act—

And so forth. My inclusion of that language merely makes it conform to the Executive order which created the War Labor Board.

As to whether it cuts out the closed shop, I agree with the gentleman from New York. I do not see how the War Labor Board ever got any power to order any company to enter into an agreement which they did not agree to. I say now—and I have said this repeatedly—that maintenance of union orders of the War Labor Board are in conflict with the expressed provision of the National Labor Relations Act, and a direct violation of the clear provisions of that statute, and I think it clear, from the provision of the bill, that this House, by adopting the bill and the conference report, means to so instruct the War Labor Board.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, strikes have no place in war production. Pursuant to the determination of the American people to support their sons and friends on far-flung battle fronts, they will not tolerate them. In line with the no-strike policy, responsible labor leaders do not condone them.

Under the no-strike pledge of the responsible labor leaders and patriotic efforts of American labor, it is not disputed that our war production in guns, planes, munitions, ships, and other war equipment has been amazing and beyond all expectation. This is particularly true in my district, where the E pennant, a merit award for production, flies over practically every war industry—an evidence of loyalty and determination of free workmen in a free country.

American labor can be divided into two groups: The one, those who have kept the no-strike pledge, and who are giving their best; the other, those in plants or industry taken over by the Government following a strike in vital war production. In the latter classification is the coal strike. In the former, approximately 99 percent of the remaining war production.

When this bill came from the Senate to the House, it was directed and confined primarily to such cases as the coal strike in Government-operated plants. In the House committee, and later on the floor of the House and in the joint conference committee, section after section was added relating to general labor relations. Most of these sections do not relate to the coal controversy or strikes in Government-seized plants, but primarily affect the legislative gains of the former group of 99 percent who are keeping the no-strike promise and who are working faithfully and diligently for their Government and their industry in producing supplies of war.

High officials of the Army and Navy charged with the responsibility of the war production, and the supplying of our men on the front with adequate equipment, have advised against the enactment of the provisions of the sections which have been added to the bill. They state in substance that in its wide and drastic scope embracing relations generally and those who have kept the no-strike pledge, that it would complicate rather than expedite production. I feel that this bill is unwise in its drastic departure from strikes in Government-seized plants following violations of the no-strike pledge.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to read to the House a telegram just received from the American Farm Bureau Federation addressed to me:

HON. ANDREW J. MAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We heartily approve the legislation you and the conference committee have presented to the Congress to deal with strikes and the abuses of labor organizations and representatives. This legislation has not come a moment too soon. We hope it will be overwhelmingly supported by Members of the House.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
EDWARD A. O'NEAL, *President.*

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to adoption of the conference report?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CELLER, of New York, moves to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to delete from the conference agreement section 8, entitled "Notice of threatened interruptions in war production."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, am I not entitled to be heard on that?

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet.

The SPEAKER. The motion is not debatable. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CELLER) there were—yeas 81, noes 155.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on the adoption of the conference report I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 220, nays 130, answered "present" 1, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—220

Abernethy	Bonner	Cooley
Allen, Ill.	Boren	Cooper
Allen, La.	Boykin	Courtney
Andersen, H. Carl	Brooks	Cox
Anderson, Calif.	Brown, Ga.	Cravens
Anderson, N. Mex.	Brown, Ohio	Creal
Andresen, August H.	Bryson	Cunningham
Andrews	Buffett	Curtis
Arends	Burch, Va.	Davis
Arnold	Burgin	Dewey
Auchincloss	Camp	Disney
Baldwin, Md.	Cannon, Mo.	Dondero
Barden	Carlson, Kans.	Durham
Barrett	Case	Dworshak
Bates, Mass.	Chapman	Ellis
Beckworth	Chiperfield	Ellsworth
Bennett, Mo.	Church	Elston, Ohio
Bland	Clark	Fellows
	Clason	Fernandez
	Clevenger	Fisher
	Compton	Folger
Fulbright	Johnson, Ward	Robertson
Fulmer	Jones	Rockwell
Gale	Jonkman	Rodgers, Pa.
Gamble	Judd	Rogers, Mass.
Gathings	Kean	Rowe
Gearhart	Kearney	Satterfield
Gerlach	Keefe	Schwabe
Gifford	Kefauver	Shafer
Gilchrist	Kerr	Short
Gillette	Kilday	Sikes
Goodwin	Kinzer	Simpson, Ill.
Gore	Kleberg	Simpson, Pa.
Gossett	Lambertson	Smith, Ohio
Graham	Lanham	Smith, Va
Grant, Ala.	Lea	Smith, Wis.
Grant, Ind.	McCormack	Sparkman
Green	McCowen	Springer
Gregory	McGregor	Stanley
Gross	McKenzie	Starnes, Ala.
Gwynne	McLean	Stearns, N. H.
Hale	McMillan	Stefan
Hall, Edwin Arthur	McWilliams	Stewart
Hall, Leonard W.	Maas	Stockman
Halleck	Mahon	Sumner, Ill.
Hancock	Maloney	Sumners, Tex.
Hare	Manasco	Sundstrom
Harless, Ariz.	Mansfield, Tex.	Taber
Harness, Ind.	Martin, Iowa	Talbot
Harris, Ark.	Martin, Mass.	Talle
Harris, Va.	May	Tarver
Hartley	Michener	Thomas, N. J.
Hays	Miller, Nebr.	Thomas, Tex.
Hébert	Mills	Thomason
Herter	Monroney	Tibbott
Hess	Morrison, La.	Towe
Hill	Mott	Vincent, Ky.
Hinshaw	Murdock	Vorys, Ohio
Hobbs	Murray, Tenn.	Vursell
Hoeven	Norrell	Wadsworth
Hoffman	Patman	Ward
Holmes, Mass.	Patton	Wasielewski
Holmes, Wash.	Peterson, Fla.	West
Horan	Peterson, Ga.	Whitten
Jarman	Phillips	Whittington
Jenkins	Ploeser	Wickersham
Jensen	Plumley	Wigglesworth
Johnson, Anton J.	Poage	Willey
Johnson, J. Leroy	Price	Wilson
Johnson, Luther A.	Priest	Winstead
Johnson, Okla.	Ramspeck	Winter
	Randolph	Wolcott
	Rankin	Woodruff, Mich.
	Reece, Tenn.	Woodrum, Va.
	Reed, N. Y.	Worley
	Richards	Zimmerman

NAYS—130

Angell	Gordon	Morrison, N. C.
Barry	Gorski	Mruk
Bates, Ky.	Granger	Murphy
Bender	Hagen	Murray, Wis.
Bennett, Mich.	Hart	Myers
Bishop	Heffernan	Norman
Blackney	Heidinger	Norton
Bloom	Hoch	O'Brien, Ill.
Bolton	Holifield	O'Brien, Mich.
Bradley, Pa.	Howell	O'Connor
Brehm	Hull	O'Konski
Buckley	Izac	O'Neal
Burchill, N. Y.	Jackson	O'Toole
Burdick	Jeffrey	Outland
Busbey	Johnson, Calvin D.	Pittenger
Butler		Powers
Byrne	Kee	Rabaut
Canfield	Kelley	Ramey
Carter	Kennedy	Reed, Ill.
Celler	Keogh	Robsion, Ky.
Coffee	Kirwan	Rogers, Calif.
Cole, Mo.	Klein	Rolph
Crosser	Kunkel	Rowan
Cullen	LaFollette	Sadowski
Curley	Landis	Sasscer
D'Alesandro	Lane	Sauthoff
Dawson	Lemke	Scanlon
Day	Lesinski	Schiffler
Delaney	Lewis, Ohio	Schuetz
Dickstein	Luce	Sheppard
Dilweg	Ludlow	Smith, Maine
Dingell	Lynch	Snyder
Ellison, Md.	McGranery	Somers, N. Y.
Elmer	McMurray	Spence
Engel	Madden	Stevenson
Fay	Magnuson	Troutman
Feighan	Mansfield, Mont.	Walter
Fenton		Weiss
Fitzpatrick	Marcantonio	Welch
Flannagan	Mason	Wene
Fogarty	Merritt	Wheat
Ford	Miller, Conn.	White
Furlong	Miller, Pa.	Wolverton, N. J.
Gavagan	Monkiewicz	Wright

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Sullivan

NOT VOTING—80

Baldwin, N. Y.	Gallagher	Pace
Beall	Gavin	Pfeifer
Bell	Gibson	Philbin
Bradley, Mich	Gillie	Poulson
Bulwinkle	Griffiths	Pracht
Cannon, Fla.	Hendricks	Rees, Kans.
Capozzoli	Hope	Rivers
Carson, Ohio.	Jennings	Rizley
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ind.	Robinson, Utah
Cochran	Johnson,	Rohrbough
Cole, N. Y.	Lyndon B.	Russell
Colmer	Kilburn	Sabath
Costello	King	Scott
Crawford	Knutson	Sheridan
Culkin	Larcade	Slaughter
Dies	LeCompte	Smith, W. Va.
Dirksen	LeFevre	Steagall
Ditter	McCord	Taylor
Domengeaux	McGehee	Tolan
Doughton	Merrow	Treadway
Douglas	Miller, Mo.	Van Zandt
Drewry	Mundt	Vinson, Ga.
Eaton	Newsome	Voorhis, Calif.
Eberharter	Nichols	Weaver
Elliott	O'Brien, N. Y.	Welchel, Ohio
Fish	O'Hara	Whelchel, Ga.
Forand	O'Leary	Wolfenden, Pa.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McCord for, with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Domengeaux for, with Mr. Larcade against.

Mr. Pace for, with Mr. Capozzoli against.

Mr. Slaughter for, with Mr. Sullivan against.

Mr. Jennings for, with Mr. Smith of West Virginia against.

Mr. Costello for, with Mr. Tolan against.

Mr. Rizley for, with Mr. Beall against.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson for, with Mr. Fish against.

Mr. McGehee for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

Mr. Steagall for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Gillie for, with Mr. Forand against.

Mr. Newsome for, with Mr. Baldwin of New York against.

Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Philbin against.

Mr. LeFevre for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Miller of Missouri against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Scott against.

General pairs:

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Mundt.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Welchel of Ohio.

Mr. Whelchel of Georgia with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Griffiths.

Mr. Weaver with Mr. Ditter.

Mr. Russell with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Hope.

Mr. Gibson with Mr. Carson of Ohio.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Rees of Kansas.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Voorhis of California with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. SLAUGHTER, who, if present, would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. GRANT. Had he been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROPERTY REQUIRED FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 235)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am submitting herewith to the Congress a report of operations for the period October 16, 1942, through April 15, 1943, under the act of October 16, 1941, as amended, which authorized the President to requisition and dispose of property required for national defense.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 11, 1943.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article concerning the nephew of a gentleman very prominent in connection with House affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

HANDLING OF FOOD CROPS

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been quite a bit said recently with reference to the methods being used in the handling of food crops. I have been in touch over the long-distance phone yesterday afternoon and this morning with two small markets in my district. On these markets there are now piled up over 30,000 baskets of fresh beans for which there is no market. They are selling at less than $1 a bushel, less than they can be grown for. I wish someone who claims to know how to handle these commodities would get busy. The entire public needs food, yet there are 30,000 bushels going to waste, and the crops will be plowed under if something is not done.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. J. A. McConnell, chairman of the Feed Industry Council and general manager of the Cooperative G. L. F. Exchange.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the contribution of the native Hawaiian people to this country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota ?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Indianapolis Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the bill and the conference report just agreed to and include certain excerpts and a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Dr. Harr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article on Cordell Hull by James D. White.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article which appeared in the Chicago Daily Times regarding a rally recently held in Humboldt Park, Chicago, Ill., and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial that appeared in the Chicago Daily News entitled "Copernicus, the First Modern."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief speech by Mr. William C. Fitts, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

VOTING FOR RUML PLAN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 6 minutes after any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

A CHALLENGE TO THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in No. 3, volume I, the June 1943 issue of Ammunition, the official publication, International Education Department, U. A. W., C. I. O., published by International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, on page 25 appears an article entitled "Made in Washington."

It is not signed and the author is not disclosed. It is a vicious attempt to discredit Congress. Among other statements are the following:

> The United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, rank and file made itself heard here last month. Delegates from eight Midwestern States came to tell Congress how the people back home felt about the shenanigans going on in Congress at a time when the people of the country are making every sacrifice in order to win the war. They also called on the various Government offices and told them the facts of life.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Groups of Congressmen and Senators met collectively and individually with delegates from their States. The pressure on Congress was climaxed by a banquet at which 13 Congressmen from 5 States were guests of all the delegates. President R. J. Thomas and Secretary-Treasurer George F. Addes spoke. Vice President Richard T. Frankensteen acted as master of ceremonies.

Then, under the heading "Congressmen impressed" is the following:

> There is no doubt that the Congressmen were impressed. Technical assistance and information provided to the delegates by the Washington office, plus the first-hand information on prices and wages and manpower which the delegates brought with them, made it plain to the Congressmen that unions were a force to be reckoned with. The delegates were impressed with the need to counter reactionary pressure being put on Congress.

Then, in black-face type, was this statement:

> One Congressman, for example, told us off the record at the banquet that all Republican Congressmen had been promised $5,000 as a contribution to their next campaign if they voted for the Ruml plan.

That statement is a direct charge that a majority of the Republicans in Congress had been offered a bribe in return for a vote for the Ruml plan.

It is all very well to talk hush-hush, but when an organization like the C. I. O., with millions of dollars at its command, which has threatened to purge Congress, makes a statement which we know is false, it is time that the Members of the House call that organization to an account.

To me, by 1 of those present, has been given the names of 11 Congressmen who were present.

My suggestion is that the Speaker of this House appoint a special committee, consisting of three members; that that committee be given power to subpena witnesses; that it meet during the coming week, call before it each of the Congressmen who was present and learn what, if anything, was said at that banquet by anyone, which would serve as a justification for the paragraph in Ammunition which has just been quoted.

In addition to the Congressmen, the writer of the paragraph should be called and, under oath, be required to tell what justification he has for so outrageous, so false a charge.

All that such an investigation would cost would be the stenographer's fees and the witness fees of the C. I. O. writer. Less than $200 would do it.

Congress has been pushed around. It has been vilified. It has been slandered and libeled and, whatever may be our shortcomings, there is no excuse for a charge like the one made. Our duty to our constituents, our own self-respect, should move us to action without any delay.

The C. I. O., time and again, has challenged the ability, the intelligence, of Members of Congress. That it has the right to do. But neither the C. I. O. nor the A. F. of L., which recently announced that it intended to purge more than 200 Congressmen, has any right to, without foundation, question the integrity, the loyalty, or the patriotism of a Member of Congress.

The C. I. O. may be riding high, wide, and handsome. It may be the political ally of the New Deal. But, if it be within my power to prevent it, it will not get away with this, its last, attempt to destroy the confidence of the people in their Representatives.

Listen again to this statement:

> One Congressman, for example, told us off the record at the banquet that all Republican Congressmen had been promised $5,000 as a contribution to the next campaign if they voted for the Ruml plan.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Did the gentleman get any such promise as that? I know that no one was bold enough to talk that way to me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They did not even come to my office. I understand that at this banquet—I do not see the gentlemen on the Republican side who were there, but I understand that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MCMURRAY] was at the banquet. This article further says:

> The friends of labor in Congress, such as Congressman MCMURRAY, of Wisconsin, and Congressman LAFOLLETTE, of Indiana, were obviously pleased to have the rank and file of the delegates present.

I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin was down to this dinner where there were 13 Congressmen, and I would be glad to have him tell the House what he knows, if anything, about this promise to pay all Republican Congressmen who voted for the Ruml plan $5,000.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. McMURRAY. I attended the banquet as did three or four other Representatives from my own State, all of them Republicans, I believe, except myself, according to my memory. I did not hear the subject discussed at the banquet at all.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then you do not know anything about it; you never heard of it?

Mr. McMURRAY. I want to say that I did not attend the Republican meeting when this offer was made.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. The gentleman is just doing as he has so often done before, assuming that something that never existed did exist. You stated you did not attend the meeting where this offer was made. Where was such meeting ever held? Tell me that.

Mr. McMURRAY. If the gentleman will yield to me, I state again that I am not a Republican, and I did not attend.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We know the gentleman is not a Republican. Tell us where you did attend this meeting which was held. Where was the meeting held? Do

you know, I ask you? Do you know of anyone who ever offered any Republican Congressman anything to vote either way on the Ruml plan?

Mr. McMURRAY. May I say that the gentleman is misinterpreting what I said. I said I did not know where such an offer was made, because I do not go to Republican meetings.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you intimate that the meeting was ever held? Have you any information? The gentleman, in view of his statement, ought to know. I ask him to answer that.

Mr. McMURRAY. The gentleman ought to know the answer to that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know what is in your mind. I am asking, four square, on a matter that touches the integrity of a large minority of the House. Do you know of any such meeting or any such offer ever being made to any Republican?

Mr. McMURRAY. I should like to say to the gentleman from Michigan that I am not interested in a personal quarrel about this. I have never made any statement about it. The gentleman asked me if I knew such an offer was made. I cannot know that unless I attended a meeting where it was made. I never attended any such meeting. I do not go to those meetings.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did you make any statement of that import, that Republican Congressmen had been offered any sum for voting either way? I am asking the gentleman from Wisconsin. I know you are not under oath.

Mr. McMURRAY. The gentleman is asking me if I made the statement?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Made any statement of that kind—intimated that any Republican ever received any sort of an offer to vote one way or the other.

Mr. McMURRAY. If the gentleman is asking me if I have ever heard any such rumor, the answer is "yes."

Mr. HOFFMAN. From whom did you hear it?

Mr. TABER rose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY] has intimated that there was such an offer made in the statement wherein he said that he did not know whether such a thing was done because he did not attend the Republican meeting. If he has misrepresented that situation before the House, it is about time we found out. He either ought to fish or cut bait. He evidently does not understand where he is.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY] has said he heard the rumor. Now I am asking him where he got the rumor? In view of the failure of the gentleman to answer the House should authorize a committee to call the Congressmen who were present at that banquet and the writer of that article and ascertain whether any such statement was made and if it was made call the maker and compel him to give the source of his information.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all legislative business and other special orders on next Monday I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes. That being Flag Day my subject will be on the flag.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, of which I am a member, has had under consideration for the past month the question of whether Congress should repeal the Chinese exclusion laws, and at the same time permit the entry of Chinese into this country on a quota basis similar to that used for the entry of Europeans. Numerous witnesses favoring this legislation testified before our committee. On Monday of this week the committee favorably reported a bill which would repeal that part of the exclusion law which specifically excludes the Chinese but which would grant them no naturalization or quota privileges and hence leave them in substantially the same position as other Asiatics.

I attended all of the committee hearings upon this subject. I can say in all sincerity that I have been able to approach the problem with an open mind. I have no prejudice against the Chinese as a race and have nothing but admiration for the gallant and courageous fight they have made against a deadly enemy. Certainly every American respects and appreciates their national courage. I repeat that I have endeavored to look at this problem with all the fairness at my command and I have reached the conclusion that, no matter what basic considerations may be involved, this is not the time to change our immigration policy either with respect to the Chinese or any other people.

Upon that primary ground I am opposed to this legislation.

Putting the matter in simple language, these bills contemplate a complete reversal of a well-established immigration policy of sixty-some years' standing. That much is undisputed. It is also undisputed that the legislation necessarily requires Congress to make this decision in the midst of a war in which almost every nation on the face of the globe is engaged. It brings to Congress the direct issue of whether it is unwise under any circumstances to continue an exclusion policy with respect to one of our principal allies in time of war.

In my opinion, the implications growing out of these assumptions are inherently dangerous at the moment. Congress is asked by the sponsors of this legislation to pass it mainly on the following grounds:

First. It is a friendly gesture toward China which will cement our relations with them in time of mutual peril.

Second. That its passage will give Chinese morale a sort of psychological lift during a period when they are morally and physically under great stress, in fact almost near the breaking point if we are to believe the testimony presented to our committee.

Third. That failure to pass this legislation will somehow be the straw that broke the camel's back and that because of our failure China might make a separate peace with Japan.

Fourth. That the exclusion barrier and failure to provide quotas makes the Chinese doubt our friendship, and might even cause their withdrawal from the war.

Fifth. That China offers the greatest trade possibilities for this country in post-war economy and for that reason we should commence now to offer proof of our sincere friendship, in order to take advantage of trade opportunities following the war.

Sixth. That it will stop one phase of dangerous Japanese propaganda; that is, "Americans are unfriendly toward Chinese, otherwise they would admit them to citizenship."

Seventh. That putting China on a quota basis with other nations is fair and equitable and that it will only amount to a bagatelle since present quota restrictions would permit only approximately 107 Chinese to enter each year; that no one should quarrel with the admission of such an infinitely small number.

Eighth. That a combination of the foregoing reasons make this bill a vital war measure.

In my judgment, each of these contentions stands on very weak ground. It might be that passage of this legislation would be considered a friendly gesture by the people of China. But that in itself is not a conclusively convincing argument in its favor, when one views the matter realistically; because while it might give the Chinese great satisfaction at the moment it should also be remembered that the Chinese might consider it an expedient gesture on our part and resent the idea that, coming at this time, it has any significance in our basic relationships. The Chinese are smart enough to know that if we pass this legislation as a strategic wartime measure that we might very well repeal it after the war as a strategic peacetime measure. We had a great many witnesses before our committee who claimed to be able to speak for the feelings of 450,000,000 Chinese and who claimed to thoroughly understand their reaction to our exclusion law. And while their sincerity cannot be doubted, the wisdom of their conclusions is open to grave speculation.

Whether this particular legislation would push up Chinese morale or give it a psychological lift is a conclusion upon which one could speculate a great deal. A number of expert witnesses testified before our committee that the Chinese have been near the breaking point because of disease, lack of medicine, hunger, and inflation. I think every American appreciates the plight of the Chinese and would have everything done within our power to alleviate conditions,

No stone should be left unturned to give them increased material assistance at the earliest opportunity.

But it is admitted that this legislation would give them no material assistance. Its value is purely psychological and aesthetic and, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to appreciate and aesthetic things of life on an empty stomach. Therefore, the psychological value of this measure to the depressed and starving Chinese is a matter of so great a conjecture that I think any reasonable American should be afraid to hazard the action it is now proposed we take.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I think it pertinent to make the observation that although this bill is prefaced entirely upon our diplomatic relations with China it is strikingly significant that no one from our State Department indicated to our committee by their testimony how our Government officially regards this measure. Whether they regard it as important or necessary, would, it seems to me, be of great benefit to Congress in its disposition of this bill. Certainly every Member of Congress would give considerable weight to the opinions of those in direct charge of our foreign policy, in a matter of this kind. Whether by silence they approve or disapprove is a matter upon which we may only conjecture.

PROPAGANDA

Almost every witness before the committee favoring this legislation urged that it would stop the insidious propaganda of the Japs, to the effect that the United States is discriminating against Chinese. With all due respect to the judgment and sincerity of the people who advance this theory, it is pure poppycock and nothing else. You cannot eliminate enemy propaganda by legislation, no matter how good your intentions may be, because such propaganda is based, not upon facts but upon the distortion of facts. It feeds upon lies, not truth. It plays up national prejudices or sympathies, whichever best suits its advantage at the moment, and it is devastating in direct proportion to the willingness of people to swallow it. Nothing but the military power of the United Nations can effectively stop Japanese propaganda. And until the last vestige of the Axis military might has been crushed, its poisonous propaganda will continue in 10,000 different directions upon 10,000 different subjects, and no one this side of heaven can stop it. So upon whatever other grounds we wish to base the necessity for this legislation let us not call it a cure for Japanese propaganda.

An outstanding example of the results of attempting to secure the appreciation of the people of other nations through our generosity toward them in this war occurred in England recently. Last week the British Gallup poll asked the British people, "In your opinion, which country has so far made the greatest contribution toward winning the war, Russia, Britain, the United States, or China?" The vote: Russia, 50 percent; Britain, 42 percent; China, 5 percent; United States, 3 percent. Britain is an intelligent nation. Its people, as a class, are more intelligent than the Chinese. I think it is completely relevant to ask how the intelligent people of the British Isles could be so apathetic of the part the United States has played in this war. If British propaganda, or intelligence, can convince no more than 3 percent of its people that the United States has made the greatest contribution to the war effort, in the face of the fact that we have saved their lives when the Empire was on the brink of disaster, how do you expect the uneducated Chinese masses to react to a gesture such as this legislation proposes to make to them?

What about our own interests, Mr. Speaker? Should they not also be considered in this matter?

The United States is the most generous country in the world. Thoughout our history we have demonstrated this time after time by act and deed. At this very moment we are showering our natural resources on countries over the far parts of the earth—to such a degree in fact that when we have finished we will have spent on this war more than the combined belligerents on both sides of the conflict. And we are doing all this without final regard for our ability to carry the burden. Maybe China has not had her just share of this beneficence. I am not in a position to say, but certainly the Government and people of China well understand that we have our military might spread over the entire Pacific, with one purpose and only one purpose in view, to crush the military powers of Japan. Having accomplished this purpose, as eventually we shall, we will have proclaimed to China and to Chinamen the world over in uncontrovertible language our sincere affection for them, and our desire to see them freemen.

This result, gentlemen, is worth 10,000,000 gestures such as this legislation attempts to give. We would be on dangerous ground, indeed, if our relations with China were so tenuous that it required gesture legislation of this type to hold us together. Not one witness for these bills claimed that China had lost faith in us. And while they may be discouraged at the slowness of the procedure, they realize, as we do, the obstacles we confront.

In the hearings just concluded, apparently to magnify its importance, this legislation was constantly referred to as a war measure. If it is proper to so designate it, Mr. Speaker, then I assert it is a dangerous war measure. I say dangerous, because it deals superficially with a great and vital policy with respect to immigration. It settles nothing and is one of those bills which create more problems than it solves. It is an opening wedge for pressure groups. It places us in the position of dealing with this situation piecemeal. It jumps all the basic hurdles related to the solution of the problem and justifies its existence on the grounds of war expediency.

We have done too much in this war, Mr. Speaker, on the grounds of expediency; it is time we slowed up.

Every Member of Congress knows the difficult matters of immigration with which we must deal following the peace. There will be groups both within and without this country who would make us the dumping ground for homeless and penniless people of the more unfortunate nations all over the world. How we will react to this pressure will depend largely upon unforeseeable events. No one knows what condition this country will be in with respect to our own economy nor in respect to our association with other nations at the peace table. The solution of these and related problems will largely govern our attitude toward immigration.

Let us leave the matter rest until future events give us clearer vision. Let us deal with the problem in its entirety because it is one problem. Let us deal with it when the war is ended, when neither the sympathies nor the prejudices of war will warp our thoughts or influence our judgment. It is a peacetime problem and should be dealt with in peacetime.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, believe it wholly unwise and inadvisable to consider this legislation in time of war, when the eyes and ears of the world will be focused upon its debate. Opposition to it on the floor of Congress can do our friendly relations with China infinitely more harm than its passage can do them good.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. The gentleman stressed the fact that there was no testimony from the State Department, and he gave me the impression at least that if the State Department had testified it might have influenced his judgment. Is that so?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Well, I would have given the testimony of the State Department, the policy makers of the State Department, serious consideration.

Mr. KENNEDY. If they had testified in favor of the bill, would the gentleman be in favor of it?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Not necessarily.

Mr. KENNEDY. Therefore, their testimony one way or the other would not have influenced your decision?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. No, I do not say that. It might have influenced my decision, depending upon what it was, but I say it is significant that they have not offered any opinion on it.

Mr. KENNEDY. One further question, if the gentleman will yield. Is the gentleman prepared to state whether or not in his opinion there is any inequality in the law by its specific prohibition directed against the Chinese people as it exists at the present time?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I am not opposed to repealing the law which names the Chinese specifically, but I am opposed to putting the Chinese or any other nation not now on a quota basis, on a quota basis in time of war.

Mr. KENNEDY. The gentleman realizes that this has been the source of great propaganda throughout the world, especially among the Axis?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. The fact that we have specifically discriminated against the Chinese, by naming them in our statute.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. You cannot stop Japanese propaganda or Nazi propaganda by law, because it comes from 10,000 unfounded directions. It has no basis in truth or fact.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The Japanese have been propagandizing to get this law repealed for the last 20 years, to my certain knowledge.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I should like to ask a question in regard to the discussion of the gentleman on propaganda. The gentleman said that Japanese propaganda has no basis of truth or fact. Unfortunately the real trouble is that this propaganda is based on the truth. We would like to remove that foundation of truth, which makes their propaganda so dangerous. May I just give one illustration? Coming home from China in the summer of 1938, an English-speaking Japanese on the boat said to me, "Why does your country always send notes to Japan, condemning us for what we are doing in China? You understand it." I said, "What you are doing is in violation of your treaties and our treaties, and we believe in abiding by our treaties." He said, "My father is a purchasing agent of the Japanese Government. He has made three trips to America to get military supplies. I am on my first trip for the same purpose. We have not had the slightest difficulty in buying anywhere in America all the things we need to do this thing in China which you say you oppose. Now, if you were really opposed to what we are doing surely you would stop helping us, would you not?"

What could I answer? His argument was based on fact. We cannot stop Japan's propaganda, but we can stop the Chinese believing it. Japan can never make the Chinese believe it unless we refuse to remove from our statute books a discrimination which demonstrates to the Chinese that our deeds do not square with our words.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I think you must admit that the effect of our action, if action were taken by Congress to repeal the Chinese immigration law and put them on a quota, would be changing a policy that we have had on our books for 60 years. Without saying whether it is right or wrong, the point is that in my judgment to change it in wartime is dangerous, because in wartime the sympathies or prejudices, whichever apply, are at their highest pitch, and men cannot think calmly and cooly as they should think when they are dealing with a vital problem of this kind.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman answer this question: Did the committee ask the State Department for its approval, as far as you know?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I am only one member of the committee. I am not the chairman. All I know is that I attended all the hearings and I did not hear anyone from the State Department.

Mr. JUDD. Do you not think the State Department might have been open to criticism on the floor of this House if it had appeared there and testified for or against the bill? Would not Members of this House have argued and properly that the Executive was trying to invade the legislative function?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. No; I do not think so. What does the gentleman think about this: Suppose this legislation were debated upon the floor of the House; I think the gentleman will agree there are a number of the Members here who are opposed to this legislation now. Suppose a bill were reported out to put them on a quota basis, and it was considered here and defeated.

What then would happen to what is referred to as the psychological effect on the Chinese. Does not the gentleman think it better to follow the old adage that it is far better to leave a sleeping dog lie?

Mr. JUDD. No; it would be far better to correct the condition; not do it just as a gesture, but put it on the basis of plain justice, not just expediency. First among the many reasons, we should do it because it is right. If a man or a nation does that which is right, and it has a good practical effect, can we say that we should not have done that which is right? Personally, I believe that only those things which are just and right will in the long run prove to have been also expedient.

There is no use to try to kid the Chinese. That cannot be done. The purpose of this bill is to try to correct an attitude on our part toward a nation with the oldest and one of the highest cultures and civilizations in the world, a nation on whose survival and friendship now our own life depends.

The gentleman said this was not the time to even consider such legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this is a most opportune time to do it. The Chinese have been holding the line for 6 years. When can there be a better time to deal with a situation that is of such tremendous importance? It is America's obligation to an ally that has been holding the line and to the lives of her own sons.

The gentleman referred to the contributions that we have made to this war. Does he think we have begun to make contributions that compare to what China has been making for the past 6 years? I believe history will record she saved our Nation by holding Japan, single-handed, until we finally woke up.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Well, I cannot agree with that; that is a matter of opinion, but I would like to add that China is fighting the battle of China; we are fighting our battle and England is fighting hers. If China is saved, it will be through our fighting effort.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Do I understand the gentleman as being opposed to changing our status quo, the immigration laws?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. In time of war; yes.

Mr. CURTIS. You are opposed to reducing the total of the quotas, are you?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Oh, no. I do not believe that. I would favor closing all quotas during the war, all of them.

Mr. CURTIS. So would I, but I am for this bill.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. What I meant was I am against opening up this problem by way of letting people into this country who are now excluded.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Speaker be authorized to sign enrolled bill H. R. 2753, the defense-aid supplemental appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RUMORS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I say this not for the purpose of controversy, but a little earlier in the afternoon unfortunately the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]—and he had a perfect right to do so if he wanted to—dignified an article that appeared in some magazine about a rumor in relation to some Members of this House about getting a promise of a $5,000 campaign contribution to vote for the Ruml plan. A colloquy took place at the time between the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I am not going into that. I do not question the right of the gentleman from Michigan or the gentleman from Wisconsin to make the remarks they did and I am not entering at all into the colloquy except for this purpose: That as a Member of the House and as the majority leader, I want to state that every one knows that any such rumor is completely without foundation at all. Every Member of this body votes as his conscience dictates. I may disagree with them, but I profoundly respect the motive which prompts them to cast their vote. Certainly the Members of the House are not accountable for rumors.

Rumors, like those referring to the WAAC's and the WAVES, I think were handled by several Members very adequately, but in my judgment the best thing is that no notice be given to some of them at all. This is one of those unfounded rumors that should have been ignored.

But as the majority leader I feel it is my duty and my obligation to say that there is absolutely no foundation at all for this rumor and nobody can get any satisfaction out of a rumor that is without foundation, and the less attention we pay to this particular rumor the quicker the rumor will die out.

THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have prepared no script to follow in discussing this question. The matter is so simple, so logical, that it requires no script. It requires only a little common sense. Let us be cold-blooded about the whole proposition.

In yesterday's RECORD, at page 5683, you will find an address on this question by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. I am more than ever convinced that any Member of this House after reading that address would have a pretty good picture of what the so-called Chinese Exclusion Act means to America. The trouble in our committee is that to a certain degree the Members try to set themselves up as judge, jury, bailiff, and warden. It has never been my policy to stifle any kind of important legislation. I do not want to assume that responsibility, nor do I think any member of any committee should undertake to keep important legislation which affects our whole country and our war efforts from coming to the floor of the House. I strongly believe that the problem involved in this issue is important enough to give every individual Member of this House a chance to consider it and to cast a vote on it—either for or against it. I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that if the Members read the testimony, and it is going to be printed, they will be convinced beyond doubt that this exclusion law must be removed not only in order to do justice to our great ally China but to do the right thing for America. After hearing, or reading, the testimony of the outstanding witnesses who appeared before our committee in support of repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws, one can come to no conclusion other than that of removing all the restrictions against the Chinese people. The existence of this law is a great danger to our war effort. Why did my colleague not tell you about Admiral Yarnell who testified before our committee and who has been in service mostly with the Pacific Fleet for 50 years? He said that if you want to take a chance of prolonging this war and go on killing American boys just keep this exclusion law on the statute books. You do not have to put American boys over there to fight if you remove the exclusion against China and give China some military help and moral support. He did not quote the testimony of Pearl Buck and others who have lived in China for 20 or 25 years, who know the Chinese people and their rather bitter reaction to this exclusion law.

Mr. Speaker, at least 40 or 50 witnesses appeared before the committee representing every religious group and denomination, from every section of the country to beg and appeal for the repeal of restrictions against China, witnesses representing in my judgment, close to eighty or ninety millions of people, begging us to remove that stigma against China.

If we give China a quota of 107 and let that quota run for 50 years, at the end of that time we would have fewer Chinese here than we have Japs today. That is a pretty broad statement, but it will stand the test. Arguments were presented to us today and in the recent past by certain of my distinguished colleagues who intend to vote against this legislation on general principles. No argument could convince them that by allowing a quota it would not open the gap, that Chinese born in England—under the Gossett bill—could not be brought in under the English quota; Chinese born in France could not be brought in under the French quota. For as a result of our recommendations after a study of this question our plan proposes that 75 percent of this quota of 107 shall be given to Chinese born and resident in China and the remaining 25 percent of the quota to Chinese born and resident in other countries. In other words, not more than 107 could come in whether they were born in China, England, France, or some other part of the world. Let me say one thing more, Mr. Speaker: China does not care how small her quota is as long as the stigma against her is removed and she is put on a quota basis and her people who are permitted to enter under this quota are allowed to become naturalized like all other legally admitted aliens.

I hope all who are interested will read the hearings when they are printed. We have also printed a small pamphlet containing excerpts from Japanese propaganda broadcasts based on the Exclusion Act. Japan is telling China every day that the American people are just fooling them, and that they do not treat them with the same respect and consideration as they treat their other allies. They urge them to break away from the Americans. They try to show that Americans are just using their Chinese allies for the dirty work of fighting their enemies without even being willing to treat them on the same basis as they treat the Germans and Italians as far as their immigration and naturalization laws are concerned.

This constant propaganda upon a weary people can impair our cause in the Far East considerably.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman has spoken of giving this quota to China. In the previous address it was claimed that we were altering or reversing the policy that we have followed for 60 years. Is it not true that giving China a quota is not a reversal of America's immigration policy, it is merely an extension of it, a perfection of the settled policy we have followed since 1924? The figure of 107 for China is arrived at by exactly the same formula as the figure of 65,000 for England is arrived at.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes, and that is based on the census of 1890.

May I say further that 30 or 40 years ago we had horse cars in my great city of New York. Times have changed. We have no more horse cars. At a time when some steamship companies and some manipulators were bringing in a lot of coolie labor it was necessary, and justly so, that immigration be restricted, but those days have gone. The 107 that you will get in this country under the quota must comply morally, physically, and financially with our laws and will therefore not be people who are likely to become a public charge.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman believes that just because a certain medicine was the right treatment for a disease that a man had 40 years ago does not mean it is the medicine he shall use for every disease that may come along.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Certainly not.

Mr. JUDD. Especially when the disease is quite different from 40 years ago.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes. I say to the country and to the House, for God's sake, for our own protection, for our own safety, let us remove that unfair exclusion provision because I am afraid that this war may go on even after we destroy Mr. Mussolini and Mr. Hitler, and we will need the good will and friendship of the Chinese people.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY. Much has been said about the conditions that led up to the original Exclusion Act. The gentleman referred to the fact that coolie labor was responsible for it. I believe the gentleman knows and recognizes the fact that these Chinese were brought here to develop the great West of our country. After the pioneering had been completed and there was no immediate use for them, they became a drug on the market and at that time this agitation started which brought about this Exclusion Act.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is true. Let me call your attention again to the fact that the committee had no bill before it at all last week when we took a vote. We had prepared what is known as a dummy print for our consideration and the very men who are opposed to a quota, remember that, the men who are opposed to a quota for China, whether it be 1 or 107 voted to remove the restrictions and all the exclusion laws but refused to consider a quota. In other words, it was simply a gesture.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I had a special order for earlier in the day and I would ask the gentleman to wait a few minutes until I could have about 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. I did not know the gentleman had an order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman had a special order, but his name was called and he was not present. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida, may proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article on aviation and also another article from the Brotherhood of Trainmen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include letters and excerpts in connection with the milk-price situation in Florida.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN]?

There was no objection.

CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, relative to the statements which were made recently concerning the repeal of our immigration laws, I feel it my duty as a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to ask the House to be cautious when propositions come in for the tearing down of our immigration laws. I hope that you will be cautious and give very, very careful consideration to any bill which may be brought in to tear down the immigration bars, particularly now and knowing what we will face immediately after the present crisis.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Has anybody suggested in this bill tearing down the immigration bars?

Mr. GREEN. I am not familiar with the substance of the bill to which the gentleman refers, but I will say that any bill that you now pass to give quotas where quotas do not now exist will result in tearing down the bars of immigration which have been in effect in this country for many, many years.

Mr. JUDD. It does not increase in the least the total number of people who come into the country and it does not tear down the immigration bars.

Mr. GREEN. I have heard all kinds of statements before the committee and on the floor from gentlemen who desire to tear down our immigration barriers and I find that practically the same arguments obtain for all propositions. Did the gentleman not as a member of that committee find that to be true?

As to whether the bills in question let down existing immigration bars is a matter for each House Member to decide. The fact is that the proposals in the legislation repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act and give immigration entrance quotas into the United States of Chinese. The existing law is a bar against entrance of orientals and they do not have quotas. I do not understand how you could repeal this law and give quotas to orientals without eliminating at least this immigration barrier or bar.

I have a high regard for the Chinese as a great people and as a people who are most nobly, valorously, and courageously performing with America and America's other allies in this war crisis. Do you believe, however, that sentiment should be magnified and permitted to sweep us off our feet to such extent that our immigration laws should be scrapped? If immigration quotas are given to Chinese, then the next effort will be made by the friendly immigrationists to give quotas to India, Malaya, perhaps Japan, and in fact, all orientals. And I ask you this question, do you believe that America's economic and labor conditions after the existing war crisis will warrant a vast influx of orientals, or in fact, citizens of any other foreign country?

I predict that during the reaction and economic crisis which may come in this country as well as in all countries after the present war is over, we will then do well if we can properly provide for and give employment to our own American citizens. This is why I feel it my responsibility as a member of the committee to ask that the House membership give very cautious and deliberate consideration to proposals in the legislation which may soon be presented to the House for consideration.

MILK CEILING PRICE IN FLORIDA

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, again today I would call to your attention the imperativeness of increase in milk ceiling prices to the producers in the State of Florida. On the 24th of May I gave to you information indicating the seriousness of this situation, and today it is my purpose to supplement this.

As a result of lengthy and frequent conferences with O. P. A. officials, it developed that this agency felt without authority to give adequate increase in producers' ceiling prices. It was indicated that the responsibility and power for relief rested in the hands of Judge Fred M. Vinson, Director, Office of Economic Stabilization. With this information, on June 1 I sent the following communication to Judge Vinson:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 1, 1943.

Hon. FRED M. VINSON,
Director, Office of
Economic Stabilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VINSON: It is imperative that milk ceiling prices in Florida be raised immediately. Our dairymen are going out of business at an alarming rate. Our herds are being slaughtered for beef; production is decreasing and will continue to decrease as long as existing ceiling prices on milk are enforced. They and I have appealed repeatedly for the past 4 or 5 months to the Office of Price Administration officials, including the Administrator, but have not obtained results. I feel it necessary to bring this matter to your attention and to earnestly ask that you intercede and give relief.

An increase of 2 cents a quart is necessary, and such increase will keep the dairymen in production and will prevent further decrease in volume output. The Office of Price Administration officials apparently are entirely unable to understand or to appreciate this situation. They apparently have lost, entirely, sight of the producers' side of this question. They apparently think only of the consumer, and their short-sighted and misunderstanding policy is now shortening, in quantity daily the consumer.

I enclose copy of speech which I made on the House floor on May 24; also, communication just received by me from Mr. B. B. McArthur, president, Grade A Milk Producers, 769 Northwest Eighteenth Terrace, Miami, Fla. I receive scores of communications daily in which there is outlined the impossibility of continuance of production under prevailing ceiling prices.

A subsidy is not the answer. An increase in ceiling price is the answer and is imperative.

I shall appreciate hearing from you at your earliest convenience concerning this matter.

Sincerely yours,

LEX GREEN,
Member of Congress.

In reply to the above communication, on June 5, Judge Vinson sent me the following letter:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1943.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEX: Thank you for your letter of June 1, 1943, with reference to milk prices in Florida.

As you doubtless know, my job is primarily to determine the economic policies and not to administer the details of each price regulation. Otherwise, it would not be possible for me to function without duplicating all the other agencies of the Government.

It does happen, however, that the Florida situation involves certain questions of policy which are illustrative of a condition that exists in other parts of the country as well. I now have the situation under study, and will promptly inform you of any action which is taken.

Sincerely yours,

FRED M. VINSON,
Director.

Subsequent conferences with O. P. A. officials have indicated that they are aware of the imperativeness of the situation but that very little relief may be anticipated. In the meantime, in Florida, the milk producers' situation is growing more critical every hour. During the last day or two I have been reliably advised that the large dairy herd of Mr. Oscar Blocker, in the vicinity of Jacksonville, Fla., has been disposed of. I am advised, also reliably, by long-distance telephone by Hon. Brady S. Johnston, vice president, Dinsmore Dairy Co., Jacksonville, Fla., that 1,500 gallons of milk in one importation shipment to Florida has been diverted, and have also been advised of spoiling of three carloads shipped into Florida recently. All of these things contribute to the ever-increasing scarcity of milk in Florida. In their desperation for relief Florida dairymen have appealed repeatedly to Atlanta

and Washington offices of the O. P. A. for relief. Here is a communication sent by Mr. J. R. Goolsby of Miami, Fla., to the Atlanta O. P. A. office:

MIAMI, FLA., *May 28, 1943.*

JOSEPH J. SPENGLER,
Regional Price Executive,
Office of Price Administration,
Atlanta, Ga.:

My son fighting across the sea. Unless you give me a living price for dairy products he will return to a bankrupt home. Is this democracy?

J. R. GOOLSBY.

Here is a communication sent to me under date of June 6 by Dr. J. G. DuPuis, of Miami, and copy of his communication addressed to the Atlanta offices of the O. P. A.:

THE WHITE BELT DAIRY,
Miami, Fla., June 6, 1943.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: Your letter received with enclosure of letter from Mr. Prentiss Brown of the Office of Price Administration, also copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with various letters from dairymen of the State of Florida printed therein. I wish to express my appreciation again for your interest in behalf of the dairy industry of our State; and trust through your future energies and intelligent guidance that you will obtain enough cooperation in Congress to preserve the dairy industry before we as dairymen are broke financially and cannot operate, even though we would like to at this time, particularly as our country needs good food and plenty of it, as well as the starving hordes in foreign lands who are our allies and others, who are helpless.

It seems that the letter from Mr. Prentiss Brown to you has dumped everything on the Atlanta regional office of the Office of Price Administration for the discriminatory acts against the dairy industry; therefore, I am enclosing you copy of letter to Mr. William J. J. Smith, Survey and Analysis Section, Office of Price Administration office, Atlanta, for your information.

I would be glad if you would advise if there has been a law defining the Office of Price Administration, its scope and authority permitting its discrimination against one of the basic industries in our State, and it is my opinion that strict accountability should be immediately required of any individual in governmental offices who discriminate against any people or industry under the excuse of war measures. Please send me a copy of such a law, if there is one.

I shall be glad to furnish you any further information from this section of our State, provided you can use the same to advantage and bring relief to the dairymen of the State and particularly Dade and Broward Counties. With personal regards, I remain,

Yours very truly,

J. G. DUPUIS, M. D.

JUNE 5, 1943.

Mr. WILLIAM J. J. SMITH,
Survey and Analysis Section,
Office of Price Administration,
Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR MR. SMITH: I wish to refer to your letter of April 27, 1943, in which you stated, that your office was working as rapidly as possible to arrive at a satisfactory solution of the dairy problem in Florida.

We have had much correspondence with the Office of Price Administration Washington office, and the regional office at Atlanta, all giving promises of immediate relief of the disastrous situation facing the dairymen of Dade and Broward Counties, which was specifically set forth in a petition, with exhibits attached showing the tremendous increase in cost of production and distribution sent you on March 25, said petition being signed by all the dairymen in this section.

It is time that we had some action on this vital matter, as we are losing money every day we operate and it is just a matter of a short time until we will lose our business entirely

We are advised that your office has the authority to relieve this situation which is forcing the dairymen in this section and all other sections of Florida out of business. If it is the policy of your office to give just promises and no relief we would like to know it at this time, that we may try and salvage something from our life's earnings, as at the rate it is going now it is only a question of a short time until we will be forced out of business entirely.

It is our sincere desire to help the war effort in every way possible, and more particularly in the production and distribution of wholesome milk for the maintenance of health and public welfare of the citizens and servicemen in this community; however, unless we receive relief promptly in the form of an increase in price to consumers in proportion to the increases in cost of production and distribution, instead of promises, we will be forced completely out of business by this discrimination against the dairy industry. Please let me hear from you immediately if we are expected to pay our bills with promises of the Office of Price Administration.

Yours very truly,

WHITE BELT DAIRY,
J. G. DUPUIS, M. D.,
Owner.

I have here a communication from Mr. Brady S. Johnston, with resolution from the Duval County, Fla., U. S. D. A. War Board. This indicates the public concern which is felt with reference to this matter in Florida:

DINSMORE DAIRY CO.,
Jacksonville, Fla., June 8, 1943.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEX: The Duval County United States Department of Agriculture War Board has furnished me with a copy of the attached resolution with the request that I forward it on to you.

Your continued efforts in behalf of the dairy industry is highly appreciated.

Sincerely,

BRADY S. JOHNSTON.

Whereas the production of milk in Duval County has gradually been decreasing for the past several months, dairy herds are being sold, cattle distributed to other areas, or in some cases slaughtered, and the supply of milk is rapidly decreasing while the capacity of production in this area is at present not being utilized. Improved permanent pastures that have been built at great costs are growing up in weeds; and

Whereas the producers of milk in this area, as well as distributors, are in a very demoralized state of mind because of the shortage of labor, and a very acute labor problem is faced by the milk producers because the greater part of dairy labor has been lost to war industries which pay much higher wages, and the present price of feed has practically doubled, the cost of dairy supplies increased tremendously, and a ceiling has been placed on the sale of dairy products which is inadequate to meet these increases; and

Whereas it is the responsibility of the United States Department of Agriculture War Board to have the milk-production goals for the county produced, and realizing that the goals are not being met because of the inability of the industry to pay competitive wage scales and increased feed and equipment costs: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Duval County United States Department of Agriculture War Board, That the Office of Price Administration, Director of Economic Stabilization, and Director of War Mobilization be advised of this situation and request that they seriously consider the facts presented and that they immediately take such steps as are necessary to prevent a further decrease in production of milk in this area, namely, an increased ceiling price thereon to partially absorb the additional increased cost in the production and distribution of milk.

The seriousness of this situation has challenged not only the attention but also the aggressive efforts of the Milk Commission of the State of Florida. Administrator Paul H. Ficht of this commission has been most diligent in his efforts, having in mind the justification and imperativeness of continuance in business after the duration of Florida dairymen, and also the present emergency of trying to meet present war demands in the Florida area. Under date of June 4, he sent to me a communication which gives pertinent information which you should have. It follows:

STATE OF FLORIDA MILK COMMISSION,
Jacksonville, Fla., June 4, 1943.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: The letter written by Mr. George J. Burke, Acting Administrator of Office of Price Administration, indicates a tendency to ridicule or break-down arguments presented by me in behalf of the Florida milk industry. In the first paragraph of his letter he made the statement "it is unfortunate that the trade journal should have created this misconception regarding the action of the Office of Price Administration." I wonder if Mr. Burke would care to publicly class the Jacksonville Journal, who first carried the article, as a trade journal creating a misconception, since the article above mentioned carried a Washington date line and in the third paragraph thereof all but quotes Office of Price Administration as the author.

In the second paragraph of Mr. Burke's letter he takes exception to my statement "that only failure has been a result of Federal control of milk in this country" by saying, "I do not think that this statement is an entirely reasonable interpretation of the conditions which arise from war economy." Mr. Burke fails to state that Florida's milk industry was geared to handle milk production in this State for both military and civilian population, and through lack of knowledge and understanding of our individual problems on the part of the Office of Price Administration, and by their failure to act upon the advice of those familiar with the Florida milk problems they have rendered Florida unable to cope with the present shortage of milk. By this same lack of understanding and unwillingness to accept advice from those who know the situation, they are well on the road to permanently crippling Florida's milk production, if not completely annihilating it. The term "war economy," as used by Mr. Burke, should have been used only as "Office of Price Administration economy" as it is certainly not the war which is the cause of the milk shortage. Mr. Burke is correct in stating that milk production during 1942 had exceeded all previous records, but please let me point out that where these records were exceeded, such

as Minnesota, Wisconsin, Indiana, Illinois, etc., the dairy farmer is now making more profit, by their own admission, than they have ever made in their entire business experience. We, in Florida, have been attempting to purchase some of this milk to alleviate the shortage here and by so doing we have further congested the rail transportation facilities and added to the present shortage of milk coming from the above-mentioned areas which should be used for manufacture of powdered milk, cheese, etc. We are experiencing considerable difficulty in getting delivery of this milk in a usable condition since the summer months are now upon us. For example, only last week five cars of sour milk arrived in Jacksonville. I am wondering if these factors can be labeled "war economy."

In the third paragraph of Mr. Burke's letter he explained (without understanding) that although milk in Jacksonville and Miami, where dairies are going out of business, there are no higher prices in any section of the United States. Although this statement is not entirely correct, suppose we assume it to be so for analytical purposes. For instance, alfalfa normally purchased by the dairymen in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Indiana, Illinois, et cetera, at a figure between $10 and $15 per ton is purchased by the Florida dairymen at a figure between $45 and $50 a ton; while the same price ratio exists in all grain products used for high protein feeding purposes. Cows being milked in these high milk producing areas can be purchased by the dairy there one-third to one-half cheaper than they can be purchased in Florida. Florida farm labor, one time rated among the cheapest, is now rated among the highest; while their proficiency is considered to be only 60 percent of normal. The machinery necessary for the production, handling, processing, and distribution of milk when purchased in Florida is roughly 20 percent higher than in most any other area. This is due mainly to the exorbitant freight rates existing on this type of equipment. Everyone knows that an automobile purchased in Florida, in many instances, costs so much more that the prospective buyer can and does travel to the point of production to make his purchase, thereby driving the vehicle home himself, actually saving money, and at the same time enjoying a trip.

Mr. Burke stated "we should be glad to have factual details explaining how the Office of Price Administration's price ceilings have led to the conditions referred to by Mr. Ficht." Of course, we are all now aware of the fact that the factual information only becomes such when obtained as a result of an Office of Price Administration survey, and that information such as just given could never be accepted as factual information. Nevertheless, I cannot see how these existing conditions can be ignored and denied except to substantiate theories on Office of Price Administration war economy. As a matter of fact, the above differences in costs represent somewhere in the neighborhood of 70 percent over those enjoyed by areas on whom Office of Price Administration has obtained factual information. If the Florida dairymen enjoyed the same profit as those areas already herein mentioned, then milk here would sell for 30 cents or better per quart.

In the last paragraph of Mr. Burke's letter he states that an order is being prepared for the entire State of Florida and that it is not anticipated that this order will increase the general level of retail prices and "its primary purpose will be to establish a more uniform pattern of prices" by which he undoubtedly means that relief will not be given and that Office of Price Administration has again failed to understand and solve the milk problem in Florida. I am wondering if Mr. Burke will explain to your satisfaction why Florida is the last area to be considered in the adjustment of milk prices when it was undoubtedly from the onset the most critical of all areas from a fluid-milk standpoint.

Thanking you for your consideration and with very best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. FICHT,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, I bring the above communications to your attention to emphasize the fact that this is not a matter of whim or passing interest but is a matter which vitally concerns the food security of the war and other personnel of Florida and, for that matter, the people of the entire country. It is not the intent of Congress that administrative agencies of the Government should either through technicalities or mal- or biased administration do injury to the American people. O. P. A.'s administration of ceiling price legislation as affects the milk producers of Florida is doing injury to the war effort and to America in general. It is forcing dairymen out of business; it is causing dairy herds to be slaughtered for beef; it is depriving soldiers, sailors, babies, and the ordinary citizens of Florida of necessary food. It is a mystery to me as to why the O. P. A. officials and/or Judge Vinson cannot heed the situation when they have presented to them actual facts as to the bankruptcy and going out of business of these dairymen. It is definite that they have been fully advised in the premises. It is definite that they do understand the plight in which these dairymen are situated. It is, in my opinion, definite that they have the power to increase milk producers' ceiling prices in Florida adequately to enable these men to continue in the production of this all-essential food.

Producers' milk ceiling price in Florida was frozen long ago, yet the price which they pay for dairy feed, equipment, and other elements going into production has regularly and consistently advanced. The price which they must pay for labor has necessarily increased. Employees in many instances have nothing to offer for sale and for aid to the war effort except their own labor. The laborer is entitled to his hire. It is just and proper that dairymen of our State have increased and paid more wages to their employees. In spite of these increases, many employees have left dairy service and gone into services which pay more. For this they are not to be censured. One is entitled to the right to seek and gain employment in such war service as may pay him more for his labor and enable him to better provide for his family, to buy War bonds, and to make himself and his services more strongly felt in the all-embracing and comprehensive war effort.

Now if O. P. A. can allow the feed sellers an increase on their sales price to dairymen, why does not the O. P. A. have sufficient wisdom to allow an increase in the sale price of milk to such an extent at least as to enable these Florida dairymen to continue production?

My colleagues, I urge that you join forces with us in Florida in an effort to exterminate such mis- and mal-administration of O. P. A. It is becoming all too apparent that we must resort to congressional remedy by taking away by act of Congress O. P. A.'s producers' price ceiling fixing powers. Their practices and policies in many instances, and particularly in the Florida milk case, are throttling, lessening, and destroying production. These practices are intensifying food shortages throughout the country and, while at the same time, food production increase is the need of America and the war effort. Your cooperation is urged.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman from Michigan speak with regard to the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws. I respect the gentleman from Michigan. I believe he is speaking that which he believes. I must say that I disagree with him 100 percent.

This issue is one I have thought about and prayed about. I believe it is more far-reaching than any bill that has come before this Congress for a long, long time, perhaps since the declaration of war. Ordinarily I vote to restrict immigration. My theories on immigration do not coincide with those of some other Members of the House. I dare say I have voted contrary to the vote of the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], more times than I have voted with him. I would vote now to restrict practically all immigration for a period of 5 or 10 years after the war, until we can see what it is all about and what the implications are, but I also believe it is important that we repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act.

I have just one request of the Members who have carried the ball on the floor in the years gone by for restriction of immigration. I hope they will read the testimony of all the witnesses and particularly that of Admiral Yarnell and several other military men before they commit themselves publicly. I think they will find they must go along with this bill.

I am the father of two little children. I cannot see it any other way than that the future is black if all of the yellow and brown men of Asia turn against us. I believe one of the most important things we have to do is to see to it that our war in the Pacific does not end up as a race war. I think this war is going

to get more vicious and more barbarous as the months go on. I believe the news reports indicate that. We must hold China as our ally, not only now, but in all the years to come, but particularly right now.

For 5 long years the Chinese have resisted invasion. With disease, hunger, and military defeat staring them in the face day after day, the Japanese say to them, "Why are you people such saps? The United States is against you. There is not one of you that can lawfully enter the United States." They know that is true.

If China capitulates and joins Japan, all Asia will go with her. If I can remove or lessen that danger by voting to allow 105—and that is the correct number—Chinese to enter this country lawfully each year, I am going to do it.

I think this measure will save innumerable lives of our boys in the war in the Pacific. I am convinced of that. I respect the individual who has a different view, but as for me, I am willing to follow Admiral Yarnell and many others who have said that it will greatly strengthen the hand of China, it will enable their Government to hang on and carry on this war against Japan.

In view of some of the riffraff we have let into this country from Europe, I am not going by my vote to refuse to allow these 105 Chinese to enter this country, and thus give Japan a weapon that they can use so effectively against our greatest fighting ally in this war for our survival. After all, there is a limit to what people can stand. We found that out on Bataan and Corregidor. There is a limit to what human souls and human bodies can stand. We need to take this weapon away from Japan, not to help China, but to help the United States.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues on the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization who are opposed to this bill will review their position. I am not here to say that I want to stand on our position of the last 60 years. I am not here to say that Germans and Italians should be able to continue to come to this country. I know what some of them did who came here after the last war. Under our present quota system a quota can be had for Mussolini to come to this country—Mussolini, who ravished Ethiopia. That is our historical immigration policy. A quota can be had for Hitler. I am not for that. I am for restricting our immigration. If we cut the quotas down 90 percent, let the Chinese take their cut. But let us not bar them and let others come into our country.

Every witness who spoke for this bill who has visited China and who has an understanding of the problem has repeatedly stated that the Chinese understand and grant to the United States the right to stop all immigration if we do it for domestic reasons, because of our unemployment, for instance. If we restrict all immigration in order to provide employment for our own people, and shut the doors, the Chinese will not object, but they do object to our letting 153,000 other people come into this country every year and not one Chinese.

This issue is too closely tied to the war. It gives Japan too much of a weapon. I firmly believe that to oppose this bill is to flirt with the lives of thousands of our soldiers and with the future of our country. I am not going to vote to shut out 105 Chinese. I have confidence in this House. Anyone who says this is a wedge to lift the bars on all immigration insults the House and the American people. The American people will not stand for it. But the American people do want a fair deal for China and they want to save the lives of all the American boys possible. Admiral Yarnell, whose testimony is on page 2778 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, says that the enactment of this bill will save the lives of our boys.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, in line with this discussion, I point out something typical of what this means for the war effort alone. Time magazine, in a recent issue, published a reproduction of a pamphlet, which is typical propaganda, which the Japanese are using in the Orient. I think this House ought to know just what they are saying. That leaflet reads as follows, and I ask you gentlemen to pay particular attention to the last sentence:

America is China's ally. Americans say they love and admire the Chinese. But can you go to America, can you become citizens? No. American's don't want you. They just want you to do their fighting. Their Exclusion Act names you and says you are unfit for American citizenship. If Generalissimo Chiang really has influence in America, why has he not had this stigma erased from American law? There will be no such discrimination against you in the greater east Asia coprosperity sphere.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program, and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. JARMAN, for 1 week, on account of illness in family.

Mr. SCOTT, on account of official business, at the request of Mr. KUNKEL.

To Mrs. LUCE, for Monday and Tuesday, June 14 and 15, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1258. An act to name certain locks in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1563. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order heretofore adopted, adjourned until Monday, June 14, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Monday, June 14, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear representatives of Office of Price Administration. (Hearings for June 9 canceled.)

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Thursday, June 17, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear drug witnesses. On Friday, June 18, at 2 p. m., to hear newsprint and paper witnesses.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2620, a bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives of the United States, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m., on Wednesday, June 16, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The subcommittee on unemployment insurance of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings on Thursday, June 24,

1943, at 10 a. m., committee prints Nos. 1 and 2, dated June 7, 1943, relative to unemployment insurance for merchant seamen.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

489. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the War Food Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Bernice B. Cooper, junior clerk-typist, Weatherford, Tex., Rural Rehabilitation Office, Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WRIGHT: Committee on Banking and Currency. Minority views on H. R. 2869. A bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 525, pt. II). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BYRNE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1206. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments," approved August 14, 1937; without amendment (Rept. No. 538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1622. A bill to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska, at Anchorage, Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 2926. A bill to authorize the designation of retired justices for service on the Supreme Court of the United States when necessary to obtain a quorum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWABE:

H. R. 2927. A bill providing for a preliminary examination and survey of Osage River and tributaries, Missouri and Kansas, with a view to the control of their floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 2928. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2931 (by request). A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make awards of compensation or pension retroactive to date of discharge or death in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 2932. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. Res. 258. Resolution providing funds for the investigation authorized by House Resolution 38; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention to frame a Federal constitution for world government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 2929. A bill for the relief of Clara A. Andresen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 2930. A bill for the relief of Yellow Cab Transit Co. and Equitable Fire & Marine Insurance Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 2933. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith Schmersahl; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2934. A bill for the relief of S. H. Kress & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1536. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 49 citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, favoring enactment of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1537. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. C. N. Price and 20 citizens of Madison, Wis., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, transportation or sale of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1538. Also, petition of Mrs. N. E. Hatfield and 23 citizens of Oakland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1539. Also, petition of B. C. Loar and 100 citizens of Independence, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1540. Also, petition of Mrs. A. W. Yocum and 84 citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1541. Also, petition of Mae Copeland and 133 citizens of Rockford, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1542. Also, petition of L. M. Fisher and 92 citizens of Washington, D. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, transportation, and sale of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1543. Also, petition of Cora Martin and 18 members of the Conversation Club of Wilmington, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1544. Also, petition of Alma Kilmer and 63 citizens of Fort Lauderdale, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1545. Also, petition of George H. Bauerle and 145 citizens of Nampa, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1546. Also, petition of P. N. Yoder and 20 citizens of Medina, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1547. Also, petition of Dr. Glenn C. James and 159 citizens of Miami, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1548. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition transmitted by Jennie Lake, of Rives Junction, Mich., and signed by 19 other residents of the community, urging enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1549. Also, petition signed by Marie Finch, of Addison, Mich., and 30 other residents of the community, urging enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1550. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of Mrs. John L. Sebring, of Columbus, Ohio, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1551. Also, petition of Albert Schwenkel and 39 other residents of Franklin County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1552. By Mr. GREEN: Petition of L. D. Lowe, Bessie Lowe, Winnie E. Johnson, and others, of Clermont, Fla., favoring passage of House bill 2082, by Mr. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JUNE 12, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of mercy, Thou art also the God of law. Through tragedy and tears the stern fact puts its relentless hand upon us that men do not gather grapes of thorns nor figs of thistles. In this golden season of seedtime and harvest as sowers go forth to sow, teach us anew the solemn lesson written in the very cells of our bodies and in the structure of the world, that as a man sows so shall the reaping be. In these National Halls where laws are enacted may we be very conscious of that one law that cannot be revoked, "He that soweth the wind shall reap the whirlwind; he that soweth destruction shall reap destruction." If we sow to the flesh we shall of the flesh reap corruption; if we sow to the spirit we shall of the spirit reap life everlasting. May we never imagine that the operation of that law is postponed to some far-off distant day. We confess with shame that what we reap today in bitterness, in starvation and slaughter of millions, in all the disruption of our common life, is the harvest of the selfish seed that we the nations of the world have sown.

Let the chastisements of Thy law be our teachers. Strip us of our boastful illusions. Open our eyes to the evils among us that we condemn in others. May we scatter seeds of thoughtful kindness, of generous good will, of universal justice, for our reaping by and by, so that, instead of the thorn with its wounding blade, shall come up the fir tree with its healing shade. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, June 11, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Pepper
Andrews	Gurney	Radcliffe
Austin	Hatch	Reed
Bailey	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Scrugham
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bridges	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maloney	Wallgren
Danaher	Maybank	Walsh
Davis	Mead	Wheeler
Eastland	Millikin	Wherry
Ellender	Moore	White
Ferguson	Murdock	Wiley
George	Murray	Willis
Gerry	Nye	Wilson
Gillette	O'Daniel	
Green	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is a member of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and is therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced his signature to the following enrolled bills, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 1258. An act to name certain locks in the St. Marys River at the falls, Michigan; and

H. R. 2753. An act making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON COOSA RIVER WATERSHED ABOVE ROME, GA.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, report of a survey of the Coosa River watershed in Georgia and Tennessee, describing an investigation of a program of run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention in aid of flood control (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Department of the Navy (5), The National Archives, and Federal Works Agency which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Emporia, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS OF CITIZENS OF ORANGE COUNTY, FLA.—REGULATION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC

Mr. ANDREWS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Orange County, Fla., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached, as follows:

To the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

Whereas in the War Act of 1917, the Congress of the United States forbade the sale of any intoxicating drink, including beer, in any of the canteens of Army or Navy, or nearby camp areas; and

Whereas the Brewers' Digest for May 1941, because of beer being made available for Army camps, stated, "Here is the chance for brewers to cultivate a taste for beer in millions of young men who will eventually constitute the largest beer-consuming section of our population"; and

Whereas the drinking of beer creates a taste for alcohol and is a contributing fac-

tor in immoral conduct, which leads to venereal disease: Now therefore

We, the undersigned citizens of Orange County, Fla., do respectfully petition you to reenact legislation similar to that of 1917, and so give the young men of today the protection their fathers had in 1917. (Signatures omitted.)

STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a telegram which I have just received from Harvey C. Fremming, regional director, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Kansas City, Kans., urging the defeat of the Smith-Connally bill, which is today before the Senate.

There being no objection, the telegram was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, KANS., *June 11, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

For and on behalf of the membership of the Congress of Industrial Organizations in your State, we urgently request that you vote against the Smith-Connally bill, which will be up for consideration by the Senate on next Monday. We believe conference report repugnant to the best interests of labor as well as free enterprises.

Regards,

HARVEY C. FREMMING,
Regional Director, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Kansas City, Kans.

THE COAL-STRIKE SITUATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter which I have received from the Board of County Commissioners of Douglas County, Kans., with its enclosure, and also another letter which I have received from C. B. Russell, mayor of the city of Lawrence, Kans., urging that immediate action be taken to settle the labor controversy in the coal industry in order that the maximum production of coal in this country may be immediately available.

There being no objection, the letters were received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOUGLAS COUNTY, KANS.,
COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE,
Lawrence, Kans., June 9, 1943.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Enclosed please find a copy of a letter sent to the President of the United States by the Board of County Commissioners of Douglas County, Kans.

This letter expresses the feeling of the county board, and is urging that immediate action be taken to settle the labor controversy in the coal industry. We believe that delivering supplies to our armed forces and winning this war is the most important problem confronting the American citizen, and firmly oppose any move that will hinder production.

Respectfully yours,

GLENNA D. DAVIS,
Secretary to the Board of County Commissioners.

JUNE 7, 1943.

The PRESIDENT,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Board of County Commissioners of Douglas County, Kans., urges the President of the United States to take immediate decisive action, in line with the recommendation of the War Labor Board, to settle the labor controversy in the coal industry.

We believe that we express the almost unanimous sentiment in this community when we say that there must be no delay, by any individuals or groups, in the maximum production and delivery of war materials to our armed forces.

Respectfully yours,

L. H. GRIFFITH,
Chairman.
ED JOHNSON,
M. N. PENNY,
Board of County Commissioners, Douglas County, Kans.

CITY OF LAWRENCE, KANS., *June 8, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The city of Lawrence, Kans., through its governing body has directed me to urge you to employ all necessary and lawful means at your command to restore the maximum production of coal in this country.

We believe that no group or leaders of any group should be permitted to jeopardize the production and transportation of war essentials and that the interests of the Nation are paramount to those of any particular industry.

Respectfully,

C. B. RUSSELL, *Mayor.*

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 1225. A bill granting a pension to Constance Eager; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1226. A bill for the relief of Charles T. Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

THE GASOLINE AND PETROLEUM SITUATION IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on June 3 I addressed what I thought was a very courteous and reasonable letter to the Petroleum Administrator, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, regarding the gasoline crisis in the New England and Eastern States. Nine days have now gone by without my receiving a reply. I have always taken pains to pay careful attention to his requests which have been made to me as a member of various committees on which I have served, and recently I took a position favorable to a matter which he favored. I hope that by inserting this letter in the RECORD it may come to his attention and that I may receive a reply. I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD, and I also ask that two editorials, one from the Worcester (Mass.) Gazette and the other from the Springfield Evening Union, be printed in the RECORD along with the letter.

There being no objection, the letter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
June 3, 1943.

Hon. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Administrator for War,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: Ever since the outbreak of war the eastern section of the country, and the New England States in particular, have been doing without a great many things upon which their normal daily life depended. The most conspicuous of these things are petroleum products in general and gasoline in particular.

The people of New England and Massachusetts are not only willing but eager to make any sacrifice which is caused by the winning of the war and which will lighten, if only for a moment, the burden borne by the fighting men. No one, consequently, begrudges the fact that gasoline which would normally be used by civilians in New England is now being used for airplanes and mechanized equipment in the combat areas.

To be deprived of gasoline because of bad planning or sectional favoritism is, as I am sure you will agree, another matter and one which I know you would not consciously sanction. It is in this regard that the duty is imposed on all of us to be sure that every deprivation of gasoline is due to the war effort and to the war effort alone.

In the many conferences which I have had with officials of your Administration, I have been told repeatedly that all available methods of transportation were now in full use bringing petroleum products from the source of supply to the East. In fact, official testimony is clear on the point that all available pipe lines, all available tank cars, and all available ships are in use. I am disposed to accept that statement.

I desire, however, to interrogate you on the matter of tank trucks. I am advised that there are hundreds of thousands of tank trucks in this country which are used throughout the United States to make local deliveries. It seems self-evident that if the rationing applied to the Eastern States were applied to the rest of the country, there would be a much smaller need for tank trucks in that part of the United States not now severely rationed. Of course, if it is the policy of the Government to maintain a business-as-usual gasoline situation in the rest of the United States, the existing supply of tank trucks must remain where they are.

I submit, however, that it is only fair to impose the same restrictions on the whole country as are now imposed on the eastern seaboard so as to make available tank trucks for supply for the East. The result would then be that the East would have a little more than it now has and the rest of the country would have a little less.

I know you agree that sectionalism has no place in a matter of this kind and hope that this proposition will appeal to your sense of justice. I await your reaction with interest.

Sincerely yours,

H. C. LODGE, Jr.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Gazette of June 9, 1943]

LESS STUDY, MORE ACTION

The letter of Senator LODGE to Fuel Administrator Ickes sums up what the average eastern motorist thinks about gasoline rationing. Senator LODGE says large numbers of tank trucks cart gasoline from place to place in the West where motorists can drive pretty much as they please. He proposes that the West be placed under the same gasoline re-

strictions as the East, releasing some of those trucks for moving gasoline this way.

Meanwhile there is talk in Washington that pleasure driving may soon be banned in several Western States. But we have heard such talk before. Every time New England Members of Congress protest the injustice of the present arrangement, somebody in Washington hints that gasoline curtailment will be made uniform throughout the country. Plans are always being studied, but there it stops.

We hope Senator LODGE gets somewhere with his proposal. If he doesn't, and if the same old buck passing continues, with the same old talk of studying the situation, he and his New England colleagues should find a way to blow the lid off the whole unfair system. The East has been patient long enough under this bluffing.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Evening Union of June 9, 1943]

"GAS" AND JUSTICE

The letter sent recently by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, to Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Administrator for War, is so eminently fair and restrained that it should impel Mr. Ickes to pay some attention, even though Mr. LODGE happens to be a Republican, and from New England, and Mr. Ickes likes neither a Republican nor a New Englander.

However, Mr. LODGE does not plead for special consideration for the East, nor for New England. All he asks is that special consideration for the rest of the country be discontinued, and that Mr. Ickes quit treating the East as if it were not part of the United States.

Mr. LODGE points out that the people of New England are willing to sacrifice everything, in order that the fighting men may have what they need. He declares that we do not begrudge the fact that gasoline which would normally be used by civilians in New England is now being used in the warfare. But, he goes on to say: "To be deprived of gasoline because of bad planning or sectional favoritism is, as I am sure you will agree, another matter." Although Mr. LODGE agrees that something is being done to relieve the eastern seaboard of its gasoline scarcity, he believes there is vast room for improvement, and emphasizes that tank trucks now delivering gasoline in other parts of the country are not being used to help bring gasoline into New England.

"I submit," he says, "that it is only fair to impose the same restrictions on the whole country as are now imposed on the eastern seaboard so as to make available tank trucks for supply for the East. The result would then be that the East would have a little more than it now has and the rest of the country would have a little less." Mr. LODGE concludes his appeal to Mr. Ickes by saying he realizes that Mr. Ickes agrees that "sectionalism has no place in a matter of this kind."

Of course, it hasn't. But, from the very first, Mr. Ickes has given it a strong first place. The result is that there has not been equitable distribution of petroleum products; the East has received less than it should have received; the rest of the country more.

And that is neither justice nor good sense.

VICTORY POTATO SHOW

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there has been a call by the President for production of food throughout the country. We need a great increase in food. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I received from the St. Louis Agricultural Society of Washburn, Wis., indicating that they are to hold on September 18 what they call a potato V show. I believe any move to foster food production merits notice and approval.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POTATO V SHOW,
ST. LOUIS AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY,
Washburn, Wis., June 9, 1943.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is a handbill carrying details concerning our Victory potato show.

Our primary purpose is to stimulate Victory gardens and we are happy to say at this time we have received Nation-wide publicity in praise of our venture.

We should like to have a word of encouragement from you and we are even so bold as to ask you to give our show a boost on the Senate floor, if that would not be contrary to Senate rules.

Since the handbills were printed an additional prize of $25 has been included, coming from the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, of Des Moines, to be awarded to the family raising and preserving the most garden stuff, keeping in mind the relation of this year's production to past years in each instance, thereby inciting the regular gardeners to do more.

We have heard something of your very fine farm and we should like to have you enter our contest. You come from the real potato area of Wisconsin and a bushel of your potatoes might win.

The Madison Square Boys' Club of New York City has written us to the effect that they plan to enter in all divisions of the show. These boys are cultivating acres of potatoes this year as their share in the Nation's program of production.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Yours for victory,
ELIZABETH HAWKES,
Director.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER BEFORE THE DRUG, CHEMICAL, AND ALLIED TRADES SECTION OF NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him at the annual banquet of the Drug, Chemical, and Allied Trades Section of the New York Board of Trade, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, March 12, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY JESSE H. JONES AT OFFICIAL INSPECTION OF THE SYNTHETIC RUBBER PLANTS INSTITUTE, WEST VIRGINIA

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, at the official inspection of the Synthetic Rubber Plants Institute, West Virginia, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW CURRENT TAX PAYMENT ACT—EXPLANATION BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, JOHN L. SULLIVAN

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. John L. Sullivan, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in explanation of the new Current Tax Payment Act of 1943, broadcast over the radio in Washington, D. C., on June 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

TEAMWORK IN A TROUBLED WORLD—ADDRESS BY ROBERT H. HINCKLEY AND EDITORIAL FROM THE ROSWELL (N. MEX.) MORNING DISPATCH

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Teamwork in a Troubled World," delivered by Hon. Robert H. Hinckley at the commencement exercises of the New Mexico Military Institute, Roswell, N. Mex., June 1, 1943, and an editorial from the Roswell Morning Dispatch of June 3, 1943, relating to the address entitled "America—And Confusion," which appear in the Appendix.]

THE MISSION TO MOSCOW—EDITORIAL BY JOSEPHUS DANIELS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Mission to Moscow," written by Josephus Daniels and published in the Raleigh News and Observer of June 10, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MISSION TO WASHINGTON—ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mission to Washington," by Frank C. Waldrop, from the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

DOWNY MILDEW OR BLUE MOLD—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM G. HOLMAN

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Downy Mildew or Blue Mold," written by William G. Holman, of Greensboro, N. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

CARE OF CHILDREN OF MOTHERS EMPLOYED IN WAR AREAS

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Mr. William F. Motavon, director of the legal department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, on June 8, with respect to Senate bill 1130, providing for the care of children of mothers employed in war areas in the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

PREVENTION OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask that during the few remarks I shall make I may not be interrupted. I make the request because of the serious nature of my feelings when I rise to speak upon the subject before the Senate.

In respect to industry-labor relations there is in my thought, as there is in the thought of every other Senator present, and of every other loyal American citizen, that in wartime there can be but one union in America, and that the Union of the United States of America. Therefore I cannot and will not speak from the standpoint of one who is taking sides in a present-day dispute, or from the standpoint of one who has decided that there must be enacted some

character of punitive legislation in order to overcome the failure on the part of certain persons, as evidenced by their actions, to realize that there is in wartime but one union, and that the Union of the United States of America.

I do not wish to pass judgment on anyone; I do not even wish to pass judgment upon the conference report; but I do wish to point out in all seriousness, that, if the conference report shall become law, there will be a serious break in what has been in the past one of the finest things about our industry and labor relations. The break will be that if the conference report shall become law we will move one step further away from the voluntary system for labor and the voluntary system for industry in our country.

Of course, I know that in making a statement of that kind I shall be answered with a question, How can there be any voluntary system of any kind when we are so tied up with prohibitory laws defining one action on the part of corporations and another action on the part of individuals? I know it will be said that labor alone has been unrestrained so far as law is concerned. But please remember that, in America's industry and labor relations, until the Supreme Court decision on the National Labor Relations Act, the Federal Government as an entity did not move into the labor field, that there were the restraints of the conflict between the jurisdiction of the States and the jurisdiction of the Nation.

Mr. President, let me call attention to the fact that when the National Labor Relations Act became law some of the ablest attorneys in the United States urged corporations and other employers of the United States not to obey the law; they went out of their way to stress that the law should be ignored, because the law was in their minds unconstitutional. We had the extremely interesting situation in our country of a group of lawyers actually taking themselves as seriously as the Supreme Court of the United States, and advising their clients to act in opposition to a law.

Mr. President, it is only since the national labor relations law was enacted that, as a Nation, we have been able to move into the labor field, and the progress which has been made since that time has been great beyond anyone's anticipation. I think every thoughtful person should realize that fact.

Another point which I should like to emphasize is that, due to our constitutional structure, of the 28 or 29 treaties entered into between the countries of the earth under the auspices of the International Labor Office, up to date the United States has been able to adhere to only seven or eight of the treaties, because of the theories entertained in our land in regard to jurisdiction, that the United States could not assume jurisdiction which belonged to the States.

Mr. President, aside from the reason I have mentioned, that such action is the taking of one step toward doing away with voluntary-ism in our country, I wish to state another reason why I shall oppose adoption of the conference report. I was a member of the industry-labor conference which the President of the United States called together immediately after Pearl Harbor in connection with which an agreement was entered into by the industrialists present and the labor representatives present that during the war there would be no strikes and no lock-outs, and that all disputes would be settled by peaceful means. I have said time and again that that was probably the most constructive action taken in the whole history of industry-labor relations in the United States. That action became a fundamental principle in connection with the new way of carrying on industry-labor relations in our country. The adoption of the conference report would destroy the efficacy of that agreement. It would bring the right to strike back again into the sphere of industrial relations, back into the sphere of action on the part of labor unions. That right, of course, has never been taken away. It is guaranteed in law. It cannot be taken away, because it is, as every laboring man knows, his only final resort in making an appeal to justice. It is his only resort to justice when everything else has been removed. But under the technique worked out in the conference report of permitting strikes in industries after a vote shall have been taken, there is reasserted the right to strike in such a way, and government itself invites labor leaders to break the sanctity of the no-strike agreement, which, it is true, some labor leaders have failed to recognize, but which was entered into by their representatives when the industry-labor conference met.

Mr. President, the step represented by adoption of the conference report is a dangerous one for the Congress of the United States to take. Some persons have said that the curbing of the right to strike by voluntary action, and the leaving of all disputes to peaceful settlement, was simply for the duration. What I shall now say has, I believe, no bearing upon the conference report, and it is hardly germane to my general remarks, but I wish to say that as the author of the no-strike motion in the conference to which I have referred, I deliberately left out of it any reference to the war and to the duration, because I am as much opposed to strikes as is anyone else on earth.

Strikes are uneconomic in their nature. They bring sadness to innocent people. They bring distress to the women and the children of the workers. Strikes are extremely ineffective even in the long run toward bringing about changes in industry-labor relations. They are very much more ineffective than the method of collective bargaining, which has been made use of by so many unions in dealing with their employers, by reason of which, for a generation or for two generations, there has not been resort to strike on the part of those who have availed themselves of collective bargaining. Labor has gone forward under that peaceful arrangement.

The peaceful method is always more constructive than the forceful method. That statement holds good as between nations as well as in industrial relations. We all know that after the war we must adjust our country first of all to peaceful relations. We must, after the war, count our loss in dead, our loss in wounded, our loss in missing. There is bloodletting even in industrial relations, as we know from our experience. The loss of life and the loss of property, in war as well as at times in industry-labor relations, are never regained, although a point contended for may have been won.

Mr. President, I hope I have said enough to convince my brethren in the Senate that it is with the deepest sincerity that I oppose the conference report. I oppose it because I have a fundamental belief in the institutions of our country, and that those institutions can best be enlarged and developed by peaceful action, by voluntary action, even if it does seem to take a longer time than might be taken if we were to follow the course which the adoption of the conference report would permit because, Mr. President, it provides for a right of review in the district courts, thus again opening up court actions. It may be denied that the whole field of industry-labor relations will be opened up again, but the adoption of the conference report would again open the courts to the field of industrial disputes. There would be endless litigation and innumerable questions remaining unsettled.

We all know that the processes of administrative law are slow enough. Let us not take a step backward and reopen the district courts of our country to industry-labor disputes, even to review actions.

Mr. President, I cannot help but repeat that I think it is a mistake for the Congress of the United States to turn its back upon a great forward-looking principle, and I cannot help but say that if we take the proposed action I am sure we will spread a spirit of ill feeling among the hundreds of thousands, yea, the millions of American working people, who are doing their utmost, not only to win the war, but to produce for our country itself, for never in the history of our country have so many persons been working, never in the history of our country has so much been produced, never in its history has there been such general satisfaction with the way our Government is being conducted, and never has there been such satisfaction with industry-labor relations.

Mr. President, there are, of course, exceptions to that in a country of 130,000,000 people. When its industry-labor relations were in a condition of flux, and there was an attempt to adjust from State control to Federal control, and the adjustment was made in a few years,

there was unrest due to the change, and due to the war, and there was uncertainty. An attempt was made to adjust the 130,000,000 people of the country to the situation, as though they were all one man. The adjustment process has been a delicate one. There have been fluctuations in prices, and, sad to relate, Mr. President, there are in the United States some persons who do not believe that there should be simply one big union throughout the country during the war, namely, the Union of the United States of America. There are thousands in all walks of life, in industry, and naturally, in labor, who must be termed the "advantage-takers." There are those who sit back when it has come to a question of collective bargaining, feeling that if the situation would continue long enough the President would have to use his authority and take over a plant, and that then, of course, by taking it over, the judgment with respect to a controversy would be on the side of those who sit back. Such persons believed that then there would be confusion, and then there would be legislation, and, perhaps, they felt they would regain some of the advantages they had previously lost. That is a description of what may be true of some of our 130,000,000 people, not a description of any given case. There have been abuses, there have been racketeers, on both sides; but there are laws against racketeering. There has been dishonesty, but there are laws against dishonesty. We must not assume that all the racketeers and all the dishonesty are connected with our labor-industrial strife.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am constrained to vote against the conference report with respect to Senate bill 796. Fully recognizing the gravity of the labor dispute in the bituminous coal industry, I am very much opposed to having the Senate pass legislation which would drastically alter the whole governmental machinery for the handling of labor disputes.

Perhaps I have not been entirely fair in the preceding sentence. The Senator from Texas could chide me for uttering it. I know that the bill has been pending during two Congresses. I know there has been an honest effort to attempt to bring about an adjustment by law, and I know that I have been opposed to bringing about an adjustment by law. However, Mr. President, because of what has been in the hearts and souls of some of us and in the minds of certain newspaper writers, the strike in the coal mines has caused a stimulus which has produced emotional voting on the part of Members of Congress. I realize when I make that statement that probably I am criticizing myself; because if one Member of Congress votes emotionally, so might any other Member of Congress. I pray that the day may come when we all shall be reasonable, when we all shall be intellectual in that which we say and in the way we vote.

Mr. President, I think one of the most wicked of all things that have been done has been the attempt on the part of certain lobbyists in regard to this legislation to use their influence upon the minds and souls of Members of Congress, and their attempt to use threats upon Congressmen in regard to their votes on a particular measure. To follow such a course is not Americanism. While, of course, I realize that every one of my colleagues lives above that, if they did not live above it they would die of dizziness because they would be in such a whirl with themselves they would never be able to think straight.

The report goes on to say that these persons will be punished if they vote in a certain way. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, after deliberation, after pleading a cause, if I did not bring agreement to my side, I should be perfectly satisfied with the honesty of the votes of my colleagues. To be sure, I should not have changed my mind; in my mind I might say they were unwise, but I should never accuse any of them of being unpatriotic or disloyal or untrue to themselves.

Only sections 3, 4, 5, and 6 have any conceivable bearing on the mining situation. The bill recommended by the conferees is substantially the bill which passed the House of Representatives last week after hearings of only the most summary character. It contains substantially all the provisions which were characterized by the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and the War Production Board—the agencies primarily responsible for the production of war materials—as tending to interfere with production and procurement, and to stimulate industrial unrest.

Mr. President, in the use of the preceding sentence I should be fair to myself and to my colleagues. We know that at the hearings held by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, certain representatives of the departments appeared and spoke in favor of the bill. We know that it has been charged that those representatives, in sending a letter at the last minute against the bill, probably were not convinced of the correctness of their stand in sending the letter. I say that out of fairness to everyone, because the letter was sent to the House of Representatives; and representatives of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission did make the declaration about the bill, not about the conference report.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, did the Senator indicate that he did not want to be interrupted during the course of his remarks?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes, Mr. President; I asked that I not be interrupted.

Mr. President, the conference report also contains the same sections which the Government agencies that were intimately concerned with the maintenance of industrial peace testified would impair the effectiveness of existing machinery for the orderly settlement of labor disputes. We are asked to adopt this legislation not only in the face of the unanimous judgment of those agencies but against the background of wartime industrial relations in which the total of man-days lost because of labor disputes has been smaller than at any other time in our industrial history. I have a right to emphasize that point. I emphasize it because I believe that the voluntary agreement relative to industrial relations has in general been respected by both labor and industry.

As I have said, shortly after the declaration of war the President convened a conference of industry and labor, with a view to securing an agreement which would maintain uninterrupted production during the war. I participated in that conference as associate moderator. The conference report runs squarely counter to the national policy embodied in the voluntary and unconditional no-strike agreement which was the fruit of that conference, and which represents the cornerstone of our wartime industrial structure, and which, as I have said, I hope will represent the cornerstone of our peacetime industrial structure as well. When the House amendments to the Connally bill were reported from the House Committee on Military Affairs, objection was made to certain sections of the bill which, in effect, seemed to repudiate that agreement by legalizing strikes, provided that certain procedures with respect to a waiting period and a strike ballot were followed. Those sections have virtually been reincorporated in section 8 of the conference report. Although the language has been changed in some particulars, the statement of the House and Senate managers concedes that section 8 embodies substantially sections 2 and 3 of the House amendments. In other words, the proposed legislation seems to repudiate the President's statement of policy embodied in Executive Order 9107, proclaiming all strikes contrary to the public interest in time of war, and by implication would also appear to release the labor organizations from their no-strike pledge if the formalities set forth in section 8 (a) of the conference report are observed.

Mr. President, here I am reiterating the point I have made as to the seriousness of attempting to break down an agreement which in general is functioning and which in general is working well to the advantage of our country.

In place of the present unequivocal national policy against stoppage, the conferees have substituted a mere requirement of a notice and a waiting period of 30 days. After the 30-day period, the National Labor Relations Board would be directed to poll all employees involved in the dispute, to ascertain whether they would permit an interruption of war production. While the section provides penalties for failing to observe those formalities, there is no penalty or even an implied disapproval of

a strike called after the waiting period. Moreover, there is neither penalty nor disapproval of strikes called after the majority of the employees have voted not to interrupt war production, nor is any penalty whatever provided against the strikers in cases in which no prior notice has been filed. In such cases, the only penalty—a civil suit for damages—would run against the representative who should have given the notice, but who failed to do so. In such an instance it would be difficult, if not impossible, to establish to the satisfaction of a jury that the representative should have known in advance that the stoppage was going to occur. This section is apparently based on the popular misconception that strikes would be universally eliminated if the rank and file were permitted to vote. It ignores the fact that the great bulk of interruptions which have occurred in wartime were wildcat strikes, instigated by rank-and-file workers against the wishes of responsible labor unions.

Mr. President, it should be said on my part that the labor leaders who have honestly stood by the pledge which their leaders made and who have worked faithfully to attempt to put down the "quickie," the sit-down strike, the quick walk-out, and the resort to irresponsible strikes, have worked with all the loyalty displayed on the part of other American citizens. They were sincere when they brought about the agreement, and I wish to testify to their sincerity. They have been sincere in attempting to see the agreement lived up to; and their sincerity needs commendation rather than condemnation. With the exception of the coal strike, I am informed that not a single strike which has occurred since the no-strike agreement has received the sanction or support of any leader of a national or international union affiliated with the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O.

Let me say a word for the independent unions, because we are interested in all of them. There was complaint on the part of the great independent unions that they were not represented in the industry-labor agreements. I went to the Secretary of Labor on their behalf and said, "Let us have representatives of some of the great independent labor unions." The problem which faced the Secretary of Labor was how to choose. It seemed impossible to choose one without giving offense to others. Representatives of the independent unions have come to my office, and we have talked things over. Every one of them has said, when he has left, "We are going to do our best to stand by that agreement, in spite of the fact that we think we were neglected and forgotten when the agreement was entered into."

In virtually every instance of stoppages, the War Labor Board has been able to get the workers to resume production promptly by calling upon the heads of the internationals to insist upon observance of the no-strike pledge. Let me invite the attention of the Senate to the way in which the War Labor Board has worked. It has accepted the theory and the action of the industry-labor conference to such an extent that it has refused to proceed with a case which has been referred to it until work has been resumed, even though the case is referred after a strike has been started. That great agency has tried to live up to the agreement voluntarily reached by industry and labor.

The conference bill would seem to foster these wildcat strikes, since any employee representative, even a shop steward or local official, could give the notice which would ultimately lead to a legal strike. Or, if the representative was uncertain of what the outcome of a strike vote might be, he could readily engineer a rank-and-file stoppage without any prior notice, and, as I have pointed out, in that case the only possible penalty under the bill would be a dubious suit for damages against the representative for not having given the notice when he should have. The strikers themselves would be immune from damages.

Finally, in the hands of unscrupulous union leaders the serving of notice could be resorted to in order to place pressure on the War Labor Board in even the most trivial disputes. Once such a notice has been given under the provisions of section 8 (2) the War Labor Board must act within 30 days. If it fails to do so, the National Labor Relations Board must forthwith conduct a poll. Since I am informed that there are more than a thousand dispute cases pending before the War Labor Board and its regional boards, and more than 25,000 cases involving proposed wage adjustments, many of them in the form of collective agreements, it can readily be seen that notices and strike ballots may be resorted to in hundreds of plants because of the mere physical impossibility of disposing of so heavy a docket within a 30-day period.

Inevitably, this would lead to so many break-downs in production that the Government would be compelled to take over the operation of scores of plants which could otherwise have adhered to schedules under the existing system.

Mr. President, there is no virtue, even in time of war, in making it necessary for the Government to step in and take over a plant. It is adding another task to an already harassed Government. In the last war chances were not taken in many places. I knew about the placement of troops at various strategic positions in industrial sections of the country, and I know of not a single case where that was not a mistake. It led to a type of unwise coercion which caused on the part of industry and on the part of labor a spirit of resentment in their hearts against the united action on the part of the American people.

Mr. President, we cannot win a war in a half-hearted way. We cannot win a battle with unhappy troops. We cannot bring about great production with unhappy labor. We cannot bring about cooperation in industry with unhappy and coerced industrial leaders. When we turn from the ordinary processes of voluntary action to forced action, we are asking men to assume an unnatural attitude.

It can be foreseen that the balloting will be preceded in many cases by extensive campaigning, thus arousing unrest and disturbing production in vital plants where industrial peace now exists. I am sure I do not have to tell any Senator that campaign periods bring about unrest and uncertainty. Balloting in a plant is a division of sides. There is argument and discussion. There is a complete let-up of the whole-hearted activity toward production.

While it would seem essential that any legislation proposing drastic changes in the present system should at least be clear and unmistakable in its intent, I also note that this section is very vaguely drafted. There is nothing to indicate whether or not the National Labor Relations Board is to conduct a ballot if the demands made by the strikers are illegal, for example, in protest over a wage ceiling or a decision of the War Labor Board itself. Moreover, the proposed strike might arise over an issue in contravention of the National Labor Relations Act, for example, an attempt of a union to secure a bargaining unit deemed inappropriate by the Board, or union recognition in the face of a contract with another union.

Mr. President, that statement is made entirely upon the theory of what might happen. We now have the facts. The Secretary of the Interior imposed a fine upon certain strikers. There have already been strikes against that fine. Whether the strikes are justified is not the question. My only point is that by Government control and coercive action in an attempt to use force in a legal way, we bring about a type of resentment which results in a return to the habit which is generations old, a habit which is bad, a habit which should be overcome, but a habit which, nevertheless, is with us and has been guaranteed in law. Please do not fail to recognize the fact that the strike medium has been recognized by the Congress of the United States as being a justifiable medium. The resort to strike, therefore, the employees can say is right, because the law is on their side. In moral, economic, and social issues, when people resort to a right in law, they do away with some of the finest things in our social life.

Although I have devoted considerable attention to section 8, this section is not

the only portion of the bill which is defective so far as draftsmanship is concerned. For example, the provisions for the seizure and operation of mines and factories are not consistently drafted. Seemingly, the first proviso makes it clear that the President may take over not only plants in which an actual interruption of production by reason of a strike or lock-out has occurred, but also plants in which an interruption is threatened. Nevertheless, the language granting authority to the President is limited to an actual interruption. It is far from certain which of these conflicting provisions is controlling in a specific case.

Section 7, which gives statutory standing to the National War Labor Board, is also by no means free from ambiguity. Although reference is made to Executive Order 9017, under which the Board is now operating, it is not altogether certain whether all the provisions of this order or only some of them are to apply to the practices and procedure of the Board in the future. Similarly, the provisions of section 5 might conceivably involve some overlapping of jurisdiction among governmental agencies in the absence of clarifying language.

As it now stands, section 9, relating to political contributions, retains the same language as section 6 of the House amendment, although the provisions of that amendment received able criticism on the House floor by members of the Judiciary Committee acquainted with the provisions of the Hatch Act. Although the section on its face does not appear to discriminate against labor organizations, since it also forbids contributions by corporations, in reality it is directed primarily at labor groups, as was pointed out, since unincorporated societies such as the National Association of Manufacturers, as well as other business groups, are not affected by it.

Mr. President, in closing I wish to thank my fellow Senators for allowing me to proceed without interruption. I have tried to make a statement which will bear perusal, and one which I hope will justify my vote.

Moreover, Mr. President, I have tried to convince my brothers in the Senate of the fact that by the adoption of this measure we may change a habit of government, as well as a habit of procedure in our industrial labor relations. The change might actually prove fatal in wartime. Let us give credit where credit is due. Let us think of the 50,000,000 workers in the United States and realize the great work which they are doing. Let us think of our neighbors who are war workers, and thank them for the sacrifices they are making. Because of the action of one or two, Mr. President, let us not at this time cast a reflection upon the fine things which our Government, under its leadership, has been able to bring about in our industry-labor relations.

Mr. GUFFEY obtained the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator from Utah does not object, I should like to ask him a question. I have listened with a great deal of interest to his remarks. I am sure all of us appreciate the earnestness with which the Senator from Utah approaches every question. However, I was greatly upset by the remarks of the Senator from Utah concerning the right of judicial review provided for in the conference report. Will the Senator point out to me what he means when he says that the conference report provides for judicial review, if I correctly understood him to that effect?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if I used the words "judicial review" in a formal and legalistic way, I made a deduction which I was not justified in making. I noticed in reading the conference report that the district courts were mentioned, and that appeals could be made to the district courts. The point which I tried to make is that in setting up the administrative agencies, appeals from the decisions of those agencies have gone directly to the circuit court. So far as the initial legal procedure is concerned, that procedure has closed the majority of Federal courts in the country. The administrative courts have been recognized. I am fearful, Mr. President, that if we undertake to write into a law an invitation to make resort to a district court, we will repeat the everlasting irritations with which we are confronted at the present time.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Allow me to add a further word, and then I shall be through. We are talking about something which has not occurred. I hope and pray that my deductions are wrong, because I do not think any Senator wants to go back and start over again the type of litigation which took place in our country before the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I feel greatly confused by the remarks of the Senator from Utah. It was my understanding that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] refused to sign the conference report because every word providing for judicial review or appeal was taken out of the bill. Am I not correct?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me so that I may make reply to the question of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Senators must understand what I meant when I said what I did. I hope I am mistaken in what I said. I hope I am entirely mistaken; but when the words "district court" stand out in one's face, I cannot help but feel that resort to the district court on the part of labor may be had.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. GUFFEY. For what purpose?

Mr. DANAHER. So that I may make reply to the question asked me by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. GUFFEY. Is it to be a brief reply?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. GUFFEY. I do not wish to be interrupted by an all-day argument, but I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Pennsylvania. May I have the attention of the Senator from New Mexico who propounded the question?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. I believe the confusion arose from the remarks of the Senator from Utah because he failed to discern that section 8, subsection (c), refers solely and simply to the duty which is required to be performed under subsection (a). It has no reference whatever to the War Labor Board. It has no reference whatever to any decision of the War Labor Board. It merely means that if anyone is required to perform a duty under subsection (c) of section 8, and willfully fails or refuses to perform that duty, any person who is injured because of that failure or refusal may bring an action in the district court to recover such damage as is attributable to the willful failure or refusal. Have I answered the question to the satisfaction of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HATCH. I am quite sure that what the Senator from Connecticut has stated is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, may I add a word, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the sponsor of the bill, whether there is a unanimous opinion on the part of those three great lawyers that there will not be a reopening of the district courts to industry-labor disputes? If I can make that point, Mr. President, I shall be happy that I made the mistake in my judgment about the bill. I should like that point to be made so firmly and so strongly that no lawyer in the land who would like to take advantage of the situation created by the mere mention of the words "district court" will resort to the court in order to confuse our industry-labor relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah said he would like to have the unanimous opinion of the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Texas, and I think the Senator from Vermont may be included, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Vermont. I think I speak for the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Connecticut and also the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], although he is not present, when I say that there is no jurisdiction whatever conferred by this bill providing for resort to the United States district court, except the one mentioned by the Senator from Connecticut, which is merely the right to go

there for a civil action for damages, and no jurisdiction whatever is given over labor disputes. Does that answer the Senator?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator for making that statement and I hope it will satisfy the lawyers of the country.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure it will.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania indulge me for 1 more minute?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. First, I want to make a brief comment on what the Senator from Utah said. The Senator from Utah is a distinguished member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I am wondering why when we considered the draft bill he did not carry into its consideration the same views he has expressed here, that we could not afford to have an Army that was restless and could not be drafted. I wonder why it is that if we can draft an Army of eight or ten million men for war duty it is a crime to provide, as to workers in war factories which are making the arms for the men in the military forces, that after the Government takes over the factories the workers shall not strike. I am wondering also why the Senator concludes that the passage of a law which affects only those who strike or who violate or break a no-strike agreement is an offense and a reflection on all. This proposed act is no reflection on any laboring man who is doing his job. I realize that millions of them are loyal and patriotic. This proposed law is not intended for them. It is intended for the outlaw. We pass a law against theft, but that does not mean it is a reflection on me; I do not conclude that if a law is passed against stealing that is a reflection on me. It is not a reflection on anyone except a thief. Laws are passed against murder, but I do not become angry at the legislature and say "They reflected on me; they passed a law against murder." It is only a reflection on the man who commits the offense of homicide, or forgery, or any other crime.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I was one of the sponsors of the Selective Service Act and, as the Senator knows, I had much to do with the conference report on the plant seizure provision in the military law on which the proposal of the Senator from Texas is built. There is a difference between drafting men for war purposes and drafting men for industry. I know the Senator realizes those differences. They are legal differences, but the greatest of all of them is that men for the Army are drafted into a disciplined organization. There is no way, even under the most acute type of regimentation tried in countries such as Germany and Italy, to draft labor into the same sort of disciplined organization. If it were not for the discipline, the malcontention in any army, of course, might bring disruption to it.

Mr. President, there is no difference of opinion between the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Texas about the right under the Selective Service Act to do certain things, and I am sufficiently well informed about the views of the Senator from Texas to know that he would hate to see the United States become an industrially and economically regimented country. We all stand against that with all our hearts and souls.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, this is a war bill; it only operates during the war; it only operates on war plants. There is no danger of permanent regimentation.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his usual generosity and kindness in yielding.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the brilliant and able Senator from Utah for the very thoughtful and constructive address he has made on the pending bill, and I wish to say to him that I am in entire accord and in sympathy with his views.

Mr. President, I desire now to address a few remarks to section 9 of the pending bill, the title of which is "Political Contributions by Labor Organizations." I do not see why we should especially pick on labor organizations, in view of the fact, as I think every Member of the Senate knows, that the Hatch Act and other corrupt-practices acts are being violated in every election. Why we especially have to name labor organizations at this particular time I am at a loss to understand.

I have in my hand a copy certified by the secretary of state of South Dakota of a document which gives the list of names and contributions and expenses filed by Walter H. Burke, acting treasurer, Republican State committee of that State for 1940.

In his report Mr. Burke includes expenses of $45,259.31 and contributions of $62,369.86. In other words, the receipts were $17,000 more than the expenditures.

I take it for granted—and I hope the Senator from South Dakota is listening—that the funds which were collected were turned over to the campaign of 1942, although I can find no evidence of any kind as to what disposition was made of the funds.

My attention was first attracted to this matter by an article published in a monthly journal in South Dakota, the name of which is South Dakota Today. It is published by the Democratic organization. A list of the contributions is given. I desire to read some of them. There is a little discrepancy between the filed list and the list as published in the paper, and possibly the Senator from South Dakota can later explain it.

Sarah Mellon Scaife, a daughter of R. B. Mellon, was credited with $4,000. Ailsa Mellon Bruce, a daughter of the late Andrew Mellon, $5,000. From one of the Mestas, $1,000, and he is listed as a Mellon contributor.

Then we go over to Delaware, where the du Ponts live, and find that in South Dakota Lammot du Pont contributed $4,000; Irénée du Pont, $2,500; Alfred P. Sloan—du Pont, $2,500; and Donald Brown, a du Pont contribution, $2,000. The Pews also gave $10,000.

The most interesting one on the list is Maxey Jarman, given in one paper as treasurer of the Tennessee Republican Committee and in the other report, treasurer, Nashville, Tenn., a contribution of $10,000. That is in clear violation of the law, and double the amount anyone is authorized to give, and especially if it is a corporation which made the contribution. If this was a contribution by a corporation, it was a clear violation of the law when the treasurer of the Republican Committee of South Dakota accepted that $10,000. There was also $10,000 contributed from the various McCormick groups of Chicago, $10,000 to $11,000.

I do not see why we should especially pick on labor, in view of these open and deliberate violations of the spirit and the letter of the law. We fixed the amount at $5,000, and then they gave jointly $10,000.

I should like to have in the RECORD a few paragraphs from the report of the Special Committee Investigating Presidential and Vice Presidential and Senatorial Campaign Expenditures for 1940. I ask to have printed in the RECORD that part of the special committee's report which appears on pages 143 to 147. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate this morning to read it.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPENDIX VIII.—*Tabulation of contributions by prominent families and individuals*

	Amount	Total
Du Pont, A. Felix: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	$1,000.00	$1,000.00
Du Pont, A. Felix, Jr.: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	1,500.00	1,500.00
Du Pont, Alfred V.: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	100.00	100.00
Du Pont, Alice Belin:		
Delaware Republican Finance Committee	1,000.00	
Democrats for Willkie	1,000.00	
		2,000.00
Du Pont, Miss Amy E.:		
Associated Willkie Clubs of America	1,000.00	
Willkie Clubs of America	175.00	
Democrats for Willkie	250.00	
New Jersey Republican State Committee	1,000.00	
		2,425.00
Du Pont, Eileen M.: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	100.00	100.00
Du Pont, Eleanor Hoyt: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	100.00	100.00
Du Pont, Eleuthera B.: Republican Finance Committee of Pennsylvania	1,000.00	1,000.00
Du Pont, Eugene: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	2,500.00	2,500.00
Du Pont, Mrs. Eugene:		
Associated Willkie Clubs of America	1,000.00	
United Republican Finance Committee of Metropolitan New York	1,000.00	
Maine Republican Finance Committee	100.00	
Delaware Republican Finance Committee	100.00	
		2,200.00

APPENDIX VIII.—*Tabulation of contributions by prominent families and individuals*—Continued

	Amount	Total
Du Pont, Francis I.: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	$100.00	$100.00
Du Pont, H. F.:		
Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee	4,000.00	
Delaware Republican Finance Committee	1,000.00	
		5,000.00
Du Pont, Henry B.: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	4,000.00	4,000.00
Du Pont, Mrs. H. P.: United Republican Finance Committee of Metropolitan New York	250.00	250.00
Du Pont, Hubert I.: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	100.00	100.00
Du Pont, Irénée:		
Republican Finance Committee of Pennsylvania	4,000.00	
West Virginia Republican Committee	4,000.00	
Delaware Republican Finance Committee	4,000.00	
		12,000.00
Du Pont, Irene S.: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	3,000.00	3,000.00
Du Pont, Janet G.: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	100.00	100.00
Du Pont, Lammot:		
Republican National Committee	4,000.00	
Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee	4,000.00	
Republican Finance Committee of New Jersey	1,000.00	
Republican Central Committee of New Jersey	3,000.00	
The Maryland Committee	4,000.00	
Tennessee Republican Executive Committee	4,000.00	
West Virginia Republican State Committee	4,000.00	
Wyoming Republican State Committee	4,000.00	
Missouri Republican State Committee	4,000.00	
South Dakota Republican Central Committee	4,000.00	
Ohio Republican State Central Committee	1,000.00	
Indiana Republican State Finance Committee	4,000.00	
Republican Finance Committee of Pennsylvania	4,000.00	
Ohio Republican Finance Committee	4,000.00	
		49,000.00
Du Pont, Mrs. Lammot: Associated Willkie Clubs of America	4,000.00	4,000.00
Du Pont, Lydia:		
Kansas Republican State Committee	5,000.00	
Delaware Republican Finance Committee	1,000.00	
		6,000.00
Du Pont, Mrs. Mary Chichester:		
Polish-American National Security League	1,000.00	
Delaware Republican Finance Committee	3,000.00	
		4,000.00
Du Pont, N. R.: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	50.00	50.00
Du Pont, Octavia M.:		
Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee	1,000.00	
Delaware Republican Finance Committee	4,000.00	
		5,000.00
Du Pont, P. S.:		
The Maryland Committee	4,000.00	
Associated Willkie Clubs of Pennsylvania	100.00	
Democrats for Willkie	500.00	
		4,600.00
Du Pont, Mrs. Pierre S.: Democrats for Willkie	500.00	500.00
Du Pont, Pierre S., 3d:		
Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee	1,000.00	
Delaware Republican Finance Committee	4,000.00	
		5,000.00
Du Pont, F. S. and Alice B.: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	4,000.00	4,000.00
Du Pont, Irénée: Tennessee Republican Executive Committee	2,000.00	2,000.00
Du Pont, Richard D.: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	$300.00	$300.00
Buck, Alice du Pont: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	200.00	200.00
Faulkner, Mary du Pont: Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee	500.00	500.00
Kitchell, Irénée du Pont: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	500.00	500.00
Lunger, Jane du Pont: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	500.00	500.00
May, I. Sophie du Pont: Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee	1,000.00	1,000.00
Mills, Mrs. Alice du Pont: Polish-American National Security League	300.00	300.00
Perkins, Alex du Pont: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	2,500.00	2,500.00
Reigel, Edith du Pont: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	500.00	500.00
Schutt, Mrs. Phyllis du Pont: Maine Republican Finance Committee	2,500.00	2,500.00
Scott, Marion du Pont: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	4,000.00	4,000.00
Sharp, Isabelle du Pont: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	500.00	500.00
Weymouth, Mrs. Deo du Pont: Maine Republican Finance Committee	2,500.00	2,500.00
Wheelwright, Ellen du Pont: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	250.00	250.00
Wier, Ester du Pont: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	4,000.00	4,000.00
Andrews, James N.: National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government	605.00	605.00
Brown, H. F.: Republican State Finance Committee	5,000.00	5,000.00
DeBlois-Wack, Mr. and Mrs. John T.: Associated Willkie Clubs of America	2,000.00	2,000.00
Downs, Molly Laird: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	500.00	500.00
Downs, Alleta L.: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	3,000.00	3,000.00
Downs, Mrs. Robert N.: Kentucky Citizens' Finance Committee	2,000.00	2,000.00
Edmonds, Natalie: Delaware State Republican Finance Committee	1,500.00	1,500.00
Faulkner, Mrs. James H.: United Republican Finance Committee of Metropolitan New York	4,000.00	4,000.00
Flint, Lucille E.: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	1,500.00	1,500.00
Ford, Mrs. Bruce:		
New York City headquarters, Associated Willkie Clubs of Pennsylvania	1,000.00	
Associated Willkie Clubs of Pennsylvania	1,000.00	
		2,000.00
Greenwalt, C. N.: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	1,000.00	1,000.00
Greenwalt, Margaretta L.: Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee	1,000.00	1,000.00
Laird, Rosa:		
Democrats for Willkie	4,000.00	
Delaware Republican Finance Committee	1,000.00	
		5,000.00
Laird, Wilhelmina:		
Kentucky Republican Committee	1,000.00	
Delaware Republican Finance Committee	2,000.00	
		3,000.00
Laird, William Winder, Jr.: Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee	1,000.00	1,000.00
May, Ernest Nugent: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	1,000.00	1,000.00
Peyton, Anne: Democrats for Willkie	1,000.00	1,000.00
Riegel, Richard Eveland: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	$4,500.00	$4,500.00
Schutt, H. S.: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	1,000.00	1,000.00
Sharp, H. Rodney: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	500.00	500.00
Silliman, Mrs. Henry H.: Delaware Republican Finance Committee	4,000.00	4,000.00
Grand total, du Pont family group		186,780.00
Pitcairn, Mrs. Clara D.:		
Pennsylvania Republican Committee	4,500.00	
New Jersey Republican Committee	1,000.00	
		5,500.00
Pitcairn, Harold F.:		
Republican National Committee	1,900.00	
Pennsylvania Republican Committee	1,500.00	
		3,400.00
Pitcairn, Karen: Pennsylvania Republican Committee	4,000.00	4,000.00
Pitcairn, Maryke:		
Associated Willkie Clubs of Pennsylvania	1,052.50	
Pennsylvania Republican Committee	1,635.95	
		2,688.45
Pitcairn, Michael:		
Pennsylvania Republican Committee	3,000.00	
New Jersey Republican Committee	1,000.00	
		4,000.00
Pitcairn, Mildred G.: Pennsylvania Republican Committee	2,000.00	2,000.00
Pitcairn, Nathan: Pennsylvania Republican Committee	425.00	425.00
Pitcairn, Raymond:		
Republican National Committee	1,900.00	
Pennsylvania Republican Committee	1,301.26	
		3,201.26
Pitcairn, Theodore:		
Republican National Committee	1,900.00	
Pennsylvania Republican Committee	2,000.00	
		3,900.00
Total, Pitcairn		29,114.71
Blossom, Elizabeth B.:		
Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee	4,000.00	
National Republican Congressional Committee	3,000.00	
Republican National Committee	1,500.00	
Ohio Republican State Central Committee	3,000.00	
		11,500.00
Copley, Ira C.:		
Republican National Committee	1,000.00	
Illinois Republican Finance Committee	4,900.00	
Indiana Republican Finance Committee	5,000.00	
Missouri Republican Finance Committee	5,000.00	
Maryland Republican State Central Committee	5,000.00	
Oregon Republican Finance Committee	5,000.00	
South Dakota Republican Central Committee	5,000.00	
		30,900.00
Sloan, Alfred P., Jr.:		
Republican National Committee	4,000.00	
Republican Senate Campaign Committee	2,500.00	
National Republican Congressional Committee	4,000.00	
United Republican Finance Committee of Metropolitan New York	2,000.00	
Indiana Republican Finance Committee	3,000.00	
Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania	4,000.00	
New Mexico Republican Finance Committee	4,000.00	
		23,500.00

APPENDIX VIII.—*Tabulation of contributions by prominent families and individuals*—Continued

	Amount	Total
Sloan, Mrs. Alfred P., Jr.:		
Republican National Committee	$4,000.00	
National Republican Senate Campaign Committee	2,500.00	
National Republican Congressional Committee	4,000.00	
United Republican Finance Committee of Metropolitan New York	2,000.00	
		$12,500.00
Total, Sloan family contributions		36,000.00
Culver, B. B.:		
Republican National Committee	500.00	
Missouri Republican Finance Committee	4,000.00	
		4,500.00
Culver, B. B., Jr.:		
Republican National Committee	200.00	
Missouri Republican Finance Committee	3,250.00	
		3,450.00
Culver, E. R. Republican National Committee	200.00	200.00
Culver, E. R., Jr. Missouri Republican Finance Committee	2,250.00	2,250.00
Culver, E. R., III: Missouri Republican Finance Committee	2,000.00	2,000.00
Culver, Edna L.: Missouri Republican Finance Committee	3,500.00	3,500.00
Culver, Gene G.: Missouri Republican Finance Committee	3,125.00	3,125.00
Culver, Mrs. Gene G.: Missouri Republican Finance Committee	3,125.00	3,125.00
Culver, H. H.:		
Republican National Committee	200.00	
Missouri Republican Finance Committee	3,250.00	
		3,450.00
Total, Culver family contributions		25,600.00
Queeny, Edgar Monsanto:		
Republican National Committee	5,000.00	
National Republican Congressional Committee	4,000.00	
National Republican Senatorial Committee	4,000.00	
Republican Finance Committee of Pennsylvania	4,000.00	
Ketchum, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa. (paid personally for services of advertising counsel)	5,625.00	
Republican Finance Committee of Connecticut	4,000.00	
United Republican Finance Committee of Metropolitan New York	750.00	
Kentucky Republican State Committee	4,000.00	
Missouri Republican Finance Committee	4,000.00	
Wyoming State Republican Committee	1,000.00	
Missouri Republican State Committee	4,000.00	
		40,375.00
Queeny, Mrs. E. S., St. Louis, Mo.: Missouri Republican Finance Committee	1,000.00	1,000.00
Queeny, Eugene M., St. Louis, Mo.: Wyoming State Republican Committee	1,000.00	1,000.00
Total, Queeny family contributions		42,375.00
Prentice, E. Parmalee: United Republican Finance Committee	1,500.00	1,500.00
Prentice, Mrs. E. Parmalee:		
United Republican Finance Committee of Metropolitan New York	4,000.00	
Citizens Information Committee of Chicago	1,500.00	
Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee	1,000.00	
Ohio Republican Central and Executive Committee	4,000.00	
New York State Republican Committee	4,000.00	
Republican National Committee	1,000.00	
		15,500.00
Total, Prentice		17,000.00

APPENDIX VIII.—*Tabulation of contributions by prominent families and individuals*—Continued

	Amount	Total
Widener, George D.:		
Kentucky Citizens' Finance Committee	$250.00	
Associated Willkie Clubs of Pennsylvania	1,000.00	
Republican National Committee	5,000.00	
		$6,250.00
Widener, Mrs. George D.:		
Associated Willkie Clubs of Pennsylvania	1,000.00	
Republican National Committee	3,500.00	
		4,500.00
Widener, Joseph E.:		
Associated Willkie Clubs of Pennsylvania	1,000.00	
Republican National Committee	4,000.00	
Republican Finance Committee of Pennsylvania	4,000.00	
Kentucky Citizens' Finance Committee	1,000.00	
Pennsylvania Republican Central Committee	4,000.00	
		14,000.00
Total, Widener family group		24,750.00
Pew, Arthur E.: Oregon Republican Finance Committee	2,000.00	2,000.00
Pew, Arthur E., Jr.: Maryland Republican Committee	1,000.00	1,000.00
Pew, Helen L., Ardmore, Pa.: Associated Willkie Clubs of Pennsylvania	4,000.00	4,000.00
Pew, J. Edgar, 1608 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.: Associated Willkie Clubs of Pennsylvania	1,000.00	1,000.00
Pew, John G., Dallas, Tex.: Republican National Committee	25.00	25.00
Pew, J. Howard, 1608 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.:		
The Maryland Committee	4,000.00	
New Jersey Republican State Committee	4,000.00	
National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government	4,000.00	
Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania	4,000.00	
Indiana United Republican Finance Committee	2,000.00	
New York Republican State Committee	1,500.00	
Missouri Republican State Committee	4,000.00	
		23,000.00
Pew, Mrs. J. Howard: New Jersey Republican State Committee	4,000.00	4,000.00
Pew, Mary Ethel:		
National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government	4,000.00	
Indiana Republican Finance Committee	2,000.00	
Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania	4,000.00	
Kentucky Citizens Finance Committee	2,000.00	
New York Republican State Committee	1,500.00	
South Dakota Republican State Committee	1,000.00	
Missouri Republican State Committee	3,000.00	
Do	1,000.00	
New Jersey Republican State Committee	4,000.00	
		22,500.00
Pew, J. N., estate of: Maryland Republican Committee	5,000.00	5,000.00
Pew, Joseph N., 1608 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.: National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government	4,000.00	4,000.00
Pew, J. N., Jr., 1608 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.:		
The Maryland Committee	1,000.00	
Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania	4,000.00	
Republican State Committee of New York	1,500.00	
Missouri Republican State Committee	2,000.00	
Vermont Republican Committee	1,000.00	
Indiana United Republican Finance Committee	4,000.00	
New Jersey Republican State Committee	4,000.00	
		17,500.00
Pew, Mrs. Myron, 1608 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.: National Committee to Uphold Constitutional Government	4,000.00	4,000.00

APPENDIX VIII.—*Tabulation of contributions by prominent families and individuals*—Continued

	Amount	Total
Pew, Hannah M. Elliott, Gladwyne, Pa.: Republican Finance Committee of Pennsylvania	$1,000.00	$1,000.00
Myrin, Mrs. Mabel Pew, Philadelphia, Pa.:		
Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania	4,000.00	
Indiana United Republican Finance Committee	2,000.00	
Kentucky Republican State Committee	4,000.00	
New York Republican State Committee	1,500.00	
Missouri Republican State Committee	4,000.00	
New Jersey State Republican Committee	4,000.00	
		19,500.00
Total, Pew family group		108,525.00

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, in that campaign the du Pont family contributed $186,780. In other words, those conducting the campaign were getting a family to make the contributions, in violation of the Corporate Corrupt Practices Act. I know the man who made the interpretation of the law for the chairman of the finance committee of the Republican campaign committee of 1940. He is a very brilliant and astute lawyer in Pittsburgh.

Then we find the Pitcairn family, which contributed $29,114.71. Ira C. Copley and his group gave $30,900. Mr. Copley, who was formerly a member of Congress, owns public utility interests west of Chicago, and now lives most of his time in California.

The Sloans, Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., and Mrs. Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., contributed $36,000.

Edgar Queeny, of the Monsanto Co., and his group, contributed a total of $42,375.

The Prentices gave $17,000.

I have not the time to pick up the list of the Mellons, but I have no doubt they held up their end. I have no total for the Pews in this report, but I am sure the Pew family contributed more than any other family at that time, because it is a well-known fact that Mr. Joe Pew has said frequently he would spend $1,000,000 any time to help defeat the present occupant of the White House.

Mr. President, recently our friend Mr. Spangler, chairman of the Republican National Committee, visited Philadelphia, and I wish to quote from an article written by Mr. Thomas P. O'Neil, one of the best-known political writers of Pennsylvania. He is accurate and forthright in all his statements. The article starts:

SPANGLER SEEKS FUNDS TO FIGHT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT FOURTH TERM—GRAND OLD PARTY NATIONAL CHAIRMAN GUEST OF HONOR AT UNION LEAGUE

(By Thomas P. O'Neil)

President Roosevelt "is already running for a fourth term."

Republican National Chairman Harrison Earl Spangler made that declaration yesterday while here to put "the bite" on wealthy Pennsylvanians for $250,000 as the State's quota for national committee expenses.

I am glad to state, from a remark made by one of my colleagues in the Senate night before last, that he succeeded in

raising the money. Whether he got it from Joe Grundy or Joe Pew I do not know, but he left Philadelphia with his subscriptions. I continue reading from the article.

"I am not for any candidate for President," said Spangler, "but I am against one—that politician from Dutchess County, N. Y., Franklin D. Roosevelt."

SAYS HE'S CANDIDATE NOW

"Do you think Roosevelt is a candidate?" he was asked.

"There is no question about it," the national chairman replied. "He is already running and the inner bunch of the New Deal crowd is spending a great deal of time promoting his fourth-term candidacy."

Spangler insisted there must be a differentiation between Roosevelt as President and as politician.

"As President," he said, "he is, of course, deserving of respect and support, but he hasn't any immunity as a politician running for office."

WILL BE HARD TO BEAT

Spangler was realistic enough to concede that Franklin Delano Roosevelt wouldn't be easy to beat.

"It will be a tremendous fight," he admitted.

But he thought Nation-wide reaction against a fourth term was running strong.

He said that a survey conducted by a national farm magazine, published in Des Moines, showed 59 percent of a circulation in excess of a million against a fourth term.

"A similar survey conducted in January 1940," he said, "showed only 28 percent against a third term."

SAYS RATIONING IS BUNGLED

Spangler agreed that the trend of the war may have a decisive bearing on the outcome of the 1944 Presidential election, but expressed the conviction that the Nation is ready to "return to American principles."

Asked if he thought rationing would have a favorable effect on the Republican vote, he said:

"Rationing as rationing will have no effect on the Republican vote, but the bungling administration of it will have a tremendous effect. The confusion and quarreling among those in charge of rationing indicate they don't know where they're going."

ATTENDED PRIVATE LUNCHEON

Spangler was interviewed at the Union League after he had been guest of honor at a luncheon behind closed doors, attended by Pennsylvania Republican leaders and a select group of multimillionaire business and industrial leaders.

The national chairman, said Gov. Edward Martin, who attended the luncheon, "is quite optimistic as to the Republican trend in Pennsylvania," and that his optimism is shared by National Committeeman G. Mason Owlett and State Chairman M. Harvey Taylor.

NO COMMENT ON WILLKIE

He had no comment to make on Wendell Willkie as the Republican candidate, but, in response to an inquiry, said that Gov. Thomas E. Dewey's friends are convinced that he meant it when he said that he wanted to finish the job for which he was elected.

Thus far, Spangler revealed, only one city, Detroit, has shown an interest in landing the next Republican national convention.

"I suppose we will hear from more cities before the National Committee meets to select a convention city next year," he said.

The Spangler luncheon was presided over by Orus J. Matthews, Republican State finance chairman.

In his address the national chairman urged Pennsylvanians to begin their campaign now, not to wait until next year.

SAMUEL NOT INVITED

Other speakers were Senator Albert W. Hawkes, of New Jersey; Governor Martin; and H. W. Prentiss, Lancaster industrialist and former president of the National Manufacturers' Association.

Guests included Joseph N. Pew, Jr.; former Senator Joseph R. Grundy; City Treasurer Edgar W. Baird, Jr.; Superior Court Judge Charles Edward Kenworthey; City Solicitor Robert M. Green; Walter H. Annenberg, publisher; as well as eastern county leaders.

Presence of Baird and Kenworthey was regarded as significant. They were Willkie leaders here in 1940. Baird is reported to be the Pew choice for mayor. Incidentally, Acting Mayor Bernard Samuel was not invited. Also among the missing was Republican City Chairman David W. Harris.

Mr. President, I ask that this certified report from South Dakota be included in my remarks, as well as a list of the contributions to the Republican campaign fund in 1942.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of South Dakota,
Secretary's Office:

This is to certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true, correct and examined copy of statement of campaign expenses and receipts of Republican State Central Committee for campaign of 1940 as filed in this office December 2, 1940, and the whole thereof, and has been carefully compared with the original now on file in this office and found correct.

The within document, book, instrument, paper, or law shall ot be received in evidence in any court of this State unless this certificate is countersigned by the State Treasurer with a statement of the fees received.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota, at the city of Pierre, the capital, on this 24th day of March 1943.

MRS. L. M. LARSEN,
Secretary of State.
E. J. YOUNQUIST,
State Treasurer.

The following is a full and true statement of all expenditures of the Republican State Central Committee in connection with the campaign preceding the general election held on November 5, 1940, showing the specific purpose for which payments were made or contracted to be made, the exact nature of the service rendered in consideration thereof.

Advertising:	
Newspaper	$4,247.04
Magazine	1,855.53
Radio	5,159.93
Outdoor	631.05
	11,893.55
Buttons and literature	4,784.66
FRANCIS CASE	500.00
J. D. Coon, expense during his term as State chairman	668.12
Mrs. E. D. Doering, expense during her term as State vice chairman	354.35
Express and freight	433.72
KARL MUNDT	500.00
Organization expense	12,758.85
Postage	1,093.85
Rent, light, heat, water, janitor, drayage, etc	406.36
Republican Herald	1,251.77
Salaries and expense (headquarters)	3,043.34
Smith & Co., Sioux Falls, 1934 campaign bill	$409.75
Stationery and office supplies	1,398.10
Speakers bureau (salaries and expense)	4,861.41
Telephone and telegraph	901.48
Total	45,259.31

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
County of Hughes, ss.

W. H. Burke, being first duly sworn, states that he is the duly elected, qualified and acting treasurer of the Republican State Central Committee of the State of South Dakota, that the foregoing is a full and true statement of all expenditures of the said Republican State Central Committee in connection with the campaign preceding the general election held on the 5th day of November 1940, to the best of my knowledge and belief.

WALTER H. BURKE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30th day of November 1940.

J. R. MCKNIGHT,
Notary Public, Hughes County, S. Dak.

STATEMENT OF CAMPAIGN EXPENSES AND RECEIPTS OF REPUBLICAN STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE FOR CAMPAIGN OF 1940

I, Walter H. Burke, duly elected, qualified, and acting treasurer of the Republican State Central Committee of the State of South Dakota, do hereby submit a detailed account of all moneys, property, or anything of value received by me, as treasurer of such committee, together with a detailed account of the money contracted to be expended up to this date of November 30, 1940.

ITEMS OF RECEIPT

Carl M. Anderson, Rapid City, Aug. 5, 1940	$50.00
William Lange, Hot Springs, Aug. 5, 1940	486.11
Anonymous donations from CHAN GURNEY, Aug. 17, 1940	50.00
W. H. Pringle, Aug. 22, 1940	50.00
W. T. Nesheim, Highmore, Aug. 26, 1940	20.00
Henry Jeffries, Lacey, Aug. 26, 1940	1.00
Donald M. Cole, Redfield, Aug. 28, 1940	10.00
M. H. Alrich, Miller, Aug. 28, 1940	25.00
Louise T. Brewer, De Smet, Aug. 28, 1940	1.00
Einar Gaarder, Canistota, Aug. 28, 1940	1.00
Thomas Pieton, Faulkton, Aug. 28, 1940	50.00
E. F. Norman, Aug. 30, 1940	67.50
H. Kopperud, Lake Preston, Sept. 3, 1940	25.00
D. E. Brisbine, Sept. 3, 1940	50.00
Jones County (Carl Miler), Sept. 9, 1940, treasurer County Republican Central Committee	71.00
Robert Knieland, Mitchell, Sept. 10, 1940	122.05
E. F. Norman, Sept. 16, 1940	35.00
P. S. Walton, Seneca, Sept. 16, 1940	2.00
M. Q. Sharpe, Kennebec, Sept. 16, 1940	25.00
J. H. Huese, Pierre, Sept. 16, 1940	2.00
Chas. H. Burke, Pierre, Sept. 16, 1940	50.00
Mildred Duncan, Pierre, Sept. 16, 1940	100.00
Badges, Sept. 16, 1940	18.00
Plinn Beebe, Ipswich, Sept. 19, 1940	25.00
C. B. Hanson, Mitchell, Sept. 19, 1940	6.80
Kingsbury County, Sept. 20, 1940, Republican Central Committee	1.00
Sully County, Sept. 20, 1940, Republican Central Committee	71.00
Roy King, Sturgis, Sept. 23, 1940	10.00

H. E. Beebe, Ipswich, Sept. 23, 1940	$50.00
Thelma Smith, White River, Sept. 23, 1940	5.00
Howard L. Saylor, Huron, Sept. 24, 1940	75.00
Mike Holloran, Hector, Minn., Sept. 27, 1940	250.00
Max McCall, Hector, Minn., Sept. 27, 1940	250.00
Paul S. Dewell, Pierre, Sept. 30, 1940	5.00
Erelra J. Anderson, Aberdeen, Sept. 30, 1940	75.00
Dorcas Carlson, Huron, Sept. 30, 1940	5.00
William T. Doyle, Sioux Falls, Sept. 30, 1940	300.00
Melvin Reinschmidt, Blunt, Oct. 2, 1940	10.00
Mrs. J. N. Kaye, Aberdeen, Oct. 4, 1940	75.00
Hamlin County, Oct. 5, 1940, Republican Central Committee	157.50
Haakon County, Oct. 5, 1940, Republican Central Committee	101.00
Don Gustafson, Sioux Falls, Oct. 5, 1950	300.00
L. E. Gustafson, Beresford, Oct. 5, 1940	125.00
O. E. Miller, Ellendale, Oct. 5, 1940	50.00
Donald Blair, Lead, Oct. 5, 1940	25.00
Tennessee Republican committee, Maxey Jarman, treasurer, Nashville, Tenn., Oct. 5, 1940	10,000.00
Lincoln County, Oct. 7, 1940, Republican central committee	244.00
Roy H. Longstaff, Huron, Oct. 7, 1940	25.00
W. J. Braskamp, Huron, Oct. 7, 1940	50.00
J. F. Halladay, Iroquois, Oct. 10, 1940	38.00
A. B. Blake, Oct. 9, 1940	2.06
Butte County, Oct. 9, 1940, Republican central committee	50.00
Grant County, Oct. 9, 1940, Republican central committee	125.00
H. H. Stewart, Deadwood, Oct. 9, 1940	30.00
Walter Frei, Wagner, Oct. 9, 1940	25.00
Douglas County, Oct. 9, 1940, Republican central committee	100.00
Catherine Barker Hickox, Chicago, Ill., Oct. 10, 1940	1,000.00
Norton Jameson, Sioux Falls, Oct. 10, 1940	500.00
Ralph D. Mershon, New York City, Oct. 11, 1940	1,000.00
Codington County, Oct. 11, 1940, Republican central committee	100.00
Lammot du Pont, Wilmington, Del., Oct. 11, 1940	4,000.00
D. J. O'Keeffe, Pierre, Oct. 11, 1940	500.00
Mary T. McCay, Oct. 11, 1940	50.00
E. F. Norman, Pierre, Oct. 12, 1940	33.00
Jack Beier, McIntosh, Oct. 12, 1940	5.00
Carl Johnson, McIntosh, Oct. 12, 1940	5.00
Hyde County, Oct. 12, 1940, Republican Central Committee	71.00
Churchill & Benson, Huron, Oct. 12, 1940	200.00
W. W. Baker, Oct. 12, 1940	75.00
Merlin J. Kuehn, Oct. 12, 1940	75.00
W. E. Perrewoud, Oct. 12, 1940	35.00
T. N. Hayter, Oct. 12, 1940	75.00
John B. Perkins, Highmore, Oct. 14, 1940	50.00
Clark County, Oct. 14, 1940, Republican Central Committee	100.00
P. L. Prostrollo, Woonsocket, Oct. 15, 1940	50.00
E. F. Norman, Pierre, Oct. 15, 1940	195.00
Donaldson Brown, New York, Oct. 15, 1940	2,000.00
L. W. Mesta, Pittsburgh, Pa., Oct. 15, 1940	$1,000.00
Faulk County, Oct. 16, 1940, Republican Central Committee	81.00
Beadle County, Oct. 16, 1940, Republican Central Committee	100.00
O. B. Anderson, Lemmon, Oct. 17, 1940	25.00
A. L. Bailey, Sturgis, Oct. 17, 1940	5.00
George B. Otte, Clark, Oct. 17, 1940	30.00
E. W. Meeker, Pierre, Oct. 18, 1940	100.00
Women's Republican Club, Mobridge, Oct. 18, 1940	5.00
Codington County, Oct. 21, 1940, Republican Central Committee	100.00
Sanborn County, Oct. 21, 1940, Republican Central Committee	142.50
Tripp County, Oct. 21, 1940, Republican Central Committee	100.00
M. E. Helgerson, Mitchell, Oct. 21, 1940	50.00
A. Friend, Oct. 21, 1940	5.00
E. W. Stephens, Pierre, Oct. 21, 1940	500.00
Robert Wright, Pierre, Oct. 21, 1940	10.00
Earl La Grave, Chicago, Oct. 22, 1940	1,200.00
Donald McMurchie, Centerville, Oct. 22, 1940	50.00
A. M. Urquhart, Huron, Oct. 22, 1940	25.00
B. B. McClaskey, Huron, Oct. 22, 1940	50.00
George A. Royer, Huron, Oct. 22, 1940	20.00
Paul Bellamy, Rapid City, Oct. 23, 1940	25.00
G. E. Thoreson, Pierre, Oct. 23, 1940	25.00
Sarah Scaife, Pittsburgh, Pa. Oct. 24, 1940	4,000.00
Lyle Hare, Spearfish, Oct. 24, 1940	25.00
R. C. Hallock, Mission, Oct. 24, 1940	5.00
Daniel Rollinger, Mobridge, Oct. 24, 1940	25.00
Hughes County, Oct. 24, 1940, Republican Central Committee	250.00
Sol J. Pruner, Pierre, Oct. 24, 1940	25.00
S. W. Clark, Redfield, Oct. 24, 1940	5.00
Hutchinson County, Oct. 26, 1940, Republican Central Committee	137.00
E. F. Norman, Pierre, Oct. 26, 1940	52.00
Stanley County, Oct. 28, 1940, Republican Central Committee	60.00
Mary Ethel Pew, Philadelphia, Pa., Oct. 28, 1940	1,000.00
I. C. Copley, Aurora, Ill., Oct. 28, 1940	5,000.00
Earl LaGrave, Chicago, Ill., Oct. 28, 1940	1,500.00
Bon Homme County, Oct. 28, 1940, Republican Central Committee	100.00
Walt Willy, Omaha, Nebr., Oct. 28, 1940	25.00
Gladys Pinckney, Pierre, Oct. 28, 1940	5.00
Donation, Oct. 28, 1940	5.00
Walworth County, Oct. 29, 1940, Republican Central Committee	77.00
Philip Rachenberger, Pierre, Oct. 29, 1940	1.00
H. J. Wegner, Pierre, Oct. 30, 1940	50.00
Herman F. Chapman, Sioux Falls, Oct. 30, 1940	10.00
Brule County, Oct. 31, 1940, Republican Central Committee	42.50
Codington County, Republican Central Committee, Nov. 1, 1940	200.00
Hughes County, Republican Central Committee, Nov. 1, 1940	$250.00
Warren Morrell, Pierre, Nov. 1, 1940	600.00
Churchill and Benson, Huron, Nov. 2, 1940	200.00
Merle Melstad, De Smet, Nov. 5, 1940	10.00
Butte County, Nov. 6, 1940, Republican Central Committee	25.00
Marshall County, Nov. 6, 1940, Republican Central Committee	100.00
A. S. Fisher, Nov. 6, 1940	25.00
A. E. Godfrey, Sioux Falls, Nov. 6, 1940	25.00
C. E. Stageberg, Pierre, Nov. 6, 1940	5.00
Roy A. Nord, Faulkton, Nov. 6, 1940	10.00
William Lakings, Parker, Nov. 6, 1940	1.00
E. A. Johnson, Pierre, Nov. 6, 1940	5.00
Joe Bush, Pierre, Nov. 6, 1940	5.00
McCook County, Nov. 6, 1940, Republican Central Committee	202.50
Harvey W. Thomas, Brookings, Nov. 6, 1940	10.00
J. Payne, Pierre, Nov. 6, 1940	3.00
Carl Riis, Pierre, Nov. 7, 1940	5.00
Walter W. Thorp, Pritton, Nov. 7, 1940	200.00
Rowland Finch, Bismarck, N. Dak., Nov. 7, 1940	50.00
Meade County, Nov. 8, 1940, Republican Central Committee	100.00
William T. Doyle, Sioux Falls, Nov. 8, 1940	50.00
L. Koplow, Sioux Falls, Nov. 14, 1940	100.00
Walworth County, Nov. 18, 1940, Republican Central Committee	77.00
Jerauld County, Nov. 22, 1940, Republican Central Committee	65.85
A. J. Moodie, treasurer	19,726.49
Interest from First National, Pierre, check	35.00
Interest from Pierre National, Pierre, check	20.00
Total	62,369.86

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
County of Hughes, ss:

W. H. Burke, being first duly sworn states that he is the duly elected, qualified and acting treasurer of the Republican State Central Committee of the State of South Dakota, that the foregoing is a full and true statement of all receipts of the said Republican State Central Committee in connection with the campaign preceding the general election held on the 5th day of November 1940 to the best of my knowledge and belief.

WALTER BURKE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30th day of November 1940.

J. R. MCKNIGHT,
Notary Public, Hughes County, S. Dak.

Filed in the office of Secretary of State on the 2d day of December 1940

OLIVE A. RINGSRUD,
Secretary of State.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN FUND IN SOUTH DAKOTA FOR THE 1942 ELECTION IN WHICH HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD WAS ELECTED TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Maxey Jarman: Treasurer, Tennessee Republican Committee; president, General Shoe Co	$10,000
Catherine Barker Hickox, Chicago	1,000
Earl La Grave, Chicago	2,700
Col. Robert R. McCormick	5,000
Ira C. Copley, Aurora, Ill., publisher	5,000
Sarah Mellon Scaife—Mellon	4,000
Ailsa Mellon Bruce—Mellon	5,000
L. W. Mesta, vice president, Mesta Machine Co. (Mellon)	1,000
Lammot du Pont—du Pont	4,000
Irenee du Pont—du Pont	2,500
Alfred P. Sloan—du Pont	2,500

Donald Brown—du Pont	$2,000
Ralph D. Mershon, New York City	1,000
Mary Ethel Pew—Pew	1,000
Earle Halliburton, Duncan, Okla.—Pew	5,000
	51,700

In addition to these contributions Bushfield himself who was running for United States Senator, reported to the Senate that he had received on contributions to his personal campaign:

Joseph L. Pew, Jr.	$1,000
Mabel Pew Myrin (from a handful of people)	1,000
	53,700

NOTE.—The figures on the South Dakota campaign contributions were taken from the office of the Secretary of State of South Dakota filed there by Walter H. Burke, of Pierre, treasurer of the Republican State committee. The first public notice of these figures was given out in the little paper called South Dakota Today, a Democratic monthly published by the Democratic State committee at Mitchell; the editor is E. H. Bremer, who was secretary to Senator Berry when Berry was Governor. Former Governor Berry lives at Bellevedere.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have been very greatly interested in the so-called disclosures of the junior Senator from the great State of Pennsylvania. We in South Dakota were very happy, I will say to the Senator, to have friends in his wonderful State who were able to assist us in the campaign for the preservation of the American Government. I am not so much concerned with the amount of money which friends in Pennsylvania contributed to the Republican Party in South Dakota, but we are tremendously inspired that we have a government in this country which permits individual Americans to accumulate and make enough money so that they can give this sort of contribution to their friends throughout the country, because we do not have anyone in our party who has such a distinguished signature that we can sell autographed campaign books for $250 apiece to deserving Democrats.

Mr. GUFFEY. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota if he will inform me, through the treasurer of the State committee, at an early date, what happened to the $17,000 carried over at the end of the 1940 campaign. Was that expended in his behalf in the election of 1942? In the expense account of the Senator from South Dakota, as filed for 1942, it appears he received the total sum of $4,000, including $1,000 from Mabel Pew Perim and $1,000 from J. N. Pew, Jr. He expended $3,187.29, leaving a balance to his account of $812.71. I presume he is saving that for the election 6 years from now. I should like to know about the $17,000, what happened to it, who kept it, and when it was expended?

I cannot guarantee these reports. They were filed by the Republican State treasurer and certified to by the secretary of the Commonwealth, and countersigned by the treasurer of the State.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I am glad to answer the question of the Senator from Pennsylvania, but I want to call attention at this time to the fact that he has not disclosed the names of the contributors to the Democratic campaign fund in South Dakota for either of those years, or how much money they had. We have not a Federal Treasury to carry on our campaigns in that section. We have to raise the money from successful Pennsylvanians.

Mr. GUFFEY. I will say to the Senator from South Dakota that the same information is available to him in South Dakota with respect to Democratic campaign contributions and expenses, which was available to me with respect to the Republican campaign contributions and expenses. I am sure the Senator will find that there was carried over no balance of $17,000. I doubt if the Senator's opponent in that campaign had a total contribution of $17,000 to run his whole campaign.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not know what contributions were made to him.

Mr. GUFFEY. That is something which is available to the Senator. He might obtain that information, and submit it for "the gayety of nations."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. But I notice that my opponent has been given a New Deal job in Omaha since I defeated him.

Mr. GUFFEY. Several Republicans, when defeated, were given jobs by their party. Mr. Hughes was made Secretary of State, and later on was appointed to the Supreme Court. Other defeated Republicans were given places of importance by Republican administrations. We can go clear back to Blaine for example, and find numerous examples from then onward. Some day I will give the Senator from South Dakota a list of deserving and worthy and competent "lame duck" Republicans who were rewarded.

I think a man who has served 4, 6, 8, or 10 years in the service of the Government particularly if he has been an elected official is much better qualified for a governmental position than a man who has never served his State or Nation. I have no objection to recognizing any one who is defeated. I was very sorry indeed to see Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle, Members of the Republican Party, raise objections to some of their defeated opponents when their nominations came before the Senate for confirmation. I have no doubt the Senator from South Dakota will be like the other eight members of Leon Henderson's "electees" and will vote for the adoption of the conference report. All of the Henderson "electees," all nine of them on the Republican side, can thank Leon Henderson for their election; they owe it to no one else, plus the money sent to the Senator's State from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. If the Senator from Pennsylvania will stick around the Senate a little while he will discover how I shall vote on the conference report.

Mr. GUFFEY. I shall be here for the yea and nay vote.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania will also be glad to know how much money members of the Mellon family gave to the Pennsylvania Democratic campaign fund.

Mr. GUFFEY. Members of the Mellon family have never contributed to any of my campaigns. I have no personal association or political association with any member of the Mellon family, have not had in my long business career or in my life in Pittsburgh. Mr. Mellon answered that himself one time when I was accused of that very thing by the then Governor Gifford Pinchot, of Pennsylvania. I am glad the Senator from North Dakota brought it out here today. It gives me a chance to answer it again. I wish to say that if the conference report comes to a vote I shall vote as the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has said he will vote, and if it is adopted I hope the President of the United States will veto the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in this discussion the fact was brought out by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that four or five thousand dollars was sent to North Dakota during the time that I was a candidate for office in North Dakota. I wish to tell the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania what became of that money and who received it. Out there in North Dakota we have a political gang made up of Democrats and Republicans, and I do not know which are the worst.

Mr. GUFFEY. Is the Senator speaking of South Dakota or North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. I am speaking of North Dakota.

Mr. GUFFEY. I did not mention North Dakota. It did not come into this discussion at all. I never mentioned North Dakota. I spoke of South Dakota. If I did say North Dakota, it was a slip of the tongue. We had the evidence with respect to the corruption in North Dakota when the Senator's case was before the Privileges and Elections Committee and when the question of seating the Senator came up in the Senate. All the evidence with respect to that case has been received here, and I would not be surprised if today some Senators who voted in favor of seating the Senator would, if they had the opportunity, reconsider the vote they cast to seat him.

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator will remain in the Senate Chamber for 10 minutes, he will hear something. I have sent for some checks which I wish to show to the Senator and other Senators. I have received them, and I will show them to Senators now. I will show the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, who talks about graft and corruption, who finances the campaigns for Democrats in North Dakota. I am now speaking of the year 1936. I have here a check made payable to Charles J. Vogel, treasurer, in the sum of $10. I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that Vogel was treasurer of the Democratic State party. The check is signed by Cleo Flugga, a poor postmaster, receiving about $100 a month.

Mr. GUFFEY. What is there illegal about a postmaster making a voluntary contribution?

Mr. LANGER. I will show the Senator.

Mr. GUFFEY. If the Senator can prove to me that that man was solicited, very well. Go ahead and prove it. Has

the Senator a letter which shows that the man was solicited?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am making this speech.

Mr. GUFFEY. It is no violation of law to make a contribution.

Mr. LANGER. I do not yield to the Senator, Mr. President. I have the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Senators engaged in a debate should conduct themselves in accordance with the rules of the Senate. I make the point of order against what is now going on. I think Senators should be at least 20 feet apart when they are engaged in such debate as this. [Laughter.]

Mr. GUFFEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection, Mr. President, to being 20 feet away from the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rules of the Senate require that Senators address the Chair if they wish to interrupt a speaker, or to ask questions. The Chair does not know whether the rules of the Senate can be interpreted to apply to the matter of the distance that Senators should be apart from each other when engaged in debate, but the rules of the Senate require that Senators address the Chair when desiring to interrupt a speaker.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I will show where the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] and his crowd got about $5,000,000.

Mind you, this check is dated July 1, on the first of the month; July 1, 1936, not the 10th or any other date. I will show the check to anyone who cares to see it, and the endorsement. It is an original check, not a photostatic copy, and is made payable to Charles J. Vogel, who is now United States district judge.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I will not yield. I have another check, dated July 17, 1936, to S. J. Nagel, county chairman of the Democratic Party, La Moure County, N. Dak., $10, from that same poor postmaster, Cleo Flugga.

I will show Senators another check, dated the 31st of July 1936, payable to Charles J. Vogel, State treasurer, Democratic Party, for $5, signed by Cleo Flugga. I show Senators another check dated August 31 of that same year, payable to Charles J. Vogel, for $5, signed by Cleo Flugga.

Here is one dated October 1, 1936, payable to Charles J. Vogel, for $5, signed by Cleo Flugga.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I will not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota refuses to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Here is one made in 1937, payable to S. J. Vogel, signed by the same poor postmaster, in Marion, N. Dak., a town of about 200 population. I will show a little later how poor this man was.

Here is another check dated January 1, 1938, payable to S. J. Nagel, county chairman of the Democratic Party, of La Moure County, for $10. All these checks are cashed in the banks, and I will gladly make them available to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylnia, or to any other Senator.

Now, Mr. President, along came the Jackson Day dinner. The party officials were not satisfied with getting $10 a month from this poor postmaster. They said, "We want $10 more for the Jackson Day dinner." He said, "I cannot afford it; I do not have the money. I can pay $5 now." So they said, "Well, give us a post-dated check for the other $5."

So we find that on January 15, 1938, this check for $5 was made payable to the Jackson Day Dinner Committee. Then the post-dated check was made out on February 15, for $5 more. It says, "Pay to the order of the treasurer of the Democratic National Committee," and it is endorsed by the Democratic National Committee—$5 taken from a poor, poor, little postmaster in North Dakota; and they said to him, "Either you pay, or we will get your job"—as I will prove in just a few minutes.

Then, on March 1 the check I now hold in my hand was made payable directly to the Democratic State Committee; and on the back of it will be found the endorsement of the Democratic State Committee of the State of North Dakota. Then, on April 15, the Members of the Senate will notice that the money was collected on either the 1st or the 15th of each month. Here and now before the Senate, I will tell the man who talks about any crookedness where this political money came from. I am glad he brought up the matter.

The check I now hold in my hand is made payable directly to the Democratic National Committee, and is endorsed by the Democratic National Committee. It says, "Pay to the order of the Bank of Manhattan and Trust Co., New York City"—$5 from that poor fellow. On May 2, another check was made out to Mr. Vogel, State treasurer of the Democratic Party, for $10; and on June 1, 1938, another check for $5 was made payable to Charles J. Vogel, treasurer, and was endorsed by him; and on July 1, another check was made payable to the Democratic State committee. The check is dated July 1, 1938, and is made payable to the director of the Democratic State committee. That check is for $5 more.

On August 1, 1938, another check was made out to Sam Nagel, chairman of the Democratic County Committee of La Moure County, N. Dak.; and on September 1, 1938, a check was made payable to Carl Willkie, assistant treasurer of the Democratic Committee of La Moure County, N. Dak.; and on the check is Mr. Willkie's endorsement.

Then, by November 3, on election day, this poor fellow got so tired and so confused that he did not know whether to make the checks payable to the Democratic National Committee or to the Democratic Party or to the Democratic State committee or to Mr. Nagel or to Vogel or to Mr. Willkie; so he simply made out the check to "La Moure County Democrat." It was endorsed by the First National Bank & Trust Co. of Minneapolis, Minn., and was cashed by the Security National Bank of Edgeley, N. Dak.

What happened to that postmaster? Well, he kept on paying until he felt he could not pay any more. So, one day, the great party about which the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] is talking fired him; they appointed a man by the name of Anderson. So Mr. Flugga wrote me about it. I stood upon this floor and showed these checks at the very time when the two distinguished Senators from Wisconsin—both of them, both the senior Senator and the junior Senator—were fighting for a man named Burkhart, who was head of the American Legion down there, and who was being fired as postmaster.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I will not yield; I am sorry.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator was quite willing to yield a year or two ago.

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry.

Mr. President, at that time I got these checks, and I demanded an investigation. I submitted a resolution calling for an investigation. At that time I showed that we had gone to the Post Office Department and had estimated that if everyone in the United States contributed on the same basis as that on which Mr. Flugga contributed, the amount taken in by the Democratic organization was approximately $5,700,000 a year.

Mind you, Mr. President, I did my best to obtain that investigation. The resolution went to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. Up to the present time we have not been able to have that investigation made.

So, Mr. President, when I made that demand Mr. Flugga stayed in office until after the election. Then, about 6 weeks ago, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and myself each received a notice from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads saying that Mr. Anderson had been fired in place of Mr. Flugga; and up to the present time I have been able to keep Mr. Flugga in.

Mind you, they have had notice of these checks for over a year. If any Senator on the other side of the Chamber did not believe the checks were accurate and honest, did not believe that this man had actually contributed the money, all he would have had to do would have been to join me in a demand before that Senate committee for an investigation.

So, Mr. President, in view of the fact that the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania has seen fit today to charge me with misdemeanors and crimes, I want to tell the Senate that I have more charity in my heart than he has. I am not going to charge him with being a crook; I am not going to charge him with not paying his income tax; I am not going to charge him with not doing a good job and an honest job when he was custodian of alien property for the

State of Pennsylvania. I am not going to charge him with any of those things at all. I am simply going to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] that so far as my record is concerned I will match it against the record of any other Senator on this floor—and I include in that statement the Senator from Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I have been arrested or sued 15 times—15 times, I say to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania. That is a considerable number of times. In every single case, without exception, I demanded a jury of my peers to hear the evidence. I never sneaked into the Bureau of Internal Revenue and paid $436,000 in my life. I demanded a jury trial. Mr. President, a jury of 12 men heard all the evidence. The constitution of North Dakota provided for the selection of a jury to hear the evidence in the State case in which I was sued. The jury looked at the witnesses; the jury heard their sworn testimony. In every case the jury brought in a verdict of not guilty, except once; and before I conclude, I shall discuss that one case in detail with the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, why was I sued and arrested so often? If the Senator from Pennsylvania is interested, let me point out that the first case was when I was a boy 23 years of age. I sued the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, the Occidental Elevator Co.'s, the big lumber companies, and the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. I sued them for $1,250,000. I was a rather young fellow. I sued them in the county court. The case was tried before Judge Nuessle who is now on the supreme bench. He decided in favor of the elevator companies, but in my favor in the oil company case, the lumber company case, and the railroad company case.

Who was the lawyer on the other side? It was a man named Andrew Miller. Some years after the people had given him a thorough drubbing in a campaign for United States Senator he was appointed, on the recommendation of Harry M. Daugherty, to be United States Federal judge.

I appealed to the Supreme Court in the elevator company case and he appealed in the other three cases; and the supreme court of that State, in volume 32 of the North Dakota Reports—if the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is interested—the court held that the railroad company, the Standard Oil Co., and the lumber company had to pay $1,250,000 in cash. They paid it.

Shortly after that I became attorney general of the State. In the meantime I had been sued two or three other times. As soon as a man fights a railroad or any of the big boys, they commence to make trouble for him almost immediately. They got one of the railroad lawyers to bring suit charging me with forgery. I demanded a prompt hearing and trial and was acquitted.

I was elected attorney general of the State a short time after that. Who, I ask the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, was the first person I sued as attorney general of North Dakota? It was the great political boss, Alexander McKenzie, who sent two Democratic Senators to Washington.

I have before me a book written by Judge Wickersham, of Alaska, giving the record of McKenzie, who played with the Democratic Party. It was the same McKenzie who led the fight in North Dakota against Senator Bob La Follette, Sr., and against Hiram Johnson—the same old Alec McKenzie. I have in my hand a book written by Judge Wickersham, who had been appointed by Theodore Roosevelt to be the first judge in Alaska. This shows what kind of a man McKenzie was. It shows that before he went out there he found that there were quite a number of poor Swedes who were not citizens of this country but who had taken out their first papers. He conceived the idea of coming to Washington and having a law passed which would make it impossible for those Swedes to hold mining claims around Nome.

Mr. McKenzie succeeded in getting the kind of Federal judge he wanted appointed—a man by the name of Noyes, from Minneapolis. Then he went to the great State of Montana and got a United States prosecuting attorney. He then came to North Dakota and got a man named Stevens, a United States Commissioner. He loaded all of those precious gentlemen into a boat and started for Alaska.

He arrived in Alaska on the 21st day of July 1900. At first the judge did not even get off the boat. Mr. McKenzie got off and went to a law firm which was bringing some of the lawsuits to throw out the poor Swedes, and said, "If you will secretly take the United States district attorney into partnership with you, and give him a fourth of your fees, I will see that you win your cases." They agreed to it, as the sworn testimony shows. I have it here. I am sorry the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has left the Chamber. I hope he will return soon.

Mr. McKenzie was not satisfied with that. He said, "I want to cut myself in for one-fourth of what you get as attorneys' fees in this firm." The sworn testimony showed that that was agreed to. Before McKenzie left the United States he had gone to the great State of Arizona and there organized a big mining company with $15,000,000 capital. So he had $15,000,000 in stock—and the record shows that he kept the greater part of it himself. He took the $15,000,000 in stock and proceeded to do business. In the dark of the night on the 22d day of July, 1 day after McKenzie got to Alaska, the judge, a tool of his, signed an order throwing out every single one of the poor Swedes who had only taken out their first papers. They were thrown out of their mines, and Mr. McKenzie was put in as receiver.

Some of those mines paid as much as $15,000 a day in gold. Mr. McKenzie apparently thought that he had the mines forever; and very likely he would have had them if it had not been for one man, a man by the name of Charles K. Lane, a fighter from California. Mr. Lane had had some lawyers imported from California; and when those lawyers appeared before Judge Noyes and asked him to issue a restraining order to keep Mr. McKenzie from acting as receiver the judge would not even talk with them.

One week went by; 2 weeks went by; and those lawyers went to San Francisco. There the circuit court of appeals, which had jurisdiction, issued an order and sent a United States marshal to Alaska to enforce it. When the United States marshal got to Alaska McKenzie refused to recognize him at all. When he demanded certain documents which McKenzie had in his safe-deposit box in the bank, McKenzie got into a fist fight with the United States marshal and refused to obey the court order. The result was that the circuit court of appeals in San Francisco cited Mr. McKenzie for contempt of court. He was tried before the court, found guilty, and sentenced to 1 year in jail.

That did not seem to bother Mr. McKenzie very much. Of course he went to jail, but he had some very strong, influential friends—some of them Democrats—in the United States Senate. They promptly went to William McKinley, who was then President of the United States. President McKinley went across the country to San Francisco, and there issued a pardon to Mr. McKenzie on the ground that Mr. McKenzie's health was very bad and that he might die within a very short time.

Mr. McKenzie came right back to North Dakota and began to take charge of the Republican and Democratic Parties of the State of North Dakota. He finagled around, without putting up any money, and got control of the Bismarck Water Co.

He wanted to make all the money he could possibly make, and he proceeded to give the people of Bismarck the rottenest kind of water. So it was not long before a typhoid epidemic arose. About that time, as I have said, I became attorney general, and I promptly brought suit against this great Democratic political boss, this man who had sent two Democratic Senators to Washington while he professed to be a Republican, this man who had been a receiver for the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. He resisted the suit, and the evidence will show that we brought in to Bismarck from Washington, D. C., from the office of Surgeon General Blue, who at that time was the Surgeon General of the United States, two sanitary engineers. These men came to North Dakota and they made a sworn report, to which they testified in court that that water furnished by this Democratic-Republican boss was not fit to be bathed in, much less to drink. Of course, when the testimony came before Judge Nuessle he promptly issued an order requiring them to build a filtration plant so the people in Bismarck, N. Dak., could have decent drinking water.

But, Mr. President, the people in Bismarck, N. Dak., are a very smart and intelligent people. They did not propose that a man who had been siphoning out typhoid germs should keep control of that plant if they could help it. So they held a meeting in which they said they wanted a municipal water plant in

the city of Bismarck. As a result of the meeting an election was held. On one side was Alec McKenzie and Andrew Miller, whom he afterward made Federal judge. They were on one side of that fight and on the other side were the decent citizens of the city of Bismarck, N. Dak. We defeated them in that election 2 to 1, which gave us the power to build our own municipal water plant. The committee then went to Mr. McKenzie and the other men and said, "We would like to buy your plant. What will you take for it?" They said, "We want $860,000."

Practically all of that was water. Andrew Miller had an interest in it which, as I understand, he received in attorney's fees. C. B. Little, head of the First National Bank, had a $30,000 interest in it. The rest was all owned by Mr. McKenzie, and originally the plant was acquired for practically nothing by buying up some bonds in Baltimore, Md. He bought them for almost nothing. When they demanded $860,000 the Bismarck citizens went to Minneapolis and got in touch with some good engineers, who said that they could build that plant for $206,000, and possibly less. In any event we finally paid $206,000 and the citizens of Bismarck secured the water plant, and they still have it. As a matter of fact, it has been very, very successful.

Mr. President, I was frankly delighted in hearing the remark which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] made about my record, because only a few days ago the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania voted for the confirmation of a man by the name of Chandler to be a Federal judge of the western district of Oklahoma. Senators can judge how much interest the Senator from Pennsylvania had in the type of man he wanted to be appointed to a Federal judgeship when it will be remembered that when the confirmation was being considered by the Senate I rose on the floor of the Senate and protested, and every Republican except one voted against the confirmation of Stephen Chandler to be Federal judge for the western district of Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I had intended never again mentioning Mr. Chandler's name. We voted upon his confirmation, and, so far as I was concerned, the matter was forgotten. However, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has charge of the next senatorial campaign, I cannot do more than honestly state in further detail why every Republican Member of the Senate except one voted against Stephen A. Chandler for the Federal judgeship for the western district of Oklahoma.

Mr. President, when the appointment of Mr. Chandler originally was made I was not even a Member of the United States Senate. Seven months before the law creating that judgeship was signed by President Roosevelt, the F. B. I. had already been asked to make an investigation of Mr. Chandler. They made an investigation. Where do Senators suppose they first investigated? In Wall Street. The record shows they went to Wall Street and there they interviewed a man by the name of C. F. Urschel, the president of the Slick-Urschel Oil Co., of Oklahoma City. There is a letter in the file in Mr. Chandler's behalf from Mr. Urschel. In order to get a lot of good company around a bad man they went to a Methodist minister by the name of Dr. Farny Hutchinson. This Methodist minister sent out letters, one of them to Francis J. Kelley, the Catholic bishop of Oklahoma City and Tulsa. In that letter this Methodist minister stated that the law creating the position had already been passed, and that they were advocating the appointment of Mr. Chandler to the position. As a matter of fact, it was 7 months later before that job was ever created. So they went from man to man in Oklahoma City getting endorsements of Steve Chandler. But the record shows that Frank Murphy evidently refused to recommend him. Mr. Murphy was then attorney general. The record shows that Mat Maguire also did not recommend him. The record shows that Bob Jackson, now Justice of the Supreme Court, refused to have much of anything to do with the appointment. This judgeship was created in 1940. Nineteen hundred and forty and nineteen hundred and forty-one went by, and finally, in the latter part of 1942, the appointment of Stephen Chandler came before the Senate. A subcommittee was appointed, and at first it recommended favorably the confirmation of the appointment. However, later there was an investigation, at my request. That investigation showed—what? It showed that this man, for whose confirmation the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] voted, one of the men whom he says was so deserving awhile ago when he talked with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD]—it showed that this man Chandler one night was in his law office with three other men. They left about 10 o'clock——

Mr. President, I said a few moments ago that I had intended never again to allude to this affair, and I would not have done so had it not been for what the junior Senator from Pennsylvania said. The record shows that 15 minutes after Chandler left his law office on the 7th day of January 1936, he came back, and that when he went into his office he locked the door. He had there a young girl stenographer who had stayed working on an emergency brief. He knew she was there, if some of the testimony in the record is to be believed. Mr. Chandler came in and locked the door. He took that little girl, 19 years of age, a girl without a father, a girl, mind you, who, as the very fullest investigation shows, was a splendid young girl, a girl who has no police record, a girl who goes to church regularly, a young lady who, even to this day, has a fine job, a girl about whom there is not even the remotest gossip. If a part of the record is to be believed, it shows that Mr. Chandler made an indecent proposal to her; that when she rejected him, he threw her on a couch, and when she resisted him he struck her; that finally, when she got up, after kicking him, he knocked her down; that when she got up the second time and wrestled with him again, he struck her again, and that the fight was so bitter and so intense that the telephone was torn from the wall of the office. When she got up he knocked her down again. When she finally got out of that room, she went home to her mother. She was there with her mother when, early the next morning, at half past 7, the mother called up Mr. Chandler's office, and in a few minutes after half past 7 in the morning Mr. Chandler's partner went over there—to do what? He was not there asking, as I did in my cases, to have that case tried before a jury of 12 men, Mr. President. The last place Mr. Chandler, the friend of the Senator from Pennsylvania, wanted to be was in a courtroom. He did not want to face a jury; he did not want to have any witnesses paraded there; he did not want any investigation to show what had taken place. He testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee that he was not drunk that night; he testified that he had not had a single drink; he testified that he knew what he was doing every minute of the time; but, Mr. President, Senator GUFFEY'S friend paid the sum of $3,000 to that girl. He made a settlement with her almost immediately and took a receipt in full.

Mr. President, what do you suppose was the defense of this man Chandler, Senator GUFFEY'S friend, whom he helped to put on the highest court in the State of Oklahoma? His defense was that this girl's lawyer was a crook and a scoundrel and a dope fiend, but when the investigation was made by the F. B. I., and by others, the record shows that that lawyer, Tim McCaffrey, up to at least 1936 was one of the best and most brilliant lawyers in the State of Oklahoma. It was not until Tim McCaffrey dared to take a case against the millionaire oil men and Chandler, and his partners, that he was called a crook. From the moment Tim McCaffrey took that lawsuit he became a marked man in Oklahoma. But the investigation discloses that he is honorable; that his word can be believed in a lawsuit, and the Assistant United States Attorney, John Breck, whom I never met and have never seen, testified that he was a good, honest lawyer, and that he would take his word for anything in a lawsuit. Yet with that record, and with the further record in the case of the girl he had assaulted, claiming that there was a rumor that Mr. Chandler had assaulted another girl before he assaulted her—and if he did God only knows how much he paid that girl—yet with that record the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] says that they only reward deserving Democrats. That is the reason, I assume the chief reason, why this man Chandler is now going to sit as a Federal judge in the western district of Oklahoma. When cases come before him for violating the Mann Act, is this expert going to sit in judgment? There are Indians in Oklahoma, thousands of them, and, as everyone knows, some of them are wards of the Government. There are also many Indians in other States. When an Indian girl is raped, the case against the

culprit will be tried in a Federal court, presumably before Stephen Chandler, GUFFEY's friend and supporter.

As I said a few moments ago, Mr. President, I had not intended to revert to this Chandler matter, but, as will be recalled, I was the only Senator who submitted a minority report at first, although later some other Senators joined me. One day upon the Senate floor I was told that if I would make this speech against Mr. Chandler, the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma would read my record upon this floor, and that he would apologize to the people of Oklahoma and North Dakota and of the United States and to the Senate itself for ever having voted to seat me. In view of the fact that that invitation and that threat was made, of course, I made the speech, and I thought that I handled the matter in a very diplomatic, gentlemanly, and dignified way.

I never met Mr. Chandler until he was appointed judge. I have no animus toward him. I know only two or three or four people in Oklahoma, and I hold no animus against anyone in Oklahoma, and I did not care who got the position. But in view of what the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania said this morning, I want the Senate to have all the record, I want Senators to know everything about me. I would feel bad, indeed, if any other Senator on this floor felt the way the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] apparently feels about me.

I have told about being tried for forgery and being acquitted. The next time I was arrested was in Minot, N. Dak. Minot, as the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] so well said during the hearings, 20 years ago was one of the toughest towns in North Dakota. It was so tough that my predecessor as attorney general did not dare go in there and clean up the town. Mr. Murphy, who was one of my attorneys here during the hearings, was the assistant to the attorney general, and Mr. Murphy is authority for the statement I have just made. If a man went to the town of Minot to clean up the town, he took his life in his hands, and no one knew it better than my predecessor. So I went to Minot in disguise. I investigated around there 3 weeks.

Mr. President, I am so glad to see the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania in the Chamber again. I know what I shall tell him will help him.

I was in Minot in disguise, and I found that the town was one large mess of vice. I had there with me helping me a Methodist minister, Rev. F. L. Watkins, the head of the State Enforcement League, and his deputy, Mr. A. W. Finwall. We rented three houses. We employed 40 Burns men, and then, because we knew of the great danger we were in, we employed 10 Thiel detective agents to watch the 40 Burns men, so we had 50 detectives there.

At the end of 3 weeks I found that there were 156 men and women to arrest. Honky-tonks, sporting houses, gambling places, places where people were smoking opium, were running wide open. The night before the raid, on the 7th of May 1917, I had a fake raid. I wanted to ascertain just how the word was flashed from one vice resort to another. We had a fake raid, and as soon as we entered one place every other place in town was closed. That made it necessary for me to take charge of the telephone company, before we could have the raid the succeeding night. So the next night, with the 50 detectives, with about 100 other citizens, whom I gathered in the office of R. A. Nestos, later Governor of North Dakota, and sworn in, I myself, with three men to help, took possession first of the telephone exchange. I put those men in charge, and they kept possession 54 minutes.

We arrested 156 people. The jails in the town of Minot were not big enough to hold them. We took the big fellows as we took the little one. We arrested the head of the Soo Railroad Co., a millionaire, for being party to shipping in 19 barrels of beer marked as "Malt." Out of the 156 arrested, we convicted 153, or they pleaded guilty.

Among others we arrested was the representative of the great institution in St. Paul, Minn., known as the Schmidt Brewing Co., which, I am informed and believe, indirectly, through some of its officers, for the last 15 years at least, has contributed to the party of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]. They had shipped in 19 barrels of beer, and marked it "malt."

They came into court and plead guilty, and what do Senators suppose Judge Amidon thought? He thought they should pay a fine of $9,700. That is what he thought, and he fined them $9,700 and some odd dollars, and they paid it.

The next day those fellows in Minot, 25 years ago, got out a warrant for me, to arrest me. They got out two warrants, as a matter of fact. They proceeded to serve them on me. They came down to Bismarck, N. Dak., and Lynn J. Frazier, who was Senator from North Dakota for 18 years, was at that time Governor. Governor Frazier promptly called out the militia to protect me. Senator Frazier—and you Senators all know what a fine, square official he was—issued a notice that if anyone, whether he was a public official or not, came within 20 feet of me, the National Guard was instructed to shoot to kill. So for weeks, morning, noon, and all night, members of the National Guard never left me.

Then one day I went over to Minot. I went there when no one was expecting me, and put up $2,000 bail for my first trial and $2,000 bail for my second trial. When the hearing came on, there were thousands of people there, and the prosecution had five of the best lawyers in North Dakota to prosecute me—five of them. When they got all through, I was acquitted on the first charge. Then they tried me on the second charge, and I was again acquitted. Again I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and I feel that he will agree with me, that whenever a man is accused of any crime, the thing to do is not to sneak into an internal revenue office or anywhere else and settle, but the thing to do is to face a jury of his peers, and show that he is honest.

So we had a second trial, and I was acquitted in that one. To show what the people of North Dakota thought about those trials and about those arrests, and about all the things which appeared in the newspapers, in the churches of nearly all the denominations resolutions were passed—and I have them in my office, if any Senator desires to see them—praising me for the raid, and repudiating the things which were said about me by some of the newspapers and by some individuals.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union did me the great honor, for which I have been everlastingly proud, and I am proud of it today, of electing me an honorary member of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the State of North Dakota. I do not know of any honor I treasure more, because as I have gone along in the years, when things sometimes have looked very, very dark for me, those women, over that period of 25 years, have been loyal friends of mine, and did not do what some other organizations did who, when I tendered my resignation to them, promptly accepted it.

As I have said, as attorney general I must have been a good one, because even the Fargo Forum, which was so anxious to have me thrown out of the Senate a while ago, said then that I would make a good Governor of North Dakota, and supported me one time without my requesting it to do so. At any rate I was elected attorney general. Of course some of the trials—and I was acquitted in every one of them—did not amount to much, but I apparently got along quite well until I was elected Governor of North Dakota in 1932. That election for Governor was a great time in my State. When I came to take office I found that the friends out there of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] these psuedo-Republicans and psuedo-Democrats, who as a matter of fact are neither or both, whichever suits their purpose, and are always against the common people—I found first of all that they were building a new capitol. They had not begun to build it yet, they had just signed the contract, and before a single shovelful of dirt was turned had paid the sum of $149,000 for architectural fees.

When I exposed that situation, this newspaper out there, which is a great friend of the Senator from Pennsylvania and which thinks as he thinks, said that I was crazy, and wrote an editorial entitled "LANGER Gone Berserk." That editorial was written in the month of October 1932. In the month of January 1933, when at my request an investigation was had before the legislature, it was discovered that those who were building the capitol had paid $149,000 to the architects.

Let us see what happened to the men who were building the capitol in Bismarck. Let me explain the difference between the way I treated them and the way the friends of the Senator from Pennsylvania treated them. They were building the capitol, and one day I dis-

covered that there was some graft on the part of three men building it. We had a hearing before the legislature concerning it. I suspended those three men, and a few days later all three of them resigned. I had one of them arrested for taking a trip to New Orleans and filling in not only duplicate slips but triplicate slips, thus charging triple expenses for one trip. He came into court and pleaded guilty to that charge.

Mr. President, the man in charge of the building of the capitol was named Frank S. Hackett—Col. Frank Hackett—and I want the Senator from Pennsylvania to remember that name well. I discovered at the capitol before the contract was entered into that the old commission had gone to the American Federation of Labor and entered into a contract by the terms of which the men who belonged to the plasterers' union or the electricians' union or any other union were to receive a dollar or a dollar and a quarter an hour, but the unskilled laborers were not taken care of at all.

One morning when I went to the temporary office of the Governor I discovered 78 men standing around a little fire in a huddle. This was on a cold, cold drizzly day. That was about 7 o'clock in the morning. I called them into my office and asked them why so many of them were standing there freezing. They then told me for the first time that some of them had gotten up at 3 o'clock in the morning, had gone over there looking for work, from the company which had the contract, the Landorf-Bicknell Co., the millionaire concern in Chicago, and the only work they received was an hour at a time, and they were paid 30 cents an hour. One man, Ted Moen, of Bismarck, N. Dak., showed me his check—and he had reported for work every day for a week. This man with 5 little children received for his week's work the sum of 30 cents. I bought that check from him and I have that check in my office now, and will show it to any Senator who cares to see it. That man received 30 cents for 1 week's work. Those were the days of the depression, Mr. President.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a few minutes?

Mr. LANGER. I cannot yield, Mr. President. If I were going to yield to anyone I would yield tc the Senator from North Carolina, but I cannot.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. When I saw that check for 30 cents I took those 78 men into my office and drew up an agreement with them. That agreement provided that none of them would work upor the capitol building, and they would ask their friends not to work on it, and organized a strike. We said we would go to work just as soon as they would receive decent pay, just as soon as they would have an 8-hour day, so that if a citizen of North Dakota got up at 3 o'clock in the morning and went to the capitol building to work he would know he would receive at least 8 hours of work at decent pay. So the work was tied up on the capitol building for 1 week, for 2 weeks.

Then they took advantage of a clause in the contract which provided that unless the company went ahead and finished the work, the State could take it over. Then it was that Mr. Frank S. Hackett showed up. Mr. Hackett proceeded to tell me that those unions were no good anyhow. Before we got through with Mr. Hackett, after Hackett sent down to Chicago and brought up a car full of scabs and strikebreakers, when those scabs and Chicago gangsters tried to work on the State capitol, I called out the militia, with sharpened bayonets, to chase them down the hill and to load them on the car again. When Mr. Hackett found that we were not going to stand for any foolishness on the part of those millionaire contractors, Mr. Hackett resigned. He resigned after the Lundorff-Bicknell Co. made a contract to pay those workers 50 cents an hour for 8 hour's work a day, and a dollar and a half an hour for overtime, and double pay for Sunday work. He resigned. Where do you suppose he went, Mr. President? Why, he came right down to Washington. Whom did he go to see? Why, his old friend and pal, Jesse Jones—Jesse Jones, of Houston, Tex. Mr. Hackett thought he would like to make some easy money; and where, oh, where, could money be made any easier than by dealing with Jesse Jones, the bosom pal of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]?

Well, they had to use strategy. So, first of all, they tried to get a huge appropriation through the Senate, to build a new R. F. C. building. I forget how many millions of dollars they asked for; but, as I remember, it was $13,000,000 or $14,000,000. It may have been more. But the Senate did not see fit to appropriate that sum of money or to appropriate any other sum of money for an R. F. C. building. So Frank Hackett went back to Mr. Jones. I do not know whether Jesse Jones talked to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania. The junior Senator from Pennsylvania seemingly is an expert on finance; he is an expert as a custodian of alien property. He proved that in Pennsylvania. He knows the business from A to Z; and it may be that he was advising Mr. Hackett. But I do not know that, and I do not claim to know.

However, strangely enough, Mr. Hackett made a deal with Jesse Jones to build an R. F. C. building in the city of Washington. I do not know what it cost. The records will show. I understand it cost nearly $20,000,000. Mr. Hackett got a partner, and they borrowed the $19,000,000 or $20,000,000 from Jesse Jones. They constructed the building and leased it to the Government. They leased it at a sum sufficient so that in 20 years the building would be paid for in full.

That is not all, Mr. President; the junior Senator from Pennsylvania's friends hired Mr. Hackett and his partner to be custodians of the building, to take charge of the running of it, to watch it so that it did not run away; and for that, I understand, they were paid the sum of $100,000 more. The records are available. I do not know who owns this building today. Col. Frank S. Hackett is dead. I know he did not get to own our State capitol. I watched that. But my understanding is that the R. F. C. building in the city of Washington is not owned by the Government but is owned by Mr. Hackett and his partner—or, rather, by Mr. Hackett's heirs.

So, Mr. President, I submit to you and to the Senate that the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] should not talk about honesty and should not cast aspersions upon the junior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the fact that at the hearings held before the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, I was not required to go upon the witness stand. Perhaps, like someone else I know, I could have sneaked in the back door of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, when charged with crime, and could have paid. I did not do that, although I understand that a certain gentleman who resides in Pennsylvania did.

Instead of doing that, Mr. President, I insisted that I be sworn on the witness stand before the Committee on Privileges and Elections; and for 5 days every one of the 17 members of the committee, if they desired to do so, could ask me any questions about my life they wanted to ask. Let me say, in passing, that they did.

Mr. President, that committee had good lawyers. It had former United States Senator E. R. Burke—the Mr. Burke who now is the head of the Appalachian-Northern Coal Operators who are fighting the union men—the same Ed Burke. He was just like McKenzie: When he was in the Senate, he was a Democrat and was a close pal of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]; but after he was defeated in his campaign for re-election to the Senate, he changed overnight into a Republican, and registered as a Republican. So, Mr. President, it does not make any difference whether a man is a Republican or Democrat; if he is against the common people, he is against them, anyhow.

So that is the man the opposition chose—all the railroads and the grain interests about which I am going to tell the Senate in just a few minutes. Those railroads and grain interests looked all over the world to find someone to aid in having me thrown out of the Senate; and they picked former United States Senator E. R. Burke, the man who now is fighting the union miners, the poor fellows with large families—so poor, in fact, that, as one of the daily newspapers said the other day, the operators certainly should give them more than they are getting.

Mr. President, those railroad interests and grain elevator interests wanted to give Mr. Burke some help. I had a reputation in North Dakota of winning all the lawsuits I got mixed up with; so some of the big boys in North Dakota said, "Maybe Mr. Burke is not quite smart enough to get this fellow. We are going to give him some help."

Over in the State of Pennsylvania, the great State of Pennsylvania, from which the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] comes, there had been a great lawyer by the name of James Beck, at one time Solicitor General of the United States. So Mr. Burke said, "Well, I suppose I could use a little help." So they got Col. E. R. McGuire, the former partner of Mr. Beck, to help.

So, Mr. President, when I sat upon the witness stand in the Committee on Privileges and Elections, in addition to having there the 17 Senators who were members of the committee, there were also ex-Senator Burke and Colonel McGuire. But Mr. President, some fellow in North Dakota said, "We think you don't realize what a smooth, slick article this man LANGER is. You ought to get some more help. We will get you some more help."

So they conferred with a man who had been against me for United States Senator, and he said, "I know a man in Tennessee who would fill the bill. He is just the man you want, because he has had more of these contests than any other lawyer in the United States. He himself once ran for Senator in Tennessee, and he contested the election of one of the Senators"—the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. So they sent for Mr. H. C. Lowrie.

Those three lawyers got together in an office downtown to figure out how they could throw me out of the United States Senate. You Senators know the story. The distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The committee sent two men to North Dakota to investigate the case thoroughly. In order to get good men they looked around, and got a man by the name of Smith, who was an expert utility man. In my fights in North Dakota I had not only taken on all the railroads and all the grain exchanges, but I had also taken on all the utilities. I had been instrumental in reducing the rate for electricity at Bismarck, N. Dak., from 9 cents a kilowatt-hour to 1 cent a kilowatt-hour, and they were still getting too much. It may seem, offhand, that reducing the rate from 9 cents a kilowatt-hour to 1 cent a kilowatt-hour would not be fair; but the record shows that North Dakota was eminently fair to those gentlemen.

I had been in office a few days in 1933 when I sent for three men—an expert electrical engineer by the name of Rausch, from the agricultural college at Fargo; an expert from the University of North Dakota by the name of Irvin Lavine, who is so good that the friends of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] have hired him to help Pennsylvania. The third man was a graduate of the University of North Dakota, a Norwegian by the name of John Iverson.

They came to Bismarck and appeared before the industrial commission, on which A. J. Gronna, son of a former United States Senator, sat. Mr. Gronna was attorney general. A man by the name of John Husby was secretary of agriculture, and I was Governor.

We called in the representatives of the utility company, which was a branch of the Insull empire in Chicago, and said to them, "We believe you are charging too much for electricity." They said, "Oh, no; we are charging only a very reasonable price." They were charging 7 cents for electricity for the twine plant at the penitentiary, where we manufactured, roughly, 12,000,000 pounds of twine each year. The Bank of North Dakota and other institutions were interested.

We said to the representatives of the utility company, "These three men are going to make an investigation. They will make a report under oath. They will give you a copy of their report. Then we want the utility company to come before the industrial commission with its engineers and show us if the rate which they fix is too low."

At the end of 3 weeks those three experts made their report. They said that the public-utility company could make money if we paid it three-quarters of a cent a kilowatt-hour. We furnished that report to the company and set a day for hearing.

When that day came, instead of coming in with their engineers to show that that price was not right, they came in with a couple of lawyers and said they were going to get injunctions or restraining orders to prevent us from carrying out our threat not to pay more than three-quarters of a cent a kilowatt-hour.

The result was that I got in touch with the Pillsbury Engineering Co. in Minneapolis, and we started to build our own light plant for the State of North Dakota. When we had spent about $10,000, one day in came the manager of the Insull company, and he said, "If you will give us a contract for 1 cent a kilowatt-hour we will be glad to get the contract." So we gave it to them on two conditions: One was that they sign a 10-year contract with the State of North Dakota. I felt that I might not be Governor long, and that it would be a good thing to have the utility company tied up under a 10-year contract. The other condition was that they pay the $10,000 of expense to which the taxpayers of our State had been put.

The result was that the utility company put up a $10,000 Liberty bond with the State treasurer of North Dakota, and signed an agreement whereby, for 10 years, the State of North Dakota would get its electricity at 1 cent a kilowatt hour. The only place I have found where electricity is any cheaper is Tacoma, Wash., the home of my distinguished colleague the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE]. I do not pretend to know one-one-hundredth of what my distinguished colleague knows about electric power. Aside from Tacoma, I think the State of North Dakota gets the cheapest electricity in the United States, and it should, because all around Bismarck we have mines, and there is no reason why those mines, lying right next door to our State capitol, should not furnish electricity at 1 cent a kilowatt-hour.

As I say, the utilities were also interested. So we had 17 Senators, Mr. Burke, Mr. McGuire, and Mr. Lowrie. They asked me any questions they wished to ask. I was on the witness stand, under oath, for 5 days. If anything I said was not true, they could have arrested me for perjury. I think even my worst political enemies will say that some of my political enemies in North Dakota were not at all hesitant about coming forward with every bit of evidence they could possibly think of.

There was one very amusing feature of the case. The newspapers of North Dakota and the politicians opposed to me said, "There is a man by the name of Jim Malloy. He was very close to Governor LANGER for 8 years. He was his private secretary. He was associated with him morning, noon, and night." Before the committee my opponents even introduced a photograph which I had given Malloy, which I had inscribed "your loyal friend." They brought out the fact that I had been godfather to his little child. The politicians said, "If anybody in the world knows about BILL LANGER it is Jim Malloy." So, after 8 years of close association, if I had been guilty of what the junior Senator from Pennsylvania insinuated today, Mr. Malloy would have been only too glad to tell about it. If there had been one crooked deal, showing that I had received a single penny of money wrongfully, Mr. Malloy would have told about it on the witness stand. Anyone can look over that record in vain to find one charge on the part of Mr. Malloy that I personally ever wrongfully received a single penny that he himself knew anything about.

On the contrary, coming back to the two men who came to North Dakota, one of whom was Mr. Smith, the utility expert, as soon as they arrived in North Dakota they were met by Mr. Malloy, and Mr. Malloy proceeded to take charge of the investigation in North Dakota.

I did not care whom they went to see in North Dakota. So they went from one place to another. They would go up to a fellow and say, "Do you know anything about BILL LANGER?" The fellow would say, "No; don't know anything about him, personally, but my washerwoman's cousin told her cousin that John Jones' aunt told him that BILL LANGER stole money sometime some place." And they would promptly hunt up the washerwoman and her cousin. Altogether they were out there 3 months. They came back with 4,181 pages of testimony on long, legal cap paper—4,181 pages. It took my lawyer and myself 1 week to read it.

Whom did they go to? They went to every crook to whom my political enemies in North Dakota could direct them. They then looked up the record of every single lawsuit I had ever tried in my life—10,181 lawsuits. The only trouble is that those fellows did not know BILL LANGER. They thought I would be foolish enough to throw my files away. Fortunately I have every file of every lawsuit that I ever tried in any court of any kind. I have them all. So these investigators went back 30 years. They went to the place where I was born. They went to the church which I attended, and after making an appointment with the clergyman of that church

they did not care to ask him any questions.

They had 10,181 cases. They searched and they searched and they searched, and I challenge the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania to find in them any indication of dishonesty. I will give him a list of all of them. I will turn all the files over to him for his examination. I say again I am willing to place my record against that of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. I shall not yield the floor for 1 single minute. He can reply all he cares to when I shall have concluded.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I want to see the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I am perfectly willing to give him all the time he wants to answer me after I am through.

I repeat that I am willing to compare my record with that of the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania, or anyone else on this floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota refuse to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. Very well. I will renew my point later.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, we had this hearing, and of those 10,181 cases they took only 6. That is what those 2 investigators found, just 6 cases.

If I had thrown my files away—some of those cases were 20 years of age—I would have been helpless.

Take, for example, a case like the August H. Wruck case in Bottineau County, in which it was said that I had committed perjury in the filing of an answer in a civil case. Mr. President, what were the facts? A man named August H. Wruck came to my office and gave me $15 to put him through bankruptcy. He was so poor that that was all that he could spare, and still keep on living. He could not even pay the $50 fee to the Government. I took his $15 and gave him a receipt for it. I then wrote to the clerk of that county 200 miles away that I wanted a list of his judgments. I had to have a list of his chattel mortgages. I paid for those lists. The records were furnished me, and I completed the bankruptcy papers. I sent them to Judge Miller's clerk of the court, Mr. Montgomery. That man was an aged man, over 80 years of age, and he took the papers and laid them by because, he said, this man had signed them "Jacob H. Ruck." He received the papers in January, and the record in my files shows that I did not receive any word from him until April, when he wrote me a letter in which he said, "I cannot file these papers because under the new law and the rules adopted Wruck must sign his second name in full."

He said, "But, in my opinion, you can just sign them up by writing out his middle name in full."

I got those papers back in April. In the month of February Mr. Wruck, my client, made a settlement with the receiver of the closed bank. In the meantime I filed an answer saying that I was putting this man through bankruptcy.

Mr. President, what did these investigators find, and what did the evidence disclose? Why, it showed that after I received that letter from Mr. Montgomery I not only paid back that $15, but I returned $18. That was the testimony of Mr. Wruck. And yet, mind you, Mr. President, upon this floor of the Senate it took hours to bring out the fact that a man had paid me $15 and I returned to him $18. The man was thoroughly satisfied. He had not complained; of course not. Besides that, I made out the papers for nothing, and got nothing for the work which I had done, nor did I become recompensed for the cost of a certified copy of the chattel abstract or the list of judgments.

I now refer to the matter wherein the United States Government hired me years ago to defend four Indians for murder down in Sioux County. Mind you, Mr. President, the United States Government hired me in that case. I was in the employ of the United States Government. The United States Government officials said that Indians in that county had been railroaded from time to time immemorial. They said, "We want a lawyer to go down there and see that these Indians are not railroaded. They are charged with murder. Their rights have been taken away. They have been sold cattle at a high price when they received second-grade scrubs. They have sold Indians calves when, as a matter of fact, other calves were substituted and under cover of darkness the little sucking calves were run back under the fence to their mothers." They said, "We want a lawyer who for once will protect the rights of those poor Indians."

I was not hired until the day before the trial. At half past 2 in the afternoon I received a telephone call, and it was 65 miles from where I lived to the place of the trial, and the railroad ran only 30 of them. I did not even have time to go home and get my pajamas or my toothbrush. All I could do was run for the train because the trial was set for 9 o'clock the next morning. I had 65 miles to travel in the dead of the winter. I got down as far as Cannon Ball, N. Dak., which was as far as the train could go, and then I hired an automobile. I got out 4 miles into the country and got stuck in the snow. I could not get through. I went to a farmer's home and hired four horses and a sled to take me down to my destination. I got into Fort Yates about 2:30 or 3 o'clock in the morning. After I was hired over the telephone the deputy sheriff said, "When you get down here you can see your clients, whatever time it may be." I said, "I am not coming unless I can see them." He said, "You can see them to prepare your trial." When I went over there the sheriff was gone. The deputy sheriff said, "Oh, no, you cannot see your clients." I said, "Where is the key?" The Indians were in the jail. He said, "The sheriff has it." I said, "Where is the sheriff?" He said, "He is out in the country." "Well," I said, "If that is true, the little wooden building over there, the jail, is a firetrap, and there are four Indians in it. And I will move to have the sheriff reprimanded for leaving his prisoners there where in case of fire the Indians might be roasted to death." The deputy then said "The key is over there in the sheriff's office." I asked him to get it for me. He would not do so; and so, of course, I broke down the door. I did what any other lawyer would do in view of the United States Government's injunction telling me to go there and protect the interests of those four Indians. I broke down the door of the office and broke open the desk and took the key. I did not break into the jail. It was claimed at the hearing that I was a jail breaker; the newspapers said I was a jail breaker. All I did was to break into the sheriff's office and get the key. I went in the jail; but the deputy sheriff was there all the time and he had charge of those men. I went in there and unlocked the cells and talked to my clients until morning, and put them back in jail, and locked the cells, and put the key back in the desk, and then was ready for trial the next day. I might add in passing that all four of those Indians were innocent; not one was guilty of murder; they were all acquitted when the jury passed on the cases. Yet that was brought up upon the floor of the United States Senate 20 years after it happened; and word goes out today and we hear the junior Senator from Pennsylvania saying there is something wrong with my character because I dared to go in there and defend those four Indians.

Let me take up another case. A woman came in who said I did not get her a divorce. The facts of that case were that that woman had been married to a man named Oster, but one day she left her husband and started living with another fellow without getting a divorce from her husband, and then she went back to her first husband. Then she met another fellow, Petersen, and she liked him pretty well, but her husband, strangely enough, objected. She went out 4 miles from Hazleton, 3 miles west and 1 mile south, and took her two children along with her, but her husband had made up his mind to resume relations with her. So he went off and borrowed a gun and put it in a corn shock close to the house; he waited a week with the gun in the corn shock, and, at the end of a week, he thought it was about time to go and kill the other fellow. So he goes there at about midnight, takes the gun out of the corn shock, goes into the garage and waits until 5:30 in the morning, sitting in the garage waiting for Mr. Petersen to come out of the house. At about half past 5 o'clock in the morning Mr. Petersen came out with a pail full of oats to feed the chickens, and when he got halfway between the house

and the barn Mr. Oster took the gun and shot and killed him. That fellow was entitled to a defense; he was entitled to have a lawyer; he had a right to hire me. All I did in that case was to show that he was not guilty of premeditated murder, that he was not guilty of first-degree murder, but guilty of second-degree murder. The result was that my position was sustained by the jury.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. LANGER. No. I am sorry. I should like to yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas if I could.

The result was that this lady was entitled to have a divorce because, under our statute, whenever a man is sent to a penitentiary, as a matter of right, the other party can get a divorce.

Mr. President, I drew up all the papers in that case. I went to Judge Fred Jansonious. He set the case for a hearing. I notified her by telephone; I notified her by registered letter. The day came. The judge and I sat in that courtroom on Saturday afternoon, when ordinarily no work is done on Saturday. We stayed there all afternoon. She never showed up. I then wrote a letter to her by registered mail—it is all in the evidence—and told her that I would get the divorce for her, anyway, but never again to fool the judge.

That is one charge that was brought in the Senate, that I failed to get that woman a divorce. Of course, manifestly I could not march out into the country, put a rope around the woman's neck, and drag her into the court and drag her upon the witness stand. I notified her, as the record shows, four times. The court set the case for Saturday afternoon, and the judge was there and said he would stay until 4 o'clock in the afternoon. Not only that, but it was a gratis case; I was doing it for nothing, doing it as a favor to her. That is another one of the cases which was brought out.

I will not go into 3 more just like it. They are all trivial cases, out of 10,181. If anyone is interested, I will get the files in my office, and shall be very glad and happy to show them. As I said a little while ago, I was sued or arrested 15 times, but I always had the case brought before a jury. I will give the Senate a typical lawsuit which was brought against me.

There was a fellow by the name of C. E. Hoover, living at Dawson, N. Dak., and this is one of the gravest charges brought against me on the floor of the Senate, the Hoover case. Mr. Hoover comes in and says to me, "I have been robbed of $11,000. I had a section of land"—this is his story—"about 6 miles north of Dawson, that I sold to Mr. and Mrs. Paul Kinev, two Bulgarians. I sold it to them and $11,000 was still owing me." He said, "In Dawson there are a couple of bankers, Mr. Rohr and Mr. Kooker. The Midland Life Insurance Co., of Minneapolis, came to Dawson selling life insurance. They appointed these two men as their agents to sell insurance. The deal was that they should keep 70 percent of the first premium, and the other 30 percent would be deposited in the bank. An agreement was made with the Midland Life Insurance Co., of Minneapolis, that the 30 percent would stay in the bank, no matter how much insurance was sold. That 30 percent stayed in the bank. In 2 or 3 years the 30 percent amounted to $11,000. So one day the insurance commissioner of the State of Minnesota called in the life insurance president and said, "Look here, banks are closing in North Dakota; you cannot carry that $11,000 as an asset. You have got to charge it off." So in 2 or 3 days up to North Dakota comes the president of the life insurance company. He goes to Mr. Rohr and Mr. Kooker, and says, "I have got to take out this $11,000." They said, "You cannot take it out; we cannot pay it. We have not got it." So the three of them got together and figured out that they would trade the $11,000 no-good deposit to this poor farmer, Charlie Hoover, for his $11,000 first mortgage. So they went to this poor farmer, residing in the north side of the town, and traded the $11,600 worthless bank account for a first farm mortgage of $11,000, and, to make it sweet, they said they would pay $600 cash. So they gave Hoover $600 cash and an $11,000 no-good account. The life-insurance officials promptly took the $11,000 mortgage to Minneapolis, and within 3 days they transferred it to an innocent holder for value. Of course, Mr. Hoover could not get a dollar on his $11,000 from the bank. He told me that story, and naturally, as would any other lawyer in the Senate, I felt that he had been shamefully treated.

He said he had consulted a lawyer, Ed. Kelly, of Minneapolis, and Knauf & Knauf, at Jamestown, N. Dak. Finally he said to me, "I will give you one-half if you can get it back." I said, "Under the statutes of this State you have to advance the filing fees and the actual costs. You can not give me half, but under the supreme court decision you can give me a sum in an amount equal to one-half." That is the statute. There may be a fine distinction, but it makes an awful lot of difference in law.

We made an agreement, and he went home and I went on to Minneapolis. I went to Dawson, made my investigation, and I conducted the lawsuit for him. It took me a little over 3 years to get the decision. I got a judgment for $11,000. Then the job was, how to collect it. The bank was broke, they had closed up. The life-insurance company had gone into the hands of a receiver. What they had left they had sold to the Midland Life Insurance Co., of St. Louis, Mo. Both the bankers were broke. So there I stood, with an $11,000 judgment.

I went to Minneapolis and St. Paul, and in Minnesota at that time there was a statute which provided that the stockholders had a double liability. I did not know how good it was, but I came home and wrote the former president of the company a letter. I told him just exactly what kind of a citizen he was. I got him very angry, just as I intended he should be when he got the letter. I got him so mad that he promptly wrote back to me that he was going to appeal the case; and he did appeal it. Just the moment he appealed it I made an application in court to require a bond to be put up. He got a Detroit company to put up a bond for $11,000. In a few weeks the supreme court affirmed the judgment, and I got a check for $11,000 from the bonding company. Of course, I had my agreement, and I took my half.

When Mr. Hoover came to cash his check, he went to the bank at Tappen to cash it, and the banker, who happened to be a deadly enemy of mine belonging to the other side of the fence, a part of this Democratic-Republican fusion they have set up out there—this banker promptly said, "You don't mean to say your lawyer charged you half of what you got?" He said, "He did." He said, "You ought to sue him." He said, "I have not any money to sue him with. I don't want to spend my half to sue him." So he said, "Some of the members of the Bankers' Association will pay for it. Go right ahead and sue him." So in a few days I was served with a summons and a complaint in a suit attempting to get the whole $5,000 back.

Well, I went into court, demanded a jury, and the first witness the other fellow called was myself; they put me on the stand for cross-examination. I might add that they had three lawyers, too, and they got good lawyers. One of the first questions they asked me was, "Have you any written contract with Mr. Hoover? Have you got any letters of Mr. Hoover saying you are to get half?" I said, "No; I have not."

So they went ahead and put in the testimony, and it took a week. When they got all through, of course, I put in my side of the case, and when I got on the witness stand my lawyer said, "Mr. LANGER, have you any written contract with Mr. Hoover to show you were to get half?"

I said, "Yes."

He said, "Have you any letters?"

I said, "Yes."

Promptly counsel on the other side jumped up and said, "You told us you did not have them."

I said, "I did not have them at the time you asked me. My lawyer had them. I turned them over to my counsel, who had them."

The contract was there for 50 percent, and the letters showed 50 percent. But it had taken about 10 days to try that case in its entirety, and that is typical of the kind of lawsuit they brought, just one lawsuit after another. They got a hired man to sue me; they got a crippled boy to sue me, knowing that every time they got a case all the money I had saved up would be spent in the lawsuit.

I was very much interested in the report of these two investigators when they brought in some affidavits. I think I will take that up a little later, however, because I want to go back to the one time when I was convicted, because the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania apparently is very much interested in my record.

As I have said, I was Governor of the State. I found, when I became Governor on January 1, 1933, that some newspapers had whole solid pages of mortgage foreclosure advertisements, solid pages. I remember one paper over in Kidder County, published in Steele, had two pages of mortgage foreclosures. As a matter of fact, before I became Governor one-half of the land of Kidder County had been foreclosed on. Insurance companies in some instances, banks in some instances, the Federal land bank in other instances, had foreclosed on this property. So the first thing I was up against was the Federal Land Bank of St. Paul. They did not like the Supreme Court decision which held that the State of North Dakota had a first lien for hail taxes. We had also passed a law providing that there could not be any antideficiency judgments taken. The Federal land bank said that unless the State of North Dakota would change that law, they would not make any loans in North Dakota. We promptly said, "We do not care whether you make any loans in North Dakota or not." I might add that for all the years since 1932 the Federal land bank has not made one loan in North Dakota.

They tried to coerce the State. Time and again they have gone before every legislature in an attempt to get that law changed, to wipe out the antideficiency law, but out there in North Dakota the farmers said, "We don't want this Federal land bank at all if in order to get it we have to repeal the antideficiency judgment law."

The result was that I declared a moratorium. I simply said that if any sheriff went out to sell any farmer's farm I would remove that sheriff from office. That applied also to personal property.

One of the big chain stores had sold a washing machine to a woman who was making her living taking in washing. The price was $87.50. That woman had paid all that sum except $3.50. Yet they hired a lawyer, they drove out over 60 miles, and took that washing machine away from that poor woman for the $3.50. The State senator from that area, Oliver Balden, telephoned me about it. I sent that sheriff a telegram and told him that if he did not get that washing machine back before 8 o'clock, we would have a new sheriff the next day in Grand Forks County, and asked him to reply by telegram. At 7 o'clock I received a reply that the poor woman had the washing machine. She paid the $3.50 as soon as she possibly could, paid it in full.

As to this matter of land, there were farmers whose grandfathers had filed upon homesteads, their fathers had lived there, and they had lived there. At that time we had had 5 or 6 years of drought. There were fields in North Dakota 640 acres in extent, Mr. President, which were just as bare as is this table. There was not enough raised on them to feed a chicken, much less a cow. I remember that one time we gave $50,000 worth of hay to McKenzie County, and in order to be sure that those who distributed it were not squandering it, I, while Governor, disguised myself and went out in old clothes to see how the hay was being distributed. I came to the home of a farmer 4 miles south of Watford City, N. Dak., and there in the yard lay 45 chickens which had actually starved to death. That in a small measure goes to illustrate the want, misery and terrible condition in that part of the country. For 726 miles in 1 year along the Great Northern Railway not 1 car of grain was shipped. The railroads did not pay their taxes, the farmers did not pay their taxes, and the job was to run the government of North Dakota without any money coming in, especially in view of the fact that my predecessor, when he went out of office, left one-half million dollars in debts. I suppose he had had his troubles, too.

So, Mr. President, I declared a moratorium, and I might add that within 6 months the moratorium was copied, in some form or other, by every Governor in the United States of America, and I have no doubt that in the States of the Senators here who were Governors at that time that you copied that moratorium in some form or other. I know that Governor Lehman of New York copied it almost in toto. It saved some 50,000 farmers at least from foreclosure in North Dakota.

Of course, that moratorium made me some enemies. In addition to that, I had declared for an income tax. We had an income tax in North Dakota, but at very low rates. Just before I became Governor the railroads had initiated a measure, which was passed by vote of the people in 1932, cutting the valuation of the railroad properties to 50 percent for purposes of taxation.

The result was that North Dakota had to obtain money from some place, and the lower house of the legislature and I decided to have an income tax. That created many enemies. I had to call a special session of the legislature for that purpose. So it became necessary in North Dakota, with every newspaper against me except one and very few weeklies for me, for me to have at least one newspaper which we could send to the farmers of my State.

My grandfather, who had come to North Dakota at about the time of the Custer massacre had been in the beginning of that fight. The Northern Pacific Railroad and the Great Northern Railroad are the two large railroads in North Dakota. Any farmer who wanted to sell his grain found that he had to sell it to an elevator company, and the directors of the elevators were officials of the railroad companies, and had interlocking directorates.

The elevator companies would pay just exactly what they chose to pay the farmer for his grain. They would give the farmer 24 or 25 or 26 cents, or whatever they wanted to pay him, for his wheat. They robbed those farmers right and left, as they had robbed my grandfather and my father. So my father and some others built an elevator right off the railroad right-of-way. They went to court to mandamus the railroad to build a spur over to the elevator, but they were defeated in court. They could not get the spur built. Then they helped to organize a cooperative exchange called the Equity Cooperative Exchange in my home town of Casselton, and within a short time they had thousands upon thousands of members, and a man named John M. Anderson was manager and George Thiel was secretary of the cooperative exchange.

They went to Minneapolis to buy a membership on the exchange, but were refused a membership. The result was that an every bushel of grain handled an extra payment of one-half cent to 1 cent had to be made. In spite of that they handled millions of bushels of grain a year. The exchange was highly successful.

What happened? One day out of a clear sky the Fargo Forum, the leading daily newspaper in North Dakota, came out with a great headline, "Equity Exchange Insolvent." Of course, that was not true. The farmers who were members of the exchange went to court, and they finally landed down here in Washington before the Federal Trade Commission. They were helped here by Senator La Follette, father of the present Senator from Wisconsin, who appeared with them before the Federal Trade Commission. It took 6 years to obtain a decision, and at the end of those 6 years the Federal Trade Commission said that the Equity Exchange was absolutely solvent, that there was nothing wrong with it, nothing wrong with the way it did business, and it was shown that some newspapers and lawyers had received the sum of $50,000 from the Minneapolis Grain Exchange, and that the action against the Equity Exchange was brought deliberately to wreck it.

When I went to college in New York I discovered that in the State of New York the elevators at Buffalo were owned by the State of New York. It is not socialism in New York for New York State to own the elevators at Buffalo. It is not socialism in Seattle, Wash., for the city of Seattle to own the fish market. It is not socialism in Maine for a town to own a lumber yard. But when we out there in North Dakota tried to amend our constitution so that the State of North Dakota could spend $300,000 to build terminal elevators to help out the farmers, immediately the cry of socialism was raised. Yet in spite of it all we won by a vote of 3 to 1.

Under the constitution of our State, however, it was necessary to vote twice on the same subject, 2 years apart. It was said that the people could not be trusted, and that in a moment of passion they might vote one way and be sorry for it afterward. So it was said that they should vote twice on a question 2 years apart, at different elections. During the 2 years' interval some newspapers did everything they could to defeat the proposal, but the election took place 2 years later, in 1913, and by a vote of 4 to 1 the people of North Dakota approved the expenditure of that money for terminal elevators.

One would think that certainly the people of a great State, having gone to the polls twice and having said they

wanted terminal elevators, should be entitled to have them. The Governor of the State at that time was the cousin of Mark Hanna, former Governor of Ohio. He is an honest, conservative businessman, a man who has been in Congress. Governor Hanna appointed a committee and that committee decided it would be bad business for North Dakota to spend $300,000 to build State-owned terminal elevators and give the farmers a decent price for their grain. When that committee made its report, 300 of us met at Bismarck with the legislature and we needed an adviser. Out of all the men in the United States we picked Robert La Follette, the man who had been Governor of Wisconsin, to be our adviser.

He came up to North Dakota and made speeches for us and talked to enormous crowds. When the vote of the people was turned down, we organized the Non-Partisan League. We said we did not care whether a man was a Republican or a Democrat; we did not care whether he was a Swede, or a Norwegian, or a German, or a Negro, or a Jew, or a Catholic, or Protestant; but we were going to get fair prices for our people; and, instead of having McKenzie, the man whom McKinley had pardoned, run the State, we would have that State run by the people of North Dakota themselves. The men who taught us that philosophy were Senator La Follette, and George S. Loftus, and A. C. Townley, and some other men out there within the borders of our State, or men whom we hired to come there and speak.

After we organized, on Lincoln's Birthday, in every precinct in North Dakota those people met. In those 2,260 precincts they elected delegates who, on Washington's Birthday, met in every county seat; and a week later they met at the State capital. If ever there was democracy functioning from the grass roots, it was in North Dakota, through the Non-Partisan League. We did not leave any chance for the grain exchanges, or the grain elevators, or the railroads, or the large banking interests from Chicago or elsewhere to control that convention. For 2 days those 300 or 400 delegates sat there discussing what was good for North Dakota. We adopted our platform. Then the time came to nominate candidates. No nominating speeches were allowed. Each of those delegates received a yellow slip of paper, and on that slip he could write as many names as he chose to write as his choice for Governor. Those names were written on a huge blackboard. Then each delegate was given a white slip of paper, and could vote for any one of those persons.

When those North Dakota farmers finished voting, they had chosen Lynn J. Frazier, as square as any man who ever sat in the Senate. They endorsed him on the Republican ticket for Governor of North Dakota. In the same way, they endorsed the full ticket. They would vote the first time; and the name of the man receiving the smallest vote would be rubbed off the blackboard; and then they would vote again, until only one name remained. It was in that way that I was endorsed for attorney general of North Dakota.

Then what happened? After we won by an overwhelming vote in the primary, and after we swamped the opposition in the fall, why, every Member of the Senate who knew Lynn J. Frazier when he was here, and who knows him now, and knows that he is a fine man and progressive, remembers that he was called all the names that John L. Lewis is being called today, and a whole lot of names worse than those. When he took over the coal mines at Wilton, N. Dak., after the attempt was deliberately made not to work the mines in North Dakota—Lynn J. Frazier stepped in with the militia and took over the mines—why, the names John L. Lewis is being called are not one, two, three, as compared to the names Lynn J. Frazier was called. One of the daily newspapers carried an article saying, "Why, those Senators, those legislators, whom the farmers elected are so ignorant"—those men who pay the taxes, those men who furnished the soldiers in the World War No. 1—"that hay and straw ought to be put on the floor of the Capitol so that those farmers would feel at home."

Yet, Mr. President, those farmers went into power and gave the State of North Dakota one of the best administrations it has ever had.

I am telling the Senate today, and especially the Senators who, during the last 2 or 3 days, have been talking about communism, that the best citizen in the State of North Dakota and, I believe, in the United States is a poor man who has been helped to own his own home. That is the policy which Senator Frazier and the rest of that administration adopted.

However, so bitter and so continuous was the fight against them, that, after Senator Frazier had been elected twice, believe it or not, they recalled him. They got 91,000 people to sign a recall petition; and, for the first time in the history of the United States, a Governor of a State was recalled. In the recall election, let me tell the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, the reactionary Democrats of North Dakota were just as ruthless to Lynn Frazier, just as contemptible, as any of the reactionary Republicans. The junior Senator from Pennsylvania talked today about Mellon contributing money for the election in South Dakota. Let me say that even in the last election in the State of North Dakota, the last time I ran for office, money was sent in by the two parties, just as the junior Senator from Pennsylvania charged in reference to South Dakota. But who got it? Not the Progressives. The money was spent against us; not a single penny of it was used for us.

So, as I say, it comes with ill grace to have the charge made upon the floor of the Senate—whether it be as to South Dakota or as to North Dakota—that any of that money was sent into the State with the idea tht it belonged to the Progressive faction of the Republican Party.

So, Mr. President, having gone back, and having given you a bird's-eye view of the Nonpartisan organization, I say that those big interests left undone nothing which they could think of doing to wreck the Nonpartisan League.

Why, when we called a mass meeting at St. Paul, Minn., to protest against World War No. 1, we looked around for outstanding speakers. We selected Senator Borah, of Idaho, and Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin. Some 20,000 persons were at the meeting in that vast auditorium. Senator Borah spoke first and then left. Senator La Follette spoke afterward. Yet, it was only by the skin of his teeth that Senator La Follette escaped from being thrown out of the Senate, because it was claimed that he had been disloyal and had said things at that meeting that he never said—things which the Associated Press quoted him as saying, and for which it afterward apologized. One of the happiest remembrances of my youth is that as a young man in my twenties, I wrote to Senator La Follette offering to testify before any Senate committee hearing that might be called.

So I came back, with that background, to North Dakota. I declared a moratorium. We had instituted a high income tax, one of the very highest rates in any State in the Union. I had issued an embargo to keep durum wheat from being shipped out of North Dakota at ruinous prices. The farmers could not get along with the prices they were getting. The price had gone up. The Democrats and opposition Republicans out there had got in touch with the New Deal—some of the friends of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY].

Strange as it may seem to Senators, although I was sick when my inauguration occurred, although I lay in the hospital for 6 weeks after the inauguration, although I was sworn in as Governor on a sick bed, almost as soon as I got out I discovered that because it so happened that I was the only Republican Governor elected that year, down in Washington I was selected as the boy to be whipped. The New Deal administration was going to make an example of the only Republican Governor elected in the entire United States. So whom do we find on the job? Harold Ickes.

First of all, I found my telephone tapped. Every conversation that I had was recorded. I found my office desk as Governor of the State broken into and the contents taken. The Gestapo at its worst in Germany was not any worse than what we had to face in North Dakota. Even my mail was intercepted.

Finally they sent 12 men to North Dakota to convict me, if they could, for violation of the income-tax law. That is always the last resort. "Get them on the income tax." For 2 weeks investigators sat down in St. Paul, going over my income-tax report. When the report was sent back to Washington they said, "We did not send enough, or the right kind of income-tax men to North Dakota." So before they got through they sent in the man who had convicted Al Capone in Chicago for violation of the income-tax law. They sent him to North Dakota to take charge of the income-tax investigation of the Governor of the State, who had committed no crime.

A large number of income-tax men—I think they had 42 of them—was divided into squads. They were sent out by automobile and by airplane. Two men were sent to 24 Produce Exchange,

New York, to the office of Frank Prina, who was handling the North Dakota flour for New York City. They walked in and went through his books.

On the same day another squad went to Wood & Sands in Boston, who were handling North Dakota flour for the Atlantic seaboard.

On the same day several men, under the direction of the man who convicted Al Capone, walked into the office of the Standard Oil Co. in Chicago. The Standard Oil Co. had sold us several million dollars' worth of oil and materials in connection with building highways. Those men wanted to see the books, and did.

On the same day they went into Chicago, Minneapolis, and Fargo, N. Dak. They went to every single broker who handled North Dakota bonds in any capacity whatsoever. They thought that because I, as Governor, had got the bonds up from 62 cents on the dollar to $1.18, I must have made some money somewhere. They were out looking for it. They could not imagine that I was honest.

When those forty-odd men reported back, they had nothing. After examining all those books in all those places they had nothing; but they said, "We must get this Governor." They had to get him, just as they tried to get Senator Borah, when they arrested Senator Borah in Idaho. Clarence Darrow was out there at the time of the Borah trial. They did not get him. When they could not get Borah, they arrested BURT WHEELER, our colleague—anything to discredit a progressive, whether he be a Republican or a Democrat. "If you cannot get Borah, get WHEELER. If you cannot get WHEELER, get Floyd Olson, of Minnesota." So they started their proceeding against Governor Olson, of Minnesota. When they could not convict Borah, or Wheeler, or Floyd Olson—they had not learned anything from all those things—they came to North Dakota to harass me.

They could find nothing that I had ever done that was a crime. I was not worrying, because I had not committed any crime. As I stated awhile ago, we needed a newspaper in North Dakota; so one Sunday, in the presence of a thousand people at Verona, N. Dak., I got up before the crowd and said, "The progressives are having a hard time with their newspapers. William Jennings Bryan could not keep his Commoner going. Senator LA FOLLETTE has had a tough time with the Progressive over in Wisconsin. I want to get a vote of you people as to whether you think we ought to organize a newspaper by having every person on the public pay roll who wishes to do so, spend 5 percent, 2 percent, 1 percent, or whatever he wants to spend. We will give him an equivalent amount of subscriptions to sell, so that he can get his money back."

There was no assessment on anybody. It was not a "2-percent club," such as that organized by Paul McNutt of Indiana. It gave a man or woman who wanted to help an opportunity to help and sell subscriptions to get his or her money back. There was nothing wrong about it then, and there is nothing wrong about it now, wherever it may be done. It is not an assessment.

They voted for it unanimously, including the Democrat who ran against the league on the opposition ticket.

In the collection of this money I contributed my share. I did not handle the funds. They went to the Republican State chairman, Oscar Erickson. In the collection of those funds six persons, not on relief, as the newspaper had said, but six persons working in the F. E. R. A., voluntarily contributed $178 in subscriptions. It so happened that the money of the highway department, wherever it was spent, was reimbursed by the Federal Government. The stenographers in the highway department received their money from the State. They received State warrants. Nevertheless the highway department was reimbursed by the Federal Government.

One day, out of a clear sky, Andy Miller, the Harry Daugherty judge, who was the tool of Alexander McKenzie, who had been in jail in San Francisco and pardoned by President McKinley, Andy Miller, who had been appointed Federal judge, the man whom I had helped defeat for United States Senator, the man against whom I campaigned all over the State of North Dakota, the man whom I had charged publicly with being a drunkard and having taken the Keely cure—during the time he was attorney general—this judge dismissed the regular grand jury. Ten days later he called a special grand jury. I heard that the special grand jury was there to indict me, and so I tried unsuccessfully to appear before the jury.

Within a short time the grand jury indicted nine of us. They indicted us for the newspaper deal which I have told about. They said we had interfered with and obstructed an act of Congress. We put up bail. In the meantime I was running for Governor again. The opening date of my campaign was set for the 17th day of May, when I was to give my opening speech of the campaign. However, Judge Miller decided that would be a good day to start my trial instead. So, though I had been advertised to appear in one place, nevertheless my trial opened at Bismarck.

There I learned how easy it is in a Federal court to convict an innocent man. Up to that time I do not suppose that in the whole State of North Dakota there had been a man who had had more experience in criminal law than I had had as a lawyer. I had had a fine law practice in the State, and it was almost all criminal work in which I specialized.

Before the trial started, I tried to obtain a change of venue, because the judge was prejudiced and my deadly political enemy; but three of the defendants would not sign it. Three men with whom I had never had any dealings, two of whom I had never spoken a word to in my life, were indicted with me for conspiracy. Those three men would not sign, and as all must sign to make an affidavit good, the result was that I had to go to trial before Judge Miller; and if the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania gets any satisfaction from that, for God's sake let him have all the satisfaction he can get out of it.

We were to be tried on the 17th day of May. We had previously asked for a list of the jurors. Up to that time and since, in every trial in the Federal court, the names of the jurors have been available. But when I came up for trial not a single name was permitted to go out, either to the defense or to the public. We did not know what names were on the jury list until we sat down to try the case.

(At this point Mr. CONNALLY approached Mr. LANGER and conferred with him briefly.)

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I claim the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I am not yielding the floor. I decline to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. I claim the floor. The Senator from North Dakota yielded the floor when he quit speaking. I claim the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is overruled. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to yield, but I cannot. I am sorry.

Mr. President, I wish to make one thing clear. I like the Members of this body. I have a deep affection for many of them as I know they have for me. I have had fine treatment from Senators. Yet, when a charge is made like the one which has been made by the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] all I can do is to get up and defend myself and my record.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LANGER. I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, when those 72 names were laid before my counsel and myself, when we could not get a change of venue because three defendants would not sign the affidavit, we found upon that list practically every personal enemy I had in the State of North Dakota. If ever a jury anywhere in the world was hand-picked, that jury was hand-picked. It did not do any good to protest. The trial proceeded.

Sitting on the jury—we picked the 12 best ones. They were all of the opposite political faith. Practically none of them came from the farm. They were hand-picked. After we finally concluded the selecting of the trial jury one member who tried me was a man who had just got through suing me as Governor under a so-called antiusury statute.

Another one of the 12 who was trying me was a man by the name of I. Hullet, who just a few weeks previously

had been before the Public Securities Commission, of which I was ex officio president, on complaint of Representative BURDICK that his company had deprived the farmers of thousands of dollars because of the fact that the stock which was issued on crop-production loans had not been returned when the loans were paid. We had just taken action which provided that a part of his salary should be deducted each month, to be paid to the farmers who had made these loans. So we had this trial. It took a month. When the 17th day of June came I was convicted; but when I took the matter to the people in the election, and just 10 days after that conviction, the people of North Dakota, in spite of all that Senator GUFFEY may say today, the people of North Dakota, knowing the facts, having heard all about that trial day after day and day after day, nevertheless renominated me by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. President, there are one or two other things I desire to mention. Senators who were present at the time my case was under consideration will remember that there were three or four chief allegations. I am not going to go into all the details of them today, but I want to serve notice now that sometime when the junior Senator from Pennsylvania is here, as I see he has left the Chamber, I shall discuss those charges involving the so-called bond sales in North Dakota, the matter of lowering railroad taxes which was talked about, and the matter of the South Dakota judge.

I desire to make it plain that I have only the deepest affection for my colleagues in the Senate. I do not think any Senator here can say that I have treated one who voted against me any differently than one who voted for me. I believe when a man comes here he votes according to the dictates of his conscience, and that is the way I have voted. But I want to serve notice here and now that from today on at a time such as when the matter of the confirmation of Judge Chandler came up, or any other time, while I am a Member of this body when any Member of the Senate impeaches my honesty or integrity and I am here upon the floor of the Senate, that I am perfectly willing to have any Senator say anything he knows about me; I am perfectly willing to have him produce any record he has; because I say that here before you today stands an honest man, a man who made an honest record as attorney general and as Governor of his State, and in North Dakota time and time and time again I have gone into court and defied my enemies to bring in any record or witnesses showing anything else. Yet they came down here and by insinuation before a committee that could not by any stretch of the imagination be familiar with the facts, presented a lot of testimony, and sent the findings all over the United States before I had a chance to defend myself or get upon the witness stand here.

As I say, Mr. President, I have taken what may seem to some Members of this body to be a large amount of time, but I merely ask any of you, who has a wife and a family, and a record of which you are proud, if the junior Senator from Pennsylvania got up and made such charge as he made here this afternoon, would you not defend yourself and state the true facts?

I might add that in my State I offered to debate with the Governor of North Dakota in the last campaign upon these issues, and the Governor of North Dakota refused to accept.

No one regrets more than I do that the junior Senator from Pennsylvania saw fit to charge me as he did this afternoon. I want to make it clear once more than I can look any man in the eye and that my conscience is absolutely clear. Here in the Senate, so long as I am here, I expect to vote for the underdog; I expect to vote for the laboring man, and for the farmer, whenever I think they are right. I expect to vote to support Franklin Delano Roosevelt whenever I think he is right. I did not come here to become the tool of any Democratic machine or any Republican machine, or any wealthy reactionary group. I came here to represent the plain, common, ordinary people of the State of North Dakota and of the United States of America. And from that nothing on this earth shall deter me.

SPECIAL ASSISTANT, COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably from that committee, without amendment, Senate Resolution 142, and ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 142) submitted by Mr. REYNOLDS on April 22, 1943, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Resolution 247, agreed to June 15, 1942, authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs to employ, during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1942, a special assistant to be paid at the rate of $3,300 per annum from the contingent fund of the Senate, hereby is continued in full force and effect during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1943.

INVESTIGATION RELATING TO SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF HYDROELECTRIC POWER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, also as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably from that committee, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 155, and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this is a resolution which was offered by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], who desires to have investigated certain power questions in the Southwest and West. I have conferred with one of the minority members of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is out of the city, and I was not able to reach the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. The resolution is satisfactory to the Senator from New Hampshire, is satisfactory to the majority of the committee, and is satisfactory to both majority and minority leaders.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Oregon has been notified of it, has he?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. The resolution had been reported favorably without amendment from the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 155) submitted by Mr. MCFARLAND on June 4, 1943.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was on page 2, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,000" and to insert "$3,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to (1) the adequacy of the supply of hydroelectric power generated in Government plants, (2) whether such supply is properly allocated and distributed for war purposes and civilian uses, (3) whether the distribution of such supply is made under proper conditions and safeguards, (4) the relation between the generation of hydroelectric power at Government plants and irrigation, and (5) whether plans for future development of Government hydroelectric plants provide for full utilization of such facilities for both development of electric power and providing water for irrigation. The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation together with its recommendations, if any, for legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $3,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I had desired to ask about the resolution. There is nothing on the face of the record indicating the character of inquiry the committee seeks to make. I am wondering whether the Senator from Illinois can advise us as to the particular aspect of power production in the West and

Southwest the committee desires to inquire into. Is the Senator advised?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not particularly advised as to the details of this special investigation. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is not on the floor at present. All I know about it is that the Committee on Interstate Commerce unanimously reported the resolution favorably, and the Senator from Arizona talked to me about it, and I discussed it with the members of my committee, both the majority and minority, and the two leaders.

Mr. BONE. Did the committee make any kind of a report on the resolution, indicating what its desires were?

Mr. LUCAS. No; there was no written report.

Mr. BONE. I know that every generator is turning not only at full capacity but turning out overloads, and I was wondering what more might be expected. When a generator is turning out an overload it is like asking a dray horse which is hauling 3 tons and utilizing all its energy to haul 3½ tons. If the desire is to develop more power, I shall be delighted to see the committee take some action which would stimulate production and more generating equipment at Grand Coulee.

Mr. LUCAS. It may be that the scope of this resolution would include what the Senator has in mind. However, if the Senator desires to defer the resolution until the Senator from Arizona can arrive in the Chamber, I shall be glad to have that course followed.

Mr. BONE. No; I know the able Senator from Arizona, and know he is a man of the utmost integrity and honor, and that he would not suggest anything but what was proper. I presume that if the inquiry broadens beyond the scope of what the author has in mind, he will be very glad to hear from any of us interested in western power developments.

Mr. LUCAS. This is just another instance of a resolution reported favorably by a committee and coming to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate without any specific written report. It is impossible for our committee to know exactly what the testimony was before the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no objection if this matter can be disposed of promptly and without debate, but if it is going to bring on debate, I shall have to object.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not blame the Senator for objecting. He is entitled to object, and if it is going to bring on debate I, myself, shall withdraw the resolution, because the Senator has waited patiently all afternoon to get an important measure before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand the resolution has already been agreed to.

PREVENTION OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 796) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, with reference to the pending legislation, I wish to state to the Senate that I propose to vote for the report rendered by the conferees on Senate bill 796. In connection therewith, I wish to have printed in the RECORD at this point a clipping from one of the Washington newspapers entitled "Teamsters' Head Says Congress Snags Victory," with a Chicago, June 7, date line, to be followed by an article from the Washington Evening Star of June 7, from the pen of Mr. Frank R. Kent, in his column, The Great Game of Politics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clipping and article are as follows:

TEAMSTERS' HEAD SAYS CONGRESS SNAGS VICTORY

CHICAGO, June 7.—Daniel J. Tobin, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, American Federation of Labor, believes that Congress is impeding the war effort and should adjourn for a year.

In reference to antistrike legislation, Tobin said:

"It would be well if that body adjourned for a year to give President Roosevelt and the people who toil a chance to win the war."

He charged that the isolationist press has disrupted the war effort by criticizing labor and the administration's conduct of the war.

[From the Washington Star of June 7, 1943]

LEWIS' DEFIANCE TRACED TO ROOSEVELT'S PROUNION ACTIONS AND SUPPRESSION OF ANTISTRIKE BILLS

(By Frank R. Kent)

The overwhelming bulk of the American people were solidly back of the President in his struggle to avert humiliating acknowledgment that John L. Lewis and his union miners were stronger than the United States Government. However drastic the steps he might have taken to end this threat to the Nation, he would have received full public support.

He simply had to achieve a surface victory. To flinch or yield publicly would have been unthinkable. He did neither and the Nation breathes easier. Nevertheless, it is clear that while Mr. Roosevelt won the form, Mr. Lewis has won the substance. The fruits of victory are the latter's.

When the final accounting is made, there is every reason to believe it will be found that Mr. Lewis has outmaneuvered, outbluffed, outfought Mr. Roosevelt and gained a large part of his original demands. This amounts to a national mortification. Already, with Roosevelt approval, concessions have been made to Mr. Lewis far greater than he expected to get.

Instead of emerging from this struggle a beaten man, he will emerge with greater strength and increased prestige.

GREAT COST

This is not pleasant reading for Americans, but the facts may as well be faced. Also, in this vital business of strikes, walk-outs, slow-downs, and other forms of labor trouble with which the country has been afflicted since long before the war began, it does seem that the stage has been reached where all save the most obtuse must perceive that, to use a slang phrase of the cities, the people have been "two timed" by the Roosevelt administration in a shameful and shocking way.

It is not possible accurately to compute the cost of this performance in men, money, and materials, but it has been very great.

The other day Mrs. Roosevelt, writing about the coal strike, said, "Perhaps, many of us have a share in the blame." This is a striking understatement. There is not space here to present full details of the record, but it ought to be enough to fix responsibility to recite a few irrefutable truths. The first s that the power which these labor leaders have—a power which enabled Mr. Lewis to defy the Government and wrest from it concessions that undermine its anti-inflation policies and menace the national economic health—was given them by the President himself. This is the big basic fact.

BUILT THEM UP

It is Mr. Roosevelt who built them up, contracted political alliances with them, permitted his name to be used in their membership drives, and accepted from them huge campaign contributions.

In addition, he forced through Congress a series of one-sided laws and appointed arbitration boards so loaded for labor that the employer is always wrong.

Much more could be added. For 10 years these labor leaders have been the most powerful figures in Washington, and their White House influence more potent than all others combined. What they asked for they got. What they opposed was killed—and always with Presidential support.

KILLED ANTISTRIKE BILL

Look at the legislative record of the last 2 years. Just before Pearl Harbor the Smith antistrike bills were passed by the House. Had these bills become law, there would have been no strikes, many millions of man-days would have been saved, and the war closer to being won. But, on the direct request of the President, they were smothered in the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

More than a year ago the Connally antistrike bill, on the point of passage in the Senate, was removed from the calendar at the direct request of the President, who said that its passage would be "harmful to the war effort." Two months ago Senator BYRD, of Virginia, introduced a "work or fight" bill, applying to strikers in defense industries. Immediately various Government heads opposed the bill, saying it would be "bad for national morale." Finally, when the most recent coal strike occurred, the Connally-Smith bills were revived.

Then Mr. Roosevelt flatly contradicts his words by his deeds. Deploring strikes in his White House conferences and public statements, he simultaneously threw his whole weight, exerted through his department heads, against the passage of the bills to outlaw wartime strikes and regulate unions.

HOUSE APPROVES BILL

Despite the opposition of the Secretaries of Labor, of War, and Navy, all clearly White House inspired, the House on Friday passed the Connally-Smith bill by a vote of 231 to 141. But, against the President's will, it can hardly get through the Senate.

It is an astonishing state of affairs. Here is the President in the middle of a great war, condemning strikes and confronted with the tragic failure of his own policy of nonstrike agreements with labor leaders, refusing to permit Congress to enact antistrike legislation. If there is any way to reconcile that with reason, it has not been pointed out.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in reference to my position upon the pending legislation, I wish at this time to request that there be printed at this point a press release, issued by me more than a year ago, to be exact, on March 23, 1942, which outlines my position relative to both labor and capital.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The press release is as follows:

"Outlaw strikes, suspend the 40-hour week, suspend the closed shop on war contracts, permit any American to work unmolested who desires to aid in the war program, regardless of whether or not he is affiliated with any labor organization, and place a 6-percent maximum ceiling on all war profits, all for the duration of the war," said United States Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

"We Americans should be thinking more in terms of giving and not so much in terms of getting insofar as our war production program is concerned. At this critical time when America is fighting for its very existence and when our Nation is imperilled from within as well as from without, I dislike very much to take issue with our President and Commander in Chief, and with Mrs. Frances Perkins, head of the Labor Department of our Government, who have stated that Congress should not take any action now in reference to the labor situation.

"Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, declared several days ago before a congressional committee that those who are advocating remedial labor legislation, such as I have suggested, are enemies of our Government. He referred to those who are advocating the passage of labor legislation as labor baiters. I disagree with Mr. Murray, because I do not believe that those thousands of signers of telegrams and letters which I have received from persons in North Carolina and elsewhere are enemies of America simply because they favor the passage of certain proposed labor legislation."

Senator REYNOLDS continued: "I am thoroughly convinced that our people are rapidly recognizing the fact that millions of Americans have not yet awakened to the realization that our country is engaged in a life and death struggle, the result of which will affect the very future of our country. The paramount need in America today is an unimpeded war production program. Maximum production is needed now, and this goal can only be attained by the complete abandonment of all selfish desires on the part of all financial or labor groups. We cannot reach our production peak if certain individuals and groups, financial and labor, insist on the status quo of operation prior to December 8, 1941.

"The time has arrived when it is necessary for every American, man and woman alike, young and old, to make every and all sacrifices at this grave time to insure for us an early and complete victory over our enemies.

"I have always been the friend of the laboring man. I believe in the right of labor to organize for its own protection and benefit. The laboring men of this country have certain rights, and I realize that these rights have not always been respected by capital. On the other hand, I am aware that labor must sacrifice along with all other American groups in a common effort to win this war. The winning of this war is our chief objective and we can win only by outstripping the axis powers in the matter of production of armaments and the sinews of war.

"Insofar as I am concerned I am now ready and willing to vote for legislation to outlaw strikes in defense industries, suspend the 40-hour week, ban overtime payments and prohibit double-time payments, outlaw the closed shop on war contracts, permit any American to work unmolested who desires to aid in the war program without becoming affiliated with any labor organization, and place a 6 percent maximum ceiling over all war profits for the duration—during the emergency.

"I favor any American citizen being permitted to work as many hours as he so desires without molestation regardless of whether he is a member of any labor organization or not. I am opposed to any further overtime or double-time pay for the period of the duration. I favor ending all strikes in defense industries for the duration.

"The millions of working Americans constituting the rank and file of labor organizations are as patriotic as any other group of American citizens. They themselves should not be subjected to the vicious criticism which has been heaped on their shoulders. The fault lies largely in the hands of many of their officials and representatives. I refer to labor agitators and those primarily interested in their own selfish attainments. In recognition of this fact, and in the interest of the American laboring men affiliated with our labor organizations, on April 7, 1941, I introduced in the Senate of the United States Senate Joint Resolution 64 entitled " 'Joint resolution to provide for the national defense by prohibiting labor organizations from employing certain persons as officers or agents:

" 'Whereas it is common knowledge that "fifth column" activities in various European countries contributed largely to their defeat; and

" 'Whereas such activities consisted in part of sabotage in key industries and propaganda disseminated among the workers of such industries; and

" 'Whereas such activities are now being carried on in this country and will gather more momentum in the future, thus undermining our national defense; and

" 'Whereas because of their key positions in our industrial mobilization plans, officers and agents of labor organizations should all be American citizens whose allegiance to their country is unquestioned and who can be depended upon to cooperate with the Government in stamping out such treacherous activities: Therefore be it

" '*Resolved*, That any alien, any member of the Communist Party, any member of the Nazi Bund, any member of any Fascist organization, or any American who is deprived of his American citizenship by reason of his conviction of a felony, shall be prohibited from holding any office in or representing any labor union or organization.'

"Unfortunately, this legislation which I proposed for the benefit of the American laboring men who are members of labor organizations was never enacted into law.

"Now, let's get to capital which in many instances is equally at fault with labor in the matter of our all-out war-production efforts. Some of these giant corporations with contracts totaling hundreds of millions of dollars have made millions upon millions in profits as a result of the toil and sweat of our laborers. The millions in profits have been made right under the nose of the workingmen who produced them. Some of these profits have been so outrageous that one company became so conscience-stricken that its officers actually voluntarily turned back into the Treasury of the United States millions of dollars in profits it had made on one job alone. Is it any wonder that it appears to the American people that every one is trying to get all they can out of these war efforts, rather than putting all they possibly can into these efforts? Is it any wonder that the unions and the laboring men of this country should demand their just and proper proportion of these billions that are being expended, thus providing unconscionable profits and tremendous waste totaling billions as was revealed by the Truman committee of the United States Senate?

"If we are to regulate labor, then we must regulate industry by eliminating its war profits. I favor a limitation of 6 percent upon all war profits directly or indirectly wherever they may be found. It would be manifestly unfair to attempt to limit wages and overtime and not limit and control war profits. We do not want a repetition of 1917 and 1918, which produced thousands of war millionaires overnight. Capital and labor must share equally of the sacrifices necessary to win this great conflict so that they may better enjoy the sweets of victory when it is won."

Senator REYNOLDS concluded by saying: "I'm for fair treatment to be provided both labor and capital. I am ready and willing to vote for any legislation which in my honest opinion will aid our war production to attain its maximum and thus insure victory. I am ready to vote for any legislation which will bring to an end existing differences between certain groups in this country. * * * If labor is to sacrifice, then capital likewise must make sacrifices equally as great for the duration.

"While I stand behind the President and the administration 100 percent in the prosecution of this war, and shall strive to do my individual utmost part in the prosecution of that program, I shall feel free at any time to oppose these leaders on any question when I conscientiously feel that such opposition is for the best interests of the people of the Nation."

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask the indulgence of the Senate for a few minutes while I address it on the pending measure.

During 35 years of public service I have never knowingly uttered a word, cast a ballot, or performed an official act detrimental to the cause of labor or the interests of the laboring man. I have consistently through the years been the laboring man's friend, and I am glad to say he has been my friend.

I have always been in sympathy with the uphill and struggling fight the laboring man has made through the years to secure a fair and square deal for himself and his family because I believe the workman is worthy of his hire.

I believe in the right of collective bargaining. I believe in the organization of labor, because it is only through unions and organizations that the laboring man has been able to secure and protect his rights against the greed and oppression of those who would grow rich and fat through the laboring man's toil and sweat.

I believe in the inherent right to strike as a means to secure a just and square deal for the men and women who really produce the wealth of the country, for it is fundamentally true that a man who sweats and toils should be given his rightful share in the fruits of his labor to better the conditions of himself and his family.

We have before us today a bill that seeks to prohibit strikes, interferences, and stoppages during the progress of this world-wide war, because we are fighting for the freedom, liberty, welfare, happiness, yea, the very existence of every man, woman, boy, and girl in our country—fighting to make safe for all time to come the blessings of this great democratic Republic.

I do not like the pending bill, and I resent the inclusion of certain provisions in it. There are some provisions in the bill which have no connection whatsoever with the prevention of strikes, and add nothing to the success of the war effort. But I am going to vote for the bill, because 98 percent of the people I represent are demanding the passage of

this bill or some bill that will prevent any man or woman or any organization of men and women from retarding or hampering the successful prosecution of the one great objective that is dear to every patriotic man and woman in the Nation—the winning of this war.

I have gotten my consent to vote for this bill, notwithstanding its many drastic and objectionable features, to which every laboring man has a right to object, because the bill contains an automatic repealing clause which provides that within 6 months after the close of the war the measure with its provisions will be wiped from the statutes of this Republic.

It is regrettable that a small handful of laborers under the leadership of stubborn, determined opposition makes it necessary to enact such drastic legislation, objectionable to the fourteen or fifteen million patriotic, sacrificing industrial laboring men and women of this country who have toiled, suffered, and sacrificed from the first day of this war to produce the greatest war machine of any nation of all times.

The people of this Republic owe a debt of gratitude to these fourteen or fifteen million men and women who have forgotten self and self-interest and contributed their all in producing tanks, planes, guns, ships, ammunition, food, and all other supplies to make possible the overthrow and the utter and ultimate defeat of the forces that would dominate, enslave, and control every human being in the world.

While this legislation or similar legislation may be a mistake at this time, the fathers and mothers whose sons and brothers and husbands and other loved ones are fighting and dying on all the battlefronts of the earth, sacrificing opportunities of life and even life itself for the salvation of our country and our American ideals of Government, demand its passage. Yet this is not, in my humble judgment, the solution of the troubles, strikes, and delays which now beset us. This I have contended from the very first.

I have realized from the very beginning of the war that the power, strength, preparation, and determination of our enemy were such as would require the patriotic cooperation of every man, woman, boy, and girl in the Nation to bring victory quickly and most certainly. Believing it would require the all-out effort of one and all, last year I introduced the first total mobilization bill in the Congress, and if the pending bill does not bring the results we are seeking, we will yet have to resort to total mobilization, placing every man, woman, boy, and girl, and all the money and resources of the Nation under the direction and positive control of the Government until the war is won and our enemies, with all their damnable theories of government, have been wiped from the face of the earth.

To my mind, there seems to be millions in this country yet who do not seem to realize the seriousness of the situation which confronts us. Of course, everyone wants to win the victory, but judging by their words and actions there are many who are doing nothing about it. With total mobilization all the resources of the Nation and every human being in it would be drafted and directed to the one great end, speedy winning of the war, thereby saving hundreds of lives of our precious boys.

Some persons are so silly as to think the war is practically won, when, as a matter of fact, we have barely gotten into it. We have a hard road ahead to travel. Our sacrifices of life and of means yet to be made are horrible to contemplate. We have just commenced to fight. Our enemies have grown stronger. They are better prepared. It is a fight to the finish. It is a battle to the death. The sooner every man and woman, boy, and girl in the Nation are made to know the job that lies ahead of us the sooner we can get the 100-percent cooperation of everyone.

If today we had total mobilization there would be no slackerism, strikes, stoppages, or delays, no labor shortage on the farms, no threatened shortage of feed and food on the home front, because none would be tolerated any more than strikes and stoppages are tolerated on the part of our brave soldier boys who are now fighting 24 hours a day, and many of whom are dying on all the battle fronts of the world.

I am ready to vote for this bill or any other bill that will enforce an all-out effort and sacrifice on the part of everyone until this war is won.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the League of Nations Economic Committee made a survey entitled "World Economic Survey for 1934–35," and made a report, which appears in volume 2 of the economic and financial section, in which it developed its findings, country by country, but I wish to refer particularly to part of its comment on Germany. I quote a paragraph from that report:

> The regulation of economic activity of Germany proceeding rapidly—after the enactment of empowering legislation in July 1934—by the prescription of price controls, the rationing of raw materials and, on occasion, of foodstuffs, the compulsory cartelization of certain industries, the regulation of entry into the various industries and professions, the dismissal of young people and of those, including married women, holding more than one position, the shortening of hours and redistribution of employment, the regulation of profits, measures to control and coordinate economic undertakings and investments of all kinds, the encouragement of domestic substitutes for imported raw materials, prohibition of the opening of new retail establishments, banking reorganization, the registration of craftworkers, prescription of workbooks equivalent to industrial passports, and finally, on March 30, 1935, the expansion of the German labor front * * * for the control of production, trade, private finance, and all social and labor issues connected therewith. In a word, the whole economic activity of the country, in its labor, trading, production, and financial aspects, was placed under centralized, authoritative control and detailed regulation.

The series of events narrated by the Economic Committee reporting to the League of Nations cannot be without significance as we trace the development of recent events in our own country. Interestingly enough, Drucker, writing with reference to the subject in the End of Economic Man, said:

> The "Neoeconomic Society," however, is by no means immune from the effects of the interplay of economic forces, and it is indeed these forces that irresistibly push the totalitarian states into the road of military adventures and prepare their inevitable ultimate collapse.

Mr. President, we have before us a bill to which the attention of the minds of men has been drawn by virtue of forces and factors outside of and beyond the Congress. But, I fear, some have been so moved in anxiety to reach the situation, that there has been too great a tendency, it seems to me, to take any bill, only so long as we get a bill, in our effort to reach, and perhaps solve, the problem.

Whose problem is it? Did the Congress create it, Mr. President? Certainly not. But if the bill becomes law we most assuredly must relate it to every other law, to every other regulation, to every other Executive order outstanding and having the force and effect of law.

There is mention, in the quotation which I have just submitted, of industrial passports. In what respect, Mr. President, is there a difference between orders requiring such industrial passports and an order of the War Manpower Commission, itself set up under Executive order of the President, requiring a "certificate of availability," so-called before a man may leave a plant engaged in war production, and go to work in another, in a plant described by the War Manpower Commission as being within a critical labor area?

Mr. President and my colleagues, I ask you to try to relate your thinking to the all-over problem, not simply to that raised by the bill.

However, in our consideration of the immediate impact of the bill, I call to your attention section 8, appearing at page 5 of the report. If there be such a labor dispute in an industry, Mr. President, which might seriously threaten to interrupt war production—

> 1. The representative of the employees of a war contractor, shall give to the Secretary of Labor, the National War Labor Board, and the National Labor Relations Board, notice of any such labor dispute involving such contractor and employees, together with a statement of the issues giving rise thereto.

We must turn to section 2 in order to ascertain what is a war contractor. There, Mr. President, we find that a war contractor is one who has—

> 1. A contract with the United States entered into on behalf of the United States by an officer or employee of the Department of War, the Department of the Navy, or the United States Maritime Commission.

Or a contractor who has—

> 2. A contract with the United States entered into by the United States pursuant to an act entitled "An act to promote the defense of the United States."

Or, Mr. President—

> 3. A contract, whether or not with the United States, for the production, manufacture, construction, reconstruction, installation, maintenance, storage, repair, mining, or transportation of—

(A) any weapon, munition, aircraft, vessel, or boat;

(B) any building, structure, or facility;

(C) any machinery, tool, material, supply, article, or commodity; or

(D) any component material or part of or equipment for any article described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).

Mr. President, the war contract may pertain to—

The production, manufacture, construction, reconstruction, installation, maintenance, storage, repair, mining, or transportation of which by the contractor in question is found by the President as being contracted for in the prosecution of the war.

When the employees of such a war contractor are engaged in a dispute, and give notice to the agencies named, all such employees, having specified what the issues in the dispute are, must continue to work under the same terms and conditions for a period of 30 days. At the end of the 30-day period, they take a vote on whether they do or do not strike. If they vote not to strike, obviously they continue under the same terms and conditions which gave rise to the dispute of which they have given notice, and which led to the election. Mr. President, if they vote to strike, they walk out. There is an interruption of production. If there be an interruption of production, under section 3 of the proposed act, the President of the United States seizes that plant, provided the conditions mentioned in section 3 are met.

Then, Mr. President, if the President of the United States seizes the plant, under section 4 of the bill, all the conditions and terms of employment, regardless of their nature, no matter how grievous, which gave rise to the dispute in the first place, are frozen in statu quo.

So, Mr. President, the cycle is complete. One goes from section 8, around through section 3, from a grievance which led to a dispute in the first place, to where the men who complained of the grievance and who have given notice to the respective departments, wind up with the Government seizing the plant; and the conditions of employment are frozen.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me ask whether the Senator from Connecticut recognizes that, that condition having become fixed, thereupon another section of the bill goes into operation, and the War Labor Board can be appealed to to determine the issue upon which the condition was created.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Vermont must know, I am sure, that I do realize there are other sections of the proposed act. But I am taking them up in the order of their incidence; and, obviously, I cannot discuss all of them at one time.

I have now taken a dispute through the stage of a strike vote down to the point where the United States Government has seized the plant—the point at which, by statute, we would freeze the very terms and conditions which gave rise to the dispute. At that point, Mr. President, section 5 has impact—section 5, on page 3 of the report. It provides that—

SEC. 5. When possession of any plant, mine, or facility has been or shall be hereafter taken under authority of section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, the Government agency operating such plant, mine, or facility, or a majority of the employees of such plant, mine, or facility or their representatives, may apply to the National War Labor Board for a change in wages or other terms or conditions of employment in such plant, mine, or facility.

Mr. President, a majority of the employees of the seized plant may join in such an application.

Upon receipt of that application, the Board may consider whether it will or will not grant the relief prayed for. If th Board decides against the employees, assuming for the moment that they have united through a majority in filing an application, they continue under the very same terms and conditions which led to the dispute in the first place. Mr. President, if the Board should grant an application of the operating agency of the Government—which may be the Navy Department or the War Department—whatever agency it may be—then, of course, more stringent terms or a measure of redress may be given. I think I should point out that at that the employer—the plant owner, the management—has no right to make any application whatever under section 5, just mentioned. So, from the time of the inception of the dispute, right on down through the cycle, and down through section 5 in the discussion, as I have submitted it, management has no voice whatever, and conversely, the employees find themselves bound at all times.

Mr. President, when the bill left the Senate, before the House acted, the Members of the Senate who believed that there should not be an interruption of production necessary for the effective prosecution of the war, had taken into account not only the possible seizure, which we would have authorized, but also, Mr. President, the fact that we would have authorized either management or the employees to seek redress of their grievances through the National War Labor Board. We would have authorized the Board to issue subpenas, and to bring the respective parties before it. We would have authorized the Board to decide the dispute. We would have authorized an appeal by either side. I say "appeal"; "a petition for review," perhaps, is more apropos. On a question of law only was the decision of the Board to be surveyed or reviewed; but, Mr. President, at least the right of review was preserved in the statute.

Now, Mr. President, for the first time in the history of American industrial relations between employer and employee, both employer and employee, so far as the statute is concerned, are being denied a right of access to the courts of the United States with reference to the subject matter of dispute.

Mr. President, I think it important to note that before section 8 is set in motion—that is, before the notice of the existence of the dispute is given; the notice which sets in motion the train of circumstances which results in the possible strike vote—there is one other applicable procedure, that in section 7. Section 7 is divided into several clauses—from (a) to (e), inclusive—and subsection (a) (1), particularly, would authorize the National War Labor Board itself to take jurisdiction whenever, on its own motion, it finds that the dispute has become so serious that it may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, or, Mr. President, whenever the Conciliation Service, meaning the United States Conciliation Service, certifies that the dispute is of such a nature.

But obviously, Mr. President, section 7 (a), subclauses (1) and (2), recourse to which is denied when the Government seizes the plant, are in conflict with the subsection (a) (2), section 8, which sets in motion the procedure resulting in the strike vote, but also continues existing conditions. Is not that a curious anomaly? Would anyone believe that a piece of legislation which had left the Senate in the form in which our bill was sent to the House could come out of conference this way?

Mr. President, I am not so sure that the need for legislation is so urgent that we must disregard all the fundamental precautions which have been set up in the statute law, and which have been subjected to decision by our courts, out of which a vast body of law has accumulated. Obviously, if it be the objective of the legislation to seize a plant where there is a strike, we did not need the bill at all, because the President has done that. He has done it on at least eight occasions. He has seized the plants, installed Government operating managers, and caused the plants to function. Therefore, Mr. President, if it were simply a case of validating past actions, the Senate bill most assuredly would have done so.

It seems to me that when our agents—for that is what our conferees are—met to consider the Senate bill which would have preserved the respective rights of all the parties and, at the same time, so far as the law can do, would have made for continuous and uninterrupted production of the plant, we would have been better advised to let the House conferees take this matter back for instructions, or ourselves report back to the Senate for additional consideration of the problem.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a clipping from the Evening Star of June 3. I wish to submit two situations narrated by the news stories there recounted:

DETROIT, June 3.—Production of Rolls-Royce aircraft engines and Packard marine engines at the plant of the Packard Motor Car Co. here was brought to a virtual standstill this morning by a walk-out of several thousand workers objecting to the upgrading of a few colored employees.

A company spokesman said the walk-out occurred on the midnight shift, affecting about 90 percent of the workers on that shift, and that many of these employees remained at plant gates and influenced the day shift to remain away from their jobs.

Incidentally, let me interrupt to remark that if this bill shall become law,

at that point in a labor dispute where section 6 of the bill will have impact, any person guilty of influencing any day-shift worker to remain away from his job will be subject to paying a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in the interest of accuracy?

Mr. DANAHER. If the Government seizes the plant, of course.

Mr. HATCH. It makes a great deal of difference.

Mr. DANAHER. I said under section 6, as the Senator may recall. Let us make it perfectly clear. It is conceivable that some Senators may not have read the bill; but if Senators have not done so, let me say that section 6 does not have application until and unless the Government seizes a plant; and under the circumstances named in the statement of fact from which I read, if the Government should have seized the plant, the penalty impact would follow.

I resume reading:

"This was done," the spokesman said, "in spite of company, union, United States Air Corps, and United States Department of Labor pleas to carry out the Government's Executive order that there be no discrimination in the employment of workers in defense industries because of race, creed, color, or national origin."

He said that the dispute was not one between the company and the United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, with which the company has a working contract.

There was no comment by officials of the United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Packard Local 190.

The dispatch says that the Packard Motor Car Co. is the owner of the plant. Under such a situation, with interruption of production due to a labor disturbance, under section 3 of the pending proposal the management loses its plant and the Government takes over and operates, and all those employees become subject to the criminal penalties of section 6. But there would remain no recourse thereafter to management—obviously a completely innocent party—even to petition for a redress of the situation which led to its plant being taken away from it. Meanwhile the employees are all bound. How are they bound? They are bound to accept whatever terms and conditions the War Labor Board orders for them. The War Labor Board thereafter issues such directions and such decisions as it chooses. Obviously, therefore, it interposes its will into the contract of labor between the employees and the management, which has been superseded by the Government agency. So the War Labor Board obviously is given what might be called an overright in every labor contract, in every plant which produces any article which may be useful in the war effort.

There is another item which is worthy of notice from the same newspaper:

ST. LOUIS, June 3.—Approximately 2,500 colored employees at 1 of 8 production units of the St. Louis ordnance plant struck today, refusing to work under white foremen, a spokesman for the United States Cartridge Co. said.

White foremen have supervised work in the unit since its formation in July 1942, but colored employees were selected this month for training as supervisors to replace them, the spokesman explained.

The colored workmen evidently are not organized, he said, and have selected no spokesman. "There is no one you can talk to. They just quit work and said they wouldn't continue under white foremen," he said.

The unit is the only one in the United States employing colored skilled and semi-skilled workers exclusively, he explained. The plant is owned by the Government and operated by the cartridge company.

The other seven units of the plant are not affected.

Mr. President, there is no definition in this proposal of what a labor disturbance is. There is no distinction drawn, by way of definition, as to whether the plant must be wholly engaged in war production, or whether the law would apply to a plant which is engaged to the extent of 20 percent in the production of an article useful in the war effort, and 80 percent in civilian production. In either case after seizure, or under section 8, all the employees will be bound, without redress other than what the War Labor Board chooses to give them, when a majority of the employees unite in an application claiming redress of the grievance; and then the Board may or may not act to their advantage.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. What did the Senator mean by the statement that the War Labor Board would have an overright?

Mr. DANAHER. I mean that if given terms and conditions of employment have created such a situation that a dispute has arisen and a vote has been taken, after which a strike has resulted, and the Government thereafter seizes the plant, the War Labor Board will fix all the terms and conditions on which that plant resumes or continues production; and obviously the employees are bound to take those terms and conditions, for if they strike they go to prison.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. With no right to appeal?

Mr. DANAHER. With no right to appeal except after conviction. Moreover, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota, they must have a majority of the employees before they can even file an application with the Board.

Again, as I assumed a few minutes ago, if only 20 percent of the employees are engaged in producing an article useful—that is the word in the act—"useful" in the war effort, and 80 percent otherwise, we find the Government stepping into what is essentially a civilian plant, if you choose. It is an interesting situation, is it not?

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I am anxious to have an expression of the views of the Senator from Connecticut on a question which arises from a reading of the conference report. It has to do with the term "war contract." Of course, the Army and the Navy are buying large quantitites of food, such as canned food and processed food of all kinds. They are buying vast quantities of clothes and materials of all kinds, because our defense organizations are now the largest buyers of these articles in the country. Is it the view of the Senator from Connecticut that this proposal would take in canning and food-processing organizations and every type of business, large and small, that is supplying defense operations with equipment and supplies?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, allow me to say to the Senator from Washington that it applies whether the plant is large or small, no matter where it is, provided only that the plant is engaged in the production of—or is equipped for—it may not even be engaged in production—but if equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials which may be required for the war effort or which may be useful in connection therewith.

I am reading from a sentence which appears eight lines down in section 3 on page 2 of the report.

So, actually this bill will apply to any plant so engaged, and it does apply to canneries. Yes.

Mr. BONE. The term "commodity" is usually a legalistic term applied to all materials except livestock. I believe that is probably the legal concept. So I take it from reading sections 2 and 3 together that we have here a picture of the application of the act to any sort of commodity which the Government might buy.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct. There is no question about it, only so long as it is useful in connection with the war effort.

Allow me to point out further to the Senator from Washington that this particular section 3 is substantially—not exactly—but substantially the language which the Senate had previously employed, while section 2 was in the House bill. We just imported it over into this bill. As a matter of fact, there is no doubt that reconciliation of a few discrepancies, such as the Senator from Washington has referred to, may well have been made.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I realize that in drafting legislation under war conditions it is almost impossible to set up fair standards of equity, and so forth. But can the Senator tell me if there is any legislation which sets up a board of arbitration for the soldier on the battlefield, or in combat in the Navy, whereby he may appeal or ask for a change of orders in battle when his life is at stake? I think those of us at home who are called upon to produce for the men in the combat service must give up some of our liberties, as the men in the combat services are giving up their liberties.

Mr. DANAHER. There is no question about it. The Senator from Oregon is eminently correct, and every single thing to which he has referred could be and was being accomplished before any legislation along this line was proposed. There is no question about that. We have the National Labor Relations Board

at this minute, which has jurisdiction over thousands of cases of disputes which have arisen under the National Labor Relations Act.

We have the National War Labor Board with hundreds of cases on which, as stated in a letter which was read by the Senator from Texas, it has acted since the President set it up by Executive order. If the bill should be torn up this minute there are media through which all involved, employers and employees, and others, might appeal for a redress of their grievances. As a matter of fact, under the bill which the Senate passed, everything which the Senator from Oregon said could and should, in my judgment, have been accomplished.

Mr. President, there is one other section which is interesting, and which I think we are pretty well agreed should never have been in the bill at all, and about which the Senator from New Mexico spoke a day or so ago. That is the section dealing with political contributions by labor organizations. What has been done by the House is to interpolate in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act the words "any labor organization." See section 9, please—

> It is unlawful for any national bank or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress to make a contribution in connection with any election to any political officer, or for any corporation whatever—

Shall apply equally to any labor organization.

Clearly, Mr. President, there has been omitted from that language any definition of offense against unincorporated associations of employers or managerial groups of whatever kind. I had already discussed this, and I think there is substantial accord on the point.

The Senator from Texas, and the Senator from New Mexico made reference a day or so ago to a future intention to do something about it by way of an amendment which would be wholly proper. Certainly it ought not to be in this proposed act without some amendment.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude in a minute or two, but first I wish to point out that S. 796 originally introduced in identically the same language in which it became the order of business here on or about May 3, was first offered by the Senator from Texas in November 1941. It reached the floor by a vote of 12 to 2 from the Committee on the Judiciary. At that time I was opposed to section 2 and section 3, and when later, Mr. President, which was about the 22d of April of this year, the matter came up on the calendar, I moved to strike out sections 2 and 3.

On May 3 the matter was brought up on motion of the Senator from Texas. At that time, Mr. President, we caused certain amendments to be made. For example, we required that the President shall find and proclaim the causes which lead to the seizure of a given plant. We struck out the words "or other cause." On the following day the Senator from Texas introduced a complete substitute for his original bill. That substitute, Mr. President, was debated. The references appear at page 3897 of the RECORD and the pages following. Finally, at page 3987, on May 5, 1943, the amendment which is now in substance section 7, was offered here on the floor. "In substance," I say, because, Mr. President, we had provided, as I have already said, for an appeal or review. We had also not carried over into S. 796 the reference to the National Labor Relations Board which appears in 7 (a) (2), but the House did. We struck out, on my motion, section 5 of the Connally substitute, which would have provided for injunctive relief through a court of equity.

Otherwise, Mr. President, the Senate bill which went to conference would have accomplished every single one of the objectives properly to be achieved in our effort to reach the situation which now confronts the country. To my mind, it is a matter of sincere regret that, as agents for the Senate, we could not have insisted that the Senate language be retained.

I have today extended my remarks from the original outline I submitted Thursday in explanation of the reasons why I refused to sign the conference report. I wanted my colleagues to know, with this more complete explanation, what the exact impact of this proposed act will be.

Mr. President, inadvertently I earlier failed to make my reference to the record as complete as I wished, in that I neglected to read from the Executive order of January 14, 1942, which set up the War Labor Board. I wish particularly to read subclause (c) of section 3:

> If not promptly settled by conciliation, the Secretary of Labor shall certify the dispute to the Board: *Provided, however,* That the Board, in its discretion, after consultation with the Secretary may take jurisdiction of the dispute on its own motion. After it takes jurisdiction, the Board shall finally determine the dispute, and for this purpose may use mediation, voluntary arbitration, or arbitration under rules established by the Board.

To summarize, we have reached the point, Mr. President, of giving statutory status to the National War Labor Board, with power to make a final decision with no review in the courts, and we will have a board over whose membership we have no voice and whose duties have not been prescribed by Congress. As the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] yesterday in a colloquy with me candidly and properly stated, the Board will still be subject to the Executive order of the President; having denied the right, as I pointed out, of management on the one side to appear before the Board and of employees to seek redress of their grievances, other than as I have indicated, since they have no alternative but to get certificates of availability, without which they cannot work, or else go back to work under conditions which they deplore and which led to the dispute, it follows that we have transferred essential, complete, final, and entire control over the destinies of labor in this country to the Executive. The basic problem remains unsolved.

I ask that the entire Executive order of January 14, 1942, be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the Executive order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER—ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

Whereas by reason of the state of war declared to exist by joint resolutions of the Congress, approved December 8, 1941, and December 11, 1941, respectively (Public Laws Nos. 328, 331, 332, 77th Cong.), the national interest demands that there shall be no interruption of any work which contributes to the effective prosecution of the war; and

Whereas as a result of a conference of representatives of labor and industry which met at the call of the President on December 17, 1941, it has been agreed that for the duration of the war there shall be no strikes or lockouts, and that all labor disputes shall be settled by peaceful means, and that a National War Labor Board be established for the peaceful adjustment of such disputes:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes of the United States, it is hereby ordered:

1. There is hereby created in the Office for Emergency Management a National War Labor Board, hereinafter referred to as the Board. The Board shall be composed of 12 special commissioners to be appointed by the President. Four of the members shall be representative of the public; four shall be representative of employees; and four shall be representative of employers. The President shall designate the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board from the members representing the public. The President shall appoint four alternate members representative of employees and four representative of employers, to serve as Board members in the absence of regular members representative of their respective groups. Six members or alternate members of the Board, including not less than two members from each of the groups represented on the Board, shall constitute a quorum. A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Board.

2. This order does not apply to labor disputes for which procedures for adjustment or settlement are otherwise provided until those procedures have been exhausted.

3. The procedures for adjusting and settling labor disputes which might interrupt work which contributes to the effective prosecution of the war shall be as follows: (a) The parties shall first resort to direct negotiations or to the procedures provided in a collective-bargaining agreement (b) If not settled in this manner, the commissioners of conciliation of the Department of Labor shall be notified if they have not already intervened in the dispute. (c) If not promptly settled by conciliation, the Secretary of Labor shall certify the dispute to the Board, provided, however, that the Board in its discretion after consultation with the Secretary may take jurisdiction of the dispute on its own motion. After it takes jurisdiction, the Board shall finally determine the dispute, and for this purpose may use mediation, voluntary arbitration, or arbitration under rules established by the Board.

4. The Board shall have power to promulgate rules and regulations appropriate for the performance of its duties.

5. The members of the Board (including alternates) shall receive necessary traveling expenses, and, unless their compensation is otherwise prescribed by the President, shall receive in addition to traveling expenses $25 per diem for subsistence expense on such days as they are actually engaged in the performance of duties pursuant to this order. The Board is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of its officers, examiners, mediators, umpires, and arbitrators; and the Chairman is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of other necessary employees of the Board. The Board shall avail itself, insofar as practicable, of the services

and facilities of the Office for Emergency Management and of other departments and agencies of the Government.

6. Upon the appointment of the Board and the designation of its Chairman, the National Defense Mediation Board established by Executive Order No. 8716[1] of March 19, 1941, shall cease to exist. All employees of the National Defense Mediation Board shall be transferred to the Board without acquiring by such transfer any change in grade or civil-service status. All records, papers, and property, and all unexpended funds and appropriations for the use and maintenance of the National Defense Mediation Board shall be transferred to the Board. All duties with respect to cases certified to the National Defense Mediation Board shall be assumed by the Board for discharge under the provisions of this order.

7. Nothing herein shall be construed as superseding or in conflict with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act (act of May 20, 1926, as amended, 44 Stat. 577; 48 Stat. 926, 1185; 49 Stat. 1169; 45 U. S. C. 151), the National Labor Relations Act (act of July 5, 1935, 49 Stat. 457; 29 U. S. C. 151 et seq.), the Fair Labor Standards Act (act of June 25, 1938, 52 Stat. 1060; 29 U. S. C. 201 et seq.), and the act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies, etc., approved June 30, 1936 (49 Stat. 2036; 41 U. S. C., sec. 35-45), or the act amending the act of March 3, 1931, relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics, approved August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1011; 40 U. S. C., sec. 276 et seq.).

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 12, 1942.*

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I intend to vote against the conference report for the reasons that have been presented by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

In my judgment, enacting such drastic legislation as is now proposed to prevent strikes during time of war in industries producing war materials is not justified without concurrent action in other phases of our economy. Instead of enacting this legislation, steps should be taken to remove conditions which have led to strikes that have occurred. I am not willing to indict as selfish and unpatriotic the working men and women of the Nation, however wrong they have been in striking.

The real reason for present conditions is that the workers of the country have consented to the stabilization of wages, but there has been no effective plan to bring prices back into line with wages. The workers of America have sons and brothers in the military service of our country on every battle front throughout the world. Their fellow workers and their brothers in the labor unions have spontaneously responded to the call to military service, and workers who have remained at home in our industries, with few exceptions, have conducted themselves with the full realization that they are soldiers of production. We must not overlook the fact that men and women in industries, as well as men and women in the military service, are also patriotically serving their country.

You ask why is it that here and there workers who are not selfish and unpatriotic have left their jobs—left them in the face of clear commands from Government agencies and even, in some cases, from their union officials, not to strike. It is not hard to find a satisfactory explanation for this extraordinary and confused condition.

The answer seems to me to be that our workers have in many instances been goaded to desperation by the sharp rise in the cost of living. They have left their jobs in some instances because they felt they could no longer stand being squeezed between their stabilized pay envelopes and the astronomical rise in the prices of commodities necessary to sustain life for themselves and their children. They appear to have become tired of talk and promises; and, in my opinion, the few strikes which have been taking place are due to the discontent growing out of our failure to take action. We are now about to take action against them, and to try to stop this growing discontent of labor, but we are taking no action to bring prices back into line with wages, or to stabilize other factors in our economy.

The rise in the cost of living for our workers, regardless of what statistics may show, has been tremendous. Of the three main family expenses—food, rent, and clothing—only rent has been stabilized. Cost of clothing has increased, taxes have become a real and increasingly burdensome hardship, and on all sides, cost of food has necessitated a substantial reduction in the diet that strengthens and sustains the workers and their families. This is the reason why there is restlessness today among some of our laboring people. They are seeking to obtain relief. To go on strike in wartime is reprehensible but to permit the price of living to increase for our workers without the imposition of equally heavy penalties and fines upon those who strike against the dinner pail and the meager comforts of our workers, is likewise reprehensible.

In approaching this problem we must realize that wages, prices, and profits are interrelated and must be considered as a whole. When we enact legislation, let us put a ceiling on prices and keep them at the level where they were before the war. Until we put a ceiling on prices and stabilize all phases of our economy at some fixed or predetermined level, we cannot, with clear conscience, put a ceiling on wages and penalties on those who strike.

If it is treasonable to strike in time of war, it is likewise treasonable to rob workers through extortionate prices or for industry to rob the public Treasury by exorbitant profits.

When we display toward black-market promoters and price manipulators the same vigor that Congress now proposes in dealing with labor, we will find the workers of the Nation as cooperative as any other group of citizens in helping to win the war.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, the pending bill has no doubt caused all Senators to feel very much disturbed, particularly because it seems that it voices more or less of a criticism of a large body of workers in the United States.

In my own State there are no miners; Delaware is not a mining State. If there are United Mine Workers in Delaware, I have not heard of them and have not heard from them.

Today I am concerned largely because the great number of workers believe that this measure is aimed at them. I know that the Senator from Texas says that it is only a war measure and that 6 months after hostilities cease it will no longer be effective. But the great body of union labor in the United States believes it is being aimed at them, and the great body of the union labor is not disloyal.

So far as John Lewis is concerned, I think too much has been made of him by commentators, by columnists, and by newspaper editorials. I think he has been given too much advertising. The people in my State have little or no patience with John Lewis. There is no doubt about that, and what I say is not intended to indicate in any way that I misunderstand the sentiment of the people of the United States with reference to Lewis, and the manner in which the strikes have been called.

When the bill came to the Senate, I, with many others, thought it was unnecessary to pass a bill authorizing the President to take charge of factories and plants in which strikes occur. In fact, many of us thought there was an implied criticism in the passage of such a measure. The President had already seized the mines, as he had the power to do. There were those who denied that he had the right. However, there are many in the ranks of union labor in the United States who are doing their part. I think that perhaps there is a tendency in America today to criticize a good deal anyway. Are we not even becoming a little critical of each other?

I remember when many of us, at least, even those who voted against it, felt the sting of criticism on Congress because of the so-called pension bill. I remember how unjust, unfair, and untrue most of the criticisms were. They were aimed directly at the legislative branch of the Government, and although the legislative branch of the Government has not been the only branch to be criticized, it seems to me that perhaps the pending bill, aimed partially at labor, as shown by the words of the bill itself, is an outcropping of the tendency to criticize each other.

It was not long before we found that the President was criticized, and that has not been such a terrible thing in the last few years. The President has not been criticized to the extent Congress has been in many instances, it appears to me, but recently I notice that the President has been criticized rather bitterly, the statement being he had sold out to or was afraid of John Lewis. That statement seems to have been peddled around rather generally.

Then after a while it became apparent that there was no connection between Mr. Roosevelt, as President, and the mine workers who were complaining because of their treatment. Then it was said that there was a secret understanding with Mr. Ickes, and that the miners were

[1] 6 F. R. 1532.

to get what they asked for anyway. That was generally passed around. Well, that did not seem to stick, and I saw by last night's newspaper that it was stated that the fine which is being imposed upon the miners is an improper method, and one which is likely to cause a great deal of difficulty. Even those who have been criticizing the President and Mr. Ickes now turn to criticism of Mr. Ickes because he is insisting upon a fine being imposed.

Mr. President, criticism of the President because of the labor situation is not the only criticism we have heard of him. We have heard his sons criticized. We have been told that they were not taking their part in the World War, that they were given special positions and special favors. A Member of another body—I have forgotten his name, and I did not try to remember it—made a statement of that sort in the House of Representatives, I believe. The statement was shown to be so unfair and untrue that it has not been followed up. At times other members of the President's family have been criticized.

Mr. President, it seems to me that Congress, the President, the manufacturing interests of the country, the agricultural interests, the labor interests, are all doing a great work in the war. I have watched vote after vote in this body, and I have seen those on the opposite side of the aisle and those on this side of the aisle join in the effort to make this a successful war. Whatever we may say in criticism, there is in the United States a working and determined American people who are writing history. They are writing the history of a great work being accomplished, of a great war being won.

When this war is over, and the record is written, the American people will not look to the criticisms which are made at this time; they will be forgotten; but the acts of the executive and the legislative branches of the Government, and of the loyal people who are making possible the winning of the war, from the soldiers to the civilian population, the sailors, the marines, and all others who are participating in the war, will be remembered as having accomplished something. The criticisms will be forgotten. The little, mean things being said now will be lost in oblivion, but the great accomplishments, as America marches on in its effort to prolong democracy in the world, to make it possible for civilization to continue, will not be forgotten, either by America or by those in other countries who are interested in the winning of the war by the forces of civilization.

That, Mr. President, is something which, it seems to me, we sometimes forget. We seem to think of this as being only a period of criticism. I do not think the present war is entirely peculiar in that respect. Some time ago an old friend of mine, a prominent Republican in my State, told me that it was his information that many leaders of the Republicans at the time of the Civil War were very critical of Mr. Lincoln, and at one time the feeling was so strong that they were almost ready to demand his abdication.

Mr. President, the American people have a right to criticize. In the Axis Nations the people do not have the right to criticize their governments. There is, as it seems to me, however, a tendency for us sometimes to overstate our criticism. A few days ago I heard a Member of Congress say that the President of the United States had sold the farmers down the river. I took the matter up with the Department of Commerce and I was furnished figures which are quite interesting to me, and I think there is no question as to their accuracy.

The national income from agriculture in the United States in the year 1932 was $2,354,000,000. In 1942 the income from agriculture was $15,480,000,000. The manufacturing interests in 1932 had an income of $6,227,000,000. In 1942 they had an income of $36,667,000,000. Incorporated business totals in 1932 showed a deficiency of $3,646,000,000. In 1942 there was shown on the positive side the sum of $7,600,000,000. Unincorporated business in 1932 showed an income of $4,849,000,000, and in 1942, $20,074,000,000.

There was a total national income in 1932, which was the year prior to the inauguration of the man who was supposed to have sold a portion of the American people down the river, of $39,912,000,000. In 1942 the total national income was $119,800,000,000.

Mr. President, there simply is no foundation for the statement that anyone has been sold down the river. But I wonder what the effect will be on our boys as they go into the various camps, as they go into foreign fields to fight the war, when they are told that everything is in confusion in America, that nothing is being run right. In fact, I do not know why anyone should buy Government bonds if the money is all being wasted. We are sometimes told that it is simply a case of the waste of the assets of the American people. But the American people do not believe it, because they oversubscribed the last issue of bonds, and they will oversubscribe the next.

Right now there is a problem facing us as to what shall be our attitude toward a particular branch of Americans, toward those who are members of union labor, but who are not members of an organization dominated by Mr. Lewis.

This week a committee of which I am a member had before it representatives of the American Federation of Labor and of the C. I. O. The American Federation of Labor representative was asked how many members there were in his organization. He said "We have 6,300,000 paying members." The representative of the C. I. O. was asked how many members his organization had. He told us the membership was approximately 5,000,000. That does not take into consideration other organizations not affiliated with or connected with the United Mine Workers.

Taking the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., there are 11,300,000 men of the great industrial class of America, the great working class of America, people who are buying their homes. I know some will say that they are not saving their money. When I look at the total of deposits in the banks of America, as the deposits have gone higher than ever before in the history of the Nation, I know some persons are saving money. In one little bank with which I am particularly familiar, deposits have gone from perhaps $300,000 to in excess of $900,000. People are not throwing their money away. They are saving their money. They are putting it in the banks. The members of the various unions are among those who are saving their money. I do not know how many adults the membership of the two organizations I referred to represent, but I should think that since there are 11,300,000 members in those two organizations they must represent 30,000,000 adult persons. That is a tremendous force in America, not only from the standpoint of voting, but from the standpoint of the interest which they are taking in American institutions, from the standpoint of the men and women who are sending their sons into foreign fields, who are sending their sons to the various camps for training.

It may be said that this measure is not aimed at union labor. I look at the title to the bill.

The title was amended so as to read:

An act relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants, mines, and facilities in the prosecution of the war, and preventing strikes, lock-outs, and stoppages of production, and for other purposes.

What are the other purposes? What was the reason for adding that language?

Let me read section 9, which has been passed over rather lightly. I was sorry the Senator from Connecticut did not dwell on section 9 a little longer than he did. I read it:

SEC. 9. Section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 2, sec. 251), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 313. It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress"—

Why confine it to a law of Congress, I do not know. I read further—

"to make a contribution in connection with any election to any political officer, or for any corporation whatever"——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wish to say—the language is not mine; I am not responsible for it; I am not for it particularly—that the language the Senator has just quoted is an exact quotation from the present Corrupt Practices Act, which has been on the statute books for many years.

Mr. TUNNELL. I understand; but that says nothing about labor unions.

Mr. HATCH. I know; but up to that point I am simply giving the Senator the historical information as to where the language came from.

Mr. TUNNELL. I thank the Senator. I realize the history of it; but I say that

in bringing before us a finished product, a finished bill, I can see no excuse or reason for jumping from a bill which is intended to break up strikes in war manufacturing, to a political subject.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Let me say to the Senator that the argument he is now making was made by the Senate conferees in the conference. We did not see the purpose in the language, either; but the conference was had between representatives of the two Houses of Congress, and the Senate conferees had to accept that language in order to get a report.

Let me repeat what I said yesterday—I do not know whether the Senator heard me—that I am preparing an amendment which will bring the employer groups into exactly the same category as the labor organizations.

Mr. TUNNEL. Mr President, the Senator does not believe the language as now contained in the bill is right, does he?

Mr. HATCH. I would not say it is not right.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then, why does the Senator want to amend it?

Mr. HATCH. I say I would not have put that provision in the bill, at all, if I had had my way.

Mr. TUNNELL. Why would the Senator change it, if it is right? Either it is right or it is not right.

Mr. HATCH. I certainly think that both the labor organizations and the employer groups should be placed on exactly the same footing and the same basis; and, with the aid of the Senator from Delaware, I hope we may yet accomplish that objective. We cannot do it all at once, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. TUNNELL. I understand that; but I do not believe in doing a wrong merely to correct it. That seems to be the situation in which the committee has placed the Senate. The committee has gone ahead and has insisted—or, at least, it has agreed; I will use that word—to the insertion of entirely foreign matter which cannot be excused on any theory on earth, except that it is a slap at labor unions.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I have read the report, and I have been curious about one provision contained in it. Perhaps the Senator from New Mexico can explain it for me.

Section 9 says:

> It is unlawful for any national bank—

As the Senator has suggested, that language is taken from the Corrupt Practices Act, I believe.

Mr. HATCH. That is correct.

Mr. BONE. Then the section employs this language:

> Or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress.

Mr. HATCH. That language also is from the Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. BONE. Yes; but aside from some corporations with which we are familiar, corporations which have been under heavy criticism here—some of the special corporations set up to do certain governmental work—I think the Senator will agree with me that there are no other corporations organized under an act of Congress which amount to much. I think the late Senator Borah, and perhaps the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], following Senator Borah's activities, sought to have a Federal law of incorporation enacted.

What was the purpose of the committee in taking in those corporations; and what corporations did the committee have in mind when it said, "Or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress"? Can the Senator tell us what such corporations are?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware permit me to answer the Senator from Washington in that regard? If the Senator from Delaware will yield to me so that I may do so, I shall be glad to reply.

Mr. BONE. I am sorry to take so much of the time of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. TUNNELL. That is quite all right; I should like to hear the reply of the Senator from New Mexico, and I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The history of the language is that is was literally lifted from the Corrupt Practices Act. The language was contained in the House bill. It was adopted by the House of Representatives. It was placed in the bill in that body. As I say, the language was absolutely lifted from the Corrupt Practices Act; and labor organizations were added to it, as I understand. I ask the Senator if that is not correct.

Mr. BONE. Well, Mr. President, let us assume a corporation having the name—I select this name at random, and I may be in error in selecting such a name as a corporate name—the Electric Home and Farm Authority. Such a corporation might have been organized under the laws of the State of Delaware. Of course, I am taking merely a crude example. Let me ask whether it is the view of the committee that such Government corporations should be permitted to contribute to political campaigns?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware will further yield, let me say that all corporations, whether organized under act of Congress, or otherwise, are prohibited from making political contributions.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, does the Senator know how effective that prohibition is?

Mr. HATCH. Certainly, I do.

Mr. BONE. The Senator does?

Mr. HATCH. Yes, and I should like to discuss it at length.

Mr. BONE. If the Senator wants to take an afternoon off, and entertain and amuse and titillate the Senate, I should like to have him take the time to explain to the Senate how much good that prohibition does. A bank cannot contribute to a political campaign; but it can contribute indirectly through its officers, and can find some way of getting the money into their hands. We have indulged in much "flapdoodle" in that connection. We think we are going to accomplish something directly, but we do not accomplish it either directly or indirectly. A man would have to be extremely dumb, I say to my friend, the Senator from New Mexico, if he were in a banking corporation, if he could not find a way to get some of the bank's "dough" into a political campaign. I have seen it done in my State. It is rather amusing to me, although I appreciate the honorable purposes of the gentlemen who wrote the language, and I have no quarrel with their purposes, and I say, as a lawyer—and the Senator is a good lawyer—that this provision is so much wasted energy on the part of Congress; because when the bank cannot make a contribution, it simply has one of the bank officials make it.

I remember that such a procedure was indulged in in a campaign with which I am familiar in the State of Washington. I think one bank was shown in the report as having had 22 of its officers make contributions—just one bank outfit—to the campaign of a candidate for the United States Senate.

We can write language such as this, and can flounder around in a tank of doubt and uncertainly until we begin to develop fins, but we are not going to settle any political issue by this sort of action.

Mr. President, the Senator still has not told me what sort of corporations he means to include in that language.

Mr. HATCH. I will tell the Senator, if the Senator from Delaware will forgive me for taking so much of his time.

Mr. BONE. Yes; I hope the Senator from Delaware will forgive us for taking so much of his time.

Mr. TUNNELL. Certainly; I am enjoying the discussion.

Mr. HATCH. I do not want to get into an argument about the provision. Certainly, I am not responsible for it.

Mr. BONE. No; but I desire information.

Mr. HATCH. I shall read the language; because, certainly, there seems to be some thought here that the language was confined to corporations organized under an act of Congress. I desire to explain the act; but if I may, I shall read the language:

> SEC. 313. It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution in connection with any election to any political officer.

If it stopped right there, the criticism would be justified; but it does not stop there at all.

Mr. BONE. Let me say to the Senator that I am not criticizing; I am seeking information.

Mr. HATCH. Very well; but the language further says "or for any corporation whatever."

Mr. President, that language is about as broad as language can be; and I believe it answers fully the criticisms of both the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Washington.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, it may answer the criticism as to corporations——

Mr. HATCH. That is what I meant.

Mr. TUNNELL. That is what the Senator means, I take it.

Mr. HATCH. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. TUNNELL. But it does not answer the criticism I have. If, as the Senator from Washington has intimated, the language would have no effect, I should not say a word; I should sit down; but it is not going to be that way. This is a bill for a specific purpose, aimed at those who, we claim, are doing something inimical to the war effort; and we inject into it a prohibition against their exercising their rights as citizens. They may not contribute if they are a corporation.

Where was the committee's thought as to all unincorporated organizations? I do not know whether the Chamber of Commerce of the United States is a corporation. Perhaps it is and perhaps it is not. I do not know whether the Manufacturers Association is a corporation. Why is it omitted? Why are similar organizations omitted? Do they not contribute? Is it because such organizations do not contribute, or were they omitted purposely? I do not know; but I do know that every labor union man in the United States will take it for granted that they were omitted as a slap at him.

There are tremendous organizations which are not incorporated. I do not believe the Adams Express Co. ever was incorporated. It was one of the great organizations using common names, without having been incorporated under the laws of any State Are such organizations to be left free to contribute as they please? At whom was this provision aimed? I do not believe it was aimed at John Lewis. I do not know at what distinguished citizen it might have been aimed.

My mind runs back to a recollection of certain contributions made by labor organizations. It is possible that this is one of the things which have more purpose in them than appears on the surface.

I know that our friends on the committee from the Senate are shrewd. They are good lawyers. I think that they have paid too high a price. I think the House conferees have "put one over" on our friends. I think they "put one over" on union labor, because there is nothing against union labor as such. It is only against one particular branch; and I suspect that it is aimed at only a few in that branch.

There could be no more loyal citizens in this war effort than the members of the American Federation of Labor, the C. I. O., and other independent organizations. Why, in the midst of this war, must we, as a Congress, place on the statute books a deliberate attempt to alienate and separate that great body of from 30,000,000 to 35,000,000 good American citizens? Why is it done? Is it the purpose to place the workingman in America in a different position from that which he has always occupied? Are we going to make of the laboring man a separate class? We have done so in this bill. We cannot get around it. It is here.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] says that he will introduce a bill to correct the situation. One of those who have favored the bill is going to try to correct it. I think the time to correct it is before the damage is done. I see no immediate reason, aside from a political reason, for putting this particular provision in the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE obtained the floor.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of putting a telegram into the RECORD? I do so by request.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. I send to the desk a telegram, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the telegram will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

HARRISBURG, PA., *June 12, 1943.*

Senator GUFFEY,
Washington, D. C.:

Bethlehem Steel Co. Steelton plant, Steelton, Pa., on June 10, 1943, closed 2 blast furnaces, and the members of Local 1688 reported to work, they discovered that these 2 blast furnaces were closed down by the management of Bethlehem Steel. One employee asked why these 2 furnaces were closed down. They told them that was none of their darn business. Bethlehem Steel requested of these men to take other men's jobs regularly scheduled to work. The union grievance committee told management that this was not fair management of Bethlehem Steel. Company gave these men 5 minutes to get out of the plant. Before 5 minutes was up they had 25 company police to drive them out of plant. As soon as management of Bethleheem Steel Co. did this they reported to newspapers, accusing union of sabotage. I, as director of United Steel Workers of America, district 11, Congress of Industrial Organizations, believe this was a deliberate attempt by the Bethlehem Steel Co. to create public sentiment against organized labor, in view of the fact that the Connally bill is pending at Washington. Am prepared to bring a committee of workmen from this group to Washington to substantiate this claim. We are asking you to make known this telegram to the United States Senate.

GEO. MEDRICK,
District Director, United Steel Workers of America.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I realize that such a state of public opinion has been created in this country that it has become very unpopular to say a word in behalf of the men who toil. I realize also that so far as the votes on the conference report are concerned, nothing I could say could possibly have any effect upon the manner in which my colleagues intend to cast their votes.

It so happens that I have given a great deal of time to a study of the history of labor relations in the United States. It came about largely as a result of my membership on the Committee on Education and Labor, and because I was chairman of a subcommittee of that committee, the so-called civil-liberties committee.

Because of my knowledge of the history of labor relations in the United States, I feel that the Congress and the President, if he signs this bill, will have joined in committing a tragic mistake in the midst of war. Because I am firmly convinced that would be the inevitable result of the final enactment of this measure, I feel that I should place in the RECORD my reasons for my belief that it would be a catastrophic mistake.

We are acting as if this legislation were about to be placed upon the statute books in an intellectual vacuum. Such is not the case. The action which we take will affect the most complex and delicate of human relations, the relationship between employer and employee. It is as delicate, it is as complex, as are all the psychological motivations which go to make the human being complex. We are acting in this matter as though there had not been a long, a bitter, and, too often, a bloody struggle in this country to establish the hard-won fundamental democratic rights which labor now enjoys as a result of statutory enactment. We are acting upon insufficient grounds to justify the drastic step which we are asked to take.

In what I am now saying, I am speaking solely on that portion of the conference report which has to do with labor relations and labor disputes in plants which have not been taken over by the Federal Government.

Let me be utterly frank in this matter. I voted against the Connally bill as it passed the Senate because I feared the ultimate repercussions of comparatively mild action. However, if action at all is justified in this situation, Mr. President, it is justified solely, in my opinion, insofar as the plants are concerned which have been seized and are being operated by the Federal Government.

Unfortunately, the conference report does not stop there. It enters a field where men are being employed by private corporations. It is true that they are manufacturing products which are related to or are useful to the war efforts. Nevertheless, by this measure we seek to inject the plenary power of government into the delicate field of relationship between private employer and civilian employee.

Mr. President, the record made by labor since our entry into the war does not justify any such dangerous and drastic step. Labor's record of production in the war has not been exceeded in the history of the human race. There is a failure to realize that, month by month and year by year, we have been able to surpass every goal which has been set for the war-production effort. This result could only occur because men and women in this country have been working faithfully, long hours, and with excellent skill.

Time after time the Chairman of the War Production Board has announced that the goal for the past month for this type or that type of war product had been exceeded. In fact, combined cooperative, voluntary effort of management and employees in this country has been so prodigious that it has forced the Government to revise and to cut back contracts, because production has exceeded even the wildest estimates of the production men in the War Production Board. Yet, in the face of that record,

in the face of the fact that those in the executive branch of the Government responsible for war production in this country have advised the Congress against the wisdom of enacting any such legislation as this, we are about to pass it.

The Secretary of the Navy, the Assistant Secretary of War, the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, the Chairman of the War Production Board, every member of the National Labor Relations Board, and the public members of the War Labor Board, all joined in a letter addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives urging Congress not to enact a bill which had been reported from the Military Affairs Committee of the House.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not wish to delay the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I know the Senator from Texas does not wish to do that.

Mr. CONNALLY. However, to be absolutely accurate, the objections which were urged were to sections 2 and 3 of the House bill, and not to the entire bill, because it was the contention that those provisions as originally written contained an invitation to strike. I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin that the original Connally bill was approved by the committee, as will be shown by a printed copy of the hearings, which were held a year or more ago, copy of which I have here.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was trying to indicate to the Senator that I am now urging rejection of the portion of the conference report which is not the original Connally bill—not the original Senate bill—but is that portion of the House bill which deviates from the principles and premise upon which the bill of the Senator from Texas was based, namely, that the Government would enact legislation governing situations in plants which it had taken over and was operating.

I say now we are asked to enter into this dangerous and delicate field of labor relations in such a way as to throw the weight and power of the Government on the side of the private employer and against his employees in plants which have not been taken over by the Government. I say that there is nothing in the production record of employees which would justify the action we are about to take.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the Senator from Wisconsin said very frankly that he had not voted for the Connally bill when it passed the Senate. I was one of those who voted for the Connally bill. I did so very cheerfully and enthusiastically, because I believed it was very necessary from the standpoint of the public welfare for the Congress to go as far as what was contained in the Connally bill. I think it was absolutely indefensible and unjustifiable for the Congress to go further than the Connally bill as it passed the Senate. That seemed to be the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the Senate. The House of Representatives proceeded to pass a bill based on an entirely different theory, not to insure production in time of emergency, but a bill essentially disposed to penalize labor and take away from it a great many of the advances which it had made over a long period of time.

Does the Senator from Wisconsin believe for a moment that any of the essential differences between the Connally bill as it passed the Senate and the conference report, embodying an entirely different theory of the House bill, would have been embodied in a vote of the Senate when this bill passed the Senate in the first place, or could it pass now except as being embodied in the conference report?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have no way of knowing what the outcome would have been. I will say that I think there would have been a great many more votes against the so-called Connally bill had it embodied the provisions which the conference report now embodies. But I was about to say, and I do not wish to be diverted from this point, for I believe it to be one of vital importance, that the responsible heads of all agencies and departments primarily responsible for seeing that the boys in the armed services, about whom we have heard so much, are adequately supplied with munitions of war—those who would be the first to be impeached if our men were to die because they had not been properly equipped and given a chance for their lives—those men have gone on record warning the Congress not to pass the legislation embodied in the portion of the conference report I am now discussing. I say to my colleagues that the essential provisions contained in the conference report do not materially differ from those sections of the so-called Smith bill as reported by the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, and against which these men responsible for war production have inveighed.

You are about to accept responsibility, my fellow colleagues, for disregarding the greatest production record ever made by laboring men and women in all the history of the world. You are about to act contrary to the advice of the men who are responsible for our war production effort if you enact this bill.

Mr. President, if I thought no ill effects would come from the enactment of the proposed legislation insofar as the war-production effort is concerned, perhaps my profound feeling of regret to see emasculated the advanced labor legislation of this country which has been won after so many years of bloody struggle and effort, would be one purely of personal concern. But if the action we are about to take tonight results in less production of planes, tanks, guns, and munitions of war, the responsibility will rest on just one group—it will rest squarely on the shoulders of the legislative arm of the Government. Such is the responsibility which you must take, my friends, if you vote for this measure; and all the hysteria, all the distortion of the true labor picture which has been presented by the press and over the radio, will not, in the last analysis, absolve you from that responsibility, for sooner or later the people of this country will know the truth.

The sponsors of the pending measure say that loyal labor should not feel that it is aimed at them. If, Mr. President, your father had been killed at Homestead, if your son had been murdered in Harlan County, Ky., if you had seen your wife and family go hungry in the effort to secure the rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States in the field of industrial relations, if you had participated in producing such an enormous quantity of war materials that those responsible for carrying forward the war program had had to cut it back, what other conclusion could you draw than that the Congress had acted against you?

Mr. President, I fear that this measure will not increase production. I fear that it will have a contrary result. I know that certain forces in this country—a powerful but recalcitrant minority of employers who have fought the national labor relations policy, by fair means and foul—are only hoping that the day may be hastened when armed force will be employed in order to bring about production in the United States. But I do not believe that forced labor, I do not believe that unwilling labor can and will produce as much as labor which is willing—labor which is voluntary.

In time of war there is no need to worry about our power. It is plenary; we can exercise it at any time we believe the use of totalitarian methods is necessary; but once we start down the road of force and compulsion, there is no turning back.

What will be your answer if, unfortunately, the fears which I have expressed concerning this measure should prove to be well founded? There is no other answer except the one which the Senator from Vermont is sponsoring—the draft of all the citizenship—and once you have adopted the Axis course, once you have drafted all the people in this country and forced them to work, what will be your answer if then they do not produce? The answer will be more force.

So, Mr. President, I say that the step we are about to take here this afternoon should not be taken lightly. For my own part, I do not believe that forced labor is as efficient, and I do not believe that labor under compulsion is as efficient, as free and voluntary labor. Yet, even in the Axis nations where government is not only all supreme, as it is in this Nation today, but is wielded by men who are utterly ruthless, there have been strikes. There have been stoppages.

A few days ago the Committee on Foreign Relations was enlightened by a Minister from a government whose citizens are under the occupation of the Nazis. Thousands upon thousands of young men, and older men, had been taken from their country into Germany, into the citadel of totalitarianism, and ruthless power, although those employees taken from their nation were under the absolute and uncontrolled power of the ruthless Nazi machine, they found ways by which to slow down their production,

and yet ways in which they could not be caught.

So I say, Mr. President, without questioning the motives—for I never do so—without questioning the sincerity of purpose of all those who disagree with me here this afternoon, I fear my country, my Congress, the Senate of which I am a Member, is about to take a great and perhaps a fatal step, insofar as the successful conduct of war production is concerned.

If my attitude shall in the future be proved to be wrong, I shall be the first to confess it. I shall be the first to welcome an indication that I am wrong. If the record of production justified the action now proposed, if we are not getting sufficient war production, if we did not have enough war materials, and therefore we were forced to take this drastic step, I should not hesitate to take it. But I say, Mr. President, that an unbiased study of the war-production record and the testimony from those who know best and who are most intimately concerned with this problem show that we are not justified in taking the fatal step which is embodied in this conference report.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the totalitarian philosophy is sound. I believe that the people of this country who were reluctantly taken into war, have given the lie to the Nazi and the Fascist contention that democracy and voluntary cooperative effort under democratic leadership could not rise to the heights required in total war. So far as I am concerned, with no evidence presented to justify it, I refuse to give my acquiescence to the suggestion that democracy has failed.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I no more relish the experience of making comment upon this measure than I do the occasion that makes it necessary to consider the proposed legislation. It is well known to the Members of the Senate that this measure is now before the Senate upon a conference report which represents the agreement arrived at by the managers of the House and the Senate deliberating together upon legislation passed by the respective bodies, in the Senate the Connally bill, and in the House the Smith bill.

It also should be known to the public, Mr. President, that when Senators vote this day, or whenever they shall vote upon the conference report, they do not vote upon it by part but as a whole. They have therefore not the privilege of selecting one portion and retaining another which might be more agreeable to them. They have to support the whole conference report or to reject the whole report.

I think it is known to those who are upon the floor at the present time and to the leaders of the Senate upon both sides of the aisle that an overwhelming majority of the membership of this body is disposed to favor legislation of this general character, and that in all probability by a large majority the conference report will be adopted by the membership of the Senate voting upon the conference report.

Therefore, Mr. President, one has to make up one's mind as to whether he will support the conference report or whether he will oppose it, and by opposing it give to the American people and to the men in the armed services and the women who wear the uniforms of our country the impression that the Congress is either unwilling or afraid—and the latter is the accusation which will be hurled against us—to deal with any kind of labor abuse.

Mr. President, it is essential to the preservation of the processes of democracy that the instruments of democracy be regarded with integrity by the people, and if those instrumentalities allow themselves to be intimidated, if ever the members of the body politic place their political welfare against an obligation of public duty, the means of maintaining the processes of democracy are already corroded and there is justification for the charge of decadence against democracy itself.

Mr. President, the Congress has been indulgent with labor extremists almost to a fault, due to the reluctance that many of us had to transgress in a field where we preferred voluntary action to take place. In fact the Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate has been so indulgent as not only to be the subject of criticism but to cause the Senate itself to take away from that committee even jurisdiction over the subject of labor legislation, and I have been one of the ones responsible for and contributing to that attitude in that committee, Mr. President, and I say it without regret or apology.

Everyone knows that for some months the Committee on Education and Labor had been so indulgent in dealing with this subject that legislation of this character has originated in and been considered by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Yet I think, Mr. President, that such a policy of indulgence has been a wise one up to this present time. I think that if one balances the good against the bad which has come out of that policy, the good will be found to predominate.

But, Mr. President, the time has come now for the Congress to indicate to the American people that it is capable of suppressing an incipient insurrection by a would-be dictator who cloaks himself under the guise of a leader of honorable labor, for every Member of this body knows that we would not be here on Saturday afternoon debating this legislation had it not been for the offense of John L. Lewis against the public interest and his defiance of the constituted authority of this country in time of war.

Mr. President, I am one of those who regard John L. Lewis as the most dangerous man in America, because he is able, he is plausible, he is colorful, he is utterly ruthless and unscrupulous, and as ambitious as Caesar ever was. That man is capable of immeasurable danger to the American Republic, Mr. President. There was but one occasion for his antagonism against the President of the United States, and that was the fact that the President was unwilling to be putty in his selfish and ambitious palm.

I made inquiry today of several persons with whom I came in contact as to what their understanding was about the so-called political contribution to the Democratic National Committee when the President was the nominee for President by the C. I. O., then headed by John L. Lewis—who gave it the only bad name it ever had. So that, in spite of the great virtue and character and unquestionable patriotism of its present president, one of the greatest of Americans, Philip Murray, that organization still has the odium of John L. Lewis' name to bear in my State and sections of the country, if not in others—I say I made inquiry, Mr. President, as to what the public opinion might be about that transaction. A great many persons, believing some of the columnists and the propagandists, said "Well, after all, Roosevelt is responsible for this man, because he has played along with John L. Lewis, and built him up, because he owed him a financial debt for the half million dollars he gave to his campaign fund."

Mr. President, I talked with several of those people. I said, "Do you understand that that was a loan, not a gift; and do you understand that every dollar and every penny of that money has been paid back?"

They said, "Frankly, I did not know that. I thought that was an outright donation by Mr. Lewis to the Democratic National Executive Committee, of which the President was the beneficiary."

When the President of the United States was elected with the aid of Mr. Lewis and his fine organization, knowing what subsequent events have proved about Mr. Lewis' character, I say Lewis expected to be the kitchen cabinet of this administration; he expected to be the power behind the scene, the uncrowned king of American policy.

The President of the United States—any President—does not need defense against such a belief. If he were worthy of the Presidency in the opinion of the American people, he would be above the suggestion of any such prostitution of his office or power.

But when the President did not elevate Mr. Lewis to such a place he incurred the undying enmity of an ambitious and disappointed man; and ever since that time, every dagger John L. Lewis could unsheath, every weapon he could uncover, every missile he could hurl at the person of the present President of the United States and his policy, John L. Lewis has thrown, regardless of the effect of that antagonism upon the welfare of his country.

Mr. President, that man went so far, in the elections of 1940, as to say that if the President of the United States then holding office were reelected by the democratic process by the American people—without soldiers at the ballot boxes, without any undemocratic coercion or intimidation that I know of upon the American people—he would resign the leadership of one of the great labor organizations of this country. That is a strange thing for a man to say: "If the present President of the United States is reelected, I will resign the leadership of this organization"—by implication admitting that the personal animosity

would be so acute that he would either do a disservice to his organization by continuing in its leadership or to the country, perhaps, by continuing to exercise its power.

Mr. President, every Senator on this floor knows that John L. Lewis has been trying to steal the leadership of American labor from his worthier compatriots—and patriots—William Green and Philip Murray. Those men, day in and day out, have had to fight uprisings in their own ranks, uprisings perfectly natural in character, against the seductive persuasion of the ruthless and unscrupulous John L. Lewis.

Mr. President, human nature being what it is, laborers are just like all the rest of us. They like to get all they can for their labor. Naturally, they strive to do it—as do we all. But when Mr. Murray and Mr. Green were willing to jeopardize their own leadership in the public interest, when they had to put the strong hand of "No" before the claims of their own men and members—not John L. Lewis. He would not be willing to jeopardize his leadership in the public interest; no, he would come in and insidiously say to labor, led by those more honorable men, "Come with me, and I will get these increases for you, whatever may be their effect upon public policy or the prosecution of the war."

Mr. President, how far did he follow that course? To the point of open defiance of the constituted authority of his country, duly and regularly set up.

Mr. President, what about all the others who are amenable to the jurisdiction of the War Labor Board? Are they any less worthy in their claims, any less deserving in their aspirations? Are they any less entitled to any just award which may be bestowed upon them, or any injustice corrected? Of course not. I am speaking of the ranks of labor—not only the millions in the American Federation of Labor and in the Congress of Industrial Organizations, but all the millions in the railway brotherhoods and in the other magnificent labor organizations in this land of ours. They have submitted themselves in the proper way—in a patriotic way—to the constituted authority of their country. They may not be satisfied. They may yet be making their claims. They may be insistent in their aspirations; but that is consistent with American democracy, Mr. President. But they have not defied their Government in time of war. They have religiously kept their faith and pledge of no strikes to the President and to their fellow countrymen.

Mr. President, there are many farmers in this country who do not think they are getting all they should get for their products. There are many white-collar workers who are not satisfied with what they have obtained. All over this great land there are special groups that want more. But, Mr. President, they are not defying the Government. The members of the soldiery were getting only $30 a month. No doubt they would have liked to have had more. They got more by the action of this Congress, by the laudable efforts of the able senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] whom, I am sorry to say, I do not at present see in the Chamber so I can compliment him upon what he did for the soldiers. But, Mr. President, they did not strike for more. They did not say, "We will take our guns and go home."

No, Mr. President; they believed in the principle of democracy, which requires the democrat to abide by the decisions of duly constituted authority.

We on this floor, Mr. President, often have our individual desires defeated by the vote of our colleagues; yet how silly would be a Senator who resigned and said, "I will no longer participate in a body which goes contrary to my sentiments." We do not put a machine gun at the door and say, like the conquerors of old, "I will coerce this body until it submits." Many of us are lawyers or have been claimants in the courts. Because we lost our case, we did not resort to the jungle remedy of self-help, Mr. President. If a man had done that, we would not have modern civilization with all its refinements and all its strength.

So, Mr. President, that is the occasion for this legislation; and we all know it.

Some labor representatives are in the corridors of the Capitol today. Of course, they have a right to be here, but they do a disservice to the cause of labor in being here.

Let me explain why I say that, Mr. President. I hold in my hand just one typical letter on this subject from just a soldier. There is not a Senator on this floor, Mr. President, who has not received many similar letters. Here is what I see, Mr. President: An animosity growing so acute and so intense between the workers and the soldiers that, if allowed to continue unchecked, it jeopardizes the foundations of the Republic. For, Mr. President, I see coming the day, beyond even the war, when the soldiers will come home seeking the jobs they deserve. I can hear the evil and sinister whispers of the Fascists and the would-be dictators of America in their ears when they are unemployed and, perhaps, are suffering: "See over there? Do you see the factory? There is a closed shop there. Who are the fellows who are working? Why, the fellows who got $20 a day and who lived in luxury while you were in the grime of New Guinea or the Solomon Islands, in the Southwest Pacific, or mingling your blood with the dirt of another Flanders Fields."

If labor were organized to defend itself, it would not be unnatural to see the soldiers organized to defend their interests. Should there be not enough jobs for all and such bitter feelings as I have feared existed, then would come the danger of conflict and strife.

There are still many persons in America who would like to see trouble, and many who would be willing to agitate it, thinking that they would gain, upon the broken bodies of their fellow countrymen and our collapsed economy, the kind of power that Hitler has, which has come out of every age of chaos and confusion throughout the history of the world. That is not an illusion or a dream, Mr. President. Read the letters from soldiers and see how bitterly they feel about this subject.

I do not know whether there is any truth in what has been said to me by a citizen, to the effect that the Army and Navy have tried to encourage antagonism on the part of soldiers and sailors against labor. I have heard the charge made that bulletins are posted on the bulletin boards in the camps and around the naval stations, emphasizing all the strikes which occur, for the purpose of making the men angry and arousing their indignation against labor. I believe that to be unworthy of our armed forces. If it is true, it is a subject for proper investigation, reprimand, and punishment by the appropriate agencies of the Government. But, Mr. President, I cannot believe that the major part of this indignation does not originate from what the soldiers and sailors gather from contacts with their homes and from the common and public means of information and communication.

So, Mr. President, we have a situation in which the American people have turned their gaze upon the Congress, to learn whether or not every group and interest in America is subservient to the public interest in time of war. The proposed legislation which we have before us today confirms authority exercised numerous times by the President, to take over the factory or the facility of management. If we were considering a bill to affect only labor, and exempting management, I should certainly not favor it, and most Senators would not; but section 3 specifically confirms the power heretofore existing and confers a new power to take over any facility the operation of which by the Government may be essential to the prosecution of the war. In other parts of the conference report other provisions are made. For example, section 4 provides that the rules concerning the employment of the employees after possession is taken by the Government shall be the same as when the facility was taken over.

In section 5 authority is conferred for an application to the War Labor Board for a change in the terms of employment at Government-operated plants if the terms as they existed at the time of the transition are unsatisfactory to the employees.

Section 6 is the heart of the bill. Interference with governmental operation of plants is prohibited and made a penal offense. That was the Connally bill. I wish that were all of the conference report. I am sorry indeed that the House of Representatives chose to give rein to its indignation against labor—which I do not share, Mr. President—in matters extraneous to the prosecution of the war itself.

In section 6 it is made an offense for any person—

(1) To coerce, instigate, induce, conspire with, or encourage any person to interfere, by lock-out—

That covers employers—

strike, slow-down, or other interruption, with the operation of such plant, mine, or facility, or (2) to aid any such lock-out, strike, slow-down, or other interruption interfering with the operation of such plant, mine, or facility by giving direction or guidance in the conduct of such interruption, or by providing funds

for the conduct or direction thereof or for the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein.

In protection of the rights of individual workers—

No individual shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this section by reason only of his having ceased work or having refused to continue to work or to accept employment.

Mr. President, when the Government operates a facility to produce essential materials for war is it a democratic right to encourage an interruption of work in that facility? That is what Lewis has done. I hope all labor will realize that laws against labor are like the laws against murder. They are aimed only against the offenders, and not the good, the loyal, the worthy, the honorable, and the faithful. Members of this body do not regard the law against murder as aimed at them; but were there no laws against murder homicide would become frequent in America. I am not offended because there is a law against murder, because I do not intend to violate it. I do not deem it a reflection upon me, or an accusation against me of designs upon the lives of my fellow men. Such laws are aimed at restraining and punishing the murderer and the gangster.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Would the Senator think a law was intended for him if a criminal statute stated that the Senator from Florida, if he should commit a murder, should be punished, and if the law said nothing about anyone else?

Mr. PEPPER. If a law were enacted which named one man, I would not regard it as of universal application, but if a law provides that anyone who commits a murder shall be subject to a certain penalty, I do not regard it as being restrictive legislation.

Mr. TUNNELL. But the proposed statute does not do that. It picks out labor unions and says that the commission by labor unions of certain acts shall constitute an offense when committed by labor unions, but not when committed by anyone else.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not know the offense to which the able Senator refers.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am speaking of section 9 of the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be very glad to come to that in a moment. As I understand, the Senator refers to the political-contribution section.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. As I stated a moment ago, I do not favor that section of the conference report. It ought not to be in the bill. It was an imposition on the Senate to put it in. It has nothing to do with the prosecution of the war. It is not essential to production in any sense of the word. It is entirely unrelated to the war, and I exceedingly regret that the conferees on the part of the Senate, under any circumstances, allowed that extraneous provision to be inserted in the bill.

Yet, Mr. President, reference in the same section is made to national banks. In the same section they are prohibited from making political contributions. In the same section corporations chartered under the laws of the United States are forbidden to make political contributions. I quote:

It is unlawful for any national bank—or any corporation—

And so forth. Any corporation is subject to the same penalty if it makes a political contribution. Therefore I do not think that the section refers only to labor organizations, when it includes other categories. However, let me say to the able Senator that it is extraneous to the subject of this legislation, the important object of which is to get on with production essential to the war. That section ought not to be in the bill. But if I had the choice, knowing that the Congress would accept or reject the measure in toto, of voting for the measure with that provision in it, subject to subsequent change—and I would join the Senator in its deletion by a bill—or voting against the whole conference report, I would vote for the conference report, in order to make clear that no one in America can defy the Government in time of war and not incur the prohibitions of the Nation's laws.

Mr. TUNNELL. Does this have anything to do with defying the Government in time of war?

Mr. PEPPER. Not this section. The Senator is absolutely correct with respect to this section.

Mr. TUNNELL. Is an unincorporated association prohibited from making political contributions, as are labor unions?

Mr. PEPPER. It is not. The Senator is absolutely correct in condemning that section of the conference report. The Senator from Delaware has not indicated how he will vote. He may feel so strongly against that particular section that he will vote against the whole conference report. I, too, feel strongly against that section, but I will not vote against the whole report because that particular section, odious as it is, is in there. Such is the peculiar parliamentary problem with which we are faced, Mr. President, in voting for or against the conference report.

Mr. President, I was saying that the heart of the bill is section 6. That is what I am voting for primarily. That is the Connally bill which the Senate passed. It provides that no one may interrupt war production after the Government takes over the facility.

There is another reason why I favor the Connally bill. I would not vote for a bill outlawing any kind of cessation of work. I would rather give the War Labor Board an opportunity to pass upon and consider such a matter first. I would rather give the Conciliation Service an opportunity to reconcile the differences between employer and employee, or between the Government and the employees before any law becomes effective. I would prefer that the President be given an opportunity to try to assuage the dissatisfaction of the complainants before the punishments of the law become operative. Section 6 applies only after a facility is taken over by the Government in order to assure the continued production of war materials.

Section 7, with regard to the functions and duties of the National War Labor Board, I also regard as extraneous to this subject. I wish it had not been included in the conference report. It is not essential to the maintenance of production of essential war materials. It protects all the rights which have previously been conferred by statute. For example, the rights of workers under the wage and hour law. I had a campaign in 1938 because I favored and would not retreat from the wage and hour law. Section 7, however, protects all rights conferred by the National Labor Relations Act and other acts upon the statute books of the Nation.

I also regard section 8 as extraneous to the conference report. Meritorious in certain respects, it is not essential to this legislation. I wish it had been left out of the conference report.

I have already referred to the section dealing with political contributions by the labor organizations. I agree with the able Senator from Delaware in what he said about that section of the act.

I invite attention to section 10, however:

TERMINATION OF ACT

SEC. 10. Except as to offenses committed prior to such date, the provisions of this act and the amendments made by this act shall cease to be effective at the end of 6 months following the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, or upon the date (prior to the date of such proclamation) of the passage of a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress stating that such provisions and amendments shall cease to be effective.

Mr. President, this is war legislation, and not peace legislation. If the provisions in this bill are not appropriate to peace conditions, they should be, and they will be, repealed or appropriately altered by the Congress. Members of Congress can initiate legislation next Monday to strike out of this measure objectionable features which it now contains. I shall join with any Senator in deleting all except the heart of it, namely, section 6, which has to do with the maintenance of essential production for the prosecution of the war. That is what is important.

Yet, Mr. President, if word goes out from this august chamber tonight that the Senate rejected the conference report, American public opinion and the sentiment of those in the services will not make hair-splitting distinctions between section 6 and sections 7, 8, or 9. They will condemn Senators as being too much afraid of their political futures to dare to say, even to John L. Lewis, "Thou shalt not stab thy country in the back in time of war. Thou canst not lead any group of men into national disservice." Those will be the headlines, however distorted newspaper headlines usually are, which will break upon the consciousness of the American public tomorrow.

We have been told that the British have not found coercive legislation necessary. I believe that is correct. But, thank God, they have not had a John L. Lewis in Britain.

Mr. President, I am proud of the record of labor in America during this war, and I am particularly proud that in my own State of Florida there has not been a single strike in a war industry. That is a record which deserves the highest praise and commendation.

But can I say, because we have had that splendid record, that John L. Lewis can defy the American Government without violating any statute?

Mr. President, the American people would think there was not a vertebra in the backbone of any Senator who would say such a thing, or they would question his patriotism.

Mr. President, my only hope is that labor will realize that this is not a condemnation of labor. This bill is aimed exclusively and solely at John L. Lewis. It is not even aimed at those honorable men in the United Mine Workers of America. Their record has been magnificent and patriotic. However, Mr. President, they cannot escape the character of their leader. John L. Lewis has put them into opposition to the national interest. They have not lost so much time, but think of all the other groups, and the sentiments which have been stirred in them for selfishness by the example of John L. Lewis in his insurrection, which has probed into the very heart of the war effort.

Of course, we will be condemned whichever side we take in this controversy. As usual, partisans want people on their side exclusively. They do not want any rationalization of the issue. They do not want a man to serve only the public interest. They generally put a man down as being on the side of labor or being against labor; and, of course, all of us, whichever way we vote, will have one partisan group or the other denouncing us as strangling the processes of democracy, and trying to heap opprobrium rather than deserved commendation upon them.

Mr. President, I do not believe any other Senator will claim a more constant record in support of the interest and cause of labor than that of the junior Senator from Florida—myself. I said to a great labor convention in my State, "Gentlemen, labor is on the defensive. If you do not clean house the public will clean house for you." They did not invite my advice. They were gracious in the way they received it. I am no oracle, Mr. President, but I believe I am right about that. They talk about preserving the gains of labor. The only way that can be done, Mr. President, is by keeping national indignation against excessive abuses of labor's power from growing so mighty that it will overflow every effort to defend legitimate labor interests.

I am saying that a little more of John L. Lewis' conduct and there will be violence in the United States. A little more provocation and even we who are the friends of labor cannot save and safeguard labor's legitimate and proper gains.

Mr. President, I am giving labor some good advice as labor's friend. Quit charging these exorbitant fees for membership in the unions. Quit allowing certain members to abuse their power. Purge them, if you will. They do discredit to your splendid men, who are 999 and more out of 1,000 among the best of the Nation. But let Congress refuse moderate legislation, and the extremists will be here in our places, and the tide of their indignation will be such that none can stand against it.

We go into the next election, Mr. President, with this war going on, and with casualties multiplied more than a score of times, with rivers of America's blood flowing as it will in the next 20 months, and Members of Congress get up on the street corner, or at a public meeting, and try to explain the difference between section 6 and section 9, those present will howl and hiss them down. Then in our place will come labor baiters who may be the minions of a fascism, perhaps, that is against all democratic sentiment and interest.

This is one of those times when a little probing may save a dangerous operation later. That is why I am willing to take section 9. I am willing to take section 8, I am willing to take section 7, and others, in order to get section 6. We all know that if we will pass this law and John L. Lewis is properly handled, there will be no more labor legislation in the Congress, and there will be no more agitation for it. This bill is the best labor is going to be able to get, and we all know it. But deprive the people of this, and you will arouse such anger in the hearts of the American people, stimulated and encouraged by their sons in the service, that we will be back here in less than two more Saturday afternoons trying to find some bill we can pass.

Mr. President, as the title of the book written by Herbert Agar, from the great State of Kentucky, recently published, suggests, it is Time To Be Great. We may this afternoon not only be rendering a great service to our country, but I think we are rendering a great service to the cause of American labor. I am willing to face them when events are proved, with the record. Let time prove if that may not be so.

Therefore, Mr. President, because it is in time of war, with which nothing must interfere—and with an equal willingness to put all necessary restraints and prohibitions upon anyone who may obstruct the war—in order to preserve the gains labor has made, in order that those gallant men of the armed services who are today, tonight, upon the high seas, in the jungle, and upon the snow-clad mountain tops in the remote Aleutians, in order that those men who fly higher than the eagles ever soared, wherever they are, may know that in their Congress the processes of democracy still fearlessly operate, I shall support the conference report.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I have no desire to prolong the debate, although I am not one who shares the view that we should display incontinent haste in passing any piece of important legislation. What I am about to say has to do with a matter which may be somewhat collateral to the issue before the Senate, but I make bold to speak of it because I should like to have my colleagues think of it in advance of what is about to happen.

Some time ago, through the efforts of the Department of Justice, a concern was indicted for deliberately putting out defective communication cable which was to be used on battlefields. Let me assure my colleagues that I am not going to take much time; I merely wish to write this into the RECORD.

I am impelled to say what I am about to say because of the remarks of my good friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], who referred to comparative sacrifices. I wish to draw this one comparison, and then I shall be through.

Businessmen in America in manufacturing cable to be used by soldiers on the battlefield deliberately, through their employees, permitted the Federal Government to become possessed of cable to be used in battle operations which would not transmit a message. That failure might be easily and readily translated into broken and battered bodies, dead boys, insane boys, unnecessary deaths, supreme tragedy in American homes, and Gold Star mothers and fathers. Every time I look at a soldier or a sailor in the galleries of the Senate Chamber, I think of that offense.

This cable, according to the Department of Justice, was required to possess certain electrical characteristics. It was supposed to have 2,200 megohms of resistance. By deliberately employing certain electronic devices the cable, which actually registered only 220 megohms of resistance, would test, when the Government inspectors were there, 2,200 megohms. But when it was used on the battlefield it would break down and fail to function.

The men who were guilty of this infamous act were indicted through the Department of Justice. According to the American press, they have now entered a plea of nolo contendere, which to the layman is a meaningless term. It is not a plea in confession and avoidance, as every lawyer knows. It amounts literally to throwing one's self on the mercy of the court. It is an admission that one is guilty of the charge in the complaint, and that he makes no defense in court.

I have talked to a great many soldiers and men who have had practical experience, as some Members of this body have had on the battlefield. If a boy in the uniform of his country, a soldier on the battlefield, should so manipulate a communications cable that it failed to deliver a message he would be taken summarily before a drumhead court martial, and would be shot to death.

There are soldiers in this body, and they are present today, and I wonder if any one of them would take issue with my statement. I look around the Senate now and I see several men who honorably served their country in its uniform. Is there a Senator in this Chamber who has had experience as a soldier on the battlefield who would take issue with the statement I have just made? I hear no reply.

I have before me a newspaper story according to which this firm says that it is technically guilty, but morally innocent.

Mr. President, I think in all the reading I have done—and I have done much of it in my lifetime—I have never seen a more peculiar expression. I wonder what would happen to a soldier who was taken before a drumhead court martial, a summary court martial, for manipulating on the battlefield a communications cable in such a way as to endanger the lives and probably cause the death of his comrades, and when he was brought before the court martial should say to the officers of the court, "Gentlemen, I am technically guilty, but I am morally innocent."

The case to which I have alluded is now in a Federal court, and the plea of nolo contendere is pending. That term, as I have indicated, is rather meaningless to the rank and file of people. I do not intend to prejudge this case, although I want to say that I shall view with a great deal of interest the ultimate decision of the court, because it will present to Americans this sort of a picture—and again I refer to the fact that discussion has been made on this floor about respective and comparative sacrifices. If these men are guilty of so manipulating a cable that its physical characteristics might result in the death of thousands of boys, and they are punishable by a fine or a short term of imprisonment, instead of being shot to death before a firing squad by the mandate of a drumhead court martial, the difference between the punishment, Senators, will be purely a geographical difference. The offense committed in a State of the Union here at home will be punishable by a fine, probably. Committed on the battlefield, where the offense is exactly the same, it would mean the death of a soldier boy.

Every time I look at a soldier in the galleries of the Senate I think of that, and I ask myself as a Member of this body why it is that a boy—he might be your boy, Senators—would be shot to death for the doing of a thing which a fellow in some State west of here can do with impunity and pay only a trifling fine, a fine which will be paid out of the treasury of a company with a large war contract, which reflects but loss of profit.

In the indictment and in the statement issued by the Department of Justice it is announced that the cable was cleverly manipulated, and deliberately and coldly manipulated—for, in the name of heaven, how could it be otherwise? Do Senators think any small-fry operator would manipulate it himself merely to be mean? If there is that sort of meanness, it can be asked just what should be done with it. In the report of the Department the statement is made that this cable is to be used for combat or communication purposes. That means on the battlefield. It uses the language, "by circumventing test and inspection requirements on Government contracts." It goes on further to say that this cable was "intended for combat service." That is not for service here in Washington, D. C.; it is for service on the battlefields where the blood is flowing, where American boys are being shot to death.

Mr. President, I am not one who is prepared to admit that some small fry, some little fellow, some inconspicuous employee, deliberately did this sort of thing. Such an assumption would do outrageous violence to all human experience. Is there a practical lawyer in this body who thinks an inconspicuous employee of a big firm would do such a thing merely for his own amusement? I do not want to be too mordant, but I have lived until I have some gray in my hair, and I think I know a few things, and I do not believe minor employees commit such an act simply because they find themselves in a frolicsome mood. They commit it because someone above suggests that they do so.

Where did the defendants obtain the instrument with which to cause a change from 220 megohms of resistance to a showing of 2,200 megohms resistance? Somebody supplied the instruments. The little fellow does not have such technical equipment. The Department of Justice said:

> This is one of the most reprehensible cases of defrauding the Government and endangering the lives of American soldiers and sailors ever to come to the attention of the Department of Justice.

The Attorney General goes on further to say:

> I can conceive of nothing more vicious or treacherous than deliberately supplying our armed forces with defective war material.

And this cable, Mr. President, was to be transported to our troops overseas! The head of the Department of Justice says:

> The department will push this case to a speedy conclusion.

I wonder what this "speedy conclusion" is to be? A gentle admonition of some sort, by a fine, which will readily be paid—a fine as a substitute for a drumhead court martial, and a body full of bullets? Mr. President, it would mean death for your boy in the Army if he did it. The offense then becomes a matter of geography, and not of morals. I think this incident presents one of the most astounding pictures I have ever seen. I doubt if in all American history we have ever seen more clearly presented a case where the punishment is a matter of geography rather than fundamental legal morality.

There are many good lawyers in this body. I do not want to take very much time; I am about through, but I wish some one of the good lawyers here would rise and explain to me why we should not visit the same punishment on a man at home for doing a thing which would invite death for the boy who did it on the battlefield. Your boy may be in the Army. Do you want your little lad to go forth on a battlefield and find that the very thing which might save his life has been manipulated by somebody at home for private profit? And the manipulator, instead of being punished by a summary court martial and being shot to death, is merely required to pay a small fine. Search your consciences, my brethren of the Senate, and find out just what sort of answer your consciences would make to you.

According to the indictment the conspiracy to circumvent Government requirements and specifications was very well carried out:

> The defendants secretly installed a transformer or circuit-breaker on insulation-resistance test equipment. It was commonly called a button box by those operating it. By secretly manipulating the button box during tests of wire and cable, company officials and inspectors were able to pass inferior or defective material which did not actually meet vigorous Government requirements of 2,200 megohms per 1,000 feet of field wire. By using this button box the galvanometer reading of the megohms of resistance could be raised as high as 10 times the actual resistance existing in the wire. Thus, wire actually having 220 megohms of resistance, by the use of the button box would test 2,200 megohms or more.

I care not, Mr. President, to go any further into this matter. I have occupied several minutes of the time of the Senate merely to call the case to its attention, and I was constrained to do so only because of the moral implications of this thing, only because I have consulted many soldiers, some of whom are in this body and are now facing me, and every one of whom has said the same thing. A boy who did such a thing on the battlefield would be executed by a firing squad. Now, when anyone is constrained to ask himself whether the sacrifices at home and on the battlefield are the same, he must, in finally achieving an answer which suits his own mind, his own judgment, and his own conscience, bring into the picture this consideration of geographical matters. You are guilty only of a little offense, which a court may lightly punish, if you do it in Podunk in the United States. If you do it in Tunis, you would be shot to death. If that is not a perversion of law, if that is not an outrage against the whole fabric of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence, if that is not a reproach to any standard of decency you and I have ever heard of, I do not know where we shall find a better example of it.

Mr. President, as I speak now I am facing several men who went through battle experiences. I do not believe one of them would stand on this floor and say that a soldier who deliberately manipulated a communication cable, and thereby jeopardized the lives of his brother soldiers, would not be shot if he were caught at it. Therefore, I rise on this floor now to challenge the morality of our whole system of law which permits men to enter a little plea and to take a small fine or to be placed in jail for perhaps a day or two or a week or two or a month or a year, for doing the very thing which would cause the life of your boy or my boy in the armed services to be taken before a firing squad if he did such a thing where the fighting was going on.

What is the difference? In addition to defying us at home, Mr. President, they are infamous in defying our code.

I have written the Attorney General about this matter. I have his answer. I shall discuss it a little later, when the whole matter unfolds. But I think such

a proceeding as I have discussed smells to heaven; it emits odors compared with which the odors of ancient Rome are as of the odors of Araby the Blest. If the Congress does not punish by more than a mere slap on the wrist anyone who has been guilty of doing such a thing—for doing that which, if done by your son or my son in the armed services, would result in his being taken before a firing squad and shot to death, provided what he did was done on the battlefield—I say that when death faces us we shall have to reproach ourselves for lack of courage. If my boy is shot for doing something which interferes with the successful prosecution and conclusion of the war, I want the men at home who interfere to suffer the same sort of punishment.

When we talk about drafting men, I wish to say, for the sake of history, since history is being written here, that I should be willing to draft property as well as men. I know of no moral right to draft our boys 100 percent, to take their bodies and to use up 100 percent of their bodies, unless we take 100 percent of the property of the country and use it up, if need be, and give back no more of it than we give back to the mothers and fathers of this country of the sound, healthy bodies of their boys. If there is any answer in the field of morality to any other theory, I do not know where it can be found.

The Government claims the right to take your son and to use 100 percent of his body; but if someone has a factory, we raise our hands in holy terror if it is suggested that the factory be taken. In God's name, Mr. President, is the factory worth more than the boy—when the boy is at the fighting front giving his life to support the right of the man to own the factory?

Some aspects of this matter are entirely too fundamental to escape our attention. They challenge our sense of fundamental decency and social morality. For one, I should be willing to take everything in the country to win this war; but the trouble is that up to this point we have taken only the bodies of our boys. When the time comes for a universal draft, I shall never in this body vote for such a draft unless property also is drafted. But there we face the decisions of our courts that we may not take the factory of a big fellow without due process of law and adequate compensation. Time after time on this floor I have risen to ask my colleagues what they thought of applying that theory to our boys? Neither the Government nor anyone else asks any questions when our boys are drafted. The Government drafts 100 percent of our boys' bodies; but if we attempt to draft the factory of the outfit that turned out that fake cable, see where we land—in the Supreme Court of the United States. Every lawyer in this body knows that to be so.

Mr. President, I have done what I intended to do in the beginning, and have taken even more time than I expected to take. I wanted to burn into the consciences of the Members of this body the thought that today in this country we probably will fine a man or perhaps imprison him for a few weeks' time for doing the thing for doing that which we would shoot to death the boys in the uniform who occasionally come into the galleries here to listen to our debates. That is an awful reproach to us; it is a reproach to high heaven itself.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak very briefly in favor of the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. President, in peace we have decreed by legislation that poverty, hunger, and injustice are the concern of the Nation; that they involve the general welfare of the Nation.

In war, by enacting the pending legislation, we decree that the stoppage of production is the concern of the Nation. It takes no argument to demonstrate that. I shall not labor the obvious.

But, we are told, this measure will be a blow at labor, organized labor. I answer with the argument we have heard on this floor this afternoon, that certainly, those who abide by the agreement made by the leaders of labor with the President not to strike will not be affected or injured in the slightest by such legislation.

Mr. President, I do not pass upon the merits of the miners' contentions. Under the law, this being a Nation of law, they have their resort to constituted authority. I will say in passing that it is generally conceded that since John L. Lewis has become the head of the United Mine Workers he has achieved much good for them; their lot has been materially improved; but that fact does not justify a strike against the state, when the state is in danger or at war.

Mr. President, war is the great disarranger. Witness what the people suffer in Poland, Norway, Czechoslovakia, France, Denmark, Holland, Belgium—all the occupied countries. Witness also what the people in the Axis countries—Germany, Italy, and Japan—have had to submit to. All their rights are gone.

By passing this law we would protect our own rights.

Much has been said this afternoon of the danger in the post-war period of groups arising which would attempt to dominate the Nation. I agree with much that has been said in that connection.

Mr. President, our boys in the armed services are dedicating their all to their country. At home we want to make sure that we have the wherewithal to carry on. Strikes and stoppages of production challenge their right—our boys' right—to have the wherewithal; strikes and stoppages endanger the very life of America.

This is war. Ninety-nine percent of the members of labor do not need this law. A fraction of 1 percent do. Most of our citizens are law-abiding. But we have laws to enforce penalties against those who violate the law. The others of us want those laws.

Mr. President, I desire to say that in my humble opinion labor wants this law. I have had the most remarkable experience in my service in Congress. Heretofore, in the more than 4½ years that I have been here, when great issues have been before the Senate, I have received letters pertaining to them from the rank and file of all our people; but on the present issue practically all the letters I have received have been from the heads of unions who denounce such legislation—with this exception: The other letters I have received have come from the mothers and the wives of union men and from the boys in the armed services, all of whom are in favor of nonstrike legislation.

Today we heard that a Member of this body had received a report, made to him by his son, about how approximately 40,000 soldiers feel on this subject. I must say that their opinion does not determine my action in the matter. I have to weigh this matter solely in the interest of the public welfare.

Mr. President, if there is any place in the United States which calls for balanced thinking it is the Senate of the United States. There is no place here for emotionalism. This is the place for thinking things through.

My distinguished colleague stated that he feared the consequences if this legislation were enacted. I have no such fear if the legislation passes; but I do have a fear if this bill does not become law.

Many reasons have been given today on this floor in substantiation of the fear which has been expressed as to what would happen if the conference report were not adopted. I shall not repeat thos reasons. The country is awake to the situation; but, in spite of pressure for the passage of this bill, and in spite of the pressure of labor union heads, including William Green, who threatens to "get" any Member of Congress who votes for this bill, it is the primary purpose of every Member of the Senate to disregard such threats, as I know Senators will, and think this thing through.

To repeat, our boys in the services are dedicating their all to their country. At home we must make sure that they have the wherewithal to carry on. Strikes and stoppages of production challenge their right to have the wherewithal, and endanger the very life of America.

The letters and this information which I have indicate that labor wants this bill enacted into law. I have just returned from the State of Wisconsin. My information is substantiated by the Gallup poll, which has gone into union labor and other labor. Mr. President, that gives me a glow within. That gives me a faith in the substantiality, understanding, and loyalty of all Americans.

I am one of those who do not fear the next election. Of course, the office of Senator has its fine features; but the people will decree whether any Member of Congress shall or shall not return. That causes no fear in me. There is always plenty to do as long as one has health and life.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the leaders who have written represent the heart and core of American labor. I have been a workingman. I have worked at many manual jobs in days gone by. I have been a lumberjack and a painter of houses. I have sold books, peddled papers, sold insurance, driven express wagons, worked as a cub reporter, and clerked in stores. All of this was before I became a practicing attorney. If I turn the hands of the clock back,

and in my mind put myself in any one of those jobs, if I assume that my country is at war, I put myself in the identical position in which millions of men in this country are today. I ask myself, "Would I strike against the Government?" The answer is, "No." That is the answer of 99 percent of the workers of this country. They are loyal Americans. To those who threaten I say, advisedly, that "if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch."

I felt that the right of review, as we passed the bill in the Senate, might have remained in the bill; but the conferees on the part of both Houses thought otherwise. We must realize that this bill is only a war measure. Judging from the past, labor certainly has no grounds to doubt that justice will be done by this Government. All America has been labor conscious. Some of its leaders are doing a disservice to the great majority of American laboring men.

We are charged with knowledge of the danger to our country from shut-downs. There is much that we cannot reveal on the floor of the Senate. Our country's welfare must be our first concern, and we must manifest the same courage in the defense of the home front as our boys manifest on the battlefront. There is nothing in this bill which brands organized labor as disloyal. More than 99 percent of labor has proved its loyalty. Labor's sons, to the number of more than 1,000,000, are in the armed services of our country. Their mothers have written to me on this subject. It is those sons, and the fathers of those sons, who have voted in the recent poll in favor of outlawing strikes. No one questions the fact that the 99 percent have performed a miracle. I have heard the job admirably described by my colleague [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. Yes; a miracle has been performed. Why? Because, when Pearl Harbor came and went, the something called cooperation entered into the heart, mind, and soul of America—not only labor, but management; not only management, but the farmer. We all "went to town," except a very small percentage. That was the time for this Government to define a definite labor policy, but that was not done. From month to month the bills lay in committees, and as a result we face the present condition. Had we done the thing that should have been done after Pearl Harbor, we would not face this crisis today. We would not have our boys, by the tens of millions, in and out of the service, questioning why we hesitate to do the obvious thing, the necessary thing, the patriotic thing, the loyal thing.

To repeat, we are charged with knowledge of the danger to our country in shut-downs. There is much that I cannot reveal. Our country's welfare must come first. We must manifest the same courage in the defense of the home front that our boys manifest on the battle front. There is nothing in the bill which brands organized labor as disloyal. I question no Senator's vote on this measure. Every Senator must decide how he will vote. This is a critical period in the life of our country. Let each Senator's conscience be his guide. Let him fear neither God, man, nor the devil when he decides how he will vote; and under no circumstances let him fear the men who would falsely lead organized labor in this country.

It is easy to make loose and impassioned appeals; but there is only one issue, and that issue is, Are strikes justifiable in time of war in war plants? Let me repeat that: Are strikes justifiable in time of war in war plants? If we answer that question in the affirmative, then I assume we would say that strikes do not impair the national safety. Mr. President, when this war is over it will be revealed that shut-downs have cost American lives. I need not say what that will mean when the boys come back. I am only hoping and praying to God that there will be no more shut-downs causing losses to our boys in the service.

When we enacted the Selective Service Act we inducted the sterling youth of our Nation into the armed services without their consent. Their pay, as compared with that of the average laborer, is considerably less. We know that the losses in the American armed forces so far have been in excess of 65,000 in wounded, prisoners, and killed. Our boys are offering their lives in the defense of their country and in the defense of the rights and liberties of our people, including—and I say this advisedly—the rights achieved by labor. In my humble opinion the enactment of this bill would protect the acquired rights of labor.

If Congress should fail to enact the bill, what would happen? We would have the Austin-Wadsworth bill in our laps within a week. If because of strikes we do not get the supplies to our boys there will be more lives lost. We want no more Bataans and Corregidors where our men failed because they did not have the wherewithal to defend themselves. I know that labor does not want any more Bataans or Corregidors. What we need in this country is a little of the old-fashioned spirit of cooperation.

I digress here briefly to tell of an incident of the last war. In France, in the last war when our boys were defending a line, over yonder was another line which was held by the Germans. A regiment or battalion of our boys were looked after by a priest, one who worked with them, one who lived with them, one who succored them, and as they were dying he administered the Last Sacrament. He was one who went out in rain or sunshine and cared for the wounded. Then one day, Mr. President, as he was in between the lines looking after the wounded he "got his." The boys carried him back of the lines. As he lay dying, with the boys he loved around him, he whispered in Latin "Co-operari." His last words were "Co-operari."

Mr. President, there are those in this country who do not understand the meaning of that word. They have built themselves up by creating class hatred, divisions, and groups. That is what I do not want to see in the post-war period. That is the way Hitler won his big battle. Divide and conquer was his technique. It was true not only in Germany, but after he had Germany under his thumb he applied his technique to the world.

Mr. President, labor in this country has done the most tremendous job in all history in the way of cooperation. So have the farmers and businessmen—all Americans. But there is 1 percent which has not, and that 1 percent is the element which has thrown the dynamite into this picture, and is creating prejudice and misunderstanding toward labor. This measure would wipe that out. It would make that 1 percent innocuous. It would put that 1 percent where it belongs, especially during the time of war.

Mr. President, I repeat we want no more Bataans or Corregidors, where our men will not have the necessary materials of war. We want more Midways, more Tunisias, more Attus, and more Pantellerias, where our boys had what was necessary. At all these places the boys had food, weapons, and matériel, but at Bataan and Corregidor they did not have them.

Mr. President, who is the true friend of labor? I ask that question advisedly. I will tell you. He is the man who generally himself has labored and who appreciates the problems of labor. He is one who believes in labor's rights to collective bargaining, a living wage, reasonable hours, the right to unionize, the right to strike, except in wartime, and against the Government. He is one who believes in improving the working conditions of the laborer. The true friend of labor is he who dares to speak out and tell labor it should know that during wartime strikes, sit-downs, and slow-downs are un-American. He is one who condemns racketeering in labor as well as racketeering in management. The true friend of labor is one who does not hesitate to call a spade a spade.

Mr. President, labor does not want any man in the Congress of the United States to be a representative of a segment of society. Labor wants each Member of Congress to represent the whole commonwealth, the whole group. When he decides how to vote, labor wants him to make his decision on the basis of what is best for the general welfare.

I believe that a great many persons in this country misunderstand labor. Labor is not dumb. It is not in favor of extortion or racketeering. That is done only when a bad man comes into a position of authority. Labor wants to clean its own house. I speak advisedly about that. Frankly, many who have talked to me want an opportunity to clean up conditions. I say that it is our duty to give them a chance to see that they do the job themselves. But we are at war. The safety of the whole country is at stake. Its safety, its liberties, and its values are at stake. No, we cannot hesitate. Mr. President, I agree with the statement which has been made that 99 percent and more of the labor element of the country is patriotic, loyal, and dependable. But there are always termites. We need to get rid of the termites. Labor knows that its own blood, sons, and daughters, are engaged in this war. Not so long ago I saw some 12,000 of our boys embark on 1 ship. They were the sons of the rich, the poor, the sons of the miners—all representing their respective States of the Nation. I saw girls walk up and enter that ship. They were nurses. If we were to take a poll of the group—and I took a poll of some of

them—we would find out how they feel on this subject.

Mr. President, labor, Senators, and Representatives in Congress belong to the same union, as was stated on the floor by the distinguished Senator from Utah. It is the Federal Union. It is the Republic. Most of us because of the fact we were born in this country received a certificate of citizenship, a union card in the Federal Union. Heretofore most of us never did anything in the nature of sacrifice or service for the country. We have been living in God's country. Now that our country is in trouble we are awakening to the fact that these freedoms of ours did not just come about like Topsy; they did not just happen. It took centuries and centuries, as well as the sacrifice on the part of countless thousands of human beings to bring about the Republic. We know now that eternal vigilance is not only the price of liberty but that it is the price of maintaining and retaining liberty. Labor knows that, and every laboring man in America is telling us to do what our conscience tells us to do for our country. The Republic first. The cause of America is greater than any group or segment thereof. When we benefit the whole, we benefit the segment.

May we all be able to say:

My Country,
Emblem of man's mastery,
Symbol of man's accomplishments,
Leader of nations.
To that great goal, where all men shall be free—
Free of hatred, of group strife.

To thee, my Country,
We of this generation
Pledge we will transmit
Unmarred to our children
The freedom and democracy we have received.

A. W.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I have never entertained a thought that was not what I believed to be for the good of my adopted country, and I shall always approach every question and every subject matter I have to consider from that particular point of view.

I had expected to speak at length on the conference report today, but the hour is late, and there are other Senators who desire to speak, and I shall make my remarks as brief as possible. I hope they will occupy not more than 5 minutes.

Mr. President, the conference report which we are now considering is one of the utmost importance and one the ramifications of which will have a profound effect not only upon labor relations in America during the present emergency—and probably beyond—but also upon the American system of free enterprise and every other aspect of the economic life of our Nation.

The distinguished and able junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], a member of the conference committee, who did not sign the report, has discussed the matter in some detail on the floor of the Senate during the last 2 days. I was deeply impressed by his description of the broad and dangerous grants of power which the report contains. The able Senator from Connecticut has made it clear that the powers and procedures embodied in this report stand as a constant and unnecessary threat to the American economic system of free enterprise—the system which has made and kept us the most powerful and progressive of all nations.

Mr. President, I was in Germany in 1928, the guest of the labor organizations of that country, After traveling through Germany with the labor representatives of practically every industrial unit of any importance in Germany, I recall very clearly they said they were sorry American workmen were not all members of trade-unions. They said every man in every important industrial job in Germany was a member of a union. I was informed that they could go to the Reichstag in the morning, and in the evening a proposal they were espousing would have been passed, Hindenburg would sign it, and it would be a law.

I recall very vividly what I said to my informant, namely, "Who is coming after Hindenburg?" No one had ever heard of Hitler. We also know that as to legislation relating to labor, the employing class are very busy seeking to set labor in its place, and Hitler came along and did the job for them.

Mr. President, shortly after we became engaged in the present conflict, I addressed, at one of the principal industrial works in the city of Pittsburgh, a group of the most productive and skilled workmen in America.

At that time, prices had begun to rise; the cost of living was going up; labor was growing restless under the pressure of prevailing economic tendencies. I stated at that time that no labor issue, no industrial grievance, and no employment problem should, for the duration of the war, be seized upon as a reason for stopping work—even for a split second. I made it clear then that, in my opinion, every industrial dispute should be settled by mediation, conciliation, or arbitration. My sentiment in regard to this matter has not changed, and I reiterate it on the floor of the Senate.

I also wish to say that I am one of those who for 10 years have advocated strongly that there must be no strikes against the Government, and I continue to hold that opinion to this very day.

After I made my statement in Pittsburgh, organized labor later came forward with its "no strike" pledge—a pledge which the recognized leaders of labor have, with but one exception, firmly and honorably adhered to. Labor has shown great respect for law and order. It has cooperated to its full capacity in the various undertakings of our Government. It has assumed and discharged its responsibility as American citizens in a worthy and commendable way.

Mr. President, in connection with references to work stoppages, let me state what the Director of Conciliation of the Department of Labor informed me on this subject. He said that the time lost because of all work stoppages, from Pearl Harbor to the 1st of May 1943, had amounted to only five one-hundredths of 1 percent of the time worked in industry. That record speaks for itself.

Mr. President, on the farm, in the factories, in the mines, and in the mills, the American workman has achieved records of production which amaze the world—records of production which have made inexorably clear that the United Nations will achieve the final victory in the great military struggle in which we are now engaged.

Mr. President, it is my belief that the American workman is entitled to a more worthy consideration than the pending report would accord him. This instrument will achieve nothing in the way of increased production, and it will achieve nothing in the way of further cooperation in the war effort. The rank and file of the American people cherish above all things individual right and freedom of enterprise. When rights are undermined or destroyed, initiative and incentive are blunted, and productive effort lags.

Mr. President, it is my sincere belief that the bill before us would contribute nothing to the security and protection of America or its people. I shall, therefore, vote to reject the conference report.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I rise not to make a speech but to ask a question of some member of the conference committee about a matter which is not yet clear to me.

When the Connally bill passed the Senate it contained, at the end of the section which defined the powers of the National War Labor Board, which is section 6 in the bill, the following language:

> The decision of the Board, including particularly its interpretation of the provisions of said Emergency Flood Control Act of 1942, and said act of October 2, 1942, shall be final, except as it may be subject to review by the court on questions of law.

That was adopted by the Senate. I understand that the conferees receded from that language, and I should like to ask some member of the committee what is the effect of such action?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it is growing late, and I regret that the Senator has withheld his question until now.

Mr. GREEN. I may say in reply that I have been trying in vain to obtain the floor through most of the day.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will respond so far as I am able to do so. There was no provision whatever in the House bill on the subject. It is true that the Senate bill did contain that clause, which was really a limitation to questions of law. The conferees struck out that provision on the ground that this was a summary measure, it was a wartime measure, it was an emergency measure. They did not care to invite appeals to the courts, and delays, which in the case of the National Labor Relations Act have averaged 232 days from the time the Board took jurisdiction with respect to cases until they were finally decided in the courts.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. GREEN. I think I have the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will yield.

Mr. GREEN. I shall be glad to yield, but I think the Senator should ask the one who has the floor to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I do not care to inquire.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the lateness of the hour will not in any wise ruffle any

feelings or sensibilities as between the Senator from Rhode Island on the one hand the Senator from Vermont on the other.

Mr. President, a letter was received from the War Labor Board pointing out that out of 746 cases decided by the Board, only in 1 case was it sought to go to the courts, and in that case the appeal was dismissed. The Board inveighed against that invitation to resort to the courts, and said that their decisions would be impeded, as well as their usefulness as a board impaired.

Mr. President, on any great fundamental question the Constitution protects the owner, and if a taking over by the President should do any injury to a man's property, the constitutional provision that no one's property shall be taken without due compensation would apply and he could, in the ordinary course, assert his rights and maintain them. That is the view of the conferees.

Mr. GREEN. So far as I can make out the provision is unconstitutional, but it is expedient.

Mr. CONNALLY. No, I do not think it is unconstitutional.

Mr. GREEN. The Senator just said that it might violate the Constitution.

Mr. CONNALLY. No, I said that if the Board in the exercise of its powers should exceed its authority and do something to a man's property which was not legal and constitutional, he could go into the court and secure damages and redress.

Mr. GREEN. The provision which was voted by the Senate secures to the parties in interest their constitutional right of appeal to the court, and its elimination is equivalent to denying them that right, so far as the law can deny it. I, of course, agree that the law cannot deny it, but the law becomes unconstitutional then.

Mr. CONNALLY. If that is the Senator's view, of course, he will be governed by it.

Mr. GREEN. I wanted to find out the view of the conferees, because that is a dilemma which I thought they must have considered.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have undertaken to give the Senator the views of the conferees as best I can.

Mr. GREEN. Did they regard the War Labor Board as a sort of tribunal?

Mr. CONNALLY. The War Labor Board was created merely by Executive order. It had no legal sanction so far as Congress was concerned.

Mr. GREEN. No; but the enactment of this measure would make it legal.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. It would make it a court.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I would not quite say that.

Mr. GREEN. A tribunal then?

Mr. CONNALLY. It has no power to enforce its decisions, except as it is afforded aid by the provisions of this measure. The Board decides the questions.

Mr. GREEN. And its decision is final.

Mr. CONNALLY. It has no marshal, it has no enforcing machinery, and even in case of subpenaing witnesses, if the witnesses fail to respond, the Board must revert to a district court for aid in bringing witnesses before it.

Mr. GREEN. But this measure would seek to make the Board's decisions final as to law as well as fact.

Mr. CONNALLY. So far as the Board is concerned, they are, but no individual is required to work under this provision if he wants to quit.

Mr. GREEN. I understand that. The law applies to groups of men, not to individuals.

It seems to me, Mr. President, from the explanation given, that there is grave doubt as to the constitutionality of this part of the measure, which goes to the essence of the whole measure.

Mr. CONNALLY. We provide that if one part falls the rest shall remain.

Mr. GREEN. If an essential part of the law is unconstitutional, that relating to the powers of the War Labor Board, for instance, there would not be much left of the act.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, it is my desire to speak briefly on the question before the Senate, and I do not approach it as a matter of labor or anti-labor legislation, but rather on the question of whether it is needed legislation, needed here in a time of war, the serious war in which our country is engaged. I had hoped, as I know many Members of this body had hoped, that there would not be need for legislation of this type. But in candor, the events of the last few months have shown to us that strikes have occurred, and we have no reason to believe that they will not again occur in essential industries in this country.

The bill is not all that I would ask in a measure of this nature. In particular, I am impressed with the point which is made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER.] I think that there should be a right of appeal from the War Labor Board to the courts. That is the usual course as of right in this country. But I am advised, and I believe correctly so, that that matter was dealt with in conference, and that to take this bill back to conference will not change it. So it must be the best that we can do in the situation.

The primary purpose of the bill, as I understand it, is to prevent strikes in time of war. The most widespread strike of recent months has been in the coal industry. That strike affected very much the State which sent me to this body, and I feel that in the closing hours of this discussion I should state that in fairness we cannot charge or blame the individual miners of this country for the strikes which have occurred in that industry. Before Senators attach any blame to the miner they must realize his situation and condition.

In order to work in the coal mines of this country the miner must be a member of a certain union. If he loses membership in that union through his disobedience of those in control of his union, he loses his job, his work, and his family goes hungry. He cannot get work at another mine. It cannot be denied that that situation has deprived him of that liberty which we talk of as the free-born right of an American citizen. I do not believe that the individual miners want to strike or to quit their work when their country is fighting for existence. They are a patriotic body of men. They are just as patriotic as any Americans in this land. They love their country. They have sent their children into this war. But when the order comes to the miner to strike he finds himself in the position of either obeying it or losing his job and seeing his family go hungry.

Only a few years ago, down in the mining sections, there was a somewhat different situation. Then the miner was the victim of the employer. There was a time, a very few years ago, when the miner could not get work if he belonged to a union. He was required to sign a contract that he would not join a union. That was wrong, Mr. President; that was a violation of the miner's personal right and of his personal liberty.

Today the situation has changed in a strange way. But the miner is not free. While he has received benefits from his union, yet he is absolutely vassal to the organization to which he must belong in order to work and to support his family. I do not believe it can be denied that the charge can well be laid at the doorstep of the present administration that brought about that situation, that, instead of creating for the miner his freedom to join his union, and to control and direct it according to his own feelings, that for partisan political reasons, he was placed in the hands and under the domination of his union officials. He has no freedom.

Mr. President, the mining people are intelligent people and when this bill is understood by the miner—and it will be, in time; I know that because of my faith in him—he will understand and will know that this measure will permit him to act in his own right.

So far as wages are concerned, so far as the miner's pay is concerned, let me say that the miner is entitled to just as fair a wage as any other man in the country. He is entitled to pay equal to that of any other man working today in any industry in this country. I shall stand for that regardless of formula. But that does not mean that the Government of our people will permit strikes in time of war to stop the processes of waging war.

This measure provides against the making of contributions for any political purpose. The present law prevents the corporate employer from making contributions for that purpose. I do not think the miner will object very gravely to a law that protects him by putting safeguards around the funds that are taken from him as dues.

I have been very much interested in the amendment proposed to be offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. In that amendment he would prohibit organizations of every kind, employers and otherwise, from making contributions for political purposes. I hope such a law is enacted. I hope the Senator's amendment is presented on the floor of the Senate and that it is agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Let me say that I shall do my best to see that that issue is presented.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator; and I hope the amendment is pre-

sented here and adopted, so that we shall let the country know that the Senate is fair in its attitude regarding this proposition. So that we shall be able to deny any assertion that we are attempting to wrong the laboring man of America. For my part I intend to do whatever is right for America and then I can wrong no man who loves America.

We are not endeavoring to wrong anyone; but in time of war we are not going to permit any group, whoever its members may be—whether they are bankers or whether they come from any industry whatsoever—to interfere with the effort of this country in waging and winning this war.

Mr. President, another right which this measure will give the miner—another freedom of American citizenship—will be that for the first time he will be permitted to vote—and to vote as he chooses—on the question of whether he wants to strike. He is entitled to that right. It has not been given to him. I know that in some of the sections of my State the district officers of the miner's union are appointed for him, and some of them come from other States. When the miner knows what this pending legislation really means, I do not believe he will feel that he is being discriminated against.

Oh, Mr. President, we cannot permit groups of people, whoever they may be, to dominate or to frighten this body which is charged with the work of governing the country. I think it has been well said that there is only one great Union, and that is the Union of the American people.

We have our churches and our lodges and our associations and our unions. Our people have the right to join them, and I hope that right will always be preserved. But when any group, under any name, rises up to interfere with the welfare of this country, particularly when our country is engaged in a serious war, steps must be taken by this body to safeguard our country's welfare, or else we shall be derelict in performing our duty.

I cannot entertain the fear which has been expressed by the able senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who thinks there may be a great walking out of work by American workmen. If so, God help America. If the people of this country, or any substantial number of them will stop their work voluntarily at a time when we have sent millions of our young men from their homes and from the paths of peace to the battlefields and to their deaths, God help us, Mr. President if we quit here.

I have no fear of the need for pressure on men to make them work or to carry on in the name of our country. I say that this legislation will give to the American workman the protection I believe he wants; it will guarantee his freedom to act. I say also that at this time I believe this legislation is necessary in order to meet the need that faces our country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I rise to discuss very briefly the subject now under consideration by the Senate. Some of my colleagues have, in good faith and with the best of purposes, taken many minutes, some of them several hours, to discuss the subject. In my opinion, the issue which is to be decided by the vote which is soon to be had can be stated in a very small compass, and it is my purpose to take only a short time in stating it.

Mr. President, there is only one issue. During the early sixties, the Nation decided the question whether the Nation or groups should prevail. At this time, that is the issue before the Senate. We are either for the Nation or for one particular group.

It so happens that the group involved in the issue at the moment is a group in which I have always been interested, and in which I intend to continue to be interested. But, so far as I am concerned, as between that particular group, or any other group, and the welfare of the Nation, there is only one decision to be made. I say that with a full understanding that the particular group which the pending legislation is supposed to affect has a right of complaint. I feel that the entire accumulation of complaints against anything wrong that labor may have done in the past is now being directed against one particular group of labor—the coal miners. I feel that the coal miners have the right to complain. I feel that the ones who employ them are taking advantage of the situation. Nevertheless, for the sake of the Nation itself, interruption of production cannot be permitted to continue. The Nation should be first, must be first, and shall be first.

As a friend of labor and as a friend of this particular group, which is an underpaid labor group, my only objection to the conference report and to the bill is that while, in order to save the Govenment, we are striking—and possibly justly—at the ones who need our help the most, at the ones who actually need a little more wages. Yet we are not hitting the racketeer. We are not hitting the man who charges workers $50 to join a union and get a job on a Government project. We are not hitting at the real racketeer of the labor groups. We are hitting the miner. But we cannot have two governments in this country. We are either for the Nation or for groups, and we must be for the Nation.

However, I hope that the coal operators and big industrialists will not think that the Senate is so innocent that it does not understand what is going on. The difficulty in the war has been that everyone wants to do his utmost for the country so long as there is a share of the profits for him. We fail to realize that the only way we can win the war is by sacrifice. Now, through law, we are undertaking to make the miner and the laborer sacrifice. Let us not forget that the man who is making a profit out of the war effort needs a little attention also. We should all sacrifice. If the rich man and the poor man make the supreme sacrifice on the battle front, it is only proper that there should be a sacrifice of profits, whether they be profits of labor or of industrialists.

I intend to vote for the conference report because I think it is in the interest of the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER rose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from North Dakota whether he desires to speak.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to speak for about 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will be that brief, I have no disposition to restrain him.

Mr. LANGER. Five minutes is all I shall need. I have not previously spoken on the report.

Mr. President, first of all let me say that I have the deepest affection for the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and I am sorry I cannot agree with him on this particular conference report. I feel obliged to follow the reasoning of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS].

I invite the attention of the Senate to the plight of the farmers 6 or 7 months ago. Everything that is being said against the coal miner was then being said against the farmer. We saw editorials in the newspapers crucifying the farmer. We saw page advertisements calling the attention of the people of the country to the contention that the farmer is greedy and unpatriotic. We saw editorials which told how the farmer was raising meat for which he received 5, 6, or 7 cents a pound, and that the same meat was costing the people of Washington 40, 50, 60, or 70 cents a pound. We were told that the farmer was a profiteer. If at that time that question had come to a vote, we would have found, on the part of scores of persons, the same feeling that is being manifested against the coal miners today.

Mr. President, as I view it, there are just two classes of people who are going to pay the war debt. One is the farmer, the man who digs wealth out of the soil. The other is the coal miner, who goes down into the bowels of the earth. I believe that their interests are absolutely identical.

What I object to, Mr. President, is that everybody is not bearing the burden equally. The junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] said that everyone was bearing the burden equally. The record shows that that is not true. I hold in my hand a record from Moody's Manual of Investments. It shows, for example, that in 1939, before income and excess-profits taxes, the United States Steel Corporation made $54,102,000; but in 1942, after income and excess-profits taxes, it made $101,252,000. I have a list of corporations. Let us take a coal company, the Glen Alden Coal Co. In 1939, before income and excess-profits taxes, it made $352,000. In 1942, after income and excess-profits taxes, it made $4,919,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table of statistics which I have be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reported net income before and after taxes,[1] *1939–42*

(Thousands of dollars)

Name of corporation	Before income and excess-profits taxes				After income and excess-profits taxes			
	1939	1940	1941	1942	1939	1940	1941	1942
United States Steel Corporation	54,102	127,642	236,249	256,652	41,127	101,342	117,549	101,252
Republic Steel Corporation	13,621	30,639	72,288	88,040	11,171	22,639	26,038	20,155
General Motors Corporation	238,180	337,866	506,341	312,138	193,328	212,538	218,349	187,638
Douglas Aircraft Co	3,532	13,850	41,708	48,755	2,884	11,282	19,977	14,555
Glenn L. Martin Co	5,019	8,548	12,651	37,418	4,108	5,424	5,773	9,659
Standard Oil Co. of California	19,283	23,988	35,909	41,309	17,883	22,488	29,909	30,559
General Foods Corporation	18,451	22,003	27,906	33,710	15,118	16,744	15,653	15,310
Standard Brands, Inc	8,894	12,451	14,209	16,486	7,356	9,516	7,759	7,234
Glen Alden Coal Co	352	3,872	5,736	7,325	314	2,909	3,925	4,919
National Dairy Products	15,993	16,212	25,003	35,745	13,200	11,496	16,058	17,245
Armour & Co. of Delaware	10,008	11,239	19,587	26,818	8,100	8,352	13,383	16,596
Swift & Co	13,084	14,419	25,608	43,774	11,003	11,409	17,636	17,319
Celanese Corporation of America	8,034	10,468	13,973	19,749	6,374	6,377	7,106	8,099
Crane Co	6,102	7,074	21,159	33,335	4,723	5,500	8,570	10,393
Owens-Illinois Glass Co	10,318	9,606	17,748	29,151	8,435	7,223	9,040	9,195

[1] As reported in Moody's Manual of Investments adjusted to conform with the definition of corporate income as set up by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Charges for contingencies, post-war adjustments, inventory price changes, etc., have been added back to net income.

Source: National Income Unit, June 10, 1943.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that, proud as we are of this country, eulogizing it as we have been—and I have heard many eulogies on the floor of the Senate—the fact remains that we nevertheless find that the poor people, the undernourished, underfed, and underclothed one-third, are still with us. The farmers of North Dakota are unable to obtain labor. Why? Because the Congress and the administration have not done their duty. Farm boys and hired help have been taken from the farms and paid $15, $20, $25, or $30 a day in war plants, leaving the farmer destitute of help. I assume the same thing is true in the coal fields.

The coal miners—without the aid of their sons, 75,000 of whom are in the Army and scores of whom, able-bodied men, used to mine coal—produced more coal this year than was ever produced in any previous year in the history of the country.

So, to return to a discussion of our country, which the junior Senator from New Mexico eulogized so eloquently, I say to the Senate that everything is not well. I say that the common man and the common woman are not receiving a square deal. Only yesterday I read the record pertaining to two camps. After reading it I received the record from the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, and it revealed the startling fact that 3,200,000 persons in the United States are afflicted with syphilis at the present time.

With reference to the Government's program against prostitution, it was disclosed that 1,200,000 men and women war workers must take time off from their work to receive treatment for syphilis and gonorrhea. The figures are from the records of the Government itself, from its official statistics. I asked yesterday where those people came from. The record shows that they come partly from the coal-mining districts and that they left there because they did not have enough to eat and wear.

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to say that when the fight was being made in the Senate against the farmers, I defended Mr. Goss, I defended Mr. O'Neal, and I defended Mr. Patton. I said they were good, loyal, true American citizens, anxious to help in the war effort. I say today that the head of the C. I. O., Mr. Murray; the head of the A. F. of L., Mr. Green; and the head of the United Mine Workers of America, John L. Lewis, in spite of all that may have been said about them, in my judgment—take it for what it may be worth—are patriotic citizens, each of whom is just as anxious to fight and battle for the United States as is the head of any one of the corporations that are making enormous war profits.

Mr. CONNALLY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD just preceding the roll call a letter from the National War Labor Board concerning the pending conference report.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1943.

Hon. FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR VAN NUYS: My attention has been drawn to a newspaper statement this morning that the Senate and House conferees have agreed to restore to S. 796 a provision for court review of orders of the National War Labor Board. Such a provision was contained in the original Connally bill but was omitted from the House bill in its final form. It is the hope of our Board that the conferees may see fit to eliminate the provision upon which agreement was reached yesterday. I trust that you will not consider it presumptuous on my part if I state to you very simply the reasons which have led our Board to this conclusion and which we presented informally to Chairman MAY of the House Military Affairs Committee at the time the bill was first under consideration by his committee.

It is the unanimous opinion of the industry, public, and labor members of the War Labor Board that if the Board's proceedings are to terminate in court, its utility will be seriously impaired. We are authorized by the Secretaries of War and Navy to state on their behalf that the delay consequent on judicial review of the Board's decisions would substantially and seriously impair the production of munitions of war.

The Board's procedure is very informal. When a dispute is certified it is referred to a tripartite panel composed of three persons representing respectively labor, industry, and the public. Local hearings are held before the panel at which the parties are invited to submit relevant evidence, oral or written. The hearings are most informal; stenographic transcripts are not taken; and settlement agreements frequently result from the very freedom of discussion engendered by the informality of the procedure. At the conclusion of the hearing the panel prepares a report on the facts and recommendations relating to the matters in dispute. Copies of the report and recommendations are furnished the parties, who are given opportunity to submit to the full Board their comments. In some cases an oral hearing before the full Board or a tripartite division of the Board is had.

Since the recent enlargement of the Board's duties, 12 regional boards have been set up with the same tripartite composition and governed by the same procedure. The decisions of the regional boards are subject to appeal by either party to the National Board in Washington.

A sampling of nearly 100 decisions of the National Labor Relations Board reveals that the average length of time between the filing of a petition in the circuit court of appeals and that court's decision has been approximately 232 days.

We believe that similar delays would gravely prejudice the effectiveness of the War Labor Board, which up to now has been able to dispose of the disputes certified to it with reasonable dispatch, and to keep the peace in the meantime. In the 16 months of its existence the Board has handled 736 labor disputes involving some 3,000,000 workers. In only 6 cases has the Board found it necessary to report to the President its inability to obtain compliance with its orders. In only 1 case has a party sought court review of a Board order. In that case the complaint was dismissed.

This record of compliance indicates that no legal change in the status of the Board's orders is necessary. These orders are in reality mere declarations of the equities of each industrial dispute, as determined by a tripartite body in which industry, labor, and the public share equal responsibility; and the appeal of the Board is to the moral obligation of employers and workers to abide by the no-strike, no-lock-out agreement and in conformance therewith to carry out the directives of the tribunal created under that agreement by the Commander in Chief.

Since the bill does not, as we understand it, permit the Board to seek enforcement of its orders in the court, the Board's orders are to remain, as we think they should remain, without specific legal sanctions. This being the case, it would seem to us inconsistent to extend to losing parties the privilege of delaying the outcome by taking the case into court for review. Limitation of the review to questions of law would not solve the difficulty. Questions of law could be conjured up in nearly every case. Every sentence of the act of Congress could be called into question. Findings of fact could be challenged on the alleged ground that the Board had abused its discretion, which is a legal question. Finally, it must be remembered that the Board is entrusted by Executive orders and regulations, issued under the act of October 2, 1942, with the entire execution of the national wage stabilization policy. The vast majority of the Board's dispute cases involve wage issues, in addition to which the Board is receiving over 2,500 cases per week of voluntary applications for approval of proposed wage adjustments. In all of these cases, the decisions of the Board on wage issues, if disappointing to one party or another, could be taken into the court on the ground that the decisions were in conflict with some provision of the act of October 2, 1942, or of the Executive orders and regulations thereunder.

This danger would be particularly acute in the dispute cases in which feeling runs high and in which the delays resulting from court review would do severe harm to the cause of industrial peace.

For all of these reasons, we respectfully submit that for the duration of the war it would be in the best interests of the country to permit the War Labor Board to function as it has in the past 16 months, without the right to apply to the courts for legal sanctions and without being subject to court review of its decisions.

If the conferees should wish any further information or advice from us or should wish any representative of the Board to appear before the conferees, we shall be only too happy to respond.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. DAVIS,
Chairman, National War Labor Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CONNALLY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I understand that on this vote the Senator from New York would vote "nay." I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who I understand would vote "yea," and I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK]; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]; and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea," and that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who would vote "yea," is paired on this question with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who would vote "yea," is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], who would vote "nay."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—55

Aiken	George	Pepper
Andrews	Gerry	Radcliffe
Austin	Gurney	Reed
Bailey	Hatch	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hawkes	Reynolds
Barbour	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Smith
Bridges	Holman	Stewart
Burton	Lodge	Taft
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McClellan	Vandenberg
Capper	McKellar	Van Nuys
Caraway	McNary	Wherry
Chandler	Maloney	White
Chavez	Maybank	Wiley
Connally	Millikin	Willis
Eastland	Moore	Wilson
Ellender	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—22

Bone	Langer	Shipstead
Clark, Mo.	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Danaher	McFarland	Tunnell
Davis	Mead	Wallgren
Green	Murdock	Walsh
Guffey	Murray	Wheeler
Johnson, Colo.	Nye	
La Follette	Scrugham	

NOT VOTING—19

Ball	Downey	Thomas, Okla.
Barkley	Gillette	Tobey
Brewster	Glass	Truman
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Tydings
Buck	Kilgore	Wagner
Butler	Overton	
Clark, Idaho	Robertson	

So the conference report was agreed to.

CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution.

CONFIRMATIONS OF NOMINATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE AND OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there are on the Executive Calendar two routine nominations in the Public Health Service and three or four postmaster nominations, all routine. I ask unanimous consent that as in executive session these routine nominations be confirmed, and the President notified forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 14, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 12 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Paul C. Campbell, Jr., to be assistant surgeon in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective date of oath.

Kenneth Grant, to be assistant surgeon in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service, effective date of oath.

POSTMASTERS

COLORADO

Frank W. Salfisberg, Silverton.

INDIANA

George B. Casaday, New Carlisle.
Melborn Grigsby, Poseyville.

LOUISIANA

Clarence H. Bonin, Gueydan.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 14, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we come this day in the spirit of solemn dedication as in the name of the Lord our God we set up the starry banner of our Nation's life. We gratefully remember that its folds are woven of a thousand strands of memory, of affection, and of hope; that in it are the recollections of a glorious past and of immortal deeds. As it floats in the free breeze of heaven it speaks to us of an awful sense of divine destiny as our Nation now plays its part as he prepared instrument of Thy providence in all the earth. That we may be more worthy of that manifest destiny in the molding of a new world, we make a new covenant sealed in the patriot blood of the past and in the blood of today. May no attitude, word, or deed of ours stain its white or shame its red, betray its blue or dim its stars. We humbly pray that wherever it waves it may be to all men the emblem of freedom, equality, brotherhood, and justice; that wherever it is

carried it may bring hope to the downtrodden, emancipation to the shackled, and doom to the thralldom of tyrants.

To Thee, Author of Liberty, we pledge, as the emblem of our heart's devotion moves forward toward the goal of a free world with the flags of other nations who cherish liberty more than life, that we will nobly live for it and if need be bravely die for it:

"What matters death if freedom be not dead?
No flags are fair if freedom's flag be furled.
Who fights for freedom goes with joyful tread
To meet the force of hell against him hurled,
And has for cap'ain Him whose thorn-wreathed head
Smiles from the cross upon a conquered world."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, June 12, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Andrews	Green	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Guffey	Overton
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hatch	Reed
Barbour	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hayden	Reynolds
Bone	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Holman	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Burton	La Follette	Shipstead
Bushfield	Langer	Smith
Byrd	Lodge	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Murdock	White
George	Murray	Willis
Gerry	Nye	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PETITION

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Rosalia, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NATIONAL REPRESENTATION FOR PEOPLE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, with the signatures, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, a petition signed by officers of twoscore District of Columbia organizations, including many of the principal business, labor, civic, educational, and social groups, supporting Senate Joint Resolution 33, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting a new power to the Congress with respect to the people of the District of Columbia. Under this new power the Congress, by subsequent legislation, would be able to provide voting representation for the people of the District of Columbia in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President.

Regarding this identical resolution, Representative HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Texas, stated on the floor of the House of Representatives on June 10:

I see no good objection to this proposed constitutional amendment from any angle. To the people who feel that the Federal Government should never surrender the power to govern the District of Columbia this proposed amendment should not be objectionable, for there is no surrender of that power proposed. If the amendment should be adopted and Congress should act under the grant of power conferred, Congress would retain the power to modify or even repeal the whole thing if the governmental arrangement inaugurated should not work. This proposed amendment will be merely an enabling provision granting power to the Congress to give to the American citizens living in the District of Columbia such rights to participate in the National Government as in the judgment of Congress would not interfere with the Federal interest.

The Washington Evening Star, referring to the remarks of Judge SUMNERS in connection with presenting a similar petition to the House, had this to say editorially in its issue of June 11, 1943:

We are fighting this war to preserve, with other things, the principle that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Washington men are fighting with the armed forces on fronts all over the world. But they are the only Americans in uniform denied the full rights of American citizenship, and this denial springs from the accidental fact of their birth or residence in the Capital of the United States.

As Mr. SUMNERS points out, the restoration to Washingtonians of the birthright of every American would involve no loss, to Congress, of its exclusive control over the seat of government. That control, it would seem, would be made more secure, rather than weakened, if the Government which exercises it practiced here at home what it preaches abroad. Continued failure to admit to full citizenship the Americans who live in the Nation's Capital is a cloud on our title to the claim of being a free democracy. It should be removed.

I am wholeheartedly in sympathy with this effort on the part of the citizens of the District of Columbia to obtain the right of suffrage and voting representation in the councils of our Nation. They are justly entitled as intelligent, worthy Americans to possess these fundamental rights—neither reason nor excuse can be offered to justify further delay in righting a great wrong.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD with the signatures attached, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Your petitioners, the Citizens' Joint Committee on National Representation for the District of Columbia, and the presidents of its constituent and cooperating organizations, whose names are subscribed below, hereby reaffirm the principles proclaimed by the founders of our Republic that "Taxation without representation is tyranny"; that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed"; and in order that "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people" may become an accomplished fact for all the people of the United States, respectfully represent:

That the over one-half million totally disfranchised and unrepresented citizens of the United States resident in the District of Columbia, obey national laws, outnumber the residents of each of 12 States, and pay more national taxes than each of 22 of the States.

That over two decades ago, when they outnumbered only six States, they supplied to the Army and Navy of the United States a larger number of men than any one of seven of the States, and oversubscribed their quotas of all wartime funds.

That again in the present war for the preservation of the principles of democracy and civilization as against despotism and barbarism thousands of these voteless and unrepresented Americans of the District of Columbia are now by voluntary enrollment and by draft serving in the armed forces of our country.

That these, your fellow Americans, now have no voice in their National Government

which requires them to fight, to bleed, and perhaps to die.

That as a fundamental right they are as justly entitled, as are other Americans, to voting representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President.

That the only sound reason which can be offered for any departure, in the case of the District of Columbia, from the fundamental American concepts of representative government is for protection of the national interest in the Nation's seat of government and then only to the extent required for such effective protection.

That this protection of the national interest—coupled with recognition of the interest and rights of the people of the District—is provided in our proposed constitutional amendment which confirms in Congress continuing control of District representation so that both the Nation's and the District's interests may always be equitably protected.

We, therefore, respectfully petition the adoption of House Joint Resolution 81 and the identical Senate Joint Resolution 33, which propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant the above-sought relief to the citizens of the United States resident in the District of Columbia.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT

"The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President Members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal."

Theodore W. Noyes, chairman, Citizens' Joint Committee on District of Columbia National Representation; Granville Gude, president, Board of Trade; Harry S. Wender, president, Federation of Citizens' Associations (66 member groups); John Locher, president, Central Labor Union (150 local unions); Mrs. Arthur C. Watkins, president, Federation of Women's Clubs (31 clubs); Mrs. Eugene Callaghan, president, Voteless District of Columbia League of Women Voters; J. G. Bell, president, Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association; W. H. Blanz, president, District of Columbia Building and Loan League; Paul B. Cromelin, president, Bar Assocation; Helen Goodner, president, Women's Bar Association; Wm. J. Mileham, president, Federation of Business Men's Associations (21 associations); Robert J. Buxbaum, president, Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor (250 local unions); Dr. Victor Meyers, chairman, Interfederation Conference; Theodore W. Noyes, president, Association of Oldest Inhabitants; Evan H. Tucker, president, Northeast Washington Citizens' Association; Claud Livingston, president, Washington Real Estate Board; Louis D. Krakow, president, Advertising Club of Washington; Dorothy E. Marvin, president, Twentieth Century Club; Martha A. Swift, acting president, Women's City Club; Charles H. Bates, president, Society of Natives of the District of Columbia; Harald H. Lund, president, Monday Evening Club; Lillian Detre, president, Washington section, National Council of Jewish Women; Julian A. Brylawski, president, Motion Picture Theater Owners of the District of Columbia; Preston W. Grant, president, Junior Board of Commerce; Samuel E. Collegeman, president, Associated Retail Credit Men of Washington, D. C.; Mrs. J. Dan Blackistone, president, Florists' Club of Washington; L. G. Jackson, president, Hotel Greeters of America, Charter 31; Thomas M. Hysong, president, Newcomers Club; Mildred C. Clum, president Soroptimist Club; Etta L. Taggart, president, The Washingtonians; Kathryn S. Mitchell, chairman, legislative committee, American Association of University Women; Richard A. Burton, department commander, Department of District of Columbia, Veterans of Foreign Wars (15 posts); Patrick J. Fitzgibbons, department commander, Department of District of Columbia, American Legion (40 posts; Joseph M. Cohan, president, District of Columbia chapter, Rainbow Division of Veterans; Charles A. Murray, president, Young Democratic Clubs of District of Columbia; Malcolm S. McConihe, Democratic national committeeman for the District of Columbia; E. F. Colladay, Republican national committeeman for the District of Columbia; Mabel H. Ellett, president, District of Columbia Congress of Parent-Teacher Associations (71 associations); Wilbur S. Finch, president, District of Columbia Suffrage Association.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 2397. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 311).

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 357. A bill to authorize the presentation of a medal of honor to J. Edgar Hoover; with amendments (Rept. No. 312); and

S. 630. A bill to amend section 107 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the district court for the middle district of Tennessee; without amendment (Rept. No. 313).

By Mr. DANAHER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 906. A bill to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to change the terms of the district court for the district of Connecticut; without amendment (Rept. No. 314).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from June 7, 1943; and

Capt. Gerald F. Bogan, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from December 7, 1942.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1227. A bill to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for killing or assaulting of Federal officers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1228. A bill to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1229. A bill for the relief of Captain G. F. Schwartz; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place, insert the following: "Upper Missouri project, Montana, Canyon Ferry Dam and Power Plant, $500,000."

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE: AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely, on page 37, line 6, after the word "assistants" insert the following: "at such rates of compensation as may be authorized and approved by the Attorney General."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2397, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

INVESTIGATION RELATING TO GRANT TO THE STANDARD OIL CO. OF CALIFORNIA OF CERTAIN RIGHTS IN THE ELK HILLS, CALIF., NAVAL OIL RESERVES

Mr. NYE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 158), which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the facts surrounding the contract or deal whereby the Standard Oil Co. of California was granted certain possessions and advantages in the Elk Hills, Calif., oil reserves by the United States Navy and/or other agencies of the Federal Government.

The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the result of its investigation together with its recommendations.

ROLL-BACK AND SUBSIDY PROGRAM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I am receiving numerous telegrams and letters from farmers and livestock men, as well as from food distributors, protesting against the roll-back and subsidy program being put into effect by the Office of Price Administration.

As I have stated before, on the floor of the Senate and in protest to Hon. Prentiss Brown, head of the O. P. A., I believe the proposed subsidy as a substitute for prices covering costs of production for foodstuffs will not work. So far from halting inflation, it will increase the pressure of two inflationary forces. In the first place, by cheapening the cost of food it will increase the surplus spending power. In the second place, it will have a strong tendency to strangle production.

Increased purchasing power and decreased supplies both work for inflation, not against inflation. For the Federal Treasury to be drawn upon to the extent of two or three billion dollars a year to feed people in a period when the national income is around $140,000,000,000 a year, double what it was a few years ago, I say simply does not make sense.

I ask unanimous consent that two telegrams which I have received be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUCKLIN, KANS., *June 7, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER:

Stockmen here request me wire you their vigorous opposition to roll-back and subsidy program on beef; if put into operation plan is sure to curtail production, as farmers now complaining of too much domination of their production efforts. Give us the open market and we will produce to the limit of our ability.

E. A. STEPHENSON.

KIOWA, KANS., *June 6, 1943.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned cattlemen of Barber County, Kans., wish to express to you our vigorous opposition to any plan to set up roll-back prices and subsidies to processors, wholesalers, and retailers of meat. We believe such a program cannot help resulting in decreased production at a time when increased production is essential. It will also result in more black markets and in general cause a confused and chaotic condition in the livestock industry. We strongly urge you to oppose any such prgram as being dangerous, vicious, and altogether unnecessary.

John Platt, Bill Wallgomott, Lloyd Mitchell, C. B. Fullerton, Roy I. Platt, Culp Elsea, Roy Ott, Leonard Baier, F. W. Storm, J. W. Warwich, D. S. Shaw, H. H. Wilson, John J. Blunk, Burk Shields, Clyde Allen, Charles W. Smith, Chas. L. Wise, R. E. McGrath.

P. S.—If needed, can get 1,000 more signers.

FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR DAVIS

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Flag Day address delivered by him before United States Department of Labor Post, No. 42, the American Legion, Department of the District of Columbia, in the Auditorium of the Department of Labor, on June 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the Flag Day exercises under the auspices of Meriden Lodge, No. 35, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Meriden, Conn., Sunday, June 13, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHORTAGE OF SUPPLIES FOR CORN REFINERIES—NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Corn Refineries Face Shut-Down as Supplies Dip," published in the New York Herald Tribune of June 14, 1943; also an article on the same subject from the Journal of Commerce, which appear in the Appendix.]

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION—EDITORIAL FROM BOSTON POST

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "War Mobilizer," from the Boston Post of May 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BLACK-OUT OF FAIR PLAY—ARTICLE BY EVELYN WALSH McLEAN

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Black-out of Fair Play," by Evelyn Walsh McLean, from the Washington Times-Herald of June 13, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

(Mr. GUFFEY subsequently made a request similar to the one above by Senator REYNOLDS.)

FLAG DAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "32 Lands of the Free—32 Homes of the Brave," from the Washington Times-Herald of June 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TARVER, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. WENE, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PLUMLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) making appropriations for advances to States for certain Federal grants for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 163. An act to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship construction reserve funds, and for other purposes; and

S. 796. An act relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants, mines, and facilities in the prosecution of the war, and preventing strikes, lockouts, and stoppages of production, and for other purposes.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) making appropriations for advances to States for certain Federal grants for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on today, June 14, 1943, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 163. A bill to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship construction reserve funds, and for other purposes; and

S. 796. A bill relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants, mines, and facilities in the prosecution of the war, and preventing strikes, lock-outs, and stoppages of production, and for other purposes.

CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in the nature of a substitute, on which the yeas and nays have already been ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment of Mr. O'MAHONEY, on page 4, after line 8, it is proposed to insert a new subdivision, as follows:

(f) The provisions of the act shall not be applicable in the case of any office or position in the Tennessee Valley Authority except the members of the board of directors.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and I offer this amendment to the O'Mahoney substitute because it is not absolutely clear what effect the adoption of the substitute would have on the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the selection and employment of its personnel.

The O'Mahoney amendment purports to be an amendment limiting confirmation to those offices and positions which are policy making. However, the O'Mahoney amendment specifically exempts from its provisions, as I understand, employees appointed under the

civil-service law, employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and employees of the Executive Office of the President.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the matter should be made clear, if the Senator is under any misapprehension, and I am not quite certain from what he says whether that is the case or not. The pending amendment does not exempt civil-service employees as such. The purpose of the clause in section 3 (a), to which the Senator refers, is to make unnecessary the confirmation of employees in the civil service who in the past have acquired a competitive status, and who occupy positions of responsibility, with policy-making authority.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the O'Mahoney amendment would not apply to civil-service employees who are now in the civil service.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. But the O'Mahoney amendment does not make the same provision for the Tennessee Valley Authority employees, as I read the amendment. There is nothing in it which would make the same provision for the Tennessee Valley Authority the amendment makes for the civil-service employees.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What reason is there for making an exception of a particular group or a particular corporation? The O'Mahoney amendment provides that the Senate shall confirm the heads, assistant heads, and head attorneys, of the several departments and agencies, including members of the boards of directors and officers of Government-owned corporations. It occurs to me that if we began to except one group because it is a technical group, we would gradually have to make all kinds of exceptions. What about the Bonneville administration, for instance, and many others?

Mr. HILL. It is my understanding that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] has an amendment to take care of the Bonneville administration.

I think where there are two sets of employees who certainly should be exempted, one the civil-service employees, whom the O'Mahoney amendment, as I understand, definitely takes care of, and the other the T. V. A. and Bonneville employees.

Mr. President, whatever might be the construction of the language of the O'Mahoney amendment, there can be no question that if the amendment shall be voted down and the bill as reported by the committee shall become law, the Tennessee Valley Authority employees will have no exemption whatever under the bill as reported by the committee, the McKellar bill.

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. How many employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority would be affected by the McKellar bill as it now stands?

Mr. HILL. About 397, as of today.

Mr. STEWART. Approximately 400?

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. Out of a total of how many employees?

Mr. HILL. At the present time, of course, there are a great many employees, because the Tennessee Valley Authority is in process of constructing a large number of dams. It has six dams still under construction. The employees today may be numbered in the thousands; but, of course, that takes in every class of employee. There are approximately 400 Tennessee Valley Authority employees who are primarily engineers, chemists, agronomists, foresters, scientists, who would be affected by the original bill, and I think perhaps also by the O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. STEWART. Are there 33,000 employees under the Tennessee Valley Authority at the present time? Does the Senator know the figure?

Mr. HILL. I should say that at the present time there are about that many employees. But let me say to the Senator that I do not think the fact that there are 33,000 employees has any bearing on the question that there are only 400 affected by the bill, because many of the 33,000 employees may be temporary employees. Most of the 33,000, of course, will cease to be in the employment of the Tennessee Valley Authority as soon as the 6 dams to which I have referred have been completed. But the 400 employees who are affected by the bill, and I think perhaps by the O'Mahoney amendment, are, as I have stated, men who really have nothing to do with the determination of policies. They are scientists, engineers, chemists, agronomists, and foresters. They do not determine the policies of the Tennessee Vallay Authority. Under the law, the policies of the Tennessee Valley Authority are determined by the Tennessee Valley Board, and under the basic act the members of the Board are subject to confirmation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Under the Senator's own definition of these employees, how does he bring them under the O'Mahoney amendment, which confines itself to policy-making officials?

Mr. HILL. I do not think they would come under the O'Mahoney amendment. Yet, if the Senator has had the opportunity or the time, with the tremendous pressure under which I know he has been working, to read the letter regarding the O'Mahoney amendment, which was addressed by the Civil Service Commission to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], he must realize that the Civil Service Commission at least feels that the O'Mahoney amendment is subject to a good many different interpretations. It is not nearly so clear as perhaps it might be. If the Senator will read the letter of the Civil Service Commission, I think he will reach the conclusion that no one can know now exactly what the O'Mahoney amendment might or might not affect.

I will say to the Senator, since the question has arisen, that between the O'Mahoney amendment and the bill itself, I strongly favor the O'Mahoney amendment, because the O'Mahoney amendment, whatever its language may be, however indefinite or uncertain it may be, purports to limit confirmations to policy-making officials.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Every time the Senator has referred to the 400 men in the T. V. A., he has emphasized the fact that they have nothing whatever to do with the making of policies.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So I think they would fall outside the O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. HILL. But the author of the amendment himself, in drawing it, has placed in it a specific exemption with respect to civil service employees, a specific exemption with respect to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and a specific exemption with respect to employees in the Executive Office of the President. The author himself has placed in the amendment those specific exemptions, so as to make certain that the employees in question shall fall without the operation of the measure. I am now asking the Senate to make certain with respect to the T. V. A. employees that they shall be placed in the exempted group along with civil service employees, the employees in the F. B. I., and in the Executive Office of the President.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is a particular reason why the F. B. I. should be outside the purview of the measure.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Where is there an analogous reason for T. V. A. to be outside?

Mr. HILL. I have risen to try to show that just as the civil service employees—and I mention them because I think they are more analogous to the T. V. A. than the F. B. I.—are outside the purview and should be outside the purview of the measure, so should the T. V. A. employees be outside its operation and purview.

To put these employees under the provisions of the bill would, in my opinion, be unfair to them. It would be unfair because they came into the employment of the Tennessee Valley Authority under a merit system which was set up by the Tennessee Valley Authority, and specifically authorized in the basic act which Congress passed creating the Tennessee Valley Authority. It would unquestionably do violence to the basic act to place them within the purview of the proposed legislation.

Let me say to the Senate that I happened to be a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs when the T. V. A. Act was considered by that committee. I was afterward on the conference committee when the conference finally approved the act. We had in the conference committee a problem

such as had never before been presented, certainly not in its entirety, to any committee of Congress. We were setting up something new and different; we were setting up a corporation which would be a Government corporation but which would operate in a field and in a manner much similar to a private corporation. It was necessary to give to this corporation a flexibility and an initiative such as that enjoyed largely by private corporations.

One of the arguments used in the debate against the bill, was with respect to personnel. It was urged that it would be impossible to set up any kind of Government corporation and have its personnel selected and employed entirely free of politics or any political consideration.

In creating this corporation the Congress really engaged in a great experiment, which would determine, and which has determined, whether the Federal Government can establish a Government corporation or Government agency and have it entirely free from any politics, or entirely free from any political considerations, certainly so far as the employment of its personnel is concerned. The Congress wrote into the basic act, section 6. That section specifically provided that all appointments in the Tennessee Valley Authority should be made solely and entirely on merit and efficiency, and stated:

> No political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency.

Then Congress went a step further and placed this provision in the act:

> Any member of said Board who is found by the President of the United States to be guilty of a violation of this section shall be removed from office by the President of the United States, and any appointee of said Board who is found by the Board to be guilty of a violation of this section shall be removed from office by said Board.

As I have said, there were doubting Thomases, and I must admit that I myself sometimes wondered whether we could create a Government corporation and have it operate entirely free of any politics, of any political consideration in the matter of the appointment of its employees. The record will show that the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority have carried out the provision of the law, both in spirit and absolutely to the letter, and there has been no political consideration, no favoritism, no nepotism, none of those things which we see creeping into Government organizations of all kinds, whether it be a Federal organization or State or municipal or county organization; none of those things have been permitted to enter into the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. None of the things, in other words, that inspired the McKellar bill.

Mr. HILL. That is exactly correct. I wish to make a personal reference. As the Senator knows, there are some 13 counties in Alabama in the Tennessee Valley area. If I have ever had any say, or if any other Senator, or any Member of Congress, or any politician in the Government or out of the Government has had any say in the naming of a single appointee of the Tennessee Valley Authority, I certainly have never heard of such a case. Appointments in the Tennessee Valley have been entirely free of any political consideration or any political test whatever.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that qualified persons who have made impartial studies of the personnel system of the Tennessee Valley Authority are unanimous in placing it at the top or at least very high on the list of personnel systems in the United States?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take too much of the time of the Senate, but in that connection I will say that I have before me a copy of a letter which was written to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] by Dr. George E. Axtelle, who is professor at Northwestern University. I wish to read merely an excerpt from this letter, because I think the letter, coming from this Northwestern University professor, a man who in a way is far removed from the Tennessee Valley Authority, who could have no personal interests or personal predilections or prejudices one way or the other, confirms clearly what the Senator from Wisconsin has brought out. Professor Axtelle wrote:

> Two years ago I took a seminar group to the Tennessee Valley Authority for 5 weeks of intensive study of it. We not only studied the internal structure, operation, and policies of the Tennessee Valley Authority, we interviewed the people of the Valley, businessmen, professional men, farmers, and workers. Almost without exception these people were enthusiastic not only about the Tennessee Valley Authority but about its personnel. This in spite of the fact that many of the employees were "foreigners."

By the word "foreigners" he meant that they did not come from Tennessee or Alabama, but came from other States, a professor of chemistry, for instance, from Ann Arbor, Mich., perhaps one came from Maine and another from Massachusetts, and so on. I wish to comment a little later, with respect to why this great Agency, which belongs to all the people, which has been financed by all the people, should in the matter of selecting its employees have no particular responsibility to any one State, even though the State be my State of Alabama.

Professor Axtelle proceeds:

> The seminar were unanimous in their very high evaluation of the personnel. We found them almost uniformly competent, tactful, and devoted to the general welfare of the people of the Valley.
>
> This is no accident. As we studied the personnel policy of the Tennessee Valley Authority we were profoundly impressed. I believe that students of personnel administration would generally agree that the personnel policy and program of the Tennessee Valley Authority represents a high-water mark in personnel selection and management. The Tennessee Valley Authority has been exceptionally successful in mobilizing the initiative, imagination, resourcefulness, and enthusiasm of its employees. There seems an almost complete absence of mediocrity and time serving.

There are no political hacks, I will say to the Senate, in the employment of the T. V. A.

Instead—

Says D. Axtelle:

> there was general devotion to public welfare.
>
> It would be a tragedy if this brilliant success in the selection and management of public personnel were destroyed or enfeebled. Before Congress alters this policy it should conduct a careful investigation of their personnel policy and program.
>
> If this American Government is to serve the needs of a complex society it must be staffed by superior people and these people should be so organized that they are impelled to give of their best efforts and finest enthusiasm.

The experiment which Congres made in the act of 1933 has proved itself, I say to the Senate, beyond the highest hopes, beyond the fondest expectations, of the Members of Congress at that time. It was an experiment to set up an agency with thousands of employees and have them employed without any reference to politics or political considerations or favoritism in any way, and it is a fine commentary that they rendered the service and have exhibited the morale and esprit de corps to which Dr. Axtelle testifies in his letter.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order to permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Entirely aside from the question of the integrity of the appointees—let us concede that—there might be another question—namely, whether the T. V. A. might be overstaffed with those very excellent people. Is there any point at which Congress has any check whatever on the power of the T. V. A. to staff itself?

Mr. HILL. Congress has two definite checks. The T. V. A. comes to Congress each year and appears before the Appropriations Committee for its appropriations. That is check No. 1. Check No. 2 is that the members of the board of the Tennessee Valley Authority—who, of course, are the ones in whom Congress has vested the power to name employees and to administer the act—are confirmed by the Senate. So Congress has those two very definite checks.

My colleague the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and I are asking the Senate to do for the T. V. A. exactly what the substitute amendment would do for civil-service employees. I think an examination will show that, so far as politics are concerned, the civil service has nothing like the almost perfect record the T. V. A. has, for, frankly, we know that politics does enter into the civil service. Under the civil-service law a selection is made of one of three eligibles; and we know—and no one dis-

putes the fact—that in making selection as between the three, politics often enters into the question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask whether the same rule as to politics which applies to T. V. A. employees also applies to the members of the Board or the members of the Authority.

Mr. HILL. I should certainly say so; because the act specifically provides that if any member of the Board is found by the President of the United States to be guilty of a violation of section 6—the section prohibiting politics—the President shall remove him.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know about the employees; as to them I cannot say. But as to one member of the Board, I think the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] can furnish some very enlightening information as to his entry into politics.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like the Senator to permit me to make my speech, and then he can speak.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to ask the Senator if it is not true that Mr. Lilienthal went all over the State, during the campaign of the junior Senator from Tennessee, and made many speeches, the substance of which was—well, I recall one in which the particular statement was made that the T. V. A. had won a battle on the Washington front, and that it was then necessary to win a battle on the home front.

I shall ask the Senator——

Mr. HILL. Just one moment, please, Mr. President; I have the floor. I desire to show the Senator every courtesy; but the Senator can make his own speech in his own time.

Mr McKELLAR. I am not making a speech; I am asking a question.

Mr. HILL. Yes; but the Senator is asking the question of another Member of the Senate; and I have not yielded for any such purpose.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I shall be very glad to answer the question.

Mr. HILL. I shall yield to the junior Senator from Tennessee, of course. I want to make my own speech in my own way, and then the Senator can make his own speech in his own way. But, of course, I shall yield to the junior Senator from Tennessee if he wants me to yield to him.

However, let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that there seems to be no doubt that a speech which Mr. Lilienthal made was construed by the junior Senator from Tennessee to be against his candidacy and against him. I think that is true; is it not?

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I think I should make an explanatory statement. It was in the very heat of the campaign before the August election of last year when the statament referred to appeared in, I think, one of the Chattanooga newspapers. The statement was credited to Mr. Lilienthal. He was reported as having stated the day before, at Knoxville, in a speech he made there, words in substance to this effect: "We have recently won a victory on the Washington front, and I warn the people of the Valley against losing"—or "not winning"—"a victory on the Tennessee front"—words to that effect.

I took that to mean, coming as it did, and in view of the fact that I was constantly being told that Mr. Lilienthal was endeavoring to turn the T. V. A. against me, that he was undertaking to arouse the people of the Valley against me in that campaign. I so stated at Chattanooga, and my statement was carried in the newspapers published on that day. I said that I accepted his challenge. He never replied to that; no explanation of any kind or character was ever made. So far as I was advised, he simply continued his work against me in my campaign.

He probably should have been called to account under the Hatch Act.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I simply wish to say that the original act itself provides penalties for such conduct as that indulged in by Mr. Lilienthal. I ask the Senator from Alabama if the passage of the pending bill with an amendment exempting the Tennessee Valley Authority from its provisions would change that situation in the slightest.

Mr. HILL. The passage of the bill with such an amendment would not make the slightest change in that situation.

Let me say here that Mr. Lilienthal has subsequently told me that he did not have the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] in mind, and did not intend to inject himself in one way or the other in the candidacy of the junior Senator from Tennessee. However, even if for the sake of argument we admit that when Mr. Lilienthal made the speech he had in mind the candidacy of the junior Senator from Tennessee, the inclusion of the engineers, chemists, and scientists of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the group of persons to whom the provisions of the bill would apply would have nothing to do with that, and the passage of the bill would not affect the situation, in one way or the other, so far as Mr. Lilienthal is concerned, because under the basic act Mr. Lilienthal has to be confirmed. He has already been confirmed twice; and, as I understand, his term expires within the next 24 months. If he is to be reappointed he will have to be confirmed again.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to say that I defied anyone at that time—and I do yet, so far as that is concerned—to put his finger on one thing that I have ever done which was against the interests of the Tennessee Valley Authority. To the contrary, in everything I have done, both in my official life and in my life prior to the time when I had any official capacity which I could use to be helpful to the Tennessee Valley Authority, I have been an advocate of the Tennessee Valley Authority and of the causes for which it stood. It is one of the great organizations which our Government has at this time. It has done valuable work in that section of the country; it has done valuable work for the entire country. I am proud of it, and I am proud of the personnel of the T. V. A. The only quarrel I have is not with T. V. A., but with some of those who are among the managers of the Authority who desire to use the powers of their office for political purposes, a thing which they have no right to do. The only criticism I have ever made in that connection has been of some of the managers of T. V. A., and not of T. V. A. itself. As I say, I have always openly and publicly done all I could to support it, and will continue to do so. I will not support any measure which to my mind would do any injury to that great Authority.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I have said, whatever might have been in Mr. Lilienthal's mind when he made the speech——

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one more word?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator has been very courteous and patient.

When this bill was introduced at the last session, I had no thought of its effect on T. V. A. in any sense. It did not occur to me that anyone in the employ of the T. V. A. would be affected. It did not occur to me that 396 out of 36,000 employees would be affected. That is not the thing that has drawn me toward this bill. It is the contemptible treatment I have received at the hands of some of the bureaucrats in Washington that has drawn me toward the bill.

Let me tell of one occurrence. I will not give the names unless it becomes necessary.

Months ago a man came to my office——

Mr. HILL. Was this man representing the T. V. A.?

Mr. STEWART. No.

Mr. HILL. Then he had nothing to do with it.

Mr. STEWART. I am telling the Senator my reasons for supporting the bill. The bureaucratic mistreatment of Members of Congress is what brought the bill about. That is the thing that ought to cause its passage.

A man representing some manufacturing industries in Tennessee came to my office and told me that he had gone to one of the bureaus in Washington, and that he had been met at the door by the bureaucrat with whom he had an appointment, and was immediately asked, "Have you been up on the Hill? Have you seen your Senator or Representative?" The man said, "No; I have not seen them." He was about to add, "I am going to call on one of them in a few moments after I see you, because I have an appointment with him," but he did not say that, because the next words that came from the mouth of the bureaucrat were, "It is to your advantage that you do not call on them, because we do not take orders from the Hill.

The fact is that it hurts your case if you undertake to put pressure on us through them."

I have seen things like that happen more than once. That is why I am for the bill. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves for not having exercised to a greater degree the authority and control given us by the Constitution.

I can get along with people as well as anyone else can. I thought we were all working for the same cause; yet in times such as these I am told by a bureaucrat to keep my nose out of affairs in which I am as much interested as he is, and in which I have as much concern as he has. That is one of the reasons why this bill ought to pass. It would retain in the Senate a control which would at least put the fear of God into the hearts of some of the "big Ikes"—as we call them down in the country—in the bureaus.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not approve any high-handed methods, or any such dictatorial conduct as the Senator from Tennessee has mentioned, any more than he does. However, I do not think this bill is the way to cure that situation. In the first place, if we were to adopt this bill as a cure, I think the cure would be much worse than any evil which may exist. In the second place, as the Senator has said, the official of whom he has complained was not in the Tennessee Valley Authority, and therefore the story which he told was not really germane to the amendment which I have offered. So far as any difference between the Senator and the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority is concerned, as I have stated, the bill would not affect the chairman or any member of the Board, because they are all subject to confirmation under the basic act creating the T. V. A.

Mr. STEWART. Every contact I have ever had with the T. V. A. has been perfectly fine. I have had no contacts with the Chairman since my political experience last year. Prior to that time I got along all right with him.

Mr. HILL. I am glad to hear the Senator say that all his contacts with the T. V. A. have been fine. Certainly that has been my experience with the T. V. A. I have found employees of the T. V. A. to be uniformly courteous, considerate, helpful, and cooperative in every way. I am delighted that the Senator from Tennessee has found them exactly as I have found them.

The report of the committee on the bill says that the committee wishes to emphasize that the bill would lay no withering touch on the civil service. My colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] and I are asking the Senate not to let the bill lay any withering touch on the merit system of the Tennessee Valley Authority or those employed under the merit system.

As I have stated, about 400 Tennessee Valley Authority employees—engineers, chemists, and scientists of all kinds—would be affected by the bill. As I stated earlier, I do not think that this great national agency, set up by the Federal Government, representing all the people and financed by money from all the taxpayers, should have its employees under a sense of responsibility to any one State, even though that State should be my own State of Alabama.

Not only does the Tennessee Valley Authority have jurisdiction over the entire watershed of the Tennessee River, which encompasses the whole or parts of seven States, but action by officials of the Tennessee Valley Authority, particularly in the matter of the control and regulation of the waters, often has a far-reaching effect on the waters in the Ohio region, and the waters of the lower Mississippi. Two or three years ago Cairo, Ill., was saved from a devastating flood by the way the engineers of the Tennessee Valley Authority operated their dams and controlled and held back the water. If those waters are controlled only with the Tennessee Valley in mind, it may mean floods in the Ohio Valley or on the lower Mississippi.

This great national agency was created for all the people and with the money of all the people. No employee of that agency should be put in a position where he would have a sense of obligation, real or fancied, to any one of the 48 States in the Union; the employees of the T. V. A. should be responsible to all the people.

The employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority are employed under the merit system. They come from all sections of the country. As I recall, there is not a State in the Union which is not represented by one or more employees on the rolls of the Tennessee Valley Authority. They came there feeling that they had met the test and the requirements of the merit system of the Tennessee Valley Authority; that they had won their jobs on their merit and ability. Up to date they have kept their jobs because of their efficiency and the service they have rendered the Tennessee Valley Authority and the people of the country. Is it fair to them now peremptorily, by act of Congress, to discharge them as of June 30? Is it fair to say to them, "You will be discharged, and unless you can be reappointed and confirmed by the Senate on the 30th of September you will go out"? Why discharge them? What test are they supposed to meet? They have already met the test of merit, ability, efficiency, and devoted and loyal public service. What test is now desired of them? What must they do in order to be reappointed? Whom must they see? With whom must they talk? What must they do? They are already in their jobs. They obtained them on their merit and ability. Why throw them out now? Must they meet some kind of political test? Is that the idea? Is that the thought? Is it fair to those 400 men who came from States all the way from Delaware to California for the Congress now to throw them out, admitting that they have done a good job? Do they stand in default? Have they failed to render the service for which they were employed? Is there a private corporation in the country which, if it had a faithful, loyal, able, and efficient employee, would proceed to throw him out without some good reason affecting the efficiency of the organization?

There are approximately 228 engineers in the employ of the T. V. A. who would be affected by the enactment of this bill. They have done a wonderful job. They have inaugurated and are successfully carrying to a conclusion the greatest engineering undertaking in all the history of the world. They have built 12 great dams in the Tennessee Valley; and 1 huge coal plant. They are now in the process of construction of 6 additional dams. They have expended between $600,000,000 and $700,000,000, and there has been not one word, not one breath of question in connection with the honesty, integrity, or devoted service of those men. In the construction of 2 of the great dams the engineers have broken 2 world records, and they have set a new record in the matter of costs and economy. They have constantly reduced the cost of construction of those dams until a new record has been established.

To illustrate: When they started, the cost of designs for the dams was about 5 percent of the total cost. Now, due to the ability, efficiency, and devotion of the engineers in the Tennessee Valley Authority, the cost has been reduced from 5 percent to six-tenths of 1 percent.

Today one of the most serious problems facing the country is the problem of manpower, the compelling need of manpower, and the shortage of manpower in so many places. The engineers of the Tennessee Valley Authority have reduced the accident rate to such an extent that the accident frequency rate of the Tennessee Valley Authority is 60 percent below the average rate for similar construction elsewhere. They have reduced the accident severity rate until it is only half the average for similar construction work throughout the country.

As the Senator from Tennessee has said, some 33,000 men are employed by the T. V. A. We have had labor troubles throughout the country. We have had stoppages of work, absenteeism, and other problems growing out of the present situation; but not one single hour has been lost from work by employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority because of strikes or other labor difficulties.

Three or four years ago a special committee of Congress, headed by a distinguished former Member of this body, Senator Donahey of Ohio, made its report following a most painstaking and thorough investigation of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The report stated that the Authority had set a new record as well as a notable example in the way it had handled its labor relations. Speed records were broken, economy records were broken, and labor records were broken, because of the efficiency, ability, and devotion of the T. V. A. engineers. The Congress of the United States is now asked to throw them out of their jobs.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has made a very able appeal in regard to the em-

ployees themselves, but I am thinking about the Tennessee Valley Authority itself.

Mr. HILL. I am coming to that question. The subject of the Tennessee Valley Authority is next on my agenda.

I spoke about the Tennessee Valley Authority being largely a great experiment. The Government had entered a field which had never been entered by our Government before. We hear much today about bureaus and bureaucrats. We have heard about them on the floor today since I started my speech. We have a great Federal agency, the Tennessee Valley Authority, which points the way, and shows the road away from bureaucracy and bureaucrats.

Instead of the Tennessee Valley Authority being located in Washington, with many employees in Washington determining many policies and establishing many rules and regulations to be enforced upon the people in the States and counties, the Tennessee Valley Authority is a "grass roots" organization. It is an organization of the people, by the people, and for the people in the Tennessee Valley. Its headquarters are at Knoxville, Tenn., in the heart of the valley. When it started its great multipurpose program including many things, from the construction of dams to the rebuilding of soil in the Tennessee Valley, instead of proceeding as a bureau might have been expected to proceed, by bringing in thousands of employees to carry forward its program and impose it and the will of the Authority on the local people, the Tennessee Valley Authority joined hands with the local people and said to them in effect, "We want the democratic process to work. We want local responsibility; we want local cooperation; we want, so far as possible, the people in the valley themselves to do the job. We want them, so far as possible, to put up all the money they can and thereby relieve the Federal Treasury of as much burden as possible. We want them to shape the policies, and to give direction and guidance to this great program."

When it came to the question of power, the T. V. A. did not go into the cities and towns in the Tennessee Valley, buy up the local distribution systems, and send a great number of T. V. A. employees there to operate them.

What did it do? It said, "We will not buy these local systems. We want the people themselves, the local municipalities, to buy, own, and operate their own electric systems instead of having it done for them." So throughout the Tennessee Valley today the Tennessee Valley Authority is not operating distribution systems. Those systems are being operated by the local people through their own officers and chosen representatives. It is the same with the farmers in their cooperative associations and R. E. A. lines. The T. V. A. did not set up the organizations and then say to the farmer, "You must do business with us according to our plans, according to our rules and regulations or else you will not get any power."

The T. V. A. encouraged and made possible and certain that the cooperative associations would be locally owned, locally controlled, and locally operated. As my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], coauthor of this amendment with me, knows, if the Tennessee Valley Authority had wanted to become a bureaucratic organization and to follow the rules of bureaucracy, when it came to this agricultural program it would have hired a lot of engineers and so-called farm experts, and sent them forth to carry on this great agricultural program for the fertilization and rebuilding of our soil; but, instead of following that policy, the T. V. A. joined hands with the Extension Service. Largely because of acts of Congress and because of Federal appropriations, as the Senate knows, in every agricultural county in Alabama and in other States there are local county agents under the Extension Service, and so the T. V. A. joined hands with the county agents, through the Extension Service, and let the county agents carry on the work. The county agents are named by the local county boards; they are exactly what their name implies, county agents, servants of the people of the county, chosen and elected by the people of the county. So the T. V. A. made use of the county agents. It did not hire a lot of employees of its own.

I shall not take time now to tell the story of what has been done in the matter of refertilization and the building of soil, and what the able scientists working on phosphate have done. The new phosphate fertilizer contains plant food as high as 65 percent; and, working with the county agents, the T. V. A., with this new plant food which was devised by the T. V. A. chemists, have raised from 30 to 60 percent the production of food which now we must have for the winning of the war. They have increased beef production, dairying production, vegetables, food of all kinds, the kind of food of which we have feared we would have a shortage, and as to which, even now, there is a serious threat of a shortage. That is what they did. They went forth, utilized the local county agents, and put on this great program which has increased by between 30 and 60 percent food production on some 42,000 farms.

Yet those chemists, those scientists, who have dedicated their lives to existence in the cloistered walls of a laboratory, without any acclaim, without any publicity, with few persons having any real knowledge of the work they are doing—those men who have devised a new phosphate which has brought about greatly increased production, providing a greater supply of food for our war effort, under this bill would be fired on June 30, this month, and unless they can meet some kind of tests other than merit, other than efficiency, other than devoted service by the 30th day of September they would be out of their jobs.

At Muscle Shoals there is a great plant making ammonia and nitrogen, which goes into the bombs which our boys are today carrying over Italy and Germany, the islands of the Mediterranean, and the islands of the Southwest Pacific. As we know, every missile whether it be a bomb or a shell or a grenade, must have nitrogen, and these chemists, these scientists of the T. V. A., who are making this nitrogen for our boys, not only to save their lives but to carry the war to the enemy, are to be told, although they have done and are doing a wonderful job, that they will be "fired" on the 30th day of this month.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not desire to interrupt the Senator unduly, but will he yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I was interested in the questions propounded by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] a while ago as to whether these men would actually be covered by the O'Mahoney amendment, about which we are not certain at all, about which there is much doubt and confusion, and that such confusion would affect these men. I wish to ask the Senator, under the amendment reported by the committee and which is now pending, there would be no doubt at all, would there, about any one of these men who received more than $4,500 a year?

Mr. HILL. No, I will say to the Senator there may be some doubt about the O'Mahoney substitute, but there can be no more doubt about this bill in its operations than there is of the fact of the light of day is now coming through the glass roof of the Senate chamber.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has said time and time again that these men are to be fired. There are 400 of them under the O'Mahoney amendment and there are a few more under the committee amendment. I want to ask him, if they are men such as he has described, has he the slightest doubt that such men would be approved by the Senate of the United States if their nominations should come before it? They would not be discharged; their names would simply come to the Senate, and if they are the kind of men the Senator has described, of course, their nominations would be confirmed by the Senate. But why should they be treated differently than all other employees of the Government?

Mr. HILL. As I have stated time and again I am asking the same treatment for them as is accorded civil-service employees. These men have given loyal and devoted service, and certainly it is to be hoped that they would be confirmed by the Senate; but, in the light of their record and the light of what they have done, why should they have this kind of threat over their heads? Why should there be cast on their records a doubt that there is something

wrong with them, so that their appointments will have to be confirmed?

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that they would not be fired, as he has repeated so often.

Mr. HILL. They have already met the test of efficiency, of merit, of devotion, of ability, of loyal service; but, under the proposed law, unless they meet some other kind of test, I do not know what the test may be—they will go out of office not later than the 30th of September.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr HILL. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I was going to suggest, in line with what the Senator is saying, it is proposed that they must secure new appointments or they are to be fired.

Mr. HILL. Their present appointments terminate by operation of law under this bill, if enacted.

Mr. HATCH. Yes, under the bill their present appointments would terminate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have spoken of the ammonia plant of the T V. A. Do you realize, Senators, what the T. V. A. means to the war effort which we are all striving to further? The proposal is not to take action with reference to an agency that functions merely in normal peacetimes. The Tennessee Valley Authority today is a great war agency. Today 80 percent of all the power generated by the Tennessee Valley Authority is going into war production. Not many days ago the head of the Strategic Materials Division of the War Production Board made this statement about the Tennessee Valley Authority:

> When I came to Washington I could not see the Tennessee Valley Authority with a telescope; today, in all fairness, I must say that we could not have our war program but for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

They are producing, as I have said, nitrogen for explosives and shells of all kinds; they are producing phosphate not only for agriculture but for incendiary shells and bombs, and for tracer bullets. Whence has the aluminum come which has gone into the production of the more than 100,000 airplanes which have been built? Whence has the aluminum come which went into the airplanes which a few days ago bombed the island of Pantelleria without the loss of a single ground soldier? Practically all our aluminum has come either from the Alcoa plant of the Aluminum Co. of America, or the Reynolds Metals Co. plant, which are in the Tennessee Valley and which get their power from the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Are we to step in now and say to the engineers and scientists who are providing this aluminum: "You will go out of your jobs on the 30th of June. Unless you can get a reappointment you will be out for good on the 30th of September."

The plants of the Tennessee Valley Authority are making chemical ingredients of all kinds. For instance, there is calcium carbide, one of the most essential ingredients in the manufacture of synthetic rubber. For months we have been discussing the production of synthetic rubber. Why has it not been produced? Why has not something been done about it? Something is being done about it by the Tennessee Valley Authority today. They are producing calcium carbide, which is a necessary ingredient. Yet we are asked to say to the scientists, the chemists, the men who are doing that work, and doing a splendid job, "We are going to fire you on the 30th of June, and if you cannot get reappointments, you are going to be fired for good on the 30th of September."

A few days ago the ammonia plant, producing nitrogen, was awarded the Army and Navy E. A representative of the War Department, Col. A. Robert Ginsburgh, went to the Tennessee Valley with that award. He is military aide to the Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson. Judge Patterson, as we know, has the prime responsibility for production so far as the War Department is concerned. This is what Colonel Ginsburgh said to those men, those scientists, those chemists, at that ammonia plant, who would be fired under the pending bill:

> I was here 2 years ago. Today some of the old landmarks are left, but the place has changed so completely that you'd hardly recognize it. It is amazing what you people have done here. In so many instances during the present emergency the Army has had to have new plants erected, starting from the ground up But in this case, we had a plant with an established organization that needed only to be expanded.
>
> At least one of your plants is turning out 50 percent more volume than it did at the time of Pearl Harbor. Another is operating at 20 percent above the designed capacity—
>
> Twenty percent above the designed capacity.
>
> And a third is 10 percent above. Such records are achieved neither by the weak nor the faint-hearted. They are made only by strong, loyal soldiers of production—the arm behind the Army. Some of the stuff used on the fronts is trademarked "Muscle Shoals." You sweat plenty to get it to the troops and you have every right to stick out your chests. Your ammonium nitrate is going into high explosives for General Eisenhower's expeditionary force and MacArthur's men in the Pacific. Because machinery whirls and whines here at Muscle Shoals, another shell whirls and whines into the Nazi lines in Tunisia. Because you ring the production bell here in Alabama, another bomb rings the bell in Bizerte.

Mr. President, that is the record of the chemists and scientists at the ammonia nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals. Is there anything about that record which indicates that those men should, by operation of law, be dismissed on the 30th of this month?

Have Senators stopped to think what effect the enactment of the pending bill would have on the morale of those men?

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am asking for information whether, as a practical proposition, the things the Senator describes would take effect if the bill were passed and the amendment he is offering were rejected.

Mr. HILL. What I have stated would be the effect if the amendment the senior Senator from Alabama and I have offered were rejected and the bill were passed.

Mr. TUNNELL. If the Senator's amendment should be rejected and the O'Mahoney amendment should be agreed to, does the Senator think there would be a doubt about the effect?

Mr. HILL. Yes, I do. To be perfectly candid with the Senator, I am not sure about the O'Mahoney amendment. I shall certainly support it. The amendment the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and I have offered is an amendment to the O'Mahoney substitute, and I very much hope our amendment will be agreed to. I think it should be agreed to.

Mr. TUNNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I spoke about the phosphate production at Muscle Shoals. Some of that phosphate is being sent to England. One shipload of phosphate takes the place of seven shiploads of foodstuffs. In other words, sending one shipload of phosphate obviates the necessity of sending seven shiploads of food.

What is there about the Tennessee Valley Authority, what has it done, what has it failed to do, that should prompt the Senate now to do violence to its fundamental act, to do violence to the whole concept of the Tennessee Valley Authority? Why should we change it? From all sides, including the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], come words of praise for the magnificent work the Tennessee Valley Authority has done. From the lips of the junior Senator from Tennessee come words which, so far as the employees are concerned, with the exception of those at the top, testify that there has been nothing but the finest kind of understanding, and courtesy, and cooperation.

Why should we change it now? We started on a great experiment, to see if we could set up an agency with its personnel based on merit and efficiency, and the experiment has proved successful beyond our highest hopes. Why should we change now? What dictates a change?

Mr. President, if our amendment shall be rejected, and if the O'Mahoney substitute shall be rejected, there are few Senators on this floor who do not know that the Senate in time of war will have wasted time even in considering the pending bill, because it will not pass, it cannot pass.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Speaking of that situation, I am wondering what would be said on the floor of the Senate if some of our great war industries, for example, the Glenn Martin plant in Baltimore, making airplanes, or the Kaiser shipyard, should suddenly serve notice on their top men, the men responsible for their entire war program, "Unless you get new appointments from the president and unless those appointments are confirmed by our board of directors you will be fired auto-

matically on June 30 of this year." What would Senators say about that?

Mr. HILL. I am sure the Senator knows what Senators would say, and the Senator knows that whoever attempted to do the firing would be himself fired promptly by the board of directors, or by whoever was responsible. Is not that true?

Mr. HATCH. Should the Congress of the United States be less jealous of our own industries than we require of private industry?

Mr. HILL. We not only should not be less jealous, we should be more jealous, because the Congress of the United States has the eyes of the Nation upon it more fully and completely than any single private industry, or all private industry. The people of the United States have a right to look to the Congress for their leadership and guidance, and they do look to it, and we are asked to set an example which, if followed through the whole war effort, through all the war industries and all the war production, would mean strangling and paralyzing and destroying the war effort.

I shall not take the time now to dwell upon the employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority, thinking of them not as individuals, but thinking of them as exceedingly important factors in the war effort. I shall not dwell upon the effect the enactment of the pending bill would have upon their morale, upon their esprit de corps. What is there about the measure in its present form which, if it shall be passed, would justify anyone giving of his best efforts? What is there in it to inspire anyone to give the best that is in him to his work, On the other hand, knowing human nature as we do, would not the effect of the passage of the bill be absolutely to the contrary? Would not the employees feel that their devoted and loyal service had not been appreciated, that they were now, without rhyme or reason, being impeded and embarrassed in their work, and perhaps thrown out of their jobs? Would not that of itself paralyze their every effort? would not that freeze their very spirit?

No, Mr. President, the bill in its present form should never be passed by the Senate. The Senate has an opportunity now to do something worth while, to do something constructive, something statesmanlike. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] when he sat down to write his amendment had the very thought in mind, the very thought that the Senate might do something statesmanlike; that it might make a constructive contribution to our Government; that it might take its place, and have its say, and assert its authority in the matter of the selection of policy-making officials. We have that opportunity now. Let us make the bill a bill which does all that. Let the Senate assert its authority in the matter of the selection of policy-making officials. No one can quarrel with that. With such a provision in the bill, when the Senate shall pass it, it will have rendered a service to itself and to the country. Let us, however, not pass a bill which some feel smacks of pie, pap, and patronage.

Mr. President, I wish to read a short letter which the bill brings to mind, from Thomas Jefferson to James Madison.

POPLAR FOREST, *November 29, 1820.*

DEAR SIR: The enclosed letter from our ancient friend Tenche Coxe, came unfortunately to Monticello after I left it, and has had a dilatory passage to this place, where I received it yesterday, and obey its injunction of immediate transmission to you. We should have recognized the style even without a signature, and although so written as to be much of its indecipherable. This is a sample of the effects we may expect from the late mischievous law vacating every 4 years nearly all the executive offices of the Government. It saps the constitutional and salutary functions of the President, and introduces a principle of intrigue and corruption, which will soon leaven the mass, not only of Senators, but of citizens. It is more baneful than the attempt which failed in the beginning of the Government, to make all officers irremovable but with the consent of the Senate. This places, every 4 years, all appointments under their power, and even obliges them to act on every one nomination. It will keep in constant excitement all the hungry cormorants for office, render them, as well as those in place, sycophants to their Senators, engage these in eternal intrigue to turn out one and put in another, in cabals to swap work; and make of them what all executive directories become, mere sinks of corruption and faction. Thus must have been one of the midnight signatures of the President, when he had not the time to consider, or even to read the law; and the more fatal as being irrepealable but with the consent of the Senate, which will never be obtained.

Shades of that bill of 1820 hang today over the Senate of the United States. We built up our civil service; then we went one step further and launched the great experiment of the merit system of the Tennessee Valley Authority. That experiment has proved to be successful. Instead of going forward with a merit system, with that system, based on efficiency and ability, it is proposed now to turn back to legislation of the character so strongly condemned by Thomas Jefferson.

Let this bill pass as it was reported by the committee, and the House of Representatives, in its wisdom, and even more, in its desire to maintain the equality of the two Houses, in its desire to make certain that both branches shall be coequal, will never in the world permit the bill to pass.

The President of the United States has already declared in a letter that the bill in its present form raises all kinds of objections, so far as he is concerned, and has practically said in the letter that he would never sign the bill.

As I have said, the Senate has an opportunity now to do something constructive, something worthy of the best traditions and the best work of the Senate. Let the Senate make this measure a bill such as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has in mind, a bill applying only to policy-making officers, and then we shall have some chance to have the bill pass in the House, we shall have a chance to have the bill signed by the President into law, and at least Senators will have the consciousness of knowing that they have not gone back into the old, obsolete, and unclean system of pie and pap and patronage, but, on the contrary, have made a contribution to the work of the Senate, and a contribution to our institutions and to the cause of good government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I inquire whether any other Senator has expressed a desire to speak on the O'Mahoney amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that so far as he knows no Senator desires to speak at this time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I desire to make a few remarks.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words also.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for a few moments?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I rise to modify the pending amendment in the following particulars: On page 1, line 5, strike out "June 30" and insert "December 31." On page 2, line 3, to strike out "September 30, 1943" and insert "March 31, 1944." On page 2, line 5, strike out "June 30" and insert "December 31."

The reason for the modifications I now make in the amendment is that the original bill was introduced in January, early in the session, and at that time there was fully 6 months' time within which to make the bill effective, if it should pass. So the dates I have just mentioned—June 30, 1943, and September 30, 1943—were fixed as of that time.

It now being the 14th of June, obviously it will be impossible to have the bill, if enacted, operate within those dates. I merely propose these formal changes in order that there may be 6 months within which to have the bill become effective.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, at the proper time I shall say to the Senator that I expected to offer the same changes of dates the Senator has offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Wyoming that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment; therefore, unanimous consent would be required in order to have the changes he has proposed made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, under those circumstances, perhaps I should suggest the absence of a quorum before making the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentarian advises the Chair that it is unnecessary to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment modified by the purely formal amendments I have just proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I ask that at this point in the RECORD the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming be printed in

full, with the changes which have just been made at his suggestion, in order that the RECORD will show precisely what the Senate is to vote on.

I should make the same suggestion relative to the original proposal of the Senator from Tennessee, but I assume he will do so himself.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. Mr. President, I have no objection to the request of the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Washington is agreed to; and the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming as modified will be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

The amendment of Mr. O'MAHONEY, as modified, is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That (1) any person hereafter appointed or promoted to any civilian office to which this section applies shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and (2) no person shall hold any such office after December 31, 1943, unless he shall have been so appointed: *Provided*, That any person now holding any such office, who was not so appointed, may continue to hold such office until his successor is appointed and qualified or until March 31, 1944, whichever is earlier, if a nomination for an appointment to such office has been submitted to the Senate prior to December 31, 1943.

"SEC. 2. Except as provided in section 3, the following persons in or under the executive branch of the Government of the United States (including Government-owned corporations) shall be deemed to be officers of the United States and the provisions of the first section of this act shall apply to the office held by each of them:

"(a) The heads, assistant heads, and head attorneys of the several departments and agencies of the Government (including members of the boards of directors and officers of Government-owned corporations).

"(b) The heads of bureaus, divisions, or other units representing the first subdivision of any such department or agency.

"(c) The heads and assistant heads of regional, area, or State offices of such departments or agencies.

"(d) All persons whose duties include responsibility for final action in connection with the preparation and promulgation of rules, regulations, or orders made or issued under authority of any act of Congress or any Executive order.

"(e) All persons whose duties include responsibility for determining the policies to be followed in administering the functions of any department, agency, or subdivision thereof as defined in paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of this section.

"SEC. 3. The provisions of the first section of this act shall not be applicable, except in cases where confirmation by the Senate is otherwise required by law—

"(a) In the case of (1) any person appointed or promoted in accordance with provisions of the civil-service laws and rules, as a result of which appointment or promotion and satisfactory service during a probationary period he acquired a classified (competitive) civil-service status; (2) any person who acquired a classified (competitive) civil-service status as in clause (1) and who, having left the service, has been or may be reinstated with restoration of such status; and (3) any person who, subsequent to appointment, acquired a classified status by action of the President or the Civil Service Commission, pursuant to act of Congress or Executive order; or

"(b) In the case of any civilian office or position held by any person on leave of absence or furlough from such office or position and in active service in the military or naval forces of the United States; or

"(c) In any case in which a person is restored to or reinstated in an office or position in accordance with the provisions of any act of Congress providing that he shall be restored to or reinstated in such office or position upon completion of active service in the military or naval forces of the United States; or

"(d) In the case of any office or position in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice; or

"(e) In the case of any person whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the White House Office in the Executive Office of the President."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide that certain civilian officers in the executive branch of the Government who are appointed without regard to the civil-service laws shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words with reference to the O'Mahoney amendment. When it is realized that I began to work for the Tennessee Valley in the early part of 1916, by introducing the first amendment to the bill to improve it in the way in which it has been improved, and in view of the innumerable fights I have had on the floor of the Senate to obtain appropriations with which to have the dams built, I take it that no one will think that I was ever more interested in any other institution set up by the Government than I have been in the Tennessee Valley Authority. The truth of the matter is that I have spent the greater part of my official life—the last 27 years—in working on it. My efforts began in 1916 and have continued to the present day. All the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has said about the good the T. V. A. has done and is doing is not only endorsed by me, but I could say a great deal more about it than he has said; because it is a part of my life, it is a part of my being, it is a part of my career, it is a matter in which I have always taken the greatest pride. I have taken a pride in my work, in the same way. Innumerable Senators have fought me here in my efforts in its behalf, and at times it did not look as if the Tennessee Valley Authority would become the great institution which the money of the Federal Government has made it. All the progress made has been brought about as the result of the actions of the Committee on Appropriations, and it was in that committee that the appropriation of the money was recommended for the purpose of developing the work.

The great speech which the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], my good friend, who is one of the grandest men in the Senate, has made today has been in behalf of 400 employees out of 33,000. He has said that all 400 are men of the greatest ability, the greatest scientific knowledge, the greatest industry, the greatest honor and integrity. Certainly, if they are the kind of men he has in mind—and I am sure he must be correct; I rely upon his judgment, because I do not know so much about the men to whom he has referred—and if what he has said is correct, all those men will be confirmed by the Senate; they will not be turned out, at all. However, why should any particular organization want to prevent confirmation by the Senate of such employees as the Senator from Alabama has described? We are passing this bill as to all other bureaus and agencies. Why should we make the Tennessee Valley Authority an exception?

In the pride I have for the Tennessee Valley Authority, if I were the chairman of the Authority I should want every one of those employees to come before the Senate for confirmation. I should not object to having all 400 of them confirmed. Why should they be excepted? If we except this agency, we shall have to except the Bonneville Dam, located in the State of my good friend, the Senator from Washington, and the other dams located in that section, and we shall have to except the Colorado Dam. They are all doing valuable work in the war effort, and we should have to except all of them, alike. I can see reason for excepting the Federal Bureau of Investigation, because it is doing work of the most highly confidential nature. But I do not know why we should expect 400 employees of only one of the 100 or 200 bureaus or whatever the number may be—we do not know the exact number—operating under the Federal Government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am further perplexed, because the Senator from Alabama has said that none of the 400 are policy-making officials. Therefore I do not see how they would come under the provisions of the O'Mahoney amendment anyway.

Mr. McKELLAR. Neither do I.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Regardless of what may be said about the O'Mahoney amendment—and the Senator from New Mexico, a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, has very great doubt as to what would be its effect—there can be no question that those employees would come under the provisions of the original bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I myself am rather bewildered. As I understand the matter, a few minutes ago the Senator from Alabama said he was in favor of the O'Mahoney amendment, and would vote for it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I said that, as between the two, I certainly would prefer the amendment. However, unquestionably, the last thing I want is the Senator's bill. I say that to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I am getting rid of a part of my bewilderment.

I understand that the Senator from New Mexico expressed himself in the committee, as I think he does here, as

opposed not only to the O'Mahoney amendment, but to any bill on the subject, and that he was opposed to any bill which was before the Committee on the Judiciary. Although he was in the minority in that committee, nevertheless, I am quite sure he is going to oppose the bill in any form.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. In view of the fact that the Senator has expressed himself relative to my attitude in the committee—and I did say I was opposed to the original bill, and would vote against it when the time came to vote on the floor of the Senate, and I gave my reasons as best I could—let me point out that when the Senator from Wyoming attempted to define policy-making officials, I said, and I repeat, that if the operations of the bill are to be restricted to policy-making officials, I shall be glad to join in such a bill; and I attempted as best I could to help the Senator from Wyoming work out a measure which would apply to policy-making officials.

When that substitute was offered in the committee I voted for it, because I thought it was a vast improvement. Then, when the $4,500 provision was put back into it, I voted against it. Today I shall vote first for the T. V. A. amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I shall vote for the substitute offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]; but if those amendments are defeated and the bill comes to a vote on the committee report, I shall vote against it, and I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. According to the last statement made by the able Senator from Alabama, it seems to me that his amendment should be withheld until the O'Mahoney amendment is out of the way, and his amendment should be offered to the original text. I can understand how it might have some application there.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In view of the doubt about what the effect of the O'Mahoney substitute would be, we felt that we should offer our amendment to the O'Mahoney substitute, so that there could be no doubt. Then, if the O'Mahoney substitute is voted down, of course, as the Senator says, our amendment should be offered to the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to have the Senator from Alabama understand that I am voting against his amendment to the O'Mahoney substitute, because I do not think the O'Mahoney substitute requires any exceptions. However, if the O'Mahoney substitute should fail, then I will concede a point in the argument in respect to the text of the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have just consulted the parliamentarian. I am advised that if the O'Mahoney substitute were adopted, the parliamentary situation would be such that it could not be amended. That is why the Senator from Alabama is offering his amendment now.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. With all deference to the Senator from Michigan—and I am very anxious to have him vote for the T. V. A. amendment—let me say that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who is a member of the Judiciary Committee, gave a great deal of thought and study to the question of the T. V. A., and whether or not the amendment ought to be offered to the O'Mahoney substitute. It was his opinion that there was so much doubt about the O'Mahoney substitute that the amendment ought to be offered to the O'Mahoney substitute. If the Senator from Michigan feels that the T. V. A. would not come in under the O'Mahoney substitute anyway, what could be the harm in adopting the T. V. A. amendment to the O'Mahoney substitute?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The harm is that we set out upon a series of exceptions and exemptions, and heaven only knows where the end ought to be.

Mr. HILL. There are other exceptions already.

Mr. VANDENBERG. For particular reasons in each case.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will read the letter of the Civil Service Commission commenting on the O'Mahoney substitute, I think he will be persuaded that there is a good deal of doubt about the O'Mahoney substitute, as to exactly what it means, and how it might be interpreted or construed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if other Senators have finished, I will proceed for a few moments. I rose merely for the purpose of saying that I yield to no man in upholding the Tennessee Valley Authority, for which I have done the principal work of my legislative life. It so happened that I was a member of the Appropriations Committee during the period when all the dams were built, with the exception of the Wilson Dam, and I helped arrange for the Wilson Dam. After the most vigorous fights I ever had in this body, I succeeded in obtaining amendments, sometimes by a majority of one or two, and sometimes after a tie vote and reconsideration two or three times. If anyone is interested in that great organization, I am.

I cannot see why anyone in the T. V. A. should want to be excused from the provisions of a law dealing with bureaucracy. Only 400 employees of the T. V. A. would be affected, and the Senator from Alabama says that every one of them is worthy. I have never known the Senate to turn down a worthy employee. I have been a Member of the Senate for 27 years, and I have never known a worthy employee to be turned down.

The Senator from Alabama talks about manpower. There are approximately 135,000,000 people in this country. Only 400 employees of the T. V. A. would be affected by the Senator's amendment. Important as those 400 employees are, I do not think they would greatly affect the manpower situation.

One thing further, and then I am through. I do not think this amendment ought to be adopted, or that any other amendment ought to be adopted, for the reason that they would merely weaken the bill. The O'Mahoney substitute is exactly the same as the committee amendment, except that it would exempt 15,000 or 20,000 persons who otherwise would be subject to the law.

But that is no the principal thing. The principal thing is that would leave to the bureaus the decision of the question as to who is a policy-making official. That is my objection to the O'Mahoney substitute. I would not object to it otherwise, if it were specific. It is not specific. It would leave to the bureaus themselves the decision as to who are policy-making officials, and the decision would be final.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand the Senator's contention, it is that the O'Mahoney substitute offers uncertainty in the place of the certainty of the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly correct. It would leave to the bureaucrats themselves the decision as to who are policy-making officers and who are not.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If that interpretation be correct, I do not see why the Senator from Alabama is worrying, because I think the T. V. A. would exempt all its employees forthwith.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it would.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not think the T. V. A. would have such authority under the O'Mahoney substitute, with all respect to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it did not have authority under that provision, under the present head of the T. V. A. it would find it in the T. V. A. Act.

With respect to the contention that the T. V. A. employees would be fired by the 30th of June, there is nothing in that argument.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have had occasion to notice with what zeal the Senator from Tennessee has worked for the Tennessee Valley Authority. He has been the heart, spirit, and soul of the T. V. A. legislatively. The dams and reservoirs which have been built have been constructed for the most part because of the earnest advocacy of the Senator from Tennessee. It is my recollection that in his advocacy of many of those projects he was opposed by those in

charge of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. OVERTON. He had to fight his way against their opposition.

It has occurred to me that the reason for this amendment is possibly that those in charge of the Tennessee Valley Authority have come to regard it as the forty-ninth State of the Union. I have understood—I may be erroneously informed—that they are preparing to have a flag of their own to wave over the Tennessee Valley Authority, just as each State has a flag, or some emblem of its own, to set it apart from other agencies of the Government. I am wondering whether that is possibly the attitude of those in charge. They seem to think that the Tennessee Valley Authority should be placed beyond any congressional control, and should be regarded as the forty-ninth State of the Union.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my understanding of the attitude of Mr. Lilienthal, the present leader of the Tennessee Valley Authority. That is his view. That is my objection to him, because that is not my view.

Mr. OVERTON. That is not the Senator's view at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as my good friend from Louisiana has just stated, at my request and earnest insistence the Senate has voted for various appropriations for the Tennessee Valley Authority. The contests for such appropriations have all come before the Appropriations Committee. As the Senator knows, with respect to every single one of them I have had to fight. Usually when I have been successful it has been by a majority of one or two. I distinctly recall that at one time there was a tie vote. I think the Senator will agree that no one ever worked harder, longer, or more persistently concerning any matter of government than I have worked to have these dams built. We have built them.

After the Senate has been good enough to me to allow the expenditure of this vast amount of money in my vicinity for what I believe to be one of the greatest projects ever conceived by man, I, as a Senator, would be ungrateful to my colleagues if I did not tell the truth, and stand for the right in regard to the Tennessee Valley Authority, just as I would try to tell the truth and stand for the right in every action of mine in this body.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I wish to corroborate the statement of the Senator from Tennessee. I have been closely associated with him on the Appropriations Committee and I know of the great work which he has done.

I wish to make a further statement. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee would not oppose an amendment to any bill which would be in the interest of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. McKELLAR. Never in the world.

Mr. OVERTON. I am sure the Senator is correct in the position he takes, and I am sure the proposed exception cannot be defended upon principle. The only reason for making an exception in this bill is that some of those in authority in the Tennessee Valley have come to regard it as something which should be set apart as a forty-ninth State of the Union, and not be subject to any congressional control.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator with all my heart.

I wish to say that if the 400 employees whom the Senator from Alabama has so eloquently described here today are the kind of men he says they are, their appointments are just as certain of being confirmed by this body as that the sun rises in the east and sets in the west. Those employees will not be taken advantage of, and I hope no Senator will vote because he wishes to save one of those 400 employees. To my mind it is an exceedingly trivial matter, and, as I have already said, if I were the head of the Tennessee Valley Authority I would ask the Congress to pass a bill of this kind. I feel about it exactly as I felt the other day when talking to the distinguished head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He was objecting to a bill which gave the General Accounting Office the right to examine his books. He said he himself had had the books examined, and he employed the best men he could find to examine them. I said, "Mr. Jones, if I were in your place I would welcome examination of my books by another department of Government. You may have the best examiners in the world, but the law is that your books should be examined by the General Accounting Office. If I were you I would follow the law."

I think the same way about the pending measure. There is no one who can say more for the Tennessee Valley Authority than I can, because I have been saying it not here lately, to help some person, but I have been saying it for 27 years as earnestly, as faithfully, as honestly, and as vigorously as I knew how. But having said it, and having gotten my colleagues in the Senate to help me build these great dams which have been a wonderful help to our Government in the present time of need, and having stood up for the T. V. A. over the protest of some who are now criticizing me because of my advocacy of the pending bill, I am not going to be ungrateful to Senators for what they have done. They have helped me in a wonderful manner. Whenever I think a measure is just and fair to the T. V. A. I shall, so long as there is life in my body, vote for it even though it may not be popular in my State to do so. I shall vote for what I believe to be honest, fair, and just. I can hold my hand to high heaven and declare that I do not think this agency should be treated any different than any of the other agencies of Government merely because it operates in my State, or merely because it is popular in my State.

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Andrews	Green	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Guffey	Overton
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hatch	Reed
Barbour	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hayden	Reynolds
Bone	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Holman	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Burton	La Follette	Shipstead
Bushfield	Langer	Smith
Byrd	Lodge	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Murdock	White
George	Murray	Willis
Gerry	Nye	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should be very glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Chair for his intercession in my behalf, but I wanted the floor in my own right for about 5 minutes, let me say to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I rose to discuss the pending amendment and the amendment suggested by the Senator from Alabama. I should like to conclude my remarks inasmuch as I do not intend to take very much time.

Mr. DANAHER. Very well, Mr. President; I shall bide my proper time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I address myself now to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in the belief that as presented to the amendment offered by the minority of the Committee on the Judiciary it does not belong on the amendment. In the second place, I see no reason why policy-making officials of T. V. A. or any other Government corporation or agency should be excluded from the confirmatory power of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator's amendment to his own amendment is brought about by the fact that this bill was passed on by the Judiciary Committee, as I recall, about 4 or 5 months ago, and at that time June 30 and September 1, I believe, were considered proper dates. The amendment the Senator is now offering is merely to extend the time further to December and March is it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. I will say to the Senator that those formal amend-

ments have already been approved. I am now addressing myself to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the theory of the minority, as I previously stated a week or so ago, is a perfectly simple one. We believe that the great objective of the Judiciary Committee in bringing about senatorial confirmation of policy-making officials would be defeated by making this power extend to persons above a certain salary grade. The reason for this belief lies in the fact that throughout the country opinion has been built up that to extend the power of confirmation to all persons receiving salaries in excess of $4,500 would be merely to engage in a patronage grab; and the measure was so criticized throughout the country. It would also involve unnecessary labor upon the part of the Senate and its committees, because it would require the Senate to give consideration to appointees who had no power whatsoever to change the policy of the Government, who were merely employees in the narrow meaning of that word, appointed and selected merely to carry out policies framed by other persons. So the minority, rejecting the salary standard, sought to define policy-making positions. Those functions were incorporated, therefore, in the amendment which is now before the Senate. To what extent, the question then arises, do the officers and employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority exercise policy-making power within the definitions of the pending bill? I wish to say to the Senator from Alabama that in my belief an examination of the definitions will show that most of the persons about whom he is concerned are not covered, and that those who are covered should be covered.

If the Senator will direct his attention to section 2 of the pending amendment—and by that I mean the minority amendment—he will find that the definition of policy-making power begins on page 2, in line 12, and the minority recommends that persons who come within the definition of section 2 should be confirmed. Who are they?

(a) The heads, assistant heads, and head attorneys of the several departments and agencies of the Government (including members of the boards of directors and officers of Government-owned corporations).

Let us apply that now to the T. V. A. Who are the heads and assistant heads? They are the members of the Tennessee Valley Board, and they are already appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. So no question arises there.

The next official is the head attorney. Is there any reason in logic, or in policy, or in principle, why the head attorney of this vast Government corporation should not submit to confirmation by the Senate? Is there any reason why, when the head attorney is to be selected, his name and qualifications should not be passed upon by the Senate of the United States?

It is only necessary to recall the description of the power and the effectiveness of the T. V. A. to realize that an officer of a Government corporation who exercises the powers which are vested in the head attorney should present himself at the bar of public opinion here in the Senate.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. There is much persuasiveness in one aspect of the Senator's argument, although I am not certain that an attorney, or even a head attorney, would necessarily be a maker of policy. The general counsel of an organization generally does what he is directed to do by the board, or the chief executive. I merely make that suggestion because I served as counsel for public bodies, and I bore the title of general counsel, and I know I did what I was instructed to do by the board.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I venture to say, knowing the Senator from Washington as I know him, that on many occasions he told his board what to instruct him, he outlined the instructions which were afterward placed upon him. That really is the experience of most general counsels.

Mr. BONE. Answering, I would say to my able colleague that if I were called upon to tell a board what it might do and still remain within the four corners of the law and the constitution of the State, I would naturally make answer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. BONE. I confess that any board is quite likely to call its general counsel and confer and consult with him, even on questions of policy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course.

Mr. BONE. And to the extent that his influence might be persuasive, he would have a good deal to say. That would be particularly true in cases in which the board itself was not made up of lawyers, and they would want to be absolutely sure they were pursuing the right sort of legal policy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator and I agree about the methods which are followed, both in public and in private corporations. In view of what I have stated, I see no reason why, under paragraph (a), T. V. A. should be excluded.

Paragraph (b) provides:

The heads of bureaus, divisions, or other units representing the first subdivision of any such department or agency.

There again we find a definition which might extend to some of the officers of the T. V. A., but only to the heads of bureaus, if there are bureaus within the T. V. A., the heads of divisions, or units representing the first subdivision. Obviously, under that definition not many persons would be covered.

Now let us go to paragraph (c):

The heads and assistant heads of regional, area, or State offices of such departments or agencies.

If I understand the organization of T. V. A., it does not now have any such offices, but the time may come when T. V. A. would want to do what is provided. T. V. A. has undertaken valuable and constructive scientific investigations of material and natural resources all through the United States, particularly in the West. It is conceivable that, under the broad powers which the T. V. A. has, it might undertake some day to establish plants in States far beyond the watershed of the Tennessee River, and in such case I see no reason why such officers, exercising such powers, should not be presented to the Senate for review.

Mr. BONE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BONE. There is such a vast field to be covered that I realize it is difficult to be definitive to a degree which would satisfy everyone, but out of curiosity I wonder whether it is the Senator's view that his substitute would cover such officials as the heads of operation under O. P. A. and W. P. B. in the various States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely, and that was the reason why that definition was written, in order to reach organizations of that kind, which are exercising a substantial power of government over the people of the State of Washington, the State of New Mexico, the State of Alabama, and elsewhere throughout the Union.

Mr. BONE. But theoretically the officers to whom I have referred were supposed to be enforcing regulations, and not establishing major policies. Does that leave them in a twilight zone, or are they identified with sufficient clearness and distinguished in the bill as to bring them within the statute, as it would be in case the Senator's amendment was agreed to?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think so. I think the language I have just read brings them definitely within the scope of the amendment, and would require their confirmation.

As the Senator has said, it was recognized that in some instances a State head would be doing nothing but enforcing a regulation written in Washington; but there have been so many experiences of State appointees being sent into States with which they had no acquaintance, to enforce regulations over populations of which they knew nothing, that it was the belief of the drafters that the power of confirmation should extend to them.

Mr. President, the definition in paragraph (c) is one which does not bother the T. V. A., however, unless it should go into regional operations beyond the Tennessee River Valley.

Now I will ask the Senator from Alabama if he will be good enough to look at paragraph (d) of section 2. Here we come to—

All persons whose duties include responsibility for final action in connection with the

preparation and promulgation of rules, regulations, or orders made or issued under authority of any act of Congress or any Executive order.

The final authority of the T. V. A. rests with the Board, so T. V. A. would not be bothered there.

The next and final definition is:

(e) All persons whose duties include responsibility for determining the policies to be followed in administering the functions of any department, agency, or subdivision thereof as defined in paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of this section.

There again we are dealing solely with responsibility.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. In reference to the sections to which the Senator has referred, I should like to call his attention, and the attention of the Senate, to the comment of the Civil Service Commission as to those sections. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] sent both the original bill and the O'Mahoney substitute to the Civil Service Commission, and they wrote a letter of comment on those measures. In this letter, signed by Harry D. Mitchell, the President of the Commission, President Mitchell stated:

Serious question may, however, arise as to the extent of subsection (d). Probably the most reasonable construction of that subsection would be that only persons who have final authority to promulgate regulations are "persons whose duties include the determination of provisions to be included in rules." In most cases, this would be only the head of the agency involved, who would already be included in subsection (a).

The language of subsection (e), however, is still indefinite, and, given its broadest application, could be held to include any person who participates in any capacity in any conference which is held for the purpose of determining policy.

It can be seen from the foregoing analysis that the enactment of this bill as proposed in either the majority or minority reports would lead to thoroughgoing administrative confusion insofar as determining whether or not specific positions were subject to the provision of senatorial confirmation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator that the letter from which he has just read does not apply to the amendment offered by the minority of the Committee on the Judiciary. The letter was written before the amendment had been perfected by the minority.

Mr. HATCH. I may say to the Senator from Alabama that the amendment to which the Civil Service Commission refers, was the substitute proposal, as it was adopted by the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. Since that time, in fact since the measure came to the floor, the Senator from Wyoming has prepared a new amendment.

Mr. HILL. Does not the O'Mahoney amendment embody much of what was in the proposal to which the letter refers?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. HILL. As I read the O'Mahoney amendment and the substitute proposal, the language is very much the same.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, but if the Senator will permit me to say so, he is basing his judgment concerning the pending amendment on language which has been abandoned.

Mr. HILL. But a considerable portion of the language has not been abandoned. A considerable portion of it appears in the O'Mahoney amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; the criticism which the Civil Service Commission voiced in its letter, in my judgment, no longer applies. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that the language was revised after conference with the President of the Civil Service Commission, for the purpose of obviating some of the more material criticism which the Civil Service Commission embodied in that letter.

Mr. HILL. I will say, if I may, and if I am in error I should like to have the Senator from New Mexico correct me, that it is the view of the Senator from New Mexico, who has given much study and thought to the matter, that the change of language did not obviate much of the confusion and much of the uncertainty over exactly what the language does mean. Is that correct?

Mr. HATCH. That is entirely correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I do not know that it is necessary for me to occupy the the time of the Senate to any greater length. I merely wish to point out, however, that we are dealing now primarily in this bill with a question of power and the use of power. I do not mean electric energy, I mean public power, the authority in departments of the Government, and in Government agencies, and in Government corporations, to exercise public authority over the lives of the people of the United States.

When the Tennessee Valley Authority was created it was granted vast authority, and it operates almost without supervision by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not think the Senator is altogether warranted in that statement. If he will examine the hearings held before the Appropriations Committees, and more particularly the House Appropriations Committee, he will see how thoroughly the House Appropriations Committee has gone into the operations and the expenditures of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know that examination is made annually with respect to appropriations. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee I have participated in some of these examinations. I am merely pointing out that so far as this bill is concerned, we are not dealing with T. V. A. as an individual organization. We are dealing with the whole broad problem of what powers shall be exercised over the people of the United States by Government-created corporations. We have only to read the record to know that the corporations extend into almost every avenue of economic activity. We know that the Board of Economic Warfare, for example, today has the power, under an Executive order, to direct the R. F. C. to organize a corporation—a most extraordinary thing.

Every lawyer knows that the history of the creation of corporations is based upon the sound principle that the power to create a corporation is derived solely from the people; that corporations could not be created except by act of the legislature or act of the Congress. Finally, some years ago, because of the great complexity of the preparation for war, the R. F. C. was authorized by law to issue charters to corporations—an almost unheard-of procedure. But now the Board of Economic Warfare, which has no statutory existence at all, has the authority to require the R. F. C. to create corporations.

The point, Mr. President, is simply that, unless in one way or another such corporations are brought before the Congress of the United States, insofar as their policies are concerned, great danger of the loss of the power of the people to regulate their affairs will arise.

My amendment represents a very moderate proposal, that so far as policy-making officials of these corporations are concerned, their names shall be presented to the Senate for examination. It is a salutary method, Mr. President. It means that all these corporations, knowing that the names of the nominees will pass in review before the Senate of the United States, will exercise the greatest care in selecting persons to exercise these tremendous powers which the Congress is giving away.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I did not want to interrupt the Senator in his present thought, but there was another point I wished to make certain and clear concerning his amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to add a word further. In 1937 the President of the United States sent to the Congress with his approval, the Report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management. It was a monumental work dealing with the whole problem of administrative management and its personnel. In this report I am reading from page 45, where we find this recommendation by the President's committee:

Our recommendations on Federal corporations may be summarized as follows:

1. Business corporations should be placed under special supervisory agencies to be set up in appropriate departments of the Government to give continuous and careful scrutiny to their affairs. These agencies should be provided with the special equipment and staff necessary to supervise competently the particular field in which the corporations operate.

2. Each Government corporation should be placed under a supervisory agency in an appropriate department.

And so on. I shall not read all the recommendations. I cite them merely to show that the fundamental necessity of maintaining popular control over these tremendous agencies exercising public power is so great that Congress should not hesitate, and it should not

set the precedent which is proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], of excluding Government corporations from the operation of this bill if it should become a law. If we do not set that precedent T. V. A. will not be injured; because, as already has been demonstrated, only a comparatively few persons in the T. V. A. would come within the definition of a policy-making official.

The Senator from Alabama himself said that some 400 persons would be affected. I am sure that when he made that statement he was thinking of the salary standard of $4,500.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me say that the Senator is correct; the number stated was based on the $4,500 salary standard.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So, Mr. President, I say that the Senator's amendment is relevant to the bill, but not at all relevant to the pending amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. While the Senator is still on his feet, I desire to make a brief statement, because I know he has very carefully drafted the provision with respect to section 3. The question has previously been propounded to him; and at this time I desire to make the point that under section 3 any person, regardless of salary, who now is employed by the Government in any capacity, under the civil-service laws, would not be required to be confirmed unless he was required to be confirmed by some other act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Exactly. The purpose of the exception was to obviate the necessity of reviewing the selection of persons, even those in policy-making positions, within these definitions if they already had been selected by a system in which the Congress had acquiesced.

Mr. HATCH. Yes; and the civil-service law is such a system.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Exactly. The effect of that exception is that if the bill becomes law it will operate in the future; it will not be retroactive.

The Senator from Alabama said to me on one occasion that if persons employed under the civil-service law to which the Senator from New Mexico has just referred, should be exempted, why should not T. V. A. employees be exempted? The answer to that question is that when the T. V. A. was set up, special care was taken to exempt the T. V. A. from the civil-service law. Language was definitely written in the act providing that the board, in exercising its vast powers, should make its appointments without regard to the civil-service laws. To me, that is merely another argument why policy-making officials as defined in the amendment should be submitted to scrutiny by the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I desire to add just a word or two along the line on which the Senator from Wyoming has been speaking, and also along the line on which the Senator from Tennessee has spoken more than once, to the effect that he wanted the employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority placed on exactly the same basis as that of other employees of the Federal Government; he wanted to have Senate confirmation of all employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority whose activities and duties correspond to those of employees in other branches of the Government who are required to be confirmed.

Mr. President, the bill itself makes an exception. The terms of both the proposed substitute and the original bill do set the Tennessee Valley Authority apart as something separate, and treat his employees in a way different from the way in which other employees of the Federal Government are treated. The Senator from Wyoming and myself have just been discussing the fact that under the terms of section 3 of the bill all civil service employees, that is, all persons employed under our so-called merit system, regardless of whether they come within the definitions of the act or are policy-making officials, so long as they are employed on the basis of a system of merit, do not come within the terms of the bill. Engineers, technicians, and experts in all the other agencies of Government regardless of the salary they receive, if employed under a system of merit which has congressional approval, as has been said, are not required to be confirmed.

However, under either proposal, is that situation true in the case of the Tennessee Valley Authority? It is not. The Tennessee Valley Authority does have a merit system. It has a merit system which it did not set up alone, voluntarily, but which is set up under the authority and direction of the Congress of the United States.

Under its merit system, the 300 or 400 employees—whatever the number may be—have been chosen in accordance with the system authorized and directed by the Congress of the United States. Would it not be fair to give to that congressional merit system the same credit and weigh we give to the so-called civil service system? Does one have any superiority over the other? I imagine one does; I imagine that by investigation it would be found that the merit system of the Tennessee Valley Authority is far superior to the general civil service system.

The Senator from Alabama made that point very clear in his remarks earlier today; and the reports of every independent investigation which has been made have clearly demonstrated that fact. In the report I filed separately, I have included a statement by Professor White, who went to Tennessee and investigated the situation for the Donahey committee. He reported that he found the system of merit working well. He pointed out some defects in the system, but they are defects which also are found in our general civil service law.

Mr. President, I do not live in the region which is affected by the Tennessee Valley Authority. In the committee I raised this question simply because I could not understand why, after 10 years of successful operation, the Congress should, without investigation, without hearing the testimony of a single witness, without calling a single official of the Tennessee Valley Authority before it, completely reverse its entire policy of more than 10 years. That was my sole reason for raising the question in the committee about the Tennessee Valley Authority. I do not know a great deal about it, but my general experience teaches me that a system which has worked successfully for 10 years should be continued unless there is some grave and important reason for changing it.

I attended every meeting of the committee. I read every word of testimony spoken before the subcommittee. So far as I am able to determine, not a single, solitary reason has been advanced for discontinuing the present merit system of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for making its employees—whatever the number may be—subject to Senate confirmation, except the sole and only reason which has been given, having to do with a speech which Mr. Lilienthal made in the last campaign—a speech for which, if he made it, he should be condemned, of course, for he had no business engaging in politics at all; and I condemn him for doing so just as strongly as the Senator from Tennessee condemned him.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. Substantially the same bill was introduced last year before Mr. Lilienthal made the speech, and I was just as strong for it then as I am now. So far as I am concerned, I have been for the bill all along; and Mr. Lilienthal's speech has had no effect except to make me more anxious than ever to have the bill passed.

Mr. HATCH. I will say to the junior Senator from Tennessee and also the senior Senator from Tennessee that I appreciate what they have both said about the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the splendid support which has been given to that Authority by both of them. Nevertheless, the inescapable fact remains that if this bill is enacted into law, that entire system, which has worked successfully, will be changed, and some three or four hundred T. V. A. employees—or perhaps more, in the light of the definitions—will be brought before the Senate for confirmation.

I do not intend to argue the other points which have already been argued; but I wished to point out as definitely and clearly as possible that an exception is being made—an exception against the Tennessee Valley Authority.

PREVENTION OF STRIKES IN DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, because of the lateness of the hour Saturday evening, I was unwilling to detain Senators further with a reference or two which, it seems to me, the facts require.

It will be recalled that after the yea-and-nay vote Saturday night on the conference report on Senate bill 796, most of the Senators who had been patiently waiting for the vote to be reached lost no time in moving toward the doors. I cannot say that I blame them.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] then obtained the floor and

asked unanimous consent—and I quote his exact words, as submitted to me by the official reporters—

to insert in the RECORD just preceding the roll call a letter from the War Labor Board on the conference report.

That fact does not appear at page 5883 of the daily RECORD. Quite the contrary, the RECORD shows the following:

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a letter from the National War Labor Board concerning the pending conference report.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 5884 of the daily RECORD the Presiding Officer is caused to say, after the point marking the conclusion of the letter:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CONNALLY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Then follows a detailed account of the yea-and-nay vote.

I wish to have the RECORD show positively that the letter to which I have referred was not before the Senate in advance of the time of the vote. It is important, particularly for the reason, Mr. President, that some students, some historians, some lawyers, and conceivably some judges some day may have to pass on the effect of Senate bill 796. It is important, therefore, that the legislative history correctly indicates that the Senate did not have before it the letter from the War Labor Board before the Senate voted.

One of the reasons, of course, is that Senators were led to say that adoption of the conference report in the form in which it was before us has a certain statutory effect, and gives certain legal status to whatever decisions the War Labor Board may render pursuant to the authority granted by that statute.

In its letter the War Labor Board says:

Since the bill does not, as we understand it, permit the Board to seek enforcement of its orders in the court, the Board's orders are to remain, as we think they should remain, without specific legal sanctions.

That is quite an important point, Mr. President, bearing on the Board's own understanding of the extent of the authority conferred upon it by Senate bill 796, and the weight and effect to be given its orders or decisions ultimately to be handed down pursuant to law.

Another thing which it seems to me may be properly stated is this: There was some intimation on the floor of the Senate that the conferees had not agreed with reference to some appeal provision. I think no one—at least no one other than through the purest inadvertence—would have meant the record so to stand. In the Washington Post for June 9, on the front page, there is a column headed:

War Labor Board rulings may be put up to courts. Way now open to contest some important decrees.

The article is written by Robert C. Albright. I read:

House and Senate antistrike bill conferees yesterday voted to open decisions of the War Labor Board to limited court review and specified that all rulings must conform to the National Labor Relations Act.

The unexpected conference action raised the possibility of extended litigation before the United States Court of Appeals for the District on some of the Board findings and opened to court challenge War Labor Board closed-shop and maintenance-of-membership orders.

I end the quotation, and turn to page 5883 of the daily RECORD. I quote specifically from the War Labor Board's letter of June 9, addressed to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], chairman of the Judiciary Committee:

NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1943.

Hon. FREDERICK VAN NUYS,
Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR VAN NUYS: My attention has been drawn to a newspaper statement this morning that the Senate and House conferees have agreed to restore to S. 796 a provision for court review of orders of the National War Labor Board. Such a provision was contained in the original Connally bill but was omitted from the House bill in its final form. It is the hope of our Board that the conferees may see fit to eliminate the provision upon which agreement was reached yesterday. I trust that you will not consider it presumptuous on my part if I state to you very simply the reasons which have led our Board to this conclusion and which we presented informally to Chairman MAY of the House Military Affairs Committee at the time the bill was first under consideration by his committee.

I end the quotation there, but to point out that the letter was signed by Mr. William H. Davis, Chairman of the National War Labor Board.

Reverting to the article which appeared in the Washington Post for June 9, I find on page 14, in a continued portion of the article previously identified, the following:

Except for yesterday's action opening War Labor Board rulings to court appeal, the bill now stands in substantially the form desired by the administration, and Senate managers were reluctant to make further charge. In its present form the bill provides a powerful deterrent against resumption of the mine strike by imposing jail sentences and fines on instigators and abettors of strike against the Government.

Although the House last week refused to ban maintenance of union orders by the War Labor Board, another provision of the bill was interpreted by Representative HOWARD SMITH (Democrat) of Virginia, chief author of the House bill, as having the same effect.

Those points are of interest, Mr. President, if we turn to an Associated Press dispatch which appeared in the Washington Post for June 6:

The reports that the White House is backing antistrike legislation, coming from authoritative but unquotable sources, said War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes had urged congressional leaders to speed passage of the Connally-Smith bill.

This measure provides for fines and imprisonment of persons aiding or instigating a strike in a Government-operated war facility. It also would give statutory authority to the War Labor Board, and it was said this latter provision was the one in which Byrnes had displayed greatest interest.

The Washington Star for Sunday, June 6, 1943, carried on its front page a paragraph relating to the same subject. It reads as follows:

The reports that the White House is backing antistrike legislation, coming from authoritative, but unquotable sources, said War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes had urged congressional leaders to speed final passage of the Connally-Smith bill, which has passed both the House and the Senate in different forms.

Mr. Byrnes was represented as indicating that several major provisions of the bill as it passed the House Friday would be acceptable to the administration. His interest in obtaining quick enacement was said to stem from a desire to clothe the War Labor Board with additional authority to deal with the coal wage dispute.

In view of the fact that no report is sent to us by a department downtown on pending legislation until and unless the Bureau of the Budget has acted upon it, as we all know, and in view of the further fact that the War Labor Board, particularly, created as it was under Executive order, was peculiarly performing an executive function, it follows that, just as the newspaper reports antedating the event and just as the fact after the event of June 9 clearly indicate, the letter of the War Labor Board was representing to the Congress and to the conferees the position of the administration with reference to the measure.

That letter, Mr. President, was read to the conferees on Wednesday last. Whatever action had been taken with reference to an appeal or review of action by the War Labor Board on a previous day was thereupon rescinded. Efforts were made to try to have an appeal provision refer only to those cases in which plant seizure actually had occurred. Those efforts were defeated.

Mr. President, I wanted the RECORD clearly to show that the letter to which I earlier referred was not before the Senate during the debate, was not ordered to be printed in the RECORD before the vote, and appeared only after the roll call had been concluded, and under the circumstances as I have now narrated them.

Briefly, in conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to point out that in the Star of Monday, June 7, 1943, reference was made to a broadcast on the previous evening by Mr. William L. Batt, who is vice chairman of the War Production Board, and who was particularly charged with the duty of industrial production in the war effort.

Describing the efforts and total results at times as fantastic, Mr. Batt proceeded, in the course of his broadcast over the Blue Network on June 6, 1943, to make the following statement:

It's simply that "we builded better than we knew." In other words, our great war plant today is producing at a rate much faster than even the foremost engineers dreamed possible a year ago; so much faster that the figures sound like something out of Buck Rogers. American ingenuity hit upon short cuts in an already streamlined industrial set-up. Not only did we gear our war machine to a pitch much higher than Hitler fig-

ured, we did better than even we thought we could.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON WAR PROBLEMS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, on June 11, 1943, there appeared in the Washington Post an article by Ernest Lindley, entitled "Congress and Parliament."

In the New York Times of Sunday, June 13, 1943, there appeared an article by Turner Catledge entitled "Byrnes Ought to End Inquiry Epidemic."

In the New York Times of Friday, June 11, 1943, there appeared an editorial entitled "Liaison With Congress."

Mr. President, the editorial and the articles to which I have referred deal with the question of simplifying the relationships between Congress and the executive branch of the Government. They indicate that there is a feeling down town that the war effort is being hampered by a confusion, and probably a lack of understanding and a meeting of the minds between the legislative branch of the Government and the executive branch. I shall not dwell long upon the subject at the present time, but I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks there be printed in the body of the RECORD the editorial and the newspaper articles to which I have referred.

Mr. President I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed immediately thereafter a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1, which I first submitted to the Senate in October of last year, and which I resubmitted during the early days of the present session of Congress. Hearings have been held on the resolution by a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs. No opposition was presented at the hearings. The resolution provides—and I assume this is what Mr. Byrnes has in mind—for the creation of a bipartisan congressional committee, selected by the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. I think it is extremely important that such a committee be appointed. I think it is equally important, Mr. President, that if there be such a committee, it be a bipartisan committee.

So I ask unanimous consent that the resolution to which I have referred, on which the Committee on Military Affairs has yet to report, be printed in the RECORD following the articles and editorial to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS AND PARLIAMENT

In the conduct of the war, Mr. Churchill's formal authority under the British system is less than Mr. Roosevelt's under our system. The President is, by the Constitution, the Commander in Chief of the armed forces. The corresponding responsibility in Britain is vested in the war cabinet, which like the whole cabinet of which it is a part, is responsible to the House of Commons. Mr. Churchill and his cabinet can be overthrown at any moment by the House of Commons.

But in practice Mr. Churchill has advantages which Mr. Roosevelt lacks. He heads a coalition government. Partisan politics has been suspended. The cabinet can get what it wants from Parliament when it wants it whether it be new taxes or greater power to regulate and control the domestic economy. Moreover, Parliament is well-informed about the general conduct of the war. In addition to the excellent reports of Mr. Churchill and the regular questioning of cabinet members, it has had now and then a secret session at which Mr. Churchill or Mr. Eden or some other spokesman for the cabinet enlightened it as to matters which could not be frankly discussed in public.

Mr. Churchill was not indulging in persiflage when he said, at the conclusion of his most recent speech, that the House of Commons has "proved itself a foundation and an instrument for the waging of successful war and for the safety of the state, never surpassed in modern or ancient times." On the record thus far made, that statement cannot be regarded as an exaggeration.

Our system has not worked so well. This is partly because of its structure which, whatever its advantages, does not tend to promote effective responsible government. But undoubtedly it would work better than it does if the legislative and executive branches earnestly set about improving the machinery for their collaboration.

Our Congress, as a whole, is not well informed. The committee system results in many Members being well informed about special phases of the Government's affairs, but not in the general education of Congress. Indeed, the committee system, like other forms of specialization, often produces lopsided thinking. Moreover, it must regretfully be recorded, some Members do not proceed as true seekers after fact. Partisan politics is their profession. They would rather make a headline with an accusation which may be poorly founded than be known for intelligent and judicial appraisal. Besides, so many of them are busy running errands for their constituents that they don't have much time to find out what is going on in the world outside their own bailiwicks.

The committee system is needed. Congress could not function without it. But it has not been effectively adjusted to the needs of the war. A great deal of the time of responsible administrators is consumed in appearing before committees with overlapping jurisdictions, and in addition, Congress has permitted the whole system to be seriously abused by countenancing the creation of special committees headed by Members with personal axes to grind. The Cox investigation of the Federal Communications Commission is a notorious example.

As Mr. Byrnes revealed, he is trying to work out arrangements with congressional leaders to avoid the waste of time and inevitable misunderstandings due to the examination of Government officials piecemeal by committees with competing or overlapping interests. He is making his own office a clearinghouse for major congressional inquiries and complaints. At the same time he has set out to try to make the Office of War Mobilization the Office which will really settle differences between Government agencies and establish harmonious policies.

It is plain from these actions that Mr. Byrnes does not regard Office of War Mobilization as just "another layer of administration." He proposes to perform the task to which he was commissioned. To succeed he must have, of course, not only the intelligent and considerate aid of Congress, but the full support of the President.

Since Pearl Harbor, the President has devoted a major part of his time to military and diplomatic aspects of the war. He has progressively delegated authority over domestic affairs. But the creation of Office of War Mobilization is the clearest-cut action he has taken toward clearing his desk of problems to which he cannot give the attention required for correct decisions without interfering with the most efficient discharge of his supreme duties as Commander in Chief.

The steps Mr. Byrnes proposes are in the direction of improving our governmental system as an instrument for waging war. If successful, they will enable the President to concentrate on the big war problems almost to the extent that Mr. Churchill is free to concentrate on them. But they will require a more patriotic form of partisanship than has been so widely in evidence in Congress during the last year and a half.

WASHINGTON, June 12.—In asking each House of Congress to designate a single committee through which all controversies growing out of the conduct of the war might be channeled to the executive branch of the Federal Government, the War Mobilization Director, James F. Byrnes, struck consciously and deliberately at one of the critical problems in Washington—the epidemic of congressional investigations.

Following the same loose system which it authorized inquiries in peacetime, Congress, through the House and Senate, already has instituted no less than 30 separate investigations devoted in whole or in part to the war effort, and resolutions are pending in the two Houses which would authorize at least 20 more.

From the beginning of the preparedness drive in the spring of 1940 to the present time, key defense officials have spent literally hundreds of hours before the various investigating committees. Often they were giving duplicate testimony. Thousands of additional hours have been spent in preparing testimony and keeping records in anticipation of further appearances.

CALLS ON NELSON STRESSED

Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, for instance, has been called to the Capitol 37 times since late 1941. He has appeared before 15 separate committees and subcommittees, for an average of 1 to 3½ hours at the sitting.

Comparable records have been made by Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox, General George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army; Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War; James V. Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy; Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the Manpower Commission, and William M. Jeffers, Rubber Director, and others.

Mr. Byrnes is too devoted to the congressional process, and too realistic a politician, to have made a frontal attack on the multiplicity of war inquiries. He exhibited a fear, however, that the whole investigative process was getting out of hand and approaching the point where it might injure rather than help the war effort.

Mr. Byrnes's point of view is shared by an increasing number of congressional leaders.

COMPLAINS ON INVESTIGATIONS

Even as the War Mobilization Director was making his proposal for a single committee contact, Representative BAYARD CLARK, Democrat of North Carolina, was complaining to the House that the investigating committees had grown so numerous that a committee should be established to investigate the investigators.

The Military Affairs Committee of the House now has about five subcommittees in operation. One of these has heard 72 witnesses and taken more than 1,000 pages of testimony on four bills covering manpower and labor. Some half dozen other committees in the two Houses are conducting inquiries on the same subject.

In addition to those made by the regular service committees, separate investigations are conducted by the subcommittees of the two appropriations committees, ostensibly to

determine the amount of money to be expended for the various activities in the Army and Navy and their components.

The Capitol chieftains fear considerable difficulty, however, if the single committee system is instituted. In attempting it they hazard a head-on collision with one of the most powerful forces in Congress—jealousy over prerogatives. Furthermore, there are forces outside of Congress, including a substantial part of the press, which undoubtedly will resist any move that has the remotest appearance of an effort to cover up.

Current congressional inquiries are directed at almost every phase of the war effort at home or abroad. The regular service committees—the Military Affairs and Naval Affairs Committees in each House—maintain general jurisdiction over legislation relating to the armed services. The Senate Military Affairs Committee, for instance, has had as many as nine subcommittees at one time going into various phases of military activities.

Resolutions pending in the two Houses call for numerous separate inquiries into such matters as lend-lease, reasons for closing domestic gold mines, food supply and manpower, civilian air transport service for war purposes, post-war unemployment, reoccupation and reconstruction, propaganda distributed by the United States Government, the status of Negroes in the armed forces, and the Office of War Information.

The only official purpose of a congressional investigation is to further legislation. Through the process Congress, theoretically, simply seeks information on which it might legislate more intelligently and judiciously. For that reason the courts have been very reluctant to interfere when committees have gone beyond the ordinary rules of evidence or have even jailed recalcitrant witnesses for contempt.

Congressional leaders realize, however, that the official basis has often been stretched near to the breaking point. In the inquiries now in progress one can detect reasons running all the way from high public purpose to a quest for personal prestige, and personal retaliation, and the desire of certain Members to take a trip.

[From the New York Times of Friday, June 11, 1943]

LIAISON WITH CONGRESS

Director Byrnes has asked each House of Congress to designate a committee to work with the executive branch. This is one of the most encouraging announcements to come out of Washington since our entrance into the war. Mr. Byrnes' action will accomplish several purposes. It will enable Congress to offer its suggestions and criticisms to the Executive in private. This should mitigate misunderstandings, minimize public bickering, and increase congressional influence. The tendency of not only the present but of nearly any administration is to be slow in rectifying a policy criticized in public. Such a rectification, it is apt to fear, will be regarded as a public admission of previous error. It is therefore commonly much easier to secure corrections of all but major policies by private advice. If the private advice is not taken, there is nothing to prevent Congress from then making it public.

To provide such a mutually accepted medium for recommendations should also tend to raise the value of the recommendations themselves. When Congressmen make criticisms in public they are too often tempted to make the criticisms that seem likely to gain them applause or votes rather than the kind most helpful to the Executive.

This is not all that Mr. Byrnes' move can achieve. He has asked each House of Congress to designate a single committee on the conduct of the war to work with the Executive. For this purpose he has suggested the special committee of which Mr. TRUMAN is chairman in the Senate, and he plans to confer with Speaker RAYBURN regarding the House committee. This procedure, as Mr. Byrnes declares, should reduce the number of congressional investigations, save the time of Government officials, and prevent needless duplication of effort. He might have added that a single committee speaking for each House, or, better, a single joint committee, would also have more power and influence than a number of competing committees.

Mr. Byrnes in his present executive capacity may help to do more for Congress than it has so far seemed able to do for itself. The reform he suggests in this respect ought to be only the beginning of more extensive reforms in internal organization to provide Congress with a unified and coherent leadership.

This is not the only constructive step that Mr. Byrnes announced on Wednesday. Another was the appointment to his personal staff of Bernard M. Baruch, Chairman of the War Industries Board in the last war. This appointment assures Mr. Byrnes of experienced, shrewd, and courageous counsel.

[S. Con. Res. 1, 78th Cong., 1st sess.]

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on War Problems (hereinafter referred to as the "joint committee"), and to be composed of six Members of the Senate to be selected by the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives to be selected by the House of Representatives Not more than three of the members of the joint committee selected by the Senate, and not more than three of the members of the joint committee selected by the House of Representatives, shall be from the same political party. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a special study and investigation of the problems arising out of the war under existing and future acts of Congress; to confer with the President and with the various departments and agencies of the Government from time to time, with respect to such problems; to consult with other committees of both branches of the Congress, and to report to the Congress from time to time, together with such recommendations with respect to legislation as it deems advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

CONFIRMATION BY THE SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I shall not take much time. I realize, especially from the fact that few Senators have been on the floor during the discussion of the pending measure, that many of them have made up their minds how they will vote, one way or the other.

Generally speaking, I am not opposed to the effort to bring about confirmation of appointments by the Senate. So far as I recall, I have voted for all the bills and amendments to that end which have come before the Senate during the past 10 years while I have been a Member of the Senate. The pending measure, however, presents a different situation.

I am opposed to this program if it includes the T. V. A. My colleague and I have offered an amendment to exclude the T. V. A. My reason for taking that position is that I am exceedingly anxious to keep the T. V. A. from being drawn into politics. It is a most useful service, as is conceded on all sides. It has given a satisfactory administration. Its employees have been of a high order. I do not know whether or not they are all splendid men; the truth is, I do not know more than two or three of them; and when I say the T. V. A. has given satisfactory service, I speak from a knowledge of its reputation and of the general understanding of the people of the Tennessee Valley who have had contact with it. I have no personal interest in this amendment. If there is a single employee of the T. V. A. who was appointed on my recommendation, I do not know who he is, and I am quite sure there is none, for I have recommended none directly since the organization was created.

There are reasons why it is not necessary to upset a satisfactory situation which has prevailed since the organization of the T. V. A. I have been directly associated with the movement in the Congress to develop the T. V. A. As is well known, I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which has had jurisdiction from the beginning of all legislation, except appropriations, relating to the T. V. A. I was a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when the original bill was reported, and from the beginning I have supported the T. V. A., and supported appropriations for it.

I am sure that my good friend, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], is justified in his statement that he has done more than any other man to bring about the present high state of development on the Tennessee River. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have cooperated with him and supported him.

One problem we have got to deal with today is the difficulty that so many

Senators have in separating in their viewpoints the interest of the senior Senator from Tennessee when it comes to excluding from the pending measure the confirmation of T. V. A. officers and employees. All members of the Senate appreciate the services and ability of the Senator from Tennessee. They recognize his splendid, outstanding public service, his conscientious effort wherever the public interest is involved, and they know of his long continued and active effort to develop the T. V. A. So, as a result, it comes about when he sponsors a bill along another line, involving confirmation by the Senate of Federal employees, and the T. V. A. is injected, there is, I realize, a natural inclination on the part of his friends here and Members who admire and respect him, to go along with him if they themselves do not have definite views. I myself probably might do the same thing if there were not other controlling reasons.

Mr. President, the T. V. A. has operated from the beginning under statutory, mandatory regulations which prevented the injection of politics of any sort into the selection of its employees. As has been stated here from time to time, the merit system has prevailed. I desire to read into the RECORD section 6 of the original T. V. A. act. It has been in the law all the time and the Authority has been administered under that requirement. Section 6 reads:

> In the appointment of officials and the selection of employees for said Corporation, and in the promotion of any such employees or officials, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency. Any member of said Board who is found by the President of the United States—

Note the words "Any member of such Board"—

> who is found by the President of the United States to be guilty of a violation of this section shall be removed from office by the President of the United States, and any appointee of said Board who is found by the Board to be guilty of a violation of this section shall be removed from office by said Board.

So strict, Mr. President, are the requirements of that section, and so extreme a penalty is provided against any member of the Board who is influenced in any way by political considerations in the appointment of officers and officials, that it early became known that the T. V. A. would consider no recommendations from politicians or public officers. As a result, I made no recommendations, and I doubt if the Senator from Tennessee ever made a recommendation. He has not been interested, I know, from the standpoint of patronage in the personal selection of employees.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not in the slightest.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am sure he took the same course the others of us took who are familiar with this organization.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. While that is true, that has not been the practice of the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I do not know whether the Senator was present this morning, and heard my colleague [Mr. STEWART] speak of the violation of the act the Senator from Alabama has just read by the Chairman of the Authority. Was the Senator here then?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I heard his statement, and I very greatly regret if what was stated occurred. I heard, likewise, the statement of my colleague from the head of the Board that he did not make a speech opposing the election of the junior Senator from Tennessee; but, whether he did or not, he is not an employee; he is already subject to confirmation by the Senate.

The point I am making is that working for the organization are numerous employees who are selected from all over this country. As has been brought out in the debate, evidently under the merit system and merit program, with the elimination of political influences, there has been built up a successful administration of the T. V. A. Why now risk bringing about a change in that situation? What would be the result if the employees of the T. V. A. were certainly included in the requirement of confirmation? Mr. President, there are many implications growing out of such a situation. Four hundred men, probably none of them knowing the present President of the United States, hereafter are not to be appointed by the members of the Board of the T. V. A. but by the President of the United States. When that is done, of course, there is an element of politics injected into it. It is perfectly apparent that when 400 good jobs are thrown open to be filled by the President there will be applications for those places; that endorsements, along the usual line in filling Government offices, will be followed, and that with a multiplicity of applications which may be made, the President will in due course, I assume, as a matter of human nature, as a man experienced in politics, find perhaps some new places in the organization for personal appointments.

Whether he should do so or not, a great multitude of officeholders would be turned loose seeking appointments. And what is the next step? They have to come before the Senate; they probably have to have someone who is known here vouch for them. There are probably men under the Authority from every State in the Union, and they would have to take the matter of their confirmation up with their own Senators, and in that way seek political influence or political activity in this body, which would be extensive and widespread.

Naturally, Mr. President, activities of that sort tend to draw into the political equation the filling of the appointments and the confirmation of the appointees. Most of those men are not policy-making officials in the ordinary sense.

There is an additional reason why the T. V. A. should not be brought into this appointment and confirmation program. The T. V. A. is a great business organization; it has no political activities; it has no policy-making programs except to carry out those declared in the act, and they have been carried out to very general satisfaction, as we have heard from all sources.

Why take the chance of changing that situation, and working in here and there outside influences, outside factors, which have not heretofore been necessary to deal with? Everything has been running smoothly, the program has been satisfactory. All who know about it approve it. We are pleased with it, and want it continued on the basis on which it has been operating.

In the Tennessee Valley, regardless of politics, the program has the approval of the people, and the effort to bring under the confirmation power of the Senate the engineers and architects and accountants and others connected with T. V. A. is bitterly resisted by the people, at least those in the Tennessee Valley in my State; and the Tennessee Valley extends from the northeast corner to the northwest corner of the State, all the way across the State, comprising one of the largest congressional districts, in population, in the State. I think it might be safely said that the opposition to changing the order of things there, and to the possibility of drawing T. V. A. into politics, is practically unanimous.

I have not heard a word from any citizen in the whole Tennessee Valley in favor of the proposed program, but, on the contrary, countless letters, by the hundreds, possibly by the thousands, have come to me in opposition to any program such as that proposed, which would have a tendency to indicate that the T. V. A. is to be made a political organization.

The T. V. A. is different from all the other agencies of the Government; indeed it is so different that I submit it is unwise, it is risky, it is unnecessary to make a change. There is no evil to be corrected, and I submit that the amendment excluding the T. V. A. would not hurt the bill and would not cause any harm. No injury would result from its adoption, but, on the other hand, it is possible that there might be great injury if it were not agreed to.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, in view of all that has been said about the amendment and about the bill in connection with the T. V. A., I wish to say a few words. At the outset, I desire to state that I am very sorry there has been any effort to inject a fight involving T. V. A. into the discussion of the pending bill. It does not belong here at all.

A bill in substance and effect about the same as the pending bill was introduced during the last session of Congress, as I recall, and, as I stated in a colloquy this morning with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I was in favor of such a measure at that time, with absolutely no thought that it might affect even one employee of T. V. A. I was for it because of certain things I had seen and heard of having taken place in some of the bureaus in Washington, concerning the attitude chiefly of the so-called bureaucrats toward the Members of both Houses of Congress.

I understand there are about 33,000 employees of T. V. A. at the present time, and that there will be actually less than

400 affected by the pending bill, those with salary limitations of $4,500, as it stands now. That is merely incidental, so far as I am concerned. I had no thought of it affecting T. V. A., any more than I had any thought of it affecting any other particular or special or singled-out department of the Government.

The fact that the bill happens to affect a few employees of T. V. A. should not at all prevent the enactment of the bill. The fact that it affects certain employees of the Authority should not, so far as I know, affect their reemployment. I know of no reason why it should. So far as I am concerned, I am not interested in any of the employees of the T. V. A. being affected by the bill one way or the other and, so far as I know, each and every one of them affected might very well and properly be reemployed.

It was pointed out by the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] that, by reason of a provision in the bill which would make the law take effect on the 30th of June, those holding on that date the positions they now occupy, unless reappointed before the 30th of September of this year, would be without employment. That should not affect the reappointment of the men under the T. V. A. It should not affect their reemployment if they are capable and qualified, and meet the requirements of the merit system of the Authority. And that is perfectly satisfactory to me. I have no candidate for any position among the employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and I have not any in mind. I have received the very kindest of treatment, I should like to repeat, at the hands of the Authority, in every instance in which I have undertaken to do business with them. I should have no hesitancy in calling upon them today or tomorrow for any kind of business I might desire to transact in connection with the Government.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is a wonderful organization. It has done great good for my section and for the entire country. I should be glad to support measures providing for similar authorities in other sections, so that the other citizens of the United States might profit and benefit as we have.

Mr. President, I do not know whether or not the applicable provision of the Constitution has been read in exact words, but I should like to have it appear here, and therefore I shall repeat the provision on which the pending bill is based. Under section 2 of article II, in defining the powers of the President of the United States, the second paragraph of the section provides:

> He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to * * * appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law. But the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, or in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

The Constitution does not provide any particular formula which the Congress shall follow when enacting such a law. It provides that Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers in the President of the United States. That is exactly what the pending bill does. It vests in the President of the United States the appointment of all inferior officers whose salaries are $4,500 or more.

I see no reason why a salary limitation should not be as good a criterion to follow as any other. I think in fact that in this case it represents probably the only solution we could arrive at that would cover the situation as it should be covered.

In the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] he undertakes to make only policy-making officials subject to confirmation by the Senate. That would probably result in considerable argument and debate as to just who are policy-making officials. In fact, I think a good demonstration of that occurred on the floor during the Senator's discussion of his own amendment, when he was interrupted by the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], who said he did not believe that attorneys or lawyers representing certain departments of the Government are policy-making officials, whereupon the Senator from Wyoming challenged him and said that they often are policy-making officials, in fact, he said that in most cases they are. That brought about a debate, or discussion, or argument on the question.

There can, however, be no argument with respect to the salary limitation, because if a man draws more than $4,500 a year he comes within the provisions of this measure. The adoption of that provision simply will mean that the President of the United States will appoint a man, instead of the head of a department appointing him, or a court of law appointing him.

So, Mr. President, I can see no harm in transferring this power of appointment from the head of a department to the President of the United States. It will not otherwise change the merit system of the Tennessee Valley Authority. No doubt the President of the United States would call upon the head of the Authority for recommendations before making appointments which would be sent to the Senate of the United States for confirmation.

Mr. President, it has been improperly stated on occasions that Members of the Senate who favor passage of the bill are interested in it because of patronage considerations. Nothing could be further from the truth. The provision of the Constitution on which the bill is based provides that the President shall make appointments by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Senate has no power of appointment. Unless the President makes the appointment and sends it to the Senate, the office would remain vacant regardless of what it might be. The Senate has no power of appointment. The Senate has merely the power and authority to give its advice and its consent to the appointment made by the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I am sorry the T. V. A. has been injected into consideration of the measure. I repeat that it is a great organization, and is doing much good, and has weathered many a storm. I am giving it my support just as I have always done, and I expect to continue to give it my full and wholehearted support. The passage of the pending bill could not affect its efficiency in any sense of the word. Those who hold office under the T. V. A., those who might be affected, incidentally, by the passage of the bill, might very well be reappointed, so far as I am informed.

Mr. President, that is all I care to say on this subject at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Andrews	Green	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Guffey	Overton
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hatch	Reed
Barbour	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hayden	Reynolds
Bone	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Holman	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Burton	La Follette	Shipstead
Bushfield	Langer	Smith
Byrd	Lodge	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Murdock	White
George	Murray	Willis
Gerry	Nye	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Presiding Officer state what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], submitted for himself and his colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD], to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. McCARRAN. I desire to have the amendment stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment of Mr. O'MAHONEY, on page 4, after line 8, it is proposed to insert a new subdivision, as follows:

(f) The provisions of the act shall not be applicable in the case of any office or position in the Tennessee Valley Authority except the members of the Board of Directors.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Senators who are opposed to the amendment to the amendment will vote "nay"; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. Senators who are in favor of the amendment to the amendment will vote "yea"; is that correct? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding. The clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained in committee meetings.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee.

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—15

Aiken	Burton	La Follette
Andrews	Caraway	Langer
Ball	Danaher	Lucas
Bankhead	Hatch	Mead
Bone	Hill	Radcliffe

NAYS—58

Bailey	Gurney	Reynolds
Barbour	Hawkes	Robertson
Bridges	Hayden	Russell
Buck	Holman	Scrugham
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Byrd	Lodge	Smith
Capper	McCarran	Stewart
Chandler	McClellan	Taft
Chavez	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tunnell
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Davis	Maybank	Van Nuys
Eastland	Millikin	Wallgren
Ellender	Moore	Walsh
Ferguson	Murdock	Wheeler
George	O'Daniel	Wherry
Gerry	O'Mahoney	White
Gillette	Overton	Willis
Green	Reed	
Guffey	Revercomb	

NOT VOTING—23

Austin	Glass	Thomas, Utah
Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Tobey
Bilbo	Kilgore	Truman
Brewster	McFarland	Tydings
Brooks	Murray	Wagner
Butler	Nye	Wiley
Clark, Idaho	Pepper	Wilson
Downey	Thomas, Okla.	

So Mr. HILL's amendment to the amendment of Mr. O'MAHONEY was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] as a substitute for the bill as amended.

Mr. McKELLAR and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who, I understand, would vote "yea" if present, and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who I understand would vote "nay" if present, and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TUNNELL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], who I understand would vote "nay" if present. If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business as a member of the Naval Aairs Committee.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—32

Aiken	Gillette	Murray
Andrews	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hill	Robertson
Bone	La Follette	Shipstead
Bridges	Langer	Taft
Buck	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Lucas	Vandenberg
Capper	McNary	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Wilson
Ferguson	Millikin	

NAYS—42

Bailey	Green	Overton
Barbour	Guffey	Reed
Bilbo	Gurney	Revercomb
Bushfield	Hayden	Reynolds
Byrd	Holman	Russell
Chandler	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Chavez	McCarran	Smith
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Stewart
Connally	McKellar	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maloney	Walsh
Eastland	Maybank	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
George	Murdock	White
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis

NOT VOTING—22

Austin	Glass	Tobey
Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Truman
Brewster	Kilgore	Tunnell
Brooks	McFarland	Tydings
Butler	Nye	Wagner
Caraway	Pepper	Wiley
Clark, Idaho	Thomas, Okla.	
Downey	Thomas, Utah	

So Mr. O'MAHONEY's amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. McNARY, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, Senators desire to speak on the bill. I was on my feet seeking recognition when the Chair announced that the bill had been read the third time.

Mr. President, there appeared recently in a New York newspaper an article with reference to my activities in the matter of securing O. P. A. appointments. A copy of the article, which I have before me, and from which I intend to quote, appeared in the New York Times of Friday, June 4. A similar article was published in nearly all the other New York newspapers.

The article was prompted by a letter of resignation submitted to the head of the O. P. A. for the New York State area by a man named Russell H. Potter. Mr. Potter was resigning, and in the letter of resignation he took opportunity to pay his respects to me. Among other things he said in the letter of resignation that—

> I could not fulfill my duties sincerely knowing that the Office of Price Administration is under the thumbs of political bosses Ed Flynn, Frank Kelly, Mike Kennedy, and Senator Mead and others.

Mr. President, I have no objection to his putting me in good company; but I never did like to be called a political boss.

Mr. President, I accepted this gratuitous insult without public utterance until now because it came from a man who was leaving the service—perhaps unwillingly—and who was paying his compliments to all those whom he may have disliked for one reason or another. I never knew the man. I did not know that he was working for the O. P. A., nor did I know that he was going to resign from the O. P. A. I had no objection to his being in the employ of the O. P. A., although it occurs to me that it would be better for the O. P. A. to employ New York men to administer the affairs of the New York office. Therefore, the only complaint which came to my office concerning this man—and it applies to his predecessor as well—was that while he was the district director for New York City, he lived in another State. If I were to suggest another objection it would be that he did not try to take a qualifying civil-service examination open to others in the city of New York.

Mr. President, I never knew his successor. I did not know, until I was later informed, that he was being drafted for the position. I certainly had nothing to do with his employment. I took it upon myself to inquire whether or not he met the standards which I thought should be the minimum standards applying to a position of this character. I learned that he was, and is, a resident of New York City, that he was a former employee of the Government, and that because of such former employment he was well qualified, so far as the merit system was concerned, to fill the position. When those two standards are met, I, as one of the sponsors of the merit system as it applies to the O. P. A., have no further interest in the matter.

Mr. President, in that masterpiece of literature in which he mentioned my name, he went on to say that in my own city there was considerable difficulty because none of the applicants recommended by me were acceptable to the Civil Service Commission. For his edification and enlightenment, allow me to say that none of the applicants recommended by me was unacceptable to the Civil Service Commission, because under the method approved by the previous O. P. A. administration, an applicant could never get to the Civil Service Commission unless he were acceptable to the O. P. A. The applicant was interviewed. How he came to be an applicant I never knew. After his interview, if he was found agreeable to the interviewer or the appointing authority, he was appointed. After he was appointed, the qualifications for the job, which may or may not have had some relation to his own qualities, were established; and lo and behold, in many instances—in almost every instance—he was qualified, and from then on held the position. The system was to select the man first and qualify him later.

Mr. President, as one of those who voted for the merit system, not only as it applies to O. P. A., but to W. P. B., the War Manpower positions, and the Smaller War Plants Corporation, I felt that the civil service should be respected, and that everyone within the community in which the vacancy existed or in which the appointment was to be made, should be given the opportunity to which every American citizen is entitled, namely, to try an open public competitive examination. I registered objection to a number of appointments, but I never initiated any. Men were appointed to Government agencies and given deferment from the draft. Some of them are still holding office, and I object to them. Men who lived in other States were appointed to positions in my city, as well as in some other cities in my State. Perhaps citizens in my State were sent into other States to administer local or district positions, and I thought that was not in keeping with the spirit or the letter of the law.

Mr. President, all this is a thing of the past. Perhaps as a result of my own efforts, the cooperation of the present O. P. A. administration, and the assistance of the Civil Service Commission, for the first time in O. P. A. history a civil service examination was advertised in the press of my city to fill a vacancy there in the O. P. A. All those who desired to try that examination were invited to do so. So far as the war agencies are concerned, I believe that the vacancies should be filled in the manner prescribed by law and now recommended by the Civil Service Commission. They should be open to all eligibles, regardless of their political affiliations. In this war all the people are enlisted; and positions in the emergency agencies, which are calling upon us all to make the fullest possible sacrifice, should be open to all patriotic citizens.

I have before me a clipping from the Buffalo Evening News of within the last 2 weeks. From it I quote the following:

> An open competitive examination for the $6,500-a-year directorship of the Buffalo Office of Price Administration office will be held by the United States Civil Service Commission as the method of filling the post now held by William F. Denny in an acting capacity. Applications are available in room 207 of the Post Office Building, and should be sent or taken there in person on or before Monday next.

That is what I voted for, not only in this instance, but in connection with every bill which has been brought before the Senate since the emergency began. I voted for the merit system in the matter of appointments to the War Manpower Commission. I regret that I am now called upon to take any part in the selection or confirmation of officers of that Commission whose salaries are in excess of $4,500. It has caused endless delay in many instances. It has not resulted in the same degree of efficiency which might otherwise have existed.

Mr. President, I wanted to make my attitude clear, and I hope I have done so. I find no fault with newspapers that have quoted from the letter of this dissatisfied employee who has resigned and who gratuitously made an erroneous reference to me.

I wish to state further, Mr. President, that my record as an advocate of the merit system in the House of Representatives over a period of 20 years, and my record as a member of the Civil Service Committee and the Post Office and Post Roads Committee of the Senate since 1938, gives the lie to the charge that I am interested in political patronage, and particularly as it applies to personnel in the war agencies of the Government.

Mr. President, perhaps there was some excuse for the method adopted under the administration of the previous O. P. A. Administrator. He was called upon by the Congress, because of the serious situation which confronted the country, to fill the positions in his organization and to fill them rapidly. He sought to secure from the Civil Service Commission appointees to fill them in the manner I have just described.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I shall be glad to yield if the Senator will allow me to finish this thought. But now, Mr. President, since the initial organization of this agency all vacancies should be filled by giving the local folk the right to try an examination. Now I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am wondering how, in the first place, the O. P. A. secured the services of Russell H. Potter. Can the Senator tell me?

Mr. MEAD. I am sorry that I cannot. I knew nothing of the man until I read

the letter, and, on inquiry at the Civil Service Commission, I was told that he did not try a civil-service examination. I was informed, furthermore, that he was not a resident of my State, and so I could not see how he could properly fill the position of district director in the city of New York.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand from reading the article that his home was in Connecticut, and that he was not a resident of the State of New York.

Mr. MEAD. I understand that to be true, and his predecessor was a resident of some other State. Mr. President, I think, in the interest of efficient administration, the director in charge of the Philadelphia office ought not to live in Boston or Atlanta, and that the director of the New York office, by the same token, ought to live in the city of New York. I have no objection to the regional director having to do with a number of States living in any one of the States outside the State of New York, but I held, from the beginning, that appointees to local O. P. A. offices, as in the case of the postmaster of a town, should be selected from the area over which they would administer O. P. A. affairs.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I rise merely because attention has been called to the fact that Mr. Russell Potter is a resident of the State of Connecticut. I do not recall having heretofore heard of Mr. Potter; I do not know him, and, of course, I was not responsible for his appointment or the appointment of anyone else in O. P. A.; but I have made inquiry within the past few days from the O. P. A. administrator in my home State concerning Mr. Potter, and I am told he is a man of excellent reputation.

Mr. MEAD. As I said in the beginning, I did not know anything about him; I had no objection to him whatever; and if he had remained there he would have done so without any word from me. My objection was general, namely, that there should be held an examination, open to everyone eligible to take the examination, and, as a matter of good policy, I held and still hold, that if he is administering the affairs of a local district he ought to live within the confines of the district; and if he is a good man, as I think perhaps he is, if the O. P. A. required his services in the State in which he lived or in a regional office covering many States, that would have been all right with me; but it occurs to me that in the case of an office which has to do only with the people in the city of New York, the people in the city of Brooklyn, or the people in the city of Albany, then an examination ought to be confined to those who reside in the particular areas.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, it is certain that the head of an agency in Washington has to go to someone to obtain information regarding a man who is to be placed in an important position of this kind. Mr. Henderson did not know every individual whom he appointed in the various districts throughout the United States, but when he made the original appointments he had to obtain information from some source; he could not appoint a man blindly, so to speak. It seems rather strange to me that, in the estimation of some people, it is almost a crime for an appointing officer to confer with a United States Senator or someone else high in the political life of the Nation in an effort to ascertain whether a man has the proper qualifications to fill a certain job.

So far as I am concerned, when it comes to recommending a man for a position of this kind I will take my chances with a Republican or a Democratic politician as readily as I will with the head of some financial or industrial institution or college group. It is certain that someone had to recommend in the first instance, and it would be interesting to know who that someone was. Yet because the junior Senator from New York is interested in obtaining the appointment, regardless of political affiliations, of someone from his State, he is criticized by the resident of another State. In my judgment, this is certainly unfair to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement which has just been made by my distinguished colleague from Illinois, and while I believe that every Senator in this Chamber could make a splendid contribution if called upon in instances similar to this, I am of the opinion that the burdens, the duties, and the responsibilities of our office in the war emergency are such that, in most instances, we would like to be relieved of passing on such appointments. It is my opinion, Mr. President, that O. P. A. started out with a great job ahead of them; they had an immense responsibility, and it was too much, in my judgment, for that agency to put into effect the powers and the authority conferred upon them by the Congress, and at the same time to devote a large amount of time to the job of recruiting personnel. Many years ago the Congress of the United States created by law a recruiting agency to do the work that the O. P. A. themselves tried to do, and that recruiting agency, as a result of years of experience, and the employment of talented experts along civil-service lines, could, and would, have done a better job if given the opportunity to do so.

Mr. President, I am very pleased to report to the Senate that the present Office of Price Administration, both in the Nation and in my State, is entirely agreeable to the plan which was adopted recently by the Civil Service Commission—that is, whenever a vacancy occurs or a new post is to be filled the people who live within the confines of the region or district or office will be invited publicly to participate in an examination, and an appointment will be made from the first three eligibles on the list.

Certainly, with the Senate working almost constantly throughout the year, with countless important war tasks before us, requiring every minute of our time and attention, I could not possibly take over, nor would I desire to do so, the added responsibility of selecting or recommending political appointments. For that reason, over a period of years, I have supported, without deviation, legislation conferring upon the recruiting agencies of the Government the authority and the power and the responsibility of doing this work.

I wish to commend the present O. P. A. and the Civil Service Commission for working out this new plan of action, which conforms, in its spirit and letter, with the law as prescribed by the Congress. If the O. P. A. and the other emergency agencies of the Government had adhered to this system from the very beginning, probably the pending bill would not be before the Senate this afternoon.

I wish to make the record clear. I have been a friend and an advocate of the merit system for a period of over 25 years. I have been associated with legislation having to do with the expansion of the civil service to as great an extent, perhaps, as has any other Senator in this Chamber, if not to a greater extent. Insofar as the emergency agencies are concerned, particularly the O. P. A., I have sought and finally secured a standard plan of examination which will in my judgment eliminate, so far as the future is concerned, the complaints of the past.

I believe the O. P. A. merits and commands the support of the Congress of the United States, because it has a very remarkable and important task to perform. It needs our help if it is to stem the rising tide of inflation, and to its credit be it said, it is doing a fairly good job. But it needs and will continue to need our help, and one way in which we can give it our assistance is by rejecting the bill before the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. President, with reference to the bill, one of the reasons being advanced in its support is that it would serve as a checkrein upon the abuse of authority by officials of the executive branch of the Government. I wonder if it would. I do not deny the existence of abuses of authority in the executive branch of the Government or minimize their seriousness. There is, however, no short cut to the proper handling of this problem. It can be dealt with only as a result of the most careful kind of study which will result in sound legislation in the field of administrative law being enacted by the Congress of the United States. Just how much can be done in this direction in the middle of a war I do not know. But certainly the appropriate committees of the Congress should be giving constant thought and attention to this all-important problem, and so I hope the pending bill will be referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I said to the Senator some days ago, and also today, that probably I would make such a motion as that to which he now refers, but in the light of the votes which have just been taken, I doubt whether it would serve any good purpose to move to refer the bill to the Committee on Civil Service at this time.

Mr. MEAD. I fear that I am in agreement with the Senator. I wish to commend him for his efforts in furthering

and expanding the civil service since he has been a Member of this body.

Certainly, Mr. President, the appropriate reference of the pending measure would do no harm. It would, in my judgment, result in great benefit and in improvement of the measure.

To allege that we can solve the problem by requiring the Senate to confirm the appointments of tens of thousands of officeholders, many of whom would have absolutely nothing to do with the formulation of policy, is, to my mind, ridiculous. The notion that an officer who has been confirmed by the Senate will not abuse his authority is an interesting one. I feel sure, however, that there is not a Member of this body who cannot think of instances where, in his judgment, persons appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate have abused their authority.

A third reason advanced in behalf of the enactment of the bill is that it would help to hold down the number of employees on the Government pay roll. In that connection, the Civil Service Committee has made a noteworthy contribution, one which has been made in no other instance that I know of since the beginning of the emergency. As a result of legislation emanating from the Civil Service Committee of the Senate, surveys are being conducted of every governmental agency in existence, both by the Civil Service Commission and by the Director of the Budget, and in many instances—in fact, in almost every instance—personnel are being furloughed or reduced or transferred to other agencies, and increased efficiency and economy of operation are resulting.

I feel, however, that in the case of the Postal Service the recommended cut is too severe, and will have to be modified. I merely mention the work of the Civil Service Committee in this instance to show that they have made the contribution which its sponsors aim to make as a result of favorable action on the pending bill, and favorable action on the bill will be disappointing to its friends. That I prophesy now.

As I have just stated, the third reason advanced by those who are supporting the pending measure is that it would result in a reduction of personnel. In my judgment, that is an erroneous conclusion. The connection between the pending bill and the number of persons on the Federal pay roll is a very difficult one to figure out. It is predicated on the theory, I assume, that the following of the process suggested would result in more capable administrators being placed in Government jobs. The selection of persons for administrative positions who are competent administrators is one of the most difficult tasks in the whole realm of government. All of us will admit that the executive branch in a good many instances has failed in its efforts to put competent administrative people in administrative jobs. That is true of every administration. It is true because of an inherent weakness in human nature. But how could the enactment of Senate bill 575 improve this situation? Would the Senate committees to which these tens of thousands of nominations would be referred have resources available for making careful investigation into the administrative competence of the nominees?

Would they have a field service to investigate and examine them? Would these committees be able to assure themselves of the fact that persons whose names were presented to them were devoid entirely of the "big shot" complex which holds that the importance of the individual is in direct proportion to the size of the organization which he administers?

Just to state these questions serves to answer them. We know that it could not be done, and it is not going to be done.

Ours is the responsibility for making sure of the fact that, by legislation and otherwise, we impress upon the executive branch our feelings that in the past the right kind of administrators have not been selected, and that we insist on improvements being made insofar as the future is concerned.

Again, there is no short cut to the attainment of this desirable objective. It can only be achieved by constant and careful study of our civil-service law, and by the strengthening of that law wherever and whenever that seems to be desirable. When that is done, Mr. President, it will be done by the Civil Service Committees of both Houses. Clearly, the proper approach to the handling of this situation is to call upon the Civil Service Committee of the Senate of the United States to inquire into the matter carefully, and then to make specific recommendations to this body. It can never be done through the kind of a device that is suggested by this bill.

Now, having looked at some of the arguments which have been advanced in support of the bill, let us consider some reasons why, clearly, the bill should not be enacted into law.

The President of the United States, in his letter of February 19, 1943, in which he commented on the provisions of this bill, said:

> It would lay all of us open to the charge that we are playing politics with the war program.

I agree with and subscribe to that expression by the President.

Let us be frank about this situation. We know that the President is right. We can dress this bill up in any way we want to, but in the final analysis, whether right or wrong, the country is going to charge us with playing politics at the expense of the war program.

We cannot and must not lay ourselves open to this kind of charge. It will undermine the confidence of the country in the legislative branch, because the country will feel that we are placing selfish political considerations above the winning of the war. It will likewise undermine confidence in the executive branch of the Government because, rightly or wrongly, the country will believe that its war program is being administered by persons who place political considerations ahead of all other considerations.

Whether such charges would be fair or not, is not the issue. The point is that such charges would be made, and the country would believe them. We cannot afford to take such chances at this critical point in the history of the Nation. I should have less objection if legislation of this kind came before the Senate under normal peacetime conditions.

Next, the bill would completely undermine morale in the executive branch of the Government. One can take either the majority or minority versions of the bill, and one will find it absolutely impossible to determine just who is going to be subject to confirmation and who is not. The minority version is an improvement over the majority. It is still, however, full of ambiguities and would result in an absolutely chaotic situation within the executive branch as administrators tried to figure out whether or not certain positions were subject to the provisions of the bill.

For example, take the majority bill. Among other things, it provides for confirmation by the Senate of "heads of bureaus, divisions, sections, and other subdivisions of such departments and agencies." A department may be divided into bureaus, the bureaus into divisions, the divisions into sections, and the sections into units. The supervisor in charge of the smallest subdivision may be a $2,000 a year employee in charge of a few clerks. Yet, under the language of the bill, he, in all probability, and employees like him, would be required to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, a huge and impossible job.

Then there is another provision in the majority bill which specifies that the Senate shall confirm—

> All persons whose duties include participation in conferences or discussions with persons from other departments or agencies, or with persons from other bureaus, divisions, sections, or other subdivisions of their own departments or agencies * * * held for the purpose of determining the policies or methods to be followed in administering and of the functions of any department or agency * * * or * * * subdivision thereof.

Imagine trying to figure out just who would be included in such a provision. Obviously, it might be construed to include any person who has any contact whatever with any other person in his own or another Government department or agency. I submit that the enactment of legislation of this kind would simply result in this body being held up to ridicule by the people of the Nation.

Then, let us consider the minority version of the bill, which is, as previously stated, an improvement over the majority bill. It provides that the Senate shall confirm heads of bureaus, divisions, or other units representing the first subdivision of any such department or agency. In most agencies the establishment of governmental subdivisions is largely a matter of administrative discretion, and is not governed by law. Consequently, the applicability or inapplicability of S. 575 to a particular position would be dependent upon the exercise of administrative discretion in establishing internal organization.

For example, if an agency were subdivided into six separate divisions, the chief of each of these six divisions would be subject to the provisions of the bill.

If, however, the same agency were subdivided into two bureaus and each of these two bureaus into three divisions, presumably only the heads of the two bureaus would be subject to the provisions of the bill, while the chiefs of the six subdivisions presumably would not be.

Under another provision of the minority bill the head of any office in any particular geographic area, however small, would have to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Let us consider another provision of the majority bill, which specifies that the Senate shall confirm—

> All persons whose duties include participation in conferences * * * with persons from other departments or agencies * * * or * * * subdivisions of their own departments or agencies * * * for the purpose of determining the policies * * * to be followed in administering any of the functions of any department or agency.

This provision could be construed to include any person who participates in any capacity in any conference which is held for the purpose of determining policy.

And so, up to the present time, at least, it has been absolutely impossible to draft this legislation in such a manner as clearly to define the scope of the legislation. Either the very nature of the legislation makes this impossible, or sufficient time and thought have not been given to the matter. In any event, the bill should be referred back to the appropriate committee of the Senate, namely, the Civil Service Committee, for further study and analysis.

Undoubtedly, personnel administration in the Federal Government can be improved by the enactment of the right kind of legislation by the Congress. I know, for example, that the Civil Service Commission believes this to be true. Let us refer this legislation back to the Senate Civil Service Committee so that consideration can be given to the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission and other parts of the executive branch. Let us not, however, try to solve a fundamental problem by slapstick legislation of this character.

In summary, we cannot afford at this time to pass legislation which opens us to the charge that we are playing politics with the war program. This legislation will do just that. The President of the United States has stated that it would. Let us not do it. If it is done, Mr. President, it will not be done without my protest. In my judgment the proposed legislation will be harmful both to the civil service and to the country at large, and the President of the United States stated that to be his opinion. Editorial comment in leading newspapers has clearly indicated that such would be the case. Organizations such as the National League of Women Voters, veterans organizations, and the National Civil Service Reform League, all of whom have made splendid contributions to the improvement of the merit system in the Nation and in the States, are opposed to the passage of the bill, and have very definitely pointed out the objection and indicated the issue.

Furthermore, Mr. President, we cannot afford to pass legislation which would create unheard-of administrative chaos in the executive branch. The Office of Price Administration, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the War Production Board, and the other new agencies of the Government now have passed their organization period. Future examinations, as I have explained, will be open competitively to all the people.

So, the future will be an improvement on the past, unless this bill is enacted into law. I plead for its substantial defeat. We cannot afford to pass legislation which would create chaos at this time or at any other time. If we pass the bill we will be telling tens of thousands of professional and scientific employees that the question whether they shall continue to hold their jobs is to be an open one. We cannot play fast and loose in this manner with the morale of a great organization such as the United States Government.

Mr. President, let us not be misled by one of the provisions of the bill which seeks to protect those who have a civil service status. Virtually every person holding a key position in the war program at this time has a war-service appointment, not a civil-service status. Consequently, the positions which we would be throwing open as to which we would be subjecting ourselves to a charge of playing politics, and the agencies in which we would be creating most of the confusion, are the positions and the agencies most closely connected with the war program.

Finally, let me read to the Senate the following letter from Thomas Jefferson to James Madison, dated November 29, 1820:

> The enclosed letter from our ancient friend Tenche Coxe, came unfortunately to Monticello after I left it, and has had a dilatory passage to this place, where I received it yesterday, and obey its injunction of immediate transmission to you. We should have recognized the style even without a signature, and although so written as to be much of it indecipherable. This is a sample of the effects we may expect from the late mischievous law vacating every 4 years nearly all the executive offices of the Government. It saps the constitutional and salutary functions of the President, and introduces a principle of intrigue and corruption, which will soon leaven the mass, not only of Senators, but of citizens. It is more baneful than the attempt which failed in the beginning of the Government, to make all officers irremovable but with the consent of the Senate. This places, every 4 years, all appointments under their power, and even obliges them to act on every one nomination. It will keep in constant excitement all the hungry cormorants for office, render them, as well as those in place, sycophants to their Senators, engage these in eternal intrigue to turn out one and put in another, in cabals to swap work; and make of them what all executive directories become, mere sinks of corruption and faction. This must have been one of the midnight signatures of the President, when he had not the time to consider, or even to read the law; and the more fatal as being irrepealable but with the consent of the Senate, which will never be obtained * * *

Everything Thomas Jefferson said about that piece of legislation could and will be said with equal emphasis about the bill now before the Senate if it is ever enacted into law.

Mr. President, I merely want to reiterate the statement I made at the beginning of my remarks. I believe that all the wartime or emergency agencies of the Government should be staffed by a personnel recruited by the recruiting agencies of our Government, and that every man and woman employed in those agencies should have a fair and an equal opportunity to prove his or her ability and qualifications. That is now being done in the agencies, with the exception of the War Manpower Administration, which we have prevented by law from doing. I trust that the pending bill will fail of passage. I hope the Senate will refer the bill to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. HATCH obtained the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I had earlier discussed, in advance of the Senator from New Mexico taking the floor, the matter of submitting two proposed perfecting amendments. I talked the matter over with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], all of whom agreed with me that we could very well substitute subsections (d) and (e) of the so-called O'Mahoney amendment for the corresponding subsections in the Judiciary Committee's bill. It was for that purpose that I rose to offer those amendments. I am sure that if they were to be considered and acted upon, no further discussion would be required, and they would be promptly adopted.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The matter has been discussed between the author of the bill and the author of the report on the bill from the Judiciary Committee. The amendments suggested by the Senator from Connecticut are acceptable to us, and if the question were left to us, we would agree that they might go into the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. I have not offered them, obviously because the Senator from New Mexico has the floor, but if he will yield further and permit me to do so, I will offer them.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator from Connecticut let me see the proposal?

Mr. DANAHER. Certainly.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I know that Senators are anxious to leave. It is growing late in the afternoon. At various times throughout the course of the debate I have expressed my views somewhat generally about the bill. I wish to assure the Senate that I shall not take very much time this afternoon in saying what I shall have to say, but I do think that the bill now pending is of so much importance that I would be unfair to myself and unfair to the Senate if I did not make a very few remarks pointing out,

if I can, what is being done by the passage of the pending measure.

Much has been said about the Constitution. It has been said that it is only sought to return to the Constitution. I shall not discuss that question today. I yield to no man in adherence to, faith in, and respect for that document, to which the Senator from Michigan referred the other day as a noted and noble document, but I do not agree at all that there is anything in the Constitution of the United States which even implies that such legislation as this should be passed. On the contrary, the things which the framers of this Government had in mind in drafting the Constitution and in the constitutional debates were contrary to legislation of this kind.

It has been said on the floor of the Senate that under the Constitution no Senator can make an appointment; that he has only the right to ratify, advise, and consent. A few years of life in practical politics, or a few years in the Senate of the United States, would convince anyone that when confirmations are had in the Senate, Senators from the States affected actually make the appointments, leaving the President only a veto power. The right to reject, which the constitutional framers vested in the Senate, has become the right to select.

I am not alone in that statement. Practically every President from Washington down to date has faced the same situation. Perhaps the situation was best expressed by former President Taft, who said:

> In the matters of recommendation and, indeed, of obtaining office, it is leg muscle and lack of modesty which win, rather than fitness and character. The appointing power is in effect in the hands of the Senators. It is subject only to a veto by the President.

Mr. President, whether or not that be true, whether or not Senators would exercise the powers proposed to be conferred by the bill as a patronage grab is unimportant. There is no power in this country that can make the people of America believe otherwise than that the Senate has stopped in the midst of wartime effort to reach out and grab unto itself more power and more patronage. That, Mr. President, will put the Senate and the Congress in a very unenviable light before the people of America.

That is not my only reason for opposing this measure. I have said repeatedly, and I firmly agree, that it is the constitutional concept that the Senate shall confirm appointments of genuine policy-making officials. I have been hopeful that out of this proposed legislation there would come some rule or plan by which that policy could be carried out.

I wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee that his bill at least established some definite plan. He laid down the rule that every Federal employee receiving in excess of $4,500 a year ought to be confirmed. Whether that rule be good or bad, it is at least understandable. The executive department or the Congress would know what was being done under such a rule. I do not believe in it at all. I believe we ought to make some effort to define a policy-making official.

So the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] drafted in the committee his substitute proposal, by which he attempted to define policy-making officials. I do not think the definitions in his proposal are clear by any means. I think that in many instances they go even further than the original McKellar bill. As pointed out by the Civil Service Commission, under those definitions a $2,000-a-year law clerk would have to be confirmed by the Senate. In many instances no one knows who would have to be confirmed and who would not have to be confirmed; and yet all those provisions are in the bill. So indefinite and uncertain are they that at the present moment the Senator from Connecticut is proposing to take a corrected portion of the amendment which the Senator from Wyoming had prepared, and which was voted on today, and insert it in the committee bill, in an effort to correct on the floor of the Senate some of the imperfections which he and I know exist in the bill. If there was confusion in the bill before, there is chaos now.

It has been said that under the McKellar bill from thirty to thirty-five thousand persons would have to be confirmed; but if we add all the indefinite definitions which are at present included in the bill, no one knows who will have to be confirmed.

My argument is simply this: It is an unwise way to legislate, no matter how much one may believe in the need for a bill; no matter how much one may wish to accomplish the thing sought to be accomplished in the original McKellar bill. The bill now presented to the Senate is far worse than it was in the beginning.

Mr. President, in line with what I have just said, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a letter written to me at my request by the United States Civil Service Commission, in which a complete analysis of the entire bill is made.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1943.

Hon. CARL A. HATCH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: Reference is made to your recent request for a report of the Commission's views relative to S. 575, a bill to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of $4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution.

S. 575, if enacted into law, would require appointments to the following classes of offices or positions in the executive branch of the Government to be made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate:

(a) Heads, assistant heads, and head attorneys of all departments and agencies;

(b) Heads of bureaus, divisions, sections, and other subdivisions of such departments and agencies;

(c) Heads and assistant heads of regional, area, or State offices of such departments and agencies;

(d) All persons whose duties include the preparation or issuance of rules, regulations, or orders made or issued under authority of any act of Congress or Executive order;

(e) All persons whose duties include participation in conferences or discussions with persons from other departments or agencies or with persons from other bureaus, divisions, sections, or other subdivisions of their own departments or agencies held for the purpose of determining policies or methods to be followed in the administration of the functions of any department or agency or subdivision thereof; or

(f) Any person receiving $4,500 a year or more, except artisans and craftsmen.

It is obvious from an examination of this portion of the bill that the language used to describe most of the foregoing classifications of employees is so broad that it may be construed to include almost any kind of Government position at all. Paragraph (b), for example, includes the head of any subdivision of any department or agency. A department may be divided into bureaus, the bureaus into divisions, the divisions into sections, and the sections into units. The supervisor in charge of the smallest subdivision may be a $2,000-a-year employee in charge of a few clerks, yet under the language of the bill he would be required to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

While paragraph (b) above is based upon internal subdivisions of a department or agency, paragraph (c) is based on a geographic subdivision of a department or agency. Under paragraph (c), the head of any office for any particular geographic area, however small, would be required to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Paragraphs (d) and (e), however, are based on the duties of the positions. The words "whose duties include the preparation or issuance of rules," contained in paragraph (d) might be construed to include a law clerk whose only function is to draft rules or regulations and who has no authority or responsibility in determining the policy or the content of such rules, or it may be construed to include even the typist who prepares such rules. The language of paragraph (e) is still more indefinite and might be construed to include any person who has any contact whatever with any other person in his own or another Government department or agency. Paragraph (f) is based on the salary of the person and would of course include many positions which are neither administrative nor policy determining, as, for example, scientists, engineers, etc.

A general criticism of section 2 of the bill, therefore, is that no uniform standard is observed in delineating the group which shall be subject to appointment by the President and confirmation by the Senate. The bill defines the group by applying such diverse standards as the kind of position, the organizational relationship of the position, the geographic location of the position, the duties of the position, and finally the salary of the position. As the size and organizational structure of the several agencies in the executive branch varies greatly, positions in one agency might be subject to the bill whereas similar positions in other agencies would not be.

Section 3 of the bill sets up five groups of employees which are exempt from the requirement of Presidential appointment and confirmation; namely:

(a) Persons appointed with a classified status;

(b) Persons who are on leave of absence for the purpose of performing military service;

(c) Persons restored or reinstated upon completion of military service;

(d) Positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(e) Positions in the White House office.

Of these exceptions, the meaning of the language of the first is obscure. The specific language is:

"In the case of any person appointed or promoted in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and rules providing at the time of his appointment or promotion for his acquiring a classified (competitive) civil service status by reason of such appointment or promotion and satisfactory service during a probationary period."

While this language would appear to except from the operation of the bill any classified employee who was appointed as a result of a competitive examination and who completed a probationary period, it does not appear to exclude thousands of classified employees who were given a civil-service status noncompetitively by statute and by Executive order. Many such employees who have spent a lifetime in the Federal service would find themselves thrown out of the Government service on June 30, 1943, unless they were nominated by the President for confirmation by the Senate.

Because of the exigencies of the war program, and the unprecedented need for personnel in the Government service, the Commission has since March 16, 1942, been operating under a special set of war-service regulations adopted pursuant to authority granted the Commission by Executive Order No. 9063 of February 16, 1942. Under the war-service regulations, many of the normal civil-service procedures have been modified or suspended, and persons appointed under the war-service regulations acquire neither a classified civil-service status nor a permanent appointment and will not be eligible to continue in the Government service beyond 6 months after the cessation of the war. As section 3 of S. 575 exempts only those appointments under the civil-service laws in which the appointeee acquires a classified (competitive) civil-service status, presumably all persons appointed under the war-service regulations whose positions fall within one of the categories set forth in section 2 would be required to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Under the amendments proposed in the minority report on S. 575 of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the following classes of offices would be subject to appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate:

(a) The heads, assistant heads, and head attorneys of all departments and agencies;

(b) Heads of bureaus, divisions, or other units representing the first subdivision of any department or agency;

(c) Heads and assistant heads of regional, area, or State offices of such departments and agencies;

(d) All persons whose duties include the determination of provisions to be included in rules, regulations, or orders of such departments or agencies; or

(e) All persons whose duties include participation in conference with persons from other departments or agencies or subdivisions of their own departments or agencies for the purpose of determining policies to be followed in administering any functions of the department or agency.

While these amendments would have some clarifying effect on the language of S. 575, uniformity would still not be achieved. Under subsection (b), for example, the head of the first subdivision of any department or agency would be required to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. In many Government agencies, organizational subdivisions are largely a matter of administrative discretion and are not governed by law. Consequently, the applicability or inapplicability of S. 575 to a particular position would be dependent upon the exercise of administrative discretion in establishing internal organization.

For example, if an agency were subdivided into six separate divisions, the chief of each of these six divisions would be subject to subsection (b) of the bill. If, however, the same agency were subdivided into two bureaus, and each of these two bureaus into three divisions, presumably only the heads of the two bureaus would be subject to subsection (b), while the chiefs of the six subdivisions presumably would not be.

Under subsection (c), the head of any office in any particular geographic area, however small, would have to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Serious question may, however, arise as to the extent of subsection (d). Probably the most reasonable construction of that subsection would be that only persons who have final authority to promulgate regulations are "persons whose duties include the determination of provisions to be included in rules." In most cases, this would be only the head of the agency involved, who would already be included in subsection (a).

The language of subsection (e), however, is still indefinite, and, given its broadest application, could be held to include any person who participates in any capacity in any conference which is held for the purpose of determining policy.

It can be seen from the foregoing analysis that the enactment of this bill as proposed in either the majority or minority reports would lead to thoroughgoing administrative confusion insofar as determining whether or not specific positions were subject to the provision of senatorial confirmation.

The Commission believes that it is absolutely impossible to amend the bill in such a way as to avoid such confusion.

Even if this were possible, however, the Commission would still be unalterably opposed to the enactment of legislation of this character.

If the legislation as proposed in either the majority or minority reports of the Judiciary Committee were enacted into law, it would seriously disrupt and impair the conduct of the war program. Its effect on the morale of employees of the executive branch who would be subject to its provisions is self-evident. Every one of these employees would be on notice to the effect that his continued employment beyond the date set by the proposed bill would depend upon action by the Senate. No private employer would think of deliberately disrupting the morale of his employees by making their continued employment dependent on something other than the need for an effectiveness of their services. It is unthinkable that the Federal Government, as an employer, would attempt to do something for which we would condemn private employers.

The effect of the legislation as proposed in either the majority or minority reports on the recruitment of persons for key positions in connection with the war program is likewise self-evident. As the President of the United States stated in his letter of February 19, 1943, addressed to the President of the Senate, "It would lay all of us open to the charge that we are playing politics with the war program."

The adoption of either the majority or minority reports by the Congress would immediately lay the Government open to the charge that spoilsmen have taken control of the filing of virtually every key position in every war agency. As soon as this fact became apparent to the American people, they would lose confidence in the manner in which their Government is being operated in time of war. American citizens should be chosen for service in their Government in a war period irrespective of political affiliations. This would not be the case, if the proposed legislation were enacted.

The selection of proper personnel is one of the most difficult processes in the whole realm of government. Over 3,500,000 placements have been made in the Federal Government since May 1940. Undoubtedly, in making this large number of placements, and particularly in view of the speed required, mistakes have been made. Clearly, heads of departments and agencies should move vigorously in the direction of correcting these mistakes.

We should not, however, in our efforts to correct these mistakes, make, as the President also stated in his letter of February 19, "the error of undermining the entire administrative structure that has been erected for the conduct of the war."

This proposal, irrespective of whether the majority or minority version is adopted, again using the words of the President, "is the very antithesis of the merit system and would sweep away years of civil service progress."

By direction of the Commission:

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

Mr. HATCH. I did not ask the Commission to give me any information one way or the other. I was occupied with other things, and I asked them to take the pending bill section by section and see just how it would affect the Government civil service. I should like to have Senators read the bill as it will appear in the RECORD tomorrow. I, of course, understand that the bill will be passed tonight. I wish it were possible for it to go over until Senators could carefully study these criticisms, which are not fault-finding but merely represent an effort to show what the bill will or will not do.

Mr. President, I wish now to refer to another important subject. One of my chief objections to this type of legislation has been that it would disrupt the civil service, whatever merit system we have in our Government. I am not any too proud of our merit system. I know that it has many defects, but I do not believe the defects will be cured by legislation of this kind.

It has been said that adoption of the committee bill would not affect the civil service, because the civil service is exempted by its provisions. Under the O'Mahoney proposal, which was voted upon a few moments ago, the civil service would be completely exempt, but not so under the committee bill. Allow me to read what is said about the effect on the civil service. I read from the letter from the Civil Service Commission, as follows:

Of these exceptions, the meaning of the language of the first is obscure. The specific language is:

"In the case of any person appointed or promoted in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and rules providing at the time of his appointment or promotion for his acquiring a classified (competitive) civil-service status by reason of such appointment or promotion and satisfactory service during a probationary period."

That is the language from the bill. I continue to read from the letter:

While this language would appear to except from the operation of the bill any classified employee who was appointed as a result of a competitive examination and who completed a probationary period, it does not appear to exclude thousands of classified employees who were given a civil-service status noncompetitively by statute and by Executive order. Many such employees who have spent a lifetime in the Federal service would find themselves thrown out of the Government

service on June 30, 1943, unless they were nominated by the President for confirmation by the Senate.

Mr. President, placing employees under the civil service by statute or Executive order is not a new practice. It has been done for many years. As pointed out in the letter from which I have read, perhaps thousands of civil-service employees who have occupied positions under civil service will find themselves thrown out of a job if the pending bill becomes law. I presume they would be reappointed. I do not know, but it merely shows one of the many vices of the bill. My thought has always been that this bill should have gone to the Committee on Civil Service. I thought it would be wise to move to send the pending measure back to the Committee on Civil Service. The Senator from New York has so recommended and I understood he would make a motion to do so. I have sent for him to see if he desires me to make such a motion.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. How retroactive would the bill be in the opinion of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. HATCH. I have stated how retroactive it would be. Perhaps thousands of persons who have been loyal and efficient employees in the civil service would find themselves confronted with no employment. I do not say that that will occur, and I do not believe the Civil Service Commission actually has said that it will occur, but it has said that the language is so confusing and so obscure that nobody knows what may happen.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that if an individual has been on the Government pay roll for the last 20 or 25 years and now receives more than $4,500 a year in salary, it will be necessary for the President of the United States to send his name to the Senate for confirmation should the pending bill be enacted into law?

Mr. HATCH. That is the effect of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Is that the holding of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. HATCH. Yes; it is. As I say, however, Mr. President, the Civil Service Commission does not exactly hold that any of these things would occur, but they have pointed out that we do not know they will not occur, and we do not know what will take place. The language of the bill is so indefinite and so obscure that no prediction can be made. Of course, as to employees receiving a salary of more than $4,500, we know what will be required with reference to them, but many civil-service employees receiving less than $4,500 may be affected. There are, as has been pointed out, perhaps $2,000-a-year clerks who would come under some of the provisions of the bill. That is the point I am making.

Mr. President, the Senator from New York is now in the Chamber. I do not care to detain the Senate longer. If the Senator from New York wishes to make a motion, I yield to him.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. Is the bill open to further amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been read the third time and is not open to further amendment, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to offer two amendments, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in reference to the parliamentary situation, I desire to point out that the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] was on his feet demanding recognition, attempting to the best of his ability to attract the attention of the Chair when the Chair announced the third reading of the bill. In view of the fact that the Senator from New York was demanding recognition, and desiring to speak upon the bill, I venture to suggest that there has been no third reading and that an amendment is still in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut asked for unanimous consent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; but that might be denied under the circumstances.

Mr. President, I make the point of order that by reason of the fact that the Senator from New York was on his feet demanding recognition to speak upon the bill, there has been no third reading, and the bill is still open to amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York state that he was making such an effort at that time?

Mr. MEAD. The Senator from New York was making the effort and so stated at that particular time. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will hold that the bill is still before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, Mr. President, I withdraw the request for unanimous consent. I now understand that the bill is open to further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment to section 2 on page 4, which would strike out clauses (d) and (e) and substitute therefor certain language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Connecticut that the amendment is, as he understands, an amendment to the committee amendment which the Chair is informed is not open to amendment, the committee amendment having been agreed to on the 7th day of June.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be stated.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I believe the ruling made by the Chair is correct, and I regret exceedingly to be obliged to make objection, but it seems to me now that the bill should go to a vote as soon as possible. Any corrections necessary to be made can be made in the other House. I hope the Senator from Connecticut will not persist in his request for unanimous consent.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in the light of the persuasive intimation of the Senator from Nevada that he would prefer that I not offer the amendment, I shall not persist. I think the amendments should be printed and incorporated in the RECORD, to the end that they may be available, and I ask unanimous consent that they so appear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, Mr. DANAHER'S proposed amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From section 2, page 4, strike out clauses "(d)" and "(e)" and insert the following:

"(d) All persons whose duties include responsibility for final action in connection with the preparation and promulgation of rules, regulations, or orders made or issued under authority of any act of Congress or any Executive order.

"(e) All persons whose duties include responsibility for determining the policies to be followed in administering the functions of any department, agency, or subdivision thereof as defined in paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of this section."

From section 3, page 5, strike out subsection (a) and insert the following:

"(a) In the case of (1) any person appointed or promoted in accordance with provisions of the civil-service laws and rules, as a result of which appointment or promotion and satisfactory service during a probationary period he acquired a classified (competitive) civil-service status; (2) any person who acquired a classified (competitive) civil-service status as in clause (1) and who, having left the service, has been or may be reinstated with restoration of such status; and (3) any person who, subsequent to appointment, acquired a classified status by action of the President or the Civil Service Commission, pursuant to act of Congress or Executive order; or."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I now move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Tennessee withhold his suggestion?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it is my purpose to offer an amendment, but since amendments are not allowable at this time, I should like to have unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a proposed amendment, so that it might be clear what was intended.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator from Michigan whether the amendment which he intended to propose was to the committee amendment or to the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was to the committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to remark that an amendment to the bill would be in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask that the proposed amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

At the end of each of subsections (a) to (e), inclusive, in section 2, strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and then strike out subsection (f) on page 5, in line 3, and insert in lieu thereof, applicable to all of these subsections, the following proviso: *"Provided,* That this section shall apply to any such person described in subsections (a) to (e), inclusive (except artisans and craftsmen) only if such person receives compensation amounting to $4,500 or more per annum for his services."

Mr. McKELLAR. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the amendment of the Senator from Michigan come within the ruling announced by the Chair in the case of the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does.

Mr. McKELLAR. I regret it exceedingly, but I shall have to make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] that the bill be referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. McNARY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McKELLAR. If we are to have the yeas and nays, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Murray
Andrews	Gerry	O'Daniel
Bailey	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Ball	Green	Overton
Bankhead	Guffey	Radcliffe
Barbour	Gurney	Reed
Bilbo	Hatch	Revercomb
Bone	Hawkes	Robertson
Bridges	Hayden	Russell
Buck	Hill	Scrugham
Burton	Holman	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capper	Langer	Taft
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McCarran	Tunnell
Chavez	McClellan	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Van Nuys
Connally	McNary	Wallgren
Danaher	Maloney	Wheeler
Davis	Maybank	Wherry
Eastland	Mead	White
Ellender	Moore	Willis
Ferguson	Murdock	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not been ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the pending question on the motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Civil Service?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the motion now pending. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], which I transfer to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who if present would vote "yea," and I permit my vote to stand.

Mr. REED (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], which I transfer to the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who would if present vote "nay," and I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained in committee meetings.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], are detained on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—22

Aiken	Hill	Radcliffe
Ball	La Follette	Shipstead
Bankhead	Langer	Taft
Bridges	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	McNary	Vandenberg
Capper	Mead	Wilson
Davis	Murray	
Hatch	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—47

Andrews	Eastland	Johnson, Colo.
Bailey	Ellender	McCarran
Barbour	Ferguson	McClellan
Bilbo	George	McKellar
Buck	Gerry	Maloney
Bushfield	Gillette	Maybank
Byrd	Green	Moore
Caraway	Guffey	Murdock
Chandler	Gurney	O'Daniel
Chavez	Hawkes	Overton
Clark, Mo.	Hayden	Reed
Danaher	Holman	Revercomb
Robertson	Stewart	Wheeler
Russell	Tunnell	Wherry
Scrugham	Van Nuys	White
Smith	Wallgren	

NOT VOTING—27

Austin	Glass	Thomas, Okla.
Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Utah
Bone	Kilgore	Tobey
Brewster	Lodge	Truman
Brooks	McFarland	Tydings
Butler	Millikin	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Nye	Walsh
Connally	Pepper	Wiley
Downey	Reynolds	Willis

So Mr. MEAD's motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. McKELLAR and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who, if present, would vote "nay." I vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. I am informed that if present the Senator from North Dakota would vote on this question as I expect to vote. If present the Senator from New York would vote "nay." I vote "yea."

Mr. TUNNELL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND]. If present he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business. I am advised

that if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

Mr. MCNARY. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who would vote "nay," has a pair on this question with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who would vote "nay," has a pair on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], wh would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—42

Andrews	George	O'Daniel
Bailey	Gerry	Overton
Bilbo	Gillette	Reed
Bone	Green	Revercomb
Bushfield	Guffey	Robertson
Byrd	Hayden	Russell
Caraway	Holman	Scrugham
Chandler	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Chavez	McCarran	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Van Nuys
Connally	McKellar	Wallgren
Danaher	Maloney	Wheeler
Eastland	Maybank	Wherry
Ellender	Murdock	White

NAYS—29

Aiken	Gurney	Murray
Ball	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	La Follette	Taft
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Lucas	Vandenberg
Capper	McNary	Willis
Davis	Mead	Wilson
Ferguson	Moore	

NOT VOTING—25

Austin	Kilgore	Tobey
Barkley	Lodge	Truman
Brewster	McFarland	Tunnell
Brooks	Millikin	Tydings
Butler	Nye	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Pepper	Walsh
Downey	Reynolds	Wiley
Glass	Thomas, Okla.	
Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Utah	

So the bill S. 575 was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide that certain civilian officers in the executive branch of the Government who are appointed without regard to the civil-service laws shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

INVESTIGATION RELATING TO SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC POWER—AMENDMENT

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, on Saturday, Senate Resolution 155 was agreed to. Previously it had been referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, from which it was favorably reported to the Senate, and thereafter it was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. On Saturday, the resolution was favorably reported to the Senate by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and was agreed to.

The matter was called to my attention hastily, and was considered by the committee only casually. I have noticed an oversight in the resolution. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the resolution was agreed to be reconsidered for the purpose of permitting consideration of an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the vote by which the resolution was agreed to is reconsidered.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I now propose the following amendment:

On page 1, lines 1 and 2, after the word "That", strike out the words "a special committee of five Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate", and insert in lieu thereof "the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof."

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I have just returned from the House of Representatives, where I had gone in connection with a certain matter. The resolution was agreed to by the Senate; was it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was agreed to on Saturday last.

Mr. MCNARY. Has the vote by which it was agreed to been reconsidered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been.

Mr. MCNARY. The resolution now goes to the calendar; does it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Request has been made for unanimous consent to have an amendment to the resolution considered.

Mr. NcNARY. But the resolution remains on the calendar; does it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been on the calendar.

Mr. MCNARY. I have no objection to having the resolution go back on the calendar for reconsideration. An amendment might be pending; and when the calendar is called, it will come up for consideration. But I do not want to consent to having the amendment agreed to this afternoon, without further consideration.

Mr. WHEELER. That will be perfectly agreeable.

Mr. MCNARY. I assumed it would be, of course. In other words, the resolution will go back on the Senate Calendar; and the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be pending, to be considered at the time when the resolution is reached during the call of the calendar. That is the status I want fixed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been made to the present consideration of the amendment, the amendment will be printed and will be pending, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I may advise the Senate that the plan is to take up the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill the first thing tomorrow. If consideration of the measure is completed in time, as we think it will be, request will be made for consideration of unobjected-to bills on the calendar.

PREVENTION OF DESECRATION OF THE FLAG

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, today is Flag Day. The Senate on more than one occasion has passed measures providing punishment for misuse and for desecration of the flag of the United States but the Senate bills have failed in the other House. The national flag is the national emblem. Forty-six States of the Nation have passed legislation on the subject of the use of the flag and punishment for its abuse.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 369, Calendar No. 303.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 369) to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I hesitate to object; but tomorrow the calendar is to be called. On two other occasions today I have had to make similar objection in view of the fact that tomorrow—only 1 day from today—we are to have the call of the calendar.

Will not the Senator agree to postpone until tomorrow his request for present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I have no objection at all to the course suggested by the Senator. I made the request particularly in view of the fact that today is Flag Day. However, I have no objection to having the course suggested by the Senator followed.

Mr. MCNARY. I thank the Senator. I should have no objection to having the bill presently considered except for the fact that tomorrow the calendar is to be called.

BASEBALL'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, baseball, the great national sport of our country, furnished additional proof last week, if any were needed, that it can and does play an important role in our war effort.

At a luncheon at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, at New York City, on June 8, 1943, in what promises to be only the preliminary in the greatest incentive yet devised for the sale of War bonds, 37 players representing the Dodgers, the Yankees, and the Giants were "auctioned" off to patriotic organizations, individ-

uals, and business concerns for the staggering sum of $123,850,000. The amounts pledged by unsuccessful bidders brought the total of war purchases to nearly $184,000,000 in bonds.

The luncheon was sponsored by the New York Chapter of the Baseball Writers Association, and the War bond rally was jointly conducted with the Treasury Department. This novel idea, credited to Jack Callan, of Caldwell, N. J., who is connected with the war stamp sales department, pledges the "purchaser" of the player to purchase War bonds in the amount of the bid, plus additional amounts during the remainder of the season, based on the performance of the player in each game. Each "purchaser" of a player is to sponsor a club named after his player, to encourage bond purchases by the "fans" who then can "vote" for their favorite players by purchasing War bonds at booths to be set up in the ball parks. It is expected that this patriotic plan will spread to all the major league cities and will create a War bond baseball league that will rival in interest the pennant races.

In commenting on the results of the first baseball bond rally in New York, Dan Daniel, the well-known sports writer, stated that baseball men predict that probably 200 baseball stars will be striving to pile up bond sales which, by October, might show a total of $500,000,000, and that the plan would prove to be the strongest incentive to bond purchasers, outside our military successes. He also made this significant observation:

> They saw the War bond baseball league sweeping the country and furnishing still another argument, the strongest one of all, in favor of continuing the game in the major leagues right through the war.

Frank Graham, noted sports commentator, writing in the New York Sun, had this to say about the idea:

> This luncheon marked the beginning, only the beginning, at $100,000,000, mind you, of a movement that may be the most successful effort on the part of any sport to aid the prosecution of the war.
>
> It is also hoped that the idea will spread to other major league cities. If it does—and there is every reason why it should—baseball, through its patriotic friends, should launch a few battle wagons, put many a plane in the sky, and send many a jeep rolling across the battle grounds of Europe and the Orient. Out of the ballroom of the Waldorf already has come a mightly blast right in "der fuehrer's face."

Milt Miller, sports writer for PM, had this to say about the drive:

> Starting today, all baseballdom, including the fans, executives, employees, and the sports writers, is on its way to show how hard it can slug the Axis.

Baseball fans showed a tremendous interest in the annual all-star game, when the players were selected by popular vote, and there are many who believe that the privilege of selecting the players for the all-star game should be returned to the fans instead of having the present system of selections by the rival managers. I believe that we can evolve out of this War bond baseball league a truly great all-star game, the players to be selected on the basis of the War bond purchases made in their names.

From the outbreak of the war organized baseball has wholeheartedly participated in the war effort. In 1942 it turned over a sum in excess of $1,300,000 as contributions to Army and Navy relief societies and the ball-and-bat fund. In addition, over 500 baseball movies are in circulation for the entertainment of our men and women in the service in all parts of the world.

Treasury officials and baseball management, writers, players, and fans are to be commended for this fine patriotic undertaking.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a judicial nomination, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nomination this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 15, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate June 14 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

James B. M. McNally, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, vice Mathias F. Correa, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 14, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we praise Thee that Thou art united to us by the power of soul life, threading our thoughts into Thy thoughts, thus answering the call to victorious destiny.

Today inspire us with a nobler citizenship, a higher public spirit, and with a more universal justice. We thank Thee for the voices of the past which set the standards of human values and established the processes of free government; grant that they may be infinitely more to our country than idle tales. Though treachery beset our forefathers and criticism buffeted them, yet the heroism of their intrepid souls challenges the admiration of liberty-loving men around the world. O God of the nations, be with America. No outer victory is worth an inner defeat and we can ill afford to win a war by losing our soul. We prayerfully beseech Thee that the symbolism of our flag may live in the very depths of all hearts: human freedom, equal rights, and good will to all men. O grant us a common faith and a common brotherhood in the name of man.

"Your flag and our flag,
And how it floats today
O'er your land and my land,
And half the world away.

"Blood-red and rose-red,
Its stripes forever gleam;
Snow white and soul white
Our good forefathers' dream.

"The one flag, the great flag,
The flag for me and you,
Glorified, all else beside,
The red and white and blue."

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 11, 1943, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1403. An act to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla.; and

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to continue the temporary increases in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2481. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. MCNARY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 796) entitled "An act relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Navy.
2. Federal Works Agency.
3. The National Archives.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had on June 11, 1943, examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2753. An act making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted to him on June 11, 1943, he did on that date sign the enrolled bill of the House (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1943, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER also announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 163. An act to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship construction reserve funds, and for other purposes; and

S. 796. An act relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants, mines, and facilities in the prosecution of the war, and preventing strikes, lock-outs, and stoppages of production, and for other purposes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the completion of the other special orders today I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix my remarks on fishery problems in the world, prepared by me and read for me at the convention in Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I was invited to the White House in the interest of H. R. 2909. While there roll call No. 97 was voted. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two newspaper articles concerning our Governor, the Honorable Earl Warren.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the city council of Los Angeles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein an article which appeared in the Sunday Star by Owen L. Scott, entitled "The Power of Harry Hopkins."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include some tables and other information on feeding cattle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GASOLINE RESTRICTIONS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SUBSIDY ON POTATOES

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and insert therein a letter published in the Bennington Journal of Bennington, Okla., by W. H. Frank.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEWART addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD with respect to farm labor and include a copy of an article appearing in the New Orleans Times-Picayune and also a telegram received on the subject from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FLANNAGAN was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an excerpt from the Pampa Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FLAG DAY

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a short statement on taxation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BLACKNEY was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement of the Treasury Department concerning the War bond purchases record of the Territory of Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Butchers Advocate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

A TOAST TO THE FLAG

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there any objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and also to extend my remarks and include therein two editorial clippings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MAJ. GEN. NORMAN T. KIRK

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by Gresham Chamber of Commerce of my district on the Japanese situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes,

with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TARVER, CANNON of Missouri, SHEPPARD, WENE, LAMBERTSON, DIRKSEN, and PLUMLEY.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944.

Mr. HARE, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 540), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ENGEL reserved all points of order against the bill.

ADVANCES OF APPROPRIATIONS TO STATES FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL GRANTS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 136) making appropriations for advances to States for certain Federal grants for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for making for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944 (1) grants to States for old-age assistance, (2) grants to States for aid to dependent children, (3) grants to States for aid to the blind, and (4) grants to States for unemployment compensation administration: *Provided*, That the obligations incurred and expenditures made for each of such purposes under the authority of this joint resolution shall be charged to the appropriation therefor in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object will the gentleman explain the purpose of the resolution?

Mr. HARE. The purpose is to provide a continuation of existing appropriation grants to the States under the Social Security Act which are made available July 1. I understand these allocations are always made quarterly and are made in advance, and it will be necessary for the Social Security Board to have this authority prior to July 1 in order to enable them to make the allocations.

Mr. ENGEL. In order that old-age assistance may be paid?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COAST GUARD AUXILIARY AND RESERVE ACT, 1941

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1616) to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

Section 402, strike out "That there shall not be more than 1 officer in the grade of lieutenant commander; nor more than 18 officers in the grade of lieutenant; and that the number of officers in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) shall not exceed 35 percent of the total number of commissioned officers: *And provided further.*"

Section 404, strike out "and shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the continental United States only."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 5 to 10, inclusive, and page 2, lines 1, 2, and 3, inclusive, and insert the following:

"Section 402, change to read as follows:

"'SEC. 402. Members of the Women's Reserve may be commissioned or enlisted in such appropriate ranks and ratings, not above the rank of captain, corresponding to those of the Regular Coast Guard, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, or by the Secretary of the Navy while the Coast Guard is operating as a part of the Navy: *Provided*, That the military authority of officers commissioned under the provisions of this title may be exercised over women of the Reserve only and is limited to the administration of the Women's Reserve.'

"Section 404, strike out 'and shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the continental United States only.'

"Strike out sections 406 and 408.

"Section 407, change 'SEC. 407' to read 'SEC. 406.'"

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute, adopted by the committee, to take the place of the amendment formerly reported to bring the bill in line with the bill for the WAVES which was passed the other day. The SPAR bill was on the Consent Calendar and was withheld in order to make it conform to the bill as passed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The purpose of this amendment is to make the bill conform with the law with reference to the other services?

Mr. BLAND. Yes; it will conform exactly with the other services, and the only change is that purpose.

Mr. WELCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. The amendment is unanimously reported by the committee.

The Clerk read the substitute, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND to H. R. 1616: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"That the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

"'Strike out section 402 and substitute therefor the following:

"'"SEC. 402. Members of the Women's Reserve may be commissioned or enlisted in such appropriate ranks and ratings, not above the rank of captain, corresponding to those of the Regular Coast Guard, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, or by the Secretary of the Navy while the Coast Guard is operating as a part of the Navy: *Provided*, That there shall not be more than one officer in the grade of captain: *Provided further*, That military authority of officers commissioned under the provisions of this title may be exercised over women of the Reserve only and is limited to the administration of the Women's Reserve."

"'Strike out section 404 and substitute therefor the following:

"'"SEC. 404. Members of the Women's Reserve shall not be assigned to duty on board vessels of the Navy or Coast Guard, or in combat aircraft at any time. No such member who is qualified to fill an available billet at Coast Guard Headquarters proper at Washington shall be assigned to duty outside the continental United States."

"'Strike out section 406, and renumber sections 407 and 408 as 406 and 407 respectively.

"'"SEC. 2. Each member of the Women's Reserve who was enlisted or commissioned therein on or prior to the date this act is approved shall be restricted to the performance of shore duty within the continental United States, unless and until she shall voluntarily sign a general waiver of said restriction."'"

The substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order to allow the gentleman from New York to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. RANKIN. I will withhold it until we see what the request is.

MOSES TENNENBAUM

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2456) for the relief of Moses Tennenbaum.

This bill, as the title indicates, would permit the entrance into this country of the father of two boys in our armed forces who on a technicality cannot secure a visa to join his boys in the United States. The father is in Cuba. The committee unanimously, without reservation, endorsed this bill. The Department has approved the bill. It is a private bill and has nothing to do with the other bills on the calendar. The boys in uniform came before the committee and said they had been separated from their father and

mother for almost 5 years on a technicality. The Department suggested this bill and the committee endorsed it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think this bill should go to the Committee on Rules. I am not in favor of breaking down our immigration laws by piecemeal. I am not in favor of breaking them down by collateral attack; I am not in favor of using the Chinese as a smoke screen to break them down; I am not in favor of using the war as an excuse to destroy the immigration laws that it took us so long to build up, and that the American people expect us to sustain and not destroy.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I object to this request. Let the bill go to the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on June 12, 1943, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1258. An act to name certain locks in the St. Mary's River at the falls, Michigan; and

H. R. 2753. An act making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes.

OUR FLAG DAY—JUNE 14

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, when the early immigrants to our shores caught their first glimpse of Old Glory fluttering in the clean free wind of the New World, their eyes filled with tears of gratitude to Almighty God, and their hearts were lifted up with fresh hope and faith and courage and resolution.

Even as they fled the ancient oppressions and quarrels of the Old World to defend and enjoy the privileges and opportunities of the New World, so today once more their sons and their sons' sons—yes, and their daughters, too—are fighting and dying all over the world under the same glorious flag to preserve for us and our children and the countless generations as yet unborn those same privileges and opportunities.

What did our gallant marines, storming the blood-stained beach head at Guadalcanal, think and feel as they followed that banner into battle; followed Old Glory through the perilous murk and mist of the tropic dawn; followed through shot and shell and ambush and death—until that flag floated in triumph over the Solomons? It was no mere piece of colored cloth to them; not just a sheet of striped silk waving gracefully before their grim eyes. Ah, no, it was far, far more than that. It was the visible symbol and memory and meaning of the American creed and American courage.

Listen with hushed and thankful hearts as Old Glory whispers the inspiring message of Bunker Hill. Listen as it shouts the deathless heroism of Gettysburg. Listen as it sings the crimson bravery of Belleau Wood. Listen as it storms the stubborn cliffs of Tunisia or the fog-shrouded ridges of Attu. Listen as it keeps the lonely watch with the sailor at sea or the sentry at his post.

To all of them and all of us it speaks with one voice as the banner of one people, united in war and in peace; the grandest banner that ever hallowed the winds of the world. It speaks, declaring in effect: "I am Old Glory. For more than eightscore years I have been the banner of hope and freedom for generation after generation of Americans. Born amid the first flames of America's fight for freedom, I am the symbol of a country that has grown from a little group of Thirteen Colonies to a united Nation of 48 sovereign States. Planted firmly on the high pinnacle of American faith, my gently fluttering folds have proved an inspiration to untold millions. Men have followed me into battle with unwavering courage. They have looked upon me as a symbol of national unity. They have prayed that they and their fellow citizens might continue to enjoy the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness which have been granted to every American as the heritage of freemen. So long as men love liberty more than life itself; so long as they treasure the priceless privileges bought with the blood of our forefathers; so long as the principles of truth, justice, and charity for all remain deeply rooted in human hearts, I shall continue to be the enduring banner of the United States of America. I am Old Glory."

Indeed, we can with profit take a lesson from the flag pledge of the Boy Scouts of America:

My flag! Whether floating proudly in the sunshine before the Capitol at Washington, or fluttering from the stern of a battleship ready to protect our liberties, or borne in loyal peace in school, church, or civic occasion, my flag. The flag of my America, home of liberty, soil of opportunity, tower of power rightly used. My America. * * * The blue of my flag represents justice, like the eternal blue of the star-filled heavens; its white is for purity, cleanness of purpose, of word or deed; its red is the red lifeblood of brave men and women, ready to die or to live worthily for their country.

Let us this day, and all our days, remember that if we look to our flag for the guarantee of our cherished four freedoms, our flag looks to us for the full discharge on our part of the corresponding four responsibilities. From every citizen who finds in its glorious folds the benefits and blessings of the American way of life—our flag, I insist, has a right to expect the fulfillment, without evasion or half-hearted compromise, of the four responsibilities, namely: Service, sacrifice, tolerance, and patriotism.

For, in the eloquent words of President Woodrow Wilson, uttered during the darkest days of the last war:

This flag, which we honor and under which we serve, is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought and purpose as a Nation. It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The choices are ours. It floats in majestic silence above the hosts that execute these choices, whether in peace or in war. And yet, though silent, it speaks to us—speaks to us of the past, of the men and women who went before us, and of their records they wrote upon it.

We celebrate the day of its birth; and from its birth until now it has witnessed a great history, has floated on high the symbol of great events, or a great plan of life worked out by a great people. * * *

Woe to the man, or group of men, that seek to stand in our way in this day of high resolution, when every principle we hold dearest is to be vindicated and made secure for the salvation of the Nation. We are ready to plead at the bar of history, and our flag shall wear a new luster. Once more we shall make good with our lives and fortunes the great faith to which we were born, and a new glory shall shine in the face of our people.

In that same spirit and with that same fortitude and noble resolve, we, here in the Capital of the Nation, as well as in the humblest American home, shall hold Old Glory high in our hearts, shall follow that beloved flag to new victories and triumphs, and shall, in the end, under God, enjoy a just and lasting peace.

PERMITTING NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS NOT CITIZENS WHOSE SONS OR DAUGHTERS SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 226.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1941) permitting the naturalization of certain persons not citizens whose sons or daughters have served with the land or naval forces of the United States.

That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order there is not a quorum present. I think the Members ought to be present to hear this.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move the call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 98]

Baldwin, Md.	Culkin	Gillie
Baldwin, N. Y.	Delaney	Goodwin
Barden	Dies	Gordon
Barry	Dingell	Gore
Bates, Ky.	Disney	Gossett
Bell	Domengeaux	Green
Bender	Douglas	Hall, Edwin, Arthur
Bonner	Drewry	Hall, Leonard W.
Bradley, Mich.	Eaton	Harris, Va.
Bradley, Pa.	Eberharter	Hart
Buckley	Elmer	Hébert
Burchill, N. Y.	Elston, Ohio	Heffernan
Butler	Fay	Hendricks
Byrne	Feighan	Holifield
Cannon, Fla.	Fenton	Horan
Capozzoli	Forand	Jarman
Carson, Ohio	Ford	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Celler	Furlong	Kearney
Chapman	Gallagher	Kelley
Chenoweth	Gamble	Kennedy
Cochran	Gavagan	Keogh
Cole, N. Y.	Gavin	Kilburn
Costello	Gerlach	
Courtney	Gibson	
Crawford	Gifford	

King	Norton	Slaughter
Kleberg	O'Brien, N. Y.	Smith, Va.
Knutson	O'Hara	Smith, W. Va.
Lane	O'Leary	Steagall
LeCompte	O'Toole	Sundstrom
LeFevre	Pace	Taylor
Luce	Pfeifer	Thomas, N. J.
Lynch	Phillips	Tolan
McCord	Pracht	Treadway
McGehee	Price	Troutman
McGranery	Reed, Ill.	Van Zandt
McWilliams	Rivers	Vinson, Ga.
Marcantonio	Rizley	Voorhis, Calif.
Mason	Robertson	Vorys, Ohio
May	Robinson, Utah	Wadsworth
Merritt	Rogers, Calif.	Weaver
Merrow	Russell	Welchel, Ohio
Miller, Mo.	Sabath	Wene
Monroney	Scanlon	West
Mundt	Scott	White
Murphy	Sheridan	Wolfenden, Pa.
Myers	Short	
Newsome	Simpson, Ill.	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and ninety-two Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

PERMITTING NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS NOT CITIZENS WHOSE SONS OR DAUGHTERS SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the resolution just called up is to make in order consideration of H. R. 1941, which is an immigration bill. I do not know whether the House wants this bill or not, but because its purpose is to do something for a certain class of our soldiers, your Committee on Rules felt constrained to report it for House consideration. Should the House see fit to take it up it will probably want to amend the bill in one slight respect. I think it would have to be amended in order for me to give it my support.

On reading the report one gets the impression that the purpose of the bill is to aid parents of soldiers who are aliens but now residing in the United States in their effort to become citizens of the country. I think the bill is broader that than. It is my opinion that the language of the bill would waive the provision of law with respect to the filing of declaration of intent by alien parents irrespective as to where they might be living; in other words, the language is broad enough to cover not only parents now living within the United States, but parents residing in any part of the world.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. That means people who are in the United States unlawfully, does it not? People who came here in violation of our immigration laws, does it not?

Mr. COX. The author of the bill and the committee sponsoring it insist that it waives nothing, except the filing of the declaration of intention to become citizens.

Let me read the language of the bill and it will make it easier for the gentleman to make his question more pertinent than it might otherwise be:

SEC. 801. Any person not a citizen of the United States whose son or daughter is a citizen of the United States and has served or is serving honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions, may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of the naturalization laws, except that no declaration of intention shall be required, and the provisions of section 326 of this act shall not apply to a petition filed under this section: *Provided*, That the petition is filed not later than 1 year after the termination of the present war.

Now, let me quote from a letter written by the Attorney General embodied in the committee report in which he sets forth in a single paragraph that part of the section of the statute which is waived.

This paragraph reads as follows:

Under existing law, a person seeking United States citizenship must file a declaration of intention, to become a citizen of the United States at least 2 years prior to the filing of his petition for naturalization (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 731). An alien who is a native of a country with which the United States is at war may not become a naturalized citizen of the United States unless his declaration of intention was filed more than 2 years prior to the beginning of the war or unless the President after investigation and report by the Department of Justice establishing the loyalty of such alien to the United States, excepts such alien from the classification of "alien enemy" (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 726).

In that paragraph there is set forth the provisions of the law that are waived by the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. In other words, in violation of the immigration law that it took the American Legion, and the American people, years and years to get passed, you virtually reach out and destroy it as to multitudes of people who have never seen this country, or who are in this country in violation of those laws.

Mr. COX. It does not destroy it. You are only amending the law insofar as the filing of declaration of intent is concerned.

Mr. RANKIN. Having seen the Attorney General's ridiculous fiasco in Mississippi I must say that I am not in position to accept his opinions with very much grace. I may say further to the gentleman from Georgia that I helped to put these immigration laws on the statute books, and, so far as I am concerned, I am in favor of closing the gates of immigration until this war is over and until our boys who are in this war get back home and have a right to vote as to who shall come to the Congress and pass on propositions of this kind.

Mr. COX. This much, at least, must be said for the Attorney General: He did raise objections to the bill as it was originally drawn and made certain recommendations which the committee saw fit to adopt. If the rule is adopted I think this bill ought to be amended so as to apply only to parents of soldiers who are now residing within the United States and should not be broad enough to cover those living in all other parts of the world.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Under the provisions of this bill a person whose parents were aliens may have been drafted into the Army as soon as the draft law went into effect and for some reason or other, either on account of inaptitude or expiration of his term or for something else he may have been discharged before the United States entered the war on December 7, 1941; still his parents who may have been here for 30 years and never even filed a declaration of intention to become citizens, who were never interested in becoming citizens, would be allowed to come in as citizens now without even filing a declaration of intention.

Mr. COX. They would be relieved of the requirement of filing a declaration.

Mr. MOTT. Can the gentleman tell us just why these people want to be exempted from filing a declaration? What is the reason given for that?

Mr. COX. I do not know that it applies specifically to parents who have been long-time residents of the United States. The purpose of the bill may be to let in parents who are residents of other countries, who are anxious to become citizens, I do not know.

Mr. MOTT. It may let hordes of aliens flock into this country.

Mr. COX. It will probably let in a goodly number.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I may say that the statement the gentleman just made was absolutely foreign to the committee hope in reporting the bill. I think the gentleman from Georgia knows that I would be the last one in the world to agree to let in a horde of people.

Mr. COX. Of course, I know that. I know the gentleman's attitude on this question.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. If the bill is not clear enough to cover only people who are actually residing here and have been residing here a good long time, then I want to do just that.

Mr. COX. But the gentleman will find it is not so restricted, and it has been publicized as being broad enough to take in the parents of soldiers now in the service no matter where the parents may reside. I think the gentleman as a member of the committee might well sponsor such an amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. I notice also that this bill changes the date of the war by 2 years. The Attorney General says that "for the purposes of this section the present war shall be deemed to have commenced on December 7, 1941," while this bill says that "for the purposes of this section the present war shall be deemed to have commenced on December 1, 1939." So they have moved the beginning of the war back 2 years. It looks to me as if every subterfuge on earth is being resorted to in order to wreck our immigration laws.

Mr. COX. That is a provision of the bill that ought to be stricken out.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have reference to the same question that was asked here about the person who has attempted during a period of 20 or 30 years to gain

citizenship but has been refused by the court for no other reason than he failed to answer the questions by the court.

Under this bill they would be blanketed in.

Mr. COX. They would have to comply with the law, with the exception of filing a declaration of intent.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Pursuing that proposition further, there is another bill in this series which will waive those educational requirements. If this bill is passed, there is another bill to be considered this afternoon that waives those educational requirements.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman from Alabama made the point I wanted to make, that there is another bill pending here which would grant citizenship to people 50 years of age or over regardless of educational qualifications. If the two bills going together are adopted, then the mothers and fathers, 50 years of age or over, of anybody serving in the Army or the Navy would be eligible to citizenship. It likewise sets aside existing law under which the President could order an investigation as to the loyalty of any aliens through the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This bill would set all that aside.

Mr. COX. That is true.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. May I say to the gentleman from Georgia that the intention of this measure is only to give the parents who are lawfully residents of the United States and who are not citizens the right to what is known as the waiving of the filing of the declaration of intention. We do have a group of people here who are admitted to citizenship without the necessity of filing a declaration of intention. The reason for this is simply that it is assumed that if mothers and fathers have sons in the armed forces who are serving honorably, they should have the right to have the filing of the declaration of intention waived, but they would come into court just the same as anybody else and would have a hearing before the court the same as anyone else. It is simply that they would not have to file a declaration of intention, that is all.

Mr. COX. The gentleman makes a very excellent statement, and I thank him. I am sure his statement reflects the attitude and is the expression of the purpose of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. I would suggest, however, that the gentleman make sure that the bill is limited to the purpose of the committee as stated by him, that he might offer an amendment to the bill when we reach that point making that certain.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am sure the committee will offer such an amendment; in fact, I shall offer amendments myself to take care of the two points in question, one to provide that the parents shall have been lawfully admitted and be residing in the United States, and the second to provide, if there is a question about it, that we shall move the date to December 7, 1941.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman not think it might be well to do that anyway?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I have two points here. In the first place, in reply to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], if these people are legally here, there is no reason why they should not file a declaration of intention. Further, my attention has been called to the fact that moving this date back 2 years would give 2 years more to put them on the old-age pension rolls, for the people of the various States to keep them up.

Mr. COX. Will not the gentleman agree that if the bill is so amended as to make certain that it is limited to the purposes stated by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], which he said was the intention of the committee, that this House might under the circumstances well afford to accept it?

Mr. RANKIN. As far as I am concerned, I must confess to the gentleman from Georgia that "all the perfumes of Arabia" could not sweeten this bill for me.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will this bill apply to the parents of Japanese?

Mr. COX. The bill as written applies to all parents whose sons or daughters are soldiers of the United States in the present war.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There are Japanese soldiers in our Army in the present war.

Mr. COX. I am not prepared to say that the bill amends our exclusion laws.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Would this apply to their parents?

Mr. COX. It would, if their sons and daughters are in the armed forces of the United States, and if the bill amends by implication our exclusion laws, which I doubt.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Let the House understand that clearly. Does the gentleman mean to say that if this bill is passed that parents of Japanese soldiers in the armed forces of the United States may be admitted to citizenship?

Mr. COX. As written the bill relieves all parents of the necessity of filing a declaration of intent.

Mr. MOTT. I want to know just how far this goes.

Mr. LESINSKI. Under the Exclusion Act, no Japanese or person of any other Oriental race can become a citizen.

Mr. COX. The gentleman probably is right in that.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from Georgia forgets that we have another bill in the committee to suspend the exclusion laws.

Mr. COX. Yes, I understand that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I largely agree with my colleague from Georgia that the bill in principle is correct but it needs considerable amendment. The bill was introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY], on this side. It is his bill, he sponsored it. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and also by the Committee on Rules. It is before the House for the House to work its will upon, and I have absolute faith in the judgment and confidence in the abiity of the House of Representatives to legislate according to its own wishes.

I agree thoroughly with the gentleman from Georgia that there are two or three provisions in this bill that must be amended or the bill should be defeated, but I am for the bill in principle because I do not believe we can go too far in trying to do something for those soldiers and sailors who are serving in the armed forces of the United States in time of war. I have had this view ever since the last war, and I do not believe in lip service, saying nothing is too good for the soldiers, and then doing nothing about it, particularly when they come back home and we do nothing to get their jobs back for them. We have a chance today to do something for their immediate families, not for their aunts and uncles and second cousins and in-laws, and so on, but for the mothers and fathers of the boys and girls, the men and women in our armed forces fighting in defense of America.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. To ask the gentleman if he believes that Japanese ought to serve in the United States Army at all?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman asks my belief. I do not know that I have given any thought to the matter. Certainly the General Staff does, and in view of the fact that the General Staff has decided they should, I hold no views to the contrary. I had nothing to do with it originally, and I do not know enough about it to criticize their action.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman knows also that the General Staff and particularly General DeWitt is not in favor of allowing any Japanese under any circumstances to come back to the Pacific coast, and he knows that the War Reallocation Authority was so strong it was able to override him and that they are coming back.

Mr. FISH. There is nothing in this bill that refers directly or indirectly to what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. MOTT. Oh, yes. This only leads up to another bill.

Mr. FISH. The exclusion laws do not permit the naturalization of Chinese and Japanese, and we are not amending those laws.

Mr. MOTT. That is exactly what I want to ask the gentleman.

Mr. FISH. Then go ahead and ask it.

Mr. MOTT. Because I have great respect for the gentleman's opinion on matters of this kind.

Mr. FISH. I am not an expert on such issues but I shall answer the gentleman's question if I can.

Mr. MOTT. Whether or not this does not modify the Japanese Exclusion Act, I call the gentleman's attention to the specific language of the bill.

Mr. FISH. Let me answer the gentleman in this way. Before I took the floor I went around to members of the committee and they informed me, the members who had this bill under consideration and acted favorably upon it, that it does not change the Exclusion Act. That is all I can say to the gentleman. If the gentleman thinks otherwise he will have to take it up in general debate, and not on the time of the Rules Committee, because I say again to the gentleman that I have to rely upon the committee to that extent and I cannot give any other answer than what they told me, and they say that it does not.

Mr. MOTT. Then I want to ask the gentleman what difference the individual opinion of the members of the committee makes in view of the plain language of the first section of this bill, which says:

> Any person not a citizen of the United States whose son or daughter is a citizen of the United States and has served or is serving honorably in the military or naval services—

I ask the gentleman whether or not that would not permit the citizenship of alien parents of Japanese citizens of the United States serving in our armed forces?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the chairman of the committee to answer the question directly.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In the first place, we are assuming something that does not exist. Under the present exclusion law no Japanese or Chinese or any other oriental can come here for permanent residence. Therefore that question answers itself.

Mr. MOTT. I do not agree with the gentleman. The Exclusion Act was passed long ago, and this is specific legislation on a specific subject, and it repeals that portion so far as the parents of Japanese soldiers are concerned.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It does not. It has nothing to do with the question at all. It only deals with persons legally in the country under our immigration laws, complying with all of the requirements, and those are the persons affected by this bill, by just waiving the 2 years of the declaration of intention.

Mr. MOTT. The language of the bill does not say so.

Mr. FISH. If the gentleman has any doubt about it all he has to do is to offer an amendment, and I am quite sure the House will support him.

Mr. MOTT. Certainly that amendment should be made, but I am afraid that there are more loopholes in this bill that the House will never catch up with.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Does not the gentleman know that this is just the first of a series of bills which, if adopted, and the others are adopted, will throw the whole question open—this Pandora's box? For instance, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is actually championing two bills which would repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, and he has been ably seconded by some Members on the floor here, and if we pass this bill and we pass the Chinese Exclusion Act, then it will apply.

Mr. FISH. All that the gentleman has to do is to offer an amendment, and I do not see how the chairman of the committee after what he has said could possibly object to it himself.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I want to suggest in this connection the obvious danger of attempting to change the status quo during this war. China is fighting on the same side with us and does anyone think that this character of discussion in connection with this particular bill is going to help our relationship with China or anyone else? It seems to me that as intelligent statesmen, in a situation of this sort, we ought to hold things in status quo until we have won this war.

Every time a bill of this sort comes to the floor of this House something is said that is bound to irritate the people whom we are seeking to hold in unity with ourselves until we get through. The mothers and fathers of these boys are not being deprived of anything. They have an opportunity, if they are fit to be citizens. Citizenship in this country is not something one can inherit. It is not something you get by having a boy or girl in the armed forces. It is an individual opportunity to be a part in a great system of free government.

Mr. FISH. I will say to the gentleman, although there is a great deal of weight in what he has to say and a great deal of logic, it would be much more effective in our relations with China if we would make more of an effort to find a way to get arms and equipment and airplanes into China to help win the war. That is what they are interested in. Everyone knows that if we do not do it they may not last another year. To me that is what the Chinese are interested in and not in any discussions here in the House on bills of this nature which affect our sovereign rights and which we propose to exert always in our own interests, regardless of the Chinese, the Japanese, Fascists, Nazis, or anyone else.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Under the law as it now exists, any one of these men and women, parents of these boys in the armed services, could follow the same procedure that every other foreigner has followed who has been naturalized heretofore?

Mr. FISH. There is not any question about it.

Mr. JENNINGS. And is this not the opening wedge of a general drive to tear down our exclusion laws and flood this country with aliens?

Mr. FISH. There are two other bills following this one. I do not know all the provisions of those bills, but in this bill we are doing something for those serving in our armed forces, those men who are fighting our battles in the front lines. Some of them are dying and some have already been killed. Does not the gentleman think that the father or mother of a boy who has been killed in our armed forces has some rights and some preferences? This is a mere preference. This does not make them citizens. This gives them a small advantage to become citizens. I am tired of lip service about what we are going to do for the boys in the service and not doing it when we have the opportunity.

However, I believe the bill should be carefully considered and amended.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another provision in this bill that I will never support and I will never support it in any bill in which it is placed. I refer to the concluding paragraph of this bill. I call the attention of every Member of this House, Republican and Democrat, to this language, because it is the most unsound, the most unwise, the most untrue, the most totally false statement that I know of. If true, one-haf of the Members of this House are traitors to their country. That last sentence reads this way:

> For the purposes of this section, the present war shall be deemed to have commenced on September 1, 1939, and shall continue until such time as the United States shall cease to be in a state of war.

Everybody knows that this war did not begin until the Congress of the United States, under the Constitution, declared war on December 8, 1941. No one else can declare war. Yet in this bill we change the date of the declaration of war and we say for the purpose of this act that the present war shall be deemed to have commenced on September 1, 1939. If that is written into the law all of you Members who tried to stay out of this war are traitors to your country, if we now say that this war began over 2 years before, or on September 1, 1939.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In the first place, no one could get us into war except the Congress of the United States.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. In the second place, the platforms of both political parties in 1940 contained statements that we should remain out of the war.

Mr. FISH. Do everything short of war.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. They provided that we were going to stay out of war, and both candidates for the Presidency, Mr. Willkie and Mr. Roosevelt, stated that we were going to stay out of the war and not send our boys abroad.

Mr. FISH. Again, and again, and again. Now, this committee wants us to change the date of the war.

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for the Congress to consider bills of this kind without a great deal of emotion and sentiment and perhaps prejudice. I have always been inclined—I do not know

what I will do on the other two bills, but I have always tried to do something for the servicemen who are fighting our battles. We do not make their parents citizens by this bill. We just let them waive the first papers. That is all. They must be in this country legally. They must comply with all our laws. It bars Communists and Nazis and Fascists. It merely waives the first papers. But they must be in this country legally, and if there is any doubt about it, let us amend the bill so that there can be no mistake that they must be legally in this country and not in some foreign land.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman enlighten us as to why the date September 1, 1939, was put in there in any event?

Mr. FISH. I must ask some member of the Committee on Immigration, because I am merely an humble member of the Rules Committee and have no knowledge of the reason. I cannot imagine what was in their minds. We do not want the parents of those who were in 1 or 2 years before we went to war to be given any preference. I only want to give these benefits to those who are fighting our battles, after the Congress declared war. That is what the bill does, except with reference to this date.

Mr. CELLER. Perhaps it has something to do with the Selective Training and Service Act?

Mr. FISH. I am for this bill in principle, but unless it is amended I will oppose it. I will oppose it certainly if this date, September 1939, is not stricken out. This reflects on 100,000,000 people in America, or 80 percent of our people, who tried to keep out of war or were opposed to going into war until we were attacked by the Japs at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. I just want to supply information in answer to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] in reference to inserting the date, September 1939: That is when Hitler ordered the beginning of the march into Poland, and I suppose that accounts for that date.

Mr. FISH. As I understand, at that time certain nations were guaranteeing the territorial integrity of Poland, and now some nations are talking about taking away a third of Poland.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] that if you are going to move the date back to September 1939, as the date the war began, for God's sake let us move it back to the time Mussolini invaded Ethiopia.

Mr. FISH. I do not think the gentleman goes far enough; it would be better to go back to the time Hitler came to power, in 1933.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

In view of the fact that one of the purposes of the bill is to do justice to those in the armed forces, many who are fighting in Africa, in New Guinea, and the far Pacific, in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, let me refer to the fact that 24 American bombers were lost last night, involving probably a loss of 240 men, many of whom were officers. I would like to take this occasion to ask some member of the House Military Affairs Committee what is being done to draft the 840,000 men on the Government pay rolls away from their desks here in Washington or elsewhere into the armed forces of the United States? While we are discussing now doing something for those who are already in, what are we doing to put some 840,000 who are qualified to serve in the armed forces, but who are now holding soft, safe jobs in the Government? Are we going on to the 10th of July and adjourn without doing something about that? Are we not competent to consider that? Are we going to wash our hands like Pontius Pilate; are we going to remain silent now and let these slackers hide away in Government dugouts. If I had my way, I do not care if the individual involved were a Cabinet officer, if he were 40 years old or younger, or an undersecretary of a department, or anyone else, because the higher the official position the more reason he should set an example. I would see that he was called into the service without further delays or deferments. I understand 89,000 deferments have been granted to Federal employees and that is exactly 89,000 too many.

Mr. Speaker, let us do something about this before we adjourn if we want to give encouragement to the men in service. There should be not one single deferment given to any of the bureaucrats or men on the Government pay roll except for physical disability.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the discussion of this rule, to what is being said, which, when printed, becomes public property susceptible of being used in the world-wide propaganda battles being carried on. This bill ought not to be considered now. The rule ought not to be adopted. It ought to be the general policy now to avoid the consideration of items of legislation not important, not emergency, but provocative utterances on the floor of the House calculated to disturb the good accord existing between this country and the rest of the countries with whom we are fighting this World War. That is fundamentally sound.

With reference to this particular item of legislation, it is urged that we must do this for the men who are fighting on our side, must give to their alien parents an opportunity to become citizens of this country without filing the application to become citizens required now by our law. All other applicants are required to file an application and presumably for good reasons. I would like to stress this. You cannot tell me that the observations that have already been made on the floor of this House and those that will probably be made if this rule is voted upon will tend to strengthen the good accord between this country and China, for instance, or even such loyal Japanese as we may have in this country. What is the use of this sort of business?

Here are men among our armed forces with parents who are not American citizens. These soldiers have the same interest in preserving liberty for themselves and their parents that other soldiers have. We have a good system now for the people who desire to become citizens of this country, assuming they are in this country. What is the use of disturbing that now? What is the hurry about it? Is there any reason why any man who is fit to be an American citizen should not be grateful for the opportunity of his parents to be in this country, if they are here now, who otherwise would be abroad—who are here now and are protected and are being offered citizenship if they comply with the requirements of the law? The men who are fighting on our side in this war, whom we have admitted to citizenship, will not be offended if we in America do not disturb this situation during the war, or if we adopt the policy I have suggested of leaving in status quo these relatively unimportant controversial matters until we shall have won the war. It is time to watch our step all along the line. There is much loose, inconsiderate talk; things said in the heat of debate might be used to much disadvantage in these dangerous times of great nerve stress everywhere. Too much talk. There are some people who know all about what we should do after the war. They have everything figured out, talking their heads off—a world remade on paper in their own private libraries. All sorts of arguments are going on and all sorts of advantages are being taken of the fact we are at war, in order to promote various pet theories, some of them to the great hurt of our own solidarity.

The great dominating purpose in America now should be to win this war. It is not won yet. We not only should avoid doing hurt to solidarity and good accord with our fighting allies but avoid the premature consideration of things calculated to provoke internal bickering and discord. Our smart boys ought to restrain themselves in some of their talking as far as possible until we win the war. It is a pity that in the distribution of intelligence, a few people were given what others do not have, the wisdom to penetrate the curtain of battle smoke that enshrouds the earth and know now what the resources of the world are going to be, and who is going to sit at the head of the council table. It is all right to be thinking about these things, but the principal thing for all of us to concentrate on now is not post-war, but winning the war, keeping all

controversial and distracting things out of the picture until the war is won. The psychological reaction that every time we take a little island in the neighborhood of Italy we are winning this war is bad.

The psychology that we are bound to win this war is bad. It is much like a political campaign. The Members here know something about that. There is no psychology on earth more dangerous than that you have got a political cinch. The same thing is true in war. The best psychology on earth when you have a fight on your hands is that you are fighting a dangerous foe and could lose. There is no vitalizing unifying force like that. All this talk about what we are going to do after the war as though we had it all but won, is not good. These items of legislation in here, calculated to provoke dangerous controversies and dangerous utterances, are not good. We are at war. We must make ourselves, the American people, conscious of our danger. We should stop going around peddling the idea that we are bound to win this war. We must be careful here where unfortunate words spoken may do irreparable hurt. I hope I am not appearing as though I am trying to lecture anybody. I was never more certain of a thing in my life than that we ought to adopt a general policy in the Congress of holding in status quo things such as this bill proposes to deal with, and many others, until we get through this war.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], a member of the committee.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I should like, if I can, to clarify things a little. The only intention of the committee in proposing this legislation was to give to noncitizen parents of boys now serving in our armed forces the right to an immediate hearing for citizenship if they want such hearing. It is said that these parents feel there is a sort of stigma against them as alien enemies, or at least, as aliens, yet their own sons are fighting in our forces in all parts of the world just the same as sons of American citizens. That is the intention of the bill, and we will amend it if necessary with that in mind. If you do not think this is the kind of legislation you want in this country, good and well; vote against it; but let us go at this thing sanely and not get all excited about it; and let us not misunderstand the intent and purpose of the bill as we go along.

I appreciate the statement the gentleman from Texas made just now and I would go even further than he did: There are a lot of things we can put off until after this war is over that we are doing these days; but that is another question. The thing for us to bear in mind now is whether we want this particular legislation or whether we do not.

This legislation does not confer any immediate citizenship on these people; they have to make application and have a hearing in court just the same as has always been the case. The only thing this bill provides is that they do not have to file declarations of intention. They do, however, have to file petitions, to go into court and have exactly the same kind of hearing as anybody else who makes application. Their applications are investigated just the same as anybody else's and they have the same kind of hearing. Then the court decides whether they should become citizens or not. From the discussion here today one would think that the mere passage of this legislation would make these people citizens. This is not correct at all. The bill just states that they may come in now if they are qualified rather than wait 2 years to have the hearing; that is all. We have similar legislation on the statute books at the present time providing that certain other groups may do that same thing. I am certainly not in favor of letting the bars down on this immigration question. I do not think this legislation does it. If I thought so, I would oppose it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members to the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] with reference particularly to the date September 1, 1939. Public Law 507 passed in the Seventy-seventh Congress for the purpose of dealing with American-born boys who served in the Canadian and English Armies is based on the date September 1, 1939. As far as the date is concerned I assure the gentleman that we could just as well make it December 8, 1941.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Does not the gentleman think it wiser to wait until the war is over before we take up these questions of citizenship?

Mr. LESINSKI. As far as citizenship is concerned I assure the gentleman that these people have worked on farms, in sawmills, and coal mines and did not have the advantages of people living in cities. That is the reason for this bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

BILL PREMATURELY BEFORE THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is prematurely before the House. Its provisions are asked for on the basis of honorable service by the sons of these people who would be naturalized. We will not know whether or not their services have been honorable until the war is over. Under this bill, if enacted into law, a young man enters the service today, his parents may apply for naturalization tomorrow and possibly after naturalization—I am not presuming this will happen, but it is possible—that young man could be dishonorably discharged for sabotage of the war effort, yet the parents would be and would remain naturalized citizens of the United States. There is no way to tell or to determine whether or not the service of one during this way has been honorable until the service has been performed, and it will not be performed until this war is over. The exact language of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 801. Any person not a citizen of the United States whose son or daughter is a citizen of the United States and has served or is serving honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war and who, if separated from such service, was separated under honorable conditions, may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of the naturalization laws, except that no declaration of intention shall be required, and the provisions of section 326 of this act shall not apply to a petition filed under this section: *Provided*, That the petition is filed not later than 1 year after the termination of the present war. For the purposes of this section, the present war shall be deemed to have commenced on September 1, 1939, and shall continue until such time as the United States shall cease to be in a state of war.

ONLY BILLS THAT WILL AID WAR EFFORT SHOULD BE BROUGHT IN BY THIS COMMITTEE

I regret that the committee brings in bills of this type during the war. I think there is one major bill that should be considered and that is a bill that will aid in the prosecution of the war. I refer to the bill to amend the Chinese Exclusion Act. If this Congress fails to take the action that is necessary to cultivate good will with China and then Japan succeeds in getting more Chinese soldiers on her side—she has 2,000,000 on her side now—and eventually wins China over and we lose a lot of men over there by reason of that, the parents of these young men who are lost will possibly blame the Congress for not cultivating good will with China and keeping China in the war when it was possible for her to help do our fighting.

Since this bill is not in aid of the prosecution of the war it should not be brought up until after the war is over.

RULE SHOULD BE DEFEATED

Mr. Speaker, I hope the rule on this bill is defeated and at the same time I hope serious consideration will be given to the bill that will aid in the prosecution of the war and that is the bill to amend the Chinese Exclusion Act. I believe that is a very serious matter and I know that all the parents in this country who have sons in the service would like to see China do all the fighting that China wants to do. We cannot expect to have her do that fighting unless we cultivate good will and keep China in the war. As long as that act remains upon the statute books unchanged the Japanese can use it to very fine advantage in propagandizing China and creating prejudice against the United States, eventually causing an alliance between China and Japan which we want to prevent if we can.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Does the gentleman go so far in his opinion as to believe that we ought to grant to Orientals the right to come here and become citizens?

Mr. PATMAN. I am willing to help China now. We need China in this war. I am not afraid of letting down the immigration bars on the quota basis so far as China is concerned. We can deal

with this problem as it arises, but we need to do something about it now.

Mr. DEWEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. I am particularly interested in the statement the gentleman from Texas has made in regard to establishing good relations with China. I wonder if the gentleman has considered the possible aftermath of the war. Here is a great country that is about to enter an industrial revolution, with four to five hundred million people, who have an economic situation complementary to our own. Winning the war is our No. 1 problem now.

Mr. PATMAN. We can deal with that problem when we get to it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself not only to this particular measure now before us but to two other bills that are scheduled to follow immediately, namely, H. R. 1291 and H. R. 1295. When I speak in opposition to these three measures I am not only speaking for myself but I am authorized to speak for the American Legion.

Any fair-minded person who looks back over our history of immigration and naturalization will, I believe, confess that it is more by dint of great good fortune than because of good sense and long-range planning that America has profited richly through its acquisition of peoples of foreign stock.

Even though we have had almost unlimited resources to develop, a tremendous industrial expansion to feed, and a vast geographical empire to absorb a rapid population growth, the evidence is plain that we have somewhat poorly assimilated the great mass of foreign peoples who have been attracted, for one reason or another, to seek a home in America.

The principal trouble is that we have not had a consistent, far-sighted national immigration policy. Personal and private interest, rather than the general welfare and the national interest, has been the guiding factor in such controls and restrictions as we have exercised. If there has ever been a national viewpoint expressed, it has been how fast can we absorb foreign stock economically, rather than in what volume can we assimilate newcomers ethnologically, socially, and politically. For several decades we have been rather proud to think of America as the "great melting pot" and have deluded ourselves in the belief that there was something in the American atmosphere which just automatically makes desirable, devoted, productive citizens from any kind of raw material.

That we have been wrong hardly needs argument, and it is no reflection on our foreign-born citizens or Americans of foreign stock who are so fully worthy of their citizenship to say so. Neither does it successfully contradict my viewpoint to offer in evidence the tremendous contributions which the comparative newcomers have made in every generation toward the growth and expansion of America. That is universally understood, and I know no reasonable person who does not gladly recognize the prominent part these men and women have taken in our development.

There still remains on the debit side of our immigration history a great many unsolved racial, social, and political problems and difficulties which are largely traceable to our failure to assimilate the immigrants we have admitted. You need look no further than these proposals we are now considering for the proof. As example, it is proposed here that we drop practically every qualifying requirement and grant citizenship almost automatically to aliens 50 years of age or over who have resided in this country since 1924. I say to you that there is something wrong with the individual or with the national policy, or something wrong with both, when we have to admit that there are aliens of long-term residence in America who cannot meet the childishly simple qualifying requirements we impose for citizenship. Any person who is so little interested or so mentally limited as to be unable after 20 years to speak, read, and write simple English, and to pass a mental examination that would be easy for any normal child of grade-school age seems to me to be hardly worthy of the precious privilege of American citizenship.

In opposing such purely sentimental proposals as this, I want to stress the fact that citizenship for the foreign born is indeed a privilege; and nothing more than a privilege. It is in no sense a right of any alien, but merely an opportunity which may be granted at the discretion of the American people in return for certain assurances, among them that the individual will offer his undivided loyalty and devotion to the country of his adoption, and that he may reasonably be expected to live as a self-supporting, productive unit in the national family of which he asks to become a part.

Wherever national, rather than private, interest has influenced our immigration and naturalization policies, I am afraid it has always been emotional, rather than rational. Keenly aware of our own priceless privileges and opportunities, we have always been generous in our willingness to share with peoples less fortunate. Now, when suffering, degradation, and despair are the lot of whole nations, compassion may very easily sway sound, far-sighted judgment. We already have numerous proposals to relax our restrictions, and will doubtless face a growing pressure to offer a haven to all suffering people.

We naturally want to deal as generously as possible, but we will be doing the world and ourselves a disservice if we forget for a minute that our first duty is to our own people, and our first responsibility is to insure our own security and welfare during the remainder of the war and the difficult readjustment period still ahead.

Mr. Speaker, this rule should be voted down, because the proposal is purely emotional, it does not help our national interest, it does not serve our country. We are at war. All of these proposals to amend our immigration and naturalization laws should be delayed until after the war when we can consider the problem in the light of conditions existing at that time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; I feel it is historically true that America has been blessed throughout her history by this intermixture of nationalities. Ours has been a glorious melting pot, but at times we have had too much "slag" in the pot. I think the gentleman is correct. Now is the time to call a halt and view this matter with great caution. Now the whole world wants to come here. We must guard the gates. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I want to make this observation to the gentleman. I do not like to disagree with the gentleman in what he says, because I recognize the gentleman as a very fine and able Member of this body. But here is a true fact: A Rumanian family or an Italian family, that may be just as loyal and patriotic as the gentleman or I am, is definitely labeled as alien enemies; are they not, right now? Here is a Rumanian father and mother who would not go back to Rumania and do not want to see any part of it, who have a son serving in our armed forces.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I decline to yield any further.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one-half additional minute.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Of course, many of these aliens are loyal and patriotic. The President, by Executive order, has excepted from the classification "alien enemy" all persons whom the Attorney General of the United States "shall, after investigation fully establishing their loyalty, certify as persons loyal to the United States." I can, therefore, see no good reason for the particular measure.

Mr. SADOWSKI. But they are labeled as enemy aliens.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I would not want to waive existing law as this bill would do, and give preference to this particular class of aliens. I hope that the rule will be defeated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, there are certain bills which in wartime should not be brought before the Congress of the United States for debate. This bill is one of them. The other two bills which are to follow this one, if the rule should be adopted, are of that class. The proposal to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act is another. To debate highly controversial bills of this kind in Congress

while we are at war is calculated to create disunity and dissension, both among ourselves and our allies, to a greater extent almost than anything else the Congress could do. No possible good can come to the people whom the legislation is supposed to benefit. On the other hand it may cause great harm to them.

I would not for anything in the world criticize any committee of this House, but I am going to take this occasion to be quite frank. I am going to speak about the general policy of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in respect to liberalizing the established requirements both for the immigration and naturalization of aliens. Those of you who have been here for a considerable time, as I have, cannot help being aware of the fact that year after year the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization has been continuously bringing to this House for its consideration bills which have had for their purpose the lowering of immigration and naturalization standards. I think definitely that this bill is one of them.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has just made a statement that this committee has brought in legislation letting down the bars. What about the Nationality Act of 1940? Has the gentleman read that measure?

Mr. MOTT. I did not say that the committee had never brought in good legislation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I understand that, but the implication as I gathered it was that the committee was trying to let down the bars.

Mr. MOTT. I simply stated as a fact, with which I believe a majority of the House will agree, that the general policy of this committee has been to let down or reduce the long-established and thoroughly tested immigration and naturalization requirements. I say that that has been the tendency. That tendency is plainly evident in this bill. That is the purpose of the bill and the rule on this bill, therefore, should be voted down.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DICKSTEIN) there were—ayes 33, noes 122.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the preferential motion that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DICKSTEIN) there were—ayes 106, noes 28.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 15, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, June 15, 1943, at 10 a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments. Room 46, old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10:30 a. m. on Tuesday, June 15, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 1388, to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes; H. R. 2697, to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior; H. R. 2818, to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914; H. R. 2819, to provide for the classification of the public lands in Alaska, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Tuesday, June 15, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear representatives of Office of Price Administration. (Hearings for June 9 canceled.)

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee on investigation of restrictions on brand names and newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Thursday, June 17, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear drug witnesses. On Friday, June 18, at 2 p. m., to hear newsprint and paper witnesses.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2620, a bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives of the United States, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m., on Wednesday, June 16, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings H. R. 2886, a bill to provide for the removal of oysters from the waters of York River and Queen Creek, Va., affected by the sewage disposal emanating from the construction battalion training camp at Camp Peary, Va., and for other purposes, on Thursday, June 17, 1943, at 10:30 a. m.

The subcommittee on unemployment insurance of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m., committee prints Nos. 1 and 2, dated June 7, 1943, relative to unemployment insurance for merchant seamen.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

490. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for killing or assaulting of Federal officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

491. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a survey of the Coosa River watershed in Georgia and Tennessee, made by this Department pursuant to the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 236); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARE: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2935. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SCANLON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 438. A bill for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskos; without amendment (Rept. No. 541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCANLON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1434. A bill for the relief of Anna M. Kohler; without amendment (Rept. No. 542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2134. A bill for the relief of Paul Szeliga; without amendment (Rept. No. 543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 2936. A bill to authorize the appropriation of an additional $200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title 11 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of

housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committe on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2937. A bill to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2938. A bill relating to placer mining claims for deposits of phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, or gas on the public domain; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2939. A bill to provide a uniform allowance for members of the Army Nurse Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2940. A bill to provide for the entry on the service record of each member of the land or naval forces of the United States a statement of prior service as a member of any home defense force; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 2941. A bill to provide that the compensation or pension to each veteran and each dependent of a deceased veteran under laws and veterans regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration shall be increased by $15 per month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 2942. A bill to reduce immigration and to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws, to place Chinese on a quota basis, and to repeal the laws denying Chinese the right to become citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2943. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

By Mr. HARE:

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making appropriations for advances to States for certain Federal grants for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LEWIS of Ohio:

H. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. Res. 259. Resolution authorizing the printing of Questions and Answers on the Tax Bill; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause I of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2944. A bill for the relief of Mike Chetkovich; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2945. A bill for the relief of the Bishopville Milling Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1553. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. S. E. Ellett and 160 citizens of San Bernardino, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1554. Also, petition of Lizzie E. McCarty and 20 citizens of San Diego, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1555. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and 55 citizens of La Grange, Ky., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1556. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and 64 citizens of Central, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1557. Also, petition of Mary B. Ives and 60 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1558. Also, petition of Rev. J. K. East and 87 citizens of Winfield, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1559. Also, petition of Rev. Charles A. Odahl and 22 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hines, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1560. Also, petition of Julia Braunbeck and 56 citizens of Conneaut, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1561. Also, petition of M. S. McClelland and 41 citizens of Santa Ana, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1562. Also, petition of Mrs. George G. Kauke and 52 citizens of Cambridge, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary to the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1563. Also, petition of Margaret S. Gray and 62 citizens of Honey Grove, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1564. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 107 citizens of the State of Iowa, urging support of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1565. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1566. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of Martin S. Swanson and 62 other residents of Winchester, Mass., favoring passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1567. By Mr. WELCH: Petition of the San Francisco Club, No. 2, of the Navy Mothers' Clubs of America, supporting Senate bill 1030, authorizing the issuance of a congressional charter to the Navy Mothers' Clubs of America which will enable the clubs all over the United States to carry on their most important work to a much better advantage among the men and families of the United States Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1568. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 20 residents of Bad Axe, Mich., urging that in the interest of reducing absenteeism, conserving manpower, and speeding production of war materials, the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic beverages in the United States be prohibited during the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1569. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the recording secretary general, Memorial Continental Hall, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to winning the war and Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.